UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 5

MARCH 10, 1966, TO MARCH 28, 1966
(PAGES 5495 TO 6872)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1966

J
11
.R
v.112
pt 5

Stacks
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
10-5-67

Congressional Record
United States of America
PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Maker of heaven and earth, by whom the innumerable worlds are sustained in illimitable space, we stand in awe of Thy divine majesty. But we stand in grateful adoration when we learn from Thee that Thou art mindful of man.

We pray that Thou wilt enable us to share something of this in Thy nature—that we, too, may be mindful of man. Our temptation is to be mindful of self, and unconcerned for man.

But we bless Thy name that the Founding Fathers of this Nation were concerned about human dignity and justice and liberty—that they were truly mindful of man.

We remember with gratitude the many acts of this body reflecting concern for human welfare. And we pray that there may always be in this honored place of high decision a concern for what happens to people as a result of legislation.

In this day of confused and conflicting counsel having to do with statistics—statistics in finance and education, in social movements and military strategy—we beseech Thee that the man may not be lost in the mass; but that always there may be wisdom and human concern that considers what happens to people.

So may there be something godlike in the actions and decisions of this day, something bearing witness that Thy servants in this honored place are mindful of man—even as Thou art mindful of us. In Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 9, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations for postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maj. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, U.S. Army, to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. *If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.*

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. ANDREW F. BRIMMER TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, recently the President nominated Dr. Andrew F. Brimmer as a Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. In view of the fact that Dr. Brimmer was eminently qualified for service on the Board, it gave me pleasure to conduct the hearing of the Banking and Currency Committee when his nomination was before us for action. The committee voted unanimously to recommend his confirmation. I was invited to attend the ceremonies in the historic East Room of the White House, at which the President not only emphasized his support of the operations of the Federal Reserve Board as an independent agency of the Government, but praised the new member of the Board in terms seldom exceeded for any Presidential appointee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the President's remarks at this ceremony.

There being no objection, the President's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SWEARING-IN CEREMONY OF ANDREW BRIMMER AS A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD, THE EAST ROOM

Mr. Brimmer, Mr. Vice President, members of the Brimmer family, Chairman Martin, members of the Federal Reserve Board, most distinguished guests, Members of Congress, ladies and gentleman, 33 years ago this week not a single bank in America was open for business. It was a time of depression and despair as Americans lost confidence not only in their dollar but in their system of Government itself.

Today all of that seems to be behind us. Our banking system is sound and there is confidence in the American dollar. Instead of depression or recession, we are beginning our sixth year of uninterrupted prosperity, the longest in America's peacetime history.

No accident of history brought about this change. It has come because we have learned the economic facts of life and we now realize that rescission and inflation are not inevitable. They can be avoided through sound economic fiscal policies. It has come because we have learned how we can work together cooperating with each other for the benefit of all the people of our land.

The great abundance of America is the result of responsible cooperation between business and banking, between labor and Government. No member of that partnership, from Government's viewpoint, is more important or has greater responsibilities than the Federal Reserve System of this country. The seven distinguished Governors of the Federal Reserve System share the task of deciding how much money and credit should be supplied to America's economy and that, ladies and gentlemen, is no easy burden.

The entire Nation, every worker and every housewife, every businessman and every farmer, is affected by the progressive spirit and the wisdom and the prudence of the men who sit on that Board.

In the choice of those men who sit there, the President of the United States has no more far-reaching decision to make. Today the Federal Reserve System of our Nation has a new Governor. I am proud of this choice. His qualifications, I think, are rare. For if it is true, as some have said, that not one man in 100,000 really understands the complexity of high finance and monetary policy, Dr. Andrew Brimmer is one that, I believe, does understand it.

He has been both student and teacher in major universities on both the east and west coasts of this land. He worked for several years in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York City. He is a doctor of economics from Harvard, a professor of economics on leave from Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania to serve in the little cabinet as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs in the important Department of Commerce.

He was also in charge of the voluntary program carried out by the businessmen of America which has done so much to correct our balance-of-payments problems by reducing our deficit from $2.8 billion last year to $1.3 billion this year.

Dr. Brimmer was born on a farm in the State of Louisiana. His achievements in life are his own. Through his own intelligence and by his own efforts he rose to the highest academic honors. In the process, he developed a deep feeling for Americans in every walk of life. He is still a young man at age 39.

Last month, in fact, he received the Arthur S. Flemming Award which is presented to the 10 outstanding young men in Government service. I don't know of a recommendation that I have received from any man in Government that was stronger than the recommendation Secretary Connor made of Dr. Brimmer and the work that he had done in the Commerce Department.

So, ladies and gentlemen, Dr. Brimmer brings energy and high professional standards, profound qualities of heart and mind to one of the most critical assignments in our public life today. He will recognize the challenges as they arise and I hope he will help us face them with intelligence, with knowledge, and with moderation.

I do not expect Dr. Brimmer to be an easy-money man or a tight-money man. He knows, as I think we all do, that the complexity of today's economy defies such a simple and rigid qualification. I expect Dr. Brimmer to be a right-money man, one who, I believe, will carefully and cautiously and intelligently evaluate the Nation's needs and the needs of all of its people and recommend the policies which his conscience and his judgment tells him will best serve the national interest.

He takes office at a time when there is much to be done by all working together, cooperating. We must continue to sustain high employment without inflation. We must complete the adjustment of our balance of payments with other nations. We must meet the heavy demands of our military and economic effort in Vietnam without losing our momentum for social progress here at home.

To achieve all of this is not going to be easy. It is going to be difficult. It is going to try the best that is in all of us. The decisions are going to be many and they are going to be difficult, but I think that the people of America can all be glad that Dr. Andrew Brimmer will be helping us to make them.

So I welcome each of you to this historic East Room this morning to witness the swearing in of this most gifted American to this most responsible post.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 2573. A bill to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1061).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1062); and

H.R. 10553. An act to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships (Rept. No. 1063).

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1064); and

H.R. 8030. An act to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1065).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 2719. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia (Rept. No. 1066);

S. 2831. A bill to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa. (Rept. No. 1067); and

S. 2835. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association (Rept. No. 1068).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated February 28, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 3072. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to prohibit threatening and harassing telephone communications; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3073. A bill for the relief of Teresina Del Toro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3074. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration cemetery at Houston, Tex., as the "Albert Thomas Veterans' Memorial Cemetery"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York):

S. 3075. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROHIBITION OF THREATENING AND HARASSING TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the telephone in recent years has become an essential part of most American homes. It provides a necessary means of communication in modern society. It is relied upon to seek help in emergencies; it is relied upon to conduct business; and it is relied upon to visit with friends. However, the telephone also provides a means for other persons to invade the privacy of the home. Telephone companies estimate that an annual average of 375,000 complaints are filed of abusive telephone calls that threaten, harass, or torment the recipient.

No person should have to tolerate this invasion of his home—this invasion of his privacy. Many States have enacted legislation to prohibit abusive use of the telephone but a good number have not. The Federal Government has undertaken through the Federal Communications Act to establish a comprehensive scheme of regulation of the telephone system. Thus, it seems fully appropriate that Federal action be taken to curtail this major abuse. In doing so, I see no reason to limit the scope of the action to interstate calls since the misuse of the telephone system is equally great when the call is intrastate. Many of our large metropolitan areas like Washington sit astride State lines. There seems no logic whatsoever in distinguishing between calls made between Virginia and the District and calls made completely in the District. The harm to the citizen is the same and the abuse of the telephone system is the same.

It is easy to give examples of the types of calls that should be outlawed. However when one attempts to draft legislative language the task is quite troublesome. Use of the telephone is closely tied to freedom of speech. It would be unwise, I believe, to place too severe limitations on the use of the telephone. As a general rule, persons who visit with each other on the telephone should be free to express themselves as they please. Otherwise, we would be faced with a law which as a practical matter could not be enforced. Also, too strict language could impose a danger to legitimate collection efforts and legitimate complaints as to business or government actions. We certainly do not want to impede the use of the telephone as a free and open means of communication.

In an effort to curtail abuses of the telephone system without unduly hampering legitimate use, I am introducing a bill that would make unlawful only those telephone calls which threaten physical injury, harass, or torment. In my opinion, the provision as to calls that harass or torment would cover obscene calls whether they were overtly obscene or only suggestive. It also would cover calls where nothing is said but are made at all hours of the day and night.

The bill distinguishes between threatening calls and harassing calls. It reaches one telephone call in which physical injury to another is threatened. However, repeated harassing or tormenting calls would have to be made by a person or by others acting in his behalf to a party before he would be subject to prosecution for such calls. Thus, one abusive call could be made without violating the law but the second call would bring the bill into play. While this leaves considerable possibilities for abuse of the telephone system I believe it necessary to prevent abuse of freedom of communication.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3072) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to prohibit threatening and harassing telephone communications, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ALBERT THOMAS OF TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to designate the Veterans' Administration cemetery at Houston, Tex., the "Albert Thomas Veterans' Memorial Cemetery."

Mr. Thomas was always a trusted friend and an able colleague. His long and hard-earned record of public service speaks for itself. He was born in Nacogdoches, Tex., in 1898, and attended public schools there. Service as an Army lieutenant during the First World War interrupted his undergraduate schooling, but after the war he returned and received a B.A. from Rice Institute in Houston. Thereafter, he was graduated from the University of Texas School of Law in 1926.

Upon his return to Nacogdoches, he was elected to the office of the district and county attorney. Later, he was appointed to be the assistant U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas where he served until 1936.

Since 1936, Albert Thomas has served more than 29 years as the Representative of the people of the Eighth District of Texas. During that time, he has shown that hard work and integrity are their own rewards. Through the years, his efforts have yielded benefits both for the people of his district and of the Nation, as well. His work is reflected in projects such as the Manned Space Center in Houston; in solutions to the problems of flood control in the coastal areas of Texas; and in the improvement of the Houston navigable ports and harbors which serve the entire Southwest. Indeed, the very cemetery to be named by this bill is a product of Mr. Thomas' unending efforts, and I feel that the tribute proposed here today is but slight recompense for the debt this country owes this fine statesman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3074) to designate the Veterans' Administration cemetery at Houston, Tex., as the "Albert Thomas Veterans' Memorial Cemetery," introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEVELOPMENT, PRESERVATION, AND RESTORATION OF RESOURCES OF THE HUDSON RIVER

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Hudson River is one of our truly great resources offering immense economic, natural, scenic and recreational value to all our citizens.

Historically, the Hudson has made invaluable contributions to the full development of this country, and particularly the entire Northeast. But today, after years of exploitation and abuse, this mighty river has been overrun by uncontrolled urban and industrial growth until now it stands merely in the shadow of its former greatness. We must act now to restore and preserve the Hudson so that we may continue to enjoy her full resources.

A number of exciting and imaginative proposals have been made to rejuvenate the Hudson riverway and its surrounding lands. Last September I was happy to introduce a bill to establish a Hudson National Scenic Riverway. During this session of Congress, the President in his messages on clean rivers and conservation committed his administration to a major effort to revitalize our riverways and make them more habitable and more navigable.

Today, I am delighted to introduce a bill, along with the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], which recognizes that some sort of interim protection must be granted to the Hudson riverway while we develop the detailed plans which are necessary for long-range development of this beautiful area. This legislation, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to review all actions of the Federal Government which could adversely affect the natural resources of the Hudson River and surrounding shoreline, is a vitally needed measure. It will provide the necessary guarantees for maintaining the Hudson riverway in its current condition until the States of New Jersey and New York can work out the details of a bistate compact for congressional approval.

I look forward to early hearings on this crucial legislation so that the safeguards contained in the bill can be put into effect as quickly as possible. Moreover, the hearing process will bring to light any modifications in language which might prove useful or facilitate administration of the act for the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3075) to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am glad to join Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey in introducing this legislation, and I am glad to join Congressman OTTINGER and the more than 30 Congressmen who are introducing a similar bill in the other body today. Congressman OTTINGER has been a leader in working on the conservation of the Hudson, and I am pleased to be associated with him in that effort. He has played a major role not just in the drafting of the bill we propose today, but also in the entire fight to preserve the Hudson for us and our children.

It is critical that we develop as soon as possible a comprehensive Federal-State program, perhaps by way of an interstate compact, to restore and preserve the beauty of the Hudson and to clean and purify its waters. The States of New York and New Jersey, and the Federal Government through Secretary Udall and other officials, have indicated their commitment to accomplish this.

Nevertheless, it is imperative that there be no further encroachment on the beauty of the Hudson and no further waste of its resources while the States and the Federal Government are developing a cooperative approach. The purpose of the legislation we introduce today is to prevent such encroachment from occurring, as well as to put Congress on record in favor of a joint State-Federal program to conserve the Hudson.

I am not irretrievably committed to the particular and detailed provisions of the moratorium which the bill provides. What I am committed to is the long-range preservation and development of the Hudson and the immediate prevention of further encroachment while a long-range program is being developed.

In pursuit of the long-range goal, I introduced last year S. 1386, which would have created a national scenic riverway on one particularly scenic section of the Hudson. Today's bill would encourage the preservation and development of the entire Hudson and would provide interim protection for the entire Hudson.

What the exact, final features of that interim protection are to be can be explored by way of hearings. There are many ways in which the present proposal can be varied to secure the agreement of everyone concerned without interfering with the overall purpose to prevent further encroachments while a long-range plan is evolving. All of the possibilities can and should be explored by way of hearings.

The basic points, I would emphasize, are that we must encourage quick development of a long-range plan for the preservation of the Hudson, and we must insure that further encroachments on its beauty do not occur while we are developing such a program. Those are the purposes of the bill we introduce today. We can develop and perfect those purposes as we proceed with the consideration of the bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL CONVENTION WITH THE NETHERLANDS RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME AND CERTAIN OTHER TAXES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Senate today Executive B, 89th Congress, 2d session, a supplemental convention, signed at Washington on December 30, 1965, modifying and supplementing the convention between the United States and the Netherlands with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes signed at Washington on April 29, 1948. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the convention; that the convention and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the supplementary convention, signed at Washington on December 30, 1965, modifying and supplementing the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes signed at Washington on April 29, 1948.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

The imposition and collection of taxes upon the same income by both the United States and a foreign country may, and often do, result in double taxation of a severe character. Such double taxation is an undesirable impediment to international trade and economic development. An income tax convention is an important step toward removing double taxation, either by reciprocal exemptions in prescribed situations or by the allowance against the taxes of one of the countries of a credit for taxes paid to the other country with respect to the same income.

Income tax conventions are presently in force between the United States and 22 other countries, including the Netherlands. Conventions of this kind concluded with three additional countries are presently under consideration in the Senate. From time to time revisions are made in these conventions in the light of changes in tax systems or policies and of experience in the administrative application of the conventions.

The supplementary convention with the Netherlands would make substantial revisions in the 1948 convention, now in force as modified by supplementary protocols of 1955 and 1963. The revisions will result in benefits for taxpayers, whether individuals or corporations, of one of the countries receiving income from sources in the other country. These benefits will arise from improvements in the convention whereby it will be modernized and brought more closely into line with more recent income tax conventions concluded by the United States, also reflecting certain principles expressed in the model income tax convention proposed by an Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

One of the principal purposes of the supplementary convention is to modify the provisions on dividends in order to make it possible for the Government of the Netherlands, in the case of dividends derived from Netherlands sources by U.S. residents and corporations, to impose withholding tax on such dividends at rates corresponding to those which the United States may impose under the existing convention with respect to dividends paid by U.S. corporations to Netherlands residents or corporations. Article V of the supplementary convention, containing the revisions for this purpose, thus is designed to assure reciprocal treatment with respect to dividends.

The scope of the exemption for professors or teachers of either country who perform teaching or research functions at an educational institution in the other country would be expanded by article X of the supplementary convention. Likewise, the scope of the exemption for students and business apprentices would be expanded by article XI of the supplementary convention, so that, instead of being applicable only to remittances received from abroad for the purpose of maintenance or studies, the exemption would extend also to gifts received from abroad, to certain grants, allowances, and awards, and to income from personal services up to certain amounts.

Important revisions are made also in the provisions regarding interest, royalties, and capital gains. Article VI would provide for a reciprocal exemption of interest, not including interest from mortgages secured by real property. Article VII would expand the definition of what constitutes royalties for the purposes of the provisions on this subject. Article VIII would provide for reciprocal tax exemption, with certain exceptions, for capital gains other than those arising from the sale of real property.

Other revisions, effecting useful modifications in the convention, relate to a variety of subjects. Article I amends the definitions of "United States" and "permanent establishment." Article II amends the provisions dealing with taxation of industrial and commercial profits derived in one of the countries by an enterprise of the other country. Article III modifies the rule authorizing allocation of income among related enterprises. Article IV modifies the provisions regarding income derived from real property so as to exclude from their application interest from mortgages secured by real property and to provide that mineral royalties may be taxed in the country where the mine, quarry, or natural resource giving rise to the royalty is located. Article VIII A modifies the "governmental salaries" provisions by limiting the exemption for compensation and pensions paid by one of the countries or its political subdivisions to an individual in the other country so as to apply only to compensation and pensions paid to a citizen of the paying country for services rendered to that country or its political subdivision in the discharge of governmental functions. Article IX makes drafting changes in the provision dealing with personal services and expands the class of persons for whom the employee may work and be able to take advantage of the specified exemption. Article XII makes improvements in the provisions dealing with the relief afforded by each country against double taxation. Article XIII amends the provisions under which a taxpayer can initiate consideration of his case if a problem of double taxation is involved. Article XIV broadens the nondiscrimination provision by making it applicable to a permanent establishment which a citizen or corporation of one of the countries has in the other country as well as to corporations the capital of which is wholly or partly owned by citizens or corporations of the other country. Article XV provides that, so far as the Kingdom of the Netherlands is concerned, the supplementary convention shall apply only to that part of the kingdom situated in Europe. Article XVI contains the provisions regarding ratification, exchange of instruments of ratification, and entry into force.

The supplementary convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury. I recommend that the Senate give it early and favorable consideration.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *March 10, 1966.*

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] be added as a cosponsor of the special school milk bill, S. 2921.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of February 23, 1966, the names of Mr. Dominick, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Saltonstall were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2969) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McIntyre (for himself and other Senators) on February 23, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, last week the administration's bill to establish a Department of Transportation was introduced and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. This proposal, to create a 12th Cabinet Department, is complex and comprehensive. It seeks to bring together transportation functions and activities now carried on by some 35 existing departments and agencies. The proposed new department would, under the terms of the pending bill, have a budget of $6.2 billion, and almost 95,000 personnel. This would rank it fifth in size, in terms of budgets of the executive departments, and fourth in terms of personnel.

It is an ambitious proposal affecting numerous Government activities which touch the lives of many of our citizens and major industries. There is thus widespread interest in this proposed legislation.

In view of this interest, hearings on the proposal will be conducted by the full Committee on Government Operations, with Senator Abraham Ribicoff, chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, serving as cochairman. The initial hearings will be held on March 29 and 30, at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons interested in testifying or filing a statement on this legislation should contact the Clerk of the Committee on Government Operations, room 3304, New Senate Office Building.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 10, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1666) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of death of Hon. John F. Baldwin, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Mills, Mr. King of California, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Keogh, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Utt were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12889) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1666) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SCHOOL MILK MEANS TEST WOULD BE HARSH IN SMALL TOWNS AS WELL AS LARGE CITIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the administration's proposed Child Nutrition Act would, as I have stated so often before on this floor, cut the special milk program for schoolchildren by 80 percent. It would do so by providing milk only to needy children or those who attend a school which does not have a lunch program.

By restricting 50 percent of the funds which would be made available under the proposed legislation to the needy the administration is promoting the kind of means test which was so roundly criticized when it was applied to our senior citizens as a prerequisite to medical assistance.

The Department of Agriculture claims that these means tests are not really means tests at all, generally speaking, but determinations made on a subjective and humane basis by homeroom teachers and school nurses. When I showed that this was not the case at all in our large cities—that a means test was, indeed, used, the Department said that large cities might find it necessary to use a means test because of the teachers' lack of knowledge of home conditions in such an impersonal environment. However, the Department felt that this was not true in smaller towns.

A few days ago I received a number of forms from small Missouri towns that required just as much information as the large city forms on the financial condition of parents whose children were applying for free school lunches. These towns were Essex-Gray Ridge, Hickman Mills, East Madison, Sturgeon, Mill Creek, Sikeston, and Eugene. These can hardly be classed as large, impersonal towns. Essex has a population of 511, Madison a population of 528. Sikeston is the largest town on the list, with a population of more than 13,000, but many of these towns are so small they are not listed in the Rand McNally Road Atlas.

I think these materials, which are available in my office for anyone who wishes to examine them, demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that a tough objective means test that would be repugnant to many parents is now used in the school lunch program and would be used in the school milk program if the new proposal is put into effect. I do not object to using a means test to determine who should receive free milk. I do object to withdrawing all Federal support for school milk purchases unless the child can prove he or she is needy enough to get free milk.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FHA IGNORES ADVERSE RECOMMENDATIONS OF LOCAL UNDERWRITERS AND APPRAISERS IN APPROVING MULTIFAMILY HOUSING PROJECT IN HOUSTON

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to another FHA multifamily housing project wherein again the adverse recommendations of the local underwriters and appraisers were completely ignored. This time the local director overrode the local underwriters and supported by the Washington headquarters, ordered the approval of a project referred to as the Clarewood House, Houston, Tex., which was built with a $4,700,000, 100-percent, Government-guaranteed, 40-year mortgage.

Last year I referred to the Comptroller General certain allegations concerning the handling of this project, and on February 23, 1966, he submitted his report to the Congress.

The Comptroller General in his report confirms these allegations and strongly condemns the local director for his arbitrary action and the Washington headquarters for sustaining his decisions.

The Comptroller General criticized the local director for arbitrarily increasing the appraised value of the land by $237,500 above the appraisal of the underwriters.

Secondly, the director is criticized for having approved this project on the basis that it was financially sponsored by the First Methodist Church, Houston, Tex., thereby eligible for a 100-percent FHA guaranteed mortgage to cover its entire construction. At the same time the director knew that the First Methodist Church, Houston, was not and had no intention of sponsoring the project; however, claiming this church as a sponsor made the promoters eligible for a $1.2 million higher mortgage with 100-percent Federal guarantee.

Mr. Neal Pickett, the director of the Houston office, knew at the time of the approval that the church was not accepting responsibility for the project. The local underwriters and appraisers had all warned Mr. Pickett that the tax-exempt status of the project would be rejected by the State since it was without church sponsorship.

To illustrate what this one decision cost the Government I quote from page 17 of the Comptroller General's report:

> We do not know whether the county attorney's opinion would have been the same when the mortgage commitment was issued in August 1962; however, the effect of local taxes on the amount of mortgage debt a project's rental income can support is significant. In the case of this project, had local taxes, which we estimate to be about $80,000 annually, been considered as an item of expense, project net income including the increased rental rates would, under FHA procedures, have supported a mortgage of about $3.5 million rather than a mortgage of $4.7 million which was insured by FHA.

Thus this decision gave the sponsors a $1,200,000 Government guarantee on a mortgage to which they would not have been entitled had the director not deliberately concealed the fact that the church was not a sponsor.

There can be no question but that the director was aware of the lack of church sponsorship at the time he approved the commitment over the objections of all his own underwriters. Furthermore, if, as claimed, the Washington headquarters was not aware of this situation, it can only mean that the director deliberately withheld from his Washington superiors information which, had it been known, would either have resulted in the project's rejection or if approved would have reduced the Government commitment by $1,200,000.

Let us examine the record.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter addressed to me dated February 23, 1966, signed by Mr. Frank H. Weitzel, Acting Comptroller General.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
> UNITED STATES,
> *Washington, D.C., February 23, 1966.*
>
> Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
> *U.S. Senate.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Herewith is a copy of a report to the Congress on our review of certain aspects of the approval by the Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, of mortgage insurance on a 40-year, $4.7 million mortgage for the "Clarewood House" housing project for the elderly located in Houston, Tex. Our review was made pursuant to the request expressed in your letter to us dated February 24, 1964.
>
> Our review indicates that the approval of mortgage insurance for this project in November 1962 was contrary to the agency's prescribed policy because the project did not have the long-term support of a sponsoring organization having a recognized interest in providing housing for the elderly and having demonstrated reliability, substance, and ability to give reasonable assurance of the successful continuity of the project throughout the term of the mortgage. Also, we are of the opinion, in view of the information available, that agency officials' action in establishing a land valuation for insuring purposes which was substantially higher than the valuation determined by the agency's technical staff appraisers was questionable and their action in increasing estimated project rental income over the rental income anticipated by the mortgagor was not adequately supported. These actions resulted in a larger insured mortgage and thereby increased the risk of loss to the Government in the event the project is not successful.
>
> In addition, our review showed that, as a result of the agency's assumption that the project would be exempt from local taxation, the mortgage which the agency insured was over $1 million more than the amount that would have been insurable had local taxes been considered as an item of project expense. Some time after the approval of insurance for the $4.7 million mortgage, the county attorney concluded that the project would be subject to local taxes, which we estimate will amount to about $80,000 annually.
>
> We do not know whether the county attorney's opinion would have been the same when the mortgage commitment was issued. However, as the effect of local taxes on the amount of mortgage debt a project's rental income can support is significant and, because we found that many other mortgages on housing projects for the elderly were insured on a tax-exempt basis, we proposed that the agency revise its procedures to require that, in determining the mortgage amount to be insured, local taxes be considered as an item of expense unless an appropriate legal officer of the State or locality furnished an opinion that the project appeared to be exempt from local taxation. We were subsequently advised by agency officials that its procedures would be revised to strengthen controls in this area in accordance with our proposal.
>
> In commenting on the matters presented in this report, the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration expressed the opinion that, although the agency's processing of the project was confused and, in some respects, poorly handled, the action taken resulted in a proper mortgage and a sound sponsorship. The Commissioner's comments have been recognized in the body of the report. In addition, the comments of the mortgagor for the project are recognized in the report.
>
> Housing projects for the elderly owned by nonprofit mortgagors are eligible for insured mortgages generally equal to 100 percent of the construction cost. Therefore, the owners of such projects are generally required to invest little or no equity capital in their projects. In such circumstances we believe that the risk of loss to the Government is greater than that encountered under other insurance programs where project mortgages are insured for less than 100 percent of the cost and the owners are required to invest some of their own capital. Accordingly, we are recommending that the Commissioner stress the importance to agency officials of close adherence to existing procedures and requirements and that he impress upon these officials the need to guard against the assumption of unnecessary risks when insuring such mortgages.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> FRANK H. WEITZEL,
> *Acting Comptroller General of the United States.*

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I quote excerpts from that letter:

> Our review indicates that the approval of mortgage insurance for this project in November 1962 was contrary to the agency's prescribed policy because the project did not have the long-term support of a sponsoring organization having a recognized interest in providing housing for the elderly and having demonstrated reliability, substance, and ability to give reasonable assurance of the successful continuity of the project throughout the term of the mortgage * * *. We are of the opinion, in view of the information available, that agency officials' action in establishing a land valuation for insuring pur-

> poses which was substantially higher than the valuation determined by the agency's technical staff appraisers was questionable. * * *
>
> In addition, our review showed that, as a result of the agency's assumption that the project would be exempt from local taxation, the mortgage which the agency insured was over $1 million more than the amount that would have been insurable had local taxes been considered as an item of project expense.

LACK OF SPONSORSHIP

Before issuing the commitment the director, Mr. Neal Pickett, notified Washington that the project had the support of an eligible sponsoring church of considerable substance. On August 27, 1962, the director in the Houston office issued a commitment to insure a $4,700,000 mortgage to the Sharpstown Tower Corp.—the promoters—for financing the Clarewood House project. This commitment was issued on the basis that it had the sponsorship of the First Methodist Church, Houston, Tex.

The application for this mortgage was first filed early in 1962, at which time the promoters, the Sharpstown Tower Corp., claimed the First Methodist Church, Houston, Tex., as the sponsoring organization.

But they did not have the sponsorship of the First Methodist Church; in fact, the official board had taken action to reject any proposals that it may be associated with this project.

On April 11, 1962, 5 months before the approval of the loan, Mr. Marvin Collie, chairman of the board of the First Methodist Church in Houston, had appointed a committee to study a request that the church sponsor this project and report back to the official board.

On June 13, 1962, at 6 p.m. the official board of the First Methodist Church met at the Quillian Memorial Center to consider this report. I quote from the minutes of that meeting:

> Judge Werlein made a report to the board, acting as chairman of the committee which had been appointed by Marvin Collie on April 11, 1962, concerning a proposal that First Methodist Church take some important part in the promotion and financing of a very large apartment house in Sharpstown for the housing of senior citizens of this community. Judge Werlein said that the committee felt that our church could not become financially involved or interested in the building project contemplated.

As further evidence that the decision of this board was not unknown to the director or the promoters, I point out that six of the seven promoters in the Sharpstown Tower Corp. were not only members of the First Methodist Church of Houston but also members of the board of stewards of that church. Furthermore, Mr. Neal Pickett, the FHA Director, was a member of this church, and he was present at the meeting when the action by the official board of the church to reject the sponsorship of this project was taken.

On that point I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article published in the Houston Post of January 28 (or 29), 1963, entitled "Pickett on Hand for Clarewood Decision."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, Jan. 28 or 29, 1963]

PICKETT ON HAND FOR CLAREWOOD DECISION—TOP FHA OFFICE LEARNED ABOUT CHURCH PULLOUT 3 MONTHS LATER

(By Harold Scarlett)

The Federal Housing Administration in Washington did not learn for 3 months of a Houston church's decision against backing a Sharpstown apartment project—even though the Houston head of the FHA attended the meeting at which the decision was made.

Ray Niblack, an FHA Assistant Commissioner in Washington, told the Houston Post Monday:

"We first learned of the absence of support of the First Methodist Church through our regional multifamily housing representative in Fort Worth in early September."

A committee of the church's board of stewards decided the church could not financially back Clarewood House, an 11-story apartment project for the elderly, at a meeting on May 31, 1962.

The committee chairman was Associate Justice Ewing Werlein of the First Court of Civil Appeals.

Justice Werlein in his committee report listed C. A. Neal Pickett as one of the committee members who attended the May 31 meeting.

Pickett is the Houston district director of the FHA.

Church backing of the apartment project for senior citizens had been considered by FHA officials in Washington as an important factor in an application for 100 percent FHA insurance of the $4.7 million loan for the project.

C. Franklin Daniels, assistant FHA commissioner for multifamily housing, says some concern arose in FHA headquarters when it was finally learned that the church was not behind the project.

"We had to work out something," Daniels said. "The project was well underway."

The "something" turned out to be a $300,000 letter of credit put up to guarantee any initial operating deficits before Clarewood House gained enough tenants to pay its way.

Pickett was asked about the apparent breakdown of communications inside the FHA on the church's decision.

"To the best of my ability, Washington was kept fully advised as to all developments at all times," Pickett replied.

He said all information he sent to Washington was channeled through the Fort Worth regional office of the FHA. However, he said he could not specifically recall when he might have notified higher FHA officials of the church's decision.

"It wouldn't have made any difference anyway," he said. "We could have gone nonsubsidized."

Pickett, a member of the church, said he attended a meeting of the stewards committee, but he added:

"I told them I couldn't serve and couldn't vote because I was the FHA Director. Besides, no decision was taken at the meeting I attended."

Werlein, however, said the committee held only one meeting, and Pickett was present.

"The decision was reached that day," Werlein said.

"There may never have been a vote taken. I can't quite recall. But the majority view was that the church could not support the project financially and that's the way I wrote it up in my report."

Marvin K. Collie, an attorney who was then president of the board of stewards, said the committee's report was adopted by the full board at its next meeting in June.

Later, after news stories linked Clarewood House to the church, Dr. Charles Allen, the church pastor, ran a statement in the all-church newspaper, the Houston Times, last August 26, saying support of the project was against church policy.

It was understood that the church stewards felt the church should not compete with privately owned apartment projects which already had plenty of vacancies suitable for elderly people.

A team of staff members of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the FHA's parent agency, has started checking into the Clarewood House loan.

Their inquiry came after the Houston Post disclosed the FHA had appraised the apartment site at twice the price for which land on either side had recently sold.

Frank W. Sharp, also a member of the First Methodist Church, got $2 a square foot or $730,760 for the land.

It was paid to him by the Sharpstown Tower Corp., a nonprofit corporation organized to build and operate Clarewood House.

A corporation officer has said Sharp put up the $300,000 letter of credit to get the FHA loan through after the church declined to back the project.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I quote from that article:

> A committee of the church's board of stewards decided the church could not financially back Clarewood House, an 11-story apartment project for the elderly, at a meeting on May 31, 1962.
>
> The committee chairman was Associate Justice Ewing Werlein of the First Court of Civil Appeals.
>
> Justice Werlein in his committee report listed C. A. Neal Pickett as one of the committee members who attended the May 31 meeting.
>
> Pickett is the Houston district director of the FHA.
>
> Pickett, a member of the church, said he attended a meeting of the stewards committee, but he added:
>
> "I told them I couldn't serve and couldn't vote because I was the FHA director. Besides, no decision was taken at the meeting I attended."
>
> Werlein, however, said the committee held only one meeting, and Pickett was present.
>
> "The decision was reached that day," Werlein said.

Mr. Pickett was determined that in spite of the decision of the official board of the First Methodist Church not to accept any responsibility or to sponsor this project, he would help the promoters get a 100-percent Government-guaranteed mortgage. First, a letter dated July 13, 1962, was obtained from Dr. Charles Allen, minister of the First Methodist Church, in which Dr. Allen endorsed the project as worthwhile and said he would do what he could to help. But this letter was signed only by the minister and very clearly makes no pretense of binding the official board or the trustees of this church. Mr. Pickett knew that only the official board or the trustees had any authority to pledge the financial backing of his church.

But with this letter as an excuse Mr. Pickett proceeded. At a press conference in early August the president of the Sharpstown Tower Corp. boasted that the project was moving forward with the blessing and financial support of the First Methodist Church of Houston, Tex., as sponsors.

When this notice appeared in the press the official board of the church became concerned, and this time they took action to establish beyond any doubt the fact that the First Methodist Church of Houston never had been, nor did it have any intention of ever being, the sponsor of this project, nor was it in any way connected therewith.

To clear up any possible misunderstanding there was printed in the official church bulletin of Friday, August 24, 1962, an announcement entitled "The Pastor's Message." I quote from that bulletin, which was given wide circulation both to the membership and to the public.

> Recently there has appeared in local newspapers, stories that might give the inference that First Methodist Church of Houston, our board of stewards, or our board of trustees, were involved in some manner with an apartment or residential venture in this community. This is to advise our membership and the public generally that this church, its board of stewards, and its board of trustees, have never had any connection whatsoever, directly or indirectly, with any such venture, or any other similar project. Any such affiliation or promotion is contrary to the stated policy of the board of stewards, the governing body of the First Methodist Church of Houston.

Once again I point out that six of the seven-man board acting as promoters of the Sharpstown Tower Corp. and that the director, Mr. Neal Pickett, were all members of this church.

Certainly they knew the church was not sponsoring this project; but notwithstanding this knowledge, 3 days later, on August 27, 1962, Director Pickett signed the commitment to insure a 100-percent Government-guaranteed $4,700,000 mortgage with the Sharpstown Tower Corp. for the construction of the Clarewood House, and this commitment was specifically approved on the assumption that it had the financial support of the First Methodist Church of Houston, Tex. As the Comptroller General pointed out, by approving the project on the basis that it was financially endorsed by the First Methodist Church the project was considered as a nonprofit operation—subject to complete tax exemption and eligible for a 100-percent guaranteed first mortgage for the full construction and land costs.

I make no attempt to guess why Director Pickett was so determined to help these friends of his; but it is a fact that by this action Director Pickett increased the Government's liability by over $1 million, and the fact that the director knew his decision was based on a false premise is in itself sufficient to raise a question of his competence.

UNJUSTIFIED INCREASE IN LAND VALUES

The appraisers and underwriters working in the Houston office placed a top valuation on the land used in the Clarewood project at $1.35 per square foot, or a total of $493,000.

This valuation was most liberal and represented a substantial profit since the county records show that land in the surrounding area was selling from 86 cents to a dollar per square foot. The sponsors of the project, however, were not satisfied and claimed they had an advance understanding with someone in FHA that they would get a $2 per square foot appraisal, or a total of $730,600, and Mr. Neal Pickett, director of the Houston office, without any basis for sustaining such action, obligingly ordered the chief underwriter to jump the appraisal of the land to the full amount requested by the sponsors—$2 per square foot, or a total of $730,600. This action was taken over the determined opposition of all local appraisers and underwriters.

Since this loan was being approved with a 100-percent mortgage, this second action represented an additional windfall profit of $237,500.

The office records show that prior arrangements had been made between the owner of the land and the promoters of the project that if this $730,000 sales price was approved he would give $100,000 back to the sponsors to underwrite the promotion costs, but this strange arrangement did not seem to be of interest or concern to the director.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the orders by the director, Neal Pickett, to Mr. George D. Humphreville, chief underwriter, under date of August 24, 1962, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the orders were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 24, 1962.

To: Mr. George D. Humphreville, Chief Underwriter.
From: Neal Pickett, Director.
Subject: Clarewood House.

It has been determined and it is hereby directed that in the processing of this application, the estimated available market price of the site is to be computed upon the basis of $2 per square foot.

NEAL PICKETT.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this order increasing the valuation of the land was dated August 24, 1962, the same day that the First Methodist Church was issuing its second public directive repudiating any connection whatsoever with the project.

Nevertheless, on August 27, 1962, 3 days later, the director, Mr. Pickett, signed the commitment for a $4,700,000, 100-percent guaranteed mortgage, completely ignoring all these known factors.

QUESTIONABLE TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF CLAREWOOD

Mr. Pickett was warned by the chief underwriter in the Houston office that since this Clarewood project was without the sponsorship of the First Methodist Church it would not qualify as a tax-exempt organization and therefore was not eligible for the 100-percent mortgage guarantee.

Again the director ignored this warning and overrode the recommendation of his own underwriters and approved the project as though tax exemption were automatic.

As predicted, the attorney general of Texas later issued a ruling rejecting the tax-exempt status of this project, thereby confirming the opinion of the local underwriters, and as stated earlier this action meant a $1.2 million increase in the mortgage.

This blunder will cost the tenants of the project an extra 10 to 20 percent in rent.

I quote from the Comptroller General's report:

> FHA's records indicate that the 10- to 20-percent rent increase, effective January 1966, was necessitated, at least in part, by the project's questionable tax status.

This Houston project represents another example of the laxity of the Washington office of the FHA in not insisting upon the regional director's complying with its regulations and rules. The result is that we have another unsound project which is already in default.

No payments have been made on the principal since June 1, 1964, and the Comptroller General's audit showed that the project as of January 1, 1965, had sustained a cumulative deficit exclusive of depreciation of $446,000.

Director Neal Pickett's withholding information from the Washington office concerning the lack of sponsorship and his ignoring of the warning about the questionable tax status is serious, and his arbitrary action in raising the appraised valuation of the land by nearly a quarter of a million dollars was without any justification.

The Washington office must also accept some responsibility for this unsound project. They, too, were warned in ample time to stop the loan but failed to act.

In October 1962 a devastating report on the Houston office was compiled and forwarded to Washington. In this report the Clarewood project was described as ineligible and worthless as a nonprofit venture. The report also said the Houston area was already overbuilt with both single homes and apartment houses and that the Clarewood project was not economically feasible.

The commitment had been signed by Mr. Pickett on August 27, but the final closing on this loan was not scheduled until the week after this report was submitted to the Washington office. They had ample time to stop the loan but did not act.

Why was this warning ignored at the Washington level? Why is it that now all that we get is another promise to do better next time?

Mr. President, these wornout promises are not enough. It is time more affirmative action is taken.

The Washington office, instead of continuously trying to defend these unwarranted decisions, should begin taking some disciplinary measures against the employees responsible.

I recommend that its first action in this connection to be to recognize that the Director of the Houston office, Mr. Neal Pickett, needs to be replaced by a more competent administrator, and I suggest that this action be taken promptly.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Comptroller General's report on this project dated February 23, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of our review, we question the soundness of the actions leading to FHA's decision to insure a $4.7 million mortgage to finance this project without the support of the original sponsoring organization. FHA's procedures with respect to mortgage insurance on housing projects for the elderly covering 100 percent of project costs appear to us to be carefully formulated to insure that such insurance is based on careful review and thorough evaluation of all factors pertaining to the projects. In our opinion, these procedures were not followed in this instance and the risk to the Government inherent in the insurance of mortgages has been increased.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Commissioner, FHA, stress the importance to all agency officials involved in approving mortgage insurance of the need for strict compliance with the agency's existing procedures. We recommend also that the Commissioner impress on these officials the need to guard against the assumption of unnecessary risks involved in insuring mortgages for housing projects for the elderly when such projects are not fully endorsed by sponsors having a proper and clearly identifiable interest in providing housing for the elderly and having demonstrated reliability, substance, and ability sufficient to give reasonable assurance of the successful completion and continuity of the project.

RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM S. CHEATHAM AS ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT AND LEGAL COUNSEL TO SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, William S. Cheatham, who began his career at the U.S. Senate almost 45 years ago, has retired as administrative assistant and legal counsel to the Sergeant at Arms.

He started on his 12th birthday as a Senate page and after 4 years served as the first clerk to the secretary to the minority—then the Democratic side. A Republican Sergeant at Arms, although Cheatham was a Democrat, appointed him his one and only secretary on the day President Hoover was inaugurated, March 4, 1929.

In the course of the next 18 years he assisted three other Sergeants at Arms, one Republican and two Democrats, excepting for the time he served in the Air Corps during World War II. In his day there was no page school, so he completed grammar school in the public night school system, obtained a high school diploma by attending private night schools, and was later graduated from George Washington University with the degree of bachelor of arts and then from Georgetown University Law School.

He resigned from his Senate position in May of 1947 to become an Assistant Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia where he tried a number of varied cases and sat as a member of several decisionmaking boards. After 5 years he left the District and went with the National Capital Planning Commission as its General Counsel and Secretary, where he remained for 4 years.

While away from the Senate 9 years, two Sergeants at Arms called on him to draft a number of legal documents. These included proposed legislation on housekeeping matters and the first motor vehicle and traffic regulations for the Capitol Grounds. The Capitol Police Board had been required to promulgate these regulations under a new provision of statute transferring jurisdiction from the District to the Capitol authorities and making the comparable District regulations inapplicable to many miles of streets and drives on the Hill.

Early in January 1956 the then Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke, requested Bill Cheatham to return to the Senate and assist with the greatly expanded volume of problems.

On his return 10 years ago, in addition to his varied day-to-day duties, Bill presented all the Sergeant at Arms' budget and appropriations requests to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and worked on various matters with the Committees on Rules and Administration and Public Works; he closely cooperated with the U.S. attorney in defending suits arising out of Senate activities; and performed endless duties serving as the Sergeant at Arms' representative under the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Arrangements for more than 2 months ahead of each presidential inauguration. He also played a major role in planning and arranging funerals for Senators who died in office and in escorting the official Congressional Funeral Committee to the services usually held in the home town of the deceased.

Bill's 4-year period at the Planning Commission was perhaps the stormiest in the Commission's history. It included law suits by citizens attempting to preserve upper Rock Creek Park from being substantially covered with a highway by the Maryland Roads Commission and battles concerning the problems involved with the Maryland Planning Commission. The local Urban Redevelopment Act caused many arguments between the Commission and the Redevelopment Land Agency. The landmark case under the redevelopment law was originally handled by Bill. When the Supreme Court decided to hear the case, Bill said he was very thrilled over the fact that Solicitor General Simon E. Sobeloff asked Bill to assist in preparing the Supreme Court argument. Bill said wistfully that this made the late Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter happy too because "You see, my wife was secretary to Mr. Justice Harold H. Burton for 18 years and Mr. Justice Frankfurter would often ask me why I did not argue before the Court. Mr. Sobeloff invited me to sit by him as he presented his argument to the Court and afterward Mr. Justice Frankfurter said to me, 'Now you are getting close.' "

When he was asked if he would write a book like everyone else is doing, Bill replied that he did not have any current intentions of writing one. However, he explained that he already had appeared in print in the Saturday Evening Post of March 20, 1926, as excerpts from his diary as a page boy were quoted in a story by Mary Roberts Rinehart entitled "Willie Cheatham Looks at the Senate."

I just want to add that in my book Bill Cheatham was one of the finest and one of the most courteous attendants of the Senate I ever encountered. I think he so richly merits the tributes we pay him today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to say a word about Bill Cheatham. I have known Bill Cheatham for the nearly 20 years that I have been a Member of the Senate. He has certainly been one of the most faithful and efficient persons we have had in the Senate. I had a good bit of contact with him in reference to the program the Foreign Relations Committee carries on when ministers and parliamentarians from other countries come here. We nearly always have them up to talk with us, or have lunch, or have coffee, or a get-together of some kind, and we usually follow that by bringing them to the Senate floor.

We always relied on Bill Cheatham to handle things for us and he has done it in such a magnificent and efficient way that I shall always remember that.

There is one other thing that comes to my mind when I think of Bill Cheatham, and that is his dear old mother. For many, many years one could see her almost any day when the Senate was in session sitting up in the gallery. She is a sweet, kind, gentle woman.

I hate very much to see Bill Cheatham retire from the Senate. I wish for him and his mother many long years of happiness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Alabama mentioned Bill Cheatham's mother. It was my privilege to learn of her a good many years ago when she was frequently in the corridors. I never see her but what I give her a little hug. She is sweet and gracious and interested in public affairs as if she were a youngster. I do not know her age. One never tells a lady's age anyway. Let us say that she lived in good health to a ripe age and still has never lost interest in public affairs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to mention two other things that come to mind. My birthday is the 20th of December. Every year when I am here I get a telephone call from her and she sings "Happy Birthday" over the telephone.

THE LEGALITY OF U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE DEFENSE OF VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of calling to the attention of Senators the very comprehensive and convincing paper which has just been released by the Department of State entitled "The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Vietnam."

I do so because the legality of our position has been challenged repeatedly on the floor of the Senate and in part throughout the country. I think it has been answered by some of the most prominent and expert lawyers in the country.

The House of Delegates of the American Bar Association meeting in Chicago recently unanimously supported the legality of our position in Vietnam. A number of professors and other legal experts have gone on record and their opinion has been placed in the RECORD.

I feel that because we are a country which believes in the legal process and a world of law, as well as a nation of law, it is important that we be precisely certain as to what justification in law there is for our prestige in Vietnam.

For this reason I call attention to this document which sets forth in detail the legal case for the following propositions:

I. The United States and South Vietnam have the right under international law to participate in the collective defense of South Vietnam against armed attack.

II. The United States has undertaken commitments to assist South Vietnam in defending itself against Communist aggression from the north.

III. Actions by the United States and South Vietnam are justified under the Geneva accords of 1954.

IV. The President has full authority to commit U.S. forces in the collective defense of South Vietnam.

Finally, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a brief and concise summary conclusion which in a few hundred words summarizes our position simply and clearly.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the document entitled "The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Vietnam" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Department of State, office of the Legal Adviser, Mar. 4, 1966]

THE LEGALITY OF U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE DEFENSE OF VIETNAM

I. THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH VIETNAM HAVE THE RIGHT UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW TO PARTICIPATE IN THE COLLECTIVE DEFENSE OF SOUTH VIETNAM AGAINST ARMED ATTACK

In response to requests from the Government of South Vietnam, the United States has been assisting that country in defending itself against armed attack from the Communist north. This attack has taken the forms of externally supported subversion, clandestine supply of arms, infiltration of armed personnel, and most recently the sending of regular units of the North Vietnamese Army into the south.

International law has long recognized the right of individual and collective self-defense against armed attack. South Vietnam and the United States are engaging in such collective defense consistently with international law and with U.S. obligations under the United Nations Charter.

A. South Vietnam is being subjected to armed attack by Communist North Vietnam

The Geneva accords of 1954 established a demarcation line between North Vietnam and South Vietnam. They provided for withdrawals of military forces into the respective zones north and south of this line. The accords prohibited the use of either zone for the resumption of hostilities or to "further an aggressive policy."

During the 5 years following the Geneva Conference of 1954, the Hanoi regime developed a covert political-military organization in South Vietnam based on Communist cadres it had ordered to stay in the south, contrary to the provisions of the Geneva accords. The activities of this covert organization were directed toward the kidnaping and assassination of civilian officials—acts of terrorism that were perpetrated in increasing numbers.

In the 3-year period from 1959 to 1961, the North Vietnam regime infiltrated an estimated 10,000 men into the south. It is estimated that 13,000 additional personnel were infiltrated in 1962, and, by the end of 1964, North Vietnam may well have moved over 40,000 armed and unarmed guerrillas into South Vietnam.

The International Control Commission reported in 1962 the findings of its Legal Committee:

"There is evidence to show that arms, armed and unarmed personnel, munitions and other supplies have been sent from the zone in the north to the zone in the south with the objective of supporting, organizing and carrying out hostile activities, including armed attacks, directed against the armed forces and administration of the zone in the south.

"There is evidence that the PAVN [People's Army of Vietnam] has allowed the zone in the north to be used for inciting, encouraging and supporting hostile activities in the zone in the south, aimed at the overthrow of the administration in the south."

Beginning in 1964, the Communists apparently exhausted their reservoir of southerners who had gone north. Since then the greater number of men infiltrated into the South have been native-born North Vietnamese. Most recently, Hanoi has begun to infiltrate elements of the North Vietnamese army in increasingly larger numbers. Today, there is evidence that nine regiments of regular North Vietnamese forces are fighting in organized units in the South.

In the guerrilla war in Vietnam, the external aggression from the north is the critical military element of the insurgency, although it is unacknowledged by North Vietnam. In these circumstances, an armed attack is not as easily fixed by date and hour as in the case of traditional warfare. However, the infiltration of thousands of armed men clearly constitutes an armed attack under any reasonable definition. There may be some question as to the exact date at which North Vietnam's aggression grew into an armed attack, but there can be no doubt that it had occurred before February 1965.

B. International law recognizes the right of individual and collective self-defense against armed attack

International law had traditionally recognized the right of self-defense against armed attack. This proposition has been asserted by writers on international law through the several centuries in which the modern law of nations has developed. The proposition has been acted on numerous times by governments throughout modern history. Today the principle of self-defense against armed attack is universally recognized and accepted.[1]

The Charter of the United Nations, concluded at the end of World War II, imposed an important limitation on the use of force by United Nations members. Article 2, paragraph 4, provides: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

In addition, the charter embodied a system of international peacekeeping through the organs of the United Nations. Article 24 summarizes these structural arrangements in stating that the United Nations members "confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf."

However, the charter expressly states in article 51 that the remaining provisions of the charter—including the limitation of article 2, paragraph 4, and the creation of United Nations machinery to keep the peace—in no way diminish the inherent right of self-defense against armed attack. Article 51 provides: "Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Thus, article 51 restates and preserves, for member states in the situations covered by the article, a long-recognized principle of international law. The article is a "saving clause" designed to make clear that no other provision in the charter shall be interpreted to impair the inherent right of self-defense referred to in article 51.

Three principal objections have been raised against the availability of the right of individual and collective self-defense in the case of Vietnam: (1) That this right applies only in the case of an armed attack on a United Nations member; (2) that it does not apply in the case of South Vietnam because the latter is not an independent sovereign state; and (3) that collective self-defense may be undertaken only by a regional organization operating under chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. These objections will now be considered in turn.

C. The right of individual and collective self-defense applies in the case of South Vietnam whether or not that country is a member of the United Nations

1. South Vietnam Enjoys the Right of Self-Defense

The argument that the right of self-defense is available only to members of the United Nations mistakes the nature of the right of self-defense and the relationship of the United Nations Charter to international law in this respect. As already shown, the right of self-defense against armed attack is an inherent right under international law. The right is not conferred by the charter, and, indeed, article 51 expressly recognizes that the right is inherent.

The charter nowhere contains any provision designed to deprive nonmembers of the right of self-defense against armed attack.[2] Article 2, paragraph 6, does charge the United Nations with responsibility for insuring that nonmember states act in accordance with United Nations "principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security." Protection against aggression and self-defense against armed attack are important elements in the whole charter scheme for the maintenance of international peace and security. To deprive nonmembers of their inherent right of self-defense would not accord with the principles of the Organization, but would instead be prejudicial to the maintenance of peace. Thus article 2, paragraph 6—and, indeed, the rest of the charter—should certainly not be construed to nullify or diminish the inherent defensive rights of nonmembers.

---

[1] See, e.g., Jessup, "A Modern Law of Nations," 163 ff, (1948); Oppenheim, "International Law," 297 ff. (8th ed., Lauterpacht, 1955). And see, generally, Bowett, "Self-Defense in International Law" (1958).

[2] While nonmembers, such as South Vietnam, have not formally undertaken the obligations of the United Nations Charter as their own treaty obligations, it should be recognized that much of the substantive law of the charter has become part of the general law of nations through a very wide acceptance by nations the world over. This is particularly true of the charter provisions bearing on the use of force. Moreover, in the case of South Vietnam, the South Vietnamese Government has expressed its ability and willingness to abide by the charter, in applying for United Nations membership. Thus it seems entirely appropriate to appraise the actions of South Vietman in relation to the legal standards set forth in the United Nations Charter.

2. The United States Has the Right To Assist in the Defense of South Vietnam Although the Latter Is Not a United Nations Member

The cooperation of two or more international entities in the defense of one or both against armed attack is generally referred to as collective self-defense. U.S. participation in the defense of South Vietnam at the latter's request is an example of collective self-defense.

The United States is entitled to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense against armed attack, as that right exists in international law, subject only to treaty limitations and obligations undertaken by this country.

It has been urged that the United States has no right to participate in the collective defense of South Vietnam because article 51 of the United Nations Charter speaks only of the situation "if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations." This argument is without substance.

In the first place, article 51 does not impose restrictions or cut down the otherwise available rights of United Nations members. By its own terms, the article preserves an inherent right. It is, therefore, necessary to look elsewhere in the charter for any obligation of members restricting their participation in collective defense of an entity that is not a United Nations member.

Article 2, paragraph 4, is the principal provision of the charter imposing limitations on the use of force by members. It states that they "shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Action taken in defense against armed attack cannot be characterized as falling within this proscription. The record of the San Francisco Conference makes clear that article 2, paragraph 4, was not intended to restrict the right of self-defense against armed attack.[3]

One will search in vain for any other provision in the charter that would preclude U.S. participation in the collective defense of a nonmember. The fact that article 51 refers to armed attack "against a member of the United Nations" implies no intention to preclude members from participating in the defense of nonmembers. Any such result would have seriously detrimental consequences for international peace and security and would be inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations as they are set forth in article 1 of the charter.[4] The right of members to participate in the defense of nonmembers is upheld by leading authorities on international law.[5]

D. The right of individual and collective self-defense applies whether or not South Vietnam is regarded as an independent sovereign state

1. South Vietnam Enjoys the Right of Self-Defense

It has been asserted that the conflict in Vietnam is "civil strife" in which foreign intervention is forbidden. Those who make this assertion have gone so far as to compare Ho Chi Minh's action in Vietnam with the efforts of President Lincoln to preserve the Union during the American Civil War. Any such characterization is an entire fiction disregarding the actual situation in Vietnam. The Hanoi regime is anything but the legitimate government of a unified country in which the South is rebelling against lawful national authority.

The Geneva accords of 1954 provided for a division of Vietnam into two zones at the 17th parallel. Although this line of demarcation was intended to be temporary, it was established by international agreement, which specifically forbade aggression by one zone against the other.

The Republic of Vietnam in the south has been recognized as a separate international entity by approximately 60 governments the world over. It has been admitted as a member of a number of the specialized agencies of the United Nations. The United Nations General Assembly in 1957 voted to recommend South Vietnam for membership in the Organization, and its admission was frustrated only by the veto of the Soviet Union in the Security Council.

In any event there is no warrant for the suggestion that one zone of a temporarily divided state—whether it be Germany, Korea, or Vietnam—can be legally overrun by armed forces from the other zone, crossing the internationally recognized line of demarcation between the two. Any such doctrine would subvert the international agreement establishing the line of demarcation, and would pose grave dangers to international peace.

The action of the United Nations in the Korean conflict of 1950 clearly established the principle that there is no greater license for one zone of a temporarily divided state to attack the other zone than there is for one state to attack another state. South Vietnam has the same right that South Korea had to defend itself and to organize collective defense against an armed attack from the north. A resolution of the Security Council dated June 25, 1950, noted "with grave concern the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea" and determined "that this action constitutes a breach of the peace."

2. The United States Is Entitled To Participate in the Collective Defense of South Vietnam Whether or Not the Latter Is Regarded as an Independent Sovereign State

As stated earlier South Vietnam has been recognized as a separate international entity by approximately 60 governments. It has been admitted to membership in a number of the United Nations specialized agencies, and has been excluded from the United Nations Organization only by the Soviet veto.

There is nothing in the charter to suggest that United Nations members are precluded from participating in the defense of a recognized international entity against armed attack merely because the entity may lack some of the attributes of an independent sovereign state. Any such result would have a destructive effect on the stability of international engagements such as the Geneva accords of 1954 and on internationally agreed lines of demarcation. Such a result, far from being in accord with the charter and the purposes of the United Nations, would undermine them and would create new dangers to international peace and security.

E. The United Nations Charter does not limit the right of self-defense to regional organizations

Some have argued that collective self-defense may be undertaken only by a regional arrangement or agency operating under chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. Such an assertion ignores the structure of the charter and the practice followed in the more than 20 years since the founding of the United Nations.

The basic proposition that rights of self-defense are not impaired by the charter—as expressly stated in article 51—is not conditioned by any charter provision limiting the application of this proposition to collective defense by a regional arrangement or agency. The structure of the charter reinforces this conclusion. Article 51 appears in chapter VII of the charter, entitled "Action With Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression," whereas chapter VIII, entitled "Regional Arrangements," begins with article 52 and embraces the two following articles. The records of the San Francisco Conference show that article 51 was deliberately placed in chapter VII rather than chapter VIII, "where it would only have a bearing on the regional system."[6]

Under article 51, the right of self-defense is available against any armed attack, whether or not the country attacked is a member of a regional arrangement and regardless of the source of the attack. Chapter VIII, on the other hand, deals with relations among members of a regional arrangement or agency, and authorizes regional action as appropriate for dealing with "local disputes." This distinction has been recognized ever since the founding of the United Nations in 1945.

For example, the North Atlantic Treaty has operated as a collective security arrangement, designed to take common measures in preparation against the eventuality of an armed attack for which collective defense under article 51 would be required. Similarly, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization was designed as a collective defense arrangement under article 51. Secretary of State Dulles emphasized this in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1954.

By contrast, article 1 of the Charter of Bogotá (1948), establishing the Organization of American States, expressly declares that the Organization is a regional agency within the United Nations. Indeed, chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter was included primarily to take account of the functioning of the Inter-American system.

In sum, there is no basis in the United Nations Charter for contending that the right of self-defense against armed attack is limited to collective defense by a regional organization.

F. The United States has fulfilled its obligations to the United Nations

A further argument has been made that the members of the United Nations have conferred on United Nations organs—and, in particular, on the Security Council—exclusive power to act against aggression.

---

[3] See, e.g., 6 UNCIO documents 459.

[4] In particular, the statement of the first purpose:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;".

[5] Bowett, "Self-Defense in International Law," 193–195 (1958); Goodhart, "The North Atlantic Treaty of 1949," 79 "Recueil Des Cours," 183, 202–204 (1951, vol. II), quoted in 5 "Whiteman's Digest of International Law," 1067–1068 (1965); Kelsen, "The Law of the United Nations," 793 (1950); see Stone, "Aggression and World Order," 44 (1958).

[6] 17 UNCIO documents 288.

Again, the express language of article 51 contradicts that assertion. A victim of armed attack is not required to forgo individual or collective defense of its territory until such time as the United Nations organizes collective action and takes appropriate measures. To the contrary, article 51 clearly states that the right of self-defense may be exercised "until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."[7]

As indicated earlier, article 51 is not literally applicable to the Vietnam situation since South Vietnam is not a member. However, reasoning by analogy from article 51 and and adopting its provisions as an appropriate guide for the conduct of members in a case like Vietnam, one can only conclude that U.S. actions are fully in accord with this country's obligations as a member of the United Nations.

Article 51 requires that: "Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

The United States has reported to the Security Council on measures it has taken in countering the Communist aggression in Vietnam. In August 1964 the United States asked the Council to consider the situation created by North Vietnamese attacks on U.S. destroyers in the Tonkin Gulf. The Council thereafter met to debate the question, but adopted no resolutions. Twice in February 1965 the United States sent additional reports to the Security Council on the conflict in Vietnam and on the additional measures taken by the United States in the collective defense of South Vietnam. In January 1966 the United States formally submitted the Vietnam question to the Security Council for its consideration and introduced a draft resolution calling for discussions looking toward a peaceful settlement on the basis of the Geneva accords.

At no time has the Council taken any action to restore peace and security in southeast Asia. The Council has not expressed criticism of U.S. actions. Indeed, since the U.S. submission of January 1966, members of the Council have been notably reluctant to proceed with any consideration of the Vietnam question.

The conclusion is clear that the United States has in no way acted to interfere with United Nations consideration of the conflict in Vietnam. On the contrary, the United States has requested United Nations consideration, and the Council has not seen fit to act.

G. *International law does not require a declaration of war as a condition precedent to taking measures of self-defense against armed attack*

The existence or absence of a formal declaration of war is not a factor in determining whether an international use of force is lawful as a matter of international law. The United Nations Charter's restriction focus on the manner and purpose of its use and not on any formalities of announcement.

It should also be noted that a formal declaration of war would not place any obligations on either side in the conflict by which that side would not be bound in any event. The rules of international law concerning the conduct of hostilities in an international armed conflict apply regardless of any declaration of war.

H. Summary

The analysis set forth above shows that South Vietnam has the right in present circumstances to defend itself against armed attack from the north and to organize a collective self-defense with the participation of others. In response to requests from South Vietnam, the United States has been participating in that defense, both through military action within South Vietnam and actions taken directly against the aggressor in North Vietnam. This participation by the United States is in conformity with international law and is consistent with our obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

II. THE UNITED STATES HAS UNDERTAKEN COMMITMENTS TO ASSIST SOUTH VIETNAM IN DEFENDING ITSELF AGAINST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION FROM THE NORTH

The United States has made commitments and given assurances, in various forms and at different times, to assist in the defense of South Vietnam.

A. *The United States gave undertaking at the end of the Geneva Conference in 1954*

At the time of the signing of the Geneva accords in 1954, President Eisenhower warned "that any renewal of Communist aggression would be viewed by us as a matter of grave concern," at the same time giving assurance that the United States would "not use force to disturb the settlement." And the formal declaration made by the U.S. Government at the conclusion of the Geneva Conference stated that the United States "would view any renewal of aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

B. *The United States undertook an international obligation to defend South Vietnam in the SEATO Treaty*

Later in 1954 the United States negotiated with a number of other countries and signed the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. The treaty contains in the first paragraph of article 4 the following provision: "Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations."

Annexed to the treaty was a protocol stating that: "The parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty unanimously designate for the purpose of article IV of the treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam."

Thus, the obligations of article IV, paragraph 1, dealing with the eventuality of armed attack, have from the outset covered the territory of South Vietnam. The facts as to the North Vietnamese armed attack against the south have been summarized earlier, in the discussion of the right of self-defense under international law and the Charter of the United Nations. The term "armed attack" has the same meaning in the SEATO Treaty as in the United Nations Charter.

Article IV, paragraph 1, places an obligation on each party to the SEATO Treaty to "act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes" in the event of an armed attack. The treaty does not require a collective determination than an armed attack has occurred in order that the obligation of article IV, paragraph 1, become operative. Nor does the provision require collective decision on actions to be taken to meet the common danger. As Secretary Dulles pointed out when transmitting the treaty to the President, the commitment in article IV, paragraph 1, "leaves to the judgment of each country the type of action to be taken in the event an armed attack occurs."

The treaty was intended to deter armed aggression in southeast Asia. To that end it created not only a multilateral alliance but also a series of bilateral relationships. The obligations are placed squarely on "each party" in the event of armed attack in the treaty area—not upon "the parties," a wording that might have implied a necessity for collective decision. The treaty was intended to give the assurance of U.S. assistance to any party or protocol state that might suffer a Communist armed attack, regardless of the views or actions of other parties. The fact that the obligations are individual, and may even to some extent differ among the parties to the treaty, is demonstrated by the U.S. understanding, expressed at the time of signature, that its obligations under article IV, paragraph 1, apply only in the event of Communist aggression, whereas the other parties to the treaty were unwilling so to limit their obligations to each other.

Thus, the United States has a commitment under article IV, paragraph 1, in the event of armed attack, independent of the decision or action of other treaty parties. A joint communique issued by Secretary Rusk and Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman of Thailand on March 6, 1962, reflected this understanding: "The Secretary of State assured the Foreign Minister that in the event of such aggression, the United States intends to give full effect to its obligations under the treaty to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. The Secretary of State reaffirmed that this obligation of the United States does not depend on the prior agreement of all other parties to the treaty, since this treaty obligation is individual as well as collective."

Most of the SEATO countries have stated that they agreed with this interpretation. None has registered objection to it.

When the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported on the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, it noted that the treaty area was further defined so that the "free territory of Vietnam" was an area "which, if attacked, would fall under the protection of the instrument." In its conclusion the committee stated: "The committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that acceptance of these additional obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests."

The Senate gave its advice and consent to the treaty by a vote of 82 to 1.

C. *The United States has given additional assurances to the Government of South Vietnam*

The United States has also given a series of additional assurances to the Government of South Vietnam. As early as October 1954 President Eisenhower undertook to provide direct assistance to help make South Vietnam "capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." On May 11, 1957 President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem of the Republic of Vietnam issued a joint statement which called attention to "the large buildup of Vietnamese Communist military forces in North Vietnam" and stated: "Noting that the Republic of Vietnam is covered by article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem agreed that aggression or subversion threatening the political independence of the Republic of Vietnam would be considered as endangering peace and stability."

---

[7] An argument has been made by some that the United States, by joining in the collective defense of South Vietnam, has violated the peaceful settlement obligation of article 33 in the charter. This argument overlooks the obvious proposition that a victim of armed aggression is not required to sustain the attack undefended while efforts are made to find a political solution with the aggressor. Article 51 of the charter illustrates this by making perfectly clear that the inherent right of self-defense is impaired by "Nothing in the present charter," including the provisions of article 33.

On August 2, 1961 President Kennedy declared that "the United States is determined that the Republic of Vietnam shall not be lost to the Communists for lack of any support which the United States can render." On December 7 of that year President Diem appealed for additional support. In his reply of December 14, 1961, President Kennedy recalled the U.S. declaration made at the end of the Geneva Conference in 1954, and reaffirmed that the United States was "prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence." This assurance has been reaffirmed many times since.

III. ACTIONS BY THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH VIETNAM ARE JUSTIFIED UNDER THE GENEVA ACCORDS OF 1954

A. *Description of the accords*

The Geneva accords of 1954[8] established the date and hour for a ceasefire in Vietnam, drew a "provisional military demarcation line" with a demilitarized zone on both sides, and required an exchange of prisoners and the phased regroupment of Viet Minh Forces from the south to the north and of French Union Forces from the north to the south. The introduction into Vietnam of troops reinforcements and new military equipment (except for replacement and repair) was prohibited. The armed forces of each party were required to respect the demilitarized zone and the territory of the other zone. The adherence of either zone to any military alliance, and the use of either zone for the resumption of hostilities or to "further an aggressive policy," were prohibited. The International Control Commission was established, composed of India, Canada and Poland, with India as Chairman. The task of the Commission was to supervise the proper execution of the provisions of the ceasefire agreement. General elections that would result in reunification were required to be held in July 1956 under the supervision of the ICC.

B. *North Vietnam violated the accords from the beginning*

From the very beginning, the North Vietnamese violated the 1954 Geneva accords. Communist military forces and supplies were left in the south in violation of the accords. Other Communist guerrillas were moved north for further training and then were infiltrated into the south in violation of the accords.

C. The introduction of U.S. military personnel and equipment was justified

The accords prohibited the reinforcement of foreign military forces in Vietnam and the introduction of new military equipment, but they allowed replacement of existing military personnel and equipment. Prior to late 1961, South Vietnam had received considerable military equipment and supplies from the United States, and the United States had gradually enlarged its military assistance advisory group to slightly less than 900 men. These actions were reported to the ICC and were justified as replacements for equipment in Vietnam in 1954 and for French training and advisory personnel who had been withdrawn after 1954.

As the Communist aggression intensified during 1961, with increased infiltration and a marked stepping up of Communist terrorism in the south, the United States found it necessary in late 1961 to increase substantially the numbers of our military personnel and the amounts and types of equipment introduced by this country into South Vietnam. These increases were justified by the international law principle that a material breach of an agreement by one party entitles the other at least to withhold compliance with an equivalent, corresponding, or related provision until the defaulting party is prepared to honor its obligations.[9]

In accordance with this principle, the systematic violation of the Geneva accords by North Vietnam justified South Vietnam in suspending compliance with the provision controlling entry of foreign military personnel and military equipment.

D. South Vietnam was justified in refusing to implement the election provisions of the Geneva accords

The Geneva accords contemplated the reunification of the two parts of Vietnam. They contained a provision for general elections to be held in July 1956 in order to obtain a "free expression of the national will." The accords stated that "consultations will be held on this subject between the competent representative authorities of the two zones from July 20, 1955, onwards."

There may be some question whether South Vietnam was bound by these election provisions. As indicated earlier, South Vietnam did not sign the cease-fire agreement of 1954, nor did it adhere to the final declaration of the Geneva Conference. The South Vietnamese Government at that time gave notice of its objection in particular to the election provisions of the accords.

However, even on the premise that these provisions were binding on South Vietnam, the South Vietnamese Government's failure to engage in consultations in 1955, with a view to holding elections in 1956, involved no breach of obligation. The conditions in North Vietnam during that period were such as to make impossible any free and meaningful expression of popular will.

Some of the facts about conditions in the north were admitted even by the Communist leadership in Hanoi. General Giap, currently Defense Minister of North Vietnam, in addressing the 10th Congress of the North Vietnamese Communist Party in October 1956, publicly acknowledged that the Communist leaders were running a police state where executions, terror, and torture were commonplace. A nationwide election in these circumstances would have been a travesty. No one in the north would have dared to vote except as directed. With a substantial majority of the Vietnamese people living north of the 17th parallel, such an election would have meant turning the country over to the Communists without regard to the will of the people. The South Vietnamese Government realized these facts and quite properly took the position that consultations for elections in 1956 as contemplated by the accords would be a useless formality.[10]

IV. THE PRESIDENT HAS FULL AUTHORITY TO COMMIT U.S. FORCES IN THE COLLECTIVE DEFENSE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

There can be no question in present circumstances of the President's authority to commit U.S. forces to the defense of South Vietnam. The grant of authority to the President in article II of the Constitution extends to the actions of the United States currently undertaken in Vietnam. In fact, however, it is unnecessary to determine whether this grant standing alone is sufficient to authorize the actions taken in Vietnam. These actions rest not only on the exercise of Presidential powers under article II but on the SEATO Treaty—a treaty advised and consented to by the Senate—and on actions of the Congress, particularly the joint resolution of August 10, 1964. When these sources of authority are taken together—article II of the Constitution, the SEATO Treaty, and actions by the Congress—there can be no question of the legality under domestic law of U.S. actions in Vietnam.

A. The President's power under article II of the Constitution extends to the actions currently undertaken in Vietnam

Under the Constitution, the President, in addition to being Chief Executive, is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He holds the prime responsibility for the conduct of U.S. foreign relations. These duties carry very broad powers, including the power to deploy American forces abroad and commit them to military operations when the President deems such action necessary to maintain the security and defense of the United States.

At the Federal Constitutional Convention in 1787, it was originally proposed that Congress have the power "to make war." There were objections that legislative proceedings were too slow for this power to be vested in Congress; it was suggested that the Senate might be a better repository. Madison and Gerry then moved to substitute "to declare war" for "to make war," "leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks." It was objected that this might make it too easy for the Executive to involve the Nation in war, but the motion carried with but one dissenting vote.

---

[8] These accords were composed of a bilateral cease-fire agreement between the commander in chief of the People's Army of Vietnam and the commander in chief of the French Union Forces in Indochina, together with a final declaration of the conference, to which France adhered. However, it is to be noted that the South Vietnamese Government was not a signatory of the cease-fire agreement and did not adhere to the final declaration. South Vietnam entered a series of reservations in a statement to the conference. This statement was noted by the conference, but by decision of the conference chairman it was not included or referred to in the final declaration.

[9] This principle of law and the circumstances in which it may be invoked are most fully discussed in the Fourth Report on the Law of Treaties by Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice, articles 18, 20 (UN Doc. A/CN.4/120 (1959)) "II Yearbook of the International Law Commission 37" (UN Doc. A/CN.4/SER.A/1959/Add. 1) and in the later report by Sir Humphrey Waldock, article 20 (UN Doc. A/CN.4/156 and Add. 1–3 (1963)) "II Yearbook of the International Law Commission 36" (UN Doc. A/CN.4/SER.A/1963/Add. 1). Among the authorities cited by the fourth report for this proposition are: II Oppenheim, "International Law" 136, 137 (7th ed. Lauterpacht 1955); I Rousseau, "Principes généraux du droit international public" 365 (1944); II Hyde, "International Law" 1660 et. seq. (2d ed. 1947); II Guggenheim, "Traité de droit international public" 84, 85 (1935); Spiropoulos, "Traité théorique et pratique de droit international public" 289 (1933); Verdross, "Völkerrecht," 328 (1950); Hall, "Treatise" 21 (8th ed. Higgins 1924); 3 Accioly, "Tratado de Direito Internacional Publico" 82 (1956–57). See also draft articles 42 and 46 of the Law of Treaties by the International Law Commission, contained in the report on the work of its 15th session (General Assembly, official records, 18th session, supplement No. 9(A/5809)).

[10] In any event, if North Vietnam considered there had been a breach of obligation by the south, its remedies lay in discussion with Saigon, perhaps in an appeal to the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, or in a reconvening of the conference to consider the situation. Under international law, North Vietnam had no right to use force outside its own zone in order to secure its political objectives.

In 1787 the world was a far larger place, and the framers probably had in mind attacks upon the United States. In the 20th century, the world has grown much smaller. An attack on a country far from our shores can impinge directly on the Nation's security. In the SEATO treaty, for example, it is formally declared that an armed attack against Vietnam would endanger the peace and safety of the United States.

Since the Constitution was adopted there have been at least 125 instances in which the President has ordered the Armed Forces to take action or maintain positions abroad without obtaining prior congressional authorization, starting with the "undeclared war" with France (1798–1800). For example, President Truman ordered 250,000 troops to Korea during the Korean war of the early 1950's. President Eisenhower dispatched 14,000 troops to Lebanon in 1958.

The Constitution leaves to the President the judgment to determine whether the circumstances of a particular armed attack are so urgent and the potential consequences so threatening to the security of the United States that he should act without formally consulting the Congress.

B. The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty authorizes the President's actions

Under article VI of the U.S. Constitution, "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land." Article IV, paragraph 1 of the SEATO Treaty establishes as a matter of law that a Communist armed attack against South Vietnam endangers the peace and safety of the United States. In this same provision the United States has undertaken a commitment in the SEATO Treaty to "act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes" in the event of such an attack.

Under our Constitution it is the President who must decide when an armed attack has occurred. He has also the constitutional responsibility for determining what measures of defense are required when the peace and safety of the United States are endangered. If he considers that deployment of U.S. forces to South Vietnam is required, and that military measures against the source of Communist aggression in North Vietnam are necessary, he is constitutionally empowered to take those measures.

The SEATO Treaty specifies that each party will act "in accordance with its constitutional processes."

It has recently been argued that the use of land forces in Asia is not authorized under the treaty because their use to deter armed attack was not contemplated at the time the treaty was considered by the Senate. Secretary Dulles testified at that time that we did not intend to establish (1) a land army in southeast Asia capable of deterring Communist aggression, or (2) an integrated headquarters and military organization like that of NATO; instead, the United States would rely on "mobile striking power" against the sources of aggression. However, the treaty obligation in article IV, paragraph 1, to meet the common danger in the event of armed aggression, is not limited to particular modes of military action. What constitutes an adequate deterrent or an appropriate response, in terms of military strategy, may change; but the essence of our commitment to act to meet the common danger, as necessary at the time of an armed aggression, remains. In 1954 the forecast of military judgment might have been against the use of substantial U.S. ground forces in Vietnam. But that does not preclude the President from reaching a different military judgment in different circumstances, 12 years later.

C. The joint resolution of Congress of August 10, 1964, authorizes U.S. participation in the collective defense of South Vietnam

As stated earlier, the legality of U.S. participation in the defense of South Vietnam does not rest only on the constitutional power of the President under article II—or indeed on that power taken in conjunction with the SEATO Treaty. In addition, the Congress has acted in unmistakable fashion to approve and authorize U.S. actions in Vietnam.

Following the North Vietnamese attacks in the Gulf of Tonkin against U.S. destroyers, Congress adopted, by a Senate vote of 88 to 2 and a House vote of 416 to 0, a joint resolution containing a series of important declarations and provisions of law.

Section 1 resolved that "the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." Thus, the Congress gave its sanction to specific actions by the President to repel attacks against U.S. naval vessels in the Gulf of Tonkin and elsewhere in the western Pacific. Congress further approved the taking of "all necessary measures * * * to prevent further aggression." This authorization extended to those measures the President might consider necessary to ward off further attacks and to prevent further aggression by North Vietnam in southeast Asia.

The joint resolution then went on to provide in section 2:

"The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Section 2 thus constitutes an authorization to the President, in his discretion, to act—using armed force if he determines that is required—to assist South Vietnam at its request in defense of its freedom. The identification of South Vietnam through the reference to "protocol state" in this section is unmistakable, and the grant of authority "as the President determines" is unequivocal.

It has been suggested that the legislative history of the joint resolution shows an intention to limit U.S. assistance to South Vietnam to aid, advice, and training. This suggestion is based on an amendment offered from the floor by Senator NELSON which would have added the following to the text:

"The Congress also approves and supports the efforts of the President to bring the problem of peace in southeast Asia to the Security Council of the United Nations; and the President's declaration that the United States, seeking no extension of the present military conflict, will respond to provocation in a manner that is 'limited and fitting.' Our continuing policy is to limit our role to the provision of aid, training assistance, and military advice, and it is the sense of Congress that, except when provoked to a greater response, we should continue to attempt to avoid a direct military involvement in the southeast Asian conflict."[11]

Senator FULBRIGHT, who had reported the joint resolution from the Foreign Relations Committee, spoke on the amendment as follows:

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. It states fairly accurately what the President has said would be our policy, and what I stated my understanding was as to our policy; also what other Senators have stated. In other words, it states that our response should be appropriate and limited to the provocation, which the Senator states as 'respond to provocation in a manner that is limited and fitting,' and so forth. We do not wish any political or military bases there. We are not seeking to gain a colony. We seek to insure the capacity of these people to develop along the lines of their own desires, independent of domination by communism.

"The Senator has put into his amendment a statement of policy that is unobjectionable. However, I cannot accept the amendment under the circumstances. I do not believe it is contrary to the joint resolution, but it is an enlargement. I am informed that the House is now voting on this resolution. The House joint resolution is about to be presented to us. I cannot accept the amendment and go to conference with it, and thus take responsibility for delaying matters.

"I do not object to it as a statement of policy. I believe it is an accurate reflection of what I believe is the President's policy, judging from his own statements. That does not mean that as a practical matter I can accept the amendment. It would delay matters to do so. It would cause confusion and require a conference, and present us with all the other difficulties that are involved in this kind of legislative action. I regret that I cannot do it, even though I do not at all disagree with the amendment as a general statement of policy."[12]

Senator NELSON's amendment related the degree and kind of U.S. response in Vietnam to "provocation" on the other side; the response should be "limited and fitting." The greater the provocation, the stronger are the measures that may be characterized as "limited and fitting." Bombing of North Vietnamese naval bases was a "limited and fitting" response to the attacks on U.S. destroyers in August 1964, and the subsequent actions taken by the United States and South Vietnam have been an appropriate response to the increased war of aggression carried on by North Vietnam since that date. Moreover, Senator NELSON's proposed amendment did not purport to be a restriction on authority available to the President but merely a statement concerning what should be the continuing policy of the United States.

Congressional realization of the scope of authority being conferred by the joint resolution is shown by the legislative history of the measure as a whole. The following exchange between Senators COOPER and FULBRIGHT is illuminating:

"Mr. COOPER. The Senator will remember that the SEATO Treaty, in article IV, provides that in the event an armed attack is made upon a party to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, or upon one of the protocol states such as South Vietnam, the parties to the treaty, one of whom is the United States, would then take such action as might be appropriate, after resorting to their constitutional processes. I assume that would mean, in the case of the United States, that Congress would be asked to grant the authority to act.

---

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18459.

[12] Ibid.

"Does the Senator consider that in enacting this resolution we are satisfying that requirement of article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty? In other words, are we now giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

"Mr. Fulbright. I think that is correct.

"Mr. Cooper. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?

"Mr. Fulbright. That is the way I would interpret it. If a situation later developed in which we thought the approval should be withdrawn it could be withdrawn by concurrent resolution." [13]

The August 1964 joint resolution continues in force today. Section 2 of the resolution provides that it shall expire "when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress." The President has made no such determination, nor has Congress terminated the joint resolution.[14]

Instead, Congress in May 1965 approved an appropriation of $700 million to meet the expense of mounting military requirements in Vietnam. (Public Law 89–18, 79 Stat. 109). The President's message asking for this appropriation stated that this was "not a routine request. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our efforts to halt Communist aggressions in South Vietnam." The appropriation act constitutes a clear congressional endorsement and approval of the actions taken by the President.

On March 1, 1966 the Congress continued to express its support of the President's policy by approving a $4.8 billion supplemental military authorization by votes of 392 to 4 and 93 to 2. An amendment that would have limited the President's authority to commit forces to Vietnam was rejected in the Senate by a vote of 94 to 2.

D. No declaration of war by the Congress is required to authorize U.S. participation in the collective defense of South Vietnam

No declaration of war is needed to authorize American actions in Vietnam. As shown in the preceding sections, the President has ample authority to order the participation of U.S. Armed Forces in the defense of South Vietnam.

Over a very long period in our history, practice and precedent have confirmed the constitutional authority to engage U.S. forces in hostilities without a declaration of war. This history extends from the undeclared war with France and the war against the Barbary pirates, at the end of the 18th century, to the Korean war of 1950–53.

James Madison, one of the leading framers of the Constitution, and Presidents John Adams and Jefferson all construed the Constitution, in their official actions during the early years of the Republic, as authorizing the United States to employ its Armed Forces abroad in hostilities in the absence of any congressional declaration of war. Their views and actions constitute highly persuasive evidence as to the meaning and effect of the Constitution. History has accepted the interpretation that was placed on the Constitution by the early Presidents and Congresses in regard to the lawfulness of hostilities without a declaration of war. The instances of such action in our history are numerous.

In the Korean conflict, where large-scale hostilities were conducted with an American troop participation of a quarter of a million men, no declaration of war was made by the Congress. The President acted on the basis of his constitutional responsibilities. While the Security Council, under a treaty of this country—the United Nations Charter—recommended assistance to the Republic of Korea against the Communist armed attack, the United States had no treaty commitment at that time obligating us to join in the defense of South Korea. In the case of South Vietnam we have the obligation of the SEATO Treaty and clear expressions of congressional support. If the President could act in Korea without a declaration of war, a fortiori he is empowered to do so now in Vietnam.

It may be suggested that a declaration of war is the only available constitutional process by which congressional support can be made effective for the use of U.S. Armed Forces in combat abroad. But the Constitution does not insist on any rigid formalism. It gives Congress a choice of ways in which to exercise its powers. In the case of Vietnam the Congress has supported the determination of the President by the Senate's approval of the SEATO Treaty, the adoption of the joint resolution of August 10, 1964, and the enactment of the necessary authorizations and appropriations.

V. CONCLUSION

South Vietnam is being subjected to armed attack by Communist North Vietnam, through the infiltration of armed personnel, military equipment and regular combat units. International law recognizes the right of individual and collective self-defense against armed attack. South Vietnam, and the United States upon the request of South Vietnam, are engaged in such collective defense of the south. Their actions are in conformity with international law and with the Charter of the United Nations. The fact that South Vietnam has been precluded by Soviet veto from becoming a member of the United Nations, and the fact that South Vietnam is a zone of a temporarily divided state, in no way diminish the right of collective defense of South Vietnam.

The United States has commitments to assist South Vietnam in defending itself against Communist aggression from the north. The United States gave undertakings to this effect at the conclusion of the Geneva Conference in 1954. Later that year the United States undertook an international obligation in the SEATO Treaty to defend South Vietnam against Communist armed aggression. And during the past decade the United States has given additional assurances to the South Vietnamese Government.

The Geneva accords of 1954 provided for a cease-fire and regroupment of contending forces, a division of Vietnam into two zones, and a prohibition on the use of either zone for the resumption of hostilities or to "further an aggressive policy." From the beginning, North Vietnam violated the Geneva accords through a systematic effort to gain control of South Vietnam by force. In the light of these progressive North Vietnamese violations, the introduction into South Vietnam beginning in late 1961 of substantial U.S. military equipment and personnel, to assist in the defense of the south was fully justified; substantial breach of an international agreement by one side permits the other side to suspend performance of corresponding obligations under the agreement. South Vietnam was justified in refusing to implement the provisions of the Geneva accords calling for reunification through free elections throughout Vietnam since the Communist regime in North Vietnam created conditions in the north that made free elections entirely impossible.

The President of the United States has full authority to commit U.S. forces in the collective defense of South Vietnam. This authority stems from the constitutional powers of the President. However, it is not necessary to rely on the Constitution alone as the source of the President's authority, since the SEATO Treaty—advised and consented to by the Senate and forming part of the law of the land—sets forth a U.S. commitment to defend South Vietnam against armed attack, and since the Congress—in the joint resolution of August 10, 1964, and in authorization and appropriations acts for support of the U.S. military effort in Vietnam—has given its approval and support to the President's actions. United States actions in Vietnam, taken by the President and approved by the Congress, do not require any declaration of war, as shown by a long line of precedents for the use of U.S. Armed Forces abroad in the absence of any congressional declaration of war.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR McNAMARA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to extend best wishes to my friend and colleague, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, who recently announced he would not seek reelection this year.

It was with great surprise that I learned the news of his decision to retire. His robust appearance and diligence to the heavy duties of his office led me to assume he would seek another term.

---

[13] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18409.

Senator Morse, who opposed the joint resolution, expressed the following view on August 6, 1964, concerning the scope of the proposed resolution:

"Another Senator thought, in the early part of the debate, that this course would not broaden the power of the President to engage in a land war if he decided that he wanted to apply the resolution in that way.

"That Senator was taking great consolation in the then held belief that, if he voted for the resolution, it would give no authority to the President to send many troops into Asia. I am sure he was quite disappointed to finally learn, because it took a little time to get the matter cleared, that the resolution places no restriction on the President in that respect. If he is still in doubt, let him read the language on page 2, lines 3 to 6, and page 2, lines 11 to 17. The first reads:

" 'The Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.' "

"It does not say he is limited in regard to the sending of ground forces. It does not limit that authority. That is why I have called it a predated declaration of war, in clear violation of article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which vests the power to declare war in the Congress, and not in the President.

"What is proposed is to authorize the President of the United States, without a declaration of war, to commit acts of war". Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, pp. 18426–18427.

[14] On Mar. 1, 1966, the Senate voted, 92 to 5, to table an amendment that would have repealed the joint resolution.

It has been my privilege to serve with PAT MCNAMARA on the Committee on Public Works, where he has been chairman for the past 3 years, and on the Special Committee on Aging, where he is chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

I have always found him willing to consider suggestions and amendments of other members of his committees. As a member of the minority party, I am especially appreciative of his willingness to let the minority set forth its views and participate actively in drafting legislation. I am especially appreciative of his cooperation on legislative and administrative matters involving my State of Hawaii.

Of course there were times of disagreement, as sometimes occur among members of different political parties. But it is to PAT MCNAMARA's everlasting credit that he could disagree without being disagreeable.

It is to his credit, too, that he has been a stanch advocate of economic development measures; harbor and flood control projects; road construction; and pollution control throughout the United States.

PAT MCNAMARA will leave the Senate knowing he has played a leading role in such vital public works legislation as Federal highway acts, nationwide flood control measures, disaster relief, the Economic Development Act, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, public works acceleration, and air and water pollution control acts.

In the field of aging, he was instrumental in establishing a separate Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He was a leader in enactment of medical care for older Americans.

These are but a few of the important and far-reaching activities of PAT MCNAMARA during his 12 years in the U.S. Senate.

As his term of office nears its end, PAT MCNAMARA can take pride and satisfaction in knowing he has compiled an extensive record of service to his State and Nation.

He will also take with him the affection and respect of his colleagues.

In closing, I want to extend my warmest aloha to PAT MCNAMARA and best wishes for many rewarding and fruitful years after he leaves the Senate.

TAX CREDIT FOR COLLEGE TUITION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, although my proposal to provide a tax credit for college tuition was not accepted by the Senate yesterday, the issue is far from dead. It will continue to be an issue because it fills a vital need in our society. It brings desperately needed assistance to the working people, the lower and middle income groups, at a time when they need it most. The point is well made in an editorial in the Hartford Times of March 8, 1966, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXING COSTS OF COLLEGE

Apparently there's to be no income tax relief soon for parents who feel the severe financial pinch of the costs of college education for their sons and daughters.

Unfortunately, administration leaders have torpedoed Senator RIBICOFF's efforts to get congressional approval of a maximum tax credit of $325 for certain college expenses. They say that if adopted, the Government would lose $1 billion at a time when war costs are mounting and the Treasury can ill afford such a drain.

In any instance of tax abatement, unless the need for which the tax is levied disappears, granting relief only means that the burden will fall elsewhere. Furthermore, every time a particular category of taxpayers is exempted (in this case parents) a new special-privilege group is established.

However, the category that Senator RIBICOFF is trying to help is in the vast middle class, upon which college costs fall most heavily.

Our tax laws today are honeycombed with exceptions, exemptions, and special advantages for people of wealth and business interests able to maintain high-priced lobbyists in Washington to plead their case. There is no such lobby for the middle-class parent.

Happily, even if all attempts fail this year, Senator RIBICOFF says, he doesn't intend to relax his efforts to get some kind of tax relief for college costs. He says he will make his tax credit proposal "year in and year out" because he is sure the administration will eventually realize something must be done.

We shall never make any substantial gains in tax relief until a sweeping tax reform program is launched. This Congress has long refused to do. The pleas of able and distinguished men to do something constructive about our hodgepodge of tangled tax laws have been futile.

THE REORGANIZED CIA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency is undoubtedly the most misrepresented and maligned agency of our Government.

This is understandable because they are in the business of gathering intelligence from all over the world. They are always vulnerable to attack because it has long been the policy of the CIA—and I think rightfully so—not to attempt to defend itself no matter what charges are leveled against them.

Mr. President, I was pleased to read a column in the Washington Post this morning, March 10, by a noted columnist, William S. White, entitled "Reorganized CIA—Making Use of Outside Skills."

From my knowledge of the CIA and their operations—and it is considerable—I believe this article to be an accurate and fair appraisal of the CIA and I wish to associate myself with the comments of Mr. White and especially with reference to its Director, Admiral Raborn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REORGANIZED CIA—MAKING USE OF OUTSIDE SKILLS

(By William S. White)

The highly secret Central Intelligence Agency is broadening its communication with Congress, with private American scientists, and with American industry.

Almost, indeed, it might be said that CIA is for the first time gingerly entering ordinary American life—or as much of that ordinary life as its unavoidably clandestine basic cast can possibly permit.

This, the most sensitive of the instrumentalities of the American Government in the cold war has not, of course, dropped and cannot drop its inherent cloak-and-dagger covering for some operations.

Within the limits of bedrock and unalterable security precautions, however, Adm. W. F. Raborn, its Director, has reorganized its whole inner structure and approach to make a wide use of outside skills and talents—and information—never before so widely available to CIA.

The production of scientific and technical intelligence, in consequence, has been immensely increased. This has been principally through the cooperation of world-famous American men of science who have been brought in as cleared consultants. Some American industrial concerns have made large direct contributions of their own.

That Raborn, a professional admiral yet, has become the chief of the CIA in order to liquidate some of its old passion for extreme apartness is not without its irony. When he took over the Agency there was much expressed fear that with a military mind at its head it would more and more tend to operate in darker and darker alleys.

The simple truth is that this has not happened. Nor has Raborn put in some GI system requiring endless saluting of the boss. In truth he has gone to the reverse. CIA was never so little a one-man operation as it is now. The admiral has given to the professional operative who is his deputy, Richard Helms, a degree of power never before held by any man other than the Director himself.

Helms, in truth, actually conducts the day-by-day operations of the Agency. He sits as the CIA representative on the U.S. combined Intelligence Board. He, as well as Raborn, briefs Members of Congress. The admiral, in short, cheerfully acknowledges Helms' superior savvy as a career intelligence operative. Raborn's simple purpose has been to merge his own executive managerial experience with the intelligence expertise of Richard Helms.

The intelligence community is a small and at heart a closed community and the introduction into CIA of a seadog outsider undoubtedly did not sit well at first within the ranks. But the best information available now is that professional morale is high and not low. This, at any rate, is the estimate of men not involved in the Agency but with certain supervisory powers over it.

The admiral seems to have found a way of running a taut ship without making it also a martial one—and a ship, moreover, which can take on outside and purely civilian passengers occasionally with no harm to them or to the professional crew.

One other fact is perhaps worth noting: Not once in Raborn's regime has CIA been caught napping in any major outbreak of trouble for us around the world.

One of his creations, a new form of special intelligence task force for special needs, involving senior operations officers from all arms of American intelligence, is on 24-hour watch in every critical area of the earth. The busiest at the moment is Task Force Vietnam—but Task Force Vietnam is not alone.

These special forces serve with far more coldly objective minds—as does the CIA collectively—than is commonly thought by eager critics. Still, nobody is naive enough to suppose that the best possible work will totally free CIA of the instinctive skepticism and sometimes outright hostility of a public which has a healthy suspicion of secret establishments and an immense appetite for melodramatic spy fiction.

One of Raborn's central efforts is to reduce this skepticism, this hostility, by what in CIA language would be called the optimum possible.

THE EXAMPLE OF SWEDEN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Wednesday the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures received aid from a developed and enlightened nation—Sweden. The aid was free. No strings were attached.

The Swedish three-member delegation came upon invitation to share with the subcommittee and all interested persons what Sweden is doing to make family planning information available upon request overseas and at home.

They came at their own expense from Stockholm to Capitol Hill.

The Swedish delegation was headed by the Director General of the Swedish International Development Authority, Mr. Ernst Michanek. With him were Dr. Ulf Borell, professor of obstetrics and gynecology and chairman of SIDA's Advisory Group on Family Planning and Mr. Carl Wahren, deputy head of the planning division of the Authority.

Sweden has pioneered in making birth control assistance an ever-increasing part of its foreign assistance program, having undertaken its first effort to help a developing country initiate a family planning program in 1958 when Ceylon requested assistance.

Because of growing interest in the population crisis I ask unanimous consent that the written statements given by Mr. Michanek and Dr. Borell be printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. MICHANEK

SWEDISH FOREIGN AID IN FAMILY PLANNING

Mr. Chairman, we have come here to talk about the most urgent problem of the present-day world: the problem of hunger and overpopulation. This is, I submit, one and the same problem. The starvation in the developing countries is increasing because of the increase in population. The starvation and death of many millions of men, women, and children can be checked only if the enormous increase in population is checked. We can do something about this situation—and we must do it.

You have been kind enough to invite us to appear before this subcommittee. Your invitation was addressed to the Government of Sweden and based upon the activities undertaken by that Government in the field of population and family planning. I am most honored to represent Sweden here in my capacity as chief executive of the Swedish Government authority for international development. With me are my chief adviser in the field of family planning, Dr. Ulf Borell, professor at the university and head of the department of gynecology at the Karolinska University Hospital in Stockholm, and Mr. Carl Wahren, administrator of foreign aid programs of health, family planning, and research.

In the discussion on foreign aid we speak of the vicious circle of poverty, ignorance, and disease, which prevent economic, social, and cultural development. In international and domestic policies we fight for human rights—rights concerning life, work, education, security for all, et cetera.

We consider it a human right for all parents to plan the size of their families—including the case of subfertility—and to be assisted with a view to getting the number of children they can provide for.

In Europe, and in North America, birth control has obviously been known and widely practiced for centuries. This goes for people of all nations and denominations—only that in some countries and some parts of the Western society family planning is discussed more openly than in others.

We have no right to reserve this knowledge for a few. On the contrary, we are under obligation to disseminate it—for ethical reasons, for reasons of morale, for social reasons, and—let us not forget—for economic reasons.

In the 19th century and still not many decades ago, Sweden, although very thinly populated, had a problem of overpopulation. More than a million Swedes emigrated to America for economic reasons. People even starved to death in years of crop failure. Sweden's population problem today is rather one of underpopulation in spite of the fact that we now have twice the population of a century ago: We have a shortage of manpower. Sweden is now an immigration country.

In Sweden we would never think of trying to deprive our people of their right to knowledge in questions of human reproduction. If I may speak in my former capacity as Sweden's Under Secretary of Labor and Social Affairs: We try in every way to see to it that all children born should be children welcome and should have a right to affection, adequate care, and education.

We think the rest of the world should have the same opportunities as are available in Sweden. This is why in our foreign aid program we have entered the field of population control.

Swedish foreign aid is not large. However, our $65 million program this year represents five to six times more than only 5 years ago. All parties in Sweden are agreed that we must move still faster toward the goal of 1 percent of our gross national product being used for aid purposes. Our official foreign aid today financially represents one-third of that target figure, and our gross national product grows at the annual rate of some 4 percent.

As an ardent supporter of the United Nations, Sweden devotes half of her foreign aid funds to the multilateral assistance programs of the U.N. and its specialized agencies. In fact, this year Sweden—a nation of 8 million people—ranks second to none but the United States as contributor to the United Nations development program, carrying some 8 percent of the total costs against 40 for the United States.

Our foreign aid program includes bilateral programs in a few countries. We are financing and running some institutions for vocational and professional training. We have entered the field of financing food purchases for starving nations. We give credits for grain storage projects, agricultural water supply, and the like. And we are working in the field of health, preventive medicine, nutrition, and family planning.

Swedish public opinion demands that we devote more of our efforts to family planning. But for reasons of lack of experience and particularly of shortage of personnel, financially only a modest part of our aid budget so far has gone into family planning. We are increasing this part, and eager to increase it more, but until such time as we have found ways of attracting badly needed experts—experienced doctors, demographers, sociologists, and the like—a strongly hampering factor will remain.

We are in no doubt regarding the interest and motivation among the population of the developing countries in such an increased activity. Apart from all evidence by way of research, reported to this committee from the competent quarters, many Swedes abroad report back how they are approached by local citizens from all strata of the community begging for information: "How do we go about having as few children as you have?" Cabinet ministers visiting Sweden from developing countries and their wives have asked to obtain knowledge for their own part. In an increasing number of cases we are now being approached by representatives of foreign governments requesting assistance.

As in other cases of requests for aid, because of our limited capacity, we would have liked to refer such questions to the multilateral programs which we support so strongly; i.e., to the United Nations. But for many long years the intergovernmental organizations have not been in a position to assist. This is why Sweden has felt compelled to try on her own to give foreign aid in the field of family welfare including family planning. Indeed we would have liked to cooperate multilaterally with other governments; but for many years we have had to pioneer among the industralized countries for lifting the ban on family planning activities as part of the official aid programs.

I speak of governments. Before mentioning more about the official activities I wish to stress what has been done by nongovernmental institutions. The largest and most active private institutions working in this field are the Population Council of New York and the other American institutions working with the support of, above all, the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations. They deserve the highest praise for truly historic achievements. What they have done by way of research, investigations, planning, training, and pilot schemes in many developing countries—and in this country—is, in my opinion, without comparison the most important international effort so far to meet the requests from the developing countries for assistance in formulating and carrying through population programs.

These American institutions need no financial assistance from outside—but we have been happy to share with them problems, findings, and experience.

For many years, the pioneering International Planned Parenthood Federation, IPPF, with headquarters in London, which is a nongovernmental federation of national or local organizations all over the world has been devotedly working on family welfare programs. The Swedish International Development Authority has taken up cooperation with IPPF in order to pool experiences and resources, and Swedish financial assistance toward the budget of the IPPF has recently been granted.

In the United Nations the Swedish activities aimed at creating awareness of the problem of overpopulation began in the early 1950's. There were indications of an awareness among leaders of some developing countries, that problems were arising as medical science and international efforts helped decrease the death rates rapidly, while birth rates remained unchecked. A Swedish demographer in the Population Commission of the United Nations brought up the issue of population policy in 1951, and was invited to India to study that country's situation and to advise the Government on family planning measures. But from the same year, sitting as a Swedish delegate to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, I remember being warned not to mention this question in official interventions at the risk of being brought to silence by procedural moves or otherwise.

In the following years Swedish delegates tried many times in the committees of the General Assembly or in U.N. functional commissions, in UNICEF, and the World Health Organization to bring the matter up for discussion. In 1960 Sweden and five governments from developing countries tried in the General Assembly to break the ice, but in vain. In 1962, 11 sponsor governments succeeded, by a very tight margin, though, in getting the matter discussed, but the most important paragraph of the proposed resolution was defeated; the United Nations was not allowed to include family planning in its technical assistance activities, even at the request of governments.

In the meantime, world population reached an increase rate of 80 million people a year.

In 1958, the Governments of Ceylon and Sweden agreed to cooperate in family planning, starting a pilot project for action cum research on the island. Research, training, and individual assistance was undertaken. By now we seem to be able to state that in the main research area the birth rate has gone down by some 30 percent. The Swedish project is since last year incorporated in the national program for family planning in Ceylon, in which the Government has engaged the whole health service system of the country. Subfertility cases are, of course, also treated. The project has now entered a "service cum training" phase. Under a new agreement between the governments, Sweden is also financing the supply of contraceptives for the national program.

For 4 years, Pakistan and Sweden have been cooperating in a family planning project. Swedish experts have helped in organizing a few pilot clinics, in training medical and paramedical personnel, in the preparation and production of audiovisual aids for the dissemination of knowledge in the field of contraception and in other ways. Last year a very ambitious family planning scheme for Pakistan, covering the 5-year plan period 1965–70, was prepared, as a result of cooperation between American experts, the Pakistanis and the Swedish team. And now the Swedish experts are involved in what I believe is so far the greatest effort in the world to introduce a large-scale national family planning program in a large country—a country of 100 million people, in which we know that the number of inhabitants will become 200 million before the end of this century if present trends prevail. Financial assistance is now being given by Sweden to cover the costs in foreign currencies for purchases abroad (and not in Sweden, by the way) of contraceptive supplies.

Other small programs aimed at linking the services in the field of maternal and child health with the teaching of contraceptive techniques have been introduced by Sweden in Tunisia, and in the Gaza strip as part of an assistance program for Palestine refugees.

A few other countries have made official or semiofficial requests for assistance in the field of family planning, and the Swedish International Development Authority is now considering how best to deal with them. During the last 10 months I have myself studied family planning projects in Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore, Tanzania, and Egypt, and my collaborators have been also in Turkey, Morocco, Tunisia, and Taiwan for the same purpose. We have also studied different activities at American universities in the field of research and training.

I mention this in order to stress in how many countries the governments are now aware of the problem and ready to take action, and many more could be mentioned. It was, therefore, late but very appropriate, that a number of United Nations bodies last year took a positive attitude to the population problem in general. In 1965 the first U.N. expert team was set up to study population programs in India at the request of the Government, and we are eagerly waiting for its report.

We hope that soon the time will be ripe for operative programs to be undertaken by the United Nations. In the meantime, the Swedish Government has made known that we are ready to support financially, by funds in trust, and if possible otherwise, operative programs which UNICEF, WHO, or others might be willing to start.

CONCLUSIONS

From our experience, although limited, I should like to draw some conclusions with respect to family planning activities.

1. Planning: A careful planning of field activities must precede operations and much of the planning must take place in the field. Planning teams should be composed of experts in various fields—medical, sociological, demographic, etc. Demographic surveys and sociological studies are particularly important for the planning and for the evaluation of results. The magnitude and the complex character of the problem indicates, that foreign personnel cannot do very much of the real down-to-earth fieldwork. International experts have their greatest role to play as planners, research leaders, advisers. The bulk of the job must be performed by national personnel.

2. The role of women: In the planning and execution of programs, the central role of women in the family planning must not be overlooked. After all, one of the most important aspects of the population policy is to improve the health, not to say save the lives of the mothers, to give women a status in the family and the community, and to strengthen their possibilities of really contributing to development.

3. Family planning and mother and child health: It seems important to integrate, wherever possible, family planning activities in mother and child health promotion and couple them with the preventive health services. Indeed it is important to include services for the subfertility cases in the program.

4. Personnel and training: The problem of operative personnel is particularly complicated in the case of family planning. It is difficult already to make a job description, still more difficult to find suitable persons—each field project is partly unique and must be adapted to local conditions. Specialized field personnel is needed for information services and motivation, for distribution of information material and contraceptive supplies, for training in various fields, for clinical services and for follow up studies. The personnel needed will in most cases be in need of special training. It is very important that training institutions get possibilities of taking up this special training, and that they can serve as international training institutes for personnel from abroad, from developing countries as well as from the donor side. I think the United Nations ought to take up a training program for field personnel. What has been done already in this field and in population research by American universities is of utmost importance—I might mention the universities of Chicago, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and the University of California, Berkeley. Indeed, it is difficult to get proper training for field activities in industrialized countries, but I have been very impressed by what I have seen myself of practical fieldwork in Chicago, undertaken by a university institution and the Planned Parenthood Association there.

The pioneer experiences of the Population Council of New York, the Ford Foundation, and the International Planned Parenthood Federation must be taken care of and utilized by all parties concerned—and may I say, Mr. Chairman, that this subcommittee is doing a great contribution by putting together so much useful information through this dialog.

5. Research: A lot of research remains to be done. In regard to contraceptive methods there is not yet a final answer to the question of methods: which are the most safe—pills or the intrauterine device or some other—and which are the simplest for women and men in various cultural and social environments? May I mention in this context that the programs should include several kinds of contraceptive methods to be in keeping with individual and cultural beliefs. We have found, for instance, that in cases of inconvenience or failure of one method a set of others must be at hand, otherwise women in many cases will resort to abortion. The institutions in the United States have already played a great role in research, and institutions all over the world must cooperate continually and if possible under some kind of overall planning. Research in other fields—demography, sociology, methods of communication, economy, etc.—should also aim at assisting in a proper evaluation of the impact of human reproduction to the individual, the family, the Nation. If it is true, and I believe it is, that a dollar paid into family planning services can save $300 in costs for education, such facts should be given and disseminated more widely.

6. Coordination: International coordination is badly needed in family planning. We need a center for information and discussion and we must try to achieve a rational division of labor between different parties and institutions.

Aid-giving agencies have to consult each other and coordinate their investigations and operations. In other fields the United Nations bodies, consultative groups or consortia, are available for international coordination. In this field it is particularly important to get the private institutions involved in a coordination machinery which they can accept.

Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago I appeared here as a witness invited by the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower under the chairmanship of Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, to speak about Sweden's labor market policies. On that occasion I said that I and my colleagues had not come here pretending to carry with us solutions or even suggestions. We confined ourselves to tell how we had tackled certain labor market problems in Sweden, and we hoped that our hosts would find the information useful in their efforts to meet problems confronting the United States.

This time I cannot be quite as modest as that. I am talking this time of a problem confronting the whole world, a problem of equal concern to all nations. This is a field of activity in which a concerted international action is necessary. Small countries like mine can do little more than speak of it, undertake some pilot projects, finance some subsidiary activities as a part of a great program.

The problem requires action on the part of all nations—and not least the leading nations of the world. The United States has started the engines—and we are hopeful.

But I dare say that we are waiting impatiently for the takeoff. We understand now that the U.S. Government is aware that this country must make a greater contribution to the solution of the world's greatest problem. I am sure it can do it. I trust it will do it.

But, sir, time is running short.

STATEMENT BY MR. BORELL

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Swedish International Development Authority's Advisory Group on Family Planning and as professor of gynecology and obstetrics at the Karolinska Institute in Stockholm, I wish to thank the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures for this opportunity to describe the methods and research in family planning in Sweden.

My remarks today are prepared to tell you more about the family planning methods used in Sweden, the Swedish legislation as it concerns abortion, present research in human reproduction in Sweden, and the need for international cooperation in demographic research projects.

If you should wish me to expand on a particular portion of my testimony, I will do so. This subcommittee has provided a public forum from which the population problems which affect all of us may be discussed and, perhaps, some new light will be directed toward the problem areas.

Let me begin by discussing the following:

1. FAMILY PLANNING METHODS USED IN SWEDEN

Already in the 1930's the birth rate was very low in Sweden, being 14 to 15 births per 1,000 inhabitants (now it is roughly 16). Oral contraceptives and intrauterine contraceptive devices were not available at that time, but the conventional contraceptive methods were widely used. Legal abortions were only few, illegal abortions—although statistics are not available, of course—were too many.

As Sweden has no problem of overpopulation there was no urgent national need for new contraceptive methods, all work done within the field of birth control being designed to help individual couples or families. It is only recently that the Swedish National Board of Health has sanctioned the use of oral contraceptives and intrauterine contraceptive devices, except for cases of gynecological diseases in Sweden; in such cases they have been long used. The effectiveness of the pills is superior to any other of the available contraceptive methods. Today, out of approximately 1.8 million women aged 15 to 49, about 150,000 take the pill, which can be obtained only on a doctor's prescription. This measure has been taken to follow up users of these drugs in order to enable early diagnosis of unforeseen side effects.

For a long time objections have not been raised against giving advice on family planning on a large scale. Swedish physicians, in general, are not inhibited by ethical or religious reasons from prescribing contraceptives.

The possible side effects of oral contraceptives have been much discussed by physicians and laymen, on television, on the radio, and in the press.

The Swedish National Board of Health has instructed the members of the medical profession to record and report any unusual complications suggestive of being due to oral contraceptive therapy. Cases of thromboembolic disease including thrombophlebitis have been reported, but there is no convincing evidence of a relationship between oral contraceptives and these diseases. Our experience concerning this point agrees with the observations made in other countries.

On the other hand, we have found that a slight risk of hepatic dysfunction was associated with oral contraceptive therapy. Following cessation of oral contraceptive therapy, however, the disturbed hepatic function promptly returned to normal in all cases found. We have now made it a rule not to prescribe oral contraceptives to women with a history of hepatic disease or gall bladder trouble. The facts involved in the causation of hepatic dysfunction are unknown. It has been suggested that this complication was due to drug allergy or genetic factors. It is rather surprising that little attention has been reported to this side-effect in other countries as it is easy to detect.

Because hepatic disease is quite common in developing countries, special attention should be given to a possible increase in its incidence in users of oral contraceptives.

Swedish doctors engaged in family planning in Pakistan have tried to introduce oral contraceptives in several clinics in that country. Unfortunately, discouraging results were obtained. The majority of the women who had been given the drugs free of charge discontinued taking them after 1 or 2 months, probably because they had not been informed that they might experience initial side effects such as nausea and vaginal bleeding in the beginning of the treatment. In my opinion it is not expedient to give oral contraceptive therapy on a nationwide scale in developing countries because the routine work of doctors and their assistants in Pakistan, for example, is so exacting that they have no time left for giving detailed directions for use of oral contraceptives. This is a very time-consuming task particularly in the case of illiterate women.

A few developing countries such as South Korea and Taiwan appear successfully to have checked population growth by the use of intra-uterine contraceptive devices. These are easy to apply, and the risk of complications appears to be negligible.

Scientific surveys from different countries would indicate that increasing motivation for family planning brings in its wake an increasing incidence of abortions until an efficient family planning program has been implemented. I suggest that governments embarking upon national family planning should be aware of this possible interrelationship. The high degree of effectiveness of oral contraceptives, however, has meant that induced abortion is virtually unknown among users of oral contraceptives as unplanned pregnancies occur seldom, if ever. The intra-uterine contraceptive devices are less consistently effective than the pill due to the expulsion rate of approximately 15 to 20 percent. Thus, the widespread use of these devices might tend to increase the demand for abortion, at least in an initial stage.

2. THE SWEDISH LEGISLATION ON ABORTION

Prior to 1938 in Sweden, all artificial miscarriage was regarded as a punishable offense. It had nevertheless become an accepted practice that abortion should not be punishable if childbirth would be likely to endanger the woman's life or health. In this purely medical indication for abortion it was required that two physicians should be prepared to give a written statement confirming the necessity for an operation. The number of illegal abortions apparently was high at that time, roughly estimated at 20,000 a year.

Under the 1938 act the interruption of pregnancy was permitted in some well defined cases, where there were strong medical, medico-social, humanitarian or eugenic reasons. Of great importance was that a legal abortion could be performed if—due to the woman's illness, physical defect (medical reason) or weakness (medical-social reason)—childbirth would seriously endanger her life or health.

The law, however, hardly led to the anticipated reduction in the number of illegal abortions. In 1946, a new indication for legal abortion was added, abortion being allowed also if the woman's living conditions were such "that her physical or mental powers would be seriously impaired through the birth or care of a child." Thus the advisability of abortion should be evaluated on the basis of environment, social, and financial conditions, as well as medical considerations.

In the beginning of the 1950's, the annual number of legal abortions was around 6,000, to compare with about 100,000 live births annually. During the second half of the decade, the annual legal abortion figures gradually dropped and reached the level of around 3,000 per 100,000 live births in 1960. In later years again the figures have increased to around 4,000, now to compare with 120,000 live births per year. My personal conviction is that the number of illegal abortions has decreased very substantially since the 1930's due to better contraceptive techniques, improved social welfare measures, etc.

Other preventive measures have been taken with a view to counteracting abortion. Legislation has, for example, been passed which prohibits dismissal from employment on account of pregnancy or childbirth. Services for the support and advice of pregnant women have been established. A number of social security and welfare measures have been added in order to improve the living conditions of children, to support the natural desire for raising a family, and to increase the feeling and the actual state of security of expectant mothers.

In view of the injury to the fetus caused by thalidomide, the Abortion Act was again revised in 1963. Abortion is now allowed if the child might be assumed to suffer from a serious disease or physical defect due to injury during its fetal life.

The Swedish Abortion Act of 1938, as amended, makes no distinction between Swedish and foreign citizens. In the last years an increasing number of foreign women have come to Sweden to get an abortion, particularly since the reporting of such a case in the world press. In 3 years, from 1962 to 1965, more than 700 foreign women applied for abortion at the Karolinska University Hospital, 292 of whom came from the United States. Only in 3 percent of all these cases an abortion was granted under our law. Legal abortion was performed in only 13 of the 292 cases from the United States (4.5 percent) after decision by the National Board of Health. In approximately 65 percent of the cases considered there was no indication at all for abortion according to the Swedish law; pure socioeconomic reasons were given, unmarried status referred to, and so forth.

To a large extent foreigners lack knowledge of the preventive emphasis in the Swedish abortion legislation, which aims at finding better alternatives than abortion by various relief measures. Since those who come to Sweden in these cases normally cannot be given social aid, the often long journey results only in disappointment and money spent in vain. In practice it is only on manifestly medical grounds that a foreign citizen can gain permission for abortion in Sweden. But as a rule in such cases abortion can be obtained in the applicant's homeland as well.

About 25 percent of the women to whom I have referred who came from the United States had been advised to come to Sweden by a physician in the United States in order to get a legal abortion. The remaining 75 percent had been misled by newspapers and magazines.

3. PRESENT RESEARCH IN HUMAN REPRODUCTION IN SWEDEN

Swedish research in human reproduction is characterized by the philosophy that whenever possible, basic information on these processes should be obtained in clinical experimentation. At the Karolinska University Hospital in Stockholm, research is concentrated on the study of the endocrine regulation of reproductive processes in the human female.

The present research work at my department has two major directions; namely (a) Studies on the endocrine regulation of ovarian function; (b) Investigations of the endocrine regulation of gestation in the human being.

The mode of action of oral contraceptives and intrauterine devices is incompletely understood. We believe that an improved knowledge of the mode of action of these agents must result in improved methods of regulating fertility and sterility.

Present studies are directed toward the exploration of the mode of action of a new type of contraceptive pill and called low-level supplementation. This method is believed to interfere with fertility without ovulation.

The other line of research involves studies on the endocrine regulation of gestation in the human. These studies led to the development of a new concept, that of the fetoplacental functional unit, and we think that as a result of these studies it will be possible to find specific steps in the hormone production which are vulnerable to exogenous hormonal or pharmacological influences.

These studies were made possible in part by a research grant of $500,000 from the Ford Foundation, but the work is also supported by the U.S. National Institutes of Health (just now a training grant of $350,000 is pending), and the Medical Research Council of Sweden ($12,000 yearly). In addition, the international pharmaceutical industry has also shown a great interest in supporting the basic research conducted in this laboratory.

During the past 3 years (1963–65), 25 postdoctoral fellows were trained in reproductive endocrinology at the laboratory. Eleven of these came from the United States.

It is hoped that this training program can be extended in the near future to include fellows also from South America and from the developing countries in Africa and Asia.

4. A DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH PROJECT

Engagement in the population problems in the economic development of developing countries requires adequate methods for analysis of the situation and trends and for the evaluation of the efforts. As for the population aspects, research is now carried out at the Demographic Institute, University of Gothenburg, Sweden. The purpose is to develop so-called demographic models as a scientific instrument for studying the interrelationships between the population changes and the economic and social development in various types of populations and economies.

It seems desirable to establish international cooperation in this field both through a suitable international body and through direct teamwork between individuals and institutes in various countries, developed as well as underdeveloped.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I offer my heartiest congratulations to the President for his timely message on crime and law enforcement in the United States. Crime is one of the best publicized facts of American life today. One cannot pick up a magazine or pass a newsstand without being assaulted by headlines proclaiming the latest bloody murder or robbery.

These occurrences are alarming and deplorable. It is understandable that we should withdraw in fear, that our impulse should be to shut our doors on the threatening outside world. But as natural as that reaction may be, it is the wrong one. It can only make the problems worse.

We can hope to win the war on crime by uniting not in fear, but in an affirmative, forward program against the many factors which contribute to criminal conduct.

It is that need to unite and, united, to move actively forward that the President so wisely emphasizes to us in his exposition of the need to perform more than superficial surgery on our existing criminal justice system. He recalls to us the relevance for crime prevention of the many broad programs for social betterment which are now beginning. In the meantime, he reminds us of the importance of firm, and immediate, legislative action.

One measure the President proposes is legislative reform of the bail system. In the last several years, compelling evidence has been amassed which testifies that our present dependence upon money bail as a condition of pretrial release is unfair. This evidence also shows the feasibility of relying on other assurances of return for trial—assurances which do not discriminate between rich and poor defendants.

The country has been shown that thousands of defendants spend months in jail awaiting trial, unable to support their families or assist in the preparation of their defense simply because they lack the funds with which to post required money bail.

We have also learned that many of those same defendants can be trusted, on the basis of such facts, as their long residence in the community or their good employment record, to return to court without the need for money bail.

It is highly appropriate that this nationwide movement of realization and resulting reform should culminate in Federal legislation, revising Federal bail practices in keeping with this knowledge and thereby setting the States a good example as well.

A second necessary proposal would provide civil commitment and medical treatment for narcotics addicts. Again, we all know of the individual suffering and the harm to those on whom the addict preys to support his habit. Here is legislation which gives an opportunity to help the addict break his habit—to return him to society as a useful, contributing member instead of a dangerous, embittered and predatory outcast.

Another step the President urges is enactment of legislation to help authorities deal with the scourage of organized crime. This measure would permit witnesses who possess information about organized crime but refuse to divulge it voluntarily to be granted immunity from prosecution and compelled to testify.

Organized crime is growing and expanding its operations in new and truly fearsome dimensions. It is penetrating legitimate businesses, terrorizing law-abiding citizens, enmeshing officials in cynical schemes to overlook or underperform their duty. The proposed immunity provisions would give the Government an important new tool in loosening the hold of this many-tentacled menace.

All these measures are important forward steps in our continuing efforts to cope with crime and improve our criminal justice system. I am pleased to join in urging passage of this legislation.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TIBET DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in March of 1959, the Government of Red China completed the suppression of the historically autonomous country of Tibet. Tibet has always been a country of peace, a nation of deep religious principles, a Buddhist people following the teachings of the ruling Dalai Lama. Red China's rape of Tibet 7 years ago was not only a violation of every law of international decency, but a breach of Peiping's own promise, signed in a treaty of 1951, to respect Tibet's autonomy, and a complete disregard of Peiping's pledges at the Bandung conference to practice noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries.

As a result of the Chinese Communist takeover, the Dalai Lama was forced to flee to India, to keep the hopes of his people alive. Eighty thousand refugees followed the Dalai Lama into exile. The life of the refugees is not a happy one, but they prefer it to life under communism. Their brethren who have had to remain in Tibet have been subjected to forced labor and widely reported genocide.

The free world has not forgotten the people of Tibet and should commemorate their hopes for religious freedom and peace.

THREE GREAT LIGHTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Freedom Foundation has given an award to Miss Lynda Hanson, a senior in the Yankton, S. Dak., high school for her editorial written in the school paper, the Waksape.

This is a very outstanding editorial. It is filled with patriotic sentiments. It indicates a maturity of thought and presents a challenge to young America.

I ask permission to have this editorial entitled "Three Great Lights" inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE GREAT LIGHTS—WILL THEY CONTINUE TO GLOW?

"And darkness was upon the face of the deep." Let us attempt to visualize such a darkened world, void of all light, of all direction.

"And then there was light." Light was everywhere. Every nook and cranny glittered—all kinds of light—the light of hope, the light of peace, the light of knowledge, to mention just a few. However, as time passed on, shadows fell upon different parts of the world and at times it seemed as though the light merely flickered over areas, as a candle striving to glow in a raging storm.

And so it was in this, our America. As our forefathers strived to keep the light aglow, so that its feeble rays might show the direction to a new way of life, out of the efforts of a noble group of patriots emerged three brilliant candles: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. A new nation was born.

As time passed on, it appeared that some would have these candles extinguished but they had been entrusted to such men as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Dwight Eisenhower, among others. Our America has remained strong and stable because of the confidence these men, as well as many women, have had in these three lights.

Thomas Jefferson speculated that God had endowed all men with "inalienable rights" which no one could take from them. He cited these rights as the right of life, the right of liberty, and the right to pursue happiness. We enjoy these rights daily as we bask in the light of the three candles. As Americans we have done this for many years, building a bigger and better Nation of free people.

We, like our forefathers, had to learn to live with neighbors who came from all parts of the world. We learned not only to tolerate each other, but to welcome and assist one another. This welding of people has contributed to the dynamic aspect of our society.

Indeed, disputes can be expected from such a people as we are, but invariably we managed to harmonize two principles—the principle of belief and the principle of freedom. At times our candles flickered momentarily, only to be sheltered by those who believed in our democratic way of life. Often cries of complaint and criticism were raised but they soon were muffled into murmurs of gratitude. In our modern world, democracy is too often taken for granted. Who can say that the finger of guilt is not to be pointed at him. Can we proclaim with sincerity, as we salute Old Glory, "This is my country."

However, as we utter these words, how do we, as students, endeavor to keep the lights shining brightly? We can point to our efforts for self-improvement and our recognition of the value of an education. Abraham Flexner, a great educator once said, "The common school is the greatest discovery ever made by man." This statement is significant to most of us but even a small minority is too many to have to be reminded of the value of an education. Our forefathers realized the importance of an educational system and planted its roots deeply among the people where it could grow and be well nourished. Our schools have always been well illuminated and must continue to be so to keep our Nation strong.

We Americans are known to be outward looking and forward looking, an endless line of pioneers striving to better our world. Unless we continue to look ahead as our forefathers did, we can expect a diminishing of the three great lights. This must never be because the future is tomorrow and we must be ready for it. We are people in process, proud of our adaptability, alert to change, quick moving, and yet sympathetic. As a nation, we made promises to the world and kept them for, as the poet, Archibald McLeish said, "America is promises."

As our three great lights illuminate our way of life to the world, we, as Americans, are obligated to assume the responsibilities as set forth by the signers of the Constitution. We must keep America strong, keep it free, and keep it filled with promises for the world that will assure the suppressed people that there is hope. Our candles will continue to light the way as they have in the past. The responsibility to keep the flames glowing is ours. We can and we shall do it, for to do this means freedom for all mankind.

THE IMPACTED AID PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution of the city council of my home city of Newport, R.I., memorializing Congress to support the Public Law 874 impacted aid program at its present level.

On February 28, 1966, I spoke in this Chamber on the hardships which would flow from a reduction of impacted aid funds to the affected communities. The city of Newport, R.I., will lose $281,113 if the proposed cut in funds is sustained. A city of 50,000 cannot readily find moneys to replace such a loss. Six thousand Newport public school children should not be made to forgo a decent education, the result of implementing the proposed cutback in aid levels.

The many parents who are now or will be stationed at the Newport Naval Base, should not feel that service in Newport is a hardship due to the poor educational system to which they would have to send their children. And while on this particular subject, are we making a service career attractive when parents know that wherever they are stationed, the school system will be substandard due to the lack of Federal aid? I think not; and, over the years, this piece of false economy may be reflected by diminishing reenlistment rates.

Again, Mr. President, I say that the impacted aid program must continue at its present level, and I intend to do all I possibly can to insure that it does.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 21-66

Whereas there is pending legislation in the Congress of the United States that would greatly curtail Federal aid for education in impacted areas; and

Whereas the city of Newport is an impacted area with its vast Federal naval installations, and is highly dependent upon Federal grants for education to implement local and State contributions; and

Whereas any decrease in the Federal grant would seriously impair our educational system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Newport does hereby request the congressional delegation from the State of Rhode Island to take whatever action it deems feasible to defeat the passage of the proposed legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution signed by the Honorable Dennis F. Shea, mayor of the city of Newport, and countersigned by the city clerk, be transmitted to Senators and Representatives in the U.S. Congress from Rhode Island.

Read and passed in council, February 23, 1966.

Dennis F. Shea, *Mayor.*

Attest: John F. Fitzgerald, *City Clerk.*

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently, a very excellent article on snooping appeared in Current Events, an American education publication for junior high school students.

As this article expresses in the clearest language the threat posed by modern snooping gadgets, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Snoopers, Snoopers Everywhere—And Not a Single Place To Hide

"We are fast becoming a nation of snoopers. The techniques and gadgets that for so many years were associated with international cloak-and-dagger operators are widely used today, not only by police and Government investigators, but by respectable businessmen and untold numbers of private investigative agencies, some respectable, some not."

In these words Representative Cornelius E. Gallagher, Democrat, of New Jersey, recently summed up the problem of invasion of privacy in the United States. He was not exaggerating.

Hearings in Congress last year, some initiated by Congressman Gallagher, piled up page after page of testimony about widespread snooping.

Snooping—the invasion of individual privacy—comes in many forms. Some are so commonplace in life today that many Americans seem unaware that they are forfeiting personal rights guaranteed under the fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution.

Wiretaps, mail covers, "bugs," concealed TV cameras, lie detectors, truth drugs, "personality" tests, computers, two-way mirrors, sniper-scopes, and ingenious lock picks are just a few of the tools used today in the national snooping craze.

WHO ARE THE VICTIMS?

The effects of snooping touch the humblest neighborhoods. They also touch the White House, itself. In a speech in Texas a year ago reported by the United Press, Maj. Gen. Chester V. Clifton, military aide to President Johnson, said:

"Bugging is a big problem we have to handle. I have found many efforts to bug the White House."

The culprits in these efforts, the general implied, were foreign agents and American businessmen anxious to know ahead of others what the Presidential decisions would be.

Bugging is the use of radio receivers—some small enough to fit in a tie clasp—to record conversations of people who don't know they are being heard.

Some receivers are sensitive enough to pick up conversations in another room or on the next block.

Such "bugs" are among several devices developed from cold war spying between the United States and the Soviet Union and also from "miniaturization" techniques resulting from space research.

Few Americans deny the right of spy agencies such as the CIA to use these weapons to maintain national security. Our fate as a nation in the nuclear age may rest on whether we know in time what our enemies are up to. Some also favor using the new snoopers to fight organized crime—illegal gambling and racketeering—provided their use is approved beforehand by proper legal authority.

The problem is that spy tools are being adapted to other uses, many of which trample on individual rights in homes, businesses, hospitals, and even schools (bugs have been used to trap student smokers).

WHO ARE THE SNOOPERS?

The Federal Government is king of the snoopers, even without counting its activities in the field of national security.

Congressional hearings in 1965 revealed that:

The U.S. Post Office had "mail covers" on 24,000 persons in 1963 and 1964. A mail cover is a check on information on the outside of a letter—addresses and place and date of postmarks.

Federal tax collectors used a variety of tools, including two-way mirrors, to spy on suspected income tax cheats. A two-way mirror on a door or wall reflects normally inside a room. An observer stationed outside, however, can see through the mirror as if it were clear glass.

The FBI used "bugs" to eavesdrop on criminal suspects in Las Vegas, Miami, and Kansas City. Today, four FBI agents and a phone company face a $6 million lawsuit for invasion of privacy.

Many other Government agencies use so-called lie detectors, or polygraphs, to test employees and job applicants at a cost of millions to the taxpayer.

Widespread snooping of this kind raises these important questions:

1. When does an organization's right to know end and an individual's right to privacy begin?

2. How can our laws be updated to deal with new space-age methods of snooping?

3. How can you catch snoopers anyway if their tools are becoming so effective that no one knows they are using them?

One expert on the matter, Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, suggests checking the problem at its source. He suggests laws regulating the manufacture, sale, and use of modern eavesdropping devices.

A THREAT TO RIGHTS

After last year's hearings in Congress, President Johnson, himself, struck a blow for the right of individual privacy. He ordered all Government agencies to stop wiretapping and other phone-listening activities except under special circumstances.

The great danger in mass snooping is the steady loss of personal privacy and its effect on our democratic society.

As Vance Packard, author and expert on the snooping question, said in a university lecture last December:

"Privacy must be at the heart of any concept we have of freedom. Respect for privacy is at the arc of any test between a free and a totalitarian society. The earmark of the totalitarian society is the fear of being watched and heard."

The individual's right of privacy is implied in the fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution (both parts of the Bill of Rights). The fourth amendment affirms the right of the people to feel safe against "unreasonable searches and seizures"—those made on whim without proper warrant or legal authority.

The fifth amendment, among other things, protects the individual from being a witness against himself in criminal proceedings.

As practiced today, snooping in the United States would seem to chip away at both these guarantees of personal freedom. Homes can be searched electronically today without homeowners being aware of it. A person can unknowingly be a witness against himself when his conversations are bugged without his knowledge.

The law, as yet, has done little to deal with this new form of invasion of privacy. Laws do exist against telephone wiretapping and wiretap evidence. But modern snooping tools make wiretapping seem crude and old fashioned.

USE AGAINST CRIMINALS?

How far should law enforcement officers go in using snooping devices?

Some high officials, including former U.S. Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY, have said that wiretapping might be used in the investigation of certain serious crimes, such as murder and kidnaping. They claim that if policemen using such devices were required to have warrants, there should be little chance of abuse.

Judge Harold Medina, of the U.S. Appeals Court, however, warns that a firm check should be kept on such practices. In a foreword to "Liberty Under Law,"[1] he says:

"The average citizen says why not use wiretap evidence in court? They do catch crooks that way, don't they?

"This citizen needs to know that wiretapping would not be used just against 'crooks.' When people tap wires they can find out a man's business secrets and his personal affairs. They can get information that could be used in politics in the worst sort of way."

Americans today submit to snooping that might have turned their forefathers red with rage. The colonists' opposition to invasion of privacy helped trigger the American Revolution and gain us nationhood.

In the 1760's officials of the Crown, armed with writs of assistance, broke into colonial homes on whim in search of smuggled goods. No such breach of home privacy was permitted in Britain itself at the time.

In fact, when the hated writs were being used in America, William Pitt the Elder, noted British statesman, was exulting in Parliament over Britain's right of privacy. He said:

"The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail; it may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter; the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter. All his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

Mr. Pitt, of course, had no idea of where science and modern technology would lead us. The electronic snooper can move in on home privacy today where once even the King of England feared to tread.

As yet we have few answers to this menace to precious rights, but at least the extent of the problem is becoming clearer.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

Main ideas to remember

1. Why is widespread snooping in business, government, schools, and elsewhere a danger to our democratic way of life?

2. In what way does modern-day snooping violate guarantees of privacy contained in the fourth amendment to the Constitution?

Talk it over

1. This week's lesson discusses the more spectacular methods of snooping in use in the United States today. Can you think of others more commonplace, but also a threat to individual privacy?

2. Someone has said, "Respect for individual privacy begins at home." Do you believe this? Explain your answer.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, before the vote on the passage of the tax bill yesterday, it was stated on the floor of this Chamber that my amendment to that bill would be dropped before the conferees reached the rotunda of the Capitol.

I am alarmed by such a suggestion. On my amendment, the Senate voted three separate times to include in the bill social security protection for 1½ million older Americans. Three votes must be considered a mandate to the Senate conferees to do everything possible to keep the amendment in the bill. To hear the Senate position capitulated before the first sound of the conference gavel is a perversion of the conference concept.

The eyes of a million and a half older Americans will be on that conference committee. To many, my amendment is the last hope in a long and devastating fight against the rigors of poverty.

From the rumors that circulated in this Chamber yesterday, it is fair to say that the administration is launching an all-out effort to persuade the conferees to kill my amendment and take away the $1.45 per day my amendment provided for over a million needy aged.

If the committee bows to administration pressures; if it disregards the desperate plight of the elderly poor; if it fails to retain the essential elements of my amendment, which the Senate insisted on in three separate votes; I shall take my case to the people. I shall engage in extensive debate and discussion on the conference report until the overwhelming sentiment of this great Nation is marshaled to the fight for the elderly poor. I shall debate and discuss the proposal until the American people are made aware of the pressures that are being applied to the conferees to take food from the mouths and clothing from the backs of more than a million poverty-stricken older Americans who have nowhere else to turn.

I have received promises of support in my efforts, particularly from some who were accused of being uninformed and irresponsible because they acceded to the supplications of the old people and not the directives of the administration.

The Senate must not allow the perpetration of a great tragedy. My office has been deluged by hundreds of calls and letters asking where to apply for benefits. I do not want to have to tell them their elected officials sent their money abroad or to the moon. I do not want to be the one to have to tell them that they are the lost battalion in the war on poverty. I do not want to be the one to inform them how woefully shallow, shamefully thin, and sorrowfully small their Great Society really is.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the absence of Harry Flood Byrd from this 2d session of the 89th Congress leaves a great void in our ranks.

A legislator in every sense of the word, he served his State and Nation well and, as chairman of the Finance Committee of this Senate, acted as a rudder in the conduct of the financial affairs of our Government.

Although no longer an official Member of this body where he served so long, I hope that his counsel and guidance will be available to our membership for many years to come. While I hope that he may enjoy a well-deserved rest now, I selfishly regret that he is not with us, not only because of our personal friendship, but because in these most troublesome days his counsel is not so readily available to the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on November 11 of last year a great public servant, Senator Harry Flood Byrd, announced to the Senate and to the Nation that he intended to resign the seat he had held in this august body since 1933.

---

[1] Liberty Under Law, American Education Publications.

Thus, our country was deprived of one of its greatest statesmen at a time of pressing national need. Senator Byrd, during his long and honorable service, achieved a standard of honesty, patriotism, and scholarship which few men ever attain. His unfailing courage and his relentless determination contributed greatly to the position of eminence this country enjoys throughout the world.

In every sense of the word, he was the guardian of the Treasury and placed his stamp of personal integrity on many major fiscal decisions of this country in modern times.

It was my good fortune, before his retirement, to have had frequent discussions with this outstanding man from Virginia, and I well remember I was consistently given better understanding, clearer insight, increased strength, and encouragement as a result of our friendship and those conversations.

Harry Flood Byrd was surely the foremost champion in our time of the cause of a balanced budget, fiscal responsibility and stability of a National Government. His was a difficult and often personally painful role in an age when spending has become synonymous with votes and when there is cause to wonder whether taxpayers appreciate the savings of billions of dollars by men such as Senator Byrd.

I think that his type of service will prove enduring and that appreciation of his devotion will grow with the years. Surely, none can doubt that our country is stronger for his devotion to it.

Mr. President, it is my wish that Harry Flood Byrd live out his years in peace and good health in his beloved Virginia which he so ably represented. I also hold every confidence that his example will prove an inspiration to his family, his State, and his Nation.

POSTMASTER GENERAL O'BRIEN SPEAKS ON VIETNAM

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, many millions of words have been spoken and written about the Vietnam conflict since this Nation committed itself to help South Vietnam more than a decade ago.

But one of the finest public expressions of our national policy on Vietnam was made February 25 at Des Moines, Iowa, by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien.

I urge each and every one of my Senate colleagues to read Mr. O'Brien's words very carefully. I respectfully ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the Postmaster General's remarks at the Iowa congressional fundraising gala to be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien at the Iowa Congressional Fundraising Gala, Des Moines, Iowa, February 25, 1966

It's good to be with you tonight.

One of President Johnson's favorite sayings is that "An ounce of work is worth pounds of words." Hard work is the secret of a President's success, of a nation's success, and certainly of a party's success. And tonight this gala is celebrating the results of hard work in the past as well as anticipating and preparing for the important tasks that lie ahead.

Of course, we don't lack for evidence that you have performed diligently and that your diligence has paid real dividends.

Democrats, through hard work, took poor seeds of farm recession planted by Republican farm policy and produced a Democratic State legislature for the first time in 30 years as well as a great bumper crop of Democratic Congressmen in Washington.

The rollcall is certainly impressive.

Bandstra, Culver, Gregg, Hansen, Schmidhauser, and Smith—each and every one of them an energetic and effective Congressman who is making his influence, and your influence, felt in Washington every legislative day.

And, of course, while we are calling the roll of leadership, let me salute your great Governor, Harold Hughes, and your outstanding State chairman, Lex Hawkins.

This evening I want to discuss a subject of great concern to all Americans, no matter where they live, no matter how they vote.

The subject is Vietnam.

During my 5 years in the White House, I saw this problem grow with ever increasing intensity. It became more and more menacing. It claimed a large portion of President Kennedy's daily attention, as it is now claiming President Johnson's.

While the scope of the conflict in Vietnam may continue, while the violence and terrorism may go on, while the demands on our patience and our strength may remain, I can tell you from my close association with President Kennedy and with President Johnson that one element is unchanged: our commitment to "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival of the success of liberty."

On October 26, 1961, President Kennedy said: "The United States is determined to help Vietnam preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins, and build a better life through economic growth." And he added "we know that the future of the Vietnamese people is not Communist slavery but the freedom and prosperity which they have defended and pursued throughout their history."

In February 1962, in a message to the Vietnamese people for their New Year's celebration, President Kennedy reiterated that pledge, saying: "Let me assure you of our continued assistance in the development of your capabilities to maintain your freedom and to defeat those who wish to destroy that freedom."

And in October 1963, he showed that increasing Communist aggression had only strengthened our resolve to see a free Vietnam. "The security of South Vietnam," President Kennedy declared, "is a major interest of the United States as of other free nations. We will adhere to our policy of working with the people and Government of South Vietnam to deny this country to communism and to suppress the externally stimulated and supported insurgency of the Vietcong. Effective performance in this undertaking is the central objective of our policy in South Vietnam."

Why did President Kennedy—and President Eisenhower before him—choose to commit this Nation to defend a country so far from our shores? Why is President Johnson continuing that commitment?

Why didn't these three Presidents choose instead to say, as did Chamberlain, that we should not be concerned over a faraway country and about a people of whom we know little? Chamberlain told the British people that he brought them peace, and that they should "Go home and get a nice quiet sleep."

Chamberlain and many others did not recognize that Czechoslovakia was the front line of England. They did not see that a scrap of paper signed at Munich would soon mean, not a nice quiet sleep, but bombs in Manchester.

History is full of examples of dead societies that did not learn the harsh lessons of existence.

One of the lessons of existence in this 20th century is that appeasement is but a downpayment on a mortgage that comes due quickly and is payable in blood.

Former President Harry Truman remembered Chamberlain and Munich when he stopped communism in Korea.

His three successors were guided by the lessons of history in choosing to support freedom in Vietnam. One of President Kennedy's favorite stories dealt with Samuel Adams, who later started a little party of his own with some tea in Boston Harbor.

Sam Adams went to call on the British Governor after the Boston massacre. The Governor warned of mass arrests. Sam Adams replied that Americans would not knuckle under to threats and told the Governor that we would fight. Later, he wrote in his diary, "I saw his knees tremble."

It was not Sam Adams' knees that trembled.

For he was on the side of freedom.

And today, our knees must not tremble; our eyes must see clearly that failure to protect freedom in Vietnam will not end the Communist appetite for conquest.

How much better for France to have marched into the Rhineland in 1936, than to go down to defeat in 1940.

How much better for England to have supported its Czech ally in 1938 instead of narrowly averting invasion in 1940.

How much better it was to face down Russian missiles in Cuba in 1962, without trembling knees, than to permit the Communists to blackmail our Nation.

How much better to say, "this far and no further," in Vietnam today than to have to draw the line again and again tomorrow, and tomorrow, always closer to our shores.

Let us remember that in defending Vietnam we are defending Iowa, and Massachusetts, and all the free world.

In sending our fighting men to Vietnam we are assuring that far greater numbers are not called to fight, elsewhere, on another day at a greater cost.

President Johnson has said: "We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else."

Yes, my friends, there is no one else.

If we do not show the same fortitude now that has marked us in other times and other crises there is no one else and there may be no other time.

In 1823 we could issue a Monroe Doctrine secure in the knowledge that a British fleet would uphold our brave words.

But in 1966, there is no other fleet, no other force, with the will and with the power.

If we do not stand firm, who will? If we cannot support freedom in Vietnam, who will?

If we cannot keep our commitment to that embattled nation, where will we keep it?

If we do not keep our trust with those who trust us now who will trust us or rely on us in the future?

If we look for some corner to hide our trembling knees while we let South Vietnam disappear will the appetite of communism decrease or will it grow?

These are the hard questions I saw John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson grapple with.

They are not easy questions and those who suggest easy answers are not serving the Nation or solving the problems.

Thirty years ago this State was in the heartland of American isolationism. I think we have all come a long, long way since then. For most Americans realize that whether they live in Iowa or in Massachusetts, they are united in the quest for a lasting peace with honor. It must, however, be a peace that will once and for all convince the aggressor that we mean business, that we will not sit on our hands while freedom is destroyed.

In a forceful summary of our policy, President Johnson once said: "We don't want to bury anyone and we don't intend to be buried."

The President made that statement in one of his first speeches as Commander in Chief and I believe that our continued firmness will drive this lesson home even in Peiping and in Hanoi.

Certainly defending freedom is our historic position—it is our position now and always will be. Every American who believes in our form of government—its accomplishments and its future—will, I am sure, give our President his loyalty, his support, and his prayers as the President pursues this awesome task: the preservation of this democracy.

PROPOSED CURTAILMENT OF PROGRAMS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from a constituent in Tonopah, Nev., commenting on the foreseeable effects of any curtailment of Public Law 874.

My constituent, H. V. Jacobs, wisely points out that this law, which has been so successful and beneficial to our State, recognizes the increasing mobility of our citizens which is the key factor involved in Public Law 874. In my opinion, any curtailment in the existing benefits rendered to the States in the field of education would deal a crippling blow to the present generation attending public schools.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Jacobs' letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tonopah, Nev.,
February 26, 1966.

From: Haskell V. Jacobs, chairman, Nye County School Board.
To: the Honorable Howard Cannon.
Subject: Public Law 874.

In a recent board meeting we discussed existing and pending legislation on Federal financing of education and its overall benefit to the State of Nevada and to Nye County in particular.

It is our opinion that Public Law 874 as it now stands, is of far greater significance to Nye County than any recent legislation, and quite possibly to the State as a whole.

We believe Public Law 874 recognizes a problem peculiar to our fine, exploding population and increasing mobility of our working people.

Curtailment in any way of this particular legislation is a matter of grave concern to us. We see nothing in recent legislation that will restore to us what we lose through any curtailment of Public Law 874. This, to us, is a considerable amount of money. I submit the following figures as evidence. For the budget year 1962–63, Public Law 874 furnished us with revenue to the amount of $33,922; for 1963–64, $20,447; for 1964–65, $28,981; for 1965–66, $42,806; for 1966–67, $43,000.

It is our opinion that a reduction in this particular area is in no way offset by new legislation.

We note with confidence and pride your efforts in our behalf in this particular matter.

Sincerely yours,

Haskell V. Jacobs.

THE AMERICAN DELEGATION TO MEETINGS AT THE GATT TRADE CENTER IN GENEVA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have just returned from a week in Geneva representing the United States and the Senate Commerce Committee as congressional advisor to the American delegation to meetings at the GATT Trade Center in Geneva.

These meetings, which were called specifically to consider the ways and means of promoting increased trade with underdeveloped nations were of great importance to the United States and, of course, of particular interest to my own State and to the port of Baltimore through which so much American trade passes.

Mr. President, I am at the present time preparing a complete report on both my formal and informal meetings and conferences with the many representatives of different countries who were gathered in Geneva for the GATT meetings as well as those who were in attendance at the UNCTAD—United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—meetings which were in session simultaneously.

Mr. President, I think it important, in the meantime, that my colleagues in the Senate understand fully the nature of these two organizations and the extent of present American involvement and participation in other international activities which are centered in Geneva and which I had the privilege of visiting during my trip.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is an international trade agreement which came into force in 1948 and which embraces all the major trading countries of the free world.

It provides a multilateral forum for the reduction of trade barriers and the promotion of world trade in place of the previous cumbersome two-country approach. Equally important, the agreement provides an invaluable code of principles and rules to insure that the tariff reductions negotiated are not impaired by other restrictive devices.

In 1966, the United States is contributing $338,590 for the entire GATT program, including such major operations as the Kennedy round of trade negotiations which is of vital importance to the trade of industrialized as well as developing countries. It is interesting to note that the costs of facilitating a trade expansion program for the developing countries through GATT are shared among the contracting parties and that the U.S. share is only 15 percent. The Trade Center budget for 1966 is $306,000 of which the U.S. share is $46,000.

In the course of my participation in the sessions of the meetings and the many corridor conferences, it was gratifying to note that the International Trade Center which the GATT established in May 1964 has already developed a good record of service to the developing countries in need of the kind of trade promotion assistance not yet available in their own countries.

The representatives of the developing countries in attendance—there were 17 developing countries represented—were forthright in their appreciation of the center's operations. The emphasis of the center's activities has been on providing direct and practical assistance to promote the marketing of a wide variety of commodities by the newer nations both in other developing countries and in the large established markets of the world. Plans for the future indicate that the center will place special emphasis on assistance to countries wishing to establish or expand their own government trade development organizations.

It is clear that as the economies of the newer countries expand—as their own products find world markets—they will become more important customers for the machinery and plant equipment made in this country which can contribute so much to their future growth.

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which was established in 1964, was still meeting when I left Geneva. The representatives to that meeting were involved in determining the variety of ways in which the trade of developing countries might be expanded.

Mr. President, I believe that the continued close attention of our Department of State and Department of Commerce to the programs and activities of both of these groups—of the GATT Trade Center and of UNCTAD—will be very much in our national interest. In addition, I believe that each of my colleagues and every American should appreciate more fully the astonishing amount of international activity which is the life of Geneva. The record of international cooperation which is being made there, through the good will of this Nation and many others, was most heartening and encouraging to me.

Geneva is the site of the European headquarters of the United Nations. There, too, are the headquarters of such U.N. specialized agencies as the World Health Organization, the World Meteorological Organization, the International Labor Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, and the United Nations Committee on Trade and Development. In Geneva are the home offices of such intergovernmental organizations as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the European Free Trade Association and the International Bureau of Education.

The Red Cross was founded in Geneva more than 100 years ago; and today that city remains the center of that organization's humanitarian efforts. Nearly 100 other voluntary, nongovernmental international associations also have their headquarters in Geneva. They include the World Council of Churches, the Interparliamentary Union and the International Commission of Jurists.

Geneva, in brief, is the scene daily, year in and year out, of an extraordinary complex of international activity affecting the lives of billions of people. More than 100 major conferences are held there annually. More than 3,000 separate meetings were held last year during conferences at the Palais des Nations alone.

Much of what goes on in those meetings is undramatic and, therefore, little reported. But out of these sessions have come programs for improving health, raising agricultural standards, expanding education, increasing trade, utilizing outer space satellites for communications and weather forecasting, training manpower in industry, aiding refugees, helping in disaster areas, and inching toward world peace.

Although some still sadly recall Geneva as the scene of the ill-fated League of Nations, it also has been the scene of major conferences to keep the peace: The Indochina Peace Conference, 1954; the Big Four Summit Conference, 1955; the Laotian Conference, 1961–62.

For many years the United States, along with other nations, has worked patiently and persistently toward feasible disarmament. One step in that direction was the nuclear test ban treaty. Although that treaty was signed in Moscow, agreements leading to it were negotiated in Geneva. And today the United States is involved in Geneva with negotiating a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. U.S. negotiators there have been instructed by President Johnson "to walk the extra mile necessary to insure that the weapons of war submit to man's need for peace."

These efforts to contain the nuclear genie may be more dramatic in the sense of newspaper headlines; but they should not obscure other major efforts underway in Geneva to cooperate across national boundaries for the general welfare of mankind.

For instance, in the field of health, international collaboration through the World Health Organization has all but eliminated malaria from many parts of the world. This may not have much meaning to those of us who live in temperate climates and in advanced nations. But it is a development of immense importance to the health, happiness, and the productivity of hundreds of millions of men, women, and children, living in tropical regions.

People everywhere long have been victimized by the unexpected savagery of hurricanes or typhoons or blizzards or droughts. The toll in lives and economic loss has been staggering. Now, through techniques of weather analysis pioneered by the World Meteorological Organization, we are coming to understand better the forces of nature. We may not yet be able to control weather, but we are advancing to the point where better and faster forecasting will reduce the damage done by storms.

In the field of economics, the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations continues to be a major international conference at Geneva. Sixty-four nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are meeting there regularly to negotiate the lowering of trade barriers on products of factory and farm. Their efforts represent the most ambitious step ever undertaken to liberalize world trade. If successful, they will have a significant effect on trade among the industrialized nations and will constitute a major contribution to the economies of developing nations as well.

Thus the story of international cooperation in Geneva develops daily—in peacekeeping, in disarmament sessions, in trade negotiations, in science and economics, medicine and agriculture, education and communications. It is concrete evidence for all visitors to Geneva that the world now recognizes, as Secretary of State Rusk has said, that "poverty, ignorance, and disease are not ordained by Providence but are matters which men can do something about."

The United States obviously has a major stake in the development and success of these international programs. Our mission there is responsible for effectively representing U.S. interests in the shaping of U.N. agency programs and budgets and for supporting U.S. delegations to conferences throughout the year.

THE URGENT NEED FOR A GOOD FIREARMS BILL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, I would like to elaborate on a portion of the message President Johnson delivered to the Congress yesterday concerning crime and law enforcement in the United States.

My comments concern that part of the President's message having to do with the misuse of firearms, a matter that sooner or later must be resolved by the Congress.

It is a problem that has been neglected for 28 years.

And because the Congress, for one reason or another, has not strengthened the Federal Firearms Act, the felons, the mentally ill, the narcotic addicts, and indeed the children of this country have used a weakness in the law to tap an arsenal of deadly weapons and use them every day to wreak havoc on the lives of the citizens of our Nation.

The press of America can and does refer to the Congress, and Members thereof, in terms of "hawk," "dove," "eagle," and even "super eagle." So be it as the press exercises its rights.

But I know this body is not an ostrich.

It cannot forever close its eyes and this year for the 28th consecutive year refuse to pass legislation that would help to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of those who should not have them.

I speak of the gross misuse of deadly firearms in the country and of the legislation to control it, Senate bill 1592 which is presently before the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

Even as President Johnson did in his annual crime message to Congress yesterday, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation and to help bring some degree of sanity into the regulation and the handling of guns in this country.

Only a few months ago an 8-year-old girl was sitting in a peach orchard near Damascus, Md. with a small boy on her lap. She was alive, playful, happy. Seconds later her head was split open by a .30 caliber rifle bullet and she died.

The explanation according to the police was that some people were practicing target shooting nearby with the death weapon.

Now, I want to make it clear that I do not cite this horrible case for the purposes of sensationalism, but I do cite it to arouse some emotions in all of us and in the American people across the land.

I do not cite it because it was an unfortunate and a tragic accident as no doubt some opponents of firearms laws will claim, but I cite it because it was an inexcusable and an avoidable accident, and because we have only our collective negligence to blame for the death of this little girl.

And finally, I cite this case because it should serve to tell us that while the aimless discharge of firearms may have been a manly sport in frontier America, it should be a felony level crime in our congested urban civilization of the 20th century.

Another instance of national significance and concern occurred just a month prior to the taking of that little girl's life. The riflemen of Watts terrorized that community for several days. Their actions were likened to guerrilla warfare.

The riots may have begun because of social conditions but they were sustained for many days because of the presence of guns in the hands of hundreds of hoodlums and criminals in that area.

The gunrunners were afraid of the frightening impact of the Watts riots. They knew that this violent eruption would have far reaching implications on gun legislation. By an unbelievable perversion of logic the gunrunners actually pointed to the riots as proof that all citizens should be armed and that their homes should be protected, much as they were in the frontier days.

They completely overlooked the facts of firearms misuse in the riots.

I cite for the record.

First, there were no gun deaths of nonrioters caused by rioters either within or without the Watts area.

Second, there were two nonrioters, one a 3-year-old boy, accidentally killed by guns that were bought to protect the home against a danger that never materialized.

Third, snipers in the riot torn area of Watts prolonged the violence for days by frustrating the efforts of law enforcement officers, the fire department, and the National Guard in their attempts to restore order.

Fourth, the majority of these night fighters who were arrested with rifles and shotguns in their possession were criminals with prior records of arrest.

Seventy-two percent of these arrestees had prior records, yet they were armed.

Do they have a right to buy guns?

I believe not.

Are they able to obtain guns?

Unfortunately they are readily available.

And fifth, these weapons by no means were all stolen guns as the gun lobby quickly tried to establish. They were weapons that were owned by these criminals months and even years prior to the violence in August.

These are the problems with which S. 1592 would come to grips. Easy access to firearms through purchase by criminals, deranged persons, and immature juveniles has been documented by this subcommittee in our hearings of last year.

I submit that over and above the legislation presently in Congress these incidents and the thousands of unnecessary accidental deaths by guns and the thousands of criminally inflicted deaths by guns will increasingly dictate that the privilege of handling firearms be restricted to those who can do so safely and responsibly.

Let me impress upon all of you the grisly results of firearms misuse:

Accidental shootings every year claim the lives of 2,200 Americans.

Over 5,000 people are shot to death annually in criminal assaults.

Ten thousand deranged persons take their own lives every year with readily available guns. And they often kill members of their families or other innocent persons in the process.

One hundred and twenty thousand persons, many of them innocent bystanders, are maimed by firearms every year.

These shootings are in addition to 26,000 aggravated assaults and 40,000 armed robberies committed by gun wielding criminals against tens of thousands of hapless victims.

According to these figures, Mr. President, every 2 minutes somebody in the United States is killed, maimed, beaten or robbed with a gun. In fact, before I finish this statement a firearm will be used to injure, threaten, or kill 15 people.

There is no question in my mind that the gun wielder in the statistics outlined above should not have had been using a gun. I know those who are now statistics would agree with me.

I wish that each and every one of us could know the families, the parents, the children, the brothers and the sisters whose lives have been touched by death resulting from gunfire. I know that the grief, the sense of waste and the insanity of these acts would be sufficient to drive us into action.

More to the point, I would like some of the opponents of firearms laws to sit in the homes of the victims of misused weapons. I should point out not all opponents are irresponsible. Sincere, honest people oppose the bill for reasons they feel are valid ones. But all too often they are misguided, with their opposition based on misleading or distorted information.

Over and above those of us who are merely standing by while pistols, rifles, bazookas, and antitank guns are being shipped throughout the country into the hands of children, criminals and mental defectives, it is the irresponsible opponents of sound gun laws who must share the major responsibility for the unnecessary bloodshed and crime perpetrated with these instruments of destruction.

These are men who profess an interest in guns and their responsible use.

Yet, they do not show sufficient regard for their widespread misuse and destructiveness.

These are men who know that it takes a mature and levelheaded person to handle a gun safely.

Yet, they steadfastly insist it is better that just about anyone can own a firearm than it is to impose even the slightest controls over these deadly instruments.

These are men who know that the millions of domestic and foreign weapons which flood the country via the mail-order route are often unfit for any worthwhile purpose.

Yet, they insist that no controls be placed over this torrent of violence.

And what is even more preposterous, these opponents of any firearms legislation of any kind have mounted a campaign of falsehoods and deceptions regarding President Johnson's gun bill which defies reason.

Not satisfied with simply expressing their opposition to the bill, these men have through their several organizations, notably the National Rifle Association, deliberately deceived the public with respect to the provisions of the bill, and they have been deplorably two faced in their statements and actions in this matter. The officers of the National Rifle Association have indicated their support of some of the provisions we have proposed, yet newsletters going out under their organization's letterhead have misrepresented the bill and urged all gun enthusiasts to oppose it.

I know of internal warfare within the National Rifle Association. I know there are reasonable men there who are trying to bring order out of chaos. But their efforts have been doomed by the "fire from the hip" boys who have thrown red herrings at me and anyone else who asks that we catch up with the rest of the civilized world. Apparently the majority of the leadership of the National Rifle Association will have to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 20th century.

In a similar vein, bulletins distributed by other organizations with a special interest in firearms such as the National Shooting Sports Foundation have helped to mount an unbelievable propaganda campaign against this modest and, in my opinion, reasonable measure to help eliminate some of the most harmful practices in the interstate gun trade.

Together these opponents of S. 1592 have been guilty of dishonesty against the American people and I for one would charge them with intentionally perpetrating harm against this country.

Let me cite for you some of the gross fallacies generated by these men. And let me point out some of the pronouncements they have made to confuse the public.

These opponents of S. 1592 have spread the rumor that this legislation forms the first link in a chain of other measures that will lead to the abolishment of private ownership of firearms.

Nothing, of course, can be further from the truth. There is no provision in S. 1592 that can or is intended to prevent anyone from purchasing, owning and using a pistol, rifle or shotgun in keeping with the laws of his community.

The opponents have said, again without reason, that the bill establishes the registration of firearms. This charge goes hand-in-hand with the deplorable implication that such registration would allow the disarming of our citizenry in the case of military invasion of our country.

Let me stress that it is a disservice to our people that responsible organizations of gun enthusiasts such as the National Rifle Association and others have not made an effort to dissolve the naive belief that the defenses of a country that has a complex military organization with the most sophisticated, destructive military hardware ever known to mankind would ever be reduced to a dependence on unorganized private citizens armed with rifles, shotguns, and revolvers.

There is no basis for the charge that S. 1592 will eventually lead to elimination of privately owned firearms by responsible, law abiding citizens.

There is no basis for the charge that S. 1592 will forbid hunters to bring their rifles and shotguns across State lines for legitimate sporting purposes.

There is no basis for the charge that the bill will give the Secretary of the Treasury or any other governmental official arbitrary powers to regulate the handling or ownership of guns by the public.

There is no possible explanation for the statement circulated in a newsletter of the National Rifle Association that Federal license fees for manufacturers of pistols, rifles and shotguns would cost $1,000 a year under S. 1592.

The actual figure is $500. The inflation of this fee to twice its size is characteristic of the magnitude of the falsehoods spread by the opponents of this measure.

And, finally, the gun lobby charges that "we have not made a case for inclusion of rifles and shotguns in S. 1592."

Overlooked as inconsequential, apparently, is the fact that 1,500 Americans are criminally shot to death by rifles and shotguns every year.

These opponents further maintain that long arms are rarely if ever used in the commission of crimes.

No proof of this is offered because they have none.

Mr. President, their position is more fancy than fact.

The majority of police departments who responded to a subcommittee questionnaire on rifle and shotgun misuse do not bear out the wishful thinking of the gun lobby.

In the majority of cases the police furnished me with information which proves that rifle and shotgun confiscations are increasing and have done so over the past 5 years. Several cities show sharp, indeed, drastic increases in the misuse of these arms. In the crimes of robbery and aggravated assault the information that I have received leaves no doubt in my mind that there is a serious problem of misuse with these firearms.

There must be a measure of control over these deadly weapons which claim

1,500 lives annually in this land. Otherwise our overall effort to control crime and reduce its parasitic spread would be significantly frustrated.

I have owned and used firearms for many years and know that many other Senators participate in shooting sports for the relaxation or the competition they afford. And I can well understand how many of our people can develop and have developed an interest in collecting firearms and in target shooting and related sports. But, I hope that the many pleasures that are derived from sporting activities involving these weapons will not blind us to the fact that the gun is essentially an instrument of destruction.

I am the first to acknowledge that firearms played a noble role in the hands of patriotic Americans at the time our forefathers wrested freedom and independence from the mighty British Empire for a handful of Colonies.

Firearms have been used with bravery and distinction in two global encounters with outside enemies on foreign soil and they are being used today in the cause of freedom in Vietnam.

But these wars, carried on in defense of our country, do not and should not bear a relationship to the position taken by some enthusiasts that guns should be available to all, including immature children, halfwits, and criminals. And, the same school of thought holds, those who misuse guns should be severely punished, given stiff prison terms.

Literally, put them in jail and throw the key away.

The proposal is in fact, "Stack these misfits in prison like so many cans on a shelf, but do not do anything to keep guns out of the hands of the next crop of misfits."

One group of opponents to sane gun regulations is actually seeking a Federal law calling for 10-year mandatory prison sentences for anyone convicted of using a gun in a crime. Well, if that misguided notion were a law last year, and the Department of Justice had only half its usual percentage of convictions, this Congress would have to either triple the size of our Federal prison system or fence off a couple of our larger counties to confine the convicts.

The institutions run by the Federal Bureau of Prisons can accommodate only 21,505 persons. Last year there were 100,000 crimes committed with firearms.

This approach would do nothing to keep guns out of the hands of irresponsible people in the first place. It would result in a chaotic situation in our already overcrowded courts and prison systems.

Mr. President, the committee of which I am chairman has conducted extensive hearings and has studied every phase of the traffic, commerce, and even the use of firearms throughout the United States.

The record will show that we have thoroughly discussed every point that has been raised regarding the burdens this law is purported to place on the sportsman, the dealer, or the manufacturer of firearms.

We have changed the bill wherever it seems unfair or unnecessarily restrictive.

We would have made other changes had reasonable causes been advanced for such revisions by any of the witnesses who appeared before us.

There were none.

The hearings were held long past the time when any worthwhile addition to our knowledge materialized from the opponents to the bill.

Mr. President, I think the time has come to bring this measure to the floor of the Senate.

President Johnson has just given it his full endorsement in his crime message.

This legislation has the support of law enforcement officers throughout the Nation.

It has the support of the American Bar Association.

It has the support of religious and civic groups.

And it has the support of most of the major newspapers and magazines in the country.

I think it is time to vote on this bill and to pass it into law.

I ask my colleagues to consider my remarks when we bring the bill to the floor.

I ask my colleagues to disregard the loud voices of a minority with something less than the broad public interest at heart.

And I ask that you look at this measure in terms of the complexities of the society in which we live. The tragedies that have resulted from this traffic are exemplified by crimes in recent years that need little elaboration.

It has cost us a President.

It has cost us thousands of deaths.

It has cost us tens of thousands of bodies and limbs, destroyed or shattered.

And unless we do something about it in this Congress it will cost us even more in the future.

The indiscriminate use of deadly weapons in our cities and congested areas dictates that gun laws be passed as a most important deterrent to our growing rate of crime and delinquency.

I want to ask that we do not destroy this bill on the basis of emotional reversions to romantic images of the frontiersman.

I ask rather that we consider the facts of crime in the 20th century.

I ask that we consider the more than 200,000 victims of gun atrocities each year.

I disagree with the witness before the Commerce Committee who maintained that in order to guarantee everyone the right to bear arms, we must accept the fact that in his words. "Somebody is going to get shot."

I do not accept that fact.

I know the 200,000 victims of our loose gun laws do not accept that fact.

I know the parents of this great Nation do not accept that fact.

And I hope my friends in the Senate will not accept that fact.

Let me assure all of you that this measure is not unduly burdensome.

It will not eliminate private ownership of firearms.

It is not based on some insidious plot to register firearms.

It will not expand the power of Federal officials.

And it will not infringe on the rights of our citizens granted by the Constitution.

On the contrary I am confident that the makers of our Constitution would insist on the passage of this legislation and I have no doubt that Daniel Boone himself would vote for this bill were he among us in this Chamber today.

"JACK JARRELL IN AFRICA"—AN ABSORBING NEWSPAPER SERIES

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, John Jarrell, chief of the Omaha World-Herald's Washington bureau has, for the past several weeks, been reporting from the Republic of South Africa and other countries of the troubled Dark Continent.

His dispatches have made an absorbing series, dealing primarily with the critical racial-political situation in South Africa which one of the officials he interviewed terms "the greatest spiritual problem of the age."

For Jack Jarrell, who for 20 years has headed the capable World-Herald bureau here, this is his 14th trip abroad and his 9th on behalf of the World-Herald.

As a war correspondent in World War II, working for the old International News Service, Mr. Jarrell covered the 1942 invasion of North Africa, spent nearly a year in China and India as chief correspondent in Asia for INS, then returned to Europe in time to participate in the invasion of Normandy in 1944.

For the World-Herald, Mr. Jarrell has covered 10 national political conventions, 5 presidential campaigns, the United Nations, and the escape from Hungary into Austria of the Freedom Fighters after the 1956 rebellion collapsed. He is one of the most objective and highly respected members of the Washington press corps.

A note to his editors accompanying his first dispatch noted that he was "accepting honors from South Africans for having brought the rains that have ended the prolonged drought."

While I am inclined to doubt Jack's rainmaking prowess, Mr. President, I can testify to his professional skill in the craft of journalism. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the articles which appeared under the headline, "Jarrell in Africa," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Jan. 30, 1966]

SOUTH AFRICA SURE WIN FOR VERWOERD—NEGROES NOT VOTING AS APARTHEID LEADER GAINS SUPPORT, STIRS FUROR

(By John Jarrell)

PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA.—It is campaign time in the Republic of South Africa, but there is no doubt about what the results will show when the votes are counted after the polls close next March 30.

The National Party, dominant since 1948 and growing steadily stronger, will win again. There is every probability that it will win big.

Some party members are concerned that its 1966 victory will be too overwhelming, that the opposition will be so reduced in political strength that its voice will be muted to the point where it can hardly be heard at all.

After coming to power in 1948, the National Party won again in 1953, 1958, and 1961. Each time its majority was larger. In the last one, it elected 105 members of the 160-member House of Assembly, which has more political oomph than the Senate.

The chief opposition is furnished by the United Party, which in 1961 captured 49 seats. The Progressive and National Union Parties won a seat each.

The National Party victory this year will keep at the helm Prime Minister H. F. Verwoerd, whose name is anathema to the black nations to the north.

For it is here in this tremendously wealthy nation, thrice the size of Texas, where the policy of apartheid—separation of races—is a fact of life. The black man will not be voting in the March election, and it is this policy which has raised such a hue and cry among most of the other African countries, and many more. It has been the object of bitter criticism in the United Nations. It has the official disapproval of the United States.

South Africa's Government—the administrative capital is here in Pretoria, the legislative capital in Capetown—feels its policies have been distorted abroad. It has no guilt complex. And it feels that its plan for separate development of the races will work, that ultimately there will be a Commonwealth of South Africa that will consist of the present Republic of South Africa and some eight independent black republics—"political independence coupled with economic interdependence," in Dr. Verwoerd's words. The first such black republic—the Transkei—has already been established.

In 1961, he said in London:

"I envisage development along the lines similar to that of the British Commonwealth. In other words, I perceive the development of a Commonwealth of South Africa in which the white state and the black states can cooperate together without being joined in a federation and therefore without being under a central government but cooperating as separate and independent states. In such an association no state will lord it over any other."

The Bantu, or black people, outnumber the whites in South Africa, which left the British Commonwealth in 1961, largely over the race question. This after having, in 1960 by referendum, become a republic.

In 1964 there were 17,500,000 persons in the republic, of whom 3,335,000 were white, 1,700,000 colored (a mixture of white, Hottentot, and including the Cape Malays), something over a half-million Asiatics, mostly Indians, and the remainder, some 12 million Bantus.

It is over the Government's policy of separate development, to be discussed in later articles, that all the furor is about.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Jan. 31, 1966]

Jarrell in Africa—Boom Hardens Stand for White Rule in South

(By John Jarrell)

Pretoria, South Africa.—The winds of change sweeping across the continent of Africa, with European nations divesting themselves of colonies and newly created black nations struggling with the problems of self-rule, have only hardened the determination of white South Africans to preserve their white government.

They say—

They can rightfully claim to have been in much of this country before the Bantu, or black, man was.

They developed it to the point where it is one of the most prosperous countries in the world, a land of untold mineral wealth and a booming economy.

They have designed a plan they believe eminently fair to the black man, one which has set aside areas of South Africa for creation of some eight black homelands, or Bantustans, destined ultimately to be wholly independent but, hopefully, part of a Commonwealth of South Africa.

Independent black Africa as well as most other powers in these days of extreme racial consciousness oppose South Africa's views.

The American State Department says: "The U.S. Government is unalterably opposed to the racial, or apartheid, policies of the South African Government. We fear that South Africa's present course, unless soon moderated, can lead only to disaster for all of its people."

Let's take a look at the three points, listed above, raised by the Republic of South Africa.

1. Who got here first? In 1652 the Dutch first settled at the Cape of Good Hope when one Jan van Riebeeck established a provision station at Table Bay, to provide food for merchantmen plying between Holland and the East Indies. Only the Hottentots and the stone age bushmen were there. White pioneers began moving northward at the same time Bantu tribesmen started south across the Zambesi. It was in the 1830's that white and black man met.

2. That the land was largely developed by the white man—Dutch farmers (Boers) and British—is generally agreed. The black man furnished the labor for much of it.

3. The plan for establishing black homelands, fathered by the National Party, has its sight set on an eventual South African Commonwealth, with eight black nations, generally formed by tribal groups, governing themselves in areas which Government spokesmen say have been traditionally black.

The first of these, under the Bantu Self-Government Act, is the Transkei, somewhat larger than Belgium, which in 1963 elected its own legislative assembly, has its own Chief Minister, although white advisers remain there.

The Transkei is somewhat larger than Belgium, has its own flag and national anthem and is, South African officials contend, well on the way to complete independence some years hence.

Opponents in black Africa cry "fraud" and denounce the plan to create Bantustans within a commonwealth as nothing but a device to perpetuate white rule. They say the homelands encompass only 13 percent of the territory and that the wealth-producing areas are retained for whites.

Further articles will try to pierce the maze of claims and counterclaims to determine just what is happening in this beautiful land where it is now midsummer.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 1, 1966]

Apartheid Backers Hope for Time

(By John Jarrell)

Pietersburg, South Africa.—The thing that South Africa needs, proponents of its apartheid policy say, is time—time to prove to the world the feasibility and justness they contend are embodied in their racial program, so roundly condemned by most of the world.

W. W. M. Eiselen, commissioner general for the Northern Sotho tribe deep in what once was the Boer Republic of Transvaal, put it like this:

"We may not succeed, because the dice are loaded very heavily against us—there are so many people beyond our borders who know better."

But if given enough time, he continued, "we may show you something."

Dr. Eiselen is the former Secretary of Bantu (Black) Affairs for the Republic of South Africa, and is credited by some with being the architect of the apartheid policy.

BLACK STATES

In brief, here is what South Africa proposes to do, upon which it has already invested millions upon millions of rands (a rand is worth $1.40) in getting it underway.

The creation of as many as eight black states, divided by tribes, to be self-governing and, ultimately, independent, working with the white Republic of South Africa in a South African Commonwealth.

The first, the Transkei, has already been established, has its own elected Chief Minister and, it is hoped, will be independent within a few years.

Under this plan, a black African cannot own property in white South Africa, and whites cannot own land in the black homelands.

To Dr. Eiselen, this is "self-determination by the various population groups in this country."

ISOLATION

He thinks it "remarkable that we should find ourselves in such complete isolation," criticized by almost every country.

He cannot see any comparison between America's racial situation and South Africa's.

"In principle," he asserted, "your Government is right to do away with segregation, because your Negroes belong in America. They are not from one particular people, they have been there for some 300 years, almost as long as your Pilgrim Fathers.

"They did not start off as a people and they did not become a people there—they lost their own traditions. They became Americans. They have no future except as Americans. Therefore, they must be integrated."

He said that South Africans think the problem in America "chicken feed, compared to ours, but even so, we can see your problem is quite complicated."

OWN CULTURE

In South Africa, he said, "our black people, unlike yours, are not without traditions, are not without their own culture. In some sections, they were here before the white man—like your Indians.

"They are not entirely a primitive people, they had occupied a considerable area, and they have every right, just like the white man, to call it their own country."

Thus the plan of the white South African Government: to create independent black states in that "considerable area" that the black man occupied when he crossed over the Zambesi River about the same time that Boer farmers were beginning their pioneering move to the northward, after having first settled on the Cape of Good Hope.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 2, 1966]

Bantu Tribesmen Are Proud of School Success

Turfloop, the Transvaal.—If the Republic of South Africa's plan is to work—creation of a number of black states living at peace and in cooperation with this white-governed country—the seeds of that success are at Turfloop.

For here is situated the University College of the North, on a new campus within a black homeland slated some day to be an independent Bantu state.

It is 6 years old and soon 450 black students—including probably 75 girls—will be enrolling for another year's college training.

This is 1 of 3 such colleges, with impressive buildings, modern facilities, a dedicated white president and a faculty of 80, one-quarter of them black, possessing some 135 degrees.

Government spokesmen say repeatedly that South Africa's Bantu tribes can be self-governing in the states to be created for them, when they have the ability to handle the multiplicity of problems facing any self-governing group. The key, they say, is education.

Official figures put the number of literate Bantu between 7 and 20 at 80 percent; with 83 percent of the total Bantu population in the 7-to-14 age group now attending school. No other African country has any such percentage.

The Government says it spends four times more per capita on educating its black residents than the next African country; that there are now 34,000 Bantu teachers; that complete literacy will come in this generation.

The president of the University College of the North is Dr. E. F. Potgieter, a man virtually bursting with energy and enthusiasm, vastly proud of his school.

To enter, black students must have the same entrance qualifications as do white ones in the white universities—12 years of grade and high school. His college follows the same syllabus as the University of South Africa and gives the same examinations.

When it opened, the college enrollment averaged 24 years of age. Now it is 21. In the first year of operation, students passed 64 percent of their courses. This figure has risen.

Psychology is the most popular course, zoology next.

White professors are paid more, a maximum of 6,000 rand annually compared to 4,200 rand for a Bantu professor.

"I'm fully aware of this economic discrepancy," said Dr. Potgieter, who has been trying to have the gap narrowed.

Six years isn't long enough to make any flat statements, he says, but he offers at least a preliminary conclusion that the learning ability of the Bantu is comparable to that of any other race. Their capacity for scholastic brilliance seems somewhat lower—but that could be due to environment and background, he said.

In 6 years he's had to expel only six or seven students. One "took a woman into his room for 2 days." Another smuggled in a bottle of brandy. By and large, his black students are there to learn—and do.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 3, 1966]

THERE'S NO TELEVISION; RADIO BANTU FLOURISHES

(By John Jarrell)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—In the Republic of South Africa's battle to avoid racial strife, Radio Bantu is one of its chief weapons.

The Bantu are the 12 million blacks who outnumber the white man in this rich country of vast land area but relatively sparse population by almost four to one. And Radio Bantu, a vital segment of the South African Broadcasting Corporation, is heard every day by some two million of them.

Its broadcasts are in all seven of the Bantu languages. The Bantu are provided a diet of everything from recipes to Shakespeare, from newscasts to advice on the rearing of babies.

South Africa has no television, one of only two African nations without it. No one seems to know when TV will come to this country. But radio flourishes.

SEVEN-DOLLAR RADIO TAX

Visit Radio Bantu's studios and you're likely to hear a black disk jockey speaking the rapid dialect of the South Sotho, where 73 words a minute are not unusual.

Or the soft-voiced words of the pretty Zulu girl who is so popular among her listeners that she receives many letters a day, offering recipes, making suggestions for programs or asking that certain numbers be played—sometimes, a proposal that a catchy commercial be repeated—or even seeking advice on a personal problem.

South African Radio Corporation is Government-owned and operated. It is largely financed by a $7-annual tax for each radio in the republic.

STORY TELLERS

Officials acknowledge that in their news broadcasts, they try to avoid items that might incite the populace. They explain this by pointing out that most of the world is unfriendly to South Africa, particularly the black nations to the north, and they seek to avoid items that might foment revolt or discontent.

Bantus of all the tribes, or nations, that make up the black part of South Africa's population, are born story tellers.

That is why Shakespeare was such a success among the Zulus, one of whose members—K. E. (King Edward) Massinga—translated nine of the Bard's plays into the Zulu tongue, which then were serialized and put on the air, with instant success.

Homer's Iliad was another favorite.

SPACE WORD

When space travel began, there was difficulty in reporting development because there was no Zulu word for spaceship. But such a word was created—iziphuphuteki—which means "the thing which wanders around aimlessly gets nowhere."

Fifty percent of the Bantu are literate—highest of all Africa—and among young people, the percentage is even higher. As a result, 1,500,000 letters were written by listeners to Radio Bantu last year.

Radio Bantu was hardly prepared to cope with a jilted tribesman who thought the radio some sort of father confessor, and wrote:

"My late brother's wife, for whom 120 rand was paid in lobola, wasn't even at her husband's funeral, but absconded with 200 rand and another man. According to tribal custom, I should have inherited her. I appeal to Radio Bantu to trace her, mete out the necessary punishment and return her to me at your earliest convenience."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 4, 1966]

SOUTH AFRICANS HOPE VIEWS CHANGE

(By John Jarrell)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—The eminent Transvaal justice, V. G. Hiemstra, put into words his view of South Africa's racial situation which, sooner or later, finds it way into every conversation here.

"We are grappling," said Justice Hiemstra "with the greatest spiritual problem of the age."

The complexities of the relationship among South Africa's white minority, its Bantu (black) and its colored (mixed) and Indian population are staggering.

Condemned as ruthless racists by its most bitter antagonists, as hopelessly behind the times by its milder critics, with kind words from almost no one, white South Africans are prepared to defend their system of apartheid as just, generous and workable.

They believe they have been made the victim of misunderstanding abroad coupled with slanted accounts of what goes on here.

The are prepared to carry on, hopeful that world opinion will change when their plan for separate development of the races takes more definite form.

BANTUSTANS

That plan calls for creation of a number of black states, ultimately to be independent, its architects say, but part of a commonwealth of South Africa.

The contention is that the tribal groupings of Bantu—who are not, they say, Negroes but, rather, members of various West African tribes who migrated south—are actually nations and that the Bantustans, or homelands, to be created will mean the actual recreation of an independent Zulu nation, a Xhosa (pronounced Causa) nation, and 4 to 6 others.

Not the least complex aspect is the urban Bantu, the black man or woman who has forsaken the pastoral life of the kraal for the congestion of the city.

They trooped into the cities at such a rate that the South African Government put a stop to further influx. Slum conditions were being created and the newcomers took jobs from black men already established in urban areas by willingness to work for less.

In the cities, the Bantu live in townships at the edge of town. They cannot reside in the city proper unless on the premises of an employer. They ride their own buses and trains to and from work. Facilities are separate.

DECENTRALIZE

How does South Africa expect to cope with its urban black residents, numbering more than 30 percent of all South African Bantu, within its program of Bantustans?

Realistic white South Africans don't expect ever to draw back to their homelands all or even the bulk of the Bantu city residents. But it does have an ambitious plan for decentralization of industries by the establishment of factories in the border areas, close to Bantu towns in their homelands, where they can work without having to travel into the white man's cities. This, they hope, will lure the Bantu to his homeland, away from the major metropolitan areas.

BOOMING

Meantime, the Government has spent vast sums on the existing townships outside cities like Johannesburg, where the Bantu, whose wages are lower than the white man, receives many free or cheap services in housing, medical care, transport, education.

White South Africans point out repeatedly that in spite of world criticism of South Africa, 1 million Bantu from black nations to the north have entered legally to work here, because wages and living conditions are better; that 20,000 more a year slip into South Africa illegally, and if the barrier were taken down, Bantu by the millions would flock across the Limpopo River to seek their fortunes in booming South Africa.

To the white man, this is proof that life for a Bantu in South Africa, with apartheid, is preferable to life in the newly emerged black nations to the north, even with independence.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Telegram, Feb. 6, 1966]

MEDICINE, HOUSING PART OF CONTENTMENT PLAN

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—The elderly Zulu with his broken leg suspended from above grinned cheerfully from his bed in Natal-Spruit Hospital on the outskirts of the bustling city of Johannesburg.

His leg is mending slowly. His hospitalization probably will require several weeks. The patient is a poor man, but he can afford to pay his hospital bill.

His bed, board and medical treatment, no matter how long he remains in the hospital, will cost him a total of 60 cents.

If he were penniless, he wouldn't even be charged that.

STANDARD COST

This is one of the ways the South African Government seeks to keep its Bantu residents, who outnumber the whites by 3 to 1, contented.

An outpatient pays 25 cents for whatever services he requires, whether it is an aspirin tablet with examination or a series of X-rays. A Bantu mother can have her baby, from prenatal attention through confinement and postnatal care for $4.20.

Not far from the 850-bed Natal-Spruit Hospital, exclusively for black patients—and it is not the largest Bantu hospital in the area—is Soweto, the vast Government complex of black townships, where a half million Bantu reside, 10 miles from the heart of Johannesburg.

TARGET

Soweto, which sounds like a native name but actually is a cannibalization of "southwest townships," provides one of the many targets for the worldwide critics of South Africa's 1,262 apartheid laws. They say it is unjust and inhuman to force black men to live in a certain area, to segregate them in districts far from their jobs in the city.

South African officials say that at great expense the Government has leveled the nauseous slums that once housed these Bantu, that it has given them homes and the sense of pride that goes with it, that sanitation has been brought to a people who had little or none, and at a price, heavily subsidized by the Government, that all could reach.

A visit to the townships along Masopha Street and Mota Street and Sofasonke Street, provides a look at 60,000 little brick and concrete homes, each with a tiny plot of ground, each with an outside toilet on the sewer line and a tap at the house. For an average $7 or $8 a month a Bantu gets his own home, with water, medical, sanitary and school services, daily postal service to his door.

LOTS AVAILABLE

The wealthier Bantu—some are well off—can buy up to two lots and put up his own fancier house, as many have. For the single male Bantu, there is a hostel where he can reside.

He rides his segregated trains and buses to work, probably three-quarters of an hour into the city. There are Bantu merchants, and none other, in the townships. Some of the houses are nicely kept up, with pretty lawns and gardens. Others are not.

Government officials say there are more automobiles in Soweto alone than in many of the new black African nations.

RIVALRIES FADE

The different tribes are kept segregated, as to housing, though a Zulu can walk into Xhosa areas if he wishes and the age-old differences and rivalries among tribes is dying out among the younger Bantu, while remaining alive among their elders.

There is a golf course. There also is violence.

There were, back in the slum days, mass bloody factional fights, where fatalities were high. Authorities say they don't occur any more, though among individuals of different tribal affiliation there are still some. But on an average, there are 80 post mortems every month in violent-death cases.

But there are also schools, 110 of them in the townships, which, while not yet compulsory—there aren't yet enough and must be divided among morning and evening sessions—are heavily attended.

In one study hall, youngsters in the 10-year-old category were industriously applying themselves. One brown-eyed boy was working on a problem of astronomy that defied the Nebraska adult peering over his shoulder. On the blackboard was written:

"Ability to think in abstract terms is in part a measure of mathematical ability."

The children are instructed in English and Afrikaans, the two official languages of the country.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 7, 1966]

FOUR RACIAL ELEMENTS ADD TO SOUTH AFRICA WOES

(By John Jarrell)

CAPETOWN, SOUTH AFRICA.—White South Africans are a proud people profoundly conscious of the almost universal unpopularity of their Government and, in most cases, inclined to express a failure to understand why this is so.

They are quick for the most part, to defend their Government's policy of apartheid, and separate development for the conglomeration of races that forms the Republic of South Africa.

An election campaign is underway right now, and the result appears to be every bit as certain as was the 1964 American election a few weeks before the polls opened. The National Party, architect of apartheid, will be returned to office, probably by its biggest majority ever.

PLUM

South Africa is the plum of this second largest of the world's continents. The nation's 3,500,000 whites, who say they built it into the teeming industrial country it is today are perfectly prepared to fight to keep black Africans from taking over here.

The complexities of South Africa are multiplied by its multiracial character. It is because of this that the theory of the multinational state has evolved. It calls for separate development of the races—sometimes called separate freedoms—and would include ultimately independent black states for the various Bantu tribes. They would live in harmony with white South Africa in a commonwealth.

There are four major groups in South Africa, with numerous subdivisions.

There are the whites, who run the country.

DIVIDED

The whites are divided, too. Roughly two-thirds of them are Afrikaners, who are descended from the early Dutch, French Huguenot, and German settlers, and most of the other one-third are of British descent. There are two official languages, English and Afrikaans, evolved from 17th century Dutch but including a touch of Hottentot and other tongues. A modern Hollander has trouble understanding it. It is a written as well as a spoken language.

Largest in point of numbers are the Bantu, close to 12 million strong, who started south across the Zambesi River about the time the early Boers were beginning to move northward.

But the Bantu are widely split, too, among the Xhosa (about 3,500,000), the Zulu (3,250,000), the Swazi, the Ndebele, the North Sotho, the South Sotho, the Iswana, Tsonga, Venda and a handful more. They speak several different languages, have their own customs and, in past years, fought blood battles with one another. A good many whites say the battles would begin again today if South Africa were handed over to the black man.

MIXED BLOOD

The third major group comprises the colored, 1,700,000 of them, of mixed origin. More nations are said to be represented among their ancestors than any in the world—they descend from slaves introduced from the Far East 300 years ago, from white European sailors and early white settlers, from Hottentots, from Malays who came centuries ago, as well as the Griquas.

And, finally, there are more than a half million Asiatics, mostly Indians who were brought in as indentured laborers 100 years ago.

The Indians, who are industrious residents, are the source of irritation among many white South Africans, who resent periodic charges that this element of the population is badly treated.

For the government has had in operation for more than a half century an Indian emigration plan, to return Indians to their homeland at government expense. Up to now, only 893 men, women and children—in more than 50 years—have taken advantage of a chance to return free to India. The others prefer South Africa.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 8, 1966]

COLORED MAN IS WITHOUT EVEN POTENTIAL COUNTRY

BELLVILLE, SOUTH AFRICA.—The colored man in South Africa is a man without, at the moment, even a potential country.

In South Africa, the term "colored" does not apply to the black, or Bantu residents, but rather to those of mixed race color may be darker than many Bantu or lighter than many whites. There are nearly 1¾ million of them.

Their ancestors were a mixture of white, Hottentot, Malay, and Grinqua.

The white government of South Africa has launched, along with its ambitious and costly plan for the Bantu under apartheid, another for the colored.

It includes a university college for them here at Bellville where Dr. J. G. Meiring, its white rector, feels pround and optimistic about the future of the nonhomogeneous people over whose destinies he regards the white South Africans as guardians and custodians.

"I don't care thruppence what the world says * * * provided you're honest with yourselves and are exercising good will," he said. "I'm proud to be able to say the colored people are beginning to believe in this place, and they are making headway."

EDUCATION

Where the Government has announced plans ultimately to set up its Bantu population in independent homelands, to be tied to white South Africa in a dominion-type operation, the ultimate future of the colored is to be determined. But their education is being stepped up, four white Members of the House of Assembly are elected by them to represent their interest, they get help in starting their own businesses and there is a separate department of state for them.

To a man like Tom Swartz, chairman of the Council of Colored Affairs, which is a liaison between the Government and the colored population, things are looking up for the colored man.

"A tremendous amount is being done for the colored people," he says.

Mr. Swartz contends that in the days before apartheid, the then ruling United Party operated with a sort of vague promise that some day we'd be equal—but in practice, the colored were not being given opportunities to improve themselves.

He said in those days a colored man had the vote, but could not sit in Parliament—that every 5 years, when there was a general election, his vote was sought but he was forgotten right afterward.

TWO WARS

"We fought in two wars against people they said were trying to oppress the world," he said. "But we didn't get the same pay as the white soldier and we traveled in separate compartments. We had a sort of first-class citizenship in theory but it didn't work out in practice. Today, under the National Party government, we can be described as second-class citizens—but in practice we are being made first-class citizens. We are being uplifted economically, educationally, and socially. I feel this is the only salvation at this time."

The colored live in what are called proclaimed colored areas.

Mr. Swartz found it odd that during the time before apartheid when the colored man had a sort of quasi-first-class citizenship in theory but not practice, the world paid no attention, but with apartheid "when the National Party began an honest policy that merely put into statutes what had been practiced for years," the protests on behalf of the colored began.

FORCED

Total integration of South Africa holds no allure for Mr. Swartz because, he said, "the Bantu would be the ruler. The colored man would go under with the white man."

T. leFleur, another colored council member, looks toward ultimate independence of the colored, with an area set aside for him similar to those envisaged for the Bantu. He was the only council member to suggest it in an interview.

"We are being given the opportunity to prepare ourselves for the day when we are given the responsibility for governing ourselves," he said.

The Government policy of separate development of the races, said Mr. leFleur, is forcing the colored South African "to stand on his own feet."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 9, 1966]

Tough Law Is Necessary—Outnumbered Whites Defend Apartheid

Capetown, South Africa.—By standards in the United States, where the writ of habeas corpus is a sacred legal tenet, same of South Africa's apartheid laws appear harsh, unjust, and indefensible.

White residents contend they are necessary, that those laws under the heaviest attack are required to keep communism out of a republic whose black residents, outnumbering whites more than three to one, are a constant target of subversive elements.

Chief object of such criticism, probably, is the 180-day clause of the Criminal Procedure Act.

ON WITNESSES

The eminent Supreme Court Justice, V. G. Hiemstra of the Transvaal, emphasized that this is a restriction in "witnesses" who "might be spirited away by accomplices of arrested persons or who might be in danger of their lives at the hands of accomplices."

The Attorney General may order such person detained when he deems it is in the interests of either the person, or the administration of justice. He can be held only until the trial of the person where his presence is required as a witness, or for 180 days, whichever is shorter.

Normally, only his family can see him. But, Justice Hiemstra says, it is compulsory that he be visited once a week by a magistrate, so he can state complaints. He is paid witness fees and if it can be shown he lost pay, he will be reimbursed by the Government.

But he has no access to the courts to apply for his release during this period. He would be able to bring a civil action if he could show he was detained in bad faith.

"These provisions have given excellent results in solving major crimes," said the judge.

John Vorster, Minister of Justice in the Verwoerd Cabinet, who many believe ultimately will become Prime Minister, said that 23 people have been detained under the act, which replaced the old 90-day Detention Act some time ago. Fourteen were white, seven were Bantu, two were Indians.

The 780-day clause is used with respect to subversion cases.

NO BAIL

Under fire on occasion, too, is the act which permits a prisoner to be held without bail for 90 days, if the Attorney General of a province so orders, for such crimes as sedition, murder, arson, kidnaping, child-stealing, conspiracy, and treason.

The Group Areas Act, which requires that anyone not obviously white is presumed colored (the colored in South Africa are a racial amalgamation, separate from the Bantu, or black) unless he can establish that he is generally accepted as white.

These, and legislation that require urban Bantu and colored to live in specified nonwhite areas, and carry identification cards—as do the whites—are always included when South African laws are discussed, condemned and defended.

Coupled with only-white voting and social welfare aspects of the nation, they can provoke interesting views on how best to describe the Republic of South Africa.

"A power democracy," said one stanch defender, a leading Capetown financier. "For whites in power it is a democracy, for the blacks and colored, it isn't a democracy. So far as the blacks are concerned, we're imposing our views on them—but I deny they are oppressed."

He pointed to the vast sums spent on the plan to develop independent black states; such townships as the vast complex for Bantu around Johannesburg where a half-million of them live in low-rent modern houses "vastly superior to anything they ever had before" with almost free hospitalization.

Someone called it a "democratic dictatorship."

A banker was asked if it could be called a free-enterprise economy with socialistic overtones, because of the welfare provisions of the South African setup.

He would not accept this because "there is no socialistic philosophy involved."

"Paternalistic, yes; socialistic, no," he declared.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 10, 1966]

Whites Determined "To Hold What's Our's"

Capetown, South Africa.—The man many South Africans believe will be their next Prime Minister, Minister of Justice John Vorster, phrased his view on the nation's policies—shared by the majority of the white population—thus:

"We sincerely believe that what is ours was gained not by theft or by stealth; we developed this country. It is legally ours. We will fight for what is ours. We are absolutely determined to hold what is our own."

To Mr. Vorster has fallen the job of enforcing the apartheid laws that have made South Africa the most controversial country of the fifties and sixties.

He is prepared to defend them, and does.

He must "marry," he says, two philosophies—the freedom of the individual on the one hand, the safety of the state on the other.

STATE SUPREME

Under Roman-Dutch law, he says—which is now applied only in South Africa, Rhodesia, and Ceylon, no longer in Holland—the "safety of the state is the supreme law."

"We believe in both principles," asserted Mr. Vorster. "Depending on circumstances, the stress will be on one or the other. At the moment, with the other African states doing their level best to organize sabotage here, the stress will fall on the safety of the state."

One of the leading political prisoners held on Robben Island, a sort of Alcatraz in the middle of famed Table Bay, is Robert Sobukwe, president of the banned Pan African Congress, who is indefinitely in jail.

Mr. Vorster said the aim of the congress was to get rid of the white man in South Africa, and that it was willing to work with the Communists to do it. Its attitude, he said, was that once the white man had been ousted, then was the time to deal with the Communists.

COTTAGE JAIL

He said Mr. Sobukwe lives not in a cell but a cottage, has been permitted visitors, and that the Red Cross, which twice saw him, reported him receiving the same treatment that a high-ranking captured officer gets in wartime.

The Minister of Justice knows something of detention himself. He was held in World War II, accused of pro-Nazi sympathies, which he denies.

He says he was a member of both the National Party, now in power, and an Afrikaner cultural organization. Half the population, he maintains, including himself, was "anti-war, which didn't mean they were pro-Nazi."

NEUTRALITY

He was jailed 85 days, held without charges in a detention camp for 14 months. "Then I got tired of it and ran away."

Of political prisoners like Mr. Sobukwe, he said:

"I make it a point to see they are better treated than I was."

And given the same set of conditions that existed in 1942, he said, "I still think I'd be on the side of neutrality. Our government then confused being an Afrikaner with being a pro-Nazi."

Mr. Vorster refused to comment about a prospective visit by U.S. Senator Robert Kennedy, democrat of New York. Then he was asked about a visit that American Negro leader Martin Luther King is said to be hopeful of making to South Africa.

"I don't think he'll be coming here at all," asserted Mr. Vorster. "Let's say we can do without him."

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Feb. 11, 1966]

Opposition Looks Only to Whites

Capetown, South Africa.—The South African Government's chief opposition comes from the United Party—but it, too, looks only to a white-ruled nation.

It opposes, however, the creation by the existing government in the hands of the National Party of as many as eight Bantu, or black independent states in the traditional homelands of the Zulus and the Xhosas and the other tribes, or nations, that began moving south across the Zambesi River at the same time the early white settlers started pushing north.

"We say," said Sir de Villiers Graaff, the United Party leader, "that we should look at the risks involved—their treaties with other powers, creation of a jumping-off place for communism. It would create a whole lot of little Cubas."

Such a view is sharply challenged by Government people.

Told by a World-Herald reporter what Sir de Villiers had said, Minister of Information Frank Waring commented:

"Do you imagine we would stand idly by for that sort of thing?"

ELECTION

The March 30 election will be fought mainly between candidates for Parliament of the National and United Parties, with the Nationals expected to add to their already commanding majority, roughly two-thirds of the members of the House of Assembly.

There are, however, other parties, including the Progressives, holding one seat, and the Liberal Party, with none and little prospect for any.

The Progressive Party favors abolition of all discriminatory laws, a common electoral roll, though beginning with the admission of only qualified black men to it. It wants fundamental rights for all embodied in a constitution.

The Liberals want equality of the races and a rigid constitution to take care of the rights of all.

At the other end of the splinter-party spectrum is the Republican Party, which feels the National Party, in control, is doing too much for the black man and not enough for the white.

PLATFORM

The United Party which Sir de Villiers heads would maintain social and residential segregation. The colored people (those of mixed birth) would be permitted to vote on the common roll, and colored candidates could stand for Parliament—though residential and social restrictions would be maintained.

His party would give the Bantu the vote, but not on the common roll—they would have Parliamentary representation, but they would have to elect white men to represent their interests.

Sir de Villiers sees for the urban Bantu the gradual emergence of a middle class, as a bastion against communism, and he favors relaxation of existing pass (identification card) laws and exemption from them of responsible blacks. He would let them own homes, in prescribed areas.

He favors government help in black rural areas, relaxation and modification of land tenure laws and development of the black reserves with white capital and initiative.

The United Party also favors a policy of heavy white immigration. Sir de Villiers accused the Government of wanting new citizens only to solve labor shortages; "they fear the Afrikaners will be plowed under" with mass white immigration.

LANGUAGE

The United Party is strongest among English-speaking white South Africans, while the National Party draws its greatest strength from the Afrikaans-speaking part of the population. The Afrikaans group is heavily in the majority in this country.

Sir de Villiers put into words what any visitor soon feels about South Africa and its division between English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking groups.

"Much bitterness" from the Boer War, fought almost three-fourths of a century ago, remains, he acknowledged.

That war settled the fate of the two Boer Republics, Orange Free State and the Transvaal.

Ultimately, there came the Union of South Africa, and eventually it became an independent nation in the British Commonwealth. In 1960 there was the referendum which made it once more a republic, with descendants of the Boers in the majority. The next year it left the British Commonwealth.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 13, 1966]

The Transkei Is Answer To Critics

Umtata, the Transkei, South Africa.—Here is the Republic of South Africa's answer to critics of its racial policies—a fertile area, larger than Belgium, that it is leading to what it says will be, at some point in the future, an independent black nation.

For the Transkei is the first of the Bantustans, perhaps as many as eight, that the South African Government plans to create, in hopes it can develop a Commonwealth of South Africa with a white nation for whites, black nations for black, living together in peace and cooperation.

Whether it will work is of course, the question.

WORKABLE PLAN

Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd's National Party, which holds two-thirds of the seats in Parliament and probably will have more after the March 30 election, insists it is a workable and just plan that can succeed if the world will permit it.

There is opposition among white South Africans; there is opposition, as well, within the ranks of the Xhosa (which is pronounced 'Causa) who inhabit the fertile farm country that is the Transkei. But the opposition is the minority voice.

It is the government position that traditionally, various Bantu tribes have had homelands, one of them the Transkei, and that the independent black nations to be formed under this most ambitious of apartheid laws will fall within those hereditary borders.

ALL-BLACK VOTE

The Bantu Self-Government Act makes these Bantustans possible, and in the Transkei the first election by an all-black electorate took place in November 1963.

Kaizer Matanzima, a Xhosa chief who believes in the apartheid tenet of separate development of the races was chosen Chief Minister, and he heads the Legislative Assembly, which meets in an attractive building in the still almost-all-white capital of Umtata.

There are 109 members of the Assembly, of whom 64, including the Chief Minister, are chiefs and headmen nominated by the Central Government at Pretoria, the others elected by the voters for 5-year terms.

There are six Cabinet officers—finance (in the hands of the Chief Minister), justice, interior, agricultural development, roads and works, and education.

YEARS IN FUTURE

Each Minister has a white secretary; the civil service is still largely white. But the plan is to turn over jobs to the Bantu as soon as they have gained the experience to handle them.

The Central Government still handles defense, security, and external affairs.

No one can say when the day will come when the reins are handed over to the Transkei government. It obviously is years in the future.

South African Government people, and their supporters, point frequently to unrest and violence in the independent black nations to the north, and say that is proof that a people must be ready for self-government before having it. But they insist that under the plan, the Transkei will, in fact, ultimately be independent and wholly self-governing.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 14, 1966]

Jarrell in Africa: Education Is Vital for Umtata

Umtata, the Transkei, South Africa.—Education is regarded as the key to the success of the South African plan to create several independent black states within the borders of this rich and controversial republic.

The Bantu of South Africa already have a literacy rate higher than anywhere else on the African continent, but there seems a special urgency about it here in the Transkei, which is the first of the Bantustans and which already has a considerable degree of self-government and its own Legislative Assembly. Bantu means "people" and applies to all blacks in South Africa.

FERTILE

One crosses the Kei River Bridge and he is in the Transkei, a fertile, 16,000-square-mile area blessed with ample rainfall with some 40 inches a year, much coal and a generally peace-loving black population of 1,600,000 Xhosa tribesmen.

As many more Xhosa live elsewhere, mostly in the townships surrounding the great cities.

It is largely cattle-and-corn country, though there are plans to bring manufacturing and shipping, too, the latter through revitalization of the old but virtually abandoned port of St. Johns, on the Umzimvubu River.

The South African Government feels the road to independence for the Transkei, its development as an independent state within a South African Commonwealth, requires an educated electorate. Thus the 1,600 schools, the 312,000 Xhosa in classrooms, the 5,400 teachers.

DETRACTORS

The Transkei has its own national anthem already—"Oh, God, Sustain Africa"—and its own flag.

It also has its detractors, both black and white, so far as prospective nationhood is concerned.

As envisaged in the Government's Bantustan plan, the Transkei and the other six or seven Bantustans will be black; South Africa itself will be white. No black man will be able to own property in white South Africa. Well-to-do Bantus can purchase homes in the townships outside the big cities, but they can only lease the land on which they sit. No white man will be permitted to own land in the Bantustana.

It is the latter aspect of the overall plan that irritates many of the whites here in the Transkei.

COMPENSATION

The law provides for adequate compensation for property owned by whites, and as this is a long-term proposition, people are not being uprooted.

Umtata, the capital, is still largely a white town where apartheid is practiced. Bantu are not permitted in the hotel or in the cinema, and have their own entrances to the postoffice. There is irritation among white South Africans because a sizable chunk of the community was zoned black.

DIVISION

This means a white businessman, while he can continue running his business, can only sell to a Bantu. The Bantu Investment Corporation and the Bantu Development Corporation have been set up by the Government to provide funds for Bantu to go into the world of business.

The Umtata whites are in the process of forming a "ratepayers' association" in an effort "to safeguard the interests of ratepayers (taxpayers) in town."

A member of South Africa's Parliament for the Transkei Territories accused Prime Minister Verwoerd of showing "no sympathy" for the white man in the Transkei.

Meanwhile, the governing black party in the Transkei, the National Independence Party, is fighting off attacks from its opposition, the Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party opposes the Bantustan plan. It favors continued alignment of the Transkei with South Africa, and holds that without nongovernment white capital, the area cannot make a go of it.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 15, 1966]

Jarrell in Africa: Black, White Agree, No Mixing

Umtata, the Transkei, South Africa.—Said the white official: "Like the white man, the Bantu does not subscribe to the idea of social integration, which is bound to culminate in the eventual destruction of the Bantu personality as well as the white personality. The recognition of the dignity of the black man lies in the retention of his creed and culture, which cannot be achieved once integration has started."

Said the black official: "My government (of the Transkei) does not believe in a multiracial state, for in that it sees the perpetuities of ceilings that are placed over the heads and progress of the Africans."

Thus did J. H. Abrahams, commissioner general of the Xhosa National Unit, and B. B. Mdledle, Minister of Education of self-governing Transkei, which South Africa says will one day be wholly independent, agree that black man and white man should not be integrated.

Mr. Mdledle, in fact, believes the United States would be better off with separate black States.

There are conflicting views in South Africa over integration. There are conflicting views here in the Transkei itself.

But the overwhelming majority of whites in South Africa believe black and white should not mix. And the National Independence Party of the Transkei, which controls the Transkei's Government and is thus representative of the area's Bantu population, believes it, too.

CORN

This is a beautiful land, the Transkei. And a fertile one. And, in the distant kraals, primitive.

Yet 80 percent of schoolage children have had at least 3 or 4 years of school.

Maize, or mealies, form the chief crop. In the United States, it is called corn.

And cattle. In all South Africa, close to 50 percent of the cows are owned by the Bantu. The proportion is high in the Transkei.

"A man is not really a man unless he's got cattle and a piece of land," says J. H. T. Mills, the white secretary to the Department of the Chief Minister.

It is difficult to get the Xhosa tribesmen, who form the black population of the Transkei, to give up the growing of corn for any other crop, even one that produces greater revenue. For centuries, they have grown corn. Why quit?

Efforts are being made to have them produce cotton, which grows well here, and would bring in more rand (the South African unit of exchange), to little avail.

WIVES

This is a land where a man can legally have as many wives as he can pay for. Payment, or lobola, usually is in cows, and a village girl usually brings her parents 8 to 10 of them. Sometimes it runs higher. A chief's daughter can cost one hundred cows.

There is one wealthy Transkei man—a herbalist who not long ago purchased an American automobile for cash he took out of a suitcase—who enjoys the luxury of 23 wives.

An indication of how complicated life is in Africa is the fact that among the Xhosa alone there are 12 different subtribes. There are, in all, 700 languages on the continent of Africa.

A visit to a kraal is likely to bring out the entire populace, including the head man with his wives, offspring and in-laws. The girls may discard their traditional orange blankets and, bare-breasted dance.

SMILES

The older women will smoke their pipes and gab cheerfully. Little ones eat their mealies. One may be invited into their homes, each of them round, made of mud, with thatched roofs, floors of polished cow dung. Each wife lives in a separate house.

Bare feet are the rule, winter and summer. It is summer now. But the sight of an old Xhosa male wearing an overcoat, and without shoes is somehow incongruous.

Yet no sound is lovelier than to hear a group of Xhosa men and women—like the dining room staff of the Hotel Savoy in Umtata—singing, in rich African voices, the words of the national anthem of the Transkei, "Oh, God, Sustain Africa."

"Here, nature smiles," says Minister of Education Mdledle.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 16, 1966]

"WE'VE HIT BOTTOM ON WAY BACK," RHODESIAN DECLARES

SALISBURY, RHODESIA.—Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith disclosed Tuesday that if current plans with regard to oil work out "we'll completely lick the embargo."

The leader of this sanctions-plagued nation declined in an interview to reveal details of the plans.

The oil situation in Rhodesia, which declared its independence 3 months ago in a dispute with Britian over its racial policies, was described as "better this week than last."

NOT ENOUGH

"We believe we've hit bottom and are on our way up."

The only announced source of oil coming to Rhodesia now is in the form of voluntary contributions from South Africa.

It is not believed, however, that such a relatively small amount as has been brought by this voluntary method to date will be enough to alleviate the shortage.

Mr. Smith expressed hope the United States would "stop this nonsense" when he was asked about the effect of United States sanctions against this East African nation.

"What have we done that the United States wants to cut off our trade?" he asked.

He said in spite of the embargo against his country, Rhodesia's overall trade is "going ahead the same as it has in the past."

ASKS ROOM

He spoke bitterly about the United States following Britain's lead on sanctions at the same time Britain is still trading with North Vietnam as well as Red China and Cuba.

He pictured Rhodesia as conducting an "experiment" in government, with its objective a Parliament where black man and white men both sit with no attention paid to color.

He asked for "room to maneuver" to attain that objective.

But in a separate interview, the black man who heads the Parliamentary opposition, J. M. Gondo of the United Peoples Party, accused the Government of making it difficult for the black man to get the education which qualifies him for the vote.

Charging this is politically motivated, Mr. Gondo said: "The fewer agitated Africans, the longer the whites can remain in power."

The opposition leader favors broadening the base to bring more Africans into the voting area, as a prelude to eventual one-man, one-vote operation.

EQUAL AMOUNTS

He said the Government spends equal amounts on educating black and white children, but called it "unfair" because there are 4 million black children and 220,000 whites.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 17, 1966]

TRANSKEI COLLEGE UPDATES PROCEDURES IN AGRICULTURE

TSOLO, THE TRANSKEI, SOUTH AFRICA.—To the average Xhosa tribesman in the lush, fertile Transkei, a bumper crop of maize means only one thing: He won't have to grow any the next year.

It isn't the toil involved—what are his wives and children for?—but, he asks, why should he raise more maize if he has enough for the mealies he and his family eat and the kaffir beer that is quaffed in truly remarkable quantities?

So, here at the Tsolo Agriculture College, another of the multitude of projects of the South African Government to bring the rural Bantu tribesman into the 20th century, or at least the 19th, modern farming methods are taught.

The young men who spend 2½ years here are expected to take the word to their elders, many of them as extension agents of the Central Government, and seek by actual demonstration to show what wonders can be accomplished with the soil if it is properly utilized.

It is here in the Transkei that South Africa is staging its greatest experiment in apartheid, the creation of a black state slated ultimately for independence, the first of as many as eight Bantu areas scheduled, when its tribal inhabitants are ready for it, to rule themselves.

But the problems of initiative, responsibility and organizational ability among a people content to do things as their forbears did centuries ago have to be met, combated and solved.

A student here must have had 11 years of schooling before he is admitted, and he is carefully screened, for there are more applicants than vacancies.

He is likely to be 18 to 20 years old, and he first has 18 months studying various subjects—sheep and wool-growing, animal and field husbandry, soil conservation, forestry, vegetable gardening, and others.

Then for a year he is assigned to project planning, for he has intensive training in how to run a small economic unit. Crop rotation, grazing rotation, bookkeeping, all of them fall to him.

For this he pays only $45 a year. It costs the South African Government 10 times that to give him the training.

When he leaves, unless he takes postgraduate work at another school, he goes into the field and tries to motivate his fellow Xhosa into adopting the white man's modern and profitable farming methods.

This isn't easy. The Xhosa is pretty well satisfied with the status quo.

WHAT'S NEED?

Maize is the staple crop. This provides the mealies that are eaten at every meal. It is corn, yellow corn, white corn. The farmers of the Transkei produce about 8,750,000 bushels of maize a year. L. O. Hagan, principal of the Tsolo Ag College, thinks they should manage 700 million bushels in this area that is almost as large as Denmark.

There is ample rainfall, and "there is virtually nothing they cannot produce," he says. Only the human element is a limiting factor.

Most Xhosa feel no necessity to produce beyond their immediate needs.

Adjacent to—just across a fence—one of the school's maize fields is a similar one owned by a Xhosa farmer. In the school's field, the usual winter-fallow, fertilization methods are followed.

The maize it produces grows faster, has better quality, makes more to the acre. For years the Xhosa farmer has seen the difference, yet never once has he manifest any interest in trying to find out why.

BEER

Fifty percent of the maize produced by the Xhosa farmers goes to make kaffir beer, the remainder is used for food. The beer is brewed in 44-gallon containers, takes 4 or 5 days to reach the peak of perfection, and is dispensed on more or less a communal basis.

A "beer-drink" is a great social event. Men and women join in, usually with the men on one side, the women on the other, each group passing back and forth the big cup that holds the brew. But after awhile the barriers break down, and the sexes intermingle.

A good beer-drink can last 2 or 3 days. Elder daughters are left home to take care of smaller children when their parents are enjoying this somewhat intensified conviviality. It is not uncommon for a participant to awaken after such a bout and embark on another.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 18, 1966]

Sword Keeps Order in Transkei Assembly

Umtata, the Transkei, South Africa.—The Legislative Assembly of the Transkei, the region that South Africa expects to have independence when its black Xhosa tribesmen are ready for self-rule, is the scene of debates sharper than in the U.S. Congress.

Remarks are made that would be declared out of order in the American Senate or House.

But the give and take is quite similar to that which goes on within the Chambers of the Capitol in Washington, though the language is Xhosa.

On hand to keep order is the sergeant-at-arms, an imposing figure in his black tailcoat with gold-fringed red epaulets and red cuffs.

SYMBOL

In the front of the attractive chamber, with its desks of "stinkwood" (despite the name, this is South Africa's finest wood, beautiful and rich of texture) stands the symbol of government, the mace.

The sergeant-at-arms has, for maintaining order, a spearlike sword that is as wicked looking as anything used by African warriors in the last century. The story is that he has had to use it only once, on two unruly members, who subsided quickly when they saw the sharp-edged blade coming their way.

A study of the English translation of debate in the Assembly shows that the black men (and one woman) who comprise it usually speak well and fluently as they make their points.

CAUSTIC

But their tongues sometimes are caustic, which apparently is acceptable in the Transkei.

During debate on one occasion, the Chief Minister, Kaizer Matanzima, was interrupted by Knowledge Guzana, one of the leaders of the opposition, a man recently denied a passport by the South African Government when he wished to visit the United States.

"Keep quiet," said Mr. Matanzima.

The Chief Minister went on to call some members of the opposition Democratic Party "spineless." And one was "a man who changes colors like a chameleon so that taking him seriously would be the task of a fool."

A PITY

In a debate over the complicated tribal structure of the Transkei, which has 4 paramount chiefs and 137 other chiefs and 917 head men, Mr. Matanzima said it was a pity one opposition member "should be amongst such a conglomeration of fools."

When exception was taken, he substituted "stupid." Later he withdrew both.

When he said the people of the Transkei still recognize chiefs "as their leaders and protectors," an opposition member asked: "Why do you have bodyguards then?"

The Chief Minister complained that an opposition member had characterized chiefs as "irresponsible, drunken, uneducated, and ignorant."

Corrected the member: "I said some of them."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 20, 1966]

Many Predict Petty Segments of Apartheid Will Go

Durban, South Africa.—When an American tries to delve into South Africa's complex and controversial racial policy, just about the first piece of advice he gets is not to try to compare the United States with this country.

To an American, geared to his own Nation's continuing, if difficult, effort to provide equal opportunity for all, many features of South Africa's apartheid policy appear questionable.

Some of the aspects of that policy that are repugnant to the visitor from the United States are in the area that is described over here ash "petty apartheid."

Separate queues in the post office, the banning of an East Indian golf champion from an important tournament, park benches marked for use only of "European-blankes"—they are hard for the American to understand.

HARSH LAWS

Other apartheid laws may be more critically challenged.

The visitor from the United States, who has grown up in a country where any prisoner is assured a trial, where the writ of habeas corpus can get him a hearing if he's held without charges or early hearing, is likely to look askance at laws which permit a prisoner to be kept in jail indefinitely after his term has ended, as in the case of the Bantu (black man), Robert Sobukwe.

The pass laws—every one must carry his identification card—may strike the American as off-key and an infringement.

The South African who supports Government policies, says the laws are required in the interest of public safety.

As to the petty apartheid, there are many predictions that these trivial and mortifying segments of racial policy probably will be abandoned.

There has been loosening up already. The black man can buy spirits, where once he was limited to Bantu beer. Except during periods when crime has brought a show-your-pass crackdown, he can be out in the cities at night without molestation. The curfew has gone.

NO INTEGRATION

But separation of the races continues, and it will continue. Both the dominant National Party and its chief opposition, the United Party, favor it. The difference here is only a matter of degree.

Where South Africa will rise or fall is in that vital area of its separate development program that proposes to set aside the traditional Bantu homelands for self-ruling and independent black states, hopefully with the idea that from them will spring a commonwealth of South Africa.

The first of these, hereditary homeland of the Xhosa Tribe, has been set up in the Transkei, an area larger than Belgium along the southeastern coast.

Detractors say the Transkei is poor country where, at best, a subsistence living is possible.

SPENDING MILLIONS

The visitor learns this is not so. The rich, fertile Transkei can produce almost anything—fruits, grains, vegetables, cotton. Its pasture lands are extensive.

The Central Government of the Republic is spending millions of rand on the education of the people of the Transkei, and on their hospitalization and on teaching farming methods that will improve crops and income.

It is doing the same in other areas of South Africa, but the experiment in the Transkei is of transcending importance because, if the plan is followed through—and the Verwoerd government insists it will be—the all-black Legislative Assembly that presently controls six departments of its government will ultimately be the governing body of a no-strings-attached independent state.

Other independent states, or Bantusians, would follow.

Of one thing, there is no doubt: the South African Government is spending huge sums to improve the lot of the black man.

HUGE FRAUD

To such Bantu as I. B. Tabata, now in the United States, who says he would be jailed if he returned home, the plan to create as many as eight Bantusians, or independent black nations, is "a huge fraud—a scheme to make these areas into a labor reservoir." Those were the words he used to a World-Herald reporter in Washington some weeks ago.

But to men like Commissioner General J. H. Abraham of the Xhosa National Unit (the Xhosa occupy the Transkei), the Bantusan plan has the "wholehearted support" of most Bantu. Mr. Abraham, a white man, declared:

"It echoes the dearest sentiments of their own hearts. In this system they can take their cultural and traditional spiritual yearnings with them and are not called upon to discard that which they regard as sacred."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 21, 1966]

Separate Development Backers Ask for Time

Johannesburg, South Africa.—Three and one-half million whites in South Africa, a vast and viable nation, are financing a tremendously costly program for the black residents who outnumber them more than 3 to 1.

It is paternalism, whatever tag is applied to it.

For whatever it is worth, this is South Africa's answer to the demands of the world's colored races, long under white rule in the days of colonialism, for a self-determining role.

In going its own way with its policy of separate development, South Africa has been condemned from almost every corner of the world.

It was over apartheid that South Africa broke out of the British Commonwealth and formed a republic, with no ties of any sort, except historical, with Great Britain.

The United Nations has called on South Africa to abandon its racial policies.

DIRTY WORD

The United States disapproves of South Africa, and down here, the name of Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams, who is in charge of African affairs for the State Department, is a dirty word.

The black countries to the north remain blazingly angry at the enormously wealthy power at the southern tip of the continent.

South Africa is accused of being a police state, which its leaders deny, but there are restrictive laws, described as security measures to hold down any Communist activity, that provide some fuel for such charges.

Yet, despite the world's condemnation of the Republic of South Africa as being harsh, unjust, and intransigent as regards its nonwhite majority, there are more than 1 million Bantu from other African countries working here, some 20,000 more try every year to enter the republic illegally—because jobs are available and wages, by black standards, good—and, if immigration barriers were lowered at the Limpopo River, Bantu by the hundreds of thousands, it is estimated, would pour across.

TIME

It doesn't take long for a white South African to tell any visitor what it is that the nation needs: Time.

Given time, they say, they can make their policy of separate development work.

And its main feature is the creation of several Bantustans.

These would be independent states, carved out within the republic's boundaries, embracing the hereditary homelands of the various black tribes that began coming south across the Zambesi about the time the early white settlers started pushing north.

For in South Africa, when the white man arrived more than 300 years ago, there were only the Hottentots and the Bushmen. The Hottentots are almost gone, and the primitive Bushmen still survive, in relatively small numbers, in areas where no one else wants to live.

CULTURE

The Government says that the black man settled in certain areas of the country, and that it is those areas it will hand back to the black man, to rule as he sees fit, but, hopefully, with economic ties to South Africa in a commonwealth or federation.

In these independent states, government spokesmen avow, the Bantu would be able to retain his own culture while using the best of the white man's know-how.

The project's cost is enormous, and the white man finances it. It is complicated by the fact that many millions of blacks reside not in these homelands, the first of which has been set up in the Transkei with self-rule slated some time in the future, but rather in the white man's cities, where he has employment but not equality.

LIKE ITALIANS

Under the plan, these urban blacks will have the vote in their homeland, even if they choose the city. The black in the homeland, with independence that is promised, won't have to live under apartheid laws. The blacks who choose to remain in urban areas will continue to reside in their own sectors of the cities, and accept apartheid.

Whites like to compare them to Italians who take jobs in Switzerland—they remain Italian subjects, but work away from Italy.

But, they say, look at what the black man gets: Modern homes at low rents, virtually free hospitalization, educational advantages denied to much of the rest of Africa, and a pay day every week.

The administrator of Natal Province, J. T. A. Gerdener—his job corresponds to that of an American Governor—told a World-Herald reporter that three-fourths of the income taxes he pays go to programs for nonwhites.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 22, 1966]

ANIMAL REIGNS AS KING IN 8,000 MILES OF PARK

SKUKUZA, KRUGER NATIONAL PARK, SOUTH AFRICA.—The old timer took his pipe out of his mouth and, speaking in Afrikaans—which was translated—said:

"We figure that old fellow is about 200 years old."

"That old fellow" was a huge crocodile, sunning himself on the banks of the Sabie River, here in Kruger National Park, a game reserve where man can look, but cannot harm, innumerable varieties of wild animals, from the gentle impala to the powerful lioness who kills for her family.

Some doubted the old timer's estimate of the venerable crocodile's age. One thing was certain though; the croc is among the park's inhabitants best able to take care of himself.

ANIMAL IS KING

Lying in the northeastern part of the Transvaal, between the Crocodile River to the South and the Limpopo to the north (Kipling fans will remember the "great green, greasy Limpopo River"), this fascinating game preserve is the size of a small state, 8,000 square miles, 200 miles long, averaging 40 miles wide.

Here the animal is king. Humans are tolerated, so long as they behave themselves. The only thing they can shoot is a camera. They can traverse the roads at will, but they must not leave their cars except at specified areas.

My previous wild-animal thrill came when a bear ambled in front of my car in Vermont. I counted 16 species of animal within a few hours, to say nothing of countless exotic birds that ranged from the snake-hunting secretary bird to the purple crested loerie.

One's first sight of the graceful impala brings ooh's and ah's. Within an hour, the sight of a herd of 200 of the leaping, curious creatures has become commonplace. They must exist in Kruger by the hundreds of thousands.

LION'S DIET

The impala forms a staple of the lion's diet. But things are lush at Kruger this summer and this, while fattening the impala, is bad news for the king of beasts, and his mate, who does the hunting.

For in dry seasons, the impala visits the regular water holes, along regular paths by which a hungry lion can lie in wait. With so much greenery and small pools all over, the impala is not dependent on the regular watering place. It isn't easy to be a lion in boom times.

Baboons everywhere. Close the car window when a pack is around, or they'll be right inside. And, perhaps, bite. They're inveterate hitchhikers, riding atop cars, or on engines or trunks.

The unlovely wart hog abounds. A baby wart hog, yet to grow into the immense ugliness of the parent, is sort of cute.

CURIOUS

There was the cheetah family that was as curious as occupants of the car; at least the cubs were. Three of them sat in the road, permitting the automobile to come within 10 yards. Off the road, their mother, powerful, lithe, graceful and alert, stood, tail thrashing. Down the road appeared a jackal, which ambled toward the cubs, hoping, perhaps, they had recently killed and he could share in the leftovers.

He came as close as the mother cheetah thought permissible. She made a pass at him. The jackal fled. The mother trotted into the bush. The cubs knew instinctively it was time for them to leave, too.

TALL GIRAFFES

Further along, 19 giraffes, 3 of them bigger than I ever saw in captivity (and I'm an inveterate zoogoer). The succulents high in the trees and bushes interested them; they could not have cared less about the humans only a few feet away. A giraffe sometimes forms a lion's meal, but lions respect the kicking ability of a giraffe—a well-aimed kick can kill—and are more likely to go for the impala or the zebra.

A pack of 15 wild dogs ambles by. A mother kudu and her calf. Monkeys. More baboons, hundreds of them. A vicious-looking cobra by the side of the road. A visit to the hippo pool, escorted by a rifle-carrying guard who lives in a hut in the park. No, he says he doesn't venture outdoors at night.

"Wild Animals Can Be Dangerous," says the signs.

Only one disappointment. No elephants. There are a few in the neighborhood, though most of them are further north in a section of the park closed in the summer. Some people saw them, but for something so big, the elephant can be an elusive fellow.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 23, 1966]

SOUTH WEST AFRICA FATE LEFT UP TO HAGUE COURT

PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA.—Of worldwide importance is the decision that probably will be handed down this year by the International Court of Justice in The Hague.

It relates to the future of South West Africa, a big chunk of largely arid land that the Republic of South Africa has been administering for close to a half century under a mandate of the old League of Nations.

The case is one of complexities and controversies, with South Africa's racial policies the crux of the issue.

It holds worldwide significance in that any adverse decision by the World Court—adverse so far as South Africa is concerned—is almost certain to bring from the black States to the north of here a demand that the United Nations take drastic action against this Republic.

The plaintiffs in the court action are Liberia and Ethiopia, but their present accusations against South Africa are not the ones they originally brought. They abandoned their earlier charges of genocide and, in fact, accepted South Africa's position on that and the other initial issues that got the case into court at the Hague.

WAS GERMAN

The background is this:

South West Africa, four times the size of the United Kingdom, is an area where rival tribes fought bloody wars for years.

In 1880, the Germans claimed it and administered it until World War I. After that war, the League of Nations gave South Africa its mandate.

After the dissolution of the league, South Africa declined to put the territory under United Nations trusteeship. And the U.N. General Assembly declined South Africa's request that it be incorporated into South Africa. But South Africa announced it would continue to administer the territory "in the spirit of the mandate."

Much of it is desert. Its coast is treacherous. To the north, where most of the blacks live, there is ample rainfall.

It has diamonds and copper.

CHARGES

A few years ago, Ethopia and Liberia, which had been members of the league, brought action in the World Court, along the lines of many of the claims that had been made in the U.N. General Assembly, attacking South Africa's stewardship.

Here the charges of genocide were hurled. It was said South Africa was militarizing the area, that the black man was used only as a labor reserve.

The U.N. General Assembly has criticized South Africa repeatedly over race policies. But General Assembly votes are not binding. If the black countries could get into the U.N. Security Council with specific action against this republic, that would be a far more serious matter. A World Court decision might accomplish it.

The plaintiffs contend that South Africa is accountable to the U.N. for South-West Africa. South Africa says it has no such legal obligation.

So South Africa defended in the World Court against the genocide and associated charges, it introduced evidence that the native population had doubled, that no land ever was taken from the blacks and turned over to whites. It said the best land in the northern section, where rain falls, is owned by black men.

NEW ELEMENT

It was after that when a new element was introduced. This was that there now exists an international norm, one of nondiscrimination, nonseparation of races, which prohibits a government from taking any action that differentiates over race. Whether such differentiation was good or bad was said not to be at issue.

So South Africa invited the court to inspect Southwest Africa, look over the entire territory. But, it suggested, the court also should inspect Liberia and Ethiopia, the complainants.

It was then that those countries dropped all earlier charges and, in fact, agreed to accept the pleadings of South Africa, relying entirely on its new position regarding the norm as its case.

South African authorities considered this a major victory. They say that, in effect, this means an admission by Ethiopia and Liberia that the charges for which South Africa had for years been condemned in the United Nations were false.

South Africa holds that it has never accepted the norm brought into the case by the two black countries, and said that acceptance by a large number of states does not make it binding. A spokesman said that such a principle, if followed all the way, could see the United States some time forced to accept communism because a majority of U.N. members might so vote.

As to discrimination, South Africa's witnesses in the World Court testified that 50 countries have practices contrary to the norm suggested by Liberia and Ethiopia, including Liberia, Cyprus, New Zealand, and many more. Meantime, the world—but particularly all of Africa—awaits the action of the court.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald,
Feb. 24, 1966]

South Africa Minority Against Race Barriers

Pretoria, South Africa.—There is opposition to the South African Government's policy of separate development of the races—but it is in the minority.

It does exist, however, in this Republic where only the white man has a voice in the Government.

There are political parties that range from the far left to the extreme right—further right, in fact, than the National Party that dominates Parliament.

The second party, the United, also is white-rule. Though it differs on methods, the party would ultimately give the franchise to the colored (mixed blood) population though not to the black man.

The National Party of Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd, in brief, feels each race should develop in its own way, and preserve its own culture. Thus its policy of creating a number of black states, which are scheduled for ultimate independence, leaving the rest of South Africa white-ruled.

REPRESENTATION

The United Party wants social and residential segregation, just like the Nationalist; it would give the Bantu (black) representation in Parliament, but with only whites to represent them. It opposes creation of Bantustans (independent black states).

The Progressive Party, which currently has one representative in Parliament (and which declined a chance to be interviewed on its position) would give the vote to educated Bantu and, ultimately, to all, but with strong constitutional protections for all races.

The Liberal Party would give every one the vote, and would have a rigid constitution to protect the rights of all. Minister of Justice John Voersler says Communists have infiltrated the ranks of the Liberals.

OPPOSITION

Then there is the Republican Party. It feels that Prime Minister Verwoerd has become too liberal, and that the rights of the white man are not being protected sufficiently.

Frequent opposition to the Government comes, too, from the Institute of Race Relations which recently felt it necessary to reply to remarks made about it in Parliament.

A member had said it had changed its view, from one opposing separate development to a position favoring it.

The Archbishop of Durban, the Most Rev. Denis E. Hurley, said the institute had never held that large-scale partition of the country "is objectionable in principle."

But it questions whether a policy of complete segregation, by establishment of black states within the white state, is practicable.

"We cannot see," said Archbishop Hurley, "how anybody can describe the present situation as separate development when (a) two-thirds of the African population and the whole of the colored and Asian populations are in the white areas; (b) the remaining third of the African population cannot exist in the Bantu homelands without sending half a million of its population to work in the white areas; (c) the white areas depend on nonwhites for 80 percent of their labor force; (d) nothing happening in the country at present promises to bring about any substantial reduction of the economic interdependence of the races in South Africa."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald,
Feb. 25, 1966]

Progs Ask Rejection of White Domination

Durban, South Africa.—South Africa's third party opposes both the dominant Nationalist Party of Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd and the United Party because they stand for white domination.

"We reject it," said L. L. Boyd, the Progressive Party leader for the Province of Natal.

Currently the Progressives have only one member of Parliament, and the outlook in the March 30 election is something less than rosy.

But the "Progs" will oppose the others in some of the constituencies in all four of the Republic of South Africa's provinces.

Mr. Boyd speaks with tempered optimism about the election and what he considers the chief issue, his accusation of white domination.

"The wise voter will reject it too, recognizing that you cannot build a secure future on systems of government which mean continuing injustices to the nonwhites," he says.

NO LEADERSHIP

He said that in today's political spectrum in South Africa there is no white leadership.

"There is only white domination," he asserted, "based on laws and practices designed to keep the nonwhite down. The United Party promises to retain the control indefinitely; the Nationalists have enough sense to recognize this is impossible, but their Bantustan policy offers no solution because they intend to go on discriminating against Africans in the towns, and of course against the Indian and colored people (mixed race)."

The Verwoerd administration plans to create a series of independent black states, or Bantustans, hewing roughly to the homelands of African tribes. Bantu (black) residents of the cities would be able to have a voice in the government of their homeland, but not in white South Africa where they reside in segregated areas.

FAIRPLAY

Mr. Boyd said most of South Africa's nonwhites recognize the need for white leadership "but that leadership must be based on recognition of their rights and interests."

He said:

"It must be leadership on merit, having as its clear objective the building of a future for all on a basis of racial good will, not on racial discrimination, unjust laws and the denial of rights and opportunities."

He said the voters of Natal would have to make a choice by voting "on the basis of their fears and their prejudices or whether they will make a stand on their own moral principles and vote for justice and fairplay for every South African."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald,
Feb. 27, 1966]

White Rhodesians Sputter if Wilson Name Mentioned

Salisbury.—The question in Rhodesia is simply this:

Will UDI work?

UDI means this landlocked, sanctions-beset country's action of last November 11 declaring itself independent of Great Britain: unilateral declaration of independence.

One might come to Salisbury expecting to find a semighost town of grim-lipped people, few automobiles because of the oil embargo, and spartan simplicity.

What one discovers is a bustling city where gas rationing doesn't seem to have curbed too heavily the cars, where people go about their business cheerfully, and where dinner in one of the better restaurants can be a gustatory delight.

In the fine, modern Meikles Hotel a small combo plays during the dinner hour, and attractive women and their companions, who don't seem burdened with the woes of the world, do the frug and the watusi between courses.

DIRTY WORD

But mention the name of British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, and most white Rhodesians are prepared to sputter.

He is the archfoe, the man who forced on them the present situation, the villain of the piece.

They take their lead from Rhodesia's Prime Minister Ian Smith, who can't understand why the United States followed Britain in the imposition of sanctions, including oil, against this east African nation whose independence is still unrecognized diplomatically by the rest of the world.

Mr. Smith told reporters that he was told that Britain trades more with North Vietnam than any other nation. Supplies going there, he said, are not only killing Americans, but troops from the British Commonwealth as well. He mentioned in that connection Australia's forces in Vietnam.

BAD RAP

"I think," he said, "it would be a fair question to ask where Mr. Wilson is aiding democracy."

Mr. Smith and his government contend that Rhodesia is getting a bad rap on the racial question, which is what precipitated the break with Britain.

He and other Rhodesians point often to the constitution adopted in 1961 at a conference presided over by the then Commonwealth Secretary Duncan Sandys, and accepted by both white and black Rhodesians, and later, they say, repudiated by the black sponsors.

They say that the constitution provides for black men to reach the A roll for voting, when qualified.

The A roll covers 50 parliamentary constituencies, and anyone can qualify by meeting certain educational and financial standards—earning $900 a year and attaining 4 years' secondary school education.

The B roll which has lower qualifications, elects 15 members to Parliament.

IMPATIENT

The more Africans improve themselves, the more they qualify for voting rights, Mr. Smith's government says.

It contends that black Africans rejected this route to ultimate domination because it would take time, and they wanted to achieve power at once.

A Government publication says:

"The fundamental difference between the Rhodesian and British Governments was this: Rhodesians believe that the reins of government should be held in responsible hands. The color of those hands is immaterial.

"The majority of those capable of exercising a vote, and thus being responsible for government, are Europeans by virtue of their culture and heritage. In time a greater proportion of the population will become eligible to vote and therefore exercise an increasing and, it is hoped, responsible influence.

"The British Government, on the other hand, believes in what it euphemistically calls 'majority rule,' by which it means black rule, which is blatant racialism.

"The fact that in several previous exercises of this kind the one-man, one-vote principle in Africa has led to one election, one party, one dictator, is apparently of no consequence."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 28, 1966]

Rhodesia Tries To Help Races Live Together

Salisbury.—Rhodesia's Prime Minister Ian Smith acknowledges that his country, where a small white minority rules, is conducting an experiment.

"It has never yet been proved that black and white people can live together in harmony," he said in an interview.

Thus Mr. Smith condemned as a failure the multiracial society in the United States.

He said a harmonious white-black relationship is what Rhodesia is striving to achieve.

It is over Rhodesia's racial policies that this prosperous nation, blessed with pleasant climate and one of the great tourist attractions of the world—the truly memorable Victoria Falls—and Britain fell out.

So Rhodesia declared itself independent, though not recognized officially by the rest of the world as such.

DIFFERENT ANGLES

The Rhodesian experiment sets it aside from its neighbor to the south, the Republic of South Africa, because the two countries, both of which have many more black residents than white, approach it from different angles.

The policy of the South African Government is to answer demands of the mid-20th century for racial equality by formulating a plan whereby black (Bantu) homelands would be created, in which the black man would govern himself, while only the white man would have a vote in the remainder of South Africa.

But the Rhodesian constitution provides the vote for any one who can qualify, the qualifications tests involving one's education, income, and property ownership.

This, the Smith government holds, opens the door to the black man to qualify and exercise his franchise and, once a sufficient number have met the qualifications, to rule where the white man now does.

Rhodesians say that events in half a dozen emerging African countries where regimes have been overthrown, sometimes with violence, prove the black man must be ready to govern before given the authority to do so.

REPUDIATION

But this isn't good enough for Britain, which, while acknowledging that the black majority is not yet ready to take over, wants the process speeded up.

Some black nationalists in Rhodesia have been noisily in opposition. A number of these are in political detention camps, accused of restorting to intimidation of their fellow black men in what Prime Minister Smith describes as an effort "to upset the Constitution unconstitutionally."

Rhodesians make much of the fact that the Constitution was agreed upon by black and white alike, with the British also giving it their stamp of approval. Now, they say, the British and some black nationalists have repudiated their earlier action.

A black man who sits in Parliament and leads the opposition, J. M. Gondo, also speaks out against the Government position. He is regarded as a moderate. He is one of a number of blacks elected by the B roll of voters. Qualifying standards are lower for the B roll than A roll, which elects 50 members of Parliament compared to the B roll's 15 members.

COMMUNIST MONEY

Mr. Gondo does not call for the immediate adoption of the one-man, one-vote concept, though he favors it ultimately. But he thinks the basis for qualifying voters should be eased.

"More advanced Africans—by our standards—should be brought to the voting rolls," he said.

He charged the Government with providing too limited educational opportunities for black Africans in order to prevent their qualifying for the vote. He said it was a device to keep the whites in control of government.

There are 220,000 whites in Rhodesia (which is about the size of Montana) and 4 million blacks.

Among the black leaders under detention are Joshua Nkomo of the Zimbabwe African Political Union, and Ndabaningi Sithole, a Congregational minister who received some of his training in the United States, head of the Zimbabwe African National Union (Zimbabwe is the name Africans want to call Rhodesia when they take control).

The detainees, who may number up to 2,000, can be released, Prime Minister Smith said, whenever they give "an understanding that they will not act unconstitutionally and not go to intimidation."

Mr. Smith has charged that Communist money has come into Rhodesia to pay "thugs and hooligans" to intimidate other blacks by burning houses and otherwise terrorizing them, to prevent them from working with whites under the Constitution.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Mar. 1, 1966]

Zambia Struck Hard by Rhodesia Blockade

Salisbury.—Rhodesia, target of sanctions designed to bring Prime Minister Ian Smith's runaway government to its knees, may be hard pressed, but its neighbor, Zambia, is more so.

And, through one of those paradoxical situations that seem to run through today's power diplomacy, Rhodesia is, in effect, keeping Zambia, a black-ruled emerging country, alive.

Zambia's economy hinges largely on the copper it produces.

Zambia requires coal to keep its copper industry going.

So, many times a day, Rhodesian railroad trains move into Zambia carrying coal, and move out bearing copper for the world markets.

While all this is going on, Zambia's leaders are making warlike noises, suggesting that Britain and other powers move militarily to bring down the Smith government in Rhodesia and put Rhodesia's black majority at the helm.

TROOPS AT DAM

Britain has troops in Zambia at the request of President Kuanda, in theory to prevent Rhodesia from shutting off power from the mighty Kariba Dam, which supplies electrical energy to both nations. But Rhodesia's Prime Minister Smith sees the soldiery as necessary to preserve law and order there.

Mr. Smith says, "We have no wish to see Zambia fall. If chaos developed there, the only people who'll rub their hands in glee will be the Chinese Communists."

The possibility of Zambian chaos came up when he said "we have good information" that it is British policy to encourage Zambia "to drop a curtain across the country," vital to its economy.

In such case, he asked, where would Zambia get the coal to produce its copper, so vital to its economy?

SOME OPPOSE

Meantime, of course, Mr. Smith has his own problems, with most of the world applying sanctions against his embattled government.

Nor is his policy wholly approved among all the 220,000 whites in this country that has 4 million blacks.

A sensation was created here when the charge was leveled that "a shadow cabinet of fifth columnists and quislings" would like to have another government than Mr. Smith's in power.

"This isn't causing us any great concern," the Prime Minister told reporters. "We know a small bunch of people oppose us and play the game the British Government wants to play. Some would welcome it if the British are successful in their sanctions."

A reporter talking to businessmen finds it is true that there are among a number of them misgivings about the Smith policy. But these men are mostly critical of the British as well.

DISINTERESTED

Among these people there appears to be a feeling that the qualifications level at which black residents can achieve the "A roll" in voting should be broadened—a view held also by moderate blacks.

This would permit a faster takeover by the blacks than envisioned in the existing Constitution, perhaps in 15 years or so.

"If in 15 or 20 years," said one, "we haven't learned to live with the blacks, we should get out anyhow."

Another business executive told a reporter: "It isn't realistic to think that 200,000 whites can continue to hold out, politically, against 4 million blacks."

Most whites in Rhodesia, whether wholehearted supporters of the Smith government or questioning its policies, seem to agree that Rhodesia's black residents are not particularly interested in politics.

For instance, they lack the political interest of Kenya's Kikuyu, who were responsible for the Mau Mau uprising that brought bloodshed but, later, independence to Kenya.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Mar. 2, 1966]

Nation of Blacks Run by Blacks

Nairobi, Kenya.—The minute a traveler steps off the plane in Nairobi's fine airport, it becomes evident that Kenya is a nation of black men run by black men.

The contrast is particularly sharp if the visitor has come from South Africa and Rhodesia where, though like Kenya the black man is in the majority, it is the white man who runs the show.

At the airport an African girl in smart blue uniform holds back the visitors until, one by one, their names are called. An African immigration employee makes sure one's passport is properly visaed. An African customs officer checks one's baggage, quickly and courteously.

Sitting at a table on the sidewalk outside the New Stanley Hotel at the intersection of Kenyatta (formerly Delamere) Avenue Kimathi (formerly Hardinge) Street, sipping coffee and enjoying Nairobi's truly wonderful summer climate, the traveler is hard put to remember that only a few short years ago this was the country of Mau Mau terrorism.

KENYATTA

Back of the hotel desk, and in hundreds more public places in Nairobi, is a picture of a smiling, bearded, benevolent face—that of Jomo Kenyatta, President of Kenya, former terrorist and convicted leader of the Mau Mau whose initiation ceremonies, so often followed by bloodletting, made Kenyan existence one of fear for years.

"Leaders to darkness and death," the British Governor at the time called Mr. Kenyatta only 6 years ago.

Now he's "Mzee" (Old Man) Kenyatta, regarded by the United States and Britain, in one of the switches of all time, as one of Africa's moderate leaders, the father of a multiracial state that, at least on the surface, seems to be working.

For, while this is an African-run country—make no mistake about it—the white man is still here, some 40,000 strong, living at peace with the black man. And here, too, are tens of thousands of East Indians, largely artisans and small businessmen.

WHITES

Kenya citizenship is open to the white man, though not many have availed themselves of it. White men continue to hold some important Government posts, though it seems widely agreed that, as the African becomes more adept at governing himself, there will be ever fewer such posts allocated to whites.

One white man is in President Kenyatta's Cabinet, as Secretary of Agriculture (some disgruntled white farmers claim he's there to take some of the heat off the Government with respect to land policies. The Government's aim is to get more black Africans onto their own farms which, for years, were held by prosperous whites).

There are white magistrates in profusion. A white man is Speaker of the Kenyan house.

Kenya isn't making the mistake of many an African country that frightens off tourists. Tourism now earns so much money for Kenya that only coffee tops it as an income-producing industry.

White hunters, bronzed and able to stir heartthrobs among the lady tourists, hang around the New Stanley in their safari boots and bush jackets, ready to take out wealthy American sportsmen wanting a crack at an elephant.

Land Rovers stand at the curb, native bearers on guard over the high-powered guns. And the armchair hunter who wants to bag big game only with a camera can have a look at a pride of lions or a herd of zebra only a few miles from Nairobi. On a still night, the roar of a lion can be heard in the heart of the city.

Africans can stay at the New Stanley, of course—this is their country. But most of the guests in the hotel and its dining rooms and bars are still white men and women, here to leave sought-after dollars and pounds and lire and kopeks and thus bolster the economy of this east African nation where white man and onetime Mau Mau terrorist have been known to reminisce laughingly of the years of bloodshed and terror that only ended in 1959.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Mar. 3, 1966]

LACK OF TACT HAMPERS PEIPING EFFORTS IN KENYA

NAIROBI, KENYA.—The Red Chinese still maintain a large Embassy staff here—one that keeps largely to itself—and the word is that Peiping's bully boys have had to pull in their horns.

They tried to move too far too fast, and in so doing they gave an exhibition of official diplomatic bumptiousness that played into the hands of the West.

The Chinese, coming into Kenya as in many other emerging African countries with large manpower, are described by knowledgeable people here as having thought they could dictate to the Kenyans, whom they considered backward and made no effort to hide that opinion, just what they should do and how they should do it.

But black Kenyans, it is said, having won their freedom from the British, showed little inclination to accept a yellow yoke in place of a white one.

Meantime, the U.S. position, which a few years ago was low, because of its actions in the Congo, is said to be improving steadily.

When the United States decided to send no more arms to South Africa, that won Kenyan plaudits. When Washington joined the British in imposing sanctions against Rhodesia, this was even more popular with this black nation.

A visit to the U.S. Information Agency's library finds it crowded, and library staff members say that between 700 and 900 Kenyans, mostly young people, visit it every day.

Recently, Kenya's Government changed its 10-mile travel ban, which the United States had protested strongly. What happened was this:

Peiping imposed a 6-mile ban, meaning that foreign diplomats stationed in the Chinese capital could not travel more than 6 miles outside it without express permission.

An angered Kenya Government imposed a similar ban here, limiting travel beyond Nairobi to 10 miles.

The U.S. protest was based on the fact that Washington has no ban on travel by Kenya's diplomats, but the Kenyatta Government, wishing to preserve its posture of nonalinement between East and West, refused to alter its edict.

Then, a few weeks ago, it did—now the ban is on a reciprocity basis. So American diplomats can travel where they will, but the Chinese, who still maintain their ban, cannot.

Not long ago, Tom Mboya, Minister for Economic Planning, made a speech in which he said that some countries giving aid to Kenya did so without conditions, while others sought to influence Kenya's internal policies.

REFUSED

Two days later Mr. Mboya announced that the government had decided not to accept Russian help on the Kano Plains irrigation plan. News reports said it foundered on a Russian demand that the project be financed by Russian consumer goods that would have been sent to Kenya.

A Kenya newspaper, the Daily Nation, applauded the government's decision and wrote:

"This country should be careful and vigilant to insure that the market here is not used as a dumping ground for obsolete goods and equipment, such as the obsolete military equipment returned to Russia last year and now the goods which the Russians proposed to send to Kenya."

Mr. Mboya said financing would be sought elsewhere. As he plans a trip to the United States in March, it is suspected he may raise the question of American help on that occasion.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Mar. 4, 1966]

DECLINE IN FARMERS' PRODUCTION—A WORRY FOR INDEPENDENT KENYA

NAIROBI, KENYA.—A visitor to Kenya is inclined to catch himself wondering idly if the waiter serving his filet mignon is a former Mau Mau terrorist.

Or if the hotel room servant with the broad grin may once have carved up a white settler.

But there is little point in such thought, for in the Kenya of today, at any rate, there seems a considerable amount of good feeling between the black man, who now runs the country, and the white man, who once did.

Fully independent, Kenya has its problems. Primarily an agricultural nation where well-to-do white farmers were the economic bulwark, it now finds agricultural production down because many of the white farmers have sold and some of those remaining are disgruntled and anxious to get out.

A Government spokesman said a decline in farm output was to be expected as black Africans replaced long-experienced whites, with smaller units replacing the big farms of other years. But he contended the decline will be halted "in a few years."

DECREASE

Before "uhuru"—freedom—there were 68,000 whites in Kenya. Now there are about 40,000.

But Kenya sources say it isn't as much of a decrease as it looks. They contend the 68,000 included 15,000 British soldiers.

Official Government figures show 6,000 whites left Kenya in 1964, but 3,000 others moved in, largely technicians and teachers.

Publicly, most whites still in Kenya speak optimistically about their chances of economic survival in a multiracial society where they form a small minority. Privately, there seems to be more of a wait-and-see attitude.

Prior to Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence, but when such a move appeared imminent, a group of prominent Europeans who still reside in Kenya issued a statement deploring the projected move by Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith.

UNFOUNDED

Asserting that their own fears of what would happen when black Africans took over the Government in Kenya "have so far proved totally unfounded," they said:

"Above all, the Kenya Government has succeeded in the face of enormous difficulties in creating a genuine feeling of stability—an atmosphere in which every man, whatever the color of his skin, feels free to get on with his job, to earn his living and bring up his family in peace."

President Jomo Kenyatta, a former terrorist and leader of the once-dreaded Mau Mau, has come to be regarded as a moderate and friend of the West, surprising as this is in view of the bloody uprising of a few years back.

Mr. Kenyatta is 76, and there is concern about the sort of man who ultimately will succeed him, and what this could mean to the whites left in Kenya.

The Kenyan Constitution provides that there shall be equal opportunity for all, regardless of race. Some white residents say privately that black men have a disproportionate number of public jobs, in spite of this provision.

EXCUSABLE

One white man in high position said as much—but found himself able to excuse the Government.

Humphrey Slade is Kenya's Speaker of the House of Representatives and is highly regarded by both races.

"One has to be honest," said Mr. Slade, "and admit that at present, in these first few years, the non-African is not getting quite the fair share—or, if you like, the share of public offices that one would expect from the provision of the Constitution itself that there shall be equal opportunity for people regardless of race."

But the Government has explained that, he continued.

"It faces the fact," he commented. "The explanation Government gives is that in the past there was such an unfair proportion of Europeans and Asians in the public jobs, having regard to the population, that there had to be what they called restoration of the imbalance by replacing white and brown with black before one could get to an even basis of distribution of the new jobs."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Mar. 6, 1966]

A CONTINENT IN FERMENT: NOTES ON A TRIP TO AFRICA

(NOTE.—In London, after visiting South Africa, Kenya, and Rhodesia, John Jarrell, chief of the World-Herald's Washington Bureau, sorted through his notes and wrote the following summation.)

LONDON.—Africa is wooed with golden words backed by hard cash by both the Western democracies and the Communist bloc. Statesmen speak learnedly of Africa's problems, their magnitude and complexity. High-sounding phrases are mixed with political venality, charges, and countercharges.

There are violence and bloodshed, restrictive laws, and iron-handed dictatorships. Some Africans fight for self-determination, often groping for methods. Thousands more, in cone-shaped huts like those of their ancestors, don't care.

Before World War II, Africa's truly independent nations could be counted on fingers of one hand. Today there are 37, and more are scheduled for independence soon. They range from tiny Gabon, with only a half-million people, to the rich, industrially powerful Republic of South Africa.

Africa is a black continent—some 700 languages and dialects—but there are significant pockets of whites, to say nothing of the Arabs who control several northern African nations, and the Asians, who as tradesmen and artisans cut a sizable economic swath.

The story of Africa today is a story of race and emerging nations as one time colonial powers relinquish their grip.

South Africa, no longer a member of the British Commonwealth and for 5 years a republic, dominates the story.

Its approach to the racial problem, its answer to the demand of the black man for racial determination are unique. South Africa feels that its apartheid policies have been distorted and misunderstood. It wants the friendship of Britain and the United States.

Its residents assert that they stand in the forefront of the battle against communism, that the West needs this rich country, its strategic ores and minerals, its command of the tip of a strategic continent.

South Africa stands almost alone, an object of almost entire-world disapproval. Its apartheid policies separating the races, its restrictive laws, particularly under its Suppression of Communism Act, its determination to keep its Government in white hands have resulted in condemnation by the United Nations and many world powers. Its racial policy underlies its break with the Commonwealth.

Make no mistake: the overwhelming majority of South Africa's 3,500,000 whites favor racial separation. Two tiny minority parties oppose the dominant Nationalist Party's programs. The only opposition party of size, the United, comprising largely English-speaking residents (two-thirds of white South Africans speak Afrikaans) is dedicated to white supremacy. Is self-interest involved? Of course.

Yet, in spite of South African apartheid laws, 1 million Bantu (black) workers from other African countries are employed there legally. Some 20,000 more make their way into South Africa illegally every year. If the gates were thrown open, no one can guess how many Bantu from the north would cross the Limpopo.

The reason is jobs. There is employment for blacks in South Africa. The pay, while below white standards, is better than in other areas of the continent.

For the black man in South Africa there is a vast program of cheap public housing, hospitalization so inexpensive that a patient can spend weeks in a modern hospital and have several major operations for the payment of 60 cents.

Black schools and colleges greatly exceed those in the rest of Africa, and literacy is high. Eighty percent of those between 7 and 20 can read and write, far and away the highest percentage in Africa.

Then there is the plan to establish Bantustans—perhaps eight—on a tribal basis in which blacks will govern themselves, under full independence ultimately.

Under this plan, the independent black states will form part of a commonwealth with white South Africa. The first such state has been set up, though the time of full independence for the fertile Transkei has not been determined. It has its own black government. White landowners are being divested of their property (and complaining about it), and eventually, none but blacks will be permitted to own land in the Transkei or other homelands as they are established.

Blacks who continue to live on the outskirts of the big cities of white South Africa will have voting rights in their homelands, and vote absentee. The plan also envisages establishment of border industries, in the hope that urban Bantu can be lured back to their homeland.

Will the plan work? South Africans say it will, if the world will give it time.

A question frequently put by South Africans to visitors is: Will the United Nations try to apply sanctions against South Africa, including an embargo on oil? Would the United States join such sanctions?

Except for oil, South Africa is self-sufficient. It produces no natural oil, but can supply some 13 percent of its petroleum needs with oil produced from coal, of which it has a thousand years' reserves.

Oil sanctions would be troublesome. But if the United States were to join a U.N. ban, American businessmen, who have big investments in this prosperous nation, might protest vigorously.

South Africans are a determined, tough people who believe they are right. They think their plan to create black homelands, self-governing and tied to the republic in a commonwealth, is fair.

One man's guess: South Africa will remain a white-ruled country, along the lines it is following, for a long time.

Kenya is black-ruled, headed by the former Mau Mau terrorist Jomo Kenyatta, now regarded as a moderate friendly to the West. Its multiracial society has escaped the turmoil that has toppled six black regimes in 4 months—a fact which South Africans and Rhodesians cite as proof that the black African needs to be introduced to self-government slowly.

Kenya has economic problems and, behind the scenes, ambitious men who want to succeed 76-year-old President Kenyatta struggle for power.

Kenya's 8 million blacks appear to get along well with the 40,000 whites. A few white men hold important political posts.

Rhodesia's 1961 constitution grants the vote to anyone, black or white, who can qualify. Black men say the educational and economic qualifications are too stringent—designed to maintain domination by 220,000 whites over 4 million blacks.

Sanctions against Rhodesia hurt—but they hurt nearby black Zambia more than they hurt Rhodesia.

Again, one man's guess:

Negotiations between Rhodesia and Britain, with which Rhodesia broke last November 11 with its Unilateral Declaration of Independence, will be resumed. A compromise will ease, to some degree, the voting qualifications.

Within 15 years, Rhodesia will have a black majority, as Kenya has.

A conclusion: Africa will have upheavals for a long time. Tribal hatreds are deep. Some ambitious politicians wear only the thinnest veneer of civilization. Rewards and trappings of power are attractive.

With East and West fighting for influence over countries which will require financial help for many years—from anyone—the seeds of unending conflict are present. But many thousands of Africans, living as their ancestors did, will be interested mainly not in who governs by what method from a city far remote from their kraals, but rather in the size of the mealie crop, the cost of a new wife, and whether the maize-made beer is up to snuff.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE DUTY OF THE FREE AND THE BRAVE

I

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for a long time Americans have been talking about Vietnam as though it was the only item on our national agenda. This week the letter of President de Gaulle to President Johnson—in effect, an eviction notice—reminds us that there is more to the world, even in 1966, than southeast Asia. If President de Gaulle expects the United States to beg to keep its troops and bases in France, he is living in a dream world. I support President Johnson's polite, swift, firm "No" to De Gaulle on this issue.

De Gaulle's challenge to the international commands of the Atlantic Alliance is not a matter between France and the United States; it is a matter between France and the other 14 allies. I back the President in his position that De Gaulle's challenge is a matter to be handled collectively by the alliance, and not bilaterally with one ally.

In all of this the President's determination is backed by the firm will of Congress and the American people.

I have been deeply concerned about Vietnam. Our stand there is very important. I have also been concerned lest the drama of Vietnam command so much attention that we neglect areas of the world which are at least equally crucial. It is for this reason that the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, recently issued a study on "The Atlantic Alliance: Basic Issues." It is for the same reason that I have frequently called attention to Europe and our relations with Europe, which are still central to the survival and success of liberty.

II

Mr. President, the United States need apologize to no one for its basic policies in the years since World War II. Our purposes are the purposes written into the Charter of the United Nations, to help create a world in which individual liberty, healing, reconciliation, and peace prevail. It is a noble cause. But a cause must have its leaders, and we may take pride in being counted among them.

Of first importance is our will—our national resolve—to defend our liberties and to champion vital free world interests, however bleak the prospect or rough the going.

This attitude, this approach to affairs, was the great strength that saw the free nations through the dark and difficult days 20 years ago when a devastated and shattered postwar Europe came under the hammer blows of Stalinist policies. The words of Winston Churchill help remind us how grim the future looked in 1947:

> But what is Europe now? It is a rubble heap, a charnelhouse, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate. Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations. Evil teachers urge the paying off of old scores with mathematical precision, and false guides point to unsparing retribution as the pathway to prosperity. Is there then to be no respite? Has Europe's mission come to an end? Has she nothing to give to the world but the contagion of the black death? Are her peoples to go on harrying and tormenting one another by war and vengeance until all that invests human life with dignity and comfort has been obliterated?

Churchill spoke these words in an appeal to Europeans to put aside their quarrels and to join forces to build a united Europe.

Likewise, a gallery of great Americans chose not to look at the future with despair. Despair was not part of the makeup of men like General Marshall, Robert Lovett, Dean Acheson, Senator Vandenberg, Senator Connally, Representative Herter, Averell Harriman, and Will Clayton. It was certainly no part of the makeup of that scrappy and sensible man from Missouri, Harry S. Truman.

The Marshall plan laid the foundation for the North Atlantic Alliance. The historic association of North America with Western Europe and the commitment of the United States and Canada to the defense of their allies in Europe have transformed the weakness of 1947 into the strength of 1966. Western Europe has enjoyed a period of high prosperity and rapid economic growth. It has made important progress toward building a European economic community; and together with the United States, Canada, Japan, and other countries, it has reduced barriers to trade and developed impressive practical measures of international monetary cooperation.

At the same time the defensive forces of the United States and its allies have been greatly strengthened, both absolutely and relatively. The shift in the balance of power since 1947, coupled with firm reaction to Soviet expansionary probes—from the first Berlin crisis in 1948 to the Cuban missile crisis of 1962—have closed the door to Soviet westward expansion. No armed attack has been made on Western Europe or North America, and provided an appropriate balance and resolve are maintained, none is likely.

The basis of today's hopes that a genuine European settlement will one day be attainable rests on Soviet recognition of, and respect for, the durability of this balance and the constancy of this resolve.

A traditional saying has it that "where there's a will, there's a way." Our experience in the Atlantic community confirms the truth of it. The problem has always been, at bottom, a problem of will. The Atlantic community had, at least potentially, the capabilities to assure its security—but capabilities without the will to use them are as sand.

Since 1947, the United States has shown by its actions both the will to resist aggression and the will to exercise restraint in the use of its power; and the combination has been the mainstay of peace in the Atlantic area. What brought an end to the Berlin blockade but the will to break it with the airlift? What led Khrushchev to back away from two challenges to the Western position in Berlin but the will of the United States and its allies not to yield? The decisive factor in the Cuban missile crisis was Khrushchev's recognition that the United States was prepared to take whatever risks were necessary to obtain satisfaction of its minimum demands. Khrushchev's reply to Peiping's criticism on that occasion was wholly free of diplomatic doubletalk. He simply said:

> The paper tiger has nuclear teeth.

And when Khrushchev found that he might be starting something bigger than he was ready to risk, and when he discovered that our will was firm, he rushed to get his missiles out.

We are of course not yet out of the woods in the Atlantic community. But our problems now, unlike 1947, are the problems that come with strength, not weakness—and that fact alone is a measure of how things have changed since 1947.

III

Mr. President, I am reminded of these things by the events of recent weeks and months. What has happened to the spirit with which we stayed the course in the West? Are we losing our capacity for calm, steady pursuit of our purposes?

To be sure, the problems we face in the Far East are different from those we faced in Europe 20 years ago. Mao is not Stalin; Communist China is not the Soviet Union; Vietnam is not Germany; Ho Chi Minh is not Tito; the circumstances of 1947 are not the circumstances of 1966. The circumstances are new, but the problem of will is not new.

When Peiping refers to the United States as a paper tiger, it is placing its bet on the table. It is gambling that we lack the will to persevere, that we will weary of the struggle, that the tactics of protracted war—according to the gospel of Mao—will prevail. That is the burden of Mao's message to Hanoi, as it is to every revolutionary group everywhere, and Hanoi has been a studious pupil.

Ho Chi Minh has based his policy since World War II on the belief that first the French and then the Americans lacked the will to win. He may now be having his private doubts, but he is still urging his forces on with the argument that the patience of the American people, like that of the French public, will wear thin, that the United States will not stay the course, that American opinion will eventually give Hanoi the victory it seeks despite the inability of its forces to win that victory on the battlefield.

It has of course been necessary and desirable to make evident our readiness to negotiate on reasonable terms. But this effort involves dangers. If we push too hard to get the adversary into negotiations, he may only hang back. For to him eagerness to get to the bargaining table is weakness.

There is another danger. Ho and Mao are exponents not only of protracted war but also of protracted conference. To them the conference room is not a place to give up the struggle, but a place to win more than they have been able to win on the battlefield. If we call off the military pressure in Vietnam as soon as the other side requests negotiations—as we did in Korea—Ho and Mao will know that our move to the conference table is a sign of weakness, and they will raise their terms. The lesson of Korea is plain: we should not sit down at a conference table without also keeping up our military pressure, for it is the pressure outside the conference room that largely determines whether a negotiation can be brought to a satisfactory end.

In any event, we may be sure that Hanoi will not ease up the struggle in Vietnam as long as it sees any chance that the will of the United States is brittle and may break.

A recurrent note in the discussion of Vietnam these past weeks has been concern that the war there is open-ended, that it may lead in the direction of a general war in Asia. This is very unlikely. China has almost no nuclear capabilities today, and would risk devastation were it to initiate the use of nuclear weapons. It would be far more difficult for the Chinese Communists to deploy and supply massed forces in Vietnam than it was in Korea, because of the hard facts of geography, transportation, and climate.

It may be true, as some students of Red China believe, that Peiping would intervene in Vietnam if the survival of the Hanoi regime were threatened. But we are not seeking to overthrow that regime or to unify Vietnam by force—facts which should be evident to Hanoi and Peiping by our obvious self-restraint in the use of force.

Clearly, our stand in Vietnam is not without risks. But if we were to plan how best to whet the ambition of Communist China or to encourage revolutionary upheavals, we could find no better way than to retreat or accept a humiliating compromise in Vietnam.

That would be the proof the Chinese rulers need that the United States is, after all, a paper tiger—and the signal their disciples in Asia, Africa, and Latin America need that the time is ripe for revolution.

I know my colleagues in this Chamber well. No one here has any doubt about the determination of Congress to support our fighting men.

The problem of responsible dissent and constructive criticism in this kind of limited war can be a difficult one for Congress—given our traditions and our constitutional responsibilities. We may and do freely discuss domestic issues, and not infrequently criticize those who disagree with us in extravagant terms. It is not of great consequence: few are listening or, if listening, they do not care. But when we discuss foreign affairs, friend and foe are listening, and our foes, in particular, have never understood the meaning of loyal opposition. We need to bear this in mind so that what we say does not obscure the Nation's fortitude.

It is my belief that the recent overwhelming votes in Congress in support of our military and economic efforts in Vietnam have helped to create a solid basis for turning now, with new unity, to the tasks ahead.

Above all, it is time to stop talking so much about Vietnam, and to get on with the job we have to do there.

IV

If we want to talk about something, let us talk about the letter of President de Gaulle to President Johnson. If the French President does not consider the Atlantic Alliance important enough to do his part, that is his decision. But other members of the Atlantic Alliance consider it one of the greatest accomplishments of modern history. America and Europe, linked in the Atlantic Alliance, are the center of world power—the great bulwark against which the Communist so-called wave of the future can be broken.

There is no hard evidence that Moscow has given up the contest for Europe, or is ready to move toward a genuine European settlement. On the contrary, Soviet forces are still in the center of Europe, the Soviet rulers continue to invest enormous resources in arms, and to reject inspected arrangements for the limitation of arms. The tempering of Soviet behavior in Europe is a matter of expedience—a consequence of the balance of forces created by NATO, not of a permanent change of course by the Soviet Union. Anything that would upset the balance of forces would encourage the Soviet rulers to be less cooperative on every front—not more cooperative.

There is no question that American policy supports the Atlantic Alliance in all its basic aspects, including the international commands. When war can mean anything between instant, massive destruction and a limited probe with conventional forces, deterrence requires an instant readiness to respond appropriately. The basic justification of the international commands is to be ready and able to take charge, within minutes, of the national forces which would come under their control in an emergency, and thus, by virtue of such readiness, to strengthen the deterrent power of the alliance.

The American commitment to help the allies defend themselves was made on the assumption that each of the allies was determined to do its part in a cooperative undertaking. The French President is playing a very risky game—counting on the American commitment regardless of what he does to his allies or tries to do to the alliance. In short, he wants to have his cake and eat it, too. The risks he is running include a rising resentment toward the French Government across the length and breadth of the United States with the resultant alienation of the American people. Under the circumstances President de Gaulle is creating, it may be necessary to revise and reduce the American commitment to the defense of France.

Also, under the circumstances, the United States must work closely with Great Britain and West Germany and the other allies who see their common interest in a common defense. If the key Atlantic allies move ahead together on the urgent issues—as they have the right and duty to do—sober second thoughts may in time prevail in our great and ancient ally, France.

American democracy has succeeded because enough Americans have been reasonable enough, steady enough, balanced enough not to panic when the going got rough, but to face difficulties with the understanding that to do one's best is the best one can do—and with quiet confidence that our best will be good enough.

On March 15, 1946, Winston Churchill was honored at a mayor's reception in New York City, and he chose the occasion to draw a moral for the United States. His words are as appropriate today as they were 20 years ago:

> I come to you at a time when the United States stands at the highest point of majesty and power ever attained by any community since the fall of the Roman Empire. This imposes upon the American people a duty which cannot be rejected. With opportunities comes responsibility. Strength is granted to us all when we are needed to serve great causes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I highly commend the Senator from Washington for his speech in its entirety.

I do not think any Senator is better qualified through background and experience to talk to the American people and to the Senate on the subject that he has dealt with. Also his speech is very timely indeed. This subject must be discussed by the Senator and by others in a similar position.

I refer particularly to the unfortunate situation with reference to President de Gaulle, his position regarding NATO, and the possibility of a breach in the friendship and alliance between France and the United States. What the Senator from Washington said on that subject is true and of solid substance.

I, too, had great faith in the NATO alliance. I had more faith in that alliance than in any of the other alliances. I thought that there was great solidarity in NATO and a common interest and that those bonds would not break.

I think that President de Gaulle, as the President of a great nation, is entirely wrong in the position he has taken with reference to this matter. His position could cause a break in this alliance.

I am very pleased by what the Senator has said. I commend him highly. His talk is of great benefit to us and to the Nation.

I hope that the Senator will continue to pursue this same subject and give us the benefit of his thoughts along that line.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the able Senator from Mississippi, for his remarks and for his basic concurrence of viewpoint on the problem we face in the North Atlantic community.

With our eyes focused, as they should be, on Vietnam, we can lose sight of the means by which we have been able to maintain peace, in the sense of avoiding a general war, since the end of World War II; namely, the power structure that exists in the concert of North America and our ancient allies and our great inheritance in Western Europe.

I yield to the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Mississippi in support of the thesis which the Senator just uttered. I consider Senator JACKSON's statement to be very important.

I made my own response on yesterday along virtually the same lines. I am very pleased that both of us should, without consultation, feel as we do. I think that the Senator's speech is of critical importance. He occupies a key position in matters of this character through his committee post and his own reputation and prestige.

Even though there is a hot war in Vietnam, we still cannot let this situation so intrude upon our national conscience that we do not realize that the base of all action in the free world, without which we could never dream of being in Vietnam, remains in the Atlantic community.

The Senator reminds us again, as he properly should, putting it in a phrase which is so understandable to so many people, that the Atlantic community represents one thousand billion dollars of productive power. That is almost unbelievable in world history. It is so much more than the rest of the world can muster. The center of power is here in the West, and we had better keep that intact.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator on his remarks about Charles de Gaulle, who is pursuing a policy of nationalism in an age of internationalism and regionalism. Such nationalism is a very dangerous form of reaction in international terms. It will tend to fractionalize, not unify the basis of strength of the free world, NATO.

The Senator prescribes again—and I would endorse his recommendation with my vote—that we work together with the other 13 member countries no matter what De Gaulle does. It is estimated that the cost of a NATO without France will be as much as a billion dollars. This is what it will cost to move SHAPE and the communications networks and other installations from France to the low countries or to Britain.

It is true—and we might as well face facts, as I am sure the Senator knows—that France has one of the best pieces of real estate in Europe, and SHAPE and its headquarters are located very much in the proper place. Nevertheless, it is still worth a billion dollars to keep the organization even without France.

I appreciate the implication of the Senator, which I think is very clear, that we should not lose hope on France, notwithstanding De Gaulle.

I cannot conceive that the French people would be so hasty as to deny themselves the strength and the support of the free world. It has been said, as the Senator has heard and I have heard, that De Gaulle believes that we will give him the nuclear umbrella no matter what he does. He believes he can receive NATO protection without sharing in NATO burdens and responsibilities as well.

That may or may not be so. But even if it is so—and it probably is, in terms of elementary survival—I cannot conceive of the French people, with their pride and their sophistication, trying for a free ride. I agree with what I think is clearly implied in the Senator's speech, that we must continue our efforts to keep the French in the alliance, but that we must go on without them, if necessary.

Perhaps some bilateral bridge can be created between the Fourteen and France to carry us through this tough period when De Gaulle's views are in the ascendancy. I have confidence that the French nation, in the long run, will want to remain a part of NATO.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the Senator from New York for his able remarks. I agree that we can only hope that the people of France will understand what is going on. As Americans, we cannot but believe that the French people, as distinguished from General de Gaulle, and this is a significant distinction, must be aware that their security in this troubled world of nuclear weapons and all the modern devices of destruction cannot be maintained by "going it alone." Certainly it has been demonstrated throughout history that "going it alone" does not preserve the peace, whereas the Atlantic Alliance has worked; we have not had a war in Western Europe. We have not had a general war.

We all wish to see the right of dissent preserved; and I think the very strength that NATO has made available has made dissent possible, and has made it possible for General de Gaulle to take the stand he has taken.

We respect his right to take it; but I think, as the Senator says, we should be prepared to do whatever is necessary in developing and acting on contingency plans, on the assumption that France will in effect leave the alliance. We can only hope that the French people, as distinguished from General de Gaulle, will wish to stay with the alliance and will understand its importance, and that good sense will prevail in France in the not very distant future.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I join the Senators from Mississippi and New York, in commending the very able Senator from Washington for his constructive words this morning about the further problem created by the most recent actions of the head of the French Republic. I would associate myself with the Senator's remarks. Nobody in the Senate is more capable, because of his past work in this field, and his long knowledge of world affairs, to have made this address this morning.

I also agree with the Senator about the importance of Vietnam, vital as it is, as against many other problems which face us, all over the world. It is true, as the Senator well knows, that the French themselves are deeply interested and involved in Vietnam; and that General de Gaulle's actions out there, economically and politically if not militarily, have been of no assistance, in fact have done damage, to the position of the United States in that area and all the Far East.

Mr. JACKSON. I say to my friend the Senator from Missouri that General de Gaulle has not limited his troublemaking to Western Europe. He has certainly gone out of his way to speak out and take positions on some problems in other areas which have been most unfortunate. On the other hand, General de Gaulle was firm and helpful during the height of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is quite true. Perhaps in his own mind, anyway, his relations with this country have deteriorated. I base this on reports of his recent approaches and activities with various members of the Communist bloc. As the Senator knows, General de Gaulle plans to visit Moscow this June, and we understand he has had considerable bilateral discussion with the Chinese Communists.

The Senator brought up the matter of our investment. We have a gigantic NATO investment. One figure which runs through my mind, from some years back, is that we have invested a half billion dollars into moving petroleum products from the western coast of France into the rest of Europe. This effort and expenditure was, of course, part of the overall effort to defend France and the United States against the totalitarian aggression of that time in World War II; and has built up since.

Finally, I was equally interested in the Senator's speech because it will arouse a great deal of interest as to the future of NATO. Whatever that future is—and I am one who believes in NATO strongly—it would be a different future without France. I can remember talking with one of the wise men of my experience, General Gruenther, in Paris in 1954, when he was in charge of SHAPE. At that time I asked him if we could have a NATO without several named European countries, to which he said yes. But when I asked if we could have a NATO without France, he said, "No, that would be impossible."

I remember asking him why. He said, "Look at the map. Geographically it is impossible, if for no other reason."

I do not believe that today, especially because of technological developments—which the Senator knows more about than I—it would still surely be impossible; but I do think one of the most important aspects of the Senator's speech this morning has to do with what type and character of NATO we will have if General de Gaulle persists in his unilateral position in this field.

So again I congratulate the Senator for a constructive address, on a subject which could be at least as important to us as any other subject in the world today.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the able senior Senator from Missouri for his remarks. He has taken a keen interest in the affairs of NATO, and I know of no one who has devoted more time to the study not only of the military but also the economic problems presented in connection with our participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, before the Senator continues, I appreciate his remarks. It was a good day for the United States when the Senator from Washington came to the Senate, because whereas a great deal of heat, especially recently, has been released on this floor, invariably, when the Senate from Washington approaches a problem, he does so in an effort to shed light instead of heat.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to join in the general commendation of the Senator from Washington. He has made an excellent speech.

There is no question but that we have lost sight of the great importance of NATO recently, because of our concentration on Vietnam. And this is indeed a time of trial for NATO. I ask the Senator if he does not agree with an editorial which I read in the New York Times this morning, which points out that it is very important that we do not abuse General de Gaulle, that we keep the door wide open for France to come in, that we do not give up hope for NATO in spite of the tremendous problem that has resulted from General de Gaulle's attitude toward NATO, and that we recognize that whereas the position which General de Gaulle has taken, particularly with respect to Germany, that France takes the position that it can have troops within Germany and maintain control of them, but that no nation can have any troops in France without France having total and complete, unquestioned control. This, of course, is an inconsistent position. As the New York Times writes, this strengthens us with our allies.

Regardless of all that, I think the tenor of the Senator's remarks is very helpful, and indicates, as I understand it, that whereas this is a problem, it is not an insoluble problem, and that it is possible that De Gaulle, like all men, and France, like all nations, can change, provided our policy is wise and accommodating.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me say to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin, that I have not had an opportunity to read the New York Times editorial and therefore cannot comment on it directly. I should observe, however, that there is a difference between General de Gaulle and the people of France. I cannot believe that the French people will, in a premeditated way, deliberately alienate themselves from the Western World. Their heritage and their whole history have been associated with the West.

Certainly, what General de Gaulle has said and what he is doing make quite clear that he has an entirely different version of the Alliance than we have. When I say "we" I mean the other 14 participants in NATO. We are, of course, not alone in our view and judgment on this issue.

It is important that we constantly distinguish General de Gaulle's position as an individual and the basic concerns of the people of France. I would hope that the people of France would realize that there is a limit to the patience of the American people. Certainly, General de Gaulle is not helping to improve our relations with France, with his statements and actions over a period of time, which are clearly averse to the development, establishment, and maintenance of an effective alliance among the Western peoples.

Certainly, General de Gaulle should realize that the American people have something to say about this, and that in a restrained way we will go forward with our basic responsibilities under the alliance and meet them, if necessary without the help of the French Government.

The alliance, in my judgment, can be made effective to act as a deterrent, as it has in the past, without France. We hope, of course, that General de Gaulle and the people of France will have some second thoughts and see the light and decide to join the other 14 of us in the alliance, to continue to make it as effective in the future as it has been in the past.

The peace of the world and the avoidance of catastrophic thermonuclear war depend, in my judgment, in large measure, upon the unity of North America and the peoples of Western Europe. This is the heart of the safeguard of freedom in Western Europe. Western Europe has a population greater than that of the United States. It has a steel production capability and capacity output greater than the United States. In the aggregate, its gold reserves are greater than those of the United States. Therefore, this alliance of the peoples of Western Europe with North America can in the future, as it has in the past, be the center of power and the steadying force for the cause of freedom everywhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the study dated February 18, 1966, issued by my subcommittee, to which I referred in my speech, and which is entitled "The Atlantic Alliance—Basic Issues."

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE—BASIC ISSUES

(A study submitted by the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations to the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate)

FOREWORD

Because the struggle in Vietnam is so important and because it demands daily so much of our national thought and effort, we run the risk of neglecting areas of the world which are at least equally crucial. But we cannot afford to be totally preoccupied with the conflict in Vietnam. The North Atlantic area is still the decisive area and it needs our national attention.

The cooperation of the North Atlantic nations in building a common defense, the steady progress toward a Western European economic community, and joint efforts of these and other nations in reducing trade barriers and strengthening the international financial system have helped to create a center of stability in an unsettled world. Recently, however, there have been signs that the solidarity of the Atlantic community is weakening.

It is not surprising that the winds of change are freshening in the North Atlantic region when they have reached gale force in so many parts of the world. Nor is it surprising that the nations of this region have not found the full answer to the problem of reconciling national sovereignty with the need for joint action in many fields.

If it remains true, however, and it does, that the hopes of the world for peace with freedom continue to depend chiefly on a strong and confident Atlantic community, the problems it faces deserve high priority on the agenda of the executive branch and Congress.

Authorized by resolution of the Senate, the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations is reviewing the conduct of national security policy, with special reference to the Atlantic Alliance. Its approach is nonpartisan and professional. During the first session of the 89th Congress, the subcommittee held hearings which laid the foundation for the present phase of the inquiry.

At my request, the staff has taken a first-hand look at North Atlantic Treaty installations, and conferred with ranking civilian and military authorities, in this country and in Europe. This subcommittee staff report, drawing on these studies and interviews, examines a number of key issues on which the subcommittee will hold hearings during the current session of Congress.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations.

FEBRUARY 18, 1966.

I. THE PROBLEM

The North Atlantic Alliance had its origins in the inability of the victor powers in World War II to make a European settlement. With Germany's defeat—and the presence of Soviet armies in the center of Europe—Stalin believed that Soviet power and influence could be extended deep into Western Europe. The United States diagnosed the danger correctly, thanks to the interplay of minds between Marshall, Lovett, Clayton, Acheson, Senator Vandenberg, and President Truman.

In 1947 and 1948, with the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan, the United States undertook the twofold task of halting Soviet expansion and rebuilding the strength of Western Europe. Shortly after the coup in Czechoslovakia establishing a Communist regime, Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, on March 17, 1948, signed a 50-year agreement for economic cooperation and common defense against aggression—the Brussels Treaty. On the same day, referring to this action in a special message to a joint session of Congress on the threat to the freedom of Europe, President Truman declared that "the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them to protect themselves."

Soon thereafter General Marshall and Mr. Lovett held a series of consultations with Senator Vandenberg and other Senate leaders, and on June 11, 1948, the Senate adopted the Vandenberg resolution affirming the objective of "association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security." The words had been carefully used in the order of their importance: "continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid."

During July 1948, in the midst of the Berlin blockade, Mr. Lovett was authorized to begin exploratory talks in Washington with Canada and the parties to the Brussels Treaty. By September the participating representatives had reached agreement on the desirability and necessity of a treaty for the collective defense of the North Atlantic area and on the general nature of the treaty. The Governments concerned approved the recommendations of their representatives and the negotiation of the treaty was started in December and completed on March 15, 1949. Early in March, Norway joined the negotiations and that month invitations to become original signatories of the treaty were issued to Denmark, Iceland, Italy, and Portugal.

Throughout the talks and negotiations, first Mr. Lovett and, after January 20, 1949, Mr. Acheson consulted regularly with Senator Vandenberg, Senator Connally, and other Senators.

On April 4, 1949, the United States and Canada joined 10 European states in signing the North Atlantic Treaty (Greece and Turkey became parties to the treaty in 1952 and the Federal Republic of Germany in 1955).

Articles 3 and 5 are the heart of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The parties agreed (art. 3) that "in order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack."

In addition it was agreed by the parties (art. 5) "that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all" and consequently agreed "that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

Like the Brussels Treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty also recognizes the interdependence of economic cooperation and a common defense. Article 2 obliges the parties, among other things, to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

The North Atlantic Treaty has no specified duration and continues in force for an indefinite period. Article 12 provides that after 1959 "the parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the treaty." Article 13 stipulates that after 20 years—that is, in 1969—"any party may cease to be a party 1 year after its notice of denunciation."

The North Atlantic Alliance has worked—superbly. It is the most effective peacetime alliance of modern times—perhaps since the Hanseatic League of the 14th and 15th centuries. Unfortunately, however, in the politics of alliance it may be that nothing fails like success.

The historic association of North America with Western Europe and the commitment of the United States and Canada to the defense of their allies in Europe contributed notably to their recovery. Western Europe has enjoyed a period of high prosperity and rapid growth. It has made important progress toward building a Western European economic community and together with the United States, Canada, Japan, and other nations it has reduced barriers to trade and developed impressive practical measures of international monetary cooperation. In their economic and financial relations these nations are demonstrating that collaboration and sovereignty are not mutually exclusive but that one may reinforce the other.

At the same time American strategic power and the other defensive forces of the Alliance have been greatly strengthened, both absolutely and relatively. The balance of forces thus created since 1949 and the resolute response to Soviet expansionist probes—especially in Berlin and in the missile crisis in Cuba—have made the policy of deterrence effective. It has closed the door to Soviet westward expansion. No armed attack has been made on Western Europe or North America, and provided an appropriate balance and resolve are maintained, none is likely. What justifiable hope there is of a genuine European settlement rests on Soviet recognition of, and respect for, the durability of this balance and the constancy of this resolve.

Nevertheless, the very success of the Alliance in influencing Soviet behavior has partly obscured the relationship between the forces and firmness of the Alliance and the moderation of Soviet policy, and has encouraged wishful thinking about the possibilities of a European settlement, if not of more far-reaching agreements, with the Soviet Union. In some quarters the advantages of alliance are now being discounted, while the disadvantages loom larger—it limits freedom of action, it complicates diplomacy, it costs money, the stability it affords is mistaken for rigidity. A desire to experiment—with nationalism, with arms limitation, with rapprochement—is gaining support.

Manlio Brosio, Secretary General of NATO, made this comment to the 1965 NATO Parliamentarians' Conference: "* * * all of us are agreed that the world has changed since 1949, and that the alliance may have to change with it, though here, of course, is where the divergencies start, in that all of us have our own ideas on why it should change and in what directions."

There is no one NATO problem; there are as many as there are allies who want changes, and allies who are asked to accept changes they believe unwise.

But if there is no one problem, there are four key questions:

1. How do the allies perceive the Soviet threat? Does a united effort still have priority as a means of deterring Soviet domination of Western Europe and of winning eventual Soviet acceptance of a genuine European settlement?
2. How does France perceive the Atlantic Alliance in relation to the achievement of French aims? As a vehicle in need of repairs? Or as one ready for the scrap heap?
3. What lessons can be learned from experience with the decisionmaking processes of the alliance?
4. Can the interallied dialog be moved onto a practical footing—away from theoretical questions and back to brass-tacks issues of real concern to governments?

II. THE SOVIET THREAT

Twenty years after the end of World War II, a genuine European settlement is still far distant. As C. B. Marshall told the subcommittee:

"The most salutary thing for the strength and durability of NATO is to get our perspectives straight about the probabilities—rather the improbabilities—of coming to an acceptable settlement with the Soviet Union."

Since Stalin and the start of the cold war, a major goal of American policy has been to bring it to a conclusion on terms that serve the legitimate interests of all the parties concerned. The relative tempering of Soviet behavior under Stalin's successors has led some Americans and some Europeans to believe that at long last the Soviet Union is ready to move toward a genuine settlement. Some people even see Communist China as the one disturbing and aggressive world power and the Sino-Soviet quarrel as a doorway through which the Soviet Union may step to rejoin Western civilization.

The Atlantic allies must of course be ready to welcome any and all serious moves by the Soviet Union in the direction of a European settlement, but the watchword of allied policy should remain vigilance—for it is not weakness but strength that exerts an attractive force in world affairs.

Moscow now appears to have some understanding of the need for preventing nuclear war by accident, miscalculation, or failure of communication. There are cases, like the hot line and the limited nuclear test-ban treaty, where we may find common ground with the Soviets on specific problems. But there is as yet no hard evidence that the Soviet Union has given up the contest for Europe, or abandoned its goal to break up the association of Western Europe and North America, or is ready to turn to serious efforts to settle basic political conflicts with the West. On the contrary, the contest for Europe—in low key for the moment—is still with us, and Soviet forces remain in the center of Europe. The Soviet Government continues to invest an increasing share of its resources in arms, to push hard for major advances in critical new weapons, and to reject internationally inspected and controlled arrangements for the limitation of arms.

It is evident that the law of change is at work inside the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe as elsewhere. Not so easy to see is how it will affect Soviet ambition and policy. We cannot be confident that a Soviet Union which may enjoy some political stability with less use of repression, and which may maintain a favorable rate of economic growth, will exert less political influence around the world or be less determined to prevail. Nor can we discount the danger that the reassertion of the national interests of the Eastern European countries will lead to new forms of crisis to which the West has given little thought. There is always the possibility that Moscow may try to restore the unity of the Eastern European nations by manufacturing a crisis centered on Germany.

Nor does discord between Moscow and Peiping necessarily increase the likelihood of substantive settlements in Europe. In fact, the incessant Chinese criticism of Soviet leadership as insufficiently militant, and whatever gains for Red China her combativeness may produce, are generating pressures on Moscow to demonstrate its own militancy. Events in Asia could have a backlash in the Atlantic area. Soviet leaders, of course, are not unconcerned with Chinese expansionism. On some problems and in some areas of Asia, Western nations and the Soviet Union may find it desirable—in terms of their own interests—to follow roughly parallel courses. But we cannot assume that Moscow and Peiping are headed for a final separation. In time, with the passing from the scene of Mao Tse-tung, some reconciliation is conceivable.

If Soviet policy in Europe continues to be relatively moderate, it is because "objective conditions," as the Communists say, impose such a policy. Should the balance of forces be upset, for example, should there be major confusion in NATO or a breakup of the alliance so that the Soviets do not confront a strong, united front of Western Europe and North America but rather a Western Europe divided again into a number of weak and competing nations, "objective conditions" would encourage the Soviet rulers to take bolder actions and run greater risks—and Berlin is always there, if no other target of opportunity is handy. We could expect a European crisis of unpredictable magnitude.

The key issue is the division of Germany. The reunification of Germany has been a goal of Western policy because, so long as Germany is split, the division will be an unsettling factor in European and, indeed, world affairs. In the words of President Johnson in December 1964: "* * * our friends and comrades throughout Germany deserve assurance from their allies that there shall be no acceptance of the lasting threat to peace which is the forced division of Germany. No one seeks to end this grim and dangerous injustice by force. But there can be no stable peace in Europe while one part of Germany is denied the basic right to choose freely its own destiny and to choose, without threat to anyone, reunion with the Germans in the Federal Republic."

Unfortunately, however, there is no way to make the reunification of Germany a practical short-run goal of Western policy. It cannot be bought with any concessions consistent with German national interests or Western interests. It cannot be compelled by measures short of war. It cannot be imagined except in the context of a general European settlement. And such a settlement requires a change in the Soviet conception of Russian national interests—at a minimum a reliable change in the means by which the Soviet leaders pursue their goals.

A European settlement will be the product of Western strength, firmness, and patience, coupled with a willingness on each side to give and accept appropriate guarantees of the security of the other. The failure to obtain a settlement is not to be explained by a refusal of the West to recognize the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union. It is not explained by a lack of imagination in the West. It is not, as some now find it fashionable to say, a lack of "bright ideas" or "brilliant policy proposals" but a lack of Soviet interest in any terms that do not take as a premise the continued Soviet hold on the

Warsaw Pact countries, and, in particular, East Germany.

There are some doubts in Western Europe about the steadiness and coherence of American policy toward East-West relations. The United States has not yet brought its foreign receipts and payments into balance, with the result that doubts grow about the financial ability of the United States to support its European policies. In its enthusiasm for a European settlement, the U.S. Government has pursued the will-of-the-wisp of rapprochement with the Soviet Union, even though this raises in Western Europe, especially in West Germany, the specter of bilateral Soviet-American deals at the expense of European interests. In their zeal for arms control and disarmament American officials have been trying to negotiate a nonproliferation agreement with the Soviet Union—as though the West had reason to fear that the Soviet Union might be about to assist its satellites or other states to acquire nuclear capabilities. An obvious danger is that major concessions will be made on our side without any compensating change of policy on the Soviet side.

For the United States to show unsureness and unsteadiness in its perception of the continuing Soviet threat is especially disturbing. Despite the remarkable recovery of the Western European allies, they do not have, separately or jointly, the strength to counter Soviet pressures. For the United States to toy with the idea of rapprochement, therefore, is to tempt its allies into unilateral exploration of the possibilities of transforming their relations with the Soviet Union—and thus to create new opportunities for Soviet diplomacy to achieve what Soviet arms and pressures have been unable to win.

The West must not overlook any signs of willingness on the Soviet side to move toward a European settlement. There may be useful initiatives to take in finding specific measures to reduce the danger of war, and in such fields as East-West trade. But the West should act together—or it will risk upsetting the balance on which the hopes of a genuine settlement rest.

President de Gaulle advocates what he calls a "European Europe" existing "by itself for itself"—a phrase which seems to mean a Europe independent of America. But for a long time to come a Western Europe isolated from the United States would not exist "by itself for itself" except at the sufferance of the Soviet Union. And, of course, the French President knows this. A Europe effectively protecting itself "by itself" is far from De Gaulle's thoughts. He is assuming the constant protection of American nuclear power, no matter what he says or does.

The United States also wants an independent Europe, meaning that we see no necessary conflict between European independence and Atlantic cooperation.

The original American conception, in the time of Marshall and Lovett, was of one Europe—"the European world," "Europe as a whole." That is still the American objective. As in the past, the United States hopes for a genuine European settlement, one which would make possible, among other things, the reciprocal withdrawal of American and Soviet forces from central Europe.

There is, in short, no real inconsistency between a truly independent Europe and the objectives of the United States and other allies. But no member of the alliance will advance this goal through bilateral dealings with the Soviet Union on the security of Europe—it will jeopardize them. Even the most expert judo artist cannot make "united we fall, divided we stand" a formula to advance the integrity of Europe as a whole.

Now, as in 1949, the foundation of the alliance is a working agreement among the allies on what the Soviet threat is and how to deal with it—together.

III. THE FRENCH CHALLENGE

No one, possibly including President de Gaulle, knows exactly what, in practical terms, the French position on allied cooperation is.

In the judgment of its partners in the EEC, France has been less than faithful to its obligations under the Treaty of Rome—but it has not slammed the door. Similarly, in international financial matters its on-again, off-again policies—now shaking confidence in the gold exchange standard, now assisting to shore it up in a crisis—reflect both French reluctance to cooperate and also to sacrifice the benefits of cooperation.

With respect to NATO, France has, on the one hand: withdrawn its Mediterranean and Atlantic fleets from NATO; assigned to NATO only small French air and ground forces (about 60,000 men); refused to permit non-French controlled nuclear weapons on French territory; withdrawn French naval personnel from certain high NATO command posts; not accepted the 1962 NATO Council guidelines for the use of nuclear weapons; not committed itself to consult with its allies on the use of these weapons in contingencies of an ambiguous nature; announced its refusal to participate in the 1966 FALLEX program; not participated in the 10-nation special nuclear committee.

On the other hand, France took a strong stand in both Berlin crises and gave immediate support to President Kennedy at the time of the Cuban missile crisis. It continues to provide valuable facilities to NATO, a French officer is commander in chief, Allied Forces Central Europe, and other French officers participate fully in the work of several international commands. It engages, on a bilateral basis, with its allies on various projects, such as joint French-American space research.

President de Gaulle himself states the French position on NATO in these terms:

"Above all, it is a question of keeping ourselves free of any vassalage. It is true that, in many areas, we have the best reasons for associating with others. But on condition of retaining our self-determination. Thus, so long as the solidarity of the Western peoples appears to us necessary for the eventual defense of Europe, our country will remain the ally of her allies but, upon the expiration of the commitments formerly taken—that is, in 1969 by the latest—the subordination known as "integration" which is provided for by NATO and which hands our fate over to foreign authority shall cease, as far as we are concerned."

When war can mean anything between instant, massive destruction and a limited probe with conventional forces, deterrence requires an instant readiness to respond appropriately. This, in turn, has dictated the deployment of large allied forces in Western Europe and of allied naval forces in Atlantic and Mediterranean waters. A corollary requirement has been the creation of some kind of allied command organization. Allied Command Europe and the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) were activated by General Eisenhower on April 2, 1951. Allied Command Atlantic and Headquarters, Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic (SACLANT) were activated a year later.

In peacetime the international commands, like SHAPE and SACLANT, are primarily planning agencies with such duties as the development and recommendation of force requirements. They also have certain responsibilities for developing and maintaining bases and supply and communication facilities, for training and exercises for an emergency and, in the case of SHAPE, for training inspection of assigned units to ascertain if they meet agreed standards, and for operational control of certain forces, such as air defense forces. These must be ready for operations on very short notice, have certain ongoing patrol responsibilities, and must be dispersed on bases in several countries. The fundamental justification of the international commands is to be ready and able to take charge, within minutes, of the forces which would come under their control in an emergency—and thus, by virtue of such readiness, to strengthen the deterrent power of the alliance.

In peacetime, however, until a certain stage of alert exists, national forces (with a few exceptions) remain under national command. The international commands do not infringe upon the sovereignty of the members nor do they violate the principle of the equality of all members. No member can be compelled to accept a plan with which it does not agree, or to provide facilities against its will, or to designate forces which would be assigned to the international commands in an emergency. There is, in short, no "integration" except as members freely agree to coordinate their policies and forces. It may be wondered whether the objection to "integration" is really a way of denying the need for coordination.

To date, the French have talked about NATO in such abstract, ambiguous, and theoretical terms as "vassalage," "subordination," and "integration," and the discussion has not been put on what Secretary General Brosio calls "a practical footing."

Of course, France may bow out completely from the unified military commands. If France insists on moving NATO military facilities out of France, or on an effective veto on their use, it will become extremely difficult to devise a sound plan for the defense of Western Europe. One need only look at a map to learn why the facts of geography make France an important member of the alliance. But allied contingency studies show that it would be possible—though costly—to replace the bases, lines of supply and communication, and other facilities now located in France.

France may decide to request a review of the North Atlantic Treaty in accordance with article 12. That has been the right of any member since 1959.

France may even withdraw from NATO in accordance with article 13. It would be unwise to assume, however, that French withdrawal is a fixed and unalterable intention. It is not, after all, likely that the "solidarity of the Western peoples" will appear unnecessary for the defense of Western Europe in 1969.

And even French withdrawal need not mean the end of NATO. On the contrary, the appropriate policy for France's allies would then be the policy of "the empty chair"—to leave a place for France at the table and to await, and work for, her return.

The French President now deliberately displays a policy of independence from allies, while accepting the benefits of the American nuclear umbrella. He is playing a very risky game—counting on the American commitment regardless of what he does or what happens to the Atlantic Alliance. The risks include a real possibility of alienating the United States.

The American commitment to help the allies to defend themselves was made on the assumption that each of the allies was determined to do its part in a cooperative undertaking. But, in the words of Dirk Stikker, former Secretary General of NATO:

"This vaunted complete independence of action has created an atmosphere of incompatibility of both aims and methods between France and nearly all of its allies. He who insists on retaining his complete independence of action can never be counted on as a devoted and stanch member of any alliance."

Much clarity on all sides is needed about the price of "going it alone." If the French

Government does not consider the alliance important enough to do its part, then the importance of France as an ally will unavoidably diminish—as the other allies do what they can to make the alliance work without France. It may become necessary to revise and reduce the American commitment to the defense of France.

Under the circumstances, the United States must work closely with Great Britain and West Germany and the other allies who can and do see their common interest in a common defense. If the key Atlantic allies move ahead together on the urgent issues—as they have the right and duty to do—sober second thoughts may in time prevail in the great and ancient French nation.

IV. THE CONSULTATIVE PROCESS

The membership of the Atlantic Alliance includes great powers and lesser powers, each with its own economic and military potential its own geographical and historical associations, and its distinct perspective: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States.

The alliance in operation is a group of governments—that is, of officials on the job with particular responsibilities and particular interests who have varying hopes and expectations about how the alliance may be useful in advancing their concerns. Because allies are governments, their actions are the product of internal bargaining among the bureaus, lobbies, and personalities comprising their own political system. As Richard Neustadt said to the subcommittee:

"The impulse to collaborate is not a law of nature. It emerges from within, arising on the job, expressive of a need for someone else's aid or service * * * if one government would influence the actions of another, it must find means to convince enough men and the right men on the other side that what it wants is what they need for their own purposes, in their own jobs, comporting with their own internally inspired hopes and fears, so that they will pursue it for themselves in their own bargaining arena. This is what we did, with Stalin's help—and economic crisis—in Europe nearly 20 years ago."

Alliance institutions, civil and military, are not sovereign authorities, but creatures of the member governments—and governments alone possess the ability to act. Thus, the importance of the North Atlantic Council and other alliance organizations, beyond their obvious symbolic value, turns on their usefulness as quiet corners where ministers from different capitals get together, and on their actual capacity to produce results of utility to key men inside member governments. If the views of the Council, the international commands, and other agencies are to attract the top-level attention of national governments, they must point the way to the practical compromises which are the very heart of joint action.

The organization of NATO is, therefore, an important but secondary subject—the cart, not the horse—of allied concerns.

It sometimes appears to be more important than it is because the processes of consultation within the alliance are not producing agreement—and because, as often happens within our own Government, disputes over high policy are cloaked as disagreements over organizational issues. Things cannot be worked out that way.

Consultative processes produce an alliance's decisions—they are its surrogate for executive authority. If they are not effective, the alliance will lack direction and energy.

Within our own Government, we are painfully aware of the difficulty of deciding on new policies. Decisions are difficult enough when the decisionmaking process culminates in a President. Within an alliance, not only are the issues inherently more difficult (because a wider variety of interests are affected) but also decisions have, in the nature of things, the character of a common denominator. That is, they must be acceptable to a group of governments and must be watered down or compromised until they are acceptable.

There is, of course, no rule of unanimity in NATO, despite the widespread belief to the contrary. The emphasis of the treaty is on separate and joint action to maintain and develop the individual and collective capacity to resist aggression (art. 3), and on such action, individually and in concert with others, as each ally deems necessary in response to an attack (art. 5). The only requirement in the treaty for unanimity is for the admission of new members. In practice, the operations of the alliance have confirmed that each member does not have to participate in everything the others do, and that no member can prevent the others from taking a joint action they wish to take.

The absence of a rule of unanimity does not diminish, however, the desirability of unanimity. A member may be unable to block a joint action by the others, but if it feels strongly, it may refuse to cooperate on other matters or even denounce the treaty. Practical wisdom dictates that a great effort should be made to reach full agreement on important issues and programs, particularly those relating to the credibility of the deterrent and relations with the Soviet Union.

In the happiest circumstances, crisp decisions by a group of governments are hard to come by, and the accommodations made in arriving at agreement should be treasured, not lightly discarded. Continuity with a second-best policy may be better than to push a better one at the cost of not agreeing on any policy at all. As General Norstad testified:

"We should not destroy the foundation under which we are working until we know we can produce a better one. Not that there is not a better one, because there is always a better one, but the criterion against which we judge this is not whether or not there is a better policy, a better plan, or a better strategy. The criterion must be: Can we get a better one accepted?"

Unfortunately, the U.S. Government has not always taken this view.

A case in point: in 1962 the United States abruptly shifted to a strategy of "flexible response." There was little or no consultation with our allies, and the shift was explained in terms which, to say the least, caused doubt and confusion about what kind of counterblows the United States might be planning in the event of a Soviet attack on Europe. To some in Europe it looked as though the United States would rather switch than fight. The change in American doctrine forced modifications in allied military doctrine as well, thus painfully underlining for the allies how little influence they had on American policies of life and death importance to them. The difficulties thereby created have not yet been overcome, especially perhaps in relations with France, whose President, like most chiefs of state, does not accept short shrift easily.

This advice to the allies from the Committee of Three in 1956 is still good advice: "* * * any variations in plans and strategic policies which may be required need not weaken NATO or the confidence of its members in NATO and in each other; providing, and the proviso is decisive, that each member retains its will and its capacity to play its full part in discharging the political commitment for collective action against aggression which it undertook when it signed the pact; providing also—and recent events have shown that this is equally important—that any changes in national strategy or policy which affect the coalition are made only after collective consideration."

At present, nuclear questions are troubling and dividing the allies. The problem is complex, involving considerations of national prestige, interallied confidence, strategy, and East-West relations. The time is past, certainly, for trying to deal with this problem on the basis that our European allies are equal but that one is less equal than others. It is not difficult to define what is wanted: a strategy which will effectively support the policy of deterrence, and arrangements which will win the confidence of the European allies in American support of the strategy in an emergency. Clearly, Soviet pressure should not deter the allies from doing what needs to be done—on that basis NATO itself would never have been created and West Germany would never have been permitted to join—but at the same time there is no point in taking militarily unnecessary measures unless it is clear that the political advantages outweigh the political disadvantages.

Beginning with the hasty improvisation of the concept of the multilateral nuclear force, organizational salve has been prescribed for a distressing political irritation—but the salve has converted the irritation into a 5-year itch.

Clearly, since the United States has 95 percent or more of total Western nuclear capabilities, it necessarily and unavoidably has the decisive power, positive and negative, with respect to the use of these nuclear weapons. And that power is and will be located in Washington; no President can delegate it to anyone else.

However it may be accomplished, therefore, Canada and the European allies need greater access to the policy counsels of the United States—and vice versa—not just regarding the more remote contingencies of nuclear war, but also the ambiguous challenges that a flexible Communist strategy makes probable. What the allies, including West Germany, need is confidence that they are, in fact, involved in major issues of strategic and political planning in such ways as to influence the actions of the U.S. Government in a crisis. And again, vice versa.

Here is where organizational imaginativeness is needed, rather than a managerial pseudoscience which formally locates power in bodies to which no member government will in fact delegate real authority.

For example, there is every good reason why the allied capitals in Europe and North America should be linked by the most effective communications arrangements that modern technology has made possible. There is still much to be done to update present arrangements.

For another example, we should be able to find ways of involving allied military officers more deeply in strategic planning that will receive a President's attention—without altering in any essential way the President's final powers of decision. SHAPE and SACLANT now participate in the Joint Strategic Planning System, based on the U.S. Strategic Air Command at Omaha, Nebr., and allied officers are stationed at the headquarters of U.S. Strategic Air Command. In addition, since 1963, the United States has committed three Polaris submarines to the planning control of SHAPE. The United Kingdom has similarly committed RAF Bomber Command. Such arrangements are a good start.

The steps now being taken to develop a special nuclear committee may also be useful, especially if such a committee can be located in Washington where it could involve keymen in the central and most worrisome problems of strategy and give them access to each other on matters high on the agenda of national governments.

What is required is access of keymen to keymen—at the North Atlantic Council and by new consultative arrangements close to, or closely linked with, the centers of national decisionmaking.

Lord Ismay, first Secretary General of NATO, paid a well-deserved tribute to the statesmen who negotiated the North Atlantic Treaty:

"They did not attempt, at the outset, to draw up a blueprint of the international organization which should be set up, or to lay down any hard and fast rules of procedure. They realized that these could only be evolved step by step in the light of practical experience."

V. A PRACTICAL FOOTING

The North Atlantic Alliance remains what it was created to be in 1949—an agreement among sovereign states for their defense, with all that implies in terms of political, economic, and military collaboration.

It does not exist in isolation, however. OECD, the Group of Ten, EEC, EFTA, the Kennedy round, and other bodies and arrangements are concerned with economic and financial problems of the North Atlantic allies and like-minded states around the world. Normal bilateral relations—private and governmental—between all these countries deal with political, economic, cultural, and military affairs. In short, difficult though it may be to name or define, these nations form a community and their community of interests finds expression in a rich variety of relationships.

The North Atlantic Alliance is but one link, albeit an extremely important link, in this chain of institutions, arrangements, and relations, and there is no point in trying to make NATO into something more than it is by duplicating the work of other agencies, or to find artificial tasks for it, such as the promotion of cultural exchanges, to keep it busy or enhance its importance.

Moreover, for the United States or any other member to expect help from its allies on matters outside the scope of the North Atlantic Treaty, and outside the obligations undertaken by the members in other alliances and arrangements, may put a heavy strain on the alliance. Members can, of course, properly seek to win understanding and support for their policies outside the North Atlantic area through bilateral channels, and NATO organs may provide useful opportunities for one ally to explain to others what it is doing and why, but the Alliance itself does not entitle one ally to claim the support of others on matters outside the treaty.

In the words of Secretary General Brosio: "To extend the scope—geographically and otherwise—of the obligations the allied countries undertook in 1949 would not be easy. It would have to be very carefully considered and the pros and cons very cautiously weighed. In any event we must beware, lest in seeking to improve the alliance and strengthen our ties, we bring about precisely the opposite result and cause a split in it."

If the threat to the allies changes or if their interests would be served by a change in the scope of NATO's concerns—if, for example, Communist China proves in due course to be the principal threat to their survival in freedom or if economic, social, and cultural developments make closer political links between the allies desirable—the time will come when the allies may wish to re-form NATO to meet the new challenges and opportunities.

But at the moment the urgent task is to put the interallied dialog on a practical footing—to cope with the hard issues of the present. Getting to work on them is, in any case, the only way of building a foundation for the future.

All agree, President de Gaulle included, that the alliance has unfinished business. Its record since 1949 is one in which all can rightly take pride. But alliances are mortal. Like old generals, they may simply fade away unless they are used by, and useful to, national governments in dealing with their real, pressing problems.

The North Atlantic Alliance has not yet achieved its initial, and still its fundamental, purpose—which is a genuine European settlement. The phrase is too easy to utter, perhaps, to suggest what a drastic change for the better a genuine settlement would mean in the world environment. It would be tragic were the Soviet Union to accomplish, by allied default, its longstanding goal of destroying the alliance at a time when a potentially stable balance of forces—the essential precondition of a genuine settlement—has been achieved. The foremost issue facing the alliance is, therefore, a working agreement on policies toward the Soviet Union.

Another real issue is an understanding with our allies on what it may be necessary and desirable to do to simplify the overproliferated international command structure—preserving its essential elements and strengthening its effectiveness while discarding the tinsel and furbelows—and to meet the costs, political as well as economic, of doing so.

Another down-to-earth issue is burden sharing. In viewing national shares in the costs of protecting the North Atlantic area, inequities are apparent: the burden falls more heavily on some, including the United States, than the others. The problem is bound to become of more concern for the United States because of its relation to our payments difficulties and of our mounting expenditures for defense of other areas of importance to the entire free world. The time is not far off when the allies must squarely face this problem in line with their obligations under article 3 of the treaty for "continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid."

Other practical issues are allied military strategy, including the role of nuclear weapons, the role of the nonnuclear powers in nuclear matters, the size and composition of conventional forces, and such questions as procurement and weapons standardization.

The alliance, like any other political arrangement, requires leadership, and the facts of power impose a special responsibility for leadership on the United States.

Leadership is needed within a national government if divergent interests are not to stymie progress. It is even more necessary in an alliance, where decisions must be the product of the round table and where the highest position any ally can attain is primus inter pares.

The United States will have no one but itself to blame if our preoccupation with other important areas of the world keeps us from showing imagination and sound judgment in the affairs of the Atlantic community—and from showing the largeness of mind needed to reconcile national interests with the needs for joint action.

It may be that under the pressure of events the conduct of Atlantic affairs has gotten into a rut, that issues and approaches have become stereotyped, and that our responses to events have become almost ritualistic. Some new heads may be needed to get the dialog back onto a practical footing.

In any event, the problems of the Atlantic Alliance call for more and better attention on the part of our Government than they are receiving.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before I discuss this bill, let me make one point clear: I do not consider a vote on this bill as a vote for or against our policies in Vietnam. Many people have regarded the bill as being a statement or restatement of policy. I do not feel that that is true, and I believe that is the feeling of most members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Senators must decide for themselves whether they consider a vote on the bill as a vote on the administration's policies. I can only state my own position, that I do not look upon this bill as a vehicle for testing congressional support of past or present policies in Vietnam.

Let me add here that I strongly support our policy in Vietnam, but I do not regard the bill as a reaffirmation of it, and I do not believe it should be considered in that light.

This is not merely a simple bill to authorize additional foreign aid. It is an emergency measure to meet critical needs in Vietnam. The Committee on Foreign Relations has been assured by administration officials that the funds for Vietnam which would be authorized by this bill are essential to our overall effort there. Secretary Rusk told the committee that he regarded "our economic assistance program in Vietnam as equal in importance with our military assistance." He went on to say:

> Without our economic assistance, the entire effort to maintain a sound economy and to build for the future would quickly fail.

I share the Secretary's view about the importance of our aid program in Vietnam.

We are out of funds for the program in Vietnam. Last year Congress approved an economic assistance program of $266 million for the 1966 fiscal year, and events have now so overtaken the estimates on which this was based that this appropriation will be less than half the requirements for the year. All of the supporting assistance funds for the fiscal 1966 program were obligated nearly 2 months ago and the AID officials have been forced to borrow $96 million from other programs to keep the Vietnam program going. Until these funds are repaid we will not have the money to meet our obligations to international organizations and fulfill other firm commitments. For example, $18 million was borrowed from the Indus Basin development fund and the AID Administrator told the committee that he fully expects the World Bank to call for those funds on March 31. The AID officials are at the bottom of the barrel and this authorization is needed, both to meet critical needs in Vietnam and to replace the funds borrowed from other programs.

Now let me discuss briefly what this bill does. It will authorize an additional $415 million in economic assistance in the current fiscal year. The approval of this amount will bring the total appropriations for economic aid this year to $2,463 million. Of the amount to be authorized, $315 million is in supporting assistance and $100 million is for the President's contingency fund.

A total of $275 million in additional aid is programed for Vietnam. The major component is $175 million which will be used to finance commodity imports. This program serves two basic purposes: it helps counter inflationary pressures caused primarily by the American military presence and it serves as a prime source of Government revenue. It might be helpful to Members of the Senate for me to describe briefly how this program operates.

Our AID people work with South Vietnamese officials in drawing up approved plans for the importation of commodities which will be needed in various segments of the economy. Private South Vietnamese merchants obtain import permits from their Government in accordance with this list. The goods are ordered, primarily from the United States; the Agency for International Development pays for the goods in dollars, and the importer pays the South Vietnamese Government for the goods in piasters, the local currency, at a fixed rate of exchange. Then the South Vietnamese Government uses the proceeds for general budgetary purposes.

The commodity import program is an essential element in Vietnam's budget. In 1966 it is estimated that the revenues derived directly from the commodity import program will be more than the total for all domestic revenues collected by the Central Government. In addition, the customs duties generated by the AID-financed imports will account for additional revenues equal to about 40 percent of total domestic revenues. Without the $370 million which we will provide for the commodity import program, this year, it is apparent that the South Vietnamese Government could not bear the burden of a major war effort as it is now doing.

Inflation is a side effect of any war and the results are particularly acute in an underdeveloped economy where there is a massive infusion of outside demand. The cost of living rose 40 percent in Saigon last year and if recent news reports are any indicator, the index will go much higher this year. It was estimated during the hearings that the American presence this year will generate demands on Vietnam's economy equal to 45 percent of her 1964 national income. I cannot state that South Vietnam's economy would collapse if our aid were reduced, but it is clear that the effects would be quite drastic. Unless inflation can be kept under control, runaway prices in the urban areas will furnish the Vietcong with fertile soil for creating further discontent. I realize that we cannot control inflation with American aid alone. The South Vietnamese Government must do its share through strong stabilization measures, and I hope that our officials will use the leverage of our aid in every way possible to see that this is done.

In addition to the funds for commodity imports, the bill authorizes $100 million for expansion of direct aid operations in logistics, construction, welfare, and development projects. I do not wish to leave the impression with Senators that all of this money will be devoted to building a better economic and social structure in Vietnam. This is simply not the case. The committee was told by the Administrator of AID, Mr. David Bell, that about half of the funds in this category would be spent on permanent type development projects and the other half would be used in the nature of maintenance.

Much of the money in this category will be used to overcome problems caused by our military buildup. For example, the authorization will finance the building of a village to house construction workers at Cam Ranh Bay military projects—$30 million is programed to improve port and shipping facilities—most of it for breaking out and operating 10 ships from the mothball fleet to bring about better distribution of AID-financed imports.

I shall not attempt to discuss each program in this category. A breakdown in the report gives further details. But I do want to stress the fact that in spite of Vietcong control over much of the countryside, our aid program can operate in much of the disputed territory. Mr. Bell told the committee that although 25 percent of the countryside was quite secure, they could work in another 50 percent of the rural area with what he referred to as "varying degrees of insecurity." According to his testimony, only about 24 percent of the inhabited areas of the countryside are not reachable by our aid operations at this time.

I might mention that the bill authorizes an additional $11,622,000 for the refugee program. The Ky government is devoting some 6 percent of its civil budget for refugee relief work this year.

General Ky has pledged that his government will undertake a long overdue program of economic and social reform. The Declaration of Honolulu by the Government of Vietnam promised to eradicate social injustice and build a better material life for the Vietnamese people. If the Ky government does not live up to its promises, we may find ourselves in the position of defeating the Vietcong and losing the war. There is little prospect for a permanent, workable solution to the conflict if the government is not able to command the confidence and support of the people. The government must be looked upon by the people as a friend, not as an enemy.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Wallace Greene, said not long ago after returning from Vietnam:

> You could kill every Vietcong and North Vietnamese in South Vietnam and still lose the war.

This, I think, states quite well the enormous task facing the Saigon government. The Ky government has undertaken a new program for pacification which, if successful, should go far in correcting many social and economic ills in the countryside. This program of "rural construction," as the Vietnamese officials call it, is a combination program involving a team approach to providing security, meeting local social and economic needs, and helping establish effective local governments. Some $20 million in this supplemental request will be used to finance our participation with advisers and materials in this program. I hope that the Ky government will carry out the program with as much fervor as they displayed in making the pledges at Honolulu.

This bill also authorizes additional assistance to the Dominican Republic, Thailand, and Laos.

The supporting assistance authorization will provide $25 million for a loan to the Dominican Republic. The revolution of last April has created such political and economic instability that the Government's tax revenues are far below normal. This additional assistance will be used for essential government budgetary support and will fill the gap between revenue and outgo and help create more stable conditions which will be conducive to the holding of elections next June.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama on the tenor of his speech. I think this is by far the most important kind of involvement we have in South Vietnam.

As the Senator said so well, if we have any prospect of achieving any degree of real freedom and independence, any meaningful kind of victory for freedom in Vietnam, it has to depend primarily on education, land reform, economic assistance.

My question to the Senator from Alabama is: Is it enough?

Judging by the committee report, we are authorizing in the supplemental $25 million, which I understand the Senator said is paid for provincial operations—schools, health, water, agriculture improvement, information programs, development of local administration, youth cadre, veteran rehabilitation, Montagnard development, self-help, and so forth—and that compares with $4.7 billion. As I calculate it, it is 188 times as much for the military effort as for all the constructive, positive economic efforts we make in South Vietnam.

If we go back to the basic authorization for this purpose the disproportion is far greater. It was $24,486,000 for all of 1966 until this supplemental, so the total is less than $50 million for these peaceful purposes, these constructive purposes, these purposes that build the possibility of a better life and the possibility, the only possibility we have to win, whereas we are spending so much more for these strictly military purposes, as the Senator stated, killing Vietcong. But the military spending for fiscal 1966 will exceed $12 billion—for a 250 to 1 disproportion.

I agree that we have to spend the military money. I am not one of those who believes that we can let up on our military effort. These things—military and economic—have to go hand in hand. It does not make sense to spend money for a schoolhouse if it is going to be burned down, or to spend money to save lives by eradicating malaria if those whose lives are saved are going to be shot down, or for training administrators, if they are going to be tortured, kidnaped, and killed.

It seems to me that there is a tremendous disproportion here.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I say to the Senator from Wisconsin, yes, I concede this is not sufficient to do the job. However, it is the request made to get the job started. Undoubtedly we shall be called upon to make further authorizations. I do not know this but probably in the regular authorization bill for foreign aid this subject will be dealt with further.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me ask the Senator if it is not true that a strong case can be made for a substantial investment in land reform. There is a situation in some Provinces in which 85 percent of the farmers are tenant farmers.

The Vietcong is using this. Their slogan is "Land for the Tiller." That is a very effective slogan. It favors the tenant farmer. It is a persuasive slogan, when they talk about the gouging that the tenant farmers are subjected to by means of the high rentals of the landlords.

We spend nothing for land reform; that is, we spent nothing for land reform in 1961, nothing in 1962, nothing in 1963, nothing in 1964, nothing in 1965. Now we are proposing to spend a little bit more than $1 million for 1967. I documented the fact on the Senate floor a month ago that if we were to invest the cost of one week of our military involvement in Vietnam, we could initiate land reform programs that would provide 5 to 7 acres to each of hundreds of thousands of tenant farmers. It would be enough land, under the economic system that prevails there, to give the farmer a stake in the land, by providing him with a workable, viable farm. It would give him a real reason for opposing communism.

Why is it that we seem to be so reluctant to provide this land reform?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the first place, we are dealing with a supplemental bill. It would provide funds for the fiscal year 1966, which has only about 3 or 4 months more to run.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But there is nothing included for land reform, according to these tables that I have consulted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There may not be. I agree with the Senator on the importance of land reform. I do not believe, however, that it is something that can be pushed out into the open at once. I believe it is something that we should provide in South Vietnam, but that it will come in its time. I believe very strongly that it will come. I would be greatly disappointed if it did not.

I should like to say, also, to the Senator from Wisconsin, that only recently I had a conversation with a retired general of the Army. The general had served overseas in World War II and also in Korea. We were talking about the Vietnamese problem, and this very subject of establishing local governments came up; and also with respect to helping these people to get land to till, and all those things that go with a stabilized civilian government.

This general, whom one ordinarily would expect to be thinking about military operations, felt that it was of such tremendous importance that it would do no good to achieve a big military victory and leave that other phase uncared for. He said it would fall to pieces if there were not local governments ready to operate, both for the purposes of maintaining a stable government and also a civilian economy. He said that a victory in arms would then be without purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the statement of the Senator from Alabama is a most useful one. He points out that military people, whose responsibility and orientation has been directed toward military achievements, recognize that if we are to have any kind of permanent military success, we have to proceed far more vigorously and progressively in the health, education, administration, and land reform framework if there is to be any success.

I wish to ask the Senator about our education in South Vietnam. I think that this country of ours has done a wonderful job in that field. We have been of great help in encouraging education. In 1955, there were only 300,000 students in school in South Vietnam. Today, there are 1½ million going to school. We have played a great part in that effort and have a great record.

I point out that a large proportion of the Vietnamese cannot finish grade school. The fact is that that amounts to well over 99 percent of the students. The South Vietnamese Government has given power and authority to those with grade school diplomas and the Vietcong, on the other hand, has identified itself with the less educated people. I wonder if it would not be well to think of going forward with a far more imaginative educational system, and finding ways or giving a greater role to those whose education is limited, so that there may be both greater support for our side in the war, and a better chance to win a free election after the war.

I realize that this is a complicated question, because it is their Government, and not ours. I am merely raising my voice because, when negotiations and elections come, I am hopeful we will be in a position to prevent a Communist election victory that would destroy much of what our boys have been fighting and dying for.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may point out that an educational program is part of our regular aid program in Vietnam. This bill carries money, admittedly a small sum, $2 million, for education, but it is added to what we had already authorized for fiscal 1966.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I just hope this colloquy and intervention by the Senator from Wisconsin will help encourage the administration and the Foreign Relations Committee to look with favor on an ambitious, imaginative, progressive program in the areas of land reform, education, and health, where real progress can be made that will give hope of bringing about genuine independence and resistance to communism. To accomplish this, we must in the familiar phrase, "put our money where our mouth is." To date we have not done this. This bill does not do it. We talked a good fight for social revolution at Honolulu. But the talk has been empty, and the complaints to this effect of Ambassador Lodge, the widely reported bureaucratic restraints on General Lannsdale indicate what a big job we should do now that we are not doing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the statement of the Senator. I think he has made a very fine contribution.

To continue with my statement, an additional $7,500,000 will be provided both Thailand and Laos. In Thailand the funds are needed to meet problems which have arisen because of expanded subversive activities in the northeast. In Laos additional help is needed to stabilize Government control of contested areas and support airlift and refugee operations.

An additional $100 million would be authorized for the President's contingency fund by this bill. The Congress provided $50 million for the Contingency fund in the regular 1966 program. The fund is now exhausted, and additional funds are needed to enable the President to meet requirements in potential world trouble spots during the remainder of this fiscal year.

The bill also contains a provision prohibiting contingency fund assistance to any country which allows ships or aircraft under its registry from carrying cargo to or from North Vietnam, unless the President determines that continued aid is in the national interest and reports that determination to the Congress. This is a reasonable extension of two restrictions enacted by Congress last year pertaining to furnishing aid to countries engaged in shipping to North Vietnam.

Finally, the bill contains a provision which permits the use of up to $1,400,000 in supporting assistance funds for administrative expenses incurred in connection with the Vietnam program. This will take care of the hiring and other administrative burdens connected with the doubling of the size of the Vietnam program.

In summary, I cannot say that the passage of this bill will mark a turning point in the war or in creating a better way of life for the unfortunate people of Vietnam. It does not propose any radical changes in our economic aid program but is primarily an expansion of what we have been doing for some time. Our military buildup since the regular aid bill passed last year has created inflationary pressures which cannot be kept in bounds without this additional support. We must be realistic and recognize that the more troops we send and the more bases we build, the more aid we must put in to keep inflation from getting out of control.

Without additional economic aid it is quite possible that inflationary pressures could lead to collapse of the Saigon Government—with the Vietcong as the only beneficiary.

I do not have any encouraging words to offer Senators on the prospects for any dramatic results in the pacification effort. Only the Vietnamese Government can determine whether this key element in the war effort will succeed. As the late President Kennedy said on September 2, 1963:

> They have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort.

The Ky government is being put to the test in their campaign to convince the people that the Government is their friend. Our hopes and prayers, and the hopes and prayers of our 215,000 men in Vietnam, are with those engaged in this effort.

The need for this money is urgent, and I hope the Senate will pass the bill and send it on to the President without any unnecessary delay.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state my amendment to H.R. 12169.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so order; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment submitted by Mr. BAYH is as follows:

On page 2, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Section 604 of such Act, which relates to procurement, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(e) Funds made available under this Act shall not be used to finance the procurement of iron and steel products for use in Vietnam if—

"'(1) the products contain any component acquired by the producer of the commodity in the form in which imported into the country of production from sources other than the United States or a country designated as a Limited Free World Country by code number 901 in the September, 1964 Geographic Code Book compiled by the Agency for International Development, at a total cost (delivered to the point of production) that amounts to more than 10 percent of the lowest price (excluding the cost of ocean transportation and marine insurance) at which the supplier makes the commodity available for export sale (whether or not financed by the Agency for International Development), and

"'(2) the total cost of such commodity exceeds by more than ten percent the lowest price (excluding the cost of ocean transportation and marine insurance) at which the supplier makes the commodity available for export sale (whether or not financed with funds made available pursuant to this Act). No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.'"

On page 2, line 12, strike out "SEC. 3" and substitute "SEC. 4".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time is the Senator from Indiana yielding himself?

Mr. BAYH. I yield myself 5 minutes, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum which includes some documentation of facts and figures, which I have received from various agencies of the Government, as well as from business enterprises in this country.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM

MARCH 10, 1966.

From: BIRCH BAYH, U.S. Senate.
Subject: U.S. AID procurement practices for galvanized steel for Vietnam.

The procurement practices of the Agency for International Development for galvanized iron and steel products for South Vietnam have been ill-conceived and poorly administered. These practices have resulted in the following:

1. AID has directly supported the Japanese steel industry in its competition with U.S. steel makers. Contrary to its own policy, AID has purchased Japanese steel plate for Vietnam over the past 12 to 18 months. Recently, instead of enforcing its policy against purchases of Japanese steel, it has changed this policy so that previous illegal purchases are now within the confines of the new policy:

U.S. imports of selected steel mill products from Japan, 1958–65

[Short tons]

1958	241,641
1959	623,846
1960	593,098
1961	594,610
1962	1,068,005
1963	1,802,110
1964	2,445,267
1965	4,406,298

2. AID has paid prices as much as 60 percent higher for its purchases than other buyers have paid for identical products from the same mills. With the amount of steel being purchased during the current fiscal year, the excess profits being made by foreign steel producers from sales to AID will amount to $10 to $15 million.

Prices paid by AID for 32-gage corregated steel sheets:

In 1963: $179 plus $16.50 freight (Korea).

In 1964: $270 plus $16.50 freight (Korea); $260 plus $16.50 freight (Taiwan).

In 1965: $259.50 plus $16.50 freight (Korea).

SIRS: We are pleased to offer according to the terms and conditions as stated hereunder:

1. Shipment: Three months after receipt of letter of credit.
2. Payment: By confirmed and irrevocable letter of credit in our favor.
3. Insurance: Insurance coverage will be for the amount of the buyer.
4. Packing: Factory's standard export packing.
5. Validity: Subject to our final confirmation.
6. Remarks: Minimum acceptable quantity per single letter of credit is 10 metric tons of one gage and one size only.

Yours sincerely,

SINCERE STEEL SHEET CORP.

Description	Zinc coating (ounces per square foot)	U.S. gage No.	Size	Quantity	Price f.o.b.-C2 (in U.S. dollars)
Galvanized iron sheets (plain or corrugated): Specifications and tolerances are in accordance with JIS G3302 standard.	0.6 ft	32	3 feet by 6 feet 10 inches or 1 by 2 meters.	Per metric ton.	162.60
	.6	31	do	do	160.65
	.6	30	do	do	157.08
	.7	29	do	do	156.06
	.7	28	do	do	154.02
	.8	27	do	do	150.96
	.8	26	do	do	149.94
	1.0	24	do	do	147.90
	1.0	22	do	do	142.80
	1.0	20	do	do	140.76

NOTE.—This applies to free U.S. dollars only and not for AID fund.

Price list—Galvanized iron sheets, River-Cherry & Brand—Size 1 meter by 2 meters

U.S. gage No.	Sheets per metric ton	Thickness	Coating (ounces per square foot)	F.o.b., U.S. dollars per metric ton	Freight, U.S. dollars per metric ton
35	304	0.198	0.80	296.00	24
34	277	.218	.80	282.50	24
33	255	.238	.80	272.50	24
32	236	.258	.80	259.50	24
31	220	.278	.80	254.50	24
30	193	.318	.80	241.50	24
29	171	.357	.80	234.50	24
28	154	.397	1.00	230.67	24
27	139	.437	1.00	219.97	24
26	129	.476	1.00	213.00	24
25	109	.556	1.00	213.00	24
24	96	.635	1.00	213.00	24
23	86	.714	1.00	213.00	24
22	78	.794	1.00	210.00	24
21	71	.873	1.00	210.00	24
20	65	.953	1.00	210.00	24

Origin: Korea.
Shipment: Within 3 months after receipt of letter of credit.
Packing: Standard export packing.

DONGKUK STEEL MILL CO., LTD.,
Seoul, Korea, February 21, 1966.

Messrs. GRIFFIN STEEL CORP.,
545 Fifth Avenue, New York City, U.S.A.

DEAR SIRS: We wish to confirm your cable dated February 17, concerning cold rolled steel sheets.

For your information, the price we are importing from Japan is C. & F. average $140US to USG26–35, 1Mx2M, cold rolled steel sheets, packed in 1 M/T bundle.

We suppose the import from U.S.A. would be difficult for us for the high f.o.b. price and freight.

Yours very truly,
DONGKUK STEEL MILL CO., LTD.,
SUKWON HA, *Director.*

REPORT ON JAPANESE PRICES FOR PLAIN AND GALVANIZED SHEETS IN THE TAIWAN AND KOREAN MARKETS

(By the U.S. Department of Commerce)

The United States is generally at a competitive price disadvantage with Japan in export markets for steel products. The Japanese steel industry is one of the world's most modern and, working from coastal locations, is designed to exploit export markets.

1. Export base price, f.o.b.[1] port of origin, cited in American Metal Market, February 21, 1966, for galvanized sheets: Japan, $130.50 per short ton.

2. The average price per ton for Japanese selected steel products landed in Taiwan and South Korea.

	Short tons	Value	Average value per ton
TAIWAN			
Galvanized sheets and plates, Japanese origin	9,784	$1,696,175	$173.36
Ungalvanized sheets and plates, Japanese origin	86,802	8,627,396	99.39
KOREA			
Plates and sheets, coated or plated with zinc or other base metals, less than 3 millimeters thick, Japanese origin	388	79,000	203.61
Plates and sheets not coated or plated, Japanese origin	15,224	2,011,000	132.09

Source: Official trade statistics of Taiwan and Korea.

3. AID is supplying South Vietnam with substandard galvanized steel products. The steelplate is thinner than any produced in the United States and it is coated with less than half the amount of zinc specified by the U.S. Bureau of Standards. With the high heat and humidity of South Vietnam, the expected lifespan of the galvanized sheets supplied for use as a roofing material is less than 6 months.

4. The U.S. balance-of-payments position is being adversely affected by AID steel purchases in the Far East. Payment for the galvanized steel products being purchased by South Vietnam is made by letter of credit redeemable in U.S. goods. Foreign steel producers have used this letter of credit to buy scrap steel from the United States that they badly need and that they normally would have to purchase with dollars.

5. The poor quality steel product that is being supplied at inflated prices accelerates the inflation of the South Vietnam economy. The corrugated steel roofing material which AID finances wears out quickly requiring semiannual replacement and creates exaggerated demands for imports of the steel. Short supply has created an 11 percent increase in the price of this commodity in Saigon in the past month. The excessive profits being paid by AID increases the cost to the South Vietnam users and contributes to the general inflationary pressures.

[From the Japan Commerce Daily, Feb. 23, 1966]

USOM TAKES NEW MEASURE FOR PURCHASE OF GI SHEET FOR SOUTH VIETNAM

According to information from dispatches of Japanese trading firms in South Vietnam, USOM (an American agency for the purchase of munitions for South Vietnam) has altered partly its way of buying galvanized iron sheet for South Vietnam as follows:

1. In addition to South Korea, galvanized iron sheet may be bought from other nations including Formosa, Thailand, and Malaysia.

2. So far, the item of goods for barter from the United States has been limited to scrap iron. It is now so prescribed that the volume of scrap iron to be bought from the United States shall be not more than 50 percent. For the balance of 50 percent, other goods may be purchased.

Meanwhile, the steelmakers here belonging to the Tuesday Meeting Club are said to have informally had an agreement with Korean makers of galvanized iron sheet that the steelmakers will not export loam plates to other nations than South Korea.

As a result of the alteration of the purchasing way by USOM, galvanized iron sheet makers in Thailand, Malaysia, and other countries will embark on export of their products to South Vietnam and accordingly request the Japanese makers for more supply of base materials. Therefore, the Japanese makers will be necessitated to adjust export of loam plates to other countries.

By the change in the volume of American scrap iron which the Japanese side is obliged to buy in exporting galvanized iron sheet to South Vietnam with AID Fund as collateral. The volume of American scrap iron to be bought by the Japanese side will be decreased to 60,000 tons from 120,000 tons in exchange for export 40,000 to 50,000 tons of cold rolled steel sheet to South Korea.

[AID small business memo issued by Department of State]

SOURCE RULING—GALVANIZED IRON AND STEEL PRODUCTS FOR VIETNAM

A decision has been made by AID that to meet high priority requirements of the Vietnam commercial import program for galvanized iron and steel products, certain Far East countries will be authorized sources under contracts for deliveries to be made on or after February 15, 1966, under the arrangements set forth below. The United States continues, of course, to be an eligible source.

The componentry limitation is waived for purchases in such Far East countries provided:

1. All the components are from free world wide sources;

2. The galvanizing is done in the source country on semifinished material:

(a) Produced in the United States, or

(b) Produced in the source country, or

(c) Produced in free world countries from U.S. source scrap to the technically maximum extent; and

3. The source country agrees to accept in payment, an irrevocable letter of credit tied to purchases from the United States. Eligible purchases from the United States under the letter of credit will be the items with a high iron or steel content which are included under the following AID commodity codes:

Code 660: Iron and steel mill products.

Code 6899: Miscellaneous metal manufactures (high iron and steel content).

Code 761: Metalworking machinery, machine tools and parts.

Code 659: Ferrous scrap (equivalent to the amount actually used in the origin country in the manufacture of the material galvanized in the source country).

It is anticipated that the Philippines, Thailand, Korea, Taiwan, and Malaysia will become approved sources after they have formally agreed to accept the above conditions. Subsequent small business memos will be issued as these countries meet the eligibility requirements.

On January 31, 1966, the U.S. AID (by small business memo No. 64–4A–23) made a source ruling which removed prior regulations which provided a 90-percent content of U.S. goods in galvanized iron and steel products for Vietnam. By this memo, the Agency brought its policy into line with the procurement practices which had been used for the past 12 to 18 months.

These procurement practices have resulted in the purchase of large quantities of steelplate from Japan at a time when competition between the United States and Japanese steel industries is growing more acute.

Previous AID directives have been aimed at removing Japan as a potential source of steel products. Japan has been removed from the list of eligible source countries because of its industrial development. The componentry ratio rulings have been put into effect to protect against indirect support of the Japanese steel industry. Memo No. 64–4A–23 changes the direction of U.S. policy to enable largescale purchase by AID of Japanese steel products—a move widely resented by U.S. industrial and labor sources.

A common size of galvanized steel sheets being purchased by the Government of Vietnam through U.S. AID financing is 32 gage with 236 sheets per ton at a price of $259.50 per ton. The steel is being purchased from Korean galvanizing mills which use Japanese black plate as base.

The Vietnamese importers are charged $259.50 per ton for galvanized (32 gage, 236 sheets per ton) purchased with U.S. AID dollars. Similar galvanized can be purchased in the open market for $162.70 per ton for the same quality galvanized. Thus, those involved in this profiteering operation are making excess profits amounting to $96.80 per ton merely by selling galvanized to the U.S AID program. On projected fiscal year 1966 purchases of $50 million worth of steelplate, the excess profits could range as high as $15 million.

AID is well aware of the previously stated allegations. Employees in AID, labor leaders, steel manufacturers, and I have urged them to take action to remedy these conditions. Despite this fact, AID determined, in a meeting held Monday evening, February 21, 1966, to withhold further consideration of the source ruling memo in question for 90 to 120 days. AID has also decided to permit the purchase of $7 to $10 million worth of galvanized plate for Vietnam under the new ruling. In addition, during the 90- to 120-day period, the Agency expects to process purchases of its fiscal year 1966 requirements for this product which may amount to $50 million.

Industry sources indicate that they fear the Agency has also decided, but not yet published, similar rulings opening the door for Japanese supply of pig iron and billets.

The steel procurement practices of AID have been widely criticized by the steel industry for many months. Following the issuance of the new procurement policy on January 31, I contacted the Agency and asked them to reverse their policy position. Their response to my request and those of other Members of Congress have been answered with a lack of candor and substance and a great deal of sarcasm. It is apparent that we can only stop these practices by legislative action. If we expect the American foreign aid program to provide the maximum benefit to recipient countries and, at the same time, to continue to merit the support of the American people, it is imperative that such practices as have been exposed in the purchase of galvanized steel products for South Vietnam be eliminated. We must not allow U.S. taxpayers' dollars to support and subsidize competitors to the U.S. steel industries in such developed nations as Japan. We must not allow prices paid for purchases financed by AID to be exorbitant and provide excess benefits to foreign or domestic manufacturers.

---

[1] The base prices do not reflect any charges for extras or discounts.

With the above in mind, I strongly urge you to support the attached amendment to H.R. 12169.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, for the sake of saving time of Senators, I shall briefly summarize what the amendment would do.

First, I invite the attention of the Senate to existing practices which we desire to correct. Before proceeding, let me say, in deference to the Senator in charge of the bill, that I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the committee, and I have discussed the philosophy, with which he is in accord, and I must say that he has not seen the final wording of the amendment, but we have tried our best to put in wording which he and I discussed relating to a practice which he agreed was deplorable which had been called to our attention.

This bill and previous foreign aid funds have been used to help in the pacification efforts going on in South Vietnam. We found that one of the items of prestige among the villagers in South Vietnam is a corrugated steel roof over some of their huts. This kind of roofing does away with the necessity of replacing a thatched roof after every major rain or heavy wind.

We plan this year—indeed, during the very next few weeks—to spend approximately $50 million to purchase galvanized steel roofing for this purpose.

Up until January 31, AID was operating under one of its own memorandums which required a 90-percent-component regulation to be adhered to in the purchase of this particular commodity.

In other words, 90 percent of the commodity had to come from U.S. steel mills and had to be manufactured by U.S. steelworkers, produced in the economy of the United States, in States such as Alabama, Indiana, and other States.

However, for some reason not yet made clear to me, as of that date, AID decided to dispense with that regulation. This was called to our attention, and in investigating it we found that for the past 12 to 18 months AID had not even been policing or adhering to their own regulation, that what they had been doing, what they planned to continue to do, and what my amendment would seek to prevent them from doing in the future, is as follows:

AID has been purchasing steelplate from Japan, sending it to Korea, where it is then galvanized and sold by AID funds purchased by the Vietnamese.

The most damning feature of this whole practice is that our AID funds are being utilized to pay between $90 and $100 a ton more for the purchase of this galvanized roofing material than could be purchased by anyone else who wished to purchase it.

In other words, the specific figures are in the memorandum, which points out that $96.80 per ton is the difference between what we are receiving through AID and what the Japanese galvanized product can be purchased for on the open market for export.

Another thing which has come to light on close examination is the fact that we found the quality of the material was far inferior to what we demand in our own country under environmental conditions which are not nearly so strenuous as those in Vietnam, because of the high humidity, heat, and moisture content in that country. We do not have to discuss further what this kind of weather will do to a metal product.

But, in looking at this profiteering product being sold with the purchase of our AID funds, we find that it is half as thick as the normally accepted product would be in this country, that it is galvanized only half as much as that required by the Bureau of Standards in this country.

We find that this has a particular "wrinkle" with some of the people engaged in the business in South Vietnam, because if it is manufactured only half as thick they get twice as many sheets per ton. In Vietnam it is sold by the sheet, not by the ton, so they make twice as much profit on it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield briefly?

Mr. BAYH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have read the proposed amendment. There have been complaints in my own State about the same matter the able Senator from Indiana brought up, I fully support his position. It ties into many things which my friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I have felt about the foreign aid programs for some time.

It shows, in my opinion, that at least to some extent the aid program is not practicing what it preaches with regard to the serious and growing more serious problem incident to our balance of payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I hope this amendment will be adopted unanimously by the Senate.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 1 minute has expired.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BAYH. Let me point out that inasmuch as this material is galvanized in Korean mills and thus sustains, to some degree, the Korean economy, I realize the significance that this might well play in negotiation which the administration is presently involved in, so far as greater Korean participation in South Vietnam is concerned.

I would not want my amendment to be interpreted in any way as interfering with that negotiation, but I see no reason for the United States to pay for Japanese steel as much as $100 a ton more than they would sell it to anyone else. I can see no reason why we cannot take steel manufactured in this country, ship it as black plate to Korea, let them galvanize it, and let them then sell it to the Vietnamese, minus the huge, almost 60 percent profiteering element involved.

I thank the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon, for their patience and tolerance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had not had the privilege of discussing this matter with the Senator from Indiana prior to a few minutes ago. However, he had discussed it with the chairman of the committee and my understanding is that the chairman of the committee was in agreement with him.

It seems to me that the amendment does have merit. The fact is, I am rather shocked by the fact that such practices are being carried on, because we have been told time after time that when materials had to be purchased under the AID program, none was purchased from the industrialized countries with our dollars.

In other words, that the purchases would be made in the United States, or, if they had to be made in foreign countries, they would be purchased from nonindustrialized countries.

I believe that has been the general practice under the AID program. From what the Senator from Indiana has said, it does not seem that that has been carried out in connection with steel purchases.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for just one observation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator is absolutely right, I wish to show the technicality. I suppose to be correct, the final, finished product, is being purchased from Korea, but the bulk of it is steel which is purchased in Japan, which is an industrialized nation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What percentage did the Japanese purchase make as compared to Korea?

Mr. BAYH. It was $140 a ton. AID is buying it for $259 but we figure galvanizing costs between $30 and $40. They are galvanizing it, but we are giving them the zinc to galvanize it. But here again, I am not debating or arguing the feature of letting the Koreans galvanize it. I am perfectly willing to go along with that feature of it, but it is the exorbitant difference between the price of Japanese black plate and that of the final, finished product, that I think we need to strike at. I believe that the mills can provide that same product, to be galvanized by the Koreans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would feel much better about this amendment if the committee had had an opportunity to check into it; but I certainly cannot find fault with it. Therefore, acting as manager of the bill, I am willing to accept it.

I yield back my time on the amendment.

Mr. BAYH. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, last week I submitted for printing an amendment to H.R. 12169, to raise the authorization in the AID supplemental by $10 million.

The $10 million increase in my amendment was for a specific purpose. Its purpose was to set aside this increase to be utilized under existing authority of the foreign aid bill for contributions to international agencies, specifically the United Nations, for programs directed toward the humane problems of refugees in South Vietnam.

Some time ago I visited the United Nations, meeting with a number of independent agencies there. I talked with them about the programs they had undertaken in South Vietnam. They indicated that there were a number of U.N. programs currently in Vietnam but on a rather limited basis—as a matter of fact, to the extent of only about $2 million.

The United Nations agencies involved in those programs are UNICEF, the U.N. Development Program, WHO, UNESCO, ILO, World Food Program, and FAO. Approximately 80 percent of the total expenditures of the U.N. agencies are for social projects such as refugees, education, health, and the like. There was, in addition, a special fund project approved on January 18, 1966, of $1.5 million for a national technical center in Saigon, principally engineering training.

My conversations with the various agencies in that organization led me to the belief that there could be expanded programs in Vietnam in the field of refugees and in general to help disadvantaged people.

One of the critical needs these various agencies mentioned was additional support. They outlined the procedure which they called funds in trust, to which a country, or a foundation, or even an individual could contribute for a specific purpose under the auspices of one of the U.N. agencies.

It was the intention of the amendment to provide that $10 million could be contributed by the United States after a request came from the South Vietnamese Government to the agencies for programs which would help in the field of refugees and in meeting civilian needs.

I understand this amendment was considered by the Foreign Relations Committee in executive session. And I understand, it was considered to have a meritorious purpose.

It was determined within the Foreign Relations Committee, that there were sufficient funds available under the contingency section of the supplemental measure to meet the needs.

As a matter of fact, I received a letter from Mr. David E. Bell, Administrator of AID, on this subject which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. But first Mr. President, I would like to read two sections of the letter.

Mr. Bell writes that:

> The Agency for International Development welcomes your active interest and efforts in this matter, but we believe sufficient legislative authority and—assuming passage of the supplemental request—funds are available to meet foreseeable needs.

In the last part of the letter it is stated:

> I can assure you that the United States will support such feasible and constructive U.N. programs as are requested by the Government of Vietnam to meet the needs of the civilian population.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1966.

The Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: You have asked for comment on your proposed amendment to authorize additional funds to assist U.N. and other international organizations social and economic programs in Vietnam, particularly those directed to meet the needs of the civilian refugee population.

The Agency for International Development welcomes your active interest and efforts in this matter, but we believe sufficient legislative authority and—assuming passage of the supplemental request—funds are available to meet foreseeable needs. A major effort is now being undertaken to meet the problems of the Vietnamese refugees. This assistance will be furnished under the existing authority of section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

In addition, the President is authorized under section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act to use the contingency fund for this purpose. The supplemental request for the contingency fund ($100 million) provides the necessary flexibility to meet any sudden increases in the need for refugee assistance. The contingency fund may be used for direct U.S. assistance, or may be used to support programs of international organizations.

Under existing authority of section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act, the President is authorized to make voluntary contributions to international organizations for their work in Vietnam. Efforts are being made to increase the assistance which the U.N. and its specialized agencies are extending to Vietnam, and if additional U.S. contributions are required, funds available from the supplemental appropriation can be used. I can assure you that the United States will support such feasible and constructive U.N. programs as are requested by the Government of Vietnam to meet the needs of the civilian population.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am satisfied at this point that the purpose for which this amendment was intended to be introduced has been met; that Mr. Bell has indicated it is the intention of the United States to support U.N. agency efforts in meeting civilian needs in Vietnam; and I want at this time to express to the Senator from Alabama and to all members of the committee appreciation for their consideration of this matter.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am a member of the Senator's subcommittee. First, I wish to state that I stand with the Senator in his desire to have the United Nations facilities used in this respect. The U.N. can play a very constructive role in Vietnam and particularly in the refugee problem.

I, too, have had the privilege of talking with the agencies. I have talked in particular to Prince Sadri Khan, the High Commissioner of the U.N. for refugees. We agree that it would be a most constructive act.

So I join with my colleague in his efforts.

I would like to make one point. I was in Vietnam, as was the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. United States policy is that the Saigon government is essentially responsible for the needs of the refugees, and that this government is not doing as well as it could or should about the refugees. The administration and care of the refugees in refugee camps is the responsibility of the Saigon government. I think that should be emphasized. But it is also true, and must be equally emphasized, that the United States has the responsibility to prod the Saigon government into taking more effective measures for and making more funds available to the refugees. The President of the United States says that we are interested in these unhappy people, but the amount of money budgeted to help them does not show a great enough recognition of the humanitarian problem of the refugees. We must give more, and we must see that what we do give actually reaches the hands of the people who need it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator from New York is correct in that observation. It has been mentioned that we are putting up some funds. I think the Senator will admit that the funds are woefully inadequate.

Mr. JAVITS. Completely.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I think the Senator will realize that the present bill provides only $20.3 million for total refugee support. About $4.6 million of this is the estimate of Public Law 480 products for refugees; another $4 million is for logistics, provincial operations, and medical support; leaving a total of only $11 million for refugee relief out of the entire supplemental amount of $415 million. And of the $11 million for refugee relief, some $10.6 million was obligated last fall. So hopefully, we are talking about $1 million left for the relief of our 700,000 people.

Mr. JAVITS. Woefully inadequate.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that the Saigon government, which has not done nearly as much as it should do with respect to the refugee problem, should do something more, and that if the refugee program is made a strong one, it will be one of the most effective anti-Vietcong forces? These refugees represent those very same people who used to live in the villages run by the Vietcong. These are the people whose hearts and minds we must win in order to pursue our real objectives in Vietnam. If they are left in squalor, the military effort will be to no real avail. We in the Senate must insist that the refugee problem is properly taken care of.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I agree with the Senator from New York. But I would note that in the last 2 weeks there has been a reorganization undertaken in Saigon. Additional expressions have been made by Mr. Bell and others in authority with respect to the organization and commitment of the Saigon government of additional funds.

As a member of the Refugee Subcommittee, the Senator from New York was extremely helpful in developing recommendations which were introduced in the Senate, outlining the specific areas in which there can be progress made.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Massachusetts is the chairman of the subcommittee. Of course, we would have to have the consent of the chairman of the full committee [Mr. EASTLAND], on this, but would the Senator not think we should have hearings on this matter so that the dimensions of it may be brought to light, and so the problems involved may be exposed, so we may thereby get more help in solving it?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. We will certainly continue the series of hearings that were commenced last year and continued for many months. I do feel that we are hopeful that the recommendations made in the last report will be considered and considered constructively and, with the help of the Senator from New York, we shall continue to oversee their implementation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts intend to offer his amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I feel that I have sufficient assurances that both the financial resources and the intent to use these resources are present for these U.N. programs to get underway in Vietnam. Therefore, I do not feel it necessary to press this amendment at this point in time.

Again, I appreciate the interest that has been shown by both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Department of State in this matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that I be recognized for 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

The Senator from Massachusetts has done a real service, in pointing up this problem, not only on the floor of the Senate but in the hearings held by his subcommittee and in the report that he has issued as a result of those hearings. The report is informative and interesting, and I commend its reading to every Senator.

I certainly believe that he has a strong point in urging the necessity of doing something further for the refugees. I believe that he refers to refugees and defectees in the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the bill for the following reasons: The first point I wish to make is that the Senate is again abdicating, in my judgment, its obligations and duties to the American people in the field of foreign aid.

Here is a so-called supplemental bill for an additional $415 million of foreign aid. Let us face it. This is an additional $415 million of foreign aid, and a refusal on the part of the Senate—certainly on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate—to adopt a policy that will save the American people hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign aid elsewhere in the world.

My position in the committee and now on the floor of the Senate is that if we are going to give an additional $415 million in a package to Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Laos, and Thailand, we ought to give the taxpayers assurance that we will save at least that much of foreign aid expenditure elsewhere. This administration is doing great damage to our domestic program by not providing the necessary funds to support a strong domestic program.

Except in war areas, such as southeast Asia, there is a greater need for this administration to support the domestic aid program in the United States than to support the wasteful, inefficient, and corruption-causing foreign aid program that it has been supporting in many parts of the world.

This administration is continuing to waste hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money as it sends that money down wasteful drains in foreign aid around the world. We cannot get an understanding out of the Senate that if we give an additional $415 million for foreign aid in southeast Asia, the Senate will commit itself to the taxpayers of the United States to save an equal amount elsewhere in the world.

This administration wants this additional $415 million and wants to continue the foreign aid at the increased level that its plans for the next fiscal year encompass. What will be the end of this?

At the same time, we cut the milk program for the schoolchildren in the United States. We are for milk for Hottentots. I am, too, but I am for milk for the undernourished little boys and girls in the United States who will be lost if we do not check this President.

Let me tell where the responsibility is. I do not go along with my colleagues in the Senate who are trying to save the President from responsibility. This is the responsibility of the President of the United States, and of no one else. Do not give me the argument of passing the buck to the Budget Bureau or the State Department or the Department of Defense. This responsibility rests right on the lap of the President of the United States.

I say to the American people, "Hold him responsible, for it is his responsibility."

We have a program here, let me say, for an additional $415 million without any commitment from the Senate that it is going to cut off at least that amount wherever it can cut it, in foreign aid programs elsewhere in the world.

My first point is that we should not pass this bill today unless we first agree to an amendment that would require the saving of at least $415 million out of other foreign aid programs in noncombatant areas of the world.

I wish now to discuss my first amendment. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate. I do not offer it now.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "$684,200,000" and substitute therefor "$671,700,000."

Mr. MORSE. What this amendment does, Mr. President, is cut the figure of $25 million of additional aid to the Dominican Republic provided in the bill to $12,500,000.

I presented this amendment in the Foreign Relations Committee, and only three of us voted for it, but that does not mean that I was mistaken. In fact, Mr. President, in my judgment, the larger the vote against me in the Senate these days, the more convinced I am of the correctness of my position, because I know what produces those votes.

Mr. President, here we are, intervening in the Dominican Republic at great loss to our prestige in Latin America. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Republics Affairs, I say that history is going to show that our course of conduct in the Dominican Republic will be a sad story, a black chapter against our country in future history books.

We are intervenors in the Dominican Republic, and have been from the very beginning. We have been from the very time when it was first made known to the people of the United States that the military junta that was ruling the Dominican Republic at the time had sent a cablegram to our Government saying it could not protect American nationals, and therefore we should send in the Marines.

But the administration forgot to tell the American people that our Ambassador in the Dominican Republic asked that military junta to send that cablegram. We were intervenors from the beginning, Mr. President, and we have lost great face throughout Latin America because of that course of action.

Let us face reality. We proposed $25 million, and I am saying—although I would not have us intervening at all, we are there—that the realities call for our cutting that in half, and saying to the other Latin American countries, "Where are you? Are you unwilling to put up the other $12½ million?"

Where is the Organization of American States? Has it become just a facade? Has it become just a symbol? Or is it to be an activating body, in accordance with its charter, to help maintain peace and help bring about stability in troubled zones in Latin America?

The time has come for our country to serve notice on the countries of Latin America that if they do not recognize a mutuality of responsibility for maintaining peace and stability in Latin America, we are going to stop footing the bill and putting ourselves in a position where we are being attacked—and with justification, I am sorry to say—as returning to a policy of American intervention in Latin America.

That policy, Mr. President, is creating Communists by the thousands throughout Latin America. That policy is playing into the hands of Communists in Latin America. For that policy is a policy of supporting military juntas and walking out, again, on freedom.

Oh, I know that the present administration, including the Secretary of State, Mr. Vaughn and Mr. Mann and others, do not like to hear anyone document the many instances in which we have walked out on freedom in Latin America; but we have been walking out on freedom in Latin America and the Dominican Republic.

I have received a letter, under date of February 16, from Juan Bosch, the former President of the Dominican Republic, overthrown by the military junta which we supported instead of constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic—which was one of our later examples of walking out on freedom in Latin America.

Mr. Bosch writes me, under date of February 16, as follows:

> DEAR FRIEND: According to the cables which have been published here Mr. John Vaughn declared to you that the Government of the United States had given my government $65 million.
>
> Mr. Vaughn has proved with his declaration that he is either an inept official or that he does not tell the truth. My government received from the United States $34,700,000 in cash, part of that sum through the sugar grant which had been retained and which was therefore Dominican money, and $15,800,000 in agriculture surpluses, food of Care and Caritas, and services of the Peace Corps.
>
> I want to clarify to you that my government did not spend the $34,700,000 in cash, but less than $20 million. The remainder was used by the triumvirate which governed after the coup d'etat of 1963.
>
> In the name of the Dominican people I want to thank you for the energetic defense which you have made the law of nonintervention without which it is impossible to maintain international comity.
>
> With cordial regards.
>
> JUAN BOSCH.

Mr. President, our democratic friends in Latin America recognized the soundness of the position of Juan Bosch. I think it is most unfortunate that we are again stamping ourselves, in this bill, as interventionists, by saying that we will put up the whole $25 million which our authorities say is needed to carry out the program that they envision—although I have a great many reservations as to that program, by the way. But we may as well accept the major premise that that program will be carried forward. Every Senator knows that we are going to have the program. We do not have a chance to stop it yet. We will have to wait for the American people to vote, in the future, before we shall be able to stop our unsound foreign policy. So we are confronted with the fact that faces us today: The administration has the votes to continue its unjustifiable policies of intervention in Latin America.

The bill calls for $25 million; but I think, Mr. President, we ought to get some support. At least we should demand that half of the money should come from the other Latin American countries, and find out what leaders in Latin America there are who will come in and make at least a reasonable contribution to what should be an OAS program and not a U.S. program. Much of the difficulty in Latin America stems from the fact that it is a U.S.-dominated program, and not an OAS-dominated program. Until we return to the policy of mutuality upon which the OAS charter is based, we shall continue to create a blackened image for ourselves throughout Latin America, to create Communists by the thousands, and to walk out again on freedom in Latin America.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment on the Dominican Republic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "$684,200,000" and substitute "$671,700,000."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

I said earlier that in my judgment the United States stands convicted as an intervenor in the Dominican Republic; that in my judgment that intervention cannot be reconciled with the charter of the Organization of American States. Earlier in my speech I read the letter from Juan Bosch, the former President of the Dominican Republic, who, as we know, was overthrown by a military junta that the United States, to its historic shame, supported, and subsequently it intervened with military forces, and for all intents and purposes is now the dominant force in the Dominican Republic.

That is the record, Mr. President. I want to see us change that record. There is no hope under this administration of the United States stopping its policies of military intervention in the Dominican Republic and anywhere else in the world that it is decided we ought to take the position of determining for other people what their course of action should be within their own area.

But, Mr. President, I do think that the time has come when we should insist that other Latin American countries assume some responsibility, including financial responsibility in respect to such a situation as presently exists in the Dominican Republic.

I make this plea to the American people for I am talking more to the American people today than I am to the Senate. It is only the American people who can bring the Senate under control, and also the Johnson administration.

I want the RECORD to show what our assistance has been to the Dominican Republic from the date of April 24, 1965, to March 5, 1966.

Mr. President, for supporting assistance grants for Government operations and maintenance, $86,300,000. That consists of funds administered through OAS, $57,000,000; and funds administered—AID, $29,300,000. For technical corporation grants, $4,636,000. The latter sum is broken down as follows: Agriculture, $941,000; education, $396,000; transportation, $212,000. For public administration, and that means to pay for running their government—and do not forget to pay for running a government that has been characterized by military junta domination—$1,161,000. For community development, $128,000; and for other projects, $1,718,000. For development loans, $5 million; food for peace, $7,858,000; military expenses—over and above, may I say, the $86,300,000—$31,300,000. That is for expenses over and above that normally required to maintain our forces, and assistance to other members of the Inter-American Peace Force.

This is a tremendous sum of money, for when one adds to the $25 million that is called for by this supplemental, one gets the grand total of $142,600,000 of aid to the Dominican Republic starting April 24, 1965, not including the large amount of aid we have given to the Dominican Republic prior to April 24, 1965.

Now, what is the senior Senator from Oregon trying to do with regard to this amendment? I am trying to call a halt to our paying the total bill. I am trying to find out whether or not we have any financial support in Latin America, as well as policy support. I would like to eliminate the entire amount.

The OAS or the members thereof should pick up this whole bill of the additional $25 million, if needed. I have grave doubts whether it is needed, but I have to proceed on these assumptions.

It would be helpful if the United States said that we will pick up one-half of this, but others should put up $12½ million. It would be helpful to our Latin American friends.

We have not only the expression of Juan Bosch in the letter that I read earlier this afternoon in the Senate, but our democratic friends in the few countries in Latin America in which there still exist so-called democracies, would be greatly encouraged if they could taper off the intervention on the part of the United States in Latin America.

I have urged the amendment on that basis. I urged it earlier as I said in the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator CLARK and Senator FULBRIGHT voted with me. But the fact that others did not vote with me does not mean that there was not great sympathy for the position of the senior Senator from Oregon.

But what is the excuse that the majority on the Foreign Relations Committee have in regard to this amendment and other amendments? I shall talk about the other amendments such as the Fulbright amendment and the McGovern amendment and other amendments offered, when I go to the bill proper. They say, "This bill is not the proper vehicle." The difficulty in the Senate is that we can never find the proper vehicle for Senators who have great reservations about this administration's foreign policies, for Senators greatly concerned about what they have been drawn into by this administration's foreign policy, are prone, whenever there is a vote on the floor of the Senate, to get up and say, "I want to tell you what my vote does not mean. My vote does not mean that I am giving a blank check. My vote does not mean that I approve the escalation of the war. My vote does not mean that I am giving carte blanche authority. My vote does not mean this or that."

But they still vote to continue that very policy, and I say in all fairness to the administration, that the language makes it perfectly clear what their votes mean. The fact is that Senators have been giving the administration carte blanche authority. The fact is that Senators have been giving the administration the authority to exercise the arbitrary discretion it has been exercising in foreign policy in regard to foreign policy votes.

I want to see this practice tapered off. This is a good place to start. We should say, "We will not give you $25 million; we will give you $12.5 million. Then we will see if other countries in Latin America will accept the opportunity to contribute at least a part of the cost."

If we continue our present course of action, we will end by financing Dominican Republic affairs for some time to come, and if military juntas elsewhere observe that this practice is so profitable, we shall be encouraging other military juntas to follow a similar course of action. There is no doubt that we are already discouraging our democratic allies in Latin America.

Mr. President, I am sorry that the majority leader is not in the Chamber, for he has assured me that he will help me to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on any amendment that I shall offer today. I have finished my case on this amendment. I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. If it meets with the pleasure of the acting manager of the bill, I should like to suggest that there be a brief quorum call, to bring enough Senators to the Chamber, so that we may decide whether it will be possible to have a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield I will make a few remarks; and then shall be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum, in an effort to obtain the yeas and nays for a vote on the Senator's amendment and shall support the Senator in his effort to obtain a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Missouri yield himself?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Do I correctly understand that I have 15 minutes in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield myself 12 minutes.

NEED FOR FULL $25 MILLION SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION FOR DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

I urge the rejection of this amendment.

As a result of severe economic and political instability following the April 1965 revolution, additional supporting assistance funds—$25 million—are necessary to:

First. Help the provisional government create and maintain the kind of stable environment which is essential if the elections planned for June 1 are to be held.

Second. Help the provisional government meet current and necessary obligations so that a newly elected government is not faced with an immediate financial crisis which would threaten its existence.

A cut from the $25 million supplemental request could seriously impair these objectives and undermine U.S. efforts to secure a more stable and progressive future for the Dominican Republic.

A cut would reduce the amount now planned—$15 million—to help finance current budget expenditures of the provisional government. The full $15 million is required for wages of employees and other operating costs which are essential simply to maintain a functioning government prior to the June elections.

A cut would also reduce the $10 million which AID plans to use for public works activities in the Dominican Republic—community development, assistance to agriculture, road maintenance and irrigation rehabilitation. These kinds of activities are all-important in the coming months to improve the life of the people and to provide more than 62,000 man-months of employment.

Other nations in the Western Hemisphere have responded to the call for assistance to the Dominican Republic following the April revolution. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Panama, Uruguay, Venezuela—all have responded generously. Mexico, for example, has contributed many tons of food and valuable supplies of medicine as well as more than 1,000 tons of needed foods. In addition, five Latin American countries—Brazil, Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay—have provided troops for the Inter-American Peace Force in the Dominican Republic.

The committee considered—and rejected—a proposal to cut the funds for the Dominican Republic. The full amount is needed if the U.S. objective of a stable Dominican Republic is to be achieved.

Mr. President, I shall now speak briefly on the bill itself.

VIETNAM AID BILL

We are being asked to approve an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which would authorize in fiscal 1966 the appropriation of an additional $275 million in economic assistance for South Vietnam, $7.5 million for Thailand, and $7.5 million for Laos.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has reported out this amendment by a vote of 18 to 1. In addition, two amendments which, in my opinion, would have worked against our position in Vietnam were defeated in committee by votes of 13 to 6 and 14 to 5.

These votes made it clear to friend and foe alike that an overwhelming majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations wants to provide all necessary support for our troops in South Vietnam.

Some opposition, nevertheless, has been expressed on the grounds that the adoption of this amendment would be tantamount to accepting the President's view of the powers which have been granted him under the Tonkin Gulf resolution, the SEATO Treaty, and the U.S. Constitution; also that its passage would involve an extension of American military commitments.

I do not propose to debate here what commitments this Nation has already made to Vietnam, or for that matter to Laos or Thailand; nor do I think it profitable to discuss at this point whether the granting of economic assistance necessarily carries with it a commitment to supply military aid in the future if such aid is later required. For the fact remains that we have already authorized the appropriation, in fiscal 1966, of over $266 million in economic assistance for South Vietnam, $55 million to Laos, and $24.5 million to Thailand. Can it be seriously argued, for example, that adding $7.5 million to the $55 million we have already authorized for Laos somehow changes the nature or extent of the American commitment? I do not believe so. Whatever military commitments already exist will neither be enlarged nor diminished by the adoption of this amendment.

What is before us is not either the nature, or the degree, of the American commitment to other nations, rather the degree of support that we are willing to provide our own men and their allies in Vietnam. The commitment involved is the commitment to supply these troops with the tools they need to handle the job that has been assigned to them.

For while it is true that today we are being called upon to authorize the appropriation of funds for economic assistance rather than for military support, the fact is, as surely we all realize, that in the broad overall struggle for Vietnam, the items included under the heading of economic assistance are every bit as necessary as items included under the heading of military assistance. To borrow an overused but accurate phrase, we are involved in a struggle for the hearts and minds of the people.

While their jobs may have less glamour and attract less attention, the American provincial representatives assisting in the distribution of food or fertilizer, the doctor injecting penicillin into a Vietnamese child, play roles comparable to that of the foot soldier slogging through the rice paddies.

The free Vietnam which we are seeking to preserve should not be undermined by economic and social chaos and despair; but without these nonmilitary efforts, it would be only too possible to keep on winning military battles while losing the political war.

Much of the funds now being requested for Vietnam go even more directly to the support of our troops. As example, measures for police protection against assassination, torture, and terror will be funded by what we are asked to authorize today.

In this unusual war, it is not enough for our troops to push Vietcong combat units out of an area. The area must then be made secure by winning the positive loyalty of the villagers, convincing them that their interests require identification with the Government. Only then will they reveal the cells of Vietcong terror left behind to reestablish control over the villages.

Only yesterday I read an article which stated that the people in the villages of South Vietnam were now reporting who was or was not in their particular locality among the Vietcong.

And unless those cells are removed and the positive loyalty of the villagers won, that area could fall again into Vietcong hands after the South Vietnamese and our own troops depart. Then once again we and our allies would be forced to engage in the same task of driving out Vietcong combat units.

The task of pacifying these areas, of gaining the support of the villagers, of establishing government within the villages—these crucial tasks are all supported by the funds we are now being asked to authorize.

All Communists in North and South Vietnam, all Communists everywhere, know today that the United States does not intend to be driven out of Vietnam. They believe, therefore, that their only hope lies in a weakening of our determination to see this struggle through; and based on that hope, they watch constantly all that happens in this country, in an effort to find any sign that our determination may be faltering.

Failure to pass this bill could only be interpreted as a failure to back up our combat units and their needed support. It would, therefore, discourage our friends and embolden our foes; and make that much less likely the prospect that Hanoi will agree to negotiations. By prolonging the war it could only lengthen our casualty lists.

On the floor of the Senate we recently passed overwhelmingly a supplemental defense authorization bill. All the considerations which led us to support that bill should require us to support this bill. Otherwise, we will be failing the men and women in Vietnam who are working and fighting for freedom.

In closing Mr. President, I was sorry to note that an outpost of the special forces of the United States, the so-called green beret troops, at Ashau, near Laos, has now fallen.

Three members of the special force team were picked up. We are certain, therefore, that 3 of the 12 got away, and there is a possibility that 6 more got away by means of escape or evasion.

Casualties will be heavy among the some 300 to 400 South Vietnamese troops who were there, because the base is now overrun. We know that because one of the courageous Americans left in Ashau requested that the air attack be directed against the base; that is, against him. Apparently he knew they were, or were going to be, overrun.

My point in bringing this matter up is that all such outposts are working very hard to win over the confidence and trust of the villagers in their respective localities; and the passage of this bill will help them be even more successful in attaining such confidence.

I am certain that this bill will help us in that effort by giving medical supplies, food, and confidence to the people there who want to avoid the aggression and brutal terror of the Vietcong. At the same time, these people naturally fear reprisals if they work with the South Vietnamese and with the American troops.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understood from the majority leader that when the Senator from Missouri concluded his talk he would suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is what I was going to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to ask unanimous consent for a quorum call even though all of the time has not been used?

Mr. MORSE. The majority leader suggested that we have a quorum call with the understanding that it will not count against my time. This quorum call would be for the purpose of obtaining the attendance of Senators. It will not be counted against my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It requires unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call and that the time for the quorum call not be charged against my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining on my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment the opposition of the Senator from Missouri to the amendment and his statement in support of his opposition do not meet the major premise that the senior Senator from Oregon has laid down.

I am not questioning the fact that there has been this large expenditure. I am saying that these other countries ought to come in and assist us with the proposal for an additional $25 million.

The Senator cited a group of Latin American countries that have been of assistance to us in the Dominican Republic. I want to say that their support has been in driblet form compared with what we have spent in intervention. Even in connection with their military forces, we do the paying. We are footing the bill.

I have already in my opening statement called attention to the $31 billion-plus that we have used to pay for these military operations.

The Senator points out that we are paying this money to governmental sources. That is true. I pointed that out, too. However, when will it stop?

I made my argument for a tapering-off program, but the essence of my argument is that now is the time for us to say quite frankly to the members of the Organization of American States: "You ought to come in under the basis of that charter and assume responsibility for bringing about stability in the Dominican Republic. You ought to be of help to us in changing our image in Latin America."

They have a hand out for all the aid that we will give them, with which to pay for their soldiery and for whatever little they do in connection with assisting in the Dominican Republic. Then, with the other hand they punch our image and point out that what we are doing is following a course of intervention—and we are.

I am asking for intervention by the Organization of American States, and not by the United States.

I am seeking to get it regularized and formalized under the charter of the Organization that should be the policy maker in Latin America, and not the United States. This is the place for us—and we would be very generous to do so—to say, "We will put up the $12½ million of the $25 million required, but we ask that the other countries put up the rest of the $25 million."

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield back the reminder of his time?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] would each note "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 75, as follows:

[No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—7

Byrd, Va.
Fulbright
Gruening
Morse
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—75

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—18

Bayh
Church
Clark
Harris
Hayden
Hruska
Kuchel
Lausche
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Scott
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Morse's amendment was rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

ABSENCE OF SENATORS CLARK AND SCOTT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by Senators Clark and Scott on the pending bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senators Clark and Scott on H.R. 12169

Mr. President, as members of the Pennsylvania State Planning Board, our presence is required at a meeting today in Harrisburg of great importance to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The board is considering the allocation of funds for the different aspects of the Appalachian regional development program in Pennsylvania.

We want the Record to show that if we were present to vote on final passage of H.R. 12169, the bill authorizing the appropriation of an additional $415 million in foreign assistance for fiscal year 1966, including $275 million of supporting assistance for Vietnam, we would vote "aye."

UNITED STATES–U.S.S.R. CONFERENCE ON MIDDLE EAST ARMS RACE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate upon a foreign policy matter which, at the moment, is not right in the storm's eye in terms of the fact that there is no "hot war" raging there, but which has such potential for mischief that it is important to have it out on the floor of the Senate in order that the country and administration may give it some attention.

One of the most important aspects of the struggle in Vietnam is that the struggle should be on one front only, and that we should do our utmost to see that we do not become involved on other fronts in the world, thereby complicating our problems.

Therefore, I am going to speak now about the arms race taking place in the Middle East.

At a time when U.S. attention, quite properly, is centered on our policy and developments in Vietnam and southeast Asia, a disquieting situation is developing in the Middle East. The buildup of sophisticated arms, threats of renewed warfare in the Yemen, internal discontent and revolts in the Arab States, eruptions of inter-Arab rivalries, and the intransigence of the Arabs toward Israel all represent real and present dangers to Middle East peace.

But even more importantly, the fact that both the United States and the Soviet Union are supplying arms to nations in the Middle East has sowed seeds of another possible confrontation between East and West, a confrontation that need not occur.

Certainly, the time has now come to launch a major international effort to consolidate the shaky Middle East peace and remove a possible source of conflict between the United States and the U.S.S.R. before, not after, an international crisis erupts in this region. This effort must include two principal elements, and I strongly recommend their implementation by our Government.

First. An understanding must be reached with the Soviet Union on the deescalation of the arms race in the Middle East, an arms race not only involving the dispute between the Arab States and Israel, but also the many disputes among the Arab States. To this end, I urge the administration to invite the Soviet Union to a conference for the purpose of ending shipments of arms and materials of war to the Middle East.

I point out, notwithstanding the fact that the Soviet Union is involved up to its neck in Vietnam, this has not stopped the U.S.S.R. from taking the diplomatic initiative, for example, with respect to India and Pakistan as it did in Tashkent. In my judgment the situation in Vietnam would not prevent them from responding to the kind of invitation which I have suggested.

Second. We must do all we can to renew our efforts to promote an understanding between the Arab States and Israel. To this end, I suggest that we use all diplomatic channels open to us and that we do so by urging the convening of a conference of all the nations of the Middle East, and all other nations having vital interests in that region, in order to make practical plans for the development of the entire region, and to pursue the possibility of permanent peace there.

The present lull in actual hostilities in the Middle East is deceptive. The Middle East today is still a smoldering fire which can be whipped into a disastrous conflagration by any of the winds of discontent which continually sweep the area. The fuel for the conflagration is accumulating through the arms race and could be ignited by the ambitions of the United Arab Republic's ambitious President Nasser.

Dangerous as are the prospects of a devastating war in the Middle East, however, the potentials for peace are also within our reach. The world climate favors negotiations as a solution to international problems—the world concern for negotiations to end the Vietnam crisis and the support for the Tashkent talks carried on by the Soviet Union, India, and Pakistan are evidence of this. The U.S.S.R. performed commendably in its role as mediator at Tashkent in the settlement of the longstanding hostilities between India and Pakistan, and certainly in arranging a cease-fire when there was actual war between the two countries. This is a momentum which should not be allowed to be lost.

The Communist East has already given evidence that Middle East talks could serve constructive ends. Just last month, Hungarian Premier Gulya Kallai, in a press conference climaxing his visit to the Arab kingdom of Kuwait, declared himself in favor of Arab-Israel negotiations.

The blood feud between India and Pakistan dates from 1947, the year those two nations became independent. This was the year before Israel attained nationhood after extensive warfare waged by the Arabs. The internecine battles among the Arab States have at least equally as long a history. If the spirit of Tashkent could bring India and Pakistan together, with the Soviets as a principal arbiter, there is good reason to assay a similar effort among the nations of the Middle East. The United States should now plainly and strongly indicate its willingness to pursue such an effort and make every endeavor to persuade the Soviets to join.

Let us deal with the first prerequisite to such a peace move—deescalation of the arms race. The continued existence of an uneasy balance between opposing forces in the Middle East serves to cloak the most significant change in the status quo since the United States, France, and Great Britain issued the Tripartite Declaration in May 1950, guaranteeing the Israeli-Arab armistice lines. In 1950 the world did not have to contend with a significant Soviet presence in the Middle East. Today—in 1966—the Soviets are very much a power to contend with in that tortured corner of the world.

The Soviets have established themselves in the Middle East principally through their trade in goods of war. It has been estimated that in the past decade the U.S.S.R. has sent more than $1 billion worth of arms into the Middle East. While these arms have gone principally to the United Arab Republic and to a lesser extent to Iraq and Syria, they have also found their way into other lands—Yemen, for example.

The vehicle for the buildup of Soviet arms into the Middle East has been easy credit. Nations—like some individuals—find easy credit terms hard to resist and end up mortgaging their futures to satisfy their desires. A principal instance of this is the mortgaging by the United Arab Republic of its long staple cotton crop, the principal export commodity of that impoverished country, to the Soviet Union for years ahead.

Soviet arms have had a narcotic effect in the Middle East. The nations receiving them have demanded bigger and stronger doses while becoming more willing to pay the price for them, even if it means weakening their economies, depleting their resources, and stripping their people. Again the United Arab Republic—now composed only of Egypt—serves as a prime example; it concluded a new arms agreement with the Soviet Union estimated at about $300 million at about the time it concluded a new agreement with the United States for $55 million in grain to feed its hungry people.

The dangers brought on by the infusion of Soviet arms can best be illustrated by the situation in Yemen. The press, which in recent months carried reports of a cease-fire and peace negotiations in Yemen, now carries ominous reports of a troop buildup and a new introduction of Soviet arms into that strife-torn corner of the Arabian peninsula. The Saudis now assert that the United Arab Republic has sent 9,000 fresh troops into the area, after a token withdrawal of 2,000 men. It is also alleged that, in violation of the Yemen truce agreement, a Soviet ship has unloaded an arms shipment at the Yemeni port of Hodeida.

And just last week, United Arab Republic President Nasser has again threatened to bring a final end to the uneasy Yemen truce and renew hostilities there, a threat which the Saudis and the Yemenis are taking quite seriously.

In this connection, I call attention to a very important news item which appeared in the press yesterday morning, headed "Faisal Warns United States on Reds in Yemen," with respect to charges that the Soviet Union and the Chinese are building up arms for subversion in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAISAL WARNS UNITED STATES ON REDS IN YEMEN—SAYS RUSSIANS AND CHINESE BUILD SUBVERSION BASE

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—King Faisal of Saudi Arabia has expressed concern to President Johnson that the Soviet Union and Communist China may be establishing a base in Yemen for subversion in the Middle East and Africa.

The King's apprehension was expressed in a private letter delivered 2 weeks ago to Mr. Johnson by Prince Sultan Bin Abd al-Aziz, the Saudi Defense Minister. With unusual diplomatic secrecy, the Faisal letter was delivered sealed to the President and translated on the spot by an interpreter furnished by the U.S. Information Agency.

The President sent back an immediate reply. While the contents of the President's letter remain secret, it was understood that administration officials do not necessarily subscribe to King Faisal's fears that the Communists are seeking to establish a foothold for subversion in Yemen.

BASE FOR SUBVERSION

The Faisal letter was reliably reported to have been largely a restatement of the Saudi position in the Yemen civil war in which Saudi-supported royalist forces are confronting the republican regime. The republicans are supported by United Arab Republic troops and Soviet supplied equipment.

In the course of defending the Saudi position, Faisal was said to have emphasized the danger that the Communists were taking advantage of the Yemeni war to establish a forward base for subversion.

According to close associates, King Faisal believes that Yemen could develop into the "Cuba of the Middle East" with the Communists using the small, mountainous country on the southwestern corner of the Arabian peninsula to support subversive activities in the Middle East and Africa.

In this connection, Saudi sources say that a 2½-mile-long airstrip constructed with Soviet assistance near Sana, the Yemeni capital, could help overcome many of the logistical problems encountered in the past in funneling arms down to dissident groups in Africa.

NEW ARMS PACT SIGNED

According to associates, King Faisal believes that the Communist interest in Yemen may help explain the difficulties in reaching a political settlement of the Yemen dispute with the Egyptian President Gamal Adbel Nasser.

His suspicion is that in return for a new pact with the Soviet Union, reported to involve $200 million in arms, President Nasser may be dragging his feet in implementing a peace pact signed last August by the Saudi and Egyptian leaders.

Under the agreement the Saudis were to stop supplying arms and supplies to the royalist forces and the United Arab Republic was to start withdrawing its forces, now estimated at 70,000.

Thus far, there has been no withdrawal of Egyptian troops, but the United States tends to support the Nasser interpretation that withdrawal was contingent upon creation of a provisional coalition government in Yemen. Such a regime has yet to be formed.

American officials are skeptical that either the Russians or the Chinese Communists are prepared to make a major political investment in Yemen or that there is an ulterior motive of subversion behind their financial support of the republican regime.

Mr. JAVITS. But Yemen, where United Arab Republic and Saudi arms oppose one another, is not the only hot spot. The Libyans early this year convicted an Egyptian agent for sabotaging its American-leased oilfields. Iraq and Iran are exchanging shots over their borders. Syria has been torn by another revolution. United Arab Republic President Nasser has renewed his diatribes against the United States. Iraqi pressures against the Kurds persist; both sides receive Soviet aid. And the Arabs continue to mobilize to fulfill their pledge to drive the Israelis into the sea.

In that connection, I also ask unanimous consent that a press report of this morning on this subject, headed "Cairo Reported To Plan Anti-West Conference," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAIRO REPORTED TO PLAN ANTI-WEST CONFERENCE

CAIRO, March 8.—The United Arab Republic, deeply concerned over the Ghanaian coup and the blow it has dealt to progressive forces in Africa, is trying to organize an anti-Western leaders' conference here later this month, authoritative Egyptian sources said Tuesday.

These sources said that the goal of meeting, if it is held, would be to try to blunt the offensive of the imperialist powers against the liberated countries.

Well-placed Egyptian sources said that President Gamal Abdel Nasser had held consultations through diplomatic channels with President Tito of Yugoslavia and that the two leaders had made contact with about 25 nonalined states in Africa and Asia with the aim of holding the conference.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, even these international conflicts do not constitute the only danger. The regimes of the relatively moderate King Faisal in

Saudi Arabia and King Hussein in Jordan could come to a violent end at any moment. Hussein's autobiography, "Uneasy Lies the Head," relates ingenious plots of his life—most of them allegedly inspired by the United Arab Republic—and he acknowledges the slender shadow that separates him from the same end by assassination which met his grandfather, the late King Abdullah.

We recall what happened in Iraq in 1958, when the pro-Western Nuri Said-Faisal regime, which had been extensively equipped in weaponry by the United States, was overthrown in a bloody revolt which saw that unhappy nation withdraw from the Dulles-organized Baghdad Pact—a withdrawal which presaged the pact's downfall—and turn away from the United States to the U.S.S.R. in that area.

U.S. News & World Report, in a January 24 article on the Middle East arms buildup, concluded succinctly:

> Next time war flares up in the Middle East, it may be with a bigger bang.

And that "bigger bang" would be a direct result of the Soviet arms boom and the use by the U.S.S.R. of the Middle East as a dumping ground for its surplus weapons.

We have been forced to react, so this is no light matter.

The recent announcement that the United States is now supplying modern tanks directly to Israel, rather than finding indirect means to maintain the arms balance, is an encouraging sign. It indicates that we now openly acknowledge what in effect is generally known in the Middle East—that the United States will not stand idly by while the Arab nations obtain a preponderance of arms to carry out their often-repeated pledge to wipe out Israel—let alone to try to wipe out each other.

On the one hand, the United States exhibits a real and sincere concern for raising the living standards of impoverished peoples in the Middle East. On the other, however, we look on as the governments of poverty-ridden Arab lands divert essential resources to a spiraling military buildup. In addition, through our aid policies—such as the recent $55 million surplus food contract with the United Arab Republic—we make possible further purchases of Soviet arms. Because Nasser does not have to use his cotton crop to buy food, he uses it to add to his arms.

At this point in history when the United States talks seriously of disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union, it seems incongruous that our Government should stand by as arms proliferate in the Middle East, an area where international tensions are at a dangerous enough pitch even without the buildup of military hardware. The Soviet Union, the United States, and 17 other nations, East and West, are currently engaged in disarmament talks in Geneva, talks which the United States and the U.S.S.R. both have indicated must not be disturbed by events in Vietnam. Yet, the Middle East arms race continues to escalate. The standards of Geneva should be applied to the Middle East.

I repeat, the United States should invite the Soviet Union to confer with respect to having a cessation to the arms buildup to which they are parties in the Middle East.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend the Senator from New York for his very thoughtful and comprehensive estimate of the explosive situation in the Middle East. As he knows, there are many of us in the Senate who have been greatly concerned about it for years and have tried to do something about it.

The comment that I wish to make and on which I would like to get the view of the Senator is this. It is all very well to try to get the Russians to change their policies, but what is the matter with the United States changing its policies?

Successive U.S. administrations have supported Nasser through thick and thin regardless of his actions, all so contrary to the interests of the United States. There were the treaty violations in his operation of the Suez Canal; his continuing war against Israel, a part of which has been the denial not merely of access to Israel's ships but to any ships of any nation carrying cargo to or from Israel; the building up of sophisticated weapons; the war in Yemen, which has gone on now for over 3 years at a fantastic cost; the toleration of the burning of the Kennedy library; the sending of arms to stir up trouble in Cyprus; aid to the rebels in the Congo; the shooting down of an unarmed U.S. plane with the resultant deaths of the pilot and copilot; persuading the Libyans to push us out of Wheelus Air Force Base; and so on and so forth. All this, coupled with denunciations of the United States, which were temporarily in abeyance when our AID program was expiring, but now that we have renewed it, are being resumed with Nasser's accustomed intemperateness.

I find it difficult to understand why it has been impossible to get the administrations not to accept the amendment repeatedly enacted in the Senate, which I sponsored and which has been cosponsored by others, including the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], that we withhold all aid to Nasser until he stops aggression. As the Senator from New York knows, in order to get this amendment adopted, it has been necessary to include in it the qualifying phrase, "unless the President finds it in the national interest to continue it." It seems difficult to understand how the President, which in this case means someone in the State Department, can continually find it is in the national interest to aid Nasser.

We should long ago have served notice on him that unless he stops these aggressive policies, opens up the Suez Canal, and so forth, we would give him no more aid. It is we, the United States, who can take the responsibility for these nauseating actions on his part because we continue to support and subsidize him with U.S. taxpayers' dollars. As long as that continues, we are a party to the tragic situation which the Senator from New York so well describes.

Mr. JAVITS. I must say to the Senator from Alaska that we tried to stop this. We tried an amendment to prevent it. I think the administration is most misguided. I am endeavoring to point this out in this speech, but not as well as the Senator has said it. With its left hand the United States is feeding the Egyptian people while with its right hand it seems to be feeding arms into the area to counterbalance the buildup of this food and aid, which helps Nasser.

We are dealing with $55 million in food. It may or may not make that difference. I am told that a large proportion of the food eaten by the Egyptians is our food.

I thank the Senator. He has described the situation well and I agree thoroughly with what he has said. I hope that the fundamental thrust that I am trying to get at today will not be lost by the high priority to be given to an effort to have the Soviet Union and arms shipments into the Near East and contributing to the arms imbalance there. I refer to ending the escalation of the arms race, which is just about in balance now from what we have given to the Arab countries. I depreciate that. It is not something I favor. It was compelled on us by necessity.

The thing to do, and I believe that there is a chance to do it, is to agree with the Soviet Union to a standstill on arms in that area.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. But while selling these 200 Patton tanks to Israel seemed to the Johnson administration the best way to achieve a balance in the Middle East arms race, it seems to me that rather than burden Israel with this great expense, when her funds are so needed for worthy economic projects, we should have tried the other course. We should have long ago withdrawn and should now withdraw our financial aid to stop the arms race. It is shocking that the United States is actually promoting the arms race. We have gone back on our long-standing professions. Moreover, selling Israel tanks, which will strengthen Israel in a ground war, will not protect that little civilized country against being destroyed overnight by Nasser's missiles, which in a few minutes could level the three cities of Israel—Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and Haifa. These sophisticated weapons Nasser has been developing with the aid of Nazi scientists.

I hope that in time, if we persist, an intelligent and decent policy will take the place of the folly we are committing by encouraging and subsidizing an arms race and encouraging, by our continued subsidization of Nasser, all his acts of aggression.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for his helpful remarks.

I wish to deal briefly with the second element of the Middle East peace effort.

Now, for the second vital element of the Middle East peace effort—promotion of an Arab-Israel understanding. It is encouraging that the efforts of President

Habib Bourguiba, of Tunisia, toward such an understanding have not met with the overwhelming opposition from his brother Arabs which had been anticipated, giving indication that the Arab leaders, if given the proper opportunity and encouragement, might seek the road to peace.

A major criticism of this administration has been its reluctance to be persuasive with the Arabs to come to the peace table, a reluctance based on the fear that the Arabs would resent the pressure. But, as West Germany demonstrated just last year, such fears rest on weak foundations. It will be recalled that the Federal Republic of Germany recognized Israel in the face of Arab diplomatic threats of the most drastic kind. Today German relations with the Arab would remain strong and the commerce between them is growing rather than diminishing. The fears proved unfounded.

Persistent and continuing efforts by the United States for a Middle East peace are vital for such continuing efforts are needed to build up public opinion—in the Middle East itself as well as in the West and the East—which will rise in support of finally laying to rest the threat of war in that troubled area of the world. An effective resolution of the longstanding Arab-Israel quarrel cannot be brought about overnight or through one single dramatic effort. The climate must be carefully created and world opinion mustered in support. But the United States must lead the way, especially since the United States missed its opportunity when it failed to support the United Nations effort of 16 African and Latin American nations in January 1962 to bring the Middle East disputes to the conference table.

That was a bad mess and we should make every effort to make up for it.

There is a delicate balance of arms between opposing forces which serves to preserve the peace today in the Middle East. Two uneasy truces stand threatened by any imbalance of arms. One involves the groups of Arab nations supplied on one hand by the Soviets—principally Syria, Iraq, and the United Arab Republic—and those supplied by the United States on the other—chiefly, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The other uneasy truce involves the Arab States versus Israel. And in order to avoid a dangerous military imbalance, the United States has sent arms into the area.

Let us have no illusions about Israel. We know that its people are valiant but bared flesh cannot be exposed to modern weapons.

Israel is in an especially precarious position with regard to the maintenance of a military balance. Surrounded by sworn enemies, it cannot afford to relax its vigilance or permit its strength to be eroded. In addition, as a growing nation which still receives on an average more than 50,000 homeless and impoverished refugees each year, it finds its necessary defense expenditures an enormous drain on its overstrained economy and a drag on its development.

There is no question about the fact that it is only the voluntary contribution of the American community which has sustained Israel in this dire situation.

Unquestionably Israel has progressed. She is in the strongest rampart we have in the Mediterranean. Its industrial growth between 1957 and 1964 averaged 10.5 percent annually, second only to that of Japan. Between 1948, when she attained independence, and 1963, the last time we had reliable figures, its agricultural growth rate has been 9.7 percent annually, surpassing that of other developing countries.

And Israel's hard currency reserves now approximate $700 million, a factor cited by Washington economists to support their thesis that Israel is no longer entitled to U.S. economic aid. While it is quite true that Israel's reserves are high in relation to its normal purchasing needs, it is also true—regrettably for Israel—that these reserves do not flow from any favorable balance in its international trade. These reserves stem from the sales of Israel bonds, which must be repaid; from German restitution and reparations, which are coming to an end and will leave a big hole in Israel's economy; and from U.S. Government economic help which has been much reduced. And—unhappily—Israel's balance of trade continues to be adverse.

Also looming large on the minus side of the ledger is Israel's foreign currency debt of some $1.2 billion. This is the highest per capita foreign currency debt in the world. Israel, therefore, must accumulate reserves to pay off this debt as it comes due.

This enormous foreign currency debt and the bleak prospects for Israel's foreign currency reserves argue forcefully for the continuation of U.S. economic aid. Israel has proven—and daily continues to prove—a true friend and reliable ally at a time when its Arab neighbors are extending gestures of friendship to the North Vietnamese and to the Vietcong.

Israel, for example, has welcomed for training agriculture and industry future leaders from several score developing nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, including Burma, Bolivia, Cambodia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Laos, Liberia, Nepal, Mali, Tanganyika, Thailand, Upper Volta, and Zanzibar, to name a few. This training is an effective counterbalance to the invitations being issued to these developing countries by Red China, the Soviet Union, and Cuba.

Thus, economic aid to Israel is a wise and proper investment in furthering our own foreign policy and pays proven dividends in strengthening democracy and a reliance upon democratic institutions—rather than communism—in developing nations throughout the world. I most strongly urge that this aid be continued.

But if the Israeli economy is the victim of the arms race, so is the economy of the Arab States, as I pointed out earlier. The United States does the Arabs no favor when we collaborate with them in the diversion for weaponry of their limited resources and energies.

The Arab nations suffer from woefully low standards of living. And food production in Egypt, Tunisia, and Jordan is failing to keep pace with their rapid population growth.

It is quite clear that the best economic aid we could give to these countries—an effort which demands the best of our energies—is to bring about an end to the costly arms race in the Middle East through an understanding with the Soviets and to launch a concerted drive to restore a measure of peace and tranquillity to that too long troubled area.

I end as I began, by urging upon our Government and upon the Senate the vital need to do something in the Middle East before we are faced with a second front in respect of the conflict which has taken place in Vietnam.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the leadership, I should like to say a word about the measure which is now pending before the Senate, the authorization for foreign aid. I trust the RECORD will show this as a part of the debate on the foreign aid bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator how much time he desires?

Mr. JAVITS. Three minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It might be well to remind ourselves that we are now operating under controlled time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the bill will run now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as the acting majority leader, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

The problem concerning refugees in Vietnam has already been discussed. I merely record again the facts set forth in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]: First, we should make certain that the refugees are well handled, intelligently handled, and effectively handled. In order to do that, the United States cannot allow the Saigon officials to run the program themselves. We should finance it, or help to finance it, and we should also take the direct responsibility to see to it that what is done is done right.

Having visited Vietnam, I am convinced that roughly 700,000 refugees can be the most effective cadre of any we are financing there for the purpose of dealing with the Communist Vietcong. These are the basic people of the country. They have escaped to us in order to avoid the terror and brutality of the Vietcong. They have every reason to feel deeply angered by what the Vietcong have done in raiding and ravaging camps and killing men, women, and children in cold blood. The Vietcong certainly showed their hand.

So this is an initiative which is critically important to our Nation. I am convinced, from having been in Vietnam, that our people there have left much too much to the Saigon government, a government which is not nearly so sensitive to the refugee problem as we are and does not begin to understand, as we do, its great significance.

My second point is this: When I returned, I urged the President to appoint a special representative who would have a title analogous to that given to Averell Harriman in connection with the Marshall plan in 1948 and 1949. Such a special representative would coordinate all the counterinsurgency pacification efforts of the United States, other than the military; and then, with the military, would adopt policies which would fit in with what the civilian agencies were doing. That effort is now being carried on by U.S. operations men in Vietnam who are administering the AID program, by the U.S. Information Service, by the civil affairs section of the military forces, and by the CIA.

Laudable as are the efforts of each agency, they must be tied together to do a complete job. I know that the President has appointed Ambassador Porter for the purpose, but I have seen little evidence so far of a strong hand to seize control of the situation in order to carry on the program effectively.

Finally, I urge the Government most earnestly to expand the opportunities and goals for a political action training school at Vung Tao, southeast of Saigon, where we are training 3,000 of the finest youth of Vietnam to be cadres in villages and hamlets for general military purposes, and to give leadership in their efforts to bring an understanding of the objectives for which the entire South Vietnamese people are fighting.

I know of no effort that should be higher in priority in all of Vietnam. The goal for this year is to achieve a force of 43,000 of these young people, 23,000 having already been graduated, in the hope of pacifying a thousand or more additional hamlets in 1966. But there are 12,000 to go.

I urge our Government and our authorities to maximize this program promptly, because it deserves parity equal to the valorous military effort which our country is making in Vietnam.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

ECONOMIC AID FOR VIETNAM—WHY IS IT NEEDED NOW?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the pending bill, H.R. 12169, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, comes to the Senate as a matter of supposed urgency ostensibly to authorize additional appropriations for the U.S. AID programs in Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, and the Dominican Republic.

But it is more than that. In transmitting this request, President Johnson stated:

> In the last 2 years, in repeated acts of authorization and appropriation, the Congress has provided continuing support for our national decision "to prevent further aggression" in southeast Asia. The quoted words come from the joint resolution of the Congress—Public Law 88-408—approved on August 10, 1964. It is in the letter and the spirit of the resolution that I request this supplementary appropriation.

For reasons which I have in the past detailed, I do not subscribe to our continued military intrusion in Vietnam and its steady escalation. I expressed my views in a major speech on the floor of the Senate just 2 years ago today—March 10, 1964. At that time, before we had committed our troops to combat, a reasonable and peaceful settlement would have been more easily attainable had we then gone to the United Nations, as our adherence to the United Nations Charter obligated us to do. We missed that opportunity and plunged our nation into war.

I also have serious doubts as to the need at this time for the additional funds asked to be authorized by the bill for the AID program in Vietnam.

It is difficult for me to support a tremendous request for economic aid for Vietnam at a time when our own domestic programs are being drastically slashed. I cannot understand a request for an additional $275 million in AID funds for Vietnam—more than a doubling of the program—at a time when our own school lunch program has been cut away back, when milk is being taken away from our children, when our impacted area school aid program has been cut out, and when our war on poverty is diminished—to name just a few of our vital programs here at home that have been sharply curtailed.

The regular AID program for Vietnam for fiscal 1966 totaled $266 million. That was for the entire fiscal year. But now, for the remainder of that same fiscal year, which has only 3½ months to run, we are asked to authorize appropriations in the amount of $275 million. This is at an annual rate of over a billion dollars for this tiny country in addition to the amount authorized under the recently passed Asian Bank bill.

I have serious doubts in view of the persistent and flagrant black market in Vietnam, the inflation rate of 40 percent, the widespread corruption and maladministration in that country that the sum requested can be wisely, economically or profitably spent there.

It seems to me that throwing U.S. dollars around in this profligate way can do more harm than good to the people of Vietnam.

As the Foreign Relations Committee so aptly stated in reporting this measure:

> The committee finds little room for encouragement under existing circumstances about the prospects for our aid being effective in molding sound economic and social developments leading to a better way of life for the people of South Vietnam.

I am not unsympathetic with the objective of the administration's pacification program and would be pleased to support such a program—but at the proper time. This is not the proper time. An economic aid program can only work in a country which has stable conditions. That is not the case with respect to Vietnam.

As the Foreign Relations Committee has stated:

> Until the military situation improves, our aid program is likely to be little more than a holding operation, keeping the wolves of rampant inflation away from the door, and providing relief where needed. The committee hopes that the officials of the South Vietnamese Government will vigorously pursue a program of economic and social reforms as pledged in the declaration of Honolulu. This committee will remain skeptical until words are matched with measurable deeds.

The committee's skepticism is fully justified, and I share it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator think it is remarkable that we should have a recommendation from a committee for the passage of a bill, while at the same time it files that negative report on the bill?

Mr. GRUENING. It is almost incomprehensible.

The committee's skepticism is justified by the unvaryingly pathetic performance of the various coup-imposed South Vietnamese officials and the 12-year-old failure of our representatives to secure any improvement.

Those self-imposed characters in power in South Vietnam have all come in to the accompaniment of hopeful plaudits by our own officialdom who have been playing the same cracked record over and over while the credibility gap has widened and widened, and widened.

For all these reasons, I am constrained to vote against this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama had 30 minutes to begin with.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall assume the minority control also, if I may, since no Member of the minority is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, 15 minutes from the time under the control of the majority side and 15 minutes from the time under the control of the minority side will be allotted to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as soon as the minority leader returns, I shall renounce my claim over that time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the bill and in support of the very able statement just made by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

I agreed to the third reading of the bill a few moments ago because it was perfectly obvious that any proposal of further amendments would be a waste of the time of the Senate. The steamroller is moving. The die is cast. The Senate is again abdicating its power and transferring more and more arbitrary and capricious power to the President of the United States, weakening in this bill again our system of checks and balances and strengthening the increasing danger in this country of a government by Executive supremacy, which is not safe for the freedom of the American people.

The Senator from Alaska was very correct in emphasizing the views of the Committee on Foreign Relations in respect to this bill.

Mr. President, without taking the time to read those supplemental views, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record the supplemental views of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

There being no objection, the supplemental views were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Supplemental Views on H.R. 12169

It is our view that the situation in Vietnam requires approval of the pending bill and we intend to vote for it. Nevertheless, we believe that the public hearings which the Committee on Foreign Relations conducted while considering this legislation indicate the need for this expression.

Evidence received by the committee, in our judgment, indicates that the reasons for the present size and scope of U.S. involvement in southeast Asia are subject to question. Furthermore, we believe that U.S. involvement there is in danger of becoming "openended," to use the phrase of the Mansfield report, and, as a consequence, that there is a serious distortion of the overall foreign policy of the United States as well as of governmental activities within the United States.

We believe that the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from South Dakota, Mr. McGovern, is a moderate expression of our views. That amendment states:

"(a) The Congress hereby declares that its action in authorizing the additional assistance for Vietnam provided by this Act—

"(1) shall not be construed as a ratification of any policy decision heretofore made with respect to hostilities in Vietnam, or as an endorsement of any future commitment with respect to such hostilities; and

"(2) is taken with the hope that such additional assistance will contribute to an early cessation, rather than a widening, of such hostilities.

"(b) Recognizing the desire of the President to limit the scope of hostilities and to reach an honorable settlement of the conflict and cognizant of the desirability of improved relations between the people of the United States and the people of Asia, it is the sense of the Congress, that United States foreign policy in Asia should seek to minimize the risks of military involvement and to promote orderly economic and social development."

Frank Church.
Joseph S. Clark.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say most respectfully that, with those views, they should be joining me in voting against the bill, and not supporting it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a statement of the conclusion of the committee, commencing on page 9 of the committee's report.

There being no objection, the statement of conclusion was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONCLUSION

Foreign aid should not remain sacrosanct when it comes to apportioning the war's financial costs among Federal activities. Belt tightening because of the war must not be restricted to domestic programs but should include our foreign aid programs as well. American citizens should not be called upon to accept reductions in programs which affect their daily lives, see their taxes increased and war costs spiral, while the foreign aid program escapes unaffected and undiminished. A reduction in the aid program will be of help in funding domestic programs proposed to be cut back in fiscal 1967.

The fiscal 1967 appropriations request for economic assistance is $2.469 billion compared with a total appropriation for this fiscal year of $2.463 billion, including the funds authorized by this bill. It appears that programs in other countries have not been reduced to compensate for the increased program in Vietnam. The committee expects that the reductions in the total program will take into account the additional assistance provided here for Vietnam and that the executive branch's presentation to the committee will be in keeping with this intent.

The committee in asking that the budget presentation reflect an appropriate reduction in the proposed program for the next fiscal year does not wish to imply that further economies are not needed in the program for fiscal 1966. Every effort should be made to make savings in uncommitted funds for fiscal 1966 and the committee will expect to receive a full report during the presentation of the 1967 program to the committee on the steps being taken to accomplish this objective.

This aid request is in the nature of an emergency measure and without these additional funds the economy of South Vietnam would be in great danger. The committee has handled this bill accordingly and has not given the nuts and bolts of the package the scrutiny that it would under normal circumstances. Although the committee has approved the bill without amendment, it does not wish to leave the impression that it finds no fault with the aid program in Vietnam or any of the other countries affected.

The committee is concerned about recent news reports of widespread corruption in Vietnam involving our aid. It is hoped that the program is being policed adequately all the way up and down the line by our officials. Recently the General Accounting Office announced that it will revitalize its investigative activities concerning the AID program in Vietnam and conduct on-the-scene audits. The committee approves this decision and urges that the General Accounting Office, the Agency for International Development, and the Inspector General of Foreign Assistance investigating units give very careful scrutiny to all aspects of our assistance program, particularly the commodity import program which is so susceptible to mishandling under wartime conditions.

The committee finds little room for encouragement under existing circumstances about the prospects for our aid being effective in molding sound economic and social developments leading to a better way of life for the people of South Vietnam. Until the military situation improves, our aid program is likely to be little more than a holding operation, keeping the wolves of rampant inflation away from the door, and providing relief where needed. The committee hopes that the officials of the South Vietnamese Government will vigorously pursue a program of economic and social reforms as pledged in the Declaration of Honolulu. This committee will remain skeptical until words are matched with measurable deeds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, any committee that brings a report such as this to the floor of the Senate, with that statement of conclusion in it, should be supporting me in opposition to the bill and not supporting the bill. When we get all through with the committee report, and with the majority and supplemental views, and when we get all through reading the transcript of record made by the committee in our discussion of this bill, we can only wonder why this bill is being recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conclusion of the so-called Mansfield report be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the conclusion of the Mansfield report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

E. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not in immediate prospect. This would appear to be the case whether military victory is pursued or negotiations do, in fact, materialize.

Insofar as the military situation is concerned, the large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment. What has changed basically is the scope and intensity of the struggle and the part which is being played by the forces of the United States and those of North Vietnam.

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a further augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended. How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force. All of mainland southeast Asia, at least, cannot be ruled out as a potential battlefield. As noted, the war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand.

Even if the war remains substantially within its present limits, there is little foundation for the expectation that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon will be able, in

> the near future, to carry a much greater burden than it is now carrying. This is in no sense a reflection on the caliber of the current leaders of Vietnam. But the fact is that they are, as other Vietnamese Governments have been over the past decade, at the beginning of a beginning in dealing with the problems of popular mobilization in support of the Government. They are starting, moreover, from a point considerably behind that which prevailed at the time of President Diem's assassination. Under present concepts and plans, then, what lies ahead is, literally, a vast and continuing undertaking in social engineering in the wake of such military progress as may be registered. And for many years to come this task will be very heavily dependent on U.S. foreign aid.
>
> The basic concept of present American policy with respect to Vietnam casts the United States in the role of support of the Vietnamese Government and people. This concept becomes more difficult to maintain as the military participation of the United States undergoes rapid increase. Yet a change in the basic concept could have a most unfortunate impact upon the Vietnamese people and the world at large. What is involved here is the necessity for the greatest restraint in word and action, lest the concept be eroded and the war drained of a purpose with meaning to the people of Vietnam.
>
> This danger is great, not only because of the military realities of the situation but also because, with a few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.
>
> Many nations are deeply desirous of an end to this conflict as quickly as possible. Few are specific as to the manner in which this end can be brought about or the shape it is likely to take. In any event, even though other nations, in certain circumstances, may be willing to play a third-party role in bringing about negotiations, any prospects for effective negotiations at this time (and they are slim) are likely to be largely dependent on the initiative and efforts of the combatants.
>
> Negotiations at this time, moreover, if they do come about, and if they are accompanied by a cease-fire and standfast, would serve to stabilize a situation in which the majority of the population remains under nominal Government control but in which dominance of the countryside rests largely in the hands of the Vietcong. What might eventually materialize through negotiations from this situation cannot be foreseen at this time wih any degree of certainty.
>
> That is not, to say the least, a very satisfactory prospect. What needs also to be borne in mind, however, is that the visible alternative at this time and under present terms of reference is the indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces. The end of that course cannot be foreseen, either, and there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.
>
> In short, such choices as may be open are not simple choices. They are difficult and painful choices and they are beset with many imponderables. The situation, as it now appears, offers only the very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, here again I am at a loss to understand how, if the conclusion of the Mansfield report is correct—and I am satisfied that it is correct—the Senate of the United States could vote for this bill this afternoon.

Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska expressed his concern about the corruption and the black market that exists in South Vietnam, and the unreliability and irresponsibility of the South Vietnamese leaders. I share his views in regard to the nature of the regime to which we are now going to provide in this bill such a large amount of the $415 million.

Mr. President, I want to refer to a statement on page 521 of the "Supplemental Foreign Assistance Fiscal Year 1966"—Vietnam transcript of hearings. I want to quote from a very able article by a great commentator, Stanley Karnow, of the Washington Post foreign service.

I want the American people again to understand the nature of the corrupt regime that the American Government is supporting in South Vietnam.

This correspondent, talking about General Ky, states:

> In his speeches and statements, Ky projects an image of himself as an honest, simple soldier dedicated to promoting "social revolution." That image has reportedly captivated the White House, where Ky's statements are said to be on the required reading list.
>
> But to Vietnamese here in Saigon—and to many American officials, too—Ky is far from the hero he is made out to be by his publicists.
>
> The Ky government is stable largely because it is immobile, explain Vietnamese. In fact, they add, it is not really Ky's government but a junta of generals who, for the sake of their own survival, have tacitly agreed not to disagree—at least for the present.
>
> In the view of Vietnamese here, moreover, the Saigon government hangs together because it is supported by the United States, which would not tolerate another succession of coup d'etat and uprisings such as followed the downfall of the Ngo Dinh Diem regime in November 1963.
>
> ANOTHER MEETING
>
> Thus President Johnson's personal identification with the Saigon leaders in Honolulu last week has been seen here as primarily an American exercise in bulwarking the local government. And it is believed that another Honolulu meeting this summer, as announced by the President, will repeat that exercise.
>
> "It's like doping horses," commented an irreverent young Vietnamese army officer the other day. "They run for a while, and then you've got to give them another shot."
>
> Much of this criticism reflects uneasiness with the degenerating economic situation here. Tremendous infusions of American money have simply unhinged and disrupted the local society to the point at which a bargirl can earn in a day what a longshoreman makes in a mouth.
>
> Soaring prices have especially affected fixed-income groups—civil servants, army officers, schoolteachers and other professionals—who are the intelligentsia of any underdeveloped country.

Then I wish to quote from an article by another great correspondent, Ward Just, also of the Washington Post foreign service, in which he writes, as of February 16—and may I say, the date of the preceding article was also February 16—

> Saigon's economic situation, serious for the past year, is becoming critical, and diplomatic sources rate it as second only to the Vietcong as "the most important political problem we have."
>
> According to Government figures released yesterday, prices rose 10 percent last month over December and nearly 50 percent over the year 1965. There is an acute shortage of skilled labor, imports, and consumer goods. A flourishing black market and official corruption add to the difficulties.
>
> Overhanging all is the massive infusion of U.S. funds, estimated to total $600 million in 1966.

Later in his article, Mr. Just writes:

> Officials here are frantically trying to open up the port of Saigon (where turn-around time for a vessel is frequently 2 to 3 weeks) to imports, to turn the sellers' market into a buyers' market. But the heavy importation of military hardware makes it a difficult task, despite the improvements to the harbors of Danang and Quinhon and the Brobdingnagian effort at Cam Ranh Bay.
>
> Rippling beneath the surface is the Government's refusal—or inability—to do anything about the black money market, to which many prices are tied. The official rate is 73 piastres to the dollar. The black market rate was 135 piastres to the dollar in August and 170 last week.
>
> Sources here say that the gigantic U.S. construction effort must also be cut back. The U.S. investment in construction is now estimated at $400 million a year, $100 million of which has a direct effect on the economy.

Mr. President, there is no question about the fact—we brought it out in our hearings—that a shocking, corrupt black market has characterized the economy of Ky's regime, that military junta regime, the regime of a man whose hero is Hitler, and who said to the London Mirror that what South Vietnam needed was 12 Hitlers. That is the kind of a rascal and tyrant we are pouring in hundreds of millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money to uphold.

What is that administration over there, under this rascal, doing for South Vietnam itself?

I refer you to Look magazine, Mr. President, and ask you to reread the article that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] published in that magazine, pointing out that in regard to the refugee problem, the Government of South Vietnam is walking out on its responsibility.

Mr. President, what is the Ky government doing in regard to land reform? What is it doing in regard to its budget? What is it doing in regard to taxation?

The Ky regime is doing so little that I am aghast to hear the administration talk to the American people in terms of its being a pliable, stable government. It is no such thing. It just happens to be a military junta that is being held up by American dollars and American blood. In my judgment, there is absolutely no justification for killing American boys in southeast Asia in support of such a corrupt regime.

I ask unanimous consent that certain material from the exhibits that were before us in the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee dealing with the matter of land reform and the failure of the Government to do what it should, the tax problem, the failure of the regime to impose reasonable taxes upon its own citizenry—because the United States is going to foot the bill anyway, the failure of the administration to control the black market, and other items presented to the committee, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

3. Land reform:

(a) How much has been spent in the past by the Government of Vietnam and AID?

From 1955 to 1960 the Government of Vietnam committed itself to the expenditure of the equivalent of $69 million for the purchase of expropriated land, 10 percent of which was paid in cash and 90 percent in the form of 12-year bonds. The French Government made available the franc equivalent of $3.8 million to buy out its landowning nationals; the land was turned over to the Government of Vietnam. The United States provided $4.1 million ($287,000 in dollar funding for training, technicians, and equipment, and the remainder in counterpart, mostly to pay administrative costs).

Since 1960, no separate budget has been appropriated for land reform, these activities being funded under the broader category covering land administration.

(b) How much is budgeted for this year?

The Government of Vietnam, however, has now decided to fund land reform activities separately and the current request, covering the next 3 years, calls for the expenditure of the equivalent of $1.9 million to cover operating costs, eg., administration and surveys, for the next 3 years. Obviously this does not include additional land acquisition costs, agricultural credit, resettlement costs, etc., which could be related and support land reform activities.

Although AID has given this subject a great deal of attention by way of policy level encouragement and experts' consultation, the opportunities for furthering land reform by large U.S. dollar expenditures have not occurred. We are prepared to allocate funds immediately on a high priority basis if circumstances develop where this would be helpful. Consequently, it is impossible for AID to have a firm budget at this time. At the moment, certain minor technical activities totalling $30,000 for the next few months have been identified.

(c) How many acres have been redistributed?

The Government of Vietnam expropriated 457,000 hectares, and acquired 225,000 hectares from the French Government. Some 248,000 hectares have been redistributed, all of it expropriated land.

(d) What large land holdings exist in Vietnam?

No owner can legally hold title to more than 100 hectares (250 acres) at the present time. About 6,300 owners hold from 50 to 100 hectares, or 25 percent of the cultivated rice land in the Mekong Delta. Another 28 percent is owned by some 28,000 owners in holdings of 10 to 50 hectares. There are some 346,000 owners of smaller units. In central Vietnam there are some 350 owners with ricelands totaling 25 hectares or more. There are 550,000 owners with smaller land units.

TAX STRUCTURE IN VIETNAM, INTERNAL TAXES

Internal taxes are classified into four groups. The four groups; with percentages of total domestic revenue collections for 1965 are: Direct (9.4 percent); indirect (20.5 percent); excise (16.2 percent); and registration (7.7 percent). The following table shows domestic tax revenue in 1963, 1964, and 1965.

[In millions of piasters]

	1963	1964	1965
Total expenditures	27.0	37.5	52.0
Total domestic receipts	12.0	12.8	13.7
Direct taxes	1.2	1.2	1.1
Indirect taxes	1.8	2.2	2.4
Excise taxes	1.3	1.6	1.9
Registration	.6	.9	.9
Customs duties	4.4	4.7	5.4
Others	2.7	2.2	2.0

Direct taxes include (1) a tax on income and profits, (2) real estate taxes, and (3) the patente, or business tax. The direct tax structure is as follows:

1. Income and profits: The system of income taxation includes four different taxes:

(a) Salaries and wages: Includes indemnities, emoluments, pensions, annuities, and all compensations for service whether in income or in kind. Salaries and wages are taxed at the rate of 1 to 16 percent. There are five brackets: 1 percent on net taxable annual income up to VN$50,000; 2 percent on income from VN$50,001 to VN$100,000; 5 percent on income from VN$100,001 to VN$500,000; 10 percent on income from VN$500,001 to VN$1 million; and 16 percent on income over VN$1 million. Abatements (personal exemptions) are VN$30,000 for single persons and heads of households; VN$15,000 additional for married persons; VN$5,000 for each child under 21 years of age; and VN$3,000 for each dependent parent or grandparent. A professional deduction is allowed for travel and entertainment (10 percent of gross income up to VN$240,000 and 5 percent of gross income exceeding VN$240,000) and exemptions for pension payments are allowable. Filing date for all income taxes is April 1 for income received in the preceding calendar year. Except for Government employees, withholding tax procedures have not been developed.

(b) Profits tax: Levied annually against all net profits from business operations of any kind, but excludes from its base capital gains and income from stocks and bonds. The tax is 24 percent for corporations and 16 percent for unincorporated businesses, including professions. The profits tax on individuals has the same abatements as the income tax on salaries. Deductions for firms include all ordinary and necessary expenses attributable to earning the profit.

(c) General income tax: Levied on all income subject to the tax on salaries and wages, to the individual profits tax or business profits tax, and on income earned from sources outside of Vietnam. Allowable deductions are the same as for the salary and profits tax; deductions are permitted for salary, profits, and general income taxes paid in the previous year. Tax rates for the general income tax are progressive within the range of 1 to 50 percent.

(d) Tax on dividends and interest paid by corporations: A withholding levy at the corporate level on dividend and interest payments. Tax rates vary between 18 and 30 percent depending on the characteristics of the corporation. For application of the tax, corporations are first divided into foreign and Vietnamese. Foreign corporations are taxed at the rate of 30 percent on all Vietnam-allocated dividends and interest payments; the allocation is construed to be the ratio of the total turnover resulting from operations in Vietnam and the total turnover of the corporation. Vietnamese corporations are subject to one of two rates: the rate of tax on dividends of a S.A.R.L. (limited liability corporation) is 18 percent; a societe anonyme (corporation) is subject to a 24-percent dividends tax. Interest payments by both types of Vietnamese corporations are taxed at 18 percent.

2. Real estate taxes: There are three basic characteristics of the Vietnamese system of taxing real property; (a) The tax is primarily a Central Government source of revenue, with other levels of government receiving income based on percentage surtaxes added to the Central Government tax. (b) Land is taxed according to productive capacity, while urban buildings are taxed on the basis of real capital value. (c) Four basic distinctions are made in the tax rates applicable to land depending on whether it is located in an urban center, used for rice production, used for mixed agricultural production or borders a rural highway or street.

(a) Rice land tax: Land is classified according to productivity and taxed by hectare. There are six classes of land; the tax ranges from VN$10 to VN$85 per hectare.

(b) Mixed cultivation land tax: There are seven classes of land; the tax ranges from VN$15 to VN$300 per hectare.

(c) Urban land and property tax: Unimproved land is taxed by hectare following a complicated schedule based on location. There are separate rates for (1) major cities (Saigon is divided into four zones and seven categories, each with a different rate); (2) first-class cities (5 zones); (3) second-class cities (4 zones); (4) third-class cities (3 zones); (5) land bordering national and provincial highways; and (6) land bordering auxiliary or communal roads. The rates on unimproved land range from VN$30 per hectare (class 6 above) to VN$10,000 in Saigon. Improved land is taxed twice: the land is taxed (there are five rates, ranging from VN$0.05 to VN$0.85 per square meter) and the improvements are taxed. The property tax rate may range from 1 to 5 percent of the real property value; it is fixed annually in accordance with the budgetary needs of the country. There is, in addition, a 40-percent tax on "super rent" properties which are rented at abnormally high prices.

3. The patente (business license): The patente is an annual fee levied on individuals and corporations for the privilege of engaging in a trade, profession, or industry. Exempt from the tax are teachers, farmers, those who are engaged in the extraction of natural resources, and a few others.

There are two parts to the tax. The basic tax is a specific levy determined by the type of business. All businesses are listed in the fiscal code, which records 743 different types of businesses and professions and establishes minimum and maximum rates for each. For example, a tailor may be taxed within the range of VN$60 to VN$3,000 per annum; for a commercial bank the rate varies from VN$3,000 to VN$100,000; a large hotel from VN$1,400 to VN$25,000; an automobile agency from VN$600 to VN$25,000; and an import-export firm from VN$800 to VN$75,000. The basic rate for most large commercial enterprises is within the range of VN$8,000 to VN$75,000.

In addition to the basic tax, there is an ad valorem levy applied to the rental value of the business property. The tax rates on rental value are progressive in the range of 3 to 10 percent depending on the amount of the basic tax assessment. This tax rate applied to the annual rent, plus the basic tax, constitutes the total patente tax for the Central Government. Percentage increases of the Central Government patente tax are added for the benefit of local governments. There is also surtax of 2½ percent of the Central Government tax for the chamber of commerce.

Twenty-five business activities, chiefly manufacturing firms, are not subject to the patents but are taxed on the basis of turnover, volume of production or services provided or according to some other specialized schedule.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do not forget that most of our aid to Vietnam is required because of our presence there. Our presence is creating the inflation which we are trying to fight by giving them $275 million under this bill.

We are on an economic treadmill. The more men we send, the more they spend, and the more aid we shall have to provide to overcome the inflation which we are causing.

One of the sad things about this $415 million, and the part of it that goes to South Vietnam, is that a large part of it will fall into the hands of the Vietcong. That is the record. We have the cart before the horse, Mr. President. The pouring of the American taxpayers' largesse into South Vietnam will enhance, not stop, the corruption, until we bring about a solution of the military problem over there, and determine what the political situation is going to be.

Mr. President, there will be a continuation of the practice that a large part of our aid, both materiel and moneywise, will get into the hands of the Vietcong; and furthermore, a good many of the installations for which we are spending this money will be destroyed by the Vietcong. Let us face it; we have to get the war over first, before we can successfully proceed with the program—the ultimate purposes of which I support—of taking economic freedom to South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I cannot sit here and acquiesce in continuing to waste the American taxpayers' money, just because there are those in this country who are whipping up a war hysteria, waving the flag into tatters, and seeking to give the impression that those of us who are trying to stop that performance over there and save the lives of American boys are somehow, some way, not supporting those American boys.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that those who are not supporting those American boys over there are those who are voting, here in the Senate, to expand and escalate that war, so that thousands more of them are sure to be killed in the years immediately ahead. They are the ones who will have the blood on their hands. But not the senior Senator from Oregon. I shall continue, so long as we do not have a formal declaration of war—which is necessary to make that war legal and constitutional—to do what I can to bring that fighting to an end by resorting to the programs that I have stood for here these many months past, by again urging on the floor of the Senate today that this administration adopt the views of General Gavin and General Ridgway and George Kennan, to provide for taking the holding action necessary to protect our boys until a good many divisions from other countries can be moved in there to help separate the competing warmaking forces and enforce a cease-fire order.

But, there are other things in the bill which I want the record to show my colleagues voted for this afternoon, because we are going to make the record as to what my colleagues voted for.

My colleagues will be voting for a bill that authorizes a $100 million contingency fund for the President of the United States, $100 million in this bill for the President of the United States to do with as he wishes.

We talk about constitutional checks. We talk about carrying out our obligations under the Constitution as Senators to check the executive branch of the Government. Senators tell me they have no fear of a movement toward government by Executive supremacy. Why, Mr. President, this $100 million contingency fund for the President of the United States in this so-called supplemental bill is more than the total contingency fund we voted the President throughout the world last year.

Last year, the total contingency fund for the President of the United States throughout the world was $50 million. We are going to give him an unchecked $100 million in the pending bill.

Mr. President, I speak impersonally. I will never have my record show that I ever gave to any President, be he Lyndon B. Johnson or any other President, that kind of unchecked power—$100 million—what are we thinking of? How can we possibly take $100 million of the American taxpayers' money and turn it over to a man to spend as he decides to spend it?

That is not government by law. That is government by man.

When I taught for years that one of the basic constitutional principles of our form of government is that we are a government by law and not a government by man, I did not teach it to come into the Senate years later and walk out on the principle that I taught.

Let me say that that $100 million is an inexcusable amount to give to a President of the United States.

How long does it take the President of the United States to travel from the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol for a joint session of Congress?

Not more than 20 minutes.

Why, Mr. President, if ever an emergency developed whereby the President would need more funds than those set out specifically in an appropriation bill, let him get up here and ask for them in light of a specific need, and not give him this kind of blanket contingency fund authority. That is dangerous to the preservation of a system of checks and balances in this country and a government based upon three coordinate and coequal branches of government.

Last year, not only did we have that $50 million for the President to use anywhere in the world, but the executive branch also got out of us another contingency fund for the President last year—I believe the amount was $89 million, $57 million of which went into Vietnam. For what good, and for what purpose?

What we are dealing with here again is a foreign aid bill in which Congress is perfectly willing to give broad, sweeping powers to the executive branch of the Government, and it will file with us a nice-sounding report in which language will be incorporated to show their reservations, their fears, and their concerns. They give those of us who oppose the development of government by executive supremacy the words, but they give the President the votes.

Mr. President, we are not going to stop this trend toward government by executive supremacy unless we start voting against it, unless we start voting to apply the checks.

It is interesting that in the Committee on Foreign Relations, long debate took place on certain amendments offered which are not being offered on the floor today.

I wish to read the Fulbright amendment which the Senator proposed in committee, which received six votes.

It reads as follows:

> At the beginning of the bill insert the following new section and renumber succeeding sections:
>
> "That section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> " 'This Act, or the furnishing of economic, military, or other assistance under this Act, shall not be construed as a commitment to use Armed Forces of the United States for the defense of any foreign country.' "

Mr. President, there was interesting discussion around that Foreign Relations Committee table. There was very little opposition to the objectives and the principle of the Fulbright proposal. What was the main reason, therefore, not to place it in the bill? Because it was not the appropriate vehicle, it was decided.

I am waiting patiently and hopefully for the legislative vehicle that my colleagues will find appropriate on the floor of the Senate to carry out so much of their discussion in the cloakrooms. That is the vehicle I wish to see. I am afraid that I am never going to see it. I am afraid that all the Senate is going to do is give to the American people language of reservation and doubt, perplexity and confusion, but it will continue, in my judgment, to delegate away what I consider to be the clear duty of the Senate to place checks upon the administration along such lines as the Fulbright amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12169

> At the beginning of the bill insert the following new section and renumber succeeding sections:
>
> "That section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> " 'This Act, or the furnishing of economic, military, or other assistance under this Act, shall not be construed as a commitment to use armed forces of the United States for the defense of any foreign country.' "

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, then there is the McGovern amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> SEC. 4. (a) The Congress hereby declares that its action in authorizing the additional assistance for Vietnam provided by this Act—
>
> (1) shall not be construed as a ratification of any policy decision heretofore made with respect to hostilities in Vietnam, or as an endorsement of any future commitment with respect to such hostilities; and
>
> (2) is taken with the hope that such additional assistance will contribute to an early cessation, rather than a widening, of such hostilities.
>
> (b) Recognizing the desire of the President to limit the scope of hostilities and to reach an honorable settlement of the conflict and cognizant of the desirability of improved relations between the people of the United States and the people of Asia, it is the sense of the Congress, that United States foreign policy in Asia should seek to minimize the risks of military involvement and to promote orderly economic and social development.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence, the McGovern amendment was a proposal which sought to make clear at least the purport of the amendment, and others that support it with a great deal of reservation, as to the meaning of the ill-fated resolution of August 1964.

But, it is said, after all, a blank check was not given; after all, the President was not given unchecked power.

How anyone can take the English language in that particular resolution and read anything else into it but a grant of complete power to the President of the United States to do what he wished to do, I am at a loss to understand.

They must have taken a course in English which I never took, because I cannot read any such meaning into the King's English in that resolution.

The Senator from Alaska is in the Chamber, listening to me, and let me say to him that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that he and I in August 1964 stood up on the floor of the Senate and told the Senate over and over again that that is exactly what the Senate would be giving the President by way of power, for the language is not subject to any other interpretation.

Mr. President, we should take back that power, for in that resolution was contained a rescission clause. I sought to get the Senate to rescind it a week ago on Tuesday, when I offered my motion to rescind. That motion was laid on the table, although I wish to say that I agreed with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I agreed also with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]—but completely disagreed with them on the policy they are supporting in South Vietnam—when they made so clear in the RECORD that a vote on that motion to lay on the table did raise the question as to whether we are going to vote to check the President's power under the resolution of August 1964.

In my judgment, irrespective of their verbal resolutions, their votes spoke louder than their words on that ill-fated day a week ago on Tuesday, when they voted to lay my amendment on the table. They once again gave to the President a vote of confidence of the same nature which they gave him in August 1964.

The check is out of the Senate. The check now is with the people.

I close by saying I oppose this bill because, in my judgment, it violates our system of checks and balances; because, in my judgment, millions and millions of dollars of this money will again be used to finance corruption in South Vietnam. Large amounts of the aid will get into the hands of the Communists. As past experience shows, it will be delivered to them by South Vietnamese who will get their hands on millions of dollars of it.

As far as the particular facilities on which it will be spent are concerned, many will be destroyed by the Vietcong. I think it is hopeless to think that we can build up a viable economy for the future in South Vietnam while this shocking war is proceeding.

I shall vote against the bill because I think a vote for it is a vote to kill additional American boys in South Vietnam, who, in my judgment, should not be killed. I think this bill will add to the expanding escalation of the war, and I want to stop the killing.

I want to find a solution along the lines the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has proposed; along the lines the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has advocated; along the lines the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I have proposed on the floor of the Senate for many, many months past—a solution that will call for the enforcement of a cease-fire order, enforced by those nations that are noncombatants in this ghasty, unjustifiable, immoral war; a cease-fire order that will say to the combatants, including my own country, "You have an opportunity to stop fighting on the basis of terms and conditions of the cease-fire order, and if you do not obey the order of the cease-fire, we will get the divisions from around the world necessary to enforce the peace."

Mr. President, that is not making war. That is enforcing peace. It is not making war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. This is the only way we will save the killing of American boys in South Vietnam.

It is the only way the United States can be stopped from expanding a war that will inevitably lead to a war with China; and a war with China will inevitably lead to a nuclear war.

I shall be proud to have my record show that I voted against this war bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], after which I shall yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and thereafter I shall yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to a part of this bill that appeals to me a great deal. That part of the bill reads:

> No part of the funds appropriated under the preceding sentence after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be used to provide assistance to any country which permits any ship or aircraft under its registry to transport any equipment, materials, or commodities to or from North Vietnam unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress.

Mr. President, what I am going to say I say as a friend of the British, but I feel it is alarming that our allies permit ships under their flag to take materials and commodities to the ports of North Vietnam.

During the last quarter of 1965, of the 44 allied ships that went into the harbor at Haiphong, 35 were British ships.

As a Member of the Senate of the United States, I want to say on the floor of the Senate and for the record that I think it is very desirable that the legislation we are passing today carries a proviso that no country shall benefit from any funds appropriated for it if that country permits ships flying its flag to go into North Vietnam harbors.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I very much share the viewpoint just expressed by the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I have stated in speeches in my own State, and other areas, that I did not understand how we could justify giving any economic aid to any country that was shipping aid to North Vietnam. I think we should halt such shipments as soon as possible.

I would like to ask a question of the manager of the bill on this very point. I understand this prohibition referred to by the Senator from Virginia applies only to the President's contingency fund. Do we have any assurances from the State Department as to whether aid not involving the contingency fund and thus not covered in this bill, is being cut off to those countries which are shipping goods into North Vietnam?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may call to the attention of the Senator the fact that there are two provisions in existing law. This is a new provision.

If the Senator will refer to page 8 of the report, there is a discussion of this provision in the third paragraph on that page:

> The House of Representatives amended the bill to prohibit the furnishing of contingency fund aid to any nation which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to carry on trade with North Vietnam, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would not be in the national interest and reports his determination to the Congress.

> This new prohibition fits in the context of two existing restrictions on aid to countries whose ships or aircraft trade with North Vietnam. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 contained a provision which requires the President to consider denying aid to countries which did not take appropriate action to prevent ships and aircraft under its registry from carrying goods to or from North Vietnam. A provision in the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1966 prohibits the furnishing of aid to any country which allows its ships or aircraft to carry to North Vietnam any of the strategic materials mentioned in section 107(a) of that act.

Mr. DOMINICK. Did the Secretary of State or any other official give any assurance that countries now shipping into North Vietnam are not receiving aid as a result of that policy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There was assurance given that every effort is being made and will continue to be made to get other nations to take action to stop ships bearing their flag from trading with North Vietnam. Much progress is being made in that direction.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama and I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah.

I believe this is an extremely important matter and we should move forward in this regard as soon as possible in order that many lives may be saved in Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the present conflict in Vietnam has, indeed, had a negative effect on the economy of that country.

I view the present authorization request as not essentially different from requests for our other aid to South Vietnam. This money will be used to stabilize the economy and thereby the Government in this time of war. It is certainly to our interests to assure that the economy and the Government of South Vietnam remain steady.

We could not effectively assist these peoples militarily while being plagued with shifting political and deteriorating economic situations.

Considering the problems involved, we are dealing effectively with our commitment toward the people of South Vietnam, Mr. President. The problem is great and the progress often tedious, but the firmness of our position has been noted behind the Iron Curtain.

Let this legislation today be noted as a further warning that we intend to pursue on all fronts the freedom and security of endangered peoples such as the South Vietnamese.

I would certainly hope that these funds are used wisely and toward the goals for which they were intended. The Government of South Vietnam must remain ever vigilant that inflation be checked so that our mutual goals of world order, in general, and freedom and security in Vietnam, in particular, can be realized.

We are engaging in a program to win the support of the people of the Vietnamese countryside to the Government. It is an entirely new challenge in a new kind of war.

But it is a problem with which we must deal. In voting for this legislation my hopes are with those who must find a way to accomplish this difficult task so that our mission in southeast Asia may earlier and more effectively be realized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last week we passed a multibillion-dollar authorization to finance our military efforts to protect the people of South Vietnam from the forcible imposition of Communist rule.

I voted for that bill because I think that as long as our troops are committed to combat, we must do all we can to support them.

We must recognize, however, the basic fact that military power alone—even power strong enough to crush out the insurgency in Vietnam—cannot crush out a revolutionary spirit. "More powerful than all the armies in the world," wrote Victor Hugo, "is an idea whose time has come." We are witnessing in Vietnam and throughout the underdeveloped world a social and political revolution which will decisively mark mankind's course for the foreseeable future.

This country has made mistakes in dealing with the struggle for a better life for the 2 billion people of the underdeveloped world. But I am not prepared to accept the proposition that communism has a monopoly on social revolution, or that the political and economic subservience from which the ex-colonies are trying to emerge should be replaced with a total tyranny of the mind and spirit.

I am not prepared to accept the proposition that the theories of personal freedom and self-determination we cherish are inapplicable or unattractive to the people of the newly emerging nations, or that the despotism of communism is in the long run a reasonable price for a people to pay for nation building.

So I support our efforts to end the fighting and the terror and the destruction of the war in Vietnam under conditions which will assure self-determination for the South Vietnamese people. Certainly the task of nation building can make little progress until the populace can be made reasonably secure. This is the job of the military. But in this economic aid bill we look beyond the narrow military task to the broader, and ultimately more important task of economic and social construction and transformation.

Transformation is too weak a word. What is required in Vietnam is nothing less than a social revolution.

We must fully appreciate the enormity of the task we have undertaken in Vietnam. It is nothing less than an attempt to build a nation; and nations are not built quickly or easily. Our goal is a South Vietnamese Government which is independent, able to protect its people, responsive to their needs and desires, and capable of providing them with at least the necessities of life.

This is a goal worthy of America. But we must have no illusions as to the difficulty of attaining it. South Vietnam has proven so vulnerable to communism, because its people have so little reason to defend the status quo. The Vietnamese peasant has a per capita annual income of about $90. He is beset with disease, burdened with debt, crippled by illiteracy, exploited by a corrupt officialdom, and has no real hope for a better life either for himself or his children. In recent years the war raging around and through his village has theatened his very life.

This situation has not developed overnight. Under French colonial rule, the peasant, who had previously been a self-contained economic unit, began to produce cash crops. He thus became vulnerable to economic forces beyond his control. A year of low production or falling prices deprived the peasant of even a subsistence income. He had to mortgage his land to live. Another bad year brought foreclosure, and the peasant assumed the precarious status of a tenant for an absentee landlord. As credit rates went up, middlemen and moneylenders proliferated and tenancy increased.

These broad economic and social changes stimulated a simultaneous rise in aspirations and frustrations. The peasant has had sufficient contact with modern urbanized life to realize keenly the opportunities which are denied him. This inevitably has bred a sense of frustration and outrage. He has very easily become prey to the Vietcong organizer who brings the peasant a promise of owning his own land and a promise of a government devoted to his welfare. These simple ideas strike a deep responsive chord in an oppressed people. Such ideas will not be eradicated by military means. They can be defeated only by equally good ideas implemented in an effective social, economic, and political program. In the words of General Lansdale:

> The Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam. It will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us. Ideas do not die in such ways.

So I want to take a few moments today to suggest some ways the revolutionary ideas at loose in Vietnam can be met and fulfilled by a free government.

All the promises and policies of the Saigon government will mean little if they are not effectively and painstakingly implemented at the grassroots level in Vietnam. The problems which have plagued our efforts in the past have been less in broad policy than in day to day implementation.

A basic difficulty in implementing effective social and economic reform in Vietnam is the condition of the Vietnamese civil service.

The French left a complex and cumbersome administrative structure, but trained very few Vietnamese to operate it. Furthermore, the Vietcong have systematically destroyed the cream of the bureaucracy, killing over 11,000 village and hamlet officials last year alone. Under such conditions it is sometimes remarkable that local government functions at all.

Yet, if any one group holds the key to the future of Vietnam it is the civil service. The effectiveness of the civil service will determine whether a viable free society can be constructed in Vietnam. We must meet the serious shortage of trained civil servants through an expanded program of training new recruits and retraining existing officials. The small corps of American advisers skilled in local government now in Vietnam should be greatly expanded. They provide a type of on-the-job training and advice that does not necessitate taking valuable Vietnamese civil servants from their jobs.

Continued efforts must be made to select talented local people in rural areas for utilization in the lower levels of administration—both to improve efficiency and to provide a channel of upward mobility to talented and ambitious peasant youth. So far as possible, we should encourage the introduction of some sort of regularized merit system of hiring and promotion in the bureaucracy.

An urgent problem in the heavily populated region of the Mekong Delta is land reform. The Vietcong derive enormous strength from their promise to provide land to vast numbers of tenant peasants. Effective land reform by the Saigon government is essential to blunt this appeal.

But effective land reform is more than a simple redistribution of land. It will require a simultaneous revision of tax, marketing, and credit laws; the establishment of rural cooperatives, agricultural extension services, and other enlightened programs to help the peasant keep the land he gets in the redistribution.

Another area of Vietnamese life which must be reformed is access to education. Secondary and university levels of education are in large part reserved to children of wealthy and influential Vietnamese families. This in turn has kept the civil service, teaching, and the professions as preserves of the privileged, because employment in these vocations has required a degree.

The expansion of rural primary education has served only to raise unfilled aspirations, since access to the secondary schools and universities remains cut off.

Access to the upper educational levels must be broadened if the revolutionary and justifiable aspirations of the peasants of Vietnam are to be satisfied.

Another area of serious crisis is the destruction of family income by the death of the breadwinner in the war. Like other oriental societies, that of Vietnam has been centered around the extended family and kin group. It is these units that have provided security to the individual. Under the impact of modernization and protracted warfare these institutions have broken down leaving only the individual and his immediate family. If something happens to the male breadwinner his dependents have no other source of support. This provides a major incentive both for the Vietnamese military and civilian government to avoid taking the kind of risks which a successful war effort requires. It is imperative then, that an adequate social security and survivors benefits program be provided by the government.

A particular concern to me as a member of the Refugees and Escapees Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is that of Vietnamese refugees from the war.

The Vietnamese refugee program has been characterized on both the American and Vietnamese sides by bureaucratic confusion and paralysis, a shortage of materials, and a lack of clear priorities. Some Vietnamese Province chiefs have regarded the refugees as the lowest priority group in their Province. As a result the refugees seldom get adequate support in terms of food, clothing, shelter, and land. The refugees have chosen the Government as opposed to the Vietcong because they believe that the Government can more likely provide them with what they seek; security and the necessities of life. Their hope must not be disappointed.

I have pointed to some of the problems we face in Vietnam not because I think they are unsolvable, but rather because I think they must be solved.

The world will never be safe, the peace will never be secure, as long as violence and terrorism are acceptable substitutes for free choice.

We simply must find a way to assure self-determination for the South Vietnamese.

I think this economic assistance bill is an essential step.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All time having been yielded back, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, should we not have a quorum call first?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], would each vote "yea."

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Gruening
Morse

NOT VOTING—16

Church
Clark
Harris
Hruska
Kuchel
Lausche
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (H.R. 12169) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] today has reearned the highest respect of the Senate with a demonstration of his typically efficient and successful management of the economic assistance supplemental. His great skill and unequaled diplomacy coupled with his clear and profound explanations brought decisive and expeditious action on this most important foreign aid authorization.

The Senate and the Nation are indeed fortunate to have this great American statesman in their service.

Important also for this great success was the splendid cooperation of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Again, he articulately expressed his strong and sincere views concerning our foreign policy but, in a most selfless manner, permitted the Senate to work its will in orderly fashion.

Additionally, high commendation goes to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], whose broad knowledge and deep understanding of our foreign assistance programs contributed immensely to this great success.

We are grateful, too, for the assistance of those Senators who offered their own constructive views but who, nonetheless, did not in any way impede the progress of this important measure. Our thanks go to the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], Indiana [Mr. BAYH], Virginia [Mr. BYRD], Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and, of course, we are grateful for the help of the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF FRANCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it is my honor and privilege to present to the Senate five distinguished members of the National Assembly of France, who are our guests in the Chamber today. They are:

Hon. Jean-Louis Gasparini, deputy, Moselle.

Hon. Augustin Marc Bordage, deputy, Deux-Sevres.

Hon. Bertrand Flornoy, deputy, Seine et Marne.

Hon. Henri Gorce-Franklin, deputy, Rhone.

Hon. Jean Moulin, deputy, Ardeche.

They are accompanied by His Excellency Charles Lucet, Ambassador of France.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the Senator from Kansas in welcoming to the Chamber our colleagues from the National Assembly of France and their outstanding Ambassador, M. Lucet.

It is a pleasure to have them with us. We hope that their visit will be enjoyable and educational. We assure them of our continued friendship and understanding.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Pursuant to Public Law 170 of the 74th Congress, the Chair appoints the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] to attend the Interparliamentary Union meeting at Canberra, Australia, from April 11 to 16, 1966, in place of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], who was previously named.

REPORT ON MANPOWER AND MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS, RESOURCES, UTILIZATION, AND TRAINING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1966.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: As required by section 107 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, I am sending to the Congress my annual manpower report, and the report of the Secretary of Labor on manpower requirements, resources, use, and training.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, after the coal mine safety bill and the Alaska centennial bill have been disposed of on Monday, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 20 minutes to speak on the subject of wage-price guideposts.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the business for the remainder of the day.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1027, H.R. 3584, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately after the renewal of consideration of Calendar No. 1027, H.R. 3584, on Monday, March 14, 1966, debate on the measure be limited to one-half hour on each amendment, and 2 hours on the bill, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator in charge of the bill, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNAMINOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, March 14, 1966, after the bill is laid before the Senate, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: ***Provided,*** That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]: *Provided,* That the two Senators, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ALASKA CENTENNIAL—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the message from the House of Representatives on S. 2614, the Alaskan Centennial bill, is laid before the Senate, that debate on any motions thereon be limited to one-half hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That when the message from the House of Representatives on S. 2614 (an act to provide for United States participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska purchase), is laid before the Senate, debate on any motions thereon will be limited to 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to call these two bills up on Monday, and following the disposal of these two bills, it is anticipated that Calendar 1025, S. 2499, a bill to amend the Small Business Act, will be considered.

Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate, may I say, concerning the 2 unanimous-consent requests granted by the Senate this afternoon there will very likely be rollcall votes on both of these measures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, does the majority leader know whether there will be any further business today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no further business today; except it is my understanding that the distinguished ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Committee is prepared at an appropriate time, which I hope will be within the next 2 or 3 minutes, to lay before the Senate the conference report on the military aid bill.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12889) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the House version of H.R. 12889 authorized military construction in an amount of $49,700,000 more than the Senate version. This additional authorization was intended for Marine Corps air facilities on Okinawa and naval port facilities in Subic Bay in the Philippine Islands. Although there is no assurance this construction authorization will be funded immediately, the requirement for it is sufficiently firm that the Senate conferees agreed to inclusion of this authorization in the conference report.

The other differences in the two bills were in the general provisions. The Senate version had included a provision requiring quarterly reports of the estimated value of military assistance furnished South Vietnam and countries allied with us in her defense. The House version did not include this reporting but did have reporting provisions covering military construction in South Vietnam. Since the objective of both the House and Senate provisions was to keep the Congress informed regarding the utilization of the authorization granted, the conferees agreed to retain the reporting provisions adopted separately by the two bodies.

As agreed to by the conferees the bill would grant supplemental military authorizations for fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $4,857,450,000.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, what was the amount contained in the bill when it left the Senate, and what is the amount contained in the bill now?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate version was $4,807,750,000. There was a House provision, to provide for the giving of notice to the House and the Senate committees of any new construction in Vietnam. In the Senate portion of the bill, there was a provision that the Defense Department should report quarterly to the committees on military assistance. There was, in addition, authorization of $10 million in the House bill for construction at Subic Bay in the Philippines and of $39,700,000 for air facilities at Okinawa. The Senate accepted those two provisions. The conference agreement is on an authorization of $4,857,450,000.

Mr. JAVITS. What happened to the other provisions, the House provision and the Senate provision?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They are contained in the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

HEARING BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION TO INQUIRE INTO WITNESS HARASSMENT AND A VIOLATION OF THE U.S. CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am inviting auto industry critic, Ralph Nader, the president of General Motors, and detective agencies to appear before my Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization on March 22.

I am calling the hearing because a General Motors statement issued late yesterday raised issues which go beyond the question of witness harassment and a violation of the U.S. criminal code. Earlier this week I asked the Justice Department to investigate reports in the press that Nader had been intimidated following his testimony before the subcommittee about traffic safety.

The GM statement issued last night held:

> It is a well-known and accepted practice in the legal profession to investigate claims and persons making claims in the product liability field, such as the pending Corvair design cases.

It appears that General Motors is seeking to justify its investigation of Mr. Nader by impugning his motives as a witness before my subcommittee.

I believe the parties in this matter should come before the subcommittee to present their views. This is the fair—the American—way of approaching a matter of public policy.

I resent character assassination in any form, and I expect General Motors to back up its charges concerning Mr. Nader's connection with pending Corvair litigation. I also expect a public explanation of the alleged harassment of a Senate committee witness.

I have not dicussed this with any of the parties concerned. But I suggest that they come before the subcommittee to discuss the entire matter. The safety of the American driving public is the basic issue before the committee. To this must now be added the additional issue of a witness' right to testify before a committee of the U.S. Congress without fear of character assassination or intimidation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram received from the Ford Motor Co., and the news release from the General Motors Corp., mentioned earlier be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEARBORN, MICH.,
March 9, 1966.

Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

With regard to your statement on the floor of the Senate Tuesday, Ford Motor Co. has not been, nor is it now, directly or indirectly involved in any alleged investigation or harassment of Mr. Nader, nor has it any knowledge of or connection with the alleged incidents concerning him. We are releasing a copy of this to the press immediately.

JOHN S. BUGAS,
Vice President, Ford Motor Co., the American Road.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY GENERAL MOTORS ON MARCH 9, 1966

General Motors said today that following the publication of Mr. Ralph Nader's criticisms of the Corvair in writings and public appearances in support of his book, "Unsafe at Any Speed," the office of its general counsel initiated a routine investigation through a reputable law firm to determine whether Ralph Nader was acting on behalf of litigants or their attorneys in Corvair design cases pending against General Motors. The investigation was prompted by Mr. Nader's extreme criticism of the Corvair in his writings, press conferences, TV, and other

> public appearances. Mr. Nader's statements coincided with similar publicity by some attorneys handling such litigation.
>
> It is a well known and accepted practice in the legal profession to investigate claims and persons making claims in the product liability field, such as in the pending Corvair design cases.
>
> The investigation was limited only to Mr. Nader's qualifications, background, expertise, and association with such attorneys. It did not include any of the alleged harassment or intimidation recently reported in the press. If Mr. Nader has been subjected to any of the incidents and harassment mentioned by him in newspaper stories, such incidents were in no way associated with General Motors' legitimate investigation of his interest in pending litigation.
>
> At General Motors' investigation, Mr. Nader spent a day at the GM Technical Center, Warren, Mich., early in January visiting with General Motors executives and engineers. He was shown a number of engineering and research testing and development programs in the field of automotive safety. A number of the accusations in his book were discussed at length, and a presentation was made of the evidence used in the successful defense of the only two Corvair lawsuits tried.
>
> Mr. Nader expressed appreciation for the courtesy in providing him with detailed information, but he, nevertheless, continued the same line of attack on the design of the Corvair in a number of subsequent press conferences, TV, and other appearances. This behavior lends support to General Motors' belief that there is a connection between Mr. Nader and plaintiffs' counsel in pending Corvair design litigation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Connecticut for requesting that the appropriate witnesses involved in this incident appear before his committee.

In listening to the statement of the Senator, I did not understand whether the Senator was requesting the General Motors Corp. to produce at the hearings the detectives who actually participated in the investigation.

Mr. RIBICOFF. We shall request representatives of the detective agencies to be present.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Connecticut have a list of the agencies that were involved in this matter?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, we have the list of agencies as it appeared in the press. We shall inquire of General Motors Corp. whether there are any agencies which did not appear in the list published in the newspaper.

Mr. NELSON. I am not a member of that committee, but I have some very strong viewpoints about what has been involved here.

Mr. President, the General Motors Corp., one of the leading business corporations in the world, has now admitted that the investigation of Ralph Nader, which has attracted widespread attention, was instigated by General Motors.

The New York Times, New Republic magazine, and much of the Nation's press had reported this shocking situation over the last few days without knowing who was behind it.

Mr. Nader became the target for this investigation by writing a book criticizing a number of automobile design features which he contended were unsafe, and by testifying before a Senate subcommittee studying auto safety on February 10. The Senate has heard of the fantastic cloak-and-dagger episodes which resulted.

Mr. Nader was harassed by anonymous telephone calls as he worked in his Washington hotel room, preparing his Senate committee testimony. He was shadowed right into the Senate Office Building by two private investigators who were so brazen as to tell a Capitol policeman that they had been following Mr. Nader around the country. His landlady has been quizzed as to his record of rent payment. His stockbroker, his editor, and business associates have been questioned.

An attorney to whom he dedicated his book has been questioned at great length by a private detective who was making lurid inferences about his private life. This investigator used all the tricks of his seamy trade—a fake reason for the interview, two different phony names, apparently even a recording device in an attaché case.

On February 20, Nader was approached by a woman in a Washington drugstore who asked him to come to a meeting with her that night to discuss foreign affairs. On February 23, he was approached by another woman in a grocery store who asked him to come to her apartment and help her move furniture.

General Motors issued a brief, carefully worded statement last night in which it admitted conducting an investigation of Mr. Nader. General Motors states that its investigation was limited to Mr. Nader's qualifications, background, expertise, and association with attorneys who represent persons suing General Motors for alleged automobile design faults.

The General Motors release also includes this skillfully worded sentence:

> If Mr. Nader has been subjected to any of the incidents and harassment mentioned by him in newspaper stories, such incidents were in no way associated with General Motors' legitimate investigation of his interest in pending litigation.

Who can quarrel with that statement? Of course the scandalous incidents related above were not associated with any legitimate investigation. Rather, it seems quite obvious that they were part of a fantastic conspiracy of intimidation and harassment spread over half a dozen States and carrying right into the U.S. Senate.

This was a carefully planned, well-financed scheme whose purpose could only be intimidation or smear.

If, as the General Motors release seems to say in its careful language, General Motors was responsible for part of this but not all of it, then we obviously must find out exactly what General Motors did do and what General Motors did not do.

As of right now, I think the circumstantial evidence is quite compelling. Knowing that these episodes did happen, involving a number of different people, and knowing that General Motors did order an investigation of Mr. Nader's qualifications, background, expertise, and associations, the implication is compelling that General Motors was responsible for much of the sordid developments which the press has outlined.

This raises grave and serious questions of national significance. What are we coming to if a great and powerful corporation will engage in such unethical and scandalous activity in an effort to discredit a citizen who is a witness before a congressional committee?

If great corporations can engage in this kind of intimidation, it is an assault upon freedom in America. No average citizen can face up to a corporation the size of General Motors which sets out to destroy him.

How could a responsible corporation deal with a critic such as Mr. Nader?

One of Mr. Nader's contentions is that the rear axle of the Corvair automobile manufactured in 1960 through 1963 was designed in such a way that the outside wheel tended to "tuck under" on turns. Mr. Nader states that the Corvair rear axle was redesigned for the 1964 model year to correct this alleged defect.

Another of his contentions is that the 1953 Buick Roadmaster, manufactured by GM, employed a power brake system which was inclined to fail. Mr. Nader supports this contention with testimony from a garage mechanic employed by a Ferndale, Mich., Buick dealer, during a lawsuit in the Wayne County Circuit Court. This mechanic testified that he had received a number of complaints about power brake failure on 1953 Buicks, but that the Buick service department treated this as a hush thing. They do not want the public to know the brakes were bad.

I do not blame General Motors for being alarmed at such charges by Mr. Nader. It certainly is possible that they could reflect on the company.

However, there are a number of ways in which a firm could deal with this problem. First of all, they could refute his arguments. Certainly this gigantic corporation, staffed with brilliant automobile engineers and highly paid experts in the field of publicity are quite capable of coping with a humble critic such as Ralph Nader.

If it should develop that his charges are correct and cannot be refuted, then the company could explain its error and the corrective steps it has taken to guarantee that such mistakes would not happen again.

These would be perfectly legitimate actions in the public interest.

However, to react to charges such as Mr. Nader has made by financing a secret investigation of him raises very serious questions. How many people, possessing information which they believe would be in the public interest but which was counter to the interests of a large corporation, would dare disclose this information to the public or to a Senate or House committee if they knew they might face the retaliation which Mr. Nader has experienced?

If, as General Motors says, this is a well-known and accepted practice, are other witnesses who testify before our committees being shadowed and investigated at this very moment?

Obviously, Congress must learn exactly what did happen in the Nader case in order to protect the sanctity of the congressional hearing process and in order to protect the right of American citizens to speak out without fear of massive retaliation by a powerful corporation.

The subcommittee which took Mr. Nader's testimony should conduct a thorough investigation into this situation—and, knowing the Senator from Connecticut as I do, I am sure that it will.

General Motors and its law firm, Alvord & Alvord in Washington, should volunteer to testify under oath.

The committee should be given the names of those who took part in the investigation, and the names of the private detective agencies which were hired to do the work and bring them before the committee.

General Motors describes this as a "routine" investigation. I think it was a shocking scandal. It seriously reflects on the honor and civic responsibility of one of the world's largest corporations. That corporation should not rest until all the facts are made known to the Congress and the American people.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I notice the statement:

> It is a well-known and accepted practice in the legal profession to investigate claims and persons making claims in the product liability field, such as the pending Corvair design cases.

Was there any evidence before our committee that Mr. Nader was an individual who was making a claim or representing persons making claims?

Mr. RIBICOFF. There was not. To my knowledge, from the information we had at the time of Mr. Nader's appearance and up to the present time, we have no evidence that Mr. Nader represents plaintiffs with liability claims against General Motors Corp.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, were some questions raised in connections with the Corvair automobile?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say that not too much information has come out concerning the Corvair automobile. We naturally were aware of the controversy over the Corvair automobile. However, it was my feeling at the time that since the Corvair automobile was in controversy and there were cases pending in various courts, including a case in California at that time, I did not feel that the subcommittee hearings should in any way interfere with the case.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, it appears to me from the statement of the General Motors Corp. that anybody in the United States critical of Corvair, whether in direct litigation or not, is subject to investigation by the General Motors Corp.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Well, I should say that it is a peculiar statement, to say the least. But as the chairman who will preside over these hearings, I should not like to be in a position of prejudging any of the parties, so I prefer not to make any statement by which it could be inferred that I was trying to prejudge any of the parties to this hearing.

The hearing will be fair and open to both parties, to make whatever statements they wish and be subject to questioning by any members.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am delighted to hear that, and I am pleased that the chairman is going ahead with it.

I should also like to request that the General Motors Corp.—and I expect the committee is bringing in the president of General Motors?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The telegram is being directed to the president of General Motors, and the statement includes an invitation to the president of General Motors personally.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes. Could we also request that he bring all of his records in connection with this agency?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That request will be made concerning the records of the detective agency and the investigation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Could we also have the detective agency bring all its records in connection with this matter?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I think the request is a proper one, and that request will be made of the detective agency.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Could we also ask General Motors Corp. to have available in the room any individuals from General Motors who have detailed knowledge about these transactions with the detective agency?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The request will be relayed to the president of General Motors.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. It might be that the counsel of the subcommittee would wish to conduct some preliminary interviews, both with Mr. Nader, to find out some of the surrounding facts, and with the detective agency and General Motors, before the time of the hearings, in order to be fully prepared.

I would further suggest that we have good counsel and staff, so that we can proceed effectively.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Our counsel and staff are excellent. They will invite conversations with all the parties involved, in order to expedite the hearings.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question on this particular issue. The press has reported that General Motors got somebody to investigate Mr. Nader. I did not hear the first part of the Senator's statement; how does that come within the purview of our subcommittee?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It comes within the purview of the subcommittee in this way: Mr. Nader appeared before the subcommittee. He testified at a subcommittee hearing. It subsequently developed that there were detectives following Mr. Nader.

A newspaper reporter from the Washington Post, who happened to come into my office to talk with me on a completely different matter, which had nothing to do with the hearings, was approached by a Capitol policeman, who told him that he was being followed. By coincidence, this reporter from the Washington Post bore a remarkable resemblance to Mr. Nader.

The reporter disclosed those facts in the Washington Post. Then it developed that in the past few weeks, subsequent to the hearing, there had occurred a very thorough investigation which started to come out in various articles in the reputable press and magazines of our country.

Mr. JAVITS. I saw it in the New York Times this morning.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It was in the New York Times, the Hartford Courant, it was in the New Republic, it was in the Washington Post, and the New York Herald Tribune, and there were other newspapers.

Now, what is involved here is potential intimidation and harassment of a witness who appeared before our subcommittee when we were conducting hearings on the Federal role in traffic safety. So we have the prospective problem of a witness before our subcommittee being harassed and intimidated.

In addition, I made a statement on the floor calling attention to this matter, and asked the Department of Justice to investigate, to see if there was any violation of any criminal law.

This morning, I received a telegram from the Ford Motor Co. stating that they in no way had hired any investigators to check on Mr. Nader.

A news release was issued last night, and I received a copy of it this morning, indicating that General Motors had hired investigators. According to them, they hired these investigators in connection with their possible liability based on a contention that the Corvair car was an unsafe automobile.

So all of this evolves around a series of hearings we started last March and have continued through last year and this year.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator indulge me 1 minute further?

This is very important, because General Motors is one of the country's largest corporations and this matter could become quite explosive. So I beg the Senator's indulgence.

I think the Senator is correct about pursuing the matter. I am a member of his subcommittee. I did not know anything about the hearings to be held until just this minute. I should hope very much that the Senator would think over the two words he has used, "harassment" and "intimidation," for this reason: I think we are on trial as well as General Motors. We must be objective, and we have to lay on with an even hand in this matter.

If X wishes to investigate Y—and many things would not be unearthed unless people were investigated—there is nothing wrong with that. The question is, Is it oppressive, is it done to intimidate, is it done to harass, is any law being violated?

So I would only suggest to the chairman—and I agree that this thing has to be looked into thoroughly—that it would be better for all of us, whatever attitude we take—that we should be careful not to make a priori judgments. That is the only suggestion I make.

I am sympathetic with the chairman of the subcommittee, and I think we should start with the feeling that we are going to have a good, objective look; then if we feel someone should be castigated, we certainly should do it. We should not do it in advance by using abrasive words like "harassment" and "intimidation," since we do not yet have the facts before us.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say this: I have been most careful not to prejudge this matter. The distinguished Senator from New York has been a very active member of our subcommittee. He has been in attendance at practically every meeting. He has been there while I have acted as chairman. I believe the Senator will agree that I try to be as judicious and careful and thoughtful of every witness who comes before the subcommittee as I can; and I assure the distinguished Senator that this attitude is very deep, and I would assume the responsibility of not prejudging anyone, and giving each witness and all the parties involved every opportunity to speak and extending them every possible courtesy.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the Senator, I know that; I would guarantee it with everything I have in the world. I know he has been a very objective lawyer, an excellent judge, as well as an excellent Cabinet officer. But the Senator did utter the words, and I merely wished to put them in focus. He has done so, and I thank him.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

Normally, this resolution would be offered by one of the Senators from California. However, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is presently in the hospital. The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is absent on official business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 757), coming over from the House of Representatives, which was read as follows:

H. Res. 575

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable John F. Baldwin, Jr., a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of thirty-seven Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Presdient, I submit a resolution which I ask to have read and for which I ask present consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 234) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. John F. Baldwin, Jr., late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Pursuant to the second resolving clause of the resolution, the Chair appoints the two Senators from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy] as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative John F. Baldwin, Jr.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1966

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative John F. Baldwin, Jr., from California, and pursuant to the previous order, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to: and (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 14, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 10, 1966:

In the Army

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066. In grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations, confirmed by the Senate March 10, 1966:

Postmasters

ALABAMA

Ray M. Smith, Chunchula.
Catherine R. Harper, Pine Hill.

ALASKA

Jack W. Tripp, Fairbanks.

ARIZONA

Francis J. Splichal, Apache Junction.
Beverly J. Sullivan, Jerome.
John M. Summey, Nogales.

ARKANSAS

Thomas M. Clevenger, Branch.
Robert R. Nix, Buckner.
Janet L. Apple, Harrell.

CALIFORNIA

Harry E. Sumners, Artesia.
Roberta D. Wallan, Bieber.
Harry H. McGannon, Cypress.
Harold V. Thoren, Del Rey.
Adeline A. Fitzgerald, Gasquet.
George R. Zeigler, La Mirada.
Roger B. Knoblock, Lemoore.
Raymond J. Bonin, Lucerne Valley.
Clyde R. Madden, Pomona.
Helen A. Avery, Rough and Ready.
Cyril E. Pewtress, Jr., Santee.
Lola R. McCaffrey, Sierraville.

COLORADO

Catherine A. Sanborn, Cascade.

CONNECTICUT

John R. Adamcik, Coventry.
George F. Hudak, Monroe.

FLORIDA

Delma M. Pons, Citra.
Margaret H. Ashley, Fern Park.

GEORGIA

Clyde C. Smith, Brunswick.
Allen T. Lanier, Guyton.
Earnest E. Trapnell, Lyons.
Marjorie G. Sutton, Ocilla.
Kenneth O. Bidne, Senoia.
Lee T. Everett, Vienna.

HAWAII

William H. K. Chang, Hana.

IDAHO

Phillip N. Hathaway, Driggs.
Charles J. Orr, Hazelton.
Howard W. Buchanan, Moscow.

ILLINOIS

Robert F. Bennett, Chrisman.
Jackie L. Floyd, Cisco.
Marvin M. Van Dyke, Hopedale.
James H. Murphy, Loami.
John H. Stauthammer, Mapleton.
James F. Orrison, Opdyke.
Fred D. Naffziger, Rochester.

IOWA

Floyd W. Forst, Bronson.
Lester F. Behrends, Buffalo Center.
Hebron L. Tilton, Carlisle.
Harold W. Spohn, Carson.
Rex E. Williams, Humeston.
William J. Coen, Iowa City.
John M. Clifton, Mechanicsville.
Eugene A. Todd, Woodward.

KANSAS

Bob. R. Donelson, Dexter.
James G. Denton, Elk City.
Lewis A. Goodwin, Florence.
Carlene F. Wendel, Ingalls.
John B. Harris, Lawrence.
Fred G. Burenheide, Olpe.
Jean M. Beck, Riley.

KENTUCKY

Sidney C. Taylor, Grayson.
Mae B. Runyon. Pinsonfork.
Howard D. Lowe, Williamstown.

LOUISIANA

Grady W. Flowers, Bogalusa.
Earl Allen, Delhi.
Lloyd G. Bouchereau, Donaldsonville.
Rodney J. Meaux, Gueydan.
Junius H. White, Jr., New Iberia.
August M. Hofmann, Jr., Reserve.
Ida M. Bethel, Roseland.
Juliette W. Chabaud, St. Gabriel.

MAINE

Arthur R. Abbott, East Lebanon.
Gertraut H. Walsh, Levant.
Robert L. Forbes, Pownal.

MARYLAND

Charles M. Potter, Jarrettsville.
Virginia W. Heather, Marydel.
Ralph W. Hutchins, Prince Frederick.
Nancy B. Riggan, Rhodesdale.
Donald L. Derr, Walkersville.

MASSACHUSETTS

Bernice E. Walker, East Wareham.
James P. Welch, Great Barrington.
John F. Landry, Halifax.
Peter S. Bobola, Housatonic.
Harold G. Sanders, Lancaster.
John E. Murphy, Millis.
James H. Malonson, Jr., Sudbury.
Earle Blake, West Boxford.

MICHIGAN

Roger W. Stump, Athens.
Charles F. Pratt, Attica.
Mathew D. Hutting, Carson City.
Matthew Q. Harrar, Carsonville.
Delia A. Bickham, Hessel.
Donald L. Whalen, Niles.
Elmer E. Lehman, Stockbridge.

MINNESOTA

Leonard V. Lumphrey, Beardsley.
Jerome E. Buhl, Dunnell.
Lawrence M. Fogarty, International Falls.
Anton E. Okerlund, Kelliher.
Alfred M. Hanson, Nielsville.
Alton E. Davis, Oakland.
Mathias Smith, Rockville.
Ethel M. Bjorklund, Saginaw.
Stanley J. Hill, Tower.
Evelyn M. Holmes, Watertown.

MISSISSIPPI

Lanie T. Huddleston, Heidelberg.
Kate H. Bishop, Moorhead.
Aimee T. Knight, Soso.

MISSOURI

Harold L. Wagaman, Bogard.
William A. Agers, De Soto.
Robert E. Sheets, Eagleville.
L. B. Mabe, Jr., Princeton.
Denver B. Newton, Van Buren.
Charles L. Panke, Wentzville.

MONTANA

Edith F. Ray, Carter.
Neil J. Boyd, Hungry Horse.
Wallace W. Paterson, Livingston.

NEBRASKA

Robert W. Goldenstein, Ingleside.
William V. Ahrens, Minden.
Edward H. Koso, Verdon.

NEVADA

Ronald F. Gandolfo, Austin.
Vivian A. Cranmer, Pahrump.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Lewis G. Putney, East Andover.
Hervey Tanner, Jr., Milton.
Richard A. LaPointe, New Durham.
Dorothy S. Quinn, South Lyndeboro.
William J. Wright, Twin Mountain.
Joseph R. Little, West Swanzey.

NEW JERSEY

Charles E. Osborn, Brick Town.
Robert E. Greenfield, Cape May.
Michael J. Talnagi, Helmetta.
John L. Dilworth, Princeton.

NEW YORK

Roger E. Mattis, Castorland.
Salvatore B. Aronica, North Boston.
LeRoy F. Sawyer, Sidney Center.
Richard M. Duquesne, Veils Gate.

NORTH CAROLINA

Virginia B. Pell, Cashiers.
Lewis A. Thompson, Jr., Franklinton.
Joseph C. Dudley, Greenville.
Joseph A. Cherry, Hamilton.
Walton E. Swain, Plymouth.

NORTH DAKOTA

Rex L. Powell, Columbus.
Patricia A. McGillivray, Flaxton.
John L. Wacker, Pettibone.
Wallace M. Holte, Stanley.

OHIO

Jacob Pavkov, Barberton.
Louise James, Beaver.
Carl C. Tschantz, Cuyahoga Falls.
George W. Hogg, Galena.
John R. Adams, Germantown.
Lawrence W. Haynes, Hinckley.
Merle F. Andregg, Kent.
C. Paul Anderson, Millersburg.
James J. McCoy, Jr., Niles.
Floyd E. Miller, Quaker City.
Joseph F. Banaski, Tiltonsville.
Gilmer T. Davis, Jr., West Richfield.

OKLAHOMA

Thomas I. Mayfield, Binger.
Estella George, Canadian.
Albert L. Rogers, Canute.
Donald R. Harrel, Leedey.
Melvin D. Skaggs, Shattuck.

PUERTO RICO

Guillermo Martinez-Mateo, Aibonito.
Gerineldo Rivera, Cabo Rojo.

SOUTH DAKOTA

George J. Liegl, Burke.
Dale U. DeNure, Flandreau.
Robert C. Uecker, Freeman.
Lloyd G. Haarberg, Mission Hill.
Henry G. Perron, Mobridge.
Stella M. Hammill, Ree Heights.
Lyle D. Lyons, Worthing.

TENNESSEE

Malcolm A. Fults, Altamont.
James C. Troxler, Normandy.
Vera R. Beck, Wartburg.
Mary G. England, Whites Creek.

TEXAS

Norma J. Brown, Coyanosa.
Harold A. Doane, Jr., Haslet.
Loralee J. Simmons, Magnolia.
Wynell C. Watson, Troy.

UTAH

Gertrude B. Turner, Jensen.
Francis E. Haskell, Payson.

VIRGINIA

Marcellus G. Carpenter, Barboursville.
Patsy T. Johnson, Baskerville.
Herman K. Williams, Galax.
Muriel J. Horlander, Meherrin.
Allie O. Tuck, Natural Bridge.
Clarence C. Haga, Pocahontas.
James H. Hale, Richlands.
Virginia B. Bruce, Woodford.

WASHINGTON

Carol Stipek, Bothell.
Horace C. Longanecker, Bridgeport.
LeRoy LeDuc, Granite Falls.
Gayanor S. Calvisky, Roslyn.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles E. Thompson, Sr., Amherstdale.
Howard A. Payne, Belington.
Henry E. Harkins, Buckhannon.
Matthew M. Kinsolving, Cedar Grove.
Freeda F. Sherrard, Inwood.

WISCONSIN

Burton W. Sauer, Arcadia.
Duane D. Chapman, Ashippun.
James W. Stellpflug, Galesville.
William J. Lee, Mellen.
Harris P. Johnson, Osseo.
Arthur A. Pritzl, Park Falls.
Clifton R. Barber, Plum City.
Harold A. Kuehl, Reeseville.
Mary F. Crary, Rock Springs.
Francis J. Tachovsky, Sturgeon Bay.
Paul R. Trauba, Theresa.

WYOMING

Theodore E. Anderson, Greybull.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Woodrow Wilson Hayzlett, pastor, Central Methodist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations.

Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.

For a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night.

Thou carriest them away as with a flood; they are as asleep: in the morning they are like grass which groweth up.

In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down, and withereth.

So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants, and Thy glory unto their children.

And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us; and establish Thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it.—Excerpts from the 90th Psalm.

O Lord, our God, God of our Fathers, by whose almighty hand this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people exists on the face of this good earth, we pray now Thy continued blessings on our beloved country so sorely tried by the shifting currents within and without. May the faith of her people be enhanced, may the awareness of Thy presence and a reliance on Thy wisdom and guidance be the first concern of these who are Thy servants and the elected servants of the citizens of this Nation. Finally, may the hand of the Almighty ever rest upon the helm of this ship of state that we at last all reach that desired haven.

We thank Thee for Thy servant with whom we walked and worked for a little while upon this earth. Thou hast received him into Thy nearer presence. Give unto his family and loved ones the consolation of Thy grace.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12752. An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12752) entitled "An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 170, 74th Congress, appointed Mr. MONRONEY to be a member on the part of the Senate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Canberra, Australia, April 11 to 16, 1966.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, KEOGH, BYRNES of Wisconsin, CURTIS, and UTT.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight Monday, March 14, 1966, to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1966 FOR PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, NAVAL VESSELS, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, EVALUATION, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12889) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1312)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12889) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

"SEC. 101. In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89–37 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1966 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles in amounts as follows:

"Aircraft

"For aircraft: for the Army $25,600,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $738,300,000; for the Air Force, $1,585,700,000.

"Missiles

"For missiles: for the Army, $64,000,000; for the Navy, $26,200,000; for the Marine Corps, $27,500,000; for the Air Force, $63,700,000.

"Tracked combat vehicles

"For tracked combat vehicles: for the Army, $75,800,000; for the Marine Corps, $10,900,000.

"TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 201. In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89–37 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1966 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

"For the Army, $27,995,000;

"For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $52,570,000;

"For the Air Force, $71,085,000.

"TITLE III—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 301. The Secretary of each military department may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, which are necessary in connection with military activities in southeast Asia, or in support of such activities, in the total amount as follows:

"Department of the Army, $509,700,000;

"Department of Navy, $304,300,000; and

"Department of the Air Force, $274,100,000.

"SEC. 302. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $200,000,000.

"SEC. 303. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

"SEC. 304. Whenever—

"(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

"(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

"SEC. 305. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this title, but the appropriations for public works authorized by sections 301 and 302 shall not exceed—

"(1) for section 301: Department of the Army, $509,700,000; Department of the Navy, $304,300,000; Department of the Air Force, $274,100,000, or a total of $1,088,100,000.

"(2) for section 302: a total of $200,000,000.

"'TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 401. (a) Funds authorized for appropriation for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other Act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes in connection with support of Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam, and related costs, during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine.

"(b) Within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall render to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report with respect to the estimated value by country of support furnished from appropriations authorized to be made under this subsection.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a description of all construction projects, including cost estimates and periodic reports, made available to the Secretary of Defense simultaneously with the receipt of such information from the persons responsible for the construction of such projects in support of Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam. Whenever such construction projects, involving $1,000,000 or more, are performed by private contractors, the Secretary of Defense or his representative in Vietnam shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives the name or names of such private contractors, the amounts involved in each contract, a copy of the report in support of each progress payment, and a complete report prior to final payment.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall also furnish to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives complete information regarding the alternative methods of adequately auditing contracts which he and the Comptroller General have agreed upon prior to the execution of any contract which would waive the provisions of section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code."

And the Senate agree to the same.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12889) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On March 1, 1966, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 12889, which is the supplemental 1966 authorization bill for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked vehicles, research and development, test and evaluation, and construction for the Armed Forces.

Also, on March 1, 1966, the Senate considered the legislation and amended it by striking out all language after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill.

COMPARISON OF HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

H.R. 12889, as passed by the House of Representatives, provided additional authorization to the military departments and the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1966 in the total amount of $4,857,450,000.

The bill as passed by the Senate provided for new authorizations in the amount of $4,807,750,000.

The Senate bill, therefore, represented a decrease of $49,700,000 in the amount previously approved by the House of Representatives.

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES

The difference between the two money figures arises from the fact that the House committee added $49.7 million to the bill for the construction of port facilities at Subic Bay in the Philippines and for Marine Corps air facilities on Okinawa.

The Senate recedes.

Other differences in the two bills were as follows:

In the Senate version, the General Provisions contained the following language.

"(b) Within 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall render to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report with respect to the estimated value by country of support furnished from appropriations authorized to be made under this subsection."

The House did not include this language but did insert the following language.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a description of all construction projects, including cost estimates and periodic reports, made available to the Secretary of Defense simultaneously with the receipt of such information from the persons responsible for the construction of such projects in support of Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam. Whenever such construction projects, involving $1,000,000 or more, are performed by private contractors, the Secretary of Defense or his representative in Vietnam shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives the name or names of such private contractors, the amounts involved in each contract, a copy of the report in support of each progress payment, and a complete report prior to final payment.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense shall also furnish to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives complete information regarding the alternative methods of adequately auditing contracts which he and the Comptroller General have agreed upon prior to the execution of any contract which would waive the provisions of section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code."

Each of these provisions was directed toward the end that the two committees be kept informed with respect to the use of the authority granted by the bill. Since each provision has a somewhat different function and both will further the ends to be achieved, the conferees agreed to embody both in the bill.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, due to the urgency and the vital need for this authorization because of the escalation of the war in Vietnam, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H.R. 12889.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services give us a brief explanation of the difference in the bill, as passed by the other body, compared with the bill which left this body.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the only difference between this and the bill which passed the House is that the other body amended the bill with a four-line amendment, which says, among other things, that 30 days after the end of each quarter a report shall be made to the two Committees on Armed Services and the Appropriations Committees as to the aid furnished, country by country. That is all. That improves the bill, and we accept it.

We had no trouble in conference whatever.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. HALL. I shall be delighted to yield to the minority leader, after an additional comment.

The minority has been advised about this. We are in agreement, too, that this actually will strengthen the bill.

I ask the distinguished chairman to comment one step further. Is it not true that the other body accepted all of the changes which this body put into the bill?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is correct. We added some $49.7 million to the bill. The other body accepted it.

Moreover, Secretary McNamara said that he would immediately fund it. This is to do the work at Subic Bay and to do the work at Okinawa for the Marines. The other body accepted that. Mr. McNamara said that he would immediately fund it.

We had provided for a reporting service. That was adopted on the floor, after being offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. It required a very thorough reporting of all moneys over $1 million.

The amendment from the Senate provides for a report at the end of each quarter, and, in addition, there will be a reporting service, country by country, as to aid furnished. That makes it even better. We were glad to accept that.

Mr. HALL. I hope this will fulfill the requirements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Do I correctly understand, from the comments made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that the quarterly reports will be made to the Committees on Armed Services and to the Appropriations Committees, both of the House and of the Senate, as to the AID military assistance furnished to each country by the United States?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If I can obtain unanimous consent for consideration of the report, we can have the specific amendment read. It is only four lines, and it comes under (c).

It merely provides for a country by country report to the four committees which deal with military foreign aid.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is this information to be so furnished to be considered classified or public information?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We do not plan to publish it. I do not know.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It will be made available to the respective committees?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It will be made available. Of course, anything that is classified will not be published.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What about other Members of Congress? Would the report be available to them if they wanted to read it at the offices of the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Positively.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of today.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow, Friday, March 11, to file a report on the bill making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order for today be vacated and I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order for today be vacated and I be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 14, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the schedule for the remainder of the week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, we have no further legislative business for this week. We will ask to go over at the conclusion of business today. The business for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are no bills.

Tuesday and the balance of the week: Tuesday is Private Calendar day. Also on Tuesday the supplemental defense appropriation for 1966, S. 2394, authorizing an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, and H.R. 6785, establishing uniform dates for daylight saving time.

Of course, this is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

We do expect an important conference report or two next week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the distinguished majority leader give us some guidance, perhaps, as to when he believes that the tax bill conference report might be scheduled next week?

Mr. ALBERT. I do not see the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means here, and I am unable to advise the gentleman at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I did have an opportunity to talk for a very few minutes with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means a few minutes ago. He indicated they hoped they would finish the conference today or tomorrow and would hope that maybe Tuesday they could bring up the conference report.

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad the gentleman was able to supply that information. I was not able to do so.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE RECORD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise Members that, of course, there will be no further business. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that without establishing a precedent it may be in order for all Members desiring to do so to extend their remarks and include pertinent extraneous material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRANSFERRING SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any remaining special orders may be transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on the bill H.R. 12453 to amend the Public Health Service Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1666. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HON. JOHN BALDWIN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the death of our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from California, JOHN BALDWIN, at 10 o'clock last evening, March 9.

Memorial services for Congressman BALDWIN will be held at Trinity Presbyterian Church, 16th and North Inglewood Streets, Arlington, Va., at 10 a.m. Saturday, March 12.

Funeral services will be held Monday, March 14, at the Danville Community Presbyterian Church in Danville, Calif. The time for the services has tentatively been set for 2 p.m.

Time for eulogies by Members of the House will soon be arranged and announcement made.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 757

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of 37 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. KING of California, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. MILLER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HAGEN of California, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. UTT, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. YOUNGER, Mr. SISK, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. BELL, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CAMERON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. DYAL, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. REES.

The Clerk will report the remaining resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 14, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2167. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 408), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 12889, an act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 6785. A bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3059. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon; with amendments (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5003. A bill for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 13464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13465. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 13466. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to September 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13467. A bill relating to the applicability of the 3-percent interest rate for loans to provide housing for the elderly or handicapped under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13468. A bill to provide that the Federal Housing Administration's new liberalized mortgage financing terms for veterans shall be available to qualified veterans without regard to whether or not they have previously used their Veterans' Administration home loan entitlement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13469. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13470. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain operations or services of common carriers by rail, in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to give full consideration to all financial assistance available before permitting any such discontinuance or change; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13471. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the position of Chief Veterinary Officer of the Service and provide for the rank of Assistant Surgeon General for said position; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13472. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 13473. A bill to amend title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide employment opportunities for unemployed, low-income persons in subprofessional service careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13474. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13475. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 13476. A bill to amend section 301 (a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 13477. A bill to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 13478. A bill to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 13479. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13480. A bill to amend titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in school health and physical education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13481. A bill to assist the domestic commercial fishing industry through the construction of three advanced-design factory fishing vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 13482. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 13483. A bill for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13484. A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13485. A bill to strengthen and improve public and private programs of assistance for institutions of higher education and students attending them; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13486. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 13487. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13488. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 13489. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13490. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an amortization deduction and an increased tax credit for certain underground electrical power transmission lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 13491. A bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13492. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 13493. A bill to require that motorbuses be equipped with seat belts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 13494. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13495. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 13496. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the maximum maturity of regular business loans thereunder to 20 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 13497. A bill to provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall not undertake certain projects to improve or expand Federal airports without specific authorization for such projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 13498. A bill to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall retain jurisdiction over all of the real property comprising the Veterans' Administration hospital facility at Marion, Ill.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 13499. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to exclude from consideration as income, for the purposes of determining eligibility for pension, all payments of any kind or from any source, including salary, retirement or annuity payments, endowments, or similar income, which a veteran receives or is entitled to receive after attaining age 72; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 13500. A bill providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 13501. A bill to amend chapter 39 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the transportation of explosives and other dangerous articles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13502. A bill to provide a retroactive effective date of July 1, 1965, for the severance pay provisions in section 9 of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965 so as to extend the application of such provisions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13503. A bill to redesignate the Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "Franklin D. Roosevelt Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 13504. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through June 30, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13505. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research and development to encourage and assist the use of underground transmission of electrical power, and to undertake research projects to evaluate and demonstrate the economical and technical feasibility of other forms of electrical power; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By SMITH of California:

H.R. 13506. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 13507. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13508. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 13509. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 13510. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 13511. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13512. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 13513. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13514. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 13515. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13516. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13517. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13518. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 13519. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13520. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 13521. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 13522. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13523. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 13524. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 13525. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13526. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 13527. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 13528. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13529. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 13530. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 13531. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13532. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 13533. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13534. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13535. A bill to Direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 13536. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 13537. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 13538. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 888. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the 7-day period beginning the second week of September this year and each year thereafter as "National Family Health Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.J. Res. 889. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 613. Concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation and study of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 614. Concurrent resolution commemorating the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the Peace Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H. Con. Res. 615. Concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation and study of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 758. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the differences and difficulties between France and the United States in regard to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with special reference to arrangements covering the operations of the U.S. Armed Forces in France; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H. Res. 759. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Res. 760. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H. Res. 761. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Res. 762. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H. Res. 763. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 764. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. R. 765. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 766. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H. Res. 767. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H. Res. 768. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H. Res. 769. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H. Res. 770. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXI,

418. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to a proposed constitutional amendment relating to continuity in the office of the President, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 13539. A bill for the relief of Benny Nielsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13540. A bill for the relief of Vito Cangialosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13541. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Cappello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 13542. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Wiercinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 13543. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario V. Machado Espinosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13544. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jaime E. Condom Valera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 13545. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alfredo Fernandez-Nespral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

342. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Joseph Weber, Gaston, Oreg., relative to the proposed Scoggin Dam in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

343. Also, petition of the Conservative Club of Yonkers, Yonkers, N.Y., relative to expressing support of the proposed Dirksen amendment to the Constitution and relating to the right of self-government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

344. Also, petition of Steve Schaefer, Jefferson City, Mo., and others, relative to a pension for the veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Iroquois Wrestlers Reach High Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, February 8, 1966, was indeed a red-letter day for the wrestling team of Iroquois Central High School in Elma, N.Y. On that day the Iroquois wrestling team broke the national record for consecutive victories. Beating the old record of 140 victories, the Iroquois wrestling team reached the 143 consecutive victories mark.

Both Coach Duane Patterson and his predecessor, Norm Foster, greatly contributed to leading the team to their outstanding accomplishment. Aiding both coaches was Assistant Coach Robert Steislinger.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these outstanding athletes and their coaches should be highly commended for their achievements. They are a fine example for all competitive athletic groups and their leaders to seek and reach high goals. I believe these boys are a credit to the youth of America.

Comments From Washington by Congressman Clark W. Thompson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Congressman CLARK THOMPSON, of Texas, is a very conscientious Representative. His efforts to keep his constituents informed are untiring.

In his recent newsletter, Congressman THOMPSON, an ex-marine, wrote of his visit with marine Gen. Lew Walt at the monthly meeting of the Capitol Hill Marines. The two marine members of my staff, Harry Sullivan and Mark Servoss, who faithfully attend these meetings, also spoke very highly of General Walt and his analysis of the situation in Vietnam.

With the marines at this very moment inflicting extremely high casualties on the Vietcong in their most recent campaign, General Walt's statements are most timely.

For the benefit of my colleagues, therefore, I introduce Congressman THOMPSON's fine newsletter into the RECORD. This particular letter is typical of the quality of the material with which the Congressman keeps his constituents informed:

COMMENTS FROM WASHINGTON BY CONGRESSMAN CLARK W. THOMPSON

DEAR NEIGHBORS: Once a month, former marines who are now Members of Congress or otherwise officially on Capitol Hill get together for breakfast. We invite the Commandant of the Marine Corps and other prominent marines to come and talk to us off the record about the military situation.

The Marine Corps never gets out of your blood once it gets in, and this process of rubbing elbows once a month with the active service keeps us informed and keeps us feeling that we are a part of the old corps.

In keeping with this monthly schedule, this past week we sat down around the table so to speak and listened to Gen. Lew Walt, who is in command of the Marines in Vietnam, tell the story of what is going on and what the future holds. Ordinarily what is said at these meetings is off the record, but this time it was not, and so I violate no confidence whatever in telling you what I learned from the general.

First, he told us something of the underlying troubles in that unhappy Vietnam country. I remember long ago, I guess maybe 15 years, my pastor asked me to occupy his pulpit one memorable Sunday and to talk to the congregation on any subject of my choosing. I chose the Communist menace, which I had been studying carefully and with deep concern. I told how in those days the Communists infiltrated an unsuspecting country—how they first would gain control of small political units such as cities and towns. They would do it by getting control first of the mayor or whoever the ruling magistrate was; then they would seize the police department so that there was no law and order and no justice except that which the Communists chose to mete out; then they would take over schools, eliminating them at first and much later filling them with teachers who would teach only the Communist doctrine. At about the same time, they would destroy all churches.

That has been the pattern for many years, and that is the pattern in South Vietnam today. Human life is expendable. Natives who resist the Communist infiltraters are killed without compunction and are probably better off if it happens quickly rather than after torture. This phase of the Communist operation is carried on by guerrillas. They are followed by more formal military units from North Vietnam.

As our troops move into an area, they first of all, after driving the guerrillas out, restore the former government or set up a new one composed of the non-Communist Vietnamese. Our troops provide the necessary security for a considerable time if necessary until the local people are ready to protect themselves. Meanwhile, we conduct military operations against the North Vietnamese and/or whoever else may be fighting beside them.

Up to now, General Walt told us there is no evidence of any Chinese troops. That is the picture in that unhappy land; and if we are driven out either by force or by the demands of a certain element here in this country, we are going to have to do the same job somewhere else at a later date.

I came away from that breakfast meeting convinced that we are right to fight it out where we are. Incidentally, there was no question in my mind, after listening to him, that General Walt thinks that we are winning and that our progress is good.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK W. THOMPSON.

Salute to Conservation District Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Vermont's soil and water conservation district leaders for their unselfish devotion and dedication to the cause of natural resource development.

These leaders, who are elected locally and serve voluntarily, are deeply involved in the development and use of natural resources for the purpose of improving the economic and social life of rural areas.

Soil conservation districts were originally organized to help farm owners and operators plan and apply conservation practices. This is still a most important function. But the districts have broadened their program of assistance over the years. Today districts offer technical help to nonfarm landowners and town and area planning groups, they sponsor community resource development projects, and promote beautification of the countryside.

Recent accomplishments include help to rural landowners in the conversion of land from crop production to income-producing recreational uses, an endeavor that is having a very favorable effect on Vermont's economy.

The people of Vermont were quick to recognize the value of the district program. By 1947 the entire State was blanketed with districts. Today the 13 soil and water conservation districts in Vermont are cooperating with more than 11,500 landowners and operators in the development and application of conservation plans. Districts in Vermont have sponsored three small water shed projects that are in the planning stage and a fourth one on which construction will begin this year. In addition, the White River District is a sponsor of the White River resource conservation and development project, one of the original 10 such projects authorized in the Nation.

Soil and water conservation districts in Vermont and the men who govern them can well be proud of their record of accomplishments. I salute them for their work and wish them Godspeed in the days ahead.

Legislation To Put Animal Thieves Out of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the need for Federal legislation to halt the growing problem of theft and mistreatment of dogs and cats that are sold for research and experimentation is clearly documented. Accordingly, I am introducing today a bill providing for the licensing of animal dealers and the inspection of their facilities and records.

Under the provisions of my bill, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to promulgate standards governing the handling and transportation of animals to be sold. It also requires that research facilities obtain animals only from licensed dealers. Furthermore, it will make the theft of animals and other violations of the provisions of the bill a Federal offense.

I have received numerous letters, as I am sure many of my colleagues have, deploring the inhumane conditions and treatment that so many animals destined for laboratories—if they survive the mistreatment—have been subjected to. I share the conviction of those compassionate individuals who have written me that we must prevent the needless suffering and abuse of these animals.

Legislation such as we are proposing today should, if enacted, aid significantly in putting unscrupulous animal thieves out of business and putting an end to the cruelty endured by so many helpless animals.

I urge favorable action on this proposal before the end of this session—the sooner the better.

ORT Saluted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute the Rochdale Village, N.Y., chapter of Women's American ORT—Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training—which at this very hour is holding a rally in the Rochdale mall in observance of the 39th anniversary drive of this splendid organization.

As part of that celebration the name of Baisley Boulevard is being changed to ORT Boulevard, with that function being officially performed by John Byrne, of the New York Department of Public Events.

The speakers at the rally include Janet Wolberg, Councilmen Michael Lazar, Donald R. Manes, and former Councilman Seymour Boyers.

I was honored to be invited by Mrs. Adele Ring to be a guest speaker at today's observance but much to my regret I could not be present because my duties in Washington necessitated that I be here. It is with deep pleasure and pride that I partake in those ceremonies by calling to the attention of my colleagues this wonderful event and some of the aims and accomplishments of ORT and applaud the untiring efforts of the Rochdale and all chapters in its behalf over the many years.

ORT Day, which is being observed nationwide today, is sponsored by Women's American ORT. It has become a traditional honored event in all communities throughout the country in which dedicated ORTists work for the rehabilitation of Jews in need everywhere in the free world.

In observance of the day President Johnson has issued a statement directed to ORT chapters everywhere and which said in part:

> Yours is a laudable mission and you have performed it with distinction.

The ORT program of vocational training has served displaced underprivileged people for 86 years. Six hundred ORT vocational training installations in 22 countries offer youths and adults the opportunity to learn the industrial skills which will make them self supporting.

ORT is a program for rebuilding lives through vocational education. The recognized vocational training agency for the Jewish people, ORT's central creed is that man is best aided by being helped to become independent, self supporting and self respecting.

Some of these training units are located in New York. Others are in Europe where more than 12,300 are enrolled and in Israel where 19,000 are enrolled and in Africa.

The standard ORT school is a vocational high school with a 3- to 4-year curriculum in which an academic high school education is given along with technical training in the most advanced industrial trades.

ORT gives training in more than 70 modern industrial skills. The trades taught vary according to the needs of the particular area's economy.

Women's American ORT, the American women's branch of the World ORT Union, is the largest World ORT Union affiliate. It now has 60,000 members in more than 460 chapters in all American cities.

The ORT program is financed by the World ORT Union and affiliates, by the Joint Distributing Committee, a member of the United Jewish Appeal and by government foundations throughout the world.

Again I offer my congratulations to the Rochdale chapter and all chapters of ORT, and wish them continued success in this great endeavor.

John F. Baldwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are deeply anguished as we pause to mark the passing of our friend and colleague, John Baldwin, who stood among us as a tower of integrity and who was the very soul of kindness and concern for the welfare of others.

Among a group of men and women dedicated to the advantage of their respective constituencies, John Baldwin loomed tall as one who always tempered his exuberance for a given bill by a wholesome respect for the views of others. And even when he appeared before us in support of his political philosophy, he did it in a way that endeared him to his listeners instead of repelling them.

I came to know and appreciate John in our weekly convocation around God's breakfast table in what we are pleased to call the House prayer group. There we could see the true spirit of this good friend as he demonstrated his love for his Maker in an increasing concern for his fellow men. Thus we saw him not as a legislator but as a Christian enlisted in the service of the Eternal.

We are deeply distressed over the irreparable loss that has been visited upon this brother's family, and Mrs. Dague joins me in prayerful petition to Almighty God that He will sustain and strengthen those who have been made desolate as they travel through this dark valley.

Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien Honoring Congressman Paul J. Krebs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night more than 900 persons gathered to pay tribute to our good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Paul J. Krebs.

Paul Krebs is held in such high esteem that Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien took time out from his busy schedule to deliver the main address. At this point I include in the Record the text of the Postmaster General's speech.

Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien at Dinner for Congressman Paul Krebs, Robert Treat Hotel, Newark, N.J., March 6, 1966

A little over 2 weeks ago I spoke in this same hall, on this same platform. I have come back tonight because I want to personally tell you how highly I think of Paul Krebs and to bring you the greetings of President Johnson.

The President believes that the Congressmen elected in 1964 have given more to America, more to their constitutents, and more to make this a Great Society, than any equivalent group in history, and the President knows that Paul Krebs is outstanding, even among this unusually talented and productive group.

Though a lifelong Democrat, Paul Krebs received many votes of thoughtful Republicans in 1964, who were bored with tired old slogans rather than creative action. The voters of this district wanted a Congressman who would be working for them full time in Washington and who would have the courage to make independent judgments on the many important issues facing the Congress.

And that's precisely what your Congressman has been doing. He hasn't missed a singel rollcall vote, and he hasn't missed a session of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This committee involves little glamour and lots of hard, detailed work, the kind of work that produces good laws and good government.

Among experienced legislators, Paul's record has already marked him as a man of growing influence—a real professional, and a man who is making the needs of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey well known to the Congress.

When last here, I had the honor of speaking at the victory celebration that marked the reelection of your great Governor and, for the first time since Woodrow Wilson's victory in 1912, the election of Democratic majorities in both houses of the legislature.

On that occasion, I spoke of how this election signaled recognition by citizens of the Garden State that they were facing serious problems—and more important, that they had the will to solve those problems.

This evening, I want to discuss an issue of great concern to all Americans, no matter where they live, no matter how they vote: the search for a secure and lasting peace in Vietnam.

During the 5 years that I worked closely with President Kennedy and President Johnson in the White House I saw this problem grow and become more intense. I saw it become ever more menacing. I saw it claim a large portion of President Kennedy's daily attention—as it is now claiming President Johnson's.

Today we live in a complex world, where the search for simple answers is almost always fruitless and frustrating; where seemingly easy solutions may end up producing even more difficult problems. We live in a world that is neither at peace nor totally at war.

We live in a world of ballistic missiles and there are no safe or secure enclaves left on this planet. Our task is difficult and delicate. It is at the same time a search for peace and a demonstration that we are committed both to peace and to honor.

The military commitment of the United States in Vietnam has been measured in terms of responding to outside aggression.

Our bombing of North Vietnam, overwhelmingly supported on August 7, 1964, in both Houses of Congress—support overwhelmingly reiterated by Congress just a few days ago—has been limited to military targets. We have not used the full power of our arsenal.

We do not seek to invade North Vietnam. We have increased our troops only to the degree needed to achieve our stated objective of defending South Vietnam. We have underlined our pursuit of peace by the nature of our military response.

We have actively sought peace in every possible diplomatic area. We have sought to enlist others, both Communist and non-Communist, in that peace effort. We have tracked down every rumor of a peace feeler. We have responded to the efforts of the Pope. We have sent our diplomats to world capitals. We have placed the search for peace in the hands of the United Nations.

As the Secretary of State has said, our peace emissaries have met with "an overwhelmingly favorable response" to U.S. efforts for negotiations "except from those who could in fact sit down and make peace."

President Johnson has made it clear that our aims in Vietnam pose no threat to Hanoi. We seek no territory. We need no bases in Vietnam. We are committed to free elections. We hope that violence will cease and that the forces that have murdered thousands of innocent civilians—schoolteachers, local officials, and others—will return to peaceful pursuits. And we have sent our Vice President and Secretary of Agriculture to Vietnam to help the Government in Saigon move more effectively toward achievement of true social and economic progress.

Further, we have three times paused in our military response as a signal of our interest in peace. We called a 5-day halt to our bombing missions in May 1965; we told our forces to cease-fire for 30 hours during Christmas; we again halted, this time for 37 days, our raids against military targets in the north.

As the President said before the AFL-CIO Convention in Los Angeles: "Our efforts * * * to talk about peace were met with silence from some, shrill propaganda from others." So, too, our cease-fire efforts have been ignored.

I know that there are many representatives of organized labor here this evening. I want to tell you that the President deeply appreciates the support he has consistently received from organized labor on his Vietnam policy.

Though we will continue to use whatever force is necessary to convince Hanoi and Peiping that they will not achieve their will through violence, the doors to peace remain open. Our efforts to find a political, peaceful solution will continue. The President has asked me to affirm to you tonight that we will never pause in this quest.

I can assure you that the President will continue to pursue the difficult path that lies between destruction and dishonor.

The President will follow that path because it is the right path, because he sees, as did Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, that freedom is indivisible. "Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettos of our own cities," President Johnson has said, "the struggle is the same. That struggle is to end the violence against the human mind and body—so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom may be won."

Yes, my friends, the struggle for peace is indivisible. We cannot see freedom sliding beneath the stagnant waters of communism abroad without being contaminated here at home. For have no doubt that Americans fighting and dying in Vietnam are serving to protect freedom here in Newark—and in the Nation and throughout the free world.

Certainly your great Gov. Richard Hughes stated the issue clearly when 2 weeks ago he termed the Vietnamese conflict "a struggle between freedom and totalitarianism, a murderous fight between the democratic idea of man and the authoritarian idea of man. If we, who exemplify freedom and democracy, do not defend those beliefs, then who will?"

Yes, if we do not, who will? And who—friend or foe—will trust our word or our resolve when next we are tested, as tested we will surely be if we fail in Vietnam?

My friends, I have seen our President grappling with enormous problems involving the very survival of our Nation. And today, the difficulties abroad are more complex and potentially more dangerous than at any time in our history.

In his difficult task, lend him your support, show him the measure of your understanding, give him your prayers.

Soil Conservation Districts Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, nowhere are the pressures on natural resources greater than in California. The State's booming population puts unprecedented demands on the area's supply of land and water. In our haste to meet these demands, we often do more harm than good. By misusing our irreplaceable agricultural land to meet nonagricultural needs, we are, in effect, foreclosing on one of the richest sources of economic wealth in this Nation.

Fortunately there are groups that take resource planning and management work seriously. I am speaking of the soil conservation districts that provide a valuable service to landowners and communities throughout the Nation.

The six soil conservation districts organized in my congressional district in Ventura, and Santa Barbara Counties, Calif., have played a major role in keeping agriculture an important segment of the local economy. Income from agriculture in my congressional district exceeds $198 million annually.

Soil conservation district programs benefit urban as well as rural areas. For example, the Santa Ynez flood prevention project not only protects agricultural land but also urban land at Lompoc, Calif. In addition, it provides flood protection to the Vandenburg Air Force Base and the Point Arguello Naval Missile Testing Base.

Local soil conservation districts are governed by locally elected directors who serve faithfully year after year with no pay. I commend these men and their organizations for their valuable services and efforts in developing land and water resources for all the people.

Valiant Stand of the Green Berets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as we came to the Chamber of this House today, many of us had in mind, I am sure, the news, both inspiring and saddening, of the stand of an Army special forces unit—the men of the Green Berets—and their mountain tribe allies, the Montagnards, in a remote sector of the Vietnam war.

My information, I should emphasize, is based completely on press and radio accounts emanating from Vietnam, but it seems evident that fewer than 20 Americans, including a basic special forces team, and several hundred of the mountain men they were assigned to advise and assist, fought off for 2 days or more a regular unit of the Army of North Vietnam approaching regimental strength.

The efforts of our own forces to relieve this beleaguered camp apparently were hampered by unfavorable weather, and the evacuation operations were characterized, according to news reports, by a dramatic rescue of the pilot of a downed aircraft through the resourcefulness and courage of the pilot of an accompanying plane.

It seems evident that special forces personnel, as well as their allies—mountain tribesmen who may not have an understanding of sophisticated democratic government but who have shown that they know the basic meaning of freedom—were willing and ready to fight to the death against overwhelming odds.

While we mourn today the fates of all but the few who survived as the evacuated wounded in this operation, and share of the grief of their dependents, we can take pride in the determination and capacity of American fighting men to give their best—men who understand, in almost all cases, why they are engaged, despite the efforts of some individuals here at home to denigrate our national commitment and the value of the individual sacrifices being made daily by the men of all of our Armed Forces, who are performing in the best traditions of our military history.

United States-French Rift Should Be Investigated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which would authorize and direct the Committee on Foreign Affairs to "conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the differences and difficulties between France and the United States in regard to the Atlantic Alliance with special reference to arrangements covering the operation of U.S. Armed Forces in France."

A congressional investigation is urgently needed in order to clarify facts, clear away misconceptions, improve mutual understanding and find a basis for improved teamwork within the Atlantic Alliance.

The French-American rift demands top priority attention for these reasons:

First. France is enormously important to the United States. NATO without France is almost unthinkable, and a glance at the world map shows why. The containment of communism would be much more difficult if France becomes separate from the alliance.

Second. For years France has expressed dissatisfaction—not with the alliance—but with its military structure. Our only apparent response has been to make plans for France's withdrawal.

Third. The opposing positions of the two Governments in regard to NATO and the future of U.S. Forces on French soil has recently hardened to an alarming degree. Each apparently has taken an unyielding position.

Fourth. This mounting crisis has not had the attention it merits. The Vietnam war has virtually monopolized the attention of the President, the Congress, and the public generally—almost to the exclusion of this grave and fundamental development in NATO.

Fifth. A substantial and friendly effort on the part of the United States toward understanding and conciliation is urgently needed in order to avert a major setback to free-world interests. The congressional investigation and study is proposed as a part of that effort.

Hopefuly the investigation and study would answer questions like these:

Are American complaints that De Gaulle wants alliance protection without French participation justified?

Are French complaints of U.S. domination of NATO justified? Has the United States encouraged full discussions of this question?

Has the United States done everything possible to meet these complaints?

In view of our long record of bilateral talks with NATO allies, why did President Johnson reject President de Gaulle's proposal of United States-French talks on the future of American Forces in France?

Why have the French and United States Presidents not conferred with each other for almost 5 eventful years, although each has conferred with most other allied heads of state?

President Johnson has repeatedly proposed unconditional discussions with the Communist enemy. Why not with the resolute President of an allied Republic?

Has the United States encouraged the North Atlantic Council to discuss French objections?

To what extent do other NATO allies share French objections?

Is the U.S. policy of actively discouraging the development of French nuclear forces in the best interests of NATO?

Is the U.S. attitude apt to encourage a French-Soviet alliance?

Has the United States foreclosed the possibility of a separate alliance with France if it should withdraw from NATO?

VFW Award for Outstanding Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at the Veterans of Foreign Wars dinner on March 8, the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen, minority leader of the U.S. Senate, received the VFW Award for Outstanding Public Service. As is usual his address in accepting this award was in keeping with the highest traditions of American statesmanship. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include his address:

Remarks of Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen, Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Accepting the VFW Award for Outstanding Public Service

I am honored to be your guest. I am doubly honored with your award for outstanding public service. I can only hope that in modest measures, I merit this expression of esteem and confidence on the part of a great, farflung, patriotic organization.

The character and activities of the VFW give this award special significance and meaning to me. I am a member of the VFW post in my native city in Illinois. But over a third of a century of service in the Nation's Capital, there has been ample opportunity to observe the work of your organization. Year by year, I become increasingly impressed with your unselfish and patriotic service to the Nation.

Fidelity to him who has born the battle and to his widow and orphan has been your foremost concern. Always, you have valiantly championed the cause of those who served and sacrificed—so many of whom will all their days carry the ineffaceable marks of conflict.

Year in and year out, you have counseled that this Nation remain strong for only strength compels respect and generates prestige.

With rare diligence, you have been in the forefront in supporting policies designed to resist and stay the forces of godless communism.

Old fashioned and amusing as it may seem to the cynics and scoffers of our time, you have steadfastly asserted the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the freedoms established by the Constitution, knowing that therein lies the last best hope for preserving those ideals and principles.

Reverently have you taken to heart the kinship of the uniform and the sanctity of that fellowship, with those who wore it, with those who wear it now, and those who may be called upon to wear it in some future day.

Who then, great human segment of America that you are, more richly merits the right to a strong voice in finding solutions for the baffling problems which beset our land and especially those which affect our national security? Who can bring to these problems a greater competence and understanding than you who have served your country abroad and have been ever mindful of the Nation's future in a world that is aglow with fever and turbulence?

These are troubled times. These are days for prayerful concern for the cause of freedom and representative government. These are days when superficial thinking, polite nonsense, misguided views, and unfounded hopes can divert us from the business at hand.

That business is grim and undramatic. When it was proposed that Theodore Roosevelt be permitted to lead a division in World War I, it was President Wilson who vetoed the idea with this laconic observation. He said, "The business in hand is undramatic." And so it was. And so it is today.

Men write and speak so glibly of hawks and doves in assessing the present scene. How quaint in a world beset with ugly fevers and terrors in which young Americans, who in the language of Colonel McRae in the conflict in which I served, "lived, felt dawn, saw sunset flow," and now stand on freedom's frontier in far-off jungles should speak of doves? How odd, that men should so glibly write and speak of these as hawks because they seek to assert our prestige, carry out our solemn pledges, fulfill our treaty responsibilities, and give heed to the Macedonian cry of a weak and defenseless people.

But where is the American eagle in this strange lore of doves and hawks—that majestic bird who so truly symbolizes our hopes, our will, our strength, our purpose, and who knows the grandeur of freedom.

Consider for a moment just why young Americans fight and die in the tropic heat, the malaria-laden jungles and the monsoon mud, thousands of miles from home.

They serve to keep our word and redeem our pledges. They serve to give meaning to our treaty obligations. They serve freedom in a shrunken world, knowing that freedom is an indivisible boon to mankind. They serve to stay the ugly force of aggression.

Foggy and inconclusive thinking can always generate strange, unsound, and disastrous courses of action for the Nation to follow.

They speak of withdrawal and of retreat. They but sound the uncertain trumpet which leads to disaster.

They speak of the wrong war in the wrong place. I know of no better evidence that we neither initiated the struggle nor selected the place. They speak of having picked the wrong battlefield. Perhaps the enemy inadvertently forgot to consult us on that point before aggression began and the assault on the freedom and independence of Vietnam got underway.

Where freedom is involved, the issue will not be solved by withdrawal. Where aggression is involved, it will not be solved by retreat. Where an implacable foe is involved, any confession of weakness or show of disunity will command no respect at the conference table. No one knows better than the veterans of our foreign wars that victory and survival depend not on running but on winning.

If the history of warfare teaches anything, it is that the decisive battles which have affected the very course of history were not fought on some carefully selected battlefield agreed on in advance by the adversaries as being mutually advantageous.

On a small plain in ancient Greece, brave and badly outnumbered men fought and died to help save what is known as Western civilization. That was the Battle of Marathon.

The hope of the Founding Fathers in their struggle for independence and in fact their very personal destiny rested on a small but savage frontier at a place called Saratoga.

The decline of the powerful Spanish empire and the rise of this Nation as a world power was signaled by the naval battle at Manila Bay.

In World War II, the open door to Japanese expansion was slammed shut with a resounding bang at a little place scarcely known but now long and everlastingly remembered. That was at Guadalcanal.

Inchon in Korea was but a spot on the map and virtually unknown to any of our people. But it was there that General MacArthur smashed the Communist invasion of South Korea with one of the truly bold and brilliant amphibious operations in all history.

Many other illustrations could be offered to prove the point. And the point is simply this. Men and nations must expect a rendezvous with destiny at unexpected places and at unexpected moments.

Today, the scene is South Vietnam. If it were not there, it would be in some other place. But wherever it might be in the intense and unremitting struggle for freedom, there would be some to say in loud and emphatic tones: "It's the wrong place and the wrong time."

There is, of course, a way to make it the wrong place and the wrong time and that is for us to lose heart and a sense of mission, to follow the counsels of despair, and above all else to do the wrong thing.

And speaking of wrong things, could there be anything more wrong than inviting into a coalition government the very same savage terrorists who our young men are fighting and dying to keep out?

I, for one, believe that we are in a strategically sound position in Vietnam. True, it is far from home and the logistic problem becomes something of a burden.

Basically, it is a peninsular war. That makes it a maritime war. In World War II and again in Korea, we demonstrated beyond all doubt how our superiority of sea gave us strategic advantages which were envied by the enemy. We have the equipment, the material, and we know how to use it. We can fight this kind of a war and we can win. What's more, it is far better to meet the enemy on the frontiers of freedom than in the citadel of freedom itself.

Tonight, as we the old soldiers of another generation salute the young soldiers in Vietnam who carry on for us in the cause of freedom, peace, and self-determination, let us not forget that we have an obligation to them until the job is done and the issue honorably disposed. Simply stated, that means that we must avoid placing any unnecessary burdens or handicaps upon them.

If the classical concept of winning a victory by force of arms is still valid; namely, to break the will and the resistance of the enemy, it must be achieved not merely by superior firepower and adequate manpower but also by interdicting the enemy source of supply of food, weapons, equipment and all other items necessary to the prosecution of a conflict.

I refer particularly to the unending procession of vessels, flying the flag of free world nations and Communist countries alike, who ply their trade in and out of the ports of North Vietnam.

A single cargo is one too many when we are engaged in a bloody and costly struggle with a relentless enemy. If that needs amplification, I need only point out that our problem is not merely the freedom and independence of a small country but the life and death of our own troops as well. Any exception to shutting off enemy supplies if it can be achieved is a clear departure from every concept of winning a victory.

For this we have fresh precedent. When the Cuban situation became critical, we imposed a "Kennedy-type quarantine" and readied our massive sea and air power. Is there any valid reason why a similar tactic cannot now be employed to bring Hanoi to the conference table?

A few weeks ago, I traveled the wards of the U.S. naval hospital at Great Lakes, Ill., and sat with the young soldiers so recently returned from Vietnam for medical attention. It was an unforgettable experience. I could only hope that their sense of mission, their dedication to a cause, and their determination might be matched by an overwhelming devotion on the home front. I am certain that you, the old soldiers of another generation who served abroad, share that spirit and conviction. There came back to me an old couplet from long ago as these young soldiers at Great Lakes, wounded in body but not in spirit, spoke of freedom's cause.

"No man escapes when freedom fails
The best men rot in filthy jails.
And those who cry, 'Appease! Appease!'
Are hanged by those they tried to please."

Bicentennial of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to note the recognition President Johnson has given, in his message to Congress, of the current 200th anniversary of the period of the American Revolution.

The Commission proposed by the President to commemorate the great events of the formative period of our Nation is along the lines of resolutions I have had pending in this Congress and the preceding one, and I am happy to support this effort to direct public attention to the genesis of our national heritage.

Historians generally agree that the period of the American Revolution began many years before the firing at Concord Bridge and the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

As a matter of fact, we passed last year, with little notice, the 200th anniversaries of two major events in the movement of American independence—the adoption of the Virginia Resolves and the meeting of the Stamp Act Congress at New York.

I am not so much interested in pageants and parades as I am in an intensified effort to acquaint our oncoming generations of young people with the sacrifices which were made by their ancestors to acquire and insure the tradition of freedom which, too often, is taken for granted today.

It is an unfortunate fact that many young people on other nations are better versed in our history of individual liberty than are our own students.

I hope legislation embracing the President's proposals will have full and free committee consideration as to the most appropriate means of commemorating the bicentennial of our Nation, with particular emphasis on the basic concepts for which Virginia leaders, and their counterparts throughout the Colonies, risked their lives and fortunes, 200 years ago, in what proved to be one of the most magnificent endeavors of freemen.

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen Publishes Debate Manual as Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I was recently presented a copy of a debate manual titled "The Pros and Cons of Compulsory Arbitration."

This manual was prepared by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen as a public service for high school debaters who have compulsory arbitration as their major topic this year.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, as we all know so well, was recently involved in the work-rules dispute with the railroads which ended in the passage of Public Law 88-108, the first peacetime compulsory arbitration law in our history.

As you know, we struggled long and hard with this law and at the end referred only the manning issues to compulsory arbitration. The other issues were returned to the parties for collective bargaining. They were finally settled in the White House under the capable direction and with the good help of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Knowing this background, we can see the publication as a progressive step in the field of public relations.

In this manual, the union has presented the background material for both sides of the debate question. It has also published the results of a survey which its president, Charles Luna, took on the subject of compulsory arbitration. The survey was made just after we had passed the law in Congress. The brotherhood is to be complimented for publishing this survey and all the phases of opinion it contained. Those who favor compulsory arbitration are represented in the brotherhood publication, as well as those who oppose it.

As we all know, the brotherhood is sharply opposed to compulsory arbitration, even to the point of calling it a threat to the survival of organized labor.

We also know that a high school student debating the subject must explore all sides. Whatever his personal opinion may be, the requirements of modern debate are such that he must investigate all facets of his subject.

Realizing the terms of reference in which the manual will be used, the brotherhood took a most commendable step and presented material for research, and material which it hopes will stimulate research on the part of these high school students. I can only praise this action as mature and statesmanlike.

The presentation of the brotherhood manual has some very important contributions to make in the field of labor. The book is designed around compulsory arbitration, but to give the proper background and provide stimulation for research a general discussion and introduction is presented on conflict and conflict resolution in the labor movement. The book goes on to discuss the historical and legal background of the labor movement, and devotes a section to collective bargaining process, problems, and effects. A similar section is devoted to compulsory arbitration, and makes a comparison of the two.

Another section is devoted to the work-rules dispute which occupied so much of our time recently. This is supported by an appendix which is a chronology of the railroad work-rules dispute, and in itself is a notable contribution to the literature of labor.

It is encouraging to see a major union stake so much in the way of effort, time, and money as the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen did in presenting this book for that very purpose of encouraging young minds to think for themselves.

The Snook Bluejays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the country seeks young people of the best physical condition to assume the strenuous responsibilities that are a part of our complex society, it is most rewarding to find an entire community dedicated to the principles of physical fitness.

As a striking example of a successful program of physical training, I would like to single out for special recognition the community of Snook in Burleson County, Tex., which is in the district I have the honor to represent.

For the second consecutive year, the Snook Bluejays have won the State high-school basketball championship in the class B division.

The game that wrapped up their second title in as many years also provided the team's 78th consecutive victory. The last time that the Bluejays were defeated on the basketball court was in December of 1964, and since that time they have given everybody in the country a licking.

The team's record this season is an impressive 52 wins and no defeats. During the past 4 years, the Bluejays posted an equally-impressive 181 to 14 win-loss record. That record, no doubt, would be a source of envy to many colleges and universities in this Nation.

Farm boys who work hard on ranches or in the fields are a little harder than the so-called city boys, reports the Bluejays' mentor, Coach James G. Horn.

Among the 79 students in Snook High School there are 30 boys, and those who participate in the school's basketball program are capable of withstanding 3-hour practice sessions without a single complaint.

There are about 200 persons in the friendly and delightful Snook community and a couple dozen stores and shops, but the smallness of the community is certainly no reflection on the community's ideas about physical fitness.

I ask that you join me in honoring a small town that has proved itself to be very much a big town by the manner in which they have provided an extensive physical fitness program for the youngsters of the community.

The Snook Bluejays' basketball record is, in my opinion, a conspicuous monument to physical fitness.

Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 512th anniversary of the birth of Amerigo Vespucci, the man for whom North and South America were named. In recent months there have been several theories advanced that it was not Columbus, or Vespucci who discovered America but another party—depending upon which paper you have been reading. Even the Russians have been advancing claims that it was one of their men that first trod American soil. It will probably follow that Pravda in short order will claim that the Americans were put where they are by the Russians. It would not be the first time they have tried to play God.

Infrequently do we hear of Vespucci and then seldom correctly. Some textbooks claim that America was so named because an ancient mapmaker confused Columbus and Vespucci. In actuality, Vespucci was a brilliant navigator who devised a system of celestial navigation which led him to calculations so accurate that they even today astound scientists. It is said, for instance, that he was able to calculate the length of the equator within 50 miles of its actual length—an amazing feat considering the knowledge available at that time. His charting of the South American coast proved, to those willing to see, that Columbus had not reached the Indies but had in fact discovered a new continent. It was this fact which led a mapmaker in Torraine in 1507 to call the new continent America—the name later being extended to North America as well.

Americans of Italian birth or descent take great pride in Vespucci—explorer, navigator, and man of letters. They take pride, too, in the many other Italians who have contributed so much to this land of ours, as well they should. I think it fitting, too, Mr. Speaker that the countries that make up the two great continents in this hemisphere take note of Amerigo Vespucci and use the anniversary of his birth as a date to be set aside for rededication to the spirit of freedom that binds all of our countries together.

This country owes a great deal to its 22 million Americans of Italian descent and one need only to look around this body to find prime examples of how Americans of Italian blood are fulfilling their role in the affairs of the country. Seventy-nine years ago in 1887, the first American of Italian descent was sent to this body as a Representative of the people of Brooklyn. Italian Americans in Brooklyn particularly can look upon the memory of Francis B. Spinola with a great deal of pride. Congressman Spinola was a lawyer in Brooklyn who held several local and State offices before attending the fateful Democratic National Convention in Charleston, S.C., in 1860. Two years later he was to be a brigadier general in the Union Army in charge of four regiments which he personally raised and then led into action. He was twice wounded in combat.

But even while paying honor where honor is due, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to single out any class of Americans and say they did the most for the country. It is for the country to say rather that without all of them—the Italians, Irish, Spanish, French, Germans, Poles, Scandinavians, Greeks—people from the world over—this country could not be what it is today.

Fortunately for our country, this immigration has not stopped. It was slowed for a long period by unfortunate legislation produced from fear. But our new immigration law signed into being by President Johnson on December 3 at the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor—a long stone's throw from Ellis Island where so many of our parents and relatives had their first contact with America—has changed all that. Once again, our country has opened its doors to all people, without discrimination. I am proud to have contributed to the passing of that law, as I am equally proud to be the son of immigrant Irish parents. Our country can only prosper from this new blood—as it always has in the past.

The New GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the day the President signed the new GI bill into law, I advised the people and organizations of my district of that fact. Since then, I have received many inquiries about details of this bill.

I can well understand the great interest of the people and of the 16 veterans' organizations in my district in this bill. There are 9,200 veterans who are potentially eligible for benefits under this bill in the 13th Congressional District in New York, which I have the honor to represent. The many inquiries I have received on the matter and the great interest in general that the bill has engendered, prompted me to make this statement explaining its provisions in greater detail.

The new GI bill provides education and training programs that generally are similar to the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict.

I have always supported these programs. In the last Congress, I introduced a bill for this purpose on June 9, 1963, and in this Congress, I again introduced a similar bill (H.R. 1128) on January 4, 1965. When the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs was considering this legislation in August 1965, I said in a statement that I submitted in its support:

> There are those who object to this legislation because its benefits are not related to need. I will support any measure that would raise our country's educational level. There is not yet any legislation on the books to provide educational benefits for all our younger people. I believe my bill would encourage more volunteers to serve their country in return for their education. I think the quid is well worth the quo. My bill will tell our youth that service to our country is a two-way street and that they are not its forgotten citizens.
>
> This bill affirms our faith in our youth.

To ascertain the impact this bill will have upon those in my district, I have obtained significant statistics from the Veterans' Administration. In the first year alone, I anticipate that 1,180 veterans will take advantage of the educational benefits and that $742,000 in direct benefits will be provided to them. Because the educational provisions are effective June 1, 1966, the veteran will have ample time to plan his schooling program.

Some 60 veterans will obtain VA guaranteed loans totaling $951,000 in that same first year. About 1,500 patient-days at a cost of $37,600 will be made available to the veterans of my district.

To be eligible for educational and guaranteed home loan benefits, a veteran must have been on active duty more than 180 days after January 31, 1955, and honorably discharged or he may have been honorably discharged with less than 180 days service because of a service-incurred disability.

Monthly payments for full-time training under the education and training sections of the bill are $100 for veterans without dependents, $125 for veterans with one dependent, and $150 for veterans with more than one dependent.

A veteran can receive up to 36 months of schooling or training on the basis of 1 month for each month spent in uniform, but he must complete his educational program within 8 years after discharge.

The home loan provisions of the bill will increase building and real estate activity throughout our country. The eligibility formula for veteran participation in this program is the same as that already in existence. The veteran has 10 years from the date of his discharge plus 1 year for each 3 months served by him in which to avail himself of this program. He is not entitled to benefits after 20 years nor may they expire within 10 years from the date of his discharge.

Guaranteed or insured loan ceilings will remain at $7,500.

The bill makes medical and hospital care available to him on the same basis as for wartime veterans. Burial benefits, employment assistance and veterans' preference in Federal employment are also provided.

The Congress and the President are to be commended for the expeditious manner and spirit of cooperation in which they acted on this urgent matter.

Texas Sisters of Providence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, with the ever-increasing need for thoroughly educating the youth of our Nation, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent work in education which has been done in Texas now for 100 years by the Sisters of Divine Providence.

The Sisters of Divine Providence is an order which was founded 200 years ago by Father John Martin Moye, who early in his priesthood saw the tremendous need to educate the neglected French peasants of the mid-18th century which he served through a congregation of women "who would be willing to go alone and without a regular salary to evangelize the neglected countryside by teaching catechism and secular subjects to the children." Now, Father Moye's dreams in France of educating the young have been expanded through the teaching order the world over including the countries of Belgium, China, France, French Indochina, Italy, Madagascar, Mexico, South America, Spain, Switzerland, and the United States.

In Texas, the beginning of this teaching order's work began after the Reverend Claude Dubuis, bishop of the Catholic Church in Texas, visited the convent of St. Jean de Bassel of the Sisters of Providence in Lorraine, France, in hopes of securing teachers for his parish school system some hundred years ago.

Within 2 years after he had staffed the first school in Austin, Tex., Bishop Dubuis sent three sisters to establish a second in Castroville, Tex. As vocations increased, from the mother house in Castroville, more schools were opened. By 1872 they totaled 8; by 1879, 13. Among these was St. Joseph's in San Antonio which is my home district. By 1903 the Sisters of Divine Providence had undertaken 47 schools in Texas.

Since Castroville was without railroad facilities, transportation difficulties had led to the move of the mother house to San Antonio in 1896. Here under Rev. Mother Florence had begun the establishment which became Our Lady of the Lake. In 1962, the Generalate was moved to the Scenic Loop, Helotes, Tex., where Rev. Mother M. Amata and some of the council members reside and carry on the administration of the congregation.

At first an accredited high school, Our Lady of the Lake College came into being in 1911. During the next 14 years, the college gained membership in the Texas Association of Colleges, the Southern Association of Colleges, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Council on Education. By 1927 Our Lady of the Lake was placed on the approved list of the Association of American Universities.

Under the leadership of Rev. Mother Philothea Thiry and later that of Rev. Mother Angelique Ayres, the college continued to expand.

Today, OLL's student body numbers 1,352. Joining San Antonians, students come from 23 States and 11 foreign countries. Degrees granted by OLL include bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of music, bachelor of music education, with a master in education; master in arts in education, in English, or in speech pathology; and a master in social work.

Here, each summer, meet the 730 Sisters who carry on Father Moye's work in a social service center, a children's home, a school of religion, 2 clinics, 3 aspirancies, 4 hospitals, and 67 schools in 5 States. Here, too, the Missionary Cathechists of Divine Providence, numbering 81, are prepared to staff their house of formation in San Antonio, and their 19 missions in Texas.

This Saturday, March 12, I have the honor of speaking at ground-breaking ceremonies for a new gymnasium for the Providence High School of San Antonio. This high school was founded by the Sisters of Divine Providence in 1951.

In the high school's first year it received accreditation in the Southern Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges. An excellent rating in the respective departments was reported after a 3-day evaluation by the association's representative committees.

It was reported in the Southern Messenger that the comments of the committee included:

> The building, the library program and the physical facilities were rated "almost perfect."
>
> The spirit of cooperation between the administration and the staff was declared to be evidently as nearly perfect as can be desired.
>
> That the students are developing high ideals, wholesome attitudes and good habits, is quite evident.

Today the enrollment at this excellent school for girls is 605 with a waiting list of over a hundred.

I am pleased to salute the Superior of Providence High School, Sister Adrienne Marie, and the other members of her order for the steadfast and excellent work they are doing. They have a wonderful heritage and one which makes it possible for work like theirs to be ever expanding.

The Seventh Anniversary of the Passage of Legislation in the House of Representatives Bringing Statehood to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a joyous occasion for celebration. Seven years ago today the U.S. House of Representatives passed legislation that gave statehood to Hawaii. We in the House of Representatives recall that historic event with true pride. Congress gave not only Hawaii statehood, but to the valiant people of Hawaii the full rights of U.S. citizenship in perpetuity.

The other 49 States, which were in existence at that time, gained immeasurably by the admission of Hawaii into our Union. During these ensuing 7 years a closer relationship has grown between us, and the prosperity, security, and happiness that was sought by this legislation have become a reality.

The State of Hawaii has lived up to the expectations that she would do her part to make this Union stronger. She has added scenic beauty to our boundaries, and her people have been more than enthusiastic in demonstrating true patriotism.

By making Hawaii a State, Congress advanced three steps in our U.S. national progress. These three steps are:

First, we have bolstered Hawaii's and our U.S. defense, by Hawaii being a full sister State, instead of a U.S. territory or possession in the Pacific.

Second, Congress has made Hawaii a center where the people of the Pacific could study and learn our best American traditions. Hawaii by its wonderful progress, has been a showcase of American democracy in the Pacific. This is a fine encouragement for the future for all Pacific peoples, and all colonial peoples everywhere.

Third. Congress and the State of Hawaii have demonstrated dramatically that the United States both cherishes and practices the democratic ideal that her citizens stand equal before the law regardless of color and creed or national origin.

The example of the State of Hawaii shines in the Pacific for half the world's people to see and to compare with the empty promises of equality held out by totalitarian states.

In peace and in war, Hawaii's citizens have proved the worth of their patriotism and Americanism. Hawaii has an experienced and intelligent electorate. It has responsible citizens devoted to their government as an average of more than 85 percent of the registered voters exercise their right to vote.

Since 1840 Hawaii has had a functioning, orderly government patterned on a constitutional form. Its State constitution, ratified in 1950, has been ample evidence of Hawaii's political maturity and capacity to conduct its affairs as an American State.

A public school system was established in Hawaii as early as 1840 and many of the children of western pioneers were sent there for their education. A congressional committee in 1951 found that—

> The public school system of Hawaii is generally recognized as among the best in the United States.

The sparkling sunshine and wholesome outdoor life that are the prime attractions of Hawaii's semitropical living help the State achieve a notable health record.

Fortunately, Hawaii wanted statehood. In 1954 its citizens presented a dramatic testimonial. In a historic petition to Congress from Hawaii's citizens, they asked for statehood. Approximately 116,000 signatures had been affixed within a few days. The giant roll was 6 feet wide, about a mile long, and was one of the largest petitions received in the history of the U.S. Congress. It transmitted the determination and desire of Hawaii's citizens to be granted the statehood status they had earned. For over half a century, the residents of Hawaii had lived as Americans, worked as Americans, and fought and died as Americans.

With the passage of statehood legislation the people of Hawaii are now given the true dignity of American citizenship, with all accompanying rights and privileges, one of the most valued possessions in the world today.

Never was a U.S. territory more ready for statehood. Never have people been more willing and able to assume all the rights and responsibilities of a State in our Union.

We rejoice today that Hawaii is such a success story that it more than fulfills the predictions of those of us who supported and worked for Hawaii statehood. We supporters look back with pride on the action that was taken in this House 7 years ago.

To the people of Hawaii we extend our continued loyal friendship and continuing hearty welcome. We give our heartfelt thanks for their cooperation, friendship, and willingness to stand with the united citizens of our good United States, for progress and the security of all of us.

H.R. 13177—Freedom Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, profoundly dynamic ideas underlie our governmental and economic system. Our forefathers recognized what individuals could and would accomplish when they were afforded the opportunity in a society freed from governmental shackles. The essence of our federal system is the subordination of governmental power to that of the individual. Giving the individual the opportunity and the responsibility for his own development released the creative capacities of men to an extent hitherto undreamed of.

Realizing the potential of our economic system and democratic form of Government, we rightly wonder why so many of the newly independent nations of the world seem to look to communism and state socialism as the fastest routes to material abundance and fulfillment of their national aspirations. The answer is obviously threefold: First, the very aggressive methods used by Communists to further communism; second, the failure of the free world to present its beliefs in a manner readily understood and applied; third, the failure of everyone to recognize the danger posed by the Communist philosophy.

Despite the increasing loss of men and countries to Communist dictatorship, it appears that few Americans, even in high governmental positions, are sufficiently aware of the stated goal of communism—world domination—and the methods designed to achieve this goal. How many persons know what is meant by dialectical materialism? How many realize that words to Communists have meanings completely different from our meanings?

Too many people hate communism—almost a kneejerk reaction to the word—without knowing or understanding communism.

Communism is repugnant to everything I hold dear, my family, my church, my country, the individual human being, the free enterprise system of doing business, free representative government. But I cannot oppose it intelligently or fight it effectively if I do not fully understand it.

Just as we cannot fight a disease if we do not thoroughly understand it, we cannot defend ourselves or our institutions against communism if we do not understand its history, objectives, language, mechanics, techniques, and methods.

Nowhere at present is there a repository of research materials on communism and the insidious subversive tactics its proponents and followers have developed. Nowhere can a private citizen who is moving to an overseas post take a course to equip himself to perceive Communist activity or to tell the story of free enterprise and democracy. No present institution can educate government policymakers and employees in Communist theory and practices. Qualified teachers are in short supply. We actually do not have enough competent teachers of Communist techniques and tactics to teach the teachers.

This crying inadequacy has placed the United States far behind the Communists in the race between freedom and communism. The tale of the hare and the tortoise is somewhat analogous except that many persons in this country do not even realize that we are in such a race. Conversely, too many of our citizens believe that we can retreat into our shell and be protected from Communist aggression and subversion. This attitude should convince even the most dubious that the free world must shake itself free from a lethargy which could lull it into oblivion.

Mr. Speaker, an extensive Communist program for training agents is well documented. The State Department has supplied the Congress with information verifying the operation of seven schools of political warfare in the Soviet Union, nine in East Germany, nine in Cuba, four in Czechoslovakia, three in Hungary, and two in Bulgaria. Meanwhile, Red China has specialized in training Latin American and African Communists. I am not aware of any published statistics on the Chinese-sponsored schools. However, the present leadership in Ghana announced the closing of a Communist school for subversives which had the blessing of former Premier Nkrumah. Even when faced with the fact of these schools which turn out thousands of operatives trained in mob violence, subversion, destruction, and terrorism too many of us want to carry on "business as usual."

The need to understand this godless philosophy is so great and urgent that we should immediately embark on a crash program to systematize our knowledge of it and then convert this knowledge into the most effective media for instructing all Americans of all ages about this menace.

Secondly, we must develop counter-Communist methods. The most creative minds available should be set to work on this challenge. Our Foreign Service personnel, employees of American businesses abroad, and even tourists could profit from training in countercommunism.

Many believe that the Voice of America should be sufficient for telling the world about America and its beliefs. While no objective tests can measure the effectiveness of the Voice, the advance of communism since World War II suggests that we need many more and better weapons.

Mr. Speaker, we will lose the struggle with communism by default unless we awaken to the danger, arouse our citizenry, and arm ourselves. The major battlefields will be in the minds of men. The most effective weapons will be ideological, buttressed by better methods of presentation.

For many years, some dedicated Americans have been working for the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy. Its purposes are the attainment of a thorough and complete understanding of communism; the development of methods to learn about and combat the effective tactics of the Communists; the dissemination of technical information on the true character of communism—both at home and abroad; and the education and training of governmental and private individuals in the new science of countercommunism.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 13177, which contains some revisions agreed to by framers of earlier legislation and some revisions of my own. I trust my bill will serve as a springboard to a final version which will be enacted. The bill admittedly needs perfection.

My bill would establish a Freedom Commission to collect and assemble current information and knowledge on communism and its methods and to devise effective means for countering communism.

My bill also authorizes the Commission to establish a Freedom Academy, similar in some respects to our service academies, to educate and train persons in the newly developed science of countercommunism. I anticipate that the Academy would be a specialized graduate institution.

The Academy would be a technical research and training institution. It would not be a counterinsurgency agency or an arm of the military or State Department.

I have introduced this bill partly to give meaning and purpose to the outstanding and dedicated work of a group of Salinas, Calif., Jaycees who have become concerned about the inadequate research materials, knowledge, and understanding of communism and the methods and tactics of Communist promotion. The Salinas and California Jaycees have resolved to support the Freedom Academy concept. I applaud their interest and initiative.

I urge interested Members and persons to scrutinize my proposal and make helpful suggestions which will strengthen it.

Thomas M. Mulry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, March 10 marks the 50th anniversary of the death of Thomas M. Mulry, and I think it appropriate that recognition be made of this anniversary since Mr. Mulry was one of the outstanding citizens of our country.

Born in New York City of a mother whose forebears went back to the earliest colonial days and a father who had come from Ireland as a boy, Thomas Mulry grew to eminence in his chosen field of business—banking, but he also became one of the foremost figures in the field of American charity—and this at a time when government had not assumed the all-encompassing position in support and guidance which it fills today.

Although he rose to the position of president of the Emigrant Savings Bank—one of the great savings institutions of New York City, Mr. Mulry's lasting devotion was to organizations serving the poor and afflicted. Much of his effort was devoted to the fostering and nurturing of Catholic charitable units and so great was his contribution that he was described by one eminent authority as "generally acknowledged to have been the greatest single person in the history of American Catholic charities."

He worked all his life for the Society of St. Vincent de Paul and in his later years served as president of its superior council.

So great was the knowledge of his tireless and energetic labors that President Theodore Roosevelt appointed him in 1909 as Vice Chairman of the White House Conference on Children which he did much to stimulate and which continues its work to this day.

It was his work in sponsoring and effecting increased cooperation between charitable organizations that was Mr. Mulry's most valuable contribution to the social development of our country and in these ecumenical times his pioneering efforts take on new significance.

In the 1880's when he began his work, private charities were either entirely Protestant or militantly Catholic. Proselytizing was carried on without any great subtlety. The idea of cooperation was unconsidered. In the face of this unpromising situation Mr. Mulry began his efforts to join the activities of groups of different faiths since he realized that a continuation of antagonistic efforts would injure the cause of each group and hurt the objects of their bounty.

He began with his affiliation with the Charity Organization Society—a purportedly nonsectarian group which sought to coordinate the charitable activities of the community. Because of their suspicion of the proselytizing activities in the past, Mr. Mulry was allowed by church authorities to affiliate as an individual, but not to commit the Society of St. Vincent de Paul which he headed.

Convinced that objectionable non-Catholic activities of existing organizations were due to ignorance as much as to bigotry, Mr. Mulry next sought a national platform to proclaim his convictions and he spoke in 1884 on this theme to the National Conference of Charities and Correction with encouraging results.

Thereafter he consistently advocated participation and cooperation with other social welfare organizations where the object was the assistance of fellow citizens regardless of nationality or creed. His efforts aroused the opposition of diehards, but their complaint to Archbishop Corrigan resulted in a ringing support of Mr. Mulry's efforts by that prelate.

With a continuation of his activities on a national as well as a local level, the religious antipathies that had been prevalent gradually gave way to a cooperation that grew and spread and created a feeling of mutual esteem and resulted in the greater service of the community.

Mr. Mulry summed up his conclusions in later years by saying:

> I feel, therefore, strongly in favor of close cooperation without any surrender of our principles. But I am convinced that the great majority of those outside of the field of Catholic relief work are fair minded. I have found even in relatively large meetings that there are very few bigots and that the great majority are in favor of fair play. Hence, I believe frankly in cooperation without any surrender of principle.

Mr. Mulry served on State and local committees concerned with social problems. He was a Knight of St. Gregory and the winner of the noted Laetare Medal of Notre Dame University. He and the former Miss Mary E. Gallagher were the parents of 13 children. His sons, Rt. Rev. Vincent de Paul Mulry of Rosendale, N.Y., and James A. Mulry, of New York City, and his daughter Miss Mary Mulry, also of New York City, survive.

In 1920, New York City dedicated a square at Greenwich Avenue and Perry Street, Mulry Square, in his honor.

In a time when private charity had the main responsibility in social life, Thomas M. Mulry made a vital national contribution whose results have survived to this time. In a time of passion and suspicion, he introduced a note of reason and cooperation that anticipated today's interfaith.

On this 50th anniversary of his death Americans should know of the work of this great American.

Postal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, last October, for the second time in as many years, I took the floor of the House to discuss in some detail the deplorable situation existing in the United States with regard to our postal service. At that time, I stated:

> There is no segment of our country, there is no individual or corporation or school or union or institution which does not rely on mail service for communication.

I further stated, and will say again now: We not only need a modern, efficient, dependable system of communication through the mails; we virtually must have it, and there is no excuse for not having it.

Mr. Speaker, I—and many million Americans—were heartened in January of this year when our President indicated that he, too, recognized this problem and was about to take steps to raise the level of mail service and restore our confidence in what was once one of our finest institutions. Various space-age methods were proposed, increased automation, accelerated delivery, bigger and better ZIP codes, and a new Postmaster General. Somewhere in all this I found myself hoping that we would indeed move our mail overnight again, that we could trace lost bank deposits and insured parcels, that we could count on having our mail delivered to our front doors every day but Sunday, hopefully even before 4 or 5 o'clock in the evening.

Unfortunately, there is very little progress to report. My mail does not indicate that the situation has improved, or that we are even aiming for it. In fact, the mail which reaches me, and apparently not all of it does, brings repeated complaints, protests, pleas concerning postal services, from delivery or lack of it right up to post office facilities themselves.

And, always, the blame is somewhere else. The excuses are numerous: facilities are unavailable, money is unavailable, personnel are unavailable, postmaster appointments are political footballs, and still, we are told of great technological strides within the Post Office Department itself. Administrative actions, administrative studies, but where are the administrative solutions?

In recent years, as post office employee pay raise bills and postal rate increase bills came before Congress, much was said to place the blame for deteriorating service on the man who carries the mail, the postman, by indicating that salaries were too low to attract qualified men or to keep them as career service employees, that they, in many cases, held two jobs in order to make ends meet.

Congress has taken steps to solve this problem by increasing pay, by increasing uniform allowances, by increased appropriations for the Department so that it could automate mailhandling and recordkeeping—and now that we have attacked the problem as it was presented to Congress, the service is poorer than it has ever been. This situation cannot be blamed on the individual postmen. Certainly, the vast majority are doing an excellent job, and the numerous complaints I have received, do not reflect for the most part, on the service provided by these dedicated men and women.

Possibly, one aspect of the problem is a lack of incentive within the service for ultimate competitive achievement. I know that some steps are being taken along this line. However, in my testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress last year, I stated my belief that postmaster appointments should be removed from political interference. I am still of that opinion, and I am today introducing a bill to accomplish this end.

In my last speech on postal matters, I cited numerous problems and complaints reported by residents of the 13th Congressional District. Some are being solved. By way of giving credit where credit is due, I am pleased to report that the village of Schaumburg, Ill., has recently received postal identification through a branch post office which opened on March 1. Our effort to secure this facility dates back to 1957 and the efforts of my predecessor in Congress—and, as late as last September, despite my continued efforts, I was told by the Post Office Department that such an installation "would not be economical."

In February the Department changed its mind, and this community of over 6,000 is now enjoying the right—not the privilege—of a local post office. We have been doubly fortunate. On February 28, the Post Office Department also announced the location of a branch post office in Streamwood, Ill., to be opened in June of this year. I have worked to achieve this improved postal service for several years, and I am heartened by the action of the Post Office Department.

Regrettably, however, many more complaints have been received. Perhaps the most illustrative and telling plea which I have received is one from Elk Grove Village which brought to my attention the fact that the Post Office Department had decided that in order "to provide the best service to new residential areas," residents must erect curbside mailboxes, which would be serviced by a postman in a 3-wheel truck. Mr. Speaker, I thought those days had gone in heavily populated metropolitan areas. Following are excerpts from letters relating to this matter:

First, from the village of Elk Grove came:

> As you are aware, the Postmaster General issued an order about mid-December that all future delivery routes would have to be serviced by mounted carrier to curb mailboxes, and in our instance and instances throughout your district, this is going to work a considerable hardship and make the Federal Government look rather ridiculous. For example, on some streets one house will have mounted delivery and the house next door will have foot delivery. One side of the street will have carrier delivery and the opposite side will have mounted delivery.
>
> Your good offices are sought to consult with the Postmaster General and see if his order cannot be modified to allow a subdivision which is partially occupied to continue to be served by carrier and have the order apply to subsequent subdivisions.

Needless to say, I protested to the Post Office Department. In their response, they said:

> Mail delivery to newly qualifying areas will be by extension of mounted (vehicle) service where practicable. This applies to all extension of delivery areas and is not selectively applicable to Elk Grove Village and Palatine, Ill.
>
> Two disturbing misconceptions have caused unfortunate reactions in a few areas. The first misconception is that mounted delivery is a rural-type delivery. The second misconception is that this type of service is a new program without advantage except to the Post Office Department. Mounted delivery to curbside boxes has existed for many years. It is very urban in approach, with mechanization to provide fast and efficient service with modern equipment. The postal patron receives both letters and parcels at the same time, and the taxpayer receives added value for his dollar.

The latest word on this subject from the village of Elk Grove reads as follows:

> You may be interested to know that our good people here in Elk Grove Village have erected curbside mailboxes and the delivery is being made by mail carriers walking the streets, rather than by mounted delivery, as the program was outlined and proposed. As you can realize and appreciate, this gives us all a good chuckle, but still it reflects very poorly on the Post Office and on the Federal Government.

If this chain of events were not so burdensome on the residents of Elk Grove Village, it might be humorous. One cannot help but wonder if the Post Office Department might next eliminate individual residential delivery altogether, since, using their logic, anyone could determine that they might conclude that mail would be available to the recipient sooner if he went directly to the post office and picked it up there.

It is going to take a good deal of effort to get the postal service back on track and assure the American people of prompt, reliable mail service. There is no sign that an effort is being made. In fact, the Postmaster General continues to hold two jobs in Government and is not even devoting his full time to the problems in his Department. Clearly, as the population continues to grow and population shifts continue to take place, postal service will continue to deteriorate unless the President and the Postmaster General resolve to execute their responsibilities. There can be utterly no excuse for the United States to have a second- or third-rate postal service. This is what we have. The authority is with President Johnson. The responsibility rests with President Johnson. And, appropriately, the blame is with President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is also introducing a resolution to remove postmaster appointments from the area of politics and place them on a merit basis.

Educational Assistance Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House in 1965, I derived great satisfaction from participating in the various processes which resulted in the largest and most significant body of educational legislation ever enacted by a single Congress. It is a source of pride for me that my first Congress exhibited a deep and earnest concern for the state of the American schools, and that it made that concern tangible by earmarking a considerable portion of the Nation's vast fiscal resources for the support and betterment of those schools.

OPPOSES PROPOSALS

Now, only a year later, I am compelled to rise in opposition to proposals which, if accepted, would belie our continuing concern. I refer to the recommended cutbacks in the program of assistance to schools in federally affected areas, first presented to us skeletally in the budget for fiscal 1967, and now more fully in the provisions of H.R. 13160 and H.R. 13161.

Mr. Speaker, the current program of aid to federally impacted schools has been in operation under Public Law 815 and 874 for only 15 years, but the circumstances which led to the enactment of the program are of much longer standing. Those circumstances relate to the historic doctrine of intergovernmental immunities, one tenet of which holds that property of the Federal Government is not subject to taxation by local or State governments in whose territory such property lies.

LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

As a result of this doctrine, local school boards have often been hesitant in accepting for enrollment children who live on Federal property. This was an unfortunate situation, but I think, an understandable one. The local school boards probably reasoned thus: "Our task is to provide public education for the children of our area. To finance this education, we draw mostly on taxes collected on the property in the district. The Federal Government pays no taxes on the property it owns—property which would be taxable if it were privately owned. Therefore, we are in no way bound to educate the children who live on Federal property. Moreover, should we attempt to school those extra children, we would actually fall down in our primary duty—that to the local children—since we would be spending the same amount of money while trying to educate a larger number of children."

TUITION SOMETIMES REQUIRED

This line of reasoning is not merely understandable; it has also been upheld judicially in a number of instances going back to a Massachusetts decision in 1841. From that time forward, the federally connected child was left in a sort of educational limbo. At one post, he might be accepted into local schools with no trouble. Transferring to another base, his parents might be required to pay tuition to get him in the local schools. At another post, he might have to enroll in a private school; and at another, the base authority itself might run schools for the children of Government workers.

In the late 1930's, with the great buildup in defense forces underway, the Federal Government realized the necessity for more systematic action in this long-neglected area. In 1940, Congress responded by enacting the Lanham Act, which provided Federal financing for housing and community facilities in areas with concentrations of Federal military and defense-connected families. Under this emergency legislation and its subsequent amendments, the Federal Government attempted to ease the Federal burden on local schools by providing funds for construction and operation. The Lanham Act was always looked upon as temporary in nature, however, and plans were made to discontinue assistance under it as soon as the war ended. Congress recognized the continuing burden on local schools by extending assistance through fiscal 1949, but it was obvious that a more unified, more permanent approach to the problem was still needed.

PRESENT LAW ENACTED

In 1950, the President called for new legislation dealing with the problem, and the outbreak of the Korean conflict and its resultant defense-military buildup made the need even more pressing. Finally, in September of that year, Public Laws 815 and 874 were enacted. For the first time, the Federal Government stood ready to compensate systematically all local schools for the continuing burden of federally connected children it was placing on them.

Public Law 874, authorizing assistance for the operation and maintenance of federally affected schools, was originally enacted for a 4-year period. Public Law 815, the companion measure providing school construction funds, was set to expire after 3 years. Yet today, a decade and a half later, both laws are still in effect. The very longevity of the laws bespeaks their need. It speaks of the continuing nature of the Federal burden, and it speaks of the effectiveness of the laws in dealing with that burden.

Since 1950, each of the laws has been extended on eight separate occasions. On each of those occasions, congressional support for the laws has been overwhelming and support from the Nation's schoolmen has been all but unanimous.

MORE THAN $87 MILLION TO COLORADO

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues in this body are aware of the splendid record of achievement associated with the operation of these two laws over the past 15 years, but I must touch for a moment on some of the figures. My State, like many of the Western States, has a considerable Federal burden, and the program of assistance under Public Law 815 and 874 has been of the greatest importance to our educational system. In 15 years, Public Law 874 has contributed nearly $62 million for the operation of Colorado schools in which federally connected children are enrolled. Under Public Law 815, $25.4 million has been used to build 1,100 new classrooms serving over 32,000 pupils.

But, in this same light let us look at what the situation would be in a couple of instances if this assistance had not been forthcoming.

In the academic year 1957–58, School District No. 20 in Colorado Springs enrolled about 70 federally connected children. Then, in the fall of 1958, the U.S. Air Force Academy moved from its temporary location at Lowry AFB in Denver to its permanent site at Colorado Springs. As a direct result of this move, nearly 600 new federally connected students were enrolled in the schools of district No. 20 in a single year. Now it is true that many of the families connected with the Academy lived in private homes and paid property taxes. But it is also true that the Academy itself, the biggest industry in the area, paid no taxes. It is quite obvious that, in the absence of Public Law 874–815 aid, School District No. 20 would have been powerless to cope with the sudden influx of new pupils.

STARTLING ENROLLMENT INCREASES

Or another instance, even more startling. In 1955, the Widefield-Security School District No. 3, also near Colorado Springs, was small and rural in nature. It operated 10 rooms for 24 students. But in the current academic year, that same district has an enrollment of 6,000 students, nearly 60 percent of which is federally connected. This staggering increase has stemmed partly from the opening of the Air Force Academy, but also from increased activity at other Federal bases in the area, such as Ent Air Force Base, Fort Carson, and Peterson Field.

School District No. 3 has not merely waited on the Federal Government to ease the burden. It has received substantial help under Public Law 815 and 874, but it has also passed 11 bond issues in the last 10 years and is now at the limit of indebtedness. Where, though, would the district stand if there had been no assistance for federally affected areas? And where will it stand if that assistance is cut back to the very bone?

REDUCTIONS UNWISE

Such a cut, of course, has been proposed, in the budget and now in the form of legislation. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I have examined the legislative proposal, and I have looked at the study on which the proposal is based. I am still convinced that the proposed reductions would be neither equitable nor wise, and I must in good conscience oppose them.

In terms of hard dollars, the suggested cutback in the program is radical indeed. For the current fiscal year, Public Law 874 assistance will amount to about $327 million—which sum, incidentally, may be only 80 to 85 percent of the amount needed to pay all entitlements in full. For fiscal year 1967, the Office of Education estimated that about $416 million would be needed to support the program as it now stands. But the budget calls for appropriations of only $183 million—$233 million less than the estimated requirement.

CONSTRUCTION SLASHED TOO

The vital program of construction assistance under Public Law 815 would also be slashed. Over the past several years, Public Law 815 has been funded at an annual level of from $50 to $60 million. For fiscal year 1966, the level will be right at the lower figure. But for next year, we are being asked to appropriate only $23 million.

These drastic reductions would result from proposed changes in the two basic laws as follows:

Three major amendments have been offered to Public Law 874. First, Federal property which is leased to private corporations would no longer be used as a basis for determining the Federal connection of children who live on such property. The second change also affects the determination of eligibility.

At present, if at least 3 percent of a school district's enrollment is federally connected, the district may receive payment for all federally connected pupils. But under the proposed amendment, the school district would be required to absorb a certain percentage of its Federal pupils—that is, to pay for their education from its own resources—and payment would be made only for those pupils in excess of the absorption factor. For category A children—those whose parents live and work on Federal property—the absorption factor would be set at 3 percent. For category B children—those whose parents either work on or reside on Federal property—the district would have to absorb the first 6 percent.

And finally, the method of computing the amount of payment for eligible pupils would be changed. The payment would be equal to the average per-pupil spending in comparable districts in the State. The district could no longer opt, as it may now, to be paid one-half the State average per-pupil spending or one-half the national average if those figures are larger than the average per-pupil spending in comparable districts.

The proposed changes in Public Law 815 are simpler, but no less drastic. At present, that part of the Public Law 815 program dealing with children whose parents both live on and work on Federal property is permanent. The program of payment for children whose parents either live or work on Federal property, but not both, is temporary, and it is scheduled to expire in June of this year. The proposed cutback in financing would be achieved by allowing the temporary provisions of the law to expire.

So much for the mechanics of the reductions. But what of justification? What reasons are set forth in support of the proposed changes?

To deal with the simplest first, we might look at the justification for allowing a good part of the Public Law 815 program to expire. I say simplest, for I am yet to encounter any justification for this proposal. Could it be that there is no longer any need for school construction assistance? Hardly, when it is noted that 10.3 million American pupils—nearly 30 percent of all our schoolchildren—must try to learn in schools jammed with over 30 children per classroom. Is it that a sufficient amount of construction assistance will be available under the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act we passed last year? Not according to our able colleague from Kentucky, who was instrumental in the formulation and enactment of that legislation, and who has said that:

> The funds provided under that act (Public Law 89-10) * * * are inadequate to enable the construction of new classroom and other educational facilities in the school attendance areas in which these programs will operate.[1]

Or did the study of Public Laws 815 and 874 carried out for Congress by the Stanford Research Institute indicate that the program under Public Law 815 should be cut back? To the contrary: the Stanford group found the program too small already and suggested changes which would call for an additional $10 million annual spending thereunder.

Since there seems to be no valid justification for allowing the temporary portions of Public Law 815 to terminate, I am of the opinion that they should be extended, and that we should finance the program at least at the level of recent years.

And what of justification for the cutbacks in assistance under Public Law 874?

On this head, the budget states that the proposed cutbacks are based on:

> (1) Recent studies made at the request of Congress, and (2) the impact of the large new Federal programs which meet many of the same needs.

These recent studies, I assume, are the ones carried out by the Stanford Research Institute, to which I have already referred. Several points seem pertinent to me in this connection. For one thing, the very size of the Public Law 874 program is such that the study could deal in detailed fashion with only a very small portion of the eligible school districts—54 out of an estimated 4,100.

Again, the study concluded that the payment to some districts was more than enough to meet the Federal burden; but also that in some districts it was far short of the amount necessary to offset the burden. Assuming this to be the case, we should certainly alter the law so that the payment to every district meets the burden. In my opinion, however, the proposed amendments would not achieve this end. Under them, approximately 1,050 districts would lose all eligibility, and virtually all of the remaining districts would have their entitlements substantially reduced. The amendments would certainly put a stop to overpayment, but they would also push underpayments even further under. Admitting that adjustments are necessary, I do not think we should make them in a hasty manner, which smacks distinctly of throwing the baby out with the bath.

Then there is the matter of the proposed absorption requirement. The Stanford report points out that if the enrollment of a district is exactly 3-percent federally connected, then the district is paid for all federally connected children; but that if a district has a federally connected enrollment of 2.9 percent, it receives no payment. This is undoubtedly inequitable. Under the proposed amendments, as we have seen, every district would have to absorb set percentages of federally connected children, for whom no payment would be made. This arrangement would indeed be equitable, in that it would apply to all school districts alike. But, in my opinion, it would violate the basic purpose of the program by requiring the local districts to foot a good portion of what is admittedly a federally imposed burden. I cannot generate much feeling for an arrangement which would remove a minor inequity by replacing it with a major one.

Finally, I would comment on the second justification propounded for the retrenchment in the Public Law 874 program—that the newly enacted Federal assistance programs will help fill the needs previously met by Public Law 874. Indeed, the budget goes even further and asserts that:

> This special form of assistance (i.e., the impacted areas program) should be periodically adjusted to reflect the growth in assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Now my understanding of the programs in question will not admit of that reasoning. Essentially, Public Laws 815 and 874 are concerned with one thing only: the burden placed on local schools by activities of the Federal Government. The two laws do not deal with rich areas or poor areas, but with federally affected areas. Public Law 89-10, on the other hand, has nothing to do with federally affected areas. Its touchstone is the general quality of education, especially in economically depressed sections. Consequently, the statement I have quoted from the budget seems to me to be founded on reasoning which is, at best, tenuous.

PROGRAMS DIFFER

Even if the programs had the same purpose, which I do not believe to be the case, would the proposed amendments to Public Law 874 really reflect the growth in Public Law 89-10 assistance? Certainly not, in many instances. For example, I would cite El Paso County in my district in Colorado. Under the present provisions of Public Law 874, the school districts of that county would qualify for an estimated $4 million in assistance in fiscal 1967. If, however, the suggested amendments are enacted, the total entitlement for El Paso County would be reduced by $1.45 million.

Under title I of Public Law 89-10, the maximum basic grant to El Paso in fiscal 1966 would be about $575,000. Should this grant be increased to $1 million for fiscal 1967—and there is no reason to believe it will be—El Paso County schools would still be out nearly one-half million dollars. That is not my conception of an increase in one program being reflected by a decrease in another.

URGES PROGRAM CONTINUE

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the proposed changes in the federally affected areas program. In spite of the various justifications offered for the suggested changes, it would seem that the real reason behind the proposals is purely fiscal. There is certainly a need to limit Federal spending, but, as this body demonstrated last year, there is a greater need to see that American education is made as strong as the Nation can make it. Retrenchment in the program of assistance to schools in federally affected areas would certainly impair that strength. Therefore, I sincerely hope that efforts toward such retrenchment will fail.

I thank you.

---

[1] School construction, 1965. Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, on H.R. 9948, etc. July–August 1965. Statement of Mr. Perkins, p. 1.

Employees Separated After June 30, 1965, To Receive Severance Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would provide a retroactive effective date of July 1, 1965, for the severance pay provisions of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965. Under the present law, only those Federal employees who are involuntarily separated from their employment on or after October 29, 1965, the effective date of the act, are entitled to the benefits of severance pay. Upon closer observation this humane law, noble in purpose, turns out to exclude from its protection many of those whom it was intended to benefit. I am sure that the Congress never intended it that way and it would seem that a change in the law is in order to give it the intended effect.

Several instances of injustice under the severance pay provisions of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965 recently came to my attention. I am told that there are many other Federal employees who are similarly affected adversely by the present law. In one case, a 23-year employee of the New York Naval Shipyard was separated from his employment on October 1, 1965, and in another case an 18-year employee of the shipyard was separated from his employment on October 10, 1965. Both were separated because of a reduction in force resulting from an order of base closure. Neither of these employees is eligible for severance pay benefits under the present law, while other separated employees with substantially less years of service to their credit are eligible for severance pay because they happen to have been separated subsequent to October 29, 1965, the effective date of the law. This is neither fair nor is it reasonable, and I am sure the Congress never intended the law to operate in that manner.

Under my bill, all Federal employees who are otherwise eligible for severance pay benefits would be entitled to them if they were separated from their employment on or after July 1, 1965. My bill would establish the same effective date for severance pay benefits as is provided in the same act for relocation expense benefits to postal employees.

Under present law, postal employees who are transferred or relocated from one official station to another are entitled to relocation expense benefits. These relocation benefits are available to all eligible postal employees who were relocated or transferred on or after July 1, 1965. There seems to be no valid reason why the same July 1, 1965, date should not also be the effective date for severance pay benefits. The same reasons that compel a July 1, 1965, effective date for relocation benefits to postal employees operate with equal cogency in the case of severance pay benefits for Federal employees.

Fair play demands that we amend present law to extend severance pay benefits to all eligible Federal employees who were separated from their employment on or after July 1, 1965. My bill does not enlarge the basis for determining whether or not an employee is eligible for these benefits. This determination remains the same.

Rural Electrification and the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM], delivered an excellent and thought-provoking speech to the 9,000 rural electric cooperative leaders who attended the 24th annual meeting of their national organization, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In his speech, Mr. STALBAUM detailed the need for the rural electric systems to obtain access to a source of supplemental capital above and beyond the annual congressional authorization for the rural electrification program.

With power loads in rural areas doubling every 7 years, the more than 1,000 rural electric systems of the Nation are requiring increasing amounts of capital in order to meet this rising demand for electricity. As Mr. STALBAUM pointed out, the Congress is not going to abandon the very worthwhile rural electrification program, which has done so much to improve the working and living standards of our farmers and other rural residents. However, the Congress must also consider the needs of many other meritorious programs.

> Ours is, therefore, not the assignment of granting all the funds asked for in every meritorious case but rather to allocate funds among all of them—

He said.

Mr. STALBAUM indicated that the Congress will probably continue to authorize funds for the rural electrification program at approximately the levels which have been authorized in the past 10 years. However, he noted that this figure would be less than one-half of the estimated capital need for the rural electric cooperatives in the next 15 years.

Based on his firsthand knowledge of the operations of the Bank for Cooperatives, Mr. STALBAUM recommended that the rural electrics seek supplemental financing through the proposed Bank for Rural Electric Systems which, like the Bank for Cooperatives, would be ultimately owned and controlled by its co-op stockholders. The NERCA delegates subsequently approved, by an overwhelming margin, a resolution urging the Congress and the administration to continue the present 2-percent, 35-year REA loan program with adequate finding for those systems requiring such loans to meet program objectives, and to establish a Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems as a supplemental source of the capital required by the rural electric cooperatives to meet the growing power needs of the rural areas they serve.

I recommend the entire remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin to you for your information and consideration:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE CONGRESS

(Speech of Representative LYNN E. STALBAUM, First District, Wisconsin, given on February 16, 1966, at special session on supplemental financing at NRECA annual meeting).

First let me extend my greetings to you who are so active in the rural electric cooperatives.

Your activities and those who hold similar capacities and those who have preceded you in the development of the rural electric cooperatives are not new to me. As has been indicated to you in the introduction, I am a Wisconsin farm boy, but must hasten to add that I grew up on the farm without the benefits of electricity. It was not until 1937 that electricity reached our farmstead, one-fourth mile off the main road.

It would be pleasant for me to stand here today and tell you that the ultimate source of power was through an REA-financed cooperative, but such is not the case. It was by a private utility. The fact remains that until REA came onto the scene and threatened to move into farm areas such as the one where I grew up in southeastern Wisconsin, the private power companies had done absolutely nothing to encourage electrical development in the rural areas.

If memory serves me correctly, and 30 years or more is a long time to remember, the original bill which they wanted to submit to us to run power to our place back in the early 1930's was $1,300. Bear in mind this was just for the powerlines to bring the electricity to our farm. It did not in any way cover the cost of the wiring and fixture installation nor the monthly charge for electrical service. And those of you who have grown up and have lived through the depression days of the 1930's, I am sure, will realize that $1,300 was about 1 year's gross income from the average Wisconsin dairy herd during those days.

And so I say today in this first opportunity to appear before a national meeting of rural electric cooperatives, a belated "thank you" some 30 years late, for getting the wheels in motion to bring electricity to us.

I have shown my appreciation of this fact in later days. Prior to entering the Congress of the United States, I was a member of the Wisconsin State Senate for 10 years and, as was true in so many States during the past few years, the battle of territorial integrity entered the legislative scene.

You know, there is an old saying that one must take the bitter with the sweet, but it always strikes me as I observe the electric utilities, that when it comes to servicing sparsely settled areas with low revenue potential, the private power companies are perfectly content to let rural electrics have this business. This is the part I call the bitter part of the business. But suddenly if this bitter, by some strange alchemy, through the development of a municipality or the expansion of its borders becomes sweet business, then immediately there are efforts by the private power companies to say that the rural electrics must give up this business now that it has become sweet. And so instead of having the bitter with the sweet, it has long appeared to me that the private power utilities are perfectly willing to leave the bitter to the rural electrics and take the sweet unto themselves, even if it means taking over territories formerly served in the buildup days by the rural electrics.

When one realizes that rural electrics average slightly over 3 consumers to the mile compared with 33 consumers to the mile for private utilities and that in this mile there are $450 of revenue on the average for the rural electrics compared with over $7,000 for the utilities, one can see the contrast that exists. And this in spite of the fact that the rural electrics have had to build over half of all the pole miles of distribution line in the country on this limited revenue potential.

So, when the efforts were made to take away from the rural electrics the right to operate in areas in which they had always operated, simply because these areas had now become built up, or in a little more complex case where they had been annexed to a community which had a municipal powerplant, I felt that the rural electrics were entitled to this little bit of sweetening to the otherwise bitter business and vigorously supported in my own State the rural electric co-ops' efforts to retain their right to those areas in which they had always operated. I am pleased to say that we won that round of the battle, although I suppose this is a war which is never completely over.

Today, however, the topic assigned to me is that of the financing of the expansion of the rural electric co-ops. I state that I have read the material which has been prepared on this subject and found this concept not too difficult because the pattern of it is so similar to that found in the Bank for Cooperatives. As indicated earlier to you, I was the secretary-treasurer-manager of a dairy cooperative in Wisconsin for 14 years. During that time, we had opportunity and need to borrow from the Bank for Cooperatives over a rather long period of time. Primarily, we borrowed for the relending of money to our patrons for the purchase of bulk milk tanks.

It was during this period that the Bank of Cooperatives moved from being a Government-owned bank to becoming, if you please, a cooperative bank for cooperatives. When I start reading about A type stock and B type stock and C type stock, these, too, are all terms with which I am familiar. And so a little later I want to show you what happened in our own St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives.

But before we do that, let's take a quick look, a look by an outsider, an interested outsider, at the financing both present and potential of the rural electrics. As I look at this, I look through the eyes of a politician. I say this in all candor because I am not scared by the word politics or the term politician. It is an honorable profession.

Someone once used the definition that "politics is the art of the practical." This, I guess, is the reason that I am proud of the title, because we are the practical men who make the views held by the extremes work. We are the ones who modify them and refine them and come up with programs which are acceptable, perhaps neither as far to one side as the proponents would like, nor as far to the other side as the opponents would like, but somewhere in that practical middle area where a result can be obtained.

And so we must look at the 2-percent REA loan rates that now exist in the light of the recently increased Federal interest rates. It is my view that we will be able to make 2-percent money available as long as your organization can present a strong case for its needs, but we will not be able to substantially expand these funds.

I know there are those among you who maintain that an outstanding case can be made for federally supplied 2-percent money for all of your capital needs. To those who hold that belief, I am not today arguing the logic or the merit of your case.

Realistically, however, as a Representative in Government, it must be pointed out that the same type of strong case is made by virtually every group who comes before us. The educator, the conservationist, the health research people, to mention only a few, can make just as strong a case as you. Ours is, therefore, not the assignment of granting all the funds asked for in every meritorious case but rather to allocate funds among all of them.

I mention this in order to warn you against deluding yourself into thinking the Congress would of necessity feel that yours was a uniquely meritorious argument to be considered ahead of all others. And especially should you consider this in the context of the recent increase in interest rates.

Everyone, it seems, would like to be the author of a natural law. I suppose the most known author of recent times is Parkinson with maybe two or three different Parkinson's laws, primarily on bureaucracy. But today I am going to give you what I call Stalbaum's natural law on low interest rates for rural electrics. My natural law is simply this: "The ability of rural electrics to retain 2 percent loan rates becomes more difficult in geometric proportions to the increase in other interest rates."

As the cost of money to the Government and to everyone else increases, the fight by the rural electric co-ops at the national level and by its fine Administrator, Norman Clapp, an old Wisconsin friend of mine, becomes more and more a problem. Realistically, we have to recognize that under these conditions it would be most difficult to expand this lending power, and it becomes more difficult than formerly even to hold it. I do believe, however, that we can hold it at approximately the levels which have existed in the past.

This to me is not the most serious problem, and I regret that some of the argument on whether or not a new financing system should be developed has enmeshed itself in the political ability of rural electric supporters to continue to get money at the 2-percent rate.

To me the most critical problem is on financial need, the financial need of your organizations. For the past 10 years, the amount of money available for 2-percent loans per year is as follows (and let me run through these figures quickly to show you both the pattern of the availability of money as well as their erratic tendencies):

	Million
1957	$414
1958	159
1959	317
1960	136
1961	170
1962	245
1963	325
1964	275
1965	365
1966	270

What does this average out to? An average of about $270 million per year, $268 million, to be exact.

Those who have looked to this source of money for capital financing should pause to consider what happened in the President's budget message presented to the Congress 3 weeks ago.

The $305 million in regular authorization which the Congress had approved for 1966 was cut to $270 million. The balance of the 1965 contingency fund which had already been released and which amounted to $37 million was impounded. The 1966 contingency fund of $60 million, not yet released, was completely deleted from the budget. In so doing, the President recommended use of some of these funds in fiscal 1967 and some in fiscal 1968.

The amount of loan funds programed for 1967 would be $270 million, the same as is now proposed for 1966. By 1968, if present budgeting procedures continue, only $242 million would be available.

Briefly, the stepdown in funds shows as follows:

Year 1966 congressional authority: $305 million plus $60 million in contingency reserve.

President's 1966 program figure: $270 million.

President's proposed 1967 program figure: $270 million.

Year 1968 projected figure: $242 million.

As one considers your future capital needs, this trend should put you on notice that it is evident that this source of funds is going down while the need for such funds is going up.

Now, what are the needs for the future? Here we have two estimates. REA has estimated that all the electric systems of America will require $140 billion in new capital for expanded plant facilities by 1980. They estimate, and this is interesting, that between now and 1980, during the next 15 years, rural electrics will need slightly over $8 billion.

Well, I smiled when I saw that figure in contrast with the next one. In all of my years in Government, I have come to expect that the party making the estimate, who is justifying the position, will have the high figure, and those who are supposed to be the conservative impartial neutral observers have the low figures. Not so in your case. Kuhn, Loeb, in their appraisal, estimate that the rural electrics will need $9½ billion during the same 15-year period. And so it is gratifying that an outside independent source estimates the needs of your organizations at a $1½ billion more than REA has estimated.

Now let's turn back to the history of the figures I have given you. The 10-year average I pointed out was $268 million. Multiply this by 15 years, and you have a little over $4 billion. Or if you prefer, take the last 5 years, with an average of a little under $300 million per year. Multiply that by 15 years, and you come up with a figure of about $4½ billion. One need not argue which figure is the more nearly correct as a projection—the plain fact remains that either figure is less than half—less than half—of the estimated need as projected by an independent observer.

I, as an outsider, looking at this whole picture, am impressed with the point that electricity provides 20 percent of the basic energy of the United States now, and that by 1980 it is expected to supply 30 percent. This projection is reasonable and may be conservative especially when we look back at the increase in percentage of the basic energy provided by electrical sources in the past 15 and the past 30 years. And so, as one who is interested in seeing America continue to grow, as one who strongly believes that we want to develop, if you please, a Great Society in America, my most basic concern is on the ability of rural electric cooperatives to get the money to play their part.

I cannot believe, based on the historical pattern of the past 2 years, that the Congress of the United States is going to greatly expand the moneys it makes available for this purpose. Certainly they are not likely to expand it if the interest gap continues at its present level or were it to widen. I do not want Government limitations on funds to be the inhibiter of the development of capital electrical facilities throughout rural America. This, to me, is the main area of concern which confronts you and which should be of interest to those who want to see America grow.

There are many prominent leaders who strongly believe that we must now turn toward the rural parts of our Nation for future development. "Why continue to encourage more growth in the larger urban centers and in so doing only aggravate their already existing problems?" these spokesmen asked. If these ideas toward the development of the smaller communities and the rural areas were to become a national trend, then it could well be that the present projections for rural electrics' needs for capital investment during the next 15 years are being drastically understated.

Putting it more simply, the question basically is this: Without the establishment of a Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems, could the individual rural electric cooperatives obtain their money? And if they could obtain it, could they obtain it as cheaply as through their own bank? The answer to both parts of the question is probably yes, and probably no. Some of the larger units, in areas where money is not as tight as in others, might, and I only say might, be able to obtain it for about the same rates. Others would not be able to obtain it, and others would have to obtain it at much higher rates. Isn't it far more sensible to pool your efforts, to cooperatively work together to obtain your own credit in effect from a bank which you will ultimately own?

How effectively could you borrow your money on an individual basis when your average equity is between 20 and 30 percent? Certainly, I contend that the present restrictions which we have imposed upon your types of organizations within the Congress on the development of generation and transmission facilities should be modified if you are going to seek your own money. But certainly it would seem evident that you would be far more able to handle your needs and to obtain your money at a lower cost through the mass sale of debentures than through the individual efforts of each of your organizations.

Granted that the debentures from such a bank would have to be sold on the money markets, but won't the collective sale of these debentures permit you to get your money at a lower cost than if each of you have to go out looking for it through local bankers or other sources? I think so.

Earlier in my remarks, I made reference to the Bank for Cooperatives and the change which was made in this organization during the time I was manager of the Racine, Wis., Milk Producers Cooperative. It would be of interest to you, I am sure, to see what has happened in a financial organization similar to the one you are considering. I, therefore, called the president of the St. Paul, Minn., Bank for Cooperatives, Mr. Ullyot, in order to refresh my own memory on what had happened in this particular operation and to bring my records current. I asked him when the start had been made to change the Bank for Cooperatives from a Government-owned activity to one cooperatively owned by the patrons and was informed that this was on January 1, 1956, so the report and illustration I am about to give you cover a 10-year span of time. During that time, the Government capital in the St. Paul bank was reduced from $11.4 to $3.8 million. Therefore, in less than 10 years, two-thirds of the Government capital had been paid off. As is proposed in your own case, they, too, have A stock, B stock, and C stock.

At the time the changeover was made, each cooperative was required to buy class C stock based on the amount of outstanding loans as of that date. In my own cooperative's case, because our loan volume was low, we were required to buy $800 of the stock which has continued to pay a 3-percent dividend.

For the balance of their financing, there was a 25 percent override on the interest payments from 1956 to 1960. It was then reduced to 15 percent. In 1966 it has been reduced to 10 percent. In the early days, if the interest rate was 4 percent, we had to pay 5 percent but the extra 1 percent was an actual investment in the Bank for Cooperatives stock subject to ultimate redemption.

The Bank for Co-ops offers its own debentures on the money market. From 1960 until 1965, they were able to obtain their money at rates which permitted them to loan at 4½ percent on loans under 1 year, 4¾ percent on loans from 1 to 3 years, and 5 percent on loans for over 3 years. Bear in mind that some of these were operating loans, not specifically related to capital development as would be true in your case.

However (and this is the significant part), each year we receive from the bank a patronage dividend which was based on the volume of business done. Part of the allocation is paid in cash, this being 25 percent of their total allocated surplus. The balance is paid in B stock. This is done after the franchise tax is paid, after the original cash patronage dividend is made, and after the 3-percent dividend is paid on the original (class C) stock, the remaining amount is paid as a patronage dividend in stock.

In 1965, the total allocations (that is the patronage dividend) amounted to 28 percent of the interest paid in by a cooperative. I point out to you that on loans of over 3 years, that while the interest charge is 5 percent, if the 28 percent allocation is charged against it, it reduces the interest rate to about 3.6 percent. And, of course, there are corresponding reductions on the other loan rate values.

This allocation in 1965 was not unique. I recall in my own report to my board of directors that I usually considered the allocation to be about equal to 1 percent interest rate on the cost of the money we got from the bank.

I don't think the St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives had any magic formula that gave them this return that you would not have. In fact, the proposals you have involving larger sums, involving debentures backed primarily by capital equipment loans could well do two things. First of all, it could encourage money at a rate lower than that which applied on Bank for Cooperative debentures where part of it went for operating funds, and second, the larger volume might well warrant an even larger allocation at the end of the year to each participating electric cooperative.

So, I speak to you as one who has been through this and has found this a very effective way of obtaining money.

I want to thank you for this opportunity of presenting my views to you today. I again point out that in my opinion the big issue for your organization is not on whether or not you can continue to obtain government money at a 2-percent interest rate. I believe you can at about the present level. More important is whether you can obtain the necessary expansion capital which will be needed by your organizations in the next 15 years, if you are to grow apace with the private utilities here in America. As I have indicated, all of my projections fail to show adequate funding potential for you at the 2-percent rate. You alone must know whether or not a supplementary method of obtaining financing is needed beyond having each individual electric association apply for its own expansion funds at some local level. If the experience of other cooperatives is a criteria, then it would be well for you to join together in the formation of the Federal Bank for Rural Electric Systems.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Edward H. Pruden, minister, First Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, and our God; God of this Nation and all nations; we come to Thee this day in full recognition of the limitations of our humanity, and of our complete dependence upon Thee. Continue to give us the awareness of our great responsibilities to all mankind in these days of crisis and confusion; and provide us with all necessary wisdom for the facing of these days. Cause Thy guiding hand to direct all those in special authority, and give to us peace in our time, O God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 10, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 10, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 251) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

TRADE AGREEMENT WITH CANADA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Government of the United States and the Government of Canada have concluded a trade agreement resulting from the entry into force in 1963 of the revised Tariff Schedules of the United States—TSUS. The agreement reestablishes, in terms of the TSUS, the concessions in the U.S. schedule to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—which were negotiated by the United States with Canada in earlier GATT negotiations. It also grants, under the authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, new concessions to be included in such schedule to offset the impairment in concessions negotiated with

Canada which was incidental to bringing the TSUS into force. The agreement was signed on December 17, 1965, and the first reduction in tariffs took effect on January 1, 1966.

In accordance with section 226 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I herewith transmit a copy of the trade agreement, together with a statement of the reasons for entering into the agreement.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Attachments.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1966.*

REPORT OF THE PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith from the Secretary of State the Fourth Annual Report of the Peace Corps.

This is a report of service to our neighbors throughout the world. It is the story of new opportunities for growth and learning among our own people.

The expansion of the Peace Corps has been as dramatic as its promise.

Five years ago today the Peace Corps was 11 days old. By midsummer, 1961, 120 volunteers were serving in 3 countries. At the close of fiscal year 1965 there were 8,624 volunteers serving in 46 countries. Africa received 3,278 volunteers—Latin America received 3,214—in Near East and south Asia, 1,285, and the Far East, 847.

There are many examples of Peace Corps impact. One is Afghanistan. Nine volunteers went there in 1962 to begin the Peace Corps work. As of June 30, 1965, there were 136 volunteers in Afghanistan, located in 19 different towns and villages. Peace Corps teachers reach nearly 40 percent of all Afghan students at the secondary and university levels.

There are other measures of progress. I am pleased to note that as the number of volunteers has risen, the cost per volunteer has declined. During fiscal year 1963, for example, the annual cost per volunteer was $9,074. For 1965 the cost was reduced to $8,028. The estimate for fiscal year 1966 is $7,832.

The Peace Corps is the largest producer and consumer of language materials in the world. Since 1961, 20,000 trainees have received instruction in one or more of about 60 languages in the Peace Corps training curriculum. Twenty additional languages are under consideration for inclusion in future training programs.

Since its inception, 150,000 Americans have volunteered for Peace Corps service. Some 15,000 have served abroad in 49 nations.

As of June 30, 1965, 4,545 volunteers had completed service and returned to the United States. Thirty-seven percent of all returned volunteers are continuing their education. Government service is attracting 17.8 percent, while another 16.4 percent are teaching. The remaining 28.5 percent are engaged in private business, nonprofit organizations and miscellaneous activities.

It is fair to say that the lives of virtually all volunteers have been changed by their service in the Corps. They have become aware—in a unique and profound way—of the bond of suffering and hope that unites men and women on every continent. And they are returning home with a new understanding of their Nation and the world.

No more valuable experience can be gained by any man.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1966.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the Calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1028, Senate Concurrent Resolution 71.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure.

PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF UTAH AS SITE FOR 1972 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) to approve selecting of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations and that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games was announced as first in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1059), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

By this resolution the Congress expresses its approval of the selection of the U.S. Olympic Committee and supports its recommendation to the International Olympic Committee meeting in April of this year in Italy, that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games.

No expenditure of Federal funds is involved in approval of the concurrent resolution.

This resolution is the latest of a number of efforts by the U.S. Olympic Committee to have sites in the United States chosen by the International Committee as the location for either the principal games held during the summer or the winter games. For instance in 1949, 1955, 1959, and 1963, the Congress endorsed similar resolutions containing invitations to hold the principal games at Detroit. Resolutions with respect to the winter games were adopted in 1949 concerning Lake Placid, N.Y., in 1955 concerning Squaw Valley, Calif., and in 1963 concerning Lake Placid again. Since 1932, only once has any part of the Olympic games been held in the United States and this was in 1960 at Squaw Valley, Calif.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 was introduced on January 19, 1966, by Senator Moss, for himself and Senator BENNETT and 50 colleagues. Thirty-nine more Senators requested that their names be added to the resolution on February 10, bringing the sponsorship of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 to 91 Members of the Senate.

On March 4, 1966, in executive session, the Committee on Foreign Relations without objection voted to report Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 favorably to the Senate. The executive branch has strongly supported resolutions similar to Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, pointing to the benefits to be expected from the influx of visitors, tourism, and the generation of international good will. It is hoped that favorable action by the Congress will give additional weight to the invitation of the U.S. Olympic Committee so that the United States will be chosen as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am hopeful, and certain, that the U.S. Senate today will unanimously endorse and send to the House Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 which expresses the approval of the Congress of the action of the U.S. Olympic Committee in its choice of Utah as America's nominee for the site of the 1972 winter Olympics and urges the International Olympic Committee to select Utah when it meets in Rome in April.

I appreciate the support and enthusiasm of my colleagues for this position and express to them my gratitude. When I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 I asked for cosponsors. Ninety-two Senators have joined on this resolution. Had there been time for me to speak with the remaining 8 Senators, I am sure that 100 would be on as cosponsors. Let me assure them, and the athletes and citizens of the countries of the world, that Utah welcomes them to our beautiful mountain slopes hard by our lovely cities in the great valleys below. Utah will be ready to receive all who will come from far and near in 1972. We have the finest powder snow in the world, dependable in depth throughout a 6-month ski season. Between now and

1972 we invite all skiers to see for themselves.

Alta, Brighton, Solitude, Treasure Mountain, Snow Basin, Timp Haven are some of our more famous areas, but there are others from Logan to Cedar City. Utah is a skiers paradise. And Utah is a transportation hub for airlines, railroads, buses and cars.

The 1972 winter Olympics in Utah will be the greatest ever.

UTAH—THE GREATEST SNOW ON EARTH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I speak for quick passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, giving the Senate's approval to the selection of the U.S. Olympic Committee and supporting the committee's recommendation that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games.

I also am happy to report that after we approve this resolution today, it will be taken to Rome, Italy, next month where it will be presented to the International Olympic Committee which will make the final selection for the 1972 games.

Mr. President, about 10 years ago a Salt Lake City newspaper reporter said Utah has "the greatest snow on earth." We had known it for a long time and last January 15, the fact was more or less proved when the U.S. Olympic Committee designated Salt Lake City and the Utah ski areas immediately adjoining the Mountain West metropolis as the official U.S. candidate for the 1972 winter Olympic games. Utah was selected over other American contenders by one of the widest margins in the history of the competition. A total 36 votes designated Salt Lake City as the American candidate for the 1972 winter Olympiad. The next closest competitor received six votes.

The Utah selection was made after an excellent presentation of detailed arguments unique to Utah's claim—the combination of terrain and climate, which guarantees snow for the Alpine events—in fact a report today showed some 119 inches of snow at one of the resorts—location of competition sites either in or only an hour from a metropolitan center; accommodation availabilities; jets and other transport facilities, virtually to the edge of the game sites; the cultural pluses available for games visitors. All of these points and more were documented, illustrated by aerial photographs where that would be useful and buttressed by expert opinion where necessary. Charts, statistical information, cross sections of sites for the downhill, slalom, giant slalom, bobsled runs, jumping, cross country, biathlon, skating, and hockey all were presented.

The result was Utah's selection. The next stop is to polish the presentation and favorably convince the International Selection Committee in Rome in the middle of next month.

Passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 will illustrate the obvious, nonpartisan and virtual complete support of every area of the United States when it is placed before the Olympic officials. I am told 92 of our colleagues have joined in cosponsoring this proposal. A total of 92 percent is pretty fair country support. It will not go unnoticed in Rome.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its approval of the selection of the United States Olympic Committee and supports its recommendation to the International Olympic Committee meeting in April of this year in Italy, that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games.

EXTENSION OF LEAVE YEAR FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 2573) to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2573

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, inasmuch as the administrative order issued by the Acting Superintendent of Yosemite National Park recalling to duty certain Federal employees to assist in meeting the storm and flood emergency which existed in late 1955 and early 1956 was in the public interest, his action purporting to extend to March 15, 1956, the time within which leave available for the 1955 leave year could be used is hereby validated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1061), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 2573 is to give congressional validation to the action of the Acting Superintendent of Yosemite National Park in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees.

STATEMENT

During a severe flood emergency in December 1955, the Acting Superintendent of Yosemite National Park found it necessary to recall to duty a number of employees who were on annual leave, and to cancel additional leave requests. As a result of these actions, it became impossible for several employees to use their annual leave before the end of the year. Such leave time, unused at year's end is forfeited.

In an effort to provide these employees their earned annual leave, the Acting Superintendent issued an order which purported to extend to March 15, 1956, the period within which these employees could carry over and make use of this annual leave without forfeiture.

On July 7, 1958, the Comptroller General of the United States issued a decision declaring the above-described action of the Acting Superintendent invalid. The Comptroller General's determination recognized the practicalities of the situation which precipitated the Acting Superintendent's orders, but stated that such action was invalid.

The proposed legislation affects 23 persons. Eleven of these have been separated from the Federal service. Eight of them received overpayment of terminal leave. Seven others have have been transferred from their posts at Yosemite National Park. Five of the persons involved are still employed at Yosemite.

The committee concurs in the view expressed by the Department of Interior through the statement of its Assistant Secretary, D. Otis Beasley:

"We believe that the Acting Superintendent would have been remiss in his duties if he had not taken prompt action to utilize all available manpower to save lives and property as a result of the disaster. The employees who responded to the call of this governmental official, who acted in good faith and in the best interest of the United States, should not be penalized."

BACKPAY ACT OF 1966

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1647) to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "1965" and insert "1966".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1062), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would consolidate and liberalize existing law on the restoration of an employee to his position after an adverse action against him has been found by appellate authority to have been erroneous or unjustified.

Present law excludes backpay for nonveterans in demotion cases in the competitive service; nonveterans in separation, suspension, and demotion cases in the excepted service; and all employees serving probationary periods. Present law also does not credit accumulated leave or provide for normal increments in pay, such as periodic step increases or enactment of Federal salary legislation.

H.R. 1647 would give to all employees, veteran and nonveteran, probationary and career, the benefits of the present law at its best, and liberalize the law by allowing credit for pay increases and accumulation of annual leave which otherwise would have accrued. It puts the employee in the same position he would have been in had the unjustified or erroneous personnel action not taken place.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Congress first endorsed the basic principle of backpay in 1948.

This principle holds that an employee is entitled to be made whole whenever an erroneous personnel action which has terminated or reduced his compensation is corrected by appropriate authority.

NONPAY STATUS FOR CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10553) to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after "January 1,", to strike out "1965" and insert "1963".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1063), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

This bill would create a nonpay status for employees of the Senate and House of Representatives so that they could continue to participate in and receive the benefits of fringe-benefit programs on a basis equal to that enjoyed by employees of the executive branch who are in a nonpay status.

In 1963, the American Political Science Association established a special fellowship program consisting of 12 grants to be awarded to employees of the Congress to further their education and improve their ability to serve the legislative branch.

In the executive branch, employees who attend school to improve their efficiency and effectiveness for Federal service are permitted to continue their coverage, without personal contribution, under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, and the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Unfortunately, even though the Member of Congress employing the recipient of such an award agrees to reemploy him at the end of the fellowship period, present law does not permit an employee whose salary is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, or the Clerk of the House of Representatives to enjoy a nonpay status. An employee is either on or off the payroll. When he is separated to pursue studies under the fellowship program in a university or college, his employment status with the Congress ceases and his fringe benefit coverage also ceases.

H.R. 10553 would remedy this inequity by extending to fellowship recipients a nonpay status solely for the purposes of continuing coverage under the life insurance, health insurance, and civil service retirement programs without personal contribution during the period of nonpay status.

To be considered in a nonpay status the bill requires that the appointing authority (Member of Congress, committee chairman, elected or appointed official) certify that such employee will be, or has been, separated for the purpose of entering into a congressional staff fellowship during the life of such award. Thus, the certification will permit the employee (1) to retain his coverage under the health benefits program, (2) to be insured under the group life insurance program at the rate of salary he was receiving upon entering into the fellowship (or at the rate of salary otherwise payable by reason of any subsequent statutory salary increases), and (3) to continue to receive credit for time and average salary purposes under the retirement program. Provision is made for authorizing nonpay status in the case of an employee who commences a fellowship after the death or disability of his employing Member, and prior to the election of a successor.

The bill contemplates that absolute separation will occur upon expiration of the term of the fellowship in the event the employee fails, or is unable, to resume congressional employment. Inasmuch as the status of nonpay is preserved to a separated employee, the clerk-hire allowance or committee complement would not be charged with such an employee against its statutory limitation of employees.

AMENDMENT

The committee has amended the bill by providing retroactivity to January 1, 1963. As referred, employees of the Congress who received such awards on and after January 1, 1965, would receive the benefits of the bill. The committee believes it is fair to make the benefits retroactive to the beginning of the American Political Science Association congressional staff fellowship program, January 1963. The only additional cost involved will be the contribution to the civil service retirement and disability fund for the 24 employees who received fellowships in 1963 and 1964.

DESIGNATIONS OF BENEFICIARIES ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEES GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

The bill (H.R. 432) to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1064), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 432 would amend the provisions of law in the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act and the Civil Service Retirement Act which control the payment of insurance and retirement benefits to survivors of Federal employees. A bill of similar intent was passed by the Senate during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

JUSTIFICATION

Federal employees covered by the life insurance program established under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 are requested, but not required, to designate a beneficiary of the insurance provided in the event of the employee's death. If no beneficiary is designated in writing by the employee and properly filed in the employer's office prior to the employee's death, the insurance payable at death is paid according to an order of precedence set out in section 4 of the Life Insurance Act (5 U.S.C. 2093).

Section 4 states:

"Any amount of group life insurance and group accidental death insurance in force on any employee at the date of his death shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving at the date of his death, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries as the employee may have designated by a writing received in the employing office prior to death;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow or widower of such employee;

"Third, if none of the above, to the child or children of such employee and descendants of deceased children by representation;

"Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of such employee or the survivor of them;

"Fifth, if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such employee;

"Sixth, if none of the above, to other next of kin of such employee entitled under the laws of domicile of such employee at the time of his death."

By regulation, the Civil Service Commission has interpreted the statutory order of precedence to exclude any designation or change of beneficiary in any will or other writing not properly filed in the employing office or the Civil Service Commission. The purpose of the regulation has been to insure that the contract of insurance would prevail in all cases regardless of the claims of any parties other than the designated beneficiary or the person entitled to payment under the provisions of section 4.

In 1961, a California case, *Austin* v. *Sears* (292 Federal 2d 960) held that where no beneficiary had been named in the insurance contract, the designation of a beneficiary in a valid will would prevail over the beneficiary enumerated in section 4 of the act in order to comply with the wishes of the insured employee. In that case, the funds payable had been deposited by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. into the court, and the issue was between the competing beneficiaries of the act and the will.

Other cases have held to the contrary. *Breckline* v. *Metropolitan* (178 Atlantic 2d 748). The equities in Sears may have prompted the court of appeals to disregard the civil service regulation and the general intent of the statute in order to comply with the insured's wishes, but the precedent established in that case could, if generally followed, result in administrative difficulties for the Civil Service Commission and the insurance companies and, more important, seriously delay paying insurance benefits to survivors of Federal employees.

To clarify Congress intent, H.R. 432 rewrites section 4 to state clearly that the order of procedure set out in that section shall prevail over any extraneous document designating a beneficiary unless the designation has been properly received in the employing office or by the Civil Service Commission.

To avoid the possibility of similar problems in regard to the payment of lump-sum benefits to survivors of Federal employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act, section 11 of that act has also been revised.

Public hearings were held on a similar bill, S. 1974, on February 10, 1964, before the Senate Subcommittee on Health Benefits and Life Insurance. The Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, John W. Macy, Jr., testified in favor of enactment. No opposition was expressed and none has since been received by the committee.

DISCONTINUANCE OF POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

The bill (H.R. 8030) to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1065), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 8030 is an administration recommendation to provide for the termination of the Postal Savings System.

JUSTIFICATION

The Postal Savings System was established by Congress in 1910 to provide a convenient and safe depository for public investment. Instituted in the progressive era, it met the needs of the times when banks were neither numerous nor always reliable.

From its establishment until the end of the Second World War, the System steadily increased its balance of funds owned by depositors in thousands of post offices all over the United States. From an infant size of 11,918 depositors and $677,145 in deposits in 1911, the System grew to include 4,196,517 depositors with a balance of $3,392,773,461 in its peak year of 1947. A significant portion of this growth occurred during the Second World War when consumer goods were in short supply and employment and wage levels were high.

By law, the System pays interest at a rate of 2 percent per annum, compounded annually. For many years this rate of interest was competitive with private banking institutions and savings and loan associations. But in recent years, interest paid in private enterprise to investors has markedly increased. At the present time interest in excess of 4 percent compounded quarterly is commonly found in the banking industry, and interest in excess of 5 percent compounded monthly (or even daily) is found in certain investment companies and savings and loan associations.

The Postal Savings System was not designed to compete with private enterprise, and it has not done so. It has served as a convenient and guaranteed-safe depository for citizens' savings. Since the 1930's, however, and the enactment of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and related legislation, the characteristic of safety is not confined to postal savings. In fact, the maximum deposit of $2,500 on any one account is only 25 percent of the insured amount in FDIC bank accounts or federally insured savings and loan accounts.

Since 1947, the number of depositors and the balance of deposits has annually declined. At the end of fiscal year 1964, there were 1,076,225 depositors owning a balance of $415,965,295. One year later, the number of depositors had declined to 997,029, owning a balance of $344,233,788, a dollar decline of 17.2 percent.

ALASKAN CENTENNIAL MEDALS

The bill (S. 2719) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2719

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia (which anniversary will be celebrated in 1967), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Alaska Centennial Commission not more than two hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Alaska Centennial Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Commission in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1967. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture; including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of such costs.

Sec. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such Commission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1066), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 2719 was introduced by Senators Bartlett and Gruening on October 22, 1965. The bill would provide for the striking of not more than 200,000 medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia.

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish the medals to the Alaska Centennial Commission. The medals will bear suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The bill provides that no medal shall be made after December 31, 1967. They will be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

The minting of the medals will not cost the United States anything, since the bill requires that security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of the cost of the medals.

The bill provides that the medals shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the commission. The committee expects that no precious metals such as gold or silver will be used in these medals. Also the committee expects that the striking of these medals will not interfere with the normal activities of the mint.

SCRANTON, PA., 100TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

The bill (S. 2831) to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2831

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pennsylvania, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Scranton Association, Incorporated, not more than one hundred and fifty thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Scranton Association, Incorporated, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the association in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1966. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

Sec. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such association.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1067), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 2831 was introduced by Senator SCOTT on January 26, 1966. The bill would provide for the striking of not more than 150,000 medals for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Scranton, Pa.

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish the medals to the Scranton Association, Inc. The medals will bear suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Scranton Association, Inc., subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The bill provides that no medals shall be made after December 31, 1966, and the medal will be considered a national medal within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

The minting of the medals will be of no cost to the United States since the bill requires that security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of the cost of the medals.

The bill provides that the medals shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Scranton Association, Inc. The committee expects that no precious metals such as gold or silver will be used in these medals. Also the committee expects that the striking of these medals will not interfere with the normal activities of the mint.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY MEDAL OF THE AMERICAN NUMISMATIC ASSOCIATION

The bill (S. 2835) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2835

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding in 1891 of the American Numismatic Association, which now holds a perpetual Federal charter from the Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and funish to the American Numismatic Association not more than fifty thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Numismatic Association subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the association in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1967. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such various metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the American Numismatic Association.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1068), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 2835 was introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN on January 26, 1966. The bill would provide for the striking of not more than 50,000 medals to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association.

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish the medals to the American Numismatic Association. The medals would bear suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Numismatic Association subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. No medal shall be made after December 31, 1967, and the medals would be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

The medals would be struck at no cost to the United States since the bill requires that security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

The bill provides that the medals shall be of such size or sizes and of such various metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the American Numismatic Association. The committee intends that no precious metals including gold and silver will be used in these medals. Also the committee expects that the striking of these medals will not interfere with the normal activities of the mint.

The following excerpt from Senate Report 499, 62d Congress, 2d session, on the bill H.R. 12623, to incorporate the American Numismatic Association, is of interest.

"Notwithstanding the suggestion of the commissioners that there is a general law under which corporations of this character may be formed, the fact remains that the numismatic association is a national organization, engaged in work of an educational, historical, and scientific character, without any purpose of profit to those engaged in it. The collection and preservation of coins is not only interesting to those engaged in the work, but will be of great value in future years.

"The membership includes prominent persons of every State of the Union and the Dominion of Canada who have affiliated themselves together for educational and social advantages. Similar organizations exist in many foreign countries, being incorporated by the respective countries, as is proposed by this bill."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that completes the call of the calendar.

PROPOSED FRENCH WITHDRAWAL FROM NATO SHOULD BE TAKEN IN STRIDE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for several additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in a recent proposal, President de Gaulle of France has stated that he wants the withdrawal of all French forces from NATO and the removal from French soil of all headquarters and foreign bases that are not under French operational control. The De Gaulle announcement should be taken in stride. It is well to keep in mind that the announcement is addressed only to the organizational structure of NATO. The North Atlantic Treaty itself remains in effect until 1970, regardless of this announcement. Indeed, President de Gaulle was at pains to make clear the continuance in force of the North Atlantic Treaty and France's continued adherence to it.

To repeat, what is directly involved in the statement of President de Gaulle is the NATO military organizational structure which has grown up under the North Atlantic Treaty. This structure owes its origins and forms largely to past U.S. military aid programs to Western Europe and to executive and departmental agreements of one kind or another.

It should be borne in mind, too, that the NATO structure dates from the time, a decade and a half ago, when Western Europe was still far from fully recovered from World War II and was still heavily dependent on the United States in many ways. Stalin ruled Russia and under him the structure of the Communist world, from East Germany to Peiping and Vladivostock and Pyongyang was rigid, except for Yugoslavia. At that time, the need for NATO in its present form was crystal clear. The concept that the United States should bear the heaviest financial and other burdens with respect to it was readily accepted not only by ourselves but by all of the Western Europeans.

It may be, therefore, that regardless of President de Gaulle's statement, the time has become ripe to reevaluate, in a fundamental sense the structure of NATO. This organization, under the North Atlantic Treaty, has obviously been effective in deterring Soviet expansion in Europe and in promoting a great measure of military cooperation at a time of Europe's grave weakness. The need for deterrence or defense obviously remains, today, in Western Europe. But it appears to me that far greater responsibility than in the past, under the treaty, can and should devolve on the European members of the Alliance. The responsibility and burdens still borne heavily by the United States might be properly reduced considerably in this process, especially in view of our commitment in Vietnam.

With respect to the French announcement, it is well to remember that this is not the first expression of President de Gaulle's intentions along these lines. He has already withdrawn strength from NATO in the form of the French fleet and other elements of the French armed forces. Previous to his most recent announcement, he has stated on other occasions that he was considering precisely the proposals which are now contained in his formal letter to President Johnson and other heads of the Western nations. The only surprise, in fact, is that President de Gaulle made his statement at this time. There had been some anticipation that he would not move until 1969, the year in which it will be in order for any nation to give a year's notice of intention to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty.

It seems to me that it ought to be regarded as most helpful that President de Gaulle has chosen to make known now his views on French participation in the NATO structure rather than temporizing until 1969. In this fashion, there is ample time for orderly change in that structure, without confusion with what is far more fundamental, that is, with the continuance of the North Atlantic Treaty itself. There is no reason to assume, in haste, that the treaty must fall simply because the organization which has evolved under it undergoes revision. On the contrary, it seems to me that the search should begin at once and, without panic or rancor, for a further evolution in the organizational structure which will preserve the essence of the treaty. I do not believe that it can be said or ought to be said that the existing organizational structure is the only one in which the North Atlantic Treaty can have meaning or desirability. Indeed, this Nation has not said so.

I believe it would be well to consider the possibility of a meeting of the NATO nations in Paris in the near future for the purpose of finding out in specifics what President de Gaulle has in mind relative to France's position in NATO and to the North Atlantic Treaty itself. There are details involved here which can and must be fully understood if the situation is to be worked out satisfactorily.

We ought not lose sight of the fact that there still exists common defense interests involving France and all the NATO nations, including the United States. The task of statesmanship, it seems to me, is to seek for a way to give new expression to these common interests in spite of the uncertainties and discomforts which inevitably accompany organizational change.

It may well be that on closer examination, the NATO nations will find that now is perhaps the proper time to begin to reappraise the NATO structure. This reappraisal can take place not on the basis of general and preliminary statements but on the basis of the facts and figures, on the basis of the current political and military realities in Europe and the world.

It may well be that on careful consideration it will be found that General de Gaulle, in raising the questions which he has raised, has performed a needed service for the North Atlantic nations. He has provided stimulus for the member states to consider deeply the position of NATO in an era, very much changed from the period in which it was inaugurated. From the point of view of the United States, it seems to me that one aspect that is clearly worthy of consideration in this respect is the question of reducing U.S. day-to-day obligations and forces in Europe. For one thing, short of nuclear war, it is obvious that Europe is in a position to take much better care of its own general defense than a few years ago. In an economic sense, the situation is drastically changed for the better for Western Europe, not only domestically but in the region's overall international position, particularly insofar as the balance of payments is concerned.

President Johnson's reply to General de Gaulle's note seems to me to be perfectly proper and correct. That, may I say, is not true of the interpretations of reciprocal antagonism which have been placed in some quarters upon the exchange of communications between the two Presidents. President Johnson's response has my full support and, I would hope that it will have the support of the Senate as a whole. The President has also taken the correct and necessary steps of assuring the other members of NATO that this Nation wants the North Atlantic alliance to continue. NATO is not going to fall apart. And to that end, may I say, it would appear most desirable that the members of NATO meet promptly. They need to examine the situation with a view to making such adjustments in the organizational structure as may be necessitated, not only by President de Gaulle's indicated intentions but which may also be desirable in the light of the realities of a changed situation in Europe and the world.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am delighted that the majority leader has clarified the situation. I spent a little time reading President de Gaulle's message and one could get the idea, after going into it, since words are often so feeble in expressing proper thoughts, that it could be followed by a denunciation of the treaty, since only the structure under the treaty is involved.

I am glad that it is going to be made very evident and very clear to the contrary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad that the distinguished minority leader has pointed out the difference between the North Atlantic Treaty itself and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—the NATO substructure—which is under the treaty and apart from the treaty in many respects.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is quite correct.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Reorganization of Department of the Navy

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed plan for the reorganization of the Department of the Navy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Establishment of American Revolution Bicentennial Commission

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Overobligations of Appropriations

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on overobligations of appropriations within the Department of Defense (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Construction Projects for Air National Guard

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on construction projects for the Air National Guard (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Disposal of Bauxite From National Stockpile

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Federal Trade Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of procedures for terminating total disability benefits under national service life insurance policies, Veterans' Administration, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on approval of mortgage insurance for a high-rise multifamily housing project in Newark, N.J., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for specific guidelines regarding Federal participation in costs of standard-type plans, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting three drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

To amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes;

To establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government; and

To avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for the fiscal year ended March 1, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY (for Mr. MCGEE), from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 969. An act to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants (Rept. No. 1069).

By Mr. MONRONEY (for Mr. MCGEE), from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H.R. 1746. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act (Rept. No. 1070).

REPORTS OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Foreign Relations, Government Operations, Interior and Insular Affairs, the Judiciary, Public Works, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and, in addition, the reports from the following interparliamentary groups:

Senate delegation, 11th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, New York City;

Senate delegation named by the Vice President to respond to certain official invitations from foreign parliamentary bodies and governments; and

Senate delegation, Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, Wellington, New Zealand.

These reports reflect the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by the above in 1965 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
J. W. Fulbright:											
France	New franc	270.00	55.10	254.15	51.87	176.40	36.00	26.45	5.40	727.00	148.37
Germany	Deutsche mark	----------	----------	119.34	30.00	177.60	44.65	24.66	6.20	321.60	80.85
Austria	Schilling	2,092.91	81.31	2,378.89	92.42	1,466.40	56.97	655.59	25.47	6,593.79	256.23
Brazil	Cruzeiro	203,286	163.51	30,000	16.17	162,358	110.34	134,125	72.10	529,769	362.12
Albert Gore:											
Guatemala	Quetzal	14.50	14.50	6.25	6.25	----------	----------	2.25	2.25	23.00	23.00
Mexico	Peso	725.00	58.00	566.25	45.30	138.12	11.05	125.75	10.06	1,555.12	124.41
Netherlands	Guilder	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,166.61	324.42	----------	----------	1,166.61	324.42
Frank Church: Brazil	Cruzeiro	661,180	300.53	263,620	133.46	650,050	[1] 295.47	25,200	11.45	1,630,050	740.91
Stuart Symington: Brazil	do	280,186	151.09	30,000	16.17	148,541	102.90	----------	----------	458,727	270.16
Claiborne Pell:											
France	New franc	437.50	89.28	387.20	79.02	103.39	21.10	100.94	20.60	1,029.03	210.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,065.40	519.47	----------	----------	2,065.40	519.47
Eugene McCarthy:											
Germany	do	374.00	93.50	314.60	78.65	92.80	23.20	18.60	4.65	800.00	200.00
Italy	Lire	144,656	231.45	118,363	189.38	40,531	64.85	8,950	14.32	312,500	500.00
United Kingdom	Pound	52.7	147.70	42.7	119.54	9.4	26.32	2.3	6.44	107.1	300.00
Bourke B. Hickenlooper: Brazil	Cruzeiro	228,066	122.95	30,000	16.17	118,276	86.58	80,000	45.00	456,342	270.70
Carl Marcy: Brazil	do	295,279	158.64	60,000	32.34	282,268	194.98	30,000	16.17	667,547	402.13
Pat M. Holt:											
Paraguay	Guarani	15,264	121.14	8,876	70.44	280	2.22	1,780	14.12	26,200	207.92
Argentina	Peso	18,998	111.10	8,162	47.73	9,270	54.21	1,820	10.64	38,250	223.68
Bolivia	do	874.97	73.68	546.30	46.00	140.70	11.86	142.13	11.97	1,704.10	143.51
Peru	Sol	463.20	17.28	307.00	11.46	50.00	1.87	519.80	19.40	1,340.00	50.01
Chile	Escudo	782.91	191.89	204.58	50.14	94.00	23.04	95.51	23.41	1,177.00	288.48
Uruguay	Peso	4,388.70	69.33	2,320.00	36.65	160.00	2.53	2,961.30	46.78	9,830.00	155.29
Brazil	Cruzeiro	210,790	95.38	92,050	41.65	7,125	3.22	192,035	86.89	502,000	227.14
Germany	Deutsche mark	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,860.00	718.95	----------	----------	2,860.00	718.95
Netherlands	Guilder	----------	----------	----------	----------	3,638.05	1,012.03	----------	----------	3,628.05	1012.03
Seth Tillman:											
France	New franc	240.00	48.98	170.95	34.82	----------	----------	74.05	15.18	485.00	98.98
Germany	Deutsche mark	----------	----------	94.00	23.63	177.60	44.65	----------	----------	271.60	68.28
Austria	Schilling	4,012.80	155.90	1,586.90	61.65	----------	----------	952.60	37.01	6,552.30	254.56
Donald Henderson:											
Bermuda	U.S. dollar	----------	----------	----------	101.50	----------	----------	----------	22.50	----------	124.00
France	New franc	300.00	61.22	335.00	68.37	76.00	15.51	49.00	10.00	760.00	155.10
United Kingdom	Pound	14.11.6	40.81	16.14.6	46.83	4.15.6	13.37	3.0.6	8.47	39.2.0	109.48
Germany	Deutsche mark	----------	----------	----------	----------	3,177.60	799.20	----------	----------	3,177.60	799.20
James Lowenstein:											
Germany	do	----------	----------	----------	----------	48,922.50	2,223.75	----------	----------	48,922.50	2,223.75
Japan	Yen	3,916.00	10.88	3,339.00	9.28	----------	----------	2,110.00	5.86	9,365.00	26.02
Thailand	Baht	4,800.00	232.45	3,835.60	185.95	519.95	25.18	1,685.45	81.62	10,841.00	525.20

See footnote at end of table.

***Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965*—Continued**

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James Lowenstein—Continued											
Malaysia	Malaysian dollar.					3.00	.99	13.50	4.46	16.50	5.45
Ceylon	Rupee	720.00	151.32	300.55	63.17	266.30	55.97	116.12	24.41	1,402.97	294.87
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	140.00	24.40	5.00	.87	17.40	3.03	126.50	22.05	288.90	50.35
Korea	Won	11,200	41.42	6,426	23.76	3,860	14.28	5,952	22.01	27,438	101.47
Total			3,054.80		1,801.22		6,944.16		796.31		12,596.49

[1] Includes airplane fare from Rio de Janeiro to Salvador and return.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	12,472.49
Appropriated funds:	
S. Res. 28	124.00
Total	12,596.49

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

MARCH 9, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Ernest Gruening:											
France	Dollar		307.73		46.65				9.94		364.32
Do	Franc	888	182.00	635	112.75	70	22.15	122	33.10		350.00
Germany	Dollar		26.00		1.85				.90		28.75
Do	Mark	380	95.00	330	65.00	38	23.25	52	16.75		200.00
Italy	Dollar		177.83		31.54		10.62		15.07		235.06
Do	Lira	156,250	250.00	120,100	165.00		84.50		60.50		560.00
U.S. transportation	Dollar						1,548.05				1,548.05
Subtotal			1,038.56		422.79		1,688.57		136.26		3,286.18
Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff:											
France	Franc	367.50	75.00	245	50.00	122.50	25.00			735	150.00
Israel	Pound	600	200.00	450	150.00	225	75.00	75	25.00	1,350	450.00
Italy	Lira	135,625	217.00	59,375	95.00			23,750	38.00	218,750	350.00
Do	do					17,150	27.44			17,150	27.44
Switzerland	Franc	431.60	100.00	215.80	50.00	107.90	25.00	107.90	25.00	863.20	200.00
Subtotal			592.00		345.00		152.44		88.00		1,177.44
Herbert W. Beaser:											
France	Dollar		188.95		46.92				2.96		238.83
Do	Franc	888	182.00	635	112.75	70	22.15	122	33.10	1,715	350.00
Germany	Dollar		17.15		2.09				.30		19.54
Do	Mark	380	95.00	330	65.00	38	23.25	52	16.75	800	200.00
Italy	Dollar		109.21		32.73		10.62		77.25		229.81
Do	Lira	156,250	250.00	120,000	165.00	7,850	19.50	38,250	60.50	310,000	495.00
Transportation	Dollar						1,534.35				1,534.35
Subtotal			842.31		424.49		1,609.87		109.86		3,067.53
Glenn K. Shriver:											
France	Dollar		17.21						28.25		45.46
Do	Franc	888	182.00	635	112.75	70	22.15	122	33.10	1,715	350.00
Germany	Dollar				1.43						1.43
Do	Mark	380	95.00	330	65.00	38	23.25	52	16.75	800	200.00
Italy	Dollar				25.77		10.62		18.01		54.40
Do	Lira	156,250	250.00	120,100	165.00	7,850	19.50	38,250	60.50	310,000	495.00
Transportation	Dollar						1,538.05				1,538.05
Subtotal			544.21		369.95		1,613.57		156.61		2,684.34
Senator Joseph Montoya:											
Peru	Sol	1,484.72	55.40	2,134.62	79.65	568.16	21.20	1,157.76	43.20	5,345.26	199.45
	Deutsche mark					2,704	[1] 680.08			2,704	680.08
Subtotal			55.40		79.65		701.28		43.20		879.53
Total			3,072.48		1,641.88		5,765.73		533.93		11,095.02

[1] For transportation from Washington, D.C., to Lima, Peru.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	5,256.97
Appropriated funds: Department of the Army	5,838.05
Total	11,095.02

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

MARCH 9, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Gaylord Nelson:											
Italy	Lira		80.00		67.50		33.00		13.50		194.00
Germany	Deutsche mark						1,325.70				1,325.70
Total			80.00		67.50		1,358.70				1,519.70

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,519.70

HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MARCH 4 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Blair, Drury:											
France	French franc	367.50	75.00	294	60.00	3,798.73	775.25	44	8.98	4,504.23	919.23
West Germany	Deutsche mark	180	45.00	200	50.00	40	10.00	40	10.00	460	115.00
Italy	Lira	37,500	60.00	50,000	80.00	48,142	77.03	5,500	8.80	141,142	225.83
Netherlands	Guilders					1,244	345.94			1,244	345.94
Spain	Peseta	1,198	20.00	1,797	30.00	299.5	5.00	295.5	5.00	3,590	60.00
Portugal	Escudo	300	10.50	300	10.50	50	1.75	59	2.10	709	24.85
Switzerland	Swiss franc	431.71	100.00	539.65	125.00	392.93	91.03	215.86	50.00	1,580.15	366.03
United Kingdom	Pound	18	50.40	22	61.60	3	8.40	3-0-6	8.47	46-0-6	128.87
Total			360.90		417.10		1,314.40		93.35		2,185.75
Senator Quentin N. Burdick:											
Netherlands	Guilder					2,966.06	823.88				823.88
Switzerland	Franc	351.55	80.68								80.68
Total			80.68				823.88				904.56
Senator Thomas J. Dodd:											
Japan	Yen		60.00						9.01	24,880	69.01
Korea	Won					125,896	493.71			125,896	493.71
Taiwan	Taiwan dollars	2,725.30	68.13					214.70	5.37	2,940	73.50
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollars.	400	69.71					29.75	5.18	429.75	74.19
Vietnam	Piaster	4,003	55.00					1,699.50	23.35	5,702.50	78.38
Thailand	Baht	1,065.10	51.09					173.90	8.42	1,239.00	60.00
Malaysia	Malaysia dollars.	75.57	24.89			121.84	40.00			197.41	65.11
Philippines	Peso	80	20.52					17.50	4.48	97.50	25.00
Subtotal			349.34				533.71		55.81		938.90
Washington refund							227.06				
Total							306.65				
Senator Thomas J. Dodd:											
Denmark	Krone	274.24	40.00	325.89	48.00			188.27	27.46	788.40	115.46
Finland	Markka	64.18	20.00	57.762	18.00			38.508	12.00	160.45	50.00
Netherlands	Guilder					3,689.06	1,025.88			3,689.06	1,025.88
Norway	Krone	149.52	21.00	128.16	18.00			78.32	11.00	356.50	50.00
Total			81.00		84.00		1,025.88		50.46		1,241.34
David Martin:											
Korea	Won					125,896	493.71			125,896	493.71
Taiwan	Taiwan dollar	1,800	45.00					820	20.50	2,620	65.50
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	162.80	28.37					65.17	11.35	227.97	39.02
Vietnam	Piaster	3,000	41.23					775.50	10.65	3,775.50	51.88
Thailand	Baht	1,200	58.11					190.60	9.23	1,390.60	67.34
Malaysia	Malaysia dollar.	147.01	48.42			121.83	40.00			268.84	88.54
Philippines	Peso	80	20.52					9.70	2.48	89.70	23.00
Total			241.65				533.71		54.21		828.99
Fred M. Mesmer:											
France	French franc	367.50	75.00	343	70.00	3,774.23	770.25	90	18.50	4,584.23	933.75
Portugal	Escudo	300	10.50	360	12.60	100	3.50	200	7.50	960	34.10
Spain	Peseta	1,198	20.00	2,400	40.20	210	3.53	980	16.45	4,788	80.18
Italy	Lira	37.500	60.00	52,000	84.15	48,142	77.03	6,200	10.03	143,842	231.21
Switzerland	Swiss franc	431.171	100.00	560	130.21	285	66.03	140	33.00	1,396.71	329.24
Netherlands	Guilder					1,244	345.94				345.94
Germany	Mark	180	45.00	190	47.00			30	7.60	402	99.60
Great Britain	Pound	12	33.60	20	56.00	2	5.60	6	17.00	40	112.20
Total			344.10		440.16		1,271.88		110.06		2,166.22

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator George A. Smathers:											
Japan	Yen	83,000	230.56								230.56
Germany	Mark					6,215.03	1,553.37				1,553.37
Total			230.56				1,553.37				1,783.93
Senator Joseph D. Tydings:											
Germany	Deutsche mark					8,512.20	2,127.52				2,127.52
India	Rupee			389	82.00	119	25.42	118	25.00		132.42
Israel	Pound	120	40.82	36	12.00	15	5.00				57.82
Lebanon	do	435	145.00	125	40.00	26	6.19				191.19
Vietnam	Piaster	11,999	165.00	2,545	35.00						200.00
Thailand	Baht	3,139	152.00	826	40.00	165	8.00				200.00
Total			502.82		209.00		2,172.13		25.00		2,908.95

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	12,958.64

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary.

MARCH 5, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Charles R. Perrin: New Zealand			60		80		10		10		160

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 11	$160

PAT MCNAMARA,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

MARCH 4, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
J. B. Anderson:											
France	Franc	581.00	118.58	567.00	115.72	315.00	64.29	87.00	17.75	1,550.00	316.34
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	508.00	88.90	441.00	77.23	84.00	14.70	40.00	7.00	1,073.00	187.83
India	Rupee	(1)	(1)	230.00	48.30	51.00	10.71	42.00	8.82	323.00	67.83
Israel	Pound	315.00	105.52	110.00	36.85	267.00	89.45	[2]141.00	[2]47.24	833.00	279.06
Japan	Yen	29,678.00	81.91	35,470.00	97.90	60,600.00	167.25	3,160.00	8.72	128,908.00	355.78
Malaysia	Dollar	177.00	57.52	133.00	43.22	190.00	61.75	24.00	7.80	524.00	170.29
Switzerland	Swiss franc	160.00	37.04	150.00	34.72	60.00	13.89	25.10	5.81	395.10	91.46
Taiwan	Dollar	1,341.00	33.52	1,520.00	38.00			120.00	3.00	2,980.00	74.52
France	Franc					[3]3,890.00	[3]794.40			[3]3,890.00	[3]794.40
Germany	Deutsche mark					[3]5,118.60	[3]1,279.00			[3]5,118.60	[3]1,279.00
W. Bates:											
France	Franc	391.10	79.78	175.00	35.71	32.50	6.63	25.00	5.10	623.60	127.22
Germany	Deutsche mark					[3]3,177.60	[3]794.20			[3]3,177.60	[3]794.20
W. F. Bennett:											
Germany	do					[3]5,118.60	[3]1,279.33			[3]5,118.60	[3]1,279.33
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	374.00	65.45	308.45	53.98	84.00	14.70	20.00	3.50	786.45	137.63
Israel	Pound	185.00	61.97	40.00	13.40	110.00	36.85	5.00	1.68	340.00	113.90
Japan	Yen	62,855.00	173.48	57,112.31	157.63	79,217.00	218.64	13,540.00	37.37	212,724.31	587.12
Taiwan	Dollar	1,331.00	33.28	560.00	14.00			180.00	4.50	2,071.00	51.78
Thailand	Baht	925.00	43.94	592.85	12.45	60.00	2.85	60.00	2.85	1,637.85	62.09
C. Holifield:											
France	Franc	538.00	109.65	295.00	60.06	167.00	34.08	75.00	15.30	1,075.00	219.09
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	519.00	90.82	364.00	63.62	284.00	49.70	33.00	5.77	1,200.00	200.91
India	Rupee	(1)	(1)	288.00	60.48	51.00	10.71	17.00	3.57	356.00	74.76
Israel	Pound	282.30	94.57	56.00	18.76	252.00	84.42	10.00	3.35	600.30	201.10
Japan	Yen	28,041.00	72.39	31,351.00	86.53	49,000.00	135.24	2,390.00	6.60	110,782.00	300.76
Malaysia	Dollar	199.00	64.67	71.44	23.22	172.00	55.90	5.00	1.63	447.44	145.42
Taiwan	do	1,368.00	34.20	1,169.00	29.22			81.00	2.03	2,618.00	64.45
Germany	Deutsche mark					[3]5,181.00	[3]1,295.00			[3]5,181.00	[3]1,295.00

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
C. Hosmer:											
Germany	Deutsche mark					[3] 2,217.60	[3] 554.26			[3] 2,217.60	[3] 554.26
Do	German mark					[3] 6,091.00	[3] 1,522.37			[3] 6,091.00	[3] 1,522.37
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,002.00	175.35	1,108.00	193.90	750.00	[2] 131.25	98.00	17.15	2,958.00	517.65
India	Rupee	(1)	(1)	101.00	21.21	51.00	10.71	13.00	2.52	164.00	34.44
Japan	Yen	25,424.00	70.17	33,825.00	93.36	49,360.00	136.23	3,090.00	8.53	111,699.00	308.29
Malaysia	Dollar	200.00	65.00	230.00	74.75	125.00	40.62	11.00	3.58	566.00	183.95
Philippines	Peso	310.09	79.60	157.38	40.40	36.03	9.25	38.96	10.00	542.46	139.25
Switzerland	Franc	233.04	53.75	130.07	30.00	21.68	5.00	27.10	6.25	411.89	95.00
Taiwan	Dollar	1,247.00	31.17	980.00	24.50			60.00	1.50	2,287.00	57.17
Thailand	Baht	2,582.64	125.00	1,033.06	50.00	206.50	10.00	309.92	15.00	4,132.12	200.00
United Kingdom	Pound	17-17-4	50.00	8-11-6	24.00	3-11-5	10.00	5-7-2	15.00	33-47-7	99.00
J. T. Conway:											
France	Franc	931.00	190.01	542.00	110.62	237.00	48.37	45.00	9.18	1,775.00	358.18
Hong Kong	Dollar	365.00	63.88	441.00	77.17	84.00	14.70	77.00	13.47	967.00	169.22
India	Rupee	(1)	(1)	189.00	39.69	51.00	10.71	15.00	3.15	255.00	53.55
Israel	Pound	248.00	83.08	73.00	24.45	249.00	83.41			570.00	190.94
Japan	Yen	24,264.00	66.97	31,146.00	85.96	46,010.00	126.98	3,050.00	8.42	104,470.00	288.33
Malaysia	Dollar	139.00	45.17	113.00	36.72	166.00	53.95	[4] 58.00	[4] 18.85	476.00	154.69
Taiwan	do	1,196.00	29.90	990.00	24.75			80.00	2.00	2,266.00	56.65
United Kingdom	Pound	35-0-0	98.00	44-12-10	125.00	8-16-5	25.00	1-15-9	5.00	90-7-3	253.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					[3] 5,118.60	[3] 1,279.33			[3] 5,118.60	[3] 1,279.33
J. B. Graham:											
France	Franc	430.60	87.88	571.40	116.62	192.00	39.18	30.00	6.12	1,224.00	249.80
Hong Kong	Dollar	350.00	61.25	484.00	84.70	84.00	14.70	23.00	4.02	941.00	164.67
India	Rupee	(1)	(1)	154.00	32.34	51.00	10.71	10.00	2.10	215.00	45.15
Israel	Pound	232.00	77.72	154.00	51.59	259.00	86.76	12.00	4.02	657.00	220.09
Japan	Yen	15,161.00	41.84	29,509.00	81.44	43,800.00	120.88	5,320.00	14.68	93,790.00	258.84
Malaysia	Dollar	146.00	47.45	142.00	46.15	166.00	53.95	4.00	1.30	458.00	148.85
Taiwan	do	948.00	23.70	950.00	23.75			120.00	3.00	2,018.00	50.45
Germany	Deutsche mark					[3] 5,118.60	[3] 1,279.33			[3] 5,118.60	[3] 1,279.3
G. F. Murphy, Jr.:											
France	Franc	3,455.30	704.22	2,615.00	533.70	[2] 987.00	[2] 201.44	143.00	29.17	7,200.30	1,468.53
Germany	Deutsche mark	84.58	21.22	245.00	61.49	[3] 6,545.80	[3] 1,638.75	20.00	5.02	6,894.98	1,726.48
Switzerland	Swiss franc	748.00	173.16	670.00	155.10	120.00	27.79	48.00	11.11	1,586.00	367.16
England	Pound	28-2-0	79.04	35-7-2	99.00	7-2-10	20.00	3-11-5	10.00	74-6-0	208.0
J. Rosen:											
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					[3] 1,576.00	[3] 438.26			[3] 1,576.00	[3] 438.26
United Kingdom	Pound	74-15-6	209.37	54-19-6	153.93	29-7-2	82.20	[4] 26-7-0	[4] 73.78	185-9-2	519.28
L. M. Trosten:											
France	Franc	307.00	62.65	187.00	38.16	117.00	23.87	30.00	6.12	641.00	130.80
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	386.00	67.55	442.00	77.35	192.00	33.60	25.00	4.37	1,045.00	182.87
India	Rupee	(1)	(1)	218.00	45.78	51.00	10.71	11.00	2.31	280.00	58.80
Israel	Pound	249.00	83.41	153.00	51.25	259.00	86.76	15.00	5.03	676.00	226.45
Japan	Yen	21,295.00	58.77	31,657.00	87.37	44,020.00	121.49	7,200.00	19.87	104,172.00	287.50
Malaysia	Dollar	156.00	50.70	138.00	44.85	166.00	53.95	6.00	1.95	466.00	151.45
Taiwan	do	1,049.00	26.22	869.00	21.73			67.00	1.67	1,985.00	49.62
Germany	Deutsche mark					[3] 5,180.00	[3] 1,294.83			[3] 5,180.00	[3] 1,294.83
Total			4,550.39		4,003.78		16,224.99		544.63		25,323.79

[1] Guest of Indian Government.

[2] Includes air transportation (commercial).

[3] Commercial air transportation.

[4] Official long-distance telephone calls included.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$25,323.79

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Atomic Energy.

MARCH 4, 1966.

Report of expenditure of appropriated funds by Senate delegation, 11th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, New York, N.Y., Oct. 3-9, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Claiborne Pell: United States	Dollar		126.00		28.31		43.50		12.89		210.70
Harrison Williams: United States	do		105.00		9.90		43.50		1.02		159.42
Maurine Neuberger: United States	do		105.00		10.97		42.50		4.59		163.06
Birch Bayh: United States	do		126.00		43.18		37.75		7.27		214.20
Frank E. Moss: United States	do		63.00		10.49		40.96		.40		114.85
Leverett Saltonstall: United States	do		63.00		64.68		74.95		4.25		206.88
Karl E. Mundt: United States	do		105.00		50.88		41.00		2.90		199.78
Jacob Javits: United States	do		126.00		5.75		36.00		23.22		190.97
Clifford Case: United States	do		105.00		2.30		4.80				112.10
Arthur Kuhl: United States	do		94.50		59.08		49.75		21.49		224.82
James Lowenstein: United States	do		73.50		57.06		43.50		20.89		194.95
Lee Szilagyi: United States	do		73.50		59.94		46.45		11.50		191.39
Margaret C. Brown: United States	do		84.00		52.10		45.30		15.25		196.65
Delegation expenses (New York):											
Office rental									73.50		73.50
Personnel meals (office)									58.63		58.63
NATO receptions and luncheons									4,077.30		4,077.30
Telephone									91.27		91.27
Transportation							82.75				82.75
John Sherman Cooper: France	Dollar		20.00		3.50						[1] 23.50

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of appropriated funds by Senate delegation, 11th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, New York, N.Y., Oct. 3-9, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jacob Javits:											
France	Dollar		272.00		77.00		794.40		20.00		[3] 1,163.40
Greece	Drachma		75.00		60.00				15.00		[3] 150.00
Turkey	Pound								20.00		[3] 20.00
United States	Dollar						722.00				[3] 722.00
Total			1,616.50		601.14		2,091.36		4,548.62		8,842.12

[1] Expended between May 3-5, 1965, France.

[2] Expended between May 21-24, 1965, France Special Committee of NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

[3] Expended between Nov. 7-17, 1965, as Chairman of Special Committee on Developing NATO Countries.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds:	
Other (Public Law 84-689)	$8,842.12
Government Department: U.S. Army	949.42
Total	9,791.54

CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Senate Delegation 11th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

MARCH 8, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies by Senate delegation named by the Vice President to respond to certain official invitations from foreign parliamentary bodies and governments, Nov. 19 to Dec. 23, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Wayne Morse:											
Japan	Yen	58,618	163.61	36,801	102.73			10,990	31.31	106,400	297.65
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	232.65	40.84	245.80	43.12	62.00	10.85	109.48	19.20	649.93	114.01
India	Rupee			151.87	32.05	25.00	5.28	60.00	12.65	236.87	49.98
Pakistan	do			58.20	12.14			34.30	7.15	92.50	19.29
Afghanistan	Afghani			670	9.43	320	4.50	440	6.19	1,430	20.12
Israel	Pound	285.00	95.00	175.48	58.49	19.80	6.60	54.68	18.22	534.96	178.31
Spain	Peseta	970	16.90	1,954	32.60	1,667.50	27.80			4,591.50	77.30
Frank J. Lausche:											
Japan	Yen	58,618	163.61	34,716	96.76	1,770	5.58	5,641	16.61	100,745	282.56
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollars.	232.65	40.84	277.30	48.60			105.56	18.48	615.51	107.92
India	Rupee			185.87	39.20	51.00	10.78	94.60	19.94	331.47	69.92
Pakistan	do			157.10	32.81	34.15	7.12	48.25	10.08	239.50	50.01
Afghanistan	Afghani	1,540	21.68	1,030	14.50			480	6.76	3,050	42.94
Israel	Pound	285.00	95.00	112.45	37.48			49.15	16.38	446.60	148.86
Spain	Peseta	810	13.50	791	13.21			378	6.30	1,979	33.01
B. Everett Jordan:											
India	Rupee			162.87	34.36			65.89	13.90	228.76	48.26
Pakistan	do			142.98	29.85			52.83	11.03	195.81	40.88
Afghanistan	Afghani	1,540	21.68	897	12.62			204	2.87	2,641	37.17
Israel	Pound	285.00	95.00	103.15	34.38	13.30	4.43	60.70	20.23	462.15	154.04
Spain	Peseta	810	13.51	768	12.80			508	8.42	2,086	34.73
Germany	Deutschemark					6,764.88	1,690.80			6,764.88	[1] 1,690.80
Hong Kong	Hong Hong dollar.					705.00	122.44			705.00	[1] 122.44
Vance Hartke:											
Japan	Yen	58,618	163.61	48,105	134.13	2,800	7.79	13,765	38.84	123,288	344.37
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.			187.20	32.85	72.80	9.26	46.65	8.18	286.65	50.29
India	Rupee			172.40	36.35			64.47	13.63	236.87	49.98
Pakistan	do			179.10	37.38	26.25	5.47	34.15	7.12	239.50	49.97
Afghanistan	Afghani	990	13.94	969	13.63			790	11.13	2,749	38.70
Israel	Pound	285.00	95.00	214.79	71.59	67.70	22.56	54.50	18.16	621.99	207.31
Spain		850.00	14.77	760.30	12.95			437.70	7.30	2,048	35.02
Quentin Burdick:											
Japan	Yen	58.618	163.61	36.546	92.18	3.000	8.34	9.460	26.28	107.624	290.41
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	232.65	40.84	126.45	22.18			21.15	3.72	380.25	66.74
India	Rupee			105.30	22.20	50.57	10.80	68.92	14.54	224.79	47.54
Pakistan	do			77.30	16.14	15.10	3.15	42.26	8.80	134.66	28.09
Afghanistan	Afghani	990	13.94	867	12.21			785	11.06	2,642	37.21
Israel	Pound	285.00	95.00	136.20	45.40	21.10	7.03	24.50	8.16	466.80	155.59
Spain	Peseta	850.00	14.77	673.00	11.53					1,523	26.30
Winston Prouty:											
Japan	Yen	58,618	163.61	33,807	93.91	2,700	7.50	8,017	22.27	103,152	287.29
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	176.55	30.94	402.36	70.59	52.35	9.17	64.30	11.28	695.56	121.98
India	Rupee			98.60	20.78			30.27	6.36	128.87	27.14
Pakistan	do			168.25	35.09	33.10	6.90	38.15	7.94	239.50	49.93
Afghanistan	Afghani	990	13.94					80	1.12	1,070	[2] 15.06
Israel	Pound	223	74.33	218.49	72.83	33.24	11.08	53.15	17.71	527.88	175.95
Italy	Lira	15,731	25.17	14,787	23.66	3,618	5.79	3,262	5.22	37,398	59.84
Transportation	Guilder					4,829.76	1,341.60			4,829.76	[3] 1,341.60
	Pound					630.00	210.00			630.00	[3] 210.00

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies by Senate delegation named by the Vice President to respond to certain official invitations from foreign parliamentary bodies and governments, Nov. 19 to Dec. 23, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Peter H. Dominick:											
Japan	Yen	58,618	163.61	35,735	99.65	2,100	6.16	5,560	15.88	102,013	285.30
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	232.65	40.84	276.80	48.52			89.38	15.64	598.83	105.00
India	Rupee			190.00	40.88			75.30	15.90	265.30	56.78
Pakistan	do			185.15	38.67	17.30	3.60	56.25	11.74	255.70	54.01
Afghanistan	Afghani	990	13.94	289	4.07			80	1.10	1,359.00	19.11
Israel	Pound	66.00	22.00	8.10	2.70			11.77	3.92	85.87	28.62
France	Franc					4,482	914.80			4,482.00	[4] 914.80
Carl Marcy:											
Japan	Yen	42,488	117.92	64,895	180.26			16,755	46.54	124,098	344.72
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	176.55	30.96	257.40	45.15			77.04	13.50	570.99	89.61
India	Rupee			167.60	35.36	43.20	9.11	93.69	19.75	304.49	64.22
Pakistan	do			43.30	9.01	11.20	2.35	35.92	7.50	90.42	18.86
Afghanistan	Afghani	900	13.94	149	2.11			80	1.12	1,219	17.17
Israel	Pound	203.70	67.90	126.15	42.04	86.10	28.70	34.33	11.44	450.28	150.08
Spain	Peseta	680	11.35	1,430	23.87	810	13.52	660	11.01	3,580	59.75
Arthur M. Kuhl:											
Japan	Yen	42,448	117.92	39,807	110.57			6,555	18.20	88,810	246.69
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	176.55	30.96	282.30	49.51			113.04	19.79	571.89	100.26
India	Rupee			187.00	39.45			60.80	12.82	247.80	52.27
Pakistan	do							27.26	5.69	27.26	5.69
Afghanistan	Afghani	990	13.94	860	12.11			805	11.33	2,655	37.38
Israel	Pound	161.70	53.90	189.85	63.28			35.50	11.83	387.05	129.01
Spain	Peseta	680	11.35	930	15.52			2.68	4.47	1,878	31.34
Delegation expenses:											
Japan:											
Hotel offices	Yen	57,488	159.68							57,488	159.68
Official meals	do			16,490	45.80					16,490	45.80
Transportation	do					508,809	1,418.91			508,809	1,418.91
Hong Kong:											
Hotel offices	Hong Kong dollar.	294.25	51.62							294.25	51.62
Official meals	do			417.55	73.25					417.55	73.25
Transportation	do					1,596.85	280.14			1,596.85	280.14
Bangkok: Official luncheon				4,527.80	219.27					4,527.80	219.27
India:											
Hotel offices	Rupee	738.34	155.76							738.34	155.76
Transportation	do					823.57	173.74			823.57	173.74
Wreaths	do							100.00	21.10	100.00	21.10
Pakistan:											
Hotel offices	do	688.47	143.73							688.47	143.73
Official dinner	do			670.00	139.87					670.00	139.87
Transportation	do					418.00	87.26			418.00	87.26
Afghanistan:											
Hotel offices	Afghani	1,280.00	18.02							1,280.00	18.02
Transportation	do					7,400.00	104.05			7,400.00	104.05
Miscellaneous	do							2,500.00	34.97	2,500.00	34.97
Iran: Transportation	Rial					3,000	40.00			3,000	40.00
Israel:											
Hotel offices	Pound	223.08	74.36							223.08	74.36
Transportation	do					2,256.00	752.00			2,256.00	752.00
Telephone and postage	do							104.00	34.66	104.00	34.66
Jordan:											
Transportation	Dinar					32.00	89.60			32.00	89.60
Miscellaneous	do							8.00	22.40	8.00	22.40
Spain:											
Transportation	Peseta					16,900	282.10			16,900	282.10
Official meals	do			1,657	27.60					1,657	27.60
Total			3,018.34		2,943.23		7,768.66		866.84		14,597.07

---

[1] Airplane fare from Washington, D.C., to Bangkok, Thailand.

[2] Refunded to American Embassy in Afghanistan.

[3] Airplane fare from Washington, D.C., to Honolulu, Hawaii, and from Tel Aviv, Israel, to Washington, D.C.

[4] Airplane fare from Denver, Colo., to Honolulu, Hawaii, and from Tel Aviv, Israel, to Washington, D.C.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	14,597.07

WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Senate Delegation.

MARCH 8, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, Wellington, New Zealand, Nov. 20 to Dec. 15, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
J. W. Fulbright:											
United States	U.S. dollar		45.12		15.07						60.19
Fiji Islands	Fiji pound	13.5.0	34.45	6.7.8	16.80	12.0.0	31.02	1.9.0	4.00	33.1.8	86.27
Australia	Australian pound.	21.10.0	45.25	15.2.2	33.90			4.10.0	10.10	41.2.2	92.25
New Zealand	New Zealand pound.	4.0.0	11.20	31.2.2	87.00	108.3.0	303.30	4.0.0	11.45	147.5.2	412.95
Tahiti	U.S. dollar		75.86		53.59		4.84		4.59		138.88

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, Wellington, New Zealand, Nov. 20 to Dec. 15, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank E. Moss:											
United States	U.S. dollar		121.87		95.67		19.75		27.29		264.58
Fiji Islands	do		34.45		15.78				5.00		55.23
Australia	do		50.15		86.14		11.81		19.05		167.15
New Zealand	do		81.20		133.20				17.15		231.55
Tahiti	do		50.57		58.89		2.54		3.45		115.45
Bourke B. Hickenlooper:											
United States	U.S. dollar		50.96		32.63						83.59
Fiji Islands	Fiji pound	13.5.0	34.45	3.18.8	10.25	9.0.0	23.40			26.3.8	68.10
Australia	Australian pound.	34.5.0	76.85	50.7.2	113.00	5.0.0	11.25	6.0.0	13.45	95.12.2	214.55
New Zealand	New Zealand pound.	29.15.0	81.20	51.19.11	140.88	108.3.0	303.30	5.0.0	14.30	194.17.11	539.68
Tahiti	U.S. dollar		75.86		51.32		6.90		4.59		138.67
Hiram L. Fong:											
Fiji Islands	do		34.45		15.90				5.00		55.35
Australia	do		66.30		73.00		9.50		10.10		158.90
New Zealand	do		81.20		129.45				8.85		219.50
Tahiti	do		60.68		45.20		6.55		2.87		115.30
Seth P. Tillman:											
United States	do		67.28		69.81				4.59		141.68
Fiji Islands	Fiji pound	7.17.6	20.50	1.18.4	4.95	9.0.0	23.40			18.15.10	48.85
Australia	Australian pound.	19.8.0	43.50	10.6.9	23.15	3.0.0	6.76	3.3.8	7.10	36.10.5	80.50
New Zealand	New Zealand pound.	3.15.0	10.50	5.00	14.00					8.15.0	24.50
Tahiti	U.S. dollar		36.20		57.23		2.30		3.45		99.18
Milrae E. Jensen:											
United States	do		89.44		55.88						145.32
Fiji Islands	Fiji pound	7.17.6	20.50	2.10.0	6.50	12.6.2	31.98	1.8.4	3.70	24.2.0	62.68
Australia	Australian pound.	19.5.0	43.20	16.16.6	37.65			3.15.0	8.35	39.16.6	89.20
New Zealand	New Zealand pound.	13.5.0	38.40	13.7.3	36.55			3.0.0	8.05	29.12.3	83.00
Tahiti	U.S. dollar		36.20		49.12				3.90		89.22
Delegation expenses:											
Postage, United States	do								14.30		14.30
Telephone and telegraph, United States.	do								19.25		19.25
Car rentals and chauffeurs, Australia.	Australian pound.					56.18.6	127.89			56.18.6	127.89
Car rentals and chauffeurs, New Zealand.	New Zealand pound.					365.8.7	1,024.81			365.8.7	1,024.81
Total											5,268.52

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,955.23
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 89 (89-1)	2,313.29
Total	5,268.52

MARCH 5, 1966.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PELL, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 3076. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3077. A bill to promote equal employment opportunity by securing equal treatment in the various incidents of employment, to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor, and for other purposes; and

S. 3078. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which relates to equal employment opportunity, to prohibit certain unlawful employment practices committed by States or political subdivisions of a State; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3079. A bill relating to rates of postage on air mail parcel post mailed to or by members of the Armed Forces in oversea combat areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 3080. A bill to amend section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 3081. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to impose sanctions against its members for exceeding production quotas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOMINICK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of 7-day period beginning April 17, 1966, as National Amateur Radio Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966, in behalf of myself and Senators McNAMARA, MORSE, PELL, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, CLARK, KENNEDY of New York, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, McCARTHY, NELSON, RANDOLPH, PROUTY, SMATHERS, and JORDAN of North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table until the close of business Friday, March 18, that any Senators desiring to do so may have an opportunity to cosponsor the bill; I also ask unanimous consent that the bill as introduced may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 3076) to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3076

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966".

SEC. 2. Section 2(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", to promote interlibrary cooperation, and to assist the States in providing certain specialized State library services".

SEC. 3. Section 101(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1957, and for each of the next six fiscal years the sum of $7,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $25,000,000, and for each of the next two fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "June 30, 1967, the sum of $35,000,000, and for each of the next four fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine,".

SEC. 4. Section 102 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

SEC. 5. (a) Section 104(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "fiscal year ending June 30, 1963" each time that it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "second preceding fiscal year", and by striking out "section 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 103".

(b) Sections 104(b) and 204(b) of such Act are each amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to which a State is entitled under subsection (a), and such amount shall be paid to the State, in advance or by way of reimbursement, at such time or times and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made overpayment or underpayment."

(c) Section 104(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "(1)", by striking out "to be effective until July 1, 1957" and by striking out paragraph (2) of such subsection.

SEC. 6. Section 201 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1964, the sum of $20,000,000 and for each of the next two fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967, the sum of $40,000,000, and for each of the next four fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine,".

SEC. 7. The last sentence of section 202 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "A State's allotment under this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available for payments with respect to the administration, during such year and the next fiscal year, of its State plan approved under section 203, and for payments with respect to construction projects approved under such State plan during such year or the next fiscal year."

SEC. 8. Section 204(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) From its allotment available therefor under section 202 each State shall be entitled to receive (1) an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 104) of projects approved under its State plan (as approved by the Commissioner pursuant to section 203) during the period for which such allotment is available, and (2) an amount equal to the Federal share of the total of the sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions for the administration of such State plan during the period for which such allotment is available."

SEC. 9. The Library Services and construction Act is amended by inserting after title II the following new titles:

"TITLE III—INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $12,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and maintaining local, regional, State, or interstate cooperative networks of libraries.

"Allotments

"SEC. 302. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $40,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 303. From the allotments available therefor under section 302, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 304 an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 104, except that the Federal share for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be 100 per centum) of the total sums expended under such plan (including costs of administering such plan).

"State Plans for Interlibrary Cooperation

"SEC. 304. (a) To be approved for purposes of this title a State plan must—

"(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

"(2) provide policies and objectives for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and special information centers for improved services of a supplementary nature to the special clientele served by each type of library or center;

"(3) provide appropriate allocation by participating agencies of the total costs of the system;

"(4) provide assurance that every local or other public agency in the State is accorded an opportunity to participate in the system;

"(5) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this title and in assigning priority to project proposals; and

"(6) establish a statewide council which is broadly representative of professional library interests and of library users which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"TITLE IV—SPECIALIZED STATE LIBRARY SERVICES

"Part A—State institutional library services

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $12,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and improving State institutional library services. For the purposes of this part the term 'State institutional library services' means the providing of books, and other library material, and of library services to (A) inmates, patients, or residents of penal institutions, reformatories, residential training schools, orphanages, or general or special institutions or hospitals operated or substantially supported by the State, and (B) students in residential schools for the handicapped (including mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired persons who by reason thereof require special education) operated or substantially supported by the State.

"Allotments

"SEC. 402. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 401 for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $40,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 403. From the allotments available therefor under section 402, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 404 an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 104, except that the Federal share for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be 100 per centum) of the total sums expended by the State under such plan (including costs of administering such plan).

"State Plans for State Institutional Library Services

"SEC. 404. (a) To be approved for purposes of this part a State plan must—

"(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

"(2) provide policies and objectives for the establishment or improvement of State institutional library services;

"(3) provide assurance that all eligible State institutions will be accorded an opportunity to participate in the program pursuant to this part;

"(4) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this part and in assigning priority to project proposals;

"(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that expenditures made by such State in any fiscal year for State institutional library services will not be less than such expenditures in the preceding fiscal year; and

"(6) establish a council which is broadly representative of State institutions eligible for assistance under this part which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) No portion of any money paid to a State under this part shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings, or the purchase of any land.

"Part B—State plans for library services to the physically handicapped

"Authorization of Appropriations

"Sec. 411. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $3,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $4,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $6,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $7,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and improving library services to the physically handicapped, including the blind and the visually handicapped. For the purposes of this part the term 'library services to the physically handicapped' means the providing of library service, through public or other nonprofit libraries, agencies, or organizations, to physically handicapped readers certified by competent medical authority as unable to read or to use conventional printed materials as a result of physical limitations.

"Allotments

"Sec. 412. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 411 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $5,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $25,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

"Payments to States

"Sec. 413. From the allotments available therefor under section 412, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 414 an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 104, except that the Federal share for the fiscal year ending June 30 1967, shall be 100 per centum) of the total sums expended under such plan (including costs of administering such plan).

"State Plans for Services to the Physically Handicapped

"Sec. 414. (a) To be approved for the purposes of this part a State plan must—

"(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

"(2) provide policies and objectives for the establishment or improvement of State plans for library services to the physically handicapped;

"(3) provide assurance that all appropriate public or nonprofit libraries, agencies, or organizations for the physically handicapped will be accorded an opportunity to participate in the program pursuant to this part;

"(4) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this part and in assigning priority to project proposals;

"(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that funds available from sources other than Federal sources in any fiscal year for expenditure under State plans for library services to the physically handicapped will not be less than actual expenditures from such sources in the second preceding fiscal year; and

"(6) establish a council which is representative of eligible agencies which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

"(b) The Commissioners shall approve, after consultation with the Librarian of Congress where appropriate, any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) No part of any money paid to a State under this part shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building, or the purchase of any land."

Sec. 10. (a) Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act is hereby designated as title V.

(b) Sections 301 through 304 of the Library Services and Construction Act are hereby designated as sections 501 through 504.

(c) Section 502(d)(2) of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by striking out "or title II" and inserting in lieu thereof "title II, title III, or part A or B of title IV".

(d) Section 503 of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by striking out "or 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, 302, 402, or 412"; by striking out "and section 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, 303, 403, and 413"; by striking out "or 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, 302, 402, or 412"; by striking out "or 203", and inserting in lieu thereof ", 203, 303, 403, or 413,"; by striking out "or 201" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 201, 301, 401, or 411"; and by striking out "and 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, 302, 402, and 412".

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO EQUAL OPPORTUNITY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on February 10, 1966, 20 Senators, under the leadership of Senators DOUGLAS, CASE, and HART, joined in introducing the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966, S. 2923, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Although I did not join as a cosponsor, I would like the RECORD to show that I endorse and support the provisions of that bill which deal with matters properly within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

However, in one of its titles—title VI to be exact—S. 2923 contains an amendment to title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Employment Practices title. Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is plain to the effect that "measures relating to labor generally" fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, not the Committee on the Judiciary. And within the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, jurisdiction over matters relating to fair employment practices is vested in the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, of which I am the chairman.

In 1963 a number of bills dealing with this subject were introduced in the Senate and were referred to the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee. Among them was the proposed Equal Employment Opportunity Act, S. 1937 of the 88th Congress, introduced by the then Senator, and now Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. After extensive hearings and much hard work and careful study by the members of the subcommittee, a revised and improved version of the Humphrey bill was unanimously reported out by the subcommittee, and was subsequently reported by the full committee to the Senate Calendar. It was never motioned up for debate, because the Senate chose to act instead on the House-passed omnibus civil rights bill, which contained a fair employment practices section inserted by the House. Senators will recall that this bill, which subsequently became the Civil Rights Act of 1964, was never referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee; it was held on the floor until the last great civil rights filibuster was finally broken.

In view of the fact that the new agency created by that law, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, has been in existence now for roughly 8 months, it seems appropriate for the subcommittee, in the exercise of its oversight power, to look into the operations of the Commission to determine what changes in the law might be needed to enable it better to achieve its goal of wiping out job discrimination in the United States. As soon as definite hearing dates are established, they will be announced.

In the meantime, however, for the convenience of Senators and in order to bring before the subcommittee various proposals which should be considered, I am introducing for reference to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

First, the Humphrey equal employment opportunity bill, in the form reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the 88th Congress with some minor modifications; and

Second, as a separate bill, title VI of the Douglas Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966, which contains an amendment to the fair employment practice title of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of these two bills be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with a fact sheet on S. 1937, the Humphrey bill, as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on February 4, 1964.

In addition I ask unanimous consent that S. 2887, introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], relating to discrimination in employment because of age, which was originally referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have been informed that Senator CANNON has no objection, and that the Committee on the Judiciary is in accord.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and fact sheet will be printed in the RECORD, and, without objection, the change of reference on Senate bill 2887 will be made, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CLARK, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3077. A bill to promote equal employment opportunity by securing equal treatment in the various incidents of employment, to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Equal Employment Opportunity Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that discrimination in employment against qualified persons because of their race, color, religion, or national origin has been practiced and continues to be practiced in the United States in a manner which restricts the fair and equal opportunity of such persons to earn their livelihood commensurate with their talent and ability. The Congress also finds that this inequality of employment opportunity forces such persons into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States. Accordingly, it is in the national interest that equality of employment opportunity be secured in commerce and in activities affecting commerce.

The Congress further finds that because of the accumulated impact of prior discrimination and related disadvantages in employment, education, housing, and other areas a nationwide effort is required to secure equal employment opportunity by the affirmative and conscious efforts of government, employers, unions, and others. Efforts to equalize disparities in employment opportunity should include all of the incidents and conditions of employment opportunity, including not only hiring, promotion, transfer, seniority, discharge, suspension and retirement but also recruitment and recruitment advertising, apprenticeship and other job training programs, access to all employment facilities and services, participation in employee organizations, and other incidents of employment opportunity necessary to the achievement of equality as an existing reality in the operation of the national job market.

The Congress further finds that due to the scope, size, and complexity of the national job market it is desirable and appropriate to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor so that the administrative resources and professional expertise of the Department may be used in implementing the policies of this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in the Act—

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, mutual companies, joint stock companies, trusts, unincorporated organizations, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, and any organized group of persons. Such term does not include a State or political subdivision thereof.

(b) The term "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the possessions of the United States, and (except as used in subsection (c) of this section) any political subdivision of any of the foregoing.

(c) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication between two or more States; between any State and any place outside thereof; between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States.

(d) The term "industry affecting commerce" means any activity, business, or industry in commerce or in which a dispute concerning equal employment opportunities would hinder or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(e) The term "person subject to this Act" means any employer, Government contractor, Federal agency, labor organization, employment agency or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship and other training programs.

(f) The term "employer" means any person who—

(1) is engaged in any industry affecting commerce, or is acting directly or indirectly as an agent of a person so engaged, and

(2) has eight or more individuals in his employ, or has had eight or more individuals in his employ while so engaged or acting.

(g) The term "Government contractor" means—

(1) any person who is carrying out a contract entered into by him with the United States or with any Federal agency.

(2) any person who is carrying out a subcontract for the execution of any part of a contract described in paragraph (1) or of any part of a subcontract described in this paragraph, or

(3) any person who is furnishing services, supplies, or materials, or constructing or repairing any property, under any program or activity in which direct or indirect financial assistance by the United States Government is provided by way of grants, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty or otherwise, or through any State agency which is participating in the administration of such a program or activity.

(h) The term "Federal agency" means any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government of the United States, or any independent agency or instrumentality of the Government of the United States.

(i) The term "labor organization" means any organization which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of (1) collective bargaining, (2) dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, terms or conditions of employment, or (3) other mutual aid or protection of employees in connection with employment, and includes any conference, general committee, joint or system board, or joint council so engaged which is subordinate to a national or international labor organization.

(j) The term "employment agency" means any person regularly undertaking with or without compensation to procure employees for an employer or to procure for employees opportunities to work for an employer and includes an agent of such a person; and such term shall include the United States Employment Service and any State employment service.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 4. (a) No person subject to this Act shall refuse or deny equal employment opportunity to any individual because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Such refusal or denial shall include any act or practice which, because of an individual's race, color, religion, or national origin, results or tends to result in material disadvantage or impediment to any individual in obtaining employment or the incidents of employment for which he is otherwise qualified.

(b) Equal employment opportunity shall include all the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment including but not restricted to: hiring, promotion, transfer, and seniority; discharge, suspension, and retirement, recruitment advertising and methods of recruitment; referrals for employment; apprenticeship training and other educational opportunity for or in employment; equality of access to facilities and services provided in employment; and equality of participation and membership in employee organizations and labor organizations.

(c) No person shall discriminate against any other person because he has opposed refusal or denial of equal employment opportunity as provided for by this Act, or because he has filed a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this Act.

(d) Every person subject to this Act shall (1) make such entries relevant to a determination concerning the refusal or denial of equal employment opportunities on such records that he keeps or is required to keep; (2) preserve such records for such periods of time; (3) make such reports therefrom to the Administrator; and (4) post such notices as the Administrator may prescribe by regulation as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of this Act or the regulations promulgated thereunder.

(e) The Equal Employment Opportunity Administrator shall from time to time, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to implement the policies of this Act.

(f) All regulations promulgated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Administrator shall be submitted to the Equal Employment Opportunity Board for approval, modification, or disapproval, and may be finally published in accordance with section 4(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act upon approval or modification by the Board or thirty days after submission to it, whichever occurs first.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Labor an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration which shall be headed by an Equal Employment Opportunity Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"). The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for Assistant Secretaries of Labor.

(b) The Administrator shall carry out the duties and functions imposed on him under this Act under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Labor. In carrying out such duties and functions, the Administrator shall, to the extent feasible, utilize the existing bureaus, divisions, and facilities of the Department of Labor.

(c) The Administrator is authorized, subject to the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to enable him to carry out his duties and functions under this Act and may delegate to such officers and employees such powers vested in him by this Act as he deems appropriate. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Administrator in any litigation.

(d) The Administrator is authorized to gather data regarding the practices of any person subject to this Act and to enter and make periodic inspection of such places and such records (and make transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, or matters as may be necessary or appropriate to assure general compliance with the provisions of section 4 and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

(e) For the purposes of any inspection or investigation provided for in this Act the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (16 U.S.C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of the Administrator, except that the provisions of section 8(i) of this Act shall apply with respect to grants of immunity.

(f) With the consent and cooperation of State agencies engaged in furthering equal employment opportunity, the Administrator is authorized, in carrying out his duties and functions under this Act, to utilize the services of such State agencies and their employees and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse such State agencies and their employees for services rendered in assisting the Administrator to carry out his duties and functions under this Act.

(g) In carrying out his duties and functions under this Act, the Administrator is authorized to secure the assistance and support of all Federal agencies.

(h) The Administrator shall have power—

(1) to furnish to persons subject to this Act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this Act and the regulations promulgated or orders issued thereunder;

(2) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this Act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

(3) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this Act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies;

(4) to engage in promotional and educational activities for the purposes of acquainting persons subject to the Act with the objectives of the Act and the methods by which these objectives may be achieved; and

(5) to create such local, State, regional, or national advisory and conciliation councils as in his judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this Act, and the Administrator may empower them to study the problem of denial of equal employment opportunity as prohibited by this Act and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Administrator for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens resident of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946, for persons serving without compensation. The Administrator may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance.

ENFORCEMENT BY ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator is empowered to require any person subject to this Act to comply with the provisions of section 4 and the regulations promulgated thereunder. Whenever the Administrator has reasonable cause to believe that any person subject to this Act is violating or has violated such provisions or regulations, the Administrator shall initiate appropriate investigation thereof and shall take appropriate measures to correct such violations, including the issuance of complaints pursuant to subsection (c).

(b) The Administrator may receive written charges by or on behalf of any individual or individuals aggrieved that such a violation is occurring or has occurred, but no charge shall be a prerequisite to his investigating any such violation which may come to his attention by any appropriate means, including inspections periodically made under his authority to assure general compliance with the provisions of section 4 and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

(c) If as a result of an investigation conducted under this section the Administrator determines that any person subject to this Act is violating or has violated the provisions of section 4 or the regulations promulgated thereunder, he shall attempt through persuasion and conciliation to bring such person into compliance with such provisions. If such attempts are not successful, he shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint specifying the alleged violations together with a notice of hearing before the Equal Employment Opportunity Board at a place therein fixed not less than ten days after the service of such complaint. A complaint may be amended by the Administrator at any time prior to the hearing and may be thereafter amended prior to the issuance of an order based thereon in accordance with the regulations of the Board.

(d) Any person aggrieved by the arbitrary or capricious failure or refusal of the Administrator to initiate an investigation of his written charge or to file a complaint thereon may petition the Board for review of such failure or refusal, and the Board may, in its discretion, grant or deny such petition and may grant such relief, including an order permitting the aggrieved person to file a complaint before the Board and directing a hearing thereon, as it shall deem appropriate.

(e) No complaint may be issued and served upon any person by the Administrator under subsection (c) with respect to an alleged violation of the provisions of section 4 or the regulations promulgated thereunder more than two years after such violation occurred: *Provided, however,* That a complaint issued pursuant to an order of the Board in a proceeding under subsection (d) may be issued and served with respect to any such violation occurring not more than two years prior to the filing of the petition in such proceeding.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY BOARD

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby established, as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, an Equal Employment Opportunity Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of five members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the members first appointed shall be appointed for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years, one for a term of four years, and one for a term of five years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years each, except that any individual appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) The President shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman of the Board who shall exercise the executive and administrative functions of the Board, including functions with respect to (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by the Board, other than personnel employed regularly in the immediate offices of the Board members, (2) the distribution of functions and responsibilities among such personnel and among administrative units of the Board, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds in carrying out any of these functions. The Chairman shall be governed by the general policies and regulations of the Board. The appointment by the Chairman of the heads of major administrative units under the Board shall be subject to the approval of the Board.

(c) Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. A vacancy on the Board shall not impair to the right of the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of the Board.

(d) The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(e) Each member of the Board, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per year. The Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per year. Each member shall be eligible for reappointment and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(f) The Board is authorized, subject to the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint such hearing examiners and to appoint and fix the compensation of such other officers and employees as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions and duties under this Act. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Board in any litigation. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, State or local, or other agencies and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed.

(g) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any employee it designates for that purpose.

(h) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place.

(i) The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such regulations as may be necessary to carry out its duties and functions under this Act.

(j) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

DETERMINATION OF CASES BY THE BOARD

SEC. 8. (a) The Board is empowered to hear and determine complaints filed under section 6. If upon the preponderance of testimony taken, the Board shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has violated or is violating any provision of section 4 or the regulations promulgated thereunder, the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person appropriate remedial orders. Such orders may include cease and desist orders; monetary awards in favor of persons suffering financial loss through the denial or refusal of equal employment opportunity; orders directing employment, reinstatement or promotion of employees or applicants; disqualification from obtaining from the United States or any Federal agency or under any federally assisted program, any privilege, contract, or subcontract under such contract; or such other affirmative orders as will effectuate the purposes of this Act.

(b) Each party in any case shall have the right to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses. All testimony shall be taken under oath. Any proceeding under this section shall so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Any member of the Board, or any hearing examiner designated by it under subsection (d) acting for the Board, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any case before the Board. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession, at any designated place of hearing.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this section, any district court within the jurisdiction of which the proceeding is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Administrator shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Board, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the proceeding.

(d) The Board is authorized to designate a division of the Board, a member of the Board, or a hearing examiner appointed by it under section 7(f) to hear and determine any case before the Board, including cases remanded for the taking of additional evidence under section 9(f). Whenever such designation is made, the hearing shall be held within the judicial district within which the violation of section 4 or the regulations promulgated thereunder is alleged to have occurred or in which the respondent resides or transacts business. The Board shall retain a discretionary right to review the action of the designated division, member, or hearing examiner, upon its own initiative or upon petition of any party in such case, within such time and in such manner as the Board shall prescribe by rules or regulations. The vote of a majority of the members of the Board less one member thereof shall be sufficient to bring any such case before the Board for review. If the Board declines to review any such case, or if no review is sought within the time prescribed by the regulations of the Board, then the action of the division of the Board, the member of the Board, or the hearing examiner shall, for all purposes, be considered to be the action of the Board.

(e) Any member of the Board, or any hearing examiner or other employee designated by the Board for such purposes, may administer oaths.

(f) Orders and other process and papers of the Board may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Board shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(g) All process of any court to which application is made under this section may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

(h) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Board, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Board.

(i) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Board, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

JUDICIAL REVIEW AND ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 9. (a) Any party aggrieved by an order of the Board issued under section 8 may obtain a review of such order in the United States court of appeals for the judicial circuit in which the violation of section 4 or the regulations promulgated thereunder was alleged to have occurred; or in the case of a party other than the Administrator in the United States court of appeals for the judicial circuit in which the person alleged to have committed such violation resides or transacts business, or in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified or set aside. If such petition is not filed by the Administrator, a copy thereof shall forthwith be served upon him. The Board shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding before the Board, including the testimony and other evidence upon which the order of the Board was entered and the findings and order of the Board.

(b) If no petition for review is filed within thirty days, the Board shall forthwith file a copy of the order of the Board in the United States court of appeals for the judicial circuit wherein the violation of section 4 or the regulations promulgated thereunder was alleged to have occurred or where a respondent named in the order resides or transacts business and the court shall cause notice of the filing to be served upon each respondent. Within fifteen days of such service any respondent may file objections to the order, and the court shall thereupon proceed in the manner provided by subsection (c) as if a petition for review had been filed under subsection (a). If objections are not filed within fifteen days of such service, the clerk of said court, unless otherwise ordered by the court, shall forthwith enter a decree enforcing the order of the Board.

(c) Upon the filing of a petition for review under subsection (a), the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act. The court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon the respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board.

(d) No objection that has not been urged before the Board shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

(e) The findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

(f) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Board, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Board and to be made a part of the transcript.

(g) The Board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

(h) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

(i) The judicial council of each circuit may designate any area within its circuit as one which is so distant from the places of the terms of the court of appeals for such circuit that the holding at such places of proceedings under this section in cases arising within such area or involving persons residing or transacting business within such area might result in substantial hardship to any of the parties (other than the Administrator or Board). The court of appeals for such circuit, upon application of any party (other than the Administrator or Board) in any such case and upon a finding that substantial hardship would result to such party because of the distance from such area to the places designated for holding terms of such court of appeals, may transfer the proceedings to an appropriate district court within such circuit. Upon any such transfer, the district court shall have jurisdiction to consider and dispose of the proceeding in accordance with the provisions of subsections (c) to (g), inclusive, and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that any party aggrieved thereby may obtain a review thereof by such court of appeals by filing in such court a written petition therefor within thirty days following the entry of such judgment and decree.

(j) The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Board's order.

TEMPORARY INJUNCTIONS OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF PENDING DECISIONS BY THE BOARD

SEC. 10. In any case in which the Administrator has issued a complaint against a person subject to this Act, the Administrator may apply to any district court for the district in which the violation of section 4 or the regulations promulgated thereunder was alleged to have occurred, or in which the person subject to this Act against whom such complaint was issued resides or transacts business, for a restraining order, temporary injunction, or other temporary relief for the restraint of such violation pending the decision of the Board. The district court to which such application is made shall have jurisdiction, in conformity with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to grant such restraining order, temporary injunction, or other temporary relief as it deems just and proper to prevent irreparable injury to rights protected by this Act.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 11. (a) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order under sections 9 and 10, or when making and entering a decree or order enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Board under section 9, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115).

(b) Petitions filed under section 9, and applications filed under sections 8(c) and 10, shall be heard expeditiously.

ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 12. The President is authorized to take action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within Federal agencies with the policies of this Act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within Federal agencies prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this Act. The provisions of sections 9 and 10 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Board under section 8 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or any officer or employee thereof. The Board may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

GOOD-FAITH DEFENSE

SEC. 13. In any action or proceeding based on any alleged violation of section 4, no person shall be subject to any liability for or on account of any act or omission if he pleads and proves that such act or omission was in good faith, in conformity with, and in reliance on any written interpretation of the Administrator, notwithstanding that after such act or omission such interpretation or opinion is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The provisions of this Act shall not apply to any person with respect to the employment of aliens outside any State.

(b) The provisions of this Act shall not apply to any religious organization with respect to employment practices or policies based upon religion.

VETERANS PREFERENCE LAWS

SEC. 15. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify any law of the United States or of any State creating special rights or preference for veterans.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 16. (a) Except as provided in section 19, nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as limiting the rights, privileges, duties, or obligations, or barring the remedies, of any person under any other Federal law, or the laws of any State, or the ordinances of any subdivision of any State (other than any provisions of any such laws which purport to require or permit the doing of any act which is in conflict with this Act or with the regulations promulgated thereunder), providing for equal employment opportunity or prohibiting discrimination in employment, on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

(b) Where there is a State or local agency which has effective power to eliminate and prohibit discrimination in employment in any cases covered by this Act, and the Administrator determines the agency is exercising such power, the Administrator shall seek written agreements with the State or local agency under which the Administrator shall refrain from issuing a complaint in any such case or class of cases referred to in such agreement. The Administrator shall rescind any such agreement when he determines such agency no longer has such power, or is no longer effectively exercising such power.

(c) Such agreements shall provide for the payment by the Administrator, either by reimbursement or otherwise, of one-half of the expenses incurred by such contracting State or local agency in performing functions which would otherwise be performed by the Administrator.

FORCIBLY RESISTING THE ADMINISTRATOR, THE BOARD, OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 17. The provisions of section 111, title 18, United States Code, shall apply to officers, agents, and employees of the Administrator or the Board.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 18. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

REPEAL OF TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

SEC. 19. (a) Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 253 et seq.) is hereby repealed, except for the purposes specified herein.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the validity of any order, determination, rule, regulation, or agreement issued or made by the Attorney General or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, established by section 705 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, (1) which serves as the basis of any agreement for voluntary compliance with title VII of such Act or any civil action or criminal proceeding instituted under title VII of such Act and (2) which shall be valid at the time sections 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 of this Act shall take effect.

(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the validity of (1) any civil actions or criminal proceedings instituted under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prior to the time sections 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 of this Act shall take effect which were valid at the time instituted, or (2) any finding, determination, order, fine, or sentence made or imposed as part of any judgment rendered in any such civil action or criminal proceeding. Any such civil action or criminal proceeding which is pending at the time sections 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 of this Act shall take effect shall be continued by the aggrieved person, or the Attorney General (either on behalf of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or the United States), or the United States attorney for any judicial district of the United States, as the case may be, proceedings therein had, appeals therein taken, and judgments therein rendered, in accordance with the law in effect when such civil action or criminal proceeding was instituted.

(d) Proceedings pending before the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and endeavors by it to achieve voluntary compliance pending at the time sections 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 of this Act shall take effect shall, insofar as such proceedings or endeavors relate to activities which would constitute violations of section 4 of this Act had such section been effective thereto when such activities occurred, be continued, in the discretion of the Administrator, by investigation or persuasion and conciliation by the Administrator and thereupon by proceedings in accordance with the other provisions of this Act, including section 6(e).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 20. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 21. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

(b) The provisions of sections 4 (and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Administrator), 6, 8, 9, and 10 shall take effect six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) The President shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this Act, convene one or more conferences for the purpose of enabling the leaders of groups whose members will be affected by this Act to become familiar with the rights afforded and obligations imposed by its provisions, and for the purpose of making plans which will result in the fair and effective administration of this Act when all of its provisions become effective. The President shall invite the participation in such conference or conferences of (1) the members of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, (2) the members of the Commission on Civil Rights, (3) representatives of State agencies engaged in furthering equal employment opportunity, (4) representatives of private agencies engaged in furthering equal employment opportunity, and (5) representatives of employers, Government contractors, Federal agencies, labor organizations, and employment agencies which are subject to this Act.

S. 3078. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which relates to equal employment opportunity, to prohibit certain unlawful employment practices committed by States or political subdivisions of a State.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VII of Public Law 88-352 (the Civil Rights Act of 1964) is amended as follows:

(a) Add a new paragraph to section 701 (a) as follows: "The term 'governmental unit' means a State or a political subdivision thereof or an agency of one or more States or political subdivisions."

(b) Amend so much of section 701(b) as appears before the word "*Provided*" to read as follows: "The term 'employer' means: (1) a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has twenty-five or more employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, but such term does not include (i) the United States, a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or an Indian tribe, (ii) a bona fide membership club (other than a labor organization) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; (2) a governmental unit and any agent of such governmental unit:"

(c) Add the words "or governmental unit" following the word "person" wherever it appears in section 701(c).

(d) Delete the phrase "or an agency of a State or political subdivision of a State," from section 701(c).

(e) Add a comma and the following language after the word "charge" on line 9 of section 706(e): "unless the respondent is a State."

(f) Insert the words "or governmental unit" in section 707(a) following the word "persons" on lines 2 and 12 of such subsection.

(g) Insert the words "for or in the name of the United States" following the word "action" on line 6 of section 707(a).

(h) Insert the words "or governmental unit" following the word "person" on line 4 of section 709(a) on lines 1 and 5 of section 710(c) and on lines 2 and 7 of section 713(b).

The fact sheet presented by Mr. Clark is as follows:

FACT SHEET ON S. 1937, 88TH CONGRESS, AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

I. COVERAGE

(a) Covers all employers having eight or more employees in businesses affecting commerce as well as labor organizations, joint conferences, general committees, joint boards affiliated with labor organizations and joint labor-management committees controlling apprenticeship and other training programs. It also extends to Government contractors (including contractors under all federally assisted programs), Federal agencies, employment agencies, including U.S. Employment Service and affiliated State employment services.

(b) Total number of employees covered—40 million. Total number of employers subject to the act—700,000.

II. EXCLUSIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

Excluded are States and political subdivisions of States.

Exempted are (1) religious organizations with respect to employment practices based upon religion and (2) U.S. employers employing citizens of foreign countries in foreign lands.

III. PROHIBITED PRACTICES

The bill provides that no person subject to the act may refuse or deny equal employment opportunity to any individual because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Equal employment opportunity is defined to include equal treatment with respect to all of the incidents of employment. The term is defined on the broadest possible basis, including recruitment, advertising, and methods of recruitment, referrals for employment, apprenticeship training and other educational opportunity for or in employment, equality of access of facilities and services provided in employment and equality of participation in membership in employee organizations and labor organizations.

IV. ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

(a) Administration:

1. A Presidentially appointed administrator, confirmed by the Senate, directs the administration of the statute. The Administrator is located within the structure of the Department of Labor and serves within the general supervision of the Secretary of Labor.

2. The Administrator is responsible for the investigation and prosecution of violations of the statute. Investigations must be undertaken on the basis of probable cause whether or not charges are filed.

3. The statute emphasizes conciliation as the principal means for settling cases involving violations of the standards of the statute.

(b) Adjudication of formal complaints:

1. If persuasion and conciliation fail, the Administrator files a formal complaint with an Equal Employment Opportunity Board, an independent agency consisting of five Commissioners appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for terms of 5 years.

2. The Board hears and decides all complaint cases presented to it by the Administrator with authority to issue broad remedial orders to remedy violations which it finds.

3. The Board also has the responsibility to review all regulations issued by the Administrator and upon application by an aggrieved party, may review actions of the Administrator in failing or refusing to investigate a charge or to issue a complaint on a charge whenever it is alleged that the Administrator acted arbitrarily or capriciously.

(c) Judicial review: The decisions of the Equal Employment Opportunity Board are reviewed by the U.S. courts of appeals on application of an aggrieved party or of the Administrator or are enforced upon application of the Board.

V. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIP

(a) State fair employment practice laws will operate concurrently with the Federal law.

(b) The Administrator, however, is directed to enter into agreements with State or local agencies having fair employment practice programs under which the Administrator agrees, (1) to suspend enforcement of the Federal act in the categories covered by the agreement and (2) to pay to the State or local agency 50 percent of the costs of performing the functions which would have been performed by the Administrator in the absence of such agreement.

VI. EFFECTIVE DATE

The bill provides that its substantive provisions shall become effective 6 months after the date of enactment.

AIR PARCEL POST TO SERVICEMEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to set uniform rates for packages mailed air parcel post from anywhere in the United States to American servicemen in Vietnam.

The effect of this proposed legislation would be to reduce mailing costs from States outside the lowest cost zone to the minimum rate level in force in that zone.

Our servicemen who are fighting and dying in Vietnam come from all over the United States—there is no single section of the country which is favored or discriminated against. The sacrifice that their families make—parents, wives, children—is equally great in California and in Pennsylvania; location makes no difference in that regard. Why is it then that we permit discrimination in our postal laws which results in the fact that it costs $6.28 more to mail a 20-pound parcel to Vietnam from Pennsylvania than from California? This inequity should be removed—we should have equal rates to our GI's in Vietnam.

I have received numerous complaints from wives and mothers in Pennsylvania about the high cost of sending parcels to relatives in the Armed Forces in Vietnam. In one letter which I received, a mother in Philadelphia wrote:

> I have just returned from the post office to send my son in Vietnam a little package from home and it cost me the outrageous price of $23 and as a widow of a veteran I cannot afford it; and yet I cannot refuse my son a small token from home.

That same package, had it been mailed from California, could have been sent for $9 less. If this bill is adopted—and I hope it will be given swift approval—the same low rate now in force in California would apply all over the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 10 days for the addition of the names of any Senators who may wish to join as cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 3079) relating to rates of postage on airmail parcel post mailed to or by members of the Armed Forces in overseas combat areas, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8 OF REVISED ORGANIC ACT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to amend section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation would amend the Virgin Islands Organic Act in two ways:

First. The first amendment deletes words from the present law which authorize the issuance of bonds to finance the economic development of the Virgin Islands. No such bonds have been issued, but at one time the territorial legislature authorized a bond issue for hotel and related economic development. The Governor did not issue the bonds, and litigation is now pending in the courts. This type of financing is probably unwise and unnecessary. The enactment of the amendment, however, is not intended to affect the outcome of the pending litigation.

Second. The second amendment raises the ceiling on the amount of bonds that may be outstanding at any one time from $10 to $30 million, but provides that not more than $10 million may be outstanding for projects other than water or power projects. The exceptions from the ceiling cover bonds that were issued by the territorial government to finance the construction of some college dormitories and that were purchased by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The exceptions from the ceiling also cover obligations issued by the territorial government as security for the purchase price of water and power facilities that were purchased by the territorial government from the United States. The exceptions will also cover obligations to secure additional purchases of property by the territorial government from the United States that are planned for the near future.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3080) to amend section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT RELATING TO IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS FOR EXCEEDING PRODUCTION QUOTAS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to impose sanctions against its members for exceeding production quotas.

A great deal of enlightened legislation has been passed to insure that working men and women will have good working conditions and will be paid a good day's pay for a good day's work. The progress that has been achieved in this area has also been effected through the growth and activities of the union movement. We still have not solved all of our problems, but we have gone a long way in aiding our working men and women. Now, however, we are beginning to go full circle; and we are facing a situation where we cannot ask for a good day's work for a good day's pay. Under the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, a union can fine its members who choose to produce more than the production quotas imposed by the union.

To me, this makes no sense. Men are naturally active and productive. They want to do a good day's work for a good day's pay. They want to do the best they can to progress as a result of their labors and not be held back by arbitrary regulations designed to achieve a mediocre performance. We have only to look around us if we want to see the results of man's activity and productiveness.

Today we have the highest standard of living that the world has known. No other nation has matched this. This record is a worthy testament to the countless individuals who have worked to build, and would like to continue to build a truly, great society.

My bill would assist those who would like to work for an even better standard of living. It would, of course, not require that each do his best. That is up to each individual employee. But it would assure each employee that he can work to the best of his ability, if he wishes, and that he will not be held back by arbitrary union quotas. This, I think, is only fair—fair to employees, employers, and union organizations.

Mr. President, I feel sure the working men and women of this country will support this bill. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will do likewise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for one week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 3081) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to impose sanctions against its members for exceeding production quotas, introduced by Mr. Dominick, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL AMATEUR RADIO WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record and appropriately referred a joint resolution relative to the amateur ham operators and a proposed proclamation that the week beginning April 17, 1966, be set aside as the National Amateur Radio Week in recognition of the many contributions of amateur radio operators and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 145) to authorize the designation of 7-day period beginning April 17, 1966, as National Amateur Radio Week, introduced by Mr. Saltonstall, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 145

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Whereas over two hundred and fifty thousand Americans are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission as amateur radio operators, and

Whereas these amateur radio operators have served their fellow Americans on countless occasions in times of crisis, such as floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, earthquakes, and power failures, by relaying information and summoning medical and other assistance, and

Whereas our amateur radio operators are a vital element in our Civil Defense network, rendering valuable assistance to Civil Defense personnel in times of emergency or natural disaster, and

Whereas our amateur radio operators are a potent force for international understanding and good will among all people, opening up channels of communication and information across the oceans and the continents, and

Whereas the National Convention of Amateur Radio Operators of America will this year convene in Boston, Mass., on April 22-24: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the seven-day period beginning April 17, 1966, as National Amateur Radio Week in recognition of the many contributions of amateur radio operators, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2837 to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, so as to prevent the loss of veteran pension benefits as the result of increases in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965, the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the special school milk bill, S. 2921, the names of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 130, to provide for the designation of National School Safety Patrol Week, my name may be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the Senate Joint Resolution 12, the district plan for amending the Constitution with respect to the electoral college, the name of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

Authority of February 28, 1966:

S. 2992. A bill to authorize the use of foreign currencies to finance family planning programs in friendly foreign nations, and for other purposes: Mr. McGee, Mr. Moss, and Mr. Simpson.

S. 2993. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and to private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs: Mr. McGee, Mr. Moss, and Mr. Simpson.

Authority of March 2, 1966:

S. 3006. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 so as to prohibit the use for political purposes of certain funds collected by labor organizations from their members, and for other purposes: Mr. Bennett, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Thurmond.

S. 3012. A bill to provide grants to the States for the strengthening of adult educational programs: Mr. Cannon, Mr. Clark, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Tydings.

Authority of March 7, 1966:

S. 3046. A bill to strengthen and improve programs for assistance for our elementary and secondary schools: Mr. McGee.

S. 3047. A bill to strengthen and improve public and private programs of assistance for institutions of higher education and students attending them: Mr. McGee.

Authority of March 4, 1966:

S. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to make a full and complete study and investigation of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and to submit to the Senate and House a report of its study and investigation together with any recommendations for amendments on or before August 1, 1966: Mr. Allott.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON INTERNATIONAL CENTER LEGISLATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations has scheduled a hearing on S. 2710 on Friday, March 25. This bill would authorize the Federal Government to acquire property in a designated area in the northwest section of the District of Columbia to provide a site for the headquarters of the Organization of American States and sites for governments of foreign countries.

The hearing will be before a special subcommittee comprised of Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senator MORSE, Senator SYMINGTON, Senator CLARK, Senator AIKEN, and Senator CASE.

It will be held at 10:00 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYS, Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. BROOMFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 12889) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ASSESSING THE COST OF MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the proposal to assess the cost of meat inspection to the packing plants to whom this service is rendered has developed a number of editorial comments, particularly in the Midwest and the Western press. There was published in the February 14 issue of the Chicago Sun Times an editorial on this subject, and still another editorial in the Chicago Tribune on February 14.

I ask unanimous consent to have both these editorials printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun Times, Feb. 14, 1966]

PAYING FOR MEAT INSPECTION

Since 1906, all meat moving in interstate commerce must pass Federal inspection. The Government employs about 3,400 inspectors who examine all meat processed in some 1,740 establishments in 720 cities. This inspection is intended to protect the health of the general public and to guarantee the quality of American meat anywhere in the world.

The meat inspectors work for the Government and are paid by it the same as other Federal employees who police drugs, foods, railroads, radio and TV, the stock market, and other industries. One year, 1947, swayed by economy arguments, Congress passed the cost of Federal inspection along to the meatpacking industry. But after 1 year of experience, Congress reverted to the traditional practice of paying representatives of the public out of the Public Treasury.

Last month, at the request of the administration, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, introduced S. 2820 which would revert to the short-lived 1947 practice. The administration argues that this would save the Government $40 million a year. Some industries, such as the seafood industry, do pay for Federal inspection but it is voluntary; it is requested by them. Meat inspection is compulsory.

All taxpayers favor Government economy. But economy should not be practiced at the sacrifice of principle. Compulsory meat inspection can be justified only if it is in the interest of the general public, not just the meat-buying public. It then falls in the category of a public health measure. When the first meat inspection bill was passed in 1906, public against private financing of its provisions was argued. It is as true now as it was true then, as one Congressman of that time argued, "No government has the right to legislate in the interests of the people and then require some special interest to bear the burden of executing its legislation."

The 1906 Congress turned down the suggestion that those inspected pay the costs of inspection because such an arrangement would "discredit the inspector and cast suspicion upon it." It is a felony for a meatpacker to pay an inspector directly or indirectly to influence him. The administration suggests that the packer can pay indirectly and the operation remain above suspicion. The meat inspection department has a fine record for honesty and efficiency. For $40 million a year it is worth the cost to keep it that way.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Feb. 14, 1966]

ANOTHER MEAT AX?

If President Johnson has his way, the cost of paying the Federal inspector who puts his stamp of approval on the steak the housewife puts on her broiler will be borne by the meatpackers and processors and not the Federal Government.

Except for 1947, the appropriation for Federal meat inspection has been an item of the Federal budget since inspection began in 1906. In his budget message, Mr. Johnson proposed to shift this cost to the meat industry. A bill embodying the change is now before the Senate agricultural committee and the meat industry is in full cry to kill it on the ground that requiring the meat industry to pay for being inspected is not in the public interest.

This is the position taken jointly by the American Meat Institute, the National Independent Meat Packers Association, the Western States Meat Packers Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and virtually every other major meat, live stock, and farm group. Even the National Farmers Union, which generally flies the house flag of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, has lined up against the bill.

At first blush, it might appear that the administration had found a reasonable budget item to cut. If inspection of meat redounded only to the benefit of the meat industry it might well be expected that industry should pick up the tab.

But Federal meat inspection did not come into being at the request of the meatpackers. Inspection started as an essential public health service, to protect the public. It has been so regarded in every debate in Congress since the first inspection bill was approved in 1906, even while the cost of the service mounted. For the 1967 budget the cost is estimated at $42 million.

"It is wrong in principle and contrary to the public interest when a regulatory agency of the Government is paid for by the industry it regulates," said a statement by leaders of the meat industry.

If Federal inspection of meat is essential to public health, as Congress has repeatedly maintained, then the cost of this service would seem to be a legitimate charge of Government. Asking the meat industry to pay for its own inspection makes as much sense as taxing the railroads to support the Interstate Commerce Commission which regulates them.

B. CARROLL REECE ON SETTLING INTERNATIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for 25 years or more, B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, served in the House of Representatives, and I regarded him as a longtime personal friend. He also served as chairman of the Republican National Committee and filled that position with honor and distinction.

In the course of his public service, he became vastly interested in a basis for the settlement of international differences between the East and the West and made this the object of a series of speeches and statements which were delivered in the years from 1956 to 1960. These have been collected and edited by his widow, Louise G. Reece, who succeeded her distinguished husband in the Congress. The book deals with an area which is the very center of the partition of Germany and Europe and the confrontation scene of Soviet and free world power.

To this series of speeches and statements Mrs. Reece has given the title "Peace Through Law," and it is published by Longhouse, Inc. In connection with these remarks, I want to include a somewhat more expanded statement which was prepared by the editor of the Steuben News in New York at the request of the National Council of the Steuben Society of America of which Mr. Ward Lange is the national chairman. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have these additional remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As to its content, Mr. Reece begins with a statement on East Prussia, enlarges the theme by statements on other areas of Germany now under Red Polish and Soviet Russian administration, remarks about the legally different position of the Sudeten land, and finally envisages a general settlement to include the border countries from Finland to the Black Sea, west of the Soviet Russian legal boundary; that is, before Stalin—much like Hitler—went on a rampage of lawless expansion by aggression and subversion.

The compilation in a single volume of the speeches and statements is a particularly happy thought for which Mrs. Reece is to be commended, and its publication at this hour is most timely. The title of the book indicates its tenor. A lasting peace will never be found by trifling with truth, juggling with facts, and sweeping ugly problems under the rug. It cannot be built on the quicksand of expediency. It must have the firm basis of international law and justice.

The five chapters reveal a wealth of information, little known and frequently overlooked facts. Each East German province is individually treated as Mr. Reece presents the case for their return into German administration: Pomerania has been part of Germany for 800 years; the boundaries of Silesia and East Prussia with Poland have stood unchanged for 600 and, respectively, 500 years (pp. 27, 29–30). Defeated in World War I, Germany was forced to cede to Poland the province of Posen, most of West Prussia, part of Upper Silesia, and one county of East Prussia; 1.5 million Germans domiciled in the ceded area were turned over to alien rule while only a negligible number of Poles remained within the German borders (pp. 35 and 38).

The basis of Germany's title to the East German provinces in accordance with present-day international law is lawfully spelled out (pp. 45–50) and the legal position of Berlin is likewise explained (pp. 98–100). The great principles of U.S. foreign policy applying to this crucial question are cited and forcefully expounded. No responsible statesman will disregard those principles and go unchallenged (pp. 50–60). The early testimony of our sixth President, John Quincy Adams, and a statement in the 1920's of the hero of Polish liberation, Josef Pilsudski, attesting to the German character of Silesia and East Prussia respectively, is quoted (pp. 32–33 and 104–105). Mr. Reece also calls to our attention the fantastic demands after World War II of Polish (Soviet inspired) chauvinists claiming all of Germany east of the Elbe and bridgeheads west of that river around Hamburg, Magdeburg, and Dresden (pp. 37–38).

Mr. Reece points to an interesting lesson of history: Only a peace treaty which restores the "status quo ante" and refrains from stealing the land of a defeated nation can have a more nearly lasting effect. In this connection he mentions the Westphalian Treaty of 1648 and the Treaty of Vienna and Paris in 1815, the latter ending the Napoleonic wars of conquest in Europe by not taking one square foot of pre-Napoleonic France (pp. 102–104). He then quotes from the prophetic warnings of the South African Statesman Jan Smuts and the American Scholar-Diplomat Archibald Coolidge against the consequences of injustices about to be imposed upon the defeated Germans in the treaties ending World War I (pp. 34, 36–37, and 75–76).

Mr. Reece suggests a realistic solution of the Eastern problem along the line in which the same problem has been satisfactorily solved on Germany's western boundaries and also perhaps with the Jewish nation of Israel (pp. 67–68 and 109–110). Finally he pleads that we make the rule of law the kernel of U.S. foreign policy and, thus, unfold a banner around which many nations and all men of good will can unite, and which by its very moral strength will make American leadership in the world a reality (pp. 111–112).

Our policymakers will be well advised to weigh these words of one of the most highly respected legislators of our time, the true American patriot, Carroll Reece.

L.B.J. MODERATION IN VIETNAM WAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, Roscoe Drummond, the nationally syndicated columnist, paid a richly earned tribute to the moderation and restraint of the Johnson administration in waging the terribly trying and difficult war in Vietnam.

Mr. Drummond concludes, in referring to President Johnson:

> And to make it least likely that Red China will enter the war, he is not using U.S. air power to bomb cities in the north; not sending U.S. ground troops to occupy North Vietnam; not seeking the downfall of the Hanoi regime; not asking for the unconditional surrender of Hanoi. He is asking only for an unconditional end to aggression against its neighbor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Roscoe Drummond be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOOD WORD FOR L.B.J.

(By Roscoe Drummond)

I would like to say a good word about President Johnson's management of the Vietnam war. Obviously there is a great risk of timidly doing too little to arrest the aggression and a great danger of recklessly doing so much that Red China enters the fighting.

With these two opposite perils in mind, I cannot escape the feeling that many more Americans will come to see that the President is bringing wisdom, caution and determination to bear on the conduct of the war.

Surely the touchstone of wisdom in our role in Vietnam is to do whatever is needed to secure South Vietnam from conquest and to use our massive military power in such a prudent and measured manner that Peiping is given no legitimate reason to enter the war.

Such a course will not get the easy plaudits of those who want to win quickly at any cost by bombing North Vietnam to bits; will not get the praise of those who want to quit at any cost by pulling out; and will not get a high Gallup rating from those who suggest we haven't the resources to defend South Vietnam and that, anyway, a little aggression in southeast Asia is no concern to the United States.

As these conflicting views find their level in public opinion, I believe that the Nation, on reflection, will feel even more reassured that Gen. Curtis Lemay is not deciding the bombing over North Vietnam, that Senator WAYNE MORSE is not managing the defense of South Vietnam and that Senator FULBRIGHT is not deciding where aggression concerns the United States and where it doesn't.

During the period when he was determining how the mounting attacks directed from Hanoi should be met, President Johnson—as reported by Charles Roberts in his book, "L.B.J.'s Inner Circle"—remarked to his intimates: "I'm not going north with Curtis Lemay, and I'm not going south with WAYNE MORSE."

Fortunately, the President is not easily pressured either by events or by extremist advice.

He did not act hastily, but deliberately; not recklessly, but with great care; not timidly—he committed the United States to do whatever is necessary to defend South Vietnam successfully, but no more.

These ingredients of mind have marked the President's course in Vietnam: deliberateness, prudence, and determination.

They have produced a clear and properly limited objective: to keep South Vietnam from being taken over by force.

And to make it least likely that Red China will enter the war, he is not using U.S. air power to bomb cities in the North; not sending U.S. ground troops to occupy North Vietnam; not seeking the downfall of the Hanoi regime; not asking for the unconditional surrender of Hanoi. He is asking only for an unconditional end to aggression against its neighbor.

SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK WINNING RICHLY DESERVED POPULAR SUPPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, few public officials occupy a post as subject to criticism as the Secretary of State. One has only to recall the ordeal of Dean Acheson, or the drumfire of criticism directed at John Foster Dulles, as examples of the abuse visited upon a Secretary of State.

Dean Rusk is no exception. He has now occupied his great office longer than any man in this century except for Cordell Hull and John Foster Dulles. He has occupied it in the middle of a trying period in American foreign relations, throughout one of the most distant, difficult to understand, and frustrating wars in our history.

He has become the No. 1 security officer of our Government—a position no other Secretary of State has so clearly occupied. He has crisply and cleanly defined our cause in South Vietnam.

He finally appears to be emerging as a Secretary of State who can do something rarely achieved in our history; namely, he is winning popular support. If this is so, Mr. President, Dean Rusk richly deserves it.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article written by Carl Rowan discussing this new public appreciation of Mr. Rusk be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSK EMERGES AS A PERSONALITY

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Adversity has done for Secretary of State Dean Rusk what 5 years of prodding by his advisers failed to do.

The ordeal of congressional and press criticisms on the Vietnam issue has drawn Rusk out to the point where he is developing a public image. He seems suddenly to be acquiring the reputation of a man who has strong and laudable convictions.

His recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has pulled in what State Department officials say is the largest volume of mail ever received on a single event—with the exception of the announcement of the fatal illness of John Foster Dulles.

I examined hundreds of the letters, which are running 10 to 1 in Rusk's favor, and they clearly indicate that Rusk emerged from the hearing as a personality with whom the public could identify.

Previously he has been regarded as so lackluster, so unassertive, that even after 5 years in office most Americans did not identify him with any aspect of foreign policy.

But the recent mail praises his "great knowledge, deep understanding—and tremendous patience." It calls him "a wonderful partner to our boys in Vietnam." It says Rusk was "forceful and made sense." A housewife in Winnetka, Ill., stated the essence of hundreds of the letters about his testimony by writing on a postcard: "Never in all my life have I been so proud to be an American."

One of Rusk's aids asked proudly: "Would you ever have believed the public would write letters like these to Dean Rusk? The Secretary has finally won the people's confidence."

It is risky to try to read too much into the flow of mail from the public. One of Rusk's main antagonists in those hearings, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, says his mail has been overwhelmingly favorable, too.

Yet, the mail to Rusk must have meaning because it is so unprecedented. And this will surely enhance his position with President Johnson, who only recently reiterated the view that "Rusk sits first in the Cabinet and he is first with me."

Because the President has a strong aversion to criticism, some observers speculate that he has embraced Rusk all the harder because of attacks on the Secretary and predictions that he will be replaced.

If there is anything that the President reacts more strongly to than criticism, it is praise; so these public tributes are likely to put Rusk in the strongest position he has been in since 1961.

In fact, last Friday's Presidential decree giving Rusk unprecedented authority over all U.S. Government activities in the foreign policy field was a bigger vote of confidence than anything the President has said.

The President is known to hold some of the same misgivings about the State Department as an institution that caused the late President Kennedy to throw his hands up in disgust.

The President apparently believes that Rusk can effectively alter a situation where Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, the Pentagon, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the U.S. Information Agency each exercises a degree of initiative and autonomy in foreign policy matters.

Some have acted more independently than others. Thus the fighting in Vietnam could be labeled "McNamara's war," after the Defense Secretary. Thus the view can be widely held abroad that the CIA is overthrowing governments without State Department knowledge and is generally pursuing its own foreign policy.

However, the initiative of some departments and agencies was laudable in the sense that they could act speedily without the interminable delays so often imposed by State's bureaucracy.

The new system promises a speedy and systematic hearing for other agencies, with the Under Secretary of State empowered to make and execute immediate decisions. The other agencies would have the right to appeal to "higher authority," which really means the President.

If Rusk's stature in Johnson's eyes is as high as it now seems to be, there will be few successful appeals.

And if Rusk is now as boldly assertive as some letterwriters think, the Secretary of State will really be running American foreign policy. That, to his credit or discredit, is just how it ought to be.

NATIONAL DAIRY COUNCIL OPPOSES CUTS IN SCHOOL MILK, LUNCH PROGRAMS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, since I began my fight to save the special milk program for schoolchildren from virtual extinction, I have received literally hundreds of letters of support for my efforts. Many of these letters have provided me with a demonstration of just how disastrous an 80-percent cut in the school milk program would be. Whenever possible, I have quoted schoolteachers, parents, and administrators to show the devastating impact which the proposed slash could have.

Just last week, the National Dairy Council indicated its opposition to the proposed cutback. Although I am sure that this comes as no great surprise to my colleagues, I think that the resolution passed by the National Dairy Council deserves careful consideration. The National Dairy Council was one of the prime movers behind the school lunch and special milk programs. In its role of sponsoring nutrition research and education programs in cooperation with recognized health leaders, it has made a great contribution to the work being done in this area.

In its resolution the National Dairy Council commends the Government, for proposing to extend the health benefits of the school lunch and special milk programs to all needy children. However, it then goes on to say that the nutritionally needy are found at all economic levels. In other words, that it is impossible to determine the need for "nature's perfect food" on the basis of a parent's income alone.

I would like to read into the RECORD one paragraph of the resolution which, in my estimation, beautifully states the case for a continuation and expansion of the school milk program on nutritional grounds.

> America's children, regardless of economic status, are the hope for the Nation's future. We must strive to make the children of today healthy and strong, better prepared to build a stronger nation tomorrow. This cannot be done through false economies. It can be done through assistance to improve their nutritional health and well-being by extending the educational values of school lunch and special milk programs to reach all of the Nation's children.

Mr. President, too little notice has been taken of the fact that the administration's Child Nutrition Act will lower rather then raise the nutritional standards of our Nation's schoolchildren. The National Dairy Council's resolution makes this point abundantly clear, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY NATIONAL DAIRY COUNCIL ON PROPOSED BUDGET APPROPRIATION FOR 1966–67 SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

National Dairy Council commends the proposals, in the proposed 1966–67 Federal Government budget, to extend the proven health benefits of the school lunch and special milk programs to all needy children. We recommend, however, that determination of need be arrived at in terms of nutrition and health, rather than in terms of economics alone. The nutritionally needy are found at all economic levels.

America's children, regardless of economic status, are the hope for the Nation's future. We must strive to make the children of today healthy and strong, better prepared to build a stronger nation tomorrow. This cannot be done through false economies. It can be done through assistance to improve their nutritional health and well-being by extending the educational values of school lunch and special milk programs to reach all of the Nation's children.

National Dairy Council strongly opposes certain contemplated reductions of $14.5 million in the school lunch program, and as much as $82 million in the special milk program. The proposed reductions represent a retreat from the well-established concept of the programs as a means to further sound nutrition education for all children.

The proposed budget reductions are inconsistent with the goal established by the 1946 School Lunch Act which, in its declaration of policy, describes school lunch "as a measure of national security to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children." The same philosophy has been applied in the special milk program. In a statement in connection with this program, the U.S. Department of Agriculture said, in 1965: "Whenever or wherever it's (milk) served; the goal is the same—to put abundant supplies of U.S. dairy products to good use boosting the nutritional quality of our children's diets."

When viewed in proper perspective with the proposed total national budget, the proposed budget for the war on poverty or the proposed budget for foreign aid, the contemplated dollar savings are incalculably small. Offsetting them would be the irretrievable loss to the nutritional health and well-being of the great majority of the Nation's children, at a critical time when the Nation needs to give all possible assistance to help them develop into healthy and strong men and women.

MODERNIZING OUR OLDER HOSPITALS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the President's message on domestic health and education certainly indicates that he intends no slackening in our efforts to improve the health of every American. I am particularly pleased that the administration has endorsed a major drive to promote the modernization of our older hospitals through a program of Federal grants and loans.

I introduced such proposed legislation as far back as the 87th Congress. The need is critical. There are an estimated 260,000 hospital beds in this country that are obsolete. Hospital capacity equivalent to 13,000 beds becomes obsolete each and every year we wait.

The need is especially pressing in our urban areas. In these areas we have hospital facilities that are much the same as they were 50 or 60 years ago. These are our teaching and research hospitals. Thus, their deterioration affects not only the medical care of the patients they serve, but the medical care of the entire Nation as well.

My own State of Pennsylvania is a good example the magnitude of urban hospital obsolescence. The State government has estimated that in 1966, hospital capacity equivalent to more than 25,000 beds is in need of modernization. Of this amount nearly 21,000 beds are in the State's 12 major urban areas.

Over the past 19 years, the Hill-Burton program has been very successful in meeting a large part of the need for hospital facilities where we had none, particularly in rural areas and small towns. Because it has been so successful we now can turn our efforts to rebuilding and renewing the health care facilities and we already have.

The heart of the proposed modernization program is a financing mechanism that is new to hospital construction—the amortization grant. Under this system, the Federal Government will pay up to 40 percent of the principal and interest on loans secured by hospital from private lenders. This will be a tremendous lever and will stimulate construction many times greater than the Federal contribution. The Surgeon General can also make the loans where none are available from private sources.

Another important part of the program is an expansion of Federal research on health care. This will make available to our hospitals the most up-to-date information on good hospital design and organization.

We certainly cannot afford to wait any longer in initiating this important hospital modernization program. Hospital costs have been increasing at a rate of from 5 to 7 percent a year for the past 20 years. The average cost of general hospital care in the country is now about $42 per person, per day. We can only hope to hold back these rising costs by modernizing obsolete facilities and making them more efficient to operate. We must also step up our research to find better and more efficient ways to provide health care.

Mr. President, I hope that Congress will act quickly on this program to modernize our hospitals. We have waited too long already. The need grows more acute each day.

AUTOMATION AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, some days ago Congress received the report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. When we consider the monumental mandate which Congress laid before the Commission when it began its work only a year ago, I am doubly impressed by their efforts. The findings and recommendations of the Commission deserve serious congressional exploration and consideration.

Its most important finding, the full meaning of which has been brought home during the past year, is that the high levels of unemployment which we experienced from the mid-fifties to the early sixties were the result of inadequate rates of economic growth. Thus, while automation and other technological changes may eliminate jobs, this Nation possesses the needed monetary and fiscal tools to maintain a rate of growth sufficient to encourage high levels of employment with reasonably stable prices in spite of increases in productivity and the labor force.

Spurred first by the 1964 tax cut, and then by the increase in Federal defense spending necessitated by our enlarged commitment in Vietnam, we have reduced unemployment to its current low level of 4.1 percent. Although this may be startling to some—especially to those who only a short time ago were predicting that automation and technological change would make much of the work force obsolete—it is not startling to those of us who over the years have stressed the importance of increased Federal spending in generating rapid economic growth and full employment. It is unfortunate that so much of the stimulus has had to come from increased military spending, but it is instructive to note the effect of such spending.

The report also finds that while the Nation as a whole possesses the tools necessary to solve its problems, many individuals lack the needed skills, training, education, or mobility to get and keep jobs in the face of labor displacements necessitated by technological changes. The Commission recommends many important programs to help these individuals to enter and reenter the labor force to upgrade their skills through education and training.

The Commission also recommends a program of public service employment which would provide many hard-core unemployed with rewarding work opportunities, while at the same time providing society with some of the human resources needed to meet our unmet individual and community needs. This proposal deserves strong and immediate consideration by Congress both in the light of the emerging labor shortages in some areas and occupations, and in light of the continuing high unemployment among teenagers and Negroes.

The Commission's proposals for 14 years of free education, for improvement of the employment service, and for better matching our technological capabilities and human needs also deserve serious consideration.

The Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will be holding hearings shortly on this report.

I should like to offer my thanks to the members of the Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress for their dedicated and successful efforts to acquaint our Nation with what needs to be done to make technological advancement a national asset instead of a national liability.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Times recently.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ON AUTOMATION

The report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress turns out to be an encouraging blueprint for national greatness rather than an essay on gloomy foreboding.

The Commission finds no evidence that technological change in the coming decade will be more rapid than the growth of demand for new goods and services, both public and private, will be able to offset. Computers and automated factories will not lead to mass unemployment and social disruption, provided social imagination does not lag in dealing with the tribulations of change.

Up to now, weedy myths have flowered faster than facts in this field. The report represents the first exhaustive joint study of all the implications of automation by businessmen, labor leaders and academic specialists. Out of their research has come agreement on the scope and nature of the problem and, in most respects, on what should be done about it. Three union leaders on the panel did enter a dissenting footnote to complain that the report lacked a "tone of urgency." But this criticism does not detract from their agreement with their business and public colleagues on the essential issues.

The Commission recognizes that unemployment is simply a waste. It recommends that the Federal Government becomes employer of last resort for the hardcore jobless, putting them to work in parks, hospitals, and other places where useful work now goes undone for lack of funds. Along with a related proposal to provide a floor under family income, this proposal will require detailed evaluation to guard against chronic welfarism.

Many of the Commission's other recommendations can be acted upon promptly. Among those with obvious merit are the federalization of the Federal-State Employment Service to increase its effectiveness, a program tailored to the needs of Negroes whose skills and education have been crippled by past discrimination, establishment of a national model building code and extension of free education through the first 2 years of college.

The report is essentially an avowal of faith in the Nation's flexibility and imagination. Automation can mean hardships for particular workers and dislocations in specific industries, but it holds the potentiality for increased abundance, more leisure and improved public services if Americans have the wisdom to act and plan together. The report is a welcome addition to the Nation's common fund of wisdom on the complexities of change.

ROBERT KENNEDY'S CONSTRUCTIVE ROLE IN THE DEBATE ON VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York, ROBERT KENNEDY, has played a highly constructive role in the debate on Vietnam. In particular, Senator KENNEDY's thoughtful statement of February 19, 1966, emphasizing the need for realism in defining our objectives in Vietnam, merits the close study of all persons, in private life as well as in the Government, who are concerned about the problem of achieving an honorable peace in southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD, together with a series of editorials and articles commenting upon it.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY ON VIETNAM, FEBRUARY 19, 1966

This week has been another chapter in a great tradition. For the Senate Chamber still echoes to the distant ringing of the great issues of our past. War and westward growth, civil strife and the rights of man have been argued on its floor; and from those debates have emerged the shaping events and judgments of American history.

The greater the issue, the larger the stakes, the more passionately debate has raged, in the Senate and across the land. Abraham Lincoln was reviled for opposing the war of 1848. The citizens of his own State called Daniel Webster traitor for proposing a compromise to avoid civil war. Those who saw the storm, and tried desperately to prepare the Nation for World War II, were cursed as warmongers, enemies of mankind, subverters of democracy—and worse.

Yet, despite the condemnations and the violent recriminations, there have always been within the Senate enough men of courage and conviction to triumph in the end over those who would stifle free discussion and action. There are hazards in debating American policy in the face of a stern and dangerous enemy. But that hazard is the essence of our democracy. Democracy is no easy form of government. Few nations have been able to sustain it. For it requires that we take the chances of freedom; that the liberating play of reason be brought to bear on events filled with passion; that dissent be allowed to make its appeal for acceptance; that men chance error in their search for the truth.

"The best test of truth is the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the marketplace," said Justice Holmes. "That at any rate is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. Every year, if not every day, we have to wager our salvation upon some prophecy based on imperfect knowledge. While that experiment is part of our system, I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fought with depth."

Our Constitution imposes on the Senate the most heavy and grave independent responsibilities. We ourselves owe to the people of 50 States the burden of independent thought and action. Our whole system of government rests on a complex structure of independence and cooperation among the branches; a structure which requires that we make our own judgments about events, giving due weight to the reason and responsibility of others.

Shall we then debate with force and passion the issues of labor relations and housing and trade—while the great issues of peace and war are allowed to pass in silence? Shall we discuss the standard of living of our constituents—while policies which affect their very existence go undiscussed? To do so would be the gravest departure from our duties as representatives of the people of the American States.

Full and informing debate rests upon moderation and mutual indulgence. Men must seek acceptance of their views through reason, and not through intimidation; through argument, and not through accusation. We are all patriots here. We are all defenders of freedom. We are all Americans. To attack the motives of those who express concern about our present course—to challenge their very right to speak freely—is to strike at the foundations of the democratic process which our fellow citizens, even today, are dying in order to protect.

I suggest that the Senate, and this entire Nation, might well adopt for its own guidance the personal creed of Thomas Jefferson. He said:

"I tolerate with the utmost latitude the right of others to differ from me in opinion without imputing to them criminality. I know too well the weakness and uncertainty of human reason to wonder at its different result. Both of our political parties agree conscientiously in the same object—the public good; but they differ essentially in what they deem the means of promoting that good—which is right, time and experience will prove—with whatever opinion the body of the Nation concurs, that must prevail. My anxieties on this subject will never tarry beyond the use of fair and honorable means of truth and reason; nor have they ever lessened my esteem for moral worth, nor alienated my affections from a single friend, who did not first withdraw himself."

The discussions which have been taking place in recent days are therefore worth while and important. But we must do all we can to make certain that the exchange of views accomplishes the most for our country—moving our policy toward the goal we all want to achieve. All of us are concerned, as the American people are concerned, about the progress of the struggle in Vietnam.

There are several aspects to this concern.

We are concerned at the casualties, the death and suffering, of our young men in South Vietnam.

We are concerned over the effect of some of our military action on the people of South Vietnam—whether more cannot be done to lessen the death and destruction of the innocent that comes with war. For a military victory at the cost of a completely destroyed South Vietnam would be a defeat for our larger purposes.

We are concerned whether the people of South Vietnam are being offered something positive to live and fight for—something beyond negative anticommunism. The President's recent initiatives are to be applauded and welcomed; but it is now incumbent on the Government of South Vietnam to make good at last on promises which the people of that unhappy country have heard for many years.

We are concerned over our relationship with Communist China—not just concern to avoid a deadly war, but also concern lest the Vietnam struggle make any reasonable accommodation with China impossible in the future. The events of the coming decade will determine whether our relations with mainland China will change for the better or for the worse. But they will change and we can influence that change; and the direction of change must receive the earnest attention of the Senate.

And we are concerned about the effect of the war on our domestic efforts to conquer ignorance and disease and unemployment—the problems of the cities—problems which, warned the McCone Commission, could split our society irretrievably. And this concern is heightened by the way in which the war perpetuates discrimination—for the poor and the less fortunate serve in Vietnam out of all proportion to their numbers in the United States as a whole.

But the central question before us now—the area of greatest present concern for the Senate, and what we must discuss at all levels of government—is our political strategy in the war in Vietnam; not simply how to move, but in what direction we wish to move.

At the outset, it must be realized that negotiations are not an ultimate goal. Negotiations or discussions are only a means by which ultimate goals may be reached. Our arrival at the bargaining table will not make the struggle disappear. Even if we arrive at the bargaining table, the real question is what goals we will seek there. Without clear goals in mind, negotiations are pointless. And without clear goals and realistic objectives, it is doubtful whether the bargaining table will ever be reached.

What, then, are our goals in Vietnam?

The Secretary of State and others have stated objectives in general terms. They are the independence of South Vietnam—or, at least, its independent right to determine its own future. They are to halt the aggression from the north and to prove to China that a policy of subversion in other lands will not work. These are worthy objectives. All are important. The question remains, however, under what realistic terms and conditions they can be advanced in Vietnam.

There are three routes before us: military victory, a peaceful settlement, or withdrawal.

The last is impossible for this country. For the United States to withdraw now, as I said last May, would be a repudiation of commitments undertaken and confirmed by three administrations. It would flatly betray those in Vietnam whom we have encouraged by our support to resist the forces of Hanoi and the Vietcong. Unilateral withdrawal would injure, perhaps irreparably, the principle of collective security, and undermine the independence of small nations everywhere in the world. And it would offer no hope for a reasonable accommodation with China in the future. There are reasonable and responsible steps which we can take to raise the possibility of improved relations with China in the future. But unilateral withdrawal would only reward aggression and could offer China no inducement to reach accommodation in a peaceful world.

I now turn to the open avenues—military victory or a peaceful settlement.

Military victory requires that we crush both our adversary's strength and his will to continue the battle; that the forces from the north be compelled to withdraw beyond the border; that much of Vietnam be destroyed and its people killed; that we continue to occupy South Vietnam as long as our presence is required to insure that hostilities, including insurgency, will not be resumed. And this will be a very long time indeed.

I cannot say with certainty that such an outcome is beyond our reach. We do know, however, that it would mean rapidly increasing commitments of American forces. It would mean a growing risk of widening war—with North Vietnam, with China, even with the Soviet Union. It would lead, indeed already has led thoughtless people to advocate the use of nuclear weapons. And it would involve all these things—commitment, risk, and spreading destruction—in pursuit of a goal which is at best uncertain, and at worst unattainable.

Despite all these dangers, we may yet come to this course. The intransigence of our adversaries may leave us no alternative. There should be no misunderstanding or miscalculation of this point in either Hanoi or Peking. The American people possess the bravery and the will to follow such a course if others force it upon us. I also believe, however, that given the opportunity by our adversaries, we possess the wisdom and skill to avoid such a grim necessity.

And President Johnson has made clear, on behalf of the United States, in every forum of the world, that this country seeks the other road: the road to negotiated settlement.

In this pursuit we have asked for unconditional discussions. This means simply that we will neither demand nor yield specific formal commitments before bargaining begins. In fact, both sides must come to any discussion with at least one basic condition; one irreducible demand; one point they will not yield. For the United States it must be that we will not turn South Vietnam over to the North. For North Vietnam it must be that they will not accept a settlement which leaves in the south a hostile government, dedicated to the final physical destruction of all Communist elements, refusing any economic cooperation with the North, dependent upon the continued presence of American military power.

These conditions, these minimum terms, can be breached only at sword's point; only by driving the adversary's forces from the field. For either side to yield its minimum conditions would be in fact to accept to defeat. If we intend to deny these minimum conditions to our adversaries, then we must defeat them completely. If this is what we intend, we should understand it clearly—and undertake it with resolution.

But if negotiation is our aim, as we have so clearly said it is, we must seek a middle ground. A negotiated settlement means that each side must concede matters that are important in order to preserve positions that are essential.

It may be that negotiation is not possible in this war because our political aims are irreconcilable; because one side, or both sides, are not willing to accept anything less than the fruits of victory. If that is so, then we must reluctantly let slip the hope of reasoned discussion and proceed to the uncertain, uncharted course of war.

I believe there is a middle way, that an end to the fighting and a peaceful settlement can be achieved. It must be said, before all else, that the middle way—the way of negotiation—involves risks. An adversary who lives may perhaps fight another day. And a government which is not continuously sheltered by American military power may be again attacked or subverted or overthrown.

These risks, I believe, we are courageous enough to undertake. They are risks, in fact, which we do take everyday in a hundred countries in every corner of every continent. There are dozens of countries which might be the target of Communist aggression or subversion. If we were unwilling to take any risk that they might be subverted or conquered by the Communists, we might simply have occupied all of them. But clearly, we would rather live with such risks than attempt to occupy these nations. We take these risks because we believe men and nations will not willingly choose to submit to other men from other lands.

If we are wrong in this basic faith, then Vietnam will be but a flicker in the conflagration which is to come. But in Indonesia, in Algeria, and in the Central African Republic the Chinese have suffered enormous defeats—not because we are stronger or more skilled than they—not because we defeated them. They were defeated because the people of these lands preferred to run their affairs in their own way—and our faith was justified. This basic faith may not be borne out on every occasion in every land. But in the past when the question has been clearly presented, men have chosen independence and freedom.

With this basic faith in the aspirations of man, what are the elements of a settlement in Vietnam?

Whatever the exact status of the National Liberation Front—puppet or partly independent—any negotiated settlement must accept the fact that there are discontented elements in South Vietnam, Communist and non-Communist, who desire to change the existing political and economic system of the country. There are three things you can do with such groups: kill or repress them, turn the country over to them, or admit them to a share of power and responsibility. The first two are now possible only through force of arms.

The last—to admit them to a share of power and responsibility—is at the heart of the hope for a negotiated settlement. It is not the easy way or the sure way; nor can the manner or the degree of participation now be described with any precision. It may come about through a single conference or many meetings, or by a slow, undramatic process of gradual accommodation. It will require enormous skill and political wisdom to find the point at which participation does not bring domination or internal conquest. It will take statesmanship willing to exploit the very real differences of ambition and intention and interest between Hanoi and Peking and the Soviet Union. It may mean a compromise government fully acceptable to neither side. It certainly means that we must take considerable risks in the expectation that social and economic success will weaken the appeal of communism—and that sharing the burden and the satisfaction of helping to guide a nation will attract hostile elements toward a solution which will preserve both the independence of their country and their new-found share of power. And we must be willing to face the uncertainties of election, and the possibility of an eventual vote on reunification. We must be prepared to think about what kind of relationship such a reunified country would have to the United States, to Communist China, to the Soviet Union.

If we are willing to accept these uncertainties and run the risks—and if our adversaries are willing to submit their cause to the same arbitration, the same peaceful choice—then a settlement may be possible; and the other hazards, the hazards of widening conflict and devastation, may be ended.

Of course, such a road toward solution must be protected from sudden and violent upheaval. There must be international guarantees to back up agreement, good faith, and mutual self-interest. Foreign forces must be withdrawn, by balanced and verified stages. And we must insist that the political process go forward under the rigorous supervision of a trusted international body.

I would stress that such a settlement would not end our burden or our vigilance in Vietnam. President Johnson has made clear that we are ready to help with economic aid for North Vietnam. Further, if South Vietnam is to remain free to determine its own destiny and to live in harmony with the north, then we must help repair the ravages of 20 years of war. Our reconstruction effort may be nearly as costly, and more demanding of care and intelligence, than is our present military effort. And we must continue to stand guard against any violation of the agreement, which must make clear that the United States would not permit the country or the Government to be seized by an outside power.

There will be many other difficulties and problems. I do not pretend to be able to forecast all the details of a final settlement, or the process by which it may be reached. That is the task of statesmanship, in full command of all the channels of communication. But we must have our terms set firmly in our own minds. And we must reveal enough of our intentions to Hanoi to eliminate any reasonable fear that we ask them to talk only to demand their surrender.

And they must be given to understand as well that their present public demands are in fact a bid for us to surrender a vital national interest—but that, as a far larger and more powerful nation learned in October of 1962, surrender of a vital interest of the United States is an objective which cannot be achieved.

I am aware that the United States cannot proclaim in advance the precise terms of an acceptable political settlement. We cannot show all our cards before we get to the bargaining table. Nor can we make all our concessions before receiving concessions from the other side. To so commit ourselves would be to show a weakness which could not serve the cause of justice or the cause of peace.

But we ourselves must look at our own cards. And we must show enough of them to persuade our adversaries that a settlement is in their interests as well as our own.

The Senate could serve no higher function than to discuss—for the benefit of our own people, for our adversaries, and for the people of the world—a framework within which a settlement would be acceptable.

That is why discussion and debate in the Senate are now so important. We stand at the doorway of great decisions and fateful action. To decide in ignorance is to risk disaster. But if we now can clearly define our ends in South Vietnam, if we can at least begin discussing what our future relations with mainland China are to be, if we can adapt our means to those ends, and, most important, if we can use only that force—and no more—that is needed to accomplish these objectives, then there is hope that they may be achieved without prohibitive cost to ourselves, to the people of Vietnam, or to the peace of the world.

And if this debate can reach such a definition, we will know at least that we have followed the path of reason and realism as far as it now can lead.

And we will have worked to meet our responsibilities to our posterity—to walk the final mile toward peace, not so much for ourselves, as for those who will come after.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 22, 1966]

ROBERT KENNEDY'S POINT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The key question in the Senate hearings has been whether the administration, which says that it wants a negotiated settlement has in fact committed itself to a policy which requires the unconditional surrender of the enemy. This is the question which is at the root of the profound concern of the Senators. It is also, most certainly, the question which is worrying the country. The question was not answered definitively in the hearings. General Taylor and Secretary Rusk kept insisting that the administration was fighting a limited war, that its objectives and its targets were limited, and that it is earnestly seeking to engage Hanoi in discussions and negotiations.

It has remained for Senator ROBERT KENNEDY to raise the decisive question about a negotiated settlement, which is whether the administration is prepared to negotiate with its adversaries in the field. We have learned promptly from the immediate reactions of Messrs. Bundy, Ball and HUMPHREY that the administration is not prepared to negotiate with its adversaries in the field. It does want to negotiate with Hanoi but not with the Vietcong unless the Vietcong is acknowledged to be nothing more than the instrument of the Hanoi government. This position is in fact a demand for the unconditional surrender of the Vietcong, which constitutes at least three-quarters of the military forces arrayed against us in the field, and it is a demand for the unconditional recognition of General Ky's government as the only political power in South Vietnam.

No one is entitled to claim that he is in favor of a negotiated settlement of the war unless he is prepared to negotiate with all his important adversaries who are engaged in fighting. Senator KENNEDY has gone to the heart of the matter in fixing public attention on the simple truth that if the administration wants to negotiate, it will have to negotiate with the enemy who is in fact arrayed against us.

This does not mean, it seems to me, that the United States itself should negotiate with the Vietcong for the purpose of forming a coalition government in South Vietnam. A negotiated settlement of the war in South Vietnam will have to be negotiated by the South Vietnamese, and our policy should be to refrain from vetoing it. We shall have to cease putting our whole influence and support behind General Ky, who refuses to negotiate. The makings of a South Vietnamese negotiated settlement have long been present just under the surface in South Vietnam.

The outcome would probably be some kind of coalition government formed for the purpose of organizing a general election. Such a government would, of course, be vulnerable to the machinations of the hard-line Communists in Hanoi and Peiping. Difficult and unattractive as this may be, it would be a great deal better than an unlimited war to achieve unconditional surrender. Moreover, there would still be open to us what in my own view is the only live option we have ever had in southeast Asia. It is to help provide the material means by which a united Vietnam—probably under the rule of Ho Chi Minh, who is the one national leader of that country—could be neutral and militarily independent as regards China.

The partisans of our present course will do well to study carefully Mr. Hanson Baldwin's article in Monday's New York Times. It deals with the present condition of our combat forces. Mr. Baldwin is not only the leading military correspondent in contemporary journalism, but has always been, and probably still is, a hawk in the Vietnamese debate. He tells us that "the Nation's armed services have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere. The commitment of more than 200,000 men to Vietnam, supported by strong air and naval forces, and the maintenance of two divisions in Korea, more than five in Europe and of smaller units elsewhere, including the Dominican Republic, have reduced the forces in the United States to a training establishment."

This report poses for the President the enormously difficult question of how much longer he can overrule the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a limited mobilization of Reserve forces. It also poses the question of whether Secretary Rusk realizes what he is saying when he tells us we have some 40 unilateral military commitments and that we must be prepared to fulfill them all. How can the American people have confidence in an administration which expands its commitments to the extent that Secretary Rusk expands them in the face of the condition of the military forces?

Mr. Baldwin's article raises the question, too, whether Secretary Rusk realizes what he is saying when he keeps telling us that the credibility of all our alliances all over the world is at stake in South Vietnam. Can he really believe that our value as an ally in Europe rises when we have to draw more and more trained men out of our Armed Forces in Europe and replace them with untrained men? Mr. Rusk has entangled himself in the error of failing to realize that it is not what the United States is willing to do but what in fact it is willing and able to do which determines the credibility of any one of its alliances.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 22, 1966]

ROBERT KENNEDY'S STAND

Considering how often the President challenges his critics to offer ideas for peace in Vietnam, it is regrettable that his advisers moved so quickly to shoot down the ideas suggested by Senator ROBERT KENNEDY. We hope that Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor's more receptive attitude, contrasting with that of Messrs. HUMPHREY, Ball, and McGeorge Bundy, heralds some sober second thought in administration ranks.

In proposing that the United States halt the troop buildup and prepare to accept Vietcong participation in a provisional government for South Vietnam, Senator KENNEDY was adopting a position already taken by Senator FULBRIGHT, and other thoughtful critics of administration policy. That he did so has highly interesting political implications, but the important thing is that these proposals go to the heart of the administration's professed eagerness for a negotiated settlement.

Unless we are ready to consider a temporary compromise government that would represent all elements in South Vietnam, we are really saying that we are only willing to negotiate a surrender by the Vietcong. Negotiations are obviously not going to get started on that basis, any more than they can get started on the basis of a Hanoi demand that the Vietcong be recognized as the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people. The administration is right to reject this demand, but its own position in the quest for peace is weakened by insisting in effect that the Saigon generals be recognized as the sole representative of the people.

Admittedly a coalition government would present difficulties, as Senator KENNEDY recognizes, and would be far from an ideal solution. But it is hard to imagine a practical alternative. To say simply that we are willing to let South Vietnam decide its own future in a free election at some unspecified date ignores the crucial problem of how a divided country would be governed during the period between a cease-fire and the election. Conceivably some solution might be worked out without setting up any central political authority, but on the basis of experience this seems unlikely. In such circumstances, to exclude the very possibility of a coalition government amounts to erecting a major barrier, or condition, to negotiations.

When President Kennedy wanted negotiations on Laos he obtained them by agreeing to accept a coalition government. True, the Laos settlement has not worked well. But that is not because it provided for a coalition government. The reason for its failure was that geographically Laos could not be separated from the struggle for Vietnam and it was unrealistic to expect peace in Laos alongside an expanding war next door.

President Johnson also has used the coalition device in his efforts to solve problems arising from an unwise military intervention in the Dominican Republic. The Garcia-Godoy provisional government, which is trying under grave handicaps to run the country until elections can be held, offers a close parallel to what Senator KENNEDY proposes for South Vietnam. If the Johnson administration can support the device in the Caribbean, there should be no reason in principle for rejecting it in southeast Asia—if the administration really wants a negotiable peace.

Basically the problem is to find workable methods by which, after years of civil war, the Vietnamese people can make their own decisions on their political future. This would be the proper business of peace negotiations; not all the decisions can or should be made in advance, or by the United States alone. Yet we cannot fairly expect negotiations even to open if we rule out, in advance, any Vietcong participation in South Vietnam's political future. By taking his stand on this clear reality, Senator KENNEDY has proved himself an effective advocate of peace.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1966]

COALITION IN VIETNAM

The essence of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY's proposal for bringing about a Vietnam settlement—which, if negotiated rather than imposed by force, inevitably must include some Vietcong participation in the provisional Saigon government—is this:

"We cannot show all our cards before we get to the bargaining table. But we must have our terms set firmly in our own minds. And we must reveal enough of our intentions to Hanoi to eliminate any reasonable fear that we ask them to talk now only to demand their surrender."

The insurrection in South Vietnam represents a political force that escalation shows no signs of destroying by military means. To face up to this fact of life, as the Times has pointed out for many weeks, requires acceptance of Vietcong participation both in negotiations and in the future political life of South Vietnam. The ultimate Vietcong role, Washington and Hanoi agree, will be determined by elections under international supervision. But there must be agreement first on the provisional Saigon government that will preside over the country from the time of cease-fire until free elections are held. In the absence of leaders capable of forming a neutral administration, such a government in Saigon will have to include all the main factions: the South Vietnamese Army, the Vietcong, the Buddhists, the Catholics, the Cao Dai and other elements. It is self-deception to talk of a negotiated settlement without, at least implicitly, accepting this as one of the results.

The real question—and the primary one, to which Senator KENNEDY courageously addressed himself—is whether to concede this point in principle now to obtain a peace conference, as President Kennedy did to obtain a Laotian Conference and settlement. Secretary General Thant, the French Government, and others in contact with Hanoi believe such a concession is essential to enable pro-negotiation forces in the Communist world—within Hanoi and the Vietcong, as well as in Moscow and Eastern Europe—to carry the day.

Communist participation in a coalition government in Saigon would involve many risks. Senator KENNEDY made no attempt to gloss the dangers. But there is no basis for the widespread assumption that a coalition government inevitably means a Communist takeover. Neither the Laotian experience nor those of postwar France and Italy justify that conclusion. The outcome was different in Eastern Europe. But, interestingly enough, one of the chief victims there—former Premier Ferenc Nagy of Hungary—now has joined those who believe that, if the most detailed safeguards are provided, a coalition government could be "a temporary solution for Vietnam."

The decision President Johnson faces is not an easy one. He already has made many concessions with little response from Hanoi. He is prepared—as White House security adviser McGeorge Bundy has said—to abide by the results of free elections. The administration is also prepared to accept a coalition government after elections, as one of its highest officials recently told the House Foreign Affairs Committee in executive session.

But in the American political context it is one thing to accept the results of elections—or even to yield on a provisional government after prolonged negotiations and mounting casualties bring general acceptance of this outcome. It is another thing to make this concession, even in principle, in advance.

Public discussion of this unattractive, risky, yet inescapable decision is vital to help the President act, as sooner or later he must. In that sense, Senator KENNEDY's proposal—which many other Senators and Congressmen support—is less a criticism of the President's policies than an invaluable contribution to the decisionmaking process.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 25, 1966]

THE RECORD ON KENNEDY'S PROPOSAL

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Despite all the hair splitting of the last few days, the administration is fundamentally opposed to the proposal by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, of a negotiated peace in Vietnam based on a coalition government, including Communists. It is now suggested that the administration's objections center more on timing than on principle. But that is not what the record shows:

To Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, permitting a coalition government would be the same as putting "a fox in a chicken coop or an arsonist in a fire department."

To Under Secretary of State George W. Ball it would be not only unacceptable, but "our experience with coalition governments hasn't been very good, you know, in which the Communists have played a significant role."

To McGeorge Bundy, the President's principal White House adviser on foreign affairs, the KENNEDY proposal was neither useful nor helpful. He also said that President Kennedy was opposed to coalition governments. That is not an accurate reflection of the late President's actual policy. John F. Kennedy did not think coalitions were ideal, but in a dour world of limited choices he preferred such compromises to war.

The most puzzling aspect of the violent reaction to Senator KENNEDY's proposal is that his administration critics were all in favor of coalition when President Kennedy sought peace in Laos on just that basis.

Back in 1961, when the situation in Laos was even more critical than in Vietnam next door, a compromise solution (based on bringing the Communists into the Laos government) was developed at a series of National Security Council meetings.

Among the participants were President Johnson, then Vice President, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ball, and Bundy, then special assistant to Kennedy. HUMPHREY, then the assistant majority leader to the Senate, was kept advised, of course.

All of them went along with the President's efforts (irrespective of elections) to establish a popular front in Laos. If any of them were opposed to it, or felt it would play into the hands of the Communists, they kept it to themselves.

Why did President Kennedy and his principal advisers favor coalition as a solution to Laos? The answer may help leaders understand why Senator KENNEDY now wants to extend this formula to Vietnam.

At the time President Kennedy came to power, the Communist forces in Laos were close to complete military victory. There were some, like Richard Nixon, who urged Kennedy to intervene, but, after the Bay of Pigs disaster, he had learned that military adventures are risky enterprises.

Nixon quotes Kennedy as saying to him, "I just don't think we ought to get involved in Laos, particularly where we might find ourselves fighting millions of Chinese troops in the jungles. In any event, I don't see how we can make any move in Laos which is 5,000 miles away, if we don't make a move in Cuba, which is only 90 miles away."

Even before he took office, Kennedy thought that, "without support of the native population there is no hope of success in any of the countries of southeast Asia." He also had said, "for the United States to * * * send troops into the most difficult terrain in the world, with the Chinese able to pour in unlimited manpower, would mean that we would face a situation far more difficult than Korea."

He was troubled that other major powers, even in the East, did not share our alarm over Indochina. As President, he said to Arthur Schlesinger, "India is more directly threatened than we are; and, if they are not wildly excited, why should we be?"

All of this led him to the conclusion that whatever the shortcomings of a coalition government, it was better than the risk of large military intervention. This political solution in Laos has had its ups and downs, but after 4 years the Communists have not yet swallowed the country and no Americans have been killed. That, in the view of Senator KENNEDY, would not be a bad deal for Vietnam.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 14, 1966]

SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY EXPLAINS HIS POSITION

(Exactly what is Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY proposing about dealing with the South Vietnamese Reds? Does he have a formula for getting the war to the conference table? To explain his position, the Senator visited the conference room of U.S. News & World Report for this interview with members of the magazine's staff.)

Question. Senator, just what do you propose in Vietnam?

Answer. I favor continuing our military commitment with the objective of getting a settlement in Vietnam which would prevent North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front from taking over South Vietnam by force, free the people of South Vietnam from terror and intimidation and from the destruction of war, preserve our honor and our commitment, and end as quickly as possible the loss of American lives and the strain on our resources.

Question. Isn't that what the Johnson administration has been after?

Answer. I therefore support the objectives of the administration. I think there are three alternatives in Vietnam:

One, we can pull out, which would be catastrophic for American interests. That's so unacceptable that it hardly needs to be discussed.

Two, have a complete military victory. We could accomplish that. We could win, militarily, if we decided that was what our policy should be. But I think there are dangers in an expanded war. There are the heavy casualties that would be suffered by American troops. There would be great loss of life within South Vietnam. Here at home, domestic programs would not receive the attention that they should receive. So, for various reasons, I don't accept that course of action—and I gather it also is turned down by the administration, and for the same reasons.

So that leaves a negotiated settlement. Now, if you're going to talk about that, you should talk about it realistically. Those who argue for a negotiated settlement without facing up to the implications of what that means are, I think, being less than realistic and less than candid.

Question. So you feel that this is the heart of the matter?

Answer. Somebody who analyzes the course of negotiated settlement might reach the conclusion that the dangers are too great—that what we're going to undertake in a negotiated settlement is a situation that you really can't live with. But if you go down the road for a negotiated settlement—which I favor—I think we can deal with the problems, although they are going to be very, very difficult.

Question. In what way?

Answer. One of the facts of life that you have to face up to is that the Communists, or dissident elements, will play some role in the Government at some point as the result of a negotiated settlement in which both sides make some concessions. If we're going to have a negotiated settlement, what that means—what we have to be prepared for—is the sharing of power with them in South Vietnam. They've been around a long time and they have considerable support in the villages, and they have continued to raise a substantial body of troops.

So I think you have to recognize these facts. The situation isn't very satisfactory—and certainly no one wants to help the Communists, or condone or excuse them—but these are the facts.

Now, if they're going to share in the political processes of the country, we'll want them to concede some things, too—to lay down their arms and return the area and people now under their control to the Central Government, and to refrain from interfering with the freedom of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own destiny. But we can't get these concessions, and thereby shorten the war, without being prepared ourselves for a settlement that brings them into the governmental structure and society in South Vietnam.

Question. Even if the declared policy should be to negotiate with the South Vietnamese Communists, how do you get them to the negotiating table?

Answer. I don't have any magic formula for that, but I think there are two ways:

First, and most important, is to demonstrate to them that they're not going to win, militarily; that they're not going to drive the United States out of Vietnam, and they're not going to be able to take over by force.

Second, if you're going to have negotiations, you've got to show them that it's worthwhile coming to the negotiating table—that we're going to negotiate and that concessions are going to be made on both sides.

I'm convinced there is tremendous pressure on them from China not to come to the negotiating table. If they do come, they are going to impair their own relationships with Communist China. So I think, first, they have to be hurt enough to know that they aren't going to win and, second, they have to feel that there is enough reason for them to negotiate to make it worth their while.

Question. Are you saying the administration is not realistic?

Answer. They've talked and stressed negotiations, but I don't think there has been a wide discussion in this country—at least, I haven't been aware of it—of the facts of life in connection with negotiations.

Now, we all hope that, at some point, you're going to have elections in South Vietnam—and there's some chance that, as a result, you're going to have some Communists within the Government. But, clearly, that will be decided by the people of South Vietnam in the elections.

Even before that, you're going to have to face up to the fact that, in the interim period, the dissident elements—those who are opposed to the Saigon government—are not going to let General Ky run the elections any more than we would want to have the Communists running them.

Now, I'm not suggesting that we go in and say to the Vietcong or the Communists: "You can have a role in the Government, and then we'll start to negotiate." As I said on February 19, "We will neither demand nor yield specific formal commitments before bargaining begins."

I'm saying to them: "The door is open to you to have a role in the future government as long as we get serious concessions from you. You might play a role during the interim period and, if you win popular support in elections, later on."

IF GENERAL KY OBJECTS

Question. What are you going to do about General Ky, who says he won't do business with them?

Answer. Obviously we're not going to turn our backs on the people of South Vietnam, but, as far as General Ky is concerned, the policies of the United States should just as obviously take into account what is in our best interest. General Ky has said he has complete control over only 25 percent of the population at the present time.

Question. Do you think the President can go over Ky's head?

Answer. We haven't always agreed with General Ky. For example, General Ky feels that all of us should extend our bombing efforts in North Vietnam, and we have not agreed with him about that. And the administration has said that the presence of the dissident elements—Communists and others—at the negotiating table is not an insurmountable problem.

All I'm saying is that we've taken a step to open the door, and the Communists have done nothing yet. If we show them what we're interested in—although we don't spell it all out in advance—we've opened a door for them, and we see if they put their foot in. If they do put their foot in, and say, "We're willing to come in, but you've got to do something worthwhile," then we can face that problem.

Now the interim period—between negotiations and eventual elections—is itself subject to negotiation. If they come to the negotiations in good faith they could expect, in return for concessions made by them, to share in the governmental processes. But that would still be a negotiable point. They don't get it in advance of negotiations, and it doesn't come to them without concessions. But if they make the right kinds of concessions, then they can share in the governmental and political process.

Question. There has been talk that you're trying to stake out a position to the left of the President and Mr. HUMPHREY——

Answer. I know there has been such talk. It probably is based on an assumption some people make on their own that I expect to run for the Presidency, and would be involved with HUBERT HUMPHREY. My own experience in the past in these matters is that it is empty to speculate about what one is going to be doing 5 or 6 years from now—or even whether one is going to be here then.

Question. Do you have any political plans for 1968 or 1972?

Answer. No, I don't.

KEEPING PRESSURE ON REDS

Question. Senator, what do you say to people who feel that Senators ought to avoid such discussions as Vietnam while the Government is engaged in delicate negotiations?

Answer. Certainly we want Hanoi and the Vietcong to understand our resolve. That is why I favor continued military action until they show that they want to bargain in good faith. To some extent, discussion raises a problem. But I think our military action should prevent any misconceptions about our resolve.

Question. Does the necessity of open discussion outweigh the risk that the enemy may misunderstand?

Answer. Well, obviously, I think that it does. And that's why we must make our resolve clear to our adversaries. But I felt that our attention should now be focused on the real problems that are going to have to be faced by the country. So, I felt I had a responsibility.

Maybe the discussion will bring more people to think that we have to win the war, rather than convince them that we should have negotiations. But, at least, everybody is going to be honestly going down the road in which they believe, and we won't be deluding ourselves into thinking that we can have the best of both worlds.

Question. Isn't the administration saying now that the tide of battle out there has turned in our favor?

Answer. Yes.

Question. But you're talking about offering the Communists a deal. Don't you agree there's a chance we can win, militarily?

Answer. Let me say this. If this tide is turning and we can win, then I think that's what we should say. Let's say, openly, that we can win in Vietnam, and not say that we're trying—so hard to get the enemy to the negotiating table.

If we have the power, and we can win without destroying everybody in Vietnam, and we don't increase the risk, materially, of a war with China—that's one thing.

But the more the war expands, the more our own casualties go up, the more destruction there is in South Vietnam, the less chance there is, it seems to me, that expanded military efforts can bring any long-term stability in that area.

Question. Isn't the argument made that the more the Vietcong is hurt, the better our leverage will be in negotiations?

Answer. Yes. So I think we should do whatever needs to be done, militarily. But it comes to this: What price are we willing to pay to defeat them totally?

If we can defeat them without paying a great price, an overwhelming price, then that's what I'd like to do. But if we're going to cause tremendous destruction to the people of Vietnam, including innocent civilian women and children; and if we're going to have tremendous—very, very, very high—casualties; and if we're going to take some of these other dangers, such as war with China and even beyond, then we get to the fact that—because of these dangers—we have to try, at least, as the administration has said, to negotiate. My judgment is, therefore, that the deaths, destruction, and risks involved in trying to destroy the Vietcong completely make a negotiated settlement advisable if it can be done honorably. It was my judgment that this was also the policy of the administration.

Question. Senator KENNEDY, does all this talk about what we will do and what we won't do—doesn't that pretty much expose our hand to the Communists?

Answer. I am convinced that the Chinese Communists do not want the Vietnamese Communists to negotiate. That's clear. The Chinese want this war to go on, so they're putting all sorts of pressure on Hanoi to keep going. Now, if they—I'm talking about the Vietnamese Communists—if they're going to come to the negotiating table, they are going to have to cut their bridges with China, somewhat. There has to be, therefore, a reason for them to come to the negotiating table—a reason other than just to come in to surrender.

All I'm suggesting is that we show them that we're offering them genuine negotiations—not that they just come in and surrender, sign on the dotted line. We have to convince them that there is some reason for them to come to a meeting with the United States. If we don't hold that open to them, then, no matter how much we hurt them militarily, there's nothing that makes it worth while for them to negotiate. They might just as well continue to fight and die because when they come to the table, anyway, they're going to cut themselves off from China, and they're going to get nothing. That must be the way they think about all this.

Now, we shouldn't expose our whole hand to them. Committing ourselves to any specific terms would show a weakness that wouldn't serve the cause of peace. But we have to show enough of our cards to persuade them that a settlement is in their interests as well as ours.

HOW COALITION MIGHT WORK

Question. If the Reds agreed to negotiations and, through them, got assurance that they would be represented in the governing power in Vietnam, how would such a coalition work?

Answer. I take it that you're talking now about the interim period—after negotiations and before elections. Whatever government there is during that period would have to be subject to international guarantees. And the fact is that you might have a wholly international operation during that period of time. But the international operation would have to be satisfactory to both sides, not just our side. You might have one man who was satisfactory to everybody to run the government during the period before elections. You might have something like the Organization of American States force that is in the Dominican Republic.

And, under international guarantees, we may well have an interim government in which the National Liberation Front has a role. This is a factor that we ought to be thinking about. That is my point.

There's concern that any coalition government, for example, might be taken over by the Communists. That's certainly a risk and a danger, and I said, when I made my statement, that we should focus on those risks and plan for them.

Ferenc Nagy, who was the Premier of Hungary when the Russians took it over in 1948, was asked about my statement. He said that the outcome and the safety of any coalition government depends on the support that outside powers give. He said the Communists could take over in Hungary because Russia dominated the country militarily. Obviously, we shouldn't allow North Vietnam—now or after a settlement—to exercise that kind of military predominance in South Vietnam. So I think if the United States, or the U.N., or some other authority, protects a settlement from being upset by North Vietnam, that the Communists won't be able to seize power in South Vietnam.

Question. Would you require the South Vietnamese Army to lay down its arms in order to get the Communists to bargain?

Answer. No. As I said, I wouldn't make any specific concessions prior to the negotiations. And I don't think anybody can spell out what all the terms are going to be. I'm just saying what some of the things are that we're going to have to deal with in a realistic way.

We, in turn, are going to try to end the casualties, and the aggression—end the war. We, in turn, are going to try to bring peace to South Vietnam.

If we don't get that, we're not getting anything. And we will have to keep on fighting.

PROTECTING U.S. INTERESTS

Question. Isn't negotiating with the Vietcong like letting them shoot their way to the conference table?

Answer. Well, we've made it clear that we're willing to negotiate with Hanoi. They are as much "murders and killers" as those operating in the south. Wouldn't you say Hanoi is shooting its way in? We're trying to negotiate with assassins and all the rest of it. They—the North Vietnamese Communists—they're the ones that are directing all this, as we say, and we're willing to sit down with them and negotiate. They're certainly as bad as the ones who are doing the actual fighting in South Vietnam.

And we have discussions with the Communist Chinese continuously, even at the present time.

But, most important, I don't think adjectives help us decide the vital questions of our national interest. No one likes the Communists. No one wants them to win, or to dominate any nation. But the question is how we best prevent them from dominating South Vietnam—and, in the last analysis, what's best for the United States. What's best for the United States, in my judgment, is not an all-out war with Communist China, or a greatly expanded war throughout Indochina.

What we do want is not to let North Vietnam or the NLF just take over. What we want is a settlement which stops the fighting, and saves American and South Vietnamese lives, and preserves the free choice of the people of South Vietnam.

I think, if we continue our military effort, and pursue the social, economic, and political efforts which I've talked about repeatedly and which President Johnson emphasized at Honolulu, and pursue our diplomatic effort along the lines I suggest, we will at least know that we have done all that's now possible to obtain the kind of settlement we want.

I think it is awfully important in our own country that we know what our objective is, so that we'll know what price in blood and anguish and money we're willing to pay to accomplish that objective.

It's a different military objective to destroy the Communists within Vietnam. It's a different military objective to try to bring them to the negotiating table. And, from the recent statements that have been made, there is some confusion among various spokesmen for our own Government as to exactly what our objectives are in Vietnam.

But I do think we have brains, we have talent, and we have imagination in this country—and, if we can fight a war, then we can also work as diligently and as effectively to find a peaceful answer to it.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 27, 1966]

THE KENNEDY-JOHNSON DEBATE

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY has helped to bring about a clarification of American thinking on Vietnam. The idea of Communist participation in a coalition government in

Saigon is so unwelcome that until Senator KENNEDY forced it into the realm of public discussion it had been shunted aside in Washington—although a great deal of private discussion had already come to focus on it. The thought was considered so "far out" that when Senator MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, advanced it recently, as he commented ruefully last week, nobody noticed. Eight liberal House Democrats had much the same experience.

President Johnson now, in his Freedom House speech, has committed himself explicitly to abide by the results of elections in Vietnam, no matter how distasteful they may be. As his press secretary, Bill D. Moyers, has made clear, that includes acceptance of Communist participation in the Saigon Government, if the vote so mandates. Mr. Moyers has specified further that a coalition government prior to elections is not excluded, but "should be left to the negotiating parties." Frank recognition of this possibility, as Senator KENNEDY said and as the Times has urged for some time, lies "at the heart of a hope for a negotiated settlement" and even of the hope for negotiation.

In effect, the administration now is facing more frankly some of the implications of its July proposal for free elections as one element in a negotiated settlement. The American objective in South Vietnam has been defined by President Johnson as self-determination, whatever that produces—not the destruction of the Vietcong. Most important the nature of the interim Saigon regime that will govern between a cease-fire and elections is admitted to be a proper subject to be decided in the peace negotiations.

If this means anything, it means a commitment that American influence will be used to assure bargaining in good faith between the Vietnamese factions to form an interim national government acceptable to both sides. The distinction between such a policy and a refusal to recognize it as a possibility is the distinction between a policy of negotiation in which both sides are willing to compromise and a policy of unconditional surrender. There would, of course, be risks in any coalition regime but the alternative of expanded war is riskier still.

Theoretically, an agreed central government prior to elections could be made up of neutral Vietnamese or international personnel. But it is unlikely that either the Saigon leaders or the Vietcong would prefer joint exclusion from such an interim government to joint participation. It would be a major accomplishment if both sides could be brought to agree on the inclusion of some neutral or international officials in important posts.

All of this may seem to be academic until Hanoi shows some interest in a peace conference. Until that point, President Johnson remains reluctant to agree to an independent conference status for the Vietcong delegation—a suggestion that obviously would be repugnant to Saigon.

Nevertheless, the Kennedy-Johnson controversy—despite the domestic political byplay—has brought a significant step forward in administration policy. By defining sharper limits to American war aims, it may help limit the military forces sent to achieve them. By removing taboos on what can be negotiated, it may advance the efforts of pronegotiation forces in the Communist world—in Hanoi and within the Vietcong, as well as in Moscow and Eastern Europe—to bring about a conference.

Most important, the first serious public debate by responsible men on the Vietnam issue—as initiated in the Fulbright hearings and carried forward by Senator KENNEDY—undoubtedly has set a precedent that will play an important role as the problem evolves.

EX-HUNGARIAN PREMIER VIEWS KENNEDY'S IDEA—OUTSIDE POWERS ARE KEY TO COALITION, NAGY SAYS OF NEW YORK SENATOR'S PROPOSAL

(By Ferenc Nagy)

(Ferenc Nagy was Prime Minister of Hungary in 1946–47. Nagy, who now lives in Virginia, shared his government with Communists and offered these views on Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S proposal for a coalition government in Vietnam.)

WASHINGTON.—As far as I know I am the only former political leader in exile in America who was the head of a coalition government in central eastern Europe after World War II.

On the basis of my experiences in my own country and observations in the whole central and eastern European area I would like to comment on Senator ROBERT KENNEDY'S proposition.

The first thing to know is that if a coalition in an ideologically troubled country is established with the assistance of outside power or powers, then the strength and endurance of the participating political parties or groups is not dependent at all on domestic popular support but on the help of the outside great powers which are behind them politically.

In my government the Communist Party had only 17 percent of popular support while my party alone was supported by more than 60 percent of the voters and the Parliament. Still the Communist Party could get in power in 2 years because they were supported by the Soviet Union and I was overthrown because no outside power gave me any help.

I would not say that a coalition government could not be a temporary solution for Vietnam but I would like to call the attention of those who are dealing with this ideal to certain basic rules that should be followed very carefully.

First of all, the goal, the composition, and the time of service of the coalition government must be made clear to the last details.

In the case of Vietnam the main goals of a coalition should be, besides ending the war, the pacification, democratization, and economic reconstruction of the country.

There must be a detailed plan for the disarmament of the fighting forces.

It is very important to decide in advance which party or coalition group will get those government posts controlling the police force and the military forces.

But the main thing is that those who would like to save the neutrality and independence of Vietnam through a coalition government should not be too tired to fight for a clear agreement in the last details, and should be determined to protect even the seemingly unimportant points of the agreement.

Otherwise, the coalition will be just a transition for a Communist takeover or the hotbed of another military conflict.

THE ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the American people have a right to know how the taxpayers' money is being spent on any Great Society program although obtaining such information is ofttimes rather difficult.

Over the past several months information has been sought as to how the money under the poverty program is being spent. Many questions have been raised as to whether or not those for whom the benefits were intended were in reality being helped.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Daily News of February 28, 1966, entitled "Thirty-seven Now Living on Suite Charity at the Astor."

Following this I ask unanimous consent that there be printed a letter which I addressed to Mr. Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, under date of February 9. I regret that I cannot follow this insertion with a reply thereto, but as yet none has been received.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTY-SEVEN NOW LIVING ON SUITE CHARITY AT THE ASTOR

(By William Federici)

For at least 37 persons, the city's antipoverty program is successful beyond their dreams. For more than a month they have been provided with posh accommodations in one of the city's finest hotels and given food allowances beyond the reach of all but the richest of the taxpaying citizens, the News learned yesterday.

Eleven families, consisting of 20 adults and 17 children, have been enjoying all the services of the elegant Hotel Astor and collecting $9 a day food allowances per person since January 28, when they went to the antipoverty people to complain of lack of heat and the like.

LIVING IN SUITES

Ever since, they have been living in suites up to three rooms. They have had their beds made by chambermaids, avoided the drudgery of housework and have had their room tabs, averaging $5.75 a day a person, picked up by Mayor Lindsay's antipoverty program.

The only comfort missing was cooking privileges. Hence, the allowance for meals.

And all is paid by city, State, and Federal funds earmarked to erase poverty.

It all started during last month's cold spell. Antipoverty program mobile units were dispatched to slum areas throughout the city to help tenants who were suffering because of lack of heat, water failures and other conditions which made their apartments uninhabitable during the freeze.

MOST PUT UP IN ARMORIES

Most were put up overnight in armories. Some, where it would take a couple of days to correct the conditions, were put up at the Astor. For those in the armories, the stay was short. For 37, the Astor became home.

All that was necessary, the News learned, was for a person to go to the mobile unit and register his complaint. Some cases received a brief investigation, others none.

CASEWORKER ASSIGNED

The families were given letters from the unit's caseworker which were presented to antipoverty program headquarters. There they got a second letter, signed by Mrs. Anne M. Roberts, temporary executive director of the economic opportunity committee and the antipoverty operations board, which enabled them to take up digs in the Astor.

Although the operation had no connection with the welfare department and many of the recipients were wage earners, a department caseworker was assigned as a liaison man to see they got everything they needed. He was identified as George Johnson, living in Astor's room 562.

It also was learned that welfare department employees—from caseworkers to the brass—are highly critical of the situation. One person, who did not wish to be identified, explained that this was not their way of doing things.

MAIDS, CLERKS UNHAPPY

Also voicing criticism were the hotel's maids, clerks, and the like. One thing, to them, distinguished the new guests from the rest. Not used to such living, they were stingy with tips.

All they did, said one maid, was get up, get dressed and take off. They don't straighten up the rooms. That's for the hired help, she said.

The situation came to light yesterday after a city ambulance was called for one of the children put up in the Astor, identified by police as Gloria Ramos, 3. Gloria, police reported, fell Saturday night in the bathroom of her two-room suite, in which she is staying with her parents and two other children, and awoke with a high fever.

The hotel physician suggested hospitalization and the ambulance was called.

A spokeman for the Astor, when asked about his new guests, answered:

"Well, I thought we were doing the right thing when we did this, but I'm beginning to have my doubts now."

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

Mr. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: On February 3, 1966, there appeared in the Journal-American an article alledging that there is a shortage of approximately $800,000 in the accounts of Haryou Act in New York City.

Please advise me whether or not there is a shortage of accounts in this particular program. If so I would appreciate the following information:

1. How much is the shortage?
2. A complete report of whatever information you may have in connection with the manner in which these funds have been handled as well as an explanation of the missing money.
3. Who were the officials in charge of this program at the time the shortage took place?

(a) If any of those officials are still on the payroll, a list with addresses, salaries at the beginning of the program, and present salaries.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

TRIBUTE TO CLARK MOLLENHOFF

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on March 4, 1966, there appeared in the Burlington Hawk-Eye of Burlington, Iowa, an excellent article by John McCormally entitled "Memo From Mac."

This article pays a well-deserved tribute to an outstanding member of the Washington Press Corps, Clark Mollenhoff.

Earlier, on February 28, there appeared in the Des Moines Register an article by Vera Glaser in which she comments on the "Despoilers of Democracy" a recent book written by Mr. Mollenhoff. This book, rapidly becoming a bestseller, is the most complete documentation of Washington intrigue that has been published in recent years.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye, Mar. 4, 1966]

MEMO FROM MAC

(By John McCormally)

It is not surprising that Robert McNamara blew his stack at Clark Mollenhoff in a press conference the other day. Sooner or later, nearly everyone in Washington does.

Mollenhoff, the Des Moines Register man, was pestering McNamara, the Defense Secretary, about congressional complaints that we are weakening our European defenses to take care of Vietnam.

McNamara gave an answer which Clark complained "doesn't get to the point at all." McNamara tried to change the subject. "I want to ask you a question," said Mollenhoff. "You have asked three," said McNamara. "You dodged it three times," said Mollenhoff, "you seem to dodge everything, Mr. Secretary."

"I unfortunately haven't been able to dodge all the rocks you have thrown at me for 5 years," replied McNamara.

This little exchange illustrates why Mollenhoff has more prizes and less popularity than any other member of the Washington press corps.

I enjoyed reading about it because I've known Mollenhoff for more than 15 years, since the time we both arrived in Cambridge, Mass., to begin a year at Harvard on a newspaperman's fellowship.

I'd come wandering into the Boston metropolis from the country, with a small child and a pregnant wife and a wildly misplaced faith in the university having found me some housing. I couldn't even find a hotel room because conventions had absorbed everything within miles. I was desperate when I discovered Mollenhoff.

He'd already nailed down a spacious apartment for himself. His family hadn't arrived, nor his furniture, so he invited us to sleep on his floor, which we gladly did until we finally found a grimy third-floor walkup of our own.

I can't forget hospitality like that, even now that I'm a fellow Iowan, doing my damndest to keep his paper out of my county, to say nothing about being a longtime admirer of McNamara.

Clark had come in to Harvard from Des Moines, where he'd been reporting local government, and soon after that year he departed for Washington to cover National Government and write a new saga in journalism.

You get awfully upset with him if you think he's picking on "good guys" like Eisenhower and McNamara or Rusk; but then you find him causing even more trouble for the "bad guys" like Bobby Baker and Jimmy Hoffa.

He is the kind of fellow who could be a friend of BOB KENNEDY (they worked closely on the Hoffa investigations which won Clark a Pulitzer Prize) at the same time he was giving John F. Kennedy fits about the TFX.

"It is good to have a fellow like Clark Mollenhoff roaring around Washington," says James Reston of the New York Times. "He keeps people honest."

John Hohenberg of Columbia University, in his recent book, "The New Front Page," says "Mollenhoff, the most formidable investigative reporter in Washington, may not win any prizes for popularity because of his activities, but he has a closetful of awards to testify to both his professional skill and his achievements. He is an intense, pugnacious, lawyer-journalist who considers unwarranted Government secrecy almost a personal affront. * * *"

His pugnaciousness is enhanced by the fact that he's built like a Chicago Bears tackle and ambles around his beat with all the delicacy of a locomotive. After an Iowa automobile accident in which he was nearly killed, he went around Washington for weeks with his head and neck in a huge plaster cast, and observers at the Press Club bar say it is the closest the Capital ever came to a real Frankenstein stalking its streets.

Readers are probably seldom aware, when they read the cold type, that important stories of Government seldom just occur. They are created by reporters being as irritating to the sources of the news as Mollenhoff was to McNamara. More such irritation is the only real answer to the problem of news management by the politicians.

[From the Des Moines Register, Feb. 28, 1966]

GOP EYES MOLLENHOFF BOOK AS CAMPAIGN DOCUMENT

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Republicans are hugging a political atomic bomb, and trying to figure how to use it with the most devastating effect in the elections of 1966 and 1968.

A new book on corruption in Government written by crack investigative reporter Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, has become must reading for the GOP and promises to become a campaign document.

"Despoilers of Democracy" is a "whodunit" peopled with real life types like President Johnson, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Bobby Baker, and Walter Jenkins. The scandals and dishonestly it portrays with alarming detail touch the defense program, foreign aid, security procedures, and the White House.

IT'S CALLED STEMWINDER

"It's a stemwinder," said California Representative BOB WILSON, chairman of the GOP congressional committee. He said he is trying to get a group rate.

WILSON's committee also rushed into print with a widely distributed two-page blurb on the book, complete with a cartoon of Lyndon Johnson slamming the door on a closet full of grinning skeletons labeled "TFX Case," "Otepka Case," and "Billie Sol Estes."

Mollenhoff, a Pulitzer Prize winner, based the book largely on sworn testimony given to congressional probers. He lets the political chips fall where they may.

Some hit the Eisenhower administration, notably on stockpile profiteering, but the evidence of collusion, arrogance, and falsehood during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations is telling enough to turn Democratic hairs gray.

It is understood that Mollenhoff's publisher, Doubleday & Co., gave the manuscript a thorough legal check before releasing it.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, who kept the Bobby Baker investigation alive long after the administration tried to quash it, calls the book a masterpiece which should be required reading for every public official, regardless of party.

Representative JOHN ASHBROOK, Republican, of Ohio, devoured it on a plane returning from Rhodesia, called it more eye-opening than the trip, then spoke out on the House floor: "Clark Mollenhoff has performed a great service for America. I doubt that he will get many prizes in Washington for what he has to say about people who take public service as a mandate for personal power."

DISTRIBUTE COPIES

Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, dispatched copies to newspaper editors, radio and television commentators throughout Wyoming. South Dakota's KARL MUNDT praised it in his newsletter. Maine's MARGARET CHASE SMITH is distributing gift copies.

"The big lie is being used through massive public relations to deceive the public and Congress and to stifle dissent against this consensus," charged Iowa Representative H. R. GROSS. He recommended the book to "every American concerned about many things going wrong in our government."

Carl Shipley, GOP chairman for the District of Columbia, fired off a letter to all Members of Congress and Republican State chieftains, urging them to quote from the book in the 1966 campaign.

JUST BEING BROUGHT OUT

"Unfortunately, the assassination of President Kennedy in November 1963, occurred at a point in history when all of these matters were just being brought out in the press," Shipley wrote, "and they were all set aside or deferred.

"In addition, the Nation's press has apparently not wanted to get into matters embarrassing to the memory of the Kennedy administration or its successor, the Johnson administration, since it might imply some criticism of Kennedy at a time when he was being characterized as a martyr and converted into a myth bigger than life."

Of 43 reviews of the book in major news media, all were favorable except 1 which criticized Mollenhoff for not coming up with solutions for the corruption he exposed.

THE FINAL PARAGRAPH

In the last paragraph of his book Mollenhoff warns, "If the public doesn't care about its Congress—or doesn't show that it cares—and if it continues to shrug its shoulders over arrogant administration and shoddy favoritism, as well as outright corruption, then one day the house of democracy may fall. For, in the end, the responsibility for good government rests with the people. America will get as good a government as Americans demand."

A spokesman for the Democratic National Committee said he had never heard of the book.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY SENATE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE IN OPPOSITION TO STANDBY AUTHORITY ON TAXES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on March 8, 1966, the Republican conference adopted a resolution in opposition to any request by the President for standby authority to raise or lower taxes.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY SENATE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE, MARCH 8, 1966

Resolved, That in view of the clear language of article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution, we are unalterably opposed to granting to the President of the United States any standby, emergency, or other authority to raise or lower taxes: Be it further

Resolved, That the executive branch of the Government should submit a concise and more realistic estimate of its proposed budgetary expenditures so that Congress and the American people may be informed as to the true cost of our vast commitments at home and abroad.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BRADEMAS, OF INDIANA, ON EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Association of American Colleges, which held its annual convention this year in Philadelphia, was honored to have as one of its principal speakers Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana. As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, Congressman BRADEMAS has been in the forefront of our Nation's efforts to provide the best possible educational opportunities for all our citizens. The theme of his address, the responsibility of the liberal arts college to educate young Americans for leadership, is particularly appropriate in this age of specialization.

The liberal arts colleges—

Congressman BRADEMAS said—

must give their students the hope of creativity in an impersonal world, an appreciation of ambiguity as a condition of life, and a willingness to become generalists rather than specialists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the distinguished Congressman from Indiana be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, OF INDIANA, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, PHILADELPHIA, PA., TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1966

Several years ago I was a teacher for a time at a liberal arts college, and it is still my good fortune to be part of an institution that provides me a continuing liberal education, the U.S. House of Representatives. And I assume, however, that you invited me to speak to you today not as a former professor but as a practicing politician.

I have, happily, the privilege of serving in Congress on the committee with primary responsibility for legislation in the field of education and, as a member of this committee, I have during the past 7 years talked with college and university presidents, students and teachers here in our own country as well as in Buenos Aires, Berlin, London, Djakarta, Warsaw, and Moscow.

This experience has given me at least some awareness of the challenges which now confront colleges and universities in the United States and which indeed cut across all phases of our national life.

I want therefore to speak to you today about the role of liberal education and particularly about the responsibility of the liberally educated man—and woman—for leadership in a free society.

It is a truism, but no less true for that, to say that we live in a fast-changing world.

Let me recite only a part of the litany of change which is the most unchanging theme of our time.

First, the recent flights of Geminis 6 and 7 make clear that man's exploration of space, including a visit to the moon, the stuff of science fiction a few years ago, is now within reach.

Second, during our own lifetime, man has learned to unleash against his fellowman destructive forces beyond the power of most of us to imagine.

Third, here at home, one long century after Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, our fellow citizens of color have burst into the national consciousness to insist that America make real the bright promise of freedom.

Fourth, each day's newspaper reminds us of new nations of the world pressing their claims not only for political independence but for a fairer share of the material benefits of the planet as well.

Even politicians feel the pressures of change. At the turn of this century, the population of the average congressional district was 193,167; in 1960, the figure was 410,481, more than twice as many people. In my own northern Indiana district, geographically smaller than in 1900, the number leaped from 200,078 to 472,958 in that 60-year period.

This expanded population is just one of the reasons Congressmen must spend more and more time handling constituents' requests and less and less on legislation.

The issues with which Congress wrestles, increasingly compounding questions of science and technology with political considerations, impose ever harsher demands upon our time and knowledge. Should we build atomic accelerators? How big? And where should they go? Is space research really productive scientifically? These are just examples.

In addition, the sheer growth of governmental activity coupled with the comparative rise in power of the executive branch has made it enormously difficult for legislators to exercise initiative and creativity in the policymaking process. The recent David Brinkley television program, "Congress Needs Help," in my judgment woefully understated our problem.

I could enumerate other areas of change, both abroad and within the United States, but let me cite only one more, of particular concern to us at this conference.

I refer to the vastly increased pressures on American colleges and universities.

The most obvious source of these pressures is the tremendous rise in the number of students. President James Perkins of Cornell said at Princeton recently that the student population is growing at the rate of 400,000 a year, the equivalent of nearly 100 new Princetons annually.

A second cause of stress is the heightened demands we place on colleges and universities to become involved in solving the problems of the Nation. The title of the recent congressional report issued by my distinguished colleague, Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin "Conflicts Between the Federal Research Programs and the Nation's Goals for Higher Education," reminds us of one of the most important burdens we ask higher education to bear (and one, by the way, which most institutions seem to bear gladly), scientific and military research for the Federal Government.

Only last year Congress passed several bills authorizing more ways in which the colleges and universities can help society attack various problems. The State Technical Services Act will help higher education do for business and industry what the Morrill Act enabled it to do for agriculture. Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 assists colleges and universities in solving community problems like housing and air pollution and, John Lindsay will be glad to hear, mass transit.

And Congress, through the new economic opportunity grants and upward bound programs, is asking colleges and universities to share in the war on poverty by opening their gates to thousands of able young men and women who have never before had access to higher education. Even without the new demands of society on higher education, the rapid evolution of subject matter and disciplines would make change within the academic community inevitable. We all know of the swiftness of innovation in physics and chemistry and biology, but the social scientists too, are now learning how to use mathematics and the computers.

The report this month on college teaching published by the Danforth Foundation may forecast yet another change in American higher education. If there has been a lot of poor teaching in the Nation's public schools, says the report, there is plenty of poor teaching in the colleges as well and "no one size or type of institution has a corner on the market."

I shall cite only two more factors of change in American higher education. As a Congressman, I am aware that recent years have seen a far greater role for the Federal Government in supporting education generally. From fiscal 1964 to fiscal 1966, Federal spending on education has soared from $4.5 billion to $8.7 billion, and the expenditures of the Office of Education alone have jumped over fourfold in 3 years.

And, of course, the other major areas of new influence on American higher education is the entire spectrum of challenges to traditional patterns of college and university life, challenges of which the student demonstrator and the faculty strikers are the most obvious symbols. To put the point another way, will the years ahead see our colleges and universities move in the direction of Latin American universities, where both students and faculty are more directly involved in governing the institution itself as well as in the political life of the nation?

Any one of these sources of change in American higher education could be the subject of an entire speech. My purpose here today is less ambitious. It is, against the background of all this flux, to raise a few questions about the role of the liberal arts colleges.

Clark Kerr has given us his vision of the future of American higher education—the multiversity.

James Perkins has exhorted us "to hold tight to the ideals of a liberal education," but has warned that the style, curriculum and system for assuring that education will have to change significantly.

Admiral Rickover tells us that colleges and universities have no business at all getting involved in solving the problems of society.

And the study sponsored by the Association of American Colleges on the future of the liberal arts college has not yet been completed. So this question is still to be answered.

What I want to do, therefore, is speak of one particular area of our national life to which, it seems to me, the liberal arts college can make a special contribution. I speak of education for leadership, leadership in our pluralistic, sometimes open, sometimes not so open, kind of society.

I will confess to you that I share the deep concern which John W. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, expressed in his recent extraordinary essay, "The Antileadership Vaccine."

Mr. Gardner declares that the educated man has defaulted, that he has not embraced the role of leadership which society expects of him. We are, moreover, Mr. Gardner charges, "immunizing" many of our most talented young people against any desire to be leaders.

Part of the difficulty, he says, is the kind of world we live in: "The conditions of life in a modern, complex society are not conducive to the emergence of leaders. The young person today is acutely aware of the fact that he is an anonymous member of a mass society, an individual lost among millions of others. The processes by which leadership is exercised are not visible to him, and he is bound to think that they are exceedingly intricate."

"Who, me?" is likely to be his response if you ask him if he plans to become a leader, in whatever field.

The point here, I think, is that we no longer live in an era when men make most of their important decisions face to face, where a sense of personal choice and accountability is the rule. We live in a society where men's lives are determined in large measure by powers and principalities—corporations, governments, unions—rather than by their next door neighbors or the family who lives down the road a piece.

I suggest that the activities of the student demonstrators from many of your own colleges and universities are, at least in part, a genuine and understandable reaction to this more complex world. And there is evidence beyond the demonstrations of a wider undercurrent of—and I must apologize for using an overworked word but it is the accurate one—alienation from many of the social structures and institutions which have traditionally been the funnels through which power and influence flow.

The existence of these attitudes of alienation, which are to be found in business and government and unions as well as in the universities, is directly related to the issue of education for leadership.

Richard Goodwin, former assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, characterized these feelings this way: "There is one central cause to our condition. It is the fear of the individual that he has become meaningless in the great human enterprise. Decisions of peace and war, life and death, are made by a handful of men beyond his reach. Cities and factories grow and spread seemingly powered by a force beyond the control of man. Our science describes our world in terms we cannot understand, reaching past the limits of ordinary understanding. Computers and marvelous machines seem to make man unnecessary—even in his oldest stronghold—his work."

Call the result what you will—alienation and estrangement, sometimes apathy and indifference—the result is apparent in many areas of life. For example, Prof. Murray Levin, of Boston University, says that today in John Winthrop's "City Upon a Hill," there is a "profound disgust and disillusionment with the political process and politicians in general."

A. H. Raskin, the noted labor reporter of the New York Times, says the white collar organization man of the large corporation is not the only one to feel depersonalized: "The worker's sense of obliteration in a mechanized society dominated by giant corporations and giant unions is making rank-and-file pressures for more recognition the most disruptive force on the strike front * * *. The structure of a big union makes it almost inescapable that the international president will find himself increasingly remote from the rank and file."

Simply to scan the chapter headings of the book recently published by my old classmate, Kenneth Keniston, "The Uncommitted," is to sense the parameters of the problem. Among the headings are: "The Fragmentation of Tasks"; "The Shattering of Community"; "The Ascendancy of Technological Values."

And certainly what happened in Watts last year dramatizes the sense of frustration and disaffection which can capture an entire community.

It should surprise no one therefore that many young people have adopted views of social change which stress personal relationships rather than organizational activities, which emphasize the politics of protest rather than the politics of party.

This bigness and the impersonality which characterize so many aspects of our culture and which issue in the sense of alienation I have been describing clearly do not make a breeding place for leaders. Retreat from responsibility for leadership is the more likely result of this condition.

But Mr. Gardner offers a second reason. Not only does the nature of the world, large and complicated, make leadership seem a difficult task. The process of education itself discourages the development of leaders. Here, says Mr. Gardner, is the view of leadership often found in the academic community: "The image of the corporation president, politician or college president that is current among intellectuals and professionals today has some decidedly unattractive features. It is said that such men compromise their convictions almost daily, if not hourly. It is said that they have tasted the corrupting experience of power."

But is it not true that the process of leadership, whether in politics, business or religion, is one which by its very nature is likely to involve accommodation, negotiation and compromise among conflicting groups, interests or principles? I here note that these are all nonnormative, descriptive words but that they are not customarily used that way by many who criticize politicians, corporation heads or even college presidents.

If you accept my major presupposition—that the liberal arts colleges must help educate young Americans for leadership—you may then ask, what ought liberal education to do?

First, I believe liberal arts colleges should encourage students to have a more sophisticated, more realistic, if you will, picture of the world, a view which recognizes, for example, that organizations need not always stifle the human spirit but can also help it flower. Men can develop organizations which will enable them to shape their lives in more creative ways. Indeed, this is the major justification for the requirement in the war on poverty that, in planning and running a community action program, there must be "maximum, feasible participation" of the poor.

Second, I believe that liberal arts colleges should teach their students not to be frightened by ambiguity or feel, in David Reisman's phrase, "threatened with complexity," but challenged and, indeed, stimulated. For leaders must learn to live with problems for which there may be no wholly satisfactory solutions. Is it not one of the marks of a leader that he can become the master of an ambiguous situation rather than be defeated by it? The educational process in the liberal arts college should help produce men who get ideas, not ulcers, when faced with the tensions of making decisions when legitimate principles and interests conflict. A truly liberal education should make clear that this is in fact, the rule not the exception, about the human condition.

Finally, the liberal arts colleges should be one of the great spawning grounds of generalists in an age of specialization. When Mr. Gardner describes the unfavorable picture of leadership which prevails in academic communities, he notes the sharp contrast with the self-image of the professional or specialist, "who is almost by definition dedicated to his field, pure in his motives, and unencumbered by worldly ambition."

"As a result," concludes Mr. Gardner, "the academic world appears to be approaching a point at which everyone will want to educate the technical expert who advises the leader, or the intellectual who stands off and criticizes the leader, but no one will want to educate the leader himself."

Of course, a society needs technicians and professionals and specialists. But we are also in desperate need of responsible generalists—men and women who can learn the language of the sciences, are not frightened by the computers, and who can help bring these special resources to bear on the larger issues of our time.

Richard Frost, former vice president of Reed College and now national director of the upward-bound program in the Office of Economic Opportunity, wrote recently in the alumni magazine of President Butterfield's Wesleyan College: "This, then, is the goal of the liberal arts institution—the specialty of generalism; the encouragement of young people along an educational track designed to give them abilities to understand the specialist's needs, competences, and workways and thereby the promise of reasonably effective 'management' of (the) same. It may be, not so surprisingly, that the old credos of liberal arts institutions have a special relevance today far beyond their earlier significance."

I think Mr. Frost is right.

To these three admonitions to the liberal arts colleges—to give their students the hope of creativity in an impersonal world, an appreciation of ambiguity as a condition of life, and a willingness to become generalists rather than specialists—I would add only one.

If a democratic society is to endure and freedom is to flourish, we must have men and women willing to assume the burdens—and the joys—of leadership. And if you will allow a Greek Methodist to talk like a Calvinist, those who have enjoyed the privilege of a liberal arts education—at least a good one—should be the first to enlist.

TRANSFER OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL TO DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the President, in his Reorganization Plan No. 2, has proposed the transfer of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior. This is a very constructive step in modernizing the organization of our Federal Government to meet its increasing commitments in the fight against one of America's serious problems—water pollution.

A major attack on water pollution has been mounted under the Johnson administration. Last year we passed the Water Quality Act, which created the Water Pollution Control Administration, increased Federal grants for pollution control, and provided for water quality standards. The President now has proposed a comprehensive effort to clean up entire river basin systems through the Clean Rivers Demonstration Act of 1966 and a simplification and strengthening of Federal pollution abatement powers.

In light of these increasing and comprehensive pollution control efforts, the structure of our Federal Government cannot remain fixed. It is proper that we seek ways to reorganize executive agencies in order to do an effective job. The President has recommended these water pollution control efforts be centralized in the Department of the Interior. This is a sound recommendation. Most of the Federal water resource programs are administered by that Department. With this change the Secretary of the Interior can better serve as a focus for the development of our vital water resources.

While this is a constructive step, it is not the last that needs to be taken. We now have a much broader Federal commitment to preserve and develop America's natural resources. This broader commitment compels us to improve the administrative structure of the Federal Government. S. 2435, introduced by Senator Moss with my cosponsorship, would bring all the major Federal agencies involved in conservation and resource development into one new Department of Natural Resources. This new Department would include most of the existing functions of the present Department of the Interior, the public works functions of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Forest Service and watershed protection activities now in the Department of Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Federal Power Commission.

Modern government cannot solve the problems which confront it unless its internal structure is equal to the task.

BUREAU OF SECURITY AND CONSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, over the last week or so there has been in the public press a great deal of comment with respect to the proposed State Department reorganization which would eliminate the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, headed, until a short time ago, by a very distinguished American, Mr. Abba P. Schwartz.

Suggestions have been made that Congress should look into the matter not only of the reorganization but the revelation of what appears to have been a back-door effort—and a successful one at that—to get rid of Mr. Schwartz.

I understand that the Government Operations Committee is going to look into the reorganization.

It also appears that a subcommittee of the House may conduct an investigation. I am not one who believes that we should duplicate in committee various matters of this sort, but I feel strongly that the Consultative Subcommittee on State Department Organization of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the chairman of which is the majority leader, ought to take a hard look at what at first blush appears to have been a possible effort to get rid of Mr. Schwartz, because of his well known views on matters of immigration, security, and the like, views which were strictly in accord with those of former President Kennedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles and editorials which comment on the Schwartz incident may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and I hope very much that Congress will look carefully into the background of what has been done.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 9, 1966]

HATCHET JOB

The Abba Schwartz story might well be headed: "Joe McCarthy Rides Again." And the painful fact seems to be that someone in the White House saddled the horse for him. It is impossible to believe that the State Department reorganization which eliminates his office and puts control of passport and visa policy in the hands of persons hostile to his views was motivated by considerations of economy. Mr. Schwartz, like so many State Department officials in the unhappy years of Senator McCarthy's reign of terror, appears to be a victim of hatchet men on the Hill—men who, like McCarthy, think that all Americans are patsys for Communist propaganda.

Abba Schwartz has done a superb job in the State Department in leading the long fight for immigration reform. He deserves great credit for a major role in drafting and bringing to realization the wise and decent immigration bill passed last year by Congress. If he made enemies in that fight they are an honor to him. He has conducted the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs with commonsense and humanity, granting passports in conformity with the rules laid down by the Supreme Court and granting visas to foreigners of divergent views, confident that the loyalty of Americans to their own system of government is not going to be overturned by the arguments of itinerant Communists or fascists. He is no believer in iron curtains.

A man who has served his government ably and faithfully does not deserve to have his job abolished while he is abroad on official duty. There ought to be a good, searching look at the Abba Schwartz case—not alone by the Government Operations Committee of the Senate but by the President himself as well.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 7, 1966]

EXPERT ON REFUGEE AFFAIRS QUITS OVER RUSK PLAN TO ABOLISH POST

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—Abba P. Schwartz, a vigorous advocate of liberal immigration, travel, and refugee policies in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, has been forced out of his high post in the State Department.

Mr. Schwartz submitted to the White House last night his resignation as Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. He said it had been offered 24 hours after he learned that he was to be the principal victim of a "reorganization" to abolish his bureau.

The reorganization was described to him as an economy measure. He said it had been planned for "many, many months" without his knowledge and had the approval of Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

The State Department had no comment. A spokesman referred all questions to Mr. Schwartz.

Some high officials said they were too upset by the affair to discuss it. One described it as "shabby," another as "scandalous." Mr. Schwartz, who is 49 years old, was the principal architect of changes last year in the immigration law that abolished restrictive quotas limiting admission to the United States for certain nationality groups. He also has long worked on measures to liberalize regulations governing the issuance of passports and to eliminate travel restrictions upon Americans.

SOUGHT TO FREE PRISONERS

Most recently, Mr. Schwartz is said to have used his wide contacts in international refugee and Red Cross circles to try to negotiate the release of more than 200 Americans being held prisoner by the Vietcong or North Vietnamese forces. He has been described as the Government's only link to these secret negotiations.

Together with Dr. Howard A. Rusk, director of the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at the New York University Medical Center, Mr. Schwartz has also worked to promote new programs of help for refugees in South Vietnam.

AIDED CUBAN REFUGEES

He was a principal negotiator of the accord with Cuba under which about 10,000 Cubans have been admitted to the United States in recent months. He has also administered American participation in worldwide efforts to relieve the plight of refugees and other displaced persons.

These have been his principal duties as head of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Security programs were removed from the Bureau before his arrival in September 1962, but he had charge of the Visa and Passport Offices, an Office protecting the interest of Americans overseas and one for refugee and immigration affairs.

Mr. Schwartz was the first person to hold the post with a Presidential appointment, requiring Senate confirmation, with the rank of Assistant Secretary of State.

He was a close associate of President Kennedy and his brother, Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Mr. Schwartz brought to the job the twin credentials of long service for liberal causes under the tutelage of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and the warm endorsement of Representative Francis E. Walter, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, who was a zealous congressional guardian of immigration policies.

Before joining the Government, Mr. Schwartz practiced law in Washington in the firm of Landis, Cohen, Rubin & Schwartz, and became one of the Nation's recognized experts on refugee and immigration matters and prisoner-of-war questions.

He was an early member of Americans for Democratic Action, a liberal wing of the Democratic Party, and first became a friend of Mrs. Roosevelt while promoting programs to help refugees from Nazi Germany. He was befriended by Mr. Walter, a Pennsylvania Democrat, while counsel to the United Nations International Refugee Organization and adviser to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

Once in the Government, he soon became embroiled in a series of controversies.

There has been an almost constant feud with Mrs. Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office, his subordinate, who protested, among other things, what she called the "dangerous" policy of letting suspected Communists obtain passports unless they were given an opportunity of facing their accusers.

CONFLICTS BLAMED FOR STEP

Mr. Schwartz has had many brushes with congressional security investigators. He is thought to have encountered frequent resistance inside the State Department in efforts to abolish U.S. bans on travel to Communist China and other Communist-held territories.

He refused to comment today, however, when asked what quarters or issues he believed had inspired the move to eliminate his job. Other sources said they believed past conflicts and not economy had led to the reorganization.

Mr. Schwartz said he had not seen the reorganization plan but understood that his Bureau's major functions were to be placed under the office of the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, William J. Crockett. Organizationally, Mr. Crockett already had supervision over the Bureau, so the main result of its abolition will be the removal of Mr. Schwartz.

Although the change, in effect, will amend the Immigration and Nationality Act that created the Bureau, the administration was said to be submitting it to Congress as a reorganization matter. Unless Congress objects, the change will take effect 60 days after submission.

Secretary Rusk and White House aids having long ago approved the change, Mr. Schwartz said, it appeared to be only a matter of days before the plan would be sent to Capitol Hill.

He said he had first learned of the plan a few hours after his return Thursday night from a confidential mission abroad and was officially informed Friday.

Apparently no effort was made to discourage his resignation.

"I knew nothing about it whatsoever," Mr. Schwartz said.

He said he had made no other plans so far and was awaiting word from the White House on the effective date of his departure.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 7, 1966]

State Department Aid Offers Resignation—Security Chief Schwartz Claims Job Is Abolished

(By John Maffre)

Abba P. Schwartz, controversial head of the State Department's security and Consular Affairs Bureau since 1962, has offered his resignation to the President because "my job doesn't exist any more."

Schwartz, who held the equivalent rank of Assistant Secretary of State, said in an interview he was quitting because a reorganization plan which he learned about only on Friday abolishes his job. He was appointed by President Kennedy.

The 49-year-old lawyer has long been at loggerheads with officials in the Department and on Capitol Hill for espousing a liberal philosophy in admitting foreigners of suspected political beliefs, and in letting Americans travel abroad to certain restricted areas.

CRITICIZES CHIEF

However, the only official he would discuss in critical terms yesterday was his chief, William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

"Mr. Crockett has not been one of the most enthusiastic supporters of our policy of maintaining a free and open society," he said. He said Crockett had declined Saturday to give him details of the reorganization plan, which affected only his office.

The resignation was delivered to the White House about 6:30 p.m. Saturday, after the President left for Texas, Schwartz said.

NOT YET RECEIVED

In San Antonio, Deputy White House Press Secretary Robert H. Fleming said that so far as he knows the resignation has not been received at the White House.

Crockett later said it was news to him that Schwartz had resigned. He said the reorganization involved no question of any feud between himself and Schwartz, and that it was "all a matter of cost reduction."

The departmental shuffle would result in a saving of nearly $300,000 a year, he said, and the number of staffers handling the functions which Schwartz dealt with would be reduced from 27 to perhaps 10. The 17 persons released from their tasks with Schwartz would be absorbed elsewhere, he said.

Crockett said he had not discussed the plan with Schwartz because most reorganization plans "are held closely until they can be analyzed and we can get approval. People have a way of being able to mobilize sympathies and their friends to thwart things."

Crockett said also it was considered better that the Secretary himself should inform Schwartz of the plans, because Schwartz was a presidential appointee even though he was in a junior position to Crockett.

Schwartz said that after learning about the reorganization, he first saw Under Secretary of State George Ball and then Secretary Rusk. Asked what position the Secretary had taken when he saw him Saturday, Schwartz thought for a moment, and replied: "The Secretary did not discourage me from submitting my resignation."

Schwartz' section was created by statute and can be amended or abolished only by further legislation. The security function had been removed from Schwartz' responsibility before he assumed the office, Crockett said, but it remained in the title for technical reasons.

The reorganization has not yet been submitted to Congress. Unless legislators differ with such a proposal within 60 days of its submission to them, it would take effect automatically.

Crockett said the plan involving abolition of Schwartz' office was part of a much larger reorganization plan, but that he could not discuss other parts of "the package." The moves were in line, he said, with the President's frequently expressed wishes for economy in Government departments.

"We have lived past the need for this kind of a setup," Crockett said, observing that the office which Schwartz held had been established by Congress by overriding a veto by President Eisenhower.

Schwartz praised Presidents Kennedy and Johnson for their liberal views on admitting foreigners with unpopular political views "in the belief that our society was strong enough to let these persons in."

But he said that in following through on that policy he "had not had the support of all my superiors, including Mr. Crockett, to whom these functions are apparently being assigned."

It has long been an open secret on Capitol Hill that the life expectancy of Schwartz' job was moot, as a result of many clashes he had had in and out of the Department.

One of his antagonists has been Miss Frances P. Knight, of the Passport Bureau, who felt that passport regulations concerning Communists were inadequate.

More recently he had been named by J. C. Sourwine, counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, as having had associations with Israelis whom he claimed were "espionage agents of a foreign power."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13, 1966]

Probe of State Department Asked: Schwartz Incident Widens Breach Between White House and Liberals

(By Richard Harwood)

A few hours before midnight last Sunday, President Johnson arrived at the San Antonio Airport to fly back to Washington. As he walked up the ramp to his plane, he was handed an envelope marked "personal" that had arrived in a diplomatic pouch from the State Department.

It contained a letter from Abba P. Schwartz:

"Having learned yesterday of a proposed State Department reorganization plan which will abolish the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, I am herewith submitting my resignation as administrator of this bureau, effective at your earliest convenience."

Within 48 hours, the resignation had reopened for some the dormant issue of "McCarthyism" in American public life. It had widened the breach between the Kennedys and the White House. It had produced demands for a thorough congressional investigation of the influences at work on the State Department. And it had added immeasurably to the administration's troubles with the liberal political community arising out of the conduct of the Vietnamese war.

"You have," an influential New Yorker angrily informed the White House, "just lost the Jewish vote in New York."

Underlying the outcry were questions involving both the credibility and the purposes of the Johnson administration. Had Schwartz been railroaded out of his job by the White House and the State Department as an act of appeasement toward conservatives on Capitol Hill? Or was he merely, as the administration insisted, the accidental victim of a desire to reduce the Federal budget by $246,000 a year?

Abba Schwartz, a wealthy and well-connected Georgetown bachelor, was no political celebrity, even by the provincial standards of Washington where every Congressman rates a line in the social register. He had never met the President, except in a fast-moving receiving line, and one presidential assistant with a good memory for political names—Marvin Watson—said blankly last week: "The only Schwartz I ever heard of in my life was a man in Galveston, Tex."

RESETTLED REFUGEES

He was claimed for wartime service soon after leaving the Harvard Law School in 1939 and after the war spent several years of anonymity in the work of resettling the homeless refugees of the world.

In this humanitarian role he had come into contact and had developed a warm friendship with the late Representative Francis Walter, of Pennsylvania, who was to figure prominently in the subsequent course of his career.

Schwartz also became, in his student days, a protege of Eleanor Roosevelt.

By 1948, his career was following the predictable pattern: partnership in a distinguished Washington law firm, an enviable social life in Georgetown and New York, and quiet works as a samaritan for refugees.

His circle of close friends included Mrs. Roosevelt, Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, and David Rockefeller, of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

The public service virus got him in 1960 with the election of John F. Kennedy, although 2 years were to pass before he joined the administration. In mid-1962 the opening came. The Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs was leaderless and Schwartz seemed to have been born for the job.

He was a brilliant lawyer. He had years of experience with refugees and immigrants with whom the Bureau was concerned. He was an impeccable liberal with the enthusiastic backing of an impeccable anti-Communist, Representative Walter, Chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Schwartz took control of the Bureau on October 9, 1962, and very quickly discovered that he was presiding over an agency that has been described in the State Department as a bureaucratic impossibility. It had had eight administrators in 9 years, the first of whom was the celebrated anti-Communist investigator, Scott McLeod, a protege of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. Its passport office was run by Frances Knight, a one-time McLeod assistant, whose venerable status in the Department is considered equivalent to the status of J. Edgar Hoover in Justice—untouchable.

The Bureau's patrons on the Hill—and the patrons of Miss Knight and other durable figures in this bureaucratic enclave—included Senator James Eastland's Internal Security Subcommittee and the Un-American Activities Committee in the House, Jay Sourwine, chief counsel for the Eastland subcommittee, once described the Bureau as "this loyal outpost of Americans."

For Schwartz, these were not the most congenial associates. Nor were his open door theories on travel and immigration popular with his subordinates or with Sourwine, no matter how closely they were in accord with the policies of the Kennedy administration.

These were among the things he could reflect on just 10 days ago when, late in the afternoon, he sat sipping a farewell glass of whisky with the impassive Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who was saying: "there is nothing personal in this, Abba."

LIBERALIZED RULES

But that was far in the future, Schwartz turned to his job in 1962 with the zest of any new administrator secure in the Presidential favor. In accordance with Supreme Court rulings and the desires of the White House, he liberalized passport and visa policies over the objections of the vocal Miss Knight. He began working on a new immigration concept and just a week before Mr. Kennedy's assassination drafted for the President an immigration message and an immigration bill which abolished the national origin quotas and which has since become law. He was the author of one of the legal documents used in managing the Cuban blockade during the missile crisis.

All this endeared him to the White House and to Attorney General Robert Kennedy but it did nothing for his relationships with Miss Knight and her congressional sponsors.

In her dealings with Schwartz, she was defiant. On one occasion a minor change in the format of the American passport was made without her knowledge. She fired off a memorandum to Deputy Secretary William Crockett, Schwartz' immediate superior, declaring that "the surreptitious handling of this (Schwartz) project is a disgraceful, calculated, gratuitous degradation of the Passport Office * * *. The only conclusion reached by the Passport Office at this time is that the recently delivered passports are a misprint and will be returned to the Government Printing Office for correction."

This and a long list of other grievances were communicated to Sourwine and the Eastland subcommittee who summoned Schwartz to an executive session on June 20, 1963, to explain if he was "out to get" Miss Knight.

LONG SERIES OF SESSIONS

That was the first of a long series of sessions behind closed doors with Sourwine and Senators.

They stretched over a period of 18 months and involved thousands of questions relating to the issuance of passports to Communists, the handling of refugees, and, above all, his treatment of Miss Knight and other subordinates.

Sourwine had a seemingly inexhaustible supply of rumors and information that had come to him through the subcommittee's intelligence network within the State Department.

"Did you," he asked Schwartz on August 13, 1964, "describe (this) committee or its proceedings in derogatory terms? Did you make a point of telling these officials that (Sourwine) was highly nervous while questioning you, and did you support this judgment by stating (Sourwine) took some pills and drank a great deal of water? What were you trying to convey to your superiors in that connection?"

[Sourwine later explained that they were reducing pills and had nothing to do with "nervousness."]

Throughout this 2-year investigation of Schwartz's administration of the Bureau's affairs, the transcript shows that the same questions came up time and again. Had Schwartz spent $15,000 to remodel his office, only to be dissatisfied with the baby-blue walls? Had he harassed Miss Knight by delaying payment of Passport Office bills and by delaying his approval of a trip she wished to make to New York? Had he said that Representative John Rooney, Democrat, of New York, "hates Miss Knight"? Finally, had Schwartz tried to fire her?

THE ANSWER WAS "YES"

The answer to that one was that Schwartz had tried many times to fire her and, as an alternative, had discussed with Under Secretary George Ball the possibility of transferring her to any number of other jobs. Nothing came of any of it and Schwartz later said, "The only thing to do was forget it. I couldn't spend my life feuding with a woman."

His last long seminar with Sourwine was on August 15, 1964, and when it was over it was obvious that he had not won any admirers. Senator Thomas Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, was repeatedly irritated by Schwartz, and Sourwine who remarked that the best solution to the problem might be to abolish Schwartz' office.

That was a prophetic remark. For while Schwartz was commuting between the State Department and Capitol Hill, Deputy Under Secretary Crockett was taking a careful look at that very possibility.

Crockett at this time had troubles of his own with the Eastland subcommittee because of Otto Otepka, the security investigator in Crockett's shop, who had been suspended from his job for leaking information to Sourwine. Schwartz' Bureau had nothing to do with that affair but Crockett and Rusk, too, were interested in its operation.

Rusk brought out of retirement former Ambassador Wilson Flake to make a study of the Bureau. Crockett put his own man on the same job, Col. George French. Their reports have never been made public, although Flake is said to have recommended that the Bureau not be abolished, but that Miss Knight should be replaced. Rusk has refused to comment on the Flake report and the contents of the French report have not even been rumored.

In any event, these studies were underway at the same time in 1964 that President Johnson asked all departments to find ways to save money. In State economy was the responsibility of Crockett and he began exploring the possibilities of administrative reorganization in a department with 25,000 employes and an annual budget of $400 million.

Some changes were made in early 1965 and by autumn Crockett had submitted to Rusk his final economy plan. It consisted of one item: abolish the Schwartz bureau, at an annual saving of $246,000.

Rusk was agreeable and, on September 20, 1965, sent the plan along to the Budget Bureau with the recommendation that it be approved.

Schwartz, busy with refugee problems in Vietnam and the added problem of trying to work out a prisoner exchange formula acceptable to the Vietcong, was unaware that he was piloting a sinking ship.

Budget Bureau approval of the Crockett reorganization plan coincided with Schwartz' departure for Geneva on a refugee mission. And the plan was cleared with Congress just before he returned to Washington (without disclosure, according to one House Member, that Schwartz was to be eliminated).

On the night of March 3, just back from Geneva, Schwartz was awakened at 11 p.m. by a telephone call from a newspaperman who told him of the reorganization plan.

The next morning he headed for Ball's office. A friend stopped him in the corridor and said: "You ought to know that George has been a sterling character through all this."

Ball confirmed that Schwartz' job would be abolished and suggested that Schwartz might become a special assistant to Rusk—with the same rank and with continued responsibility for refugee and immigrant affairs.

The next stop was Rusk's office, late that afternoon, where the drinks were served, where Schwartz' letter of resignation was discussed, and where no further mention was made of a new job offer.

That was the last meeting between Rusk and Schwartz. The next morning was Saturday and Schwartz went into his office to polish up the letter of resignation. During the day, friends came by to urge him to reconsider and to wait for further word from Rusk.

The afternoon passed, with the resignation still unsent. A little before 6 o'clock the phone rang. It was the Secretary: "Abba, I cannot discourage you from submitting your resignation tonight."

Within 6 hours, the resignation was in a diplomatic pouch, headed for Texas where the President received it 24 hours later, while boarding the plane at San Antonio.

The next day Mr. Johnson replied with an impersonal letter of praise that began: "Dear Mr. Schwartz * * *" and ended with an acceptance of the resignation.

Then the storm broke.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 8, 1966]

WHITE HOUSE ACCEPTS SCHWARTZ RESIGNATION

The White House announced yesterday that President Johnson has accepted the resignation of Abba P. Schwartz, head of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

The circumstances surrounding Schwartz' resignation drew fire from Senator **EDWARD M. KENNEDY**, Democrat, of Massachusetts, who said he might hold hearings to look into a plan to abolish the bureau Schwartz heads.

Schwartz submitted his resignation to the President over the weekend. He said he is leaving because he has been reorganized out of a job and had not enjoyed the full support of his superiors.

Schwartz singled out Deputy Under Secretary for Administration William J. Crockett as one with whom he had had differences over immigration policy. Crockett is Schwartz' superior.

In confirming Schwartz' resignation and the proposed abolition of his bureau, a State Department spokesman said yesterday the information he had been given indicated that the motives behind the planned reorganization were totally economic and not connected with Schwartz' views on immigration or other policies.

The spokesman noted that Schwartz had contributed much to the liberalized immigration bill adopted last fall, which had the full support of the President, the Secretary of State and the Department.

Late yesterday, Senator **KENNEDY** issued a statement praising Schwartz as a "direct action, liberal public servant." **KENNEDY** said he is "reserving judgment on the reorganization and how it will affect our refugee and immigration policies until details of the plan are made clear."

KENNEDY is chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and was floor manager of the new immigration bill. He has been critical of the American and Vietnamese handling of the refugee problems in South Vietnam.

Robert J. McCloskey, the Department's spokesman, said that the reorganization was in compliance with a Presidential directive to all departments to streamline.

He said that this is the second major change since July, 1965, when the Bureau of Administration was abolished. No further major changes are believed contemplated at present.

Both the White House and the State Department said that Schwartz had been offered a new position as Special Assistant to the Secretary of Refugee and Migration Affairs but that he had declined.

Three of the four offices now under Schwartz will be moved directly under Crockett's jurisdiction. They include the Passport Office of Special Consular Services. Where the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs will go has not been decided, the Department said.

The Office of Security, which was part of Schwartz' bureau until 1962, is now under Crockett's direct supervision and will not be affected by the proposed change.

The reorganization plan must be submitted to Congress for approval.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, March 9, 1966]

STATE'S NEW ROLE

(By Joseph Kraft)

The alltime world's record for smooth orchestration of different views was probably set by General Eisenhower in the great war against the Germans. It was therefore assumed that as President Eisenhower he would coordinate the various agencies of American foreign policy—the more so as he spoke of the need and acted to buttress the coordinating machinery of the National Security Council.

But Mr. Eisenhower named as his Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. By force of conviction and mind, Mr. Dulles ran his own show. Thus despite the President's intentions, foreign policy in the Eisenhower era was only dimly harmonized.

That famous mismatch of procedure and personality is relevant to the foreign policy reorganization announced here over the weekend. For while the change looks good on paper, it is a question whether enough of the right men are in enough of the right spots for the new arrangement to work in practice.

The main feature of the new approach is the reassertion of the primacy of the State Department in foreign affairs. The Secretary of State is assigned "overall direction, coordination and supervision of interdepartmental activities of the U.S. Government abroad (less exempted military activities)." For decision just below the Cabinet level there is set up a new Senior Interdepartmental Group (already baptized SIG) chaired by the Under Secretary of State, and including representatives of the military, intelligence aid and information services. Similar committees are set up for each geographical region, with the regional Assistant Secretaries of State acting as chairmen.

When these tasks are matched against the men on the job, problems show up immediately. For examples, the Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and South Asia, Ray Hare, is a Foreign Service officer who has been looking to retirement for years, and who lacks the stamina to aline other agencies with State's view.

Moving up to the Under Secretary level, George Ball undoubtedly has the brains and energy to run the senior interdepartmental group. But Mr. Ball, like most lawyers in government, is not notably a team player. His most important contributions have been one-man operations—chiefly his role as devil's advocate on Vietnam. Under the new setup there is a danger that Mr. Ball will bog down in coordination, thus draining away energy from the kind of thing he does best. Certainly, he is not now going to be in a stronger position to hold the President's coattails on Vietnam.

As to the Secretary, Dean Rusk has repeatedly favored the most mediocre members of the Department against its strongest people—witness, now, his part in pushing for the resignation of Abba Schwartz as Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Mr. Rusk has also seemed far more partial to the intense cold war view of the military services, where he spent his early years in Government, than to the more moderate conviction of his own Department. Vesting overall supervision with Mr. Rusk, accordingly, seems to tilt the balance even more strongly toward the military.

Lastly, there is the position of the President himself. Currently, the most serious procedural trouble in American foreign policy arises from the disposition of Lyndon Johnson to pay attention only to Vietnam. The new setup will not disrupt that habit in the slightest. If anything, the Senior Interdepartmental Group, by fostering the illusion that it can handle all other matters, may make it even easier for President Johnson to act as though Vietnam was the center of the world.

The point, of course, is that an organizational arrangement is not better than the people in it. Asserting the primacy of the State Department cannot be accomplished by fiat. There must be changes of attitude and of people. And if the changes are not forthcoming, then the coordinating function will slip back to the White House.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 9, 1966]

THE WATSON TOUCH

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

To oust a middle-level official in the State Department, top figures in the Government—including Presidential intimate W. Marvin Watson, Jr.—plotted for months in secrecy matching the wartime atom bomb project.

Deep White House involvement is the untold story in the forced resignation of Assistant Secretary of State Abba Schwartz, a champion of liberal immigration policies and prime target of conservatives on Capitol Hill.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk knew only the barest outlines of what was happening. Detailed planning was handled by William Crockett, his deputy for administration.

Crockett's partner in drawing up a reorganization plan that abolished Schwartz' Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs was Watson, President Johnson's appointments secretary and confidential detail man. The distinctive Watson touch, which led earlier this year to monitoring White House phone calls, is in evidence here.

The Watson-Crockett team worked in total secrecy completing the reorganization plan last September 20, and obtaining Rusk's final approval.

The Department's legal officer, Leonard C. Meeker, learned of it by chance in January. Seeking a copy of the plan in State Department files, he found none existed. He finally obtained a photostatic copy from the White House, under a strict secrecy edict. Even more surprising, President Johnson's personnel chief, John Macy (an old friend of Schwartz) was totally unaware of the plan.

In contrast, Government reorganization plans usually are debated for weeks before going to Congress, where they can be vetoed by either House within 60 days. Why, then, was this plan, abolishing Schwartz' bureau as an "economy" measure (saving $250,000 a year), drawn up under such elaborate secrecy?

Behind the answer lies one of the official Washington's bitterest perennial wars: the emotion-charged struggle over immigration policy.

Schwartz, a controversial liberal Democrat, was handpicked by President Kennedy to take control of immigration policy after 8 years of restrictive immigration in the Eisenhower administration. He has operated under this open-door policy: Grant visitor visas to anyone wanting to come to the United States to lecture, teach, or even agitate.

For example, in 1963 Schwartz had no hesitation in admitting an international law professor from Japan to lecture around the United States although he was a Communist and a winner of the Lenin Peace Prize at that. By the same token, Schwartz unsuccessfully favored admitting Moise Tshombe, then head of the split off Congo state of Katanga, although Tshombe then was regarded by liberals here as a far right-winger.

Schwartz' open door infuriated conservative Democrats on Capitol Hill, notably Representative Michael Feighan, of Ohio, and members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

For months, these conservative Democrats have plotted to have Schwartz removed. In the White House, Watson was unhappy about Schwartz as a Kennedy man. The result was the reorganization plan. Total secrecy was supposed to prevent Schwartz' liberal allies from starting a backfire.

Watson's feeling about Schwartz was shown late last fall when he interceded at the last moment with the State Department to prevent Schwartz from heading a U.S. delegation to an immigration conference abroad.

Why didn't the President just ask for Schwartz' resignation?

If forced out, President Johnson would have had difficulty replacing him. An Assistant Secretary acceptable to Feighan and company would be bitterly attacked by the liberals in Congress.

When Schwartz first heard about his fate last Friday, he offered to resign, if that would save the Bureau. Rusk turned him down flat, citing Watson and Crockett.

By abolishing the Bureau outright, policymaking is handed to Crockett, who is expected to give enlarged immigration duties to Frances G. Knight, head of the Passport Office. She and Crockett both are close to the Feighan Democrats.

Yet the Watson touch may backfire in the Schwartz affair just as it did in the White House telephone scheme. Hard opposition to the plan from the liberal-packed Senate Government Operations Subcommittee that will consider it, is certain. The Schwartz case is not yet over.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 11, 1966]

State Explains Resignation of Schwartz—Puts Blame on Leak—Says Ball Offered New Job to Him

(By Richard Harwood)

The State Department's management yesterday blamed the resignation of Abba P. Schwartz on a clumsy breakdown in internal diplomacy.

Schwartz, according to the authoritative Department version, returned from a 3-week trip to Geneva, Switzerland, at midnight last Friday. He was met at the airport by a journalist who informed him that his job as Administrator of the Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs was being abolished.

The next day—Saturday—Schwartz appeared at the State Department in an agitated frame of mind. He met separately with Secretary Dean Rusk and Under Secretary George Ball, who explained that in his absence the Bureau of the Budget had unexpectedly given its approval to a reorganization plan affecting Schwartz' Bureau.

Rusk had laid the plan aside, pending Schwartz' return. It had been his intention, acording to the Department, to discuss it with Schwartz before any other steps were taken. The premature leak at the airport had been an unfortunate slip-up.

During this Saturday discussion, Ball asked Schwartz to remain in the Department in the same rank (equivalent to Assistant Secretary of State) as a Special Assistant to Rusk. His new duties would have encompassed immigration and refugee affairs which, Rusk has said, Schwartz had handled superbly since 1962.

But Schwartz, the Department maintains, was in no mood to take a new job. He turned down the Ball offer and expressed no interest in any other assignment.

Rusk, accordingly, made no effort to dissuade him from resigning and on Sunday Schwartz announced that he had quit.

This version of the Schwartz affair, which has aroused political liberals in and out of Congress, is likely to be disputed in the days ahead, by Schwartz, among others. The dates, the sequence of events, and the new job offer are among the matters at issue.

In any case, both the White House and the State Department were perturbed yesterday over the repercussions of his resignation. From both quarters came firm denials that Presidential Assistant Marvin Watson had played any part in the matter and equally firm denials that the departure of Schwartz signaled any change in the liberal policies he had pursued with respect to the issuance of passports and visas and the administration of immigrant affairs.

The Department's managers and the White House both insisted that the abolition of the 27-man Bureau that Schwartz had headed was being recommended for only two reasons. The first was that the Bureau was an unnecessary appendage of the Department's bureaucracy. The second was that its elimination was an economy move that would save $246,000, with no loss of departmental efficiency.

It was pointed out that last year Rusk had abolished the job of Assistant Secretary Dwight Porter, who was an Administrator, and had combined the Bureau of American Republic Affairs with another departmental unit. There was not a word of protest, according to the Department, and the result of those and other shifts has been a worthwhile reduction in jobs and an elimination of unnecessary way stations in the chain of command.

Schwartz, in his resignation announcement on Sunday, implied strongly that his leaving was related to policy disagreements with Deputy Under Secretary William J. Crockett. He said Crockett had not been "one of the most enthusiastic supporters of our policy of maintaining a free and open society."

This explanation has been accepted by liberals who have described the Schwartz departure as an effort by the administration to appease conservatives, mainly in Congress, who were disenchanted with Schwartz and his "liberal" ideas.

Rumors to this effect in Congress were brought to the attention of White House Press Secretary Bill D. Moyers yesterday. He replied: "The worst source (of information) in Washington is obstreperous Members of Congress."

Congress, in any case, will have the final say on whether Schwartz' old Bureau will be abolished.

The Bureau was created by Congress and can be abolished only by Congress through approval of the reorganization plan which the President will submit.

There are already indications that the plan will be closely scrutinized by Government Operations Committees in both Houses.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in yesterday's Parade magazine Reporter Jack Anderson speaks of Senator Mike Mansfield as "one of those rare politicians who cares nothing for power or publicity."

As we all know, and as Anderson has written:

> He is guided only by conscience and duty, and in politics the demands of one do not always coincide with the demands of the other.

Senator Mansfield's manner of responding to conscience and duty—so much admired by his colleagues—is illustrated by the article he has written in the same magazine issue, "What's Going To Happen in Vietnam?" With typical honesty the majority leader says conditions have not changed since last fall when he reported:

> The situation as it now appears, offers only a very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of the continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland.

Yet he recognizes how earnestly President Johnson pursues those very slim prospects while confronting problems more complex and difficult than those facing any American President in this century. He speaks of the President's "intense preference for the works of peace" and concludes on the hopeful note that, although the eagle in the Great Seal of the United States holds both the olive branch and the arrow, "his head is inclined toward the olive branch."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this richly deserved tribute to Senator Mansfield, and the excellent article he has authored himself, both from the March 13 issue of Parade, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Parade magazine, Mar. 13, 1966]

The Agony of Dissent

(By Jack Anderson)

Washington.—In this city of awesome decisions, most leaders search their souls before plunging ahead on a course that could take the Nation to the edge of a nuclear holocaust. But few go through the agony that Mike Mansfield suffers. For the 62-year-old Senate majority leader, a key figure in the great debate now raging over President Johnson's conduct of the Vietnam war, is one of those rare politicians who cares nothing for power or publicity. He is guided only by conscience and duty, and in politics the demands of the one do not always coincide with the demands of the other.

The lean, 6-foot Montanan with the gentle manner and quiet voice, whose tanned, lined face shows the somberness of his mood, his misgivings about the war. Yet duty and loyalty require that he give maximum support to Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam policies. If Mansfield allows the voice of his conscience to speak too loudly, it might be interpreted abroad as a dramatic division in the top policymaking councils, thus weakening the President in whatever action he ultimately may be forced to take.

Mansfield himself, puffing slowly on the pipe that is rarely out of his hand, explained to Parade: "I have a responsibility as Senate majority leader which I intend to uphold. I have a responsibility as Senator for Montana which I intend to uphold. I also appreciate the difficulties confronting the President. I have probably seen the President on Vietnam more than any other Senator. All I can tell you is that I do the best I can in line with my conscience."

Though they may differ in style and occasionally in opinion, the President has the highest regard for Mansfield's integrity. It was Lyndon Johnson who urged Mansfield to accept the Senate leadership. "I didn't want the job," Mansfield later confided to an intimate, "but I felt I couldn't say no." However, he did say no—quiety but firmly—in 1964 when President Johnson began telling people that Mansfield was the best man for the Vice-Presidency. The thought of becoming the man second in line for the White House was too much for the modest Montanan.

After the ironfisted Senate rule of Lyndon Johnson, many considered the choice of the retiring MANSFIELD an error. One newspaper went so far as to call it "a tragic mistake." MANSFIELD retorted mildly, "If that means I am not a circus ringmaster, the master of ceremonies of a Senate nightclub, a tamer of Senate lions, or a wheeler and dealer, then I must accept the words."

Though his predecessor had been all these things, MANSFIELD was not hitting at Johnson, whom he admires. It was merely MANSFIELD's way of asserting that he intended to be himself. He relies on persuasion, accommodation and understanding. He doesn't try to run the Senate himself, as Johnson did, but urges committee chairmen to take the lead. He gives them all the credit and glory. When the flashbulbs begin to explode and the TV cameras to whir, he steps back and pushes others to the front.

In every poll that has been taken, MANSFIELD has been voted by Democratic and Republican Senators alike as the colleague they most admire. "He doesn't have a single enemy in the place," says Senator RUSSELL LONG, the No. 2 Democrat. And the dean of the Republicans, Vermont Senator GEORGE AIKEN, declares: "There isn't a Republican Senator who would raise a finger to hurt MIKE." In short, MANSFIELD is living evidence that in politics, if not in baseball, nice guys can win.

MANSFIELD is by no means a peace-at-any-price man. But he does believe that every effort should be made to moderate hostilities in Vietnam while the search for peace is pursued. His views, written exclusively for Parade, are printed here.

President Johnson asked him to head a Senate delegation last fall to call on world leaders about Vietnam. Though the President turned his personal plane over to them and gave them a big sendoff, MANSFIELD didn't report back what the President wanted to hear. In grim language, most of it still secret, the report questioned the wisdom of some of Johnson's policies.

Asian leaders who met MANSFIELD responded to his obvious honesty and fairness with a warmth that surprised American diplomats. Even in Burma and Cambodia, whose leaders have been hostile to the United States, his sincerity was never questioned. Red-leaning Cambodia, for example, described him as "a man of great justice."

If MANSFIELD had his choice, he would prefer to go down in Senate history as a foreign affairs expert rather than a great leader. That he reached the Senate at all is an accolade for the son of poor Irish immigrants. Born on the edge of New York's Hell's Kitchen, MICHAEL JOSEPH MANSFIELD didn't get his high school diploma until he was 30. Through extra courses, he got his college degree at the same time and became an assistant history professor at Montana University.

If this was a sheltered life, he had already seen it in the raw. The least combative of men, he has served in three of the four armed services. During World War I, as a boy of 14, he lied about his age and enlisted in the Navy. By the time he was 19 he had also served in the Army and the Marines. He still wears the Marines' discharge button in his lapel.

After his military service he returned to Montana and dug his way up from the copper mines, where he earned $4.25 a day as a mucker and ore sampler. It was while he was at the bottom, literally, that he married his wife, Maureen. They have one daughter, Anne.

MANSFIELD entered politics in 1940 and 2 years later gained a seat in the House. After five terms he was elected to the Senate in 1952. He has specialized, as a professor, Congressman, and Senator, in Far Eastern affairs.

HIS FRIEND AIKEN

In a Senate full of friends, MANSFIELD's closest companion is Senator AIKEN, and the contrast between the two men is dramatic. The Democrat from the West, tall, spare, and solemn, towers over the Republican from the East, who is short, gnarled, and elfish. The two have been eating breakfast together almost every morning for 15 years. When MANSFIELD occasionally arrives 5 minutes late, AIKEN greets him with a dry "Where have you been this forenoon?"

Though MANSFIELD scorns the flexible morality of many politicians, he is an excellent politician himself. He considers being a U.S. Sentaor "the finest job in the world" and is in his office every day at 7 a.m. to catch the first mail delivery from Montana. He sees as many of his constituents as he possibly can and, while wrestling with the problems of the Senate leadership, still finds time for the details that win votes. "If I forget Montana, then Montana will forget me," he explains.

Some men seek power and enjoy and employ it. Some have power thrust upon them and accept it only from a sense of duty. Frequently they find its exercise painful in the extreme. Such a man is MIKE MANSFIELD. He is a worrier but a worrier for the best.

WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IN VIETNAM?

(By Senator MIKE MANSFIELD)

On the Great Seal of the United States, the eagle holds an olive branch in one claw. In the other there is a bunch of arrows. That is as near to an expression of current U.S. policy on Vietnam as is likely to be found.

If we are on an escalator in Vietnam, it is one in which both sides go up. Our military efforts climb rapidly. Also on the rise are the efforts to find a way to peace.

Clearly in 1 year we have put to use more military power in Vietnam than has been brought to bear on any one place at any time since Korea. This great strength blunted the thrust of the Vietcong drive for the conquest of the south. It undoubtedly saved the Vietnamese Government from collapse a year ago.

With armed forces of 600,000—half of whom are regulars—the government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky in Saigon has managed to hold its political position somewhat more firmly than any of its many predecessors since Ngo Dinh Diem. But there is no blinking the fact that after the assassination of President Diem a great deal in the way of popular support and terrain was lost by Saigon. The terrain has not been recovered, and popular support can hardly be expected for military leaders whose names are probably better known in this country than to the people of Vietnam. To be sure Saigon has many plans to alter this situation. With U.S. aid-backing, programs of political, social, and economic development are being developed. It may be that the Honolulu Conference in February will have spurred these plans into practice. Certainly, President Johnson has laid great stress on this aspect of the Vietnamese problem, even sending the Vice President to southeast Asia.

However hopeful the plans may be, the fact is that no significant reversal of the situation has yet been brought about in South Vietnam. The sooner we face that fact the better off we are going to be. General Westmoreland put it well at the end of the President's meeting with the Vietnamese leaders in Honolulu recently when he stated: "I do feel we must be prepared for a long war. The nature of the enemy is such that we cannot expect him to be defeated by a single battle or series of battles."

That more has not been achieved during the past years is no fault of the American forces in South Vietnam. They have fought with courage, skill, and great dedication. They have taken many casualties in the bitter, brutal struggle in the jungles, swamps, and mountains. But the grim truth is that these forces were injected into a political situation which, after repeated coups, was in an advanced stage of disintegration. Moreover, they have had to face a brave, cunning, and tenacious foe who has a fighting tradition going back decades and in a setting in which he is thoroughly at home.

Finally, it should be borne in mind that our forces are in an open-ended war. In 1 year the conflict has already spread by air from South Vietnam to North Vietnam. By air it has already spilled over the borders of Laos. There is a constant threat of a further expansion into Cambodia and Thailand.

So far the North Vietnamese have been able and willing to escalate their commitment of men and material sufficiently to neutralize our increased aid and prevent any fundamental change in the basic situation in South Vietnam. It is no wonder that further escalation of the U.S. commitment has been under consideration for some time in Saigon and Washington. The Defense Department has been budgeted for a $1.7 billion increase, most of it earmarked for Vietnam. More and more there is talk of doubling the 200,000-man U.S. force in Vietnam before the end of 1966 and of redoubling the total in 1967.

If present trends continue, the need for additional military strength in Vietnam is inescapable. What is uncertain, however, is whether the increase will alter the fundamental situation or merely spread the devastation in South Vietnam and push the ground war beyond its borders. The fact is that the Communists in Asia remain in a position to raise the ante in Vietnam and southeast Asia as our commitment rises. To date, that is precisely what they have been doing, and they still have scarcely touched General Giap's North Vietnamese main force.

The U.S. military effort is already so great in Vietnam as almost to overshadow that of the Vietnamese forces themselves. If it grows much heavier serious questions may well arise in Vietnam and elsewhere as to the nature of the war and of its relation to the Vietnamese people.

Considerations of this sort obviously are of great military significance. That is why men of the caliber of Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin (retired) recently counseled the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to "Stop, look, and listen," to "Take a look at the alternative realistically and in light of our total global commitment."

Beyond military realities, President Johnson's research for an end to the war by negotiations is also a response to the overwhelming desire of the American people for peace. It is an expression of an abhorrence for modern war's inevitable and massive devastation, especially as it is visited on a primitive country that has seen and suffered little but war for decades. It is a reflection of the President's intense preference for the works of peace.

Even as our military efforts have gone up, therefore, our diplomatic search for peace has also escalated. The peace drive began in earnest with the President's Johns Hopkins speech in Baltimore on April 7, 1965. It has grown steadily, reaching a climax in the great midwinter peace offensive.

THE JOHNSON MESSAGE

In his state of the Union message on January 12, 1966, President Johnson spelled out in the clearest detail the lengths to which the United States is willing to go to initiate negotiations. He stated: "There are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table, discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and consider the views of any group."

The North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front have shown no interest in negotiations except on terms that mean the total scrapping of the government of the republic. The Saigon Government, with our continued support, on the other hand, is just as determined that its authority shall not be jeopardized by any discussions of peace with the National Liberation Front. That appears to be the nub of the issue of peace in Vietnam. Until and unless it begins to yield to solution, there is no reason to alter the conclusion that four colleagues and I reached after an extended visit in southeast Asia and Europe last fall:

"The situation, as it now appears, offers only a very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland."

The situation that confronts President Johnson in Vietnam is, in fact, more complex and difficult than that which faced Woodrow Wilson in World War I, Franklin D. Roosevelt in World War II or Harry Truman during the Korean conflict.

One thing is certain: Slim as the prospect of reaching peace through negotiations may be, President Johnson will continue to press for it. That is as it should be with respect to Vietnam. Indeed, it would be well to remember that while the eagle on the great seal of the United States holds both arrows and olive branch, his head is inclined toward the olive branch.

THE THREAT OF INFLATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Richard M. Nixon is one of the most able and articulate public servants of this generation. He has served his Nation and the Republican Party in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, and for 8 years as Vice President of the United States.

Few Americans of our time are so qualified to address themselves to the great issues confronting this Nation.

In a series of newspaper columns, distributed throughout the United States, Mr. Nixon is speaking out on these issues.

The first column, carried in the Los Angeles Times, deals with the ominous threat of inflation, a threat to the paycheck of every American worker and the budget of every American housewife.

In the tradition of the loyal opposition, Mr. Nixon has held out an alternative course of action for our Government to avert this danger of inflation.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Nixon's comments be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON INFLATION MAJOR ISSUE OF 1966: NIXON ACCUSES PRESIDENT OF WAGING WAR ON PROSPERITY

(By Richard M. Nixon)

(NOTE.—With this article Richard M. Nixon begins a series of monthly columns which will appear in the Times. The former Vice President outlined his objectives in this letter:

("In the forthcoming months I will have the opportunity to be writing a series of columns discussing the great issues that will be debated in the 1966 campaign.

("It is the tradition of the loyal opposition in this country to support the President when his policy is in the best interests of the American people, and to oppose and constructively criticize those administration programs or policies which we believe to be misdirected or wrong.

("These columns will remain in that tradition.

("As you are aware, I have supported the actions President Johnson has taken to assist the people of South Vietnam to defend their national independence from Communist aggression. His efforts to secure a just and honorable peace and to guarantee the freedom of the Vietnamese people will continue to receive that support.

("This first column, however, deals with a great domestic issue where the President and I do not agree. That is the issue of inflation.

("I do not believe the course of action the President has chosen is a wise one; I do not believe it will successfully meet this growing domestic peril.

("Therefore, I am taking this occasion to criticize the administration's program and to hold out an alternative course of action which I believe must be taken to remove this threat to the well-being of every American.")

Johnson inflation will be the major domestic issue of the 1966 congressional campaign. The President's deceptive guns-and-butter budget, which just a month ago was hailed as a political masterpiece, has turned out to be his first major political blunder.

His irresponsible refusal to face up to the danger of economic escalation at home at a time when we have military escalation abroad will cost his party scores of House and Senate seats in November; more important, it will cost those Americans who can least afford it billions of dollars in higher taxes and higher prices.

His budget message should have been a declaration of war against inflation. Instead it was a declaration of Mr. Johnson's "war on prosperity"—a war in which the casualties will be the family budgets of millions of Americans.

The American people are entitled to have the answers to two questions: How did we get into this "war on prosperity?" And, how can we get out of it?

CLEAR ANSWER

The answer to the first question is clear.

As prices and taxes rise, administration spokesmen will try to blame labor for demanding higher wages, they will try to blame business for asking for higher prices, they will try to blame the war in Vietnam.

There is only one place to put the blame—the budget-brinkmanship of the Johnson administration.

There were plenty of early warning signals.

There was the highest December rise in the cost of living in 15 years.

There was the yearend report that wholesale prices went up more in 1965 than they had in the last 8 years.

There were the accumulated deficits of 6 years of unbalanced budgets of the administration.

There were the demands of the war in Vietnam.

In a speech on December 3, I warned: "The American economy is on a collision course with inflation. Unless strong corrective action is taken dealing with causes rather than symptoms, the American people face higher prices, higher taxes, and wage and price controls in the next 2 years."

Along with many others in the loyal opposition, I recommend cutting nondefense spending and checking the expansion of credit. Instead of using these weapons, which could have won the war against inflation, President Johnson moved in exactly the opposite direction.

Instead of moving to check the expansion of credit, he criticized William McChesney Martin for raising the Federal Reserve Board discount rate.

Instead of cutting nonmilitary expenditures, he raised them.

Instead of presenting an honest budget his administration overestimated revenues, underestimated expenditures, and threw in some one-shot accounting gimmicks to disguise a $9 billion budget deficit as a cash surplus.

Instead of using these battle-tested weapons to fight the war against inflation, he relied on new, untried weapons which proved to be duds—so-called "voluntary" guidelines for prices and wages. These weapons were too little, too late, and aimed at the wrong target.

He failed to recognize that the best way for Government to set guidelines is for Government to set an example. Instead he demanded that business slam on the price brakes while Government stepped on the spending accelerator.

Now with the war on inflation being lost and Mr. Johnson's "war on prosperity" launched, the casualties are beginning to mount.

In his state of the Union message, the President asked of those who recommended budget cuts: "Whom will they sacrifice?"

His question has turned out to be a deadly boomerang. As the Johnson inflation begins to eat into family budgets all over the Nation, millions of Americans are asking, Whom will he sacrifice?

If prices continue to rise at the December rate there will be a 5-percent increase in the cost of living in 1966. This is like imposing a 5-percent sales tax across the board on food, clothng, and all the necessities of life.

Whom then will he sacrifice?

Not the rich, who can hedge against inflation, but the poor; the 20 million retired Americans living on social security who have no pay raise coming; the 3 million Americans in the armed services and the millions more working in Federal, State and local governments who have no clause in their contracts to compensate them for rising prices.

The 16 million union workers will suffer as well. If the Johnson guidelines hold their wage increases to only 3.2 percent while the Johnson inflation raises the prices of what they buy by 5 percent, their real wages, measured in purchasing power, will actually be cut by 2 percent in 1966.

Losing the war against inflation will also mean another battle lost in the war against poverty. If the Johnson inflation is not checked it will succeed in creating a new class of poor. Among the new poor will be millions of retired citizens. They will see their life insurance, their pensions, their social security, and their savings eaten up by the hidden tax of inflation.

Here is the ultimate tragedy: As we continue to lose the war against inflation we shall become hopelessly bogged down in the war nobody wants—the "war on prosperity."

TAX RAISE POSSIBLE

Because it failed to cut nonmilitary expenditures, the administration has now indicated that it may soon have to raise taxes. And lurking just around the corner is prosperity's most deadly enemy—compulsory wage and price control. As Dr. Arthur Burns said recently: "Such controls might suppress inflation for a time but at the cost of impairing efficiency and destroying economic freedom."

How can we start winning the war against inflation and end this "war against prosperity?"

It is time for the administration to adopt as its guideline not politics as usual but economic statesmanship of the highest order.

It is time for the President to level with the American people and to tell them that in a period when we are spending billions more for military expenditures abroad, it is necessary to cut nonmilitary expenditures at home.

Instead of condemning Chairman Martin for his courageous farsighted action, the administration should encourage action in the public and private sector which will check the rate of expansion of credit.

If these major weapons are not thrown into the battle immediately, the war against inflation will be lost and Mr. Johnson's ill-advised war against prosperity will escalate.

Normally we could rely on the Congress to restore responsibility to the budget. However, the Democrats with their current 2-to-1 majority in the House and Senate are creating such a racket bickering with each other and the President over Vietnam and shouting through approval of every new domestic spending program coming down from the White House that the voice of the responsible Republican opposition is lost in the chorus.

What this country needs, what the President needs, is a Congress that will stand up to him in defense of the dollar at home and stand up with him in defense of freedom abroad.

SENATOR SYMINGTON SPEAKS OUT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, my colleague on the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Honorable Stuart Symington, of Missouri, has energetically and effectively rebutted some of the assertions of critics of the administration's southeast Asia policies. On February 23, he appeared with me on a radio program for broadcast in my home State of West Virginia, and he emphasized that the American people want peace but they want it with honor. He further pointed out that many of the statements by administration critics are undoubtedly giving aid and comfort to the Communist aggressors in Asia.

Senator Symington has continued his efforts to rebut some of the claims of administration critics of the U.S. Asian policies. The article, "A Rebuttal of a Rebuttal of Vietnam Policy," published in the Sunday, March 13, issue of the Washington, D.C., Post, is an eloquent statement of his views.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Rebuttal of a Rebuttal of Vietnam Policy

(By Stuart Symington, Democratic Senator from Missouri, and former Air Force Secretary)

Within the past several weeks, the Washington Post has published an address by Under Secretary of State George Ball defending the Johnson administration's position on Vietnam and a rebuttal article by Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, headed, "The Basic Flaw in Our Asian Strategy."

The following thoughts have to do with certain basic views presented by Senator Church; later I make some observations of my own concerning the relationship of history to the Vietnam problem we face today.

The Senator brings up three main points in his disagreement with Secretary Ball: first, that Asia and the other less-developed continents are different from Europe; second, that there is a sizable and significant difference between "Chinese aggression" and "Communist expansionism," and third, that the concept of spheres of influence is still a logical and useful way to come to grips with the problems of international order.

From these premises, Senator Church concludes that our present Vietnam policy is unwise and unworkable although with candor he acknowledges the difficulty that lies in the way of embarking on an alternative one.

The Senator disagrees with those who believe that the war in Vietnam is a test case of our ability to resist the accepted Communist tactic of "wars of national liberation." He views this struggle as basically the working out of anticolonialist and nationalist resultants left over from the end of French rule in 1954.

REVERSE DOMINO

Before examining his argument in detail, let us note the wider implications of his analysis. He does far more than merely question the policy of this administration: assisting the people of South Vietnam in resisting the attack that has been mounted against them. He attacks the foundations of U.S. policy throughout the less developed world—the so-called southern two-thirds of the globe, wherein live four-fifths of the world's population.

Were it not a metaphor that has been gravely weakened by misuse, one could describe his position as the "reverse domino" theory; because if United States overall policy in Vietnam is as wrong as the Senator suggests, its policy is likely to be mistaken in other areas as well. If the "policy domino" falls in Vietnam, it will carry down with it a number of policy principles that are being applied in the rest of the world.

The first contention of the Senator is that the rest of this world is not like Europe in the sense that Europe, after World War II, was composed of well-established governments able to resist either internal subversion or Communist political takeovers. The problem facing Europe, he suggests, was the threat of Soviet military aggression, and in order to halt and contain this threat, we cooperated in the formation of NATO.

This "stopped the westward movement of Russian aggression," not "the spread of communism," a phrase in the Ball speech which he rejects because he believes it an unsatisfactory description of Soviet ambitions. But to describe the problem of Europe after World War II as being no more than the prevention of Soviet tanks from rolling westward is oversimplifying history to the point of distortion.

BUILDING FROM SCRATCH

In 1945, the countries of Europe were on their knees economically, and it took sizable amounts of American aid to start them on the road to recovery. The war left behind the remnants of discredited political arrangements, and not just in the defeated countries of the Axis. Political stability was an elusive goal in some countries.

Large Communist elements existed in France, Italy, and elsewhere. Their continued existence to this day apparently would lead Senator Church to his conclusion that Soviet aggression, not communism expansion, was what was contained by American forces.

Surely the situation allows of another explanation which to me is both more plausible and more pertinent to what is now happening in Vietnam. The vital point is not that there were strong Communist parties in Western Europe but rather that they did not move to take power as they did in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania.

The explanation may be that Communists west of the Danube are benign, parliamentarily and morally opposed to the use of force. In that case, the Communists now fighting to export North Vietnam's way of life into South Vietnam are different from those in Italy and France—but surely in ways that entitle South Vietnam to greater, not less, American assistance.

It would seem that a more likely explanation, and one with equal or greater pertinence to the current situation in Vietnam, is that the Communist elements in Western Europe were restrained by the presence of Western forces both before and after the formation of NATO. The Communist parties of Western Europe protested with all their resources of propaganda and disorder at what they described as an assertion of American hegemony in Europe.

THE GREEK AFTERMATH

The Senator's argument ends on a curious note, for he concludes that even though we succeeded in Europe, we are likely to fail in Asia. The success in Europe that we now take for granted was hardly evident during the grim winter of 1946–47.

Let us remember that in 1947, Communist forces in Greece were just 20 miles from Athens. That war was halted by sizable injections of American assistance, including military personnel, and later by the withdrawal of Yugoslavia from the Soviet orbit, leaving the Communists without that secure base.

What happened in Greece yields clear lessons for today's struggle in Vietnam, and the analogy is not destroyed by the fact that, as Senator Church puts it, "we did not intervene with troops." Neither did we intervene with troops for the first several years of the Communist attack against Vietnam. Only when the infiltration of Communist military forces from outside became obvious, and beyond the capabilities of the South Vietnamese to resist adequately on their own, did we begin to put American fighting forces into Vietnam.

In Senator Church's opinion, the analogy between Europe and Asia, and between Greece and Vietnam, also breaks down on the point that we and the Europeans share a common culture and civilization, including a common experience of freedom. Surely the concept of cultural spheres of influence depends on who is drawing the lines.

Greece has cultural links with France, England, and the United States, but its ties to the East and South are not insignificant. The Eastern Orthodox Church belongs as much to Russia as to Greece. Conversely, Vietnam, after 80 years under French domination, may have earned some title to a common heritage, with a culture and way of life that Westerners are quick to appreciate and admire.

I do not mean to press the point, but in this nuclear space age, the concept of mutual cultural interests is to me a much too narrow basis for determining where and when we should make our presence felt in assisting independent nations in their effort to preserve freedom from Communist exploitation.

By his emphasis on this point, Senator Church comes perilously close to limiting our protective role to a "seamless web," to use his phrase, of Western civilization. He may protest this interpretation of his argument, but it is no more incorrect than his charge that our Government fails to see the differences between and within Communist countries.

There is nothing in the reasoned argument of Secretary Ball, or, as far as I know, in any statement by any administration spokesman, to suggest that the State Department does not recognize the important differences between the Communist governments of Eastern Europe, for example, on the one hand, and those of mainland China or North Korea on the other. In fact, the administration has shown itself to be clearly conscious not only of the differences between the various Communist camps but, perhaps more significantly—for this is a point left out of the argument of my colleague—it recognizes that communism itself changes with the passage of time.

The Soviet Union of today is not the Soviet Union that suffered under the nightmare rule of Stalin in his final, paranoid years. It is as great a mistake to fail to note the differences between the shrewd and flexible line of a Khrushchev preaching peaceful coexistence and the strictures of a Stalin as it is to overlook the differences between national varieties of communism.

A HOPE FOR ASIA

The changed conditions that now enable the President to proclaim a policy of "building bridges" to Eastern Europe also point in the direction of a future solution to the problems posed by Communist expansionism and Chinese aggression in Asia. For it is in the possibility of an eventual change within the regimes now leading the Asian Communist nations that hope lies for the future peace, freedom and development of the countries of Asia.

In the Communist world today, China leads the militant camp, preaching a doctrine of continuous and violent revolution directed at the less developed nations of the world. Its form of aggression has been the export of subversion, and whether this should be characterized as expansionism or aggression is to mince words. Either way, it seeks to advance the coming to power of Communist governments.

In seeking to acknowledge the correctness of a geopolitical claim to spheres of influence by China, Senator CHURCH in effect consigns a number of neighboring countries to the tender mercies of the commissars—not just Vietnam, but also Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia the Philippines—and possibly one should add Korea and Japan. They are located within the Chinese range of power and thus, by his logic, would not be entitled to our assistance to resist Communist encroachment.

The Senator feels that China does not need to use open military methods in order to achieve its aim. Yet in Vietnam, the Communists sought for several years to achieve their purpose by techniques of subversion and propaganda. Only when these means were frustrated did they move to a more active stage of military effort.

The United States successfully aided South Vietnam during the earlier 1956-59 period. Only when the Communists escalated their attack by the introduction of large numbers of cadres and weapons from North Vietnam did we begin to provide military forces, first as advisers, then in combat strength.

It is the Communists who shaped the nature of that attack; we did not. I would like to ask Senator CHURCH: At what point in the shift from what he might call "expansionism" to what is plainly today a case of aggression would he have halted American assistance to South Vietnam?

COMPARING SPHERES

A final point about spheres of influence: The Senator concludes in a most curious fashion that we and the Chinese have similar rights to "spheres of influence": we in this hemisphere, they in the countries on their periphery.

Such a view cannot be left unchallenged. Surely the Senator does not mean to suggest that the Communist Chinese policy of exported subversion is similar to the voluntary and cooperative relationship that exists among the countries of this hemisphere and ourselves, as expressed in the OAS and the Alliance for Progress.

The Senator cites Cuba. But when that country allowed itself to become a base for Soviet missiles, the countries of Latin America voted 20 to 0 to condemn this action and support the blockade.

The Senator uses an analogy from the game of chess. Each "piece"—pawn or king—represents large numbers of people in important parts of the world. Surely one man's pawn is another man's king or queen. It all depends where they, and the observer, are located.

We heard Neville Chamberlain state in the late 1930's that Czechoslovakia was "a faraway country of which we know little." But to the people who wept in Prague when German tanks rolled in, that country was not far away but right there.

Should we not consider that today, in military time, Red China is far closer to all of America than Czechoslovakia was to Britain? This telescoping of time and space, along with the development of megaton weapons, can only change radically the "spheres of influence" concept. From the standpoint of national security, in effect every country is now in the next county.

LATE HOUR INDEED

And so it would seem to me that if one accepts the position of Senator CHURCH and his supporters, the claim can be made that we have lost some money and, what is more important, some lives. If these people are wrong, however, and if we do not recognize our responsibility as the only Nation left capable of resisting such aggression, tomorrow we could be fighting for more than justice; we could be fighting for survival.

In his "total disagreement" with the views of the State Department as to the importance of early deterrence of further Communist aggression, Senator CHURCH holds that the Department's position "is a myopia reminiscent of the Bourbon kings of whom it was said, 'They have learned nothing and forgotten nothing.' "

Earlier this year, it was Dean Acheson who said: "The fate of the people of Vietnam is of the same vital concern to the United States as that of those whom in the past we have helped to resist subjugation. Indeed, the situation in Asia today is reminiscent of the problems the United States confronted in Europe in 1947."

The last line of Senator CHURCH's article reads, "And the hour is late." With that I fully agree. It is not as late as it was for the French after Munich, but if it is important to liberty that Communist world aggression be resisted with unity in the free world, it is becoming very late indeed.

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: My colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has performed a timely service in bringing to the attention of the Senate and in presenting for publication in the RECORD the Washington Post article of Sunday, March 13, 1966, entitled "A Rebuttal of a Rebuttal of Vietnam Policy," by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

The Senator now speaking was impressed by the basic article by Under Secretary of State George Ball, which was published in the Washington Post of Sunday, February 6, 1966, and which was republished the following day in the RECORD under my auspices.

I believe, too, that the able senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], in his Washington Post article of Sunday, February 20, 1966, and in his remarks the next day in the Senate were thought-provoking rebuttal.

Now, Mr. President, we have—in Senator SYMINGTON's rebuttal to the Senator Church rebuttal to Under Secretary Ball's searching analysis of our involvement and efforts in Vietnam—a penetrating discussion which adds both facts and dignity to the debate.

The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] addresses the issue persuasively and from a remarkable background. He draws upon knowledge and experience based on years of service on both the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees and upon prior distinguished service as one of the Nation's most capable Air Force Secretaries.

Because of Senator SYMINGTON's credentials and his qualities of statesmanship, I consider him to be one of the most expert of Americans—whether in, or outside of, the field of public affairs—on the subject of our involvement in southeast Asia and what should be done as a consequence of this vexing condition.

Mr. President, I have associated myself generally with the position statement by Under Secretary of State Ball. I have read the rebuttal by Senator CHURCH and commend him for having forthrightly expressed his views. I have studied carefully the Symington rebuttal to the Church rebuttal, and I am convinced that Senator SYMINGTON's position is a realistic one.

West Virginians join their fellow Americans in being understandably concerned with the problems we face in southeast Asia. They realize that the changing, yet ever-real, struggle against communistic aggression must be counteracted as we are opposing it in South Vietnam.

IMPACTED AREAS SCHOOL-AID CUTS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the drastic reduction proposed by President Johnson in his 1967 budget for Federal financial aid to schools in impacted areas.

Under Public Law 874, the 1967 entitlements for Hawaii would be an estimated $7,828,897.

Under the President's proposed amendments, Hawaii's estimated entitlements would be only $4,609,128, a reduction of $3,219,769.

This is a cut of approximately 41 percent—a very severe cut to impose, especially since the cut occurs in one year.

This means that the people of Hawaii will somehow have to make up this $3.2 million loss.

Yet the people of Hawaii already are making strenuous efforts to provide more and more funds for our schools. Improving school buildings, facilities, opportunities for teacher improvement, special services, greater opportunities for students—in short, a better school system is one of the highest priority programs in Hawaii.

Although ours is an island State, we have a single education district organized under the Hawaii State Department of Education. It is a fine school system and we are proud of it. But there are many needed improvements and changes to keep our school system abreast of the knowledge explosion.

The people of Hawaii want good schools. They fully realize how important a good education is to their children, to their own future, and to the future of our State. This is why the people of Hawaii, through their State legislature, have agreed to substantially higher school budgets in recent years.

The loss of $3.2 million in Federal school assistance would put a very heavy unexpected burden on the people of Hawaii.

Since 1950, Hawaii has received Federal school aid under Public Law 874 to help cover operating costs involved in education of federally connected children. Congress enacted this law, and Public Law 815 for construction assistance, in recognition of the fact that Federal installations, agencies, and activities have many times caused a mushrooming of school enrollments. To help offset the financial burden this imposes on local school districts, Congress has provided by formula for Federal financial assistance.

Where these Federal agencies and activities continue, the local school districts had every reason to expect that Federal financial aid would continue to be forthcoming.

In Hawaii, there are many Federal activities, of which the military establishment is the largest. The entire Nation knows how important Hawaii is to our Pacific defenses and to our effort in Vietnam. School plans have been made in anticipation of continued Federal assistance on the same basis as heretofore for federally connected children in Hawaii's school system.

A reduction such as the President proposed in his 1967 budget would really upset the school applecart.

I know a great many other school districts in America will also be adversely affected if these budget cuts remain.

Mr. President, the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii recently adopted a concurrent resolution protesting the President's proposed cut in impacted areas aid and requesting the President to withdraw these cuts. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the resolution be printed in full.

I believe the proposed reductions are very ill advised, and I shall certainly do all I can to prevent these cuts taking place.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

Whereas the Federal Government currently provides funds to areas designated as Federal impact areas to assist States which have a heavy financial burden of educating children of military and civil service workers residing on or employed on Federal property; and

Whereas approximately thirty-one percent of the schoolchildren in Hawaii from grades kindergarten through twelve are classified as students in Federal impact areas; and

Whereas President Johnson's proposal to cut back funds in Federal impact areas would have a severe and damaging effect on the educational programs of this State; and

Whereas Public Law 874 provides Federal funds to the Department of Education which are used to supplement State funds for operating budget expenditures; and

Whereas these funds were earmarked to help pay the salaries of teachers and administrative personnel required to meet the heavy student enrollment anticipated for the school year beginning in September 1966; and

Whereas the proposed cutback of Federal funds under Public Law 874 will result in an estimated loss of $3½ million to Hawaii for the fiscal year 1966–67; and

Whereas President Johnson in his state of the Union message delivered January 12, 1966, reaffirmed the Nation's commitment to Vietnam while recommending that the programs of the Great Society be continued and that Congress provide the resources to carry forward, with full vigor, the great health and education program that were enacted into law last year; and

Whereas President Johnson's proposal to cut back funds to States with designated Federal impact areas, reduces the effectiveness of his state of the Union promise to build a Great Society at home: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1966 (the Senate concurring), That President Johnson be, and is hereby, requested to withdraw his proposal to cut back Federal funds for education in Federal impact areas; and be it further

Resolved, That Hawaii's delegation to Congress be and they are hereby requested to make all possible attempts to persuade the President not to cut back Federal funds to States with Federal impact areas; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson; the President of the Senate, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY; the Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK; Senators HIRAM L. FONG, and DANIEL K. INOUYE; Representatives PATSY T. MINK and SPARK M. MATSUNAGA; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner; and the Honorable John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii.

Passed the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, February 25, 1966.

Attest:

ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
SHIGETO KANEMOTO,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed by the Senate of the State of Hawaii, March 3, 1966.

Attest:

KAZUHISA ABE,
President of the Senate.
SEICHI HIRAI,
Clerk of the Senate.

IMPACT ON LINCOLN COUNTY, MONT., SCHOOL SYSTEM RESULTING FROM LIBBY DAM CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on February 3, 1966, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning on page 2003, letters relating to the estimated addition to the school population in Lincoln County, Mont., as a result of the construction of Libby Dam. I wish now to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD additional letters on this subject which I have received from the Seattle District Engineer, C. C. Holbrook, colonel, Corps of Engineer, and from B. Alden Lillywhite, director, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
SEATTLE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
Seattle, Wash.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Your letter of February 10, concerning the estimated impact on the Libby, Mont., school system resulting from Libby Dam construction activities is very much appreciated. I had received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 3, 1966, a few days ago and had, a few days earlier, become aware that this question had been raised. The assertion that the Corps of Engineers had issued conflicting estimates came as a great surprise to me. I have thoroughly investigated and found that conflicting information has not been given.

In your statement to the Senate, you quote advice given by the Corps of Engineers to the Office of Education, as extracted from Mr. Lillywhite's January 19, letter to you. This quotation concerns the seasonal nature of some of the work on the Libby project and leads to the conclusion that the impact on the Libby school system will be less than anticipated by school officials. There has been no inconsistency in this regard in the information furnished by the Corps. Enclosed are four charts, including the one which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which show more fully the estimates which we have prepared and furnished to all persons and agencies concerned.

Chart No. 1, "Estimated contractor and corps personnel requirements for construction of Libby Dam project," illustrates the manner in which work on the project may be seasonal; please note that this does not concern population increase.

Chart No. 2 shows "Estimated population increase in surrounding communities at peak of construction." Footnote 3 indicates the corps' assumption that 25 percent of Government workers and 45 percent of contractors' employees would be single or without their families at the site. Thus it is clear that we have taken into consideration personnel who would be without their families.

Chart No. 3 gives detail by year on the "Estimated population increase of Libby, Mont.—1966–75." The same footnote appears with this chart.

Chart No. 4, which is the one appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, shows "Estimated increase in Libby, Mont., school enrollment as a result of Libby Dam project."

The integration of these figures with projected increases or decreases expected otherwise in the local population, and the resultant calculation of additional classrooms required, was then accomplished by local authorities as the basis for their requesting State and Federal assistance. I am sure you will recognize that the Corps of Engineers is in no position to participate in this analysis.

From my investigation, it appears to me that the confusion may center around the schedule of requirements for additional classrooms. Our estimates, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are for calendar years, not school years. In an excellent paper of December 17, 1965, developed by Mr. Carl Engebretson, superintendent of Libby public schools, he has tabulated the classroom needs for each year.

His table shows that for the elementary school, a total of 31 more classrooms is needed but only 1 prior to the 1966–67 school year, with the bulk of the construction required prior to the 1967–68 school year; for the junior high school, a total of 24 required but only two prior to the 1966–67 school year and again most of them in construction prior to the following year; and, for the senior high school, a total of 26 additional classrooms is required, none prior to the 1966–67 school year and the first increment of seven required prior to the 1967–68 school year.

Thus, it appears entirely possible that local authorities can accommodate the small requirement for the 1966–67 school year without new construction and this may have been the information that has been misinterpreted. If not, I firmly believe that your correspondence and the investigations which have been made will clear things up. It does appear that a substantial amount of classroom construction is required prior to the 1967–68 school year; your assistance in this regard undoubtedly would be most welcome.

The estimates that have resulted from our own studies and which we have furnished local interests are considered the best available appreciation of the regional and local impact of the Libby project. I intend, however, to continue our impact studies so that experience on the first few contracts can be used to refine our projections for the peak construction years. State and local authorities will be kept advised of our findings as they develop. Any additional information you desire will be gladly furnished.

Sincerely,

C. C. HOLBROOK,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1966.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This will reply to your letter of February 19, 1966, concerning the impact of construction of the Libby Dam on Lincoln County schools.

As you requested, we have reviewed the information submitted to you by the Corps of Engineers and the local school district regarding the expected increase in school enrollment that will result from construction of the Libby Dam and have compared it with the information available in this Office. This review indicates that there are no significant differences in the estimates or projections of school enrollment or school needs in the Libby public schools given you by the Corps of Engineers and by this Office. What appears to be a conflict results from the fact that the comments in my letter of January 19, 1966, related primarily to the 2-year period covered by the applications from the school districts which are the school years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, while the data submitted to you by the Corps of Engineers covers the 9-year period from 1966 through 1975.

The information submitted to your office from the various sources indicates that there will be a substantial need for additional school facilities beginning in fiscal year 1968, but that there will be very little need, if any, for additional classrooms prior to that time. This agrees with the information submitted to us in the school district applications which also was given to you in my letter of January 19, 1966.

Since the provisions of Public Law 815, as currently in effect, do not permit us to count any enrollment increases in "B" category after June 30, 1966, nor any increases in "A" category children beyond June 30, 1967, our determination that district applications were ineligible for assistance may have given the wrong impression regarding the projected enrollment increases and school needs in the districts after June 30, 1967.

Although the data presented in the table that was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows only about two-thirds as many schoolchildren as new workers, we agree with you that these data indicate a substantial growth in school enrollment during the construction period and a need for additional school facilities in this district beginning in the fall of 1967.

We also feel that if additional school facilities are to be ready for occupancy during the 1967–68 school year, funds for their construction should be available at least a year in advance of the occupancy date. However, under the present provisions of Public Law 815 and the administration proposals, there is no further action we can take on the Libby application at this time. The information presented below again reviews the reasons it was necessary to determine at the present time that these applications are not eligible for assistance under the present provisions of this act.

It is expected that the construction contracts affecting the Libby area will be let in April 1966. Thus, the expected increase of 180 schoolchildren during 1966 will most likely occur in the latter part of 1966 which is the 1966–67 school year. We can consider only increases in enrollment which are expected by June 30 under the district's 1966 application. The Libby school officials estimated in their 1966 application that there would be an increase of only 30 federally connected children in the school district by June 30, 1966. This is considerably less than the number necessary to meet the 5-percent requirement for eligibility under Public Law 815.

The best information now available indicates that most of the families of construction workers who move into the Libby area will reside on private property. The children of these workers will be the subsection 5(a)(2) category of children. As Public Law 815 is currently amended, the provisions of subsection 5(a)(2) expire June 30, 1966. Therefore, children in the subsection 5(a)(2) category cannot be considered at this time in any application on file for a membership increase period ending later than June 30, 1966. Since only "A" category children may be considered at this time for a 1967 application, eligibility of this application also is doubtful. Should there be any change in these circumstances we would immediately review the application and take the action that was indicated by the change in circumstances.

It should also be pointed out that the information furnished by the school district officials in both their 1966 and 1967 applications, indicates the urgent need for additional classroom facilities will not occur until after June 30, 1967. Both applications report the capacity of existing school facilities in the district to be 2,648. The total school membership is estimated by these school officials to be 1,991 by June 30, 1966, and 2,234 by June 30, 1967. According to these estimates there will be capacity for 637 additional children on June 30, 1966, and on June 30, 1967, the school district still will have enough unused capacity for an additional 414 children.

Col. C. C. Holbrook, district engineer in Seattle, sent us an information copy of his letter of February 4, 1966, to the Honorable ARNOLD OLSEN, House of Representatives, on this same subject. I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of Colonel Holbrook's letter. It is believed that it will assist in clarifying some of the questions raised in your letter.

Our regional representative has advised us that, in view of the excellent working relationships which exist between his office and the Seattle office of the Corps of Engineers, he is confident that he would be notified by the corps within a matter of days should there be any change in the situation affecting the Libby School District. We expect to have a further report from Mr. Rose after the construction contracts are let and construction work in the Libby area is actually underway. When we receive this additional information, we will again review both of the applications from the Libby Elementary School District No. 4 in the light of such information, and take appropriate action.

If you need any additional information concerning this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

B. ALDEN LILLYWHITE,
Director, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas.

AN ACT OF GALLANTRY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the bravest acts in the history of American gallantry occurred in Vietnam last week—an act of bravery so daring and so audacious that it took the enemy by surprise and saved an American pilot from capture and possible death.

Unmindful of his own safety, Air Force Maj. Bernard Fisher, of Kuna, Idaho, landed his fighter-bomber aircraft on the strip beside the beleaguered Ashau outpost and snatched to safety fellow pilot, Maj. Stafford Myers, who moments before had crash-landed his own fire-crippled plane on the same strip.

Intense Vietcong fire—some of it from as close as 20 yards away—was ignored by Major Fisher as he landed and taxied his plane to where Major Myers had taken cover in a shallow ditch. Major Myers ran to the Major Fisher's Skyraider, jumped on the wing, and the plane took off into the very muzzles of blazing Vietcong guns.

Major Fisher is an Idahoan and I take great pride in that fact, and I have offered my personal congratulations to his wife and five young sons.

While Major Fisher was making his daring landing, another Idahoan, Air Force Capt. Dennis Haigh, of Kellogg, Idaho, another member of the attacking flight, strafed the sides of the airstrip to hold back the charging Vietcongs.

I am sure all Americans join with me in praise of these daring airmen. An account of the rescue is graphically told in the March 11 issue of the New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S.-LED TROOPS ABANDON POST IN VIETNAM AFTER 36-HOUR SIEGE: COPTERS TAKE OUT SURVIVORS—300 OF 400 DEFENDERS BELIEVED TO HAVE DIED

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON, March 10.—After holding off a superior enemy force for more than 36 hours, American and allied units abandoned a lonely outpost on the Laotian border late this afternoon.

Helicopter pilots flew through low clouds into a valley to try to evacuate the exhausted and dirt-caked survivors of the outpost's 400 defenders.

Casualties among the defenders were described as heavy, and there were reliable reports that fewer than 100 men had lived through the 36 hours of hand-to-hand fighting.

It was not clear how many of the surviving defenders had been pulled out.

A team of 20 Special Forces soldiers—U.S. Army specialists in guerrilla warfare—had clung to the camp along with 375 highlander mercenaries despite determined attacks from at least 2,000 North Vietnamese regulars.

The camp—at Ashau, 275 miles north of Saigon and less than 3 miles from the Laotian frontier—was officially closed at 5:45 p.m. It was the first Special Forces outpost lost in more than 6 months.

Col. William McKean, commander of all Special Forces units in South Vietnam, said at Danang: "The Vietcong had everything in their favor. We sent in swarms of helicopters, but the weather just closed in on us."

Four American fighter-bombers were shot down in the defense of the camp.

One, a propeller-driven Skyraider, was struck by antiaircraft fire and engulfed in flames. Its pilot, Maj. Stafford W. Myers of Newport, Wash., immediately headed toward the camp's airstrip, which was surrounded by enemy troops.

His cockpit filled with dense smoke, Major Myers set his plane down on the strip. Machinegun bullets tore open its fuselage. His clothing was on fire, but he wiggled out of the cockpit and dived into a small ditch.

The flight leader, Maj. Bernard Fisher of Kuna, Idaho, put his Skyraider onto the strip right behind Major Myers'. Although his plane was riddled by bullets fired at point-blank range, Major Fisher escaped injury.

Major Myers ran to the second plane, jumped onto its wing and squeezed into the cockpit. A third Skyraider swooped in and mowed down an enemy soldier who was running toward the plane 20 yards from Major Myers.

With that, Major Fisher shoved his throttle forward and took off as antiaircraft guns on the strip blazed away.

"It was the bravest thing I've ever seen a man do," said Capt. Dennns B. Haigh, another pilot in the formation. "I guess the guerrillas were so amazed they just watched in astonishment."

Captain Haigh, a 28-year-old resident of Kellogg, Idaho, said the camp's radio operator told him in the morning: "You are free to hit anything in the camp. Anything that moves on the surface is Vietcong."

Before the clouds made it impossible for American fighter-bombers to reach the hard-pressed garrison, it appeared that the camp might be able to hold out though the enemy had broken through its defenses.

But airpower, which has often turned the tide of battle in the Americans' favor, could not save Ashau.

Before leaving the camp, the survivors destroyed their weapons and equipment to keep them out of enemy hands. An AC-47 plane that had crashed near the camp was demolished by air strikes for the same reason.

At 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the Americans and the highland tribesmen clinging to the northern rim of the camp were ready to stage a counterattack against the enemy trench line along the southern barbed-wire perimeter. But the attack was postponed, and then canceled, when the weather turned bad and the planes could not strike.

One group of 19 survivors climbed out of helicopters in Da Nang, and others went in bases in the northern sector of the country. The group that arrived at Da Nang, in a gloomy drizzle, included three Americans. They were carried to ambulances.

A Marine spokesman said that two of 18 helicopters involved in the evacuation had been shot down. The crew of one was picked up, but the four men aboard the second were missing.

Four times during the day, as enemy troops massed along the broken south wall of the camp and then near the airstrip to the east, C-123 transport planes parachuted supplies and ammunition to the troops inside.

Some packages landed inside the enemy lines.

REDUCTION IN SCHOOL MILK FUNDS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, by recommending a drastic cut in funds for the school milk program in the same budget that calls for grandiose new spending schemes, this administration has exposed the insincerity of its alleged commitment to economy in government.

We have been asked to cut the school milk fund from $103 million down to $21 million—a reduction of some 80 percent.

Yet in the same budget we are asked to appropriate billions to expand Great Society programs, such as the war on poverty, where the weapons are mostly rapid-fire mimeograph machines for publicity releases.

This is only one of many areas where prudent budget cuts can and should be made.

To my knowledge the administration has never voiced any concern about the $115 billion in foreign aid we have showered upon the world during the last 20 years.

Instead, we are told this should be continued but our own school children should be made victims of a phony economy move.

I am gratified that a majority of the Members of the Senate have expressed opposition to this unjustified proposal by supporting S. 2921. I strongly support the aim of this legislation to establish funding for the school milk program at a reasonable level.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I regret that because of the necessity of presiding at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I was unable to be in the Chamber last Tuesday when my Finance Committee colleagues paid tribute to Harry Byrd.

As a junior member of that committee I hope I will be allowed to second everything they said at that time about our good friend. He served his people, his State, and his Nation well for nearly 33 years in this body. No man in Virginia's history served in higher office longer than Harry Byrd. He was a credit to this body and I join my colleagues in wishing him many happy, peaceful years of observing the public scene from the sidelines. The peace and rest he is now enjoying have been well deserved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Senator Harry Flood Byrd has retired from the U.S. Senate after a lifetime of public service. He stands as a unique figure in our country's public life. As Governor of his home State at an early age, he built an administration based on integrity, efficiency, and service to the people of Virgina. His term of service endeared him to the people of his State so that when he became a candidate for the Senate he received an overwhelming endorsement, and this endorsement carried through five terms. In fact, when in 1960 he announced his intention to retire from this body, the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia unanimously requested him to serve again. He and Mrs. Byrd were so moved by this expression of confidence that they agreed that he should carry forward the mandate.

It has been my honor to serve with Senator Byrd for 22 years, and like all other Members of our body, I recognize and respect his steadfastness, his courage, and his forthrightness in speaking and voting for what he believed to be in the best interest of the United States. Throughout the period of our service he was one of the most influential Members of the Senate, not only because of the important positions he held, but also because of his strength of character. As chairman of the Finance Committee and as a colleague on the Armed Services Committee, he was always fair, always thoughtful, always concerned about the welfare of our Nation. Everyone recognized that and respected him for it. At times—sometimes when when it was difficult to do so—he put our country ahead of his State. Certainly to his colleagues he exemplified the real essence of a legislator in the best sense of that word.

I know him as a friend. My four grandchildren are his great-nephews, and I have always enjoyed showing him their pictures and telling him that they, like him, stand firmly for what they believe in.

We always knew where Senator Harry Flood Byrd stood. All the positions he took in this body were based on his objective analysis of the situation and were never personal. In that way he retained as friends and admirers those with whom he did not agree.

We have always enjoyed our visits to Senator Byrd's home in Berryville, especially in the spring when his well-kept apple trees are in full bloom, and we look forward to visiting him there in the future. We shall all miss him in the Senate, and we wish him many years of happy life.

ALF M. LANDON SPEAKS ON VIETNAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, once again the Honorable Alf M. Landon has made a substantial and enlightening contribution to the dialog concerning one of the great issues which face our Nation and this generation.

His speech delivered on March 7 in Topeka, Kans., concerning the Vietnam war represents, I think, an understanding of an incredibly complex problem and a clarity of thought which has long been absent in the Vietnam debate.

Mr. Whitley Austin of the Salina Journal commented upon this address in an editorial in the Salina Journal on March 10, 1966, entitled, "Containment Now May Stop World War Later." As Mr. Austin observes:

> No one puts the pieces of the Vietnam puzzle together more clearly than Alf Landon, the former Governor, who has become as much of a fox at international relationships as he once was at Kansas politics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Governor Landon and the editorial herein noted be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vietnam

(Address by Alf M. Landon, Kiwanis Clubs meeting, Topeka, Kans., Mar. 7, 1966)

As the Vietnam war pressure mounts on our manpower and our economy—two questions are being asked by Americans.

First, how did we get into this war—and, second, how do we get out?

The first leads to the second, and that has long range impact on the entire world's governments' domestic and foreign policies.

The genesis of our being in South Vietnam is the Truman containment policy and the failure of the Marx-Lenin theories to work in practice in any of the Communist countries. The Communists have found it necessary to steadily water down their theories by increasing individual incentive motives. That varies from country to country. Red China has just barely started on that capitalistic principle—while Yugoslavia has gone farther than probably any other Communist country in departing from the Marx-Lenin dogmas.

It is evident from this record that the only chance any form of communism has to conquer and dominate the world is by military force. They never will bury us economically, as Khrushchev once boasted. Therefore, Mao is probably brutally right—as far as Communist domination is concerned—when he told Nehru that he was planning a nuclear war because—with the size of their population—there would be more Chinese left than any other peoples in the world.

However, that does not suit the Russian heirarchy in the Kremlin. Therefore, the pulling in opposite directions by China and Russia that is splitting the Communist parties in every country in the world. That split may reach a climax in the coming late March meeting of the Communist countries. Right in the midst of these contradictions is Vintnam that is spurring a hard line by the Soviet military.

The Truman containment policy—as Secretary Rusk said in his honest, clear, detailed, and sound testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—is also at stake in the Communist attack on South Vietnam.

The Secretary said simply and clearly that we are fighting a big war there to maintain the Truman containment policy in the interest and security of the United States of America and the free world, and to keep our commitment under the SEATO Treaty.

Here is the truth at last from our national administration's spokesmen.

It's a continuation of 20 years of worldwide nibbling here and fighting there by Communist countries on the Truman containment policy that was first adopted to protect Greece and Turkey from Communist subversion when President Truman was informed by England that it was no longer able to.

When Secretary of State Dean Atcheson practically invited China into Korea by publicly saying it was "beyond the periphery of our defenses," the Chinese—taking him at his word—invaded Korea. Mr. Truman then promptly acted courageously and correctly—between night and morning—opposing with our Armed Forces their invasion.

There was the bombardment of Taiwan by China—which Mr. Eisenhower answered with the concentration of our 7th Fleet in the strait between Taiwan and China.

There was the threat by Russia on Tunisia—which Mr. Eisenhower answered with the concentration of the 6th Fleet there.

There were Laos and Cuba.

Then there was Guatemala—and now Santo Domingo.

So little Vietnam—practically unheard of and unnoticed until 5 years ago—is today the center of the nervous attention of the world governments. It can well become the great test of the Truman doctrine. I do not mean that is immutable. I do say it has not served its useful purpose until and unless Russia and China change their proclaimed intention of conquering the world.

Little South Vietnam—a country of only 15 or so million population—with absolutely no strategic military or economic value—no transportation to speak of outside of water—no natural resources outside of agriculture, principally in the rice-rich Mekong Delta—no popular interest in their country or Government—was probably chosen by China as the most likely place to weaken the Truman doctrine.

The Vietcong has been organized and trained by North Vietnam in starting liberation fronts in the traditional Communist underground way of creating terror by murder and kidnaping. Secretary of State Dean Rusk recently called the Vietcong "an invention of the Communist Party of North Vietnam to serve as a political cloak for its activities in the south."

Our national administration is no longer describing it as a brush war—no longer describing our soldiers as advisers. However, it is still incorrectly describing it as a limited war, because it is not a limited war. As the North Vietnamese feed in more troops—America feeds in more troops.

Our President said, on Saturday, February 26, that there were no requests for additional troops on his desk. On the following Monday, the top U.S. marine in South Vietnam told President Johnson, "We need more marines there to drive out Communist forces and make sure they stay out."

All that clatter and chatter has weakened the confidence of the American public in the credibility of our national administration—destroyed by a long record of unrealistic optimism as to the size—the length—of a war that we were first told was to be won by American bombers and Vietnamese ground troops.

This loss of confidence in what we have been—and are being—told by our national administration is bad for our country. The grim factual report by Senator Mansfield of actual conditions in South Vietnam shocked Americans.

Roving Ambassador Averell Harriman said that Vice President Humphrey's swing around the Asiatic circle to line up stronger allied force to meet the threat of China was timely, in that he was able to offset misunderstandings of Vietnam policy debates in the Senate and public hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, coupled with editorials and commentaries that "might have caused some real concern as to whether we will stick in South Vietnam." That is questionable.

However, that real concern is very definitely encouraged by our President's characteristic involved, circuitous, steering line of action. That is the way he operates from beginning to end. It permeates his whole political career—his Great Society program here at home—and all his foreign policy. I must say, that is true of most foreign offices in the world. And, by the same token, that same policy has resulted in bringing about many of the wars humanity has suffered.

Mr. Johnson got away with his long practiced put-and-take procedure masterfully last year in his domestic program. Whether he can get away with it in foreign policy on Vietnam is the big question.

It is a stupendous calculated risk. Don't ever delude yourself that Mr. Johnson does not know what he is doing. The risk is that other peoples and their governments may delude themselves as to what our President is up to and what is the real policy that motivates him and that he is pursuing. In the history of mankind, many wars—that were to be short range and turned into long range ones—were stumbled and fumbled into this way.

I quote John S. Knight in Editor's Notebook: "Only now and far too late are we hearing any debate on Vietnam. The handful of U.S. Senators who dare to question Government policies are treated with studied contempt.

"So at least it is clear that the President has assumed all responsibility for the conduct of the war."

Senator John Stennis, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, has said, "this is no longer peacetime, and disaster may lie around the corner if we continue to conduct a war under peacetime policies and funding."

That brings me to the second question—how do we get out of South Vietnam? There are two ways.

One is to go all out and fight to the bitter end with everything we have got until China is no longer able to support the Communist Vietcong and they are driven out of South Vietnam.

We are failing to do that. We are still trying to scare the North Vietnamese with threats and they don't scare—alternating with offers of economic assistance. We were still not bombing military strategic places in North Vietnam until last Friday when, for the first time, we destroyed 100 miles of a railroad military supply line.

The other way to get out of South Vietnam is to phase out—as Senator Robert Kennedy advocates—by negotiations based on the Vietcong being in a coalition government.

Two days later, Mr. Johnson's press secretary announced there was no conflict with the Senator's position and the President's. They both agreed such an "accommodation"—that is a weasel-word for coalition—with the Vietcong would have to be agreed to first by the South Vietnamese in a free election.

All right, what are we waiting for and what are we continuing to fight for? Let's hold the general election right away—if that's neocolonialism, as far as the so-called Government of South Vietnam is concerned—it is realistic—even though Marshal Ky stood up to President Johnson before the ink was dry on the pact of Honolulu on the section relating to the Vietcong participating in any negotiations.

The point is that there never has been a free election in South Vietnam. There is not any possibility of holding one now or for a long time. The world governments know there will not be any Communist representation in the South Vietnamese Government except by America's advice and consent. Therefore, why all this weasel-worded talk about a free election in South Vietnam to ratify a Communist coalition government?

Any government in position at the time of that election is going to control it. That is why the North Vietnamese will not accept it as a peace solution unless the makeup of the South Vietnamese Government is first determined ahead of time. I quote from an AP story dated February 24 from Saigon:

"Washington talk of free elections in Vietnam 'with all of us abiding by the consequences of those elections, whatever they may be' (quoting the President here) is another area that gets increasingly complex closer to the scene.

"The Ky government is talking of elections. There are plans to name an advisory council for the building of democracy that would work out a draft constitution. It has been said that such a constitution would be submitted to a referendum late this year and that general elections would be held next year.

"With the amount of land and the number of people the Communists control, it hardly seems likely that voting booths are about to spring up.

"The outlook is that there is a lot of war to be fought first."

There is the sound statement of our Vice President on the matter of accommodating the Vietcong—who likened that to admitting a fox to the chicken coop—after a while, there would be no chickens left—or an arsonist to a fire department. That is the 100 percent record of Communist participation to an extent in any government anywhere in the world. I quote from the February 25 "Research Institute Recommendations":

"ROBERT KENNEDY'S 'coalition with the Vietcong' recommendation is a Rubicon in the U.S. policy debate that can't be recrossed. Despite his 'explanations' and backtracking since he proposed it, the 'coalition' idea has found its inevitable place in the debate."

"There's a faint chance that a coalition with Reds would work, that the Communists wouldn't turn it into an eventual takeover. A detailed RIA study of past coalitions with Reds shows that they have not been able to seize power in every situation.

"1. For example, the Reds had posts in the 'popular front' government in France in the mid-1930's, also under De Gaulle in 1946. They've been in the Parliaments of Britain, Luxembourg, and Italy, even were elected to a few places in U.S. localities in the thirties.

"These were situations where they had no chance of taking over. They settled for what influence they could exert on foreign policy, usually in furtherance of Soviet world objectives of the moment. When Moscow's aims changed, the popular fronts were all junked, as when Stalin decided to woo Hitler, rather than fight him.

"2. Where Reds had power positions, the story was different. They turned every coalition in Eastern Europe into a takeover after World War II, ruthlessly disregarded solemn wartime promises not to. They controlled the key ministries, had Soviet power behind them.

"3. There's a third category of Red 'collaboration': Paralysis. Where they could neither rule nor ruin, they went in for blocking. The classic case is Laos. From 1954 on, their Pathet Lao troops have kept every government hog tied through active military terrorism.

"In 1962, they reaffirmed the 'coalition' principle in Laos, but the Pathet Lao has yet to enter the central government peacefully. Only the diversion of Hanoi's aid to the war in South Vietnam, plus U.S. force in Thailand, has kept them from taking over.

"Conclusion: There's small hope they'd regard a coalition in South Vietnam as anything but another invitation to seizure of power.

"Their model, in fact, is already set and waiting—in Hanoi. For years before he took over, Ho Chi Minh insisted his Vietminh wasn't Communist dominated. He made the same claims at the time that Liberation Front backers are making in today's conflict—that it included non-Reds, nationalists, Socialists, Trotskyites.

"But once Ho came to Hanoi as 'coalition' chief in 1954, he turned on the non-Communists, exterminated them ruthlessly. France's expert Bernard Fall, a stanch critic of U.S. policy, estimates that Ho killed 10,000 to 100,000 opponents after 1954. Ho's defense chief, General Giap, has boasted openly how he did it."

There is no prospect of the short and easy victory for America and her allies that we were first assured would be the case. To those who object to the term "victory," my answer is that if President Eisenhower had not made the Korean truce when he did 13 years ago—with 50,000 American soldiers still stationed in Korea to maintain it—Mr. Kennedy probably would not have been confronted with Russia in Laos. If we had not helped to establish Castro in the face of warnings by three American ambassadors to Cuba that he is a Communist—Mr. Kennedy would not have been confronted with the Russians in Cuba. We probably would not be fighting today in South Vietnam, and, if we were not fighting today in South Vietnam—China's devastating political defeats in Asia and Africa probably would not have occurred.

How we settle the Vietnamese war is of international interest and concern. There is not any question anywhere of America's winning our South Vietnamese war. The only question in the foreign offices is whether the United States is willing to pay the cost of ultimately obtaining its objective—that is, to make the Truman doctrine for containment of communism stick in South Vietnam, a bitter and unwelcome task that may threaten the distintegration of the world—or whether we are going to phase out by abandoning South Vietnam ultimately to the Communists, at a cost also that really threatens the distintegration of world resistance to Chinese or Russian Communist encroachment.

Either way, it will affect our relations with every government in the world.

There is no war psychology in the United States now. As a matter of fact, the Vietnamese war is not popular.

Therefore, let us look with unemotional foresight where either settlement leaves us.

The first—that is, clearing the Communists out of South Vietnam and clearing out ourselves, aiding that little underdeveloped country to a higher standard of living, including education—leaves free America in a strong balance of power position militarily—and what's of great importance in this modern world—politically.

That means an increasing economic loss and—what is of infinitely more importance—loss of American blood.

The second—admitting Communists to a coalition South Vietnamese Government—over the strongly expressed position of the South Vietnamese Government—even though it is in name only—means the weakening of our balance-of-power position and the strengthening of the Communist position in every government in the world.

We become somewhat isolated. President de Gaulle—who believes we haven't the patience and the determination to win in South Vietnam—is already anticipating that in his French policy of establishing better relations between China and France. It's the old principle—if you can't lick them, join them.

In England, the leftwing of the British Labor Party favors the same policy. If we weaken, we cut the ground out from under a stanch supporter of the United States of America, Prime Minister Wilson.

West Germany, Italy, Turkey, and Japan will be forced to establish new relations with all the Communist bloc.

Will the failure of the Marx-Lenin theories to work economically force the Communist bloc to attempt to conquer the world by armed force or subversion?

We must be prepared in our thinking for all those possibilities. Those who advocate a settlement in South Vietnam with "accommodation" to the Vietcong Communists have not come up with any answers to what then should be our policy.

I am no Johnny-come-lately, at least, in discussing some of these key questions. Where were they when I was urging admission in 1944 of Red China to the United Nations—trade with Communist countries—criticized John Foster Dulles' brinkmanship—promptly urged accepting Chou en lai's proposal for a world conference to abolish nuclear weapons—which U Thant as Secretary General of the United Nations unprecedentedly endorsed the next day—for discussion, and France and Russia subsequently accepted.

Those could have led to hard-headed discussions and negotiations between Communist countries and the free world. "Accommodation" in Vietnam is not negotiation for peace—but surrender to terror.

If we settle in South Vietnam for a Communist victory through a coalition government—that means the fragmentation of our Truman containment policy—that has been a massive force in protecting the interests of free countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa from the neocolonialism of China and Russia. Therefore, our foreign policy and other nations' international relations will be forced into a new pattern.

China will recover some of the political ground it has recently lost.

That may launch Russia into a hard line in its relations with our country, as Premier Kosygin's recent tirades against America seem to mean. Although it is possible that the increased threat of China may turn Russia toward better relations with the West. That coming March 29 Communist caucus in Moscow may throw some light on the Soviets' intentions.

Elsewhere in the world, and on this hemisphere in particular, more Communist self-styled liberation fronts will explode.

In other words—it is not only that world war III might come from the escalation of the war in Vietnam. It is more likely a world war might come from the escalation of appeasement by Americans.

Be that as it may—for better or for worse—we must back our President's decisions in this critical state of world affairs. His strength is in an informed people.

I am confident that I speak for many Americans in asking him to keep us better informed.

[From the Salina (Kans.) Journal, Mar. 10, 1966]

CONTAINMENT NOW MAY STOP WORLD WAR LATER

No one puts the pieces of the Vietnam puzzle together more clearly than Alf Landon, the former Governor, who has become as much of a fox at international relationships as he once was at Kansas politics.

When Landon speaks today he is heard. Here is a quick synopsis of what he said this week:

Communist failure is at the root of the trouble. Marxian theories of economics don't work. Russian and western Reds are edging into profit capitalism. The only chance for communism to dominate the world is by military force. This is Red China's objective, in Vietnam and elsewhere.

To contain Communist expansion has been our purpose since Harry Truman first put forth that doctrine. Containment has worked wherever vigorously pursued. Now the doctrine is being tested again in Asia.

This hasn't been made clear to Americans until now. The Government has made contradictory statements. We have tried to scare the Reds with threats. We have confused ourselves. Johnson's technique of taking one step backward for every two forward hasn't been understood.

Now we are in the war, how do we get out? A free election under South Vietnam auspices is unacceptable to the north. To accommodate the Vietcong and North Vietnamese by a coalition government, as the brothers KENNEDY suggest, can result only in a Communist seizure of power. This is what has happened when Communists have been accommodated in the past.

If we abandon the doctrine of containment in this fashion, China will recover some of the political ground it has lost. Russia may be expected to take a harder line toward us. Elsewhere in the world, more Communist self-styled liberation fronts will explode. The Reds will be on the march.

While it is possible World War III might come from escalation of fighting in Vietnam, it is more likely a world war might come from the escalation of appeasement by Americans. It would invite Communist imperialism to expand.

Our other choice is to clear the Communists out of South Vietnam and then clear out ourselves, after giving that little country a higher standard of living. To do so would put America in the position of strong balance of power, militarily and politically. Communism would be contained again.

But such a choice means an increasing economic loss—and what is more important—a greater loss of American blood.

Yet containment now may prevent a much heavier loss of blood later on.

It is a hard choice. For better of worse, Landon concludes, we must back our President's decisions in this critical state of world affairs. But if we are to back him, we must be better informed.

We must understand what containment is about and how it operates. Landon has contributed to this understanding.

THE ROLE OF THE DISTRICT AS THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the RECORD at this point a speech which I delivered on the evening of Saturday, March 12, before the 56th anniversary dinner of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia. The dinner was held at the Mayflower Hotel.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE DISTRICT AS THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Washington belongs to the Nation.

When the Congress was sitting in Philadelphia near the end of the Revolutionary War, a mob of disgruntled soldiers marched upon the Congress, surrounded the meeting hall, and threatened and interrupted the business of the National Legislature. Appeals by the Congress to the officials of the city of Philadelphia and to the officials of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania brought no assistance to the Congress. Lacking the power of control, the Congress removed to Princeton, N.J., to reconvene and get on with the execution of the Revolutionary War.

The genius of the framers of the Constitution found a solution to such a problem by providing for the establishment of the seat of the National Government at some location which was not a part of a city nor a part of a State, but an area ceded to the Federal Government and completely under the control of the Federal Government to serve for the sole purpose of becoming the seat of the National Government.

This concept was put into language by the framers of the Constitution, which provision was part of the Constitution ratified by the people of the States, in article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution, which provided, among other powers of the Congress, that it "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States."

The Founding Fathers gave the District a unique role in that they did not ordain it as a seat of the Government, but, rather, as the seat of the Government—the one and only seat of the Government of the United States.

Clause 17, section 8, article I is, therefore, the source of Congress' power to govern the District of Columbia. Congress, itself, however, is not required to exercise this power, but may at any time create a government for the District and vest in it the same range of lawmaking power as it has always customarily vested in territories of the United States. In 1871, it did, in fact, do so; and while this Government was later (1878) abolished and the present system institute, certain of its legislative acts are still in force.

The District of Columbia was established solely, therefore, for the purpose of being the seat of Government of the United States, and it is first and foremost the Federal City. It belongs to every American citizen no matter where he lives. This is a city sui generis, and we want the District of Columbia to remain the unique city that it is.

Granted that there are many features of the present running of the District of Columbia which can and ought to be improved, there is no ground for assuming that the governmental purposes and functions would be better served or as well served if the United States abrogated to the residents its duty of providing a safe center of government. They should, however, have their own duly elected representation in Congress.

As the home of the Federal Government, the District stands in a profoundly and magnificently unique role. As the Federal City, of course, the District commands a prestigious position unequalled by any other American city and, in many respects, by any other city in the world.

Here it is that the three great coordinate branches of government of this Republic have their seats. The Congress meets annually here; the President and the Executive family live and function here; and the judiciary, represented by the highest court of the land, holds its sessions here. The eyes of the Nation and the world look toward Washington so named for the first President of our country.

No other American city is so richly endowed by history, so favored with Federal largesse and payroll, so courted by student and diplomat, so blessed with museums and memorials—in truth it is the Athens, the Rome, and the Constantinople of the modern world—a city like him for which it was named: first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

Homer, of old, wrote of Mount Olympus, in northern Thessaly, where Zeus, king of the gods, and arbiter of human destiny, sat upon its topmost ridges, and made or marred the fortunes of human beings. Washington, like Mount Olympus, often decides the interests of the state and determines the destinies of men. It marks their futures, for war or for peace, deciding whether they shall lift or lay down the sword, and its influence upon the fortunes of old and young, rich and poor, rustic and urbane, is felt from the cradle to the shroud.

President, Shah, and King; Senator and Governor; scientists, inventor, and astronaut; lawyer, merchant, and priest; artist and singer of joy—the paths of all cross here—the Capital of the Nation, the hub of the world, the heart of the universe.

What is the District's role of responsibility? The city which is the home of the Federal Government should, first of all, be representative of the country and of the people served by that Government. But the city is not truly representative of the country. Perhaps the greatest underlying problem of this city is the problem of population distribution, which is not representative of the population throughout the country. Rooted in this problem is a kind of inherent weakness foredooming, I fear, any effort toward making this a representative seat of Government. In reality, if we are to have a good National Capital, the Federal Government itself ought to do something about studying population mobility and its causes, and this city might become a laboratory for such a study.

It is a pathetic thing to see Negro families crowded five and six in a room, coming from Mississippi, Ohio, or anywhere, where at least they had open space and a shack to live in. The place to get at their problem is right there. Notwithstanding this terrible problem of population imbalance, we should all bend every effort, as best we can, toward making this a model city, one which will attract not only the eyes but also the admiration of the rest of the Nation and of the world.

In asserting that it should be a model city, one readily assigns to the Nation's Capital many roles—the role of leadership in art, music, and culture; the role of leadership in cleanliness and beauty; the role of leadership in recreation; the role of leadership in learning; the role of leadership in health and medical programs and facilities. Add to these the role of leadership in peace, prosperity, and safety for its citizens—for boycotts and money collections by agitators and extremists can hardly be representative of the Nation's Capital.

As a matter of fact, they are not representative and do irreparable harm to the legitimate objectives, of the responsible people of the community, for better living conditions and better schools.

The city as the Nation's Capital should be a place where family life is emphasized as against highly sophisticated social activities. But, like all national capitals, the city is presently one of social activity with emphasis on cocktail parties and society affairs which draw not only the rich and those who are well to do, but also those who do well to make ends meet. In this regard, the city is not really American in the traditional sense of moderation and modesty. But this is something that will never be changed and one might seriously question whether or not the average American citizen would expect or want it to be otherwise.

But in other respects there is much to be desired if the city is to fulfill its proper role.

PUBLIC WORKS

For example, there is no question but that we should build freeways in the District of Columbia. There are strong opponents to this. Not only should we build them, but we should go to great lengths to make sure that they represent the very best. We should set the pattern.

In urban communities, the basic problem of construction of a freeway system is in making long-range benefits outweigh short-range adversities. Everything must be done to minimize the impact upon the community with respect to breaking up neighborhoods and displacing people.

With regard to the construction of public works—whether it be a freeway, a library or a school building—there are probably more objections raised in this community than in any other because of problems of relocation, particularly when overcrowding of families is involved, and because of the destruction of historic landmarks. The basic principle that must be kept in mind here, particularly here, is that the facility is constructed to serve the people and, once a decision is made in the affirmative that the facility is required, then all efforts should be placed toward minimizing any of the normal adversities of construction.

In the next 6 years of construction in the District of Columbia, the number of families displaced by freeways, I am advised, will be roughly two-thirds of the displacements occasioned by other District of Columbia construction. In other words, although most people associate the adversities of public works construction with the freeway program, the future construction plans of the District indicate that the construction of schools, libraries and other similar District facilities, will displace 50 percent more families than the planned freeway program.

The subway system which Congress has recently authorized is under design at the moment. The latest plans indicate that the first construction of this system will probably come about in the early fall of 1967. This is another and very good example of a major public works project which undoubtedly will cause extreme problems both to District inhabitants and to District business during construction. But its construction is so urgently needed by the entire metropolitan area that these adversities must be accommodated and accepted by all concerned, and extraordinary measures should be taken to minimize the impact during construction.

EDUCATION

Washington should be a city in which education is geared to the maximum level attainable, so that every youngster has a chance to fulfill the utmost of his potential. The school system should be one to which the Nation could point with pride—a school system where no one is left out; a system with the finest buildings, the best equipped classrooms, and well-paid and highly competent teachers.

It must also be a system which will prepare its outgoing students to take their place in society, to go on to college or to make a living. Every child must be prepared to later support himself so that he will contribute to society and not be a drain upon it.

We often hear it said that this school facility or that school facility in the District of Columbia is a disgrace. Members of Congress annually take tours through the city and splash into print by pointing to this or that building as outmoded, antiquated, and disgraceful. And in the context of the Nation's Capital, there is much validity in the adjectives used.

Nevertheless, the citizens of the District of Columbia have a responsibility to themselves even if they disregard their responsibilities to their neighbors and to the Nation. They should take pride in whatever facilities are present and strive to protect and improve these. They, themselves, for example, should take strong action against vandalism and wanton destruction of school properties.

Community responsibility must start at the precinct level, and the nearby residents should share responsibility for their schools.

At the hearings which I conducted last year on the District of Columpia appropriation bill, it was stated that, in the preceding year, 27,689 windowpanes were broken in the District of Columbia schools, at a replacement cost of $112,868. This is a disgrace. How many books could have been bought? How many band instruments could have been purchased? How many teachers could have been employed with $112,000? He who would be ruler over many things, according to the parable of the talents, must first be faithful in discharging his stewardship over the things already possessed.

There should be no sparing of money, where needed, to promote the interests of education in the Nation's Capital. The money, of course, should be spent wisely, and to the best advantage of every child, whatever that child's potential. The slow learner should be given every opportunity to proceed as rapidly and to go as far as his limited abilities will carry him. The child that has been blessed with a keener intelligence should be encouraged to move forward to the full extent of his capabilities and, be he black or white, should not be impeded in his intellectual growth and development by being forced to slow his pace to match the pace of other children born less fortunate.

Education remains the foremost and primary purpose, objective, and function of the public school system, and if we are not to render a lasting disservice to the child, be he white or black, that primary function of education should never be subordinated to goals or concepts of lesser, and ephemeral, and even questionable, value.

Finally, education must prepare a child to become a useful and productive man or woman to take his or her responsible place in society, for only then can one acquire a deserving dignity and rewarding satisfaction regarding accomplishments resulting from self-motivation and industry.

WELFARE

The Nation's Capital City is a city of many extremes. There is great wealth and there is also some poverty. Most of you are probably somewhat familiar with my stand on the matter of public welfare in the District of Columbia. Unquestionably, my position has been distorted and misrepresented, and, as a result, it is probably widely misunderstood.

In my judgment, the Nation's Capital should point the way for the rest of the Nation in its welfare programs as in other programs. To put it simply, persons who qualify for assistance under the governing regulations should receive assistance, and ineligibles should not be allowed to bring discredit to public welfare nor should they be permitted to siphon off funds which could better be spent by deserving and qualified recipients. Persons capable of rehabilitation, and willing to work, should have every opportunity for rehabilitation.

Contrary to editorials that have been written, leaflets that have been distributed, and statements that have been made from pulpits and elsewhere, I do not support or espouse Gestapo visits by investigators in the middle of the night, nor is this permitted by the Department of Welfare. It simply does not happen. Investigators have a very important and appropriate place in the proper administration of the welfare program, and the public should support every effort to maintain integrity in that program, every effort to locate missing parents, every effort to rid the caseload of ineligibles, and every effort to collect overpayments of welfare benefits.

These constitute the functions of investigators. None other than the Comptroller General of the United States has stated that welfare recipients cannot be depended upon to reveal the true facts of their family circumstances to social workers. Social workers are not trained in investigative techniques, and if the taxpayers are going to be protected against wholesale cheating by undeserving recipients, an adequate and well-trained force of investigators is a positive necessity.

At the same time, welfare programs should be properly financed and social workers should be provided in adequate numbers to allow due attention to be given to those families that are in need of counseling and guidance so that the welfare cycle may be broken and those families made self-sustaining. Welfare should not become a way of life in the Nation's Capital or anywhere else in the country, but, unfortunately, this is too often the case with third and fourth generation welfare recipients.

Additionally, strong emphasis upon family planning should constitute an arm of the health and welfare programs throughout the country, and the Nation's Capital should lead the way through this thicket.

Unfortunately, this is a subject that has too long been taboo, but a disease does not go away simply by our closing our eyes or our wishing it away. Past generations may have avoided coming to grips with this problem, but we of the present generation may eschew it only at the peril, discomfort, and suffering of posterity.

It is our civic, our patriotic, our moral responsibility to face up to the population explosion, and we should be gravely concerned by the burgeoning of the birth rate among those families least capable of adequately providing for and rearing children. People who are least able, financially and temperamentally, to feed, clothe, house, rear, and educate children are the very people who, all too generally, are contributing most to the population increase. In all too many instances these people are welfare recipients, and, unhappily, the children are too often illegitimate.

Last year I noted in the records of the District of Columbia welfare recipients that there were 6 mothers with 61 illegitimate children—all on welfare. There were 10 mothers with 90 illegitimate children on welfare. There were 18 mothers with 12 dozen—144—illegitimate children, all on welfare. And there were 170 mothers with 850 illegitimate children—all on welfare. Some of these mothers gave birth to children of as many as seven different fathers. These figures are shocking. The average citizen is not aware of what is going on, and too many people who are aware are simply content to close their eyes to the startling rate of illegitimacy prevalent among ADC recipients. Little wonder that there is poverty, but this particular cause seldom gets into print.

The country today is becoming alarmed over the rising crime rate. Yet, the seeds are being sown daily as the rate of illegitimacy accelerates. These illegitimate children usually are born into an environment which is not conducive to their proper upbringing. Many of them never learn the identity of their fathers, and many of their mothers are not worthy of the name. The children later become juvenile delinquents and then they become youthful criminals. Others become alcoholics and drug addicts, while others will be future candidates for welfare payments, often to contribute, in their turn, to more and more illegitimate and unwanted babies.

The Nation's Capital has a responsibility to do something about illegitimacy and welfare freeloading, not only within its own environs, but also as a model to other large urban areas of the Nation.

CRIME

In crime prevention, the District should be a model for the Nation. When people look to the National Capital, they should be able to look to it with pride rather than embarrassment. A city that is constantly before the eyes of the world should be one in which there is law and order. Things that occur here are broadcast across the Nation and across the world. In 1957, Washington was 12th among 16 comparably sized cities in crime-index offenses. These are cities ranging between 500,000 and 1 million population. Last year, Washington was in fourth place. Today, it has moved into third place, and, at the rate it is going, it will not be long until Washington will have the highest crime rate among cities of comparable size in the Nation.

This is not the proper and desirable role for the greatest of all American cities. Indeed, it is a shameful role when newspapers in the District carry constant accounts of intrusions into the home of citizens even within the shadow of our Capitol dome. Citizens refuse to walk the streets at night in their own neighborhoods.

Women walking in Washington's parks are assaulted and raped. Women are raped on elevators. They are raped in Government buildings. Not too long ago 1 woman, according to the press, was detained 15 hours and repeatedly raped by from 15 to 20 men. Rape is committed in the Nation's Capital virtually with impunity, and it has become so commonplace that people have long since become incapable of evidencing righteous indignation in regard to it. It is such a frequent occurrence that few people, other than the unfortunate victim, pay any attention. Forcible rapes in the District of Columbia increased 45.8 percent last year over the previous year, compared with an increase of 30 percent throughout the Nation since 1958.

There have been innumerable reasons cited for the astronomical increase in crimes, but I believe that, in great measure, it results from a number of court decisions which have strengthened the rights of the individual and unduly restricted the police. No American in any way wants to see any abrogation of civil liberty or abuse of constitutional privileges. Yet, there is conclusive evidence that some judges, in their decisions, are today unnecessarily fettering and restricting law enforcement.

Let us remember that the police officer must make his decisions, often within the space of a few seconds, on the scene. He has no time to read long sociological treatises, which apparently figure large in the decisions of some modern jurists, particularly those on the U.S. Supreme Court. The courts do have a deep responsibility to see that the defendant's constitutional rights are safeguarded but the courts also have a duty to the general public. The attention of people in communities all over the Nation should be aroused to the maudlin mollycoddling of criminals by some of the Federal courts, particularly. Only in this way can an alert and aroused citizenry make its voice heard by the appointing authority.

Another factor in the increasing crime rate, here in the Nation's Capital, as elsewhere, is the low morale of the policemen, which results from their being made the constant targets of unsubstantiated charges of police brutality. Policemen are becoming increasingly abused and physically assaulted by irresponsible hoodlums and mobs, and few people are coming to their aid.

In 1964, 1 out of every 10 police officers was attacked as he attempted to carry out his duties. It seems that everyone is concerned with police brutality and, yet, too few are concerned over the maltreatment of officers of the law. The policeman represents authority, and this is anathema to unwashed, scraggly haired, bearded beatnik revolutionaries and uncouth, insolent, arrogant, foulmouthed, irresponsible hoodlums. The policeman is kicked, spat upon, cursed, knocked down, and often disarmed, and if he must resort to force in subduing his attacker, the policeman then is charged with police brutality.

A good example of this was the incident which took place last September in the 10th Precinct, an incident in which two police officers, having issued earlier warning, took into custody four juveniles for playing football in an alley. An altercation later took place, as a result of the attempted intervention by an individual who had no business becoming involved. One policeman was beaten, an unruly mob descended upon the stationhouse and threatened to hang one of the policemen, a riot was narrowly averted, and the two policemen were publicly charged by a superior officer with having used bad judgment. Various investigations ensued, one of the policemen was transferred to another precinct, and the morale of the men at the 10th Precinct hit rock bottom.

Little wonder, when policemen having done their duty, are publicly criticized by superior officers who reach hasty conclusions and make unwarranted statements for press consumption before the facts have been carefully and thoroughly investigated. This constant vilification of police, this lack of support from their superiors, is hampering the police in their work, making them ineffectual, and making it virtually impossible to employ the number of policemen necessary to maintain law and order, particularly in the big cities where they are most needed, and here again, Washington is a prime example. The Washington Metropolitan Police Department has conducted rigorous efforts to recruit policemen, and it consistently fails to fill the positions that have been authorized by the Congress.

If the police force is subjected to chronic harassment and unjustifiable charges of "police brutality" by those who desire to weaken its authority and effectiveness for good law enforcement; if policemen are made to feel that they cannot properly do their work because of the ever-constant threat of unjustified complaints being lodged against them to be followed possibly by unjustified public censure or disciplinary action; if policemen can no longer be sustained by a faith in the steadfast support of their superiors—then, indeed, the morale and efficiency of the police force will be impaired and cause for concern will be given to every citizen.

Washington can never become a model city until it has first become a safe city—safe for the ambassadors and other representatives of foreign nations who serve in their posts here; safe for the students and tourists who come to visit this national shrine from all points of the country; safe for the government workers and the businessmen who win their livelihood in this city; safe for the old man, the young woman, and the child, Negro and white, as they walk the streets from the grocery store, as they seek relaxation in the parks, and while they worship in the churches of the city. And every law-abiding and self-respecting citizen should rally to this cause. As William Pitt said: "Where law ends, tyranny begins."

So the future role of Washington covers not only stretches of green grass and gray marble, but also the problems of its people. We must all strive to make urban living in the District of Columbia more pleasant and relaxing, and more peaceful and rewarding.

But its future role demands of us more than this. As people speak of the classical age of Moliere and Racine and point out that Paris was its natural place of birth; as they talk of the Age of Enlightenment arising in London and the advances which it brought to government of man; and as they talk of the "glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome"—so should this "city of magnificent distances" be known as an unsurpassed center of beauty and simplicity, forever synonymous with the best in culture, the greatest in art in all its forms, the most progressive and realistic in learning, and the highest in spiritual and moral values. Only then can it be the seat which it was meant to be, of a Republic whose history, like the path of the just—"is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

MEXICAN-AMERICANS OF THE SOUTHWEST

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there is a group of people in the Southwestern United States who have contributed significantly to its history, which today comprise 12 percent of its population, which are disadvantaged economically in comparison with the Anglos living in the same area, and who are not always well understood by their neighbors. I am speaking of the 3,465,000 Mexican-Americans who live in the Southwestern United States, from Brownville, Tex. to San Diego, Calif., primarily in the five States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, Colorado, and Texas. According to the 1960 census 1,417,810 of these good people live in Texas. This is 14.8 percent of the population of my State.

In an effort to contribute to an increased understanding of the Mexican-Americans of the Southwest, at least in terms of their sociological characteristics, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Raymond Clapp entitled "Spanish-Americans of the Southwest." appearing in the January 1966 issue of Welfare in Review, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPANISH-AMERICANS OF THE SOUTHWEST

(By Raymond F. Clapp, consultant, division of research, welfare administration)

(NOTE.—Spanish-Americans in the Southwestern United States comprise a generally disadvantaged but little understood population segment. They are a significant group in the Southwest, representing 12 percent of the population of the five States of California, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. In addition to their sizable numerical strength, the Spanish-speaking peoples, through their early settlement history, have left a permanent imprint on Southwest life, ranging from clothing and food to architecture and linguistics.

(But poverty and discrimination have, in turn, left their imprint on the Spanish-Americans. President Johnson, in his Howard University speech on June 4, 1965, pointed to the plight of these people in his own Southwest State of Texas and spoke of the cruel effects of prejudice: "I have seen this uncomprehending pain in the eyes of young Mexican-American schoolchildren."

(This article by Raymond F. Clapp is drawn from a full-length study now underway by the Division of Research of the Welfare Administration. The tables and charts presented in this issue serve as an introduction to a more comprehensive analysis of the relative status of the Spanish-speaking peoples of the Southwest region. In addition to the statistical analysis of economic and social characteristics of this group, the current study includes research findings relating to the cultural and psychological aspects of this population.

(Today, as governmental and voluntary agencies and citizen leaders marshal resources to relieve the stresses of poverty wherever it exists, parallel efforts are also made through research and factfinding to provide the knowledge needed for policy and program design. Yet as research brings its resources to bear in identifying and clarifying the dimensions of poverty, it opens other doors for further inquiry and the next series of research activities begins.

(To keep open those doors, to increase our storehouse of knowledge and the scope of our tested techniques, we must often take enormous strides just to keep pace with today's challenging new programs for the alleviation of poverty and its attendant ills. We anticipate that this study of Spanish-Americans will accelerate the pace.)

The Spanish-American population has had a long history in this country. Colonization of what is now the Southwest was started more than three centuries ago when this entire area, along with Mexico, was part of Spain's vast overseas empire. Santa Fe was an important urban settlement in 1609. By 1790 the white population of the Southwest was practically all Spanish and included an estimated 23,000 persons, distributed as follows in areas which later became the States of Arizona, 1,000; California, 1,100; New Mexico, 15,000; and Texas, 6,000.[1]

Now, more than 350 years later, the Spanish-American population in the Southwest numbers 3,465,000 persons—12 percent of the population of the five States under study. The total 1960 population of the five States was 29,300,000, of whom "Anglos" represented 79 percent, Negroes 7 percent and all other nonwhite persons, 2 percent.

White persons, other than those identified as Spanish-Americans are commonly referred to in the Southwest as "Anglos," and that term will be used in this report when Spanish-Americans are compared with other whites. The study excludes "braceros," Mexican residents who enter the United States under contract for a limited time to work as farm laborers and then return to Mexico.

Because Spanish-Americans comprise a group that is classified with other whites, few statisticians outside the Southwest, and not even many within that area, have attempted to identify this group in their social data. In most census tabulations they are included with other whites. It is, however, in the special Census volume "White Persons of Spanish Surname,"[2] that the most meaningful data have been found. Our preliminary report is essentially an analysis of the statistics presented in this valuable document.

Related census data referring to other ethnic groups have also been utilized. As an example, we may consider the Negro population. In the United States as a whole 20,488,000 nonwhites were enumerated, of whom 18,848,619, or 92 percent were Negro. Because the Negro is so predominant in the nonwhite population outside the West, it has become the practice of many statisticians to equate nonwhite data with Negroes and to disregard other races in gathering their information. Fortunately, the Census Bureau has not ignored this fact, nor have we in this study. Two census subject reports entitled "Nonwhite Population by Race,"[3]—covering Negroes, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos—and "Puerto Ricans in the United States,"[4] have proved invaluable and permit a comparison of many of the characteristics of these ethnic groups with Spanish-Americans.

EDUCATION

In education, as measured in median number of years completed by the adult population, the Spanish-American ranks as low as, or below, any other ethnic group identified and tabulated by the census except the American Indian woman (table 1).

TABLE 1.—*Years of school completed*

Sex	White persons of Spanish surnames in 5 Southwestern States [1]	Puerto Rican birth and parentage, United States	Nonwhite persons in the West			Nonwhite persons in California	
			Negro	American Indian	Chinese	Japanese	Filipino
Total males: 14 years old and over	8.1	8.4	10.3	8.2	11.3	12.4	8.7
Total females: 14 years old and over	8.2	8.2	10.6	8.1	11.8	12.3	11.5

[1] Median years of school completed by persons aged 14 and over of selected ethnic groups in the Southwest and West from various 1960 U.S. Census reports.

The group most nearly comparable to the Spanish-American in the Southwest, in numbers and in economic and educational status, is the Negro. For this reason a series of tabulations comparing Spanish-American with Negro groups in the five-State area has been prepared for this article.

In school enrollment of males aged 14 years and over, when compared to all males aged 14–24 inclusive, the Spanish-American ratio is 33.3 percent, the Negro 34.9 percent (table 2).

MALE UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment runs high among Spanish-American men—almost twice that of the "Anglos." However, unemployment among Negro men is slightly higher, and among American Indians considerably higher than that for Spanish-Americans.

In 1960, the ratio of unemployed Spanish-American men seeking work to the total male civilian labor force was 8 percent, as compared with 4.5 percent for "Anglos" in the same five-State area. For Negro men it was 9.7, for the American Indian 18.4 percent. Other racial and ethnic groups range from a male unemployment ratio of 2.6 percent for the Japanese to 4.0 percent for the Chinese (table 3).

TABLE 2.—*School enrollment*

Sex and age	Spanish-American	Negro
Males:		
Number of males age 14 to 24	312,080	168,255
Number of males age 14 and over enrolled in school	103,954	58,680
Ratio of enrollees to males age 14 to 24	33.3	34.9
Females:		
Number of females age 14 to 24	313,988	171,168
Number of females age 14 and over enrolled in school	111,744	67,177
Ratio of enrollees to females age 14 to 24	35.6	39.2

Source: U.S. Census, 1960. Subject Repts. PC(2)-1B, tables 2 and 6; PC(2)-1C; table 50.

TABLE 3.—*Unemployment: By sex and ethnic group*

Ethnic group	Male			Female		
	Civilian labor force	Number unemployed	Percent unemployed	Labor force	Unemployed	Percent unemployed
Spanish-Americans in 5 Southwestern States	801,045	64,277	8.0	295,417	28,512	9.7
Negros in 5 Southwestern States	470,986	45,694	9.7	321,201	27,741	8.6
Persons of Puerto Rican birth and parentage in whole United States	214,279	20,365	9.5	102,640	11,281	11.0
American Indians in the West	43,324	7,991	18.4	17,362	2,378	13.7
Chinese in the West	43,625	1,753	4.0	19,783	882	4.5
Japanese in California	45,210	1,191	2.6	26,507	820	3.1
Filipinos in California	24,008	1,871	7.8	4,586	626	13.7
Anglos in 5 Southwestern States	6,027,385	269,754	4.5	2,907,536	147,444	5.1

Source: U.S. Census 1960: Repts. PC(2) 1B, 1C, and 1D and vol. 1.

---

[1] Report of the "1932 Report of the Committee on Linguistic and National Stocks in the Population of the United States," representing the American Council of Learned Societies. Cited by Herschel T. Manuel in "Spanish Speaking Children in the Southwest," 1965.

[2] Subject Report PC(2)IB 1960 U.S. census.

[3] Subject Report PC(2)IC 1960 U.S. census.

[4] Subject Report PC(2)ID 1960 U.S. census.

In these calculations the labor force is defined as all employed persons except Armed Forces personnel, plus all persons unemployed but seeking employment.

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

The majority of Spanish-Americans are found to have a relatively cohesive family life: 75 percent of their households have both husband and wife present, as compared with 61 percent of Negro households. Based upon the number of household heads, Spanish-American households average 4.31 persons and Negro households, 3.51. Nonrelatives are found less frequently in Spanish-American than in Negro households, with a ratio of only 1 nonrelative to 50 Spanish-American homes, and 1 to 10 Negro homes (table 4).

TABLE 4.—*Households*

Relationship	Spanish-American			
	Number	Per household [1]	Number	Per household [1]
Persons in household	3,369,651	4.31	2,097,772	3.51
Head	775,844	1.00	598,084	1.00
Wife (husband present)	583,232	.75	362,699	.61
Children and other relatives	1,972,598	2.54	1,077,756	1.80
Nonrelatives	37,977	.02	59,233	.10

[1] Based on number of household heads.

Sources: Census Subject Rpt. PC (2) 1B, table 3.
Census Subject Rpt. PC (2) 1C, table 50.

In the five-State area under study, there were 630,000 Spanish-American children under age 6, and 268,000 Spanish-American mothers with one or more natural children of this age under their care who were neither employed nor seeking employment (table 5), a ratio of 243 such children to 100 such mothers. In the same area there were 364,000 Negro children under age 6, and 106,000 Negro mothers, neither employed nor seeking employment, caring for one or more children of this age, a ratio of 334 such children to 100 such mothers. Obviously, not all preschool children were with a mother who was free of outside employment, but it seems reasonable to assume that the Spanish-American child receives this type of care more often than the Negro child. It also seems likely, from the higher proportion of husband-wife households, that the Spanish-American child more often lives in a home with both parents present than does the Negro child.

TABLE 5.—*Employment status*

Sex	Spanish-American		Negro	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALES				
Total males, 14 years and over	1,056,904	100.0	679,627	100.0
Labor force	819,271	77.5	504,963	74.3
Armed Forces	18,226	1.7	33,977	5.0
Civilian labor force	801,045	75.8	470,986	69.3
Employed	736,768	69.7	425,292	62.6
Unemployed	64,277	6.1	45,694	6.7
Not in labor force	237,633	22.5	174,664	25.7
Inmate of institution	21,650	2.0	23,415	3.4
Enrolled in school	103,954	9.8	58,680	8.6
Other, under 65 years old	63,294	6.0	51,850	7.6
Other, 65 years old and over	48,735	4.6	40,719	6.0
FEMALES				
Total females 14 years and over	1,027,276	100.0	726,520	100.0
Labor force	295,417	28.8	321,201	44.2
Employed	266,655	26.0	292,698	40.3
Unemployed	28,512	2.8	27,741	3.8
Not in labor force	731,859	71.2	405,319	55.8
Inmate of institution	5,593	.5	5,042	.7
Enrolled in school	111,744	10.9	67,177	9.2
Other, under 65 years old	551,149	53.7	274,136	37.7
With own children under 6 years old	267,844	26.1	106,374	14.6
Other, 65 years old and over	63,373	6.2	58,964	8.1

Source: U.S. Census, 1960: Subject Repts. PC(2)1B, table 6, and PC(2)IC, table 55.

The importance of this condition is emphasized by the population pyramid, which depicts the high proportion of younger children in the Spanish-American population. The extent to which young children are in two-parent homes with a mother who is not working and therefore unable to provide supplementary income is an important factor in the welfare of the Spanish-American family.

The high birth rate of Spanish-Americans, evidenced by this age distribution, is accompanied by a relatively high death rate among adults, as indicated by the rapidly shrinking upper levels of the Spanish-American pyramid. This condition points to the need for inquiry into the adequacy of medical care.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF MEN

Employment and related indices are generally similar for Negro and Spanish-American males. At the time of the 1960 census, the proportion of all males aged 14 and over who were in the Armed Forces was 5.0 percent for Negroes, about three times the 1.7 percent for Spanish-Americans. In the civilian sector, however, we find that about 70 percent of Spanish-American men over age 14, and 63 percent of Negro men over that age were employed. Unemployment in table 5 is calculated as a percentage of the total population aged 14 and over.

Only 2 percent of Spanish-American males were in institutions, compared to 3.4 percent of the Negro men; 9.8 percent of all Spanish-American males aged 14 and over were enrolled in school and 8.6 percent of the Negro men.

In addition to the above categories, another 10.6 percent of the Spanish-American males and 13.6 percent of the Negro males were out of the labor force; that is, neither at work nor looking for work. In evaluating these comparisons, it should be kept in mind that a substantially larger proportion of the Spanish-American males are under age 35 than the Negro males and that conversely an appreciably higher proportion of the Negro males are over 40 than of the Spanish-American males. This would help to explain, at least in part, the higher rates of school enrollment of Spanish-American persons 14 and over—both male and female—and lower proportions in institutions and of "others not in the labor force."

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF WOMEN

The employment pattern of Negro women is very different from that of Spanish-American women. Of all Negro women aged 14 and over, 40 percent were employed at the time of the 1960 census. This is more than half again the 26 percent of the Spanish-American women who were employed. Conversely, 71 percent of Spanish-American women were neither employed nor seeking employment, in comparison with 56 percent of Negro women. Those unemployed and looking for work represented 3 percent of all Spanish-American females and 4 percent of all Negro females.

Of those women in the civilian labor force; that is, either at work or looking for work, 9.7 percent of the Spanish-American women were unemployed, and 8.6 percent of the Negro women. Women aged 14 to 65 who were neither in the labor force nor enrolled in school, nor in institutions, comprised over half (53.7 percent) of all Spanish-American women of this age range, but little more than one-third (37.7 percent) of Negro women of this group.

Spanish-American women, not in the labor force and caring for their own children under 6 years of age, represented 26 percent of all Spanish-Americans aged 14 and over, while Negro women in this category represented less than 15 percent of all Negroes 14 years of age and over.

MALE OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION

The Bureau of the Census has developed a hierarchy of occupations, with professional, technical, and managerial at the top and service and labor at the bottom. Table 6 represents the relative distribution of employment of men and women in the two groups under analysis, together with that of the "Anglos."

TABLE 6.—*Occupational distribution*

	White persons of Spanish surname		Negroes		Anglos	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
OCCUPATION, MALES						
Total males employed	736,768	[1] 100.0	425,292	[1] 100.0	5,757,627	[1] 100.0
Professional and technical; farmers and farm managers; managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	77,407	10.5	31,976	7.5	1,810,036	31.4
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	58,799	8.0	26,513	6.2	878,678	15.3
Craftsmen, foremen, operatives, and kindred workers	285,075	38.7	134,387	31.6	2,126,815	36.9
Service workers, including private household	53,627	7.3	79,569	18.7	295,049	5.1
Farm laborers and foremen	117,688	16.0	21,247	5.0	118,115	2.1
Laborers, except farm and mine	106,409	14.4	92,520	21.8	271,376	4.7
Occupation not reported	37,763	5.1	39,080	9.2	257,558	4.5
OCCUPATION-FEMALES						
Total females employed	266,655	[1] 100.0	292,698	[1] 100.0	2,760,342	[1] 100.0
Professional and technical; farmers and farm managers; managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	21,909	8.2	25,874	8.8	591,163	21.4
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	74,545	28.0	25,105	8.6	1,264,801	45.8
Craftsmen, foremen, operatives, and kindred workers	69,485	26.1	29,996	10.2	273,955	9.9
Private household workers	28,514	10.7	113,947	38.9	119,890	4.3
Service workers, except private household	41,189	15.4	68,491	23.4	341,609	12.4
Farm laborers and foremen; laborers, except farm and mine; occupation not reported	31,013	11.6	29,285	10.0	168,924	6.1

[1] Percentages may not add to 100.0 due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Census of the Population: 1960. Subject reports· Persons of Spanish surname; final report PC(2)-1B, table 6. Subject reports: Nonwhite population by race; final report PC(2)-1C, table 55, vol. 1, "Characteristics of the Population," pts. 4, 6, 7, 33, and 45, table 58.

It can be seen that, as a group, Spanish-American men on the average enjoy a somewhat higher place in the occupational hierarchy than Negro men, but a considerably lower position than Anglo men. Of the Spanish-American men in employment, 19 percent were found in the professional and clerical occupations, while 14 percent of Negro men and 47 percent of Anglo men were employed in these occupations.

Craftsmen and operatives included 39 percent of Spanish-American, 32 percent of Negro, and 37 percent of Anglo men. The Spanish-American, with 16 percent working as farm laborers and foremen, greatly exceeded the Negro (5 percent), and the Anglo (2 percent) men in this category.

In service occupations were found 19 percent of the Negro men, 7 percent of the Spanish-Americans, and 5 percent of the Anglos; and in laboring jobs, 22 percent of the Negro, 14 percent of the Spanish-American, and 5 percent of the Anglo men.

FEMALE OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION

The pattern of female occupations as with the male pattern, differs substantially among the Anglo, Spanish-American and Negro women. But the extent of the differences in the three groups is much greater for the women than for the men.

In professional, technical, clerical, and sales were found 67 percent of the Anglo, 36 percent of the Spanish-American, and only 17 percent of the Negro employed women. Women employed as craftsmen and operatives totaled 26 percent of employed Spanish-Americans, and 10 percent of both Negro and Anglo women. Private household work accounted for 39 percent of Negro employment, 11 percent of Spanish-American employment and 4 percent of Anglo employment.

ANNUAL INCOME

Consistent with the occupational advantage of Spanish-American over Negro males, the income distributions was also more favorable for the Spanish-American group. Figure 5, however, indicates the low-income distribution for both groups as compared with Anglo males. For instance, total income in 1959 was below $3,000 for 31.8 percent of the Anglos, but 52.8 percent of the Spanish-Americans, and 59 percent of the Negro men in the 5 Southwestern States earned less than $3,000. At the other end of the distribution, annual income of $7,000 or more was reported by 24.5 percent of Anglo men, but only 6.9 percent of Spanish-American men, and 2.8 percent of Negro men earned $7,000 or above.

NATIVITY, PARENTAGE, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

Of all Spanish-Americans in the Southwest, according to the 1960 census, 84.6 percent were born in the United States. Only 15.4 percent were born elsewhere: the majority 13.5 percent, in Mexico, and only 1.9 percent in other countries (table 7). Of the total Spanish-American population, 54.8 percent were native born of native parentage, and 29.8 percent, of Mexican parentage.

TABLE 7.—*Nativity and parentage: Spanish-Americans*

	Number	Percent
Total	3,464,999	100.0
Native born	2,930,185	84.6
Native parentage	1,894,402	54.8
Foreign or mixed parentage	1,030,783	29.8
Mexican parentage	917,614	26.5
Other	113,167	3.3
Foreign born	534,814	15.4
In Mexico	468,684	13.5
Elsewhere	66,130	1.9

Source: U.S. Census, 1960, Subject Rept. PC(2) 1B, table 1.

Data from the most recent census, from earlier census tabulations, and from migration records support the conclusion that a high proportion of the Spanish-American group under study migrated from Mexico or are descendants of such migrants.

URBAN-RURAL RESIDENCE

Much the same as other Americans throughout the Nation, Spanish-Americans are tending to concentrate in urban areas in the Southwest. This is also true of the Negroes of this area (table 8).

TABLE 8

Ethnic group	Year	Urban	Rural	Total
Spanish-American	1960	79.1	20.9	100.0
Do	1950	66.4	33.6	100.0
Negro	1960	83.5	16.5	100.0
Do	1950	72.4	27.6	100.0

Source: "U.S. Census of the Population: 1960." Vol. 1, PC(1)-1B, U.S. Summary, table 47: Age by color and sex for the United States. Subject reports: PC(2)-1B, "Persons of Spanish Surname," table 2: Age of white persons of Spanish surname, PC(2)-1C, nonwhite population by race, table 50: Social characteristics of the Negro population.

NEXT STEPS

Findings to date indicate that Spanish-Americans rate lowest in education as it is measured by years of school completed. To be explored further in the literature is the extent to which members of this group continue to hold to Spanish as the language of home and community and how this practice limits learning in a land where English is so vitally important.

The fact that Spanish-Americans have to a considerable degree found their way into technical, clerical, and skilled occupations offers promise for their further escalation, as opportunities are afforded them. The relative cohesiveness of Spanish-American families would also seem to be reassuring for the future progress of this group.

But many Spanish-Americans have far to go. This is conclusively demonstrated by the fact that 53 percent of Spanish-American men had incomes of less than $3,000 in 1959. Given the preponderance of large, young families and the apparent tendency of Spanish-American mothers to stay out of the work force when their children are young, it seems unlikely that this low income could be increased to any meaningful degree without increasing substantially the earning capacity and opportunity of the men.

With a substantial proportion of incomes below the poverty line figure, the problems of Spanish-Americans are further compounded by the fact that their education is limited. At the same time, it is not a simple matter to extend necessary services to this group since they tend to live apart from the mainstream of American life.

Whatever programs may be suggested to help meet the needs of this largely underprivileged group will depend on the outcome of continued analysis of relevant information.

SOUTH VIETNAMESE MORALE IS HIGH

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in a letter dated March 7 from a friend of mine serving with the military in Vietnam, I read with such gratification a personal report on the attitudes and the determination of our men in Vietnam that I desire to share those inspiring sentiments with the Congress and with the country.

The young man reporting to me is a typical South Dakotan and I dare to believe he is also a typical American. His brave words and his inspiring report should give greater confidence and more realism to those in our country who proclaim that our cause in Vietnam is hopeless and perhaps induce them to refrain from expressing sentiments of disunity and dissent.

I offer this letter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope others may receive from it the same inspiration that it has provided me. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DA NANG AIR BASE,
REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM,
March 7, 1966.

* * * * *

While I have only been here in this country a little over a month, I can honestly say I have been most impressed with what I've seen here. This is a most unusual yet interesting country, and by custom, it is so much different from our way of life in the United States. Yet it is quite easy to learn to appreciate the Vietnam old and ancient way of life. * * * I am an intelligence adviser. * * * I have found these military men to be true workers and they, like we Americans, have a like devotion to country and duty, so it is a real challenge for Americans to offer as much assistance as we can.

Living conditions here for the American military man are not up to stateside conditions, naturally—however in a war situation every man realizes that we have it as best can be provided by the United States. Mail coming in has improved greatly, food is very fine, living conditions are being made better daily, and our commanders are showing greater concern toward their men than was shown in World War II or in Korea. This is most gratifying. I see men from all branches of service daily, eat with them, live with them, and spirits are high, morale is good, and naturally both of these are most important.

Before closing my letter to you, sir, I should like to share an experience with you, which I feel will clearly show what type of men are here in Vietnam today. We have a port of embarkation at McGuire Air Force Base on the east coast and one at Travis Air Force Base in California. In 1960 I left from McGuire Air Force Base for a tour to Germany. While waiting for my flight there I'll simply say the air was filled with much happiness. Fellow military men were anxious for their departure and looking forward to seeing a lovely old country, of young foreign girls, the taste of a new and different life for the duration of each man's tour in Europe. All of us were dressed in class A uniforms, spotlessly clean and all thoughts were gay and happy. Naturally there was a note of sadness, leaving loved ones, family, wives, but a situation of war did not then exist and fear was not a consideration. Turn now to February 1966, to Travis Air Force Base, and we find a different situation, a different condition in general. There I saw men in green shaded fatigues, field packs on some, men carrying weapons, uniforms not so neatly pressed, and faces were not smiling, voices were not gay. Here was an air of anticipation, of concern, what lies ahead for us, and on that day, many questions still remained unanswered. After a time of listening and watching, talking with other fellows, I found that though this feeling was present, never were ill words spoken, no one said, "Why are we going over to fight their war," these men were military men, with a true devotion for duty, a high ideal toward honor and men seemed to gather around the older soldiers, or men who were returning to Vietnam for a second tour, asking questions. The answers were serious ones, not of foreign girls this time, of gay places to visit, only answers to how best avoid dangers of war, to avoid the enemy, and most of all, how to stay alive, keep from getting injured, and placing strong emphasis on learning about the people and the country. It was a true experience for me, one I'll not soon forget.

One fact I have learned over here is that the United States does not hope to win this war; we hope only to win the hearts of the people, and in doing this, the proud people of this country will surely win the war for themselves. It is obvious that the United States is highly respected by the people of Vietnam, the military man is an ambassador of goodwill, one to advise and direct these people, not to shove and push them into any situation. I say the United States can well be proud of the men serving in Vietnam, and each man can be proud of the part he is playing here to bring a quick peace to this land and its determined people.

Well Senator MUNDT, sir, I have rambled on here much too much, but I feel in my heart that what I've said to be true, and I know that the United States is just as proud of its military might as are the men who serve her with honor and dignity.

* * * * *

THE STATE OF THE ARTS IN MONTANA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a few weeks ago it was my privilege to view the Foote collection of Montana historic artifacts on display at the Department of Commerce. The Foote collection has now moved on to the Galeries Lafayette in Paris. I know that Members of this body, of the President's Cabinet and many others enjoyed the privilege of viewing this fine collection.

Last November, thousands of Washingtonians, and visitors from around the Nation and overseas, viewed the exhibition of Montana arts and crafts in the caucus room of the Old Senate Office Building. The works of some 55 Montana artists were exhibited there in a display arranged by one of Montana's artists now residing in Washington, Mr. Raymond Dockstader, legislative assistant to the majority leader.

These two displays of Montana art before approving national and international audiences are but the latest examples of distinguished art among residents of a State which chose, as its representative in Statuary Hall, the great western painter and illustrator, Charles Russell.

Recently articles appearing in the New York Times and Saturday Review indicated that Montana and its sister State, Wyoming, are so bereft of artistic talent that they cannot provide needed leadership in the field. The articles, which I shall insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, quote Governors' representatives of those two States as saying that they had no cities with the talent and facilities to provide vigorous leadership in artistic affairs.

Montana has, in fact, extraordinary local leadership in artistic affairs, not only in several cities but in small towns which regularly produce historical dramas, and on Indian reservations such as the Crow, whose annual enactment of the Custer battle attracts national attention. The University of Montana at Missoula and Montana State University at Bozeman, the Montana Arts Council, the Montana Institute of the Arts, and the Community Concert Association provide leadership and incentive for both amateur and professional artists in the Northwest. The State capital, Helena, is the home of the Archie Bray Foundation whose creative potters—Peter Voulkus, Rudy Autio, Ken Ferguson, and now Dave Shaner are well-known ceramic artists. The Montana Historical Museum in Helena and the Charles Russell Gallery in Great Falls house displays not only of regional significance but are also host to many well-installed displays of contemporary artists. Most recently the Montana Historical Museum was the recipient of a large gift of contemporary art from the Poindexter collection in New York.

Billings is one example of a city that has shown magnificent leadership in artistic affairs. Several years ago a small group of public spirited individuals decided that Billings needed an art gallery. A fund-raising campaign was successful and they took over the old city jail, renovated it into a modern gallery with excellent display space and facilities for instruction and storage. This Yellowstone Arts Center has been open to the public since October 1964. It has had a number of fine exhibitions from throughout the country and more are scheduled. The gallery promotes local talent, has a full-time director. This local effort has been a great success; the dream of a few has become a source of pleasure to thousands.

Arlene Francis of the National Broadcasting Co. featured the Yellowstone Arts Center on her radio program, "Emphasis." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD immediately following these remarks the text of her program, and the Saturday Review and New York Times articles to which I referred earlier.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arlene Francis radio program "Emphasis," Nov. 12, 1964]

This is Arlene Francis, emphasis, women. What does one do with an old, leftover county jail? Now, admittedly, that isn't a question that confronts many people. But if it did, I'll bet the standard answer would be something like, "tear it down, and maybe we can sell the real estate." Well, not so with the townspeople of Billings, Mont. The good people of Billings have set us all a proud example of community spirit that I want to tell you about.

Several years ago the Yellowstone County jail was abandoned for more modern accommodations. For a long while it sat empty and deteriorating, a situation that would have been ignored by many less inventive towns. But 2 years ago, when a Billings architect found the building to be still structurally sound, he and some fellow-townspeople hit upon what may seem to be a far-fetched idea: they wanted to turn the old jail into a fine arts center. They encountered the same old problems: stirring up enthusiasm among the County Commissioners and the community at large; facing the fact that there were no tax moneys available for renovation or maintenance. Sounds familar, doesn't it? Well, they set out to raise the necessary $25,000 and not only succeeded, but also received offers of volunteer labor, equipment, and materials which eventually were just as important as the money.

Even with all that behind them, their problems were far from solved. They were faced with the prospect of removing from the jail 150 tons of steel cell blocks. And they removed them—and sold the steel. Much of it was brought by Montana ranchers to use as cattle guards. Where there's a will, there's a way.

From there on in, everybody helped. Men and women from all walks of life—professional people, housewives, officeworkers—everybody pitched in and built, repaired, cleaned, and painted the building into the fine arts center they wanted for their town. And here is the result.

On October 18 a two-story brick building in downtown Billings—still looking rather like a jail—opened its doors for an exhibition of paintings by American artists from the year 1875—a year when Billings was pretty much the wild and woolly West. The collection was on loan from the Walker Art Institute and the national collection of fine arts of the Smithsonian Institute and from private collections and neighboring historical societies.

In the Billings Fine Arts Center, there are smaller galleries devoted to exhibits of pottery, weaving, graphic arts, sculpture, architecture, photography, and industrial design. And they haven't stopped there. The second floor of their center is reserved for children's art classes, musical ensembles, little theater productions, lectures, and films.

Billings, a town of 75,000 people, has shown us democracy in action. Has shown us what the American people, with their unquenchable thirst for culture, can do with just their heads, their hands, and their hearts. I hereby invite everybody else in the country to join me in taking off my hat to the people of Billings, Mont.

This is Arlene Francis, NBC, "Emphasis."

[From the Saturday Review, Mar. 5, 1966]

First of the Month

(By Cleveland Amory)

On a happier note, our favorite sign of the month was one on New York's 57th Street, "Culture Clearance," it said, "80 percent off." And, as if that weren't enough, there was quite a clearing of the culture air out in Chicago during the month, when the National Conference of Governors' Representatives of State Art Agencies met to consider, among other things, how to spend the Federal Government's $50,000 per State matching grants. Two speakers, for example, Governors' representatives from Montana and Wyoming, said that their States were so sparsely populated that there wasn't "one city with the talent and facilities to provide art leadership."

What they needed, it seemed, wasn't kind of art-lift—to *de*populate, say Greenwich Village and *up*populate, say Butte.

On the other hand, the art representative from New Jersey declared that his State was "a keg being tapped at other ends—New York in the north, and Philadelphia in the south." The reason, he felt, "that most residents with interests in the arts gravitated toward the cities for their gratifications."

Next came the representative from West Virginia. His State, he felt, "could benefit greatly from access to artists and institutions in such bordering States as Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky."

That certainly was more like it. Never mind the measly $50,000. Go all out—build Art Throughways, Culture Expressways, Free Thought Freeways.

But the really good news came from the Governors' art representatives from Massachusetts. He remarked quietly that "the resources of Boston" were so varied and satisfying that the State "seemed hardly aware," as he put it, that "other communities," were "gravely neglected."

It gives you a tingle—a statement like that. But perhaps this writer should not be the one to comment. Perhaps it would be better if the compliment came from one of you out-of-towners.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 1, 1966]

New Breed in the Arts—Managers of Opportunity Are Urged To Bring Rewards of Talent to Public

(By Howard Taubman)

In his keynote address to last week's National Conference of Governors' Representatives of State Arts Agencies in Chicago, John M. MacFadyen had some stirring words of advice to all those about to plunge into the burgeoning field of State support of the arts.

"Remember," the former executive director of the New York State Council on the Arts told about 200 representatives from all the States, "it is not incumbent on you to establish or represent an official taste. Look for and explore all possible avenues of opportunity."

Speaking of the members and executive directors of arts councils and commissions now spreading from the States, Mr. MacFadyen described them as a new breed—"managers of opportunity," not artists or managers of the arts.

On these managers of opportunity, Mr. MacFadyen went on, "as with no other group, rests the responsibility to improve and expand the opportunity for our creative artists to work and to have their work heard and seen; the responsibility to provide our talented interpreters of the arts with more and better opportunities to be properly trained and to bring the rewards of that talent and training to the public and the responsibility to provide improved and increased opportunities for a growing audience to receive and respond to the communication of the arts."

THE HAVE-NOT STATES

To most of the States' representatives gathered in Chicago, the overriding question was how to go about organizing these opportunities with the limited means at their disposal. For the truth is that in the arts there are many more have-not than have States.

As one talked with delegates from different parts of the Nation, one discovered how diverse the problems were.

A man from New Jersey said that his State was like a keg being tapped at both ends—New York in the north and Philadelphia in the south. The result was that most residents with interests in the arts gravitated toward these cities for the gratifications they sought instead of devoting their energies and means to the development of New Jersey institutions.

A man from Massachusetts remarked that the resources of Boston were so varied and satisfying that the State seemed hardly aware that other communities were gravely neglected.

A man from West Virginia said his State was small and poor and had little immediate prospect of lifting itself by its bootstraps in the arts.

Representatives from Montana and Wyoming said that their States were so huge and sparsely populated that no cities had the talent and facilities to provide a vigorous lead.

Representatives of a few other States frankly conceded that until the adoption of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 there had been hardly a glimmer of official interest in the arts in their areas.

COUNCILS ARE SPURRED

Congress deliberately wrote into the new law provisions that would activate the States. To States without any arts council or commission $25,000 is offered for surveys leading to the establishment of such an agency. This one-time grant will be available only in the next fiscal year.

To all States the Federal Government offers up to $50,000 a year as a matching grant for an arts program. The resulting $100,000 must be spent entirely on program; no part of it may be spent on administrative costs.

For the have States, like New York and Missouri, which are carrying out lively programs, and California, which is far advanced in its planning, the $50,000 program contribution is easy to win. Their legislatures have provided more than $50,000 in matching money.

For a State like Illinois, which expects to raise its matching $50,000 from private and foundation sources, the Federal offer is equally pleasant.

But for the have-not States the matching demand is a problem. They all expect to apply for the survey fund, and they hope, with the drafters of the law, that the very process of conducting a survey will arouse public support.

But there was an awareness at the Chicago conference that going it alone would not do for the have-not States. Cooperative regional programs are a way out.

ACCESS TO ARTISTS

On the final morning of the conference representatives from the Appalachian States met to examine possibilities. West Virginia thought it could benefit greatly from access to artists and institutions in such bordering States as Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky.

It was encouraging to note that in Chicago the danger of State pride was not yet a worry. In his "Guide to the Organization and Operation of a State Arts Council," which was distributed to the delegates, W. Howard Adams, formerly head of the Missouri Council and now associate director of the Arts Councils of America, warned against this danger. So did Mr. MacFadyen in his keynote speech.

There is no doubt that the have-not States will need help from outside sources if they are to make up cultural deficiencies. It would be disastrous if the movement for State patronage of the arts led to a spread and tolerance of mediocre work. The maintenance and raising of standards are another responsibility for the new arts breed, the managers of opportunity.

A DEBATE ON CHINA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I was most interested to read in the New York Times magazine of March 13, 1966, a debate between Hans J. Morgenthau and Frank N. Trager on China. This article has considerable bearing on the Foreign Relations Committee's current hearings on China, and I commend it highly.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

China Is, Is Not an Aggressive Power

(Note.—Three times in the past 25 years the United States has had to answer the question: "What is the nature of the enemy?" Our participation in World War II was the answer to the Axis powers. A form of peaceful coexistence seems to have emerged as the reply to the Soviet Union. Dominating the minds of Washington policy planners today—and the subject of hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—is the question as applied to Communist China. The New York Times Magazine asked two distinguished analysts to discuss U.S. policy vis-a-vis Peiping—Frank N. Trager, a professor of international affairs at N.Y.U.'s Graduate School of Public Administration and the author of "Marxism in Southeast Asia"; and Hans J. Morgenthau, Albert A. Michelson, distinguished service professor of political science and modern history at the University of Chicago, and senior research fellow at the council on foreign relations. The moderator was Max Frankel, diplomatic correspondent of the Times.)

Mr. Frankel. A basic assumption of U.S. diplomacy these days—one that underlies our foreign policy in general and our Vietnam policy in particular—regards Communist China as an aggressive power that has to be stopped. But though this assumption is widely held, it is also open to serious doubt.

Dissenters say that China is behaving like any other great power—the United States or the Soviet Union—and is merely attempting to play its natural role in its historic sphere of influence. In this view, China is considered an expansionist power with limited objectives rather than an aggressive nation with an unlimited territorial appetite.

On the other hand, those who believe China is an aggressor nation offer various definitions of Peiping's militant strategy. Some compare it to the grand designs of Germany and Japan in the thirties and forties; some see the development of new techniques of aggression, called wars of national liberation; others believe China's policies are an exaggerated response to a sense of insecurity, an aggressive form of defense. Despite these differences, this group of analysts would agree with the statement by Adlai Stevenson, made in one of his last letters: "I do not think the idea of Chinese expansionism is so fanciful that the effort to check it is irrational."

With this preamble, let me ask Mr. Trager to argue the affirmative basis of the assumption: China is an aggressive power.

HOW CHINA'S HISTORY EXPLAINS CHINA TODAY

Mr. Trager. I believe China today is an aggressor nation, not just because of the issues of power to which you have alluded, but also because of what I think we tend to overlook and underestimate—the great sequences of Chinese history.

At least since the first century B.C. and under every great Chinese empire, Han, Mongol, Ming, Manchu and so on—the Chinese have moved steadily south in what has been called "the march to the tropics." Along with this tradition there has also been a move westward toward the Urals; remember, for example, that Mongol power in the 13th and 14th centuries extended as far as Kazan in what is now the Soviet Union.

So though we shall be addressing ourselves to the role of China today, the historic role of this great power, with its arrogant belief in its mission as a civilizing country—only France compares with her on this issue—has to be understood as background.

Mr. Morgenthau. Well, let me say a word about history, which, of course, can be read in different ways.

May I ask Mr. Trager whether it isn't correct that the present limits of China were really fixed about 1,000 years ago, that in the last 1,000 years there has been no substantial expansion of Chinese territory?

Mr. Trager. No, that is not correct. From the 15th to the 18th centuries the Chinese moved down into what is today Canton and Yunan in the south and southwest. They made decided military efforts to go further below the Himalayas into southeast Asia. Then, more recently, they took over Mongolia and Tibet. The northeast frontier of India, penetrated on several occasions, is the most recent example of Chinese aggression.

Mr. Morgenthau. This is another kind of problem. You see, when we talk about Chinese expansion, we have a Western concept of expansion in mind—a conquest by armies marching over frontiers.

Chinese expansionism has been much more subtle than that. They have penetrated outlying areas not for the purpose of conquering them, but for the purpose of establishing tributary relations and guaranteeing the existence of friendly states at the borders of the Chinese empire.

Mr. Trager. That was their form of conquest.

Mr. Morgenthau. Yes, but it is a very subtle and indirect form of conquest. You really can't call it conquest at all. The relations that exist today between China, on the one hand, and Burma and Cambodia, on the other, appear to me as a modern version of these traditional relationships of indirect domination.

Instead of asking the question as to whether or not China is an aggressor, I would rather ask: Is it an expansionist power whose objectives impinge upon the interests of the United States? I think this is the revelant question with which we must deal as Americans.

Mr. Frankel. Mr. Trager, do you agree with this slight redefinition?

Mr. Trager. I certainly would accept it. I think that between the use of the words aggressor and expansionist, there is little to choose.

MAO'S MISSION IN THE WORLD

Mr. Morgenthau. Now that we've settled that question, we can turn to other ones and maybe tougher ones. What is it that pits us against China? Is China an imperialistic nation with unlimited objectives? Is it an imperialistic nation with limited objectives? Or are we simply confronted with the unsettled issues of World War II which, if settled, would normalize our relations with China?

Mr. Frankel. How would you answer your own questions?

Mr. Morgenthau. First of all, I'd say China is a traditional imperialistic power, a great power with great inner strength and a natural expansionist tendency. Second, it is a seat of a secular religion—communism—which believes it is the wave of the future. Third, China is also a great civilization, a great culture which has an enormous attraction all over Asia.

Mr. Trager. I agree with you. This kind of expansionism—whether in Tibet, their claims to northern Burma, Thailand, Vietnam as far south as Hué—reflects their sense of their mission in the world. In the 20th century their interest continues in the tropics, which provide Lebensraum and rice.

Mr. Frankel. Is this sense of mission a literal one—that we shall inherit the earth—or does it have limits?

Mr. Morgenthau. I think you have here a very interesting parallel to the American expansion into the North American continent in the 19th century. That is to say, we regarded the North American continent as a kind of heritage assigned by Providence. We are now at the limits of our expansion—the two oceans. Canada and Mexico were somehow excluded even though there were lots of people in the 19th century who tried to include them.

The Chinese, too, have stopped at the geographic limits of their empire, as it were: the steppes in the north, the Himalayas in the west, the jungles in the south, and the Pacific Ocean in the east.

Mr. Trager. I do not accept this notion of the fixity of Chinese Empire. I've tried to indicate that the notions relevant before the 10th century were continued into the 20th century. It's their attempt to get south of the Himalayas that I regard as being part of this Chinese drang nach southeast Asia.

Mr. Morganthau. Of course, I disagree with this interpretation. These historical analogies are easy to make but they are extremely dangerous.

What is much more important is the continuity of the objectives of Chinese foreign policy throughout history, and those objectives cannot be attributed to the Communist character of the Chinese regime.

Mr. Trager. One important fact we must include in our estimate of contemporary Chinese policy is what happened in the 19th century, the century of shame which I think most Chinese feel should be wiped out at some point. Two British opium wars were fought to foist upon China the sale and use of opium. The French, in 1883–95 forced the Chinese to sign treaties giving up suzerainty over north and central Vietnam and Laos. And that wasn't all. In many respects the origins of the Chinese Communist movement in 1920–21 were built on the basis of that shame.

Mr. Morganthau. I agree in substance with what Professor Trager has said. I think today we are really confronted with a Chinese Empire which uses Marxist-Leninist slogans to justify and legitimize what is essentially a restoration of the power of the central Government of China.

Mr. Frankel. Well, what is the Communist part of Communist China today? Is it the application of whatever communism may mean in the Chinese vocabulary to their domestic development for the sake of more or less traditional Chinese external objectives? Or is there also some ideological sense of a special Communist mission in the world?

Mr. Morgenthau. There is no doubt that the latter is true. No Chinese emperor would have sought to foment revolution in Tanzania, let me say, or Venezuela. Here you have a new and baffling element in Chinese policy. It is not the idea of a Chinese empire performing the mandate of heaven to develop Chinese civilization as the only great civilization in the world, but a mandate of heaven given by Marx and Lenin to transform the whole world into the image of communism.

Mr. Trager. Here we are in complete agreement. I think Mao's communism today is about as orthodox a Leninism as one can find anywhere in the world, including the orthodoxy of Lenin himself.

PEIPING'S WORDS VERSUS PEIPING'S ACTIONS

Mr. Frankel. Gentlemen, let us now have some mercy on our poor policymakers in Washington whose time for history unfortunately is brief.

In trying to answer the question of what we must do about China in policy terms, I'd like to ask you now about Chinese rhetoric and what it means, and then about recent Chinese patterns of behavior and what they mean.

Specifically, I have in mind the most famous piece of Chinese rhetoric currently on tops of desks in Washington, the pronouncement by Defense Minister Lin Piao that the rural areas of the world will surround and conquer the cities of the world. That is, the underdeveloped nations, in joint rebellion, will eventually triumph over the developed nations. Is this rhetoric or a new design for worldwide aggression?

Mr. Morgenthau. I think this is mere rhetoric. Instead of putting it at the top of the mountains of paper on the desks of Washington policymakers, it ought to be put in the wastebasket. The idea that you can apply the principles which have led to the communization of China—conquering the rural areas, surrounding the cities, strangling the cities until they fall into your lap—to apply this concept to the rest of the world is, I think, sheer nonsense.

It is not a program for action, as was "Mein Kampf." It reminds me of the metaphysical excesses of the more eccentric German geopoliticians. And I must say I find it disturbing that this kind of madness makes such a deep impression upon our policymakers.

Mr. FRANKEL. Are you saying it will not work and therefore it is mad, or that the Chinese do not really mean it?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. They do not mean it because they are not mad in their actions. I come back to your original question, the discrepancy between Chinese rhetoric and Chinese actions. Chinese rhetoric has always been extreme, unrealistic, and in good measure absurd—the result of China's traditional ethnocentrism and lack of understanding of the outside world. But in action, the Chinese have been extremely cautious and have moved, as I have pointed out, in the nationalistic tradition of Chinese objectives.

They stopped the bombardment of Quemoy and Matsu when they realized the Russians would not support them and that the U.S. 7th Fleet was an insuperable obstacle. They rectified the border with India by pushing the frontier farther south, but they did not overrun India, which they could have done easily. Look at what they have not done in Vietnam. Imagine for a moment the United States being in a position of China with China having sent an army to Mexico and bombarding Mexican cities close to the American frontier. Imagine Mexico having the same kind of Government as the United States and an alliance treaty with the United States, and the United States doing virtually nothing.

The Chinese have been extremely cautious, not because they are good, but because they are weak. And I think it would be sheer madness on our part if we were to take their rhetoric as an indication of policy.

Mr. TRAGER. Here's where we have our sharpest disagreement.

Mr. Frankel said that Lin Piao's pronouncement is on the desks in Washington and it is being read today. Perhaps that is the case only because the men behind the desks in Washington haven't done their homework. Everything in Lin Piao's statement of September 2, 1965, had already been said in one or another of Mao's basic documents since 1936. Putting them together in a 24,000-word declaration is rhetorical in the sense tha Lin Piao used words, but it is a piece of rhetoric that summarizes some 30 years of Mao's thinking, since the time he developed his views in "Strategic Problems of Chinese Revolutionary War" in 1935–36, and "On Protracted Warfare" in 1938.

And though I'm not necessarily going to equate Lin Piao's statement with Hitler's "Mein Kempf," I think there are not unreasonable analogies one could make between them.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. The Chinese have penetrated outlying areas not for the purpose of conquest but to establish tributary relations and guarantee the existence of friendly border states.

Mr. TRAGER. That was their form of conquest.

Mr. FRANKEL. Are you saying that the Chinese purpose is very simply to overthrow non-Communist governments and to annex, conquer, or subjugate neighboring countries as fast as they can possibly do it?

Mr. TRAGER. Yes. I'm saying that.

Mr. FRANKEL. And where they are Communist, as in the case of North Korea and North Vietnam, to make them satellites?

Mr. TRAGER. Satellites.

Mr. FRANKEL. In Stalin's sense by imposing their own people, or simply by making them dependent and loyal to Peiping?

Mr. TRAGER. I would say a combination of both.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. But where have they done this? They haven't done it in Burma. They haven't done it in Cambodia. And Laos is really a case apart.

WOULD PEIPING SETTLE FOR NEUTRALIST NEIGHBORS?

Mr. FRANKEL. Let me bring you to a direct clash on this point. Is Mao after what Stalin was after in Eastern Europe—a Moscow-run Poland, say, or a Moscow-run Hungary? Or are the Chinese after a Finland, which merely sanitizes a neighboring country, so to speak? If it is not a threat they don't really care what goes on.

Mr. TRAGER. They have said very clearly they want the Moscow-run Poland, the Moscow-run Hungary. They will accept the second choice, the sanitized country, as an interim step, and they couch the acceptance in typical Leninist two-stage terms: the petit-bourgeois nationalist revolution, they say, necessarily will be followed by the Socialist revolution. It's only a matter of time.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. Of course, the actual policies pursued by China point toward a cordon sanitaire, the creation of independent neutralist countries leaning toward China. We can, of course, speculate about the future, but if one looks at Chinese history I think one would recognize the establishment of this cordon sanitaire as a modern application of traditional Chinese tributary relationships with adjacent countries.

So I would again warn against oversimplification in our interpretation of Chinese foreign policy. It is infinitely more subtle, infinitely more complex than the kind of foreign policy with which we are acquainted through our Western experience. I watched Chou En-lai in action at the Geneva Conference in 1954, and I must say I was fascinated by the enormous subtlety and profundity of the man.

Mr. TRAGER. One of the most able diplomats in the world.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. He was in a class by himself in comparison to, say, Molotov and Eden—not to speak of Walter Bedell Smith—who just were second or third rate.

So, I don't think the Chinese need to conquer all the outlying countries in their vicinity. They can be satisfied with neutralist governments which are not hostile, which do not allow themselves to become the military outposts of a hostile Western power.

Mr. TRAGER. One could make a case for the cordon sanitaire, the example of Finland, if that's where Chinese policy stopped. But that is not where Chinese policy stops. Witness the fact that the Chinese export revolution, which is their phrase, though on an advertised do-it-yourself basis with their support and blessing. Witness the fact that they have made a real effort in Africa, such an effort that they overbid their hand and recently were asked to leave Burundi, Dahomey, and the Central African Republic because they had been interfering in domestic politics. In addition, their relations with at least another half-dozen African nations are severely strained: Algeria, Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Niger, and Upper Volta. It is also the case that they made their bid in Latin America, though much less successfully than in Africa.

In other words, by no stretch of definition can a cordon sanitaire reach over to Africa and Latin America. My analysis of the pattern of Chinese revolutionary activity, it seems to me, is supported by facts.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. Obviously, I do not deny the involvement of China in subversion and the promotion of civil war all over the world. This is a fact. But the real problem is: What does it mean in terms of Chinese foreign policy?

I think one has to look at it in terms of competition with the Soviet Union for mastery over the world Communist movement. These activities are tactical maneuvers to weaken the Soviet Union and the United States. China is not interested in the transformation of Tanzania or Dahomey or Colombia into Chinese territories or Chinese satellites. So we must sharply distinguish between those two facets of Chinese foreign policy.

At the same time we must devise a foreign policy which anticipates the worst—that is, the emergence of China in 10 or 20 years time as the most powerful nation on earth.

CONTAINING CHINA COMPARED WITH CONTAINING RUSSIA

Mr. FRANKEL. You raised the question of what the United States should do. Why is it that the United States is more acutely aware and more dramatically eager to act upon this sense of China's aggression against her neighbors than some of those neighbors themselves? Do they disagree with us or are they asleep?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. Neither. They take a look at the map. Only a nation which is completely oblivious to the geopolitical aspects of its position will challenge militarily this enormous power potential. So these nations behave like Latin American nations do vis-a-vis the United States: They adapt themselves rather reluctantly to the realities of the situation.

Mr. FRANKEL. Are you then in essence agreeing with Adlai Stevenson's rather agonized last testament? That is, on the basis of this fundamental estimate of Chinese power and ultimate capacity, it is the job of the United States, even without the help of China's neighbors, to "contain" Communist China?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. You are raising a problem that lies at the very core of our Asian policy.

We are—quite naturally and quite unfortunately—obsessed with the parallel of our containment of the Soviet Union. In a sense, the success of our military containment of the Soviet Union has become the bane of our Asian policy. We told the Soviet Union in substance: "If you take one step beyond the 1945 line of military demarcation you will be automatically at war with the United States. And the presence of our divisions in West Germany is the guarantee of such an outcome."

The situation with regard to China is utterly different. The threat which China presents to Asia and the rest of the world is not the threat of Chinese armies conquering everything in sight. It is rather that here is a potentially great power, a great civilization, beheld with a mixture of awe and admiration by all of the nations of Asia.

You are not going to contain this power—if this is what you want to do—by creating so-called military strongholds around the periphery of the Chinese empire. If you want to contain China, if you believe the United States and China cannot live together in this world, you have to strike at the core of Chinese power. You must be willing to go to war with China.

My main objection to our Asian policy is that it's neither here nor there. It tries to contain Chinese power with half-hearted military means which are not going to succeed. Either we bring our means into line with our objectives or we have to cut down our objectives to the measure of the means we are willing to employ.

Mr. FRANKEL. Could I just pin you down? Are you saying that China cannot be contained, in the sense that the Soviet Union was contained, without destroying her base of power?

Mr. Morgenthau. Absolutely correct.

Mr. Frankel. But are you also advocating that China need not be contained?

Mr. Morgenthau. I would keep my fingers crossed. But if I should conclude that the most pessimistic estimate—the Trager estimate—of Chinese foreign policy is correct, I would then use the same means against China which successfully contained the Soviet Union: the nuclear power of the United States. I could imagine an American foreign policy which would make it perfectly clear to China that if it takes a military step beyond the boundaries of its empire it would be at war with the United States.

Mr. Frankel. But you said earlier it was not a case of her wanting to take military steps. Let us presuppose India going Communist. Would you then threaten a direct attack on China?

Mr. Morgenthau. No, I would not. Because India going Communist would not be the result of Chinese aggression but of the internal disintegration of India.

Mr. Trager. The real issue is: Do we have to use the bomb in order to contain China? Or can we carry out containment, as Stevenson suggests, as it was carried out in Europe? I say it is possible to contain China from further expansion south of the Himalayas in Asia. I say it is possible to do this without using the bomb. But it would require the resolution of the discrepancy between our words and our deeds. For until February 1965, when we finally made a decision to go after North Vietnam, we were properly characterized as a paper tiger. We put no sinews in our spate of policies. Our aid programs—and I was aid director in Burma—were minimal; we made no real effort to shore up these countries. We made no real effort to make the words of SEATO meaningful. When SEATO threatened North Vietnam and China in September 1959, over Laos, the threat was followed up by a movement of the 7th Fleet, period. That's all we did.

If the policy is to contain—and I think it's a right policy—then it has to be backed by power in the Pacific and in the Indian Ocean. It does not mean war. It means that we have to have power there. And the power could be in Australia or in similar bases which would not necessarily offend Asian nations and Asian people. We should have power there in the same way as we have power in Europe. With that degree of containment it would be possible to see how the dust settles for the future. If then, when Mao goes to his fathers and Chou En-lai goes there too, a second or third generation of leaders want to settle down into a more peaceful world, we can perhaps reduce our guard. But we have no guard there now. We have 200,000-plus troops in South Vietnam and the 7th Fleet engaged in a limited war which should be speedily concluded in an irresistible defense of South Vietnam.

Mr. Morgenthau. Professor Trager has said we didn't put enough power into Asia in the fifties. But the nations which would have been the object of our protective power didn't want us to use that power. Burma told us to get out and didn't want any aid. Indonesia told us to get out and didn't want any aid. Cambodia did the same thing. Those nations pursue an entirely different policy from ours. In Europe after World War II, Great Britain, France, and Italy wanted our protection against the Soviet Union. The countries just mentioned don't want it. In other words you are here obsessed with a Maginot Line mentality which worked well in Europe but cannot work in Asia, because in Asia we are dealing with an infinitely more complex expansionism. This is, I think, the heart of the matter.

Mr. Frankel. How do you draw the line, Professor Trager, and how do you enlist the help of those who are on it?

Mr. Trager. I draw the line at the Himalayas in the same way it was drawn in Western Germany. The line to draw is easy. The second part of your question is difficult: How do you get a reconsideration on the part of the affected Asian powers? It is complex but I think there are certain steps to be taken. For example, Pakistan's Ayub Khan has twice offered India a defense pact on the basis of a settlement of the Kashmir question. The United States had tremendous leverage in 1962, 1963, and 1964 when India needed our assistance, and we gave it without a quid pro quo. The quid pro quo in my view should have been a settlement of the Kashmir issue.

Mr. Morgenthau. This would force India into the waiting arms of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Trager. I don't think "force" is the right word. I'm for India getting substantial U.S. aid, but at a price—a price of settling the one flagrant issue that is the root cause of tension in the Indian subcontinent.

Mr. Morgenthau. If you do that you would not only drive India into the waiting arms of the Soviet Union, you would probably promote the disintegration of India as a unified nation.

Mr. Trager. I don't think so.

Mr. Frankel. You've mentioned the Soviet Union, which some people also consider a victim of eventual Chinese expansion. Is the Soviet Union our effective ally in any effort to contain China?

Mr. Morgenthau. The Soviet Union is, of course, faced with a real dilemma. On one hand, it is mortally afraid of China; on the other hand, it competes with China for control of the world Communist movement. So it must try to contain China—and here our interests and the interests of the Soviet Union run parallel—while it must also take a stance in international affairs at least as militant and uncompromising as China in order to be able to compete with China.

Mr. Frankel. Is Russia's fear so great that containment really ought to be Moscow's primary problem, not ours?

Mr. Trager. The answer leads us into the future, and obviously I have a 50-percent chance of being right or wrong. Anyway, I see an eventual healing between Moscow and Peiping, so long as both remain Communist. I think the present period is a difficult one for each of them, but my crystal ball sees the reassociation of Moscow and Peiping, making a combined threat to the free world.

Mr. Morgenthau. While this is possible, one should not underestimate the reemergence of national tendencies which everywhere in the Communist world take precedence over the community of Communist ideology. Just as there are all kinds of capitalists with all kinds of national aspirations, I think more and more there will be all kinds of Communists with all kinds of national aspirations.

This doesn't exclude that under particular circumstances the Soviet Union and China will march hand in hand, but I think it will not be on the basis of communism per se, but on the basis of the coincidence of national interests.

While we're on the subject of national interests, let me add something else. I would find no discrepancy between the national interests of the United States and the existence of a number of independent states in Asia leaning toward China. If other nations would be in the same position as Cambodia and Burma, my equanimity would not be disturbed.

Mr. Trager. Leaning toward China is one thing; being a satellite of China like North Korea would be another. Would you accept that, too?

Mr. Morgenthau. I would not accept that, but North Korea is not really a satellite of China. It straddles the fence between the Soviet Union and China as does the North Vietnamese Government.

Mr. Trager. Would you be willing to face the possibility of southeast Asian states becoming Chinese-dominated or becoming communized states under Chinese influence?

Mr. Morgenthau. One has to choose one's words very carefully. Chinese influence I would accept. The expansion of Chinese military power into regions where it does not prevail today I would not accept.

Mr. Trager. How would you prevent it?

Mr. Morgenthau. I would prevent it in the same way in which we have prevented the expansion of Soviet military power. That is to say, by our nuclear capability.

Mr. Trager. You cannot say nuclear capability, period. You have to spell it out. It means the symbols of nuclear capability, plus the fact we would be in a position to use it, plus the fact that we are prepared to make a treaty and honor it, like the SEATO treaty. So far we have relied on a military strategy that hasn't been implemented by a political strategy. And we need both.

THE RISK OF WAR

Mr. Frankel. What about China's strategy? What are the forces working for moderation inside China today and how significant are they in determining Chinese foreign policy.

Mr. Morgenthau. The forces of moderation will arise only out of the experience of failure in foreign policy. In other words, the Chinese traditionally have had an unrealistic picture of the outside world and they will continue in that tradition. They are not going to be dissuaded by arguments or ideological debate with the Russians or anyone else, but only by the lesson of failure. After all, Mao Tse-tung and the other Chinese leaders are not only Marxists but also Confucian pragmatists. One must rely on the latter quality for initiating a process of moderation.

Mr. Frankel. Is this likely within the next generation?

Mr. Morgenthau. Mao has shown in the past that he quickly reverses his course if he is up against an insurmountable obstacle. This is not a matter of generations but of failure.

Mr. Trager. There appears to be no kind of firm evidence that there are forces of moderation at present within China. However, there have been some indications in Chinese publications that the older generation who made the revolution is not wholly satisfied with the revolutionary fervor of the generation below the fifties. There appears to be some tension between them and the younger, educated Chinese.

What this means at this point is difficult to say. One interpretation is that the younger generation may be merely clamoring for positions which it has been thus far denied. Another interpretation suggests the younger people are more deeply dissatisfied. It is too soon to tell, but it is clear that there is no moderation of the revolutionary fervor of Mao's thought, which is now enshrined as if it were a revelation.

Mr. Frankel. What, then, are the chances of war between the United States and China?

Mr. Morgenthau. The chances of war arise when we approach the national interests of China in a hostile manner. That is to say, if and when the Chinese are confronted by a situation similar to that which developed when we approached the Yalu during the Korean war. Then they go to war regardless of risk. I see such a contingency if we should push North Vietnam to the brink of utter defeat. Neither China nor the Soviet Union can afford to allow a "fraternal Socialist country" to be defeated by an "imperialist power."

Mr. Trager. The risk of war is always real. The question is the probability of war—general nuclear war, for any war with China would be a nuclear war. Despite Mao's brave words with respect to his fearlessness about war, it would appear to be that the probability of such a war at this time is not high.

The Chinese Communists would be risking too much. Their armed forces, 2½ million men, would be relatively meaningless in a nuclear war.

One way to decrease the probability of war has been taken by President Johnson in his firm and repeated iteration of the limited objectives which the South Vietnamese and the United States are seeking. That is, to defend the integrity of the Republic of Vietnam with no design on the destruction of North Vietnam.

Mr. Frankel. Now that the discussion has raised at least one aspect of the Vietnam problem, let me ask you this: Is the situation we are facing in South Vietnam an expression of Chinese expansionism? Or is it one of those purely local, accidental events that happens to fit into Chinese purposes and that they are exploiting at the moment?

THE MEANING OF VIETNAM TO CHINA AND TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Morgenthau. I would emphatically subscribe to the local theory. This is a civil war which started in the South because of conditions there. It was then supported to an ever-increasing extent by the North Vietnamese Government. Our involvement plays exactly into the hands of China, but China has not been the instigator of the South Vietnamese civil war, nor has it been the instigator of the support which Hanoi has extended to the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

Mr. Trager. The Chinese interest here is to keep the war going, because they're not fighting it. It's part of their notion of protracted warfare. If warfare continues and saps the strength of the West without reaching a definitive end, then that is in Chinese interests. Our interest ought to be to end the war as quickly as possible in terms of our stated limited objectives, so it will not continue to sap us and the South.

Mr. Frankel. There is a final question here which seems to grow out of this discussion. Let me put it to you this way. As long as China, in one way or another, is aggressive; as long as the Soviet Union, for its own reasons, is not playing this positive game of containment the way we would like it; as long as India is unwilling—because of Kashmir, confusion, incapable leadership or whatever reason—to mount an energetic campaign of containment with our help; as long as Japan is relatively passive in this situation; as long as Pakistan, Cambodia, Burma, and others for their own reasons, scramble for safety—then why is the containment of China an American mission? Why should not the United States retreat to the nearest natural boundaries, holding on to Taiwan and its other effective bases, and position its offshore power there? Why don't we count upon time, decades perhaps, to let different communisms and different nationalisms and different fragmentations take their course? To sum up, why is our national interest so intimately engaged up to the Himalayas?

Mr. Morgenthau. If you put it in this positive way, I fully agree with you. You take the words out of my mouth.

Mr. Trager. Obviously, I don't agree with the implications of your remarks. And this brings us to a question of philosophy. I reduce the philosophical objectives of the United States in the world to two major propositions. One is to prevent the further erosion of freedom anywhere, which means denying any territory and any people to the Communist enemy; the other is to use our great resources to help freedom everywhere. That is, using our great resources to help newly independent countries as well as others to establish the kinds of polities that they want—not in our image, but in their image—so long as they are not taken over by the Communist enemy. Those two objectives spell out my philosophy of U.S. objectives and I assume that each of us has a comparable philosophic outlook.

We have no interests in Asia, in the narrow sense of the word. We don't need their rice. We are the third largest exporter of rice in the world. We don't need their rubber, nor their tin, nor any of the other resources they have. We have no economic interests and certainly have no territorial interests in the area. I, therefore, define our aims in terms of my belief that the United States stands for freedom in the world. Freedom means to deny the erosion of freedom to the enemy, and positively, to help those states that still retain their freedom to better themselves.

Mr. Morgenthau. Of course, one must agree in abstract terms. But if you apply this philosophy to South Vietnam, one is forced to say that since 1954 when we became actively involved there, South Vietnam certainly has not known freedom. It has lived under a series of dictatorships and I don't know whether free elections tomorrow would show that the lack of freedom under the Vietcong is preferred by the majority of South Vietnamese to the lack of freedom they have enjoyed since 1954.

I think we are dealing here with a global concept which is incapable of translation into political reality. It is a very dangerous, crusading concept which obscures the actual power relations which exist in the world and which a nation can disregard only at its mortal risk.

Mr. Trager. I would argue there is some evidence in South Vietnam to indicate a preference—not more than that—for the Government. The plebiscite of 1955 and elections of 1956, though certainly not fair, were such evidence. The 1959 elections were a third sign. Fourth, the 900,000 Vietnamese who marched down from the north to the south after 1954. Fifth, the 700,000 Montagnards and others, many of whom—perhaps as many as 100,000—are now refugees from the Vietcong.

I could go on by saying that in my own personal experience, and I've been in Vietnam half a dozen times in the last 10 years, the villagers who have some degree of protection remain loyal to Saigon—or at least remain within the orbit of Saigon—even though villagers in Asia generally look upon a central government as one of the "five evils."

And I add that if we are successful in Vietnam, fence sitting will diminish among the other Asian nations. Some of the latent support that we have had and have frequently dissipated will be won back.

Mr. Morgenthau. Well, I don't think I want to go further into the Vietnam problem. But obviously, to speak of elections under Diem in South Vietnam is a very dubious argument. Nobody knows exactly the preferences of the Vietnamese peasants, except that they want to be left alone. But I don't want to go into this, because then this discussion will never end, and I have to go.

Mr. Frankel. Right. We're at the end of our rope anyway.

[From the New York Times Magazine, Mar. 13, 1966]

Stevenson on China

(Note.—In one of his last letters, addressed to the writer and social critic Paul Goodman, the late Adlai Stevenson argued that Red China must be stopped in Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia. An excerpt from the letter follows:)

Is the line we stand on halfway across Vietnam a reasonable line? Should we hold it?

The answer depends on the assumptions made about Chinese power. In the past, some Chinese dynasties have been aggressive, claiming sovereignty over wide areas of Asia, including all southeast Asia and even some of India. So far, the new Communist "dynasty" has been very aggressive. Tibet was swallowed, India attacked, the Malays had to fight 12 years to resist a "national liberation" they could receive from the British by a more peaceful route. Today, the apparatus of infiltration and aggression is already at work in North Thailand. Chinese maps show to the world's chagrin the furthest limits of the old empire marked as Chinese. I do not think the idea of Chinese expansionism is so fanciful that the effort to check it is irrational.

And if one argues that it should not be checked, I believe you set us off on the old, old route whereby expansive powers push at more and more doors, believing they will open until, at the ultimate door, resistance is unavoidable and major war breaks out.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last week the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, Mr. David Bell, appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee in behalf of the President's food-for-freedom program.

I hope that my colleagues will read the printed record on their appearances as soon as it is available, for their discussions of committee questions were in the highly articulate and well-reasoned style that we have come to expect from these two distinguished public servants.

In the meantime, I know that Members of Congress as well as private citizens would like to have the prepared statements of Secretary Rusk and Mr. Bell available to them so I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record:

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, Before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, March 7, 1966

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you this morning the problem of food and population—a problem which has been receiving high priority from all of us in the executive branch who are concerned with matters of international well-being. It is a subject which doesn't make the headlines that Vietnam does day after day. Nevertheless, it is of very great importance. Our handling of it will have a significant impact upon our own and future generations.

The root of the problem is clear enough: In many parts of the world, food production is beginning to lag behind population growth. As Secretary Freeman has said, "The less-developed world is losing the capacity to feed itself."

The problem of growing enough food to meet the need is not new. What is new is the dimension the problem has assumed as we look at the next decade. With the continuing and sudden sharp rise of population throughout much of the world, this food crisis demands urgent attention. Fortunately, there is a growing world recognition of this problem, which may in itself be the first step toward its elimination. It has prompted activity within the highest councils of this Government—reflected by the President's recent message to the Congress on food for freedom, as well as related legislation which has been referred to this committee. Before World War II, the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America were exporting sizable quantities of grain to the more economically advanced nations. In the 1930's, for example, Latin America exported more grain than any other region of the world. Today, for the most part, the laden grain ships are sailing in the opposite direction—and nearly three times as many are required to do the job. As an illustration, more than 30 million tons of grain probably will be shipped this year from the industrialized to the nonindustrialized countries. This amount is more than double the magnitude of annual shipments of the 1950's, and an increase of more than 50 percent just in the past 5 years. And even with these enormous imports—much of them in the form of food aid—and with some developing countries already straining their port capacity, there are many countries in which the food intake per individual was less this year than last year, less last year than the year before. Unless this disturbing trend can be reversed, it will soon have profoundly deteriorating effects. There is a very real relationship between hunger and political instability. There is also a very real relationship between the ability to meet elementary human needs and economic and social development. In coming years, the problem we discuss today, unless curbed, could become a serious obstacle to import foreign policy goals of the United States.

What can be done? Throughout history, the hungry man often solved his problem—when it was solved—in one of two ways. He either cultivated new lands or migrated to a region of the world with greater opportunities. The latter alternative no longer exists today as it did in the past. Although less than a tenth of the earth's land surface currently produces crops, the new supply of potentially productive land is severely limited. The only other alternative was starvation, an alternative which is unacceptable in today's world.

In what other direction can we turn? First, we cannot realistically face the food crisis without simultaneously looking at the population problem. In country after country, impressive increases in food production have been offset by population growth. However, a number of countries have come to recognize that the food problem cannot be solved without addressing themselves to both sides of the food/population equation. The race between food and population is a critical one.

Nevertheless, even with the most optimistic of achievements in family planning, we realistically face the fact that such measures cannot prevent the serious threat of hunger in the next decade.

With limited land availability, our best hope is to obtain more food from lands already under cultivation, and from the sea. We have known for a number of years that better seeds, fertilizers, flood control, irrigation, pesticides and other miracles of technology can multiply food production many times. However, the benefits of such techniques have largely been confined to the already-rich nations. In the United States and Canada, for example, yield per acre in the last quarter century has been increased over 100 percent—compared with only 8 percent in the less developed world. Secretary Freeman often describes his grandfather's farm which operated in the days when the American farmer could feed himself and three others. In contrast, the American farmer today feeds himself and 32 others. The prime reason is modern technology which enables the American farmer to grow six times as much corn on an acre of land as does a farmer in India.

How do you best encourage such an increase? How do you best transfer a technology which we know exists and can work? How do you encourage the needy countries to face up to this problem and solve it with their own resources? How can we make the most effective and, at the same time, the most economical contribution to such an effort?

These are the questions to which the administration has addressed itelf. No one has been more aware of the gravity of the situation than the President, and his deep, personal concern is reflected in the legislation which is now before your committee.

Last year, President Johnson requested a thorough analysis of the situation, and the bill we are discussing today is the culmination of more than a year's intensive study by the executive branch. It adds a new dimension to an effort which has been evolving over the past two decades.

The bill gives recognition to the importance of food as an integral factor in a country's life and growth.

The bill recognizes the gravity of the food problem, certainly the most critical many countries will be facing over the next decade.

The bill correctly suggests that the only solution to the food problem will be through the increased agricultural production of the developing countries themselves, and that we should make efforts to assist that process.

The bill proposes that our own agricultural effort be directed not only to domestic needs, but also to our participation in overseas requirements through both commercial and assistance channels.

Mr. Chairman, there are four aspects of this legislation to which I would like to direct your special attention.

First, is the emphasis placed on self-help. There is little question that the final resolution of the world food problem must come from the developing nations themselves. Yet, in many ways, agriculture has been the weakest rung in the ladder to development. In many countries it has been short-changed, time and again, in favor of more glamorous industrial projects. Today, a new philosophy is emerging. Now there is a growing recognition that a strong agricultural base is a prerequisite to development. The concept of self-help is inherent in this legislation, and any food assistance on our part will be directly related to the extent of these efforts. We will carefully assess the self-help efforts by the recipient countries to assure that they are doing everything possible to increase their own productive capacity.

The second point I would like to call to your attention is the transition from sales for local currencies to sales on dollar credit terms. Some criticism has been leveled over the years—perhaps some of it justified—that certain recipients of our food aid had assumed that our food assistance would continue indefinitely, and thus encouraging them to neglect their own agriculture for other priorities. Some may have felt they were doing us a favor by taking our so-called surplus problem off our hands. With this new provision, and the fact of our disappearing surpluses, food will be provided on the same terms as development loans—and will highlight the fact that food aid has the same value as aid in other forms.

Third, I would like to point out the emphasis of this legislation on combating malnutrition. This is a new dimension to the food problem, which was barely recognized in the early days of Public Law 480. Scientific findings of the past few years emphasize the fact that the kind of food we eat is often more important than how much we eat. We now realize that protein malnutrition, especially among young children, can result in both physical and mental retardation. Indeed, as the President has said on a number of occasions, the problem of malnutrition could well become one of the basic obstacles to the entire development process. At a conference of the National Academy of Sciences, it was pointed out that our approach to this aspect of the food problem could have a direct effect "on what our civilization looks like, acts like, and thinks like in 1984."

Fourth, and perhaps the most dramatic element in this new program, is the concept of "growing to meet the need." This is a positive and logical extension of previous food aid efforts. It provides a link between domestic farm programs and oversea commercial and assistance requirements which cannot help but make a more effective use of our magnificent agricultural capacity.

I do not pretend to possess expertise in a field which you gentlemen have studied for many years. However, in addition to the foreign policy implications which I know are very serious, the domestic economic benefits of the Food-for-Freedom Act are readily apparent to me. Time and again, we see evidence that the developing nations are important potential customers. As their economies grow, their dollar purchases increase. What we're really suggesting, aside from the obvious humanitarian and foreign policy features of the legislation presented here, is that we are helping to build bigger dollar markets more quickly. Food is a stimulus which can help and has helped, to expedite the arduous development process.

I would like to stress, Mr. Chairman, that our food aid program has been a valuable foreign policy tool because it is directed toward positive changes—strengthening democratic governments, promoting political stability, encouraging economic stability, assisting national development. Our food has been and will continue to be used in the cause of peace. On certain occasions our donation programs, especially child-feeding programs, have continued in countries when all other forms of formal relationships were ruptured.

Our pattern of operation necessarily is different in different countries. The quid pro quo, for example, often is different as relationships with countries differ. But what I want to emphasize is that our food programs are important components of our overall bilateral relationships. In each case, as we negotiate agreements, we consider the U.S. national interest, just as the other country considers its national interest.

The legislation before you is based on two American traits—a compassion for fellow human beings in need, and a technical skill and productivity in agriculture which must surely be considered as one of the great success stories of modern history. These two threads of American greatness were woven together by this committee during the 83d Congress more than 10 years ago, with the enactment of Public Law 480. As you well know, the evolution of the bipartisan food-for-peace program over the years has made it one of the most successful and imaginative of our oversea assistance programs.

The achievements of food for peace have been many, and we have learned much during the decade of Public Law 480. The new legislation takes advantage of this experience. It is adapted to the needs and conditions of today.

President Johnson has proposed that "* * * the United States lead the world in a war against hunger." I view the legislation being studied by your committee as supporting this goal.

As I said at the outset, we are dealing with a problem of immense proportions. From my desk at the State Department, where rarely a day passes in which I am not involved in some food-related issue, it looms as one of the major problems our Nation will be facing during the coming decades. A major attack on the problem today can prevent serious political, economic, and social turmoil in many countries within a very few years.

I recommend to you the attack on hunger as proposed in the Food-for-Freedom Act and its companion legislation as being in the best interests of the foreign policy of the United States.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, MARCH 8, 1966

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before this committee in support of the President's recommendations for using our agricultural resources more effectively to alleviate the world's hunger and to help establish strong and growing economies in the developing nations.

The resources that need to be mobilized include not only our food and fiber—but also our knowledge and experience about developing and maintaining an efficient and abundant agriculture.

Our goal is to help establish economies that are capable of either producing the food these nations need or of earning enough foreign exchange to purchase it commercially.

Only such a course can lessen the heavy requirements for concessional food aid, in the long run, and eventually build greater commercial markets.

There is no doubt about the seriousness of the world's food problem: the strongly rising trend of demand for food in the developing countries, resulting both from rising populations and from increasing incomes, and the inadequate rate of growth of food supplies in those countries.

Let me make it clear that we view this as a world problem, not just our problem. It is primarily a problem for the food-deficit nations themselves. They are the ones that must do the most to solve it.

We know we alone cannot feed the nearly two-thirds of the world's population now existing on less than adequate diets. But we know we can help developing nations do a better job of feeding their own people—and we are willing to share some of our abundance with those who show an awareness and willingness to help themselves.

Even the task of helping them to help themselves, and temporarily meeting the most urgent food requirements until they can improve their own production, is not a responsibility we accept alone. Rather, it is a responsibility of all developed nations—a responsibility we are willing to share, but one which we will insist others share as well.

The President's war on hunger recommendations to the Congress, including both the food-for-freedom proposal before this committee and the changing emphasis proposed in our foreign economic assistance program, are specifically aimed in this new direction.

Mr. Chairman, I know that Secretary Freeman has discussed with the Committee at more length the changing conditions that have resulted in these new recommendations to the Congress. You are familiar with the reasoning which led the President to reject the costly and impractical alternative of trying to meet the entire world's food gap over the coming years by more and more massive shipments of food aid.

Instead, as Secretary Freeman made clear, the President has proposed the more sensible course of helping other countries to develop their own food production, and through temporarily increased food aid shipments to fill the immediate gap until their production can be expanded.

In this task, the principal contribution of the Agency for International Development is to organize technical and capital assistance to help the developing countries raise their rates of increase in agricultural output, as part of the general task of economic development.

As you know, there has been considerable improvement in agricultural output in these countries over the past 15 years, so the problem is not that of overcoming the total inertia of a motionless machine, but of sharply accelerating growth processes already underway. To this end, we must mobilize the best talent available in the United States, in the Department of Agriculture, in the land-grant universities, and in the farming and business communities of our country.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has a sizable stake in AID's efforts to improve agricultural production in developing nations. To the extent we succeed, as we have in such cases as Taiwan and Israel, for example, we lessen the need for concessional food aid and increase the opportunity for commercial agricultural exports. For that reason I welcome this opportunity to explain how our programs, funded out of foreign assistance appropriations, are developed and carried out, as well as to comment on the important contribution food aid provided through the Department of Agriculture is making to our overall objectives.

AID, in planning and executing its programs to assist nations grow economically, has learned that it must look at development objectives on a countrywide/economywide basis. This country planning begins, of course, with the host country. The U.S. AID mission in the country is responsible for working with and advising host country officials on planning and carrying out development programs that make the best overall contribution to economic growth. It is clear that agricultural development is an important element—often the most important element—in this picture. Our AID mission is also responsible for planning and executing, following approval here in Washington, the U.S. assistance to complement host country development efforts.

I should like to stress the essential relationship between self-help measures by the aid-receiving countries, and our assistance. Only if we are convinced that countries are doing what they can for themselves are we prepared to give them full-scale assistance.

It is a complex task to analyze the various measures—some directly in the agriculture field, some outside—which are needed to achieve food output increases. They range from price, credit, and supply measures affecting farm output directly, to foreign exchange policies affecting, say, the importation of raw materials for fertilizer production, and policies encouraging (or discouraging) private ownership and initiative. The AID missions in each country, with help from experts from the Department of Agriculture, the universities, and other sources, must study all these matters, and lay out the combined pattern of self-help and outside assistance which will achieve the results that are necessary.

As we look ahead, we expect that our AID capital and technical assistance directly to enlarge agricultural output, in the next fiscal year, will rise by about 50 percent, to around $450 million. This will cover such items as the following:

Fertilizer plants and imports: AID financed about $65 million of U.S. fertilizer exports in fiscal year 1965 and that amount is expected to rise next year. We are also helping to build fertilizer plants abroad. We are encouraging these efforts directly through surveys, through the possibility of joint financing, and through investment guarantees. AID currently has before it applications for guarantees covering $250 million in planned American private investment in fertilizer production overseas. In 1965, AID guaranteed about $12 million in fertilizer plant investments in Korea, India, and Nicaragua, and lent $48.8 million to two new plants in Korea, in which the principal American private investors were Swift, Gulf, and Skelly.

Educational activities related to agriculture, including schools, extension services, research, and training: In India, for example, we have been working with the Universities of Illinois, Missouri, Tennessee, Ohio State, and Kansas State, to develop agricultural universities in seven Indian States. We shall increase our support in these projects for adaptive research in plant breeding, soil and water management, and in pest and disease control.

Technical advisory services to governments, farmers, and agricultural institutions: For example, in Uganda under a contract with the National Farmers Union, since 1962, over 8,000 cooperative leaders and managerial personnel have been trained. For another example, we have just signed a contract with the University of Minnesota to review with ourselves and the Government of Tunisia what steps are needed in order to establish a better base for planning agricultural policies and programs.

Wells, irrigation, and other activities related to water in support of agriculture, including specific attention to making the most effective utilization of water which is available: For example, we have helped Pakistan with the installation of tubewells (many of which are public and some 40,000 private), with engineering consultation to the West Pakistan Water and Power Authority, and in a 1.2-million-acre irrigated area assisting a demonstration program in modern farming techniques. We are helping irrigation projects in Korea, in Laos, in India, in Tunisia, in Morocco, in Afghanistan.

Transportation facilities: Greater improvement must be made in the capabilities of agricultural producers to transport commodities to markets on a timely and efficient basis. Road programs in southeast Asia, in Latin America, and in other areas will contribute to this effort.

Under these efforts, we are financing well over 1,000 agricultural technicians overseas, most on a contract/or participating agency basis: We also finance the training of almost 2,000 participants in the United States. We anticipate increases in these numbers.

In all these ways, we shall be encouraging and supporting the expansion of agricultural output in the developing countries as part of their general economic growth. This work will go forward, under the President's recommendations, in close cooperation with the food aid program.

As the President made clear, food aid is expected to be more closely tied together with our other economic assistance, and to be conditioned upon self-help cooperation by the recipient country. Thus, both may be better used to encourage increased agricultural production in recipient nations.

We strongly support the food-for-freedom program submitted to you by the President because we believe it will enable a far more effective job to be done in the future.

Elimination of the "surplus disposal" concept will end once and for all any idea that food aid is not a resource of real value, and will strengthen our bargaining position in obtaining self-help commitments. We also believe this change will assist us substantially in urging other developed countries to contribute to the solution to the food problem.

We are also convinced that the proposed transition from local currency sales to sales for dollar credits, putting the valuable resources of food and fiber on the same basis of loan terms as we follow in making nonagricultural commodities available to aid-receiving countries, will help compel developing nations to face up to the fact that eventually they must be able to produce for themselves or to buy their food requirements.

Although it is our intention to move to sales for dollars within the 5-year period, there will be instances in selected countries where U.S. interests may be better served by our continuing to accept some local currency in lieu of dollars. The proposed bill envisages three kinds of situations where this might arise. The first is where foreign currency receipts can be used to meet our Government's financial obligations abroad. The second situation occurs when foreign currencies can be used for the common defense, as in Korea and Vietnam where currency generations from existing Public Law 480 programs make an important contribution to joint security related interests. The third situation we envisage is when foreign currencies can be usefully employed to support, through loans, American private investment abroad. When foreign currencies are needed for any of these uses, we are requesting authorization to permit the U.S. Government, at the time sales agreements are negotiated, to provide for payment in foreign currency rather than dollars.

In other words, while our objective is to move to dollar credit sales, we want to reserve the option to receive payment in local currency where it is in the U.S. interest to do so. We do not want to accumulate local currencies for which we have no requirement.

In addition to consolidating the former title I and title IV provisions of Public Law 480 into a single new title I concessional sales program, the legislation before you also consolidates the former title II and title III provisions of Public Law 480 into a new single donation section covering famine relief, economic development "food for work" projects, school feeding programs, and people-to-people distribution programs of the American voluntary foreign aid agencies operating overseas.

At the present time, more than twice as much food is transferred abroad under concessional sales programs as is donated. We expect this ratio to be maintained in the years ahead. Nevertheless, title II of the new bill covers activities that have become increasingly effective in recent years.

Under title II, section 202, of the present law, the number of economic development and community development programs has continued to increase. As experience has been gained, an increasing number of governments and voluntary agencies are discovering that food, when intelligently applied with the input of other resources, is a powerful resource to promote development.

During the past year, 53 new economic and community development projects were undertaken in 41 countries, and 126 projects were continued, for a total of 179 projects in 65 countries providing food to 12 million people.

Typical activities being carried on under these projects include:

In northeast Brazil, over 50,000 workers will be working this year on food for work programs. To date over 2,600 miles of rural roads and 22 small irrigation dams have been built. In Korea, more than 250,000 workers are engaged in land reclamation and farm improvement, farmland rearrangement, reforestation, feeder road construction and flood control.

A most significant change in the donation program has been occurring in the title III programs, in the response by the registered voluntary agencies and our AID missions to the challenge to use food rather than merely to dispense it. This is in accord with the congressional mandate in the 1964 extension of Public Law 480 which provided that title III food should be "directed toward community and other self-help activities designed to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance." The worldwide response has exceeded our most optimistic expectations. In areas large and small, urban and rural, in every part of the less-developed world, many thousands of people have begun to use the energy the food provides, together with other resources, in activities designed to eliminate their need for food assistance.

Voluntary agencies, heretofore bound to distribute food without requiring—or even permitting—the contribution of work by the recipients, have begun to use food to do more than merely satisfy the immediate pangs of hunger. The very considerable personnel resources of these agencies and their counterparts—800 non-Government American employees abroad, 6,700 non-Government foreign employees, and hundreds of thousands of volunteers—have joined hands with thousands of Federal, State, village, and town officials and our AID mission personnel in a massive cooperative effort to implement this new direction.

The activities are as imaginative as they are widespread: A village in Upper Volta has its first cemented well. Refugees in West Bengal in India are building an elevated road to serve also as a dyke to protect newly built homes and newly planted fruit trees that will bring them self-sufficiency. In Paraguay, colonists are pioneering in rugged frontiers, establishing homesteads and clearing and cultivating new lands. In Chile, a village built for itself a first aid station to serve as its first medical center. Literacy classes have been established in remote areas of Brazil. In the rural areas of the Philippines, mothers are taught sanitation and homemaking skills while their husbands move tons of rock by hand to build dams and to divert streams which have flooded their villages for centuries.

The individual projects are small, but to hundreds of thousands of people in farflung areas, they represent progress, development, hope—and the knowledge that the hands of the people of America are extended to them in cooperation and friendship.

Under title II of the new bill, we will continue to respond to requests for emergency disaster relief. In the last year, $38 million worth of food was provided to meet the needs resulting from 31 disasters around the world.

Any discussion of the donation programs would be incomplete without mentioning the progress of school feeding activities around the world. Each day some 70 million children receive supplemental food either through school, institutional, or family feeding programs. Perhaps the most dramatic example has been in the "Operation Ninos" program in Latin America, where the number of children fed increased from about 4 million to about 16 million over a span of 3 years. Most significantly, the effort has led to greater budget allocations by Latin American countries for expanding the school feeding programs, and resulted in better school attendance as well as better school performance.

During the past year we have started to shift our emphasis from school feeding toward greater efforts to reach the preschool child in medical centers and maternity clinics, because of our growing concern over the serious effects of malnutrition on these youngsters before they reach school age. During the past year $1.9 million of AID funds were used to fortify nonfat dry milk with vitamins A and D for these feeding programs. We intend to step up other activities aimed at combating malnutrition in infants, including technical assistance and health education, as well as use of our investment guarantee authority to encourage the American food processing industry to undertake manufacture abroad of infant food meeting proper nutritional standards.

As you know, title II also authorizes making food available through international organizations. It is under this title that we have encouraged other food-producing nations to share to a greater extent in food aid through our participation in the world food program, sponsored jointly by the U.N. and FAO. For the past 3 calendar years, 1963–65, the program has operated on an experimental basis. In this period the world food program budget totaled $94 million. The United States contributed $40 million in commodities and $10 million in ocean freight and cash. The program has demonstrated that economic development, child feeding, and emergency programs utilizing food as the primary resource can be conducted successfully by a multilateral organization.

In December 1965, the U.N. General Assembly and the FAO Conference reviewed the world food program's accomplishments and agreed to extend the program with a goal for the upcoming 3 years, 1966–68, of $275 million in commodities and the cash necessary to move them and to administer the program. Again, the United States offered to match the amount of commodities made available by other countries. The world food program projects are the same type we would normally carry out under title II bilateral program. By participating in the world food program, however, we are able to encourage other donors to share in providing the needed food and also obtain a bigger "breadbasket" of more different commodities for such programs. Our cash contribution to the world food program comes out of regular AID appropriations, not Public Law 480. The same will be true under the new legislation.

Before concluding, I want to emphasize the crucial importance of the longer-term authorization proposed in the legislation before you.

As we move from surplus disposal to sharing our agricultural productive ability whenever it best serves our national interest, it is going to be necessary to do longer-term planning. We will need to look ahead as to requiremeints, so the Secretary of Agriculture can be properly guided in making production goal decisions. And we will need to have some assurance that the temporary food gaps can be supported while the developing nations carry through their longer-range programs of agricultural development.

With the new concepts and authority of the food-for-freedom bill, and with the new emphasis on developing agriculture under our foreign assistance program, I am convinced that we can provide a balanced input of food aid with technical and other types of assistance that can, over a period of years, reduce to manageable proportions the very serious food gap confronting the world today.

GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE MEMORIAL WINDOW

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate were good friends and warm admirers of Gen. Thomas D. White, former Air Force Chief of Staff who passed away last December. I was very glad to hear that friends and associates of General White have decided that a window in his honor, installed in the nave of the Washington Cathedral, would be a fitting memorial.

General White, the son of an Episcopal bishop, was raised in an Episcopal rectory. His great-grandfather was an Episcopal minister and was the man who married Abraham Lincoln and Mary Todd. The general was a regular worshipper at the National Cathedral.

The White Memorial Window will be installed in a part of the National Cathedral now under construction in one of a series depicting vocations. I believe this window will be a specially appropriate tribute to General White and his great military career in the service of the Nation.

WEST VIRGINIA NATIONAL GUARDSMEN IN PANAMA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a series of training exercises for elements of the West Virginia Air National Guard resulted in a personalized foreign aid program in Panama.

The February 6 issue of the Sunday Gazette-Mail State magazine, Charleston, W. Va., relates this story and comments on the results when American military men start a people-to-people aid program.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Aid at the Grassroots Level

(Editor's Note.—Yaws is a contagious systemic disease occurring in hot regions caused by a parasitic fly, and is marked by raspberry-like excrescences on the face, hands, feet, and around the external genitals. These excrescenses may run together in fungus-like mass, and may form pustules or become ulcerated.)

(By Harold C. Gadd)

The 130th Air Commando Group of the West Virginia National Guard is currently providing foreign aid at the grassroots level for neighboring countries south of the border—and at the same time is being trained in jungle operations.

The project is called "Operation: Highland Fling," and is the first time any air commando unit of the National Guard from anywhere in the United States has been deployed out of the country in full force. It was launched in January 1965, when the West Virginia Air Guardsmen were airlifted to Panama in three separate movements. This year the Air Guard is going back—in Highland Fling No. 2—but in two, instead of three, airlifts.

The first group this year spent the latter part of January in Panama. The second group departed from Kanawha Airport last Friday.

Once on station in Central America, the guardsmen are assigned to their regular Air Force counterparts and work side by side with them for 2 weeks carrying out practical aid projects.

Typical of such projects is the weekend one team of the 130th Air Commando medical detachment spent in Los Uveros last year. Los Uveros is a jungle community of about 150 persons, 50 minutes from Panama City by helicopter—or 2 days by horseback—the only other way to get there.

Los Uveros is typical of about three-fourths of rural Panama, according to M. Sgt. Clarence Michaelson, a medical technician who was part of the 4-man team that treated 175 persons in a 2-day visit there.

Other members of the team included Dr. Maj. Lester Keys, 605th Air Commando Squadron, Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone; S. Sgt. William A. Fizer of St. Albans; and A2c. Edward Samples, of Lens Creek, a pharmacist.

The economy of the village might be termed the "survival type." Residents live off the land for the most part. Some have a few coffee plants, or raise bananas. There are a few small family gardens.

There are two stores in Los Uveros. The entire stock of a Los Uveros store is probably about what you would take home from the supermarket to feed your family for 1 week, Sergeant Michaelson said. He and the other members of the Guard medical team in Los Uveros referred to the two stores as "Kroger" and "Evans." They are stocked by "travelings salesmen," who move about the interior with a small pack train, which Michaelson labeled the "Bell Line." Customers at Los Uveros Kroger and Evans stores don't buy cigarettes by the pack or carton. They buy one cigarette at a time.

The "jefe" (or chief) of Los Uveros is "Julio" and he has his office by popular demand, Sergeant Michaelson said.

"He's the smartest man in the village. Everyone looks to him to make the decisions. All the little villages have a similar chief."

Julio (pronounced "Hooleo") was one of two men in the village the medical team visited who could speak both Spanish and English. At one time, Sergeant Michaelson thinks the chief served as a houseboy for military personnel in Panama City.

"While we were in Los Uveros, he acted as our interpreter and wrote the instructions on the medicine we gave to his villagers."

Before they departed, Julio had the Guard medical team over to his house for dinner. It was his "diplomatic dinner": the best he had. Boiled rice—without seasoning or adornment—just plain, boiled rice.

With the type of aid the Air Force and the Air Guard is giving, life may improve at Los Uveros in the future. It is already improving.

A small—1,500 foot—airstrip has been hacked out of the jungle so that small planes can land at Los Uveros.

It is a constant fight, that airstrip. Turn your back and the jungle has taken it back.

To achieve it in the first place, a small plane, with loudspeakers in the doors, flew over telling the residents of the village how to clear off the airstrip. Then shovels, wheelbarrows, mattocks and machetes were dropped. Two years later the airstrip was about complete.

"Loudspeakers from the sky" are the most practical, modern method of communication for interior Panama. Three days before the Air Guard medical team visited Los Uveros, the loudspeaker equipped small planes swept over the area announcing that "Medicos will be in Los Uveros Saturday."

Master Sergeant Michaelson said that some Panamanians traveled 2 days to get to Los Uveros to the "medicos."

"We went in by helicopter," Sergeant Michaelson said. "The people were so happy to see us, they met us on the strip and helped carry our supplies down to the village, which was about one-fourth of a mile away through the jungle. While we were there, they followed us everywhere.

"You don't just treat one patient in a community like Los Uveros. You treat the whole family. All of them have the same ailments: malnutrition, worms, malaria, yaws.

"We treated the yaws with 1½ million units of penicillin and it worked like magic," Sergeant Michaelson said:

An earlier medical team had flown in in August 1964, and treated, among others, the only man—other than in the local jefe—who could speak English, for yaws. At that time his back was completely ulcerated, from neck to waist, with the yaws.

"When we arrived (in January 1965) he had one small sore, about the size of a half dollar. We gave him penicillin to clear it up.

"All of them have worms. A baby that looks perfectly healthy has muscles that feel like sponge rubber. She's bloated with worms. We give a bottle of worm medicine to a whole family. They need to be wormed about every 35 or 40 days.

"We got a young girl in, she was about 14 years old, and was having chills and fever. I think her temperature was up to about 104° F. We took a blood sample and checked it under the microscope. It was malaria. We had the medicine to give her adequate treatment.

"Many of those we treated had never seen a doctor before. One man we took care of on Saturday came back the next day and wanted to see the doctor again. He wanted to know if it was all right for him to take a bath while he was taking the medicine we had given him."

"We were there during the dry season. It starts to rain in March and rains for 9 months. While we were there, there were no mosquitoes. We slung our jungle hammocks under the school. It got down to about 60° F. during the night, and since we were sleeping in our clothes—except our shoes, and it is hard to sleep in one of those hammocks because you keep falling out—we pulled down the mosquito netting for a blanket.

"When we awoke the next morning, about half the village was there waiting for us to get up—just standing around waiting for the American medicos to get back to work."

Sergeant Michaelson explained that the schoolhouse was built on stilts to keep jungle snakes and animals from taking up residence inside.

"We weren't bothered by snakes or wild animals while we were there. Incidentally, another thing that makes life in the jungle rough is the ants. They're big and very destructive. You can see paths they use regularly—a strip about 2 inches wide leading off through the vegetation.

"Members of the air crews were given survival training in the jungle. They were taken out into the jungle by Air Force instructors and had to hack out a place to sleep for a couple of days. It was plenty rough, but they said they enjoyed it.

"One instructor was an expert in stalking. He would sneak into their camp and steal a hat without them knowing he had been there. Then the hat owner had to pay a buck to get his hat back."

The area under the school, where the medics slung their jungle hammocks to sleep, is a loafing area during the day for those who come to deal at the stores.

"There are benches down there under the school. They are crude, just as the desks and tables inside the schools are. Two boards nailed together make a bench or desk.

"Our treatment table was a rollaway bed someone had found somewhere. We had brought out sheets. There was no mattress. We spread the sheet over the springs."

As you read this, Master Sergeant Michaelson is back in Panama, on Highland Fling No. 2.

He has 18 years of service in the Guard; has served in Korea and has participated in Guard training exercises in Georgia, Ohio, Michigan, and other areas.

"If everyone had an opportunity to see what it is like down in Panama, and what we have been able to accomplish during these field training exercises, they would have a much better ideas of their Government and how their tax dollars are spent.

"Conditions down there aren't pretty. But, it is a beautiful country. You can spend days on end photographing the jungle. I'm looking forward to going back."

That's what happens when you start a people-to-people aid program.

FULL SECURITY IN OLD AGE FOR AMERICAN SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to state my support for S. 2837, a bill introduced by Senator Burdick for the purpose of eliminating an adverse result of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965.

When the 89th Congress gave final approval last summer to the act establishing the health insurance program for older Americans as well as providing an across-the-board increase of 7 percent in social security pensions, an unplanned and unwanted byproduct became apparent.

In the fall of 1964, the bill to increase social security payments by 7 percent was pending before the Congress at the same time a bill was pending to increase pension payments to veterans of wartime service. It was clear at that early date that the social security increase would cause a reduction or a total loss of pension for some veterans because their newly increased income would rise above certain levels. To protect the pensioners' interests, a provision was added to the service-connected bill excluding 10 percent of income from all other retirement sources in computing veterans' income for determination of pension eligibility. Thus amended, the pension bill was enacted in the closing days of the 88th Congress.

The social security increase proposal, however, did not pass until last summer. As a result of this timing, many veterans received larger pension payments during several months of 1965 than would have been possible had both bills been enacted late in 1964. Following the enactment of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965 last summer, the Veterans' Administration indicated reductions in payments to those veterans whose total income had been boosted beyond the eligibility levels by the 7-percent increase in social security.

I have long felt that this difficult problem necessitates prompt corrective action by the Congress. In fact, we in the Senate attempted to avert the conditions created by the belated approval of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965 on several occasions, but to no avail.

I am pleased to add my support to the Burdick bill, for it will make clear anew the determination of the Congress and the country to guarantee full security in old age to the millions of American servicemen and women who gave so freely to guarantee the survival of our free society.

THE GENERATION OF MINE MOUTH ELECTRICITY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I have been watching with great interest developments in the West, particularly in Utah, of a project for the generation of mine-mouth electricity.

The project can be greatly beneficial to the continuing resurgence of mining in the West and I look forward to a similar development being located in the State of Nevada.

The imaginative Utah project was described in the February 17 issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly by the distinguished Senator from Utah, Frank E. Moss. The project is being constructed by three western private utility firms. Senator Moss has helped clear the way for necessary cooperative agreements with the State of Utah and the Federal Government. The site of the plant is a remote section of southern Utah on the Kaiparowits Plateau. It will use the extensive coal deposits there and the water from Lake Powell to produce electricity which will be transmitted by high voltage lines to towns and cities where it is needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Senator Moss, entitled, "A Half-Billion Mine Mouth Plant for Utah," be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Public Utilities Fortnightly, Feb. 17, 1966]

A Half-Billion Mine Mouth Plant for Utah

(Note.—Cooperation between the Federal Government and 3 western electric utilities has brought about plans for a huge electric generating project in a remote county in Utah. The wise and effective use of national resources and the capital of private enterprise have combined to transform this desert region into an industrial and recreational area that will be beneficial to several Western States.)

(By the Honorable Frank E. Moss, U.S. Senator from Utah)

A combination of three factors has made possible a half-billion dollar powerplant development in a region of my State of Utah that is today too remote to be served by a single power line.

The factors are—

The West's booming demand for electricity;

Technical capability to operate larger powerplants and higher voltage transmission lines;

Storage of 27 million acre-feet water behind a Federal dam on the Colorado River.

The strange location of this proposed new industry is a land of crimson cliffs reflected in the blue waters of Lake Powell, a 186-mile-long manmade body of water.

Three western public utility corporations are engaged in a joint venture to exploit some 500 million tons of coal underlying the Kaiparowits plateau in Kane County, Utah. No more than a few tons have been mined here before, even though Utah is the major coal-producing State west of the Mississippi River.

A steam-generating plant is projected which would produce 5 million kilowatts of electrical power to go to load centers in Arizona and southern California.

The entrepreneurs are: Southern California Edison acting through its subsidiary, Associated Southern Investment Co.; San Diego Gas & Electric Co., acting through its subsidiary, New Albion Resources Co.; and Arizona Public Service Co., acting through its subsidiary, Resources Co.

The parent concerns are the 3 major power companies serving Arizona and southern California.

Obviously, immense economic benefits would flow to Utah from such an enterprise. The capital cost of a 5 million-kilowatt plant will be in the magnitude of $500 million. The extraction equipment and coal conveyance system will take expenditures in the vicinity of $96 million. Transmission facilities in the State of Utah would cost some $4 million.

Many facets of the Kaiparowits venture sparkle with interest for industrialists, lawyers, legislators, and State and Federal officials.

It demonstrates how long-dormant resources may support new bonanzas in response to the demands of increasing populations and prosperity.

It offers a fascinating look into the future of the development of Utah and other regions of the Rockies.

It involves significant questions of law and public policy relating to natural resource exploitation. Finally, it requires the negotiation of complex arrangements with State and Federal Governments.

Before pursuing legal questions further, let us examine the three basic factors underlying the development—demand for electricity, technical advances, and Lake Powell water.

THE NEED FOR ELECTRIC ENERGY

The electric power demand of the Nation is said to be doubling every 10 years. Arizona and southern California are the two fastest growing areas. Demand for electric power is presently over 11.1 million kilowatts.

The three companies state that they must add 24,280,000 kilowatts to their generating capacity between now and 1980. The proposed plant will supply about a fifth of this. The annual capacity of Kaiparowits, however, will be 30 percent greater than the 1964 electric power sales of Southern California Edison, largest of the developers.

To match the burgeoning demand of their markets, the companies plan several great steam-generating plants to burn western coal. One is already going at Farmington, N. Mex. It currently serves Arizona Public Service Corp. only. However, additions are contemplated which will serve other utilities in the Southwest. On the drawing boards is a second, to be in southern Nevada adjacent to the Colorado River and 3 miles below Davis Dam. Coal would be obtained from the Black Mesa area of Navajo County, Ariz. A letter of intent with a major coal supplier has been executed to furnish this requirement.

THE ADVANCES IN TECHNOLOGY

The technical advances of the electric power industry became front-page news during the blackout of the Northeast United States in November.

Explaining the practice of power pooling, the New York Times stated that it was made possible by a "combination of extremely efficient generating stations, plus rapidly improving means of transporting electricity over greater distances."

In the past two decades, ever-larger turbine generator units have been built, and they utilize higher temperatures and pressures.

One result is that 0.7 pounds of coal will now yield a kilowatt-hour of electricity, in contrast with the 1.1 pounds it took in 1938.

To achieve higher efficiency in transportation, power men have gone to transmission lines using higher and higher voltages. The higher the voltage, the larger is the amount of energy that can be pushed through the line.

The use of direct current is a major engineering advance that has led to significant savings here and in Europe. Direct current is now used to move electricity on jumps of hundreds of miles before it is transformed to alternating current for delivery to homes, factories, and stores.

Because of the location of generating plants in relation to markets, some European nations have led the United States in the development of high-voltage transmission techniques.

I noted this fact on a trip I made to Russia in 1959. The tour was made by a Senate special subcommittee which I headed. Our assignment was to inspect Russian hydroelectric projects.

Building on the experience of the capitalist nations, Russia began early to construct huge projects at the appropriate locations on her great rivers. Most of these locations are far from cities, making economical long-line transmission a necessity.

In the fall of 1959, the Russians were using 400-kilovolt lines, and were preparing to replace them with 500-kilovolt lines. The highest voltage then in use in the United States, I believe, was 345 kilovolts.

Though no details were supplied, the claim was made that they were considering direct current transmission at 800 kilovolts. The report of our subcommittee stated: "At this voltage they expect that their losses will amount to only 4 percent for lines about 600 miles long as compared to the 7½ percent now being experienced on the 400-kilovolt alternating current lines from Kuybyshev to Moscow."

Direct current connections now carry power from the Swedish mainland beneath a 60-mile ocean strait to the island of Gotland. Other direct current lines are in operation or under construction to link Denmark and Sweden; the two islands of New Zealand; and Sardinia and Italy.

The first major direct current long-distance line in the United States will carry electricity from the Dalles Dam, in Oregon, to Los Angeles. It is scheduled to begin service in 1969.

Also in the works is the huge Pacific Northwest-Southwest interite, a project that will use direct current transmission lines stretching from the Northwest 1,200 miles to Liberty substation near Phoenix, Ariz.

To wheel power from the Kaiparowits Plateau to southern California, a 450-mile transmission line will be needed.

THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Modern powerplants require large quantities of cooling water; 6,647,300 gallons are needed annually for each 1,000 kilowatts of plant size. Without the dams on the Colorado, water would not be physically available for the Kaiparowits plant. Nor would it be legally available.

Building the dams has been a monumental enterprise, not only for the 6 million cubic yards of concrete that have been poured, but also for the legal work that preceded construction.

The Colorado River system serves Mexico and these States of the United States: Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and California.

After 22 years of wrangling, the waters were divided between the upper basin and the lower basin by the Colorado River compact finally ratified in 1944. A final settlement between Arizona and California was made by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1964.

The portions of the river system in Colorado, Wyoming, nearly all of Utah, and parts of New Mexico and Arizona compose the upper basin. The lower basin includes most of the river system lying in Arizona, all lying in Nevada and California, and one Utah stream with its tributaries—the Virgin River. The cutoff point on the river between the upper and lower basins is Lee Ferry, Ariz., 40 miles upstream from Grand Canyon National Park.

The compact bound the upper basin to deliver to the lower basin 75 million acre-feet of water in each 10-year period.

In 1957, Congress authorized the Colorado River storage project. It consists of four major storage units: Flaming Gorge, on the Green River in Utah, just downstream from the Wyoming border; Glen Canyon, on the Colorado River in Arizona, just downstream from the Utah border; Navajo, on the San Juan River in New Mexico; and Curecanti, on the Gunnison River in Colorado. The first three are completed. Construction is proceeding on Blue Mesa, one of the three dams of the Curecanti storage unit.

The purpose of the Colorado River storage project is to enable the upper basin to use its share of the Colorado's waters. Under the law of prior appropriation that governs the use of water in the West, this could not be done until the upper basin could meet its commitments to the lower basin.

The flows of the Colorado vary widely. In some years, those flows (which average about 13 million acre-feet at Lee Ferry) have fallen to 4.5 million acre-feet. With the storage units, however, the lower basin entitlement will be on hand through wet years and dry.

Further, the upper basin can now put to use the Colorado's tributaries through "participating" projects. An example is the central Utah project, which is under construction. It will take water from tributaries of the Green to use in some of Utah's most populous areas.

It should be noted that the authorized electric power capacity of the storage project is 1.3 million kilowatts. This will not come close to supplying the power needs of the region.

The Bureau of Reclamation has stated:

"The full production of Colorado River Storage project power will be taken by the preference users (municipal plants and REA cooperatives) as rapidly as it comes on the line.

Looking ahead to 1980, the total installed capacity needed to meet all the anticipated electric power needs in the intermountain west will approach 20 million kilowatts."

This, of course, includes no Pacific coast requirements.

It should also be noted that the project could serve the entire power operation of the region in one way—by providing supplemental peaking power. Electricity cannot be stored. It must be generated continuously as it goes on the line. But water can be stored and put through the generators as the electricity is needed.

THE COAL SUPPLY

A firm supply of at least 14.6 million tons of coal annually for 50 years is required for the development of this new superpower plant.

Southern California Edison, San Diego Gas & Electric Co., and Arizona Public Service Co. have under permit and lease 45,000 acres of Federal and State coal lands and have expended in excess of $500,000 in blocking out a body of fuel.

Coal in place in excess of 1.5 billion tons has been blocked out, of which 500 million tons are deemed recoverable using current mining methods.

Previously, Federal law placed a limit of 15,360 acres on the public lands upon which one person or association could hold coal leases or permits within one State. This limitation was an obstacle to the use of western coal for modern powerplants.

Representative Edmondson, of Oklahoma, introduced in the House, and I introduced in the Senate, a bill to increase the limit to 46,080 acres. It became a law in 1964.

How long will it take to build the Kaiparowits project?

The firms state that, if all negotiations with governmental agencies could be completed today, the first unit could be producing electricity in 5 years. They propose the construction of two 750-megawatt units to begin production in the period 1970–72. Two more 750-megawatt units will be added, followed by two 1,000-megawatt units during the following 10-year period.

INTERIOR'S ROLE IN THE PROJECT

The most immediate problem facing the proponents of the powerplant project has been the acquisition of an assured water right. In September, the Secretary of the Interior approved a four-party agreement involving the Ute Indian tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. That agreement paved the way for Governor Calvin L. Rampton and the Utah State engineer to formally approve the use of 102,000 acre-feet of Utah's allocation of the Colorado River by the combine of private power companies.

Economic benefits from the use of this water for industrial purposes measured in income and employment in Utah will be many times greater than if the same amount of water were used for agricultural purposes.

The project is expected to provide optimum economic use of the water to attain optimum development of the coal resource. After approximately a 50-year period, it can be expected to be phased out, and the water returned to the State of Utah for reassignment.

As this is written, the companies are discussing with the Bureau of Reclamation the price to be paid for the use of water from Lake Powell.

The Department of the Interior is involved in several phases of the Kaiparowits venture. The water will come from a reservoir managed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Payment for use of the water will go into the Upper Colorado River Basin account, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Seventy percent of the terrain of Utah is owned by the Federal Government. Most of this land is managed by the Bureau of Land Management. Both the proposed plant site and the coalbeds are on public lands.

Ideally, a plant site is close to both coal and water. The one chosen for the Kaiparowits venture is less than 2 miles from Lake Powell, and about 10 miles from the coal deposits. It is between Wahweap Creek and Warm Creek, 9 miles north of Glen Canyon Dam.

The site is on lands presently withdrawn for reclamation purposes. It is within the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area which surrounds Lake Powell and which is managed by the National Park Service under an executive agreement.

I have introduced a bill to establish by statute the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. Following discussions with agencies of the Department of the Interior, it is agreed that my bill will exclude the plant site from the recreation area.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Under consideration is an agreement for an initial 49-year plant site lease or easement with a renewal guarantee for another 49-year term.

When the coal deposit is exhausted, the lands would revert to the Federal Government for reincorporation into the recreation area.

The size of the undertaking can be better understood in relation to facts like these:

The plant will consume 14.6 million tons of coal per year, which is more than three times 1963 production in the entire State.

The capital expenditures for eight coal mines and railroad facilities will be $96 million.

The construction payroll will be in excess of $95 million over a 15-year period.

The daily cost of mining and processing the coal will be $239,000, of which $69,000 will be in wages and salaries

Property taxes from the coal operation at 1964 rates will be $1,442,000 per year; taxes from the powerplant will be many times that figure; sales, income, corporate, franchise, and other taxes and coal royalties will provide millions of dollars of Federal, State, and local revenue.

The Kaiparowits venture will have an explosive effect on Kane County. Five-sixths the size of Connecticut, Kane is home to 2,660 persons, one nine-hundred-and-seventy-fifth of Connecticut's population.

The assessed valuation of the county's taxable property will be increased approximately 4,000 percent. A city of 25,000 to 30,000 persons will be needed to support the project. Employment at the plant will be about 150, and at the coal mine about 2,400.

Today, Kane is known principally for spectacular scenery. Zion National Park crosses Kane's western border, and about a third of Bryce Canyon National Park extends into the county from the north. Its southern border meets Arizona. Its entire eastern border is now Lake Powell, the "Jewel of the Colorado."

On Kane's portion of the lake is located the "Crossing of the Fathers," the point at which the Catholic priest Escalante and his party crossed in 1776 on his historic trek to California. Catholic priest Garces, at about the same time, used in his writings of the river the name Colorado—"The Red."

To America, the significance of the Kaiparowits project is its demonstration of the value of wise resource development. Critics of the Colorado River storage project deplored what they called despoilment of Glen Canyon.

It is true that the canyon is a glorious work of nature. But the clear blue lake has made it more glorious. Lake Powell is the base for a great recreation complex that will expand human enjoyment of the area a hundredfold.

Another significant point is the indication of the changing nature of the reclamation program. Begun in 1902, the program's purpose was to provide irrigation water to reclaim the land for agriculture.

Gradually, the projects have been providing more and more water for cities, factories, and homes; less for irrigated fields. Now we have the example of this great coal mine and power transmission complex which is possible only because we have stored the water. Thus the desert has been made to blossom—with a giant industrial project and a marvelous recreation area that will serve as a playground for thousands far from the crush of megalopolis.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM CHEATHAM, OF THE OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments of the Senate's time today to pay tribute to a man who has given so much of his own time to working long and well for his country. With the retirement of William Cheatham from the Sergeant at Arms office the Senate will be losing a valued and trusted member of its staff.

His career began as a Senate page at age 12 and for 4½ decades he has served this Nation and its Capital City. His earnest devotion to duty stands as an example to all of us.

We first met as young men 34 years ago when we both started out in this same Sergeant at Arms office that must now endure the loss of his retirement.

Mr. Cheatham has taken time out from his assistance to the Senate only to serve his country in other ways. He was a member of the U.S. Army Air Corps in World War II and he has administered to the needs of the Nation's Capital first as an Assistant Corporation Counsel to the District of Columbia and later as General Counsel and Secretary to the National Capital Planning Commission.

He has achieved the goal of every man: to retire with the respect of those who have worked with him—respect for a life's work that has been a record of constancy and contribution.

SPELUNKING BECOMES A POPULAR SPORT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there is a subterranean world, a major portion of whose secrets are still hidden.

Perhaps the challenge of discovery in the hope of contributing to knowledge is a prime part of the fascination which our Nation's caves and caverns exert to many people. Perhaps the sheer adventure of entering an ages-old, unknown area is the irresistible lure to those exploring our American portion of this subterranean world. Whatever the magnet, so widespread has become the sport of cave and cavern exploration that its devotees have formed cooperative associations for spelunkers—the amateurs—and speleologists—the professionals.

For all, there is a real opportunity for action in West Virginia, in caves known for their rugged character, such as the difficult Schoolhouse Cave in Pendleton County. Presently there are known to be approximately 500 caves in the Mountain State, with names such as Laurel Creek Cave, Hell Hole Cave, Organ Cave, Silers Cave, Smokehole Caverns, and John Brown's Cave, and the National Speleological Society is an excellent source of information on these.

A Saturday, February 5, article in the Weekender, the features section of the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., recounts the thrill of spelunking.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPELUNKERS GOING BATTY OVER CAVES

(By Betty Murphy)

A growing local group of extremely adventurous souls has taken up one of mankind's oldest diversions.

They like to drop into deep pits dangling on a length of rope, crawl over slippery rocks and squirm through winding, muddy tunnels; then climb back out, pleased that they have been where few have ever been before.

Speleologists is the formidable name they are known by. Some call themselves spelunkers. Actually they are cavers or cave explorers.

About 500 men and women in the area belong to one or more of four organized caving clubs, three of which are member grottos of the National Speleological Society.

The District of Columbia Grotto, the National Capital Grotto, and the American University Student Grotto are affiliated with the national organization of about 9,000 cavers, while the Potomac Speleological Club is independent.

Winter or summer, any time of year, these hardy individuals take off weekends and holidays whenever they can for nearby Virginia and West Virginia caving areas. If time permits, they go even farther and participate in national conventions around the country.

WEIRD WILDLIFE

Their biggest thrill is to discover rooms and passages where no human has even been before. They also look for unusual stalagmites, stalactites, and other cave formations and delight in finding animals and fish "you never see outside."

Blind white fish, spiders, grasshoppers, salamanders, rats, and bats are some of the species peculiar to a world without light.

The bats are "particularly beautiful," according to one caver, who has been tempted to disregard an ancient law of the underground and pat the creatures during their winter sleep.

"You shouldn't pat hibernating bats," he said, "because they wake up, use up energy they're supposed to be storing and soon die."

Cavers have many laws of their own which they respect to the letter. They know the sport is dangerous but maintain it is "practical and safe" if people stick to the rules.

Grotto members strongly advocate membership in an organized group for this reason.

"Unorganized, untrained cavers are much more accident-prone than those who belong to caving clubs and have been taught the rudiments of safety precautions," according to A.U. Grotto charter member Peter Plantec, who helped organize the group over a year ago.

SENSIBLE RULES

Never cave alone; go with experienced cavers; and always let someone know when you are going down and coming up. These are some of the rules. Also three sources of light—a carbide helmet lamp, a flashlight, and a candle—are recommended for wandering through total darkness.

A well-equipped caver should also have matches in a waterproof container, extra carbide, a supply of water as most cave water is polluted, and, to protect life in and around the caves, a plastic bag to carry away the poisonous spent carbide.

Another practical consideration is to wear "dirty old clothes." They get that way anyway after squirming around in slimy cave mud.

Cavers also have a language all their own. They never descend or ascend. They rappel, prussic, and chimney.

Rappelling is controlled descent on a rope, usually with a Swiss seat or a sling made out of nylon webbing attached to the rope. Prussicing is "walking back up." The climber sits in a seat sling and walks up on slip knots around his feet. And chimneying is pushing up or working down a narrow chute with back, feet, and hands. They practice these acrobatics by squirming under chair rungs and shinnying up doorways.

GIRLS JOIN, TOO

Girls, who are well represented in the sport, although they are not in the majority, are frequently better at getting in and out of small places. In fact, according to one male caver, "Girls make better cavers than men, when they know what they are doing."

The American University grotto even elected a female chairman, Janet Pickens, a sophomore at the college. She "got bitten" a year ago on a trip through Endless Caverns and has gone on frequent expeditions ever since.

She likens the sport to "climbing the Alps at midnight, if they were muddy, only you go down before you go up."

Imagination also seems to be a prerequisite to enjoyable exploring. Area cavers have found "cathedrals" and "enormous football fields" underground, along with 100-year-old ladders perfectly preserved in nearly 100-percent cave humidity.

Weather is no deterrent to the sport. Cave temperatures, which average about 53 degrees, remain constant throughout the year. As a result, they seem warm in winter and cool in summer, but the humid air is always "beautiful to breathe."

The enthusiasm of these adventurers is boundless. One newly married couple, both of whom are cavers, went caving on their honeymoon.

"After one trip, you either love it or hate it," according to one.

Evidently more and more people are loving it. The area's newly organized caving groups are growing every year. People of many occupations and ages are catching the caving fever. However, most cavers are fairly young and should be in excellent physical condition. Keep that mind if you're thinking of joining. And remember—"Don't pet the bats."

SOUTH DAKOTA BACKS OAHE PROJECT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the State of South Dakota has greeted with universal enthusiasm S. 3001 to authorize the construction of the initial unit of the Oahe irrigation project.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record a concurrent resolution of the South Dakota Legislature memorializing Congress to review and approve the authorizing legislation at its earliest possible convenience.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress to promptly review and approve authorizing legislation for the construction of the Oahe unit, an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Whereas the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) as supplemented and extended by the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 641) authorized a general comprehensive plan for the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin; and

Whereas the Oahe unit is an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project, which following exhaustive studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation has been found to be engineeringly feasible and economically justified as evidenced by that agency's report titled "Oahe Unit, James Diversion—South Dakota, Missouri River Basin Project," dated May 1965, which was subsequently approved by the Secretary of the Interior on October 6, 1965; and

Whereas residents of South Dakota have for many years counted on new irrigation development possible through the construction of the Oahe unit to justify the large sacrifice of 509,000 acres of productive lands given up for the storage of water behind the four main-stem reservoirs constructed with the State; and

Whereas the development of the Oahe unit will further result in increased and stabilized agricultural production from lands which are presently under production, which in turn will result in many benefits to the State of South Dakota, the region, and the Nation: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the 41st Legislative Assembly of the State of South Dakota sincerely and respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to promptly consider and take favorable action authorizing the construction of the Oahe unit; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, the members of the Missouri River Basin States congressional delegations, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Lem Overpeck,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

Niels P. Jensen,
Secretary of the Senate.

Charles Droz,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

Paul Inman,
Chief Clerk.

HOW NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT PROPOSED CUTOFF AFFECTS NOTRE DAME

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there is a great deal of evidence accumulating, to which I hope to refer at greater length on a later occasion, to indicate that the proposed elimination of national defense education loans as proposed by the administration is destined, if carried through, to work a great hardship on many students. There is every reason to believe that it will be impossible, as a letter recently appearing in the Congressional Record from a banking association official indicated, for private banking institutions to pick up all of the slack through use of the title IV provisions of the Higher Education Act.

Not only is there the difficulty in a tight money market of securing for students the loan money needed to replace this source of funds, but there is the difficulty in many States such as my own in meeting in time the requirements of the law for the State agency structure necessary for the guaranteed private loans. The Indiana Legislature does not meet this year, and the problem is compounded, as it is on other States similarly situated.

I recently addressed an inquiry to the presidents of Indiana institutions of higher education to secure their opinions on the effect this proposed shift will have in their own schools. The first reply which I have received is from the director of financial aid at the University of Notre Dame, Brother Robert Sinnaeve, C.S.C. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, which details the effects they anticipate at this well-known institution, may appear in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, Ind., March 10, 1966.

Hon. Vance Hartke,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., has asked me to reply to your letter concerning the discontinuance of the National Defense Education Act loan program. You are very right that we are concerned over this phaseout proposal. We are concerned because the shift to the new guaranteed loan program will cause a sudden cutoff of aid for students, and the new programs will not be in operation in all States for the coming school year. Already we are receiving letters from students indicating that the new State programs will not be available in time. We anticipate considerable confusion and definite problems for those students residing in States reluctant to establish the new guarantee loan program.

Indications here point out that the new guarantee loan program will not be able to, and in some cases be unwilling to, assimilate the student loan load carried through the National Defense Education Act program for the past 7 years. Private financial institutions, banks, etc., will not be able to carry the load, especially in view of the new Federal Reserve interest rate. The new program will attract a horde of new customers. If the banks are able to take care of this new load, the National Defense Education Act at its present level of operation would still be needed to take care of the low-income group. It is unrealistic to expect the low-income student to be adequately served if the proposed drastic reductions go into effect.

We have projected our National Defense Education Act loan level for 1966–67 to be: 500 students—$400,000.

In order to supply these 500 students with National Defense Education Act loans we expect to receive about $100,000 in repayments; and we had asked for a Federal contribution of almost $270,000, to be added to our share of about $30,000. As it stands now we will have just the repayment of $100,000 available. This will provide for about 125 students. As I mentioned above, it is unrealistic to expect the new guarantee loan program to cover the balance in such a short time.

Incoming freshmen will lack the guidance and information on sources of funds. Since many State programs will not be underway, since many banks are indicating reluctance to participate, or have made unreasonable restrictions, we anticipate it will cause some students to drop their desire to attend college; or even make it impossible.

We strongly urge that the national defense loan program be maintained, at least for another year, at its present level. By then, the new programs should be established and we would have had a chance to seek additional sources. Also, the banks could enter the program at a pace much more reasonable.

The administration's bill, presented to Congress on March 1, does not solve the problem. This form of phaseout will cause disruptive problems. If we are to ever reach the exceptionally needy student, as identified under the Higher Education Act of 1965, we must have the aid sources available at the institution. If not, we are defeating the purpose of the act.

We appreciate this opportunity to express our views to you.

Very sincerely in Notre Dame,
Brother Robert Sinnaeve, C.S.C.,
Director of Financial Aid.

FARMERS UNION LEADERS RETIRE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, 25 years ago a young man by the name of James G. Patton became the president of the National Farmers Union. Four years earlier another young man had taken over as president of the North Dakota Farmers Union. His name was Glenn J. Talbott and he later became chairman of the board of directors and vice president of the National Farmers Union. This week, these two men will step down from their positions of leadership. With their departure an era comes to an end, an era in which they played a memorable role in the farming regions of the Nation.

These men and the organization they led were dedicated to making life better for those who tilled the soil. For a quarter of a century they traveled the rural areas making speeches and conducting meetings, inspiring farm families with the idea that by working together through a spirit of cooperation with their Government they could improve farm prices and the quality of their lives.

They appeared in the Halls of Congress, pressing and urging legislation which would help the family farmer. They attended international conferences and exchanged ideas with farm representatives from foreign lands. Their work was the labor of devotion and dedication. Their views and ideas played no small part in the shaping of farm legislation during that period.

It was my good fortune to become acquainted with these men, prior to my coming to Congress, in my capacity as a practicing attorney. For a good many years, the North Dakota Farmers Union was one of my clients and I had the opportunity to witness the abilities of its leaders, both at the local and national level.

I know that thousands of farmers will view the retirement of James Patton and Glenn Talbott with regret, but they will also view it with appreciation for the contributions both have made.

Other competent men will, of course, step into their shoes and carry on the work which they have begun but their retirement does bring to an end the Patton-Talbott era which many will not soon forget.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES G. PATTON

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as of today James G. Patton is stepping down as president of the National Farmers Union.

Jim Patton has long been a good friend of mine, and it is with regret that I see him removing himself from the important leadership position which he has so long held. He has made great contributions to the understanding of farm problems. He has done so not alone as president of his organization but also as a public spirited citizen who has frequently responded to the call of the Federal Government for service on advisory committees and commissions dealing with thorny agricultural issues. His work in the freedom for hunger campaign is well known. Nor has Jim Patton's contribution been confined solely to questions dealing directly with the welfare of farmers. He has always taken an enlightened interest in a broad range of public questions, and has never hesitated to speak out upon them, adding his voice and influence to the process of molding public opinion for the welfare of the Nation.

At the same time another farm leader in the same organization, Mr. Glenn Talbott, is leaving to others the responsibilities of vice president. Mr. Talbott, too, has made a genuine contribution to the Farmers Union and to the Nation as he has worked in that organization's leadership team.

But even though that leadership is now changing hands, I am sure that neither of these men will find it possible to retire from public life but will continue insofar as possible to serve us in a variety of ways. I wish them both well as they lay down the burden of active leadership, and I wish well also the organization they have led and their successors.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the biggest news at the National Farmers Union convention in Denver this week is the decision of James G. Patton not to run for president again. In the 25 years he has held that job and the 33 he has been with the Farmers Union, most of us have gotten to know Jim as well as the farmers he represented knew him. We will miss him, as their advocate.

He has been a lively, vigorous champion for his members. He has let us know where he stood, not only on farm legislation but on other legislation he thought would affect farmers. His concern has been, not just with the state of the farm, but also with the state of the farmer. He has fought for policies he thought would improve farm income. He also has fought for opportunities for farmers to improve themselves.

Jim Patton has had the courage to speak out for his beliefs. Although his concern has been the family farmer, he has looked beyond the family farm. When surpluses developed, he saw past the surplus to hunger and disquiet abroad. He urged using our abundance as an instrument of spreading democracy. When increasing farm income nationally made little dent in poverty in certain areas, he advocated a war against poverty and made it clear poverty existed in rural areas as well as in cities where it was more evident.

In Oklahoma, we claim a certain kinship with Jim Patton. Born in our neighboring State of Kansas, he was educated in our neighboring State of Colorado. It is in Colorado that he has had his headquarters as president of the National Farmers Union, although he spent much time in Washington.

Patton's close associate, Glenn Talbott, the Farmers Union vice president, also is not running for reelection this year. He will be missed, too. We cannot claim his State of North Dakota as a next-door neighbor to Oklahoma, but we claim him as a good neighbor, a farmer who has become as well acquainted with financial statements and cooperative balance sheets as with the combine or the tractor.

These men have served their country as well as their membership in a period when farm policy in the Nation had to be forged to fit changing methods, changing population, and a changing world. I am sure I represent many Oklahoma farmers when I express my thanks for their contributions. Even when I have disagreed with Jim Patton, I have respected his conviction, his purpose, and his dignity.

I do not know how many nonfarmers recognize their special debt to Jim Patton, but they have one also. Not only has he supported much legislation which benefited Americans generally rather than any one group, but he has been creative in his efforts to show the interdependence of rural and city folks and to help lessen the separation between them.

We all can be glad that the Farmers Union elected as president for 25 years a man of such wisdom and vision as Jim Patton. I salute him and I hope his successor will grow into as great a usefulness to his Nation.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today Mr. James G. Patton steps down as president of the National Farmers Union. In his long years of service to the National Farmers Union and to agriculture in the United States, he has been a vigorous and forthright champion of the interests of the American farmer.

Voices which champion the cause of the farmer are sorely needed in the United States today, and Jim Patton's voice has been heard. We in the United States cannot neglect a system of agriculture which has made us the most productive in the world—producing food and commodities at lower cost to the consumer than any other nation in history. This is all the more true, as Mr. Patton has argued, because the economic vitality of rural America and even urban America is closely intertwined with the health of the farms and farmers. Main street businessmen depend for their livelihood on strong farm purchasing power, and in turn cities depend on strong purchasing power in Main Street and rural America.

I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Patton on the occasion of his resignation of leadership of the National Farmers Union, and want to thank him on behalf of all farmers in Minnesota for his strong and effective leadership in this area.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, James G. Patton is retiring today after more than 25 remarkable years as president of the National Farmers Union.

Under Jim Patton's dynamic direction, the National Farmers Union has experienced unprecedented growth and development. In 1940, when Jim Patton took the reins of leadership, the National Farmers Union included 78,000 farming families. Today this organization ably represents 250,000 farming families.

Jim Patton's considerable abilities and energies have been effectively dedicated the past quarter century to representing farm families' interests and seeking for them a more equitable share of our national prosperity.

But Jim Patton has been much more than an outstanding advocate for America's farming families. He is a true patriot, a successful pioneer, and an honored prophet. As a consultant to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Jim Patton showed his unselfish devotion to his country and his great breadth of vision.

Jim Patton did not hesitate to denounce selfish farm leaders who demanded higher farm prices during World War II. Instead, he called just as loudly for "parity of sacrifice" for all segments of the population.

The Full Employment Act of 1946, widely hailed as a landmark in economic legislation, was based in part upon proposals made by Jim Patton in 1944. It was also at Jim Patton's urging that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations became a reality in the war against world hunger.

As long ago as 1951, Jim Patton encouraged the United States to send farmers and technicians to live abroad and teach their skills to the peoples of underdeveloped countries. This proposal was heeded and broadened by President John F. Kennedy in our Peace Corps. Even then Jim Patton realized where our efforts for international peace must be concentrated when he wrote:

> The real war we must wage is not one with guns, tanks, planes, and atom bombs, but a war against poverty, ignorance, disease, landlessness, and hopelessness.

I salute Jim Patton on the day of his retirement and congratulate him for his long and invaluable service to our Nation and our Nation's farmers.

A TRIBUTE TO JIM PATTON, WHO MADE PROGRESSIVE DREAMS COME TRUE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, delegates to the National Farmers Union convention in Denver, Colo., are this evening paying tribute to their retiring president, who is well known to every Member of this body—James G. Patton—and to their retiring vice president, Glenn J. Talbott, who is also well known.

I wish it were possible for me to be present, for both Jim and Glenn have made great contributions to this Nation, and to constructive world programs, in their quarter century of service in the Farmers Union. Since I cannot be there, and they richly deserve national recognition, I take this means of expressing appreciation of their work.

Jim and Glenn, who was long president of the North Dakota Farmers Union, are both going to be missed from their farm organization posts in the years ahead, but I hope that neither of them will be missed from the national scene for I know they are both capable of continuing great contributions.

Glenn Talbott, son of a Farmers Union leader who gave his life during his efforts to improve the farmers' lot and rural life, built the North Dakota State Farmers Union, which his father founded, into the strongest State farm organization in the Nation's history. Composed only of farmers, its membership has included 90 percent or more of all of the farmers in the State for a good many years. Other State farm organizations have had more members, but none has had a higher proportion of potential farmer members. Glenn is an exceptionally well informed and forceful person, who has appeared before our committees many times here in Washington.

To both Jim and Glenn, I wish Godspeed in the activities they will undertake on retirement from the active leadership of the Farmers Union.

Some time ago, Mr. President, I reviewed some of Jim Patton's outstanding accomplishments in a tribute to him at an award dinner in Denver given him by Histadrut, Labor Israel.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO JIM PATTON

(Address of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, recognition dinner for James G. Patton, sponsored by the Denver Histadrut Council and Colorado Trade Union Council for Labor Israel, Denver, Colo., Sunday, Feb. 7, 1965)

I came to Denver today to bear testimony, on behalf of national and international leaders, to the worldwide vision of the man we honor and to express appreciation to Colorado for having given him to us. The high esteem that we all have for Histadrut, Labor Israel, and indeed for the friends everywhere of this great democratic venture in the Middle East—the State of Israel—is further enhanced by your wisdom in honoring Jim Patton tonight.

Jim has profoundly influenced the course of our Nation and of world affairs. I do not say this because the occasion permits indulgence in a little extravagance, but because it can be documented. As one of the New Frontiersmen who set out to blaze new trails in 1961, I have repeatedly come across paths which say: "Jim Patton was here."

Last Monday, I introduced a bill in the Senate to create a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers at the White House and to establish select committees in the House and Senate on resources and conservation. The measure is aimed at assuring the best use of our land and other resources. When introducing it, I called attention to the fact that we have had 49 consecutive months of economic growth. This record of unbroken advancement was not an accident. A White House Council of Economic Advisers created by the Employment Act of 1946 has studied and related Federal economic actions so we now have sufficient understanding of the effects of economic measures that we can avoid recessions and depressions. We can thoughtfully plan and execute economic policies to attain predetermined goals.

The resources bill, cosponsored by 15 Senators, proposes a similar Council to insure that we use the land and other resources wisely to meet present and future needs.

The man who first proposed the highly successful Council of Economic Advisers which my resources proposal imitates was Jim Patton. Jim blazed the trail on that frontier at the end of World War II. In the campaign for the Employment Act of 1946, he put together a farmer-labor coalition that not only won the fight for commonsense analysis and planning, but he helped the participating groups, especially farmers and workers, to realize that a full employment economy is a common cause, beneficial to all.

During my service in the House of Representatives whenever I turned to Jim Patton for guidance on crucial issues, he always sent back enlightened replies. He was the exceptional farm leader who favored better labor standards, who fought the importation of low-wage laborers for corporate agriculture. Jim and his Farmers Union members know two things well: First, low-cost imported labor gives big farmers an advantage over family farmers who must compete with migrant workers; second, low wages in cities mean restricted markets for farm products. Likewise, low farm prices mean reducing purchasing power and is a threat to every city worker and merchant.

It is sometimes difficult to hold to these fundamental concepts. It is easy for farmers in periods of low prices to be resentful of city wages and consumer prices. Opportunistic farm leaders have sometimes played upon this resentment to build membership. But the man we honor has never wavered from his conviction that prosperous labor means a good market for the farmer's produce and good farm income is good news for workers and merchants. The welfare of farmer, worker, and merchant are interwoven in his view of society.

When President John F. Kennedy named me the first Director of the food-for-peace program, I found myself again on a frontier criss-crossed with trails Jim Patton had blazed long before.

During World War II he served on several Presidential top policy advisory boards working with the problems of economic stabilization, labor-management policy, and war manpower. But he was not too busy with Farmers Union and civic duties to participate, at the height of the war effort, in blazing a trail toward accomplishment of President Roosevelt's four freedoms and especially "freedom from want." He was one of those who inspired the Hot Springs Conference in 1943 which led to the formation of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, formally organized in 1945 and first headed by Jim's dear friend, Boyd-Orr of Scotland—a Nobel Prize winner.

He was a founder of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, serving first as its vice president and then as its president.

He helped initiate U.N. studies of the world food gap, of the nutritional deficits in the have-not countries and other moves intended to focus attention on the need for constructive world food policies. He advocated a U.S. food bank that helped open the way to the food-for-peace program.

Jim today remains a frontiersman—calling for an all-out advance against man's oldest enemy, human hunger.

He believes with me that we should seek to break down the barriers between nations, that East-West trade especially in food makes sense morally, economically, and politically. He believed, before I was around to have convictions on any subject, that the world could be refashioned into a peaceful, abundant home for all the children of the earth.

Jim has sometimes been accused of living on cloud nine. The objective of full employment in the United States was one of his early cloud-nine ventures. It is good terra firma now, the solid base of 49 months of economic growth. A food-for-peace program was one of his cloud-nine adventures in the forties. It is now moving three large shiploads of American food every day to feed the poor in the far corners of the earth. Many of Jim Patton's cloud-nine projects have been mountainous achievements which verify the Biblical promise that a man of faith can move mountains.

Under his leadership, the National Farmers Union, with its roots in the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountain country, has been much more than a commodity-oriented farm organization. It has been a powerful voice for the general welfare of America and a faithful army in the cause of peace.

Some authorities credit Jim Patton's leadership of the Farmers Union with preventing a merger of big business and big agriculture in the 1940's. Jim's influential letter to the Saturday Evening Post, refusing to participate in a private national planning operation sponsored by eastern capital because he believed such planning should be done by all the people through their Government, is a part of the historic record of that time.

The repeated appearances of Jim Patton before the committees of Congress in support of constructive labor and social welfare measures have helped build a bridge of cooperation between agriculture, labor, and our society as a whole. The Farmers Union has advocated resources development—a Missouri Valley Authority, a TVA on the Nile, social security, the United Nations, better health care, education, and housing.

I said recently at a Western Power and Water Consumers Conference in North Dakota that when Jim has a dozen awards besides his French Croix d'Officier de Merite Agricole—France's highest agricultural award—he would have begun to get the recognition he deserves.

He especially deserves the honor he receives tonight, symbolizing the common aspirations of farmer and labor groups, and your appreciation for a lifetime crusade of a good man, a dear friend, and a great citizen. Jim Patton is a living testament to President Johnson's recent reminder: "The task of achieving a life of equality and dignity in rural as well as in urban America is one that will engage our minds and hearts and our energies for a lifetime."

The late John Kennedy would frequently close a speech with some favorite lines from Robert Frost's poem:

> "The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
> But I have promises to keep,
> And miles to go before I sleep,
> And miles to go before I sleep."

John Kennedy is asleep now in Arlington Cemetery, but the spirit of the New Frontier is not asleep and nowhere does that spirit burn more brightly than in the heart of Jim Patton.

During a long and brilliant public career that will continue for many years to come, Jim has been guided by the philosophy of the late President's inaugural challenge: "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth, God's work must truly be our own."

AID PROGRAMS IN FOOD AND HEALTH

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, late last month the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation held a conference on legislative proposals to step up America's efforts in the worldwide war on hunger. I had the honor of being invited to address that distinguished gathering, as did the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Mr. McGOVERN; the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Representative COOLEY; Congressmen STALBAUM and DOLE; and spokesmen for the administration.

One of the most interesting talks was given by Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, who called attention to the close ties between our aid programs in food and health. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS RELATED TO INTERNATIONAL HEALTH[1]

(By William H. Stewart, M.D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I am very much pleased to be in this distinguished company this morning and to represent Secretary Gardner in your discussions of food and health. The two subjects are clearly inseparable. And both are inseparable from every nation's aspirations for freedom and fulfillment.

Last year was a year of towering legislative achievement in advancing the health of the American people. Titles 18 and 19 of the Social Security Act broke through longstanding economic barriers to health care, not only for our older citizens but for millions of others as well. The heart disease, cancer, and stroke amendments outlined a program that will also break through many existing barriers to the delivery of the best in health care to all who need it. Amendments to the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act will make it possible to enhance not only the quantity but also the quality of future physicians, dentists, and other professional manpower. New legislative charters were written for achieving and maintaining a safe environment.

This year, 1966, may well mark a similar turning point in international health—a decision for full commitment of our resources in behalf of the health of people around the world.

Through the Food for Freedom Act, the International Health and Education Acts of 1966, and his proposal for foreign aid, President Johnson has written a new kind of prescription for international collaboration. When these proposals are translated into action I am convinced that we shall strike a real blow at what the President has called the incessant cycle of hunger, ignorance, and disease.

My principal mission this morning is to describe briefly for you the provisions of the President's international health program of 1966. In doing so I shall give special attention to the aspects of that legislation which are especially close to your hearts—the program to combat malnutrition. I also shall bear down fairly heavily on what is to me the pivotal element in any health program—the development of manpower to do the job.

These two areas of our special interest—building the nutritional foundation for health and developing health manpower—were listed as the first two goals for the future by the distinguished Committee on Health of the National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation, in their report presented last fall at the White House Conference on International Cooperation. They stated them this way:

"Basic to the improvement of world health are the steps that might be taken to effect an overall rise in standards of living throughout the world. * * * This implies a commitment to programs of economic development, family planning, and the provision of adequate food supplies."

And, as their second goal: "The building of a strong body of health workers in each country of the world is a necessary task."

With this preamble, let us turn directly to the international health program of 1966. It has five major components.

The first is designed to create an international career service in health. Specifically the President proposes:

(a) To increase by at least 500 during the first year the number of American graduate students preparing for participation in international health activities. This would be done through a program of grants administered by the Public Health Service to U.S. universities.

(b) To establish a select corps of international health associates, available for assignment at home and overseas. Their work with Federal agencies and international organizations would give them experience upon which to build careers of international service to health. The President urges recruitment of 100 promising young people to begin this work.

(c) To establish a program of fellowships in international health. Fifty special fellowships would be awarded to young Americans who have already worked overseas and have shown outstanding capability, to prepare them for international health leadership.

(d) To create within the Public Health Service an International Corps, a special career service that would be capable of carrying out our international health commitments and aspirations.

This comprehensive package is designed to develop American manpower for service to world health. Speaking as a health professional, there is no more urgent need. We have the knowledge and the technology to conquer most of the deadliest threats to the health of people in the developing nations. Moreover, those nations know that we know how. What we need above all is people to deliver the goods.

These manpower programs are modest in size. But it is important to recognize that they will create manpower for leadership. These people will recruit and train others, in greater numbers, to do the many jobs that must be done.

Even more important, the nations we seek to help must also be able to help themselves. And virtually all of them lack the trained manpower to serve with us and eventually to shoulder the full burden.

Therefore, the second component of the international health program is directly complementary to the first. It is designed to help meet the health manpower needs of the developing nations. Specifically it proposes:

(a) To more than double the existing AID program for strengthening health training institutions. This program supports construction of teaching facilities and laboratories, improvement of teaching materials and methods, and the assignment of American faculty abroad, for a broad range of the health disciplines.

(b) To enable the Peace Corps to recruit and provide more volunteers for service in the health manpower programs of developing nations. This proposal will call for increased emphasis on health in recruitment and training programs of the Peace Corps.

The third major element of the international health program is the proposal to combat malnutrition, especially among the very young. It comprises three specified objectives.

(a) To establish what the President calls a headstart nutritional program to increase the number of infants, children and mothers receiving adequate diets under the food-for-peace program to a level of 150 million within the next 5 years. Our programs currently reach about 70 million, of whom only about 10 million are under 5 years of age. In conjunction with this, the President has directed AID to enlarge its program for enriching milk and other food-for-peace commodities with vitamins and minerals.

---

[1] Presented at the Conference of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, Washington, D.C., Feb. 24, 1966.

(b) To support training of nutrition specialists, including both professionals and technicians. Such training for manpower from the developing nations would be supported both in the United States and in nutritional institutions now existing in some 27 nations.

(c) To expand research on malnutrition—both as to the effects of nutritional deficiency and as to practical, inexpensive ways of solving nutritional problems.

For me to document the need for this program to this audience would be carrying coals to Newcastle. You are already fully aware that nearly 270 million children in the developing countries will be suffering from malnutrition by next year. This is an awesome figure. Further, you know that despite our own substantial efforts and those of the international organizations, only about 2 percent of preschool children in these nations are receiving some type of food supplement. The dimensions of the challenge are overwhelming.

We can take pride in the progress that has been made in recent years: the nutrition surveys in 27 countries which have not only supplied valuable data but awakened interest in many places; the enriching of our skim milk powder, wheat flour and cornmeal shipped overseas; progress in the development of infant food formulas based on cereal grains and protein supplements; and other signal achievements. But there is compelling urgency to accelerate our effort.

The last two sections of the international health program, which I shall describe less fully than they deserve, deal with problems which are superficially separate but actually interlocked with the nutritional challenge. The first is concerned with the control and eradication of communicable diseases. The second confronts the problem of worldwide population explosion.

Part IV of the international health program proposes six specific actions to control and eradicate disease:

(a) To eradicate malaria within 10 years from the Western Hemisphere and also from Ethiopia, Nepal, Jordan, the Philippines, Thailand, India, Pakistan, and Iran. These areas have a combined population of some 800 million.

(b) To eradicate smallpox from the world by 1975. This bold and simple determination—to obliterate a disease from the face of the earth—is now within our capability.

(c) To reduce the hazard of measles. This disease, deceptively mild in the United States though often leading to serious after-effects, is a deadly scourge in many parts of the world.

(d) To develop methods for controlling cholera and diarrheal diseases in developing nations.

(e) To control animal diseases, thereby increasing the meat supply and preventing many human illnesses transmitted from animals.

(f) To expand United States-Japan science collaboration designed to combat some of the major diseases of Asia.

In all of these activities agencies of the Federal Government, including AID and the Public Health Service, will be working closely with international organizations and with individual countries toward our common goal—freeing millions of people from man's most ancient enemies. We shall continue our vigorous support of the World Health Organization which has already accomplished much toward several of these objectives.

The fifth major component of the program proposes cooperation in worldwide efforts to deal with population problems. There are three specific proposals:

(a) To expand research in human reproduction and population dynamics. The Public Health Service has been accelerating its support of research in these fields for several years. The response from scientists in universities and research institutions has been spontaneous and gratifying. With additional support, and in partnership with vigorous programs already underway through AID and the World Health Organization, I believe the research attack will pay increasing dividends in the years ahead.

(b) To enlarge the training of American and foreign specialists in the population field. In this area, as elsewhere, existing knowledge is still awaiting effective dissemination because of shortages of qualified manpower. In fact the manpower proposals already discussed are fundamental to the accomplishment of all these goals.

(c) To provide assistance to family planning programs in those nations which request our help. Our willingness to share knowledge in this as in other scientific fields is on record as a matter of national policy. We are eager to help wherever and in whatever way we are invited to do so.

Thus, to sum it up, the international health program of 1966 is a declaration of interdependence. It challenges a rich, powerful, and humanitarian nation to deliver its full measure of support to the well-being of people everywhere. I believe we shall respond to that challenge.

I thought I would conclude by reaching back into the past to illustrate two points: the long-recognized interlock between nutrition and health, and the international character of human advance.

As many of you know, one of the proudest chapters in the history of the Public Health Service tells the story of Dr. Joseph Goldberger and his brilliant conquest of pellagra. Dr. Goldberger's studies and experiments demonstrated unshakably the dietary cause of pellagra, shattering in the process the widely held viewpoint of the time that pellagra was a communicable disease. He stated his conclusions crisply:

"The idea that pellagra is a communicable disease receives no support from this study.

"Pellagra may be completely prevented by diet."

But Dr. Goldberger, solid scientist that he was, was thoroughly familiar with the literature of his field. In a report published in 1915, he cited the following quotation from a Professor Roussel, of Paris, written in 1866—exactly 100 years ago:

"Without dietetic measures all remedies fail. When drugs and good food are simultaneously employed it is to the latter that the curative action belongs."

Professor Roussel, like Goldberger, was writing of pellagra. But his thematic sentence can be broadly applied to many problems of our modern world: "Without dietetic measures, all remedies fail."

WHITE WATER CANOEING AT PETERSBURG, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, anyone witnessing event of the annual Petersburg, W. Va., white water weekend canoeing classic, can well understand why the sport of white water canoeing is growing in national popularity.

One of the contests involves competitors racing through the wild water for a distance of about 15 miles, descending at the rate of 40 feet per mile, faced with obstacles such as the natural hazards of the turbulent water, rocks, steep drops, large waves, and fallen trees, with the fastest time providing a win for the hardy contestant. Each competitor has only one run, so split-second judgment is required in "reading" the water correctly, to avoid spills and accidents and to come through safely, while going full speed.

An article in the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., of March 13, carries a lively account fo the white water canoeing and kayak classic on the North Fork of the South Branch of the Potomac River, to be held this year on April 1–3.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMPIONSHIP AT PETERSBURG: WHITE WATER CANOEING A THRILLER

(By John L. Berry, Canoe Cruises Association)

The third annual Petersburg, W. Va., white water weekend, April 1–3, will have as its central attraction the national championship wild water races for canoe classes and the women's kayak championship.

The downriver races start at mouth of Seneca, W. Va., and follow the turbulent boulder-strewn North Fork of the South Branch of the Potomac River for approximately 15 miles through roaring Hopewell Canyon, finishing at Smoke Hole Caverns a few miles south of Petersburg along Route 28.

Most of the racecourse is visible from the road. The exciting canyon rapids may be viewed after a short walk from several points of access off Route 28.

Competition in the rapidly growing sport of white water canoeing is divided into two types of races, with championships held each year. First is the slalom race, which is run over a short course (500 to 700 yards) of river rapids.

BEST TIME WINS

Contestants are required to pass through up to 28 gates, actually parallel poles roughly 44 inches apart, suspended from wire stretched across the river and hung a few inches above the water. They are strategically placed to demand a high degree of paddling skill and boat maneuverability in order to effect a penalty-free passage.

The racer's score is better time of two runs through the course plus prescribed penalty seconds assessed for gate touches or omissions.

National slalom championships will be held in May on Vermont's West River below Ball Mountain Dam, but among the special Petersburg events will be an exhibition canoe slalom April 13 in Harmon's Store Rapids on the North Fork.

The second type of race in rapids is the wildwater or downriver event. Such contests range in distance from 5 to 26 miles. At Petersburg, the North Fork championship course is about 15 miles long and descends at the rate of 40 feet per mile. The only obstacles are such natural hazards of the river as rocks, steep drops, large waves, and fallen trees. The fastest time wins.

THREE CANOE CLASSES

The contestant has only one run, so a premium is placed on the racer's ability to "read" the water correctly (that is, to avoid obstacle and choose the fastest passage) the first time, while going full tilt.

In both slalom and wildwater the racer competes against the other boaters entered in his particular class. In canoes, there are three classes: C–1 or one-man canoe, C–2 or two-man canoe, and C–M (mixed) or man and woman double canoe. There are two kayak classes: K–1 (men's single) and K–1W (women's single). There are no double kayak classes in white water racing.

In slalom racing the emphasis is upon ability to maneuver quickly, and all classes of slalom boats are as short as the rules permit and feature rocker-shaped bottom profiles to give a center pivot point for turns.

Downriver or wildwater boats, on the other hand, are built for speed. They are as long and as narrow as rules allow and ride on straight-line V-shaped bottoms. Both types of craft are inherently "tippy" and paddlers must learn to control them with body balance, leans, and paddle braces.

ROCKY RIVER

The downriver boats of recent design sacrifice turning ability for straightaway speed. In a rock-garden river like the North Fork, the racer must choose his course with care and correctness, because unlike the paddler in a slalom boat, he cannot turn or maneuver at the last minute to avoid obstacles. There is no second chance.

In whitewater canoes, the paddler kneels and is braced against a thwart, and is assisted in his ability to control the boat in river turbulence by foot braces and leg (thigh) straps which "lock" him in position. A waterproof skirt, worn by the paddler, snugs around the lip of the cockpit rim, making the craft completely watertight.

The paddler wears a lifejacket and crash helmet as required in most races. In event of a capsize, most experienced paddlers in both canoes and kayaks can recover or roll up without leaving their boats.

The kayatist sits in his craft and uses a double-blade paddle. He also uses foot braces, and in place of leg strap has hip pads and knee cups to fix him in position. Both types of boat are of lightweight fiberglass construction.

Several Washington area national champions, members of the Canoe Cruisers Association, as well as those representing more distant clubs, will be competing at the North Fork this year. The ladies' K-1W champion, Marion Hardy of the CCA, will be defending her title against a strong contingent of high school and college paddlers who have been her pupils.

Among these are Nancy Adams, of Garrett Park, Md., and Alfred University, and Terry Franz and Karen Modine, both from Garrett Park, students at Walter Johnson High School.

Men's C-1 champion, John Berry, also of the CCA, is abdicating his title to compete in the C-2M class with his 18-year-old daughter Kathy. Kathy, a Walter Johnson senior is also a national champion, having won the C-2M class last year with CCA's Bob Harrigan as her partner.

Harrigan and John Berry won the men's C-2 class in the first North Fork race in 1964. Following a victory in the singles last year, Berry hopes to make a clean sweep with successive titles in each of the three canoe classes.

The father-daughter team will be hard pressed by another CCA mixed pair, Carol Lewis and Swede Turner, who have been competing for 3 years as a team, and represented the United States in the 1965 world championships in Austria last summer. In the 1965 North Fork race, this pair was second to Bob Harrigan and Kathy Berry by only 9 seconds.

NEW YORK DEFENDERS

The men's C-2 champions, Bill Heinzerling and Rowan Osborne of the Kayak and Canoe Club of New York, will be defending against, among others, two strong local teams, Bob Harrigan and Jim Zacharias, former national champion from the Colorado White Water Association, and Jim Raleigh and John Connet, who were second last year.

With no defending C-1 champion, such paddlers as Bill Bickham of Penn State Outing Club, 1964 winner and second last year, Cornell's Tom Southworth and Dartmouth's Wick Waler, a CCA trained Washingtonian appear the strongest contenders.

The men's kayak (K-1) class will be run for eastern championships. The nationals for this class, under a system permitting the previous year's winner to select the championship site, will be held in Colorado in June.

The 1965 winner, Joe Knight of Dartmouth's Ledyard Canoe Club is entered and is the favorite. Local CCA paddlers, ageless Dan Sullivan, 1964 winner and second last year, and Charlie Bridge a U.S. team member in Austria last year, are the other leading contenders.

This year, in addition to the championship race on Saturday, there will be a shorter, 9-mile downriver event for junior and cruising class, the slalom on Sunday and a "hooligan" race in which anything that floats, except a boat, is an acceptable entry.

IMPACT FUNDS ARE VITAL TO IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on January 13, 1966, I alerted my colleagues in the Senate to the possibility that one of the most essential Federal assistance programs for elementary and secondary schools faced massive reduction. I further warned them that the effects of such a reduction would cripple hundreds of small, rural school districts throughout the country.

At the time of my initial warning, I based my statement upon a general knowledge of the past dependencies of these small school districts upon Public Law 874 and its companion measure, Public Law 815. I hoped that my statement, made in advance of actual budget accountings, might have been overly pessimistic. I find now that my worst fears have been realized.

The full force of the proposed reductions in Public Law 874 funds is yet to be realized, but, already, individual school districts have begun to report the potential disaster they face if we approve the proposed reduction of this program.

What is most distressing, Mr. President, is the apparent misinterpretation of Public Law 874 and Public Law 89-10. When the proposed administration budget was presented to Congress, the reductions in Public Law 874 were annotated with the explanation that other legislation would fill the gap. Accompanying the President's budget was an explanatory publication entitled "The Budget in Brief." On page 48 of that publication it states:

> The special aid to school districts affected by Federal activities is declining by $87 million in 1967, reflecting recent studies of this program and the impact of the large new Federal programs which meet many of the same needs.

There are two errors in this statement. First of all, the Federal assistance program to impacted areas is not declining by $87 million, but by $233 million. The second error is the most grievous and must stem from a misinterpretation of the results of the survey cited in the statement.

It was never the intent of Congress that the provisions of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, would substitute for existing essential Federal educational assistance programs. I cannot emphasize this point too strongly.

But even though Congress might acquiesce to such an interpretation, the very language of Public Law 89-10, and, in particular, title I of that law, does in no way provide the essential assistance now rendered by Public Law 874.

We have been told that title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, providing assistance to school districts having underprivileged students, will supply the funds now available under Public Law 874. I submit, Mr. President, that it will not meet that need and was never intended to do so. I offer graphic evidence of the effects of these proposed cuts on 51 school districts in my own State of Idaho. The following tabulation has been prepared by my staff in coordination with the U.S. Office of Education. It compares the losses to the 51 districts now receiving Public Law 874 funds, to the eligibility under title I of Public Law 89-10.

I ask unanimous consent that the chart may appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of Public Law 874 proposed cuts and Public Law 89-10 entitlements on affected Idaho school districts

	Public Law 874			Public Law 89-10 title I available funds	Net change (+) or (−)
	Estimated fiscal year 1967 entitlement	Entitlement, if amended	Losses		
Ada: Boise No. 1	$184,599	$18,826	$165,773	$206,679	+$40,906
Adams:					
Meadow Valley No. 11	23,100	6,276	16,824	3,820	−13,004
Council No. 13	21,543	8,640	12,903	7,468	−5,435
Bannock: Pocatello No. 25	96,548	0	96,548	133,038	+36,490
Benewah:					
St. Maries No. 41	14,898	6,366	8,532	12,852	+4,320
West Benewah No. 42	17,259	3,365	13,894	5,731	−8,163
Bingham:					
Snake River No. 52	39,170	17,826	21,344	25,530	+4,186
Blackfoot No. 55	210,650	112,953	97,697	86,840	−10,857
Fifth No. 59	12,853	4,456	8,397	9,552	+1,155
Shelley No. 60	36,725	19,736	16,990	22,578	+5,588

Comparison of Public Law 874 proposed cuts and Public Law 89–10 entitlements on affected Idaho school districts—**Continued**

	Public Law 874			Public Law 89–10 title I available funds	Net change (+) or (−)
	Estimated fiscal year 1967 entitlement	Entitlement, if amended	Losses		
Blaine:					
Hailey No. 61	$9,939	0	$9,939	$21,015	+$11,076
Boise:					
Garden Valley No. 71	13,674	$3,819	9,855	N/E	−9,855
Basin No. 72	18,990	5,457	13,533	N/E	−13,533
Horseshoe Bend No. 73	3,030	1,546	1,484	2,431	+947
Bonner:					
Sandpoint No. 82	56,263	15,461	40,802	70,861	+30,059
Bonneville:					
Idaho Falls No. 91	394,988	222,183	172,805	90,139	−82,666
Swan Valley No. 92	11,202	6,639	4,563	4,342	−221
East Bonneville No. 93	131,465	75,759	55,706	34,562	−21,144
Boundary: Bonners Ferry No. 101	32,148	10,277	21,871	30,567	+8,696
Butte: Arco No. 111	73,648	37,379	36,269	6,599	−29,670
Clark: Dubois No. 161	18,476	2,910	15,566	6,078	−9,488
Clearwater:					
Orofino No. 171	29,835	5,184	24,651	34,041	+9,390
Elk River No. 172	10,740	2,455	8,285	N/E	−8,285
Custer:					
Challis No. 181	17,570	4,548	13,022	9,031	−3,991
Mackay No. 182	11,346	5,093	6,253	9,552	+3,299
Elmore:					
Glenns Ferry No. 192	12,827	2,911	9,916	7,815	−2,101
Mountain Home No. 193	722,207	370,778	351,429	18,853	−332,576
Franklin: Westside No. 202	2,564	0	2,564	9,205	+6,641
Fremont: St. Anthony No. 215	26,535	5,093	21,442	22,752	+1,310
Gooding: Hagerman No. 233	4,632	0	4,632	8,684	+4,049
Idaho:					
Grangeville No. 241	63,089	26,557	36,532	46,198	+9,666
Cottonwood No. 242	21,039	2,638	18,401	23,967	+5,566
Jefferson:					
Rigby No. 251	54,227	19,827	34,400	49,498	+15,098
Ririe No. 252	10,444	3,819	6,625	9,205	+2,580
Kootenai:					
Coeur d'Alene No. 271	21,135	0	21,135	59,572	+38,437
Lakeland No. 272	7,761	0	7,761	14,068	+6,307
Kootenai No. 274	10,531	2,182	8,349	12,678	+4,329
Worley No. 275	7,076	727	6,349	N/E	−6,349
Latah: Potlatch No. 285	3,858	0	3,858	4,342	+484
Lemhi: Salmon No. 291	26,461	9,368	17,093	41,683	+24,590
Lewis:					
Nezperce No. 302	5,421	0	5,421	5,731	+310
Kamiah No. 304	34,729	10,823	23,906	13,199	−10,707
Minidoka: Minidoka No. 331	34,184	0	34,184	69,472	+35,288
Nez Perce:					
Lewiston No. 1	22,141	0	22,141	60,093	+37,952
Lapwai No. 341	59,020	19,370	39,650	23,099	−16,551
Oneida: Malad No. 351	6,897	0	6,897	16,152	+9,255
Owyhee: Bruneau-Grand View No. 365	38,408	12,368	26,040	9,899	−16,141
Power: American Falls No. 381	30,014	5,274	24,740	85,130	+60,390
Shoshone: Avery No. 394	11,157	1,728	9,429	N/E	−9,429
Valley:					
McCall-Donnelly No. 421	36,168	16,825	19,343	5,210	−14,133
Cascade No. 422	21,443	6,821	14,622	N/E	−14,622

NOTE.—22 districts (all but 3 are small rural) lose $635,329; 29 districts (all but 7 are rural) gain $418,364.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it has been said that title I of Public Law 89–10 will provide many of the same needs now covered by Public Law 874. But title I is designed to give financial assistance to schools that have childern whose families' income is less than $2,000 annually. What about the small rural school district made up of families in the middle-income group, inundated by a wave of children from a nearby Federal installation ?

Such is the case in at least one district in Idaho. I shall introduce into the record a letter from Mr. Leroy Hughes, superintendent of School District No. 193 in Mountain Home, Idaho. At this point, let me quote briefly from the letter in order to translate cold tabulations of figures into stark actuality.

In his letter, Mr. Hughes writes in part:

> Seventy percent of the 3,600 children that attend the Mountain Home schools are federally connected. A reduction of $360,000 in 874 funds would amount to $100 per student per year. This would amount to 24 percent of our entire M. & O. budget of $1,500,000 or approximately the entire expenditure for 900 children a year. * * * The proposed cut of $360,000 could mean the entire salary for approximately 70 teachers which is more than one-third of our entire staff. Teacher salaries in Idaho are already among the lowest in the Nation. Therefore it would be impossible for us to secure qualified teachers if the salaries are lowered any more. The portion of our budget which is expended for instructional materials, for clerical personnel, for janitors, heat, lights and water is already at a minimum. The main curtailment would have to be largely in the cutting of staff which would be disastrous to our whole program. * * * The District is making a maximum effort at the local level, we levy 30 mills for M. & O. purposes, which is the maximum levy allowed by the State of Idaho. We receive all of the moneys allowed us under the State foundation program. Under the laws of the State of Idaho we cannot receive any other money from local county or State taxes.

Mr. President, the figures supplied me by the Office of Education indicate that Mr. Hughes' school district will not be losing $360,000 in Public Law 874 funds; it will lose $370,000. It is said that title I of Public Law 89–10 is designed to take up the gap. Again, according to the most accurate figures available from the U.S. Office of Education, Mountain Home School District No. 193 is eligible for exactly $18,853 in title I funds, for a net loss to the district of $332,576.

In the face of this disastrous financial blow, the Mountain Home school district has no alternative but to drastically reduce its teaching staff, making it almost impossible to provide schooling for all its 3,600 pupils.

The majority of the children attending the Mountain Home schools come from families directly connected with the big Mountain Home Air Force Base, currently in the process of shifting from the Strategic Air Command to the Tactical Air Command. It is conceivable, Mr. President, that some of the men and officers stationed at Mountain Home Air Force Base are now serving on temporary duty in Vietnam. Their families still reside on or near the airbase. It would be the height of bitter irony for our servicemen in Vietnam, fighting to preserve the rights and freedoms of a backward nation, to receive a letter from home saying their own children are being denied adequate education in order to finance the costs of the war.

Does it seem farfetched or an overstatement to say that reduction of Public Law 874 funds will actually force schools to close their doors?

Mackay Public School District No. 182 sits in the heart of the Stanley Basin in Idaho's rugged Sawtooth Mountains. Many of the pupils come from families connected with the national forest, but another large block of youngsters represent families of loggers and forest workers whose annual income fluctuates across the $2,000 mark from one year to another, depending upon the severity of the winters and the vagaries of the lumber market. The district is entitled to $11,346 under Public Law 874. I quote in part from a letter from Mr. George Hinds, superintendent of the district:

> We are severely cramped for room. The staff is overloaded, the classrooms are overloaded, I need additional teaching personnel. I cannot continue to operate this district without outside help. From all funds I have a total of $159,000. * * * I need $169,000 for maintenance and operation alone to offer only the basics of education. * * * If I do not receive the full $11,346 to which we're entitled (under Public Law 874) I am going to have to severely cut back our instructional program which is not warranted. We have no frills. I cannot afford to make a financial mistake. I have the best staff in Idaho and this staff has been working for years on minimum salary schedules, but they have been content. Where do I replace them Senator? I cannot hope to compete with districts around me. I am fighting strictly for survival for if the State sales tax is defeated in November and I lose $5,000 of Federal funds and the hot lunch program is not supported 100 percent I stand to lose $25,000 and I shall have to close. I am desperate, frustrated and despondent. * * * I do not believe the President intended to hurt us but I can assure you that if we lose these impact funds my program is lost.

This, Mr. President, is not the wail of a money-hungry administrator, looking for a Federal handout. This is the soul-searching report of a dedicated school man who has lived for years in the constant shadow of fiscal disaster, yet still trying to educate his district's youngsters as best he can.

I could cite at length from other letters, but I will ask that they be printed as a part of this statement.

The situations I have illustrated for Idaho can be duplicated in almost every State in the Union, but perhaps more pointedly in the Western States where great blocks of federally owned land detract from State and local property revenues and where the impact of large Federal installations in small communities is immense.

I have been identified as a supporter of measures for the conservation of our natural resources. The most valuable resource this Nation has is to be found in the minds and in the unplumbed talents of its young people. I was an enthusiastic supporter of the great progressive educational assistance programs enacted by the first session of this Congress, for I believe they are the means to future national growth and enrichment. But they were not meant to be substitutes for then existing programs.

I therefore urge the Senate to provide continuing funding in fiscal year 1967 for Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 at the same levels of support both programs enjoyed in fiscal year 1966.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that pertinent letters from Idaho school officials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 193,
Mountain Home, Idaho, March 4, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U. S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: The proposed reduction of Public Law 874 funds to our district would cause a critical curtailment in our educational program. If the information that we have received is correct it would make it impossible for us to continue an adequate program.

Seventy percent of the 3,600 children that attend the Mountain Home schools are federally connected. A reduction of $360,000 in 874 funds would amount to $100 per student per year. This would amount to 24 percent of our entire M. & O. budget of $1,500,000 or approximately the entire expenditure for 900 children a year. As you are well aware the funds available for education in Idaho is one of the lowest in the Nation already, a drastic cut such as this for our district would cause us to curtail teacher personnel and curriculum to such an extent that our schools would lose their accreditation.

The proposed cut of $360,000 could mean the entire salary for approximately 70 teachers which is more than one-third of our entire staff. Teacher salaries in Idaho are already among the lowest in the Nation. Therefore it would be impossible for us to secure qualified teachers if the salaries are lowered any more. The portion of our budget which is expended for instructional materials, for clerical personnel, for janitors, heat, lights, and water is already at a minimum. The main curtailment would have to be largely in the cutting of staff which would be disastrous to our whole program.

The district is making a maximum effort at the local level, we levy 30 mills for M. & O. purposes which is the maximum levy allowed by the State of Idaho. We receive all of the moneys allowed us under the State foundation program. Under the laws of the State of Idaho we cannot receive any other money from local county or State taxes.

The following figures show a condensed form of our M. & O. budget:

Receipts:	
County taxes	$320, 000
State and county foundation program	560, 000
Federal funds	658, 000
Miscellaneous revenue	12, 000
Total	1, 550, 000
Expenditures:	
Administration	35, 000
Teachers salaries	1, 100, 000
Instructional expenditures	225, 000
Operation of plant	175, 000
Other auxiliary agencies	15, 000
Total	1, 550, 000

The 89–10 program under title I and title II only brings to our district about $20,000 per year and this money cannot be used to replace 874 because this is allotted to us on the basis of our district offering new programs over and above the programs that are already in existence. The amount of $20,000 is only a fraction of the $360,000 that we might lose in the curtailment of the 874 funds.

We certainly appreciate your efforts in pointing up the need for 874 funds for districts such as ours and know that you will continue your efforts to maintain these funds at least at their present level.

Yours truly,

LEROY HUGHES,
Superintendent,
Board of Trustees.

MACKAY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 182,
Mackay, Idaho, March 4, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: In your letter of February 25 you requested budget figures for our school district concerning impact funds under Public Law 874 and what effect it would have before and after.

Senator, my district operates on $1,650,000 of assessed valuation. Since last year, our enrollment has increased to 146 students in the high school and we are severely cramped for room. The staff is overloaded, the classrooms are overloaded, I need additional teaching personnel. I cannot continue to operate this district without outside help. The maximum millage of 30 mills will bring me, from the local district, $47,000. My teachers' salaries, and we pay very poorly, amount to $114,000 for the next fiscal year. The State will furnish $112,000 roughly for maintenance and operation. Putting them together we have a total of $159,000 to perform all of the maintenance and operation functions. If I do not receive the full $11,356 to which we are entitled, I am going to have to severely cut back our instructional program which is not warranted. We have no frills, Senator. I cannot afford to make a financial mistake. The clerk, the board and myself live with a budget in their hands. What services do I sever? I need $169,000 for maintenance and operation alone to offer only the basics of education. I need additional members on the staff, I need classroom space, I am bonded to the limit and I do not appreciate the fact that the larger systems, with their huge assessed valuations, can offer courses we do not even dream of. I have the best staff in Idaho and this staff has been working for years on minimum salary schedules, but they have been content. Where do I replace them Senator? I cannot hope to compete with districts around me. I am now fighting strictly for survival for if the sales tax is defeated in November and I lose $5,000 of Federal funds and the hot lunch program is not supported 100 percent, I stand to lose $25,000 and I shall have to close.

I am desperate, frustrated, and despondent because I see things that I need and cannot afford. We have made tremendous strides in Idaho since the last legislature but our taxpayers are burdened with a heavy school tax, we are levying the maximum levy and still to lose a dollar is tragedy for the small school. I do not believe the President intended to hurt us but I can assure you that if we lose these impact funds my program is lost. It would be senseless to go into each minute detail of the budget so, therefore, I have given you large numbers. You can see what I need to operate in maintenance and operation without any waste, but with the loss of Federal funds, we might just as well seek employment elsewhere.

Thank you so much for your concern. You have done much for our State. I only hope that you and a few other enlightened Senators have the courage to stick by your guns.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. HINDS,
Superintendent.

BOISE, IDAHO,
March 4, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: The Idaho Education Association notes with concern that moneys originally intended for education are being curtailed by budget cuts.

Public Law 874 cutbacks will make it difficult for many school districts to function when they are faced with sharp enrollment increases because of Federal projects in the area. The Dworshak Dam on the Clearwater River and the future dam on the Snake River are examples of areas that will be affected with abrupt enrollment increases. Also, it is most difficult for school districts accustomed to Public Law 874 funds to absorb the costs of pupils from federally related enterprises.

Curtailment of school lunch funds is another loss to Idaho's schools. We note that the Gem State ranks 17th in the Nation in the percent of elementary and secondary schoolchildren (both public and private) participating in federally subsidized lunch programs. It is evident that our young people profit considerably from having a hot lunch. We sincerely hope for full implementation of the school lunch and special milk programs.

We also look with concern at the proposed budget trimming of $300 million from the Higher Education Act of 1965. Under the work study section of this act, many college students are able to earn a portion of their expenses, thus making it possible for them to attend college and begin their careers of becoming useful and productive citizens. We were elated when funds were provided for teacher training. Cutting the budget to less than one-third of the $225.7 million originally proposed will hamper seriously this personal help to teachers.

We hasten to mention briefly the tremendous assistance that the National Defense Education Act has been to the schools in Idaho. For the first time many of our schools across the State have acquired modern audiovisual equipment which brings to life things they have studied before, but without complete understanding. Studies in mathematics, science, social studies, and the language arts expanded and improved because of this help. Under the same act many teachers and administrators received further specialized training toward master and doctor degrees.

As President Johnson declared many times, we have only recently experienced the tremendous breakthrough in education by means of Federal grants and aids to assist institutions and teachers to further the cause of education in our separate States. We heartily endorse these acts and urge you to take action to protect them.

Thank you for your continued efforts to work for sound education in our State and Nation.

Sincerely,

WAYNE YORK,
Executive Secretary, the Idaho Education Association, Inc.

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 41,
St. Maries, Idaho, March 4, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator from Idaho,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I just returned last night from 3 busy days in Boise, and your letter of February 25 was waiting for me.

Our district, in total dollars, will not be hit so hard; the proposed reduction approximates $8,000. However, we are a very poor district, with but $3,600 valuation behind each pupil, and this $8,000 item is a big thing in our budget.

This amount will reduce our potential teacher salary offering about $130 per teacher. This is not a huge sum, but with Idaho teacher salaries already much lower than in the surrounding States, these little amounts often add up to the teacher making the decision to stay with us or move to the more lucrative pastures.

The title I funds of the 89–10 law would approximate $14,000, and the original expected 874 funds would be almost the same amount. The big difference is, however, that 874 funds paid teachers, heated buildings, and swept floors, whereas the Federal control of 89–10 dictates that all of this money must be for something we were not already doing. Expansion is lovely, but first we would like to have the basic education better supported.

At DeSmet, 16 Indians will receive $21,000 according to a Headstart release. If we in our district could get one-third this amount per pupil for the basic educational program, we could provide a much stronger program. Further, as a schoolman, I resent terribly Headstart, since it bypasses State department of education and the local school boards. We are old fashioned enough to believe the true American way is for education to be under the duly constituted authority; namely, the State and local boards of education.

I hope this helps you and that it will arrive in time.

Sincerely,

ANDY HAWKINS,
Superintendent.

IDAHO SCHOOL TRUSTEES ASSOCIATION,
Moscow, Idaho, March 3, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Enclosed is a resolution approved by the executive board of the Idaho School Trustees Association at a regularly called meeting on February 26. I am sure that the intent of this resolution is apparent since there is some uncertainty as to whether or not school trustees might qualify under the present laws. We have asked Dr. James Turman, of the Office of Education, to investigate whether or not school boards may make proposals. If it is not possible we ask a very careful consideration of this resolution and the drafting of additional legislation.

There is a great deal of concern in Idaho, as I am sure, in all of the other States, concerning the reduction of funds in Public Law 874. Figures from the Office of Education supplies through Senator JORDAN's office were circulated at the conference February 26.

It looks as though Idaho would lose close to one and three-quarter of a million dollars under this bill. Public Law 89–10 with all its multitudinous possibilities and even all of the opportunities afforded to Idaho schools, does not offset or even complement this loss from Public Law 874.

I am sure you are aware that under Public Law 89–10 and its various titles, proposals must be quite specific in order to be approved, whereas moneys from Public Law 874 may be used for the general development of the overall program in the district.

It is this latter which Idaho needs very badly.

There is also concern about the school lunch program. I realize that there is a complementary and self-administered program under Headstart through the Office of Economic Opportunity. However, these are not offsetting programs and local school districts will be forced through public pressure to maintain the lunch program by local or State funds. I am sure you realize that this is practically the equivalent of a reduction in budget since the funds would have to be taken from instruction or other M. & O. items. Districts in Idaho cannot afford such a shift. Trustees urgently request that Congress reconsider the proposals for reduction.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. SNIDER.

RESOLUTION FOR CONSIDERATION, FEBRUARY 26, 1966

Whereas certain percentages of Federal moneys allocated to public education are set aside for purposes of research; and

Whereas these moneys have been made available to State departments of education, State universities and colleges and their departmental subdivisions; and

Whereas there are numbers of problems not directly in the field of education but which have a great impact for effectiveness to which professional departments and educational institutions may not be addressing themselves; and

Whereas lay leaders of education are concerned about these problems and their relation to the effective operation of schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the drafting of supplementary legislation to present bills, or in their revision, provision be made for State school trustees' associations, independently and voluntarily organized to present proposals for educational research moneys, such funds to be administered under their own direction through their association officials.

BUTTE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 111,
Arco, Idaho, February 25, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: May I add my protest against proposed legislation that would cut back funding of Public Law 874 (in lieu of tax moneys for public school districts).

As you undoubtedly realize our school district receives a substantial amount under this Federal program, in fact, it accounts for approximately 14 percent of our total budget. Any cut would present a great financial problem to our district.

While I am not always enthusiastic about Federal aid to education programs, I have always thought of this law as it implies in the sense of "in lieu of taxes." I would much prefer to have General Electric, Westinghouse, Phillips, and the many other contractors at the AEC site paying actual taxes in this county, but since we receive no direct tax support from them it seems fair that we do receive some support in lieu of taxes.

Any assistance you may give us in support of the continuance of Public Law 874 will be of great assistance to this school district, as well as to many other Idaho schools.

Very sincerely,

VERNE A. DUNCAN,
Superintendent.

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 365,
OWYHEE AND ELMORE COUNTIES,
Grand View, Idaho, March 1, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I would urge that everything possible be done to continue the Public Law 874 program, as a fully funded program.

The Public Law 874 amounts to slightly more than 10 percent of our total budget, and I cannot think of any way that the fund could be replenished to take up the loss if they are reduced. If these funds are reduced it will create an undue burden and hardship on the children being educated in our schools.

You many count on our support to maintain the Public Law 874 program.

Respectfully,

Charles A. Brown,
District Superintendent.

State of Idaho,
Department of Education,
Boise, February 21, 1966.

Hon. Frank Church,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Church: I am communicating direct to you our concern about the amendments which are being proposed for Public Laws 874 and 815. Each of these are discussed below. Your full cooperation with the schools of Idaho to not financially hurt the present educational programs would be deeply appreciated.

PUBLIC LAW 874

The recommendation for a reduction and the amendments to provide for the reduction of Public Law 874 is causing great concern to 56 of Idaho's 117 school districts. School districts are now preparing budgets for the 1966–67 school year. Any reduction of Public Law 874 funds would require budget adjustments with no source of revenue to replace the funds not made available.

Funds received by school districts for federally connected students have gone to the district's general fund and have been used for teacher salaries and other expenditures of the regular school program. The assumption that this fund loss would be replaced by title I of Public Law 89–10 is not correct. Title I funds are for programs through projects which are not part of a regular school budget. In most instances the funds from title I are less than the loss of Public Law 874 funds.

Approximately 72 percent of Idaho's land is not taxable. Federal land in Idaho is approximately 64 percent of the total land area. Idaho's Public Law 874 schools last school year claimed federally connected students totaling nearly 9 percent of the State's total enrollment. Funds received by these school districts was only a percent of the public school current expenditure.

Many of our Public Law 874 schools will have to reduce their teaching staff and limit their expenditure for materials and supplies. The larger school districts will have to make drastic cuts which will greatly affect their educational programs. The school districts affected by the increased personnel at Dworshak Dam will be forced to operate a substandard educational program.

With the present emphasis on education and the efforts of our schools to retain high standards and meaningful instruction for all children, it is hard to understand the purpose behind the reduction of funds in this worthwhile program. We urge your support for continuation of the Public Law 874 program as it is now constituted for the next 2 years.

PUBLIC LAW 815

In recent years there has not been too much activity by Idaho schools with the use of funds from this program. It would appear that the principal activity will be by those schools which will be affected by the construction of Dworshak Dam.

In Idaho the use of Public Law 815 has been largely through qualification of schools due to parents of pupils working on Federal property. This method of qualification expires June 30, 1966. Orofino, a district already qualified for some Public Law 815 funds, is handicapped because a predicted increase of pupils can't be given beyond June 30, 1966. The estimate of the Corps of Engineers is 1,900 pupils of parents working at Dworshak Dam during peak employment. It is thought most of these students will be in schools in the Orofino, Kamiah, Lewiston, Lapwai, and Kendrick school districts. In addition to these students, Orofino will also have an increased student enrollment due to the mill recently constructed at Pierce, the housing built in Pierce, and the logging of Federal land for the mill.

Public Law 815 would have to be extended if any of the above schools have an opportunity to use these funds for the construction of the school facilities which will be needed to house pupils of parents working on Federal property. We urge your support for an early extension of the temporary sections of Public Law 815 with no change of student eligibility.

Sincerely,

D. F. Engelking,
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction.
Harold Farley,
Deputy State Superintendent.

Snake River School District No. 52,
Blackfoot, Idaho, February 25, 1966.

Hon. Len B. Jordan,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Jordan: I appreciate the information received as per your letter dated February 22, 1966 relative to the proposed reductions in funds to finance Public Law 874. We have been deeply concerned about the proposal as it will drastically affect our operating budget. We are opposed to this reduction. The funds under Public Law 874 are as free from redtape and Federal supervision as any funds we receive. We count the children and receive the funds based on average costs of comparable school districts. It is reported that Public Law 874 funds can be replaced by money received under the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Public Law 89–10. This is not entirely true. Some school districts who may be receiving 874 funds may not receive 89–10 funds. Public Law 874 funds assist the school district with the operational costs created by students whose parents work on Federal property. Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds should be used to develop an educational program for educationally deprived children. These programs should be over and above those the district usually would finance. Assuming that economy is the prime reason for the proposed reductions we would rather have Elementary and Secondary Education Act reduced and leave 874 intact.

While we are on the subject of reduction of schools funds may we direct your attention to the proposed cuts in the school lunch program. We, and many other school districts, are experiencing a real financial problem in the operation of our school lunch programs this year due to the reduction of USDA commodities to our districts. Unless we can obtain an increase in these commodities we will have to increase our lunch costs to the student next school year. This will eliminate those who really need the hot lunch service and place additional hardship on the lunch program. We have to feed as many students as possible now in order to get the volume of participation necessary to pay expenses. If the commodity program is further reduced, the special milk program practically eliminated, and the funds for the regular school lunch program reduced, we would have to discontinue the sponsorship of the program and request the students bring lunch from home. This would indeed be unfortunate for the welfare of children, if this were to happen.

We would appreciate anything you can do to work for inclusion of the full appropriation for both programs during this session of Congress. Feel free to contact me, if you need any further information.

Sincerely yours,

R. Laverne Marcum,
Superintendent.

School District No. 59,
Firth, Idaho, February 28, 1966.

Senator Frank Church,
Senator From Idaho,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Church: Please continue to extend yourself in full support of Public Law 874 as the law currently reads. The amendment would stifle our budget. This program is vital to the schools of Idaho. We must kill the amendment.

Sincerely,

Deto Harada.

School District No. 59,
Firth, Idaho, March 2, 1966.

Senator Frank Church,
Senator From Idaho,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Church: We need to keep Public Law 874. The proposed amendment would have serious effect upon the schools of Idaho.

Please continue to extend your efforts in behalf of the present law.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

L. Dagby Hendricks.

School District No. 59,
Firth, Idaho, February 28, 1966.

Senator Frank Church,
Senator From Idaho,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Church: My letter concerns Public Law 874 and the proposed amendments regarding decreased expenditures for schools affected by Federal activities. Should this amendment pass both Houses, the results will be serious to the federally affected schools within our State.

As you have pointed out on several occasions, two-thirds of Idaho's land is under Federal ownership. Therefore, our State is somewhat unique from other States. We are sorely in need of the funds derived from this program. We feel that it is the best money we received from our Federal programs. We can use this money where the local board deems advisable. We do not have the redtape that is involved with other programs.

In our school district we would lose $8,397, which would mean that we cannot increase our teaching staff to meet increased enrollment. I am certain that larger districts, realizing more serious Federal impaction, would be more seriously injured due to this amendment.

We appreciate your conscientious endeavor in attempting to retain Public Law 874 according to the current law. Thank you for every consideration extended in behalf of this program.

Sincerely,

Ellis L. Williams,
Superintendent.

American Falls Public Schools,
American Falls, Idaho, March 4, 1966.

Senator Frank Church,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

(Reference: Letter February 25, 1966 (Public Law 874 funds).)

Dear Senator Church: The 1965 fall survey of children eligible in the American Falls schools for Public Law 874 funds are enrolled from the following Federal properties:

Property:	*Number of children*
Michaud Flat irrigation project	53
Michaud Flat irrigation project office	10
Fort Hall Indian Reservation	67
Agricultural stabilization office	10
Soil conservation office	5
Total, all properties	145

The Michaud Flat irrigation project is Indian property being put under irrigation. Payment under Public Law 874 is in lieu of taxation for Indian property not on the tax rolls. Sixty-three children were enrolled in the American Falls schools in October whose parents were employed on the project producing farm crops. More land is going under cultivation this spring, as new land is reclaimed the number of school children will increase.

Sixty-seven Indian children are enrolled from the Bannock Creek area of the Fort Hall Reservation. None of this property is on the tax rolls.

Fifteen children whose parents are employed in the offices of the soil conservation and the agricultural stabilization office are enrolled in the American Falls schools. This building is not being taxed for school purposes.

A total of 145 children are in our schools for which we are eligible under the present Public Law 874. Our total enrollment, as of October 1, 1965, was 1,337 pupils including the 145 pupils above. Our total budget for the 1965–66 fiscal school was $693,260. Children eligible under Public Law 874 represent 10.85 percent of the total enrollment; 10.85 percent of the total budget would be $75,218.71. Our estimated payment from Public Law 874 funds is $30,014 or 39.9 percent of the actual cost of educating the 145 children. If the funds are further reduced, as proposed under the amendments to Public Law 874 in the fiscal year 1967 Budget to $5,274, we would receive 7.4 percent of the actual cost of educating those children presently eligible under Public Law 874.

Without an equal amount of funds from Public Law 874 it will be necessary for us to decrease our pressent teaching staff by several teachers or decrease other school services.

A copy of our estimated receipts and approved budget for the 1965–66 school year is enclosed.

If I can furnish additional material to you to help in avoiding possible cuts in Public Law 874 funds, please write to me.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM THOMAS,
Superintendent.

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 25,
Pocatello, Idaho, March 2, 1966.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: The news concerning the possible reduction of funds for Public Law 874 is very distressing. The loss of these funds would prove to be a staggering blow for the Pocatello schools. This money as noncategorical aid has gone into the general funds to hire teachers and to purchase supplies. Under the regulations of newer aid programs they cannot be used to substitute for Public Law 874 funds. If Public Law 874 funds are lost to the Pocatello schools, we will simply have to dismiss a specific number of teachers and distribute these students to already overcrowded classrooms. This would make little sense in view of the present overall educational objectives of the Congress.

I urge you to make every effort to see that this program is funded at its current level.

The loss of funds now received for the Federal milk program would make it necessary for our school district to abandon serving a hot meal to our students at noon. The milk subsidy and Federal commodities are necessary to keep the price of meals within the reach of most children. Your interest in this area would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

RULON M. ELLIS,
Superintendent.

SHELLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 60,
Shelley, Idaho, February 28, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: In our district we think Public Law 874 is one of the best Federal programs there is. When we receive the money we can use it according to the needs of our district in upgrading all of the instructional programs. The instructional cost per student is very low in our district and without 874 money we would have to reduce or cut out some areas of our instructional program.

Public Law 874 money has been a great asset to our school district. We think it should be continued at the present level or improved, not cut back. We can improve all areas of our instructional program with Public Law 874 money whereas some of the other Federal programs only allow us to upgrade certain departments in our curriculum.

Thanks for your interest in the school districts of Idaho.

Sincerely,

DONALD J. HOBBS,
Superintendent.

JOINT CLASS A SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 171,
Clearwater County, Idaho, March 4, 1966.

Mr. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator, State of Idaho, Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Thank you for your letter of February 25, 1966, relative to your support to reverse the proposed reduction in the impacted funds. Namely, Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. We appreciate your efforts in our behalf. It is a pleasure to assist in any manner possible.

Following, please read our budget figures or actual money received during the 1965–66 school year from Public Law 874 amounted to $36,509. M. & O. budget figure $761,635 which included only $15,000 for Public Law 874; thus, we got $16,509 more than we budgeted.

Our 1966–67 budget is not in final form this early; however, we anticipate it to be approximately the same, or perhaps a slight increase. In Public Law 874 we estimate that we will have a budget figure of approximately $30,000 for the 1966–67 school year. Estimated entitlement under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in the fiscal year 1967 budget will be reduced from the $30,000 down to $5,000 figure; thus, a loss of $25,000.

With our anticipated growth due to industrial development in the area, Dworshak Dam and new mill at Pierce, we will have to increase our faculty perhaps 10 members, costing $40,000 to $45,000 additional per year.

Actually, under Public Law 89–10 title I, we received $34,041.28 this year, with an estimate of $44,000 for the 1966–67 school year. As this money is in a sense a special grant and limited as to how it may be expended, it helps us very little directly in maintenance and operation functions as we cannot use it for salaries except to cut down class size. The total relationship between receiving and expending 89–10 title I money is somewhat distinctively different.

I would like to enlist your continued interest in opposing the curtailment in any respect to Public Law 815. We are badly in need of secondary buildings and must have money from Public Law 815 in conjunction with our bond money to adequately finance our building program. As the majority of our students are in the category of working on and living off, it is of primary concern this factor not be reduced or removed.

I trust this letter hasn't confused you.

Yours truly,

MICHAEL L. CASSETTO,
District Superintendent.

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO,
March 9, 1966.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Lakeland PTA protests cut in Federal aid to federally impacted areas and subsidized milk program.

FRANCES S. HEARD,
Chairman.

DUBOIS, IDAHO,
February 25, 1966.

FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Public Law 874 is very vital to school district 161. Public lands in Clark County appraised at $2 an acre is about $1½ million. The $15,000 to $18,000 we receive for federally connected students is a great financial assistance to the district. We would necessarily have to hold special levy elections if this fund was reduced or eliminated. The trustees would appreciate anything that you could do to retain this program.

DAVID ROSS,
Superintendent.

SOUTH BEND, IND.,
March 3, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Recent poll by Citizens National Committee for Higher Education of college presidents and trustees indicates 4,056 in favor and 401 against the Ribicoff-Dominick amendment for tuition tax credits. Parents need help. More scholarships can be provided. Please support this amendment.

O. C. CARMICHAEL, Jr.,
President, Citizens National Committee for Higher Education.

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 181,
Challis, Idaho, March 8, 1966.

Mr. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Thank you for your letter of February 25.

Should Public Law 874 funds be provided as requested in the President's budget message, this district would stand to lose not less than $10,000.

This figure is slightly more than we will receive this year under Public Law 89–10.

This figure is approximately 5 percent of our maintenance and operation budget.

It would appear that the gain from Public Law 89–10 would almost offset the loss of funds from Public Law 874.

This, of course, is not true since Public Law 89–10 must be used to expand the present educational program.

Since we have no other local source of revenue available to replace 874 funds (we are taxing the legal limits), it appears probable that the loss of 874 funds would also cause the loss of 89–10 funds, since we could not possibly maintain our present program.

Very truly yours,

IRVIN W. SPENCER,
Superintendent.

CASCADE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Cascade, Idaho, March 8, 1966.
Senator FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I received your letter concerning the proposed reduction in Public Law 874 and how the reduction would affect our school district. As you will see from the figures later in the letter any reduction would be a serious blow to our district. Of course, the method chosen to make the reduction is very important to us also. The loss of the (b) student, (live off, work on) would almost eliminate us from the Public Law 874 program. This coupled with the fact that our district is not eligible for title I funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would have a drastic effect on our program.

I am not sure how our program would be cut back but drastic cuts would have to be made. We therefore support wholeheartedly your stand to reverse the proposed reduction and commend you for your efforts. Our only hope is that many other Congressmen are as concerned as you and will not allow this reduction.

In the 1964–65 school year the Public Law 874 revenue to our district was $9,926 out of a total of $143,383.19. This constituted 6.9 percent of our total general fund income. This current school year we anticipate receiving $12,000 from Public Law 874 out of a total general fund income of $153,381 or 7.82 percent. As you can see the amounts are small but still constitute a significant part of our income. The loss of these funds would deal a crippling blow to our school.

Another fact that should be considered is that Public Law 874 provides a payment in lieu of taxes for these federally connected students whose parents employment is on tax exempt land. This tax exempt land constitutes about 92 percent of my school district. We are in dire need of some income to help educate the children that are here because of this Federal property.

Many are advocating that districts will not be hurt since they are going to get additional money through title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is not true in our case. We are not eligible for any title I moneys.

I hope this is the information you requested and that it will be of some value to you. I again would like to thank you for your efforts in working to reverse this reduction and wish you success.

Sincerely,
JERRY L. EVANS.

HAYDEN LAKE, IDAHO,
March 9, 1966.
Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: As a new resident of Idaho, with four children in the public school system, I am very concerned over the request of President Johnson to cut Federal aid to our schools.

It is vital to the future of our country, that each child be afforded the best education possible. Without Federal aid, Idaho schools will be unable to provide this, as you know. I urge you to do all that is possible to stop passage of this proposed bill.

Sincerely yours,
CAROLYN THIENES
Mrs. Earl Thienes.

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 304,
Kamiah, Idaho, March 8, 1965.
Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: The Joint School District 304 at Kamiah, Idaho, will suffer greatly if reductions are made in the Public Law 874 funds.

This little school district with 680 students and 30 teachers has one of the lowest assessed valuations in all north Idaho, due to the fact that, so much of the land in the district is on the nontaxable Nez Perce Indian Reservation.

The assessed valuation is $1,884,215 or $2,770.90 back of each child. Our R.S. F–1 Public Law 874 approved claim for this year 1965–66 is $30,246.

We have 187 3(B–1) and 3(B–2) federally connected pupils this year at $144.19 rate. Losing this money would take away $26,963.53 from our maintenance and operation budget forcing us to reduce our staff and curtail purchase of elementary and secondary consumables.

Under the Secondary and Elementary Education Act, we have received $13,199.68 for our disadvantaged youth. It is hard to understand how the Government could give us $13,199.68 in one hand and then say, "Here, give me back $26,199.68." What kind of game is this?

Add to our situation the fact that Kamiah has 154 students in a junior high school building condemned by the U.S. Department of Health, Idaho State Department of Education and Kamiah School District, plus an overflow of 200 students expected to move into our school system caused by construction of the Dworshak Dam, any day.

I should point out that title I funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act do not take the place of Federal money used for maintenance and operation. They are used in addition to supplement the budget. Even so, we would still lose $13,763.85.

Please continue your steadfast efforts to see that our Idaho youth in this poverty area do not suffer, as we cannot exist without this aid.

Yours truly,
Mr. DON BLAKELY,
Superintendent,
Kamiah Public Schools.

SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President I enthusiastically support this resolution. Throughout my State of South Dakota, school safety patrol service prevents tragic accidents and provides outstanding citizenship training to our youngsters.

In Sioux Falls, our largest city, patrols have been used by virtually every grade and junior high school for many years. There is no record of a youngster ever being struck by a car at a crossing covered by a patrol there.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article describing the school safety program in Sioux Falls be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAFETY PATROLS PROTECT STUDENTS IN ALL WEATHER

Before school bells ring each morning, members of the school safety patrol in Sioux Falls and other communities are at their posts helping younger children get to school safely, no matter how adverse the weather can be. And while others are on their way to play after school, patrol members remain on duty a few minutes for the sake of their fellow students.

Students of the patrol, sixth graders for the most part, work under the direction of teachers or principals acting as patrol supervisors. They are assisted, in Sioux Falls, by Police Sgt. Cecil Fisher, whose full-time assignment is child safety work.

Patrol members wear identifying orange or white Sam Browne belts and badges. This equipment, along with training manuals, record books, training films and other materials, is supplied by the South Dakota Auto Club. Sometimes the PTA, a business firm or other organization will provide bright, yellow raincoats for use in bad weather.

Patrols operate at intersections around schools and occasionally at more remote crossings. Their purpose is to teach and direct fellow students. They do not direct automobile traffic and have no authority to do so. Patrol members are trained to utilize natural gaps in traffic to insure safe crossings.

Each patrol member pledges to do his best to:

Report for duty on time.

Perform duties faithfully.

Strive to prevent accidents, always setting a good example.

Strive to earn the respect of fellow students.

THE BROOKLYN NAVY YARD—164 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE NATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on June 30, 1966, the Brooklyn Navy Yard is expected to be formally closed, bringing to an end a most auspicious 164-year history of achievements which have had a direct bearing on the Nation's naval power.

It is my hope that the entire New York congressional delegation, in cooperation with the city and State of New York and the United States, may bring about the development of this great property for civilian uses, for the benefit of the community and the Nation.

I invite the attention of Senators to two articles published in the Civil Service Leader edition of February 22, 1966. One deals with the Brooklyn Navy Yard's history as remembered by workers, and the other is a tribute to James Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, who led the fight to save the Navy Yard and later to obtain the maximum in fair treatment for the workers. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES DOLAN: DEDICATED TO FAIR AND DECENT TREATMENT OF BROOKLYN NAVY YARD AIDS

"It has a great past, but it has no future." With these words, it was reported, did Robert McNamara dismiss the subject of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, shortly after he announced its scheduled closing. The order to close the shipyard was made public on November 19, 1964, and is slated to be effective on June 30, 1966, a few short months from now.

Many events have taken place between the announcement date and the present time. The *Sandoval, Intrepid, Ogden,* and *Duluth,* all fighting ships of a fighting Navy, have been completed and sent to their places on the seas in the defense of this country. With unseemly haste much of the fine facilities of the Brooklyn Navy Yard have been ordered moved or destroyed. The hammerhead crane, the largest weight-handling structure in the port of New York, with a replacement value of over $2 million was sold for $6,000 and demolished for the junk value. The Navy yard with a record of 165 years of achievement was left to the control of individuals who seemed to step out of the pages of "The Caine Mutiny" or "Mr. Roberts."

But what has happened to the almost 10,000 men and women workers during this time? We can answer this question best by looking to James J. Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, president of Carpenters Local Union 2031 and now general representative of the Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America. Jim Dolan, as president of the council, represents all of the workers at the shipyard. For the past 2½ years he led the fight to save the Navy yard and later to obtain the maximum in fair and decent treatment for the workers. This was a task that required in many instances 16 hours a day, innumerable meetings, frequent trips to Washington and a dedication to his fellow workers that borders on the unbelievable. It might well be thought that the salary of president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council must be quite high. The reverse is true; the position does not carry a salary. As Jim said when asked, "My satisfaction is being able to help the devoted, hard-working people of the Brooklyn Navy Yard in any way possible, especially at this time when most of their fair-weather political friends are not to be found."

What has this 38-year-old father of six been able to accomplish during his time as representative of the yard workers? Prior to November 1964 he spearheaded a drive to keep the yard open that will long be remembered. The assistance of chambers of commerce, labor unions, fraternal, and business groups was obtained. Petitions numbering almost half a million were collected and forwarded to the President of the United States; street rallies attended by prominent political figures were held; a letter campaign was started; proposed legislation was submitted to our lawmakers; Madison Square Garden was packed with New Yorkers protesting the threats to the Navy yard; and a comprehensive program of public education was undertaken.

The President of the United States publicly acknowledged, at Albee Square in Brooklyn, having had the Brooklyn Navy Yard future repeatedly brought to his attention. Despite these efforts of Jim Dolan, and the many who joined him in the fight, the Secretary of Defense, Robert Strange McNamara, announced the intention of closing the yard that had served the Nation so well and so long.

On November 19, 1964, the civilian work force at the Navy yard totaled 9,625. The average worker's age was 46 with 18 years of service at the yard. To this group, whose only mistake was that of choosing a career with the Federal civil service, the closure announcement was a thundercap of doom. With their shipbuilding skills not required in the New York area and with family ties that in many cases prevented moving, they felt they were destined for the industrial scrap heap. However, at no point in the ensuing months did their dedication to duty falter. They continued to perform their work on ships in the same high-quality manner that had long ago earned the "Can Do" name for the shipyard. Commendation after commendation was received by the yard for top-notch work, performed on time.

TOP WORKMANSHIP

While the shipyard commander freely predicted an inability to produce work, the faithful men and women continued to turn out top quality workmanship. All this, while they were "working on their own coffin." When this work was finished, their jobs were through. Many believe that this sterling performance was in no small part due to the leadership of Jim Dolan and the fact that the workers knew that he was there to help them. During this time an outplacement program was established and Dolan was successful in tempering certain aspects of it that would have worked extreme hardship on the workers. He was also able to have layoffs delayed until they were required by lack of work. He continued meeting with legislators and assisted directly and indirectly in obtaining the passage of laws that provided for improvement of both retirement benefits and severance pay.

On September 16, 1965, at a testimonial dinner, Borough President Abe Stark of Brooklyn presented a citation to Jim Dolan in recognition of his efforts "not only in behalf of the 10,000 men and women * * * at the shipyard * * * but also in behalf of the people of the Borough of Brooklyn." The testimonial dinner was attended by numerous prominent labor representatives, chamber of commerce officials, and most important to Jim, many of the workers whose interests he has so well represented.

Since that date many of the workers have moved on to other jobs, some in other sections of the country, others have retired, and one of his worker friends gave his life while working on the U.S.S. *Intrepid* at the Navy yard. With the last ship, the U.S.S. *Duluth*, gone from the once-proud Brooklyn Navy yard the remaining workers are engaged in dismantling or packing machinery and equipment for shipping to other locations or scrapping. The former admiral in charge of the yard has been removed, a new admiral assigned and it is hoped a final phase of decent treatment for the remaining workers has commenced.

Thus the curtain slowly falls on the Brooklyn Navy Yard; the yard that has built and repaired the finest fighting ships of the U.S. Navy. The shipbuilding tradition that extended back to the time of Washington, Jefferson, and Adams is now to be broken. Dolan has said hopefully, "May the time never come when American lives are lost because of the Navy yard that no longer exists but whose ships are vitally needed."

As for Jim Dolan, he will continue to represent and fight for fairness for his workers until the last man leaves and the gates are slowly swung shut.

NAVY YARD'S HISTORY IS REMEMBERED BY WORKERS

(By Mike Klion)

The nostalgic past comes up and meets you in the face as you walk through the gate at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. You remember the 164-year history of this place and it makes you wonder why, after being the backbone of America's naval power, the yard was closed.

Walking through the Brooklyn Navy Yard today is like being in a deserted ghost town of the Old West. Where there once was activity and noise there is now only the deafening roar of silence and desertion.

The drydocks that saw so many of this Nation's greatest warships built and repaired now stand empty.

The administration building where the upper floors once hummed with active people working are now almost bare.

Railroad sidings that once held material of war in boxcar after boxcar now stand rusting and the few railroad cars that are left are there to carry away the salvaged remains of the 219-acre facility.

WAR BASIS

Once over 70,000 men and women worked around the clock to help construct the greatest naval war fleet that the world has ever seen. They also repaired those war machines, 5,000 of them in World War II, and when they couldn't repair them, they made them over. Now where these 70,000 people worked and crowded this place, there are less than 3,000 who, like hermits, are rarely seen. These remaining few are nailing the coffin closed.

You talk to some of these men and they still can hear the war activity going on. That sound will never leave them.

These people know that their job ends June 30. Yet, they don't know why. "If only someone would tell why we were closed, it might make things a little easier for us," one shipworker said.

Another employee of the yard who has been there since the height of the war said, "McNamara has changed the reason so often that I wonder what the real reason might be."

There are those who come back from the Philadelphia Navy Yard, just to visit. They tell of the conditions there that make it almost impossible to run an efficient facility and they too wonder.

One former Brooklynite told of a question that was asked in Philadelphia. He said that a production supervisor asked for a breakdown on the number of men who were working on a particular ship and the number of men in each area that were on vacation or had taken some other leave. The question couldn't be answered. When told that information of that kind was always available in Brooklyn, the supervisor said "yeah, that's why you were closed."

The shipworker said that if the reason for closure was efficiency then somebody overlooked at least that problem in Philadelphia.

It is important to note that the men are now resigned to the idea that their jobs are ending here in New York. They don't talk anymore about a longer phase-out or keeping the yard open. They now talk about the reasons and the lack of good ones for the closure. Most of them know where they will be going from New York. Others are aware that they will have to find some other kind of work.

You walk back into the administration building and go to the 13th floor which houses among other things, the production department.

You enter a room that at one time had hundreds of people planning and analyzing production procedures. All that remains now is vast emptiness.

AL GRAHAM

In an office near the end of this room sits the administrative officer of the production department. He has been at the yard for over 25 years.

Al Graham has seen the finest years of the yard and he has to also see its last years. On a board behind his desk is a placard which states "Save the Brooklyn Navy Yard."

Graham said that once he wished he could get caught up on his work. "My desk was hard to find under the paperwork. Now, I am caught up, and you know, I wish I wasn't."

The final chapter is being written today at the yard. The few remaining shipworkers are now doing a job that is usually left for funeral directors. They are burying the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 3584.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair states that under the previous agreement there is a 2-hour limitation on debate on the bill now pending, 1 hour under the control of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and 1 hour under the control of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and 30 minutes on each amendment divided between the mover and the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the unanimous consent agreement, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may be allowed to proceed for 13 minutes apart from the consent order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? There being no objection, the Senator from Illinois is recognized.

HIGH PROTEIN FISH CONCENTRATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I want to speak today about fish flour, or what is now euphemistically called high protein fish concentrate. This is the story of how one agency of the Government, the Bureau of Fisheries, is spending $1.8 million to duplicate an existing product in order to get around and overcome a stupid and idiotic ruling of another agency of the Government; namely, the Food and Drug Administration. It is also the story of how, in the process, an agency of the Government, and members of an ad hoc committee of the National Science Foundation, failed to give credit to the innovator and developer of a process which a Government agency duplicated. They have, by this failure, come very close to practicing "scientific plagiarism," that is, taking credit for another person's work.

For many years now I have been aware of and interested in a high protein fish concentrate, popularly termed "fish flour," which can be produced inexpensively and hygienically and which could meet the protein deficiencies in the diet of hundreds of millions of peoples throughout the world—particularly those living in the tropics.

Due to the lack of refrigeration, fish, meat, and milk spoil quickly in the heat of the tropics and, as a result, hundreds of millions of people in these areas suffer from a serious nutritional deficiency. There are also millions in our own country who have a similar lack.

PRODUCT DEVELOPED LONG AGO

One of my constituents, Mr. Ezra Levin, of Champaign, a Ph. D. in Nutritional Chemistry and president of the VioBin Corporation, developed a process well over 15 years ago at his plant in Monticello, Ill., which used the whole fish and produced a product that was completely sanitary and hygienic.

I have a small quantity of this powder in my hand and I have larger quantities here with me.

This "fish flour" was approximately 85 percent protein and large quantities could be produced for from 12 to 15 cents per pound, depending on whether the fish taste was retained or eliminated. In other words, for half a cent, one could get as much protein from this powder as from a dollar's worth of beefsteak.

Mr. Levin gave large quantities of this concentrate to children's clinics in Mexico and Peru and the results were found to be extremely beneficial.

After investigating the matter and trying out both varieties, I came to the conclusion that this was one of the best ways of meeting the nutritional deficiencies of the world and of our own country. The seas and many of our lakes abound with fish nearly all of which could be used in making the fish concentrate.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad that I came to the floor of the Senate at this time to hear the speech of the senior Senator from Illinois about fish protein concentrate, a subject in which he has been deeply interested for many years and one in which he has been the leader.

It now appears very likely, as the Senator has suggested, that the Food and Drug Administration will at long last approve fish protein concentrate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We hope. It is not yet certain.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is not yet certain. There has been no official word. It is really only hope so far.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. But if this clearance is finally given by the Food and Drug Administration, the Senator is exactly correct in saying that it will be a development of utmost importance.

The millions of people in undeveloped and underdeveloped lands eat too much starch. They do not have enough protien to be healthy. Now, this concentrate, which we believe can be produced cheaply, can be mixed, for example, with rice or whatever the chief food may be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. It may be mixed with rice, or mixed with bread or tortillas.

Mr. BARTLETT. This is important because sometimes protein is available in a form foreign to the people of the particular country and they will not adopt new eating habits. I have been told that some people would rather starve than alter their dietary habits. The process would be a way to give them this concentrate.

Would the Senator agree with me that in addition to performing this humanitarian service, it would be perhaps the greatest boost to the American fishing industry that has ever been had?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is true. We do not utilize products of the sea to any degree that we should, and this would create a big market for fish and increased income for the fishing industry.

Mr. BARTLETT. We have at this time huge Japanese and Russian fleets off the coasts of Alaska, Washington, and Oregon, taking the bottom fish that we do not take. If we did take the fish, we might utilize it in the manufacture of this concentrate, when and if the Food and Drug Administration approved. We can organize fishing fleets to go out and profitably take these bottom fish and build up the American fishing industry. We can give this needed protein to millions elsewhere, and establish—which we should have had before—the fishing rights off of our coasts.

I applaud the Senator from Illinois for his wonderful work in this field.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Alaska, who has been a strong supporter of this program.

As a small recognition of his service I give to him now a package of fish flour which he can use to feed some of his constituents.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator. As a matter of fact, I am proceeding from here to the dining room. I do not intend to transfer this to any of my constituents. I am going to sprinkle it on my lunch almost immediately.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Good.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, would the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The last time that I was in Peru I went through the laboratory to which the Senator from Illinois has just referred. I talked to the director of the laboratory and there is no question that the Senator is right in regard to the use of this protein, with not only children but also adults in Peru.

I examined the head of the laboratory concerning the relationship of the fish flour to diet and to health. He told me that it meets all the tests and that there is no reason at all for its not being made available for human consumption.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon. His testimony is very strong.

FDA OBSTRUCTION

Somehow it seemed impossible to get the program underway. What then was the reason for hindering the processing and sale of this fish flour? I soon found out that the obstacle was the Food and Drug Administration under its then Chief, Mr. George P. Larrick.

After much ado about nothing we succeeded in getting the FDA to examine the concentrate with the following results: The FDA admitted that the concentrate was absolutely pure. The FDA admitted that it was highly nutritious. The FDA admitted that it could be produced cheaply. But the FDA refused to approve fish flour for sale in the United States because they said it would raise unesthetic thoughts in the minds of consumers.

The fact that it was made from the whole fish, using the head and internal organs, was enough to make Mr. Larrick turn his thumbs down on the preparation. He admitted that the six to eight washes in water and six to eight washes in alcohol, plus the thorough cooking of it, made the powder completely sanitary, but he still said that people would think of the origin of the white or brown powder and would be repulsed.

FDA APPROVES RATTLESNAKE, BEES, AND GRASSHOPPERS

It was in vain that I pointed out the number of unesthetic products approved for consumption by the FDA. Delicacies, such as candied ants, bees, and grasshoppers, canned rattlesnake, and snails, and such items as sardines and clams are gourmet delights in every corner of the world.

I have on my desk a menagerie which the Food and Drug Administration has certified as suitable for human consumption: candied ants, caterpillars, bees, and grasshoppers. They raise some unesthetic thoughts in my own mind, but the Food and Drug Administration has approved them.

Here is a genuine diamondback rattlesnake, with supreme sauce. That fills my mind with terror; but the Food and Drug Administration has approved it.

Here is green turtle meat with water and salt added. I do not like the esthetics of that, but the Food and Drug Administration has approved it.

Here is a can of grasshoppers. The Food and Drug Administration approves grasshoppers as a dietary delicacy and perfectly proper. It says they do not raise any unesthetic thoughts.

Here are some fried ants, which the Food and Drug Administration approves.

Here is part of an octopus spiced with vegetables. Mr. President, are your thoughts so esthetic when you think of this?

Here are whole fish, internal organs and all, that have been approved. They come from Japan.

Also, here are sardines—which are the whole fish.

Here are snails that have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration—the whole snail, internal organs and all.

FDA NO AUTHORITY ON ESTHETICS

I also pointed out that it was not the function of the Food and Drug Administration to pass on alleged esthetics, upon which it was certainly not an authority, but merely whether a given preparation was beneficial and sanitary.

Then, Mr. Larrick made a slight concession. He said that "fish flour" could not be used in the United States but could be exported to the underdeveloped countries. Mr. Levin wanted to give the process without charge to Latin American countries, but he knew if this were done, the Communists would say that the United States was unloading upon the peoples of the tropics a product which our Government had declared to be unfit for human consumption at home. Mr. Larrick had, therefore, very cleverly checkmated the use of this new product.

In the meantime, however, the dispute which we were waging with the Food and Drug Administration aroused the interest of the fishing industry and of Senators from fishing States, as well as the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Stewart Udall. Finally, Secretary Udall asked the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to start an intensive research effort to develop methods to manufacture high protein fish concentrate. They did this as a method of getting around the senseless decision of the Food and Drug Administration.

I do not criticize Secretary Udall for his effort, but Mr. Levin already had such a process which was workable.

METHOD OF PRODUCTION DUPLICATED

The Department has already spent $1.47 million and another $465,000 has been requested. Thus, more than $1.8 million is now being spent essentially to duplicate a process already in existence. I do not blame the Bureau of Fisheries or the Department of the Interior for this because of the great importance of the issue both to the fishing industry and, especially, to the hungry people all over the world. They did it because of the inane and ridiculous ruling of the FDA.

After modeling the plant and the processing upon that of Mr. Levin's, and after spending approximately $1,800,000, the Bureau of Fisheries presented its findings and its product to an ad hoc Advisory Committee on Marine Protein Concentrate set up by the National Science Foundation. To the surprise of no one, the National Academy of Sciences announced that the product was completely sanitary and hygienic, cheap, and highly nutritious. In their own words, they declared the fish protein concentrate to be "safe, nutritious, wholesome, and fit for human consumption." They also indicated that the Government should continue producing the product. But the FDA, following the policy of Mr. Larrick, said that it had not yet yielded or changed its position in the slightest.

FAIL TO GIVE CREDIT

This brings us up to the present. Secretary Udall filed a petition with the Food and Drug Administration asking that the Bureau of Fisheries' process be approved for human consumption. While I am pleased at this action by the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Fisheries, I am dismayed that the work of Ezra Levin, discoverer and early pioneer in this field, has been shunted aside with not a word of credit for effort or consultation or experience. It is my hope that the new Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. James Goddard, who has started off well—I commend him for his start—may reverse Mr. Larrick's erroneous decision and permit both Mr. Levin's fish concentrate and that of the Bureau of Fisheries to be produced and sold.

It may well be that Mr. Levin's product is, in fact, superior to the Bureau of Fisheries' high protein concentrate because Mr. Levin's process is less expensive and uses a wider variety of fish. This is not a field which should be made a Government monopoly, although it may well be that Government production should continue for some time until the product is well established. But there is no reason why Mr. Levin's plant and process should be barred from the field. There is room for both.

PROPOSED LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAM

When I was in Mexico in December and January, I proposed that the United States, Mexico, and Peru join in a program to produce and distribute large quantities of this fish concentrate to help meet nutritional deficiencies in Latin America. This proposal met with a great deal of approval and is, I believe, thoroughly practical. It can also be used in Asia and Africa and could be one of the main features of our food-for-peace program. It also has a role in the United States in helping to overcome the lack of proteins in low-income families.

With a growing population crisis throughout the world and the inability of countries to meet the basic nutritional necessities of daily diets, we should act on this proposal as soon as possible. It is important to remember that by helping the undernourished of the world, we will also be helping millions of undernourished Americans.

As the Senator from Alaska has said, it will help the American fishing industry, too. I hope, therefore, that we may get appropriate action from the Food and Drug Administration which is already showing signs of shaking off some of the bad practices of the old order.

I hope that Mr. Levin will submit requests for the approval of his process to the Food and Drug Administration, and I hope that the Food and Drug Administration will cease its past destructive policy which has cost the people of the world an enormous amount in health during recent years.

A very good account of some of the recent developments is given by the reliable and well-known reporter, William McGaffin, in the Chicago Daily News for March 4, 1966. I ask unanimous consent that his article may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fish Flour Tests Smell a Bit Fishy

(By William McGaffin)

Washington.—George P. Larrick, who used to be Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, ate fish flour once without realizing it.

It was baked into a roll which he was served at a luncheon given by Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois. Since it was tasteless and odorless, Larrick did not know he had eaten it until Douglas told him afterward.

The fish flour had been manufactured by Ezra Levin, an Illinois scientist and businessman, in his plant at Monticello. Because it had been recognized that the high protein content of fish flour would be extremely useful in combating malnutrition in underdeveloped countries, Douglas was trying to change Larrick's mind about it.

The Commissioner did not suffer any ill effects after eating the fish flour roll. He still continued, however, to refuse to approve it for human consumption in the United States on the grounds that it was not "esthetic."

He objected that it was "filthy" because Levin ground up the whole fish—intestines, tail, head and all—to make the flour. He refused to be convinced of its cleanliness, even though Levin put the flour through a purifying process.

Larrick suggested that the flour be made with only part of the fish, after the entrails, etc., had been thrown away. Levin explained this would make it too expensive and would prevent the mass production of it.

Unless Larrick could be persuaded to approve it, the United States did not feel that it could promote the use of fish flour in other countries.

Larrick could not stop the flour from being exported. But the United States knew that if it did so, it would be giving the Communists a readymade issue to exploit. They would be able to charge that the U.S. Government was trying to get foreigners to eat something which was not considered fit for Americans.

It was 5 years ago that Larrick turned thumbs down on Ezra Levin's fish flour, despite the pleas of DOUGLAS, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall and others. Levin, incidentally, had offered to give up any profits connected with manufacture of the flour.

This week, Udall filed a petition seeking the approval of Dr. James Goddard, Larrick's successor, for a fish flour process developed by Interior's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. A committee of scientists named by the National Academy of Sciences has pronounced the Government-made "fish protein concentrate," as it is called now, "safe, nutritious, wholesome, and fit for human consumption."

But if it is so good, why does the Government need to get the FDA approval that it is all right for Americans to eat? For the reason that this "new" Government product, like Levin's, is made by grinding up the whole fish, entrails and all. And it is done for the same reason—because it is the only economical way it can be produced.

Officials of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries have acknowledged that they spent $1,700,000 over the last 4 years on the project.

"Why in heavens name," they were asked, "did you spend all this money to develop fish flour when Levin had already done it?"

They acknowledged that they had "nothing against his process." Their explanation was that "there seemed to be an impasse between FDA and Levin." They decided, they said, that unless additional research were done "it would be difficult to convince FDA that fish flour is acceptable."

It apparently did not occur to them that there might have been a less costly way of solving this problem.

The Government's expensive and unnecessary plunge has raised questions of vital interest to those taxpayers who are concerned about the wisdom with which Washington spends the money it collects from them.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill before us today amends the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines. It passed the House of Representatives on June 1, 1965, by a vote of 335 to 43.

The purpose of H.R. 3584 is to extend the mandatory safety provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to mines regularly employing less than 15 men underground, which are now exempt from such requirements. Further, it strengthens certain other provisions of the act in order to increase the protection of lives and property in all underground coal mines to the maximum extent feasible through legislation.

The purpose, then, of this legislation is to increase the safety for persons employed in underground mines. The need for this legislation is evident from an examination of fatality statistics in underground coal mines. The preliminary data on coal mines for the calendar year 1965 reveal 255 fatalities. This includes 63 underground fatalities in title I mines—that is, those employing less than 15 persons—and 158 underground fatalities at title II mines—that is, those mines employing 15 or more persons underground. In addition, nonfatal injuries in 1963 totaled 1,769 for title I mines and 6,807 for title II mines.

While this legislation was under consideration in the House and Senate during 1965 and 1966, 4 underground disasters occurred at coal mines, killing 24 men. Two of the disasters occurred at title I mines, killing 8 men, and 2 at title II mines, killing 16 men. One of these disasters occurred as recent as 12 days ago at Hesperus, Colo. There a foreman and two miners were killed as a result of an explosion in a gassy title I mine which normally employed four persons.

I do not represent that this legislation will prevent all such disasters. However, I do say that the number of fatalities and injuries in this industry establish the hazardous nature of employment in underground coal mines. The committee believes that these amendments to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act will give greater protection to miners by extending the safety provisions of the act to all underground coal miners, by strengthening enforcement orders upon a finding of serious violations of safety requirements and by enlargement and intensification of coal mine safety educational programs in cooperation with the States.

Hearings were held by the Senate Subcommittee on Labor June 14 and 21, 1965. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the full committee, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], chairman of the subcommittee, asked me to serve as chairman of the hearings because of my past work on mine safety legislation.

At the hearing, the committee heard testimony from the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines in support of this legislation. Thereafter, the bill was reported to the full committee on September 29. After thorough and extensive discussion by the committee, including consideration of amendment 371 offered by Senator COOPER, H.R. 3584 was ordered reported without amendment.

We have the report of the committee before us. We have the special minority views of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], which include a statement by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

There is no question about the fact that Senator COOPER has given much effort to the consideration of the bill. He does not share the view of the subcommittee in reporting the bill, but I would be less than appreciative—and I use the word "appreciative" advisedly—if I did not express my thanks to the Senator from Kentucky for his appearances before the subcommittee. He not only appeared before the subcommittee at the time of the committee hearings, but I thought that, in fairness to the Senator, he deserved further consideration, which the subcommittee gave him. The subcommittee approved, by recommendation, that Senator COOPER be called before us again for a rather lengthy executive session when we were marking up the bill; and he presented again in detail the point of view he has held during his many years in the Senate whenever the matter of mine safety legislation has been before us.

Several members of the administration were also requested to attend the markup, to review with us again the administration's position on the bill, as we considered again the points of view presented by Senator COOPER. They were not in agreement with the Senator's position as a matter of policy.

At the close of the sessions with Senator COOPER and the administration witnesses, the committee decided to recommend the bill without amendment. Senator COOPER—and he can speak for himself shortly—with his usual courtesy, has advised the chairman this morning that he proposes to offer at least one amendment, and has sought the chairman's approval of that amendment.

I cannot approve the Senator's proposed amendment. I told him that I would check into the matter, and I did check with the administration. The administration has asked me to urge the Senate to pass the bill without amendment. The administration favors the bill without amendment. The committee favors the bill without amendment. I think the bill would accomplish its purposes better without amendment. I shall have something to say when the Senator presents his amendment in regard to a provision of the bill, section 6—which will be found on page 12 of the committee report—which I think in effect provides for the consideration to which the small mines are entitled, without in any way removing them from the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Mines.

But I think it is owed to Senator COOPER, at the very beginning of this debate, to let him know that the floor manager of the bill will oppose amendments, and urge that it be passed without amendment; and that the manager has the backing of the administration in making that recommendation to the Senate.

At this time I wish to acknowledge the valuable assistance rendered by the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. In particular, the expertise of Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, who represent States with large coal production, was extremely helpful. Senator CLARK has been a pioneer in this legislation as far back as 1958 when the Senate considered legislation to repeal the title I exemption from the provisions of the act.

Senator RANDOLPH's association with this legislation dates back to his service in the House of Representatives. At that time he served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Coal of the Committee on Mines and Mining. Hearings were held by Senator RANDOLPH involving mine safety proposals.

In fact, Senator RANDOLPH is on the floor, though Senator CLARK is necessarily absent because of Senate business elsewhere at the moment. But because I feel it is due the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I wish the RECORD to show that we more or less turned Senator RANDOLPH and Senator CLARK into defense witnesses, so to speak, and subjected them to thorough cross-examination in regard to the bill and the amendments offered by Senator COOPER. Although they were members of the committee, I think what we did was only fair, and I am sure Senator RANDOLPH would be the first to so testify. We took the position that we would put the burden of proof on them, and unless they could satisfy us that we should vote against the Cooper amendments, the bill would be headed for amendment. I wish to say that they convinced us by a preponderance of the argument and the evidence, and so we have brought the bill to the floor without amendment.

Hearings were held in 1958 and 1959 and a bill was reported in each of those years. In the 86th Congress, the Senate passed legislation by a vote of 80 to 4 which, among other things, removed the title I exemption from the safety provisions of the act. In 1963, the Congress was made aware of the need for this legislation in a report issued by the Task Force on Coal Mine Safety which had been appointed by President Kennedy. This report recommended the repeal of the title I mine exemption as an essential safety measure.

The major provisions of the bill are as follows:

First. As previously stated, the exemption of coal mines regularly employing no more than 14 persons underground from the provisions of the act, is repealed.

Second. An additional provision in section 203 of the act provides that where a violation of the safety requirements of section 209 of the act is found, not involving imminent danger but of a nature that could significantly and substantially contribute to a disaster-type accident, and if such violation was caused by an unwarrantable failure of the operator to comply, a reasonable time for abatement of such violation shall be fixed. There is further provision for reinspection within 90 days, which is in addition to any reinspection required to ascertain whether the violation has been abated. If upon reinspection the operator has failed to comply because of his lack of due diligence or reasonable care, a withdrawal order shall issue. This type of withdrawal order is available in cases of imminent danger of a disaster-type accident presently provided in the act, and the appeal provisions to the Director of the Bureau of Mines, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, and the Federal appellate courts, are made available.

Third. The Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review is reconstituted with five members instead of three, giving representatives of workers and operators to the newly covered title I mines. Also, the Board is required at the request of the operator to hold hearings at the county seat of the county where the mine involved is located.

Fourth. The Director is required to coordinate safety enforcement between the State and Federal Governments.

Fifth. Five hundred thousand dollars is authorized for grants to the States to enlarge and intensify coal mine safety educational programs.

Sixth. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to conduct a study into the adequacy of present Federal safety requirements and report to the Congress within 1 year on the results.

Seventh. The Secretary is also directed to convene conferences to familiarize persons affected by this bill to insure that all persons understand its provisions.

The provisions of this bill have been carefully designed to advance the safety of those persons who must earn their livelihood in one of the Nation's most hazardous industries, the underground mining of coal. At the same time, we attempt to attain this goal with a minimum burden upon those engaged in the coal mining industry and to augment, rather than duplicate, State efforts in this field.

The safety of the men employed in coal mines, the security of their employment, and the economic well-being of the industry have been thoroughly considered and the conclusions have been adopted in H.R. 3584.

Mr. President, I make two additional points in this presentation of my case in chief.

I wish to point out that many of the provisions of the Federal Mine Safety Act will not, in practice, apply to these small mines, because some of the small mines are not gassy. The provisions of the law seek to give protection to life in small mines as well as large mines, particularly directed to the handling of so-called conditions of gas in the mines.

Second, the law does not apply to a good many of the small mines because of the great differences in the equipment that is required in the small mine in comparison with the large mine. Therefore, only where there is a mine that meets the equipment requirement standards will we find the law applied.

Mr. President, I think that when we weigh all the evidence involved, the bill merits the approval of the Senate, and I urge its passage.

I wish to say also that section 6, to me at least, is a very important section. It will not meet the satisfaction of the Senator from Kentucky. It is somewhat different from an amendment which I, at an earlier date, when the bill was before the Senate, did go along with. I went along with the Cooper amendment the last time the Senate passed legislation on this subject. But because I went along with it then does no bind me to go along with it now, in view of the record we have now, compared with the one then. I believe that section 6 gives reasonable administrative assurance to both Congress and the owners of the mine that if the application of the bill for the next year shows that there are some needed changes in it, the report called for by section 6 will place a clear duty upon Congress, then, to adopt the changes.

Section 6 reads:

> SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special study to determine the sufficiency of the present safety requirements of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, with particular emphasis upon the requirements relative to roof support, ventilation, and electrical equipment. The Secretary of the Interior shall make a report to the Congress on the results of such study, together with his recommendations, within one year after the enactment of this Act.

The provisions of the bill will be in operation for that year. I have no doubt that as a result of that experience, we can make any changes which the Secretary of the Interior should decide needed to be made, but it would be a mistake to proceed on the assumption that the changes will be needed.

I do not believe that we could possibly justify postponing the application of the provisions of the bill for a year while that study is being made; because if the law, as amended, during that year would save just one human life, we could not possibly justify any postponement. There is a danger that lives will be lost. The record is clear on that. I am not arguing that the law will save all lives, but I am arguing, on the basis of the record of the Federal Bureau of Mines, that these amendments are necessary in order to increase the possibility of saving lives.

I believe that the code is a good legislative insurance policy.

I ask to have it passed today, because within 1 year we will have the study made by the Secretary of the Interior, and if needed changes can be supported by him at that time, we can proceed with legislation then.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the 15 minutes allotted to me.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator just referred to the code being a good insurance provision, and I should like to make clear what I believe the committee report brings out about codes.

I note on page 5 of the committee report that the committee has referred to:

> The fear that title II would force small mines out of business is predicated largely on the misconception that such mines would be required to comply with the provisions of the Federal mine safety codes, as distinguished from the act.

The Senator was not referring to those codes, was he?

Mr. MORSE. No. I am referring, really, to the law.

Mr. MILLER. Referring to the law.

Mr. MORSE. I am referring to the law.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand the committee report, the bill before us would—so far as the small mines are concerned—merely impose a certain requirement with regard to safety and nothing else; is that not correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated, but first let me correct the amendment, as follows: First sentence, last paragraph, strike "(1)" and capitalize the t of "the."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment, as corrected, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] proposes an amendment. Beginning with line 5, page 1, to strike out all to and including line 7, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of section 201 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 693; 30 U.S.C. 471(b)) is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(b) The provisions of this title shall apply to all mines, except that in the application of such provisions to mines in which no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground—
>
> "The Director shall, by regulation established after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, modify or make inapplicable any provision, or part thereof, of section 209 to any mine or class of mines when he finds that such provision or part thereof does not substantially contribute to the safety of the men working in such mines covered by such regulations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. COOPER. Ten minutes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the Senator in charge of the bill, for his usual kindness in speaking of the efforts I have made with him in past years, to bring to the Senate floor a mine safety bill which would be both applicable and fair to small mines which are classed as title I mines employing no more than 14 persons.

Mine safety legislation has been under consideration for 8 years. When a bill was first introduced in 1958, to remove the exemption of the Mine Safety Act applying to title I mines and making all provisions of the act applicable to small mines, I was serving on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I opposed the bill as being unfair. Extensive hearings were held. After hearings, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare agreed with me. It did not accept the insistent argument of the Bureau of Mines that all requirements of the act were applicable to small mines. The committee reported a bill which directed the Bureau of Mines to conduct hearings in coal mining States and report its findings to the Congress. It authorized the closing of title I mines in cases of imminent danger. The bill was not acted upon by the Congress, chiefly, I believe, because of the opposition of the Bureau of Mines. I assisted in writing the bill.

Eight years have passed, and I should like to say that if that bill had been enacted by Congress in 1958, a bill which required the Director of the Bureau of Mines to hold hearings to provide Congress with the proper statistical information as to injuries and fatalities in all classes of mines, a bill which would have required the Director to make a special study of safety conditions with particular reference to open roof falls, which are the primary source of injuries and fatalities, a bill to close mines in cases of imminent danger, I believe that information would now be available to us and we would know more accurately, whether the provisions which now relate to title II mines—large mines—chiefly those in section 209—are properly applicable to title I mines. This is what my amendment would now instruct the Bureau to do, while maintaining, at the same time, the authority to close mines in cases of imminent danger or when conditions could contribute to imminent danger.

In 1959, after the Senate had failed to act upon the bill which had been reported in 1958, extensive hearings were again held under the leadership of the Senator from Oregon.

Again, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare did not adopt the position of the Bureau of Mines that section 209 of the act was wholly applicable to title I mines, and reported a safety bill which was passed by the Senate by a vote of 80 to 4.

I helped write and voted for that bill, a bill which would have provided effective measures to increase safety in small mines, and yet insured fair methods of review and appeal by small mine operators from unfair orders.

Again, for some reason, it never came to a vote in the House. I do not wish to charge anyone unfairly but it has always been my judgment that the Bureau of Mines, because it could not get all the legislation it wanted, because it could not take absolute control over these small mines, resisted the passage of these bills.

Now, 6 years later, after accidents, injuries, and fatalities, the Bureau of Mines is supporting in this bill, some provisions which were incorporated on the two preceding bills.

In this bill are some measures which I advocated in 1958, 1959, and 1960, which were then opposed by the Bureau of Mines. It is a vast improvement over the original proposal of the Bureau of Mines.

I know this bill was passed by the House by a large majority. It has been reported by the Senate committee. I assume it will pass here today. I oppose it, as turning total jurisdiction over to the Federal Government. My purpose today is to ask questions of the manager of the bill, to secure an interpretation of the bill.

I have submitted an amendment, an amendment which was written into the bill in 1960, an amendment which was then adopted by the Senate, to point up my position, one which has been maintained by the committee until this bill, that conditions in small mines differ from those in large mines and that all of the provisions which pertain to title II mines are not relevant to them.

I am interested in the bill for one reason, because my State is the third largest coal producing State in the Nation; but I am also interested in safety, as I have said in the Committee, and on the floor throughout the years.

But the question is whether all the provisions of section 209, are truly applicable to title I mines. If they are not and the provisions of section 209 are arbitrarily enforced by Federal inspectors, the effect would be of closing some small mines, not because they are unsafe, but because of the arbitrary application of these States by provisions which are not needed.

There are physical differences between the two types of mines—title I and title II. It is hard to describe the differences unless one has been in the mining country. I live on the edge of the eastern area of Kentucky. I have been in the mines, and have observed their operations.

After World War II it became necessary to mechanize the larger mines with efficient and expensive machinery. In these larger, highly mechanized mines, miners can produce 35 to 40 tons of coal a day in some instances. At least, the average is between 15 and 20 tons a day, as against 4 or 5 tons a day of pre-World War II days. The cost of installing such machinery, according to the Bureau of Mines, can run from half a million dollars to $10 million or even $30 million. According to the Bureau of Mines, an average of 67 miners are employed in these mines. Such an operation requires a large acreage of coal.

These mines called "drift" mines have entries going into the side of the hill, sometimes for miles, with rooms and airways. The mine area is honeycombed with workings. They are dangerous and require the type of inspections defined in section 209 of the act.

On the other hand small mines employ, on an average, five miners, and the area worked may be a few acres at the top of the hill. Testimony placed their average depth in the mountain at 1,500 feet, and they are not gassy.

My position has been that the Bureau of Mines, should be required to determine what provisions of section 209 are actually applicable to these small mines.

And for the interim, I have proposed true and known safety measures.

This year I introduced an amendment to give the Bureau of Mines power to withdraw miners from any mine where there are conditions of imminent danger.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **COOPER**. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

As is prescribed for large mines, and also to close any mine if any defect as detailed in section 209 contributed to imminent danger.

The State mine inspection agencies are on the ground week after week, and conditions other than those involving imminent danger would be better left with them as to safety determinations.

In 1963 officials of the Kentucky Bureau of Mines testified they had made thousands of inspections annually in Kentucky, more inspections than the Federal Bureau of Mines make annually in all of the States.

I may say to the Senator from Oregon that, my amendment formalizes what is implicitly noted is this bill—that there is a distinction in the two types of mines.

I point out that these amendments, which have been placed in these bills up to now, admit the distinction.

First, the bill recognizes the distinction because for the first time it provides that two members of the Coal Mine Safety Review Board shall represent mines with no more than 14 employees, one representing the miners and one representing the operators.

The bill further emphasizes the difference, because for the first time it provides that violations of section 209, before an order is issued, must be concurred in, either by a State inspector or by an independent inspector.

That is the provision we had in the bill 6 years ago. Now, finally, it is accepted by the Bureau of Mines.

The Senator has referred to section 6, requiring the Bureau of Mines to study safety conditions and make recommendations after the bill has passed. That provision in substance was in the bill 6 years ago, requiring the Bureau of Mines to study and to ascertain if the provisions of the act were applicable to title I mines.

My thesis has been from the beginning that greater safety in title I mines should be assumed; that these conditions should be provided for workers in small mines; but requirements which are not applicable to them should not be included in the bill, because if they are not applicable to safety and are used arbitrarily by Federal inspectors, they could have the effect of driving out of business many small mines, and thousands of miners out of work not only in my State but all over the Nation.

I should like to ask, if I may, a few questions of the distinguished manager of the bill.

There has been fear among the operators of small mines and mineworkers that the Federal Coal Mine Safety Code would be used by the inspector to determine whether there was a violation of section 209.

I wish to read from the report on the bill on H.R. 3584.

On page 5 of the report there appears the following statement of the committee:

> The fear that title II would force small mines out of business is predicated largely on the misconception that such mines would be required to comply with the provisions of the Federal mine safety codes, as distinguished from the act. The bill emphatically would not require title I mines to comply with the codes, but only with the limited number of safety provisions in the act. The codes are merely advisory and were issued as guides for improved coal mine health and safety. The codes have also been incorporated by reference in a number of collective bargaining agreements in the industry. However, the Federal inspectors are restricted in their enforcement authority to the provisions of title II, and these provisions alone would be enforcible in title I mines upon enactment of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All time of the Senator on the amendment has expired. Does the Senator wish to take time on the bill?

Mr. **COOPER**. Mr. President, I take 10 minutes of the time allotted for the bill.

> Moreover, the bill specifically requires the Secretary of the Interior, upon adoption of the bill, to indicate clearly and comprehensibly to the mine operators the exact nature of the enforcible provisions of the act, and this instruction will obviate any possible confusion which might exist between the codes and the act.

I ask this question: Does the manager of the bill, in interpreting the bill, concur in the statement made by the full committee in the report that the Federal Mine Safety Code, for those provisions which are not contained in section 209, could not be used by Federal inspectors in their inspection?

Mr. **MORSE**. Making legislative history on this bill, may I say to the Senator from Kentucky that the language he just read is the language of the manager of the bill?

If the Senator would permit me, I would like to get this in early because we are discussing safety in this colloquy, and the Senator in regard to his amendment talked about safety.

I want the RECORD to show the people of Kentucky, the Members of the Senate, and the people in all of the coal mine areas of this country that I testify here and now on the floor of the Senate that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has been just as concerned about the matter of safety and accidents, and deaths and injuries to coal miners, as any member of this committee. There is no question about the fact that the Senator from Kentucky seeks the same safety protection as the manager of the bill.

Our difference is not over whether or not dangerous mines should be permitted to continue to operate. The Senator from Kentucky is just as desirous as any of us in seeing that safety is imposed on these mines.

Our difference is over how best to accomplish the safety. That is what our difference is. I do not want anyone to entertain for a moment the notion that the Senator from Kentucky is advocating less safety than the senior Senator from Oregon. Our differences are over how best to accomplish safety. The committee believes we are doing it by this bill, to the extent it can be done, we believe, under legislation. That is why we ask that it be done without amendment.

The statement the Senator just read is an accurate reflection of the point of view of the manager, and those words are mine.

Mr. **COOPER**. I appreciate the Senator's response.

To go a step further, in the event of a closing or withdrawal order in a title I mine, based solely on violation of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Code, where its provisions were not spelled out in section 209, would the Senator says that would be a proper subject for review and appeal under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. **MORSE**. First, I wish to say there cannot be a closing of a mine unless there is a violation of section 209, but the repeal provision is spelled out with great clearness in the bill. It has to be held in the county seat of the county where the mine is located. There have to be two representatives of the small mine on the Board of Appeal.

I think that procedurally greater protection could not be given to the small mine than we have worked out in the bill.

Mr. **COOPER**. I know the procedures, but I would want to ask again, if it is not correct that in the event of an inspection, and a closure or withrdawal order, the order, whatever it is, should be based on the Federal Coal Mine Safety Code and not on the application of section 209, would it not be a proper subject, in the Senator's view, for review and appeal?

Mr. **MORSE**. I do not think that there is any doubt about it, but I ask the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to comment.

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. I thank my chairman. In response, in a supplementary way, because what the chairman has said is certainly correct, I go back for a moment and indicate we do not apply the code to the citing of a violation.

The code is only used for the purpose of inspection when the Federal Bureau of Mines is checking out a mine. But when it is the citation of a mine, this would not be done in any wise under the code but only under the provisions of the law, the act itself.

I think it important to emphasize this point again, Mr. Chairman, although it has already been brought out.

Mr. **MORSE**. I would like to supplement my statement if I may, and I will give the Senator whatever time he wants on my time.

Let us assume a hypothetical. Let us assume that they made the mistake in judgment of closing the mine on the basis of the application of the code. That would entitle immediate appeal. That would be an erroneous act on the part of the Administrator. There is no danger about the parties not being protected by any attempt to mistakenly apply the code rather than the law. It is the law that is applicable and not the code.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The other would be an illegal closing.

Mr. MORSE. It would be.

Mr. COOPER. It was clear that it was not intended for the Federal inspector to use any other guide toward inspection and toward issuance of their orders except section 209.

Mr. MORSE. As the manager of the bill I wish to say for future reference in the courts or anywhere else that it is the intent of this bill that violation of the code is not to be the basis of a funding or order, but the law is.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield on my time to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. COOPER. I have two more questions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would like to interject at this point that there is nothing improper and I think it is reasonable, that the code would be the basis for investigative effort.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not think that the Senator from Kentucky, and he is certainly an expert in this field, would indicate that there is no place in which the code could be used in connection with the study of mines.

Mr. COOPER. That is what bothers me now. I do not want any suggestion at all, if I can have it, that this code can be used as a basis for an order in the place of section 209; that is, it cannot be used.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It cannot be used as a basis of the order, as the Senator from Oregon said so well.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask the Senator from Oregon, looking at the new provision in the bill relating to section 209, calling for authorization or permitting the operator to call for a State inspector and then, if necessary, to call for an independent inspector appointed by the district court in the event that the operator desires to follow that procedure, it is mandatory procedure, is it not?

Mr. MORSE. If Senator Cooper refers to section 203(g) (1) and (2) he is correct in stating a withdrawal order under section 203(a) requiring notification of a State inspector within 24 hours after issuance of such order. Also in the case of State plan under section 202(b), a State inspector must have participated and concurred in an order made pursuant to section 203 (c) or (d).

Mr. COOPER. Is it not correct that under the imminent danger provision, section 203(c), or the new section 203(d), if an operator believes he is aggrieved by a finding of the Federal inspector, he is given the right to ask for an inspection by a State inspector?

Mr. MORSE. My statement stands. I shall make it clear to the Senator from Kentucky that the bill does not interfere at all with State plan procedures, where there is a State plan. But if there is a State plan, there is no question that State plan procedures are applicable.

Mr. COOPER. The procedure I have just outlined?

Mr. MORSE. The procedure the Senator has just outlined.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Six State plans are now operative. For the record, I think it would perhaps be good to have them set forth.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the six State plans be set forth at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the six State plans were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows: Oklahoma, Washington, North Dakota, North Carolina, Alaska, and Wyoming.

Mr. COOPER. This particular provision for review enables an operator to ask for a State inspector; and then, if there is a lack of concurrence, to go to the U.S. district court for the appointment of an independent inspector. That procedure applies only when a State plan is in effect.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Looking now at section 202, if a State—and I shall specify my State of Kentucky—should now submit a State plan in which the State agreed to meet the provisions of section 202, in the event of an inspection by a Federal inspector, either in the case of imminent danger under section 203(c) or section 209, if the operator then wanted to avail himself of his right of having an independent State inspector, the Director would then be required to go along with such review?

Mr. MORSE. I think that is pretty well covered under paragraph (3):

> The Director shall approve any State plan or any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection. He shall not finally disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing.

We are not amending that section in any degree whatsoever.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the provisions of section 202(b).

Mr. MORSE. I join in that request.

There being no objection, section 202 (b) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> (b)(1) In order to promote sound and effective coordination in Federal and State activities within the field covered by this title, the Director shall cooperate with the official mine inspection or safety agencies of the several States.
>
> (2) Any State desiring to cooperate in making the inspections required under this title may submit, through its official mine inspection or safety agency, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this subsection. Such State plan shall—
>
> (A) designate such State mine inspection or safety agency as the sole agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State and contain satisfactory evidence that such agency will have the authority to carry out the plan,
>
> (B) give assurances that such agency has or will employ an adequate and competent staff of inspectors qualified under the laws of such State to make mine inspections within such State,
>
> (C) give assurances, that upon request of the Director or upon request of an operator under section [203(e)(1)] *203(g)(1)*, the agency will assign inspectors employed by it to participate in inspections to be made in such State under this title, and
>
> (D) provide that the agency will make such reports to the Director, in such form and containing such information, as the Director may from time to time require.
>
> (3) The Director shall approve any State plan or any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of parargaph (2) of this subsection. He shall not finally disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing.
>
> (4) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that in the administration of the State plan there is—
>
> (A) a failure to comply substantially with any provision of the State plan; or
>
> (B) a failure to afford reasonable cooperation in administering the provisions of this title,
>
> the Director shall notify such State agency of his withdrawal of approval of such plan and upon receipt of such notice such plan shall cease to be in effect.
>
> (5) No inspection of a mine shall be made by a representative of the Bureau under this title in any State in which a State plan is in effect unless a State inspector participates in such inspection in accordance with such plan, except where, in the Director's judgment, an inspection is urgently needed to determine whether a danger described in section 203(a) exists in such mine, and participation by a State inspector would unreasonably delay such inspection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time. I had hoped very much that the Senator from Oregon would accept the amendment which has been offered, because I believe it expresses in more precise form the trend of the legislation and its procedure over 8 years, and its implications in the pending bill.

My colleague from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] and myself—and he will speak for himself—have tried for 8 years to get a bill which would provide additional protection to the miners in small mines, and at the same time, not turn over complete jurisdiction to the Federal Government. Two bills which we supported were accepted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and one was passed in 1960 by a vote of 80 to 4.

This bill before us, in several of its provisions, incorporates amendments which we worked for in past years, amendments which were then resisted by the Bureau of Mines, but which the Bureau is now willing to accept. I regret that the manager of the bill will not accept my amendment, but I thank the Senator from Oregon for his consideration and helpfulness during all these years.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his kindness.

Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the amendment. My first answer concerning the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky should be made a matter of record:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] has proposed that H.R. 3584 be amended in a manner similar to the committee amendment to S. 743, which passed the Senate in 1959. What he has said about that action in 1959 is absolutely correct.

The amendment he now proposes, as I understand it, would provide that the Secretary would issue regulations exempting mines from any provision in section 209 of the act, if such provision does not substantially contribute to the safety of the underground workers in those mines. However, it is obvious, as the Bureau implicitly stated at the hearing on H.R. 3584, at page 411, that any provisions which did not substantially contribute to the safety of the workers would not be applicable to, nor applied in, a mine under the present act. It would not be applicable unless it applied to a matter of safety.

Stated otherwise, those provisions which, by their terms, would apply in a small mine would all substantially contribute to the safety of the workers in that mine; otherwise they would not apply at all to that mine.

Moreover, unlike in S. 743, if any conflict arose in this regard, an appeal could be taken promptly and inexpensively to the Board, and the two representatives of the small mines would be required to participate in any resolution of this controversy, under H.R. 3584. Consequently, no need exists for the regulatory provision of S. 743, as the Senator from Kentucky now proposes, and it was therefore omitted.

I wish to return to section 6, because I believe it is applicable also to this amendment. Under section 6, the Secretary of the Interior is required to conduct a special study into the sufficiency of the existing Federal Coal Mine Safety Act requirements and to submit a report to Congress with recommendations within 1 year after the enactment of the bill.

As the Senator from Kentucky said, we called for such a report in 1959 and in 1962. I am sorry that it was not prepared, but such a law was not passed. We proposed to pass such a bill today. There is no question of such a report being available to us anyway. But if I interpret the results of the proposal of the Senator from Kentucky accurately, I have this difference with him. I do not want the Secretary of the Interior to be given authority to adopt or to order provisions or regulations, because, in my judgment, that is a legislative function.

I want the Secretary to prepare such a report and submit it to us; then we will do the legislating. This is an old problem that the Senator from Oregon has talked about many times in the many years in the Senate. I do not want to delegate to an administrative officer what I consider to be a legislative function. We in Congress ought to pass legislatively upon safety regulations and upon proposals that the Secretary of the Interior himself might evolve. So for that additional reason, I oppose the Senator's amendment.

My first reason is that I just do not think it is necessary to have such an amendment, under the changes in the language of this bill as compared with S. 743. The appeal provision that we have worked into this bill gives the small mine owners adequate appeal protection. I have already made clear in making legislative history that the act applies, not the code. If the Federal Director should at any time attempt to apply the code to close a mine, for example, contrary to the provisions of the act, the owners would be entitled to an immediate appeal hearing in the county seat where the mine was located, and two representatives of small mines would be on the appeal board.

In my opinion, we have before us a bill that avoids the fears of the Senator from Kentucky, which provides protection, and which ought to be passed without amendment. Therefore, I ask that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky be rejected.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I want to ask a question about section 6 for interpretation. I have listened to the Senator's explanation of section 6, and of course, I have studied it.

Is it the Senator's view that after the Secretary conducted a special study to determine the sufficiency of the safety requirements of the act, with particular emphasis upon requirements concerning roof support, ventilation, and electrical equipment, and found that stricter provisions were necessary, he could so recommend?

Mr. MORSE. We could pass legislation or reject it.

Mr. COOPER. If it is found that some of the requirements now outlined in section 209 are not applicable, does the Senator think it would be the duty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to recognize those recommendations and to propose amendments?

Mr. MORSE. I not only think that is so, but I give the Senator my assurance, and, as he knows, I keep my assurances as a member of the committee—and I suppose that the chairman of the committee would give me the same prerogative in handling the measure next year—that if he comes in with such proposals, I will see that they are submitted as amendments and that hearings are held on them.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it will be recalled that in the consideration of H.R. 3584 there was testimony from certain representatives of the coal mining districts. The Senator from Kentucky knows those representatives very well, as do I. Provision was actually written into the bill as a protective feature. I think it would do exactly as the chairman has said and would be protective.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Oregon. I express my appreciation to him and to the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which committee has done such a fine job on the bill pending before the Senate.

I pay my respects to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] who has been discussing amendments which I opposed. However, I recognize that his objective is to try to get a good, workable bill, a bill that would provide safety for miners.

Since the 86th Congress I have been the principal sponsor in the Senate of a bill to amend Public Law 82-552 by deleting section 201(b) which provides that title II of the act shall not apply to mines in which 15 or fewer individuals are regularly employed underground. In the 89th Congress, my bill is S. 1032 and is cosponsored by Senators BARTLETT, BAYH, BURDICK, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HARTKE, MCGEE, and METCALF.

H.R. 3584 is the House version of this measure. It is much more extensive in its provisions. However, basically, it has the same objective of eliminating section 201(b), the section making the safety provisions inapplicable to small mines.

I have long felt that the enforcible safety provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act should be applied to small mines, as well as large ones, if the products of that mine regularly enter commerce, or if the mine operations substantially affect commerce.

We are all aware of the arguments made by those who oppose the deletion of section 201(b). It is most certainly true that small mines differ in some respect from large mines, and it would be insupportable to impose additional requirements on small operators if it would not improve the safety of the men who work in them. This has been the stumblingblock that has held the bill up in past sessions of Congress.

It is, therefore, with interest that I have viewed the efforts, both in this Congress and the last, of the General Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor, to work out a bill that is sound and equitable, but a bill that would allow us to move ahead with the task of reducing safety hazards in small coal mines. I feel this has been achieved in H.R. 3584, as reported by that committee and passed in the House, and I am glad to support it.

I believe that reconstitution of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, so that the views of the operators and workers in the newly covered mines can be heard, is an admirable step. I also approve of the time for abatement provisions of the findings and orders section of the act relative to safety requirements. Furthermore, the intensification of coal mine safety educational programs and the authorization of a Department of Interior study into safety requirements with a report to Congress within a year, are provisions with which I feel no one can quarrel. All of these amendments have made it a more acceptable bill to more people.

We must improve safety conditions for workers underground in small coal mines. From 1940 through 1964, 283 disaster-type accidents have occurred in the exempted underground coal mines and they resulted in the death of 101 persons and injury of 204 others. In eight of the explosions, all the men underground were killed. Bureau of Mines records show that imminent danger of explosion, fire, inundation or man-trip or man-hoist accident was cited in reports on 23 percent of the exempted mines inspected during the last 5 months of 1964, and that less than 2 percent of these cited dangers were abated during the Federal inspection.

During the period 1952 through 1964, the number of exempted underground mines increased 24 percent whereas the number of mines covered by the mandatory provisions of title II decreased 56 percent. The number of employees in exempted underground mines increased from 26,451 in 1952, to 31,549 in 1962, whereas the number of employees in title II mines decreased from 264,711 to 72,238 in the same period.

In 1952, only 9 percent of the total underground coal mine employees were not protected by the mandatory provisions of title II of the act. By 1962, this figure had increased to 30 percent and is expected to be higher when the 1963–64 data are available. Thus, the exemption of small mines had far less significance in 1952 than it has today.

In view of these facts, there can be no justification for a law which says a mine with 15 or more workers must come under Federal jurisdiction, and be subject to Federal mining laws, while a mine which has fewer than 15 persons is not. We now have 50 years of experience in mine safety. That experience should be applied to all men who work anywhere underground in coal mines, regardless of the number of workers.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will pass this House-passed bill, H.R. 3584, without amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am ready for third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall yield first to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and then to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, nearly 15 years ago I sat as a member of the Education and Labor Committee to consider legislative proposals to minimize the danger of disasters in the Nation's underground coal mines.

As enacted in 1952, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, or Public Law 552, prescribed certain inspection and compliance procedures to curb mine disasters. The act further defined a disaster as an accident involving five or more fatalities occurring underground from specified causes—explosion, fire, inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident.

The act further stipulated that mines employing 15 or more men underground must comply with directives to abate disaster-type situations covered by the act, but mines with 14 or fewer employees underground were exempted from the mandatory compliance requirement. However, title I mines covered by a union contract must comply with the act as a condition of the bargaining agreement.

Congress granted the exemption after a long and impressive list of witnesses submitted compelling evidence that the small mines should not be covered by the act. The control of day-to-day accidents, which predominate as causes of injury and fatal mishaps, was reserved to the individual States.

I have observed the operation of the act in relation to the mines' safety performance over the years, and I am of the opinion that the so-called title I mine exemption is as justified and valid today as in 1952. I am also of the opinion that modification of the title I exemption, as proposed in H.R. 3584, has been promoted by pressures completely divorced from the safety issue.

There has always been a curious relationship between the economics of the coal industry with emergence of the small mines as a major part of the industry and the demand to repeal or modify the title I exemption.

Although I am opposed to H.R. 3584, I consider the bill's proposals an improvement over what we started out with back in 1958 and 1959. Further, I feel that the Congress has a better understanding of the issues involved.

The coal industry accepted mechanization after World War II as essential to its survival in the highly competitive fuels economy. Trained manpower released by mechanization turned to a new field of labor in the small mines, and the small mining industry has been the economic salvation in a considerable number of Kentucky coalfield counties.

Much has been said over the years to the effect that the real issue at stake is not safety but economic, and a battle between the United Mine Workers of America and nonunion operators over tonnage royalties and union dues. Most of the small mines are nonunion, and the record shows they produce a significant percentage of coal from which no tonnage royalty flows into the union's pension and welfare coffers.

Through the years, we have seen a weight of contested evidence, data, information, records, and statements presented both for and against changes in the title I exemption. As I stated before the Senate Labor Subcommittee, testimony generally has always boiled down to vigorously supported opinions.

However, data furnished the subcommittee show the impact of the small mines on the total coal mining economy. Title I production rose from 23.5 million tons in 1954 to 49.6 million tons in 1963. At the same time, title II output dropped from 282.5 million tons to 259.1 million tons in 1963.

Title I underground employment rose from 24,759 in 1954 to 30,749 in 1964, as compared with a drop of from 173,860 to 69,893 employees in title II operations over the same period.

Although Public Law 552 dictated mandatory compliance for title II mines in correcting violations under law, disasters and disaster-type accidents continue to occur. Since July 16, 1952, through 1964 the large mines experienced 883 disaster-type accidents, involving 394 fatalities and 505 injuries. Title I mines experienced 164 occurrences with 61 fatalities and 108 injuries.

The individual States have done a remarkable job in safety inspection, accident prevention, and safety education. In Kentucky, which is the major small-mines State, the inspection and safety laws are completely adequate and competently administered. As I said earlier, I see no justification to change the law, but it is apparent this will be done through H.R. 3584.

Independent title I operators have expressed deep concern that enactment of H.R. 3584 would open the gates to undue harassment by inspectors under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Codes. I was happy to note that the report of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee stated that title I nonunion mines would not be required to comply with the codes but only with the limited number of safety provisions in the act. It was further reassuring to note that the Secretary of the Interior would be directed to spell out to the operators the enforcible provisions of the act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. I repeat that without his expertise and that of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the bill in its present form would not be before the Senate today. Therefore I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has been a privilege to work with the floor manager and with the Subcommittee on Labor and with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in its efforts leading to the bill's presentation here since the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] designated the Senator from Oregon to go forward with the hearings.

I reiterate what has been said, that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], although not a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, really became a part of our group during the consideration of this measure in the subcommittee as well as in the full committee.

I express, as he has, our concern, not only for the safety—that is the primary consideration—of those who mine for their livelihood; for the actual miner himself, who goes beneath the earth and is subjected to the hazards of the work that he does—but I also realize that there is the consideration, and it is a proper subject of concern, of the cost of operation of the mines. We have had these concerns through the years, as we have gradually broadened the number of persons covered by the Mine Safety Act, for the legislative proposal which is the pending business of the Senate is not new; it is a matter which has drawn the attention of Congress for some years. It is a vital concern of both the Senate and House Members.

In 1958, the Senate considered bills which would have brought all coal mines under the protective regulations of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. Hearings were conducted in both 1958 and 1959, and during the 86th Congress in 1960 the Senate gave its approval 80 to 4 to a measure which would have ended existing exemptions relating to coverage of mines with 14 employees or less. The Senate bill was reported from committee in the House of Representatives, but no floor action was achieved.

In 1963, after extensive hearings and investigation into this subject, President Kennedy's Task Force on Coal Mine Safety recommended the repeal of those exemptions in title I of the act which limit the extent of Federal safety regulations.

It is gratifying, therefore, that substantial progress has been made in the 89th Congress toward broadening the beneficial effects of Federal coal mine safety legislation as it applies to the smaller mines. The bill which is before us this afternoon, H.R. 3584, has been the subject of searching hearings in both Houses of Congress. The measure was passed in the House of Representatives on June 1, 1965, by an overwhelming vote of 335 to 43—more than 7 to 1.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its Subcommittee on Labor, it has been my responsibility to examine this legislation, and in the House I was active in this area of legislative effort. We recall that H.R. 3584 was reported to the full Committee, and to the Senate, without amendment.

Mr. President, the intent of the legislation is to improve safety and reduce casualties which occur as a result of accidents in smaller mines. By applying Federal safety regulations to all coal mines, regardless of the number of employees, we can expect meaningful headway to be made. This is a moderate and reasonable approach. It would improve Federal-State cooperation and coordination in the area of coal mine safety. It would promote safety education programs at both the Federal and State levels. It requires a detailed study of the adequacy of existing Federal safety requirements by the Secretary of the Interior, with a report to be issued within 1 year. It revises and updates certain review and appeals procedures.

Mr. President, I endorse this measure which I cosponsor as being necessary to improve safety standards in the coal mines of our Nation. Every man, regardless of the size of the mine in which he is employed, is entitled to the assurance that his well-being is a source of concern, and that his safety is considered to be the most vital element in his daily tasks. I trust that the Senate will give approval to H.R. 3584 without delay.

Mr. President, I say that the proposed legislation is actually moderate and reasonable. But it is realistic legislation, and it is very important that the Federal-State cooperation which we have had through the years now be extended to the small mines.

Perhaps the best justification which was given to the subcommittee during the hearings was contained in the testimony of the Acting Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, Mr. Frank C. Memmott. He knows the mining industry and spoke from actual personal experience. He referred both to his personal experience and his official responsibility when he appeared, on June 14, 1965, and gave testimony concerning this proposed legislation.

He said:

> Because of this background, my interest in the legislation before you is personal as well as official. Many of my close friends are working today in coal mines across the country. Some are employed at large operations and therefore are protected by the mandatory (title II) provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952. Others, working at small mines that employ fewer than 15 men undergound, daily face the hazards of their occupation without such protection.

He went on to say:

> As the Bureau's Acting Director I have observed closely for more than 6 months now its operations under the mandatory provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. I can testify that coal mine operators and workers and the State and Federal Governments are cooperating smoothly and effectively to achieve not only the letter but the spirit of our existing law.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] pointed out that under existing law there had been a smoothly working program. Senator MORTON also indicated that operations had been effective. We have every reason to believe that there will continue to be a cooperative effort.

I read further from what Mr. Memmott said:

> There is, in my opinion, no reason to anticipate anything less than the same kind of cooperation when this law is extended—as it should be—to cover operations that represent over 85 percent of the active coal mines in the United States, employing nearly a third of all our working coal miners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Memmott continued:

> We contend that excluding one out of every three of our coal miners from the protection afforded by mandatory provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act—and doing it solely on the basis of the size of the mine they work in—is in effect a form of discrimination. Like other forms of discrimination, it cannot be tolerated in a nation dedicated to the principle of equal justice and equal protection under the law.

I conclude my quotation from the statement of Mr. Memmott with the following excerpt:

> The legislation now before this subcommittee affords an outstanding opportunity to advance the cause of safety in a major domestic industry. We in the Bureau of Mines are confident that you gentlemen will make the most of that opportunity.

That is what the subcommittee and the committee are attempting to do. We are aware of the knowledge and the competence of the Bureau of Mines. It has the benefit of some 55 years' experience. I think it is a responsible organization; and Mr. Memmott asks not only the privilege, but the responsibility of carrying forward the mine safety program.

This is an especially important measure in West Virginia, Mr. President, because our State is the leading producer of bituminous coal. In the year 1964, for example, West Virginia mines brought forth some 139,361,204 tons of coal. The production average in the decade between 1954 and 1963 was more than 126 million tons per year. And, between 40,000 and 50,000 of our citizens are employed as miners, many of them in smaller mines.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I reiterate my conviction that the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments (H.R. 3584) should receive the expeditious approval of the Senate. We must not delay in making available to all those who go into the mines for their livelihood the added safety and security which is embodied in this positive legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator in charge of the bill still have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nineteen minutes remain.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to express my gratitude to the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], not only for giving me this opportunity to participate in the debate, but also for his kind words about me in his presentation of the bill.

Mr. President, this is a great day for coal mine safety, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] deserves a major part of the credit. He has persisted through the years in urging legislation which would make it possible to bring to the smaller mines the kind of safety inspection and requirements for safety devices and facilities which have long been applicable to the larger mines covered in the Federal Coal Mines Safety Act.

I tip my hat to the Senator from Oregon, both for his ability and for his persistence in continuing to urge this much needed legislation upon Congress.

I have been an advocate of this legislation since 1958, when I first introduced, in the 85th Congress, a bill to repeal the exemption of small mines from the enforcement provisions of the Coal Mine Safety Act. That bill was favorably reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—with the assistance of the Senator from Oregon—but not passed by the Senate. In the 86th Congress, however, on April 27, 1960, S. 743, which I sponsored, did pass the Senate, but failed in the House. Subsequent attempts in the

87th and 88th Congresses to make the Coal Mine Safety Act applicable to all mines, regardless of size, were tried, but, unfortunately, not enough votes were able to be summoned in the House. Now, after 7 years, under the sponsorship and able leadership of my colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative JOHN H. DENT, and the extraordinarily capable leadership of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], by an overwhelming majority of 335 to 43, has passed this long overdue legislation.

It has been 13 years since title II of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act was enacted by the 82d Congress in 1952. Title II gave the Federal Government, for the first time, the authority to prevent major coal disasters. It empowered Federal inspectors to issue an order of withdrawal in the event of imminent danger of a mine disaster, or for failure to comply with Federal mine safety regulations within a reasonable time. This enforcement power was given, however, only with respect to mines regularly employing 15 or more persons underground. So-called title I mines, employing 14 or less individuals underground, have been subject only to inspection and the recommendations of the Bureau of Mines.

The exemption for title I mines was adopted as a result of opposition by mine operators who contended that enactment of the safety law would work an economic hardship on the smaller mines. The 14-man limit was a purely arbitrary legislative compromise. Experience has proved it to be an unfortunate one.

While injury and fatality rates for title II mines, those presently subject to the safety and enforcement provisions of the Coal Mine Safety Act, have shown a marked decrease since 1952, the record for mines employing less than 15 shows about the same fatality rate over the past 5 years as in the 5 years preceding the 1952 act.

Thus, according to the Bureau of Mines, in the 5 years between 1948 and 1952 there were 2,176 fatalities in title II mines, whereas in the last 5 years, from 1960 through 1964, the number of deaths was reduced to 842. For the same 5-year period prior to 1952 there were 400 deaths in title I mines. That number has been reduced by only 14, to 386 during the past 5 years.

I have with me, for the record, a chart showing the number of underground facilities and the death rate per million man-hours for the coal mining industry, for title I and title II mines, each year from 1953 through 1964.

According to this data, compiled by the Bureau of Mines, the rate of fatal accidents per million man-hours for 1961, in mines employing 14 or less men underground, was 2.20. The fatality rate in mines employing 15 or more was 1.37. While this gap was closed slightly in 1963 and 1964, the fact remains that title I mines are far more hazardous places to work than title II mines.

Furthermore, the number of title I mines is increasing each year. Between 1952 and 1962 the number of these smaller mines increased by 30 percent. In that same period, the number of title II mines decreased by 53 percent. The evidence is clear, moreover, that many large title II mines have been split into several smaller title I mines, thus enabling them to avoid compliance with Federal safety standards.

Finally, and perhaps most revealing, during 1961, mines employing 14 or less men underground produced only 12 percent of the underground tonnage of coal, and yet these mines were responsible for 34 percent of all underground fatalities in that year.

Repeal of the small mine exemption is particularly significant for my own State of Pennsylvania, which ranks second in the Nation with 1,827 active title I mines in the year 1964. Two hundred and seventy-five Pennsylvanians have died in those mines from 1948 through 1964.

A majority of these men, I am sure, would be living today, had the mines in which they met their death been subject to the enforcement authority of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

Coal mining is, at best, a hazardous occupation. Those unfortunate enough to labor in a 14-man mine have had to defend themselves against the hazards of the industry. Their lives are just as dear to them and their families as are the lives of those who work in larger mines. They are equally entitled to a safe place to work and to the full protection of their Government.

Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the amendments proposed by the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], amendments which I have consistently opposed through the years. I now understand that they have been rejected in the debate which took place on the floor of the Senate while I was, unfortunately, detained on another engagement. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] whether he had occasion during debate to refer to what I consider to be the most convincing rebuttal of the points made by my good friend the Senator from Kentucky, and by his colleague on our committee the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], which begins on page 5 of the committee report.

If not, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have that part of the report printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. It begins on page 5 with the paragraph, "The fear that title II would force small mines out of business, et cetera."

Mr. CLARK. Even above that.

Mr. MORSE. We did not cover that part, but that was my argument to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky today, as covered in that paragraph. That is the only amendment the Senator offered. He now states that he will not offer any others.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend the Senator from Oregon. That is my answer, too. I do not believe in burdening the RECORD with material which is set forth so clearly in the committee report for which, of course, the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oregon, is responsible.

I wish again to thank my friend the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy, and also to express my strong support for the passage of this legislation.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I yield back the remainder of my time, I wish to thank Mr. Forsythe, counsel for the full committee, and Mr. Bruff, counsel for the subcommittee, for their able, effective, and efficient work, and for being of such valuable assistance to the committee throughout the hearings, throughout the markup, and throughout full committee consideration; I also wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee in the preparation of the report.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I take the floor to respond to the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, about statistics provided by the Bureau of Mines. A great deal of statistical evidence has been introduced, by the Bureau of Mines through the years in hearings, as to the scale of injuries and fatalities in title I and title II mines. The committee has stated in at least two reports that evidence received from the Bureau of Mines could not be verified.

The conclusion that the Bureau's statistics were inaccurate appeared in 1958 in the committee report. It appeared again in 1960. I believe it is only fair to say that from the methods of securing information which the Bureau of Mines uses, it is impossible to say whether the rate of injuries and fatalities in title I mines is greater than in title II mines.

Those who operate title I mines and many of the State agencies hold the view that the record is better in title I mines. This statement I have made about the unreliability of Bureau of Mines statistics must be made in fairness to those who operate and work in title I mines. But all agree that the fairest safety measures ought to be provided. I have thought it was a mistake simply to provide jurisdiction to the Bureau of Mines, and thereby to assume that it would insure better safety conditions than at present.

The act provides that the Bureau of Mines shall inspect each mine once a year.

Earlier in my statement I pointed out that Kentucky inspectors made thousands of inspections in 1963, a greater number than the total of all inspections the Bureau of Mines made throughout the country. When this amendment becomes effective, it will mean that the Bureau of Mines will have to enlarge its staff of inspectors, if it hopes to make as many inspections as the State agencies make today.

There is nothing written in heaven which says that Federal inspectors are any better than State inspectors. Simply because the Federal Government appoints them does not make them better inspectors than those appointed by the State government.

Mr. President, I fear that when total jurisdiction is turned over to the Federal Government, and the State agencies are left without any real authority, their interest naturally will be reduced. The small mines will not have the constant help, and educational efforts of State agencies and safety conditions may deteriorate rather than improve.

I voice these thoughts because they are practical. I hope the Bureau of Mines will do as it is directed to do in the bill—that it will begin, finally, to cooperate with the State agencies and enter into joint efforts to examine and improve safety conditions—and with fairness to the small mines.

One other point and I shall close. I do not think many people recognize the change in coal mining that has occurred in the last 15 years. Because of the mechanization of the large mines, because of the ability to produce a great volume of coal, coal miners have been forced out of work in these mines. In the eastern part of my State, where 50,000 or 60,000 coal miners were employed at the close of World War II, between 25,000 and 30,000 now produce the same volume of coal. When miners were forced out of work in the large mines—and many of them are elderly—they opened or worked in small mines. Many of them are members of the United Mine Workers of America.

If this act is applied fairly and justly and solely on the basis of safety, I am not worried; but if the Federal inspectors who, from other States, come into my State or any other coal producing State and apply the provisions of the act, particularly section 209, arbitrarily or unfairly, to the small mines, to those who work in the small mines—2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and up to 14—will be thrown out of work. Then the depression which now exists in the coal areas will be multiplied again and again.

So I earnestly hope—that the provisions of the bill will be applied with fairness and justice and with no consideration except safety.

I wish to refer to the conflict that goes on between the large mines and the small mines. I would be foolish if I did not know that to the extent the production from small mines is eliminated, it will go to the big mines. We cannot escape the fact that this proposal is connected with the battle that has been going on for years between large and small mines.

I can only hope that the Bureau of Mines will develop an attitude somewhat different than it had for the last few years when it was determined to force the bill on the small mines and small miners without any amendment.

I hope its attitude will be fair to the small mines, their operators, and those miners who depend on them for work and for a living. If they do not act fairly—the bill will produce not increased safety, but the elimination of many of the mines, and the unemployment of miners who cannot find jobs anywhere else, and hardship for themselves and their children in my State and other States.

I thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from West Virginia for their references to my efforts. I can state that for 8 years I have offered amendments to provide better safety for the small mines, and yet fought against arbitrary bills which would, I feared, put our small mines and miners out of business. If the provisions of this bill are not used fairly, I will count on those who know something about the mining industry—the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who knows it by careful study, and by observation, and my friend from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], who also knows mining by observation and study—to act to correct the inequities that may develop.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Tennessee 2 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to lend my support to the pending bill. My distinguished junior colleague [Mr. Bass] and I have discussed the bill at some length and we have concluded its passage is deserved and is needed in the public interest. I appreciate the consideration the committee has given to the problem, with which it has wrestled for a long while. Like the senior Senator from Kentucky, I hope when it becomes law, it will result in a saving of lives, more economical operation, and a safer operation in a basic industry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 3584) was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with passage of the Coal Mine Safety Act amendments today, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] again demonstrated his unequaled abilities as an advocate. His great skill in handling the measure and particularly, his clear and precise explanations, more than anything, helped to achieve this efficient and successful action.

Moreover, the distinguished senior Senators from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], are to be commended for their splendid assistance in explaining this measure. They articulately demonstrated a profound understanding of its provisions and we are grateful for their immense contribution.

We are grateful also for the splendid cooperation of the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper]. While effectively expressing his strong and sincere views on the measure he selflessly sought to obtain the expeditious action which was achieved. We are indebted to him. The same commendation is extended to his colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], who similarly expressed his sincere views on the measure, but nonetheless cooperated greatly in permitting prompt and efficient action.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCarthy in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Sparkman and Mr. Hickenlooper conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1025, S. 2499; that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2499), to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation of interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE ALASKA PURCHASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 2614.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2614) to provide for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska purchase, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That, in recognition of the national and international significance of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia in 1867, the Congress hereby declares that it is the purpose of this Act to provide for appropriate United States participation in the statewide 1967 centennial celebration, jointly with the State of Alaska, through industrial, agricultural, educational, research, or commercial projects, or facilities which contribute to the celebration and result in an enduring symbol of the significance to the United States of its purchase of Alaska in

1867 and a permanent contribution to the economy of Alaska.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants to the State of Alaska, for use by the State, its political subdivisions, municipalities, or public or private nonprofit corporations to defray no more than one-half of the costs of projects planned to support initially the 1967 Alaska Centennial as an event of national interest. Such projects shall be eligible for grants only after they are approved by such department of the State of Alaska as shall be designated for such purpose by the Governor of the State of Alaska. In accord with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall establish additional criteria to be met by such projects and shall promulgate regulations governing the submission and approval of applications.

(b) It shall be a condition of the receipt of any grant for a project that recipient of such grant furnish adequate assurance to the Secretary of Labor that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects financed under this section shall be paid wages at not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed $4,000,000. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available for expenditure until June 30, 1968.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary may provide for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the centennial celebration, whenever the national or international significance of any event of the centennial celebration will be enhanced by such United States participation.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this section, the Secretary may—

(1) provide for the display of Federal exhibits at one or more sites in the State of Alaska in buildings or structures furnished to the United States, during the period of the centennial celebration, except that the Secretary may utilize United States-owned mobile geodesic-domed exhibition buildings or structures erected on land owned by the State of Alaska or any political subdivision thereof and furnished to the United States, without cost, during the period of the centennial celebration;

(2) incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including but not limited to expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor and the actual display thereof, and including but not limited to related expenditures for costs of landscaping, transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, maintenance and operation, and dismantling;

(3) enter into such contracts as may be necessary to provide for United States participation in appropriate ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the centennial celebration;

(4) appoint such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, except that no person appointed under this paragraph shall receive compensation from the United States at a rate in excess of that received by persons under the Classification Act of 1949 for performing comparable duties;

(5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem when actually employed; and

(6) accept any gifts, donations, or devises, or loans other than of money, to be used in carrying out the purposes of this section.

(c) In determining the exhibits to be installed by the United States during the centennial celebration and in selecting the site or sites in the State of Alaska for such exhibits, the Secretary shall consult with the Alaska State Centennial Commission.

(d) The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized—

(1) to cooperate with the Secretary with respect to United States participation in the ceremonial aspects of the centennial celebration; and

(2) to make available to the Secretary from time to time, such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Secretary in carrying out his functions under this section.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed $600,000.

Sec. 4. The Secretary shall report to the Congress within 6 months after the date of the official close of the centennial celebration concerning the activities of the Federal Government pursuant to this Act, including a detailed statement of expenditures. Upon transmission of such report to the Congress, all appointments made under this Act shall terminate.

Mr. BARTLETT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call outside the time limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 2614.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, did the Senator make a motion to concur in the House amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] I send to the desk an amendment to the House substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute motion will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, line 5, in lieu of the figure "$4 million" insert "$3 million."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska yields to himself how much time?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this measure has been well considered and debated at some length.

Of course, I am not in favor of the substitute offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams].

The situation here historically is as follows: Congress directed the Department of Commerce to make a study of the feasibility and advisability of participation on the part of the Federal Government in the centennial observance of the purchase of Alaska in 1867 by the United States from Russia.

This study was made. The Department of Commerce reported back to the Congress recommending that the U.S. Government participate in this centennial.

Subsequently, bills were introduced in the two Houses of Congress calling for a Federal appropriation in each case of $7.2 million, to be matched by the State and/or local political subdivisions in Alaska; and in addition, authorizing an appropriation of $600,000 in each case for direct Federal exhibits.

This original submission in the amount of $7.6 million was altered, first in the Senate and later in the House of Representatives, although that amount of money which was the purchase price paid for Alaska was approved by the administration. On the last day of the last session this bill came before the Senate. It was a crowded day. It was a busy day. This bill was brought up relatively late in the afternoon when not much time remained. The Senator from Delaware, as I recall, offered an amendment reducing the recommendation of the Commerce Committee of $4.6 million to $3.6 million. That amendment was accepted.

I should say, because I think it is important, that the bill came out of the Commerce Committee by a vote of 16 to 1. A week before last the House of Representatives considered this bill and approved it after a roll call vote with a recommended authorization of $4.6 million.

Now, Mr. President, when this appropriation is made, as I am confident it will be following approval of the authorization act, it does not mean that $4.6 million will necessarily flow to Alaska. This is so for two reasons. First, as I said, there has to be a matching effort on the part of the State or local community. Second, the Secretary of Commerce is placed in charge of all of this. He has to screen each application. He has to approve each application.

We may not infer, I think that he is going to recklessly and wildly approve all applications submitted whether or not they have merit.

Of course, the local community is not going to ask for something that it is not ready to support itself, because it has to put up dollar for dollar. That will not be easy in the case of some of the small towns in Alaska.

But, Mr. President, Alaska is looking forward to this great celebration next year. If we are to move by way of Federal involvement, we must move speedily, because the 1966 building season—the essential building season—is almost here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCarthy in the chair). The time of the Senator from Alaska has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield myself an additional minute.

Substantially all the construction work must be performed in the spring, summer, and early fall of 1966.

Does this proposal create a precedent? Of course it does not. There is a list longer than from here to there of similar celebrations in the past, dating a long time back, which have been financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government. We seek to establish no precedent. In most cases heretofore, as I am informed—at least, in many cases—there has been no local participation at all. In this instance there will be. The Secretary of Commerce will seek to protect the interests of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 3 minutes. Mr. President, in the closing days of the last session of Congress, this same bill was before the Senate. At that time, as it was reported by the committee, it provided for $4,600,000. The Senate adopted an amendment, of which I was the sponsor, reducing the first item from $4 million to $3 million, and still leaving $600,000 intact. In other words, the Senate reduced the amount of the bill by $1 million.

The bill went to the House, where the $1 million was fully restored. Nothing has happened in the interval to justify increasing the authorization by 25 percent. Quite the contrary, there has been an acceleration of the Vietnam war. Certainly we shall have to start somewhere to curtail expenditures if we are ever to take any steps at all toward reducing Government expenses.

The Senator from Alaska argues that the bill does not establish a precedent. I cannot agree with him on that point.

It is true that centennial commemorations have been held heretofore; but prior to this, single locations were selected to celebrate a particular event. In this instance, surely the commemoration is of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska. But what is proposed? It is not proposed to select one location, such as Anchorage or Fairbanks, for the building of the centennial center, where this historic occasion would be commemorated. Instead it is proposed to construct convention halls in three cities in Alaska. That is what it boils down to. One million-dollar convention hall would be built at Sitka, which has a population of only 6,600; one would be built in Anchorage; and one in Fairbanks.

Many cities in the United States would like to have convention halls. Some cities in my own State would like to have them. But is it the responsibility of the Federal Government to build convention halls in various areas of the United States? How far can we go in observing the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska? It is interesting to note that the original request for the observance of the centennial was $7.6 million. This was about as much as was paid for Alaska. I agree that the event should be commemorated, but more should not be paid for the celebration than was paid for the purchase of the territory in the beginning.

In recent years such proposals have been getting out of hand. In 1962 the Federal Government was asked to provide $9.9 million for the exposition held in Seattle. For the 1964–65 New York World's Fair the Federal Government contributed $17.5 million. In January of this year we provided $7.5 million for the Interama. Now we have before us this bill to provide $4.6 million in Federal funds for the commemoration of the centennial of the purchase of Alaska.

Last year the Senate cut this amount to $3.6 million. Now we are asked to raise the ante by 25 percent above what, as recently as 1965, we decided should be the maximum amount. The adoption of this amendment will merely restore the bill to the exact amount that was approved by the Senate last year. The amendment at that time was accepted by the sponsors of the bill.

Why should we now raise the amount by an extra $1 million?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired. Does he yield himself additional time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself an additional minute.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] has taken an active interest in this bill. He is unavoidably detained today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the individual views of the Senator from Ohio, as published in the committee report, be printed at this point in the Record. They outline the reasons of the Senator from Ohio for objecting to the proposal. Needless to say I agree completely with his arguments.

There being no objection, the individual views of Mr. Lausche were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Individual Views of Mr. Lausche

I do not concur with the recommendation of the Commerce Committee that the Senate approve S. 2614, as amended, a bill to provide for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967.

While I recognize the merit of such domestic expositions, I am deeply alarmed and concerned about the frequency of Federal participation in local fairs and celebrations of this type.

Domestic expositions can provide a limited cultural and economic benefit for the State in which such an event is held, but the Federal Government should not be attempting to pour large sums of money into these events every few years.

From 1940 until 1962, the U.S. Government did not significantly participate in any domestic exposition or fair, but then began what is developing into a mass parade on Washington for Federal funds. This trend started with the "Century 21" Exposition in 1962 in Seattle, Wash. For that event a total of $9.9 million was appropriated. Following the 1962 Seattle Exposition, the New York World's Fair in 1964–65 received an appropriation of $17.5 million. At each of these fairs the Federal Government constructed huge and costly exhibition halls.

Now we have Alaska asking for $7.2 million in Federal appropriations to aid their 1967 Alaska Purchase Centennial. This Federal money will not be for one major project such as was done in Seattle and New York, instead the major share will go to three Alaskan cities on a matching basis for the following centennial buildings and parks:

1. Anchorage, Alaska, population 66,550 (plus military personnel).

In Anchorage, a multipurpose convention-civic center is planned as a permanent structure to be used for conventions, historical pageants, an international fur auction, and other major events of the centennial year.

Following the centennial year this building's primary function will be that of a convention center. It is planned to accommodate a wide variety of events. These events can be grouped into four basic categories:

(1) Conventions, meetings, rallies, and lectures.

(2) Trade shows, industrial exhibits, and miscellaneous commercial activities.

(3) Musical and theatrical performances.

(4) Sports activities.

Estimated total cost of this project is $5 million.

2. Fairbanks, Alaska, population 25,000, plus military personnel.

Fairbanks plans to develop a 40-acre centennial park as the central exhibit hub of the centennial celebration. The site includes such tourist attractions as a reconstructed gold rush town, a zoo, a narrow-gage gold rush train, a refurbished riverboat, and an international house. The latter building would be used to house historical pageants, performing arts, conventions, and Federal exhibits.

This is the Pioneer Memorial Park in Fairbanks. Everything on this site is permanent, except the exhibit area and the amusement area. After 1967, it will be turned over to Pioneer Memorial Park as a permanent tourist attraction.

Total estimated cost of this project is $4,500,000.

3. Sitka, Alaska, population 6,690.

Sitka is planning on construction of a centennial center to be used primarily for the performance of the Alaska Day pageant. This building will also be used as a convention and exhibit area.

Sitka is the historical center of the 1967 celebration. This centennial building will serve as a permanent convention center type of structure.

Total estimated cost of this building is $1,660,000.

I cannot see the justification of a U.S. Government auditorium at Sitka, Alaska, a city of only 6,690 people. I also disapprove of using Federal moneys to build convention centers in Fairbanks and Anchorage where there are only 25,000 and 66,000 people, respectively. It is clear that these buildings or historic park developments will only be used for local functions and conventions although financed by the taxpayers of the United States.

With the Alaska Purchase Centennial taking place in 1967, we would have substantial Federal participation in three domestic expositions in 5 short years. But this has only been the starting point. San Antonio, Tex., has planned a HemisFair for 1968 and is asking for at least $10 million of Federal funds. Next we find that Florida is expecting to receive $15 million from Federal sources for its "Interama" exposition.

Thus, what begins as a celebration of local interest becomes a massive plan whereby the Federal Government is called upon to provide funds to promote the construction of facilities to be used as a part of a permanent civic center or convention hall. In addition,

> the Federal Government is committed to and must contribute to the Universal International Exposition in Montreal, Canada, in 1967. Plans are now also being initiated for a U.S. World's Fair in celebration of the 200th anniversary of the United States in 10 years.
>
> This multitude of past investments and future asked-for commitals has serious implications and unjustified costs. If Alaska, HemisFair and Interama are approved, over $60 million of Federal funds will have been expended for domestic fairs and expositions in less than 10 years. When will it stop? Every city and State planning centennials and sesquicentennials will feel justified in approaching Congress for large financial grants.
>
> In order to put a stop to this ever increasing frequency of Federal expenditures for domestic celebrations, I feel it necessary to oppose the passage of S. 2614.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would the Senator from Alaska be willing to accept, as a modification, a reduction halfway between the figure provided in the House bill and the figure provided in the Senate bill—$3.6 million as passed by the Senate and $4.6 million by the House?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; the Senator from Alaska must advise the Senator from Delaware that he feels obliged to adhere, to the best of his ability, to the figure established by the House of Representatives as recently as the week before last. The House had ample time to consider the measure. I should say now, because I believe it will have real meaning to my friend from Delaware, that a reduction of $1 million from the committee estimate for this bill in the House of Representatives was made by the sponsor of the bill in the House, Representative Rivers, of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired. Does he yield himself additional time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Alaska has time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the Senator from Delaware wish to yield me a minute?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely; I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Had not Representative Rivers himself voluntarily submitted an amendment to reduce the amount by $1 million, it very well could have been that the bill would have reached the Senate providing for an authorization of $5.6 million.

I believe we have gone quite far in cooperating with those who do not approve the proposal in any form, whether $3.6 million, $4.6 million, or $2.6 million.

We take the attitude that this centennial celebration will be of real national significance. If Alaska is willing to contribute $4.6 million, it seems to us that the Federal Government, which has gained such great dividends from the ownership of Alaska, ought to be willing to contribute a like amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Alaska is not in a compromising mood. I appreciate his position; however, I too feel strongly about this and shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

I do not believe the Federal Government should be required to build three convention halls, some in towns having populations of less than 7,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Would the Senator not agree with me that it would be much better to erect a convention hall that would endure and continue to serve a constructive purpose for years to come rather than, as the Federal Government has done in the past, to make a direct appropriation for a fair building, for example, and to have that building demolished at the conclusion of the fair?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think that convention halls are wonderful. The only question is, Can the Federal Government put one in every town of less than 7,000 population all over America? I do not believe that it is necessary to erect three conventions in Alaska for one centennial.

Mr. BARTLETT. Perhaps we did not need the World's Fair building which cost the United States a good many millions of dollars. That building was subsequently torn down. It has been the judgment of Congress to do this in the past.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have a great deal of faith in the judgment of Senators, and that is what I am trying to uphold. It was the judgment of the Senate last year that $3.6 million was sufficient.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware and I, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], who was the manager of the bill, are aware of the reasons why that amendment was agreed to. It was late in the afternoon of the final day of the session. We had a number of bills yet to consider. There simply was not enough time to debate that measure.

As I recall, the Senator from Delaware said that he intended to take quite a little time if there were not acquiescence on the part of the supporters of that measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, why was the bill brought out in the closing days of the last session? Pork barrel measures presented on the last day of a session should run into more opposition than they did last year.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this is not a pork barrel measure. It is far from that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I join my colleague, the Senator from Delaware, in his comments on the bill.

I wish to make it very clear to my friend, the Senator from Alaska, that this amendment gives no indication of anything but our firmest love and appreciation for his fine State of Alaska. It has been my privilege to visit his beautiful State. I have a tremendous amount of respect and admiration for Alaska.

I think all of us wish to have the Federal Government participate in a fitting centennial celebration. The question is whether the Senator from Alaska is asking for an excessive amount.

I believe that when this measure was introduced originally, it contained a request for $7,600,000. This was nearly double the amount contained in this measure. The amount is getting down to a more reasonable figure now.

The Senate approved a figure of $3 million. The House increased that figure to $4 million. The Senator from Alaska wants the figure to remain at $4 million. The Senator from Delaware has suggested a compromise of $3.5 million.

I point out that there is another $600,000 which the Federal Government would have to pay for expenses and participation by various Federal agencies and personnel.

We are now talking about an amendment that would provide $3 million for capital improvements, plus $600,000 for these other expenses. It seems to me that at a time when we have unforeseen expenditures, such as the war in Vietnam and foreign aid for pacification programs in Vietnam, we should try to keep these other nonessential expenditures as low as we possibly can.

It will be noted on page 4571 of the Congressional Record of March 2, 1966, that Representative Rivers of Alaska has pointed out that the cost of the convention hall at Sitka in Alaska would be $3 million, $1.5 million to be put up by the Federal Government and $1.5 million to be put up by this little town of Sitka, Alaska, with a population of 6,600. Surely the people of Sitka could find uses for their locally raised $1.5 million that would be more advantageous to the town than would a convention hall of this magnitude.

Alaska has its problems. It is just now beginning to come out from under a serious earthquake and water damage catastrophe at Anchorage and other Alaskan cities. Alaska has need for improvements in its schools and hospitals. However, a suggestion is now made that we give Alaska $4 million for a celebration.

On page 4574 of the Congressional Record for March 2, 1966, a list of the type of items that are programed for this centennial appears.

I read that list from the Congressional Record:

> The following items show the scope and character of Alaska centennial permanent projects for which State and local planning is nearly complete, or is in an advanced stage:
>
> First. International House and related buildings—Fairbanks.
>
> Second. Multipurpose building for conventions, and so forth—Anchorage.
>
> Third. Convention and exhibit center—Sitka.
>
> Fourth. State Museum—Juneau.
>
> Fifth. Amphitheater for presentation of historic drama—Kodiak.
>
> Sixth. Alaska Prehistory Museum—Homer.
>
> Seventh. Fort Kenai reconstruction—Kenai.
>
> Eighth. Reconstruction of a barrabora—Soldotna-Kasilof.
>
> Ninth. Memorial to William H. Seward—Seward.
>
> Tenth. Restoration of Russian-American Co. school—Ninilchik.
>
> Eleventh. Alaska Railbelt Historical Museum—Talkeetna.

Twelfth. Library addition for historical display—Kotzebue.

Thirteenth. Reconstruction of authentic Tlingit community house—Yakutat.

Fourteenth. Auditorium for "Boys of '98 Show"—Skagway.

Fifteenth. Tourist information and community center—Valdez.

Sixteenth. Vitus Bering Memorial—Cordova.

These projects may all have some historical and cultural significance. However, it seems to me that Alaska should erect these projects themselves rather than call on the American taxpayers to do so.

I suggest that if Alaska had to put up the money, they would give priority to their schools and hospitals and keep these proposed expenditures within bounds.

I hope that the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the reason my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska is not present to support this measure is that he was called out of town on official business.

I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] who was in charge of the bill last October.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I think that a review of the discussion at the time the Senate passed the measure responds adequately to the concerns that have been voiced again today.

I do not think that any of us pretends to have any contact which would tell us precisely how much should be appropriated in any situation such as this. However, very careful consideration was given to this subject by the Committee on Commerce.

I am satisfied, as I was last fall, that a figure substantially higher than that which we now propose properly could be appropriated.

The symbolism of Alaska and the kind of world in which we live at this moment is very great and fully justifies our presence there as a solid symbol of the progress that a free society can make. Alaska is a State which is located right next to Russia.

I hope very much that the Senate will agree to the higher figure, a figure which, indeed, many of us think is not high enough.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTLETT. How much time does the Senator from Delaware have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has used all his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the senior Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Before the Senator yields, I had promised 1 minute to another Senator. Would the Senator from Alaska object to a unanimous-consent request that each side be granted 3 additional minutes?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Each side may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I inquire as to the possibility of offering an amendment. I am not so disturbed, and I am not objecting so much to helping Alaska with the centennial, but I am concerned about the building of three auditoriums in Alaska by the use of Federal money. I think it is a bad precedent, and I think it is not justified.

I wonder if an amendment could be offered here to the effect that any building or structure constructed with Federal funds as provided in the bill would have to be torn down and removed within 6 months after the centennial is over, unless the State or local people pay the Federal Government for the cost of that building, if they wish to keep it as a permanent building for local use.

It would seem to me that that would be only fair. I repeat, I am not against helping Alaska, but I am against building permanent auditoriums for local cities and towns, especially a million-dollar auditorium—or whatever it costs—for a town of 7,000. We have a number of towns of 7,000 in my State. We received no Federal help for our 150th anniversary celebration. I am not against helping Alaska, but we in Iowa would like to have million-dollar auditoriums in all our towns of 7,000 over the State. They would be wonderful additions for those municipalities.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did the Senator from Iowa ask a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. I wondered if the Senator would be amenable to an amendment of that kind: That if the people of Alaska wish to keep the auditoriums which are built with Federal funds, they either pay for them within 6 months or have them torn down and removed.

Mr. BARTLETT. No, I would not be willing to accept such an amendment, because I think it is incomparably better to maintain such buildings as permanent, useful structures.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Why should not the local communities pay for them?

Mr. BARTLETT. They will pay half. Of course, the building proposed to be provided for the town of 7,000 is not a million-dollar building; it is a $750,000 building.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is close enough so that I cannot see what difference it would make.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I say to the Senator, I watch the dollar very closely. It is considerably less than a million dollars, and half that money would be furnished by the local community, which has already bonded itself in the amount of $400,000 to pay its share.

Furthermore, there is a long list of suggested projects. We do not know which of those projects will ultimately be approved by the Secretary of Commerce. They are not all convention halls, by any means.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely think it is a bad practice.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield the Senator 1 minute.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I point out one thing. I have already quoted from the Congressional Record, and I quote the colleague of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] to the effect that $1.5 million would be put up by the people of Sitka and $1.5 million by the Federal Government, and not $750,000. If that is in error, perhaps the Record should be changed, but as I pointed that out in my earlier comments, that is what the Record shows.

Mr. BARTLETT. I now correct the amount. The amount is $750,000, half to be furnished locally and half by the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLER. Do I understand that that is $375,000 by the Federal Government and $375,000 by the local community, or is it $750,000 from each?

Mr. BARTLETT. Three hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars from each.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the Senator's making that clear. I repeat, if the Senator will look at the Congressional Record to which I referred earlier, it will show $1.5 million from each.

Mr. BARTLETT. I was there when that statement was made. I realized it was erroneous at the time.

Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator still has 3 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield those 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Commerce Committee, from which the bill was reported.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be happy to accept a small portion of the 3 minutes.

It seems to me we are quibbling here about what the Federal participation may or may not be in this very worthwhile centennial celebration, which Alaska is trying to arrange, to give to the people of the United States and other visitors an indication of what that great territory, which is now our 49th State, means to the United States and to the world.

As the Senator from Alaska has pointed out, it is a little difficult to pinpoint the exact amount for each particular exhibit which is to be staged throughout the State. Were this exhibition to be concentrated in one central area, such as the ones held in Seattle, San Antonio, New York, and other areas, it would be much simpler. But it is difficult to pinpoint every part of it.

I think the amount the committee agreed to, after lengthy hearings on the matter, is about what is needed to do the job right. I hope the Senate will not change that amount, because the people of Alaska, I am sure, will contribute their share, and ultimately their local contributions will probably be even more. The Federal contribution is usually the base and the stimulus for doing a great many things. I am sure that whatever will be spent in Fairbanks, Anchorage, Sitka, Juneau, and the other places, as we try to apportion it here, reasonably anticipates the needs, but will be only the beginning of what the local people will finally contribute to the centennial.

The Alaska centennial will attract thousands of people. We found, after the Seattle World's Fair, that as a result of the stimulus created by the Federal contribution—some statistician figured it up—because of the money spent and the taxes paid by the millions of people who enjoyed themselves there, we pretty much got it all back.

Alaska is a new State. It is doing very well, despite the dire predictions to which I listened on this floor when the statehood bill was being considered. The proposed centennial celebration will be a stimulus for it to do a great deal more. Progress in Alaska is better than anticipated. For the thousands of people who will come to know that great area better, and what it means to us, to our history, to our economy, and to the future of these United States and the whole North Pacific realm, I feel the expenditure is well worth the amount of money proposed. As a matter of fact, if I had my way, it would have been more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from Washington, and I hope the Senate will reject the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might say for the record, the approval of the committee was unanimous, except for the individual views of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who, I see, has toned down his opposition even more so than when he opposed the Seattle World's Fair, which he now says was a great success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will only state that while this bill may have come out of the committee with an overwhelming vote, when the bill was before the Senate in the closing days of the session last year the Senate, by an even greater overwhelming vote, amended the bill by reducing the total amount provided to $3 million.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was not on a rollcall vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is equally true that there were no dissenting votes recorded against it. Sure there were some expressions against it, but the Senate by a substantial majority in the closing days of last year's session approved this bill with a $3 million figure. I believe that position should be sustained here today. The least we could do would be to send the bill to conference and see whether we can get a compromise agreement. We cannot afford to be putting a convention hall in every town in America having a population below 7,000. I think the time to stop it is right now.

The amendment should be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the House amendment.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Aiken
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Dominick
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—46

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—30

Bass
Brewster
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Morse
Morton
Murphy
Muskie
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to the House amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the House amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of myself and the

Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, on page 3, line 5, in lieu of the figure "$4,000,000," to insert "$3,500,000."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

If Senators will be patient, I think the amendment can be disposed of very soon.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, during the debate on the preceding amendment, the views on both sides of the question were pretty well aired. I have only one comment to add.

I point out that when the bill passed the Senate, it called for $3 million. The House has increased the amount to $4 million. The question is now whether it will be $3,500,000.

During the discussion which preceded the last vote, I think there was brought out what was misimpression on the part of the House.

The Congressional Record shows very clearly that the House voted for $4 million under the impression that it was going to cost the Federal Government $1½ million for a convention hall at Sitka, Alaska. It has been made clear that the cost will be only $375,000, instead of $1,500,000. So with that in mind, I believe the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, which was just rejected, should have been approved.

But let us not compound the error by failing to do something on this proposal. My amendment would cut the amount from $4 million to $3,500,000. It is a compromise as between the Senate and House figure. I suggest that the $3 million is not needed, in view of the discrepancy which the debate showed had occurred.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Let us not leave with the Senate the impression that the money is appropriated or will be spent for auditoriums or convention halls. These have been singled out. There is a long list of projects which have to be approved locally and by the Secretary of Commerce.

I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] for the same reasons that I opposed the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams].

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to cast my vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on offical business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 56 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Aiken
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Case
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—50

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—28

Bass
Brewster
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Morse
Morton
Murphy
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Miller's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I know that many of us who are members of the Committee on Commerce, and in fact all of us who come from the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii, wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] for the work, time, energy, and dedication he spent on the bill. The people of Alaska will find that the dedication and efforts he has put forth for the passage of the bill have resulted in pointing up how important this great area of the United States is to the Nation and to the world.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question now recurs on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to concur in the amendment of the House was agreed to.

Mr. HART. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senate accepted the House version of S. 2614, a bill which provides for Federal participation in the Alaska land purchase centennial in 1967.

The bill was approved by the House authorizes $4 million in matching funds for projects of enduring economic value and $600,000 for exhibits relating to the role of the Federal Government in the development of Alaska.

When the Senate acted favorably today on the House-passed bill, it lent support to the position that the celebration marking the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska from Russia is an event of national importance. Equally important was the Senate's recognition of the unique provisions of the bill insuring that Federal funds will aid the economic development of Alaska for years to come.

It should be made clear that the administration has, from the beginning, supported this legislation and its approach to Federal participation in an event of national and international significance such as the Alaska land purchase centennial. The legislation was drawn on the basis of a Commerce Department study authorized by the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget approved the bill as did other Federal agencies subject to recommended amendments. The agency amendments were incorporated in the language of the bill by the Senate Commerce Committee.

The administration's position on the bill was stated most clearly by Secretary of Commerce John Connor on a recent television show. Secretary Connor said:

> I want to compliment you, sir, for the form in which the centennial celebration will take shape because, so far as I know, it is unique to have this kind of a constructive economic program as the vehicle for celebrating an event of this kind. It makes so much sense to do it this way than to sort of shoot the works on one event which does not have the lasting significance that this program will.

Congress should feel secure in passing S. 2614, for it is no open-ended giveaway program, as some would have the Nation believe.

The legislation limits Federal participation in any one project to 50 percent or less of the cost.

The projects must be of enduring economic value. In other words, structures will not be constructed only to be torn down at the end of the celebration, but they must be designed for use after 1967, as well as to contribute to the significance of the centennial event.

The Secretary of Commerce will have the final word on approving projects for Federal funds, and Secretary Connor is on record as promising a close screening of all proposals. It appears as if there will be stiff competition for funds, insuring that the Secretary will have ample opportunity to select outstanding projects.

And finally, inasmuch as these projects must be built for use during the centennial year of 1967, there is a cutoff date after which unallocated funds will be returned to the General Treasury.

No, Mr. President, this program is no giveaway. On the contrary, it could be one of real national importance.

Alaska, which is just beginning to tap its vast natural resources, is building significant trade with Asian nations. In these times of turmoil and conflict in Asia, these trade relations can help break down barriers and open lines of communication, which is what must be done if this Nation is to help upgrade living conditions and create conditions for a stable peace in Asia.

But the importance of Alaska's trade with Asia can be described in more concrete terms. Alaska exports to foreign markets five times what it imports from foreign nations. Alaska is one place where the gold flow is running in the right direction.

Clearly, Mr. President, projects of enduring economic value, such as called for in S. 2614, will speed development of Alaska's vast resources, including her potential for tourism, one of the fastest growing industries in the State. Just as clearly, as the resources are developed, Alaska trade with Asia will increase, as will the important side benefits of that trade.

To sum up, Mr. President, the favorable action by the Senate today will not create a celebration, for, as I noted previously, the planning is already underway. There will be a celebration with or without Federal participation.

Granted, it will be a bigger and better centennial because of this legislation, but the Senate will do more than increase the size of an observance. It will authorize a unique program which combines Federal participation in an observance of an event of unique national importance and Federal participation in projects of enduring economic value.

In short, the Federal Government will take part in a centennial with a future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] for his splendid leadership in winning the Senate's decisive support for Federal participation in the 1967 Alaska centennial.

His strong and sincere advocacy, coupled with his gracious handling of the measure, assured its passage. We wish him and his great State every success and good fortune in their coming celebration.

Also, the Senate appreciates the splendid cooperation of the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. While expressing their own ideas on this proposal, they joined in assuring expeditious and unimpeded action, and we are grateful.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2499) to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no further votes today. The discussion of the small business bill, which is the pending business, will start tomorrow. It is my understanding that several Senators desire to make speeches this afternoon. However, I repeat that there will be no further voting today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

L.B.J. SKILLFUL HANDLING OF WAGE-PRICE GUIDEPOSTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, too many have been denouncing wage-price guideposts too loudly and too often. Management, labor, Members of Congress and many economists have joined in the general critical chorus of denunciation.

If anyone except those in the administration immediately responsible has risen to the defense of the guideposts, that defense has been so quiet and gentle it has escaped notice.

It is time someone speaks out loud and clear in defense of this struggle—and it is a crucial and vital struggle—by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to keep down prices. This is why I rise to speak this afternoon.

Mr. President, it is a tough but true fact of economic life that American big business—producing a lion's share of what the American consumer buys—is not and cannot be reached by monetary policy; that is, increasing interest rates, or by tax policy—raising taxes will not seriously influence its price behavior; or spending policies—we will not persuade them to cut back prices no matter how sharply we curtail Government spending.

SURVEY SHOWS BIG BUSINESS UNAFFECTED BY MONETARY POLICY

Indeed, last December the National Industrial Conference Board told us on the Joint Economic Committee that a survey it has just completed of all of the 1,000 largest firms in the country on the effect of the Federal Reserve Board's December decision to raise the rediscount rate by ½ percent would be virtually nil.

Mr. President, just think of the significance of that survey. It was conducted by a highly reputable, competent, honest business association. It polled all of the 1,000 biggest firms in the country, the firms that are responsible for 75 percent of the total business investment in plant and equipment.

It asked these firms what would be the effect of the most serious and dramatic change in monetary policy this country has seen in recent years on the investment practices of those firms. The result: no effect.

Just the day before this revelation, Chairman William McChesney Martin told our committee that in his judgment the prime effect of the raise in the discount rate in holding down prices would be to discourage business from investing in plant and equipment.

Obviously, if Martin was right, and he may have been, the brunt of the consequences of tight credit and high interest rates in stemming business demand had to be borne by 4½ million firms in the Nation that are not among the 1,000 big firms, the small firms that account for only 25 percent of the total investment in plant and equipment.

PRICES NOT RESPONSIVE TO DEMAND-SUPPLY

Mr. President, there is a simple economic reason why these big firms cannot be reached by Government policies designed to reduce demand pressure on prices. It is the cold fact that many—probably most of these firms—determine their price policies with little reference to supply and demand.

This has been most transparent in the steel industry, which for years has been increasing its prices when it has been operating far below capacity. It has done so when it has been operating at 70 or 60 percent of capacity or even less.

And, as is well known, the steel industry has desisted from raising prices on occasion when demand was much better and it was moving closer to capacity.

What is true of steel is true of many other industries.

FOR BIG BUSINESS PRICING; COSTS ARE CRUCIAL

On what basis do these industries raise or lower prices? Anyone who has had any experience in these industries can tell you that costs—especially labor costs—are likely to have a critical effect in their price behavior.

Four years ago the administration recognized that if big labor could be persuaded to relate its wage demands to its productivity increases, it would be possible to have regular and reasonably substantial increases in wages without increasing wage costs.

EVOLUTION OF GUIDELINES

And thanks to labor statesmanship and wise policies by the administration, labor was persuaded to confine its wage demands generally to its productivity increases. Clearly if the wage only increased as much as the production of a particular worker increased, the wage increase would not push up wage costs at all; prices could be stable.

For example, a worker earns $3 per hour. He turns out 100 units of a product each hour. The labor cost is 3 cents per unit. If he should increase his production by 10 percent, to 330 units per hour, then his wages could be increased to $3.30 per hour. But the cost per unit would still be 3 cents.

Consequently, the wage only increased as much as the production of the worker increased. As a result, the wage increase did not push up labor costs at all. Prices could be stable.

It is this principle which has formed the basis for the wage-price guideposts at first enunciated by the Council of Economic Advisers in its economic report in January of 1962.

In applying these guideposts the Council was, of course, immediately confronted with this serious equity problem:

Workers in industries with rapidly rising efficiency—subject to automation, for example—could receive fat productivity wage increases without increasing wage costs because their hourly production was rising sharply. But those workers in industries that for technological reasons could not share in rapid efficiency increases would receive little or nothing in productivity wage increases.

The Council properly recommended that, in general, the compensation of employees in any particular industry should increase at the same rate as the longrun increase in labor productivity for the Nation as a whole.

Now this, of course, would mean that in those industries with sharp increases in efficiency, labor costs would actually drop because the increase in wages would not keep pace with that industry's rapid efficiency increase. As as result stable prices would mean higher, and perhaps, much higher profits.

But for those industries with a low efficiency increase, to raise their employees' wages by the national average productivity increase would mean a rise in labor costs, and stable prices would mean lower profits or even losses.

The Council recommended that this difficulty be met by permitting the low efficiency industries to increase prices, the average efficiency firms would be expected to maintain stable prices and the high efficiency firms to reduce prices.

In the 1965 Economic Report of the President, this additional leeway was permitted in applying the guideposts:

Wage increases above the guideposts were permitted when:

First. The industry was unable to attract sufficient labor to meet the demand for its product. Correspondingly, the rise was to be less when the industry was characterized by above-average unemployment.

Second. Wages in the industry are particularly low. On the other hand, the wage increase was to be less than the guideposts when the wage level was exceptionally high.

Third. Wage increases would be less when changes in work rules permitted large gains in productivity.

The guideposts were modified to permit price increases above the guideposts when:

First. An increase occurred in nonlabor costs.

Second. The industry is unable to attract capital.

In that Economic Report of a year ago, the Council put the case for guideposts in our free economy this way:

> The guideposts offer a standard for responsible business, labor and Government leadership in an environment of informed public opinion. They are an attempt to operate our economy as it is—without controls, without wholesale fragmentation of our large, successful enterprises, and to maintain stable prices while using our resources, our capital and our labor to their full potential. They are in the tradition of America, asking those to whom the society has entrusted economic power to exercise it in ways consistent with the national interest.

SKILLFUL HANDLING OF GUIDEPOSTS BY L.B.J.

Now it is clear that any national economic policy as complicated and new as this—any policy that cuts right to the heart of making money or losing money as this policy does—can be expected to provoke loud and frequent complaints; or to collapse because its administration requires more wisdom on the part of the administrators than the administrators have or more forbearance and regard for the public interest on the part of labor and management than realistically develops.

I think that under the circumstances the Johnson administration deserves an A-plus for the way it has handled this tough new policy.

The Johnson administration has repeatedly and skillfully used the guideposts in specific bellwether situations to persuade labor and management in some of the leading industries in America to reach wage agreements that would not put pressure on prices.

Similarly, the administration has persuaded management in some of the leading industries in America not to raise prices.

Mr. President, this record is so impressive that I want to refer in detail to 10 episodes that in aggregate played the crucial role, in my judgment, in achieving price stability in the past 4 years. These include steel wage negotiations in 1962, 1963, and 1965, steel price announcements in 1962, 1963, and 1966, wage agreements for the automobile industry in 1964, the Federal employees' pay raise in 1965 and copper and aluminum price announcements in 1965.

GUIDELINE RESULTS: STABLE PRICE

Mr. President, this Nation has enjoyed a remarkable price performance in the past 4 years. And I choose the word remarkable advisedly. Consider that from 1956 to 1960 was a period of generally rising unemployment and diminishing pressure on plant capacity. The utilization of plant capacity dropped. And yet the Consumer Price Index rose about 9 percent.

Compare that with what has happened in the 5 years since 1961—a period of falling unemployment, of increasing scarcity of skilled workers, of steadily rising pressure on plant capacity, higher utilization—all the elements generally associated with rising prices. But what happened to prices during this 5-year period? There was no 9-percent increase or 8 percent or 7 percent or even 6 percent. Prices rose only about 5½ percent.

Consider how this was accomplished:

1. STEEL WAGE SETTLEMENT OF 1962

In the late months of 1961, the Kennedy administration made it clear to both labor and management that a price increase or inflationary wage settlement in 1962 would adversely affect the national interest, possibly setting off a wage-price spiral that would stunt economic growth, keep unemployment high, weaken the dollar, cut into the sale of steel exports, and further aggravate the outflow of gold.

On March 31, 1962, labor and management in the basic iron and steel industry reached an agreement which called for a small increase in fringe benefits, approximately 10 cents an hour, and no increases in wages—effective July 1, 1961. Although this contract was to cover a period of 2 years from date of settlement, the union was given the option to demand a raise in wages after July 30, 1963, and retained the right to strike if the companies refused their demands.

In general, the agreement was hailed by Government and industry leaders alike as a major step in the direction of maintaining economic stability and promoting sustained economic growth. President Kennedy in a statement to the union's 170-member wage-policy committee and 34-member executive board, stated that the pact was "obviously noninflationary" and had provided "new and imaginative benefits in areas vital to employees—job and income security."

2. STEEL PRICE CONTROVERSY OF 1962

On the afternoon of April 10, Chairman Roger Blough of the United States Steel Corp. informed President Kennedy that United States Steel would increase steel prices on an across-the-board basis by $6 a ton, effective immediately. In justifying this general increase in prices, Chairman Blough stated that the industry had absorbed all increases in wages and material costs since 1958 without raising prices, and the point had now been reached where United States Steel could no longer absorb such costs and also maintain the profit margin needed to finance current and future expenditures for modernization and expansion of plant and equipment. Shortly thereafter, seven other major producers followed the lead of United States Steel in announcing price increases: Bethlehem, National Steel, Pittsburgh Steel Co., Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Republic Steel, Jones & Laughlin, and Wheeling Steel Corp.

In prompt response to this action, the administration replied:

> While employment costs per hour of all wage and salaried employees in the basic iron and steel industry rose from 1958 to 1961, there was an equivalent increase in output per man-hour. As a result, employment costs per unit of steel output in 1961 was essentially the same as in 1958.

For this reason the administration took the firm position that this action on the part of certain firms was unjustified, especially since the industry at that time was operating at well below full capacity and was losing ground rapidly in the highly competitive world market.

In addition to announcing its disapproval of this action on the part of certain members of the industry, the Government ordered a grand jury investigation to see if the antitrust laws had been violated. In addition, Secretary of Defense McNamara released an order that steel for defense purposes would be bought where possible from companies that had not raised prices.

Three major producers, Inland Steel, Armco, and Kaiser Steel announced that they would not raise prices at this time. On Friday morning, April 13, Mr. Joseph Block, board chairman of Inland Steel, gave support to the Government's stand by stating to the press that "we do not feel that an advance in steel prices at this time would be in the national interest."

Because of these pressures, the eight firms which had announced price increases rescinded these increases on April 13 and 14. Bethlehem Steel, the first of the companies to do so, announced on April 13 that the company was canceling its price increase "in light of competitive developments and all other current circumstances, including the removal of a serious obstacle to proper relations between Government and business."

Mr. President, I think that this incident is clear in the minds of almost all Senators and Members of Congress. It was a spectacular development, and we do recall it. But I think it is very easy for us to forget the significance of developments which occurred a few years ago. This was the first great contribution, in my judgment, of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to price stability. It was immensely important.

It resulted, perhaps, in a serious loss of business support for President Kennedy, and that attitude did not change until he was assassinated. But I think it would be hard to overestimate the significance of the influence that this battle the Kennedy administration fought to keep prices down had on the subsequent performance of prices, not only in the steel industry, but in all of American industry, in services as well as in manufacturing, in the subsequent 4 years. I think that any discussion in the current year of price performance—and I suspect we can anticipate plenty of that in the coming campaign—should recognize that this was a remarkable performance by the Kennedy administration, and that it did contribute very strongly to price stability.

3. STEEL PRICE INCREASES IN 1963

Over the period April 9–16, 1963, increases in prices of some steel products were announced by eight major steel companies, including United States Steel Corp., the Nation's largest steel producer. The first announcement of selective price increases was made by the Wheeling Steel Corp., the 11th largest producer in the Nation. After careful study of this new development, President Kennedy in a statement issued on April 11 stated that:

> This administration is watching closely the possibilities of a general across-the-board price increase in steel. I opposed such an increase last year; I oppose it now. * * * It is the American public which would suffer most from a general increase in steel prices. It would invite another inflationary spiral in place of the present wage-price stability. * * * It would adversely affect our balance-of-payment position. * * * It would reduce the gains of our economic growth and reduce job opportunities. * * * However, I realize * * * that selected price adjustments, up or down as prompted by changes in supply and demand, as opposed to across-the-board increases, are not incompatible within a framework of general stability and steel price stability and are characteristic of any healthy economy.

Following this announcement by the President, seven major producers in addition to Wheeling Steel mentioned above—Lukens Steel Co., Republic, Pittsburgh Steel, Armco Steel Corp., United States Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin, and Inland Steel Co.—over the period April 14–16 announced price increases for selected products.

On April 19, President Kennedy issued a statement saying that these steel companies have acted with some restraint in increasing prices selectively on only about one-half of their products. He stated further that he hoped other companies particularly in the oil industry and the steelworkers union would act with similar restraint. In the same statement, the President said that these increases represented a 1-percent increase in steel prices.

4. STEEL WAGE SETTLEMENT OF 1963

As stated above, in 1962 labor and management in the steel industry signed a contract which provided that the union could demand higher wages after July 30, 1963, and could call a strike if such demands were refused. Instead of waiting until the deadline date, the union and management conferred for a period of several months and came to an agreement on a new contract on June 20, 1963—some 10 days before the strike deadline. This contract, which was to run until May 1, 1965, did not call for a wage increase but it did make provision for certain new or additional fringe benefits, especially in the area of job and income security, which amounted to a 15-cent-an-hour increase in wage costs over a 21-month period.

According to most close observers of the industry, the agreement fell well within the limits of the administration's guidelines. Although the administration at this time had not cited any specific figure for the guideline, in its 1963 Economic Report to Congress it did state that wage increases should fall somewhere within the overall annual rate of increase in national productivity—or output per man-hour—which was estimated to range somewhere between 2 and 3 percent per year. Incidentally, since then we have been able to recalculate it; and during that period, productivity actually increased between 3 and 4 percent; close to 3½ percent.

When asked for President Kennedy's reaction to the new agreement, White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said that the President was gratified by the early agreement in steel.

5. THE AUTOMOBILE WAGE AGREEMENT OF 1964

At the annual convention of the United Auto Workers Union in March 1964, President Johnson and his top economic adviser, Walter Heller, in addresses to the convention urged both labor and management in the upcoming negotiations to settle on noninflationary wage increases. In response to this recommendation by the administration, UAW President Walter Reuther stated that the union would seek a wage agreement which would match the current rise in the industry. According to estimates made by the union, productivity was advancing at a rate of 4.9 percent per year. In other words, the union would seek as its goal a package of wage and fringe benefit increases worth 4.9 percent.

Shortly thereafter, Chairman Heller responded that the Reuther statement was a "misinterpretation of the guideposts." He went on to explain that wage increases are not to be determined by the rate of productivity in a particular industry but by the national trend rate of increase in output per man-hour. As the Council of Economic Advisers stated in the President's 1964 Economic Report to Congress:

> The general guide for wages is that the percentage increase in total employee compensation per man-hour be equal to the national trend rate of increase in output per man-hour.

For 1964, the Council estimated that the national trend rate in productivity stood at 3.2 percent—based on the average annual percentage change in output per man-hour during the past 5 years.

On September 9, 1964, the UAW and Chrysler Corp. announced that they had agreed on a new 3-year contract. The average employee's gains under the new agreement were reported by the union to be worth about 53 cents an hour, while Chrysler estimated the cost at somewhere around 57 cents an hour over the life of the contract. In short, the contract called for no wage increases in the first year, a 2.5-percent raise in the second year and a 2.8-percent increase in the third year. In addition, the contract called for a wide range of additional fringe benefits.

If one were to take into consideration only the increases in wages, then increases in direct compensation fell within the limits of the administration's wage-price guidelines. However, when fringe benefits are taken into account, close observers of the industry estimated that the increased costs amounted to somewhere in the neighborhood of from 4.0 percent to 4.7 percent per year, which exceeded the noninflationary guidelines for 1964.

In a press conference on the same day, President Johnson stated that:

> I am pleased that the Chrysler-United Auto Workers case has been settled peacefully and privately on true good faith and collective bargaining.
>
> I have not seen the actual terms and have no comment on them.
>
> I am gratified, however, by the statements by the parties that this settlement takes full account of both public and private interests, that it will mean jobs, and that it will be noninflationary.

Shortly after the Chrysler agreement, the UAW and Ford announced on September 18, 1964, that they had agreed to a 3-year contract which followed the same general pattern set by the Chrysler agreement. The total cost of the package, however, was higher than the Chrysler agreement, amounting to about 63 cents an hour over the life of the contract.

On October 5, 1964, the UAW and General Motors agreed to a 3-year contract which again closely resembled the recently negotiated Chrysler and Ford agreements. The total annual cost of the agreement, including fringes, was estimated at 60 cents per hour.

Shortly after the agreement was announced, the President issued a statement saying that:

> While the auto settlement was a generous one, it must be judged in the context of the industry's very high profits * * *.
>
> Both labor and management realized the unique nature of the auto settlement. I expect that other industries with profits below the high levels in the automobile industry will not use the auto settlement as a pattern.

6. STEEL WAGE AGREEMENT OF 1965

Following several weeks of negotiation for a new contract, both labor and management interests soon came to the conclusion that they could not reach a final agreement before the May 1 strike deadline. Mainly as a result of strong pressures from the Government, both parties on April 26 agreed to an interim agreement which called for an 11½-cent-an-hour increase in wages which was to be put into escrow while new contract negotiations were continued past the contract expiration date of May 1. Under the agreement, both sides would have the right on August 1 to give 30 days' notice of terminating the agreement. Such termination would permit a strike on September 1.

President Johnson on April 28 praised both sides, saying that he had "never seen a period when labor and management have been more responsible." According to most observers of the industry, the interim agreement meant a wage increase of about 2.7 percent, which was well within the 3.2 percent wage-increase guideline set by the President's Council of Economic Advisers for the year 1965.

Negotiations on the new steel contract continued up to August 30 without any agreement. Since the strike deadline would go into effect on September 1, the Federal Government, following intensive mediation efforts, was able to get the parties to agree to an 8-day extension of the strike deadline.

At his news conference on August 25, President Johnson referred to the war in Vietnam and said that "there must be continued cost and price stability in our American economy, and I expect full and complete responsibility in the current wage negotiation."

On August 28, President Johnson announced that he was sending Senator WAYNE MORSE and Under Secretary of Commerce LeRoy Collins to the negotiation headquarters in Pittsburgh that day to see if they could isolate the issues and attempt to bring the sides closer together.

As a result of these and other pressures from the Federal Government, labor and management announced on September 4 that they had reached an agreement on a national contract, which would extend through August 1, 1968. The cost of the contract was estimated at about 47.3 cents per hour over the 35-month period of the contract. This meant, therefore, that the steel industry's labor cost over this period would increase at an annual rate of about 3.7 percent. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz told the Christian Science Monitor in an interview on September 9 that "the settlement was well within the 3.2-percent guidelines. It will contribute greatly to the stability of our economy."

7. FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY INCREASE OF 1965

On October 1, 1965, the House of Representatives approved a bill calling for a $1.5-billion pay raise which would directly affect the livelihood of 1.8 million Federal civilian employees. If approved by the Senate, Federal employees would receive a 4-percent increase in pay. On October 16, the administration issued a statement that it would veto the pay bill if Congress approved a pay increase exceeding the administration's wage-price guidelines. As a result of this development, the Senate approved a bill calling for a 3.6-percent pay increase. The administration indicated that this increase would be acceptable since it included an attempt to bring postal workers' pay up to comparable industry levels. As a result, on October 22, Congress approved a pay raise of 3.6 percent, retroactive to October 1.

8. ALUMINUM PRICE CONTROVERSY OF 1965

On October 29, 1965, three major aluminum producers—Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp., Reynolds Metals Co., and Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp.—announced a price rise of ½ cent a pound to a price of 25 cents a pound for primary aluminum, to be effective November 5.

On November 1, the White House announced that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler, and Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor had held a conference to discuss the "possibilities of disposing of surplus stockpiled aluminum to meet increased needs of aluminum for the war effort in Vietnam and to slow down the increasing importation of aluminum into the country." The administration stated that there was no connection whatsoever between this meeting and the price increase in aluminum. In this connection, the Government had announced in May of 1965 a desire to dispose of some of its 2½-million-ton aluminum stockpile, of which 1,400,000 tons was in excess, and of which 550,000 tons could be sold without further congressional authorization.

On November 5, Alcoa, the largest producer in the Nation, joined in the price increase. On the following day, Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, denounced the price increase as being inflationary. He stated that this was due to the fact that productivity in the industry had increased at a much faster rate than wages and that the industry's profits had over the past year increased at an impressive rate—up an average of 33 percent over the past year.

As I recall, the increase over the previous 3 or 4 years was something like 80 percent.

At the same press conference, Secretary McNamara announced that the Government would sell 200,000 tons of aluminum from the Government stockpile on the market over the next year, especially since the industry had shown an indication that it would not undertake the responsibility of taking this amount off the Government's hands during a time when the industry was operating at full capacity and defense needs were increasing.

On November 8, Leon E. Hickman, an Alcoa executive, defended the industry's action by stating that the price increases were justified both because aluminum prices were still below their 1960–61 level and because the industry's earnings have over a long period of time fallen below the average for manufacturing industry in general. The following day, President Johnson announced that 100,000 tons of aluminum would be sold immediately and 200,000 additional tons would be sold at a later date, bringing the total to 300,000 tons.

Following this development, Alcoa's president held a series of meetings with Secretary McNamara and on Wednesday evening, November 10, Alcoa announced that it was rescinding its price increase.

In so doing, the industry received the assurance from the Government that the Government would not follow through with its announcement to sell aluminum on the market and that negotiations would resume concerning the orderly disposal of the entire 1.4 million tons excess aluminum reserve of the Government.

9. COPPER PRICE INCREASE OF 1965

The ninth incident involved and contributed greatly in my judgment to price stability in the economy was the copper price increase of 1965—that is, the way the Government handled that situation.

On November 1, 1965, the Copper Range Co. announced that it would raise prices by 2 cents a pound, effective immediately. Shortly after this announcement all of the major producers of copper, with the exception of Kennecott Copper, announced similar increases in prices.

On November 17, Secretary of Defense McNamara announced that at least 200,000 tons of copper would be freed from the national stockpile for sale to relieve the copper shortage and pressure for higher prices.

McNamara stated that the action was based on a threat of market disruption due to "our greatly increased defense efforts in Vietnam and recent international political disturbances." He stated further that the market disruption, "despite the best efforts of our American copper industry to supply the market can lead to strong inflationary developments not only in copper, essential to defense needs, but also more generally throughout our economy." The Secretary also stated that the industry had been consulted on the matter before the decision was made.

In response to these developments, the copper industry, led by Anaconda Co., quickly rescinded its price increase on November 19. Spokesmen for the industry denied that the action on the part of the industry paralleled that of the aluminum industry. In the case of aluminum, spokesmen for the copper industry said, the U.S. stockpile posed a direct threat to markets which were already adequately supplied with aluminum. But they maintained that in the case of copper, the release of Government stocks would serve as a respite from heavy demand for the metal which was already in scarce supply. In other words, the industry took the position that the price increase in copper was designed primarily to ration supply rather than a move to increase profits, as was the case in the aluminum industry.

In a statement made shortly after the Government's announcement to reduce the size of its copper stockpile, Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler said that:

> Recent events demonstrate that your Government stands ready to blow the whistle impartially on labor and business and, indeed, on its own employees. * * * No matter how unwelcome the burden, the Government, in the present situation, has the clear and undeniable responsibility to identify, without fear or favor, price or wage developments that threaten continued economic stability and expansions.

Mr. President, I am sure that many cynical persons greeted the argument of Secretary Fowler as a political argument or as one pointing with pride to the administration. But if we put in perspective all of these actions, beginning with the first guideline action on steel wage negotiations back in 1961, it can be seen that the statement is true.

It is not exaggeration. It is not boasting. It is actually what the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have done. They have blown the whistle without fear or favor on labor, on management, and on its own employees.

In every case it has been politically unpopular in a narrow sense, but it has certainly been in the national interest and in the interest of all Americans, and has certainly contributed to price stability.

10. STEEL PRICE INCREASE OF 1966

On December 31, 1965, Bethlehem Steel Corp. announced a $5-per-ton increase in structural steel products. This move on the part of Bethlehem was immediately denounced by President Johnson and Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. On January 1, Chairman Ackley summoned four Bethlehem executives to Washington for a conference. Following the meeting, Ackley issued a statement saying the $5 increase was unjustified and inflationary, and that he hoped that it will be withdrawn and that other producers will refrain from raising their prices.

Following this development, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the General Services Administration issued a joint order on January 3 which stated that structural steel would be purchased by these agencies at the lowest possible price. Also on the same day, Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton instructed his field offices "not to concur in the award of contracts for Federal aid products requiring structural steel and reinforcing steel except as State highway departments and bidders established that the prices are not greater than the prices prevailing prior to January 1, 1966."

Two other steel producers followed the lead of Bethlehem by announcing similar increases in structural steel products on January 3. Inland Steel's board chairman, Joseph L. Block, said:

> The impact of this price increase is minor in relation to the average price of all steel and therefore can hardly be deemed a potential cause of inflation.

During the course of this controversy concerning steel prices, United States Steel Corp. officials came to Washington to discuss the situation with Government officials. Although no specific prices were discussed at the meeting, United States Steel announced shortly thereafter on January 4 that it had decided to increase the price of structural steel products by $2.75 a ton and would cut the price on cold-rolled sheet steel made at its Pittsburg, Calif., plant by 6 percent or $9 a ton.

Following this announcement, Chairman Ackley expressed the hope that Bethlehem and Inland would adjust their prices to the $2.75 level. Shortly thereafter, Bethlehem rescinded its increase pending further study, and Inland said it would soon post prices competitive with United States Steel's.

In evaluating the impact of the steel price compromise, Ackley stated that the net effect of these price changes would be inconsequential since the increase would be less than one-tenth of 1 percent and that, he said, is "about as close to absolute stability as you could get."

Mr. President, on March 8—that is less than a week ago—the Wall Street Journal carried a detailed discussion of this action by the steel industry and left the very clear impression, in my judgment, that the steel industry was making a shambles of the guideposts and increasing overall steel prices in the process. Because this article raises serious questions about the administration of the guideposts, I wrote Chairman Ackley about it.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article and the Ackley letter, along with the Council of Economic Advisers press release of February 28, be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 8, 1966]

LESSONS IN STEEL: ITS LATEST BOOSTS SHOW UNITED STATES STEEL IS ACTING MORE SHREWDLY

(By George A. Nikolaieff)

PITTSBURGH.—United States Steel Corp. suddenly is finding itself in an unprecedented position: Everybody is heaping praise on the corporation for its public-spirited price policies.

This fact is not without significance for the steel industry and the general public. It's becoming clear that steelmakers—and United States Steel especially—are evolving a price strategy far more shrewd than that of the past. They are artfully taking their price gains a small bite at a time and yielding to White House pressure for advance consultation on changes. Eveh more importantly, they are mixing up price increases with complex revisions and even small price cuts so that the public and the Government can be excused if they occasionally wonder just what is going on.

Last week's major price overhaul by United States Steel is a good case in point, for it is becoming clear that the price changes are far from what they first appeared to be. "The reaction," said a United States Steel spokesman as he happily lifted a martini at lunch the day after the price announcement, "was very good."

He had reason to be jubilant. United States Steel had boosted prices on steel plate, a big tonnage product, by an average $2.92 a ton. At the same time, it seemingly slashed prices on a heavy sheet product that it said could be substituted for plate and stressed that it hoped customers would switch to the lower-priced sheet, thus taking pressure off its heavy plate mills which are straining to meet demand.

Also it threw out its price lists for many common nails and one type of wire rod, announcing that henceforth it would negotiate prices in order to meet the lower quotes of foreign steel makers, who have grabbed half of the wire rod and nail market.

A "STANDOFF" CLAIMED

The overall impact on steel prices, United States Steel claimed, was "about a standoff."

These price changes, according to Washington sources, were explained to the President's Council of Economic Advisers the weekend before public disclosure. Chairman Gardner Ackley was pleased. "In the council's judgment, relative price adjustments can contribute to economic efficiency when they take place within a framework of price stability," he said.

Laudatory comments came from other quarters, but for a different reason. "It was a very wise move," comments one well informed New York steel analyst. "It had to be done in a way that would command only modest headlines." The net effect, he calculates, was a "very definite upward price move." The withdrawal of price lists and other downward adjustments, he believes, amount to "camouflage" for the increase.

The steel analyst's view is at least plausible. The boost in plate prices will raise the average level of all steel prices by about two-tenths of 1 percent. This seems small enough but it is a series of precisely such increases that has boosted overall steel prices by about 1.3 percent in the past year. It is also of about the same magnitude as Bethlehem Steel Corp.'s abortive January 1 price increase on structurals. That increase was withdrawn after Mr. Ackley and others denounced it as inflationary and unwarranted.

Bethlehem, however, didn't accompany its price increase with other cuts or apparent reduction. United States Steel has learned this lesson well. It put through a tinplate increase last November while announcing a lower price on tinless steel for cans which won't be sold in quantity until at least late this year. Similarly, the company got a price increase on structurals about half as large as Bethlehem's shortly after Bethlehem backed off. Again, United States Steel threw in a seemingly large $9-a-ton cut in the price of sheets on the West Coast, but the small tonnage it involved made its impact on overall revenues almost negligible.

This time, United States Steel has sharpened its price maneuvers to a finer edge. The plate increase, United States Steel suggests, was offset somewhat by savings of $2 to $25 a ton on the new price for heavy coiled sheets. But these heavy sheets are a new product that are sold now in what one mill terms "insignificant volume." If this is to be a meaningful price cut, United States Steel will have to convince users to buy much more of it and that poses a special problem.

Although various steel users concede they probably could use the heavier sheet in place of plate, many say they won't because it requires a heavy capital outlay. The stumbling block is that the sheet comes coiled and must first be unrolled and straightened. Machines that do this cost $750,000 or more, according to a sales executive for a company that makes such machinery. A purchasing agent for a railroad car building company says flatly, "We couldn't realize any savings on the sheet because we haven't got any of that unraveling machinery."

The price moves on wire rods and nails are an even greater imponderable. "Last year," United States Steel said in its announcement, "imported nails accounted for half of the nails sold in this country, and foreign rods took 47 percent of the overall domestic market." By removing its published prices United States Steel intends to compete with the cheaper foreign products. This prompted Mr. Ackley to say, "This should help meet foreign competition and thus improve our balance-of-payments position."

However, despite its political appeal, there is some evidence that the gesture may have little economic significance. Domestic buyers of U.S. rods and nails report that the published list of most U.S. producers is largely fictional because they buy such products below list prices now. Because of this a sales executive for one major steel producer concedes, "It certainly is impossible to forecast how deeply rod and nail prices will be cut."

Too, both rod and nail markets are relatively small. According to U.S. Steel's own estimates 2,724,400 tons of rod and 600,000 tons of nails are consumed in the United States yearly. This is roughly 3.5 percent of all shipments, compared with the 11 percent of the steel market affected by the plate increase.

A VIGOROUS SALES EFFORT?

It remains to be seen just how vigorously U.S. Steel plans to pursue this market. "American steel makers haven't been anxious to keep these low-margin markets for rods and wire products," one steel analyst says. "It would take too much capital expenditure to modernize old wire facilities and this is a low-priority area for capital improvements." With profit margins already low, steel analysts find it hard to see why the company would elect to pursue a low-margin market, or, if it does, just how long it would do so before returning to its previous price levels.

No one questions the fact that U.S. Steel would like to retaliate against foreign steel makers who have carved out a U.S. market in recent years that now accounts for one in nine tons of steel consumed. What some analysts do question is how deeply the corporation is willing to cut prices below present levels to win back part of that market.

What is clear is that U.S. Steel remains anxious to raise the level of steel prices to offset mounting labor and other costs. It has come a long way since President Kennedy in 1962 rolled back a $6-a-ton increase on all steel products by telling a national television audience the boost was a "wholly unjustifiable and irresponsible defiance of the public interest."

In 4 years it has almost won the price gains denied at that time. It has slowly evolved a price policy that is infinitely more patient. Unless the political climate changes radically, it would appear that the future will bring more highly selective and modest increases, many mixed with small reductions, all carefully cleared with the White House in advance and most pushing upward the cost of steel.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, March 12, 1966.
Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: This is in answer to your letter of March 8 regarding the recent Wall Street Journal article on the price adjustments by United States Steel.

The article is misleading in several respects:

1. United States Steel did not win administration "approval" or "praise" for the action. We have not yet concluded that the price changes met the standards of the price guidepost. The Council's press release (copy enclosed) cautiously avoided either approval or censure. (In background briefing we pointed out that the Council could not give the United States Steel move its full blessing because we didn't have the necessary information.)

2. As the article admits, even the industry itself cannot be certain of the ultimate effect on net revenue per ton because it is not known by how much rod and nail prices will be reduced. Rough calculations indicate that rod and nail prices would have to drop by about $12 a ton in order fully to offset the increase of $2.92 a ton in plate prices. This is not an unreasonable expectation. The disparity between domestic and import prices exceeds $12. Furthermore, there is precedent for a drastic cut of this type. In 1961, United States Steel withdrew its pricelists for reinforcing bars in order to combat mounting imports. Subsequently the price dropped from $130 a ton to an estimated $80 to $85, reversing the trend toward higher imports.

3. It should be kept in mind that United States Steel's announced price changes were designed to promote economic efficiency and improve steel's foreign trade balance. Even if, in the final analysis, the adjustments should raise the average of steel prices by a tenth of a point, the effect is very different from an equal overall rise brought about by some price increases but no decreases.

4. The Wall Street Journal suggests that the steel industry is, by piecemeal price adjustments, recouping the abortive, across-the-board price increase of 1962, thus eradicating President Kennedy's victory. This seems a little absurd. United States Steel's move in April 1962, had it succeeded, would have raised steel prices by more than 4 percent. Now, almost 4 years later, steel prices are only 2½ percent higher. In any case, can anyone believe that steel prices would thereafter have been completely stable had the President not intervened? On the contrary, a 4-percent rise in 1962 would have probably encouraged larger subsequent price increases than we have in fact observed.

Your letter also asked about steel productivity trends. In the Council's steel report of April 1965, the productivity trend for the steel industry was estimated at 3 percent. Recent experience has been much better. In 1965, productivity grew 3.7 percent, and in the last 5 years its growth has averaged 4.1 percent a year.

I hope this helps to answer the questions you raised.

Sincerely,

GARDNER ACKLEY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,
February 28, 1966.

Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, today issued the following statement:

"The Council of Economic Advisers was informed by the United States Steel Corp. of its intention to adjust prices on selected steel products. According to the information provided, certain prices will be increased by amounts which add 0.2 percent to the total price of steel. The company stated that these increases will be offset by price reductions elsewhere, still not determined in exact amount, so that the overall effect of the changes on revenue per ton is about a standoff."

"Reductions in prices on nails and rods, for which there is idle capacity, should help meet foreign competition and thus improve our balance-of-payments position. Adjustment of other prices is calculated to increase the efficiency of utilization of available facilities.

"In the Council's judgment relative price adjustments can contribute to economic efficiency when they take place within a framework of price stability."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have gone into this detail because I think many people have been puzzled by what is happening in steel. If one is not following it as closely as the Council of Economic Advisers does, I think many people, particularly cynical or skeptical people, feel that steel is getting away with murder—that the industry has made increases in the prices of products which it sells widely, and has made price decreases in products which it does not sell a great deal of. Indeed, the analysis by the Wall Street Journal is to that effect.

The Council of Economic Advisers has gone into a very comprehensive analysis of the situation. It is a group which is made up of competent men, and Mr. Ackley's letter speaks emphatically of their view.

GUIDEPOST EXAMPLE CRUCIAL

Mr. President, in steel, automobiles, aluminum, this use of guideposts has been itself a solid and highly significant contribution to price stability, but the critical effect of guideposts is in the example they set.

Certainly the acceptance of guideposts by the Nation's great labor and business leaders in widely reported negotiations gives all of American business and labor an example of great significance.

Indeed, until the last few months—and I challenge anybody to think about this—there has been no other force slowing down price increases on a great national scale. And yet the price performance of the American economy in the period since the initiation of the guideposts 4 years ago—as I have said—has been excellent.

CHALLENGE TO SKEPTICAL

Mr. President, I challenge any Senator to give me a better explanation of this phenomenon of relative price stability in our booming economy. Let me ask: Is not the skillful use of guideposts at least one logical explanation of the superior price performance of the economy since 1962?

Indeed, a study by the Joint Economic Committee confirms this. This study is entitled "Governmental Policies To Deal With Prices in Key Industries in Selected Foreign Countries."

This is a concise and brief study of the policies in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. I ask unanimous consent that the study be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES TO DEAL WITH PRICES IN KEY INDUSTRIES IN SELECTED FOREIGN COUNTRIES

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

OCTOBER 31, 1963.

To Members of the Joint Economic Committee:

Transmitted herewith is a brief survey of public policies pursued in selected countries of Western Europe in dealing with prices and price increases in key industries. This is one of a series of staff materials being issued as aids to understanding of the international implications of various economic policies which, for the respective countries are likely regarded as essentially domestic issues. No precise pattern will be followed in the series. I believe, however, that, by making data more readily available for a comparison of national policies and practices in various areas, members of the committee, other Members of Congress, and the general U.S. reader will be aided in understanding economic problems within the framework of the enterprise and free market "rules of the game" as practiced by the leading industrial nations.

Faithfully,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS, *Chairman.*

FOREWORD

The free flow of world trade and commerce, especially among the Western nations, depends upon relative production costs in the various countries and the price competitiveness of commodities and services. It is useful, therefore, to know how other countries handle the problem of price increases.

In the "President's Economic Report for January 1962" (pp. 185–190), the Council of Economic Advisers suggested as U.S. economic policy a set of criteria as "guideposts for noninflationary wage and price behavior." These proposals were again referred to in the report for January 1963. These suggestive guideposts are, for the convenience of the reader, summarized in appendix 1.

In view of the prevailing concern over the balance of payments and the competitive game as played by the world's leading industrial countries, members of the Joint Economic Committee, at the suggestion of Representative HENRY S. REUSS, have asked the committee staff to present brief statements on devices employed in dealing with price rises in key industries in selected Western European countries. With full recognition of the briefness and uncritical nature of these comments, we feel that the materials collected may nonetheless be of interest to Members of Congress and students of the competitive position of the United States.

ECONOMIC POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Belgium: Governmental policies to deal with prices in key industries

Belgium Government policy on prices has undergone several changes since World War II and is currently under further review, the Government being now in the process of revising the basic legislation.

The basic legal authority remains the Regent's decree-law of January 22, 1945, adopted under the wartime (though post-liberation) regime of plenary powers and thus having the force of law. In general, it authorized the fixing of maximum prices and declared that even where no specific maximum prices were established, it was illegal to sell at more than "normal" prices, as determined by a tribunal, but which should not be more than 2.75 times those prevailing for the same article during the first half of 1939. The Government was given powers to cut off the supply to establishments which violated price orders, and if necessary to close them down.

In practice, the administration was not as severe as the ordinance seemed to suggest, since action depended largely on complaints being brought by injured parties. The real sanction against unjustified price increases was the power of the Minister of Economic Affairs to fix maximum prices, and this power could usually be effective without being actually implemented. Whether a price increase is "justified" or "excessive" now rests upon a determination by a regular magistrate, taking into account the findings of the Minister of Economic Affairs as assisted by the consultative Commission des Prix described in a later paragraph. Legislation recently under consideration would give this power of determination on national interest aspects to the Minister, confirming his power to fix maximum prices.

During the late forties there was a gradual administrative decontrol, but with the inflationary pressures generated by the Korean war, the Government moved toward closer surveillance of prices. There were decrees requiring the posting of meat prices, and a new basic decree regarding the power to fix maximum prices.

The main new element introduced during the 1950's, and what is still the chief instrument to avoid excessive price increases, has been the requirement of advance notice of the intention to increase prices. An initial ministerial decree of December 20, 1950, was replaced by the ministerial decree of October 10, 1959, which still is the prevailing code in this field. It requires producers and importers of some 82 specific goods and services to give 21 days' advance notice to the Ministry of Economic Affairs before putting into effect price increases. The notice should contain justification, in terms of cost factors, for the proposed increase. The headings involve mostly processed foods, household articles and appliances (e.g., washing machines, heaters, flatirons, and radio and TV sets), basic items of clothing and furniture, basic construction materials (bricks, roofing, tiles, cement, and tar), petroleum and gas products, and a few critical chemical products (sulfuric acid, ethyl alcohol, products of soda and potassium, and fertilizers). The only service charges included are those for haircuts, laundry, drycleaning, and motion picture admissions.

The decree permits professional groups to make the advance notice on behalf of their members. It contains no requirement that the proposed price increases must actually be approved by the Minister, and the merchants are in fact legally free, after complying with the advance notification requirement, to implement their proposed increases. The sanction is primarily that of moral pressure, in that the producers or merchants would be reluctant to defy the Minister's expressed disapproval, but the ultimate sanction of a maximum price order is always available in the background.

In deciding whether to approve or disapprove a proposed price increase, the Minister of Economic Affairs has, since April 1960, had the assistance of a consultative Commission des Prix. The royal decree of that month, creating the Commission, specified that its members should be appointed from the following interest groups:

Four members representing industry. Three members representing agriculture. One member representing local handcrafts (artisanat). One member representing importers. Four members representing wholesale and retail merchants. Four members representing larger chain and department stores. One member representing the transport industry. One representative of credit institutions. Nine representatives from the most representative trade unions. Four representatives of "family interests." One delegate each from the Ministries of Economic Affairs, Middle Classes, the Prime Minister's Office, Agriculture, Finances, Labor and Social Security, Communications, Public Works and Reconstruction.

A permanent committee was created within the Commission, with a representative chosen by the members representing each of the major interest groups: Industry, agriculture, commerce, trade unions (three members, and family affairs, together with the delegate of the Ministry of Economic Affairs.

The Commission is entrusted with the broader tasks of keeping a general watch over price movements and making appropriate recommendations to the Minister. Although purely consultative, it exerts in fact considerable power, as a Minister would be reluctant to disregard its advice.

Rationale of proposed new legislation

Some months ago the Ministry of Economic Affairs prepared a new draft law which would have given the Minister increased powers in the matter of price controls. At present, the regular magistrates are asked to decide on complaints that given prices are "abnormal." Although they can rule on whether costs have actually increased to the point of justifying a price increase, they have not felt competent to rule on the aspect of national interest. The draft bill would give this power of determination, on the national interest aspects, to the Minister. It would also confirm the Minister's existing power to fix minimum prices and extend such power to apply not merely to categories of products but to specific products, by brand name. Finally, it would prohibit retail price maintenance agreements and would establish certain definite rules on fair competition, such as a prohibition against false sales claims and a prohibition against selling below cost except in certain defined situations such as on traditional seasonal sales (e.g., stock clearance sales after Christmas). Many provisions of this last part of the bill, dealing with fair-commercial practices, already exists in other individual laws, and there has not been much opposition to having them reasserted and strengthened. But there is strong opposition to the grant of power to the Minister to determine whether prices are abnormal and to the proposal to give him special investigatory powers, including authority to requisition company records. There is also criticism in some quarters of the bill's proposal to grant the Minister power to prohibit "imposed prices."

The Central Economic Council—a consultative body with representatives from industry, labor, and other interest groups—has received the draft law and issued an opinion, as requested by the Government. It would uphold the Minister's power to issue orders fixing maximum prices or margins, though of limited duration (e.g., 6 months). In emergencies he could issue orders for a shorter validity, of say 1 or 2 months, without recourse to the consultation required for 6-month orders.

The Central Council opposed giving the Minister power to fix prices by specific trade-named product. On the proposed power to prohibit "imposed prices" by a manufacturer, the Council's opinion was divided. Some members of the Central Economic Council would confer this power on the Conseil du Contentieux Economique, an arbitral body which now handles trade complaints, notably between trade associations and individual firms, and which plays a role in hearing complaints under the law against the abuse of economic power of 1959.

Having received these criticisms and suggestions from the Central Economic Council, as well as widespread protests from certain business circles, the Government is restudying its original draft law and it is generally conceded that the powers of the Minister will be more restricted in the revised draft.

Press critics of the new bill, as originally proposed, declare that it is based on the assumption that competition is inadequate as a regulator of prices. Officials concerned with the bill reply that to an extent this is true, and that competition is imperfect as a regulator, either because of the existence of oligopoly or because, as for instance in some retail fields, the entry of new firms in an already crowded field may cause existing firms to raise their margins in an effort to maintain the same income from a reduced share of the trade. But they declare that the main justification for new legislation lay in the fact that the tribunals were not technically competent to decide on complex commercial questions.

France: Governmental policies to deal with prices in key industries

Confronted with recurring inflationary pressures, and in keeping with the extension of the area of Government responsibility which evolved in the early post-World War II years, French governments have accumulated a relatively full range of devices designed to contain or limit price increases. These same two factors, however, have led to broad-spectrum price control measures, rather than to a key industry approach. The relaxation of controls and changes of policy which accompanied the economic recovery of the 1950's were so accomplished that the present system is complex and often applied on a product-by-product or case-by-case basis.

The devices and techniques which the French Government presently employs to deal with price increases may be grouped as follows:

1. Direct price (and rent) controls. 2. Administration of the prices of the nationalized sector. 3. Formulation of an incomes policy. 4. Persuasion and publicity. 5. Reduction of import duties and turnover taxes.

Excluded from the foregoing listing are the usual indirect means of reducing price pressures—broadly speaking, monetary and fiscal policy.

1. Direct Price (and Rent) Controls

Direct price controls presently employed in France are based on authority established in 1945 (Ordinance No. 45–1483, June 30, 1945), as amended. (An ordinance is an action taken by the Government under special authority which would normally be the subject of legislation.) Under this system, four different regimes are distinguished:

(a) Liberte totale: This may sometimes mean no control at all, as might be inferred, or it may only mean that a product's price is not controlled at one or several stages of production and/or distribution.

(b) Liberte surveillee: This regime differs from the preceding in that producers and/or distributors must inform the price control authority of prevailing prices and of price changes.

(c) Liberte controlee.—While producers and distributors may fix their prices freely, they are required to inform the price control authority of prevailing prices and of price changes. The price control authority may, within 15 days, refuse to approve price increases.

(d) Taxation.—In this case, the Government fixes a precise price for the product involved, and/or a ceiling price, and/or the permissible margin (or markup).

Frequently a combination of two or three of the above systems is applied to the same product, according to the stage of production or distribution.

The extent of recourse to direct price controls has varied considerably in the postwar period, and in recent years the trend has been toward liberalization. In April of this year, however, a series of decrees involving some 80 products provided new evidence of the Government's willingness to resort to these direct controls if necessary.

Due to the complexity of the system and the lack of any comprehensive compilation of the degree of control employed on the product-by-product basis, it is difficult to generalize as to the extent to which direct price controls are used in connection with key industries. They have been or are applied for certain key products, such as wheat, milk, and gasoline, for both political and economic reasons.

In a certain number of urban areas, notably including Paris, rents are still controlled on older (pre-1948) buildings. Unfreezing rents is taking place progressively, but rent control still represents a significant characteristic of the housing market in France.

2. Administration of the Prices of the Nationalized Sector

Nationalization of important sectors of the economy gives the Government control over the prices of several key products and industries. Particularly noteworthy in this connection are the railroads, the Paris transport system, coal, gas, and electricity. In fixing prices for the products of these industries, the effect of increases on the general price level is a prominent consideration. It should be noted that the granting of government subsidies to certain of the nationalized industries has been and still is frequently one of the most important alternatives to price increases.

3. Formulation of an Incomes Policy

In 1962, the Government sponsored important steps toward formulation of an incomes policy within the framework of the French planning mechanism. The desire was to obtain a consensus on the distribution of future increases in the national income by discussion among income groups—including wage and salary earners as well as other income recipients. In this manner, it was hoped that excessive claims on real resources might be avoided, and inflationary pressures brought under control. A roundtable discussion in the fall of 1962 on this question was unable to reach agreement, at least in part because of difficulties in compiling adequate statistics on present income shares. The Government plans to continue this line of approach.

4. Persuasion and Publicity

Due to the wide sphere of direct and indirect governmental control in France, and to the existence of a planning mechanism which brings Government and business together, possibility exists for the Government to exert considerable influence on the price decisions of key industries. One highly publicized recent case where persuasion is thought to have been effectively employed involved proposed increases in steel prices in France in 1962. Contact by French Ministers with business and industry leaders and representatives is quite extensive, and ministerial advice on price questions is probably frequently heeded, especially since the possibility of imposing direct price controls usually exists.

Publicity is probably not as important a device in France as is persuasion, and is not particularly associated with key industries. At times in the past, governments have undertaken campaigns to convince the public of the need for restraint, or even to bring about decreases in prices. Such campaigns have usually been short lived, although the Government's more general pleas for price (and wage) restraints are, of course, a recurring theme.

5. Reduction of Import Duties and Turnover Taxes

To a limited degree, France has adopted the practice of reducing import barriers specifically in order to combat price increases. A recent step of this nature was aimed at a number of specific products (i.e., not generalized), and involved the anticipation of tariff reductions which were to take place within the Common Market framework in any case 2 months later. In the same line, the quantitative import restrictions which France still maintains on certain food products (e.g., fresh apples and pears) are temporarily relaxed from time to time when prices on the French retail market rise above a specified level.

Reduction of the turnover tax has also been employed as an anti-inflationary tool, to some extent. Since, in order that domestic prices come down as a result of a decrease in a turnover tax, producer or distributor prices must not be increased; such action may be accompanied by agreement on the part of sellers to maintain or lower their own prices.

Germany: Governmental policies to deal with prices in key industries

Germany's theory of a "social free-market economy" (Soziale Marktwirtschaft), as expounded by Ludwig Erhard, has no place for a government price policy except where necessary for pressing social reasons. Except in rare instances, therefore, the Government has not tried to influence pricing directly, but has relied instead on general economic policy measures, particularly monetary policy, aimed at controlling the overall level of demand.

The exceptions for social purposes consist primarily of direct controls over pricing of medicines and medical supplies, certain basic foodstuffs (mainly milk and sugar), and rents for social housing. In addition, there are the usual controls over pricing in the public utilities and transportation fields, and the cartel law provides protection from monopolistic practices.

Despite the limited use of price control techniques, the Federal Government possesses vague, and dubious, legal authority to prohibit any price rise which could result in a "basic change in the general price level, especially the cost of living." This authority is contained in the price law (Preisgesetz) of 1948, which was designed to give protection against possible inflation while postwar controls were being dismantled. Thus far, it has only been used to meet emergencies resulting from temporary shortages. The law is widely recognized as being very weak, and its constitutionality has been questioned. It was to have been replaced by a new law over 10 years ago, but the need for price control legislation is not generally recognized at present and there has been no move to draft a substitute law.

In recent years, the Government's approach to the problem of inflation has shown some signs of changing, as basic economic conditions have changed. Until recently, the inflationary threat was primarily—one might even say solely—of the classical, overdemand variety. It is only in the past 2 or 3 years, as demand has gradually subsided, that attention has begun to shift to the possibility of autonomous cost-push inflation. The Government's Economic Report for 1963, for example, includes the following passage:

"In order to restore stable prices it is not sufficient to bring supply and demand within the economy into harmony with each other. Action must therefore also be taken in a third direction with the object of checking the rise in costs. In certain circumstances the rise of prices can continue for some time even during a recession, if the upsurge of costs is not ended. Precisely for 1963 there is a danger in the Federal Republic that despite progressive relaxing of cyclical tensions, the movement of wage costs will not allow the rise in prices to stop."

The Volkswagen price increase in the spring of 1962 was an important milepost in the evolution of government thinking. The episode closely paralleled the well-known steel industry case in the United States which came only a few weeks earlier. In the midst of a Government campaign for price-wage moderation, spearheaded by Minister Erhard, Volkswagen announced increases in automobile prices of 5 to 8 percent. This provoked a highly publicized attempt by Erhard to get the increase rescinded, including a threat to reduce tariffs on imported automobiles. Volkswagen refused to yield, however, and tariffs on automobile imports from EEC countries were reduced by an average of about 50 percent. Tariffs would have been reduced at a later date anyway, under the EEC Treaty, but this action advanced the reduction by as much as 4 years.

Italy: Governmental policies to deal with prices in key industries

The Italian Government has full authority to control the prices of goods and services under a law (No. 347 of Oct. 19, 1944, as amended) which established an Interministerial Price Committee (Comitato Interministeriale Prezzi, usually known as the CIP) composed of the President of the Council of Ministers (the Prime Minister) and the Ministers of Finance, Treasury, Agriculture, Transport, Industry and Commerce, Public Works, Labor and Welfare, Foreign Trade, Budget, and State Holdings.

The Price Committee is assisted by a subcommittee, composed of the Ministers of Industry and Commerce, Treasury, and Agriculture, which supervises the activities of a secretariat which prepared staff studies for consideration by the subcommittee or the full committee, and which publishes a biweekly review of domestic and international price and economic trends. This review (Relazione Quindicinale sull'Andamento dei Prezzi) is circulated only within the Government.

Although there is no legal limit to the authority of the Interministerial Price Committee, at the present time it controls only the following types of prices:

(1) Industrial products: solid and liquid fuels (coal and petroleum), cement, lime, fertilizer, daily newspapers, specialty medicines (pharmaceuticals); (2) Foodstuffs: wheat, rice, beets, beet seeds, sugar, molasses; and (3) Public services: electricity, gas, telephone, water, radio-television license fees, hotel and boarding-house (pensions) rates, railway passenger and freight rates.

Basing its decisions on the recommendations of its secretariat and subcommittee, the Interministerial Price Committee fixes maximum prices for those commodities which it decides should be controlled. The controlled prices are imposed upon publications in the form of decrees in the Official Gazette (Gazetta Ufficiale), and are effective upon publication. The actual administration of the control system is delegated to Provincial price committees, under the chairmanship of the prefect, in each of the Provinces of Italy.

Affected industries or businesses may apply to the Interministerial Price Committee for reconsideration of the existing level of controlled prices, if they believe that increases are justified. Prices of commodities which are not presently under control may be increased without reference to the committee.

The following penalties, depending upon the degree of seriousness of the offense, were established (by law No. 896 of September 15, 1957) for violation of the system of controlled prices:

(1) Fine of 15 million lire ($24,000); (2) Fine of 10 million lire ($16,000) and up to 3 years in prison; or (3) Fine of 20 million lire ($32,000) and up to 6 years in prison.

An offender may also have his business license suspended for up to 1 year, and, in addition, may be denied the right to engage in import-export trading for up to 1 year.

The Netherlands: Governmental policies to deal with prices in key industries

The Netherlands Government deals with price-control matters through its price policy and its wage policy.

Ever since the Korean boom, the Netherlands Government has exercised some form of control over prices which has varied in strictness depending largely on the cyclical situation.

The Economic Minister's legal authority to control prices originally derived from the 1939 Hoarding Act (Hamsterwet), which in 1961 was replaced by the Price Act (Prijzenwet, see Embdesp. 320, Nov. 23, 1960). Under provision of the latter, Economic Minister can (1) impose price ceilings through so-called price decrees (Prijsbeschikking), (2) establish accounting rules which will show how prices are formed, (3) lay down rules for price marking. At present any contemplated increase in price must be reported in writing to the Minister of Economic Affairs according to procedures established in 1958. Within the Ministry of Economic Affairs, the Economisce Controledienst is charged with supervision of price controls.

In practice price controls in recent years have been administered flexibly and primarily through moral suasion. There is an understanding between the Ministry of Economic Affairs and national associations of industrial employers whereby latter cooperate in persuading their members to follow certain criteria in pricing their products. The principal rule is that only cost increases caused by external factors may be reflected in higher prices (e.g., higher raw material prices). Conversely, any reduction in such factors is supposed to lead to a lowering of prices; in practice this has rarely happened, however. Any proposed price increase must be limited to the increment in the external cost factor, i.e., the profit component may not be recalculated to yield the same percentage margin as before but must be maintained in terms of guilders per unit. Since wages are not an "external" cost factor, pay increases may not be reflected in higher prices even when they are not wholly offset by increased productivity.

While retail trade margins are no longer fixed as they were in 1951 to 1956, Ministry of Economic Affairs continues to keep a close watch over trade margins for certain consumer articles. Maximum prices for milk and bread continue in effect.

Price decrees in 1962 imposing price ceilings did not affect key industrial items but were limited to food and beverages; namely, potatoes and soft as well as alcoholic drinks served in restaurants and hotels.

United Kingdom: Governmental policies to deal with prices in key industries

1. Although the United Kingdom has a comprehensive price and income support program for agriculture the only presently existing statutory control of prices is the control of the maximum retail price of liquid milk. This price is established by the Minister of Agriculture.

2. The Government has a significant degree of direct influence over the establishment of prices in nationalized industries, i.e., the railroads, coal, electricity, and gas. Although the basic responsibility for establishing prices in these industries rests with the executive agencies responsible for their administration, these inform the Ministers concerned (the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Fuel and Power) of substantial price changes they intend to make and obtain the views of the Ministers regarding

the price changes in advance of action. The Minister and his staff unquestionably have a significant influence over decisions. In recent years the Government has probably reduced the frequency and force with which it intervenes to change price increases proposed by the nationalized industries. It should be noted that the Government is responsible for providing finance for capital expansion programs of the nationalized industries and has assumed responsibility for substantial deficits in some of them. As a result the price policy followed by the nationalized industries has direct repercussions on the ultimate financial responsibility of the Government for their operations.

The white paper entitled "The Financial and Economic Obligations of the Nationalized Industries" (Cmnd 1337 of April 1961) states:

"Although the Government possesses no formal power to fix prices in the nationalized industries, nationalized undertakings have, in fixing their prices, given great weight to considerations of the national interest brought to their attention (par. 29)."

It also says:

"The Government recognizes, however, that the industries must have freedom to make upward price adjustments especially when their prices are artificially low (par. 30)."

It is possible that the British Railways Board is marginally more free to fix its rates than other nationalized industries as a result of the Transport Act of 1962 and the fact that it need not publish the rates it charges but probably this freedom extends more to discriminatory price concessions to obtain business than it does to price increases.

3. The British iron and steel industry is in a special situation under existing legislation, the Iron and Steel Act, 1953, under which "denationalization" of the industry is nearly completed. Its prices are controlled by the Iron and Steel Board which is subject to Government influence and advice. (The Government appoints the members of the Board.) Proposed price increases in the iron and steel industry are almost certainly discussed with the Minister of Fuel and Power and he is in a position to influence them. However, the Board, in its annual report explains and justifies the prices it sets (Cf. ch. 4, Annual Report for 1961).

4. Aside from the more or less direct influence on price rises in key industries summarized above, British Governments have for some time constantly emphasized the dependence of the British economy on the competitiveness of British industry, particularly export and import competing industries. Although no legislation or formal machinery for investigating the significance of price rises exists, two recently established agencies potentially have a significant role to play in the price field. The National Incomes Commission whose establishment was announced by the Prime Minister in July 1962 was given its formal terms of reference by royal warrant on November 5, 1962. This five-man commission, headed by Frederick Geoffrey Lawrence, a Queen's counsel, is intended to consider any current claim or specific questions relating to pay or other conditions of service or employment, matters referred by Ministers for review relating to pay or other conditions of service or employment where the cost is met in whole or in part by the Exchequer, and any particular settlement referred by a Minister relating to pay or other conditions of service or employment, except an award at arbitration. In considering these matters the Commission is to have regard to the circumstances of the case concerned and to the national interest including in particular:

"(a) The desirability of keeping the rate of increase of the aggregate of monetary incomes within the long-term rate of increase of national production;

"(b) The desirability of paying a fair reward for the work concerned;

"(c) The manpower needs of the service industry or employment concerned, taking into account any regional or local differences in such needs, and the importance of securing the most efficient deployment and use of national resources including manpower;

"(d) The policies and practices in the service, industry or employment concerned in such matters (where appropriate) as pricing, profit margins, dividends, efficient use of manpower and equipment, and organization;

"(e) The repercussions which a particular settlement in the case concerned might have in other employments."

It is also intended to report upon the need for action necessary to restrain by fiscal or other appropriate means any undue growth in the aggregate of profits which may follow from restraint in earned income.

The Commission operates by publishing its findings and recommendations. The British Trades Union Congress and individual trades unions have refused to participate in the Commission. The Commission has so far produced a report on the Scottish plumbers and builders agreements made in 1962. This report stated that there was no evidence before the Commission that the general level of profit margins and dividends of the Scottish construction industry at the present time are excessive or unreasonable. It implied it expected that the costs of the wage agreement made by the industries would be passed on in price increases but took no position regarding the acceptability of such action. However, it suggested a means of implementing the wage increases agreed which it described as limiting the inflationary aspects of the agreement.

Additional wage agreements have recently been referred to the NIC and future reports by it are to be expected.

The National Economic Development Council, established in 1961, has been given responsibility for developing agreed policies contributing to more rapid and sustained economic growth in the United Kingdom. In the reports which it has prepared and published it has discussed the necessity of avoiding undue increases in costs and prices if economic growth is not to endanger the balance-of-payments position of the United Kingdom and thereby to require the imposition of restraints on the economy. The opinions the NEDC has expressed regarding prices (and incomes) are general, emphasizing the importance of insuring that British exports are sufficiently competitive so that regular increases in them are possible. The NEDC has not suggested any measures of price control. The principal emphasis of its rather general comments has been on the desirability of developing an incomes policy, that is to say, of restraining the growth of wages and other incomes so that this growth does not exert so much pressure on prices that British exports lose their competitiveness.

5. Two other sources of public comment on price increases and price policy should be noted, although they are not, properly speaking, "devices used by the Government to deal with price rises." A Member of Parliament by putting a question to the responsible Minister in the House of Commons can focus attention on a price rise. Price rises, or the ability to raise prices without fear of effective competition, may be relevant to the reasoning and recommendations of the Monopolies Commission or the restrictive practices court here. A price rise could be the principal factor persuading the Government to refer a particular situation to the Monopolies Commission.

APPENDIX

United States: Guideposts for noninflationary wage and price behavior[1]

Individual wage and price decisions assume national importance when they involve large numbers of workers and large amounts of output directly, or when they are regarded by large segments of the economy as setting a pattern. Because such decisions affect the progress of the whole economy, there is legitimate reason for public interest in their content and consequences. An informed public, aware of the significance of major wage bargains and price decisions, and equipped to judge for itself their compatibility with the national interest, can help to create an atmosphere in which the parties to such decisions will exercise their powers responsibly.

How is the public to judge whether a particular wage-price decision is in the national interest? No simple test exists, and it is not possible to set out systematically all of the many considerations which bear on such a judgment. However, since the question is of prime importance to the strength and progress of the American economy, it deserves widespread public discussion and clarification of the issues. What follows is intended as a contribution to such a discussion.

Mandatory controls in peacetime over the outcomes of wage negotiations and over individual price decisions are neither desirable in the American tradition nor practical in a diffuse and decentralized continental economy. Free collective bargaining is the vehicle for the achievement of contractual agreements on wages, fringes, and working conditions, as well as on the "web of rules" by which a large segment of industry governs the performance of work and the distribution of rewards. Similarly, final price decisions lie—and should continue to lie—in the hands of individual firms. It is, however, both desirable and practical that discretionary decisions on wages and prices recognize the national interest in the results. The guideposts suggested here as aids to public understanding are not concerned primarily with the relation of employers and employees to each other, but rather with their joint relation to the rest of the economy.

* * * * *

Prices and wages in individual industries

What are the guideposts which may be used in judging whether a particular price or wage decision may be inflationary? The desired objective is a stable price level, within which particular prices rise, fall, or remain stable in response to economic pressures. Hence, price stability within any particular industry is not necessarily a correct guide to price and wage decisions in that industry. It is possible, however, to describe in broad outline a set of guides which, if followed, would preserve overall price stability while still allowing sufficient flexibility to accommodate objectives of efficiency and equity. These are not arbitrary guides. They describe—briefly and no doubt incompletely—how prices and wages rates would behave in a smoothly functioning competitive economy operating near full employment. Nor do they constitute a mechanical formula for determining whether a particular price or wage decision is inflationary. They will serve their purpose if they suggest to the interested public a useful way of approaching the appraisal of such a decision.

If, as a point of departure, we assume no change in the relative shares of labor and nonlabor incomes in a particular industry, then a general guide may be advanced for noninflationary wage behavior, and another for noninflationary price behavior. Both guides, as will be seen, are only first approximations.

---

[1] Excerpt, report, Jan. 12, 1962, Council of Economic Advisers, pp. 185–190.

The general guide for noninflationary wage behavior is that the rate of increase in wage rates (including fringe benefits) in each industry be equal to the trend rate of overall productivity increase. General acceptance of this guide would maintain stability of labor cost per unit of output for the economy as a whole—though not, of course, for individual industries.

The general guide for noninflationary price behavior calls for price reduction if the industry's rate of productivity increase exceeds the overall rate—for this would mean declining unit labor costs; it calls for an appropriate increase in price if the opposite relationship prevails; and it calls for stable prices if the two rates of productivity increase are equal.

These are advanced as general guideposts. To reconcile them with objectives of equity and efficiency, specific modifications must be made to adapt them to the circumstances of particular industries. If all of these modifications are made, each in the specific circumstances to which it applies, they are consistent with stability of the general price level. Public judgments about the effects on the price level of particular wage or price decisions should take into account the modification as well as the general guides. The most important modifications are the following:

1. Wage rate increases would exceed the general guide rate in an industry which would otherwise be unable to attract sufficient labor; or in which wage rates are exceptionally low compared with the range of wages earned elsewhere by similar labor, because the bargaining position of workers has been weak in particular local labor markets.

2. Wage rate increases would fall short of the general guide rate in an industry which could not provide jobs for its entire labor force even in times of generally full employment; or in which wage rates are exceptionally high compared with the range of wages earned elsewhere by similar labor, because the bargaining position of workers has been especially strong.

3. Prices would rise more rapidly, or fall more slowly, than indicated by the general guide rate in an industry in which the level of profits was insufficient to attract the capital required to finance a needed expansion in capacity; or in which costs other than labor costs had risen.

4. Prices would rise more slowly, or fall more rapidly, than indicated by the general guide in an industry in which the relation of productive capacity to full employment demand shows the desirability of an outflow capital from the industry; or in which costs other than labor costs have fallen; or in which excessive market power has resulted in rates of profit substantially higher than those earned elsewhere on investments of comparable risk.

It is a measure of the difficulty of the problem that even these complex guideposts leave out of account several important considerations. Although output per man-hour rises mainly in response to improvements in the quantity and quality of capital goods with which employees are equipped, employees are often able to improve their performance by means within their own control. It is obviously in the public interest that incentives be preserved which would reward employees for such efforts.

Also, in connection with the use of measures of overall productivity gain as benchmarks for wages increases, it must be borne in mind that average hourly labor costs often change through the process of upgrading or downgrading, shifts between wage and salaried employment, and other forces. Such changes may either add to or subtract from the increment which is available for wage increases under the overall productivity guide.

Finally, it must be reiterated that collective bargaining within an industry over the division of the proceeds between labor and nonlabor income is not necessarily disruptive of overall price stability. The relative shares can change within the bounds of noninflationary price behavior. But when a disagreement between management and labor is resolved by passing the bill to the rest of the economy, the bill is paid in depreciated currency to the ultimate advantage of no one.

It is no accident that productivity is the central guidepost of wage settlements. Ultimately, it is rising output per man-hour which must yield the ingredients of a rising standard of living. Growth in productivity makes it possible for real wages and real profits to rise by side.

L.B.J. GUIDEPOST ADMINISTRATION BEST IN WORLD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit on the basis of this record and in view of these demonstrable facts:

First. Wage costs in manufacturing in this country have been virtually stable during the past 5 years because wages generally have not exceeded productivity increases.

Second. This is a better performance—a much better performance—than in other industrialized countries.

Third. Prices have risen gently and slowly in the past 5 years.

Fourth. In every other country from which reliable data is available prices have risen far more rapidly.

Certainly this is a record for which the Johnson administration, along with American labor and business, deserves solid credit that it has not received.

GUIDEPOSTS DO JOB FISCAL-MONETARY POLICIES CANNOT DO

Since neither monetary nor fiscal policy can get at the pricing and wage setting practices of big labor or big business, and since the pattern of economic behavior is so heavily influenced by big business and big labor, I think it is high time we loudly and clearly affirm the desirability of wage-price guideposts and hail the success of the administration in using them.

SERIOUS LABOR INEQUITY IN GUIDEPOSTS

All this is not to say that these guideposts have been perfect. Indeed, there is strong evidence that they will be particularly unfair to labor as applied in the coming year. This is true although labor received a two-thirds percent benefit from the increase in employer social security payments that is not included in labor's allowed 3.2-percent wage increase. The total labor compensation increase allowable in the current year within the guideposts would therefore be 3.9 percent.

BASIS FOR LABOR INEQUITY

Here is why this will shortchange labor: The guideposts assume that prices in the coming year will be stable. But the administration is virtually certain they will not be. They will increase. Virtually every administration witness before the committee agreed they would go up. The Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics—probably the Nation's outstanding authority on price behavior—predicted a price rise in the coming year of between 2 and 3 percent, with 2½ percent likely.

If prices do rise 2½ percent and labor receives a 3.2-percent wage and fringe increase plus 0.667-percent social security payment benefit, its increase in real wages—total compensation—will be less than 1.4 percent, although it is contributing a productivity increase of more than twice that.

This means that employers will enjoy a profit increment—from the price increase of 1.8 percent on their labor costs, and, of course, 5½ percent—productivity 3 percent, price increase 2½ percent—on their nonlabor cost.

REMEDY SUGGESTED

This labor inequity deserves the attention of the administration. The administration should either greatly increase its flexibility in handling of the wage-price guideposts to take this inequity into account or it should from time to time in the course of the year adjust the wage productivity measure upward from 3.2 percent with a cost-of-living adjustment to take actual price behavior into account.

In the UAW contract there is provision for a cost-of-living increase, so in that instance labor would not be shortchanged. In most others, there is no such provision in the contract to take care of the increase in the cost of living. It is my understanding that the number of workers so protected represents a very small proportion of the labor force of this country.

CONCLUSION

So, in conclusion, it would be a tragic mistake to abandon wage-price guideposts because of the predictable avalanche of complaints from interest groups that have been hit where it hurts the most: in the pocketbook.

Under skillful administration handling, these guideposts have served the Nation well. Of course, they cannot do the whole job. But monetary and fiscal policy cannot do the whole job either without provoking a needless recession.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is not only a member of the Joint Economic Committee and chairman or vice chairman in rotation of it, but also a member of the American Economic Association, and, without question, the most competent economist in the Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin on this very able discussion, and ask this question. Is it not true that the administration was greatly aided in repressing price increases in copper and aluminum by the fact that it had a large stockpile of these metals?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. This was a great benefit. One could almost say this may well have made the difference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And it acquired this stockpile, in large part, to prevent prices from falling lower at a time these prices were going down.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the principal reason, although there is a justification on the ground that we should have strategic stockpiles in the time of war or other emergency. But any realistic evaluation of the situation would have to recognize that stabilizing prices or supporting prices for the copper and aluminum industries was a prime reason.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, therefore, since the administration had purchased copper and aluminum in order to prevent prices from falling it was not improper for it to be willing to sell copper and aluminum in order to prevent prices from rising.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The logic is absolutely inescapable. It makes good sense and it makes sense that it is good business for the Government and the taxpayer to buy when the price is low and sell when it is high.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And criticism of the administration on the ground that it is interfering with the economic process comes with ill grace from those who applauded and were benefited by the efforts of the Government to keep raw materials prices stable when prices were falling.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is an additional reason for supporting the administration's actions. They contribute to the overall price stability which is important to all Americans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the Government does not have a stockpile in steel. It did not have this tool. All it could do was to play off one set of producers against another and to make an appeal on the basis of the public interest to some of the largest producers. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. As the Senator will recall, there was cooperation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. United States Steel.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And from Mr. Block of Inland Steel in the earlier incident, which was helpful. The Government did have some real power in addition. It is a big buyer of steel. As long as some producers did not increase their prices there was leverage.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator for stressing the fact that the present guideposts on wage increases do not take into account possible increases in the price level or the cost of living.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. This can be a serious inequity.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, to the degree the cost of living rises, the money wages of the workers do not take this into account. It is a deflation of real wages and constant increase in profits.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. Let me give an example. The example that I had given in my speech is not as dramatic or as clear as this one.

Suppose there were a hypothetical situation in which prices increased 4 percent and wage-price guideposts permitted an increase of 4 percent in wages. This means that the real wage increase would be less than zero. There would be a loss, an actual reduction in wages in real terms. Labor would be getting less. It would be getting less in spite of the fact that they are producing more. The inequity would be clear and under those circumstances the employers and management would be getting the full benefit of the price increase and labor would be getting nothing, in fact taking a loss.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator deserves a lot of credit for pointing this out. I hope that his speech will be studied by representatives of the Government. I am sure representatives of organized labor are aware of this fact and that due action will be taken. Again, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin.

I think his statement that increases in the interest rate will not deter big business from investing, is correct.

Corporate surpluses are so large that adequate funds will continue to be available and to accumulate. They do not have to look into the money market to borrow additional funds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. It is astonishing the way they have increased. There have been great increases in the depreciation reserve as well as profits. Together they put big business in a position where they can invest enormous amounts without borrowing money or selling stock.

Incidentally, any big company listed on the Stock Exchange and the other exchanges, can easily go to the equity market. The stock market has been dropping but it is, in any historical comparison, enormously high. They can do that and raise money easily. I understand the average stock yield is now about 3 percent.

Here is another availability for big business which small business does not have. Small business has to go back and they are being hit by the increase in the interest rates which the Federal Reserve Board is using.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator say, however, that, if the war in Vietnam causes us to operate at an increasing deficit, an increase in taxes would be desirable in order to make it unnecessary for the Government to go to the money market to borrow additional funds?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think in general, certainly in retrospect, we would have been far better off in past wars if we had financed more of the wars' cost by taxing during the wars. There would have been far less inflation. The cost of paying off the cost of the war after the war would have been much less onerous.

I would be careful about the kind of tax increase we get and I would want to look very carefully on any increased taxes which the administration proposes.

In general it is hard to fault the advice of the leading economists of the country who come down pretty hard on the side of increased taxes now, and almost everybody comes down hard on the side of increased taxes soon, if the situation gets worse.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I remember we got one-third of the cost of World War I by taxes and two-thirds by borrowing. In World War II we raised roughly three-sevenths by taxes and four-sevenths by borrowing.

The borrowing which the Government undertook was in large part financed by the banks buying bonds, thus creating additional monetary purchasing power. The result was that monetary purchasing power was increased faster than the increase in production of goods. In other words, there was too much money chasing too few goods. There was an increase in prices under the quantum theory of money.

It would be a great mistake, would it not, if we for the third time tried to finance the cost of the war by creating money?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct, particularly in view of the situation now. Both World Wars I and II obviously took a sharp increase in taxes that the American people had no experience with.

We just had a substantial reduction in taxes in 1964 and another in 1965. We had a modest restoration of some of the 1965 cut in 1966.

On this basis there would be an opportunity to have a temporary emergency Vietnam tax to meet this situation without an adverse impact. This is particularly true in view of the economic factors in the economy. We have an economy in which there seems to be some excessive demand and this seems to be clearly the time when we should probably increase taxes and strive to run a Treasury surplus.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If, as, and when a decision is made to increase taxes, there will be a strong temptation merely to increase the corporate income tax or the personal income tax by a given percentage. This would be, arithmetically, the simplest thing to do. But would not this freeze into the tax structure all the existing injustices?

Mr. Philip Stern, following material which some of us have prepared, has shown that if what is termed the horizontal inequity could be removed—namely, departures from the principle that people with equal incomes should pay equal taxes—the same amount of money could be raised for one-half the present rate of taxation. To allow these situations to continue seems to me, personally, to be unjust and detrimental to the morale of the people.

For example, and I have stated these facts on previous occasions, in 1966, 20 persons in the country had incomes of over $500,000 a year but did not pay a single cent in taxes; that one person having an economic income of $26 million did not pay a cent in taxes; that five persons having incomes of more than $5 million a year did not pay a cent in taxes.

Would it not be much better to plug these loopholes or truck holes in the tax system, and thereby either obviate or reduce the levy, and not have a vertical increase in the tax levy?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That makes eminently good sense. It is my understanding that those in the country having top incomes—more than $1 million a year—and there is a surprising number of people in that category—actually pay a remarkably low percent of their income in taxes. I hesitate to name the precise amount, but, as I understand, it is something in the neighborhood of 20 percent, on the average. Some pay more than that. We know that the maximum income tax rate is——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Ninety-one percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Ninety-one percent. It has now been reduced to 70 percent. At any rate, almost nobody pays that rate. If he does he ought to get a lawyer who can show him how to pay much less. This is because the loopholes—the truck holes, as the Senator from Illinois so well states—are wide open and most inviting.

Virtually any competent tax lawyer can point out where they are. When the Federal Government loses not millions, but billions, of dollars in this way, the effect on the morale of those who have moderate incomes and have to pay such a high percentage of their income in taxes is very bad.

Mr. DOUGLAS. During hostilities, when men are being killed, there is, of course, a great ethical need for as much approximation of equity to sacrifice as possible. The spectacular loss of life accompanied by the failure of some persons to pay taxes is not something that would sit very well on the conscience of the American people. I say this as one who, like the Senator from Wisconsin, supports the policy of the administration in Vietnam.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed, it is tragic. I think that every American feels that way. Certainly those fighting in Vietnam must feel it most acutely when the infinite sacrifice is required from those who serve in Vietnam, while people at home are enabled not only to get away with tax loopholes but also, frankly, to get great benefits and to make profits out of the military situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his most helpful part in this colloquy.

The historical part of my remarks, referring to the experience which the Johnson and Kennedy administrations have had under wage-price guidelines, was gathered by Mr. Edward Knight, analyst in industrial organization and corporate finance, Economic Division, Library of Congress. He did a remarkably fine job.

ADMINISTRATION BATTLE AGAINST INFLATION ON OTHER FRONTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Washington Post Writer William Chapman yesterday reported a whole series of other fronts on which the Johnson administration is working hard and well to stop inflation. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION FIGHTS INFLATION ON SEVERAL FRONTS—ITEMS RANGE FROM CANNED FRUITS TO COWHIDES

(By William Chapman)

Stirred by renewed admonitions from the President, the Johnson administration has put more force into its drive to combat inflationary price pressures on a selective commodity-by-commodity basis.

In the past week it has acted to keep the price lid tight on such items as cowhides and corn and is considering similar moves on such disparate goods as the canned fruit served to soldiers and the type of coverings stitched on Government furniture.

"The President is determined that we don't see the kind of inflation—particularly on foods—that we had in the Korean war," a White House aide said this week.

Here is what some agencies are doing:

The General Services Administration has told suppliers it wants to see substitutes used for materials that are under strong price pressures. It is asking that aluminum or aluminum alloys be used in place of copper wiring where possible and is considering switching from leather to plastic furniture coverings because cowhide prices has skyrocketed.

The Agriculture Department last week began selling corn from Government stores at an even faster pace than before, almost doubling the totals of January and February. The result has been a nearly 10-cent-a-bushel slide in Chicago corn prices since January. Agriculture is substituting margarine for butter in food distribution programs in order to increase commercial butter supplies and combat a 5-cent-a-pound increase in the last 2 months. A further tightening is expected when milk support prices are pegged later this month.

Defense procurement officials are scanning their entire purchasing list for possible substitutes, particularly food products, and will begin with such minor steps as switching the kind of canned fruit offered on Armed Forces' menus.

The Commerce Department Friday clamped down export controls on cowhides to help turn back a price upsurge that amounted to 43 percent last year. It will limit U.S. exports to 11.5 million hides, 2.5 million less than probably would have been shipped abroad in the absence of controls this year.

Administration forces turned on the heat on Capitol Hill and won a promise of early hearings for at least a dozen bills permitting the Government to dispose of stockpiled commodities, some of which can affect market prices significantly. Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, allowed the stockpile subcommittee to start hearings on March 21. Among the items affected by the bills are aluminum, platinum, vanadium, sisal, and asbestos. But the administration still has not decided whether to seek authority to dispose of another 200,000 tons of copper, the major weapon against inflation in that key metal.

Top officials in several departments have been scouring their fields to find other ways to combat price pressures. In the Agriculture Department, Under Secretary John A. Schnittker is charged with watching food prices, and GSA Administrator Lawson B. Knott, Jr., is handling Government purchases and stockpiles. From the White House, Mr. Johnson has assigned Joseph A. Califano, Jr., a speecial assistant, as impromptu coordinator.

Food prices are getting the closest scrutiny now. Officials recall that in the first 2 years of the Korean war, prices leaped 22 points as measured by a 1957–59 consumers' index. They are rising again now, but not nearly so fast.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, March 14, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Fred B. Smith, of Maryland, to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Rufus L. Taylor, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be lieutenant colonels

Abbott, Arlo E., O64447.
Achee, Fernand M., Jr., O50470.
Adair, Don W., O28491.
Adinaro, Joseph T., O80532.
Agnor, Thomas J., Jr., O28152.
Alderson, Frederick K., O28458.
Allen, George R., Jr., O50495.
Allen, Robert W., O28211.
Allred, Wayne, O64584.
Andersen, Andrew M., Jr., O81945.
Anderson, Charles W., O81946.
Anderson, Ferd E., Jr., O27906.
Andersson, Gunnar E., O28239.
Applebee, John E., O80541.
Appleton, Rolland D., O81948.
Armstrong, John L., O28469.
Ashton, Shirley S., Jr., O28502.
Asmus, Grover W., O28605.
Atherton, Paul R., O64449.
Badger, Frederick C., O27902.
Bagot, Alfred W., O81951.
Baker, David T., O27984.
Baker, Francis R., O28543.
Baker, Van R., O28083.
Balaker, Basil C., O80551.
Ball, Edmund K., O28308.
Barker, Charles W., O28012.
Barlow, Kendrick B., Jr., O28438.
Barnhill, Gervase L., O76850.
Barrett, John C., Jr., O28481.
Barthol, Paul I., O28674.
Basham, Edwin W., O28344.
Bassler, Robert E., Jr., O28064.
Baughman, Victor D., O61241.
Beahler, Lee E., Jr., O80560.
Beasley, Rex W., Jr., O28165.
Beatty, Roy P., O27981.
Becker, Jack G., O27915.
Beckner, Richard G., O28001.
Becraft, Clarence W., O80563.
Bell, Ernest L., O80564.
Bell, Thomas L., O80566.
Bender, Keith G., O80567.
Benedict, Calvert P., O28286.
Benson, Theodore N., O80570.
Bentz, Harold F., Jr., O28392.
Berris, Michael T., O80577.
Berry, Robert H., O27986.
Bess, Victor E., O80579.
Beyer, Donald S., O28673.
Biersack, Christian M., O80582.
Bigler, William R., O28292.
Binder, Robert T., O89415.
Bishop, William C., Jr., O28428.
Blankenbaker, George S., O50494.
Blanton, Walter P., O39474.
Blazey, Frank E., O28693.
Blum, Stanley D., O27971.
Blum, William, Jr., O27862.
Blyth, Rodney A., O28294.

Boake, Corwin, Jr., O28484.
Bolz, Henry H., Jr., O28364.
Book, Clair L., O28430.
Booth, Shephard A., Jr., O28654.
Boudinot, Truman E., O28669.
Bowie, Kyle W., O28559.
Bowles, Alvin H., O80595.
Boyd, Benjamin F., O28696.
Boyd, Russell R., O28040.
Brady, Philip B., O28192.
Braun, Edgar G., Jr., O27897.
Bresnahan, Richard A., O28643.
Brigandi, Joseph, O80608.
Brigden, Douglas A., O88591.
Brooks, Herrold E., Jr., O28563.
Brouse, Marion D., O76852.
Brown, Benjamin C., O28493.
Brown, David D., O28009.
Brown, Levi A., O27914.
Bryant, David T., O27950.
Bryant, James W., O89323.
Bryant, Oren W., O80618.
Bugh, Arthur J., O28470.
Burgess, James M., O80624.
Burke, James R., O80626.
Burkett, Joseph F., Jr., O81968.
Burnell, Ray L., Jr., O28026.
Burney, John C., Jr., O27982.
Burns, Patrick J., O80628.
Bush, Leonard R., O80630.
Butler, Olva B., O50507.
Cabell, Henry B., O58800.
Calhoun, James R., O76856.
Callaghan, John W., O28580.
Carlisle, Carshall C., Jr., O28273.
Carney, Clement E., O60113.
Carpenter, Clyde P., O80639.
Carpenter, Jay D., O79767.
Carter, James E., O28710.
Caruso, Frank S., O28730.
Case, Francis R., O80056.
Cassias, Clarence E., O80643.
Cavanaugh, Edward J., O28499.
Chalupsky, Fred A., O58804.
Channon, Robert I., O28219.
Chapman, Curtis W., Jr., O88351.
Child, Thomas W., Jr., O80651.
Clark, Clyde O., O56632.
Clark, Stephen, O30657.
Clavio, James D., O80658.
Clifford, Carcie C., Jr., O28194.
Cloutier, Francis M., O80660.
Coggins, Clyde A., O80664.
Colaw, David L., O28459.
Coleman, James E., O28021.
Collins, Edward J., O28251.
Collins, Joseph E., O28633.
Colvocoresses, Alden P., O80668.
Compton, Jack E., O80669.
Conant, Frank D., Jr., O27990.
Conger, Lester M., O28416.
Conner, Steven L., Jr., O28432.
Constant, Thomas M., O28426.
Convey, James E., Jr., O28103.
Conyne, Albert H., O50505.
Cook, Bruce K., O80670.
Corcoran, Frank, O81980.
Cortez, Clyde A., O80677.
Cound, William T., O28231.
Coyle, Martin J., O80062.
Crizer, Pat W., O28579.
Cronkhite, Willis D., O28269.
Crowley, Edward F., O28628.
Crowley, Robert E., O27967.
Dalpino, Milton D., O84602.
Daniel, Charles D., Jr., O28258.
Daniel, Robert S., Jr., O28455.
Darby, Charles R., O58072.
Daskevich, Anthony F., O76864.
Daugherty, William F., O27491.
David, Bert A., O28441.
Davis, Edward M., O81987.
Davis, Harry A., Jr., O28512.
Day, Franklin R., O28003.
Day, James A., O28160.
Dayton, John B., O28049.
DeLong, Walter J., Jr., O28184.
DeMoya, Harold G., O28299.
DeRieux, Stanley N., O80694.
DeSanto, Anthony J., O80695.
DeWitt, Richard P., O80696.
Dean, Gernard D., O80697.
Delaney, Edward J., O80699.
Dempster, Robert N., O80700.
Denhart, John F., O80701.
Dennett, George L., O28565.
Devens, W. George, O28008.
Dieleman, William K., O76867.
Dillon, Paul C., O80707.
Diver, Richard B., O28137.
Dixon, James T., O28130.
Dodd, William R., O80709.
Dorney, James J., O28185.
Dort, Dean R., O58280.
Douthitt, Robert S., O28317.
Dover, Donovan C., O80715.
Dowell, Vern B., Jr., O81990.
Drake, Oscar, O80718.
Driscoll, James A., O50467.
Drozd, Walter M., O80719.
Ducote, Richard J., O80073.
Dumas, Walter A., O28278.
Dunbar, Philip H., Jr., O80721.
Duncan, William L., O80722.
Dunlap, Jack A., O80723.
Dunn, Horace B., Jr., O80725.
Dwyer, Robert C., O80729.
Dye, Earl S., Jr., O28262.
Eblen, George C., O61195.
Edelstein, Leonard, O27965.
Edgar, Joseph S., O94746.
Edwards, Stephen O., O28127.
Elder, James M., O28473.
Eliasson, Arne H., O80735.
Elkins, Robert D., O80736.
Elsaesser, Louis O., O27936.
Emerson, John E., Jr., O76874.
Erickson, John D., O80744.
Etchemendy, Leon O80745.
Fair, Stanley D., O28551.
Farnham, Kenneth N., O80751.
Farrell, William J., O38488.
Feduska, Paul G., OF102869.
Feild, Terry T., O83596.
Felch, Robert I., O80752.
Fields, Hampson H., O89206.
Fields, Jesse A., Jr., O28731.
Fink, George B., O27942.
Fish, Frederick J., O80758.
Fitzgerald, Charles A., O28593.
Flather, Herbert H., O28234.
Fletcher, Don S., O50476.
Flores, Joe B., O28371.
Floyd, Harry A., O28573.
Fogleman, Paul V., O82000.
Folawn, John S., O60169.
Forrester, Charles T., Jr., O80767.
Frago, John A., O84452.
Frankland, Walter L., Jr., O28391.
Franks, Glenn E., O80086.
Frech, Frederic A., O27930.
Freed, Debow, O28477.
Freeman, Herbert H., O84612.
Freitag, Horace V., O91589.
Fuller, Elisha J., O28268.
Fuller, Howard R., Jr., O28098.
Fuller, William C., O28055.
Furrer, Robert C., OF100514.
Furth, Norman J., O80778.
Futrell, Alvin F., O28720.
Gaddis, Hubert D., O82004.
Gambill, Charles L., O50435.
Gannon, Vincent D., Jr., O28202.
Gardner, George M., O76876.
Garn, Phil R., O50395.
Geary, John C., O28542.
Gerardo, Alexander, O28119.
Giacomozzi, Francis, O80089.
Gigante, James J., Jr., O28267.
Gilham, Jack K., O27988.
Gillespie, John W., Jr., O28577.
Gillig, Roy W., O28358.
Gioe, Joseph F., O56619.
Glass, Malvin F., Jr., O80793.
Glidewell, Calvin E., O28418.
Godfrey, Wayne R., O80795.
Goodwin, Felix L., O88078.
Goodwin, Guy R., Jr., O80798.
Gorler, Howard W., O80091.
Gosling, Francis G., O27941.
Grady, John H., O28223.
Graham, Daniel O., O28212.
Graham, James E., O89997.
Greene, Byron D., Jr., O28506.
Gregg, George F., O80807.
Greksa, Paul, O76879.
Gribble, Lee Roy W., O80809.
Grimm, Charles C., O63226.
Grodin, Richard A., O80813.
Grosz, Peter, Jr., O27977.
Gruenther, Richard L., O28711.
Gustafson, Carl W., O83822.
Haake, Thomas G., O84623.
Hadley, Alvan C., Jr., O28191.
Hagopian, Jacob, O97913.
Haisley, Philip D., O28380.
Hales, William M., Jr., O76881.
Hall, Charles M., O28456.
Hall, George E., Jr., O28323.
Hall, William C., O28023.
Hall, William W., Jr., O28005.
Hallgren, Hal E., O28116.
Halls, Alexander E., O28065.
Hamer, George R., O80829.
Hamilton, Joseph J., O80830.
Hamilton, Milton H., O28245.
Hamilton, Robert M., O28326.
Hanna, Nathaniel P., O80833.
Hansen, Lawrence P., O61959.
Hanson, Benjamin S., Jr., O28076.
Harris, Neal W., O80841.
Harris, Roland, O80843.
Hassinger, Robert W., O80847.
Haughney, Edward W., O61964.
Hayes, Stephen H., O80852.
Haymaker, Gerald L., O80853.
Haynes, Thomas E., O76883.
Hazzard, Rutledge P., O28088.
Healey, William R., O50456.
Hearn, William M., O80855.
Hecklinger, Henry D., O80856.
Helterbran, David J., O80857.
Herring, William A., O41340.
Hickey, Daniel W., III, O28427.
Hickey, Frederick F., Jr., O28099.
Hill, Benjamin H., O82023.
Hill, John G., Jr., O27997.
Hill, Joseph C., O27838.
Hill, Ralph E., O80866.
Hinrichs, Frank A., O80868.
Hipley, Fred F., O80869.
Hoar, John C., Jr., O28345.
Hobson, James B., O28419.
Hockman, Lucien J., O84453.
Hodges, William J., O82024.
Hoefling, John A., O28404.
Hoey, James K., O28036.
Hoffman, Joseph H., O27823.
Hopkins, Paul E., O80878.
Horne, Harold W., O28337.
Horne, Kibbey M., O28057.
Hoskins, Lynn W., Jr., O28713.
Hough, Granville W., O28399.
Howard, Hubert C., O80884.
Huddleston, Thomas M., O28340.
Hummel, Atlee V., O80890.
Humphreys, William A., O28348.
Hurd, James W., O80891.
Hursh, Donald G., Jr., O80892.
Hutchison, David N., O27928.
Hyndman, James H., O80894.
Ingle, Robert H., Jr., O84455.
Inskeep, James H. W., O28682.
Ireland, Paul M., Jr., O28288.
Ireland, Robert A., O80896.
Isenson, Raymond S., O83823.
Ives, Albert R., Jr., O28675.
Jacks, John L., Jr., O80900.
Jackson, Charles A., O80901.
Jaco, Charles M., Jr., O28203.
Jacula, Peter M., O28716.
Jameson, Malcolm M., O80905.
Jamison, Bruce W., O89342.
Jank, Arthur W., O27926.
Jansen, Joseph A., O27964.
Jennings, Dan D., Jr., O80907.
Johnson, Sewall H., O28712.
Jones, Alfred H. E., O27407.
Jones, Harold I., O80913.
Jones, Harry L., O80914.
Jones, Hubert R., O80916.
Jones, John T., O28214.

Jordan, Clarence E., Jr., O28078.
Joy, Albert E., O28534.
Joyce, Jean K., O28284.
Judd, Donald S., O80919.
Jungerheld, Warren S., O28662.
Kamaras, John G., O28100.
Kane, Robert V., O28612.
Kearins, Patrick F., O80927.
Keefer, Loren R., O38492.
Keehn, Kent, O28336.
Kelley, Paul A., O28688.
Kelley, Peter E., O80931.
Kelso, Winchester, Jr., O59656.
Kent, Irvin M., O69963.
Kerker, Edward L., O80936.
Kesler, MacPurcell, O92078.
Kilby, William L., Jr., O84638.
Kim, Young O., O80941.
Kingsbury, Clarence W., O28325.
Kinney, Richard M., O28609.
Kitts, Alfred R., O39483.
Kline, Roland A., O28747.
Klundt, Roland E., O80944.
Knapp, Robert E., O28079.
Knepp, Lester J., O80945.
Knox, Thomas J., O80947.
Koch, Harlan G., O28725.
Koehl, Leonard H., O80949.
Kramer, William W., O58281.
Kren, Robert E., O28277.
Krieger, Marvin G., O59657.
Krueger, Richard F., O84642.
LaMar, Andrew W., Jr., O28240.
LaRock, Ralph I., O28159.
Ladd, James V., O28464.
Lamb, Robert J., Jr., O28667.
Lampert, Ernest R., O80127.
Landis, Benjamin L., Jr., O27963.
Landress, Sylva M., O84790.
Lane, Robert W., O80955.
Lassiter, George L., O80957.
Lathrop, Robert M., O60109.
Lawson, Wayne E., O28450.
Lee, Robert V., Jr., O27974.
Lehman, Raimon W., O56586.
Lehman, Raymond G., Jr., O56621.
Leininger, Daniel M., O27992.
Lennon, Eugene F., Jr., O80963.
Lenzner, Robert E., O28082.
Leonard, Robert T., O80965.
Leonard, Robert W., O80966.
Lepski, Theodore J., O28571.
Lewelling, Billy R., O80968.
Lewin, Edward H., O80970.
Lewis, William W., Jr., O28433.
Lincoln, William T., O28161.
Lind, Ralph W., O80972.
Link, Roger J., O80974.
Lochrie, Arthur J., Jr., O28142.
Long, William F., Jr., O80984.
Longsworth, Ned V., O82044.
Loome, James R., O28383.
Lopez, Fernando, O80987.
Lovrien, John G., O70105.
Lowry, Leonard, O80989.
Mabry, J. P., O80995.
MacDonald, Malcolm, O28701.
MacPherson, William J., O80141.
Madigan, William, O81001.
Malley, Robert J., O27978.
March, Robert L., O28101.
Martin, James M., O81015.
Martin, Samuel R., O28044.
Marvel, Edgar E., O84871.
Mathias, John R., O28042.
Matteson, Jack F., O28221.
Mattox, Walter S., O28592.
Maxwell, Benjamin B., Jr., O62048.
McCain, John W., O84458.
McCandless, Clarence E., O81023.
McCarty, Charles F., O28715.
McChristian, Clarence E., Jr., O28504.
McClain, Wallis E., O81024.
McCluskey, Joseph E., O85348.
McDonald, Joy A., O92487.
McDonough, Charles J., O81030.
McDonough, John D. H., O28183.
McDugald, Lunsford, O90270.
McFadden, John J., O84647.
McGarity, James M., O28406.
McTague, Norman S., O81041.
McWhorter, John C., O28148.
Meerbott, Joseph O., Jr., O28352.
Meeting, Herbert Jr., O60110.
Melton, Paul E., O82060.
Menefee, Robert G., Jr., O81043.
Mewborn, Needham P., O28645.
Meyers, Lowell J., O90297.
Michau, Herbert J., O76897.
Miles, James S., O81048.
Miller, Francis D., O81051.
Miller, George L., O28013.
Miller, John E., O81053.
Miller, Judson F., O38518.
Miller, Leo J., O28011.
Miller, William B., O81054.
Milton, Thornton M., O28032.
Mishtowt, Basil I., O81057.
Mitchell, Douglas W., O84399.
Mock, Alfred J., O81062.
Monroe, Ernest M., Jr., O38497.
Montague, Jack H., O28625.
Montgomery, Robert A., O28697.
Montondo, Robert D., O82064.
Moore, Carl G., O59455.
Moore, Clarence A., O81066.
Morgan, David C., O83610.
Moriarty, Daniel R., O28607.
Moriarty, Richard L., O50440.
Morris, Edward L., O76899.
Morris, Jack W., O28646.
Morris, James H., O81074.
Mosgrove, George G., O81077.
Muir, George C., Jr., O28457.
Murphy, Arthur A., O27951.
Murphy, James M., O81082.
Murphy, Wallace S., O63174.
Musser, Robert H., O76901.
Myer, Charles R., O28091.
Nichols, Wayne S., O27999.
Nicholson, Charles A., O81089.
Nishimura, Bert N., O81094.
Novy, James F., O81098.
Nye, Roger H., O28010.
O'Brien, John A., O81100.
O'Brient, Lex E., O76903.
Ochs, Elmer R., O28547.
O'Connor, Patrick J., O28509.
Olk, Henry J., Jr., O60115.
Olson, Charles M., O90357.
Olson, Clifford A., O81107.
O'Neil, Donald S., O59837.
O'Neill, Carroll R., O28505.
Ortiz-Moreno, Orlando, O90520.
Ost, Lincoln E., O84655.
Otte, George F., Jr., O28164.
Owen, Thomas S., O28544.
Pagano, Stephen J., O28463.
Palmatier, Francis M., O28684.
Pankowski, Bernard, O27925.
Pannell, Napoleon B., O80159.
Pardee, Robert E., O81120.
Pardue, Thomas W., Jr., O28576.
Park, Joseph D., O28597.
Parker, John G., O28250.
Parker, William C., O28140.
Parmly, Eleazar, IV, O28423.
Patterson, Edwin F., O84656.
Patton, George S., O28685.
Paull, Joseph K., O81127.
Peck, James M., O76907.
Peck, James N., O83614.
Pence, Arthur W., Jr., O28440.
Pence, William F., O28112.
Pendergrass, Billy P., O27985.
Pepe, Joseph P., O28471.
Perkins, John III, O27931.
Persons, Wilton B., Jr., O27975.
Peters, David M., O28581.
Petrone, Rocco A., O27972.
Pfauth, Eugene V., O28256.
Pfeiffer, John V., O81134.
Philips, David E., O81136.
Philips, Robert H., O28708.
Phillips, Merton H., O84659.
Philopena, Raymond C., O82078.
Pilant, Joseph L., O81141.
Pohl, Richard S., O28374.
Polak, Philip B., O27193.
Porcella, Arthur D., O58742.
Post, Jack H., O83615.
Potter, Carleton F., O81146.
Poulin, Paul R., O81148.
Powell, Charles J., O85363.
Powers, E. Lloyd, O28045.
Prater, Robert M., O38507.
Price, John T., Jr., O28369.
Prost, Louis J., O76908.
Purkhiser, Harry R., O88888.
Quantz, Raoul J., O28169.
Quillian, Eugene L., O84462.
Ranck, Roger L., O84663.
Rasula, George A., O81161.
Rea, Everett L., O28415.
Redding, William V., O81166.
Reeder, William T., O28540.
Reese, Thomas H., O62992.
Reeve, John D., O81169.
Regn, Elmer M., O76909.
Rehm, Donald H., O27807.
Reiss, Matthew W., O56659.
Reitan, Robert V., O76910.
Reynolds, Clifford H., O81172.
Rheault, Robert B., O28111.
Rheuark, George D., O82085.
Rhodes, Howard D., O50525.
Rice, Herman R., O81176.
Richards, William G., O28460.
Richmond, Robert T., O28525.
Richter, Francis A., O28347.
Riggsby, Raymond M., O80174.
Riordan, Frank J., Jr., O76911.
Roberts, Gene A., O41349.
Robinson, Elisha M., Jr., O28541.
Robinson, Gerald E., O81186.
Rock, Warren V., O81187.
Rogers, Guy A., O28207.
Rogers, Joseph B., O28233.
Rogers, O. B., O80322.
Rogers, Selwyn P., Jr., O27991.
Rolfe, Richard L., O82088.
Roller, Harry N., O85447.
Ross, Charles C., O56661.
Rothwell, Joseph B., O84886.
Rouillard, Irving G., O28177.
Rowan, Paul J., O38288.
Rowland, Hampton, Jr., O38512.
Roxbury, Edward J., Jr., O28075.
Ruble, Richard L., O28695.
Rufsvold, Robert M., O27983.
Russell, Lester F., O81195.
Sadler, John A., O28743.
Sanders, Wilburn L., O84417.
Sandoval, Richard R., O28017.
Sanger, Marshall, O28327.
Saucier, Robert H., O84464.
Saylor, Paul, O84063.
Scharth, Otto P., O41337.
Schneider, William P., O27979.
Schoen, Frank C., O28590.
Schug, Willis E., Jr., O28039.
Schulke, Herbert A., Jr., O28014.
Sciortino, John C., O92120.
Seaman, Robert W., O28668.
Seeber, William T., O28306.
Shade, Leslie N., Jr., O28698.
Shaper, William, O81214.
Shattuck, Amos B., IV, O28146.
Shelton, Fields E., O28600.
Shircliff, Robert G., O84670.
Shoemaker, Robert M., O28097.
Shroyer, James L., O81219.
Shultz, John M., O28341.
Siegrist, Robert H., O39475.
Simkins, Roy G., Jr., O28560.
Simmet, Kenneth D., O81222.
Simmons, Charles J., O28133.
Simpson, Charles M., III, O27957.
Simpson, John E., O28196.
Simpson, William C. S., O28381.
Sinclair, Christopher B., Jr., O28265.
Sine, Robert R., O81225.
Skelley, James L., O81230.
Skemp, Samuel C., Jr., O28210.
Skidmore, William F., O81231.
Slate, Francis T., O81233.
Smith, Charles R., O50542.
Smith, Chester R., O76918.
Smith, David H., O27903.
Smythe, Harry C., Jr., O28107.
Sniffin, Charles R., O50437.
Snyder, Arthur F., Jr., O81243.
Snyder, Harry A., O81244.

Sovern, Charles, O81247.
Spitzer, Joseph B., O81252.
Spiva, Forrest R., O84425.
Sprague, Elmer G., O28555.
Sprinkle, Homer R., O84466.
Stanfield, Norman T., O27945.
Stannard, John E., O28442.
Stapleton, Thomas J., O28285.
Stark, Charles L., O50451.
Stark, Leroy W., O84675.
Starner, Ralph A., O28482.
Steele, Robert L., O28429.
Steen, Kenneth J., O28050.
Sterling, John E., O27952.
Sterling, Thomas M., O59655.
Stevenson, Leland L., O76919.
Stirling, Harold J., O28182.
Stone, William L., III, O28538
Storm, Robert W., O28742.
Stovall, Thomas L., O50512.
Street, Oliver D., III, O28053.
Streiff, Richard W., O28060.
Strelecki, Joseph L., Jr., O50468.
Strever, John E., Jr., O81264.
Stroud, William R., O28201.
Sullivan, John F., O81267.
Sumner, Gordon, Jr., O38489.
Sundby, Selmer A., O91524.
Supplee, Charles R. H., O27924.
Svilar, Matthew, O81270.
Talbot, James S., O58082.
Tasker, Clayton B., O57966.
Tassey, George, O38348.
Taylor, Raleigh O., O76922.
Taylor, William W., O81276.
Terrell, Harold A., Jr., O28132.
Terry, Walter C., O81280.
Tessieri, Philip J., O81281.
Thayer, Raymond E., O28275.
Thomas, Eldridge, O81283.
Thomas, James D., O76923.
Thomas, Robert L., O84467.
Thomasset, William, O27943.
Thompson, John G., O81288.
Thornton, Samuel B., Jr., O81290.
Throckmorton, Elbert S., O28339.
Thurman, John R., III, O28225.
Tixier, Lewis B., O28276.
Toohey, James B., O80196
Torgerson, Allan C., O28619.
Traber, Oscar W., Jr., O28030.
Treadwell, John R., O27976.
Trost, Leonard E., O80197.
Tuck, Richard C., O27955.
Tucker, Harlan W., O28153.
Tully, Robert B., O28678.
Udclaire, Robert K., O93531.
Uhland, Herbert W., O85381.
VanAuken, Kenneth C., O28168.
VanBuskirk, Lawrence E., O81307.
Vance, Jasper C., Jr., O56715.
Vega, Antonio, O85275.
VerHey, William J., O81309.
Victor, Alfred H., Jr., O27938.
Vinet, William C., Jr., O61194.
Viney, George C., O38516.
Vohs, Ralph H., O76926.
Von Der Bruegge, John H., Jr., O38523.
Waitt, Thomas M., O50475.
Waldman, Myron, O81310.
Walker, Sam S., O28197.
Wallace, James L., O81313.
Wallace, Josiah A., Jr., O28297.
Wallis, Matthew R., O28068.
Walsh, Joseph A., O76928.
Walters, Jesse L., O81314.
Wardell, Dennis J., O50237.
Warner, Jack W., O81316.
Warrick, Fred A., O81317.
Wary, William D., O81318.
Watkins, Norman C., O28131.
Watson, Billy H., O85695.
Watson, Donald S., O28316.
Webb, George S., Jr., O28015.
Webb, Harold J., O81322.
Webb, William H., O28263.
Weber, Edwin L., Jr., O28178.
Weinstein, Marvin S., O28149.
Welch, James C., Jr., O28367.
Wells, Thomas M., Jr., O59453.
Westfall, Chester C., Jr., O50469.
White, Eston T., O84686.
White, James T., Jr., O85389.
White, Loren H., O84470.
Whitener, William J., O28041.
Whittington, Jere O., O28411.
Whittington, William, O27815.
Wieben, John D., O82122.
Wieringa, John S., Jr., O28644.
Wildrick, Richard M., O28019.
Willets, Robert T., O81338.
Williams, Benjamin, O28515.
Williams, Charles T., O27923.
Williams, Jay B., O81340.
Williams, Lawrence H., O58740.
Williams, Robert H., O81341.
Wilson, Minter L., Jr., O28244.
Wilson, Penrhyn, Jr., O84690.
Winfree, Robert T., Jr., O28189.
Winkler, Carl E., O58081.
Winstead, Richard S., O81352.
Wirrick, James E., O28529.
Wolf, Duquesne A., O28187.
Wolff, Herbert E., O39485.
Wood, Allen H., III, O28672.
Woods, Harris H., O28190.
Wray, William R., O27949.
Wright, Lyle H., O81356.
Young, William H., O28333.
Zanin, John B., O81360.
Zeidner, Robert F., O27499.
Zerick, Thomas T., O93103.
Zimmerman, Albert C., O82130.
Zurek, Charles M., O81364.

To be lieutenant colonels, Chaplain

Andrews, Joseph R., O70250.
Gefell, Gerard J., O63103.
Griffin, Johnson L., O76791.
Harms, Erhard H., O68818.
Helt, James W., O66161.
Jones, Joseph W., O79685.
Kapusta, Emil F. J., O66171.
Morrill, James W., O66184.
Sommer, Jerome O., O65424.
Sperring, David H., O70513.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

Arney, Glen K., O63170.
Barila, Timothy G., O64939.
Barquist, Richard F., O67984.
Barry, Kevin G., O63478.
Bethea, William T., Jr., O99792.
Bindeman, William W., O58713.
Borski, Anthony A., O65443.
Bosman, Robert I., O65437.
Boyson, William A., O64967.
Bridgeford, Otis E., O65450.
Brown, Paul W., O64946.
Buess, John E., O65436.
Cabezas, Miguel E., O96671.
Cosand, Henry C., Jr., O62982.
Daniels, John R., O65460.
Deffer, Philip A., O67915.
Deutsch, David L., O67916.
Dimond, Francis C., Jr., O65682.
Eaves, Charles C., O65577.
Eberlin, Eugene W., O67813.
Essex, Henry A., O69916.
Ewart, James A., O65449.
Giffin, Robert B., Jr., O60152.
Grant, Arthur E., O64960.
Green, Robert W., O65461.
Hamilton, Richard D., O65681.
Hawkins, Joseph A., O63835.
Hennard, Georges M., O95337.
Hopeman, Alan R., O65455.
Hudson, Heber S., O65446.
Kaisch, Kenneth R., O67812.
Kellenberger, Robert E., O64062.
Keller, Niklaus J. A., O61957.
Kilby, Ralph A., O91762.
Kolmer, Harold S., Jr., O68360.
Kovaric, John J., O69965.
Kroyer, John M., O60089.
Lam, Gene N., O62932.
Lamson, Thomas H., O75385.
Law, Arthur G., O62977.
LeBourdais, Wallace R., O68372.
Leonard, Robert R., Jr., O60096.
Lopez, Cesar A., O97005.
Lynch, Charles L., O57911.
McCabe, Marshall E., O71555.
McLeod, Donald G., Jr., O65445.
Metzger, Joseph F., O64940.
Mueller, Harold W., O65451.
Mullaney, Thomas P., Jr., O68799.
Nelson, Kenwyn G., O67947.
Nitz, Robert E., O70003.
Omer, George E., Jr., O63636.
Parrish, Matthew D., O65447.
Platoff, Gennady E., O63457.
Pope, James K., O64941.
Raymond, Bruce A., O63834.
Reeve, Arnold M., O65453.
Richardson, William L., O65441.
Rose, Lawrence R., O75423.
Rosenberger, Eugene A., O82922.
Ruhe, Joseph G., O71717.
Schanzer, Stephan N., O65465.
Schroeder, Peter, O97034.
Schwamb, Halbert H., O67954.
Sellers, Thomas D., O65432.
Shadish, William R., O71720.
Shafer, James A., O65464.
Sheffler, Paul W., O65459.
Simmons, John R., O64972.
Sloane, Jeremiah P., O71280.
Stalker, Daniel E., O64959.
Stratton, Albert W., O68056.
Sugiyama, William M., O91397.
Sulak, Michael H., O64951.
Switzer, Walter E., O65442.
Syner, James C., O65462.
Tearse, Herbert G., O67966.
Vineyard, William R., O64954.

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps

Albright, Cecil R., O63726.
Bell, Wilfred B., O60103.
Belser, John H., O62794.
Bohling, Walter H., Jr., O61777.
Brehm, Thomas W., O61953.
Christopher, Andrew, O62791.
Doane, Richard A., O62984.
Foxx, Fred F., O61077.
Hobson, Robert W., O58278.
Howard, Richard L., O57576.
Hunter, Ernest L., O67583.
Lancaster, Wallace L., O60154.
Marlette, Robert H., O60102.
Meikle, Wendell A., O62792.
Nealey, Everett T., O78107.
Norlind, Gunnar, O98404.
Ormes, Walter M., Jr., O58070.
Parker, James F., O57575.
Peterson, James H., O82356.
Rau, Martin H., O59447.
Shaffer, Francis W., O57896.
Snodgrass, John W., Jr., O63477.
Summa, Joseph P., O65574.
Vonnahmen, Francis H., O61952.
Wakefield, Walter W., O74033.
West, Robert H., O62985.

To be lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps

Bridenstine, William O., O63225.
Carter, Leland B., O69878.
Farmer, Garland R., O68342.
Meckstroth, Leslie E., O65538.
Morgan, Richard B., O65540.
Nossov, Gabriel, O63223.
Ott, Bruce S., O66064.
Rothe, William E., O70031.
Vaninetti, Gus A., O65535.
Young, James B., O70071.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps

Adams, Raymond E., O79646.
Beakes, Francis C., O80283.
Cevey, Paul E., O80290.
Doran, Gerald J., O84315.
Fanning, William E., O80293.
Gray, Stephen E., O28683.
Hinrichs, Herbert H., O79665.
Holland, Donald B., O83842.
Holtwick, Philip B., O80303.
Hooker, Laray D., O80304.
Kammerer, William M., O79667.
Kinney, Charles R., O83566.
Luban, Albert J., O79669.
Malizia, Walter F., O85810.
Newman, Forest P., Jr., O80313.

Ostrom, Thomas R., O50576.
Poucher, Clyde R., O79673.
Rojo, Fernando S., O84833.
Ross, William E., O80324.
Shepard, Leonard G., O79660.
Tate, Robert W., O81872.
Tsakonas, Charles T., O84809.
Weatherall, Richard T., O76804.
Winkler, Harry T., O80331.

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Chellman, Betty P., R10116.
Frazee, Mary E., M10107.
Hamlyn, Alvera E., M10099.
Hughes, Rosamond E., R10029.
Huston, Nancy L., R10015.
Johnson, Frances J., M10031.
Kemske, Dorothy L., M10052.
Mayhugh, Elna C., R10132.
Radke, Margaret E., R10024.

To be major

Traver, Daniel G., O69819.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3304:

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Angell, Elizabeth E., N2325.
Bailey, Willie V., N2510.
Bilisky, Frances J., N758.
Blaney, Mary L., N2514.
Breton, Margarita E., N2080.
Browning, Ann C., N2894.
Clark, Mary E., N1295.
Cleveland, Rita A., N2324.
Craig, Iris V., N2315.
Crowley, Julia T., N2195.
Cullom, Barbara M., N1101.
Fisher, Lucille C., N1922.
Fusselman, Gladys L., N1419.
Gattis, Margaret L., N1245.
Horne, Elizabeth R., N1277.
Jamison, Pearl E., N2009.
Jankoviak, Angeline P., N996.
Jarma, Luciana, N2323.
Kay, Lethie L., N2508.
Koszalka, Julia E., N1562.
Kudletz, Rose M., N1560.
Laubacher, Harriet T., N1112.
Long, Johnnie E., N1994.
Maher, Margaret L., N2319.
Marks, Alice S., N1418.
Matthias, Doris V., N2485.
Mears, Anne, N2456.
Metzger, Alice M., N2329.
Mire, Ouida R., N2461.
Orbin, Mary J., N2476.
Pearce, Marie L., N2212.
Pesci, Jane C., N2449.
Ryden, Etta L., N2422.
Skadorva, Estelle M., N1923.
Smith, Frances K., N1271.
Smith, Maude M., N1096.
Taylor, Alice C., N1915.
Tkacik, Mary C., N1659.
Wallsten, Alma E., N1503.
Whalen, Louise A., N1586.
Wilborne, Mary W., N1728.
Wink, Alice R., N858.
Young, Miriam E., N2081.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Adams, John A., O97377.
Adler, Kenneth H., O98000.
Aery, John W., OF102129.
Ahrens, Alfred J., O98001.
Allen, Richard F., O98357.
Anderson, Calvin M., OF103794.
Anderson, Carlton L., O98005.
Andrews, William R., O98358.
Au Buchon, James M., O98012.
Baker, Carter G., O98363.
Baker, Ronald W., O93397.
Barron, Nicholas, O98365.
Bartnett, James T., Jr., O97387.
Bassett, Sterling P., O98368.
Beckett, George T., O97393.
Bell, Robert J., O97395.
Bergeron, Paul R., OF100656.
Bezner, Robert Z., O98372.
Bidorini, Edward K., OF100433.
Black, John R., O99132.
Blevins, Andrew, O98025.
Bode, Donald D., Jr., O98376.
Boling, Robert H., Jr., O98377.
Bowles, Dallas L., O98379.
Boyle, James F., O95800.
Brandon, Lawson W., Jr., O98027.
Brierley, Alan A., O97418.
Broadwater, Terry W., OF102823.
Brokovich, Michael J., O98383.
Brookshire, Carl W., O99138.
Broussard, Allen, O98384.
Brown, Elwyn L., O98029.
Brown, Gerald M., O98350.
Brown, Jack L., O97422.
Buelow, Edward H., Jr., O98037.
Buffardi, Louis N., Jr., O98038.
Burdett, John C., OF100424.
Butler, Alvin L., O98041.
Carlile, Thomas R., O98044.
Carmack, Ronnie G., O97441.
Carter, Edward E., O96926.
Cawyer, Telefus B., O98391.
Caylor, Eugene H., O97447.
Charles, Doran W., O99144.
Christol, John G., O97455.
Cloud, Earl W., O98053.
Coleman, Ronald A., OF102437.
Collins, William A., OF104400.
Comee, William C., Jr., O98398.
Conrad, Robert S., O98055.
Coonfield, Derrill G., O98059.
Couvalt, Marvin L., OF103817.
Creasy, Joseph L., O98062.
Crews, Walton N., Jr., O97470.
Cullu, Kenneth H., O97474.
Danner, John J., Jr., O97480.
Dardis, John J., O98403.
Dasher, Marcus, Jr., O98405.
Davidson, Edward L., O98407.
Davis, Harley C., O98068.
Degiulio, Anthony P., O96841.
Denmon, James L., O98073.
Diehl, Richard P., O99153.
Donnell, Victor L., O98409.
Doyle, Peter, O97501.
Drees, Donald B., O97502.
Dwyer, Allen R., O97505.
Eager, Benjamin F., III, C95670.
Esposito, Anthony L., OF102459.
Ewers, Rayburn O., O98085.
Falcone, John P., Jr., O95514.
Fernandes, Alfredo J., Jr., O96654.
Fernandes, Vincent, II, O97517.
Flebotte, Paul R., OF102114.
Fortner, John P., O98091.
Foster, James H., Jr., O98422.
Frederick, Jonathan E., O98423.
Froehle, Harold A., O98424.
Fulmer, Frank E., O98096.
Fulton, Larry B., O97536.
Furman, John B., O95526.
Gabelmann, James F., O99847.
Gary, Harley J., O98427.
Gasca, Joseph S., O97542.
Gee, Bobby J., O98101.
Godfrey, Thomas G., O98105.
Gorden, Henry, O98437.
Gosnell, Robert A., O98438.
Graham, Thomas A., III, O97655.
Griffith, Edward W., O97562.
Grochowski, Gerald A., O97066.
Haisten, Robert W., O98441.
Hamm, Michael R., O98126.
Hardt, Jerome D., O98131.
Harris, Dalrymple M., Jr., O96779.
Harvey, John R., O98134.
Hayes, William H., Jr., O97167.
Herman, John D., O98448.
Hinkle, Donald E., OF102914.
Hirte, Douglas J., O97584.
Hitchcock, Gary, O98139.
Hoebeke, Terrell A., O98141.
Holdsworth, John W., O97587.
Hudgens, George T., O98454.
Hurst, Bobby R., O99186.
Ibanez, Armando R., O98456.
Irving, Robert J., O96375.
Iwasaki, Robert H., O98458.
Jacobs, Ronald R., O97600.
January, Michael O., O97602.
Jay, James R., O98459.
Jenkins, Kenneth E., O98155.
Jessen, Otto W., O98157.
Jones, William P., O97611.
Jordan, Dewie D., O97612.
Keath, Medford E., Jr., O98161.
Kindred, Jon D., O98165.
Kirby, Wilford R., OF103864.
Kirkland, Joseph M., O98474.
Klein, Frank W., Jr., O98476.
Koepp, David R., O98478.
Koga, Malcolm T., O98170.
Krannawitter, James C., Jr., O98173.
Kubek, Donald R., O98177.
Lamont, James M., O97065.
Lawhon, Edward H., O98184.
Lehman, Nelson, S., Jr., O97642.
Leonard, George R., O98487.
Lewis, Joe A., O98492.
Lingenfelter, Duane F., O98493.
Lister, Paul R., O98494.
Little, John H., O98191.
Litton, James L., O99200.
Lowrie, Michael A., O99206.
Lucas, Kenneth W., OF102538.
Mackey, David R., O98198.
Mahaffy, Paul D., O98498.
Mahalik, Paul D., OF102336.
Mallard, Richard L., O97657.
Mandeville, Craig H., O97659.
Manning, James G., Jr., O98502.
Mason, William B., Jr., OF104492.
McCullough, Joe G., OF100934.
McCurry, William K., O97668.
McDonald, Daniel W., O98208.
McGill, Brian J., O97232.
McKeon, Charles A., OF102974.
McLellan, Charles G., O97670.
Mellon, Joe S., Jr., O99213.
Miles, Milton E., O97682.
Mills, Clarence R., Jr., O97685.
Moerbe, Ronald H., OF102564.
Morey, Donald E., O98510.
Mowery, Ralph B., O99221.
Mueller, Paul G., O98230.
Murphree, John D., O97697.
Murphy, Errol L., O97699.
Necessary, Kenneth A. J., O98233.
Nibert, Lewis R., O98514.
Nordheim, Bobby W., O97709.
Norton, Robert C., Jr., OF100993.
O'Connor, Denis, O97712.
Oldfield, John F., O98238.
Olsen, Gary A., O97238.
Olson, Richard V., O97715.
Owen, John F., O97718.
Parrish, Feegeebee, O97721.
Parrish, John C., O97722.
Pedigo, William E., OF103005.
Pilgrim, Mark T., OF102592.
Pilmaier, Joseph M., O97733.
Powell, William E., O98254.
Prieto, Harry P., Jr., O98524.
Pruitt, Ronald O., O98526.
Prusinowski, Louis H., O97247.
Radford, Charles W., O97739.
Read, Donald E., O97250.
Redner, Daniel B., O96611.
Reece, Charles R., O97744.
Reese, Arvel C., O98528.
Reynolds, James E., O97747.
Riggs, William C., O97751.
Roark, Stanley L., O98266.
Robinson, Crawford M., O98529.
Ross, Norman E., Jr., O98270.
Rust, David H., O98271.
Saffron, Joseph P., O98532.
Salley, Hammond M., O98533.
Sander, Lawrence W., O98275.
Sausker, William F., O97256.
Schofield, Dale W., O98534.
Schuetze, Irving P., O98280.
Scribner, Jeffrey L., O97771.
Shaffer, Richard G., O97257.

Shanahan, Michael G., O97778.
Shaw, Ray A., O97779.
Shea, George D., Jr., O99165.
Shearer, Robert L., O98539.
Shirey, Wilbur C., O98540.
Sitter, Laurence F., O98283.
Smallwood, Edward K., O98287.
Smith, Gardner W., O98289.
Smith, Paul M., O98545.
Smith, Richard M., O97795.
Snook, Larry, O98291.
Sellinger, Jerry M., O99253.
Solomon, Eckwood H., O98355.
Spencer, Wilbur P., OF103042.
Spring, Michael C., O98219.
Sprinkle, Edgar E., O98293.
Stallwitz, John F., O99255.
Stock, Lawrence W., OF103744.
Sullivan, Gerald R., O97604.
Swift, Joe B., Jr., O97817.
Szymanowicz, Philip B., O98552.
Terrill, Joel B., O98554.
Terry, Millard D., O98307.
Timpf, Richard H., O97828.
Trotter, Kenneth E., O98312.
Trudeau, Raymond L., O97834.
Tucker, James E., O98314.
Van Wagtendonk, Jan W., O97839.
Vaughn, Ronald K., O98559.
Walsh, William F., Jr., O98327.
Ward, Houston E., Jr., O97846.
Ward, James A., Jr., O97847.
Ward, Joel H., O97848.
Weber, Richard L., O97852.
Wells, Charles T., OF102665.
Wells, Robert D., Jr., O98562.
Westbrook, James P., OF103074.
Whitmer, Dennis K., O97863.
Williams, Charles L., O98565.
Wilson, John C., Jr., O98341.
Winn, Robert B., O97272.
Wise, Jon R., O97870.
Womble, Columbus M., OF103924.
Zentis, Joseph J., O98352.
Zyko, Eddi Z., O97878.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Bradford, Jackie E., O98026.
Danielski, Linn J., O97479.
Engelkirk, Paul G., OF104417.
Greenwood, Robert J., OF104432.
Heisig, David W., OF102907.
Hula, Roger P., II, O98149.
Jones, Lewis M., O99187.
Lawrence, Frank M., O98185.
Morgan, John W., Jr., O98227.
Mumma, Patrick J., OF102989.
Picone, Gaspare P., OF100085.
Powell, Frederick C., O97246.
Rians, Charles W., III, OF103017.
Sack, Gerald E., OF103022.
Simpson, Gordon T., O98543.
Yoder, William G., OF103082.

In the Air Force

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Harvey E. Cooper, FV3124951.
James T. Freestone, FV3125203.
Jack G. Hastings, FV3044954.
Marvin V. Simon, FV3125222.
Leonard J. Spencer, FV3125138.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Jerry D. Gardner, FV3165174.
James A. Hammelman, FV3142569.
Richard J. Landino, FV3140393.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be first lieutenants

Charles C. Adams, FV3120128.
Duane A. Adams, FV3105039.
John S. Adams, Jr., FV3131551.
Richard A. Ahart, FV3130423.
James K. Akley, FV3107788.
Raymond H. Albers II, FV3108619.
David F. Albrecht, FV3132640.
Linden R. Albright, FV3119169.
Richard T. Aldinger, FV3132800.
Lonny R. Alexander, FV3119789.
Roland T. Alexander, FV3135249.
Theodore G. Alexander, FV3132112.
Douglas J. Allen, FV3130029.
Norman S. Allen, FV3129364.
Joseph C. Alonge, FV3131500.
James E. Altwies, FV3129621.
Paul C. Amann, FV3134858.
James R. Ames, FV3107858.
Harold M. Amfahr, FV3108031.
John A. Anderla, FV3129433.
Gerald W. Anderson, FV3061926.
John A. Anderson, FV3131005.
John M. Anderson, FV3122771.
Marty D. Anderson, FV3129469.
William E. Anderson, FV3122826.
David W. Anderton, FV3132497.
Jan B. Andre, FV3135418.
Melvin R. Andrews, Jr., FV3134525.
Antonio R. Angulo, FV3132310.
Dexter A. Armstrong, Jr., FV3106936.
Robert E. Arrington, FV3132408.
David A. Atchison, FV3134627.
Roger A. Ayres, FV3135424.
Michael J. Babbidge, FV3119617.
Bryce H. Baker, FV3122591.
James H. Baker, FV3129543.
Andrew E. Bakos, FV3131247.
Gary A. Ball, FV3122865.
Arthur C. Ballman, Jr., FV3128850.
Ramon R. Balut, Jr., FV3135427.
Phillip D. Barber, FV3128851.
Dennis B. Barborak, FV3135360.
Norman G. Barfoot, FV3134624.
Lawrence A. Barlock, FV3120267.
Everett E. Barnett, Jr., FV3134748.
Ford H. Barrett, FV3135055.
Ronald P. Barrett, FV3129939.
Charles V. Barrows, FV3119603.
Frank J. Bauer, FV3134454.
Gerald H. Bauer, FV3130630.
Robert L. Baumgartner, FV3135434.
Wayne R. Bechler, FV3132519.
Michael W. Benedetto, FV3119887.
Garnett T. Bennett III, FV3129172.
James D. Bennett, FV3135467.
Anthony N. Benson, FV3118973.
Larry L. Benson, FV3129107.
Frank M. Benton, Jr., FV3134625.
James S. Berry, FV3130056.
William E. Berry, FV3119316.
Roy W. Best, FV3120372.
Matthew C. Bianco, FV3128269.
Timothy M. Biddle, FV3119888.
Harold F. Biestek, FV3122842.
Frederick D. C. Bigelow, FV3135550.
Marvin R. Bilse, FV3133071.
James R. Birchfield, FV3132782.
James E. Birmingham, FV3135598.
Robert A. Bischoff, FV3128852.
Ronald E. Bizzarri, FV3129575.
James C. Blackburn, FV3131007.
Ronald H. Blake, FV3129577.
Doyle D. Blasingame, FV3118766.
Howard J. Bloy, Jr., FV3122820.
Carroll C. Bobb, FV3132380.
James H. Bogart, FV3128060.
Lawrence D. Bonham, FV3135385.
Raymond E. Bonwell, Jr., FV3119175.
Donald R. Booher, FV3119666.
John A. Borchert, FV3129849.
Murray L. Borden, FV3131645.
Dennis J. Borin, FV3135462.
John E. Born, Jr., FV3128776.
Anthony G. Borra, FV3131505.
Karl R. Bossi, FV3135276.
Daryl L. Bottjer, FV3119739.
Peyton R. Bowden, FV3132820.
Wellington B. Bowler, FV3119642.
Winfred R. Boyer, FV3132154.
Raymond K. Bradsby, FV3131176.
Chadwick P. Breaux, FV3130611.
Leo J. Brennan, FV3134460.
William L. Brennen, FV3128505.
John H. Brewster, Jr., FV3129576.
Eugene W. Bricker, FV3130405.
William A. Brickman, FV3128777.
Andrew O. Bridgeman, FV3134917.
Earl R. Bridges, FV3119957.
Richard C. Brightman, FV3134461.
William I. Brooks, Jr., FV3129444.
William C. Brooks, FV3129637.
Derwin F. Brown, FV3135483.
James W. Brown, FV3122152.
Stanley E. Brubaker, FV3132155.
Richard C. Brunk, FV3134664.
Robert K. Brunton, FV3132947.
Francis R. Buckley, FV3130034.
Alan D. Buell, FV3131759.
Walter F. Burke, FV3131398.
Hubert W. Burkhead, FV3132948.
Bruce A. Burns, FV3130515.
Philip Burns, FV3135491.
Robert D. Burns, Jr., FV3130940.
Charles A. Burton, FV3122867.
Lamar L. Burton, Jr., FV3132932.
Daniel H. Bythewood, FV3129446.
Warren J. Camarano, FV3134986.
James B. Camp, FV3129447.
Alan D. Campbell, FV3135499.
Vincent R. Campisi, FV3129580.
James J. Capellman, FV3122823.
Raymond A. Carlson, FV3134405.
John P. Carpenter, FV3133116.
David A. Carson, FV3135507.
Jimmy L. Cash, FV3132530.
Charles V. Caskey, FV3136065.
David I. Casperson, FV3135510.
Louis N. Cattafesta, Jr., FV3132290.
Charles R. Caudill, FV3130549.
Donald C. Cepull, FV3129179.
William W. Chace, FV3132999.
Eldon A. Chambers, FV3119793.
Calvin L. Chasteen, FV3132614.
Vincent A. Chiarello, FV3136108.
William C. Chocallo, FV3136118.
Edward R. Cihoski, FV3127893.
Eugene J. Clare, FV3127967.
Frank B. Clark, Jr., FV3129449.
George W. Clarke, Jr., FV3135056.
David T. Clift, FV3118802.
Vinton J. Cline, FV3135014.
Charles M. Cloud, FV3132533.
Charles A. Coble FV3134647.
Charles D. Cochard, FV3120274.
Billy N. Cochran, FV3131964.
Francis J. Coffey, FV3135530.
Kenneth F. Coho, FV3129587.
Owen H. Colling, FV3119457.
Thomas W. Collins. FV3106588.
Michael F. Colpitts, FV3131209.
Neal E. Coltrane, FV3135535.
Richard G. Comried, FV3130413.
Walter R. Connally, FV3119795.
Castex P. Conner, Jr., FV 3132535.
Ralph M. Conner III, FV3135748.
Joseph P. Connor, FV3130753.
David F. Conrad, FV3135259.
Malachi T. Conway, Jr., FV3135808.
Frank A. Cook, Jr., FV3127895.
John D. Cooke, FV3120238.
Jimmie L. C. Coombes, FV3132536.
Harry E. Cooper, FV3129873.
Frank J. Coprivnicar, FV3135544.
Roger G. Corman, FV3135546.
James W. Corrigan, FV3120133.
Terence P. Corrigan, FV3120339.
Lawrence G. Costanzo, FV3128783.
James W. Cox., Jr., FV3129648.
Allen F. Crabtree III, FV3131210.
Paul D. Craska, FV3129049.
Donald A. Crews, FV3131492.
Alvis V. Cromer, Jr., FV3119323.
Kenneth E. Cromwell, FV3129366.
Gordon R. Crook, FV3118770.

Gary Culp, FV3119624.
Robert W. Cummings, FV3130997.
David D. Currin, FV3131650.
Lawrence E. Curtis, FV3107380.
John R. Curtis, FV3134958.
James D. Cutter, FV3131651.
Philip E. Daisher, FV3131918.
David R. Dalrymple, FV3134650.
Robert S. Dalrymple, FV3135566.
Donald B. Damm, FV3134933.
Denny C. Darby, FV3132695.
Ernie R. Dash, FV3135044.
Chovin R. Davis III, FV3129593.
Clarence L. Davis, FV3129460.
Gordon G. Davis, FV3133090.
Joel C. Davis, FV3135571.
Darral D. Dean, FV3132542.
Lawrence F. Dean, FV3128070.
Ramon E. Dearigunaga, FV3135328.
John A. Decaire, FV3130942.
James H. Delaney, FV3129649.
James C. Delong, Jr., FV3131368.
Leslie E., Dennis, Jr., FV2291416.
Charles F. Denwalt, FV3131970.
John J. Deppen, FV3134993.
Charles D. Depriest, FV3128071.
Roger C. Derby, FV3132803.
Paul E. Derstine, FV3132159.
James R. Desens, FV3129510.
Thomas J. Devine, FV3131140.
Jon P. Didlo, FV3129650.
George W. Dietel, FV3129354.
Jerome D. Dilling, FV3132059.
William T. Dlugos, FV3128073.
Leonard J. Dobias, FV3118851.
Lee P. Dodd, Jr., FV3119552.
Robert K. Doerk, Jr., FV3133081.
Robert E. Doherty, FV3130790.
Joseph A. Dolfi, Jr., FV3132546.
David E. Donoghue, FV3129881.
John K. Dorr, FV3129944.
Robert B. Doyle Jr., FV3119865.
Milton V. Driggers, FV3129896.
William S. Druyun, FV3128859.
Henry E. Dubuy Jr., FV3119587.
Robert A. Dueease, FV3139025.
James V. Dugar, FV3129975.
Robert M. Dunco, FV3131760.
John E. Dunkle, FV3139026.
Edward M. Duran, FV3132547.
Rolland P. Eastburn, FV3134597.
George R. Eberle III, FV3130059.
Thomas K. Eckhart, FV3122845.
Anthony L. Edler, FV3134682.
Paul K. Edrington, FV3061912.
Bobby O. Edwards, FV3134655.
Walter F. Edwards, FV3132705.
Clarence B. Ehly, FV3129467.
Edward D. Ehrenberger, FV3132220.
Donald G. Elden, FV3134470.
Harvey R. Elliott, FV3139001.
Dennis J. Ellithorpe, FV3108747.
James L. Elmer, FV3135612.
John D. Enloe, FV3134921.
John W. C. Entwistle Jr., FV3135000.
Robert E. Evans,FV3132060.
Felix M. Fabian Jr., FV3119326.
Edward A. Facey III, FV3131217.
John S. Fairfield, FV3135623.
James R. Faulkner, FV3131971.
William M. Faust, FV3132062.
Marvin L. Feir, FV3132162.
William G. Ferguson, FV3130998.
Oscar L. Ferrell, FV3107174.
Charles A. Finnigan Jr., FV3132889.
Thomas D. Fiorino Jr., FV3131051.
Rodney W. Firl, FV3130010.
John R. Fischer, FV3135184.
John N. Fiske, FV3135630.
Lee N. Fitch, FV3129378.
James A. Fitzgerald, FV3135224.
William J. Fitzgerald, FV3131095.
Danie L. Fitzgerald, FV3130640.
Allison S. Fleming Jr., FV3136371.
Orvil W. Fletcher, FV3134660.
George E. Ford, FV3131259.
Lynn J. Forrest, FV3119626.
Thomas L. Forster, FV3120215.
Walter L. Franks Jr., FV3130669.
Joseph N. Franzetti, FV3134966.
Carl F. Freeman, FV3136388.
William R. Friebel, FV3129659.
David W. Frutchey, FV3130641.
Milford E. Fuller, FV3135657.
Bruce E. Fullerton, FV3119627.
John E. Gaffney, FV3129914.
Charles R. Galbach, FV3129059.
Russell D. Galbraith, FV3131761.
James M. Galyen, FV3132063.
David N. Gardner, FV3128789.
Roy C. Garren, FV3131787.
Brian E. Gaskill, FV3122870.
Robert R. Gaulin, FV3135366.
James A. Gault, FV3134793.
Michael S. Genewick, FV3135668.
Richard S. Gibson, FV3094056.
Roger T. Giles, FV3134925.
Ronald T. Giza, FV3135266.
Howard H. Glick, FV3128938.
Edward A. Glowatski, FV3129061.
Charles H. Gobrecht III, FV3135676.
Melvin L. Gondron, FV3130672.
Thomas N. Goode, FV3133027.
Edmond F. Gormel, Jr., FV3134943.
Lawrence P. Gould, FV3132224.
Bobby Grabstald, FV3136417.
Claus D. Graef, FV3135685.
Mark H. Graybill, Jr.,, FV3132895.
Thomas S. Graybill, FV3134944.
Stanley C. Green, Jr., FV3131262.
James E. Greening, FV3120289.
Stephen C. Gresley, FV3120290.
William A. Griffin, FV3122849.
John J. Grosmann, FV3132464.
Guenter W. Gross, FV3131338.
Norman J. Grove, FV3134968.
Richard L. Gruendyke, FV3134969.
John P. Grumbles, FV3129485.
William A. Guenon, Jr., FV3136432.
Michael J. Guthrie, FV3129669.
John T. Guttman, FV3120164.
John T. Gwynne, FV3132319.
Michael P. Gyauch, FV3119644.
Gerald E. Haba, FV3135166.
Clifford L. Habblitz, Jr., FV3134861.
Harry G. Haefner, FV3130012.
Harold L. Haines, FV3119518.
Charles E. Hale, FV3136438.
Clovis R. Hale, FV3118998.
Gael M. Halgren, FV3134887.
Walter E. Hall, FV3129297.
Frederick P. Hallsworth, FV3134480.
Lamon H. Halsell, FV3136441.
John G. Hamilton, FV3128867.
Charles E. Hamilton, FV3130430.
Cosmo G. Hamilton, FV3131494.
Edward E. Hamilton, FV3129919.
Gerald M. Hampton, FV3133008.
Margie N. Hancock, FV3129151.
Roy M. Handsel, FV3128868.
Orrel T. Hansen, FV3129190.
Edward J. Hardenbrook, FV3136452.
Tristam M. Hardy, FV3130644.
Bruce S. Harger, FV3129291.
William W. Hargrove, III, FV3129980.
Daniel K. Harmon, FV3132065.
Robert T. Harmon, FV3129191.
Bruce E. Harper, FV3135270.
Billy M. Harrison, FV3131978.
Walter J. Harrison, FV3131704.
William C. Harrison, FV3108839.
Donald H. Hart, FV3135723.
Richard J. Hart, FV3135724.
John R. Hartmann, FV3131263.
James J. Hauser, Jr., FV3135729.
Richard J. Havranek, FV3131556.
James E. Hawkins, FV3134888.
Joseph P. Hawranek, FV3106882.
Harvey L. Hayden, FV3131472.
Peter D. Hayes, FV3119800.
William J. Heaphy, FV3135735.
William R. Helmer, FV3136470.
William J. Hentges, FV3133011.
Robert L. Herman, FV3136476.
David J. Herrington, FV3129195.
Steven L. Hershberger, FV3107954.
Paul F. Heye, FV3132553.
Warren L. Hicks, FV3139003.
Cornelius J. Higgins, FV3131526.
Erma J. Higgins, FV3128768.
Gary E. Hignett, FV3131039.
Franklin S. Hinds, FV3135018.
Robert J. Hisel, FV3132118.
Anthony L. Hoff, FV3129773.
Anthony T. Hogan, FV3135751.
Thomas A. Hohman, FV3132557.
James R. Holley, FV3132558.
John A. Holstein, FV3129012.
Robb L. Hoover, FV3130035.
James L. Houk, FV3130589.
Jerry W. Hover, FV3130014.
Wayne C. Hovey, FV3131169.
Jerry W. Howard, FV3129983.
Edward L. Hubbard, FV3122827.
John H. Huisjen, FV3135019.
James L. Humphrey, Sr., FV3131660.
Robert W. Hunter, FV3064952.
Norman M. Hyduk, FV3132171.
Andrew Iaccarino, FV3128083.
Lawrence R. Inabinet, FV3129387.
Robert S. Ingram, FV3132172.
Brownie N. Inman, FV3129984.
Wayne C. Ireland, FV3135771.
Paul H. Jachman, FV3131061.
Julius P. Jaeger, FV3130036.
Charles T. Jaglinski, Jr., FV3119872.
Howard G. Janssen, FV3129684.
Derald N. Jendersee, FV3136532.
Joseph J. Jevcak, FV3109096.
James C. Johnson, FV3135784.
James E. Johnson, FV3128876.
Martin D. Johnson, FV3129902.
Richard C. Johnson, FV3132654.
Robert S. Johnson, FV3129839.
Robert W. Johnson, FV3130524.
Terrill C. Johnson, FV3122829.
Victor B. Johnson, Jr., FV3129777.
Warren D. Johnson, Jr., FV3135392.
Johnnie A. Jones, FV3132486.
Lynn K. Jones, FV3136552.
Roberts T. Jones, FV3129389.
John D. Jordan, Jr., FV3109097.
Leo D. Jostad, FV3135789.
Gerry D. Kammer, FV3129903.
Michael L. Kardos, FV3136559.
Michael P. Katz, FV3129499.
Norman B. Kaufman, FV3135334.
Allen R. Kearns, FV3134550.
Wendall L. Keays, FV3135020.
Charles D. Kelley, FV3129391.
Robert S. Kem, FV3130725.
Terry S. Kemp, FV3135256.
Hubert J. Kenney, FV3135023.
Thomas L. Kepple, FV3132231.
Norman A. Kerlin, Jr., FV3135805.
Edwin L. Keuter, FV3135806.
Charles A. Kezar, FV3109059.
John J. Kilcullen, FV3131408.
Franz V. Kilgore, FV3134880.
David D. King, FV3130898.
George S. King, FV3129501.
Roger C. King, FV3129392.
Walter L. King, FV3129782.
Joseph E. Kinnan, FV3129134.
Robert E. Kirkbride, FV3129135.
Marlin R. Kitchen, FV3130944.
James B. Knight, FV3129688.
Henry J. Knoch, FV3131922.
James T. Koczak, FV3136593.
Frank Kokotajlo, FV3134669.
Joseph A. Kralovec, FV3108687.
Alan J. Kreglo, FV3136603.
Herbert I. Kronk, FV3139033.
William D. Kucera, FV3134535.
Wayne W. Kuppler, FV3135827.
Gerald P. Laird, FV3128948.
Victor Lambert, Jr., FV3135832.
David C. Lamont, FV3128804.
William W. Lana, FV3131475.
Paul R. Lange, FV3136617.
Harold F. Langenbach, FV3128805.
Dale R. Larabel, FV3129906.
Ronald E. Larsen, FV3132792.
Allan D. Larson, FV3130957.
George D. Larson, FV3133154.
Wilbur J. Latham, Jr., FV3130461.
John T. Leavitt, FV3129503.
James L. Lecompte, FV3131632.
Finley P. Ledford III, FV3128087.
David L. Lee, FV3106570.

James E. Lee III, FV3119907.
James M. Lee, FV3131015.
Leonard C. Lee, FV3129248.
Lauren R. Lengyel, FV3081654.
Cecil E. Leonard, FV3136628.
John C. Lervick, FV3135853.
Victor L. Lesher, FV3129791.
Bobby P. Lewis, FV3132467.
Donald W. Lewis, FV3133058.
William A. Lewis, FV3132905.
William F. Lewis, FV3135854.
Lamoyne A. Liberty, FV3134783.
Richard R. Lifsey, FV3136630.
John K. Lilley, FV3130867.
George K. Link, FV3131272.
Robert S. Lloyd, FV3128756.
George F. Logan, Jr., FV3129508.
Herman F. Lombard, FV3139034.
William J. London, Jr., FV3131105.
William R. Long, FV3129204.
Phillip W. Loper, FV3135087.
Nelson L. Lovegren, FV3131729.
David E. Loveless, FV3133114.
David A. Low, FV3128807.
Loren G. Lundberg, FV3133019.
Roger D. Lundberg, FV3135869.
Stephen C. Lutton, FV3134868.
Dale M. Lutz, FV3131183.
Frederick L. Lyon, FV3136643.
Steven R. Mackenroth, FV3133059.
Daniel A. B. Magruder, FV3136649.
John J. Maguire, FV3128808.
Levelle Mahood, FV3130648.
Michael Mahovich, Jr., FV3132809.
Lawrence C. Makowsky, FV3120303.
Dennis R. Maldonado, FV3130016.
Paul G. Mallory, FV3128090.
Leslie L. Manley, FV3130566.
Frank L. Markel, FV3129799.
David H. Martin, FV3131563.
Frank K. Martin, FV3131385.
Roderick D. Martindale, FV3132071.
Jerome Mastal, FV3135357.
William A. Mastin, FV3134789.
Daniel T. Mattioli, FV3129324.
William A. Maule, FV3120116.
Jerry D. McAnulty, FV3129512.
Donald L. McCabe, FV3136675.
Jack L. McChesney, FV3132712.
James P. McCormack, FV3136681.
Jack E. McCormick, FV3129513.
John L. McCranie, FV3136682.
James M. McCrank, FV3131718.
John F. McCurry, FV3129327.
Bruce L. McDaniel, Jr., FV3132574.
John D. McDaniel, FV3120008.
Martin J. McDonald, FV3128092.
Michael N. McDonald, FV3128759.
David L. McFarland, FV3130569.
John A. McFerran, FV3130043.
James E. McGinnis, FV3136686.
Glen R. McGonagle, FV3136688.
Bobby F. McGough, FV3135903.
Spencer D. McGraw, FV3132179.
John W. McHale, FV3130699.
Raymond P. McIntosh, FV3135908.
Eugene H. McKenzie, FV3109371.
Alfred J. McKevitt, FV3136694.
Robert D. McLaren, FV3134530.
Brian H. McManus, FV3130761.
Gerald B. McNelly, FV3132181.
Ronald L. McPherson, FV3107807.
Michael S. McRae, FV3120049.
Michael P. Medlock, FV3120009.
Stephen L. Meek, FV3129927.
Richard S. Meeks, FV3128983.
James W. Meier, FV3120050.
Wallace L. Mekkers, Jr., FV3129702.
Harry A. Meloeny, Jr., FV3119370.
Lloyd C. Mertens, FV3137121.
Stanley B. Metcalf, FV3133083.
Leonard S. Mewhinney, Jr., FV3119017.
Vincent P. Micucci, FV3120352.
Mindaugas V. Mikolainis, FV3105269.
Warren H. Milberg, FV3129252.
Louis W. Miles, FV3131387.
Charles W. Miller, FV3139039.
Dennis R. Miller, FV3129404.
Edmun R. Miller III, FV3128891.
Rodney J. Miller, FV3131744.
William H. Miller, FV3136726.
William J. Miller, Jr., FV3134983.
William T. Mills, FV3107811.
Dennis M. Milotzky, FV3130962.
John A. Minkler, FV3129955.
Saul Minkus, FV3136729.
Charles R. Mitchell, FV3134952.
James S. Miura, FV3120093.
John N. Modders, FV3130947.
Terry J. Moeller, FV3131585.
John E. Monahan, FV3131535.
William R. Monfort, Jr., FV3120011.
Kenneth J. Monroe, FV3128702.
Robert H. Moore, FV3136740.
Dale E. Morin, FV3132106.
Gayle N. Morris, FV3130542.
Larry E. Morris, FV3120052.
James P. Morris, Jr., FV3139011.
Jose G. Morrison IV, FV3129408.
Thomas S. Moorman III, FV3131239.
Edwin J. Motyka, FV3122879.
Richard J. Mugavero, FV3128957.
Thomas H. Mulcahy, FV3129256.
Robert H. Murashige, FV3068636.
Craig E. Murden, FV3129518.
Arthur L. Murray, Jr., FV3133122.
Raymond A. Murray, FV3134698.
John H. Nasmyth, FV3120117.
Gary G. Nelson, FV3132451.
Lonnie B. Nelson, Jr., FV3134760.
Terry W. Nelson, FV3131775.
William E. Nelson, FV3135071.
Darrel L. Nesseth, FV3136761.
Roger K. Nesti, FV3129957.
Thomas L. Neubert, FV3131414.
Paul R. Neuda, FV3131415.
Arthur G. Nevins, FV3130397.
John D. Newman, FV3129710.
Robert K. Nicholson, FV3134801.
Matthew G. Nichols, Jr., FV3131600.
Kenneth E. Nidiffer, FV3107902.
Morris E. Norsworthy, FV3119632.
John C. Novak, FV3139042.
George L. Nowell, Jr., FV3137122.
Ralph H. Oates, FV3132859.
Rudolph O. Oates, FV3131635.
Edwin R. Offer, FV3135969.
Carl R. Oliver, FV3119691.
Thomas C. O'Malley, FV3129713.
William J. O'Neill III, FV3119654.
David S. Osterhout, FV3135974.
David N. Overley, FV3132050.
Kent W. Owen, FV3119846.
David A. Owens, FV3129908.
Richard L. Packham, FV3061259.
Richard B. Palmer, FV3136792.
Robert E. Park, FV3130794.
Raymond C. Parker, FV3129990.
Eddie L. Parris, FV3132794.
Kenneth W. Pastore, FV3131614.
Alexander J. Patrick, Jr., FV3130732.
Chris G. Patterakis, FV3117124.
Daniel M. Patterson, FV3136795.
Newel O. Payne, Jr., FV3128816.
Howard L. Pedlikin, FV3135990.
David J. Pedretti, FV3130045.
Charles F. Peebles, FV3132510.
Paul W. Peeples, FV3135992.
Robert A. Peeples, FV3130989.
Frank E. Penaranda, FV3105403.
Thomas G. Pence, FV3120260.
Francis J. Perella, FV3130021.
Nehru Permaul, FV3122858.
Charles R. Peters, FV3130595.
Edward A. Peters, FV3131174.
Delbert R. Peterson, FV3130436.
James E. Peterson, FV3131565.
Frank L. Pettengill, FV3107180.
Otto W. Peucker, FV3129150.
Thomas J. Pfeiffer, FV3136811.
Dale E. Pflaum, FV3136000.
Larry L. Phelps, FV3134423.
David D. Phillips, FV3132434.
Garth E. Phillips, FV3136001.
Robert T. Pierce, FV3129810.
David J. Pina, FV3132019.
John F. Piowaty, FV3128099.
Stephen P. Piszczek, FV3129717.
Perry W. Polk, FV3132623.
Robert Poplawski, FV3130848.
Richard P. Porter, FV3132077.
Elmer E. Potter, FV3130418.
Michael Pregmon, Jr., FV3132187.
James E. Pressick, FV3134565.
James L. Provines II, FV3109536.
Ronald R. Pruden, FV3129720.
Kermit K. Pruyne, FV3130849.
Cordell F. Ragland, FV3106310.
Richard R. Randolph III, FV3130078.
Bobby G. Rankin, FV3129337.
Kenneth H. Rasmussen, FV3135345.
Randall Ratliff, FV3130024.
William T. Ray, FV3130080.
John R. Rec, FV3131545.
Warren J. Redd, Jr., FV3131673.
Charles R. Reed, FV3122833.
Thomas L. Reese, FV3130046.
Francis G. Reid, FV3136025.
John A. Reidy, Jr., FV3120361.
Wayne J. Reisner, FV3129523.
Robert L. Rennaker, FV3129992.
Jon F. Reynolds, FV3100525.
Harold T. Reynolds, FV3133034.
Nelson D. Rhodes, FV3129909.
John P. Rhude, FV3136852.
Gerald L. Rhyne, FV3131674.
Stephen H. Rice, FV3136857.
Robert R. Roach, FV3129265.
Stanley B. Roadarmel, FV3131456.
John M. Roberson, FV3130624.
James E. Roberts, FV3132625.
Cecil C. Robins, FV3128904.
Willis C. Robinson III, FV3135076.
William T. Robinson, Jr., FV3132472.
Brian D. Rockel, FV3131130.
Curtis R. Roe, FV3139012.
David A. Rogers, FV3132109.
Henry M. Rogge, FV3129724.
Joseph B. Ronchetto, FV3131158.
Thomas G. Rorabaugh, FV3136047.
Donald V. Rosella, FV3139013.
Dennis E. Rossing, FV3136875.
David C. Rowe, FV3132081.
Daryl D. Ruehle, FV3131896.
Thomas E. Ruffini, FV3136057.
John M. Rundell, Jr., FV3130655.
Francis M. Rush, Jr., FV3055294.
Ronald C. Rush, FV3106080.
Albert L. Russell, FV3135330.
Charlotte A. Russell, FV3136251.
Thomas A. Ryan, FV3130025.
Edward F. Sagmeister, FV3136889.
Norman J. Sahley, FV3129728.
Gerald A. Salome, FV3131357.
Donald D. Sams, FV3136064.
Richard H. Sandelin, FV3136893.
Thaddeus H. Sandford, FV3132587.
Roger A. Sansoucie, FV3131227.
Larry A. Sausker, FV3109277.
Harold C. Sauter, FV3119992.
Joseph R. Scarlett, FV3129221.
John W. Schatz, FV3122882.
Paul G. Scheidemantel, FV3136072.
Howard L. Schloeman, FV3135283.
Edward A. Schmitt, Jr., FV3134738.
Kenneth A. Schmitz, FV3132083.
Gerard C. Schneider, FV3136906.
James D. Schneider, FV3136077.
Paul J. Schreiber, FV3131604.
Albert H. Schroetel, FV3134722.
Gordon S. Schwartz, FV3136915.
Ray D. Schwartz, FV3129289.
Charles J. Schwertner, FV3132588.
Walter J. Sciutti, III, FV3132869.
Leonard A. Seagren, FV3131002.
Heyward L. Seale, FV3130658.
Wayne H. Seden, FV3129821.
Daniel R. Seger, FV3130601.
Barry A. Seidman, FV3130812.
Robert M. Seute, FV3130498.
Orlando C. Severo, Jr., FV3132916.
Clifford G. Sharp, FV3139050.
David R. Shaw, FV3132965.
Robert V. Shea, Jr., FV3132306.
Bernard F. Shearon, Jr., FV3119994.
Bennett H. Shelfer, Jr., FV3119946.
Stanley A. Shell, Jr., FV3136088.
Jon E. Shepardson, FV3136089.
Carlton J. Sheperd, FV3129032.
Richard H. Sherman, FV3107450.
Claude R. Short, FV3131079.
Edgar F. Sichel, FV3119995.

William L. Siegfried, FV3129540.
David M. Simpler, FV3119598.
Kenneth W. Simpson, FV3131111.
Taliaferro S. Simpson, III, FV3129338.
Wayne R. Sims, FV3129964.
David A. Skartvedt, FV3133023.
Robert O. Skinner, FV3136105.
John H. Smith, FV3122885.
Joseph S. Smith, FV3120015.
Minturn G. Smith, Jr., FV3136113.
Riley M. Smith, FV3120121.
Rodger A. Smitley, FV3129966.
Lynn E. Snyder, FV3129421.
Neil E. Sodemann, FV3130473.
Jerome E. Soares, FV3139051.
David M. Southworth, FV3135346.
Henry W. Spangler, FV3132871.
Stuart F. Spicker, FV3097791.
Ronald W. Spjut, FV3129422.
Loren L. Splittgerber, FV3119807.
David H. Squire, FV3128829.
Nicholas S. Stankosky, FV3129343.
John H. Steffens, FV3120367.
Paul A. Stenseth, FV3134432.
Thomas L. Stenstrom, FV3130813.
Gorham B. Stephenson, FV3107851.
John A. St. Laurent, FV3136140.
Frank G. Stone III, FV3129996.
Francis B. Storey, FV3134777.
Theodore J. Strasser, Jr., FV3130971.
James O. Strickland III, FV3130049.
William D. Stripling, FV3130084.
Kevin W. Sullivan, FV3122886.
Albert Sullivan, FV3120233.
Billy R. Sullivan, FV3130625.
Burrell F. Sullivan, Jr., FV3129228.
Ludvik Z. Svoboda, FV3129967.
Antone M. Swanda, FV3136979.
Gene E. Syarto, FV3119882.
Bernard L. Talley, Jr., FV3129281.
Frank A. Tantillo, FV3133044.
Jerry F. Tardy, FV3107853.
Leonard C. Tatum, FV3130577.
Allen K. Taylor, FV3131204.
Edward D. Taylor, FV3134712.
Billie D. Tedford, FV3139016.
Arnold L. Tessmer, FV3109150.
Gene R. Tetrault, FV3131735.
John M. Thayer, Jr., FV3133035.
Ivan L. Thomas, FV3131994.
Kenneth W. Thomas, FV3130882.
Glen A. Thompson, FV3061606.
Reynold J. Thompson, FV3129230.
Paul N. Thomson, FV3136154.
Neal J. Thomssen, FV3131194.
Allen J. Tiedman, FV3131846.
Lloyd L. Tilley, FV3129550.
William F. Tobey, FV3131589.
Donald G. Tock, FV3130992.
Bruce A. Toelle, FV3131377.
James R. Tolbert, FV3137002.
Ralph J. Tosti, FV3096564.
Carl D. Towery, FV3136162.
John A. Triplett, FV3133102.
Virgil R. Trotman, FV3128721.
John M. Troyer, FV3134607.
James L. True, Jr., FV3129997.
John T. Turbridy, FV3137008.
Arthur R. Turnier, FV3131462.
Richard W. Tuttle, FV3129162.
Robert P. Twardzik, FV3132196.
Anthony R. Ulehla, FV3132945.
Joseph Utley, FV3137012.
Kenneth B. Vandillen, FV3134849.
David Vanpoznak, FV3129426.
Larry K. Verley, FV3133103.
Ralph E. Vick, FV3120069.
Andris Vinakmens, FV3122838.
Louis W. Voit, FV3137019.
George B. Vosmera, FV3119831.
John M. Vosse, FV3137021.
Charles G. Wade, FV3137024.
Larry D. Walker, FV3130053.
Robert M. Wallace, FV3130850.
John H. Wambough, Jr., FV3131440.
Loren E. Wanless, FV3128725.
Billy I. Ware, FV3131027.
Richard E. Watkins, FV3131195.
Niel K. Weatherbie, FV3134516.
Charles H. Webber, Jr., FV3130835.
Nolan E. Weber, FV3119833.
Gustave A. Wedin III, FV3129283.
Willie M. Weeks, Jr., FV3130001.
Frederick W. Weil, FV3130054.
David N. Welch, FV3130605.
Edward G. Welch, Jr., FV3128979.
Robert P. Welch, FV3129969.
David W. Welp, FV3130442.
Francis J. Welsh, FV3132309.
Kip Westling, FV3131292.
Robert E. Whitcomb, FV3131233.
Edward T. White, Jr., FV3119528.
Victor W. Whitehead, FV3108603.
Paul E. Whiting, Jr., FV3119681.
Jerry D. Whitlock, FV3129038.
Richard J. Whittington, FV3130086.
Earl J. Wiese, Jr., FV3128117.
James R. Wifall, FV3131721.
Joseph A. Wildberger, FV3119787.
Channing G. Williams, FV3132878.
Raymond W. Williams, FV3132702.
James A. Wilson, Jr., FV3108336.
Franklin E. Wilson, FV3130028.
Kurtis B. Wimsett, FV3120331.
James H. Wirsching, FV3128981.
Ronald L. Witcofski, FV3135285.
Harmon T. Withee, FV3130702.
John D. Wolfe, FV3130666.
Daniel L. Wood, FV3137064.
Edward M. Woodson, FV3130443.
Donald R. Woodwell, FV3132199.
Woodie Woodworth, FV3129973.
Bruce Worrell, Jr., FV3131699.
Walter T. Worthington, FV3131700.
Wayne W. Wright, FV3136225.
John H. Wylie, Jr., FV3131165.
Franklin L. Wynn, FV3129754.
Eugene J. Young II, FV3135371.
Frank E. Zachary, FV3137074.
Raul Zamora, FV3132736.
Karl F. Zick, FV3119278.
Charles F. Zurla, Jr., FV3136236.

To be second lieutenants

Robert W. Ackerman, FV3136261.
Raymond D. Aigner, FV3135569.
Thomas R. Allocca, FV3136426.
James M. Anderson, FV3137473.
Paul V. Anderson, FV3135414.
Gary M. Aston, FV3135490.
Melvin T. Baas, FV3139139.
Robert T. Bagby, FV3133199.
Eugene L. Bahns, FV3137780.
Ronald W. Bainton, FV3135515.
Billy A. Barrett, FV3137834.
Marion O. Becnel, FV3130631.
Alan L. Behall, FV3119585.
Ronald L. Benton, FV3139140.
Peter D. Bernstein, FV3131802.
John D. Bickford, FV3137889.
Jimmie Blackwood, FV3136387.
Jack R. Blount, Jr., FV3137857.
James H. Brahney, FV3136557.
Gerald E. Bronnenberg, FV3137945.
Douglas A. Brosveen, FV3130996.
Richard H. Brown, FV3137882.
James K. Broyles, FV3137886.
John E. Burgess, FV3139054.
Byron C. Burson, FV3133218.
Winford E. Butler, FV3136270.
Brian J. Callaghan, FV3137897.
Jay C. Callaway, Jr., FV3133178.
Albert F. Carzoli, FV3137726.
Bobby L. Casey, FV3137904.
Dwight O. Casteel, FV3132037.
Lyle F. Chadwick, FV3136991.
Edward L. Chase, FV3131859.
Francis E. Christ, Jr., FV3131047.
David J. Clark, FV3138033.
James G. Cloud, FV3139055.
Roger L. Coakley, FV3131178.
Richard C. Conant, FV3137733.
Douglas F. Conaway, FV3132500.
Lowell R. Conder, FV3132534.
John L. Cotton, FV3133050.
Lawrence J. Counts, FV3129974.
Michael D. Cox, FV3136308.
Barbara R. Craun, FV3137696.
Chester G. Crosby, FV3137738.
John R. Cunningham, FV3134080.
Jimmy L. Daniel, FV3130105.
Ernest E. David, FV3137960.
Michael E. Davis, FV3137964.
Michael J. Dekofsky, FV3119701.
Glen W. Denner, FV3144390.
Roy V. Dent, FV3132740.
Robert M. Dephilippis, FV3133500.
Larry L. Desch, FV3119741.
Joseph G. Dietrich, FV3130125.
Dana A. Dilley, FV3131807.
William A. Doorley, Jr., FV3130133.
Thomas E. Doran, FV3130134.
Anton J. Dorr, FV3131352.
Jerry C. Dumas, FV3131035.
Marion A. Dykes, Jr., FV3139084.
William A. Edwards, FV3136285.
Robert F. Edwards, FV3130146.
Kenneth N. Eldrup, FV3130149.
Roger J. Erway, FV3130155.
Grant H. Everett, FV3139143.
Robert T. Evertsen, FV3138016.
Duane A. Fitch, FV3138275.
Charles P. Fortenberry, FV3138291.
David P. Francis, FV3120240.
William H. French, Jr., FV3136289.
Richard F. Gaines, FV3138053.
Judd M. Gambill, FV3130186.
James R. Glasgow, FV3130198.
Robert S. Goetz, FV3133054.
Sherwood C. Gordon, FV3138354.
Robert G. Gough, FV3132145.
James H. Graff, FV3130205.
Harold E. Graham, FV3138079.
Neil W. Greenhalgh, FV3132769.
James R. Griffith, FV3138360.
John A. Grimm, FV3133055.
Kenneth A Grubb, FV3138711.
Gerald A. Gustafson, FV3133006.
Jerry A. Hallman, FV3119537.
William T. Halvosa III, FV3138100.
James L. Hanley, Jr., FV3137556.
Clarence L. Hansell, FV3120293.
Charles J. Hansen, FV3061880.
Frederick A. Harris, FV3155201.
Thomas J. Harris, FV3138108.
James R. Haug, FV3130322.
Barry S. Hausman, FV3130242.
Dean H. Hermeling, FV3138391.
Michael W. Hillyer, FV3138132.
Ted L. Hodges, FV3132556.
Albert B. Holliman, FV3156782.
Ronald L. Holton, FV3130271.
James H. Horney, FV3139060.
Charles R. Hurst, FV3138714.
Sidney L. Jackson, Jr., FV3130282.
Robert M. Jamieson, FV3136296.
Dennard J. Jenkins, FV3139128.
Arnold E. Johnson, FV3139063.
Larry D. Johnson, FV3130291.
Wayne D. Johnson, FV3139065.
William O. Johnson, FV3131727.
Robert B. Jones, FV3139129.
Thomas A. Jones, FV3136298.
Jerry C. Jose, FV3132092.
Hayden O. Kepley, Jr., FV3130306.
Frank R. King, Jr., FV3119855.
Alonzo D. Kinkade, FV3130317.
Hugh J. Kleinhenz, FV3130318.
Robert W. Klessel, FV3139130.
Kenneth B. Knechtel, FV3156012.
Frank A. Koi, Jr., FV3139147.
Ross E. Kramer, FV3133197.
James W. Kronmiller, FV3133787.
Michael Kuenstler, FV3130335.
Thomas E. Lafferty, FV3138568.
Michael E. Larkin, FV3133978.
Charles D. Link, FV3137779.
David G. Link, FV3119824.
Ernest B. Longmire, Jr., FV3119554.
David P. Loomis, FV3130361.
Hugh G. Lovelady, FV3154955.
Bradford R. Luke, FV3133522.
Alan B. Macilroy, FV3139132.
Robert C. Macleod, FV3130370.
Lee M. Macmurdo, Jr., FV3058259.
John A. Madden, Jr., FV3131016.
Vincent O. Maes, Jr., FV3119825.
Maurice J. Maguire, Jr., FV3133164.
Robert Mair, FV3130373.
Dion J. Mannen, FV3131067.
Peter Mariniello, FV3138744.
Wayne R. Markison, FV3130361.
Neil S. Marples, FV3138285.

Paul M. Marschalk, FV3130987.
Joseph R. Marvel, Jr., FV3137603.
Chester B. Mason, FV3137128.
David J. Mason, FV3136309.
David L. Mattingly, FV3120304.
Ronald F. May, FV3132048.
Robert E. McAlpine, FV3138296.
Harold T. McCubbin, FV3138304.
William L. McCutcheon, FV3138694.
Roger E. McGovern, FV3137787.
Jovian B. McKinley, FV3137788.
Larry J. McKinley, FV3138704.
William E. Mercer, III, FV3156694.
Glenn F. Miller, FV3139133.
Jere M. Miller, FV3137171.
George M. Montgomery, Jr., FV3139086.
Walter L. Mowles, Jr., FV3130072.
Leon J. Murphey, FV3131072.
Vincent P. Murphy, Jr., FV3138358.
John J. Murray, FV3137191.
William H. Neill, Jr., FV3133440.
Rexford L. Newman, Jr., FV3137201.
John M. Nickey, Jr., FV3138369.
Wylie E. Nolen, FV3119631.
James E. Orlando, FV3154651.
Jack N. Parrish, FV3133168.
Thomas J. Patterson, FV3138798.
Robert C. Peck, FV3131154.
Carl E. Pilot, FV3137805.
James J. Pizzorno, FV3138413.
Todd F. Pohorylo, FV3138418.
Jerry L. Porterfield, FV3138821.
John R. Porterfield, II, FV3130023.
Alan J. Provost, FV3120311.
John H. Puch, FV3131779.
Rogelio Reyes, Jr., FV3138834.
Paul J. Rinaldi, FV3137278.
Robert J. Ringleb, FV3137812.
Thomas L. Ringley, FV3138840.
Ronald S. Robinson, FV3138464.
Bernard J. Russotti, FV3137815.
Nancy L. Rust, FV3138702.
John F. Ryan, FV3137296.
Joseph A. Sabin, FV3138480.
Louis D. Sassman, Jr., FV3137300.
Richard W. Schaab, FV3131286.
Howard Schneeberger, Jr., FV3120366.
Wayne N. Scott, FV3138502.
William C. Scully, FV3138503.
Jon H. Shive, FV3138514.
Frank A. Shumaker, Jr., FV3137822.
Charles H. Smith, FV3137340.
Clyde K. Smith, FV3133159.
John F. Steele, FV3137826.
Raymond A. Steiner, Jr., FV3131161.
Jon S. Stilp, FV3137366.
Melvin L. Stone, Jr., FV3138729.
Phillip L. Strottner, FV3139091.
William H. Summers, FV3133068.
James C. Swinney, FV3137377.
Charles J. Sykora, FV3131991.
Benny D. Taylor, FV3138554.
Thomas E. Taylor, FV3138558.
Jimmy R. Thomas, FV3137388.
Joseph M. Thomas, FV3119542.
George W. Thompson, FV3139155.
Frederick W. Thorne, III, FV3138011.
Raymond E. Trusz, FV3129998.
William W. Tyre, Jr., FV3119950.
Charles H. Ulmer, FV3137831.
Halsted S. Vanderpoel, FV3137415.
William H. Vanpetten, Jr., FV3136590.
Jose E. Velezcolon, FV3131084.
William A. Verkest, FV3138924.
Gary E. Vice, FV3132723.
Victor J. Wadsley, FV3119738.
Donald E. Wagner, FV3137423.
Robert L. Wasson, FV3139138.
James G. Watts, FV3139076.
Peter M. Watts, FV3137431.
Parke R. Weaver, Jr., FV3138930.
Edson S. Weeks, FV3137434.
William E. Welch, FV3137682.
Roger G. Wells, FV3137841.
John C. Wenger, FV3137438.
Wesley L. West, FV3138618.
Robert J. Wielatz, FV3137844.
Albert R. Wilson, FV3119382.
William E. Wilson, FV3131752.
Charles H. Wimberly, FV3133165.
Henry Winters, Jr., FV3137453.
James P. Woody, FV3130004.
John C. Wray II, FV3130536.
Richard L. Zimmerman, FV3131359.
Frank S. Zimmermann, FV3138965.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Farris Bryant, of Florida, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Richard C. Kirch, assistant pastor, St. Mary's Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Prayer of St. Francis of Assisi: "Lord make me an instrument of Your peace. Where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy. O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood as to understand; to be loved as to love; for it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 10, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 234

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. John F. Baldwin, Junior, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12169. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12889) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 170, 74th Congress, appointed Mr. BENNETT in lieu of Mr. SCOTT to be a member on the part of the Senate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Canberra, Australia, April 11 to 16, 1966.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. EDWARD GARDINER LATCH TO ACT AS AND TO EXERCISE TEMPORARILY THE DUTIES OF THE CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by Public Law 197, 83d Congress (67 Stat. 387; 2 U.S.C. 75-a-1-(a)), the Chair appoints Edward Gardiner Latch, D.D., L.H.D., of Washington, D.C., to act as and to exercise temporarily the duties of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. EDWARD GARDINER LATCH AS CHAPLAIN

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the House is very fortunate to have Dr. Edward Gardiner Latch to act as Chaplain. The Speaker is to be commended for such an excellent choice. As the days go by Members will be blessed by the selection which has been made.

Many Members of this House—on both sides of the aisle—have attended services at Dr. Latch's church over the years. They know him as a Christian gentleman and religious leader. They love and respect him. They count him as a friend—indeed, as a friend to all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well for the RECORD to show something of the background of this distinguished churchman and I submit the following:

REV. EDWARD GARDINER LATCH, D.D., L.H.D., PASTOR, METROPOLITAN MEMORIAL METHODIST CHURCH, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Dr. Latch comes to the House after a long tenure of service in the ministry. Born in Philadelphia, Pa., and reared in Baltimore, Md., he is a graduate of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., and Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N.J. He took postgraduate work at Northwestern and American Universities. Dr. Latch is married to the former Rieta van der Vies of Oakton, Va. They were blessed with two children; a daughter, Mrs. Dallas S. Maxwell, Bethesda, Md., and a son, Edward, Jr., now deceased. They have seven grandchildren.

Dr. Latch has been in the ministry for 44 years. He served pastorates in Virginia and Maryland before assuming his duties at the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church where he has served for the past 25 years.

TO AMEND FURTHER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYS, Mrs. BOLTON, and Messrs. FRELINGHUYSEN and BROOMFIELD.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file three privileged resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

A COMMISSION ON REVISION OF THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws. This bill is intended to carry out several of the recommendations made by President Johnson in his message on crime and law enforcement.

There is a need to review all our criminal laws to make them simple, clear, uniform, and as direct as the needs of our complex society will permit. The comprehensive survey and study of all the Federal criminal laws provided for in my bill is intended to make them serve better the ends of justice.

A nine member Commission is called for. Three members are to be appointed by the President, one of whom shall be designated as Chairman, three members are to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, and three members by the President of the Senate. Among the responsibilities of the Commission is to seek a recodification of our criminal laws, including consolidation of laws which treat of the same and similar subject matter; to recommend repeal of unnecessary, undesirable, or obsolete sections of law; and to study the penalty structure of existing law with a view to recommending elimination of existing disparities.

The Commission is required to submit interim reports to the President and the Congress at such times as it deems necessary and appropriate and shall submit a final report within 2 years after the effective date of the act. The Commission will terminate within 90 days after submission of the final report.

WEATHER CONTROLS ACTION DUE

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Santa Fe New Mexican, the daily newspaper in the capital city of my State, has a run a very interesting editorial concerning the support given for safe and effective programs for modifying the weather.

Because of the great interest in this particular subject, I would like to call this editorial to your attention:

[From the Santa Fe (N. Mex.) New Mexican, Feb. 24, 1966]

WEATHER CONTROLS ACTION DUE

President Johnson's support of a move looking to the establishment of "safe and effective programs for modifying the weather" should give this undertaking just the impetus it needs. We now stand on the verge of an era in which weather control will increasingly become feasible. Some of the techniques are known; others can be foreseen.

What is required is a new thrust of research and development.

Mr. Johnson's interest in this was underscored by his submission to Congress of a National Science Foundation report on weather modification research. The report concludes. and we agree, that it is time for this country to channel such research and experimentation "into an active, long-range program."

The Science Foundation envisions a program that would study and experiment in such fields as cloud seeding to make rain, redirecting storms toward drought areas, weakening and changing the course of hurricanes, dispersing fog, forestalling hail formation, and so on.

There already have been experimental successes in some of these things. There is reason to suppose that much swifter development of weather control would follow if a broad-scale, intensive program were undertaken.

Mr. Johnson's interest in this is shared by many in Congress. There is, however, one practical difficulty; as often happens, a bureaucratic fight is shaping up over which Federal agency should handle the program.

That should not present a serious obstacle, however. Hearings on at least two weather modification bills are to be held at this session of Congress. There is some prospect of fairly prompt action.

That is well. For, as President Johnson said when he submitted the National Science Foundation report, "we can now begin to see the day when such programs may become operationally feasible."

SOUTH KOREA UNDERSTANDS COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the friendship of the Republic of South Korea and the United States, the Houston, Tex., Chronicle, an outstanding daily dedicated to progress and survival of the United States and the free world, printed a concise but forthright editorial Wednesday, March 2, 1966.

They point out that one of the salient reasons underlying their willingness to accept a share of the free world's responsibility is that "more than most Asian nations, South Korea understands the meaning of Communist aggression."

Because this editorial points the way for other nations to work with us for freedom and is of significance to all of us, I include this editorial to which I have referred in the RECORD:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Mar. 2, 1966]

SOUTH KOREA MAKES MAJOR CONTRIBUTION

The decision of the South Korean Cabinet to send some 20,000 more troops to fight in South Vietnam will go a long way toward dispelling the U.S.'s feeling of isolation in its conduct of the war there. South Korea already has 20,750 troops in Vietnam. If the National Assembly approves the troop movement as expected, that number will rise to 40,750—a sizable force by anybody's standards.

More than most Asian nations, South Korea understands the meaning of Communist aggression. The truce line on which its armies stopped fighting in 1953 today remains heavily fortified on both sides.

One of the paradoxes of the Vietnam war has been the seeming apathy of other Asian nations to this evidence of Chinese expansionism. Japan and India, the two strong nations which have most to lose, have shown no interest in helping South Vietnam defend its precarious independence. Asians generally seem more concerned over the possibility of an enlargement of the war, and this has weakened to some degree the moral justification of the U.S. participation in the hostilities.

When North Korean Communist armies invaded South Korea, the United States responded swiftly. The United Nations immediately joined in, thereby putting the weight of world opinion behind the U.S. action. Before that conflict ended, 15 other nations sent fighting troops to South Korea. Five others sent medication assistance, and 46 offered economic aid.

That's a far cry from the situation today in Vietnam. Now South Korea at least is demonstrating its concern over the Vietnam war. It would be even more gratifying if more nations would follow suit with at least token forces.

MISS SUZANNE DIXON HONORED BY RITA BLANCA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Miss Suzanne Dixon of Morse, Tex., in the district I have the honor to represent, delivered one of the two prize-winning orations in a contest sponsored recently by the Rita Blanca Electric Cooperative, with headquarters in Dalhart. A junior in Morse High School who has established an outstanding record of achievement in 4–H Club work, Suzanne is the daughter of Mrs. Elvagene Dixon, of Morse.

Suzanne's speech makes clear the great contribution to this country of rural electrification:

> By lighting the dark corners of America, the rural electric cooperatives not only benefited the rural areas but all Americans.

In June, Suzanne will be coming to Washington along with other outstanding young Texans who won top awards in the oratorical contests sponsored by the rural electric cooperatives of Texas. I am looking forward to an opportunity to visit with her and the others, and I want to share with our colleagues in the House and other Americans the words, which follow, of Suzanne's fine speech:

(By Suzanne Dixon)

"Let there be light," cried the farmers of America. And the rural electric cooperatives answered this cry and brought the magic of electricity to the farms of America. By lighting the dark corners of America, the rural electric cooperatives not only benefited the rural areas, but all Americans.

As a result of rural electrification over 5 million farms have electricity and the output of the American farmer has doubled. REA borrowers have invested $4 for every $1 loaned by the Government. Rural electric consumers have spent over $16 billion for appliances, plumbing, wiring, and equipment.

To prove my point that rural electrification is good for all Americans, stroll with me down Main Street, USA, and let us talk to some businessmen to get their reactions to the effects of rural electrification.

The grocer on the corner has been in business since the early 1930's. He was here before the farms had the magic of electricity and still has a few old kerosene lamp wicks in stock. He tells us that only 11 percent of the farms were electrified and private power companies wouldn't even talk about extending their service to the rural areas. "The farmers had to help themselves," states the grocer. "And that's an American tradition," he continued. He tells us that the farmers did form their electric cooperative, but in so doing they didn't take business away from anyone, they just helped themselves to what their city cousins had enjoyed for years. Since that time the grocer says he has farmers and city people, but he can't tell the difference because they all purchase the same type of items. "I figure," concluded the grocer, "that the rural electric cooperative has created a whole new market for things I sell."

The next merchant we shall stop to chat with is in the hardware business. It certainly didn't take him long to tell us that nearly all those farmers with electricity had bought from one to three electric pumps to put running water into farm homes, not to mention all of the power tools purchased. "Why, my hardware store has expanded twice since the electric cooperative started," stated the hardware owner.

Farther down Main Street, U.S.A., we come to an appliance store, something new since rural electricity came into existence. The owner told us that the national market for electrical equipment and appliances, just on rural lines alone, is estimated at more than $1¼ billion for this year. "I believe electric cooperatives are good for everybody's business," emphasized the appliance dealer.

The electrical and building contractors of Main Street, U.S.A., tell us essentially the same story. When electricity came to the farms, the farmers needed their services where before they had no use for them.

The clothing store owners, the beauty shop operators, even the amusement businessmen tell us that the habits of everyone have changed since electricity came to the country. Farmer's production output has doubled, he has more money to spend for this type of goods. "Why, the rural electric program has restored the roses to the cheeks of the women of America," one businessman commented.

Not only has the standard of living changed for the farmer, but for many people. More than half of the people supplied by rural electric cooperatives are nonfarmers. Travel with me down the highway leading out of town and we see a filling station, a motel, a drive-in, a freezer plant, all dotted along the highway which was once farmland. All of these businesses are made possible by electricity in the country put there by the rural electric cooperative.

The mayor of Main Street, U.S.A., tells us that the tourist business has flourished due to rural electricity. Today there is a lake located 3 miles from town which is heated with cooperative electricity. He reminds us of all the dollars the tourists will put in the cash registers of the city businessmen, primarily due to rural electric cooperatives which helped make the scenic spot possible.

On Main Street, U.S.A., "electriconomy" is evident everywhere as it is over the rest of the Nation. "Electriconomy" is the amount of business and the standard of living made possible by the availability of electricity to all. And this has been made possible in the rural areas by the electric cooperatives. It has resulted in an increase in the manufacture and sale of appliances, in location of new businesses, industry and recreational facilities. That is "electriconomy" in action, Americans—all Americans—enjoy it every day.

Because it has contributed so much to the economic well-being of a large portion of the population, rural electrification has truly been good for all Americans. The program is big—big enough to exert a real influence on the general economy. Rural electric systems must constantly build new facilities and improve existing ones, thereby constituting a tremendous market for utility apparatus and line equipment. Factories and all kinds of private enterprise in every section of the country will share in this market in the coming years, just as they have already shared in the construction programs already completed. The rural electric market is constantly expanding. As national population grows, it will settle more in the rural areas. The use of power by the rural electric consumer doubles every 5 to 7 years, therefore these lines must be rebuilt and heavied which take big investments. These investments add up to a constantly expanding market, a market that will continue to be a source of business for years to come for industry and labor in all parts of the United States.

The taxable base of our local, State, and Federal Governments has been greatly expanded as a result of the creation and extension of rural taxable income and property. This stems directly from the economic stimulus given by rural electric cooperatives.

Many rural Americans as a result of rural electric cooperatives have jobs, increased incomes and higher standards of living. City residents have benefited since the bulk of farm and rural income is spent on merchandise and other goods and services produced in urban areas. All of this has been made possible by the rural electric cooperatives who answered the rural cry, "Let there be light," and brought the magic of electricity to the rural areas of America.

YOUNG TEXAN, TOMMY NISBETT, PRAISES RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN PRIZE-WINNING DALHART SPEECH

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, young Tommy Nisbett of Dalhart, Tex., in the district I have the honor to represent, will visit Washington in June as a prizewinner in the recent oratorical contest sponsored by Rita Blanca Electric Cooperative. Tommy's address, entitled "Rural Electric Cooperatives—Good for All Americans," is an inspiring summary of the development of rural electrification and of its continuing promise.

Tommy is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joe Nisbett, of Dalhart, and is a junior in Dalhart High School. He is very active in Boy Scout work and represented the Llano Estacado Council recently in a meeting with Gov. John Connally.

I am looking forward to seeing Tommy when he comes to Washington in June. In the meantime, I think our colleagues and Americans everywhere will be interested in the words of his winning oration. They are as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES—GOOD FOR ALL AMERICANS

(By Tommy Nisbett)

This is a story that had its beginning in poverty, unemployment, and depression. This story began at a time when wheat was selling for 37 cents a bushel. Hogs brought $2.68 a hundredweight on the Chicago market in the fall of 1932. Corn was being burned for fuel because it was cheaper than coal. Fifteen million men were unemployed and the relief agency could carry only a part of the loan. But out of this idea grew one of the greatest transformations ever to occur in rural America—electricity on the farm. This is the story of rural electric cooperatives; a story of how farmers joined hands and with the support of the Federal Government did what private industry has said for years was impossible by providing the means to make electric power available for rural America at rates it could afford.

Such was the situation in 1932 when Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President. Electricity was still in the possession of those in cities and towns. Farmers could only continue to dream for the future. Cooperation as the key to the solution of the problem was only a vision dimly seen by a few throughout the land. Those few farmers demanded electricity. Finally, they began to turn direction to a new agency of the Federal Government which they had heard about. Here and there, with the help of the Government, about 30 groups formed these electric cooperatives which had been recently created from the Rural Electrification Administration. All of these were small. The largest had only 63 miles of line and 350 members. Yet, they were surviving and serving their purpose.

Behind the rapid and successful development of rural electrification in the United

States lie the efforts of almost 1,000 nonprofit electric systems. While a few of these are organized as public bodies, the vast majority are consumer cooperatives, a private enterprise form of corporate organization which is owned and controlled by those it serves.

Today these rural electric systems operate more than 1½ million miles of line, providing service to approximately 20 million rural people. These consumers, who represent more than half of all the rural electric customers in America today, are located in 46 States, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

All this has been accomplished by the hard work and determination of local people, with the help of a realistic Federal loan program.

Just what is an electric cooperative? An electric cooperative is an ordinary business, a necessary business, a local business, and a self-supporting business.

An electric cooperative is a business owned by its members who each have one vote. They elect directors who set policies and employ a manager who, with employees he hires, carries out the policies. A necessary business where members keep costs low through efficient operation. Rural electric cooperatives not only aid those that are members. Rural electrics are also helping in the war on poverty, and act to profit all Americans. After all, who should know the problem better than those who live and operate in rural America? Fewer than one-third of our Nation's population lives in rural America, yet more than half of those who exist below the poverty line live in our rural areas. That's why rural electric systems across the country are taking a special interest in helping to lift the blight of poverty from the land. Rural electric systems know from experience what cooperative enterprise can accomplish and what new areas of economic and social opportunity can be opened to all Americans.

Electric cooperatives have, and will continue to develop, the necessities and desires that were once only found in our urban areas. Electric cooperatives have literally broken the city-country barrier. Now the farmer's wife can have each and every modern device enjoyed by the urban wife.

Americans are always looking for the ultimate formula, the final panacea that will solve all of our problems. No one would claim that electrifying America's farms has done that. Yet, it has greatly increased farm production and raised the standard of life of farmers everywhere. The important thing is that this great far-reaching program has shown once again that Americans, in spite of the prophets of gloom, know how to solve their problems, how to roll up their sleeves and pitch in and do what has long needed to be done. The electric cooperative is every bit American in concept and in practice as the bygone quilting bee and the barn raising.

You have heard a portion of the story of rural electric cooperatives but this story is not ended; many more chapters remain to be written. Rural electric cooperatives are definitely very good for all Americans. But not only are they good, they are a necessity. If America is to remain the greatest nation on earth; if we Americans are to maintain our standards of living, rural electric cooperatives will be the dominating force pulling together with the American public in their program—good for all Americans.

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been joined by 29 Members of the House in urging that the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress give favorable consideration to the establishment of a new standing committee to be called the Committee on Urban Affairs.

In a letter sent to the Joint Committee on March 1, we stated:

> We believe that a separate standing Committee on Urban Affairs would provide a more coordinated approach to legislation in the sphere of urban problems. This is especially desirable now that the Congress has created the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In recognition of the growing urbanization of America—an America containing more than 70 percent city dwellers—the Congress during the last session finally gave the city a spokesman in the President's Cabinet by setting up the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. This new Department, which is now being shaped, is intended to bring order out of the chaos that now characterizes the manner in which we currently deal with our urban problems.

Now that the new Department has been established, it is only logical to create a new standing committee to parallel the activities of HUD.

I include at this point in the RECORD, the complete text of the letter we sent to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. I hope that other Members of the House will join us in this effort of focus more clearly on the pressing problems of our cities:

> CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> *Washington, D.C., March 1, 1966.*
>
> Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
> Representative RAY J. MADDEN,
> *Cochairman, Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, CAP S. 146, U.S. Capitol, Washington.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY AND REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: We urge that the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress give favorable consideration to the establishment of a new standing committee to be called the Committee on Urban Affairs.
>
> We believe that a separate standing committee on Urban Affairs would provide a more coordinated approach to legislation in the sphere of urban problems. This is especially desirable now that the Congress has created the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.
>
> At present jurisdiction in both bodies of Congress for the legion of problems that afflict the cities is scattered through a number of committees. Urban problems are mounting at a staggering rate, yet the Congress is using a committee system for handling the affairs of our cities that evolved two decades ago.
>
> Both Congress and our cities would benefit by the creation of a Committee on Urban Affairs. Such a standing committee would be an effective instrument for overseeing the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and alternately, our cities would be able to deal with one committee instead of several in seeking assistance for a concerted and effective attack on urban problems.
>
> We believe the jurisdiction of this new committee should be coextensive with that of the new executive department. It could have jurisdiction for public and private housing, air and water pollution, water supplies and sewage facilities and urban mass transportation.
>
> By setting up a Committee on Urban Affairs, the Congress can play a wider and more creative role in dealing with the growing problems of urban America.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, ALPHONZO BELL, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER, JOHN CONYERS, JR., CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DONALD H. FRASER, JACOB H. GILBERT, SEYMOUR HALPERN, JAMES M. HANLEY, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, CHARLES S. JOELSON, EUGENE J. KEOGH, PAUL J. KREBS, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, ROBERT N. C. NIX, ARNOLD OLSEN, OTIS G. PIKE, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, THOMAS M. REES, JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, GEORGE M. RHODES, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, HERBERT TENZER, LESTER L. WOLFF,
> *Members of Congress.*

UNFAIR TACTICS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I observed on the front page of the Evening Star last Thursday the photo of a handbill which is being distributed in Washington, D.C., by an organization called the Free D.C. Movement. This handbill is a grossly unfair characterization of two of our colleagues, South Carolina Representative JOHN MCMILLAN and West Virginia Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, who did not ask for the positions which they now hold but who ascended to those positions by their seniority.

This handbill depicts a Negro with an iron collar, being tugged at by chains held in the hands of our colleagues. Although I have not personally seen the handbills, I am told that they characterize the Negro in chains as a victim of "lousy schools, filthy housing, and cops—who—cuss us."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stand idly by while such vilification of our colleagues is depicted. I believe that when you run out of logical arguments and start resorting to this form of personal abuse, it hurts the cause you serve. I deplore the use of such handbills and trust that those who are distributing them will withdraw them from further distribution.

SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in my short term as Congressman, numerous businesses have asked me to help in securing extension of Small Business Administration loans. Loans to individual concerns are made for 10 years, and experience has been that the Administration is properly strict about granting extensions of these loans.

However, for many of the business enterprises in my district, and particularly the small businesses that operate hotels, it is clear from experience that the 10-year term of the loan is working a hardship. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I last week introduced an amendment to the Small Business Act to increase the maximum maturity of regular business loans thereunder to 20 years. This will avoid the occasional necessity of ballooning payments at the end of 10 years. It will provide an orderly and even curve of repayment which would not be the case if there is uncertainty about the possibility of extension beyond 10 years.

Under my amendment, no distinction is made between loans to individuals and loans to groups of small business concerns in the term or period of a loan. This has been the case under the present law. However, groups will still enjoy the opportunity to borrow greater sums than individuals and at more flexible interest rates.

The existing law does permit extensions beyond the present term of a loan. My bill would permit any loan to be made up to 20 years, plus construction time in the case of construction loans. Having in mind this generous provision, my bill is written so as not to permit extensions of loans having original maturity in excess of 10 years plus construction time in the case of construction loans.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that these provisions will simplify the administration of the Small Business Act and reduce the number of defaults by providing a more bearable amortization. At the same time, they should increase the possibilities for small business enterprises to establish themselves.

AIR FORCE MAJ. BERNARD FISHER, OF KUNA, IDAHO

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Air Force Maj. Bernard Fisher, of Kuna, Idaho, with an almost unbelievable display of courage and daring, has become the United States most notable hero of the Vietnam conflict. He has captured the imagination of the world and the respect of fighting men on both sides. With particular pride that Major Fisher and his family are Idaho residents, I call attention to the account of his exploits as reported in the March 13 edition of the New York Times:

Flier, Safe, Thanks "Crazy Guy"—Fighter Pilot Landed in Besieged Camp To Rescue Buddy

(By Neil Sheehan)

Saigon, March 11.—In Vietnam, where tales of great courage are not rare, the rescue of a downed American flier by a fellow pilot yesterday may long be remembered as a particularly daring act of heroism.

The two men told their story at a news conference in Saigon today. They are Maj. Stafford W. Myers, a 46-year-old resident of Newport, Wash., who was shot down, and Maj. Bernard Fisher, 39, of Kuna, Idaho, who saved his life in the besieged U.S. camp at Ashau, in a valley near the Laotian border.

"The cockpit filled up with smoke," Major Myers said in a quiet voice, "and I couldn't see a thing, so I opened one side of the canopy to try to get a fix on the strip."

Major Fisher, circling nearby, guided him toward the field over the radio, calmly reading off prearranged instructions for a crash landing. He warned the endangered pilot to drop his bombs and then to pull up his Skyraider plane's landing gear to avoid bouncing the plane on its side when it hit the ground.

TRACERS STREAK BY

After about 40 seconds of maneuvering, while streams of enemy tracer bullets crisscrossed the sky, Major Myers landed the Skyraider halfway down the runway. It skidded, swerved, and came to a halt.

"The plane was a ball of flames when he was going in, and I never thought he would get out of it," said Major Fisher, who was on the same strafing-and-bombing mission over the camp. "I made a pass to have a good look, and I saw him jump out and wave at me."

Major Fisher radioed for a rescue helicopter. Then he and two other Skyraider pilots repeatedly strafed the 2,000-man North Vietnamese force that had held the camp under siege for more than a day.

ENEMY HOT ON TRAIL

Major Myers unstrapped himself, leaped over the side and ran through the brush to the edge of an 8-foot embankment alongside the runway. He could hear the North Vietnamese entrenched atop the embankment, some of them 10 to 20 feet away, firing at the three other aircraft.

"Those people were pretty close to him," Major Fisher said.

After about 15 minutes, Major Fisher noted that the clouds were closing in and concluded that the rescue helicopter would probably not arrive in time to pick up Major Myers. He decided to land on the airstrip.

Asked why, he replied, "Well, those people might have captured him, and he wouldn't have gotten the best of treatment."

Myers, crouching beside the embankment, believed that he would not be rescued. He made up his mind to try to work his way to the jungle at the edge of the valley.

"I never, never dreamed somebody would land and pick me up," he said.

As Major Fisher maneuvered for a landing, he instructed the two remaining pilots, and two other Skyraiders that had just joined them, to suppress the North Vietnamese fire as much as possible by strafing.

He landed the plane, turned and taxied back up the runway, pockmarked with bomb craters and shell holes, toward the spot where he had seen Major Myers.

"When I saw him landing," Major Myers said, "I thought, 'You crazy guy. We'll never get off this airstrip alive.' "

Then, as soon as the plane came to a halt, he leaped up and raced to it.

"I figured I'd be catching some fire from that embankment," he said, "and nobody's ever seen an old man like me run so fast in all his life."

Major Fisher said that when he halted his plane he could not see Major Myers at first, and he began unstrapping himself to climb out and search for him. "Then I took a look in the rear mirror," he said. "I saw this pair of red eyes climbing up over the back and I knew he was all right."

As Major Myers dived headfirst into the cockpit, Major Fisher taxied back to the end of the strip. The plane roared down the runway and into the air.

"When I straightened myself out," Major Myers said, "I gave him a couple of hugs," then he looked out and saw that both the right wing and the cowling over the engine were perforated with bullet holes.

"I thought, 'Oh God, we'll have to put this thing back down again,' " he said.

The Skyraider continued to function perfectly, however, and the men landed safely at Pleiku airbase, 150 miles to the south.

The camp was later abandoned, and the survivors in the garrison were picked up by Marine Corps helicopters.

Air Force officials said today that Major Fisher would be recommended for at least the Silver Star Medal for gallantry and possibly for the Air Force Cross, a decoration ranking just below the Medal of Honor.

I know my colleagues would be interested in learning more about Major Fisher, the man. Therefore, I insert the following story from the March 10 edition of the Nampa, Idaho, Free Press:

Wife Says Hero Quiet, Religious

Maj. Bernard Fisher, the Air Force pilot who made a dramatic rescue of a downed buddy in Vietnam today, and whose wife and five sons are living on Robinson Boulevard between Nampa and Kuna, is a man of many contrasting aspects.

At home, he is described as a quiet, religious man who likes to hunt and fish and teach his sons to shoot rifles. At some of his stations in the Air Force, he worked with Boy Scout and Cub Scout units. He also was active in the Latter-day Saints Church.

At Homestead Air Force Base, Fla., where he twice was named pilot of the month for safely landing two crippled F-104 jet fighters before he volunteered for duty in Vietnam, one of his fellow officers commented today, "I remember he used to like to ride sharks." For recreation he used to take his sons skindiving.

Mrs. Fisher is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Johnson, Kuna, Route 1, and a registered nurse who took her training at St. Luke's Hospital, Boise.

FIVE SONS

Their sons are Brad, 16, a sophomore at Kuna High School; Courtney, 14, and Bob, 12, students at Kuna Junior High; Timothy, 10, a fifth-grader at Kuna, and Scott, 5.

Major Fisher has a brother, Richard Fisher, Boise. Mrs. Fisher's other relatives in this area include a sister, Mrs. Eldon Yorgason, of Nampa; brothers, Russell Johnson, of Melba, and Burton Johnson, of Meridian.

Fisher first came to Kuna in the last years of World War II to join his parents, the late Bruce Fisher and Mrs. Fisher, now of Ogden, who had moved here while he remained in Utah to graduate from high school. He attended Boise Junior College and met and married his wife. He then went to the University of Utah and took Air Force ROTC. That led to his commission in the Air Force toward the end of the Korean war.

Major Fisher went to Vietnam in last July, was home for 2 weeks of leave in January, and is scheduled to come home again in June, Mrs. Fisher said.

In Vietnam, he is with the 1st Air Commando Squadron, the Air Force's equivalent of the Army's Special Forces (Green Berets) and one of the most decorated units in the USAF.

He flies an A1E propellor-driven fighter out of the squadron's base at Pleiku. He has had more than 160 missions.

The rescue he made today was his second in Vietnam. Last fall, he made a landing in enemy territory to pick up a downed pilot

> but that one did not get into the news, Mrs. Fisher related.
>
> "Families over there want to raise rice, not fight a war," Major Fisher told his wife and sons when home on leave. "We are over there to help them win the right to that way of life."

This final paragraph from the Nampa story, a simple statement of Major Fisher's understanding of the Vietnam conflict, should not be overlooked as we praise his heroism. When we understand his personal motivation to fight, his act of bravery becomes more believable.

OBJECTION TO REDUCING FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, educating our people is perhaps the most urgent task with which we are faced and it is with this thought in mind that I wish to register my objection to the administration's proposal to significantly reduce its financial support of local school districts under the provisions of Public Law 874.

This measure was enacted in 1950 in response to a recognized need by the Congress that the Federal Government should develop an assistance program for those areas in which tax exempt Federal activities, such as military installations, resulted in heavy new demands being placed upon individual school districts.

To me, this represented sound thinking, especially in view of the fact that these installations, with their large evaluations, are withheld from the assessment rolls from which school taxes are levied. Consequently, in lieu of taxes, some form of contribution to the local school districts was required to help pay for the extra teachers, facilities, and equipment necessary to accommodate the incoming dependent children.

The type of Federal-local partnership then created has proven its value consistently during the 15 years of its existence. When a move by the Federal Government resulted in a significant increase in student enrollment within a school district, financial assistance to ease the imposed burden soon followed. Quality did not have to be sacrificed for quantity.

Despite the continuing success of this impacted area aid plan, the administration's budget for fiscal year 1967 proposes amendments to the law decreasing Federal commitments to the program by $233 million. Such action can only be supported if the impact of Federal activities on local school districts will be considerably less in the year ahead, or if we no longer attach to education the sense of urgency that we evidenced during the last session when we passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

In my view, education remains a domestic responsibility of the highest priority and, accordingly, I will continue to support reasonable, well-conceived programs that are consistent with the objective of helping to make available to our youth the opportunity for full educational attainment.

At the same time, however, I will oppose any plan which threatens to jeopardize, in any way, our efforts to achieve that goal. I believe the proposed cutback in Public Law 874 assistance falls into this category.

To illustrate the impact such action will have on affected schools, I wish to bring to your attention some pertinent comments provided me by the principal of a central school in my congressional district.

The principal states that he has been notified that the school's allotment under Public Law 874 is scheduled to be reduced in 1967 from $16,711 to $1,877. That $14,834 cut would be enough to pay for 1 year the salaries of two highly qualified foreign language teachers or mathematics instructors. It would be enough to purchase a new bus to replace an older model used to transport children to and from school or to add another full-time librarian to the staff and have a sufficient amount remaining to stack the shelves with valuable books and essential reference material.

Measured by present-day yardsticks, $14,834 is not very much in comparison to the millions and billions of dollars so frequently mentioned in debate. However, to this one school district, it constitutes very valuable dollars difficult to replace.

If the proposed cut in Public Law 874 assistance is approved, the alternatives confronting school districts across the country will be extremely difficult to face. Will quality of educational offerings be sacrificed, or will already overburdened taxpayers be called upon to make up for the loss of this Federal payment which has been recognized due in lieu of taxes?

In the particular case mentioned earlier in my remarks, the principal advised me that local property taxes for school purposes will have to be raised $3.67 per thousand dollars assessed valuation to overcome the loss in the school budget that would result from the anticipated reduction in Public Law 874 assistance. Perhaps the effect of such an increase in taxes would not immediately be overwhelming, but I hesitate to speculate on what may happen the next time the voters are called upon to act on a school bond issue.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a table, prepared by the Office of Education, to show the effects of the proposed amendments to Public Law 874 on the school districts in the area which I am privileged to here represent:

School district and county	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	1967 estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874
Central School District No. 1, Towns of Trenton et al., Oneida	87,734	55,284
Central School District No. 1, Remsen, Oneida	3,418	0
Central School District No. 1, Town of Boonville, Oneida	16,711	1,877
Central School District, City of Rome, Oneida	1,100,091	735,753
Forestport Central School District No. 10, Oneida	3,418	1,706
Central School District, Town of Camden, Oneida	40,829	7,849
Union Free School District, No. 4, Oneida	17,281	4,948
Central School District No. 1, Towns of Westmoreland et al., Oneida	36,031	15,698
Central School District No. 1, Town of Whitestown, Oneida	37,220	20,476
Central School District No. 2, Town of Whitestown, Oneida	57,920	0
Union Free School District No. 7, Town of Augusta, Oneida	2,849	0
Central School District No. 1, Towns of Kirkland et al., Oneida	22,218	0
Central School District, City of Sherrill, Oneida	76,149	31,566
Central School District, City of Oneida, Madison	39,309	0
Central School District, City of Utica, Oneida	200,155	15,015
Central School District No. 1, Town of New Hartford, Oneida	33,422	0
United Free School District No. 8, Town of New Hartford, Oneida	4,178	0
Central School District No. 3, Towns of Newport et al., Herkimer	4,558	0
Central School District No. 1, Towns of Stockbridge et al., Madison	4,937	0
Congressional district total	1,788,478	890,172

As the table clearly shows, more than $800,000 in Federal support will be withdrawn from the schools in just three of the country's many thousand counties if we go along with the requested cutback.

I have never opposed wise reevaluation of Government spending programs. I wish to see proper economy of funds; however, this proposal, in effect, repudiates a relationship which was properly conceived and continues to be observed. The theory justifying the adoption of this plan in 1950 was sound and we find it equally sound now in 1966 as we reexamine and place in proper perspective the role of the Public Law 874 impacted area assistance program.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE EXTREMISTS THREATEN TO BOYCOTT BUSINESSES

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the threat of the District of Columbia home rule extremists to boycott businesses who do not contribute to their political cause, or to boycott the businesses if they do not favor their cause and express their favor, is strikingly similar to the situs picketing bill which will legalize identical boycotting in the construction industry.

Membership in a union today usually involves dues to a central political arm which uses the union dues for purposes which may or may not be to the best interests or to the wishes for dues paying members. To legalize the secondary boycott in the building trade, then, is to legalize political coercion. This is strikingly what seems to be involved in the District of Columbia boycott. Mr. Marion Barry threatens to invoke this form of coercion, extortion, or blackmail, which is a holdover of the gangsterisms of the 1930's around the Nation at large, presumably through his student nonviolent organization. It seems to me the time has come to reexamine the name "nonviolent."

I had wished that civil rights overtones would not enter the District of Columbia home rule picture. It is a legitimate debate without the magic formula for political success in recent times, namely, "If it is civil rights, it's right." The District of Columbia home rule debate raged long before the District of Columbia population became predominantly Negro.

THE ARMY ARSENAL SYSTEM AND THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CONTE, and I take the floor today for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Congress and the Nation a situation that has developed in our area of western Massachusetts which can have extremely serious consequences, affecting the future security of the Nation and more immediately equipment for support of our troops in Vietnam. I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to the current actions of the Department of the Army in carrying out the orders of the Secretary of Defense to close out all operations and facilities at the Springfield Armory between now and April 1968. These actions have shaken employee morale and have interferred with operations to the extent that there is danger the Army will not be able to meet the demands currently being imposed upon it for support of our troops in Vietnam.

Why has this situation developed? Actually, it almost appears as if the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. Some sections of the Defense Department and the Army are going ahead with closeout plans, including recruitment of people to go to other facilities, while, at the same time, other sections of the Army are asking the armory to perform the highest of priority work in support of the war in Vietnam. All new development work on guns for our troops has been stopped completely, pending the transfer of this function to another facility some time between now and April 1968. And this action is taking place while we are in the midst of a war—a war for which the President has asked the Congress to provide an additional $14 billion plus during the current fiscal year alone. A war, which the Secretary of Defense himself said at a recent press conference, the Communists have every intention of expanding.

Mr. Speaker, a very serious mistake has been made in ordering the closeout of the Springfield Armory. Over tht next few days and weeks, it is the intention of Congressman CONTE and I to bring various facts regarding this situation to the attention of the Congress as well as the various committees of jurisdiction. We will make a series of presentations—of which this is one—exploring all facets of the life and times of the Springfield Armory and what is happening to it and why.

The Springfield Armory was the first facility of its type established in this country. It was the first of the various Army arsenals, and the only one called an armory. The nucleus of this establishment was organized during the Revolutionary War at Springfield, Mass. It became the United States Armory by act of Congress in 1794. It has been the nucleus for supplying our troops with small arms in every war since the Nation was established. It has been the center for maintaining the arts and skills of gunmaking for our soldiers through all these generations and especially during the financial famine periods when private industry was not interested in providing the small quantities of arms being procured for our Army. It has provided the guidance and know-how for private industry to supply our needs for arms whenever mobilization and mass production was required, including that for the current Vietnam conflict. It is currently performing very essential work in support of that war—a war which the Secretary says the Communists are expanding—yet it has also been ordered closed. Its employees are confused and uncertain. Their efficiency is impaired.

Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Armory is one of the original establishments of this Nation that has indeed become an institution so deeply involved in our military history that to talk of abolishing it is incredible. This is particularly so when the original claims for cost reduction have been successfully refuted and discounted and the only basis for abolishing it is an admitted desire to shift the work to private industry.

What is being proposed for the Springfield Armory, and the Army arsenal system as a whole, is a very dangerous thing. I say this move involves a gamble with the future security of the Nation. This gamble is that private industry will provide our Armed Forces with the conventional weapons they require, through feast and famine, including the development of new weapons and a continuation of the arts and skills of such weaponry during times of peace and disarmament when the future looks rosey and no one ever expects to have to fight again. We all know that such peaceful times come, especially our military men trained to appreciate military history. Thank God, that over the years these military men have been able to preserve our basic skills in armaments when diplomats and politicians have been swayed by the temper of the times to look upon such things as unnecessary. Such times will come again, I am sure, and this is why it is dangerous to follow the current policy of the Department of Defense of complete reliance upon private industry for our small arms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make it perfectly clear that I am not taking a position in opposition to private industry. This is the furthest thing from my purpose here today. The case which I am trying to make is for our time-honored one of a combination—and I should add a winning combination—of our public and private facilities in support of our fighting men when the time comes, as it always seems to come. What I do not want to do is to gamble on changing that relationship now, in the name of cost reduction, when private industry is seemingly interested in supplying all of our military needs because the volume is currently great enough to stimulate that interest. I believe that private industry management is also sufficiently concerned about the future of our armaments capabilities to understand what I am talking about. The marriage of private industry and our arsenal system has served us so well in the past, that, except possibly for the Johnny-come-lately's industry management of experience will agree with what I am saying. I hope to make our case so clear, in subsequent presentations, that there can be no question about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have called upon the Secretary of Defense, we have implored the Secretary, in the immediate interest of our war effort in Vietnam, to call off the people working directly on this closeout of the Springfield Armory. This closeout operation should be stopped at this time, if only in the interest of getting current requirements for the Vietnam war fulfilled, and at least until congressional hearings can be held and we are all more certain of what the real long-term effects of this action are likely to be.

We say, Mr. Speaker, that a serious mistake has been made and is still being made. We ask the help and support of the Congress in correcting this error.

THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my distinguished friend and colleague on his presentation here today on behalf of the Springfield Armory, and to associate myself entirely with his remarks.

It has been my privilege to work closely with the gentlemen in recent months in an effort to save this vital, essential facility and to preserve the skills and industrial capabilities that have been as stanch a bulwark in this country's defense posture since the founding of the Republic as have our great armies and navies.

It is frustrating to me, as I am sure it is to my colleague, to note the stubborn persistence of the Defense Department in clinging to its plan to shut down this facility and to try to duplicate its output somewhere else.

This is false economy in the extreme. What is infinitely worse, in my opinion, is that this plan represents the grossest kind of injustice to the highly skilled craftsmen and artisans that have made the Springfield Armory what it is today and who have committed themselves to a career of service to their country through the armory.

The Springfield Armory holds a unique place in our history. In many ways, the capacity and capabilities of this facility are a throwback to the days of family industries, of skills that are handed down from father to son, developed with each succeeding generation until they cannot be matched anywhere else in the world.

It is my hope that certain facts concerning the Springfield Armory with respect to our present defense requirements and our future needs can soon be brought to light and prove to the policymakers and taxpayers of this country that a shutdown of the Springfield Armory will not bring the economies which have been claimed; that it will not serve the best interests of our national security; and above all, it will not help our boys presently fighting it out in the jungles of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the Gun Report magazine recently published a series of excellent articles tracing the history and development of the Springfield Armory. This series demonstrates how the unique skills and capabilities of this facility did not come about by accident, and that they are not likely to be duplicated overnight, as our Defense Department seems to think.

Under unanimous consent, I include the first of this series of articles entitled "History of the Springfield Armory," written by the armory's information officer, Mr. Christopher Dvarecka, at this point in the RECORD:

HISTORY OF THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY—ARMORY HISTORY DATES BACK TO PREREVOLUTIONARY DAYS

(By Christopher L. Dvarecka)

"A complete history of Springfield is something yet to be written; and when this is accomplished the U.S. armory will occupy the front ranks in its chapters relating to religion, politics, mechanics, and many local and physical improvements." (Albert Harleigh Kirkham in "King's Handbook of Springfield" (1884).)

This article is the first in a series on the history of Springfield Armory from the early concentration of gunmaking activities in this area to the present time. As one of the Nation's oldest national institutions, the armory has played not only an important role in the military history of this country, but also an equally important part in the development of Springfield as a community. Acknowledgment is made at the outset to the many reference works used to compile this series. Among the works referred to are: "A History of Springfield Armory," by D. S. Whittlesey; "King's Handbook of Springfield"; M. A. Green's "Springfield 1636–1886," and other related community and arsenal histories.

The history of Springfield Armory actually has its roots in the years preceding the outbreak of the Revolutionary War.

In early colonial days, when new lands in the little-known territory were opened to settlers, a gun was a necessary implement for survival. As the population gradually increased in the northeast sector of the country so did the number of guns. In those years all guns were made in England, Germany, Spain, and France. Since Europe was so far removed in distance, some far-sighted colonists who possessed the necessary talents opened gun repair shops and soon had all the business they could handle. This New England gun industry attracted some of the best gunmaking talent of the Old World and soon Springfield and the surrounding communities were known for the quality and quantity of their gun work.

As the colonists inevitably drifted toward an open rift and outright warfare with Great Britain, thoughtful and alert citizens of the Massachusetts Bay Colony began to look for concrete means of carrying out armed resistance to what they considered an intolerable situation. The means were readily at hand in the large number of gunsmiths, blacksmiths, and artisans of all kinds at work in this area.

In 1774, a parliamentary embargo was slapped on the exportation of firearms to the American Colonies. This action led the Massachusetts Committee of Safety to immediately concern itself with the provisions of arms and munitions of war. In that year Richard (Foley) Falley of Westfield was designated armorer for Massachusetts. There were a score of expert gunsmiths living and working in the area at that time (including two from Springfield, one in Northampton, and one in Grandby) who, in addition to Falley and a number of less skilled artisans, formed the potential nucleus of a gunmaking center in the Springfield locality. (One of these men, Robert Orr, who was engaged in the manufacture of arms at Bridgewater at the time, later became the first master armorer of the National Armory at Springfield in 1795.)

These men and everyone else who could adapt themselves to the work of gunsmithing pitched in to provide badly needed arms as quickly as possible as the initial skirmishes of the Revolutionary War began.

Springfield—in conjunction with other area towns—recorded payments to three local mechanics for 20 guns in March 1776. A division of labor saw one mechanic make the barrels and the ramrods, a second the locks and rigging, and the third the stocks.

Inevitably, as time passed and the conflict heightened, the Continental Congress came more and more to depend on Springfield for its munitions. Col. Henry Knox of Boston, one of General Washington's more experienced officers, was then a commanding officer of a Continental regiment of artillery. His knowledge of a then little known branch of warfare, made him consider material more than personnel—unlike the infantry officers of that day.

The colonel addressed the Continental Congress on September 27, 1776, from his headquarters within the defenses of New York City. He submitted a list of suggestions "for the improvement of the artillery of the United States." One of the colonel's suggestions was "That there be one or more capital laboratories erected at a distance from the seat of war, in which shall be prepared large quantities of ordnance stores of every species and denomination. That at the same place a sufficient number of able artificers be employed to make carriages for cannon of all sorts and sizes, ammunition wagons, tumbrils, harness, etc. That as contiguous as possible to this place a foundry for casting brass cannons, mortars, howitzers, be established upon a large scale."

Thus, the recommendations of Colonel Knox contained the seed of the idea for a system of arsenal and armories for this country.

Three months after his aide's recommendations, General Washington wrote to Congress from his camp near Trenton and gave an outline of his plans—cannon, carriages, and shot were to be provided at "laboratories to be established, one in Hartford and another in York. Magazines of provisions should be laid in." Colonel Knox was to be in charge of this work and, on December 27, 1776, was accordingly raised in rank and made a brigadier general and chief of artillery.

At this point, a conflict over a choice of a final site arose. Most prominently mentioned were the towns of Brookfield and Hartford. Much New England support was rallied in support of Brookfield. However, General Knox, who had at first favored Hartford as the laboratory site, changed his mind and recommended Springfield as the most suitable site. This decision appears to have been the outgrowth of a visit to Springfield in the latter part of January 1777. During this visit he wrote Gen. Nathanael Greene "that it (Springfield) was the best place in all the four New England States for a laboratory, cannon foundry, etc."

One of the advantages cited at that time was Springfield's location on the Connecticut River. Although the river was navigable above Hartford, it was narrow and shallow enough in spots to prohibit the passage of heavy war vessels. This made Springfield somewhat less vulnerable to attack than Hartford. Its overall geographical location was considered superior to that of the other contending town, Brookfield.

General Knox also stated in another letter in 1777 that "When the buildings, magazines, etc., shall be erected in a complete manner the plain just above Springfield is perhaps one of the most proper spots in America on every account."

Knox was so determined in his championship of Springfield that General Washington gave him the green light to go ahead with the works here.

The undertaking was financed by the Council of Massachusetts Bay. At first, buildings were rented in the town proper, located on what is now Main Street. However, work was started at once on the construction of barracks, shop buildings, storehouses, and a powder magazine on the high ground in the rear of the town, called the "training field," which included the areas now known as Armory and Federal Squares. Land for this purpose was leased from the town of Springfield. A powder mill was rebuilt on Mill River, and it was in this manner that the forerunners of the Hill Shops and the Water Shops of the present Springfield Armory came into being.

SPRINGFIELD "A LIVELY LITTLE VILLAGE" DURING REVOLUTION

General Washington and his aides had been stressing the urgent need for speedy production of war munitions and General Knox, as previously mentioned, had started work even before the Springfield site had finally been approved by the slower moving legislature.

A Col. Thomas Dawes had drawn up plans for housing the development and was recommended as superintendent of construction by General Knox, who had approved Dawes' projected plans. However, premises for immediate use were to be rented in Springfield in the meantime.

The first work shop appears to have been a barn in the rear of a building known as the Hitchcock House, located on Main Street where Emery Street now forms an intersection. The building was rented from one Ebenezzer Stebbins in 1777.

The first work done at this sites seems to have been connected with cartridges—papier mache or cloth cartons containing the powder. Each man carried about 40 rounds, and constant use wore them out. It was the business of the laboratory here to refill and renew these cartridges. In April of 1778, one week's work saw 7,584 such cartridges turned out.

So acute was the demand for powder from the very start that Gen. William Heath, commander of the eastern department, reported with some astonishment that all the powder belonging to the Continental Army at Boston had been sent to Springfield by Knox's order early in 1777.

Very shortly after the laboratory began operations, Springfield also became known as a storage center of some importance. General Heath (in the same month his own warehouses were depleted of powder) transferred for storage at Springfield "25 cases of arms lately arrived" in Boston from Martinque. This general urged that a similar course be followed with respect to "part of the cannon * * * the muskets, flints, powder, tents, and lead ball * * * in order to their being conveyed to the Army."

This material was part of a consignment which had been delivered with the help of the French Government, another shipment of which had been delivered to Portsmouth, N.H. General Heath tried to forward this material to Springfield too, but met opposition from the Continental agent for New Hampshire.

When the issue came to Washington's attention, he recognized the necessity of removing the precious stores from an exposed coastline. He succeeded in sending to Springfield not only the Portsmouth consignment, but all the supplies along the New England seaboard.

Thus Springfield became a military supply depot of the first rank, distributing to the whole eastern and northern part of the warring States. Its location gave Springfield the responsibility for supplying all operations aimed at repelling or dislodging the enemy on the coastal edge of New England, and all expeditions concerned with Canada and the northern frontier.

A growing need for more and better housing facilities proved a constant and acute problem for 3 years. By 1780 a number of buildings were under contract, as shown by the recorded rentals of that year—the largest of which was $775 to Charles Pynchon. Less than a month after the first of the Continental supplies began to be moved to Springfield, all the buildings available for hire were in use, and it became necessary to look for additional means for storage.

Heath had already suggested that it was dangerous to locate military stores in one central location. He feared enemy raids and Springfield's lack of defense. Washington doubted that the enemy would penetrate the area in order to destroy the stores, but he did state that "the whole might be lost, in case of other unhappy events." It's possible that he had in mind the impending invasion from Canada by way of the Champlain-Hudson depression in an attempt to sever New England from the rest of the colonies.

Washington vetoed Heath's proposal to establish Worcester as a secondary supply center because the town lay "on a very public road, and moreover was the place marked out by Congress where prisoners are to be kept." He recommended the alternate site of Brookfield and, accordingly, supplies Springfield couldn't handle were sent to that town.

Meanwhile, further storage facilities were constantly being added in Springfield through the construction of new building under Dawes' direction, Congress had previously decided that a magazine was to be erected at Springfield "sufficient to contain 10,000 stands of arms and 200 tons of gunpowder and a laboratory thereto." Knox felt that so much powder should be stored in two or more separate buildings in order to decrease the risk of explosion and complete destruction.

However, it was decided to begin building operations with a single powder magazine, and Thomas Dawes was "appointed a committee to purchase in the town of Springfield, the county of Hampshire (in which it was located at that time), a piece of ground and take a deed thereof to the treasurer of this State in trust for the United States sufficient to erect a magazine upon and also for erecting a laboratory adjacent to such magazine."

(It was during this same period that the Continental Congress discussed a motion to establish at Springfield a foundry for casting brass field pieces, howitzers and mortars. This motion to make artillery here was tabled, however, and contracts for this work let out instead.)

The land Dawes wanted was a part of the training field of the militia and had been used since the 17th century for military purposes. The year 1778 saw the erection of Dawes' magazine, a barracks and accommodations for the operation of the laboratory on the training field. (This is the area now embracing Armory and Federal Squares.)

Not all military activities were removed to the hill however, with the erection of these buildings. During the fall of 1777, the Massachusetts Council subsidized 60 pounds for the rebuilding of the powder mill at Springfield. This powder mill was rebuilt on the Mill River and quickly had the reputation of making good powder. The buildings constructed on the hill and the Mill River were the forerunners of the modern Hill Shops and Water Shops plants.

The activities connected with the Burgoyne campaign furnished the principle stimulus for operations at Springfield during the Revolutionary War. The importance of Springfield in supplying State and Continental troops with both ordnance and commissary stores is vividly illustrated by the recorded impressions of one of General Burgoyne's captured British officers who viewed the busy arms center as he was marched through the town on his way to Cambridge late in 1777.

"East Springfield is an exceedingly lively little village. This place is a veritable magazine for the storage of weapons for the Americans; and it also has a small but very well-built armory or arsenal. We saw various parks of artillery, with their trains, and among other things, 12 entirely new 4-pounders of French make. The store or magazine houses were filled from top to bottom; and workmen of all trades were seen in the houses engaged in the manufacture of ammunition, wagons, guns, etc.

Stores kept at Springfield from 1777 to 1779 were used in supplying the extensive operations connected with the repulse of the invasions of Burgoyne, Howe and St. Leger in 1777; the march and countermarch of the captured armies in 1778; the Canadian expedition of 1779; and other operations in the Hudson Valley, the Canadian frontier, the seacoast towns, and even the remote western frontier.

As director of ordnance, Lt. Col. David Mason was placed in full charge of the Springfield laboratory. At first, the work force here was made up of enlisted personnel who were skilled artisans in their trade. These men were undoubtedly diverted from the combat areas because of their special qualifications. The laboratory was somewhat comparable to the modern ordnance repair shop in organization.

The work force functioned under the direction of several officers (rank of captain), each of whom directed his own branch of the work. At one time there were captains of the carpenters, the wheelwrights, the smiths, and the harness makers, besides a master tinsmith, a quartermaster, a paymaster, and sundry clerks.

Thus, it was at Springfield, early in the military life of the Nation, that the diversification of activities brought about the separation of the functions of quartermaster and ordnance officer.

Manufacturing operations were divided into two groups: the repair and replacement of arm and artillery equipment; and the making of cartridges and fuses. There were not enough soldier workmen to handle the work so recourse was made to civilian labor—mostly unskilled help, it was not long before the civilians greatly outnumbered the military.

During the latter part of 1778, the town became crowded with outsiders seeking employment and some trouble cropped up between the townspeople and the newcomers. There were several factors involved in this ill feeling (the least of which was the raiding of chicken roosts in West Springfield by soldiers and workmen) and investigation was finally conducted by higher authorities. The matter appears to have been resolved to the satisfaction of all parties concerned.

In the summer of 1780, a call came for retrenchment and many officers and soldiers were demobilized and the supply organization dismantled. This action was a clear indication that the war was definitely over—even though peace terms were not signed until some months later. The laboratory was closed, the skilled artisans sought other work, and the storage operation was greatly curtailed.

The end of the campaign of 1781 actually closed the successful revolt of the 13 colonies against Great Britain. Despite the termination of the conflict, plans for the adequate care and storage of quartermaster and ordnance stores at Springfield was made.

In a resolution passed early in 1782, the Continental Congress ordered that "The Secretary of War take orders for establishing good and sufficient magazines for the reception of the public ammunition at the following places: at Springfield, in the State of Massachusetts; at West Point, in the State of New York; at the Yellow Springs, in the State of Pennsylvania; and at New London, in the State of Virginia."

Contemporary accounts give a picture of the Government works during this period of transition from the Revolution to the days of sober industry following the war and the establishment of the National Armory.

"The road from Wilbraham to Springfield is * * * a continued pine plain, without fence. * * * Pass the magazine, a long brick building. Further on, are two large public stores for arms and a number of barracks. * * * The ferry which we crossed at Springfield is very commodious."

Following his visit here in 1789, Washington made the following entry in his diary:

"Reached Springfield by 4 o'clock, and while dinner was getting, examined the Continental stores at this place, which I found in very good order at the buildings (on the hill above the town), which belongs to the United States.

"The barracks are going fast to destruction, and in a little time will be no more, without repair.

"The laboratory, which seems to be a good building, is in tolerably good repair, and the powder magazine, which is of brick, seems to be in excellent order, and the powder in it very dry."

Generally speaking, the government of the Confederated States managed to keep the storage depot in fairly good repair in this period.

EARLY HISTORY OF ARMORY MARKED BY REVOLT AMONG LOCAL FARMERS—SHAYS' REBELLION

One of the most spectacular events in the history of the arsenal at Springfield took place in 1787. This was the incident known as Shays' rebellion. The short-lived revolt of local country folk came as the result of the expenses incurred in the war, the heavy taxation, and the depreciation of paper currency, which left many small farmers heavily in debt.

By 1786, the insurrection (also reflected in other States) reached its peak. Mob violence occurred in this period at Northampton and Springfield. The most prominent leaders of the rebellion were Daniel Shays, of Pelham, and Luke Day, of West Springfield, both of whom had served as officers in the Continental Army.

To protect the courts, then under particular fire, the Government issued orders to raise an army of 4,000 men. Of this number 1,200 were raised in this area. They were placed under the command of General Shepard and ordered to report at Springfield.

On January 25, 1787, Shays approached Springfield from the east with a force of about 2,000 men. It was his intention to seize the military stores at the arsenal to further the rebellion. Shepard's forces were prepared for the assault and warned the advancing force that they would be met with armed resistance. Shays disregarded the warning and the defenders' fire killed and wounded several of the attacking force. The well-directed gunfire broke the ranks of Shays' men and they fled from the scene (area now known as Benton Park opposite Building 104). This abortive attempt to seize the arsenal virtually ended the rebellion.

An interesting sidelight to the rebellion was the defection of Luke Day, Shays' fellow conspirator. It resulted from some plain advice handed out by Parson Joseph Lathrop, of West Springfield. Captain Day insisted on divulging the secret of the proposed attack on the arsenal to Parson Lathrop, whose judgment he very highly valued, and received the following rebuff: "Captain Day, your army is deficient of good, true, and trusty officers. You are engaged in a bad cause, and your men know it. I advise you to disband them, and let them return peaceably to their homes; for, as sure as you advance upon the public stores, 'tis certain that you will meet with sore defeat." It is very likely this bit of advice prevented any juncture of Shays' men attacking the arsenal from the east and Day's rebels from West Springfield.

As previously mentioned, General Washington had visited Springfield in 1789 and was evidently impressed by the location of the arsenal here. When the new Federal Government was formed, the leaders of the country were immediately faced with the task of providing a suitable military defense. On April 2, 1794, the Congress authorized the establishment, under the President of the United States, of three or four arsenals and at each of these arsenals a national armory was to be included. Because of its role in the Revolutionary War, Springfield received special recommendation in this act. President Washington personally selected Springfield as the location for one of these arsenals. Thus, Springfield Armory, formally established in 1794, is now the oldest manufacturing arsensal in the land.

The second armory established was at Harper's Ferry in Virginia. Both the Springfield and the one at Harper's Ferry served the Nation until the Civil War when the national armory at Harper's Ferry fell to the Confederate Army. This left the Springfield Armory as the only nationary armory, a position it held until 1904 when the manufacture of rifles was undertaken on a small scale at the Rock Island (Ill.) Arsenal.

Four years after the armory's establishment, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in Boston passed an act authorizing the United States to purchase land from the town of Springfield, not to exceed 640 acres, for the permanent site of the arsenal. The first piece of land purchased in 1798 was on the Mill River and was chosen because of available water for power facilities. This site proved inadequate, however, and additional property in the vicinity was added from time to time. These purchases eventually resulted in three different plants on the river; namely, the Lower Water Shops, the Middle Water Shops, and the Upper Water Shops. The land at the training field on the hill, which had been under lease, was purchased outright from the town. As the need for additional facilities arose, more and more land was procured. These later purchases now provide the sites for shops at the Hill Shops on Federal Square, and offices, storehouses, and quarters in Armory Square.

The appearance of the hill at that time was not especially formidable in a military sense. There was a powder magazine (on what is now Magazine Street) made of brick with an arched roof of brick about 3 feet thick. This magazine was blown up some years later. There were two red wooden storehouses built earlier in 1787, soldiers' barracks, and an old dwelling house where the armory storekeeper resided.

The first superintendent of Springfield Armory was David Ames who served from its establishment in 1794 to 1802. He was the first of a line of civilian superintendents who have numbered seven in all throughout the armory's history. David Ames was born in Springfield and, in addition to his position at the armory, was noted for his paper manufacturing enterprises. It was Ames who was instrumental in maintaining a strong paper industry in this country.

During Ames' tenure in office, Robert Orr served as master armorer of a work force of 40 men. It is interesting to note that Ames' salary was $70 per month, while Orr received $50 monthly. Records further reveal that the first gunlock was filed after a struggle of 3 days and was stocked by hand.

The introduction of the flintlock type of musket into American military history began during the Revolutionary War. The Continental Congress purchased several thousand such muskets from European nations, principally France. The flintlock system of ignition was used over a longer period of time than any other type, approximately 200 years (1640–1840).

A quick peek back into history shows that the matchlock type which required the shooter to carry a lighted piece of slow-burning material, such as punk, for the purpose of igniting the powder charge, was supplanted about 1636 by the introduction of the flintlock, which adapted the principle of striking flint and metal together as a means of starting fire to ignite the powder charge. This invention is credited to Dutch chicken thieves, whose activities at night were handicapped by the glowing match, which forced them to develop other means of ignition less likely to disclose their whereabouts and intentions.

Although a musket of Springfield manufacture appeared in 1795, production was small. Lafayette, who came to America in 1777, brought with him a mixed lot of firearms—about 250 of which were muskets. Most of these were the 1763 model of Charleville manufacture. Arms of that model and place were sometimes called Lafayette muskets. It was this musket that served as the model for the first musket produced at Springfield Armory.

The French Charleville musket was undoubtedly used in the Indian War in Ohio in 1790, probably at Norfolk against the Picaroons (1799), and in the war with Tripoli (1804), and in the War of 1812. It is possible that some were still in use as late as the first Seminole War (1818), although by this later date, newer models of domestic manufacture had been produced in quantity.

Not much is known about the first muskets made at the armory in 1795, except that 245 were turned out. It's possible that some of these were issued. However, indications are that by successive improvements the 1799 model resulted, and most of the preceding models were modified, leaving very few, if any, of the early muskets in existence as originally constructed. The manufacture of the flintlock type of various models, patterned after the 1799 model, continued until 1844.

Assuming that some of the 1795 models were issued, their service may be included with that of the 1799 model, which probably saw its first service in the war with Tripoli, followed by the War of 1812, including the battles of Tippecanoe (1811). Lundy's Lane (1814), and New Orleans (1815). It also served in the first Seminole War (1818), the Black Hawk War (1832), and the second Seminole War (1835), and the Mexican War (1845), including the battles of Buena Vista and Chapultepec (1847).

PROJECT PUSH

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night, March 8, 1966, a remarkable group of young people held open house at Shaw Junior High School in the District of Columbia.

Called PUSH—Pupils United for Superior High Schools—they represent schools throughout the city of Washington. The pupils led guided tours through small, ill-ventilated, ill-equipped, gloomy, old classrooms; small gymnasiums with peeling paint and dangerously cracked floors which flood during each rain; an overcrowded cafeteria with desks doubling as serving tables; and other inadequate facilities.

Remarkable about this group was their age. They were all students of high school or junior high school age. No faculty advisers or parents were on hand to urge, advise, or agitate. With pride, criticism, and a desire to assume responsibility and work toward progress, these youngsters guided the adults through the school and patiently explained the conditions in each room.

The problems were numerous—an improvised classroom in a partitioned-off section of the drafty gymnasium where a pupil explained how the bouncing of a basketball against the classroom wall interfered with the concentration of the students, a variously used science lab, cooking room, music room, where half the period is spent with the teacher writing on the board because there are no books, rooms without desks, broken typewriters on desks so close together that the students have no room to move their arms, and so forth.

The depressing physical plant was in sharp contrast to the enthusiasm, assurance, and articulateness of even the youngest student.

During the brief presentation program, PUSH chairman, Dee Moore, of Western High School, explained that the students had organized on a citywide basis for the purpose of publicizing conditions and improving their schools. She said the membership of PUSH has grown to more than 200. They hope to interest prominent citizens in their plight. They intend to go to the source, as their fact sheet puts it, and hope to appeal to Congress in the spring. She told of a PUSH party at which $225 had been raised for Shaw Junior High School.

Miss Alice Gaines, principal of Shaw Junior High School, placed responsibility for "the shame of Shaw" on Congress and asked for help in the school's efforts to improve itself.

Mrs. Dorothy Lynn, president of the Shaw Junior High School PTA, explained that the $225 had been used for needy pupils and expressed the gratitude and support of the PTA for the activities of PUSH.

The Reverend Walter Fauntroy, of Washington, D.C., deplored the neglect of the District schools. The District of Columbia spends less money for education per capita than any State in the Union, he said, and school construction progresses at a rate slower than in any State. He condemned the Capital of the greatest country in the world for shamelessly neglecting its duties toward education.

He spoke of the hope for the future one gained by seeing children organizing and working to make conditions better and urged them to continue.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders how desperate actual daily conditions must be to produce such a valiant attempt by the children to effect a change. The children of Washington, D.C., the Nation's Capital, have pointed to the dreadful neglect. How long will their pleas be ignored?

As the Reverend Fauntroy pointed out:

> It is not enough to have integrated schools—we must have quality schools.

Mr. Speaker, how long will the children of our Nation's Capital be condemned to an inferior education? I call on all my colleagues to consider this question in full conscience and with the utmost care.

DISCRIMINATION AND THE SENIORITY RULE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the age-old tradition in this body that dictates that freshmen Members should be seen and not heard. In breaking this tradition of long standing, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I may be forgiven by my colleagues in this body, and especially by the older Members of this body who have accumulated two, three, four, and even five terms of seniority. Certainly I would not want to offend any of my more senior junior colleagues, since I am merely serving my 10th consecutive term in this body.

Back in 1942, when I graduated from the flying cadets and was commissioned a second lieutenant, our class was informed that we were being made "gentlemen by act of Congress," and were exhorted to act as such in our newly acquired status as officers. Most of us did our best to conduct ourselves accordingly. In January 1965, after accumulating 18 years of seniority here, I was made a "freshman by act of the Democratic caucus." In this newly acquired status, Mr. Speaker, I have done my best to act accordingly.

In the twinkling of an eyelash on a cold day in January 1965, I was summarily relegated from the high and lofty rank of heir apparent to the throne of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the lowest of the committee positions. Since there were 22 Democratic members on the committee, I dropped 20 places, and if there had not been a bottom place for me to land, I suppose I would still be falling. You see, I had committed the unforgivable sin of voting my honest convictions—along with 87 percent of my constituency—in the last presidential election. The fact that my own State Democratic Party had given me full license to do so under a unanimous resolution of their own convention less than 2 months before the election constituted no defense. The fact remained that I was from the State of Mississippi, and not from New York State for instance, where such offenses are overlooked or excused by the Democratic majority here.

Though I occupy the lowest rung on the Democratic seniority ladder, I am not new in politics. I harbor no malice, ill will, or grudge against those whose political ends were served by the sentence imposed by the kangaroo court action of the majority of the caucus. I understand their situation. Indeed, what Minnesota or California or New York politician would not like to take a Mississippi or South Carolina or Alabama or Georgia political scalp home to display proudly to his constituency? Who among these would not covet the opportunity to say "look at me, I'm Sir Galahad; I slew a Mississippi dragon."

No, Mr. Speaker, I have no bitterness or rancor toward them; but I do pray for their forgiveness. I understand fully the vagaries and anomalies of politics, and especially power politics, and accept this as a political fact of life.

When the Democratic caucus met in January 1965, it adopted the following resolution by a vote of 157 to 115:

> *Be it resolved*, That the committee on committees is hereby directed by this Democratic caucus to assign the last two positions on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to John Bell Williams, of Mississippi, and Albert W. Watson, of South Carolina; and in the event they are assigned to any other standing committee of the House that they be assigned to the last position on said committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the will of the majority. As to Mr. Watson, he has long since repaired to warmer climes, and my discussion here will not concern him.

The resolution did not make it clear whether I was to move up in seniority in the event of future vacancies of my committee, but it would stand to reason that through implication, at least, it was intended that I was to be consigned to the obscurity of a political "Siberia," there to languish in "durance vile" throughout the term of this Congress. Certainly I was under the impression that was the intent of the resolution, as I am sure it was the intent of the knights in shining armor on the white horses who used it as their lance to slay the dragons and claim the hands of the fair maidens of political acclaim.

I sit so far away from the chairman of my committee I cannot see him without a telescope. However, Mr. Speaker, I have served with my chairman on the committee ever since he came on the committee after me. I already know what he looks like, so being unable to see him from where I sit does not bother me much. However, I do feel that any new members appointed to the committee should be able to see him once in a while and to see what he looks like. It is for that reason that I rise to make an honest, sincere, and heartfelt protest today in behalf of my colleague, Hon. Brock Adams.

When our distinguished colleague from Arkansas, Hon. Oren Harris, resigned to don the black robes of the judiciary, and Hon. Harley Staggers was elevated from his place as the third most senior Democrat on the committee to the chairmanship, a vacancy was created on the Democratic side.

When the vacancy occurred, I informed members of the committee on committees that I was enjoying the historic distinction of being the most senior junior member of the Democratic Party, and that I trusted they would abide by the mandate of the caucus and leave me at the bottom of the seniority ladder on my committee. After all, I have no intention of climbing that ladder again, rung by rung. I belong either at the top of the committee, or I belong at the bottom. I do not belong in the middle. Since the caucus had made the decision for me, I thought certainly I could depend on its holding good throughout this Congress.

You can imagine my surprise when I learned last week the vacancy had been filled by a first-term Congressman, and that I had soared from the lowly 22d position into the stratosphere of No. 21. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I wish I could express pleasure at this meteoric rise in seniority, but the air is so thin at that altitude I have difficulty in breathing. I feel the same sensation that Major White did when he walked in space—I cannot keep from falling and I cannot keep from rising.

I have tried to assess the situation from every angle, particularly to diagnose the apparent change of heart in the committee on committees. I wonder if it could be possible that the Democratic study group demanded that I be plummeted forward in my committee seniority? Could it have been the result of action on the part of the House Democratic leadership? Did Martin Luther King threaten to boycott the committee; were they afraid it might escalate the Vietnam war?

Mr. Speaker, I did not take the floor today to discuss my own situation, except as it affects the political and congressional fortunes of one of my colleagues. I rise in the defense of the rights of my distinguished colleague, Hon. BROCK ADAMS, who was appointed to fill the vacancy on our committee, and who has been placed below me in seniority on the committee notwithstanding the mandate of the caucus.

Six Democratic members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are serving their first term in this body. Without exception, all six of these members were given positions senior to the one given me by the committee on committees by order of the caucus. Why, Mr. Speaker, must the seventh first-term member to be appointed to that committee be made the victim of such rank and brazen discrimination? Why, Mr. Speaker, is Mr. ADAMS not being given the same rights and prerogatives of Democratic seniority that are being enjoyed by other Democratic members of equal seniority—or lack of seniority? It must be humiliating indeed to this distinguished gentleman to be singled out as the only Democratic first-term member on our committee who must occupy a position junior to the most senior member of the committee.

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic committee on committees does not regard the constitutional requirement of "equal protection of the laws" to be applicable to the Congress? I am inclined to think that if I were Mr. ADAMS, I would register a complaint with the Civil Rights Commission, for certainly he has been made the victim of a highly discriminatory act, and deserves their protection.

I realize that I can do nothing to change this situation, but I can protest this most unfair treatment of one of my respected colleagues, who is entitled at least to the same level of seniority on his committee that is enjoyed by other members serving their first-term in the Congress.

Perhaps Mr. ADAMS has some liberal friends in Congress who could do something about this; I do not know.

But if so, they could refrain from bathing for a couple of weeks, grow long hair and scraggly beards, don tight pants, dirty sweatshirts and open sandals, learn to master the "go limp" technique, and conduct sit-ins, kneel-ins, pray-ins, and sleep-ins in the Ways and Means Committee room. They might even conduct a wade-in at the new swimming pool in the Rayburn Building. I suggest that because demonstrations and civil disobedience seem to be the way to get things done in Washington these days. Obviously, I could not take part in such a protest demonstration because I have taken a public position against them, but I am sure seasoned recruits among our colleagues would be readily available, more especially those who gained such invaluable experience through their participation in marches on Selma, Montgomery, and other points south.

There will be a new Congress next year. A lot of us will be back for that term, and a lot of you will not be back. The Democratic Members who do return will be elected under the rules of the Democratic Parties of their respective States; that is the only way they can come here as Democrats. That is the way I came here as a Democrat. I know that you will feel that your State's Democratic Party should be entitled to the same rights and immunities as the Democratic Party of any other State, and that you will be recognized as a Democrat here if you have met all the requirements of your State party, and have not violated its rules.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am a product of the Democratic Party of the State of Mississippi. I have been nominated and elected to Congress 10 consecutive times by the Democratic Party and Democratic electors of my State, and I have never violated any of their rules or principles.

When I supported Senator Goldwater for President in 1964, I did so with full approval of the Mississippi Democratic Party, as outlined in a resolution passed unanimously at its September 1964 convention, less than 2 months before the election.

Those who felt that they had to "punish" me for having voted my conscientious convictions in that election did not take into account the consequences of their act. Indeed, I had voted as 87 percent of my constituency voted, and I had done so with the assurance of the Mississippi Democratic Convention that I could do so without in any wise affecting my party affiliation.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago in Jackson, Miss., the Mississippi State Democratic Executive Committee held its first formal meeting since the caucus action. In this meeting, their first order of business was to adopt a resolution, copies of which have been forwarded to Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, Speaker; Hon. CARL ALBERT, Democratic majority leader; Hon. EUGENE KEOGH, chairman of the Democratic caucus; and all Democratic members of the Mississippi delegation in the House of Representatives.

This resolution reads as follows, and I hope that all Democratic Members of this body will take the trouble to study it carefully in the light of the action of the caucus last January.

RESOLUTION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MISSISSIPPI DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Whereas the Democratic Party of Mississippi in convention assembled on September 9, 1964, at Jackson, Miss., passed unanimously a resolution (No. 1), a portion of which is as follows:

"A Mississippi Democratic Legislature enacted and a Mississippi Democratic Governor signed house bill 439 which is chapter 309, Laws of 1948, appearing as section 3129, Mississippi Code of 1942. This act provides a qualified elector with the right to cast his ballot for electors for President and Vice President as he may choose and see fit without in anywise affecting his party affiliations.

"We oppose the creation of a two-party system within the State of Mississippi and the resultant damage this could create. We call on the people of Mississippi to work within the framework of the great Mississippi Democratic Party and at the same time this convention urges all Mississippi Democrats to vote for, and support, those candidates who they sincerely believe will best serve our State and Nation as President and Vice President."

Whereas acting under the directives thus specified, and with the unqualified approval of the Mississippi Democratic Party, as shown by the vote of 87 percent of the qualified electors voting, Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS cast his vote for those presidential electors who supported the presidential nominees who in his opinion more clearly followed the political, economic and social philosophy of the people of Mississippi. These nominees were Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, and Congressman William Miller, of New York; and

Whereas under our State constitution, statutes, and the rules of the Mississippi Democratic Party, Mississippi Democrats have this sacred right so to do; and

Whereas the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives has heretofore rewarded certain northern Democrats, including Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, with a chairmanship, in spite of the fact he deviated from the Democratic Party of New York, and on the steps of the Capitol in Washington repudiated publicly the nominees of the National Democratic Party, and supported the Republican nominees; and

Whereas in contrast for the first time in modern political history, a deliberate and malicious reprisal has been made against one of Mississippi's duly elected Representatives, who has a distinguished record of loyal and forthright service in Congress to the people, and to the Democratic Party of Mississippi; and

Whereas the aforesaid action of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives is so unjustified and unfair that it is in fact an affront to and an assault upon the integrity of the Democratic Party of Mississippi: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do officially deplore the unwarranted and discriminatory action on the part of the Democratic majority in said House; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby reassert the right of Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS and all other Mississippi Democratic officeholders in the exercise of this sacred prerogative guaranteed by Mississippi's statutes and the rules of the Democratic Party of Mississippi; and be it further

Resolved, That we do now call upon the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives to reconsider their unjustified action in denying Mississippi's Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS of his seniority rights as a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives; and finally, be it further

Resolved, That we petition nothing more or less than that JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Democratic Representative from the State of Mississippi, be accorded all the privileges, rights, status, and prerogatives appertaining to all other Democratic Representatives in Congress, commensurate with their respective seniorities; that copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Hon. CARL ALBERT, majority leader of the House of Representatives; and Hon. EUGENE KEOGH, chairman of the Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives; and to Hon. W. M. COLMER, Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, and Hon. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Democratic Congressmen from the State of Mississippi.

Respectfully submitted, Bidwell Adam, chairman, Mississippi Democratic Executive Committee.

Adopted in open meeting, this the 17th day of February 1966, by unanimous vote.

BYRD P. MAULDIN,
Secretary, Mississippi Democratic Executive Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I was not "punished" by the caucus action of last year, but the Democratic Party of the State of Mississippi was punished. The action against me can be taken no other way except as action against the Mississippi Democratic Party. If the action was an insult to me, it was likewise an insult to the Mississippi Democratic Party. If the caucus action was recrimination against me, it was likewise recrimination against the Democratic Party of Mississippi.

Yes, I plan to come back to the Congress next year, and I firmly believe my people will send me back. We are weary of being treated as political stepchildren, and we intend to change that situation. When I return to this body as an elected Representative of the Democratic Party of the State of Mississippi, I shall expect to be accorded the same rights and privileges of seniority that appertain to any other Democratic Representative from any other State, and I shall accept no less.

To deny me that will be to deny it to the Democratic Party and electors of the State of Mississippi. All Members of Congress are political children of their respective State parties, and the Mississippi State Democratic Party might well say to you the same words spoken long ago by the savior of the world: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PASSAGE OF THE HAWAII STATEHOOD BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii Mr. [MATSUNAGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, all last week we celebrated the seventh anniversary of the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill by this august body. Through the courtesy of the Pineapple Growers Association of Hawaii, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and I had the pleasure of bringing delight to the taste buds of the Members of this House and their staffs. We hope that the pineapples picked in Hawaii only 48 hours before they were delivered by United Airlines here in Washington, and the pineapple juice and the pineapple "mahalo" coffee rolls, all helped to give some indication of the deep gratitude that the people of Hawaii feel toward the Members of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it was on March 11, 1959, that the Senate passed S. 50, the bill to make Hawaii the 50th State, and it was on March 12, 1959, that this House approved the Hawaii statehood bill by an overwhelming vote of 323 to 89.

How well I remember that momentous occasion. The Hawaii Territorial Legislature was then in session, but we had called a recess and had all gathered in the Iolani Palace House chamber. I was the majority leader of the house then. We were in direct telephone communication with our then delegate to Congress, John A. Burns, who was relaying to us a blow-by-blow description of the proceedings on this floor from one of the telephone booths in the cloakroom. The receiver at the other end was hooked up to an amplifying system so all assembled in the Iolani Palace throne room could hear.

When the final vote was announced there was a deafening uproarious cheer which must have raised the rafters of the throne room—but only for a moment, for a strange thing then happened. Every member of that tumultuous crowd suddenly found himself entranced in an almost mysterious overpowering silence, and as if guided by an unseen hand all present joined in silent prayer, with heads bowed, some kneeling, many with tears unashamedly welling in their eyes, to thank the Almighty for the great blessing He had seen fit to bestow upon Hawaii's citizens and to ask Him for His divine guidance in new and heavier responsibilities. I can never forget the excitement and the gaiety, topped by the moving solemnity of that great occasion.

Mr. Speaker, when we of Hawaii were knocking at the congressional door, asking to be admitted into the Union, we contended that as a State we could make greater contributions to the Nation than as an incorporated territory; that we would serve as a showcase of American democracy in the vast Pacific region; that we would help to bridge the gap of understanding between the East and the West; that we would develop a viable State economy and become an asset rather than a liability to the Nation as a whole.

After only 7 short years, we believe we can now safely say, "We told you so."

The summit meeting, held in Honolulu last February between the President of the United States and the leaders of South Vietnam marked a dramatic chapter in our international relationship with the Asian nations. It highlighted the quiet work that has been going on for years at the East-West Center for Cultural and Technical Exchange and of the University of Hawaii and many organizations and individuals concerned with the promotion of better understanding between Asians and Americans. More and more, Hawaii is gaining recognition as an ideal spot for Asian-American gatherings. During the Interparliamentary Conference held in Tokyo last November, for example, the Japanese leaders suggested that Hawaii be selected as the site for annual confabs between members of the Japanese Diet and Members of this Congress.

The people of Hawaii, too, have developed a stronger awareness of the fact that they are especially equipped to play a major role, by geography and by ethnic background, in helping to establish international understanding and cooperation for world peace.

Domestically, statehood has brought phenomenal business growth to Hawaii. In 1955, the gross State product—the total output of goods and services—amounted to $1.2 billion; by 1964 it had nearly doubled to $2.2 billion.

Although Federal expenditures, stemming largely from the military buildup occasioned by the unpleasantness in Vietnam, continue to comprise a major segment of the Hawaiian economy, the accelerating prosperity is based on more than a single pillar. Other principal sources of income are tourism, the sugar and pineapple industries, building construction, manufacturing, and diversified agriculture. One of the most promising developments in the last category has been a change in emphasis in the marketing of pineapples. Exports of fresh rather than canned pineapples have nearly tripled in volume in the last 3 years.

As of this month the islands have enjoyed 139 successive months of economic expansion. In total personal income, Hawaii has had an annual growth rate since 1954 of 7.5 percent, as compared with 5.5 percent for the rest of the Nation. In 1964, Hawaii ranked 14th among all the States in per capita income. Other striking comparisons between the islands and the mainland for the decade 1954–64 are these: a population increase for Hawaii of 38 percent as compared to 18 percent nationally; a 32-percent growth in civilian employment as compared to 16 percent nationally; an 84-percent increase in retail sales as compared to 55 percent nationally; an increase of 175 percent in electricity generated as compared to 98 percent nationally; and an expansion in private bank deposits of 138 percent as compared to 22 percent in the Nation.

It is equally noteworthy that consistently throughout this period, Hawaii's rate of unemployment has been below the national average.

In March of 1965, when the figure for the mainland hit a 7-year low of 4.7 percent, Hawaii's rate was only 3.3 percent.

Furthermore, Hawaii has been paying into the Federal Treasury more taxes than 11 States.

The future holds promise of continuation of the Hawaiian success story. Experts on the Hawaiian economy envision the rate of advance in the next decade as "more than equaling" the magnificent record of the first 7 years of statehood. And as we commemorate Hawaii's seventh anniversary as a State, as one of Hawaii's Representatives to Congress I wish to take this opportunity to say to the Members of this august body, "Mahalo, mahalo nui loa" for having bestowed upon our island State the great privilege of being a part of, and growing with, the greatest Nation on the face of this earth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to rise once again to say "happy anniversary" to my State, and to express my gratitude for being here today as a Representative from the 50th State of the Union. For those of my colleagues who were here for the historic debate on Hawaii statehood back in 1959, perhaps the excitement, the novelty has worn off. But we in Hawaii still remember the exhilaration of achieving statehood, and the memory is fresh enough to vitalize our individual lives and our society.

It is difficult for me to imagine a more satisfying and momentous transition than that from territorial status to statehood that we experienced 7 short years ago. All our efforts and our hopes to be recognized as full-fledged citizens of this Nation came to culmination in March 1959, when President Eisenhower signed the statehood bill, and the celebration of that event is fresh yet in my memory. For 61 years as a Territory, we had labored and served in the shadow of America without being considered more than an insular possession, an admitted Polynesian paradise of flowers, music, and the graceful hula. We were known as a carefree people, but for this very reason there were doubts about our maturity and readiness for responsibility. Known for the racial diversity and harmony of our population, yet we were mistrusted for the same. Surely, many believed, people of such varied ethnic background could not be considered fully American.

And so we waited, hoping that our loyalty and abilities would see us through. And thus it was to be. Perhaps the magnificent record of Hawaiian combat units in World War II was the catalyst, as our men proved time and again their courage and devotion to democratic ideals, even after having been brought up in a relegated status in which full citizenship had been denied them. Surely, we must agree that the unexpected devotion of sons of Hawaii to the defeat of tyranny around the world became an important measure of our worth and our deserving of full statehood.

And with this recognition, after the war came the slow dawning of a new respect for Hawaii and its people. Many statesmen who are serving in the 89th Congress today became persistent advocates of Hawaiian statehood during those years, and their efforts on our behalf will not be forgotten.

As the postwar economy of Hawaii boomed and the political life of our State was vitalized by the activity of young dedicated citizens, the quest for statehood became only a matter of time. We in Hawaii knew in our hearts that statehood would be good for us; we labored to prove that Hawaii would be good for the United States.

With an ever-increasing influx of mainland residents coming to Hawaii to live, our population soared over 750,000 in 1965, a 20-percent increase since statehood. In addition, the pleasures of our islands were sampled by 600,000 visitors last year, an increase of more than 100 percent since 1959. Surely, these must be added to the resident population as people who have adopted the aloha spirit.

Hawaii has become the bastion of our Pacific defense establishment, with some 63,000 service residents, and this military influx has contributed in no small way to an economy that has driven Hawaii's per capita income from a rank of 22d to 14th in the Nation since statehood.

In the past year alone, local manufacturing increased 4 percent, with export products such as Kona coffee, garments, canned tuna, pineapples, other fruits and juices, flowers, and macadamia nuts welcomed in all parts of America. Wholesale sales have increased almost 10 percent in the past year, and the value of construction went up more than 9 percent. Bank deposits rose almost 5 percent, and the retail tax base zoomed to an 8-percent increase over 1964. And the end of this boom is not yet in sight. Besides the important tourism and military-connected business, pineapple in Hawaii had a $125 million export value in 1965, and sugar crops were valued at $175 million, while the civilian labor force unemployment figure continued to shrink well below 4 percent. Federal tax collections in Hawaii in 1965 hit $285 million, a definitive proof that we contribute our share to the growth of the Nation.

Our educational system continues to grow in stature, and Hawaii now ranks fourth in the Nation in per capita State expenditures for all education. In recent years, approximately 85 percent of the students who begin high school in Hawaii complete their secondary education, a percentage that ranks third among all the 50 States. Teachers' salaries continue to go up, and school construction funds are an important part of our biennial budget.

But in the long run, Mr. Speaker, statistics tell only part of the story. The good life that is possible on our sunny shores is no small part of the Hawaii that has endeared itself to this country. The vigor, the intelligence, and the congeniality of our people have contributed not only to the enrichment of life in Hawaii but to the country as a whole. We are pleased with what we have been able to contribute to America, and we are grateful for having been given that opportunity. It is a great joy for me to share in this seventh anniversary of statehood with my colleagues and friends from all the great States that combine to form this successful experiment called America. I bring to you all the greetings of my State and my constituents.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction and pleasure today to be able to wish the citizens of our 50th State and their extremely capable congressional delegation *a hauoli la hanau ia-oe.* Or, to put it another way, happy birthday.

Seven years ago on March 12, 1955, this body passed by an overwhelming vote of 323 to 89 the bill which President Eisenhower signed 6 days later making Hawaii our 50th State. It has been called, and rightly so, the greatest civil rights bill of the 1950s. Statehood did not come easily for Hawaii; as a matter of fact it had been sought for almost 100 years before becoming a reality. I was privileged to be able to vote for the bill as I was to work for statehood with a succession of distinguished citizens from those wonderful islands. And I feel equally privileged to list as a friend the Governor of Hawaii, the Honorable John A. Burns, who for so many years as a Delegate to this body and in other capacities led the fight to bring statehood to his islands.

I look, too, with satisfaction on the achievements of the East-West Center of Cultural and Technical Interchange located on the campus of the University of Hawaii. I am happy that I was able to join with the then Delegate from Hawaii, John A. Burns and the then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson in bringing about the establishment of the Center which has done so much to bring East and West together in an academic and social environment.

Our late beloved President Kennedy chose Hawaii to be the scene of his first major address on civil rights and said at that time:

> Hawaii is what the United States is striving to be.

How right he was. Hawaii with its cultures and races is indeed the showcase of American democracy and one which we can point to with pride throughout Asia and the rest of the world. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the harmony we have in Hawaii should be a major weapon for this country in the war for the minds of men—particularly in the Afro-Asian bloc of nations which the Communists are trying so hard to sway ideologically.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible to continue for hours on the things that distinguish Hawaii—her wonderful climate and beautiful scenery, her industry, her awesome volcanoes and unbelievable beaches, the warmth and strength of her people and their devotion to this country. Instead Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the people of our newest State "aloha" and hauoli la hanau ia-oe.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who has demonstrated his ability to speak genuine Hawaiian—hauoli la hanau ia-oe—to which I respond with mahalo nui loa.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the passage of resolutions by the Congress admitting Hawaii as a State of the Union, I extend to our fellow Americans and friends in the State of Hawaii the great happiness of the people of the other States that within our dual system, Hawaii is an integral part of our great country with the rights and fullness of statehood.

It was my pleasure, with so many other Members of both branches of Congress, to fight for the admission of Hawaii to statehood. There were many in good faith who opposed admission, simply because Hawaii was not contiguous to the continental United States. That argument made no impression upon me at all. I considered it an irrelevant reason and argument.

To me, the history, size, population, and loyalty of the people of Hawaii warranted that their decades of ambition be attained, for there was no question that the American spirit and the love of our institutions of government existed in the minds of the people of Hawaii as in the minds of the people in other States of the Union.

The admission of Hawaii added strength and glory to our beloved country.

The citizens of our country are a people, not a race. Our people are of all racial origins and of various religions.

Our country is the greatest experiment of all history. Over and above the differences of race, color, and creed, we are Americans. For with our love of country, of our institutions of government, of the Declaration of Independence, and of the Constitution of the United States, with its guarantee of liberty and protection of the individual rights, we are a government of laws and not of men, and this has created what is properly termed "the American spirit," which welds us together as a people and a Nation.

As a territory, and now as a State, Hawaii and her people are an outstanding example of "the American spirit." The contributions of Hawaii as a territory, and now as a State of the Union for 7 years, have strengthened our great country.

In the years that lie ahead, in the union of 50 States, we and her people, in peace and war, will make greater contributions to the strength, the dignity, the progress, and the preservation of our beloved country.

I salute Hawaii and her people on this anniversary.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the distinguished Speaker for his remarks. I wish to assure the Speaker that the people of Hawaii are forever grateful for the leading and major role which he played in the admission of Hawaii to statehood when he was majority leader of this great body. Thank you.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to join with and congratulate our distinguished colleague from Hawaii on the celebration of the seventh anniversary of statehood.

Of all the decisions in which I have been privileged to participate during the years of my service as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I think perhaps the two most historically significant events were those in which this Congress granted statehood to Alaska and to Hawaii.

I first saw those beautiful islands early on a morning of 1943. Perhaps their beauty as they reflected the sunlight on that occasion was partly enhanced in my eyes by the assurance which their appearance on the horizon gave that our navigator had properly plotted the course from Hamilton Field, Calif.

It was my pleasure to be there for all too brief a while. In that short period, it seemed to me that there was something strangely incongruous about the spectacle of this proud and dedicated and loyal people, bearing our burdens and our taxation on a par with other citizens and having their sons drafted into our military service to do battle in the defense of the United States, and yet not sharing that special privilege of citizenship which comes with voting and with being represented on an equal basis in the Halls of the U.S. Congress.

So it was my pleasure later to join in the fight for statehood for Hawaii.

During that conflict of World War II, many of my personal friends and associates from my State of Texas had occasion to discover not only the real patriotism but also the great heroism of the people of Hawaii, when the 442d Regimental Combat Team, comprised of Japanese-Americans, fought through the German lines at great risk and at severe loss of life and limb, to rescue part of the 36th Division from Texas.

I said then and say today that those people surely were and are and will be entitled to all of the rights and privileges and emoluments that go with being full fledged citizens of the United States. I think the historic effect of our granting statehood to Hawaii demonstrated three big things; three big things to the world and also three big things for history.

First of all, it showed that this country, which was born upon the cry that taxation without representation is tyranny, still believes it.

Secondly, it demonstrated that there is a way in the world today for a nation to grow, not by military expansion and armed aggression but by others coming to us and voluntarily asking to share in our privileges and responsibilities.

Finally, I believe it has demonstrated to the world that this thing we call democracy is a thing that works not just for Caucasians but for orientals and Polynesians and people the world over, in whose hearts beats the desire for liberty and loyalty to their country.

So I join you in saluting this seventh anniversary of statehood for the great people of Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] for his felicitations. As a member of the 100th Battalion which subsequently became the 1st Battalion of the 442d Regiment, I feel happy now to be associated with the gentleman from Texas as an honorary Texan. Because of the fact that we had saved the lost battalion of Texas, we of that regiment were all made honorary Texans. For the people of Hawaii and for myself, I thank the gentleman from Texas for that honor and for the generous tribute he has paid Hawaii's people today.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my distinguished colleague in this tribute to the great State of Hawaii and join with the other gentlemen who have spoken in regard to the seventh anniversary of statehood for Hawaii.

When I first came to Congress 16 years ago, Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and a member of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs. I used to hear a great deal about statehood for Hawaii in that committee, because my seatmate on that committee was Joe Farrington. I think we have to go back a little in the history of the attempts to gain statehood for Hawaii. It was not accomplished overnight but, rather, was a long, hard struggle made by many people to convince those of us here that statehood should be enjoyed by Hawaii. I should like, if the gentleman from Hawaii will permit, to pay a little tribute to Joe and Betty Farrington for the hard work that they did during their period of service here in building the highway to statehood for Hawaii, together with many others. Their leadership along these lines was excellent and invaluable.

Just as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] stated earlier, I first knew Hawaii during the war when I was there and saw the loyal support that the fine people of that great State gave to this country at that critical period of time. The beauty of this new State is well known to everyone. I think anyone who has not had the great privilege and pleasure of visiting Hawaii should make it their one ambition to go there, because, well, it is paradise out there in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I think mention might be made, also, of a great thing that is being done in the State of Hawaii now; namely, the support it is giving to the East-West Cultural Center of the United States where the scholars from Asia come in to learn more about us and our democracy. This is making a great contribution, I think, to friendship in the Pacific and in the Far East. This is just an offhand suggestion that I am making now. The gentleman from Hawaii, now in the well of the House [Mr. MATSUNAGA], is the Congressman of the district where one of my grandsons resides who is now a citizen of Hawaii. I hear many fine things from my grandson about the friendships that he has been able to make since he has been in this great new State of Hawaii.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman for yielding to me and giving me this opportunity to express my feelings on this subject, and I extend my sincere congratulations to him and to the fine people of the State of Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for his felicitations. I know of the great interest he has had in the further development of the East-West Center for Cultural and Technical Exchange. I shall look forward to a much closer association with his grandson, now a constituent of mine when I return to my home State after Congress adjourns sine die.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the gentlemen who have spoken in congratulating the great State of Hawii on this, its seventh anniversary as a member of our magnificent Union of American States.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for statehood for Hawaii in 1947, in 1950, and in 1953, and finally again in 1959. I was pleased, indeed, to support statehood for Hawaii, first, because the citizens of this great State deserved it; and, secondly, because citizens from my own State of Louisiana worked hard and diligently to secure statehood for Hawaii.

There is one private citizen who is still very much alive and active, Mr. George Lehleitner, of New Orleans, who spent a fortune in his own money to help the people of Hawaii, and also to help the people of Alaska to obtain statehood.

Mr. Speaker, he had the same experience as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright] just described his first visit to Hawaii. Mr. Lehleitner was so taken with the beauty of the island and the devotion and the loyalty of its people that it became with him a matter of dedication to secure statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there was former Representative Henry Larcade, Jr., who represented the Seventh District of my State for 10 years, and he, too, joined most effectively in this fight to secure statehood for Hawaii.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel many ties with this our newest State. I must say, too, Mr. Speaker, that the service here of the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Patsy Mink, whose beauty is equaled only by the beauty of the isle itself, and the brilliance of the gentleman who now occupies the well of the House has indeed been an inspiration to me, and I am sure to all of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the zest and the enthusiasm of these two Members who represent our newest State transmits itself to all of us who have had the great honor and the high responsibility of serving here for many years.

In a sense you, Sparky, and your colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink], typify the constant renewal of the American ideal of freedom and liberty for people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, on this seventh anniversary of House approval of statehood for Hawaii, I am more convinced than ever that this was one of the wisest decisions the Congress has made in our history. In fact, I often wonder why we waited so long. The first bill to provide statehood for our 50th State was introduced by the Hawaiian delegate to Congress in 1919—and it was not until 40 years later, in March 1959, that both the House and the Senate finally gave approval.

We all know now that the United States of America is stronger today because of the admission of Hawaii to full-fledged partnership in our great Union.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am happy, indeed, to salute the State of Hawaii, and I am equally happy to salute the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] and his distinguished and lovely colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the distinguished majority whip.

I happen to be a very close friend of Mr. George Lehleitner, who is very much alive. He is still interested in worthwhile projects such as which he undertook for Hawaii and Alaska. We of Hawaii are certainly grateful to him and to the State of Louisiana, for it was a Congressman from the State of Louisiana, Mr. Larcade, who headed one of the first congressional investigatory missions to Hawaii. It was Mr. Larcade's committee which came back and made one of the most favorable reports on Hawaii. Like these great friends of Hawaii, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] has unmistakably demonstrated his friendship for the people of Hawaii, who shall forever be grateful to him and to his great State of Louisiana.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for many years some Americans doubted the practicality or the wisdom of statehood for Hawaii. I never shared any of these misgivings myself. I rejoiced when statehood was achieved by the Territory of Hawaii, and I must add I have heard no expressions of misgivings since that happy event 7 years ago. So I am very happy to join with my friend and colleague from the State of Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] in recognizing this great milestone.

I believe the gentleman from Hawaii may be interested in an item which I read in a newspaper several weeks ago quoting a statement made by one of the very prominent leaders of the Government of Australia. I do not recall the leader's name at this moment, but in a speech which he made in Australia he made a very significant observation. He said he believed that within a period of not more than 20 years New Zealand must somehow become a part of the United States for security reasons. He said Australia can hold out a little bit longer, but not much.

Mr. Speaker, this was the observation of one of the prominent leaders of Australia. He added a further comment. He stated that lest one think this is an impractical idea, he drew attention to the fact that Australia is closer to Hawaii than Hawaii is to the mainland of the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, who knows what the future will hold for this growing house of freedom. Certainly statehood for Hawaii has been a source of gratification and I think encouragement to all those who look forward to the day when freemen everywhere will have close ties with one another.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I might state that we would be more than happy to make Australia a county of Hawaii. Knowing of the tendencies of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley], I am doubly happy that the gentleman has joined in extending his felicitations to the good people of the State of Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Hawaii for taking this time and giving some of us an opportunity to say how very, very happy we are that 7 years ago we made a most wise decision.

Mr. Speaker, somehow it is typical of Hawaii that 7 years after being the recipient of perhaps the greatest gift that can be given to any area, Hawaii should say "thank you" again.

Gratitude is a very transitory thing in public life. But I am impressed by the fact that Hawaii is as grateful for statehood today as it was on that historic date 7 years ago. The gentleman's description of what happened in Hawaii on the day that the statehood bill passed here in the House set loose a flood of recollection in my own mind. I was some distance away from where the gentleman was located at that time. I was on the floor of the House. It was my great privilege to have been the floor manager for the Hawaiian statehood bill. I remember well we were discussing the House bill on that occasion and not the Senate bill which had passed the day before. So about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, I believe it was, I moved to substitute the Senate bill. I recall that the then majority leader, now the distinguished Speaker of the House, whispered to me, "What are you doing that for? Don't you want to be the one man who will send two statehood bills to the White House in your name?" I said, "Yes, sir; I would like that honor." But I said that in Hawaii at this moment, people are standing—they are standing by piles of wood with matches in their hands—they are ready to whoop it up. I said that if we wait another day, it will be an anticlimax. So while I did surrender that unique honor of having my name on two statehood bills, there is enough honor for all of us in the very fact that Hawaii has become a State.

I listened with great interest to what the gentleman has told us about the progress since statehood. I listened with a great deal of pride too. But I think in addition to all the magnificent economic gains, Hawaii has reason to be proud today that when the call of the House is made in this Chamber, one of the names called is that of a gentleman named MATSUNAGA.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]. Insofar as the people of Hawaii are concerned, deep in their hearts they still consider LEO O'BRIEN, of New York, as the author of their statehood bill. I realize the sacrifice that the gentleman did make in substituting the Senate bill for the House bill for passage in this body on March 12, 1959. The fact that as House manager, he obtained a majority of 323 to 89 is something that we have never yet been able to get over. We had not expected such an overwhelming majority. We know it was largely through the efforts of the gentleman from New York that we were able to get such a majority and for the people of Hawaii I once again thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to be here today to follow the distinguished gentleman from New York whom I followed 7 years ago when he led the statehood for Hawaii bill through to passage on the floor of this very Chamber. I am happy to be here too to follow the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii who represents the newest State in the Union, who together with his charming colleague, PATSY MINK, has brought great talent and dedication to the House. We are all very fond of them; we have no finer Members.

Like some of our colleagues, I had the honor of visiting the State of Hawaii long before it became a State. As a matter of fact, my first trip to Hawaii was in 1928 when I was a sophomore at the University of Oklahoma. I had the pleasure of spending about 6 weeks in Hawaii at that time. It was a great experience and during my visit I learned a lot about this wonderful island archipelago.

In the first place I learned that it is one of the most beautiful spots in all the world. Only the poets can properly describe Hawaii. They have been correct in referring to Hawaii as the pearl of the Pacific. We on the mainland have long sung about America, the beautiful. Since Hawaii came into the Union, America has become more beautiful.

I learned years ago that Hawaii more than any part of the United States was a place where men of various national and racial origins could live together not only in peace and harmony but in complete brotherhood and cooperation. Never in my life had I ever seen a friendlier or more hospitable people. Never had I seen a more democratic people—people who are dedicated by their very nature and environment to the principles of democracy.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, had I ever seen a more patriotic people. Wherever I went—to Oahu, to Hawaii or to the smaller islands—I found among people of Polynesian, European, and Asiatic origin a uniform devotion to America and all that it means. I can only say that never in my life—and I think never in the history of this country—did a people more thoroughly and completely earn the right to be full-fledged citizens of the United States. Hawaii came into the Union as a matter of right.

We all rejoice that she is now one of the States and congratulate her on this legislative anniversary of her admission.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his words of felicitation. The people of Hawaii well know, through our representations made back home, that the majority leader has given such a guiding hand to all Members of the Hawaiian delegation who have served in this body that the majority leader's name is well known in Hawaii. I shall look forward to continued association with the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. His support of Hawaii's cause has continued beyond the granting of statehood to the aloha islands.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join our distinguished colleague from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] on this very important occasion. The people of Hawaii can well be proud of the fact that he represents them in Congress and proud of his service in this body, as well as the service of our charming colleague [Mrs. MINK]. Both of Hawaii's Representatives are making an invaluable contribution to the deliberations of the House. This alone shows the foresight and the wisdom of the House of Representatives 7 years ago when the House voted to admit Hawaii to statehood.

All of us also can learn lessons from the history of Hawaii and the interracial harmony which prevails in the islands. The comingling and blending of the various racial strains show that we can indeed achieve in this world, if we follow the lesson of Hawaii, peace among men and among nations.

Mr. Speaker, long before the House of Representatives, 7 years ago today, voted to admit Hawaii to statehood, the marvelously diverse peoples of our Pacific territory were giving lessons, unheeded by the rest of the world, in the art of interracial harmony.

For generations the Hawaiian population has defied an exact racial accounting. In 1940 the major ethnic groups were Japanese, Caucasian, Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian, Filipino, and Chinese. But these distinctions merely hinted at the unique combinations of blood lines within and between the categories. A girl might have been of English, Portuguese, French, and German descent; a boy might have been of English, Japanese, Filipino, and Hawaiian descent.

Twenty-six years later the islands boasted the same primary divisions, except that the Caucasians, who had been only half as numerous as the Japanese, had replaced the latter as population leaders. But the intermingling of heredities was just as complex; and the good will and tolerance that is so peculiar to the islanders was just as pronounced.

Mr. Speaker, harmony has prevailed among a people in whom every one of the 64 possible racial strains can be found. Perhaps the close association of many racial groups in the fields and in the canneries, in the marts and the neighborhoods, revealed the worth and dignity of one to another. Perhaps the very air of tranquillity enveloping Hawaii has made for good will and cooperation. Whatever the reason, or reasons, no other people have lived together, worked together, and played together with less friction.

One of the most gratifying aspects of Hawaii's equable—and equitable—society is the ignorance of bias among Hawaii's children. In school and at play they revel in their Americanism and its equality. It is heartwarming to see a pretty Chinese girl leading the school band at a football rally while her Japanese, Caucasian, and Hawaiian classmates respond.

The practice of racial equality in the everyday lives of the people is rooted in a long tradition of mutual tolerance and an even older rationale that harmony is the only sensible guide to community living.

It is obvious that there are those on the mainland who could profit from a reading of the lessons Hawaii offers.

It is also obvious that most of the world could afford a class or two in the Hawaiian school. Its lessons, and its solutions, show the way to brotherhood and world peace.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I certainly thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN]. Realizing what a leader he has been in the area of civil rights and world brotherhood, I feel doubly grateful for the words of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KREBS. I, too, rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the people of the State of Hawaii on this, their seventh anniversary as a State, and to take an added moment to pay a richly deserved tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. PATSY MINK], for the outstanding representation they are giving to the people of the State of Hawaii.

HAWAII: ISLES OF AMERICAN DESTINY

The paradise islands that are Hawaii have constituted a magic, irresistible lure to Americans for well over a century. Exotic, glamorous ports of call in the days of the clipper ships, the islands in the jet age are still primary meccas for mainland Americans young in heart and appreciative of beauty in its myriad of forms.

For all their unmatched charms as founts for refreshment of the spirit, the islands also have offered compelling material reasons for enchantment. Early in the 19th century, whalers, traders, and sugar planters from the United States and other Atlantic communities perceived with increasing clarity the economic possibilities of the Pacific archipelago. Before 1850 most of the ships calling at Hawaii were American; and within a few years hopes were expressed throughout America that the Kingdom of Hawaii would become, not an American protectorate in the image of European colonialism, but an American State. In 1854 the United States negotiated with Hawaii a treaty of annexation providing for the immediate according of statehood to the islands. Largely because of the selfish opposition of certain sugar interests in the United States, the treaty was rejected by the Senate.

Despite repeated reverses, a succession of American Presidents kept alive the hope that Hawaii eventually would be counted among the sisterhood of States. Treaties of commercial reciprocity with the kingdom were concluded in 1855 and 1867, but on each occasion the American Senate withheld consent. By 1875, however, Senate opposition had largely dissipated, and a comprehensive treaty of reciprocity was finally ratified. The depressed Hawaiian sugar industry was immediately stimulated to new heights, while the economy in general became so tied to the United States that political union became as logical as it was inevitable.

Within 25 years Hawaii became part of the United States, but half a century more was to elapse before Hawaii's destiny was finally, and fully, realized.

After the fabulous Queen Liliuokalani was forced by revolutionists to abdicate in 1893, the Republic of Hawaii began a fitful, half-hearted existence that endured only half a decade. The leaders of the new nation actually preferred integration with the United States, and in 1897 approved a treaty of annexation drafted by the McKinley administration. Ratification, however, was stalled indefinitely following the registering of complaints by both the Japanese Government and antiexpansionists in the American Senate.

While the treaty lingered in limbo, the Spanish-American War erupted. Considerations of Hawaii's strategic importance were now added to the philosophic, economic, and political arguments for annexation; and in the early summer of 1898 the fight for the treaty, which required the affirmation of two-thirds of the Senate, subsided, and a joint resolution providing for annexation, which could be passed by a simple majority vote in both Houses, was introduced. The resolution was quickly approved, and President McKinley signed it on July 7, 1898.

Two years later, on June 14, 1900, Hawaii, following passage of the Organic Act, was designated an incorporated territory and thus became an integral part of the United States.

The Hawaiian people were now citizens of the United States and they enjoyed a large measure of autonomy. But they could not elect their own Governor, who, along with all other Federal officers, was appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Federal Senate. Their only voice in national affairs was through a nonvoting delegate in the House of Representatives. Complete self-government remained far in the offing.

Cries for statehood, in Hawaii and on the mainland, were muted for a generation. In Hawaii, the people's energies were devoted largely to making the islands the most prosperous of America's territories; a high degree of financial solvency had to be reached before thoughts of statehood could seriously be entertained. In America, the so-called Yellow Peril posed by Japan engendered suspicion of the loyalty of Hawaii's many Japanese-Americans.

By 1919 the islanders were justifiably proud of their economic progress and were confident—somewhat naively—that they had given ample proof of their Americanism; in that year the Hawaiian delegate in the House of Representatives, Joseph Kuhio Kalanianaole, a former Prince of the Realm, introduced the first of what was destined to be a long series of bills to admit Hawaii to statehood. The bill died in committee. From that time until 1959, approximately 50 statehood bills were introduced in the Congress.

Three time—in 1947, 1950, and 1953—the House overwhelmingly approved admission, and once—in 1954—the Senate consented to the entry of both Alaska and Hawaii; but on each occasion the admitting bill failed of final passage.

The arguments over the years against statehood were numerous, repetitious, and invalid. Perhaps the hardiest of all the canards was that the Americans of Japanese ancestry were not to be trusted. The unequaled record for valor in World War II that was written in the blood of Hawaii's Nisei demolished in the minds of all reasonable men this absurd charge of disloyalty. Another specious argument was that Hawaii lacked the resources and the people to support statehood. Hawaii, in fact, was the richest territory ever to seek admission to statehood. In 1959, per capita income was only $42 below the national average; in 1961 it was $144 above that average. In terms of population, Hawaii is larger than seven other States.

After Alaska was admitted to the Union on January 3, 1959, pressure for the entry of America's last incorporated territory became inexorable—and rightly so. Certainly Hawaii's qualifications for statehood were no less impressive than had been those of Alaska. On March 11, 1959, the Senate passed a Hawaiian statehood bill by a vote of 76 to 15, and the next day the House approved it by the margin of 323 to 89. Exactly a week later the President signed the bill, S. 50, into law.

The 59-year battle was over; there remained only technicalities to be resolved and the issuance of the official Presidential proclamation of admission. Hawaii—and America—had won. Hawaii had realized its destiny.

Mr. Speaker, not only Hawaii, but the entire United States are infinitely richer because of this.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS] for his remarks. Serving with him on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have truly enjoyed my association with him and look forward to many more years of continued association.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I remember well the gallant fight which was waged to make Hawaii our 50th State as we mark the seventh anniversary of the passage of the bill in the House.

I feel personally close to Hawaii because a very dear friend of mine, George H. Lehleitner, of New Orleans, more than any other individual—in Government or out—had been at the forefront in advancing the cause of statehood for Hawaii.

Also, I recall well the friendships which were cemented with Joe and Betty Farrington and later John Burns when they were delegates from Hawaii.

On March 12, 1959, this body voted 323 to 89 to sew another star on Old Glory's ocean of blue. Hawaii has earned this vote of confidence over the years, and I extend my best wishes to her on her seventh birthday.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Europe always has had its disciples and the call of the Caribbean is ever seductive, but Hawaii, with its polyglot peoples and its variety of Edens, exudes a charm that has enthralled mainland Americans in progressively greater number ever since the Congress 7 years ago on March 12, 1959, opened the door to statehood. It is not merely the distinctive beauty of each of the seven major inhabited islands that in the last decade has induced millions of Americans from California to New York to desert, for varying periods, their native States. It is not only the numberless wonders, from the softly appealing to the awe inspiring, that abound; it certainly is not exclusively the delightful personality of the purebred Hawaiians who, constituting only 1 percent of all the peoples in the islands, amiably accept all "foreigners," including their multiracial fellow citizens of Hawaii. It is the synthesis of all these factors, and the admixture of the essence of Polynesia, the Orient, and the West that make up the magnetism of Hawaii.

In 1950, 50,000 tourists visited the islands and left behind $24 million. In 1964 the number of visitors rose to 500,000; they spent $225 million. Last year 600,000 sightseers parted with $250 million. It is estimated that by 1970 the islands will be hosts to more than a million guests annually; indeed, it is not unreasonable to predict, as airline roundtrip tickets plummet in cost, friendly annual invasions of a million and a half bewitched souls within a decade.

In anticipation of an ever-increasing influx, hotels, for the modestly endowed as well as the affluent, are almost literally springing up all over the neighbor islands of Kauai, Maui, and Hawaii, as well as on Honolulu's Waikiki Beach. Waikiki already has, among many other hotels, the 525-room Royal Hawaiian, the Hawaiian Village—a complex that will soon be expanded by a $27 million project—and the Ilikai, another $27 million, 30-story hotel and condominium apartment house.

These impressive figures do not reflect a frantic catering to the rich; on the contrary, the boom in the building of tourist hostelries denotes essentially a transition from a class to a mass market, geared in large part to the visitor who spends less per day and stays a shorter time. For those who insist on gilding the incomparable Hawaiian lily, they can be accommodated not only at Waikiki but also at various plush spots on the islands of Maui, Kauai, and Hawaii.

But it is not the lavish, exquisite accommodations or the marvelous fishing and surfboarding or the limitless possibilities for romance that prompt 9 out of 10 visitors to return at least once to the islands. It is the breathtaking scenery—of indescribably gorgeous flora and lush green slopes, of cascading waterfalls and mirrored lagoons, of sandy or black volcanic beaches washed by the clear, brilliantly aquamarine Pacific—combined with the "aloha" spirit which permeates even the most insensitive of men that makes the transient a Hawaiian chauvinist.

Hawaii calls—and Mark Twain's "loveliest fleet of islands that lies anchored in any ocean" is heard, by the multitudes.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the entrance of Hawaii into the American Union in 1959 climaxed a campaign of many years in behalf of justice, equality, and dignity for the Hawaiian people. When Hawaiian statehood was attained, in that year, the friends of democracy were gratified, in every corner of the world.

Almost from the moment Hawaii became an American territory, in 1898, its citizens have worked in harmony with American principles, notwithstanding a million cultural differences. Indeed, the spirit of the Hawaiian people has been phenomenal in this regard and has played a major part in readying the islands for the responsibilities of statehood.

A major reason for this development would seem to be the response of the island population to the introduction of public education. For surely the effects of education on Hawaii's population have been outstanding, in keeping with the deep respect accorded scholarship on the part of oriental tradition.

Another reason for the speed with which Hawaii has blended into the American community is undoubtedly the democratic spirit of the region, spawned under frontier conditions, and molded to fit the special needs of the machine age and the approaching nuclear society.

Still another reason, I believe, is the kindly and generous nature of the Hawaiian people, who from the start had little difficulty in getting to know Americans from the mainland, whose personal interests were also tempered by kindness and generosity.

It used to be argued by certain persons opposed to Hawaiian statehood that the people of the islands were deeply attached to customs contrary in nature to those of the mainland. Therefore, it was said, the Hawaiians simply could not be assimilated into the American culture. But never was there an idea so wholly and unquestionably incorrect in every particular.

As it has turned out, the Hawaiian people have proven themselves as good Americans, in every respect, as any of their fellow countrymen, and all of us are proud to hail their achievements, in battle and in civilian life.

Who could fail but to honor the veterans of the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Regimental Combat Team—a substantial number of whose members were Nisei from Hawaii—who fought valiantly in Italy during World War II.

The 100th Battalion and the 442d Combat Team received a vast array of military decorations for courage in battle—establishing a record in this regard unequaled on any warfront during the entire course of World War II.

At home, of course, the Hawaiian people have demonstrated a diligence and industry worthy of any American community. Indeed, the addition of Hawaii to the Union has been a two-way blessing, from every point of view.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in the 7 years that have elapsed since the enactment of the Hawaii statehood legislation the faith and confidence Congress placed in the people of Hawaii have been confirmed. I am pleased to have played a role in such an important phase of the history of our great Nation—that of granting statehood to a noncontiguous portion of our continent and the full benefits and full responsibilities of American citizenship to a wonderful and deserving people of our Nation. It is possible that this act may have been a forerunner of moves to extend continuing benefits and responsibilites to other offshore flag areas at some later date.

The people of Hawaii have met the responsibilities of statehood in a forthright manner. The 50th State has had at all times excellent representation here in Washington. The State and local administrations have proven to be on par with those of the other 49 States and their subdivisions of government. The economic conditions in Hawaii are stable and viable and the beauties of Hawaii have been maintained.

I join my colleagues in commending the people of Hawaii for the progress they have achieved since statehood and I wish them every success for the future.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate today the seventh anniversary of House passage of the bill which provided for admission of Hawaii as our 50th State. Three hundred and twenty-three Members voted for Hawaiian statehood; only 89 voted against it.

The Congress was fully justified, I am sure, in thus recording its conviction that Hawaii is well on the way to making a unique contribution to American democracy.

This conviction has a twofold basis.

I should like to cite first the superabundant enthusiasm of the people of the State about self-government. I doubt that the people of any other State are imbued with a deeper sense of responsibility for their own government and for that of the Federal Union than are Hawaiians.

Nine years before they attained statehood the people of the territory had formulated and adopted a State constitution for themselves. This constitution was modeled on our Federal Constitution. Its exemplary character has been widely recognized.

No fewer than 116,000 citizens of the territory signed a statehood petition to Congress in 1954. Considering that the total population of Hawaii is less than 700,000, these signatures represented an impressive proportion of the adult population. These were men and women eager both to assume full responsibility for the government of the islands and to exercise the full political rights of U.S. citizenship.

This same political enthusiasm and sense of responsibility is evidenced time and again when 85 percent or more of registered Hawaiians turn out to vote. This sense of responsibility and political interest has been particularly manifest in the excellent representation which the State of Hawaii has had in the Congress. Men and women like the Honorable John Burns, the last Delegate of the Territory, who can properly be called the "father of statehood" because of his effective labors to that end, Senator Daniel Inouye, and Hawaii's outstandingly able Representatives in Congress, the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga and the Honorable Patsy Mink, reflect great credit on their State, the Nation, and the Congress.

Men and women of Hawaii are impelled by the realization that the quality of their government depends upon themselves, and that they can have just and progressive government if they make it so themselves.

That they intend to exercise their rights of democratic self-government to promote justice and social progress is evidenced by their recognition of the equal dignity and rights of men regardless of race, creed, or color.

Four years ago, the Hawaii Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission stated that it had had "no requests of any kind for action or assistance in the field of civil rights" and that it "knows of no instance in Hawaii which calls for enforcement of any laws on civil rights," according to the 1961 report to the Commission on Civil Rights from the State advisory committee.

Hawaiians' perception of the rights of human personality is not blurred by the color of any man's skin. They recognize with enduring conviction what belongs to every person because he is a person.

Hawaiians' political maturity and enthusiasm devoted to further realization of human rights through the democratic process justify our high expectations for the future of their State and make us proud to have Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, when the vote of the House 7 years ago March 12 climaxed a half century of struggle for the admission of America's last incorporated territory into the Union, jubilation marked the reaction of nearly all Americans, whether in the islands or in the States.

Long acknowledged as one of nature's loveliest gifts to man, Hawaii has proved in these last 7 years to be one of the most prosperous and progressive States in the American Union. This House is proud of its role in adding the 50th star and new glory to an ensign that for generations has symbolized the hope of the world.

The Congress of the United States has been proud and fortunate to have persons like Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, Senator HIRAM L. FONG, Representative SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, and Representative PATSY T. MINK representing the State of Hawaii. Their presence here has contributed much to the concept of democracy and the meaning of Americanism as a way of life for all people.

There is nothing but brilliance ahead for Hawaii in terms of its progress as a State. With its economy booming, this Nation can look forward to great things from Hawaii.

America can also indeed begin to look to this youngest State for leadership in many areas.

I am happy indeed to be serving in this Congress and to have this opportunity to extend to our youngest State a warm and enthusiastic greeting on its seventh anniversary.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commemorate this seventh anniversary of the passage by the House of the bill providing for Hawaiian statehood by bringing to the Member's attention the great social and political meaning of Hawaii's economic productivity.

We could scarcely find a more dramatic example of Hawaiians' productivity than their success in reclaiming for agricultural production land that has been inundated by volcanic lava.

Credit for their achievement goes primarily to the Department of Soils and Chemistry of the University of Hawaii. The experimental research which this department has performed has made possible the cultivation of valuable crops, such as papaya, guava, acerola cherries, and macadamia nuts in lava land. Macadamia nut orchards now cover hundreds of acres of such land near Hilo on the island of Hawaii.

Sugar growers in Hawaii spend $2 million to support scientific research through their experiment station in Honolulu. Scientists there have succeeded in almost eliminating sugar losses caused by pests and diseases, and have also developed new canes. They have made it possible for Hawaiians to produce more than twice as much sugar per acre as other sugar areas of the world.

Similarly, nine pineapple companies together spend more than a million dollars a year for experimental work at the Pineapple Research Institute. Scientists at the institute developed DDT as a soil fumigant.

I cite these particular examples of scientific agriculture because I think that Hawaii's productivity reflects both equality of opportunity in the State and the activity of the free mind.

The State advisory committee to the Federal Civil Rights Commission has reported the virtual elimination in Hawaii of discrimination because of race, creed, or color. Equality of opportunity is indicated by student enrollment at the University of Hawaii, which is one of Hawaii's most important research centers. More than 14,000 students attend the university, out of a State population of some 700,000. Nondiscrimination means that no one will be prevented from realizing his mental possibilities because of the color of his skin.

The Communists subordinate men and women to totalitarian dictatorship for the sake of economic productivity and social equality. America's 50th State represents living proof to the communized peoples of Asia that these goals of productivity and equality are better realized through freedom.

All Americans should be grateful and proud that Hawaii can be seen by all the peoples of Asia as a superb representation of liberty, equality, and technical progress.

And Hawaii can rightfully be proud not only of its accomplishments in the first 7 years of statehood, but also for the high caliber representatives it has sent to Congress, men like SPARK MATSUNGA, who is held in the highest esteem by his colleagues and with whom I have had the great privilege of serving together on the Committee on Agriculture since my first term in Congress. To the people of the 50th State, my heartiest congratulations.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, only 7 years ago the beautiful island Territory of Hawaii became this Nation's 50th State. It is difficult to imagine a more lovely, romantic, or welcome addition to the great diverseness and grandeur of America. I may be somewhat prejudiced, for both my parents now live in Hawaii, but I am sure no one can disagree with this.

Today we are proudly celebrating the anniversary of the House passage of the Hawaii statehood legislation on March 12, 1959. And, I might add, that in doing so we have enjoyed the delicious pastry and pineapples which have been so graciously distributed. It is a very pleasant reminder that the pineapple industry of Hawaii dominates the world market, producing, in fact, about four-fifths of the world's pineapples.

Hawaii has long been known as the paradise of the Pacific because of her famous subtropical beauty. Her volcanic peaks and green plains, blue water and white surf, palm trees and flowers have made her one of our country's most popular tourist attractions. But the beauty of Hawaii goes deeper than the surface of nature. It goes into the spirit of her people. Despite the bustle of modern life, the friendliness of the islands has remained as an indestructible element of the endemic culture.

In a world beset with racial and ethnic strife, the harmony and friendship of Hawaii stands as a shining example of hope. The islands' people have come from every corner of the globe. The 1960 census reported that 69,000 immigrants then living in Hawaii came from about 70 countries—from nearly every nation in Europe, the Western Hemisphere, Asia, and Oceania. Today, more than 750,000 residents are sharing in Hawaii's enviable brand of tolerance and democracy.

Hawaii, probably more than any other State, is one in which racial discrimination is unknown and where equality of opportunity is a reality, with business, professions, and government open to all qualified persons regardless of ethnic background.

On June 14, 1900, the islands of Hawaii became a part of the United States voluntarily. After 100 years of independence, the islands chose to cede to this country their public funds, forts, docks, and more than a million acres of public land. It was a tremendous compliment to American democracy.

In the many years that followed annexation, before statehood was finally obtained in 1959, the social, economic, and political maturity of Hawaii became a well established fact. Her great value to the United States was unquestionable and, in looking back, the delays which she met in attempting to achieve the full status of statehood are a regretful part of our history.

But on March 12, 1959, the statehood legislation for Hawaii was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives and the door was opened for the final achievment of full and equal citizenship for the graceful and industrious people of our island territory. It was a long-awaited and jubilant day.

Hawaii, today, has more than fulfilled our expectations as an equal partner in our sisterhood of States. In per capita income she ranks 13th in the Nation. Salaries for office jobs in Honolulu are generally comparable to those in New York City. The value of her diversified manufacturing, excluding the processing of sugar and pineapple, rose 145 percent between 1958 and 1963.

During the same years the value of her exports to foreign countries increased 59 percent, with her exports to countries in the Western Pacific more than doubling. In fact, Hawaii's growing importance as the center of Pacific commerce is evident in her geographic position and in the cultural and business ties of Hawaii's people with the countries of the Pacific and the Far East.

In fact, Hawaii's ethnic and cultural ties with the Far East offer a challenge beyond that of commerce and trade. The balance of power between the two philosophies of democracy and totalitarianism may ultimately be decided in the Orient, the home of over half the world's population. In Hawaii, approximately two-thirds of the State's citizens are of Asiatic origin. Their living, working example of the tolerance and brotherhood that can flower in the sunny climate of freedom offers a ray of hope for mankind and a lesson for men everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it my good fortune to have been closely associated with the gentleman in the well, Hawaii's representative to Congress, Spark Matsunaga, ever since he and I were assigned together to the House Committee on Agriculture in our freshman year. His popularity is evidenced by his being elected president of the 88th Congressional Club, and his legislative effectiveness has been ably demonstrated in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations, and as secretary of the House Democratic steering committee. He is irrefutable living proof of the political maturity of the people of our youngest State in the Union. I am indeed happy to join my colleagues in congratulating Hawaii's citizens on this their seventh anniversary of statehood.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1954, the citizens of the territory of Hawaii presented to the President of the Senate, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, the second largest petition ever received in the history of the U.S. Congress. It bore the names of 116,000 signers. It was 6 feet wide and something like a mile long. This document was a petition to Congress for immediate statehood.

The proportions of this document fitly represented the intense and general wish among Hawaiian citizens to exercise the political rights of American citizenship.

And the proportions of the document represented the fervor and enthusiasm with which the men and women of Hawaii have fulfilled their duties to the United States.

Hawaii became an incorporated territory by the Organic Act of 1900. The act provided Hawaiians with the means both to develop and demonstrate the capacity for responsible self-government. It provided for limited self-government through a bicameral legislature consisting of Senators and Representatives elected by the Hawaiian people.

In the course of more than half a century, Hawaiians demonstrated beyond question remarkable political maturity and capacity for representative self-government.

Indeed, Hawaii stands as an example to her sister States of political responsibility. It is usual for 85 percent or more of registered voters in Hawaii to give effect to their views in the voting booth.

Hawaiians' fulfillment of their duties to the United States has been no less impressive than their demonstrated capacity for self-government.

No duty to country is graver than military service in defense of her liberty. Hawaiians could not have proved more conclusively their devotion to the United States than by their battlefield record in World War II. Especially worthy of grateful remembrance are those Americans of Japanese ancestry from Hawaii who fought at Anzio and Cassino in the 100th Infantry Battalion.

An indispensable duty of citizenship is to pay taxes for the support of government. It is a proof both of Hawaii's productivity and of Hawaiians' sense of responsibility that even as a territory Hawaii contributed more to Federal revenue than did a number of larger States.

Hawaii became our 50th State on August 21, 1959. We commemorate today, March 12, 1966, the seventh anniversary of the House passage of the admission act for Hawaiian statehood. This House passed that act by an overwhelming majority of 323 to 89. The vote reflected a strongly favorable consensus among all Americans.

Despite their demonstrated capacity for self-government, citizens of the territory could not, through their elected representatives, make laws for themselves which were not subject to disapproval by Congress, nor could they elect their own Governor or Lieutenant Governor.

Despite the amount of Federal taxes they paid, citizens of the territory were denied the right to be represented in Congress by Members of the House and Senate who could vote on how Federal revenues should be expended. It has been rightly said that this was a flagrant example of taxation without representation.

Despite their services in defense of the United States, citizens of the territory were denied the right to vote for President.

I wish to express my satisfaction and gratitude that citizens of Hawaii have now the political rights of American citizenship which they so richly deserve.

And, Mr. Speaker, I also want to say a personal word in tribute to my colleagues, Mr. Matsunaga and Mrs. Mink. They have worked very hard to focus attention on this great occasion and I am sure they have richly and rightly earned the thanks of our fellow Americans in Hawaii. All of us in the House, I am certain, have a better appreciation of the meaning of Hawaiian statehood because of their efforts.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker the fact that each year Hawaii has made a most enthusiastic and wonderful observance of the anniversary of statehood serves to emphasize the very profound earnestness with which statehood was desired in the islands, and how much it is prized there, now that it has been achieved. This delightful celebration here today affords me an opportunity to say some things that I have been wanting to say anyway.

While we in the older States here on the mainland endure all manner of trials and tribulations in the field of civil rights—to a large extent as a result of past misdeeds—I cannot but view with awe and admiration the enormous progress that our newest States have made in the field of civil rights and race relations. In this respect, Hawaii—and Alaska as well—stand as models, for our older States, of societies in which questions involving race and color rarely arise, for these differences in pigmentation are no longer regarded so important or significant.

Only a year ago, Senator Daniel K. Inouye pointed out that Hawaii has one of the most polyglot populations on earth, its people having come from every corner of the globe. There were then some 69,000 immigrants in Hawaii coming from about 70 countries—from nearly every nation in Europe, the Western Hemisphere, Asia, and Oceania. Nearly four-fifths of the migrants came from Japan—25,000—and the Philippines—29,000.

In the last 100 years, beginning with the time when the island population was 63,000, and 91 percent were pure Hawaiians, the total population has grown to more than 700,000, while the ethnic composition has been completely reversed. One writer has said that it "has turned completely upside down." Now only 1.7 percent of the islanders are pure Hawaiian, some 15 percent part Hawaiian, Caucasians, or haoles, as they are called on the islands, constitute about one-third of the total population. Approximately two-thirds are of Asiatic origin, and of these, half are Japanese.

No other State has a percentage of population anything near as high. California, the next State, has only 2.2 percent; New York has only 0.4 percent. I do not want to labor the point, which is that, after two centuries of exposure to Western culture, plus a significant number of intermarriages, the Hawaiian society has become the most racially mixed on earth. It is a society in which differences in race and color are no longer regarded as significant, and today little attention is paid to them. The fact is that today all live together, as decent human beings should, with a high degree of peace and harmony.

I have seen numerous and convincing bits of evidence of this on the several occasions I have visited the State. The traveler from the mainland, if he tarries a bit, is likely to be profoundly impressed not only by the absence of friction, but by the existence of an affirmative spirit of good will among men.

On this occasion, I salute our newest State for its accomplishments and progress.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1959, the House of Representatives passed legislation that gave statehood to Hawaii. We look back on that occasion with the knowledge that true justice was accomplished and that Hawaii has brought to the United States added beauty and numerous resources. This also meant the addition of a citizenry whose great desire was to be a part of our Nation.

Although there are many ethnic backgrounds represented in Hawaii's cosmopolitan population, a high degree of racial harmony and mutual respect identifies our 50th State. We have learned through the years that the people possess a natural hospitality and friendliness which is unsurpassed.

It has been said of Hawaii that it is "the loveliest fleet of islands which lie anchored in any ocean." It has been described as a "garden of the Pacific." The colorful Hawaiian people, their language, traditions, and music contribute to much of the charm that makes the islands so attractive to visitors.

Probably in no other region of the world do so many different races and nationalities live together so closely and in such harmony.

Education in the State of Hawaii has advanced steadily since 1820. Early settlers in the Western States sent their children to Hawaii for schooling and both public and private schools were established in the early 19th century by missionaries. Equality of educational opportunity has long been a feature of the public schools and all are operated as one unit under the department of education. Schooling is compulsory for all children from 6 to 13 years of age. Adult education programs were started in 1945.

The Hawaiian Islands not only are rich in tourist attractions, but they are productively rich as well. Trade between the mainland and the islands amounts to over a half billion dollars annually. Goods purchased from the Mainland are about equal in value and Hawaii ranks seventh in the value of products brought from Continental United States.

The oldest industry, sugar, also is the one of first importance in the State's economy. The first sugar mills were erected in 1835, although sugar was said to have been produced as early as 1802. Over 230,000 acres are under cultivation and yield more than 1 million tons of sugar with a value of over $160 million.

The growing and canning of pineapples is a $120 million a year industry. This delicious product covers approximately 70,000 acres.

Fish and fish products are a growing industry. Coffee raising is important. Cut flowers have a high place in the export bracket, reaching close to 500,000 packages shipped annually to all parts of the world.

There is a Hawaiian saying which translated means, "You have not lived until you have seen Hawaii."

We can be proud of the added prestige that Hawaii has brought to our Nation. We are proud of its people. They know the meaning of democracy and deserve our congratulations and continued good wishes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, March 12, 1966, marked the seventh anniversary of the passage by this House of legislation to admit the territory of Hawaii to statehood.

For many years it was my pleasure to work for statehood with the then delegate from the territory of Hawaii, the present Governor of the State of Hawaii, the Honorable John A. Burns. After Hawaii became a State in August of 1959, the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE became a Member of this body as the State's first Representative in the House. He now ably serves his State in the other body.

At the present time Hawaii is represented in the House by two Representatives, the distinguished gentlewoman, Mrs. PATSY MINK, of Waipahu, Hawaii, and the distinguished gentleman, SPARK MATSUNAGA, of Honolulu, Hawaii.

These 7 years have brought tremendous growth to Hawaii and its people can be justly proud of that growth and of the contributions that their State has made to the Union. I would like to say "Mahalo" to Mrs. MINK and to Mr. MATSUNAGA for the pleasure of knowing and working with you.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today we in this body are commemorating the 7th anniversary of our vote to admit the Islands of Hawaii into the Union as the 50th of the United States. For me it is an especially welcome commemoration since that vote on March 12, 1959, was one of the first in which I was privileged to participate as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives. May I say, it is a vote in which I have always taken great pride and satisfaction.

I have been struck, of course, by the singular coincidence of one who is honored to represent one of the Original Thirteen States and the State in which the War of Independence began almost 200 years ago, to be able to cast a vote in favor of the admission of our newest State.

And we on the easternmost reaches of this great Nation are proud and honored on this occasion to salute our countrymen on the westernmost reaches.

The admission of Hawaii as a full-fledged partner in the United States has enhanced the prestige and luster not only of the chain of Emerald Isles set in the blue pacific, but of the other 49 partners as well.

The history of Hawaii is one of rich and colorful traditions. It introduces ethnic strains and cultural facets heretofore lacking in the background of the United States. The addition of Hawaii to the galaxy of States has both enhanced the economic strength of our Nation and broadened the cultural base of our society.

Because the native population of our 50th State contains a strong oriental and Polynesian representation, the promise of America is again fulfilled: the promise of a land for all people, of equal opportunity, equal rights, and equal protection under the law, regardless of race, creed, or religion. In spite of the travail and tragedy that have for too long plagued some in this country in their quest to fulfill that promise for themselves, it is again reaffirmed in our newest and westernmost State and Hawaii established an important example for the rest of the States in this regard.

The brief history of our 50th State over the last 7 years has been an enviable one. It is a record of steady growth and achievement; of genuine contributions to the welfare and security of the entire Nation.

I am sure that, were we in this body to again cast our votes on the question of statehood for Hawaii, the resolution would carry by acclamation. I am confident that whatever reservations might have been held on the question originally, they have been dispelled without exception in the years since 1959.

It is my very great pleasure and high honor to extend my personal congratulations to my distinguished colleagues in this body who represent the 50th State and, on behalf of the people of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts, to extend my warmest best wishes for a happy anniversary and for continued prosperity and growth in the generations ahead.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1959, this House approved the Hawaii statehood bill. Seven years later, in March of 1966, we all can look with pride on the progress of our 50th State. I join with others of my colleagues to wish Hawaii and its people a happy anniversary.

Besides being the paradise islands of the Pacific, it is a shining example of the peaceful and successful blending of cultures and races. The warmth of her sun and beauty of her beaches are surpassed by her warm tolerance for individual beliefs and values and her appreciation for human dignity. How much many of us can learn from Hawaii. In Hawaii, racial equality lives while in some parts of America it is still only a dream.

May Hawaii continue to add to its achievements of the past 7 years.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in celebrating the anniversary of the date that statehood legislation for Hawaii was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives.

The overwhelming vote of March 12, 1959, climaxed years of effort by the people of territorial Hawaii to obtain full citizenship status. It cleared the way for the Presidential proclamation which finally declared Hawaii to be our 50th State.

Beautiful Hawaii, often referred to as "the loveliest fleet of islands that lies anchored in any ocean," will celebrate her seventh anniversary as a State this August. And, it is an unusual testimony to the maturity of the democratic spirit of our youngest sovereignty that she, more than any other State, has recognized in both legal and living terms the essence of equality and tolerance.

Discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, or ancestry is not only forbidden in Hawaii by law, but is a stranger to the harmonious spirit of one of the most friendly and polyglot spots on earth. Hawaii's citizens come from every corner of the globe, and they have welcomed and returned in kind the gracious spirit of aloha.

It is interesting that Hawaii is not only a young State, but her citizens, also, are young and energetic. The average age of the island resident is 24 years old, younger than our national average. And they are educated young people. Hawaii's fine educational system can boast of having the highest university enrollment in proportion to population of any other State.

Culturally, Hawaii hopes to become a bridge between East and West. Her varied ethnic composition gives her a unique advantage in promoting international relations and understanding. In the summer of statehood, 1959, the University of Hawaii sponsored the third decennial East-West Philosophers' Conference. Over 40 leading philosophers from 11 nations came to the island paradise. Today Honolulu's newly constructed International Center can seat more than 11,000 persons in a theater-concert hall and arena complex.

Hawaii's natural advantages are abundant. Her warm equable climate offers year-round appeal to the vacationer. Her location in the mid-Pacific is ideally suited to international trade with the nations of Asia and the Pacific rim. Her strategic military value is unquestioned. So, also, is her value for the expanding research and development activities in the fields of oceanography, volcanology, and astronomy as well as in space vehicle and missile tracking and in the studies of solar radiation and other astronomical phenomena.

Hawaii, our most western and most southern extension of the United States, has been a beautiful and proud addition as our 50th State. The translation of her official State motto gives an inspirational reminder of her ideals: "The life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness."

Already the home of a civilized and graceful people when first discovered by Capt. James Cook in 1778, Hawaii has bloomed through the dynasty of Kamehameha into the 20th century and statehood with enviable success. She has been able to derive the benefits of modern life without losing her charm and Polynesian softness.

The brotherhood of man is a meaningful concept in our outlying State, a rather strange paradox since she, not the mainland, felt the bombs of World War II. Let us hope that mankind can learn from her example.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues in congratulating the great State of Hawaii on the seventh anniversary of its statehood.

When Hawaii became the 50th State of the Union, the boundaries of our Nation were extended westward into the Pacific to include the seven major inhabited islands which comprise Hawaii. The new State, though far removed from the mainland in distance of miles, has consistently demonstrated its oneness with the Union by rapid and constructive progress economically, socially, and politically since the achievement of statehood in 1959.

The population of Hawaii since that date has increased by 20 percent. Local manufacturing has increased 4 percent. Hawaii's per capita income has increased from a rank of 22d to 14th in our Nation. As a vacationland, it is renowned throughout the world. Today its development as a commercial and cultural center of the Pacific is equaling its fame as an island paradise.

The 50th State of our Union is a wondrous combination of the exotic and the jet age, the ancient and the world of tomorrow. It is meeting every challenge of statehood and is a credit to our country.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good, wise, and eloquent friend, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], in noting with pride and rejoicing the seventh anniversary of the State of Hawaii, and from the bottom of my heart I extend greetings and congratulations to Governor Burns, a former beloved Member of this body, to Senator INOUYE, also a former colleague whose popularity with his colleagues was unsurpassed, to Senator FONG, to Congressman MATSUNAGA, Congresswoman MINK, and to all the men, women, and children who impart a warm, human touch to the beautiful island in the Pacific.

Twice since I have been a Member of the Congress I have voted for Hawaiian statehood and the occasions were 10 years apart, on March 7, 1950, and on March 12, 1960. My humble remarks 16 years ago in this historic chamber were commented upon favorably in the press of Honolulu and were reproduced in full in one of the Hawaiian dailies. These remarks I am repeating today on the anniversary of the statehood that came over 10 years after the remarks were voiced.

They follow:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 6, 1950]

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the statehood bill for Alaska which we have passed and the statehood bill for Hawaii which I anticipate we will pass, a new pattern is being laid for that association of sovereign States formed at the beginning of the Republic to attain through union the highest measure of welfare for the citizen and of security for the Nation.

For the first time we are accepting into the family of sister States those territories that are outside of continental United States and not contiguous thereto. Where this will end, to what extent conceivably the pattern may be carried in the realization of the dream of our generation of a permanent peace through a world union of states, only the future can tell.

I think it is proper here to place emphasis on the fact that the step we are taking has not been decided upon hastily. It is altogether too important a step to be left for decision alone to the Members of this body. However able and conscientious they may be, nevertheless in common with all humankind their judgment cannot be infallible. What we are doing is merely making effective the decision arrived at by the American people. That is the way democracy functions with us. The question of statehood for an island in the Pacific and for a mainland not contiguous to continental United States, with a long stretch of island running into the Orient, has been discussed for a long time in every city, hamlet, and crossroads in the country. My colleagues and I must accept it as the judgment of the American people as a whole—or that substantial majority which under our democratic system controls—that this step should be taken and in a new world, bound much closer by radio transmission of the thoughts of men and aerial transportation of persons and products, the pattern of the Old World of the horse and buggy should be modernized even in the matter of selecting territories to be taken into the Union as States. I say we must accept this as the judgment of the American people because when the delegates met at the national conventions of the two major political parties, with scarcely a dissenting note, they pledged the support of their respective parties to Alaska-Hawaii statehood. We Democrats and Republicans may differ in our interpretation of how far the majority vote in a closely contested election is to be construed as a mandate. There can be no question, however, about the validity of the mandate when it emanates from the voters of the two major parties.

I respectfully suggest to my colleagues, with no desire to pose as a prophet, that the new pattern we are setting up may prove a more vital factor than we imagine in bringing the world closer together in peace and the common pursuit of human happiness. Many in this Chamber, in their ardent desire to advance the cause of understanding and of permanent peace, have sponsored the World Federation resolution. It at least is worthy of note that what we are now doing, although certainly it is not in the minds of any of us here, may furnish in the future the basis for a United States of America expanded, on the petition of other peoples, into a United States of the World.

I am not advancing this thought with the idea that having moved in the direction of taking in territory far from continental United States we actually may, as the world grows closer and closer together, add to our sisterhood of States territories still farther removed. For one thing there is the difference in languages and in customs, which even if distances were annihilated would still present a formidable barrier. But there is no escaping the import of the departure we are approaching. Considered in connection with the development of the backward areas of the world under point 4 of President Truman's plan—an undertaking the success of which hangs on the removal of trade barriers—it at least should furnish the subject for intriguing speculation and lively discussion in the way the American people have of thinking and talking things over even when such things are still in the realm of the improbable and the unexpected.

That we are making history today I think there can be no doubt. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of these days of the Alaska-Hawaii statehood debates very likely will be consulted by historical researchers long after the last of those participating in these debates has had his hour in the traditional memorial services in this Chamber. For that reason I am putting in the RECORD, with especial emphasis, that the pattern for the future admission of States, when no longer required to be of contiguous territory or a part of continental United States, came to us from the sound judgment of the American people arrived at after long discussion and deliberation and so wholly on a bipartisan level that both major political parties incorporated in their respective platforms expression of that judgment arrived at by the American people.

On the occasion of the *Maine* memorial anniversary, I called attention to the fact, sometimes overlooked, that the explosion in Habana Harbor on February 15, 1898, started the United States of America on the road to world leadership. I ventured the suggestion that future historians would term the period of the Spanish-American War, World War I and World War II—the half century or so from the destruction of the *Maine* to the bomb of Hiroshima—as the 50-year war that ushered in the golden era of American world influence.

Now that Hawaii is on the threshold of statehood and a new pattern is being adopted in conformance with the unquestioned mandate of the American people. I think my colleagues will be interested in the remarks of Senator Teller in the U.S. Senate on February 16, 1898, the day following the sinking of the *Maine*. I am quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day:

"Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, there has been some interest manifested throughout the world over the question whether or not this Government was about to take the Hawaiian Islands and make them part of the United States * * *. The people of all the world have been looking to see what we are about to do. I picked up the other day a copy of the London Globe of last June * * *. The article was commenting on our desire to annex the Hawaiian Islands, if they should become ours: * * * it was very apparent that the Globe was not friendly to that movement on our part. This is what the Globe said, and it is so truthful that I think it may be worth while to read it:

" 'The American Navy is absolutely unfit to protect the islands (Hawaiian) which lie at the mercy of any Spanish ships appearing at Honolulu while Japan's sea power is so immeasurably superior to that of the United States that a Japanese naval demonstration would place President McKinley in a difficult and perilous position * * *.

" 'Viewing the great strategic value of the group to England, it is a matter of regret that the islands were not added to the British Empire long ago. Lord Salisbury should stiffen his back and tell McKinley plainly that Great Britain claims the right to be consulted before the matter of annexation is decided.'

"Mr. President, Japan is a small power. Small, I mean, when compared to the United States, small in resources compared with the United States, though it is strong in its Navy when you consider the results it might accomplish as a nation. Yet, when there was a note of protest from Japan against the annexation of Hawaii, it was urged by a great many people in this country as a bar to annexation that we were not free to exercise our own judgment because it would not do to get into a quarrel with Japan."

Mr. Chairman, I am voting for statehood for Hawaii as I voted for statehood for Alaska. With every new State that joins up with us, to share under free government, the benefits and the responsibilities of joint effort in advancing human welfare, greater strength is given us to carry on. My faith is in my country and the purity of its purpose to ask nothing for its own people than it does not seek to make possible for all men to attain in a world of brotherhood. My faith is in the people of the United States and when after discussion and deliberation they have reached a judgment, by that judgment I will abide.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks relative to extending felicitations to the State of Hawaii on its seventh Anniversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL PENSION FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for a special pension for veterans of World War I and their widows.

Those honorably discharged veterans who served 90 days or more between the period April 6, 1917, and September 1, 1919, would be eligible to receive a pension at the rate of $5 a month for service performed in the continental United States, and $10 of each month spent overseas on foreign service. Thus, the minimum would be a pension of $15 monthly for a veteran who served only 90 days in the continental United States. The maximum pension, irrespective of service, would be $150 monthly.

This special pension will apply to all veterans who served during the aforementioned period with the exception of Regulars, or National Guard equivalent, who are presently compensated with other pensions. Furthermore, World War I veterans who are drawing pensions or compensation for any reason will not have their monetary benefits reduced under my bill.

Widows of World War I veterans, who were legal wives at the time of the veterans' death, will be paid half of the pensions earned by their deceased husbands. Presumably, all World War I veterans' children are now mature and need not have benefits.

I have introduced this bill for the purpose of finding a solution to the World War I veteran pension problem. It is a pension for services rendered and will not be restricted because of the present income of the veteran. A frugal person should not be penalized in favor of a spendthrift.

I am not wedded to the specific provisions of my bill, and would be receptive to any constructive change. My objective is to give this problem a new avenue of approach for consideration by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on which I have the honor to serve as a member.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, March 10, 1966, marked the anniversary of the death of a great poet, Taras Shevchenko. The people of the Ukraine commemorated his passing in the secrecy of their homes, for he wrote and fought for the cause of freedom and individual dignity.

Today the Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation within the Soviet Empire. Despite repression, the Ukrainian people continue their search for the freedom of which Taras Shevchenko wrote so movingly.

The great poet was born March 9, 1814 and died March 10, 1861. In his relatively short lifetime he inspired his people with his great poetry and still served as the great driving spirit of Ukrainian nationalism against insidious Communist control.

Less than 2 years ago a statue of the great poet was dedicated here in Washington, which is dramatic evidence of the impact of the poet's leadership in the free world.

Although this anniversary could not be celebrated openly in the Ukraine, Americans of Ukrainian descent marked this day with appropriate ceremonies and solemn dedication to continue their work for freedom.

I am happy to join my friends of Ukrainian background in paying homage to this great man.

RESULTS OF 1966 OPINION POLL FOR 22D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the tabulation of replies to my 1966 opinion poll received within the last 2 weeks has just been completed. During the past 10 years in which I have sought the opinions of my constituents by means of an annual questionnaire, an excellent response has been received. This year over 20,000 families have again given me the benefit of their thoughts on some of the important national issues of the day.

It is always interesting to note those issues that have the greatest percentage of public support. The results of this poll indicate that the issue having greatest public appeal is question No. 4, where 77 percent of the replies favor adoption by the Congress of a stronger national law to deal with strikes which affect our national interest—such as strikes affecting mass transit operations. Other issues receiving wide popular approval are question No. 11 with 66 percent of the replies favoring a Federal income tax credit for parents covering the cost of tuition of college students, and question No. 14B where 66 percent of the people express their views that there should be additional legislation to prohibit discrimination in the selection of juries in State and local courts.

Equally revealing are the issues that bring forth the greatest opposition. Question No. 9 elicited the unfavorable response of 71 percent of the people who oppose Federal Government subsidies for the payment of rent of families in lower income brackets, with only 19 percent favoring such subsidies and 10 percent having no opinion. Other issues receiving more than 2-to-1 opposition were question No. 1 where 64 percent of the replies oppose repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, and question No. 8

with 63 percent of the replies opposing increased Federal appropriations for the war on poverty.

One of the issues uppermost in everyone's mind today is our participation in the conflict in Vietnam. It is evident that the administration does not have the widespread support of the residents of the 22d Congressional District. Although 47 percent of the replies to question No. 12 favored present U.S. policy in Vietnam, 37 percent of the replies oppose the U.S. policy in Vietnam, with 16 percent having no opinion. Last year a similar poll question was asked concerning U.S. participation in Vietnam, and a favorable response of 46 percent was received, while 38 percent opposed our participation in 1965, with 16 percent having no opinion. With the tremendous increase during the past year in our military and financial commitments, and the casualties we are suffering in Vietnam, it is apparent that the administration has either not given the American public the full information it wants on Vietnam, or has not adequately convinced the public of the justification and basis of U.S. military policy there.

The complete results of this poll follow:

Do you favor or oppose—	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
LABOR			
1. Repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to adopt right-to-work laws?	26	64	10
2. An increase in the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.75 per hour, with coverage extended to include employees in restaurants, laundry and dry cleaning establishments, theaters, recreational facilities, and agriculture?	50	43	7
3. Federal legislation to establish minimum standards for State unemployment compensation programs?	45	43	12
4. A stronger national law to deal with strikes which affect our national interest—such as strikes affecting mass transit operation?	77	18	5
GOVERNMENT			
5. A constitutional amendment to provide 4-year terms for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives?	55	34	11
6. The creation of a new cabinet-level Department of Transportation?	43	37	20
7. A constitutional amendment permitting a State the right to apportion 1 house of its State legislature on factors other than population?	34	41	25
WAR ON POVERTY			
8. Increased Federal appropriations for the "war on poverty"?	29	63	8
9. Federal Government subsidies for the payment of rent of families in lower income brackets?	19	71	10
TAXES			
10. Restoration of the Federal excise tax on telephone service and automobiles to help finance present military and domestic programs?	31	62	7
11. A Federal income tax credit for parents covering the cost of tuition of college students?	66	26	8
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
12. Present U.S. policy in the conflict in Vietnam?	47	37	16
13. The administration proposal to expand the foreign aid program to include an International Education Act and International Health Act?	24	58	18
CIVIL RIGHTS			
14. Additional Federal civil rights legislation to—			
A. Prohibit discrimination in the sale or rental of housing on a national basis?	32	57	11
B. Prohibit discrimination in the selection of juries in State and local courts?	66	26	8
C. Provide Federal criminal court trials and penalties for anyone causing injury or death to a civil rights worker?	49	41	10

TO ENCOURAGE AND ASSIST UNDERGROUND POWER TRANSMISSION BY MEANS OF TAX INCENTIVES AND RESEARCH

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today two bills to encourage and assist public utilities and private industry in placing electrical power transmission lines underground through an expanded research program and tax incentives. These bills are similar to bills introduced in August 1965, by my colleague from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] and include several changes suggested to me by experts in the field. I welcome all suggestions for constructive changes in these legislative proposals.

The first bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research and development to determine the most effective and economical means of power transmission. It includes an authorization of $30 million for this purpose. The Secretary is further directed to utilize existing research information from other Federal and State agencies, private industry and educational institutions. This is a provision which I have developed to accelerate research effort and avoid wasteful duplication. In addition, grants and loans would be provided to enable non-Federal power transmission systems to participate in the Federal research program.

I take this action in response to the deep concern expressed by my constituents over the proposed installation of overhead powerlines in the northern part of New Jersey. My constituents are justifiably concerned with the effect such overhead powerlines will have on property and scenic values. Experience has shown that compensation never adequate covers the damage incurred when overhead powerlines are built on and over presently used property.

The proposal for an overhead powerline network in New Jersey is presently before the New Jersey Department of Public Utilities. I was advised earlier this year, in answer to my inquiry to the Board of Public Utility Commissioners, that a voluminous record of expert and lay testimony has been accumulated on the subject, including information on the economic and engineering feasibility of underground powerlines. This is now being evaluated by the State Board, in consultation with the Federal Power Commission and other State utility commissions experiencing similar problems. The intent of both of my bills is to encourage and assist research and cooperative effort in order to find solutions truly in the public interest.

The second bill I have introduced today amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an amortization deduction and an increased tax credit for those private utility companies placing powerlines underground and undertaking research in this area. It is true that utility lines have been installed underground in cities and suburban areas for years, and that research in technology and construction methods has decreased costs. Fortune magazine, in its March 1965 issue, for instance, reported that in the last 10 years, the cost of underground systems has decreased from 10 times the cost of overhead lines to only 1½ times as much, not counting the increase in esthetic values.

Nevertheless, the cost of burying giant, high-voltage overhead powerlines over long distances is very great. Although I expect that the research I have called for will find more economical means, the problem demands a more immediate answer as well. I do not think it fair to expect private power companies to carry the entire burden of the high installation costs of such lines. A comparison could be made, perhaps, with the Federal tax depletion allowance granted for the exploration and development of oil and gas. A tax incentive to private utility companies to bury powerlines, as I have suggested today, is at least as desirable from the point of view of public benefit.

It is time for Congress to act. I understand that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury may have already submitted reports to the Bureau of the Budget on the basic proposals contained in my bills. If this is so, there is no reason why hearings cannot be held immediately, and a start made toward a more adequate resolution of this growing national problem—which would be welcomed by all.

The text of the two bills referred to follows:

H.R. 13490

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an amortization deduction and an increased tax credit for certain underground electrical power transmission lines, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 183. Amortization of Underground Electrical Transmission Lines.

"(a) Allowance of Deduction.—

"(1) Eligibility.—Any public utility (as defined in section 247(b)(1)) which constructs an underground electrical transmission line (as defined in subsection (d)) shall, at its election, be entitled to a deduction with respect to the amortization of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of such line based on a period of 60 months. The 60-month period shall begin as to any such line, at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the line was completed, or with the succeeding taxable year.

"(2) Amount of deduction.—The amortization deduction provided in paragraph (1) shall be an amount, with respect to each month of the amortization period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis of the line at the end of such month, divided by the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall be in lieu of the depreciation deduction with respect to such line for such month provided by section 167.

"(b) Election of Amortization.—The election of the taxpayer under subsection (a)(1) with respect to (1) taking the amortization deduction and (2) the time at which the amortization period begins, shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for the first taxable year for which such amortization deduction is taken, unless the regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate provide that the election may be made at an earlier time.

"(c) Termination of Amortization Deduction.—A taxpayer which has elected under subsection (b) to take the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) may, at any time after making such election, discontinue the amortization deduction with respect to the remainder of the amortization period, such discontinuance to begin as of the beginning of any month specified by the taxpayer in a notice in writing filed with the Secretary or his delegate before the beginning of such month. The depreciation deduction provided under section 167 shall be allowed, beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction does not apply, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deduction with respect to such line.

"(d) Definition of Underground Electrical Transmission Line.—For purposes of this section, the term 'underground electrical transmission line' means an underground transmission line (or a submarine cable having a circuit length of less than 12,000 feet)—

"(1) which has a nominal operating voltage between phases greater than 60,000 volts, or a nominal operating voltage between a conductor of the line and ground greater than 34,000 volts.

"(2) the construction of which was completed after December 31, 1965, and before January 1, 1975. The term 'underground electrical transmission line' shall include only property of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167.

"(e) Determination of Adjusted Basis.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), in determining the adjusted basis of any underground electrical transmission line the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1965, there shall be included only so much of the amount of the adjusted basis (computed without regard to this subsection) as is properly attributable to such construction after January 1, 1965.

"(f) Depreciation Deduction.—If the adjusted basis of the underground electrical transmission line (computed without regard to subsection (e)) exceeds the adjusted basis computed under subsection (e), the depreciation deduction provided by section 167 shall, despite the provisions of subsection (a)(2) of this section, be allowed with respect to such underground electrical transmission line as if the adjusted basis for the purpose of such deduction were an amount equal to the amount of such excess."

(b) The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding below the last item the following:

"Sec. 183. Amortization of underground electrical transmission lines."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 1082(a)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to basis of property exchanged in obedience to Securities and Exchange Commission order) is amended by striking out "or 169" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 169, or 183".

(b) Section 1245(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to recomputed basis for gain from the disposition of certain depreciable property) is amended by striking out "section 168" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "section 168 or 183".

Sec. 3. Section 46(c)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the investment credit for public utility property) is amended by striking out "In" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in the next sentence, in", and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of the adjusted basis of section 38 property which is public utility property and consists of underground electrical transmission lines (as determined in section 183 (d) and (e)), the construction of which is completed before the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, the amount of qualified investment shall be seven times the amount determined under paragraph (1)."

Sec. 4. (a) Section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definitions and special rules for the investment credit) is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i) and by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

"(h) Adjustment to Basis of Underground Electrical Transmission Lines.—

"(1) In general.—The basis of any underground electrical transmission line shall be reduced, for purposes of this subtitle other than this subpart, by the amount by which that portion of the investment credit under section 38 attributable to the construction of such line was increased for any taxable year by the application of the second sentence of section 46(c)(3)(A) (relating to investment credit for underground electrical transmission lines).

"(2) Certain dispositions, etc.—If the tax under this chapter is increased for any taxable year under paragraph (1) of section 47(a) or an adjustment in carrybacks or carryovers is made under paragraph (3) of such section and if the property with respect to which such increase is made is an underground electrical transmission line, the basis of such line (immediately before the event on account of which such paragraph (1) or (3) applies), shall be increased by an amount equal to the portion of such increase and the portion of such adjustment attributable to such line, but only to the extent that such basis was previously reduced under paragraph (1) of this subsection."

(b) Section 1016(a) of such Code (relating to adjustments to basis) is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (21) to a semicolon and by adding after such paragraph the following:

"(22) to the extent provided in section 48(h) (relating to the basis of certain underground electrical transmission lines)."

Sec. 5. (a) Subpart B of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to year of inclusion of an item in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 457. Reserve for Underground Electrical Transmission Lines

"(a) Increase in Tax.—The tax under this chapter for each of the 5 taxable years beginning after December 31, 1974, shall be increased by the amount (on the last day of each such taxable year) of the reserve for underground electrical transmission lines provided in subsection (b).

"(b) Reserve.—The reserve for underground electrical transmission lines shall at the end of each taxable year be equal to the amount by which—

"(1) 20 percent of underground electrical transmission line credits exceeds—

"(2) the sum of—

"(A) amounts paid or accrued during such taxable year for the construction of underground electrical transmission lines, to which the second sentence of section 46(c)(3)(A) is inapplicable, and for which a deduction is allowed under section 183 (relating to amortization deductions for underground electrical transmission lines), and

"(B) the amount of any increase in tax for such taxable year under section 47 (relating to dispositions of section 38 property) attributable to the disposition of all or part of an underground electrical transmission line but only to the extent that an addition to such reserve was made on account of the construction of such line or part thereof."

"(c) Underground Electrical Transmission Line Credits.—For purposes of this section, the term 'underground electrical transmission line credits' means the aggregate amount by which investment credits allowed for all taxable years under section 38 were increased by the application of the second sentence of section 46(c)(3)(A) (relating to investment credit for underground electrical transmission lines).

"(d) The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations the manner by which the reserve shall be computed under subsection (b)."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart B is amended by adding below the last item the following:

"Sec. 457. Reserve for underground electrical transmission lines."

Sec. 6. It is the intent of the Congress in providing the amortization deduction under section 183 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and in increasing the investment credit in respect of underground electrical transmission lines under section 38 of such Code to provide an incentive for the construction of underground electrical transmission lines. Accordingly, Congress does not intend that—

(1) any agency or instrumentality of the United States having jurisdiction with respect to a taxpayer, or

(2) any agency or instrumentality of a State which has jurisdiction over a taxpayer whose rates and accounting methods could be regulated by Congress under the Constitution of the United States, shall, without the consent of the taxpayer, use either such amortization deduction or such increased credit to reduce such taxpayer's Federal income taxes for the purpose of establishing the cost of service of the taxpayer or to accomplish a similar result by any other method.

H.R. 13505

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research and development to encourage and assist the use of underground transmission of electrical power, and to undertake research projects to evaluate and demonstrate the economical and technical feasibility of other forms of electrical power transmission

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Underground Power Transmission Act of 1966".

Sec. 2. The Congress finds and declares that the growing number of high-tension powerlines and towers supplying electrical power to meet the ever-increasing demands of our society results in growing economic damage and loss to property owners; that these powerlines and towers are defacing and destroying precious reserves of open space and scenic areas, and marring public parks and historical and religious shrines; that they are weakening local zoning and planning efforts and needlessly reducing property values and local real estate revenues; and that they generally are a part of and affect interstate commerce. It is therefore of the greatest importance that economically and technically feasible methods be developed to encourage and assist private industry to transmit electrical power by underground or other suitable means not requiring the loss of property values and the defacement of property, and it is the purpose of this Act to assist in the development of such methods.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall undertake a program of research to determine the extent of the economic and other damage that has resulted and will result from overhead transmission lines in the United States, giving particular consideration to the impact of such lines upon scenic assets, zoning and planning and public confidence therein, property values, real estate revenues, and the natural beauty of the Nation, and such other factors as he deems relevant.

(b) In connection with the program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct such research as may be necessary to develop objective standards for measuring the economic values of scenic assets, particularly in regard to land values, tax revenues, recreational potential, and the health and welfare of citizens;

(2) utilize such research as may be available in other Government departments and agencies, Federal, State, and local, and private industry, and educational institutions; and

(3) gather such information as may be necessary to project the extent of future construction of overhead transmission lines.

Sec. 4. The Secretary shall submit to the President and the Congress within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act a report on the research program under this Act, together with such recommendations for legislative and other action as he deems appropriate, and shall make such report available to the public at cost.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall undertake research programs to develop economically and technically feasible methods of transmitting power underground or by such other means as would accomplish the purpose of this Act. In carrying out this section the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to utilize such research as may be available in other Government departments and agencies, Federal, State, and local, and in private industry and educational institutions;

(2) to conduct research, technical development work, and engineering studies to determine optimum design and conditions of operation, and the most economical methods of construction and operation;

(3) to acquire, by purchase, license, lease, or donation, such processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, licenses, land and interests in land, facilities, and other property or rights as are required for the purpose of this Act;

(4) to engage, or contract with, engineers, scientists, and such other personnel as may be considered necessary, and educational institutions, scientific organizations, and industrial or engineering firms deemed suitable, to carry out any part of the research or other related work, and to the extent appropriate to correlate and coordinate their efforts; and

(5) to cooperate with any other Federal, State, or municipal department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, educational institution, or other organization, in effectuating the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 6. The Secretary shall also undertake projects to ascertain and demonstrate the reliability, safety, and engineering and economic feasibility and potential of underground transmission of power or transmission of electrical power by other means. In carrying out this section the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of underground transmission facilities and other facilities and means by the Department of the Interior to demonstrate and evaluate programs and techniques in furtherance of the purpose of this Act;

(2) to enter into contracts with public, private, or cooperative power producers for the construction, operation, and maintenance of demonstration facilities, with the requirement that each contractor compile complete records as required by the Secretary and make such records available to the Secretary upon demand; and

(3) to dispose of demonstration facilities, which are no longer needed for the purposes of this Act and are surplus to the needs of the Federal Government, in such manner as will promote the purpose of this Act. The terms of any such disposal shall provide for a fair return on the Federal investment, and preference shall be given to units of State and local government and nonprofit and cooperative power companies, educational institutions and other nonprofit institutions and organizations.

Sec. 7. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is further authorized—

(1) to make grants and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with public or private agencies or organizations, and with individuals;

(2) to accept and use donations of funds, property, and personal services or facilities;

(3) to accept financial and other assistance from any State or public agency in connection with the purposes of this Act, and any funds so provided shall be available for expenditure as if they had been specifically appropriated;

(4) to acquire lands or interests in lands by donation, acquisition with donated funds, devise, or exchange for acquired land or public lands under his jurisdiction which he finds suitable for disposition; and

(5) to issue such regulations as he deems necessary with respect to the administration of lands, facilities, or projects under his jurisdiction in furtherance of the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 8. All information and data resulting from programs and projects undertaken under, or in any way supported by or financed under, the provisions of this Act, shall be made available to the public, and access by the public to demonstration facilities under the jurisdiction of the Secretary shall be assured during all phases of construction and operation, subject to such reasonable restrictions as to time and place as the Secretary may require or approve.

Sec. 9. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of Congress on the programs, projects, and other activities undertaken or instituted by him under the provisions of this Act. In these reports the Secretary shall recommend such further legislation regarding research, demonstration, or standards of operations as he deems necessary to achieve the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 10. The authority granted the Secretary under this Act shall terminate on July 31, 1975.

Sec. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $30,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

THE SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, few administration proposals have generated as much genuine concern across the country as the proposed cutbacks of the special milk and school lunch programs. It is obvious that any program which successfully assisted 16 million children last year in achieving balanced nutritional diets is worthy of such concern.

As I will have more to say concerning this proposal at a later date, I will at this time request permission to include in my remarks a letter I have received from the legislative chairman of the Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc. I believe Mrs. Huffman's arguments in support of the restoration and enlargement of these programs merits the attention of my colleagues.

Minnesota Congress of Parents
and Teachers, Inc.,
St. Paul, Minn., March 8, 1966.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Nelsen: I am writing about our concern with the administration's proposed cutback of school lunch and special milk program funds.

This cutback seems to us ill-advised. It was said that those who could would now pay for their school lunches; we believe these distinctions are not readily made, and if they are attempted children may suffer. Further, we believe the school lunch and milk programs are good investments in health and health education of our children and youth at relatively small cost—and a strong support to their capacity for education.

In view of what this would mean to Minnesota we strongly urge you to support: (1) restoration of last year's appropriation and (2) additional funds to enable poorer school districts to finance necessary free lunches and thus participate in the program.

Very sincerely,
Mrs. Charles M. Huffman,
Legislation Chairman.

"OBSTREPEROUS MEMBERS OF CONGRESS"

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that my colleagues were as disturbed as I was last week when I read in the Washington Post of White House Press Secretary Bill D. Moyers' remark:

> The worst source (of information) in Washington is obstreperous Members of Congress.

Now according to Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, "obstreperous" means "uncontrollably noisy; unruly" and it is a synonym for vociferous. If I am being obstreperous with these remarks today, so be it.

It seems unfortunate to me that this statement was made by the right-hand man of a former member of this and the other body, who has always endorsed the concept of balance of power in our Federal Government. Just 5 days after the burdens of the office of the Presidency fell upon him under those tragic circumstances, Lyndon B. Johnson told a joint session of the Congress:

> As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and the integrity of the legislative branch. And I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones.

We sincerely welcomed the President's 1963 statement.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident in Bill Moyers' obstreperous attack on Members of Congress, we may ask has the 1963 declaration been abandoned? With this attack, the administration is attempting to establish itself as the sole dependable source of information in our Government. Only a brief review of recent gems of administration information is necessary to refute that claim.

Just last week I directed the attention of the House to information distributed by the Department of Agriculture on December 17, 1965, as follows:

> Sales of CCC feed grain stocks in 1965–66 are expected to be considerably smaller than in 1964–65. * * * Anticipated 1965–66 requirements can be met largely out of the 1965 crop, with only limited amounts expected to be made available from CCC-owned stocks.

How does the Department rate as a source of dependable information when we consider the fact that the CCC dumped enough corn during the first 9 weeks of 1966 to equal almost 43 percent of the total unloaded during the entire 1964–65 season?

Consider also the January 1966, piece of administration information that "decisive progress was made in 1965" toward solving our balance-of-payments problems. This welcome information was followed in February with notice that we lost $1.6 billion of our diminishing gold supply in 1965. Consider the state of the Union message this year which informed us that we could afford both guns and butter, countered with the proposal to cut the school milk program by 60 percent. Consider the lipservice paid to the concept of a balanced budget while the Government has piled up $31.5 billion in deficits since 1961. Consider the reassurance in January of this year that "the Federal Government does not have the authority to impose ceilings on wages and prices" compared with the calculated dumping of Government stocks of aluminum, copper, wheat, and feed grains. And consider the administration's well-publicized furor which followed the action by the Federal Reserve Board in raising interest rates to curb inflation and the later, less-publicized admission that inflation is "perhaps our most serious economic challenge in 1966."

I could go on all day, but perhaps the most puzzling comparison of administration statements is the one between Defense Department aid Arthur Sylvester's assertion 4 years ago that the Government has a right to lie, and U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg's comment:

> We have a great problem here maintaining our credibility with our own people.

A further example of dependable administration information has now come to my attention in the form of a news release from the National Broiler Council. The council asks:

> Is USDA accomplishing by indirection the merger of poultry and red meat inspection which the Department indicated in a December 7, 1965, news release it was not planning?

In line with my "obstreperous" nature, I request permission to include the text of the council's release at the conclusion of my remarks. I would like to assure Mr. Moyers and the administration that when they curb their tendency for issuing biased and inconsistent public information, I will curb my obstreperousness.

[From the National Broiler Council News, Mar. 10, 1966]

Washington, D.C.—"Is USDA accomplishing by indirection the merger of poultry and red meat inspection which the Department indicated in a December 7, 1965, news release it was not planning?" asked the National Broiler Council in a statement today.

NBC posed the question following a meeting on March 7 in Washington, D.C., of Associated Poultry and Egg Industries, the body that coordinates legislative and regulatory activities of national and regional poultry organizations. Frank Frazier, executive vice president of NBC, is also vice president of Associated. Currently, he, along with NBC President G. Ted Cameron, is in Japan where both men are participating in an international feed trade exhibit and seminar.

NBC said, "At the March 7 meeting of Associated, there was spirited discussion of USDA's reorganization of poultry and red meat inspection, especially of actions taken by the Department since their December 7 announcement on the subject."

"In a communication dated January 21 of this year," according to the council, "a USDA official said, '* * * it is expected that better utilization of the technical personnel being combined from the two inspection programs in the new Technical Services Division will provide both the poultry and the meat inspection services with an improved service over that previously provided'."

NBC commented, "What appears plain now is that USDA has indeed consolidated the two inspection programs in many significant ways, whereas the December 7 announcement said, in direct reference to poultry, that only the matter of labeling would be merged in the new Technical Services Division."

"So that there can be no misunderstanding of the merger which now has been made by the Department, the USDA man said, '* * * it should be emphasized that the Technical Services Division * * * is a service unit to both the poultry and meat inspection systems. The new division will bring together under competent leadership the highly technical disciplines associated with engineering, food technology, label analyses, residues, chemical compounds, and truth-in-labeling on a uniform basis for the two services * * *. The Technical Services Division will have responsibility for establishing standards for both poultry and meat products, for both slaughtering and processing plant requirements, on such subjects as sanitation, refrigeration, etc., and for surveillance over the foreign inspection system'."

NBC asked, "How can we square the Department's January 21 statement, 'The Technical Services Division will have responsibility for establishing standards for both poultry and meat products' with this quote from USDA's December 7 news release, 'Today's reorganization does not affect the principal poultry inspection activities of C. & M.S.'s Poultry Division. This division * * * provides * * * services such as * * * developing quality standards for poultry and eggs'?

"Two little words in the Department's January 21 communication give the tip-off as to the method used in accomplishing the merger, in spite of industry and congressional opposition," continued the NBC statement. "The two words are 'over time.' USDA said, 'There was a twofold objective in the reorganization—the principal one being to effect a set of arrangements which will, over time, provide a more effective inspection system for both poultry and meat.'

"This is what we are afraid of," said NBC. "After all, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George Mehren stated in a letter to Representative Harold D. Cooley, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, last December, 'This (December 7) action completes the realinement of these programs. There are no plans to merge the meat and poultry inspection services.'

"That is not all," NBC continued, "The USDA representative said that 25 to 30 people in the Poultry Division will be transferred to the Technical Services Division or to the Program Appraisal and Compliance Staff. What are the functions of this latter group? USDA said that investigatory work relating to the poultry program 'had previously been assigned to USDA's Office of the Inspector General' and further that '* * * surveillance and compliance work on both meat and poultry which precedes formal investigations by OIG will be assigned to a program appraisal and compliance staff reporting directly to the Deputy Administrator for Consumer Protection.'

"This is perhaps the most radical change of all," said NBC. "Nothing was said in the December 7 announcement about duties in connection with investigatory work being assigned to a 'program appraisal and compliance staff.' USDA at that time spoke only of a 'program appraisal staff'; they said nothing about 'compliance' in this connection. Why the change?

"Why did the Department on December 7 not spell out all the administrative changes they were making, especially in view of the industrywide opposition to these actions? Why have the changes seeped out piecemeal?

"The Department has not only acted in a cavalier manner as regards the Nation's poultry industry," said NBC, "it has also financed the expressed will of Congress. Chairman Cooley asked in a letter to Secretary Freeman last December 17 whether the reorganization of USDA's Meat Inspection Service announced on December 7 is the final determination on the question of a merger of the poultry and red meat inspection services or 'merely the first step toward a complete consolidation of these services.'

"Mr. Cooley added that, if the December 7 announcement is only the first step, he is sure some leaders in the poultry industry and a substantial number of Members of Congress will want to make preparation for vigorous resistance to any further undertakings to merge the two services."

The National Broiler Council is glad to join with the other member organizations of Associated Poultry and Egg Industries in support of associated's resolution of March 7, 1966, which reaffirms the opposition of the affiliated organizations "to the proposed transfer of poultry inspection activities from the Poultry Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, to newly created units in the Department."

DAMAGING AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture issued a statement concerning several important aspects of the President's proposed agriculture budget for 1967.

The statement charges that the agriculture budget as presented shows little regard for the future of U.S. agriculture and rural America, and strikes severe and damaging blows at our Nation's youth.

The statement points out that in case after case, the administration proposes that funds be taken from time-tested, beneficial programs—programs which have shown themselves to be sound investments in our country's future—in order to finance new untested activities, experimental projects, and programs which lend themselves more easily to Executive control.

In his state of the Union message, the President asked:

> Who will they sacrifice? Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning?

But the President made no speeches about his proposals in the agriculture budget which would sacrifice millions of dollars from proven programs of health and education for our Nation's young people—sacrifices which involve programs such as school milk and school lunches, activities such as 4-H and Young Homemakers groups, and institutions such as our excellent land-grant colleges and universities.

Per capita farm income still averages little more than half that of the rest of the Nation, and the median family income of rural America is only about three-fourths the national average. The administration's agriculture budget for 1967 will only penalize, not help rural America, and will add further economic burdens to American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I include in the RECORD, the task force statement:

STATEMENT BY THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE—MARCH 7, 1966

The President's agriculture budget for 1967 shows little regard for the future of U.S. agriculture and rural America, and strikes severe and damaging blows at our Nation's youth.

Although the President declared that his budget would provide both guns and butter, it is clear from the agriculture budget proposals that his "butter" doesn't spread much beyond pet Great Society programs. The pressures of Vietnam have turned what was a poor set of budget priorities to begin with into a completely unbalanced priority system, in which proven, established programs find themselves in direct competition with new, unproven ones.

In case after case, the administration proposes that funds be taken from time-tested, beneficial programs—programs which have shown themselves to be sound investments in our country's future—in order to finance new untested activities, experimental projects, and programs which lend themselves more easily to Executive control.

SACRIFICES AMERICAN YOUTH

A masterpiece of inconsistency, the agriculture budget also plainly reveals the President's penchant for saying one thing while actually doing another.

For example, in his state of the Union message on January 12 of this year, President Johnson said, "Well, let us rather ask them, who will they sacrifice? Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning * * * ?" And yet in his agriculture budget, without making any speeches about it, the President himself proposes to sacrifice millions of dollars from proven programs of health and education for our Nation's young people—sacrifices which involve programs such as school milk and school lunches, activities such as 4-H and Young Homemakers groups, and institutions such as our excellent land-grant colleges and universities.

SCHOOL MILK AND LUNCH

The President proposes to sacrifice a large part of the school lunch program and drastically curtail funds for school milk. In testimony taken before the House Agriculture Committee just a few days ago, Agriculture Department officials testified that they expect school milk consumption to be 1 billion half pints less next year—a full one-third drop—if the administration's proposal to cut the program is accepted.

How depressing it is to realize that we have arrived at a point where milk for children has become an economic gimmick, if not a political football for the administration. Last year school milk and lunches were good for all children—this year they are not.

In testimony taken a year ago before the House Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, an Agriculture Department official expressed concern that the majority of schoolchildren as well as the very needy, should receive school lunches. Talking about the situation in the District of Columbia, he said "* * * and this is the one thing we are quite concerned about in the District, is that the program is not available to the majority of children in the schools—only those who are the very, very neediest."

Special assistance to the needy is necessary, he said. Why?

"So that the regular school lunch money could be freed for providing it for many other children. There may be those who are right on the borderline and need a lunch pretty badly too. This is a problem faced by many, many areas around the country."

Last year, the President wanted to expand the program. This year, he will not "sacrifice the children." No, not the children—just their school lunches and milk.

FOUR-H PROGRAM IN JEOPARDY?

The important and highly beneficial work of the Extension Service is well known, especially its work with our young people in such areas as 4-H and Young Homemakers groups, family nutrition, leadership and citizenship development, and work with all age groups in such areas as home economics extension, farm management, community and resource development, public affairs programs, work with senior citizens and low-income families. And the scope of the Extension Service extends far beyond farm families alone. A recent survey shows that on the basis of people served, extension agents gave almost half of their time to helping urban residents and rural nonfarm people.

Yet, for 1967, the President has recommended a shift of funds which will result in a cut of almost $10 million in formula payments available to the States for work under the Extension Service program. The administration says that because of the cut, it will be necessary for the States to make adjustments in their current programs and staffing arrangements."

The President will not "sacrifice the children"—he asks only that adjustments be made in those programs which have served our young people so well in the past.

WEAKENING OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The President proposes to cut millions of dollars of funds for research projects, much of which is carried on by the land-grant colleges and universities around the country. In addition to that, he proposes to reduce payments to agricultural experiment stations by several millions more.

If this were not enough, the President has also cut land-grant college funds by millions in nonagricultural sections of the budget. This destructive combination of cuts cannot do other than weaken the whole structure of our land-grant college system. If ever there was a need for strong and viable agricultural institutions to conduct progressive agricultural experiments and to broaden our base of competent agricultural specialists, the time is now, when we are faced with a constantly worsening world food situation.

The President will not "sacrifice the children who seek the learning,"—he will just weaken the institutions which educate our Nation's youth.

RESEARCH PROJECTS CUT

Besides having the effect of weakening the land-grant colleges, the administration's proposed research cuts are inconsistent as well. A few years ago when a surplus of wheat and other crops was a problem, research on these crops was increased. But now, when our grain reserves are dwindling and the problem of the world food supply becomes daily more critical, we find the administration proposing that our research be curtailed.

For instance, research on the dreaded wheat rust will be reduced. Reduction in research on corn, grain sorghum, flax and other crops is also proposed.

ROB PETER TO PAY PAUL

In other, similar recommendations, the administration displays a kind of "Rob Peter to pay Paul" mentality.

Take, for example, the proposal to "shift" Extension Service funds, a part of which would be used to expand extension work in outlying U.S. possessions—the Virgin Islands and Guam. A worthy objective to be sure, but the money would be taken at the expense of proven, established extension activities in the United States.

Another such instance is the administration's recommendation that funds for the agricultural conservation program be cut, while at the same time proposing that funds for similar programs in Appalachia be increased. Here again, an increase is proposed for one area to the detriment of another.

ADMINISTRATION CONTROL INCREASED

In addition to this, it is most discouraging to realize just how often these "shifts" and transfers of funds end up in "special" projects, new programs and activities which lend themselves far more easily to Executive regulation and control. The Extension Service funds, for example, have been "shifted" out of formula payments regulated by law, into "special" projects regulated by Executive decision.

Funds to agricultural experiment stations, also distributed under a formula specified by law, would be cut, while a program of special grants and contracts would be increased. And, of course, such programs as food stamp and aid to Appalachia with all its "special projects" would be well funded.

"Who will they sacrifice?" asked the President. But the question should be, "Who will you sacrifice, Mr. President?" Proposed costs of the war on poverty have been increased $463 million—from $1.2 billion this year to over $1.6 billion proposed for next. This $463 million increase could more than make up the cuts in school milk, school lunch, land-grant college funds, the agricultural conservation program, agricultural research projects, Agricultural Experiment Station payments, Extension Service funds—in short, all the major and most harmful reductions in the agricultural budget. And the objectives of the poverty program might actually be better served if this $463 million were used to restore the cuts.

Must an already well funded, highly controversial program be expanded at the very real expense and sacrifice of programs which have served so well our youth, U.S. agriculture, and rural America? Shall we build a new wall on an unsettled foundation by borrowing bricks from the other solid walls? Surely by so doing, we place the whole house in danger of collapse.

Per capita farm income still averages little more than half that of the rest of the Nation, and the median family income of rural America is only about three-fourths the national average. The administration's agriculture budget for 1967 as presented will only penalize, not help rural America, and will add further economic burdens to American agriculture.

WHAT MAKES A RUSSIAN TICK?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with all the complications facing the Western World, it is necessary for us from time to time to analyze conditions behind the Iron Curtain. I submit for the Record an article by columnist Dumitru Danielopol, which appeared in the Aurora Beacon-News:

Writer Looks at Homo Sovieticus—What Makes a Russian Tick?

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Washington.—What makes a Russian tick?

Yugoslav Writer Mihajlo Mihajlov has taken a penetrating look at the "Homo Sovieticus"—the Russian man.

"The first characteristic of Homo Sovieticus is the agreement with and acceptance of everything that is decided at the top," he writes.

"These are not bad people but weak people who sincerely believe in all the nonsense handed down by the top."

Mihajlov points out that there has not been a single leading person since Lenin in the history of the Soviet Union who has not been found in due course to be a "capitalist lackey, a traitor, a member of one of the many antiparty groups etc."

"The impression which Homo Sovieticus creates in an outside observer is chiefly immaturity—namely, the naive readiness to believe even in one's own lies," he writes.

This was a noticeable flaw in another dictatorship, nazism.

"Every dictatorship, even the most terrible one," Mihajlov says, "is supported by honest fanatics. There are always very few conscious rascals and they never inflict so much damage as the honest fanatics.

"The psychology of Homo Sovieticus contains a strong element of plebeian attitude, a lack of spiritual (not biological and social) aristocratism. * * * the complete lack of faith in one's own opinions, the need for leadership, for advice on the part of experts."

Nobel Prizewinner Boris Pasternak made a similar observation.

"Every attempt to crowd into a herd hides a center of mediocrity," he wrote.

The intellectual "innocence" of the Soviet man at first amuses, then bores.

"All that happened before 1917 is not only unimportant, but also completely uninteresting," says Mihajlov. "All non-Marxist thinkers are either 'capitalist mercenaries' or 'immoral idiots' * * * the lack of personality among the bearers of such psychological outlook is incredible."

So it is not surprising that the true Eastern European and Russian intellectual is striving to raise himself above the clouds of mediocrity that have hung over the Soviet empire for so many years.

While leftist American "intellectuals" like Staughton Lynd and Eugene Genovese preach an ideology which leads man back to the Dark Ages, in Russia the younger generation grows aware of all the absurdities of centralized statism.

"The young ones react with fanatic hatred against each and every lie, however small," Mihajlov says.

He sees a third Russian revolution.

"The old idea which gave people their spiritual bread, namely the concept of 'earthly paradise,' is not a moving force any more," he says. "New spiritual movements will get hold of men's souls."

What do such Eastern Europeans think of Lynd, Genovese and their like in America?

The words are not kind:

"Misinformed," "naive," "bad faith," "simply stupid."

Take your choice.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial commentary is especially pertinent at a time when misguided Americans are advocating appeasement of Communist aggression and our misguided State Department and the President are preaching coexistence with the Eastern European dictatorships and their Moscow masters. Any subsidized trade, indirect aid, or subsidized sale of surplus commodities to any Eastern European Communist dictatorship or to the Soviet Union merely serves to perpetuate these despotic regimes which would crumble of their own weight and terror if not shorn up by this administration.

I also submit as a part of my remarks an article by Mr. Danielopol which appeared in the Joliet Herald-News:

Strain Showing: Reds Losing Yugoslavia

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Washington.—The place: a court in Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

The time: autumn 1965.

Several people are waiting in line to get documents legalized.

A man struts in, goes ahead of the line to the judge, shows him his credentials. He is a high-ranking member of the Communist Party.

"I am sorry, Comrade," says with authority. "I want these papers legalized."

"I am sorry, Comrade," says the judge, "you will have to wait your turn."

"What do you mean, wait my turn? Can't you see who I am? I am one of the original partisans, a fighter for the liberation."

"I congratulate you. But you have to wait your turn."

The people in line show signs of impatience, even anger. There are hoots of derision. The Communist looks about for support, finds none and, finally cowed, he waits his turn.

The man who told me this story was waiting in that line.

Four months ago he was in Yugoslavia. Today he is in Washington—one of the hundreds of thousands who have quit Marshal Tito's paradise.

"The temper of the people is beginning to show everywhere, just as it did in that court," he said. "It isn't so healthy anymore in Yugoslavia to boast of being a Communist."

What went wrong?

"Tito couldn't win the peasants," the man explained. "He applied the Marxist theory that peasants were the enemies of the system. And he couldn't win over the youth, the intelligentsia, the clergy.

"He is openly being blamed for everything that is wrong.

"There is no more communism in Yugoslavia," he said. "The regime is beating a hasty retreat back to capitalism, in the hope of saving itself, but it can't be saved.

"It is discredited. It has had too many failures."

Seven million tourists went through Yugoslavia last year, many of them from the West, he explained, as Tito bid desperately for Western capital. They brought in new ideas and proof of the success of capitalism.

"At least 200,000 young doctors, lawyers, engineers, architects, teachers, writers have already left the country for good," he said. "As soon as they are out of college, they leave. Tito has to let them go. There are no jobs for them. Besides, he is afraid of them."

He said trains are filled to capacity every day taking out farmer, skilled and unskilled workers to jobs waiting in Western Europe. They send home money to help their families, but Yugoslavia loses their talents.

But this exodus is not Tito's biggest headache. His nationalist policy has boomranged.

The new exile recalled that when Tito came to power, instead of consolidating Yugoslavia's various ethnic groups, he played one against the other. "Divide and conquer" was his strategy.

"Now no one is a Yugoslav anymore," said the exile. "They are Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, Montenegrins or Macedonians.

"I am a Slovene, and I believe Slovenie will eventually break free from Yugoslavia and join some other group. The Serbs feel the same. They hate the Croats, even more than before. Tito is a Croat so they blame the Croats for all their sufferings."

After Tito, what? I asked.

"Possibly the army, controlled by Aleksandar Rankovich, will try to take over for a while," he said. "But it won't be for long. The nationality strains will tear Yugoslavia apart."

This article is most pertinent, Mr. Speaker, since it points up the complications in Yugoslavia, which is laboring under Tito's dictatorship that would not be in existence today had not his government been so blindly supported by the State Department for almost 20 years.

The peoples of Yugoslavia deserve freedom and the peoples of Yugoslavia have a heritage of freedom. Certainly, legitimate spokesmen in exile for the Yugoslavian peoples represent the thinking and aspirations of their compatriots far more than Dictator Tito and his agents.

SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 27th anniversary of Slovak Independence Day, and on this historic occasion, I would like to pay tribute to the brave Slovak people who suffer today under the yoke of Communist tyranny. They are not permitted by their Red tyrants to publicly celebrate their national holiday.

Therefore, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to these valiant people and the other captive nations under communism. We must not only observe the historic national days on the floor of the House, but we should establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations to more forcibly bring the present plight of these unfortunate peoples to world attention.

Another effective step the U.S. Government could take to show our interest in the Slovak people and their aspirations for freedom from communism would be lengthier and more effective broadcasts by the Voice of America which would pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the Slovak people. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America has cut back both its hours of broadcast in the Slovak language and the nature of these broadcasts. The VOA now has only straight news programs because of the present administration's fear of offending the Soviet Union. The Voice of America should instead be a vehicle for delivering the message of truth to the Slovak people so that they can resist the brainwashing of the constant propaganda from the tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, March 10 was the 105th anniversary of the death of the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko, who lives today in the hearts of the Ukrainian people as a symbol of freedom and Ukrainian nationalism.

The free world also remembers Shevchenko's great leadership of the Ukrainian nation and paid tribute to his memory in 1964 with the erection in the Nation's Capital of a statute of the Ukrainian poet laureate.

The Ukrainian people yearn today for freedom from their Communist oppressors. Unfortunately, the Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation within the Soviet empire, is not permitted to publicly celebrate this historic anniversary. The freedom and individual dignity of each human being for which Shevchenko fought is being denied the people of the Ukraine and the other captive nations of communism.

Mr. Speaker, I join the Ukrainian people in the free world who observe this anniversary and who strive for the day when freedom and independence from Russian tyranny will be restored to their compatriots in the Ukraine.

By honoring the ideals about which Taras Shevchenko wrote in his lyric poetry, we honor his memory and the faith of the Ukrainian people that the future holds independence and freedom for them.

TEENAGE DRINKING IN NEW YORK

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., published a remarkably detailed and revealing article documenting the extent to which teenage youngsters are lured into New York State to consume alcoholic beverages which are prohibited to them by the laws of New Jersey and every other State which borders on New York.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I insert this article, a public service of great importance, following my remarks.

The Journal's in-depth reporting of the New York teenage drinking scandal should help mobilize new efforts, in and out of New York, to persuade that State to do justice to its neighbors by raising its legal drinking age from 18 to 21.

New York State's stubborn and irresponsible refusal to act is harming not only its own youngsters but those of New Jersey, Connecticut, Vermont, Pennsylvania, and Canada as well. In New Jersey alone, New York's policy has led directly to dozens of teenage deaths, hundreds of injuries, considerable property damage, and, perhaps worst of all, substantial moral delinquency among teenagers, including those as young as 14 and 15. This sorry record is repeated in other States bordering on New York and unquestionably in even greater numbers within New York itself.

Whether young men and women of 19 or 20 are emotionally capable of handling alcoholic beverages is debatable. Some may be; many others are not. But New York's law, as a practical matter, does not limit consumption of liquor to persons 18 years old and above. Just as 19- or 20-year-olds can often pass for 21, the legal drinking age in other States, 15- and 16-year-olds can pass for 18 in New York, and I defy anyone to tell us that kids of that age should be drinking liquor in public roadhouses. According to high school surveys, substantial numbers of boys and girls under 18 do drink in New York. They themselves, their families, and innocent victims of all ages suffer the consequences, especially when youthful drinkers become youthful drivers, a deadly combination.

New York encourages this teenage death and delinquency. It does so by maintaining its drinking age at 18, by permitting the issuance of more than five times as many liquor licenses in counties adjoining other States as in the State generally, and by refusing to adopt effective checks to prevent those under 18 from drinking. In one border county, for instance, a voluntary identification system was quickly scrapped when local liquor dealers and tavern owners found it cut into the under-18 trade.

This is a matter of utmost concern to the entire Northeast. All six New England Governors have petitioned New York to raise its drinking age, as well as the Governors of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In 1962, 26 U.S. Senators and Representatives from New York and its 5 neighbor States joined me in calling on New York to act. Last year, I introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that New York should adjust its law to the laws of the other States, and 18 Congressmen have sponsored identical resolutions.

Polls show that between 55 and 80 percent of New Yorkers agree with our contention that their drinking age should be raised to 21. If we can alert this majority to the evils of New York's law, we may yet persuade their legislature to act.

As I have pointed out on many previous occasions in the House, Mr. Speaker, the teenage drinking situation in New York has become a source of intergovernmental conflict of growing proportions. I urge again that the Committee on the Judiciary hold hearings on our concurrent resolution and permit the Congress to add the weight of its moral influence to our struggle for interstate comity and for the protection of youngsters who are being ruthlessly exploited for private profit.

OFF TO THE ISLAND—TEENAGERS TELL OF GOETHALS TREKS, DEFEND UNDER-21 DRINKING

(By Carl Bernstein)

Every Friday and Saturday evening, hundreds of Union County teenagers bow to the east, praise Jack Daniels, then begin a dutiful pilgrimage toward the Goethals Bridge.

On the other side of the span lies Staten Island, the Mecca where teenagers from Union and other New Jersey counties congregate to partake the sweet sacraments denied them by their home State's minimum drinking age of 21.

Solemnly, the pilgrims make their 50-cent offerings at the port authority toll booths to gain admission to the Holy Land and begin the last mile before immersion.

(An explanation: Staten Island bars and taverns which cater to teenagers are generally meticulous about checking for proof of age. Underage teenagers get served on the basis of false identification, not because of laxity on the part of the establishments.)

Once on "the island," carloads of the faithful descend like lemmings on the more than 40 bars, taverns, and discotheques which basically owe their prosperity to New York's minimum drinking age of 18—and to New Jersey teenagers aged 15 through 19.

The first thing to know about Staten Island, these teenagers say, is that everybody has one or two special bars. All the kids from Plainfield go to one or two places, Union's have a couple special hangouts, Cranford's go to a particular tavern, Garwood's to another.

GENERALITIES THAT ATTRACT

Remember also, they advise, that nobody's parents know their kids go to Staten Island; everybody who visits the island regularly began drinking at age 15, 16, or 17 with the aid of fake ID cards; there is absolutely nothing to do in Jersey at night because you can't drink; only a few of the kids cause any trouble.

Remember, also, Jersey teenagers go to Staten Island to have fun, pick up girls, get picked up, meet friends, and get away from it all; Jersey teenagers know Staten Island's labyrinthian maze of streets and neighborhoods like a book; New Jersey authorities who say Staten Island is some kind of immoral world and badger New York to raise its drinking minimum aren't realistic.

An exhaustive (and exhausting) tour of Staten Island's teenage nightspots where nubile girls and beardless boys lap up booze like traveling salesmen confirms the basic truth of all these generalities.

Phil Maiorano's Tap Room on Forest Avenue is a small tavern that looks pretty much like any other working-class bar. There are dozens of these places on the island—Mambo Joe's, Ted's, Artie's, Calypso Billy's—which specialize in hundred-proofing of teenagers.

TINY TABLES IN SHADOWS

Maiorano's, like most of the bars on the Forest Avenue strip, is cold, dark, and damp. It has eight tiny tables on one side of the room, 15 or 20 stools at the bar.

But it is Friday night and Phil's, as the regulars call it, is jammed with more than 100 teenage customers, about one-third of them girls.

A pretty blonde (she is 17, her friends say) is perched on a jukebox holding court to four guys while the machine blares out old rhythm and blues songs and a few beatles numbers.

At a table, two couples, all high school juniors are doing a sitdown version of the monkey. They stop, order two beers for the boys, two rum-and-cokes for the girls, then resume the dancing. They are not drunk, they are not causing any trouble, and they are having a good time.

Across the room a young man with a Newark State College jacket is standing with his girl, kissing her. One hand is caressing the girl's face, the other clutches a beer bottle.

At the bar, five guys, all rather tough looking, are sizing up the girls in the room; so are a lot of other fellows who look like sensible, unalienated high school students. A group of girls is sizing up both crews.

Cindy is a 19-year-old Westfield girl who was graduated from Holy Trinity High School last year. Sitting alone at the bar, she is dressed similarly to most girls in the room—tight slacks and sweater. Talking to her is very easy, probably because she has been drinking two hours.

Cindy has been going to Staten Island since she was 16. "You go because there's nothing else to do," she says. Almost everybody is 16 or 17 when they start going, some are 15. Everybody has somebody else's driver's license or some kind of fake ID which proves you're 18.

"The good thing about Maiorano's is that you know everybody here. The ones that are here now, most of them aren't my close friends. But I know just about everybody in the place. We're all from Westfield and Scotch Plains, just about."

CLEVER, VERBAL PLOY

A boisterous fellow next to Cindy (he is wearing a car-club jacket) decides to join the conversation. "Whatddaya mean, you come here to see your friends. You come here to drink." Again incredulously: "You come here to see your friends, ugh."

Cindy, not at all charmed with the young man, stalks off while Car-Club Jacket raises his voice to the bartender: "What'd I do?"

The bartender ignores the question.

"The girls," he says, "can drink more than the men and stay twice as sober. Not really more sober, maybe, but the girls are more mature. Some of these guys become 10-year-olds when they get a drink in their hand. There are always a few every Friday night."

The observation seems true. Rarely does a girl on Staten Island make a fool of herself because of drinking. But every bar appears to have a couple of males like Car-Club Jacket.

DRINKERS EDGE OUT BOWLERS

At Knotty Pines Lanes, about a mile down Forest Avenue from Maiorano's two 17-year-old juniors from Plainfield High School are drinking beer. The Knotty Pines is a semibowling alley with a bar that gets more customers than the lanes.

The two boys, Billy and Rick, are both good students, plan to go to college and usually spend at least one night of the weekend on Staten Island.

Both are convinced that people have the wrong impression of Staten Island. "They talk like its some den of iniquity or something," Billy complains. "It's just a place where you can drink. If the age were 21 in New York, then we'd drink in New Jersey." Rick picks up the conversation.

"It's not that we're all a bunch of drunks," he says. "But look, when you turn 16 or 17 in any city, the kids drink beer. Maybe liquor sometimes. The Island just happens to be the easiest place to get it. So everybody comes here."

Both confirmed that they don't tell their parents of their weekly pilgrimages.

"If I told my mother I was over here drinking, I don't know what she'd do," Rick says. "Why tell them?" Billy asks. "They'll just get worried, they can't stop you. You just say 'I'm going to a party' or 'I'm going over to Rick's, and that's that.' "

Most of the Jersey teenagers who spend their weekend nights on Staten Island travel in groups.

"The way it usually works," a girl who has joined Billy and Rick says, "is that on Thursday or Friday at school you find out who has the car and team up. Tonight I was with six kids, but the others decided to go dancing on the other side of the Island."

The girl, Laura, is down to a dollar and borrows another from the two boys.

"It's hard to say how much anybody drinks," she says, "because it all depends on how much you've got in your pocket. Like sometimes I might really feel like getting smashed—not often—and that means I need about $7 or $8. Tonight I don't feel like drinking a lot."

FEW GO HOME SOBER

Although it is difficult to gage how much alcohol the Jersey teenagers consume on Staten Island, bartenders there confirm Rick's view that "not many people go home what you would call sober."

"You've got to figure," says Laura, "that when you come over here you spend 4 or 5 hours at least. You can't stay that long and just have one or two drinks.

"You might have four, you might have seven or eight. The girls usually drink mixed drinks and they drink slower than the boys. The boys will drink beer or whisky and soda, something like that. But the girls can get pretty looped when they want to, although they might not show it as much as the boys."

Billy, Rick, and Laura are agreeable to making a tour of island nightspots and lead the way to the parking lot.

Laura pointed to a couple necking in a car. "You can't make any hard and fast rules about pickups," says Billy, "but most of the necking in cars, I think, is with pickups. Sometimes we'll try to pick up somebody, but we don't usually go out of our way.

"But I'm always amazed at some of the girls I see getting picked up. You know, you wouldn't figure they're the type."

LOOK FOR FREE DRINKS

"Then again," says Laura, "you don't know if everybody you see getting picked up is doing anything or if they just want to sap some guy for drinks. But there is a small group of girls in the places we go who have pretty bad reputations. Out of say 50 girls, I'd say there are only 5 or 6 in that category."'

The first stop on the tour is the Surfside Terrace discotheque at the far end of the Clove Lakes Expressway, across the water from Brooklyn.

The Surfside Terrace is a huge establishment with a long bar in the front room, a standup bar in a smaller second room and a large dance floor surrounded by tables in a third room.

A band is playing at about 800 decibels and the monkey, jerk, swim, and hully gully are the order of the day.

The crowd at the Surfside is a bit older than on the Forest Avenue strip or at the bars in Mariner's Harbor, Tottenville, Great Kill, and Elm Park. Also, instead of the 50- to 70-cent prices in those sections a drink at the Surfside costs $1.

FRUG BREAKS THE ICE

With the aid of a somewhat serviceable frug, it was possible to make the acquaintance of an Elizabeth secretary named Karen.

Karen is 18, a graduate of Battin High School and has never been very enchanted with Staten Island.

"I don't like to drink, so I've only been over five or six times," she says. "Except that the Surfside and the Beachcomber (another big discotheque) are good for dancing, you could float Staten Island into the ocean and it wouldn't bother me."

Karen first visited Staten Island when she was 17 and took an immediate dislike to the place.

"I understand that kids want to drink," she says, "but you'll never get me to understand why they're so enthusiastic about Staten Island. Why don't they go into Manhattan? It's only half an hour farther than coming here."

ADMITS FIGURE IS HIGH

Because she is not a Staten Island regular one expects that Karen might dispute the claims by Billy, Rick, Laura, and others that 40 to 50 percent of Union County's high school juniors and seniors make it to the island at least three times a month. But she doesn't.

"I think at least 40 to 50 percent go regularly," she says. "When I was in school they used to organize carloads for Friday and Saturday night. Plus, you must have about a fourth or a fifth of the sophomores coming over, especially the boys, and all the dropouts are here on the weekends.

"And there are a lot of people like me, who either don't like to drink or don't like the island, but find that all their friends are here. So they come every once in a while too."

With the exception of the discotheques and Deyman's Hofbrau in Stapleton, other teenage taverns on the tour appear to be rubber-stamp versions of Maiorano's or the Knotty Pines.

DIFFERENCES NEGLIGIBLE

The differences among the dozens of taprooms like Kullman's in Elm Park, the Christmas Tree Inn in Tottenville and the Nile Room in Mariner's Harbor are negligible. The only major variations occur in what towns the customers come from and whether a bar allows dancing to its jukebox.

The Hofbrau, on the other hand, seems to be the one teenage temple on Staten Island that falls into the category of a conventional big-city restaurant (with bar) which caters to young people.

It is a large pleasant place which draws a mixed crowd of Jersey high school students, Wagner College students from Staten Island, and couples from Jersey colleges.

"You go to the Hofbrau," it is explained, "if you have a date. That's the only time we come in here. Also, it's pretty expensive, so you might spend the night drinking somewhere else, then come up here to get something to eat. It's not one of the 'regular places.'"

The spectacle of armies of New Jersey teenagers crossing the Arthur Kill in search of booze at "regular places" has, of course, raised some steam among legislators and law-enforcement officials.

A 21-YEAR LIMIT URGED

The administration of Gov. Richard J. Hughes has long urged New York to raise its drinking minimum to 21. The most recent round in the battle, which also involves Connecticut, took place last month in Albany when a New York legislative committee offered a plan whereby Jersey, Connecticut, and New York would all set drinking minimums at age 19½. The plan was flatly rejected by New Jersey and Connecticut.

The teenagers who gravitate to Staten Island to find 86-proof happiness in the Borough of Richmond dismiss adult concern about their activities as hokum.

In the Flamingo, a small roadhouse that seems to thrive on noise, one girl set it this way: "If they raised the age in New York, all it would mean is that we would start drinking in New Jersey.

"It's not much more difficult to fake your age to 21 than it is to 18. And it would mean there would be lots more drinking in cars and at parties. I don't see why that should make the Jersey cops happy."

At another teenage temple, a waiter explained his view: "I don't see where there's that much trouble. There are fights on the island every once in a while, but you would have them without the drinking. Anyway, this way it all happens in New York so why should Jersey kick?"

TROUBLE EXAGGERATED?

The police on Staten Island and officials of the New York State Liquor Authority also say that New Jersey legislators and police exaggerate the trouble caused by Jersey teenagers who drink in New York. Nonetheless, they concede New York's 18-year-old minimum does account for trouble that wouldn't result if it were raised to 21.

A lieutenant at one of Staten Island's three police precincts offers this estimate: "The drinking adds to our work. But it's not enough extra work to add any extra men on the weekend. These kids aren't running around with clubs and baseball bats.

"What it amounts to is that sometimes they get to be a pain in the neck because we have to watch them closely. But because they know we're watching them, they go out of their way to avoid trouble."

A Staten Island traffic patrolman says, "My impression is that these teenagers are rather careful to see that there is always somebody sober enough to drive." (Many of the teenagers say they often assign the driving chores to one person and make sure he stays sober.)

SPOT CHECKS HELPED

The patrolman, who has been on the Staten Island force for 10 years, says, "The situation used to be worse and we had some pretty bad accidents. But then Jersey started running spot checks on the kids when they got on the other side of the bridge.

"The word got out and now the kids know they have to play it smart. And they do. There is nothing about the traffic problem that we haven't got under control."

Gustave Brugger, director of Elizabeth's Police Department, takes a different view.

"Staten Island drinking presents a real problem," he says. "When those teenagers get back here and get into an accident, it's in our laps."

Brugger concedes the problem is less serious since the last series of spot checks in 1965. At that time, Elizabeth police stopped every car at the Jersey end of the Goethals Bridge and checked the condition of youngsters.

(The check also revealed that close to 1,000 Elizabeth area teenagers make the Staten Island scene every Friday and Saturday night.)

BUT ACCIDENTS CONTINUE

"There are still accidents," Brugger says, "spot checks or no. And kids still come back to Elizabeth drunk and get into fights. The age limit should definitely be raised in New York."

Representative Florence Dwyer, of Union County, has been at the forefront of the movement to get New York to raise its minimum drinking age.

She cites 24 New Jersey fatalities between 1962 and 1964 that police attributed to teenage drinking in New York as convincing evidence that the drinking age should be upped.

Last year, six persons died in New Jersey accidents that police attributed to teenage drinking in New York.

The battle will continue, all parties to the dispute agree, but it is extremely doubtful that New York will relent in the near future and raise the State's drinking age minimum.

It is just as doubtful that Jersey teenagers will halt their spirited pilgrimages to the promised land of Staten Island.

EXAMINATION OF CANDIDATES QUALIFYING PAPERS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Edwards] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General reportedly has issued instructions to Justice Department officials to obtain detailed information regarding individuals who have qualified as candidates for public office in Alabama and other Southern States.

The following news item from the Mobile, Ala., Press of March 10 tells something of what has happened:

An FBI agent, on orders of Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, is poring over candidates' qualifying papers in the offices of probate judges in all counties of Alabama, but local Justice Department sources say they don't know why.

Agent Frank Wilent, who has been working out of the Mobile office for 3 months, was making the check on Probate Judge John Moore's records.

He said he was obtaining the "names, addresses, offices sought, subdivisions involved, and race of all candidates."

Reminded that the race of a candidate is not indicated on the qualifying papers, he was asked how he proposed to determine that matter.

"I can't tell you that," he replied. "You'll have to ask the office."

Wilent said he had "no idea" what the purpose of the check might be, nor to what use the Attorney General might put the information he was obtaining.

Special Agent in Charge Dillard Howell, who heads the Mobile office, was not available there for comment.

The same newspaper on March 10 wrote to the Attorney General to ask for more information. In the belief that this will be of general public interest I want to quote the newspaper's questions here, and urge that the Attorney General provide a response at an early date. I adopt these questions as my own and I ask the Attorney General to supply me with the answers to these questions promptly. The questions follow:

1. Why have you assigned Federal agents to obtain the names, addresses, offices sought, political subdivisions served, and race of all persons who have qualified for the Democratic primaries in Alabama?
2. Since qualifying papers do not indicate race of candidate, how do you propose that your agents will obtain such information?
3. Why is this information of interest to the Justice Department?
4. Under what authority do you demand such information?
5. To what use do you plan to put such information?
6. Does your Department plan to police polling places in Alabama? Under what authority?
7. Have you given any thought whatsoever to the possibility that some people may take your actions as a form of Federal intimidation?
8. Are you obtaining similar information on elections in other States?
9. If so, are any of these States outside the Voting Rights Act of 1965's "target States," most of which repudiated the Great Society in 1964?
10. Are Federal agents checking election procedures and researching candidates in any of the big cities where machine politicians—usually allied strongly with the national Democratic administrations—control elections? If not, why not?
11. Are FBI agents checking on elections in New York, or in Illinois, where serious charges of "election theft" were leveled in 1960? If not, why not?

HENRY WAGNER, JR., TOP WINNER IN WESTINGHOUSE TALENT SEARCH

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this body the distinction recently conferred upon one of my young constituents, Henry Wagner, Jr., of Gwynedd Valley, Pa.

Henry, who is 16, has been named the Nation's most promising young scientist in competition with 25,798 other high school seniors in the 25th annual Westinghouse Talent Search. He has been awarded a $7,500 scholarship for his original research into the molecular structure of a protein.

I am very proud of the outstanding achievements of this young man from Montgomery County, Pa., and of his school, Wissahickon High School, Ambler, Pa. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been very much concerned with the educational needs of our Nation and it is reassuring to note the attainments of our young people like Henry Wagner, Jr.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and I are very pleased that the President last Thursday recommended that an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission be established now to begin planning for the commemoration of the bicentennial of American independence. We are especially pleased that the draft joint resolution submitted by the President resembles very closely the bills—H.R. 12252 and H.R. 12260—which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and I introduced on January 24.

The coming bicentennial will be observed and commemorated by activities of unprecedented scope and significance, for we will be celebrating not simply the battle for independence, but the birth and expression of our American ideals of liberty, equality, and justice. Many learned societies, historical organizations, patriotic groups, and State and local bodies are already developing plans for their own commemorative activities. The range of efforts and the wealth of talent and resources involved make comprehensive planning and continuing coordination of all activities necessary and desirable.

Mr. Speaker, we are gratified that the President has endorsed the creation of a national American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and that the Administration has incorporated in the draft resolution the planning and coordination features which are central to our bill. We hope that this legislation, with bipartisan endorsement, will be enacted during this session of Congress.

The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission would be a national coordinating body with broad responsibilities and great prestige. It would include high Federal officials, Members of the Senate and the House, and interested citizens appointed by the President. It would have full responsibility for overall planning and coordination, and full directions to cooperate with and provide assistance to all State and local bodies and private organizations and groups participating in the bicentennial.

The heart of our bill is its planning procedure, and we applaud the administration's endorsement of this process. Under our bill, the Commission would devote its first 2 years to comprehensive planning and the development of a full blueprint for the bicentennial. To insure that all points of view were heard and all suggestions considered, the Commission would convene within a year of its establishment a National Assembly of representatives of the Federal Government, the States, and all interested local and private bodies. The recommendations made by this Assembly would be fully considered by the Commission in the preparation of its own plan.

Mr. Speaker, the Morse-Mathias bill and the administration resolution agree in concept and differ in only five respects. I would like to summarize these.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Both proposals would establish an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission with broad national representation, including the Federal Executive, the Congress, and interested private groups and organizations. The Morse-Mathias bill establishes a 31-member Commission including the President, President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House, ex officio; 15 members from private life, to be appointed by the President; 4 Senators and 4 Members of the House; the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, Librarian of Congress, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities. All representatives of the executive branch would serve ex officio.

The Commission defined in the administration resolution includes 33 members, not including the President, President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House. To the members proposed under our bill, the administration measure would add the Attorney General, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, all ex officio; and 2 additional members from private life, for a total of 17.

MANDATE OF THE COMMISSION

Both measures give the Commission ful authority to plan, encourage, and coordinate bicentennial activities in cooperation with all participating groups. The Morse-Mathias bill gives the Commission the additional authority to conduct bicentennial observances. We feel that this additional authority, used sparingly and sensibly, could be valuable in the development of truly national observances which should appropriately be under the direct management of the national Commission.

The administration measure, while not authorizing the Commission to conduct activities, does include the power to develop commemorative activities, a slightly more restricted grant directed toward a similar goal.

PLANNING PROCEDURES

As I have noted, both proposals provide for a 2-year planning period and a full report of Commission recommendations. The Morse-Mathias bill provides that this report shall be submitted by the Commission directly to the Congress, while the administration measure proposes that the Commission submit its report to the President, who shall then transmit it to Congress with his own recommendations and report of administrative actions taken.

Both measures recognize the significant contributions which can be made by Federal departments and agencies. The Morse-Mathias bill includes three specific directives for cooperative activities and outlines steps which can be taken by the Secretary of the Interior toward the development of historic sites and battlefields; by the Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities and his associates, in encouraging and coordinating scholarly works and presentations; and by the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian, and the Archivist of the United States, in developing, displaying, and distributing exhibits, bibliographies, catalogs, and other relevant source materials.

The administration measure makes no specific reference to the contributions of Federal agencies to the study of the history, culture, and political thought of the Revolution. The administration resolution does provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall study possibilities for developing historic sites and battlefields, and shall report to the Commission prior to the Commission's comprehensive report. In our judgment, if such a procedure is adopted, it should be expanded to include reports from all Federal departments and agencies participating in commemorative activities, so that a full picture of Federal contributions to the bicentennial may be presented in the Commission's report.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Both measures establish a Commission with ample authority to employ personnel, engage consultants, make contracts, and exercise the powers necessary to carry out its purposes. Both measures provide that administrative services for the Commission shall be performed by the Department of the Interior, with the receipt and expenditure of funds implicitly overseen, as for every Federal agency and Commission, by the General Accounting Office. In order to free the Commission from these bureaucratic regulations and restrictions which may prove constricting to a relatively small and inexpensive office, the Morse-Mathias bill gives the Commission power to procure services, supplies, and property without regard to the procedures applicable to Federal departments. The Administration measure omits such a provision, and ties the Commission securely to the procurement procedures of the Department of the Interior.

LEGISLATIVE FORM

There is one final and somewhat peculiar difference between our proposal and that of the administration. The Morse-Mathias measure is a bill; the administration's is a joint resolution. Both, if enacted, would have the full force of law. However, Jefferson's Manual states in section 397 that joint resolutions "are used for what may be called the incidental, unusual, or inferior purposes of legislating."

Mr. Speaker, in our judgment the celebration of our Nation's bicentennial should not in any way be considered "incidential" or "inferior." We hope, of course, that it will be unusual—exceptional in scope, extraordinary in impact, and unique in the care of its preparation. So that these goals can be achieved, we urge the Congress to act now to establish an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

I would like to include at this point a section-by-section comparison of the Morse-Mathias bill and the administration's draft resolution:

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MORSE-MATHIAS BILL AND PRESIDENT'S DRAFT JOINT RESOLUTION TO CREATE AN AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

	MORSE-MATHIAS BILL (H.R. 12252 AND H.R. 12260)	DRAFT RESOLUTION
Legislative form:	Bill.	Joint resolution.
Declaration of purpose:	Declares it is appropriate and desirable that the bicentennial of the American Revolution be celebrated and commemorated by local, national and international observances and activities planned, encouraged, coordinated and conducted by a national commission representative of appropriate public and private authorities and organizations (sec. 1).	Declares that it is appropriate and desirable to provide for the commemoration of the American Revolution and related events through local, State, national and international activities planned, encouraged, developed and coordinated by a national commission representative of appropriate public and private authorities and organizations (sec. 1).
Establishment of the Commission—Title:	American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. (Sec. 2(a).)	American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. (Sec. 2(a).)
Membership:	The President, President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House, ex officio members;	(Not included.)
	Four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House;	Identical to Morse-Mathias bill.
	The Secretary of State, Secretary of the Interior, Librarian of Congress, Secretary of the Smithsonian, and Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities, all ex officio members;	All those included in Morse-Mathias bill, plus the Attorney General, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; all ex officio.
	Fifteen members from private life appointed by the President (sec. 2(b)).	Seventeen members from private life appointed by the President (sec. 2(b)).
Chairman:	Elected by the Commission from among its membership (sec. 2(c)).	Appointed by the President (sec. 2(b)).
Advisory groups:	Commission may appoint honorary members and establish an advisory council at its discretion (sec. 2(c)).	Commission may appoint advisory committees, and may designate special committees with State, local, and private representatives to help plan specific events (secs. 3(b) and 6(b)).
Appointments:	Shall be made within 90 days of date of enactment of the bill (sec. 2(d)).	No such provision.
Vacancies:	To be filled in manner in which original appointment was made (sec. 2(d)).	Identical to Morse-Mathias bill (sec. 2(c)).
PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMISSION:		
General mandate:	It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare an overall program for commemorating the bicentennial of the American Revolution, and to plan, encourage, coordinate, and conduct observances and activities commemorating events which took place primarily between 1773 and 1783 (sec. 3(a)).	It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare an overall program for commemorating the bicentennial of the American Revolution, and to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate observances and activities commemorating the historic events that preceded, and are associated with, the American Revolution (sec. 3(a)).
	See section 4(a).	Commission shall give due consideration to related plans and programs developed by State, local, and private groups (sec. 3(b)).
	No such provision explicitly stated (see secs. 4 (c) and (d)).	Commission shall give special emphasis to ideas associated with the Revolution (sec. 3(c)).
National assembly:	Commission shall convene within 1 year a national assembly including representatives of the Federal Government, the States, and interested local public bodies and private groups and organizations. The assembly shall consider and make recommendations to the Commission on the most fitting and proper commemorative activities (sec. 3(b)).	Identical to Morse-Mathias bill (sec. 3(d)).
Report:	Commission shall make comprehensive report to Congress within 2 years (sec. 3(c)).	Commission shall make comprehensive report to the President within 2 years. President shall transmit report to Congress with his recommendations (sec. 3 (e), (f)).
Specific contents of report:	May recommend activities including publication of materials, bibliographical projects, conferences, convocations, lectures, seminars, development of libraries and exhibits, ceremonies and celebrations of specific events, programs focusing on the international significance of the American Revolution, and the issuance of commemorative coins, medals and stamps (sec. 3(c)).	Virtually identical to Morse-Mathias bill (sec. 3(e)).

Comparative Analysis of Morse-Mathias Bill and President's Draft Joint Resolution To Create an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission—Continued

	MORSE-MATHIAS BILL (H.R. 12252 AND H.R. 12260)	DRAFT RESOLUTION
	Commission shall include recommendations for allocation of financial and administrative authority, and for such legislation and administrative actions as deemed necessary (sec. 3(c)).	Identical to Morse-Mathias bill (sec. 3(f)). President, in transmitting report to Congress, shall recommend legislation and report on administrative actions he has taken.
Cooperation with the Commission:	Commission is authorized and directed to consult with, cooperate with, and seek advice and assistance from appropriate Federal departments and agencies, State and local public bodies, and learned societies and historical patriotic, philanthropic, civic, professional, and related organizations. Federal departments and agencies are authorized and requested to cooperate with the Commission (sec. 4(a)).	Identical to Morse-Mathias bill (sec. 4(a)).
	Specific projects: Secretary of the Interior is authorized to undertake further preservation and development of Revolutionary War historic sites and battlefields to insure that appropriate ceremonies and observances may be held at appropriate times during the bicentennial (sec. 4(b)).	Secretary of the Interior is authorized and requested to undertake a study of actions to preserve and develop historic sites and battlefields. His report shall be made to the Commission and included in the Commission's report to the President (sec. 4(b)).
	Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, and Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities are authorized and requested to cooperate especially in encouraging and coordinating scholarly works and presentations focusing on the history, culture and political thought of the period of the Revolution (sec. 4(c)).	No such provision.
	Librarian of Congress, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and Archivist of the United States are authorized and requested to cooperate, especially in developing and displaying collections and exhibits, and in developing and distributing bibliographies, catalogs, and other relevant materials (sec. 4(d)).	No such provision.
ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS:		
Property:	Commission may accept donations of money, property or personal services (sec. 5(a)).	Identical to Morse-Mathias bill (sec. 5(a)).
	Books, manuscripts, etc., donated to the Commission; may be deposited for preservation in National, State, or local libraries or museums or be otherwise disposed of by the Commission in consultation with the Librarian of Congress and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution (sec. 5(b)).	Identical to Morse-Mathias bill (sec. 5(b)). Commission shall also consult Administrator of the General Services Administration.
Expenses of Members:	Members shall serve without compensation, but shall be allowed necessary travel expenses and other necessary expenses without regard to the Travel Expense Act of 1949, etc. (sec. 6(a)).	Members shall serve without compensation, but shall be allowed necessary travel expenses as authorized for official travel and the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (sec. 6(a)).
Staff:	Commission may appoint and fix compensation of such personnel as deemed necessary, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 (sec. 6(b)).	Commission may appoint and fix compensation of such personnel as deemed necessary (sec. 6(b)).
	Commission may procure, without regard to the Classification Act, temporary and intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, at rates not to exceed $50 per diem (sec. 6(c)).	Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services as authorized by Section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 at rates not to exceed $100 per diem (sec. 6(c)).
Administrative services:	Shall be provided by the National Park Service, which shall keep complete records of expenditures and receipts (sec. 7(b),(c)).	Shall be provided by the Department of the Interior, whose regulations for the administrative control of funds shall apply (sec. 6(e)).
Procurement, etc.:	Commission may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property; make contracts; expend funds appropriated, donated, or received through contracts; and exercise powers necessary to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this act (sec. 7(a)).	Similar grant of powers, except that personnel, budgeting, and procurement services shall be provided by the Department of the Interior, and paid for by the Commission in advance or through reimbursement (sec. 6(e)).
Surplus property:	Any property remaining on the termination of the Commission may be used by the Secretary of the Interior, or disposed of as surplus property (sec. 7(d)).	Identical to Morse-Mathias bill (sec. 6(f)).

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MORSE-MATHIAS BILL AND PRESIDENT'S DRAFT JOINT RESOLUTION TO CREATE AN AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—Continued

	MORSE-MATHIAS BILL (H.R. 12252 AND H.R. 12260)	DRAFT RESOLUTION
Appropriations:	Authorizes the appropriation of such funds as may be necessary, except that not to exceed $200,000 is authorized for the first 24 months (sec. 8(a)).	Identical to Morse-Mathias bill (sec. 7(a)).
Termination date:		Commission shall terminate on December 31, 1983 (sec. 7(b)).

FREE SHIPMENT OF PARCELS TO GI'S IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written lately concerning the air of apathy and indifference to the problems of others, which seems to be all too prevalent in some of our larger urban areas. I believe therefore that it is most refreshing to witness a willingness on the part of many of our citizens to involve themselves in the problems of our times, and to extend themselves for others.

In my congressional district in Queens, N.Y., great efforts are being made by ordinary citizens to help our GI's in Vietnam. In response to a number of exhortations from the Long Island Press, citizens of every age, social group and political persuasion, have rallied together to collect books for our servicemen in Vietnam. By providing books to our men in uniform, these citizens perform a dual service: they enhance the end toward which our men may devote their leisure time, and they demonstrate to our men on the front lines that the people back home care about them and appreciate their sacrifices.

I believe that the leadership evidenced by the Long Island Press represents the highest order of responsible journalism, and the corresponding dedication of our citizens reflects the kind of civic-mindedness which should be commended and encouraged. I am delighted to join in these noble efforts, and shall tomorrow introduce legislation to provide for the free airmail transportation of these parcels.

I believe that those who donate, collect and wrap these books, and carry them to their local post offices perform a laudable service. I feel that the least the Federal Government can do is to absorb the $3 or $4 it costs to ship a package of books. My bill therefore, will provide that parcels weighing up to 10 pounds will be transported by air, at no cost to the sender, between the point of embarkation in the United States, and the Armed Forces post offices in Vietnam. In addition, the language of the bill is broad enough to cover any similar future situations in which U.S. forces are engaged in hostilities with any foreign force.

The cost of transporting these packages would be borne by the Department of Defense, which would reimburse the Post Office Department for the expenses which it incurs.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that this is the least we in the Congress can do for our men in Vietnam. And I am sure that they will know that this is not simply a Government program, but an American program—one which was privately initiated and one which will continue to depend for its success, on the spirit and concern of private American citizens.

SITUS PICKETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 13401, a situs picketing bill. My bill simply provides clarifying language to H.R. 10027 that has been reported by the Rules Committee. I strongly favor the general purpose of this legislation, which is to equalize the right of building trades unions with the right of industrial trades unions in picketing. Unfortunately, it now appears that the situs picketing bill as reported by the Rules Committee is being interpreted, by friend and foe alike, to do many things for which it was not originally intended.

In 1960, Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, and I wrote supplemental views in favor of the situs picketing bill then pending. In the supplemental views accompanying the committee report on H.R. 9070 in the 86th Congress my colleague, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN and I pointed out that that bill was "conceived and designed merely to eliminate a discrimination against the rights of union members in the building and construction industry." We also stated that we found no necessity for defining the exact limits of the term "construction industry"; that the proposal did not authorize activities by employees of an industrial plant to induce employees of contractors working on the plant to strike, and vice versa; that it was clear the proposed amendment did not permit activities for the purpose of boycotting supplies or other products or materials shipped or otherwise transported to and delivered on the site; that the proposal related to refusals to perform services at the site only; and that the *Moore Drydock Company*, 92 NLRB 547, rule should apply only where one of the employers, unlike employers in the construction industry working on a common site, is a neutral wholly unconcerned with the dispute.

My concept of the purpose of H.R. 9070 was, to a great extent, verified by the testimony of many of the proponents of a common situs picketing bill in their testimony on H.R. 6411 and similar bills before the Special Subcommittee on Labor during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Thus most of the Members of Congress who testified in favor of the bill cited, as an important reason for their support, the need for eliminating disparity of treatment between building trades unions and industrial unions—Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor, 89th Congress, 1st session, 1965 on H.R. 6411 and similar bills—common situs picketing, pages 5, 31, 32, 48, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 72. The Secretary of Labor voiced a similar view, page 5. In these hearings, emphasis was also placed on the idea that the bill would have no effect on production and maintenance employees at a factory site where building tradesmen are involved in a dispute while making alterations or repairs—see, for example, page 10—and assurances were given that the bill could not be used to further product boycotts—pages 11, 124, 138; see also, committee report, page 8.

While one finds these statements reassuring, the course of events since 1959, when our supplemental views on H.R. 9070 were written, raises grave doubt as to whether such statements provide adequate safeguards. Even a superficial review of the application of the 1959 Landrum-Griffin Act demonstrates that mere assurances are not enough. Only additional statutory language will afford proper protection.

One, if not the principal, reason for this conclusion is the well-documented history of the Board and the courts in refusing to accept the ordinary meaning of the statutory language which the Congress has enacted. To illustrate, the Board, with court approval, has interpreted the word "truthfully" in the proviso to 8(b)(7)(C) to mean "no intent to deceive," a meaning completely divorced from ordinary understanding—*Barker Bros.*, 138 NLRB 478, affirmed 328 F. 2d 431 (C.A. 9, 1964). The words "product or products produced by" in the publicity proviso of section 8(b)(4)(B) has been construed to make a television station a producer of the automobiles, bread, gasoline, and beer distributed by its advertisers. *Great Western Broadcasting Corp.* v. *NLRB* F. 2d (C.A. 9, 1966), and cases cited therein.

Board and court treatment of railroad employees under section 8(b)(4) provides another example. The 1959 amendments were clearly intended to close the loophole in the secondary boycott provisions by which such employees had been deprived of the act's protection. Yet, by permitting picketing of railroad premises located adjacent to a primary employer's plant, thereby involving the railroad directly in the union's dispute with the primary employer—*Steel Workers Local 5895—Carrier Corp.*—132 NLRB 127, affirmed 376

U.S. 492—the congressional intent was completely circumvented.

These and other examples show that, in technical areas of our labor laws, it is extremely difficult to convey to the Board and the courts what the Congress intends. Common words acquire uncommon meanings. Because legislative history has proven inadequate, it seems inescapable that, insofar as possible, precise meanings must be spelled out in the statute itself.

To meet this problem in the common situs picketing bill, the language attached should be added to H.R. 10027 as it now reads. Primary emphasis in the draft is on language which will equate the right of a building trades union at a construction site with the right of an industrial union at a manufacturer's plant. The technique adopted avoids changes in the current text of H.R. 10027 and, instead, adds a sentence delineating the construction to be given key phrases in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point information which clearly defines the purpose of each clause in my clarifying amendment:

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 13401

STATUTORY LANGUAGE	EXPLANATION
Strike the quotation mark in line 11, page 3, and add this sentence: "For the purpose of construing the third proviso of clause (B) of paragraph (4) only and notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—	H.R. 13401 has been introduced as a clarifying amendment to H.R. 10027. Therefore, the language of the latter bill has not been altered.
"(1) 'employers who are in the construction industry' shall mean only those employers whose principal activity is in such industry;	Proponents of H.R. 10027 emphasize that bill will not permit common situs activity where the issues in dispute involve a labor organization representing employees of an employer at the site who is not engaged primarily in the construction industry. The added language clarifies and makes more specific this intent and assures that a manufacturer, for example, at whose site construction, alteration, painting or repair is being carried on, will not be construed to be in the construction industry within the meaning of H.R. 10027.
"(2) labor disputes unlawful under this Act or in violation of an existing collective bargaining agreement shall include, but not be limited to— "(a) any attempt by a labor organization to require an employer to recognize or bargain— "(i) with another labor organization or	H.R. 10027 "is a limited bill precisely drawn to eliminate the inequity toward which it is directed" (committee report, p. 8). It is not intended to legalize activity otherwise unlawful under the act. Section 8(b)(7) forbids picketing, among other things, to force recognition or organization except when an election petition has been filed and then with severe limitations. However, H.R. 10027 might be construed to contradict this section and legalize unlawful activity by permitting a union, which is unable or unwilling to file an election petition, to picket a construction site to force recognition or organization. Thus, for example, the added language will preclude Union A from picketing or placing pressure on an employer whose employees it neither represents nor is interested in representing in order to require that employer to recognize or bargain with Union B. It would not prevent Union B from picketing the entire construction project in order to obtain recognition itself. In other words, the Lathers Union, for example, would be prevented from picketing the common site in order to force organization of the roofing contractor, but the Roofers Union would be allowed to picket for recognition or organizational purposes within the restrictions of section 8(b)(7). Without such language the Lathers, because their purpose is neither recognition nor organization, would not be covered by section 8(b)(7) and would therefore have a broader right to apply economic pressure than the Roofers who have a more direct interest in the work being performed.
"(ii) with any labor organization if another labor organization is lawfully recognized as the representative of his employees, or	Section 8(b)(7) also makes unlawful picketing for recognition or organization, for example, where another labor organization is the lawfully recognized representative of the employees involved. Thus an incumbent industrial union at a manufacturer's plant cannot picket the manufacturer in order to force the manufacturer to recognize it as the representative of employees within the plant already represented by another union—e.g., a craft union. It can picket in support of a dispute in the bargaining unit which it represents. Activity otherwise unlawful under the act would be made legal, therefore, if picketing is permitted at a common site in order to eliminate from that site a bargaining unit of employees who already have a lawfully recognized bargaining agent. The added language makes clear this result is not intended, but does assure equality of treatment between industrial unions and the building trades. Moreover, this subparagraph and subparagraph (i) also make clear that so-called "area standards" picketing may not be used as a subterfuge to disguise the real purpose of the picketing. As a result, common situs picketing will not be available to eliminate from the construction site labor organizations such as U.M.W. District 50, or successful bidders such as those who have been chosen under statutory procedures on the basis of competitive bids over which other contractors at the site have no control.

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 13401—Continued

STATUTORY LANGUAGE	EXPLANATION
"(iii) with a labor organization which denies membership on the ground of race, creed, color, or national origin.	Although not stated in the committee report, it is clearly the intent of the proponents of H.R. 10027 that common situs picketing will not be used to further racial discrimination within the building trades unions. Recent events in St. Louis area and other publicity given the policy of certain local building trades unions to exclude applicants for membership on the basis of race make it imperative that language be added which will preclude use of common situs picketing for such purposes.
"(b) any dispute which is a breach of or interferes with any existing collective bargaining agreement between any employer and the labor organization representing its employees at the construction site or for which a remedy is available under procedures set forth in such agreement or in any other applicable agreement;	A strike in violation of a collective bargaining agreement is unprotected, *NLRB* v. *Sands Mfg. Co.*, 306 U.S. 332, 4 LRRM 530, as is a strike to force a breach of collective bargaining agreement covering other employees of the same employer [section 8(b)(4)(D) of the act]. Employees at an industrial plant, for example, may be disciplined or discharged for violating a no-strike clause. Consequently, the added language places the building trades unions in a similar position to that of their industrial union counterparts by not permitting strikes which would cause employees to violate a no-strike clause or to cause others to do so. In addition to contractual remedies, there may be other disputes settlement procedures available, e.g., the National Joint Board for the Settlement of Jurisdictional Disputes, procedures set up by the Missile Sites Labor Commission, no-raid pacts of the AFL–CIO. Where these are available, it would contravene the policy of the entire act as well as specific provisions such as section 8(b)(4)(D) to extend the power to exert economic pressure.
"(c) any attempt by a labor organization to force or require any employer to cease or refrain from handling, installing, using, or permitting use of a product or products produced by any other employer regardless of whether such product or products have previously been produced at a construction site;	Proponents of H.R. 10027 have consistently pointed out that the bill would not permit activities intended to cause the boycotting of supplies or other products or materials shipped or otherwise transported to or delivered on a job site. Activities with such objects in view are commonly referred to as product boycotts. They generally have as their specific purposes (1) either the boycotting of products produced by a manufacturer with which a union has a labor dispute (see *The Burt Manufacturing Company*, 127 NLRB 1629), or (2) the boycotting of products produced by nonunion members or not bearing a union label (see *Cardinal Industries, Inc.*, 136 NLRB 977, 989), or (3) under the alleged justification of so-called unit work protection or work preservation, the boycotting of prefabricated, or other technologically improved, products (see *Woodwork Manufacturers Association*, 149 NLRB 646; *American Boiler Manufacturers Association*, 154 NLRB Nos. 11 and 12). The added language serves to clarify the scope of the amendment by making it clear that activities intended to cause, or in support of, product boycotts of the kinds enumerated would not be permitted.
"(3) 'An employer at the site who is not engaged primarily in the construction industry' shall include, but not be limited to "(a) the owner, lessor, lessee, or user of the premises at which the construction, alteration, painting, or repair in question is being performed, and "(b) any employer performing work at such premises related to the normal operations of the business located thereat."	This provision supplements (1) above and strengthens the distinction between construction employers at the common situs and others doing business there which are not directly involved in the construction work.

LIBRARY SERVICES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act.

The public library program has been one of the most successful and most popular ever passed by the Congress and I am proud to have had the opportunity of being a part in its development. Nationwide progress toward good public library service for all persons has continued at an increasing rate since this program began in fiscal year 1957.

Rhode Island libraries have made great gains. We have a new State library law that provides State grants to match the Federal appropriation. These funds are then added to local money to upgrade all libraries throughout the State. State funds available under the rural Library Services Act in Rhode Island rose from $48,000 in fiscal year 1958 to $58,713 in 1964. Then in fiscal year 1965, under the expanded Library Services and Construction Act, State funds jumped to $364,000. To maintain this momentum it is essential that the Library Services and Construction Act be enlarged and extended.

Title I of my bill will permit continued progress in the development of good public library services. Title II will allow the States to continue the construction of new public libraries. In 1965 and 1966 an estimated 700 public library construction projects were receiving assistance from the present act. The extension of the program and the increase in the authorizations will help replace the thousands of obsolete and dilapidated public libraries still in existence.

In addition to preserving this much needed continuity in the present program, this bill provides for the further extension of library services in four essential areas. The first of these new areas is interlibrary cooperation. Title III recognizes the essential unity of libraries of all kinds by providing funds to help establish and maintain cooperative networks of libraries. This means that school, academic, special, and public libraries can make maximum effective use of all their resources and service in meeting the needs of their users.

A special survey, "Library Cooperation" conducted by Brown University in 1963 recommended this pattern of university-school-community library coordination in the State of Rhode Island. Funds under title III will allow prompt and efficient implementation of these recommendations and help assure the greatest possible return on the money invested in libraries of all types.

Every State and Territory can take immediate advantage of title III by developing plans for similar cooperative networks. Rhode Island is small enough to profit from a statewide system with appropriate interstate arrangements for special purposes. Other States will be able to develop interlocal or regional networks to give full service to all residents of a given district or area.

The second new feature to be included in this bill is contained in part A of title IV. This part will provide special assistance for the first time to State institutional libraries. From coast to coast our institutional libraries are a case study in poverty and neglect.

In most areas of the country, books and library services for patients and inmates of State hospitals and institutions are nonexistent. Part A of this title will enable States to begin providing library services to those persons confined to State operated penal institutions, reformatories, hospitals, and orphanages. Libraries in special residential treatment facilities operated by the State, such as hospitals for the handicapped, the aged, or mentally ill, would also be eligible for participation in this part. The exclusions would be those day-care centers or institutions of higher education which are eligible under various other Federal programs.

The basic purpose of this part is to extend the benefits of public library service to those persons who are unable, because of their institutional confinement, to use regular community library facilities. The responsibility for such service has long been clearly recognized as resting with State library agencies, but lack of funds has prevented the satisfactory meeting of this need.

The third new feature of this bill is continued in part B of title IV. This part will provide Federal assistance for the first time to those libraries serving the various agencies and departments of State government.

The conditions of our social structure which make quick access to reliable information essential to students and citizens are even more vital with respect to governmental officials. This part will assist States in providing books and other library materials to those agencies and departments of State government which require accurate and specialized information. Legislative reference and research services, State law libraries, archival and historical library services would be eligible for participation as would other specialized professional or research library operations performed at the State level. Funds under this part would be made available on a 50-50 matching basis and neither the Federal grant nor the matching funds could be substituted for funds previously available for the same purposes.

The "information explosion" and the rapid rate of change in our political and social life are combining to create tremendous pressure on all libraries and other communication facilities. At the Federal level, large libraries are just beginning to adopt automated information storage and retrieval techniques in order to handle the load. This part will help States keep up with both the increased demands on their resources, and with the latest and best means of controlling and processing the information itself.

Part C of title IV is the fourth new feature of this bill. Under existing legislation library services through the Library of Congress are provided for the blind. Under this bill these services will be expanded to the near blind and visually handicapped and also to those physically handicapped readers who are now unable to read or use conventional printed materials as a result of physical limitations.

In Rhode Island, these funds will be used to carry out existing recommendations as published in the Brown University study. These include the following services:

First. To collect, organize, maintain, and make available all official Rhode Island documents issued by State, city, and town governments and to serve as the archives of the State.

Second. To collect, organize, maintain, and make available those official bills, laws, and documents of other States, of the Federal Government, and of foreign governments as are required for legislative reference and research services.

Third. To administer a statewide system of depository libraries for Rhode Island documents.

Fourth. To advise and assist other departments within the State government on their requirements for library materials and for library-related services.

Mr. Speaker, I have used Rhode Island as a point of emphasis simply because I am more familiar with its libraries. The bill I have today introduced would have like application to each of our States and to the country as a whole. It brings closer to fruition that ideal of bringing to bear every library resource for the benefit of every user.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORICAL BUILDINGS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, America is continuing its drive toward the Great Society. Progress is apparent all around us. Vast areas of social progress are being cleared, and our citizens can rightfully expect further social and economic progress.

However, Mr. Speaker, we must not lose sight of the fact that our great Nation is a land of tradition and heritage as well as of progress. Progress should not be permitted to damage or destroy the aspects of American life which reflect its growth from a young nation to that of the acknowledged world leader.

Unfortunately, all too often today historic sites and buildings with archeological, architectural, or historic significance are lost to future generations of Americans under the guise of progress. In my own city, the wreckers' hammer will soon destroy a landmark known the world over. After a long and glorious history, the Metropolitan Opera Co. will leave its grand old home for a new shiny stage in Lincoln Center. The destruction of this fine establishment which has echoed the voices of the world's greatest singers is symbolic of a trend which we see too frequently.

I am today introducing a bill declaring it a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites and objects of national significance and buildings having archeological, architectural, or historic significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States. It will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and restore properties of historical significance and also to make matched grants to appropriate local entities to assist in acquiring and restoring such properties in their respective areas.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place the bill in the Record at this time:

H.R. 13601

A bill to amend the Act of August 21, 1935, in order to establish a grant-in-aid program for the preservation of buildings having archaeological, architectural, or historical significance

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461), is amended to read as follows: "That it is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites and objects of national significance and buildings having archaeological, architectural, or historic significance, for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States."

Sec. 2. Subsection (f) of section 2 of the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 462(f)), is amended to read as follows:

"(f)(1) Acquire, restore, reconstruct, rehabilitate, preserve, and maintain historic or prehistoric sites, objects, and properties of national historical or archaeological significance and where deemed desirable establish and maintain museums in connection therewith.

"(2) Acquire, restore, reconstruct, rehabilitate public or private buildings having archaeological, architectural, or historic significance, and in the case of such buildings acquired by the United States, maintain such buildings and where deemed desirable establish and maintain museums in connection therewith."

Sec. 3. Section 3 of the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 463), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) A general advisory board to be known as the 'Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments' is hereby established, to be composed of not to exceed eleven persons, citizens of the United States, to include representatives competent in the fields of history, archeology, architecture, and human geography, who shall be appointed by the President and serve at his pleasure. The members of such board shall receive no salary but may be paid expenses incidental to travel when engaged in discharging their duties as such members.

"(b) The board shall advise on any matters relating to national parks and to the administration of this Act submitted to it for consideration by the Secretary and shall make recommendations with respect to applications for grants for acquisition, restoration, reconstruction, or rehabilitation of buildings submitted under the provisions of section 5 of this Act. It may also recommend policies to the Secretary from time to time pertaining to national parks and to the acquisition, restoration, reconstruction, conservation, and general administration of historic and archaeologic sites, buildings, and properties."

Sec. 4. The Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-462) is further amended by redesignating sections 5, 6, and 7 as sections 6, 7, and 8, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 4 thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as the Congress may determine to enable the Secretary to make grants for the acquisition, restoration, reconstruction, or rehabilitation of public or private buildings in the several States and the District of Columbia which have archaeological, architectural, or historical significance.

"(b) Any State, the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision of a State which determines that a public or private building within its jurisdiction has archaeological, architectural, or historical significance and (1) should be acquired by such State, District, or subdivision, or (2) is in need of acquisition, restoration, reconstruction, or rehabilitation may make application to the Secretary for a grant under this section for the acquisition, restoration, reconstruction, or rehabilitation of such building.

(c) Each application for a grant under this section must set forth—

"(1) a description of the building with respect to which such application is made, and the reasons why such building is deemed to have archaeological, architectural, or historical significance;

"(2) the name or names of the entity or entities having title to such building; and

"(3) the amount of the grant requested to carry out the acquisition, restoration, reconstruction, or rehabilitation of such building;

"(4) assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that—

"(A) adequate financial support will be available for the completion of the project of acquisition, restoration, reconstruction, or rehabilitation and for the maintenance of such building after such completion;

"(B) the archaeological, architectural, or historical significance will be available for the study, inspiration, and benefit of the people of the United States; and

"(C) Reasonable assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on the project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar work in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a-5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this subparagraph the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(d) For each project for the acquisition, restoration, reconstruction, or rehabilitation of a public or private building having archaeological, architectural, or historical significance with respect to which an application complying with subsection (c) is filed which is approved by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments and by the Secretary, the Secretary may make a grant of not to exceed one-half of the reasonable cost of carrying out such project (as determined by the Secretary).

"(e) Any grant under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement in such installments as the Secretary may determine."

PLEA OF OUR PETS: "PLEASE HELP US"

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have been happy to introduce a bill designed to eliminate the very cruel crime of theft of pet cats and dogs by unscrupulous individuals who then sell them for research use.

The bill I have introduced would deal with this problem by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to license legitimate dealers and research facilities and prescribe standards to govern the handling and transportation of these animals to promote their health, well-being, and safety. Violation of the act would be punishable by a maximum $10,000 fine or imprisonment for up to a year.

There is growing awareness and concern about the nationwide scope of this heartless crime. All crime is abhorrent to us. But this is a particularly cruel and tragic type, for all too often the stolen dogs and cats are the sole companions of lonely aged people or children's beloved pets.

I have had indication of considerable support for this legislation from people of the 10th District. Of all the interest expressed, however, none has been more eloquent than that of the children in the grade 2A class taught by Mrs. Alma G. Reveal at the Linden Avenue School in Glen Ridge, N.J.

On behalf of the entire class, young Billy Elder wrote to me as follows:

> A story in Life magazine makes us very sad. We love our pets. They are our pals. We are kind to all animal friends. We do not understand how grownup people can be so mean to steal pets and starve them and make them suffer. Please, Mr. Rodino, help animals. Make laws to punish people who are unkind to animals. We wrote to tell you what animals would say if they could talk. Yours faithfully, grade 2A, Linden Avenue School, Glen Ridge.

I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that it were possible to reproduce pictures and photographs in the Record. For accompanying Billy's letter was a poignant drawing by Patty McIntire, age 7, of a sad brown cat and an unhappy long-eared dog behind cage bars. It is titled, simply, "Please Help Us."

The pets of our country could have no better spokesman. For this simple, touching letter and drawing go more to the heart of the problem than pages of expert testimony ever could. As a civilized society with compassion for all living creatures, we should wipe out this distressing crime. I am heartened that the committee has held hearings on this legislation, and I strongly urge early action.

While predatory mammals are certainly not family pets, the same plea, "Please Help Us," applies to their plight. I have also introduced a measure to establish a national policy for conservation of wild predatory animals such as wolves and coyotes. For too long there has been much indiscriminate and unnecessary destruction of these valuable and interesting wildlife species. They have a vital role in nature and it is time to act now to preserve these dwindling wildlife resources before man thoughtlessly renders them extinct. I hope the committee will consider this legislation soon.

PFC. HIRAM D. STRICKLAND

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on two different occasions in recent weeks, I asked permission to insert correspondence in the Record concerning the death of a young soldier in Vietnam and the manner in which his parents were notified of his death.

At this time, I would like to add another chapter to this story—the tale of a brave and forthright young American, who gave his life proudly as a soldier of the United States of America.

Along with his personal possessions sent to his bereaved family was a handwritten note, which eloquently expresses his dedication to country and to cause. I wish there were some way his letter could be read in every public demonstration of anti-involvement in Asia. In his own words, this brave young man, Butch Strickland, set what could be an example for all of us when he said "for I'm happy I died fighting my country's enemies, and I'll live forever in people's minds." He will live forever in the minds of all who love and honor freedom, our dearest possession.

I would like at this point to have the story of this brave young man and his last letter printed in the Record. It was first printed in his hometown newspaper, the Burlington, N.C., Daily Times-News on March 8.

The article follows:

PARENTS IN GRAHAM RECEIVE A DELAYED LETTER FROM PRIVATE FIRST CLASS STRICKLAND—LOVE OF COUNTRY, SUPPORT OF VIETNAM CAUSE IS EXPRESSED PRIOR TO DEATH

Graham.—"He must have known that he was going to die. That's why he wrote the letter, I suppose."

Mrs. Donald A. Strickland of Route 2, Graham, was thinking many thoughts today as she read and reread a letter she received yesterday from her 20-year-old son, a letter written prior to his death in Vietnam February 1.

Her son, Pfc. Hiram D. Strickland, wrote his letter by pen on notebook paper, and it was found in his personal belongings that were forwarded to the parents.

His letter began:

"I'm writing this letter as my last one. You've probably aready received word that I'm dead and that the Government wishes to express its deepest regret * * * Believe me, I didn't want to die, but I know that it was a part of my job. I want my country to live for billions and billions of years to come. I want it to stand as a light to all people oppressed, and guide them to the same freedom we know. If we can stand and fight for freedom, then I think we have done the job God set down for us. It's up to every

American to fight for the freedom we hold so dear. If we don't, the smell of free air could become dark and damp as in a prison cell.

"We won't be able to look at ourselves in a mirror, much less at our sons and daughters, because we know we have failed our God, country, and our future generations."

LETTER UNDATED

The letter was undated. His mother feels that he wrote it and left it in his pad, knowing it would be delivered.

Lt. Col. Harry O. Amos, commanding officer of the artillery battalion of which Private First Class Strickland was assigned, told the parents:

"The enclosed pad of stationery with the undated letter to you still intact was found among your son's personal effects. Because of its highly personal nature, I held it until I could talk to the sergeant who was with your son at the time he was killed.

"Having talked with him, I am now convinced that the letter was in fact written by your son prior to his death.

"What he wrote showed an unusual dedication to all that Americans hold dear and a maturity of purpose unusual in a man of his age. Your great sense of loss should be more than equaled by a deep sense of pride."

LETTER RELEASED

Mrs. Strickland today said that she was reluctant to release the letter, but she felt that what her son expressed about Vietnam and his country might tend to reduce the attention which some might get when they oppose the Nation's fight against communism.

The son's letter continued:

"I can hold my head high because I fought, whether it be in Heaven or hell. Besides, the saying goes: 'One more GI from Vietnam, St. Peter, I've served my time in hell.'

"I fought for Sandy, Nell, Gale (his sisters), Mom and Dad. But when the twins and Sandy's kids get old enough, they'll probably have to fight, too. Tell them to go proudly and without fear of death, because it is worth keeping the land free.

"I remember a story from Mr. Williams' (Thomas Williams, a teacher at Southern High School) English classes when I was a freshman. It said: The cowards die a thousand times, the brave die but once.'

"Don't mourn me, Mother, for I'm happy I died fighting my country's enemies, and I'll live forever in peoples' minds. I've done what I always dreamed of. Don't mourn me, for I died a soldier of the United States of America.

"God bless you all and take care. I'll be seeing you in Heaven.

"Your loving son and brother, Butch."

Mr. and Mrs. Strickland were informed of their son's death on the night of February 2. Their experience of being informed by telegram delivered by a taxi driver also has led to a change of policy by the Department of Defense, as presented in Congress by Representative Horace R. Kornegay of the Sixth District.

SPEED INSTALLATION OF UNDERGROUND TRANSMISSION LINES

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am very gratified that my distinguished colleague from across the aisle, Mr. Widnall has introduced legislation (H.R. 13490 and H.R. 13505) designed to speed the underground installation of high-voltage transmission lines.

When I introduced similar legislation last August, I warned that the destructive influence of these overhead transmission lines was spreading. I said that it deserved the attention of all legislators because no State, no town, no village would be safe from defacement and devaluation as our electrical industry expands to meet the needs of our growing Nation. Too frequently the utilities measure only their own construction costs and fail to consider the total cost to the communities from devaluation and defacement of large tracts of land that results from overhead lines.

Now the problem has touched New Jersey and my distinguished colleague from that great State is to be complimented for his swift and affirmative action.

I have discussed this problem and the legislation with the gentleman from New Jersey with whom I have frequently enjoyed collaborating on the Banking and Currency Committee of which he is ranking minority member. I am pleased to say that his proposals include several interesting and constructive modifications which have been suggested since I introduced the original bill. I welcome this kind of creative help and look forward to early hearings on the legislation so that we can act now while there is still time.

The President expressed the need for action in his message earlier in this session on natural beauty. He endorsed this kind of legislation when he reluctantly signed the bill asserting the AEC's legal supremacy over State and local ordinances in Woodside, Calif. Now is the time for us to act on these recommendations and on this great need.

A BILL TO SPEED ACTION FOR THE HUDSON RIVER

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, On Thursday, March 10, 32 other Members of the House joined me in introducing new legislation to further negotiations on an interstate compact between New York, New Jersey, and the United States for the development, preservation, and rehabilitation of the Hudson River.

In deference to the passing of our distinguished colleague from California, Mr. Baldwin, I postponed my remarks regarding this legislation until today.

The primary purpose of my bill (H.R. 13508) is to authorize the Secretary of Interior to enter into formal negotiations with Governors Rockefeller, of New York and Hughes, of New Jersey, to draw up a mutually acceptable and effective interstate compact under which the resources of the Hudson River can be fully developed and restored.

This puts a Federal stamp of approval on the efforts to negotiate an effective compact along the lines proposed by Governor Rockefeller and Laurance Rockefeller, chairman of the Hudson River Valley Commission.

While negotiations are being pursued to create an effective compact establishing a permanent commission to review riverway projects, it is important that Federal agencies not be permitted to take actions that would prejudice the actions of such a commission.

Accordingly, the measure would authorize the Secretary to take certain necessary steps to limit Federal—and only Federal—activities that would adversely affect the riverway while the compact negotiations are going on.

AFFECTS FEDERAL ACTION ONLY

When enacted, this bill will not affect any State, local, or private actions on the riverway. It will not bar industrial development. In proposing the formation of a compact, Governor Rockefeller promised State legislation that would review State, local, and private activity on the riverway. Accordingly, we have left that role entirely to the State.

The measure only affects four Federal agencies directly. It bars the FPC from issuing any licenses along the riverway until a compact is formed or for a maximum of 3 years. It requires that the Bureau of Public Roads, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Corps of Engineers must submit to the Secretary of Interior any projects they have affecting the resources of the riverway for the same period. Other Federal agencies merely are instructed to cooperate with the Secretary.

It should be stressed that the bill places no limitations on urban renewal or any other Federal-aid activity.

ENCOURAGES INDUSTRY

Let me also stress that I and all who introduced this legislation feel strongly that there should be real encouragement of industrial and commercial activity along the river.

In fact, the measure lays down standards for the Secretary in his negotiations and the very first is:

> The need to encourage all beneficial uses of the land and waters of the Hudson riverway, including, but not limited to, commercial, industrial, and other economic development.

The second standard is:

> The need to encourage and support local and State autonomy and initiative in planning and action to develop, preserve, and restore the land and waters of the Hudson riverway.

Certainly, this is susceptible of no misunderstanding. Anyone who says that the bill bars industrial development is patently incorrect.

NEW JERSEY SUPPORT

I have discussed this legislation with Governor Hughes, of New Jersey, and I am happy to report that he and the five distinguished gentlemen from New Jersey, who have joined in bipartisan support of the measure, have played a particularly constructive role in our Hudson efforts.

A great deal has happened in the 15 months since I first introduced legislation to protect and develop the priceless resources of the Hudson riverway. Up to that time, the Hudson justly merited the title it was later given in the CBS–TV documentary—"The Forgotten River." Federal, State, and local governments had turned their faces from its plight. The magnificent gorge and highlands, which Baedecker once called "more beautiful than the Rhine," had for 80 years been stripped and pillaged by thoughtless and selfish private interests. The waterfronts of our Hudson River towns had been allowed to slip into decay and blight. Municipal and industrial wastes were poured into the river turning its stream into an open sewer of indescribable filth.

Those entrusted with responsibility, allowed these shameful conditions to accumulate and took no action.

I wish that I could say all this has changed in the 15 months since I introduced the original Hudson bill. Of course, it has not, but there has been tremendous progress.

There was, and continues to be, an unparalleled and unflagging flood of support for my Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway bill.

Forty-one Congressmen from 14 States, including a bipartisan majority of the New York congressional delegation, introduced similar bills. Three distinguished Senators, ROBERT F. KENNEDY and JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey, introduced companion bills. Significantly, all but one of the Congressmen representing Hudson River districts affected by the proposed legislation supported the bill.

LOCAL SUPPORT GROWS

Along the riverway, towns and villages turned out in almost unanimous support. In hearings held on the bill by the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, in Putnam and Westchester Counties last summer, more than 411 people asked to testify and of the approximately 240 represented in the hearings, only 9 individuals opposed the bill in any way.

More heartening still, the towns and villages began to act upon this new enthusiasm and proposed local actions within their jurisdiction to do something about the river's deplorable condition. The cities of Yonkers and Peekskill, and the communities of Hastings, Dobbs Ferry, Irvington, Tarrytown, and Cold Spring proposed waterfront development plans to wipe away the blight and create new public recreation facilities. Individuals have come forth with offers of land to be set aside for public use and enjoyment along the river.

In short, the citizens of the Hudson Valley have demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt their sincerity and their earnest desire to restore and preserve the Hudson and its shores. But there is little they can do without the help of the State and Federal Government. The problem is too great, the opposed interests too powerful.

INTERSTATE COMPACT PROPOSED

When I introduced the Hudson bill, the State reacted quickly and, I regret to say, negatively. Governor Rockefeller opposed it as a "Federal takeover" and asked for time for the State to come up with its own plan and program. Federal action was stalled while he formed a commission to study the river and come forward with a program.

Based on the report of this commission, the Governor, fortunately and, I think, wisely, reversed his position, acknowledged that Federal participation was necessary and propesed the formation of an interstate compact to plan for the development, preservation and rehabilitation of the Hudson.

I have only praise for the Governor for his courage and his willingness to admit the need for Federal help. While I have always had reservations as to whether an effective interstate compact can be devised for the Hudson, I am willing to give the Governor my full support. The resources of the Hudson are too valuable and their danger is too great for us to lose time quibbling about the method of protecting and developing them.

The Governor has promised to come forward with effective State legislation to protect the Hudson from actions by State agencies and private interests that would further destroy the river's precious resources and to promote the development and beneficial use of the riverway.

We must give him the time and support needed to formulate this State program and work out an effective interstate compact, and that is one intention of my present bill.

SECRETARY LEADS

The Secretary of the Interior is the logical person to act for the Federal Government in the compact negotiations. He has exercised great leadership in conserving the resources of this Nation. He has played a pivotal role in the formation of our most effective interstate compacts and has worked closely and successfully with the Rockefellers on conservation projects in other States and territories of our Nation. In fact, he has already been working informally with the Rockefellers on this very problem for at least the past few weeks.

Furthermore, the President has selected the Secretary to head this administration's attack on our polluted rivers through the Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966. The principal mechanism selected by the President is the commission or other authority to plan for comprehensive river basin development and he is reported to have selected the Hudson as one of his first targets for action. The legislation that I and my colleagues have introduced is wholly consistent with this and it will give the Secretary the tools with which he can get started.

In addition, the Secretary is familiar with the problems of the Hudson, having headed a study of the riverway in connection with my bill. He has played an important role in helping to solve a few of the major problems we face along the river, for example, he opposed both the Hudson River Expressway and the controversial Storm King pumped storage proposal.

FEDERAL PROTECTIONS NEEDED

The interim protections provided in the bill are minimal, but they would restrain Federal action on two major threats to the riverway until such time as the permanent compact commission could be set up. With respect to the expressway, the public works department of the State of New York last year proposed the construction of a commercial superhighway along the Hudson which would effectively bar public access to the river from Beacon to the Bronx. This has been opposed by every town and village, and, in fact, the State senate has repealed the authorization for one section of the expressway and the New York legislature now has legislation under consideration repealing the entire authorization.

My bill will guarantee to the Secretary of Interior the authority regarding the expressway that he requested from the Secretary of Commerce in his letter of June 17, 1965, when he said:

> I would appreciate very much an opportunity to review the plans for this road with your people prior to the allocation of any Federal funds for its construction.

The Secretary of Commerce in a letter to me on October 8, 1965, indicated his concern about this project and his desire to find a way to cooperate.

With respect to the other major existing threat to the riverway, my measure will lift, for a period of 3 years, the power of the FPC to issue any license that will further damage the river and its shores.

BARS HASTY ACTION

This provision is aimed specifically at preventing repetition of the FPC's hasty and ill-advised action, subsequently reversed by the U.S. court of appeals, regarding the controversial pumped storage project at Storm King Mountain which aroused national opposition. It will also help to avoid similar hasty actions regarding other pumped storage sites already threatened along the river.

Now that Governor Rockefeller has joined the Secretary of the Interior in supporting a search for feasible alternatives to the Storm King project, my bill supports the State's position as well.

There should be no misunderstanding about this provision of my bill. It does not block Consolidated Edison from building a pumped storage plant at Storm King Mountain. It provides time during which the Congress, the State of New York, and all the other interests can work out what is best for the Hudson and what is the best way to meet the power needs of New York.

SUPPORTS COURT RULING

That such a moratorium is necessary is now beyond dispute. The court of appeals decision revoking the earlier license and remanding the case for further

FPC hearings substantiated the claims that I and many others made last year that the project was not receiving full and fair consideration. The court found that, after 3 years of hearings by the FPC:

> The record as it comes to us fails markedly to make out a case for the Storm King project on, among other matters, costs, public convenience, and necessity, and the absence of reasonable alternatives.

Suspension of the FPC's authority until a compact commission is established, will allow time for this project to be weighed fairly and in the absence of untoward pressures.

I think it highly unlikely that the studies required by the court's order can be completed within the next 3 years.

One final provision of my bill requires that the Secretary of the Army and the Atomic Energy Commission obtain approval of the Secretary of the Interior for any new projects under their jurisdiction along the Hudson River.

PRESIDENT MAY WAIVE RULE

This is not an attempt to block any known project by these important agencies. It merely assures that any projects under their control are coordinated with the Secretary and are designed in such a way that they will enhance the river and its shores.

The Atomic Energy Commission is now considering an application by Con Edison to expand its nuclear energy plant at Buchanan, N.Y. I am informed that it will soon be considering another application to build a new atomic plant in New York City. From the facts now available, I believe that both of these projects deserve support. But I would remind the House that the Atomic Energy Commission does not claim the authority that the FPC claims regarding the need to show that their projects enhance natural resources and, also, that the AEC felt it had no jurisdiction to consider the problem of massive fish kill in the Hudson resulting from the Indian Point plant at Buchanan. Since the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act has proved ineffective in protecting these natural resources, there can be no objection to subjecting AEC plans to Interior Department review until the Congress and the State have a chance to set up a permanent authority to coordinate such projects and protect the resources of the river.

In the event that some unforeseen project of great national importance should come to light while this interim legislation is in effect, I have provided that the President by Executive order, may waive all or any of the limited restrictions in section 6 of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the job of shaping an effective and mutually acceptable compact is a difficult and delicate task that will require the utmost skill and diplomacy. The negotiations cannot be carried on successfully in an atmosphere of pressure and contention.

If we are to be successful, we must have time; we must have full support from every quarter.

My bill would give the time and support that is needed and the assurance that no further "rape of the Hudson"—as the Secretary described the Storm King project—can be licensed by the Federal Government until a permanent mechanism is adopted.

The Secretary of the Interior has assured me that he will take responsibility for overcoming the many potential problems that must be faced in forming an effective compact. I do not intend to relax my efforts, but I am content to accept the assurances of the Governors and the Secretary that they will work toward an effective compact that we can all support wholeheartedly.

I am pleased to say that the Secretary has also informed me that he feels that a compact can be perfected and enacted this year. My bill will unquestionably help and support him in this effort, but should his predictions prove to sanguine, then it also will provide protection while the negotiations continue.

Mr. Speaker, the State has recognized the need for cooperative action by the State and Federal Governments and has called for help along the Hudson. The Secretary of the Interior has volunteered to carry on this delicate negotiation. The people of the Hudson have asked for action. How can we fail to act?

H.R. 13508

Mr. **KREBS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **OTTINGER**. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 10, 32 distinguished Members of the House, and Senators Robert F. Kennedy, of New York, and Harrison A. Williams, of New Jersey, joined me in introducing the following bill:

A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the Hudson River and its shores are a resource of immense economic, natural, scenic, and recreation value to all the citizens of the United States; that the States of New York and New Jersey (hereinafter referred to as the "States") are now working toward a joint program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and have requested the aid and participation of the Federal Government; and that it is in the best interests of the citizens of the United States that the Federal Government lend all possible aid and assistance to the States, their political subdivisions and agencies in developing legislative proposals for cooperative action to assure the development, preservation, and restoration of the resources of the Hudson River and its shores.

Sec. 2. As used in this Act, the term—

(a) "The Hudson River" means the Hudson River from mouth to source, including tributaries, related waterways and New York Harbor.

(b) "The Hudson Riverway" means the Hudson River and its shores comprising all lands within eye view of any part of the Hudson River.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is directed to cooperate with the Governors of the States of New York and New Jersey in preparing and proposing a program of legislative action for the States and Congress, and to submit to Congress and the States at the earliest possible time, but no later than March 1, 1967, recommendations regarding legislation necessary and desirable to achieve the development, preservation, and restoration of all the resources of the Hudson Riverway.

Sec. 4. Where necessary and desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to represent the United States in negotiations with the States regarding proposals for legislation to protect and develop the resources of the Hudson Riverway and shall make a report to the President and the Congress regarding the proceedings and any agreements entered into as a result of any such negotiations.

Sec. 5. In making recommendations as required in this Act, the Secretary shall be guided by, but not limited to, the following considerations:

(a) the need to encourage all beneficial uses of the lands and waters of the Hudson Riverway including, but not limited to, commercial, industrial, and other economic development consistent with the preservation and rehabilitation of the natural, scenic, historical, and recreation resources of the Hudson Riverway.

(b) the need to encourage and support local and State autonomy and initiative in planning and action to develop, preserve, and restore the land and waters of the Hudson Riverway, insofar as such planning and action is consistent with comprehensive development, preservation, and restoration of the natural, scenic, historic, and recreation resources of the Hudson Riverway;

(c) the need to abate water pollution, protect clean water, and develop the water resources of the Hudson Riverway for beneficial use;

(d) the need to preserve, enhance, and rehabilitate the scenic beauty of the Hudson Riverway;

(e) the need to preserve, enhance, and develop archeological and historic sites, shrines, or structures along the Hudson Riverway; and

(f) the need to protect and enhance the fish and wildlife and other natural resources of the Hudson Riverway.

Sec. 6. (a) In order to avoid any decision or action by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States which could unfavorably affect or alter the resources of the Hudson Riverway until such time as the States and the Congress shall have had an opportunity to receive the Secretary's recommendations and act:

(1) For a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act, all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States shall inform the Secretary of any plans, programs, projects, grants, licenses, or applications for licenses under their jurisdiction within or affecting the Hudson Riverway and in order to carry out the provisions set forth in section 5, shall cooperate with the Secretary's recommendations regarding such plans.

(2) For a period of three years following the date of enactment of this Act—

(i) the Secretary of Commerce shall not approve for the purposes of sections 106 and 117 or any other sections of title 23 of the

United States Code, any survey, plan, specification, or estimate for the inclusion in any Federal-aid highway system of any highway in the States which would be located within one mile of the mean high water line of the navigable portion of the Hudson River without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

(ii) the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, and the Atomic Energy Commission shall not hereafter authorize, license, or otherwise undertake to approve the construction of any projects within one mile of the mean high water line of the navigable portion of the Hudson River without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

(iii) the Federal Power Commission is hereby directed not to issue any license for any project within one mile of the mean high water line of the navigable portion of the Hudson River.

(b) Upon the adoption by the legislatures of the States and the Congress of the United States of legislation which, in the opinion of the Secretary, assures proper development, preservation, and restoration of the resources of the Hudson Riverway and achieves the purposes of this Act, the provisions of this section shall thereafter be of no force and effect.

(c) The President, by Executive order, may suspend any or all of the provisions of this section where he deems the national interest to be adversely affected by their application.

I am pleased to report that 7 new Congressmen have now joined this effort bringing the total to 39.

ADDRESS OF CHARLES S. MURPHY, CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE AERO CLUB OF WASHINGTON

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under the dynamic leadership of its new chairman, the Honorable Charles S. Murphy, the Civil Aeronautics Board has brought courage and confidence to an industry which has lived for so long in the valley of the shadow of doubt, insecurity, and, at times, despair.

In my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it was my privilege to be the guest of the Aero Club of Washington on March 1 at a luncheon. The speaker that day was Chairman Murphy of the CAB. It was a significant talk, because it was one of Mr. Murphy's principal pronouncements since assuming his duties and because his audience consisted of a most representative gathering of airline executives.

Mr. Speaker, the CAB has two chief objectives; it must protect the interest of the traveling public in matters of service, economical fares, and safety, and it must do everything possible to create and foster a healthy, financially responsible and imaginative airline system, both domestic and international, under honest, economical, and efficient management.

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Murphy, the CAB is working to accomplish these objectives. It has encouraged air carriers when encouragement was necessary. It has provided restraints when they were required in the public interest and when new departures or air adventures, in the Board's opinion, might have been harmful overall to the carrier and its future.

Our trunkline domestic carriers are enjoying unprecedented prosperity. At least a modest portion of this credit is due the CAB. The local service carriers are beginning to see daylight. They are still heavily subsidized by our Government, but working in coordination with the CAB and the Congress, the local service airlines have high hopes, within a few years, of eliminating completely the need for Government support.

But it was in the international field that Chairman Murphy made his most telling points in his remarks before the Aero Club. He said:

> Although more than 60 percent of all international air passenger traffic to and from the United States consists of the travel of U.S. nationals, U.S.-flag carriers handle less than 49 percent of this traffic.
>
> In the important market between the United States and Europe, U.S. citizens account for 61 percent of the travel, yet the U.S.-flag carriers receive only 40 percent of this market.

Mr. Speaker, these remarkable figures indicate that too many of our traveling citizens are using foreign airlines at a time when our country has a serious balance-of-payments problem. True, our international carriers have made remarkable progress in the past several years. To a large extent through the ingenuity of their own management and intelligent assistance from the Board, Pan Am, TWA, and Northwest in particular have produced solid black figures after many years of subsidization and/or hardship.

But Chairman Murphy, judging from his words, is not letting his agency sit idly by, taking periodic bows, simply because the international lines are starting to bring to their investors some modest returns after so many years of emptiness.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Chairman Murphy told his Aero Club audience:

> It is extremely difficult to establish and maintain arrangements with other countries which give U.S.-flag carriers an equal opportunity to participate in the traffic. It is acutely necessary for the board to intensify its studies of means to secure fair treatment and equal opportunities for our carriers.

I heard Chairman Murphy deliver his talk in person. Since then I have read it. I am more impressed with its contents than ever before and I feel that every Member of the House who has a responsibility to, or an interest in, commercial aviation should read and digest its contents.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the remarks of the Honorable Charles S. Murphy be made a part of the RECORD.

REMARKS OF CHARLES S. MURPHY, CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE AERO CLUB OF WASHINGTON, MARCH 1, 1966

I am both honored and intimidated by this opportunity to speak to such a sophisticated group. You know so much more about air transportation than I do that you should be talking and I should be listening. However, I suppose we will have to proceed the way the program is laid out.

I do feel extremely fortunate that I have so many personal friends among you (both old and new). I value your friendship, appreciate your help, and must rely upon your tolerance. I hope you will continue to help me and advise me with respect to the performance of my duties at the CAB—especially to make sure that no injustice is done to any of you or to those whom you represent.

I wish to take this opportunity to tell you something about the impressions I have gained about the air transport industry in the past 9 months since I have been at the Board, and to tell you something of our current activities there and our future plans and objectives.

The first thing I wish to say is that I get more excited about the air transport industry day by day and week by week. It's a fast-moving, fast-growing, fast-changing business. New frontiers are met and crossed every day. There is a combination of romanticism and hard-headed practicality that is little short of bewitching. More people dream more dreams—and make more of them come true in a shorter time—in this industry than in any other I know of.

Some of you may think that the CAB exists just for the purpose of slowing down or frustrating what the industry would otherwise accomplish, but I hope that on the whole we, too, make a constructive contribution. We are making substantial efforts at the CAB to talk things out with the industry—to seek more effective means of cooperating to achieve our mutual objectives. The results of these exchanges of views with the industry are encouraging. I hope we can continue and strengthen the process. I think it will help the CAB to do a better job.

The major objectives of the industry and the Board ought to be the same, and I think they are. We all want a strong prosperous air transport industry, providing the maximum public service, all in line with the policy declared by the Congress in the Federal Aviation Act. By talking together I am satisfied we can minimize misunderstanding, we can identify and even broaden our areas of agreement, and we can narrow our areas of disagreement. There always will be some remaining areas of disagreement and, in our efforts to settle them, we undoubtedly will have to resort to the formal regulatory procedures made and provided for such cases. But in my candid opinion that is not usually the best way to get things done—and it certainly is not the quickest.

This exchange of views with the industry is a two-way street. The CAB is on the receiving end as well as the sending end. I have received some rather pointed advice as to how we might improve our performance—and I must say that some of the points were well taken. All right, we're going to accept the advice, we are going to respond to it, and we're going to try to improve our performance. We would rather have constructive criticism than not have any. We hope that our constituents won't be too hard on us, but we will look forward to their continued help.

I do want to emphasize that in these informal exchanges of views with the industry, we will be meticulously careful not to infringe upon the rights of interested parties to due process and fair play in the disposition of matters affecting them.

I do not consider that the CAB is the sole guardian of the public interest in economic matters relating to air transportation. First, of course, there is the Congress with its basic responsibility. And the Congress has delegated some important functions to us and given us some standards to follow in exercising those functions. This does place upon us some heavy responsibilities with respect to fostering and protecting the public interest, and we will try to meet them fully.

At the same time, the industry itself has important public responsibilities. The award of a public franchise creates obligations to provide public service. I am happy to say that our air carriers appear to recognize and to have accepted those obligations. This tends to create a good working climate for those of us in the regulatory agency. I have quickly come to have a genuine respect and admiration for the men who conduct the affairs of the airlines. To be regulating an industry with such people as this—and an industry which is at the same time very happily prosperous—is not a bad job at all.

Now I would like to turn more specifically to some of the things I see ahead of us at the CAB.

On the economic side of our activities, I see something of a reordering of priorities in the Board's work to achieve more effective use of its funds and personnel, and to concentrate greater attention upon problems of major importance and urgency.

I expect that we will make a major and comprehensive effort in the field of local-service air carriers: (1) to improve the service provided, (2) to strengthen the earning capability of the carriers, and (3) to reduce subsidy needs and subsidy payments.

I testified at length on this subject yesterday before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate, and will not repeat here all that I said then. I will only say that I expect it to be a subject of highest priority for the Board in the year ahead.

We also expect a certain amount of route activity affecting the trunkline and international U.S. carriers. Some of you may have noticed some flurries lately with respect to the Pacific, the Atlantic, the Caribbean, Latin America, Canada, as well as some important areas within the United States. All these will receive our attention. I will not undertake to predict the results.

I do suggest that the growth of traffic and improvements in flight equipment may dictate some rather fundamental changes in our concepts of desirable route patterns. I don't believe we know nearly as much about this as we should, and a comprehensive study of this question might well be in order.

We should give major attention to improving the position of U.S.-flag air carriers in international air transportation. Although more than 60 percent of all international air passenger traffic to and from the United States consists of the travel of U.S. nationals, U.S.-flag carriers handle less than 49 percent of this traffic. In the important market between the United States and Europe, U.S. citizens account for 61 percent of the travel, yet the U.S.-flag carriers receive only 40 percent of this market. It is extremely difficult to establish and maintain arrangements with other countries which give U.S.-flag carriers an equal opportunity to participate in the traffic. It is acutely necessary for the Board to intensify its studies of means to secure fair treatment and equal opportunities for our carriers.

It has been suggested that we need stronger advocacy and firmer positions in negotiations with other nations for air transport agreements. I am not at all sure that this is the answer. We may need some new policies and some legislation. I'm quite sure we need some hard study.

As a matter of fact, since I have not participated personally in any of our bilateral negotiations, it might not be inappropriate for me to say that I think they are handled very well. I'm happy to say that relations between the CAB and the Department of State are most harmonious—not only in respect of bilateral negotiations but in other fields as well. I feel that the manner in which the Department of State is handling problems concerning the Warsaw convention is outstanding.

The CAB has a contribution to make in encouraging travel to and within the United States. We have freely and gladly promised to do all we can to that end. We know of the active and sympathetic interest many of you have in this same subject. We have been in touch with you about it. We appreciate the warmth and constructive character of your response. We expect to continue to work with you on this—touching upon such matters as free or reduced fare travel for travel agents, commissions for travel agents, excursion fares, and promotional campaigns. I'm sure all of us agree that we must reduce the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments which results from the so-called "travel gap". I'm also sure that no one of us wants to be in a position to be called upon to have to explain why he failed to do his part.

Turning to the subject of fares, I expect this topic to be of continued major importance in the year ahead. Most of you may be aware of the Board's decision last summer that circumstances required it to adopt a hold-the-line policy against fare increases, and of the ensuing discussions concerning new jet surcharges, promotional fares, and related matters. If you are not aware of all this, I can provide you with considerable literature, but will not review it all here today. Suffice it to say that the Board is pleased with the course of events.

The promotional fares that have been and are being instituted will provide very significant savings for the traveling public. At the same time, they will develop new traffic for the carriers and will tend to even out the peaks and valleys in traffic patterns. It is my belief that these fares will insure a continued phenomenal growth in air travel this year. This continued growth is highly necessary to help pay for all the equipment the carriers have ordered. In short, I believe we are headed in the right direction on the fare question.

As the Board indicated in its announcement of February 9 concerning excursion fares and jet surcharges, we expect in the months ahead to make a thorough study of the passenger fare structure. Actually, the Board's staff has already done considerable work in analyzing the current fare structure.

The present fare structure is largely a product of evolution over many years and it contains many anomalies. Major attention in the past has been concentrated on the adequacy of the general fare level. This is quite understandable for the industry's developmental period, and during its lean years. Now there seems to be increasing sentiment for a broad review of the structure—the relationship of particular fares, one to another.

The structure should give appropriate consideration to costs and value of service, to differences between classes of service, and to differences between long- and short-haul fares, to be equitable to individual fare payers. By the same token, the carriers and the communities they serve have a substantial interest in a sound fare structure. A sound structure will tend to balance opportunities among carriers to achieve a fair overall rate of return by producing a closer relationship of fares to cost of service. Similarly, the carriers' incentives to provide adequate service would tend to be better balanced among the wide range of routes and communities served.

We do not expect this job to be easy. We do not expect to find any simple formula for a sound fare structure. We recognize that each fare cannot be exactly equated to the cost of service, and there will be many factors which will require individual fares to be set above or below the norm. But we do believe that substantial improvements may be in order and this is the time to get to work at it.

We expect to call on the carriers for assistance in this study. We will surely consider their views most carefully before arriving at any major conclusions as to what the Board's own views will be. I would hope that we might begin to see some beneficial results from this study within a year.

Finally, with respect to the Board's outlook for the coming year, let me say that we anticipate a marked strengthening of our staff capabilities and activities in the fields of planning, programing, and economic research. President Johnson has requested all agencies to strengthen their planning and programing activities in order to perform their functions more effectively and efficiently. This is especially necessary for the CAB because (1) the rapid growth and development of air transportation require the regulatory agency to have the best possible understanding of its economics for forward-looking regulation; (2) effective overall planning and programing are required in order for the Board to be able to handle the workload of individual cases brought before it without a large increase in staff; and (3) the staff resources of the Board in the economic field in the past have been far below those that are necessary to meet its needs of the present and future.

I have a notion that if we are going to undertake to regulate the air transport industry, we ought to know as much about its economics as anyone else.

In conclusion, I wish to thank you again for your friendly interest in our work at the CAB and to express the hope that we can work together in the days ahead for the public good.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the pressing and immediate problems of Vietnam and other international trouble spots command our daily attention, but it is vitally necessary that we also give attention to the challenges facing the Nation over a long period of time. Involved as we are, and will be, in critical world problems, one of our most important needs will be adequate education in all aspects of international affairs.

In his message to Congress on February 2, 1966, the President called attention to this long-range problem, and urged the Congress to consider several proposals that would enhance the quantity and quality of education in international affairs. The main features of his proposals were:

First, in cooperation with institutions of higher education, the creation of centers for advanced international studies where graduate work would be pursued either on specific geographical areas or on particular subjects in international affairs.

Second, the strengthening of undergraduate programs in international studies by such activities as training of faculty members in foreign countries, by bringing foreign teachers and scholars to the United States as visiting faculty, and by expansion of foreign-language courses.

Third, starting new programs in international studies for elementary and secondary schools by earmarking funds provided through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Fourth, the establishment of school-to-school partnerships through which U.S. schools would help in construction of sister schools in developing countries.

And fifth, provision for educational attachés in U.S. embassies to give direction to these programs in foreign countries.

These are very important proposals. We need to take a very close look at the level of our international education and try to make a judgment on whether it should be raised and by what type of programs.

For example, the revolutionary changes in Africa in recent years have resulted in a great scarcity of teachers with the preparation to teach African affairs at the college level, not to mention high schools and elementary schools. This is generally true, also, for the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America. Especially in the field of area studies, classroom and library work must be supplemented by residence in the area of specialization for a reasonable period. Only in this way can future teachers bring back an understanding of the culture and thought processes of the people of these areas for the benefit of large numbers of future American students. Study abroad is also necessary, of course, to produce good teachers of foreign languages.

We should give attention, also, to the idea that it is important to bring more foreign students to the United States for study here. The President spoke in his message of an exchange Peace Corps. Besides our Peace Corps abroad, he would like to see a corps of foreign young people come here as "Volunteers to America." These volunteers could teach their own language and culture in our schools and colleges while they learn about American life.

In this connection, I have noticed that very often our stanchest friends abroad are those who have spent some time in the United States. Certainly we have a better working relationship in the future with those whom we have previously worked and studied with either at home or abroad.

I hope we can obtain a program in international education that will spark a new concern and a new dynamism which will in turn give us the teachers and experts we are going to need in the years ahead.

SEMIRETIREMENT OF JOHN J. GILL

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a news article from the Providence Sunday Journal Business Weekly of February 27, 1966. The article comments on the semiretirement of my good friend, John J. Gill, and touches on just a few of his many activities.

John Gill has been a moving force in the Rhode Island and New England community for many years and a very personable and effective one. I have an idea that his new retirement, rather than taking him out of the stream of civic responsiveness, will find him accepting even increased activities. If this works out to be true, and I certainly hope that it does, all of us in Rhode Island will be the better for it.

JOHN J. GILL, PETRO'S LONGTIME OFFICIAL, RETIRES BUT WILL CONTINUE AS CONSULTANT

John J. Gill, a longtime crusader for sufficient fuel oil to meet the needs of New England—particularly those of his adopted State of Rhode Island—is retiring as chairman of the board of Petroleum Heat & Power Co. of Rhode Island, it was announced yesterday by Phineas Sprague, company president.

The recognized authority on fuel oil and highway problems is not completely severing his affiliation with Petro, however. He is to remain with the company on a consultant basis.

Mr. Gill's connection with Rhode Island dates back to 1930 when he was transferred here to manage the Providence branch of the company. He had joined Petro 5 years prior to that time as a cost accountant in its Boston office. Growing with the company, he became branch accountant and credit manager in 1927.

Under his direction, the local branch experienced steady growth. In 1952 he and his associates assumed financial control of the company. Mr. Gill became president. He retained the presidency when in 1957 Petroleum Heat & Power of Rhode Island was merged with the C. H. Sprague & Sons Co. of Boston, one of the largest fuel companies in the Nation. It was 2 years ago that he resigned as president to become chairman of the board.

FOUGHT FOR FUEL OIL

During the years, particularly during war periods, Mr. Gill fought many an uphill battle to procure fuel oil in sufficient quantities to meet the home-heating needs of this State. His interest was in the general fuel oil problem—not alone the problem of his company's customers.

Recognition of his efforts resulted in his appointment to the Governor's fuel commission for Rhode Island during World War II. He was chairman of that commission in 1947–48.

Additionally he served on the $40 million highway study commission during Senator PASTORE's terms as Governor and later was appointed during the administration of Gov. Del Sesto to his toll road and bridge authority and the Rhode Island Safety Council. He currently is a member of the Governor's highway advisory commission and the Rhode Island Bridge and Toll Road Authority.

For many years, Mr. Gill has been—and continues to be—treasurer of the Rhode Island Petroleum Industries Committee.

National recognition of Mr. Gill's interest in highways and safety culminated in 1960 when he was elected national president of the American Trucking Association. He became the first New Englander to hold the office. His election also marked the first time that a private carrier had been chosen to fill the post.

Long active in trucking association work both on the State and National level, he had served as president, vice president, treasurer, and a director of the Rhode Island Truck Owners Association, and had been third vice president of ATA prior to being elected its president.

AIDED SAFE TRAVEL

Among his attainments as ATA president, he will be remembered for a safety measure he initiated on a nationwide basis to enhance safe travel on holidays—driving both day and night with headlights beaming out a "Drive Carefully" reminder.

Among the honors conferred upon him during his long career was his designation as "Yankee Oilman" by the Oil Dealers Association in 1959. Recalled was his many contributions to the oil industry, particularly his many trips to Washington during World War II in an effort to procure fuel oil for this region.

Mr. Gill, a resident of Cranston and an active member of the Metacomet Country Club, is a native of Charlestown, Mass. His civic interests include a present directorship of Blue Cross. He also has served as chairman of the operating committee of the USO.

A NEW GENERATION OF AMERICANS ARE WILLING TO ASSUME THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in the past weeks we have heard a good deal from the critics concerning the fighting in Vietnam. I think it is time we started to hear from the men who are doing the fighting.

One of these brave men is Melvin S. Hall, Jr., a marine from Roselle, N.J. He wrote a letter and a poem that was published in the Elizabeth Daily Journal, February 21, 1966.

It impressed me so that I called his grandmother, Mrs. Ted Saunder, of Roselle, N.J. to congratulate her. She told me that she had written to the President and sent the poem and a picture of her grandson to him. She told me with great happiness and pride that the President had personally acknowledged her letter and how wonderful it was that he took time out to do so.

I asked her if I could put copies of this correspondence in the RECORD along with Melvin Hall's poem and letter. I am happy that she agreed.

Running through this correspondence of a marine in Vietnam to his grandparents and their letter to the President and his letter to them is the thread of all that is wonderful in the United States of America. It demonstrates that a new generation of Americans are willing to assume their responsibilities because as

Marine Melvin Hall wrote, America "is worth fighting for, and if need be, worth dying for." It demonstrates, too, the concern and compassion of the President of the United States for the young men in Vietnam who are doing the fighting and dying. It should be reassuring to the parents and relatives of all our men in service and, indeed, reassuring to every person in this country.

ROSELLE, N.J.,
February 22, 1966.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking this opportunity to send this picture of our grandson, and the editorial that was published in the Daily Journal paper of Elizabeth, N.J., to let you know how our grandson and all the other boys in Vietnam feel about this great country of ours, and what you are doing to make this a free world to live in.

We wish you continued success and may God bless you and yours.

Sincerely yours,
TED and MARIAN SAUNDERS.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 28, 1966.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. SAUNDERS: I cannot tell you how grateful I am to you for sending me the picture of your grandson, Melvin S. Hall, Jr., and the poem that he wrote.

The knowledge that brave, young men like your grandson are fighting in the cause of their country and are uncomplaining in the duties to the preservation of justice and freedom makes this President proud and strong. As long as there are young men like Melvin S. Hall, the future of this country will always be secure.

Sincerely,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Feb. 21, 1966]

READERS WRITE OWN EDITORIALS—FROM VIETNAM

EDITOR JOURNAL: I am a marine presently doing a tour of duty in Chu Lai, South Vietnam. My home is 146 East Ninth Avenue, Roselle, N.J. For this reason I am writing to your paper. Over here we hear quite a bit about the protest against the United States in Vietnam. So I am enclosing a poem I wrote which more or less expresses my feelings and I'm sure the feelings of every fighting American here in Vietnam. Perhaps if the people read it, they will better understand how it is for us down here.

MELVIN S. HALL, JR.

A PLEA TO YOU

As I sit here in this dismal tent,
My arms are folded, my head is bent.
I keep asking myself, "why must this be?"
Far from my home, away across the sea.
This place I'm at, they call it Chu Lai
Many young men come here, and here some of them die.
But die for what, is it all in vain?
And at this point, my heart is filled with pain.
The pain of disgust of some people back home,
Who protest on the grounds I used to roam.
What do they object to, what do they mean?
Burning of draft cards can even be seen.

They want us to leave here, pull out of Vietnam
And let it be taken by the Communist Vietcong.
They do not consider the men who have perished,
Leaving their loved ones and life so dearly cherished.
We are Americans, people of dignity,
Fighting to preserve human rights and liberty,
Fighting now in Vietnam, certainly much to our sorrow.
But complete victory here today can make all the difference tomorrow.

We must fight hard, steady, and fight even more
So communism will never find it's way through our own front door.
To you few Americans who protest and disagree,
Just consider what you have and I'm sure you will see
It's worth fighting for, and if need be dying for
Don't tear down our morale, our desire, our dedications
But give us your moral support, your prayers, your inspirations.
So when I go back across this vast blue sea,
And return to my home, the "Land of the Free"
I can walk with my head held high,
They'll be no mistake when you pass me by,
Eyes filled with tenderness, yet an expression of means,
I'm a Vietnam veteran, and a U. S. Marine.

STRENGTHENING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Law Environment Assistance Act of 1965 has provided the Department of Justice with new tools to improve the quality of law enforcement and crime prevention work throughout the country. Experience gained in the adminstration of that law has served to identify a variety of needs, many of which are being met within the framework of the law and some which require amendments to strengthen our Government's work in this important field.

I have introduced a bill today to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 as a means to meet three urgent needs not covered by existing law.

The first is to authorize the Attorney General to make funds available to selected individuals for study in the fields of law enforcement and crime prevention. Traineeship and fellowship programs at colleges and universities, including graduate and undergraduate training, would be established for personnel now engaged in law enforcement and for those preparing for a career in crime prevention and control.

The second amendment would authorize the Attorney General to make cash or honorary awards to policemen or other personnel engaged in crime prevention programs who make outstanding contributions to their fields. The purpose of such awards is to recognize individual contributions to law enforcement which have national implications and values.

The third amendment provides authority to forgive up to 50 percent of loans under the National Defense Education Act taken out by needy students who later serve as full-time law enforcement officers. Ten percent of the total loan would be canceled out for each year of service given up to 5 years, which is the same benefit provided to needy students who enter into full-time teaching after graduation. This should provide encouragement for more young people to take up law enforcement and crime prevention as a career.

Finally, my amendment calls for an extension of the act for an additional 2 years.

These proposed amendments are in keeping with the recommendations made by President Johnson in his message on crime and law enforcement.

GEORGE BALL: MAN TO WATCH

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, public life has its perils. High among the hazards, as many in this Chamber know, is living at the tender mercies of the ever-attentive press. As a famous part-time journalist once remarked:

> I am always in favor of the free press, but sometimes they say quite nasty things.

We all know what Winston Churchill meant. It is a pleasure, therefore, to call the Members' attention to a refreshingly different piece of reporting by Robert Spivack, of the New York Journal American.

Mr. Spivack gives a good man his due. He gives Under Secretary of State George Ball the public credit and respect he has never sought, but has earned so long and well. George Ball is a professional's professional—a quiet, modest, tough-minded man who prefers grabbing the action to grabbing the headlines. His temperament is matched by his talents. They are great and many, but—as Mr. Spivack writes:

> Ball's real talent is the fact that he is a thinking man, always forward-looking, aware of what is ideal and what is attainable, a team player.

The President, I know, would agree—enthusiastically. He regards George Ball as a standout on the superlative team of advisers to whom he turns for counsel and strength.

Mr. Spivack's article is entitled, "A Man To Watch." George Ball is also a man to know—a man to appreciate. I place this short column in the RECORD, so that every Member will come to know George Ball better, and appreciate him more:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Mar. 10, 1966]

GEORGE BALL: MAN TO WATCH

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—There were three men in the Cabinet, President Kennedy once told a friend, whom he considered especially helpful and he wished he had more like them.

The three were: Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, and Under Secretary of State George W. Ball.

They were not only decent men, Kennedy said. "They're tough."

Ball is probably the least known to the public at large, but he is the man to watch in the months ahead.

Who is George W. Ball? Will he eventually assume the role played by McGeorge Bundy? Why is he so well liked at the White House?

If one were to believe all the myths spread by some of L.B.J.'s too-precious critics, there would be no place in this administration for a man of Ball's background. He doesn't come from Texas, he doesn't chew tobacco, he is neither a hawk nor a dove, and he is not a "yes man."

Yet the President has reached into the State Department to give Ball an increasingly important role in both the shaping and administering of foreign policy, with all nonmilitary agencies, including the CIA, under his jurisdiction.

Ball is a liberal, with his feet on the ground. For 30 years he was Adlai Stevenson's closest personal and political associate. Together with a brilliant young law associate, John Sharon, he organized and ran the Stevenson-for-President movement of 1960.

What commends Ball to President Johnson? His background, of course, qualifies him: internationalist, League of Nations and United Nations advocate, and attorney with a tremendous overseas clientele, before joining the Government. But there are other Washington lawyers with these qualifications.

Ball's real talent is in the fact that he is a thinking man, always forward looking, aware of what is ideal and what is attainable, a team player, not given to sulking when things do not go his way. In the Vietnam war he has clearly been a restraining influence on those who have wanted to "get it over with quickly" by pulverizing North Vietnam.

What's more, he knows how to get along with the President without really trying. Basically it is that he aims to be helpful, does not impose his views on others. He knows when to speak up, and when he talks he has something to say. He is not vain, seeking glory for himself, sure that he is so right that the other guy must not only be wrong, but stupid.

In short, Ball is a rational and modest man. He gets along well with Secretary of State Rusk because he does not upstage him and carries out his assignments without grumbling.

But as President Kennedy recognized, Ball can be tough. More than anyone else he has had to deal with French President de Gaulle and that's no school for amateurs. As many Americans before him discovered, De Gaulle can be trying and provoking. His major achievement has been to make the French President respect the Johnson administration.

What does Ball's new status mean in terms of foreign policy? My guess would be: no abrupt changes. There will be continued determination to contain Red China, but with a willingness to make accommodations when and if China's Communist leaders are cured of their political paranoia.

IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO BENEFIT VETERANS OF THE PULAJANE AND MORO WARS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Schisler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to benefit the men who fought hostile Moros in the South Pacific between July 4, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

This legislation seeks to grant pension benefits to the small number of veterans still surviving who fought the Moros under the same conditions and at the rates prescribed by the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or amended in the future. It is shocking to realize that the few remaining survivors of these wars receive no veterans benefits today.

Legislation similar to the measure I introduced was introduced in previous Congresses. In the 79th Congress a measure passed the House overwhelmingly but died in committee in the Senate.

In the 81st Congress a measure like the one I introduced today was sponsored by Representative Rankin. It, too, failed to receive favorable consideration by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we just recently passed legislation which has been hailed as the new GI bill of rights. I am proud of this legislation and I am proud to claim an association with the 89th Congress—the Congress which has given our veterans since the Korean war the recognition and rights which they deserve.

I have received letters from my own constituents—men who are veterans of the Korean war and men who fought for our country in World War II—in support of legislation to benefit the veterans of the Moro war. Just recently, I received a letter from one of the veterans of the Moro war. His letter was a moving one and his plea was one I could not ignore. I would like to share some of his comments with you and my colleagues here today.

He wrote:

> This no doubt will be the last plea that ever will be made to obtain justice for a few old soldiers now in their eighties who are still alive today.

He goes on to urge the introduction of a measure similar to the one I introduced today. In defense of his plea, he describes his own position:

> At 80 years, I still have my first dollar to collect from charity, and I don't want charity. But my wife and I find that getting along on our meager income is getting harder every day and our savings are going fast * * *. It seems our Government can take care of most everyone * * * but when it comes to us old soldiers, they seem to run short of money. Why? And the injustice to me is that friends who are not much past 70, who were never outside the United States, no worse off either financially or in health than I am, receive a pension, and can go to a veterans' hospital. Understand, I don't begrudge this to these men. I think they have it coming, but when they say, "Why, you get a pension, don't you?" * * *. I am hoping that the 2d session of the 89th Congress will have compassion on the few of us old ones left.

Mr. Speaker, it has not been determined exactly how many survivors of the Moro and Pulajane wars are still alive today, but we do know of their age and of their need. Two thousand were estimated to be alive in 1944 who, the War Department felt, were entitled to receive the Philippine campaign medal for services rendered after 1902. It has been suggested that there are probably no more than 250 of those 2,000 living at the present time. Thus, the costs of this legislation will be negligible.

The passage of this measure will grant to those veterans still surviving the Moro wars a measure of relief that is certainly theirs by right. I am anxious that this measure be given very careful consideration by my colleagues and I hope that the 89th Congress, which has already done so much for our younger veterans, will also see fit to help those older but nonetheless deserving men who supported our country and who suffered untold hardships in the Moro Province.

FOOD FOR INDIA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial of the Milwaukee Journal has raised the same point I raised in a special order on January 27 calling attention to India's food plight and the related cause—industrialization emphasis instead of agricultural development.

The editorial, in the February 24 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, laid the blame on India's recent government which failed to do anything about stimulation of crops production and control of population.

President Johnson's message in early February closely followed the idea I proposed that major food contributions to underdeveloped countries, such as India, must be accompanied by a desire of these needy nations to eventually help themselves.

Agricultural self-help is both necessary and a solid keystone to the economic growth of these nations.

The editorial follows:

A Cry From India

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has informed President Johnson that her country is in dire economic straits and badly needs help. Vice President Humphrey, visiting India, promised an immediate loan of $100 million to enable that country to import materials and parts needed for industry. And word comes that grain shortages are much worse than previously reported. The figure now is anywhere between 15 and 22 million tons—a quarter of the country's basic annual food needs.

Grain is on the way from this country, but India has a major problem in getting it to the starving. Ports are not adequate to handle huge shipments. Internal transportation is limited. Many areas where food is needed most lack even proper highway connections with railheads.

India has been plagued by food problems for years. But its present crisis grows in large part from the failure of recent governments to do all they should have to control population and stimulate agricultural production. India has had a birth control program for a decade but it has not been extensive enough. The birth rate is not among the highest in the world but the sheer numbers of births present an annual problem. And instead of concentrating on fertilizers, better grains, improved methods of planting, and irrigation, the government has built steel mills and heavy industry.

In helping India now we must insist that it vigorously tackle these major problems.

WAR PROFITEERING MUST BE STOPPED

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is time to assure ourselves that there is no war profiteering. There is a vehicle for limiting profits on defense contracts. This vehicle is the Renegotiation Board. The Renegotiation Board performed an outstanding service during the Korean conflict. A similar Board was in effect during World War II. At that time it was a high speed, fully manned operation. Since the end of the Korean conflict it has been drastically cut down in terms of manpower, operating funds, and authority. There is no longer any excuse for placing the full burdens of the war in Vietnam on the wage earner, the consumer, and the men who are doing the fighting. The war has already resulted in great sacrifices for millions of Americans. For others, it may be resulting in tremendous, unchecked profits.

In order to make sure that there is no pernicious practice of war profiteering, the Renegotiation Board must be permitted to operate at full speed.

To illustrate the forced curtailment of activities of the Renegotiation Board, I have obtained a table setting forth the number of personnel on Washington, D.C., and regional boards for each year from 1952 through 1965. The table follows:

Fiscal year	Total	Headquarters	Regional boards
1952	558	169	389
1953	742	178	564
1954	639	174	465
1955	540	193	347
1956	466	181	285
1957	359	155	204
1958	326	142	184
1959	301	136	165
1960	284	130	154
1961	271	123	148
1962	193	114	79
1963	223	131	92
1964	206	121	85
1965	184	108	76

This table shows the steady decline in Renegotiation Board manpower from the year 1953, at the height of the Korean conflict, when there was a total of 742 personnel. At the end of 1965 there were only 184 persons employed by the Renegotiation Board.

Perhaps of even greater importance, have been the statutory restrictions that have been placed around the Board's activities. During World War II, under the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, contractors with an annual total of $100,000 in defense contracts were required to file annual reports for review by the Board. Today, only contractors with a minimum of $1 million in defense contracts are required to file annual reports with the Board.

There are, in addition, a number of exemptions under the present law exempting certain contracts and subcontracts from review by the Renegotiation Board. One of the most important of these exemptions is for agricultural commodities In the past few days, the Department of Defense has justified the practice of defoliation of crops in Vietnam on the precise grounds that agricultural commodities are essential to the war effort of the Vietcong. The official State Department statement reported in the press March 9 and 10, said in part:

> In war, food is essential to the effectiveness of a military unit as weapons and ammunition.

Yet, agricultural commodities are exempt from review by the Renegotiation Board. Other exemptions apply to contracts and subcontracts involving common carriers, public utilities, and tax-exempt organizations under certain circumstances, certain competitively bid construction contracts, and certain prime contracts. Contracts for the sale of new durable productive equipment are partially exempt from renegotiation. This list could be extended, and the number of restrictions and limitations placed on the Renegotiation Board could be enlarged.

My point is that the Renegotiation Board, although performing a remarkable job under the present circumstances, could be and should be made more effective an instrument of national policy. War profiteering, the taking of excessive profits during a time of national crisis and armed conflict, should not be tolerated and even the possibility of profiteering must be avoided.

Profit limits on defense contracts have long been established as a matter of public policy. Traditionally, profit limits on defense contracts are tightened up during periods of war. The mechanism for profit limitation is renegotiation. As early as 1934 limits were placed on profits on naval ship procurement, and on aircraft procurement in 1939. Renegotiation was established as a matter of law with the Renegotiation Act of 1942. This act created the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board. The Renegotiation Act of 1951 transferred the functions of this board to the Renegotiation Board. The Renegotiation Board has been operating under this act ever since.

The word should now go forth that all defense contracts will be subject to review by the Renegotiation Board, and that excessive profits will be cut. The many regional boards that existed during World War II and the Korean conflict should be reestablished. Even the possibility of war profiteering should be eliminated.

GOVERNMENT COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has just completed tabulating all Federal medical expenditures for the current fiscal year. This has been customary and routine of this organization since 1952, and it is a great service to departmental heads and branches of Government. It is available to Members of Congress, their staffs, and many of the committee staffs use it as a locator throughout the year for enacted programs pertaining to the health of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in addition there are many requests from outside students of government, and others, for this material. It will be noted that the total is greater than $13 billion, exclusive of the medicare program which will start with fiscal year 1967. I believe our colleagues will laud this readily available information and the availability of the rather heroic and factual work, the way it is set out by title, including the explanatory prolog, the analysis by major agency, the program descriptions, concluding with the chart showing disability payments in which the U.S. Government participates. The information follows:

FEDERAL MEDICAL-HEALTH APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL 1966 (JULY 1, 1965 TO JUNE 30, 1966)

The following report details medical-health activities of Federal agencies and Government employees health programs and the Federal contributions in the medical-health field to the District of Columbia. The total appropriation made by the 1st session of the 89th Congress to carry out these activities is $6,581,372,121. This sum is $726,833,038 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1965. While the total appropriations for medical-health purposes were increased, some agencies received smaller appropriations for these purposes. As in previous years, the lion's share (92.1 percent or $669,431,330) of the increase went to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In fiscal 1966, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its agencies passed some fiscal milestones. For the first time, the Department received more than 50 percent of the total appropriations for health and medical purposes. More than 60 percent of its appropriation was earmarked for the Public Health Service which, for the first time, received appropriations which exceed $2 billion. More than one-half the Service's appropriations have been earmarked for the National Institutes of Health which, for the first time, received an appropriation in excess of $1 billion.

The report attempts to identify all programs, describing their purpose and comparing their appropriations for the present fiscal year with those of the preceding year. It is a factual study and, as such, makes no attempt to evaluate the programs. The report is based on scrutiny of appropriation acts passed by the Congress and on information supplied by program and fiscal officers in the various departments and agencies.

Because most appropriation acts do not earmark funds for medical activities and because of the bookkeeping practices used by some agencies, the use of estimates is necessary in some cases. The report should be considered as "conservative" for these reasons. Further, the report does not include the activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity; administrative expenses for medical-health loans made by the Small Business Administration, under the National Defense Education Act, or under the college housing program; nor are the funds for the Bureau of Narcotics included because of inability to separate medical from enforcement activities.

The last two pages list in table form payments made to persons because of disability, through programs financed entirely or in part by the Federal Government. The beneficiaries of such programs total 7,512,780—an increase of 520,746. Payments are expected to total $6,738,326,000—an increase of $671,959,000.

Comparison of fiscal 1966 and 1965 medical-health budgets of Federal departments, agencies, and commissions

	Fiscal 1966	Fiscal 1965
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	$3,512,172,830	$2,842,741,500
Veterans' Administration	1,339,742,600	1,302,210,000
Department of Defense	1,050,908,070	1,040,782,000
Federal employees health insurance	168,840,000	165,800,000
Department of Agriculture	128,430,600	120,164,202
Department of State	100,189,800	138,766,340
Atomic Energy Commission	83,000,000	77,152,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	71,300,000	61,800,000
National Science Foundation	68,300,000	47,000,000
Peace Corps	14,986,000	10,484,000
Department of Labor	12,822,000	12,919,800
Department of the Interior	10,748,000	10,735,000
District of Columbia	6,075,161	5,144,331
Canal Zone Government	5,908,000	5,730,000
Federal Aviation Agency	5,647,900	4,958,900
Department of Justice	3,653,325	3,636,000
Post Office Department	1,623,755	1,482,620
Federal Trade Commission	813,000	808,500
Civil Service Commission	609,900	609,900
Department of Commerce	529,000	1,547,100
Selective Service Advisory Committee	38,000	38,000
Attending physician of Congress	34,180	28,890
Total	6,581,372,121	5,854,539,083

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (THIS YEAR, $3,512,172,830; LAST YEAR, $2,842,741,500)

Public Health Service	**$2,174,250,000**
Last year	**1,854,030,000**
National Institutes of Health	**1,138,406,000**
Last year	**965,992,000**
Institute of Mental Health	**232,669,000**
Last year	**187,932,000**

Approximately 86 percent of this appropriation is apportioned for research and training through grants to individual investigators and public and private institutions Under the research program, funds will be utilized for general research support grants, hospital improvement grants, and clinical research centers, as well as for the regular grant programs. Among the traineeship programs are research fellowships and psychiatric training for general practitioners. The sum of $6,750,000 is allocated to the States for community mental health services; $5,692,000 will be used for technical assistance to States. The remainder is for direct research operations and collaborative studies, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Bethesda (Md.) Clinical Center and related auxiliary services.

National Cancer Institute	$163,768,000
Last year	[1] 150,011,000

[1] Includes $10 million for special cancer research which was incorporated into the National Cancer Institute in 1966.

About 54 percent of this appropriation is earmarked for grants to non-Federal individual investigators and private institutions for research and training. Almost 14 percent will be used to support contracts with the pharmaceutical and chemical industries in research on chemotherapeutic agents for the treatment of cancer. The balance is for direct research operations, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Bethesda Clinical Center and related auxiliary services.

National Heart Institute	$141,462,000
Last year	124,824,000

Grants to non-Federal individual investigators and public and private institutions for research and training take about 85 percent of the appropriation. The balance is for direct research operations, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Clinical Center and related auxiliary services.

Institute of General Medical Sciences	$127,188,000
Last year	114,418,000

Grants to public and private investigators for research and training total 96 percent of this appropriation. Research includes molecular biology, cell biology, genetics, biophysics, biochemistry, biomedical engineering, and biomathematics. The balance is for collaborative studies, especially pharmacology and toxicology, and for salaries and supplies.

Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases	$123,203,000
Last year	113,050,000

Grants to public and private investigators for research and training total 85 percent of this appropriation. Studies include diseases such as arthritis, cystic fibrosis, diabetes, gout, rheumatism, and gastrointestinal disorders. The balance is for direct research operations, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Bethesda Clincal Center and related auxiliary services.

Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness	$101,153,000
Last year	87,821,000

Grants to public and private investigators and institutions for research and training total 84 percent of this appropriation. Studies include cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, epilepsy, and conditions causing blindness and deafness. The remainder is for direct research operations and collaborative studies, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Clinical Center and related auxiliary services.

Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	$88,987,000
Last year	69,847,000

Research grants to public and private investigators for research and training amount to 72 percent of this appropriation. Research activities in staphylococcal disease, upper respiratory infections, cystic fibrosis, basic immunology, tropical diseases, and vaccine development are supported by this Institute; $350,000 will be used for payment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute for operating and maintaining the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. The balance is for direct research operations and collaborative studies, including salaries, supplies, and this Institute's share in the cost of operating the Clinical Center and related auxiliary services.

General research and services	$60,469,000
Last year	50,341,000

These funds support the Division of Computer Research and Technology, the Division of Research Facilities and Resources, and the Office of International Research, with practically all funds being expended for research grants and fellowships.

Institute of Child Health and Human Development	$55,024,000
Last year	42,696,000

Approximately 90 percent of the funds will be used for grants to public and private investigators for research and training. The remainder is for a direct research program at the Perinatal Physiology Laboratory in Puerto Rico, collaborative studies, review and approval of grants, and administrative expenses.

Regional medical programs	$25,000,000
Last year	([1])

[1] New program.

The 1966 appropriation provides funds for grants for planning and feasibility studies and for the operation of pilot projects to implement the program for combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke. A separate organization will be created within NIH with the responsibility of administering the regional medical programs.

Institute of Dental Research	$23,677,000
Last year	20,083,000

Grants to public and private investigators for research and training total about 76 percent of this appropriation. The remainder is for direct research at Bethesda, review and approval of grants, administrative expenses, and support of the Clinical Center.

Biologics standards	$6,806,000
Last year	4,969,000

Activities include administration of the Biologics Control Act; establishment of standards for the preparation of biologics; testing of vaccines and their preparation; and research related to the development, manufacture, testing, and use of vaccines and analogous products.

(NOTE.—Included in the 1966 appropriations for the NIH are the following amounts for special programs: $50,040,000 for regional clinical research centers, both general and categorical; $7 million for primate centers; $11,850,000 for special resource centers; $3 million for international centers for research and training; and $18 million for hospital improvement grants.)

Public Law 86–798 authorizes the setting aside of a uniform percentage (up to a maximum of 15 percent) of amounts provided for research grants to be used as grants-in-aid to public or nonprofit universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other institutions for the general support of their research and research training programs; $45,200,000 is allocated for this purpose.

Hospital and medical facilities construction	$303,304,000
Last year	266,907,000

This appropriation finances the Federal participation in the extended and expanded Hill-Burton program under Public Law 88–443, two programs for the construction of facilities for the mentally retarded authorized by Public Law 88–164, and a new program for the construction of demonstration health facilities under the Appalachian

Region Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-4).

Hill-Burton program	$260,000,000
Last year	220,000,000

Of these funds, $160 million is used to help finance the construction and modernization of hospitals and related health facilities. Through June 30, 1965, Federal funds had partially financed, for this phase of the program, 5,838 projects, which provide 282,972 inpatient beds and 2,259 public health units. The remaining $100 million provides $70 million for long-term care facilities; $20 million for diagnostic or treatment centers; and $10 million for rehabilitation facilities. As of June 30, 1965, a total of 2,012 projects had been approved, providing 948 long-term care, 726 diagnostic or treatment, and 338 rehabilitation facility projects. Under these programs, the funds are allocated among the States on the basis of population and per capita income. The Federal share may range from one-third to three-fourths of the total cost of the project.

Programs for the mentally retarded	$22,500,000
Last year	17,500,000

Of these funds, $10 million is for project grants to assist in the construction of mental retardation facilities associated with a college or university, and $12,500,000 is for a program of formula grants to States in the construction, expansion, remodeling, replacement, and equipping of community facilities for the mentally retarded. These facilities provide a full range of inpatient and outpatient services and will demonstrate the provision of specialized services for the diagnosis, treatment, training, or care of the mentally retarded.

Research and demonstration program	$12,568,000
Last year	3,028,000

These funds are used for research, experiments, and demonstrations on utilization of hospital services, and resources. The bulk of the money is granted to States, universities, hospitals, hospital associations, professional associations, and community organization, and a small amount is used for direct research by the U.S. Public Health Service.

Special project planning grants	$5,000,000
Last year	2,500,000

A program of special project planning grants provides assistance in the development of comprehensive regional, metropolitan area, and other local area plans for health and related facilities. Public and nonprofit agencies and organizations are eligible to receive these grants. Applications are recommended for approval or disapproval by the State agency designated to administer the Hill-Burton program.

Administrative expenses	$3,236,000
Last year	3,004,000

This appropriation is used for administration of the hospital and medical facilities and mental retardation facilities construction programs. Salaries and expenses for headquarters and the nine regional offices are involved.

Construction of demonstration health facilities	----------
Last year	$20,875,000

Under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, grants are made for the construction and equipping of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic or treatment centers, and other facilities. The 1965 funds were made available in a supplemental appropriation and are available through June 30, 1966.

Community health activities	$266,233,000
Last year	165,923,000

This group of activities includes the following programs, each financed from a separate appropriation: Community health practice and research, chronic diseases and health of the aged, communicable disease activities, nursing services and resources, tuberculosis control, venereal disease control, dental services and resources, and injury control.

Community health practice and research	$84,282,000
Last year	28,230,000

This appropriation is made up of about 61 percent grants, 29 percent student loans, and 10 percent direct operations. The grant programs consist of $10 million for general health formula grants to States; $15 million for training grants, traineeships, and fellowships to schools or students of schools of nursing, engineering, and public health to strengthen and expand their graduate or specialized public health training programs; $3,816,000 for research grants; $3 million for family health service clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers; $9 million for a new program of home health service formula grants to develop, improve, and expand State home health services; $10,482,000 for educational improvement grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry (under new legislation); and $200,000 for scholarships to outstanding students of low-income families for medical, dental, osteopathic, and optometric education. The allocations for student loan programs are $15,800,000 for the health professions and $8,900,000 for nurses. The remainder, $8,084,000, is for direct operations to provide research, technical services, demonstrations, and training directed toward more effective administration of State and local health services.

Chronic diseases and health of the aged	$83,088,000
Last year	53,908,000

Of this appropriation, $12,300,000 is used to assist the States in expanding and improving programs for the development of community facilities and services for the care of the aged and chronically ill. An additional $10 million is for grants to States or nonprofit agencies for studies and demonstrations aimed at the development of new or improved ways of providing services outside the hospital. Now financed through this appropriation are a research grant program, $3,551,000; State grants for cancer, $3,500,000, and heart, $9,500,000; and project grants for cancer, $13,933,000, and neurological and sensory diseases, $7,250,000. A research training grant program is in its second year, with $200,000 to offer students broad training and experience opportunities in the field of chronic diseases. A new program of grants to implement planning against mental retardation is included at a level of $2,750,000 under authority of the Social Security Amendments of 1965. The balance is for direct programs for the development and improvement of methods for the identification and prevention of chronic illness; for the care and restoration of the chronically ill and aged; and for meeting special health problems of older people.

Communicable disease activities	$40,497,000
Last year	29,974,000

About 40 percent of this appropriation is used for direct activities of the PHS Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta, Ga., and its affiliated operations. The Communicable Disease Center carries on studies in epidemiology, furnishes laboratory diagnostic services, and sponsors special projects to assist States. In addition, there are programs of grants for: (1) community immunization against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, tetanus, measles, and whooping cough, $8 million; (2) research, $1,921,000; and (3) the eradication of the Aedes Aegypti mosquito in nine States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, $14,267,000.

Nursing services and resources	$19,575,000
Last year	21,660,000

This appropriation provides: $9 million for traineeship grants to prepare nurses to teach in the various fields of nursing and to serve in administrative and supervisory capacities and other nursing specialties; $3 million for project grants to diploma, collegiate, and associate degree schools of nursing to assist them to improve or expand their programs; $2,500,000 to be used as grants for payment to diploma schools to defray a portion of the cost of training federally supported nursing students; $412,000 for fellowship grants to individuals to increase the number of scientifically trained nurses qualified to undertake a research in nursing; $480,000 for research training grants to basis science departments in universities to improve training opportunities in the health-related sciences for nurses; and $2,170,000 for research grants to develop better methods of patient care. The balance of the funds is to be used for direct operations in the improvement of nursing practices, better utilization of nursing resources, and the administration of the grant and loan programs.

Tuberculosis control	$15,666,000
Last year	10,932,000

This appropriation will continue the implementation of the recommendation of the Surgeon General's Task Force on Tuberculosis Control. Grants to States for diagnostic and treatment clinics, mass casefinding, and follow-up services account for $12,700,000, of which $9,700,000 is for project grants to States or political subdivisions to concentrate on problem areas of tuberculosis control, $3 million is for allocation to States on a formula basis. The remainder is for direct research into the areas of risk of infections and preventive measures and for making technical assistance and training available to States and local health departments.

Venereal disease control	$10,392,000
Last year	10,105,000

Of this appropriation, $6,229,000 is for grants to States and to political subdivisions thereof for venereal disease detection, treatment, and control on a special-need basis. The remainder is for technical assistance to the States, especially in high-prevalence areas, and for research and evaluation activities.

Dental services and resources	$8,383,000
Last year	7,226,000

Of this appropriation, $944,000 is for extramural research leading to preventive and control measures and the application of techniques to meet the dental needs of people. $2,549,000 of the total is for grants to dental schools for the training of students in the use of dental assistants. A program of formula grants to States to stimulate the development of State and community resources for the prevention and control of dental disease is included at a level of $1 million. The remaining funds are provided to study the status of the Nation's dental health and of its dental manpower supply, to conduct studies and demonstrations relating to the development and applications of methods for preventing and controlling dental diseases and disorders which can be applied on a community basis, to develop methods for extending the availability of dental care, and to provide professional and technical assistance relating to these activities.

Injury control	$4, 350, 000
Last year	3, 886, 000

About 45 percent of this appropriation is used to support research through grants to non-Federal organizations. Two new programs have been initiated to increase the supply of research manpower: a program of fellowships to individuals, $50,000; and training grants to institutions, $100,000. The balance is for direct research operations, for epidemiological investigations to determine the extent and cause of accidents, and for demonstrations and technical assistance to agencies responsible for accident control.

Construction of health educational facilities	$90, 599, 000
Last year	110, 782, 000

These funds provide for construction grants to increase the opportunities for the training of professional health personnel. This appropriation provides: $45 million for the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, or professional public health personnel; $15 million for the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of dentists; $15 million for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, professional public health personnel, or dentists; and $15 million for the construction of teaching facilities for nurses.

Environmental health activities	$83, 388, 000
Last year	64, 459, 000

This group of activities includes the following programs, each financed from a separate appropriation: air pollution; radiological health; environmental health sciences; environmental engineering and sanitation; and occupational health.

Air pollution	$26, 662, 000
Last year	20, 995, 000

This appropriation provides: $5,339,000 for research grants; $1,687,000 for fellowships and training grants; $5 million for control program grants; and $1,850,000 for survey and demonstration grants. An additional $1,899,000 is used for research contracts. The balance is devoted to the conduct of research related to the effects, control, abatement, and prevention of air pollution; to consultative services to State and local health and air pollution control agencies; and to training courses for State, local, and industry personnel.

Radiological health	$21, 044, 000
Last year	19, 720, 000

Of this appropriation, $2,546,000 is used for research grants; $2,500,000, for grants to provide training for radiological health specialists; $2,378,000 for research contracts; and $2,500,000, for State program development grants which are distributed to States by formula. The other funds finance direct PHS research to determine the levels of radiation exposure of man from various sources and the precise biological effects, and the laboratory and surveillance activities to provide basic data. Technical assistance and training courses are also provided.

Environmental health sciences	$15, 983, 000
Last year	9, 380, 000

This appropriation was established in 1964 to finance activities which are basic to the environmental health programs but which cannot be classified into one of the five categorical programs. The appropriation includes $6,219,000 for research grants; $3,578,000 for research training grants; $2,524,000 for research contracts; and $914,000 for the Arctic Health Research Center at Anchorage, Alaska. The balance is for direct research in environmental toxicology and epidemiology with emphasis on pesticides.

Environmental engineering and sanitation	$13, 842, 000
Last year	9, 170, 000

This appropriation provides $5,349,000 for research grants; $150,000 for training grants to develop qualified researchers in solid waste disposal; $2 million for grants to demonstrate new and improved methods of disposing of solid wastes; and $400,000 in planning grants for surveys and planning by State and interstate agencies. An additional $345,000 is used for research contracts. The remainder of the funds is used by PHS to provide professional guidance and leadership to States and local communities to help them insure that only safe milk, shellfish, and food supplies are served to the public and to the 2 million travelers per day carried on interstate conveyances; and to maintain healthful environments. This is done through research, consultation, application of research findings, technical assistance, training, and inspections.

Occupational health	$5, 857, 000
Last year	5, 194, 000

Grants are made to individuals and to organizations for research studies on hazards and diseases related to the occupational environment. These grants account for 46 percent of the appropriation. In addition, $308,000 is for research contracts. The balance of the funds finances direct PHS research on these problems, and assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies and to industry in preventing and controlling occupational hazards and diseases.

Indian health activities and facilities	$80, 289, 000
Last year	71, 775, 000

The Public Health Service is responsible for the health of American Indians and Alaskan natives (Eskimos, etc.). The total is broken down as follows: hospital care in Indian hospitals, $38,688,000; contract medical care, $12,892,000; field health service, $12,770,000; program direction, $1,843,000; and modernization of hospitals and construction of facilities, $14,096,000. In addition, the Indian health activities of the PHS will receive approximately $855,000 as reimbursements from other Government agencies.

Hospitals and medical care	$58, 210, 000
Last year	55, 064, 000

These funds are used for operational costs and maintenance of Public Health Service hospitals and health services in caring for American seamen, Coast Guardsmen, members of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, PHS commissioned officers and their dependents, Federal employees injured at work, leprosy patients, and narcotic addicts. The appropriation also includes $1,200,000 for payments to Hawaii for the care of patients suffering from leprosy. Not shown in the appropriation is approximately $8,905,000 additional income principally from other Federal agencies for reimbursable services.

Grants for construction of health research activities	$56, 000, 000
Last year	58, 000, 000

These funds are available for planning and construction of research facilities. To be eligible for grants, the applicant must be a public or nonprofit institution determined by the Surgeon General, after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Health Research Facilities, to be competent to engage in the type of research for which the facility is to be constructed. This is the ninth year of this program's operation. The 1966 appropriation included $6 million for construction grants to assist universities and nonprofit institutions in the construction and equipping of facilities for research on mental retardation and related aspects of human development.

Construction of community mental health centers	$50, 000, 000
Last year	35, 000, 000

The Community Mental Health Centers Act (title II of public Law 88–164) authorizes a program of matching grants for the construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers. These centers will offer a comprehensive range of services including inpatient services, diagnostic and emergency services, consultation and education, rehabilitation, research, and training.

Retired pay for PHS commissioned officers	$8, 020, 000
Last year	7, 066, 000

As of June 30, 1965, there were 536 retired commissioned officers of the Public Health Service receiving benefits under this program. By June 30, 1966, it is estimated that there will be 607 on the rolls. Included in the activity are funds for dependents' medical care in non-PHS facilities.

PHS buildings and facilities	$7, 977, 000
Last year	19, 702, 000

The following projects, totaling $7,977,000, were authorized by Congress: $180,000 for the communicable disease facility, San Juan, Puerto Rico; $76,000 for the Northeast shellfish sanitation research center addition; $250,000 for a dental health center; $118,000 for the Northwest shellfish sanitation research center; $370,000 for a solid waste research facility; $100,000 for the laboratory facility, Cincinnati, Ohio; $20,000 for the Appalachian environmental health field station; $1,093,000 for the modernization of PHS hospitals; $236,000 for multilevel parking facilities at NIH; $1,314,000 for repairs and improvements; $1 million for a child health and human development research facility at NIH; $1,550,000 for a clinical center addition at NIH; and $1,670,000 for neurology-child health research facilities, Puerto Rico, NIH.

Foreign quarantine activities	$7, 436, 000
Last year	7, 009, 000

The Public Health Service provides medical quarantine services at almost 400 ports of entry on borders of the United States. It also operates 32 medical examination stations on foreign soil for the examination of aliens seeking visas to enter the United States. Inspections are made of all seagoing vessels and aircraft entering the United States. It is estimated that the Service will examine more than 5,800,000 aliens in this country and 211,000 abroad during fiscal 1966.

National Health Statistics	$7, 230, 000
Last year	6, 304, 000

The National Center for Health Statistics administers the National Health Survey Act and the functions formerly assigned to the National Office of Vital Statistics. Its program includes: (a) the collection, compilation, analysis, and dissemination of statistics on births, deaths, fetal deaths, marriages and divorces, and other health data related to these basic vital events; (b) continuing surveys and special health statistics studies on the amount, distribution, and effects of illness and disability in the United States and the services received for or because of such conditions; (c) studies of health survey methods with a view to their continued improvement; and (d) technical advice and assistance on the application of statistical methods in the health and medical fields.

Office of the Surgeon General	$6, 648, 000
Last year	6, 214, 000

These funds are used for administrative expenses of this office, including international health activities and evaluation of public health needs.

National Library of Medicine	$5, 510, 000
Last year	3, 958, 000

The National Library of Medicine has the most extensive collection of published medical information in the world. In addition to making its resources available through traditional library practices, the Library has placed the computer-based Medlars (medical literature analysis and retrieval system) into operation. Medlars is utilized to publish the "Index Medicus," to provide current awareness services in particular research fields, and to perform special one-time searches of the literature for information bearing on specific scientific or professional topics. The 1966 budget includes funds for expanding the central Medlars capability and the decentralization of Medlars to university medical centers, implementing part of a Departmentwide program to improve the communication of information on the actions and effects of drugs, and increasing efforts to halt the loss of medical information through paper deterioration.

Scientific activities overseas	$5, 000, 000
Last year	1, 000, 000

This appropriation provides for the purchase of U.S.-owned local currencies in foreign countries for the conduct of medical research activities in those countries under the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and of the International Health Research Act of 1960.

Emergency health activities	----------
Last year	$8, 875, 000

This program assists States and communities in their survival and recovery plans in the event of an emergency by: stockpiling and prepositioning emergency medical supplies; development of preparedness programs covering health services and resources; and development and institution of training, research, and health resources programs at the national and regional levels. No funds were appropriated for this activity in 1966; however, the program will be financed from unobligated balance in the amount of $9,543,000 brought forward from 1965.

Bureau of Family Services (medical payments)	$869, 000, 000
Last year	648, 000, 000

Officials of the Welfare Administration estimate that approximately $5.5 billion in Federal, State, and local funds will be spent in fiscal year 1966 for assistance payments to, or on behalf of recipients of the federally aided public assistance programs. It is estimated that approximately $1,770 million, or more than 30 percent, of these public assistance payments will be used for medical and health needs of those recipients—about $1,620 million to be paid to vendors of medical care (such as physicians, hospitals, pharmacists, nursing homes, etc.), and about $150 million in the form of direct payments to recipients to enable them to meet their medical care needs. The Federal share of the combined medical payments ($1,770 million) will be about $869 million.

Public Law 89–97, the Social Security Amendments of 1965, permits states to continue to make payments to medical vendors under the present categories or to establish a new single category (medical assistance program) for all recipients of money payments in the other categories and for the medically indigent beginning January 1, 1966. The amendments also permit Federal financial participation in payments for aged persons in institutions for mental illness or tuberculosis, beginning January 1, 1966. The foregoing estimate for 1966 includes an increase for a half year that would result from the 1965 amendments. The estimates increase as a result of the more favorable matching for vendor medical payments under title XIX cannot be distributed by program because the States are free to use the additional Federal funds and to transfer currently available funds among programs in whatever manner seems most suitable to meet program needs and requirements. Among the requirements for an approved plan for medical assistance programs under title XIX is that the medical care made available to all recipients of a money payment under the other titles must be of the same amount, duration, and scope. Since most States make available less medical care to recipients of aid to families with dependent children than they do to the aged, it seems likely that more of the increase in Federal funds for title XIX will be used for children than for the aged.

The estimated Federal share of vendor medical payments shown above has been computed by assuming that these payments are matched last within the formulas for Federal financial participation. This results in a smaller Federal share than would have been shown had it been assumed—as it was in earlier years—that Federal participation in every item of need, including medical care, is the same. In order to obtain the increase in Federal funds for title XIX, it must be assumed that vendor medical payments under the present formula are matched last. Since it is not known which States will adopt title XIX, the Federal funds for medical care for recipients of old age assistance have been estimated for both 1965 and 1966 by assuming that vendor medical payments have been matched last within the formula for old age assistance. Thus, the estimated Federal funds for medical care for recipients of old age assistance, including medical care in the money payment to the recipient, is $308 million in 1965 and $336 million in 1966, without giving any effect to title XIX in 1966. That is, these are the estimated expenditures from Federal funds for medical care that all States would spend for medical care under old age assistance if there were no title XIX in 1966. The estimated Federal funds for medical assistance for the aged are $267,800,000 in 1965 and $350,100,000 in 1966, without giving any effect to title XIX in 1966.

Federal Water Pollution Control Administration	$187, 142, 000
Last year	130, 936, 000

This group of activities includes those previously carried under the appropriations "Buildings and facilities, Public Health Service" and "Water supply and water pollution control, Public Health Service" for water pollution control programs now included under the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration established by Congress in 1966.

Grants for waste treatment works construction	$141, 000, 000
Last year	93, 000, 000

Federal Government makes grants for the construction of waste treatment plants. The annual authorization was increased by the Water Quality Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–234)—$121 million will be allocated for waste treatment works construction. In addition, in 1966 $20 million was appropriated for grants and contracts to demonstrate new and improved methods of controlling the discharge of sewage or other waste from sewers.

Water supply and water pollution control	$45, 142, 000
Last year	35, 126, 000

Grants and contracts account for 37 percent of this appropriation. These include $6,045,000 for research grants; $3,210,000 for fellowships and training grants; $2,165,000 for demonstration grants; $5 million for control program grants to States and interstate agencies; and $300,000 for research contracts. The balance of the funds finances development of comprehensive river basin water pollution control programs; basic and applied research; establishment of water quality standards, including review of State-proposed standards and provisions of consultation and guidelines to the States; enforcement of water pollution control legislation; collection and dissemination of basic data; field studies of water quality problems; and technical assistance to other agencies.

Buildings and facilities	$1, 000, 000
Last year	2, 810, 000

The Congress authorized $1 million for a facility for field evaluation of advanced waste treatment.

Children's Bureau	$141, 105, 000
Last year	89, 761, 000

Operating under the Welfare Administration, the Children's Bureau administers grants to States for maternal and child welfare. This year $187 million was appropriated to fund these grants. Of this total, $139 million directly supports health-related activities, including maternal and child health services, crippled children's services, special maternity care projects, research relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services, and special project grants for health care of school and preschool children. The increase over 1965 mainly represents the increased authorization for grants for maternal and child health services and crippled chilren's services, an increase for special project grants for maternity and infant care, and the initiation of a new program of special project grants for health care of school and preschool children. In addition to the grants, it is estimated that 43 percent or $2,105,000, of the Children's Bureau's direct operational funds ($4,840,000) goes to administer these health-related grants and to provide consultative services to State agencies and other public and voluntary organizations engaged in maternal and child health services.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	$53, 627, 000
Last year	40, 359, 000

Grants to States are provided for: (a) Support of basic rehabilitation services, including medical examinations, surgical and therapeutic treatment, hospitalization, prostheses, occupational tools and aids, vending stands, rehabilitation facilities, vocational training, and funds for maintenance, $121,500,000 (of which it is estimated that $30,800,000 will be used for medical rehabilitation); (b) the innovation of rehabilitation services, $3 million; (c) the expansion of vocational rehabilitation services, $5 million; (d) construction of facilities and workshops, $1,500,000; and (e) workshop improvement activities, $1,310,000.

Appropriations for research and training are divided as follows: (a) To support research and demonstration projects which hold promise of making a contribution to the solution of vocational rehabilitation problems common to all or several States, $20,570,000; (b) for training of rehabilitation personnel, including physicians, therapists, psychologists, counselors, and medical and psychiatric social workers, $24,800,000; and (c) for special centers for research and training in rehabilitation at universities having appropriate resources for clinical research and teaching in the several disciplines of rehabilitation, $7,575,000. Also $3,908,000 of the funds available under (a) above are used for projects relating to the medical aspects of rehabilitation, such as projects in the field of rehabilitation medicine. In addition, $11,539,000 of the funds under (b) above are used for teaching grants and traineeships in medicine and related fields. About $6,570,000 of the funds under (c) above are for medical activities. This appropriation also provides $100,000 for domestic support for the international rehabilitation research and training program and $100,000 for a national study of rehabilitation needs.

The sum of $3,875,000 is available in fiscal year 1966 for salaries and expenses to carry out all vocational rehabilitation activities, of which approximately $810,000 is used to carry on medical- and health-related activities—$560,000 is also available for the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act.

Rehabilitation activities overseas	$2,000,000
Last year	2,000,000

This appropriation provides for the purchase, from the Treasury, of U.S.-owned local currencies of foreign countries for the conduct of research and training in rehabilitation in those countries under the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), as amended, and the International Health Research Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–610). This program is administered by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.

Food and Drug Administration	$53,079,000
Last year	40,370,000

The above amount is appropriated to enforce the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and five related laws. Combined, these statutes provide FDA, through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with authority to help insure that: (1) Foods are safe, pure, and wholesome; (2) drugs are safe and effective; (3) cosmetics are harmless; (4) therapeutic devices are safe and effective; (5) certain hazardous household chemical aids carry adequate warning; and (6) all of the foregoing are honestly and informatively labeled and packaged. By supplemental appropriation, FDA is given the capability under new authority to curb the use of psychotoxic drugs and prevent the distribution of counterfeit drugs through investigating diversions from legitimate channels and educating the public of their dangers. To implement these laws, FDA inspects factories, warehouses, and distributors; samples and examines shipments moving in interstate commerce; and investigates illegal activities. FDA also clears all new drugs for safety and effectiveness before they are marketed; checks to see that dangerous drugs are sold only upon prescription; sets safe levels or amounts (tolerances) for all food additives, pesticides, and artificial colors; combats medical, nutritional, and mechanical quackery; works with industry to promote voluntary compliance with the law; and works with consumers to help them obtain maximum protection from the law. Also in fiscal year 1966, $2,692,000 (obtained from fees for services paid by industry and not included in the total above) will be used to: (1) Certify the strength, purity, and other requisites of antibiotic drugs and insulin and its derivatives; (2) establish tolerances for residues of pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural products; and (3) establish tolerances for, and certify batches of, all colors used in or on foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

FDA buildings and facilities	$5,720,000
Last year	10,875,000

The buildings and facilities appropriation for fiscal year 1966 includes $375,000 for converting 15,000 square feet of office space to laboratories in FB–8 and $750,000 for portable equipment for FDA's headquarters scientific personnel. Funds for the district office renovation program include $3,240,000 for constructing and $705,000 for equipping district offices in St. Louis and San Francisco, and $650,000 to acquire portable equipment for Denver, Philadelphia, and Chicago.

St. Elizabeths Hospital	$11,572,000
Last year	11,652,000

St. Elizabeths Hospital provides treatment for several classes of mentally ill persons, including those residing in the District of Columbia; beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration; beneficiaries of the PHS; mentally ill persons charged with or convicted of crimes in the U.S. courts (including the courts of the District of Columbia); certain American citizens and nationals found mentally ill in foreign countries, the Panama Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands; and members of the military services admitted to the hospital prior to July 16, 1946. Total operational expenses in fiscal year 1966 are estimated at $29,906,000, of which approximately $20,311,000 will be obtained as reimbursements from other agencies (mainly the District of Columbia) and $9,595,000 from an indefinite Federal appropriation. The Congress has also appropriated $1,977,000 for facility improvements. This hospital has an average daily patient load of 5,936.

U.S. Office of Education	$5,000,000
Last year	5,000,000

The Office of Education administers a program of Federal aid to State boards of vocational education for the purpose of expanding, improving, and operating both practical nurse education and training for other similar health occupations. During the current fiscal year, $5 million in Federal money was allocated to the States for use on a matching basis. Expenditure of these funds is limited to costs of instruction, equipment and supplies, guidance services, supervision, studies, teacher education, program promotion, and selected administrative costs. In addition to the above amounts, unspecified amounts of money are available under other appropriations for vocational education (the George-Barden Act and Public Law 88–210, the Vocational Education Act of 1963). The latter are authorized for use in the broad range of vocational education programs and may be used for practical nurse education as well as training for other health occupations that are supportive to the medical, dental, and nursing professions.

Freedmen's Hospital	$4,624,000
Last year	4.038,000

This institution, with an average patient load of 361 plus 40 newborns, is a medical teaching facility and general hospital. Its patients are chiefly from the District of Columbia and the adjoining areas. The hospital is utilized for training of interns and residents, many of whom are graduates of Howard University, and it has a nurses' training school. A total of $7,831,000 is authorized for operating costs. Of this amount, $3,207,000 expected 1966 reimbursements from charges made to patients and payments made by the District of Columbia and by the counties surrounding Washington which utilize these facilities for welfare patients, must be realized. Some supervisory functions over this program are vested in the Public Health Service.

(NOTE.—Public Law 87–262 authorizes the transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University and the construction of a new hospital of up to 500 beds.)

Howard University	$2,841,000
Last year	2,403,000

This university is jointly supported by congressional appropriations and private funds, and offers instruction in 10 schools and colleges, including colleges of medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy. The Federal contribution for direct current operations in the colleges of medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy is estimated to be $2,841,000 for 1966. This represents approximately 25 percent of the university's appropriation for salaries and general expense.

The entire student body of the university for 1965–66 is expected to exceed 9,800. There are 395 students enrolled in the college of medicine, 342 in the college of dentistry, and 223 in the college of pharmacy, for the fall semester of 1965.

Assistance to refugees in the United States	$1,784,000
Last year	2,421,000

Under authority contained in Public Law 87–510, outpatient medical care and hospital care for acute illnesses are provided needy Cuban refugees registered at the Refugee Emergency Center in Miami, Fla.

Assistance for repatriated U.S. nationals	$313,000
Last year	278,000

The Secretary of HEW is authorized to provide temporary care, including hospitalization at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D.C., or at any other appropriate Federal or non-Federal hospital, for American nationals adjudged insane or otherwise found mentally ill in foreign countries. The amounts included above for this purpose are $271,600 for 1965 and $306,000 for 1966.

The Social Security Act authorizes temporary assistance to U.S. citizens and their dependents who return to this country because of destitution, illness, or international crises, and who are without available resources. Estimated Federal funds expended for medical costs for this group, included in the above estimates, are $6,000 for 1965 and $7,000 for 1966.

Federal surplus property donation program	$115,830
Last year	118,500

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare administers a program of disposal of Federal surplus real and personal property for public health purposes, including research. Surplus personal property is donated through State agencies to tax-supported and private nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, and medical research and other similar institutions. Surplus personal property is donated at no cost to the recipient other than the handling costs involved. Surplus real property is conveyed at market value against which a public benefit allowance discount is applied, based on the benefits accrued or to be accrued to the Nation from the use of such property. The amounts of such allowances range from 40 to 100 percent of market value, and are earned over the normal 20-year period of deed restrictions. Last year, personal property costing approximately $39,400,000 at the time of acquisition, and real property costing approximately $3,100,000 was transferred for health purposes. It is expected that the level of donations and transfers for fiscal year 1966 will be approximately the same as for fiscal year 1965.

Federal funds for the Federal surplus poverty program are only appropriated to defray the direct Federal administrative expenses of operations of the surplus poverty program. It is estimated that of the $1,053,000 authorized for this use in 1966, approximately $115,830 will be utilized for the distribution of surplus property for health-related purposes.

VETERAN'S ADMINISTRATION (THIS YEAR, $1,339,742,600; LAST YEAR, $1,302,210,000)

Medical care	$1,191,956,000
Last year	1,154,409,000

This appropriation funds the operating costs of all medical care programs conducted by the VA other than agency level administration costs and research activities. It includes the costs of operating 164 hospitals, 16 domiciliaries, 2 restoration centers, outpatient clinics located in each hospital, plus 49 clinics or subclinics not located in a hospital setting. It also includes the costs related to the inpatient care of veterans in non-VA hospitals and nursing care beds, domiciliary care provided eligible veterans in

State veterans' homes, and fees to physicians and dentists who are not VA employees for care and treatment provided under a hometown care program.

The appropriation does not limit the distribution of funds among the major activities financed thereunder. The costs reflected under the funded activities represent estimates of how the appropriation will be distributed in fiscal 1966.

Inpatient care in VA hospitals	$967,800,000
Last year	947,152,000

VA's largest medical care expenditure covers inpatient care provided in 164 VA hospitals. In fiscal year 1966, it is estimated that a daily average of 117,507 hospital beds will be operated to care for an average daily patient load of 108,959—an occupancy rate of 93 percent. Costs include the salaries of physicians, dentists, and other personnel needed to operate the hospitals. Also included are the costs of operating 1,645 nursing care beds providing care for an average daily load of 1,510 in VA facilities.

Outpatient care	$144,731,000
Last year	138,257,000

The bulk of these costs is for care and treatment provided on an outpatient basis to eligible veterans by clinics located within and outside a VA hospital setting; $11,074,000 is planned for fees to physicians and dentists who are not VA employees for services provided under the hometown care program.

Domiciliary care	$41,085,000
Last year	39,793,000

Domiciliary care is provided in VA facilities for about 14,729 veterans who, while incapacitated for employment, are not in need of full hospital care. VA also makes payment to 33 State veterans homes for both domiciliary and nursing care with an estimated daily load of 9,480. These payments are expected to amount to approximately $8,843,000 in fiscal year 1966.

Contract hospitalization and nursing home care	$25,529,000
Last year	16,888,000

These costs cover inpatient care provided eligible veterans in non-VA hospitals. It is estimated that an average of 2,595 patients will be cared for daily in non-VA hospitals, and an average of 2,138 patients will be provided nursing home care in community facilities, on a contractual basis in fiscal year 1966. The patient load in other Federal hospitals is estimated at 1,333, and in non-Federal hospitals, at 1,262. Mental disabilities constitute the largest single category of contract patients in hospitals.

Miscellaneous benefits and services	$12,811,000
Last year	12,319,000

Included under this heading are expenses not directly connected with medical care and treatment of patients, such as travel costs of beneficiaries, operation of personnel quarters, services provided other governmental units on a nonreimbursable basis, and maintenance and operation of cemeteries.

Construction of hospitals and domiciliaries	$90,511,600
Last year	98,103,000

These funds are for the construction, replacement, and relocation of hospitals and modernization, alterations, or major repairs for existing VA hospitals, domiciliaries, and other facilities. In 1966, construction funds are provided for replacement hospitals at Chicago, Ill. ($17,093,000) and at Columbia, Mo. ($11,815,000).

Construction of State nursing homes	$2,500,000
Last year	0

The first appropriation of matching funds for the construction of State nursing homes for war veterans under Public Law 88-450, enacted August 19, 1964.

Medical research	$40,893,000
Last year	37,000,000

These funds are for research, mostly in VA hospitals. The appropriation may be broken down as follows: general medical and surgical research, $23,770,000; neuropsychiatric, $6,133,000; atomic medical research, $4,479,000; pulmonary, $2,652,000; prosthetics testing, $1,275,000; and other, $2,584,000.

Medical Administration	$11,771,000
Last year	10,687,000

This appropriation covers the expenses of overall administration and direction of medical care and research programs.

Medical education and training	$1,725,000
Last year	1,625,000

These funds cover the costs, other than salaries, related to educational assignments for physicians, including residents, and other employees in VA hospitals and clinics. These activities are conducted both in and outside VA facilities. Included are such costs as tuition charges, travel, lecturers' fees, and training materials and devices.

Medical care—Philippine veterans	$386,000
Last year	386,000

This sum is used to reimburse the Philippine government for the cost of hospitalization for service-connected veterans of the Commonwealth Army who served with the U.S. Forces during World War II. The program is scheduled to terminate in June 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (THIS YEAR, $1,050,908,070; LAST YEAR $1,040,782,000)

Figures for the Department of Defense are estimates. Appropriations are not broken down into detailed categories of activities.

The reader is cautioned against using the reported appropriation figures as a yardstick for comparing the activities of the three services. Differing assigned missions, organization, and bookkeeping systems make it impossible to obtain total figures for all medical activities. For example, the amounts contained in this report for the Navy medical service cover only services and facilities under the direct control of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. The operation expenses of station hospitals and shipboard facilities are carried on the budget of the individual naval station or ship.

It must also be understood that funds appropriated for construction may not be totally obligated during the fiscal year.

Army

Army medical service	$395,000,000
Last year	397,900,000

The Army expects to operate 81 hospitals throughout the world, with an expected daily patient load of 12,025. To operate these hospitals, the Army had, as of August 31, 1965, 5,023 physicians, of whom 1,874 were in the regular service; and 5,055 nurses, 1,880 of whom were civilians. To meet the expenses of its medical activities, the Army expects to expend in fiscal year 1966, $395 million, not including reimbursements.

According to the Office of the Surgeon General, the following amounts, including reimbursements, will be expended:

Hospitalization in Army hospitals	$142,800,000
Outpatient care in Army facilities	92,700,000
Dependents' medical care	80,800,000
Training and other miscellaneous activities	53,300,000
Research	51,900,000
Dental care in Army facilities	42,600,000
Construction	31,200,000

Approximately $100,200,000 of reimbursable activities are included in the figures listed above. For example, although $80,800,000 is shown for the care of military dependents in civilian hospitals under the Dependents' Medical Care Act, only $24,200,000 is for the medical care of Army dependents. The remainder of $56,600,000 is for civilian services provided to dependents of the other military services on a reimbursable basis. This reimbursable amount is included since the Department of the Army is the executive agent for the dependents' medical care program.

Air Force

Air Force medical service	$379,500,000
Last year	397,900,000

The Department of the Air Force estimates that in the 1966 fiscal year it will spend $379,500,000 for medical services it will provide on a worldwide basis to all tactical, strategic, air defense, and other commands or separately identified activities. Service will include hospitalization, outpatient care, dental care, military public health and occupational medicine, bioenvironmental engineering, aerospace medicine, veterinary medicine, aeromedical evacuation (including casualty staging flights) for all the services, physiological training (including altitude chamber operations and pressure suit fittings), and the operation of epidemiological flights.

In fiscal year 1966, the Air Force will use about 10,621 officers to perform its total medical mission, of which 3,287 will be physicians and 3,300 nurses. The remainder of the officer personnel consists of dentists, veterinarians, medical service corps, and biomedical science corps.

The Air Force will operate 118 hospitals and 85 dispensaries with a total capacity of 10,538 operating beds. It is anticipated that in fiscal 1966 the inpatient workload will be 8,289 average daily occupied beds, and annual outpatient visits will total 15,396,000.

The estimated costs outlined below are for the total cost of operating the Air Force medical service, including military salaries and payments to other services for care provided to active duty and retired personnel of the Air Force. The following items of expense have been identified:

Operation of hospitals, medical centers, and dental clinics	$294,700,000
Dependents' medical care (civilian hospitals)	25,300,000
Medical care in non-Air Force facilities	22,400,000
Construction	16,400,000
Medical education and training	3,000,000
Medical administration	2,100,000
Medical research	100,000
Other activities nonrelated to patient care	15,500,000

Navy

Navy medical service	$275,083,000
Last year	243,302,000

In 1966, the Navy will operate the following facilities:

Medical Centers [1]	3
U.S. naval hospitals—continental [1]	22
U.S. naval hospitals—overseas	3
Medical research activities [1]	10
Preventive medicine units [1]	4
Disease vector control centers [1]	2
U.S. naval dispensaries [1]	3
U.S. naval dental clinics [1]	10
Hospital ships	2
Station hospitals	31
Selected dispensaries	160
Shipboard facilities	995

[1] Under management control of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

During fiscal 1966, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery estimates that the Navy will operate, on a daily average, 12,961 beds. The daily average occupied beds at naval hospitals and medical centers is expected to be 10,209. The daily average of patients in other medical facilities is estimated as follows: other military or Federal, 2,469; civilian hospitals, 1,624; shipboard facilities, 703. The medical officer strength as of July 31, 1965, amounted to 3,887, consisting of 2,103 in the regular service and 1,784 reservists.

Under the Navy's bookkeeping system, the budget of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery supports only those activities under its management control. Thus, the following figures do not reflect the costs applicable to medical facilities not under its management control, nor the salaries of military medical personnel attached to ships, fleet operating units, and the fleet marine force.

To carry out its operations, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery estimates that its expenditures in 1966 will be $275,083,000, broken down as follows:

Military pay	$91, 484, 000
Operation of Bumed activities [1]	67, 410, 000
Dependents' medical care	39, 251, 000
Medical care in nonnaval facilities	29, 561, 000
New construction	[2] 13, 458, 000
Research	10, 531, 000
Care of the dead	2, 332, 000
Other costs	21, 056, 000

[1] The Bureau of Yards and Docks has assumed responsibility for maintenance, utilities, communications, transportation, and support of certain personnel facilities at naval medical activities; therefore, funds are not included for these functions.

[2] Includes funds for 1 naval hospital under the management control of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and 15 smaller medical activities not under its management control.

Office of Civil Defense	$1, 245, 000
Last year	1,585, 000

In 1966, the Office of Civil Defense expects to spend $745,000 for its medical self-help training program, under which training is designed to enable a person to meet emergency health needs if professional medical care is unavailable for prolonged periods; and $500,000 for research studies to determine essential health and medical requirements during and after a disaster.

Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (health and medical)	$80, 070
Last year	95, 000

This Office is responsible for the broad planning and coordination of the medical and health programs of the Defense Department, the integration of the activities of the three military medical services, and the development of medical policies for the Defense Department. The Office also operates certain aspects of the service recruitment programs for physicians, dentists, and veterinary medical officers.

The above sum does not include salaries for the eight medical service officers and the one enlisted man who are assigned to the Office.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAMS (THIS YEAR, $168,840,000; LAST YEAR, $165,880,000)

Health insurance for Federal employees	$155, 200, 000
Last year	151, 000, 000

Under the terms of Public Law 86–382, the Federal agencies, as employers, are authorized to provide health insurance benefits for their employees who are active or who retired on or after the effective date of the law, and for their dependents. The employee has the right to select one of the following types of insurance plans: service benefits such as offered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield; an indemnity program offered by commercial insurance companies; programs offered by employee organizations; or comprehensive health plans such as HIP. Under the law, the Federal Government will contribute a specific amount, depending on the employee's marital status—2,194,700 employees have elected to participate in the program. Over 4,671,900 of their dependents will also be covered.

For fiscal year 1966, total subscription charges under the program are expected to approximate $520,100,000, with the Federal Government contributing approximately $155,200,000. While the law authorized a high and low option under both the service and indemnity plans, it anticipated that there would be at least one low option to which the Government would contribute 50 percent of the cost. If the employee selected one of the other higher priced options, he would still receive the same dollar contribution but would have to pay the difference. Slightly more than 86 percent of the employees selected the high option. Approximately 56 percent are enrolled in the service benefit plan, 23 percent in the indemnity benefit plan, 15 percent in the employee organization plans, 4 percent in the group practice plans, and 2 percent in the individual practice plans.

Health insurance for retired Federal employees	$13, 640, 000
Last year	14, 480, 000

Under the terms of Public Law 86–724, Federal agencies, as employers, are authorized to provide health insurance benefits for certain qualified retired employees and their dependents or survivors who are not covered under the program authorized by Public Law 86–382 above. Under the law, the retired employee has the right to choose to participate in a single Government-wide plan which is underwritten by commercial insurance under a contract with the Government or to receive protection under a qualified private plan of his own selection. Under the Government-wide plan, the retired employee may elect to subscribe for basic coverage only, for major medical coverage only, or for both. The Government's monthly contribution ($3.50 for a single annuitant, $7 for an annuitant with a dependent) for any participant—in the Government-wide plan or in any private plan—is equivalent to approximately one-half the premium for basic coverage or for major medical coverage in the Government-wide plan. Those selecting the Government plan would have their contribution deducted from their annuity. Those choosing a private plan would have their annuity increased by the amount of the Federal contribution.

Retired employees totaled 227,300 (of which 101,350 had dependents) were covered under the program as of June 30, 1965. Of the employees covered, 123,620 chose the Government plan; 103,680 purchased their own programs (Blue Cross-Blue Shield enrolled 63,885; employee organizations, 27,565; insurance companies, 8,255; and others, 3,975). The cost of the Federal Government's contributions is estimated at $13,640,000. It is not possible to estimate the total cost of the program because there is no way of ascertaining the cost of the insurance programs carried by annuitants who are purchasing their own insurance.

Since Public Law 86–724 provides coverage only for Federal employees who were retired at the time of its enactment, this program can be expected to become smaller with the passing of time.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (THIS YEAR, $128,430,600; LAST YEAR, $120,164,202)

Agricultural Research Service	$67, 051, 000
Last year	63, 533, 000

The activities of this Service having medical- and health-related significance are aimed toward learning how infectious diseases and harmful parasites of livestock and poultry are transmitted to man, the role of insects as vectors, and developing methods for their diagnosis, prevention, eradication, and control. Approximately 90 domestic livestock zoonotic diseases are transmissible to man, including brucellosis, leptospirosis, mycotic diseases, vesicular diseases, tuberculosis, swine erysipelas, worms and protozoa, leukosis, Newcastle, ornithosis, and salmonellosis.

Research is conducted to devise protective measures for decontamination and utilization of crops, animals, and soils affected by direct radiation or radioactive fallout to minimize their effects on the Nation's supply of meat and meat food products.

Research is also conducted on the use of pesticides to avoid the side hazards of pesticide residues in insects, crops, and livestock and on the effects of chemicals on crops, livestock, and water. This research includes the following: toxicological and pathological effects of pesticides, feed additives, etc., on livestock as found in their feed and on crops; physical and chemical nature of plant viruses; effects of pesticides on the composition and nutritive value of the current food supply; biological and other methods of controlling stored-products insects; and development of nontoxic mothproofing treatments. Research is also conducted on new and improved growth promotants, as well as on farmstead water supply, wastes disposal, health-related problems of tobacco, and deleterious molds and their control.

Human nutrition research is directed toward nutritive requirements of man; availability of nutrients in foods; metabolic response of man to various combinations of dietary proteins and fats; and discovering relationships between soils, plants, and animals to improve nutrition. Consumer and food economics research includes investigations of food consumption practices and the nutritive value of customary diets. Clothing and housing research includes microbiological studies on textiles.

Utilization research activities include development of dairy plant methods for removing Strontium 90 from milk; maintenance of a culture collection for identification of cultures from medical sources and for screening micro-organisms for production of antibiotics and vitamins; development of improved emulsion for intravenous feeding; and development of specialized methodology for obtaining characteristics and composition of fats from various tissues. This work also has included screening plant extracts for biological activity, such as for treatment of heart disease and cancer. The commercial development of penicillin came from departmental research in the micro-organism field.

Marketing research is directed toward minimizing deterioration and spoilage of farm commodities in marketing channels in order to provide the consumer a more wholesome product. Research is conducted on the effects of various disease organisms on poultry and the effects of light on the identification of poultry diseases in connection with poultry inspection activities.

To carry out the above purposes, $36,328,000 will be expended for the conduct of research ($35,040,000) and for research facilities ($1,288,000).

The Service also conducts preventive and community services, which include eradication of animal diseases, such as brucellosis and tuberculosis, which are transmissible to man; prevention of the introduction from foreign countries of animal diseases which may affect man; the regulation of pesticides which may be toxic to man; evaluation of pest control programs, with special reference to environmental impact associated with control and eradication procedures; and monitoring pesticides in agriculture.

For the above purposes, $30,723,000 will be expended.

Meat inspection, previously reported under this Service, has been transferred to the Consumer and Marketing Service.

Consumer and Marketing Service	$54, 814, 600
Last year	49, 168, 202

The programs financed from these funds for 1965 consisted of meat inspection ($32,909,705) and poultry inspection ($16,258,497). For 1966, $37,366,700 will be expended for meat inspection, and $17,447,900, for poultry inspection. These services are performed as a protection to the health of consumers. They assure a clean and wholesome supply of meat and poultry moving in interstate and foreign commerce through minute inspection in slaughter and processing plants of meat animals and their products, and poultry and its produce. Any such products found to be diseased or otherwise unfit for human consumption are removed from channels of trade and destroyed.

In addition to the appropriated funds shown above, fees paid by plants for overtime work and by other users of the Service are $8,661,000 for meat inspection and $2,645,000 for poultry inspection.

Cooperative State Research Service	$6, 565, 000
Last year	7, 463, 000

The State agricultural experiment stations are engaged in a number of research activities that have a direct effect upon or are related to human health. These research activities include (1) veterinary research to learn how infectious diseases and parasites are transmitted and to develop methods of diagnosis, prevention, and control of diseases; (2) dietary requirements of humans and human nutrition problems; (3) preservation of foods; (4) studies on plant diseases, particularly viruses, that help to provide a better understanding of the biology of human pathogens; (5) studies on nutritional physiological processes in animals that may be related to human health problems; (6) toxicological effects of agricultural chemicals; (7) pesticide residue research; (8) farm wastes disposal and rural sanitation; (9) assaying micro-organisms for production of antibiotics and vitamins; and (10) fallout studies on forages and vegetables.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE (THIS YEAR, $100,189,800; LAST YEAR, $138,766, 340)

Agency for International Development	$64, 760, 000
Last year	104, 424, 000

Bilateral activities of the United States in the field of health are carried out primarily by the Agency for International Development of the State Department. The Agency, through cooperatively financed programs, is helping more than 40 countries at their request to improve their health and living conditions. Other programs in health care are carried out by the State Department itself or through multilateral organizations such as the United Nations. Because programs are the subject of negotiation, it is difficult to determine until the end of the fiscal year which programs in which AID participates can be categorized as health or health-related programs. However, AID will participate in the following programs, the major portion of appropriations for which will be distributed in the form of loans.

Malaria eradication program	$19, 000, 000
Last year	26, 000, 000

The sum of $19 million has been programed thus far for U.S. participation in the worldwide malaria eradication program. The funds will be distributed as development grants, development loans, and special assistance under bilateral programs. Fifteen countries will participate in the program, including India, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, and Brazil, which have continuing programs. Further, the six Central American countries will receive funds for the purpose of carrying out a regional malaria eradication progam in fiscal 1966.

Community water supply program	$15, 760, 000
Last year	44, 000, 000

The sum of $3,760,000 has been earmarked for community water supply programs in Vietnam. It is anticipated that an additional $12 to $14 million will be allocated in fiscal 1966 for health-related community water supply programs.

Other cooperative health programs	$30, 000, 000
Last year	34, 424, 000

These funds represent grants to finance a broad range of health projects in the nature of capital assistance (one-third) and technical assistance (two-thirds) falling into the fields of (1) medical and nurse education, including grants to the American University of Beirut; (2) health center and hospital development; (3) rural health services; (4) training of health personnel locally, in the United States, and in third countries; (5) strengthening of public health institutions and health planning activities of Ministries of Public Health; (6) specific disease control campaigns; and (7) funds for Project Hope ($1,500,000).

U.S. Operations Mission, Vietnam	[1]
Last year	[1]

[1] Unknown.

The U.S. Operations Mission in Vietnam is participating in five health programs designed to give direct aid to civilians: (1) A military provincial hospital assistance program provides teams of U.S. medical personnel to care for Vietnamese civilians at provincial hospitals. Six teams (3 physicians, 1 administrative officer, and 12 medical technicians) are currently in service, and 15 additional teams are expected to be operational by the end of August 1966. (2) Under an AID contract with the People to People Foundation, Project Vietnam provides a continuous supply of 32 volunteer civilian physicians to serve a minimum of 60 days in provincial hospitals. (3) Four surgical teams from the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. Navy, and the Public Health Service are on detail to serve in provincial hospitals. (4) Medical logistical support is provided for the Medical Civic Action Program in rural areas. (Under this program, mobile teams consisting of a Medical Corps officer and two enlisted men, supplied with 13 basic drugs provided by USOM, stationed throughout the country conduct sick call for the rural population. The teams also train village, hamlet, civil guard, and self-defense corps health workers.) (5) Coordination and support of the efforts of ten other governments in providing health care to Vietnamese civilians, is provided.

Under the program, USOM is assisting in the development of the national provincial hospital network at 39 Vietnamese provincial hospitals. It has provided financial aid in the construction of 31 surgical suites in such hospitals, and it expects to provide aid for the total renovation of 16 hospitals.

In the field of health education, USOM has allocated $4,500,000 for the construction of a basic science complex for the faculties of medicine and dentistry of the University of Saigon. Through contracts with the American Medical Association and the American Dental Association, USOM will provide administration for the medical and dental education project to include development of curriculum standards and faculty assistance to the faculties of medicine and dentistry at the University of Saigon.

Similar assistance will also be provided to the faculty of medicine at the University of Hue.

USOM has financed the construction of classroom and ancillary buildings for two schools of nursing and will assist in the development of two additional schools. It will assist in the development of curriculum and provide faculty assistance at two schools of nursing and two schools of practical nursing.

USOM also will aid in the establishment of a physical medicine and rehabilitation center in Saigon for amputees and other casualties of war through a contract with the World Rehabilitation Fund, Inc.

World Health Organization (WHO)	$12, 327, 000
Last year	10, 852, 040

The assessment budget for WHO for calendar year 1965 is about $39,400,000, of which the United States will contribute about $12,327,000 (31.28 percent). WHO sponsors health projects in most areas of the world, with particular emphasis given to underdeveloped countries. Not reflected in the above total are U.S. contributions through AID to the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance and the special fund. In 1965, WHO executed about $11 million for the health portion of these programs. The U.S. share of that amount, at 40 percent, would be $4,400,000.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	$12, 000, 000
Last year	12, 000, 000

About 120 countries and territories are contributing to UNICEF's activities, which are expected in calendar year 1965 to cost over $35 million. The proposed U.S. contribution for calendar year 1966 is $12 million (30 percent). The fund is providing aid in more than 120 countries and territories. About 75 percent of UNICEF's program is devoted to health services, disease control, and nutrition, but at the same time a portion of its funds will go into the fields of education, family and child welfare, and vocational training.

Pan American Health Organization (PAHO)	$4, 700, 000
Last year	4, 263, 600

The assessment budget for PAHO for the calendar year 1965 is approximately $7,100,000, to which the United States will contribute about $4,700,000 (66 percent). PAHO sponsors health programs in the Western Hemisphere and serves as the regional office of WHO in the Americas. Not reflected in the above total is the U.S. contribution of $2,190,000 through AID for the malaria eradication program administered by PAHO, and $340,000 for community water supply programs.

U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA)	$4, 400, 000
Last year	4, 300, 000

For fiscal year 1966, the total U.S. contribution to UNRWA is anticipated to be $29 million (70 percent) for the relief activities for Palestine refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Gaza. For the calendar year 1965, UNRWA has budgeted $6,300,000 for all types of health and nutritional services for the refugees. The U.S. share of that amount, at 70 percent, would be about $4,400,000.

Health program for overseas employees	$1, 500, 000
Last year	1, 430, 000

In fiscal year 1966, the Department of State will expend an estimated $1,500,000 for its overall health program for its employees. Included in this sum is the direct cost of providing examination and inoculation services and certain medical travel and hospitalization for the Department's 7,307 employees and their 11,711 dependents.

This sum also includes the overall cost of administering a centralized program which serves 7,062 overseas employees and 12,625 dependents of 13 other Government agencies which also participate in the program: the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Agricultural Research Service, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Peace Corps, the Library of Congress, the Geological Survey, the U.S. Travel Service, the Veterans' Administration, and the Department of the Treasury. Each of these agencies pays directly the cost of medical travel and hospitalization for its overseas staff members and their dependents.

The Department is presently operating 37 health rooms at overseas posts—22 doctors, 34 nurses, and four laboratory technicians, all American citizens, staff these dispensaries. The above sum does not include salaries for physicians, nurses, and technicians overseas, and the administrative staff in Washington, or salaries, allowances, and travel expenses to and from posts.

U.S. refugee programs	$502, 800
Last year	1, 496, 700

Under the provisions of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-510), the United States makes contracts with private agencies for various types of care for escapees or refugees. The program operates in Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, and the Far East, with medical care being provided through the American voluntary welfare agencies. During the calendar year 1965, expenditures for medical care in Europe amounted to approximately $25,600. These funds were used for medical care as part of the care and maintenance of refugees from the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, and for medical examinations required for aliens to obtain visas for permanent settlement in other countries. For Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Macau, the amount is approximately $380,180. These funds include payment for the services of doctors and nurses, provision of medical supplies, rehabilitation of handicapped children and the blind, purchase of ambulances, and participation in the construction of hospitals and clinics in refugee communities. Assistance has also been given for the rehabilitation of TB convalescents. An additional amount of about $97,000 has been provided for medical assistance to Tibetan refugees in India, including medical supplies and services, construction of clinic, and the training of personnel.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (THIS YEAR, $83 MILLION; LAST YEAR, $77,152,000)

The above sum will be spent by the AEC's biology and medicine research program in the following manner:

Somatic effects of radiation	$22, 772, 000
Radiation effects, general	14, 049, 000
Toxicity of radioelements	8, 723, 000
Environmental radiation studies	18, 315, 000
Atmospheric radioactivity and fallout	9, 482, 000
Terrestrial and fresh water ecology	5, 190, 000
Marine sciences	3, 643, 000
Molecular and cellular level studies	$14, 915, 000
Radiological and health physics and instrumentation	6, 581, 000
Radiological and health physics	3, 929, 000
Radiation instruments	2, 652, 000
Radiation genetics	6, 521, 000
Cancer research	5, 678, 000
Selected beneficial applications	3, 000, 000
Combating detrimental effects of radiation	2, 080, 000
Nuclear energy weapons effects studies	1, 830, 000
Nuclear energy civil effects	1, 455, 000
Biological and environmental consequences of nuclear war	375, 000
Radiation pasteurization of foods	700, 000
Chemical toxicity	608, 000

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION (THIS YEAR, $71,300,000; LAST YEAR, $61,800,000)

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration provides civilian control of aeronautic and space activities other than the development of weapons systems. NASA carries on its medical- and health-related activities through an in-house program and through research grants and contracts. The above sum will be expended in the following activities:

Bioscience (space biology)	$40, 600, 000
Last year	37, 700, 000

Bioscience is concerned with providing a better understanding of life and life processes, assisting in the discovery of unique aspects of the space environment which are pertinent to life in space, and in developing information which is essential to long duration manned space flight. Of the above sum, $36,600,000 will be distributed through grants and contracts.

Aerospace medicine	$15, 800, 000
Last year	10, 800, 000

This field is concerned primarily with the training, safety, and health of crews before, during, and following flight missions. Of the above sum, $13,400,000 will be distributed through grants and contracts.

Human Factor Systems	$14, 900, 000
Last year	13, 300, 000

These funds are used in research on man's capabilities and limitations in advanced aerospace systems to determine overall human factor requirements and to utilize them in advanced aeronautical, astronautical, and ground support. Of the above sum, $12,100,000 will be distributed through grants and contracts.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (THIS YEAR, $63,300,000; LAST YEAR, $47,000,000)

The Foundation's overall budget for fiscal year 1966 is $479,999,000. The sum of $49,300,000 is earmarked for grants for research in the biological and medical sciences. Approximately $9 million is to be available for modernization and refurbishment of graduate-level biological research laboratories, and about $5 million for support of specialized biological facilities, including biological equipment. The Foundation provides support for basic scientific research, for scientific training and education through fellowships and programs to improve science teaching, and for programs to improve the exchange of scientific information.

PEACE CORPS (THIS YEAR, $14,986,000; LAST YEAR, $10,484,000)

The above sum will be expended in two major medical activities: support of Peace Corps volunteers ($5,751,000); and overseas medical and health programs carried out by Peace Corps volunteers ($9,230,000). The figure for support of Peace Corps volunteers can be broken down into the following elements: cost of medical care for Peace Corps volunteers and trainees, $3,199,000; salaries and related costs of Peace Corps physicians who care for volunteers overseas, $2,076,000; and cost of Medical Division in Washington, $476,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (THIS YEAR, $12,822,000; LAST YEAR, $12,919,800)

Bureau of Employees' Compensation	$10, 900, 000
Last year	11, 027, 800

An estimated 2,500,000 Federal workers are eligible under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for medical and hospital care, rehabilitation services, disability and death payments, and funeral and burial expenses. For treatment of employees by private doctors and hospitalization in private facilities, the Labor Department has set aside $9,550,000 this fiscal year ($259,134 less than was spent for this purpose in 1965), and for similar services in Federal hospitals and clinics, $1,350,000.

Bureau of Labor Standards	$1, 922, 000
Last year	1, 892, 000

For promotion of industrial safety, the Bureau plans to obligate $1,922,000. The Bureau develops standards for hazardous occupations, assists the States in accident prevention programs, and gives safety training to State and union personnel. In addition, it carries out a program of promoting and enforcing safety in the maritime industry under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (THIS YEAR, $10,748,000; LAST YEAR, $10,735,000)

Bureau of Mines	$9, 099, 000
Last year	9, 128, 000

With respect to health and safety, this Bureau has the responsibility of inspecting all coal mines and of reporting on observed hazards with appropriate corrective recommendations. It also conducts investigations of all serious accidents, and makes recommendations to reduce working hazards, to safeguard the health of workers, and to promote efficiency in the mineral industries. The Bureau encourages accident prevention education through safety organizations, exhibits, safety film production, demonstrations, instructions in accident prevention, and first aid and mine rescue methods. These activities account for $7,029,000 of the Bureau's appropriation.

The Bureau will also spend $2,070,000 in health and safety research into improving electrical and diesel equipment to counteract health hazards of the mineral industries; establishing a more scientific basis for roof control, including prevention of "bumps" or rock bursts; improving mine ventilation generally and aiding the mining industry in solving difficult ventilation problems; and preventing dust explosions and mine fires by applying new concepts on dust binding, rock dusting, and controlling float-dust transport.

Geological Survey	$993, 000
Last year	926, 000

The primary objective of the Geological Survey is the assessment of the Nation's mineral resources, including water. Research projects are in support of this objective and any relation to medical or health research is incidental. However, the Survey does conduct some projects in the physical and biological sciences that are health-related. Water resources research projects include determinations of the occurrence and distribution in water of minor elements and radioactive materials and studies of the behavior of detergents, pesticides, and other pollutants, including radioactive wastes, where released into the soil-moisture environment of natural water systems. The Survey's geological research projects in health-related programs are chiefly for study of the geology and geochemistry of selected areas and substances (such as humates), and in connection with geobotanical exploration (study of trace elements in plants) techniques to study the geochemical variations in plants and soils to (1) correlate with areas of incidence of certain human diseases or with other health problems, and (2) determine the effects on the nutrition of plants and animals.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	$656,000
Last year	681,000

This Bureau conducts research projects to determine the possible medical- and health-related implications of fish oils, pesticides, and botulism as applied to fishery products and nutritional studies. Included are the following studies: (1) the effect of dietary oils on blood cholesterol; (2) the nutritional effect of oxidized marine oils; (3) oxidative deterioration of fish and fishery products; (4) fractional distillation of extracted fish oil for medical research purposes; (5) nutritional value of fish protein concentrate; (6) engineering studies to improve the processing methods of fish protein concentrates; (7) pesticide residues in fish and shellfish; and (8) botulism studies.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (THIS YEAR, $6,075,161; LAST YEAR $5,144,331)

For fiscal 1966, the Congress has voted a budget for the District of Columbia's Department of Public Health in the amount of $51,051,769. These funds will be used for the operation of five major activities of the Department, as follows: preventive services; mental health and retardation (which includes over $18,482,700 for St. Elizabeths Hospital, only a portion of which is reflected in this part of the report); medical care and hospitals; environmental health; and administration. Since the Congress contributes 11.9 percent of the District's budget, $6,075,161 can be considered as the Federal contribution for health and medical activities in the District of Columbia.

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT (THIS YEAR, $5,908,000; LAST YEAR, $5,730,000)

Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1966 for operation of Canal Zone Government hospitals, clinics, and public health activities are $11,402,000. Expenditures for the operation of hospitals and clinics are estimated to be $9,902,000, and revenue is estimated at $5,431,000. Four hospitals are operated by the Health Bureau of the Canal Zone Government with 872 beds available daily, as follows: Gorgas Hospital (349); Coco Solo Hospital (150); Corozal Hospital (253); and Palo Seco Hospital (120). In addition, there are two dental clinics, one district medical clinic, and six community health centers. Expenditures for public health activities, which include the Division of Sanitation, Health Director's Office, Division of Veterinary Medicine, Division of Preventive Medicine and Quarantine, and general governmental expenses applicable to the Health Bureau, are estimated at $1,500,000, with revenue estimated at $63,000. All reimbursements are returned to the U.S. Treasury, together with payments by the Panama Canal Company for the remaining net cost of the Canal Zone Government.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY (THIS YEAR, $5,647,900; LAST YEAR, $4,958,900)

Funds included in the Federal Aviation Agency appropriation this fiscal year for the aviation medical program are divided as follows: $2,128,400 for salaries and administrative expenses at Washington and Oklahoma City to cover operation of a medical certification program for civil airmen, health services, investigation of aircraft accidents, development of airman medical standards, and direction of the Agency medical research and education programs; $1,130,000 for salaries and administrative expenses in regional offices; $1,980,500 for the Civil Aeromedical Research Institute at Oklahoma City; $409,000 for Georgetown Clinical Research Institute at Washington, D.C. Sixteen full-time medical officers in the field either supervise or conduct the periodic physical examinations required of commercial and private pilots. In addition, there are approximately 5,600 private physicians who have been certified by the FAA as aviation medical examiners in the United States and overseas. A total of 300,000 examinations were made last year, and it is expected that this number will increase to 318,000 this year. Pilots pay examining private physicians directly for this service.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (THIS YEAR, $3,653,325; LAST YEAR, $3,636,000)

The Bureau of Prisons estimates that it will spend the above sum for medical and dental services for approximately 22,000 prisoners in 31 Federal penal and correctional institutions. The bulk (about $2,916,000) goes to commissioned officer and civil service personnel of the Public Health Service assigned to the prisons for services that include medical, surgical, psychiatric, psychological, nursing, and dental treatment. Approximately $235,000 is earmarked for fees to 350 consultants in various medical specialties.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (THIS YEAR, $1,623,755; LAST YEAR, $1,482,620)

Health units in post offices	$1,496,000
Last year	1,352,620

These units are operated only in large post offices and are used for treating on-the-job illnesses and injuries requiring emergency attention; preemployment and other examinations; referral of employees to private physicians and dentists; and preventive programs relating to health.

Medical fraud investigations	$127,000
Last year	130,000

The postal fraud statutes impose on the Postmaster General the duty of preventing the use of the mails in the perpetration of schemes to defraud the public. Treatments are offered by mail for every conceivable disease, including cancer, diabetes, heart disease, and arthritis. Medical fraud investigations are conducted primarily by a special group of postal inspectors who work directly from Post Office Department headquarters in Washington. D.C. During fiscal year 1965, investigation of medical fraud schemes resulted in the return of 14 indictments, 16 arrests, and 8 convictions in cases involving $1,430,000.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION (THIS YEAR, $813,000; LAST YEAR, $808,500)

The Federal Trade Commission is charged by Congress with preventing the use of deceptive practices, including false advertising in the sale of foods, drugs, cosmetics, devices, and other products. Approximately 6 percent of the Commission's total budget ($13,550,000) will be used for enforcement, including research and testing in the field of food, drugs, cosmetics, and devices.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (THIS YEAR, $609,900; LAST YEAR, $609,900)

The Commission's total budget for fiscal year 1966 is $25,630,000, of which 2.37 percent is used for salaries of 8 medical officers in Washington and 10 medical officers in the regional offices, plus clerical assistance in both the central and regional offices. The Medical Division's duties include establishing and reviewing physical standards for positions in the competitive Federal civil service; arranging and evaluating physical examinations for disability claims under the Civil Service Retirement Act; and helping to formulate educational and experience requirements for physician and paramedical positions in the competitive Federal service.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (THIS YEAR, $529,000; LAST YEAR, $1,547,100)

Economic Development Administration	(1)
Last year	$996,000

[1] New program.

The Area Redevelopment Administration, which operated the area redevelopment program and the accelerated public works program, has been succeeded by a new agency, the Economic Development Administration. During its existence (May 1, 1961–August 31, 1965), the Area Redevelopment Administration participated in medical-health activities in the form of loans and grants to the tune of $549,345,315. Of this total, $127,109,531 was for hospitals and nursing homes; $202,868,784 was for water and sewer systems; and $219,367,000 was for waste treatment plants. The Economic Development Administration may also participate in projects involving water and sewer systems, waste treatment works, and hospitals and other medical facilities, but only if they contribute directly to the economic development of a distressed area. It is not possible to estimate the amounts which will be granted by the EDA for the above purposes, since they will depend to a high degree on the extent to which individual applications will advance the prospects of economic development in a given area.

National Bureau of Standards	$529,000
Last year	551,100

The National Bureau of Standards will spend a total of $1,057,000 in fiscal year 1966 in performing tests and in developmental research on its own initiative and at the request of others. The Bureau will expend $529,000 of its own money this year as follows: radiation research, $497,000; and audiometric calibrations research and instrument tests, $32,000. In addition, the Bureau will receive $528,000 from other agencies, divided as follows: radiation research, $285,000; dental materials research, $100,000; air pollution research, $65,000; audiometric calibrations research and instrument tests, $60,000; and cardiovascular equipment and development, $18,000.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM (THIS YEAR, $38,000; LAST YEAR, $38,000)

Under the Selective Service Act, the National Advisory Committee has the responsibility of advising the Selective Service System on the deferment of physicians in such essential capacities as residents, teachers, laboratory and clinical researchers, as well as those in the civilian practice of medicine who are essential to their communities. In 1966, Congress provided an appropriation of $38,000 to maintain a skeleton staff and for expenses of the committee's operations, plus the expenses of State committees which are now on a standby basis.

The State and territorial committees request deferment of physicians and allied personnel whom they consider to be essential. In appeal cases, the National Advisory Committee always seeks the State committee's opinion. On the other hand, the State committees may request and obtain deferment on their own.

Of the 55 cases considered by the National Committee, 34 were considered to be essential by the National Advisory Committee and 23 of these were subsequently deferred by the Manpower Division and State or local boards. Ten of these were second- and third-year residents who were all deferred because Selective Service decided to take only interns on this call.

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OF CONGRESS (THIS YEAR, $34,180; LAST YEAR, $28,890)

The attending physician of Congress provides outpatient care for Members of the House and Senate and their staffs. Funds voted by Congress are for medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses ($20,045) and for a technical assistant to the attending physician ($14,135). The office is filled by a medical officer of the U.S. Navy. Sole occupant of the post has been Rear Adm. George W. Calver. Compensation of Dr. Calver, his assisting physicians, and enlisted corpsmen, is paid from Navy funds.

PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS BECAUSE OF DISABILITY THROUGH PROGRAMS IN WHICH THE U.S. GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATES (FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1966)

Figures below represent only payments to the beneficiaries; no administrative costs are included. Further, there are some Federal retiree plans which are not listed in this report. No adjustment is made for payments to one individual through more than one program:

Program	Estimated beneficiaries	Approximate annual payments
Veterans benefits [1] (average number):		
A. Service-connected disability	[2] 1,993,467	[2] $1,704,797,000
B. Non-service-connected disability	[3] 1,211,604	[3] 1,223,931,000
Military retirement [1] (average number):		
A. Permanent disability	91,021	263,847,000
B. Temporary disability	14,188	35,658,000
Federal employees compensation [1]	24,500	[4] 35,493,000
Public assistance: [5] [6]		
A. Needy permanently and totally disabled	581,500	[7] 601,600,000
B. Dependent children aid (incapacitated father segment)	[8] 1,005,000	[8] 421,000,000
C. Blind	94,500	[9] 101,000,000
Disability annuity payments to civil service retirees [10]	160,000	305,000,000
Social security, OASDI disability: [11]		
A. Disabled workers	1,057,000	1,330,000,000
B. Childhood disability benefits	207,000	130,000,000
C. Dependents of disabled workers	856,000	380,000,000
Railroad retirement: [12]		
A. Permanent disability for regular job	[13] 45,000	67,000,000
B. Permanent disability for all employment	[13] 66,000	95,000,000
C. Temporary disability [14]	[15] 100,000	40,000,000
D. Childhood disability benefits [16]	6,000	4,000,000
Total	7,512,780	6,738,326,000

---

[1] These programs are fully financed by the United States.

[2] Includes 389,988 service-connected veterans rated not less than 50-percent disabled and entitled to receive additional compensation for approximately 811,612 dependents. Does not include $2,526,000 annual payment for 1,027 retired officers.

[3] Includes 375,800 non-service-connected veterans entitled to additional pension for approximately 435,800 dependents.

[4] This figure excludes death cases reported in previous years.

[5] Federal contributions to these programs in 1965 were as follows: Disability, 56.5 percent; dependent children, 55.1 percent; and blind, 47.3 percent.

[6] Average monthly number of recipients.

[7] $338.9 million of this total is provided from Federal funds. In addition, the administrative cost of the program is about $70,000,000 of which $39,000,000 is Federal.

[8] Provides payments to children and other beneficiaries in 179,200 families with incapacitated fathers. $232,000,000 of the benefits is Federal. In addition, the administrative cost is about $49,400,000, of which the Federal share is $30,800,000.

[9] The Federal contribution to this program is $48,200,000. In addition, administrative costs of the program are about $9,900,000, of which the Federal share is $5,000,000.

[10] This program is financed 50 percent by the United States and 50 percent by employees.

[11] These programs financed by social security tax.

[12] A, B, and D financed 50 percent by employer and 50 percent by employee; C financed entirely by employers.

[13] During fiscal 1966, an estimated 45,000 persons will receive disability payments originally awarded for conditions preventing their participation in regular employment, and 66,000 will receive benefits for disabilities preventing their participation in any employment. On June 30, 1966, the numbers will be 41,000 and 61,000, respectively.

[14] Provided under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

[15] This figure represents the estimated total number of individuals who will receive benefits for temporary disability periods during the entire fiscal year 1966. It is estimated that those receiving benefits in June 1966 will total 19,000.

[16] Eligibility based on disability incurred before age 18. Paid to or on behalf of children (regardless of age) of deceased employees only.

BENJAMIN A. BIDLACK, AUTHOR OF FIRST PANAMA CANAL TREATY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal is one of the great undertakings toward the accomplishment of which many have devoted years of dedicated and sacrificial service. Some were rewarded during their lives with great fame but most of the creative contributors remained relatively unknown until long after death. Among the latter was Benjamin A. Bidlack, of Luzerne County, Pa., who, after serving as a Member of the Congress—1841–45—was appointed as Chargé d'Affaires of the United States in Bogotá, New Granada—now Colombia—in 1845. He lived there until his death under tragic circumstances in 1849—the year during which the Panama Railroad was launched.

Early in his assignment, Bidlack recognized a great opportunity in connection with the Panama transit route, and, on his own responsibility and without instructions, negotiated a General Treaty of Peace, Amity, Navigation, and Commerce between the United States and New Granada, signed at Bogotá on December 12, 1846, which was finally promulgated on August 16, 1848.

This treaty amounted to an alliance between the two countries for enforcing freedom of transit over the Panama route, which President Polk, in his message forwarding the treaty to the Senate, described as the "most practicable for a railroad or canal." Its significant part was article 35 which granted to the United States the right to build a railroad or canal across the Isthmus of Panama.

In 1885, at which time the great French effort to construct the Panama Canal was at the height of its activity, Panama was the scene of bloody insurrection, threatening the security of isthmian transit.

Under the terms of the Bidlack Treaty of 1846, the United States intervened with naval forces and prohibited fighting along the line of the canal and railroad, thereby supplying a model for handling a comparable situation 18 years later after our Government had decided to construct an Isthmian Canal.

In November 1903, when Panama seceded from Colombia, the United States again intervened under the provisions of the Bidlack Treaty to maintain "free and uninterrupted transit," recognized the independence of Panama, and negotiated the necessary treaty for constructing the Panama Canal with the successor state instead of Colombia. Thus, in the light of what grew out of Chargé Bidlack's initiative, places him among the earliest and successful heroes of the Panama Canal enterprise.

At long last, the work of this able U.S. diplomat has been publicly recognized.

In a moving series of four articles by Harrison H. Smith, publisher and editor of the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Times-Leader, he tells the story of Bidlack's life and his heroic work at Bogotá.

In these general connections, Mr. Speaker, I may be pardoned in saying that it has been pointed out that years later, I, as a Representative in the Congress from Luzerne County in Pennsylvania, have been very active in endeavoring to find wise and just solutions to our current Panama Canal problems. The work of Bidlack as our Chargé in Bogotá was of the most outstanding character and determined the course of isthmian events, finally through the independence of Panama and the building of the canal. In order that the Bidlack story, as told by Mr. Smith, may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress and thus be made available to the Nation at large and become an inspiration to the youth of our country, I quote the indicated series and article 35 of the Bidlack Treaty of 1846 as parts of my remarks:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, Jan. 8, 1966]

LOCAL PUBLISHER NEGOTIATED FIRST TREATY IN CANAL ZONE

(By Harrison H. Smith)

The father of what has been termed "the United States most controversial piece of extraterritorial real estate"—the Panama Canal Zone—was a Luzerne County Congressman and newspaper publisher, Benjamin Alden Bidlack. Yet, he never was fully honored for this act, since his name was all but swallowed up in the political turmoil which attended the administration of Expansionist James K. Polk in the 1840's, by those who tried to take most of the credit themselves.

This was among some of the hitherto unpublished highlights on the life of Benjamin A. Bidlack of Luzerne County, revealed in an interesting treatise prepared by Daniel J. Curran, Ph. D., department of history, King's College, and published in the

December issue of the Wyoming Review, quarterly publication of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society.

Not unlike Benjamin Disraeli, who acted upon his own initiative to secure British control of the Suez Canal, Benjamin Bidlack of Luzerne County, U.S. Chargé d'Affaires of Bogotá, Colombia (then called New Granada), from 1845–49, once signed a treaty for the right to build a canal or railroad, across the Isthmus of Panama, without any positive instructions from the Government.

Educated at the Wilkes-Barre Academy, under the tutelage of Joel and Samuel Jones, the youthful Bidlack first read law in the office of Garrick Mallery, after whom Mallery Place is named. He was admitted to practice in the county in 1825.

ADMITTED TO BAR

About 1830, when he was 26 years of age, he was admitted to the Pennsylvania bar, and soon thereafter was appointed deputy attorney general for Luzerne County. In 1833 he purchased the Republican Farmer newspaper in association with John Atherholt. A year later, the paper was sold to Mr. Samuel P. Collings. From 1834 to 1841, Mr. Bidlack was editor of the Northern Eagle in Milford, the first paper in Pike County, Pa.

According to a notation in the "Historical Record," the first copy of Bidlack's Milford newspaper was delivered to its subscribers by William Bross, who in later years became a distinguished politician and journalist in Chicago, and founder of the Chicago Tribune, still one of the most influential journals in the Midwest.

Mr. Bidlack's political career began in 1835, when he was elected to the Pennsylvania Assembly after briefly holding the post of county treasurer. He served one term. In 1841, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives as a Democrat.

FRANCES SLOCUM BILL

It is interesting to note that, during his active career as a Congressman, Mr. Bidlack first made a name for himself by securing passage of a relief bill in behalf of Frances Slocum, the storied "Lost Child of Wyoming," who had been captured by the Indians during the Revolutionary period and spent a lifetime as their captive.

In a speech before the House of Representatives on June 4, 1844, Representative Bidlack vigorously attacked the Whig Party and Henry Clay, throwing his support to James K. Polk, recently nominated presidential candidate of the Democratic Party, whom he called "Young Hickory."

APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT POLK

Mr. Bidlack failed to be reelected in 1844, although James K. Polk won for the Democratic Party. Mr. Polk repaid him for his earlier support by appointing him Minister to New Granada, now called Colombia, in 1845.

It was thus that Bidlack embarked on the start of his diplomatic career in a remote and then little-known part of the world, to negotiate what is, after nearly a century and a quarter, still the most important document ever signed with a Latin-American country.

After receiving instructions from advisers in the State Department—the Honorable Daniel Webster was then Secretary of State—Bidlack took one of his sons with him, leaving his wife and other children at home, and, in July 1845, began the long, arduous 6-month journey to Bogotá to assume his newly assigned diplomatic duties.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, Jan. 15, 1966]

LOCAL MAN SECURED FIRST CANAL ZONE RIGHTS

(By Harrison H. Smith)

At the end of the 1st half of the 19th century, when the United States was still in its infancy as an international power, a Luzerne County newspaper publisher and ex-Congressman deftly negotiated a compact with a South American nation which was to form the foundation for later treaties which brought about construction of the Panama Canal.

This area's pioneer diplomat in foreign relations was Benjamin Alden Bidlack, member of a prominent Wyoming Valley family, who was instrumental in effecting a treaty with Columbia, then called New Granada, which gave rights to transit across the Isthmus of Panama, more than a half century before Teddy Roosevelt became President of the United States.

FAMILY FROM PLYMOUTH

The Bidlacks were a most unusual family. Congressman Bidlack had four daughters and three sons, one of whom accompanied him on the long and arduous diplomatic mission to Central America in 1845.

Another son, Dr. William Bidlack, of Milford, accompanied Samuel P. Collings, who had succeeded the elder Bidlack as editor of the Wilkes-Barre Farmer, leading local newspaper of that era, when Mr. Collings went to Tangiers, North Africa, as U.S. consul. He later served as army surgeon during the Civil War. The third son, Dr. James B. W. Bidlack, also traveled extensively abroad, once acting as medical director to an American exposition in London, England.

The Congressman's father, the Reverend Benjamin Bidlack, rode the circuit in northeastern Pennsylvania as a Methodist preacher after having served in the Army with distinction during the Revolution, and was a pioneer settler of Westmoreland township (now Plymouth).

The Bidlack treaty was actually written without positive instructions from the State Department, since Secretary James Buchanan and the James K. Polk administration were too busy with affairs in Mexico and failed to reply.

FOREIGN INTRIGUE

That the treaty was consummated at all is remarkable in view of the fact that Bidlack, as Chargé d'Affaires at Bogotá, was confronted with all kinds of blocking maneuvers from British and French competition, as these nations were both anxious to win the rights of transit across the Panama isthmus.

With still no response to come from the State Department—James Buchanan had since replaced the veteran Daniel Webster as Secretary, and Webster was not to return to this position until the administration of President Fillmore—Chargé d'Affaires Bidlack took matters into his own hands.

(In this respect, as mentioned in a previous article, he was compared to Benjamin Disraeli, England's Prime Minister who 30 years later, in 1875, was to act without full backing of the Parliament, to secure British control of the Suez Canal.)

To protect American interests, Mr. Bidlack negotiated and signed on his own initiative a treaty of peace, emity, navigation, and commerce, which abolished differential duties, and in article 35, gave the United States rights to communicate across the Isthmus of Panama by any means in return for a guarantee of neutrality and of Granada's sovereignty over the isthmus.

FAVORABLE REACTION

President Polk was very surprised when presented with the treaty, but after seeing the favorable reaction of the American press and people to it, pressed for its ratification.

The National Cyclopedia of American Biography remarks that "During the debates over the newly established Republic of Panama in the congressional sessions of 1903–04, this treaty was under discussion, and the diplomatic correspondence relating to its ratification was printed as Senate Document No. 81, 58th Congress, in which Mr. Bidlack's good work for the United States in getting the 35th article ratified by New Granada * * * was the first made public."

But even with ratification of the treaty by the U.S. Congress, after the Polk administration has removed the roadblocks, Bidlack's work was not over. New Granada, meanwhile, began to balk on some of the original terms, but due to the continuing skillful diplomacy of Mr. Bidlack, this country finally ratified the compact in June 1848.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, Jan. 22, 1966]

BIDLACK WAS UNSUNG HERO OF U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Harrison H. Smith)

From the time of the Spanish conquistadors of the early 16th century, the dream of an interoceanic passageway across the narrow Isthmus of Panama had been advanced.

Prior to the end of the 1st half of the 19th century, it fell the lot of a local Congressman and newspaper publisher to negotiate successfully the original Panama Canal Zone treaty, despite a complete lack of cooperation from his own State Department and in the face of severe opposition from foreign powers who were all eyeing this strategic piece of real estate at the time James K. Polk became the 11th President of the United States.

The local diplomat, Benjamin Alden Bidlack, member of a pioneer Wyoming Valley family, has been termed by Daniel J. Curran, Ph. D., Department of History, King's College, as "one of the unsung heroes who have served their country with distinguished excellence in Government service."

BITTER FRUSTRATION

The concluding chapters on the life of Congressman Bidlack were marked with bitter disappointment, frustration, sorrow (over deaths in his own family), then illness and finally his own demise in a remote and alien land, separated from his family and friends.

Many of his diplomatic frustrations came as the result of the activities of the Polk expansionist administration, which in 1846 was too preoccupied with the Mexican war and bringing California into the Union to pay much attention to their foreign representative in distant New Granada, South America.

As Chargé d'Affaires at Bogotá, Colombia (then called New Granada), he was given the herculean assignment of obtaining guarantees of a right of transit across the Isthmus of Panama, as well as to settle claims of American shipowners, some dating back to Revolutionary times, whose cargoes had been seized by New Granadian privateers.

Mr. Bidlack had to resign his position as publisher of the Wilkes-Barre Republican Farmer, leading local publication of that era, before undertaking the arduous 6-month journey to the jungles of Central America. He previously owned and published the Northern Eagle of Milford, Pike County's first newspaper, before serving as representative in the legislature, and later Congressman.

Even when the mantle of success should have been draped upon Mr. Bidlack's shoulders for his accomplishments, the State Department, headed by James Buchanan as Secretary, ignored his pleas to return home after his 3-year separation from his family. He became ill from rheumatism, but his entreaties to return continued to be ignored or rejected.

MONUMENT ERECTED

Alone, desperately ill, and isolated from his family and friends, in a remote section of the world, he is recorded as having died on February 6, 1849, although there is some question as to the veracity of this date as a letter informing the State Department of Mr. Bidlack's demise reached Washington on February 8, only 2 days later, according to Library of Congress files.

(Six months was then the minimum time required for a letter to go from Bogotá to the

Nation's Capital.) The letter to the Department, signed on behalf of American citizens residing in Bogotá, stated the cause of Congressman Bidlack's death was "brain fever."

The New Granadian Government gave Benjamin Bidlack a magnificent funeral, indicating the esteem in which the foreign official was held, and for years his grave was maintained in the British cemetery near Bogotá, marked by a monument in his memory, erected by American citizens.

In his paper, appearing in the December issue of the Wyoming Review, official publication of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, Dr. Daniel J. Curran noted that it was an act of foresight and courage on the part of Charge d'Affaires Bidlack to sign the treaty without any positive instructions to do so, either from Secretary of State James Buchanan, or President Polk.

EXCERPTS FROM PAPER

Dr. Curran stated:

"In his (Bidlack's) belief he considered it dangerous to let the golden moment pass and thus he acted as he did. The treaty with the pertinent documents arrived in Washington in January 1847 and was soon the subject of extended discussion.

"In his message accompanying the treaty, the President accurately noted that article 35 granting us the right of transit across the isthmus in return for the guarantee of its neutrality and New Granadian sovereignty over it was the most important part of the agreement."

It is interesting that Dr. Curran noted also that President Polk, who later was given all the credit for securing the treaty, first absolved himself of personal blame by reminding the Senate that Benjamin Bidlack had acted "upon his own responsibility and without instructions."

"By a vote of 29 to 7 the Senate ratified the agreement, which was formally proclaimed on June 10, 1848. The following month Buchanan wrote Bidlack: 'Permit me to congratulate you upon the association of your name with this treaty. It has been most favorably received by the public, and, I doubt not, will be of great and lasting advantage to both countries.'"

This congratulatory note from James Buchanan, which came after more than a year and a half after the final draft of the Bidlack agreement had arrived in Washington, was of little succor to the Chargé d'Affaires, who was then in the final stages of a tropical illness, and who had repeatedly asked for and was denied permission to return home.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, Jan. 29, 1966]

AUTHOR OF CANAL ZONE TREATY DIED IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By Harrison H. Smith)

Various papers and treatises in connection with the history of the original Isthmus of Panama treaty negotiated by Congressman Benjamin Bidlack of Wilkes-Barre, U.S. Chargé d'Affaires at Bogotá, Colombia, from 1845 until his demise in 1849, indicate that to a certain extent international intrigue played some role in the negotiations in a setting as remote and isolated as was Colombia (it was then called New Granada).

This may have been the basis for later rumors that the local diplomat, who has been called "the father of the Panama Canal," did not die in South America from natural causes, as recorded.

RUMORS OF ASSASSINATION

A possibility that the Chargé d'Affaires was actually assassinated, under heavy overtones of cloak-and-dagger activities, has been advanced by a relative of Mr. Bidlack's, James Timbrell, a professional engineer from Berwick.

About a year ago, Mr. Timbrell wrote to Charles A. McCarthy, Pittston, author of another published article on Mr. Bidlack, as follows:

TIMBRELL LETTER

"Your recent item in regard to Congressman Benjamin Alden Bidlack and the Canal Zone was of special interest as my grandfather was Benjamin Alden Bidlack, a nephew of Congressman Bidlack.

"About 40 years ago, I heard a story about Mr. Bidlack and his efforts in the Canal Zone and I have always wondered whether it was a true story.

"It seems that after Mr. Bidlack had negotiated for the canal rights, the French Government was very bitter as they were trying to obtain the same rights.

"Mr. Bidlack sailed for home and was assassinated aboard ship about 2 days out of Panama. His assassin was never revealed but at that time there was a strong belief that he was murdered by an agent of the French Government. Do you have any information about this?

"It is possible that I may have obtained this story from Rev. S. B. Bidlack, a former prominent historian of Wyoming Valley and a retired Methodist minister. Reverend Bidlack is still living, although 89 years old."

NO SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

A search of old newspaper files and historic papers on the subject at that time has failed to reveal any evidence to support Mr. Timbrell's information. No mention, either, is made of this supposition in an interesting treatise titled "Benjamin A. Bidlack and the Treaty of 1846," by Daniel J. Curran, Ph. D., recently published by the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, which is perhaps the most complete history yet compiled of Congressman Bidlack's worthy contribution to early American international relationships.

Still another check, instituted by Alan B. Reed, representative of the Foreign Affairs Archives of the Library of Congress, brought to the surface no indication that the American agent had met with foul play, despite the fact that there appears some uncertainty as to the exact date of his death.

DR. CURRAN'S TRIBUTE

Yet, despite the unsubstantiated cloud over the career of the American diplomat, the concluding paragraphs of Dr. Curran's work, definitely point to the society, definitely point to the fact that the Bidlack treaty was of utmost significance for the United States.

Dr. Curran wrote:

"It was on the basis of article 35 that the United States intervened many times during the next 60 years to protect the rights of American citizens living on the isthmus and to maintain our hegemony in that region. This treaty served as our justification for assisting the successful revolt of Panama, the American military preventing the Colombian Government from landing troops to prevent independence."

BIDLACK'S FORESIGHT

"In fact, the entire history of the Panama Canal can be understood in terms of the effects of this pact. It was the most important treaty this Nation ever signed with a Latin American nation. Fortunately for this country, the American Chargé at Bogotá in this period had the independence of spirit and foresight to seize the opportunity presented and to sign this most beneficial agreement for the United States."

A GENERAL TREATY OF PEACE, AMITY, NAVIGATION, AND COMMERCE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF NEW GRANADA [1]

[Signed at Bogotá, December 12, 1846; ratified by New Granada, July 15, 1847; ratification advised by United States Senate, June 3, 1848; ratified by the President, June 10, 1848; ratifications exchanged at Washington, June 10, 1848; proclaimed in Washington, June 12, 1848; promulgated in Bogotá, August 16, 1848.]

ARTICLE XXXV

The United States of America and the Republic of New Granada desiring to make as durable as possible, the relations which are to be established between the two parties by virtue of this treaty, have declared solemnly, and do agree to the following points:

1st. For the better understanding of the preceding articles, it is, and has been stipulated, between the high contracting parties, that the citizens, vessels and merchandize of the United States shall enjoy in the ports of New Granada, including those of the part of the Granadian territory generally denominated Isthmus of Panamá from its southernmost extremity until the boundary of Costa Rica, all the exemptions, privileges and immunities concerning commerce and navigation, which are now, or may hereafter be enjoyed by Granadian citizens, their vessels and merchandize; and that this equality of favours shall be made to extend to the passengers, correspondence and merchandize of the United States in their transit across the said territory, from one sea to the other. The Government of New Granada guarantees to the Government of the United States, that the right of way or transit across the Isthmus of Panamá, upon any modes of communication that now exist, or that may be, hereafter, constructed, shall be open and free to the Government and citizens of the United States, and for the transportation of any articles of produce, manufactures or merchandize, of lawful commerce, belonging to the citizens of the United States; that no other tolls or charges shall be levied or collected upon the citizens of the United States, or their said merchandize thus passing over any road or canal that may be made by the Government of New Granada, or by the authority of the same, than is under like circumstances levied upon and collected from the Granadian citizens; that any lawful produce, manufactures or merchandize belonging to citizens of the United States thus passing from one sea to the other, in either direction, for the purpose of exportation to any other foreign country, shall not be liable to any import duties whatever; or having paid such duties, they shall be entitled to drawback, upon their exportation; nor shall the citizens of the United States be liable to any duties, tolls, or charges of any kind to which native citizens are not subjected for thus passing the said Isthmus. And, in order to secure to themselves the tranquil and constant enjoyment of these advantages, and as an especial compensation for the said advantages and for the favours they have acquired by the 4th, 5th, and 6th articles of this Treaty, the United States guarantee positively and efficaciously to New Granada, by the present stipulation, the perfect neutrality of the before mentioned Isthmus, with the view that the free transit from the one to the other sea, may not be interrupted or embarrassed in any future time while this Treaty exists; and in consequence, the United States also guarantee, in the same manner, the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory.

---

[1] Manuscript, United States Department of State, Archives, Treaty Series, No. 54. Also H. Miller, Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America, V, 115–43 (English and Spanish) (US); S. Doc. No. 17 (58th Cong., 1st Sess.) (English); Colombia, Codificación Nacional, XIII, 263–77 (Spanish); Colombia, Colección de tratados públicos de los Estados Unidos de Colombia * * *, I, 38–57 (Spanish and English).

2d. The present Treaty shall remain in full force and vigor for the term of twenty years, from the day of the exchange of the ratifications; and, from the same day, the treaty that was concluded between the United States and Colombia on the 13th of October 1824, shall cease to have effect, notwithstanding what was disposed in the 1st point of its 31st article.

3rd. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if neither party notifies to the other its intention of reforming any of, or all, the articles of this treaty twelve months before the expiration of the twenty years, stipulated above, the said treaty shall continue binding on both parties, beyond the said twenty years, until twelve months from the time that one of the parties notifies its intention of proceeding to a reform.

4th. If any one or more of the citizens of either party shall infringe any of the articles of this treaty, such citizens shall be held personally responsible for the same, and the harmony and good correspondence between the nations shall not be interrupted thereby; each party engaging in no way to protect the offender, or sanction such violation.

5th. If, unfortunately, any of the articles contained in this treaty should be violated or infringed in any way whatever, it is expressly stipulated that neither of the two contracting parties shall ordain or authorize any acts of reprisal, nor shall declare war against the other on complaints of injuries or damages, until the said party considering itself offended shall have laid before the other a statement of such injuries or damages, verified by competent proofs, demanding justice and satisfaction, and the same shall have been denied, in violation of the laws and of international right.

6th. Any special or remarkable advantage that one or the other power may enjoy, from the foregoing stipulations, are and ought to be always understood in virtue and as in compensation of the obligations they have just contracted, and which have been specified in the first number of this article.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ichord, for 1 hour, on Thursday, March 17.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, March 16.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Gurney), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Gurney), for 15 minutes, on March 15; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Gurney), for 15 minutes, on March 16; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Goodell (at the request of Mr. Gurney), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter, charts and tables.

Mr. Chamberlain (at the request of Mr. Gurney), for 10 minutes, on March 15; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Krebs), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Rogers of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gurney) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Halpern in two instances.

Mr. Fino.

Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Laird.

Mr. Duncan of Tennessee.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Krebs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Monagan.

Mr. Reuss.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.

Mr. Burke.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 12889. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 9, 1966, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney;

H.R. 1918. An act for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello;

H.R. 2627. An act for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain personnel instructions;

H.R. 3076. An act for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased;

H.R. 3236. An act for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski;

H.R. 4928. An act for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki;

H.R. 4995. An act for the relief of Muhammad Sarwar;

H.R. 5231. An act for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker;

H.R. 5530. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert A. Ethridge;

H.R. 5973. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Hower;

H.R. 7667. An act for the relief of Donald F. Farrell;

H.R. 10338. An act for the relief of Joseph B. Stevens; and

H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2168. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effects of foreign currency sales on commercial sales of wheat to the United Arab Republic, title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Department of State, Department of Agriculture, and Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2169. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a plan for the reorganization of the Department of the Navy, pursuant to the provisions of section 125, title 10, United States Code (H. Doc. No. 409); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

2170. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of battery grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2171. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2172. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report with respect to certain construction projects for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and the authority delegated to me by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2173. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2174. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone, and President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ended December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 398; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2175. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of procedures for terminating total disability benefits under national service life insurance policies, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2176. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of approval of mortgage insurance for a high-rise multifamily housing project in Newark, N.J., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2177. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for a specific guidelines regarding Federal participation in costs of standard-type plans, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2178. A letter from the Assistant to the President, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of its charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

2179. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation: (1) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes; (2) to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government; and (3) to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 10, 1966, the following bills were reported on March 11, 1966:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 13546. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 12453. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to help train and otherwise provide professional health personnel for health work abroad, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 14, 1966]

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 771. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5147, a bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 772. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10027, a bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strikes at the sites of construction projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 773. Resolution providing for waiving points of order against H.R. 13546, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2829. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAY: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10284. A bill to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 12752. An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 10, 1966, the following bill was introduced on March 11, 1966:

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 13546. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[Submitted March 14, 1966]

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.R. 13547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 13548. A bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13549. A bill to establish a consolidated Federal corrections system and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 13550. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13551. A bill to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 13552. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 13553. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 13554. A bill to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13555. A bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13556. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend indefinitely the initial enrollment period for coverage under the supplementary medical insurance program in the case of individuals reaching age 65 before 1966; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 13557. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13558. A bill to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, and registration of certified public accountants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 13559. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13560. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13561. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 13562. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13563. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 13564. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 13565. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, and handling of dogs and cats in commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 13566. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13567. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that peacetime veterans will be accorded hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as veterans of a period of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13568. A bill to restore non-service-connected veterans' pensions which have been reduced or eliminated because of the receipt of increased social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 13569. A bill to authorize the disposal of platinum from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13570. A bill to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13571. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to allow a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 13572. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965, to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 13573. A bill to amend section 3581 (d) of title 39, United States Code, to increase the travel allowances of road-duty employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 13574. A bill to require certificates of fitness in the sale of automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13575. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 13576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 13577. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 13578. A bill to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13579. A bill to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13580. A bill to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13581. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 13582. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to increase health benefits for dependents of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13583. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a civilian health benefits program for retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 13584. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13585. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 13586. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 13587. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, to prohibit feeding of livestock by certain packers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13588. A bill to designate the Carlyle Reservoir on the Kaskaskia River, Ill., as the "Eldon E. Hazlet Reservoir"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 13589. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 13590. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 13591. A bill to designate dam B and its reservoir on the Neches River, Tex., as the "Town Bluff Dam" and the "B. A. Steinhagen Lake," respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 13592. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, so as to increase by 10 percent the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to the parents of deceased veterans, and to increase by 10 percent the income limitations applicable to the payment of such compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13593. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for a pension of $100 a month to veterans awarded the Philippine Campaign Medal for certain service after 1902; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 13594. A bill to assist the States in providing technical recreation service and advice to private landowners and local public agencies relating to the management and development of areas for public outdoor recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13595. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a special pension for veterans of World War I and their widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 13596. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who serve with the U.S. military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 13597. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Southeastern Power Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13598. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Southwestern Power Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13599. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13600. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prevent certain employees of community action agencies and Volunteers in Service to America from engaging in pernicious political activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13601. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1935, in order to establish a grant-in-aid program for the preservation of buildings having archeological, architectural, or historical significance; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 13602. A bill to protect domestic consumers against an inadequate supply of soybeans and soybean products, to maintain and promote foreign trade, to protect producers of soybeans against an unfair loss of income resulting from the establishment of a reserve supply, to assist in marketing soybeans for domestic consumption and export, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.J. Res. 890. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.J. Res. 891. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of May 8 to May 14, 1966, as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 892. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.J. Res. 893. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 894. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 616. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print, "Basic Laws and Authorities on Housing and Urban Development"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

419. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to enacting legislation receding to the State of Colorado, jurisdiction over Fort Lyon, Colo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

420. Also, memorial of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, relative to legalizing as the national anthem the words and music of "The Star-Spangled Banner" as composed by Francis Scott Key and arranged by Thomas Carr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

421. Also, memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to enacting legislation presenting to the States a proposed constitutional amendment permitting the recital of a nonsectarian prayer in the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

422. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations transmitting a copy of Resolution H. 1004 approved February 4, 1966, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 13603. A bill for the relief of Josefina Molina Hodge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 13604. A bill for the relief of Eugene Horace Dietrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 13605. A bill for the relief of All Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13606. A bill for the relief of Evangelina de la Vega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 13607. A bill to authorize Gen. Herbert D. Vogel to accept the award of First Class Order of the Most Nobel Order of the Crown of Thailand with the rank of Knight Grand Cross; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 13608. A bill for the relief of Juana Perla Abramowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 13609. A bill for the relief of Georgios Fotopoulous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 13610. A bill for the relief of Sun Young Choy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13611. A bill for the relief of Mr. Leopoldo Murillo Campos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 13612. A bill to permit Edward C. Bower to serve as a director of the Virgin Islands' National Bank prior to his obtaining U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 13613. A bill for the relief of Gordon Pak Man Gartner-Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

345. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to studying the executive agencies within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

346. Also, petition of Mariana Islands District Legislature, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to a resolution expressing their gratitudes to certain U.S. Representatives and their guests, for their concern for the welfare of the people of the trust territory, as demonstrated in their recent visit; to the Committee on House Administration.

347. Also, petition of State chairman, Democratic Party of Guam, Agana, Guam, relative to enactment of H.R. 11775 relating to the popular election of the Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

348. Also, petition of chairman, State Recreation Commission, Sacramento, Calif., relative to acquisition of the proposed Redwood National Park in the Mill Creek area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

349. Also, petition of Ralph Boryszewski, Rochester, N.Y., and others, relative to an amended petition with respect to the impeachment of the Honorable Stephen S. Chandler, U.S. district judge for the western district of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, until 1878 the Bulgarians had been suffering under the autocratic regime of the Ottoman Turkish sultans. For four centuries their historic homeland had been part of the Ottoman Empire, and they were subjected to the detested rule of their oppressive masters. During that long period they had tried to free themselves on innumerable occasions, but all their efforts had proved unsuccessful, and each uprising against their oppressors was ruthlessly suppressed. But during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78, they had the support of the Russian fighting forces, and as the result of that war they secured their freedom. In the treaty of peace signed on March 3 of 1878, their freedom was recognized by the Turks. That day marked their liberation, and to this day it is observed as their Liberation Day, their national holiday.

Since that distant day of 88 years ago, Bulgarians have had their trials and tribulations in the two World Wars, but during the last two decades they have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Just as their forefathers fought their Ottoman oppressors for centuries before their final liberation, so today they are carrying on their relentless struggle for their freedom against their ruthless Communist oppressors.

On the 88th anniversary of their liberation day let us hope that they will again regain their freedom and enjoy the blessing of peace in their homeland.

Rogers, Ark., DeMolay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Hugh Grimm, whom I have known since our boyhood, has been one of the leaders in DeMolay since his early years. His lodge, 460, which sponsors the DeMolays of Rogers, Ark., and the DeMolays of Rogers are celebrating International DeMolay Week March 13 through 20.

I know no one who has done more to help the boys of the area than Hugh Grimm. He is a leader not only in leading boys to a better understanding of their responsibilities in life but in all other fields of community activities.

To him and to the DeMolays, my heartiest greetings.

National UNICEF Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day." A number of our colleagues have introduced similar resolutions.

The purpose of this proposed joint resolution is to recognize the high honor of the Nobel Peace Prize award to UNICEF and to pay special tribute to the boys and girls of our own country whose magnificent generosity in collecting coins at Halloween for less fortunate children around the world has, in a very real sense, contributed to the success of UNICEF. Our own American boys and girls have indeed helped to earn the Nobel Peace Prize.

Every President of the United States since UNICEF was established has given strong endorsement to its work. The recognition of the important work of this organization through the passage of this joint resolution by the Congress would be well deserved.

It is my hope that early and favorable action will be taken.

Shamrock, Tex., Marks St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each year on St. Patrick's Day the city of Shamrock, Tex., in the eastern Texas Panhandle, marks the celebrated holiday with a parade and other events attracting thousands of visitors. The Shamrock celebration of St. Patrick's Day is not quite as large as that held in such cities as New York, but it is certainly as spirited. There is no finer hospitality to be found anywhere.

I took note of the Shamrock celebration in my newsletter going to constituents this week, and I wanted to share it with you and our colleagues and other Americans for whom there is something very special about St. Patrick's Day:

AN EMERALD ISLE IN THE UNITED STATES

Just below the last escarpment of the Rocky Mountains in the great Panhandle Plains country of Texas, lies an Emerald Isle. Its name is Shamrock (Texas, that is). Every year on March 17 there is a tremendous gathering of the clan (spelled, of course, with a "c")—the O'Tolles, the O'Shaughnessys, the O'Worleys, the O'Blonsteins, the O'Pavlovskys, the O'Garmans, the O'Pakans, the O'Macinas, the O'Torgersons, the O'Lewises, the O'Lummuses, the O'Adkins, the O'Joneses, the O'Zeiglers, the O'Weldons, the O'LeBlancs, the O'Rogerses, the O'Ryans, and the O'Kellys, just to name a few of the most Irish-sounding names. It makes no difference whether you are Jew or Gentile, Mohammedan or Christian, green, pink, black, or white, on March 17 in Shamrock, Tex., you're Irish, and you'd better believe it.

Anything might happen and usually does, but whatever it is, the color of it will be green, whether it be a horse and rider in the parade or the stew at the local cafe. On this day, the crowds that gather at Shamrock will do most anything within the law short of blowing up Lord Nelson's monument, and they might even do this if they had one. The wit and charm which permeate the air would equal what one would hear in any celebration in the old country, and there are plenty of snappy comebacks—like the one where the waitress was asked by a customer if the glass of milk was fresh. She replied, "If it was any fresher, it'd be grass."

And there are plenty of Irish jokes, like the one about the Irishman who walked into the bar one morning with a bulge in his pocket. The bartender said, "MacGillicuddy, what is it you have in your pocket?" MacGillicuddy replied, "A stick of dynamite." "And what," said the bartender, "are you going to do with it?" To which MacGillicuddy replied, "Every day when O'Houlihan sees me he belts me in the side and breaks me pipe. Today, I'm telling you, he's goin' to blow his hand off."

Or the one about the widow whose husband had fallen into the river and drowned. The insurance company gave her a fortune of 10,000 pounds. A friend, consoling the widow, said, "Poor Paddy, he was a fine man, even though he never did learn how to read nor to write." The widow interrupted her weeping to reply, "Nor how to swim, thanks be to God."

And then there's the one about the Irish nobleman who was suspected of being in the IRA. The British regiment invaded his castle and literally ransacked it looking for him or some evidence. As the soldiers were leaving emptyhanded, the Irish butler said to them, "Whom shall I say called?"

And then there's the one about the will contest. The contestants claimed that the deceased's signature had been forged. The opposing counsel said that the testament was signed while the deceased was on his death bed and "while he still had life in him." To which the contestants' counsel replied, "Yes, he had a fly in his mouth."

And, of course, the one about the errant Irishman whose life had not been entirely sinless, who was about to depart this life and was being given the last rites by the Father, who said, "And, Pat, do you renounce the Devil and all his works?" To which Pat replied, "Father, the shape I'm in, I'm in no position to offend anyone."

It is a well-known fact that the Irish can do more with words than a crooked confidence man with three walnut shells and a dried pea. It is said that the average European has a vocabulary of approximately 500 words, while the Irish employ at least 5,000 in their everyday conversation. It isn't always the words but the way they put them together and the meaning that comes out. An example of this is my favorite Irish toast, "May you be in heaven one hour before the Devil knows you're dead."

So, if you want a real taste of Ireland, you can get it without resorting to the method suggested by the Irish tourist attendant when the Englishman asked her the cheapest way to get to Ireland. Her reply: "Swim." You can get to Ireland by walking, riding, or flying, if you will go to Shamrock, Tex., on March 17 of any year.

"The Redeemer," a Worthy Motion Picture That All Should See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am asking for this moment to call attention to the Members of the U.S. Congress that a very worthy motion picture is currently making the rounds in theaters throughout the United States. The picture is entitled "The Redeemer," produced by Family Theater, an organization founded by Father Patrick Peyton, who thus becomes the first priest-producer in American History.

Currently, this film has been shown in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the States of Texas and New Mexico. It has been widely acclaimed. The technical excellence of the production and the reception it has received by both critics, clergymen, and the general public, prove that wholesome and religious entertainment can be a success, not only financially but spiritually.

At a time when so many of our motion pictures that are being shown have an adverse effect, particularly on young people, it is welcome news to learn that efforts are being made to have presented a film which has such a meritorious effect on people. One of our major national problems is the growing crime rate and increasing defiance of law and order, in all age groups and conditions. There is little doubt among many analysts of the problem that much of this is traceable to the crime, sadism, and violence presently depicted on the screens of the Nation.

There is little doubt that youth tends to imitate. Youngsters exposed to unsavory fare on television 3 to 4 hours a day cannot fail to absorb, at least subconsciously, many of the attitudes, emotions, and conflicts depicted into their systems and perhaps incorporate these into their own patterns of behavior. It is for this reason that a film like "The Redeemer" should receive national recognition in that it can influence young minds in the same manner, but toward an opposite direction.

As this Nation was founded upon principles derived from our common Father, we as a nation should especially take pride in pictures making Him better known and loved. "The Redeemer," which is one of these pictures, should therefore receive our every support and encouragement.

I understand that inquiries on this matter can be addressed to Rev. Albert Heinzer, C.S.C., 7201 Sunset Boulevard Hollywood, Calif., or better still, here in Washington, D.C., to Rev. Raymond J. Cassel, C.S.C., American International Pictures, 1100 Vermont Avenue NW., room 704.

I strongly recommend that all Members of Congress take the opportunity to see this picture and I am certain it will be a refreshing and rewarding experience. It is my understanding that the picture will be shown in our Nation's Capital at one of the local theaters very soon, and I would suggest you watch the newspapers for its premiere.

Rev. Patrick Peyton, Rev. Albert Heinzer, and Rev. Raymond Cassel are truly three of God's great noblemen, and deserve the commendation of the entire Nation for their uplifting efforts.

James G. Patton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues join with me today in paying tribute to James G. Patton, one of the great voices in American agriculture. After 25 years as president of the National Farmers Union, he is stepping down. All of us regret this necessity. The loss is made doubly difficult because Glenn Talbott is stepping down from the vice-presidency at the same time.

These stalwart champions of the American farmer have made their impression upon the events of the past and have helped to shape the things to come. Without this kind of leadership, the farmers position would be much less favorable than it is today.

All of us know that the farm problem has not been whipped. But without the keen foresight of men like James Patton we would still be groping in the darkness of night. The dawn of a new day in agriculture is coming and Jim Patton has helped to bring it about.

We hate to see him go—but we are eternally thankful that he was here.

Fino Introduces Bonus Bill for America's First Asian Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to provide for a bonus to veterans of the early 20th century campaigns in the Philippine Islands, who received the Philippine campaign medal.

I have received a number of letters from aging veterans of the Philippines campaigns of the early 1900's. These veterans, few and far between, are for the most part in their eighties and nineties. They badly need this money because of rising and other expenses.

These men are veterans of a war America has long forgotten, a war in which America pacified the Philippine Islands after taking them from Spain in the Spanish-American War. Throughout the islands, our soldiers fought headhunting and cannibalistic tribes—men who fought well and fiercely for years with the weird, curved Malay and Philippine bolo knives. It was a type of war that our American soldiers were not used to, just as today's soldiers are finding Vietnam a new kind of war.

Our Philippine veterans fought a tough enemy who believed he was fighting for independence. It was a hard fight, and in the end it was not so much won with weapons as with policies of respect for the people. Our soldiers in the Philippines suffered fiercely from tropical diseases we had not yet learned how to deal with.

Today, with our minds so much on the war in southeast Asia, I think we should take time out to think of the men who fought and died for America's toehold in the Pacific in the days of the Great White Fleet and the "big stick." I urge this bonus as a tribute to the first American southeast Asian veterans, now forgotten.

There are under 500 of these veterans, perhaps far fewer. This bonus program will cost very little. We should act immediately.

Save the Children Federation: Helping the Poor To Fight Poverty—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I want to continue the story of the Save the Children Federation, a unique program to help the less fortunate which started more than a quarter of a century ago.

Young people engaged in self-help projects are their own best champions in the fight against poverty. Save the Children Federation activities for American Indians make this point

For the past 5 years, summer camp programs for Indian youth have offered self-help training in building skills, ranch improvement, herd operations and craft work; classes in health and grooming; recreation; and field trips. One hundred federation-sponsored Indian young people were placed as volunteers in hospitals, clinics, and in-the-field health groups where they learned good health habits, supported medical techniques and practiced simple nursing skills. Sixty-three of the participants who represent the potential leadership of four reservations now expect to train for a career in public health.

From its early efforts in Appalachia, SCF has grown into a worldwide organization advocating the principles of self-help. In times of emergency or disaster, the federation carries on special programs of relief, as it did during the war years to help refugee children. Since that time, the overseas sponsorship plan providing cash and needed commodities to relieve hunger and shortage, gradually changed to emphasize payments which would allow children whose parents could not afford the cost to receive basic education, or sponsorships which enabled the purchase of seed, tools, or equipment to raise the family's food production or increase its regular cash income.

To help parents realize their dreams of a better life for their children, SCF has long encouraged families to plan and carry out their own solutions for raising annual income. Wherever possible, this encouragement comes in the form of interest-free loans instead of grants. The federation's loans, supplemented by sound counseling, stimulate greater family self-reliance, influence more practical goals, and strengthen the chances of success. With such loans fishermen in Brittany bought nets and a boat to catch and sell more fish. Korean farmers purchased improved rice seed and fertilizers for more abundant crops. A Lebanese shoemaker purchased leather and tools to double his business. A Greek widow bought a sewing machine to make clothes for her children and to add a little cash by sewing for others.

Helping families to develop their earning potentials so they themselves can more quickly assume the responsibilities for their children is another strong feature of the federation's self-help program.

Recognizing that the community as well as the family can take a more responsible share in child development, the Federation takes a positive interest in upgrading neighborhoods and improving community services for the health, education, and welfare of all children. Child-family-community sponsorships overseas and for American Indians reach beyond the child to give the family a greater security and the communities a new strength.

This dynamic program offers a threefold way of accelerating child growth toward self-sufficiency, for the welfare of a child and his family is inextricably woven into the welfare of the community. This direction of federation effort provides people with an opportunity to shape a better future for themselves and their children within the framework of a healthy community of interdependent and forward-looking citizens.

These self-help sponsorships, recently introduced in the American Indian program, support long-range goals worked out by the federation with Hopi tribal officials to encourage more participation by parents and neighbors in community improvements. Many American Indian boys and girls today attend schools away from the reservation where they may enlarge their circle of friends, find courses to prepare them for contemporary vocations, and effect an adjustment to the non-Indian world. The SCF sponsorships which provide funds for school supplies, personal books and spending money help children in their new relationships and encourage wider social participation and a greater fluency with the English language.

For the families of these children, the new sponsorships provide small grants to improve sanitary conditions of each home—to repair, screen and paint windows and doors to keep out flies, and to build supports to hold water tanks provided by the U.S. Public Service, so that each household will have safe water. Sponsorships like these are a major breakthrough toward a more wholesome environment for American Indians.

Accent on Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal these days about protest groups, particularly among the younger generation. As long as the rights of others are not violated, and sincere protest does not take the form of violence and destruction, I am always prone to see the positive rather than the negative. This, in my belief, has been the foundation of America's strength.

In fact, while a great many people see these vocal protests and other manifestations as corruptive and unjustified, I am inclined to view peaceful demonstration with a spirit of tolerance. Dissent is healthy. I like to see the conventional wisdom subjected to dispute.

Nonetheless, it is always pleasant and eminently reassuring to learn of the experience of groups which are committed to the sureties of democratic life which all of us, in essence, respect. They help to restore a real balance when all of our communications media are bent, by nature, toward reporting contentions and upheaval.

I have long been impressed by a performing group known as the New Christy Minstrels. They are a musical ensemble comprised of eight boys and two girls, whose average age amounts to 20 years.

They say, in chorus:

> It seems to us that the only voices being heard around the country belong to the anti-this or anti-that groups. What about for-this and for-that teams of young Americans who, we are sure, outnumber the anti-groups by millions?

The New Christy Minstrels report that they will make no effort to protest against protesters. They will stress, at every occasion and at every appearance, the preservation of American traditions.

In a joint statement, the group said:

> We hope to encourage campus leaders to conduct polls on national issues and to conduct debates based on knowledge and fact. Fear and anger are emotions, and emotions create blind spots. We will do all we can to aid those millions of young Americans who are dedicated to preserve the traditions of the United States, its history, and those creeds for which it stands.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the true patriotic spirit, and I doff my hat to this inspiring ensemble.

President James G. Patton and Vice President Glenn Talbott Step Down After 25 Years of Distinguished Service to the National Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, at its national convention in Denver, Colo., which began yesterday, March 13, and will end on Thursday, March 17, the National Farmers Union will honor two distinguished leaders who are stepping down from their posts of responsibility and leadership. President James G. Patton, and Vice President Glenn Talbott, have both served with distinction and dedication the great organization known to all who take an interest in agriculture, the National Farmers Union.

I have today sent a telegram to Jim Patton and Glenn Talbott which, under unanimous consent, I will include in the RECORD at this point.

The telegram referred to follows:

To James G. Patton and Glenn Talbott, President and Vice President, National Farmers Union, Denver, Colo.

(Attention of Walter A. Hasty, Jr.):

Have recently learned of your decision to step down and not seek reelection to the presidency and vice presidency of the National Farmers Union. Would like to take this opportunity to extend you both my very best wishes in the days and years ahead knowing that in the future you both will continue in the same tradition you established in your positions of responsibility and leadership in the National Farmers Union.

Best regards,

MEL LAIRD.

Farmer in the Nation's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout his long career in and out of public life, James George Patton, retiring president of the National Farmers Union, has been a farmer in the Nation's service. Tonight, in Denver, Colo., the organization which he has headed for 25 years is honoring Mr. Patton for the long and dedicated service he has given it.

Jim Patton's distinctions and accomplishments are too numerous to catalog at this time. His presidency of the National Farmers Union goes back to 1940. He has been a top advisor to President Franklin Roosevelt and in subsequent administrations.

From time to time, Jim Patton has been mentioned as a possible Secretary of Agriculture. If that had happened, he undoubtedly would have enjoyed a period of distinguished high office, but he might not have been able to give full sweep to his many interests. This Nation and the world might never have reaped the full benefits of his broad sympathies and activities.

The food for peace program, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N., even the Peace Corps and the war on poverty were brought into being, in part, through Jim Patton's leadership.

While advancing the interests of the family farmer, his legislative concerns have also ranged from health care to Federal aid to education, from fair employment practices to a defense of the one-man, one-vote principle. He was a moving force behind the Full Employment Act of 1946, and played an important role in the administration of the Marshall plan.

Jim Patton's world view, his vision of a great and peaceful society, can be appreciated from his own words, written some 14 years ago: "The real war we must wage is not one with guns, tanks, planes, and atom bombs, but a war against poverty, ignorance, disease, landlessness, and hopelessness."

Mr. Speaker, we see in these words a man whose constituency is not only the farmers of America, whom he has served so long and so faithfully, but all men everywhere who have ever hoped for a better world.

Bonds for the Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to me a very worthy and patriotic suggestion from a constituent who expressed concern over the influence on our fighting men in South Vietnam of minority group demonstrations.

Mr. Guy S. Sandulli, Jr., Hickory Road, Waterbury, Conn., recommended that the Treasury Department Savings Bonds Division set aside a special day for the purchase of savings bonds and that the day be called "A Bond for the Boys." Mr. Sandulli very patriotically suggested that the bond purchase would help to support the war and show the people of other countries that there are 180 million people behind our boys in South Vietnam and also make it clear to our fighting men that the demonstrations in question are by a very small minority group.

I have already thanked Mr. Sandulli for his recommendation and I have also forwarded it to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler. Mr. Fowler has replied that Mr. Sandulli's suggestion will receive thorough attention and will be given every consideration by the Savings Bonds Division. The Secretary of the Treasury has also asked me to extend to Mr. Sandulli his appreciation for Mr. Sandulli's patriotic concern.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith Mr. Sandulli's letter of February 2 in which he recommended the "Bond for the Boys" day and I also include Secretary Fowler's reply. I do this for the purpose of calling to your attention a sound suggestion from a solid citizen who is not only concerned for the well-being of our Armed Forces but also shows interest in the Nation's fiscal strength and economy.

WATERBURY, CONN.,
February 2, 1966.

The Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On a recent newscast, I heard that our boys in South Vietnam are in very low spirits because of the demonstrations of some of the people here in the States.

Could it be possible to set aside 1 day in the near future whereby every "head of the household" would buy one or more U.S. Savings Bonds as a token of our support for the fighting men and also show support for the policies of our Government. This day could be called, for example, "A Bond for the Boys." This bond would help support the war and show the people of other countries that there are 180 million people behind our 180,000 boys in South Vietnam.

Maybe this would be a small way of showing our fighting men that these demonstrations are from a very small minority group. I would appreciate your comments.

Sincerely,

GUY R. SANDULLI, Jr.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1966.

The Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: We appreciate the interest you evidence in our savings bonds program by forwarding the good suggestion from your constituent, Mr. Guy R. Sandulli, Jr., of Waterbury, Conn.

Let me assure you that our Savings Bonds Division has been acquainted with the suggestion and that it will be given every consideration. The idea is similar to one used effectively during the first war bond drives.

In the words of President Johnson, as he announced the higher interest rate of 4.15 percent, "it supports our fighting men in Vietnam who need to be supported at this very hour and it supports the cause of our freedom everywhere in the world." A copy of the President's statement is enclosed.

I know you realize that our savings bonds people receive numerous suggestions related to the promotion of our program. However, in relation to its applicability and within the framework of our budgetary allocations, Mr. Sandulli's "Bonds for the Boys" recommendation will receive thorough attention.

I am sure you will want to extend to him our appreciation for his patriotic concern and we are indebted to you for your thoughtfulness.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

Conservation and the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of addressing the 30th annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation at the Hotel Hilton in Pittsburgh last Friday, March 11. I include the text of my remarks hereafter:

CONSERVATION AND THE CONGRESS

Thank you for inviting me to your 30th birthday party. There are some who might not like to admit to the passage of the great divide which a 30th birthday signifies. But when you look back at the America of 1936, when the National Wildlife Federation first convened—an America of a conservation movement up against the ropes, with the remains of our forests burning, our soil eroding, and our ducks and geese about to go the way of the passenger pigeon—you can be proud of your 30th birthday and the progress you have made.

It is good to share the platform with a distinguished conservationist, Gov. William Scranton. I had the honor to serve on the House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee with Bill Scranton some years ago. Now, you may not think of the Banking and Currency Committee as the center of the conservation movement. But when we needed to get a bill through Congress making available surplus Government grain unfit for human consumption for migratory waterfowl, we wangled the bill before Banking and Currency on the theory that surplus grain was essentially a banking operation. Anyway it worked, and the bill became law.

In discussing conservation and the Congress, let me exude some optimism. I am optimistic because in a democracy, people in the end get what they really want. And the American public is now ready to back an all-out drive on man's pollution of his environment.

The American public has had enough of streams and lakes which stink to the heavens from human wastes, which are gory with the blood of packinghouses, which are sterile from the acids from mines and industries, which are covered with a coating of detergent foam from somebody's laundry, or of cottage cheese from a processing plant. The American public is fed to the teeth with air that is polluted with harmful gases and solids. We are deeply ashamed with the contamination of our land by longlasting pesticide poisons.

What about water pollution? Fortunately, people no longer are debating whether pollution should be abated. Now they are debating how pollution control can best be achieved. Are we ready to pay for it? The people of New York State said so last fall by a vote of four to one. Citizens of St. Louis, of Omaha, and of Kansas City and Portland, Oreg., have said so. And the President is calling for a massive water cleanup campaign, one affecting rivers from their headwaters to their mouths. There is reason for optimism here, if we will but keep moving.

Air pollution is a particularly insidious problem, because the harmful gases are generally invisible. We often do not recognize the dangers until an epidemic of respiratory diseases hits, or until gardeners no longer can grow leafy vegetables near the highways, or until there is extensive structural damage to buildings and bridges—an $11 billion bill annually.

A prime cause of air pollution is automobile exhausts. It is high time we take notice of the automobile population explosion—incidentally, one population explosion we can discuss without raising the religious issue.

The auto industry, we learn, is equipping new 1968 models with air pollution control devices. But will people keep the air pollution devices on their autos and use them? More important, will they pay the cost of keeping the engine tuned up and running at peak efficiency—for no exhaust device can ever replace a faulty combustion process? Will they help reduce refuse burning? I am confident they will, but conservationists and other concerned citizens must intensify their educational campaigns in this direction.

Can we afford to be optimistic about pesticide poisons? Well, Federal and State agencies are tightening controls. Industry is doing a better job of educating people in the proper use of these dangerous materials. Pesticide research is getting important money in the Federal budget. I have hopes that we can develop biological controls that will control pests without poisoning the environment.

We can be optimistic about the establishment of public outdoor recreation areas, even though the President's program to round out the National Park Service by 1972 appears ambitious. The Congress this year already has enacted legislation establishing the Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina. It appears possible that the following areas also can be established this year: Sleeping Bear Dunes and Indiana Dunes Lakeshores in Michigan and Indiana, Oregon Dunes Seashore in Oregon, the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas, and the Bighorn Canyon and Flaming Gorge National Recreation Areas in the West.

A lot of action is scheduled for this year on classifying wildernesses, on establishing wildlife refuges. I wish I could be as optimistic about the chances of the wild rivers bill (a topic which your handsome National Wildlife magazine covers so beautifully in the current issue). Several of us Wisconsinites are plugging mightily for establishment of scenic waterways on the St. Croix and the Wolf. The latter, by the way, would save not only one of the Midwest's last free-flowing rivers, but one of our historic Indian tribes, the Menominees, which lives along its banks.

There are many other opportunities. The Redwoods, the Buffalo, and Allagash Rivers, and the North Cascades simply must be preserved. I am convinced that they will be.

All of us are awaiting the results of the new Public Land Law Review Commission. I am hopeful that only those lands which are actually needed for residential, commercial, or industrial sites will pass out of Federal ownership. These public lands that remain must be managed for multiple uses, including fish and wildlife and recreation.

Speaking of multiple use, you and I have seen the devastating effect of six-strand barbed wire fences and hog fences erected by livestock interests and the Bureau of Land Management on the public domain in the Western States. The fences may hold the sheep, cows, and horses, but they also interfere with the natural migration of our priceless antelope resource. You and I have seen the pictures of antelope that get caught on the prongs of the barbed wire fence and starve to death.

It has been an exciting experience for me to work with Tom Bell and others in the Wyoming Wildlife Federation in standing up for the public's interest in these beautiful animals. We have brought our fight to the Department of the Interior. This morning I am happy to announce that Bureau of Land Management Director Charles Stoddard has just informed me that the Bureau will, from here on out, cancel the grazing permit of any grazer who puts up an unauthorized fence on the public domain; and that the Bureau is working to identify unauthorized fences already erected, and will require that they be taken down or otherwise modified in order to permit the free migration of antelope.

This is progress. I hail Secretary of the Interior Udall and BLM Director Stoddard for it. And I applaud the Wildlife Federation for yet another successful fight.

I am sure you also are aware that with the advent of the Job Corps, many of our young people are being sent to camps throughout the United States to assist in important conservation management work. We, therefore, should give our support to Director Charles Stoddard of the Bureau of Land Management for suggesting that applicants for Job Corps work be competent and alert to the requirements for the particular effort in which they will be involved. In Director Stoddard, we have a dynamic leader who will do a job if he is given the right personnel and tools to work with.

There is reason for optimism in the new cropland adjustment program. If the Department of Agriculture and the State wildlife agencies work out cooperative programs, I am confident that thousands of acres of privately owned land can be opened to public hunting and fishing. This is another area where you can provide real leadership.

When we stop water and air pollution, we help protect fish and wildlife. When we preserve areas for public recreation rather than for commercial or industrial sites, we help wildlife. When we manage public lands for multiple use or take private lands out of intensive agricultural production, we enhance the opportunities for wildlife.

But we need to do more. We need to halt the drainage of wet lands of prime importance to fish and wildlife. We have put a stop to Federal subsidies for the drainage of waterfowl wet lands, but unsubsidized drainage goes on.

We need to preserve more duck production areas. I hope that the accelerated waterfowl wetlands acquisition program can be accelerated some more. I have joined Congressmen Dingell and Saylor in sponsoring new legislation which would allow U.S. duck stamp funds obtained by a voluntary surcharge to be used to set aside wetlands in Canada and also in the United States for propagation purposes and for establishment of wintering grounds in Mexico. Under this legislation, volunteer citizens groups such as Wetlands for Wildlife and your own National Wildlife Federation affiliates will be able, through private funds, to acquire these areas where presently there is objection to their being acquired as public areas. A dollar spent in a Canadian marsh or in the prairie pothole country of the United States may breed a lot more ducks for our flyways. It may also be important to spend a portion of the funds for wintering grounds in Mexico.

We must set aside areas for the protection of endangered species of wildlife, not only in the United States but all over the world. I have introduced legislation looking toward an international United Nations conference in which all governments can join in a cooperative effort to conserve wildlife. International trade in wildlife and its products must be controlled. This traffic today threatens many species of birds, mammals, and reptiles. We must demonstrate the economic and spiritual values of wildlife. We must combat fashions—such as the leopard skin coat fad, and superstitions—such as the belief that powdered rhinocerous horn is a sex stimulant. We must help the new countries—and some of the older ones as well—develop their own sound conservation programs.

This has been an optimistic report. But please don't disband, on your 13th birthday, with mutual congratulations that the job of preserving wildlife is done. On the plane to Pittsburgh, I read in Esquire of the vision of the future of Dr. William Cummins of the Navy's Taylor Model Basin. They're developing a hovercraft that will be ready to go shortly. And here is what Dr. Cummins says:

"If I were a duck hunter I'd cruise over swamp grass and use my boat for a blind. If I were a fisherman, I'd want an inflatable hovercraft that I could unfold from the trunk of my car, and then attach an outboard motor and hover along a rocky stream * * * at 30 or 40 miles an hour."

If we can ground Dr. Cummins for just a few years, we may be able to save our fish and wildlife yet.

The National Wildlife Federation, since the beginning, has taken the lead in coordinating conservation efforts. Women's and youth organizations, civic clubs, garden groups, and even organized labor have vital interests in the things you stand for. Invite them to join you. Zero in on broadscale conservation problems, rather than directing your major efforts toward detailed hunting and fishing regulations.

It was my friend, the late Clem Miller of California, who told you back in 1961 that the word "cooperation" has a magical effect on Congressmen. "We are so busy being ground down by the relentless effects of political competition," he said, "that the parties who can sing in unison are greeted with open arms. To the conciliator we are frequently willing to give our devotion."

Nor should we automatically consider that all industry is bad for conservation. The petroleum industry, I am told, has made real strides toward reducing its damage to natural resources. Many timber concerns provide outstanding recreational opportunities on lands managed for sustained yield. Some electric power interests recognize the values of preserving certain streams as wild rivers. And so it goes. I think you well can meet with many of these groups to find ways of cooperating for the benefit of conservation.

Above all, I urge you to keep your own organizations strong. Develop intelligent, responsible, and dedicated leaders who have a recognized status in their own communities. Organize affiliate groups in all areas to give you broad representation. Make your voices heard in the State Capitols—and in Washington, D.C. As one who knows—and as one who can say this sort of thing—take the information which your national headquarters develops and distributes so effectively, and then act on it. Buttonhole your Congressmen when they are at home. Get them committed on specific issues before the elections. Write us. Wire us. Call us. I can honestly say that most Members of Congress really want to know what you—their constituents—think about current issues. There are more conservationists in the Congress than you might think.

Conservation is an attitude, an approach, a concept which permeates our lives. As a conservationist, I wish the National Wildlife Federation well as it presses forward to bring this concept to all the people of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Most Rev. Bishop Zoltan Beky, Hungarian Reformed Federation of Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all nations, Creator and Keeper of all people.

We stand before Thee in humble reverence as leaders and chosen representatives of this great Nation.

We invoke Thy blessing upon this great assembly. We confess that we are unable to carry the heavy responsibilities of our enormous tasks, without Thy help. We pray for Thy guidance and Thy wisdom.

Our entire world, divided as it is, needs Thy deliverance. Make us all the instrument of Thy will.

We pray for our beloved country, "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

We pray for our Nation, for our dedicated men and women with the Armed Forces, for our sons fighting in the jungles of Vietnam, against the most cruel enemies of our civilization—fighting for the freedom and liberty of all mankind. Grant them victory that their sufferings and sacrifices will not be in vain.

On this day, O God, we remember the heroic sacrifices of a small, but brave nation, the people of Hungary, who defended the frontiers of civilization and faith for thousands of years, and rendered many sacrifices for the freedom and peace of others.

Since it is the day of freedom in their history, we pray for Thy help that the true day of lasting freedom may come to this nation which is now subjugated by its oppressors and forces of evil.

We pray for our beloved President, our Speaker. Strengthen them in these most difficult and challenging times of our history. In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 14, 1966:

H.R. 1484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney; and

H.R. 4928. An act for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki.

On March 15, 1966:

H.R. 12889. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; and

H.R. 8030. An act to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10553. An act to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2614. An act to provide for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska Purchase.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia;

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.;

S. 2835. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association; and

S. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution to approve selecting of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12169) entitled "An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Sparkman and Mr. Hickenlooper to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as the Congressman from the Seventh District of Louisiana, it is my solemn duty to announce the demise of one of my predecessors, the very able statesman and loyal American, Henry D. Larcade, Jr.

This gentleman distinguished himself as a Member of this Chamber representing Louisiana's Seventh District from 1943 through 1953. After a long illness, Mr. Larcade, at the age of 76, passed away on March 14 in the quiet of his home in Opelousas, St. Landry Parish, La.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that all Members be allowed 5 legislative days in which to prepare and insert into the Record remarks of sympathy and esteem relating to the life and service of our former colleague, the Honorable Henry D. Larcade, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague from Louisiana in paying tribute to the memory of one of the most delightful people, I feel, who has served in this body, Henry Larcade. Not only was he delightful as an individual, as a person, as a friend, but he was energetic and effective as a Member of this body in representing the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, Henry Larcade, as it might well be said in Louisiana, was born to politics. He was reared in a political atmosphere. He served his State for many years in the State legislature before coming to the Congress. He retired from the Congress voluntarily.

Mr. Speaker, during the years in which he served here those who served with him will always remember this remarkable man. Few of us, however, remember or know of his participation in politics which dates back to the inauguration of Theodore Roosevelt, when he represented the State of Louisiana in Theodore Roosevelt's inaugural parade.

Mr. Speaker, from then on the name of "Larcade" was written across the political history of the State of Louisiana, and in this body he exemplified the courage and independence to which few men can lay claim.

Mr. Speaker, I join in extending my deepest sympathy to his wife and to the members of his family.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to concur in the statements made by my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Edwards] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert], in paying tribute to our former colleague, Henry Larcade.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Larcade was beloved in our State. He had many, many friends in this body. He served with distinction here for a decade.

Mr. Speaker, coincidentally, I was pointing out on yesterday, as we observed the seventh anniversary of statehood for the State of Hawaii, the leading role which he played in securing the passage of that statehood resolution. Almost at the minute that I was speaking, Mr. Larcade died at his home in Opelousas.

Mr. Speaker, the work that he did for the State of Hawaii was one of his greatest achievements.

Mr. Speaker, he lived a long fruitful life. He will be missed by the people of my State. Mrs. Boggs joins me in expression of sympathy to Mrs. Larcade and the members of his family.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana. [Mr. Passman].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to my personal friend and former colleague, Henry Larcade. He was indeed a dedicated American. He rendered distinguished service as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Henry served as a Member of this House for a period of 10 years, January 3, 1943 to January 3, 1953. He was a Member when I came to the Congress in 1947. His assistance to me as a freshman Member, and his personal friendship which has lasted throughout the years, have made my life infinitely more rewarding and pleasant.

Throughout his lifetime Henry's efforts were directed toward the betterment of his fellow man and his country. As a young man just out of school, he served with the U.S. Army during World War I. Prior to his election to the U.S. Congress, Henry was active in educational, banking, civic, and political affairs. He served in the Louisiana State Legislature prior to and subsequent to his service in the U.S. Congress. His decision not to seek reelection in 1952 was indeed a loss to this House and to our country.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Louisiana and the Nation as a whole can truly be grateful for the life and work of this great American. Indeed, this world is a better place in which to live for Henry Larcade's having lived in it.

I wish to extend my deep personal sympathy to his beloved and devoted wife, Virginia, and to the other members of his family. I pray that God will comfort them in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to concur in the remarks made by my colleagues and in expressing our deepest sympathy to the family of Mr. Larcade of Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I knew the former Congressman quite well, because upon his retirement from this body he served 4 years in the Senate of the State of Louisiana, of which I was a member, and in which body I was a colleague of his. He brought much to that body during the 4 years of his service there.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express the deep sorrow felt by the people of Hawaii at the passing away of an outstanding former Congressman, the Honorable Henry Dominique Larcade, Jr., of Louisiana. Though Representative Larcade was best known for years of dedicated service to the people of Louisiana, he is remembered by us for his unflagging efforts on behalf of statehood for Hawaii during his distinguished career in the U.S. Congress.

Born in 1890, Mr. Larcade, banker by profession, entered public life early as a member of the school board in the St. Landry Parish in Louisiana from 1913 to 1928. He was a member of the Louisiana State Senate from 1928 to 1932, served that body as assistant clerk from 1932 to 1936, and then became a member of the

State house of representatives from 1936 to 1940.

In 1943, Mr. Larcade entered the 78th Congress and was elected to four succeeding terms, for a total of 10 years of able and effective work in this body. He chose not to stand for reelection in 1952 but the call of public life was too strong, and he became a member of his State's senate again from 1956 to 1960.

We join in the deep sadness of the people of Louisiana at the loss of this dedicated public servant, and I want to assure them that Representative Larcade's unrelenting efforts in attempting to procure statehood status for us will not be forgotten. His works will live after him, for he was a man whose career inspired the profound respect and admiration of citizens from all sections of this great land who knew of his devotion to the public good.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittees on Public Lands and Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, on this date the Hungarian independence of March 15, 1848, is commemorated as well as the magnificent courage of Louis Kossuth, the leader of that revolution. This great Hungarian patriot visited in the United States of America and was highly honored by our people for his fight against Hapsburg rule. It was just 10 years ago in 1956 that another Hungarian revolution took place for the purpose of freeing these people from Communist domination. Now, 10 years later, in 1966, they are still trying. During the past 3 months approximately 5,000 persons have been arrested in Hungary on charges of conspiracy against Russia. The Hungarian people have proven that their ideas of freedom are similar to our own.

I have risen, Mr. Speaker, to remind the House that House Joint Resolution 684, introduced last October 7 by the gentleman from New York, Congressman Horton, is a resolution which recognizes and honors the Hungarian freedom fighters.

As we remember today the anniversary of the Hungarian independence drive of 1848, it is entirely appropriate that we recall the nearer 10th anniversary of the revolution in our own day, which will be fast approaching this fall.

EXPORT CONTROLS OVER CATTLE HIDES AND LEATHER ARE HARMFUL

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last week with the concurrence of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce imposed export quotas on hides. I asked immediately for a justification for this action and I have now received their answer. I do not think it is at all justified according to the documents that I have received. These documents and excuses ignore the fact that there are an abundance of substitutes to cover any shortages that may exist. They ignore the fact that hides went up from very low prices to the prices at which they have recently been selling. The justifications ignore the fact that foreigners were willing to pay the prices that they were paying for hides and that a considerable percentage of the hides they buy are of inferior quality anyway and there is no adequate U.S. market for all those inferior hides.

This action by the Department of Commerce has reduced our ability to lower our balance of payments since the reduced prices are below what foreign customers are willing to pay and the volume will be reduced.

The cost of the green hide in a $20 pair of shoes is less than 20 cents and I do not think anybody should get excited about that. While the price of shoes was going up $10, the cost of the green hide did not increase by 10 cents.

This order by the Department of Commerce has tumbled hide prices and reduced the price of live cattle the equivalent of 25 cents per hundredweight on those cattle. The real cost of this unjustified order, I suggest Mr. Speaker, will come out of the hides of cattle producers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in protesting against this export quota on hides.

INCREASING IMPORTATION OF GLOVES

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have received a number of inquiries from glove manufacturers in my congressional district calling to my attention the effect that the increasing importation of gloves is having upon our domestic glove industry.

My constituents are experiencing economic distress by reason of the competitive advantage foreign glove manufacturers are enjoying. With lower labor and material costs, foreign glove manufacturers can place their product on the American market at a price domestic manufacturers cannot hope to meet.

The U.S. Tariff Commission has furnished me with information which indicates that, in 1961, 4,649,111 dozen pairs of gloves with a value of $37,275,184 were imported into the United States. The average unit value per dozen pairs of these imported gloves was $8.02.

In 1965, 7,989,423 dozen pairs of gloves, valued at $61,555,189, were imported into the United States. The average unit value per dozen pairs of these gloves was $7.70.

It will be seen, therefore, that foreign gloves were sold in the United States in 1965 at a cheaper price than were foreign-manufactured gloves in 1961. During the same period, however, the cost of gloves manufactured in the United States increased. In 1965, it cost the American glove manufacturer approximately $13.50 per dozen pairs to place his product on the market.

I have a number of glove manufacturing firms in my district. These firms are being adversely affected by the increasing importation of cheap foreign-made gloves.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the appropriate committee of the Congress will look into this matter in an effort to secure some relief for the American glove manufacturing industry.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. EDWARD GARDINER LATCH AS CHAPLAIN

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] in expressing to you, Mr. Speaker, my appreciation of your having named Rev. Dr. Latch to serve as our Acting Chaplain. He is indeed a most worthy successor to our late beloved Dr. Braskamp and to all who have served in this capacity.

In so honoring Dr. Latch you do honor to all of us. You have selected to guide and counsel us a man who is truly a man of God whose entire life has been dedicated to the performance of God's work and the realization of God's kingdom on earth.

Dr. Latch has been pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Church for 25 years. I have been privileged to be one of his parishioners for many, many years. His sermons are rich in knowledge of the ways of man as well as the teachings of the ways of God. One cannot sit in his presence but recognize he is in the presence of a man of both wisdom and faith, and be inspired.

Dr. Latch is not only a theologian. He is a scholarly man of letters, knowledgeable in the vast scope of man's endeavors. As he has inspired and enriched the lives of his own congregation and countless others who have known him, he will inspire and enrich the Members of this House as we hear him in his daily morning prayer and have opportunity to visit with him.

It has been my very great privilege to be a personal friend of Dr. Latch. I cannot possibly tell you how delighted I am that our beloved Speaker has named him to serve us as our Acting Chaplain.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished friend from Illinois, and compliment the Speaker and the House of Representatives on the selection of Dr. Latch as our Chaplain.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I fully subscribe to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

I have personally known Dr. Latch for many years. I worship in his church. He is a great and good man. I am sure he will be greatly loved, admired, and appreciated by the Members of this House, as he is by the members of Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church.

Our Speaker is to be congratulated on such a fine selection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I share the views expressed by the gentleman from Illinois and others, and I wish to compliment the Speaker on his making Dr. Latch our temporary Chaplain during the remainder of the 89th Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I rise only to associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Illinois. I have had the good fortune of hearing Dr. Latch a number of times. He is a great preacher and devoted Christian leader. He will serve us here in the high traditions of those who have occupied this important office in the years gone by.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding, as well as for the magnificent statement he made about the distinguished clergyman who has joined us.

I remember so well that shortly after my arrival in Washington I had the very kind invitation from Dr. and Mrs. Latch to visit them in their home and to visit their wonderful church. I know that all of us join with the gentleman from Illinois in commending the Speaker for the selection of this outstanding gentleman, outstanding theologian, and wonderful man to be with us here in the House of Representatives as our Chaplain.

COMMISSIONING OF OSTEOPATHS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, some of the Members may recall that last week I brought to their attention the fact that osteopaths, who are duly licensed to practice medicine and surgery in most of the States of the Union, are not acceptable for commissioning in the military forces of the United States, in spite of the acute shortage of medical doctors.

I pointed out that one married medical doctor with seven children was drafted, while no osteopath is eligible for commissioning or acceptance by draft in the Medical Corps as officers.

I wrote to the Secretary of Defense and asked for an explanation of why the law of the land, Public Law 763 of the 84th Congress, has not been implemented and why osteopaths are not acceptable in the armed services. These are the reasons that have been given to me by Shirley C. Fisk, M.D., Deputy Assistant Secretary, Health and Medical. I would like to bring them to the attention of the House. Dr. Fisk expresses his view that:

> Both the specific language of the Public Law 763, 84th Congress, and it legislative history clearly reflect its permissive nature.

He then outlines the reasons why the military Secretaries are not accepting osteopaths.

> The first reason involves the possible loss of approval by the various civilian medical specialty boards of the training programs carried on in various military hospitals. The second involved the possible loss of accreditation by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals of various military hospitals.

Now these are the two reasons that are at this moment advanced as to why duly licensed and properly educated and federally assisted doctors are not acceptable in the Medical Corps of the United States. I intend to pursue this matter further and shall report at a later date. I am particularly interested in why the military hospitals should be threatened if they accept osteopaths. This in my judgment violates the very purpose of Public Law 763. I intend to investigate this entire matter.

EXPORTATION OF HIDES AND IMPORTATION OF KNIT GLOVES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join those colleagues who spoke earlier this afternoon in protest to the action of the executive branch of the Government in drastically reducing the export of hides and, on the other hand, tremendously increasing the imports into this country of knit gloves and mittens.

Some Members of the House should find a mirror and take a look at themselves before protesting. Many Members should do this because they voted to delegate to the executive branch of Government the authority to take the action it did with respect to hides and, in the case of the importation of woolen gloves, voted to join the free trade movement by eliminating effective tariffs.

The next time the Trade Agreements Act is extended vote differently than you have in the past if you want to shut off these imports that are destroying American industry.

DESIGNATING THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1966, FOR CELEBRATION OF PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the House Resolution 754 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> H. Res. 754
>
> *Resolved*, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 7, 1966, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day, after the reading of the Journal, remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADE AGREEMENT RESULTING FROM REVISED TARIFF SCHEDULES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I think there ought to be some Members here to hear the President's speech.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Adair
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Baring
Bell
Bolling
Brown, Calif.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Conyers
Dawson
Delaney
Derwinski
Dowdy
Everett
Fuqua
Green, Oreg.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Holifield
King, Calif.
Leggett
McCarthy
McVicker
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Matthews
Michel
Miller
Mosher
Murray
O'Hara, Mich.
Pool
Powell
Reinecke
Roncalio
Roudebush
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TRADE AGREEMENT RESULTING FROM REVISED TARIFF SCHEDULES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 411)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The following message from the President of the United States was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Government of the United States and the Government of Canada have concluded a trade agreement resulting from the entry into force in 1963 of the revised Tariff Schedules of the United States (TSUS). The agreement reestablishes, in terms of the TSUS, the concessions in the U.S. schedule to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which were negotiated by the United States with Canada in earlier GATT negotiations. It also grants, under the authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, new concessions to be included in such schedule to offset the impairment in concessions negotiated with Canada which was incidental to bringing the TSUS into force. The agreement was signed on December 17, 1965, and the first reduction in tariffs took effect on January 1, 1966.

In accordance with section 226 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I herewith transmit a copy of the trade agreement, together with a statement of the reasons for entering into the agreement.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1966.*

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith from the Secretary of State the fourth annual report of the Peace Corps.

This is a report of service to our neighbors throughout the world. It is the story of new opportunities for growth and learning among our own people.

The expansion of the Peace Corps has been as dramatic as its promise.

Five years ago today the Peace Corps was 11 days old. By midsummer 1961, 120 volunteers were serving in 3 countries. At the close of fiscal year 1965 there were 8,624 volunteers serving in 46 countries. Africa received 3,278 volunteers—Latin America received 3,214—the Near East and South Asia, 1,285, and the Far East, 847.

There are many examples of Peace Corps impact. One is Afghanistan. Nine volunteers went there in 1962 to begin the Peace Corps work. As of June 30, 1965, there were 136 volunteers in Afghanistan, located in 19 different towns and villages. Peace Corps teachers reach nearly 40 percent of all Afghan students at the secondary and university levels.

There are other measures of progress. I am pleased to note that, as the number of volunteers has risen, the cost per volunteer has declined. During fiscal year 1963, for example, the annual cost per volunteer was $9,074. For 1965 the cost was reduced to $8,028. The estimate for fiscal year 1966 is $7,832.

The Peace Corps is the largest producer and consumer of language materials in the world. Since 1961, 20,000 trainees have received instruction in one or more of about 60 languages in the Peace Corps training curriculums. Twenty additional languages are under consideration for inclusion in future training programs.

Since its inception, 150,000 Americans have volunteered for Peace Corps service. Some 15,000 have served abroad in 49 nations.

As of June 30, 1965, 4,545 volunteers had completed service and returned to the United States. Thirty-seven percent of all returned volunteers are continuing their education. Government service is attracting 17.8 percent, while another 16.4 percent are teaching. The remaining 28.5 percent are engaged in private business, nonprofit organizations, and miscellaneous activities.

It is fair to say that the lives of virtually all volunteers have been changed by their service in the Corps. They have become aware—in a unique and profound way—of the bond of suffering and hope that unites men and women on every continent. And they are returning home with a new understanding of their Nation and the world.

No more valuable experience can be gained by any man.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1966.*

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE AND PROPOSED EASTER RECESS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to any information he can give us as to the schedule at Eastertime.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the gentleman has made this inquiry, because we would like to give the Members the opportunity of having as much advance information as possible. Barring some unforeseen contingency, which we do not expect, I advise the gentleman that it is our plan to recess at the close of business on Thursday, April 7, 1966, and go over until Monday, April 18, 1966.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, then, we will have business on Thursday, April 7.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And we will resume with business on Monday, April 18?

Mr. ALBERT. We will have business on Monday, April 18.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I think it is important to be sure that everyone knows we have business on Thursday, April 7, and business on Monday, April 18, which I understand is a day for suspension of the rules.

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the call of the Private Calendar.

OSMUNDO CABIGAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RONALD WHELAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7141) for the relief of Ronald Whelan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7141

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the limitations of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 2733 of the United States Code or any other statute of limitations, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to receive, consider, and settle the claim of Ronald Whelan, a minor, in accordance with the otherwise applicable provisions of section 2733 of title 10 of the United States Code based upon the injuries and disabilities he suffered as the result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle in Frankfort, Germany, on or about September 26, 1960; and if found to be meritorious, the claim shall be paid in accordance with the procedures provided in that section. The claim authorized to be considered by this Act shall be filed within one year of the date of approval of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD POIRIER, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8865) for the relief of Ronald Poirier, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8865

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Ronald Poirier, a minor, the sum of $542.10 in full settlement of all claims of the said Ronald Poirier against the United States and Airman First Class Roger Blatchford, and in full and final payment of the judgment and costs docketed in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, in favor of the said Ronald Poirier, a minor, in an action brought in his behalf by his father, Roland Poirier, as his father and next friend, against the said Airman First Class Roger Blatchford for damages for personal injuries growing out of an accident on May 31, 1957, in Springfield, Massachusetts, while said Airman First Class Roger Blatchford was operating an Air Force vehicle and was engaged in his duties as a member of the Air Force. No part of the money appropriated in this Act in excess of 20 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after "out" insert "of".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax reductions, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it is our intention fully to discuss and explain the conference report, I would ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement and ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1323)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 302. BENEFITS AT AGE 72 FOR CERTAIN UNINSURED INDIVIDUALS.

"(a) MONTHLY BENEFITS.—Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'BENEFITS AT AGE 72 FOR CERTAIN UNINSURED INDIVIDUALS

"'Eligibility

"'SEC. 228. (a) Every individual who—

"'(1) has attained the age of 72,

"'(2)(A) attained such age before 1968, or (B) has not less than 3 quarters of coverage, whenever acquired, for each calendar year elapsing after 1966 and before the year in which he attained such age.

"'(3) is a resident of the United States (as defined in subsection (e)), and is (A) a citizen of the United States or (B) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence who has resided in the United States (as defined in section 210(i)) continuously during the 5 years immediately preceding the month in which he files application under this section, and

"'(4) has filed application for benefits under this section,

shall (subject to the limitations in this section) be entitled to a benefit under this section for each month beginning with the first month after September 1966 in which he becomes so entitled to such benefits and ending with the month preceding the month in which he dies. No application under this section which is filed by an individual more than 3 months before the first month in which he meets the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall be accepted as an application for purposes of this section."'

"Benefit amount

"'(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the benefit amount to which an individual is entitled under this section for any month shall be $35.

"'(2) If both husband and wife are entitled (or upon application would be entitled) to benefits under this section for any month, the amount of the husband's benefit for such month shall be $35 and the amount of the wife's benefit for such month shall be $17.50.

"'Reduction for governmental pension system benefits

"'(c)(1) The benefit amount of any individual under this section for any month shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount of any periodic benefit under a governmental pension system for which he is eligible for such month.

"'(2) In the case of a husband and wife only one of whom is entitled to benefits under this section for any month, the benefit amount, after any reduction under paragraph (1), shall be further reduced (but not below zero) by the excess (if any) of (A) the total amount of any periodic benefits under governmental pension systems for which the spouse who is not entitled to benefits under this section is eligible for such month, over (B) $17.50.

"'(3) In the case of a husband and wife both of whom are entitled to benefits under this section for any month—

"'(A) the benefit amount of the wife, after any reduction under paragraph (1), shall be further reduced (but not below zero) by the excess (if any) of (i) the total amount of any periodic benefits under governmental pension systems for which the husband is eligible for such month, over (ii) $35, and

"'(B) the benefit amount of the husband, after any reduction under paragraph (1), shall be further reduced (but not below zero) by the excess (if any) of (i) the total amount of any periodic benefits under governmental pension systems for which the wife is eligible for such month, over (ii) $17.50.

"'(4) For purposes of this subsection, in determining whether an individual is eligible for periodic benefits under a governmental pension system—

"'(A) such individual shall be deemed to have filed application for such benefits,

"'(B) to the extent that entitlement depends on an application by such individual's spouse, such spouse shall be deemed to have filed application, and

"'(C) to the extent that entitlement depends on such individual or his spouse having retired, such individual and his spouse shall be deemed to have retired before the month for which the determination of eligibility is being made.

"'(5) For purposes of this subsection, if any periodic benefit is payable on any basis other than a calendar month, the Secretary shall allocate the amount of such benefit to the appropriate calendar months.

"'(6) If, under the foregoing provisions of this section, the amount payable for any month would be less than $1, such amount shall be reduced to zero. In the case of a husband and wife both of whom are entitled to benefits under this section for the month, the preceding sentence shall be applied with respect to the aggregate amount so payable for such month.

"'(7) If any benefit amount computed under the foregoing provisions of this section is not a multiple of $0.10, it shall be raised to the next higher multiple of $0.10.

"'(8) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, benefit payments under this section to an individual (or aggregate benefit payments under this section in the case of a husband and wife) of less than $5 may be accumulated until they equal or exceed $5.

"'Suspension for months in which cash payments are made under public assistance

"'(d) The benefit to which any individual is entitled under this section for any month shall not be paid for such month if—

"'(1) such individual receives aid or assistance in the form of money payments in such month under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI, or

"'(2) such individual's husband or wife receives such aid or assistance in such month, and under the State plan the needs of such individual were taken into account in determining eligibility for (or amount of) such aid or assistance,

unless the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan notifies the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, that such payments to such individual (or such individual's husband or wife) under such plan are being terminated with the payment or payments made in such month.

"'Suspension where individual is residing outside the United States

"'(e) The benefit to which any individual is entitled under this section for any month shall not be paid if, during such month, such individual is not a resident of the United States. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'United States' means the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

"'Treatment as monthly insurance benefits

"'(f) For purposes of subsections (t) and (u) of section 202, and of section 1840, a monthly benefit under this section shall be treated as a monthly insurance benefit payable under section 202.

"'Annual reimbursement of Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund

"'(g) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare deems necessary on account of—

"'(1) payments made under this section during the second preceding fiscal year and all fiscal years prior thereto to individuals who, as of the beginning of the calendar year in which falls the month for which payment was made, had less than 3 quarters of coverage,

"'(2) the additional administrative expenses resulting from the payments described in paragraph (1), and

"'(3) any loss in interest to such Trust Fund resulting from such payments and expenses,

in order to place such Trust Fund in the same position at the end of such fiscal year as it would have been in if such payments had not been made.

"'Definitions

"'(h) For purposes of this section—

"'(1) The term "quarters of coverage" includes a quarter of coverage as defined in section 5(l) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.

"'(2) The term "governmental pension system" means the insurance system established by this title or any other system or fund established by the United States, a State, any political subdivision of a State, or any wholly owned instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing which provides for payment of (A) pensions, (B) retirement or retired pay, or (C) annuities or similar amounts payable on account of personal services performed by any individual (not including any payment under any workmen's compensation law or any payment by the Veterans' Administration as compensation for service-connected disability or death).

"'(3) The term "periodic benefit" includes a benefit payable in a lump sum if it is a commutation of, or a substitute for, periodic payments.

"'(4) The determination of whether an individual is a husband or wife for any month shall be made under subsection (h) of section 216 without regard to subsections (b) and (f) of section 216.'

"(b) CERTAIN APPLICATIONS UNDER 1965 AMENDMENTS.—For purposes of paragraph (4) of section 228(a) of the Social Security Act (added by subsection (a) of this section), an application filed under section 103 of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 before July 1966 shall be regarded as an application under such section 228 and shall, for purposes of such paragraph and of the last sentence of such section 228(a), be deemed to have been filed in July 1966, unless the person by whom or on whose behalf such application was filed notifies the Secretary that he does not want such application so regarded."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 19 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 4 and insert:

"SEC. 303. TEMPORARY DUTY-FREE ENTRY FOR GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES IN COMBAT ZONES.

"(a) GIFTS COSTING $50 OR LESS.—Subpart B of part 1 of the appendix to".

On page 19 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in the matter following line 7, after "may prescribe" insert a comma.

On page 19 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in the fourth line from the bottom of the page, strike out "(b)" and insert:

"(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—".

On page 19 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in the last line, strike out "(c)" and insert:

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—".

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JAMES B. UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following Senate amendments made technical, clerical, clarifying or conforming changes: 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32. With respect to these amendments (1) the House recedes, or (2) the Senate recedes in order to conform to other action agreed upon by the committee of conference.

WITHHOLDING ALLOWANCES BASED ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: The bill as passed by the House and the Senate permits employees to claim withholding allowances (which are to have the same effect as withholding exemptions for purposes of income tax withholding) equal to the number determined by dividing by $700 the excess of (1) estimated itemized deductions over (2) an amount equal to the sum of a specified percentage of the first $7,500 of estimated wages and 17 percent of the remainder of the estimated wages. Under the bill as passed by the House, the percentage of the first $7,500 of estimated wages was 12 percent. Under Senate amendment No. 4, this percentage is reduced to 10 percent. The House recedes.

Under the bill as passed by the House, any fraction resulting from the computation was to be disregarded except that, if the number determined was one-half or more but less than one, it was to be increased to one. Under Senate amendment No. 5, fractional numbers are not to be taken into account. The House recedes.

The conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate are concerned about the extent of overwithholding which prevails under existing law and which it appears will continue at a reduced level under the graduated withholding system provided by this bill, even with the withholding allowances as provided in the agreement reached by your conferees. For that reason, it has requested the Treasury Department to continue to survey and study ways and means of reducing overwithholding, particularly in the case of seasonal and intermittent employment, and has asked the Treasury Department, as it gains some experience under the system provided by the bill, to report back from time to time to the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance as to any practicable means of reducing the remaining overwithholding.

Amendment No. 7: Under the bill as passed by the House, an employee's estimated itemized deductions for any estimation year could not be greater than the amount of the deductions (other than the deductions referred to in sections 141 and 151 of the Code and other than the deductions required to be taken into account in determining adjusted gross income under section 62 of the Code) shown on his Federal income tax return for the taxable year preceding his estimation year. Under Senate amendment No. 7, if the employee did not show such deductions on his return for such preceding taxable year, the amount of his estimated itemized deductions is not to exceed the lesser of $1,000 or 10 percent of the wages shown on such return.

The House recedes.

OPTION OF INDIVIDUALS TO DISREGARD BALANCES DUE AND OVERPAYMENTS OF $5 OR LESS

Amendment No. 18: This amendment added a new section 5 to the code under which individuals were given an election to disregard balances due and overpayments of $5 or less where their withholding and other tax credits and payments of estimated tax for a year were within $5 of their tax liability for the year as shown on their returns. This election would have been effective for taxable years after 1966.

The Senate recedes.

Although the House conferees did not agree to Senate amendment No. 18, they recognize the desirability of simplifying tax collection and refund procedures, an objective toward which this amendment was directed. For this reason, the conferees, both on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, are requesting the Treasury Department to study and report back to the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance as to the practicability and desirability of foregoing tax payments and refunds in cases where the amount due at the time the final return is filed is small because of substantial payments through withholding or payments of estimated tax, or both. This study and report to the committees is to be made in conjunction with the study on ways of relieving overwithholding referred to earlier in this statement.

FLOOR STOCKS TAX ON PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES, ETC.

Amendment No. 19: The bill as passed by the House provided for a floor stocks tax on passenger automobiles and trailers (other than house trailers) suitable for use in connection with passenger automobiles which on the day after the enactment of the bill are held by dealers and have not been used and are intended for sale. Under this provision the tax was 1 percent of the price for which the article was sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer. The tax was to be paid by the dealer and be collected from him by the manufacturer, producer, or importer. The tax was to be paid at such time after 60 days after the date of enactment of the bill as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

Senate amendment No. 19 strikes out this provision of the bill.

The House recedes.

LOCAL RESIDENTIAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Amendment No. 22: The bill as passed by the House increased the tax on communication services to 10 percent (the rate in effect on December 31, 1965), for the period from the effective date of this provision through March 31, 1968. Senate amendment No. 22 provided that this temporary increase was not to apply to local residential telephone service, as defined in the amendment, and that the tax rates provided by existing law (3 percent for calendar year 1966, 2 percent for calendar year 1967, and 1 percent for calendar year 1968) were to continue to apply to this service.

The Senate recedes.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF INCREASE IN COMMUNICATIONS TAX

Amendment No. 26: Under the bill as passed by the House, the amendments made by section 202 of the bill (relating to communication services) were to take effect, under the rules prescribed by the bill, on the first day of the first month which begins more than 15 days after the date on which the bill is enacted. Under Senate amendment No. 26 the effective date is April 1, 1966.

The House recedes.

DISALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN INDIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES

Amendment No. 33: This amendment adds a new section 276 to the code providing that no deduction otherwise allowable under chapter 1 of the code shall be allowed for any amount paid or incurred for—

"(1) advertising in a convention program of a political party, or in any other publication if any part of the proceeds of such publication directly or indirectly inures (or is intended to inure) to or for the use of a political party or a political candidate,

"(2) admission to any dinner or program, if any part of the proceeds of such dinner or program directly or indirectly inures (or is intended to inure) to or for the use of a political party or a political candidate, or

"(3) admission to an inaugural ball, inaugural gala, inaugural parade, or inaugural concert, or to any similar event which is identified with a political party or a political candidate."

The new section also defines the term "political party" and provides that proceeds are to be treated as inuring to or for the use of a political candidate only if (A) such proceeds may be used directly or indirectly for the purpose of furthering his candidacy for selection, nomination, or election to any elective public office, and (B) such proceeds are not received by such candidate in the ordinary course of a trade or business (other than the trade or business of holding elective public office). The new section applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965, but only with respect to amounts paid or incurred after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The House recedes.

INFORMATION RETURNS MADE BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 34: Section 6041(a) of the code now requires information returns to be made by persons engaged in trade or business and by officers and employees of the United States with respect to certain payments of $600 or more in a taxable year. The return sets forth the amount of the payments and the name and address of the recipient. Senate amendment No. 34 added a new subsection (e) to section 6041 providing (1) that information returns which are required under section 6041(a) with respect to payments under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture are to be rendered by the Secretary of Agriculture or by one or more officers or employees of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary of Agriculture to make such returns on his behalf, and (2) that the Secretary of Agriculture (or the officer or employee rendering the return) is to furnish to each person whose name is set forth in the return a written statement showing the aggregate amount of payments to the person as shown on the return.

The Senate recedes.

Although the conferees on the part of the House, because of problems of administering the amendment, did not agree to Senate amendment No. 34, it was recognized that there is a problem in correlating the different payments which may be made to a farmer during a year at different times or by different offices or agencies of the Department of Agriculture. It was thought that a means should be developed administratively to report with respect to any farmer a total of the payments made to him which should be reported for tax purposes. Also, a study should be made of the feasibility of reporting to the farmer amounts paid to him which are reported to the Internal Revenue Service. These studies should be made by the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Department of the Treasury and a report made to the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance early in the next Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN AGED UNINSURED INDIVIDUALS

Amendment No. 35: This amendment adds a new section to the bill to provide monthly benefit payments under section 202 of the Social Security Act to individuals who meet the requirements of the new provisions. Under the Senate amendment, an individual would be entitled to the new benefits if he has filed application for the benefits and (A) has attained age 70, (B) either (i) is not and would not (upon filing application) be entitled to monthly benefits under existing section 202 for the month in which he attains age 70 or (if later) the month in which he files application for the new benefits, or (ii) is entitled to such benefits but the amount is less than the amount of the new benefits, and (C) is a resident of the United States (as defined in section 210(i) of the Social Security Act) and is a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence who has resided in the United States (as so defined) continuously during the 5 years immediately preceding the month in which he files application for the new benefits.

Under the Senate amendment, the amount of the new monthly benefit would (in effect) be $44, except that the amount would be $22 in the case of a married woman whose husband is entitled to the new benefits. Under the Senate amendment the new provisions would apply for months after September 1966, and section 227 of the Social Security Act (relating to transitional insured status) would be repealed as of the close of September 1966.

The Senate amendment authorized appropriations to be made from time to time to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to the Federal hospital insurance trust fund to place each trust fund in the same position in which it would have been but for the Senate amendment.

Under the conference agreement, the House recedes with an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Senate amendment. Subsection (a) of section 302 of the bill as agreed to in conference adds a new section 228 to the Social Security Act providing for benefits at age 72 for certain uninsured individuals.

Under subsection (a) of the new section 228 an individual is (subject to the limitations provided by section 228) to be entitled to benefits if he—

(1) Has attained age 72,

(2) Attained such age before 1968 or has not less than 3 quarters of coverage (whenever acquired) for each calendar year elapsing after 1966 and before the year in which he attained such age,

(3) Is a resident of the United States (as defined in the second sentence of subsection

(e) of the new section 228), and is a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence who has resided in the United States (as defined in section 210(i) of the Social Security Act) continuously during the 5 years immediately preceding the month in which he files application under new section 228, and

(4) Has filed application for benefits under new section 228.

Entitlement is to begin with the first month after September 1966 in which the individual becomes entitled to such benefits and is to end with the month preceding the month in which he dies.

Subsection (b) of the new section 228 provides that the benefit amount for any month is to be $35, except that if both husband and wife are entitled (or upon application would be entitled) to benefits under new section 228 for any month, the husband's benefit for such month is to be $35 and the wife's benefit is to be $17.50.

Subsection (c) of the new section 228 provides for the reduction of the benefits under this new provision on account of periodic benefits for which the individuals concerned are eligible under governmental pension systems (as defined in new subsection (h)(2)).

Under paragraph (1) of the new subsection (c) the amount of the new benefit for any individual is first reduced by the periodic benefits under governmental pension systems for which such individual is eligible.

Paragraphs (2) and (3) relate to husbands and wives and in effect provide that the new benefit amount to which one spouse is entitled will be further reduced, in the manner specified, by a portion of the periodic benefits for which the other spouse is eligible under governmental pension systems.

Paragraph (4) of the new subsection (c) provides in effect that, in determining the eligibility of individuals for periodic benefits under governmental pension systems, applications for such benefits shall be deemed to have been filed and the individuals concerned shall be deemed to have retired.

Paragraph (5) of the new subsection (c) provides that where a periodic benefit is payable on a basis other than a calendar month, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is to allocate the amount of such benefit to the appropriate calendar months.

Paragraph (6) of the new subsection (c) provides that a monthly benefit amount under the new provision (determined before rounding under new subsection (c)(7)) of less than $1 is to be reduced to zero. Where both husband and wife are entitled to benefits under the new provision for the month, their benefit amounts are to be reduced to zero only if, after such amounts are combined (but before rounding under new subsection (c)(7)), they aggregate less than $1.

Pargaraph (7) of the new subsection (c) provides that any benefit amount which is not a multiple of 10 cents is to be raised to the next higher multiple of 10 cents. In the case of a husband and wife, this rounding provision is to be applied separately to the benefit of each spouse.

Paragraph (8) of the new subsection (c) provides that, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, where the amount otherwise payable under the new provision to an individual (or to a husband and wife) is less than $5 that amount may be accumulated. Where the amounts so accumulated equal or exceed $5, they will become immediately payable.

Subsection (d) of the new section 228 provides, in general, that the benefit to which any individual is entitled under section 228 for any month is not to be paid if he receives aid or assistance in the form of money payments in such month under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act. Such benefit for any month is also not to be paid if such individual's spouse receives such aid or assistance in such month and the needs of such individual were taken into account in determining eligibility for (or the amount of) such aid or assistance.

Subsection (e) of the new section 228 provides that the benefit to which any individual is otherwise entitled under the new section 228 is not to be paid for any month during which the individual is not a resident of the United States. For this purpose, the term "United States" means the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Subsection (f) of the new section 228 provides that monthly benefits under the new section are to be treated as monthly insurance benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for purposes of sections 202(t) (relating to suspension of benefits of aliens who are outside United States), 202(u) (relating to conviction for certain offenses), and 1840 (relating to payment of premiums for supplementary medical insurance benefits). It is to be noted that this treatment (as monthly benefits under section 202) does not apply, for example, with respect to section 226 of the Social Security Act (relating to entitlement to hospital insurance benefits) or to section 202(m) of such Act (relating to minimum benefits).

Subsection (g) authorizes to be appropriated to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare deems necessary on account of—

"(1) benefit payments made under the new section 228 during the second preceding fiscal year (and all fiscal years prior thereto which begin after June 30, 1966) to individuals who had less than 3 quarters of coverage as of the beginning of the calendar year in which falls the month for which such benefit payments were made.

"(2) the additional administrative expenses resulting from such benefit payments, and

"(3) any loss in interest to such trust fund resulting from such benefit payments and administrative expenses,

in order to place such trust fund in the same position at the end of such fiscal year as it would have been in if such benefit payments had not been made."

Subsection (h) provides definitions for the new section 228.

Paragraph (1) provides that the term "quarter of coverage" includes a quarter of coverage as defined in section 5(l) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.

Paragraph (2) defines the term "governmental pension system" to mean the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act or any other system or fund established by the United States, a State, any political subdivision of a State, or any wholly owned instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing which provides for payment of (A) pensions, (B) retirement or retired pay, or (C) annuities or similar amounts payable on account of personal services performed by any individual (not including any payment under any workmen's compensation law or any payment by the Veterans' Administration as compensation for service-connected disability or death).

Paragraph (3) provides that the term "periodic benefit" includes a benefit payable in a lump sum if it is in commutation of, or a substitute for, periodic payments.

Paragraph (4) provides that the determination of whether an individual is a husband or wife for any month is to be made under the general rules of subsection (h) of section 216 without regard to the special rules in subsections (b) and (f) of such section.

The new subsection (b) of section 302 of the bill, as agreed to in conference, provides that, for purposes of paragraph (4) of the new section 228(a) of the Social Security Act (which requires the filing of an application as a condition of entitlement to the new benefits), applications filed before July of 1966 under section 103 of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (which provides eligibility for hospital insurance benefits for certain uninsured individuals) shall be treated also as an application for benefits under the new section 228.

DUTY FREE TREATMENT OF GIFTS FROM SERVICEMEN IN COMBAT AREAS

Amendment No. 36: Under existing law (sec. 321(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930) bona fide gifts from abroad may be imported free of duty if the retail value in the country of shipment does not exceed $10. Senate amendment No. 36 adds a new item to the Tariff Schedules providing for the temporary duty free entry of articles constituting a bona fide gift from a member of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in a combat zone to the extent such articles in any shipment do not exceed $50 in aggregate retail value in the country of shipment and with such limitations on the importation of alcoholic beverages and tobacco products as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. The provision would apply only if the articles are purchased in or through authorized agencies of the Armed Forces of the United States or in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. For purposes of this provision the term "combat zone" is any area designated by the President by an executive order under section 112(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exclusion from gross income for certain combat pay of members of the Armed Forces). On April 24, 1965, the President designated Vietnam and adjacent waters as a combat zone.

The Senate amendment applies to articles entered after the date of the enactment of the bill and on or before December 31, 1967.

The House recedes with clerical amendments.

W. D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
Eugene J. Keogh,
John W. Byrnes,
James B. Utt,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we bring to the House pertains to the bill H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966.

GENERAL

Before discussing the conference report in detail, I should like to point out that it has been barely 2 months since the President sent his tax proposals to the Congress. For the second time in 2 years, the Congress has acted with dispatch on a major tax bill. Our target was March 15. If this conference report is agreed to, we will hit that target. What is more, the action this time was on a bill to raise revenue and not on a bill to reduce taxes. Congress has demonstrated, in other words, that it can and will take action quickly, both to lower revenues and to raise them, whenever there is clear evidence of the need for quick action.

Let me turn now to the language as agreed to by the conferees. The conference agreement does not depart to any significant extent from the bill passed by the House on February 23. This is indicated by the fact that the bill as passed by the House provided for an increase in administrative-budget revenues of $1.2 billion in the fiscal year 1966 and an increase of $4.8 billion in the fiscal year 1967. The bill as agreed to by the conferees provides for an increase in administrative-budget revenues of $1.1 billion in the fiscal year 1966 and $4.8 billion in the fiscal year 1967. There is virtually no difference, then, in terms of revenue between the bill that was passed by the House and the bill agreed to by the conferees. This result is significant, for the bill passed by the Senate provided for substantially less revenue than the bill passed by the House. The Senate-approved bill would have provided $1.1 billion in administrative-budget revenues in the fiscal year 1966 and only $3.9 billion in the fiscal year 1967.

The language agreed to by the conferees represents a responsible approach in helping to meet the financial demands of the Vietnam conflict. These demands—which are the sole reason for this bill—cannot be met out of the revenues generated under existing tax rates. Significant additional revenues must be provided. Without these additional revenues, there would be too large a deficit in the budget. Such a deficit, occurring at a time when our economy is once again operating at close to full employment levels and capacity, might generate serious inflationary pressures.

All told, there were 36 numbered Senate amendments to the bill as passed by the House. Sixteen of these amendments, however, were technical, clerical, or conforming in nature. Of the remaining 20 amendments, 8 were connected with 2 relatively minor revisions in the provisions of the House-passed bill.

Of the 12 amendments that I would classify as substantive, the conferees on the part of the Senate agreed to recede on 6. The conferees on the part of the House receded on six of these amendments, three of which concern matters not directly related to the provisions of the bill passed by the House.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS AGED 72 AND OVER

Perhaps the most important Senate amendment to the bill, which in a greatly modified form was agreed to by the conferees, involves a social security amendment and not an income or excise tax matter. That amendment was sponsored by Senator PROUTY. It would have authorized a minimum social security benefit of $44 a month—$22 for a wife—to all persons not eligible for social security benefits who have attained age 70 now and in the future. People who qualified for monthly social security benefits of $35 or $17.50 under the special transitional insured status provision enacted last year for people already in their seventies would have had their benefits raised to $44 and $22. The benefits would have been paid regardless of the entitlement under other Government retirement systems—in other words, on top of any Federal, State, or local pension. It would have called for a first-year expenditure of $790 million from the general fund in fiscal 1967, $735 million in fiscal 1968 and so forth for a considerable number of years. The amendment would have resulted in a substantial drain on the railroad retirement account and would have left that system with a very large actuarial deficiency. In addition, it would have made these new benefits available to persons receiving old-age assistance, and, in most cases, their assistance payments would have been reduced by the amount of these benefits with the result that such individuals would not be better off than they now are. The effect of the amendment would have been to shift an additional part of the burden of support of the needy aged from State funds to Federal funds. It would have covered persons aged 70 or over for all future years instead of merely on a transitional basis. It would have repealed the transitional insured status provision which we enacted just last year.

Clearly, this amendment in the form in which it came to us from the other body would have accomplished its basic purpose in a very costly and inefficient manner.

The Senate conferees agreed to extensive modifications to bring it more in line with the legislation which the Congress enacted last year authorizing benefits for certain aged people at age 72 who have as little as three quarters of coverage.

Benefit amount: Under the conference agreement, the benefit amount, as in last year's law, would be $35 for the husband and $17.50 for the wife, instead of $44 and $22.

Transitional provision: A transitional provision has been included, similar to the one we provided last year for the uninsured aged under hospital insurance, so that persons who attain age 72 in 1968, or later, will be required to have at least three quarters of coverage. Eventually, the number of quarters required will merge with the regular insured status requirements of the law.

Number of persons covered: The provision agreed to by the conferees makes an estimated 370,000 persons who are now 72 or over, or who will reach the age of 72 in either 1966 or 1967, eligible to receive social security benefits who do not now receive such benefits. About two-thirds of these beneficiaries will be women and 80 percent of the women will be widows. Thus, the typical beneficiary might be said to be a widow aged 85, whose husband had been a farmer who died in the early 1950's.

Offset provision: Another modification made by the conference committee would be the imposition of an offset for amounts received under other governmental retirement systems against the entitlement under the new program. The objective is to guarantee to these aged individuals retirement payments of $35 a month for the husband, $17.50 for the wife, or a family total of $52.50. The offset would apply to payments made under Federal, State, or local governmental pension systems, and would include payments of first, pensions; second, retirement or retired pay; or third, annuities or similar amounts payable on account of personal services performed, but would not include any payment under any workers' compensation law or any payment by the Veterans' Administration as compensation for service-connected disability or death.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I should mention that this offset provision will not apply to amounts payable under national service life insurance, or U.S. Government life insurance policies.

Examples of offset: Mr. Speaker, let me illustrate the manner in which this offset would work. First, take the case of a retired State employee, age 72, who is receiving a State pension of $25 and who has a wife age 72. Under this provision, he would receive an additional $10, bringing his pension and benefit receipts up to $35, and his wife would receive a benefit of $17.50, making a total family income from these sources of $52.50.

Take another example, an aged retired governmental employee who receives $10 a month from a local pension and whose wife receives $30 per month as a retired schoolteacher. Their total income from these other governmental sources is $40 per month. Under this language, an additional $12.50 would be payable to the husband, bringing their total up to $52.50.

A third case shows how this language excludes from the provision retired employees who are receiving substantial amounts from other governmental sources. Take the case of a retired Government employee who is receiving $300 a month. Under this language, he would not receive additional amounts, nor would his wife. Or, take the case of a Government employee, age 69, who is still working but who—if he retired—could receive a pension of $200 per month, and who has a wife age 72. Neither would receive anything under this amendment. Mr. Speaker, I will insert at this point a table showing further illustrations:

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS PAYABLE UNDER AMENDMENT FOR CASES OF PERSONS RECEIVING GOVERNMENTAL PENSION SYSTEM BENEFITS

Case A-1: Government employee aged 69 working, but eligible for pension of $100; his wife is aged 72. Neither receive anything under this amendment.

Case A-2: Same as case A-1 except his potential pension is $40; his wife receives $12.50 under this amendment.

Case A-3: Same as case A-1, except his potential pension is $15; his wife receives $35 under this amendment.

Case B-1: Retired Government employee aged 72, with wife same age, receiving pension of $80 per month; neither receive anything under this amendment.

Case B-2: Same as case B-1, except husband's pension is $40; he receives nothing, and his wife receives $12.50 under this amendment.

Case B-3: Same as Case B-1, except husband's pension is $20; he receives $15, and his wife receives $17.50 under this amendment.

Case C: Husband and wife both aged 72 or over and both receiving Government pensions, as follows:

Government pension		Social security benefit under this bill	
Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife
$50	$20	----------	----------
20	50	----------	----------
40	10	----------	$2.50
10	40	$2.50	----------
30	10	5.00	7.50
10	30	12.50	----------

FINANCING

Mr. Speaker, let me explain the financing of the conference language. Under this substitute, the financing initially will come from the social security old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, which in turn will be reimbursed from the general fund of the Treasury beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and continuing in this manner for each year. The reimbursements will be for benefit payments to individuals who have less than three quarters of coverage, administrative expenses, and the loss of interest to the trust fund resulting from the benefit payments and administrative expenses. The basic concept, Mr. Speaker, is to place the trust fund in the same position at the end of each fiscal year beginning with June 30, 1969, as it would have been in if such payments had not been made.

In summary, this financing is sounder fiscally and follows more closely the benefit eligibility principles of past social security legislation. It reduces the Prouty amendment general revenue expenditures almost eightfold and will have no budget impact until fiscal 1969.

The first year cost under the Prouty amendment would have been around $790 million; the first year cost under this amendment will be about $95 million for fiscal year 1967, and about $115 million in fiscal year 1968. Thereafter, the cost for each fiscal year will decrease.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Mr. Speaker, the effective date for the benefits under the conference agreement will be for the month of October 1966.

SUMMARY

Mr. Speaker, your conferees believe the approach contained in this conference agreement is far preferable to the language contained in the Prouty amendment.

This approach has a number of advantages—

First. It is in accord with the general approach which we took last year with respect to the transitional insured status provision, and with respect to coverage of the uninsured aged under the hospital insurance provision;

Second. It provides for a washout effect of transitional benefits for the aged which will not inhibit the orderly extension of social security coverage;

Third. It would not substitute Federal funds for State funds as the base of public assistance payments;

Fourth. It will not add to the actuarial burdens of the railroad retirement system;

Fifth. It contains an offset so that inequitable results will not be obtained by putting this benefit on top of and without regard to benefits received under other governmental pension systems; and

Sixth. It will provide real assistance for many of our elderly citizens who are most in need of assistance.

FLOOR STOCKS TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

A second important change in the bill passed by the House that was agreed to by the conferees concerns the floor stocks tax on passenger automobiles. The bill passed by the House provided that dealers and distributors would be assessed a tax equal to 1 percent of the manufacturer's price of the cars they held in inventory on the day after the date of enactment of this bill.

The conferees on the part of the House agreed to Senate amendments which delete the floor stocks tax from the bill. On the day following the date of enactment of the bill, the manufacturer's excise tax will rise from 6 to 7 percent with regard only to cars shipped by manufacturers and not with regard to new cars held by dealers or distributors on that date. It is estimated that this amendment will result in the collection of $25 million less in revenue in the fiscal year 1966 than the bill passed by the House.

WITHHOLDING ALLOWANCES

Two of the Senate amendments agreed to by the conferees on the part of the House concern the procedure for computing withholding allowances. Members will recall that the bill passed by the House included provisions intended to permit persons with relatively large itemized deductions to adjust their withholding in a manner that would prevent excessive overwithholding. The adjustment procedure consists of a method whereby withholding allowances may be claimed. Such allowances are to be treated as additional withholding exemptions for withholding purposes.

The withholding allowance procedure was developed by the Committee on Ways and Means because its members were concerned about the overwithholding which would otherwise be experienced by some taxpayers as a consequence of the adoption of graduated withholding rates. While the procedure approved by the committee did much to solve the problem, it was felt that even more should be done, particularly for those with incomes of less than $10,000 who have heavy itemized deductions and therefore would experience significant overwithholding. That is why a committee amendment was offered on the floor of the House when H.R. 12752 was considered. That amendment would have permitted a person whose estimated itemized deductions exceeded the applicable limits—12 percent of estimated wage income up to $7,500 and 17 percent of estimated wage income above $7,500—to claim a single withholding allowance if his excess itemized deductions exceeded $350 rather than a full $700.

The Senate considered the graduated withholding system further, having the benefit of the earlier deliberations of the House. As a result, the Senate modified the provision adopted on the floor of the House. The Senate amendments require that excess itemized deductions equal a full $700 before a withholding allowance can be claimed but, to offset this, reduce the percentage upon which excess itemized deductions are based from 12 percent of the first $7,500 of estimated wage income to 10 percent of such income. No change was made in the 17-percent requirement which applies to estimated wage and salary income in excess of $7,500.

The conferees on the part of the House agreed to the Senate amendments just explained. It was pointed out that the procedure adopted in the amendment submitted on the floor of the House would have resulted in underwithholding for some persons who were merely trying to reduce overwithholding. The House conferees agreed that it would be unfortunate if a taxpayer found himself faced with an unexpected tax bill at the end of the year simply because he followed an approved procedure for reducing overwithholding. Furthermore, in the opinion of the House conferees the objective of the provision adopted on the floor of the House will be largely achieved by reducing the percentage limit for the computation of excess itemized deductions from 12 to 10 percent of the first $7,500 of estimated wage income. The latter change will insure that persons with incomes of less than $10,000 and relatively large itemized deductions have ready access to the withholding allowance procedure.

INDIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES

The two remaining Senate amendments of importance agreed to by the conferees on the part of the House involve matters not directly related to the provisions of the bill passed by the House. The first of these disallows deductions for indirect contributions to political parties. The amendment is intended to clear up an area of uncertainty under existing law. It does so by clearly disallowing any deduction for advertising in a convention program of a political party or in any other publication if any part of the net proceeds of the advertising inures to the benefit of a political party or candidate. It also disallows deductions for payments made in connection with any dinner or program if any part of the proceeds inures to the use of a political party or candidate. Finally, it disallows deductions for admission payments to inaugural balls, galas, parades, concerts, or similar events. The amendment applies to taxable years which begin after December 31, 1965, with respect to amounts paid or incurred after the date of enactment of this act. The conferees on the part of the House agreed that it was desirable to remove any uncertainty concerning the deductibility of such payments.

DUTY-FREE GIFTS FROM SERVICEMEN IN COMBAT ZONES

The final Senate amendment of substance that was agreed to by the conferees on the part of the House concerns a tariff provision. It raises the value of gifts which may be sent into this country from abroad without payment of duty from $10 to $50 when the gifts are sent by members of our Armed Forces who are serving in a combat zone as designated by the President. In view of the fact that a similar regulation was in effect from December 5, 1942, until July 1, 1961, with respect to gifts from servicemen stationed abroad, the House conferees agreed that this privilege should be extended to our servicemen now in Vietnam.

The $50 limit will be computed on the basis of retail values in the country of shipment. The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate is authorized to limit imports of alcoholic beverages and tobacco products. Furthermore, to qualify for the special $50 exemption limit, the gift articles will have to be purchased in or through authorized agencies of the Armed Forces.

The Treasury Department estimates that this amendment will involve an additional outflow of only $9 or $10 million as far as the balance of payments is concerned. The reduction in customs duties which will result from this amendment will be negligible. The new provision will apply on articles which enter the country after the date of enactment of this bill. The provision, however, will expire on December 31, 1967.

MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES

I mentioned earlier that eight amendments agreed to by the conferees on the part of the House concerned minor modifications of the provisions in the bill passed by the House. Six of these amendments involve a change in the effective date of the provisions concerning communications services. The bill passed by the House provided that the 10-percent tax on local and toll telephone service and teletypewriter exchange service was to be effective with respect to bills rendered on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 15 days after the date on which this bill is enacted. The bill as agreed to by the conferees sets April 1, 1966, as the effective date for the communications tax provisions. That is, the 10-percent rate will be in effect on bills for taxable communications services rendered on or after April 1, 1966. Since Congress has acted with dispatch on this bill, the communications tax provision would, in all probability, have gone into effect on April 1 in any case. The modification merely clarifies the exact date on which the new provisions will become effective.

Two other minor technical amendments provide that in computing eligible withholding allowances, a taxpayer who used the standard deduction in the prior year may consider the amount of his itemized deductions for the prior year equaled 10 percent of his wages in that year or $1,000, whichever is less. These are simply amendments to clarify the provisions of the House bill.

SENATE AMENDMENTS DELETED IN CONFERENCE

OPTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXPAYERS TO DISREGARD BALANCES DUE AND OVERPAYMENTS OF $5 OR LESS

The Senate added amendment under which individuals were given an election to disregard balances due and overpayments of $5 or less where their withholding and other tax credits and payments of estimated income tax for a year were within $5 of their tax liability for that year as shown on their tax returns. The conferees deleted this amendment. However, the conferees are requesting the Treasury Department to study and report back to the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance as to the practicability and desirability of forgoing tax payments and refunds where the amount due at the time of the final return is small. This study and report is to be made in conjunction with a study on ways of relieving overwithholding which was also directed to be made.

EXEMPTION OF LOCAL RESIDENTIAL TELEPHONE SERVICE FROM RESTORATION OF TAX

The House-passed bill restored temporarily the 10-percent tax on local and long-distance telephone and teletypewriter services. This was the rate in effect prior to January 1, 1966. On January 1, 1966, the rate had dropped from 10 percent to 3 percent. A Senate amendment provided that this temporary restoration of the tax—through March 31, 1968—was not to apply to local residential telephone service. The conferees agreed to delete this amendment.

INFORMATION RETURNS

Under present law persons engaged in a trade or business and officers and employees of the U.S. Government who make payments of $600 or more to a person are required to file information returns with the Internal Revenue Service. This includes payments made by the Department of Agriculture to farmers. The Senate added an amendment requiring that copies of these information returns in the case of farmers were also to be furnished to the farmers. The conferees deleted this amendment. In this connection, a study is to be made by the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Department of the Treasury and a report is to be made to the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance early in the next Congress. This study is to also include the administrative feasibility of making such reports.

REVENUE TABLES AND COMPARISON OF EFFECT OF BILL IN VARIOUS STAGES

Estimated revenue increase and expenditure increase (—) under H.R. 12752 as reported by the Ways and Means Committee, as passed by the House of Representatives, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, as passed by the Senate, and as reported by the conference; fiscal years 1966 and 1967

[In millions of dollars]

	As reported by the Ways and Means Committee, Feb. 15, 1966		As passed by the House of Representatives, Feb. 23, 1966		As reported by the Senate Finance Committee, Mar. 2, 1966		As passed by the Senate, Mar. 9, 1966		As reported by the conference, March 1966	
	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967
Excises:										
Communication taxes:										
Local residential telephone		315		315		315				315
Long-distance service and local business telephone service		470		470		470		470		470
Automobile tax:										
Floor stocks	25		25							
Sales on and after effective date	35	420	35	420	35	420	35	420	35	420
Total excises	60	1,205	60	1,205	35	1,205	35	890	35	1,205
Corporate tax speedup	1,000	3,200	1,000	3,200	1,000	3,200	1,000	3,200	1,000	3,200
Graduated withholding for individuals	95	275	95	210	95	245	95	245	95	245
Increase in declaration requirement for individuals from 70 to 80 percent		150		150		150		150		150
Taxpayer election to disregard final tax liability of +$5 to −$5							(1)	(1)		
Reimbursement of social security trust fund by general fund for benefits for certain aged individuals								−590		(2)
Total, administrative budget	1,155	4,830	1,155	4,765	1,130	4,800	1,130	3,895	1,130	4,800
Self-employment tax, quarterly declaration payments		200		200		200		200		200
Social security benefits for certain aged individuals								−590		[2] −95
Reimbursement of social security trust fund by general fund for benefits for certain aged individuals								590		(2)
Total, cash budget	1,155	5,030	1,155	4,965	1,130	5,000		4,095	1,130	4,905

---

[1] No revenue impact in fiscal years 1966 and 1967; estimated revenue loss for fiscal year 1968 is $10 million.

[2] Reimbursement from the general fund of its share of the benefits payable in fiscal year 1967 does not occur until fiscal year 1969.

Comparison of administrative budget receipts and expenditures with and without H.R. 12752 as reported by the Ways and Means Committee, as passed by the House of Representatives, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, as passed by the Senate, and as reported by the conference; fiscal years 1966 and 1967 [1]

[In billions of dollars]

	As reported by the Ways and Means Committee, Feb. 15, 1966		As passed by the House of Representatives, Feb. 23, 1966		As reported by the Senate Finance Committee, Mar. 2, 1966		As passed by the Senate, Mar. 9, 1966		As reported by the conference, Mar. 14, 1966	
	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967
Expenditures without bill	106.4	112.8	106.4	112.8	106.4	112.8	106.4	112.8	106.4	112.8
Receipts without bill	98.8	106.2	98.8	106.2	98.8	106.2	98.8	106.2	98.8	106.2
Deficit without bill	7.6	6.7	7.6	6.7	7.6	6.7	7.6	6.7	7.6	6.7
Increase in expenditures under bill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	[2] .6	0	([2])
Total expenditures (including those under bill)	106.4	112.8	106.4	112.8	106.4	112.8	106.4	113.4	106.4	112.8
Increase in receipts under bill	1.2	4.8	1.2	4.8	1.1	4.8	1.1	4.5	1.1	4.8
Total receipts (including those under bill)	100.0	111.0	100.0	111.0	100.0	111.0	100.0	110.7	110.0	111.0
Deficit after taking account of revenues and expenditures under bill	6.4	1.8	6.4	1.9	6.5	1.9	6.5	2.8	6.5	1.9

[1] Figures are based on President's budget message, and therefore totals include estimated effects of proposed legislation other than H.R. 12752. Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

[2] As passed by the Senate this figure represents reimbursement in fiscal year 1967 of social security trust fund by general fund for $590,000,000 of benefits for certain aged individuals; as reported by the conference the amount and coverage of benefits were reduced and reimbursement by the general fund of the $95,000,000 of benefits payable in fiscal year 1967 does not occur until fiscal year 1969.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The Secretary of the Treasury made a very significant speech in my State of Michigan yesterday before the Economic Club of the City of Detroit. He talked about taxes, inflation and the problems of our economy. Prior to making that speech he had a press conference and in that press conference, he said the following, and I quote:

> My whole speech implies there might be a need for further moderate tax increases depending on the factors I mentioned in the speech.

Has there been any indication by the Secretary to the committee or to the chairman that such a request is in prospect?

Mr. MILLS. Not to me—there has not been any such indication. We are all concerned, as I know the gentleman from Michigan is concerned, with what the future holds. But none of us, at least I am not capable of adequately predicting what we may have in the future with respect to the costs in Vietnam, for instance. Frankly, I do not know what the future holds in that respect. I think we must keep abreast of what is occurring on a day-to-day basis and do what we can to protect the value of the dollar and to protect other values here in the United States.

I am sure that my friend would say with me that if the time came where it was necessary to prevent inflation to consider a tax bill that we ought to give consideration to it and reach a conclusion based upon what the facts are at that particular time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Do you believe based on the facts as you have seen them so far that there is such a need for the kind of Federal tax increase mentioned by the Secretary?

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will remember, during the course of the general debate on the bill itself, the problem as I see it is primarily with respect to the enormous deficit, and I called it enormous, under the present conditions that we have in the fiscal year 1966 on the basis of projection—and that is all we have to go by. For the fiscal year 1967, we have a projected deficit of $1,800 million and certainly that kind of deficit would not exert as much inflationary pressure as does the present deficit of some $6½ billion projected for fiscal year 1966. I do not know what the final cost will be in 1967. But I say we must watch it in order to see to it that we take pains to preserve and protect the value of the dollar and avoid any decrease in it and any runaway inflation in prices.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. One of the problems in this fiscal year as has been well pointed out in the minority views of the Committee on Appropriations on the bill that we will have before us later today is the fact that the Department of Defense in the last 6 or 12 months has so grossly underestimated its anticipated expenditures. If we go on the basis of experience in the last 12 months and forecast what will happen in the next 12 months based on the figures of the Department of Defense, it does not look too encouraging. The Defense Department expenditure forecasts have badly missed their mark. The spending forecasts were too low and as a result there has been serious upward pressure on our national economy. Better spending forecasts by the Defense Department might have helped the Johnson-Humphrey administration in its decisions in meeting the challenge of inflation. Defense Department spending estimates were wrong. The Nation is in an inflationary spiral. The administration must bear the burden for the errors which have been made.

Mr. MILLS. I caution my friend against reaching any conclusions now about the matter, and I hope that he will not, because regardless of how far off the Department of Defense may have been at some time in the past, I point out realistically how difficult it is for any administration to project what the total costs of Government may be some 12 months or 18 months ahead. We all remember when President Eisenhower in his 1959 budget estimated a half-billion dollar surplus, and it turned out he was off $12.9 billion, because we had a deficit of $12.4 billion. I do think that it should be pointed out that there has been in the past 2 or 3 years, with respect to the total rate of spending, some overestimation of that rate of spending in total amount. In the 1965 budget the original estimate was $97.9. The actual figure was $96.5 billion. In 1964 the estimate was $98 billion. The actual figure was $97.7 billion.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I would not necessarily agree, but the record must speak for itself.

Mr. MILLS. If you go over the 2- or 3-year period, I believe you will be able to see that they have been about as accurate as anyone could possibly be, and they have actually overestimated, because we have ended up spending less than the budget suggested we might spend in some of that period of time. Of course, we have had some increases in revenue over what was projected. So the best thing for us at the moment to do is to keep our eyes and ears open and be attuned to the developments that happen from day to day and reach conclusions as to what we should do when we have full information with respect to the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for clarification of amendment No. 33?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. It is my understanding that in certain States there are nonpartisan publications which are published and which receive ads in a standard business fashion. On occasion both political parties perform services for that publication, and they receive payment for those services. Is it the intention of the gentleman from Arkansas to eliminate that sort of activity on the part of political parties?

For example, there are the distribution services and the sales of the magazine.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will read the statement on page 8 of the report that we prepared in explanation of the amendment, he will get a clearer understanding of what was intended in the amendment.

Does my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, wish to respond to the question? Frankly, I do not know what the answer is. Each case depends on the facts. Did the gentleman from Wisconsin follow the question? We were thinking in terms of the publications of each party. Your attention is called to paragraph (1). I do not know just what the situation would be if it were a nonpartisan publication. It depends on where the money goes, mainly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the issue is whether there is a potential in revenues from the particular undertaking, be it an advertising venture, a catalog, a ball, or some other activity of that nature—if it has a potential of inuring to the benefit of a political party.

Mr. MILLS. A banquet.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes, a banquet. Then the expense of that advertising or the expense of the admission charge could not be deducted as a business expense.

Mr. MILLS. In the case which the gentleman mentioned, that, it seems to me, would be in the field of nonpolitical activity. But if the proceeds of that venture inured to the benefit of either or both parties in Tennessee, or to any of the political candidates in Tennessee, the expense would probably not be deductible as I read it.

Mr. BROCK. I did not have particular reference to that point. I am speaking of nonpartisan publications for which both political parties perform services.

Mr. MILLS. You would have to give me more facts and particularly whether or not the proceeds go to the benefit of candidates or a party. If they do, the expense would appear not to be deductible. I want to make it clear that there is uncertainty at the present time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand the able chairman, if the conference report is adopted, henceforth advertisements of business groups, business corporations, and business enterprises in publications put out by political parties or their respective units would no longer be tax-deductible?

Mr. MILLS. I do not know whether they are now or not. I would say to my friend from Florida that we are making it clear here that they are not deductible when they inure to the benefit of a political party or a political candidate in the future.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the committee, having taken that rather salutary approach, has in any way provided in this conference report for the removal of any exemptions that may now exist for certain radio and publication expense?

Mr. MILLS. No, we have not done anything except what we have done in this amendment we are talking about in that direction.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought since the gentleman from the other body was attempting to stop one source of loss of revenue which was being received for political purposes, consideration might now be given henceforth by the able Ways and Means Committee to publications that are nothing but political publications and radio programs that are nothing but political, and the question as to whether they are entitled tax exemption.

Mr. MILLS. Consideration would have to be given to that in the future. We did not do so here.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the conferees have done the best job that it is possible for them to do with respect to the subject matter of this conference. I would urge the Members of the House to accept the conference report. Let us get the bill signed into law within the period that the committee had as its target date on the commencement. Therefore, I urge you to vote for the conference report.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter affecting California, New York, and two other States. These States have a program called disability insurance.

It is a program paid for entirely by a payroll deduction system. It is financed, as a rule, by employee contributions only.

It provides weekly payments in situations other than work-connected disability and injury. It is quite analogous to the workmen's compensation law, but neither the conference committee nor the gentleman's statement clarified this matter.

Will I be correct in assuming that these unemployment compensation disability payments will be treated just as the workmen compensation payments for purposes of the $35 payment provisions in the report?

Mr. MILLS. We specifically said, Mr. Speaker, in the conference report that, for purposes of any reduction in the new benefits, workmen's compensation would not be taken into account.

I do not know enough about the gentleman's provision, in the State of California, frankly, to know whether or not benefits under the provision would be taken into account for purposes of the offset. I will have to check with the gentleman later to find out more detail about his State provisions.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I did not sign the conference report, but I would like to report that as far as the tax aspects of this bill are concerned, which was the bill that passed the House, I think the conferees in conference did a good job. The one feature that was changed was where we accepted a Senate amendment other than a number of technical amendments, I might say, which the Senate offered, which were very necessary to this bill. This one matter of substance that was changed has to do with the floor stock provision for automobiles owned by the dealers amounting to $25 million.

This is a matter that some of us on our side of the aisle opposed in the Ways and Means Committee in the first place. I am satisfied that this is a better tax bill now, partly for the reason as the chairman explained, but also because the administration's agreement that because we have given the floor stock exemption when the automobile excise tax was lowered, therefore when we increase it we ought to put back the tax on floor stock, is unsound. There are certain things that only go one way and not the other. You can either have a valve or a conduit. This happens to be a valve. The reason for the treatment of the floor stock when the tax went down was that automobile dealers were caught with higher priced inventory, inventory assessed at a higher tax rate than the new automobiles delivered after the tax went down. They could never get rid of that inventory, or at least they would have a difficult problem doing so. So we eased that off and said, "No. The floor stock tax will be waived."

However, when you go in the other direction and you go up with the tax, then the dealers are left with inventory of lower taxed cars. Obviously there is no problem in their getting rid of the floor stock at a lower price. So I was pleased about the elimination in conference of the floor stock tax.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think it should be pointed out and understood that this tax is one which is assessed against the manufacturer.

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. You cannot impose it on the dealer and still be consistent with the philosophy as to where the impact of the tax is and its nature. It is a manufacturers tax and not a delears tax to begin with.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is absolutely right. And it became one of the issues in the Ways and Means Committee as to whether we changed that manufacturers tax to a retailers tax. But at any rate, it is an improvement and I wanted to point it out.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman made the argument in the committee that the committee should not include it in the first place.

Mr. CURTIS. That is right. Now, as to why I have opposed the conference report. I think this is a very serious matter that the House at some time or other is going to have to face up to. We bring these tax bills in here under closed rules on the floor of the House, thus denying really to every Member of the House the opportunity to amend, even under our rules of germaneness in the House, which are fairly strict rules. Then under the procedure followed the bill goes over to the Senate where they have no rules of germaneness or closed rules.

Any Senator can offer an amendment on a tax bill, whether it pertains to the bill or not. Then the matter comes back to the conference and your conferees, who are members of the Committee on Ways and Means, are constantly confronted with material that we have not had an opportunity of studying and have not had the opportunity, really, to give a good opinion on. Now, it so happens that the Constitution prohibits tax measures from originating in the Senate. The Senate does have a right to amend. They have assumed that means they can amend regardless of whether it is germane or not. Now, I am not asking the Senate to adopt the House rule of germaneness, but I am asking that there be a rule of germaneness that applies to this kind of procedure. Otherwise we are constantly confronted with situations like the one that now faces us. There are three nongermane amendments in this conference report. Not only are they not germane, but two of them do not have anything to do with the Internal Revenue Code. We are confronted with this situation.

Now let me point out the question on the benefits of people over the age of 70. That is the way the Senate put it in. This was an amendment that was not even considered in the Senate Finance Committee. It was written on the floor of the Senate. Then it comes in to conference, and obviously it needed changing.

So the conferees attempt to write then and there this new language that you find in the report. The committee or the conferees had to meet yesterday to amend it even further. The point is this is no way to legislate. The objectives may be sound. I could not agree with the objectives on this more because Congressman Byrnes has primarily, and I have joined with him over a period of years in seeking to do something about these people over the age of 70. So has Congressman Mills.

This was rejected, I might say, in the Social Security Act of 1965, although part of it was in there. However, the technical language used is very important and very serious. The House never considered it and the Ways and Means Committee never considered it and the Senate Finance Committee never considered it. If we want to do proper justice to people over 70 or to any group, we had better pay attention to what is the orderly way to write legislation.

The amendment in regard to the GI's overseas and what they can send back home duty free is another item. There is no question that if a bill for this purpose were introduced and offered before the Committee on Ways and Means, we woud get it in proper language and vote it out and it would pass here unanimously.

It would be considered in the other body in the same way and passed unanimously, and this could become law within a month, but properly drafted and fully considered.

Mr. Speaker, instead of that, this matter is put on a tax bill where it has no business. We had not really considered it. We tried to write this language in conference. I might say that I do not believe we did a very good job.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we want to be for the GI's. That is not the issue. The issue, however, if we really want to help them, is to vote for their interests following an orderly procedure in writing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, finally, as far as the Williams amendment is concerned, this has to do really with the Corrupt Practices Act. There is no question but that this hits at a very small part of the entire problem involved, how political parties and political candidates are financed.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this was written in a fashion where there was not proper consideration given to the entire problem.

Mr. Speaker, the author of the amendment, Senator Williams, of the other body, admitted it. The Treasury Department said they had not studied it. It is obvious, based upon the few questions asked today on the floor that the House of Representatives has never considered it, and the Committee on Ways and Means has never considered it.

Mr. Speaker, this procedure, in my opinion, makes a shambles of the legislative process.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me talk as a politician. If we in the House of Representatives want to be able to amend tax bills and have our thoughts made a part of them, we had better start paying attention to either knocking out the closed rule under which we have to consider tax bills, or stand firm on this constitutional right that tax measures can originate only in the House of Representatives. And, if our colleagues in the other body have some ideas as to how they would like to amend tax bills, let them come over and consult with the House Members. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that any one of us would be happy to accommodate them, and introduce a bill along the line that they would like so that it can be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means, so that it can be considered on the floor of the House, with testimony backing it up at a public hearing, and with a written report upon the bill.

Mr. Speaker, as matters stand here we are considering things in this tax bill that should be properly studied and properly debated.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to some remarks that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] directed to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in regard to future tax increases, if I could have the attention of the gentleman.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] asked questions of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] as to whether or not the administration had approached him about tax increases. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means replied that it had not. However, it looks very apparent to me that the administration has approached some of our colleagues in the Congress along this line.

This, I feel, is true because, beginning tomorrow, a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, headed by the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths] who also serves on the Committee on Ways and Means, plans to hold hearings on this subject of tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit worried about this, because I too am a member of the Joint Economic Committee, and some of my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means have been looking at me as if I had something to do with this bypassing of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Let me assure you that I have not, and I have not been a confidant as to the scheduling of this subcommittee's hearings. However, it is very obvious to me that the Secretary of the Treasury and others are behind these hearings that will start tomorrow, to be conducted by the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the administration will be a little more forthright in what they are trying to do as far as increased taxes are concerned, even though they will not consult with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. It might not be unusual for me not to be considered on every question involving taxes, but let me clarify the gentleman's statement. The gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths] discussed this matter with me. I believe it was her idea, frankly. I do not think she had to be put up to holding her hearings. She wanted to know if I had any feelings that the hearings should not be held. I told her that it was perfectly all right with me, since any legislation would have to originate in the Committee on Ways and Means along this line anyway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for clarifying this. I believe that is probably so, because the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths] has been very interested in this area, and has been quite concerned about the economic aspects of our tax laws. However, if the situation is that way, let me say this: The administration certainly has seized the opportunity—and it is very clear that they are more than cooperating with the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths] in bringing about these hearings. It seems quite clear that the administration, at least, is sending up a trial balloon to see just what reaction there will be to the increased taxes.

I will close my remarks by simply saying we certainly need tightening in the fiscal area. But the other side of fiscal coin other than taxes and debt is expenditures, and the administration still seems completely unconcerned about the necessary reforms in the expenditure area to avert inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I hope I will not use the entire 5 minutes, but I do not wish to let this opportunity pass without making a few brief remarks about this.

Last June when we passed the tax bill, I voted against it. I said at that time that we were not providing for the recouping of losses in that tax bill and I predicted at that time that it would be necessary to have a tax bill to replace the losses. When this bill came up here last month, I voted against it because I felt it was a discrimination when we had eliminated the taxes on many of the luxury items, which were not being restored, although we did reinstate excise taxes on telephones and automobiles.

Now, when the bill comes back here, I think it is a worse bill because of what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] just said: the way we permit the other body to insert items that are not germane. I hope some time this House will have the intestinal fortitude to adopt a rule that any amendment that is not germane under the rules of the House of Representatives will not even be considered when they are placed in a bill by the other body.

Now, as to the statement about a study for increased taxes, I do not think anybody has to be smart to know that we are going to have another tax bill before this session is out. You do not have to have hearings to arrive at that conclusion. I think it is apparent that we are going to have it. Another thing that I think is very wrong—and someone said how can you vote against a bill that is going to give some old folks some money. If you are laboring under the delusion that you are doing something there under a program that has been studied and planned, you are just as wrong as you can be. Hearings were not held in either House or Senate, and the amendments were adopted on the floor of the Senate.

There are so many things that need to be done with reference to social security that we should not try to correct them by amendments to a tax bill. It does not make sense.

For instance, some time ago I introduced a bill (H.R. 11327), which has been referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, providing that certain social security benefits may be waived and not counted as income. This became necessary when increases under the Social Security Act had the effect of reducing veterans' and widows' benefits by an amount in excess of those increases granted by social security. I do not think this was intentional, and I do believe that this inequity should be corrected.

If we are going to amend the social security laws, let us amend them and help everybody and remove the inequities. But this bill does not remove these inequities at all. It touches on some of them.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons I am going to vote against this conference report. I hope this administration will have the wisdom to come up here and say: "We need money for Vietnam and we are recommending and advising you to provide an adequate tax to pay for Vietnam, and after that situation is over, take off the tax." That will solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that as long as we vote for these makeshift, piecemeal, patchwork type of bills that do not accomplish the announced purposes of the bill, in this case, namely, to raise more revenue for the conduct of the war in Vietnam, we will continue to confuse the taxpayer and make it more difficult to solve the problem.

How much more simple it would be if we would decide just how much money is needed and then provide an increase in the form of a surtax or an "excise" tax on personal and corporation income taxes, with the understanding that after the specific need has been met the tax will be automatically eliminated.

As I have said before, I realize it is so simple it will not be considered by the bureaucrats who make the recommendations to Congress, but I am willing to put my money where my mouth is that before this session of Congress adjourns, the administration will be back to Congress requesting another increase in taxes, and Congress will go along with the request. I do not relish the idea of increasing taxes, and would welcome reductions in expenditures, but I do believe it is better to pay as we go, and face the issues as they arise.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I certainly sympathize with the position taken by the gentleman who just left the floor, and the position taken by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], with respect to the amendments which were put on by the other body which would not have been germane if presented here. In fact, we prevent any Member of the House from even proposing such amendments, even if germane, by reason of the fact that we consider this type of legislation in the House under a closed rule.

Of course, this creates a situation which we all recognize is overly fair to the Senate and completely unfair so far as many Members of the House are concerned.

However, what we are talking about here now is a conference report. There is the problem of compromising between the position taken by the other body and the bill as it passed the House. There were some very adamant positions taken by the Senate.

But I would also point out that here in this tax bill we do have some problems as far as timing is concerned. Should this bill be delayed for any length of time, it could mean that badly needed revenue would be lost as the result of that delay. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I hope this conference report will be adopted because I think it is essential in view of the current fiscal situation and the inflationary pressures that exist today that we provide the additional revenue that will be produced by this bill.

I would go one step further and say, however, that unless there are some changes made in our thinking in the area of governmental expenditures and Government fiscal policy, we are today on a collision course toward increased taxes. The only question seems to be as to the date when those taxes will be asked for by the administration. Unless there is some retrenchment, and unless there is some recognition that we are in a wartime situation, and must accommodate to that situation and provide for those increased costs of that war, not by increased taxes but by a reduction in expenditures, then the only alternative open to us will be an increase in taxes which I am sure the administration will then recommend. I assume that it will probably try to avoid doing so before the November election. But a tax increase is in the making unless this Congress and this administration at an early date—and today is not too soon—changes some of its attitudes with reference to some of the domestic spending that is being proposed here at home.

For this reason, I think the adoption of this conference report is essential at this time. As I said in the debate on this bill, I do not think at this time we can enjoy the luxury of the alternative as to whether we raise taxes or cut expenditures, because we have already incurred a deficit for fiscal 1966 that approaches $6.5 billion at a time of unprecedented economic activity. It is too late to change the spending picture for fiscal 1966 to the degree that would obviate the need for this additional revenue.

Today we have no alternative but to provide the increased revenue that is in this bill. But, if we act properly today, we can still have an alternative for the future. We have the alternative of cutting back and retrenching by establishing some priorities for our domestic expenditures, and if we fail in that, the only alternative—and, make no mistake about it—will be an early and heavy increase in taxation to prevent economic chaos in this country.

Let me say just a few words about some of the amendments that were adopted.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to point out, and I want to see if the gentleman agrees, if there is a heavy increase in taxes, it will have to be partly in individual income taxes. It cannot be done merely in corporate taxes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is no easy way to increase taxes. Let us make up our minds about that. If we have to get even $500 million more in revenue, it will be painful and it will be tough. Some of it we will, of course, have to find in the individual income tax sector.

Let me briefly make a few comments about the amendments that were adopted in the Senate.

I agree with my colleague from Missouri that the blanketing-in, that is, the coverage of our older people who, as I have pointed out, were either born too soon or Congress acted too late to provide them with the basic benefits we have provided for the great majority of our people, has long presented a problem that should be taken care of. Some 7 years ago I introduced the first bill to try to remedy this particular problem by a so-called blanketing-in process. What the Senate has done here is to adopt that principle. The conference report is in accord with the general philosophy and general purpose of proposals that I have been making for some 9 or 10 years.

As I have said, I do agree with my colleague from Missouri that it would be much better to do it in the normal procedure. To consider the proposal and report it out by the Ways and Means Committee for passage by this House instead of on the basis of a Senate floor amendment which is then adopted in principle by the conference.

The same thing is true as far as the duty on gifts is concerned.

In both of these cases, however, I must agree fully with the results. It is a step in the right direction. I cannot argue with the merits.

Nor would I argue with the merits of another amendment that was adopted, as far as general principle is concerned. That is the amendment related to the deductibility of an advertising expense that, in a sense, is really intended for political purposes.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. I would like to state my most emphatic commendation to the gentleman from Wisconsin for his farsighted, initial, and continuing leadership in the effort to see to it that the older people in our country who have not had the benefit of social security coverage not be penalized in their waning years.

I would hope that the gentleman would pursue his efforts and see to it that the Members of this House have, before the end of this session, an opportunity to expand the concept contained in the conference committee report because, as the gentlemen well knows, this report contains within it a dramatic change in the financing structure of the Social Security Act, but along sound conceptional lines. I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin knows, most lamentably, it is the low-income veteran and it is the low-income person on public assistance that, as a result of the understandable compromise in the conference committee, does not get any increase in weekly or monthly benefits under this bill.

I am certain that the gentleman from Wisconsin shares my concern, that in the effort to correct this injustice that the gentleman from Wisconsin has been battling for so long—an injustice not remedied by this bill as to either first the lower income veteran of this Nation and second, the lower income aged who have to look to public assistance to maintain a minimal standard of living. These are among the people who should receive our primary interest, not our secondary consideration.

I am going to support the conference committee report, noting in fact that in many instances it will be the better-to-do, rather than the worst off of our older people, who are going to get the benefit. I do not quarrel with it. I would merely request that the gentleman from Wisconsin respond to my hope that he will pursue this matter.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, let me say in the first place that we have not excluded veterans from the benefits of this program. On the contrary, we have specifically provided, in the "definition" subsection that a "governmental pension system," for purposes of the offset, does not include any payment by the Veterans' Administration to disabled veterans for service-connected disability. The conference report, on page 4, states "not including any payment under any workmen's compensation law or any payment by the Veterans' Administration as compensation for service-connected disability or death."

In that instance, we have specifically excluded any such compensation that a veteran may receive in order to determine whether or not he comes up to the $52.50 of the family's payment.

Then with respect to the people on welfare, the gentleman from Wisconsin recognizes, I am sure, that if we provide this amount for those who are on public assistance, all in the world we will be doing will be, in effect, reducing the amount that the State makes available and increasing the amount that the Federal Government makes available. We would not increase by $1, in all probability, the total amount that is received by the average recipient from both sources.

I would think that the gentleman from California would appreciate the action of the conference committee in bringing back a proposition that takes care, to the extent that we have, of the people who are without any type of retirement system. Perhaps in time the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Arkansas—all of us—will find it possible or advisable to do more. I think that at least this is a good beginning, and the conference committee should be at least commended for making this step.

I want to pay tribute to my friend from Wisconsin for having started the idea of doing something in the later years of their life for these people who, as he said, either were born too soon or the Congress acted too late to bring them under social security.

I remind the Congress that two-thirds of the people we are talking about in total are women, and 80 percent of that two-thirds are widows, signifying the fact that perhaps we did act too late with respect to the coverage of their spouses under social security. Here we are making up, at least, for that failure on our part.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Arkansas does not choose to leave the impression that those receiving the veteran's benefits, apart from the disability payment—the low-income veterans—by definition, those receiving a veteran's pension—as distinguished from disability payments—do not receive a nickel under this proposal. I am certain that the gentleman from Arkansas does not want to leave the record ambiguous in that regard.

Mr. MILLS. Of course I did not want to leave a wrong impression. That is why I read specifically what the conference report states. The gentleman from California is not anymore interested in veterans than are any of the members of this conference. And I do not want him to feel that any of us were deliberately trying to do something to these whom he describes as the poor veterans of the country.

We thought we were making a step in the right direction, that we would provide, out of the general funds of the Treasury, this particular benefit for those people who are included here. We can look at it later on and see whether we should do more and whether it is possible to do so.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have taken a very important step by the action of the conferees toward the problems of these older people who have been our concern for some considerable period of time.

I would hope, with the gentleman, that we would continue to look at the problem that does exist in this area because of factors beyond the control of these people who are today over 72 and who have been left by the side of the road while we were going ahead, making social security universal, while we were increasing benefits, and so on. At least we are moving in the right direction.

I am pleased that the conferees did move at least this far.

I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, by reiterating what I said at the beginning. I would hope that this conference report would be accepted. I think it is essential that we act to pass this bill at the earliest possible date. In my judgment, it is the only responsible thing for this Congress to do.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 does not include the aged of Puerto Rico as beneficiaries of the social security amendments added to the bill.

This is a tragic circumstance which must have been an oversight on the part of the conferees who were working under great pressure.

There has been no opportunity for me to obtain an extension of these benefits for the people of Puerto Rico. The social security provisions of the bill were not included in the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 when it was before the House of Representatives.

The pity of it is that the amendment does not have too much real meaning for most residents of the States or the District of Columbia. It provides for a fill-up pension to $35 for persons having a pension below this amount from Government sources. However, it would apply to all persons now over 72 who are not now receiving a Government pension and would give them $35 per month.

In Puerto Rico we have so many elderly citizens to whom $35 a month would be a godsend in the sense of providing them with the necessaries of life.

I am taking immediate corrective action by the introduction of legislation to take care of this situation.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, when this bill to reimpose some excise taxes originally appeared on the floor of the House, I voted against it. Not because I am blind to the need for increasing revenues to finance the Vietnam war and to combat inflation, but because I regarded this means of doing so as too little and too late. I voted in protest against a palliative, a treatment of symptoms instead of the disease. Because of some vital changes in the bill by the other body and by the conference committee, I am obliged to change my vote today to "aye."

But I still consider it a palliative. I still think it indicates an unfortunate reluctance to face the issues squarely on the part of the Congress and of the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like even to think of raising taxes. Apparently that attitude is not limited to myself. But I am convinced that I must think of it, that all of us must think of it very seriously. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to reduce spending on our worthy social program.

But the effect of inflation is both to raise taxes and reduce the effective financing of our social and all other programs. And in respect to inflation, it is later than most of us care to think.

Inflation, Mr. Speaker, to me is worse than a tax increase. At least the increased tax which is taken from the American taxpayer brings more money into the U.S. Treasury. Inflation is a penalty. It takes money from the taxpayer and puts it nowhere. And it takes money from the U.S. Treasury, too, in that it decreases the Government's buying power just as it decreases the individual's buying power.

A tax increase, while odious to all of us, is used for Government purposes. Inflation, just as odious, is a penalty which all of us pay and from which nobody benefits. And it is particularly hard on the poor and the people who must live on fixed incomes.

I am aware that there is another way to assist in curbing inflation aside from cutting spending and increasing taxes. The other way is wage and price controls. Such controls will be a last desperate effort in the battle against inflation. None of us wants such controls. That is why we should take other and less painful action while there is still time.

I wish it were not necessary to increase taxes. But inflationary pressure is forcing us to do so, Mr. Speaker, and the need will become intense in a terribly short time. That is the way inflation works, something like a forest fire: it starts small and spreads wildly; it is much easier to put out when it starts than after it has spread.

The fire lookouts already have observed the smoke of the fires of inflation in our economy. I fear the economic forest is dry as tinder, that the wind is rising, that the prospects for rain are dim.

That being the case, it is my belief that right now we should be formulating a program to combat inflation. The administration is taking some action. The Congress is making some motions in this direction. Private interests are acting. But, if I may return to the forest fire analogy once more, our combined actions to date have been in the nature of clearing away smoke. We must face the uncomfortable fact that more drastic action is needed.

If we do not now make ready, at a minimum, standby remedial action with full deliberation and complete attention to all ramifications, we may well find ourselves in the position of being unable to halt inflation before tremendous harm is done, and find ourselves in the equally unhappy condition of overreacting to a situation that has gotten out of hand—and thus probably causing equal harm to the economy in another way.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I am not happy about the prospect of an increase in taxes. If that is what is needed as the lesser of evils, however, then I say we had better face that issue squarely, and begin our deliberations at once.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against passage of the conference report on H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966.

When this bill was before the House last month I stated that in view of the provision it contains for reimposing excise taxes on automobiles and telephone service, acknowledged by the President to be unfair and burdensome only last year, I simply could not in good conscience support it. At that time nor at this time however, would I want my actions to be interpreted as suggesting in any way an unwillingness to provide the needed funds for our fighting men in South Vietnam. I fully recognize that we are going to need more tax revenue, but I further believe that it can and should be raised on an equitable basis.

Neither should my vote today be construed to indicate a lack of interest and sympathy for certain of the amendments added to this bill by the other body which I would, in fact, be inclined to support had they come to us on their own two feet and in not such objectionable company.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have protested these discriminatory taxes in good times and bad—in time of budget deficits and budget surpluses. There is simply no right time to vote for an unfair tax. I submit that the administration has not tried hard enough either through economies here at home or through recommendations for tax equality to properly provide the revenue needed to fulfill our most pressing commitments.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, since the President's state of the Union message, which contained his request for postponing the repeal of telephone and automobile excise taxes, I have been on record as strongly opposed to reinstituting these regressive taxes as a means of procuring the needed funds to finance the war in Vietnam.

I was most encouraged when the Senate last week adopted the amendment to keep the excise on residential phone service at its present 3-percent rate. Unfortunately, the conference committee deleted the Senate amendment, with the result that the tax on local telephone service will again rise to 10 percent. Without any wavering in my strong support for well-reasoned legislation to obtain the needed additional funds for use in Vietnam, I am reluctant to support the conference report because of the unnecessary burden it places on people in the lower income levels, to whom an automobile and telephone service are necessities, not luxuries, today.

With this hesitation, I have decided to vote in favor of the conference committee's compromise, because of another provision it contains. I am referring to the provision that will provide social security benefits to over 300,000 American citizens who are reaching the age of 72 and are not covered by social security under present law. This provision is an important step in broadening our social security system to cover those who had retired or were near retirement when Congress acted to cover jobs they had held.

I have been urging the passage of this amendment to the Social Security Act for over a year now. Across-the-board monthly benefits for persons reaching age 72 who do not meet normal quarter-coverage requirements was a major part of H.R. 5039, which I introduced last year—many provisions of which were later enacted into Public Law 89-97.

Under this enlightened provision, persons who are not now receiving any State, Federal, or local pension, in most cases persons who are most in need, will receive $35 monthly through the social security system if they reach age 72 before 1968. For persons reaching age 72 after 1967, this new provision provides that fewer quarters of covered employment will be required for eligibility for social security benefits. Thus, over $120 million will be made available to persons who qualify under this section.

While I have very serious reservations about the wisdom of reimposing the same excise taxes which Congress worked so diligently to repeal just last year, I cannot with conscience vote down this very necessary and enlightened step in the broadening of our social security laws to cover needy senior citizens. I am gratified at the inclusion in this report of a major portion of my own social security legislative program.

Thus, with noted reluctance, I am casting my vote in favor of the conference committee's report on the Tax Adjustment Act.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state that I will again vote, very reluctantly, for this tax increase measure, called the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. As I stated on February 23, when the bill was first approved by the House—see page 3699 of the Record—only the administration's refusal to cut back on its unprecedented high level of domestic spending constrains me to vote for this bill. In this absence of fiscal restraint on the part of the administration, which increases the dangers of inflation it becomes necessary to provide the additional revenues in this legislation. The costs of the war in Vietnam and threat of inflation demand it.

At the same time, I wish to add a word of high praise for the amendment adopted in the Senate to give older persons at least some assistance by extending a measure of social security protection to many of those excluded from the program through no fault of their own. I am proud of the fact that my State's senior Senator, Norris Cotton, played such a prominent role in sponsoring this amendment and getting it adopted. With all the money being poured out by the Government on various welfare programs, it is good to know that at least some will now go to relieve the needs of senior citizens directly, without Federal controls or new battalions of bureaucrats. This is an antipoverty measure which I can support. It follows the precedent we established at Republican insistence, when we provided medical care for the elderly not covered by social security.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may include their remarks at this point in the Record on the conference report. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes], and others who have spoken on this conference report may have permission to revise and extend our remarks and to include certain tables and charts that refer to this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 288, nays 102, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—288

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—102

Abbitt
Abernethy
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bennett
Berry
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Cameron
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Conable
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dulski
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Fisher
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Gettys
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Henderson
Hutchinson
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Langen
Latta
Lennon
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Michel
Minshall
Morton
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Pike
Quie
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stephens
Talcott
Taylor
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Weltner
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—41

Adair
Baring
Bell
Bolling
Brown, Calif.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Conyers
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dowdy
Downing
Everett
Fraser
Fuqua
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Holifield
Ichord
Landrum
McCarthy
McVicker
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Matthews
Miller
Mosher
Pool
Powell
Reinecke
Roncalio
Roudebush
Sisk
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Willis
Wyatt

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Waggonner against.

Mr. Downing for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Roncalio against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Baring with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Pool.

Mr. RUMSFELD, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, **Mr. FOUNTAIN,** and **Mr. SKUBITZ** changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 773, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 773

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 773 provides that points of order shall be waived in the consideration of H.R. 13546, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13546 includes $13,135,719,000, the amount of the budget estimate for the military assistance and economic assistance programs of the Government directly related to operations in southeast Asia. This involves an increase in the numbers of both military and civilian personnel, the increases in the operation and maintenance costs of men, machines, and structures; the production of aircraft, ordnance, ammunition, and other materiel; military and construction projects; selected and specialized research and development programs; and also economic assistance.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I would like to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I wonder if the chairman would advise the House as to whether or not this bill appropriates a sufficient amount of money to carry on the war in Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I believe so, at least for the time being. With the funds included in this bill we will have made available for the current fiscal year a total of about $61 billion for the Department of Defense. We entered the current fiscal year with about $30 billion in the hands of the Department of Defense which had not been expended. Most of those funds had been committed for such things as missiles, airplanes, submarines, ships, and other long lead time items. So I would say certainly from the financial standpoint the funds provided here are adequate for the foreseeable future. Of course, we cannot tell whether peace will come or whether war will remain at the present level or whether it will escalate. So we do not know how much additional funds may be required even this year for the further prosecution of this war if it continues.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that answer. I wanted to point out that all of us are concerned over reports that we hear from time to time of shortages over in Vietnam. We realize that there are bound to be isolated items of that nature and we want these shortages to be eliminated as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from a constituent of mine, a responsible citizen, who has a son, a lance corporal in the Marine Corps in Vietnam, who is complaining of the lack of jungle boots for the Marine Corps troops over there while the Army has them. I want to ask the chairman to have someone on his staff check on this matter, please?

Mr. MAHON. I would say with respect to equipment and clothing for the men in Vietnam that I know of no real shortage, no significant shortage.

Of course, there may be a temporary shortage at a given place at a given moment. I shall be glad to present this matter to the appropriate officials in the Department of Defense. We conferred at great length with General Greene, the commandant of the Marine Corps, and discussed with him some problems with regard to supplies, but he did not complain of any serious problem of supplies in Vietnam at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the hearing record is already clear that the committee does not preclude the introduction of another supplemental appropriation bill with respect to expenditures for this purpose. I seem to get the very definite impression that another supplemental is not precluded at all.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do hope to leave the very definite impression that another supplemental is not precluded. In my opinion, and it would be my hope, there will be no further supplemental for fiscal 1966 related to the war in Vietnam, but there may be a supplemental for fiscal 1967. We do not want to give to the Department of Defense a blank check. Last year we did not want to give the Department of Defense billions of dollars for which it could not define a specific use. So we feel, as I am sure the gentleman from Iowa feels, when funds are required the officials of the executive branch should come to the Congress and request the funds, and then we will provide them, as we are undertaking to do in this case. However, no one can predict the future. It has not been possible to predict it in any war which we have fought.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but I am not too well satisfied, from a reading of the hearings, that you have adequately financed the situation as it presently stands.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, we have just done the best we could under the circumstances.

I must say that in another supplemental bill which will be pending before the House of Representatives, probably before Easter, funds will be carried almost to the extent of $1 billion because of pay increases for members of the armed services and civilian employees as a result of legislation passed last year.

Mr. GROSS. That is one of the items in your hearings here, and I am a little bit surprised that that item is not covered in this bill.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, the pending bill includes funds for the new rates of pay for the additional men in the Armed Forces. We have almost 400,000 more men in the Armed Forces than we previously had programed in the original 1966 budget. However, this bill does not take care of the supplemental required, as a result of the pay increase, for the originally programed numbers of military, which we provided for at the old rates in the regular 1966 appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. And yet this bill takes into account expenditures, other than for those directly related to Vietnam?

Mr. MAHON. To some quite limited extent.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, to some extent. This is the point I am trying to make, that this supplemental is not all-inclusive; that we are already looking at another supplemental to take care of the pay increase.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And, I cannot help but be a little surprised that it is not contained in this bill rather than another bill yet to come to the floor of the House.

Mr. MAHON. We had thought that we should present all the pay increases for the whole Government in one bill. It is anticipated that that bill may be before the House for action week after next.

Mr. GROSS. One other question: Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] explain briefly to the House why points of order are waived in this bill?

Mr. YOUNG. Of course, it is obvious that the points of order are waived because the authorization bill has not been passed or signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Has it passed the other body?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; it is in conference.

Mr. GROSS. But it has not been signed by the President?

Mr. YOUNG. No; it is in conference.

Mr. MAHON. The economic assistance portion of the bill is in conference.

Mr. YOUNG. The foreign aid part is still in conference, and the other part of the bill has gone to the President but has not been signed.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, for a question.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to raise this question at this time, but since the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has raised it, I am concerned about shortages of clothing that have been revealed during the hearings which have been held by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, as well as in the hearings which have been held by the Armed Services Committee of the other body.

Do I understand the gentleman to say that there were no shortages of clothing in the Marine Corps, or that these shortages were being taken care of?

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing my question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, the Department of Defense is requesting additional funds here to meet certain requirements for additional manpower. We have increased manpower to the extent of about 400,000 men in the last year.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as I know there are no significant shortages in South Vietnam. There are some shortages within the continental United States which are of no serious import in my judgment. And, these requirements are being met.

Mr. Speaker, there could not be a military effort of this magnitude without some shortages showing up here and there. The Department of Defense has tried to husband its funds rather well, in my opinion, in recent years. Officials have not asked for supplies to last for the next 20 or 30 years of certain items, as has been the case in some isolated instances heretofore.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this more accurate and careful budgeting procedure is in the public interest, and generally would be approved. Of course, we do not want any shortages that would be significant, we do not want any shortages at all, but these shortages will occur in any war. Therefore, we have to do the best we can to see that these shortages are not significant or hurtful to the fighting forces.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, since the gentleman from Texas has mentioned General Green's testimony, his testimony before the Committee on Armed Services revealed that there were shortages of clothing, but that they were being taken care of through the medium of decreased clothing allowances.

Mr. MAHON. This relates to the continental United States, and not to South Vietnam, I believe.

Mr. LATTA. There will be no decreased allowances as far as clothing is concerned for our South Vietnam fighting soldiers?

Mr. MAHON. Not, I believe, for the soldiers in South Vietnam. There is no clothing problem about which I know, with reference to personnel in Vietnam, except some isolated instance here or there, but some of the clothing under order for the increased strength of the Marine Corps will take a little time for delivery. But there is no serious situation here. And the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Ohio referred, when testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, points out that he thinks the Marine Corps will be able to handle this matter without any serious effect upon the readiness of the marines.

Mr. LATTA. Likewise I will point out to the gentleman that General Greene in his testimony before the Committee on Armed Services stated in their examination of the problem, meaning the problem of ammunition as I recall, they found six different types of ammunition in which there were indications of shortages. This is General Greene's testimony. Are there sufficient funds to take care of these shortages?

Mr. MAHON. The bill provides $2 billion for ammunition and associated equipment. There are certain new types of ammunition that are not immediately available which would be desirable for use in Vietnam which are not now being used. But we have sufficient firepower to meet the requirements. Whatever the deficiencies are in our prosecution of the war in Vietnam, they are not brought about by the lack of money or of supplies, in my judgment.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 773 does waive all points of order so far as the bill H.R. 13546 is concerned, the supplemental defense appropriation bill for 1966. As I understand it, the points of order were requested to be waived for two different reasons. The first is the two bills that have been passed, I think $415 million for the foreign aid bill, and I believe the other one having to do with the armed services and supplies, have not been signed by the President of the United States with the result that we cannot appropriate unless there is first a law on the books authorizing us to do so. That is the first point.

The second point, as I understand it, is that there is certain language in the bill in the nature of legislation in an appropriation bill which is against the rules of the House and the Committee on Rules was asked to waive that so that we could proceed with this legislation here today.

I think the total amount of the bill is somewhere around $13 billion, $12.3 billion in new military spending and $415 million in connection with the foreign aid matter that we passed here a short time ago, the majority of which goes to Vietnam, some to Thailand, some to Laos, and some to the Dominican Republic. Then there is $375 million for military assistance projects previously authorized and begun.

There has been some discussion as to whether or not the World War II language goes too far; whether that authority should be given to the Department of Defense or not. So far as I am concerned, I feel our men are in Vietnam and they are fighting and I, for one, intend to give them all the equipment and ammunition and everything that we can to help them to do their job so that we can get them back home as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, I support the waiver of the points of order and I support the rule and I support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time so far as I know.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental defense appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be divided equally between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we will use more than 3 hours in general debate, but we do not want to preclude any debate that the House desires to have on this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 13546, with Mr. Wright in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. This is the first appropriation bill to be considered by the Congress at this session. We have been requested by the executive branch to appropriate for the forthcoming fiscal year about $121 billion. The bill before us of course, is not applicable to the 1967 fiscal year but, rather, to the current fiscal year.

There has been so much said about the war in Vietnam through all media and in many public places, including this body and the other body, that there are many who feel, perhaps, that they have heard enough.

But this bill totals $13 billion. It is the first opportunity of the House of Representatives to express its will on the urgent request of the President for all of the additional funds to prosecute the war in Vietnam.

This supplemental appropriation request for the Department of Defense has occupied much of the time and effort of many Members of the legislative branch in recent weeks. The President's request for the supplemental funds arrived here on Capitol Hill on the 19th day of January. The House Appropriations Committee began its hearings on the measure on January 26 and concluded hearings on March 3.

Three subcommittees—the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, the Subcommittee on Military Construction, and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations—were all involved in the consideration of this request.

The full Committee on Appropriations met last Friday and ordered the bill reported to the House, and it was scheduled for consideration today.

Since some of the amounts requested required additional authorization, several of the legislative committees of the Congress have given their attention to this matter. The Committee on Armed Forces of the House held hearings beginning February 3 and ending on February 17, having had 8 days of hearings on many of the matters in the bill that is before us today.

The authorization bill was reported from the House Armed Services Committee on February 18 and passed the House on March 1.

In the other body, joint hearings were held by the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee beginning on January 20 and ending on February 3—5 days of hearings.

The bill was reported to the Senate on February 10. The Senate debate began on that day and continued until the Senate passed the bill on March 1.

The conference report on that authorization bill was filed on March 10 and was adopted by both the Houses last week, as the Members know.

Since the pending bill provides supplemental appropriations for economic assistance, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate have considered the matter and drafted the required authorizing legislation. The House Foreign Affairs Committee began hearings on January 26. The committee held 3 days of hearings. The authorization bill for economic assistance was considered on the floor on February 24.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee began hearings on January 28 and continued hearings until March 3, hearings being held on a total of 8 days. The other body considered the Economic Assistance Authorization bill, as we did, on March 10.

The conference on this economic assistance part of the legislation has not yet been concluded, and the legislation, of course, has not been signed into law. Neither had the military authorization portion of this legislation until today. For that reason a rule waiving points of order was requested by the Appropriations Committee last week and granted by the Rules Committee.

So it is evident that Congress has been preoccupied with the issue of the Vietnam war since we assembled in January, and properly so, I would say.

Last year, during the consideration of the Defense Appropriation and Authorization bills, it became apparent that a supplemental appropriation would be needed early this year if the war should continue. We were hoping and praying that it would not. This view was generally taken by Members of the House and Members of the other body who deal in depth with military requirements. This view was also taken by officials of the Defense Department.

We were told that additional funds would probably be needed, but since they could not then pinpoint the specific funds; they would not ask us for blank checks for financing the war. It was generally thought that early this year a request for additional funds would be presented. Early this year, on January 19, the request came. So it is no surprise that we have been engaged in recent weeks in debate and discussion of this important matter.

Not only this, but during the course of the consideration thus far of the pending $13 billion appropriation, it has been apparent that most Members feel that the additional amounts are required.

The truth is that there has been no real question in the minds of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body that the funds requested are needed. I will go further, and say that many feel that additional funds may be required in fiscal year 1967 for the Department of Defense, that is funds in excess of the budget request.

This certainly is my view, but no one can tell the turn which the war will take and, therefore, what the requirements may actually be.

It is true that we cannot predict, as I say, the course of the war, the chances for peace, or the degree of intensity of the fighting.

We do not know what the Communists might do in southeast Asia or elsewhere. We have no way of knowing. Hence, it is inevitable that some uncertainties will confront us in the future, as they have confronted us in the past in dealing with these matters.

When and if additional sums are required, I would make bold to say for the House of Representatives that everyone can be sure that those additional funds will be approved by the House of Representatives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the able minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has pointed out that there are many, many uncertainties as to the precise course of the conflict in Vietnam. President Johnson, as the elected Commander in Chief, does not himself know exactly what decisions he must make in the crucial days ahead. We do not know today what the President must do in the way of a commitment for more strength on the ground or in the air or on the sea.

However, I gather, from what the gentleman from Texas is saying, that a Member of the House who votes for this Defense Department appropriation is giving to the Commander in Chief the day-to-day authority to carry on the execution and implementation of our Nation's position of strength in South Vietnam. An "aye" vote on this bill today means that one supports adequate military strength to meet successfully the challenge of Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. This, I believe, would be a fair interpretation of a vote in favor of the pending legislation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. It is true that we cannot tell the degree of the escalation, but it is my view—and I have no inside information—that the probabilities are that the war will escalate, that it will grow in intensity, because I do not think our opponents are yet ready to go to the conference table.

We have given them ample opportunity. We have had the bombing pause, and we have been most tolerant and considerate in undertaking to convince our opponents, and the entire world, of our desire for peace. Our efforts have not been successful thus far. We have no other alternative than to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion.

It is in this context and under these circumstances that the Committee on Appropriations brings this request to you today for your consideration.

I would like to say that it is due to the foresight of Congress and to the foresight of the executive branch that we are as well prepared as we are for the conditions which confront us in the world at this time. Beginning in 1950 with the Korean war, we have kept our Military Establishment in a considerable degree of readiness. We have appropriated large sums of money for defense. We have spent money for defense at a rather high level since the early 1950's in order to be ready to meet aggression if aggression came.

I should call your attention to some significant facts:

First. We have carried more than 200,000 men and the arms and equipment to support them and to support our allies' army of more than 800,000 men, by air and by sea, more than 10,000 miles from our shores.

Second. We have wisely protected the lives of our fightingmen by expending munitions at tremendous rates. We have the weapons and ammunition to make this possible. If we did not, more lives would be lost. We program the expenditure of 1 billion rounds per year of small-arms ammunition, for instance, and 1,700,000 bombs.

Third. We have been building up our conventional forces substantially since 1961. For example:

First. We have added $50 billion to the defense program since 1960 for this purpose.

Second. We had achieved a 100-percent increase in airlift capability.

Third. The number of combat-ready Army divisions has been increased 45 percent.

Fourth. The number of combat helicopters, upon which the mobility of our forces in Vietnam depends, has been increased 45 percent.

Fifth. The number of Air Force fighter squadrons has been increased 51 percent.

If the Congress and the Defense Department had not had the foresight to program these increases, we would indeed have had real supply problems and American lives would have been unnecessarily sacrificed.

So it is as a result of this policy, that the Members have supported, that we are as well prepared as we are for the war in which we find ourselves.

I should like to say this: The United States has been better prepared for and has acted more quickly and more efficiently to cope with the demands of this war than any other war in our entire history. This understanding is necessary to a proper perspective of the situation.

We hear allegations of shortages and inefficiencies. There are some shortages and inefficiences which should surprise no one in an effort this large. But the overall picture as to military strength and readiness is amazingly good. We have every reason to be proud of our men, and not only of our men but of the equipment which has been provided by the foresight of the Government in recent years.

I say that for all of the administrations involved. No shortage of equipment or supplies has adversely affected the conduct of the war insofar as our hearings have been able to determine.

There is every indication that our forces in Vietnam are being well led. General Westmoreland seems to have the complete confidence of military and civilian leaders in the executive branch of the Government, and this, of course, includes the President.

General Westmoreland also seems to have the full confidence of the Members of Congress who have made on-the-spot checks of the situation in southeast Asia. The bravery of our troops and their morale is without question. We have every reason to be proud of the performance of the Nation as a whole in this time of difficulty and trial.

There seems to be little reason to argue about the amount of money requested in this bill. We are going to need all of these funds. We have spent 24 days in hearings in the Committee on Appropriations already this year exploring our military requirements for funds. One cannot separate this supplemental from the fiscal 1967 regular budget for defense. We have had Secretary McNamara before our committee on defense requirements of the Nation a total of 5 days, and we have had many other witnesses, also. We have been giving consideration to this matter, and properly so, since the beginning of the session. We will continue to do so, and we hope that in a couple of months we can bring the new bill before you. However, certainly, for the moment, we should support this legislation and provide the equipment, the clothing, the ammunition, and the other things that are needed now.

In this bill before us we provide for 2,005 additional helicopters which are very much needed in the type of war that we are fighting. We are providing for the procurement of 906 fixed-wing aircraft. We are providing the huge sum of $2,078 million for munitions, weapons of war, and associated equipment. So it is very evident to me that this is an important and necessary installment for the active prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

Briefly, the bill provides—

U.S. military	$12, 345, 719, 600
Military assistance to South Vietnam	375, 000, 000
Economic assistance to South Vietnam	415, 000, 000
Total	13, 135, 719, 000

Funds for about 113,000 more military personnel than already approved for fiscal year 1966.

An additional $2,316,269,000 for operation and maintenance to provide generally for the increased tempo of operations.

For procurement:

Aircraft	$3, 212, 400, 000
Missiles	181, 400, 000
Munitions	2, 078, 000, 000
Other procurement such as electronic and communications equipment	1, 547, 600, 000
Total	7, 019, 400, 000

For research and development effort on weapons and equipment directly required in southeast Asia, $151,650,000.

For military construction in support of operational requirements in Vietnam, $1,238,400,000. The actual construction projects, although primarily located in Vietnam, are also located in the United States and in other countries such as the Philippines.

When we vote for this bill I think we will show to the Nation and to the entire world that the elected representatives of the people stand firmly together in resisting any program of appeasement or of vacillation and are supporting a program of unyielding opposition to aggression. By our action in supporting this bill we put the country and the world on notice that we feel that we in this country have a vital stake in the outcome of the war in Vietnam. It is true that we want to be helpful to the Vietnamese, but we are not spending all of these billions of dollars and the lives of our men only to be helpful to the Vietnamese. We are trying to obtain peace in the world, which happens to be very important to the welfare of all humanity.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California, the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommitee on Defense Appropriations on the minority side [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today, H.R. 13546, provides supplemental defense funds for the fiscal year 1966 budget totaling $13,135,719,000 in new obligational authority as requested by the President for military functions and military and economic assistance to support our operations in southeast Asia.

This measure is of vital importance to our security and welfare for the United States must remain ready and able to act in the national interest and to support such action fully.

As approved by the Appropriations Committee, the Department of Defense portions of the bill, which total $12,345,719,000, provide for the following:

For military personnel, the bill provides $1,620 million which will support, in addition to that previously approved, a net increase of approximately 113,000 military personnel and certain additions to the Army National Guard and other Reserve components.

In the area of operation and maintenance, the bill proposes an appropriation of $2,316,269,000.

For procurement of military supplies, the bill includes $7,019,400,000. Broadly speaking, this includes funding for ammunition, various types of rotary and fixed wing aircraft, various types of vehicles, electronic and communication equipment, and for other items such as ships, spare parts, clothing, and other consumables. In some cases the stocks are exhausted or are dangerously low, and these funds are needed to replenish the supply.

For research, development, test, and evaluation the supplemental request provides $151,650,000, much of which will be devoted to special needs generated by the Vietnam war. This includes such programs as an increase in medical research to provide new drugs to combat a severe strain of drug resistant malaria, for work in developing aircraft suppressive fire systems, helicopter modification, developing a fast deployment logistic ship—FDL—and to speed up development of advanced radar techniques for surveillance purposes, and to modify aircraft to increase their effectiveness in their close air support missions in a southeast Asia environment.

Military construction funds in the bill total $1,238,400,000. This is for construction projects both in the continental United States and in the southeast Asia area at bases, airfields, ports, and related facilities.

Also the bill includes $375 million relating to military assistance and $415 million for the Agency for International Development for economic assistance in Vietnam.

COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 13546. There should be no question in anyone's mind about the necessity of providing completely ample funds to support our commitment in Vietnam and related areas. Nor should there be any reservation about the need to supply our American boys fighting over there with the necessary arms, ammunition, and other requirements. Prompt passage of this measure would also illustrate to our fighting men, our citizens, and our enemies that we are willing and able to take the steps that are necessary to back up our country's commitment to insure freedom in South Vietnam and prevent the further expansion of communism.

At the same time, I believe that additional comments on this measure and the defense picture generally are necessary.

The escalation of the conflict in Vietnam intensified in February of last year. But even in view of the worsening Vietnam situation last year the fiscal year 1966 defense budget originally submitted to Congress was "tight," as described by Department of Defense witnesses before our subcommittee. No amendment to the fiscal year 1966 original request for additional funds was made by the administration to support the increased activity in southeast Asia during the time the House Appropriation Subcommittee on Defense held several months of hearings and the bill was taken up and passed by the House in June. The only action taken, which amounted in large part to a token gesture as far as the amount of funds was concerned, was the supplemental request for fiscal year 1965 for a $700 million emergency fund for southeast Asia, approved by the Congress last May.

Because of this fact and our deep concern that there must be adequate, timely funding for the defense program, two other members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and I felt compelled to make the following statement in additional views in the committee report last June on the regular fiscal year 1966 budget as submitted to the House:

> It is our firm belief that appropriations must be sufficient to carry out successfully U.S. commitments anywhere in the world.
>
> American personnel in Vietnam must be equipped and supported in such a degree as will give maximum assurance of safety and a capability to carry out their duties. We believe the President should immediately revise this fiscal year 1966 defense budget with a view toward requesting the Congress to provide for the unplanned and unprogramed expenditures which have resulted from his decision to assume a greater role in southeast Asia (H. Rept. No. 528, 89th Cong., 1st sess., p. 63).

Despite repeated urgings such as this, no change in the original fiscal year 1966 budget request was received until August of last year, almost 7 months after the increased action in Vietnam. Then, the request was made for a $1.7 billion southeast Asia emergency fund add-on which was amended into the House version of the defense bill by the Senate. Even then, this added amount covered only a fraction of the needs, to start increasing production rates and construction projects, and some other items that were critically needed. It was too obvious not to be widely recognized at the time that the $1.7 billion amendment did little more than begin to provide the funds needed.

The $12.3 billion supplemental request we are considering today for Department of Defense, military functions, was presented to Congress in January, only several months later. We were told by witnesses who appeared to testify for the $12.3 billion defense portion of the supplemental bill that the needs were not precisely known before this time. It is, of course, understood that our needs in situations such as this cannot be identified precisely. As a matter of fact it is clear from the testimony that the needs are still not precisely known. But from the evidence on hand it seems clear also that had the budget request been submitted earlier, it could have prevented extensive budgetary manipulations that have been going on within the Department of Defense.

DEFICIENCIES IN BUDGETING AND PLANNING

Let me illustrate some of the results of this type of budgeting and planning in the defense program.

The Secretary of Defense has used all of the discretionary funds he had available in the construction program for Vietnam. He has virtually exhausted research and development emergency funds. In addition there has been extensive use of his transfer authority and reprograming of funds to meet critical needs.

As a matter of fact it was brought out in the testimony that this bill would have to be approved by approximately March 1, which of course passed 2 weeks ago, to prevent further budgetary maneuvering and the use of emergency actions.

Secretary McNamara himself stated that if the funds were not provided by March 1:

> We might have to take certain emergency actions to keep on schedule and those actions would not make for as orderly an operation and as efficient an operation as we would have if the bill is enacted by March 1.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

In the area of military personnel, for the first time funds for military personnel have been requested and are in this budget covering the escalation of activity. Also, for the first time the matter of combat pay for our men in southeast Asia is adequately covered since the escalation of activity. The Department of Defense up until this time has been handling the increased regular personnel and combat pay requirements by using up available personnel funds. This is just no way to budget and to handle financing for the pay of our military personnel.

This supplemental does not even include funds to take care of military pay increases approved last year. The Department of Defense has submitted still another separate supplemental request for this purpose as part of a Governmentwide bill. That request, for an additional $863 million, was submitted to Congress March 8, 1966. Serious difficulties meeting personnel expenses can be expected if the supplemental pay request is not approved soon.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Though the Vietnam escalation began last February, this bill provides the first appropriation for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 1966 funds to reflect our increased needs in southeast Asia. Operation and maintenance includes such critical items as fuel, logistical and operational support, and medical support to all the services. The fiscal year 1966 budget, including the $1.7 billion add-on for southeast Asia, which was signed into law last September did not include such funds. Increased requirements in this area have been handled by the Department of Defense by shifting of funds to meet emergency needs.

PROCUREMENT

Procurement for vital military equipment such as aircraft, weapons, vehicles, and ammunition at more than $7 billion makes up the major portion of this supplemental request.

Analysis of this item reveals that a portion of the request is for replenishment of war reserve stocks. This need, in my view, should have been recognized many months earlier, for our stock levels were and are known and it should be readily recognized that any escalation would dip further into the stockpiles.

After the various branches of service submitted their individual requests to the Department of Defense for the original fiscal year 1966 budget, numerous cuts were made by the Secretary. This action is expected and generally is neither unusual nor objectionable. However, it does become a matter of concern when a budget is presented which should and could more adequately have anticipated critical developments. This bill, and to some extent the August 1965 $1.7 billion amendment, contain some of the very items which were cut last year by the Secretary of Defense from the services' request for fiscal year 1966 in such areas as aircraft, spares, repair parts, and support material, all vital to the conduct of the war.

Now we come to a situation almost completely opposite to the examples I have been discussing. While it is necessary to have funds required for our defense program requested and approved in a timely manner, it is equally true that responsible budgeting requires that money requests be considered in orderly schedules commensurate with our needs at the time and not swept through in supplemental bills.

Some of the items that properly should be included in the regular defense budget for fiscal year 1967 which will come up later in the session have been injected into this supplemental. A number of items amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars were deleted by the Office of the Secretary of Defense from the fiscal year 1967 regular budget request by the service branches and moved into the supplemental request that we are discussing today.

Additionally when it is realized that this $12.3 billion defense supplemental request is for fiscal year 1966 which has less than 4 months to go, other questions must be raised. For example, considering the long leadtime needed to start up production or to increase production rates, this, coupled with the large quantities involved, indicates that a portion of the procurement funds could have been included in the regular fiscal year 1967 budget request. Sufficient funds could have been included in this supplemental request to accelerate the production rate for long lead parts and tooling and fund production items to carry through the 4-month period. Such a procedure would have had the effect of moving many millions of dollars into the fiscal year 1967 budget with no ill effects upon scheduled deliveries.

This is the type of budgeting taking place in such a crucial area as procurement. One could come to the conclusion that this has been done in an effort to make the regular 1967 budget look lower.

The picture is further clouded by the fact that items are to be procured to fill needed requirements as a result of attrition which occurred during the previous 3- to 4-year period.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

With regard to the request for supplemental appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation, it has been said repeatedly that our planning was aimed at enabling us to pursue the type of conflict as is going on in Vietnam in an expeditious manner. Yet it took an escalated activity in Vietnam to produce a fund request to support a level of effort needed to make these new findings and weapons available quickly. Though we can hopefully say that these funds should provide a measure of improvement, some other research and development programs are being funded at a level of effort lower than a realistic assessment of the overall threat would indicate they should be.

LANGUAGE CHANGE

This supplemental package includes fiscal gimmickery in the form of a language change contained in section 101 of the bill with regard to the working capital funds, known as stock funds. The language change will eliminate the requirement to maintain cash balances equal to accounts payable. The new language provides for transfer between funds and states that balances "may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds." If this change of language had not been proposed by the Secretary of Defense in this bill, it would have been necessary for the Secretary to ask for another $350 to $500 million.

From an accounting standpoint and based on the brief look the subcommittee had of this item, it appears to be a reasonable proposal. However, because there was not time to completely evaluate it, the committee is requiring the Department of Defense to provide quarterly reports giving the financial status of each working capital fund, including information as to any adjustments that have been made as between the working capital funds. Congress must keep close watch on this item and take appropriate action if it is found that this procedure is not working properly.

CONCLUSIONS

Our men in Vietnam are serving bravely and with great distinction. They are fighting to preserve and advance freedom in the world against Communist aggression. Based on my observations in Vietnam last fall and from testimony in the hearing, their morale is high, their motivation strong. They are there to win.

Such practices as I have described here in my view are neither good management nor do they reflect the maximum in effective planning which is so necessary to insure that the men and material will be where they are needed in a manner which will afford our servicemen worldwide the ability to perform their mission and receive the maximum protection for their safety.

The result has been patchwork defense budgeting in many respects, which is both unfitting of our great Nation and not in keeping with the seriousness and importance of the Vietnam effort.

Congress should be concerned for the available evidence suggests efforts to reduce congressional control over the defense budget. It suggests that better defense planning and management could be done. Congress should be disturbed because the evidence also suggests that the decisions as to when budgetary requests are to be submitted and how much each of these should contain are not necessarily determined solely by our military requirements, but that arbitrarily shifting and juggling is done to influence, impress, or convince the public, depending on what is considered most needed at any particular time.

A lack of effective planning could undermine not only our effort in Vietnam but weaken our national security as a whole. We live in dangerous times that warrant the utmost vigilance and preparedness. The threat to Vietnam is not an isolated incident, and therefore we cannot blind ourselves to problem areas in the rest of the world, now or in the future.

I strongly urge the administration to review our overall defense posture and policies, with a broad view of our commitments, not just Vietnam. Because of the effect the conflict in Vietnam has had upon our defense structure there is a need for such a review immediately. I feel confident that Congress will assist in any way it can in such a review and provide the necessary authority for any legitimate increases or modifications that appear to be warranted. In this regard, Congress must receive the full benefit of military judgment without constraints. Congress must have frank discussions by both the civilian and military members of the Department of Defense in order to reach objective judgments and carry out its constitutional mandate responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill to provide additional funds for southeast Asia. I felt it was necessary, however, to comment today in some detail on the bill and I also respectfully call attention to the additional views contained in the report calling for improved fiscal procedures. It is my hope that the views expressed receive full consideration by the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am very happy to note that there is genuine bipartisan support for this appropriation measure. I, of course, support this bill.

Joining 39 Governors, I support the President on Vietnam. The $13.1 billion fund is essential for the support of our troops and for carrying out our commitments in South Vietnam.

The direction of policy in this conflict is far from easy. It bristles with serious and awesome problems.

The President must make the final decisions. He has his intimate advisers, yet he is like a lonely man atop a mountain.

Many are his sleepless nights, especially when he reads the tragic dispatches. At times he is veritably torn asunder with doubts and fears. But courage and stamina are not lacking. He knows that patience is bitter but bears rich fruit.

Like all who are responsible and dedicated, he is not insensible to criticism. He welcomes it when it is not mordant or abusive. Some of his frenetic critics seem more interested in crushing him than in our triumph against aggression in South Vietnam.

I do not deprecate—nay, I would encourage debate on this momentous topic of Vietnam. Only on the anvil of debate may we forge the truth.

But some of the attacks are below the belt. Some are mere billingsgate. With the monotony of a drumbeat we hear some of these armchair strategists and "pinafore" admirals saying what should be done. Ofttimes they speak in pique and spite. For them whatever the President does is wrong.

Some ranted that he should have gone to the United Nations. Although he was told by his trusted advisers that such action would be futile, he nonetheless made the trek to the United Nations. When he did that the same detractors railed that such a move was ridiculous and bound to fail.

These same carping critics ridiculed his efforts at peace and said he sought peace only halfheartedly. "Let him appeal to the Pope at Rome." He did. When his Holiness offered all in his power and did not succeed in budging Hanoi or Peiping, these same habitual faultfinders said, "I told you so."

President Johnson made direct appeals to 19 nonalined nations with a view to having them persuade Hanoi and Peiping to the conference table. These nations did, but were rebuffed.

The President sought particularly India's intercession. The rulers of Hanoi and Peiping again showed their fangs.

The President, you may remember, was savagely condemned for continued bombing of the north. He ordered the bombing stopped. The cessation yielded serious military disadvantage to us. The President received no credit for his efforts. The Vietcong were brought no nearer to the conference table.

The President requested Soviet Russia to arrange another Geneva-like conference. Russia demurred. Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung just turn their faces away from all who bring the olive branch of peace. Only yesterday, our offer of friendship, conveyed by Vice President HUMPHREY, was branded as the "kiss of Judas."

Yet, the incessant defamers of the President continue to vent their spleen against him. Never do they utter a good word for anything he may do. They dip their pens in venom or gargle with gall, and write or speak "grapes of wrath."

They refuse to realize the results of their incautious remarks, fail to understand that they create the false impression abroad, that our Nation does not support the President. Nothing is further from the truth.

I raise my voice in clarion tones to defend and applaud my President, and at the same time support this appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his statement. I think it is apropos, timely, forceful, and to the point. I especially like what he said about the armchair strategists and the Pinafore admirals, because, as Sir Winston Churchill once said, "It is very easy indeed to make plans to win a war if you have no responsibility for carrying them out."

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, who conducted some of the hearings on this bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, let me stress the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has been ready to bring this bill to the floor for several weeks. Under the able direction of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, hearings were initiated immediately after the request for funds for the Vietnam war was received. There is no disposition to withhold any funds which are needed to insure victory. And ours is a bipartisan effort. This is in some measure a guess. But it is the best estimate which is available. We have to trust someone. We are placing our trust in the recommendations of the Nation's military leaders.

Now the gentleman from Texas has spoken at length about the state of readiness of our military forces when the confrontation began and it is in fact a remarkable and commendable situation. But let us not disregard the continued efforts of district leaders in the Congress like the gentleman from Texas and many others to make this situation true.

I regret to state to the membership that those who attempt to read the hearings, will find them in considerable part useless. The testimony has been so heavily censored, much of it incomprehensible. Some of this is ridiculous. It serves only to confuse the Congress and the American people. Some of the censored material has subsequently been released in uncensored form by other committees, or even by Pentagon officials. This makes a mockery of the efforts of this committee to cooperate on security matters.

Now let us talk about the bill. I shall confine myself primarily to the construction problem on which separate hearings were held. As the House knows, the logistics problem in the Southeast Pacific is unbelievably large. Logistics is and has been the limiting factor. We are supplying large forces, 12,000 miles away from home, halfway around the world.

Last fall the U.S. forces were built up to more than 200,000. This was necessary to stem the tide of victory which was rolling for Communist forces. They nearly won the war before we realized and acted on the threat.

But it was also thought that we were putting enough forces into Vietnam to permit government forces to win. We underestimated enemy capabilities. They were building up too—men and equipment. The Ho Chi Minh trail was improved and developed into a road system capable of delivering large quantities of supplies. Food was no problem. The Communists were living off the Vietnam rice crop and they still are, because they hold most of the countryside.

To win a war you must be prepared to deny territory to the enemy. The victorious sweep of United States and Vietnamese forces into enemy held countryside are in most instances, followed by withdrawal to secure areas, and the Communists roll right back as we leave.

To insure the defeat of expanding enemy forces and to secure and hold territory now in Communist hands, we must have additional forces in Vietnam. We are now in the process of doubling their number.

That means doubling the logistics problem. We need port facilities, airfields, encampments, storage facilities. In December, when I saw the area work on some of the facilities then needed for 200,000 men, had not begun. On others, the percentage of completion was extremely small. The overall job is running a year behind schedule. This is not the fault of the construction team. They are doing an outstanding job. The enormity of their task is the main problem and it is staggering in scope. Let us not take away credit for the work which has been done.

The construction of essential operational, logistical, and support facilities are a pacing factor in the deployment of allied forces and the conduct of military operations in southeast Asia. The nature of the terrain, the paucity of operational bases and the lack of national ports and other supply and logistical facilities in that area have resulted in a major construction effort if we are to adequately support our military requirements. In addition, backup and training requirements have generated other urgent construction needs in other areas of the Pacific and in the United States. The amount of $417,700,000 has been made available to date in support of this program. Additional funds in the total amount of $1,238,400,000 are recommended in the accompanying bill. This brings the total to date to $1,656,100,000 for construction.

This is broken down as follows:

Appropriations in support of southeast Asia to date

[In millions]

Country	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Vietnam	$115.2	$78.2	$77.6	$271.0
Philippines		21.4	7.7	29.1
Guam		.5	1.6	2.1
Wake			.7	.7
United States	7.0			7.0
Various	40.0	17.5	50.3	107.8
Total	162.2	117.6	137.9	417.7

Recommended in accompanying bill—Program

[In millions]

Country	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Vietnam	$407.5	$207.1	$128.0	$742.6
Philippines		28.2	9.0	37.2
Guam		5.7	8.0	13.7
United States	34.1	24.3	5.0	63.4
Other	138.3	24.4	174.1	336.8
Planning	29.8	14.9	(1)	44.7
Total	609.7	304.6	324.1	1,238.4

[1] Distributed by country.

Appropriation

[In millions]

Army	$509.7
Navy	254.6
Air Force	274.1
Defense emergency fund	200.0
Total	1,238.4

Appropriations and recommendations to date

SUMMARY

[In millions]

Army	$671.9
Navy	372.2
Air Force	412.0
Defense emergency fund	200.0
Total	1,656.1

In the past, there has been a serious lack of central authority and coordination in the construction efforts. Effective coordination between the construction and operational programs has been limited. The recent establishment of a general officer position on the staff of the Military Advisory Command in Vietnam to effectuate this coordination should assist in overcoming the problem. But vigorous efforts still must be made to properly coordinate the construction effort and make it fully responsive to operational requirements.

An essential portion of the construction problem is the lack of sufficient skilled labor forces in South Vietnam to meet the military construction effort which is needed. The present contractor effort is requiring all of the available local labor force plus generating a requirement for the use of foreign labor which naturally adds to the cost. The construction battalions of the Navy and the Army are doing heroic work in their activities there. Theirs is one of the outstanding contributions. If the escalated construction program is to be successfully implemented, there is a need for more troop construction battalions from both the Navy and the Army. The requirement for these troops will be accentuated as additional facilities become operational and it becomes necessary to maintain them with troop labor. In order to meet the overall requirement for the construction and maintenance of facilities, steps now are being taken to double the troop construction units in South Vietnam. However, this is not enough. Through the use of only a part of the Reserve Engineer Construction Battalions and Navy Seabee Battalions—for which equipment is available—the number of these forces in the southeast

Pacific can be doubled again. To do this would save lives and time and money. This is one of the most important steps which could be taken, but there are no indications it is going to be done.

Now, this is a costly program. This is not the end of it.

It is no time to get careless on costs, and there always is the temptation to do so when money is readily available in unlimited amounts from Congress. It is the attitude of Congress that America's fighting men must have whatever they need to fight a war. But this is not an invitation for the Pentagon to spend recklessly or wastefully. I am very much afraid that time will reveal that there is waste and reckless spending in some instances. I give you one illustration which applies to the bill as a whole. The Army has contracted to buy a light observation helicopter in considerable numbers for $19,000 each per airframe. But in the program before you the Army proposes to buy the same helicopter with slight changes from the same manufacturer for $47,000 each. The Army does not even seek to take full advantage of an option to buy additional helicopters at the contract price of $19,000. A competing firm with a helicopter which is essentially the same recently offered to provide helicopters at $29,800 each. I am convinced that today there are a number of firms which would welcome an opportunity to provide helicopters at a figure much lower than $47,000. This is an inexcusable situation. Here is a place where heads should roll. And there may well be other instances. The Pentagon should launch its own investigations to determine that the specter of waste and careless purchasing does not belie the sacrifices of those who serve on the fighting front. I can tell you that this committee, through its chairman, has notified the Pentagon of our strong concern about the case in point.

The Committee still is deeply concerned that the programed expanded labor force and improved construction capability will be insufficient to meet the construction requirements. Continuing effort must be made to provide the construction capability in South Vietnam necessary to support operational and logistical requirements. To do less would seriously jeopardize the efforts our military forces are making to achieve the victory and peace desired by this Nation.

There also is a tendency to utilize peacetime financial and programing procedures in the military construction program in South Vietnam. Steps have recently been taken to broaden these procedures so as to provide additional flexibility in the program. The Committee is concerned that these changes might not be sufficient to meet the requirements for the proper implementation of the program. It will be expected that the Department of Defense will continually examine this phase of the program to insure that the necessary flexibility is provided within the overall construction program to meet changing tactical and logistical requirements and to provide a responsive and progressive program.

There has been a turn for the better in the fighting in Vietnam. The Saigon government shows more stability than at any time since the Diem regime. There is now recognition of the necessity to face up to the problem of winning over the people of the villages and hamlets—many of whom have been Communist-dominated for years.

These things may well give rise to a feeling at home that the problem of Vietnam has essentially been solved—that victory is near. This would be dangerous thinking indeed. The biggest casualty lists of the war are coming in now. We have far to go. We must never forget we are in a war—a dirty, dangerous war which soon will involve nearly half a million American fighting men. They must have the solid backing of the American people and the Congress.

It also is a time for soul searching efforts in the Pentagon to insure that the right decisions are being made. There is no time to hold back the forces or the methods which can help to insure an early victory.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently, a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 37]

Adair
Baring
Bell
Bolling
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Conyers
Davis, Ga.
Derwinski
Devine
Dowdy
Downing
Ellsworth
Everett
Fraser
Fuqua
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Holifield
Howard
McCarthy
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
Mosher
Pool
Powell
Reinecke
Roncalio
Roudebush
Sisk
Steed
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Willis

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having assumed the Chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 13546, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 391 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has 54 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] has 1 hour and 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the defense appropriation subcommittee report on this supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $13.1 billion.

The support of those of us on the minority side of the Committee on Appropriations for this bill is predicated on the necessity and the awareness that these funds must be provided in order to back up our fighting men in Vietnam.

I would like to point out to the Members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the last supplemental appropriation that we will be considering for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966. Submitted to the Congress under a transmittal that came up here entitled District of Columbia supplemental appropriations for 1966, just the other day, there is contained almost another billion dollars in appropriation requests for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1966 to handle military pay alone.

Those of us on the minority side of the House back when the defense appropriation bill for 1966 was before the Congress pointed out that no funds were included in the 1966 budget statement last January to cover the cost of escalating the war in Vietnam.

I would like to say today that although this supplemental is before us today, this coupled with the 1967 budget for the Department of Defense will not finance current plans and contingencies for the fighting in Vietnam through the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1966 and the fiscal year 1967.

As the chairman of our committee so ably said, this supplemental has to be considered along with the 1967 budget for the Department of Defense. It should be pointed out here on the floor of the House today that the 1967 budget was out of date 2 days after it was submitted to this Congress. It was out of date because the manpower ceiling so far as the Department of the Army is concerned was removed 2 days after the budget was submitted to the Congress by the President of the United States.

Those of us working with the Department of Defense budgets know full well that additional funds will be needed in 1966 as well as in 1967 in order to finance the commitment of the United States not only in Vietnam, but to maintain our present worldwide commitments supported by this administration which were so ably set forth by the Secretary of State in his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate just 10 days ago.

Mr. Chairman, on March 4, 1966, the Department of State issued through the office of its legal adviser an important document entitled, "The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Vietnam."

The document was prepared to combat the persistent criticism from certain Democratic Members of the Congress that this Nation is acting illegally in using American military power in Vietnam.

With the major thesis of this document, I have no quarrel. A compelling case for the right of the United States under international law to use its military forces to assist in the defense of South Vietnam against aggression can certainly be made.

I am grieved, however, to find that the State Department chose to distort history in this publication when it came to explain the commitments which have resulted in the involvement of the United

States in the war in Vietnam. The distortion is of two kinds. First, the document ignores completely some highly relevant facts. Second, it misleads by failing to analyze fully the declarations which it cites, sometimes conveying thereby a false impression of their import.

In summary, this document argues that the present military involvement of the Nation in Vietnam was made necessary by pledges made by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. It does not cite a single utterance by President Johnson. It suggests that the present administration had nothing at all to do with any commitment to Vietnam.

This document contains a section of 6 pages headed, "The United States Has Undertaken Commitments To Assist South Vietnam in Defending Itself Against Communist Aggression from the North." The evidence which it then presents to prove the existence of the commitment of the Eisenhower administration is the following: the statements of President Eisenhower at the end of the Geneva Conference of 1954, the SEATO treaty, the assistance given by the United States to South Vietnam after the Geneva Conference, and a joint communique issued by Eisenhower and Diem on May 11, 1957. This is followed by a citation of two statements made by President Kennedy on August 2, 1961, and December 14, 1961.

Then, abruptly, the State Department's history of the commitment of the United States to South Vietnam ends.

Equally strange is the section of this document captioned, "Actions by the United States and South Vietnam Are Justified Under the Geneva Accords of 1954." The actions of the United States which are described in this section are the supply of "considerable military equipment and supplies from the United States prior to late 1961" and the establishment of an American Military Assistance Advisory Group of "slightly less than 900 men" in Saigon. Further the document relates:

> The United States found it necessary in late 1961 to increase substantially the numbers of our military personnel and the amounts and kinds of equipment introduced * * * into South Vietnam.

And there, abruptly, the State Department ends its account of the military action of the United States in South Vietnam.

If some future catastrophe were to destroy every written record of the relations of the United States and Vietnam during the 1950's and 1960's except the State Department's publication, "The Legality of United States Participation in the Defense of Vietnam," the historian who tried to reconstruct the facts from this document would write something like this:

> Two Presidents of the United States—Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy—involved their Nation in a war to defend South Vietnam against aggression from North Vietnam. Their pledges of support to South Vietnam led to the sending of military supplies, to the dispatch of 900 military advisers, and in 1961 to the commitment of substantial numbers of American troops.
>
> This conflict may have been going on in Vietnam as late as 1966 under another President of the United States whose name is not recorded. In that year the Department of State issued a document upholding the legality of the actions of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

Mr. Chairman, this manipulation of history should give us all deep concern. When our Department of State releases a report of this kind, I fear we are closer to 1984 than the calendar indicates. This is the kind of propaganda that makes it difficult for the administration to establish its credibility. This is playing politics with Vietnam.

NO COMMITMENT OF COMBAT TROOPS UNDER EISENHOWER

If the State Department document of March 4 were the only instance of distortion of history on the part of the administration in explaining why American troops are fighting in Vietnam, it might be forgotten. But time after time, administration spokesmen, including the President, have sought to make it appear that the steps taken since November of 1963 were forced upon it by commitments of earlier administrations.

President Johnson, for example, said on August 3, 1965:

> Today the most difficult problem that confronts your President is how to keep an agreement that I did not initiate—I inherited it—but an agreement to help a small nation remain independent, free of aggression—the nation of South Vietnam.

Earlier the President and others in his administration were in the habit of citing a letter written by President Eisenhower to Diem on October 1, 1954, as "the commitment." This letter was nothing more than an expression of willingness to discuss ways and means of aiding Vietnam if the Diem regime made certain reforms.

More recently, the administration has been using the SEATO treaty of 1954 as the source of the commitment.

This treaty was not a commitment to send American troops to fight in southeast Asia. It carefully avoided the kind of automatic response to aggression embodied in the NATO agreement, summarized in the principle, "An attack upon one is an attack upon all."

Section 1 of article IV of the SEATO agreement reads:

> 1. Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

Secretary Dulles, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the SEATO treaty, declared:

> The agreement of each of the parties to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes leaves to the judgment of each country the type of action to be taken in the event an armed attack occurs.

Further, Mr. Dulles said:

> The treaty does not attempt to get into the difficult question as to precisely how we act.

On the floor of the Senate in the debate on ratification of the SEATO agreement, on February 1, 1955, Senator Smith, of New Jersey, clearly explained the nature of the commitment in these words:

> Some of the participants came to Manila with the intention of establishing an organization modeled on the lines of the North Atlantic Treaty arrangements. That would have been a compulsory arrangement for our military participation in case of any attack. Such an organization might have required the commitment of American ground forces to the Asian mainland. We carefully avoided any possible implication regarding an arrangement of that kind.
>
> We have no purpose of following any such policy as that of having our forces involved in a ground war.
>
> Under this treaty, each party recognizes that an armed attack on any country within the treaty area would endanger its own peace and safety. Each party, therefore, agrees to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. That means, by implication, that if any such emergency as is contemplated by the treaty should arise in that area it will be brought before the Congress by the President and the administration, and will be considered under our constitutional processes. We are not committed to the principle of NATO, namely, that an attack on one is an attack on all, calling for immediate military action without further consideration by Congress.
>
> For ourselves, the arrangement means that we will have avoided the impracticable overcommitment which would have been involved if we attempted to place American ground forces around the perimeter of the area of potential Chinese ingress into southeast Asia. Nothing in this treaty calls for the use of American ground forces in that fashion.

The speaker, Senator H. Alexander Smith, was a member of the U.S. delegation to the Manila Conference and a signer of the SEATO agreement.

One academic authority, W. McMahon Ball, has written:

> The treaty does not oblige the United States either legally or morally to take any course in southeast Asia than the course it might be expected to take if the treaty did not exist.

Article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty clearly reserves to each signatory the right to determine the nature of its response to armed aggression and does not commit in advance any signatory to use its armed forces to deal with the aggressor.

Recognizing this fact, the Kennedy administration did not use American forces to repel Communist aggression in Laos.

The legal commitment of the United States to South Vietnam is the same as its commitment to Laos. Both of these countries of southeast Asia were brought under the protection of SEATO.

Lyndon Johnson as Vice President made it clear in 1961 that the United States had not up to that time committed itself to an obligation that would require employment of its military forces. In a memorandum to President Kennedy dated May 23, 1961, right after his return from a tour of Asia, Johnson wrote:

> The fundamental decision required of the United States—and time is of the greatest importance—is whether we are to attempt to meet the challenge of Communist expansion now in southeast Asia by a major effort in support of the forces of freedom in the area or throw in the towel. This decision must be made in a full realization of the very heavy and continuing costs involved in terms of money, of effort, and of U.S. prestige. It must be made with the knowledge that at some point we may be faced with a further decision of whether we commit major U.S. forces to the area or cut our losses and withdraw should our efforts fail. We must remain master of this decision.

Finally, Gen. Maxwell Taylor in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 17, 1966, demolished the argument that there was any commitment to employ American troops in combat under the Eisenhower administration in the following exchange with Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER of Iowa:

> Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now, up until the end of the Eisenhower administration, we had only about 750 military personnel in South Vietnam, did we not?
>
> General TAYLOR. It was very small, something like that.
>
> Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think that is within 25 or 30 of the number, either way, and they were entirely devoted to giving technical advice on training to the South Vietnamese troops.
>
> General TAYLOR. That is correct.
>
> Senator HICKENLOOPER. To your knowledge, did we have any commitment or agreement with the South Vietnamese up to that time that we would put in active field military forces to conduct a war along with them?
>
> General TAYLOR. No, sir. Very clearly we made no such commitment. We didn't want such a commitment. This was the last thing we had in mind.
>
> Senator HICKENLOOPER. When was the commitment made for us to actively participate in the military operations of the war as American personnel?
>
> General TAYLOR. We, insofar as the use of our combat ground forces are concerned, that took place, of course, only in the spring of 1965.
>
> In the air, we had been participating more actively over 2 or 3 years.

When President Eisenhower left the White House, there were no American troops in South Vietnam. There were only approximately 700 military advisers. When President Eisenhower left the White House, there was no commitment to send American troops to South Vietnam.

Under President Kennedy, the first American combat casualties occurred in December 1961. Although President Kennedy increased the number of U.S. military personnel in Vietnam to 17,000, the American forces were there primarily to advise, not to fight.

The New York Times of August 19, 1965, correctly stated the case when it said:

> The shift from military assistance and combat advice to direct participation by American combat troops in the Vietnamese war has * * * been a unilateral American decision * * * by President Johnson.

THE HONOLULU COMMITMENT

I find it unbelievable that a State Department document dated March 4, 1966, purporting to explain the commitment of this Nation in South Vietnam could avoid mention of the Honolulu declaration of February 8, 1966. For part IV of that declaration is entitled "The Common Commitment." It reads:

> The President of the United States and the Chief of State and Prime Minister of the Republic of Vietnam are thus pledged again to defense against aggression, to the work of social revolution, to the goal of free self-government, to the attack on hunger, ignorance, and disease, and to the unending quest for peace.

These are important and weighty commitments. Yet they go unreported in the State Department's survey of the commitment of the Government of the United States to South Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean here to be critical of the actions of the President with relation to Vietnam. I simply plead that, when the administration undertakes to defend itself against critics in the President's party, it present the facts and all the facts. Let the administration acknowledge is decisions as its own and justify its actions on their merits.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has made reference to the historical background of the war in Vietnam.

I believe that if a look backward reveals anything it reveals our difficulties in South Vietnam have been nonpartisan in nature. The actions which this country has taken have been actions taken in defense of the security of the United States and have not been motivated in my opinion by political considerations.

The war by the Vietnamese against the French began in 1946. In 1950 we began to give some assistance to the French in an effort to try to conclude successfully this war. The French finally capitulated. We began to provide aid to the South Vietnamese against aggression in Vietnam in 1950. In 1954 or 1955 we began to provide foreign aid, direct military and economic, to the people in Vietnam who were fighting for freedom.

Mr. Chairman, during this time a number of negotiations took place. Mr. Dulles was very instrumental as Secretary of State in negotiating the SEATO treaty. In this treaty, to which we subscribe, the United States undertook an international obligation to help defend South Vietnam against aggression.

The treaty said:

> Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement might hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with constitutional processes—

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

So, Mr. Chairman, we recognized early that the security and well-being of the United States was heavily involved in southeast Asia.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point in the treaty?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to discuss that point.

Mr. MAHON. I do not want to discuss it in detail, but I want to briefly refer to the history of this situation in which we found ourselves and in which both our political parties and all administrations have stood out against aggression, and properly so, in southeast Asia.

Mr. LAIRD. If my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will yield to me, I would like to state that I am sure he agrees with me that the State Department document is not correct in its interpretation of our present commitment in Vietnam.

I would like to quote from the testimony of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles when he discussed this particular section to which the gentleman from Texas alludes at this point.

When Secretary Dulles testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this particular section he declared:

> The agreement of each of the parties to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes leaves to the judgment of each country the type of action to be taken in the event an armed attack occurs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is quite different from the language which is included in the NATO agreement, when the NATO agreement comes out as an attack on one is an attack on all.

Mr. Chairman, I am placing in the RECORD a discussion of the definition that Secretary Dulles made very clearly between the SEATO and the NATO agreements.

The point of my remarks is not to question the SEATO agreement. It is to question the interpretation used by our State Department to justify military action in Vietnam today, on the basis of that treaty, because I believe that treaty is not the basis for justifying direct military action by one country in the treaty organization without consent of all countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

We, it is true, were not specifically committed by the treaty to send American troops to war. We all know that as a result of Communist aggression the situation in Vietnam has continued to worsen. The SEATO agreement is, of course, available for all to interpret. I do not undertake at the moment to get into the details of the treaty.

Now, in 1959 Mr. Eisenhower said—and correctly, in my judgment:

> Unassisted Vietnam cannot at this time produce and support the military formations essential to it or, equally important, the morale—the hope, the confidence, the pride—

> necessary to meet the dual threat of aggression from without and subversion within its borders.
>
> Strategically, South Vietnam's capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The remaining countries in southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement. * * * The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom.

In the period 1953-57, during the Eisenhower administration—this Government provided $1,100 million in aid to Vietnam in an effort to stop aggression. But this was only partially successful.

This aid continued throughout the Eisenhower administration and then under the Kennedy administration and continues under the Johnson administration. The problem finally culminated in this war which is being fought out of necessity, growing out of the commitments and the facts of life as they existed in 1950 and 1954 and ever since that time under all administrations.

This is not a partisan war. It is a war brought about by necessity to preserve the interests of the United States in southeast Asia.

We want to help the people in South Vietnam. That is true, but we also must look out after our own self-interests. The purpose of this bill today is to safeguard our own self-interests, the best interests of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, first may I say that it has been my privilege to serve under the chairman of the full committee and of this subcommittee for many years. It has been my privilege to serve with other members of the subcommittee both on the minority and on the majority side. It has been my experience that never has there been a time throughout all these years when this country and this Congress could not look to these gentlemen to see that finances are provided to enable this Nation to meet its national defense needs in any military area, where we may have to exercise our might.

Certainly if we have erred through the years, it has been on the side of making absolutely certain that adequate funds are available. May I say that our hearings have always been full and in great detail. So that there will be no misunderstanding here, I would repeat again that you know and I know that all of us, without exception, will be supporting and defending our men in service whatever policy our Government decides upon in Vietnam.

I might say further, as I pointed out last year in our report, the matter of full funding of approved requests of the Defense Department has many weaknesses. But it has some advantages. Last year, for instance, as our committee reported, and as it exists today substantially, we have $30 billion in unexpended funds to the credit of the Department of Defense. We had some $9 billion not even obligated a year ago. All of that money would be subject to the decision of the Congress to be reappropriated, or to be simply transferred by the Department.

The point I make is that any planning and any actions that may have been taken by the Department of Defense have been for reasons other than that funds were not available, because they have been and are now available.

There is a substantial need for the bill that is before you, not because the money is not available if handled through channels, but this represents a projection of the action expected to be taken by the Defense Department in connection with Vietnam for which we are making funds available in this bill.

Again, it is not because there is no money—it is because these projects, the acquisition of materiel and other actions, will cost money, and we are providing the money to do this job as we go along.

THERE ARE MANY CAUSES

I have served on this committee most of the time since 1943, or at least one segment of it, and I think this matter of going into the cause, while it is academic in some respects, in many ways would be well insofar as deciding where we go from here. It is my personal view, and may I say the leaders on both sides of the aisle differed with me then and they differ with me now—but if I were to look for the cause, I would go back to the period after World War II when we went around the world telling practically every nation which would listen, "we will take care of you—we have the atomic bomb." We made those commitments in many places where, subsequently, it has become apparent we simply cannot carry out such promises, especially since others now have the atomic bomb.

Yes, if I were to look for the cause, I would remember that we went through a period when the Congress and the American public thought all we needed was the atomic bomb. To a great degree we quit producing conventional weapons and we reduced our efforts for maintenance of our defenses to the point where one of the top people in our Air Force said we were giving little training to our flyers in dropping ordinary bombs, because we had been lured into feeling we could drop a big bomb and that would be it. Unfortunately, today we are in the midst of a war; and we are using conventional weapons.

If I were to look further as to the responsibility, I would see that the leaders of both parties have followed a common foreign policy through the years right up until this moment.

If I looked at Cuba, I would realize there is enough fault to be found, looking backward, to include both parties and their leaders.

If I looked at many other areas, I would see somewhat the same situation.

A STALEMATE IS NO VICTORY

But what we have here, Mr. Chairman, is more serious than that. The question is, Where are we and what are we going to do about it? Here we are halfway around the world, as my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] said, with a 10,000-mile supply line and engaged in battle in an area where human life means very little to the enemy, and where they can carry sufficient supplies for guerrilla warfare on their backs. We are engaged in a deadly conflict at the end of a 10,000-mile supply line. Both parties have followed policies which have ended in this situation, though I am sure no one intended it.

We find—and the record will support this—that Haiphong Harbor in North Vietnam is an open harbor. Through Haiphong Harbor 80 percent of the supplies being used by our enemy in South Vietnam are passing and, with the exception of several small countries, along with Communist nations our so-called friends are continuing to ship to our enemies through Haiphong Harbor.

Yes, if we carry the matter a little bit further, on the question of winning the war I agree we must win; but we must decide what it is to win. What does to win mean to us? To me it cannot be a maintenance of the status quo. Here is a little 100th-rated power, North Vietnam, pulling the biggest power in the world around by the nose day after day. It leads me, as an individual, to feel that the Vietcong may be winning as long as they can maintain the status quo and actually feel that they are. This we must stop and the first start, to me, appears to be to stop the inflow of materiel to our enemy.

We will supply this money. We argue about financial budgets. We want to keep waste down. We want to be economy minded in handling appropriations. But in World War II I well remember that when war materiel was sent to forward theaters, it was marked off then and there. That is not the major problem that we have. We are reconciled to the fact that these funds will be spent.

We are in an engagement at the end of a 10,000-mile supply line, with our troops slugging it out, fighting in swamps, attacked by mosquitoes and suffering from malaria; fighting under the most trying conditions where it seems we do not know who our friends are, but where our leaders feel we must remain to show that we will be in southeast Asia.

Speaking for myself alone, if we are to keep our young men there—and our leaders and our country feel not only a commitment but a present necessity to keep our forces there—we owe it to them to do those things that would cut off the supply line of their enemy, a supply line that to a great degree is fed by folks who are supposed to be our friends.

FOREIGN POLICY DETERIORATES

I repeat, the record will show that the only countries which have cut off shipping to North Vietnam are a relatively few minor ones. We are not stopping that shipping because we think these other countries might not give us the support we want in NATO or so I surmise. But look what has happened, already France has virtually announced her withdrawal from NATO. If you want to second-guess our policy in the last number of years, look at Africa. The men who had some know-how and brains to govern were forced out by us. It has drifted back to where the men with strength to run these little countries, the men we shoved out, have had to be returned for such order as they can effect.

We started on our present course a long time ago. If we look in every direction we can see the mortar cracking. We can see the high hopes of many of our people running out. We can see member nations failing to put up their share in the United Nations.

But all of that is beside the point. We have young men fighting in a war that is as much a war to them as World War II, and we are here wondering whether we should do anything to cut off the supplies of the opposition, supplies which are being transported by people supposedly on our side. To me the answer is, we must.

My friends, there is only one side to this appropriation bill. As I have said, the Defense Department has money that could have been used. They have money that they could now use. But we are financing the projection of contracts to supply material that it is apparent they are going to need.

There are two or three other things we might say. If we need a base in southeast Asia, might not we have the courage to say so and supply a base as against saying that we are trying to let people follow the path of their own determination, with all the mixed-up information that we can get on that subject?

I wish to say again that I am for this country, and I know the Members of the Congress are, too. I do feel an obligation, having questioned the Secretary of Defense and various others, and I shall put those questions and answers, where they exist, in the Record, to question present actions or lack of determination to put up.

I feel we have an obligation to question a war in which we are engaged as the result of a foreign policy participated in by both parties. As we do that, we do not have to be hawks or doves. We are in a quagmire, and we need to get out of it. It is not for me to say or for you to say, but it is for all of us to insist that we take appropriate action, as long as we are in it, to back the men who are there, to determine what we must have for them and take action to see that an untenable situation does not simply go on and on, with resulting loss of life.

If our friends in other parts of the world will not stand by us, it is better to find out such fact. To support my views, I believe questions and answers of the Secretary, pages 51 through 91 of the hearings would be of interest to you. I read them here:

ADEQUACY OF MILITARY FUNDING

Mr. Whitten. Mr. Secretary, we all are interested in the overall aspects of this matter, but there are two or three things I think might well appear in the record.

I know last year when you were before us and afterward there was quite a difference of opinion and a difference in statements as to whether the reduction in the military funds for the Defense Department would result in perhaps some injury to our defense capabilities.

The committee, in view of that, provided or stated in its report and I read from last year's report on page 9:

"Appropriations to finance any such items of urgent need continue available from prior years in staggering totals. For example, the budget in January 1965 indicated $30,520,379,000 total unexpended carryover into fiscal 1966, of which a total of $9,624,627,000 would be unobligated."

I am certain this committee will back your request here. I am not saying it critically in the least.

I think it is well you are here. The point I make here is that the military effort has not suffered from the lack of available funds if you had seen fit to request the use of these funds to meet your need problem up to this point.

Secretary McNamara. I fully support that conclusion, Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Whitten. You were before us last year in connection with the regular defense bill and again on several supplementals, and Defense Department witnesses have been before us numerous times when we have approved a reprograming request. If you had foreseen the need of the money you are asking for now, you would have asked for it, would you not?

Secretary McNamara. Yes. I stated to the committee in August that we foresaw the need for additional funds but for a number of reasons were not requesting them: (1) we could not predict our needs with certainty, (2) we knew that it would be possible to return in January with a better estimate of those needs, and (3) we felt that the funds which would be available to us in the original fiscal year 1966 budget and the August amendment would carry us through the early part of this calendar year.

Mr. Whitten. The point I make is that the defense effort has not suffered from lack of funds either on your part or on the part of Congress.

Secretary McNamara. I fully support that conclusion.

EFFECTS OF BOMBING ON NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. Whitten. Now carrying it one step further, General Wheeler, I am trying to make clear in my mind, as I understood you in enumerating the targets in North Vietnam, that in effect you indicated that insofar as the present military effort is concerned, where we are having this guerrilla-type warfar, they were what might be termed secondary targets, in that none of them are sufficiently vital as to cripple the Vietcong in their efforts against South Vietnam, is that correct?

General Wheeler. That is essentially correct, Mr. Whitten. I pointed out the other day when I ran over the entire target system—I believe in response to a question from Mr. Sikes—that when we talk of industrial targets in North Vietnam, we are really talking about something that essentially does not exist.

Even so at the levels of conflict in South Vietnam, and with the number of Vietcong and PAVN troops that must be supported, we cannot completely cut off the introduction of supplies. We can hurt them. We can make it cost them more. We cannot cut off the flow of supplies completely.

Mr. Whitten. As I understood it either you or the Secretary said, that while there are some changes as a result of the lull in bombing, really it was not as significant as we might think. That, notwithstanding our bombing, due to the fact it is guerrilla warfare they could supply the troops they had even by human beings on trails. As long as that was true the bombing was not—in line with what you just said—sufficient to strangle their supply system. In other words, their capability of supplying so far exceeds the actual need for the present operation that they would probably have that much if we had kept up bombing. Am I recalling it approximately correct?

General Wheeler. I think Mr. McNamara said the greater part of the statement you made, Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Whitten. I am asking this to clarify it if my recollection is not correct.

General Wheeler. (Off the record.)

Mr. Whitten. Is the chief value of bombing to prevent an enlargement of the Vietcong operation as of now?

General Wheeler. (Off the record.)

Mr. Whitten. I am not trying to play on words but if I could reduce it to this ——— it is very important to keep them from supplying a much larger force.

General Wheeler. That is my judgment, Mr. Whitten.

ABILITY TO PROTECT LOCAL POPULATIONS

Mr. Whitten. On Wednesday, I believe it was stated that we had received some benefit from the bombing in that the North Vietnamese had become convinced that they were not safe.

In other words, that the North Vietnamese Government could not protect them from air attacks. At that time, I could not help but have the thought that the South Vietnamese, by this time, should be equally convinced that we cannot protect them.

Yesterday's Washington Post—and I am quoting the testimony as I remember it over a series of years—carried a story by Jack Foisie of the Los Angeles Times—and I would have to say that this story reflects the impression I have gotten from witnesses on your side of the table, and I read it here:

"Saigon, January 26.—A U.S. spokesman today described the terrorism and sabotage that goes on in South Vietnam every night. He emphasized the havoc the VC inflict on innocent villagers in the belief that they are pro-Government. But in most areas the villagers would stay neutral if they could. The spokesman also wanted to show what damage has been done by the Vietcong to communications that keep the Government-held areas in touch with one another.

"The spokesman in doing this also revealed the Vietnamese-American inability, despite the substantial U.S. buildup that began 10 months ago, to improve the situation in the countryside for the uncommitted peasant. Reading from a summary of reports by American field representatives, the spokesman estimated that no more than 10 percent of the entire Vietnam railroad system is operative because of guerrilla cuts in the line. If true, this is worse than the previous low point of last July, when it was officially reported only 30 percent was so protected."

Is that approximately correct?

General Wheeler. Mr. Whitten, that article is a series of generalized statements drawn from (off the record).

Mr. Whitten. General, that is all right. I do not mean to appear to be abrupt. We have been briefed at the White House. We have been on this committee listening and we have had details. I have yet to hear witnesses say that there is any place where people are perfectly safe. It may be that you are willing to so state. I am asking these questions after listening to a lot of people and I have yet to hear anyone say that there is any place there where we are safe from the guerrilla warfare or from bombs or anything else. Are you willing to say it?

General Wheeler. I am not saying that, sir.

But what I am saying is that this article is an overstatement, a generalization of things that can happen anywhere, the same thing that can happen in Washington, D.C.

When you go out here at night to get into your car, you can get mugged. But generally speaking, Washington, I believe, is a reasonably safe area.

Mr. Whitten. Lots of folks in my area kind of draw an analogy between Washington and Vietnam though I am somewhat surprised at your drawing the same one.

USE OF HUMAN TRANSPORT

There is no need of pursuing that further. I was trying to get this quite clear. It is my understanding that this supply line which we were talking about to the north is something like a thousand miles long.

Of course, one man could not carry 50 pounds a thousand miles. How many points of exchange would there be if the supply lines are so much as a thousand miles long, or do we know?

General Wheeler. We have a feel of it, let me say that.

(Discussion off the record.)

GOVERNMENT DESIRED BY PEOPLE OF VIETNAM

Mr. Whitten. Carrying that one step further, now, I keep hearing that our purpose in Vietnam is to allow—and I believe I quote correctly—allow people to seek their own destiny. The testimony uncontroverted insofar as I recall is that Vietnam has a series of villages ———. We have been told that the people in a village do not know of anything, usually, except their village and the one next to them and do not care. They never have subjected themselves to a central government, do not know what it is, and do not want one.

Now, when we insist that they subject themselves to a central government, how can you say that is permitting people to seek their own destiny?

Secretary McNamara. Mr. Whitten, a very substantial percentage of the people do not live in villages. I would guess that at least 15 percent live in large metropolitan areas, perhaps more than that.

Mr. Whitten. I will limit my question to the other 85 percent.

Secretary McNamara. I would say at least 15 percent. It may well be more.

Second, I do not think it accurately reflects the situation in Vietnam to say that the people, generally, do not know of anything other than the affairs of their own village plus the affairs of the adjacent village.

Mr. Whitten. I may have oversimplified my words.

Secretary McNamara. I am sure that is not the situation there.

Mr. Whitten. I do not want to change the meaning of witnesses who are supposed to be equally well informed.

Secretary McNamara. I do not know which witnesses you are speaking of, but I would be happy to review their testimony. Based on my own knowledge of the situation that is not an accurate assessment of the breadth of concern and awareness of the people in the countryside. I have visited literally hundreds of villages there, and I can testify from personal experience that some of the people in the villages, at least those that I have talked to, are informed of and aware of affairs far beyond the limits of their villages. In particular, they are aware of the kind of an environment in which they would live were North Vietnam to come to dominate their area, and they do not wish to live in that kind of environment. We have other evidence to support that conclusion, not the least of which is the movement of people out of these villages when the Vietcong come into the area.

There are hundreds of thousands of refugees who have left Vietcong-controlled areas because they do not wish to live under that kind of control.

Mr. Whitten. I think it well to say right here that the specific witness I was quoting was ———.

I want to say again I am speaking from recollection. I would not want to tie preceding witnesses to the impression or the understanding I have, but that is where my understanding came from. I also would like to say to you, as Secretary of Defense, I doubt that you saw too many villages in person.

Secretary McNamara. On the contrary, I have seen a large number of villagers. I visited Vietnam six times in the last 5 years, and I have visited the countryside widely. I do not pretend to be an expert on Vietnamese affairs, but I do say that based on my personal knowledge it would not be correct to state that the typical villager's knowledge of his national government or its programs is negligible or that his knowledge is limited to the affairs of his own and nearby villages.

ADEQUACY OF BOMB INVENTORIES

Mr. Whitten. I probably should have prefaced what I said by saying that I just want to understand this.

I am trying to find out where we are and where we are going, and I think the American people are, too. I have the utmost sympathy for you folks because it is your prime job. Is there any credence to the claim that we stopped this bombing because we were short of bombs?

Secretary McNamara. Absolutely none. I will give you the bomb inventories.

(The information requested is classified and was furnished to the committee.)

SUPPLY SHORTAGES

Mr. Whitten. Or other supplies?

Secretary McNamara. Absolutely none.

General Wheeler. May I add something to that?

Mr. Whitten. I asked the question so you can get the answer in the record.

Secretary McNamara. I appreciate that.

General Wheeler. I would like to make a comment, if I might, because I think it is pertinent.

I spent 5 days during the Christmas season visiting Vietnam. I visited Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine units both in Vietnam and in Thailland, and I also visited one of the carriers, staying overnight.

I asked every responsible commander that I saw—and I saw a great many of them down to battalion level—if their operations had been hampered by shortages or deficiencies in consumables. I am talking about ammunition, POL, et cetera. The answer invariably was no, that they had been able to carry out their combat operations.

Secretary McNamara. May I make a further comment, Mr. Whitten, in order to throw light on this subject? I issued an order to the commanders ———. So every bomb that we would have consumed had we continued to bomb North Vietnam has been consumed. It is our estimate or it was our plan, I should say, that during the month of January we would drop 150,000 bombs ———.

That plan was not limited in the slightest degree by bomb shortages.

Mr. Sikes. May I ask one very brief question? I asked the same question of many field commanders and in each instance I was told that there was no essential operation that had been prevented or hindered by lack of supplies.

It was stated, however, that the level of supplies in some areas or in some fields was dropping significantly because of the heavy consumption of supplies and the difficulty of resupplying.

Has that situation been reversed?

General Wheeler. I would not say it is reversed yet, Mr. Sikes. I know that with the improvements that we have obtained over the last couple of months in unloading and in port clearance and so on, the situation is being corrected and we should get up to a very satisfactory operational level of backup in the very near future. In fact, I am thinking in terms now of March for some items and probably June for others.

MILITARY BASE CLOSINGS

Mr. Whitten. We have been going to great limits to let the world know that if the Vietcong do not make peace we are prepared to go all out for whatever is required to get them to the peace table. I listened to Secretary Rusk Sunday afternoon. I have listened here. Since it is very apparent that we are putting on a show of force and a threat of force and a willingness to use it, is there any concern that when you announced a cutback of military bases, that it had any bad effect upon our image in the world?

At that time there were many people, including me, who, whatever the merits and however it might have been done, wondered if to announce this curtailment to the world would indicate that we were weakening.

Did you see any sign of that result?

Secretary McNamara. Mr. Whitten, I have seen no evidence of such a feeling on the part of any foreign power or in the foreign press.

Mr. Whitten. I do not want to cut you off but let me ask you one thing that you might reply to. Is that possibly one of the reasons that they have refused to take advantage of our lull in bombing and come to the peace table. Could that be one of the reasons?

Secretary McNamara. No sir, it could not be one of the reasons.

Mr. Whitten. Why do you say it so flatly?

Secretary McNamara. Because we do have indications of the kinds of information getting through to them and the kind of information that influences their actions. I have seen no evidence that the elimination of surplus and obsolete military bases—at a time when we are rapidly expanding our budget by announcing a supplemental of $12.3 billion to the existing budget—has, in any way influenced them.

Mr. Whitten. Couldn't they take it that we are now waking up and rectifying a mistake?

Secretary McNamara. Are you speaking about the base reduction program as rectifying a mistake?

Mr. Whitten. And planes, et cetera.

Secretary McNamara. I do not see how it would be possible for them to interpret closing obsolete bases as rectifying a mistake. In any event, I can tell you, Mr. Whitten, that no expert that I have talked to has ever even raised this point much less put any weight on it. As a matter of fact, I had one brought over here from London just last week to discuss with me the reaction of the North Vietnamese.

PREVIOUS JUDGEMENTS ON VIETNAM

Mr. Whitten. Let me ask two or three questions and then I shall pass the witness on, Mr. Chairman. Last spring we saw no need for this supplemental. I have in front of me your prior statements, Mr. Secretary. I would not want to read them to you. I would not want mine read to me. I know they were sincere and honest and based on the best information you had. This has not worked out like you folks hoped it would and we had hoped it would. Where have we miscalculated, in your opinion?

Secretary McNamara. There is an indirect reference, and I know you were very gentle even in the indirect reference. With respect to my prior statements——

Mr. Whitten. Let me say this, that this committee has backed your judgment so we are in it, too. I am just asking now with hindsight, where can you point your finger and figure that we miscalculated as a group, not just you?

Secretary McNamara. Mr. Chairman, because of the reference to prior statements and in anticipation of such a reference, I went through my prior statements a few weeks ago, and I have extracted all the pertinent parts relating——

Mr. Whitten. That is all right. Where would you say we miscalculated? That is my question. Don't get away from my question.

Secretary McNamara. I will come to the question. But the question carries an implied reference to prior statements, Mr. Chairman. Therefore, I would ask the permission of the committee to introduce into the record my previous statements on the war in Vietnam. There are 59 of them.

Mr. Whitten. I have no objection to that.

Mr. Mahon. Yes. They will be included at this point.

(Note.—This information appears in vol. I, pp. 57 to 87 of the hearings.)

Mr. Whitten. I am making no condemnation for prior opinion.

Secretary McNamara. I understand. I appreciate that your reference was gentle. Mr. Chairman, the question was, Where was it that we miscalculated?

Mr. Whitten. In your opinion.

Secretary McNamara. I do not know if you should call it a miscalculation. I think it is perfectly clear that the North Vietnamese have continued to increase their support of the Vietcong despite the increase in our effort and that of the South Vietnamese. I say that I do not know whether or not this was a miscalculation. If you go through these statements that I have just inserted in the record, or the statements of President Kennedy or those of President Johnson, you will find that they repeatedly refer to this point, namely, that the response required from us will depend to a considerable degree upon the action taken by the aggressor, in this case, the North Vietnamese. We simply cannot predict their actions accurately. We cannot, therefore predict the amount of force that we will have to bring to bear in order to achieve our political objective. What has happened is that the North Vietnamese have continually increased the amount of resources, men, and material that they have been willing to devote to their objective of subverting and destroying the political institutions of South Vietnam. Whether or not you describe the evolution of the situation in Vietnam as a miscalculation, I think is a question of semantics.

Mr. Whitten. It has not turned out like we thought it would. That is a homely way of putting it, but it has not turned out like we thought it would. Where were we wrong in our thinking? That is bringing it down to a level where we all can understand it.

Secretary McNamara. I think it was hoped that the South Vietnamese by their own efforts could contain the insurgency that the North Vietnamese has initiated inside South Vietnam. Later, when it became very clear they couldn't, it became necessary for us to supply advisers and substantial amounts of equipment to improve their capability for containing the insurgency. Even with this assistance they couldn't contain the Vietcong, because the North Vietnamese were continuing to expand their program of sending men and material into the south.

Mr. Whitten. Let me ask one other question.

(Off the record).

Secretary McNamara. Let me go back because I did not finish——

Mr. Whitten. What is the plan for winning?

Secretary McNamara. Let me go back to the previous question because I did not finish my statement with respect to the changes that have occurred during the past several years which in turn, affected the amount of effort that we have had to put into the struggle.

Mr. Whitten. Don't let us forget my question.

Secretary McNamara. I won't. I want to answer one question at a time, however.

I think that one event that significantly influenced the course of the conflict was the overthrow of Diem which was the result of many forces, most of them not within our control. But the Diem overthrow, as much as anything else, affected the course of the conflict in the following year or two.

This factor, plus the continuing increase in the amount of effort that North Vietnam applied to their objective caused a continuing increase in the amount of force which we have had to apply in South Vietnam.

Now your second question, How do we hope to win?

Mr. Whitten. How do we plan to win?

Secretary McNamara. I am answering the question as it was phrased.

PLAN FOR WINNING THE WAR

Mr. Whitten. Let me change my question, What is our plan to win?

Secretary McNamara. All right, what is our plan to win? We plan with the help of the South Vietnamese to apply sufficient force against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese military units in the south to prove to them that they cannot win in the south. While doing so, we have applied bombing to the north to increase the cost of their operations in the south and to reduce their capability for expanding their operations in the south.

Mr. Whitten. Have we not already tried that and failed, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary McNamara. No. We have not failed, we have not lost.

ECONOMIC COST OF THE WAR

Mr. Whitten. We have not lost, but we certainly have not won. I think you are doing as well as you can with what you have to do in the situation we are in, so I am not being critical—I have yet to find anybody who has a plan to win. We cannot do it by bombing these targets in North Vietnam. I do not know what the relative cost of the war per day in money is to us as compared to them. I do know their standard of living. They carry supplies on their backs. Human beings are almost unlimited in that area of the world. I know it is way around the world from us. Let me interrupt to ask, Have you any comparative dollar cost?

Secretary McNamara. No.

Mr. Whitten. You do not figure war in money, but I am talking about the drain on your economy. Could you give us any kind of comparison as to the relative per day cost to the United States as compared with them?

Secretary McNamara. There is no possible means of developing that financially.

Mr. Whitten. It would be tremendously greater, would it not?

Secretary McNamara. The cost in economic terms is far greater to them than it is to us. One simple indication is that the intelligence estimators conclude that they have diverted from ——— thousand men from other pursuits to rebuild the roads and the bridges which our bombing has destroyed. And that particular diversion of the work force is but a minor part of their cost of carrying on their operations against the south. Out of a society that has a total adult male population of perhaps 4 or 5 million, that is a tremendous drain for just one part of their war activity. So there is no question but what the relative economic cost to them is far greater than it is to us.

PLAN FOR WINNING THE WAR

General Wheeler. May I answer your question about what is our plan? You said you do not know of a plan.

Mr. Whitten. I would be glad to have you do so.

General Wheeler. Before I do, though, I would like to put in one remark that is perhaps not completely germane to this. (Off the record.)

Mr. Whitten. The closing of bases and cutting back of the military.

General Wheeler. No, sir.

That is my point. Now let me go to the other one if I might. We have actually had in South Vietnam substantial numbers of U.S. and free world combat forces for about 6 months. You should recognize that even then the weight of effort has been available only within about the last 2 months.

The Republic of Korea division, for example, was only available to General Westmoreland in a combat configuration late in the month of November. General Westmoreland has achieved to date, precisely what we estimated he would have achieved with these accruals of force; namely, he has reversed an adverse trend of military events. While he has not yet achieved a momentum which will give him "victory," he actually has just begun his campaign. His concept, which is, I believe, a sound concept and one to which I subscribe, is this——

Mr. Mahon. You mean the South Vietnamese?

General Wheeler. Yes, sir. (Off the record.) It is not going to be a quick process, but it has been successful to date.

Mr. Whitten. You use the word "win" the war, and it is natural. What do you mean by "win" the war?

General Wheeler. I mean, sir, the political objective set for us by the President; namely, a free and independent Vietnam which can pursue its own destiny unhampered and unpressured by outside forces, has been met.

EVENTS WHICH WOULD FOLLOW PEACE AGREEMENT

Mr. Whitten. This is the last question, Mr. Chairman. As you can imagine I could go on all day and we all could. What if tomorrow Hanoi and the North Vietnamese Government would say that we will agree that the South Vietnamese may go their own way and follow their destiny, whether it is in a local village or in a central government; we will agree that each village that does not want to be subjected to any central government be like it wants to be? If they send us that message through channels and it reached you and it reached the White House, what would we do?

Secretary McNamara. I am not clear what you said about each village.

Mr. Whitten. I said if they agree.

Secretary McNamara. Pardon me?

Mr. Whitten. You said you did not understand. I want to make it clear, Mr. Secretary. If they agreed that they would do what we claim we want them to do.

Secretary McNamara. That is not the way it was phrased.

Mr. Whitten. I will change it because I am not playing on words. This situation is serious and I think the American people are like me, I do not think they believe that we have a plan to win.

Secretary McNamara. Let me say this: If tomorrow, North Vietnam says they will agree to do what we want——

Mr. Whitten. What will we do?

Secretary McNamara. Then, we would plan to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam as soon as the North Vietnamese demonstrated that they were sincere and had a real plan of action for the withdrawal of their subversive forces and would allow the South Vietnamese Government to develop, unhampered, stable political institutions in areas now controlled by the Vietcong. As soon as it was evident that the North Vietnamese were carrying out such a pledge, we would withdraw our forces and allow the Government of South Vietnam to work with its people as any other government does.

Mr. Whitten. Pending that time we would insist keeping our people there to enforce it.

Secretary McNamara. To enforce what?

Mr. Whitten. To enforce the carrying out of the agreement.

Secretary McNamara. We would stay only to protect the Government and the people of South Vietnam against a violation of the agreement.

Mr. Whitten. At this stage, and this is my last question: Haven't they convinced you that there will never be any agreement as long as a part of it is that you insist that you keep your people there to enforce such agreement?

Secretary McNamara. No; I do not think that this is a major element of the problem.

Mr. Whitten. What is your feeling based on?

Secretary McNamara. In the first place we do not insist that we keep our forces there, as you put it. The enforcement of an agreement is not part of our proposal, nor have we ever made any public statement to that effect.

Mr. Whitten. I thought you told me that is what you would do.

Secretary McNamara. No, I simply said——

Mr. Whitten. Mr. McNamara, what would we do then?

Secretary McNamara. I said that if tomorrow the North Vietnamese pledge that they will do what we want them to do, we will withdraw our forces as we see evidence in their actions that they are carrying out that pledge. The actions that we would like to see are: the withdrawal of their military units from South Vietnam and the cessation of their direction and support of the Vietcong and the guerrillas who are attempting to subvert the political institutions in the south.

INDICATIONS OF NORTH VIETNAMESE STOPPING AGGRESSION

Mr. Whitten. At this stage, having had your experience and having at least been thwarted in our high hopes—if you do not like the word "miscalculate"—what evidence is there in the actions of the Vietcong, Hanoi, or the North Vietnamese Government, that leads you to have any hopes that they will change their attitude?

Secretary McNamara. We see signs of dissension among the political leaders of the north. We see signs of strain on their economy. We know that they see the buildup as General Wheeler mentioned a moment ago, of our capability to inflict even higher levels of casualties on the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. I think it is a reasonable conclusion that at some point these rising casualties, and these higher costs, and these increasing strains are going to become so great that they will conclude that they cannot win in the south. When they reach this conclusion, they will be unwilling to continue to bear the costs of a program that cannot achieve their objectives.

Mr. Whitten. I keep wanting to end my questions because I am taking too much time. You say they cannot win and you say we can win because we have not lost.

THE BUDGET—NOT THE MAJOR CONCERN

So far as arguments about budgets are concerned, I served in my State legislature when I was 21. I learned then that a budget represents the highest hopes of the administration for income from taxes and the greatest expectation for holding down expenditures; and the other side never accepts such estimates and is usually right. I have not seen any difference here in Congress, either under the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. It works the same as State administrations.

This argument has very little to do with this bill before us now, where we are in trouble up to the ears and where we are going to have to take firm steps to back the men in the service. This money will be gone when we appropriate it, but it will be used for an absolutely essential and necessary purpose.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the supplemental appropriation of $13.1 billion to back up our commitment of men and material in South Vietnam.

There is no debating the immediate necessity in approving these funds. Indeed, I predicted as early as last summer that these funds would be required. I strongly urge unanimous and anticipate quick approval by the House. Nearly 300,000 of our American troops in the Far East are looking to us for prompt support of their efforts to defeat Communist aggression.

But, as a member of the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee which took initial action on this supplemental request, I would be remiss if I did not call the attention of my colleagues to the additional views accompanying the report on the bill before us. The debate thus far has not given these views the attention they deserve.

In these additional views Congressmen Lipscomb and Laird and I point out the diminishing effectiveness of the appropriations system under the heavy-handed practices of the Department of Defense.

Within the last few years we have grown increasingly concerned as the Defense Subcommittee and the Congress are relegated more and more to the role of rubberstamp in approving the dictates of the Department of Defense.

The appearances of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their backup witnesses, grow more perfunctory each year. The abuse of the "top secret" stamp to blank out politically sensitive portions of their testimony before the subcommittee is evermore in evidence. It has reached the point where witnesses have in effect withheld their own views from the committee unless pressed, and, when pressed, argue against their own position if it is contrary to top level Department of Defense policy.

We three minority members of the subcommittee feel that a blackout on much essential information was reached some time ago as far as the American public is concerned. It is approaching a critical point as far as the Defense Subcommittee is involved.

I call to the attention of the House that there were only 2 days of hearings on the bill we will pass today.

It is our strong conviction that insufficient attention was paid to maintaining sufficient forces to meet U.S. commitments in portions of the world other than Vietnam. We are convinced that defense needs have been underestimated in the 1967 budget now under consideration, just as they were underestimated last year, and that there will be supplemental requests later this year similar to the one before us this afternoon.

For those of you who have not had an opportunity to carefully read the additional views in the report, let me quote from the summary:

> The growing frequency of reprograming actions is of particular concern because it represents, in effect, a bypassing of Congress on matters that are often of critical concern.
>
> The financing of the war by supplemental demonstrates a growing lack of planning which could, if not altered, produce serious risks for the future security of the United States, and, indeed of the free world.
>
> The growing tendency on the part of committees of Congress to consider grave matters in perpetual haste can only insure a continued and rapidly increasing loss of control by the Congress over executive decisions and actions.
>
> This committee has a vital role to play in insuring an adequate defense posture for the United States. That role cannot be discharged without full cooperation from the executive branch.
>
> Nor will it be discharged properly and effectively until the Congress and its committees reassert their traditional powers.

I strongly subscribe to these sentiments.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman] such time as he may consume.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the supplemental defense appropriation for 1966.

Last November I had an opportunity to visit Marine units in Vietnam. Much of my time was spent with the 3d Marine Division, the same division I served with in the Second World War.

Unfounded reports have been circulated concerning the adequacy of supplies for our troops. I found that our servicemen were well equipped with every necessary item for the conduct of their operations. In fact, they are better equipped than we were in World War II.

The fact remains that the Marines are responsible for the pacification and security of vast land areas in the vicinity of Da Nang, Chu Lai, and Hue Phu Bei. Their objectives cannot be achieved without more men and support.

The funds we are asked to approve today will serve a vital function in supplying more men, supplies, and construction in Vietnam. In addition, this appropriation will speed the activation of the 5th Marine Division at Camp Pendleton, Calif. This division, in turn, constitutes an essential support for our Vietnamese efforts.

American and allied personnel in Vietnam deserve our strongest backing. The supplemental defense appropriation is required if the United States is to maintain our firm policy in resisting Communist aggression. That firm policy is our best hope of achieving a negotiated settlement.

The specific appropriations for the Marine Corps are: $184,600,000 for personnel, $102,600,000 for operation and maintenance and $516,600,000 for procurement. In each instance I am glad to say that our Appropriations Committee has recommended the full amount requested by the Department of Defense.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, many people ask why we are in South Vietnam. We are there because we agreed to help the people of South Vietnam establish their new nation. This they were doing with remarkable progress until North Vietnam, in violation of the Geneva accords, organized, armed, and directed the National Liberation Front—Vietcong—in a campaign of terror and aggression to impose communism on the people of South Vietnam. We are helping South Vietnam to resist that aggression. It is fruitless to debate now whether or not we should have undertaken this course. We did so. If we fail to honor our present commitments, we will encourage similar Communist aggression elsewhere.

Vietnam is the latest of many efforts by the Communist nations to expand their territory, and it must be viewed in its proper historical perspective.

In 1947 President Truman enunciated the Truman doctrine as follows:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure.

In pursuance of that policy, massive U.S. aid to Greece and Turkey saved both nations from Communist conquest. We followed the same policy successfully in Lebanon. Soviet Russia eventually satisfied itself that we would not permit further expansion in Europe and the Near East and turned its attentions elsewhere.

The war in Korea was part of the same pattern. Our resistance halted Communist expansion in that part of Asia. The Chinese have shown an appreciation of our firm intentions and our power with respect to Formosa, and have refrained from attacking in that area even though it must be the prize they desire above all others. Now we are resisting the effort to expand into southeast Asia. Many people fear that we risk war with China or that we are on a course that will lead inevitably to such a war. In my opinion, the lessons of history show that war with China would be far more likely if we permit them to succeed in their aggression in Vietnam. If we stand firm in Vietnam, history leads me to believe that the Chinese in Asia, like the Russians in Europe, may turn from unrewarding aggression to more peaceful endeavors.

Recent discussion has centered about two questions. The first is: Who should participate in a peace conference? The second is: What should be the government of South Vietnam during and after a conference? Related to these questions are various suggestions to submit the whole problem to the U.N. or to propose arbitration by the countries who participated in the Geneva conferences.

In my opinion, these are artificial and academic questions.

The United States has made clear, time after time, that we wish to go to a peace conference. We are ready to negotiate. We have asked the U.N. to help. We have said that there will be no difficulty in having the views of the Vietcong represented at a peace conference. This is not an insurmountable problem.

The insurmountable problem is the fact that North Vietnam will not agree to a peace conference. It will not agree to arbitration. It will not agree to a U.N. settlement of the dispute. North Vietnam has said repeatedly that it will settle the whole business only if we would recognize the Vietcong as the sole representative of South Vietnam and if we will withdraw our troops. These are conditions that North Vietnam insist upon before any conference, arbitration, or other discussion can begin. In other words, North Vietnam demands the unconditional surrender of South Vietnam and its allies including the United States. It is fruitless for us to have a domestic argument over this issue. Our Government has explored and continued to explore every possible avenue for settling the conflict. North Vietnam is not willing.

The second question, What shall be the government of South Vietnam during and after a conference? is the central issue of the conflict. South Vietnam is a nation recognized by 70 other nations of the world. We cannot and do not wish to impose a government on this nation and we are fighting to prevent the Communists from doing so. We have said that we will abide by the results of a free election.

Then there is the question of the conduct of the war. Many letters suggest a blockade, quarantine, the bombing of various targets. I am not a military strategist, but I do believe that the air and sea power of the United States could be employed more effectively than has been the case to date and that we can and should bring this conflict to a speedy conclusion. Moreover, I believe that great improvements can be made in the support of our troops. We can and must make certain that they have everything that is required for the success of their mission and for their personal safety and comfort insofar as either can be provided under the conditions of war.

We have suffered many casualties in South Vietnam. This heartrending loss can be justified only if we achieve the objectives we have set. If aggression is rewarded in Vietnam the same tactic will be tried elsewhere and the cost of overcoming it may be far greater than the price we are paying today. Nations that seek peace at any price usually find the price is a downpayment on a bigger war.

I believe it is necessary that we pass this supplemental today. I would hope that it would pass unanimously so that we can demonstrate to the world the solidarity of the representatives of the people in the conflict in which we are now engaged.

There will be other supplementals in the near future, not involving Vietnam, which I will not support as I am supporting this one. And it seems to me that this is a proper time to add a word of caution as to the terrific burden we are putting on the shoulders of the taxpayers of this Nation of ours. The interest on our national debt is costing us almost $25,000 every minute.

We cannot continue to build this great public debt and avoid inflation, which is not just threatening us, but which is actually here. It would seem to me that two courses lie ahead. Either we cut down this excessive spending in many of the Great Society areas or we substantially increase taxes. I shall not at this time spell out specific items which, if not entirely eliminated from future consideration, should be delayed at this period when we are engaged in a conflict such as the one in South Vietnam. It is not difficult for my colleagues to know the areas where these cuts can be made.

It would also seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come when a careful review should be made as to the extent of our commitments in Europe and careful consideration should be given to the withdrawal from Europe of many of our troops. If President de Gaulle seems so confident that NATO is no longer necessary, then it would seem to me that it is time that we bring many of our forces and their dependents now living abroad home. This not only would reduce these great expenditures, but would also help solve our balance-of-payments problem.

We cannot and should not continue down the road we have been traveling these many months and years, but we must again embark upon a program of fiscal responsibility if we are not to destroy at home that which we are fighting to preserve in southeast Asia.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], our distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to compliment the Committee on Appropriations and its various subcommittees that have had jurisdiction over the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the full committee and the subcommittee have done a first-class job in responding to the request of the executive branch of the Government. Also I wish to compliment those three Members of the minority who did write excellent minority views setting forth the minority's viewpoint on certain aspects of defense policy and the carrying out of the programs thereunder.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the record is clear that the Department of Defense in the past year has been uncertain as to what its needs were. This uncertainty has resulted in their underestimating the expenditures which have developed in the prosecution of the conflict in Vietnam.

This underestimating of expenditures, Mr. Chairman, has to a substantial degree created some of our economic problems which we are facing domestically today. The uncertainty as to the course of the war and our policy and the underestimation of expenditures by the Defense Department has created to a very significant degree the inflationary pressures which we face in the United States at the present time.

I believe that the Department of Defense could have done a better job in the last 12 months in forecasting what their expenditures would be. It is my hope that their forecast of expenditures for the next 12 months are more accurate. If these estimates are not more accurate, we will be faced with an even more serious inflationary problem than we have on our doorstep at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this country has had during my time here in the Congress outstanding men on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has been my privilege over the years to know many of them intimately. I was annually privileged from 1953 through 1964 to hear the testimony of the able members of the Joint Chiefs for a period of 12 years. I think this country is blessed that men of their caliber and their experience are giving us the kind of military advice and leadership that is so essential in the crisis we face at the present time. It is my most sincere hope that the Commander in Chief, who was elected by the American people, will follow the wise and sound recommendations of these men who over the years have dedicated their lives to giving this country the kind of military strength and leadership that we need in this crucial hour.

At times in past months I have felt that our military leaders' advice has not been followed to the degree that it should have been. But be that as it may, with the problems getting more and more critical in Vietnam and elsewhere, it is my strong belief that the Commander in Chief should to the maximum degree follow the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs under the leadership of our able Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Wheeler.

Mr. Chairman, it seems at the present that our Nation is following a course of action of strength against Communist aggression in southeast Asia. It appears to me our Nation is meeting the challenge of communism in South Vietnam. This legislation we have before us today will give substance to the ability of our troops and our military leaders to meet this challenge.

Mr. Chairman, the approval of this legislation today will back up the policy, the posture, and the position that I think our Government is taking in Vietnam today. It may not be enough and there may be more required in the months ahead. But this is a tangible way for every one of us to indicate our support for what appears to be our Nation's policy at the moment.

It is crystal clear to me that anyone who votes for this legislation is endorsing the policy currently being executed by the Commander in Chief.

Let me add this postscript. When the roll is called today—and I trust there will be a unanimous vote for this legislation—I do hope there will not be qualifying statements made outside of the Chamber. I hope there will not be petitions signed which would, in effect, withdraw the kind of support that an "aye" vote gives to the position, the posture, and the policy that I think our Nation has and ought to have in this crisis.

I think the President, if he is to follow this course of action, must have our support in its execution, in its implementation, and in the funding requirements to carry out that policy.

People cannot vote "aye" today and then issue a statement tomorrow withdrawing support. An "aye" vote means just one thing—that the elected Commander in Chief of our country, whether we voted for him or not, will have $13 billion to use for the purpose of supporting a position of firmness against Communist aggression.

If more is needed, this House and the other Chamber will make it available.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the vote today will be unanimous.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, of course, with most of what the distinguished minority leader has said I am certainly in agreement, particularly with respect to the last part of his fine speech. I believe the gentleman has said that the Defense Department has been uncertain as to what its requirements are. I would like to comment briefly on that one statement. Of course, there has been an element of uncertainty in what the problem was going to be in Vietnam, and there is still that element of uncertainty. There are so many possibilities in the picture that it would be almost impossible for anyone to prognosticate what is going to happen 6 months, a year, or 2 years from now in that part of the world.

I think the gentleman would agree with me that it would be the part of wisdom to base estimates of needed expenditures on facts that are known, or reasonably known and reasonably projected, rather than simply upon unreviewed future possible requirements that are not within the reasonable knowledge of those who are making the estimates. I am sure the gentleman does not want the Congress to make available for military spending huge and unreviewed sums of money.

The gentleman will recall that during the Korean war defense appropriations increased $35 billion in 1 year, durable goods manufacturing industries' volume of unfilled orders increased by $34 billion in 1 year, and wholesale prices skyrocketed by 11.4 percent between 1950 and 1951.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In response to the observations of my good friend, the able majority leader, I do not believe that we can compare the circumstances of June 1950 with the circumstances of the last 6 or 12 months. In 1950, as I recall, we had had submitted to us a military budget for $13 billion, and all of a sudden, in late June of 1950, we were faced with a very grave and critical military situation in Korea. Almost over night the Congress, as I recall, went from the budget that had been submitted by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, of $13 billion, to a military budget of $70 to $80 billion.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with what the gentleman is saying. The circumstances are certainly different. But the effects of overfunding and overappropriating are not different; and that is the point I am trying to make. Requests for appropriations should be based on careful consideration of needs and resources. Appropriations should be requested when needs are known and not when we do not know how much might be needed. It is not the part of wisdom to overappropriate and to permit excessive funding.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me respond and then I will yield to my friend from Wisconsin. It does not seem to me that the Congress, in light of the fact that we have had three supplemental bills, and in light of the probability that we are going to have another supplemental in the next month or so, has overappropriated. It hardly seems fair to say that we have overappropriated.

Mr. ALBERT. I am not saying that we have overappropriated. I am merely advising that it would not be the part of wisdom to do so. I am trying to defend the position which the administration has taken. I think its course under the facts known at the time requests were made has been sound.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is quite a difference, as the gentleman knows, between making obligation authority available and actual expenditures.

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, that is true.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I do not believe that the Defense Department has asked for an adequate amount of obligation authority.

Mr. ALBERT. I think that is a question of judgment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And for this reason, they have had to come back periodically for their various supplementals.

But, leaving that aside, even with the obligation authority they had available and that which they anticipated the Congress would give them, they have not accurately forecast their expenditures. Military expenditures which have been underestimated have created or caused the serious inflation to a substantial degree in the circumstances of our economy today.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course they have not always accurately forecast what was going to happen. Had they done that, they undoubtedly would have asked for exactly what they needed, which would be ideal. Again, however, I commend the gentleman on the balance of his remarks.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the kind comments made by the gentleman from Oklahoma on other portions of my remarks. As he well knows, people probably far wiser than we and more knowledgeable than we on these intricate problems of the economy and inflation have honorably disagreed. So on this issue I do not mind disagreeing with my friend from Oklahoma. I am delighted that on the other areas there is a high degree of unanimity on the position of our country and the policy we ought to follow.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS].

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this subcommittee, I support this bill.

There has been a lot of argument about how we got into Vietnam and whether or not we should be there, and so on. In my opinion such arguments are academic. The fact remains that our people are committed in South Vietnam today, our men are being wounded and killed in South Vietnam, our flag is being fired upon in South Vietnam. It behooves Americans to support those men in South Vietnam all the way, and that is all this bill does. It provides the tools of war for our men in the hope—in the prayerful hope—Mr. Chairman, that this war can soon be terminated.

I hope that there is not a single vote against this bill, on a rollcall, so that we let the world know that this Congress is supporting our fighting men in South Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN].

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, for the past 12 years this Nation has had the opportunity to aid in establishing a popular and stable government in South Vietnam. For at least 11 of those 12 years they, and we, have failed.

As a result, today our youth are slogging through the mud in South Vietnam, killing—and dying—in order to preserve for this Nation a longer time, the opportunity, the possibility to try once again. For that is all our soldiers can accomplish. That is all this appropriation can accomplish—to gain time and to hold open an opportunity.

We owe these brave and uncomplaining men and the Vietnamese people on whose land they fight—the greatest possible effort on our part to form, to build, to secure a government in South Vietnam which is popular enough to quell the conflict, and to build an economy there which is productive enough to support its peoples.

Hundreds of American civilians have committed their energies, some even their lives, in South Vietnam in the past months, to build the base and structure of social and economic and political life needed in that land in order that a government, in those famous words, "of the people, by the people, and for the people" can be created and then prevail.

Thousands of American troops are needed there now, to provide protection for the harassed and fearful Vietnamese villagers and farmers.

But can only a few hundred civilians complete this enormous task: the reconstruction of a society, in a reasonable time, so that the opportunity for which our 220,000 soldiers fight is not simply wasted? Are we not failing our troops tragically, by hoping that this small band of only a few hundred can untangle the inheritance of centuries of misrule?

Our record for the past 12 years is not impressive. The reasons are many. But one stands out.

In earlier years it was difficult for us to accept the necessity for military intervention in South Vietnam. Today, it remains difficult for us to accept that we must participate and intervene far more aggressively, not only in the economic, but also in the social and political fields.

If we are not prepared to do this, then we should get out of South Vietnam at once. Yet, while many of our citizens strongly support the conscription of our young men to service with gun and flamethrower, sadly enough we find very few of those citizens willing to go to South Vietnam to serve in a civilian capacity: to rebuild and build anew.

The Agency for International Development needs men in Vietnam. The International Voluntary Services, a nongovernmental organization similar to the Peace Corps, needs men for Vietnam.

I ask that all of us here, and the leaders in our administration, urgently emphasize the great and immediate need of this Nation for courageous men and women to serve in these absolutely essential roles. I am certain that our citizens desire to live someday in peace, as brothers, with the peoples in Asia.

I will support this appropriation of money, but I ask others here to support my request to pay this money to the right men. Our current course of action will not produce the result we seek unless we rebalance our efforts.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain language provisions in the legislation before us, and I would call your attention specifically to section 102. The version of the bill before us contains the language proposed by the President in his budget estimate. However, the conference version of the bill authorizing our military procurement items, and so forth, provided language somewhat different than that which had been proposed.

I shall offer an amendment to make the language in this bill comport not to the budget language, but to the language which has been agreed to and which, I understand, has become the law. I shall offer an amendment which will strengthen the position of the Congress insofar as the control of these funds is concerned. It will be submitted, of course, during the reading of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I now ask that the Clerk read.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Department of Defense supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $13,135,719,000.

My support is based upon the necessity and the awareness that these funds must be provided to back up our Nation's commitment of men and material in Vietnam. In recent days we have learned that another 20,000 American military men have been committed to Vietnam which will bring our total forces there to approximately 235,000 in the near future.

There is included in this supplemental appropriations bill $375 million in foreign military assistance funds and $315 million for economic assistance to South Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and the Dominican Republic. Another $100 million is allocated to the contingency fund.

The minority members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee have expressed a deep concern, which I share, about "the growing disregard evidenced on the part of the executive branch toward the appropriations process."

They cited the fact that a massive $12.3 billion supplemental request was considered in the short span of 2 days by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

It should also be pointed out that the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, on which I serve, held but 1 day of hearings on the economic and military assistance requests contained in this bill.

In the area of foreign aid, the administration has promised new directions of this massive assistance program. Such redirection and reevaluation of the program should be undertaken deliberately and not through deficiency fund requests.

In this supplemental request there are certain programs which are worthy of our support. One of these is civil police programs in Thailand and Vietnam.

A substantial amount of the supplemental request for Thailand will go for this police program including such equipment as radios and transmitters. It is my understanding that approximately $27 million will be allocated for public safety and police in Vietnam.

On the recent trip which I made with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee [Mr. PASSMAN], I had the opportunity of seeing firsthand the police training program in Thailand. I was impressed by the work of Mr. Jeter L. Williamson, the Chief of the Public Safety Division of our U.S. Operations Mission in Thailand and of other American experts assisting the Thais in this important program. This is a practical kind of program conducted by the United States to help the Government of Thailand increase the security of its border area and rapidly develop the counterinsurgency capability of the Thai civil police. This same kind of program is being conducted in Vietnam and I was advised that it will cover 72,000 men there.

There are questions which await answers as we consider this further funding to support the American commitment in Vietnam.

Why does not the administration more aggressively pursue necessary efforts to bring about a halt to free world shipping to North Vietnam?

When I questioned the Administrator of the Agency for International Development last month regarding this problem, he advised me, and I quote from the hearings:

> Last November, the only ships that called at North Vietnam outside of the Communist bloc countries were several flying the British flag but actually based in Hong Kong. We are not, of course, providing any U.S. assistance to Britain.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are disturbed, as am I, by the continuing trade by our allies with North Vietnam when American lives are being lost in faroff Vietnam.

The American people are puzzled by administration policy which calls for instant cooperation with Great Britain in its difficulties with Rhodesia; but deals softly with the British regarding their trade with North Vietnam.

Last year I made a motion at the time we had the conference report on foreign aid appropriations before the House to stop aid to the countries shipping materials to North Vietnam. That motion was defeated, and the President retained authority to use his discretion in giving such aid. In recent months, there has been legislation introduced to bar countries serving North Vietnam from sending their ships to U.S. ports. The administration has blacklisted certain ships from carrying Government-financed cargoes; but this action does not go far enough.

Another question which many Americans are asking: What is being done to secure the cooperation and participation of our allies in the Vietnam conflict?

The American people have poured billions of dollars into aiding our European allies, both militarily and economically, since World War II. Now that the United States has gone to the aid of South Vietnam, it is obvious that the response for meaningful assistance from our allies has not been deafening.

We will, however, examine very carefully and with interest the administration's 1967 foreign aid budgets for respective countries around the world. We will keep in mind the 235,000 Americans who are on the frontlines fighting communism in southeast Asia, and in the political vernacular, we will ask the administration spokesmen:

"What have these countries we are aiding done for us lately?"

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe my position is clear on our commitment in southeast Asia. I have been opposed to our military policy in Vietnam. I am strongly opposed to escalation of the war, and I am distressed by the deterioration of our foreign and domestic policies which has been brought on by our Vietnam operations.

I will vote for H.R. 13546, the supplemental southeast Asia appropriation measure before this House today. I will do so because I feel it is unwise to decide policy issues through the appropriations process. It is the job of the authorizing committees to debate policy matters. It is the job of the Appropriations Committees to oversee the administration of duly authorized funds.

A year ago, I opposed the $700 million supplemental appropriation for Vietnam. I oppose that appropriation because it was used only as a ruse to obtain approval of administration policy in Vietnam. The $13.1 billion appropriation before us today—19 times as much money as we approved on May 5, 1965—has been duly authorized. My policy reservations have been stated earlier. Today I can but remind my colleagues of them.

My vote for this appropriation means two things. It does not alone mean that I do not believe it is proper to express my policy preferences in an appropriations measure. It also means that an appropriations measure should not be used by anyone else to express their policy preferences. My vote today is not an endorsement of our past policy in Vietnam. It is not an endorsement of our future policy in Vietnam. It is not an endorsement of military escalation. It is not an endorsement of the mining of Haiphong Harbor. And, it is not an endorsement of any increase in troop commitments. It is merely a certification of prior House action on authorization measures.

In supporting this measure and discussing it with my colleagues in the House today, I am compelled to make certain observations about its contents. In voting $13.1 billion today, we are doing many things, and must be aware of them.

We are appropriating $275 million for economic assistance programs within Vietnam. However, we are in this same bill appropriating $742.6 million for military construction within Vietnam alone. Thus we will spend in the coming fiscal year 270 percent more money for military construction than for socioeconomic reconstruction. And, we are spending $3.2 billion for aircraft procurement and $2.1 billion for procurement of munitions and associated equipment. All of this money, as the report of our able Committee on Appropriations states, is "the amount of the budget estimates for the military, military assistance, and economic assistance programs of the Government directly related to operations in southeast Asia." Thus, in the coming fiscal year, our country will spend $1.1 billion to build in Vietnam, and $5.3 billion for the aircraft and munitions which will destroy the resources of Vietnam. As I told this House only 13 days ago, we will continue to see destruction outpacing development. We will continue to see our military commitment make a mockery of our calls for economic development; for a policy of millions for development and billions for destruction cannot succeed.

My colleagues should also be aware that, despite the opening disclaimer of the Appropriations Committee report, not all the money in H.R. 13546 is going to programs related to southeast Asia. Twenty-five million dollars is going to the Dominican Republic in the form of economic aid.

Finally, we should be aware that the $375 million appropriated for foreign military assistance will, according to the committee report, "be recorded on the books of the military assistance program and paid to the applicable procurement appropriation accounts of the military services, to reimburse those accounts for the value of goods already delivered to military assistance recipients." A minority of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee noted that this "was given scant attention by this committee." I would only note that in our debates over the misuse of foreign military aid, we should not allow such aid to be awarded through the military appropriation proper. Foreign military aid is a separate issue with distinct problems, and should be considered separately.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this massive, supplemental defense appropriation bill. The Nation is engaged in a critical war and our military efforts must be fully supported.

Nevertheless, I am deeply concerned about the manner in which this legislation is being handled. We are here acting on a bill appropriating $12,345,719,000 for the military functions of the Department of Defense, $375 million for the President to allot in military assistance, and $415 million for him to allocate in economic assistance.

This vast total is being handled in a supplemental appropriation bill on which the Appropriation Committee held only 2 days of hearings. In that time, of course, only the most cursory consideration could be given. In effect, Congress is unable to perform its constitutional task of carefully scrutinizing the administration's requests and weighing them in detail.

In view of this haste, one must question the wisdom and foresight of a government which, just a few months ago, did not conceive of these enormous extra expenses, reduced taxes and said we could afford them but now has to raise them and seek from Congress an additional $13 plus billion.

Either the Government has not been honest in telling us what the war in Vietnam was going to cost or its planning has been extremely bad.

One does not wish to think that the Government does not know what it is doing nor does one wish to think that it is deliberately concealing facts from the public. It is hard, however, to avoid reaching either one conclusion or the other or, indeed, both.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first supplemental defense appropriation bill in this session for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. It embodies the $4.8 billion which the House authorized on March 1.

When the $4.8 billion authorization bill was before the House, I pointed out that a basic issue of policy was involved. It was, I said, a bill to finance escalation, not to finance an existing policy. I spelled out in my speech on March 1 my reasons for opposing what I called a policy of mindful escalation and my view that a policy of stabilization should be pursued. What I said then applies today.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of this appropriations bill is the $4.8 billion which was authorized on March 1. In effect, the appropriation contains an escalation rider. It is not simply an appropriation to support the present effort in Vietnam. The funds are intended to escalate the war. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], said earlier this afternoon that "the war will escalate and grow in intensity."

This is not simply an appropriation to provide supplies and equipment to the courageous American fighting men who are engaged in combat. If that were the purpose, there would be no argument. As long as they are committed to battle, our dedicated forces must be adequately equipped, supplied, and protected in carrying out assigned missions. The real issue is the policy question embedded in the authorization and now in the appropriation.

In my speech on the supplemental defense authorization on March 1, I discussed what I understood to be the implications of our vote. I said then that a debate was raging between those who believe that we should stabilize the war and those who believe that we should escalate it mindfully. That debate still continues.

The only opportunity the House has to express its views on foreign policy is when we are asked to authorize or appropriate funds. If we are to participate in this debate on Vietnam policy, we must do so this afternoon. An affirmative vote, no matter how individual Members of the House may regard it, will be interpreted by the administration and the public as a full endorsement of administration policy. A vote for this bill is a vote for the escalation rider as well.

My vote this afternoon is not an easy one to cast. My thoughts are very much with the gallant American fighting men in Vietnam. They should not be denied anything they need. I, too, fought in a jungle war in the Pacific some 20 years ago. However, the administration has asked us to appropriate funds to allow the President to escalate the war. Once again the crucial question is not whether we will support the men in the field, but whether we will give the President the funds to commit hundreds of thousands of additional young men to this war on the Asian mainland. As the Vietnam war stands today, this I am unwilling to do.

Mr. Chairman, instead of pursuing a policy of extended escalation leading to an unlimited war in an "open-ended" military situation, as Senator MANSFIELD's report described it, the administration in a stabilized situation should explore realistic alternatives to escalation. As I have said so often, the conflict in Vietnam is not susceptible to a wholly military solution. It must be resolved politically and diplomatically.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Supporting assistance

For an additional amount for "Supporting assistance", $315,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask a question or two concerning the emergency fund of $200 million.

Is this in the nature of a blank check to the Department of Defense or to the Executive, or what is it?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman talking about the funds for military construction or the contingency fund?

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the language as shown in the report on page 12—Secretary of Defense, $200 million for an emergency fund.

Mr. MAHON. This is military construction. As the gentleman knows, this bill contains $1 billion, plus, for military construction, most of which is in Vietnam. The course of the war is rather unpredictable. This is the sum of money made available in order to meet the situations as they may arise.

Mr. GROSS. Then, this is for the specific purpose of construction?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Now, how about the $100 million for the contingency fund? This seems to be a blank check to the President.

I was disappointed in reading the hearings of the gentleman's committee on this bill in that there was no indication as to how this money is to be expended.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, it is a contingency fund. It is impossible to predict how a contingency fund will be used. It may all be used in Vietnam and some of it might be used in Africa. It might be used elsewhere. However, it is available to protect the interest of the United States in this area of activity.

I do not believe anyone can tell us how it might be used. I wish it would not be necessary to use it at all.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas suggested another question when he said "Africa."

Does the gentleman have any idea as to how much money has been expended from the contingency fund for the purpose of joining with the British in the outrageous boycott of Rhodesia—in other words, using contingency funds to pay for the airlifting of oil and gasoline into Zambia, which has been cut off from its normal supply through Rhodesia?

Can the gentleman from Texas bring us up to date on how many millions have been expended up to this point in financing the British boycott?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not able myself to give the gentleman the answer as to what funds may have been expended in connection with this problem.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any part of the fear that I have that through this action in which we are presently engaged—this boycott of a friendly government—we may be committing ourselves to another war, this time on the continent of Africa?

Mr. MAHON. I do not have any fear that we are committing ourselves to another war. It may be that not all of us fully support the actions with respect to Rhodesia, but this is one of the facets of our foreign policy, on which people may differ. However, the purpose of this fund is certainly not primarily for use in Africa, but to be available if necessary principally for activities associated with the war in Vietnam.

Theoretically, of course, it could be used in other places.

Mr. GROSS. Well, the contingency fund voted for the President is being used for this purpose. My question went to how much has been used and how deeply are we being committed. The Queen of England served notice as late as last week that if necessary the British would send troops to invade Rhodesia, and already we are hearing talk of the same tactics being applied to the Republic of South Africa.

Just how deeply we are being committed is a grave question that should be of concern to every American.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Iowa is himself an important member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and I assume he is familiar with this matter and could possibly give a better answer to his own question than I could.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that the Foreign Affairs Committee has just started hearings on the regular authorization bill today, and it will be my purpose to try to get full information. It is not always easy to obtain information, as the gentleman from Texas well knows, from certain individuals in this Government.

I thought, perhaps, the gentleman from Texas and his committee had developed information that I did not find in the hearings.

Mr. MAHON. I know of no plan to use these funds for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 shall be available to support Vietnamese and other Free World Forces in Vietnam and for related costs on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine: *Provided*, That unexpended balances, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, of funds heretofore allocated or transferred by the President to the Secretary of Defense for military assistance to support Vietnamese and other Free World Forces in Vietnam shall be transferred to any appropriation available to the Department of Defense for military functions (including construction), to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have several amendments to section 102 at the desk and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered as one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 8, line 3, insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 102.".

On page 8 line 5 insert "for their stated purposes" immediately after "available".

On page 8, after line 16, insert the following:

"(b) Within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall render to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report with respect to the estimated value by purpose, by country, of support furnished from such appropriations".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make the language of the bill compatible with the language in the authorization bill which I understand was signed into law today. It undertakes to improve in a measure the actual wording of the authorization.

It tightens up and make a little clearer the intent of the Congress with respect to this matter. The language in section 102 as reported reads:

> SEC. 102. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 shall be available to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam and for related costs on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine: *Provided*, That unexpended balances, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, of funds heretofore allocated or transferred by the President to the Secretary of Defense for military assistance to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam shall be transferred to any appropriation available to the Department of Defense for military functions (including construction), to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred.

When the amendment is agreed to, it will read:

> SEC. 102. (a) Appropriations available to the Department of Defense during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 shall be available for their stated purposes to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam and for related costs on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine: *Provided*, That unexpended balances, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, of funds heretofore allocated or transferred by the President to the Secretary of Defense for military assistance to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam shall be transferred to any appropriation available to the Department of Defense for military functions (including construction), to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred.
>
> (b) Within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall render to the Committee on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report with respect to the estimated value by purpose, by country, of support furnished from appropriations authorized to be made under this subsection.

The point is to require reports to the Congress, through the appropriate committees, within 30 days after the end of each quarter, with respect to the estimated value by purpose and by country of support furnished from these appropriations.

The basic section 102 provides that funds which would otherwise be labeled "Military Assistance" may be spent as direct military funds. To some extent, in the future, comparability of funding levels will thus be distorted for both regular military functions and military assistance. It is the purpose of this amendment to require that Congress be informed of the best estimates of the utilization of these funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The purpose of section 102, and I wonder if the gentleman agrees to this, is to provide that these funds are to be expended for the purpose for which the bill and the Congress intends that they shall be spent; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman used the words "stated purpose."

Mr. MAHON. Yes, for stated purposes such as procurement—providing certain funds for procurement—or for personnel—and otherwise to support our allies including the Vietnamese. The Vietnamese have about 850,000 men, including local police forces, under arms. This language is designed to enable our Government to support appropriately the efforts of those who fight with us.

Mr. GROSS. And that is, in Vietnam?

Mr. MAHON. In Vietnam—yes, of course.

Mr. GROSS. That is the intent?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, that is the intent.

Mr. GROSS. The intent is to support the forces—whatever they may be—there are too few there—but to support the forces in Vietnam and not somewhere else in the world?

Mr. MAHON. That is certainly the intent of this amendment.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Did the gentleman say that the reports were to come directly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations in the House and in the Senate?

Mr. MAHON. That is with reference to the funds that are used for this purpose under the provisions of section 102.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I do not intend to raise the point, but I believe this would be subject to a point of order and is a violation of rule 40 of the House of Representatives which requires reports to come to the Speaker and to the House as a whole rather than to a specific committee. It seems to me the reports should come to the House of Representatives and to the Senate, and to the extent that they go directly to a committee and bypass the membership as a whole that the prerogatives of the Speaker of the House and of the membership as a whole are set aside. I think it is an important point although, as I say to the gentleman, I am not going to raise the point of order. But I would hope that the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services would bring their bills in, when they call for reports, with the reports to come to the Speaker and to the President pro tempore of the Senate rather than going directly to a committee.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman has made a good point. But, of course, anything that is made available to the committees is made available to the Speaker and to the Congress. What we are doing here is to tie it in with the authorization language which has already been included in the law and which is the basis for the language in the amendment.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I do not quarrel with the intent of the amendment.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has talked this over at great length with the minority. We certainly agree as to the necessity for this amendment and heartily support it.

The language of section 102 as presently contained in H.R. 13546 can readily be interpreted to give extremely wide latitude to the Secretary of Defense. The provision relates to military assistance type funds. But within the context of military assistance the present language could be interpreted to permit the merger of unexpended balances of fiscal year 1966 and prior year military assistance funds and future funds in fiscal year 1967 for South Vietnam with the accounts for military functions to be mingled between purposes. In other words the present wording of the bill was susceptible of being interpreted as unlimited transfer authority.

This provision is required because there is now no authority to use funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for any purpose other than support of U.S. forces. Military assistance funds are now appropriated to the President and allocated to the Department of Defense.

The proposed amendment does not reject the request for authority to merge military assistance for South Vietnam with military functions but adds limiting language to that authority in two respects.

First. It limits the transfer of authority to the extent that Department of Defense appropriations for a particular purpose must be kept within that purpose. For example, personnel funds would be used for personnel, operation and maintenance for operation and maintenance, procurement for procurement, and so forth. This limitation is provided by the addition of the words, "for their stated purposes."

Second. The amendment adds a new subsection intended to assure that the Congress be kept informed on a timely basis of the use of these funds that may be made available for the support of the South Vietnamese and other free world forces under the authority granted in section 102. The amendment also states that the information be broken down by purpose and country in order to insure that the intent now expressed in section (a) be adhered to, and in the form that Congress will have the capability to oversee that it is.

There is no intent to create any condition that will prevent our troops and the troops of the free world that are assisting us from acquiring the necessary equipment and funds in a timely manner. This amendment will not jeopardize this process in the least. Its purpose is to make sure that congressional control is not diluted. The conditions as proposed in the amendment are that these fiscal transactions not violate the existing appropriations structure, it makes clear that this provision does not authorize any unlimited transfer authority, and that Congress be kept informed on a timely basis.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear to my colleagues that the gentleman from California made the suggestion with respect to this amendment. I think it is a good amendment and I am pleased to offer it.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment and with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 389, nays 3, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—389

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Bekworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Dikinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—3

Burton, Calif.
Conyers
Ryan

NOT VOTING—39

Adair
Baring
Bell
Bolling
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Davis, Ga.
Devine
Dowdy
Downing
Ellsworth
Fisher
Fuqua
Gallagher
Goodell
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
McVicker
Mackay
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
Moore
Mosher
Powell
Price
Reinecke
Resnick
Roncalio
Roudebush
Sisk
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Price with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Devine.

Mr. McVicker with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Del Clawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members speaking on the bill just passed may revise and extend their remarks and include pertinent extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF HON. CARL ALBERT, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 779

Resolved, That Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of the Honorable CARL ALBERT as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to mention that this resolution is being offered at the request of the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. ALBERT assumed the Chair and the oath of office was administered to him by Mr. CELLER, a Representative from the State of New York.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MORGAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12752) entitled "An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes."

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to provide for the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to establish in the Public Health Service a National Eye Institute for the conduct and support of research and training relating to blinding eye diseases and visual disorders, including research and training in special health problems relating to the mechanism of sight and visual function.

Surveys disclosed blindness ranks second to cancer as the affliction most feared by American people, more so than heart disease, polio, and tuberculosis or loss of limbs.

More than 1 million Americans over 40 have glaucoma, these being prime targets for eventual blindness. Most of them have never heard of the disease. More than 10 million throughout the world are totally blind.

One million Americans cannot read ordinary newspaper type with the aid of glasses, while 1½ million are blind in one eye.

Ninety million Americans suffer from ocular malfunction.

The National Health Education Committee discloses that incidence of cataract among people aged 60 is nearly 60 percent, at age 80 almost 100 percent.

A Gallup survey disclosed that one out of five people has no idea what a cataract is, and even the most educated have only a vague conception of what is involved in this disease. Lack of public knowledge results from the fact so little has been done in the field of eye research.

More than 80 percent of all loss of vision in the United States results from diseases whose causes are unknown to science. Five percent are the result of accidents.

Visual disorders constitute one of the Nation's leading causes of disability. One-tenth of all patients seen in American hospitals are eye patients.

In 1963 the cost of caring for the blind was more han $1 billion. Moneys invested in eye research by both Government and private sources amounted to $9 million that same year.

SOUTH VIETNAMESE EXECUTION

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, a grave travesty on justice has been perpetrated by the Government of South Vietnam in the name of social and economic reform. The public justification for this execution was, and I quote yesterday's Washington Post: "to fulfill Ky's pledge to President Johnson at the Honolulu Conference to put South Vietnam's social and economic house in order." For all the influence that we have on this regime, we did nothing to stop this senseless public execution which makes a mockery of our whole system of justice.

Out of the Honolulu Conference came a display of unity of purpose of our two Governments. There was renewed good will in the joint resolve and reaffirmation to help the people of South Vietnam succeed in their own efforts to secure a better life, but this recent spectacular exhibit of totalitarian edict to secure certain ends points to the vastly different worlds we truly live in.

General Ky's goals and ours may be the same, but can we, in the eyes of the Asians whom we seek to influence and to save from communism, embrace his methods of the firing squad by our silence and our acquiesence?

I urge the President and the Vice President to quickly intercede to prevent these extreme measures from becoming the means by which all of his social and economic problems are solved.

Lest we make a mockery of our valiant and tragic sacrifice of the lives of our American youth who need to have complete faith in the integrity of the South Vietnamese Government, we must forcefully insist that its leadership understand and apply to its own people the same moral and ethical code of conduct that has caused our American soldiers to give their lives for the sake of the ideals of a democratic society.

This barbaric act must not be allowed to be repeated. To accept this kind of a solution to an economic phenomenon is to invite the easy road to ultimate ruin without treating the cause at all. A thousand executed profiteers will not buy a stable economy or a new social order.

THE 118TH ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with special pride that I speak today on the 118th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising for liberty against the Hapsburg dynasty.

It is special for several reasons.

It is special because my dear friend of many years, Bishop Zoltan Beky, president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, delivered the beautiful and moving prayer heard this noon in the House of Representatives.

It is special because people who love and cherish freedom throughout the world have a particular respect for the Hungarian people. They have always been champions of liberty.

And it is also special because one of the greatest fighters and leaders that freedom ever had—Louis Kossuth—inspired the Hungarian revolution for freedom we are observing today.

These revolutionaries for freedom were successful in their fight against tyranny and Louis Kossuth became head of the Government. But their freedom did not endure and the revolution was overthrow by the Hapsburg dynasty.

After Kossuth fled to Turkey, he later visited the United States, where he received many honors as a hero of freedom.

Judging not only from his deeds, but from the words of praise that came from some of America's greatest men, Louis Kossuth was indeed great.

Greeting him at Concord, Ralph Waldo Emerson called Kossuth, "Freedom's angel."

Horace Greeley, another literary immortal, said of Kossuth:

> Of the many popular leaders who were upheaved by the great convulsions of 1848 into

> the full sunlight of European celebrity and American popular regard, the world has already definitely assigned the first rank to Louis Kossuth, advocate, deputy, finance minister, and finally Governor of Hungary.

Whittier lauded him as "the noblest guest."

And as we near recent history, we note that Woodrow Wilson in 1918 praised Kossuth and said:

> I know the history of the gallant Magyar nation.

Tribute was not restricted to Americans of renown. The famous English economist and statesman Cobden declared:

> Kossuth is certainly a phenomenon: he is not only the first orator of his age, but he unites the qualities of a great administrator with high morality and an indefatigable courage.

Because he loved freedom so deeply, Kossuth recognized despotism and always fought it vigorously—with sword and pen. As far back as October 27, 1851, he observed:

> The principle of evil on the Continent is the despotic and encroaching spirit of the Russian power. Russia is the rock which breaks every sigh for freedom.

Louis Kossuth knew the threat of Russia even then but he also knew the promise of America. For about 116 years ago, he warned a gathering in Massachusetts that, "From Russia, no sun will ever rise."

But he had faith in America's purpose and dream, for he also told that group:

> To find the sunlight where it most spreads and lightens the path of freedom, we must come to America.

In 1852, Kossuth was presented to the United States Senate and also to the House of Representatives. He did not speak long, but, as always, spoke with eloquence. He said:

> It is remarkable that while in the history of mankind, through all the past, honors were bestowed upon glory, and glory was attached only to success, the legislative authorities of this great Republic bestow the highest honors upon a persecuted exile, not conspicuous by glory, nor favored by success, but engaged in a just cause. There is a triumph of republican principles in this fact.

Later, Louis Kossuth, in heavy demand as a brilliant speaker, gave almost 300 public addresses, all unforgettable.

Mr. Speaker, on this day of tribute to the Hungarian people, it is hard to conclude, because our hearts and thoughts are full of gratitude and love.

Since Louis Kossuth will always be the symbol of the courageous and freedom-loving Hungarian people, I would like to quote from the poem written by James Russell Lowell, named "Kossuth."

> Land of the Magyars, though it be
> The tyrant may relink his chain,
> Already thine the victory,
> As just future measures gain.
>
> Thou hast succeeded, thou hast won
> The deathly travail's amplest worth,
> A nation's duty thou hast done,
> Giving a hero to our earth.

And Daniel Webster delivered an address of welcome to Louis Kossuth on January 5, 1852. His words express the feelings I have for the Hungarian people on this day of remembrance—and I believe the feelings of many of my colleagues. Said Webster:

> Hungary stands out far above her neighbors in all that respects free institutions, constitutional government and a hereditary love of liberty.

How true these words are even 114 years later.

The free world will always remember and admire the courage of the Hungarian people in 1956, when they rebelled against the tyranny of communism. Their courage was an inspiration to the entire world.

I visited Hungary last November and I observed with my own eyes that the people there have no freedom under communism. Russian soldiers with machine guns make the whole country a jail. The people seem lethargic—almost as if life is not worth living.

Mr. Speaker, on the 118th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising for liberty, let us pray to God that once again—soon—Hungary will be free.

OREGON COUNTY, MO., MOVES AHEAD WITH NEW CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this month the Missouri State Soil and Water Conservation Districts Commission authorized the people of Oregon County to move ahead in the protection and sound development of their soil and water resources by approving a soil and water conservation district for that county. This action resulted from a referendum in which the people of Oregon County voted for a conservation district. Incidentally, this vote of approval was 382 to 20.

I have been extremely pleased with the stepped-up interest in soil and water conservation districts in Missouri. Thirty-one have been formed in the last 6 years, accounting for nearly half of the 68 that have been formed since 1944. I believe that this indicates recognition of the benefits of sound conservation and development. I believe that it also indicates recognition of the value of the district mechanism through which the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies can channel help to rural individuals and communities. It is a healthy trend and I hope will continue.

Conservation districts have proved to be a sound way for communities to work together and plan for not just the present but for the long-term needs of the community. Their objectives to manage the land and water resources soundly while developing them assures a community of resources that will remain an asset for future economic growth. The reasons for supporting this vital conservation movement are valid—whether viewed from the point of the care of resources themselves, or whether from the point of the economic value these resources have in the community.

The congressional district which I represent—in which this new conservation district is located—is a highly productive area and represents a large part of the agricultural income of the State. I have observed some of the conservation work that local people have done to overcome water management and flood problems. Some of these problems the individual farmer can handle by himself. Many require broader technical assistance such as is available through soil and water conservation districts. Many of the resource problems are of a community nature where a group approach is required. Here again, the conservation district provides coordinated action. Its farsighted and comprehensive resource inventories and programs are responsive to the needs and desires of the community because they are planned and carried out by local people.

I commend soil and water conservation districts for the vital role they have taken in community development and I am gratified that Oregon County has joined their ranks, and am hopeful that the few remaining counties in the 10th district which do not have soil conservation districts will give serious consideration to the benefits which they might derive from the creation of such districts.

OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, hearings are now underway on the poverty program. Congressman QUIE and I are pressing for consideration of our proposal to substitute an opportunity crusade for the misfiring war on poverty.

Last week, Mr. Shriver testified rather superficially on a variety of issues. Among other things, in his prepared testimony, he made the incredible statement:

> Since last summer fewer than 50 ineligibles have been discovered in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The very next day, Secretary Wirtz contradicted Mr. Shriver by admitting that at least 5,000 to 6,000 enrollees in the Neighborhood Youth Corps have been found ineligible and dropped since last summer; 1,700 were dropped in Chicago alone since January 1. Now they are saying that these are welfare cases, barely exceeding the strict poverty standards. Well, a quick spot check of widely dispersed records in Chicago gives quite a different picture. Although arbitrary handling of the hearings prevented me from questioning Mr. Shriver on these, here are some samples. I have removed the names of the enrollees to spare them embarrassment; however, they are available to officials who may be interested:

Male enrollee, 17, family of four, father head of household, income $11,000 a year.

Male enrollee, 19, family of five, father head of household, income $10,200 a year.

Female enrollee, 19, family of two—housewife with no children—husband head of household, income $5,000-plus a year.

Female enrollee, 18, family of three—an only child—father and mother both work, earn jointly $150 per week.

Female enrollee, 20, family of three—an only child—father head of household, income $7,500 a year.

Male enrollee, 17, family of six, father head of household, income $7,000-plus a year.

Male enrollee, 19, family of five, grandfather head of household, income $7,000-plus a year.

Male enrollee, 18, family of six, father and mother both work, earn jointly $500 a month.

Male enrollee, 20, family of five, father head of household, income $5,400 a year.

This is the program supposed to help poor youngsters who are school dropouts or likely dropouts for reasons of poverty. Obviously, a full investigation would reveal many times more than Mr. Shriver's 50 ineligibles in Chicago alone. And no wonder. Last November the public relations representative for the Chicago poverty program stated:

> We don't know what the families of kids make. No straight flat figure on what an applicant family should make has been set. We have no statistics on incomes of the families of the kids in the Corps. We assume that, when we receive a name from the Illinois State Employment Service, the candidate named is qualified.

At that time, the executive director of the Chicago program was quoted as follows:

> It is absolutely correct that, until today, no means test was given in recruiting.

Almost one-quarter of the total enrollees in Neighborhood Youth Corps in Chicago had to be dropped because they exceeded the income requirement. At the same time, the poverty director in Chicago admits that there are at least 35,000, and others estimate up to 60,000, young people between the ages of 16 and 22 in Chicago who fully meet the poverty standards for Neighborhood Youth Corps but weren't given a chance.

Mr. Speaker, these are not isolated cases; they prevail all over the country. In addition to the 1,700 dropped in Chicago, Mr. Jack Howard, director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, admitted that about 2,000 in New York City and at least 1,000 in Los Angeles were ineligible. That is close to 5,000 ineligibles from three cities alone.

In the next few days, I will discuss other serious violations in the poverty program in Chicago. In the meanwhile, let me emphasize that the Quie-Goodell opportunity crusade would correct these deficiencies and put 50,000 youngsters into productive jobs in private enterprise through a new Industry Youth Corps.

DEFENDING FREEDOM WITH FREEDOM

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last month Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board, United States Steel Corp., and a native of my hometown, delivered an address at the founders day banquet of Washington University in St. Louis, Mo. Since a portion of it deals with the fiscal responsibilities of Congress, I commend Mr. Blough's presentation to my colleagues.

Without question, lack of restraint on the part of the administration in requesting appropriations and lack of restraint on the the part of Congress in making such funds available are the major provocations in an inflationary trend. They are the principal impediments to holding onto the value of our money.

Providing the finest equipment and tools of war is the topmost consideration at this time. As Mr. Blough has established, however, this cost has not reached a point where it can be tagged as the sole reason for the growing excess of Federal expenditures over Federal income. The real culprit is bureaucratic waste, and it cannot be tolerated if Congress has any intention of holding the line against the destructive forces of inflation.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Blough's address appears herewith:

> Founders day in any university provides a welcome opportunity to indulge in recollections of past achievements. It serves to recall the humble beginnings of what, in this case, has proven to be a monumental educational venture that was undertaken more than a century ago. Everyone associated with Washington University may well be proud of its history, its traditions, and of its past performance which weighs so heavily as a promise for the future.
>
> People have come to expect great things of this university and of its graduates; and if I do not dwell, tonight, upon the commendable degree to which these expectations have been fulfilled, it is only because I am understandably reluctant to do anything which might contribute to inflation—even of the ego.
>
> But founders day, as you observe it on this campus, has a current purpose which transcends the mere recognition of a fine and noble tradition. It provides a unique occasion to contemplate contemporary issues of mounting importance. Many of you will recall that last year, the Chief Justice of the United States discussed with you the "foundations of freedom" as those foundations are imbedded in the law, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. And in doing so, he shed much penetrating light upon an issue of profound importance to the future of this Nation.
>
> Tonight, I should like to consider with you another aspect of freedom which seems to me to be of imminent importance and which certainly touches the lives of all of us. It concerns the preservation of economic freedom in America while we seek to defend the political freedom of other peoples throughout the world.
>
> As we meet here, we are confronted by the fact that despite prodigious efforts to reach a negotiated peace, our Nation is engaged in what might—if you wish—he called a negotiated war. Two hundred thousand American men are now fighting in Vietnam. Each month, some thousands of others are receiving their "greetings" from Uncle Sam. And present indications are that before the year is out the number of American troops engaged in this conflict will have more than doubled.
>
> So for the fourth time in this century, American youth has answered the call to repel aggression in foreign lands, to protect a foreign people against subjugation, infiltration, and subversion, and to help them find a solution to their own problems.
>
> In this effort our men are heavily handicapped by a jungle-type existence, by a climate and terrain that is alien to anything they have known, by extended supply lines reaching halfway around the world, by inadequate help from most of the other free nations, and by extreme barriers to understanding.
>
> Meanwhile, among our people here at home, there are some who question vehemently the necessity, the wisdom or even the morality of our involvement in this war. And this, too, is an exercise of freedom that few of us would seek to deny, I suppose, however deeply we may disagree with such expressions.
>
> But there is one basic point, I believe, upon which true Americans can never disagree: That everything needed to protect the lives of our soldiers in Vietnam shall be provided to the limit of our national resources, both material and human. If the sacrifice of economic freedom will, in fact, hasten the winning of the peace in Vietnam and reduce our casualties there, there can hardly be any loyal opposition to such a sacrifice. But if, on the other hand, the economic freedoms which have made this Nation the most productive in the world are—as I believe them to be—a unique source of our military and economic strength, then we should, and must, defend and preserve them in the national interest.
>
> In short, the question before us is: To what degree may we assist in the fight for freedom by relying upon freedom—freedom in production, freedom to buy and sell, and freedom in occupation? Or must we revert to wartime types of wage controls, or price controls, materiel controls and even controls of movement among occupations in order, as a nation, to wage the defense of freedom?
>
> The question is a grave one; and it is none too early to explore it now in the cool, unemotional light of reason and fact; for the good sense and the patriotic endeavors of the American people will have much to do with determining its solution. What the people think, and what they say to their Representatives in Congress, is certain to influence the final decision since eventually—under our system of laws—Congress must make that decision.
>
> Let us consider, then, three aspects of this question. Do the pressures generated by the war in Vietnam, plus those created by a rapidly growing economy, make controls necessary now or in the foreseeable future? Do the economic disruptions caused by controls themselves negate or outweigh the benefits to be expected from them? Are other, less disruptive means available for use in dealing with these pressures?
>
> Turning first to the question of necessity, we recall that in World War II and again during the Korean conflict controls were imposed upon production, distribution, wages and prices in order to channel the necessary portion of our Gross National Product into the war effort. How then do conditions

today compare with those that existed before?

Well, at the peak of World War II, defense expenditures averaged about $84 billion a year and exceeded 40 percent of the total GNP. At the height of the Korean war, they were almost $49 billion and accounted for 13⅓ percent of the GNP. Last year they amounted to $50 billion; but they represented only 7½ percent of the GNP. That is because the GNP itself has more than trebled since World War II, and has nearly doubled since the peak Korean year of 1953.

During the present year it is estimated that our total defense expenditures may rise to $60 billion which would still be less than 8½ percent of the anticipated GNP; and they would have to mount to an astronomical $100 billion in order to reach the 13⅓ percent rate that prevailed at the height of the Korean war. That is far beyond any projected requirement of the action in Vietnam.

As for manpower, it must be noted here also that the national labor force has substantially increased in numbers during the past 20 years.

At the end of World War II, there were 11,500,000 men in our Armed Forces—or 17½ percent of the total labor supply. During Korea, there were 3,500,000 men in the military, representing over 5 percent of the labor force; and about 475,000 of these were actually engaged in Korea.

Last year, some 2,800,000 men were in the armed forces and this accounted for only 3.6 percent of the labor supply. Future requirements, as presently projected, could call for an additional 300,000 men in the services; but even if that number were to rise to 500,000, the military drain on the national labor force would amount to only about 4 percent as compared to more than 5 percent during the Korean conflict.

And as for Vietnam itself, the 200,000 men now stationed there constitute only one-fourth of 1 percent of our national labor supply; and President Johnson reports that the total production of goods and services for the war "accounts for less than 1½ percent of our gross national product."

So it is evident, I think, that Vietnam is not the primary source of the economic pressures we are experiencing. Vietnam may provide an excuse for the advocacy of controls. But it is not a reason for them; and if we seek out the major cause of these pressures, we must look to the unusually rapid rate of our economic growth in the nonmilitary areas.

Last year, the American economy grew at a greater rate than that of any other major industrial nation in the world. After correcting for rising prices, the real rate of growth was 5½ percent; and all of this new activity increased the demand for manpower, and the upward pressure on wages and prices.

During the 1960's, the expansion of the supply of money and credit has been at twice the rate prevailing in the late 1950's. Government expenditures at all levels—Federal, State, and local—have increased 65 percent since Korea even though there has been no appreciable rise in military outlays. Thus virtually all of this increase has occurred on the nondefense side of the ledger.

As a result, a head of economic steam is building up to a point which is beginning to cause national concern lest it break out in a burst of rising wages and prices. And this concern is understandable at a time when we are confronted by a stubbornly continuing imbalance of international payments, a worrisome outflow of our dwindling gold supply, the need to widen the narrowing gap in our favorable balance of trade, and the necessity of preserving the integrity of the dollar as a medium of international exchange.

Trying to find out how long we can contain this mounting head of steam while continuing to heat up the boiler is something like playing Russian roulette. Certainly we cannot continue indefinitely no matter how hard we try to hold back the hand on the pressure gage. For the present we are pinning our faith upon the willingness and the ability of both industry and labor to comply voluntarily with the governmental guideposts established some years ago; and while a considerable degree of price stability has been achieved during this period—especially in the more visible industries where a certain amount of "persuasion" could be applied—the boiler is clearly beginning to leak.

For the entire nongovernmental sector of the economy, employee compensation per man-hour has risen more than output per man-hour in each of the past 3 years; so unit labor costs have kept mounting. Across the economy generally, labor settlements last year exceeded the guidepost limits of 3.2 percent; and a recent release by the Department of Labor reports that in the construction industry, for example, wages and benefits rose 4.8 percent during the past fiscal year, while their study of a limited number of these labor contracts negotiated in 1965 revealed increases averaging 6.1 percent and ranging up to 8.3 percent.

Under the pressure of these rising costs and of the increased economic activity generally, the Consumer Price Index has risen 11 percent since 1957–59, and the tempo has accelerated recently. In fact I might add, parenthetically, that during the 7 years since the end of 1958, the cost of living has gone up about six times as much as the price of finished steel. But I mention that only in passing.

Further energizing this trend toward higher wages and consequent rising prices is the fact that we now have practically full employment, and there is an actual shortage of skilled workers. Only about 4 percent of the labor force is presently classified as unemployed, and the Council of Economic Advisers reports that this figure will drop to 3¾ percent for the current year and will be well below that level at year's end. Among married men, unemployment is now down to 2 percent and is still declining.

Under all of these circumstances, it will clearly become increasingly difficult to maintain an acceptable degree of wage and price stability through the publication of guideposts and the powers of Presidential persuasion; and the question arises: "What next?"

So the situation that confronts us today is much like that which prevailed at the end of 1950, when the United States had started down the road to wage and price controls. Then, as now, the road was paved with requests for a voluntary freeze; and standards for the freeze were being drawn up. Under the pressures of that day, the prices of many products were rising; and the prospect of price control, itself, added greatly to these pressures as producers and merchants sought to cover their rising costs before the freeze hit them. Production shifted from lower price lines to more expensive, and more profitable goods; and retailers built their inventories to a record high, thus adding to demand in an already overheated economy.

But before we travel that road again, let us stop, look, and listen, for it is one thing to talk of controls and quite another thing to survive them. There is no doubt that for a limited period they can and do hold down the lid on prices. There is also no doubt, however, that they create scarcity and thus add to the economic pressures that caused their adoption in the first place. Some of us whose memory goes back to the controls of 20 years ago will recall the butter that was sold from under the counter to favored customers, and the deterioration in the quality of merchandise that occurred as producers and merchants were often forced—at the peril of their own survival—to pay higher-than-ceiling prices on purchases in order to get the materials to keep their businesses running.

Then, too, there is a wasteful deployment of manpower at a time when a shortage of manpower already exists. Under the normal operation of a free market, the people themselves—as buyers—determine what manpower will be allocated to what production. If they do not choose to buy a certain product, then that product will no longer be made and the manpower will go elsewhere to produce what is wanted and needed.

Controls not only wipe out this self-adjusting, competitive mechanism, but—by their almost unbelievable complexity—they create enormous new manpower demands in the administration and the application of the regulations.

To illustrate, let me recall that during the Korean war, United States Steel's operations were under control by eight different Federal agencies, the most important of which were the National Production Authority and the Office of Price Stabilization.

Regulations and directives of the National Production Authority aggregated about 300,000 words and underwent approximately 400 amendments, supplements, revocations, and directions.

The Office of Price Stabilization issued 37 different regulations applying to our business. One ceiling price regulation alone consisted of almost 30,000 words and was amended 41 times with 20 supplemental regulations. So estimate if you can the number of accountants, lawyers, engineers, and others required to keep up with these regulations; expand that to cover all the businesses in the country, big and small; add the thousands employed in the administration of these controls on the Government side, and you come up with some idea, at least, of the great wastage of manpower that is inherent in the mere application of controls themselves.

But, you may ask, can the Defense Department—in the absence of controls—get what it needs to carry on its military efforts? The answer is that it can and it does. We already have a system of priorities under which Defense has first claim on essential production.

But will not the Government have to pay more than it should? And the answer to that is also simple; for the Government is the sole buyer of war material while there are many sellers competing for its business. Thus we have the opposite of a monopoly—a monopsony. And as a monopsony, the Government imposes conditions of purchase under which it exercises the right to renegotiate contracts and to reclaim an adjudicated part of the purchase price if the profits on the sale are deemed too large.

But then, you may ask, how about the average fellow, the pensioner, or widow living on a fixed income. Without controls, is there any better way of keeping prices from skyrocketing? And here, I can only think of the ardent young suitor whose proposal of marriage had been firmly rejected by the girl of his dreams.

"Tell me," he pleaded, "is there anyone else?"

"Oh, Elmer," she replied, "there must be."

So it is with controls. There must be better solutions; and I believe that there are.

In the first place we must recognize that our productive capacity in America is expanding substantially every year; so there is an ever-increasing supply of goods and services to meet our Nation's demands, both military and civilian.

The President has called upon business to exercise restraint in its pricing policies; and has asked labor unions to keep their demands within certain bounds. Here it must be said that the two problems are somewhat different. Among businesses there is a high degree of competition which tends to repress prices; but among unions there is also a high degree of competition—more in the nature of political competition—which tends conversely to escalate wages.

For example, transit workers in New York recently won wage and benefit increases far in excess of guidepost limits; and now it is announced that the New York City Police will seek pay boosts that will also shatter the guideposts concept.

It goes without saying that among labor unions you will find just as many patriotic and dedicated men as in any other segment of our society. These men, however, have a real problem. They feel compelled by force of circumstance to demand "more" in behalf of the individuals they represent. That is their function and their job; and it is asking much of them when they are called upon to exercise restraint.

Similarly it is the inescapable obligation of business managers to keep their enterprises healthy and to generate the profit necessary to keep America's industrial facilities modern and competitive—not only in the interest of the owners but in the national interest as well. So there must be some wage and price flexibility to accommodate the myriad changes that occur from day to day. Yet I believe that the wiser heads in the leadership of both labor and business will recognize that the exercise of restraint in the highest possible degree is imperative at a time when the probable alternatives are rising costs and runaway prices or disruptive controls.

But restraint is not a one-way street, and no matter how diligently and patriotically business and labor may try to plug the leaks in the economic boiler, they cannot succeed unless someone stops pouring on the coal. And that, I believe, is where Congress comes in. On the monetary side, the Federal Reserve Board is authorized and equipped to retard the expansion of currency and credit; and I would not anticipate that Congress would seek to oppose the necessary exercise of these powers.

On the fiscal side, Congress can ease the pressure by the judicious use of taxation; and the President has already recommended the reinstatement of certain excise taxes and a speed-up in the payments of personal and corporate income taxes.

But it is in the area of restraint in appropriations and other legislation that the hard-working men on the Hill face both their most difficult problems and their greatest opportunity to prevent a further heating up of the economy; for it is they who control the purse strings.

Today we dream of an America where there will be no slums, no pockets of poverty, no illiterates, no unemployed, no discrimination, no lack of medical facilities for all, and a minimum of crime. And, being Americans, we are impatient to reach those shining goals—which is as it should be. But excessive impatience at a time of great economic pressure can be disastrous and produce the wage and price explosion which neither guideposts nor controls can permanently prevent. And it is up to all of us to recognize that we cannot have what I call instant affluence.

Certainly it should be possible to defer a number of programs which call for pouring of additional dollars into the economy from Government sources, however meritorious those programs might be under other circumstances.

Is it necessary, for example, to press forward with make-work types of projects at a time when manpower is already scarce and growing scarcer?

Is this a time to undertake other large governmental expenditures which will divert manpower from more immediately necessary production? No one discounts the value of training the youth of this Nation and providing jobs for them; but is it not better for them to be trained on the job while earning their own keep and doing useful work? And does not the growing shortage of skilled workers create new opportunities for the unskilled to acquire skills?

Then, too, is this the year to enact, for example, a law increasing the minimum wage by 40 percent, and at the same time talk about a 3.2-percent limit on increases under the guideposts? Will this not tend to elevate the entire wage structure when the increased social security and medicare taxes that went into effect last month have already added at least two-thirds of a percent to employment costs generally—an addition, incidentally, which the guideposts do not take into account?

Is 1966 the year in which to federalize unemployment compensation by legislation that will add still further to the cost of employment in hundreds of corporations all over the country?

In short, is this the time to enact—in the name of social progress—far-reaching programs that are costly, inadequately managed because of the lack of trained manpower, and in many instances designed to correct situations that the present economic buildup is already tending to correct without governmental intervention?

The answer is up to the Members of Congress. It is their prerogative to authorize expenditures. It is their obligation to view the economic picture as a whole and act in their own best wisdom.

Summing up, then, this is a plea for recognizing where we are as a nation—a nation which necessarily must meet its commitments abroad and maintain its economic strength at home.

It is a plea for practical restraint by both business and labor.

It is equally a plea for restraint on the part of Congress which will finally determine the extent of the pressures unleashed in our economic system.

It is even more a plea to recognize that the most effective way to help our Government achieve its purposes is not through the imposition of controls—and that even the suggestion of controls breeds apprehensions which induce scare buying and, in turn, increase the upward tendency of wages and prices.

Above all, this is a plea to recognize the free market economy for what it is: the most efficient, productive source of our material freedom; and to acknowledge that interference with the markets operation leads to inefficiency, inequity, and to shortages.

In a word, it is a plea to defend freedom with freedom.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on the vote which was just concluded on the appropriation bill I was unavoidably detained and arrived in the Chamber immediately after the conclusion of the vote. I should like to announce that had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE ARMY ARSENAL SYSTEM AND THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY—NO. II

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CONTE, and I addressed the House for the purpose of bringing to the attention of Congress the extreme seriousness, to the security of this country, of current steps being taken by the Department of Defense and the Army toward closing out all operations and facilities at the Springfield Armory.

Today, we are providing more basic information in opposition to this most inadvisable and fateful decision on the part of the Secretary of Defense. It is a decision which, in our opinion, gambles—first in the name of disproved cost reduction and now in the name of private enterprise—with the long-range security of the Nation as well as the immediate support of our troops in Vietnam. We say disproved cost reduction because, as will be shown in subsequent statements, no real saving to the taxpayer can result from this move. In this statement we want to give you some highlights of the background which led up to this fateful order.

Following World War II and during the late 1950's, following the Korean war, the Army lived on rather short rations in small arms for the purpose of using up many of the stores accumulated during the Korean war and immediately thereafter. This meant relatively little new procurement for such weapons. Defense money, for the most part, was being spent on bombers and missiles. These were lean years insofar as procurement of small arms was concerned. Accordingly, they were lean years for many of our Army arsenals involved in weapon production. However, the arsenals were kept going, even though the unit costs were high.

This was the period for expansion of industrial type funding to many defense installations and under this type of funding the arsenals were required to support themselves by sales of weapons and services. These arsenals were required to support a war production reserve, in effect, from thin current earnings. Naturally, under such circumstances, unit costs at the production facilities of the arsenals were high. Army procurement officials and their customers in the other services, under the pressure of cost reduction, began to buy elsewhere, whenever possible. This added to the difficulties of the arsenals and a vicious cycle was created.

Mr. Speaker, we have prepared and submitted to the Armed Services Committee of the House a rather lengthy memorandum which provides the background for the decision to close Springfield as we have been able to trace it and put it together. We submit this memorandum here for information and consideration of all Members of the Congress:

Memorandum to Hon. L. Mendel Rivers, Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., and Hon. Edward P. Boland

Our deep concern over the decision to close the Springfield Armory has caused us to review as thoroughly as possible the background of this fateful decision. While our main concern in the beginning was for Springfield, in the process of our study we have also developed a great concern for the future of all inhouse research and development and production capability in support of our Armed Forces. There has been a drastic change in Department of Defense policy regarding these important inhouse operations which has evolved in the past 3 years. This is a policy change which the Armed Services Committee should be concerned about and, which we believe, should never have been undertaken without the benefit of extensive congressional review and perhaps legislation.

Our review of this policy development has been limited to the policy within the Department of the Army, as directed by the Department of Defense, but we believe that it has much broader implications than just the Army and it can seriously affect the future security of this Nation. We believe you will agree with us once all the facts are brought into proper focus. Let us summarize for you what we have been able to put together on this matter.

Prior to 1963, it had been the policy of the Department of Defense and the Army to maintain a system of arsenals to keep alive the arts and promote the sciences which are so necessary in producing war materiel. Past experience had shown that to fill the needs for ordnance materiel, during an emergency, an adequate system must be in existence when the emergency occurred. The arsenal system was considered to be the only feasible repository available for the knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish immediate and effective production of war goods in an emergency. On this premise, the Army had developed the arsenal system beginning with the Springfield Armory in 1794. The primary mission of the arsenal system was to design, develop and procure weapons and ordnance materiel. A secondary mission was to prepare mobilization plans for aiding industry in emergencies to convert from civilian to war production with a minimum of delay and confusion.

With the advent of the cold war and especially during and following the Korean war it became evident that the United States would need to maintain a fairly strong peacetime military force. With the increased demand for military weapons, private industry found it profitable to remain in the field and compete with the arsenals for these continuing military requirements. During the 1950's, operations under industrial type funding was expanded and the arsenals were expected to compete on a cost basis. The mobilization role of the arsenals was pushed aside.

By 1960, it became evident that the arsenal system was in trouble. The then Assistant Secretary of the Army for Logistics, Mr. Courtney Johnson, personally surveyed operations at the various arsenals. He expressed alarm at the way things were going for these facilities, because he strongly believed in the necessity of perserving the Army arsenal system. We quote from a memorandum on this subject which he wrote in September 1960.

"I am convinced that the in-house capabilities that we have are essential to the Army's role in the defense of the country. It is historically obvious that we retain, by this method, capabilities during peacetime which would not and could not be maintained in industry. Industry cannot hold its own properties in standby, producing no income, and cannot pay and preserve the hard core of knowledgeable engineers, scientists, technicians, and teachers who deal specifically with military problems and products in which industry is not interested unless money is continuously available for production, thus affording the opportunity to make a profit.

"The installations are, generally speaking, operating at a low level. Overheads, which are incurred in order to preserve for future mobilization purposes, facilities, and knowledge, are charged against the small current production for the installation, thus raising materially the selling price of the items produced. These higher selling prices are discouraging to Army procurement personnel and to our other customers (Marines, etc.) with the result that the tendency is for the amount of business to decrease. This vicious circle will put us out of business."

Mr. Johnson went on to propose solutions. He suggested a study which "should result in a plan which would establish the operation of these in-house facilities on the basis that meets essential military requirements for special research, production engineering and methods, pilot line operations, the education and retention of scientific personnel, military production specialists, inspectors, and teachers." He went on to propose that a certain percentage of all PEMA and research and development funds be allocated for the program.

As a followup to Mr. Johnson's memorandum, task groups were formed to make studies of the various arsenals. The arsenals were called upon to furnish information for these studies. The studies suggested by Mr. Johnson were sidetracked for a time by the change in administration voted into office in 1960. However, Mr. McNamara's cost reduction programs came into being and the search was on in earnest for facilities and operations which might be closed, curtailed, or otherwise changed.

In March 1963, the Chief of Staff of the Army initiated what was called a comprehensive review of the Army arsenal complex. This led to a study entitled "The Future of the AMC Arsenal System." The Chief of Staff instructed the Board, appointed to make this study, to consider the continuing requirement for a military arsenal capability to perform the following missions:

"(a) That of conducting the research, development and engineering of new items and producing experimental models and quantities for engineering and troop tests with the end purpose of providing a procurement package of drawings, specifications, and technical advice to assist industry in quantity production.

"(b) To be able to support the Army contract negotiators with knowledgeable technical experts who can review production plans and insure that the Government receives quality materiel at reasonable prices and on schedule.

"(c) That essential production skills and know-how be maintained through a limited-quantity production effort, with the full recognition that quantity production of any item must not be allowed to become a function of any arsenal except where commercial concerns are unwilling to undertake it, when their prices are unreasonable, or where it is required for security reasons."

The Board making this study concluded that of 10 facilities performing a substantial amount of manufacturing, 5 must be retained to perform required research and development functions and because their manufacturing capabilities are unique in the arsenal system and not available in private industry. Of the remaining five facilities, the Board recommended closing two (one of which was to be maintained in standby for mobilization purposes), two more were to be given further study and retention of the Springfield Armory in an active status was suspect because of the general availability of comparable capability on small arms in private industry. The Board recommended further study of the Springfield Armory.

In February 1964, the Army Weapons Command was directed to make a study to find alternate methods for performing the missions of the Springfield Armory in effect so that the armory could be closed. The decision to close Springfield had, for all practical purposes, been made in advance of the study. The purpose of the study was to find other means for doing the essential work of this facility. By this time, and, because of the Vietnam buildup, private industry had become heavily engaged in the production of small arms, under the guidance and with the help of the experts at Springfield. Without those experts it is doubtful if it could have been done, except at great expense and the loss of critical valuable time. However, since the small arms business was once again profitable, private industry was in it in a big way as they have been in previous wars. The conclusion, a very shortsighted one we might add, was that, with industry doing this work, Springfield was no longer needed and that it was proposed to merely transfer a small research contingent to another facility and close Springfield Armory.

A very interesting aspect of this Army Weapons Command study is revealed by a brief memorandum which turned up at the Rock Island Headquarters of the Army Weapons Command. This memorandum provided certain basic guidelines for the people from this command making this study. Two pertinent paragraphs of this highly significant memorandum are as follows:

"Establish the hard core requirement for Watervliet and Rock Island Arsenals; and then establish the fact that Springfield Armory is excess to requirements. This determination having been made and properly supported by facts, we will move into the next section.

"Based on the foregoing alternate plans, conclusions should be drawn terminating with the conclusion that it is in the best interests of the Government to close Springfield Armory and transfer the R. & E. functions to Rock Island."

We do not want to appear to dwell too much on the case of the Springfield Armory, because we know that your interest is the much broader one of the entire Army Arsenal system. We must bring Springfield into it, however, because this is the case history which we have studied and it also happens to be a key factor in the development of current Department of Defense policy regarding the arsenal system.

The study of the future of the AMC arsenal system produced some recommendations as "proposed augmentation of Department of the Army philosophy." Two of these recommendations pertaining to this issue were as follows:

"AMC will maintain centers with responsibility for technical direction through the cradle-to-grave cycle for each commodity.

"AMC will rely almost completely on industry for quantity production, but should maintain multipurpose pilot lot production capability for selected items which could be expanded to perform limited quantity production as required in the interest of time, cost and military exigencies."

The conclusions of the small arms study on Springfield were arrived at before the study was made. It seems obvious to us, from the guidelines memo quoted earlier, that the purpose of the study was to support those conclusions. This was also inherent in the previously quoted instructions from the Chief of Staff which said, "That quantity production of any item must not be allowed to become a function of any arsenal." Quantity production of small arms had been a function of the Springfield Armory from the beginning along with the development of new weapons. The Springfield Armory has served as the nucleus of small arms production in support of our troops in every war throughout our history, including the Korean and Vietnam wars, as well as during the slack times between wars.

Now, in the name of shortsighted cost reduction, the Department of Defense is going to rely completely upon private industry for the future development and production of small arms. A small in-house research contingent will be maintained, but there will be no production, not even pilot production. Based on this study, in November 1964, Secretary McNamara ordered the Springfield Armory phased out and finally closed by April 1968.

The conclusions of this small arms study were that a savings would accrue by closing the Springfield Armory, based upon cost figures compiled by the group. Once these cost figures become known, people interested in keeping Springfield going found them to be fallacious. Other erroneous information and conclusions were also found in this report. These findings by our Springfield group were presented to Secretary McNamara in February 1965. After further review of the matter in the Department of Defense, Secretary McNamara directed that an independent study of the Springfield Armory problem be made by the consulting firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. This study was transmitted to Secretary McNamara October 15, 1965.

The Booz, Allen & Hamilton study and report was based on a question, as follows:

"To meet DOD needs effectively and economically, should any part of the Springfield Armory be retained in Springfield, and, if so, for how long?"

This study found that the actual costs of manufacture for the armory and for industrial contractors which have produced small arms are about the same for all practical purposes. It was found that as a result of DOD efforts (with the help of Springfield) to build up industry interest and capability there was no longer any significant manufacturing capability at the armory that does not exist in industry and, therefore, the armory's manufacturing capacity is no longer needed. It also found that industry had also created a research and development capability equal to the armory's (at Government expense, of course).

The study found that the proposed move of nonmanufacturing functions is distinctly marginal from a savings-cost standpoint, and that some risk in the performance of current programs would be taken with such a transfer. Yet the report went on and rationalized the closing of Springfield and to find that DOD policies with respect to small arms weapons systems, which assign to industry the development and design of hardware, the technical data package preparation, and both pilot and quantity production, are completely feasible. This latter statement completely ignores experience and history. It must assume that spending for arms will go on at a substantial rate indefinitely and that such work will always be profitable for industry.

Based upon this study by a consulting firm which is to a large extent dependent upon the Department of Defense and Defense contractors for its present business volume, Secretary McNamara reaffirmed his decision to close out the Springfield Armory. His previous decision had been based on cost reduction. With the claim for cost reduction refuted by our people and by the DOD oriented Booz, Allen & Hamilton study as well, a new justification for closing the Armory had been developed. This was the Booz, Allen & Hamilton assurance that private industry could now do the complete job and, therefore, the Armory was no longer needed. With all other matters being nearly equal, one would hardly have expected a different recommendation from this firm.

Now the real kicker in this business of developing a policy to fit a case is the way it was actually done in connection with the Booz, Allen & Hamilton study. To give you a feel for how this was done, we want to quote certain correspondence and supporting documents between Harry L. Vincent, Jr., vice president of Booz, Allen & Hamilton, and the Honorable Cyrus Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense. This material speaks for itself. The significance of this exchange is that it took this private organization to develop a statement of policy for the Department of Defense. This stated policy changed substantially the previous evident policy laid out by the Army. And strangely enough, the newly stated policy supported the decision to close out the Springfield Armory after it had been shown that the closeout could not be supported as a cost reduction move. The letters and supporting documents showing how this firm established the guidelines which it was to follow are as follows:

"Hon. CYRUS R. VANCE,
"Deputy Secretary of Defense,
"The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

"DEAR MR. VANCE: Our study efforts to date in connection with the Springfield Armory situation have demonstrated the need for defining and documenting current Department of Defense plans and policies regarding the manufacturing role of Army arsenals, and the research, development, and engineering role of Army arsenals.

"In addition, there is a need to clarify and, insofar as possible, quantify the probable future trends in small arms weapons developments.

"Documentation of long-range plans (5 to 10 years) for small arms weapons development does not appear to exist at present. However, key OSD and Army officials have identified for us some elements of the current thinking concerning future small arms development and the concomitant mission for Army arsenals. Thus, up-to-date thinking and DOD position concerning small arms of the future is a prerequisite for sound conclusions regarding the closing of the Springfield Armory.

"To insure that our analysis is solidly based, we have documented the viewpoints we have received in the form of a position paper (attachment A) concerning the emerging role of Army arsenals. For comparison, we have also included a current arsenal mission statement (attachment B). DOD observations concerning the probable trends in small arms weapons development are reflected in attachment C.

"Summarizing the views we have received, it is clear that Army weapons materiel is becoming more sophisticated and that greater emphasis is being placed on the systems approach to weapons development. Thus, there is a need for the Army to utilize its in-house technical resources in the critical fields of operations analysis, program planning, program management, and system evaluation. To the extent that in-house technical resources are fully utilized for these functions, it is logical to expect that actual hardware design work will be conducted by contractors.

"The following exhibit displays graphically the differences between the current and proposed arsenal mission statements. The current mission encompasses all the functions shown (outer heavy circle) while the revised mission encompasses only the inner heavy circle.

"It is our plan to conduct our study on the basis that the thinking expressed to us by OSD and Army officials is truly guiding long-term DOD planning for the future of the arsenal system.

"We therefore desire to discuss this thinking with you and obtain any comments you may have concerning the adequacy of our understanding.

"Very truly yours,
"BOOZ, ALLEN & HAMILTON, INC.,
"HARRY L. VINCENT, Jr.,
"Vice President."

"ATTACHMENT A

"THE EMERGING ROLE OF ARMY ARSENALS

"1. Research and engineering: In general, the actual design and development (including pilot production) of weapons and weapons systems will be conducted by contractors. Some basic and applied research may also be conducted by contractors.

"The arsenal system shall retain and/or develop in-house R. & E. capability to—

"Establish weapons requirements;

"Direct and monitor the course of industry efforts in weapons design, development, and technical data package preparation;

"Evaluate the competitive development efforts of industry;

"Conduct technical work sufficient only to—

"Sustain the competence required to monitor the technical aspects of the overall program.

"Adequately support related nontechnical management functions such as contract negotiations, contract administration, proposal evaluation, configuration control, cost analysis and patents control; and

"Stimulate industry activity in actual design and development.

2. Manufacturing:

"(1) In general, quantity manufacture of operational weapons hardware will be conducted by industrial contractors. Exceptions may exist in situations where—

"Military security requirements dictate that manufacture must be performed inhouse (e.g., nuclear devices, top secret fuzing devices).

"Industry has no capability and/or interest in developing that capability (e.g., BCW agents).

"Other manufacturing activities should be performed by Army arsenals only when cost and quality for that work is clearly more advantageous than industry can provide.

"(2) To the extent that pilot production of weapons hardware is required, this production will normally be performed by the same contractor who is responsible for preparation of the technical data package.

"ATTACHMENT B

"THE ARMY ARSENAL MISSION AS PRESENTLY STATED

"As extracted from the Army study, entitled 'The Future of the AMC Arsenal System,' the current mission of an arsenal is as follows:

"There is a continuing requirement for a military arsenal capability to perform the following missions:

"That of conducting the research, development, and engineering of new items and producing experimental models and quantities for engineering and troop tests with the end purpose of providing a procurement package of drawings, specifications, and technical advice to assist industry in quantity production.

"To be able to support the Army contract negotiators with knowledgeable technical experts who can review production plans and insure that the Government receives quality material at reasonable prices and on schedule.

"That essential production skills and know-how be maintained through a limited quantity production effort, with the full recognition that quantity production of any item must not be allowed to become a function of any arsenal except where commercial concerns are unwilling to undertake it, when their prices are unreasonable, or where it is required for security reasons."

"ATTACHMENT C

"OBSERVATIONS MADE BY OSD AND ARMY OFFICIALS CONCERNING TRENDS AND LONG-TERM THINKING IN SMALL ARMS

"1. Small arms technical trends: Small arms development efforts will be characterized in the foreseeable future by the five following trends:

"Continued progress toward lighter, higher-speed projectiles and higher rates of fire.

"Continued reduction of recoil and weight with attendant increases in accuracy.

"Development of multipurpose small arms (e.g., rifle, grenade launcher combinations).

"Accommodation of new types of ammunition (e.g., flechettes).

"Increased emphasis on the application of small arms to aircraft and ground vehicle weapons systems.

"2. Planning guidelines:

"(1) Physical collocation of the several functions within research and engineering is desirable in two situations:

"Design and development of weapons hardware should be collocated with pilot production activities. To the extent that weapons design and development is performed by industry, so, too, industry should perform pilot production.

"Army R. & E. functions should be collocated with the broad range of functions related to weapons management for maximum support effectiveness.

"(2) As the Army strengthens its in-house, small arms, technical capability to accommodate the greater emphasis on operations analysis, program planning, program management and system evaluation, the need for a single, geographic focal point for Army small arms R. & E. activities becomes more evident because—

"Physical consolidation can result in more efficient management by the Army; and

"Industry benefits from and can be more responsive to a single coordinating agency for all small arms work.

"It may even be possible and desirable to combine Army in-house small arms R. & E. activities such as:

"The small arms weapons system management, procurement, quality assurance, etc., functions; and

"The small arms ammunition test and evaluation functions.

"(3) Current Defense Establishment planning emphasizes readiness of forces in being. As the readiness objective is achieved, the requirement for an in-house, manufacturing capability for mobilization diminishes."

"The Deputy Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

"Mr. Harry L. Vincent,
"Vice President, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc.,
"Washington, D.C.

"Dear Mr. Vincent: This is in reply to your letter of May 6, 1965, in connection with the Springfield Armory. We believe that you have correctly interpreted most of the facets presented by the present situation as regards Army arsenals.

"In the context of small arms, we see two trends underlying the changing emphasis from arsenal to commercial development. The first is that the concept of small arms has changed to include weapons of larger caliber and higher rates of fire. In such cases vehicle mounting is usually desired and design tradeoffs with other parts of the combined system are needed. Secondly, there has been a trend on the part of American industry to enter this field due to continuing U.S. and foreign needs. A concomitant increase in industrial competence in operational research and effectiveness evaluations has enabled industry to prepare professional, attractive proposals and has demonstrated emerging creativity and competence. As we see the future, industry will prepare technical data packages, and do pilot production as well as full-scale production. When this occurs, we believe that the in-house responsibility will change to one of technical evaluation as practiced in other commodity areas. Perhaps we should use some other name than "arsenal" mission for the changed responsibilities.

"If you have any further questions I would be most happy to meet with you at any time.

"Sincerely,

"Cyrus Vance."

"Hon. Cyrus R. Vance,
"Deputy Secretary of Defense,
"The Pentagon,
"Washington, D.C.

"Dear Mr. Vance: We appreciate very much your reply to our letter dated May 6, 1965, which dealt with the plans and policies of the Department of Defense for small arms research, development, engineering, and manufacturing.

"As we have continued to study the Springfield Armory situation our analysis has confirmed the importance of these plans and policies, as necessary ingredients for our study of the Springfield situation. In addition, we believe that a clear understanding of these plans and policies within the Department of Defense is vital to the effective management of the overall small arms mission. Thus, we wish to be absolutely sure that in our recent exchange of correspondence we have accurately depicted the current DOD policy.

"It is our understanding that the current policy of the Department of Defense, with respect to small arms weapons and weapons systems, includes the following:

"1. Hardware design and development leading to a technical data package shall be procured from industrial companies.

"2. Technical data packages and pilot production shall be procured from industrial companies.

"3. Quantity production, except in those few instances where military security or lack of industrial capability dictate 'in-house' production, shall be procured from industrial companies.

"We would appreciate your confirmation that we have accurately articulated these policies of the Department of Defense.

"Very truly yours,
"Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc.,
"Harry L. Vincent, Jr.,
"Vice President."

The Deputy Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

"Mr. Harry L. Vincent, Jr.,
"Vice President, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc.,
"Washington, D.C.

"Dear Mr. Vincent: Your letter of June 24, 1965 correctly states the current policy of the Department of Defense with respect to small arms weapons and weapons systems.

"Sincerely,

"Cyrus Vance."

Insofar as we know, other than Mr. Vance's brief confirming letter to the Booz, Allen & Hamilton people, no steps have been taken to fully implement these policies developed by this firm. Yet these very policies have been relied upon to reaffirm the earlier decision to close Springfield.

This entire affair seems to us to be completely incongruous with the respective roles of the Congress and the Executive. It is a matter which we feel your committee should explore to the fullest extent. We urge that this be done.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the second in a series of articles published by the Gun Report magazine entitled "History of the Springfield Armory," and written by Mr. Christopher Dvarecka, contains further examples of the indispensable contributions made by this facility to the welfare and security of the United States.

It also contains some provocative information in regard to historic quality control methods in the days before complete machine automation, when such equipment as bayonets had to be fashioned largely by hand. The techniques described in part two of the story of the Springfield Armory undoubtedly have a great deal to do with the reputation of the armory for promptness and reliability in production. These are assets which prevail today in the operation of the armory and account in large measure for the effectiveness of U.S. firepower in the Vietnam conflict where our forces have so often been outnumbered by the enemy.

Under unanimous consent, I include the second of this series of articles at this point in the Record:

History of the Springfield Armory—Part Two

(By Christopher L. Dvarecka)

At the beginning of the 19th century, this country was at peace with the world at large; with no immediate use for firearms then being made at the armory and faced with the possible accumulation of some 53,000 pieces by 1809, the sale of weapons from stores began—and Indians were the buyers in most instances.

At first the Indians were persuaded to trade for the French model musket, but soon their demand was "small gun, no good; big gun, big noise, big bullet—no boy's gun for Indians." After that they would only buy those of larger caliber, such as the King's and Queen's Arms, rather than the Charleville model.

Production figures show that in 1817 about 14,000 muskets were made here. By 1836 there were 260 men employed and 13,500 guns were turned out that year. At the close of 1936 there were 170,000 guns stored in the arsenal.

The first pistols at the armory were produced in 1818 when about 1,000 caliber .69 pistols were made. In 1822, a new model of the flintlock musket was manufactured here. This 1822 model was considered superior to any foreign muskets then on the world market.

The early plan of construction on the hill shops was that of a group of buildings arranged in a quadrangle in the general area known today as Armory Square. The first permanent building in the quadrangle was a two-story brick storehouse called the west arsenal, erected 1807–08. This building, which stands on the brow of the hill facing

State Street, is the oldest existing building at the armory. A third story was added in 1863. At various times it has been used as a barrel house, storehouse, and recreation building. It was also used as an enlisted men's barracks. During World War II it was made an officers' club and is still used for that purpose today—nearly 150 years later.

The first building erected for manufacturing purposes on Armory Square was a two-story brick building used to house the filing and stocking shops, completed in 1809. This building was burned down on a raw, cold day in March 1824. The building burned to the ground with an estimated loss of $30,000. The high winds that day carried the cinders as far away as the water shops. The building was rebuilt that same year and parts of it are now used for officers' quarters. The first permanent officers' quarters erected were quarters No. 7, 10, and 17 in 1833. The middle arsenal was built in 1836 on the south side of the quadrangle. In 1812 the plot of land now embracing Federal Square was purchased. A two-story office building was constructed in 1819 for the armory superintendent, master armorer, and paymaster. This building, after extensive remodeling, is now the armory's main administration building.

As has been previously mentioned, the water shops in this period consisted of three plants along the Mill River. The 23 buildings comprising these plants were not of a permanent nature and nothing remains of them today. A road connecting the works at the hill shops and the Mill River factories was built in 1811 over the area called Walnut Street today.

During the War of 1812, the U.S. armory, being a Government post, often saw soldiers quartered in the barracks and houses. The dwelling houses were ordinarily occupied by armorers, but at short notice that soldiers were coming they moved out and the soldiers took over. A portion of the ground now occupied by the long storehouse was then used as a graveyard and soldiers were often buried there in full military regalia. During the 1840's while foundations were being dug for the long storehouse off Pearl Street, the remains of 12 soldiers dressed in full regimentals were uncovered.

The early superintendents at the armory were civilians, mostly natives of Massachusetts. There was no "command" as such. Superintendents, master armorers, and storekeepers vied with each other for control. With the appointment of Lt. Col. Roswell Lee in 1815, the first military superintendent, there was, naturally, much controversy and for a long time the question of military or civilian control split the town into two factions. Following Lee's 18-year superintendency (1815-33), civilian supervision again took over for 8 years. In 1841, a military superintendency was reestablished.

Following the first superintendent, David Ames, civilian superintendents were Joseph Morgan (1802-05), Benjamin Prescott (1805-13), Henry Lechlar (1813-15) and Prescott again for 5 months in 1815.

The first quarter of this century saw many exciting and humorous scenes and incidents between the workers and the superintendents, among the employees themselves, and between the workmen and the townspeople.

Benjamin Prescott, the third superintendent, was capable of managing any number and all kinds of men, but as he had some rough and ready ones to deal with, he sometimes had to resort to tough discipline. In 1812-15, the usual license was restricted—the Nation was at war with England; the State militia and the Regulars needed guns; the men must be on the job; boys, even the workmen's sons, must not enter the shops. Military enthusiasm was running high and the spirit became contagious. The Hill Shops workmen formed a company of artillery and paraded with wooden guns and a battery of a dozen lead cannon. One day as Superintendent Prescott was on his way to the Water Shops via horse carriage, the boys were having a parade on the street. Spotting "Old Prescott" driving toward them, one of the men cried out, "Here comes Old Prescott; let's fire at him." A line was quickly formed on each side of the road and a half-dozen loaded cannon were placed in front of each rank. Intent upon his business, Superintendent Prescott paid no heed to the hostile reception committee and rode through the ranks. He was thunderously saluted with gunfire from both flanks. Emerging unscathed and feeling the greeting was meant as a compliment, he returned the greetings by shouting "Well done, well done, boys."

Old armorers had great respect and affection for Lt. Col. Roswell Lee and his administration was recognized by armory experts as able and aggressive. Once or twice during his tenure in office (the longest on record here), his vigor carried him to extreme lengths.

It was a source of anxiety to him that the armorers spent so much of their earnings for rum, and his zeal in checking this practice caused quite a scene in 1816. The old Toddy Road was named for obvious reasons and Lee did not reduce the travel along this road as much as he had hoped. He discharged two workmen who were found wrestling publicly in the midst of a circle of fellow workmen. There was a liberty pole in the center of the ground where the incident occurred that had been erected by the subscription of the workmen, and here the friends of the discharged men gathered to protest the firings. A rum bottle quickly made the rounds and the cry went up, "If we can't have any liberty, we won't have any liberty pole," and an axe was put to work on the pole. Clerk Wolcott, then the colonel himself, then Master Armorer Foot with some out-of-town officials hastened to the scene. The pole was saved, and the little "rum rebellion" was ended. It had a good effect all around, however, and greater understanding prevailed. Toddy Road did not lose its name for some years though.

One of Springfield Armory's great distinctions is its pioneering role in the development of the principle of "interchangeability of parts," an outstanding contribution of American industry to the manufacturing world.

Along these lines, in 1822, Thomas Blanchard, an armory workman, designed a machine for turning gunstocks. The original machine, which is the forerunner of all machines since used for this purpose, was in operation for many years in the shops (and is now on display in the museum).

Blanchard is also credited with many other models or forms, the prototype of many now used extensively in the duplication of parts in modern manufacturing methods.

Concerning Blanchard's revolutionary invention, an old armorer who was a fellow boarder at the time recounts the following incident:

"One Sunday we particularly noticed Mr. Blanchard for he had in his hands a musket which he seemed to be meditating upon. This meditation was nothing new; for he was a man who said but few words, a man who communed with himself or, rather, did a great deal of brain work in a quiet way. But now he had something in his hands upon which his thoughts seemed to rest, and this was uncommon. The gun was turned over and over; it was looked at from tip to breech; evidently he was thinking hard; after a long time thought became words, 'I believe that I can turn a stock like this,' and eventually he did."

The first machine made to turn irregular forms was made and put into operation at the Upper Water Shops: shoe lasts were the first item produced. The next machine was made for the express purpose of turning a gunstock and proved to be just what was needed at that time and also (not then realized) the forerunner of all machines, models, or forms which are now used to make every component part of a gun interchangeable.

During these same years, as already indicated, many of the workmen were a pretty rough bunch and quite lawless. They could not forget their old "camp" habits and did a great deal of foraging in the countryside. One Sunday a group of some 20 men started out on one of their expeditions, the objective point being a certain watermelon patch in the vicinity of Longmeadow.

The good people of that town were at church, but the news of the impending raid was quickly conveyed to the town constable. He promptly raised a posse and surrounded the threatened watermelon bed. The marauders hove onto the scene and were quickly captured and imprisoned in a nearby tavern. Most of the men were barefoot. The townspeople went down to the tavern to get a look at the rascals. The landlady whose patch had been the goal of the raiders also came down to take a look at the culprits. With spectacles balanced at the end of her nose, she glanced at one man's foot and saw that the foot had only four toes—the big toe was missing. She promptly walked up to him and, shaking an accusing finger in his face, shouted, "You are a thief. You are an arrant thief for I've seen your tracks in our watermelon bed more than a hundred times."

While some of the armory workmen were on the lawless side of the ledger, many employees of that time were hard-working, law-abiding citizens. In fact many families have contributed generations of workmen to the armory. The names of these local families are legion. The longest in point of service, however, was the Hosmer family. The first Hosmer employee began service in 1809 and finally ended with the retirement of William E. Hosmer, chief inspector here, in the 1930's.

The Springfield Armory of the 1840's presented an imposing yet attractive appearance to those who had occasion to view it.

There is no better way to describe the setting and what the viewer saw than to repeat it in the words of a visitor to the armory.

A color picture set in the words and descriptive phrases of that day went like this:

"The village of Springfield is one of the most beautiful villages of New England. The business part of it lays along the bank of the Connecticut, on a sort of plain; and from this plain, streets ascend to more elevated land behind it, which is covered in every direction with handsome villas overlooking the village and the river, and the broad and beautiful valley of the Connecticut.

"The principal buildings of the armory are situated upon another plain, which extends back from this elevated land, at the distance of perhaps half a mile from the river. The buildings are very large and handsome and are arranged around the sides of a spacious square which is ornamented with walks and rows of trees. The effect is one of appearing like the buildings of a college. There was one ediface in the center of the principal front of the square which had a cupola upon it, as if it were a chapel. This was the office and counting house. The other buildings were shops and storehouses.

"On one side was a long row of houses which were used for the residences of the officers and others connected with the armory. From this central square, streets diverged in every direction over the plain which were bordered with small but very neat and pleasant houses for the workmen. These houses were ornamented with trees and shrubbery and surrounded with pleasant yards and gardens. The whole scene presented, on every side, a very pleasant prospect to the view.

"Walking from the buildings on the plain in a southerly direction, a winding road descended, into a valley where the water shops were located. It was a beautiful glen, shaded by trees, with a millstream flowing through the center of it. There was a road, leading up and down the valley, on each side of the stream with a bridge connecting one road with another. Above the bridge was a dam of handsome mason work with various flumes for conveying the water. There were also some large and handsome shops, on each side of the stream, with torrents of water pouring out from beneath them, indicating that they contained machinery which was carried by water.

"There are three water shops on the stream, about half a mile apart.

"Entering into the middle shop, one saw a very large apartment on the ground floor, and not well lighted, except by the blazing fire of the forges. There were rows of forges extending through the whole length of it, which were glowing with the intense heat of anthracite fires, urged by bellows which were carried by water.

"Connected with each forge was a great hammer worked by water. The handle was a beam of wood, perhaps 10 feet long, which moved on an axle near the end of it. The end of the handle projected a short distance beyond the axle on which it turns and was armed at the extremity with iron. Beyond it was a wheel with projecting cogs or pins of iron which struck against the end of the handle, as the wheel turned round, and drove it down. This made the head of the hammer rise up. Then, when the cog in the wheel, which had struck against the end of the handle, slipped by, it let the end of the handle up and the head of the hammer fell down upon the anvil or, rather, the work placed upon the anvil to be forged.

"The lower water shops building had several activities going on simultaneously. In one area, iron bars were rolled out and cut in lengths suitable for forming the barrels.

"Also in the lower of the three dam building areas, was the stocking shop where the stocks of the guns were turned. The water power supplied by the dam turned the wheel and machinery which made possible the shaping of the wooden stock.

"Another in the most interesting processes seen during the visit was the grinding of the barrels after they had been turned. Although great effort is made to keep the machinery and the barrels stationery, the barrels are still not precisely alike when they come from the lathe. Some will be a little thicker or thinner in some parts than others. Then, besides, the tool does not leave the iron perfectly smooth, for as it moves slowly along at the same time that the iron revolves, it cuts in a spiral direction and leaves the work marked with a sort of spiral depression. This depression has to be ground away by an enormous grindstone, 5 or 6 feet in diameter revolving with great velocity, in order to make smooth the barrel throughout.

"Machinery for polishing the outsides of the barrels were also included in the shop. There were two machines for polishing and each had four gun barrels in it. The form of the machine was an upright iron frame and the barrels were placed in it in a perpendicular position. The upper ends were attached to wheels, by which they were kept in constant revolution, and these wheels were also attached to a beam which ascended and descended continually, like the beam over the piston rod of a steam engine or that which carries the saw in a sawmill. Thus the barrels were alternately drawn up and pushed down, continually revolving at the same time. They passed in this manner between a set of leather cushions covered with oil and emery—a fine powder used for polishing. These cushions were pressed together by springs with the barrels between them, and thus all the roughness of the iron, left by the grindstone, was gradually worn away and the barrels came out at last highly polished.

"The smaller parts of the musket, such as the screws, bands, and parts of the lock, were polished in a different manner—by holding them one by one against wheels revolving with great velocity. Many of the wheels turning were revolving with a rate of 1,500 times per minute.

"Testing of bayonets were also conducted in one of the Water Shops buildings. The manner of testing bayonets was like this: a workman put them, one by one, upon a gun, and then, striking the point a little into the floor, he would spring it forcibly one way and the other, to see if it would bear the necessary strain. By this operation, the bayonet was bent a little to one side or the other. This was called taking a set. The more highly tempered the steel, the less easy it is to 'make' a set. The bayonet requirements include a desirability to have it elastic—but not too brittle.

"Another ingenious way of testing for elasticity was this: there was a place fitted at the end of the bench where the workman could rest the neck of the bayonet upon a solid support, which seemed as sort of a fulcrum. The point of the bayonet was then inserted into a loop in a wire, which had attached to the end of it a heavyweight of lead. Then, by bearing down upon the end of the gun, the lead was lifted, the whole weight of it resting upon the point of the bayonet. This weight was so heavy it bent the bayonet that would spring back nearly into place but not quite. It 'set' about a quarter of an inch. The man who was examining the bayonets said that if they did not set more than a quarter of an inch in lifting such a weight, they were considered as passing a satisfactory trial in respect to their elasticity.

"The workmen said that losses of bayonets due to workmanship are marked against the payment of the worker. Losses due to metal defects are not charged to the worker. All bayonet work was done by the piece and if the part did not stand inspection, the loss was charged against the man who made it.

"Most of the machinery making the parts cost about a hundred dollars each.

"The finishing shops and the storehouses of the armory were located around the great square on the plain above Springfield. The first building entered was near the northwest corner of the square. On entering it, a long spacious apartment with a double row of forges extending through the middle of it, could be seen. The floor was paved with flat stones. The walls and ceiling were neatly whitewashed. Over each forge was a pair of blacksmith's bellows.

"Apparatus used here was much more complicated than in the Water Shops.

"Large anvils at each forge had a variety of depressions and perforations on the flat surface rather than a smooth surface. There were also smaller anvils called stakes beside each larger anvil, also full of depressions and perforations.

"These anvils were used in forging irregular parts by placing hot iron into the depressions and perforations, covering it with another piece of steel called a jumper and then driving the whole upon the stake.

"At other large buildings on the plains, various other operations connected with finishing the locks and guns were going on. In one room, men were employed smoothing over the gunstocks; others were fitting the locks to the stocks, filing and finishing the small parts of the lock.

"Each bench in one of the big apartments was fitted for one particular branch of work. The patterns were made of steel and the workmen filed the work to correspond with them exactly. All pieces were made exactly alike.

"Finally, after leaving the manufacturing rooms, I went into the central building, on the main front of the square, for this was the office and counting house. Here I asked to go into the arsenal which was one of the large buildings where the muskets were stored after they were finished.

"The walk to the arsenal from the counting house was along a gravel walk which led between two rows of trees toward the center of the square. When the door of the arsenal was opened we were struck with the imposing spectacle presented to view.

"Except for the necessary space for passages, the room was entirely filled with muskets. They were arranged with the utmost perfect precision and symmetry in an upright position, the butts resting in frames made for the purpose and raised at a little distance from the floor. The tops of the bayonets reached nearly to the ceiling. The dark and glossy brown color of the stocks, with the highly polished luster of the bayonets and the other metallic parts, gave to each individual gun a very beautiful appearance; but in addition to this, there was a most surprising effect produced by the immense numbers and admirable arrangement of the whole. The rows of bayonets glittered in a long perspective. Even the locks, and the ramrods, and the sights upon the barrels, and in fact, every single part of the gun, were presented to the eye, in long ranges, extending up and down the room. The guns were placed on the frames only about half an inch apart, and yet so precise was the arrangement that, by standing at one end of the room and looking through, the window at the other end of the room which was at a hundred and twenty feet distance and 40 feet wide, could be seen. There was another such room on the second story, of the same dimensions and filled in the same manner.

"There were more than 100,000 muskets in the building with each ready to be fired. Each of the guns was taken down and oiled every few years to keep the parts bright and clean and free from rusting."

(The foregoing was excerpted from "Marco Paul's Travels and Adventures: The Springfield Armory" by Rev. Jacob Abbott. The book, printed in 1843, was made available to Chris Dvarecka by Brian King, editor of the Springfield Republican roto section. The courtesies of Mr. King are appreciated since it provided the necessary color for the historical period indicated.)

JAMES PATTON OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in extending congratulations to James Patton, of the National Farmers Union, on his many years of service to his organization. I offer him my best wishes on his retirement.

Congratulations are also in order for Mr. Glenn Talbott who is also stepping down after 25 years of service.

Much progress has been made by both of these gentlemen in the direction of agricultural income commensurate with the other areas of our economy which are soaring ahead. And yet, we must not lose sight of the fact that we have much to do for the American farmer in guaranteeing a decent price for his products.

I am certain that the Farmers Union will feel deeply the loss of their president, but look forward to working closely with the new leadership of this important group which is working hard for the American agricultural producer.

CONSERVATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is very encouraging to note that the Soil Conservation Service budget for fiscal year 1967 is $228 million or $2 million above last year's level. It is encouraging because a near tragedy was narrowly averted last year when the administration cut the program and fortunately the funds to continue this effective program were restored by Congress.

Budget forecasts made by the Soil Conservation Service indicate that $3.7 million will go toward activities in South Dakota.

The largest item estimated for the State program is $2.1 million for conservation operations, followed by $1 million for the Great Plains conservation program, in which South Dakota is a leading participant.

Other budget estimates include $300,000 for watershed protection, $100,000 for watershed planning, and $121,000 for the resources and conservation development program in Bon Homme and Charles Mix Counties.

The Bon Homme-Charles Mix budget includes an additional $5,000 for planning purposes which may include Douglas County in the project.

It is my sincere hope that this budget will be sustained by the House Appropriations Subcommittee and the Congress so this important work can continue without interruption.

It is essentially that the Soil Conservation Service program be carried on at its current funding level, and I can think of no better endorsement for the fine work that is being done in the Second Congressional District of South Dakota than the announcement of the Soil Conservation Service that three conservation districts have received awards in the nationwide district newsletter contest sponsored by the Farm & Industrial Equipment Institute and the National Association of Conservation.

The purpose of the contest is to stimulate effective communications between districts and the rural and urban interests in conservation. The Bennett County district at Martin, S. Dak., was a second place winner in the national category. Sully County's district headquartered at Onida, S. Dak., placed second in the Northern Plains area, and the Edmunds County district at Ipswich, S. Dak., placed second in the special new newsletter division for districts beginning publication during the contest year.

These awards speak very well of the dedication of district boards in soil and water conservation districts in South Dakota to keep rural and urban interests currently informed of the conservation efforts being carried on by them and the services available.

These outstanding efforts must be carried on uninterruptedly by providing adequate funding for this key program in our Nation's battle to conserve its natural resources and bolster guaranteed agricultural income.

THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF CALVIN COLLEGE AND SEMINARY, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Calvin College and Seminary in Grand Rapids, Mich., today is observing the 90th anniversary of its founding. Beginning in an upper room of a school building in 1876 Calvin College has outgrown one campus and today, with nearly 3,000 students, is constructing a new campus to meet the needs of 5,000 students and representing an investment in excess of $20 million.

Owned and operated by the Christian Reformed Church, it serves a nationwide constituency and attracts many students from Canada. Religiously orientiated and highly acclaimed in the academic community, Calvin College and Seminary is devoted to preparing young people to serve God and their fellowmen.

I mention this college and its anniversary today because I never cease to marvel at the faithfulness and resourcefulness of its supporters, the competence and dedication of its staff, the enthusiasm and determination of its student body, and the loyalty and accomplishments of its graduates. I take this opportunity to extend greetings from the U.S. House of Representatives to Calvin College and Seminary on its 90th anniversary.

May I add that two members of my staff are Calvin graduates, and that many others are serving in the Government or the Armed Forces in the Washington area.

"FACE THE NATION" AS BROADCAST OVER THE CBS TV AND RADIO NETWORK WITH CONGRESSMAN LAIRD

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of my most able, knowledgeable, and responsible colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Melvin R. Laird, appeared on the Columbia Broadcasting System program, "Face the Nation," on March 13, 1966.

Because of Representative Laird's vast experience on the House Committee on Appropriations his penetrating observations and constructive views should be a part of the Record. On this program Representative Laird contributed to the public information on the crisis our Nation faces both at home and abroad. I am honored to submit the text of this program for inclusion in the body of the Record.

"Face the Nation"

(Broadcast over the CBS Television Network, and the CBS Radio Network, March 13, 1966)

Guest: The Honorable Melvin R. Laird, U.S. House of Representatives, Republican, of Wisconsin.

News correspondents: Martin Agronsky, CBS News; Neil MacNeil, Time magazine; George Herman, CBS News.

Producers: Ellen Wadley, Prentiss Childs.

Director: Robert Vitarelli.

Mr. Agronsky. Congressman Laird, you have charged that the President is not being candid with the American people on the real facts of the Vietnam war. What is being withheld from the people?

Representative Laird. It seems to me that the President of the United States should make very clear what the short-term aims and long-term objectives are of the United States in Vietnam; whether he supports the statements made by his press secretary or his Vice President. It is important so that there will not be a miscalculation on the part of the Communists and confusion on the part of the American people.

Announcer. Live, from CBS Washington, "Face the Nation," a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with Representative Melvin Laird, of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Republican conference. Mr. Laird will be questioned by CBS News Correspondent George Herman; Neil MacNeil, chief congressional correspondent, Time magazine; CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky will lead the questioning.

Mr. Agronsky. Congressman Laird, I presume the fact that you feel is being withheld is what the United States would do in Vietnam about including Communists in a coalition government.

Now, you have recently declared that if the United States is prepared to accept the inclusion of the Communists in a coalition government in Vietnam, then the fighting there makes no sense. Is that your point?

Representative Laird. I think it is very true that if we decide that we are going to take in Communists in the coalition government, then we might as well announce that now, because the war in Vietnam it would seem to me would ease considerably. That is what the shooting is all about in Vietnam at the present time. As one member of the Defense Appropriations Committee, I have always felt that that is what the war was all about.

Mr. MacNeil. Mr. Laird, you are put in a position I think of saying that the elections if held—I am asking this, really—that the Republicans would not be prepared to accept under any terms the admission of Communists in the South Vietnam——

Representative Laird. That is not what I said. The dispute seems to be in regard to whether the Communists will be given a place before free elections. I think that is the important issue involved here. And I think the administration has to make its position very clear.

As far as withholding information from the American people, I think that there are many areas in which all of the facts are not put before the American people, and I think that they should be put before the American people.

For instance in the area of the Soviet involvement in the Vietnamese war—I think there are a lot of people in the United States that do not understand fully and clearly the full involvement of the Soviet Union in the Vietnamese fighting, and in supplying the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong at this time.

I think that there are also other areas in which facts are being classified. For instance, the ships that are being used to carry goods into the port of Haiphong. The Red Chinese know the names of these ships, the Russians know, the North Vietnamese know. Yet this information is classified information as far as the American people are concerned.

Now, when the enemy or the potential enemy knows these facts, why should they be withheld from the American people?

Mr. Herman. Mr. Laird, obviously we are going to get back to these points which you have just raised. But before we do, I just want to clear up a point which sort of got left behind. And that is about the participation of the Communists. You said they should not be allowed to participate before a government. Does that mean that you and your party rule them out as participants in negotiations before an election?

Representative Laird. I think the Secretary of State has made the position of the country very clear—that the Vietcong would be able to come into any kind of a conference as a part of the North Vietnamese representation, because, after all, the war is being run from Hanoi, and I think that most people that are informed on the activities of this war effort know full well that the shots are being called in Hanoi and in Red China.

Mr. Herman. But that would be acceptable to you—that the Vietcong should be included in some way in negotiations.

Representative Laird. Well, I would assume that Hanoi would include them with their representatives at any kind of a conference. This would be a decision that Hanoi would make, not a decision for our Government to make, it would seem to me.

Mr. Agronsky. I don't want to belabor the point, but the statement that you had made was that if the United States is prepared to accept the inclusion of the Communists in a coalition government in Vietnam, then the fighting makes no sense.

Now, the thrust of that statement would seem to be that under no circumstances would you want to see the inclusion of Communists in a coalition government in Vietnam.

Is that correct or is it not, sir?

Representative Laird. Well, if after free elections they elect people——

Mr. Agronsky. You would accept them.

Representative Laird (continuing). To positions that are members of the Communist Party, I think that is a different question. But the question that was originally addressed to me had to do with before free elections, and it had to do with the dispute that is going on within the Democratic Party over this issue.

Mr. Agronsky. Let's talk about it after elections. Would you permit the inclusion of Communists in a coalition government?

Representative Laird. I would support the decisions that came about through free elections in Vietnam. But I think you have to understand, Martin, that free elections are a long way off as far as South Vietnam. South Vietnam is not in a position to conduct any kind of elections. We can elect village chiefs and so forth—they can be elected. And there would be the procedures for that. But as far as a national election in South Vietnam that you are talking about now, which is an entirely different question, I think you will find that that kind of an election process is quite a way off when you consider the amount of land territory now that is completely beyond the control of any established government in South Vietnam now.

Mr. Agronsky. I am not arguing the timetable. I am talking about the principle. Because when you said that to accept the Communists in a coalition government, then the fighting makes no sense, that would clearly indicate you would exclude them.

Representative Laird. I was referring to the kind of a settlement that we had in Laos. This was an imposed settlement in which the eight points that Secretary Rusk so adequately set forth as the prerequisites to having a solution in Laos were not lived up to when the agreement was finally made.

We imposed a coalition government, giving the Communists a veto power, without any free elections at all. And it would seem to me that the fine statement that Secretary Rusk made prior to the Laotian agreement is a statement that I would stand on and I think a statement that he continued to stand on, but the negotiations which were conducted by Governor Harriman did not live up to the Rusk criteria.

I would like to say that I have great respect for Secretary of State Rusk, and I am thankful each day that he is our Secretary of State.

Mr. MacNeil. Mr. Laird, some Republicans—former Vice President Nixon—have been making charges in recent weeks that some of the Democrats are in effect advocating appeasement.

If, after free elections, there were Communists in the Saigon government, would that be a political issue with Republicans? Would you be charging in effect that the Johnson administration had been guilty in some way or another of appeasement?

Representative Laird. No; this is not the question that we have before us. The question before us now is that Secretary—the Secretary of State, President Johnson, have made conflicting statements as far as the interim government is concerned. Senator Kennedy has advocated taking the Communists into an interim government; that it would be all right with him. Press Secretary Moyer indicated that perhaps this would be all right with the administration.

Now, it seems to me that we have to clear up this question and there is only one man that can clear up that question and that is the President of the United States.

I think it is most important that this question be answered, so that not only the American people know what the position of our country is, but that the North Vietnamese, the Red Chinese, yes, and the Soviet Union know what the position of the United States is in regard to peace terms.

Mr. MacNeil. Mr. Laird, you sit on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House, and as such you receive top-level briefings, both from the Defense people and from our own CIA.

I would like to ask you what they are telling you. For example, how much more money is this war going to cost; how long is it going to take?

Representative Laird. Well, first, I am not at liberty to break classification on any information. The Secretary of Defense is able to do this and make a determination, as he did in his press conference, where information that had been given us on a classified basis was used. He can do this for his own political security, sometimes I don't think in the interest of national security. But I cannot.

But I would like to tell you one thing.

That is, that the defense needs of this country are being underestimated. They were underestimated in the President's budget of 1966, when it was originally submitted, by some $15 billion. The supplemental request which we will act upon in the House of Representatives on Tuesday or Wednesday of this week—I think the American people were led to believe that that was all the money that would be necessary for the remaining portion of fiscal year 1966. It is simply not true. We will have another supplemental bill for defense spending even to cover military pay before us within a very short period of time.

The 1967 budget, Martin, is underestimated again. As a matter of fact, the Army manpower limitations that were in that 1967 budget, 2 days after the budget was submitted to the Congress, had been removed, making that budget out of date.

Mr. Agronsky. Are you contending that the President, that the administration is deliberately misrepresenting both the monetary and manpower needs of this war to the American people today?

Representative Laird. No. They want to finance it on a supplemental basis instead of a pay-as-you-go basis—they want to come in on a supplemental basis and have refused in 1966 to estimate adequately what the needs would be in southeast Asia, as well as the needs to meet the other defense requirements which we have all over the world.

Now, this is done for one reason, and it is important to get this point across. It is done so that the other programs of the Great Society can be funded in the budget. And it is done because they know the Congress will always come along and finance national security and defense needs at a later time.

Mr. Agronsky. Well, if it is not misrepresentation, what do you call it?

Mr. Herman. Yes, that is the point. There is a complication of language in here which I am not sure most of the audience will get. You say they want to do it on a supplemental basis. I don't think most Americans know what a supplemental basis means. You mean that they are under——

Representative Laird. Well, they don't want to put it in their budget estimate.

Mr. Herman. They are understating it originally.

Representative Laird. Now, in 1966—they are understating it. Take this fiscal year in which we are currently.

Mr. Herman. Deliberately understating it.

Representative Laird. Deliberately understating it, I believe. And I have so charged over a period of the last few months.

Back when the defense bill was up in 1966—for the 1966 fiscal year, we filed a minority report stating that the defense needs were underestimated, and we made this very clear in our minority views. This is done deliberately so that the American people get the first impact, as they did in the 1966 budget, when it was announced that it was going to be under $100 billion. There was a great hue and cry all over what a grand job the President had done in submitting a budget less than $100 billion. Those of us on the Defense Appropriations Committee—and we so stated in our report—knew full well that this was a phony figure, because the defense needs were not adequately estimated, not a single dollar was put in the bill to carry on for the escalation of the war in Vietnam in the submission that was made in January for the 1966 fiscal year.

Mr. HERMAN. This implies another whole string of economic problems, does it not? If they are underestimating, if the Vietnamese war is going to cost a great deal more than we have been told, it brings up——

Representative LAIRD. Well, that has been proven. We have already got a supplemental that is going to be voted on——

Mr. HERMAN. And you are expecting another.

Representative LAIRD. Additional money for fiscal year 1966, a new obligation authority——

Mr. HERMAN. And you personally expect another.

Representative LAIRD. I expect another for 1966, and there will be still further supplementals covering the 1967 fiscal year.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Have you any idea of how much money you are talking about?

Representative LAIRD. Well, I know that the defense bill, the defense budget for fiscal year 1966 was underestimated by at least $15 billion as far as new obligational authority, and that is being proven now by the string of supplementals. This is a supplemental, an additional request for new obligational authority, new appropriations for fiscal year 1966.

Mr. HERMAN. That is on the order of 15 percent of the total budget. What is this going to do to the economy—how about our tax structure?

Representative LAIRD. Well, it seems to me that this is a problem that is being given too little attention as far as the administration is concerned. This whole question of inflation is an issue which it seems to me the President has been so preoccupied with the deep divisions that exist within his own political party on a national basis that little attention is being paid this problem of inflation which is being brought about by these huge expenditures and continuing the idea that we can do business as usual and still fight a war.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Congressman LAIRD, not a single Republican said nay in either the House or the Senate on the defense appropriation that was just passed. Not one said no.

Representative LAIRD. That is the very point I make. And I believe that you will find that we will continue to support the national security needs and the defense needs of this country.

Mr. AGRONSKY. But if there is a misrepresentation, why don't you say so? Why don't you indicate its nature?

Representative LAIRD. We certainly did. We gave you our minority reviews in the 1966 bill. We have done so in the report that will be made public this weekend, as far as the supplemental request for fiscal year 1966.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Again may I ask you what is the size of that supplemental that you think is not being adequately reported.

Representative LAIRD. $12.2 billion is the supplemental which will be acted on as far as the military is concerned on Tuesday of this week. And I intend to support it. I hope all Republicans, I hope all Americans, will support it. These funds are needed in order to meet our worldwide commitments as outlined by Secretary Rusk so adequately in his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee just two weeks ago.

Mr. MACNEIL. Mr. LAIRD, I would like to come back to a question I originally asked you which is, Hasn't the CIA or someone indicated an expectation of how long this war is going to go? There is no indication at all—without violating security or anything like that?

Representative LAIRD. Well, we——

Mr. MACNEIL. Is this open-ended?

Representative LAIRD. We have had very optimistic reports on this war from Secretary of Defense McNamara for the last 4 years. Back in the 88th Congress he told us that we would be withdrawing our troops from South Vietnam and at that time we had less than 18,000, by sometime in December of 1965. We have always had optimistic reports from the Secretary of Defense. It seems each time he has gone to Vietnam, he has come back and given us a more optimistic report as to the conditions there.

I would not want to use those reports of the Secretary of Defense as the basis for such an estimate, because he has always given optimistic estimates as far as Vietnam is concerned.

Mr. MACNEIL. The reason I am asking this question is it seems to me that we are engaged in an open-end war in Vietnam, and that we are, in MacArthur's phrase, bogged down in a land war in Asia.

Now, the Republicans have said they would not support such a commitment. And yet you are.

Representative LAIRD. Well, we have made very clear in our coordinating council statement, which represents the Governors, the House, and Senate leadership, and the top party leaders of our country, that we would suggest to the President, and we did suggest in December, that rather than continue escalating the war on the ground, as he has proposed, that we first try to use the sea and air power; that we believe that if negotiations are our goal, peace through negotiations, we should use the pressure in the area where we can best bring about these negotiations.

By merely going on the ground, escalating on the ground and putting the major emphasis on the ground, that we do not use the kind of pressure that is best likely to bring about the desired negotiations.

Mr. MACNEIL. But the emphasis is on the ground, and you are supporting it.

Representative LAIRD. Now we seem to have a different policy. The negotiation policy of course was a policy enunciated by President Johnson in his April 7 speech at Johns Hopkins University. Now Vice President HUMPHREY, in all of his speeches, is talking about victory—whether it be a speech in Saigon, his speech in Australia, his speech before the VFW and the American Legion. It is not so much the emphasis of the Johns Hopkins speech that the President made in April. It is more of a harder line statement as set forth by the Vice President.

Mr. AGRONSKY. What change would you recommend? Would you have Haiphong bombed, or would you have the policy of hot pursuit into China? What would you do?

Representative LAIRD. I would stand by the Republican Coordinating Council's statement.

I think that greater use of air and sea power is a better means than building up and escalating the ground forces to 400,000, 500,000 or perhaps more.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Where would you bring the greater air and sea power to bear?

Representative LAIRD. It seems to me—we have had our recommendations rejected, as you know, Martin.

The President did not follow our recommendations. He rejected the idea of more adequate use of air and sea power against significant military targets—and we have always limited it to that. This was rejected by the President of the United States. He is the Commander in Chief and he has the authority to reject our coordinating council's statement, which he did.

But that is no reason for those of us in the Republican Party which is the minority party in this country today to say—"well, we are not going to support the President of the United States as our Commander in Chief," simply because he rejected the recommendations which were included in our party position statement as enunciated by the coordinating council.

I think it would be a mistake to do that, Martin.

The national security of our country is involved, and it seems to me that we in the Republican Party should put our country first always.

We are used—the President uses us on many occasions. When there is a hard decision to make, the President always calls my leader, Congressman JERRY FORD, to the White House—when it is a decision to resume bombing, when it is a decision about landing marines in the Dominican Republic. But when it is a decision to go to the United Nations or to stop bombing, then my leader, JERRY FORD, is not called to the White House.

Now, we in the Republican Party know that we are being used in this area; but we are being used, we feel, in the interests of our country, and we shall always continue to put our country ahead of our party.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Congressman LAIRD, there are many more things we would like to ask you, and we will continue the questioning in a moment.

* * *

Mr. AGRONSKY. Congressman LAIRD, is the Republican Party for a tax increase now?

Representative LAIRD. I think it would be a great mistake for the Republican Party to come out now for a tax increase. This would take the lid completely off expenditures as far as the administration is concerned. We should call for a listing of priorities from the administration, such as the listing that was called for by Senator Johnson when he was majority leader of the U.S. Senate, when President Eisenhower was President. This listing of priorities on domestic expenditures is most needed now.

If we come out for a tax increase at this time, the lid will be completely off on expenditures and runaway inflation will be the order of the day.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You are against a tax increase.

Representative LAIRD. Well, I had voted the other day for a tax increase. I think if we have to have a tax increase, I will be one that will be in favor of not having a budget that is completely out of balance. But let's put the emphasis on expenditure reductions. And if we in the minority party come out for a tax increase now, it would be the greatest mistake we could make, it would do a great disservice to our country. And I hope that we do not fall into that trap. Let us keep the pressure on reducing expenditures for the time being.

Mr. MACNEIL. Mr. LAIRD, I would like to turn to the elections. How many seats do you expect the Republicans to win this fall?

Representative LAIRD. I would expect at least 50.

Mr. MACNEIL. How do you expect those?

Representative LAIRD. Well, at the present time, as you know—we received about 43 percent of the vote, as you know, in the 1964 elections. Two percent increase in our popularity would mean 31 additional seats.

According to the recent polls we have taken, Republican preference has increased in the last 6 weeks by a total of 2.5 percent. If we have a 5-percent increase in acceptance of Republicans—this is strictly a mathematical calculation, and you can do this for House seats—a 5-percent increase in popular acceptance for Republicans in the Republican Congress would mean 58 seats. I do not believe a 5-percent increase is out of line at all, in view of the fact that we have moved 2.5 percent in a short period of 6 weeks.

Mr. MACNEIL. I wanted to ask you about those polls. A year ago you had some polls, and at that time you said that the Republicans in Congress had failed to develop any issue up to that point.

What do these polls reflect in terms of the issues that you have developed now, if any?

Representative LAIRD. Well, the No. 1 concern, of course, is Vietnam that has shown up in these polls. No. 2 is the cost of living, particularly among women polled at the present time—this increase in the cost of living, 2 percent last year and at least 3 percent in the President's own budget revenue estimates—anticipated increase in the cost of living of 3 percent, and I believe it will be closer to 5 percent. This is like levying a national sales tax on each wage earner in the United States. And this is of great concern, I believe, to the American people, and this—the President likes to take credit and the Democratic administration for good times. I think they also have to take credit for the tremendous increases in the cost of living.

Mr. MacNeil. How are you going to respond to the Democratic claims that we now have 5 years of unbroken prosperity? Unemployment is down, the lowest point in——

Representative Laird. Well, I think unemployment is down—and that is a very good question. But I think it is easy to solve the unemployment problem if you continue to increase the draft, if you continue to increase the Peace Corps, the Job Corps, and all of these other programs, and putting everybody on the Federal payroll.

Mr. Agronsky. Gentlemen, I'm terribly sorry, but our time is up. Thank you very much, Mr. Laird, for being here to face the Nation.

CLEVELAND URGES EXPANDED WATER-POLLUTION FIGHT; OFFERS BILLS TO FOSTER STATE, AND INDUSTRY EFFORTS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years, we have become increasingly aware of the severe water-pollution problems confronting this Nation.

This Nation's tens of thousands of lakes and streams were once deep, clear, and swift-running; teeming with game fish; rich in oxygen and pure and safe enough to drink from the stream's or lake's very shore. But today many of those lakes and streams are shallow, sluggish, and clogged with municipal and industrial wastes and the millions of tons of silt which have eroded from stripped and barren watersheds. Today our silt-choked rivers cannot begin to handle the overload of offal, bilge, and filth that is being poured into them.

This Nation has a near-catastrophic water-pollution problem. There is just not enough clean water for municipal, industrial, commercial, and irrigation purposes.

What there is, in most places, is so polluted that taxpayers and industries must pay ever-increasing taxes and spend ever-increasing sums of money for purification. Some of this Nation's greatest rivers have become sewers to the sea.

WATER POLLUTION, A NATIONAL CRISIS

In my opinion, there are few problems confronting this Nation today of the magnitude and seriousness of maintaining sufficient and pure water supplies. The need for adequate, good quality water for all of this Nation's uses is paramount, for water pollution destroys natural beauty, menaces the public health, reduces our property values, and raises taxes.

The water supply and pollution problems are so great that one is no longer called an alarmist when he talks of either running out of water almost entirely or of running out of potable water entirely. Many areas of the Nation already suffer acute water shortage problems, and other areas suffer acute water pollution problems. New England suffers from both.

Toward the end of maintaining an adequate supply of clean water in this Nation, many Federal, State, and local officials, in a spirit of cooperation, are moving ahead with many dynamic programs to control water pollution.

On December 14, 1965, the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, met in quarterly session in New York, N.Y., to discuss water pollution control measures. The commission adopted two resolutions which I consider to be of prime significance.

NEW ENGLAND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include these two important resolutions in the Record:

Resolution of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission To Urge Congress To Amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act

Whereas the rate of municipal sewage work construction is greatly determined by the availability of Federal construction grant funds; and

Whereas the rate of construction must proceed at a much higher annual rate if the rate is to meet water pollution control needs and protect vital water resources in a reasonable time; and

Whereas in order that sewage works construction may proceed at the greatest possible rate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission urge the existing Federal Water Pollution Control Act be amended to include provisions for paybacks to State governments which advance the Federal share and to local governments which incur construction costs in anticipation of receiving Federal aid for this purpose in instances where the existing annual appropriations are insufficient to meet current demands.

Attest:

Thomas C. McMahon,
Executive Secretary.

Resolution of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission Recommending Congress Adopt Federal Legislation Providing Financial Incentives to Industry for Construction of Water Pollution Control Facilities

Whereas industrial waste constitutes a significant portion of the overall water pollution problem, and

Whereas the abatement of industrial pollution is not keeping pace with the municipal programs, and

Whereas the benefits to be derived from industrial pollution abatement are regional and interstate in character justifying the concern and active support of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission recommend adoption of Federal legislation to provide financial inducement for abatement of water pollution such as accelerated tax writeoffs of plant investments made in the interest of water pollution control.

Attest:

Thomas C. McMahon,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, these two resolutions are only a small indication of the vast amount of time and attention being devoted by concerned public officials and interested private parties in the New England area and in the State of New Hampshire to take adequate measures to insure clean water for now and the future.

CLEVELAND BILLS DESCRIBED

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two bills with a view toward controlling water pollution. It is my understanding that the first bill will most probably be referred to the Committee on Public Works, a committee on which I have served for 4 years. I understand that the second bill will most probably be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. I sincerely hope that both committees will favorably consider these two proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the first bill, which I introduced today, is to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to States, municipalities, or intermunicipal or interstate agencies that undertake the construction of treatment works in advance of the availability of funds. If, prior to commencement of construction of any sewage treatment works in advance of the availability of funds for a grant under section 8 of the act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare approves such project, and the State, municipality, intermunicipal, or interstate agency for the control of water pollution thereafter constructs the project and submits an application to the Secretary approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies for a grant for the project, the Secretary, upon his approval of such application, is authorized to make a grant under section 8 for the project to be paid from future appropriations.

No such grant shall be made unless all of the provisions of the act have been complied with to the same extent and with the same effect as though the grant were to be made for future construction of the project, and no such grant shall be made in an amount exceeding a grant which would otherwise be made under this section for the future construction of such project.

To prevent any entanglements regarding either the authorization or the appropriation of funds for the Federal water pollution control program by the Congress, neither an approval of the project by the Secretary prior to construction, nor the making of a grant by the Secretary for a project to be paid from a future appropriation, nor any other provisions of the subsection which would be added to the law by this bill, shall be construed to constitute a commitment or obligation of the United States to provide funds to make or pay any grant for a project.

DIFFERENCES NOTED

This proposal differs from others which have been introduced to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, which would authorize reimbursements of States that prefinance certain treatment works. The legislation which I have introduced would go beyond the reimbursements of States which have used the proceeds of bonds issued by States, counties, cities, or other political subdivisions of the State for the construction of projects which otherwise would be eligible for a grant under section 8. Under those legislative proposals, the political entities may claim payment of any portion of the sums allotted or reallotted to it under this section to aid in the retirement of the principal of bonds at their maturities, to the extent that the proceeds of such bonds have been actually expended in the construction of one or more of such projects.

My legislation would go beyond the mere bond concept. It would extend to the financing of the construction of treatment works in advance of the availability of funds for a grant by whatever means the political entities may employ in raising their revenues for such construction.

TAX INDUCEMENT FOR INDUSTRY

Mr. Speaker, the second bill which I introduced today is one to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works by private industry to control water pollution by permitting the deduction of capital expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works.

Under this bill, the construction of pollution treatment facilities is treated as a capital expenditure and there is provided an accelerated writeoff over a period of 3 years.

The treatment works would be required to meet certain specifications, and a certification of the project would be required.

STATE EFFORTS NEED FEDERAL BOOST

This latter bill is not a new concept. Bills of this nature have been introduced since 1947 by many Members of Congress. A number of States have recently moved forward and adopted measures to ease State and local taxes in order to encourage good pollution control practices by industry. But the task which lies ahead is still great. I am convinced that it will take legislation on a Federal level to obtain a full realization of the concepts embodied in such a proposal.

Mr. Speaker, only by concerted action on Federal, State, and local levels of government to claim the water which falls on our land and rises from it, by making adequate and good use of that water as it winds its way to the sea, and to implement effective water pollution control, can we assure the citizens of this great land that there will be adequate clean water for the future. The answer lies in the effective use and reuse of water, and that cannot be achieved without the cooperation of government and industry, from the Nation's Capital to every county courthouse, and from monstrously large enterprises to small plants.

The people of New Hampshire, the people of New England, the people of all America needed an effective water pollution control program.

FREEMAN VERSUS ACKLEY ON CCC DUMPING

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in Minneapolis last week, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman referred to my remarks to the House concerning the dumping of Commodity Credit Corporation corn stocks on the feed market as "a lot of political noise."

Freeman continued:

> We hear this sort of talk every time an ounce of grain is moved out of storage * * * I keep telling our farm people they can't have their cake and eat it too.

The Secretary questioned my figures which showed that the CCC dumping activities had dropped the price of corn 6 cents in Chicago, and said that 2 cents was more accurate. He quoted the Chicago price at $1.29 a bushel which, in his opinion, is a "pretty healthy price."

The facts are that 175 million bushels of corn were dumped in the first 9 weeks of 1966, and it has been reported to me that approximately 80 million more bushels were unloaded last week. Roughly 250 million bushels of corn make for a lot of "ounces."

In regard to the prices at Chicago, it is obvious that both Mr. Freeman and I can use any particular day's market quotations we prefer. However, on March 9, 1966, the day Mr. Freeman made his Minneapolis remarks, the price for No. 2 corn at Chicago was $1.27 a bushel. How can this be considered a "pretty healthy price" when it is 5 cents a bushel lower than the $1.32 price of March 9, 1965?

In the face of these lower prices, the Department of Agriculture Index of Prices Paid for Commodities and Services by the farmers has gone up 11 points. Thus, the farmers are paying higher prices to produce their corn but are receiving a lower return for their labors.

Compare the farmers' return with the average weekly gross earnings of production workers in all manufacturing which increased from $105.52 in January 1965, to $110.00 in January 1966. Contrary to Mr. Freeman's assurances, the farmers are not even getting their cake, so there is not too much worry about them taking too big of a slice.

Mr. Speaker, I have suggested that the Department of Agriculture is purposefully holding down the market price of corn. Mr. Freeman has scoffed at this as "a lot of political noise." On March 10, 1966, the day after Mr. Freeman's speech, Gardner Ackley, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors was quoted as follows during an interview with Ray Scherer of NBC News on the Today Show:

> Increase in supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn, and we're trying to hold down the price of corn. The Government's acquired large stocks of corn in its past price support operation, now we're releasing them into the market.

Surely the Secretary of Agriculture would not accuse the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers of putting out "a lot of political noise." Perhaps the Secretary is merely concerned with the corn market price in view of the fact that as of February 25, farmers had declared their intention to divert only 11 million acres of feed grains under the feed-grain program compared to 19.1 million acres during the same period in last year's signup program. The Secretary neglected to mention this possibility in his response to me.

A FLAIR FOR INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age of mayors and Governors coming to Washington with their hats in their hands requesting Federal financial help, it is refreshing to read of places still displaying the good old-fashioned American spirit of pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps.

Such a place is Welch, W. Va., a city of about 5,000 population located in the heart of West Virginia's southern coalfields.

Welch is unique in that it has a mayor who preaches of the dangers of State and local political leaders abdicating their responsibilities by continually looking toward Washington for financial help. Welch is unique in that it has a mayor who practices what he preaches. He is Mayor W. B. Swope. Mayor Swope recently addressed a dinner in Bluefield, W. Va. His speech was fully reported by the Bluefield Daily Telegraph.

I wish that my colleagues will have a chance to read of this mayor of a small city in West Virginia, a mayor with a flair for independence. Under unanimous consent I include it with my remarks:

BUREAUCRACY, EROSION OF FREEDOM ARE FLAYED

> Federal bureaucrats are operating a "crooked poker game" that is going to bankrupt both States and municipalities and eliminate the last vestiges of freedom in the United States unless present trends are reversed, Mayor W. B. Swope of Welch said Thursday night.
>
> Swope told a Mercer County Lincoln Day dinner gathering that only a dictatorship can result if State and city political leaders continue to abdicate their responsibilities and turn to Washington for financial help for every local improvement.

"It makes me sick to see how helpless communities have become," he said, "when it can be demonstrated that any community can do almost anything it needs to have done at a fraction of the cost required when the Federal Government helps do it."

BUILDS ITS OWN

Swope said his own city of Welch, which recently turned down a $625,000 Federal sewer-building grant, has discovered that it can build a better system for $150,000 of its own money than it could by accepting the Federal money and the rules and regulations that go with such grants.

"We are building an interceptor sewer system for almost what it would cost for engineering and legal fees if we had taken the Federal grant," he said, "and we are avoiding the rules and regulations that the Government would fasten on us."

Swope said Welch also had discovered that it could have completed another project, which he did not identify, for $70,000, but that it actually cost $160,000 when the Federal Government became involved.

He noted a recent newspaper report that Princeton is considering a request for Federal aid to improve its sewer system, and added:

"I'm sure that they can build whatever they need for about what it would cost them to fill out the papers they'll need to get Federal help."

VICIOUS CIRCLE

Swope said his experience as mayor of Welch indicates that the Federal Government's huge array of grants and loans is going to bankrupt both States and cities which not only have to supply the money the Federal Government uses but then must come up with more to match what the Federal Government returns in the form of aid.

"I don't understand," he said, "how the Government can take our money, change its name and call it 'Federal money,' con us into going into these programs, where we put up more money, and then tell us how to spend both."

Swope said he also was proud of the fact that the Republican city administration of Welch had reduced its own annual budget from $260,000 to $220,000 during a period when most municipal budgets were increasing at an average of 10 percent a year.

EROSION OF FREEDOM

He said he and all Republicans are particularly concerned over the continued erosion of basic American freedoms, and that this is typified by Federal agencies like the Internal Revenue Service.

Swope said the tax collectors have completely reversed the old American principle that a man is innocent until proved guilty. "Now they (the tax collectors) tell you how guilty you are, and it's up to you to prove you aren't," he said.

He said he spoke from bitter personal experience, because it once cost him 3 years of work and $4,000 to prove that his tax returns were accurate, and that in the end he received "a refund of $40.20 and an apology."

Swope was introduced by a former Welch resident, J. Don Clark of Bluefield, who called him "the greatest mayor in the United States." Brief remarks also were made by Republican County Chairman A. Harry Vest, Mercer County Republican Club President Earl Landers, Wade H. (Jim) Ballard III of Peterstown, and State Republican Chairman John C. Shott, who also served as master of ceremonies. The group was welcomed by Mrs. Ben H. Williams, president of the Bluefield Republican Women's Club which sponsored the dinner. The pledge of allegiance was led by former Republican national committeewoman Mrs. Sayers F. Harman of Bluefield. Piano music was by Mrs. Olivia H. Canaday.

THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to encourage States and local subdivisions to take immediate and effective action with respect to water pollution.

It is obvious that the tremendous expenditures which are necessary effectively to deal with the problem of water pollution, require the intervention of the Federal Government. However, we would not want the States and localities to sit back and wait for such help. Accordingly this legislation would insure that if any State or locality proceeds in this area, it will not be penalized and will obtain its proper share of Federal reimbursement when the Federal Government finally does make additional and sufficient funds available for this purpose.

States should be encouraged to initiate water pollution control programs now, with the assurance that if Federal funds become available at a later date they will be reimbursed. This retroactive provision will eliminate any lingering doubt that the pioneers in such an important movement for conservation and restoration of our water resources might lose the opportunity to share in future Federal funds.

I believe that this legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize reimbursement of States that prefinance certain treatment works," will provide the necessary safeguard and the incentive for immediate action for clean water.

A copy of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Any State that shall use the proceeds of bonds issued by the State, county, city, of other political subdivision of the State for the construction of one or more projects which otherwise would be eligible for a grant under this section may claim payment of any portion of the sums allotted or reallotted to it under this section to aid in the retirement of the principal of such bonds at their maturities, to the extent that the proceeds of such bonds have been actually expended in the construction of one or more of such projects. Such claim for payment may be made only when all of the provisions of this Act have been complied with to the same extent and with the same effect as though payment were to be made to the State for a project for future construction, and the Federal share payable with respect to such project shall not exceed the amount which a grant could have been made under this section for such project."

WAR ON HUNGER

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Association of Wheat Growers held their 11th annual convention at Spokane, Wash., last December, and it was my pleasure to have participated in the convention, along with a group of knowledgeable and highly regarded experts in their fields.

A great deal of attention was given to the subject of how our wheat producers might best assist in the development of plans for the worldwide war on hunger, and how best our wheatgrowers can participate to help assure success of such a giant undertaking.

As my colleagues are aware, our House Committee on Agriculture is delving into this subject at the present time and will, before long, have recommendations for the consideration of the House. For this reason, I feel it appropriate to bring to the attention of my colleagues a particularly interesting talk given at the Washington Association of Wheat Growers Convention by Mr. Norman Kraeft, an agricultural editor for 15 years who has served as national agricultural editor for both the Mutual Broadcasting System and the American Broadcasting Co. Among other enterprises in the agricultural field, Mr. Kraeft is editor of the agricultural management letter of the Bailey Farm Business Service.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that excerpts from Mr. Kraeft's speech be printed at this point in the Record:

The New Telescope

(A speech by Norman Kraeft at the 11th annual convention of the Washington Association of Wheat Growers at Spokane, Wash., December 7, 1965)

From my Washington, where we specialize in the crop known as words, to your Washington, where you produce more tangible crops, such as wheat, the word is out: Let's start a war we can win, a worldwide war on hunger. Let's set our production sights in terms of the needs of the world. That would mean, of course, a direct and complete reversal of our public policy for agriculture in the United States as we have known it for a third of a century. It means that we set about producing more rather than less. It means that we think in terms of a world food shortage rather than in terms of surplus production for U.S. needs. It means a deemphasis—if not a complete rejection—of acreage or poundage controls and the consequent price support mechanisms. That's the new telescope. Through it, we see increased production by American farmers to help meet world food needs.

The prospect holds some exciting possibilities. Every farmer I have ever talked with in 15 years as a farm editor wants to produce food to feed people, not to go into storage. If the worldwide war on hunger becomes a reality, farmers will be able to take the brakes off their production machines and really produce. Such a development could mean that Government would play a lesser role and that farmers could play a larger part in running the Nation's farms.

As far as the internationalization of agriculture is concerned—and that's what we are talking about—American wheat growers have led the way for many years. Under Public Law 480, our food for peace program, we have in recent years exported 50 percent or more of total U.S. wheat production. Wheat is bread and bread—from time immemorial—has been the staff of life. That is true here in the United States and it is equally true in many parts of the world. Raymond Ioanes, Administrator of USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service, pointed out at USDA's last annual outlook conference that wheat represents about 60 percent of our total food for peace program. I think that figure attests to the important role that wheat, the food you produce, plays in feeding the world's hungry. I think, further, that those in and out of Government who are planning the worldwide war on hunger could well look to you wheat producers and learn much from your experiences in satisfying world food needs.

Man may not be able to live by bread alone, but in a hungry world it's a pretty good start.

Through the new telescope, we will not only see a step-up in our food aid programs, but in our trade programs as well. Here, too, you wheat people are doing outstanding work. In his report, Mr. Ioanes said that our wheat exports during the July–September quarter of this year were running 12 percent higher than a year earlier and that most of this increase was in commercial sales for dollars. Last year we exported 728 million bushels of wheat; 22 percent of the total was commercial sales, 78 percent food for peace. Your market development organizations, such as Western Wheat Associates and Great Plains Wheat, are doing an outstanding job of promoting, selling, and merchandising wheat around the world.

The war on hunger about which we are hearing so much these days is a vast concept and a long-range idea. Being worldwide in scope, it would be an undertaking of huge complexities. Therefore, the warning flags thrown up by persons such as your own Members of Congress, Mrs. CATHERINE MAY and Mr. TOM FOLEY, are very much to the point. I don't think we can quarrel with Mrs. MAY's suggestions to go slow, to learn to crawl before we start running in unfamiliar territory, or with Mr. FOLEY's projection to the effect that we probably will not be in a position to move ahead significantly in this area until the 1970's.

I want to pause here and pay tribute to your Members of Congress who represent the wheat country of Washington State. I have known Mrs. MAY for the last 4 years and have observed her work as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. There are few members of that important committee who are more diligent than CATHERINE MAY in attendance at committee hearings and meetings or who are more familiar with the issues upon which they speak and vote. TOM FOLEY, in his first term in Congress, is doing an excellent job on the Agriculture Committee.

Some of you are personally familiar with the committee on which CATHERINE MAY and TOM FOLEY serve.

This is democracy at work. The 35 members of the committee (34 men and Mrs. MAY) represent every major agricultural region and every important commodity or commodity group in the United States. They are Democrats and they are Republicans. They are northerners and they are southerners, not to speak of easterners and westerners. They are farm boys (and a girl) and they are "city slickers." They swear by Government farm programs and they swear at Government farm programs. Considering the diversity of the committee, it is a wonder that the farm legislation which is produced is as good as it is.

Being the diverse group that it is, the House Agriculture Committee usually evolves farm legislation only with great difficulty. The workings of the committee, however, are only a reflection of the point that Sir Winston Churchill once made about democracy. "Democracy," said the Prime Minister, "is the worst form of government ever conceived by the mind of man, except for all the rest."

If you have any doubts that our democracy is the greatest political system in the world, a good refresher course would be a few visits to open hearings of the House—or Senate—Agriculture Committee. Pity the witness who comes unprepared or who has frail nerves. The committees pride themselves on never having refused to hear anyone who wished to be heard. Having asked to be heard, however, the witness had better be prepared to defend his point of view under some of the most vigorous questioning he will ever encounter. It's a no-holds-barred atmosphere in the congressional Committees on Agriculture, as committee members work to get to the bottom of the issue before them at a given time. Observing this, one silently offers thanks that we live in a country whose laws are still devised in an atmosphere where ideas are batted back and forth like volleyballs in plain view of everyone who cares to look, rather than delivered from the desk of a dictatorship.

At this point may I say, and emphasize, that all this is taking place in Congress, the legislative branch of our Federal Government. That is where the future of our democracy is protected. Which means, that is where we, the people, must protect the future of our democracy.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE of Georgia, a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, issued this reminder a short while back:

"Our Founding Fathers devised a system of government comprised of three separate and coequal branches, each one independent, and each acting as a check on the power of the others. In recent years the separation of powers has become less and less distinct. We have seen the Chief Executive issue orders that have legislative authority. In numerous instances, we have seen the U.S. Supreme Court hand down decisions that had the effect not only of legislation, but also of amending the Constitution itself. For the most part in the past 30 years, we have seen the legislative branch of Government decline in importance. Congress seems to have lost its independence. It is sad but true at the present time that the Congress' primary role appears to be the consideration of bills that have been sent up by the executive branch of Government. I do feel that the Congress should assume more of its duties, and take an independent and active role in our Government in keeping with its constitutional responsibilities."

It is true that, for the most part today, the executive branch proposes, and Congress disposes. But in disposing—one way or another—of legislation proposed by the executive branch, Congress feels increasingly the heavy hand of the executive in making its decisions.

The point is that these decisions affect all Americans. Since they do, all Americans should have a voice in those decisions. Never forget that the legislative branch has 535 Members (Senators and Representatives). All 535 are elected by the people. Of the millions of people in the executive branch, the people elect only two: the President and the Vice President. The rest are appointed and, in point of practice, appear too often to give their first allegiance to the system which gave them employment rather than to the American people as such. I leave it to you as to which branch of the Federal Government—the legislative or the executive—is more directly responsive to the wishes of the American people.

I know a man who, for years, began every speech he made with the words, "Every morning I give thanks that we don't get all the government we pay for." In the light of the growing size and power of the executive branch, I am fearful that we may be getting all the Government we pay for, and more.

On the subject of Congress, I would like to take issue with those who make much of the diminishing numbers of Congressmen from farming and rural areas. We hear in some quarters that it is going to be harder and harder to pass farm legislation through Congress because there are fewer Congressmen from farming and rural America in Washington. I consider such talk as an insult to Congress.

I believe that Congress—for all its diversity—does legislate in the national interest. Has Congress withheld its favors from agriculture recently? I don't see how anyone can say that, considering that Congress in 1965 passed the biggest, most expensive, most extensive farm bill ever enacted into law in the United States of America, including 4-year commodity programs for wheat, feed grains, cotton, dairy and some other commodities. If Congress, from time to time, takes a dim view of certain farm legislation that comes before it, I believe the congressional opposition that develops is based on Congress' belief that the bill in question constitutes bad legislation. I have never observed that Congress opposed farm legislation because it is farm legislation.

No, I don't think it is Congress that farmers must worry about. Has the present Secretary of Agriculture taken a position on legislative reapportionment, for example? He has not, even though most farmers and their organizations are strongly opposed to the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision of last June.

Was it Congress which suggested that 1 million farmers may be enough to feed the Nation? No, it was the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who is responsible to the White House. On this subject, I have often wondered what is so magical about the 1 million figure. What guarantee is there that the drop in farm numbers will stop there? How do we know that, a few years from now, we won't hear that 500,000, or 50,000, or 5,000, or 500 or 50 farms will suffice? Is it not a matter of public policy as well as economics as to whether we shall have many or few farms dotting the American landscape? Is democracy more likely to thrive in a land where many farmers own and operate their own farms or where relatively few farmers employ large numbers of hired laborers to do the farming?

I think I sleep a little better at night knowing that America is still covered with farms, most of which are operated by their owners. William Brake, longtime master of the Michigan State Grange, has said: "The owner-operator concept in American agriculture is our greatest bulwark against communism." I believe that we will allow this concept to slip away from our national life at our national peril.

This is a matter of utmost urgency. Reference to the dwindling away of farms and farmers from the American scene has been made a number of times at this convention. We have been losing farms and farmers at about the same rate under both Secretary Benson and Secretary Freeman. A Minnesota farmer expressed surprise when national attention was focused on the closing of the Studebaker plant in South Bend, Ind., some time back, throwing thousands of people out of work. The Minnesota farmer did a little arithmetic and reported: "We lose that many farmers every 2 weeks and nobody cares."

Meanwhile, is the war on hunger to be maimed before it is born? Certainly, Mrs. MAY in her speech yesterday gave us good reasons why we should look at the idea carefully before rushing ahead. Careful analysis of the proposals in this area is a major purpose of the proposed U.S. World Food Study Commission, supported by many Republican Members of Congress. The war on hunger will undoubtedly be an important study topic also in the President's new National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber. It will be an ironic repetition of the historic divisions which have split the house of agriculture over the years if the war on hunger falls prey to a war between commissions.

Incidentally, President Johnson has said that his new Commission is composed of Americans "of broad experience and great talent." If that is so—and I think it is—why did he feel it necessary to appoint with the Commission a Committee on Food and Fiber to be chaired by the Secretary of Agriculture? Must the Commission operate in the shadow of Government officials? Why, in this democracy, cannot a citizens' commission or committee advise the Government, without Government help? Many people in Washington are fearful that, in the present instance, we may be in for yet another advisory committee operation. We have seen advisory committees come and go by the dozens under Secretary Benson and Secretary Freeman and, more often than not, these committees end up as sounding boards for proposals of the administration in power. The committees, alas, have been more noteworthy for taking rather than giving advice.

Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, has promised early hearings in 1966 on extension of Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, titles I and II of which expire as of December 31, 1966. (Titles III and IV are permanent legislation.)

One of the points that may develop into a major controversy during these hearings is the President's recent action transferring the food-for-peace program to the Department of State. After all, the State Department operates the foreign policy of the United States. U.S. foreign policy today is heavily involved—in one way or another—in hot and cold wars around the world.

Is there not a danger that the best of U.S. motives may be misinterpreted abroad when one agency, the State Department, administers cold policy for hot wars and dispenses food at the same time? Are we not in this manner flirting with the fire of a world opinion that may view [wrongly, perhaps] our food-for-peace programs as pawns on the chessboard of foreign policy?

The new telescope is going to require many careful adjustments before we can see our way clearly in an attempt to gage our public policies for agriculture in terms of world food needs.

Our best hope in this and other fields of action in this democracy is for all of us to do everything we can to see that Congress, the legislative branch of the Federal Government, remains a separate, strong, and independent branch. By electing the best man or woman in each instance, we can continue to make our national will known and respected. In that way we can help assure that the executive and judicial branches will be responsive to the national will.

There is good, much good, on both sides of the political aisle. Working with Members of Congress every day, I have yet to meet the Member I do not like or the Member who can be condemned out of hand for the work he does.

The genius of our political system is its checks and balances. That means that we must have two strong, responsible parties to bring out the best in America, for America. Remember, power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. A strong two-party system means a strong America. It always has, and I trust it always will. Thank you.

THE MAZE OF TAXES

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the growing maze of taxes, particularly what has been described as the hungry search of State and local taxing bodies for new tax revenues to be extracted from companies located wholly outside their jurisdictions, is a critical problem that needs immediate attention and remedial action by this session of Congress.

A Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the Committee on the Judiciary has recently been conducting hearings on H.R. 11798, the proposed Interstate Taxation Act. On February 24, the subcommittee heard forthright testimony from one of my constituents, Werner N. Davidson of Bethlehem, who is vice president of finance for Caloric Corp., Topton, Pa., gas range and appliance manufacturer.

Mr. Davidson said that:

> The exploding T-bomb of State taxation has produced a fantastic fallout of paperwork that threatens to slow down the momentum of marketing.

He urges favorable action by the subcommittee on H.R. 11798, a bill that would limit the bases on which States can impose taxes. He pointed out that States currently levy corporate taxes on as many as four factors: sales, inventory, payroll, and real property. H.R. 11798 would remove sales and inventory as bases for State and local taxation. This would quite properly leave payroll and real property as the bases for State and local levies.

Mr. Davidson went on to say:

> This would eliminate the sales factor, which is the greatest source of confusion, without restricting the traditional right of State and local taxing bodies to levy taxes against citizens over which they have jurisdiction. Today the overlapping State, county, city, and school district tax structure reminds me of a pyramid built by drunken Egyptians.

The witness cited State income taxes, payroll taxes, disability taxes, State, county, and city franchise taxes, sales and use taxes, ad valorem taxes, gross receipts taxes, and occupational license taxes.

> Some of these must be reported monthly. Others must be reported quarterly; others semiannually, and still others annually. And many of these taxes feature a unique formula for arriving at the total dollars to be paid. Trying to find one's way to the top of the pile is a nightmare.
>
> In 4 years, the number of tax returns my company has had to file has increased 36 percent, from 999 to 1,363. In addition, we find that our cost of preparing our average tax return has increased 57.2 percent in that period, from $70 per return to $110. Thus, the total cost of filing the Caloric tax returns has doubled in 4 years, from $70,000 to $149,998.
>
> I take personal issue with last month's statement by the National Association of Tax Administrators that progress toward uniformity of State and local tax regulations has been made. If I understand the statement correctly, the NATA is asking for 4 more years so that NATA can do the job. We need H.R. 11798 now, not 4 years from now.

The range manufacturer spokesman pointed out that his firm had recently purchased a Honeywell computer and it is operated around the clock, with one of the three shifts devoting virtually all of its time to developing and maintaining tax data.

> It's fortunate that computer technology matured during the past 4 years. Without the electronic computer, our cost per return would have increased even more than it did.
>
> The work doesn't stop when the return is filed and the check is in the mail. There is a peculiar tax torture device called the audit. Last year, we had 18 such audits by State and local tax auditors. Each one required a minimum of 1 day. And from what my friends in the financial fraternity tell me, our company had relatively few audits.
>
> The cost to my company of gathering the information, preparing the State and local tax returns, handling the accounting and cooperating in the audits exceeds the total cost of all the State, county, and local taxes which we pay by a substantial margin. And, if it costs us (as a company) more for the paperwork than for the taxes, the measurable benefits of taxes to the State taxing bodies must be questionable, because the collection cost must be astronomical. We need a Marquis of Queensberry to convert the law of the jungle in tax collecting into a rule-of-law, commonsense activity.

Mr. Speaker, for companies doing business across the State lines, this is an acute and growingly critical problem. The House subcommittee is performing an outstanding service in bringing these facts to light in connection with H.R. 11798.

HORTON CITES CERTAIN REPRISALS AS BACKDROP FOR HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this week thousands of American citizens throughout this wonderful country will pause to pay tribute to the anniversary of the 1848 revolution for Hungarian independence. I am pleased to take this opportunity to offer congratulations to those thoughtful Americans and a few remarks on the revolution and its background.

Before reviewing the valiant and fascinating history behind the celebration of Hungarian Independence Day, however, I feel compelled to remind my colleagues of Hungary's present enslaved condition. For while we mark this week the 118th anniversary of the 1848 revolution, this year is also the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian freedom fighters revolution of 1956—a revolution against Communist enslavement which ended with a brutal crushing of Hungarian liberty by Soviet armored divisions.

Political, social, and economic dissenters in Hungary are no safer from punishment now than they were in 1956. As evidence of this alarming fact, which is contrary to assurance we have had from the Communist Kadar government that restrictions have been lifted since the 1956 revolt, I submit the following report of events that transpired in Hungary since the first of the year:

> Reliable sources in Vienna estimate that 5,000 persons were arrested in Hungary during the past 2 months. In Hungary, unrest spread in industrial areas due to food shortage and food prices raised recently by the government. Reports say that workers in Csepel rioted January 9 and that they scuffled with factory militia and the police. Approximately 160 arrests were made. In the industrial complex of Dunaujvaros, January 10 approximately 100 persons were arrested. The hanging of Party Secretary Janos Kadar was suggested by designs on walls in Pecs. The city of Miskolc and localities in Nograd county also reported unrest.
>
> In an obvious attempt to intimidate the Hungarian people the official Communist Party organ Nepszabadsag announced February 19 that several persons were arrested for the "suspicion of an attempted conspiracy." A priest and a newspaperman were mentioned among those arrested. According to information received by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation of this country a total of 400 persons were arrested on February 19, all of whom were participants in the 1956 revolution. A conditional amnesty in 1963 set these persons free. These persons, many of them in their early twenties, will have to complete their suspended sentences in addition to the term that will be imposed on them by new trials.
>
> Nepszabadag went into great length explaining that the people arrested were not just exercising honest criticism, but were actually conspiring to overthrow the government.
>
> The food shortage in Hungary is due to the continued exploitation of the country's resources by the Soviet Union, and to the irresponsible management of the socialistic economy. Prime Minister Gyula Kallai, now on a round-the-world tour, promised to United Arab Republic President Nasser the shipment of food amounting to $50 million.

This report was carried recently by the Associated Press, and has been verified to me by sources within the Hungarian Freedom-Fighters' Federation in this country. Only with these present conditions in mind, and with the deep concern we must all feel for the people who are forced to live under these circumstances today, can we meaningfully approach the subject of the successful 1848 revolution. In that historic event, we may find a ray of hope for improving the lives of Hungarians in the 1960's.

The fight for Hungarian independence did not just spring up overnight, but was the painstaking outgrowth of former Austrian Emperor Joseph II's attempted germanization, which aroused a new nationalism throughout Hungary. At first that nationalist expression took the form of a linguistic, literary, and romantic revival; but when the economic slump following the Napoleonic Wars set in, the movement widened into one for political, economic, and social reform directed largely against the dead hand of Austria. For example, in 1823 Francis I of Austria tried to raise money and recruits by unconstitutional means; but the resistance was such that the Diet—legislature—had to be convoked in 1825 and regularly thereafter. Among the chief figures in the new movement were the Hungarian patriots Ferenc Deak and Lajoz Kossuth. They agreed on some basic points, but the fiery Kossuth was the leading proponent of breaking ties with Austria. The others were primarily interested in achieving reforms within the existing context of relations with Austria.

While some reforms did occur, Austrian political leaders were afraid of the consequences if Kossuth were permitted to continue his agitation for Hungarian independence. Thus, in 1837 he was imprisoned, but was released in 1840. Upon his release, Kossuth resumed his efforts in behalf of Hungarian independence, this time through Pesti Hirlap, the first Hungarian political journal. More concessions were won, but Kossuth's daring and constant demands for independence led some of his more moderate supporters to desert his cause.

However, in February 1848, the entire Austro Hungarian empire was shocked by news of the revolution in Paris and its effects throughout Germany, where every government was threatened with being overthrown. Once again Kossuth demonstrated his leadership and the lower House of the Diet adopted his proposal for the appointment of an independent, responsible ministry. Emperor Ferdinand hesitated, but on March 13 the Vienna revolution broke out and Prince Metternich, the former Foreign Minister, fled to England. Ferdinand then quickly appointed Count Louis Batthyany premier of the first responsible Hungarian ministry, which included Kossuth as Minister of Finance. He soon became its leader in rallying the nation's defenses, and in April 1849, proclaimed Hungary an independent state.

We are all too familiar with the story of the ensuing collaboration between the Austrians and Russians in quashing the young Republic's independence. However, Austria's decadent government was in no position to negate all the gains made by the Hungarians. As a result, the Compromise of 1867 established a dual monarchy of Austria and Hungary and allowed the Magyars a degree of self-government.

The story of Lajos Kossuth and his deep-seated belief in an independent Magyar state is one which has continually inspired and encouraged freedom fighters throughout the world. Kossuth had a dream—a dream of a Magyar state in which his people could hold their heads high and be proud to proclaim their allegiance to their own country. His life's work was dedicated to the achievement of that dream. Though independence was short lived, he did live to see that dream come true.

THE ILLEGAL STOCK VOTING PRACTICES OF CLEVELAND TRUST CO., SHOULD BE STOPPED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.

This applies to economic freedom, as well as political freedom.

The right to vote would become a hollow mockery in an economy dominated by ruthless business buccaneers whose sole concern is their own selfish aggrandizement. Many times in our national history it has become necessary for the people, acting through Congress and their State legislatures, to curb the growing power of greedy overlords of business and finance.

Today, I would like to turn the spotlight on a little group of men who rule—and, I venture to say, rule illegally—a multibillion dollar sector of the American economy.

These men are absolute czars over many great corporations. Their decisions affect the destinies of millions of men and women in many major industries. It might be said that they have as much, if not more power to set wage, price, and industrial development policies as the President of the United States.

These men do not wield this awesome authority by right of ownership or popular election. Indeed, the source of their power may be described as a completely rigged and probably illegal election.

I am talking about the rulers of the Cleveland Trust Co., one of the Nation's mightiest financial institutions.

Next March 23, at 1:30 p.m., a few men and women will straggle into a meeting in this bank's main office in the heart of downtown Cleveland. Formally, they will be attending the annual stockholders meeting of the largest bank in Ohio, a financial institution with more than $2 billion in assets.

Theoretically, a stockholders meeting is a form of economic democracy. The stockholders are entitled to set the policies of their company through their selection of directors, just as the American people guide their National, State, and local governments through their election of public officials.

Can you imagine the outraged outcries that would arise if, in a National, State, or local election, the administration in power started off the count by casting one-third of the total votes in its own favor—and did so in flagrant defiance of the law of the land?

"It cannot happen here," you might say.

But this is exactly what will happen March 23 at the Cleveland Trust Co.'s stockholders meeting.

For many years, the bank's management has perpetuated itself in power—and has gradually extended its influence over industry—by voting one-third of its stock in its own favor.

The corporation laws of Ohio state clearly that a company may not vote its own stock in such an election, but the rulers of the Cleveland Trust Co. evade this regulation through a tricky deception.

This stock, I might explain, is literally the property of widows, orphans, and other heirs. It is owned by various estates of which the bank is trustee and administrator. Legally and traditionally, the bank's officers are under oath and obligation to manage these estates in the best interests of the beneficiaries—not to enhance and expand their own interests and economic power. Please consider the facts and judge for yourself whether or not this oath and obligation is being honored.

Probably recognizing both the illegality and impropriety of voting this stock in its own name, the Cleveland Trust Co. has established a dummy partnership known as A. A. Welsh & Co. Voting rights of stock held by the bank's trust department are assigned to A. A. Welsh & Co., and this shadowy appendage exists for no other purpose than to advance the interests of the Cleveland Trust Co.'s top management.

I repeat, A. A. Welsh & Co. functions to the benefit of the little clique that controls the bank—not to the benefit of the bank's stockholders, the beneficiaries of the estates which own the stocks, or the public in general.

Through the stock-voting rights assigned to A. A. Welch & Co., two officers of the bank—George Gund, the board chairman, and George Karch, the president—have placed themselves on the boards of directors of more than 40 major corporations in such basic industries as steel, coal, newspaper publishing, and paint.

When the Cleveland Trust Co.'s stockholders meeting is convened March 23 the one-third of the company's stock held by its own trust department will be voted by A. A. Welsh & Co. to reelect Gund and the other incumbent directors to the board.

Gund is going ahead with this program in open defiance of a special investigation ordered by the Ohio State Legislature.

This investigation was voted almost unanimously, with bipartisan support, by both houses of the Ohio Legislature. The bill setting up the inquiry specifies that the joint house-senate inquiry would examine the "legality and propriety of a bank management perpetuating itself in power by voting its own stock.

With such an investigation underway, one might expect the bank to seek an immediate clarification of its position, or else to forgo use of its roundabout technique of voting its own stock until the air is cleared.

But Gund and his little clique of colleagues, having defied the letter and spirit of the law for several decades, apparently have no intention of changing their course now.

It seems to me that State and Federal agencies which are charged with protecting the public's interest in this matter have long been remiss in doing their duty. For example, I see no reason why the Ohio superintendent of banks or the Ohio attorney general could not stop this illegal stock voting practice at once.

Let me point out a few ramifications of the Cleveland Trust Co. situation.

This bank, through A. A. Welsh & Co., also votes large blocs of stock in other major banks in Cleveland and Akron. H. Chapman Rose, a former Under Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, who is legal counsel for the bank, shares a law office with John Reavis who is a director of the National City Bank of Cleveland and also legal counsel for that bank.

It is quite obvious that Gund and Karch, by perpetuating their management of the Cleveland Trust Co. through the illegal voting of a third of the bank's stock, have achieved control of many billions of dollars of lending power and of corporations with additional billions of dollars worth of assets. They have, in effect, the power to decide whether a mechanic may borrow money to buy a home or an auto, or whether a great corporation can have the cash it needs for a $100 million expansion program.

Their decisions can affect the daily lives, the bread and butter, the comforts and conveniences, and the ability to send their children to college of millions of Americans who never heard of George Gund and George Karch.

I submit that the great economic power wielded by these men and the manner in which they attained and continue it should be a matter of major and immediate concern to Congress and the American people.

In recent weeks, a number of articles spotlighting the manner in which the Cleveland Trust Co. exerts dominating power over various Midwestern industries has been published in the Lorain Journal, a daily newspaper at Lorain, Ohio. These articles, written by Irving Leibowitz, editor of the newspaper, deserve careful study and evaluation by everyone concerned with the maintenance of economic freedom in the United States. I herewith insert them in the Record for the consideration of the Members, along with some Cleveland Press articles.

It would be an ironic tragedy if this Nation, while committing its money and manpower to the defense of freedom abroad, were to slip into economic bondage at home because public officials and the people were either asleep at their posts or unaware of the menace.

The newspaper articles follow:

The Cleveland Trust and the Ohio Banking Probe

(By Irving Leibowitz)

The Cleveland Trust Co. is not a bank so much as it is a powerful empire ruled by two financial kings—Chairman George Gund and President George Karch.

They have the immense power, with other directors of the bank, to perpetuate themselves on the throne.

They rule a financial kingdom that has control or influence with two other Cleveland banks (National City Bank and Union Commerce), the Firestone Bank of Akron (more than 50 percent of the stock), and a large interest in two banks in Canton and Warren, and one bank in each of the following Ohio cities: Ashland, Elyria, Findlay, Franklin, Mount Vernon, Painesville, Port Clinton, Sandusky, Shelby, and Tiffin.

Using its vast economic power, the Cleveland Trust Co. has placed its two financial kings—Gund and Karch—on the boards of 43 corporations, including the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Sherwin-Williams Co., the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., and Island Creek Coal Co.

How did the Cleveland Trust obtain this tremendous concentration of economic power?

The bank controls much of the stock it holds in trust for various estates. As a result, the Cleveland Trust controls 33 percent of its own stock and the bank officers vote the share to perpetuate themselves in power.

The State of Ohio has a law which prohibits corporations from voting its own stock. National banks chartered by the U.S. Government are not allowed to vote their own stock.

The Cleveland Trust is not a national bank. Its officers say it is a common practice among trust companies and financial institutions and is permittted by the Ohio act, holding securities as fiduciaries, passed in 1945.

However, there have been legal opinions by eminent corporation lawyers that hold that under Ohio law a bank may not directly or indirectly vote shares issued by it.

How does the Cleveland Trust do it?

Congress Wright Patman, respected chairman of the House Banking Committee, said in Washington:

"The Cleveland Trust Co. skirts this rule by assigning voting rights to a third of its stock to a dummy partnership known as A. A. Welsh & Co.

"Through this same device, using the economic power of stock held for various estates by its trust department, this bank has placed its chairman and president on the boards of 43 corporations.

"Through these board memberships, they either control or have a loud voice in the affairs of companies with billions of dollars in assets.

"Through a combination of these positions and the power of their bank to grant or deny credit, these men wield vast economic power which would seem to be totally out of keeping with the principles of our economic free enterprise system."

Alarmed by the consequences of having so few men in control of so much, the Ohio State Legislature passed a resolution to investigate banks voting large blocks of their own and other banks' and corporations' stocks.

The first meeting of the Ohio Bank Study Committee will be held Wednesday at 1:30 p.m. in the senate hearing room at Columbus. The legislation originated in the house of representatives with Representative A. G. Lancione of Bellaire and was sponsored in the senate by Senators Ray T. Miller, Jr., of Cleveland and Oliver Ocasek of Summit.

President Karch of the Cleveland Trust has explained that the purpose of A. A. Welsh & Co.—called nominees—is for efficient handling of numerous accounts, including those set up by individuals and charitable institutions. He termed it a common practice among trust companies and financial institutions.

His statement did not mollify the legislators. They issued a statement which said: "It is apparent, in some cases, that groups of men have seized enormous economic power through either their open defiance of the laws of Ohio, or because of loopholes in the law or ambiguity in existing laws."

In Washington, Congressman PATMAN said: "It has long been the public policy of the United States to curb and prevent such concentrations and power of life and death over whole industries and the entire economy."

Tomorrow: Does the Cleveland Trust misuse its vast power for its own benefit or to the detriment of any other corporation?

THE CLEVELAND TRUST: WHO IS PROTECTING WHOM?

(By Irving Leibowitz)

When a person dies, his estate—money, land, stocks, business—is left sometimes to a bank to manage and distribute. This is a precious and personal relationship between the dead person's estate and the bank.

Because the Cleveland Trust Co. is the biggest bank in Ohio and one of the largest in the Nation, it gets millions of shares of stock in its trust department to control.

Today, on the eve of an investigation of Ohio banks by a study committee in Columbus, the question has been raised as to whether the immense concentration of economic power of the Cleveland Trust Co. is ever misused for its own benefit or to the detriment of any other corporation.

Chairman George Gund of the Cleveland Trust Co. says that the voting of stock held in trust is controlled by the terms of the wills. He said some are voted with the approval of a third person and some wills give the bank the authority to vote the stock as it sees fit.

Legislators in Columbus, however, are challenging the legality and propriety of the officers of the bank voting the bank's own shares to perpetuate their own control, and also using the bank's trust department to dominate many major corporations.

At the heart of the probe is whether the Cleveland Trust misuses its trust.

In May of 1962, Probate Court Judge Frank Merrick of Cuyahoga County told the Cleveland Trust to stop using an estate in its charge as a level for opposing and delaying the development of a competing bank—Society National.

Commenting on the case editorially, the Cleveland Press said:

"The bank was committing far more money and time to pushing an appeal of the Society case than the estate heirs possibly could have received in benefits.

"The Cleveland Trust's motive clearly was not to protect the interest of the heirs, but rather to push its own interests against a fast-footed new competitor."

As Judge Merrick stated it:

"Would the impression be dominant that Cleveland Trust was engaging in harrassment of a rather new arrival in the local field of trust banking?"

One of the targets of the legislators in the current banking probe is whether a huge bank could limit competition.

The Cleveland Trust, for example, is the largest stockholder in its only major competitor in Lake County, the First National Bank of Painesville.

It is rare for a newspaper to criticize a bank. Most banks conduct themselves with the dignity of great and respected financial institutions. However, in the case of the Cleveland Trust and Society National, the Press editorialized against the Cleveland Trust:

"This is Cleveland's biggest bank—one of the biggest in the country. And it should, of course, set a pattern of decency and fairplay. But it chose, instead, to indulge in a cynical kind of obstructionism."

In Columbus tomorrow, a group of legislators will start the study of Ohio's banking laws and regulations. Most of them will be interested in the gigantic operations of the Cleveland Trust and how its officers control and vote 33 percent of their own stock.

President George Karch, of the Cleveland Trust Co., told the Wall Street Journal last year that the bank acts as trustee, agent or custodian for numerous accounts, including those set up by individuals and charitable institutions. Corporate stocks held by such accounts, Karch said, are carried in the name of A. A. Welsh & Co., a nominee partnership registered with the Internal Revenue Service.

The purpose is for efficient handling of the accounts and has been authorized by Ohio law, he said. Karch explained it was a common practice.

He said that since many of the accounts are established by Cleveland Trust shareholders "it is only natural" that some Cleveland Trust shares would be held in the accounts.

Karch added that a total of 461,672 Cleveland Trust shares were held in 594 trust accounts last year. In this total are about 357,000 shares for which the bank—on advice of legal counsel—does not need approval under terms of the trust to vote the stock, he said, while there are about 103,000 shares that can be voted with approval of the trust or voted unless otherwise instructed. Consequently, some 460,000 nominee shares were voted at last year's meeting.

Karch said there are some 156,000 shares among the 357,000 for which the bank has voting rights which cannot be sold under terms of the trust and about 107,000 shares over which the bank has complete control to vote or sell.

Karch said at the time that counsel had advised the bank that banks are not governed by an Ohio State law which prohibits a company from voting directly or indirectly any shares issued by it. He said the State banking code governs banks.

Tomorrow: How the Cleveland Trust influences other corporations, such as the Cleveland Plain Dealer and what it means to you.

THE CLEVELAND TRUST AND THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

(By Irving Leibowitz)

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, respected chairman of the House Banking Committee, has charged that the powerful financial empire of the Cleveland Trust Co. has either control or a loud voice in the affairs of many companies with millions of dollars in assets.

Today in Columbus, legislators have opened an investigation of Ohio's banking laws and regulations.

They are mainly interested in the legality and propriety of the officers of the Cleveland Trust Co. voting the bank's own shares to perpetuate their own control, and also using the bank's trust department to dominate major corporations.

Congressman PATMAN says Chairman George Gund and President George Karch, of the Cleveland Trust Co., are on the boards of 43 corporations and that through a combination of these positions and the power of their bank to grant or deny credit, they have vast economic power which would seem to be totally out of keeping with the principles of our economic free enterprise system.

One illustration of the power of the Cleveland Trust is the active interest it has taken in the management and control of the Forest City Publishing Co., publishers of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

In 1944, I. F. Freiberger, an officer of the Cleveland Trust Co., became president of Forest City Publishing Co. He continued in that capacity until the early 1950's. Then, he became chairman of the board. He is still serving as chairman of the board of Forest Publishing Co. and is a director of the Cleveland Trust.

Who is Frieberger?

He started with the Cleveland Trust in 1901, working in the trust department, which deals with estates. He became vice president of the bank in 1923, later became president and chairman.

He was a high ranking officer of the Cleveland Trust, with a voice in the policies of the bank, when he became president of Forest City Publishing Co. For a time, he served as both chairman of the Cleveland Trust and the Forest City Publishing Co.

In 1962, he left as chairman of the Cleveland Trust, but retained an important director's seat on the policymaking board of the bank. Freiberger was 87 on Decembr 12.

How much the Cleveland Trust has influenced editorial or business policies of the Cleveland Plain Dealer is not known.

But at all times, the power was there.

In addition to having an opportunity for an influential voice in the community and State, through the Plain Dealer, the Cleveland Trust has a dominating interest in many other large Ohio corporations, including Sherwin-Williams Co., the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., Island Creek Coal Co., and many other prominent midwestern corporations.

The Cleveland Trust is the largest bank in Ohio. Through its dummy partnership of A. A. Welsh & Co., called nominees, the bank is the largest stockholder in its own bank as well as National City Bank and Union Bank of Commerce, all of Cleveland.

It also is the largest stockholder in its only major competitor in Lake County, the Lake County National Bank, and has more than 50 percent of the stock of the Firestone National Bank of Akron. Cleveland Trust has considerable stock in many other banks in Ohio.

In spearheading the study of Ohio banks, three legislators—Representative A. G. Lancione of Bellaire, and Senators Ray T. Miller of Cleveland and Oliver Ocasek of Summit—issued a statement which said, in part:

"This is a situation which, in one way or another, affects the daily lives and pocketbooks of every individual and company in Ohio."

Other legislators on the bank study committee are:

Chairman Charles W. Whalen, of Dayton.

Senate: William H. Deddens, of Cincinnati; Robin F. Turner, of Tiffin; Anthony O. Calabrese, of Cleveland; David T. Matia, of Cleveland.

House: Carol D. Long, of Urbana; Don Goddard, of Bartlett; Charles Fry, of Springfield; Margaret Dennison, of Warren; John Weis, of Lancaster; Vernal Riffe, of New Boston; John Corrigan, of Lakewood; and William Elliott, of Malta.

IT'S A GOOD LEGAL QUESTION: ATTORNEY GENERAL COMMENTS ON BANKS VOTING THEIR OWN STOCK

(By John W. Saffell)

COLUMBUS.—Attorney General William Saxbe said today he is surprised that someone has not gone to court to test whether a bank could vote its own stock.

Saxbe made his comment as legislators opened the first meeting of the Ohio bank study.

The Journal, in a series of articles, has pointed out that officers of the Cleveland Trust Co., vote much of the stock of the bank and perpetuate themselves in office. The bank holds and votes 33 percent of the stocks it has in trust.

"I'm surprised someone hasn't brought an action in court," Saxbe said. "We are following it (the probe) with a great deal of interest. We know a great deal about it."

Asked whether he has written a legal opinion on whether bank officers can vote the bank's own stock, Saxbe said:

"No—and no opinion has yet been requested. I don't imagine we will get such a request until after the hearings. This is a good legal question * * * whether the officers of a bank can vote their own stock."

The State of Ohio has a law which prohibits corporations from voting the firm's stock. Officers of Cleveland Trust say this is a common practice among trust companies and financial institutions and is permitted by the Ohio act, holding securities as fiduciaries, passed in 1945.

However, there have been legal opinions by eminent corporation lawyers that hold that under Ohio law a bank may not directly or indirectly vote shares issued by it.

State Senator Charles Whalen, Jr., of Dayton, chairman of the Ohio Bank Study Committee, told the Journal:

"We start today * * * and we must have an outline of what we are going to investigate and study."

Asked whether the committee will explore the Cleveland Trust situation, Whalen said:

"Yes, we will bring up the Cleveland Trust situation and the adequacy of the present law, especially in light of Federal laws dealings with concentrations of power * * * and about banks voting their own stocks, and anything else."

Under a headline, "Predict Whitewash of Banks That Vote Their Own Stock," the Cleveland Press said yesterday:

"And the political betting in Columbus is the committee will come up with little, if anything, to comply with the original intent of the legislative resolution."

A large stockholder in the Cleveland Trust—but unfriendly to its management—told the Journal that the bank was hoping to be able to vote its stock at the March 23 meeting and then try for a change in the Ohio law during the next session of the legislature.

Chairman George Gund of Cleveland Trust was not available for comment since yesterday morning.

Carl Stokes and Senator Ocasek Demand Action: Cleveland Trust Under Fire at Hearing on Ohio Banks

(By John Saffell)

Columbus.—The Cleveland Trust Co., biggest bank in the State, has become a storm center at legislative hearings that could lead to changing Ohio's banking laws.

Several legislators are calling for a close look into what they describe as a Cleveland Trust practice of voting its own stock and some it holds in trust.

Representative Carl Stokes, who just narrowly lost the race for mayor of Cleveland to Ralph Locher, sent this telegram to State Senator Charles W. Whalen, Jr., chairman of the bank study committee.

"The Lorain Journal has published this week a series of articles highly critical of the policies and practices of the Cleveland Trust Co., the largest financial institution in Ohio. I urge you to bring these articles to the attention of all members of your committee at the beginning of your investigation of Ohio banks."

State Representative Stokes added:

"I was deeply disturbed to read in the Cleveland Press a story which predicts that your committee will whitewash the banks in their practice of voting their own stocks and in other acts that many consider to be illegal and improper. The common man has a deep interest in the ethical standards of our financial institutions and I am confident that your committee will do a good job in the important study which the senate and the house have instructed you to undertake."

State Senator Oliver Ocasek, of Northfield, was responsible for the resolution which started the probe in Columbus. He kept off the study committee.

Senator Ocasek, nevertheless, also sent a telegram to the committee, saying:

"The Cleveland Trust Co. stockholders meeting to elect directors for a year, occurs next month. It is reported that the bank again intends to vote some 35 percent of its own stock for a board of directors selected by its chairman. In my opinion, the laws of Ohio forbid an Ohio bank to vote stock issued by it.

The senator also said:

"The public interest demands that your committee investigate and report prior to their impending annual meeting on the legality and ethics of insiders in banks perpetuating themselves in office by voting of stock held in trust for widows and orphans. I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this with your committee."

The initial 2½-hour session of the 15 member committee proved somewhat of a "feeling out" period in which the scope of the study was discussed.

The committee agreed to take up three of the less controversial areas first:

Adequacy of the State division of banks to conduct regular examinations.

Standards and methods used in granting charter and branch permits.

Advisability of changing the method of selecting the superintendent of banks. (Now, he is appointed by the Governor.)

The three hot items on the agenda will be taken up last, later this year, and possibly not in time for the next session of the legislature in January. They are:

The legality and propriety of any bank voting its own shares of stock.

The possible adverse effect upon competition and other public interests of interlocking holding of stocks among various banks of the State.

The possible need for enlarging the powers and responsibilities of the State banking advisory board.

Cleveland Trust Flayed for Secretive Trust Operation

The Cleveland Trust Co. came under new criticism today for operating a trust "secretly" and "restrictively."

While the bank was under attack, State Banks Superintendent Clarence Luft was criticized for not cooperating with the State bank study committee, which is taking a hard look at the Cleveland Trust and other financial institutions in the State.

Cleveland Trust holds the purse strings for Kingwood Center, a flower garden and beauty spot which the late C. K. King left in trust for the benefit of the people of Mansfield and Ohio.

In an editorial, the News Journal of Mansfield said:

"As corporate trustee, the Cleveland bank has never revealed publicly the amount of the trust, nor has it revealed the amount of annual earnings from which Mr. King designated that Kingwood Center be operated and maintained.

"The public has no way of knowing whether the trust is being capably and wisely managed. It appears to be the attitude of Cleveland Trust that this is none of the public's business even though Mr. King clearly intended that the center be operated for the benefit of the people of Mansfield and Ohio.

"Recently when it was sought to determine if a theater could be built, as Mr. King suggested for part of the center's development, the answer came back from Cleveland Trust: "No chance for at least 5 years. Planning requires knowledge of funds on hand and reasonably anticipated. When the knowledge is withheld, so is the opportunity to outline future progress.

"Inasmuch as C. K. King began planning for the establishment of Kingwood Center for many years before his death, it appears unlikely that he ever envisioned such restrictions upon scheduling of future growth and development as now exist.

"Legally and technically, the Cleveland Trust may be entirely correct. As a matter of public relations it is dead wrong."

State Banks Superintendent Luft was chastised by the Cleveland Press and Governor Rhodes urged to make sure his employees cooperate with the legislature. The editorial said:

"The leisurely probe of State-chartered banks by the legislature's bank investigating committee got off to a sorry start. Neither State Banks Superintendent Clarence Luft nor any of his employees appeared as requested.

"This uncooperative attitude gives added weight to those speculations that the probe will accomplish little. So does the date of the next public meeting, March 14.

"This investigation is important. Ohioans should know how much financial power is concentrated in State-chartered banks. Luft and his staff insult the legislature and the public by their uncooperative attitude. Governor Rhodes should be sure his employees are present when the committee resumes March 14."

Cleveland Trust Resources Top $2 Billion; Ohio First—Earnings Greatest of Nation's Banks

The Cleveland Trust Co., which is under fire for its immense concentration of economic power, today reported that it had become the first bank in Ohio to achieve $2 billion in total resources.

The annual report also showed that 1965 was the year in which net operating earnings increased 19.8 percent—the greatest improvement reported by any of America's top 25 banks.

Two Ohio legislators—State Senator Oliver Ocasek and State Representative Carl Stokes—want the new Ohio Bank Study Committee to challenge the property and ethics of the Cleveland Trust voting its own stock and dominating major corporations and banks. The next meeting of the legislative bank committee is March 14 at Columbus.

In the Cleveland Trust's notice to stockholders of the annual meeting March 23, 1966, at 1:30 p.m., at 916 Euclid Avenue, Chairman George Gund and President George Karch pointed out that its dummy partnership, A. A. Welsh & Co., holds 502,329 shares (33.48 percent) of the outstanding stock of the bank.

Stewart Anthony, secretary of the bank, explained that A. A. Welsh & Co. is a partnership organized by the bank for the sole purpose of acting as "nominee" to take and hold record title to registered securities held by the bank in various trust capacities.

The bank officers vote this stock, along with another 25,278 shares held by the bank in other capacities, including F. J. Haffner & Co. and Custo & Co.

Much of the criticism leveled by legislators and others boils down to the charge that the bank officers vote the stock to perpetuate themselves in office and to dominate and control other corporations.

Here's how the voting of 527,560 shares are held in the bank's trust capacity:

One: 12,994 shares were registered in the names of principals of agency or custodian accounts and the bank as fiduciary has no power to vote the shares.

Two: 61,309 shares were held in agency or custodian accounts where the direction of the principal is required before voting.

Three: 3,931 shares were held in trusts where the direction of the donor, cotrustee, or other person is required before voting.

Four: 51,607 shares were held in trusts or estates where the approval of the donor, cofiduciary, or other designated person or persons is required before voting.

Five: 152,351 shares were held in trusts or agency where the bank as fiduciary may determine the manner of voting only in the absence of instructions from one or more designated persons.

Six: 245,368 shares (16.38 percent of the total shares outstanding) were held in trusts, estates, or agency where the bank as fiduciary has sole voting power.

The bank management solicited proxies from stockholders to vote for new directors. The Cleveland Trust appointed to handle and vote the proxies the following of its own directors:

Herman L. Vail, president of the Cleveland Plain Dealer; George Gund, chairman of the Cleveland Trust; Arthur W. Steudel, chairman of Sherwin-Williams Co.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Feb. 16, 1966]

THE BANK EXAMINERS

If the special bank investigating committee created by the 1965 legislature has the best interest of all Ohio in mind, there will be no whitewash of any bank practice, nor of any particular bank or banks.

Under its chairman, State Senator Charles W. Whalen, Jr., of Dayton, the committee has opened its hearings in Columbus. The legislator responsible for its creation—Senator Oliver Ocasek—was not shown the courtesy of being named to the committee.

But Ocasek has said he will be present. Certainly the committee can do no less than hear him explain in detail just why he believed Ohio needed such a probe into its State-chartered banks at this time.

If he suggests, as he has indicated he would, that there are dangerous signs of extreme concentration of power in State banking circles, then let's see if such concern is justified.

The banking community of Ohio is in need of no whitewash. It is sound enough to take without a quiver a searching examination into its methods of operation—and its interlocking interests.

We in Cleveland, home of the State's largest banking institution—the Cleveland Trust Co.—will be watching the work of this committee with great interest.

[From the Cleveland Press, Feb. 17, 1966]

BANK'S CHIEF SKIPS LEGISLATURE'S HEARING

(By Gordon C. Raeburn)

COLUMBUS.—The first legislative study of Ohio's banking laws and regulations since 1933 is off to a slow start because of the State commerce department's division of banks.

The six senators and nine representatives wanted to discuss the State's problems in regulating and examining Ohio's banks at yesterday's first hearing.

Neither Banks Supt. Clarence C. Luft nor any of his employees appeared as requested.

State Representative William L. Elliott, Democrat, of Malta, the committee's vice chairman, said "It is extremely relevant that we have someone here from the banking department."

State Senator Anthony O. Calabrese, Democrat, of Cleveland, said the committee could not go ahead until the superintendent of banks appeared to discuss problems in the banking industry.

Meantime, the legislative service commission has been asked to gather information it can in two areas:

Adequacy of the State division of banks to conduct regular examinations of banks as required by law.

Advisability of changing the method by which the superintendent of banks is selected.

Dave Johnson, acting head of the legislative service commission, told the committee that present Ohio law makes no reference to experience requirements of the superintendent. He is appointed by the Governor.

He suggested a look into the method of selecting the superintendent and scrutiny of the bank examination requirements and whether they are being met as part of a six-point study of the banking industry and laws.

Other points on the Johnson recommendation, which the committee temporarily accepted, were:

Legality and propriety of any bank voting its own shares of stock.

Adverse effects of interlocking directorates and holding of stocks.

Appropriateness of standards used in granting charters and branch bank permits.

Enlarging the powers of the banking advisory board.

State Senator Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Republican, of Dayton, chairman, asked the legislative research commission to obtain a transcript of all testimony concerning Ohio banking which has been given before the House Banking Committee, headed by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas.

The executive manager of the Ohio Bankers Association, O. E. Anderson, said his organization welcomes the study.

"We have complete confidence in your ability in not allowing this to become a witch hunt," Anderson said.

He said the association is sure the committee would "approach it [the study] on an industry basis and not be swayed by extraneous matters and personalities."

Although the committee is primarily concerned with State banks, it will compare regulations affecting national banks with State laws.

There are 548 banks in Ohio, of which 332 are State banks.

"The largest bank in Ohio is a State bank—the Cleveland Trust Co.," Anderson said. "The second largest is a national bank, the National City Bank of Cleveland."

[From the Cleveland Press, Feb. 18, 1966]

UNJUSTIFIED ABSENTEEISM

The leisurely probe of State-chartered banks by the legislature's bank investigating committee got off to a sorry start. Neither State Banks Superintendent Clarence Luft nor any of his employees appeared as requested.

This uncooperative attitude gives added weight to those speculations that the probe will accomplish little. So does the date of the next public meeting, March 14.

This investigation is important. Ohioans should know how much financial power is concentrated in State-chartered banks. Luft and his staff insult the legislature and the public by their uncooperative attitude. Governor Rhodes should be sure his employees are present when the committee resumes March 14.

FREE AIRMAIL SHIPMENT TO SERVICEMEN IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to provide free airmail shipment of parcels to our servicemen in Vietnam.

I have had the privilege of visiting our fighting men in Vietnam, and I can attest to the fact that there is nothing like a gift from home, to boost the morale of our GI's at mail call. Whether it be knitted socks from a GI's girlfriend, a box of cookies from mother or an interesting book from father, it makes a GI feel more remembered.

I firmly believe that this is the least we can do. The sending of gifts on a large scale will reflect to our fighting men, a gratified public; and the free use of the mail will reflect a grateful government. Campaigns urging the public to send books and other gifts of interest have been gaining considerable support, but they would be given a real impetus if we allowed these modest mailing privileges.

The bill would, among other things, allow for the free airmail shipment of parcels weighing up to 10 pounds to our servicemen in Vietnam. In addition, the language is broad enough to cover any similar future situations in which U.S. forces are engaged in hostilities with any foreign force.

I believe that those who donate, collect and wrap these gifts, and carry them to their local post offices perform a truly laudable service, and the least the Federal Government can do is absorb the three or four dollars it costs to ship one of these gifts.

I invite my colleagues to join in sponsoring this legislation, and I urge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to accord full consideration to this measure.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include lists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time during this past year, I have endeavored to keep my colleagues of the House informed about the serious problem of free world shipping to North Vietnam. Just recently I received the report on this shipping for the month of February and take this occasion to make this information available to the Members of the House.

The unclassified information for the month of January shows that seven free world ships called at North Vietnamese ports during that month as follows:

NAME OF SHIP, FLAG, GROSS TONNAGE, AND DATE ARRIVED

Agenor, Greece, 7,139 gross tons, January 25.

Amon, Cyprus, 7,229 gross tons, January 28.

Hellas, Greece, 7,176 gross tons, January 19.

Kanaris, Greece, 7,240 gross tons, January 19.

Milford, United Kingdom, 1,889 gross tons, January 4.

Shienfoon, United Kingdom, 7,127 gross tons, January 9.

Shirley Christine, United Kingdom, 6,724 gross tons, January 31.

During the month of February, there were six such arrivals, all of United Kingdom registry, as follows:

NAME OF SHIP, FLAG, GROSS TONNAGE, AND DATE ARRIVED

Ardtara, United Kingdom, 5,975 gross tons, February 15.

Greenford, United Kingdom, 2,961 gross tons, February 19.

Milford, United Kingdom, 1,889 gross tons, February —.

Shienfoon, United Kingdom, 7,127 gross tons, February 2.

Shienfoon, United Kingdom, 7,127 gross tons, February —.

Wakasa Bay, United Kingdom, 7,040 gross tons, February 7.

While the volume of this trade has decreased substantially from what it was during the first 2 months of 1965, I hasten to point out that the secret reports show more than twice the number of vessels just mentioned.

While it is regrettable that this traffic was permitted to flourish for so long, the administration officials responsible for finally acting to bring about a reduction of this trading with the enemy are certainly to be commended for their efforts. That this trade has been reduced clearly shows that effective measures can be taken to discourage our friends from such shipping activities.

In recent weeks there have been reports that Norwegian shipowners have privately agreed to stop plying the North Vietnamese trading lanes. In addition, King Constantine of Greece signed a decree effective as of March 10 forbidding the use of Greek-flag vessels in carrying cargoes to or from North Vietnamese ports, except for those already under charter before the decree was effective. These actions are most encouraging.

Nevertheless, the attitude of our own Government remains decidedly less than fully satisfactory. The gap in our official efforts has invited, and perhaps required, the independent initiative of non-Government organizations to bring full pressure to bear to dry up this trade such as the threatened boycott proposed by the maritime unions of the east and gulf coast ports. As I join those who commend the maritime unions for their concern I must at the same time express disappointment with the administration's abdication of the conduct of foreign policy in this field.

Now, however, is not the time to relax our efforts. Our momentum must not be lost. It must be accelerated to eliminate entirely the possibility of even one free world ship going to North Vietnam. To accomplish this there must be fuller information provided to the American people and to the world about this trade. If free world ships are helping to supply the enemy, why should our people be told half the truth—why not the whole truth?

A good measure of the success achieved in curbing this trade has been due to an aroused and informed public opinion both within and without the Congress. If we are to keep faith with the hundreds of thousands of boys we have sent to Vietnam, we must not fail in giving them our full support. I call upon the administration to be more forthright in reporting the true extent of this aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Again I commend the gentleman from Michigan for bringing this information to the Members of the House. I ask the gentleman if it is not also important that pressures be applied to these various countries, including Britain, which are shipping to Red China? By this devious route they can still provide the sinews of war to North Vietnam.

This involves not alone the question of shipping to Haiphong, but also the question of shipping to Red China.

Why should there be, also, shipping to Communist Cuba, which has become the spawning ground and the training ground for subversion in the Western Hemisphere?

It seems to me that the State Department and the officials of this Government ought to be applying pressure not only with respect to North Vietnam but also with respect to trade with Red China and with Communist Cuba.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I share those views completely.

The administration certainly should be looking at these areas.

I have called attention to North Vietnam because this is such a flagrant case. Hundreds of thousands of our boys are there tonight, in combat with the enemy, while our friends are carrying material to keep the war going. This should not be tolerated.

CHICAGO TRIBUNE'S SPECTACULAR REPORT ON CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune has begun a spectacular series on the history, growth, and the present magnitude of Chicago as a world center of commerce, industry, science, religion, education, sports, and culture.

I am taking the liberty of putting this series in the RECORD as it unfolds because I would like to share with my colleagues and the distinguished readers who follow the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the real story of how Chicago—once called the crime capital of the world—today stands as a model city of the world.

The Chicago Tribune deserves the highest commendation for its fair and impartial writing of one of the great stories of our time—the renaissance of America's second largest city.

Mr. Dave Halvorsen has magnificently captured the spirit of Chicago, 1966.

I hope those around the world who are so quick to criticize this thriving metropolis known as Chicago will read Mr. Halvorsen's penetrating series.

Recently I said that the second half of the 20th century belongs to Chicago. This dynamic series in the Chicago Tribune fortifies my contention; and it gives a new spirit of pride and dedication to 3½ million people who live in Chicago.

The Chicago Tribune is performing a most significant public service in bringing to all Americans—through its influential and widespread national circulation—the real story of Chicago as it exists today.

The first articles of the Chicago Tribune series follow. It is my plan to include the rest of the articles as this impressive series unfolds:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 5, 1966]

CHICAGO SHAKES OFF OLD LABEL OF SECOND CITY—"PRAIRIE TOWN" ADDING NEW FRONTIERS

(By David Halvorsen)

(NOTE.—Chicago has come alive in the last 10 years and is experiencing the greatest prosperity in its history. Its citizens see its municipal development not as problems but as challenges. The Tribune begins today a comprehensive and exhaustive series of articles analyzing Metropolitan Chicago's resurgence and what it will mean in years to come.)

Chicago forged a giant structure of prosperity in the last decade to place the city at the threshold of the greatest era in its history.

The midwestern metropolis is fulfilling the dreams of those who believe in it.

Once called a prairie town because it was one, and later called a prairie town in spite, because it was not one, the city has come alive and is one of the most vibrant, progressive cities in the world.

Thomas H. Coulter, chief executive director of the Chicago Association of Commerce, has called it "the most enlightened city in the world today."

HAS YET TO HIT PEAK

The city has yet to reach the peak of its current resurgence, and chances are it will not for a long time, asserts Mayor Daley.

Chicago is not advancing in the wake of a prosperous economy; it is leading the surge. It has shaken off the inferiority complex of the crime-ridden prohibition era and the era's legacy of civic doldrums which set in after the depression and lasted for nearly 25 years.

"For years we believed what everyone said about us," said a city hall official. "We kept comparing Chicago with perfection. Now we have changed. We are comparing it with other great cities, and we are coming out first.

"Perfection is the ultimate goal. We are closer to it than anyone else."

Civic leaders are calling this the "sensational sixties," outstripping even the great rebuilding era following the Chicago fire of 1871 which burned out 2,124 acres of the central city and caused property damage of $200 million.

PRODUCT IS HUGE

Metropolitan Chicago's share of the gross national product, the sum of all services and manufactured goods, is $34.4. This is six times more than the national output of Austria and greater than that of all the Scandinavian countries combined.

The area's industrial development is twice that of its nearest competitor—and that includes New York City. More than 4,000 new factories have been constructed here in the last 20 years, most in the last decade.

"At one time the industrial center of the United States was just west of New York City," Coulter pointed out. "Now it is in Chicago and will be for a long time to come."

Studies by Coulter's association show the average family income of metropolitan Chicago to be $11,400. This is 30 percent more than the national average and $1,000 more than New York City.

The association places the Indiana counties of Lake and Porter and the Illinois counties of Cook, Lake, McHenry, Du Page, Kane, and Will in the metropolitan area.

LOOP IS FOCAL POINT

The drama of the city's prosperity is performed in the central business district with the Loop as a stage for all the world to see.

Here are giant buildings, some with revolutionary forms of architecture.

The erection of the Prudential Building in 1955 was the breakthrough. It was the first major structure built on the Loop since the Field Building in 1932.

New York City experienced an extraordinary post-World War II construction boom while little was happening in Chicago. Now, New York is beset with major municipal problems while Chicago and its suburbs leap ahead.

Daley, a Democrat, first was elected in 1955. Chicago's revival closely parallels the emergence of his leadership.

Businessmen, industrialists, labor and civic leaders all give their respective professions much of the credit for this new vitality, but they point to Daley as the person who brought all the forces together.

BRINGS ABOUT RAPPORT

"The mayor has brought about an amalgamation of the best of labor, politics, religion, education, and business," said Edward Logelin, vice president of the United States Steel Corp. and chairman of the Chicago plan commission. Logelin is a Republican.

"When he gets us around the conference table, it is not to talk about differences but the common interests of Chicago."

In pinpointing the reasons for Chicago's resurgence, 1959 is a vintage year.

After 7 years of discussions, work commenced on O'Hare International Airport. The St. Lawrence Seaway opened, making Chicago an international port. Chicago was host to the Pan-American games. The city's first international trade fair took place and the Queen of England came to visit.

Her reception was quite different from that of the first royalty to visit the city.

PRINCE WAS INVITED

That was in 1860, when Long John Wentworth, the mayor, invited Albert Edward, Prince of Wales and later to become Edward VII, to visit Chicago.

The prince accepted on the condition he could come incognito as Baron Renfrew. There was to be no fanfare.

Edward underestimated Chicago's resourcefulness. When he started to tour the city, shiny fire engines fell in behind his carriage. Then came numerous floats representing the city's industries, and 50,000 persons lined his route along Wabash and Michigan Avenues.

This sort of spirit always has been a characteristic of Chicago.

It is with this same energy that Chicago is beating the drums for new business. The city's emissaries have been well received in New York City and other cities by businessmen anxious to learn of the advantages offered here.

COMPUTER TELLS STORY

When Chrysler Corp. decided to build a new plant, it collected basic information from probable sites throughout the country. This data was put on 1,600 tabulating cards and fed to a computer. The answer came up Belvidere, east of Rockford, and only 75 miles northwest of Chicago.

A key reason was Chicago's vast transportation network. It is the center of the world's air, rail, and truck systems and is rapidly developing as a seaport.

Businesses are finding that the prestige address of New York City may be costing them thousands of dollars in extra operating costs.

An accountant association in New York City made a survey of operation costs in Chicago. The association found it could save $70,000 annually in air fares alone by locating here.

A confectionery company discovered it's more economical to import cocoa beans, needed for chocolate, through Chicago and market the finished product from here than to import the beans through east and west coast ports. The company closed down its coast operations.

FOUNDED AS TRADING POST

Chicago is only 129 years old. It was founded as a frontier trading post. It is now the greatest trading center in the world.

Its image has been given a big boost because of the misfortunes that have befallen New York City.

New York has a per capita bonded debt of $446.07. Chicago's is $145.90. Furthermore, Chicago's bonded debt is of short duration and represents 42 percent of the city's constitutional limit of indebtedness.

New York's heralded World's Fair fell short of expectations. The city has experienced crippling newspaper strikes and the recent transit strike. It was the victim of a power surge which blacked out the New England States.

The east coast metropolis faces another severe water shortage this summer unless New England gets above-normal snowfall the rest of this winter.

Crime publicity, which had made Chicago a favorite whipping boy for three generations, has tapped a lucrative source in recent years in New York City.

Chicago has not had a newspaper strike in 17 years. It last had a mass transit strike in 1922. Commonwealth Edison has said that the massive blackout which hit New England is unlikely here.

WATER SUPPLY IS EXCELLENT

The water supply in Chicago is excellent. A city resident can get unlimited water for approximately $30 a year. This includes garbage pickup. Chicago provides water to 61 suburbs. The city put into operation a year ago the world's largest and most modern water filtration plant.

Jarred by the Summerdale police scandal in 1961, Chicago reacted positively to reform. Police Superintendent O. W. Wilson streamlined the police communications system, increased the number of squads on the street, boosted the prestige of the policeman, and instituted Operation Crimestop, a program encouraging citizens to report crimes and suspicious activities.

Last year, crime on Chicago streets declined 12 percent although every other metropolitan city and the Nation as a whole reported substantial increases. Chicago's police administration has become a prototype for other municipalities, both foreign and national.

The summer before the great fire of 1871, Chicagoans were paying more in fire insurance rates than they were contributing in municipal, county, and State taxes combined.

By contrast, Chicago today has a class II rating from the National Board of Underwriters for fire insurance. What makes this remarkable is that no city has a class I rating and only 11 cities have class II. Chicago is the only city of more than 1 million population among the 11.

HAS LOW DEATH RATE

The city had the lowest metropolitan traffic death rate in 1960, 1962, and 1964, and earned the honor again in 1965. Chicago has received the cleanest city award in 5 of the last 6 years.

The resurgence reaches far beyond the boundaries of the city or the 7.5 million persons living in the eight-county metropolitan area. Chicago's influence on the entire Midwest is probably greater than is actually realized, civic leaders point out.

For example, a truck pulling out of a Chicago terminal tonight with a cargo of manufactured goods will be unloading at a warehouse in Charles City, Iowa, 360 miles distant, tomorrow morning.

Many producers have found it more economical to export overseas from the port of Chicago than through the coastal cities of New Orleans and Baltimore.

A canning factory in Madison, Tenn., which exports canned corn to northwestern Europe, has found it cheaper to ship through Chicago than New Orleans.

GET FAVORABLE RATES

Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kansas producers are discovering more favorable shipping rates through the Chicago port.

Businessmen are continually revising the boundaries of the Chicago trade area. Now they think in terms of a 500-mile radius which includes a population of 63 million.

The revitalization of the railroads, the completion of the Interstate Highway Systems and city expressways, and the expansion of the seaport make all of this realistic.

Historians have called Chicago the most American of all cities. Some have been critical of the premium put on the dollar by Chicagoans.

MANY BECOME WEALTHY

The society of other great cities was based on heritage. Chicago's society was determined by bank accounts. Great personal fortunes have been made here, and in many different ways.

The Palmers, Armours, Fields and others became some of the world's wealthiest families.

In assessing the drive behind Chicago's current prosperity, history may offer a lesson. At the very beginning, Chicago's wealthy leaders found private gain and public interest were compatible.

A healthy city meant a prosperous business. The formula is still working today.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 6, 1966]

CHICAGO GROWTH TO GREATNESS IS ONLY BEGINNING

(By David Halvorsen)

The wagon trains trundled regularly into the dirt streets of Chicago in the 1830's. They set up temporary camp south of Fort Dearborn along what is now Michigan Avenue.

Most were fortune seekers heading westward, but some assessed, quite accurately, that the frontier town had a future and therefore was a place to make a lot of money and make it fast.

Indian trails had led to the confluence of the Chicago and Des Plaines Rivers, and for much the same reason the pioneers followed these routes. It was a logical way to get across the country.

GEOGRAPHY TRUMP CARD

Soon followed the steam locomotive. Chicago became the terminal between the Eastern and Western railroads. Later came the highways bearing motorcars, the waterways to the Mississippi River and the sea, and the airlines.

Geography has been Chicago's trump card since the city went after the high stakes of becoming one of the world's great urban centers.

In the last decade the city has been dealt a handful of aces.

1. Metropolitan Chicago is the industrial center of the world. The area, with 3.8 percent of the national population, produces 5.1 percent of the gross national product.

NEAR POPULATION CENTER

2. The population center of the United States is on a 160-acre farm, 6.5 miles northwest of Centralia and about 1 mile south-southwest of the community of Shattuc in Clinton County.

3. Illinois is the leading agricultural producing State in the Union.

4. Chicago is the center of the world's greatest transportation network.

5. The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway has made Chicago an international port of call.

With these cards on the table, this is what Chicago gets:

1.The highest average income in the world.

2. The highest employment rate in the Nation. There is a labor shortage of 100,000 in skilled jobs.

FARSIGHTED LEADERSHIP

3. The greatest investment in future economic development of any metropolitan area in the country.

In short, Chicago can produce more, transport more, and sell more goods than any city in the world.

Behind this ability are farsighted leadership, diversity, and the bedrock stability of private development. The city has gotten few of the Federal contracts that boomed the economies of the west coast and Texas.

Chicago's pioneer industrialists and merchants were frugal men who employed the sound principles of moneymaking. When they died, so did the one-man corporation. It was replaced by the board of directors, which may lack the colorful personality of an Armour or a Palmer, but not their sound moneymaking codes.

Diversification of industry forms a solid economic base. Chicago leads the Nation in 16 major categories of manufacturing. It produces goods in 96 percent of all manufacturing categories.

The largest concentration of metropolitan Chicago's manufacturing employment, 13.6 percent, is in electrical machinery production.

This compares with 19.1 percent of workers in Los Angeles concentrated in the electrical industry, 40.8 percent in Detroit's auto industry, and 44.2 percent in Pittsburgh's primary metals (steel) industry.

NEED LARGER SHARE

Chicago leaders believe the city must get a larger share of Federal contracts, particularly in the fields of research and development.

"What has happened during the last few years simply is that the Nation has come to Chicago," explains Thomas H. Coulter, executive director of the Chicago Association of Commerce.

"Cities that once were too far away are now considered in our trade area and they depend upon us. The channel of the economic mainstream has shifted to put us right in the middle."

MOVE FROM ST. PAUL

Coulter noted another trend that is becoming important to Chicago. Major corporations are developing regional headquarters and getting away from centralized operations.

A timber firm shifted from St. Paul to Chicago to get into the regional mainstream, even though it took the company farther away from the forests of the Northwest.

Edward C. Logelin, vice president of United States Steel Corp., said his company is finding it more efficient to locate some of its purchasing operation in the Chicago region rather than do it all through the Pittsburgh headquarters, the past policy.

EXPAND INTO LAKE

Chicago, incidentally, used to be an importer of steel products. Now it and the vast Gary steelworks produce more than one-third of the Nation's primary metals.

In 1959, United States Steel completed an automated structural steel mill in its south Chicago works. Two buildings had to be cleared away for construction of the new plant. Now the corporation is seeking to expand on landfill in the lake because it has no other way to go.

In Coulter's opinion, and it is shared by many, Chicago is only beginning to realize the potential of navigating the economic mainstream.

Industrial and commercial development programed for the next few years bears out this statement. Investment in industry in Metropolitan Chicago has increased to record figures in each of the last 3 years.

Investment in new industry amounted to $737,788,000 in 1965. A similar sum is expected for 1966 with many plans already on the drawing boards.

Most of this huge amount has been in expansion of the steel industry in Lake and Porter Counties in Indiana. Though the money was invested in 1965, the construction will take up to 3 years.

Construction of 1,037 commercial buildings, such as the 100-story John Hancock center, totalled $418,428,000 in 1965. There has never been anything in Chicago's history to compare with it.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 8, 1966]

RAILROAD LAND, ONCE A "WASTE," NOW GOLD MINE

(By David Halvorsen)

Railroad property on the near south side that was once termed a millstone around the industry's neck has become a diamond necklace.

The railroad has 150 acres of the most desirable land in the city. The tract is surrounded by 2,000 acres of homes and buildings that need to be upgraded.

ROOM FOR HOUSING

The proximity to the central business district is considered ideal for several uses.

Suggestions have been made to develop it as a sports center. Another possibility is an international trade mart to meet the needs of Chicago's global business.

A housing development, such as Carl Sandburg Village on the near north side, has been recommended. Some 9,000 persons live in the area now. The development could provide dwellings for 150,000.

City planners are thinking in terms of an expanding central business district that could take part of the area. Industry would like to see research laboratories on the railroad land.

"The Chicago Loop of the future may be three times as large as the present one," John Duba, head of the new department of city planning and development, has predicted.

What it boils down to is a 50-year-old puzzler for Chicago: the consolidation of the city's railroad terminals.

Realization of this goal was never closer than in 1960 when the city was seeking a site for the University of Illinois campus. When the campus was finally located in the Harrison-Halsted area, the consolidation drive faded out like the old steam locomotive.

MERIT AGREED UPON

The merit of a single terminal had been agreed upon in principle many years ago. What is needed is the impetus of economic necessity.

This may be at hand. Chicago is finding that many manufacturers are moving to the suburbs because they cannot find room in choice locations in the city.

Premium land is selling for $100,000 an acre in the city. A company can locate in the suburbs for $25,000 to $40,000 an acre.

In the view of those working on the problem, they see the possibility that it might solve itself. Where civic incentive has failed to get the job done, the lure of high profits may succeed.

City planners are keeping an eye on the proposed merger of the New York Central and Pennsylvania railroads. If it comes to pass, it is doubtful that the New York Central will continue to operate from the La Salle and Illinois Central stations and the Pennsylvania from the Union Station.

Everybody is in favor of consolidating the terminals, including the railroads.

"It is a very complicated thing to work out," explained Thomas H. Coulter, executive director of the Association of Commerce and Industry. "We need some genius to solve these matters."

THE STATIONS INVOLVED

The stations are the Illinois Central, Grand Central, La Salle, Dearborn, Union, and North Western. In some, passenger service is less than 10 percent of what it was in World War II.

In others, only the frequent arrival and departure of commuter trains break the silent monotony in the trainsheds. Of the 110,000 persons daily using the railroad stations, only 6,500 are intercity travelers. The rest are commuters.

Donald Graham, vice chairman of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., heads a mayor's committee to resolve the problem.

One of the stickiest issues is joint ownership of the stations. Railroads sharing ownership must work out an agreement among themselves before much progress can be made on consolidation.

A member of the mayor's committee said it is a matter of marking time until the proposed merger of the New York Central and Pennsylvania is settled.

"If this merger comes off, we can see a breakthrough," he said.

STEP-BY-STEP DEATH

Some city planners believe the consolidation will come step by step; that is, one station closing at a time when the costs of operating it for so few passengers becomes prohibitive.

There is more than just a passenger terminal involved. The railroads own considerable warehouse property around the terminals. Furthermore, some are building special facilities to accommodate the piggyback carriers, now a lucrative source of revenue.

The city would prefer to see these facilities built away from the Loop, but there is little it can do to stop construction in the near South Side yards.

"Railroads have a history of tenaciously holding on to land they acquired back in the mid-1800's, even if they do not need it," a civic leader said. "This tradition is one of the problems we must overcome."

In 1935, the city planning commission observed that a terminal was essential if Chicago is to keep its supremacy in transportation.

A huge station was proposed at Randolph Street, just east of Michigan Avenue. It was estimated that a modern terminal to serve 18 railroads could be built for $15 million.

ESTIMATES OF COSTS

Now the estimates range from $20 to $30 million to renovate one of the existing terminals into a central station to more than $100 million to build a new one.

Where the money will come from is another question blocking consolidation. There is a strong feeling among the railroads that the city should finance it. City planners, on the other hand, have suggested that profits derived by the railroads from development of the old terminal areas should be invested in the central terminal.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 9, 1966]

Chicago Lures Ambitious Men From Far East—Vast Markets Bring 45 Firms From Japan

(By David Halvorsen)

In the 1840's, thousands of families migrated from the east to Chicago in pursuit of the wealth the prairie town offered. In the 1960's they are still coming, only now it is from the Far East.

Mitsuo Sakata started his career as a Japanese pearl farmer. He learned his skills well in the small bays guarded by Mount Fuji. Sakata and his brother formed their own pearl company in Tokyo.

LIVING OYSTERS SEEDED

The cultivation of pearls is in itself a fascinating operation. Living oysters are seeded by hand with the nuclei of pearls. They are fertilized and placed back in the calm inlet of a bay in wire cages. The cages are suspended on racks made of bamboo.

Nature is left to cultivate the pearls for 2 or 3 years, although they are taken from the water every month for inspection.

The story of Sakata and his pearl farm meant nothing to Chicago until 7 years ago. Sakata, a former water ski champion, came to the United States to find a new market for his pearls. He spoke only a few words of English.

VISITS TRADE FAIR

New York City had always been considered the best market and he looked it over carefully. But Chicago was holding its first international trade fair in 1959 and Sakata was interested.

He visited the fair, conferred with Chicago businessmen, some of whom he had met when they were in Tokyo, and he studied the market. One important fact stood out in his mind. Ninety percent of the mail order merchandise industry was located in Chicago.

Sakata went back to Japan to weigh the merits and problems of expansion to the American market. He made two more trips to the United States before deciding that Chicago was a prime market for his pearls.

OPENS OFFICE HERE

Two years ago, he opened an office on Michigan Avenue. Through the use of interpreters he hired here, Sakata went after the mail-order companies. They liked what he offered.

The Japanese businessman transferred his headquarters from Tokyo to Chicago and brought his family here. They rented an apartment in Carl Sandberg Village.

Within 1 year his operation was so successful that he opened a branch office in New York City.

TELLS OF AMBITIONS

"I have a small company now," he said. "But I am ambitious. There is no city in America that offers more opportunity to an ambitious man than does Chicago.

"My office is here. It will be all my life."

In 1959 when Sakata first visited Chicago, there was not a single Japanese trading company here. Now there are 45 and indications that more will come.

What one Japanese businessman learned is what Chicago has been telling the world for years. The city has much to offer the man who wants to get ahead.

BRITAIN "FINDS" CHICAGO

On the other side of the world, Britain has "found" Chicago. Prince Philip will visit Chicago in a few days with the dual purpose of good will and promoting trade.

"His most important speech on commerce and industry will be made in Chicago," explained R. Winfield Ellis, president of the British-American Chamber of Commerce in the Midwest.

"This is not a one-shot affair. Britain has mapped a program of concentrating on the Chicago area through 1966 and 1967.

"A serious effort has never been made here before by British traders. The purchasing power in Chicago is very high. Surely, the opportunity is here."

CONCENTRATES ON COASTS

Britain traditionally has concentrated its trade on the seaboards, particularly the Atlantic. The increasing number of trade companies that have located in Chicago in recent years points up the new direction of British merchants.

"There are three things needed to attract new business," asserts Thomas Coulter, executive director of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

"They are wealth, creativity, and a market. We have all three in Chicago. Mitsuo Sakata will tell you that."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 10, 1966]

Labor Policies Are Big Factor in City's Surge—Daley Is Given the Credit by Leaders

(By David Halvorsen)

Considering the turbulent beginnings of the labor movement in Chicago, it might seem paradoxical that management and labor agree today the city has a good labor climate.

Chicago was the scene of the violent Pullman strike and the riot in Haymarket Square. Frightened city leaders gave the Government 600 acres of prime North Shore land in exchange for a Federal garrison at what is now Fort Sheridan to be available to quell labor disturbances.

Labor agitators found a ready audience in the immigrant workers of Chicago. Their cause was aided by the recalcitrance of such men as George Pullman, who refused to acknowledge delegations of his employees whose main grievance was that their take-home pay had dwindled to as little as 7 cents a week.

CHURCH STANDS EMPTY

Pullman cut the salaries of his employees, but not the rents in his model community on the far South Side or the prices in his company store. He asked such a high rent for the community church that for years it sat empty because no denomination could afford it.

Chicago is a highly unionized city. Many of the union bosses are in their late sixties and seventies and battled on the streets for what they believed was right.

"Perhaps it is our bitter struggle for recognition that makes us feel so responsible to improve our community today," suggests Stephen Bailey, first vice president of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

"Chicago has the best labor climate in the Nation," declares Earl J. McMahon, president of the building trades council.

HARMONY IS CITED

"The harmony between labor and management has attracted commercial investment in Chicago," said Thomas H. Coulter, executive director of the Chicago Association of Commerce.

Observers note that labor earns more in Chicago, in terms of buying power, than in any other metropolitan area in the Nation. The average family income in Chicago is higher than anywhere else in the world.

The demand for labor also contributes to peace, it was pointed out. Jobs are opening up faster than skilled workers can be developed to fill them. Industry has found it necessary to start its own training programs to ease critical labor shortages.

In the last 24 months, 145,000 new jobs have been created in Metropolitan Chicago. The U.S. Department of Labor estimates there are 100,000 job openings here.

About 60,000 young people entered the labor force and 50,000 older adults went to work in the last 2 years. Many of the older workers are housewives supplementing family incomes.

Employers will be seeking 170,000 new, qualified employees this year. Indications are this demand will increase in the next few years.

HAVE JOINT BOARD

An example of how labor and management came to a meeting of the minds is the joint conference board of McMahon's contractors.

Around 1900, legitimate union leaders and contractors found themselves frustrated by the unsavory elements of both sides. The results were lockouts, strikes, and very little construction.

Much of the turmoil centered on jurisdictional disputes within the trades.

A joint conference board of 10 contractors and 10 union men was established in 1913. The board constitution requires that a jurisdictional complaint be settled within 48 hours.

A subcommittee is appointed to make an on-the-scene investigation and deliver its recommendation to the board. McMahon said the procedure has been so successful that there has not been a major jurisdictional work stoppage in 30 years.

Many cases are warded off before they get to the board by an informal prejob conference between McMahon and the contractor handling the work.

SOME BALK AT ACTION

Some out-of-town contractors have balked. Only Boston and New York City also have joint boards. As a result some contractors are dubious of sitting down with a labor man before the first nail has been hammered.

"We have had cases where local contractors have stepped in and set the out-of-towners straight on how we do business in Chicago," McMahon said.

Bailey gives credit for the labor harmony to his close personal friend, Mayor Daley.

"Daley keeps labor support because you can believe in him. He says yes or no and you are on your way."

The hard core of Daley's Democratic Party political strength comes from labor.

LABOR HAS A SEAT

The mayor assures that labor is represented on all his committees, along with management. He has given both major sides responsibilities, with the result that management and labor leaders have found themselves working in a common cause.

McMahon serves on the zoning board of appeals and is a trustee of McCormick Place. Labor has a seat on the board of education.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 11, 1966]

Chicago Looks to Lakefront as Recreation Area—Seeks To Improve Already High Land Ratio

(By David Halvorsen)

Chicago and the surrounding metropolitan counties have rolling acres of open land for recreation, but there is a growing need for more and the price is getting higher each year.

Fortunately, early planners such as Daniel Burnham provided open spaces in the developing city. Burnham's visionary lakefront plan and Cook County's unique forest preserve system have provided Chicago with the finest natural recreation areas of any metropolitan city in the United States.

Enjoying an expanding economy, the metropolitan area finds it is confronted with mounting pressure to churn the soil for homes and buildings rather than for flowers and trees.

DEER GROVE FIRST

When the first land, an acreage called Deer Grove in northern Cook County, was purchased in 1915, it cost $70 an acre. Today, the average cost is near $2,500 for a similar parcel.

Housing subdivisions overlap into pastures. It is not uncommon to find a winding street of new homes end a few feet from an old barn. Industry, once restricted to enclaves in the central city, has shifted extensively to suburban industrial parks.

Chicago's city planning and development department, the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission and the open lands group of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago are three agencies directly concerned with conservation and recreation.

That ample outdoor facilities are essential to the quality of life is the premise for establishing developments that are green and growing, explains Louis Wetmore, deputy city planning commissioner.

PLAYGROUNDS UNPARALLELED

The lakefront of Chicago has been called the most beautiful in the world. Its beaches, marinas, and parks offer unparalleled summer playgrounds for Chicago's millions.

Anyone who has been on a lakefront beach on a steamy July 4 might arch an eyebrow at a proposal to make the lakefront accessible to more people, but that is the prime objective of a new study for which the Chicago park district has appropriated $100,000. The survey has been given a high priority by Mayor Daley.

The city is considering means of providing more transportation to the lakefront. The outer drive and the Illinois Central railroad right-of-way are barriers along much of the lakefront, Wetmore pointed out.

PLAN WINTER USE

Plans go beyond getting more people to the beaches on July 4, however. The lakefront is not used in the winter, and facilities must be developed for winter recreation, Wetmore asserted.

Primarily, this means construction of fieldhouses and other types of enclosures that can be used in cold weather.

Wetmore acknowledges that objections will be raised to the construction of buildings, but he believes that the right type of structures will fit into the natural appearance of the lakefront.

Another consideration is whether the people would use such facilities if they were available. The lake, glazed with ice in the dimness of winter's gray shroud, may appear foreboding.

It is the purpose of the study to find answers to these questions.

EXPANSION IS PROBLEM

There is also the matter of expansion. Property acquisition is out of the question on the lake front. The alternative is landfill, Wetmore said, and 2 square miles are recommended. The city may try for half of this in the first stage.

The standard of 10 acres of open space for each 1,000 persons is used for planning purposes. In Cook County, the present ratio is 11 acres for each 1,000 the highest ratio in the Nation.

In breaking down that standard, a different picture emerges. Five acres should be for regional parks, such as the forest preserves, and 5 acres for neighborhood parks.

For Chicago the ratio is 8.5 regional and 2.5 neighborhood, which illustrates a need for local parks.

Federal funds are available to help acquire and clear open spaces. Another means is to provide recreation space in urban renewal developments.

PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT CONTROLLED

The city also has control over large private developments. It can deny approval of plans that do not provide outdoor recreational facilities.

The county purchased 2,140 acres of land for the forest preserves in 1965. This is the second largest purchase ever made in a single year.

* * * * *

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 15, 1966]

City Is Blessed With Leadership in Universities

(By David Halvorsen)

The development of Chicago's universities is no less extraordinary than that of Chicago itself. Founded through unusual circumstances and blessed with brilliant leadership when needed, this city's higher education has reached preeminence in keeping with the vitality of an enlightened metropolis.

Concerned with the easy morality of Chicago in the 1940's, Methodist leaders sought an area north of the city that might be ideal for a university of a community of desirable citizens. The university was chartered as Northwestern in 1851 and the community named Evanston for Dr. John Evans, a leader in developing the university.

IIT IS ESTABLISHED

The forerunner of Illinois Institute of Technology was established because a minister, speaking from the pulpit, boldly suggested how his richest parishioner, Philip D. Armour, might spend some of his wealth.

Impressed by the sermon, Armour agreed to give $1 million if the minister would give 5 years of his time to Armour Institute. Today, IIT is the third largest technical school in the country and is embarked on a $25 million fundraising drive, its greatest in history.

The role of the ministry figures prominently in the founding of the University of Chicago. The institution's subsequent growth may have been in a large part due to the cycling pleasures of its president and benefactor.

TELL ROCKEFELLER'S ROLE

The benefactor was John D. Rockefeller, in 1886 said to be the world's wealthiest man. Prevailed upon by Baptist clergymen Rockefeller agreed to contribute $600,000 if the ministers would come up with $400,000.

The ministers appealed to Baptist churches throughout the Midwest to get the money. It took many months, but they succeeded.

William Rainey Harper, a Yale professor, was named the first president, and he frequently went to Cleveland where he and his family would cycle with the Rockefeller clan, opening the door for discussion of new buildings for the university.

Harper came back with another million dollars and planned a university even grander than he had hoped for.

SEEKS $160 MILLION

The university is now embarked on the greatest fund drive in its illustrious history, seeking $160 million. Like in its founding days, the school is faced with a challenge, this time from the Ford Foundation.

The foundation has put up a challenge grant of $25 million. The university must raise $75 million to get the Ford money.

There are 58 colleges in the Chicago area. For most of them, the 1960's are a time for expansion and this brings a pressing need for more money.

A general analysis of one of these institutions and how it sees itself in the 1960's tends to point up what all schools of higher education are facing.

ONE MILLION—POOF

Armour Institute was established on the million-dollar handshake of a preacher and a financial tycoon. That million dollars would operate Illinois Tech for a week in today's economy.

John T. Rettaliata is president of Illinois Tech and in keeping with the Chicago tradition, he is the right man at the right time.

He cannot stay in an ivory tower nor can he build a wall around IIT, and isolate the campus from the city. In the first place, he would have to tear down the wall every few years for expansion.

In 1940, Armour Institute covered seven acres and consisted of four buildings between 32d and 34th Streets, Dearborn Street on the east and the Rock Island Railroad tracks on the west.

Not far away were the once-elegant brownstone homes on Prairie Avenue of Chicago's great families, the Armours, the Fields, and the Pullmans.

The IIT campus of today stretches for 120 acres from 30th to 35th Streets and Michigan Avenue to the Rock Island Railroad tracks.

Further expansion is on the drawing boards. It will take in the section from Michigan to Indiana Avenues between 31st and 34th Streets.

An institutional planning committee told Rettaliata in 1964 that IIT would need $60 million in the next 10 years to meet its needs. So as not to scare benefactors away, IIT decided to take progress in degrees and set its first stage target at $25 million.

Within 8 months, IIT had 48 percent of its goal, not counting a $5 million challenge grant from the Ford Foundation.

FACULTY SALARIES INCREASED

All of this expansion will be paralleled by an increase in enrollment. The present enrollment is 8,300, an increase of 500 in 1 year. The institute also must expand its faculty, which Rettaliata has substantially upgraded through paying the third highest salary level in Illinois.

The University of Chicago and Northwestern University are the only schools in the State with higher pay scales.

The campus of the University of Chicago embraces the midway of the Columbian Exposition of 1893, a marvel in its own right, though history has imprinted as its best known legacies, a belly dancer called "Little Egypt" and a massive steel girder amusement wheel invented by a man named George Ferris.

The university's academic reputation is one of the finest in the United States. One of 10 college presidents either was graduated from or was on the faculty of Chicago.

HIGH STANDARDS CONTINUE

For its continued high standards of scholastic excellence and complex demands of administrative leadership, Chicago has President George W. Beadle, a Noble Prize winner for his work in genetics.

The university has 12 hospitals and clinics, the Argonne National Laboratory, and institutes for computer research, the study of metals, biophysics, and the famed Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies, named after the father of controlled nuclear energy.

Northwestern University found the land set aside by its Methodist forefathers was not enough, but the only option to expansion was eastward into Lake Michigan.

FILL IN 74 ACRES

It required 2 years to fill in 74 acres of the lake to permit the university to expand. The task cost $6.8 million. A computer center built in the new tract has a machine capable of 380,000 additions per second.

De Paul University is campaigning for $22.5 million and Loyola University is embarked on construction of a medical center costing $34.5 million.

The most recent and spectacular addition to Chicago's higher education is the University of Illinois Circle campus on the near West Side.

The need for this school had long been apparent. Its beginning was not cast through the words of a sermon or the benevolence of a Rockefeller. Rather, its battle was to find a home.

HOUSEWIFE'S EFFORT FAILS

It found a home, despite the almost single efforts of Mrs. Florence Scala, a housewife, to block the campus in the Harrison-Halsted area.

The first stage of Circle campus cost $60 million and now the university is moving ahead on the $27 million second step in development.

The impact of these universities on their immediate neighborhoods has been significant. The University of Chicago has spent $29 million of its own money in helping to improve the Hyde Park-Kenwood area.

Rettaliata serves on the Chicago plan commission and is directly involved in the redevelopment of the area around IIT near West Side neighbors of Circle campus have been renovating their homes and shops in a conservation program of the city department of urban renewal.

"Universities have been a spark plug for urban renewal in Chicago," Rettaliata said. "The decision of IIT to stay in its present location encouraged the New York Life Insurance Co. to finance the Lake Meadows housing project near here."

NEW DIRECTION AND NEW EMPHASIS IN FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, over the years there has been significant Republican support for the foreign aid program, but those of us who have supported the program have consistently believed that the program needed improvement. To that end a group of Republicans in the House has worked for several months, developing recommendations which might be made to the executive branch of the Government, which could effectively improve the foreign aid program.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. I call attention to the fact that 25 Republican Congressmen have joined in a statement which I shall ask to have printed in the Record, which is the result of a 6-month study by this group concerning new directions and new emphasis in foreign aid.

This is a statement by the following Congressmen: Mark Andrews, of North Dakota; Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts; Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey; William S. Mailliard, of California; F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts; Garner E. Shriver, of Kansas; Alphonzo Bell, of California; William S. Broomfield, of Michigan; William T. Cahill, of New Jersey; Barber B. Conable, Jr., of New York; Robert J. Corbett, of Pennsylvania; Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey; Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas; Seymour Halpern, of New York; Frank Horton, of New York; John C. Kunkel, of Pennsylvania; Theodore R. Kupferman, of New York; Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland; Joseph M. McDade, of Pennsylvania; Ogden R. Reid, of New York; Howard W. Robison, of New York; Henry P. Smith III, of New York; Charles M. Teague, of California; and John W. Wydler, of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

New Directions and New Emphasis in Foreign Aid

At its outset, the American foreign aid program was a unique endeavor in the relations among nations. While the American people were willing to embark upon the most generous experiment in all human history, it was nonetheless an experiment. We had no precedents to guide us. We did not know how long it would take. We did not know who should and who should not receive our help. We did not know which programs promoted long-term growth and which did not. We did not know how to organize the effort. We did not even know what the specific goals of our policy should be.

As the Marshall plan evolved into aid to the developing countries, we knew for sure only that our security, our freedom, and our economic prosperity were somehow tied to the security and the long-term growth in freedom and prosperity of the billions of people striving for a better life in the southern half of the globe. This is as true today as it was then.

Mid-20th century communications have built not just an interdependent world but a world in which all men can and increasingly do know of the advantages which others enjoy. The deprivation of the people in the southern half of the globe and the prosperity of the people in the northern half of the globe are visible to all. And so the demands of the people in the developing countries, encouraged by the promises of their political leaders, have created a full-blown crisis in each developing country and a collective instability which may be an immediate threat to the security of the entire world.

Whatever the successes or failures of our foreign aid program to date, the crisis which demanded our attention two decades ago is as severe and as perilous today as it was then. If we do not recognize the very real revolution of rising expectations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and if we make no effort to guide that revolution in a peaceful course toward political stability and economic prosperity, we will soon have to choose between wars of national liberation everywhere or an illusory isolation in a world where the cause of freedom seems doomed to failure.

If there is an undeniable lesson from the history of Vietnam, it is that the same thing can happen in any country where the population is susceptible to organization in the pursuit of more progress than the Government is providing—where Communist promises have appeal because rising expectations have been inadequately fulfilled. Our economy cannot afford to fight Vietnam-type wars everywhere; our security cannot afford Vietnam-type wars everywhere. Our only course, therefore, is to attempt to guide the revolution of rising expectations in the knowledge that prosperity, political stability, and political freedom are the surest paths to peace.

The United States has now had two decades of experience in foreign aid. This experience has taught some very clear lessons which we believe are reflected in the recommendations below.

We welcome the President's new emphasis on education, food, and health in the foreign aid program. The importance of this new emphasis is that it represents an effort to reach the people with our aid.

Sure the purpose of U.S. foreign aid is to help people achieve progress. Unless the people benefit from development efforts, no meaningful progress can result from foreign aid. It is equally true that unless the people contribute to development efforts no meaningful progress can result from foreign aid.

The only reasonable measure of community progress—whether it be progress in social, cultural, political, or economic terms—is the degree of progress in which each individual in the community can share and benefit. Development which does not reach the people is not progress in human terms, and thus cannot significantly better the community. A grandiose economic infrastructure of transportation networks and physical plants and port facilities and industrial capacity is not by itself evidence of human progress or worthwhile development.

For progress the economic infrastructure must be an integral part of the community. It must provide direct benefits to the people; it must be compatible with the political, cultural, and social behavior of the people; it must be intermeshed with the people of the community it is designed to serve.

In short, an economic infrastructure cannot provide meaningful human progress unless it springs from a vibrant human infrastructure. The task of development might best be expressed not in sterile economic terms, but in terms of people—their awareness of the possible, their education and skills, their determination and participation—the impetus they provide and the satisfaction they receive.

A human infrastructure where the people are engaged and engage themselves in the process of development can assure progress—in social, cultural, political and economic terms.

Our recommendations reflect, as well, another lesson of the foreign aid adventure. It is that nonviolent progress in many of the developing countries is impeded by the inability of their governments to administer and accommodate change. In a few cases, governments may not desire change—and in those cases foreign aid makes no sense. Most developing countries, however, desperately want change, but lack the administrative skills, the political techniques and the managerial capacity to provide for orderly progress which reaches the people.

U.S. foreign aid must place new emphasis on building the capacity of governments to administer development. Unless we do so, most foreign aid funds will be wasted—and worse, the revolution of rising expectations, inflamed by Communist promises, will turn violent.

We will support a constructive program of foreign aid. We believe that our recommendations will contribute to such a program.

Our support is far from indiscriminate however. While aid should not depend upon the utterly predictable foreign policy support of its recipient, aid should not be extended to those who make anti-Americanism a hallmark of their policy. While we should not insist upon carbon copies of Western political institutions, aid which diminishes or tends to discourage popular participation in government is not justified. While evidence need not be in the form of visible development aid projects such as stadiums, dams and highways which do not necessarily insure development progress, the U.S. foreign aid administration must be able to give meaningful evidence that its programs justify the expenditure.

The program outlined by the following recommendations will not require an increase in public foreign aid funds. It will require an increasingly determined effort to make the most productive use of the current level of funds requested—and it will require an expanded involvement of private U.S. institutions in the foreign aid program.

1. The administration should issue a firm declaration of the purposes of its foreign aid program. With a precise statement of foreign aid objectives the program may be able to achieve greater support at home and minimize suspicion of U.S. motives abroad. Having once defined the objectives of foreign aid, the administration should not vary in pursuit of them; aid for purposes of temporary political expediency is unwise.

2. Just as the United States should not hesitate to declare openly the precise objectives of its aid program, neither should it hesitate to identify U.S. aid with a U.S. label. It is important that the people who receive aid know where it comes from. The bond between peoples, one sincere in its desire to help and the other appreciative for the help received, can be a vital source of international stability over coming generations.

3. The U.S. foreign aid program should place new emphasis on the need for the growth of popular participation in the development programs of the developing countries and the increased capacity of recipient governments to perform effectively in the broad spectrum of development tasks.

4. AID might appropriately consider, on a case-by-case basis, the transfer of specific industrial and economic development projects to multilateral management by the World Bank, the International Development Association or the Inter-American Development Bank when such a transfer is feasible in economic, political and administrative terms. Such a transfer would increase AID's capacity to concentrate on other aspects of development such as aid for civic institutional improvement and for popular participation in development. Project transfers to multilateral management should not involve any increase in U.S. aid expenditures.

5. All of the recommendations of the Watson Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid should be given careful attention by the Congress in order to increase private U.S. foreign investment in the developing countries in support of economic development projects. The President has reported that some of the Watson committee proposals are already being put into effect, but the entire package deserves the most detailed consideration by the Congress.

6. A new position of Deputy Administrator of AID should be created for the sole purpose of encouraging greater U.S. private investment in the developing countries.

7. In accordance with the recommendation of the National Citizen's Commission to the White House Conference on International Cooperation, "a permanent International Private Investment Development Board (should) be established consisting of a small number of leading American businessmen who would be given extensive advisory responsibilities within the U.S. foreign assistance program."

8. The United States should encourage a program of selectivity and emphasis for development assistance among the developed allies. The United States, for its part, should be selective in the number of countries in which it has an aid involvement; and it must be selective in the choice of the countries in order to assure that aid recipients have the desire and ability to make the best use of aid. The United States has a special responsibility for development in Latin America, and it should receive special emphasis. A greater concentration of effort and funds can better achieve the purposes of foreign aid.

9. New emphasis on foreign aid in Latin America requires efforts to restore the flagging enthusiasm of the Alliance for Progress. The excitement of promise created in its early days must now be matched by the excitement of achievement. Public relations is not a substitute for accomplishment.

10. The Agency for International Development should restructure its thinking to give new attention and emphasis to the need for effective governmental administration and greater popular participation in the development programs of aid recipients. Such an emphasis will require a new effort to enlist the support of the private voluntary associations in the United States and particular attention to the following seven recommendations.

11. Consistent with new emphasis on the administration of and popular participation in the development, U.S. foreign aid should be made contingent upon a defined set of basic criteria which conduce toward political growth. For example:

While we should not insist upon carbon copies of Western political institutions, aid which diminishes or tends to discourage popular participation in government is not justified.

No government-to-government aid should be extended to any country that shows no interest in holding popular elections, establishing broad suffrage, or creating a civil service system based on merit.

No government-to-government aid should be extended to any country whose development plans do not extend to each segment of its population—including the rural peasantry and the modernization of agriculture.

No government-to-government aid should be extended to any country where corruption or inefficiency in the government are so widespread that progress is impossible, and where no effort is being made to correct it.

12. Similarly expanded AID emphasis is required, not just in general education as outlined by the President, but in programs of education in administrative skills and in the theoretical and practical elements of political science. In particular AID support should be given to the establishment of training institutes for teachers at the secondary and primary levels and for programs of aid in translated political science textbooks. Such efforts should concentrate in the teaching of political skills, but care should be taken not to assume that particular Western political institutions are necessarily appropriate in the underdeveloped areas.

13. The United States should promote the establishment of a Latin American Civil Service Academy, as recommended by the House of Representatives Republican Task Force on Latin American Affairs.

14. New emphasis on the administration of and popular participation in development will require expanded AID attention to programs for community development, including health facilities, housing, schools, libraries, transportation, communications, sewage disposal facilities, and savings institutions. These programs in turn depend upon and encourage the growth of active political participation by the people in democratically organized popular efforts.

15. This emphasis in AID programing also requires increased concentration on facilitating the means of communications by which the government of a developing country can reach and engage the people, the people can make their desires known to the government, and the purposes of national and international development programs can be explained.

16. U.S. food and agricultural technology can be and should be used as positive instruments for development and peace. They are the best evidence of the superiority of Western democracies over communism in supplying the basic needs of man. Public Law 480 should be reoriented to eliminate the impression that the program is designed merely to dispose of unwanted surpluses. The purpose of our food aid should be to help those in need and to demonstrate that a free society can produce agricultural abundance. Because our food supplies are not endless, because world population continues to expand dramatically, and because a viable agricultural economy can be a bulwark against communism, the United States must couple its food aid with programs to expand agricultural productivity and technical skills in the developing countries. Local currencies received in exchange for food should be used toward this end.

17. Because the tools and processes of assistance to the administration of and popular participation in development are not as yet well defined, AID must undertake and sponsor broad programs of research to develop the tools and methods necessary to create the human infrastructure in the developing countries which will encourage and accommodate orderly growth.

18. The U.S. Government, with the enthusiastic leadership of the White House, should make a broad effort to engage the private voluntary associations of the U.S. democracy in a people-to-people aid program so as to encourage the growth of participation by the people of the developing countries in their own development plans. The following nine recommendations are particularly relevant.

19. In addition to a broader program of financial investment in the developing countries, the American business community should be encouraged to establish and participate in its own training programs in the developing countries to teach technical and administrative skills.

20. In support of national foreign aid policy, the business community should be asked to lend, at its own cost, junior executive talent to AID on a rotating 1-year basis.

21. The U.S. labor unions should be asked to continue their efforts to help organize the labor force of the developing countries in democratically based unions, and should permit a greater decentralization of their efforts so that local unions can cooperate in local people-to-people projects.

22. The major farm and agricultural worker organizations in the United States should be encouraged to increase their activities to bring agricultural productivity and modernization to the developing countries.

23. Through AID and private foundation contracts, American colleges and universities should be asked to increase their efforts in support of American foreign aid in the developing countries, particularly with new emphasis on the theoretical and practical aspects of political science, public administration and business management.

24. With enthusiastic cooperation from the administration, private foundations such as the International Development Foundation should be promoted in order to assist in facilitating the more competent administration of national development programs and the growth of popular participation in development.

25. With AID encouragement and financial assistance if necessary, other U.S. voluntary associations such as church groups, women's organizations, professional societies, and student groups should be encouraged to undertake their own programs to establish ties with counterpart groups in the developing countries and to encourage their participation in the human infrastructure necessary to achieve and accommodate meaningful progress.

26. The Republican and Democratic parties, acting in concert, should undertake a carefully devised but vigorous program of support for development in Latin America, including greater contact between United States and Latin politicians, help in the establishment of legislative reference services for Latin American parliaments, and establishment of a Latin American Institute for Democratic Development at which representatives of Latin American political parties might learn the theoretical and practical aspects of political science.

27. Under the enthusiastic leadership of the Governors, and the enthusiastic support of the administration and AID, the U.S. State governments should seek to establish their own programs for popular participation in development with individual countries in Latin America. In a State-to-country program, contracted under AID arrangements as in the present Chile-California program, the State governments should attempt to enlist the business community, the educational institutions, and the voluntary associations in their own States in support of coordinated programs to make people-to-people aid projects more effective and dramatic. The congressional representation for each State participating in such a program should share in the responsibility for making the program successful and effective.

28. In order to coordinate this greatly broadened private aid effort, and in order to minimize duplication and waste, AID should establish an official Government clearinghouse and coordination center for the private aid program.

29. The Congress should establish a special staff unit of expert technicians to provide continual field evaluation of foreign aid. It should report on good as well as inadequate performance. It would fill a vital need in keeping the Congress, and through the Congress the people, informed of the use to which foreign aid funds are being put.

30. The appropriations for military assistance and other foreign aid assistance should be kept separate, as recommended by the administration.

31. Foreign military aid in the form of hardware should, whenever possible, be extended only to regional defense organizations.

32. The administration should make renewed efforts to find new uses for U.S.-owned foreign currency funds available for aid programs in the developing countries. Except in those cases where their use would contribute to a severe inflationary spiral, these foreign currencies should be put to use in support of development programs, through legislative appropriation as part of the AID budget.

The purpose of these recommendations is to strengthen the security of the United States by making its foreign aid program more realistic and effective. The major thrust of the recommendations has been toward a greater recognition of the role which popular participation in development must play in the growth of the security of independent developing nations. With new emphasis on this aspect of development, the U.S. foreign aid program can enter into a new and more rewarding phase—in which the American people can be engaged directly in the process and in which real development needs will be served.

Attention to the administration of and popular participation in development will require also new emphasis on diplomacy and tact. It will require a willingness to face a new form of suspicion of our motives. But in the end, it will serve the purpose of our own national security, the security of independent nations everywhere, the growth of modern democracy, and the evolution of peace and freedom which are and must always be the ultimate goals of American foreign aid and American foreign policy.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for his presentation here today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the United States has now had 20 years of experience with foreign aid. During that period many billions of dollars have been spent, the economies of many countries have been strengthened, and in other areas also a great deal has been accomplished. However, let us admit, frankly, that mistakes have also been made during these past 20 years. The question now is how to avoid similar mistakes in the future, and how, on the basis of 20 years' experience, we can develop more effective programs.

The foreign aid recommendations which we are discussing today are based on a careful study of past experience. It is our feeling that a new emphasis, and a change of direction, are needed. We recognize that even now we still do not have all the answers. For example, to insure more effective use of foreign aid, we need still more research—into the processes of changes, of what occurs when peoples and nations become involved in the development process, and into the significance of the external resources contributed by others.

It is evident, we feel, that the United States needs policies and guidelines for foreign aid that are clearly enunciated by our policymakers, and broadly understood by our people. There must be popular understanding that foreign aid is more than a response to an appeal to our humanitarianism, that the welfare and security of the United States and the free world are enhanced as other nations acquire political and economic independence.

Coupled with this need for general principles for the conduct of an effective foreign aid program is the need for flexibility in furnishing assistance. Countries which need aid differ widely in climate, geography, culture, history, and resources and in stages of development. For aid to be effective, each country needs a program tailored to its needs, and the methods of achieving the desired objectives must be defined with precision.

The development of plans by individual countries, and the receipt of aid in conformance with priorities established in such plans, does not, of course, always produce successful results. In some cases, as in the case of Taiwan, aid provides the needed stimulus for solid advances, but in other cases the results are negligible. Why should this be so?

Experience indicates clearly that many factors are needed for success in development programs. One lesson we have learned the hard way is that it is a serious error to concentrate on either the agricultural or the industrial sector at the expense of the other. At first we seemed to assume that since developed societies were industrial, and undeveloped societies were agricultural, that we needed only to concentrate on rapid industrial growth. We have come to learn, in the words of Walt W. Rostow:

> A failure to modernize agriculture can produce two results—often at the same time—neither of which is socially and politically sound for the life of the Nation. It may yield a rush of rural folk to the cities, in an effort to share somehow the advantages of modern life; or it can entrap in the countryside manpower badly needed for industrial development, leaving the Nation split between a vital modern sector and an impoverished archaic traditional sector.

The effect of industrialization in a developing country is quite different from industrial activity in developed Western countries. In underdeveloped countries per capita income is so low and broad purchasing power for consumer goods so minimal that it is not possible to achieve profits with high sales volumes and low profits on each sales. Even if a manufacturer in a developing country lowers his prices, he does little to increase his market. Since that is so, he may even increase his prices, relying on the willingness of the rich to continue to buy—but the fruits of industrialization fail to reach the masses.

So too we have learned the error of concentrating, as we did at first, in urban areas at the expense of rural areas. Since 70 percent of the population of developing areas live in villages and rural areas, it is obvious that organization and modernization in this sector could have tremendous impact. It is noteworthy that this is where the major thrust of Communist organizational efforts takes place—as was obvious in Cuba, and is today obvious in Vietnam.

To achieve a reasonable balance between competing demands, and to provide the needed skills to execute the plans, is obviously no small task. In many developing countries, unfortunately, the necessary skills are not available, skills incidentally which include not only the ability to read instructions on machinery. Also needed but frequently not available is useful technical know how, the capacity to handle administrative jobs, and the capacity to assume political responsibility.

Experience indicates clearly the importance of finding ways by which our own knowledge and skills can be applied to help meet the needs of developing nations for managerial and administrative skills, education and training for specific jobs, and to improve communications generally. In these ways our aid can reduce critical shortages which inhibit development, and by raising skills we can bring about a better balance between industrial and agricultural development.

The administration is to be commended for recognizing the importance of meeting the needs of developing countries in the fields of education and health, and in agricultural development. There is danger, however, in raising hopes too high. Would it not be wiser, for example, to concentrate educational efforts on management, administration, and communication? All these are skills which would improve a government's capacity to administer development programs, and facilitate popular participation in the development process.

Nor do I think it possible to overemphasize the importance of private groups in encouraging the political and economic progress of developing countries. Too little has yet been done to encourage or secure the support of private organizations, business groups, farm groups, labor unions, and the like.

The partners of the alliance program is a good example of the kind of people-to-people involvement we need, not only in Latin America, but elsewhere. My State of New Jersey is engaged in the partners program with the State of Alagoas, Brazil. New Jersey citizens, recruited from business, labor, and civic organizations, work directly with a counterpart committee of citizen leaders in Maceio, the capital of Alagoas. The New Jersey committee has been supplied with a list of over 100 projects and, since the program is a two-way street, Alagoas is engaged in projects involving New Jersey.

In conclusion let me say that I personally can see no advantage in the proposed 5-year authorization for foreign aid. As I have pointed out previously, we still are making changes in the relative importance of various objectives and how we should handle the job. President Johnson himself has come up this year with major new recommendations which he did not make a year ago. Next year we may easily see another set of changes. If Congress had no full opportunity for an annual review, there might well not be this continuing search and effort to improve existing foreign aid programs.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman in the well [Mr. MORSE], for his leadership in what I think has been a very constructive piece of work and one which I think will be helpful in the entire field.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the significant contribution made by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], in the preparation of this document.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the Honorable SILVIO CONTE of Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that he be granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that a man becomes an old man once he has lost his enthusiasm for life. So, too, it can be said that the supporters of our ongoing foreign assistance efforts become disenchanted when they lose their enthusiasm for the program—when, year after year, the same hackneyed phrases are used to describe, less than enthusiastically, the same warmed-over programs and musty projects, overseen by the same stereotyped functionaries. Over it all could be waved a banner proclaiming, "What was good enough for the Marshall plan is good enough for southeast Asia—or Africa—or Latin America."

But it is not.

And, I have not lost my enthusiasm for the program nor the will to try to see it changed—with new ideas—and with new directions.

Foreign aid should be neither completely self-serving nor completely self-sacrificing, for us or for the recipient countries. The underlying motivating spirit of foreign aid is the mutual, cooperative relationship which cannot always be measured in dollars and cents, which cannot always have as its hallmark success, but which moves the developing country forward—slow as that progress may at times be.

U.S. foreign aid is a giving relationship, in which the overall needs of the developing nation must guide our assistance, but the individual must not be overlooked or forgotten.

U.S. foreign aid is a receiving relationship, in which the development of the needs of the nation and its people enables them, in many instances for the first time, to be able to choose a democratic way of life and make it work. Then, we receive the quid for the quo in the new-found security of yet another country and its government and a greater security for this country.

With a new appreciation of the role which the administration of development assistance must play in promoting the security of developing nations, must also come a great realization that, if our aid is to be effective, we must be better organized for the task than we are.

This is not to say that yet another administrative overhaul of our aid-dispensing agency should be called for, for administrative overhauls seem generally to succeed in little more than attaching a new facade and a new set of initials to what is otherwise the same old administrative problems and the historic, tangled web of bureaucratic redtape and procedure.

Better organization can many times be most successfully achieved by a little effective reorganization than by resorting to a totally new organization. Therefore, in order to preserve a continuity in our aid efforts and the lessons of hard experience we have learned over the past two decades, we ask for no attack to be launched against the present structure of AID, but, rather, we devote our attention to, and ask your consideration of, other enormous organizational questions remaining to be resolved—questions posed by such new directions as multilateral versus bilateral aid, the role to be played in future aid efforts by the private sector, the use of our agricultural products and technology for development, the role which should or must be played by our developed allies, and the criteria we will utilize in determining how many and what countries will be recipients of aid.

THE ROLE OF THE AID ORGANIZATION

The emphasis in foreign aid which we recommend will not be a completely new departure from prior and existing AID practice. It is true that the structure of the agency, its personnel, and the reporting of its statistics have been primarily geared to the essentially economic theories of growth. There have been exceptions, primarily in the Latin American bureau, where there has been a growing realization that the creation of an economic base is meaningless without a human involvement to give impetus to change and without dramatic improvements in the governmental capacity to perform.

No doubt, AID has been hesitant to embark boldly upon programs to build the recipient government's capacity to administer development and to encourage popular participation in development out of fear of a misunderstanding of U.S. motives. To alleviate this fear and to allay suspicion of our motives abroad, therefore, we have set out as our first recommendation that the administration issue a firm declaration defining the objectives of its foreign aid program.

It is imperative to understand that we are not proposing, and AID must never attempt, to interfere in the political processes of independent nations.

U.S. foreign aid should never insist upon or attempt to establish particular governmental institutions.

U.S. foreign aid should never be in league with political movements in opposition to government power.

The politics in aid recipient countries is their business, not ours.

What we propose is not interference in the domestic affairs of independent nations, but help to those nations to make their development programs more effective.

U.S. foreign aid must strive to help recipient governments attain the capacity to accommodate change, to administer development.

U.S. foreign aid must strive to help recipient countries to build the human base of popular participation which will create progress and allow the people to share in that progress.

If foreign aid ignores these tasks it cannot be effective.

It is true that in large measure the process of building participation on the part of the people, in the manifold institutions of a modern society, is a process which must be left to people-to-people aid relationships—that is, relations between the U.S. private sector, the professional societies, the labor unions, the churches, the private foundations, and similar institutions, on the one hand, and the people of the developing countries, on the other.

Even in this sphere, however, AID has a vital, if indirect, role to play. Community development projects, agricultural cooperatives, political science education, are all areas where our foreign public aid has a direct byproduct of encouraging the involvement and civic consciousness of the people.

AID can act directly, however, in the expansion of the developing countries' governments' capacity to perform. By increasing the efficiency of the government through training, education, and technical advice; by encouraging greater decentralization of administration; and, by direct aid to government programs which increase the capacity of the government to communicate effectively with the people, the needs of development will be served.

This is most important and obvious in the areas of communications and education. The communications needs are immense. The people must learn to, and how to, communicate with their government; the government must learn to, and how to, communicate with the people. The people must be able to communicate with each other, so that through association they can achieve common ends.

The tasks in education seem even more immense. We applaud the President's new emphasis on education for the people through foreign aid. It must provide facilities for teacher training, but it must also provide to the people the texts and knowledge of relevant technical skills, the science of agricultural modernization and the use of simple and complicated tools.

The forms of public and private aid in education can be many: international student exchange, expanded exchange programs in the United States for potential leaders from abroad, technical advisory missions, national institutes for expert knowledge, and local schools for rudimentary and technical knowledge. But, even more important than all of these will be the educational responsibility that every man and woman, who engages in the foreign aid operation, must carry. For it will be their responsibility, through patience, understanding, and persistence, to teach indirectly and by example the essential civic skills which every American tends to take for granted, but upon which the development of our society has relied.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND TECHNOLOGY

U.S. foreign aid in agriculture must have two quite distinct goals.

The first is to help to get food and nutrition to the two-thirds of the people of the world who are hungry.

The second is the modernization of the agricultural capacities of the developing countries so that they need not rely on emergency food supplies from abroad and so they can free the manpower necessary for industrial development from their struggle with the earth for a food supply that is thwarted by the methods employed.

One-third of the world must diet while two-thirds of the world is starving.

Fifty percent of the preschool age children in the developing countries of the world suffer from malnutrition.

Minds, diverted by hunger, do not seek the road to development.

The conscience of the developed countries, with their incredible agricultural productivity, must be engaged in a new program.

Public Law 480 provides for the sale or donation of some agricultural surpluses. The law is a generous one, but it is essentially a negative one—designed primarily as a means to make some use of, and to gain some economic advantage from, American farm produce. Merely providing a market for our surplus does not meet the need of the developing countries nor employ the productive capacity of the agricultural capabilities of this country.

A more positive approach would be to determine how much food is needed to provide adequate nutrition to the people now suffering and to coordinate, through our foreign aid program, the efforts of this country to produce, rather than to dispose, to supply this need. Public Law 480 should be reoriented. Food for Peace should be translated into a positive effort to fight starvation.

At the same time, the additional foreign currencies coming to this country as a result of increased activity in transactions involving food supplies, where food commodities are supplied on a sale basis to the developing countries, must increase the urgency for the long-awaited action for the utilization of these currencies—putting them to work for us and for the good of the recipient country.

Of course, we are not advocating, nor have I or any Member for whom I am speaking today, ever advocated the willy-nilly use of foreign currencies—the spending of these funds merely for the sake of getting rid of them. But it is time to stop talking and to start acting to ensure that excess U.S.-owned foreign currency funds, available for development projects in a recipient country, be put to development use. Caution must be exercised in every instance to avoid any inflationary effect on the internal economy of the country, but the coordinated efforts of the administration, AID, and officials of the developing countries could ensure that the potential provided by these funds is effectively tapped.

Again, I remind you, the utilization of these funds need not be contingent upon an increase in foreign aid expenditures, but upon the inventive application of these currencies to expenses currently incurred in the program and otherwise funded directly by American dollars. There should be no continuation of arguments over the language by which this should be done nor the committee within whose jurisdiction the question comes. It is a problem of the American people and must be a concern of every Member of the Congress. We have waited for action too long and the continued accumulation of these funds around the world in this country's account is as inimical to the interests of the developing countries as it is our own.

The second goal of aid in agriculture must be a simultaneous effort to increase the agricultural productivity of the developing countries themselves. By modernizing agriculture, the developing countries can reduce their dependence upon emergency food aid, free some labor for the growth of industry, create popular participation in the development of rural areas, and serve to bring the progress of development to the people. This effort will require promotion of farming cooperatives, the teaching of the technical skills of modern agriculture, in which the United States is unsurpassed, and the supply of the modern instruments of agriculture.

PROGRAM OF EMPHASIS BY SELECTIVITY

If the security of the United States depends upon the security of the developing countries, and if the security of the developing countries depends upon our assistance in specific programs for development, then it makes no sense for the United States to continue foreign assistance programs denied the opportunity of success by the failure of the developing countries to do those things essential for their success. Neither does it make any sense for the United States to continue keeping a "hand in" in countries where we have no total development commitment, where the assistance programs are denied, the opportunity of success by the failure of this country to do more than maintain a presence.

There is a desperate need to inject into the U.S. program of foreign aid a more realistic attitude toward the establishment of criteria under which aid is extended.

The United States has made some progress in recent years in making our aid program more selective. While this progress is welcome, it cannot divert our awareness from the fact that some 40 percent of all our foreign assistance is spread among 65 countries and 5 percent of our foreign aid is going to 41 separate countries. In terms of national development, these programs could hardly be effective. In many instances, without contributing significantly to the development process, our aid may only have a nuisance value and complicate political relations without achieving corresponding benefits.

I have called in the past for a further implementation of a program of carefully planned selectivity and I welcome the support and approval today of my Republican colleagues of this proposal as it is embodied in the recommendations we have made.

Operating within a reasonable budget for expenditures, the needed emphasis to facilitate the earliest obtainment of the high goals we set for our aid efforts can be made possible only through a carefully implemented program of selectivity. We must be selective in the number of countries in which we will have an aid involvement and we must be further selective in the choice of the countries filling out that number in order to assure that those countries in the program will coordinate and cooperate in the efforts we extend.

THE ROLE OF OUR ALLIES

For many years, there has been a rising demand within the United States that our European allies, the recipients of our assistance during Marshall fund days, assume a more active role in sharing the burden of development aid to the southern half of the globe today. This demand persists and is understandable. However, many Americans may not fully appreciate the extent to which these governments have undertaken major foreign aid programs of their own. Germany, Italy, Israel, and Japan all have major and expanding foreign assistance programs. France extends more foreign aid per capita than any other nation in the world, including the United States. The British development assistance program is certainly as large, if not larger, than her precarious balance-of-payments situation will allow.

The problem is not a lackadaisical effort by our allies, although they could, perhaps, increase their efforts. The problem is that time is so short and the problems are so great that the available financial resources of all the developed Western allies are insufficient for the task.

We must make a more effective concentration of our efforts and encourage a program of emphasis by selectivity among our developed allies, such as that I have proposed for this country. It is applicable to the efforts of these allies, just as the program of our allies must be considered in implementing our own program of emphasis by selectivity.

It cannot be ignored that for the United States to maintain expensive, but relatively minor, foreign aid programs in two countries, neither one of which is sufficient, denies it the opportunity to spend the total amount of funds in one country where, perhaps, an adequate job could be done. Similarly, whatever the potential value of even a minimal U.S. presence, a minor foreign aid program in a country which also receives significant foreign aid from one of our allies, inevitably causes duplication of efforts, overlapping of programs, and dilution of results despite the most sincere efforts at interallied cooperation.

PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

We have said that the emphasis of the past on development and growth of an economic base at the sacrifice of involvement of the people and development of their talents and capabilities has been a weakness of the foreign aid efforts. In stressing the necessity of AID to enlist popular participation and administration in development, it cannot, of course, come at the complete sacrifice of an ongoing economic development, building an economic structure within the developing country into which the people's knowledge and skills can be channeled. However, for the Government, the time is too short and the resources too limited to move successfully forward at both levels of development. A greater encouragement and involvement of the American private business community to invest its capital and human resources in economic development projects will permit the necessary freedom for AID to emphasize the new directions in foreign aid we are recommending.

I think we know, as I have emphasized in the past, that the vast reservoir of financial, managerial, administrative, and technical resources of our American businesses must be tapped if we are to successfully move the developing countries around the world into the 20th century as partners in future progress with the United States. It is even more important to marshal these forces to join with the Government in this fight against the deprivation of human liberty and the desecration of human dignity of the peoples dependent upon the concurrent economic development of their countries.

Last July's report of the Watson Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid to AID is an outstanding contribution toward the more effective utilization of the private sector in support of the purposes of foreign aid. The President has reported that some of the Watson Committee recommendations are being followed. I urge, as we have, recommended, that the Congress carefully study all of these recommendations for potential incorporation in legislation.

Above all, however, there must be a new atmosphere at AID and throughout the administration, which not only makes the business community feel welcome in its participation in the development process, but actively seeks to engage the business community in support of the development process.

AID must have a Deputy Administrator to serve this task alone. It should also have a business board to advise it on investment policies and opportunities. The task is too big, the funds are too limited, and the time is too short, to rely only upon the Government. The business community must be engaged, and the business community must also accept the responsibility of offering its resources to the foreign aid program so that it may serve this vital national purpose, as well as its own economic prosperity.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND REGIONAL MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS

The President has proposed the separation of the legislative package for military and other assistance. Military assistance in the form of hardware may, in some circumstances, add to a nation's security, but it does not have a direct relation to the development process. Therefore, I have previously proposed and we recommend today the extension of such military aid, whenever possible, to regional military organizations rather than to individual national military establishments.

CONTINUING CONGRESSIONAL EVALUATION

Congress, working through its committees, is severely hampered in discharging its responsibilities of authorizing and appropriating funds annually for the conduct of our foreign aid program by the limitations imposed upon it due to inadequate staffing and lack of sources of independnt evaluation of program specifics.

The status of current projects, the needs of a country in a particular area of development, the work of the AID field personnel, the acceptance of the recipient country of the development efforts being made in terms of people and ideas, all these important and determinative factors must be gleaned from ceremonial inspection trips by congressional delegations and justification materials submitted to the congressional committees by the very agencies directly concerned with making a bed of roses from a can of worms. I have found my personal attempts at getting an unannounced first-hand look at some of these projects thwarted and I am sure everyone here has heard stories of our powdered milk being used to mark off a ball field in some developing country.

Therefore we are recommending the establishment of a special investigative staff, to function under the authority of the House through its responsible committees, to travel in every country in which we have an aid involvement, to inspect every program and project for which American dollars are going into these developing countries, to talk with the people in the recipient countries, and not just the heads of state, but those same people we are asking AID to involve in its development efforts, to talk with the field personnel of AID and to report back to the Congress on their findings. The personnel of this staff will not be individuals out after a "cushy" job nor will they be antagonists of the personnel or harassers of the program. Their evaluation will be an independent one, their criticisms constructive and their praise of worthy efforts encouraged Just as the history of our assistance efforts through the past 20 years have had bipartisan spokesmen and support, theirs will not be a partisan appraisal—but a report to the entire body.

With such assistance, the Congress will be better able to evaluate all aspects of the foreign aid program, to coordinate efforts, to emphasize successes and to get rid of potential powder kegs before they explode under us. This staff team would be of special value to both the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee in discharging responsibly their duties to this body and would enable every Member of this body to be better informed in their reports to the people, on whom we call for support of our foreign aid program.

CONCLUSION

We are emphasizing in our statements and our proposals, not a sweeping departure from prior and existing practices and programs of the Agency for International Development, but, rather, that this is the time to propose, consider, and implement solutions to the enormous organizational questions undermining the overall effectiveness of our assistance efforts, and to strike out in new directions to stimulate the development of the countries around the world looking to us for help.

TOWARD A THEORY OF EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the recommendations we have made today for the conduct of our foreign assistance effort go beyond changes in administration. They are designed to provide an entirely new dimension in our programs to assist the developing nations. Development on the scale necessary if these countries are to become proud and stable members of the international community is principally a job for government of these countries: only government can provide the legal and institutional framework that is essential for the efficient application of technological and other tools of development. We can, I believe, help these governments develop the capacity to direct and shape development.

We must give our attention to two separate spheres. For a society to achieve growth it must, on the one hand, have a government with a highly developed capacity to perform. The government must be able to plan efficiently, to administer effectively, to communicate with the people easily and to engage the participation of the people in the development process.

Popular participation involves the ability to communicate with government, the capacity to organize and the competency to initiate and follow through on projects through techniques and instruments the people have developed for themselves.

The governmental capacity to perform: Many of the developing countries have only recently achieved self-government; many others have only recently become aware of the opportunities for advanced economic prosperity. It is understandable that they are still reaching for the capacity to effect change. They have experienced difficulties with various combinations of problems including a lack of a sufficient number of competent officials, inadequate knowledge of their own geography and resources, rudimentary transportation and communications systems, and traditional political viewpoints and institutions.

If the foreign-aid program is to be successful, the United States must assist these nations in improving their performance. We should not seek to impose an institutional pattern, but rather to instill respect for a process of government that engages the people in decisionmaking. U.S. foreign aid must never be an instrument of uninvited interference in the domestic affairs of independent countries.

The United States has a number of opportunities to influence quite directly the establishment and growth of some of the most fundamental instruments of government. Our help is occasionally asked for in the drafting of national constitutions. Legislators in the developing countries can learn a great deal from U.S. experience in developing staff and research support for the legislative process. Our assistance in helping parliaments establish legislative reference services would be of important practical utility.

Decentralization of governmental functions and political power may also provide a constructive area for study. Formal federalism may not be appropriate for many developing countries, but our experience may be useful in emphasizing that decentralization will not bring benefits in governmental capacity or popular participation unless the people are involved in the government that decentralization brings closer.

Although the administrators of our foreign-aid program have recognized the importance of establishing effective, honest, and competent civil service and public administration, the United States has not given this field sufficient attention in our aid effort. Technical assistance in the development of merit systems, examination programs, and inservice training could be extremely useful. This is the kind of thing the Republican Task Force on Latin America had in mind last November when it recommended the establishment of an Inter-American Civil Service Academy.

One of the most important tests of any government's performance is its ability to maintain law and order. Both the armed services and the police have a role here if the civilian government employs these powerful tools with restraint. The training of law enforcement officials in the use of power and restraint would be an appropriate use of foreign aid funds. Likewise in the military sphere, assistance in the form of hardware does not contribute directly to the development process, but assistance in the form of training can help transform the military of the developing countries from a feared vehicle of authoritarianism to a popular instrument of progress. Here again U.S. experience with the Army Corps of Engineers and the use of the military to enforce civil rights is relevant.

The performance of a government will also be reflected in the strength of its mechanisms for channeling popular support. The political party structure need not follow a two-party pattern. The experience of Mexico demonstrates that a single party coalition can be a major instrument of development; in a multiparty system competition between parties for popular support can provide impetus for reform, communication between people and government, and a popular voice in governmental decisions about development.

To be sure, many political leaders need greater understanding of the concept that elections involve not only victory, but a mandate from the people for the conduct of policy in their interests. New techniques for the training of leaders and the organization of support must be brought to their attention; much can be done even with simple programs of instruction in how to run a meeting, how to operate a mimeograph machine, and how to raise funds for political action.

Political participation of the people: It is at the point of governmental mobilization of support and opinion that the problems of governmental capacity and popular participation merge. I think that our experience with development over the past 20 years has demonstrated that sound development depends on the participation of the people.

Alexis de Tocqueville commented more than once on the vitality of U.S. local government and private voluntary associations. Of local government he wrote:

> Local assemblies of citizens constitute the strength of free nations. Town meetings are to liberty what primary schools are to science; they bring it within reach; they teach men how to use it and how to enjoy it. A nation may establish a system of free government, but without the spirit of municipal institutions, it cannot have the spirit of liberty.

For a variety of reasons, both historic and philosophic, many developing nations have extremely strong central governments. It is difficult for a government that is distant to win the allegiance of the people. Yet, even a government that is close must involve the people in its decisions.

We cannot urge a drastic realinement of administrative and political power in the developing countries, but we can make available to them the benefits of U.S. experience with strong local government. We can suggest techniques of developing leadership in the villages and rural areas; we can assist in the development of recruitment programs that will provide the government with a source of personnel to be trained in the techniques of public administration and then set to work among their own people.

We should certainly improve our knowledge of the attitudes of people toward government. What steps should be taken to increase their belief in their own ability to effect change? How can government encourage and assist in the exercise of popular initiative? These questions may best be answered through the efforts of the private voluntary institutions and associations which contribute to the initiative, achievement and accommodation of change. De Tocqueville commented on the range and effectiveness of such groups in the United States:

> As soon as several of the inhabitants of the United States have taken up an opinion or a feeling which they wish to promote in the world, they look out for mutual assistance; and as soon as they have found one another out, they combine. From that moment they are no longer isolated men, but a power seen from afar, whose actions serve for an example and whose language is listened to.

Such associations are practically unknown in the developing world. Too often the kinds of associations, such as trade unions, which we know as both supporting and opposing participants in the democratic process, may be, in some of the developing countries, an instrument by which the government controls workers.

Our foreign aid effort should recognize the significance of private groups in change and development and make an effort to bring to the developing countries the concepts of democratic participation, education, equality and public service that have informed U.S. private groups.

The natural groups of society—labor, students, professional people, farmers, women, and so forth—must be encouraged to organize to serve their common purposes. They must be encouraged to recognize and analyze their common interests, and the advantages of joint action and self-discipline on behalf of the greater national development purpose. The sensitive teaching of these lessons and responsive understanding of them will contribute to the consciousness of group capacity to shape the future.

Aside from political parties, one of the most obvious areas for voluntary association is in labor—industrial labor in the cities and agricultural labor in the rural areas. The Communists know this lesson and have been busy. They have perceptively applied the Marxist doctrine that the source of revolution was to be found among industrial wage earners to a theory of agrarian revolt. Che Guevara has written:

> In underdeveloped America the countryside must be fundamentally the locale of the armed struggle.

This was also the burden of the Chinese Defense Minister's statement of last fall on the inevitability of conflict between "the cities of the world" in North America and Western Europe and "the rural areas of the world" in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

We began too late in this area, but we do know that in a very literal sense the modernizing of a society begins with the work of the labor force; those who work in the development process will be most attuned to its potential and its failure. Their participation can be enlisted for the national program, or for those who promise a brighter future.

Organization is particularly vital and far more difficult in the rural areas. The organization of agricultural workers to initiate, administer, and support agricultural reform and technological advance is imperative. Per capita agricultural production in most of Latin America has actually decreased in the past decade. Cooperatives and other voluntary associations should be encouraged, not only as desirable vehicles of civic action but as sources of technical education as well.

Rural development requires, as AID Administrator David Bell has said, not just better agricultural techniques, but "improvements in marketing and transportation arrangements, in education and health facilities, in better institutions of local government, and of private cooperation." It requires housing, schools, libraries, hospitals, and savings and credit institutions. The development and channeling of initiative on the part of the rural population is a proper area for U.S. support.

Engaging the American people in foreign aid: In light of the tremendous impetus that has been given to reform by various forms of citizen groups in the United States throughout our history, it is ironic that this should be a missing ingredient in our foreign assistance efforts.

The Watson Committee recently recommended:

> The role of the nongovernment groups—of business enterprises, labor unions, professional societies, and all the rest—must be greatly expanded.

While the committee had words of praise for AID officials, it pointed out:

> Private organizations are generally capable of greater speed, flexibility and incisiveness than Government agencies.

In fact, it continued, without restraints of bureaucracy, "private organization can outperform official agencies."

Not only would a greater involvement of U.S. private groups increase the quality and volume of our foreign aid effort, it would help to create a larger constituency for the foreign aid program here in this country. Decentralization of the aid process would involve sustained enthusiasm from the White House and a constant determination at AID to utilize all the private sources of influence in the task of promoting and sustaining a network of voluntary associations in the developing countries.

If we believe that the development process will depend on the political effectiveness of those it seeks to serve, we must seek to engage the efforts of the people of the United States in its success.

Business: The extraordinary responsibility which American business has demonstrated in its participation in local community affairs has proven to be not only an important key to community improvement but of economic benefit to business. The 3,000 U.S. businesses which maintain facilities abroad have increasingly realized that their practices and policies abroad have a direct impact upon the success of American foreign policy.

Business can build upon this hopeful record of public service by playing a more active role in support of foreign aid. Business has, in three important spheres, an opportunity to become an active participant in development, while at the same time demonstrating to the developing world some of the gains that can result from efficient, economic, responsible private enterprise.

First. U.S. private investment abroad can be increased. It is here that the recommendations of the Watson Committee are particularly important, and I am presently drafting amendments to foreign aid legislation that will reflect those recommendations. The magnitude of the need for additional capital is reflected in the committee's estimate that the gap between the amount of capital available to the developing countries and the amount which they need ranges from $5 to $20 billion annually.

Increased public attention should also be given to the work of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—ADELA—an association of United States and European government and business leaders who are attempting to encourage private foreign investment in Latin America. Just 2 weeks ago, Britain's Foreign Secretary, Michael Stewart, indicated that Britain was considering ways to increase its capital export to Latin America.

Second. U.S. business abroad can launch a program of management and vocational training in the underdeveloped countries, particularly in Latin America. This would have an enormous impact upon the capacity of modernizing societies to develop the skills necessary to accommodate growth. The International Executive Service Corps provides one creative channel for such assistance. There are others, such as greater use of U.S. plants for the conduct of AID sponsored vocational and technical education programs, and support for institutions, such as the School of Administration and Finance in Medellin, Colombia, which will provide an increasing supply of technical and middle-level management. The recent recommendations made to the White House Conference on International Cooperation Year are also worthy of study.

Third. As the Watson Committee recommended, U.S. business can make available to Government foreign aid operations some of its own highly competent personnel on a short-term basis. This would not only be a significant business contribution to the foreign aid effort, but has potential for improving its administration as well. Such an arrangement worked satisfactorily during World War II and has been tried with outstanding results by Gov. James Rhodes of Ohio.

Labor: The American labor movement has no peer as a private institution devoted to participation in private international affairs. Its contribution through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has been substantial. While there have been criticisms that labor's overseas activities have not always been sensitive to internal political situations in the host countries, I think it is clear that the American labor movement has been unique in its willingness to contribute its services and resources in support of the purposes of American foreign aid.

American labor will not always be welcome. Particularly in Latin America, where labor union development has followed the European pattern, there is some feeling that private European efforts are more appropriate.

Perhaps the most productive contribution that American free labor can make is to help instill the sense of national consciousness and national responsibility that has made labor such an effective force in U.S. economic growth. Decentralization of the labor effort may be of value too. Locals might beneficially be allowed more freedom to cooperate in community-to-community and people-to-people projects organized for a variety of local organizations acting together.

Farm groups: The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the National Farmers Union fully recognize that the world's population explosion imposes on American agriculture not just the potential benefit of increased sales, but the responsibility of helping to feed the hungry of the world. It imposes on them also the responsibility to extend the knowledge of agricultural productivity and modernization to the developing countries. It is clear that not even the enormous productivity of American agriculture will be able to feed a world population that is growing at the current rate.

Through private programs, extending the technical knowledge of American agriculture to the rural areas of the southern half of the globe, American farmers can offer not only technical skills, but the means by which agricultural workers and farmowners can become an effective voice in public policy. Groups such as the 4-H Clubs, with their youth and enthusiasm have a vital role to play and should be encouraged.

Educational institutions: American colleges and universities have an outstanding record of support for U.S. foreign aid. Largely on contract to AID or philanthropic foundations, they have undertaken valuable research projects that have served the foreign aid program well. Through exchange programs and the establishment of schools in the developing countries, they have brought skills and knowledge. Two of the most outstanding efforts are the schools for middle-management capabilities operated in Peru and Central America under contract with AID by Stanford University and the Harvard Business School respectively.

Management administration, technical skills and teacher training are all so desperately needed that there is no danger of doing too much. Equally important, however, is expanded teaching of political science. This is a new discipline to many developing countries, but there is growing evidence that the younger generations are eager for the tools of social science to help them shape their future.

American colleges and universities must be encouraged to accept every opportunity for bringing to the developing world a greater knowledge of political science and organization skills. Greater attention should be given to the law schools where the great U.S. tradition of the partnership between law and public policy can serve as a useful example to societies where the study of law is more narrowly conceived.

Private foundations: The contributions of the Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, and other foundations to the development process know no equal. The opportunities for such foundations are immense. They are uniquely equipped to provide the kind of financial and technical assistance needed to expand the teaching of political science and to help reshape university curriculums to reflect modern needs.

The International Development Foundation has served as one kind of model for an experiment in creating independent private foundations. It is worth considering whether initial and supporting capital for such an operation could come directly from AID. Of course, it would have to be made clear that both the foundation's operations were consistent with the U.S. foreign aid program and that its policies and programs were established and implemented privately. National sensitivities in this field in efforts to increase popular participation may be aroused but the ends of development are too important for the means of development to be limited merely by fear of controversy.

Other voluntary associations: There are a number of other groups in the United States that have given form and shape to our own development as a modern society. It is impossible to think of a single segment of American society that does not have its institutional representation. All of these groups, the League of Women Voters, the Knights of Columbus, the American Bar Association, and the National Council of Churches, to name just a few, represent the interests of their members. Independently, these groups are effective; collectively they have undeniable strength in a democracy. They are a creative and vital force that must be engaged in the foreign aid program.

Political parties: The most obvious voluntary public associations in the United States are, of course, the two major political parties. Their potential in support of foreign aid is immeasurable. It is important that whatever they do they try to do collectively.

Merely a greater facilitation of contact between U.S. politicians and their counterparts in the developing countries would be extremely beneficial in building an understanding of the developmental process. But more broad and specific programs could be designed. The short-lived Institute for Political Education established in Costa Rica to teach political skills and public policy knowledge to progressive Latin American political parties may have provided an important clue as to the most valuable contribution which the Republican and Democratic Parties collectively can make.

Proposals in this country have been made for a Latin American Institute for Democratic Development to aid Latin American political parties in the identification and training of new leaders, in education in political science and organization skills. It would be an important and appropriate initiative taken collectively by the two great U.S. political parties to found such an institute, to finance it and to sustain it.

A further important role could be served by both parties at the national and local levels if they would take it upon themselves to encourage other private voluntary associations to participate actively in the foreign aid program. The Republican and Democratic Parties now reach into every community in the United States. They have a responsibility to engage themselves and to seek to engage others in support of development in the developing countries.

A new role for the States: There are now 28 Partners of the Alliance programs which have enlisted American States, or portions of them, in mutual development efforts with nations or regions of Latin America. The purpose of the Partners program is not to build roads and bridges, but to build the confidence of the private sector, in the United States and in Latin America, in the goals and purposes of the Alliance for Progress. My own State of Massachusetts has a Partners program with the Department of Antioquia, Colombia. The goals are modest, but the dividends are great, not only for mutual understanding, but for a new faith in the development process.

This program, in my judgment, has been given too little attention and too little support. Its potential for increasing the foreign aid constituency here in this country and for providing the high impact support perhaps most needed in many parts of Latin America is enormous.

Another example of successful decentralization of responsibility for foreign aid is the Chile-California Program of Technical Cooperation, by which the State of California, under contract with AID, has undertaken to assist the people of Chile in the planning and research of development projects. Since the program was undertaken in the spring of 1964, eight technical assistance project studies calling for a U.S. contribution of $1,367,000, have been negotiated. The projects cover research, in Chile and at California universities, in transportation, agricultural development, education, budgeting, and regional planning.

When I visited Chile last fall, I was impressed by the enthusiasm and support the program was receiving. Historic ties and similar geographic conditions have increased the responsiveness of the Chileans to the California-administered program. Certainly, this pattern can be repeated successfully. One of the reasons for the Partners of the Alliance program between Massachusetts and Antioquia was the similarity of our mutual development patterns. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has the educational facilities, the business community, the labor movement, and the church, professional, youth and political groups to undertake a broad collective effort to participate in the development of Colombia.

The States would not be in competition with AID, but would cooperate fully with AID guidelines and coordination. AID should welcome their initiative and the opportunity to engage the people in a direct and beneficial State-to-State program that can facilitate the participation in development we believe is so necessary to meaningful economic growth.

A clearinghouse for private aid efforts: In 1955 the Technical Assistance Information Clearinghouse, a private center for the collection and dissemination of information on overseas private development programs, was established and supported under contract by the predecessor of AID. The clearinghouse has served as an information center on the programs and operations of U.S. voluntary agencies, missions, and foundations engaged in technical assistance abroad. It maintains comprehensive files on more than 400 organizations and their technical assistance programs, AID contract information, and related material. This information is available to Government and private agencies for their use in planning programs and to individuals and groups seeking channels for using their special skills and resources.

This limited concept of a clearinghouse may have been adequate in 1955. It is inadequate today. And if the private sector of the American economic and political communities is to be engaged in support of development abroad in a more active way, as has been proposed here, the existing clearinghouse will prove to be obviously insufficient. It is necessary to have this information exist within AID itself, for the coordination—as opposed to direction—of the multitude of private aid efforts by a multitude of voluntary associations in the United States will require extraordinary emphasis and attention.

With over 400 agencies in the private aid field already, with over 3,000 private U.S. business concerns operating with facilities abroad, and with an ever-increasing participation of local communities and other voluntary groups, it is essential to establish a clearinghouse and coordinating office that will be able to minimize the duplication of effort and maximize the information available on what efforts are being undertaken and what efforts need assistance. The program to engage the private sector in the development process in the support of foreign aid imposes a new obligation upon AID to provide the administrative framework within which such a vastly expanded program of personnel and communications can be effectively and orderly managed.

Conclusion: We believe that the recommendations we have made here today will contribute to the strength and effectiveness of our efforts to assist the developing countries. Insofar as they reflect a sharp break with the past, we recognize how little we really have learned about the development process. We have learned a good deal about programs and policies that will not work; we have learned a good deal less about those that will.

We really do not know to what extent the experience of U.S. voluntary agencies will be transferable to a situation which differs so sharply from our own. We really do not know just what it is that will give people in the rural backwaters of Latin America, Asia, and Africa a sense of their own political effectiveness.

But we do know that there is a revolution going on. Either we will use our resources in an effort to channel that revolution in a direction that promises freedom, or we will leave it to those for whom freedom has no value.

If we truly believe that the principles of freedom, liberty, equality, and self-government have relevance for all people in the modern world, we must, as a matter of national interest and moral conscience, move in the direction we have proposed today.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives today in a commemorative tribute to Hungarian independence.

The Hungarians fought for their independence against the Hapsburgs in 1848 and, more recently, against the Communists in 1956. Throughout their history, the Hungarian people have exhibited a love of freedom and independence which cannot be quenched though their country be overrun by those who have sought in vain to impose tyrannical regimes upon the land.

Our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman FRANK HORTON, has introduced a resolution to provide for a memorial to be built here in Washington to commemorate the great spirit of the Hungarian people so nobly symbolized by the heroic stand of the freedom fighters only 10 brief years ago.

I support my colleague in his efforts to arrange for a site for this memorial in Washington. This city represents the hope of the world and I can think of no more fitting location for such a statue. The memorial would be erected by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation and maintained by our Department of Interior. It would serve to remind Americans and all who visit here of our unrelenting struggle to secure the blessings of self-determination and freedom for the people of the captive nations.

The Hungarians have been in the forefront in the fight for human liberty. As long as they, and their neighbors behind the Iron Curtain, are kept under Communist domination, we in the free world will remember and pay tribute to their gallant past, when freedom truly was an intrinsic part of each man's life. Such a day, hopefully, will dawn once more for the Hungarians and all those oppressed millions who now rely on us to speak for them in the free forums of the world.

IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965, SPEECHES OF JAMES J. HINES

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include two speeches delivered by James J. Hines, General Counsel of the Visa Office of the Department of State. One of these speeches was given before the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference at New York, N.Y., on December 7, 1965. The other was delivered before the regional conference sponsored by the Michigan Committee on Immigration and the United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit on February 28, 1966. Mr. Hines is a recognized expert in his field and I commend his analysis of, and comments on, the new Immigration Act to all my colleagues:

THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965

(By James J. Hines, General Counsel of the Visa Office)[1]

I am very grateful for the opportunity to be with you this morning and to discuss the role of the Visa Office and the U.S. Consular Service in the implementation of the Immigration Act of October 3, 1965.

Long before the dramatic signing of H.R. 2580 at the Statue of Liberty on that beautiful Sunday afternoon in October,[2] the Visa Office was in constant communication with our 200 immigrant visa issuing posts abroad, keeping them abreast of developments in the Congress. The consuls in the field were well aware of the contents of H.R. 2580 by the time the President affixed his signature on October 3. The duty of the Visa Office to instruct and advise the consular service on the technical aspects of the new law is a continuing process, and it will carry on for many months to come. The Department in my opinion has responded to the challenge of Public Law 89–236 in a very responsible and creditable manner.

One of our major responsibilities under the new law, as in the past, is that of controlling the distribution of quota numbers. The process has not been substantially changed, but the dimensions of the task are more expansive. Any discussion of the quota-control process may seem unduly involved and technical, but I think there is a public interest in the mechanics of quota control. There certainly are some misconceptions about where the quota-control function is centered.

Actually, the determination is made by the quota-control unit in the Visa Office of the Department of State, on the basis of reports received monthly from some 200 visa issuing offices throughout the world. These reports reflect the qualified demand for visas within each of the preference categories as well as within the nonpreference category. It is on the basis of these reports that the requested numbers are allocated, subject of course to the availability of sufficient numbers to meet the demand and subject to the statutory ceilings.

Heretofore, intending immigrants have competed for the limited supply of quota numbers within their respective national quotas. It made no difference to the fourth-preference Greek or Spanish registrants how many fourth-preference Italians were on the waiting list. They were not competitors prior to December 1, but they are today.

The competition for the 55,000 visa numbers constituting the immigration pool for this fiscal year is now worldwide. These numbers will be allotted to qualified preference immigrants, without regard to country of birth, strictly in the order in which the approved petition was filed with the Attorney General and in the order in which the immigrants otherwise qualify for a visa, provided they cannot promptly obtain an immigrant visa under the national quota to which they would normally be chargeable.

In other words, the filing date of the petition is not necessarily controlling. The consul does not request a visa number until the alien has qualified in all respects, and this depends to a large extent on how promptly he assembles the supporting documents and forwards them to the consul.

During the remaining 7 months of this fiscal year, we will have sufficient numbers to meet all qualified demand in the first four preferences, and this being so, priority dates will not be too important. But they will be important so far as concerns fifth preference, where we anticipate a qualified demand in excess of the available numbers. Some adjustments have had to be made in order to make numbers available for the sixth preference (labor in short supply) and the seventh preference (refugees). Otherwise, the first five preferences might preempt all available numbers.

This will not happen after July 1, 1968, when the maximum authorization of 170,000 numbers could as a practical matter be fully utilized. But as for this fiscal year, we are limited by the 55,000 numbers in the pool plus the numbers which will be made available from the national quotas, and the latter allotments have normally not exceeded 100,000 in any one year. It is estimated that we may not exceed 150,000 visa numbers for this year, and yet the preference ceilings are geared to the higher figure of 170,000. This explains why we have had to be realistic and have reserved a portion of the numbers for the sixth and seventh preferences.

So far as concerns the U.S. consul abroad, his duties certainly are not diminished by the passage of Public Law 89–236, although with the repeal of the Asia-Pacific triangle restriction, he is relieved of the task of determining the ancestry of intending immigrants in order to charge them to the proper Asian quota. The consul is assuming new duties in connection with the more restrictive labor safeguard which, with the possible exception of those provisions phasing out the national origins quotas, is the most significant aspect of the new law.

---

[1] Address made before the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference at New York, N.Y., on Dec. 7.

[2] For remarks made by President Johnson on signing the bill, see Bulletin of Oct. 25, 1965, p. 660.

How much additional workload will devolve upon the consul by reason of the published lists of skills and occupations in short supply or oversupply remains to be seen, but it could be very substantial. If the alien's particular skill or occupation appears on the short-supply list as compiled by the Department of Labor, this will constitute the Secretary of Labor's certification and relieve the applicant of the necessity of securing an individual clearance. On the other hand, where Labor's short-supply list does not include the applicant's profession or occupation, or where the applicant does not clearly qualify in any profession or occupation on the short-supply list, the responsibility for further action will revert to the Department of Labor. In the circumstances, the consul will suggest that the applicant seek an individual clearance, or he may request an advisory opinion from the Department of Labor on the question of the alien's qualifications.

The Department of State will, of course, cooperate fully to minimize the number of individual clearances, but the consul's primary responsibility is not changed by the new law, that is, to examine visa applicants in relation to grounds of ineligibility such as crimes involving moral turpitude, moral character, public charge, fraud, draft evasion, and security. Responsibility for the enforcement of the labor safeguard is entrusted solely to the Secretary of Labor.

MEANING OF TERM "LABOR"

In the visa regulations which were published in the Federal Register of November 30, 1965 (22 CFR 42.91(a)(14)), we used the expression "gainful employment" in implementing section 212(a)(14) of the act, whereas the statute refers to "aliens seeking to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor." Obviously, the executive branch cannot expand the meaning of the statutory language. The more general words "gainful employment" merely serve the purpose of indicating a broad interpretation of the term "labor." When we consider that members of the professions, as well as the arts and sciences, are made subject to the Secretary of Labor's certification under section 212(a)(14), it seems quite apparent that the legislative purpose was to give the term "labor" a rather broad meaning.

In an opinion rendered by the Attorney General on September 20, 1963, on the question of whether airplane pilots and flight engineers perform "labor" within the purview of section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, it was observed that not every occupation involves "labor." I quote from that opinion: "No one would suggest that the work of a college professor, concert pianist, doctor, consulting engineer, or corporate officer, for example, could fairly be described as labor." Nonetheless, I think that the labor provisions of Public Law 89–236 override any such limited meaning of the term "labor" as expressed in the 1963 opinion of the Attorney General. Since the third-preference professionals, artists, and scientists are subject to the labor certification, we could hardly contend that the same individuals are not coming here to perform labor when they apply for a visa as a Western Hemisphere special immigrant or as a nonpreference immigrant.

LABOR SAFEGUARD PROVISION

The language of the new immigration law, if read literally, would subject every nonpreference immigrant and every Western Hemisphere special immigrant to the Secretary of Labor's certification regardless of whether he or she would be employed in the United States. We are indebted to Senator [EDWARD] KENNEDY of Massachusetts for what I consider the most helpful legislative history of the entire debate on H.R. 2580. In his opening statement, he explained the new labor safeguard as follows:

"Mr. President, this provision was included in this bill to further protect our labor force during periods of high unemployment. But it was included with the intent that it be meaningful only where it has some meaning. Section 212(a)(14) of the act which is amended here relates only to those aliens who come here for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor. Hence one would not expect a nonpreference housewife to be forced to seek a specific case clearance from the Secretary."

Also the amended section 212(a)(14) expressly subjects third- and sixth-preference immigrants to the Secretary of Labor's certification. I have difficulty understanding why this was necessary.

The fact is that third- and sixth-preference petitions are approved by the Attorney General only after consultation with the Secretary of Labor. What is the purpose of this consultation if it is not to determine possible displacement of American workers and adverse effect on American wages and working conditions? Furthermore, a sixth-preference petition cannot be approved except for labor in short supply, and yet the regulations will require the prospective employer (sixth preference) first to apply for the certification and then, if he obtains it, file a petition with the Immigration Service.

The only purpose thus served by the first step is to determine adverse effect, a fact which could be ascertained in the process of approving the petition. In third-preference cases, I understand that Labor's certification and the approval of the petition will be handled in a single action. In other words, the procedures are more involved for employers who desire to import skilled or unskilled labor in short supply, and, as a consequence, the labor safeguard is rendered even more restrictive by administrative action.

I wish to make an observation as regards present thinking on the matter of prearranged employment in the cases of nonpreference immigrants and Western Hemisphere special immigrants. The newly published regulations clearly imply that a specific offer of employment will be a prerequisite to any certification under section 212(a)(14) with respect to these two classes of immigrants. It may be that the Labor Department officials feel that this is a necessary condition to any favorable certification. I want to make it clear that the Department of State has never imposed any such requirement on immigrants with respect to the public-charge provisions of the law. As a matter of fact, the third-preference professional need no longer have prearranged employment, and this was done for reasons which are explained in the section-by-section analysis which accompanied the administration's bill, S. 500. I quote as follows:

"Under present law, skilled specialists may qualify for preferred status only when a petition requesting their services is filed by a U.S. employer. This requirement unduly restricts our ability to attract those whose services would substantially enhance our economy, cultural interests, and welfare. Many of these people have no way of contacting employers in the United States in order to obtain the required employment. Even if they knew whom to contact, few openings important enough to attract such highly skilled people are offered without personal interviews, and only a few very large enterprises or institutions have representatives abroad with hiring authority. Thus many such skilled specialists cannot obtain the employment presently required for first-preference status."

If the alien of high education, exceptional ability, or specialized experience had difficulty locating an employer, you can imagine how much more difficult it will be for nonpreference immigrants and Western Hemisphere special immigrants.

Another far-reaching change effected by the act of October 3, 1965, is the elimination of the Asia-Pacific triangle. This restrictive provision, designed to limit immigration from Asia, unquestionably created an unwholesome atmosphere in our foreign relations. Although the act retains the national quotas until June 30, 1968, and provides that the annual quota of any quota area shall be the same quota which existed for that area on June 30, 1965, I believe that the abolition of the Asia-Pacific triangle implicitly terminates the Chinese persons quota which the Congress authorized in 1943 for the exclusive use of Chinese immigrants regardless of their country of birth.

The Chinese persons quota is part and parcel of the triangle philosophy, and its retention after December 1, 1965, would stand in contradiction to any assertion that the last vestige of racial discrimination had been stricken from our immigration laws. Fifty percent of this quota was mortgaged to the year 2028, and this represented a total of 2,664 numbers. These mortgaged numbers were canceled with the expiration of the Chinese persons quota on December 1, 1965. The quota of China, first established under the Immigration Act of 1924, will continue in effect until June 30, 1968. Consular officers will henceforth be relieved of the responsibility for determining the ancestry of visa applicants in order to charge them to the proper Asian quota, no simple task at best.

PROBLEM OF THE "MALA FIDE" NONIMMIGRANT

As with all major legislation effecting basic reforms, the Immigration Act of October 3, 1965, presents a challenge to those charged with the responsibility for its administration, but at the same time it poses no insurmountable problems. We anticipate that the new labor restriction will tempt some intending immigrants to misrepresent their skills, or lack of them, in order to bypass the noncertification lists as compiled by the Department of Labor. If this occurs, a serious question of visa eligibility will arise. One of the basic exclusion provisions of existing law bars aliens who willfully seek to procure a visa by fraud or misrepresentation of a material fact.

The criteria for determining materiality are well established, but the unresolved question is whether a misrepresentation made directly to an official of the Department of Labor in attempting to obtain a section 212(a)(14) certification will support an adverse finding under section 212 (a)(19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This question will inevitably arise and will require serious consideration. Also we expect that the more stringent labor safeguard will cause certain intending immigrants to pretend to be temporary visitors and use the nonimmigrant visa as a means of entering the United States.

At a recent visa conference held in London one of the consuls asked me how the Department could successfully pursue a loose nonimmigrant policy and a tight immigrant policy at the same time. He had in mind, of course, our current policy of waiving personal appearance and issuing nonimmigrant visas by mail in about 70 percent of the cases and a policy of strictly enforcing the labor restriction in immigrant cases. We recognize that this will present a real problem.

In the past the mala fide nonimmigrant generally was one who sought to circumvent quota limitations by posing as a temporary visitor or possibly a student. In the future, I suspect, it will be the Secretary of Labor's certification which he will attempt to evade, now that the quota situation has been considerably eased. This will call for greater vigilance on the part of the consular officer, and where he has reason to doubt the good faith of the nonimmigrant applicant, the consul's discretion to waive personal appearance will not be exercised. In any event, the mala fide nonimmigrant will encounter the labor restriction in attempting to regularize his status in the United States, but this may not deter him.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION

As to the future, we look forward to the recommendations of the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration. There are incongruities in the law which deserve attention.

The Western Hemisphere has no preference system; it has no provision for refugees and will have no foreign state limitation if and when the 120,000 ceiling takes effect on July 1, 1968. Moreover, the new labor restriction does not apply equally to the Western and Eastern Hemispheres. For example, brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens who happened to be born in the Eastern Hemisphere are exempt from the restriction, but their counterparts in the Western Hemisphere are subject to it. This is likewise true of the adult sons and daughters (married or unmarried) of U.S. citizens. If born in the Eastern Hemisphere, they do not require a labor certification but do require it if born in the Western Hemisphere. Also, as regards immigration from the Western Hemisphere, no distinction is made in the law between the skilled and the unskilled; between the immigrant of exceptional ability or specialized experience and the immigrant who lacks ability and experience in any field of endeavor.

If family unity and needed skills are important in relation to immigration from the Eastern Hemisphere, surely they are no less important in relation to immigration from the Western Hemisphere. Perhaps the more stringent labor safeguard will compensate in some degree for the lack of preferences in the Western Hemisphere because the immigrant who is educated, skilled, or talented in some particular line of work will have a better chance of getting the labor certification. It is the unskilled worker in the main who will be found among the noncertified.

These are matters which the Commission will doubtless consider in formulating its recommendations. What is emerging, I suspect, is a single immigration system uniformly applied to both hemispheres, a system which places all nations on equal footing, and which distinguishes in the selection of our prospective citizens solely on a basis of individual merit and national interest.

THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965

(Statement of James J. Hines, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, before a regional conference held in Detroit on February 28, 1966, and sponsored by the Michigan Committee on Immigration and the United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit)

I think it is fitting that we meet today in the State of Michigan for a discussion of the Immigration Act of 1965. History will record the names of many distinguished legislators who formed the vanguard of a long and constant struggle to achieve a more equitable immigration law, but no name will deserve more acclaim than that of your able and thoughtful Senator HART. When he addressed the Senate on September 17, 1965, during the debate on H.R. 2580, he was not unmindful of the many friends of the immigrant, outside of Congress, who had successfully welded public opinion in support of immigration reform, particularly the abolition of the national origins quota system which President Kennedy once described as a system without basis in logic or reason. Senator HART said on that occasion:

"The heroes, Mr. President, of this long and historic struggle to achieve the abolition of the national origins system of selectivity, are properly tens of thousands of Americans. They have organized through community, religious, and fraternal groups to achieve the victory now being consummated in the Congress. It is these Americans, who in years past opened their homes, their communities, their businesses to welcome the refugee, the relative, and the homeless of the world. These citizens conducted community conferences and urged their national organizations to press for immigration reform. Today is their victory."

I feel sure that the Michigan Committee on Immigration was uppermost in Senator HART'S thoughts when he spoke these generous words.

During the past 2 weeks I have been thinking seriously about an appropriate subject for discussion at this conference. There are many aspects of the new immigration law which I am sure you would find timely and interesting. However, a recent article published in a national magazine gave me an idea. It conveyed the impression that the administration's immigration bill, S. 500, which the President sent to Congress on January 13, 1965, was rejected by the Congress and that H.R. 2580 as passed by the House of Representatives represented a completely new approach to immigration reform. I would like to take this occasion to examine each bill in a general way, to compare those provisions which were common to both bills and to point out the disparities. The following provisions were contained in the administration's bill, S. 500, and in H.R. 2580 as passed by the House of Representatives:

1. Repeal of the national origins quota system;

2. Elimination of the Asia-Pacific triangle restriction;

3. Nonquota status for Jamaica and Trinidad, thus providing equal treatment for natives of all independent countries in the Western Hemisphere.

4. Nonquota status for the parents of U.S. citizens (S. 500 stipulated no age limit for the citizen relative whereas H.R. 2580 fixed the age limit at 21 years);

5. Elimination of the requirement of prearranged employment for professionals and others of exceptional ability in the arts and sciences, i.e., those aliens who formerly comprised the first-preference class;

6. Preference status for labor in short supply;

7. Discretionary authority granted consular officers to require departure bonds in visitor and student cases;

8. Discretionary authority granted the Attorney General to waive the inadmissibility of certain aliens found excludable on medical grounds (S. 500 was more inclusive in this regard);

9. Discretionary authority granted the Secretary of State to reregister aliens on the waiting lists, and to regulate the time and manner of the payment of visa fees;

10. Elimination of "epilepsy", and substitution of "mental retardation" for "feeblemindedness" as grounds of exclusion;

11. Prohibition on issuance of quota visas to immediate relatives of U.S. citizens.

12. Authority conferred on consular officers to retrieve visa numbers for allocation to other qualified immigrants;

13. Relief for refugees included in the permanent law for the first time although the manner of giving relief to refugees differed considerably in each bill;

14. Absence of any numerical restriction on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. (The 120,000 ceiling was added by the Senate and adopted in conference.)

The two bills were dissimilar in the following major respects:

1. H.R. 2580 did not include the administration's proposal to establish an advisory Immigration Board consisting of Members of Congress and other members appointed by the President.

2. H.R. 2580 rearranged the order of the preference classes giving priority to family unity, added a sixth preference for labor in short supply and a seventh preference for refugees; it also modified the percentage limitations on allocation of visas within each preference class.

3. H.R. 2580 increased but retained a ceiling on immigration from colonial and other dependent areas. (S. 500 would have removed this ceiling over a 5-year period.)

4. H.R. 2580 restricted adjustments of status in the United States by denying the benefits of section 245 to all natives of the Western Hemisphere.

5. H.R. 2580 strengthened the labor safeguard.

I think it is fair to conclude from this comparative review of the major provisions of the two measures that except for two or three proposals which would have attained the same objectives by different means, the similarities outweighed the disparities.

The principal reform contained in the Immigration Act of October 3, 1965, concerned the national origins quota system. It will be phased out over the next 2½ years. In the meantime, the Department will be allocating visa numbers from two sources, namely, the national quotas which continue in effect until June 30, 1968, and the immigration pool which consists of the quota numbers unused during the previous fiscal year. The numbers in the pool for this fiscal year total about 55,000, and they are being made available regardless of the alien's country of birth, for visa issuance, for adjustments of status in the United States, and for the conditional entry of refugees. One of the principal differences between the quota reserve under S. 500, and the immigration pool under H.R. 2580 is that the numbers constituting the pool may be used only for preference immigrants whereas the numbers in the quota reserve would have been available to both preference and nonpreference immigrants. We had estimated that the immigration pool for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, would contain about 62,000 numbers, that is, the total quota numbers remaining unused at the end of this fiscal year.

It now appears that our estimate was too conservative. Nonpreference visa issuance in previous years accounted for 80 percent of all quota immigrant visas issued. This is not likely to be the case in the future. With 4 months of the fiscal year remaining it is safe to assume that all of the 55,000 numbers in the immigration pool will be allocated and used but as concerns the available numbers under the national quotas (158,000 in the aggregate), it is quite apparent that the allocations for this year, inclusive of visa issuances and adjustments in the United States, will be appreciably below last year's total of 102,892. The immigration pool for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, may reach a total of 70,000 numbers, and next year's estimated qualified demand in the preference categories will fall far short of the 70,000 numbers. Consequently, a sizable portion of these numbers in the pool will not be used. This prospect lends some merit to Congressman CONTE'S bill which would give nonpreference immigrants access to the immigration pool, but the unknown factor in any projection of nonpreference qualified demand is the labor certification. It cannot be stated with any certainty that all of the 70,000 numbers would be absorbed if nonpreference applicants are given access to the immigration pool. We recognize that it is too early to assess the real impact of the new labor restriction and that it takes time to set the machinery in motion. However, if the trend of visa issuance as reflected in the statistics covering the first 2 months of operation under the new law continues, a significant change in the character of our immigration is forecast. A few examples will illustrate what the initial impact of the strengthened labor safeguard has been:

Nonquota visa issuances

	December		January	
	1964	1965	1965	1966
Montreal	874	303	906	216
Toronto	875	187	836	120
Quebec	258	85	232	44
Vancouver	329	71	352	60

Quota visa issuances

	December		January	
	1964	1965	1965	1966
London	988	326	963	427
Paris	182	65	170	29
Frankfurt	656	38	675	87
Hamburg	219	5	178	27
Dublin	219	2	306	12
Rotterdam	196	54	162	66
Naples	360	2,446	249	1,767
Palermo	136	564	129	965
Vienna	85	11	77	12
Warsaw	392	976	395	591
Hong Kong	26	328	22	435
Manila	--------	132	1	251
Athens	52	341	48	353

An analysis of these figures shows that at those posts where we had a heavy preference backlog of relatives of U.S. citizens or permanent-resident aliens, such as Naples, Palermo, Lisbon, Hong Kong, Manila, and Athens, visa issuance for the months of December 1965 and January 1966 has shown a substantial increase. These relatives, as you know, are not subject to the labor certification. On the other hand, a substantial decrease in visa issuance has occurred at posts such as London, Paris, Vienna, Dublin, Frankfurt, Hamburg, and Rotterdam, where traditionally we have had no preference backlogs in the relative categories, and where visa issuance in the past has been heavily nonpreference. It is too early, in my opinion, to measure the full import of the above figures which cover the first 2 months of operation under the new law.

With the exception of those provisions of Public Law 89-236 which will ultimately abolish the national origins quota system, it is generally agreed that the labor provision is the most significant aspect of the new law. We had no indication in the Department of State of any dissatisfaction with the labor safeguard which the committee reports accompanying the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 described as "adequate." The labor certifications under section 212(a)(14) had steadily increased in recent years. During the period from June 3, 1957, when the first certification issued, to May 22, 1964, the Secretary of Labor issued 60 nonagricultural certifications against specifically named employers and eight area certifications. Twenty-four of both types were issued during the first 5 months of 1964. Some of these certifications resulted from an administrative arrangement between the Department of State and the Department of Labor whereby visa cases involving 25 or more workers destined to the same employer in this country were reported to the Department of Labor for investigation. Effective July 1, 1963, we instituted a special procedure with respect to immigration from Mexico because of a widespread practice of falsifying job offers. This procedure required prospective employers of Mexican workers to submit their job offers to the U.S. Employment Service for approval prior to the issuance of a visa. Under this program 6,740 certifications barring the entry of the immigrant were issued by the Secretary of Labor during the period from July 1, 1963, to August 1, 1964. They accounted in large measure for a 41-percent decline in immigration from Mexico during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963. It was for these reasons that we assumed the labor safeguard contained in the 1952 act was fulfilling its intended purpose.

What is the essential difference between the labor provision enacted in 1952 and the more restrictive provision contained in Public Law 89-236? Prior to December 1, 1965, the responsibility for taking the initiative to establish displacement of American workers or adverse effect on wages and working conditions devolved upon the Secretary of Labor. The labor restriction had no force in the absence of a certification and, as a matter of fact, the provisions of section 212(a)(14) were completely dormant for 4½ years after the McCarran-Walter Act came into force. The preamendment certifications of the Secretary of Labor had the effect of excluding any intending immigrant whom the consular officer found to be within the scope of the certification. Now under the amended provisions of section 212(a)(14) a labor certification has the effect of admitting the particular immigrant or immigrants for whom it is granted, and the burden of proving nondisplacement of American workers and no adverse effect has been transferred to the American employer. There are other important differences. The labor certifications under the former law were directed against specific employers in this country or against designated geographical areas and were issued on a selective basis. They were, in other words, limited in scope as contrasted with the recently published schedule B (occupations in oversupply) which has a nationwide application. We appreciate the problem inherent in any listing of the schedule B occupations on an area-by-area basis, since this tends to invite evasion, but the language of section 212(a)(14) clearly contemplates a determination (shortage of able, willing and qualified workers) with respect to "the place to which the alien is destined." Congressman FEIGHAN emphasized this point during the debate on H.R. 2580 when he said the following: "New labor controls are established to govern the admission of all immigrant worker classes. These new controls require the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding on an individual case basis that, with respect to the job the immigrant worker is to fill in the locality to which he is destined, there is no able, willing, qualified and available American worker to fill that job."

In conclusion, I can assure you that the administrative officials who share responsibility for enforcement of the immigration law have been remarkably flexible in their construction and application of the new labor safeguard. Particularly commendable was action of the Secretary of Labor in giving a blanket certification for some 150 Polish immigrants who, short of possessing passports, had qualified for visas in all respects when the new law came into force. Equally commendable was his ruling that Cuban parolees in the United States are not subject to the labor certification when they apply for immigrant visas abroad. A blanket certification has been granted for persons in the service of religious denominations. There is general agreement that the labor provision applies only to the head of the family and not to his spouse and children; also, that it does not apply to the self-employed, or to those who will not be gainfully employed in this country. Doubtless there will be other rulings of a like nature. I think they reflect a disposition on the part of government to be fair and reasonable as we strive to carry out the will of Congress. The Secretary of State in the last 2 years made four appearances before the congressional committees in support of immigration reform. Each time he accented three features of the former law which were adversely affecting our foreign relations; namely, the national origins quota system, the Asia-Pacific triangle restriction, and the denial of equal status to immigrants born in two of our American Republics. These irritants were removed by the act of October 3, 1965, and this is one reason by, when we appraise that act in terms of all its provisions, the conclusion is inescapable that the immigration law today is infinitely more equitable than at any time in our history.

FEDERAL IMPACT FUNDS SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1950, after its Education and Labor Committees held hearings throughout the Nation, the Congress recognized its responsibility to communities where its activities imposed special burdens and enacted Public Laws 874 and 815. These now famous laws provide financial assistance for maintenance and operation and assistance to construct facilities needed because of Federal impact.

The rationale of this legislation is that while the Federal activities create additional school enrollments, Federal properties do not contribute property tax revenues. Thus, Public Laws 874 and 815 were designed for the Federal Government to accept the responsibility of the normal citizen in a community.

Since the passage of this legislation 16 years ago, the burden has increased as the cost of education and the number of boys and girls has increased. Though the legislation was designed to be of a temporary nature, the burden imposed on local communities has proved to be permanent; thus, currently requiring legislation designed to adequately compensate for the progressive and lasting nature of this burden.

Throughout its history, there has been and shall continue to be a progressive need for greater funds under this legislation. Since 1952, the second year of its operation, entitlements under Public Law 874 have increased from $45 million to $283 million in 1964, an annual increase of 16½ percent. Yet, each year we are confronted with proposals to reduce the amount of funds and are faced with the same problem: an inadequate law to take care of a highly significant and progressively greater problem.

To recapitulate, we, the Federal Government, after acknowledging the existence of the problem, enacted legislation to meet the immediate problem without realizing its continuing and progressive nature and, consequently, we faced the problem each year without taking steps to alleviate in any way the problems of the future.

In November of 1964 the Stanford Research Institute conducted a thorough study of the Federal assistance program to federally impacted areas in accordance with the President's request. I would like at this time to highlight the findings revealed in its report to the Commissioner of Education in June of 1965.

The study revealed that:

> (a) the financial burdens created by the establishment of a Federal project are not restricted to the project's initial impact, but are continuing burdens; and (b) that financial burdens created by Federal activities vary from district to district.

It further noted in Public Law 874 that school districts that just meet the 3-percent requirement—that is, 3 percent of the school enrollment consists of children whose parents work and/or live at Federal installations—get paid for all the federally connected children in their districts while those who just fail to meet the requirements get no Federal payments.

With the aforementioned in mind, I propose that this House take into consideration the importance as well as the need for refining the present legislation.

I advocate at this time, even as vociferous voices have been raised to reduce payments, that we express our opposition to such reductions and consider the following revisions: First, that the requirement of 3 percent of the entire enrollment consist of children whose parents live and/or work at Federal installations be lowered to 1 percent so as to meet the burden by those communities that are presently not able to receive compensation for the burden thrust upon them by Federal activities, and, second, that the criteria for payments be based on the per student cost of education in that particular district, thus allowing for the disparity between districts and meeting the burden imposed on that particular district. Also on this basis the districts that spend more per student—and it is interesting to note that the study by the late Dr. Paul Mort of Columbia University which served as a basis for the present Rhode Island State aid structure revealed a strong correlation between moneys spent and quality of education—will receive more, thus encouraging greater local spending and the fostering of quality education.

By making payments in this manner, the Federal Government is paying for the education received by the children of its employees and it will free State funds for education to be used where most needed. This also will remove payment inequities to local districts because of various plans of State aid to education, always inherent in past payments where State aid affected the expenditure listed as "local contribution rates."

Gentlemen, I am frankly disturbed to see so much money expended by this Government to help other nations and to provide a diversity and multitude of nice programs for our own folks and yet, in a matter as crucial as education and one in which a heavy burden is placed upon local school districts by the impact of Federal activities, we speak of a reduction of funds and fail to provide adequate legislation to meet the demands made upon local school districts because of the lasting impact of Federal activities.

In my own State of Rhode Island the proposed reductions would amount to a 50-percent cut from $3,051,729 to $1,546,501. If approved, the proposed changes would eliminate all payments to nine Rhode Island communities; communities that have been burdened, and will continue to be burdened by the impact of Federal activities—an impact, gentlemen, that studies have revealed to be of a lasting and not temporary nature.

Therefore, a reduction of funds to meet this burden simply is not justified. If anything, the funds should be progressively increased as they have in the past to meet the rising cost of education and the expansion of our school population.

PERMANENT MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will provide for the establishment of a permanent milk program for all children in our primary and secondary schools as part of the school lunch program.

This year, quite unexpectedly and almost unbelievably, the administration has recommended that the special milk program begun in 1954 be phased out and that milk only be provided for those who will be tagged as needy.

While it is true that this program got its beginning to help promote the consumption of our surplus milk, once it became part of the school program throughout the Nation, it was quickly recognized as a great step in the overall improvement of the health of our children.

I believe that our administration is wrong in asking that this program be cut back to needy children only, for now not only the unfortunate poor benefit from the consumption of milk, but all children enjoy the same relative benefit.

I am also so convinced of the great value of this program as a health measure that I do not believe it ought to be tied to the presence or absence of dairy surpluses, but ought to stand on its own as a program which deserves our support. We have seen it grow in importance, in acceptance, and in the consumption of increasing amounts of milk, since its inception in 1954. It is a tested and proven program, and ought not be sacrificed for any reason.

This $103 million program was curtailed this current year to $100 million administratively. In next year's budget proposal, it is reduced to the paltry sum of $21 million for the entire country as a program only for the needy children.

Mr. Speaker, this program has been so successful that in fiscal 1965 between 24 and 26 million students participated in approximately 93,000 schools across the country. The consumption of half pints of milk is recorded as over 3 billion. And the cost to the Federal Government was only a little over $100 million. I believe it is false economy to remove this Federal support and jeopardize the continuation of this worthwhile program by letting the child decide whether he personally wants to drink milk at 8 cents cost to him, or pocket the money for an after school bottle of carbonated water. It must be apparent to all who have had children what the choice will likely be. It is obviously not a case of affluence dictating wisdom in the child.

I am in total agreement that the program ought to pay greater attention to the needy children, and that the support ought to be increased to make possible special programs for these unfortunate youngsters, such as the serving of hot milk for breakfast, or milk with cereal, and the like. But because this special program is gaining emphasis, it ought not to justify the discontinuance of the program to all children. I plead that this Nation is mighty enough to do both.

Hawaii's schoolchildren have utilized this special milk program in fiscal 1965 by consuming 5,310,000 half pints of milk.

I urge my colleagues to help save this program by enacting it as a permanent part of our regular school lunch program.

The bill that I have placed before the House today will provide for an expanded program to cover the special needs of the poor children in addition to the benefits to all our youngsters, and will extend coverage to American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the trust territories, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, I include the bill in its entirety at this point in the RECORD for the reference of the Members of this House:

H.R. 13630

A bill to provide a permanent milk program for children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Children's Milk Act of 1966".

LEGISLATIVE FINDING

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the increased consumption of fluid milk by a maximum number of American children is in the public interest in order to promote public health and nutrition.

SEC. 3. The Act of July 1, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 276, 74 Stat. 84, 75 Stat. 147, 75 Stat. 319), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture shall, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, encourage the consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children, and (3) in programs for children or youths conducted, under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, by nonprofit associations or institutions. For the purposes of this Act "United States" means the fifty States and the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

SEC. 5. All sums appropriated under this Act, less such amounts as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and necessary for his administrative costs and reserves and less $21,000,000 in each fiscal year for allocation under the next sentence, shall be allocated at the earliest possible date for the use of nonprofit schools, other nonprofit institutions, and nonprofit associations desiring to participate in the program and shall be used to reimburse such nonprofit schools, other nonprofit institutions, and nonprofit associations for fluid milk served to children. The sums reserved under the preceding sentence for allotment hereunder shall be allotted by the Secretary to nonprofit schools, other nonprofit institutions, and other nonprofit associations, on such basis as he deems most equitable, to be used to make reimbursement for milk served to needy children. Any such allocation, or portion thereof, which the Secretary shall determine will not be fully utilized by any such nonprofit school, other nonprofit institution, or nonprofit association as then allocated, shall be reallocated by the Secretary so as to accomplish maximum use of such funds.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $176,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $181,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed $186,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each succeeding fiscal year thereafter, not to exceed $191,000,000.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on March 10 the bill proposed by the President in his state of the Union message calling for broad reforms in jury selection and in the overall administration of justice. In his message, President Johnson urged Congress to "establish unavoidable requirements for nondiscriminatory jury selection in Federal and State courts, and to give the Attorney General the power necessary to enforce those requirements."

I am in total agreement with this recommendation and with the bill, S. 2923, The Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966, submitted in the Senate on February 10, 1966. However, since the Senate bill failed to recognize that there are still States in this country which bar women from jury duty and States which exempt women from such duty merely because they are women, I have submitted this bill with amendments to assure the women of this Nation equal responsibility in the execution and administration of justice through the jury system.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, is submitted in the hope that it will lead to uniformity throughout America of the procedures to be followed in the selection of juries. Trial by jury is basic to the American way of life, and I believe that we seriously undermine our principle when we continue to allow individual States the right to exclude women from jury duty. It is shocking to reflect that women have been eligible to serve on all Federal juries only since 1957, and my bill is designed to extend the privilege and responsibility of such service to women in all of the States.

I urge my colleagues to demonstrate their support of total nondiscriminatory selection of juries by supporting this legislation.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, since World War II, the Vice Presidents of the United States have been called upon more and more to perform duties of the highest importance. The duties and responsibilities of our present Vice President, for example, provide excellent proof of the expanded role of the office of the Vice President.

No longer does the Vice President merely preside over Senate debates. He now chairs the National Aeronautics and Space Council, the Peace Corps Advisory Council, the Special Cabinet Task Force Travel U.S.A., and the Cabinet Task Force on Youth Opportunity.

The Vice President is also honorary Chairman of the National Advisory Council to the Office of Economic Opportunity; he is a member of the National Security Council and the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and at the request of the President he helps coordinate and implement the Federal Government's responsibility in the areas of civil rights and property.

In addition, the Vice President is often given highly important diplomatic assignments as was the case of President Johnson when he was Vice President, and as exemplified by recent assignments of Mr. HUMPHREY.

His increased stature presents new problems. Personal security, for example, becomes a greater necessity. The lack of an official residence designed for the office places the Vice President in the awkward position of selecting his own home on factors such as his income rather than what is in the best interest of the office and the country.

It is my strong feeling, therefore, that legislation to provide an official residence for the Vice President is long overdue. As our society becomes more complex and as our domestic and international problems multiply, the responsibilities of this office will in all probability increase rather than decrease. As a matter of fact, the Vice President now performs so many official functions that reduce the President's burdens that it is unfair to expect the Vice President to defray the costs of these additional functions.

It is, therefore, my very strong hope that the House will vote overwhelmingly in favor of this measure to provide an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

H.R. 13480, AMENDING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT TO INCLUDE HEALTH INSTRUCTION AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Americans today are living in an age of paradox: The paradox of advancing to land a man on the moon and yet being stymied by the sudden New York blackout. The paradox of being a nation on wheels and yet being short-changed of parking places. And the paradox of creating new technology and now being physically destroyed by it. For the technology which originally grew out of our energy and skill now deprives us of the activity necessary for healthy physical development.

We have become inert with our modern conveniences and have grown stale with our abundance of leisure time. Consequently, we have more time for walking and keeping in good physical condition, but all too often use the time for sitting and performing only as a spectator. This led President Kennedy to refer to us as "soft Americans."

This is why I proposed on March 10, H.R. 13480, to eradicate this reference by amending titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act to include health instruction and physical education. It is unpleasantly familiar, yet necessary, to reiterate the findings we have heard before. Americans are not as physically fit as they were a generation ago, or as fit as the people of other lands today. One-third of all American young men are judged to be unfit for military services for health reasons. The life expectancy of the American male has not increased significantly in the last decade. Men of at least 26 nations can look forward to longer life expectancy at age 45 than can American males. And in at least 11 countries, the women age 45 have more remaining years than American women.

The statistics prove similar in regard to American youth. As recently as last year, tests were given to measure physical fitness of pupils in one-half of the Nation's schools. Of those tested, about one-third failed to achieve the desired level of performance. It is shocking also to learn that one-third to one-half of American children are overweight. Since the bad habits connected with obesity begin early in life, it is imperative to start health instruction and physical education at a young age.

This can be best accomplished by amending title III of the National Defense Education Act to include health instruction and physical education in the list of critical subjects to be taught in our Nation's schools. However, I feel that we must be explicit in assigning the area of athletic equipment to be purchased with Federal funds in order to avoid extraneous supplies or uniforms, and so forth.

Legislation has been justly enacted to encourage the excellence of academic and vocational eduaction in America's schools. The President's Council on Physical Fitness has attempted to supply the gap made in the realm of physical education, but this is an area which requires congressional support so that it may reach out to every American school system.

According to "A Report to the President" on 4 years of fitness from 1961 to 1965, 14 States did not even have a full-time person in their State education agency to provide leadership in health and physical education. Also, a shortage of health and physical education specialists was particularly noted in the elementary schools, and many of the physical education teachers were inadequately trained. I believe that many of these weaknesses could be eliminated by amending title XI of the National Defense Education Act to provide regular sessions or short-term instruction for those now teaching or planning to teach school health and physical education.

President Johnson has so aptly said:

> The fitness of our Nation for the tasks of our time can never be greater than the general fitness of our citizens. A people proud of their collective heritage will take pride in their individual health.

I join with President Johnson in his observations and state that we can only endure the tasks of our time if we improve health instruction and physical education. We will progress little if we make a visit to another planet before solving our earthly problem of why 1½ million Americans miss work on an average day because of illness.

THE FLOWERING OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY—GREEK BRANCHES AND JEWISH ROOTS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, at the midwinter convocation at the Temple Emanu-El in Miami Beach, I had the honor to hear an outstanding address by Prof. Bernard Mandelbaum.

Dr. Mandelbaum is the provost at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, in New York City. Dr. Mandelbaum's address was entitled "The Flowering of American Democracy—Greek Branches and Jewish Roots."

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I place this wonderful lecture at this point in the Congressional Record:

The Flowering of American Democracy—Greek Branches and Jewish Roots

(By Dr. Bernard Mandelbaum)

Mrs. Kennedy, Chancellor Finkelstein, Vice Chancellor Arzt, Dr. Lehrman, Mr. Samuel Friedland, Mrs. Friedland, colleagues, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, the simplest of everyday experiences convey the profoundest of insights. For example, the framework of this lecture is illustrated by a young boy who came into a store, and hurried to the phone booth. In his haste he left the door open and the store owner overheard the following: "Is that job you advertised a week ago still open? Oh, it is filled. Well, are you satisfied with the boy's work? Oh, you are. Well, thank you." When he exited from the booth, the owner said, "I could not help overhear your conversation, and young man, with your determination, you don't have to worry; you will get a job." The boy answered, "Oh, I have sir; as a matter fact I have that job." Then "Why did you call?" "Well," said the lad, "I was just checking up on myself."

In the same way, my remarks this afternoon seek to check on ourselves, as Americans, as free men, seeking a world of peace and plenty, for all mankind.

We turn the pages of history to find some guidance and strength. There is a fundamental issue that underlies todays tensions between nations and the problems within our own American borders: What hope is there that freedom—the way of life identified with America and the West—will win the hearts and minds of men?

The record of history is not always encouraging. Consider the time and place described in the following:

"Our Constitution favors the many instead of the few; this is why it is called a democracy. If we look to the laws, they afford equal justice to all in their private differences; if to social standing, advancement in public life falls to reputation for capacity. If we turn to our military policy, there also we differ from our antagonists * * * never to exclude foreigners from any opportunity, although the eyes of an enemy may occasionally profit by our liberality. Instead of looking on discussion as a stumbling block in the way of action, we think it an indispensable preliminary to wise action."[1]

Is this the United States of America—in our time—at any time? The words are those of the Athenian statesman, Pericles, who lived 2,300 years ago. It is his description of the glory that was Athenian Greece. The briefest reflection on the tyranny and turmoil, the inhumanity and strife, that fill the pages of world history since that time must give us great pause. If there was such a vision—if not the reality—of man and society so long ago, why has there been no greater progress toward its fulfillment? If Greek thought and life, the powerful world influence in its time, could not advance the democratic society, why assume that we, in our time, will do any better for ourselves and for generations to come? Is there any difference between the state described by Pericles and the American ideal that can give us reason to hope that what the free society seeks for itself today has some promise of realization?

Thucydides' history of Greece, and Greek philosophy generally, reveal the powerful currents of thought that shaped ancient Athens. In Pericles' day there was a cold war between the sea power, Athens, and the land power, Sparta. Between these competing empires was the little island of Melos, which wished to preserve its neutrality in the struggle. The democratic progressive Athens answered the appeals of Melos in these words:

"Right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must."[2]

Athens attacked Melos. The description of what Athens did to Melos may have shocked past generations. However, we in our time have but to recall the Nazi fiends' massacre of men, women, and children in the little city of Lidice, and we have ancient Melos before our eyes.

This brutality of the Athenians was possible because of seeds of thought deeply imbedded in Greek soil. The noble sentiments of a Pericles could not raise the behavior of the Athenian state above a morality that was nourished by a concept of man and society that had the seeds of its own destruction.

Indeed the facade of democratic political structures as described by Pericles could not be improved upon. Democratic institutions adorned Athenian society. However, just as a building's strength, security, and longevity depend upon its unseen foundations rather than its visible superstructure, so the permanence and influence of the structure of a society ultimately depends upon its deep-rooted commitments. The ideas and principles on which it is founded—rather than its external forms.

Greek life, at its best, was elevated by the philosophy of a Plato and an Aristotle. Their use of reason to probe the meaning of truth, justice, the good society, yielded a literature and a method of inquiry that helped shape the Western World. However, they built their structures on foundations of sand. For at the base of what they taught was a view of man and God and freedom that doomed all that rose above it.

Consider this view of man. According to Plato: "Some are by nature free and others slaves," "man is a troublesome animal * * * a troublesome piece of goods." According to Aristotle: "Man is by nature, and in all ways superior to woman." (I just saw half the audience jump.)

Consider this view of God (for the Greeks, the power in the world greater than man), according to Solon, "The power above is full of jealously and fond of troubling our lot."

Consider this view of justice, as reported by Thucydides and Thrasymachus: "It is nothing else than the interest of the stronger."

I submit then that the cause of the failure of the Periclean ideal of Greek democracy to forge a permanent, new pattern in society may be discovered in a maxim of the rabbis in the "Ethics of the Fathers."[3] Greek democracy was like a "tree whose branches are many, but whose roots are new; the wind comes and plucks it up and overturns it upon its face." The winds of temptation—empire building, accumulating power, self-seeking—are strong in human history. To resist them a nation requires more than the branches, the exterior of democratic forms; to resist them a nation must be deeply rooted in a belief in man, in God, and in the promise of society.

The contention of this analysis is that American democracy is unique in human history. It is like a tree whose branches—whose external image—are not always the best or the most numerous, but whose roots are many and deep.

For basic to the ideology of this New World democracy is an Old World view of man and his universe that has biblical roots and that is planted in the rich soil of faith in God and hope for man. "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal."

---

[1] "The History of the Peloponnesian War," Thucydides.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ch. 3: 22.

One hundred and eighty-nine years, since 1776, is a brief paragraph in the 5,000 years of recorded history, yet the history of America, with all its difficulties, frustrations, and disappointments, is unique in its achievement, and even more in its promise. The democratic purpose of this country is an imaginative, external structure with a solid foundation, a vision for the future derived from the wisdom of an ancient Hebraic heritage, a program for mankind as whole with a profound respect and endless concern for each man, woman, and child. The American ideal that can endure and serve as a basis for the good society, is not articulated necessarily in the details of our particular form of government but in the ideas and beliefs on which this country is founded.[4]

Foundations, too, are made up of several levels, from that which is hidden underground to the part just visible above the surface. On the surface of the American foundation is a concept of human society involving two seemingly paradoxical elements—diversity and unity. Maturing beyond the late 19th and early 20th century ideal of this land as a melting pot that dissolves differences of culture and background, we now view the pluralism of our society as one of its most remarkable characteristics. Actually, it is a wholesome acceptance of a feature of America from colonial times, of Quakers, Anglicans, Puritans, Jews, Negro, and white. Samuel Eliot Morison records:

"There were already enough Irish in New York in 1764 to celebrate St. Patrick's Day, enough Jews to maintain a synagogue, enough Scots to support a Presbyterian church, enough Germans to maintain four services in their language."[5]

In 1840, Alexis de Tocqueville, a student of American democracy observed:

"The sects that exist in the United States are innumerable. They all differ in respect to worship which is due to the Creator; but all agree in respect to the duties which are due from man to man."[6]

The subsequent history of immigration to these shores enriched the diversity of population. As Louis Adamic reported in 1938:

"Within its population of slightly less than 130 million, the United States has today over 30 million citizens—the overwhelming majority of them young citizens—who are the American-born children of immigrant parents of various nationalities: German, Italian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Servian, Croatian, Slovenian, Bulgarian, Jewish Russian, Carpatho-Russian, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Finnish, Hungarian, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Dutch, French, Flemish, Spanish, Portuguese, Rumanian, Armenian, Syrian, Lett, Albanian, Greek, Turkish, and of course, English, Scotch, and Irish."[7]

Morison again points to the amazing paradox, and most promising feature of American history: that this diversity was paralleled by a growing unity. Colonial America of 1763 consisted of 13 separate British colonies, with tensions between Delaware and Maryland, Georgia and South Carolina, with immigration from New England and the middle colonies to the southern colonies. The Declaration of Independence of these colonies in 1776 was the first major step, but only the first, in the uniting of States. The expanding frontier reached out, uniting a nation beyond the Missouri River and finally beyond the Rocky Mountain, to the west coast.[8] Economically and politically there was a hard fought but steady forging of the United States of America—one land, one nation, but with a many faceted, multicolored diversity.

In fact, then, the history of this country is a microcosm of human society; one world, with diverse nationalities, cultures and religions. This view of the diversity within the unity of society traces back to a concept of creation. The rabbis teach in the tractate of Sanhedrin:

"For this reason was man created alone * * * to proclaim the greatness of the Holy One, blessed be He. For if a man strikes many coins from one mould, they all resemble one another, but the supreme King of Kings, the Holy One, blessed be He, fashioned every man in the stamp of the first man, and yet not one of them resembles his fellowman."[9]

Men have a common dignity; they are fashioned in the same mould. Yet each man has his precious individuality. Such unity and diversity is true of everything from blades of grass to the nations of the world. Diversity, a basic feature of the world, expresses itself in the pluralism of American life. Living with it, appreciating it, building with it is not only the unique strength of this land, but also the source of its ultimate influence on world civilization.

Diversity within unity, or pluralism, is the visible part of the foundation of American society and derives strength from its roots in a concept of creation. It is supported by a deeper layer of truth—a concept of man and his possibilities. What is commonly labeled as "American optimism," and sometimes caricatured as the "get-up-and-go" mentality, has its source in a profounder reality of the American mind. The earliest 17th century Pilgrims, the 18th century pioneers of the West, the most recent immigrants to these shores, have all been motivated by the conviction of the biblical view of man and life: "I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse: therefore choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed."[10]

The United States of America have been synonymous with "choose life," new life, a new beginning—materially, intellectually, spiritually. The biblical view of man that is spelled out by the rabbis in classical Judaism in the details of life and law also permeates the American ethos. In an unpublished manuscript of a revised study of the Pharisees by Dr. Finkelstein, the following summary of rabbinic thought expresses the nature of man as viewed in this land:

"The purposes of creation is the emergence of man as creator. It stresses man's initiative, rather than his obedience. Unlike the physical universe, the moral one is subject not only to discovery but also to creation. Judgment and discrimination, vital to effective and creative decisionmaking, are available in large measure to all."[11]

"Judgment and discrimination, vital to effective and creative decisionmaking, are available in large measure to all * * *" this has been the underlying faith in our commitment to the power of man to grow and improve his own values and behavior, to every man's role in shaping the destiny of our Nation.

In life, significant change is never quick or easy. Thus it was that only 89 years after the founding of this Nation did equal rights become the law of the land, and it took a Civil War to do it. It is taking a hundred years and more to make the law into a reality of life. However, there is movement forward because the underlying faith in equal rights of all men—regardless of creed or color—is at the very foundation of the structure of American democracy. In Biblical and Rabbinic Judaism there was continuous development of laws to weaken and ultimately eliminate the practices of slavery which were common at that time. Yet in the 700 years of ancient Greek hegemony (from the fifth century B.C.E. to the fourth century C.E.; including the Roman culture, which was basically Hellenistic) there was no elimination of slavery because Greek thought accepted it as a fact of nature; the rights of women were seriously limited because women were viewed as basically inferior; exploitation of people in another part of the world or in one's own society was possible because there was no reverence for the sanctity of life.

Another attempt at a brief summation of systems of thought, patterns of culture, and trends in history suffers from oversimplification. Many of the finest aspects of American culture—art, letters, science—derive directly from Greek influence on the Western mind. American thought and life, with their biblical roots have been darkened at times by provincialism and superstition. However, in terms of underlying commitments and what a contemporary rabbinic scholar, Prof. Max Kadushin, calls emphatic trends, the principal roots of American society are nourished by ideas that account for the uniqueness of American history and give promise of its moral influence in the future.

In summary, therefore, the growth and development of the United States, the rise and fall of Greek society, and history generally, instructs us in a fundamental truth. The posture and purpose of a nation are determined by the power of ideas that are continually active; in the words of Emerson, "even when men are sleeping." When slavery, the rule of force, or materialism are the foundation of a society its destiny is ultimate collapse. When the rights of all men, justice and the sanctity of life are the foundation of a society its destiny is as permanent as the world created by God.

There is a delightful story in Jewish folklore which illustrates this hidden power of an idea and shapes the world. The rabbis tell us that the righteous will be rewarded in the world to come with the opportunity to study continuously with the Almighty. (Indeed, it may explain why some people aren't working too hard to get there.)

In this world, too, then, the study of God's word, the Torah, is a primary value. All of Jewish religious life, the legend tells us, is dependent on the example of a famous "masmich" in Poland, a saint, who studies continuously 20 and 22 hours a day. How so? Well, the "masmich" studies 22 hours a day. The rabbi sees the "masmich" studying 22 hours and says to himself: "Well, if he studies 22 hours daily, then I must study at least 11 hours a day." The cantor sees this and says, "Well, the rabbi studies 11 hours a day, then I must study at least 5 hours." The principal of the school sees this and he says: "Then I must study 2 hours a day." The president of the synagogue in Poland, sees this and he says: "I must study at least 1 hour a day * * *" and the legend concludes, "you know the Jews in Paris who attend the synagogue only three times a year—it is only because of the influence of the 'masmich' in Poland."

---

[4] "In Democracy in America," Alexis de Tocqueville writes: "I am very far from thinking that we ought to follow the example of the American democracy and copy the means that it has employed to attain this end. But I am of the opinion that if we do not succeed in gradually introducing democratic institutions into France, if we despair of imparting to all the citizens those ideas and sentiments which first prepare them for freedom and afterwards allow them to enjoy it, there will be no independence at all, either for the middle classes or for the nobility, for the poor or for the rich, but an equal tyranny over all."

[5] The Oxford History of the American People," Samuel Eliot Morison.

[6] For source, see note 4 above.

[7] "My America," Louis Adamic.

[8] See note 5.

[9] Mishnah Sanhedrin, ch. IV.

[10] Deuteronomy 30: 19.

[11] Unpublished paper on the Pharisees, Louis Finkelstein.

The power of ideas permeate the world almost as if they flow in the hidden recesses of the earth and the unseen currents of the atmosphere.

Indeed the hope that all men—the world over—can enjoy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is strengthened by the ideas, the spiritual roots of American civilization which give it nourishment. America has the resources to sustain itself, to survive the winds of adversity, and to lead. It must be a leadership of example, understanding, and compassion. This kind of leadership is itself one of the outgrowths of the ideas which have shaped America. The importance of this leadership for the future of man was anticipated with rare prescience by Alexis de Tocqueville in 1840 when he wrote:

"The question here discussed is interesting not only to the United States, but to the whole world; it concerns, not a nation only, but all mankind. I am aware that there are many worthy persons at the present time who are so tired of liberty as to be glad to repose far from its storms. They judge of absolute power of the despotism of one man by what it has been and not by what it might become in our time." [12]

This warning of the dangers of despotism was written in the 1840's, before the world knew of a Hitler, a Stalin, a Mao, and their modern societies built on those ideas of ancient Greece which were primitive—slavery, the rule of force and materialism.

The alternative—the hope of mankind—is the dream of America which is built on the Biblical and Rabbinic ideas of human equality, justice, and peace. In our day, this dream of America was projected as a goal of the 1960's. But in mysterious ways known only to God, the words with which I conclude have become a classic expression of the dream of all mankind.

"The same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the beliefs that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God.

"We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home, and around the world.

"Whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own." [13]

MEDICAL CARE FOR RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which I hope will solve the problem of insufficient medical care for retired military personnel and their dependents.

Beginning in 1960, large numbers of military personnel who began their military careers prior to, and during World War II became eligible for retirement by virtue of completing 20 years or more of active military service. The impact of these large-scale military requirements is, I am sure, of great concern in many areas. The need for a long-range solution became more urgent when in September 1962 the Department of Defense announced that pending the development of an overall solution to the retired problem, no beds or other inpatient facilities for retired members or their dependents would be programed in new military construction.

The enactment of the Dependents' Medical Care Act in 1956 gave specific statutory basis for the "space available" medical care which the military services had been providing as a matter of policy and moral obligation to servicemen who had been advised that this was one of the fringe benefits available to them for remaining in active service. This was one of the methods of enticing men into remaining in service until retirement. We are now told, however, that we have arrived at a period when traditional and promised military benefits will no longer be provided in military medical facilities.

The size of our military retiree population is rapidly increasing and has doubled in the last 4 years and will again double by fiscal year 1971.

In fiscal year 1960 the retired military population of 275,000 increased to 475,000 and will go to 840,000 by fiscal year 1971. Retired dependent population now is over 1 million and will be 2.3 million by fiscal year 1971.

The total retired military population by 1971 will be over 3 million and over 4 million in 1980.

The limited medical service that is now being provided in certain areas will rapidly diminish. Retirement records reflect that of all service retirees, 22 percent have located in southern California. I know that in my district there is a shortage of personnel especially as far as the outpatient clinic of March Air Force Base near Riverside, Calif.

The Los Angeles through Palm Springs area is serviced by the 150-bed facility at March Air Force Base where retirees and their dependents can be hospitalized. This hospital services a retiree population area equivalent to the entire State of Florida.

The retired military population in the area is doubling every 3½ to 4 years. At the old March Air Force Base Hospital facility there was an average daily patient load of about 100 inpatients. In the new hospital, there are about 145, a 50-percent increase. In 1964, 29 percent of the average daily patient load were retired families. In 1965—January through October—35 percent of the average daily patient load were retired families. The total effort expended by the medical staff at the March Air Force Base Hospital on retired families is 60 to 75 percent.

Our commitment in southeast Asia has taken a large percentage of our military resources. I believe that the Department of Defense plans to draft a great many more physicians. These physicians will not be used to care for retired military personnel. More and more active duty personnel are being sent overseas while their dependents remain at home. Care of retired military families is continuing but at a decreasing rate. The volume of retired personnel is so large in southern California that if the military medical personnel devoted all of their time to care for them, there would still be a shortage of staff, facilities, and funds to do an adequate job.

There is a strong moral obligation on the part of the Government to continue to provide medical care by some means for the retired military population and their dependents.

There have been stated and implied promises of medical care following retirement as a standard part of personnel recruitment and retention efforts.

I feel that the enactment of this legislation will guarantee retirees and their dependents medical care in civilian facilities if military facilities are not available. The Secretary of Defense will be given discretionary authority to arrange for such care beginning in 1967.

The Government is under a moral obligation to insure that retired military personnel and their dependents receive medical care. A promise was made to them and this promise must be kept.

LETTER FROM CANON CHARLES MARTIN, HEADMASTER, ST. ALBANS SCHOOL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the RECORD a letter from Canon Charles Martin, headmaster of St. Albans School in Washington, D.C.:

JANUARY 30, 1966.

DEAR FRIENDS: There is a blizzard on outside. The drifts are high, and the wind is strong and biting, the cold is intense. It is good to be home, unless, of course one should be somewhere else. And then she should be there.

Early this morning it was black, cold, and forbidding. I hated to get moving, but after shoveling out the snow that fell in the house when I opened the door and after shoveling a path to the street, I felt better. It was exhilarating to pit oneself against the wind and snow. At school and after that at the cathedral, I felt positively comfortable, even self-righteous. The latter state was quickly dispelled by a brief conversation with a young acolyte.

"Hello."

"Hello."

"How did you get here?"

"Walked and hitch-hiked."

"Where do you live?"

"Out by the District line."

---

[12] "Democracy in America."

[13] Inaugural address, Jan. 20, 1961, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Now I am back home making a few observations evoked by the blizzard.

First, when I got out in the storm, it was rough, but not nearly so rough as I had anticipated. In my experience, most of our problems are in our mind, not in the facts of life themselves. Twenty-five miles is a considerable distance to an easterner; one hundred miles, a modest one to a westerner. Mental states, attitudes, make a great difference. One fears to face up to a long pull, a difficult situation, but when he does, he finds the pull not so long, the situation not so difficult as he had anticipated and, no matter how long the pull or how great the difficulty, he often finds the experience strengthening, even exhilarating.

On my way to church this morning I saw my neighbor who is the choirmaster at a church in Silver Spring working on his car with a broom, cleaning the windows and windshield. Beside him was a shovel, and his car was parked downhill. My guess is that with this kind of preparation and so early a start, he will be playing the organ in his church, and on time. One doesn't meet life successfully unless he is prepared. And most of us do little preparation for storms of the atmosphere or for the storms of life.

There were only a few persons present at the service in the cathedral this morning, but it had a greater reality than usual. We gave thanks for the hard and demanding in life that makes for strength; and we gave thanks for the new appreciation of our dependence one upon another. We remembered those made to suffer by the storm and all the hardships in life, and we prayed that we and others might, in sympathy and understanding, be useful to them. Even the formal prayers had a new reality—the collect for the day had a new relevance to life:

"O God, who knowest us to be set in the midst of so many and great dangers, that by reason of the frailty of our nature we cannot always stand upright; grant to us such strength and protection, as may support us in all dangers, and carry us through all temptations; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

And this is my experience: When one faces life as it comes, not evading the hard, he is stronger; knows a new sense of dependence, and is granted an inner quiet and well-being that is satisfying and enables him better to face life.

Now back to my acolyte. If I had been his parent, I would have been greatly troubled at the thought of his going out on such a hazardous trip, and it would not have been easy to allow him to do it. But I am sure the boy is stronger and better for his experience. Life has risks. They must be faced and not evaded. And it is amazing the strengths that are within us when we are really tested. We can scale the 14-foot fence when the bull is behind us; we can pass the difficult algebra course when we make up our minds to; we can face the sad and tragic when we must and become finer human beings as a result.

American life does not make these truths at once evident, for the whole emphasis is on making life easier and more comfortable. The escalator saves us from walking up a flight of stairs; the pushbutton gadget saves us from getting out of the chair and tuning the TV, and many of the programs save us from thinking. The thermostat saves us from firing the furnace and the air conditioner from fanning ourselves. On the whole, this is good and we ought to enjoy and accept with thanks the increasing comforts of life. On the other hand, we ought not to be softened by them or misled by them. There are always going to be flights of stairs to be climbed, and our hearts, minds, and bodies need to be ready for them. Intellectual effort is always going to be required, and we ought not to allow our minds to become flabby. While temperatures may be controlled within the house, the rise and fall of events in life cannot be controlled and we have to be able to meet them and to adjust to them.

This is very clear at school in all kinds of ways. Take college entrance, which is much on our minds today. Competition is very strong and it is difficult to get into college. I wish it were not so, but it is. While all boys can get into college who should get in, there is fierce competition for admission to the more prestigious colleges which makes for worries and anxieties. Worse, secondary education is often vitiated by a narrow preoccupation with preparation for college instead of being concerned with the healthy development of individual gifts that comes, among other things, from relaxation, freedom, and time to do nothing. But the fact remains that we live at a time when one cannot enter a college for the asking. This has to be accepted, adjusted to, taken in stride.

When I finish this letter I am going to call on two young friends whose fathers just died. Death is the ultimate reality that we have to meet. We generally ignore it and we seek to escape its reality with all kinds of euphemisms and strange customs, but we cannot escape its finality—we must meet it.

While we all must meet the ultimate reality of death, there are all kinds of other, less shocking but still demanding experiences that we must meet. As we face them, we shall be surprised at the resources within ourselves, perhaps previously unknown, that give us strength. We shall also be surprised at the understanding and kindness that come from people, the help that come out of life itself—from God himself.

This is why I don't like to see a boy late, or a boy stay indoors when he has the sniffles, or a boy stay out of sports because his leg hurts, or a boy stay home when he feels indisposed, or a boy drop a subject when he finds it hard; and this is why we don't close the school when it storms. I know we have to be prepared to meet life as it comes. I know we have great untapped resources within us and strengths that are undeveloped; I know that it is good for us to be forced to depend one upon the other; I know it is good for us to know that we have resources outside of ourselves in life itself, in God.

Storms are good; life is good; it is fun to be in the midst of both.

Faithfully,

Charles Martin.

EDGARD VARESE

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the Record articles that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of November 7, 1965, and the New York Times of November 14, 1965, about Edgard Varese, who died on November 6.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 7, 1965]

Edgard Varese, 82, Pioneer of Avant-Garde Music

Edgard Varese, 82, one of the last of the great pioneers of modern music, died early yesterday morning at University Hospital of complications following an operation.

Mr. Varese, who was born in France, had three careers: one, in Germany before the World War I, as a conductor and promising modernist protege of Richard Strauss and Feruccio Busoni and the model for Romain Rolland's "Jean Christophe"; a second, in this country after the war as a controversial modernist and prophet of the new, and a third in recent years as a pioneer of electronic music and the acknowledged American master of the young avant-garde.

Mr. Varese long ago anticipated the whole new world of electronics and he lived long enough to compose the first masterpieces in the new medium. He was the first to think of music in three dimensions, as a series of sonorous spatial objects moving and colliding in a new, imagined musical space. He was the first to compose music purely in terms of sonorous objects—densities and intensities built up in great layers of sound and expressing, not classical ideals of order, but the rhythm and poetry of modern life as he understood and interpreted it.

In 1917, the New York Avant-Garde magazine 391, edited by Marcel Duchamp and Francis Picabia, published an article by Mr. Varese in which he said: "I dream of instruments obedient to my thought and which, with their contribution of a whole new world of unsuspected sounds, will lend themselves to the exigencies of my inner rhythm."

This was to remain Mr. Varese's credo for the rest of his life, a great portion of which was taken up with an unending search for the new technical means to realize this inner vision.

He was, to his last day, almost the only older composer regarded by the younger generation as a genuine avant-gardist. But Mr. Varese himself had no use for the term or the concept of "avant-garde." "Poof," he would say, "the composer is never ahead of his time, it is the audience which is behind." Told again and again by dubious critics and a hostile public that what he wrote was not music, he merely shrugged his shoulders and dubbed it organized sound.

Now, with the old controversies of atonality, 12-tone, neoclassicism and neotonality long since past, the music that Mr. Varese wrote and performed in New York 40 years ago has a greater relevance than ever to the development of contemporary ideas.

Mr. Varese considered himself an American composer and held an unswerving devotion to New York which he considered the real cultural center of the West. The very prototype of the rugged individualist, both in his intense square-cut features and in personality, he endured hostility, then, even worse, neglect, and lived long enough to see himself acclaimed as a prophet now out of the wilderness.

The musical community was celebrating his 80th birthday this year but, in fact, the generally accepted date of his birth is an error. He was born in Paris in 1883 of Italian and French parentage. His father wanted him to be an engineer or a scientist and gave him education on this line. But Mr. Varese studied music privately in Italy and was accepted at the Schola Cantorium in Paris in 1904 as the pupil of Vincent d'Indy and Albert Roussel.

Mr. Varese began a lifelong love affair with medieval Rennaissance music at the Schola which was then doing pioneer work in this field.

But the budding modernist was not much for academc routine; he did not get on with d'Indy and he left the Schola for the Paris Conservatoire. Here the story was much the same; his principal teacher was the academic Widor and he fought with the Conservatoire director, Gabriel Faure. In 1907, he left France for Germany.

Through Romain Rolland, leading critic and writer who used Mr. Varese as the leading character of his famous novel about a composer, Varese was able to meet the leading figures of the day. Busoni and Strauss helped get his music performed and got him engagements as a conductor. One of the most remarkable aspects of his Berlin stay was his friendship with Hugo von Hofmannsthal, the well-known poet and librettist of Strauss' operas "Salome," "Elektra," and "Der Rosenkavalier." Hofmannsthal and Varese collaborated on an opera, "Oedipus and the Sphinx," which was just completed in 1914 when World War I broke out. As an enemy alien, Mr. Varese had to flee back to France.

Varese served briefly in the French Army and received a medical discharge. Back in Paris, Debussy tried to help him. ("A composer has a right to make the kind of music he wishes," Debussy once told him, "provided the music is his own. Your music is your own. But I don't understand it.") Disillusioned, however, with France, Varese set sail for the New World.

The break with the past was to be even greater than he anticipated. His manuscripts were stored in a warehouse in Berlin that was burned during the war. Nearly all of his earlier works, including the opera, were destroyed.

In New York, Varese conducted a mammoth performance of the Berlioz Requiem in the New York Hippodrome and his reputation as a conductor was made. Getting his music (or any other modern music) performed was not quite so simple and Varese himself was instrumental in the formation of the New Symphony Orchestra, the International Composers' Guild, and later, the Pan-American Association of Composers, all devoted to modern music.

With the help of Mr. Varese and others, New York became one of the major important centers for modern music and new ideas—in many ways surpassing anything in Europe at the period. Varese produced his series of now-famous path-breaking works, "Ameriques," "Offrandes," "Hyperprism," "Octandre," "Integrales," "Arcana," and culminating in the famous all-percussion "Ionisation" of 1930–32.

Nearly all of these works caused a sensation and the reputation of "Ionisation" with its siren and its battery of things to hit, scratch, and smash was notorious. Yet it can be seen today as a serious and thoughtful attempt to get away from the conventional tempered scale and widen the means of musical expression. At this time, he also worked on a large-scale piece called Espace in which "electrical" (we would say "electronic") means were to be used to project and resynthesize sound in many directions and dimensions.

In fact, the work was never realized. From the thirties there is only the "Equatorial" and the famous "Density 21.5" written for the solo platinum flute of Georges Barrere and then 15 years of silence.

Mr. Varese's silence has been attributed to neglect—it was the period when American music turned away from avant-gardism to a more popular style—but it was partly also that the composer was searching for the means to realize his ideas. He talked to Bell Laboratories and he even went to Hollywood to visit the sound studios, but all to no avail. Only with the beginning of electronic music in 1950 was he finally able to realize his life dream. His "Deserts" for instruments and electronic sound sources, written in 1950–54, and his "Poeme electronique," commissioned for the Le Courboisier Phillips Pavilion at the Brussels Fair in 1956–58, are masterful sound collages and astonishing breakthroughs in the entirely new medium which he had predicted so many years before.

In his last years, after the "Nocturnal" of 1960–61, Mr. Varese again went back to his old "Espace" concept in a new work, provisionally entitled "Nuit." It is not known if the composer left this or any other music in a performable state.

Surviving are a daughter by a first marriage and his second wife, Louise Varese, a well-known translator of Rimbaud, Baudelaire, Stendahl, Nobel Prize winner St.-John Perse and other major French writers. According to the composer's wishes, there will be no funeral.—ERIC SALZMAN.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 14, 1965]

MAVERICK, REVOLUTIONARY, AND FATHER TO A GENERATION

(By Harold C. Schonberg)

For a composer with only a handful of works to show for a lifetime in music, Edgard Varèse exerted an influence all out of proportion to his output. But though his oeuvre was slender, it was remarkably potent, and as far back as the 1920's he was writing music that was a remarkable anticipation of some of the farthest-out music today. To the younger generation he was a symbol. More than Stravinsky, more than Bartók, more than anybody he represented the maverick, the natural revolutionary, the uncompromising creative mind that lives by and for an ideal.

And so he lived to be hailed as a hero. All interested in modern music paid homage to him. To the general public he was not well known; but at concerts of new music in recent years there always was a buzz when his sturdy body entered an auditorium. "Varèse—Varèse—there's Varèse." He represented something bigger than life, and it was as much for that as for his actual accomplishment that he was hailed. It is given to few to live a life exactly as one wants to live; to ignore the frills and concentrate on the basics; to create purely for the satisfaction of creation; to be content to have what one has and not wish for more—not if it would interfere with the ideals that govern the very act of existence.

NO SERIALIST

If not for the strange turn that music took after the Second World War, Varèse at best would today be considered an eccentric, a man who experimented with pure planes of sound. But such is the wheel of art. It spun around, and Varèse's name came up. This was all the more astonishing, for Varèse belonged to no school. He was not a serial composer; indeed, he had little respect for serial technique. No school formed around him, his music was little played, and he went pretty much his own way, convinced that orthodox music had played itself out, convinced that new instruments, new textures, new organizations had to be developed.

But what he did do, long before 1945, was concentrate on pure sound, abolish melody (in the traditional sense of the word), explore spatial relationships, invent new methods of notation, pulverize tone, and, in effect, anticipate a good deal of what the new school is doing. He may be saint, he may be devil. If there is a shift in values, his music will be forgotten. If the new music takes hold for good, he will be enshrined.

He lived only for the new, the experimental. As a young man he served as conductor and had a thorough knowledge of music of the past. But certainly during the last half of his 82 years he had virtually nothing to do with any music except the new and preferably the avant-gardé. His listening tolerance for "old" (pre-1920) music was admittedly low; he would get bored, then restless, after a half hour of listening. He needed new sounds, new combinations, to interest and stimulate him.

Just about 20 years ago this writer first interviewed Varèse. It was like trying to encircle a geyser. Varèse, pugnacious and lively, had strong views about everything. The thing that bothered him most, those days, was what he called the commercialism of music, and he had tart remarks for some hallowed figures. He spoke violently about those who would prostitute their art to make money. And he had some dire predictions to make.

"You will see," he said. "This country will die because of the middleman. Here in America there is always great excitement to see what's coming next. Always the manager, the middleman, will try to make a discovery—a new virtuoso, a new singer. Conductors, they are anxious to get first performances, and then never play the music again."

Varèse, who always had a low boiling point, got excited and started to wave his arms. What is it, a first performance? What does it mean? The 10th, the 20th performance—that's the important thing. Unfortunately for the majority in America, art is only tolerated. It is not a necessity. We must draw a line between entertainment and art. Art is from the shoulders up. The others is from the hips down."

This was early in 1946, and he had some prophetic words to say about the future of music. He grew furious when the concept of "American art" was mentioned, and said that it was pitiful for composers to try to recreate a style that had vanished.

"Previously," he snorted, "there could be provincialism, but not today. When the atomic bomb fell, nationalism was wiped out. I think all over the world this is happening. Today is one complete world, not individual countries barred from the rest. National art is a ridiculous concept; it has broken up. You cannot have a protective tariff on thought, which is what many nationalists want. Fifty years ago, yes; today, no. Let me repeat what I have said. You cannot have a protective tariff on thought."

What Varèse predicted has come true, at least in the avant-gardé. There is an international style today, what Virgil Thomson has called the musical Common Market. Nationalism is completely passé. New instruments are being created, and the electronic composers are assuming more and more importance. This especially pleased Varèse in his last years. He always had been interested in electronic instruments; had fooled around with the theremin, and as soon as tape music came into being was one of the first to experiment with the new medium. As is well known, early Varèse scores—"Ionization," especially—are startlingly close in sound and texture to electronic music, even though composed long before there were any electronic instruments to use.

OLD MASTER

As an old master, and one who generated admiration for his pioneer work from all composers, Varèse around 1950 found himself in the enjoyable position of having all of his works called masterpieces. Stravinsky's reaction is typical. After some hedging in his "Memories and Commentaries" of 1960, he came to the conclusion in the 1963 "Dialogues and a Dairy" that "Varèse's music will endure. We know this now because it was dated in the right way. The name is synonymous with a new intensity and a new concretion, and the best things in his music—the first seven measures from No. 16 in 'Arcana, the whole of 'Deserts'—are among the better things in contemporary music. More power to this musical Brancusi."

Yes; it became very fashionable to give blanket endorsement to Varèse. But that did not help him get performances. By and large his music was played only by the small avant-gardé groups and occasional performances of "Ionization" by the bigger ensembles only accentuated the lack of knowledge about his later works. Fortunately there are a few recordings. Whatever his eventual place, he will occupy a special niche as innovator, experimeter, and as spiritual father to a new generation: a sort of latter-day Satie.

A GOOD WORD FOR L.B.J.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record an editorial by Roscoe Drummond that appeared in the Washington Post on March 13, 1966, about the President's management of the Vietnam war.

A Good Word for L.B.J.

(By Roscoe Drummond)

I would like to say a good word about President Johnson's management of the Vietnam war. Obviously there is a great risk of timidly doing too little to arrest the aggression and a great danger of recklessly doing so much that Red China enters the fighting.

With these two opposite perils in mind, I cannot escape the feeling that many more Americans will come to see that the President is bringing wisdom, caution, and determination to bear on the conduct of the war.

Surely the touchstone of wisdom in our role in Vietnam is to do whatever is needed to secure South Vietnam from conquest and to use our massive military power in such a prudent and measured manner that Peiping is given no legitimate reason to enter the war.

Such a course will not get the easy plaudits of those who want to win quickly at any cost by bombing North Vietnam to bits; will not get the praise of those who want to quit at any cost by pulling out; and will not get a high Gallup rating from those who suggest we haven't the resources to defend South Vietnam and that, anyway, a little aggression in southeast Asia is no concern to the United States.

As these conflicting views find their level in public opinion, I believe that the Nation, on reflection, will feel even more reassured that Gen. Curtis LeMay is not deciding the bombing over North Vietnam, that Senator Wayne Morse is not managing the defense of South Vietnam, and that Senator Fulbright is not deciding where aggression concerns the United States and where it doesn't.

During the period when he was determining how the mounting attacks directed from Hanoi should be met, President Johnson—as reported by Charles Roberts in his book, "L.B.J.'s Inner Circle"—remarked to his intimates: "I'm not going north with Curtis LeMay, and I'm not going south with Wayne Morse."

Fortunately, the President is not easily pressured either by events or by extremist advice.

He did not act hastily, but deliberately; not recklessly, but with great care; not timidly—he committed the United States to do whatever is necessary to defend South Vietnam successfully, but no more.

These ingredients of mind have marked the President's course in Vietnam: deliberateness, prudence, and determination.

They have produced a clear and properly limited objective: to keep South Vietnam from being taken over by force.

And to make it least likely that Red China will enter the war, he is not using U.S. airpower to bomb cities in the north; not sending U.S. ground troops to occupy North Vietnam; not seeking the downfall of the Hanoi regime; not asking for the unconditional surrender of Hanoi. He is asking only for an unconditional end to aggression against its neighbor.

NEW DIRECTIONS AND METHODS FOR NATIONAL TRANSPORT NEEDS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal outlined some of the reasons why a single agency is needed to handle transit problems.

It noted that President Johnson has asked for a Cabinet level department consolidating the activities of 11 separate Federal agencies. It added that while the idea is not a new one, a whole new set of imperatives has arisen "which make the proposal more timely than ever."

The article is most informative and because others will want to see it, I offer it for inclusion in the Record.

New Directions and Methods for National Transport Needs

The entire transportation picture is changing so rapidly that it has become essential to create a single agency of the Federal Government to keep track of what is going on and to channel Government spending and research into the areas where they are most needed.

To this end President Johnson has asked for a Cabinet-level department consolidating the activities of 11 separate Federal agencies. The suggestion is not a new one. Presidents John F. Kennedy and Dwight D. Eisenhower considered creating the same post. A whole new set of imperatives has arisen in the meantime which make the proposal more timely than ever.

The Nation has at last become conscious of the need for a drive, coordinated at the Federal level, for safer automobiles and tires. There have been calls for an end to the meaningless numbers game in reporting traffic fatalities and a start on a more scientific approach to the reasons so many of us drive ourselves to our deaths. There has been comment about the disparity in death rates between various modes of transportation and speculation about how this relates to the amount of money spent on safety research.

The President's message was responsive to this concern. He called for increased Federal grants to State highway safety programs, construction of a national highway safety research and test center authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to determine the need for additional safety standards for automobiles.

The whole question of priorities has also come in for a good deal of public attention lately. Is it fair to subsidize the automobile by putting up 90 percent of the cost of interstate highways while starving mass transit? Is it worth rebuilding the Nation's merchant marine fleet at vast cost to the Federal Government? Would it make more sense, for example, to put the money into hydrofoil boats which could ply the inland waterways? The President has indicated that he means to stick with a 1974 deadline for a supersonic airliner, but it could be that a transportation czar would see more need for a subsonic jet bus which could carry 750 passengers at low rates and thus lure more travelers into the air.

The transportation problems of the eastern seaboard are forerunners of what cities like Louisville and Lexington may someday be faced with. Railroads, the single great unsubsidized portion of the American transportation system, must revive their commuter and short-haul passenger service if the travel needs of our populous areas are to be met. Once in or near a large city, mass transit must be added to the transportation mix if we are to avoid being choked to death by our own automobiles. At present, mass transit is the responsibility of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Ultimately, it should be transferred to the new Department so that the President's goal of having all transportation functions coordinated "in a single coherent instrument of Government" can be met.

TOWARD PEACE

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in The Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., on March 2, 1966, reminds us that the hard line being taken by Hanoi does not mean that America should abandon all efforts to negotiate a peace in Vietnam.

At present, the paper points out:

> Hanoi makes negotiation unattainable, while loudly accusing America of bad faith in its efforts toward peace.

Since this article sheds light on an issue of such vital concern, I include it in the Record:

Hanoi's Fifth Point Makes Peace Talks Impossible

Many millions of Americans hope fervently for negotiations to end the fighting in Vietnam. Many have not always been fully satisfied with the zeal of the Johnson administration in promoting that objective. At the same time, they are certainly getting no encouragement from the Communist side.

Washington's position, indeed, has softened on one vital precondition for talks, while the position of Hanoi and Peiping has hardened significantly. This is the question of who would speak for South Vietnam at the bargaining table.

A few months ago, the Johnson administration indicated that the government we support in Saigon would have to be the only spokesman for the South Vietnamese. But we have pulled away from that doctrine. The President himself has not said that he would also accept the Vietcong at the conference table, but his willingness has been vouched for by such close associates as Ambassador Harriman and Press Secretary Moyers.

On the other side of the line, the position has been altered for the worse. Ho Chi Minh has added a fifth point to the four he had previously set as conditions for peace talks. It is that the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) must be the sole spokesman for South Vietnam in any negotiations. This condition is stressed in every propaganda statement from Peiping.

FOUR PREVIOUS POINTS

The North Vietnamese National Assembly on April 10, 1965, had posed these four points as conditions for negotiations:

1. All U.S. troops must withdraw from South Vietnam. (It was not stipulated that withdrawal would have to take place before a negotiated settlement rather than after,

so this point was apparently left open for bargaining.)

2. Pending peaceful reunification of Vietnam, the 1954 military agreement must be respected and both North and South remain neutral.

3. Internal affairs must be settled by South Vietnamese themselves, "in accordance with the program of the National Liberation Front," without any foreign interference.

4. Peaceful reunification of Vietnam to be settled by Vietnamese people in both zones without foreign interference.

These conditions are subject to long and tortured interpretation, but they are not a complete bar to discussions. They are not irreconcilable with the 14 points set forth by President Johnson on January 3, 1966.

The President's offer of negotiation terms, however, quickly drew the new and impossible fifth point from Ho Chi Minh. He knows of course that we could not refuse a place at the conference table to the government we have supported in Saigon. To do so would be to surrender the people we have made our allies to the Communists, fully and finally. It would be to seal the fate of South Vietnam without an expression of the will of the people.

It is a familiar technique in a dispute for one side to offer to talk, but set conditions it knows its opponent cannot conceivably accept. The Soviet Union has played that game in the long struggle for disarmament. Now Hanoi makes negotiation unattainable, while loudly accusing America of bad faith in its efforts toward peace.

The intransigence of Hanoi does not mean that America should abandon all efforts to negotiate. If anything, it increases our duty to maintain and strengthen our peaceful intentions.

But in the meanwhile there is no use blinding ourselves to what is happening in Hanoi and Peiping. The Communist leaders believe they are going to win, and they will at present accept no compromise short of total victory.

SUPPORT OF POLICY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. King] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Salt Lake Tribune states editorially that in voting additional funds to conduct the war in Vietnam "Congress acted responsibly—and in accordance with the views of most Americans."

The paper believes that most Americans do not want an "unrestrained escalation," but that they do want an honorable peace and that they are ready for "unconditional negotiations toward that end anywhere, under any auspices."

Because the summation made by this newspaper will be of interest to many, I am making the editorial available by offering it now for publication in the Record:

Congress Votes Support of Viet Policy

There seems little doubt that the overwhelming approval in Congress of additional funds to finance the war in Vietnam is a victory for the administration in the current debate over its Vietnam policy.

The House voted approval of the additional $4.8 billion by 392 to 4, the Senate by 93 to 2.

Approval of the money was inevitable, for Congress could hardly vote in effect to abandon the more than 200,000 American troops now engaged with the Communists on the ground in South Vietnam.

But the vote might not have been so overwhelming, and it need not have been preceded by such a smashing Senate defeat of Senator Wayne Morse's effort to repudiate the 1964 resolution pledging congressional support for "all necessary measures" to resist Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

On a motion to table (kill) Senator Morse's motion, only 4 Senators joined Morse, with 92 in effect voting to reconfirm the resolution.

NO ESCALATION MANDATE

A minority of House and Senate liberals—put at 77 in the House and 17 in the Senate—deny the vote for more Vietnam funds was a mandate for unrestrained escalation of the war.

Of course it wasn't. And only a small minority of Americans advocate such escalation, just as only a small minority advocate American retreat.

Even Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who voted with Morse on the 1964 resolution repudiation, did not advocate withdrawal in explaining his vote. He rather simply pointed to the need for seeking a "general accommodation" in southeast Asia for "neutralization of the entire region as between China and the United States."

But as Peter Lisagor, of the Chicao Daily News Service, points out, administration spokesmen have supported a neutral Laos and Cambodia, and have agreed to a nonaligned South Vietnam if the Communists will call off their aggression. It is Communist China, not the United States, which has consistently rejected neutralization.

Despite the continued negative attitude of both Communist China and North Vietnam, President Johnson again extended the olive branch. While the Senate was debating the increased aid bill, he called again on Hanoi to "negotiate peace" and renewed his offer for a "massive effort of reconstruction" after a settlement in both North and South Vietnam.

UNDER CAREFUL CONTROL

While this was balanced by a promise to continue the "measured use of force," the White House said the President would "continue to act responsibly" and it reiterated his New York pledge to use "prudent firmness under careful control."

It seems to us that this is all anyone can ask, and that Congress acted responsibly—and in accordance with the views of most Americans. They desire, no more than the President, unrestrained escalation of this war. They want a peace settlement which will permit the orderly and honorable withdrawal of American troops. They are ready for unconditional negotiations toward that end anywhere, under any auspices.

It is not new American policy to support people resisting Communist aggression, nor to uphold the basic principle of self-determination of people. American policy in Vietnam is simply a continuance of a firm U.S. stand against Communist aggression which this country has followed for nearly 20 years at a dozen points along the vast periphery of the Russian and Chinese Communist empires. And we believe that fundamental policy has the same basic American support today that it had when it first took form under President Truman.

TOO MANY COOKS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. King] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star editorially praises the President's recommendations made in his message on pollution and conservation.

His recommendations included transfer of the Water Pollution Control Administration from the Public Health Service to the Interior Department, and establishing a National Water Commission "to review and advise on the entire range of water resources problems."

The Star concludes that:

> Perhaps the great conservation task that so badly needs doing is at last about to shift into high gear.

The timely appraisal will interest my colleagues, and I therefore make the editorial a part of the Record:

Too Many Cooks

Two things emerge from President Johnson's message on pollution and conservation that may have more long-range significance than the specific requests he has made. These are his recommendations to transfer the Water Pollution Control Administration from the Public Health Service to the Interior Department, which controls most water programs, and to establish a National Water Commission "to review and advise on the entire range of water resources problems."

At the moment there are far too many cooks at the Federal level involved in the field of conservation. For example, in our own Potomac Basin a White House-backed team working to make the Potomac a model for the Nation is confronted with coordinating antipollution planning among four agencies. The President's recommendation would at least narrow this to three.

What is really needed, of course, is a much greater concentration than this. The Hoover Commission recommended that total conservation responsibility be concentrated in a Department of Natural Resources. And a bill sponsored by Senator Moss, of Utah, aimed at this desirable goal even now is before Congress.

The political complexities in any such reorganization are great and there can be no quick and easy solution. But the proposals to transfer antipollution responsibility and coordinate water resource planning look like steps in the right direction. Perhaps the great conservation task that so badly needs doing is at last about to shift into high gear.

VIETNAM

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. King] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the congressional dialog on Vietnam continues apace, and few there are, by now, who have not spoken out. My own position is that we must continue to resist Communist aggression and terrorism. I have affirmed, and reaffirmed, this proposition on occasions too numerous to mention.

I willingly concede that we have made mistakes. If it were possible to unravel the tangled fabric of the past, no doubt a better fabric could then be rewoven. But that is not our present option. It was Adlai Stevenson, I believe, who said: "If the present persists in setting in judgment on the past, the future is lost."

The time is now for action. The signals have already been called, and the ball is in motion. America has no other choice than to execute the play, and to smash forward to a touchdown. This does not mean that our policy or methods are no longer open to discussion, or even to criticism. Far from it. On several occasions I myself have raised my voice against sloppy and inefficient practices which I felt were militating against our success in the field. I shall continue to do so.

It is one thing, however, to offer constructive criticism, in order to improve the war effort. It is another thing to embarrass, or obstruct, or to deliberately weaken our national will to fight. With any such effort I have no sympathy.

There has been so much said about what we are doing wrong, and so little, comparatively speaking, about what we are doing right. It is with a view to strengthening our will, and putting our present posture into a truer perspective that I am taking this time to review, briefly, the splendid work of our JUSPAO organization, and the success it has had in the field of psychological warfare. We hear so much about the conventional battles that are raging in Vietnam, and about the statistics on casualties suffered, lives lost, and planes and materiel destroyed. The real war however, is being fought, not for the bodies but for the minds of the Vietcong. The work of JUSPAO is no less significant because it receives so little recognition. In my opinion it is our ultimate weapon.

SELECTIVE ACHIEVEMENTS OF JUSPAO

GENERAL

Just as crucial as, and in the long run more important than, the current military effort in Vietnam is the struggle for the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese. At the heart of this psychological task is communication—particularly communication between the populace and their government. In the U.S. mission, the agency with primary responsibility for counseling and assisting the Government of Vietnam—GVN—in the field of psychological action is the Joint United States Public Affairs Office—JUSPAO.

JUSPAO was created in May 1965 as a result of President Johnson's decision giving the Director of USIA authority over all U.S. psychological operations in Vietnam. The majority of the American staff are USIA officers, but others come from the Department of State, AID, and the U.S. military. Headed by a senior USIA official—who is also Minister Counselor of Embassy for Information—JUSPAO is a U.S. mission organization which provides unified direction for all U.S. psychological action in Vietnam. Having directly integrated the communication media functions of USAID Vietnam, JUSPAO is the U.S. civilian channel for providing communication equipment and technical advice to the GVN. Through policy direction given to the psywar operations of MACV's Political Warfare Directorate, JUSPAO helps assure close coordination between U.S. civilian and military psywar personnel in provincial operations.

JUSPAO has three main psychological objectives: First, to strengthen the Vietnamese will to support GVN/US mutual objectives; second, to strengthen the government's communication media and programs to increase popular support of its overall objectives; and third, to strengthen free world support for Vietnam and of Vietnamese support for U.S. worldwide policy objectives.

In pursuit of these objectives, JUSPAO has over 150 American officers and nearly 400 Vietnamese employees. Ideas, personal contact, media materials, and communication equipment are tools and channels in this war for men's minds. The impact of various JUSPAO programs very often is localized. The successes may not lend themselves to newspaper headlines. They are the backside of news, and some of these are capsulized below.

RADIO

In a country like South Vietnam where literacy rate is low, particularly in the rural area, radio is a vital link between the Government and the people. In the past, the Radio Vietnam—VTVN—with a station in Saigon and several regional transmitters was not fully utilized or coordinated because of poor organization, lack of trained personnel and programing skills. As a first step toward helping the GVN develop a more truly national radio network, JUSPAO convinced and assisted the GVN in December 1965 to restructure Radio Vietnam into a semiautonomous broadcasting corporation. Steps are now being taken to link the existing stations into a national network. Two JUSPAO radio advisory teams are actively engaged in training Vietnamese in program production, station and network management and administration, and central and regional programing. One of the teams is assigned to the VTVN while the other is assisting the Vietnamese Defense Ministry's Voice of Freedom Station which broadcasts to North Vietnam.

JUSPAO also produces locally between 60 and 75 hours of radio programs every week for placement with Vietnamese stations. From Washington, the Voice of America broadcasts to South and North Vietnam 6½ hours daily in Vietnamese. The Voice maintains a transmitting and relay complex in Hue, South Vietnam, just south of the 17th parallel. The 50,000 watt, medium-wave relay transmitter has directional antennas capable of providing strong signals to both North and South Vietnam. Over the past year and a half, incidentally, the site has been shelled by the Vietcong several times.

OTHER MEDIA

JUSPAO effort is not confined to radio. A publication adviser is working with the Vietnamese Ministry of Psywar in the production of pamphlets, leaflets, and posters. In the GVN's National Motion Picture Center, a JUSPAO adviser helps in all aspects of the conception and production of newsreels, documentaries, and feature films. To help the GVN improve its press output and thus to facilitate coverage of Vietnam developments by foreign newsmen, a JUSPAO press adviser is assigned to the Vietnam Press, the Government's national news agency, to provide on-the-job training and classroom instructions on journalism.

PSYCHOLOGICAL OPERATIONS IN THE PROVINCES

JUSPAO operates extensively in rural South Vietnam, and some 40 American JUSPAO field representatives are stationed in the provinces to give assistance and support to cadres of the Vietnamese Information Service—VIS—in psychological operations. The tasks of JUSPAO field representatives cover a wide spectrum; namely, stimulating action by provincial psychological operations committees in every province; assisting in the publication of 24 provincial newspapers and programing of regional radio stations; showing GVN and JUSPAO films made for provincial audiences; developing posters, pamphlets, leaflets, and other publications designed for audiences in a particular province or even district; employing airborne loudspeakers and leaflet drops for fast exploitation of local issues; and deploying VIS and JUSPAO cultural troupes which present a government message via entertainment.

A considerable part of the JUSPAO effort in the provinces has gone into supporting the Government's Chieu Hoi—Open Arms—program which encourages Vietcong and their followers to return to government-controlled areas. Where local Chieu Hoi programs are imaginatively and vigorously pursued and where especially effective leaflets and other messages are employed, the psychological tasks of persuasion has yielded results. The following incidents show this by the extent of Vietcong reaction and counteraction.

In August 1965, 150,000 copies of a JUSPAO-originated leaflet were airdropped into parts of Vinh Binh Province in the Delta. According to returnees who defected on the basis of it as well as captured Vietcong documents, within 3 days every Vietcong found picking up or holding this leaflet was immediately transferred to another region so that he would not "contaminate" others. Also around this time, in Vinh Long Province nearby, the Vietcong were driven to holding public meetings to counter the Chieu Hoi appeal. The villagers in these public meetings were warned that anyone found with a leaflet was liable to be shot. They were also told that anyone going over to the government side in response to the appeal would be tortured.

That Vietcong threats and intimidation have not been fully effective can be seen in the number of individuals who have responded to the Chieu Hoi appeal since the program was launched in February 1963. From that time to date, some 30,000 Vietcong and their followers had returned to the government side; 11,000 of them came back during 1965 alone. The monthly returnee rate last year is particularly notable for its sharp upward trend. In January 1965, there were 406 returnees; by December the number had climbed to 1,482. In January 1966, the 1,672 Chieu Hoi returnees who came back set an alltime record. These statistics reflect the impact of U.S. military buildup, upswing of Vietnamese morale and the series of GVN–US military successes. Since JUSPAO psychological operations were aimed at reinforcing and exploiting these favorable trends, the Chieu Hoi statistics are in part a measure of JUSPAO accomplishment.

Statistical profile aside, there have also been instances of specific reaction to the GVN/US psychological operations aimed specifically at the Vietcong.

On October 24, 1965, copies of eight different leaflets were airdropped in a coordinated psywar campaign into Vietcong strongholds in the IV Corps area. In the next week, a check of Vietcong defectors indicated that of the 86 coming in from the areas covered, 62 carried copies of the leaflets dropped on October 24. Reacting to other media used, the Vietcong in one instance moved into a village and removed all anti-Vietcong slogans and banners and warned the people not to take part in any demonstration being organized as part of the psywar campaign. Yet in another village, as a result of demonstrations held, the villagers drew up a letter stressing their determination to resist Vietcong pressure. The letter was signed by 65 villagers—an act of considerable courage since it could easily turn into a Vietcong death warrant.

A complete unit defection, that of a 22-man Vietcong guerrilla platoon occurred in mid-December 1965, in Binh Tuy Province, as a result of a coordinated military-psychological warfare operation. JUSPAO played an active role assisting the Vietnamese in carrying out the psychological phase which included ground and air loudspeaker operations and leaflets. Wives of known Vietcong were permitted and encouraged to cross the frontline positions to contact their husbands and assure them that they would be well treated and that they should surrender. The surrender appeals specified that the Vietcong should come via roads, with their shirts off, hands over their heads and with their rifles slung, muzzles pointed downward. Within a week of the operation, Vietcong defectors began to come in, usually in two's and three's. The 22-man platoon, however, brought with them 9 rifles and, as a group, followed the explicit instructions mentioned above.

JUSPAO SUPPORT TO SOCIAL REFORM

Compared to the immediate impact of psywar efforts, the JUSPAO role in support of social improvement and reform programs in South Vietnam is of a longer range nature. To assist the Government to win and maintain the loyalties of its people, particularly in rural areas, JUSPAO exploits the economic and social progress which the GVN with AID support has been able to achieve in the countryside. There, military security must precede economic and social developmental efforts, but such development is directly related to a favorable psychological climate which JUSPAO activities aim to create. This involves more than publicizing GVN projects carried out with AID assistance; it involves instilling confidence in the benefits of self-help on the part of the villagers as well as confidence that the Government is sincerely interested in helping the people and in fact is doing so in various fields; and of great importance, in helping the GVN communicate to its people its plans for a social revolution.

Media products on AID activities are produced by JUSPAO for use not only in Vietnam but—through USIS posts—in many third countries as well. A series of photo packets are periodically sent to some 78 USIS posts worldwide for placement in the indigenous press and periodicals; these contain a substantial number of AID stories. Two USIA officers are assigned full time to maintain liaison with USAID in Saigon; they help develop media materials on AID projects and facilitate third-country coverage of these projects. In motion pictures, the JUSPAO biweekly series of news magazines deals with U.S. aid to South Vietnam, among other topics. And between one-third and one-half of the regular radio series—produced by JUSPAO in the field or USIA in Washington—are frequently on AID topics; such as roundtable discussion on economic development programs, documentary coverage of AID projects, interviews with "uncommon people," among whom are AID technicians and experts.

AID stories and articles on agricultural hints and self-help projects are featured prominently in the JUSPAO mass-circulating magazine, Rural Spirit. A monthly magazine written in simple language designed principally for a peasant audience in support of the GVN rural construction program, Rural Spirit is distributed in 350,000 copies per issue. The Vietnamese edition of Free World magazine also carries the story of economic development and nation building to a more sophisticated audience of schoolteachers and students. Its monthly circulation is 235,000 copies.

POSTSCRIPT

As James Reston wrote in the New York Times of February 18, 1966:

> Vietnam is the first American war * * * fought with the television cameras right on the battlefield. The advantages are obvious. These * * * scenes of our men under fire are taking some of the silly romance out of war, but inevitably they portray only one side of the story.

The Vietnam struggle is indeed many sided. The material herein represents a quick review of some aspects of the U.S. nonmilitary effort in South Vietnam, in which USIA is directly and intimately involved.

INCREASE DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to give the Department of Agriculture the additional authority it needs to increase dairy support levels.

The falloff in milk output, which began last year, has hastened the disappearance of a national surplus that already was dwindling. The total milk production for 1965 fell to some 125 billion pounds, a drop of 1½ percentage points from the 1964 level. The January 1966 figures indicate an even more drastic decline. The reports for that month show that the total U.S. milk production fell 5.3 percent below the year ago level. The decline was far more alarming in the top two milk producing States—a 7-percent drop in Wisconsin, the No. 1 producing State, and a 14-percent decline in the No. 2 producer, Minnesota.

The Department of Agriculture's count of the Nation's dairy herd reported a January total of 16.6 million. This is 5.6 percent less than the previous year and the largest year-to-year percentage decline on record.

The current dairy price support is 75 percent of parity—some $3.24 a hundred for 3.7 milk. This price has been in effect since April 1, 1965. A new support level will be announced for the new marketing year that starts April 1, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, unless price supports are raised, there simply is not enough incentive, at the current price suport level, for the farmer to remain in dairying. Tempted by soaring meat prices, many dairymen have switched to the feeding of cattle or the raising of hogs. Others have left farming entirely to take advantage of the industrial boom and other off-the-farm opportunities. The exodus from dairy farming reached an alarming rate of an estimated 12 departures a day in Wisconsin during 1965.

The present support price is much too low to allow for a reasonable return on labor and investment. Furthermore, if the current downward trends of dairy production continue, we will be faced with acute shortages of milk and dairy products.

Under current legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture is limited in his action to set the support price. The price he must set, under the law, is simply the price that will assure an adequate supply of milk during the next marketing year.

My bill would broaden the price setting power by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to take into consideration the present supply factor as well as three additional related factors in the setting of a price support level somewhere between 75 and 90 percent of parity.

The four factors, then, to be considered would be, first, the supply of milk in relation to the demand; second, the importance of milk to agriculture and the national economy; third, the ability to dispose of stocks of dairy products acquired through price support operations; and fourth, the need of dairy farmers for a fair return on their labor and investment.

This bill is designed to provide what is needed to meet the current crisis—more administrative discretion in dealing with the present slump in dairy production.

If we hope to reverse the current dairying trends, we must have higher support levels in order to assure an adequate income for the dairy farmer. In the absence of increased price supports, we may well confront a situation in which dairy production continues to drastically decline and dairy prices rise to inflationary proportions.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION'S RURAL RENEWAL PROGRAM

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bandstra] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which, if enacted into law, would greatly improve the effectiveness of a rural renewal program being conducted by the Farmers Home Administration in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This legislation is of particular importance to Appanoose and Monroe Counties in Iowa, since these two counties comprise one of five areas in the United States now designated as eligible for rural renewal assistance.

The basic purpose of this program is to stimulate long-range economic development in rural areas where family incomes are relatively low. The program itself is sound and constructive, but the legislation under which it was established is badly in need of improvement.

Under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the Farmers Home Administration was authorized to allocate rural renewal loan funds to "local public agencies" in designated areas. These local public agencies, in turn, would then make long-term rural renewal loans to private individuals or groups.

Examples of projects which might be undertaken and financed with rural renewal loan funds, under existing law, are as follows:

Purchase of small tracts of land, consolidation of the tracts, and resale as family-sized farms or for nonfarm use;

Purchase of large tracts of land for subdivision and resale as family-sized farms or for nonfarm use;

Development of a reservoir or system of reservoirs for flood control, conservation, recreation, and water supply;

Construction of water and sewer systems and service buildings, when required to make possible a broad land-use improvement project;

Purchase of scrub timber land and its development, including timber stand improvement, construction of access roads and conservation measures; and

Purchase and development of a grazing area for use by ranchers and farmers.

The potential of this comprehensive program has been recognized by the local citizens in Appanoose and Monroe Counties. In an effort to take advantage of the program, they formed the Appanoose-Monroe County Rural Development Corp. In 1964, the organization published a detailed 125 page report, pointing out the rural development needs of the two-county area.

However, because of restrictive language in the existing law, the organization in Appanoose and Monroe Counties has been unable to make any rural renewal loans. The problem arises from the limitation that these loans can be made only by "local public agencies."

This difficulty is not confined to Iowa. The Farmers Home Administration, in addition to my home State, has designated rural renewal areas in Arkansas—Little River and Sevier Counties; Florida—Washington, Holmes, and Walton Counties; North Carolina—Clay, Graham, and Cherokee Counties; and West Virginia—Hardy and Mineral Counties.

Only in Arkansas and North Carolina have the State legislatures passed the necessary enabling legislation allowing establishment of "local public agencies" to administer rural renewal programs. Thus three of the five designated areas cannot benefit from the program.

Under the bill I am introducing today, this problem would be resolved by amending the existing law to allow "local nonprofit organizations," as well as "local public agencies," to make rural renewal loans.

If this legislation becomes law, it would enable the Appanoose-Monroe County Rural Development Corp. to move ahead with a rural renewal program in the two-county area. It would also clear the way for action in present and future designated areas where "local public agencies" cannot be formed.

There is ample precedent for this legislation. Local nonprofit organizations are authorized to conduct programs established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. I can see no reason why such organizations should not be allowed to administer a rural renewal program.

The bill which I am introducing also would amend the present law to permit the use of rural renewal loans for the development of recreational facilities. This would greatly enhance the economic potential of the existing program, since recreational activities can be an effective source of new income for rural areas.

Appanoose and Monroe Counties, for example, will benefit greatly from the recreational development at the Rathbun Reservoir. The 11,000-acre reservoir, which will cover portions of the two counties, is expected to attract about 1 million visitors a year. If rural renewal loans could be used for recreational development on land near the reservoir, it would result in an even greater economic stimulus for the two-county area.

I am hopeful that the Congress will act favorably on this legislation. The rural renewal program can be of great value to Appanoose and Monroe Counties, as well as other areas in the Nation, but only if the existing law is amended to remove unnecessary limitations.

HUDSON RIVER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger], who has worked so hard and long for the Hudson River, and more than a score of Members from New Jersey and New York, in introducing legislation which will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to begin negotiations leading up to an interstate compact for the Hudson River.

Mr. Speaker, the congressional district which I represent is adjacent to the Hudson River. As a matter of fact, the 14th District lies entirely within the boundaries of a county which has received its name from the river which is the very lifeblood of our area. The people of Hudson County need the Hudson River restored and it is time that action is taken to see that the resources of this great artery are protected by Federal as well as State and local action.

I commend the gentleman from Westchester County, N.Y. [Mr. Ottinger], for the tremendous leadership he has shown in his struggle to preserve and redevelop the Hudson River. The bipartisan approach he has taken in this matter is a credit to the people of Westchester County who have sent him to the Congress. The people of Westchester can take pride in their unusually able Representative. Few Members have made the fine impression upon colleagues on both sides of the aisle that he has made in his first term. The people of our part of the United States will always be indebted to him for his tireless efforts in behalf of the Hudson River.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that all levels of government work together to restore the Hudson River. This river is vital to the very existence of our part of the Nation, but I would not want to leave the impression that this is a local bill of interest only to New Jersey and New York Members. On the contrary, the Hudson River is a keystone of the Nation's economy and the future of the United States is inextricably linked with the future of this river.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overstate the need for action to save the Hudson. This bill which I have introduced today will, in my view, assist the Federal Government to promote negotiations between the two States involved as well as provide interim protection for the Hudson while these negotiations are proceeding. I urge prompt action on this bill.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE RABBI MORRIS ADLER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Detroit has been greatly saddened by the loss of one of her most distinguished scholars, theologians, and civic leaders. Death came to Rabbi Morris Adler on March 11, a month after he was shot by one of the young people whom he loved so well. The tragic attack upon Rabbi Adler in the new synagogue of the Shaarey Zedek congregation of more than 6,000 members shocked the entire Nation.

Rabbi Adler was an eminent scholar and theologian who was respected and admired not only by the members of his faith, but by Catholics and Protestants alike. His scholarly achievements brought fame and honor to the city of Detroit, his home since 1938. Our city will long mourn the loss of this spiritual giant who personally worked so tirelessly to foster brotherhood and understanding among men of all faiths. Rabbi Adler dedicated his life to the improvement of the human condition through his religion, his learning, and his involvement in the affairs of his community.

I personally recall Rabbi Adler's sense of justice and impartiality as chairman of the United Auto Workers Union Public Review Board. I appeared before him several times as attorney for individuals who had grievances to present. Rabbi Adler always dealt fairly with my clients and impressed me with his respect for all men and their opinions. Rather than try to list all the things that Rabbi Adler meant to each of us who find a sudden emptiness at his passing, I insert following my remarks a collection of eulogies taken from newspapers around the country. To all those closest to him—his wife, his daughter, and his congregation at Shaarey Zedek—may your memories of Rabbi Adler and the fruits his great work sustain you.

The eulogies follow:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News]

DETROIT SHARES FAME WON BY RABBI ADLER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A close friend of Rabbi Morris Adler, Detroit News Religion Writer Harold Schachern, was shocked to hear of the shooting in the synagogue. Schachern was covering a Catholic-Lutheran series of unity talks at the University of Chicago at the time.)

(By Harold Schachern)

CHICAGO, February 12.—Rabbi Morris Adler, as much as any churchman in the city's history, has brought distinction and honor to the Detroit community.

Just as his synagogue, Shaarey Zedek, is considered by architects and artists as one of the great religious buildings of the United States, Rabbi Adler's name also looms impressively in the awareness and admiration of the Nation's churchmen and scholars.

HOLDS LIFE TITLE

The 59-year-old spirtual leader has since 1954 been designated as rabbi for life of Shaarey Zedek, Detroit's second oldest Jewish congregation and its largest Conservative congregation.

Having no great seminaries of either the Jewish or Christian tradition, Detroit is not known as a city of famous religious leaders.

However, Rabbi Adler has overcome this barrier by his own scholarly dedication and achievement.

His contributions to scholarly journals have won him a wide following in American intellectual circles, both Christian and Jewish.

Despite these achievements he has maintained a common touch which made his messages readily understandable at a lesser intellectual level.

Rabbi Adler's knowledge and sympathy with his neighbors of other faiths had made him a key figure in the ecumenical scene, both local and national.

He has been as familiar a figure at Catholic and Protestant meetings and social functions as he is at Jewish gatherings.

Rabbi Adler has traveled extensively and leaders of Jewish thought in Israel have looked to him as one of their principal spokesmen in the Western World.

A CLUTTERED DESK

Like most busy men, Rabbi Adler has had difficulty saying no to those who would have imposed on his time. His desk, about which visitors often joked, has always been piled high with correspondence, pamphlets, magazines, and other literature which he always insisted on reading before disposing of.

At each visit to his office, he always insisted on teasing visitors that the pile was a new one—that he had gone through the stacks that they had seen last time.

His personal library in his study at the synagogue was larger and contained more volumes than that boasted by some institutions of learning.

LONG HOURS OF STUDY

He had a comfortable couch there where he often would study late and spend the night there to be fresh for morning services.

The writer recalls the night of President Kennedy's assassination when Rabbi Adler left his pulpit at the crowded sabbath eve service to go to a telephone in the synagogue corridor. In a choked voice he expressed his desolation of spirit at the President's death.

Like many scholars and theologians, he takes his work seriously but never himself. He is ever ready to joke about the lighter side of theological subjects and employs a ready wit to ease strained relations when sectarian issues were raised.

BUILDING FOR CENTURIES

More than 1,200 persons attended the dedication of the monumental $4½ million synagogue in June 1962. The building, Rabbi Adler said then, was the largest of the conservative movement in the United States.

"We're building here for centuries," he said.

In private conversations, he cautioned his members that this was a building, not to express worldly prosperity or pride, but to express the honor and glory of God.

Clean shaven most of his life, the Russian-born rabbi grew a beard on a visit to Israel several years ago and has worn it ever since.

He is no pallid scholar, but a big broad-shouldered, barrel-chested man with the build of an athlete.

He came to America in 1906 and attended College of the City of New York before graduating from the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1935. He came to Congregation Shaarey Zedek in 1938.

During the last 2 years of World War II he served as chaplain of Rhodes General Hospital as it moved from the Philippines to Japan.

He has been active in the Round Table of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews and has participated in city-sponsored management conferences.

Until last September he was on a year's sabbatical leave with Mrs. Adler in Israel.

Only last month he received an honorary degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary and a group of Christian friends joined his coreligionists in a flight to New York City to attend the ceremony.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Feb. 13, 1966]

RABBI A SCHOLAR, LEADER, LEGEND

Rabbi Morris Adler is a man who has become a legend in his own time.

The spiritual leader of Shaarey Zedek, one of the Nation's largest synagogues, with a congregation of more than 6,000 spread across the Detroit metropolitan area.

A religious scholar and teacher and author of learned tomes; an expert on Judaism, Zionism, and the modern State of Israel, where he spent a year absorbing the young nation's new-old culture.

A hard-working civic leader—chairman since its founding in 1957 of the United Auto Workers Union's public review board, vice president of the UAW-sponsored Community Health Association, founder and board member of the Detroit Round Table of Christians and Jews, adviser to Wayne State University's department of Near Eastern languages, member of the Governor's committee for higher education, past national chairman of the B'nai B'rith Commission on Adult Jewish Education.

"Rabbi" means "teacher," and "Shaarey Zedek" means "gates of righteousness."

Dr. Adler is a teacher and practitioner of righteousness.

Steeped in the centuries-old traditions of Judaism—his father was also a rabbi—Dr. Adler has worked tirelessly for religious and racial tolerance.

He has preached in Protestant churches. He has encouraged members of other faiths to attend services at Shaarey Zedek. He has brought Negroes and whites together, saying he knows the "position of a minority in a democracy."

He has served his country in peace and war. During World War II, he was an Army chaplain, and he was the first and only Jewish chaplain in Japan when that nation surrendered. He is a past national chaplain of the Jewish War Veterans.

Raised in the Orthodox faith, Rabbi Adler switched to the conservative practice while he was an honor student at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

He spent 3 years as a rabbi in Buffalo, N.Y., before coming to Detroit in 1938 to be assistant rabbi at Shaarey Zedek.

In 1954, he became chief rabbi of the synagogue.

It was in that year that he made his first trip to Israel. He had helped finance the creation of the new nation, serving as president of the Zionist Organization in Detroit.

He made a second trip to Israel in 1964 and stayed until last August. His congregation had raised a special fund to finance the yearlong stay of Dr. Adler and his wife, Goldie.

Dr. Adler, 59, has one daughter, Mrs. Eli Benstein, and three grandchildren.

But his "family" extends to the thousands, with members of his congregation looking upon him as a wise father.

"A rabbi practices the most unspecialized profession in the universe," Dr. Adler said in a recent interview. "But my association with the young people is, for me, the most satisfying part of my work."

It was one of the "young people" who turned on him Saturday.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1966]

Rabbi in Detroit Shot at Service—Adler Critically Wounded by Former Mental Patient

Detroit, February 12.—A former mental patient climbed to the pulpit of a crowded synagogue today, told the congregation that its members "make me ashamed to say that I am a Jew," and shot the rabbi.

The young man, a member of the synagogue, then shot himself in the head. The congregation of about 1,000 included his parents, grandmother, and sister. Some members ran weeping into the street.

Both men were critically wounded. They were rushed to local hospitals.

Rabbi Morris Adler, 60 years old, a nationally prominent leader of conservative Judaism, was shot in the back of the head as he pushed a teenage boy from the line of fire. He underwent emergency surgery for 2 hours.

Since 1963, he had served as chairman of the highly influential Adult Jewish Education Commission of B'nai B'rith.

Rabbi Adler, a close friend of Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, is a member of the Michigan Fair Election Practices Commission and a member of the Labor-Management Citizens Commission.

In recent years, he had been active in the roundtable of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews and is regarded as one of the leading spokesmen for the Jewish community in Detroit.

ASSAILANT IDENTIFIED

Police identified his assailant as Richard S. Wishnetsky, 23, of Detroit and said that he had once been a mental patient. The shooting occurred in the modern new synagogue of Congregation Shaarey Zedek, founded more than 100 years ago. It is located in suburban Southfield.

Witnesses said that Wishnetsky rose from his seat as Rabbi Adler was finishing a portion of a bar mitzvah service for Steven Frank. Wishnetsky's younger sister had participated in the service.

He climbed to the pulpit, firing a shot in the air, seized the microphone from Rabbi Adler, pulled a prepared speech from his pocket and read it. His words were recorded by a tape recorder used to preserve all services at the synagogue.

"This congregation is a travesty and an abomination," he said. "It has made a mockery by phoniness and hypocrisy of the duty and spirit of Judaism and is composed of people who, on the whole, make me ashamed to say that I am a Jew.

"With this act I protest an unacceptable situation."

THREE SHOTS FIRED

He fired three times. The first shot hit Rabbi Adler in the arm. The wounded rabbi turned and pushed the Frank boy down. The second shot hit the rabbi in the back of the head.

Wishnetsky then turned the gun on himself.

Eugene Merkow, a member of the congregation who was sitting on the pulpit participating in the service, calmed the congregation.

Wishnetsky's father rushed to the pulpit and leaned over his son.

"Oh, my God, that's my son," he cried.

Mr. Merkow told the congregation to file out in an orderly fashion. They did, although the police said that earlier the synagogue worshipers had been in near hysteria.

Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh urged the people of Detroit to "pray for the recovery of Rabbi Adler."

"He is truly one of our great citizens," the mayor said. "He has worked tirelessly and unselfishly to create a climate of decency and understanding in this community. It is deplorable that a man of such noble intentions should be the victim of this senseless act."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Mar. 11, 1966]

Rabbi Adler Is Dead—Services Sunday—Wife and Daughter at Bedside—Victim in Coma Since Shooting a Month Ago

Rabbi Morris Adler died today in Sinai Hospital, where he had been in a coma since he was shot February 12 during a sabbath service in Congregation Shaarey Zedek.

With him when he died were his wife, Goldie, who has spent much of the time since the shooting at his bedside, and his daughter, Mrs. Shulamith Benstein.

The religious leader had suffered brain damage from a bullet wound in the head. His condition had worsened during the last several days despite intensive care and two brain operations.

SUNDAY SERVICES

Services for Rabbi Adler will be held at 2 p.m., Sunday in Shaarey Zedek, 27375 Bell, Southfield. His body will not lie in state. The place of burial has not been decided.

His family requested that memorial offerings be made to the congregation's Morris Adler Scholarship Fund, or to any charity.

Governor Romney proclaimed Sunday as a day of mourning throughout the State.

Rabbi Adler died at 7:42 a.m.

His attacker, 23-year-old Richard Wishnetsky, who had a record of mental illness, died of a self-inflicted wound 4 days after the shooting.

The death of the 59-year-old rabbi robs the city of a great humanitarian and a leader of religious thought.

A WIDE ROLE

Although his duties as spiritual leader of Detroit's largest Conservative Jewish congregation were taxing in themselves, Rabbi Adler's role in the city went far beyond this.

In his 28 years as rabbi of Congregation Shaarey Zedek he became a key figure in the national and local ecumenical scene because of his understanding of other faiths.

A man of great sympathy and good will, he was a founder and board member of the Detroit Round Table of Catholics, Protestants and Jews.

Widely traveled, Rabbi Adler had recently concluded a sabbatical year in Israel. That young nation had come to regard him as one of its leading spokesmen to the Western World.

Born in Russia, Rabbi Adler was brought to the United States in 1912. He graduated from College of the City of New York and then from the Jewish Theological Seminary.

He was named rabbi at Congregation Shaarey Zedek in 1938 after serving in Buffalo. During World War I, he served in the Pacific Theater as chaplain of Rhodes General Hospital.

DEDICATES SYNAGOGUE

His physical monument in his lifetime was the magnificent, $4¼ million synagogue building dedicated in 1962.

He pointed out at the time that the building was the largest of the conservative movement in the United States and declared:

"We're building here for centuries."

But he often cautioned that the building was to express the honor and glory of God rather than to reflect worldly prosperity.

HEADS UAW PANEL

In 1957, Rabbi Adler was named chairman of the UAW Public Review Board which acts as a final appeal panel for union members.

Boards and civic bodies on which he served included the Governor's Committee for Higher Education, the State Cultural Commission, the Governor's Commission on problems of the Aging, the Fair Election Practices Commission and the Citizens' Committee for Equal Opportunity.

On his 25th anniversary at Shaarey Zedek, State and community leaders joined in a special "service of tribute."

ROMNEY AT TRIBUTE

Speakers included Governor Romney, Federal Judge Wade H. McCree Jr., UAW President Walter P. Reuther and the Reverend Henry Hitt Crane, pastor-emeritus of Central Methodist Church.

Surviving Rabbi Adler are his wife, his daughter and three grandchildren.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Mar. 11, 1966]

Romney, Cavanagh Lead Adler Tributes

Tributes to Rabbi Morris Adler as a spiritual leader not only of Congregation Shaarey Zedek but also of the entire Detroit metropolitan area came today from Governor Romney, Mayor Cavanagh, prominent churchmen, civil leaders, and union officials.

Governor Romney also proclaimed Sunday as "a period of mourning throughout the State of Michigan."

Governor Romney said in Lansing today:

"PERSONAL FRIEND

"The State of Michigan has suffered a great spiritual and civic loss with the passing of Rabbi Morris Adler.

"His magnificent contributions to the moral and spiritual betterment of all men knew no theological bonds.

"In addition, he was a good personal friend. His advice and counsel on ethical and moral matters were constant sources of help to me for many years, in industry and in public life.

"Mrs. Romney and I join thousands of other citizens in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow and family, and to the members of his congregation."

OBSERVE MOURNING

"I urge every citizen to observe this Sunday mourning period in his own way and to personally strive in thought and action to fulfill the high standards of moral and ethical behavior to which Rabbi Adler devoted his life."

Mayor Cavanagh said:

"Rabbi Adler was one of the great citizens of our community. His death is a personal loss to me as a friend.

"I offer the sympathy of the people of Detroit to his widow and daughter and to the members of the Synagog Shaarey Zedek.

"Rabbi Adler was a renowned scholar, educator, spiritual leader, and a man deeply conscious of human problems.

"Besides great learning, he had that rare quality of simplicity which endowed him with wisdom as a counsellor and a deep sensitivity for the needs of people. His efforts to create a climate of decency and a true spirit of brotherhood in our community are traits for which he will long be remembered.

"All faiths will miss Rabbi Adler's devotion to religious understanding which he worked so hard to achieve through the Round Table of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews."

PRAISED BY DEARDEN

The Most Reverend John F. Dearden, Catholic archbishop of Detroit, said:

"A dedicated and inspiring life has been lost to the world in the passing of Rabbi Adler.

"In the name of the archdiocese, I express my deepest sympathy to his family, to Congregation Shaarey Zedek, and to the entire community.

"We shall remember him in our prayers."

Dr. G. Merrill Lenox, executive director of the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches, paid this tribute:

"Rabbi Adler was one of Detroit's most distinguished religious leaders; none was more able than he; only a few, if any, were more influential.

"He was sensitive to the needs of all people—especially those least able to speak for themselves. He was respected and heard among the mighty but honored as well in the ranks of the disadvantaged.

"Intellectually, he was a towering giant; religiously, a good balance between priest and prophet; civically, a concerned and powerful leader."

IMPORTANT FIGURE

"He was amused when referred to as a figurehead by an enthusiastic chairman, who, of course, meant to characterize him as an important figure in the community.

"Indeed, he was a great figure in the community. His moral, mental, and spiritual strength more than matched his stalwart physical frame.

"Our sympathy is extended to his heroic widow who, through the ordeal, has manifested all the qualities of a great person, possessing a deep and effective religious faith.

"Her concern for the innocent parents of her husband's assailant was in itself a measure of her great character and spirit.

"To Congregation Shaarey Zedek, in its crushing loss, the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches expresses its profound sympathy and the hope that the example of the noble leadership of this prophet of God might long remain as a source of challenge and inspiration."

LEADING CITIZEN

The Right Reverend Richard S. Emrich, bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Michigan, said:

"Detroit has lost one of its leading citizens and I personally have lost a dear friend.

"We honor a man chiefly by carrying on his work. One statement of Rabbi Adler's that I clearly recall was, 'Remember that silence can be a sin.'

"Let any of us who see injustice in the world remember Rabbi Adler's statement—and fight for justice."

Edward L. Cushman, vice president of American Motors Corp., said:

"Rabbi Morris Adler's death is a tremendous loss to all of us who knew and worked with him in community betterment.

"He was a man of wisdom and deep concern for 'all sorts and conditions of men,' including businessmen.

"Since 1956 he had served as a member of the clergy panel, which has advised American Motors management on moral and ethical matters involving corporate human relations. He will be sorely missed."

LOSS FELT BY ALL

The Detroit District of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, said in a statement:

"Rabbi Adler's death is a loss felt by all of us. He was not only a spokesman for his faith—and a very articulate one—but frequently for the entire community.

"A sensitive concern for people, coupled with outstanding leadership ability, brought him into a warm and respected relationship with those on all levels of city and national life.

"Our heartfelt and deepest sympathies go out to his widow, and all of his 'church family' at Shaarey Zedek."

Because of Rabbi Adler's death, the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at Wayne State University has canceled plans for a dance at 8 p.m. tomorrow in McKenzie Hall on the university campus.

WORKED AS FRIEND

UAW President Walter P. Reuther, a friend of Rabbi Adler, called his death a "grievous and deeply personal loss." Reuther said:

"To us in the UAW with whom he worked closely and intimately as a friend and colleague, his life will be measured by the timeless qualities which his noble spirit reflected—love of people, social mindedness, courage, and intelligent, unselfish leadership.

"He walked in quiet nobility as a man among men."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1966]

Rabbi Morris Adler, 59, Dies—Shot During Service on February 12—Detroit Conservative Leader Had Been in a Coma Since Attack in Synagogue

Detroit, March 11.—Rabbi Morris Adler, spiritual leader of Detroit's largest Conservative Jewish congregation, died early today in Sinai Hospital, where he had been in a coma since he was shot February 12 during a Sabbath service in Congregation Shaarey Zedek. He was 59 years old.

With him when he died were his wife, the former Jennie Resnick, and his daughter, Mrs. Shulamith Benstein.

Rabbi Adler had suffered brain damage from a bullet wound in the head. His condition had worsened during the last several days despite two brain operations.

His attacker, 23-year-old Richard Wishnetsky, who had a record of mental illness, shot himself moments after he had shot the rabbi and died 4 days later.

Today, Gov. George Romney declared Sunday as a day of mourning for Rabbi Adler throughout Michigan.

A DISTINGUISHED EDUCATOR

Rabbi Adler, prominently identified with Conservative Judaism, was one of the country's most distinguished Jewish educators. His lectures and writings were known here and in Jewish communities the world over.

He often decried the absence of "creative conservation" among the different philosophies of Judaism, and "the gaps and misunderstanding and resentment" that threatened Jewish community life.

Once, in a lecture, he termed as "an irony of American Jewish life in our times" that when new forms of communication have linked the world "the Jewish community has seemed to have lost its capacity for communicating across denominational and ideological lines."

With an almost around-the-clock devotion, Rabbi Adler toiled in behalf of adult Jewish education. Since 1963, he had served as chairman of the highly influential Adult Jewish Education Commission of B'nai B'rith.

In 1964, he initiated an experiment in Jewish adult education that linked 14 study groups in 13 cities for a lecture and discussion by telephone. The project was sponsored by B'nai B'rith. Rabbi Adler conducted the experiment from his study of Congregation Shaarey Zedek in Detroit on the subject: "Will Jews Be Jews in 2084?"

In addition to writing on numerous articles on every phase of Jewish life, he was the author of two books, "Selected Passages From the Torah," published in 1948, and the "World of the Torah" (1958).

Rabbi Adler was born in Russia, the son of Rabbi Joseph Adler, and came to this country in 1913. He was graduated from City College in 1928, was ordained a rabbi at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in 1935 and was given honorary degrees by Wayne State University, where he had been an adviser to its department of New Eastern languages and literature.

His first pulpit was at Temple Emanu-El in Buffalo, from 1935 until 1938, when he went to Detroit. From 1943 to 1946 he served in the Army.

He directed the building of the $4.5 million synagogue in Detroit, which was dedicated in 1962 and is considered to be one of the largest of its kind in the Conservative movement.

Rabbi Adler was a close friend of Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers. He was a member of the Michigan Fair Election Practices Commission and of the Labor-Management Citizens Commission.

In recent years, he had been active in the roundtable of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews and was considered a leading spokesman for the Jewish community in Detroit.

Last September he returned to Detroit after a year's sabbatical leave in Israel.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1966]

Assassin's Bullet Fatal to Rabbi Morris Adler

Detroit, March 11.—Rabbi Morris Adler died today, victim of an assassin—a young man with a twisted mind—who gunned him down nearly a month ago during a service at his synagogue.

Gov. George Romney declared a day of mourning for all of Michigan Sunday.

A Russian immigrant who rose to leadership of one of the Nation's most powerful and respected congregations, Rabbi Adler, 59, died of complications resulting from the coma he entered 27 days ago when Richard Wishnetsky shot him in his head.

He never regained consciousness. Doctors at Sinai Hospital had performed two operations but extensive brain damage made the battle almost hopeless. They warned Tuesday night that the end was near.

Wishnetsky, 23, a Phi Beta Kappa scholar whose writings revealed a mind torn between flashes of genius and pits of darkness, died February 16 of the the bullet wound he inflicted upon himself moments after he shot Rabbi Adler.

The shooting occurred during a bar mitzvah service. Wishnetsky jumped to the platform and denounced the congregation, saying he was "ashamed" to be a Jew. The audience, including members of other faiths invited for an ecumenical experiment, watched in horror as Wishnetsky fired two shots at the Rabbi and then shot himself.

Romney said Rabbi Adler "was a good personal friend. His advice and counsel on ethnical and moral matters were a constant source of help to me for many years in industry and public life."

United Auto Workers Union President Walter Reuther said Rabbi Adler "walked in quiet nobility as a man among men. His good works will live long after him. And we who grieve for him are better for having shared his friendship, his compassion, and his affection."

Rabbi Adler served on the union's public review board since 1957. He was also a strong spokesman for civil rights and a former national chairman of the B'nai B'rith Commission on Adult Jewish Education.

In Washington, Dr. William A. Wexler, president of the B'nai B'rith, in a statement this morning, said: "The Jewish community has suffered the loss of one of its most distinguished scholars whose passion for righteousness, incisive brilliance of learning, compassion for the troubles of others and capacity to articulate goodness and wisdom were harmoniously combined in a wonderful human being."

A delegation of high officials of the Jewish service organization, including members of its adult Jewish education commission, will fly to Detroit to attend the funeral service on Sunday at Shaarey Zedek, the multi-million-dollar synagogue Rabbi Adler built in suburban Southfield—the temple from which he was carried February 12.

A HEAVYWEIGHT CHAMPION?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, it was a cloudy morning, and quite cool over the flat, bush-filled fields of France that day in 1944. It was, or at least seems like a long time ago. From my pilot's seat the window of the glider was semifrosted and the land seemed to be passing by so fast that it was but a blur as the glider descended. Mr. Speaker, I do not know as I compile these remarks to my colleagues that I can be completely dispassionate or entirely objective. For I want these remarks really to project a feeling I have for this land of ours that first, I would suppose, occurred to me over the fields of France some two decades ago.

I recall that within recent weeks Senator LONG of Louisiana said on the Senate floor, that, as he walked about our Capitol his chest swelled a little every time he saw the Stars and Stripes flying from a pole. With all of the controversy over Vietnam, and in general a healthy discussion of such a subject is a proper function of the Congress, it sometimes seems as though the virtue of patriotism is going out of style. As I wrote in my recent newsletter to constituents quoting Tennyson:

> There is no such thing as a good war or a bad peace.

No one wants to see bloodshed on the jungle-tangled plains of South Vietnam. Americans are constituted, by our past history and military glories, to fight a war as quickly as possible, win it as quickly as possible, and settle back to peace as quickly as possible. Unfortunately the war in Vietnam is not that kind of a war.

Surely no one in this entire Nation feels more pain when reading the casualty lists each day than the President of the United States. He must face, in his high office, the agonizing decisions that can and will affect the human life of Americans over there. I do not envy him that task. I do not find it easy myself to hear and read of boys from my district who have been wounded or killed in this frustrating struggle but the United States is committed to the cause of freedom, in southeast Asia, and everywhere else. To welch or back off from that commitment is as unthinkable as surrendering to Adolf Hitler or Mussolini would have been in my days of military service.

The discussion of the best course to be followed for resolution of this bloody struggle will and must go on. But there is some stage at which our use of free speech and open discussion becomes a transgression on good commonsense. There are times, certainly, when it can even come close to giving aid and comfort to the enemy. At least the discussion in the Halls of Congress revolves around resolution of the problem, not total avoidance of it. I am sure that a number of my colleagues presently sitting in this Hall would be hard pressed to remember exactly when the resolve came upon them to take up public service as a career. But I would bet my bottom dollar that it occurred to many of them while in military service or shortly thereafter.

It does seem logical enough that after skimming hedgerows in France or landing on sandy Anzio Beach or pushing through the steaming and rotting jungles of an Okinawa or Guadacanal that you think to yourself—"Let us go back and make something of this land of ours." Surely it was said in a thousand different ways and each and every day in this Chamber we have our differences as to what the best road is to that better land of ours. But we each seek our own truths and do the best we can. And that best in so many cases originally stemmed from a feeling of pride in the service we had given, as we should, to our country.

While it is the flags flying on Capitol flagpoles that give the distinguished Senator from Louisiana a slightly swelling chest, it is the recent action of two of our Governors, in States other than my own, who give me a feeling of pride. As I say, as a former boxer myself, that it is the actions of the heavyweight champion of the United States or the world, as it may be defined today, turns my stomach and leads me to recall those days in France with even more pride. I am not a hero. I am not a superpatriot. But I feel that each man, if he really is a man, owes to his country a willingness to protect it and serve it in time of need. I think, further, that that debt or obligation is proportional to what this Nation has given to the individual. The more he has received the more the Nation can reasonably expect, if not in actual service, for there may be legitimate reasons or limitations, at least in public mein or attitude.

From this standpoint the heavyweight champion has been a complete and total disgrace to the land that has provided him with the opportunities to make millions of dollars. I applaud the action of the Governors of Illinois and Maine in rejecting out of hand, the appearance of such an ingrate within the boundaries of their States. Surely such a production must necessarily bring some revenue to their States but what price glory. Is there a price tag that can be placed on the coffins being loaded on ships off Vietnam?

It is encouraging to see that men of courage and vision and above all patriotism sit in the statehouses of this Nation. It is almost totally discouraging to see a man who has reaped the profits of the public say this war is not his war. Is it my war? Is it President Johnson's war? It is everyone's war—and we hope that just as soon as possible it will be no war at all.

But until that time it is an effort on the part of all of the American people. And the heavyweight champion should bear an equal share of that load. There is no citizen of this land who deserves better or worse when it comes to rights, privileges, or duties. But they all go together. Who is he, or any other citizen of any race, creed, color, or denomination, to have the right to march to the sound of different drums.

I laud the intention of the American Legion to picket any theater in this Nation that shows this man's next fight whenever it is held, if at all. I further urge that the Legion be joined by the VFW, the Spanish American Veterans, the veterans of all of our wars, organized or not. Further than that I urge the citizens of the Nation as a whole to boycott any of his performances. To leave these theater seats empty would be the finest tribute possible to that boy whose hearse may pass by the open doors of the theater on Main Street, U.S.A.

And I am not talking about black or white. I am talking about green. The Green Berets that move quietly through the devastated overgrowth of South Vietnam. And I am talking about red. Not the red blood that may flow from this man's opponent's nose and spill on a canvas at $1,000 an ounce. But the red blood of Americans, black and white, that spills on the foreign ground of a southeast Asian nation in the cause of freedom, without an inflated price tag. And I am talking about blue. Not the blue-black of boxing shorts or the blue-hued purple shorts of a man who can hardly be called a champion after his recent utterances. But rather the tattered and torn blue Navy uniform of a boy blown from the deck of his ship off the shores of that distant land and continent.

I hope the citizens of this land will rise up in righteous indignation and take the money they would have spent at the box office and send it to CARE or some other worthy charity. But above all I hope that each and every seat of each and every theater will stand empty in tribute to our men in Vietnam. I hope the voice of the announcer coming from Toronto or wherever and whenever another of his fights may be held will ricochet all over the walls of those empty theaters just as the bullets ricochet around the helmeted heads of our fighting men. Only in this way we say to these men "we will not tolerate those who are unwilling to serve our Nation." We must, and should, grant anyone the right of free speech, unless and until it becomes seditious. But can we do less for those men who are fighting and dying for this Nation in a foreign land. Let us grant them their equal time and the right to free speech by an overwhelming and stunning silence. The silence of hundreds of empty theaters.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam is the most important and difficult problem which confronts us today. The situation is complex. The solutions are not simple or clear cut, and the efforts to substitute negotiations for shooting are not entirely within the control of any single government.

Learned observers disagree as to just how this war developed, and historians of the future will debate the wisdom of specific policy decisions of the past 12 years. The one thing on which all reasonable men can agree is that we want to end this war, with its terrible toll of lives and its tremendous drain on the resources of this and other countries, as soon as possible.

We seek peace and we seek independence and freedom for men to determine their own future. We prefer to achieve these goals by peaceful means. We prefer to work out at the conference table the means by which the Vietnamese people can freely establish their own government, build their own society, and develop their own economy.

If our present efforts to achieve negotiations and a cease-fire through the United Nations, or through a reconvened Geneva Conference, are unsuccessful, I believe we must continue energetically and persistently to persuade our opponents that we desire not war but peace; that we desire neither personal gain, military bases, nor political dependence. I believe we must continue our efforts to persuade them, through every direct and indirect recourse at our command, that we desire only a conference without preconditions, an effective cease-fire and self-determination for the South Vietnamese.

In the meantime, we must use our military force with prudence and restraint. We must limit it to the measured response which will prevent the other side from achieving its goal of domination, and we must guard wisely against the kind of escalation which could bring China into the war.

One of the responsibilities of a Member of Congress is to see that his views, and the views of his constituents, are made known to our policymakers. This responsibility I have pursued repeatedly. In statements to the House and in conferences with members of the administration I have expressed my views and the deep concerns of many of my constituents.

Since last summer I have advocated, both publicly and privately, that the full resources of the United Nations be brought to bear in seeking a peaceful settlement. I have advocated negotiations based on the Geneva accords and including all parties to the conflicts.

I joined in the preparation and circulation of a letter to the President on January 21, signed by 77 Members of the House, urging this country to formally request the U.N. to seek an effective cease-fire; supporting the moratorium on bombing North Vietnam; and encouraging continued efforts to bring the war to the conference table.

On March 1, I presented a statement to the House in behalf of 78 Members, stressing that our vote for a supplemental authorization to support our troops was not a mandate for unrestrained or unrestricted enlargement of the war, but rather was cast in the context of the President's assurance that our objectives were limited and designed to bring about a cease-fire and negotiations.

In separate remarks to the House on the same day, based in part on my just completed 5-day inspection trip to Vietnam, I emphasized my belief that we must intensify our efforts to find a peaceful settlement of this war. I stated that I shared many of the doubts and questions raised by such distinguished men as Senator FULBRIGHT, General Gavin, and Ambassador Kennan, and that we must not overlook any reasonable diplomatic initiative.

I again warned against the risk of taking military steps which, in an attempt to hasten victory, might bring on a still larger war. And I emphasized the importance of encouraging our policy planners to make clear that we would negotiate with all those who are actively engaged in carrying on this war.

In this connection, it is pertinent to mention that as far back as August 9, 1965, Congressmen HENRY REUSS and I, in a television broadcast on channel 2, Oakland, stated that we should negotiate with all the people who are shooting at us, including the Vietcong.

I would also like to make it clear that I endorse the present open hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and applaud the committee's efforts to throw more light on our policy and relationships with Communist China.

As a former labor negotiator, I know that practical realities limit the extent to which conferees can unilaterally announce in advance what positions they will take if and when the other side agrees to talk. Our Government has repeatedly said, in public announcements and in private communications, that it imposes no prior limitations or preconditions on what can be discussed or negotiated. Much as we would like the President and other officials to spell out more details, we must recognize that the success of their efforts is even more important.

Many have asked why the other side persists in fighting if we have made clear our willingness to negotiate and to abide by the results of free elections. I do not know the answer, and the questions trouble me, too.

Perhaps our opponents expect to win militarily and deliberately reject the risks of free elections.

Perhaps they do not believe us, or perhaps they mistrust the Saigon Government.

Possibly the discourse between Hanoi, Moscow, and Peiping involves complexities and conflicts which require more time to resolve.

Whatever the stumbling blocks, we must tirelessly seek to overcome them. With the dangers of a larger and much more costly war on one hand, and the unmet needs of our own society on the other, the stakes are simply too great not to make every reasonable and practical effort.

The decisionmaking process in a democracy involves the study and counsel of many advisers. Inevitably they will vary in their views as to which course is wisest.

For my part I shall continue to urge, by whatever means my judgment indicates will be most effective under the circumstances, that we adhere to our announced policy of a firm but limited military resistance; that we encourage long-needed economic and social reforms; that we search tirelessly for some means of bringing this conflict from the battlefields to the conference table; and that we support free elections, under appropriate international safeguards, so that the people of Vietnam may truly and independently determine their own future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted the following Members (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

Mr. MATHIAS, for today, on account of illness.

Mr. REINECKE, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. ELLSWORTH, for today, on account of illness.

Mr. MOORE, for today, on account of family illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 16, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, March 17, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, on Friday, March 18, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO.
Mr. CALLAN.
Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.
Mr. JOELSON.
Mr. TRIMBLE.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.
Mr. FEIGHAN.
Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mr. BOLAND.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of metals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2835. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution to approve the selection of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2614. An act to provide for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska Purchase.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines;

H.R. 8030. An act to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12752. An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 14, 1966, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12889. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2180. A letter from the chief scout executive, National Council, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the 56th annual report of the growth and effectiveness of the Boy Scouts of America, for the year 1965 (H. Doc. No. 410); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2181. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for the Post Office Department for "Transportation" for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2182. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for the Post Office Department for "Operations" for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriations to provide for certain increased pay costs and for handling a greater mail volume, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2183. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83-172; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2184. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2185. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff on December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2186. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvements in the management of moneys held in trust for Indians, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2187. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of loan program financial statements for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2188. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improved procedures for determining ability of patients and responsible relatives to pay for care at St. Elizabeths Hospital, Department of Public Health, District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2189. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the management of inventories by the Army Map Service, Washington, D.C., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2190. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the relocation of railroad facilities, Walter F. George lock and dam, Fort Gaines, Ga., Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2191. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of possible savings in ocean transportation costs for surplus agricultural commodities donated under titles II and III, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Agency for International Development, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2192. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Virgin Islands Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Virgin Islands Corporation on the operation of its saline water plant at St. Thomas, V.I., for the year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 85-913; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2193. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 53d Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 604; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2194. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 Decennial Census; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2195. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 707. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 774. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2394, an act to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 775. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6785, a bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1326). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1791. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State; with amendments (Rept. No. 1327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee of Conference. H.R. 12169. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1328). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 13614. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13615. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 13616. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 13617. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for certain members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 13618. A bill to mesh the combined efforts of government at all levels with private endeavors to provide jobs and dignity for the poor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 13619. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 13620. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder, and to provide child's insurance annuities for children between 18 and 22 who are full-time students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13621. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend certain mailing privileges with respect to parcels to members of the Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel in Vietnam and other overseas areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 13622. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUOT:

H.R. 13623. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 13624. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 13625. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 13626. A bill providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13627. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize reimbursement of States that prefinance certain treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request)

H.R. 13628. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 13629. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 13630. A bill to provide a permanent milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 13631. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13632. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13633. A bill providing for an additional administrative assistant for all House Members; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 13634. A bill relating to the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers from civil service registers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 13635. A bill to increase the rate of pension payable to veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, and the widows and children of such veterans who are receiving pension under the provisions of title 38, United States Code, as in effect on June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 13636. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13637. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a National Visitor Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13638. A bill to assist the States in providing technical recreation service and advice to private landowners and local public agencies relating to the management and development of areas for public outdoor recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 13639. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 88-240 to provide that the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission shall cease to exist on November 6, 1967; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13640. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13641. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 13642. A bill to include railroad retirement benefits as income of veterans for Veterans' Administration pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13643. A bill to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate certain duplications in Federal benefits now payable for the same, or similar, purpose; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13644. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to credit physicians and dentists with 20 or more years of service in the Veterans' Administration with certain service for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13645. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to credit physicians, dentists, and nurses with 20 or more years of service in the Veterans' Administration with certain service for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13646. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to credit physicians and dentists with 20 or more years of service in the Veterans' Administration with certain service for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 13647. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13648. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to increase health benefits for dependents of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13649. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a civilian health benefits program for retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 13650. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13651. A bill to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13652. A bill to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 13653. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize reimbursement of States, municipalities, or intermunicipal or interstate agencies that wish to undertake the construction of treatment works in advance of the availability of funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13654. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 13655. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize reimbursement of States, municipalities, or intermunicipal or interstate agencies that wish to undertake the construction of treatment works in advance of the availability of funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13656. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act so as to accord injured employees entitled to benefits thereunder freedom to choose the services of optometrists; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 13657. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 13658. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that the judicial district of Maryland shall be comprised of a northern and southern division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 13659. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, and handling of dogs and cats in commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 13660. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 13661. A bill to authorize the disposal of battery grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13662. A bill to authorize the disposal of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13663. A bill to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 13664. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, so as to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable with respect to service-connected deaths; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13665. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13666. A bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 13667. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 13668. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13669. A bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 13670. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13671. A bill to provide for the imposition of quotas on mink skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13672. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13673. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prevent certain employees of community action agencies and Volunteers in Service to America from engaging in pernicious political activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 13674. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 13675. A bill to require certain safety devices on motor vehicles sold, shipped, or used in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13676. A bill to prescribe certain safety features for all motor vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 13677. A bill to provide that the social security benefits provided by the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 for certain uninsured individuals at age 72 shall apply in the case of residents of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 13678. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN ANDREWS:

H.J. Res. 895. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 896. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 897. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 as National UNICEF Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.J. Res. 898. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 899. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 900. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.J. Res. 901. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 902. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 776. Resolution providing additional compensation for services performed by employees in the House Publications Distribution Service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 777. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 778. Resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers offered by the late Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives during the 89th Congress to the time of his demise; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 13679. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Matteo Groppo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 13680. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Colucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 13681. A bill for the relief of Nadia Khalaf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 13682. A bill for the relief of Donald E. Auseon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13683. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Ivins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13684. A bill for the relief of Pantelis Andreas Gavrilos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 13685. A bill for the relief of Maj. Robert Sanabria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith H. Amos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13687. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 13688. A bill for the relief of Mario Noto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 13689. A bill for the relief of William Scoville Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 13690. A bill for the relief of Sarah Kozminsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13691. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 13692. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Miri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 13693. A bill for the relief of Dr. Johan Zwaan and his wife, Fransje Zwaan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13694. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Davi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13695. A bill for the relief of Luis Botelho Mota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

350. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., relative to home rule for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

Rabbi Maurice Lamm, Hebrew Institute of University Heights, Bronx, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Father of Mercy, on a globe seething with tumultuous, dramatic upheavals, percolating with military revolutions abroad, and cybercultural revolutions on this continent, with bursting crises of freedom in the new nations across the seas and old minorities at home, we ask Thee to bless these legislators in whom is entrusted the welfare and security of this Nation, and keep their minds free from oppressing personal difficulties of ill health and domestic unrest, so that they freely may apply their unflagging energy and deep human wisdom to the solution of the problems of America and the world.

As these Senators gather in this august House, to weigh and balance the measures that will determine the fate of men and nations, at this critical historic moment—as tense as that moment between lightning and thunder—we find ourselves in an interlude between creation and possible cremation, in the dangerous crevice between the runaway breakthroughs of man's technology and the sluggish pace of his emotions and consciousness, in the terrible psychological pause between the startling beauty of the truly open society and the worn-out ugliness of the tattered ancient blinkers; we pray that their brilliant minds, their pure motivations, and their clear vision be equal to the huge and complex burdens of contemporary national leadership.

Finally do we pray, dear God, that not by the rocket's red glare and the bombs bursting in air, may we have proof that the flag is still there—but by the tranquillity of men's souls, the decency of their actions, and the unspoiled quiet of nature's dawn, will we have proof that the stars and stripes are forever.

For this do we pray, O Lord, and so may it be. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 14, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE CURTAILS LUMBER PRODUCTION IN MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, early this morning I received the following wire from one of the major lumber producers in Montana:

St. Regis Paper Co.,
Libby, Mont.

Sincerely regret to inform you that the Montana operations of St. Regis, Forest Products Division, located at Libby and Troy, are shutting down all departments at the end of Monday's shifts, the 14th, because of the complete absence of any railroad boxcars for shipping purposes. This shutdown will be in effect until further notice; 1,386 employees and their families are affected. We have experienced shortages of boxcars since the first of this year. Last week this entire operation received 23 boxcars. The daily requirements are 30. From information available to this operation, it does not appear that any effective relief is in sight. Urgently request that you take immediate steps to assist us in securing adequate numbers of boxcars so that we may resume normal operations. We have endeavored to keep operating so that our employees can have work, but stockpiling of products has reached the saturation point. Serious problems will result if sufficient boxcars are not made available for future operations. Copies of this message sent to Gov. Tim Babcock, Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf, and Representatives James Battin and Arnold Olsen.

A. J. Agather,
Resident Manager.
Robert N. Helding,
Manager, Public Affairs.

This is the latest in a series of developments in the railroad boxcar shortage which is having very serious economic effects in the Northwest. What used to be a seasonal nuisance has now become a year-round problem of mounting proportions. The grain trade and the lumber industry have been the hardest hit. Those of us from the congressional delegations in the Northwest have made repeated requests to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Railroads, asking that they take immediate action in expediting the flow of unused boxcars to these congested areas. To date, there has been little or no relief.

This afternoon a meeting has been scheduled by the able chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], with the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, representatives of the grain industry and Senators, Congressmen, and their representatives. I sincerely hope that this meeting will bring about a clarification of the problem. Just exactly what is the cause, what can the ICC and the industry do now and what, if need be, must the Congress do. When people are being laid off from their jobs and industries are closing down because of insufficient boxcars something is wrong. There is a need for immediate and firm action, and there is also a need for the other body to take up the Magnuson bill, which passed the Senate last year and which has been lying in the doghouse over there for many months.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am delighted that my esteemed friend, the Senator from Montana, has made his statement, and for a very personal reason.

We have the same type of shortage in the Middle West, and our shippers have been writing to me, insisting that all the boxcars are being funneled out to the West and Northwest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator means to the East.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the West and Northwest, and that we in the Middle West have been stranded. The Senator gives me great comfort when he makes his statement today, because it will be living proof which I can cite that they were mistaken in their assumption, and that, while it could be the East, it is not the West or the Far West.

I have been confronted with a peculiar request from one railroad company, asking that I intervene to compel another railroad company to send back its boxcars.

I do not know exactly what a Member of the Senate or his authority can do to compel one carrier to send back another carrier's missing boxcars, but it is a problem involving all sections of the country, and it gives point, Mr. President, to the effort we made toward the retention of the so-called incentive tax in the tax bill; because I know as a fact that the Santa Fe Railroad, because of that incentive, is building 25,000 boxcars. I assume that other roads are doing likewise. But they have probably failed to keep up with the need over a period of years, and it will be a little while before the need is met, because, while 25,000 looks like a great many boxcars, it is not very many for a country of 190 million people, and the high state of business in this country.

So I am delighted by the Senator's statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader. Most of the boxcars are in the East, not in the Midwest, not in the West, not in the South; and the eastern railroad companies are willing to pay an increased rental so they can keep on using them.

But the situation is such that we would like, for example, in Montana, just to have the boxcars belonging to the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, and the Milwaukee returned to them, so that we can use those cars to get rid of the accumulated production from our natural resources.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, just as a suggestion off the top of my head, there is a summary remedy for this problem. If the demurrage were raised, perhaps fivefold or tenfold, so as to have a real punitive effect and an impact on the carriers' earnings, I think they would start sending back these boxcars.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not a bad idea. I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The junior Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to join in the statement made by the majority leader. The closing of the St. Regis Lumber Co. mills, throwing 1,500 people out of work, is only the last of a long series of events which have taken place in the lumber, mining, and grain industries. As the majority leader has said, if our railroads, the great transcontinental railroads of the Northwest—the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, and the Chicago, Milwaukee, & St. Paul—could just have the boxcars they own available for transportation from Chicago and the middle western areas to the Pacific coast, we would not be in such a serious condition as the result of a boxcar shortage.

But more than half of the boxcars that the Great Northern Railroad owns are in operation in the East. They have less than half the cars, even including those they have on loan other than their own. We should enact the Magnuson bill and be sure to see that the boxcars are allocated in the areas of natural resources and freight shipments which will perform the greatest benefit for the people of the whole United States.

Much of the movement of grain which has concerned Congress in farm bills over the years has been handicapped by reason of the fact that we do not have boxcars to move the grain. Our elevators are burgeoning with grain, there are many markets anxious to ship that grain, but we have no boxcars in which to ship them.

The shortage exists not only in Montana, but also in North and South Dakota and in Minnesota, and all the way across the West from the Middle West.

I compliment the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for holding this meeting this afternoon, and I hope that some results will come from the meeting of the Senators and others represented.

The most important thing is for the other body to get busy and pass the Magnuson bill, and, as the Senator from Illinois has stated, to keep this incentive tax going and have the railroads build more and more boxcars to keep up with the needs of our great and growing Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to what my distinguished colleague has just said, we merely want our own boxcars back.

Mr. METCALF. If the 22,000 boxcars belonging to the Great Northern Railroad were in operation along the Great Northern Railroad, people would not be in trouble along that line.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And 1,400 men would be working in the lumber mills of Eureka, Libby, and Troy.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Naturally the remarks of the Senators from Montana are of great interest to me, coming from Oregon, which particularly affects our lumber business. The comment concerning the boxcar shortage is good for a politician any day in the week. It gets attention because it is always a vital issue and the one who can promise to get the boxcars back the soonest assumes that he has gained some political advantage.

Oregon has been criticized at times for shipping logs to Japan rather than making lumber and shipping it to the big constructing areas of the Midwest and the East, but one of the reasons we have had to do it is the shortage of boxcars in which to ship the finished lumber.

With the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on the floor, let me say the way the Middle West is coming and going is because Chicago, as Carl Sandburg said so well, is the transportation center of the country and we pay homage to Chicago on everything we ship, East, West, South, except the North; but I am glad the majority leader his brought this to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, and also the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the lady from Oregon, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], in regard to the difficulty we are having all over this Nation in regard to boxcars. I share the views of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If they would just return our own boxcars, we would not have any trouble in the Midwest.

There are three large railroads in the area; namely, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe; the Union Pacific; and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroads. If we could get our own boxcars back, we could send them out to the West as has been mentioned this morning, and we could move the grain and the shippers would have no more complaints.

We have serious problems, at the present time, in moving Government grain which has been ordered to move into gulf ports by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I sincerely hope that action can be taken at the meeting this afternoon along that line, and I also sincerely wish the majority leader and those associated with him every success in getting the additional boxcars for transportation purposes.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the chief Scout executive, National Council, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization for the year 1965, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1008

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law the 'Recommended Revision of H.R. 4671' approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board on February 8, 1966, and endorsed by the Colorado General Assembly

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, such proposal currently being designated as H.R. 4671; and

"Whereas although the original purpose of such proposed legislation was the construction of the Central Arizona project, a revised draft designated 'Recommended Revision of H.R. 4671,' dated February 8, 1966, has been modified to:

"(a) Permit States in the Upper Colorado River Basin to deliver committed water at Lee Ferry without impairment of their own uses;

"(b) Return to the credit of said States funds which have been or may be expended from the Upper Colorado River Basin fund to compensate for power deficiencies at Hoover Dam;

"(c) Program the augmenting of the Colorado River water supply, including a possible importation of water; and

"(d) Provide for continuing water resource development in the Upper Basin States, including the immediate authorization for construction of five participating reclamation projects in Colorado; and

"Whereas in connection with such proposed legislation, every facet of the Colorado River problem has been continuously and thoroughly explored by the Colorado Water Conservation Board, by other agencies of the State and municipal governments of Colorado, including virtually all of the water conservancy districts, throughout Colorado; by other States of the Colorado River Basin; and by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas there has been in the past considerable controversy in Colorado pertaining to certain provisions of Senate Document No. 80, 75th Congress, 1st session, which now has been resolved in the 'Recommended Revision of H.R. 4671' approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board;

"Now, therefore, in order to make known to the Congress of the United States that the Colorado Water Conservation Board in approving said 'Recommended Revision of H.R. 4671' has the support not only of the various water conservancy districts and water boards throughout Colorado, but also of the Colorado General Assembly, the legislative branch of our State government: Be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That this General Assembly hereby endorses the 'Recommended Revision of H.R. 4671,' approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board on February 8, 1966, and strongly urges and memorializes the Congress to enact such legislation into law as expeditiously as possible during the current session of the Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this joint memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Colorado.

"ALLEN DINES,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"EVELYN T. DAVIDSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1009

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to implement Public Law 874 at the existing level or at a level based upon needs of the public schools of the States concerning children whose parents live or work on, or both live and work on, Federal lands

"Whereas, under Public Law 874, Federal moneys have been distributed to school districts of the various States to meet a portion of the costs of education of children whose parents live or work on, or both live and work on, Federal lands; and

"Whereas, there are several proposals before the Congress of the United States to reduce the amount of such distributions by as much as 60 percent; and

"Whereas, increasing needs and costs of education in the public schools have already created serious financial problems in primary and secondary education; and

"Whereas, greater emphasis has been placed by the Federal Government on improvements in education at all levels for social and economic progress in this Nation, and to meet our defense needs; and

"Whereas, underimplementation or reduction of Federal assistance under the said Public Law 874 would create new problems and hinder the solution of existing problems in public education: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein.) That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to implement Public Law 874 at the existing level or at a level based upon needs of the public schools of the States concerning children whose parents live or work on, or both live and work on, Federal lands in those States; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"ALLEN DINES,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"EVELYN T. DAVIDSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 73

"Joint resolution urging the continuation of the Federal aid to airports program

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas the Federal aid to airports program will expire on June 30, 1966, unless extended; and

"Whereas the Federal aid to airports program is vital to the Nation but particularly vital to Alaska which is so dependent on air transportation for its existence and growth; and

"Whereas a decision on another 3-year extension of the program is now before Congress: Be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska, That Congress is urged to continue the Federal aid to airports program because it is essential to the national interest and of vital necessity to the State of Alaska.

"Copies of this resolution are directed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman, House Appropriations Committee; the Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce; and to the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"H.J. RES. 65

"Joint resolution requesting a Presidential commission for the Alaska native

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas it is the unanimous view of the Legislature of the State of Alaska that a series of articles on 'The Village People' prepared by the staff of the Anchorage Daily News, Anchorage, Alaska, is an outstanding combination of well-researched and well-written text supported in its excellence by the best in journalistic photography; and

"Whereas the series of articles and supporting photographs on 'The Village People' has had a tremendous impact on the people of Alaska and those around the Nation, most of whom for the first time have learned of the economic and social plight of the Alaska native people as they strive to find their place as citizens in a fast-moving and increasingly technical society; and

"Whereas it is the conviction of the legislature that the problem of the Alaska native citizen as ably revealed and described by the efforts and reporting of the Anchorage Daily News is mainly a Federal one requiring conscientious and immediate attention rather than the piecemeal, inadequate and disastrously uncoordinated efforts of the present: Be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska combines its highest commendation of the service performed by the Anchorage Daily News of Anchorage, Alaska, in preparing and publishing its thoughtful and moving series of articles on 'The Village People' with an endorsement of its call for Federal action which the legislature earnestly commends to the attention of the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, in the language of a summary statement found in the collection of the Anchorage Daily News articles:

" 'We believe that nothing less is required, immediately, than a Presidential commission for the Alaska native. Such a commission should be headed by a nationally respected figure. It should look at the record, talk to the native people and transcend the authority of existing agencies to set up machinery for the restoration of the Alaska native to a place of equality and dignity.'

"Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"William A. Egan,
"Governor of Alaska."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 70

"Joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska,* That the following article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Congress of the United States through the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1, 89th Congress, 1st session, is ratified:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'Sec. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'Sec. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'Sec. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.'

"Copies of this resolution shall be certified by the secretary of state and sent by him to the Administrator of General Services with facsimile copies to be sent to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representatives, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"William A. Egan,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Presenting to the States a Proposed Constitutional Amendment Permitting the Recital of a Nonsectarian Prayer in the Public Schools

"Whereas in the recent case of *Engel* v. *Vitale*, the Supreme Court of the United States declared the use of a voluntary prayer as prepared by the board of regents of the State of New York to be unconstitutional; and

"Whereas it is the will and desire of the majority of our citizens to recognize the existence of God and our dependence on Him; and

"Whereas it is their belief that there is a great need to instill in the hearts and minds of our youth proper respect and reverence to a Supreme Being; and

"Whereas the recital of voluntary prayers in our public schools will accomplish that purpose and will help maintain traditions cherished by so many of our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation presenting to the States a proposed constitutional amendment permitting the recital of a nonsectarian prayer in our public schools; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 17, 1966.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"Senate adopted in concurrence, February 21, 1966.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Providing That Cancellation Stamps on All Mail Contain the Words 'For God and Country'

"Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts enacted chapter 502 of the acts of 1965, legislation which provides that on every public school building within the Commonwealth there may be placed in a conspicuous location a suitable plaque which shall contain the words 'For God and Country'; and

"Whereas veteran and patriotic groups and individuals are donating these plaques to schools and some of these groups are stamping their mail to members with the words 'For God and Country'; and

"Whereas these words appearing on all U.S. mail would be an answer to atheistic communism and to the anti-Vietnam agitators and would serve as an inspiration to all American adults and schoolchildren: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that cancellation stamps on all mail contain the words 'For God and Country'; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 18, 1966.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Memorial 1

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to oppose the Dodd bill or any other Federal legislation relating to the regulation of mail-order firearms sales.

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas since the unfortunate and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy, considerable impetus has occurred for the passage of the Dodd bill relating to regulation and registration of mail-order firearms sales; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill (S. 1592), if enacted, will prohibit citizens from purchasing a firearm by mail, and give the U.S. Treasury Department such broad regulatory powers it could subject such citizens to police investigation and harassment and lead to registration of said firearms; and

"Whereas, such requirements will cause an inconvenience, and an undue burden on, law abiding people of this country, particularly in rural areas, and such legislation will open the door for the Treasury Department to regulate who may buy firearms; and

"Whereas the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States and article 2, section 26 of the constitution of the State of Arizona guarantee to its citizens the right to keep and bear arms, and the Dodd bill, if enacted, will be direct violation of such guaranteed rights; and

"Whereas responsible organizations such as the National Rifle Association, National Wildlife Federation, and others have no objection to workable laws that will prevent the misuse of firearms by increasing penalties for crimes committed with firearms; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill, if enacted, will seriously hamper small industries that build fine custom rifles for mail order trade throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas any restrictive legislation should be directed to merely requiring that shipments of firearms in interstate commerce be made in compliance with the laws of the State of destination; and

"Whereas since practically all States have laws regulating sale of firearms to juveniles, convicted felons, and incompetents and against carrying concealed weapons, and since there are already Federal laws which make it a crime for a convicted felon to transport firearms across State lines, no Federal law for regulation and registration of mail-order sales of firearms is necessary.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States take positive action leading to the defeat of the Dodd bill (S. 1592).

"2. That the Congress of the United States carefully examine and oppose any other Federal legislation relating to registration and regulation of firearms which restricts the rights of law-abiding citizens and usurps the police power of the States to control firearms, and that it urge the State Department to exercise more control under the Munitions Control Act of imports of cheap foreign pistols and military surplus.

"3. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation.

"Approved by the Governor February 7, 1966."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 27

"Whereas increased air travel between the United States and Asia has proven to be beneficial in opening up new markets for America's and Asia's tourist and other industries; and

"Whereas a continuous expansion of these industries is in the best interest of the United States and the Asian countries; and

"Whereas Hawaii, which is situated between Asia and the continental United States, is a direct beneficiary of any increase in transpacific air travel; and

"Whereas it now costs approximately 9 cents per mile, at economy rate, to travel between Hawaii and Asia while the cost of travel between Hawaii and the continental United States is less than 4 cents per mile; and

"Whereas a reduction in fare between Asia and the United States, as requested of the International Air Transport Association by the Civil Aeronautics Board will aid materially in fostering increased travel between Asia and the United States with a consequent growth of America's and Asia's tourist and other industries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Third Legislature, State of Hawaii, at its Budget Session of 1966,* That it hereby fully supports and endorses the recent request made of the International Air Transport Association by the Civil Aeronautics Board for a reduction in transpacific fares, and the International Air Transport Association is respectfully requested to give serious consideration to this request of Civil Aeronautics Board; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the International Air Transport Association, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, the Honorable Hiram Fong and the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senators from Hawaii, and the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga, and the Honorable Patsy T. Mink, Members of Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 21

"*Resolved by the Senate of Texas,* That it hereby express its full support of U.S. policy in Vietnam pursuant to the 1954 Southeast Asia Treaty, negotiated by the Eisenhower administration; and be it further

"*Resolved by the Senate of Texas,* That it express its gratitude, as well as its admiration, for the courage, bravery and sacrifices of American troops and their allies from Australia and South Korea, in resisting the forces of communism seeking to engulf the free world within their evil embrace through armed aggression, as well as by subversion; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States; to the Secretaries of State and of Defense; to Gen. William Giles Westmoreland; and to the Presiding Officers of the Houses of Congress, under the seal of the Senate of Texas by the secretary of the senate.

"Preston Smith,
"*Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.*

A resolution adopted by the Army Advisory Committee of the State of Hawaii, favoring the continued maintenance and operation of the Armed Forces Recreation Center, Kilauea Military Camp, Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H.R. 6926. An act to strengthen the financial condition of the Employees' Life Insurance Fund created by the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to provide certain adjustments in amounts of group life and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance under such act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1071).

By Mr. TOWER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio (Rept. No. 1072).

REPORT ENTITLED "DEVELOPMENTS IN AGING 1965"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1073)

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in behalf of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] who is chairman of the Committee on Aging, I submit that committee's annual report, entitled "Developments on Aging—1965." He asked me to express his regret that he is prevented by illness from being here today to submit this report.

The year 1965 was a banner year for our Nation's elderly. Two landmark bills were enacted last year, the Social Security Amendments of 1965, which included the new medicare program, and the Older Americans Act of 1965, which established the new Administration on Aging, and authorized grants for accelerating action throughout the Nation in behalf of older Americans. These and other significant developments in aging are discussed in this report. We of the Committee on Aging commend it to Senators and others who are interested in keeping abreast of developments in aging.

Mr. President, I ask that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators Dirksen, Carlson, Prouty, Fong, Allott, Miller, and Pearson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Dixon Donnelley, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; and

Stanley R. Tupper, of Maine, to be Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3082. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, relating to annuities based on retired or retainer pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3083. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Penalver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3084. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title and to make related changes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 3085. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 3086. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to improve the quality of medical care provided veterans by entering into cooperative agreements with medical schools, hospitals, and research centers for the purpose of sharing the most advanced medical information, equipment, and facilities available for the diagnosis and treatment of human diseases and injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3087. A bill to provide for the leasing of certain unappropriated public lands to permit the extraction of minerals derived from saline noncoastal waters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3088. A bill to designate the Carlyle Reservoir on the Kaskaskia River, Ill., as the "Eldon E. Hazlet Reservoir"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3089. A bill to provide a comprehensive program to combat alcoholism; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

A BILL TO EXTEND THE ENROLLMENT DEADLINE FOR MEDICARE BENEFITS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the enrollment deadline for supplemental medical insurance through May 31, 1966.

Mr. President, the medicare bill enacted last year includes two coordinated plans: a hospital insurance plan covering hospital and related expenses and a medical insurance plan covering physicians' services and related services. Protection under the hospital insurance plan is generally automatic; the great majority of our old people will have this protection when the plan goes into effect on July 1 of this year without taking any action. But the medical insurance plan is voluntary; everyone who wants the protection of this plan must enroll. The law sets a deadline of March 31 for enrollment by people who were 65 before January 1 of this year.

The Social Security Administration, which is responsible for administering medicare, has made an all-out effort to reach all of the older people who are eligible. It has mailed application forms to everyone with an available address. It has used every possible publicity device and has had the cooperation of many Government and private organizations in trying to reach these eligibles. The results were good: As of March 8, nearly 80 percent of the persons who will be eligible for medical insurance when it begins on July 1 have signed up for this insurance. Another 5 percent have taken a definite action by indicating that they do not want to sign up.

But I am greatly concerned about the older people who for one reason or another will not be able to reach a decision by March 31. Some of them are waiting to find out what plans their present medical insurance plan or their employer may have for providing medical insurance after medicare goes into effect. Some employers and insurers have met with problems in determining just what changes they should make in their existing plans covering older people. They have not yet been able to let those covered by the present plans know exactly where they will stand after July 1. And of course the older people will need a little time to decide whether to enroll in the medical insurance plan after the changes in the private plans have been announced.

Another reason why people need more time to enroll is that we still have a substantial number of older people who do not speak or understand English, and the usual news media may not be effective in reaching these people.

With the Federal Government matching the premium paid by the individual, this medical insurance is a bargain. It should not be denied any of our old people because they did not have enough time to make a decision about enrolling. To make absolutely sure that everyone of our old people has a fair chance to make a considered decision, I am introducing a bill to extend the March 31 deadline for 2 months, until May 31.

I recognize, of course, Mr. President, that the present law contains a "good cause" provision. This permits a person to enroll after March 31 if he had good cause for not enrolling earlier. But under the good cause provision, protection cannot begin until 6 months after enrollment. A man who enrolled in April would not have protection until October. If he enrolled in May, he would not be protected until November.

This delay in protection seems too much of a penalty to inflict on a man or woman who may have delayed enrolling through no fault of his own. With my proposed extension, persons enrolling in April and May would still be eligible on July 1 when the program goes into effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3084) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title and to make related changes, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

A PROGRAM TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF VA MEDICAL CARE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve the quality of medical care provided veterans. The bill authorizes the Administrator of the VA to enter into cooperative agreements with medical schools, hospitals, and research centers throughout the country so that VA hospitals can receive from and share with these other institutions the most advanced medical information, equipment, and facilities available for the diagnosis and treatment of human diseases and injuries. Wherever practicable these shall also be shared with the surrounding medical community.

Last year the Veterans' Administration announced plans to close several of its hospitals. This action was predicated on the fact that the hospitals are remote from medical centers and therefore out of the mainstream of modern medicine. This, in turn, was stated to make for difficulties in recruiting high caliber physicians, leading thereby to substandard medical care and an inefficient and uneconomical operation.

I cannot escape the strong conviction that this is not the best solution when examined from the viewpoint of human needs. But for the moment let me agree that the Veterans' Administration is caught in something of a predicament due to the remoteness of certain of its hospitals, and then immediately remind you that this is not a problem unique to the Veterans' Administration. This is the predicament of most of the hospitals in the country. When viewing the total national picture it is clear that relatively few institutions are in fact associated with major medical centers. Most of them are in small cities away from medical schools, or in the more or less rural areas of this country. The predicament of the remote VA hospitals is the predicament of much of America. If what the VA claims is true, then it means that a broad segment of American medicine also is in a bad way, and if this is true then we are faced with a very serious matter indeed. In fact, the Veterans' Administration itself is faced with a very serious matter because I note that, of its approximately 170 hospitals, only 85 or so are affiliated with medical schools. I suspect this means that many of the remaining 85 are rather isolated and probably are suffering, or soon will suffer, the difficulties experienced by the VA hospitals under threat of closure. Does this mean that one by one, or by wholesale, other VA hospitals across the country will be closed in the future and moved to medical centers? I do not believe that anybody's interest will ultimately be served by this trend which only confuses the issue and adds to the already serious problems facing this country with regard to the unwieldy buildup of urban centers.

If what the VA claims is true, then I submit it shirks its responsibilities by running away from the difficulty. How much more in keeping with the traditions of this country if, recognizing the problem in its own system, the agency had decided to turn its best thoughts and imaginative planning to the task of improving the environment of peripheral institutions, thereby providing guidelines and help to the large number of this country's hospitals not in large urban centers with regard to techniques for upgrading medical activities in their particular setting.

I must confess being somewhat disappointed that the VA did not come up with creative ideas along these lines; the best it could offer was the traumatic expedient of simply closing down those hospitals which were not in a medical school complex. By the same token, I am proud to know that the truly creative ideas on this subject were generated right here in the Senate. On April 9, 1965, the majority leader of the Senate, my esteemed colleague, Senator MANSFIELD, appeared before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and inserted into the record a number of suggestions for bringing peripheral hospitals into the mainstream of medicine. I ask unanimous consent to insert Senator MANSFIELD's testimony into the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Closed circuit television emanating from a regional medical center could bring lectures, symposia, and demonstration operations into each VA hospital and assist in a program for continuing education of physicians. Such a program is necessary if they are to keep abreast of new discoveries and new methodologies. A two-way TV and/or radio system could be used for question and answer programs, for teaching and for consultations with prominent specialists who prefer to remain in urban areas.

2. Staff rotation programs might be instituted so that each VA physician would serve at least one tour of duty in an isolated post. It is also possible to establish regional centers or pools where young residents could be flown to such areas for emergency duty on an ad hoc basis.

3. Regional or national computer programs for diagnostic and consultative purposes might be set up to provide proper direction in treating extraordinary diseases. This could be done for X-rays, electrocardiograms, myelograms, and other diagnostic procedures. Such a service could be made available to assist private hospitals as well.

4. Long-term or chronic patients at VA hospitals might be moved to the more isolated and underutilized facilities in instances where no family hardship would be involved. Such a program might be a touchy business and is to be treated with great care so as not to create personal hardship or discomfort. However, insofar as feasible it would make beds available in the more crowded hospitals and more fully utilize the less crowded facilities.

5. VA hospital facilities might also be used in training nurses, aids, orderlies, laboratory personnel, and technicians. Qualified hospital personnel are in short supply and this would be one means of alleviating that shortage while utilizing existing units for veterans' benefit. They could be trained tuition free in veterans' hospitals and upon graduation they would be assigned to serve in areas where their skills are needed.

6. VA facilities already serve as the world's largest and most comprehensive medical network. They frequently operate in close conjunction with medical schools and perform outstanding original research. There is a great deal of national public pressure for stroke centers, heart disease research, geriatric, and cancer research. There is no reason why these could not be established on existing sites—a medical research center with an outstanding program will attract competent medical personnel wherever its location and improved medical personnel would serve the cause of improved medical care for veterans. The VA already has an excellent research program in the basic sciences and this could easily be expanded to meet our continuing needs.

If such a program were adopted the entire medical profession would benefit. Consultative and diagnostic information would be made available in every part of the country without regard to the location of the hospitals. Miles City would have the same benefits of the latest up-to-date information, treatments, and expert consultation as New York City or any other large urban area. There would be no inferior medical libraries if such a program were instituted; no area of the country would be medically underdeveloped. Information as to new discoveries and new methods would be available on a wider and more immediate basis. It would even be possible to make such a service available to all physicians and hospitals, private as well as Government, to teachers and researchers as well as practicing physicians. This could be a self-liquidating program with charges for use by private physicians and hospitals. I believe that if this plan were adopted veterans and other Americans would benefit significantly from the improved practice of medicine on a countrywide basis.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that the provision of adequate medical care and medical facilities for the 20 million veterans of our wars is not a political issue—it is not a State or a sectional or geographic issue—it is a national issue; a question of national conscience and the payment of a national debt.

If Miles City is discontinued as Mr. Driver has ordered, by June 30 of this year, it will mean that veterans, if they want to go to another hospital, could go to a hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., 450 air-miles, and I emphasize air-miles, because by land the distance is considerably longer. Or perhaps they could go to the Sioux Falls hospital in South Dakota, which is 490 air-miles away.

Or they could go to the Lincoln hospital in Nebraska 600 miles away, or to Grand Island hospital in the same State 545 air-miles away. Or they could go to Cheyenne, Wyo., 370 air-miles away, or to Boise, Idaho, 550 air-miles, or to Spokane, Wash., 570 air-miles. Of course, they could go to the veterans' facility at Fort Harrison just outside the capital city of Montana, Helena, which by air is only 300 miles, but by road is 370 miles.

There is another hospital about 150 miles away at Sheridan, but that is for psychoneurotics, and it has, I understand, a waiting list of some months at the present time.

Miles City hospital serves an area larger by far than all the New England States combined. It was a hospital built in 1951. It is a modern hospital. It is a hospital which has a low cost because I note in the hearings on the Veterans' Administration medical program in the 2d session of the 88th Congress in April and May of last year, on page 3286 there is a list of the costs of the veterans' hospitals, and strangely enough there is only one in the entire West that I can pick out which is cheaper per patient than the one at Miles City, and that is at Fresno, Calif. The cost per patient at Miles City is $672 and at Fresno, Calif., it is $667. Others are cheaper on a per patient cost, but the majority of the veterans' hospitals in this country range from $2,250 per patient cost at Fort Thomas, Ky., down to $488 at Fayetteville, N.C. The average cost per patient is $892, the average national cost $892, whereas the cost at Miles City is $672.

I am sure that this subcommittee is aware of the fact that today there are 20,000 veterans living who served in the Spanish-American War, and their average age is 85.6. In World War I there are living today 2,285,000 veterans, and their average age is 69.5 years. From World War II there are 15,750,000 living veterans, and their average age is 44.5. From the Korean conflict there are 5,688,000 living veterans. Their average age is 34.3. The average daily load in VA hospitals throughout the Nation in 1950 was 69,643; in 1955, 106,682; and in 1960, 111,408.

Incidentally during the last 5 years a number of new hospitals have been completed and others are either now in process of construction or have been authorized.

The percentage of beds used in the VA at Miles City was 82.7 percent in 1960, 82.6 percent in 1961, 78.6 percent in 1962, 82.2 percent in 1963, 87.2 percent in 1964, and when this announcement was made this past week, Miles City had one vacancy. The next day it had two because a veteran died that night.

The VA doctors handle all the cases at the Miles City hospital. The local doctors are there only as consultants. As of December 31, the patients on the rolls of the hospital at Miles City 15.5 percent came from within a distance of 50 miles; 8.5 percent, 51 to 100 miles; 50.7 percent from 101 to 200 miles; and 25.3 percent more than 200 miles.

I think that Montana is one of the States in the Union. I do not think a small State populationwise should be discriminated against. I do not think that everything should be shifted to the urban areas which are becoming more urban with each passing day. I think we are entitled to a square deal, and I hope that this committee will see to it that not only Montana but other States are treated on an equitable basis. What the Veterans' Administration has done is an outrage and that is putting it mildly.

This is not economy. You may call it that. But this is computer card economics. This is a milked economy. It is the kind of economy which tends to accelerate the process of headlong flight of people to urban areas. This will make blighted areas. The problems there are not growing less acute; that is in the urban areas, for that is where veterans' hospitals along with countless other public and private services are steadily being concentrated. In accelerating this process it is false economy, because it multiplies problems and skyrockets costs in the cities.

It is the kind of economy which tends not only to increase urban blight, but to hasten rural decay.

May I say that, as a western Senator, I have always tried to sympathize and understand the problems of the urban areas, and I have done it to my political distress, and so has my colleague. But I do not think that the rural areas should become the forgotten part of the United States of America.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in my opinion, those suggestions open the door to something of great importance to the health aspirations of the entire country, while contributing powerfully to improving health services to the veteran.

Instead of closing hospitals, the Veterans' Administration should utilize the wealth of modern technology in attempting to erase the impact of distance. Two-way television is the open sesame of doing away with isolation. By proper techniques, the wonders of medicine in the great centers of learning are not hundreds of miles away, but only so far as it takes to punch the proper TV button. Through the magic of electronics, physicians with a difficult diagnostic case can call on experts wherever they may be—if necessary, even those in foreign countries, via the marvels of future communications satellites. Entire libraries are now, or soon will be, stored in computors and readily available to any institution that may have the proper facilities for calling on the remarkable memory of these machines. Thus the latest in medical thought, expression, and writings would become available.

But this alone is not enough. It helps, but it does not establish an academic environment. This is accomplished by a continual learning experience embodied in formal lectures, visits by world authorities discussing their latest work, seminars and the availability of experts in their laboratories for discussion of problems of mutual interest. Currently these are generally only available in major medical centers. But this need not be the case. In fact, it must not be the case if the people of this country are to receive the best medical care. With the techniques being discussed, any hospital in the country could be a partner in these vital experiences.

This is not altogether a new idea. Here and there around the country it has been given attention, but not on the scale, or with the support, calculated to produce the best results. I dare suggest that unwittingly the VA may have rendered the country a major service with the threat of closing hospitals by focusing attention on a very serious national problem. I believe the time is preeminently ripe to develop fully the potential inherent in what is here being suggested, and thereby make a lasting contribution to all citizens whose health is in the balance. And what better institution to explore this realm than the Veterans' Administration. I must confess that it gives me great satisfaction to anticipate that veterans, who already have given so much to their country, shall contribute much additional service by making it possible, through their hospital system, to evolve a medical care capability in this country that will mightily serve all the people by demonstrating what can be accomplished to upgrade isolated medical facilities.

What I have in mind is that authority and money be made available for the VA to enter into contracts with selected medical schools, hospitals, and research centers for the purpose of developing pilot programs to demonstrate what can be accomplished in bringing remote hospitals into the mainstream of medicine by utilization of modern technology. The bill which I hereby introduce, on behalf of myself and Senator MANSFIELD, provides the VA with the authority to proceed.

I would like my colleagues to understand that however dedicated I am to the veterans' cause I would feel somewhat constrained in pushing for this bill if I were not convinced that the veteran's cause is the focal point of a great need for the entire country. In resolving the problem of isolation in its own system, the Veterans' Administration can make a lasting contribution to us all. The cynics often say that democracy is government by crisis. I am happy to believe that in the present bill we are anticipating a serious problem before it gets to crisis proportions and are laying out a rational method of dealing with it.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3086) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to improve the quality of medical care provided veterans by entering into cooperative agreements with medical schools, hospitals, and research centers for the purpose of sharing the most advanced medical information, equipment, and facilities available for the diagnosis and treatment of human diseases and injuries, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3086

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subchapter as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER IV—COOPERATIVE MEDICAL PROGRAMS

"§ 5051. Statement of congressional purpose

"It is the purpose of this subchapter to improve the quality of medical care provided veterans under this title, especially in areas of the United States where Veterans' Administration hospital and medical facilities are inadequate, by authorizing the Administrator to enter into cooperative agreements with medical schools, hospitals, and research centers throughout the country in order to receive from and share with such medical schools, hospitals, and research centers the most advanced medical information, equipment, and facilities available for the diagnosis and treatment of human diseases and injuries, and, whenever practicable, to share such information, equipment, and facilities with the surrounding medical community.

"§ 5052. Authorizing cooperative medical programs

"(a) The Administrator is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with medical schools, hospitals, research centers, and individual members of the medical profession under which medical information and techniques will be freely exchanged and the medical services and facilities of all parties to the agreement will be available for use by any party to the agreement under conditions specified in the agreement. In carrying out the purposes of this subchapter, the Administrator shall utilize recent developments in electronic equipment to provide a close educational, scientific, and professional link between Veterans' Administration hospitals and major medical centers. Such cooperative agreements shall be utilized by the Administrator to the maximum extent practicable to create, at each veterans' hospital which is a part of any such agreement, an environment of academic medicine which will help such hospital attract and retain highly trained and qualified members of the medical profession. As used in this subchapter, the term 'research center' means an institution (or part of an institution) the primary function of which is research, training of specialists, and demonstrations and which, in connection therewith, provides specialized, high-quality diagnostic and treatment services for inpatients and outpatients.

"(b) In order to bring about cooperative utilization of all medical and hospital facilities especially in remote areas, and to foster and encourage the widest possible cooperation and consultation among all members of the medical profession in such areas, the educational facilities and programs established at Veterans' Administration hospitals and the electronic link to medical centers shall be made available for use by the surrounding medical community on an annual fee basis established by the Administrator after appropriate studies to determine fair and equitable rates. The financial status of any user of such services shall be taken into consideration by the Administrator in establishing the amount of the fee to be paid.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated an amount not to exceed $3,000,000 for each of the first four fiscal years following the fiscal year in which this subchapter is enacted for the purpose of developing and carrying out cooperative medical programs under this section on a pilot program basis. Such pilot programs shall be carried out at Veterans' Administration hospitals in geographically dispersed areas of the United States.

"(d) Funds authorized under this section shall not be available to pay the cost of hospital, medical, or other care of patients except to the extent that such cost is determined by the Administrator to be incident to research, training, or demonstration activities carried out under this section.

"§ 5053. Grants

"(a) The Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Cooperative Medical Programs, established under section 5056 of this subchapter, is authorized to make grants to medical schools, hospitals, and research centers to assist such medical schools, hospitals, and research centers in planning and carrying out cooperative agreements authorized by section 5052 of this title. Such grants may be used for the employment of personnel, the construction of facilities, the purchasing of equipment when necessary to implement such programs, and for such other purposes as will facilitate the administration of this subchapter.

"(b) The Administrator, after consultation with the Advisory Committee on Cooperative Medical Programs, shall prescribe general regulations covering the terms and conditions for making grants under this section.

"(c) Each recipient of a grant under this section shall keep such records as the Administrator may prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grant, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such grant is made or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(d) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination of any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient of any grant under this section which are pertinent to any such grant.

"§ 5054. Coordination with programs administered by the Surgeon General

"The Administrator and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate programs carried out under this subchapter and programs carried out under title IX of the Public Health Service Act.

"§ 5055. Reports to Congress

"The Administrator shall submit to the Congress not more than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year a report of the activities carried out under this subchapter together with (1) an appraisal of the effectiveness of the programs authorized herein and the degree of cooperation from other sources, financial and otherwise, and (2) recommendations for the improvement or more effective administration of such programs.

"§ 5056. Advisory Committee on Cooperative Medical Programs

"(a) There is established within the Administration a committee to be known as the Advisory Committee on Cooperative Medical Programs (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Committee'). The Administrator shall serve as chairman of the Committee and the Chief Medical Director shall serve as vice chairman; and both, together with the Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education shall serve as permanent members of the Committee. There shall be four other members of the committee who shall be appointed by the Administrator. Such appointees shall serve for a period of three years and shall be eligible for reappointment.

"(b) It shall be the function of the Committee to consult with and advise the Administrator on matters regarding the administration of this subchapter."

SEC. 2. The section analysis at the beginning of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER IV—COOPERATIVE MEDICAL PROGRAMS

"5051. Statement of congressional purpose.
"5052. Authorizing cooperative medical programs.
"5053. Grants.
"5054. Coordination with programs administered by the Surgeon General.
"5055. Reports to Congress.
"5056. Advisory Committee on Cooperative Medical Programs."

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on March 23 the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs will hold a hearing on several bills concerning the VA hospital system. Among these are the bill I am introducing today and H.R. 11631, a House-passed bill sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Congressman Teague's bill would add the training and education of health service personnel to the already established functions of the Veterans' Administration hospital system.

I hope that this hearing will provide an opportunity for a thorough exploration of the present and future role of the VA hospital system in America's rapidly evolving world of medicine.

EXTRACTION OF MINERALS FROM NONCOASTAL SALINE WATERS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain public lands for the purpose of extraction of minerals from noncoastal saline waters. This proposed legislation would make possible important industrial development in my own State of Utah and other areas in the country which have large bodies of heavily mineralized water adjacent public lands.

The Great Salt Lake in Utah has for years been a low-cost source of sodium chloride—otherwise known as common salt which is used on our tables and in our industries. However, a great many other minerals are known to be present in the heavily saline waters of the lake. These minerals include magnesium, potassium, and lithium, all of which are important industrially.

During recent years, Utah, in its traditional pioneering spirit, has been encouraging private enterprise to look into the possibility of development of these natural resources in Great Salt Lake. Several companies, among them some large national and international enterprises, have spent considerable sums of money in economic and technological research on the concept.

Happily, they have arrived at the conclusion that large-scale development of extraction industries from the heavily mineralized waters of Great Salt Lake is feasible. These companies are prepared, they have stated on the record, to invest very substantial sums—sums running into the millions of dollars—in such development.

However, large areas of land are required for the pooling and solar vats needed. Only if land areas of sufficient size are available on reasonable terms can there be justified such huge investments as will be involved.

As the Members of the Senate know, under the Submerged Lands Act as well as historic precedent, the waters of Great Salt Lake and the lands beneath them are the property of the State of Utah. The upland areas—the areas above the meander line of the historic shoreline—are, for the most part, federally owned public lands. For the most part they are wastelands, economically speaking, being unoccupied and nonutilized. While there is some controversy as to where the shoreline, the line demarking Federal and State proprietorship of the lands above the present water's edge, begins, that problem is not involved in this legislation.

My bill deals only with Federal lands that are not, or will not be, in question. There are vast acreages of them which are well suited to the industrial purposes I have mentioned and which are presently wholly useless.

As a lawyer, I am well aware that there is on the statute books the act of February 15, 1901, found, as amended, in 43 U.S.C. 959. This law authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue "use permits for, among other things, water plants, dams, and reservoirs used to promote irrigation or mining or quarrying."

However, attorneys and officials of some of the major companies are convinced that this law, at least as presently administered, is not adequate for the purposes. For one thing, a "use permit" does not give any assurance of tenure. It is revocable. For another, under the regulations of the Department of the Interior it can extend for only 5 years at most, and Interior officials question whether this 64-year-old statute, enacted with nothing like the present purposes within its purview, could be held to authorize promulgation of new regulations that would encompass actual leasing authority of the magnitude required.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation is gravely needed, and needed now, in Utah and possibly elsewhere. Vast new industrial development in the West awaits its enactment. I earnestly commend it to the Congress for prompt approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3087) to provide for the leasing of certain unappropriated public lands to permit the extraction of minerals derived from saline noncoastal waters, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FEDERAL ALCOHOLISM ACT OF 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce what shall be known as the Federal Alcoholism Act of 1966.

Over the past year, there has been mounting interest in Congress to provide at the Federal level a sound program to combat alcoholism. This is one of the Nation's most severe medical-social problems. It has been largely ignored by the Federal Government up to now.

On October 15 of last year, I introduced the first specific legislation on alcoholism introduced in the Senate, S. 2657. My colleagues, Senators Burdick, Morse, and Donald Russell joined in sponsoring this bill. At that time, hearings had already begun in the House of Representatives on an identical bill. Since then, much interest has been demonstrated both in Congress, and in the executive and judicial branches.

On January 22 of this year, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in Richmond, Va., handed down a significant ruling in favor of the appellant, Joe B. Driver of North Carolina. Mr. Driver is a sufferer from alcoholism, who had been arrested and convicted of public drunkenness more than 200 times. The eight-page opinion, written by Judge Albert V. Bryan, has been placed in the Congressional Record by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] but I think that one paragraph in that unanimous decision is worth repeating.

Judge Bryan stated:

> The upshot of our decision is that the State cannot stamp an unpretending chronic alcoholic as a criminal, if his drunken public display is involuntary as a result of the disease. However, nothing we have said precludes appropriate detention of him for treatment and rehabilitation so long as he is not marked a criminal.

For all who have compassion for the sick and helpless, and for all who would move forward to help them, this decision is to be applauded. To continue to mark the alcoholic as criminal, is no less than a criminal act of society.

We must, however, now begin to lay plans and implement constructive programs for handling the chronic inebriate. Delay in following through on this enlightened court decision would be indefensible.

In his health and education message to Congress on March 1, President Johnson included a very positive section concerning alcoholism:

> The alcoholic suffers from a disease which will eventually yield to scientific research and adequate treatment. Even with the present limited state of our knowledge, much can be done to reduce the untold suffering and uncounted waste caused by this infliction. I have instructed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint an Advisory Committee on Alcoholism; establish in the Public Health Service a center for research on the cause, prevention, control and treatment of alcoholism; develop an education program in order to foster public understanding based on scientific fact; and work with public and private agencies on the State and local levels to include this disease in comprehensive health programs.

To my knowledge, Mr. President, this is the first time in history that a President has made specific reference to the need to combat alcoholism at the Federal level in a message to Congress. This statement by President Johnson makes it emphatically clear that he sees the need for a comprehensive program of alcoholism control.

Because of these recent developments and because of the extensive interest in this problem shown by Congress, I have called upon several professional organizations to help in the development of this bill—which in their opinion represents a feasible Federal program. Included among those who have offered invaluable assistance and consultation are the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs, the National Council on Alcoholism, and the Christopher D. Smithers Foundation.

In my State of Utah, Mr. Clyde Gooderham of the Utah State Board on Alcoholism has been an inspiration. The private Utah Alcoholism Foundation has always been ready, willing, and able to provide valuable help.

Alcoholism is a tremendous problem. The many thousands of chronic alcoholic court cases which will be affected by Judge Byran's opinion, and perhaps by similar opinions in other cases which are now pending in the Nation, represent but a small percentage of America's alcoholic population—though perhaps the easiest portion of the total alcoholic population to identify.

Whereas it is estimated that between 70 and 75 million Americans consume alcoholic beverages to some extent, but without apparent excess consumption, it has been estimated that more than 5 million citizens are alcoholics. For each alcoholic, several other persons, such as relatives, friends, police and court workers, and others, are affected.

Mr. President, direct involvement includes more than 10 percent of our population. In this population group, the impact of alcoholism greatly compounds the other social and health problems facing this Nation.

The crime rate, juvenile delinquency resulting from poor parental guidance in the homes of alcoholics, divorce rates which constantly rise, poverty—these and other social problems are greatly magnified by alcoholism.

Additionally, our gross national product, which is the world's best, is hampered by the residual effects of alcoholism among the employees of industry.

In all candor, it is time we faced this problem squarely. It is time this disease was tackled through a sound, well-planned program at the Federal level in keeping with the President's desire. This is not a partisan issue. Some 20 Members of both parties in the 89th Congress have sponsored alcoholism legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table for 10 days so that my colleagues may join me in sponsoring this legislative milestone.

I also ask that the bill be printed in full following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 3089) to provide a comprehensive program to combat alcoholism, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3089

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Alcoholism Act of 1966."

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES; DEFINITIONS

Declaration of objectives

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that alcoholism is a disease and a National health problem requiring independent Federal action and Federal assistance for State programs to conduct and foster basic research relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of alcoholism; to develop and demonstrate new methods and techniques for the prevention of alcoholism and the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics; to improve and coordinate community services for the prevention of alcoholism and the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics; and to support programs for the specialized training of persons to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) The Congress further declares that, in addition to the funds provided for under this Act, it is the policy of the Congress that other Federal legislation providing for Federal or federally-assisted State research, prevention, treatment, or rehabilitation programs in the fields of health and disease shall be utilized to help eradicate alcoholism as a major health problem.

Definitions

SEC. 102. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(2) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the Administration on Alcoholism; and

(3) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa.

TITLE II—ALCOHOLISM CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

Establishment of Administration

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Administration to be known as the Alcoholism Control Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration").

(b) The Administration shall be under the direction of a Commissioner on Alcoholism who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall be an individual who has knowledge of, and an interest in, the subject of alcoholism.

Functions of Administration

SEC. 202. (a) It shall be the duty and function of the Administration to—

(1) serve as a clearinghouse for information related to alcoholism;

(2) assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to alcoholism;

(3) administer the grants and contracts provided for by Titles III, IV, and V of this Act;

(4) develop, encourage, and foster plans and programs in the field of alcoholism;

(5) provide technical assistance and consultation to States and political subdivisions thereof with respect to programs for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of alcoholics;

(6) prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the prevention and treatment of alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of alcoholics;

(7) gather statistics in the field of alcoholism which other Federal agencies are not collecting; and

(8) stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

(b) In addition to the duties and functions set forth in subsection (a), it shall also be the duty and function of the Administration to assist in coordinating all Federal efforts to deal with the problems of alcoholism and alcoholics, including, but not limited to, those involving the following Acts, as amended, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, Manpower Development and Training Act, Older Americans Act of 1965, Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965, Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, Hospital and Medical Facilities Amendments of 1964, Social Security Act, Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the civil service laws, and laws providing for the treatment and discharge of members of the armed forces and the support and treatment of veterans of the armed forces.

TITLE III—GRANTS FOR STATE PROGRAMS

Program grants

SEC. 301. The Secretary shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and during succeeding fiscal years, a program of grants to States in accordance with this title for—

(1) planning and coordination of programs for carrying out the purposes of this Act;

(2) establishment of new, or expansion of existing, programs (including pilot programs) to carry out such purposes, including establishment of new or expansion of existing centers providing treatment, vocational and other rehabilitation services, and informational, health, welfare, counseling, and referral services for alcoholics, and assisting alcoholics to take advantage of volunteer community or civic services.

Allotments

SEC. 302. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated for a fiscal year under section 704(a), there shall be allotted to (A) the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa an amount equal to five-tenths of 1 per centum of such sum, and (B) to each other State an amount equal to 1 per centum of such sum.

(2) From the remainder of the sum so appropriated for a fiscal year each State shall be allotted an additional amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population of such State bears to the population of all of the States, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce.

(3) A State's allotment for a fiscal year under this title shall be equal to the sum of the amounts allotted to it under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State notifies the Secretary will not be required for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Secretary may fix, to other States which the Secretary determines (1) have need in carrying out their State plans so approved for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under subsection (a), and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts for projects approved by the State during the period for which the original allotment was available. Such reallotments shall be made on the basis of the State plans so approved, after taking into consideration the population criteria referred to in subsection (a)(2). Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a).

(c) The amount of each allotment to any State for any fiscal year shall be available to such State, if such State has a plan approved by the Secretary under section 303 in effect on the first day of such fiscal year, to pay not more than 75 per centum of the total cost of carrying out the State plan.

(d) A State which, on the day of enactment of this title, has no existing alcoholism plan shall, upon application, receive, without obligation to expend any State funds, not more than $50,000 to enable it to prepare a plan for establishing an alcoholism program. Any amount so paid shall be charged to the allotment of the State determined in accordance with section 302.

State plans

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary shall approve a State plan for purposes of this title which—

(1) establishes or designates a single State agency as the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan, which agency shall be the agency primarily responsible for coordination of State programs and activities related to the purposes of this Act;

(2) provides for the development of programs and activities for carrying out the purposes of this Act, including the furnishing of consultative, technical, or information services to agencies and organizations engaged in activities relating to the special problems of alcoholics and alcoholism, and for coordinating the activities of such agencies and organizations to the extent feasible;

(3) provides for consultation with, and utilization pursuant to agreement with the head thereof of the services and facilities of, appropriate agencies and organizations in the development and implementation of such programs and activities;

(4) provides such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards of the applicable State authority, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

(5) sets forth criteria for determining the priority of projects in the State, and provides for approval of such projects in the order determined by application of such criteria;

(6) provides for a hearing before the State agency for any applicant whose application for approval of a project is denied; and

(7) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable him to perform his functions under this title and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

The Secretary shall not finally disapprove any State plan, or any modification thereof submitted under this subsection, without first affording the State reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of a State plan approved under subsection (a), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to such State under this title (or payments shall be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(c) A State which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Secretary under subsection (a) or (b) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Secretary may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Secretary's action.

Costs of State plan administration

SEC. 304. From a State's allotment under section 302 for a fiscal year, not more than 10 per centum or $15,000, whichever is the larger, shall be available for paying one-half (or such smaller portion as the State may request) of the costs of the State agency (established or designated as provided in section 303(a)(1)) in administering the State plan approved under section 303, including the costs of carrying on the functions referred to in subsection (a)(3) thereof.

Funds not to be available to replace present State expenditures

SEC. 305. No funds shall be available under this title to any State that hereafter reduces the amount of State funds committed at the time on enactment of this Act to programs for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

Payments

SEC. 306. Payments under this title may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE IV—DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Project grants and contracts

SEC. 401. In order to encourage National, State, and local efforts to apply new methods to the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and the rehabilitation of alcoholics, the Secretary is authorized to carry out the purposes of this Act through grants to, or contracts with, any agency, organization, institution, or individual—

(a) to demonstrate new approaches, techniques, and methods that promise substantial contribution toward the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and the rehabilitation of alcoholics;

(b) to develop or demonstrate approaches, methods, and techniques for achieving or improving coordination of community services and facilities (including law enforcement facilities) for the handling and treatment of alcoholics; or

(c) to evaluate such approaches, methods, and techniques, as well as others that may assist alcoholics to enjoy wholesome and meaningful living and to resume their contributions to the strength and welfare of our Nation.

Payments of grants

SEC. 402. (a) Payments under this title pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) and advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

(b) The Secretary shall, when appropriate, consider the relationship of a grant or contract proposed under this title to the State plan, if any, established pursuant to section 303(a) in the State in which the project supported by such grant or contract will be operated.

(c) No grant or contract shall be made or entered into under this title until such proposed grant or contract has been approved by a majority of the members of the National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism.

TITLE V—TRAINING PROJECTS

Project grants and contracts

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to or contracts with any agency, organization, institution, or individual for the specialized training of persons working or preparing to work in carrying out programs related to the purposes of this Act, whether on a remunerated or volunteer basis (including, but not limited to, physicians, other medical professionals, sociologists, psychologists, social workers, teachers, clergymen, law enforcement officials, and members of other supporting disciplines).

Payment of grants

SEC. 502. (a) Payment under this title pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

(b) The Secretary shall, when appropriate, consider the relationship of a grant or contract proposed under this title to the State plan, if any, established pursuant to section 303(a) in the State in which the project supported by such grant or contract will be operated.

(c) No grant or contract shall be made or entered into under this title until such proposed grant or contract has been approved by a majority of the members of the National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism.

TITLE VI—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALCOHOLISM

Establishment of institute

SEC. 601. Title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., ch. 6A, subch. III) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART F—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALCOHOLISM

"Establishment of institute

"SEC. 451. There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Institute of Alcoholism (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Institute').

"Alcoholism research and training

"SEC. 452. In carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to alcoholism, the Surgeon General, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism (established pursuant to section 701 of the Federal Alcoholism Act of 1966, and hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Committee'), shall—

"(a) conduct, assist, and foster basic research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of alcoholism;

"(b) promote the coordination of research conducted by the Institute and similar researches conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

"(c) make available research facilities of the Service to appropriate public authorities, and to health officials and scientists engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this part;

"(d) make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, agencies, institutions, and individuals for such basic research projects relating to alcoholism as are approved by the Committee;

"(e) establish an information center on basic research relating to the cause, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment, of alcoholism, and collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, information about basic research and other activities carried on pursuant to this part;

"(f) secure from time to time, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of persons from the United States or abroad who are experts in the field of alcoholism; and

"(g) in accordance with regulations and from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose (1) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Institute and elsewhere with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train research workers and procure the assistance of research fellows from the United States and abroad, and, in addition, provide for such fellowships through grants, upon recommendation of the Committee, to public and other nonprofit institutions; and (2) provide training and instruction and establish and maintain traineeships, in the Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of alcoholism with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for trainees as he may deem necessary, the number of persons receiving such training and instruction, and the number of persons holding such traineeships, to be fixed by the Committee, and, in addition, provide for such training, instruction, and traineeships through grants, upon recommendation of the Committee, to other institutions.

"Administration

"SEC. 453. (a) In carrying out the provisions of section 452 all appropriate provisions of section 301 shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General, in grants-in-aid for alcoholism research and training projects shall be made only after review and recommendation of the Committee.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Secretary acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of alcoholism, or for the acquisition of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this part may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors."

SEC. 602. (a) Paragraph (d) of section 301 of such Act is amended to add, immediately after "National Advisory Dental Research Council", the following:

"or, with respect to alcoholism, recommended by the National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism;"

(b) Paragraph (h) of section 301 of such Act is amended to add, immediately after "National Advisory Dental Research Council", the following:

"or, with respect to alcoholism, upon recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism."

TITLE VII—GENERAL

Advisory Committees

SEC. 701. (a) (1) For the purpose of advising the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on matters bearing on his responsibilities under this Act and related activities of the Department, and for the purpose of advising the Surgeon General on matters bearing on his responsibilities under part F of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (as added by title VI of this Act), there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism, consisting of the Commissioner, the Director of the National Institute of Alcoholism, and fifteen persons, including a chairman not otherwise in the employ of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. Members shall be experienced in or have demonstrated particular interest in the special problems of alcoholism and shall represent a variety of specialized fields.

(2) Each appointed member of the Committee shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (B) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, five at the end of the first year, five at the end of the second year, and five at the end of the third year after the date of appointment.

(3) The Committee shall meet as often as the Chairman deems necessary or appropriate, except that the Chairman shall call not fewer than two meetings of the Committee in any fiscal year.

(b) The Secretary, upon the recomendations of the Committee, is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, such technical advisory committees as he deems appropriate for advising him in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee or of any technical advisory committee appointed under this section, who are not regular full-time employees of the United States, shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such committees or otherwise engaged on business of such committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Functions of the Committee

SEC. 702. The Committee is authorized and directed to—

(a) review proposed projects or programs relating to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of alcholism, and certify approval to the Secretary or to the Surgeon General, whichever is appropriate, for prosecution under titles IV and V of this Act or under part F of title IV of the Public Health Service Act, any such projects or programs which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of alcoholism;

(b) recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance of conditional gifts pursuant to section 501 of the Public Health Service Act for carrying out the purposes of such part F; and

(c) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of this Act and to the Surgeon General with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of such part F.

(d) review the policy, work, and activities relating to alcoholism of (1) the Administration on Alcoholism, (2) the National Institute of Alcoholism, (3) other Federal agencies, and (4) the States, and submit to the Secretary and to the Congress a report at least once each fiscal year containing such suggestions, recommendations, and conclusions as it deems advisable.

Regulations

SEC. 703. The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such regulations as he deems necessary for the efficient administration of this Act.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 704. There are authorized to be appropriated the following sums for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act during the first five fiscal years, and for succeeding fiscal years such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law:

(a) for the program grants authorized by title III, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

(b) for the demonstration project grants and contracts authorized by title IV, $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

(c) for the training project grants and contracts authorized by title V, $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

(d) for the research and training authorized by title VI, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1966—AMENDMENT FOR MENTAL RETARDATION STAFFING

AMENDMENT NO. 505

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], an amendment to S. 3008, the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966, on which hearings commence tomorrow before the Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This amendment is identical with S. 2836, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1966, introduced on January 26, 1966. This proposal would provide funds for staffing mental retardation facilities in the same way as Congress provided funds last year for staffing mental health centers. The amendment would also include the cost of acquiring sites as part of construction costs for mental health centers and mental retardation facilities.

The time is appropriate for enactment of this proposal as a logical sequence to the legislation enacted by the Congress in 1964 and 1965 for mental health centers and their staffing, and for mental retardation facilities. There has been a surfeit of study on this subject—in 1961 President Kennedy created a panel on mental retardation which reported the following year; in 1963 funds were made available for State studies and by 1965 most of the State studies were complete; and since 1962 there has functioned within the executive branch an Interdepartmental Committee on Retardation.

Specifically, the amendment provides:

First. Federal aid on a declining scale over a 51-month period for the staffing of community mental retardation facilities. Last year, Congress amended the 1963 act to provide this sort of aid for community mental health centers, and the bill introduced today seeks to provide the same portion of Federal aid for mental retardation facilities. The amendment authorizes $30 million for this purpose and provides Federal aid for 75 percent of new staffing costs for the first 15 months, 60 percent during the next year, 45 percent the following year, and 30 percent for the final year.

Second. Further amends the 1963 act to include the cost of acquiring sites as part of construction costs for community mental health centers and mental retardation facilities.

Mentally retarded children can be educated to be useful citizens, in many cases self-supporting, and in most instances to be free of the need for expensive institutional care. If adequately rehabilitated, between 75 to 85 percent of the mentally retarded can become self-supporting and between 10 and 20 percent can become partially self-supporting; the remainder will remain completely dependent.

More important—and incapable of measurement—is the effect this rehabilitation will have on parents and family to whom the necessity for institutionalization is a shattering experience. And the meaning to the retarded themselves also cannot be measured in money—it is the difference between being a whole human person and being an impersonal statistic in an institution.

Three out of every one hundred children born are destined to be mentally retarded. Mental retardation is the major cause of disability among the young adults, aged 21 to 35, who receive assistance under the Federal program for aid to the permanent and totally disabled.

While communities are spending more than $650 million annually for treatment, education, and training of the mentally retarded, these services fall short of the need for special training and care that is required. They require the staffing assistance provided by this amendment.

The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Centers Construction Act of 1963 would be further amended by the amendment I introduce today to include the cost of acquiring sites as part of construction costs for mental health centers and mental retardation facilities. Experience has shown that the original act was not broad enough to cover critical situations, especially in urban areas where land is expensive and often difficult to obtain. In urban areas, this shortcoming represents a serious deterrent to the public and private agencies desiring to provide buildings for services. The provision to correct this situation follows the pattern of the amendment to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act adopted last year.

While recognizing that the matching formula in the present law is inadequate, I have refrained from including corrective language in my amendment at this time. However, it is my intention to press in committee for reform of many inequitable allocation formulas. Under present law, the Federal share of construction projects varies from 33⅓ to 66⅔ percent among the States. Under this formula, an organization or community with modest resources would receive the minimum Federal share if located in a high-income State and, conversely, a well-to-do community or organization would receive the maximum Federal contribution if located in a low-income State. This obviously is unfair and demands correction.

I urge all who are concerned with the well-being and rehabilitation of the mentally retarded to join in this effort to bring to these unfortunates the care and training they require and which, all too often, overburdened State, local, and private agencies are unable to provide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 505) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as cosponsors of the bill, S. 2935, to provide regional solutions for transportation problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 128, the Atlantic Union resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the Adult Health Protection Act (S. 2983), the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] be added as a cosponsor to S. 2877, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added as a cosponsor to S. 2903, a bill to extend the registration period for medicare benefits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 2, 1966, the names of Mr. CARLSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 231) relating to the distribution among the States of research and development funds made available by Government agencies, submitted by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and other Senators) on March 2, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON DUAL DISTRIBUTION BILLS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, last September the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly held 3 days of hearings on the so-called dual distribution bills, S. 1842, S. 1843, and S. 1844, filed by the able assistant majority leader, Senator LONG, of Louisiana. It was announced that further hearings would be held this year. I announced resumption of the hearings on March 29, 30, and 31 at 10 a.m. in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Persons, other than those who have already asked to be heard, interested in testifying or filing a statement on these bills should contact promptly the subcommittee staff, room 412, Old Senate Office Building. It is anticipated that these will conclude public hearings on the proposed legislation.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2855, TO GOVERN THE RECOVERY OF FUGITIVE BAILEES BY BAIL BONDSMEN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, and for my distinguished colleague, Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, who is chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, I wish to announce that the two subcommittees will hold a joint hearing on S. 2855, a bill to govern the recovery of fugitive bailees by bail bondsmen. The hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, April 5, 1966, at 9:30 a.m. in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

According to longstanding court decisions a bondsman has unbridled power to take a bailee into custody summarily at any time and return him to the public officials who sanctioned his release. There is virtually no restriction placed upon what a bondsman may do to effect this return. The bondsman's summary power over his bailee permits him to pursue the bailee across State lines and forcibly recapture the bailee without regard to even elementary considerations of procedural due process. This state of the law has its roots in a philosophy that regards the bailee as nothing more than the bondsman's chattel.

The bill for consideration by the subcommittees on April 5 would remedy this defect in existing law. It provides procedures which will permit the return of a fugitive bailee to the jurisdiction that granted him bail, but only after the bondsman has obtained a warrant from a Federal judicial officer for the fugitive's removal.

Any person who desires to testify on S. 2855 should contact immediately the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6308, New Senate Office Building, or the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, room 102B, Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2282, THE ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND SURVEYS BILL

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee next month will conduct an open public hearing on S. 2282, the ecological research and surveys bill.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. Thursday, April 21, in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

The measure would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research, study and surveys, documentation, and description of the natural environmental systems of the United States, for the purpose of understanding and evaluating the systems.

Any person interested in presenting testimony on the bill is invited to notify the committee in writing.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

William H. Terrill, of Colorado, to be U.S. marshal, district of Colorado, term of 4 years (reappointment).

Clinton N. Ashmore, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney, northern district of Florida, term of 4 years (reappointment).

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, March 22, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CONSTANCE BAKER MOTLEY TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee on the judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, April 4, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Constance Baker Motley, of New York, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of New York, vice Archie O. Dawson, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and myself as chairman.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Joseph Palmer II, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 15, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2614) to provide for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska Purchase.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address entitled "Water Quality and the National Interest," delivered by Senator Muskie, of Maine, at the Public Water Supply Seminar, American Water Works Association, on March 1, 1966.

SENATOR MANSFIELD AND NATO

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] made what is, to me, an extremely significant statement with respect to NATO and its future in the light of General de Gaulle's most recent actions.

I should like to associate myself with the position taken by the majority leader.

Paraphrasing some of the things he said, and I note that his talk begins on page 5596 of the March 14 Congressional Record, I agree that the time has become ripe to reevaluate in a fundamental way the significance of NATO. The responsibility and the burden still borne heavily by the United States might be properly reduced, especially in view of our commitments in Vietnam.

The search, in my judgment, should be begun at once, and without panic or rancor, for a further evolution in the organizational structure which will preserve the essence of the treaty.

It may well be that on closer examination, the NATO nations will find that now is perhaps the proper time to begin an appraisal of the NATO structure on the basis of current political and military realities in Europe and the world.

From the point of view of the United States, I agree with the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] that one aspect which is clearly worthy of consideration in this respect is the question of reducing U.S. day-to-day obligations of its forces in Europe. For one thing, short of nuclear war, it is obvious that Europe is in a position to take much better care of its own general defense than a few years ago. In an economic sense, the situation is drastically changed for the better for Western Europe, not only domestically but also in the region's overall international position, particularly insofar as the balance of payments is concerned.

I would hope that the State Department is giving active and prayerful consideration to the change in our situation in Western Europe. I would have some fear that it is not. In all too many instances in the recent past, the attitude has been frozen, despite the fact that the situation itself is fluid and flexible.

I would also hope, let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], that perhaps the Committee on Foreign Relations would engage in some such reappraisal of our Western European, our Russian, our German, and our French policies as is presently being conducted in connection with our China policy.

(At this point Mrs. Neuberger took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

THE PROPOSED BUDGET REDUCTIONS FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND AGRICULTURE RESEARCH

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, the proposed budget cuts for land-grant colleges and agriculture research are of grave concern to every citizen interested in the welfare of agriculture.

Agriculture research, as any type of research, is not something that can be turned on and off like a faucet. When we are just beginning to realize the importance of improving the qualities of our products, developing new outlets, controlling weeds and insects, and so forth, it would be disastrous to terminate or reduce any of these programs.

The recommended cut for the land-grant colleges seems to be out of line with all of the law being enacted to aid all forms of education. As the late President Kennedy stated so well back in 1962 when the land-grant colleges were celebrating their centennial year:

> The land-grant system of higher education is the Nation's largest single source of trained and educated manpower and now contributes more than one-half of the Nation's trained scientists and nearly one-half of all Regular and Reserve officers entering the Armed Forces through the military programs conducted at civilian institutions.

The proposed cuts for land-grant colleges and agriculture research reflect a cut in land-grant teaching funds of almost $12 million and a similar cut in agriculture research funds for experiment stations of almost $9 million. This I believe is unwarranted and cannot be justified.

Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State University, wrote an article in regard to the work of the Cooperative Extension Service at Kansas State University which was published in the Kansas Farmer, issue of February 19, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS EXTENSION SERVICE ADJUSTS TO THE CHANGING TIMES

(By Dr. James A. McCain, president, Kansas State University)

For more than half a century the Cooperative Extension Service at Kansas State University has contributed enormously to the economic and intellectual progress of Kansas people.

Through these years, extension—working cooperatively with university research—has helped make Kansas agriculture a miracle of production. The extension 4–H Club program has developed admirable qualities of character, service, and leadership in successive generations of farm youth. And most recently Cooperative Extension, through its services to the agri-businesses, has contributed significantly to industrial growth.

Cooperative Extension, as our society grew more complex during this half century, has adapted and adjusted its activities to changing conditions. Now extension is on the threshold of another transition in its task of carrying university knowledge to Kansas people.

Two developments are pointing the way: First, the increasing size and specialization of farms, coupled with population shift from farm to city, challenge the effectiveness of the traditional county organization.

Secondly, the mechanism of Cooperative Extension may soon be enlisted for programs of industrial service designed to assist small businesses and in other ways stimulate general economic development. The tremendous potential for such a program already has been shown in the services of Cooperative Extension to various agri-business.

Land-grant university administrators throughtout the country agree that the Cooperative Extension Service must broaden its base to tap more of the total university resources. We can soon expect extension to draw on the more than three score departments at Kansas State University.

To alter the local organization for extension will require greater specialization on the part of personnel. Doctors, automobile mechanics, and lawyers, long ago saw the wisdom and advantages of specialization. The county agricultural agent should be no exception to this trend. Today, he is being called upon for many new technical services requiring the skills of a variety of experts.

Education is another factor which has stimulated the need for greater specialization. Rural families of today have a high level of scientific understanding. Consequently, they demand more professional competency in extension personnel. In response to this demand, more of the Kansas county agricultural agents are pursuing advanced study for higher degrees.

However, extension still faces the problem of how to provide such specialized professional competence in each of our 105 Kansas counties. One promising solution is to replace the county extension unit with an area organization encompassing several counties. Changes in rural living patterns and the growing urbanization in traditional agricultural sections of the county support such a reorganization.

Under this area plan, extension specialists with talents fitted to the requirements of a particular multicounty area would be housed in a central office within the area. These specialists would be members of the universally faculty trained in the specific fields related to the area they would serve, such as beef cattle nutrition, marketing, horticulture, agricultural engineering, public affairs, or child development.

These area extension centers would be designed to give all the people access to all university resources. In addition to making specialists immediately available for field problems, the centers would provide facilities for meetings and classes covering a wide range of subjects and would house libraries and the latest teaching equipment.

Many advantages might be expected from this new type of extension organization. A group of southwest Kansas counties employing irrigation, for example, could profit from the services of a resident irrigation engineer.

A dairy specialist might be stationed in east central Kansas to serve the multimillion-dollar dairy industry there. Crop and livestock specialists would, of course, be required in many parts of the State as would specialists in food, clothing, family health, and youth programs.

Kansas State University, with a notable record of pioneering in extension, already has pilot area projects underway with highly encouraging results.

An area horticulturist to be located at Ulysses, and Dean Dicken, an agronomist at Hiawatha, illustrate how area specialists can perform. The on-location work of these two men, supported by university research and nearby county agents, is effectively promoting the agricultural developments of counties in the southwestern and northeastern areas of Kansas.

Southwest Kansas, for example, has the potential to produce profitable horticultural crops. A K-State specialist is working with farmers in such a program.

Cantaloupes grown in the area are now being marketed in such distant points as New York, Chicago, and St. Louis.

In a six-county area of northeast Kansas, Dicken is concerned primarily with weed control and soil fertility. In 3 years, Dicken and his farmers have made northeast Kansas an agricultural showplace.

Achievements in Brown County are typical. In November 1926, Brown County farmers initiated an intensified soil fertility program in cooperation with extension. Examinations of some 1,600 soil samples demonstrated need for more fertilizer to correct soil deficiencies which, in turn, were depressing crop yields.

About 65 percent of the farmers of the county took corrective measures, resulting in an increase of 145 percent in the use of nitrogen, 100 percent in phosphate, and 360 percent in lime. Corn, grain sorghum and soybean production soared to new heights. The Brown County farm income for 1963 showed an increase of almost $2 million over 1962.

A pasture improvement program is underway in northeast Kansas. Tests show that bromegrass production can be increased 275 percent with only 53 pounds of added nitrogen an acre. This treatment has resulted in an average net profit of $17.76 per acre to the participating farmers. Tree, brush, and weed control demonstrations also have shown profitable results.

Thus, an area extension program has proved its capacity to achieve striking economic gains and thereby serve more effectively the specialized requirements of modern agriculture. The area program will be designed to transmit research results promptly to the various areas of the State.

Kansans can take deep pride from the fact that their cooperative extension service has been prompt to recognize and adapt to change. As agri-businesses have expanded in scope and variety, for example, extension has developed programs and appointed specialists in such new fields as feed manufacturing, farm machinery, marketing, and food retailing. We now have public affairs specialists who help farmers and rural people acquire a better understanding of public affairs and issues that involve agriculture. K-State economists, sociologists, and political scientists are participating in statewide redevelopment programs.

As families have moved from farm to city, extension has moved with them and today operates thriving 4–H Clubs and home economics units in towns, cities, and suburbs and assists urban families with their lawns, evergreens, shade trees, home gardens, flowers, and ornamental plants.

Of course, the demands for the services of home economists in extension work are growing. The need is increasing for specialists in such fields as child development, food and nutrition, clothing, and family relations. The area extension program will require increasing numbers of such specialists.

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, I spoke in this body earlier this session of my deep dismay at the low level of the administration's budget requests for water resource development—and particularly reclamation development—for the fiscal year 1967. I said at that time that we could not afford to postpone or delay construction of important projects like the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project in my State of Utah which the 1967 budget would finance at no more than a snail's pace. I pointed out that water is the No. 1 resource scarcity in the Nation and that it was foolhardy in the extreme to hold up development which makes full and beneficial use of every drop we have.

I mentioned also what some of us tend to forget at times—that money spent to build reclamation dams is not money gone forever from the U.S. Treasury, but that it will be returned by the water users to the Federal Government when the project pays out. And that, furthermore, the projects themselves create untold tax revenues for Uncle Sam—tax revenues from farms, from new communities, and sometimes from new industries.

A prime example of what I was talking about has just come into the spotlight in my State of Utah. On the 15th of February—last month—the ECHO reclamation project paid out in full. The water users of the Weber River made full and final payment on the project. Every penny which the U.S. Government used to build the ECHO project has now been paid back into the Treasury.

I say final—and full—because in the case of ECHO, the project was completely paid for by the water users. There were no allocations to recreation, or flood control, or navigation, or beach erosion, or area development, or even electrical power.

The water users on Weber River have required 34 years to complete these payments. They have incurred the further risks of private borrowings to finance buildings, farm equipment, and land improvement. They have planned, and worked, and succeeded. Thus, they have made barren lands beautiful, and produced sustenance from desert soils. They have created a culture in the high tradition of American farm life. They have made for themselves and their neighbors a great society. They have created new taxpaying farms, and new homes and business enterprises around the nucleus of the dam.

Madam President, these benefits of reclamation on the ECHO project are pictured and described in the February issue of Reclamation News. Although the photos cannot be reproduced in the Congressional Record, I ask unanimous consent to print the article in full.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Echo Project Pays Out—Plus

As the Federal Government devises and finances ways to the Great Society, the potential of western irrigation merits special consideration because: Irrigation, while furthering the aims of the Great Society, has the following advantages. It is reimbursable, and therefore, a minimal drain on the hard-pressed taxpayer. It motivates through the sharing of risk, creates long-lasting capital assets, and provides needed consumer products. It develops water resources which will finally demand full attention regardless of other social actions.

A case to illustrate is the Echo project, above Ogden, Utah, for which construction funds were advanced nearly 30 years ago. This week the Weber River Water Users Association completed repayment of the Federal funds invested. But that is only part of the story.

During the payout period, jobs have been created and people trained to fill them. Fruit, vegetables, eggs, poultry, and meat have been produced for local use and export. The water users have paid taxes on land made more valuable by irrigation. They have collected profits, and induced others to invest in supporting facilities. And together they—the water users and the goods-and-services people—have built healthy, comfortable communities.

Or examine Echo's success and its contributions another way. Consider the evils avoided by the Federal assistance that made possible the Echo project. The farmers, stock and poultry men, truckers, railroaders, warehousemen, food processors, tradesmen, professionals, and others who are at work because of Echo would have been competing elsewhere for jobs. Their competition would have contributed to the demands for rent subsidization, slum clearance, job training, and similar measures of poverty alleviation, measures which may neither create jobs to match the training, nor cure the causes leading to rent subsidization. Thus, projects providing for irrigation in the West avert many social ills by providing an economic base of permanence.

And those benefits go on and on. In the year 2000, Echo project will be giving employment, directly and indirectly. It will be providing food demanded by larger populations, yielding taxes, and furnishing to all visitors the vistas of green pastures and flowering orchards. But this did not occur without planning; Echo was first thought of 60 years ago.

And so, while stating our thanks to the Congress, to the Bureau of Reclamation, and those bankers who financed private credits, let us be mindful of this fact in the creation of major public works; time is a dimension. How important a dimension? From the table below you can see for Echo the time between idea and reality.

Today, the continuing development of water resources makes each new concept more complex, and the risk and the cost of mistakes much greater. Considering the increasing complexity, together with the past crises overcome at great expense, and near crises barely avoided, one concludes that the time for effective planning for the future is now.

Postponement because of Vietnam, or deferment in favor of other courses toward the Great Society, would only force a later crash planning program to meet crises thereby made inevitable. Let us avoid that evil and, instead, pursue the goal of optimum economic benefit through comprehensive planning on an orderly and timely basis.

TIME, AS REQUIRED FOR THE ECHO PROJECT

Year 1904: Reconnaissance of reservoir areas.
Year 1905: Construction of stream-gaging stations.
Year 1922: Preliminary site surveys.
Year 1937: Going farms and ranches.
Year 1924: Appropriation for detailed planning and design.
Year 1927: Initiation of construction.
Year 1932: Beneficial use of water.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AMERICAN BANKS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I have good news which indicates that efforts by individual Senators sometimes get results. On the 25th of February, at a hearing of the Finance Committee, I urged upon the Secretary of the Treasury that we seek to have American banks set up in South Vietnam so that American expenditures would not go into the Bank of Indochina and thus be used as a means of constituting a gold drain from the United States.

The President and the Treasury Department have moved with great speed on this suggestion, and on the 9th of March the South Vietnamese Government authorized the establishment of two branches of American banks in South Vietnam. As I understand, they are the Chase Manhattan Bank and the Bank of America.

This is a great step forward, and if the dollar expenditures of our Government in South Vietnam are routed to these banks, and away from the Bank of Indochina, we will have a further potential saving in gold drain of probably not less than $500 million a year.

I want to commend the President and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Government of South Vietnam for moving with speed in this matter, and to suggest that it indicates that this administration is ready to receive and respond to constructive suggestions.

AMA AT LAST APOLOGIZES AND PAYS DAMAGES TO STEELWORKER LEADER IT MALIGNED IN 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, in the Congressional Record, volume 109, part 17, page 22581, I called the attention of the Senate to a fraudulent representation which the American Medical Association was making in its all-out war against enactment of health-care-for-the-aged legislation.

I inserted in the Record a New York Times article describing the AMA's distribution of copies of a phonograph record—which on its face was fraudulent—which the AMA said was a recording of a speech by Mr. Paul Normile, director of District 16 of the United Steelworkers of America, to a union meeting. The recording portrayed the union leader in gangsterlike fashion and had him threaten the audience to make contributions in behalf of medicare. Apparently the AMA hoped to encourage stronger, and better financed, opposition to medicare legislation by playing this recording to antimedicare meetings.

I made this matter a point of discussion in the Senate because I thought Mr. Normile was being unfairly attacked for his legitimate support of pending legislation—I went into the matter at some length—and because I wanted to be sure that the Congress and the people were aware of the tactics being used by the opponents of medicare.

Madam President, the newspapers have reported over the weekend that the AMA has not only publicly apologized to Mr. Normile for distributing the spurious record, but has also made a substantial financial settlement out of court

I regret that it took so long to clear up this matter for I think the Congress has a responsibility to see that fraudulent methods of lobbying or intimidating proponents of legislation are exposed before, not after, the legislative questions involved are resolved. But I am very glad to see that Mr. Normile's name has been cleared and the responsibility for these fraudulent methods has been admitted.

Madam President, although this matter occurred over 2 years ago and medicare is now law, I think the record should be filled out, and so I ask unanimous consent that an article from the AFL-CIO newspaper, an article from the March 12, 1966, edition of the Washington Post and John Herling's article in today's Washington Daily News be printed in the Record.

First, I call attention to the final paragraph of the second article, which reads:

> During court proceedings 2 years ago, an AMA official's affidavit disclosed he had bought the recording for $20 in 1963 from a middleman sent by a man known to him only as Irv, who had described himself as a disgruntled union member.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the AFL–CIO News, Mar. 12, 1966]

AMA Issues Retraction in Normile Libel Suit

The American Medical Association has issued the following statement:

"In March 1963, the American Medical Association was sent a tape recording of what purported to be a political fund-raising speech made in Pennsylvania by a Pittsburgh labor leader, Mr. Paul Normile, director of District 16, United Steelworkers of America. Believing in good faith that the tape recording was authentic, the AMA reproduced it and the American Medical Political Action Committee produced and distributed a booklet, entitled "The Voice of COPE," containing the text of the speech and a phonograph record made from the tape as evidence of the tactics which they believed labor used in support of its objectives.

"Mr. Normile thereafter filed a lawsuit alleging that he never made the speech in question. Distribution of the tapes and records was immediately voluntarily discontinued pending full investigation of his contention. As a result of its exhaustive investigation, the AMA is now satisfied that Mr. Normile did not make the speech in question. In fairness to him, the statement that he did so is retracted. Furthermore, all copies of the tape recording and the AMPAC booklet and record in the possession of AMA or AMPAC have been destroyed. To prevent further playing of the recording, it is urged that any person having a copy of either the tape or the record take similar action. The AMA sincerely regrets the error."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1966]

Steelworker Leader Gets AMA Apology

(By Frank C. Porter)

The American Medical Association publicly apologized yesterday for circulating a spurious phonograph record. The voice on the record purported to represent a labor leader threatening members who failed to contribute to a promedicare campaign.

The retraction was part of an out-of-court settlement of a $400,000 libel suit brought by the labor leader, Paul Normile, director of District 16, United Steelworkers of America.

The AMA also agreed to pay Normile $25,000, sources close to the case said.

David E. Feller, former Steelworkers general counsel who represented Normile, had called the record a complete fabrication. He said it portrayed Normile as "a semiliterate moron * * * and thug" who was violating his trust to union members.

The AMA's retraction was carried on page 1 of the AFL–CIO News yesterday and will be published in the next issue of the American Medical Journal.

"As a result of its exhaustive investigation," the statement read in part, "the AMA is now satisfied that Mr. Normile did not make the speech in question.

"In fairness to him, the statement that he did so is retracted. Furthermore, all copies of the tape recording and the AMPAC (American Medical Political Action Committee) booklet and record in possession of AMA or AMPAC have been destroyed.

"To prevent further playing of the recording, it is urged that any person having a copy of either the tape or the record take similar action. The AMA sincerely regrets the error."

During court proceedings 2 years ago, an AMA official's affidavit disclosed he had bought the recording for $20 in 1963 from a middleman sent by a man known to him only as Irv, who had described himself as a disgruntled union member.

AMA Slip Was Showing

(By John Herling)

The American Medical Association has just had to eat crow, apologize to a union leader, and pay $25,000 to settle a libel suit.

The AMA was caught in political malpractice and they are so sorry. Under the settlement, the AMA will have to print its apology in the next issue of the AMA Journal.

The story broke in November 1963, when Paul Normile, director of District 16 of the United Steel Workers, learned that functionaries of the AMA were distributing through medical society channels, a disc which purported to be a recording of a speech made by him before a union meeting. In this speech, the voice was heard bellowing at union members to "come across" with their contributions to COPE (the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education), threatening those who didn't kick in, with the "graveyard shift" and so on. It was a "dese and dose" speech, with plenty of rough talk.

It was a stupid fabrication, as the AMA now admits, although it took them nearly 2½ years to get around to admitting it.

To understand the nature of this exposed fraud one must ask certain questions. Why, for example, should the American Medical Association, the national body of American doctors, be involved in such a shoddy affair? Part of the answer is that the AMA has more than once strayed from its ostensible purpose, which is to encourage the practice of medicine and to enlighten the public about the great achievements of American medicine.

Over the years, the AMA has operated one of the strongest lobbies here and in State capitals. It has sought to block at every turn social and economic legislation, some of which had only the faintest relation to the immediate interests of the practicing physician. But its one big target for the past two decades has been the prevention of any legislation in the field of medical care. By making "crisis" appeals, it has levied assessments on its membership to raise war chests against the "specter" of "slave state" legislation.

Through its own political action committee, the AMA moved into campaigns, furnishing funds to favorite Congressmen and Senators in return for their opposition to liberal legislation. Thus, the AMA made common cause with the National Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and any other large scale group with influence on the Hill.

But above all, the AMA recognized the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations as the chief target. At almost every facet, the AFL–CIO's legislative program was poison to the AMA. Whether is was medicare, or minimum wages, or liberalization of unemployment compensation, the AMA lobbyists would throw their weight against legislation.

Finally, came the Normile caper. Apparently the perpetrators of this fraudulent tape recording thought that if they could circulate it fast enough and far enough, the leaders of organized labor could be painted as "semi-illiterate morons and thugs" and violators of their trust to their members and of the law itself. Five thousand such records were manufactured. Many were distributed to local societies and women's auxiliaries.

When a libel suit for $4 million was filed against the AMA in behalf of Mr. Normile by David Feller, then the general counsel of the United Steel Workers, the AMA fought it at every turn. Now, after considerable reluctance and bargaining back and forth, the AMA admits that no such speech was ever made by Mr. Normile.

It has ordered the destruction of all tapes, recordings and booklets entitled "The Voice of COPE" reproduced by the AMA and the American Medical Political Action Committee. "The AMA sincerely regrets the error," its statement concludes. Meantime, medicare is now part of the law of the land and the AMA is adjusting itself to a new reality and a new diet.

INFLATION: NO. 1 PROBLEM OF AGED—MINORITY VIEWS, COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, this year's annual report by the Senate Special Committee on Aging, being transmitted to the Senate today, includes a statement of minority views signed by Senators CARLSON, WINSTON L. PROUTY, HIRAM L. FONG, GORDON ALLOTT, JACK MILLER, JAMES B. PEARSON, and myself.

The report contains valuable factual material. I invite the attention of every Member of the Senate to both the majority and minority statements.

Because of its timeliness I especially urge review of the minority statement. Among the major considerations to which it directs attention are several which I feel deserve special comment by me now.

Inflation and loss of real income is the No. 1 problem of older Americans today.

Preventive and corrective action to maintain income adequacy for the elderly in the face of inflation is becoming increasingly necessary.

A halt to unnecessary Federal spending and waste is recommended as a first step in preventing further erosion of dollar values.

Congressional action to compensate for economic injury already suffered by the elderly as a result of inflation appears appropriate without delay.

Purchasing power of a 72-year-old person with a fixed income of $3,000 a year has been reduced by over $330 since 1957–59.

There has been an 11-percent rise in the consumer price index over the 1957–59 base as of December 1965. In the past year, the increase was 2.2 percent.

Because of very large price increases for many bare necessities, those with lowest incomes and minimum ability to adjust spending patterns have been hit hardest.

The magnitude of inflation's impact on the elderly is shown by a projection based on the current price-rise rate.

A purchasing power loss of over $3.5 billion a year will be suffered by persons over 65 by 1971 if the current trend continues.

In the absence of sounder Federal fiscal policies, the loss in dollar values may rise even more rapidly.

It is regrettable, as inflation becomes more severe, that so much of the pressures by Government—actual and contemplated—are those against labor, agriculture, business, and taxpayers generally, while there is resistance by the administration to reasonable requests for reductions in unnecessary Federal spending.

In the face of Vietnam war costs, the need is to halt proliferation of new domestic programs, many of which are of questionable value, and expansion of bureaucracy which has seen a 5-year increase of 200,000 Federal civilian employees.

Equally important are proposals which can ameliorate losses already suffered by older Americans of all income levels.

We call for serious and productive consideration of ways to compensate the elderly for losses suffered through inflation and to strengthen their ability to adjust to the problems inflation creates, including:

First. Automatic cost-of-living increases in social security benefits;

Second. Increases in minimum social security payments;

Third. Extension of social security benefits to more people, young and old;

Fourth. Increase in aged widows' social security to 100 percent of spouse's benefits;

Fifth. Assurance of adequate old-age assistance programs.

It should be noted that the recent 7 percent social security cash benefit increase, adopted with bipartisan support, provides only partial relief for purchasing power losses suffered by older Americans in the last 5 years.

I join with the other minority members of the Committee on Aging in also supporting efforts to: First, provide adequate sheltered care for the aged who are infirm; second, widen use by the States of Federal grant-in-aid programs to meet special needs of the elderly; third, greater flexibility in social security, and fourth, liberalization or elimination of earnings limitations which impose penalties on social security beneficiaries who earn more than $1,500 a year.

SENATOR CHURCH ANNOUNCES POSITION ON MISSED VOTES

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, speaking engagements in Idaho, which included our annual, statewide Jefferson-Jackson banquet, precluded my presence in the Senate on February 28 and March 1, and my participation as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Hamilton, Bermuda, occasioned my absence from the Senate from March 7 through March 10. As a consequence, I missed certain recorded votes on which my position was unannounced.

To keep the record complete, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing my position with respect to each recorded vote on which I was unannounced, may be published here in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bill—Supplementary authorization for military procurement, fiscal 1966:

Motions:

To table the Morse amendment to repeal the Bay of Tonkin resolution: "For."

To table the Gruening amendment to bar the use of draftees in southeast Asia: "For."

Bill—Tax Adjustment Act of 1966:

Amendments:

Prouty amendment to blanket with social security coverage those persons over 70 not otherwise entitled to coverage: "For."

Hartke amendment against reimposition of excise tax on residential telephone service: "For."

Bill—Supplementary authorization bill for foreign assistance in southeast Asia and Santo Domingo:

Amendments:

Morse amendment to cut the nonmilitary aid funds for the Dominican Republic: "Against."

A NEW SYSTEM FOR FOREST ROADS FINANCING

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, in 1962 President Kennedy submitted a 10-year program to Congress for the development of the national forests. It was a well-conceived and long-overdue plan. Its basic concept was multiple use of our national forest lands; its key was an adequate transportation system, allowing easy access to the forests for vacationers as well as loggers.

Unfortunately, that program has never been implemented. Today, despite its efforts to provide the American public with development commensurate to our growing population needs, the U.S. Forest Service is forced to continue horse and buggy planning in the age of high-speed transportation.

It is not my purpose, to bewail or belabor past inadequacies. The very problem we face today in the urgent need to achieve adequate development of our forest lands is the result of regressive thinking. But we can no longer delay, we can no longer defer action, nor finance national forest development on an outmoded, piecemeal basis. Although our dedicated Forest Service planners have sought to provide comprehensive development of an adequate road system, lack of funds have forced them to dissipate what moneys they have been authorized in greasing the wheels that squeaked the loudest.

It is time now to lubricate the entire forest transportation vehicle.

The development of the network of roads in our national forests has been a process of evolution, starting with the simple logging trail that eventually widened into a forest road and became a main thoroughfare many years later. Because the prime concern then was for a means of removing salable timber, these evolved roads later proved inadequate for recreational purposes. But a few decades ago, these simple trails were enough since the overall growth of the forest road system was slow. A smaller national population was just beginning to find the forests as sources of relaxation and recreation. Today, with a national population over 190 million persons and expected to reach 350 million by the turn of the century, roads cannot be built fast enough. Almost from the instant a new road or trail is opened, the touring public is vying with the logger for use of the road, even to the most remote back-country regions.

We can no longer afford the luxury of leisure in the conservation of any of our natural resources, whether it be in the development of river basins or forest lands.

Financing of the forest transportation system has heretofore fallen into four categories: First, authorized appropriations under the Federal-Aid Highway Act; second, funds returned to the Secretary of Agriculture for road construction and maintenance for forest roads and trails; third, construction of roads by timber purchasers; and fourth, construction by users of national forest lands, including roads built under easement to serve private land within the boundary of the national forest.

To compound this cumbersome system, the actual construction funds in each category are controlled by a different source.

Forest highway funds are appropriated to the Department of Commerce and are administered by the Bureau of Public Roads in accordance with regulations approved by both the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Forest development roads and trail funds are administered by the Forest Service.

Timber purchaser roads are built as a condition to the timber sales contracts. Those logging roads which will be retained and maintained by the Forest Service are located and designed by the Forest Service which also supervises construction.

I submit that under such a system, it is amazing that we have a road network today capable of handling even a portion of the demands made upon our national forests.

In 1962, President Kennedy submitted his 10-year program to Congress. The accumulated authorizations since that time have lagged behind the planned road construction program by $169 million. In addition, the program has been further reduced by a series of catastrophes which occurred in the last 3 years, including an earthquake in Alaska, and floods in Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Idaho, Utah, and South Dakota. Although Congress added $38 million to regular authorization for fiscal years 1966 and 1967, it was still necessary to reprogram about $18 million from regular authorizations to restore damaged roads and trails.

In 1965, by way of example, while $33 million was appropriated for construction of forest highways under the Bureau of Public Roads program, almost double that amount, or $57 million, was spent by timber purchasers for roadbuilding in the national forests.

Such disproportionate expenditures between public and private funds for the development of a public resource is no longer feasible and is, in fact, a serious danger to the already shaky viability of the timber industry.

I cited a 350 million national population figure, Madam President, that will be crowding the limits of all of our national facilities by the end of this century.

Multimillions of Americans already live within the boundaries of our vast cities. Improved national highway systems, combined with shorter workweeks, rising incomes, all add up to a need for tremendously expanded natural recreational facilities to serve this vast population.

But the need for recreation just represents a part of the problem. This same growing population will make new demands upon forest products. In order to avoid depletion of our rich timberlands, the most efficient and well-developed management system will have to be applied. Again, building a forest transportation system that allows for orderly harvest of our trees at one place, and reforestation and growth at another, is most urgent.

Obviously, such comprehensive, multiple-use road planning cannot be accomplished under the haphazard system of financing heretofore in effect. The timber users have borne an inordinate share of road construction costs, and it has been difficult to require timber operators to build roads to standards needed for multiple-purpose use of national forest resources.

No State is more aware of the multiple values of national forests than my own State of Idaho and few Federal programs have stirred the interest and concern of Idahoans as has the need for revitalizing our methods of forest road development.

I will submit as part of the record of this hearing Senate Joint Memorial No. 1, passed by the second extraordinary session of the 38th session of the legislature of the State of Idaho, together with resolutions adopted by 16 governmental, civic, and industrial organizations, as well as a letter from the Honorable Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho, all supporting congressional approval of new financial assistance to forest road development.

This basic change is embodied in the concept of general fund appropriations for such road development, under a single monetary source, eliminating the current requirements of roadbuilding as a condition of timber sales.

The need for this change is imperative. Only through long-range, comprehensive forest road planning can we protect our resources from fire and pests; provide orderly marketing of timber, when there is a demand and when values are high assure competitive bidding for forest resources; eliminate road supervision problems and thereby reduce timber sales administration; and finally, reduce costs in roadbuilding.

There are today in my State of Idaho 17,700 miles of yet-to-be constructed roads and trails that, under present planning and financing, will take 150 years to complete. There are 1,225 miles of roads and trails that should be brought up to standards of forest highways. Present financial planning will require 39 years to complete this work. And there are yet another 1,560 miles of roads and trails eligible for inclusion in the system. This is in one State alone.

We do not have a century and a half. We do not even have the 39 years to upgrade one small group of roads. National economic and recreational demands require that we immediately return to the 10-year program proposed by President Kennedy, salvage what we can of the lost years in that program, and begin an accelerated program of forest road planning.

Accordingly, I urge the Senate to recommend that $169 million be provided in supplemental general fund appropriations to the U.S. Forest Service for fiscal year 1967, the amount that authorizations have lagged behind the 10-year program in fiscal years 1963 through 1967.

I would further urge the Senate to include in its recommendations, that all future forest road systems be built through public financing, a method which has the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture and the support of every category of forest user.

I now ask unanimous consent that the supporting documents I cited earlier be printed here in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 1 BY STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(In the Senate of the State of Idaho, 2d extraordinary session, 38th session)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to the full use of the natural resources in the national forests in the State of Idaho; and

Whereas under the present rate of road construction, it will take 100 years to complete an adequate national forest conservation road transportation system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact the necessary legislation to authorize the financing of primary National Forest Conservation roads from the general funds of the U.S. Treasury and to provide an appropriation commensurate with the urgency of the demonstrated need: Be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 18th day of February 1966.

W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 24th day of February 1966.

PETER T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF IDAHO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Boise, January 26, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Mr. Theodore Hoff, Jr., has kindly made available to me a copy of your letter to the Secretary of Agriculture relative to the problem of access roads into our national forests.

Today's press carries a report that Senator JORDAN had again pointed out the great need for a more aggressive program of access road construction.

It is of the utmost importance that we create as soon as possible an adequate forest transportation system for use by all types of forest users, along the lines of the program proposed by President Kennedy in 1961. That plan would, if it had been pursued with vigor, have produced an adequate network of multiple-use roads by 1972.

Road planning, on a forest-by-forest basis, conceived so as to promote and secure maximum multiple use would serve not only the historic users of the forest but would promote recreation and tourism and really sound conservation.

The speed with which these available forested areas are opened up is of extreme economic importance to Idaho, and for that matter to all the Northwest. For the rest of the United States it seems to me that it constitutes prudent management and conservation of resources that belong to all the people.

I agree most wholeheartedly with you in your statement that it is imperative that an entirely new concept of forest road construction be developed and implemented. The Kennedy proposal is sound, but it should be activated by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to appropriations by the Congress.

I am unable to ascertain what amounts are contained in the new budget specifically allocated to access roads construction. The budget document is not yet available here. I have little doubt, however, that the amounts recommended are inadequate to our needs.

I desire to suggest a concerted effort on the part of the entire congressional delegation and the State government, acting together to secure a favorable consideration of your proposal. You will recall that we conferred in Boise in December with the leaders of conservation groups and forest user groups. Remarkably, unanimity of purpose was achieved in that meeting.

It occurs to me that there might be merit in seeking special consideration of this problem from the Appropriations Committee of either the House or the Senate, where a goodly delegation from Idaho could give testimony supporting the need for a new construction concept and the need for moving ahead with a program designed to secure an adequate access road program at the earliest possible time.

I shall be most happy to be guided by your suggestions and to attempt in any way to accommodate our total resources in manpower and information to the successful accomplishment of an adequate forest use highway construction program.

I have a feeling that a concerted effort might secure results again, as it sometimes has in the past. I am thoroughly mindful that military expenditures have required a down-hold on domestic investment, but I do believe this problem is of sufficient magnitude to the State that we should pursue a satisfactory solution with great vigor.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT E. SMYLIE,
Governor.

Whereas vast areas of our national forest lands in the West are virtually unused and unprotected due to the continuing lack of convenient and economic access; and

Whereas this deficiency not only prevents the effective management and utilization of the many material resources of the lands such as timber, forage, fish and wildlife and impedes their protection against the ravages of disease, pests, fires and floods, but also precludes recreational travel and the benefits of superlative outdoor recreational pursuits including hunting, fishing, camping, etc., on some of the most beautiful lands in the Nation; and

Whereas the traditional procedure of requiring the resource user to provide road access under timber sale contracts or otherwise, is no longer adequate or suitable for the type of high-quality, primary road that is needed for multiple-use management; and

Whereas this type of primary access road would not only constitute a vital link in the major highway systems of the United States, now on an accelerated rate of construction, but would also open up tremendous areas for more efficient resource management and utilization for the benefit of all the people of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Kiwanis Club of Emmett, Idaho, Inc., on this 2d day of February 1966, recommends that the Congress of the United States enact with all deliberate speed the necessary legislation to authorize the financing of primary, forest management roads from the general funds of the U.S. Treasury and to provide an appropriation commensurate with the urgency of the demonstrated needs.

We further recommend that the U.S. Forest Service be authorized and directed by this legislation to designate the location, prepare the plans and set the specifications for these forest management roads and be required to give adequate notice and hold hearings on such plans and specifications in the areas or localities directly affected.

Done this 2d day of February 1966.

KIWANIS CLUB OF EMMETT,
IDAHO, INC.,
By BENNING F. JENNESS,
President.

Whereas vast areas of our national forest lands in the West are virtually unused and unprotected due to the continuing lack of convenient and economic access; and

Whereas this deficiency not only prevents the effective management and utilization of the many material resources of the lands such as timber, forage, fish and wildlife, and impedes their protection against the ravages of disease, pests, fires, and floods, but also precludes recreational travel and benefits of superlative outdoor recreational pursuits including hunting, fishing, camping, etc., on some of the most beautiful lands in the Nation; and

Whereas the traditional procedure of requiring the resource user to provide road access under timber-sale contracts or otherwise, is no longer adequate or suitable for the type of high-quality, primary road that is needed for multiple-use management; and

Whereas this type of primary access road would not only constitute a vital link in the major highway systems of the United States, now on an accelerated rate of construction, but would also open up tremendous areas for more efficient resource management and utilization for the benefit of all the people of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Parma Chamber of Commerce on February 2, 1966, recommends that the Congress of the United States enact with all deliberate speed the necessary legislation to authorize the financing of primary, forest-management roads from the general funds of the U.S. Treasury and to provide an appropriation commensurate with the urgency of the demonstrated needs.

We further recommend that the U.S. Forest Service be authorized and directed by this legislation to designate the location, prepare the plans and set the specifications for these forest-management roads and be required to give adequate notice and hold hearings on such plans and specifications in the areas or localities directly affected.

PARMA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
————.

RESOLUTION

Whereas vast areas of our national forest lands in the West are virtually unused and unprotected due to the continuing lack of convenient and economic access; and

Whereas this deficiency not only prevents the effective management and utilization of the many material resources of the lands such as timber, forage, fish and wildlife and impedes their protection against the ravages of disease, pests, fires, and floods, but also precludes recreational travel and the benefits of superlative outdoor recreational pursuits including hunting, fishing, camping, etc., on some of the most beautiful lands in the Nation; and

Whereas the traditional procedure of requiring the resource user to provide road access under timber sale contracts or otherwise, is no longer adequate or suitable for the type of high-quality, primary road that is needed for multiple-use management; and

Whereas this type of primary access road would not only constitute a vital link in the major highway systems of the United States, now on an accelerated rate of construction, but would also open up tremendous areas for more efficient resource management and utilization for the benefit of all the people of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Gem County Chamber of Commerce on this 20th day of January 1966 recommends that the Congress of the United States enact with all deliberate speed the necessary legislation to authorize the financing of primary, forest management roads from the general funds of the U.S. Treasury and to provide an appropriation commensurate with the urgency of the demonstrated needs.

We further recommend that the U.S. Forest Service be authorized and directed by this legislation to designate the location, prepare the plans and set the specifications for these forest management roads and be required to give adequate notice and hold hearings on such plans and specifications in the areas or localities directly affected.

Done this 20th day of January 1966.

GEM COUNTY CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE INC.,
ROBERT J. CHAPIN,
President.

(This resolution has been adopted by the board of directors, Greater Boise, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce at its regular meeting held Monday, January 31, 1966 and by motion duly made, properly seconded, and regularly adopted as attested by the signature of its authorized officers.)

Whereas vast areas of our national forest lands in the West are virtually unused and unprotected due to the continuing lack of convenient and economic access; and

Whereas this deficiency not only prevents the effective management and utilization of the many material resources of the lands such as timber, forage, fish and wildlife and impedes their protection against the ravages of disease, pests, fires, and floods, but also precludes recreational travel and the benefits of superlative outdoor recreational pursuits including hunting, fishing, camping, etc., on some of the most beautiful lands in the Nation; and

Whereas the traditional procedure of requiring the resource user to provide road access under timber sale contracts or otherwise, is no longer adequate or suitable for the type of high-quality, primary road that is needed for multiple-use management; and

Whereas this type of primary access road would not only constitute a vital link in the major highway systems of the United States, now on an accelerated rate of construction, but would also open up tremendous areas for more efficient resource management and utilization for the benefit of all the people of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Greater Boise, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce recommends that the Congress of the United States enact with all deliberate speed the necessary legislation to authorize the financing of primary, forest management roads from the general funds of the U.S. Treasury and to provide an appropriation commensurate with the urgency of the demonstrated needs; and be it further

Recommended that the U.S. Forest Service be authorized and directed by this legislation to designate the location, prepare the plans and set the specifications for these forest management roads and be required to give adequate notice and hold hearings on such plans and specifications in the areas or localities directly affected.

W. W. GARTIN, *President.*
ROGER B. MCGINNIS, C.C.E.,
Executive Vice President.

(This resolution has been adopted by the board of directors, Greater Boise, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce at its regular meeting held Monday, January 31, 1966, and by motion duly made, properly seconded and regularly adopted, as attested by the signature of its authorized officers.)

Whereas forest highways promote utilization of resources on the national forests and provide recreational enjoyment for people from all the States; and

Whereas highway construction in the United States has been accelerated by increased appropriations for interstate and A–B–C funds; and

Whereas forest highways are integral links in principal highway systems of the United States; and

Whereas the President of the United States and the National Congress have indicated an urgent need for more consideration of the beauty and scenic values of national road and highway systems; and

Whereas demands of additional elements in road construction in the form of scenic and recreational requirements will raise the costs of construction; and

Whereas the rate of construction of forest highway sections of these extremely important routes has not kept pace with a rate of development commensurate with other sections at the route: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors, Greater Boise Chamber of Commerce urgently request the Congress of the United States to increase the authorization and annual appropriations for forest highways from the present level of $33 million to the amount of $85 million, beginning with fiscal year 1967.

W. W. GARTIN, *President.*
ROGER B. MCGINNIS, C.C.E.,
Executive Vice President.

(This resolution has been adopted by the board of directors, Greater Boise, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce at its regular meeting held Monday, January 31, 1966, and by motion duly made, properly seconded, and regularly adopted as attested by the signature of its authorized officers.)

Whereas a transportation system is a catalyst to land management; and

Whereas the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to full multiple use management in Idaho; and

Whereas it will take 100 years to complete an adequate transportation system in Idaho at the present rate of construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Greater Boise Chamber of Commerce be on record to urge the immediate adoption of all reasonable and prudent measures to remedy the deficiency.

W. W. GARTIN,
President.
ROGER B. MCGINNIS, C.C.E.,
Executive Vice President.

(This resolution has been adopted by the board of directors, Greater Boise, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce at its regular meeting held Monday, January 31, 1966, and by motion duly made, properly seconded, and regularly adopted as attested by the signature of its authorized officers.)

Whereas timber, water, and wildlife are products of our Idaho's forest lands whose management, protection, and use are highly essential to the economy of the State; and

Whereas more effective and efficient methods for managing, protecting, developing, and using these resources are needed to encourage their maximum present and future contributions to the State; and

Whereas the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station of the U.S. Forest Services has responsibilities for and is presently conducting limited research programs in watershed management, wildlife habitat improvement, and forest insect control; and

Whereas such research is far less than justified by the importance of the timber, water, and wildlife resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Greater Boise Chamber of Commerce urge members of the Idaho congressional delegation to seek additional appropriations to expand research on:

1. Watershed management, whose objectives are to identify forest lands where soil instability is critical; improve road design and construction criteria for such areas; develop effective mechanical and vegetative methods for stabilizing soils disturbed by road construction or logging; and determine size, spacing, and orientation of clearcuts for regulating streamflow.
2. Learn more about our destructive forest insects, when they need to be controlled, and how to control them efficiently and effectively with the least possible side effects on wildlife and other resources.
3. Develop methods for improving and maintaining browse on big game winter ranges on our forest and rangelands; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to members of the Idaho congressional delegation and interested congressional committees.

W. W. GARTIN, *President.*
ROGER B. MCGINNIS, C.C.E.,
Executive Vice President.

POTLATCH FORESTS, INC.,
Lewiston, Idaho.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
405 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Enclosed please find a copy of resolution No. 5 as unanimously passed at the most recent meeting of the North Idaho Chamber of Commerce.

This is a problem which has only in recent years become apparent and to which attention must be directed immediately if the northwest forest products industry is to continue to be the chief source of jobs in the State of Idaho and especially in the 11 western counties.

The NICC is unique in that it is composed of government employees, independent professional people and business and agricultural interests. Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JACK CLIFFORD,
Director, Public Affairs.

RESOLUTION 5 OF THE NORTH IDAHO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the NICC is in full support of the principle of multiple use as expressed in the Multiple Use Act of 1960, and

Whereas the economic well being of the local communities is vitally dependent upon the utilization of the full allowable cut: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the NICC at its regular meeting in Coeur d'Alene on October 29, 1965, requests that the Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, receive increased appropriated funds for forest roads, trails and forest highways to permit economic utilization of the full allowable cut of timber and other resources uses of the national forests of Idaho; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the resolutions committee send copies of this resolution to the Idaho congressional delegation, the Secretary of Agriculture and the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

——— ———.

COUNCIL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE—RESOLUTION

Whereas this chamber feels that better access roads to public lands are needed for recreation purposes, disease control, and fire protection as well as for timber sales;

Whereas the present policy of the forest places a large burden upon the timber purchasers; and

Whereas local counties are penalized in the computation of county funds and county benefits from the sales: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this chamber go on record as favoring a revision of the Forest Service policy concerning public land access roads, that such roads be built separate from the timber harvest contract.

Whereas forest highways promote utilization of resources on the national forests and provide recreational enjoyment for people from all the States; and

Whereas highway construction in the United States has been accelerated by increased appropriation for interstate and public lands highway funds; and

Whereas forest highways are integral links in principal highway systems of the United States; and

Whereas the President of the United States and the National Congress have indicated an urgent need for more consideration of the beauty and scenic values of national road and highway systems; and

Whereas demands of additional elements in road construction in the form of scenic and recreational requirements will raise the costs of construction; and

Whereas in Idaho there are many national forests with few roads and many road improvements to be made; and

Whereas the rate of construction of forest highway sections of these extremely important routes has not kept pace with a rate of development commensurate with other sections of the highway system; and

Whereas the largest stand of marketable, mature block of timber, not harvestable presently due to insufficient access roads, is located in Shoshone County, Idaho: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kellogg Chamber of Commerce now in meeting at Kellogg, Idaho, this — day of December 1965, urgently requests the Congress of the United States to substantially increase the authorization and annual appropriations for forest highways.

Approved as amended.

CHARLES A. EASTMAN,
President, Kellogg, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce.

Whereas public lands highways are an integral part of principal highway systems of the United States and are of particular value for recreational travel and resource utilization for people from all of the States; and

Whereas the $7 million currently authorized for the fiscal year 1966 is far short of the funds needed for improvements through public lands at a level commensurate with regular A-B-C and interstate appropriations; and

Whereas construction work on the public lands highway system has for many years lagged seriously behind urgent needs; and

Whereas the President of the United States and the national Congress have indicated an urgent need for more consideration of the beauty and scenic value of national road and highway systems; and

Whereas public lands highways pass through the most naturally beautiful lands in our Nation: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Soda Springs Chamber of Commerce, Soda Springs, Idaho, at its regular meeting this the 18th day of November 1965, urgently request the Congress of the United States to increase the public lands highway authorization and appropriations for fiscal year 1967 to $30 million and maintain that level of appropriation until substantial completion of these highways is attained; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the members of the Idaho delegation in the Congress of the United States, the Bureau of Public Lands Office, Portland, Oreg., the Office of the Forest Service Engineer, the Governor of the State of Idaho and the Office of the Idaho State Highway Commission, Boise, Idaho.

Whereas forest highways promote utilization of resources on the national forests and provide recreational enjoyment for people from all the States; and

Whereas highway construction in the United States has been accelerated by increased appropriation for interstate and public lands highway funds; and

Whereas forest highways are integral links in principal highway systems of the United States; and

Whereas the President of the United States and the National Congress have indicated an urgent need for more consideration of the beauty and scenic values of national road and highway systems; and

Whereas demands of additional elements in road construction in the form of scenic and recreational requirements will raise the costs of construction; and

Whereas in Idaho there are many national forests with few roads and many road improvements to be made; and

Whereas the rate of construction of forest highway sections of these extremely important routes has not kept pace with a rate of development commensurate with other sections of the highway system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the District I Association of County Commissioners and Clerks now in conference assembled at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, this 18th day of November 1965, urgently requests the Congress of the United States to substantially increase the authorization and annual appropriations for forest highways.

RALPH W. COPE,
Executive Director of District No. 1, Association of Commissioners and Clerks.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Wallace, Idaho, December 20, 1965.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: The Wallace Chamber of Commerce, on the 15th day of December 1965, unanimously passed the enclosed resolution which requests that the Congress substantially increase the annual appropriation for forest highways.

We will appreciate your support for such action in the next session of Congress. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Wallace Chamber of Commerce.
By D. L. **Hess**, *Secretary.*

Whereas forest highways promote utilization of resources on the national forests and provide recreational enjoyment for people from all the States; and

Whereas highway construction in the United States has been accelerated by increased appropriation for interstate and public lands highway funds; and

Whereas forest highways are integral links in principal highway systems of the United States; and

Whereas the President of the United States and the National Congress have indicated an urgent need for more consideration of the beauty and scenic values of national road and highway systems; and

Whereas demands of additional elements in road construction in the form of scenic and recreational requirements will raise the costs of construction; and

Whereas in Idaho there are many national forests with few roads and many road improvements to be made; and

Whereas the rate of construction of Forest Highway sections of these extremely important routes has not kept pace with a rate of development commensurate with other sections of the highway system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wallace Chamber of Commerce now in meeting at Wallace, Idaho, this — day of December 1965, urgently requests the Congress of the United States to substantially increase the authorization and annual appropriations for forest highways.

————— —————,

Wallace Chamber of Commerce.

Southern Idaho Forestry Association,
Boise, Idaho, December 13, 1965.

Hon. **Frank Church,**
U.S. Senator,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: The Southern Idaho Forestry Association at their meeting held in Boise, Idaho, on November 19, 1965, passed the attached resolutions, reaffirmed the resolution of November 1964 of which a copy is also attached and instructed the secretary to forward these to the Idaho congressional delegation, and to the chairmen of the committees involved in these problems seeking their support.

The association asks for your support and help in the effort to get more funds made available to these areas of need and which can be so beneficial to the economy of the State of Idaho.

Sincerely,

Southern Idaho Forestry Association.
Robert D. Hayes, *Secretary.*

Resolution of the Southern Idaho Forestry Association

(Resolution presented and approved at the combined meeting of the Southern Idaho Forestry Association and the North Idaho Forestry Association; and other natural resource users held at Shore Lodge, McCall, Idaho on November 16 and 17, 1964.)

Whereas a transportation system is a catalyst to land management; and

Whereas the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to full multiple use management in Idaho; and

Whereas it will take 100 years to complete an adequate transportation system in Idaho at the present rate of construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Idaho Forestry Association and the Southern Idaho Forestry Association be on record to urge the immediate adoption of all reasonable and prudent measures to remedy the deficiency; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to members of our congressional and delegation and interested congressional committees.

Resolution of the Southern Idaho Forestry Association

Whereas forest highways promote utilization of resources on the national forests and provide recreational enjoyment for people from all the States; and

Whereas highway construction in the United States has been accelerated by increased appropriations for Interstate and ABC funds; and

Whereas forest highways are integral links in principal highway systems of the United States; and

Whereas the President of the United States and the National Congress have indicated an urgent need for more consideration of the beauty and scenic values of national road and highway systems; and

Whereas demands of additional elements in road construction in the form of scenic and recreational requirements will raise the costs of construction; and

Whereas the rate of construction of forest highway sections of these extremely important routes has not kept pace with a rate of development commensurate with other sections at the route; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Southern Idaho Forestry Association in conference assembled at Boise, Idaho, November 19, 1965, urgently requests the Congress of the United States to increase the authorization and annual appropriations for forest highways from the present level of $33 million to the amount of $85 billion, beginning with fiscal year 1967.

North Idaho Forestry Association,
Lewiston, Idaho, December 14, 1965.

Hon. **Frank Church,**
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Church: At our recent meeting in Moscow, our association reaffirmed two resolutions previously acted upon by this group.

The first stresses the importance of the Federal Government to implement the second stage of the planned research facilities at the Moscow Forestry Science Laboratory.

The resolution acted on at the Joint North Idaho and Southern Idaho Forestry Association meeting at McCall in November 1964, urges action be taken to remedy the lack of an adequate transportation system to develop full multiple-use management of lands in Idaho.

We know you are fully aware of and sympathetic toward these projects and trust your efforts on behalf of them will be successful in procuring adequate appropriations from the next session of Congress.

Copies of the resolutions are enclosed.

Sincerely,

George W. Beardmore,
Secretary.

Mr. Burton Schmidt of the North Idaho Forestry Association presented the following resolution:

"Passed November 17, 1964, at joint meeting, North Idaho and Southern Idaho Forestry Associations at McCall, Idaho. Discussed and reaffirmed on November 12, 1965, at North Idaho Forestry Association meeting at Moscow, Idaho.

"Whereas, a transportation system is a catalyst to land management, and

"Whereas, the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to full multiple-use management in Idaho, and

"Whereas, it will take 100 years to complete an adequate transportation system in Idaho at the present rate of construction; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the North Idaho Forestry Association and the Southern Idaho Forestry Association be on record to urge the immediate adoption of all reasonable and prudent measures to remedy the deficiency."

Mr. George Rauch moved for adoption of the resolution, was seconded by Mr. Max Stoddard and approved unanimously.

Kootenai County,
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho,
November 29, 1965.

Senator **Frank Church,**
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am enclosing a copy of a resolution that was passed at our November 18 meeting of District No. 1 Association of County Commissioners & Clerks, which consists of the five northern Idaho counties.

It is hoped that you will give this resolution your full support before the Congress of the United States.

Very truly yours,

Ralph W. Cope,
Executive Director, District No. 1.

Resolution

Whereas forest highways promote utilization of resources on the national forests and provide recreational enjoyment for people from all the States; and

Whereas highway construction in the United States has been accelerated by increased appropriation for interstate and public lands highway funds; and

Whereas forest highways are integral links in principal highway systems of the United States; and

Whereas the President of the United States and the National Congress have indicated an urgent need for more consideration of the beauty and scenic values of national road and highway systems; and

Whereas demands of additional elements in road construction in the form of scenic and recreational requirements will raise the costs of construction; and

Whereas in Idaho there are many national forests with few roads and many road improvements to be made; and

Whereas the rate of construction of forest highway sections of these extremely important routes has not kept pace with a rate of development commensurate with other sections of the highway system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the District No. 1 Association of County Commissioners & Clerks now in conference assembled at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, this 18th day of November 1965, urgently requests the Congress of the United States to substantially increase the authorization and annual appropriations for forest highways.

Ralph W. Cope,
Executive Director of District No. 1, Association of Commissioners & Clerks.

SOCIAL INJUSTICE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, early in June of last year the civilian government of South Vietnam was overthrown by 10 generals. After the military overthrew the civilian authority, the generals then selected Ky, the flamboyant and brash air marshal, so-called, of the air force of South Vietnam, as prime minister of that unhappy and violently civil war-torn country.

From September 28 until October 19 I was in southeast Asia. I was at every air base in South Vietnam. I was in Saigon briefly, and I had a conference with Ky on a Wednesday morning.

That conference only lasted about 40 minutes and, of course, in that short period of time I was not able to form a definite judgment of him. He may be a very gallant aviator, but as the ruler of a nation, he struck me at the time, in talking with him, as a brash and a flamboyant young man.

It should be borne in mind that I met with him in the middle of the week—on a Wednesday. He said:

> Yesterday we arrested a man for black marketing. He was a wealthy man in Saigon, and a friend of mine.

Wanting to show how honest he was, Ky said:

> He was arrested yesterday and on Thursday he is going to be tried, and on Tuesday of next week, he is going to be executed.

Here is a Prime Minister who had fixed the execution date well before he had held the so-called trial.

In the Washington Evening Star of yesterday there appeared a picture of a Chinese merchant, slumping away from the post, after being executed by a firing squad in Saigon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. On the other side of the page there appears a picture of Dang Cao Sach, a convicted South Vietnamese embezzler, who has also received a death sentence.

Here is a man, Ky, who received some prestige by being met by our President in Honolulu, and being permitted to drink coffee with our President. He talks about democracy, but he evidently has no knowledge, not even superficial, of what democracy is. Here we can see that we have a despot on our hands.

He has been in office for 9 months and he is quoted as having said he intends to eradicate social injustice among the people of South Vietnam. What has he been doing all this time other than strutting around in Saigon? Social injustice in any country is not accomplished by drumhead courts martial, by mock trials, with firing squads, or under a Prime Minister who on a Wednesday has already determined that on the next Tuesday he is going to execute a man accused of black marketing who is to be tried on Thursday.

The American people must have a feeling of sorrow and also of outrage in reading of these executions. The Cleveland Press, one of the great newspapers of this Nation, on March 9 had a fine editorial under the caption, "Despotism in Saigon." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESPOTISM IN SAIGON

> At Honolulu, Premier Ky of South Vietnam put out a communique stating his intention to eradicate social injustice among his people. "We must build a democracy," he said. Ky also declared that he is no warlord nor an Asian despot.
>
> He'll have trouble convincing Americans of all this piety if he goes ahead with the firing squad execution of Ta Vinh, a Saigon Chinese. Vinh was convicted of black marketing, profiteering, and hoarding. He was tried in a brandnew court and three military officers served as judges. Ky himself opened the court session.
>
> In an inflation-ravaged country like South Vietnam, profiteering is doubtless a very serious crime. If he is illegally contributing to this, Ta Vinh deserves punishment.
>
> But the death penalty is surely excessive. Social justice is not accompanied by drumhead courts nor democracy by firing squads. Nor is equality advanced by anti-Chinese prejudice.
>
> Premier Ky's regime rests in good measure on U.S. public opinion and this harsh sentence is not going to help his cause.

TWENTY-THIRD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY—AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXTEND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 29 the 23d Congress of the Communist Party will open its sessions in Moscow.

I wish to call attention to this because of the pending 8-day Passover holiday as it will be observed by the Jews of the Soviet Union next month. Since 1957, they have been restricted in their ability to obtain unleavened bread, the matzoh, necessary for observance of the Passover by members of the Jewish faith.

There has been some little easing of the restraints this year but the obstacles to obtaining matzoh still continue. Only in the synagogue in certain communities may this unleavened bread be baked, and even there Jews must register their names with the authorities, a procedure designed to intimidate all but the courageous few.

I wish to call attention to the fact that there has been considerable easing of the controls imposed upon minority groups in the Soviet Union. Among the beneficiaries have been the Poles, the Kalmyks, and the Volga Germans. The post-Stalin era has been full of guarantees of liberation for the Soviet people, but the Jewish people, representing 1.1 percent of that nation's population, are still denied rights guaranteed to them under the Soviet Constitution and by Soviet law. They suffer deprivations not imposed on other religious or so-called national groups in the U.S.S.R.

The 23d Congress of the Communist Party being opened in Moscow on March 29 is a landmark meeting. It marks the 10th anniversary of the historic denunciation of the late Josef Stalin by Nikita Khrushchev, and the opening of an era of increased liberties for the Soviet people.

The convening of the 23d Communist Party Congress, attended by delegates from every corner of the world, offers the Soviets an opportunity to redeem their oft-repeated pledges of freedom from discrimination for their own minorities, pledges put into the law of the U.S.S.R.

I hope that the U.S.S.R. will extend to its 4 million Jewish citizens the religious rights guaranteed them by Soviet law and that they may be able to obtain without restriction or intimidation the matzoh necessary for the proper observance of the Passover festival, a holiday commemorative of the liberation of the ancient Jews from Egyptian bondage. In this hope, I feel that I am joined by men of conscience throughout this Nation and the world.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate proceeded to the consideration of S. 2499, to amend the Small Business Act. The problem involved is so fundamental and simple that I shall refer to it in the limitations of the morning hour.

A small business needs operating capital. The Small Business Administration is out of funds and cannot provide them. The Committee on Banking and Currency has reported a bill which we think provides a practical way to solve this problem.

Mr. President, the current boom, like all others, is moving into a period of credit squeeze. Many small businesses cannot get money from their banks because of this credit squeeze. In addition, the Government funds are being squeezed by the $10 to $12 billion extra which is required for Vietnam, and that condition may get worse before it gets better.

Through the unwise commingled use of SBA disaster and business loan funds, the money for SBA business loans has been exhausted. Ordinarily, I would not endorse anything that had any resemblance to back-door financing. However, we are now dealing with a real emergency for small business. I have often said that if you bankrupt the farmers, you are looking at the beginning of a national depression. By the same token, if small business is bankrupted, we shall be looking at the beginning of real trouble for big business.

In my judgment, the Banking and Currency Committee acted wisely and prudently when it reported with my support and approval S. 2499, which would permit SBA to market obligations now in its portfolio, with guarantees either by SBA or by SBA and FNMA. I understand that the appropriations committees will review these transactions in the course of considering expenditures by the SBA and, of course, the amounts outstanding would have to be within the ceilings imposed under the Small Business Act. In view of the importance of the matter, and in view of this measure of Federal control, I support S. 2499 and urge that the Senate approve it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency from the bottom of my heart. I feel certain that all Members of the Senate know that there is no Member of the Senate who has a sharper eye for waste, for extravagance, or for loose fiscal policy than has the Senator from Virginia. Over many years, in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, he has been a bulwark of sound and thoughtful financing. He is one to whom all of us have looked for advice in matters of this kind.

It is most significant that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency clearly and eloquently supports this bill. I know it is a controversial measure, but the Senator from Virgina has stated the case as well as it could be stated in his concise remarks to the effect that small business is in trouble. That is a practical fact; we have to recognize the trouble. If we do not provide some kind of modest assistance that the Small Business Act provides, and which the Small Business Administration has not been able to provide since October, the toll of bankruptcies and of very great difficulties by small business will be much larger than it should be.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the high compliment. I have just conferred with the chairman of the board of a large corporation. He told me that they were so urgently in need of funds that they were floating a $350 million bond issue.

Small business cannot float bond issues; it does not have that kind of credit. It takes big businesses, having assured earning capacity and connections with big banks, to do that.

Congress established an agency and promised small businesses that it would help them. That agency has done good work. It has rendered much help. But it was never more needed than it is right now. Yet it is out of funds. We cannot hope to get money, in my opinion, by increasing the President's budget. That was not contemplated.

So are we going to say to small business, "We will not help you"? Or shall we withhold a little of our reluctance to what may appear to be something like backdoor financing—there will still be a ceiling, in view of the requirements of the Committees on Appropriations—and let small business market bonds—Government bonds—and use the funds as revolving funds?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

LET'S AGREE TO DE GAULLE'S DEMAND NOW

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the recent ultimatum issued by President de Gaulle demanding that we either place our servicemen and military installations in France under French military command or withdraw them should compel us to reconsider and reevaluate without delay our entire commitment to Western Europe. Unwittingly, the French President may have performed a great service to us.

It is now 21 years since the end of World War II and the nations of Western Europe have continued to evade the responsibility for their own defense. As a result of their failure and because of the urgent requests in the past by our European allies, we have maintained Army, Navy, and Air Force units in great strength in West Germany, France, Spain, and England.

It is astonishing but the fact is that the present total of our Armed Forces in Western Europe exceeds 345,000. We have nearly 650,000 men of our Armed Forces and their dependent wives and children living in Western Europe helping to fatten the economy of West Germany, France, Spain, and England and helping produce unparalleled prosperity there.

These countries are considered our allies and friends but it is interesting to note that not one of them has sent a single combat soldier to aid us in South Vietnam. To the contrary, there is ample evidence that many of our so-called allies are trading with the North Vietnamese and providing them directly or indirectly with war materiel.

Mr. President, our deficits-of-payments problem is not due primarily to American tourists traveling abroad. One of the biggest factors in our chronic outflow of gold problem is the fact that we are maintaining 643,000 men and their dependents in Western Europe. The cost of doing so plus the amounts of moneys spent by service families compelled to rent houses and apartments of German and French landlords at exorbitant prices has helped to reduce our gold reserves.

Mr. President, in that regard, the American public has not been fully informed regarding our Status of Forces Agreement with the West German Government. Despite the fact that Germany started two world wars which devastated Europe and caused the death of millions of men, women, and children, we have been enriching the German economy throughout all of the 21 years since the end of World War II. Our Government has catered to West German Government officials. One would think they had won the war.

With hundreds of thousands of our soldiers stationed on a permanent basis in West Germany together with a like number of dependents, our spending has enriched the German economy. West Germany is now the wealthiest nation in Western Europe.

In our agreement with West German officials, German nationals even have the privilege, in many instances, of making purchases at the U.S. commissaries and PX's, so called. At this time German wives of American servicemen not only enjoy the privilege for themselves, but this includes all of their German relatives.

One factor that is very irksome to American GI's is that no dependent wife of any American officer, noncommissioned officer, or soldier or airman, may be employed in a U.S. commissary or PX. Such employment is reserved entirely for German women.

How can this atrocious provision be defended by anyone? The facts are that our commissaries and PX's are filled with merchandise provided and transported to West Germany by American taxpayers' money.

Americans generally do not know it, but our Status of Forces Agreement also provides that in the event of disagreement between German nationals and Americans, the German interpretation of the dispute is to be followed.

The procedures practiced in West Germany to the prejudice of our fellow countrymen and brought about and countenanced by agreements on the part of officials of our Government with West German leaders give an American a feeling of shame.

In the years following World War II there was a real threat of Soviet aggression in Western Europe and the nations of that area, ravished by World War II, required the presence of our Armed Forces to deter the Russians.

Today, Operation Airlift, whereby a combat division may be airborne from the United States to West Germany with all its armor and equipment and in the field ready for combat in much less than 48 hours, is additional proof that we should withdraw approximately 100,000 men of our Armed Forces and a like number of dependents from Western Europe, and that we should do this without delay and despite the yelps of officials of those nations which, for 21 years now, have profiteered by our presence in huge numbers in Western Europe. Whatever men of our Armed Forces are sent to Western Europe for a tour of duty in the future should be sent for a period of not more than 13 months and with no dependents.

The prosperous nations of Western Europe must assume a greater share of the burden of their own defense. They must provide additional soldiers to protect themselves from any threatened Russian aggression which, at the moment, seems nonexistent.

In view of the fact that these allies have refused to send any soldiers to aid us in Vietnam, thousands of these trained soldiers of the United States should be reassigned to Vietnam and other areas of the world where they are really needed.

The time for a sensible change in our overseas policies with our Armed Forces is long past due.

WALL STREET JOURNAL CAUTIONS AGAINST IMPULSIVE ANTI-INFLATION ACTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, George Shea of the Wall Street Journal continues his highly useful warnings that an economic downturn—rather than a bigger boom and inflation—may be in the offing.

Yesterday in his front page column in the Wall Street Journal Mr. Shea said that much of the expectation of boom and inflation is based on the projections of additional business investments in plant and equipment. Mr. Shea argues that these expectations based on past performance are likely to be wrong if the economy begins to level off or turn down. This happened in 1960 and it has happened before. He cites 1953–54 and 1957–58 as examples.

Shea argues that spending on plant and equipment tends to move with corporate profits and they have not increased rapidly in recent quarters and profits are not expected to go up if at all in the coming year.

In addition Shea says that tight credit may affect business plans more than presently anticipated. And I might add that today's news that inventory accumulation has slackened since the start of the year also suggests an absence of the hoarding spirit that would contribute to an inflation psychology.

Then too there is the performance of the stock market which continues to be anything but inflationary with its cautious downward slide over the past several weeks.

Altogether this adds up to a strong argument for the administration's cautious, moderate approach in its fiscal policy.

Yesterday Secretary of the Treasury Fowler again suggested that the Government should not slam on the brakes too fast and precipitate a depression by hasty and excessive tax action.

There is a strong case for the Secretary's position in Mr. Shea's column of yesterday as well as in other developments. I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled, "Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

There is a wide tendency to assume that because the newest projections for capital spending show a big gain for 1966 the boom in general business is safe through the year. Unfortunately, history shows that while heavy capital spending does of course contribute to the size of a boom, an optimistic projection for such spending cannot by itself prevent a general business recession from starting.

The latest projections, which came out the latter part of last week, forecast for all industries a spending increase in 1966 or 16 percent over 1945, to $60 billion or more. By quarters, the plans schedule a steady climb, from an annual rate of $55 billion in last year's fourth quarter to $57 billion in the current 3 months, to $59 billion yearly in the next quarter and to over $62 billion annually in the second half of the year.

However, in the past, one special characteristic of these estimates has proved to be that they can't be counted on if general business goes into a downturn. A typical example is what happened in 1960, when business turned down after reaching a high in May.

The projections made in March of that year, just 2 months before business hit its then highest level, were almost as favorable, relatively, as those just made. Compared with 1959's total spending of $32.5 billion the projections for all of 1960 indicated a gain of some 13 percent. Just as now, furthermore, the plans scheduled a steady climb, from an annual rate of $33.6 billion in the fourth quarter of 1959 to a rate of almost $38 billion in the second half of 1960.

However, after matching the projections reasonably well in the first half of 1960 the actual spending figures fell sharply below the forecasts in the second half. Second-quarter spending was at the rate of $36.3 billion, only $600 million less than forecast. But the third-quarter and fourth-quarter outlays were respectively $35.9 billion and $35.5 billion yearly, rates some $2 billion less than projected in March.

The projections were overoptimistic not only in March, before the general recession started, but also in June, the month after the general top was reached. The June survey foreshadowed third-quarter spending at $37.5 billion annually, only a bit less than the second-half rate forecast in March. The quarter's actual spending rate turned out to be $1.6 billion under the June forecast.

Not only are the projections not dependable when business turns down, but the actual spending figures seem to follow or at best coincide with general business activity, rather than influencing general business or swinging ahead of it. In 1960 the high for spending was in the second quarter, which included the month of the general business top, May. But while business declined sharply in the third and fourth quarters, the spending figures slipped gently, from $36.3 billion yearly in the second quarter to $35.9 billion and $35.5 billion in the next two 3-month periods. Then they dropped sharply in the first 1961 quarter to $33.9 billion a year, easing further in 1961's second quarter to $33.5 billion, although by that time general business was moving up strongly from its February low.

Similar sequences can be found in the recessions of 1953–54 and 1957–58. The high for capital spending each time was in the same quarter as the monthly high for general business, but the drop in spending in the following 3-month period was very mild. Only after general business had been falling for 6 months or more did capital spending follow it with substantial declines. In addition, spending in those recessions continued to decline for 3 to 6 months after business hit its lows.

Another characteristic of spending on plants and equipment is that it seems to move with corporate profits. From 1956 to 1961 capital spending and corporate profits after taxes remained quite steady although industrial production was advancing from 100 percent of the 1957–59 average to 110 percent. Corporate profits were $27.2 billion after taxes in 1956, fell to $22.3 billion in 1958, and were back up to $27.2 billion in 1961. Capital spending was $35.1 billion in 1956, fell to $30.5 billion in 1958, and recovered to $34.4 billion in 1961. Only when profits in 1962 began advancing strongly did the outlays follow suit.

Today the profit trend seems to be leveling off again. Corporate net after taxes grew from under $33 billion in 1963 to more than $37 billion in 1964 and to $44.5 billion last year. But the last substantial quarterly jump was a year ago, when the figure for the first 1965 quarter was up to a rate of $43.6 billion annually from a $37.8 billion rate in the preceding 3 months. Since then the quarterly figures have been $44.1 billion, $44.5 billion and something over $45 billion for the final 1965 quarter. For the current quarter a relatively small gain is expected.

Indeed, gains for the whole year are likely to be smaller than those of 1965. The latest Federal budget projections put corporate pretax profits in 1966 at $80 billion, an increase of only $3.2 billion from the fourth 1965 quarter, as against the much larger gain of $8.7 billion for all of 1965 over the rate in the fourth 1964 quarter.

This trend isn't conducive to big further increases in capital spending. Also tending to restrict such increases is the shortage of lendable funds which is causing interest rates to move ahead relentlessly. Last Thursday's boost in the basic bank rate on business loans to 5½ from 5 percent is frankly intended to induce borrowers to ask for less money or to postpone their borrowings. Those that want to borrow anyhow are being encouraged to turn to the bond market, and in that market a high credit electric utility, Appalachian Power, has just had to promise to pay 5.9 percent on a new issue. Such rates are calculated to give pause to any would be borrower.

Thus, the projections of sharp 1966 gains in capital spending cannot be counted on unless general business continues to advance, and further advances in both general business and capital spending are threatened by the leveling off indicated in corporate profits and by the paucity of available credit.

George Shea.

SIGNIFICANCE OF L.B.J. APPOINTMENT OF ANDREW BRIMMER TO FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a column in last night's Washington News, Whitney Young paid tribute to the appointment of Dr. Andrew Brimmer to the Federal Reserve Board.

As I said then, Mr. Brimmer appeared before our Senate Banking and Currency Committee for consideration. President Johnson has made a brilliant appointment. Dr. Brimmer has all the educational experience qualifications anyone could ask. He has demonstrated great ability in positions of heavy responsibility and he has an excellent judicious temperament—an ideal temperament for a Federal Reserve Governor.

But Mr. Young puts the Brimmer appointment in another dimension. As a fine representative of the so-called Negro revolution himself, Mr. Young is well equipped to comment on the significance the Brimmer appointment has in this sense.

Here is the way Young concludes this analysis:

> Men like Andrew Brimmer are as important to the ultimate success of the civil rights revolution as more dramatic incidents. Our youth must have prominent men with whom they can identify and strive to emulate. Our boxers, ballplayers, and entertainers have been a great source of pride, but when we see a Thurgood Marshall arguing a case before the Supreme Court or a Robert Weaver guiding the destinies of our cities, a chord is struck in the heart of many a young man or young woman who finds new meaning in his schoolwork and renewed pride in his race.
>
> Now there is Andrew Brimmer helping to guide the banking policy of this great Nation and taking his place of power in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Whitney Young entitled "One Giant Step" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One Giant Step

(By Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

Another victory in the so-called Negro revolution was announced recently by President Johnson. The event was the appointment of economist Andrew F. Brimmer, a Negro, to the Federal Reserve Board.

Naming mild-mannered, staccato-speaking, computer-brained Professor Brimmer to a position on the board of a staid banking organization may not seem dramatic. It doesn't rate TV coverage like the sit-ins and demonstrations, but it is, like those efforts, a move that can affect the very marrow of American life.

In this one giant step Mr. Brimmer enters the top circle of men who help steer the ship of state. Along with such movers and doers as Robert C. Weaver and Thurgood Marshall, Mr. Brimmer is in a position to affect the destiny of each and every American and millions of other citizens in the world.

The Board is the group of seven wise men who make the decisions in the sphere of finance. One of their jobs is to decide how much money will cost. This may sound strange, but it means that they decide the basic rate of interest on the money the Nation's banks must use, and the amount of interest they can pay on time deposits.

When the Fed, (as it is called) twiches, an earthquake shakes banks throughout the Nation. When the Fed raises the rate of interest on bank money, as it did last December, banks all across the land move up a notch the amount of interest they charge businessmen. This has the effect, later on, of raising the cost of goods, because the businessmen pass along the increased cost of money to us consumers.

And as prices go up, you and I tend to think twice before we spend money for nonessentials. This is one of the things the Board had in mind when it boosted the rate. It is one way the Fed combats inflation: by making money more "expensive" it takes some of it out of circulation, thereby dampening inflationary pressures.

With power to change money policy in the United States, the Reserve Board is extremely important. And so it is imperative that men of sound judgment and solid experience serve on this panel. Mr. Brimmer is, as President Johnson said, "a man of wide professional experience and great personal integrity, a man of moderation whose brilliance is combined with a sense of fairplay that I believe will enable him to serve with distinction."

I called Mr. Brimmer's appointment another victory in the Negro revolution, and so it is, but not in the way those who read only headlines are likely to understand. For this is one of those quiet, straight-to-the-core victories that comes only when a combination of forces and opportunities are present. Andrew Brimmer would not have received this appointment if he had not been magnificently qualified in every respect.

Men like Andrew Brimmer are as important to the ultimate success of the civil rights revolution as more dramatic incidents. Our youth must have prominent men with whom they can identify and strive to emulate. Our boxers, ballplayers, and entertainers have been a great source of pride, but when we see a Thurgood Marshall arguing a case before the Supreme Court or a Robert Weaver guiding the destines of our cities, a chord is struck in the heart of many a young man or young woman who finds new meaning in his schoolwork and renewed pride in his race.

Now there is Andrew Brimmer helping to guide the banking policy of this great Nation and taking his place of power in Washington.

WHAT A SCHOOL MILK MEANS TEST WOULD MEAN IN ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has proposed an 80-percent cut in the special milk program for schoolchildren. As a result, participation in the program would be limited to schools without a lunch program as well as to needy children. To be eligible to receive federally supported milk, the needy children would have to pass a means test.

Twice over the past few weeks I have discussed the forms now being used to qualify needy children for free lunches under the School Lunch Act. The reason? These forms would be used for 50 percent of the children receiving Federal assistance under the School Milk Act if the proposed changes are accepted by Congress. Children in schools having a lunch program could not receive Federal support for midmorning and midafternoon milk breaks unless their parents filled out these forms. In other words, the forms are the first step in applying a means test to children who want to receive milk in school with the aid of Federal dollars.

Today I would like to direct the Senate's attention to the form used in Atlanta, Ga. It is a bit more complicated than the form being used in Kansas City and the many forms being used in Missouri's towns and villages, which situation I have discussed in past days. The Atlanta form asks where the mother and father work. As used in some Atlanta schools, the form also asks, "If mother does not work, why not?" The form goes on to inquire, "Who cares for small children while mother works?" Other questions are, "Names of brothers or sisters working," "Their earnings per week," and "How many rooms does family live in?"

I submit, Mr. President, that very few low-income families would be willing to give this type of information. Consequently the number of children who would participate in the proposed school milk program for the needy would be very small indeed.

At the end of one of the forms used in the Atlanta schools is the statement "We expect good behavior and good attendance—no tardies—from each child." So, in effect, by giving school milk only to the needy—children who pass a means test—the Federal Government in this case would condition participation in the school milk program in Atlanta on comportment and good health. A sickly child with a bad attendance record, or an unruly child with a bad behavior record might well not qualify.

I am confident that my colleagues in the Senate will not permit harsh means tests to determine who is to participate in the school milk program and who is not.

GOLDEN JUBILEE YEAR OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is the golden jubilee year of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business. The hallmark of quality in any program in higher education is evidenced by full accreditation. In the field of business administration the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business performs this important function.

This association is recognized by the National Commission on Accrediting as the official accrediting agency for business administration in colleges and universities. Today, well over a hundred schools of business are accredited by this association. Organized in 1916, the association has fostered excellence in collegiate education for business for a half century.

Mr. President, I want to congratulate this association for its 50 years of effort in the promotion and improvement of collegiate education for business and I ask unanimous consent that a statement with reference to this golden anniversary of the association be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS

The American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business is celebrating its 50th year of service dedicated to the promotion of excellence in higher education for business. To appropriately mark this anniversary, the week of March 20, 1966, has been designated "Higher Education for Business Week."

The American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business is today a vital organization recognized by the National Commission on Accrediting as the official accrediting agency in higher education for business at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The association, today comprised of 117 member universities and colleges, began in 1916 as a dream shared by 3 prominent educators. On June 16, 1916, E. F. Gay, dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University; L. C. Marshall, dean of the College of Commerce and Administration of the University of Chicago; and A. E. Swanson, acting dean of the School of Commerce of Northwestern University, invited representatives from various universities to attend a meeting in Chicago, Ill., for the purpose of considering the formation of an association of collegiate schools of business. As a result of this meeting, at which 17 institutions of higher learning were present, the association was formed and a constitution adopted. The constitution declared the "object of the association is the promotion and improvement of higher business education in North America."

During the years from its birth to World War II, the association was primarily concerned with curriculum development and research. While brief statements of standards for membership were published from time to time, the association did not accept an accrediting role until after the war. It was during this period that the association first adopted the proposition that its function was to search for the best in the activities of its members while encouraging a high degree of experimentation. It was during this period also that the concept of a core area of business and economic courses was developed. This led to the fostering of business programs which gave proper balance to the professional character of business management and to the values of an excellent general education in the arts and sciences.

Throughout the war period and immediately thereafter, the association undertook a complete review of the total resources available for the improvement of business education, and a serious reevaluation of its own functions in the process. In this review, it became immediately obvious that, whether the association wished it or not, the increase in membership was causing it to be looked upon more and more as an accrediting agency. Of particular influence was the view of the public, as enactment of the GI bill led to the listing of member schools in many public documents.

Following a decision to accept the accrediting function, the association initiated a thorough revision of standards. In order to fulfill this new obligation and to perform this function effectively, the association also developed accrediting procedures which would avoid the problems experienced by accrediting agencies in other fields. The National Commission on Accrediting recognized the association as the sole accrediting agency in the field of business in 1953, and, since that time, the association has endeavored to serve both members and nonmembers through expanded services and the implementation of quality standards for accreditation.

The years from 1953 to the golden anniversary year of 1966 have been marked by the growth and development of AACSB in many respects. These include the impact of growth in membership, in extended influence, and in expanded services to education, business, and government. As AACSB comes to the close of its golden anniversary year, its members view with confidence the solid foundation laid for the continued promotion and improvement of collegiate education for business. There is always unfinished business in the preservation and maintenance of quality in education. In keeping with the heritage of the first 50 years, AACSB looks forward to the challenge of the future.

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I have always felt that the best word which could be used to describe the good citizen or good public official is the word "useful." I think that all of us hope that when our days are ended there will be those who will look at our lives and say that we were "useful."

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY has been useful to his fellow man and to his country in so many ways, in so many situations, on so many subjects. It will be said one day that he was a man who personified usefulness.

I think, however, in the troublesome situation involving Vietnam, Vice President HUMPHREY is carrying out the most important, most needed, most useful task of his life to date.

As a student of the history of our country, I continue to be amazed at how invariably, as history records, a man always comes forward who is uniquely fitted for a special responsibility, when the need is greatest. Vice President HUMPHREY is the right man at the right time and in the right place for the hard but necessary job of explaining to our own people and to the world what great and important principles are involved in Vietnam. No other man could do it quite so well.

He is uniquely qualified to help us see that the courageous and difficult role the United States has assumed in Vietnam will be viewed by historians one day as a critical and decisive point in American foreign policy and that the United States once again made the hard but right decision.

Most recently the Vice President rendered great service to the American people, representing our President and our country on his mission to nine Asian and Pacific nations. On March 1, 1966, the Vice President reported on that mission and on the Vietnamese situation in an excellent address to the National Press Club. The closing paragraph of that address by the Vice President is as follows:

> Let me close by making this prediction: 10 or 20 years hence, historians will mark Vietnam as a place where our Nation—and free peoples—were faced with a challenge by totalitarianism * * * and where they met the challenge.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Vice President's entire address may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 11, 1966

As you know, I returned a few days ago from a mission on behalf of the President to nine Asian and Pacific nations. Today I would like to share with you some of my conclusions about what is happening in that part of the world and about our policy there.

I will begin with words from Confucius: "If a man take no thought about what is distant, he will find sorrow near at hand."

The war in Vietnam is far more than Neville Chamberlain's "quarrel in a remote country among people of whom we know nothing."

It is the focus of a broader conflict which involves the whole Asian Continent. It also involves basic principles of international conduct.

I will return to this later.

Why are we in South Vietnam?

We are in South Vietnam to repel and prevent the success of aggression against the Government and the people of that country.

We are there to help assure the South Vietnamese people the basic right to decide their own futures, freely and without intimidation.

We are there to help those people achieve a better standard of living for themselves and their children.

We are there to help establish the principle that—in this nuclear age—aggression cannot be an acceptable means either of settling international disputes or of realizing national objectives.

If aggression is permitted to go unchecked, we cannot in good faith hold out much hope for the future of small nations or of world peace.

This is why we are in Vietnam.

We are not there to build an empire, to exercise domination over that part of the world, to establish military bases. We are not there to impose a government or way of life on other peoples.

That last point is worth dwelling on. The National Liberation Front claims to be an authentic nationalist movement, representing the overwhelming majority of the South Vietnamese people.

I agree with only one part of the National Liberation Front's contention: That it is a front.

There was a time, in the colonial days, when the old Vietminh movement contained authentic nationalists. (Many of them are now, I might add, members of the South Vietnamese Government.)

Today there are a few non-Communists in figurehead Vietcong posts. The nominal leader of the National Liberation Front, for example, is not known as a Communist. But most of the Vietcong soldiers—at least those defecting or captured—don't even know his name. (It is Nguyen Huu Tho.) But they all know Ho Chi Minh.

There are in the National Liberation Front leaders of alleged non-Communist parties. But they are parties without any apparent membership.

There are a good many well-known and recognized nationalists in South Vietnam outside the present government. Quite a few of them opposed the late President Diem and suffered in prison for their opposition.

To this day not one of these people has identified himself with the National Liberation Front. Yet it would be easy for any one of them to slip into Vietcong territory and do so.

None has. And you can be sure the National Liberation Front would tell the world if any one of them did.

The same is true of religious leaders, Buddhist and Catholic alike, of trade union officials, of student leaders. They differ widely among themselves—the Vietnamese are an articulate and argumentative people. But on one thing at least they are agreed: They don't want to live under Communist rule.

Twice in recent months the National Liberation Front has tried to demonstrate its strength by calling a general strike. This is a tactic which has been used very successfully by authentic nationlist movements elsewhere. But in Vietnam it was a failure: No popular support.

Contrary to what many people believe, you do not have to have overwhelming, or even majority, support to wage a guerrilla war. A determined, highly disciplined, trained, and well-organized minority can do that.

Without massive American aid to the Greek Government after the war, Communists would have taken over that country. Yet subsequent elections have shown them to be a small minority.

Without the aid of British and Gurkha troops over a period of many years, Communists would have won in Malaya. But subsequent elections have shown them to be an even smaller minority than their Greek comrades.

Without outside aid the overwhelming majority of the South Vietnamese people would have no hope of self-determination. They would be ruled by force and coercion, as they are today in areas under Vietcong control.

We are giving aid: military, political, economic, and social aid.

On the military front, the Vietnamese, together with American and allied troops, have made substantial progress in the past few months.

A series of defeats have been inflicted on main force units of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese soldiers.

Allied forces have been able to move in on Vietcong strongholds which had previously been immune to attack.

We have been able to open up stretches of highway and railroad which the Vietcong had long controlled.

Mobility and firepower of allied forces is impressive. Coordination among Allied forces has markedly improved.

Vietcong and North Vietnamese casualties are difficult to determine. But the best available figures show that they have doubled over 1964 and are now running several times current allied casualties.

The defection rate for Vietcong has also increased—partly because of a special South Vietnamese program to encourage defection. Defectors were being received at a rate of about 2,000 per month while I was in Saigon.

Defectors report shortages of food and low morale.

They report that the accuracy and impact of our artillery and bombing have been devastating.

But we don't have to rely on the word of defectors alone.

An article published in the January issue of the Vietcong theoretical journal and broadcast over its radio complains of difficulty and confusion in the ranks.

It says that Vietcong agents, having organized a protest movement in the villages, sometimes lose control of it, and even allow it to be transformed into an anti-Communist demonstration.

It warns that, although its agitators must use all sorts of people partially and temporarily in carrying out the struggle, they must wipe out the influence of reactionary elements belonging to various religious organizations and beware of trade union leaders.

A number of articles and broadcasts warn against defeatism and pacifism in the ranks.

General Giap has publicly complained from Hanoi that the American commitment to Vietnam has given rise to an extremely serious situation.

And an article recently published in Hanoi denounces "a small number of comrades * * * (who) see only difficulties and not opportunities (and) display pessimism, perplexity, and a reluctance to protracted resistance * * *."

Peiping, in more general terms, has acknowledged that "in some lands, revolutionary struggles have temporarily suffered reverses, and in others the political situation has taken an adverse turn."

It blames these setbacks on "imperialists, colonialists, and neo-colonialists, headed by the United States."

We have been subject to some harsh words by Asian Communists. But, as President Johnson has said: "We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed."

Things are better in Vietnam, militarily, than even a few months ago. Though we must be prepared for military setbacks and disappointments ahead, I believe we have reason for measured encouragement.

There is no substitute for the use of power in the face of determined attack. There are times when it must be used.

But the use of power, necessary as it is, can be counterproductive without accompanying political effort and the credible promise to people of a better life.

The peasants of Vietnam—and, indeed, of all Asia—are rebelling against the kind of life they have led for ages past. They want security. But they also want dignity and self-respect, justice, and the hope of something better in the future.

The Communists—in their drive for power—seek to use and subvert the hopes of these people. If they succeed, we could win many battles and yet lose the war.

The struggle will be won or lost in rural areas.

We have said this so often it has become a cliche. But it must now be proved by programs of action.

The Chinese have a saying, "Lots of noise on the stairs, but nobody enters the room."

There have been, as I am fully aware, many promises made to the peasants over many years—but painfully little performance.

The hour is late. The need for deeds as well as words is urgent.

That is why the Vietnamese Government, with our support, is pressing the other war with vigor—the war against poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance. This is the theme of the declaration of Honolulu—and I believe that the Honolulu Declaration could be a milestone in the history of our policy in Asia.

They are beginning in earnest the struggle to win and hold the allegiance of the people who live in rural South Vietnam, in more than 2,600 villages and approximately 11,000 hamlets—villages and hamlets subject to years of Vietcong subversion and terror.

This is hard and dangerous work. In 1965 alone, 354 of the people engaged in it were assassinated, and something like 500 wounded.

I do not for a moment minimize the practical difficulties of carrying out the social revolution to which the Republic of Vietnam is now committed.

Vietnam has experienced a quarter of a century of almost constant warfare, generations of colonial domination, and a millennium of Mandarin rule.

History has endowed it with no full and readymade administrative apparatus to undertake such a monumental task. It will have to be carefully built. But there are a number of well-trained and educated high- and middle-level officials to form the nucleus for this effort.

The important thing is to begin, and this the present Government has done. Responsibility has been fixed, a spirited attack on inertia and corruption has begun. There is determination that the whole chain of social and political action will be conceived and administered with hard-headedness and efficiency—beginning in the ministries in Saigon and going right down to the village and hamlet level. High standards of performance have been set and are expected. And we are working with the South Vietnamese Government at each level to help see that the product matches the expectation.

South Vietnamese cadre in hamlets and villages will be doubled to more than 45,000 by the end of this year. Today, they are still outnumbered by Vietcong activists. But the gap is steadily closing.

Today the South Vietnamese Government—late in the day, it is true—is trying to meet the pressing needs of the country. Prime Minister Ky was candid with me when he said "Our social revolution is 12 years late—but not too late."

Some 800,000 people have fled to government-controlled areas in South Vietnam during the past year and a half. Almost 300,000 have already been resettled. The South Vietnamese Government, with allied help, is working to house, feed, and clothe these refugees.

In the countryside, schools and hospitals are being built.

In Saigon, a new constitution is being framed and the Government is working toward a goal of national elections by the end of next year.

In short, a forced-draft effort is being made to create a new society to replace the old. It deserves and requires our support.

Meanwhile, the country faces staggering economic problems—the most severe of which is the problem of inflation.

Despite today's inflation, the long-term economic prospect is good. There is new business investment in new industries. South Vietnamese land is rich and productive. The people are industrious, ambitious, and quick to learn new skills—and they are learning. Communications, port facilities, and transportation are being expanded.

But full economic development certainly will not take place until an environment of violence and conflict is replaced by one of stability and peace.

My observations of Vietnam are not the product of a weekend visit to Saigon.

To be sure, my visit there was informative. It gave meaning to what I had read and to the deliberations of government in which I participated.

As student, professor; Senator and Vice President, I have been intellectually and directly involved in matters of national security and foreign policy. I have read too many books, attended too many hearings and meetings, and participated in too many discussions at the highest levels of government to arrive at any instant solutions to complex problems or to be naively optimistic about a troubled world.

Having said this, I have reason to bring home a message of encouragement about Vietnam.

I know that our opponents are diligent and determined. They are well organized, and in many areas have a long headstart on us.

Thus far they have not responded to our unconditional offer of negotiation—an offer which still stands—nor have they responded to the good offices of other nations, of the United Nations, of the Pope and other religious leaders who seek to bring the conflict to the conference table.

And they have not responded, I am sure, because they still believe that time is on their side—that we will ultimately tire and withdraw, either abandoning South Vietnam or accepting a settlement which will give the Vietcong an open road on one of its three publicly declared routes to victory.

The first two routes—a general uprising and the famous Mao-Giap three-stage guerrilla war—have been stymied by resistance of the South Vietnamese Government and her allies.

The third declared route to power is through a coalition government.

Should there be any doubt in Hanoi, let me make it once more clear: We will neither tire nor withdraw.

We will remain in Vietnam until genuinely free elections can be held.

If the Vietcong, in those elections, gain honestly a voice in government, so be it. But prior to elections, this government will not be a party to any settlement which amounts to a pre-election victory for Communists which cannot be won at the ballot box.

I, for one, doubt that the South Vietnamese people will give that victory to the Communists. No Communist government has ever come to power through free election, and I doubt that one ever will.

We will pursue, with patience and persistence, the difficult course we have set for ourselves—the course neither of withdrawal nor of massive escalation, but of measured use of strength and perseverance in defense both of ally and principle.

As the President has said: "* * * the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open—to help the men of Hanoi when they have the wisdom to be ready."

At the beginning today I said that the conflict in Vietnam was the focus of a wider struggle taking place in Asia.

During my recent mission I was struck by the depth of feeling, among almost all Asian leaders, that Asian communism had direct design on their national integrity and independence.

Almost all cited examples of subversion, and in many cases direct military involvement by Communist troops, within their countries.

And none—without any exception—questioned our involvement in Vietnam. There were questions about aspects of our policy there, but none concerning the fact of our presence there and our resistance to aggression.

Among the leaders with whom I spoke, there was repeatedly expressed a deep concern as to whether our American purpose, tenacity and will were strong enough to persevere in southeast Asia. Public debate in America was sometimes interpreted as a weakening of purpose. I emphasized the firmness of our resolve but also our dedication to the rights of free discussion and dissent.

For we know that John Stuart Mill's advice remains valid: "We can never be sure that the opinion we are endeavoring to stifle is a false opinion; and if we were sure, stifling it would be an evil still."

Asian communism may be a subject for discussion here. In Asia, it is a clear and present danger.

No single independent nation in Asia has the strength to stand alone against that danger.

I believe that the time may come when Asian communism may lose its fervor, when it may lose some of its neuroses, when it may realize that its objectives cannot be gained by aggression.

But, until that time, I believe we have no choice but to help the nations of southeast Asia strengthen themselves for the long road ahead.

I also said, at the beginning today, that some very basic principles of international conduct were under test in Vietnam. Some people think not.

Of them, I ask this: Were we to withdraw from Vietnam under any conditions short of peace, security, and the right of self-determination for the South Vietnamese people, what conclusions would be drawn in the independent nations of Asia? In Western Europe? In the young, struggling countries of Africa? In the nations of Latin America beset by subversion and unrest? What conclusions would be drawn in Hanoi and Peiping?

I have heard it said that our vital national interests are not involved in South Vietnam as they are in Europe.

I heard it said 30 years ago that our vital national interests were not involved in Europe as they were in the Western Hemisphere.

This time we cannot afford to learn the hard way. No continent on this earth is any longer remote from any other.

And, may I add, the principles of national independence and self-determination should be no less dear to us in Asia than they are in Europe.

We live in a time when man has finally achieved the ultimate in technological progress. Man today possesses the means to totally destroy himself.

Yet our time also offers man the possibility, for the first time in human history, of achieving well-being and social justice for hundreds of millions of people who literally live on the outside of civilization.

Being an optimist, I have some faith in the ability of man to see this safely through.

And I, for one, believe that it will not be seen safely through if those who seek power by brute force have reason to believe that brute force pays.

Finally, may I add two additional observations.

First, Asia is astir with a consciousness of the need for Asian initiatives in the solution of Asia's problems. Regional development and planning are increasingly being recognized as necessary for political and economic progress. The power of nationalism is now tempered by a growing realization of the need for cooperation among nations. Asians seek to preserve their national identity. They want gradually to create new international structures. But they want to pursue such aims themselves. They want foreign assistance when necessary, but without foreign domination.

Second, the American people, as well as their leaders, need to know more about Asia in general and Communist China in particular, the relationships of that nation with her neighbors in Asia and the Pacific; the nature of Chinese Communist ideology and behavior; and the operational apparatus of Communist parties under Peiping leadership or influence. The intellectual and political resources not only of the United States, but of the entire free world, should be mobilized for this effort.

In this regard, I want to commend the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for its hearings on China.

We have not set ourselves any easy tasks. But the tasks and responsibilities of the most powerful nation in the history of the earth are not, cannot be, will not be easy.

Let me close by making this prediction: Ten or twenty years hence, historians will mark Vietnam as a place where our Nation—and free peoples—were faced with a challenge by the totalitarianism and where they met the challenge.

THE FATE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE AND THE POWER OF THE RISING ACADEMIC ELITOCRACY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Earl J. McGrath, the distinguished former Commissioner of Education, is now affiliated with the Institute of Higher Education of Teachers College, Columbia University. He has ready for publication a book which I believe will be of great interest to Senators, as well as the education community.

Chapter 3 of the book, entitled "The Fate of the Liberal Arts College and the Power of the Rising Academic Elitocracy," is, in my judgment, particularly stimulating. I commend Mr. McGrath for his distinguished service to education and I ask unanimous consent that the chapter of this forthcoming publication be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FATE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE AND THE POWER OF THE RISING ACADEMIC ELITOCRACY

From the beginning of time all societies have had dominant classes of various sorts. Although there have been notable individual exceptions, through most of recorded history scholars as a guild have usually not become intimately involved in the resolution of public issues nor in the determination of the course of social movement. To be sure, the early institutions of higher learning both here and abroad trained many of the functionaries of church and state. Many of the leading figures in the Massachusetts colony were sons of Harvard. But the professoriate itself has through the ages largely remained within the academic community. Indeed, it manifested its separateness in its claim to a considerable range of specific legal immunities and social privileges. Until recently in the history of the United States, although colleges and universities educated many of the leaders in society, they did not produce a dominant social class. In fact, many of our citizens considered the highly educated not especially well equipped for positions of public leadership and, except within a portion of their own small coterie, even in recent decades the judgment of academics on social problems has been questioned. One need only refer to the small so-called brain trust of the Roosevelt administration to document this point.

Now, however, the swelling company of the learned and the producers of knowledge is becoming a new select social group, comprising not only the graduates but more especially the members of the academic community. A socially powerful class of extensively, although not necessarily ideally educated technologists, is emerging in American society. I do not refer to the fact that an increasing percentage of our people over 25 years of age hold academic degrees. They do, and I applaud this striking evidence of educational commitment unprecedented through the ages of man. I refer rather to an exclusive and increasingly dominant set within the expanding group of those who have had a higher education.

The members of the emergent group of the so-called "well educated," I would name the rising elitocracy. The phrase derives from two ancient words meaning "the chosen" and "the ruling" or "the dominant." The members of this special class can be observed in the prestige institutions of higher education, in government positions and advisory bodies, in the philanthropic foundations, and in public affairs generally although not predominantly in elective office. Even the most desultory review of the membership of educational advisory committees of foundations, corporations, the State and Federal Governments, and the policymaking corps within educational associations reveals the relative exclusiveness of this group and the potential of its influence. The same names tend to appear over and over again. In fact, they form a type of interlocking directorate and a consolidation of control that in industry and commerce has been frowned upon by citizens generally if not prohibited by statute and court decision.

The characteristics of this new elitocracy resemble those of the exclusive social club except that the former are probably more rather than less limited in the diversity of their community contacts and preoccupations. As a group they would score in the top ranks on standardized tests of academic ability. On the average their capacity for abstract thought would be above normal. In terms of their ability to absorb theoretical knowledge quickly and to use it in the manipulation of concepts and generalizations within limited areas of learning, most of this company would be classified as intellectuals. Typically, their grades in school and college would have been high, particularly in the specialized fields of learning in which they excelled. A significant percentage of this choice group would have earned their degrees in undergraduate and graduate programs at the prestige institutions whose admissions standards tend to attract a scholastically advanced and homogenous student body. The "name" institutions from which they graduate would consider as one criterion of their excellence the thousands of applicants they turn away, students who, it should be observed, often differ little in any measurable respect from those they accept.

Although on this occasion time does not permit an inclusive review of the influence of the elitists on our social and political institutions, we are concerned with the influence of this group on one class of institutions, the 800 or more independent liberal arts colleges, and their more than 800,000 students, and the consequences of the ascendance of an elitist class on our citizens' opportunity to develop their abilities to the fullest. The rising academic aristocracy make their influences on the independent liberal arts colleges felt by various direct and indirect means. Indirectly, through positions which they occupy as advisers to Government and industry, they affect the purposes and the well-being of colleges by establishing policies external to these institutions on scholarships, fellowships, exchanges of faculties and students here and abroad, grants and loans for buildings, laboratory equipment, and libraries, and gifts for current operating expenses. Through the influence of a relatively small percentage of the total academic community unprecedentedly large Government appropriations, corporate gifts, and personal philanthropy go to a correspondingly small percentage of the institutions of higher education and to their students.

I believe that the education profession, to say nothing of the uninitiated general public, is not aware of the influence of the elitists on public policy or of elitist attitudes and suppositions on our traditional educational practices. Let me indicate a few of these assumptions. First, the elitocracy appear to believe in the rule of a few—particularly an aristocracy of brains—in contrast to the rule of the many. Second, they are interested only in developing a few prestigious colleges and universities rather than improving many institutions. Third, they are interested in only one characteristic—abstract intelligence—as an indicator of personal worth. And fourth, they are interested only in educational specialization—not in educational breadth. Because these ideas strike so seriously at our need for educated men in America, I want to consider them one by one.

THE RULE OF THE MANY OR THE RULE OF THE FEW

By and large, our citizens do not object that an intellectually superior group of their countrymen occupy governmental or other positions of influence and decision in American society. But most of them, including our intellectuals as a group, have rejected the concept that a small percentage of citizens possess special capabilities by virtue of their natural endowment to formulate public policy and to direct the lives of their contemporaries. Even those among us who have not articulated a social and political philosophy very precisely have embraced the idea that all citizens, regardless of their ability, social position, or other accidental differences of life, should have equal rights and responsibilities in the determination of public policy—and within reasonable limits the privilege of aspiring to positions of public responsibility. One of the obvious reasons for this egalitarian view, recognized by the humble as well as the exalted, is the fact that wisdom and knowledge are not synonymous terms, and intelligence, integrity, and concern for the common good are not invariable concomitants.

It may well be that the complex and rapidly changing condition of modern life, and of the knowledge required to live it, now require a reexamination of the entire philosophical basis of our social and political institutions. But I do not believe the answer lies in the development, as the elitist philosophy suggests, of a small aristocracy of brains. Some observers of the evolution of the human enterprise have remarked that all societies which have achieved greatness—Greece, Rome, and Elizabethan England, to take only three examples from Western culture—have been aristocracies. That is, their directive classes have been exclusive, small, powerful, and to a considerable extent, self-perpetuating if not self-serving. Enamored of this type of social organization, some theorists have even argued that individuals can rise to high levels of achievement and leadership only on the burdened backs of their less fortunate fellow human beings. What these proponents of social dominance and aristocratic preferment seem to overlook is the fact that all these elitist societies have either decayed or completely disappeared from the human scene. The reasons for the inability of these older social organizations to survive in the evolution of human culture are numerous, fugitive, and complex. But their decline has undoubtedly been hastened by their failure to capitalize on the full resources of all their people, to exploit differing abilities to the maximum, and to involve all citizens fully in the processes of policy determination and social betterment.

Other nations only now are perceiving the evils and the social impoverishment which flow from caste and class systems that disregard and suppress human potential or that classify human beings into two groups, those of promise and those of irredeemable inadequacy. In America we have long since passed the time when only a small percentage of the people, highly educated, could constitute the higher classes while the lower classes could encompass the great mass of the uneducable. Some say that our culture can be preserved only if we cultivate and make maximum use of the best among our people, and that we must concentrate our resources on genius and the extraordinarily gifted. But I would suggest that the best be more broadly considered than this.

The many criticisms of the quality of American education to the contrary notwithstanding, the evidence is that in terms of educated native ability more citizens in American society reach higher levels than the members of the relatively small select groups of the earlier cultures which achieved greatness. In spite of all the pressures toward conformity, practicality, and anti-intellectualism the percentage of our people whose minds have been cultivated for imaginative thought, social and technological invention, and innovation in all aspects of life is immensely larger than in any other society, ancient or modern. The preservation of our culture and its continuous intellectual and spiritual renewal will be greatly enhanced by a continuation of our thus far irresistible tendency to extend educational opportunity.

I submit, therefore, that to the degree that the idea of an aristocracy has any appeal at all it should be conceived in terms of a large rather than a restricted company of citizens. Even now, a large company of able and devoted men and women are available for positions of public trust and influence. An objective analysis of the abilities, the academic and social backgrounds, the dedication to the public good, an interest in and devotion to the betterment of human life, or any other measure of personal quality of our citizens would surely reveal a great reservoir of unused talent and wisdom which a democratic society can profligately waste only at its own peril. The membership of the elitocracy, in short, ought to be deliberately expanded, not only to level its rising academic, social, and political barriers which are so repugnant to our people, but to draw into the dominant stream of social thought and action the host of individuals now unexploited for the public good.

THE FEW COLLEGES VERSUS THE MANY

The interest of the elitists in a small proportion of our citizens explains their concern for only a limited proportion of educational institutions. Their educational philosophy was intimated several months ago in a public address by a prominent educator, who proposed the formation of an association of the top fifty or so undergraduate colleges and a league of about the same number of top graduate and professional schools. Presumably this plan would destroy the idea that those who hold similar degrees from other institutions have had an education of equal quantity. Through the mere creation of such associations, signalized by appropriate publicity, the graduates of these superior institutions would in time be recognized by the institutional name on their diplomas as a select company of Americans. Since many of the prestigious liberal arts colleges enroll relatively few students, the aggregate of this elite circle would constitute only a small percentage of those who annually receive diplomas from over 2,100 American institutions of higher education, and an infinitesimally small proportion of their age group in the population at large.

This proposal is arresting not because of its novelty, for the utterances of others have revealed similar propensities, but because of its uncommon ingenuousness. It clearly illustrates the elitist philosophy that talent should be concentrated in selected colleges, while the masses are shunted off to less worthy institutions. Presently, however, many students of high ability attend and make distinguished records in institutions which would not fall in the select 25 or 50. It is true that as measured by standardized tests the best students in some of the weakest institutions hardly match the weakest in the best institutions. But many colleges and universities of only modest national repute attract and graduate a significant number of very able young people year after year. For a century or more, many of these centers of learning have produced persons who later reached high levels of accomplishment in all walks of life, including the field of scholarship.

No thoughtful person would oppose any well-conceived plan calculated to assure the maximum development of those members of our society who demonstrate high potential ability. Yet any classification system which stigmatized or depreciated the socially valuable work of the majority of our institutions or placed their graduates in a category of second-class academic citizenship would not be in the public interest. Such a practice would handicap their graduates in many obvious ways. It would also tend to draw off to other places even the modest percentage of the very capable which they now attract, thus reducing the intellectual climate and the stimulating atmosphere which now exist.

A more defensible national policy in terms of social investment, institutional vitality, and personal equity would be one which recognizes students' individual differences in interests and abilities and, by strengthening institutional faculties, facilities, and programs, provides a broad range of educational experiences both within and among institutions. Such a policy might even continue the concentration of students of high academic records in a limited number of institutions which are now becoming "prep" schools for the professional and graduate divisions of the "name" universities, but it would seem an action of doubtful public policy to nurture the idea among our people that either these restrictive institutions or their students constitute an identifiably superior class.

This elitist philosophy has been reflected within the Federal Government by the Government's treatment of various types of academic institutions. The hundreds of millions of Federal dollars for research flow primarily to a few universities and to a few departments within them, and often only to a select group within these departments. This is such an old, well-known, and fully documented story that a repetition of the details would be superfluous. It is enough to report the remarks of a recent commentator about Federal research and development funds to the effect that: "The top 10 universities on the list of recipients soak up nearly 40 percent of the funds: the top 20, nearly 60 percent and 100 universities account for all but 10 percent of the funds." Hence the vast majority of institutions, including even the old and reputable independent liberal arts colleges, receive only a trifling share of these grants. Yet this aid to institutions and the fellowships and scholarships provided to students through Government funds come from taxes resting broadly on the people, and if the general public knew the facts, they would doubtless consider it a matter of the utmost national significance that the many respectable colleges outside the gigantic centers of learning become more equitable beneficiaries of the grants-in-aid of the U.S. Government.

President Johnson himself has publicly expressed his awareness of the growing difficulties which the small colleges are encountering and the necessity to preserve their traditional teaching functions at a high level of efficiency. He has stated that he intends to do something about their present privations and the debilitating social consequences which they entail. If he and the Members of Congress who make the appropriations to aid higher education are to succeed in their efforts to provide the various forms of financial assistance to the colleges and yet assure the continuance of their unique function of instructing undergraduate American youth in the liberal arts and sciences, these officers of Government will have to gain a wider spectrum of opinion from educators. An examination of the lists of advisers to the executive branches and of witnesses in the legislative committees reveals that at present there is a disproportionate representation from the institutions which are already the special beneficiaries of Federal largess. Too few represent the small liberal arts colleges themselves, their administrative officers, their dedicated teachers, and their successful alumni.

The serious consequences of such elitist policies have recently been illustrated by discussions about one particular group of institutions: the colleges and universities attended predominantly by Negroes. As my own study shows, these institutions, in terms of the preparation of their faculties, the previous education of their students, their courses of study, and their physical facilities, extend over the entire range of the total company of American institutions of higher education. Some rank with the best. But on the average they fall below the average of the aggregate. Because of educational privation for which they cannot be held responsible, both faculty members and students, regardless of their potential ability, often fall below desirable levels of academic accomplishment.

The elitists, both white and Negro—many of whom would classify themselves as liberals in politics, economics, and social outlook—have their usual solution for these institutions and for the enhancement of higher education for Negro youth. Their proposals basically reflect their aristocratic philosophy. They would close a large percentage of the predominantly Negro colleges or classify them as so inferior as to be unworthy of aid; they would raise the standards among those which remain to the point of excluding all but the top achievers; they would draw off the ablest of the Negro faculty members through faculty recruitment policies in predominantly white institutions; some encourage promising Negro youth who complete graduate degrees not to return to their undergraduate schools as faculty members because they would thus lose status among the elite academic class. In short, consistent with their attitudes toward all American higher education, they would achieve excellence in the aggregate of predominantly Negro colleges by closing most of them, elevating a few to high status, selecting students more discriminatingly in those which remain, and turning away all other Negro youth to take their position in the lower levels of society and occupations, as has been their lamentable lot in the past. However much such proposals would gain for the ablest Negro youth, they would only perpetuate for the rest the forms of social discrimination that have shackled their forebears.

A more suitable procedure for improving the opportunity for higher education for Negro youth, and indeed for those of every race, would be consistent with our earlier egalitarian philosophy and practices of higher education; namely, to preserve as many existing institutions as possible; make every private and public effort to improve their programs and services; keep the standards of admissions at realistic levels; provide special instruction for those who, because of inadequate earlier education or slow learning, need it; and by these devices integrate the entire educational community. These policies will do more for youth of all races than any plan calculated to identify either institutions or young people of extraordinary ability and single them out for educational, social, and economic preferment while at the same time closing the door of opportunity to those who, on the basis of measures of doubtful validity at a given moment in their lives, seem to be less promising.

INTELLECT VERSUS CHARACTER

The upper-class academicians, especially those prominent in public affairs and dominant in the universities, who recently have come to occupy positions of greatly enhanced status and influence in the elitocracy, are acquiring far-reaching though not yet obvious social power by determining who shall or shall not be admitted to higher education and thus to the preferred occupations and positions in public life. They now possess the potential to select future leaders in government, industry, and public affairs from the upper ranks of high school, college, and university students and to close out thousands of others, who, studies show, will on the average be no less successful in any sphere of life. This pervasive and increasing power seems to them now to bring utopia within reach. But in selecting the putatively superior students, these academicians are prone to neglect most other talents beyond academic ability and neglect most other measures than grade point averages.

The pursuasive power of the elitist school of thought exhibited itself recently when a representative of a nationally known company asked my advice on ways in which his firm could aid higher education. I suggested that this corporation provide scholarships for young people whose high school grades fell somewhat below the top 10 to 15 percent. Under existing barriers to higher education the members of this group often find it difficult to obtain financial aid in spite of the fact that in the opinion of their teachers they possess qualities of mind and personality characteristic of the lives of successful men such as dedication, presever-ance, and a concern for the welfare of others. This proposal initially met with hearty acceptance. But, alas, after consultation with some of the ranking members of the academic hierarchy, the company decided that its financial support of such a scholarship program might suggest its endorsement of an educationally second-rate enterprise.

Some of our elitists do not seem to realize that high grades at one level of education guarantee little other than high grades at succeeding levels. The fact is, as I pointed out earlier, that those who have made the most careful and objective investigations of the relationship between academic success and any other aspects of personal, professional, or social achievement find that test scores and grades at present bear little relation to any measures of adult accomplishment. Consequently, some informed and thoughtful observers are questioning whether a broader "mix" of students in terms of ability, attitudes, values, and life goals might not be better than a more homogeneous academic community.[1]

Roger Ricklefs, in a survey of innovations in admissions practices reported in the Wall Street Journal for December 23, 1965, entitled "Diverse Campuses: More Colleges Seek Students With Unusual Backgrounds, Talents," shows that a number of even those institutions which have high admissions standards now recognize the need to increase the diversity of their students.

Despite these few encouraging signs of reforms in admissions requirements, the overemphasis on abstract intelligence continues within most of our leading institutions. No educational philosophy or practice based solely on intellectual ability can possibly be adequate to the needs of our times or the perpetuation and enrichment of our culture. As Paul H. Davis says, "There are other types of superior students":

"Dwight Eisenhower couldn't get into the Naval Academy. Herbert Hoover flunked bonehead English. Winston Churchill's early grades weren't high. Gifted learning ability is an asset, but quick learning doesn't insure individual superiority. Constructive and critical thinking are also qualities of superior students."[2]

Any view that intellect and character are mutually exclusive would be rejected by genuine intellectuals, but some advocates of college admission and classification on the basis of intellectual ability as represented by grade averages and test scores would seem to believe either that formal education has no concern with character or that it is an imponderable with which they do not have the time to concern themselves. Yet in any modern concept of social excellence, character as evidenced in personal conduct and in social relationships must be an essential ingredient. Plato's conception of education has a great advantage over some recent thoughts on the subject because he merged the cultivation of the intellect with the nurturing of character. He was concerned with the conduct of life. The educated man, he said, "will learn how to order his own house in the best manner, and he will be able to speak and act for the best in the affairs of state."

Except in institutions related to some religious body, one hears little discussion of the impact of local educational policies and procedures on character. In fact, the large well-known institutions become more and more like their archetypes on the continent where the cultivation of the intellect is the almost exclusive objective. One would have to search diligently for lectures, discussions, or examinations concerned with problems of morality, with the topics of justice, goodness, propriety, the subjects, the aspects of human behavior with which much of the great writings of the world—philosophic, humanistic, and religious—were preoccupied. Yet it is with these very matters and the failure of their mentors in the classroom to reveal any firm views on them that young people today are concerned. They search often in the dark not only for the essential knowledge but for the traits of character on which the foundation of a meaningful and satisfying life can be built.

One of America's most perceptive men, Henry Allen Moe, speaking of the need for a more embracing concept of aristocracy in our centers of learning, holds that educated citizens must combine superiority of character with excellence of mind as, he observes, the Greek philosophers did. Touching specifically on Sir Richard Livingstone's statement that the university education of the Athenian was concerned with the conduct of life, he said:

"One could wish it were a larger part than it is of the university and college education of midtwentieth century Americans. There are now about 500,000 of them, college and university graduates, each year. Multiply them by 40 years of their post-university lives, add the millions we already have, and the total will number 30 million or so. And that would be enough of an aristocracy—if they were aristocrats of brains and character—and would be the largest aristocracy there ever has been."[3]

I am convinced that one major reason why American higher education has been free from exclusive concern with narrow abstract intelligence has been the fact that education in this country has been legally controlled by lay boards of trustees. In the European lands in which the members of the profession have dominated higher education (and often that of the select secondary schools as well) the avenues to advanced schooling, and the social status and benefits which it confers, have been closed to all but a small percentage of youth.[4] Yet while other nations move toward a more egalitarian philosophy and practice of education, a school of thought is rapidly growing in this country that American higher education would be elevated in quality if the members of the academic profession had exclusive responsibility for the making of academic policy. The social implications of this idea are extensive, grave, and largely unexposed to public view.

---

[1] Everyone who wants sincerely to understand the significance of institutional categorization and highly selective admissions policies based on academic grades should examine the literature on these and related subjects. A good beginning can be made by reading The American College, edited by Nevitt Sanford, which contains a collection of essays and reports by some of the leaders in research on problems of American higher education. A less comprehensive but no less provocative and insightful short critique on the increasingly narrowing selective admissions policies in one institution came several years ago from the pen of Wilbur J. Bender entitled "The Top-One-Percent Policy," Harvard Alumni Bulletin, Sept. 30, 1961.

[2] Paul H. Davis, "Formula for Significant Survival of Private Liberal Arts Colleges" (Philadelphia: Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities, 1966).

[3] Henry Allen Moe, "On the Need for an Aristocracy," address before the Cosmos Club on receiving the Second Cosmos Club Award, Apr. 5, 1965.

Only one consequence of the doctrine of faculty control of educational policy is directly relevant to this discussion: the impact of faculty decisions on admissions policies. Under this prerogative which academic bodies are exercising with mounting absolutism and a pseudoscientific nicety, the standards of admission are rising in some institutions to the point of changing the essential purposes for which their founders and generations of successors gave their dedication and their substance. Consequently, thousands of American youth, often the sons and daughters of alumni who rank high on any measure of personal achievement or social contribution, are finding themselves excluded from their parents' alma mater by criteria of potential about as reliable as an elastic tape measure.

One may question whether the motivation of the faculty springs from a desire to give the students an education of higher quality than their predecessors received, or to enhance the prestige of the institution within the emerging academic class-conscious society. Whatever the object the end result in most instances will be a transformation of institutions without the public sanction that has been traditional in American society. Under our system the trustees of institutions of higher education, both public and private, have been legally and morally responsible for determining the purposes, the programs, and the character of education offered. To the extent that they surrender or nullify this trust by delegating powers which are used to change the essential character of the institution, they violate their charge. It is time for trustees and the philanthropists and taxpayers who support our institutions of higher education to examine the changing admissions policies and the flimsy foundation on which they rest. Those whose children do not rank in the upper 10 or 15 percent ought to be particularly concerned, for it is their youngsters who will most often be excluded from the institutions of their choice if the elitist philosophy prevails.

BREADTH VERSUS DEPTH

The fourth and final postulate of the elitist philosophy that demands analysis concerns the breadth of education needed by the leaders of our society. Will our colleges and universities produce broadly educated men and women for socially and morally sensitive leadership in the sphere of public life? Or will they send out narrowly trained specialists, socially useful within the confined limits of their knowledge and skills, but no better and perhaps less well prepared than many other members of this populous democracy to produce and act upon what Walter Lippmann called a public philosophy? An examination of recent trends in our prestige institutions regarding their curriculum practices, their choice of faculty members, and the vocationalization of their graduation requirements even in the conventional liberal arts disciplines, raises serious questions whether their graduates could be expected to formulate and execute distinctively superior policies in the domain of public issues.

As early as 30 years ago, Henry Seidel Canby, one of Yale's most celebrated and beloved teachers, concluded that even then, our leading institutions of higher education were failing to educate such leaders. Speaking of faculty members at that time he said, "They taught physics for physicists, biology for biologists, history for historians. They were not interested in the American youth who was not going to be a specialist, a professor, but only a leader of industrial, commercial, political America." How much better is American higher education meeting the need for broadly gaged leaders today? If the observations of Christopher Jencks, mentioned in the first lecture, are accurate, and I believe they are, the situation with regard to the general education of young people for the broad responsibilities of life as citizens and individuals rather than as technically competent workers has worsened in many of the prestige institutions—not improved. Yet the advocates of an identifiable institutional and individual elite view the current state of education as desirable. They see a rosy prospect in which those of singular academic accomplishment, carefully selected for superior advanced education and for positions of leadership in the professions, in government, in commerce and industry, and in public affairs, can solve the grave and frustrating problems of human life and destiny not only for themselves but for their less well educated contemporaries.

Anyone even modestly acquainted with the history of ideas knows that such an alluring prospect is not new. In fact, it is as old as Western Philosophy. Plato in "The Republic" envisaged an ideal society ruled by philosopher kings, whose formal education and life experiences were to qualify them to move society toward proper goals through the establishment of wise laws and prudent customs. Plato's perfect social organization never came into being. There are now those who believe that some semblance of it is within each. Those who see a cheering analogy in the present ascendance of an intellectual aristocracy should, however, be reminded that the philosopher kings were to be specifically prepared for their demanding public responsibilities. This preparation was to include years of education in social and political philosophy, the use of dialectic to reach considered judgments on the nature and destiny of man and his world, and extended practical experience in human affairs. Moreover, under Plato's system, adequate time for leisure, for reflective analysis, and for systematic thought, in contrast to the current governmental hurly-burly and shooting from the hip, were to assure deliberate action on the fateful issues involved in the determination of what is good and just and proper.

Plato's ideal contrasts sharply with the contemporary situation. First, many of our brightest students at the prestigious institutions have had no advanced general education designed to provide the knowledge, cultivate the skills, or instill the traits of character required in the formulation of large public policy. Second, unlike Plato's intellectually accomplished social leaders, they have generally been required to devote little of their learning time to a consideration of the characteristics of the good society or the just man. On the contrary, their vocational success and their social status stem increasingly from the very reverse; that is, from specialized narrow education related to a specific occupation, particularly in the technologies or the sciences. Even in the social sciences and the humanities, however, many students increasingly specialize in restricted branches of learning which possess no patent efficacy in preparing them for the formulation of wise and compassionate public policy. These institutions, therefore, in terms of their educational practices and objectives do not seem to be the ideal to be emulated generally. A broader learning would seem to promise more both to the individual and to society.

During the past quarter century many educators made thoughtful attempts to design a suitable general education for college students. In the main these promising efforts have now turned out to be abortive. Yet they were not abandoned as educationally unsound in terms of the cultivation of genuine intellectual interests, in the things of the mind, in opening up the broad and delightful world of learning—and in producing a more enlightened citizenry. Instead, they were pushed aside by the academic specialists, motivated by proprietary interests in their own subjects and in departmental expansion. As a result, American higher education is now moving steadily, especially in the so-called excellent centers of learning, toward earlier and narrower specialization and the cultivation of expertise.

As one views the current return to specialism he ought to recall what one of the most perceptive and analytical minds of this century had to say about the dangers of the ill-educated specialist. After scrutinizing the cultural history of Western Europe, the discerning Spanish philosopher, José Ortega y Gasset, writing in 1930, observed that:

"Civilization has had to await the beginning of the 20th century to see the astounding spectacle of how brutal, and yet how aggressive, is the man learned in one thing and fundamentally ignorant of all else."

And he added:

"The contemporary university has developed the mere seed of professional instruction into an enormous activity; it has added the function of research; and it has abandoned almost entirely the teaching or transmission of culture.

"It is evident that the change has been pernicious. Europe today is taking its sinister consequences. The convulsive situation in Europe at the present moment is due to the fact that the average Englishman, the average Frenchman, the average German are uncultured. * * * This new barbarian is above all the professional man, more learned than ever before, but at the same time more uncultured—the engineer, the physician, the lawyer, the scientist."[5]

More recently one of our own countrymen, Elton Mayo, of Harvard's Graduate School of Business Administration, writing in 1945, articulated the same criticism of our own higher education when he said that:

"Under the influence of economic theory, we have a system of education that trains young men in technical understanding and technical skill; we do nothing whatever to develop social insight or to impart social skill. Indeed we provide an education that operates to hinder the development of such skills * * *

"We have failed to train students in the study of social situations; we have thought that first-class technical training was sufficient in a modern and mechanical age. As a consequence, we are technically competent as no other age in history has been; and we combine this with utter social incompetence. This defect of education and administration has of recent years become a menace to the whole future of civilization."[6]

---

[4] See Frank Bowles, "Access to Higher Education" (UNESCO, 1965).

[5] José Ortega y Gasset, "Mission of the University" (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944), pp. 61, 57–58.

The immense social power now placed in the hands of a few men specialized in one branch of learning and their influence on the destinies of their countrymen can best be observed in the fateful Government decision to drop the atomic bombs on Japan in 1945. A recent book by Ralph Lapp, entitled "The New Priesthood," reveals that only a small group of scientists and technicians advised the President of the United States during World War II on this action of the most obvious social and moral import not only to our own people but to all other human beings. Similarly, only our space and technical experts can now tell us how to land a man on the moon. But the relative value of so costly and fateful an enterprise should be determined by those whose technical competence in engineering and science has been enriched by broad humane learning. And even then these opinions of experts should be reviewed by other citizens of broad culture and dedication to the advancement of the well-being not only of our own people but of the whole of mankind.

In Government, in scientific research, in business and industry, as well as the professions, we need men and women who will bring to positions of power, social perspective, and compassion as well as technical competence and skill. And among the electorate generally we need men and women of equally broad knowledge, interests, and concerns. For unless we intend to relinquish to intellectual surrogates our basic rights as individuals, questions of public policy must be decided by the people generally, to whom any elite governing class, whatever their special qualifications of mind or spirit, must remain responsible.

My studied view of the present American scene in general and of the academic world in particular leads me unreservedly to the conclusion that the particular services which our colleges could perform in providing a liberal education for our young people are more needed now than ever before. That some of them have lost their earlier effectiveness and dominant position in American higher education, that they exhibit an instability of purpose and an obsequious aping of the universities cannot be denied. These conditions do not in my opinion argue that their day is past and that they should be allowed to wither on the academic vine. On the contrary, if the disparaging evaluations of scholars in the more prestigious institutions are even moderately valid, then the only socially defensible course of public action is to strengthen the colleges, not abandon them. The additional resources needed and the change in attitude required among our people generally toward the value of liberal education will only be realized if the colleges themselves and those who understand and value their services speak out as one prominent American has recently done. Admiral Rickover firmly believes that:

"We have no alternative but to demand completion of a liberal arts college course if we want future professionals to be broadly and liberally educated before they specialize for their particular career.

"Where in the past, life itself developed in most Americans the wisdom and experience they needed to reach intelligent opinion on public issues and to choose wisely among candidates for public office, we must today acquire this competence largely through studies that many people do not find particularly congenial. Yet unless one understands the world he lives in, including issues requiring political solutions, he is not a productive, contributing member of society. Uneducated citizens are potentially as dangerous to the proper functioning of our democratic institutions as are uneducated workers when they handle complicated machinery.

"Paradoxically, liberal education which at one time we tended to regard as aristocratic, is the very kind of education we now need most to preserve our democratic way of life. Since it seeks to develop all the potentialities of the individual, not merely those he needs to earn a living, liberal or humanistic education shapes or forms him into a more capable, a more observant, a more discriminating human being. This he needs to be if he is to cope with the huge public and private power conglomerates that now dominate our society and interpose themselves between the American people and the men elected to public office, making it increasingly difficult for the popular will to assert itself whenever it goes counter to the interests of large organization."[7]

These words from a man prominent among scientists and technologists dramatically pose the issue now before the American people. Will these fateful purposes of our colleges be buttressed by public support and understanding or in our dedication to specialism, materialism, and elitism will we destroy them and the heritage of broad learning, compassionate humanitarianism, and individual freedom for which they have long stood? I submit this is a question which every teacher, every administrator, yes, every student, in these colleges must ask himself and answer. They must also raise it repeatedly and unremittingly in the public forum if citizens generally are to be aroused to the dangers of ineffectiveness or extinction which now threaten independent colleges. In the performance of this social responsibility they cannot expect support from the academic elite: instead, they can more realistically only count on indifference, outright opposition, or forbearing tolerance.

Paul H. Davis has posed the problem of the independent colleges in these terms:

"The private liberal arts colleges, islands in a sea of change, all face the liability of being compressed into insignificance. Yet this liability can and should be turned into an asset. Americans rally to a cause, a conception which rises above their daily concerns, providing the leaders show courage, conviction, persistence, determination, and action. Truly the trustees and administrators now—right now—can rally their greatest coterie of volunteer support, of talent support, and of financial support, by serving as symbols of their college's shared values, by serving as symbols of dedicated leadership of effective action. Now, indeed, is a time to turn the tide, the time to turn an impending liability into an immense asset.

To turn the tide, to turn the present fashion of decrying liberal arts' future, each college should define its purpose, preferably a unique purpose, yet certainly a clear-cut purpose that is attainable within the potential resource of men, materials, and money."[8]

Yet as a group the independent colleges have not thus far exhibited the clearness of vision, the fixity of purpose, or the corporate unity required to convince either public appropriating bodies or private benefactors that they deserve larger support because they have a special and indispensable contribution to make to American society. To gain the aid that will be of real assistance to them in the achievement of their proper purposes they should argue that they will use this aid, not to compete with universities whose functions are and ought to be different from their own, but, on the contrary, to strengthen their socially indispensable service of providing superior undergraduate teaching. They should above all define "excellence," that much abused term from the vade mecum of the professional rank and file, in terms of the achievement of their own goals, not in terms of the artificial and unachievable standards imposed by the extramural, self-appointed arbiters of academic quality.

In conclusion, may I say forthrightly that I impute no base motives to those who espouse the policies I have criticized here. Differences of opinion and of philosophical assumptions are desirable characteristics of our democratic system of higher education. I believe, however, that these elitist policies are having a detrimental impact on our colleges. I believe the present trend toward a division of colleges and their students into that of the elite, the mediocre, and the inferior—into the promising and the giftless, into those that deserve large Federal assistance and those that deserve little or none—is a practice which rests on too limited knowledge of the social value of various types of educational institutions and the potential of human beings infinitely varied in their abilities, their motivations, and their developmental possibilities. I believe further that the segregation of the extremely able from those of lesser ability within narrow limits, quite aside from the social class system it must inevitably create, militates against the maximum development of all.

I believe that the relative openness of our system of higher education, even acknowledging some consequent loss of efficiency, has been the mainstay not only of our material well-being as a people and our strength and prosperity as a nation, but the primary cause of our political and social stability. We have held to an egalitarian notion which some consider insufferably romantic; that is, that anyone could through diligence and dedication become a leader in any phase of American enterprise or life. Perhaps we may have to abandon such ideals which have moved many men of humble beginnings to greatness. We may have to allow the social scientists and the computers to classify young people and the educational institutions they attend into the elite, the mediocre, and the inferior, and arrange for a nice fit between students and institutions. I for one do not believe we yet have enough reliable knowledge to justify such fundamental changes in our social philosophy and practice. Indeed I believe that the "conventional wisdom" which has become a virtual dogma on the relationships between aptitude for and accessibility to learning offers no sound basis for a reversal of our traditional open-door policies.

I believe that when our people generally understand the values at stake in our democratic practices in higher education they will take the appropriate personal and public actions to preserve them. They will not condone the elitists' excessive preoccupation with the upper 10 percent in ability. They will reject proposals to single out a select group of institutions or of individuals destined to be the recipients of special identification, peculiar privilege, and preferred treatment—treatment based on dubious measures of ability and almost totally inadequate in the appraisal of other qualities of the human spirit which in the past we have used to take the measure of a man. They will realize that any prospective benefit from the present proposals for the separation of the very superior in a few institutions from the ordinary mass of students in other institutions will at best be offset by the ill effects of creating a technically competent but civicly incompetent and socially snobbish elite.

---

[6] Elton Mayo, "The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization" (Cambridge, Mass.: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1945), pp. 50, 120.

[7] Hyman G. Rickover, "A Humanistic Technology," Muhlenberg News, September 1965, pp. 3–7.

[8] Paul H. Davis, op. cit., p. 20.

With our enormous national wealth—by the end of 1966 estimated to be over $700 billion—our people will see the wisdom of closing the gap between the strong and the weak institutions by providing larger support to the latter rather than letting them wither through inanition. They will see the justice and the social benefit in enhancing and extending opportunities for advanced education. When they know the facts I believe they will oppose the establishment of an elite class in American society—even one based on the special privileges in higher education. If the independent liberal arts colleges operate on such convictions they will enhance their status in the eyes of our people and at the same time preserve their peculiar contribution to American life and culture. These are goals worthy of their most dedicated efforts.

LEGAL SERVICES TO THE POOR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate an address made by the Director of the Legal Services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. E. Clinton Bamberger, Jr., before the National Conference of Bar Presidents, in Chicago, Ill., on February 19, 1966.

Few will underestimate the importance of providing legal services to the poor, so that they may enjoy the full measure of the legal and civil rights to which they are entitled as citizens, and which come as a matter of course to those fortunate enough to be able to afford a lawyer when legal counsel is needed. We are indeed blessed to have, as the Director of the Legal Services program, a man whose dedication and steadfast hard work are up to the challenge that extending effective legal services to the poor poses.

There are several important ideas in Mr. Bamberger's remarks before the National Conference of Bar Presidents that should be noted. First is the exhortation that the legal profession must respond today, as it has so many times in the past, to challenge with forward-looking leadership rather than skeptical complaint. We sometimes tend to forget that traditionally it has been the task of lawyers not to defend the status quo but to change it. In reminding the legal profession of this tradition of providing society with leadership for orderly change Mr. Bamberger performs a singular service, and one that should not go unnoticed by the organized bar, for the success of the Legal Service program will depend in great measure upon the acceptance of its goals by the lawyers of the country.

But perhaps the most important message of Mr. Bamberger's remarks is that the Director of the Legal Services program thinks of that program as something more than simply providing lawyers to poor people who have legal problems. Were this the only aspect of the Legal Services program, I might indeed be skeptical of its ultimate success, for simply providing legal services to those who are already embroiled in legal difficulties strikes not at the heart of the problem but at its manifestations. But Mr. Bamberger has the broadness of outlook and the acuity of mind to recognize that perhaps the most important function that the Legal Services program can perform is to develop laws and programs aimed at eliminating many of the legal problems of the poor before they arise. It is this approach—an attempt to uncover the legal causes of poverty and to "remodel the systems which generate the cycle of poverty and design new social, legal, and political tools and vehicles to move poor people from deprivation, depression, and despair to opportunity, hope, and ambition"—that distinguishes the program which Mr. Bamberger so ably pilots from other efforts that have not grasped the full significance of the problem posed by the individual who cannot afford a lawyer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. E. Clinton Bamberger, Jr.—a distinguished Marylander, a distinguished lawyer, and now a distinguished public servant—be reprinted in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY E. CLINTON BAMBERGER, JR., DIRECTOR, LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BAR PRESIDENTS, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 19, 1966

The poor people—one-fifth of this Nation who live the emasculating contradiction of poverty in an affluent society—do not have equal justice. The deprivation of justice for the poor weakens—and indeed even threatens—the viability of our society.

The poor do not have equal justice because they do not have lawyers. Lawyers make our laws just and unless the poor have advocates for their cause—they will not have equal justice. A massive body of our law is considered only by the executive and legislative branches of our Government—but never considered, scrutinized and interpreted by the judiciary. Legislators and administrators are not omniscient—what they do is improved when what they did is debated by lawyers and interpreted and applied by a judge whose mind has been sharpened and enlightened by advocacy.

A search for truth and justice which depends upon an adversary system gropes half blind when there is no advocate for one side of the proposition.

It is fair to judge the success of American justice—and the need for this program of legal services to the poor—by considering the administration of justice in civil courts.

We can visit countless courtrooms in which civil trials are held and observe temperate and intelligent judges listening to competent counsel defend the interests of affluent clients. But what would we see if we visited a small claims court, with jurisdiction limited to several hundred dollars that serves primarily as a collection agency for retail merchants and installment credit vendors? Or a domestic relations court, where a stream of women on the public assistance rolls come to swear out contempt citations against the husbands or boyfriends who left them penyless and pregnant? Or a landlord and tenant court inundated by petitions for evictions of impoverished tenants of marginal housing?

The court's day passes in a tedious litany of names, each followed by the single word "judgment" droned out by the landlord's or merchant's attorneys. Evictions issue unchallenged, writs of repossession are signed in bundles and default judgments are the course of the day. The poor are not represented. Judgments are rarely denied, and as the clerk dockets the judgment or issues the writ of garnishment, repossession or eviction another loss is tallied on the score of a man or woman who probably has an inadequate education; a menial, degrading and irregular job, a broken marriage and a brood of illegitimate children.

Many of you know that I could extend indefinitely the catalog of disability suffered by the poor in our judicial system. They sign installment contracts with unscrupulous merchants, they go on relief and spend their lives hiding from arbitrary administration of welfare regulations; and they life in rat-infested, often-unheated slums without ever knowing that the law requires landlords to provide them with heat in the winter. They are too ignorant and to intimidated to be able to obtain their legal rights—without the advice and advocacy of lawyers.

But I have not come here merely to tell you once again that justice for the poor man in America has not succeeded, or to join you in a vague and general clucking about what we all agree is a most unfortunate situation.

Instead, I have come here to speak to you about a vastly more difficult question: the question of what you, as members and leaders of the organized bar, can, should, and I hope will do to assure equal justice for the poor. I have come here not merely to obtain your tolerance of the Office of Economic Opportunity's program to provide legal services to the poor, but to persuade you that you should lead the revolution that will bring America's poor out of their bondage and into the promised land of full equality before the law. I proffer to you the opportunity to serve as the leaders and lawgivers of a revolution conducted for the benefit of people who are poor, inarticulate, unsophisticated—and who do not have advocates.

Some may think it curious to consider lawyers as leaders of a revolution. Yet, no role could be more true to the traditions of our profession. Since the days when all land in England was owned by the king, and lawyers devised ways to make property alienable, lawyers have led the struggle to destroy archaic forms and to free their clients from the mortmain of the past. In our own country, lawyers developed the corporate forms of business enterprise that have given American business freedom to grow according to the laws of economics. In our own time, I need only point to the brilliant work of lawyers during the era of the New Deal and the lawyers in the civil rights movement during the past decade to demonstrate what a crucial role effective representation and advocacy can play in changing the posture of our Nation.

It is and has been for centuries the task of lawyers to change the status quo. In every case that turns on the law rather than the facts, a lawyer is attempting to persuade a court that the law should not be interpreted as it has been in the past, but should be given a new interpretation.

It is fallacious to think of lawyers as guardians of tradition—rather we are the guardians and watchdogs of orderly change. It is perhaps the greatest genius of the Anglo-American system that we have always, except when confronted with the terrible agony of the Civil War, been able to change the deepest and most fundamental characteristics of our society peacefully, with a stability of government and laws that is the awe and envy of other nations.

Today, we are asked once again to follow brilliant tradition. Lawyers are exhorted to guide, control, and direct a change in our society. I ask you to put your traditions and skills to work, not for the benefit of the corporations, not for the benefit of the Federal Government, but for the benefit of the poor. I ask you to lead the struggle to provide economically underprivileged Americans with a full and fair participation in American justice. Specifically, I have come to ask you to work actively in your communities to establish and support programs to provide free legal assistance for people who are poor and cannot employ an attorney. I ask you to challenge the critics who attempt to undermine our effort without knowledge of its goals or character.

It might be helpful if I dealt briefly with what seems to be a common concern of some lawyers who have expressed at least skepticism, if not opposition, toward the legal services program. That concern might best be expressed as the fear that we will so thoroughly accomplish our task of providing legal services to the poor that attorneys who now draw some or all of their practice from people with lower or lower middle incomes will find themselves without clients.

This concern stems from a basic lack of understanding about poor people and their communities. It presumes that there is a static quantity of legal work that needs to be done in a given community of poor people, that that work is now being done by attorneys, and that at the introduction of free legal services, the clients of those attorneys will immediately take their business to the free office. These presumptions are not correct.

First, there is not a fixed amount of legal work in a given community. Poor people are constantly confronted by problems that we as attorneys would immediately recognize as legal, but which they, without education or the custom of consulting a lawyer, never realize might be solved by advocacy or representation. If the poor had the habit of talking to a lawyer, if there was, in the community of the poor, the consciousness of the need for and utility of lawyers, I submit that the volume of problems about which lawyers would be consulted would rise from a trickle to a flood. As evidence of this fact, in 1965, the first year in which the neighborhood law offices were established in Washington, they handled about 5,000 inquiries, and the Legal Aid Society at the same time reported the greatest annual volume of cases in its history of 50 years.

Second, it is not true that the legal work of the poor is now being handled by attorneys. How many poor people, for example, hire an attorney to avail themselves of the rights that they have in many jurisdictions to a jury trial on a complaint for eviction for nonpayment of rent? Lawyers are not doing this work now, nor are they giving advice to people who come into conflict with welfare authorities, nor are they advising the many ignorant people who are tempted into signing unfair installment contracts. And these are merely three of the literally hundreds of ways in which lawyers might but are not now representing the poor.

Finally, I do not believe that either the present or the potential clients of attorneys in poor neighborhoods will leave their attorneys in any significant number to enjoy free legal services. Not only is the lawyer-client relationship a highly personal one, but once the legal services program is functioning well, for every client who comes into the "free" office to have his leave examined, 10 unexpected clients will retain a private practitioner as a result of the general increase in consciousness of and confidence in the law, legality, and the availability of a defense against injustice which the legal services program will create. Private practice will grow enormously by bringing the poor into our world of the law and lawyers.

I have spoken about the contribution lawyers in general and yourselves in particular, as leaders of the organized bar, can make to provide adequate legal representation for the poor. We should agree that the poor are not now adequately represented, and that the quantity and quality of that representation should be improved. The question now is how that should be done.

The predominant method in the legal aid movement and OEO's efforts has been the creation of entities similar to law firms which will advise and represent the poor. I know that other methods are possible. But the basic concept of a law firm, with attorneys hired and paid by the firm out of its own funds is, in my judgment, preferable to any of the alternatives which have been presented.

Specifically I think is is important to point out my concerns about the so-called English system and its variations. These are programs whereby some branch of the State or local government or some other organization certifies the indigency of a potential client, who may then consult the private attorney of his choice at the whole or partial expense of the Government.

At first glance, the English system seems attractive. With only a relatively minor change in our present system of legal representation, it would permit many more people to consult a lawyer. It would also make every lawyer in the community available to the poor, instead of just the small group which may be practicing in a firm of free lawyers. This is the so-called freedom of choice argument. And finally, the lawyers who perform the services are guaranteed payment, a virtue which needs no further explanation.

But these apparent advantages are, unfortunately more advantageous for lawyers than for the poor we are committed to assist. Indeed, for the poor, such a plan has at least one major deterrent. The contemplated certification of indigency would require them to submit themselves to another means test by the welfare authorities or their counterparts. It is a certainty that vast numbers of poor people would be too frightened or too proud to place themselves voluntarily in the gears of another bureaucracy, with the result that they simply would not participate in the program at all.

The English system is also disadvantageous for another reason that I consider even more important. It clearly can achieve no other goal than the mere resolution of controversies. The legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the legal aid movement have far greater ambitions.

We cannot be content with the creation of systems of rendering free legal assistance to all the people who need but cannot afford a lawyer's advice. This program must contribute to the success of the war on poverty. Our responsibility is to marshal the forces of law and the strength of lawyers to combat the causes and effect of poverty. Lawyers must uncover the legal causes of poverty, remodel the systems which generate the cycle of poverty and design new social, legal, and political tools and vehicles to move poor people from deprivation, depression, and despair to opportunity, hope, and ambition. I do not believe that an English system which parcels out the legal problems of the poor to lawyers engaged not because they have a singular dedication to assist poor people but because they are members of a bar association or a lawyer referral panel and somehow chosen freely by the poor will ever provide the necessary concerted and thoughtful legal analysis and challenge which must occur if the OEO program will be more than a chain of legal first-aid clinics. Twenty lawyers selected by 20 poor clients on 20 different days to defend eviction notices will never have even the opportunity to learn that every eviction was retaliation for the tenant's complaint of housing code violations and so look for the test case to challenge the consequent perversion of the administration of justice. But three lawyers in a "poor man's law firm" would soon see the common thread and seek the legal remedy to prevent the continued proliferation of the same legal crises.

I also entertain the presumption that an "English plan" is more costly than the provision of free legal services by salaried attorneys. Given a fixed sum of money, I speculate that I could obtain more lawyer assistance by employing a lawyer's full time for a definite period than by dispensing the same money to numerous lawyers in specific fees for services rendered.

But I admit my concerns are speculative. We will approve a very limited number of English system applications, evaluate the costs and the results carefully and assess the comparative success of such an approach. We have several preliminary applications for this method; I doubt that we will approve all of them, and I am certain that there is little likelihood that additional applications will be approved. However, we may approve such plans in sparsely populated areas where there is no other reasonable method to provide free legal assistance for the poor.

My attitude about the English system is best described by the remark a judge once made about my argument before him: "Mr. Bamberger, I have an open mind about that point—but not necessarily an empty one."

I do not expect that we will find easily the perfect solution to the task we have undertaken. Nor do I imagine that we will answer all the criticisms of the bar and public without leaving some residue of doubt about the rights and wrongs of our specific course of action. I hope that I am not disappointed in my request for your active and enthusiastic support—and for your constructive criticism.

My principal purpose is to convince you that I offer you the opportunity to use your leadership, your wisdom, your skills, and your advocacy on behalf of the poor in the finest traditions of the bar.

MEDICAL AID TO SOUTH VIETNAMESE CIVILIANS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, almost every day some Senator's office is visited by a delegation of constituents with an ambitious—and often worthy—plan to accomplish a specific purpose.

Usually, somewhere in the presentation is a sentence that goes, "We just know this will work if only we can get—"

At that point, the Senator or an aid must make a decision whether the office properly can or should help do the "getting."

A few days ago, three Michigan men were in my office with a plan to get medical aid to South Vietnamese civilians.

The plan was ambitious enough to generate a temptation to dismiss it. But as they continued spelling out problems, they followed each one with a reasonable and seemingly practicable solution.

And somewhat surprisingly, they never got to the part that starts, "And all we need from the Government is—"

They did not ask for Government funds, Government supplies or Government transportation from this country to Vietnam. They were just hopeful of getting consent.

The men were two members of the Michigan Jayces—Edward James and Douglas Lawrie, of Clawson—and an older man, Dr. Jerome J. Robb, a Pontiac, Mich., physician.

And their plan—which has been endorsed as a State project by the Michigan Jaycee executive committee—is this:

They hope to collect food, medical, and sanitation supplies in this country, for use by Saigon hospitals and Jaycee mobile clinics.

Dr. Robb, who spent 6 weeks in Vietnam last year as a volunteer physician, has agreed to be the project's unpaid medical field director.

Mr. James and Mr. Lawrie, keenly aware that the military just does not have the space for civilian cargoes, have settled on a solution to that bottleneck; the project will try to buy its own plane so that the Jaycees can do their own ferrying.

They are keenly aware of the black market problems in Vietnam so they have determined to get their own warehouse, their own trucks.

Will they be able to raise the money to do all these things? I do not know and neither do they. But I am impressed by their energy.

Mr. James, a research technician, and Mr. Lawrie, an airlines sales representative, have been working on the project during spare time for months. They are hopeful that the Jaycees will adopt the idea as a national project.

As I say, I have no idea what degree of success they will meet. But even their attempt, I suppose, is a significant comment on the American temperament.

These men do see a need and do feel a desire to do something to meet that need. Meanwhile, they have pragmatically studied the difficulties and the economics. And they have developed ideas on how to deal with them.

Most of us, I think, are agreed that people-to-people contact has an unmatched value in international relations.

Dr. Robb, who is particularly concerned with the welfare of Vietnamese children, puts it this way:

> This is an opportunity to provide a fertile ground for democratic ideals while affording a small measure of humanity.

Both pursuits are equally admirable.

PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I believe the President's proposed reductions in the Nation's school lunch and school milk programs are the wrong cuts in the wrong programs at the wrong time.

President Johnson's 1967 budget recommends $101 million less for these programs than for fiscal year 1966.

The special school milk program would be cut by $82 million, down from the $103 million appropriated for 1966. This is an 80-percent reduction in just 1 year.

In my State, the Agriculture Department estimates Hawaii would receive only $36,000 in special milk funds for fiscal year 1967, compared with $174,000 in fiscal year 1966. This estimate for 1967 is based on the estimated use rate in 1966.

Appropriations requested for the school lunch program are $19 million less than Congress appropriated last year. The 1966 total was $202 million; the 1967 total, $183 million.

Proposed reductions total $101 million.

These reductions are proposed despite rising student enrollment.

In other words, although there are more students, the Federal share of the school lunch and school milk programs would decline, under the President's recommendations.

For years the school lunch and school milk programs have operated efficiently and successfully. They are noncontroversial. Schools in all the States are familiar with these programs. Administration functions smoothly. State and local governments put up $330 million for school lunches in 1965.

These programs have been an important factor in improving the health of millions of schoolchildren. There can be no doubt about the importance of good nutrition to the learning capacity of young people.

The 1967 budget states that the school lunch program during the peak month in 1965 provided lunches to over 35 percent of the approximately 48.2 million schoolchildren in the country. That would be more than 16.8 million students. In December 1964, according to the budget, the program reached 17 million children in 70,132 schools.

Official estimates show between 24 and 26 million children in 92,000 to 93,000 schools received more than 3 billion half pints of milk under the special school milk program in 1965. Each child paid 3 to 4 cents on the average for a half pint of milk costing 6 to 8 cents total. The milk was distributed during recesses and during other times of the day.

I am very much concerned about the adverse effects of the drastic reductions proposed in these programs.

My concern is shared by the Hawaii State School Food Service Association. Recently, I received a letter from Miss Chieko Okamoto, chairman of the legislative committee of this organization. In her letter, Miss Okamoto pointed out:

> If these cuts are not restored at the congressional level, it will mean that the State would be called upon to make up what we will lose in Federal subsidy.
>
> Any chance of getting a bill through our State legislature to take care of this during the present budget session seems very dim. Consequently, all of the cuts must be made up by the children who buy the lunches at the school cafeterias.
>
> Higher lunch prices would mean lower participation and lower participation would mean higher per capita overhead cost. This will cause a vicious cycle, which will mean the deterioration of the school lunch program here in Hawaii, which today is one of the best in the country.

Mr. President, because of the importance of these programs to the school children of America, I include the entire text of Miss Okamoto's letter, to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I have also heard from Mrs. Laura H. Hayashi, cafeteria manager of the Kapunahala Elementary School in Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii, who wrote:

> It is our hope that the Federal subsidy can be maintained at its present level so that we may continue to serve the children of Hawaii.

HAWAII STATE SCHOOL
FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 4, 1966.

Hon. HIRAM L. FONG,
Member of Congress,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FONG: According to the local press and reports coming out of Washington, we have been informed that there will be tremendous cuts in the Federal subsidy as far as the national school lunch program is concerned. As near as we can determine these cuts will total approximately $100 million.

Because of my connection with the school lunch program in Hawaii, these reports are of great concern to me.

If these cuts are not restored at the congressional level, it will mean that the State would be called upon to make up what we will lose in Federal subsidy.

Any chance of getting a bill through our State legislature to take care of this during the present budget session seems very dim. Consequently, all of the cuts must be made up by the children who buy the lunches at the school cafeterias.

Higher lunch prices would mean lower participation and lower participation would mean higher per capita overhead cost. This will cause a vicious cycle which will mean the deterioration of the school lunch program here in Hawaii, which today is one of the best in the country.

We humbly ask on behalf of the future leaders of our State, the youth of Hawaii, that you make a sincere effort in restoring these budget cuts to the existing levels.

Thank you, mahalo and aloha.

Sincerely,

Miss CHIEKO OKAMOTO,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

THE SUDDEN REDISCOVERY OF SEATO

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in recent days there has occurred what the distinguished columnist, Arthur Krock, called in the New York Times of Sunday, March 6, "The Sudden Rediscovery of SEATO."

Mr. Krock relates this new emphasis upon the agreements of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization establishment to the failure of the previous reliance on the Tonkin Bay resolution as the President's cachet of authority for our operations in South Vietnam. Rather than citing the Tonkin Bay resolution, as was done previously in letters both to a group of Congressman and a group of Senators, Secretary Rusk in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee "fell back on the treaty as a sworn national obligation," Mr. Krock notes.

But this too, in the opinion of the distinguished New York Times commentator, is a belated argument which "has since been badly damaged in the critical analysis to which it has been subjected." As evidence, Mr. Krock cites both from the statement of Senator Walter George as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee at the time of the SEATO Treaty discussion in the Senate, and from the views of persons interviewed by Mr. Krock who participated in drafting the 1954 treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUDDEN REDISCOVERY OF SEATO

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—The citation by Secretary of State Rusk of the Southeast Asia Treaty of 1954 as the fundamental source of President Johnson's authority to commit the United States to whatever expenditure of manpower and treasure he deems necessary to sustain the war in Vietnam was a shift of emphasis by the administration. And the reason is as plain as the ground is weak.

The reason was that influential senatorial voices were rising in protest against the administration's oft-reiterated claim that the President's open-ended commitment in Vietnam derives from the so-called Gulf of Tonkin concurrent resolution approved by Congress in 1964.

The voices arose from Senators who had been given officially to understand at the time that the resolution would not be so construed by the administration, and some of them had stated this reservation in voting for the measure. It was in the presence of this disturbance that Rusk, in the course of his testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, fell back on the treaty as a sworn national obligation which the President is executing with steadily mounting employment of armed force.

ARGUMENT DAMAGED

This belated argument has since been badly damaged in the critical analysis to which it has been subjected. Mr. Johnson appeared to recognize its vulnerability when he interposed in the debate a reminder that he is also Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and believes this role gives him the obligation as well as the power to make such use of these forces as he considers essential to preserve the national security when he adjudges it to stand in peril.

Though there are impressive constitutional challengers of this interpretation of Commander in Chief power when the United States is not formally at war, it has been established in previous practice. And the Supreme Court has dismissed all such challenges which have reached it for review.

The actual consequences are that (1) any President can involve the Nation in war and maintain it there indefinitely without the formal declaration which the Constitution reserves as an exclusive power of Congress; and (2) count on the declaration being made when and if his conscience or his political necessity induces him to propose it to Congress.

UTILIZED PROVOCATION

This is a fixed condition, and not a theory. But for obviously practical and technical reasons Presidents do not concede it on the public record. The alternative chosen by Mr. Johnson was to utilize the provocation of the Tonkin Gulf attack on the Seventh Fleet by North Vietnamese gunboats to get a generalized expression of support from Congress. This worked well enough until it was argued, against the public record, as approval by Congress of any expansion of the war the President might make in an unforeseeable future. Then Rusk shifted the major basis for the claim to the SEATO compact.

But extracts from the 1954 Senate debate on the treaty demonstrate the fragility of this claim. In explaining the commitment to the Senate, Chairman George of the Committee on Foreign Relations made these statements:

> The treaty does not call for automatic action; it calls for consultation (with the other signatories). If any course of action shall be agreed * * * or decided upon, then that action must have the approval of Congress, because the constitutional process (of each signatory government) is provided for. * * * It is clear that the threat to territorial integrity and political independence * * * also encompasses acts of subversion. * * * (But) even in that event (the United States) would not be bound to put it down. I cannot emphasize too strongly that we have no obligation * * * to take positive measures of any kind. All we are obligated to do is to consult together about it.

In the debate which followed Rusk's new resort to the treaty, Senator MORSE made this point: If the administration is almost unilaterally waging the war on a decision that there has been "an armed attack" (that represents "a common danger") on an independent nation within the treaty's zone of protection, then the treaty requires that the measures taken "shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations." With respect to this requirement, said MORSE, "We have been acting in violation of the U.N. Charter for years." And when the United States at long last went before the Council it was "with an olive branch in one hand and bombs in the other."

FIRSTHAND EVIDENCE

But the most effective refutation of Rusk's statement that SEATO imposes on the United States "a clear and direct commitment to the security of South Vietnam against external attack" is made by persons interviewed by this correspondent who participated in the drafting of the treaty in 1954. This is a brief composite of their comments:

The reservations as to "constitutional processes" was written in at Secretary Dulles' insistence to give notice to the other signatories that the final decision as to making war was vested in Congress. He was also a great believer in collective security, and he knew that when the French pulled out of Indochina there would be a vacuum into which the Communists would flow if there was not collective action to prevent it.

All of the parties, including Great Britain and France, are bound to the others to take action under the treaty. Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos are not parties, and the treaty signatories are not bound to them. They were added by protocol to the treaty area, not for their benefit but for the benefit of the signatories.

Our basic trouble in Vietnam is that we have not been proceeding under the treaty but going it alone. This is due to a complete misappraisal and underestimate of the military and political considerations involved. We thought it was a minor concern we could handle ourselves without difficulty. So we did not insist that our partners participate.

For confirmation of this background, the persons interviewed cited the report on the treaty of the Senate committee. Hours of effort to procure a copy were, however, unsuccessful.

GREAT ACT—GREAT ACTORS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, columnists have recently noted the soundness of the Employment Act of 1946. It is now generally recognized that this act has wrought a fundamental, beneficial change in the capitalistic system. It is possible to avoid depression.

I think we should pause a moment to recognize the farsighted men who put the Employment Act of 1946 on the books. One of them was my predecessor, the late Senator James E. Murray. He was the author of the act. He guided it through committee and through Congress. The act bears no man's name but truly it should be termed, and I term it, the Murray Employment Act of 1946.

The man outside Congress who did the most to enact this historic legislation is one whose lifetime of service is being recognized this week. He is James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, who is retiring after 25 eventful years as president of that great farm organization.

Also retiring this week is his colleague and close associate, Glenn Talbott, vice president of the National Farmers Union. Glenn Talbott is the leading member of one of the most remarkable families this Nation has ever produced. He became president of the North Dakota Farmers Union after his father, who organized and headed it, was killed in an auto accident. Glenn Talbott's sister, Mrs. Gladys Talbott Edwards, was for many years the highly effective director of education of the National Farmers Union. Their nephew is now carrying on the family's proud role as an official of the North Dakota Farmers Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, immediately following these remarks, two articles concerning the Murray Employment Act of 1946, to which Senator James E. Murray, President James C. Patton, and the Talbott family contributed so much. One article, by Joseph R. Slevin of the New York Herald Tribune News Service and headlined "Boom Is Tribute to Employment Act," appeared in the February 1966 issue of the Washington Post. The other, by Walter Lippmann, headlined "The Boom," appeared in the March 15, 1966, issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 20, 1966]

BOOM IS TRIBUTE TO EMPLOYMENT ACT—1946 MEASURE MARKED POLICY TURNING POINT

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

The Unemployment Act of 1946 is 20 years old today. The American economy is booming. And there is an increasingly hot debate about whether President Johnson ought to call for higher taxes to damp the fires of inflation.

The booming economy is a very real tribute to the employment act.

So, too, is the burgeoning tax debate.

The employment act established a national policy to use the power of the Federal Govenment to influence economic activity. The economy is booming in large measure because those powers have been used.

The deliberate, persistent use of Federal power to influence the economy is a new development. It has gained increasing acceptance since the employment act was passed but it has won general recognition only in the decade of the 1960's—during the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

MEMORIES OF 1930'S

The expectation in 1946 was that the Government would have to take steps to prevent a deep depression and to provide millions of jobs for the American people. Memories of the great depression of the 1930's were fresh in mind and the main goal of the act's original sponsors was to see that another such calamity did not follow World War II.

The bill started out as a full employment law but a Senate-House conference committee watered down the final version and set the more modest maximum employment target. Among other things, the legislators wanted it clear that the Goverment was not guaranteeing a job to anyone.

As it turned out, the immediate postwar problem proved to be inflation. After that, the challenge was to offset mild recessions—with the one exception of the Korean war boom in the early 1950's. More recently the Government has been trying to move toward the twin goals of attaining noninflationary full employment at home while balancing the U.S. international payments accounts.

Four recessions have hit the United States since the end of World War II. They came in 1948-49, 1953-54, 1957-58, and 1960-61.

EISENHOWER WAS COOL

The Employment Act approach almost died a young death when Eisenhower became President in 1953. He was suspicious of economic planning, and mistrusted both the setting of goals and the use of Federal power to achieve them. Mr. Eisenhower intended to abolish the Council of Economic Advisers established by the act but decided to rebuild it under the chairmanship of Arthur Burns only after he had been in office for some months.

The historic Employment Act breakthrough came in June 1962, when Harvard man Kennedy went to Yale to accept an honorary degree and called for reducing taxes to stimulate a growing but sluggish economy.

Mr. Kennedy acted primarily at the prodding of Walter Heller, the Chairman of his Council. It marked a profound change in President Kennedy's own instinctively conservative position.

Ten months later President Kennedy made his precedent-setting decision to call for lower taxes even though the country was increasingly prosperous and even though the Government still had a large budget deficit.

The budget no longer was to be viewed as a set of books that were to be balanced in good times and that, if necessary, could be allowed to become unbalanced in poor times.

Instead, it was to be looked upon as an economic tool to achieve broader national policy goals—more jobs, higher living standards, increased production, stable prices, and the like.

The tax cut became law in the winter of 1964 after Dallas and after Lyndon Johnson had become President.

It supplied the prescribed stimulation. Economic activity rose strongly and steadily after it became law.

But the current U.S. prosperity was not entirely planned that way despite some strong administration hints to the contrary.

The theory of the tax cut was one thing. The actual execution of the plan was something quite different.

Congress voted a substantially larger cut than the administration had asked so the rapid pace of the upturn that followed was partly fortuitous.

Then, there was Vietnam. The economy is rocketing ahead a significant measure because of the very large additional stimulus the Vietnam buildup has provided since last summer.

Employment has been going up much faster than the administration expected a year ago and unemployment has been dropping much more rapidly than it anticipated.

PLANNING LESS THAN SCIENCE

All of which makes the point that economic planning as it is practiced in the mid-1960's continues to be something less than an exact science.

Now the debate is over the great and central stabilization question of whether Mr. Johnson is acting vigorously enough, soon enough. It is adding a new, important dimension to the Employment Act as it enters its 20th year. More will be heard of it at a special 20th anniversary symposium that will be held here on Wednesday.

Perhaps the most striking thing about the debate is that no one, not the most conservative participant, is arguing about whether it is proper for Mr. Johnson to intervene to prevent inflation.

An occasional voice is raised to assert that Mr. Johnson should reduce inflationary demand pressures by slashing Federal civilian program spending in preference to increasing the Nation's tax burden.

But the heart of the debate is over the question of whether the President is acting vigorously enough, soon enough.

There is agreement that it is right and proper for him to act, for the Government to intervene.

The United States has come a long way in 20 years.

[From the Washington (D.C) Post, Mar. 15, 1966]

THE BOOM

(By Walter Lippmann)

The best minds among us who watch and deal with the management of the economy are engaged in earnest discussion of how to preserve and promote the unprecedented prosperity which the country is enjoying. It is now 20 years since the Employment Act of 1946 declared that "full employment" was a national objective, and it is 5 years since President Kennedy inaugurated the fiscal and monetary measures which have produced the great expansion of the economy. This great expansion was managed successfully under the direction of Mr. Walter Heller, and supported by a consensus of the preponderant majority of the leading economists in the country.

The story of this expansion, for which there were few tested precedents, is very heartening to those who dare to believe that reason and rational method and rational discussion can be made to prevail in human affairs. Forty years ago none, except perhaps a few solitary thinkers in Europe, believed that the capitalist system of private property and free enterprise operating in markets could proceed without severe ups and downs. The business cycle of slump and boom was regarded as being, like the cycle of the seasons, beyond human control and something to be accepted as inherent in the human condition.

This fatalistic view was first challenged effectively in the Western World by John Maynard Keynes, though he himself drew on the teachings of others, notably Knut Wicksell of Sweden. Keynes began to write in the twenties—between the depression after the first World War and the Great Depression of 1929. Keynes was long regarded as heretical, subversive, even sacrilegious, in that he refused to bow with the accepted nature of things. However, Keynes' teachings made their way here and abroad in the universities, and from them into the finance ministries of every advanced industrial nation. In the past 5 years a new generation of American economists, all of them descended in one manner or another from Keynes, have been at the center of policymaking and decision.

The economic policy which they have directed during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations has been in its overall results a dramatic success. The objective of "full employment" laid down by Congress in 1946 is within sight of being achieved. Full employment cannot in fact be total employment. In a society like ours there are a considerable number of potential workers who, given their location, their lack of opportunity or training or personal ability, are presently unemployable.

By comparison with our own past or by comparison with any other country, the expanding American economy in the past 5 years has been a miracle. In these 5 years the gross national product has increased by $190 billion. The average annual rate of growth of real output over this period has been 5.5 percent. The rate of real growth has been nearly twice as big as it was in the 1950's, before the "New Economics" became the guide of U.S. policy.

Although this dramatic expansion has brought big increases of real wages to labor and of profits to business, there has as yet been no real inflation. From 1960 through 1965 consumer prices rose less than 2 percent a year. The wholesale price index remained stable until last year. Overall labor costs rose on the average by less than 1 percent a year.

In these 5 years the expansion did something, though not nearly enough, to improve the lot of the poorest people in the country. The number of persons and families below the poverty line ($3,000 a year) has fallen from over 22 percent to less than 17 percent. The gap between Negro and white income has narrowed. Adult Negro unemployment is down from 9 to 5.6 percent in the last quarter of last year. Prof. Otto Eckstein, formerly of the Council of Economic Advisers, was amply justified in saying that "when firing on all eight cylinders, our economy is a mighty engine of social progress, the greatest man has so far devised."

The central question before the economists and before the country is how to manage this marvelous economy, now that full employment is in sight and now that there is the added inflationary pressure from the Vietnamese war.

We have reason to be confident that the management of the economy will be successful in this new period. For one thing there has never been a time when the technique of measuring a boom was as highly developed or the common property of so many highly expert men. These economists have now achieved such high authority and public respect that politicians will not easily overrule them nor will they be easily obscured by the propaganda of special interests.

POLITICS AND PREJUDICE ARE IN THE DRIVER'S SEAT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Government Operations Committee, I have taken a keen interest in the hearings on highway safety conducted by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. Many charges and countercharges regarding the auto industry have been produced by these hearings.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the February 14, 1966, Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly. The article entitled "Safety First? Politics and Prejudices Are in the Driver's Seat" points out quite accurately that regardless of what might be done in the field of safety design and engineering, "what really counts is the finger on the trigger or the hands on the wheel." The driver is the greatest cause of accidents on the highway. Certainly far more highway death and carnage is built into the motorist than in the motorcar.

I ask, Mr. President, that the article to which I have alluded be printed in the body of the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAFETY FIRST?—POLITICS AND PREJUDICE ARE IN THE DRIVER'S SEAT

To judge by a recent spate of advertisements, Detroit has learned how to turn out automobiles that run more silently than either the Mercedes-Benz or the prestigious Rolls-Royce, in which "the loudest thing you hear is the ticking of the clock." What it seems helpless to do along these lines, however, is to moderate, much less muffle, its noisy opposition. On the contrary, the wheezes, rumbles and knocks from all sides lately have grown deafening. Once content to mutter about insolent chariots, tailfins and the horsepower race, the free-wheeling critics have shrilly begun to assail the Big Three for making cars that are "unsafe at any speed." With fine contempt for the rules of evidence (not to mention the laws of libel), the American Trial Lawyers Association recently went on record condemning "murder by motor."

In the interests of fair play and justice, we hereby move that the Trial Lawyers—and others of like persuasion, in and outside of Government—call a halt to what every day looks less like a trial, either before the bar of public opinion or anywhere else, than like a lynching. Even those who are charged with vehicular homicide, after all, are entitled to their day in court. Despite the overwhelming mass of biased testimony, moreover, the case against Detroit strikes us as far from open-and-shut. Contrary to the sweeping charges, the Nation's automotive safety record is nothing to be ashamed of in this imperfect world. It happens to be far better than most of its counterparts abroad, where safety supposedly comes ahead of style, and it has shown a vast improvement over the years.

Vital statistics, to be sure, are no substitute for human beings; properly understood, however, they can point the way to survival. Going by the record, we would argue that the critics have taken the wrong turn. While collapsible steering wheels and seat belts may help in time of stress (the authorities differ), the key to automotive safety is the man behind the wheel. The U.S. population explosion of the forties, which in the sixties suddenly has put millions of teenagers in the driver's seat, surely has some connection with the recent rise in the accident rate. The arrival on the scene, of compulsory auto insurance and the general inability of regulated casualty underwriters to earn a profit on their operations, doubtless have impaired the industry's traditional leadership in the drive for safety. Sensational charges and hasty legislation may make headlines and win votes; they rarely end up saving lives.

In the realm of auto safety, sensation and haste lately have become standard equipment. The trend was accelerated several months ago by publication of the muckraking "Unsafe at Any Speed," written by a lawyer who once worked for a Senate subcommittee set up to investigate Detroit and all its works. From this lofty vantage point, the author charges that General Motors, Chrysler and Ford dominate the so-called U.S. safety establishment; in consequence, they have succeeded in blocking meaningful progress toward a safer car. Several States, notably Iowa and New York, have been pushing for stricter safety standards. Washington also has jumped on the bandwagon: the General Services Administration now demands a number of safety features on all Government vehicles, while the White House is pushing a vast new safety program. Even the Big Three have succumbed to the prevailing hysteria; last week, despite earlier reservations and misgivings, General Motors announced that it plans to install dual brakes and collapsible steering columns on all its 1967's.

Like lung cancer and poisoned wells, death on the highways constitutes what politicians call a gut issue; i.e., one in which emotion tends to prevail over reason. The outbreak of the current inflammatory campaign against the automakers, as well as Detroit's panicky response, plainly smacks of the irrational. Contrary to the impression skillfully conveyed by alarmists, the automobile over the years has become a far less hazardous means of transportation. Everyone knows that traffic accidents claimed nearly 50,000 lives last year. Nobody stops to realize that by the only meaningful yardsticks—relative to the total number of cars on the road and the number of vehicle miles—fatal accidents in the past generation have declined by more than half. Since 1935, according to the National Safety Council, deaths per hundred-million vehicle-miles have skidded from 15.9 to 5.6. In 1965, the council disclosed that Friday, that rate showed the first drop in half a decade.

Viewed in perspective, the much-maligned U.S. "safety establishment" looks pretty good. Compared to Europe, over which the "Big Three" cannot possibly exert the same degree of baneful influence, the record positively glitters. According to statistics supplied by the World Health Organization, this country leads the entire Continent in automotive safety, frequently by margins of two or more to one. Thus, in terms of 100 million vehicle miles, the death rate in Great Britain recently stood at 8.9 (8.4, including motorcycles and motor scooters); in West Germany, 14.7 and 13.3, respectively; and in Italy—see Rome and die—at 32.6 and 21.3. In Yugoslavia, where nobody ever made headlines by saying "what's good for the country is good for General Motors, and vice versa," the comparable death tolls happen to run to a staggering 52.6 and 35.8. By the counsel of perfection, even one traffic death is too many. In the real world, where absolute safety, even at home, is only a dream, the U.S. record is nothing to decry.

Blaming cars for fatal crashes, the statistics suggest, makes little more sense than blaming murders on guns. What really counts is the finger on the trigger or the hands on the wheel. In an article titled "Dangerous Driving Is No Accident," the February Reader's Digest quotes the results of an analysis of 653 English motorists with records of serious traffic offenses. The author concludes that "only 14 percent of the 'accidents' in the district under study were actually caused by unpredictable events which a driver could not forestall, such as a jammed steering wheel, a blowout, or a wasp buzzing into the car. In the other 86 percent, the offender himself was directly responsible * * *." On the U.S. scene, the upcreep of recent years in the fatality rate—when reached an alltime low of 5.2 in 1961—surely has something to do with the population explosion of relatively high-risk young drivers, who, thanks to the postwar baby boom, lately have hit the road in unprecedented numbers.

While safer automobiles might help—on this score Detroit has been no laggard—the real issue is safer drivers. Here is where politics, in the form of tightfisted regulation of casualty underwriters, has played a wholly destructive, and little-recognized role. In their own self-interest, insurance companies have been traditional leaders in advancing the cause of safety; nearly two centuries ago, privately owned British fire insurance firms organized the first fire brigades. "By penalizing features of fire hazard and allowing discounts when the property is suitably protected," notes the Encyclopaedia Britannica, "the companies have done much toward the prevention of fire." With respect to traffic safety, however, the regulatory authorities—through such devices as assigned-risk plans and ceilings on rates—have effectively prevented underwriters from encouraging good drivers and discouraging poor ones. On the highways bad public policy has come home to roost.

None of the foregoing is likely to stop muckraking writers or political demagogs, who know pay dirt when they strike it. The facts, however, should give pause to all who are truly concerned with reducing the Nation's traffic toll. Whatever Albany or Washington may pretend, highway safety hangs primarily on individual responsibility. No Federal program will ever get from here to there.

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF AID TO IMPACTED AREAS — PRESIDENT WILL GET MESSAGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am in receipt of much correspondence evidencing the concern of citizens throughout the country over proposals in S. 3046 to change the thrust of Public Law 874.

An example of the type of editorial opinion which has recently come to my attention is the editorial entitled, "President Will Get Message," which appeared in the Oklahoma Journal on Thursday, March 3, 1966. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oklahoma Journal, Mar. 3, 1966]

PRESIDENT WILL GET MESSAGE

The perennial furore over cutting down on Federal aid to impacted areas is presently in full swing, but there are overpowering indications the message will be gotten across once more that such a move is tantamount to downgrading education in America and no sane-minded legislator in Washington wants that stigma on his voting record.

This furore does not, of course, stem from the President wanting to economize at the expense of the schoolchildren. It stems from honest ignorance on the part of his advisers in the Bureau of the Budget who do not keep abreast over the years with the trends in education, and, as a result do not know what damage would accrue to school districts in every State of the Union if Federal aid to impacted areas is cut.

Fortunately, Members of Congress do keep abreast of the trends in education since they take testimony on this vital matter every year and so know that any cut in Federal aid to impacted areas would actually wipe out some schools and seriously penalize the programs in others.

Since there are 322 congressional districts which would be penalized by a cut in Federal aid to impacted areas, it goes without saying there are going to be a large number of Congressmen opposing any such cut.

One needs only to look around him in this heavily impacted area to realize how serious a threat to education any suggested cut in Federal aid would be.

Students are already attending classes in makeshift quarters and more funds are badly needed for construction of more buildings.

The districts need more help, not less.

Federal authorities cannot argue that the school districts should vote more millage, because it is a fact that 90 percent of them are already voting the maximum.

These people are education minded, and they want the best for their children.

And while we are on the subject of Federal aid to education, we might mention in passing the proposal to cut down on milk in the hot lunch program.

This, too, may sound like a great economy measure, to some people—certainly not to us—but a closer look shows up the discrepancies.

The argument is used that people who can afford to buy milk for their children should do it, and those who can't afford should get it free.

This makes good sense, but it violates the spirit of the manner in which the program was set up in the first place.

The idea behind the free lunch program was to insure that needy children would get a good meal without having to advertise to their classmates they were indigents.

This, in our opinion, is still a valid idea, and one worth perpetuating.

It is deplorable to a marked degree that some agencies of our Government must behave like unthinking computers when they set out to modify certain pieces of legislation.

Apparently the Bureau of the Budget is unaware that the cost of education has doubled in recent years, and the number of pupils has skyrocketed, while the number of buildings has lagged badly.

As we mentioned before, Members of Congress, thank goodness, are not quite so ill informed.

We have a feeling they will get their point across to the President in the weeks ahead.

USEFUL SUGGESTIONS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, President Johnson's suggestion in his crime message that the Governor of every State form a committee on the administration of criminal justice is a step of major importance in developing a national strategy against crime.

The decision to encourage wider participation is significant because though crime is a national problem, it mostly must be fought at the State and local level. Also, for too many years, and in too many States, there has not been sufficient coordination among the various law enforcement agencies within each State.

The problem is much more complicated than just working out some sort of cooperative agreements between various police departments within each State. Much more difficult and much more important, the time has come for the police, the courts, and the corrections authorities to join together in an integrated program to eliminate crime from our society.

The time has long passed when the different parts of the entire system of criminal justice can afford to distrust one another. Phrases like "brutal" police and "muddle headed" judges and "soft" parole officers should no longer be heard. Instead, we must concentrate our energies on the real problems: developing more effective programs to prevent juvenile delinquency, better police, more efficient and fair courts, and improved correctional systems. The President's invitation to the Governors to form broadly based committees to examine the overall crime problem should give the police, the courts, the corrections authorities and the public a place to meet, to come to understand each other's special problems and finally, to seek better solutions.

It occurs to me that as the State committees come to grips with their problems they may wish to share their solutions with the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice—now working on the crime problem at the national level. Thus, the good ideas of one State may be utilized by the whole country.

On the other hand, the State committees may be able to help the national effort against crime by considering the value and appropriateness of the various recommendations pending before the President's Commission.

In addition, the State planning committee may eventually prove valuable in helping the recently created Office of Law Enforcement Assistance set priorities on what are the most significant projects within each State.

Thus, the State committees proposed by the President should play a creative and important role in developing the country's response to the constant threat of crime. Crime is increasing and the towns and counties, the cities and the States, and the Federal Government must join together in finding effective methods to combat it.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, for years truth-in-packaging opponents have been peddling the story that only professional consumers support the bill. The inference was that these groups were just troublemakers and did not reflect the thinking of the typical American consumer.

Frankly, in the past I thought the claim too preposterous for comment.

However, the opponents' drive against the bill has intensified the past weeks as the moment neared for the Commerce Committee to consider the bill. Because the "nobody really wants this bill" line is still prominent in arguments against the bill, I thought it is time that I give a detailed answer to, "Who supports the truth-in-packaging bill?"

My office did a cursory survey of the groups which have gone on the record as for the bill during the years. The list, which is not all-inclusive, is impressive even to the chief sponsor of the bill—both as to quantity and quality.

First off, we discovered that the 12 organizations for which we were able to locate the data represent almost 42 million members. Those who like to muse over the relativity of statistics might like to spend some time balancing that 42 million figure against the 57 million households there are in the United States.

The 12 groups and their memberships are:

AFL–CIO, 13 million.

Cooperative League of the United States, an association of consumer-owned stores throughout the United States, representing 15 million family owners.

Rural Electric Cooperative Association, representing 4,715,462 member owners of 979 electric systems.

National Council of Senior Citizens, 2 million.

National Council of Negro Women, 3,850,000.

Michigan Credit Union League, 1 million.

National Farmers Union, 750,000.

National Grange, 700,000.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 175,000.

National Council of Jewish Women, 123,000.

American Veterans Committee, 25,000.

National Consumers League, 15,000.

Other organizations which, while smaller in some instances, rate special attention because their membership is especially qualified to judge this bill include:

Consumers Union, which reports the bill has brought more mail from readers of Consumers Reports magazine than any other in its 30-some year history.

National Federation of Independent Businesses, who polled their 190,000 members—all operators of small stores—and found them largely in favor of the bill.

State directors of weights and measures departments, 81 percent who were in favor of the bill in a poll conducted by the Weights and Measures Research Center.

Executive Committee of the National Association of State Department of Agriculture.

Kansas Home Economists Association, an organization of 700 home economists who at a convention unanimously adopted a resolution in support of the bill.

Federation of Homemakers, a national organization with membership in all States.

Numerous local homemakers groups, such as the Friendly Homemakers Club of Milton, N. Dak., Woman's Club of Idlewood, Md., and the North Boroughs Woman's Club of Pittsburgh.

Other organizations which have gone on record in support of truth in packaging include:

Consumers Cooperative of Berkeley, Maryland Consumers Council, Association of California Consumers, and the Harlem Consumers Education Council.

As legislators being asked to wrestle with this bill, my colleagues may take particular note of the actions of other legislators:

City Council, Elsinore, Calif., which adopted a resolution in favor of the bill.

Colorado House of Representatives, which adopted a House memorial in favor of the bill.

New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Consumer Protection which after intensive study is recommending adoption of a similar bill.

Also, 12 U.S. Senators cosponsor this bill and 16 Congressmen have put it in, with more going in weekly.

Typical of the great individual concern our senior citizens have expressed over this bill was a letter from Mrs. Alice Kline, 1530 Collins, Avenue, Miami Beach. Mrs. Kline's letter of support concluded with signatures of 52 of her "friends and neighbors who are also in complete accord with the above statements."

The bill also has won editorial endorsement from outstanding papers across the nation, including the New York Times, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Kansas City Star, Washington Post, Washington Star, and the Kansas City Times.

Back on the Washington front, may I remind my colleagues that the bill has the support of President Johnson, the Council of Economic Advisors, the President's Advisory Council on Consumer Interests, the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, the Secretary of Commerce, the Food and Drug Administration Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.

Missing on this list of supporters, of course, are representatives of the large food and packaging concerns. They are not, happily, missing in the body of supporters. Many have told me—albeit off the record—that they would favor the bill as a means to stopping competitors from engaging in unfair competitive practices. Or as Lowell Wakefield, president of Wakefield Fisheries, Port Wakefield, Alaska, expressed it in a letter:

> It seems to us that any firm interested in correcting this sad state of affairs has everything to gain and nothing to lose from the sort of legislation now before you.

Another employee of one of the companies wrote, but asked:

> Please do not use my name as I am still an employee and could lose my job.

He had been told to write me to protest the bill, he said. However he wrote to say:

> For over 30 years I have seen phony labeling and misleading containers bilk the public. I don't think the * * * or any other manufacturer need worry about honest labeling and keeping container sizes within the bounds of truthfulness. Neither can this be done on a local or State level. I urge passage of your bill or a similar bill.

Mr. President, this, then, is a sampling of the supporters of the truth-in-packaging bill. It shows, I think, that the bulk of those who support it are "nonprofessional consumers" who seek packages which give them sufficient information to make rational buying decisions in the supermarket.

After answering one question, I now would like to ask one: With a mandate such as this, how can Congress further delay enacting the bill?

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON COMMENDS AND SIGNS NEW GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on March 3, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the cold war GI bill into law. At that time, he recalled in his remarks the benefits that previous bills have given to this Nation, and indicated that this was a renewed pledge to the fighting men and women of the Nation that our country is behind them. More than 3 million cold war GI veterans will be eligible to go to school June 1 under this new GI bill. Citing the great benefits that the previous GI bills have brought to our Nation, the President said:

> One hundred and sixteen Members of the House of Representatives, in our Congress, received training under the GI bills, as did 11 U.S. Senators, 12 of the Governors of our States, 3 members of the President's Cabinet, 1 Justice of the Supreme Court, 6 of our astronauts, and 5 of the President's Special Assistants here in the White House.
>
> The first two GI bills cost $21 billion. Our economists now estimate they resulted in a return of some $60 billion in Federal taxes for that $21 billion invested.
>
> The educational level of World War II and Korean war veterans averaged about 2 years above the level of nonveterans. This difference exists primarily because of what the GI bills were able to do.
>
> We made the most promising investment that a nation can make, an investment in the talent and the ambition of our citizens. The return on that investment has doubled and has redoubled ever since.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the President's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING THE COLD WAR GI BILL IN THE EAST ROOM

Members of the Cabinet, distinguished Members of the Congress, invited guests, ladies and gentlemen, during World War II when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the first Veterans Readjustment Act, he stated on the occasion of that signing, "This law gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people never intend to let them down."

That first GI bill, and later the Korean GI bill, brought, out of the hardship of war, hope for all of our American service people. They returned home to find not just gratitude, but concrete help in getting a fresh start with educational assistance, with medical care, with guarantees that permitted them to buy homes to live in.

They found opportunity which they used to enrich themselves and to enrich the Nation.

As we meet here today in this historic East Room and look around and see our friends gathered, we see the results of that legislation.

One hundred and sixteen Members of the House of Representatives, in our Congress, received training under the GI bills, as did 11 U.S. Senators, 12 of the Governors of our States, 3 members of the President's Cabinet, 1 Justice of the Supreme Court, 6 of our astronauts, and 5 of the President's Special Assistants here in the White House.

The first two GI bills cost $21 billion. Our economists now estimate they resulted in a return of some $60 billion in Federal taxes for that $21 billion invested.

The educational level of World War II and Korean war veterans averages about 2 years above the level of nonveterans. This difference exists primarily because of what the GI bills were able to do.

We made the most promising investment that a nation can make, an investment in the talent and the ambition of our citizens. The return on that investment has doubled and has redoubled ever since.

Today we come here in a time of new testing. Today, by signing a new Veterans Readjustment Act that was authored in the Senate by my colleague and friend of many years, Senator YARBOROUGH, and reported in the House by Chairman TEAGUE, with the unanimous support of his committee, we are reaffirming President Roosevelt's pledge of 22 years ago. We are saying to the brave Americans who serve us in uniform, in camps and bases, in villages and jungles, that your country is behind you; that we support you; that you serve us in time of danger.

To say this does not mean that all Americans agree on everything that is done or on every policy or on every commitment. But it does mean that once that policy is established, once that commitment is made, once that pledge is given, we support fully the young men who are the spearhead of that policy.

The Congress has passed this legislation. It passed it without a single dissenting vote. In doing so, it said we will support these men who are defending our freedom to debate, who are joining in a most historic protest for their country, a protest against tyranny, a protest against aggression, and a protest against misery.

The budget I sent to Congress this year resulted from a very careful study of the Nation's resources. My Cabinet officers brought to my home in Texas, where I was recuperating from an operation, budget requests that they had gone over very carefully that amounted to $130 billion. They felt that they could not reduce beyond this amount. It was my sad duty to bring those requests in line with what I thought our resources were and what I thought the Congress would approve. We reduced them down to a little under $113 billion.

Of that $113 billion, over $10 billion—$10.2 billion to be exact—will go this year to education and training. When I became President in fiscal year 1964, we were spending $4.75 billion. Although I have been in the Presidency just a little over 2 years, we have more than doubled the amount that we are spending for education and training, from $4.75 billion to $10.2 billion, from fiscal year 1964 to 1967.

Education gets more money in this budget than any other items except interest on the public debt, some $12 billion, and the Defense Department, which, as you know, exceeds $50 billion.

I must be frank. I had felt that we could start the new GI program, and that we should, by providing special funds for soldiers who served in combat areas. Others could be provided opportunity grants through the Higher Education Act. In that way, I was hopeful that we would not ask for more than we could get, or bite off more than we could chew in educational costs.

The Congress considered these measures, and in their judgment, as I say, passed this by a unanimous vote. They felt that we should go far in excess of what I asked for this year. The bill before me this morning exceeds my budget request by more than $245 million for fiscal year 1967, and by more then $1.8 billion over the next 5 years.

Because it is for education, I am going to sign this bill, even though it provides hundreds of millions of dollars more than I thought it advisable to recommend or to ask for this year.

This is the first major measure enacted in this session of Congress, and a President just must not ignore the unanimous vote of both Houses of the Congress, the two Texas chairmen, YARBOROUGH and TEAGUE, and some 5 million men who will be the beneficiaries who have worn the uniform.

I want to call attention however, and make a most solemn warning about future legislation. Unless we can balance our requests with prudence, and our concern with caution, then we are likely to get our figures back to that $130 billion which came over from the departments.

I am going to sign this measure this morning notwithstanding the fact that it goes further than I was willing to ask for this year, because, paraphrasing what Secretary Rusk said the other day in response to a question from Congress, he said, "Well, Senator, could it be that they could perhaps be wrong?" It just could be that the President was wrong when he made his original request.

I supported this legislation when I was a Member of the Senate, and sometimes you look at things a little differently from one end of the avenue than you do from the other end.

I have tried to take into consideration all of the factors that should be weighed. I have heard the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, and every commander—General Walt this week, General Westmoreland a couple of weeks ago—tell me about the dedication of our fighting men. I am convinced that these brave Americans who serve us on many fronts today, particularly in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, and others, are the very best men that our country has ever produced. They are great soldiers.

I am going to resolve this doubt in behalf of the Congress, which has spent more hours considering this than I have, and sign this legislation in the hope that when the peace is won, we can provide the means of making great civilians in time of peace out of these great soldiers who served us in time of need.

Thank you very much.

THE 118TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION OF 1848, AND 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION OF 1956

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today, I wish to commemorate the Hungarian Revolution of 1848 and of 1956. Both of these uprisings for freedom and independence were brutally suppressed; both still stand, nevertheless, as symbols of the Hungarian spirit and quest.

The first revolution against Hapsburg rule, led by the Hungarian patriot Louis Kossuth, was crushed, but recognizing the deep sense of freedom which motivated the Hungarians, the Austrian monarchy deemed it wise to establish Hungarian action. The Hungarian people were not so fortunate in 1956. Soviet tanks reimposed Communist rule in Hungary, killing many and causing over 200,000 to flee their native land. The fact that Russia had to bring her armies back into Hungary in order to bolster a totally unwanted Communist government is testimony to the determination and courage of the Hungarians who fought for their freedom and independence.

The revolution of 1956, although unsuccessful, did irreparable damage to the Soviet cause. The bloody suppression led to a widespread revulsion against Soviet Communist domination and a disillusionment with communism. The revolt also smashed the myth of the invincibility of Communist totalitarian systems, by demonstrating the elemental truth that an aroused people has strength well beyond their numbers and means.

There is pending now before the Senate a resolution to erect a memorial statue to the Freedom Fighters of the 1956 Revolution. I support this resolution and believe that such a memorial would serve as a constant reminder of how really important and meaningful are freedom and independence.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today marks the anniversary of the Hungarian people's struggle for independence from Hapsburg domination. One hundred and eighteen years ago, on March 15, 1848, a group of young Hungarians met in Budapest to draft their uncompromising declaration on individual liberty and national sovereignty.

To the casual observer, not well versed in history, this anniversary might seem insignificant today. But that declaration had no less significance than the words of Webster and Calhoun, spoken in this Chamber 118 years ago.

For nearly 100 years the Hungarian people steadfastly maintained their independence. Then, in the face of an apathetic world, Hungary was sacrificed to Communist domination. For 10 years, the Hungarian people silently resisted Communist oppression. Then, on that wonderful day of October 23, 1956, a freedom-loving people, heirs to the first constitutional government ever created on the European Continent, rose in arms against tyranny. The events of March 15, 1848, were repeated.

We in America are inclined to take freedom for granted. Yet we should recall that we maintained our freedom by adhering to certain basic principles and venerable documents which guarantee our freedom. Our support of the ideals of liberty and national self determination must have a universal application.

Mr. President, the ideals of the Hungarian people are identical with ours. And this is why I am taking this opportunity, the Hungarian national holiday of independence, to express my support of Senate Joint Resolution 119, authorizing the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation to erect a memorial in Washington, D.C., in honor of those brave men and women who died during the 1956 revolution for the ideals of the West. This is the least we can do in telling the American people and the world that freedom has one universal meaning.

THE PROBLEM OF LEADERSHIP

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 11 the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Joseph W. Barr, spoke at DePauw University in Greencastle, Ind., before a group of potential leaders. This was the Phi Beta Kappa chapel of the university, and Mr. Barr, himself a Phi Beta Kappa member, addressed himself to the problem of leadership in our increasingly complex society, in which we need both the technical specialist and the person whose broadgage understanding of the large questions cuts across specialties.

I ask unanimous consent that this illuminating address may appear in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Challenge of Macro-Leadership

(Remarks by the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, at the Phi Beta Kappa Chapel, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind., Friday March 11, 1966)

In May of 1965 the then president of the Carnegie Foundation and now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, delivered a speech entitled, "The Antileadership Vaccine." A year earlier, at the annual Loeb Awards dinner in New York, I delivered a speech entitled "Political Economy—The Need for a New Look." Both addresses dealt with this question of leadership, and as I pondered the subject of my discussion today it seemed appropriate, with Secretary Gardner's permission, to attempt to advance this important inquiry.

A Phi Beta Kappa chapel seems an especially appropriate forum in which to undertake an intellectual exercise of this kind. Election to Phi Beta Kappa is tangible recognition of excellence in a particular area of human endeavor. But it is no less true that those who aspire toward a leadership role today—and I hope people such as you are so aspiring—face a difficult task in making the transition from particularized excellence to the more general and complex problems of leadership.

Secretary Gardner in his "Antileadership Vaccine" address made several particularly relevant points in this respect.

Leadership and power in this Nation are dispersed, and communication or cooperation between leaders in various areas (education, government, the arts, science) is often tenuous and sometimes nonexistent. This fragmentation of leadership in a highly pluralistic society such as ours often produces in individual leaders the conclusion that, "it isn't anybody's business to think about the big questions that cut across specialties—the largest questions facing our society."

Secretary Gardner also had this to say about the training of leaders: "The best students are carefully schooled to avoid leadership responsibilities. * * * the academic world appears to be approaching a point at which everyone will want to educate the technical expert who advises the leader, or the intellectual who stands off and criticizes the leader, but no one will want to educate the leader himself." Such leaders will lack the essential element of confidence so necessary for reaching and following through on difficult decisions. Indeed, Secretary Gardner refers to what he calls the latest modern art, "How to reach a decision without really deciding."

How serious is our problem? What is its exact nature? It seems to me that in a highly developed pluralistic society such as ours, two contradictory forces are at work which severely complicate the problem of leadership. On the one hand, increasing specialization in all professions makes technical expertise an essential prerequisite for anyone who seeks a position of influence within his or her profession.

On the other hand, in this age of large-scale organization and increasing specialization, we face a more urgent need than ever before for people who are capable of practical action in complicated areas requiring deep knowledge of several related disciplines. A person who has climbed the ladder within his profession may be incapable later in life of thinking in broad terms about what Secretary Gardner called "the largest questions facing our society." And, the person who dabbles in a number of disciplines may find that despite his good intentions he lacks the depth, experience, and expertise required to relate various complex fields. I would suggest that this is a very real dilemma which this country will face increasingly in coming years.

Perhaps one way out of the dilemma is to identify some of the largest questions facing our society, and then to inquire as to the specialized training and generalized experience that will equip future leaders to deal with the largest questions. Let me identify what in my opinion is certainly one such question: How are we to fit a highly sophisticated industrialized society into the political, economic, and cultural institutions that are realities in the world today? The technical revolution which has characterized the development of western economies for the past century has increasingly demanded ever-larger markets for efficient functioning. We have seen two costly world wars, the breakup of colonial empires, and the emergence of a new balance of power in the world. In the West, the result has been increasingly interdependent economies, and larger markets which have become increasingly intolerant of political and cultural restraints. This is natural because the thrust of modern economic development is toward large-scale organization. To some extent the same process is now occurring in the Soviet bloc countries, but in the underdeveloped world of Asia and Africa, where the need for modern economic development is urgent, the trend of the past 2 decades has been toward political fragmentation.

It is not simply a question of rich and poor nations, though this indeed is one of the most serious problems we face. Rather, it is a question of somehow building new relationships between individual countries and groups of countries. Europe has moved slowly but purposefully toward the creation of a common market whose breadth and depth will support and sustain a modern economy. There are faltering steps of this type in other regions—Latin America, parts of Africa, and even parts of Asia. These are processes which in my view must be encouraged and to which the United States should lend its support. They raise whole new areas for world leadership which will be wide open to the political economist.

If we accept as given the political boundaries of today's world—if we also accept as given the economic imperative for developing markets and trading areas with the depth and breadth to support modern economies, then it seems we are faced with a conundrum. A striking example in southeast Asia.

With the nations of the region turning their attention to economic development, the obvious course for development is apparent. South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Burma are all connected in one way or another with the vast Mekong River system. Up to now this river has been literally untouched; not a bridge has been thrown across its banks. Its potential for the development of power, irrigation, and transportation systems would seem to be a basic requirement for any sort of balanced economic development in this area. But obviously the solution to this problem is made more difficult by political subdivisions which, however, represent real boundaries between ancient and hostile peoples. The problem is to develop the Mekong through a regional plan which minimizes the inefficiency inherent in narrow political divisions without eliminating all possibility of progress by ignoring national tradition and tribe. This will require a rare combination of specialized expertise and experience.

It would also be most difficult to build a viable system of higher education in southeast Asia through some sort of a regional concept. It may even be impossible to do this job in any other way. In all probability the same concept will logically apply to the operations of their central banks, the development of road and rail systems, and quite possibly to the practical problem of developing the savings and raising the capital which will be required to finance these projects.

What is obvious in southeast Asia is almost equally apparent in other areas. The Indus basin project in India and Pakistan demonstrates that this sort of problem can be solved in the most difficult circumstances, given a constructive attitude, enormous technical skill, and a generous measure of hard work. Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America offer many other examples. In each case the problem and the solution may be apparent to the economist, though not nearly so clear to the politician. Even Europe, with its close economic ties and its relatively common historical traditions, is experiencing severe difficulties in establishing a common market and trading organizaiton. How much more difficult is the problem among the new states who so jealously guard their recently acquired independence.

One can see here the vastness of the problems. Are there any solutions in sight? I think the answer is yes, but the steps forward are slow and tentative, the barriers both formidable and complex. In general, the solution is one of regional development. One aspect of this approach is the recent creation of regional development banks. There has been an Inter-American Development Bank since 1959, an African Development Bank since 1963, and most recently the world is currently engaged in forming the new Asian Development Bank. This bank will be made up of 19 Asian countries supported by the contributions of 12 industrialized nations who have joined together in an institution which can focus the attention of the world on rational economic development in Asia.

In April 1965 in an address at Johns Hopkins, President Johnson threw the support of the United States behind this concept, which had been developed initially by the nations of Asia. I was assigned responsibility for coordinating the U.S. effort in this undertaking, with Mr. Eugene Black, ex-President of the World Bank, acting as the President's special representative.

I must confess that I undertook this responsibility with some doubts that were shared rather widely by economists and financiers. I wondered whether or not it was appropriate to fragment and to regionalize our approach to economic development. Reasonable men can still debate this point and can possibly argue that from a purely economic standpoint, the global approach is more appropriate. However, from the standpoint of a political economist, the concept of a regional development bank appeared sound, because it offered the best possibility of reconciling the economic imperatives of regional development with the political difficulties involved in reaching decisions that cut across national boundaries.

During the negotiations which led to the bank's creation, it was reassuring to discover that Indians and Pakistani could sit across the table and discuss the problems of economic development on a rational basis; that my own personal relations with the Finance Minister of Cambodia were cordial and easy; and that the cultural differences which have separated Muslims, Hindus, and Buddhists for centuries did not appear to have a divisive influence. It seems that the comparatively simple and obvious demands of economic development can bring together men of diverse cultures, religions, and nationalities.

If this conclusion is true, and I believe that it is, then the man who can lead and guide these institutions is a crucially important leader in the world today. It is not reasonable to expect the tensions that are built into boundary lines, cultural differences, and religious differences to disappear quickly from our world. But if it is true that the concept of regional economic development can override the realities of these tensions, then the man who can organize, finance, and get political agreement on these projects is truly a leader in whom all of us can place great hope.

There are such men in the world today, though they are in critically short supply. I refer to men such as Mr. Eugene Black, the former President of the World Bank; his successor, Mr. George Woods; the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, Mr. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer; the President of the Inter-American Development Bank, Mr. Felipe Herrera; and finally to the man for whom the world is currently searching to lead the new Asian Development Bank.

This, then, is an area which warrants our close attention and the interest of the American public generally. It is an area which will demand leaders capable of practical action in the fields of both politics and economics. In the past we have been extremely fortunate in developing leaders in all fields, but as our national and international problems multiply, and the economic and political milieu in which we are called upon to operate becomes increasingly complex, the question arises as to whether there will be enough such leaders for the future.

I dealt with this problem in my Loeb Awards speech of 1964, where I expressed my regret that the academic discipline of political economy had been divided into the specializations of political science and economics. The result has been to create economists with too little knowledge of how to implement their theories and political scientists who have no real grasp of the economic forces determining political action. I also referred to the French system of "inspecteurs de finance" which has produced men of outstanding skill both in academic economics and in politics, many of whom have come to occupy the very highest positions in French Government. I myself proposed the creation of what I called a financial reserve corps, a group of leaders experienced in the field of political economy. I might add that since then, Secretary Gardner put forward a leadership program which has now been implemented by the President. I refer to the White House fellows program under which 15 able young men ranging in age from 23 to 35 are assigned to the White House, to the Vice President, and to the various executive departments, with definite instructions from the President that they should be included in the policy process at the highest levels in our Government. One of these young men, Mr. David Mulford, serves as my assistant and is with me today.

It is clear to me that the White House fellows concept has developed into a remarkable program which should provide an important nucleus of leadership in the next 20 years. Legislation will soon be submitted to Congress which if enacted will make the White House fellowships a permanent Federal program. My hope is that the same approach might be taken in other areas of Government, such as the financial sphere which I have discussed today.

In 1964 I proposed the creation of a Financial Reserve Corps to meet our future leadership needs in the financial sphere. I believe that such a corps could make a unique contribution in this area and in closing I would like briefly to outline my proposal. Though set up on a permanent basis, the corps would have to be created gradually through a carefully planned education and on-the-job training program running over a period of something like 3 years. During this period participants would be put through two cycles of a year and a half each—6 months intensive academic training, for example, followed by 1 year of practical experience in one of the departments or agencies of the Federal Government. Thus, in the 3-year period, participants would have two rounds of academic training and hold two responsible posts in the Government. Assignments might be arranged in the Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Federal Reserve, State Department, the Pentagon, the Commerce Department. To administer the program a Presidential Commission might be appointed, comprising a professional staff and leading private citizens, congressional representatives, and high Government officials to conduct the selection of candidates.

As for candidates, I think it should be recognized from the outset that we are talking about an exceptional type of person with a rare combination of talents, attitudes, and experience. Such people defy both specific description and broad generalizations, but certain attributes would seem to be essential. They should be well educated, relatively mature—possibly between ages 25 and 33—and have some idea about the general direction of their career. Hopefully, candidates might be drawn from a wide variety of sources, including Government, banking and investment institutions, business, the legal professions, and the universities. Their background training might be equally diverse—say, for example, economics, law, political science, mathematics and engineering, history, or philosophy. Above all, it would seem essential that candidates show unusual capacity for creative thinking, as well as the ability to relate their ideas to complicated economic and financial data. This is a great deal to ask, and I think it would be unwise to be too specific here, because the capacity to make decisions and to follow them through politically is not an easy thing to assess. I do think, however, that participants in the scheme should be expected to commit themselves to serving 3 or 4 years in Government, either immediately after their training or later in life. In this way a reservoir of trained men would be built up over the years which the Government could draw upon to fill top level positions in the economic and financial spheres.

In the final analysis, however, leadership is essentially an attitude of mind. No matter what programs of specialized training and generalized experience any of us can devise, there must be the willingness by some individuals to accept the risks that are the inevitable companions of leadership.

Today, more than any other type of leader, we need the man who can relate diverse and complicated fields, the man who has specialized but also remains a sophisticated generalist. This is where "attitude of mind" comes in. The men and women who can achieve expertise but retain flexibility, who can define alternatives and still put their hand to the task of implementation—these will be the leaders of the future.

A GOLDEN THANK YOU

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on February 9, a friend of mine, Mrs. Harry Watson, of Anchorage, Alaska, received a gold pin commemorating 30 years of Federal service.

The occasion was worthy of note for two other reasons. February 9 was Mrs. Watson's 73d birthday and this is her 59th year as a telephone operator.

Mrs. Watson began her life in Alaska and her career as a telephone operator in Dawson at the time of the Klondike gold rush. The year was 1907. She was 14.

As an article in the Anchorage Daily Times noted, Mrs. Watson "is a pioneer in the truest sense of the word, not only in Alaska but in the field of communications as well."

Having known Mrs. Watson for many years, I agree with that statement and take this opportunity to congratulate her on her many years of service to the people of Alaska.

It is entirely fitting that her 30-year service pin be of gold. Mrs. Watson can recall when prospectors would put on the switchboard several gold nuggets and tell her to pick one or two in appreciation of her service as a telephone operator. In those days an operator delivered messages, ordered supplies, as well as completed calls.

Mrs. Watson has seen many changes in Alaska and in the telephone industry, but apparently everything has not changed over the years. Gold is still a great way to say, "Thank you."

I ask unanimous consent that an article about Mrs. Watson entitled "Still Plugging Away" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL PLUGGING AWAY

Lillian Watson, pioneer Alaskan, added another gold nugget to her collection at a ceremony commemorating her 30th year of Federal service. The ceremony was held February 9 at Anchorage.

The nugget was a gold 30-year service pin presented to her by George M. Gary, director of the Alaskan Region of the Federal Aviation Agency. It was also Lillian's 73d birthday, and 59th year of service as a telephone operator.

Lillian is a pioneer in the truest sense of the word, not only in Alaska but in the field of communications as well. She has witnessed many changes in both.

Lillian Watson, nee Smith, followed closely on the heels of that hardy band of adventurers who struck out for the Klondike in search of gold at the turn of the century.

Seattle-born, Lillian was one of five children. Her two older brothers and a married sister were the first to catch the gold fever and head north. Later, her sister Cora joined them in Dawson where she operated the first switchboard. Lillian and her mother joined the others in 1907.

"Mother and I left Vancouver, British Columbia," Lillian recalls. "It took us a month. We traveled by ship, river boat, railroad, and horse-drawn stage."

In 1907, the Smith girls were a telephone operator team. They worked 12-hour shifts and thought nothing of it. For the miners up and down the gold creeks, they provided an indispensable service, placing orders for supplies, delivering messages, and reporting train robberies. "One man even asked me to phone the marshal," recalls Lillian. "He had just killed a man and wanted to turn himself in. Of course, I had to charge him $1 for the call. He waited in my office for 3 hours until the marshal came to arrest him."

The "Hello Girls," as Lillian and her contemporaries were known, were revered by the prospectors in the gold rush towns.

"It was nothing for one of them to come in and dump a poke of nuggets out on the switchboard and tell us to pick out a nugget or two—just to show their appreciation for some help we gave," she said.

There weren't enough telephone books to go around and people didn't use them anyway. Callers would request their party by name. The operators not only had to remember names and numbers, but know the number of rings on the party line. "There were 17 users of the party line at Eldorado. Just imagine, 17 combinations of long and short rings to remember."

Lillian met Harry Watson, a steamboat man, while working at Iditarod, a gold rush town in southwest Alaska, when she was 19. Watson and Lillian became engaged in Fairbanks and were married in Juneau on November 11, 1925. At that time, Watson was serving as secretary to Governor George A. Parks. The wedding was held in the Governor's Mansion with Parks serving as best man.

Four years later, the Watsons moved to Fairbanks. Later he became budget officer for CAA, and, in 1942, he was transferred to Anchorage. He retired from CAA in 1954, and his name was added to the scroll of Alaskan pioneers who have passed on in January 1964.

Lillian still works under pressure, but finds it easy compared to the gold rush days. No one comes in to drop a poke of nuggets on the switchboard now, but there are other rewards for her loyal and dedicated service. She has earned numerous sustained superior performance awards and the respect and affection of all who know her.

DIRECT POPULAR VOTE OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I have introduced Senate Joint Resolution 143, which proposes to amend the Constitution to provide for direct popular election of the President and Vice President on a nationwide basis. It proposes candidates for President and Vice President having the greatest number of the total popular votes cast, would be President and Vice President, respectively.

In case there are three or more candidates and if no candidate should receive a plurality and at least 45 percent of the total number of popular votes cast for President and Vice President, the Senate and the House assembled and voting as individual Members of one body, would choose by ballot the President-elect and Vice-President-elect from the two persons receiving the highest number of popular votes for such offices.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Indiana, Mr. BAYH, has completed one round of hearings on this subject and plans another in the near future. Although the subject of electoral college reform is an old and recurring one, I believe the climate for change is now more favorable than it has ever been before. The recent approval by the Congress of an amendment on presidential inability and vice-presidential vacancy indicates a deep concern that legal and constitutional defects which affect their highest office should be eliminated. The evils and weaknesses of the present electoral system are well known and have been stated many times.

Mr. President, nationwide popular vote makes sense.

With the implementation of the Supreme Court's one-voter, one-vote principle in the election of State legislators and Members of Congress, why should not this same democratic principle also be applied to the election of the President. The majority of the American people probably now believe that the President is elected on this basis. Election campaigns are conducted on national appeals and a candidate's margin is measured by the public in terms of his national popular vote margin.

All agree that it would be a tragedy if a President were to assume office in the space and nuclear age if he had been rejected at the polls by a majority of voting Americans. Nonetheless, this is a real possibility under the present system, and under any proposed reform other than by direct popular vote. The current system has permitted the election of three Presidents, John Quincy Adams, Rutherford

B. Hayes, and Benjamin Harrison, who trailed their opponents in the popular vote.

A study of past considerations of this subject shows that nationwide popular vote has never fully and fairly been considered by the Congress. It is dismissed by some on the assumption that it has no chance of ratification because it is alleged the smaller States would lose a disproportionate voice in presidential elections if the electoral vote allocation were abolished. Just the contrary is true.

As a Senator from one of these smaller States, I believe that my constituents and most other Americans will be attracted to the inherent fairness and justice of national popular election. The list of Senators from small States sponsoring direct popular vote proposals includes SMITH, of Maine, AIKEN, of Vermont, Beall, of Maryland, MORSE, of Oregon, Langer, of North Dakota, Norris, of Nebraska, Chavez, of New Mexico, and MANSFIELD, of Montana. It is interesting to note that in 1956 the late Senator William Langer conducted a poll of the voters in North Dakota and found that by a vote of 8 to 1, they preferred the election of the President and Vice President by direct popular vote. There is no good reason why an American citizen in one State should have a greater voice than a citizen of another State in electing the President of all the people.

Some say that the present system serves the federal principle which underlies our system. In this regard, I should like to quote a statement by the distinguished Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD which he made when he introduced a similar proposal in the 87th Congress:

> To the only significant argument which still serves to underwrite the electoral college system; that is, that it is a part of the federal system, and as such must be preserved, I can only reply that, in my opinion, the federal system is not strengthened through an antiquated device which has not worked as it was intended to work when it was included in the Constitution and which, if anything, has become a divisive force in the federal system by pitting groups of States against groups of States.
>
> As I see the federal system in contemporary practice, the House of Representatives is the key to the protection of district interests as district interests, just as the Senate is the key to the protection of State interests as State interests. These instrumentalities, and particularly the Senate, are the principal constitutional safeguards of the federal system, but the Presidency has evolved, out of necessity, into the principal political office * * * for safeguarding the interests of all the people in all the States. And since such is the case, in my opinion, the Presidency should be subject to the direct and equal control of all the people.

To those who say that such an amendment is impossible of ratification, I say: Give the people a chance. The proposal, which makes so much sense and which is so inherent in our democratic principles should be no longer dismissed in congressional committees without giving the people a chance to decide for themselves.

The summary dismissal of the chances of this proposal in the past has prevented it from being fully studied and its effects properly analyzed.

Some say that national control of elections would be required. This is not necessarily true. The same State election machinery, which now provides us with popular vote totals which are converted into electoral votes at the State level, could now provide us with merely the popular vote totals which could be certified to Congress in the same manner as electors' votes are now certified by State authorities.

Others say that our two-party system would be threatened because minority groups and splinter parties, who cannot now produce enough votes to capture entire States and therefore be counted in the electoral vote column would be able to see their votes reflected in the national totals. I believe that there are available means to counter this objection and that the proposal can be tailored so that fragmentation of parties is not encouraged.

There are several possibilities. One is to have a national runoff between the two leading candidates if neither obtains a majority. This would discourage minority parties because it would be certain that the ultimate choice would be between the two candidates of the major parties. Another possibility which I included in Senate Joint Resolution 143 is to have the election by the Congress if no candidate obtains a specified plurality which would likewise insure an ultimate choice based on the two-party system.

These are questions which call for critical, scholarly analyses of the sort which has never been brought to bear on this proposal. The two competing reform proposals, the proportional system and the district system, have both been sharply analyzed and criticized over the years, and each seems to have defects and raise sufficient doubts and uncertainties that they have little chance of passage.

The other alternative is to continue and to perfect the present system of electoral votes whereby each Sate's entire electoral vote is cast for a candidate receiving a plurality of its popular vote. This is a system which has been rejected in every other phase of our democratic system. Its unfairness has never been stated better than it was by the great Senator Thomas Hart Benton when he said in 1824:

> To lose their votes is the fate of all minorities and it is their duty to submit; but this is not a case of votes lost, but of votes taken away added to those of the majority, and given to a person to whom the minority is opposed.

Senator George Norris of Nebraska, a strong advocate of the direct popular vote, likened the electoral college to "a fifth wheel on a wagon."

In reviewing the record of recent testimony before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, I am impressed with the range of support for the direct election of the President and Vice President by a popular vote.

I am pleased to note that the testimony of Mr. Donald H. Scott, chairman of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Subcommittee on Electoral College Reform, indicated that the Public Affairs Committee of the chamber favored nationwide popular election of the President by a vote of 24 to 16. It is highly significant that this group would approve this proposal in view of the relatively slight public attention which it has received.

Mr. Neal R. Peirce, political editor of the Congressional Quarterly, made a strong statement in support of the direct election by popular vote. I commend the testimony of Mr. Peirce and Mr. Scott to your attention.

Another significant development is the recent announcement by the American Bar Association that it is undertaking a study and will seek to arrive at a recommended proposal. I applaud this effort and eagerly await the results of the distinguished group which is to explore the subject for the bar association.

Mr. President, national popular election of the President makes too much sense and is too much in accord with our democratic principles for it to be rejected on mere conclusions without reasons or efforts.

I earnestly request your consideration of a number of significant points concerning advantages of a direct popular vote.

It has been fairly well established that a direct vote would encourage larger turnout at the polls, because each person would know that his vote is meaningful in the final outcome of the election. In the last presidential election 62 percent of the eligible voters exercised their franchise. This is low when contrasted with the percentages of Western Europe. Italy, France, and Germany, for example, have continually had over 80 percent voter participation.

The possibility of accident or fraud deciding a national election would be greatly reduced.

It would eliminate the possibilities of electors disobeying instructions.

With a direct popular vote every citizen's vote would count. Minorities would have influence in direct relationship to their numbers. Today the voters choose officials at every successive level of the U.S. system by a popular vote. It, therefore, should follow that the Chief Executive be chosen on a one-man, one-vote basis.

The present system of "winner take all" gives the more populous States undue leverage in presidential elections. For instance, it is possible for a combination of the 12 larger States of New York, 43, California, 40, Pennsylvania, 29, Illinois, 26, Ohio, 26, Texas, 25, Michigan, 21, New Jersey, 17, Florida, 14, Massachusetts, 14, Indiana, 13, and North Carolina, 13, to elect a President. The larger States thus receive the major political attention.

Under my proposal political activity would have to be directed to the people of all the States rather than to key pivotal States as is the case today. It would also encourage campaigns in so-called safe States, and in small States.

The President is the President of all the people. It follows then that all the people should elect the President. We should remove forever the possibility of electing a President by less than a majority of the people. National popular election of the President? Why not?

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that Victor A. Arrigo, lawyer, historian, lecturer, newspaper columnist, and first vice president of the Municipal Art League of Chicago, gave a slide lecture on Constantino Brumidi, "the Michelangelo of the U.S. Capitol," before members and friends of the Municipal Art League of Chicago, on Saturday, March 12, 1966.

Mr. Arrigo stated:

> Constantino Brumidi, the Italian-born artist, was responsible for much of the beauty that has made the U.S. Capitol one of the greatest depositories of art in the world. The famous "Apotheosis of Washington" is the Brumidi mural in the eye of the dome of the Capitol. Only recently legislation has been introduced both in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives by U.S. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, and Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, Democrat, of Illinois, for the placement of a bust of Brumidi in the U.S. Capitol.

I certainly share Mr. Arrigo's kind appreciation of the work of Constantino Brumidi.

THE POPULATION BOMB

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Mr. Hugh Moore, the founder of the Dixie Cup Co., and now acting national chairman of the population crisis committee, recently testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Mr. Moore point out:

> Per capita food production in most of the developing countries is declining.

He urged:

> First, the importance of the United States tackling the food-population problem on a massive scale forthwith, and second, collaterally, to enlist the support of such a program by the American public.

Mr. Moore specifically recommended the addition of language such as Senator YARBOROUGH and I have proposed to the food-for-freedom legislation to make clear the concern of the U.S. Government over the twin and related problems of food and population. Mr. Moore, incidentally, was the first to use the term "population explosion," which is now an accepted part of world vocabulary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from his testimony.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY HUGH MOORE BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, MARCH 4, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during your consideration of food-for-freedom legislation.

My name is Hugh Moore. I am a consultant of the American Can Co. and founder of the Dixie Cup Co. I have served as a consultant to the U.S. delegation at the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in 1945, and as Chairman of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation by appointment of President Eisenhower. I am acting chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, Inc., here in Washington, vice president of the International Planned Parenthood Federation with headquarters in London, and chairman of the Population Reference Bureau in Washington. I am speaking today in my personal capacity and not as a representative of the foregoing organizations.

Today, as you know, food production in the developing countries is increasing at a rate of about 2½ percent a year, but this improvement is wholly swallowed up in the tremendous population growth. Today one-half of the world's population and two-thirds of the world's children do not have an adequate diet. Yet the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization indicated in its 1965 report that per capita food production has not increased since 1960 and in the heavily populated, underdeveloped nations of Asia and Latin America per capita food production has actually declined.

I am here to emphasize (1) the importance of the U.S. Government tackling the food-population problem on a massive scale forthwith, and (2) collaterally, to enlist the support of such a program by the American public.

Fifteen years ago birth control was a dirty word—just as venereal disease had been a few years earlier. It was not mentioned in the papers or in polite society. Margaret Sanger had been put in jail for proposing it.

I became interested in the subject rather indirectly. Having served in the First World War and my two sons in the Second, I had put my savings from a successful business career in trust to promote world peace.

I happened to read a book about the runaway growth of world population and concluded that it would be the root cause of future wars—a conviction expressed by Secretary Rusk recently when he said that Americans could not find security in a world where other people live in misery and starvation.

I got out a pamphlet approximately 10 years ago called "The Population Bomb," setting forth in simple language the facts about the population explosion—the first time, incidentally, that the term "population explosion" was used, so far as we have learned.

"The Population Bomb," has now run through 11 editions with between 1 million and 1½ million copies in print, distributed largely by first class mail. The third edition, printed in 1956, reported that world population was then increasing at the rate of 40 million persons per year. The 11th edition, which I have submitted to the committee, printed only 9 years later in 1965, reported that world population was growing at the rate of 70 million persons per year.

The American people have been aroused to the importance of the problem. Newspapers are full of stories about the population explosion. President Johnson has committed his administration to dealing with it.

Yet, with all the outpouring of American largess under the food-for-peace law, we have scarcely made a dent in solving the problem of bringing resources and population in balance.

Everything within reason should be done to increase our shipments of food abroad, in spite of the not inconsiderable amount as in India which goes to feeding the sacred cows and monkeys. However, if we were to continue to furnish food on a vastly stepped-up scale as now proposed to the point where American farmlands were exhausted, we still could not feed the burgeoning billions of people abroad.

I would, therefore, most respectfully recommend that the committee consider writing into this legislation its concern over the population as well as food issue. I would suggest that the committee consider very carefully the meaning of the word self-help which is rightly emphasized in this program now and perhaps include in this definition of self-help programs undertaken by these countries to reduce overly rapid rates of population growth.

A certain percentage of the funds generated by this program, either in local currencies or even in repayable dollar loans, could be specifically earmarked for use in population and family planning programs. It would also, in my judgment, make sense to coordinate closely the proposed nutrition programs with family planning efforts.

There will be 300 million more people at the breakfast table in 5 years—most of them hungry. Hunger brings turmoil—and turmoil, as we have learned, creates the atmosphere in which the Communists seek to conquer the earth.

I trust that the facts set forth by the authorities who are testifying before this committee may excite the American people with a sense of urgency, and may galvanize into action the legislative and administrative personnel of our Government.

Thank you.

MARI SANDOZ—DEATH OF AN ARTIST

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, death last weekend claimed one of America's brightest literary talents when Mari Sandoz died of cancer at the age of 65.

Although Miss Sandoz spent most of her later life in a tiny Greenwich Village apartment, she returned almost every year to her native Nebraska whose history came alive in the earthy prose of her 17 books.

Miss Sandoz' first major work—and to many of the most memorable—was the Atlantic prize-winning biography of her father, "Old Jules." There was an irony here because it was only after his death that Miss Sandoz, who had started to write when she was 9, finally was released from the constraint placed upon her by her father's pronouncements when she was a child.

"Fiction," he said, "was fit only for maids and stable boys" and "writers and artists are the maggots of society."

Just before his death he asked her if she was still writing. When she confessed that she was, Old Jules said:

> Why don't you write the story of my life?

Mamie J. Meredith, a close personal friend of Miss Sandoz, recalls:

> The eldest of six children, Mari had been born and reared on a homestead in Sheridan County, in northwestern Nebraska, near the Niobrara. Her parents were Swiss immigrants, and when she started to school at the age of 9, she spoke only a few words of English—with an equal smattering of Polish and French mixed into her mother tongue, Swiss German.

In all, she went to school less than 5 years. She noted:

> I went when I could, but with father being crippled, a community builder, and a conversationalist, mother had to do much of the outside work and I looked after the younger children. I also learned how to run father's trapline and when necessary, to skin anything from a weasel to a cow.

When she was 16, Miss Sandoz won a rural teaching certificate and taught for 5 years in the sod schoolhouse where she had been a pupil. When she was 21, the University of Nebraska admitted her as a special student, although she had never attended high school.

Miss Sandoz never forgot the university and often returned there to counsel aspiring young writers, many of whom she aided financially. The university, in turn, conferred upon her an honorary degree of Doctor of Literature.

History will rank Mari Sandoz along with two other great Nebraska writers, Willa Cather and Bess Streeter Aldrich. Fortunately, each of them has left a rich legacy of literature to add to the lore of the land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorial expressions of three Nebraska newspapers of the loss felt at Miss Sandoz' death.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal, Mar. 11, 1966]

MARI SANDOZ: FROM SANDHILLS TO HISTORY

Mari Sandoz will ever be linked to her father, Old Jules, the harsh pioneer who shaped her life, gave her toughness with which to conquer adversities, and a questioning and intelligent mind.

Her road to literary fame was paved when "Old Jules," the story of her father's life, was awarded the Atlantic nonfiction prize. Many said, "How could she write this book about her father?"

Those who had lived in that sandhills country did not ask. They understood. Her father had made an impact on that pioneer country. He had become almost a legend. His daughter had the courage to write his story honestly and it's her story too.

Next to her father, the country in which she grew up left the greatest impact on her life. The love of this country comes through in all of her writings. The stories she heard from her father whetted her appetite to learn more. Her research and talents have preserved for posterity much of history of the region.

Mari's literary career had its beginnings in Lincoln. It was here that she worked her way through the university, never quite sure of her next meal. She worked nights on the proof desk of the Lincoln Journal, did research for the State historical society in Sioux Indian history.

In later years she returned to Lincoln many times, was honored by the State and the university but her pleasure was to seek out acquaintances of earlier years and gather with a few close friends. In such groups she was a delight. Her conversation and her reminiscences sparkled like her books.

If her father had been a hard taskmaster, she was an even harder one on herself. Her work was her life and no effort too great to accomplish the jobs she set for herself. It is characteristic that she considered her last illness only as interruption and she made her last days a race to finish some of her writings.

Literary critics will debate which is her greatest work, but Nebraskans can find some of her most beautiful and poignant writing in the stories she tells in "Hostiles and Friendlies" printed by the University of Nebraska Press.

Mari Sandoz went to New York because it was a literary necessity but her heart belonged to Nebraska and in death she has returned to the sandhills. Nebraska's daughter has served her State well and many people will mourn that she lives and writes no more.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Mar. 12, 1966]

MARI SANDOZ

As a little girl, Mari Sandoz played on the Nebraska prairie, learned its ways, groped for its meaning, and came to love it as she loved no other place on earth. Her father forbade her to write about it. But she had his cussedness, and she wrote anyway, eventually immortalizing him in "Old Jules."

Her writing, rooted in the Sand Hills, spread to encompass all the plains and the people who lived on them. She wrote of the Indians, the buffalo hunters, the cattlemen, the sodbusters, the bone pickers, of meadowlarks and cool cottonwoods along sparkling streams, of dust, of blizzards, of birth, of courage, of cruelty, of madness. And of death, which claimed her this week.

She wrote with fire and vision, transforming incredible scholarship into incomparable prose. This newspaper's book editor, Victor P. Hass, said of her: "No writer in our time, and few in any other time, has so understood the mystique of the great prairie and of the Indians who once owned it as Miss Sandoz. That understanding has been her contribution to American literature."

She was, as Mr. Hass said, an "extraordinary woman whose shining talent has done so much to illuminate our lives."

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, Mar. 12, 1966]

COURAGE IS THE KEY

(By William O. Dobler)

In the life and writings of Mari Sandoz, probably the most prominent author the State has produced, emphasis is placed upon a way of life that now exists only in the pages of such books as the 17 she had published. Miss Sandoz died in New York this week, a victim of cancer. But the courage instilled in her as a child never left her even when her illness became known.

EARLY RUGGED TRAINING

Rather than seeking out a restful approach to life, Miss Sandoz took the news of her illness in stride and announced her intention of proceeding with work on some seven additional books. She knew she would never finish them all but she intended to try. The authoress was a product of pioneer Nebraska, of times when life was often harsh and demanding. The prime consideration in those days was just staying alive, a consideration that stayed with Miss Sandoz through the early years of her life. It brought her to the newsroom of this newspaper during the years when she was writing "Old Jules," an account of her father and family life that was published in 1935.

Success of her books, of course, lifted the cloud of hard economic times that had always weighed upon her but the imprint had been indelibly made. But it was an imprint of hard times tempered with something else. Miss Sandoz had a great admiration for the country in which she was raised and those who played a part in its development.

There are those who believe it is too bad that times today are not what they were at the turn of the last century. In some respects this is true but it is to overlook the real nature of life and your environment. While the environment of young people today is quite a contrast with the childhood days of Miss Sandoz, opportunity is no less.

The past is characterized by rugged individualism, by hard work and personal sacrifice. It produced in many people a determination to succeed that could not be quieted. It instilled in them a tenacity that could not easily be shaken. It gave them, too, a sense of values that left satisfaction in the achievement of even small things. Yet, it was a hard life and all those who lived it worked that it might be changed for a future generation. It has changed, too, but the environment we have today is not necessarily secondary to that of the pioneer days. The principles by which we live and by which the next generation will live are the outgrowth of a different but no less demanding way of life.

While life at the turn of the century was hard, it is today highly complicated. Rather than the challenge of eking out a living, of tiring physical labor and of conquest of the elements, young people today are faced with an advancing technology and a changing society. Where it was once important to understand the workings of simple firearms, we now must try to comprehend the mysteries and power of the atom. Rather than a living from the soil, most people today compete in a mass of humanity. The problem of getting from farm to town has now been transformed into the problem of getting to and from the suburbs or between giant metropolitan areas. Those who believe that there is any less challenge today than in years gone by have not kept step with the times.

Mari Sandoz captured in her books that part of our past that constitutes our heritage and in doing so assured herself of a lasting influence. But her efforts would be wasted if all we profited from what she wrote was a nostalgia or an accumulation of unused facts.

The important thing is that we apply to the current times and in our way those qualities and characteristics that shaped the settlement of the Nation. The sense of responsibility that marked some of the times about which she wrote can be perpetuated through one generation after another. And we can expect, too, some of the more undesirable qualities of the human race, just as they were present 65 years ago.

PRESERVED FOR FUTURE

What is missed most today is the communication with nature that Miss Sandoz enjoyed in her youth. The grandeur of our State and Nation is lost on many young people of today because of suburban growth which has hemmed them in. But the current generation has no reason to grow up without a dedication to the cause of freedom and a determination to further it. Mari Sandoz recorded the times of pioneer Nebraska so that their lessons might not be lost on those who did not live them.

Her own life spoke eloquently of the rewards of a disciplined society, and her writing is testimony to the fact that any environment calls for exertion and realization of the maximum potential within people. Mari Sandoz provided us with a great insight into the spirit of our land and its people. Her death deprives the Nation of a great asset, but she has left us much of value for which she can and will be remembered.

ACTIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE IN ADMINISTERING THE SUGAR ACT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, recent actions of the Department of Agriculture in the administration of the Sugar Act have been directed to my attention and warrant, it seems to me, the attention of the Senate and the public.

Mr. President, these actions have not merely opened wide the gates for foreign sugar imports, but have even encouraged heavy shipments of foreign sugar into the United States during the first quarter of this year. The result is a present and serious threat to the income of the American sugarbeet farmers in the Midwest and Western States and a similar threat to the income of American sugarcanegrowers of the Southern States.

Three actions by the Department of Agriculture opening the gates for foreign sugar imports apparently were for the purpose of first restraining and then even rolling back the price of refined sugar in certain areas of the United States. But the real effect, Mr. President, has been to push down the price of raw sugar which is the foundation of the entire sugar price structure of the Nation.

Let me briefly review the three actions taken by the Department of Agriculture.

During the first quarter of this year 70,000 tons of foreign sugar imports were authorized. On February 10, the Department further authorized the importation of an additional 500,000 tons and specified that this additional tonnage must be imported through ports north of Cape Hatteras, that is, through ports in the Northeast States.

Now apparently the concern of the Department was that the price of refined sugar in the Northeast area would get further out of line and that as a control additional supplies of raw sugarcane would be made available to the Northeast sugarcane refiners during the first 3 months of this year. The hope seems to have been that a greater supply of raw sugar for that area would be a supply and demand damper on the price of refined sugar.

But Mr. President, this is not the whole story. Just 4 days later, on February 14, the Department of Agriculture stated that there had been an increase in the refined sugar price in the Chicago-West area and again increased by another 50,000 tons the amount of foreign raw sugar imports during the first quarter. In announcing this new relaxing of import restrictions, however, the Department said that these additional imports were not to be confined to any particular area but could be brought into any mainland U.S. port.

Now, Mr. President, the slight increase in the refined sugar prices in the great Chicago-West region was entirely justified for two reasons.

First. It helped to narrow, at least to a small degree, the disparity between the base price of refined sugar in the large Midwest and West area and the base price of the refined sugar in the Northeast. In the Northeast States, the base price for refined sugar is still $1 more than the base price for refined sugar in the Chicago-West marketing area and $0.95 more than the base price on the west coast.

Second. It is well known that there have been steady rises in the production costs of farmers, as amply attested by the rise in the Department's own parity index which, I submit, serves as further justification for the slight sugar price increase in the Midwest markets.

Yet, as stated before, just 4 days after using imports in an attempt to control sugar prices in the Northeast, the Department aimed that same weapon at sugar prices in the Midwest which had gone up only a modest amount—in fact, less than one-third of a cent per pound.

These are two actions the Department has taken and yet, Mr. President, the third was the most drastic of all. On February 23, only 13 days after the first opening of the foreign sugar gate, the Department lifted all controls off sugar imports during the first 3 months of this year. In other words, if a foreign nation could get its entire quota for the year to our shores before March 31, it was at liberty to do so. The apparent objective of this move was to flood our markets with foreign sugar to such an extent that the refined price could be rolled back—anywhere and everywhere.

This was heavy artillery not aimed at any particular target, but used as a saturation bombardment upon the market.

Mr. President, what has been the effect of these three separate but related actions by the Department of Agriculture? Have they rolled back the refined sugar price in the Northeast or anywhere else? Have they reduced the disparity between the high Northeast base price and the lower base prices in the rest of the Nation? The answer to all of these questions is in the negative.

The price of refined sugar in the Northeast or elsewhere has not been lowered one iota. The only effect has been to drive down the price of raw sugar—thus increasing the spread of the cane sugar refiners and threatening the entire sugar price structure of the United States upon which, I might note, depends the income of sugarbeet farmers in Kansas and in more than a score of other Midwest and Western States—and causing a direct threat to the income of the cane farmers of Louisiana and Florida.

Mr. President, the raw sugar price now is 12 cents a hundredweight below the target price established by the Congress. The spot raw sugar price last Friday was only $6.85 per hundredweight. This is, as I stated, 12 cents under the price of $6.97—which is the figure established by the formula devised by Congress.

If one can find a single bright ray on the sugar horizon, Mr. President, I assume that it must be that the first quarter of this year, in which these misadventures have taken place, is nearly over. I am sure that many share with me the hope that the effects on the incomes of sugarbeet growers in Kansas and elsewhere are not too destructive in that time.

And I am sure many also share the hope, Mr. President, that the Department of Agriculture will act with more judicious restraint in administering the Sugar Act during the second quarter of this year.

The truth is that this is only one more instance that literally commands Congress to review the Nation's entire domestic and foreign sugar program.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah wishes to associate himself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kansas regarding this matter, which is so important to the sugarbeet growers of his State, as well as to the sugarbeet industry of Utah and other vast areas of the Middle West and West.

Mr. President, the sugar actions of the Department of Agriculture to which the distinguished Senator from Kansas referred, and which he so clearly explained, are but some of the most recent instances in which it can be clearly shown that the Department is acting contrary to the intent of Congress.

The Sugar Act clearly states, in section 201, that the Secretary shall, in his administration of the law, seek to attain a raw sugar price that is geared to the parity index as determined by the Department's own calculation—the price objective of the law, in other words, is geared to the production costs that farmers incur. As the Senator has pointed out, the raw sugar price objective, on that standard, is now $6.97 per hundred pounds. Before February 10, when the first of the actions the Senator from Kansas described took place, the raw sugar price was approaching that objective, but had not quite achieved it. Since those actions were taken, the raw price has been driven down to $6.85 per hundred pounds—12 cents below the objective determined by Congress to be fair both to consumers and to producers.

The concern of the Congress that the law be administered to achieve the price objective was expressed in the report of the Senate Finance Committee with regard to the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. The report, on page 8, specifically mentions the committee's concern that the price stability which the Congress intended under section 201 of the act had not been consistently achieved, and the report further admonishes the Secretary of Agriculture that he should—and I quote from the Finance Committee report: "seek to achieve and consistently to maintain the approximate target date throughout the quota year."

Mr. President, it is the feeling of the Senator from Utah that the distinguished Senator from Kansas should be heartily commended for bringing this important matter to the attention of the Senate, and that the sugarbeet growers of his State of Kansas should be grateful that they have in this body a statesman so alert to a very acute local problem and their well-being.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Utah on the very important statements they have made on the sugar problem that we face. It seems to me it is a problem which should be brought into the open and discussed on the floor. I think it is time for us to take action to see that the will of Congress as expressed in the Sugar Act is followed. I congratulate both Senators.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2499) to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 5(b) of the Small Business Act is amended by deleting the word "and" at the end of paragraph (8), by deleting the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof two new paragraphs as follows:

"(10) notwithstanding any other provision of law, issue, offer, sell, guarantee, and purchase participation certificates evidencing a beneficial interest in principal and interest collections to be received by the Administration on obligations comprising loan pools established by it. Proceeds from the sale of, and collection receipts allocable to, the participations shall be deposited in, and payments required on account of the certificates evidencing such participations shall be made from, the revolving fund established by section 4(c), or, if two or more such funds shall be so established, the deposits in, and payments from, such funds shall be on the same proportional basis as the obligations, comprising the pool against which the participations were issued, are allocable to such funds. Substitution or withdrawal of obligations in such pools may be made, but the amount, interest rates, and maturities of such obligations shall at all times be sufficient to assure all payments under the participations. Participations issued and guaranteed by the Administration shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority and control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof. Such participations shall also to the same extent as securities issued or guaranteed by the United States or its instrumentalities be deemed to be exempt securities within the meaning of the laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the limitations and restrictions contained in paragraph Seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), with respect to the power of any national banking association to deal in, underwrite, and purchase for its own account certain securities, shall not apply to such participations; and

"(11) notwithstanding any other provision of law, set aside a part or all of the obligations held by him and subject them to a trust and, incident thereto, guarantee payment thereof. The trust instrument may provide for the issuance and sale of beneficial interests or participations, by the trustee, in such obligations or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom; and may provide for the substitution or withdrawal of such obligations, or for the substitution of cash for obligations, but the amount, interest rates, and maturities of such obligations shall at all times be sufficient to assure all payments under the participations. The trust instrument may also contain other appropriate provisions in keeping with the purposes of this paragraph. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal National Mortgage Association may be named and may act as trustee of any such trusts and, for the purposes thereof, the title to such obligations shall be deemed to have passed in trust: *Provided*, That the trust instrument shall provide that custody, control, and administration of the obligations shall remain in the Administrator subject to defeasance in the event of default or probable default, as determined by the trustee, in the payment of the beneficial interests or participations. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4(c) hereof relating to the payment of collections into any revolving fund established by such section, collections from obligations subject to the trust shall be dealt with as provided by the instrument creating the trust. The trust instrument shall provide that the trustee will promptly pay to the Administrator the entire proceeds of any sale of beneficial interests or participations to the extent they are based upon such obligations or collections. The Administrator shall deposit such proceeds in the revolving fund, or, if two or more such funds shall be established, the Administrator shall deposit such proceeds in such funds on the same proportional basis as the obligations, which are subject to the trust, are allocable to such funds. The Administrator is authorized to purchase outstanding beneficial interests or participations to the extent of the outstanding amount of his commitment to the trustee. In the event that collections from obligations subject to the trust are insufficient to enable the Administrator to meet any of his responsibilities with respect to such beneficial interests or participations the Administrator may utilize, for the purpose of meeting such responsibilities, sums available in the revolving fund, or, if two or more such funds shall be established, the Administrator may utilize amounts available in such funds on the same proportional basis as the obligations, which are subject to the trust, are allocable to such funds. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to such revolving fund or funds any amounts not otherwise available therein as may be required to enable the Administrator to meet any of his responsibilities with respect to beneficial interests or participations based on obligations set aside by the Administrator pursuant to this subsection."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Small Business Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) Certificates issued in connection with the sale of beneficial interests or participations under paragraph (10) or (11) of subsection (b) shall bear appropriate language clearly indicating that such certificates, together with the interest thereon, are not guaranteed by the United States and do not constitute a debt or obligation of the United States or of any agency or instrumentality thereof other than the Administration or the Federal National Mortgage Association, as the case may be."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 302(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages".

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that members of the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted on the floor during the consideration of S. 2499, the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that I have the floor after the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill, S. 2499, is to substitute private credit for public credit in funding the Small Business Administration's lending programs. It would accomplish this by enabling SBA either to sell participation certificates in pools of loans directly, or by permitting SBA to enter into a trust agreement with the Federal National Mortgage Association whereby FNMA would sell participation certificates based on a pool of SBA loans.

This technique of funding Government lending programs has been used by FNMA for several years. It began in 1964 when the National Housing Act was amended to permit FNMA to enter into trust agreements with agencies of the Federal Government under which FNMA guarantees and sells to the public certificates or participation in pools of loans owned by such agencies. At that time the Veterans' Administration was given power to pool loans and enter into a trust agreement with FNMA as trustee to sell participation certificates based on a pool of VA and FNMA loans. Three offerings totaling $1.2 billion have already been successfully made. The success of these offerings and the opportunity afforded by this method to widen the basis for public participation in financing Government lending programs has prompted the administration to recommend that SBA be given authorities similar to VA to pool its loans and sell certificates in the pool through a trust administered by FNMA. As an alternative, this bill would also permit SBA to pool and guarantee its loans and sell to the public participation certificates based on this loan pool.

In recent years the SBA has sold a significant amount of assets through direct sales of individual loans, but most of the loans in its portfolio are not readily marketable on advantageous terms if the buyers have to examine them on a case-by-case basis and to take over the servicing of the loans purchased. Participations in federally guaranteed portfolios of SBA loans, serviced by SBA, will be attractive to a much wider range of investors, who would not normally invest in individual loans of this type.

Parenthetically, I might say that with a guarantee, and with the experience which the public will obtain over a period of time, the terms on these participation certificates become more attractive, and the cost to the Government, in my judgment, using the method permitted in this bill, will not be more; it will be less than through the direct sale of individual loans.

Thus the assets can be sold on much better terms and in larger volume. At the same time this approach will help to accomplish the general objective of encouraging the substitution of private for public credit.

Testimony received at the hearings on this bill shows that it is estimated that the sale of these participation certificates will increase the cost of securing funds by SBA, by comparison with the cost through the appropriation method of financing, by 25 basis points, which is another way of saying by one-quarter of 1 percent. At the same time, I am convinced that it will cost the Government less than the direct sale of the loans.

One reason for the slightly higher cost is because these participation certificates would be taxable by the States. These certificates would therefore afford to the States additional revenue if the States desire to levy a tax against them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator points out that the participation certificates would be taxable by the States. That is nothing unusual; similar agency bonds are likewise taxable by the States, are they not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that general treasury obligations are not taxable. Participation certificates of any agency are taxable by the States. The State of Wisconsin does not tax Federal bonds, and it is my understanding that most States do not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not Federal bonds but is that true of all States?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is my understanding. The statute, if I may call it to the Senator's attention at this point, says:

> Except as otherwise provided by law, all stocks, bonds, Treasury notes, and other obligations of the United States, shall be exempt from taxation by or under State or municipal or local authority. This exemption extends to every form of taxation that would require that either the obligations or the interest thereon, or both, be considered, directly or indirectly, in the computation of the tax, except nondiscriminatory franchise or other nonproperty taxes in lieu thereof imposed on corporations and except estate taxes or inheritance taxes.

There is a provision in the proposed legislation which would permit these participations to be taxed by the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But FNMA would be in the same category.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So this is not a departure; this is not anything new. It is following out the same pattern of existing law.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; except that it would be new as compared with the appropriation process, under which it will be necessary for the Government to issue bonds and bills to raise the money. They would not be taxable by the States. These participations would be.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right. Now, when the Federal Government, and I believe that this argument was used effectively some time back, sells the bonds in this manner they are paying at least one-half of 1 percent and oftentimes three-quarters of 1 percent more than they would if they bought them direct; is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that with the experience they have had with FNMA, and these participations could be marketed by FNMA the differential would be one-fourth of 1 percent, no more. This has been the experience of FNMA over a period of many years a one-quarter of 1 percent or 25 basis points, is a reliable, authoritative estimate of the difference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know that is what it said in the report, but in actual experience FNMA sold bonds, a couple of months ago, and I have the notice, and they paid 5.3 percent. At the same time they paid that 5.3 percent Government bonds were selling on the basis of about 4.7 percent yield. These are the actual figures. The Secretary confirmed before the Finance Committee that it would cost at least a quarter, if not one-half percent more to finance the Government in this manner than it would do it in the normal manner; that is, let the Government sell the bonds direct and, appropriate the money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We are talking about a secondary mortgage—I beg the Senator's pardon—the Senator is talking about the secondary mortgage rate rather than the participations rate, when he refers to a 5.3 percent rate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; but I am speaking of the sale of FNMA mortgages. The most recent sale was on the basis of 5.3 percent interest. These certainly will not sell at any better advantage.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Can the Senator confirm that this 5.3 was on participations guaranteed by the Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right. Participations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Participations?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Participations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The information I have, then, contradicts that. I do not know how we can reconcile it. The Senator may be right and I may be right, but the information I have from the staff and others checking it tells me that the 5.3 percent rate refers to second mortgages.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is easy to check. Just put in the RECORD the rates at which the Government pays.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I might say to the Senator also that as he knows very well—he is an expert in these areas—it is difficult to get precisely comparable Federal obligations comparable in terms of precise length of time. One of the things which has concerned me is the great difference in yields of various Federal obligations, some of which do not seem completely logical. So that it is possible any time to contend that there is a larger than one-quarter of 1 percent difference and cite various rates. But the top FNMA people who have studied this situation claim that the differences would be one-quarter of 1 percent and I think both their word and competence is good. I would agree with the Senator from Delaware that we cannot pin it down to 25 basis points or precisely one-quarter all the time—it might go higher, it might be lower on occasion. As the public gets more experience, it would be more likely to be in the area of 25 percent or less because this is a Government-guaranteed loan. This is completely safe. It has the SBA guarantee, the FNMA guarantee, and FNMA can go to the Treasury to make up its losses. How can you beat that for airtight safety? The money market will discover this and take up these participations in a hurry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Even assuming for a moment it is one fourth of 1 percent, as I understand the plan of the administration it is to liquidate $4.7 billion of these assets altogether in fiscal 1967.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware, that was the plan of the administration in the budget, but that plan in the budget is not encompassed in this particular bill. This bill deals only with the Small Business Administration. I understand that the administration may come along with additional legislation which would include other obligations, but this bill is confined strictly to the SBA. In 1967, the planned sale of participations would be $800 million. It would not be $4.7 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. The $4.7 billion includes the estimate for this $800 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And others.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As well as FNMA sales. I believe that the Senator is correct, that next a new plan is to come down requesting authority to sell other assets of the Government. This will add to that total.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that the additional authority will be necessary to make it possible for them to sell the $4.7 billion. This would include the Veterans' Administration. It would include college housing, and it would also include obligations of this kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Well, the Secretary of the Treasury never told our committee anything to that effect. This is an expansion of authority to sell our assets. He said that he had the authority now to sell $4.7 billion. They sold, I believe it was, around $2.5 billion last year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The additional legislation which they would request would be for the sale of $4.7 billion, include college housing loans, and so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The point I am making is——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly it is not in the budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Why use this unorthodox method of financing the Government and pay an additional quarter of a percent when it is not necessary? The quarter of 1 percent may sound insignificant but a quarter of 1 percent on $4.7 billion is nearly $12 million a year. They are selling these on a 30-year mortgage basis. That is $360 million, a lot of money. There is no need for it at all. No one gets any benefit. Why resort to this unorthodox method of financing? Why do they not continue to sell Government bonds as an obligation of the U.S. Government and then appropriate the money to pay for the programs of the Great Society under the Small Business Administration, and so forth? Why go around to the back door to get this same mathematical answer by paying $360 million premium over 30 years?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would say there are several justifications set forth. One is that it is private financing instead of public financing. That is always desirable, I believe. Another reason is that we would have much greater availability of funds to the SBA. One of the facts of life during the Eisenhower administration, as well as during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, was that the SBA program has been repeatedly interrupted. Eight times in the few years since the SBA has been in business, it has been stopped cold and SBA has not been able to make its loans. We therefore proposed legislation of this kind designed to take care of this inability of SBA to lend.

We have already established the fact that the States would be able to tax these obligations. That is one of the main reasons why the rate is one-quarter percent higher. The States would be able to tax these obligations to the Federal Government and in view of the straitened circumstances of the States who are in need of funds for welfare and education purposes, it seems to me that these are prices that the Federal Government can pay. It is a moderate price over a period of years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator knows so well that this administration and previous administrations, the Kennedy and Eisenhower administrations, have all taken a firm position against allowing the States to tax generally the Government's bonds, and this position is still maintained. I am speaking now not of this particular bond, but regular Government bonds. This is not a question of private financing versus Government financing.

The Small Business Administration is still making these loans direct as a Government agency. The only thing is, the Government discounts its notes at the bank, gets the money on them and spends it on daily transactions.

Is it not true that the real purpose of this proposal here, the real purpose of selling FNMA mortgages to the extent they are, the real purpose of this request for authority to do the same thing with notes of the Small Business Administration is to camouflage the true deficit of the Government? And is it not further true that if this legislation is passed the $800 million worth of small business loans which will be sold under this program in fiscal 1967 will be used to reduce the reported expenditures, to reduce the reported deficit, and thereby to reduce the national debt correspondingly and make a more glowing and favorable picture for the taxpayers?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Frankly, I do not see anything dishonest about it. When the Federal Government lends money to small businesses, it is considered an expenditure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Therefore, when the Federal Government discounts these loans, it is considered a reduction in that kind of expenditure. It is consistent. I do not think it is deceptive to anyone who wants to get the facts on it and consider what it means. It is true that it will not be comparable with what has been done in the past, when this practice was not engaged in, or to the same extent; but I do not think it is immoral or deceptive or evil or wrong. It is a matter of providing that private individuals put up their money and that there be this flexibility in SBA, so these programs can proceed without having the delays under which they have been deprived of the funds which it was intended they should have.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The President boasted that in his budget for fiscal 1967 expenditures would be about $110 billion. He said $10 billion of that will be to pay for the cost of the Vietnam war and that therefore the other expenditures would be about $100 billion. The President boasted of that figure in comparing it with the preceding fiscal year.

In reality, he is not spending $100 billion but $114.7 billion because he is taking expenditures which will pay for the normal expenses of the Great Society programs and paying for them with proceeds from the sale of assets and writing them off as though they were not a part of the budget. The President had much to say about wanting truth in lending and truth in packaging so the housewife would know what was in a can of goods and the borrower would know how much he was paying for the use of borrowed money. I suggest that what this administration and the President should support is a Truth-in-Government program. Tell the people the budget will be $114.7 billion, of which $10 billion is for the Vietnam war.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not think the Government is deceiving the American people. I think it is telling them the truth. The difficulty is that we have a budget which is a combination of budgets. We do not have separate capital budgets such as businesses or many State governments have. When the Government lends money, it is considered an expenditure. When business lends money, it is considered that it is turned into another asset, a receivable. The Federal Government does not do that. So if the Government wants to make a loan—it is perfectly proper and honest—it tends to be a reduction in expenses, in a sense. It shows up in the budget. It is not dishonest. But if people are not informed, they may misinterpret that action.

I think the Senator from Delaware has performed a service in telling us what has actually happened, but at the same time, there is nothing immoral, wrong, or deceptive about the Federal Government's selling these assets and getting the greater availability in a number of cases, as in the case of the SBA, in the process of doing so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall discuss this point later. This type of Government obligations pays an interest rate of 5⅜ percent or higher. One of the reasons this procedure has been followed is that there is a legal ceiling on interest rates for Government bonds where it cannot pay more than 4¼ percent on Government bonds beyond 5 years. The Government is still living in the 19th century when it thinks it can borrow money for 4¼ percent. It does not have the courage to ask to have the ceiling repealed so that Government bonds can be put on the market bearing a maturity date beyond 5 years. This is a method of concealing the true interest rate. I think the President ought to ask Congress to repeal the 4¼ percent ceiling because it is not effective. Certainly the cost of Government borrowing today goes beyond 4¼ percent. The interest rate on Government bonds goes to 5 percent or more. Instead they are selling Government bonds at a discount. That is not the proper way to finance the Government. The administration ought to recognize the facts and call expenditures what they are, repeal the artificial, unrealistic ceiling of 4¼ percent, and borrow its money in the way it has been done heretofore. I think the administration is only kidding itself and the American people. Maybe it is not fooling as many American people as it thinks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. I have stated my position. I say once again I do not think the Federal Government or the present administration is deceiving the American people or trying to deceive them.

To continue with my statement, States have been trying to find additional sources of revenue, and this will be an attractive source for them to tap.

In my judgment, this increase in cost is outweighed by the advantage of securing these funds from the private market. I believe that as this method of financing becomes better known to the public, the cost of these certificates will become closer to the cost of regular Treasury borrowing.

This additional method of obtaining funds for SBA would not deprive the Congress of control over the program levels of the various SBA lending activities. Specifically, the present ceilings placed by the Congress in the Small Business Act on the dollar amounts outstanding on SBA lending programs would remain fully effective.

That point was made by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], in his support of the bill.

These participation certificates would be offered for sale only after consultation with the Treasury Department so that they can be timed to mesh with other public offerings planned by the Treasury. Such coordination, should minimize the effect, if any, that these offerings would have on the money market and on the availability of funds for other needed purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With reference to these small business mortgages which bear interest rates from 2 percent to 4½ percent, when the mortgages are sold in a package and bid off such as the FNMA mortgages are and they bring 5¼ percent or more, how does the administration propose to pay for this increased interest rate? Is it going to subsidize the differential in a cash subsidy? If so, how will it raise the amount of money to pay for the subsidy in the interest rates?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. These are small business loans. Therefore, under the law, 5½ percent will be the level for most of the loans, 5 percent for some SBIC loans, and disaster loans on which the interest rate will be 3 percent.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. The disaster loans are put into the pool by what is called an overcover. There may be $200 of loans there, but only $100 of participation is sold. So the interest yield will be sufficient to meet the interest owing to holders of participations.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. As I understand the Senator, it will subsidize the differential at whatever the interest rate is.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Of course, the Federal Government subsidizes the disaster loans, which interest rates are set at 3 percent. That action won the overwhelming vote of the Senate and the House. I think that can be supported on a moral basis, because a small business involved in a disaster should be given some help, and should be able to borrow money at an interest rate which is low. So there is a subsidy involved there.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The Senator misunderstood my question. I am not questioning the interest rate on the disaster loans, but the procedure. Suppose they are sold at interest rates of 5½ percent. Some of these mortgages are at rates of 3 percent. Does the one who purchase the bond get the extra interest by having more mortgages assigned to him, or does the Government just pay the 5½ percent to the purchaser of these certificates?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I call the attention of the Senator to page 6.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. A man buying $1,000 worth of certificates, how does he get paid his 5¼ percent?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I call attention to page 6, line 24, to page 7, line 2. It is only four lines. I will read it. It says:

> The trust instrument may provide for the issuance and sale of beneficial interests or participations, by the trustee, in such obligations or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom; and may provide for the substitution or withdrawal of such obligations, or for the substitution of cash for obligations, but the amount, interest rates, and maturities of such obligations shall at all times be sufficient to assure all payments under the participations.

As the Senator recognizes, where there is a 5½-percent loan and it is a good loan, and they will only put good loans in, if it goes bad, they will substitute a good loan for it. The 5½ participation can be sold. Where there is a disaster loan, there will be put in about $200 for every $100 of participation.

The people who buy participation loans will be paid out of income from the small business loans. There should not be an additional element of subsidy involved.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I go back to my original statement. It seems to me that the principal objective of this entire proposal is to camouflage the true expenditures of this Government from the American people. On this one transaction that we are asked to approve here today, bringing the total to $4.7 billion, the extra cost will be $360 million over 30 years solely to help the administration cover up the true picture of what they are spending.

I respect the position of the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been a strong advocate of the Small Business Administration. I am not trying to make this as a point against the Small Business Administration getting its funds. That is not a part of this argument.

This is a proposal of financing by an entirely new method, which until now, has never been resorted to by any administration.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Section 1 of this bill would authorize SBA to pool obligations held by it and sell participation certificates in the obligations in the pool. SBA would guarantee the participation certificates.

It is contemplated that the amount of the obligations placed in the pool will be greater than the amount of participations that are sold to the public. If any obligation which has been placed in the pool becomes delinquent or in default, SBA may remove that obligation from the pool and place a sound obligation in the pool. The proceeds from the sale of these participation certificates would be placed in SBA's revolving fund or in the two funds as contemplated in a bill, S. 2729, now pending before the Congress. These proceeds would be available to carry out the lending functions of SBA.

Section 1 of the bill would also authorize SBA to pool a part or all of the obligations held by it, subject them to a trust, and incident to the trust guarantee their payment. SBA would enter into a trust agreement with FNMA and FNMA would sell to the public participation certificates based on the obligations subject to the trust. FNMA would guarantee these certificates.

If they are not sold, the Small Business Administration is able to take them out and substitute those that will.

I read the lines in the bill that provide this.

I would like to point out that these participation certificates would be safe investments. In the first place, the loans themselves comprising the pool would be sound. The bill provides that the amount, interest rate, and maturities of the obligations in the pool shall be at all times sufficient to assure all payments under the participations. Thus, as added security, the amount of loans in the pool would exceed the amount of the participations sold. In the present arrangement that FNMA has with VA, roughly $125 worth of mortgages are in the pool to back up sales of $100 worth of participations. Roughly this same overcovering will be used in the trust agreement which would be entered into under this bill. In the case of disaster loans a greater amount of obligations would be placed in the pool due to the low interest rate charged on disaster loans. The over covering adds an important additional security factor to the participation certificates sold. The bill provides for the substitution of loans within the pool, therefore, if one loan in the pool becomes delinquent another loan could be substituted in the pool in its place. In the second place, SBA would guarantee payments of these obligations placed in the trust to FNMA as a part of the trust agreement.

Of course, that guarantee would be of great importance to any investor. And finally, the certificates would be guaranteed by FNMA.

In the offerings that FNMA has previously made, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury has been received by FNMA stating that the sale of these participation certificates are functions for which FNMA may properly borrow from the Treasury. The committee was assured that a similar letter from the Treasury would be obtained to enable FNMA to guarantee any participation certificates which may be sold under the authority of this bill.

Any amounts received by FNMA from the sale of these participation certificates would be immediately paid to SBA for deposit in SBA's revolving fund, or in the two SBA revolving funds as contemplated in a bill, S. 2729, now pending before the Congress. These proceeds would be available to carry out the lending functions of SBA.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the participation certificates sold either by SBA or by FNMA must clearly show on their faces that they are not guaranteed by the United States, only by SBA and FNMA. This provision would make it entirely clear that these participation certificates would not be exempt from taxation by or under Sate or local municipal authority as provided in 31 U.S.C. 742.

As I have said, this is a reason why the cost to the Government would be greater and why this is a 25 basis point difference, but it is also a good reason for support by those who feel the SBA should be given this opportunity for additional revenue.

Section 3 of the bill would broaden section 302(c) of the National Housing Act, which authorizes FNMA to enter into trust agreements with other Government agencies and sell participation certificates. At the present time, first mortgages and other obligations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development are eligible securities for inclusion in the trusts that have been established. However, only first mortgages held by other agencies are eligible. This section of the bill would permit both first mortgages and also other obligations held by SBA and other agencies to be eligible securities for inclusion in pools which may be subject to trusts.

I would like to point out that this broader authority concerning the eligibility of other obligations applies only to FNMA, FNMA would have authority to receive, as trustee, both first mortgages and other obligations as part of the pool subject to the trust. VA now has authority to pool first mortgages and installment sales contracts and enter into a trust agreement with FNMA. This bill would not broaden VA's authority to pool "other obligations." Other agencies would have to have their own statutory authority to pool their obligations including first mortgages and enter into a trust agreement with FNMA other than that provided in this bill.

That is why I said to the Senator from Delaware it would take additional obligations before they can sell $4.7 million. They continue to sell $850 million in fiscal 1967.

This bill grants that authority to the Small Business Administration. It may be that Congress will decide not to grant similar authority to other agencies. In other words, unless other agencies have their own authority to pool their obligations and enter into a trust agreement with FNMA, they would not be affected by this bill.

I would like to call attention to two important reasons why this legislation should pass. I referred to this in my colloquy with the Senator from Delaware, but I wish to emphasize it.

Under the appropriations process, SBA has been forced to shut down its regular business loan program under three Presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.

I have a chart before me which shows the periods when the regular business loan program has been curtailed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the chart to which I refer.

There being no objection the chart was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

History of business loan approvals being suspended or curtailed because of shortage of funds

Period	Basis	Advice of favorable consideration used
Apr. 10 to May 21, 1956	Suspended to reserve funds for disaster loans	Yes.
Feb. 1 to Apr. 22, 1957	do	Yes.
June 6 to 13, 1958	do	No.
Dec. 1, 1961, to Oct. 12, 1962	Applications were restricted to a maximum of $200,000 SBA share for other than "defense oriented" firms.	
Mar. 2 to Aug. 31, 1962	Funds available only for "urgent" cases and released on a case-by-case basis. From continuing resolution amount in both July and August, some funds were released for approval of oldest cases in backlog.	Yes.
Nov. 10, 1964, to Oct. 12, 1965	Effective Nov. 10, 1964, applications limited to $15,000 direct loans and $50,000 SBA share of immediate participations.	
	Effective Dec. 18, 1964, priority order by program for loans approved in field offices was established and as modified on Dec. 23 became (1) EOL loans, (2) physical disaster loans, (3) guaranteed business loans, (4) all other disaster loans, (5) local development company loans, and (6) all other business loans. Use of advice of favorable consideration instituted.	Yes.
May 19, 1965	Application ceiling was raised to $100,000 for direct loans and SBA share of immediate participations with less than 25-percent bank participation. These are presently in effect. Discontinued use of advice of favorable consideration technique.	
Oct. 12, 1965, until the present time	Discontinued acceptance of business loan applications except under loan guarantee program.	

Mr. PROXMIRE. This bill will assure a steady supply of funds so that this should not happen in the future.

The program was closed down and loans not made in 1956, 1957, 1958, a part of 1961 and 1962—that is, from November 10, 1964 to October 12, 1965.

From May of 1965, until October 1965 and to the present, SBA has not been able to make at least some of its regular business loans. This bill will help overcome that inability. They have to have funds for disaster and have been unable to get additional funds from the Congress in appropriations. This would mean that SBA would be in a position to take its portfolio, discount it efficiently, and be able to fund the program adequately.

The other reason I wish to stress—I have mentioned it in my colloquy with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], but it ought to be emphasized again—is that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is as careful a man with a dollar as we have in the Senate. He has been highly critical of backdoor financing. He has been careful to see to it that every proper authorization and appropriation process is observed. He has helped to provide sound, honest financing by the Federal Government.

The Senator from Virginia, however, sees the difficulty in which small business finds itself because of the absence of such legislation as is proposed, and the desirability of the legislation to help small business get the kind of capital it needs so that it can move ahead. It seems to me that the vote on this bill will be a most significant vote for any small businessman in the country who desires to obtain financing from the Small Business Administration.

If Congress does not pass this legislation, it will mean that in Delaware, as well as in Washington, Texas, Wisconsin, and other States, it will be far more difficult in the future for small businessmen to get the kind of loans they need, whether under Republican administrations or Democratic administrations. The record speaks eloquently as to that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the bill. I know nothing that I can add to the clear statement already made by the chairman of the full committee earlier in the day, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson].

I believe that the pending bill makes good business sense. It is following a pattern which we have established in other fields of Government obligations. It would create a flexibility which would make it possible for the building up of a revolving fund so that the Small Business Administration may be able to carry on its work.

I earnestly hope that the Senate will approve the bill and that it will soon become law.

Mr. President, there is one suggestion which I make in connection with the bill. I discussed it with the chairman of the subcommittee, who is the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire]; and that is an amendment, which I shall offer, which would make it possible for the credit unions to buy these obligations.

At the present time, the Federal Credit Union Act specifies the obligations that may be purchased by Federal credit unions. In addition to obligations of the United States of America, Federal credit unions are authorized to purchase obligations issued by banks for cooperatives, Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal home loan banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the obligations of any corporation designated in section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act as a wholly owned Government corporation. These investment provisions are found in section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757).

The amendment that I propose to S. 2499 will, in effect, amend section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act. This amendment can be made to S. 2499 by adding a new section 4 to the bill. It is that which I propose to do, and I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill, the following new section:

Sec. 4. Section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended by adding after "wholly owned Government corporation;" the following: "or, (F) in participation certificates evidencing a beneficial interest in principal and interest collections to be received by Government agencies on obligations comprising loan pools when the agency issuing, offering or selling the certificates has set aside a part or all of the obligations held by it and subjected them to a trust for which the Federal National Mortgage Association or some other Government agency has been named to act as trustee."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to support this amendment. I understand that it has been considered by the Republican members of the Small Business Subcommittee. It is a desirable amendment, which will help both credit unions and the Government because it will broaden the market somewhat for these obligations; and I am therefore happy to support the amendment. I hope that the Senate will approve it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to support S. 2499 which proposes to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the sale of participation interests based on pools of loans held by the SBA.

I understand that the legislation contemplates the sale of $3.3 billion of such interests during fiscal year 1966, and about $4.7 billion in fiscal year 1967.

As I have pointed out repeatedly, the moratorium which has closed down the SBA direct loan program since October 11, 1965, has had serious consequences for small-business men in Rhode Island and throughout the Nation. Small firms winning contracts have had to forfeit work because it has been impossible to obtain financing from the SBA. Other small companies have been prevented from expanding, and thus denied their share of the Nation's economic prosperity.

This bill promises some relief. The certificates would reach broader markets for funds. This is so, I believe, because they would be freely transferable, would be lawful investments for private and public trust funds, and would be acceptable as security for Treasury tax and loan accounts. They would thus be an attractive medium for some investors, and SBA would regain a degree of liquidity and funds to reinstate the direct loan program to some extent.

The procedures under which the certificates would be marketed are workable, as the success of similar marketings by agencies such as the Export-Import Bank and the Veterans' Administration have shown.

Although this method of financing is not without its disadvantages, it is a step in the direction of reviving the SBA. I thus believe that, on balance, we should support the efforts of the administration and the Banking and Currency Committee which have recommended S. 2499 as a vehicle for bringing these vitally needed funds into the agency at this time.

I hope it will be the first in a series of steps to put the SBA in high gear as the instrument for aiding, assisting, and protecting small business as the Congress has envisioned it.

The unfortunate fact remains that, as helpful as the bill before us today may be, the SBA continues to be plagued by internal difficulties not all of which can be solved by this bill. In this connection, I should like to call attention to two recent articles, one entitled "Eviction Notice Caps SBA Woes," from the Washington Post of March 10, and an editorial from the March 10 issue of the Catholic Standard, Washington's archdiocesan newspaper, entitled "Small Business Troubles."

We ask unanimous consent that these articles be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 10, 1966]

EVICTION NOTICE CAPS SBA WOES

(By Richard Harwood)

Life has been rough the last few months for the independent Small Business Administration.

Since August, it has had no leader. Since October, it has had no money for direct small business loans. And since January, it has been threatened with absorption by the big Department of Commerce.

Now it is about to become homeless as well. The General Services Administration revealed that SBA is to be evicted from the Lafayette Building at Vermont Avenue and I Street NW. to make room for the new and expanded Department of Housing and Urban Development.

On Tuesday the Senate took note of SBA's sea of troubles. First Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, and his Select Small Business Committee went on record in opposition to any Commerce-SBA merger.

"Such a transfer," said the committee, "would deprive small business of an effective advocate within the executive branch of Government."

The resolution was adopted by an unanimous, bipartisan vote, and a few hours later the full Senate voted to give SBA an additional $125 million in lending authority to tide over the agency until midyear. The House is expected to agree.

But the eviction is still in the works. The GSA plan will clear the Lafayette Building of all its tenants except HUD. SBA and the Subversive Activities Control Board are headed for the Longfellow Building at Connecticut and Rhode Island Avenues. The Export-Import Bank will be given space in a building yet to be leased.

The displaced agencies are muttering about the false economies of the move. HUD will occupy the Lafayette Building only until its new $22.3 million building is completed in the Southwest next year.

[From the Catholic Standard, Mar. 10, 1966]

SMALL BUSINESS TROUBLES

A very vital member of our Nation's economy, the small businessman, is in trouble. Statistics show that each year more small businessmen close up their shops—they cannot compete with large companies and industries. The Federal Government attempted to do something about the situation and help the small businessman by creating the Small Business Administration in 1953. Yet, at the present time, the SBA might as well not exist for all the help that it is giving to small businessmen.

Since October 11, 1965, the SBA has been unable to accept any application for assistance under its loan program. The reason why the SBA has been forced to adopt this policy is simple—like many small businessmen, it too has a shortage of funds.

This has caused a new crisis for small businessmen who frequently have trouble in securing long-term loans from banks.

The importance of the small businessman cannot be overestimated. Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island, the current champion of small businessmen, has pointed out that they represent the strength and imagination of our economy. He has also noted how small business offers men and women from minority groups the opportunity to better themselves in society. Indeed, small business is essential in a great society as a means for the poor to overcome the poverty that surrounds them.

America has been a land of opportunity and of self-reliance. Small business has played an important role in making it such a land. Let us hope that the SBA is voted the money needed to continue its work. Its functioning is essential to economic and human progress in Washington and in other urban centers.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the bill before us concerns the Senator from Utah very greatly, because, while it seems to be technical and comparatively unimportant in the total amount of money involved, we are now taking one of the most serious steps we could take affecting our fiscal policy, because we are now opening a backdoor to the Treasury which can be approached at the present time and under this bill through the Small Business Administration and FNMA, a backdoor which makes it possible to conceal the cost of operating the Government by providing funds for that operation outside of the appropriation process.

We are being asked in this bill to permit the sale of Small Business Administration loan participation certificates through the facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association—in other words, participation certificates on pools of loans which the Small Business Administration has made in the past. These loans are usually made to companies and individuals who have to prove that they cannot get financing through ordinary private sources. Therefore we can assume that the loans are not up to the ordinary commercial standards.

These loans can be translated again into money for the Federal Government by the process of turning them over to FNMA, which in turn translates the value of the loans into a new piece of paper called a participation certificate, which it in turn sells in the private market. The money received from the sale of these certificates goes back through FNMA into SBA, either to be used to loan again or to be placed in the Treasury. That returned to the Treasury can be used by the Treasury to pay bills of the Government without having to sell its own notes or bonds.

FNMA for a number of years had the right to sell mortgages which it acquired to private individuals. Last year we added to the law the privilege of selling mortgages issued by the Veterans' Administration. Last year, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee was asked to expand the authority to include mortgages owned by any Federal agency, and this request was refused.

Now, we are making it possible for them to cash in through the participation certificate process on any loan made by the Small Business Administration, whether it is represented by a mortgage on real property or some other security.

While we are engaged in debate over the provisions of this bill, we know that the administration intends to present to the Senate another bill which will seek congressional approval to permit FNMA to sell loan participation certificates of several other Government lending operations.

To me this is the test. If we establish the principal and allow the sale of participations in the Small Business Administration loans, the next bill may suggest that the similar privilege be given for loans created by a large number of agencies now making loans.

The program of sales of direct loans, and loan participation certificates envisioned in the President's budget message, as brought out earlier in the day, is designed to take money out of the private money market in the total amount of $3.3 billion in the fiscal year 1966 and $4.7 billion in the fiscal year 1967.

The budget submitted in January included requests for legislation to expand this authority to the Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration, which it is estimated would sell $600 million worth of participation certificates in the next fiscal year; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, which could sell $100 million worth; the Federal National Mortgage Association which it is estimated could sell an additional $400 million; college housing loans which would add about $820 million; public facility loans which would add $80 million; and SBA, it is estimated, will market $850 million in participation certificates in fiscal 1967.

These proposed sales total an additional $2.8 billion in the next fiscal year. This is only the beginning of what must be expected if we determine that this is a desirable change in policy for financing Federal programs.

It can be expected that further use of this new budgetary scheme could follow in the fiscal 1968 budget and beyond because there are nearly two score direct lending agencies within the administrative arm of the Government, and more might be added.

Page 113 of the hearings on this bill in the Banking and Currency Committee contains a list of agencies now making Federal loans and accepting collateral, many of which could request authorization to have FNMA sell participations based on their securities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that list provided for the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Collateral held by banks for cooperatives.

Collateral held by Bureau of Reclamation on project and system loans.

Collateral held by Farm Credit Administration functions.

Collateral held by Farmers Home Administration.

Collateral held by Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (policies).

Collateral held by Federal intermediate credit banks (farm loans).

Collateral held by Federal land banks.

Collateral held by Rural Electrification Administration.

Collateral held by Federal Credit Unions.

Collateral held by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Collateral held by Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Collateral held by U.S. Post Office Department.

Collateral held by ARA.

Collateral held by Civil Aeronautics Board.

Collateral held by Defense Department (loan guarantee program).

Collateral held by District of Columbia Fiscal Service (public works loans).

Collateral held by General Services Administration (surplus property sales).

Collateral held by Interstate Commerce Commission (railroad loan guarantee).

Collateral held by Maritime Administration (ship loan and mortgage insurance).

Collateral held by Office of Defense Lending (production loans).

Collateral held by Under Secretary for Transportation (aircraft loans).

Collateral held by Small Business Administration.

Collateral held by Office of Education (Cuban loans) (loans to institutions) (nonprofit school loans) (student loans).

Collateral held by Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (upgrade loans) (shipbuilding).

Collateral held by Public Health Service (Hill-Burton loans).

Collateral held by Housing—community facilities (college housing) (elderly) (public works) (public facility).

Collateral held by Federal Home Loan Bank System.

Collateral held by Federal Housing Administration (insurance program).

Collateral held by HHFA (voluntary home mortgage credit) (mass transportation) (low-income demonstrations).

Collateral held by Public Housing Administration (public housing).

Collateral held by Urban Renewal Administration (urban renewal).

Collateral held by Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Collateral held by Agency for International Development (dollar development) (local currency loans).

Collateral held by Export-Import Bank.

Collateral held by Inter-American Development Bank.

Collateral held by International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Collateral held by International development program.

Collateral held by International Finance Corporation.

Collateral held by International Monetary Fund.

Collateral held by International Affairs.

Collateral held by Office of Territories (Micronesian trade loans).

Collateral held by Pan American Sanitary Bureau (advance purchases).

Collateral held by Office of Minerals Exploration.

Collateral held by Veterans' Administration (home, farm, business).

Mr. BENNETT. With this overall picture of asset sales in mind, I should now like to turn our attention to the merits and demerits of such a change in fiscal policy rather than giving all of our attention to the single determination as to whether it would be good or bad to permit the sale of small business loan participation certificates through FNMA.

Perhaps we should look beyond the question of whether it is good or bad for the lending operations included in the bill here pending, and we should study this from the point of view of whether the new fiscal scheme perverts the basic elements of honesty in the cost of government and imposes on the financial structures of the country a concealed burden of public debt.

COMPLICATES UNDERSTANDING OF FEDERAL BUDGET

The effect of this legislation is to make borrowings from the public through the Small Business Administration and ultimately through an undetermined number of other Federal agencies without showing such borrowings as part of the public debt.

It is to be expected that the administration would use all of the means possible to try to show as small a deficit as possible, especially in an election year, but it seems to me that this proposal unnecessarily complicates an already extremely complicated budget procedure. One already needs to pour over thousands of pages to come to an understanding of our annual Federal expenditures and debt financing. This procedure adds one additional problem, because in the President's budget and in the proposals for appropriations it will be difficult to determine the source of this money which could flow into the Treasury through the back door.

GETS AROUND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The approach to agency financing contained in this bill could easily lead to "back door" financing bypassing the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. In this particular SBA program, the difference in authorizations and appropriations is a relatively small $36 million. This could and likely will become a larger differential in the future. Since an enlargement of the program does not require additional appropriations nor will it be considered as additional Federal spending, and will not appear in the budget as an expenditure, there will be far less emphasis on holding this and other programs in line with the usual budget demands.

There is about $1.8 billion of authorization for this particular program now outstanding. If the SBA can use FNMA as a funnel through which to pass loans as fast as they can make them we may never increase this authorization as long as we keep the total volume of loans held by SBA within it.

The other is floated out through the private sector of the economy and any money received by this process can be put back into the Treasury for its use until such time as it begins to approach again the authorization limit.

An argument might be made that this is a good thing because we are transferring Government obligations back into the private sector. Of course, all funds which the Government borrows eventually come from the private sector, the private economy, and we are just opening a new way by which the Government gets funds for its use. This time the borrowing is represented by a new kind of instrument called a participation rather than by a bond.

ALL FUNDS ULTIMATELY COME FROM PRIVATE SOURCES NOW

It has been claimed that this type of financing is replacing Federal funds with private funds. On the surface, this seems to be true. It is not necessary to increase taxes or the Federal deficit in order to increase or to continue such spending. Instead, the Federal obligations are sold to private citizens or institutions.

As I have said we open a new way of securing money outside of our debt limit and outside of our regular record of obligation.

It concerns me that this procedure claims a greater use of private funds, yet control of the program still rests entirely with the Federal agency.

If this is carried to the ultimate we would find that the Federal Government could get complete control over all segments of the economic activity in which private funds could be channeled through a Federal Government agency and then channeled back into the private sector.

I have long been an advocate of getting the Federal Government out of business and letting private enterprise do as many jobs as possible, but this is not a method of achieving that aim.

In addition to the other problems created by the sale of participations by Federal agenies, it is a more expensive method of financing. The reason it is more expensive is that the Treasury, with the backing of the Federal Government and its taxing powers, can borrow funds through its securities at a lower rate than can be done by any of the Federal agencies.

Using figures of the estimated additional cost that this financing would incur, provided by the Small Business Administration, it has been estimated that the total additional cost over the life of the participation certificates expected to be sold as a result of this and other legislation requested in the budget in fiscal 1966 and 1967 would amount to more than $380 million. This is a premium that the Federal Government is willing to pay in order to get this money without having it show in budget figures thus affecting the deficit.

Admittedly, it is difficult to make accurate projections of the difference between the cost of Treasury borrowing and that of agencies whose securities are less desirable. Suffice it to say that this procedure of selling participation certificates will add to the cost of Federal programs, and ultimately these programs, as we all need to remind ourselves once in a while, must be paid for by taxpayers.

We have seen the experience of the Export-Import Bank sales of loan participations in 1962 and 1963, which, according to the Comptroller General, added $8 million to the cost of Government through the fluctuation of interest rates on Government borrowing between the time of sale and redemption.

There are recognized signs of rising money costs ahead of us because of the various Government and non-Government pressures on the money market, so it stands to reason that similar added costs may be expected in the budget gimmick that is contained in this bill.

It seems rather clear to me that if we isolate our sights on single or small groups of lending programs which are dribbled into the legislative stream, we will lose sight of the obligation and the opportunity of Congress to require an honest fiscal report to the people, because no true estimate of the ultimate total additional cost to the people can be ascertained until these certificates are redeemed at some time in the future.

We should determine whether we wish to embark on such a drastic new program in the face of higher costs and a certain loss of congressional controls over those programs which will come about through the possible eventual bypassing of authorization ceilings and appropriations.

We must also keep in mind that in many instances the sale of participation certificates in certain direct loan programs will require the Government to provide a dual subsidy: first, in the initial loan interest rate; and second, in the Treasury's obligation to meet the agency losses incurred through the margin between interest rates received from loans made and those paid by the agencies on money borrowed through the securities issued.

Of course, these participation certificates will be an effective guarantee that the face of the certificates will be repaid. The certificates will not state that the full faith and credit of the United States is behind them; but SBA certificates will be sold by FNMA. They will have behind them the assets of SBA plus the assets of FNMA; and FNMA has the particular ability to go to the Treasury directly to borrow money to make up any losses. FNMA does not have to come to the Federal Government and say, "We need an appropriation to make up our losses."

So on that basis the certificates are almost secure as direct Federal obligations. I feel certain that when banks, insurance companies, and other sources of concentrated capital are urged by the Treasury to buy participation certificates, the safety provided by this situation will be pointed out to them, and they will be told, in effect, "This is as good as a Government bond."

I have made the point that right behind this bill is another one, which will extend this principle to many other agencies. It would be the part of wisdom for us to have a look at the whole problem then, rather than to set a precedent for this one agency, a precedent which can be used against us when we look at the total that may be contained in the second bill.

So at an appropriate time, when the debate has ended, I shall move that this bill be recommitted, and I shall ask for the yeas and nays on that question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The Chair recognizes the venerable Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware desires to ask me a question, if he may do so at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Delaware for that purpose?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is not one of the reasons behind the bill an attempt to save the administration the embarrassment of repealing the 4¼ percent ceiling on Government bonds? Under the mechanics of selling either SBA bonds under this bill, or FNMA bonds the rate can be 5 percent or 5½ percent, thus bypassing the legal ceiling on Government bonds and also by passing the debt ceiling?

Mr. BENNETT. That is perfectly true; but this administration has demonstrated that it is not limited to this particular method of getting around the ceiling on long-term bonds. The administration has been willing to sell long-term bonds at a discount.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct; the Government is trying to maintain an artificial ceiling and pretend it is holding interest rates down when in reality they are paying the highest interest rates in recent history.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct. The loans which will back up these participations will have interest rates higher than Government interest rates although the participations must be sold at rates higher than the loans in the pools on which they are based.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For example, disaster loans of the Small Business Administration were made at 3 percent; will not the taxpayers have to subsidize the differential?

Mr. BENNETT. I tried to make that point a little earlier. There could be a subsidy along the line which is used as the basis of the participation. Then, in order to get the participation sold, the Government may sweeten the proposal further.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. One further question: Did not the Secretary of the Treasury before our Finance Committee a few weeks ago admit that the sale of FNMA bonds or other assets such as are being proposed here, in reality act as a reduction in the deficit reported to the American people? It gives the Treasury a chance to claim a reduction in expenditures when in reality there is no such reduction. The American people are being misled to that extent.

Mr. BENNETT. May the Senator from Utah first clarify the RECORD? When the Senator said, "Our committee," he was speaking, was he not, of the Committee on Finance?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Committee on Finance.

Mr. BENNETT. The pending bill was before the Committee on Banking and Currency. But the Senator from Delaware is correct: This is one of the devices that the administration is using to reduce the paper deficit. To me, this is a device of receiving cash for a long-term asset, and then applying the proceeds to the current operations of the Government. It is like a man selling his furniture in order to pay his grocery bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that point. One further question or comment: The Committee on Banking and Currency has before it two bills which, as I recall, that the President mentioned in his state of the Union message. One is a truth-in-packaging bill; the other is a truth-in-lending bill. I wonder whether the administration or someone else should not present a third bill, a bill to provide for greater truth in Government so that the administration will tell the American people and taxpayers the truth, which is that we have in Washington today the most extravagant administration that has ever had control of the Government in the history of the Nation, an administration which is today spending from $500 million to $600 million a month more than it is taking in and which next year will be spending at the rate of $800 million a month, while at the same time trying to tell the American people that it is spending less and sustaining that false claim through the sale of assets and treating the proceeds as normal income.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I do not think that we need a truth-in-government bill so long as the Senator from Delaware is available to stand on the floor of the Senate and point out the problem as eloquently as he has done today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Texas if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall be delighted to yield to my venerable colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me. However, I am worried about that word "venerable."

Mr. President, the colloquy which has just taken place, between the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Utah, points out the need for the bill that the Senate has passed twice and the bill that is now pending in the House. This measure would let Congress and the American people know the undisclosed debt as opposed to the direct debt shown by the debt limit.

Mr. President, I speak in opposition to the bill and in support of a motion to recommit when such motion is made. I speak as the ranking minority member of the Small Business Committee. Incidently, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and I are two of the original members of the Small Business Committee.

I have tried to support the Small Business Administration and its existence as a separate agency of the Government ever since I have been a member of the committee.

This bill is to amend the Small Business Act, to authorize issuance and sale by the Small Business Administration of loan participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

At the present time, the Small Business Administration has authority to make direct business loans, disaster loans, prime contract authority loans, State and local development companies program loans, small business investment company program loans, trade adjustment loan program loans and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. These programs are funded through an SBA revolving fund.

The Small Business Administration is, at present, virtually devoid of funds to sustain its direct loan program. The principal reason offered for this situation is the drain on the revolving fund caused by flood disasters in various sections of the country. This bill purports to substitute private for public credit to finance the Small Business Administration loan program. Furthermore, it is intended to attract a wider range of investors.

I see however some fundamental objections to the bill. First, the bill would take away from Congress the responsibility for appropriating funds to sustain the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration. Second, this method of financing would be more costly than is the appropriation method of financing. Third, the American Bankers Association, I am informed, believes that the bill may add substantial pressure to credit markets. Credit demands are already huge. The commercial loan deposit ratio is at a 35-year high, and the capital and credit markets are extremely tight.

This means that the Government will have to pay higher interest rates to sell these certificates to private investors. Therefore, the program will cost more.

Current statistics on the Small Business Administration loan programs conducted under its revolving fund are as follows: The current authorization ceiling is $1.841 billion. That ceiling has been increased by the Senate during this session of Congress.

The amounts appropriated for the revolving fund are $1.805 billion. Thus, the differential between that amount appropriated and the authorization ceiling is $36 million. Certainly these appropriations can be increased, if Congress deems it necessary, in order to build up to the allowable authorized strength.

The total amount outstanding and committed under revolving fund programs as of the end of February 1966, was $1.729 billion. The balance remaining in the revolving fund as of the end of February was $76 million.

The demand for this bill at the present time is caused by the fact that the amount outstanding and committed under the direct loan and disaster loan programs, as of February 1966, was $1,325 million. This has limited the amount of money available for direct business loans by the Small Business Administration.

My principal reason for objecting to the bill in its present form is that it would take away authority from Congress to appropriate funds for SBA lending programs. We would transfer this authority to another agency, the Small Business Administration. For example, assume that 10 people each had a small business loan from the Small Business Administration. The Small Business Administration, as I understand it, could pool those loans and turn them over to be sold by FNMA acting as trustee. FNMA can then issue certificates, which can be sold to banks. The banks would pay the money back into FNMA as trustee. This amount would be returned to the SBA and be an additional amount for it to loan.

FNMA guarantees these loans, as does the Small Business Administration. FNMA has unlimited access to the U.S. Treasury. It does not require appropriations to obtain the money it needs. The certificates would be backed by the guarantee of the Small Business Administration and FNMA. Thus, the indirect debt of the Government could be increased without Congress having the ability to limit the direct debt or determine what it shall be.

This arrangement would be more costly to the Government because the interest would be a part of the certificates. If this money were to come back to the Small Business Administration, it would have money with which to pay the outstanding interest on these certificates or to make new loans.

Mr. President, from the point of view of the Small Business Administration and of small businessmen who want to borrow from that agency, ultimately there will be difficulty because this procedure will increase to such a degree that there can be an adverse reaction. Small business would become big business.

I would like to comment, also, on suggestions which have been made to the effect that the Small Business Administration should be transferred to the Department of Commerce. I personally have objected to this. I told Mr. Connor, the Secretary of Commerce, in a personal conversation that I would oppose such a transfer. Such a move would eliminate the necessary independence of the Small Business Administration to represent the interests of small business. If the Small Business Administration were to be under the control of the Department of Commerce, it would lose its small business identity. It would become a part of the entire Commerce Department business orientation. We know that the small businessmen would have no particular attention given to their affairs.

Mr. President, I am opposed to this bill. I shall join in the motion to recommit. It is my understanding that another bill either has been introduced or will be introduced to apply this same procedure to other agencies of the Government.

That would mean that FNMA would be used for purposes that were not originally intended.

It is my understanding that FNMA was set up to take care of mortgages covering residential property.

If we extend the functions of FNMA to a number of other agencies, then we may be overburdening FNMA to the point that it will not be able to carry out its original purpose.

So fundamentally, Mr. President, I shall support the motion to recommit, because I believe that the proposal will injure, in the long run, the necessary and important functions of assisting the Small Business Administration.

I regret that the direct business loan program has been suspended. I hope it will be reactivated. Certainly, as a member of the Small Business Committee and a member of the Appropriations Committee, I intend to vote to increase the Small Business Administration appropriations for those purposes. These funds are necessary to carry out their program as intended. I support these programs. However, the proper way to obain those funds is through the traditional method of congressional appropriations, and not through the back door of the Treasury, which would be the case if this bill becomes law. The Small Business Administration will depend upon FNMA, which can go directly to the Treasury and obtain whatever funds it needs for that purpose.

I hope, for the reasons stated, that this bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, in order that the whole situation may be determined at one time. I hope that the motion to recommit will prevail.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his very important and significant contribution to the debate on this matter, which stems from his long experience in fiscal matters.

I think this bill should be carefully considered, and I concur in the proposals to submit this method of financing to careful scrutiny for unintended consequences.

It is my belief that the administration will probably send to Congress a proposal providing for further disposition of assets by agencies and commissions, thus giving further evidence of a new governmental monetary policy, and that the proposal will manifest itself in new fields of Government financing, which will make it increasingly difficult for private lenders to carry on normal business.

Seen in this light, this piece of legislation should not be viewed as a single entity, but instead as indicative of a broad new policy of budgetary manipulation. Not only should S. 2499 be studied for its pattern setting, but also for other questionable features contained in it. I point out that there will be reduction of congressional control of program activity as well as over the lending activities of the agency. As the sales go through the Federal National Mortgage Association, the true cost of the Small Business Administration operations would be, I think, inevitably obscured from Congress. If such a fiscal policy as provided for in this measure were extended to all secured loan activities of the Federal Government, the actual cost of such functions might not be known to the taxpayers for at least several years, due to the probable cost to the Government the adverse effect of this program of asset sales would have.

I cannot support the measure. I do not believe its passage would be wise. I would, however, be prepared to vote for a motion to recommit, so that we may consider the matter further in the Banking and Currency Committee, together with other related pending legislation which may be submitted to us for consideration. I very much hope that the motion to recommit will carry, and that we shall have an opportunity to scrutinize this matter further.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is not present. In his name and in the name of the Senator from Texas, I would like at this time to get on the record a motion to recommit the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator now make that motion?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I so move.

Mr. ALLOTT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the role.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments about the pending bill, and particularly to join in the views of the Senators from Utah, Massachusetts, and Texas.

There is one overwhelming reason why I must and will vote to recommit this bill. I think the discussion of the distinguished Senator from Utah has made it very clear that we are not talking simply about borrowing once through the back door on this particular bill. We are talking also about borrowing a second and third time through the back door, without any limitation by Congress.

May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. In other words, what we are talking about is that the Small Business Administration will sell its mortgages to the FNMA, the FNMA will issue certificates against them and sell those certificates; they will be bought, presumably, by private parties; the money will come back into FNMA and go back over to the Small Business Administration; and they will start the cycle of lending again, resell their obligations to FNMA, FNMA will again sell on the open market, and so we shall no longer have a government of budget, but simply a government by gimmick.

I am sure I am not the only Senator, nor the only person in the United States, who is deeply concerned about the aspects of government by gimmick. We have seen this sort of thing occur in the financial and fiscal policies of this Government over and over, this year. It has happened with our schools. It has happened with the Federal land-grant colleges, where the Federal Government has withdrawn support in an attempt to force the cost back upon the States, so that the administration will have more money to spend on Great Society programs and other foolish programs.

It is obvious why they would like to put this program into effect.

There are many reasons. First, they do not wish to show the American people what they are spending. They do not wish to let the American people know what they are spending. It is one of the greatest tricks to hide the way we are going into debt that can possibly be imagined.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand some quotations published in the Wall Street Journal for today, March 15, 1966, on sale of Treasury bonds, which take huge losses. For example, I notice that one of the bonds quoted for maturity in 1975 is as low as $82.24. In other words, the Federal Government takes an 18 percent discount on this money today. Bonds maturing in 1995, go down to a price of $79.20, which is 21 points of discount. It is obvious that we will lose control over the money appropriated by Congress if we do this.

A bill has been introduced in the other body in which an attempt will be made to do this with many other loaning agencies. The Senator from Texas has placed a long list of these agencies in the hearings, on page 113. Thus, what they will do will be to permit loans, one on top of another, and there is not a man or woman in the Senate or House of Representatives who will ever be able to keep track of this money, after it is gone.

Mr. President, I shall vote to recommit, as I said, basically for two reasons. First, personally, I do not believe that the people of my State sent me to the Senate to give up the right to help fix by authorization the moneys which the United States will spend. Second, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I certainly do not intend to abrogate to God knows what appointee in the Federal Government the right to make appropriations for the needs of this country.

Make no mistake about it, this is exactly what we will be giving up, if we pass this bill.

Since the other bill, broader in scope, has been introduced—I presume with the advice of the administration—I believe that the best thing we could do would be to recommit the bill and consider it, then, in the light of the newly introduced bill in the House, and see what we will do with it.

Mr. President, I have long been a supporter of the Small Business Administration, even though lately I have been critical of the recently retired administrator of that agency. He has now been gone for several months, and the President has not seen fit to appoint another administrator. I also note—and this may be significant—that the Small Business Administration is about to be kicked out of its present quarters and therefore, at the moment, it has no place to go. Thus, it looks as though the Small Business Administration, at the moment, is the stepchild of the administration and the stepchild of the President.

Those of us who have gone through disasters in our States as a result of floods, tornadoes, and other sources, have good reason to appreciate the wisdom of those who originally set up the Small Business Administration. Without the emergency powers given to it, in addition to its regular powers, many of the areas of our country hit by disasters could not possibly have achieved recovery without the aid of SBA.

I see the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] sitting in the chair, and I am sure that his own State could not have hoped to recover with such great facility—I will not say ease, because it was a hard row back—but Maryland could not have hoped to recover from its tornadoes 3 or 4 years ago, had it not been for the facilities of the Small Business Administration which Congress provided.

Mr. President, I believe that we have come to the crossroads. I believe that it is time we face the proposition squarely as to whether we are going to abrogate our responsibilities in the Senate to keep control of the money which the Federal Government spends, to determine how far we are going into debt, and to determine actually what we will spend through the process of appropriation—or else we will live to regret it.

It is no secret that this country is approaching a serious fiscal crisis. The degree to which we approach it, and how soon it may come, may be a matter of a difference of opinion among various people. But, when we see our banks—even our most conservative banks—loaned up to the hilt, when we see our smaller banks loaned up to the hilt, and when we see the interest rates rising and rising and rising every day because of the shortage of money, I believe that everyone should be concerned.

I remember in the late 1950's when the opposing parties, day after day, talked about the great increase in interest rates which the Federal Government was having to pay, and how the people who borrowed money on homes at that time were having to pay the terrible rate of 5 percent interest.

Here, in the Government's borrowings, it is getting up to close to 5 percent today. By the Federal Government. Housing loans all over the country have gone up until they are now 6½ percent, 6 and a fraction percent, close to 7 percent, and in some instances actually 7 percent interest for prime first mortgages on houses.

This is what the irresponsible financial and fiscal policies of the Government have brought us to.

For these reasons, because I do have a regard for what people have to pay when they wish to borrow money in order to build or to buy a home, because I do have a regard for what is happening in our banking institutions throughout the country, and because I do have a fear for the financial and fiscal future of this country, I shall vote to send the bill back to the committee.

I shall be reasonable in my actions—even generous—to see that the Small Business Administration is able to carry on its ordinary functions, and those additional burdens which are placed upon it by reason of disasters which may hit the country in one place or another, regardless of what State it may be.

But, I certainly am not going to turn over to some individual in some never-never land, over whom the people of this country have no control—they cannot vote not to elect him, or to elect him—the opportunity to make a decision as to how many hundreds of millions of dollars—and I repeat hundreds of millions of dollars literally—first to borrow and reborrow through the backdoor of the Federal Treasury, without ever having to account for it to anyone, without ever coming to Congress for an authorization bill, or without going to either the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives or the Senate to obtain this money.

This is an area where we should be generous, because it is the small businessman in the country today who needs help more than anyone else. We should be generous. When it comes to disaster loans granted by the SBA, we should be more than generous to help lift these people out of the total despair that comes from total disaster. And we will be. Congress always has been and always will be. But I am sure we do not propose to open the door wide to Government by gimmickry and say, "You take it and do what you please." It is almost as if a man who was working on a salary and having a hard time supporting his wife suddenly found that his wife had gone to a loan bureau downtown, mortgaged the house, the furniture, the car, and everything they had, and all of a sudden they were spending a lot of money. But the day is not here yet when the two will not have to get together and pay off the debt.

I know there are those who think we should never pay off the Federal debt. We probably never will. But there ought to come a time when we realize that a great enlargement of the present national debt is having its influence on the fiscal affairs of the country.

I hope my colleagues will join us in voting for the motion to recommit, simply because the proposal represents an essentially unsound Government practice.

Others may say, "Well, your President did this," or "Your President did it there." The way the money can be loaned and reloaned and go back and forth between FNMA and the private sector constitutes the possibility of the expansion of the debt by literally billions of dollars over a period of years. It is not going to happen now. It is not going to happen in the next 6 months. But as the money passes back and forth, it will mean an expansion of the debt by that much. But more than that is involved the question of expansion of money in this country. There is not a housewife in this country who is not aware of the inflationary costs today and what it is costing her and her family in increased living expenses.

By voting not to recommit the bill, Senators will in fact be helping to set in motion one of the best inflationary measures we have had before the Senate in many and many a year.

I hope the motion will be agreed to.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a table which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal, entitled "Government, Agency, and Miscellaneous Securities," showing quotations on Government obligations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 15, 1966]

Government, agency, and miscellaneous securities, Monday, Mar. 14, 1966

TREASURY BONDS

	Bid	Asked	Previous bid	Yield
3¾s, 1966, May	99.26	99.28	99.26	4.45
3s, 1966, August	99.5	99.7	99.5	4.89
3⅜s, 1966, November	99.0	99.2	99.0	4.82
2½s, 1962-67, June	97.17	97.19	97.14	4.50
3⅝s, 1967, November	98.0	98.2	97.30	4.85
3⅞s, 1968, May	97.25	97.27	97.22	4.94
3¾s, 1968, August	97.2	97.4	96.30	5.02
3⅞s, 1968, November	97.5	97.7	97.2	5.00
2½s, 1963-68, December	94.7	94.9	94.3	4.75
4s, 1969, February	97.15	97.17	97.11	4.92
2½s, 1964-69, June	93.12	93.14	93.6	7.40
4s, 1969, October	96.24	96.26	96.19	4.99
2½s, 1964-69, December	92.21	92.41	92.6	4.72
2½s, 1965-70, March	92.4	92.8	91.26	4.64
4s, 1970, February	96.17	96.19	96.11	4.96
4s, 1970, August	96.3	96.7	95.28	4.96
2½s, 1966-71, March	90.24	90.28	90.18	4.57

TREASURY BONDS—Continued

	Bid	Asked	Previous bid	Yield
4s, 1971, August	95.9	95.13	95.4	4.98
3⅞s, 1971, November	94.8	94.12	94.4	5.03
4s, 1972, February	94.25	94.29	94.20	5.00
4s, 1972, August	94.8	94.12	94.2	5.04
2½s, 1967-72, September	87.26	87.30	87.16	4.67
2½s, 1967-72, December	87.15	87.19	87.7	4.66
4s, 1973, August	93.10	93.14	93.4	5.07
4⅛s, 1973, November	93.27	93.31	93.20	5.08
4⅛s, 1974, February	93.24	93.28	93.18	4.07
4¼s, 1974, May	94.16	94.20	94.10	5.06
3⅞s, 1974, November	92.2	92.6	91.28	5.00
3½s, 1980, November	87.2	87.10	86.30	4.70
4¼s, 1987-92, August	92.16	92.24	92.10	4.74
4s, 1988-93, February	89.24	90.0	89.10	4.65
4⅛s, 1989-94, May	90.14	90.22	90.18	4.73
3½s, 1998, November	81.2	81.10	80.24	4.61

Government, agency, and miscellaneous securities, Monday, Mar. 14, 1966—Continued

U.S. TREASURY NOTES

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
1½	April 1966	99.25	99.27	5.07
4	May 1966	99.27	99.29	4.51
4	August 1966	99.19	99.21	4.82
1½	October 1966	98.18	98.22	3.96
4	November 1966	99.10	99.12	4.96
3⅝	February 1967	98.24	98.26	4.96
4	do	99.1	99.3	5.02
1½	April 1967	97.6	97.12	4.09
4¼	May 1967	99.4	99.6	4.98
3¾	August 1967	98.11	98.13	4.93
4⅞	do	100.3	100.5	4.76
1½	October 1967	95.22	95.28	4.29
1½	April 1968	94.6	94.12	4.41
1½	October 1968	92.23	92.29	4.48
1½	April 1969	91.8	91.14	4.54
1½	October 1969	90.2	90.8	4.51
1½	April 1970	88.24	89.0	4.51
1½	October 1970	87.20	87.28	4.48
5	November 1970	100.9	100.11	4.92

U.S. TREASURY BILLS

Maturity	Bid	Asked	Maturity	Bid	Asked
	Discount			Discount	
Mar. 17	4.70	4.30	June 30	4.69	4.62
Mar. 22	4.50	4.20	July 7	4.71	4.64
Mar. 24	4.45	4.25	July 14	4.72	4.69
Mar. 31	4.43	4.20	July 21	4.72	4.65
Apr. 7	4.35	4.15	July 28	4.73	4.65
Apr. 14	4.37	4.15	July 31	4.73	4.63
Apr. 21	4.47	4.38	Aug. 4	4.79	4.72
Apr. 28	4.49	4.42	Aug. 11	4.82	4.75
Apr. 30	4.60	4.45	Aug. 18	4.82	4.76
May 5	4.56	4.49	Aug. 25	4.82	4.76
May 12	4.62	4.55	Aug. 31	4.80	4.70
May 19	4.63	4.57	Sept. 1	4.86	4.81
May 26	4.64	4.58	Sept. 8	4.86	4.84
May 31	4.62	4.52	Sept. 30	4.70	4.57
June 2	4.66	4.62	Oct. 31	4.72	4.58
June 9	4.67	4.64	Nov. 30	4.73	4.63
June 17	4.70	4.63	Dec. 31	4.74	4.66
June 22	4.68	4.64	Jan. 31	4.84	4.78
June 23	4.69	4.63	Feb. 28	4.86	4.83

FEDERAL LAND BANK

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield [1]
3¼	May 1966	99.24	100.0	3.20
4.35	May 1966	99.28	99.30	4.68
4¼	July 1966	99.19	99.23	5.04
4.55	September 1966	99.18	99.22	5.08
4⅜	December 1966	99.12	99.16	5.04
4⅛	February 1972–67	94.0	95.0	5.11
4¼	February 1967	99.0	99.8	5.08
4	May 1967	98.18	98.26	5.03
4¾	August 1967	99.13	99.17	5.09
4½	October 1970–67	96.24	97.24	5.06
4⅛	October 1967	98.0	98.12	5.19
5⅛	January 1968	100.0	100.4	5.05
4¼	March 1968	98.0	98.12	5.10
4	June 1968	97.4	97.20	5.12
4¼	August 1968	97.16	97.28	5.19
4⅝	March 1969	96.24	97.24	5.19
4⅝	July 1969	97.16	98.16	5.11
4¼	July 1969	96.28	97.8	5.15
4¼	October 1969	96.12	96.24	5.25
5⅛	February 1970	99.24	100.24	4.91
3½	April 1970	93.16	94.16	5.02
5⅛	July 1970	99.24	100.24	4.93
3½	May 1971	91.24	92.24	5.13
3⅞	September 1972	92.16	93.16	5.07
4⅛	February 1978–73	90.24	91.24	5.06
4⅝	April 1975	93.16	94.16	5.13
5	February 1976	99.12	99.28	5.02

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
4.35	March 1966	99.30	100.00	4.21
4.30	April 1966	99.28	99.30	4.70
4.35	May 1966	99.26	99.28	4.86
4.40	June 1966	99.26	99.28	4.70
4.35	July 1966	99.20	99.22	5.10
4⅛	August 1966	99.15	99.19	5.09
4.95	August 1966	99.27	99.29	5.13
4.60	September 1966	99.20	99.22	5.13

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK—Continued

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
5.15	October 1966	99.28	99.30	5.24
4	November 1966	99.10	99.14	5.10
4½	January 1967	99.9	99.13	5.20
4¼	September 1967	98.16	98.24	5.12
4⅜	March 1968	98.9	98.13	5.24

BANK FOR CO-OPS

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
4.35	April 1966	99.30	100.0	4.27
4.40	May 1966	99.28	99.30	4.80
4.50	June 1966	99.27	99.29	4.89
4.95	August 1966	99.27	99.29	5.17

WORLD BANK BONDS

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
4¼	1966	99.12	99.24	4.65
4⅜	1967	99.10	99.24	4.55
3¾	1968	95.24	96.8	5.60
3½	1969	95.16	96.0	5.00
3½	1971	92.0	92.16	5.04
3	1972	88.0	88.24	5.10
4½	1973	95.0	96.0	5.13
3⅜	1975	86.0	86.24	4.52
3	1976	84.0	84.24	4.94
4½	1977	94.16	95.16	5.05
4¼	1978	90.24	91.24	5.18
4¼	1979	90.16	91.16	5.16
4¾	1980	96.0	97.0	5.04
3¼	1981	83.0	84.0	4.71
4½	1982	95.8	96.0	4.86
5	1985	98.24	99.16	5.04
4½	1990	91.0	91.24	5.10

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
4¼	December 1982	90.0	91.0	5.05
4½	April 1984	93.0	94.0	5.00
4½	November 1984	93.0	94.0	5.00

FNMA NOTES AND DEBENTURES

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
4⅛	December 1966	99.0	99.8	5.17
5	February 1967	99.27	99.31	5.03
5.30	May 1967	99.30	100.6	5.12
4½	October 1967	98.16	99.0	5.16
3⅝	March 1968	96.16	97.0	5.23
4⅜	April 1969	97.0	97.10	5.09
4⅝	April 1970	97.12	97.28	5.21
4⅛	September 1970	94.28	95.12	5.29
4⅛	August 1971	94.8	94.24	5.25
4½	September 1971	95.28	96.12	5.25
5⅛	February 1972	99.22	99.28	5.15
4⅜	June 1972	95.12	95.28	5.15
4½	February 1977	94.16	95.0	5.10

FIC BANK DEBENTURES

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
4.35	Apr. 4	99.30	100.0	4.22
4.30	May 2	99.28	99.30	4.65
4.35	June 1	99.26	99.28	4.83
4.35	July 5	99.23	99.27	4.97
445	Aug. 1	99.20	99.23	5.11
4.60	Sept. 1	99.21	99.23	5.15
4.90	Oct. 3	99.26	99.28	5.08
5	Nov. 1	99.27	99.29	5.12
5.15	Dec. 1	99.28	99.30	4.24

[1] Yield to call date.

NOTE.—Over-the-counter quotations source on request.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on the motion of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to recommit the bill to committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2614) to provide for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska Purchase, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Will the Senator yield so that we may have a quorum call in order to alert Senators that the tax measure is before the Senate?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Yes, after the conference report is laid before the Senate.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Surely.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, pp. 5788–5791, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, we have before the Senate at the present time the conference report on H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. This is the bill that was passed by the Senate only last Wednesday. As you can see, the conferees acted expeditiously, and the legislative history demonstrates once again that the Congress can act on tax legislation with dispatch appropriate to the occasion.

It is just 2 months since the President sent his recommendations to the Congress. These recommendations, unlike those which resulted in the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, called for raising tax revenues through excise tax increases and revisions in the timing of current payments of individual and corporation income taxes. Careful consideration was given to the President's recommendations and their objectives, but Congress did not overlook the effect of those provisions which would cause unusual difficulties for taxpayers.

The bill, as agreed to by the conferees, does not depart appreciably from the revenue raising objectives of the President's recommendations. The conference report will raise $1,130 million in revenue in fiscal year 1966, and $4,800 million for the administrative budget, and a net additional $105 million for the social security trust fund in fiscal year 1967.

There were 36 amendments added to the House bill by the Senate, 14 of which involved technical amendments or corrections of clerical errors. The House readily concurred with the Senate's action on them. The remaining 22 amendments concerned 10 substantive provisions from which the House receded on 7, and the Senate receded on 3.

Three of these ten substantive issues were related to the introduction of the graduated withholding schedules on wage and salary income. The first issue represented Finance Committee amendments modifying the withholding allowances on graduated withholding for those with large itemized deductions. These amendments simplified the calculation of the withholding allowance by reducing the percentage on the first $7,500 of income above which allowances are taken into account from 12 percent to 10 percent. They also reduced the underwithholding implicit in the House-passed provision by requiring a full $700 excess of itemized deductions over the percentage minimum base before the first withholding allowance could be claimed. These adjustments met the requirement of reducing overwithholding on taxpayers in the $5,000 to $10,000 income class without providing underwithholding to any significant degree. The House receded on these amendments which will increase revenues by $35 million in fiscal year 1967.

On the second issue, the House also receded on Senate amendments added by the Finance Committee which provide a procedure for determining the withholding allowance for itemized deductions by taxpayers who used the standard deduction in the preceding year. The taxpayer in this case may treat as itemized deductions for the prior year the lesser of 10 percent of wages shown on his return for that year, or $1,000.

The third issue relates to the option of taxpayers to disregard a difference of up to $5 between the tax liability shown on their return and the amount of withholding and declaration payments that they have made. This was a floor amendment submitted by the junior Senator from Louisiana. In the discussions in conference, the House conferees pointed out that it involved a revenue loss of $10 million, which was not directly associated with any consideration of taxpayer equity. The House conferees urged further that it would be preferable to allow some passage of time to test how the withholding schedule in the bill would function and to check the accuracy of the system relative to the final tax liability. We can reconsider this provision after we have had that experience, if we find that a large number of taxpayers find themselves within this $5 range of their final tax liability and that the revenue losses involved for the Internal Revenue Service for the forgiveness of up to $5 is not large. Accordingly, your conferees receded on this amendment, with the understanding that the Treasury Department will conduct a thorough study of its feasibility.

On the fourth, the House receded on Finance Committee amendments which deleted a provision imposing a floor stock tax on 1 percent on passenger automobiles in the hands of dealers on the day the increased excise tax is to become effective on automobiles.

On the fifth issue also the House conferees receded on a Senate floor amendment that made April 1, 1966, the effective date for the restoration of the excise tax on telephone and teletypewriter service to 10 percent.

The sixth issue concerned the amendment the Finance Committee added to the bill which would allow deductions from income tax for certain indirect contributions to political parties. That was the amendment by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The House conferees also receded on this amendment.

The seventh issue involved the amendment the Senate Finance Committee added which would require the Department of Agriculture to supply farmers who receive $600 or more of annual payments under programs administered by the Department with copies of the same information returns which it presently is required to send to the Internal Revenue Service. The House conferees understood the problem at which the amendment was directed, but they insisted that it deserved careful, systematic study before legislation. Your conferees receded with the understanding that a study of the subject would be instituted.

The House conferees also receded to the Senate on the eighth issue—a floor amendment offered by Senator TOWER to raise the exemption level from duty for gifts sent by members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat zone to $50 retail value, from the present $10 exemption level applicable to all other U.S. citizens who send bona fide gifts to this country from abroad. The $50 duty-free provision will apply to articles purchased in or through authorized agencies of the Armed Forces and which enter the United States after the date of enactment, but on or before December 31, 1967. It is estimated that this will involve an additional outflow of $10 million with respect to the balance of payments, but its effect on customs duties will be negligible.

The two remaining amendments adopted by the Senate involve substantial amounts of money—a revenue loss of $315 million a year on local, residential telephone service and increased expenditures of $790 million for broadening coverage under the social security system for persons 70 years or older presently ineligible for its minimum benefits. The conferees from the House, since both of these involved a large loss in the net funds which would otherwise be obtained under the bill, resisted them strongly.

With respect to the floor amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] to retain the present 3-percent excise tax on local residential telephone service, the House conferees maintained that the $315 million revenue loss in fiscal year 1967 is much too great to sustain in a bill designed to increase revenues to avoid inflation in this period of increased military commitment. They also believed that since this tax will affect almost all the taxpayers in this country, its burden will be spread broadly and therefore not be particularly burdensome with respect to any single taxpayer or group of taxpayers. The House conferees were adamant about retaining this provision, and your conferees finally receded, but only after substantial concessions were obtained on the amendment I am about to discuss.

Mr. President, we found the House conferees were strongly opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to provide persons age 70 years or older with monthly social security benefits of $44 and an additional $22 for a spouse.

The House conferees pointed out that this Senate amendment was drafted with loose language involving extremely complex considerations. They pointed out these aspects had broad implications which had not been fully considered. They further pointed out that neither the Finance Committee nor the Ways and Means Committee had held hearings on its provisions to determine the full extent of the problems of the elderly poor, that is, how many are without any retirement or assistance benefits, how many receive inadequate benefits, or how the Congress best can meet their needs?

The House conferees pointed out that this amendment provided benefits for many more persons than the needy aged now inadequately provided for under other systems. They noted that its provisions seriously contradicted the fundamental concepts of the self-supporting, contributory social security system, in that it did not require any minimum eligibility in covered work. They indicated that it repealed the transitional requirements for persons 72 years or older enacted last year, provided greater monthly benefits than the $35 a month made available to them last year, and authorized payment of this benefit in addition to other benefits an aged person may be receiving under pension plans.

Because of this feature, the Railroad Retirement Board estimated that the Prouty amendment as passed by the Senate would have cost the Railroad Retirement Fund $170 million in the first year and approximately $90 million yearly on a level basis thereafter. The chairman of the Subcommittee Railroad Retirement of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Honorable CLAIBORNE PELL, advised me that such additional benefit payments could have put the Railroad Retirement Fund in an unsound actuarial position, and that he strongly supports the conference substitute.

After considerable discussion and consideration, the conferees worked out a substitute for the Senate amendment. This substitute achieves the basic objective sought by the Senator from Vermont. It provides social security benefits for aged retired persons who do not now receive adequate benefits under any Government retirement program.

Under the conference agreement, an estimated 370,000 persons who become 72 before 1968 may qualify for a $35 monthly benefit—plus $17.50 for a spouse 72 or over—if they are not otherwise eligible for social security benefits.

The hardship cases recited by Senator PROUTY during discussion of his amendment are included among the 370,000 aged persons to which the conference substitute applies. These are persons who either do not receive any benefits from another public retirement system, or who receive less than $35 a month, $52.50 a month for married couples.

Individuals age 72 and over who receive less than $35 a month from Federal, State, or local government retirement systems will have their benefits built up to $35 per month under the conference agreement. Similarly, married couples age 72 and over who receive less than $52.50 per month under Government retirement systems will have their aggregate benefit built up to $52.50.

Persons who receive old-age assistance under any Federal-State aid program will not be eligible for the $35 payment under the conference substitute while they are receiving the assistance. However, they may receive the $35 benefit in the event cash assistance should be terminated. Veterans and widows receiving compensation payments from the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disability or death will be eligible for the monthly $35 or $52.50 benefit without regard to these VA payments. Similarly, receipt of workmen's compensation will not reduce an eligible individual's benefits.

The conference substitute merges the provisions of this amendment with the existing provisions of the Social Security Act. Thus, individuals who become 72 before 1968 may qualify for the $35 monthly benefit without covered work contributions, persons who reach 72 in 1968 must have three quarters of covered work. Persons who reach 72 in 1969 will need six quarters of covered work, and those reaching 72 in 1970 will need nine quarters of coverage, and thereafter three additional quarters a year until the permanent maximum level is reached.

Those eligible this year may apply for benefits beginning in July, and the first benefit payments will be made sometime in November 1966. The initial benefit payments will come from accrued reserve funds in the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. In fiscal year 1968, the actual payments will be totaled, and an appropriation equal to the total payments plus interest will be requested in the next budget to enable the general fund to reimburse the trust fund for these expenditures. The first year cost—for three quarters of fiscal year 1967—is estimated at $95 million. Under the procedure for reimbursement, the first payments from the general fund will be made to the trust fund in fiscal year 1969. The estimated cost in the second year is $115 million, which will be incurred by the trust fund in fiscal year 1968. This cost will be reimbursed to the trust fund from the budget for fiscal year 1970. Thereafter the cost will decline by about $10 million per year.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, as conferees on the part of the Senate, I and the other Senate conferees fulfilled our obligation to the best of our abilities. We represented the Senate on these amendments without regard to what our personal position had been with respect to them during the Senate consideration. This is the practice that I intend to follow at all times.

As I indicated earlier in my statement, 10 substantive amendments were made by the Senate, and the conferees succeeded in maintaining the Senate position on all but three of these amendments. One of the three on which we did not insist was my own amendment, the amendment which would have made it unnecessary for taxpayers to pay amounts of less than $5 where withholding or declaration payments accounted for most of their tax liability. The second amendment on which we failed to obtain House conferee approval was an amendment offered by another Senate conferee, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Technically, this was a Finance Committee amendment but was one offered by the senior Senator from Delaware in the committee consideration, agreed to by the committee, adopted by the Senate, and taken to conference. I am referring to the amendment he offered to require reporting by the Department of Agriculture to farmers with respect to payments made to them which they must take into account for tax purposes.

Apart from these two amendments—my own amendment and the amendment of my fellow conferee—we brought back to the Senate all but one of the amendments placed on this bill by this body. It was impossible to bring back both the amendment retaining the local telephone tax at 3 percent and the Prouty social security amendment. The House conferees were completely unwilling to lose the more than $1 billion which these two amendments would have entailed in the form as passed by the Senate. We did, however, bring back the heart of the Prouty amendment, because we are providing minimal social security coverage to all persons over age 72 who do not already receive this minimal amount in the form of some other governmental pension—be it a military, Federal civil service, or State or local government pension. Even persons receiving old-age assistance can obtain such a pension in lieu of their public assistance payment if the pension is larger.

I believe that we have brought back the maximum amount possible as a result of our conference with the House. We have done this at the same time that we have managed to provide the additional revenue necessary for the Government in the period immediately ahead.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Since we do not have a printed conference report, will the Senator from Louisiana state for the RECORD, if he has not already stated it, the difference between the original request of the administration and the amount agreed to in the report, apart from the social security amendment, which I think I understand?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In terms of the administrative budget, the amount resulting from the conference action is almost the same as the recommendation of the President.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understood from the press yesterday, when a short statement appeared on the news ticker, the President's request originally involved slightly more than $6 billion a year, both in increased taxes and advance payments, while as reported by the conference committee the amount was reduced to about $5.9 billion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is $5,930 million. The President's recommendation was, roughly, $6 billion, and the amount provided in the conference report is about $5,930 million. So the difference is about $70 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. In view of the fact that the conference committee decided to continue the selective sacrifice method of taxation on telephone service and automobiles, rather than to approach the question as a comprehensive tax policy, I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana, both in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Finance and as assistant majority leader, has any special information he can give the Senate as to future tax laws, especially in view of the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury yesterday, in a statement to the Economic Club of Detroit, indicated a possibility that new taxes would be necessary.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know of no plan presented to the Committee on Finance for any increase in taxes. I am not saying that among Senators or among Members of the House someone might not have a plan for tax adjustment, one way or another; but I do not know of any plan before the Finance Committee for any general increase in taxes.

So far as the conference was concerned, as the Senator from Indiana well knows, the Senate had adopted an amendment that provided for the repeal of the floor stock tax on automobiles, and we succeeded in persuading the House to accept that amendment. As a result we made at least that much headway in the direction in which the Senator from Indiana would like to see us move.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes; but does the Senator from Louisiana, in his capacity as a member of the leadership of this body, have any information from the Treasury as to any plan they are pursuing with respect to future taxation: whether any plan will be submitted to Congress, and whether the Committee on Finance will have an opportunity to discuss this matter on a later date? Is a study in depth to be made at the recommendation of the Treasury or the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I can only say that the Treasury has presented no plans either to the committee or to me to increase any tax. I am sure that the Treasury is constantly studying the situation and, if it determines that it is necessary to raise taxes it will recommend this to us.

However, I think it is safe to say that as of this time no recommendation is before us for a tax increase beyond what is provided in this bill.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator from Louisiana have any information to indicate any change in the estimate of the cost of the war in Vietnam or any change in aspects in this regard which would indicate that we could expect or anticipate in the reasonably near future a change in the present overall budget toward an increase in general taxation?

I am not speaking about the correction of inequities and fairness in administration, which I am sure the Senator from Louisiana would always welcome, as would the Senator from Indiana. However, with regard to the cost of the war in Vietnam, do we have any more definitive figure? Has the Secretary of Defense submitted any further information which would define the matter more specifically? Has the Director of the Budget given any indication that he has a better estimate as to what we may expect within the next 4 or 5 months, an estimate which would be more in line with anticipations and more reasonable?

It will be recalled that when we adjourned last fall, we found, within a period of less than 6 months, that the excise taxes which we hailed with a great deal of enthusiasm as a means of lessening the burden on the poor and the low-income groups had to be reinstituted because the war had to be borne and paid for by the poor.

We made a mistake. Although the Senator from Minnesota and I were discussing a few moments ago that the Senate acted with great dispatch, I wonder if the Senate acted with the same amount of intelligence.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is certainly privileged to have his opinion on these matters. I too would like to make improvements in the tax system and I should like to see the taxes of many people reduced if we could afford to do so. However, we need this money to carry out the commitments that have been made and to carry out the military requirements of our country. So far as I know, we have taken care of these in this measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Indiana is correct. The administration, to my knowledge, has not suggested any increase in taxes as far as our committee is concerned. However, I think it should be pointed out that the administration is well aware of the fact that the pending bill is only a stopgap measure and would provide approximately $6.5 billion in one-shot revenue. This money will not be from additional taxes, but merely from an acceleration of the rate of payments. The money would be used to reduce the projected deficit for next year. The country will be operating next year, not on a deficit of $1.8 billion as claimed, but on a deficit of approximately $10 billion. The only tangible evidence I see that the administration is trying to solve this problem is its effort to get further authority to sell the assets of this country and use the proceeds to pay for the current operating expenses of the Government today. It is a shortsighted policy. It is a policy which will come back and haunt the administration later. The administration is deliberately laying the groundwork for a boom-and-bust period.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this bill would provide the funds with which to see us through our plans for next year. If we need more revenue later, something can be done then.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. This bill will see the administration through the 1966 election, and after that, watch out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we need more revenue thereafter, we will take all of these matters into account.

I think that this measure would see us through our deficit that would otherwise exist in fiscal 1967, and keep it within reasonable bounds. It seems to me that, without this measure, the deficit would be very high.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am in favor of holding down the deficit. Is it true that this measure would raise approximately $1.2 billion in additional, new revenue?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The bill would raise this much from new excise tax revenue in the fiscal year 1967.

Mr. HARTKE. That is the only new revenue that would be raised by this measure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The measure would bring in several billions of dollars more, however, from adjustments in collection procedures, including an additional $3.2 billion by speeding up the collection of corporate income taxes.

Mr. HARTKE. Those taxes would be collected anyway. It is not a matter of new taxation. It is merely a matter of collection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a one-time gain.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is informed and knows what a one-time gain is. We collect it one extra time and never have to pay it back. That makes the deficit that much less for that year.

We anticipate that we shall continue to have a growing economy, as we presently do. This means we should have approximately $6 billion in additional revenue in the following year. Moreover, many economists think that is a very conservative estimate and that we will have as much as $7 billion or $8 billion in additional revenue in each year with our present growth. If that is the case, and we do not substantially increase our expenditures, we would have a balanced budget in the years ahead without having to levy any additional taxes.

Mr. HARTKE. At this point no one in a responsible position has indicated that we will have a 1-year war. This war effort in all likelihood will continue for a longer period than will the acceleration of taxes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope that we shall eventually be able to bring this war to an end and in the near future to get the war sufficiently under control so that it will not cost any more than it presently does.

Mr. HARTKE. As the Senator knows, I do not intend to ask for a rollcall. I compliment the Senator for at least following his own admonition to this body. Following the action of the Senate, and I believe the measure was passed by the Senate on March 1, the measure went to conference on March 10. It is now March 15, and the bill is ready to go to the White House this afternoon. That is a totally elapsed time of from the 1st of March to the 15th of March.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senator the fact that, while the Senator was not in charge of that measure, he indicated that there was some attempt to stall or filibuster the measure.

I hope the Senator will state who the filibusters were. The measure was passed by the Senate on March 1, and no conference was held until March 10. In fact, the conferees were not appointed until March 9. It has taken until today, March 15, for that very important measure—which everyone indicated at that time was so necessary in order to provide ammunition and help to the boys in Vietnam—to be ready to go to the White House for signature by the President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was not one of the conferees on that measure. I am not in a position to speak for them. I presume that every conferee does his best as the merciful Lord gives him the talent to see the right and to do it.

In my judgment, while we spent 3 weeks on that measure, it could have been disposed of in 1 week. If we had done so, it would have probably shortened the session by that much.

EFFECT OF VIETNAM ON THE STOCK MARKET

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune for March 8 comments on the relationship between the uncertain tax policy involved in our Vietnam expense and the war in Vietnam.

The editorial quotes from comments in the same paper made by the financial columnist Eliot Janeway, who points out that the tax bill, whose final passage we are voting upon today, by its concentration on a "one-shot" method of tax collection does little to dipsel forthrightly the existing uncertainty about future tax policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune,
Mar. 8, 1966]

THE STOCK MARKET AS SOUNDINGBOARD

Eliot Janeway, writing on our financial page, discusses the financing of the war in Vietnam and its effect on the stock market. He says that we are mobilizing to fight a destructive war, but that the administration is acting as if it could be fought on the cheap.

President Johnson's tax proposals, Mr. Janeway feels, are altogether inadequate if the administration continues to insist on huge expenditures at the same time for domestic "welfare." Once the troops are committed, the backup decision to levy taxes to support the troops becomes a necessary followthrough.

But the administration's fiscal stance clings to the fairy tale that the luxuries of domestic spending, as well as Vietnam, can be paid for with one-shot tax gimmicks improvished to meet the bills that are now piling up. The $1.2 billion to be raised by reinstating auto and telephone excise taxes are, Mr. Janeway says, the equivalent of a tip to the waiter, while the scheme to accelerate collections from individuals and corporations leaves everybody up in the air.

"Fear of shaking up business and consumer confidence," says Mr. Janeway, "is no excuse for the failure to close the 'credibility gap' on the tax front. The deterioration in the stock market leaves no doubt that business likes uncertainty even less than it likes taxes. The combination of a 'quickie' tax plan for a long war, of costs inflating, and of liquidity deflating is giving the stock market and the taxpayers plenty to be uncertain about."

To this we would add that Mr. Johnson is quite aware that national congressional elections lie ahead this fall, and he knows that a sharp rise in taxes at this time would not commend his administration to the voters. The bad news, however, is only deferred if he persists in demanding butter along with guns, without the means to pay the price. The tax boost will come, but meanwhile the stock market shows its trepidation as prices recede ever further from the breakthrough envisioned not so long ago in the magic 1,000 point level of the Dow-Jones index.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator to say that under the conference report there would be actually $1.3 billion in new taxes as a result of this measure?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There would be excise tax revenue in the fiscal year 1967 of $1.2 billion.

Mr. ALLOTT. That would involve chiefly the automobile and the telephone tax.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. The speeding up of the corporate payments would be a one-time gain in revenue to the Government. It will also be a one-time additional cost to the corporations paying the taxes. I do not want to mislead anyone concerning that. When we tell somebody that he must pay his taxes 6 months earlier, and he has to continue paying similar taxes 6 months earlier than he otherwise would have had to, a large amount of additional revenue may be collected.

Mr. ALLOTT. A lot of revenue would be collected. This has been repeatedly referred to as a "one-shot deal." What we have actually done is to accelerate the collection of taxes this year at the corporate and individual level. But the amount of payments that are accelerated and paid into the Federal Government, by the same token, would not be paid next year, because it is only a "one-shot deal." The Government would not be collecting any additional revenue from people by this bill, other than on the two items that the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is true that we would only collect any given tax liability once. However, if the Government obtains an additional amount of revenue in just one year but collects no less in subsequent years than it would otherwise do it would still be ahead by that much revenue. That is what has happened as a result of the Revenue Act of 1964, which began this speedup in collections which this bill still further speeds up. The corporations will know that they are out more in taxes over this period.

Mr. ALLOTT. But the Government would not be ahead, because what they collect this year would have been collected next year, when income tax time comes around.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But in the following year, the Government will collect just as much money as it would otherwise have done in the absence of these two acts. In other words, when we speed up tax collections in one year, the following year we do not give it back, we simply in that year collect amounts which otherwise would have been collected in later years, and so on. In this manner we eventually gain 1 year's revenue.

Mr. ALLOTT. But we have not raised the rate, and so, even though the people pay it next year at the same rate, all we have done is accelerate the payment of taxes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This bill will cause us to collect $3,200 million more from corporations in the fiscal year 1967 than we would have collected otherwise.

In fiscal 1968, we will still collect a full year's taxes from corporations, even though we may receive considerable additional revenue if the corporations are making more profits.

Mr. ALLOTT. If they do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If they are they will pay more taxes for that reason. We hope they will. But they do not get that $3,200 million back in the following year; they simply pay a full year's taxes in that year.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understand that. I think this is simply government by gimmickry. It is an attempt to bring in more cash so that the deficit does not look so large, and I think it should be made clear that that is what it is. It is nothing else. It does not raise new taxes; it just staves off the day a little bit, until we do it again.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say to the Senator that what we are doing is putting the corporations more on a more current basis for paying the taxes as they accrue. It is something that should be done in any event. However, it is something we would not want to do on occasions where we did not have full employment, and when people did not have enough money to invest in plant and equipment. On such occasions, we would want them to be investing their money and expanding plant and equipment, providing new employment, and distributing the money in dividends to their stockholders, as a result in such cases we would want people to be able to spend more money and generate more investments and consumer spending.

The same thing is true with regard to the money we pick up by the graduated withholding rates on individuals. On a short-term basis, it makes the Government a substantial amount of money. However, we would not wish to do that if we were at the same time trying to stimulate spending, either consumer spending or spending for capital investments.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not wish to continue the argument, but it does not make the Government any money; it merely precollects that money, and that is all it does.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would say yes; it "precollects" of the Senator wishes to call it precollecting, although as a practical matter, we are not making anybody pay taxes ahead of the time when the liability accrues, however, by this action of making the tax all payable earlier than would otherwise be the case the taxpayer is not able to keep the money and use it as long as he formerly could. By making him pay it sooner, we gain revenue for the Government.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, before addressing myself to the conference report, I should like to try to dispel some of the confusion and misconceptions which have arisen since the adoption of my social security amendment by the Senate last Tuesday.

A rather critical editorial appeared in the New York Times on March 10, and I wish to quote excerpts from a letter which I subsequently wrote to the editor of that great paper:

> I take great issue with the allegation that my proposal is a perversion of the social security system. Medical care under social security brings those who never contributed a penny toward hospitalization under a program of benefits at age 65. The transitional amendments of 1965 bring under social security those who contributed only a very small percentage toward the benefits they ultimately receive. My proposal is not a perversion but an extension of these existing principles and programs.
>
> Nor does my proposal merit the label "share-the-wealth scheme" you imposed, as under existing social security laws the beneficiaries of my proposal would be subject to the same earned income limitations imposed on present beneficiaries. Of the 1.5 million beneficiaries of my proposal, 1.1 million are already under some form of welfare program.
>
> My proposal attacks poverty in a class of people statistically identified as, man for man, woman for woman, the poorest in the United States.
>
> Their retirement income, if any, is often based on wages and salaries of the 1930's and 1940's. Many retired teachers, for example, receive as little as $25 a month and have never been permitted to contribute to or participate in the social security system.
>
> Your editorial was critical of funding my plan from general revenues. Research discloses that the Social Security Act of 1935 as amended in 1943 provided funding for certain programs out of general revenues of the Treasury. The same principle is used under the Medicare Act to pay for health insurance for those age 65 who have made no contributions to the trust fund.
>
> Again my proposal utilizes an existing principle. Finally, the class of people sought to be protected by my proposal will diminish in number as social security coverage approaches universality. It is designed, therefore, to offer a minimum program of retirement benefits ($44 a month) to those age 70 and above who would not be eligible for social security, who have been denied the opportunity since 1935 to participate in the social security system.

I think it should be pointed out, also, that under existing social security law, an individual may have an unearned income of millions of dollars each year, plus a very lavish private pension, and still draw maximum social security benefits. The people that I am trying to protect are not in that class.

Under existing law, Members of Congress may draw social security payments, if they come under the program, and also draw their congressional pensions. Any Member of Congress who is 65 is entitled to participate in the medicare program, regardless of whether he has ever been under social security or not.

On the basis of his study of the world's great civilizations, the Historian Toynbee concluded that a society's quality and durability could best be judged by the respect and care given its elderly citizens.

By that standard we have not measured up too well. You know it, I know it, and the Senate knew it when it adopted my amendment to provide $44 a month to anyone age 70 or over who never qualified for social security. This amendment, which withstood a challenge of three votes, would have aided 1.5 million older Americans.

Who are these million and a half elderly people? Do they really need the money the Senate voted for them? Here is my answer. One million one hundred thousand of these retired folks must now lean on public assistance in their effort to cling to survival. Looking at the money income received by older persons not covered by social security, we notice a shocking thing. Only about 12 percent of this income comes from retirement benefits of any kind. In fact, less than one-half of 1 percent of the money expended by older folks not protected by social security comes from private pensions. Only one-half of 1 percent of the money spent by nonbeneficiaries comes from contributions by relatives.

Nonbeneficiary couples—by that I mean couples not covered by the Social Security Act—who have reached retirement age, receive more than two-thirds of their income from employment, only 12 percent from retirement benefits for railroad and Government employees, and less than 1 percent from private pensions.

In a word, Mr. President, many of these people are forced to work when they are no longer able to work. They have virtually nothing in the way of pension income, and even retired Federal employees, who are in a better position than many other age 70 or older, have far from an adequate income.

Of the more than 200,000 surviving widows and children of civil service employees, 79 percent receive less than $100 a month. Ninety-three percent receive less than $150 a month. And 99 percent of all surviving widows and children receive less than the so-called poverty level of $3,000 a year.

These are the facts, Mr. President. I ask you: Was the Senate justified in voting a modest pension of $44 to each person and $66 to each couple age 70 or over?

I say that it was not only justified, I blush at the thought that we offered so little to so many who need so much.

To those who stood side by side fighting to provide pensions to one and a half million Americans, I say do not lose heart.

It is true that the number of beneficiaries has been reduced by the conference committee from 1.5 million to 300,000.

It is true that the conference committee reduced the benefit level from $44 to $35.

It is true that the age at which the social security benefit is first available has been raised by the conference committee from 70 to 72.

It is true that the conference language will require all Government pension recipients, Federal, State, or local, to offset against the new benefit any income they may receive from public pensions, while their neighbors with private pensions may receive the full benefit.

And lastly, it is true that the conference committee language would deny social security benefits to those who fail to attain the age of 72 before 1968 unless they have three quarters of coverage for each calendar year elapsing after year 1966 and before the year at which they attain the age of 72.

These people, who worked perhaps as long as 50 years, will be forced to go out and get a job, whether physically able or not, in order to qualify for the meager benefits.

I shall not contend that this requirement is absurd, unreasonable, or downright callous. Let the language speak for itself and deduce from it what we may.

Mr. President, nothing I have said here can take away from the fact that even in its substantially altered form my amendment represents a victory.

It is a victory for the principle that this Nation owes an obligation to the forgotten people age 70 and over who never had a chance to obtain social security coverage during their working years.

It is a victory for the principle that general revenues must be used to increase the incomes of elderly Americans.

It is a victory for the 300,000 older citizens who will receive an increase in income, in many cases as much as $35 a month.

Finally, it is a victory for the brave souls who fought in conference to uphold the action of the Senate and who, despite heavy and severe pressures from the administration to kill my amendment, managed to come out with at least something of substance.

I think the conferees for waging this fight under the most difficult conditions imaginable and for standing by the decision of the Senate. I might well include the conferees in the other body, because they were under great pressure as well.

Some well-heeled editorial writers, who undoubtedly will retire with plush private pensions plus social security, have branded the Prouty amendment a "share the wealth" scheme—and I commented on this earlier. To those comfortably situated writers, I can only say: If to put $1.45 per day in the homes of over a million older Americans who have known little but hardship and fear for at least 70 years of their life is to share the wealth, then I plead guilty. And further than that, I intend to continue to fight to improve the incomes of these people, in Congress and on the public platforms of this country, until that one day when justice has been done and every retired American obtains enough income to purchase the bare necessities of life.

It has been said that a journey of a thousand miles must begin with one step. We have taken that one step and we are going to make the entire journey.

And it will be made with or without the help of the occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

It will be made with or without the help of powerful newspaper publishers.

The journey will be made because the American conscience will no longer tolerate witnessing thousands of elderly folks feebly marching in the ranks of destitution.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate sponsors of my amendment. I thank those who voted for the amendment. I thank those who fought in conference to retain it.

I thank Ernest Giddings, legislative director of the American Association of Retired Persons, for his unflagging and constant interest.

I thank most of all the older Americans who make up the lost battalion in our war on poverty. God bless them for their courage, their patience, their help in past endeavors, and for the aid which I know they will give in the struggle which lies ahead.

We have not seen the last of this issue, Mr. President. I shall seize every opportunity to bring it before the Senate so that all may know where we stand on one of the greatest social problems of our time.

To those who are downhearted or disappointed about the narrow scope of our victory, I would offer these words from the Psalms:

> The needy shall not always be forgotten; the expectations of the poor shall not perish forever.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the thousands of letters which I have received since the Senate adopted my amendment. These letters from older people are written from the heart and they are written from heartbreak. They tell a story no Senator could equal. I commend them to your attention and to the attention of the public conscience.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you so much for your sponsorship of legislation to include certain older people in social security. Many of these people, like my mother, have no way to qualify under the present system, and as she (now 89) will be greatly relieved by even a small monthly assistance. These grants will not continue long but will be of great help in the meantime.

Thanking you again for your human compassion.

My mother will be 85 years old in July. She resides in North Dakota, and was widowed 20 years ago. She owned a farm until early 1950 when she could no longer take care of it even as far as the business end. She thought at the time that the proceeds from it would carry her for the remainder of her life, but with inflation and her expenses for living and maintaining her small home in a small town, her savings has dwindled to nothing. She gets no State aid and the only help she gets is from her children. She raised eight children, and I might add that they all are working and paying into social security, men and women. Her one wish in life was to be able to support herself, and a check, regardless how small, would add dignity to her life and many others who are not now covered.

Here is a bird's eye view of what happened to just one family and such benefits as veterans' benefits, social security benefits, medicare benefits etc.

I have been denied all veterans' service, connected, or nonservice disability; we have been denied dependency allowance on a son killed in action in World War II.

Three of us in this one family have paid into social security and have been denied all benefits, viz—

I paid in for all of 1937 and until August 1, 1938, but somehow my record for 1938 has been lost, so I am denied any social security benefits and that denies me part of hospital or medicare.

My wife and I have what is termed the uniform plan, of the Federal Healths Benefits Act; we have basic family and as under a new law, when medicare goes into force July 1, 1966, it will be illegal to collect duplicating coverages and all that will be left of part 2, or supplementary medical of medicare, after the parts that conflict with basic family of the uniform plan, will not be worth the $6 per month it would cost my wife and I, so while persons who never worked under social security are given both parts of medicare and thousands who paid into social security are denied it and medicare.

So, I am denied all social security, VA benefits, medicare and as I draw my disability pay from the Bureau of Employees Compensation, I am denied all pay raises granted other civil service employees.

On behalf of my 79-year-old mother I wish to thank you for the social security provision you offered, and which we hope will receive final congressional approval.

This is a first for me. I have never written a letter of this type. This measure you have introduced will bring a semblance of independence to thousands of dependent "oldsters" like my mother, and I had to let you know how grateful these wonderful people will be.

My mother is wholly dependent on myself for the necessities of life. I am her only living child and the fact that I have had to support her—along with my two fatherless children—has been a bitter pill for her to swallow. My father died 13 years ago, was self-employed and therefore never participated in the social security fund. All of their savings were used up during his 5-year illness. When he died I naturally assumed the complete responsibility of caring for my mother.

If your measure is approved my mother will hold her head high once again, because she will have a dollar in her pocket that has not come from—as she puts it—"the sweat of my daughter's brow." $35 a month may not seem like much, but to her it is almost like being the recipient of a million dollars.

I am 86 young and receive $58 a month and give $3 back for medicare. I was a small farmer and wasn't in on social security except 1 year in shipyard and what little I had saved up is nearly gone.

My experience as head of the trust department of this bank and previously in the same capacity in a bank in Florida, indicates a drastic need to supplement the income of individuals not presently covered by social security. So many of these individuals, now in advanced years, retired before being covered by social security and many widows, whose husbands died prior to their coverage, are actually living a substandard existence, and even a meager $44 a month will mean a great deal to them. These aged individuals who are now destitute or who invested their life savings in U.S. Treasury bonds or insurance annuities many years ago, have seen inflation gradually reduce their ability to live a decent life in their last years.

God bless and keep you in the best of health.

I am so glad someone remembers the unpaid employees of the city of Chicago. I am a widow of a Chicago policeman who has suffered extreme hardships due to unpaid salary of my husband.

My children were deprived of college education. My oldest son deprived of a high school diploma because his tuition wasn't paid due to the death of my girl who was a victim of a doctor's blunder in administering a shot and who was later removed from a lot in the cemetery because we couldn't pay $50 per month on it. I owed $1,500 on my home, today I owe $3,500; I draw $51.52 pension from city of Chicago police division. Our salary at that time was $99.21 every 2 weeks take home pay. I had 7 children.

I am a former railroad man and we men were forced to have the railroad retirement instead of social security.

I had to retire due to illness and have been unable to work for 22 years. I am drawing only $129 per month.

I wish to call your attention to a small group who are in need of some legislation for their benefit. They are the widows of totally and permanently disabled veterans of World War I with service-connected disability. There is no social security and no income other than the $64 per month given to all widows of veterans.

I read of the bill you were trying to get through to help older people not covered by social security and I truly hope you can get it passed. I am a Spanish War widow trying to get along on a pension of $65 a month. I'm 80 years old and not well, so I'm having a pretty hard time. My husband was in bad health for many years before he passed away last July, was never able to work under social security, therefore I don't get anything except the $65 pension, not even any welfare help.

I am a veteran's wife of World War I. I get a widows pension $64 a month from the Government. No other income. I pay $30 rent $5 electric, $8 for gas. Now what I would like to know why us widows can't get no more. The relief was raised. The social security was raised but not us widows. Next question I would like to ask you. I made 4 quarters on social security.

You see my mother will be 77 years of age this March 11, and I was wondering if she came under the law. My father died March of 1936 and left mom a widow, my sister and I were just 11 and 9 at the time. We had to go on relief as mom could not work due to us children being too young and also her hearing was very bad from a child. So she brought us up to be good children and kept a good home for us and made every penny count. When I became 18 I went to work for a short time, and then into the service in March 1943. I was sent overseas and wounded, this only gave mom more to worry about. Then when I got out in 1945 I went to work and have been working ever since. You see I wanted to make it much easier for mom. Then in 1950 I got married. We now have 2 children, and also mom lives with us. I try to give mom some spending money but it is hard today to bring up a family and keep everyone happy.

I have mom registered under medicare with extended coverage. I am hoping your bill that was passed in the Senate will cover her, because our parents are only here on earth a short time, and they went through a lot to help us all through life and we owe them just a little something extra in life. It was not their fault that they could not completely work under social security. If this is something she comes under this would tend to make her feel a little independent. God bless you and speed you in your work and thanks and thanks again from the bottom of my heart for thinking of those few Americans left that could benefit, if only for a short time, on some type of payment.

I am a widow of 66. I am still under a doctor's care after suffering a coronary heart attack and arthritis.

I pay Crouse-Irving Hospital $10 each month, doctor bills here, board and room, all out of $77.80.

I could not live in my trailer we have been fixing up because I cannot afford to buy oil for furnace, and gas for cook stove, along with my other bills. Now I wonder if I am supposed to go begging to the Welfare Department for some assistance?

My mother, Mrs. Grace E. Donahue, 114 North Fairview, North Prairie, Wis., an 87-year-old widow has never been eligible for social security, because my father was a country storekeeper in North Prairie (not Sun Prairie), a town of 292, in the 1930's and early 1940's. One clerk was employed, and my parents, when social security became a law, not only paid what they were required to but also paid the clerk's share of the social security payment. You see, there was not much profit in an independent (nonchain) general store's business; consequently, my parents could not afford to pay a large salary—and so to keep the clerk from leaving, paid her total social security. My father died suddenly of a coronary at the age of 68 in 1942, and my mother carried on alone (with the help of the clerk) until it became too much of a burden and strain on her, and she sold the store in 1944.

And so my mother has never been eligible for social security all these years—because she was unfortunate enough not to have come under the social security law when it was passed originally. She does not have a pension or any retirement benefits.

My brother's mother-in-law, is 78 years old. Her husband, a pattern maker in a toolshop, was paralyzed by a stroke in 1929—died in 1939. The children all helped support their mother when they were at home. The 45-year-old home was later remodeled to provide an income—Mrs. K living alone down stairs now—the upstairs rented. Mrs. K cannot obtain social security because her husband was not covered.

These two widows deserve social security if any one does. They struggled to rear their families. Certainly all of the children help as much as possible to see that they are not in want. But is it fair to exclude them from badly needed social security checks?

I am a retired New York City teacher who has been penalized. I retired 6 months before the present law was passed. My health failed, and the health department of the board of education would not permit me to return to become eligible for the benefits.

DEAR SENATOR PROUTY: I want to express my appreciation to you for your amendment to the tax bill which would blanket under social security all persons over 70 not now covered. Even if your amendment should be defeated in committee, you have performed an outstanding public service in bringing to the attention of the Nation the needs of our "forgotten" citizens.

My 76-year-old mother-in-law is a perfect example of this segment of our population. This dear, gentle lady never worked a day in her life and never had to. The vicissitudes of life have left her penniless.

I do not mind supporting her but it is a sore affliction to her morale and to her spirit to be completely dependent on me. Her hopes and prayers are centered around dying quickly and inexpensively. It is cruel that this all-powerful, rich Nation should neglect its elderly. Even in China, the elderly are treated with greater care and respect than we do in the United States.

I only wish that I was a voter in your State and could show my appreciation in a more forthright manner.

I have retired from the New York post office, since May 31, 1958. I have tried many places to get a job but because of my age, all the applications I filled out were never answered, so I never got the chance to work under social security.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD various memorandums relative to this subject.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS TO THE ADMINISTRATION TAX BILL

The compromise version pays $35 ($17.50 to a wife) to everyone attaining age 72 or over before 1968 without regard to quarters of coverage. Commencing with 1968 and subsequent years the beneficiary must have three quarters for every year elapsing after 1966 up to the year the beneficiary reaches age 72.

Reductions from the benefit amount are made in the case of recipients of governmental pensions less than the benefit amount.

In the case of a husband and wife, only one of whom is entitled to benefits under this amendment, the benefit shall be reduced, first, for any public pension received and, second, shall be further reduced by the excess of the periodic governmental pension of the spouse, not entitled to benefits under this amendment, over $17.50. For example, if A is eligible for the new benefit, and B, his wife, is not, and A receives a civil service retirement annuity of $10 a month, and his wife receives a civil service retirement annuity of $25 a month, A's new benefit of $35 is first reduced by his public pension of $10, leaving a new benefit of $25, less the subsequent reduction of the excess over $17.50 received by the wife, namely, $7.50. Hence, the eligible husband's benefit would be $17.50.

If both husband and wife are entitled to the new benefit, the benefit of the wife ($17.50) shall be first reduced by the excess (if any) of the eligible husband's public pension over $35. In the case of the husband, his new benefit shall first be reduced by the amount of his public pension and then further reduced by the excess of his wife's public pension over $17.50.

For example, if the wife receives a public pension over $17.50 and the husband receives one in excess of $35, no new benefit is payable. If the wife receives a public pension in excess of $17.50 per month while the husband receives a public pension less than $35 per month, the wife receives no new benefit, and the husband's new benefit is reduced by the amount of his public pension and the excess of his wife's public pension over $17.50. Conversly, if the wife receives a public pension less than $17.50 per month, but the husband receives one of more than $35 per month, the husband get no new benefit, and the wife's new benefit of $17.50 is reduced by the amount of her public pension and the excess of her husband's public pension over $35.

Persons receiving State public assistance moneys under State plans funded by social security are not eligible for the new benefit. Where the needs of the husband or wife of a public assistance beneficiary are taken into account by the State in determining the benefit payable to the recipient, the husband or wife is not eligible for the new benefit.

The cost of the new benefit program is funded out of general revenues in fiscal 1969, with the OASDI trust fund being reimbursed so as to put it in the same position at the end of fiscal 1969 as it would have been if the new benefits had not been paid. The trust fund is also to be reimbursed out of general revenues for expenses of administration and the interest loss to the fund.

Entitlement to benefits commences the first month after September 1966 that the beneficiary first becomes eligible.

Memorandum on Federal Retirement Annuities

Of the more than 200,000 surviving widows and children of civil service retirees, 38 percent receive less than $50 a month; 79 percent receive less than $100 a month; 93 percent receive less than $150 a month. Ninety-nine percent of all surviving widows and children receive less than the so-called poverty level of $3,000 per year. Of the 170,000-some widows on the civil service retirement rolls as of June 30, 1965, the average age was 65.8, the average annuity a meager $80 per month.

The situation of surviving widows and children is not necessarily the most desperate. Look at the unfortunate figures relating to employee annuitants: 49,700 receive less than $50 a month; 126,100 receive less than $100; 214,300 receive less than $150 per month; 307,600 receive less than $200. Viewing the so-called poverty level as $250 per month, 377,500 civil service employee annuitants out of a grand total of 508,500 receive less than poverty-scale annuities.

Alarmingly enough, nearly 74 percent of all civil service employee annuitants receive less than the magical poverty level.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have listened with keen interest and appreciation to the words of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. I commend him highly for the fight he is making for his amendment.

It was my privilege to stand with him in the last session of Congress when we tried to increase the social security of those receiving the minimum. It was my privilege to share with him some of the attacks which were made; that it was an attempt to debase the social security system which was a system of insurance—although almost everyone who faces the facts realizes that it has ceased to be an insurance system and has now become, to a large extent, partly an insurance system and partly a system of benefits extended from the Treasury.

I shared with him the fight for his amendment last week.

I do not share with him—and I say this with all appreciation and without any attempt to differ with him—quite the sense of encouragement which he expresses about the result of the conference committee and the so-called compromise which was brought back.

No words of the psalmist can reconcile me to the fact, which is the pungent, outstanding fact, that this group of aged persons who, through no fault of their own, do not qualify for social security, are going to be compelled to wait 2 long years before they will have an opportunity to enjoy even the limited benefits of this bill as it comes from conference.

Mr. President, a 2-year wait for a person 70 years old who is on relief and who is living in conditions of poverty is an exceedingly serious and cruel punishment to inflict upon that person. And the consolation that they will not wait forever will not be true of those who do not survive those 2 years.

The obvious answer, I suspect, that might be made to this statement is the fact that they are waiting 2 years as their contribution and as their sacrifice to the expenses of maintaining the war in Vietnam. I fail to see why it should be placed on the shoulders of this particular group of aged Americans.

We all listened to the impassioned words of the President of the United States—those eloquent words—in his state of the Union address. To remind the Senate, I will read what the President said:

> I have not come here tonight to ask for pleasant luxuries and for idle pleasures. I have come here to recommend that you, the Representatives of the richest Nation on earth, you the elected servants of the people who live in abundance, unmatched on this globe, you bring the most urgent decencies of life to all of your fellow Americans.
>
> There are men who cry out that we must sacrifice. Well, let us rather ask them, Who will they sacrifice? Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning, or the sick who need medical care, or the families who dwell in squalor that are now brightened by the hope of home? Will they sacrifice opportunity for the distressed, the beauty of our land, the hope of our poor?

Those were glowing words, and the question propounded to the Congress was a mighty question: Whom shall we sacrifice? And now we have the answer. We will maintain all of the benefits scattered throughout this Nation by the myriad programs of the Great Society. Those will not be sacrificed. We shall have, as the President has declared, both guns and butter, because this great, rich Nation can afford both guns and butter. The only ones we are going to sacrifice is that little group of aged people. They are the ones who are being compelled to wait for 2 years, from the age of 70 until the age of 72. Outside of the men who fight, that little group is the first group I have heard designated by this administration and its spokesmen on the floor of the Senate, and even the joint conference of the two bodies of the Congress of the United States, as being compelled to make the sacrifice and wait so we can fight a war.

I do not consider this compromise a satisfactory compromise. I consider that it is one of the most cruel and heartless resolutions I have witnessed since I have been a Member of the Congress. I do not intend, now or hereafter, to have every tax increase, that is requested crammed down my throat on the ground that it is being raised to finance the war effort in Vietnam, because we have had the word—and we have had the word from the most high—that with this burgeoning economy, with the rich resources of this country, we can maintain these humanitarian programs, many of which are essential, all of which seem desirable, but we can maintain them all, and we are not going to defer the glorious benefits of the Great Society for one moment.

The larger portion of the dollars raised under this tax bill will come straight from the pockets of the people who need them most. Whatever we do to corporations taxwise is simply passed on to the consumer. I have heard Senators wring their hands and cry out day after day after day how friendly and solicitous they are about the consumers. Do not forget that a portion of every single dollar that will be realized by this tax increase will be going, if you please, to maintain all these programs of the Great Society.

In general terms, the total cost of the Great Society programs for the coming year, fiscal year 1967, is estimated to be $22.5 billion.

Over the next 5 years, these new domestic programs of the Great Society, more than 50 new and expanded ways of spending money, if they are carried out and if appropriations are made, will cost the taxpayers $98 billion.

Certainly, no one can be critical of all of these programs. Some of them, like water pollution, air pollution, health research facilities, including heart, stroke, and cancer, and mental health, are highly desirable programs. But the bulk of the Great Society spending represents the fluff and frosting of Government beneficence. This type of program will cost the taxpayers more than $19.5 billion next year, and $83 billion over the next 5 years.

The cost of these new and expanded spending programs of the Great Society will be a real factor in the Federal budgets to come, and they will be a real burden on the taxpayers.

I have not heard anybody speaking for the administration who has questioned that directive—that because of the rich resources of this country and because of the booming business conditions in this country and the full employment, we can continue the program and fight the war. If I can understand plain English, most eloquently phrased, that is precisely what the President told us in his state of the Union message, and that is precisely what he has said on every occasion. If that is so, how can anyone justify picking a group of old people who through no fault of their own do not qualify for social security, and insisting that they wait 2 years and insisting further that not at 70 but at 72 this great Government, this great, rich country, able to do all of these mighty things, will then give them not even $44 a month but $35 a month. I cannot comprehend that kind of action.

I wish to suggest, Mr. President, that there were some things said here last Monday that were very illuminating. I recall that the spokesman for the bill, after the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Vermont has been adopted—I suspect rather unexpectedly—stood on the floor of the Senate and, to my amazement, began to talk about that portion of these people over 70 who did not need $44 a month. They were rich. They had millions in income. They were retired bank presidents and retired business executives. It was ridiculous.

Somebody else—I have forgotten who it was—looked at the Senate and said:

> The idea that Senators would vote themselves $44 a month after they are 70 years old when they do not need it.

That is true. That is the gospel truth and I agree with it. But I was amazed to hear it because when we had the medicare bill before the Senate, the Senator from New Hampshire offered a sensible amendment, and others offered similar amendments. We stood on the floor and called for a needs test, not the kind of needs test that sends social workers out to call on oldsters to determine how much they spend each week for tobacco, but simply one providing that those who reported incomes of over a certain amount should not be eligible and would not receive the special health benefits under medicare because they were well able to pay for it themselves.

Now, friends on the other side held up their hands in holy horror. It was absolutely incomprehensible to them that we should suggest such a needs test. There was something degrading about it. It was an insult to those who were poor. It was something we should pull away from and scorn, and they attacked the Kerr-Mills law, which would have gone a long way to take care of the health problems in this country if the bureaucrats had not stifled it and refused to push it. They attacked that law because it did have an income needs test. Do Senators remember that?

Then, all of a sudden last Monday, out of the clear sky, they jump up and say that we should have a means test for this pittance, this minimum allowance that we had the audacity to request for this group of people who were left out. I agree with that. It is a good place to start. We should have started sooner.

We have no need to pay $44 a month or $35 a month to any Member of the Senate who becomes 70 or 72. We have no need to pay a benefit to a retired bank president or anyone who has ample income.

If they meant what they said I wonder why the conferees did not come back to us with the needs test for the $44 a month and the $66 a month for the aged over 70 who are not eligible for social security.

It would have been a compromise and a perfectly sound and just one, as it would have been sound and just in the case of medicare.

The war-on-poverty program carries a needs test. The benefits of the war on poverty have a needs test, which is roughly $3,000 income with a family of four, with some variations. But whatever it is, it was very carefully and thoughtfully worked out to determine who is poor, who needs help, and who should have help.

What in the name of all that is great and good prevented these distinguished conferees for the Senate and the House of Representatives from proposing a needs test when they were worried about the $1 billion that was going to be wasted. Incidentally, I do not accept that figure. I do not accept that figure for many of those who would receive this had already been on welfare and the Federal Government is paying a lion's share of that welfare.

But they could have taken care of all of it. They could have stopped at a billion dollars or three-quarters of a billion dollars or a half a billion dollars. They could have put this money right where it is needed and needed the most by letting them have it at the age of 70 and not after 72, if they live that long; not after the war is won in Vietnam, not by and by, and then only a part of it, by simply turning out their own words when they stood in the center aisle of the Senate and held up their arms and said, "Why, you can't do this thoughtless thing. You have to have a needs test. Why, you can't do that."

Why could they not give us a needs test.

I do not want to vote a cent for someone who does not need it and is not on social security. I see no reason why any Member of the Senate when he passes the required age, with his retirement privileges, should draw a dollar from this amendment to the bill. I see no reason why the wealthy people should participate. It is a simple thing to see that they do not. That is one of the glaring inconsistencies.

I have enumerated other inconsistencies. The first one is that in a situation where it has been declared the national policy that we should have both guns and butter—and that we should not hold up for a moment the great programs of the Great Society—that we should insist on holding up this one benefit to this one small group who need it the most, hold it up for 2 years and then only give them part of it. That is the first inconsistency.

The second inconsistency is on all the discussion about this money going to the rich and that there should be some kind of qualifying test. It is a simple enough matter to write into this bill exactly and precisely the same needs test that is in the war-on-poverty program and give it to them now and not ask that one group to wait for 2 years and then get only a portion of it.

So far as I am concerned, I must say that I am not happy about this compromise brought back by the conferees.

I am sure they did their best. I am not criticizing them personally, of course. But to me, it is not much encouragement. To me it is the most grotesque and inconsistent proposition that I have heard for a long time.

I was not enthusiastic about voting for this tax bill; in fact, I had determined to vote against it. We must face the expenses of the war in Vietnam and I have unhesitatingly voted to meet those expenses. I voted for the military authorization bill to meet our requirements in Vietnam and just last week I voted for the supplemental authorization bill providing foreign aid in southeast Asia. I do not intend to withhold what is needed or to have anybody think for a single moment that the Senator from New Hampshire is not ready to help present a united front to the world, and let the world know that we intend to stand firmly behind the President, now that we are at war, and now that the world is looking at us to ascertain whether this Nation is resolute and determined, or is irresolute and faltering.

But, by the same token, I would rather see the increase in taxes that is coming. I doubt whether a single Member of the Senate, either within sound of my voice or in his office or somewhere else, is not perfectly aware that we shall have further increases in taxes; that they are imperative; that they are a must; and that the increases are coming just as fast as night follows day. We should meet this need head on, not piecemeal.

The subterfuge of reinstating some excise taxes—and excise taxes are a fancy name for sales taxes—is the worst form of taxation, the most unfair form of taxation, in the world. They are pickpocket taxes. They reach into the pockets of the poor and extract pennies from their purses when they do not even know or realize that it is being done.

The taxes are leveled, so far as the world is concerned, at the great corporations, but there is not a corporation that will pay a cent of them. They will pass them on, and the taxes will come out of the homes of the people of the land.

But I finally held my nose and voted for this tax bill, even though I wanted to oppose it for that reason and for the reason that it merely defers the evil day when we shall find out how much money will be needed, when we shall determine an overall policy of authorizing the revenue bills to raise the taxes.

I predict that the day will come when either the President and the administration or the Committees on Appropriations of Congress will decide that we must forgo some of the luxuries of our domestic programs until the war in Vietnam is fought and won.

But I voted for the tax bill. I voted for it because I was so deeply concerned in the Prouty amendment. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Vermont consoles himself with a victory of principle, but that amendment, as I see it, has been emasculated. This tax bill is not merely to raise money for the war. It is designed to raise money for our domestic programs. It does not face head-on the whole tax problem. The Prouty amendment, which was so necessary, has been destroyed.

The Hartke amendment, which would have taken out of the tax bill that part which bears most heavily on those who can afford it least—the local charge for telephone service, which is not a luxury but a necessity—has been thrown out. So far as I am concerned, one feature of the bill has been emasculated; the other has been thrown out.

I shall not go along with either the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] or the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] when the time comes to vote on agreeing to the conference report. I hope we may have the yeas and nays. I want the opportunity to do what I desired to do in the first place, but did not do because of the amendments that I thought were so important. I want the opportunity to vote "nay," and I do not want anyone to try to tell me that when I vote "nay" I am taking the guns out of the hands or the food out of the mouths of the boys in Vietnam, because that is pure hogwash.

The bill provides $6 billion; spread it where they will. It will go into the Treasury; and whatever portion is intended for the war will be allocated for that purpose. More taxes will be coming later. I hope they will be fairer taxes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for making an outstanding statement on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I hope that Senators who were not present will have the opportunity to read it carefully. I hope the press of the country will report it adequately, because it is a statement with which the American people should become familiar.

The so-called Prouty amendment might well be called the Prouty-Cotton amendment, because the Senator from New Hampshire has been by my side fighting for the elderly people this year and in the past. I appreciate his help and support.

While I, too, am dissatisfied with the compromise developed by the conferees, a set of principles has been adopted—a first step down a long, hard road has been taken. The conferees preserved these principles and took this despite powerful pressure from the White House. I frankly say that the conferees deserve great credit for standing up to the Presidential emissaries and withstanding the phone calls from high places which everyone knows were being made right and left. Betty Beale, reported in her society column that the Secretary of the Treasury and top Presidential aids were late in arriving at the Embassy of Kuwait the night my amendment was adopted because of consternation at the White House. Battle plans were being laid against the amendment the very night it was adopted. The conferees overcame great obstacles.

So I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will change his mind and feel that we are doing something for the elderly people, even though it is not by any means nearly enough.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his kind words, which I deeply appreciate. I wish to make it clear that I am not withholding credit from the conferees: I am sure they acted in good faith. I am sure they did the best they could. The conferees stood by their guns—and butter.

I do not know about the telephone calls from the White House; I never received one. But perhaps Senators stood by their guns. Perhaps half a loaf is better than none, even for the group of elderly people who are being left out.

However, I should like to reassure the distinguished Senator from Vermont and tell him something that I think he already knows. Even if we rejected the conference report, we would still have another chance. The Senate could send the report back with a mandate to find a different type of compromise, if we had to have one. But I can reassure the Senator from Vermont that neither his vote nor mine is needed; the majority party has the votes. They will adopt the conference report. All that I ask, all that I hope to get, is an opportunity to make one more speech on the report, and that is to stand up in my place and say "No."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. There is one further amendment in the bill which is most important.

I wish to comment on this amendment to be sure that all Senators understand exactly what we are doing. I refer to the amendment contained in section 301 of the bill, which amendment would disallow certain deductions for certain indirect contributions to political parties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment as approved by the Committee on Finance, by the Senate, and by the conferees, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sec. 301. Disallowance of Deduction for Certain Indirect Contributions to Political Parties.

(a) Disallowance.—Part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 276. Certain Indirect Contributions to Political Parties.

"(a) Disallowance of Deductions.—No deduction otherwise allowable under this chapter shall be allowed for any amount paid or incurred for—

"(1) advertising in a convention program of a political party, or in any other publication if any part of the proceeds of such publication directly or indirectly inures (or is intended to inure) to or for the use of a political party or a political candidate,

"(2) admission to any dinner or program, if any part of the proceeds of such dinner or program directly or indirectly inures (or is intended to inure) to or for the use of a political party or a political candidate, or

"(3) admission to an inaugural ball, inaugural gala, inaugural parade, or inaugural concert, or to any similar event which is identified with a political party or a political candidate.

"(b) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Political party.—The term 'political party' means—

"(A) a political party;

"(B) a National, State, or local committee of a political party; or

"(C) a committee, association, or organization, whether incorporated or not, which directly or indirectly accepts contributions (as defined in section 271(b)(2)) or make expenditures (as defined in section 271(b)(3)) for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the selection, nomination, or election of any individual to any Federal, State, or local elective public office, or the election of presidential and vice-presidential electors, whether or not such individual or electors are selected, nominated, or elected.

"(2) Proceeds inuring to or for the use of political candidates.—Proceeds shall be treated as inuring to or for the use of a political candidate only if—

"(A) such proceeds may be used directly or indirectly for the purpose of furthering his candidacy for selection, nomination, or election to any elective public office, and

"(B) such proceeds are not received by such candidate in the ordinary course of a trade or business (other than the trade or business of holding elective public office).

"(c) Cross Reference.—

"For disallowance of certain entertainment, etc. expenses, see section 274."

(b) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 276. Certain indirect contributions to political parties."

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965, but only with respect to amounts paid or incurred after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I point out that this amendment would prevent using as a deduction any advertising in any publication of a political party. Likewise, in the event of advertising in any other publications the amendment would prevent the taking of a deduction if any part of the proceeds inured, or would inure if there were a profit, either directly or indirectly to the benefit of a political party or a political candidate.

A question has been raised whether this amendment would cover so-called almanacs which are being printed by some parties in different States. A question is raised whether this amendment would cover advertising when turned over to a so-called nonprofit research organization. A question is raised whether it would be permissible to turn the funds over to the so-called voter education clubs. The answer most emphatically, as agreed on by the conferees and by the Treasury Department, is yes, it would cover all procedures that have been used heretofore as well as procedures which might be dreamed up at a later time.

This amendment covers them all. Under no circumstances is advertising in any type of publication by a political party or by some other organization which plans to turn the proceeds over to a political party or candidate to be allowed as a deduction for tax purposes.

To make sure that we covered all of it we said "or similar organizations." We do not intend that there be any loopholes in this law.

The second part of the amendment provides that in the event of charges for admissions or charges for dinners or for programs—such as the $100 dinners or the $1,000 presidential clubs—no deductions may be taken. In all cases where any part of the proceeds inures, or if any part would inure if there were a profit, either directly or indirectly, to the benefit of a political party or a political candidate they cannot be claimed as deductions for tax purposes.

I repeat that if any part of the proceeds were to go either directly or indirectly to a political party or to a political candidate, or if any part were intended to go to a political party or a political candidate if there were a profit, no deduction either for the advertising or for the cost of the tickets, and so forth, may be made. I think that is clear.

The advertising contained in those programs and the purchase of tickets for a dinner are covered and are not permissible deductions for income tax purposes under any circumstances.

The third part of the amendment provided that no deductions are to be allowed for the cost of tickets to inaugural balls, galas, or other similar events. This part of the bill is likewise quite clear.

Let there be no misunderstanding. I call attention to a new suggestion that I have just received and which is likewise covered. This represents an elaborate plan for a new fund raising. A map of the United States was included with the suggestion.

This new proposal points out how $25 million can be raised by having annual White House balls. They have a breakdown to show how much money should come from each of the 50 States.

It is pointed out that this celebration could be held on the birthday of the President. The promotors pointed out that the Republicans could use this same plan to celebrate the birthday of a former President. They suggest a presidential ball at numerous places in the country. The top officials of the parties and other celebrities could attend these celebrations in the various States and raise as much as $25 million for the committee.

This is an elaborate plan, but let there be no misunderstanding—such a plan is covered by this amendment.

A political party may have a presidential ball; however, under this amendment those who attend that presidential ball will pay for the privilege of attending without the benefit of any tax credit or tax deduction. That point should be made very clear.

By selling advertising in the booklet "Toward an Age of Greatness" the Democratic Party raised approximately $1.5 million last year. There was also a campaign brochure issued at the 1964 convention in Atlantic City with a multimillion-dollar advertising scheme. All of the advertising in such booklets or brochures is covered under this amendment and are not deductible. In fact, in my opinion they are not deductible under existing law either. There is complete agreement on the part of the conferees, the Finance Committee, and the Treasury Department as to the manner in which this amendment should be interpreted. Likewise, this amendment does not propose to legalize those old transactions. They can continue to work out their problems with the Department.

I want to make it clear so that we do not pick up a newspaper tomorrow and find some other imaginary scheme whereby someone proposes to finance campaigns out of the Treasury of the United States as a result of Department rulings.

I agree that we do have a duty to find a method by which we can enlarge the source of smaller contributions and will work toward that objective.

In that connection I introduced a bill for our committee study and have submitted it to the Treasury Department. We should make a step in that direction. In that bill I proposed that the first $25 contribution be afforded some form of tax credit. I suggested 70 percent of the first $25 as a tax credit and that consideration be given to affording a deduction for the next $75.

The reason for suggesting a tax credit for the smaller contributors is that those who use the standard deduction and do not itemize deductions would get no credit if some such formula were not provided.

When the representatives of the Treasury Department testified before our committee the Secretary of the Treasury said that the President was interested, and he expected to come up with a legislative proposal to encourage small contributions for political parties in a legitimate way.

We should take some action toward this objective, but let us approach the problem with legislation and not through back-door rulings where one taxpayer gets a deduction and another does not.

We must spell out in the law what is permissible. I did not press for action on this proposal at this time because the Secretary asked that we withhold it with the clear understanding on the part of the committee and the Treasury Department that the administration will be coming before Congress in the near future with a proposal which would expand the source of revenue and make some provision to attract smaller contributions.

Whatever the formula may be, however, whether it be something that I suggest or a plan that the Treasury Department suggests, is immaterial. What is important is that we must spell it out in the law. Let us do it through legislation and not on the basis of which party is able to get a favorable Treasury Department ruling that the other party will not find out about until 6 or 8 months later.

I am getting a little impatient at what has happened. This is the second time it has happened where the Democratic Party has dipped into the Federal Treasury to finance an election. I most advisedly say that the third time it happens I will be a little rougher in my comments than I have been thus far.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill and its legislative intent, and the interpretation of this amendment as prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendment on Indirect Political Contributions

My amendments is designed to clear up the tax treatment of what really are indirect political contributions. It is the committee's view that political contributions either generally should be deductible or not deductible. I see no reason for special treatment just because we call some of them advertising, admissions, or anything else.

Under existing law political contributions generally are not deductible. Nevertheless, it is common knowledge that this rule has, for some time, been circumvented by the simple expedient of framing contributions in the form of purchases of advertising space in various party-sponsored publications. In spite of the obvious transparency of this device, I am informed that it is by no means certain that deductions for such "advertising expenses" will be disallowed. I am not only concerned with the lack of clarity in present law as to the deductibility of these contributions. I am also concerned about the participation of political parties in schemes which by indirection attempt to create tax deductions for payments which, if made directly, would not be allowable.

For these reasons I proposed this amendment to the bill (H.R. 12752) to make it unmistakably clear that political contributions made in the form of advertising, payments for admissions, or payments by other indirect means, are not to be deductible for income tax purposes.

Under this amendment amounts paid for advertising in a political convention program are not to be deductible under any circumstances. In addition, amounts paid for advertising in any other publication are not to be deductible, if any part of the proceeds of the publication inures, directly or indirectly, to a political party or a political candidate. In determining whether proceeds inure to a political party or candidate the use to which they are put by the party or candidate is completely irrelevant. The fact that such proceeds are used by a political party or candidate only for educational and research purposes, or for any other similar purposes, does not make the advertising deductible.

In addition, my amendment specifies that no deduction is to be allowed for the admission charge to any dinner or program, if any part of the proceeds of the dinner or program inures, directly or indirectly, to a political party or a political candidate. A charge for admission for this purpose includes not only amounts paid for the right to attend the event, but also includes any additional amount paid to entitle the person to participate in activities carried on at the event.

My amendment also provides that charges for admission to an inaugural ball, inaugural gala, inaugural parade, or inaugural concert, or to any similar event which is identified with a political party or political candidate are not to be allowed as deductions. This provision applies regardless of the sponsorship of the event or of the disposition of the proceeds. Under this provision, charges for admission to an inaugural ball sponsored by a nonpartisan or bipartisan committee or organization are not deductible. This is true even if the proceeds are used only to defray the expenses of the ball or similar event. The provision applies whether the inaugural celebrated is for a Federal, State, or local official (elected or defeated).

A political party for purposes of my amendment includes (in addition to a political party as commonly understood) a National, State, or local committee of a political party. It also includes any committee, association, or organization, whether incorporated or not, which directly or indirectly accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the selection, nomination, or election of any individual to any elective public office, or the election of presidential or vice-presidential electors. These organizations are treated as political parties whether or not the individual succeeds in being selected, nominated, or elected.

In general, this amendment is patterned after the provision of present law denying deductions for worthless debts owed by a political party. However, it differs slightly to make it clear that (as was intended under the worthless debt provision) it applies to candidates at primary elections.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I repeat—this is not the first time that this has happened. I call attention to one prior incident which happened in the 1948 and 1951 period but which was not discovered until 1958. This situation was corrected by legislation in 1958 and is not a part of this pending legislation. I review this merely to emphasize to anyone in the Treasury Department who on some future occasion may try by rulings to do something that Congress never thought the law intended. I want to impress upon them the importance of coming to Congress in order to change the law and not to attempt to do it in conference with the national committee of either political party.

It was called to my attention around 1958 that large political contributions were being made to the Democratic Party and that the contributions were being written off under the guise of bad debts. These contributions to the Democratic Party before the election were called loans. Of course every political party is out of money by election day. The Treasury Department, after the election ruled that the party had no money and therefore the contributions could be written off as bad debts and would not be subject to a gift tax. There was no basis for any such rulings but they were made and kept secret for nearly 8 years.

I shall put these rulings in the RECORD. By the way, one of these rulings was issued less than 48 hours after it was applied for; the application was mailed from North Carolina, and the ruling was approved in Washington in less than 48 hours, which is an all-time speed record for the Treasury Department. Under this ruling of December 30, 1948, Mr. Richard J. Reynolds was permitted to write off as a bad debt a $310,110.45 contribution which he had made to the Democratic committee in New York.

They said, "Since you can't collect it you write it off as a bad debt, and it will not be subject to a gift tax."

Likewise, Mr. David A. Schulte had contributed $50,000 to the Democratic Party and called it a loan, and on May 18, 1949, he also received a ruling that he could consider it as a bad debt, and it was not even subject to a gift tax. Mr. Marshall Field contributed—or should we say loaned—$50,000 to the Democratic Party, and he too was allowed to classify it as a bad debt, and it was not subject to a gift tax.

I review these old rulings to show just how tax laws can be changed without Members of Congress knowing anything about it. Never again do we want to hear of a secret ruling on political contributions.

Next I read a ruling issued to Mr. William Neal Roach, the assistant treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, Ring Building, Washington, D.C., under date of July 26, 1951:

JULY 26, 1951.

MR. WILLIAM NEALE ROACH,
Assistant Treasurer, Democratic National Committee, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROACH: Reference is made to your letter of July 12, 1951, transmitting a letter from Mr. Wilson Gilmore, president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America requesting a ruling concerning the deductibility by corporations of contributions to the Young Democratic Clubs of America for their convention.

He has stated that such clubs will hold their national biannual convention at the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, Mo., on October 4–6, 1951. In order to defray the large amount of expenses that will be incurred by the convention program, they are seeking contributions. It is stated that it has been their idea to organize a convention corporation under the benevolent corporation laws of Missouri and to obtain a pro forma decree for this nonprofit corporation. Such corporation would be the recipient of all convention funds and would pay all expenses and attend to all other official business of the convention. After the convention such corporation would be dissolved. A ruling is requested as to (1) whether contributions from corporations would be deductible by them for Federal income tax purposes as business expenses if given to the Young Democratic Clubs of America, and in the alternative; (2) whether such contributions would be deductible if given to the proposed convention corporation.

On the basis of the information submitted it is held that contributions for the purposes of the convention made to either the Young Democratic Clubs of America or in the alternative to the convention corporation when organized by corporations engaged in a trade or business in the city of St. Louis and its environs would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23(a) of the Internal Revenue Code in the Federal income returns provided that such donations are made with reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of donations.

Very truly yours,
GEO. J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

I am sure all those who contributed had a reasonable expectation of getting value received in return; most of them were defense contractors. Let us face it, this was just a procedure to shake down some contributors and ease their burden by allowing them to claim their contributions as tax deductions.

Proof that those who made these rulings recognized the impropriety of their actions is evidenced by the fact that they went to such great lengths to keep it a secret for 10 years.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the four rulings to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the rulings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., December 30, 1948.

MR. RICHARD J. REYNOLDS,
Reynolds Building,
Winston-Salem, N.C.
(Attention: Mr. Stratton Coyner.)

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Mr. Stratton Coyner, attorney, dated December 28, 1948, in which it is stated that you have received a final settlement offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York of 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of unpaid demand notes issued by the committee, which you now hold for collection.

A ruling is requested as to whether (1) the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift, and (2) the loss representing the difference between the aggregate face value of the notes and the amount received in full settlement would be considered as a nonbusiness debt.

The letter states that you now hold the following notes of the Democratic State Committee of New York:

Note dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand, signed by Carl Sherman, treasurer, $75,000.

Note dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand, signed by Carl Sherman, treasurer, $100,000.

Note dated October 14, 1944, payable on demand with interest after demand at rate of 1 percent, signed by Carl Sherman, treasurer, $96,000.

Note of Democratic State Committee of New York dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand to Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, endorsed without recourse by the Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, by (not stated in letter), $39,110.45.

The notes presently held by you are represented to have been issued in consummation of a series of transactions involving advances to the Democratic State Committee of New York. In all transactions it is represented that the advances were in the nature of loans inasmuch as notes were received as evidence of the obligations incurred by the committee. The representations in respect of advances made over a period of years extending back to the year 1940, the notes issued in respect of the obligations and the payments made on such notes are fully disclosed in the letter of your attorney.

It is stated in the letter that you were assured at the time the loans were negotiated that repayment of the loans, fully covered by demand notes, would be made on an annual basis. Subsequent events, however, precluded the committee from discharging, as contemplated, the several notes issued as evidence of its obligation to repay the advances made by you. It is stated further that demands have been made at various times for the payment of the notes which have resulted only in the receipt of renewal notes.

The possibility of instituting legal action against the committee, it is stated, was of no avail inasmuch as reducing the notes to judgment and throwing the committee into bankruptcy would have accomplished nothing toward the payment of the obligations. Furthermore, it is stated that the Democratic State Committee of New York has no assets of any consequence, and no uncollected enforcible pledges. A certified page from the official report of the Democratic State Committee of New York dated November 2, 1948, showing the outstanding loans payable by that committee has been submitted and, supplementary thereto, it is stated that the Democratic State Committee of New York has only a small bank balance of less than $5,000 and office furniture for four offices and a reception room in the Biltmore Hotel in New York City.

It appears that your demands for payment of the notes finally resulted in the submission of an offer on the part of the Democratic State Committee of New York to pay in full settlement, in cash, 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of the outstanding notes. The offer is contained in a letter addressed to you under date of December 23, 1948, and signed by Mr. Carl Sherman, treasurer, Democratic State Committee of New York.

In view of the representations and data submitted it is concluded that (1) the acceptance of the offer of the treasurer, Democratic State Committee of New York, would not, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift, and (2) any loss incurred resulting from such acceptance would be considered as a nonbusiness debt within the meaning of section 23(k)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. McLarney,
Deputy Commissioner.

May 18, 1949.

Mr. David A. Schulte
New York, N.Y.
(Care of Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner).

Dear Mr. Schulte: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner dated April 26, 1949, in which it is stated that you have received an offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York, hereinafter referred to as committee, of 10 percent of the face amount of a note of the committee in full settlement thereof. The letter dated April 8, 1949, from Mr. Carl Sherman, treasurer of that committee making such offer was submitted with the letter of April 26, 1949. In the absence of a power of attorney authorizing Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner to represent you this letter is being addressed to you.

A ruling is requested as to (1) whether the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift; and (2) whether the loss incurred by your acceptance of said offer would constitute a nonbusiness bad-debt loss.

It is stated that in 1944 you were asked to lend the committee $50,000; and that you were assured that after the campaign in 1944 the note would be gradually repaid as different finance programs made funds available. The $50,000 was loaned to the committee and you were given a promissory note in that amount. Such note has not been paid, and the committee has informed you that it would be unable to make payment on the note or to its other note-holding creditors, but that it has been promised sufficient money to offer in settlement 10 cents on the dollar to all of its creditors.

The committee has also informed you that its principal creditor, Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, has accepted its offer and received payment, and that Mr. Marshall Field, another noteholder, has also consented to accept the offer.

Based upon the information submitted it is the opinion of this office that acceptance of the offer of the committee will not, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift, and that the loss resulting from such acceptance will be considered as a nonbusiness bad debt within the meaning of section 23(k)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. McLarney,
Deputy Commissioner.

May 18, 1949.

Mr. Marshall Field,
New York, N.Y.
(Care of Mr. Howard A. Seitz).

Dear Mr. Field: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Mr. Howard Seitz, your attorney, dated April 15, 1949, in which it is stated that you have received an offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York, hereinafter referred to as committee, of 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of a note of the committee in full settlement thereof.

A ruling is requested as to (1) whether the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift; and (2) whether the loss thus incurred by your acceptance of the offer of settlement would be considered a nonbusiness bad-debt loss.

It is stated that in 1940 you were asked to lend to the committee the sum of $50,000. The loan was made and you accepted a promissory note. The matter of payment has been discussed with the committee, and the officers of the committee have informed you that they have insufficient funds to make payment. In December, 1948, you were informed by the committee that it would be unable to make payment of the note to you or its other note-holding creditors. You have decided to accept the offer of settlement of 10 cents on the dollar.

You have been informed that Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, the principal creditor of the committee, has already accepted a similar offer of the committee, and that Mr. David A. Schulte, another creditor, has consented to do likewise.

Based upon the information submitted it is the opinion of this office that acceptance of the offer of the committee will not, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift, and that the loss resulting from such acceptance will be considered a nonbusiness bad debt within the meaning of section 23(k)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. McLarney,
Deputy Commissioner.

April 19, 1950.

Mr. Stuyvesant Peabody, Jr.,
Morris Hotel,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Mr. Peabody: Reference is made to your inquiry as chairman of the Chicago Host Committee for National Jefferson Jubilee to be held in Chicago on May 13, 14, and 15, 1950, with respect to whether contributions made to the Committee by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in business in the city of Chicago would be deductible for Federal income tax purposes.

You state that the Chicago Host Committee is playing host to thousands of guests who will participate in extensive panel discussions pertaining to the issues of the day. It is also intended to pay tribute to Thomas Jefferson through parades and pageants depicting his contributions to the welfare of our country. It is expected that the thousands of guests and visitors spending three days in the city of Chicago will bring new money into the community and will benefit the business of the community.

The contributions from local tradesmen are solely intended to defray the expenses to be incurred in playing host and running the above-mentioned functions. It is understood that the contributions referred to in your letter will not be used to defray the expenses of the political aspects of the event.

On the basis of the information submitted, it is held that contributions made to the Chicago Host Committee for National Jefferson Jubilee by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in a trade or business in the city of Chicago would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, in their Federal income tax returns, provided that such donations are made with a reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of the donations.

Very truly yours,

Geo. J. Schoeneman,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is one other ruling which I shall read. This ruling was dated September 22, 1950, and it was solicited by the Republican Committee of New Jersey. Significantly the Republicans received an adverse ruling. I ask unanimous consent that this ruling also be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the ruling was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

September 22, 1950.

Hon. John E. Manning,
Collector of Internal Revenue,
Post Office and Courthouse,
Newark, N.J.

My Dear Mr. Manning: Reference is made to your letter dated September 12, 1950, in which you request advice with respect to a letter from Mr. John J. Dickerson, chairman of the New Jersey Republican State Committee.

In his letter Mr. Dickerson states that the New Jersey Republican State Committee is sponsoring a dinner in Atlantic City on September 30, 1950, and that a question has arisen as to whether or not the purchase of tickets would constitute a deduction for Federal income tax purposes. Mr. Dickerson further states that it is his "understanding of the State law that if the taxpayer can clearly show that the purchase of the ticket was in the ordinary course of business and if his business was benefited thereby, he is entitled to deduct the cost of the ticket as a business expense."

It appears that the view expressed by Mr. Dickerson is based upon his belief that the purchase of the tickets in question may be deducted under section 23(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code as an ordinary and necessary business expense. The application of this provision of the law, however, depends upon the existence of facts which have not been given by Mr. Dickerson, such as the purpose in the purchase of such tickets and the use to which the money so expended will be put. It is well established that political contributions are not deductible. See section 29.23(q)-1 of regulations 111; *Textile Mills Securities Corporation* v. *Commissioner* (1941) 314 U.S. 326, C.B. 1941-2, 201; I.T. 3276, C.B. 1939-1 (pt. I), 108. On the other hand, contributions made by local tradesmen to business or civic organizations for the purpose of attracting and playing host to conventions or similar gatherings which will draw sizable numbers of guests and visitors to the community, may be deducted provided that such contributions are made with a reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount contributed. See section 29.23(a)-13 of regulations 111, and I.T. 3706, 1945, C.B. 87. Accordingly, if the tickets are purchased to support the political aspects of the occasion in question (as distinguished from the business aspects attendant on obtaining new money and customers from the event, regardless of its nature), a deduction is not allowable.

Since the occasion for which the tickets are to be purchased is apparently a political one, it cannot be assumed that the purchase of such tickets by a business concern will give rise to a deduction.

Mr. Dickerson also asked to be advised whether or not a corporation is permitted to purchase tickets. Since this question concerns matters not necessarily in the jurisdiction of the Bureau and detailed information is not furnished, it does not appear to be appropriate for comment by the Bureau.

Very truly yours,

Geo. J. Schoeneman,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall read excerpts from the ruling. This ruling is addressed to the Honorable John E. Manning, Collector of Internal Revenue, Newark, N.J.:

Dear Mr. Manning: Reference is made to your letter dated September 12, 1950, in which you request advice with respect to a

> letter from Mr. John J. Dickerson, chairman of the New Jersey Republican State Committee.
>
> In his letter Mr. Dickerson states that the New Jersey Republican State Committee is sponsoring a dinner in Atlantic City on September 30, 1950, and that a question has arisen as to whether or not the purchase of tickets would constitute a deduction for Federal income tax purposes.

Continuing, I read the next to the last paragraph:

> Since the occasion for which the tickets are to be purchased is apparently a political one, it cannot be assumed that the purchase of such tickets by a business concern will give rise to a deduction.

This ruling was negative, but notice that the rulings for the Democratic Party were all favorable.

At that time in 1958 I asked the Secretary of the Treasury to have his Department check back through the history of that Department and to furnish copies of all rulings that had been made to either political party, regardless of whether they were affirmative or negative, and they were able to furnish only these six rulings, five of them in the affirmative, all to the Democratic Party, and one negative to the Republicans.

This situation was corrected by legislation in 1958, and we thought then that the Democratic Party had learned that it was not to use Treasury rulings to help finance its political campaigns.

At that time I introduced a bill which spelled out that neither Democrats nor Republicans could classify their contributions as bad debts. That bill was passed by the Congress, and I thought we had closed the loophole; but we underestimated the ingenuity of some warped bureaucrat.

In 1964 we found that someone had come up with the ingenious idea that campaign contributions could purchase what they called advertisements, but what I prefer to call shakedowns, at $15,000 a page, and deduct the cost as a business expense. Their names were printed in the book called "An Age of Greatness" and in the 1964 Democratic Convention programs.

It is lucky they did not go higher than $15,000. If a company has a multibillion-dollar defense contract, why not $50,000 or $100,000? There is nothing sacred about the amount when a corporation is confronted with a shakedown.

We understand that these so-called advertisers, too, were given to understand that they could write such expenditures off as a business expense for income tax purposes.

Before I leave the subject I regret to say that after the success of these two money-raising schemes had been demonstrated by the Democratic Party some in our own party thought, "Here is a rather neat idea; all that is wrong with it is that we didn't get into it first," and as a result an effort has been made by some Republicans to use this same devious device. I said then and I repeat now, you do not correct an error by copying a wrong that has been done by the other party. The only way to correct a wrong decision is to stop it—spell out in the law that neither party can do it; and that is what we have done in this bill. The Senate Finance Committee, the Treasury Department, and the conferees are unanimous in agreement that this was an ironclad amendment, and it is intended to be interpreted as completely closing this loophole. I do not intend that there be any misunderstanding in the days to come. In 1958 we corrected the bad debt rulings, and today we are correcting another highly irregular procedure of allowing contributions to be called advertisements. As one who introduced both bills in this connection, I close with this advice. If anyone has any ideas as to how the law should be changed in the future let him spell it out in a legislative program and send it to Congress so that every taxpayer in America, I do not care whether he be Republican, Democrat, or independent, will know exactly what the rules are.

As I say, this is the second time such an incident has happened, and I most respectfully suggest that it would not be wise for it to happen a third time. If a doubt arises as to how the law should be interpreted let the Treasury Department come to Congress or to the Joint Committee on Taxation and obtain a clarification as to the congressional intent. Frankly I do not think this was a misunderstanding in the first place; I consider it a deliberate attempt to finance a political campaign out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wonder whether the Senator could answer this kind of inquiry: Would an advertisement in any kind of pamphlet published by an organization such as COPE also be nondeductible under the terms of the amendment, COPE being not directly a political party; but is the amendment designed to cover that kind of organization as well?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That question has been raised before, and the answer again is yes, advertisements in any program are not deductible when any part of the proceeds may be used to help any political party or candidate. The amendment spells out very clearly that any organization is covered when any part of the proceeds derived therefrom accrue to the benefit of either political party, or if they are intended to accrue in the event there is a profitable operation. So that the answer is that this amendment covers any and all organizations when any part of the proceeds accrue or are intended to accrue either directly or indirectly to the benefit of a political party or to a political candidate.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to express my appreciation to the Senator for asking me that question. I meant to mention it before because I, too, have received a letter raising the same question. The answer is that it does not make any difference who sponsors the affair. If any part of the proceeds of the advertisements, either directly or indirectly, is directed to the support of a political party or any candidate they are covered by this amendment and are not deductible.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of asking for the yeas and nays on the conference report?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for that purpose.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. One final point, the question has been asked, would the so-called almanacs, newspapers, and so forth, that are published in various States by political parties be covered, and the answer again is "Yes." Likewise, it covers voter education and research committees and any other label that may later be designated. We have tried to think of all the various ingenious proposals that have been mentioned as well as any new labels that may later be coined. To the best of our ability we have covered them all.

I want to express my appreciation to the Senate, to the members of the Senate Finance Committee, and to the conferees for their cooperation in having this amendment approved.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would feel remiss if a yea-and-nay vote was called on this particular conference report without expressing my commendation to the Senator from Vermont for his untiring efforts in behalf of a large number of our citizens—a substantial group who have been ineligible heretofore for coverage under the social security system. This has been a problem with which the Finance Committee has wrestled for many years.

I remember that last year, under the Revenue Act, we covered 370,000 persons. Three hundred and thirty-five thousand were based on a three-quarters coverage. There has been a lot of discussion in the Senate about the Prouty amendment and the fact that we have covered persons who have not paid into the social security fund.

In order to keep the record straight, the 335,000 persons whom we covered last year with three-quarters coverage, paid an average of $1.50 per person.

In this particular bill we cover 370,000 at a cost of $125 million, without any charge to the Federal Treasury.

There are still a few hundred thousand citizens in this Nation who are still ineligible for social security, for the reason that they were not eligible to apply at the time the act was passed. Of the 370,000 covered under the Prouty amendment, 335,000 are covered for the full $35 per month, and 35,000 are for a portion of the $35 per month. Under this proposal, a husband and wife can draw a total of $52.50, $35 for the husband and $17.50 for the wife—or reversed, if that should be the situation in the instances that this would apply.

It is interesting to note that two-thirds of those covered under the Prouty amendment are women. Not only that, 80 percent of them are widows. There has been a lot of talk in the Senate this afternoon, and in previous sessions of the Senate, about these people. I am not happy about the amounts. I wish it were more. But I believe that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is entitled to a great deal of credit for starting out on a program of this kind. I hope that the Senate in the future will increase the amounts, which I believe to be niggardly amounts, but at least it is a start. There are still several hundred thousand citizens, who should be qualified, and who would have been qualified had they had an opportunity to comply with the law.

Mr. President, again I say that the Senator from Vermont is entitled to great commendation for his efforts.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I take the floor partly to make sure that I am completely accurate in my thoughts regarding this bill.

It is my understanding—and I would ask the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] if he would be kind enough to try to give me the answers, as the Senator in charge of the bill—that the major portion of the revenues which the Government anticipates raising will come from the acceleration of payments in the income tax; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; the Senator is correct. Similar steps have been taken in the past under the both Democratic and Republican administrations.

Mr. DOMINICK. Let me say to the Senator in charge of the bill that I appreciate his frank answer.

We used this approach in our State at one point, under a Democratic Governor and we later referred to this approach as "Golden Gimmick No. 1." The Governor followed this golden gimmick with a couple of similar schemes. The net result of these schemes was a subsequent tax increase on individuals and corporations.

Obviously, the problem with this approach is that we get the revenue up to a high level by accelerating as much of the income tax as we can, then in order to keep up that high level of revenue, we have to raise the tax rates. We then come back to a situation which we might as well face now, where it becomes necessary, if we are going to have to do it, to raise taxes.

The other major portion of revenue is going to be raised in this bill by an increase of excise taxes on telephones and automobiles; is that not accurate?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. From the taxes on telephones and new automobiles.

Mr. DOMINICK. Again, I appreciate the frank answer of the Senator in charge of the bill. I would say that, here again, we are restoring a tax on which we have spent literally months and years trying to eliminate; a tax which was originally imposed as a wartime tax. The Senator from Indiana offered an amendment eliminating the local tax on telephones which carried, but was eliminated from the conference report. It is my understanding that at no time did the administration oppose putting excise taxes on what might well be considered luxuries instead of necessities. I am talking about the tax on cabarets. I am talking about all kinds of luxuries which could be classified as luxuries in time of war. That is what we are in now—a period of war. It seems to me that to put the taxes on some necessity items as opposed to luxury items without taking real cognizance of what is needed in the income tax field, is a shortsighted approach.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his answers.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we have reduced taxes by over $20 billion in the period 1962 through 1965. Despite this very large reduction, our revenues in the fiscal year are estimated at $98.8 billion, higher than in any prior year. This was in no small part due to the fact that these tax reductions brought better business conditions and more employment, more income and more profits than would have been true in the absence of these bills. These reductions have brought the growth to our economy—which we must in this bill keep under control—which will reoccur in future years. The so-called "one-shot" revenue gains in this bill, together with the other revenue raised in this bill we hope will be sufficient to tide us over to the time when the continuing growth in our revenues will again be adequate to meet budget requirements.

Let me say that we predicted an increase in revenues as a result of those prior bills, and such revenues did materialize to an even greater extent than predicted. The only part we could not predict was the great increase in expenditures required because of the war in Vietnam. This bill is intended to provide such revenues to the extent needed to meet the added military expenditures in the period immediately ahead. It is hoped—although I cannot know whether they will be enough—that the growth in revenues occurring in the period after this "one-shot" gain wears off, will provide the additional funds needed at that time without further tax increases.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because Senator SMATHERS is necessarily absent, he has asked me to make the following statement, which he has prepared, in support of the conference report on the Tax Readjustment Act of 1966.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS READ BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance for his able presentation of the conference report on this important tax bill. As one of the conferees on this bill, I can tell the Senate of the difficult position we were in, having to argue for nontax amendments added to the bill by the Senate. There were 36 amendments added to this bill in the Senate. The Senate was forced to recede on only three of them. On another, we effected a compromise.

The amendment we compromised was offered on the floor by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. It would have provided minimum social security benefits for persons who attain age 70 without requiring that they have prior covered employment. Without going into the details of the Prouty amendment, let me state that the House conferees were strongly opposed to this amendment for several reasons. First, they insisted it was not germane. They felt we had no right to amend a tax bill with nontax amendments. Secondly, they felt the amendment went too far in providing benefits for those who did not need them. Thirdly, they insisted it cost too much. Fourthly, they pointed to problems we had not faced when we acted on the Senator's amendment.

Despite this, the distinguished chairman of the committee insisted that he would not take a bill back to the Senate which did not contain benefits for our older citizens. Fortunately, there was some support among the House conferees for amendments of the type approved by the Senate. With this breach in their ranks we were able to work out provisions which go a long way toward filling the need upon which the Prouty amendment was premised.

Under the conference agreement, persons who reach 72 before 1968 are going to be assured a pension under the social security program of $35 a month, even though they have no prior work experience in covered employment. If a married couple is involved, the combined pension under the substitute will be $52.50. To make certain that these benefits go only to those who are in greatest need, the conference substitute provides that the $35 amount or the $52.50 amount will be reduced by amounts these persons may already receive under other Federal, State, or local retirement programs. This is the biggest single difference between the Senate amendment and the conference substitute. Benefits under the Senate amendment would have been in addition to other payments the elderly person might be receiving, while the conference agreement makes the new benefit available only where there is no other governmental pension available, or where the other benefit is quite small.

The principal amendment on which the Senate conferees had to yield was offered in the Senate by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. It would have left the telephone tax at 3 percent on local residential service while permitting a tax of 10 percent on business calls and on long-distance service. The House conferees refused to accept this amendment for two important reasons. First, they would not permit the revenue under their bill to be depleted by the $315 million involved under this amendment. Secondly, they felt a 2-bracket tax system for telephone service raised problems for both the telephone companies and their subscribers, as well as for the tax collector. They insisted such a tax system would be administratively difficult and set bad precedents. Because of their strong position on this amendment and because of our insistence for preserving some social security benefits for our aged citizens, the Senate conferees were compelled to yield on this telephone tax.

I need not go into the other changes made by the conferees—the chairman has ably described them. Let me just add that, on balance, I believe the Senate will agree that the Senate conferees did a remarkable job of retaining important elements of the Senate's most important amendment—social security for our needy elderly citizens.

Like the chairman, I urge the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I support the conference report on H.R. 12752, the proposed Tax Adjustment Act of 1965.

The purpose of this act is to provide revenue of approximately $6 billion which is needed for the war in Vietnam. The provisions to raise these funds should be voted, but in my view, it would have been better if the President had proposed a general tax measure for consideration by the Congress.

I say this, because if the war continues, I believe it will be necessary to provide additional revenues through a broader measure of tax adjustment. Also, I do not think it entirely fair to consider adjustments piecemeal and thus impose the burden on some groups rather than others.

When the bill was before the Senate last week, I voted for the amendment which would have exempted local telephone calls and local residential service from the reimposition and payment of additional excise taxes. It would have reduced these additional revenues, but the telephone is a necessity and not a luxury. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, and I am sorry it has been stricken in conference.

Now I would like to speak of the Prouty amendment to provide monthly benefits to older citizens who are not presently included in the social security system. I have wanted to see a change to provide this coverage, and last year when the Congress enacted new social security benefits in a bill I spoke and voted for, I supported the Prouty amendment in a vote in the Senate because I thought it just and needed. Important also, the amendment offered last year provided funds to pay for the benefits.

Last week, when this tax adjustment bill—a bill to provide revenues to carry on the war in South Vietnam—was before the Senate, I voted against the amendment offered by Senator PROUTY because it did not provide revenues to pay the cost. The cost would have come from taxes being levied especially to support our men who are fighting in Vietnam, and I did not feel it would have been responsible to vote new benefits without a means of payment.

I said at the time in the Senate, that if the House agreed to provide funds to pay for new benefits, so that an amendment to extend social security coverage would not cripple the war effort, I could vote for the Prouty amendment and for its benefits as I have done in past years.

The tax adjustment bill has now been reported back to the Senate after a conference with the House, and the House has agreed to provide a means of paying the cost from social security funds. The cost of extending this needed coverage to our older citizens who are 72 and over will not reduce the revenues to be raised by this bill for the requirements of the war in Vietnam in 1966 and 1967, and payments from the trust fund will be replaced in coming years.

I believe the bill reported from the conference meets the purposes I have discussed, and I will vote for it, and for the amendment which will provide social security benefits to our older citizens who are not presently eligible for benefit payments under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

The chief feature of this amendment to provide coverage for our older citizens in this bill is a monthly payment of $35 to persons who are 72 or older, or who reach the age of 72 before 1968. In the case of a husband and wife who are qualified, payments will be $35 for the husband and $17.50 for the wife, and they will begin on October 1, 1966. In the case of persons receiving benefits under other social security and retirement programs, the payments will amount to the difference between the new benefits and the amounts already being received.

I shall explain other helpful provisions of the bill to the people of my State of Kentucky, but I note the chief advance is the provision of monthly benefits to many thousands of people who could not qualify for coverage under social security and who deserve the benefits which will be provided by the provisions of this bill. The funds have been provided for these monthly payments in the bill before the Senate today, and I am happy to vote for the tax adjustment bill with the amendment providing monthly benefits for our older citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—5

Cotton
Dominick
Hickenlooper
Miller
Morse

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McGee
McNamara
Murphy
Pearson
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Smathers
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the successful adoption of the conference report on the Tax Readjustment Act marks another fine achievement for the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. Its clearance today for the President's signature has been achieved in large measure by his effective leadership and his profound understanding of the Nation's financial structure.

As much as anyone, he is devoted to achieving effective and constructive tax measures, and we are indebted to him for his unfailing and undaunted efforts in doing so.

Additionally, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is to be highly commended for his significant role in achieving success at last week's conference. He is always a tireless worker on behalf of fiscal matters, and we are grateful for his splendid assistance and unsurpassed cooperation.

To all members of the Committee on Finance, the Senate and the Nation as a whole, owe a debt of gratitude for expediting action on this vital legislation.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for the balance of the day and the balance of the week, if he can tell me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the questions raised by the distinguished minority leader, I believe the yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion to recommit the pending business, which is under the managership of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. We hope to dispose of this bill shortly. If the Senate would bear with me we would like to take up the conference report on the economic aid bill, which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is ready to present for consideration.

Then, I would like to have the Senate go over until Thursday. There will be a short meeting on Thursday, and if things work out we would go over from Thursday until Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be no business on Thursday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whatever legislation is on the calendar. There is not too much.

I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator say that we are going to take up the conference report on the economic bill on southeast Asia?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator be interested in a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. I would not wish to transgress upon the desires of anybody else in the Senate, but so far as I am concerned, the conference made it a much worse bill and did not help it. I opposed it. I made my case against it. It would take me 10 minutes to pay my disrespects to the bill. Any unanimous-consent agreement that gives me 10 minutes will be agreeable with me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall do that at the appropriate time.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the conference report comes up, there be 20 minutes for its consideration, 10 minutes to a side, with 10 minutes under the control of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and 10 minutes under the control of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not want the agreement reached before I mentioned the fact that I am so agreeably astonished by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and by his magnificent tolerance this afternoon on taking only 10 minutes on the conference report, that perhaps we ought to give him a vote of thanks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am very appreciative.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. We could not hear the majority leader very well. There will be no session on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the present intention; to go over until Thursday, clear up the calendar that day, and go over until Monday. That is the intention at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the intention with reference to taking up the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The present intention is to take it up on Monday.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2499) to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am going to take a very short time, only a couple of minutes, to discuss the bill. But I have to clear the record because it has been confused by opponents of the bill who want to recommit it.

It was argued that Congress will lose control of SBA appropriations and authorizations, that Congress will lose control of this program if it is recommitted.

I wish to make it crystal clear that this is not so. The hearings emphasize this. I wish to read a short part of the hearings. This is testimony from the head of the SBA. I will read four short paragraphs.

> While participations sales by SBA would reduce the need for additional appropriations to the revolving fund and for increased statutory authorization for such appropriations, the agency would still be required to regularly obtain legislation to increase its loans authorized to be outstanding. As you know, section 4(c) of the Small Business Act contains two limitations on loan amounts which may be outstanding at any one time from the revolving fund.
>
> One of the limits pertains to the aggregate amount of business and disaster loans outstanding under the Small Business Act, and the other limit is on the total outstanding amount of loans under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.
>
> SBA guarantees of loans are included in these limits, and no loans or guarantees may be made in excess of the limits, regardless of the amount which may be available in the revolving fund.
>
> These restrictions, of course, would not be changed by the participations legislation. Accordingly, any funds raised by SBA through participation sales could not be utilized for additional loans except as permitted by these restrictions, which can only be raised by congressional action.

There is one other point. Questions which I put to the head of the SBA make this clear.

> Now to put my question another way, does a small business loan made under section 7(a) still count as a charge against the $1,375 million loan ceiling even when it has been put in a pool under paragraph 10 or an FNMA trust under paragraph 11 as security for the sale of participation certificates?
>
> In other words, the insertion of paragraph 10 and paragraph 11 in section 5(b) as provided in S. 2499 would not amend or change in any way the ceilings imposed by section 4(c) on loans made under sections 7 and 8? And the same principle would apply to the ceiling of $461 million on loans to SBIC's and development companies?

This was the answer by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Ross Davis:

> I would like to state as clearly and precisely as I possibly can that the aggregate outstanding limitations specified in section 4(c) cannot and will not be exceeded by the sale of participation certificates.

What that means, simply stated, is that it will still be up to the Committee on Banking and Currency to determine how much the SBA can loan. Included on that committee are the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I submit that it would not be possible to find five Senators who have a clearer or a better notion of economy and who will insist more earnestly on economy and careful scrutiny when this matter comes before the committee.

One concluding note: This is urgent legislation. The SBA has not been able to process a loan since October. If the Senate recommits the bill, it will mean that it will be, in my judgment, months before the SBA will be able to move ahead, as it should move ahead, to provide necessary credit to deserving small business. Congress intended this when it passed the Small Business Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator from Wisconsin tell me how, in principle, this program differs from the program that the Eisenhower administration submitted in 1959, as I recall, for the sale of FNMA mortgages, which required a certain adjustment of interest? I voted against that procedure then. I seem to feel that this proposal may be similar to that. How am I to reconcile voting for this proposal when I voted and worked against the proposal of 1959? The Senator is familiar with what I am talking about, is he not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. It is my understanding that this proposal is a sale of participation, while in 1959 it was a sale of mortgages.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But what is the difference? In that case, we objected that it was a taking of a loss by the Government; that it was merely a budget gimmick to make the budget of the Eisenhower administration look better than it ought to by the sale of mortgages at a discount. If this proposal is the same as that was, how will I explain why I voted as I did that time, and voted the other way this time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The principle is similar, but I believe the situation is quite different now. The SBA is in great difficulty. The SBA needs the money now. This is a matter of providing an opportunity to SBA to get funds in the future. The SBA, eight times since 1956, has had to interrupt its loan program because it did not have funds available. This bill will make it possible for SBA in the future to make loans that are authorized to be made by law. In 1959, there was no similar urgency for FNMA's sale of mortgages.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What bothers me is that I am for the SBA, but I do not feel that there is any virtue in being inconsistent in matters of this kind. It seems to me that I would just be varying my position according to which party was in control of the executive branch of the Government. That is all that bothers me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I can only say to the Senator from Arkansas that he knows Emerson's quotation as well as I do.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that in this instance the Small Business Administration has an inelastic, overall limitation which it cannot exceed, notwithstanding this provision, whereas that was not the case with reference to FNMA?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is an excellent distinction and is true.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Speaking of poets, I am sure the Senator remembers Walt Whitman's poem:

> Do I contradict myself?
> Very well then I contradict myself,
> (I am large, I contain multitudes.)

The difference is that this is a proposal of the Democrats. That should be sufficient for anybody.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey; but there are other differences.

The Senator from Arkansas just asked: Does that mean that this time the Senator from New Jersey is going to be consistent and vote for the bill?

Mr. CASE. I am going to vote with the Democrats this time. I voted with the Republicans the last time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is consistent.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator said there were certain built-in restrictions in making new loans out of the pooled fund. What are those restrictions? He did not state what they were. He stated there were restrictions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The restrictions are the authorization ceiling contained in the Small Business Act.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, the SBA cannot make new loans out of pooled funds above the authorization ceiling?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. The authorization ceiling is over $1 billion. The SBA is going to refinance a billion dollars, so it can make a billion dollars worth of new loans?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is a ceiling right now, at the present moment. The SBA is right now close to the level of the ceiling. It cannot make additional loans. It is at the ceiling. The Senate passed a bill (S. 2729) which increases the ceiling by $125 million.

Mr. JAVITS. But if the SBA gets the proceeds of the FNMA notes, can it not make the loans out of that fund?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It cannot make loans out of proceeds above the ceiling level.

Mr. JAVITS. Unless the ceiling is increased?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Unless the ceiling is increased by the action of Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Suppose the loans are repaid by the small business concerns and the SBA then lends that money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That money can be loaned, yes.

Mr. JAVITS. It can be loaned?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. That is true now.

Mr. JAVITS. Therefore, if the SBA cannot lend money above the ceiling, what good would it do to provide new money by this transaction?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It means that Congress, acting through its Committees on Banking and Currency, can provide authorization increases to enable SBA to proceed at a rate fixed by Congress by these ceilings. The Senate just last week passed S. 2729 which increased the ceiling by $125 million. It also provided for a necessary increase in the ceiling for SBA's need through fiscal 1967.

Mr. JAVITS. Congress would then have to increase the authorization?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. The House must now act on the Senate bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Beyond how much—that is, the increase in the House bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I said, the Senate has approved additional authorizations of $125 million in the regular loan account, which is a sizable amount.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Massachusetts has the figure, but I wish to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question. Would the Senator give us the figure?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The current authorization, with the increase we have already authorized this year, is $1,841 million.

Mr. JAVITS. How much of that would be available out of new loans—if the House passed the bill—out of funds that would come out of FNMA?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The bill we passed increased that by the amount that is now available—by $125 million. The Senator from Massachusetts placed those figures in the RECORD earlier.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the figure?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At the present time, the current authorization ceiling is $1,841 million. The amount appropriated for the revolving fund is $1,805 million, leaving a differential of $36 million.

Outstanding at the moment, under the revolving fund, is $1,729 million, which leaves the balance in the revolving fund, as of the end of February, of $76 million.

Mr. JAVITS. So $76 million would be added to the $125 million?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No.

Mr. JAVITS. And SBA could lend $200 millions?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No.

Mr. JAVITS. Then let us understand what we are doing here.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They cannot go over the ceiling.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand; but we are trying to find out whether what we are doing will provide the SBA with money to lend, absent the repayment of previous loans. The Senator says it will. I am trying to find out by how much.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The differential in the appropriations fund requested is $36 million. So the authorization today is $36 million above appropriations to date.

Mr. JAVITS. To which there has been added $125 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, the $36 million already takes account of $125 million. Can the Senator tell us how much money the SBA will be able to lend in new loans if this bill passes?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This bill will provide an opportunity for the SBA to sell participations, so that it will be possible for it to lend additional money without going through the appropriations process.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand, but to what extent. The Senator said there are some controls built in by Congress——

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Congress built in controls by setting an authorization ceiling.

Mr. JAVITS. But how much?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This bill does not provide a penny of additional authorization.

Mr. JAVITS. Out of the money the SBA gets from FNMA, it can only lend $36 million. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. I am trying to find out what is proposed to be done by the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They can loan up to their authorization which is, as the senior Senator from Massachusetts has said, $1.841 billion. Does that answer the question of the Senator from New York?

Mr. JAVITS. It does not answer the question. The Senator states that they have already loaned up to that figure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator want the differential?

Mr. JAVITS. If this money is granted out of FNMA bonds, how much money can the SBA loan?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield ?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not all of the participation certificates that can be sold, whatever volume is sold?

Mr. PROXMIRE. SBA may only lend up to the authorization provided by Congress, which is now $1.841 billion.

Mr. COOPER. However, they could sell participation certificates up to $1.841 billion. This bill would provide $1.841 billion for loans.

Mr. JAVITS. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. This bill will only provide for the sale of participation certificates. The proceeds of these certificates will be available to SBA for relending but only up to the amount of the authorization ceilings.

Mr. JAVITS. I think that none of us knows what the SBA would be in a position to do if we pass the bill. I do not see how we can legislate in that kind of darkness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I think I can answer the question of the Senator from New York. At the present time there is $76 million remaining in the revolving fund. That has been appropriated. Then, under the new authorization, there would be another $36 million for which there is no appropriation. If we add $76 million and $36 million, we have $112 million, if my addition is correct, which the Small Business Administration can loan under the bill, of which $36 million would be through the FNMA process and $76 million would be from appropriations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we had better understand the situation or the Senate will pass a bill without knowing what the bill would do. I do not think that anyone wants to do that.

The Senator said that it would be $76 million plus $36 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. There would be $850 million for 1967 and $350 million for 1966. It would be $1,200 million, if my arithmetic is correct. Which figure is correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York is correct that it is contemplated that in fiscal years 1966 and 1967 a total of $1.2 billion of participations will be sold. This does not mean that SBA could lend this whole amount. The figures cited by the Senator from Massachusetts involve the amount presently available to SBA for lending, $76 million and $36 million which has been authorized by Congress to be appropriated but for which request has not been made by the Administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator have the information as to how much is presently loaned?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We do not have that information at the moment.

Mr. JAVITS. Is any limitation contained in the bill as to the amount which FNMA can in effect guarantee? I notice that it is stated to be $350 million and $850 million for a total limitation of $1,200 million, or is it completely open end?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is not open end. The limitation would be $1,841 million. The present limitation on business and disaster loans is $1,375 million. Of the remaining $461 million is the SBIC limitation and $5 million from the loan guarantee program. That would be the limitation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask what seems to me to be a simple question. They have available under their authorization now $1,841 million. However, they have loaned close to that amount.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let us say that they have used close to the authorization.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Securities would be sold, and let us assume that they would get $1.8 billion from investors for those securities. What would be done with the $1,841 million that they would receive?

Mr. PROXMIRE. They can do nothing with it until they get authorization. They can then loan out as much as Congress agrees that they can loan. The present plan is for $350 million for this fiscal year and another $850 million for the next fiscal year. However, that would require additional authorization.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Why do we need this bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We need this measure because we have had difficulty in the past in going through the authorization and the appropriation process. All this measure would do would be to make it unnecessary to have that double process in order to make these loans.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I just understood the Senator to say that it would require an additional authorization to make the loans?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. However, it would not require an additional appropriation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It then appears to be in the nature of backdoor financing to avoid the appropriation process.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Iowa is correct, and we have had that precedent.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think this is a glowing example of why this bill must be sent back to the committee for clarification and understanding.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he can assure the Senate that the SBA will breathe again if the bill passes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Small Business Administration urgently needs this legislation. We believe that it will help out.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with the cooperation of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] I move that the bill be recommitted. I do so for two very simple reasons. In the first place, this would be back-door financing as we know it. It would take away from Congress the responsibility for appropriating funds for small business loans. It would give authorization and that is all it would give. There is a limitation to the authorization, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. By creating these certificates through FNMA, the financing of this authorization can be done through the guarantee of FNMA. FNMA has an open door on the Treasury of the United States.

I shall not make a long speech. However, I believe we should not take away from ourselves the responsibility of appropriating the funds. I believe that we should keep our eyes on the Small Business Administration.

As a supporter of the Small Business Administration and as a member of that committee, I believe we should send this bill back to the Committee on Banking and Currency so that it can be further studied.

I call attention to the fact that the proponents of this bill say that there will be other bills to provide for other agencies to come in with new legislation and seek to have the FNMA back their authorizations.

If we pass this bill, we will create a precedent for other agencies to come in under FNMA. FNMA was created for loans to homeowners for houses. We gave FNMA back-door financing into the Treasury. We do not want to increase that procedure unless we want to give up the responsibility that we have for appropriating funds of the Government.

I hope that the bill is recommitted, not for the purpose of eliminating the measure, but to give the measure more consideration than has been afforded to it at this time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, during this rather heated and many-sided discussion, I think we have probably lost track of what we are doing. Since I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and one of those whom the Senator from Wisconsin said would be sure to be present at the hearings to look after the problem if it came up again, I should like to address a question or two to the Senator from Wisconsin.

I am just as anxious as is the Senator to get this mixup concerning the authorization and appropriations straightened out.

Let us assume that approximately $1,841 million has been authorized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. $1,841 million is the present total authorization ceiling.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not concerned about how much of the amount has not yet been committed. If this bill passes, let us assume that it has all been committed. There would be a $1,841 million authorization and $1,841 million loaned. We are not worried about any margin that would be left. If we pass this bill, this would give the Small Business Administration the right to turn part of its loans into money by selling participation certificates with those loans as collateral.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Suppose they were to sell $1 million in participation certificates. Is it the point of the Senator that this would not increase the ceiling on the loans that they can make?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would not increase the ceiling. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, even though they now have $1 million in their hands, they could not go out and lend any more money because they have a ceiling that states that they cannot do so.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. All right. Then what are they going to do with the million dollars?

Mr. PROXMIRE. They would go to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and the House and get additional authorization. Otherwise, they could not use it.

Mr. BENNETT. In normal operations, they can come to us now, without this bill, and say, "We need another $1 million authorization; let us have it and we will loan it."

Mr. PROXMIRE. They have, and we have granted that. We have granted them additional money. But in the past they have been required after receiving the authorization to go to the Appropriations Committee. If this bill is passed they will not have to do so.

Mr. BENNETT. But is not the net effect of this bill to give them $1 million, assuming my example, which they cannot use, which they will return to the Treasury, which the administration will then use to offset the necessity of borrowing another $1 million through the ordinary process? So are we not in the business of financing the U.S. Treasury? We are not in the business of helping SBA, because SBA must have authorization to increase its lending limits, anyway. Let us understand what we are voting on.

Mr. PROXMIRE. An increase in authorization is not contained in this bill.

Mr. BENNETT. All right.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The authorization is increased in S. 2729 so that they can make additional loans if this bill passes.

Mr. BENNETT. But that is identical to the bill. We could have a separate bill to increase the authorization.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct; we do.

Mr. BENNETT. The purpose of the bill is not to increase the authorization.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. The fundamental purpose is to give them the right to sell participations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is certainly the principal purpose, that is true.

Mr. BENNETT. And if they cannot lend the money after they get it, they have to give it back to the Treasury, so the Treasury will have it available for other purposes, and we are selling the long-term assets of the Federal Government to apply to this year's budget.

On that basis, I think this is bad legislation, and I hope the motion to recommit will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 51, as follows:

[No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Prouty
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—51

Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McGee
McNamara
Murphy
Pearson
Scott
Smathers
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the bill, as amended.

The committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Russell of South Carolina in the chair). The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2499) was passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] today has won the Senate's high respect for his successful handling of this measure which permits SBA loan participation by the public. We congratulate him for a well-deserved achievement.

His strong advocacy was joined by broad understanding and sincere views which could not have been better articulated. Such a combination assured successful action.

Further commendation is due the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman]. Their constructive assistance is always greatly appreciated.

Also, we appreciate the cooperation generously extended by both the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. In urging their own strong and sincere fiscal views on this proposal, these distinguished Senators joined nevertheless to obtain the Senate's efficient and orderly action. And for that we are always grateful. The same may be said for the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and, of course, for the highly capable ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Small Business the distinguished senior Massachusetts Senator [Mr. Saltonstall] whose cooperative efforts are always exemplary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Hon. Carl Albert, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines;

H.R. 8030. An act to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12752. An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

(To accompany H.R. 12169)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

John Sparkman,
B. B. Hickenlooper,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Thomas E. Morgan,
Clement J. Zablocki,
Edna F. Kelly,
Wayne L. Hays,
Frances P. Bolton,
Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen,
William S. Broomfield,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of this report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, I have received many inquiries as to whether there would be a yea-and-nay vote. Let me say that I have no intention to ask for one.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I wish to speak for 10 minutes to make a record against the conference report.

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, I rise to oppose the conference report. I wish the Record to show a summary of my position. Let me point out to the Senate that the conference report calls for an expenditure of $415 million by way of a supplemental authorization—$275 million to go to Vietnam; $7.5 million to go to Laos; $7.5 million to go to Thailand; $25 million to go to the Dominican Republic; and $100 million for the President's contingency fund.

Mr. President, concerning the $275 million for Vietnam, it is my view that at least half of it will get into the hands of the Vietcong, one way or the other, or be destroyed by them. I cannot imagine how the Senate could vote to waste this much of the American taxpayers' money until we get that war settled.

There is a certain amount of aid that we can provide while the war is going on, but we cannot provide the kind of massive aid which the President is talking about while the war is going on.

In my judgment, if the Senate votes for this conference report, it will be voting to throw away large sums of American taxpayers' money into an area in which it cannot possibly do any good.

Furthermore, let me say that under this administration, a great deal of this money will be used by one of the most corrupt regimes in Vietnam we can imagine. I am satisfied that much of this money will go straight into graft and corruption under the Ky administration in Vietnam.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the committee report on the bill, and let it speak for itself. I am at a loss to understand how the committee could bring this report to the floor of the Senate and then recommend the authorization and appropriation.

The report states, in part:

> Foreign aid should not remain sacrosanct when it comes to apportioning the war's financial costs among Federal activities. Belt tightening because of the war must not be restricted to domestic programs but should include our foreign aid programs as well. American citizens should not be called upon to accept reductions in programs which affect their daily lives, see their taxes increased and war costs spiral, while the foreign aid program escapes unaffected and undiminished. A reduction in the aid program will be of help in funding domestic programs proposed to be cut back in fiscal 1967.
>
> The fiscal 1967 appropriations request for economic assistance is $2.469 billion compared

> with a total appropriation for this fiscal year of $2,463 billion, including the funds authorized by this bill. It appears that programs in other countries have not been reduced to compensate for the increased program in Vietnam. The committee expects that the reduction in the total program will take into account the additional assistance provided here for Vietnam and that the executive branch's presentation to the committee will be in keeping with this intent.
>
> The committee in asking that budget presentation reflect an appropriate reduction in the proposed program for the next fiscal year does not wish to imply that further economies are not needed in the program for fiscal 1966.

Mr. President, let me warn the Senate tonight that the administration does not intend to reduce foreign aid by one single dollar, that the administration intends to continue foreign aid—yes, even on an increased basis.

What did I try to do in committee, as many Senators now in the Chamber know? I tried to get some commitment or assurance that we would cut back on foreign aid elsewhere in the world while we pour these hundreds of millions of dollars into southeast Asia. All I got from the committee was language, but not votes.

In my judgment, the committee cannot justify bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate, without first assuring the taxpayers of the country that we are reducing at least an equal amount of foreign aid elsewhere in the world.

Who is responsible for it?

The President of the United States.

What is he up to?

He is up to cutting domestic programs—the so-called Great Society programs—by millions of dollars.

I urge the American taxpayers to hold the President to an accounting for this course of action. The American taxpayers are entitled to have appropriations for domestic programs go forward until there is first a drastic cut in the budget for foreign aid.

This is the time to start.

I am going to vote against the conference report. The Committee on Foreign Relations would not make the start. It gives us only language in the bill, approving the principle of what I assert, but it will not give us a bill which puts that principle into effect.

Listen to what the committee states in the majority:

> The committee is concerned about recent news reports of widespread corruption in Vietnam involving our aid.

So we proceed to give them $275 million more. Continuing reading:

> It is hoped that the program is being policed adequately all the way up and down the line by our officials. Recently the General Accounting Office announced that it will revitalize its investigative activities concerning the AID program in Vietnam and conduct on-the-scene audits.

Mr. President, one of the reasons I am going to vote against this conference report is that I am satisfied the Ky administration is thoroughly corrupt, that we are pouring money into a corrupt administration which we are supporting and which happens to be our puppet administration in South Vietnam.

I say we ought to wait until we settle the war and then provide what is necessary—and I am for it—so we can properly plant the economic seedbed in Vietnam, which would be the best guarantee to check communism in that part of the world. The evidence shows that the Ky government is engaged in corruption. Too much of this aid will get into the hands of the Vietcong. Too much will be captured by the Vietcong. Too many of the economic improvements will be destroyed by the Vietcong.

I think that providing this money is putting the cart before the horse. I do not think we can justify wasting the money of the American people in this way.

I turn now to the Dominican Republic. Twenty-five million dollars is provided to give support to more American wrongdoing in the Dominican Republic. If it were not for the fact that so much of our attention has been directed to Vietnam, and the American people knew what was going on in the Dominican Republic, there would be a hue and cry against it.

Twenty-five million dollars from the United States. What is the matter with our allies in Vietnam? Why is not the Organization of American States willing to put some money toward this $25 million?

I offered an amendment in committee that would have cut $12.5 million from the funds for the Dominican Republic. As I recall, it received three votes.

In my judgment, the expenditure of an additional $25 million in the Dominican Republic cannot be justified. It will greatly change our image in Latin America. Again we are being charged with intervention, and rightly charged, because we are guilty of intervention in the Dominican Republic. We cannot possibly justify our action in the Dominican Republic. I want that dispute put into the hands of the Organization of American States, just as I want the war in Vietnam to be put into the hands of the United Nations and have that organization lay down a commitment for a cease-fire and enforce it against the United States and North Vietnam and the other combatants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take the position that it is time for us to start saving the American taxpayers the millions and millions of dollars that are going to be wasted in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and elsewhere through this authorization bill.

I am sorry to find myself in such disagreement with the Foreign Relations Committee, but when the committee sets forth language that sustains the principles I have been supporting for some time now, without doing a specific thing to start this economy, I find myself standing against the committee. I want this record for future reference so that the American people can know why they are being fleeced of millions of dollars being spent for unwise purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The only difference between the Senate and the House on the aid supplemental was over the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] relating to policies governing AID-financed procurement of iron and steel products for use in Vietnam.

As I stated when the amendment was being considered in the Senate last week, the Committee on Foreign Relations did not have occasion to go into this subject during its work on the supplemental authorization bill. The officials of the Agency for International Development have assured the Senate conferees that new procurement procedures, now being implemented on a trial basis, should be a considerable improvement over the earlier policy, particularly in their effect on the balance of payments.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a memorandum explaining the background of the AID policies concerning this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has always taken a strong interest in AID procurement policies and I can assure the Senate that the subject of the Senator from Indiana's amendment will be considered thoroughly by the committee during its work on the regular AID bill. On behalf of the committee, I wish to express my thanks to the Senator for focusing attention on this problem.

In view of the need for more detailed study of this matter, the Senate conferees agreed to recede with the understanding that the problem will be gone into further during the hearings on the 1967 AID program. The House conferees have also agreed to the need for the Foreign Affairs Committee to study the matter and have pledged that this will be done during their work on the regular program for the next fiscal year.

There was no disagreement as to the importance of taking whatever action might be required to insure that AID procurement policies serve the national interest as effectively as possible.

EXHIBIT 1

AID PROCUREMENT POLICY ON GALVANIZED SHEET AND PIPE FOR VIETNAM COMMERCIAL IMPORT PROGRAM

AID has recently instituted a new set of rules to permit the continued, quick importation of galvanized steel sheets from Korea and other less developed Asian countries (not Japan) into Vietnam, without feeding inflation in Vietnam, and without adversely affecting the U.S. balance of payments or the U.S. steel industry.

Under the new galvanized sheet procurement procedure, the Koreans, Chinese, Filipinos, Malaysians, and Thais will be paid by a special letter of credit restricted not only to U.S. source, but to certain AID codes for iron and steel products and tools with high iron and steel content, plus limited amounts of U.S. scrap. Purchases of scrap are limited, however, to half of the tonnage of Japanese black plate, approximately the amount of scrap required to be used in its manufacture. The restricted special letters of credit will provide new iron and steel business for the United States, which, in the first 10 months of 1965 (latest figures available), for example, supplied only $1.3 million, or 5 percent of Korea's purchases in these categories. (Japan had 79 percent, Western Europe 16 percent.) This new business for U.S. industry should more than offset losses in sales of galvanized sheet. In return, the Asian countries again may utilize Japanese black plate in their manufacturing process.

The background of the new procedure is as follows:

Prior to July 1963, AID policy allowed the developing countries to participate in supplying selected commodities under AID-financed programs without regard to their source or origin. Not only did this usually result in lower costs to AID and to the foreign consumer but it also enhanced foreign exchange earnings by countries receiving U.S. grant aid. During this period, Korea and Taiwan imported Japanese black plate, galvanized the black plate and sold it to Vietnamese importers under the AID-financed commercial import program, resulting in a substantial flow of AID dollars indirectly to Japan.

In July 1963 AID adopted a new procurement policy in order to lessen adverse effects on the U.S. balance of payments. This regulation required that the item procured must come from an eligible source, and limited to 30 percent of the f.o.b. sales price the components of the item which could originate in advanced foreign countries such as Japan. Under this regulation, Korea and Taiwan continued to import and galvanize Japanese black plate for sale to Vietnamese importers under AID financing. The Korean and Taiwanese suppliers contended that less than 30 percent of the components by value, as measured against their final sales price, came from an ineligible source (Japan), particularly since the Japanese black plate was made in large part from U.S. scrap. The dollars earned were free foreign exchange to be expended wherever in the free world Korea and Taiwan chose.

In January 1964 AID modified the 70–30 componentry ratio to 90–10. This made it extremely difficult for the underdeveloped countries to continue their trade in galvanized steel products. As a result, Taiwan terminated export sales to Vietnam in August 1965. Korea continued to import and galvanize Japanese black plate for export to Vietnam, justifying its actions by importing U.S. scrap for delivery to bonded warehouses in Japan for the purpose of making black plate to be shipped to Korea for further processing. AID found it increasingly difficult to police and enforce the 90–10 componentry ratio in connection with these Korean exports of galvanized steel plate and sheets to Vietnam. Therefore, AID suspended shipments of galvanized products under AID financing from Korea to Vietnam. This action seriously troubled the Korean Government which had just sent large contingents of Korean troops to fight in Vietnam and was considering further troop contributions, and deprived Vietnam of a nearby, low-price source of an urgently needed commodity.

After detailed careful investigations, AID developed and instituted the new procurement procedure.

* * * * *

It is estimated that procurement of galvanized steel products directly from the United States would cost at least $30 to $40 a ton more than from the Asian countries under the new galvanized sheet procurement procedure. An alternative would be to require that the Asian countries utilize U.S. black plate in their manufacturing process. However, it is estimated that this would increase the cost of the delivered products by at least $60 a ton. Either increase would have considerable inflationary effect in Vietnam, which will import at least $20 million of these commodities this year under the commercial import program.

Countries other than Korea were included as eligible sources under the new procedure in part to insure competition to prevent possible Korean profiteering. Each of the included countries is supporting in various ways U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

AID believes that the new procedure provides quick, nearby sources of galvanized roofing and pipe urgently needed for Vietnam at a reasonable price, also serving U.S. foreign policy interests, all without damaging either the U.S. balance of payments or the U.S. steel industry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

"HOW EFFECTIVE CAN DEMOCRACY BE?" SPEECH BY GEORGE E. AGREE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by George E. Agree, executive director of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, on the subject "How Effective Can Democracy Be?"

I found it to be such a searching analysis on the subject of democracy that I believe it is deserving of the consideration of all Members of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Speech of George E. Agree, executive director, National Committee for an Effective Congress, at American-German Cultural Center and Library, New York City, March 2, 1966)

HOW EFFECTIVE CAN DEMOCRACY BE?

When I was a boy, my father took me to hear a lecture by Mr. Seger. And it is a great pleasure and honor to share a platform with him now. My distinguished associate in our discussion this evening was then recently arrived in America as a kind of latter-day Paul Revere to spread the alarm that the Nazis were coming.

In the 30 years since that lecture, there have been many changes. Instead of the Nazis coming here, Democrats and Republicans went to Germany. Our western corner of the world is much improved; and I believe that on balance the whole world is in better shape.

But 30 years is a very short time. The cost has been high, and the achievement is precarious. No one who has lived through this time, or who can look ahead to the widening impact of the population, technological, and other explosions of our age, can be overly sanguine about our prospects.

Nevertheless, I believe there is good reason for optimism.

Men of our general appearance and capacity have had a rather long existence on this earth, but only a very short history. What we call civilization—those new activities which began when men for the first time saw themselves, however dimly, as shapers rather than mere clay—is a phenomenon of only the last 8,000 or 10,000 years; that is, of only the most recent 2 percent of homo sapiens' 500,000 years' existence.

But this vision of ourselves spread very rapidly from the middle eastern river valleys in which it first appeared—and today, but for a few isolated remnants of the Stone Age, it is shared to some degree by all mankind.

And the vision has its consequences. Five hundred years ago, men did not even know the shape of our planet. Now we can circle it in 90 minutes and are preparing to land on others. Five hundred years ago, representative government was virtually unknown on this earth. Now more people govern themselves through representative institutions than were alive in the entire world as recently as the time of the Declaration of Independence.

I believe it was natural and inevitable that advances in man's ability to respond to and control his environment should have been accompanied by this growth of representative government—and this form of government should have taken firmest root in precisely those areas where most of the advances occurred.

For there is a fundamental and organic relationship between progress and freedom. Wide-ranging curiosity, the initiative to experiment, the enterprise to change can only flourish among men who are free. And, as even the Russians are beginning to learn, the complexity and interdependence of the new world we are creating impose great and, in the long run, insupportable difficulties on governments whose decisionmaking institutions are not responsive to all information and sensitive to all interests in a society.

The answer to our question here tonight is that political democracy, whatever its faults or weaknesses, is the best form of government yet devised for assuring this responsiveness and sensitivity—and that in technologically advanced countries all other forms of government ultimately prove too inefficient and costly, in both economic and social terms.

What are the distinguishing characteristics of a democracy?

Two are essential, it seems to me.

The first, as I have already suggested, is that people have a certain view of themselves in relation to the world. This view is not automatic in man: it has to be learned. But it is implicit in the human condition, and men are learning it.

In the United States, the political expression of this view was bred out of centuries of prior Anglo-Saxon development, reinforced by a natural frontier skepticism of authority.

In some other countries, its political expression is bred out of bitter and painful experience with the inadequacies and dangers of other systems.

The other essential characteristic of democracy is a representative structure based on election of the Government's principal officers. This structure must be suited to the attitudes and comprehension of the people; and it must operate with a fair degree of sensitivity and efficiency.

The American representative structure is distinguished from the characteristic European structure principally in that it did not grow out of and is not conducive to a party system. The authors of our Constitution were antiparty; and the Constitution was in fact designed in the hope that it would avoid the development of parties.

All Representatives, all Senators, and the President, himself—as well as their counterparts at the State level—are individually elected by direct popular vote in geographically defined constituencies. They act with primary reference to their own constituencies, and their fortunes are largely independent of each other. The result is that effective consideration and decision of public questions occurs almost exclusively within the Government, rather than the parties, and is conducted almost exclusively by elected officials or their agents.

The authors of the system conceived of an inherently neutral process of arriving at exigent decisions, rather than one expressing, or mediating between, ideologies. The result has been a substantial bulwark against the development of ideologies; and the parties that have developed despite their intention are still essentially nonideological.

Under a parliamentary system, there is incentive for even small ideological groups to form parties of their own, because they may hope to elect a few members of the legislature and that these, in turn, may participate in the coalitions that form the government. Here, there is no such incentive. Any faction hoping to have leverage upon the President must affiliate with one of the two major parties.

Accordingly, our parties exist primarily, and almost exclusively, for the limited purpose of conducting and winning elections. They have almost no role in the policy or operating levels of government. Indeed, it would be almost inconceivable for even the national chairmen of either of our parties to take any part in the formulation of administration or congressional policy.

How is the system working now? Again, I believe encouragingly well.

Ours is a very open form of government, and there is much access at many levels to the centers of decision. Furthermore, most economic, social, ideological, and other interests have developed effective instruments and techniques for utilizing this access.

Though here, as elsewhere, the executive power has grown greatly in relation to the legislative, the cockpit for most of our contention on public issues remains the Congress. It is an institution with many faults—a few of which it may be in the process of correcting; but, on the whole, it continues to perform its essential function. There is hardly ever an interest or point of view which does not receive some expression in its Halls.

It is often forgotten that much of the New Frontier and Great Society program was actually developed by Democrats in Congress during the period of Republican administration in the fifties. Certainly, the final shape of even Presidential proposals is greatly determined in the House and Senate.

In addition to its role in determining policy, the Congress—as it has vividly demonstrated in recent weeks—has an enormous power of public education, independent of Executive will. Whether or not this is used wisely or responsibly, and often it is not, that power remains one of the most constructive features of our government and one of our greatest safeguards against executive encroachment upon the democratic process.

Looking ahead, we always will have the problem of those who may be impatient with the system, who may feel at any given time that it is not producing enough of what they may happen to want.

In recent years, the principal theoretical critics of the system have been in the liberal community—and particularly in its academic wing. There are some political scientists who believe our parties should be greatly strengthened as a means of compelling greater congressional responsiveness to the President. They deplore what they consider our chaos, and admire the order in parliamentary systems.

They are, for example, among the principal proponents of a 4-year term for Representatives concurrent with that of the President—because it would contribute to the discipline they believe is required.

But to make the legislature more responsive to the Executive, without making the Executive as responsible to the legislature as it is in parliamentary systems, would not emulate those systems so much as it would prepare the ground for a kind of American authoritarianism.

The principal growth of this school of thought among political scientists occurred during the 20 years following the 1938 election, when the House of Representatives was dominated by what has been called the "conservative coalition." Based on rural and southern constituencies, where there was either a declining population or a disenfranchised population, the coalition, and therefore the House, was felt to be not as representative of the American people as was the President. This was contrary to constitutional theory; but it did accord with the facts to some degree.

Nevertheless, if the problem was that the House was unrepresentative, the proper solution was to make it more representative—not to put it under Presidential influence. This is now happening—thanks to history, the courts and the Congress itself. The urbanization of our people, reapportionment, and the extension of the franchise are together producing a profound shift in the electoral base of the House—making it more representative and much closer to that of the President. In my view, this organic implementation of our constitutional system is infinitely healthier than would be any such mechanistic alteration of the system as the 4-year term represents.

In closing, let me emphasize my belief that today's world provides little margin for the kinds of error that can be made by entrenched authority concerned more to protect that authority than to meet developing needs. No frequency of public opinion polls, with all due respect to those who read them, no future computerization of economic or other factors of concern to Government, will ever take the place of allowing those factors and the people whom they concern to determine who shall sit at the points of decision.

The world changes ever more rapidly, and people's needs and concerns change with it. In an age when a single event, such as the lofting of a sputnik, can alter a strategic balance or change the temper of a nation, government must become ever more responsive.

"THE COMPETITIVENESS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS IN WORLD MARKETS"—ADDRESS BY RAY R. EPPERT, CHAIRMAN, BURROUGHS CORP.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Ray R. Eppert, chairman of the Burroughs Corp., before the National Industrial Conference Board, delivered on March 3, 1966, dealing with the difficult and complicated question of American investments overseas. It relates to the balance-of-payments problem; but, more significantly, as related to the influence of America in the world. I generally subscribe to these views, and hope that all Senators may take time to read the address.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Competitiveness of American Business in World Markets

(An address by Ray R. Eppert, chairman, Burroughs Corp., before the National Industrial Conference Board conference, New York, N.Y., March 3, 1966)

The competitive posture of American business in world markets is influenced positively or negatively by many things. One important negative factor involves the Government's application of our domestic antitrust laws overseas. However, before discussing this element, I want to document the vital importance to our country of maintaining, through business, a satisfactory external fiscal position.

In 1965 new all-time economic records were established in the United States and our domestic economy is generally forecast to continue its demonstration of great strength. But in spite of this economic strength at home, our country is in trouble externally. Our present international balance-of-payments programs, while making some improvement, have not solved the problem nor will it be solved satisfactorily until certain fundamental actions are implemented by the Government which are necessary to effect a real solution.

Taking an aspirin for a constant headache is not a substitute for correcting the basic cause of the headache and, in essence, that is what we are doing.

The voluntary industry balance-of-payments program implemented in February last year has helped. We should be thankful that the approach used was a voluntary one rather than a program of mandatory controls which would have decimated our competitive world market position. But the present programs, both for banks and industry, must be recognized for what they are—aspirins which may alleviate, but will not cure the basic headache.

I think we are fighting the calendar on our external fiscal problem and that presently we are on an economic collision course.

I say this bluntly because the voluntary programs and guidelines will produce maximum effectiveness only on a temporary basis. This belief is based on the fact that to achieve a cooperative short-term correction, American business is, in many instance, taking actions which in a normal course would not be considered good business judgment. For example there is, when obtainable, substantially increased overseas borrowing in order to effect the greatest remittance of earnings to the United States, rather than utilizing funds generated internally from operations to supply the additional working capital needed to hold or improve competitive positions. Also, investments which are needed because of competitive situations, or opportunities to expand, are in many cases being delayed and the opportunities may be permanently lost. The net effect of these and other actions is to weaken the international balance sheet of American business and its competitive position.

I want to emphasize that it is not private direct investment that has created our balance-of-payments difficulties. The record clearly shows that business has consistently contributed generously to a strong payments position but the simple truth is that this record has not been good enough to offset the negative outflows involved in the public sector.

I do not say this in a critical way because there are good reasons to believe that assistance programs of one kind or another will be necessary for many years in the emerging, developing nations. Also, there is probably a definite limit to the decrease, if any, that can be achieved in our present overseas defense-aid expenditures.

If this conclusion is correct, then it is very clear that the only effective solution to our balance-of-payments problem is an increased performance by American business in the world market. This improvement must be sufficient to offset the necessary international aid and defense expenditures and balance our external accounts.

The voluntary programs may temporarily restore the dollar to its rightful position as the most respectable world reserve currency, but greater future American business success in the world market is absolutely essential to maintain it in that role.

I said we are fighting the calendar on this problem. After a certain time the voluntary plan will, of necessity, lose momentum and begin to deteriorate, and any substitution of mandatory controls will compound and accelerate a negative situation. At that precise moment we must be ready to move toward an effective solution by implementing a coordinated action plan designed to improve the worldwide competitiveness of American business. If such a plan is not ready when needed, or if it is not implemented, we may well be in serious trouble because without it the sad history of our balance of payments in the last 9 years will undoubtedly be repeated.

In the beginning I said that the competitive posture of American business in world markets is influenced by many actions. If satisfactory results are to be achieved our Government's attitude toward activities of American business overseas must be promotional, not punitive.

Some of the major things involving the Government are domestic policies which have an international business impact, such as monetary and fiscal policies, wages and productivity, and regulatory principles and policies. Also involved are present tax laws which cover foreign-source income, administrative attitudes, incentives for exports, a broad understanding and acceptance of the vital importance of private direct investment, an understanding of the negatives which are created when we export our domestic antitrust policies, the maintenance of realistic goals and policies in trade negotiations, and an adequate promotional activity which will encourage many more American companies to enter the world market.

For a moment let's examine this market.

International business is an intimately interrelated mixture of direct investment across national frontiers, export and import of goods and services, and licensing of property rights. The relationship of these factors is often not readily apparent and consequently is not fully understood by those not directly engaged in the world market. Americans who urge the selling of more goods overseas often fail to recognize that this usually requires locating overseas sales and service organizations, distribution facilities, and often manufacturing in whole or in part. These necessary activities require direct investment.

A worldwide economic revolution is taking place. Old concepts that international trade consists solely of shipments of raw material or the export of finished goods are no longer valid. There are radical innovations in manufacture, packaging and marketing, to say nothing of the speeding of transportation and communication facilities. New alliances of nations, such as the European Economic Community, European Free Trade Association, Latin American Free Trade Association, etc., are altering trade patterns.

To achieve the maximum results in today's world it is not uncommon to conduct raw material procurement in one country, subassembly and storage in another country, and final assembly and sale in additional countries. Agriculture, banking, transportation, and other businesses as well as manufacturing are experiencing profound change—new opportunities and, above all, new challenges.

The approach of U.S. companies to foreign business is usually evolutionary, both in terms of techniques utilized and the type of economy to which investment capital is committed. A frequent pattern of development has been for a company to begin by exporting, then go to licensing, and then to investment in direct operations.

Normally investment in developed regions is a prelude to investment in underdeveloped regions. The investment in the developed regions becomes a source of earnings and experienced foreign-oriented management personnel, to support investment in less developed areas. Such programs expand American business opportunities and assist in the economic development of these areas without major direct capital outflow from the United States.

Sometimes there is a tendency to think that foreign investment indicates a preference by business to operate overseas. Nothing could be further from the truth. More often than not American companies face a choice of going abroad to maintain markets or losing them altogether.

There is widespread lack of understanding of the important relationship between foreign operations and direct exports from the United States. Exports are promoted in various ways as a result of private investments abroad. First, the investment itself creates a long-term interest in foreign markets on the part of the U.S. company.

Second, the establishment of a permanent operation overseas improves contacts with foreign customers and, by giving the company greater local identification, increases opportunities for market penetration. Also the company usually finds that its foreign customers are more willing to purchase products of the foreign-based company and also products of the home company manufactured and exported from the United States.

Third, as companies invest abroad and become oriented to world markets, they normally develop extensive foreign distribution channels to handle the products they may manufacture overseas. These same distribution channels are then used in aggressively marketing products imported from the United States.

In this connection is should be pointed out that it has been typical for companies to establish a sales and/or service subsidiary to cover a number of countries. Most American companies do not have financial resources to establish separate subsidiaries in each foreign country in which they want to do business; and even if they had, the amount of business which could be done might not warrant the establishment of a separate company. It is more practical to handle such business from a centralized foreign company. The 1962 Revenue Act which governs foreign business activities, levies a penalty on this type of operation and places a premium upon an artificial reorganization of foreign sales and service facilities which results in reducing the commercial benefits for the United States.

The maximum competitive participation in world trade and the most beneficial financial results for the United States can be obtained only by using all of the methods open to us. These methods include straight export, export to American owned sales and service branches and subsidiaries, overseas assembly and manufacture in whole or in part, licensing, and joint ventures. Direct exports from the United States are increased by each of these methods of participation in the world market. Each in its own way contributes to maximum domestic employment and aids our international balance of payments through exports, remission of profits, royalties, know-how payments, etc.

Governmental attitudes toward world marketing problems are fundamental, for it is attitudes which determine the laws, regulations and policies and the spirit in which they are administered. Present negative attitudes may exist because the vital importance of international trade to the U.S. domestic economy has been grossly underestimated and misunderstood. The situation demands a continuous examination and reexamination by both business and government of policy and attitude areas. No domestic or foreign policy should be immune from such an evaluation.

Foreign investment by American business has built one of the strongest supports for the stability of the dollar. Sales abroad from U.S.-owned plants overseas are today more than twice as great as the total nonagricultural exports from the United States. In recognition of this fact, private foreign investment must be viewed as a basic component of our national economic strength, a component whose continued efficient production, both in the developed and in the developing nations of the world, is vital to our welfare.

Any attempt by the Government to apply discriminatory treatment for investment in one foreign region as against another cannot take into account the increasing extent to which simultaneous investments in various parts of the world are now frequently but facets of a single economic venture. U.S. private overseas investment should not be viewed as a nozzle which can be turned on and off and sprayed in various directions by administrative decision in Washington.

Any sustained interference with the investment flows which provide the base both for our foreign production and sales and for the development of increased direct exports from the United States could be disastrous to our competitive effectiveness.

The U.S. Government has already taken unfortunate steps down the road toward an attempted administrative control of our private direct foreign investments, as evidenced by efforts in extending antitrust activity abroad, and by certain provisions of the Revenue Act of 1962.

It is ironic that the United States was the propulsive force in exporting antitrust policy. It promoted the enactment of national antitrust laws in economically developed foreign countries. These foreign antitrust laws are neither harmonized among their own provisions nor are they in harmony with American antitrust laws.

Our competitive position abroad is hampered when our Government attempts to force American business activities in foreign countries into a mold made in Washington. These overseas operations must be conducted within the framework of laws and customs in the foreign areas concerned and the United States should not attempt to employ its economic power to override the rightful supremacy of local law abroad.

Especial care should be taken in the application of the U.S. antitrust laws to transactions and business arrangements within foreign countries. In many instances in the past such applications have disregarded the lack of any real impact of such transactions or arrangements upon U.S. commerce. Such attempts to export American law to other countries have provoked sovereign resentment and objections to what many foreigners consider to be a new form of imperialism and interference by the United States. Increasingly, foreign countries have developed their own antitrust standards and do not relish or welcome attempts by our Government to apply U.S. law to regulate conduct within their borders.

Such antitrust applications have not only worsened the business climate for U.S. companies operating in foreign countries but have fundamentally disregarded the varying standards, customs, and practices of other nations. In many countries custom, necessity, or local law, may require American companies to agree to terms which would be objectionable within the United States. When the doctrinaire application of the U.S. antitrust law abroad handicaps American concerns, the result is to give foreign competitors the advantage and to lose business for the United States.

In the absence of substantial effects upon U.S. commerce, our Government should not apply its antitrust laws to transactions and arrangements outside its borders. Before prosecutions involving foreign commerce are initiated, the Department of Justice should notify other interested Government departments, as well as the defendants, and the defendants should be accorded an opportunity to be heard at informal preliminary hearings. When transactions involving foreign investments or companies fall within the appropriate scope of the U.S. antitrust law, the application of that law should carry with it the rule of reason and should avoid enforcement that ignores foreign opinion. Full recognition should be accorded to the effect of prosecution upon American business abroad and the varying conditions faced by these companies in foreign markets.

Our Government should recognize that greater risk, together with the need to pool complementary skills or assets, may require joint ventures between competitors abroad more frequently than in the United States. The unwise dictum that such foreign ventures may be illegal, per se, should be repudiated.

In the licensing field, where know-how or trade secrets are involved, it must be recognized that greater contractual protection may be required abroad than in the United States because of the failure of many countries to recognize this type of industrial property. Today, in the light of existing confusion as to the view of our Government, American firms, particularly of small and medium size, hesitate to enter into license arrangements abroad. To remove this obstacle to productive international business for the United States, the Government should recognize that limitations placed upon a licensee with respect to the territories to which he can export products made under a license are valid as ancillary to the grant of industrial property, so long as the licensee could not manufacture and sell the products without the license.

Above all, our Government should reject any antitrust policy that would discriminate in favor of exports as against foreign investment as a mode of American business abroad or would attempt to restrict normal commercial relations between parent and foreign subsidiary. American firms should be free to choose that form of business operation abroad which maximizes their opportunity to compete in foreign markets.

As you know, numerous proposals have been made for revision of our antitrust laws so far as they are applicable to foreign trade and investment abroad. If the competitiveness of American business is to be not only maintained but improved, we might well question whether we should wait until Congress considers such legislative proposals or until the Supreme Court has clarified the limits of antitrust legality of overseas operations of American business.

Today's technological and economic developments are too accelerated to permit absorption by American companies of the risks incident to protracted delays in legislative revisions and ensuing judicial interpretations pertaining to the legally permissible antitrust boundaries of American business activities in overseas markets.

Pending such possible developments, a very constructive move could be made now if the Executive Office of the President would prepare directives to the Department of Justice and recommendations to the Federal Trade Commission which would be designed to coordinate and harmonize adjustments in our antitrust policy applied to overseas business of American enterprises within the allowable range of existing antitrust laws and consistent with such congressional intention.

My remarks today have covered many of the elements which are involved in the maintenance of a satisfactory competitive position for American business in world markets. All of these elements are important and not one can be ignored.

The urgency of our balance-of-payments problem and the vital need to maintain the dollars as the world's principal reserve currency requires constructive action now.

It should be recognized that progress, or lack of it, can only be measured by the total mixture of all external credits and debits and the resulting net contribution to our balance-of-payments account. In many situations, in many companies, an increase in overseas investment rather than a static or lesser position, is necessary to produce the maximum contribution for the United States.

It has been publicly stated that the voluntary program will probably be finished in 1968.

What will succeed the present program? Will it be a period of attrition in our overseas competitive position, which would jeopardize the world economic leadership role of the United States, or will it be a new chapter of forward progress?

One thing is crystal clear—there is no acceptable alternative to American business success in world markets.

Our time latitude for taking the corrective actions needed to maximize this success is shrinking every day and I suggest we forget the speed limit and get moving.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Thursday morning next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS, FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, AND FOR THE SIGNING OF DULY ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate from today until 11 a.m. Thursday, committees be permitted to file reports; that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President and from the House of Representatives; and that the Vice President and President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a great American, the distinguished former Senator from Virginia, Mr. Harry F. Byrd.

While he resigned from this body last fall, his valiant service to his State and country, his decisive leadership and his unequaled graciousness will never be forgotten and, indeed, will serve always as an example to which we all should aspire.

Harry Byrd is a gentleman in the finest sense of the word. He was tolerant, understanding, and considerate. He was also a man who was aware of what the Senate meant and he devoted his life in this body to upholding the precepts of this institution. But even more, he is a great American whose loyalty and devotion could never be perverted. He is a man whose character compelled him to rise above those petty vanities to which many of us at times succumb.

Senator Byrd's resignation from this body can be accepted only with deep regret. Though it is a selfish loss. For I, as much as anyone, will miss his inspiring manner, his unsurpassed integrity, and, frankly, his warm and inviting personality. He possessed every fine and wonderful quality which I can imagine. And, regretfully, I say that it will be a long, long time before another man so blessed with those qualities, will reach this body.

We now wish him a most speedy recovery from his recent illness and a long and fruitful, well-earned retirement.

We look forward to a visit by him to this body, and we all look forward to a visit with him in Berryville.

THE WELFARE OF THE AMERICAN FISHERMAN AND HIS INDUSTRY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to express again, as I have on other occasions, a deep concern for the welfare of the American fisherman and his industry, as he begins the road back to his deserved production position in the world fishery community. These are critical times for this great industry and the kind of posture we take today may well be the determining factor in our long-range position.

I have risen on this floor many times to discuss the reasons for our decline in world fishery production, and the Senate has expressed agreement by support of the needed programs to get America back in this important race for fish.

But despite our support of these programs, and despite our desires to give our American fishing fleets a decent competitive chance against the heavily subsidized foreign producers, I find that the administration, through the Bureau of the Budget, in its funding requests to Congress, is consistently cutting back these programs, at a time when we need them most.

This skimping of funding is totally unrealistic, and is clearly demonstrated by the annual addition of supplemental funds by the Appropriations Committee of the Congress. It is something like sending a fisherman with his vessel to sea; giving him all encouragement, wishing him good harvest and Godspeed; and then failing to provide him with the fishing nets and gear with which he must work.

It is not as though we were heavily subsidizing the American fisherman, or giving him aid even in the same measure as this country has offered to his foreign counterparts. Indeed, the assistance is meager—these modest funds for research, exploration, technological assistance, and the limited construction loans. Even these would not be available were it not for repeated congressional insistence, expressed through legislative enactments. And none of these have been fully implemented by the executive branch.

Out in my home State, we have had phenomenal initial success in our effort to develop new fisheries, and along with it the benefits of increased employment and contribution to America's dwindling fishery production. A relatively new ocean engineering program by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has already provided employment for two fishing vessels in Puget Sound, and their production of hake has exceeded 2¼ million pounds since last November. Two other vessels are now working with Bureau gear specialists in the area to further increase the harvest and utilization of the previously unsought specie.

Some fishery experts are forecasting that this limited inner sound fishery might support the regular employment of as many as 10 vessels, and further that their production could easily exceed the present total offshore and inshore production of the State of Washington's sizable trawl fleet.

But where we consider this inshore resource in terms of millions of pounds, the offshore potential production of Pacific hake is regularly spoken of in the realm of billions. Limited funds have prevented a complete assessment of the hake and anchovy population off Washington, Oregon, and California, but continued explorations indicate that the earlier estimates were conservative.

The budget for fiscal 1966 for pelagic explorations and midwater trawling for Pacific hake totaled $226,000, and I find that the 1967 budget includes no increase, despite the demonstrated success of the initial effort. In normal times this seemingly orderly program might be adequate and I would hesitate to raise the question here today, but these are not ordinary times. These are critical times.

Mr. President, I was advised this week that the Soviet Union's Far Eastern Fish Industry Administration has reported the discovery of large gatherings of hake in the eastern section of the Pacific Ocean. We have reason to believe that the stocks mentioned may very well be those which we are just now preparing to harvest on a limited scale. We have already followed the path of exploitation of the huge latent fishery resources of the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska by the fleets of Japan and the Soviet Union, and it is important that we not be left watching from the beach in the impending harvest of Pacific hake.

The critical nature of this situation dictates increased effort now, if America is to achieve its share of this resource and participate on an equal footing in the future conservation of this resource. An additional funding of $100,000 could expedite this program in the refinement of gear and techniques necessary for economic harvest.

I plan, as do other Senators from the area, to urge the Appropriations Committee to adopt this $100,000 item so that this important Pacific hake work can proceed. The President, in his recent food-for-freedom message, called attention to fish protein concentrate and its potential value to the hungry world. This $100,000 will provide the means to hasten the program to reality.

Much of our current Bureau of Commercial Fisheries effort is in the realm of research, and I am certain that long-range benefits will occur, but meanwhile we must provide the technological program to immediately assist our fleets in the present race to harvest this resource.

The able Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] spearheaded legislation in the 88th Congress to provide matching funds to the States for research and development of fisheries. This was good legislation, and it was subsequently approved by the President and signed into law. The State fishery agencies were enthusiastic and began making plans for participation in this program, and began earmarking funds for such use to the limit and extent of their entitlement under the act.

This Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 authorized the apportionment to qualifying States of $5 million for each of 4 succeeding fiscal years to be used in supplementing State funds in carrying out Federal-State programs. In addition, $400,000 was authorized for each of the first 2 years, and $650,000 for each of 3 subsequent years to assist States where a commercial fishery failure had occurred as the result of natural disaster, and $100,000 was authorized each year for States to develop new commercial fisheries.

The act came too late for the fiscal 1965 budget, though the $400,000 for disaster relief was appropriated for 1965 by the Congress and is included in fiscal 1966 budget.

But of the $5 million authorized for Federal assistance to State programs, the Bureau of the Budget proposed only $1.9 million for fiscal 1966, and only $100,000 for administration.

Recognizing these figures as unrealistic, Congress increased the funding to $4,100,000 and administration to $300,000. Subsequently, the administration limited the administration expenditure to $210,000, in effect denying the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries $90,000 in appropriated funds for this purpose.

This is another example of the laxity and seeming determination of the administration and the Bureau of the Budget to continue to cut down in this important hour.

Today, less than 8 months after fiscal 1966 funds became available, 41 States are actively participating in this program, and projects approved to date total $3.2 million in Federal funds with States matching from 25 to 50 percent, depending on the type of program.

Mr. President, it seems incredible that the Bureau of the Budget would have the Federal Government—now that an impressive start has been made of this joint program—break faith with the participating States and welsh on a substantial portion of our funding commitments.

But this is precisely what the administration, through the Budget Bureau, in its fiscal 1967 proposal, has done.

Funding in this program has been slashed from this year's authorized total of $4,100,000 to $2,600,000 for fiscal 1967.

Mr. President, this constitutes a sham of a virtual obligation to the States by our Government, and could cripple the good relationships necessary to get America back in the race for fish.

The damage goes deeper. Many of these States have provided new facilities and have employed additional men on their professional staffs, so that they could carry out their part of the joint responsibility in the development of commercial fishery resources, to say nothing of the sacrifices in the commitment of necessary matching funds.

These new facilities must not remain idle and vacant; neither should these good scientists and technicians be discharged before being given the opportunity to meet these respective challenges.

Mr. President, I know that Congress will not let this happen, but will restore these funds and let these planned programs go on to success.

But why must this be the subject of annual recital? I do not know how many times I have had to make a similar appeal in this field.

We have determined that the broad national interest of the United States sharply dictates our development of these resources, and that the tide of foreign exploitation of the fisheries off our coasts be turned with substantial participation in these resources by our own vessels.

Mr. President, much of the distress faced in our commercial fisheries has not been self-caused, but has come about as the result of practices in our foreign policy which have favored the foreign fishing fleets ahead of our own. We have reduced tariffs and thereby encouraged the importation of huge quantities of foreign fishery products into the U.S. market to the extent that it constitutes some 60 percent of our present national consumption. A part of the failure of American fishing fleets to keep pace with the expanding foreign effort off our own coastline must be charged to market lack due to imports.

I do not believe this is the will or intention of the Congress, and I cite the language we approved in the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 under section 2, outlining some goals in our national policy toward our fishermen:

> 1. Protection from subsidized competing products.
>
> 2. Protection of opportunity to fish on the high seas in accordance with international law.
>
> 3. Maintenance of an economic atmosphere in which domestic production and processing can prosper.

If one were to ask a New England groundfish captain—particularly if he were harvesting scallops at the moment—if the United States is living up to its promise to protect him from subsidized competing imports, what would his answer be?

If one were to question a member of the southern California tuna fleet—particularly a member of the crew of the fishing vessel *Day Island* which was recently arrested and towed into port in Colombia—if the United States is doing everything it can to protect his opportunity to fish on the high seas in accordance with international law, how would he answer?

Ask the Dungeness crab fishermen in my own State about economic atmosphere and the prospect for future prosperity.

I would suggest that the answer would be negative and he might well call your attention to the fact that more American dollars have gone to foreign countries for fish and fishery products during the past seven years than have been paid to American fishermen.

Indeed, he might even suggest that those same exported dollars are helping build the huge new and modern foreign trawlers which are now ravaging the coastal resources of the United States. I could name the countries, one by one.

And he might further mention that there is a difference in his dollars and those which have gone abroad, for he is an American taxpayer, a supporter of American churches, schools, charities, and business enterprises. The American fisherman is making a contribution to the gross national product and his share in strengthening and maintaining our national security is historic and continuous.

There are many handicaps facing the American fisherman as he prepares to get into direct competition with his foreign counterpart. He lacks product subsidy and many of the beneficial aid programs for foreign fishing vessels and fishermen are not available to him—particularly in the tax field. He must be concerned with the economics of his operation, while the goal of massive production increase, without fear of economic loss, guides the fishermen of Communist nations.

American fishermen are forbidden by law to construct vessels in foreign shipyards which, though it provides a necessary protection to our own important shipbuilding industry, is a further handicap to the American vessel operator. To partially compensate for this disadvantage, we have provided construction differential subsidies, the budget for which was $7,105,200 for fiscal 1966. More than half of these funds have been cut from the 1967 budget, leaving only $3,300,000 to help build the kind of fishing vessels we need to harvest the adjacent resources on an equal basis. These funds should be reinstated so that the American fisherman may have the proper tools to compete in the fisheries.

One of the important national fishery resources is that of the salmon, an anadromous specie which requires much study and assistance. After many years of effort, the first session of this Congress passed my anadromous fish bill to provide a 5-year program to assist the salmon and other anadromous species. Five months later, I find not a penny for implementing this program, either in the budget of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries or the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. If we do not move quickly and provide funds for this effort, we will lose one-fifth of the entire program.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, incidentally, was also hard hit in trying to provide for the Nation's recreation needs. Their budget for 1966 of $104,822,679 has been reduced by more than $16 million, to a figure of $88,787,000. With the expanding urban populations, the increasing tensions of modern society, and more leisure time, Americans are turning to the out of doors, and sports fishing is a large factor in their recreation demands. I do not know how many fishing licenses are taken out in this country, but I know in my own State there were close to 400,000 fishing and hunting licenses issued last year—this in a State with a population of approximately 3 million.

While I am on the subject of salmon, I know that all of us are aware of the problems associated with power and reclamation development on the Columbia River, and the effect on the natural spawning habitat of the great salmon runs.

The Congress in the fiscal 1966 budget added some $600,000 in funds for phase A of the Willamette Falls, Oreg., fishways, a project which promises great return to the fisheries, particularly spring chinook salmon. This salmon, during its ocean life, provides a tremendous offshore fishery for both commercial and recreational fishermen.

By the transfer of $90,000 of other Bureau of Commercial Fisheries project funds and the industry contribution of $132,000 the necessary $832,000 was provided for phase A of this project and the work on the contract is now underway.

To complete the second phase of this important project and assure its total contribution to these Columbia River runs, we must provide an additional $2 million in the fiscal 1967 budget. I shall work diligently toward this end.

This is another example of the difficulty encountered when we try jointly to do something about saving these great resources.

In the conservation and management of our fishery resources, the United States is a party to a large number of treaties and conventions. With this membership comes responsibility for the affected resources. In addition, the 1958 Geneva Conventions provide an obligation to the coastal state to know something about the effect of fisheries on the respective resources.

An example of this need is the proposed study of skipjack in the eastern tropical Pacific, an effort to determine the substance of the resource. Our failure to provide funds for this work not only restricts our possibility of expansion in this fishery, but it endangers the future maintenance of the fishery because of lack of knowledge. We want to restore America to its rightful production position in the world fisheries community, but we do not wish to do so at the expense of conservation. We must have knowledge of the extent of these resources before we can expand the harvest.

The 1965 commercial fisheries catch in 1965 reached a record high of about $440 million, 13 percent over 1964 and 11 percent above the previous record of $386 million achieved in 1962. This new record would merit enthusiasm if imports of foreign fish and fishery products last year had not totaled $468,995,087, exceeding, as in every year since 1958, the value of the domestic catch.

Since 1958, more than 3 billion American dollars have flowed into foreign coffers for the purchase of foreign fishery products—$3,122,825,087 to be exact.

During the same period, American fishermen have received for their effort $2,666 million or $456,825,000 fewer American dollars than their foreign competitors. While importing fish, we are exporting dollars that are not offset, as in normal international trade, by equivalent moneys received for exports of American fishery products.

During the 7 years that we were importing foreign fish in the value of well over $3 billion, our exports amounted to only $339,789,000. Thus, we have had in this brief period an unfavorable balance of payments totaling $2,783,036,097.

We have, in fact, opened our gates wider to foreign fish than to any other item of human consumption that we, ourselves, produce. For example, in 1965, we paid more for foreign fish than we did for all foreign meat and meat preparations; we paid more for foreign fish than we did for all foreign beverage products, alcoholic and nonalcoholic; we sent abroad 11 times as many dollars for foreign fish as we did for all imported cereals and cereal products, and more than 3 times as many as we did for tobacco and tobacco manufactures.

It is our great fortune that our Nation is rich in produce from the land; that we have plentiful grains, fruit, vegetables and meat and dairy products. Our Nation could be equally fortunate with respect to fisheries were our Government to give producers of these health-giving foods similar interest and attention.

Adjacent to our shores are the world's richest fishing grounds, so rich that more than a dozen Old World nations are harvesting them each year, and harvesting them with fleets of larger and better-equipped ships than our own embattled fishermen can acquire from their meager earnings.

Ironical though it may seem, the competing foreign fishermen reaping the resources off our shores are selling back to us more than half the fish that we consume.

In this connection, Mr. President, may I cite the International Commission for North Atlantic Fisheries catch figures for 1964, the latest year for which totals are available. The area includes the Grand Banks and Georges Banks.

Canada leads the catch off the Grand and Georges Banks by over 1 billion pounds. The United States is somewhat lagging with 104 million pounds.

The figures are as follows:

[In million of pounds]

Canada	1,010
U.S.S.R.	457
Spain	340
Portugal	188
United States	104
France	77
Poland	41
Denmark	28
United Kingdom	27
West Germany	16
Norway	10
Iceland	10

During 1965 East German and Rumanian fishing vessels were also operating in this area.

Catch figures in the Bering Sea during 1964, as estimated by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries were:

[In millions of pounds]

U.S.S.R.	1,250
Japan	915
United States	56
Canada	3

The budget now before us for fiscal 1967 recommends that from the general fund Congress appropriate $28,036,000 for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries—$8,925,259 less than the general funds appropriated by Congress for the Bureau in the current fiscal year. The budget request for fiscal 1967 appropriations from the general fund for the Bureau is, in fact, lower than its request 2 years ago for fiscal 1965.

Mr. President, in this connection, may I call attention to the article by James J. Kilpatrick, published on February 1, 1966, in the Washington Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent that this article, "Programs Pared for Great Society," be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Programs Pared for Great Society

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Thus far, most of the critical comment on President Johnson's new budget has been directed toward the revenue side of the ledger—and with good reason. The President is relying for new money upon a remarkably iffy collection of devices that range from seigniorage on those clunky quarters to a 20-percent increase in revenues from licenses and permits.

If everything goes swimmingly—if the Congress accelerates the collection of income taxes and postpones a reduction in other taxes—the Treasury may get the $111 billion it expects in fiscal 1967. But many observers are not so concerned about the revenue side. They are concerned at some of the items that make possible the President's estimate of $112.8 billion in expenditures.

In his determination to keep his pet Great Society programs moving ahead, the President has pared every other domestic program down to the bone. Some of these other ventures doubtless could use some paring. In whacking $300 million off the space program, for example, Johnson touched nothing but fat. Yet in many other agencies, the Presidential knife has dealt brutally with requests that had a sound basis in need. The President will get his butter for the poor, but he will churn it from cream off everything else.

Every old-line department of the Government is affected by this trimming and lopping operation, but the process can be seen most clearly in the Department of the Interior. The Department's Bureau of Indian Affairs did all right, but most of its other agencies got scalped. In the Bureau of Land Management, to start at the top of the list, expenditures for the coming fiscal year are to be cut by nearly $5 million in combined general and special funds. The Bureau's contribution to the Great Society will include the swallowing of a million dollars in pay increases and an outright cut of another million dollars under present levels. Out in the Far West, in programs of range management and fire protection, something will have to give.

One of the most farsighted programs of the 88th Congress contemplated the development of a nationwide outdoor recreation plan. Grants were envisioned to the States for the actual acquisition of the open spaces that will be desperately needed by a highly urbanized America a generation hence. Under the President's budget, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is given a small increase for operating expenses, but the fund for land and water conservation grants is cut from $125 to $110 million.

The Geological Survey is awarded a handsome increase of not quite 1 percent, short of the sum required even to cover raises in basic pay. The recommended appropriation of investigating water resources—one of the most important programs in the entire domestic budget—is raised by only 3.6 percent, far below what should be spent on this vital task. Funds for geologic surveys and mapping are reduced.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is allocated $28 million from the general fund, down $8.9 million from the present fiscal year. The budget contemplates sharp reductions in programs for research and development. The number of fishing vessels qualifying for construction subsidies would be cut from 35 in 1966 to 23 in 1967. In a related field, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife would be trimmed from $64 million to $49 million; programs for wildlife restoration and the conservation of migratory birds would be cut even below the levels of 1965.

One of the country's most loved agencies, the National Park Service, also, is called upon to give blood for the Great Society. At a time when the national parks are expecting 137 million visitors, compared to 120 million in 1965, the agency's budget would be cut by $327,000. In 1965, the parks got $43 million for new construction; in the present fiscal year they have $26 million; the Johnson budget trims this to $23 million for 1967.

Careful study of the budget discloses this same pattern over most of the executive agencies. The Patent Office, struggling with a mountainous backlog of applications, needs a major increase; it won't get it in this budget. Air travel is up, but the budget of the Federal Aviation Agency is down, and the fund for airport grants-in-aid is cut from $75 million to $50 million. The Atomic Energy Commission, the State Department, the General Services Administration, the Veterans' Administration, all take their lumps.

Doubtless the various programs will survive this whittling and nibbling process; and doubtless many of the President's reductions can be well defended. At the same time, it seems a course of doubtful wisdom to keep a tight lid on important old-line programs, especially in the field of conservation, in order to pave the hills of Appalachia and spread some wealth in Harlem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is allocated $28 million from the general fund, down $8.9 million from the present fiscal year. The budget contemplates sharp reductions in programs for research and development. The number of fishing vessels qualifying for construction subsidies would be cut from 35 in 1966 to 23 in 1967.

In a related field, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife would be trimmed from $64 million to $49 million; programs for wildlife restoration and the conservation of migratory birds would be cut even below the levels of 1965.

Mr. President, funds invested in outdoor recreation and in sports fisheries and wildlife bring health and happiness to millions, increased revenues to hundreds of villages and towns in remote areas, and finance conservation programs which assure the preservation of vanishing fish, fowl, and mammals.

Restoration and expansion of our commercial fisheries would check the constant drain of millions of American dollars to foreign countries, provide increased employment for our fishermen, improve the Nation's diet with an increased domestic supply of protein-rich foods, and enhance the economy of scores upon scores of seashore, lake, river, and bay communities that since World War II have suffered continuing decline.

Mr. President, these are critical times in fisheries; we have emergent problems to work through, and the United States is not keeping pace with the rest of the world in production. We are now at the crossroads; shortsighted economies could well damage our forward movement beyond repair. The Federal Government, working in concert with the States and the commercial fisherman, must push forward in this race for the harvest of the ocean's resources. The limited expenditures in these programs today will be repaid a thousand thousand times to the gross national product and to the welfare and benefit of our citizenry, as this hard-working fish industry moves forward.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD, ONE OF THE SENATE'S GREAT MEN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is indeed difficult to pay adequate tribute to a man such as Harry Flood Byrd. It is not easy to find words to characterize a man of his stature, ability, and character. When we speak of Senator Byrd, we speak in superlatives because he is one of the great men who has served in the U.S. Senate. To have been associated with him in his last 12 years in the Senate has been a privilege and an education.

Harry Byrd is the epitome of integrity, honesty, and courage. Few men in the history of our country have so well served the best interests of the people. Repeatedly, even in the face of strong opposition, he exhibited the tenacity of spirit and the firm courage of conviction that marked him as one of the most respected and esteemed men to serve this Nation.

In November of 1965, Senator Byrd retired from the office which he held for over 30 years. This marked the completion of over 50 years in the dedicated service of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States. For more than half a century, he has worked tirelessly and selflessly to carry out those abiding principles of our democracy in which he so strongly believes.

Senator Byrd is best known for his outstanding work as a member and later as chairman of the Committee on Finance. He labored unceasingly to maintain a sound and stable fiscal policy for our Federal Government. While there were some of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle who did not always agree with his views of budget-balancing or pay-as-you-go, Senator Byrd never vacillated and always acted in what he thought was in the best interests of the country.

The retirement of Harry Byrd has brought forth an outpouring of genuine regret from his many friends. All of us feel deeply the loss of his friendly and courteous presence and of his great wisdom.

His retirement has left a huge void in the Senate. But he has left a tremendous legacy for all of us—a superior record of unselfish and devoted service in the finest tradition of the State of Virginia and the United States.

To Senator Byrd I wish many years rich in the enjoyment of memories of a long and illustrious career and rich in health and happiness.

FACTS, NOT EMOTION, SHOULD GOVERN FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week, the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee will go into executive session to consider several pending bills concerning firearms.

It is essential that the members of the subcommittee approach the difficult and complex task before them in a calm and constructive manner, free of the emotionalism which so frequently has surrounded the subject.

NATIONAL CRIME STATISTICS

As Members of the Senate are aware, the skyrocketing increase in crime is one of the most serious problems facing the Nation. In 1964, the most recent year for which detailed statistics are available from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, approximately 2.6 million serious crimes were committed. The 1964 figures represented a 13-percent increase over the preceding year. Preliminary estimates for 1965 indicate that another 5-percent increase has been recorded. In all, the crime index has climbed almost 50 percent since 1959.

These hard statistics are alarming. They present problems of the most serious magnitude, deserving of massive efforts to arrest and reverse this frightening trend.

THE ROLE OF FIREARMS IN THE COMMISSION OF SERIOUS CRIME

In 1964, according to the FBI uniform crime report, firearms were used in the commission of approximately 100,000 crimes. The following table shows that in 1964 firearms were used in about 55 percent of the willful killings, 15 percent of the aggravated assaults, and 57 percent of the robberies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these figures be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Relationship of firearms to other weapons used in the commission of serious crime, 1964

	Breakdown of various weapons used (percent)	Total crimes committed	Crimes in which firearms were used
Homicide		9,250	
Firearms	55		5,090
Knives or cutting instruments	24		
Personal weapon (hands, feet, etc.)	10		
Blunt objects	5		
Miscellaneous (unknown)	6		
Aggravated assault		184,000	
Knives or cutting instruments	40		
Firearms	15		27,700
Blunt objects	23		
Personal weapon (hands, feet, etc.)	22		
Miscellaneous			
Robbery		111,750	
Armed	57		63,697.5
Strong arm (muggings)	43		
Total		305,000	96,488

Source: FBI Uniform Crime Report, 1964.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. It is apparent that firearms were involved in the commission of approximately 4 percent of the 2.6 million serious crimes committed in the United States in 1964. Further, firearms are used in less than a third of the homicides, robberies, and aggravated assaults. So even if all firearms in this country were somehow eliminated, the problem of serious crime would still be with us.

Mr. President, I want also to point out another fundamental fact about crimes involving firearms. They are committed primarily in our large cities.

The uniform crime statistics of the FBI for 1964 reveals that more murders were committed in Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Washington, than were committed in 31 States with populations more than double those four cities and their suburbs. More aggravated assaults were committed in the four cities during the same period than were committed in 37 States with population totals three times greater. More robberies were committed in those cities than were committed in 43 States with 4 times the population of those 4 cities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table developed from the 1964 FBI report, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of crime incidence in 4 cities and selected States

	Chicago, Ill., Los Angeles County, New York, N.Y., and Washington, D.C.	31 States [1]
Population (population ratio equals 1:2)	26,875,000	54,690,000
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter cases	1,672	1,591

[1] Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virgina, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

	Chicago Ill., Los Angeles County New York, N.Y., and Washington, D.C.	43 States [2]
Population (population ratio equals 1:4)	26,875,000	108,676,000
Robberies	40,937	40,076

[2] The States in footnote 1 in addition to Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

	Chicago, Ill., Los Angeles County, New York, N.Y., and Washington, D.C.	37 States [3]
Population (population ration equals 1:3)	26,875,000	74,666,000
Aggravated assaults	48,887	48,635

[3] The States in footnote 1 plus Louisiana, Maryland Mississippi, Missouri, South Carolina, and Tennessee

NOTE.—Total U.S. population equals 191,334,000.

Source: FBI uniform crime report, 1964.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, from these figures, it seems safe to conclude that crimes involving firearms are primarily a problem of the larger cities.

Why then is it necessary to saddle the entire Nation with harsh and restrictive legislation to control the commerce in firearms to attack a problem that is centered for the most part in our larger cities?

This is not to say, of course, that crimes committed with firearms are not serious or that they do not present a threat to society. No reasonable person can disagree with the objective that firearms, or any potential tool of the criminal, should not be kept from the hands of those who might misuse them.

But the basic question is how this objective can be best achieved without hampering or limiting the right of our citizens to purchase and possess firearms for lawful and legitimate purposes.

COMMERCE IN FIREARMS

Before it is possible to legislate intelligently on the subject of firearms control, some understanding of the nature of commerce in firearms in this country must be obtained. Unfortunately, such data are not readily available. In an effort to obtain a description of the nature of firearms commerce, I directed my staff to contact appropriate governmental agencies for available information.

From the Department of Commerce it was learned that the Department ordinarily does not collect this data except in years when census surveys of manufacturers have been taken. For the years 1958 and 1963, figures are available. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table presenting this data be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Quantity and value of ordnance and accessories shipped by all producers in the United States, 1963 and 1958

[Dollars in thousands]

Product	Total shipments			
	1963		1958	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Small arms, 30 millimeters and under		$147,289		$86,037
Pistols and revolvers	496,139	19,716	489,340	18,969
Rifles:				
Center fire, repeating	528,814	35,394	224,921	12,495
Rim fire, repeating	371,145	9,564	289,540	7,633
Rim fire, single shot	179,875	2,354	163,239	1,639
Total rifles	1,079,834	47,312	677,700	21,767
Shotguns:				
Single barrel:				
Repeating	321,869	17,916	382,945	17,072
Single shot } Double-barrel, including over and under type	281,170	7,475	224,277	5,327
Total shotguns	603,039	25,391	507,222	22,399
Total, all firearms	2,179,012		1,674,262	

Source: 1958 and 1963 Census of Manufacturers.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this table indicates that for 1963 domestic manufacturers shipped about 1 million rifles, about 600,000 shotguns and about 500,000 pistols and revolvers, a total of about 2.1 million.

It is not known what means of distribution these shipments used before they reached the public. However, it would seem to be safe to assume that the large majority of these weapons are sold by licensed dealers through over-the-counter sales to individuals. A substantial, although undetermined portion of these sales are made by licensed dealers to individuals upon mail order and are shipped to the buyer via common carrier.

IMPORTS

The role of imports in the commerce in firearms has been a subject of much controversy and some exaggeration. In an attempt to place the role of imports in proper perspective, I directed my staff to inquire of appropriate governmental agencies to determine the facts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared by the Business and Defense Services Administration in July of 1965 be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

U.S. imports of small arms, 1963–64

[Quantity in units; foreign value in U.S. dollars]

Description	1963		1964	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Rifles, breech-loading:				
Rifles, used, not over $5 each	156,064	577,817	93,859	317,299
Rifles, new, not over $5 each	5,905	20,934	7,057	31,819
Rifles over $5, not over $10 each	8,092	57,682	13,731	103,173
Rifles over $10, not over $25 each	25,926	586,772	35,816	836,025
Rifles over $25, not over $50 each	274	10,450	3,156	96,217
Rifles over $50 each	22,289	1,523,205	27,913	2,056,661
Total, rifles, breech-loading	218,550	2,776,860	181,532	3,441,194
Shotguns, breech-loading:				
Shotguns not over $5 each	162	644	119	345
Shotguns over $5, not over $10 each	3,878	36,613	7,140	70,114
Shotguns over $10, not over $25 each	4,751	73,941	4,979	89,497
Shotguns over $25, not over $50 each	8,195	317,974	9,747	385,940
Autoloading shotguns over $50 each	75,979	4,850,880	84,309	5,835,899
Other shotguns over $50 each	26,461	2,719,359	32,300	3,432,850
Total shotguns, breech-loading	119,421	7,999,411	138,594	9,814,645
Shotgun-rifle combinations, breechloading:				
Shotgun-rifle combinations not over $5 each	273	1,229	[1]30	[1]1,935
Shotgun-rifle combinations over $10, not over $25 each	24	386	15	230
Shotgun-rifle combinations over $50 each	35	9,513	53	11,244
Total shotgun-rifle combinations, breechloading	332	11,128	98	13,409
Pistols and revolvers:				
Pistols and revolvers not over $4 each	3,106	9,433	622	1,792
Pistols and revolvers over $4, not over $8 each	47,895	299,303	46,269	269,654
Pistols and revolvers over $8 each	172,067	2,188,698	206,309	2,668,674
Pistols and revolvers, total	223,068	2,497,434	253,200	2,940,120
Grand total	561,371	13,284,833	573,424	16,209,368

[Quantity not reported for following categories; foreign value in U.S. dollars]

Description	1963		1964, January to December, value
	Period covered	Value	
Muskets, shotguns, rifles, pistols, and revolvers not designed to fire or capable of firing a fixed metallic cartridge or fixed shotgun shell, and parts.	January to December	588,298	462,077
Guns, gun parts, and accessories, not elsewhere specified (including mounts).	January to August	439,287	(2)
Pistols designed to fire only blanks; and parts	September to December	57,985	289,068
Other firearms operated by or expending an explosive charge (captive-bolt pistols, harpoon guns line-throwing guns, very light pistols projecting signal flares) and parts.	do	12,642	74,039
Rifles operated by compressed air or gas, spring mechanism, rubber, etc.; and parts	do	39,227	168,844
Pistols and other arms operated by compressed air or gas, spring mechanism, rubber, etc.; and parts	do	8,546	103,872
Other arms (other than side arms and firearms) not elsewhere specified; and parts	do	103,552	38,795

[1] Apparent error in price category or quantity.
[2] Category dropped as of Sept. 1, 1963.

Sources: 1963, Census Report FT-110, U.S. Imports; 1964, Census Report IQ-245.

Prepared by Consumer Durables Division, Business and Defense Services Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., 20230, July 1965.

Mr. HRUSKA. This table indicates that for the year 1964 approximately 573,000 rifles, shotguns, and handguns were imported into this country. This figure is approximately one-fourth of the domestic commerce and substantially less, in fact less than half, than figures for that year used by proponents of firearms legislation. The figures, incidentally, include new and used materials.

These figures do not include the so-called starter pistols.

To gain a more complete estimate of the import statistics, starter pistols must be included. These are cheap handguns, newly manufactured, usually of pot metal or other inferior materials. They normally retail from $5 to $15. Usually as imported, they are capable of firing only blank ammunition. However, a very inexpensive conversion can be made which transforms the pistol into a lethal weapon.

Until last summer, the State Department did not require import licenses for these items nor did the Census Bureau maintain figures until the third quarter of 1963. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Bureau of the Census and accompanying table be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1965.

Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: As requested in a telephone conversation between Mr. Velde of your office and Mr. Freeman of our Foreign Trade Division, enclosed is a table providing data on imports of pistols designed to fire only blank cartridges or blank ammunition, and parts thereof for the calendar year 1964 and for September–December 1963. Inasmuch as this import classification includes parts, data for it are collected and reported in terms of value only.

As was explained to Mr. Velde, data for the details shown in the enclosed table are not available prior to September 1963, the first month the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated were in effect. Also as further explained to Mr. Velde the Bureau of the Census does not have data broken down by caliber of rifle but only in terms of the value breaks indicated in the material sent you with our letter of September 10, 1965.

If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

A. ROSS ECKLER,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

U.S. imports of pistols designed to fire only blank cartridges or blank ammunition, and parts thereof (Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated No. 730,800) for consumption September–December 1963 and calendar year 1964

	Value (dollars)
September–December 1963	57,985
Calendar year 1964	289,068

Mr. HRUSKA. This table indicates that for the calendar year 1964 less than

$300,000 worth of these items were imported. Using an arbitrary figure of $3 per item, this would amount to about 100,000 pistols. So this figure should be added to the total previously given.

When all the import figures are totaled, it is apparent that imports in a given year, although substantial, do not begin to approach the commerce in firearms from domestic sources. Yet, they would be singled out for elimination.

Now, a word about destructive devices. Testimony before our subcommittee indicated that there is minimal traffic in the so-called destructive devices, or crew-served weapons of heavy ordnance such as bazookas, antitank weapons, and field artillery. These devices are not a significant factor in the commission of crime. However, no reasonable person would contend that there are legitimate civilian uses for these items. Therefore, it is almost universally agreed by sportsmen's groups and others that these items should be brought within the control of the National Firearms Act. Some minor problems concerning the technicalities of defining what is a destructive device remain, but they are not significant.

EXISTING FEDERAL AND STATE FIREARMS CONTROL LEGISLATION

There are literally hundreds of Federal, State, and local firearms control laws and regulations. On page 168 and following of part I of the House Ways and Means Committee hearings on firearms last year appears a summary of existing Federal and State firearms acts. The summary, prepared by the National Rifle Association, was submitted for the House hearing by Director Sheldon Cohen of the Internal Revenue Service. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent portions of the table be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the portions of the table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Basic Facts of Firearms Control (Federal and State)

(Prepared by the National Rifle Association, Washington, D.C.)

FEDERAL FIREARMS CONTROLS

The National Firearms Act of 1934, as amended

This law—

(a) Imposes a tax and registration on the making or transfer, among other weapons, of all fully automatic firearms and all short-barrel rifles and shotguns.

(b) Provides that all manufacturers and importers of, and dealers and pawnbrokers in, the foregoing kinds of firearms must pay an annual occupational tax.

The Federal Firearms Act of 1938, as amended

This law—

(a) Requires the licensing of manufacturers and importers of, and dealers in, firearms, ammunition and components thereof;

(b) Provides certain restrictions on the movement of firearms and ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce;

(c) Prohibits convicted felons, persons under indictment, and fugitives from justice from shipping, transporting or receiving firearms or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce;

(d) Prohibits the shipment, transportation, or receipt of stolen firearms or ammunition, or firearms from which the serial number has been removed, obliterated or altered.

Postal laws and regulations

Concealable firearms, such as pistols or revolvers, may not be shipped through the mails, except to certain classes of persons and under certain conditions. Unloaded rifles and shotguns are mailable.

Department of State regulations governing the international traffic in arms

(a) Manufacturers, exporters, and importers of firearms and ammunition or components thereof must pay an annual registration fee of $75.

(b) The importation or exportation of firearms or ammunition (except shotguns and .22-caliber rim-fire ammunition) by any person requires an import or export license.

Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended

No person, except under special authorization, may carry a deadly or dangerous weapon aboard a commercial air carrier. Unloaded firearms in baggage not accessible to the passengers while aboard the aircraft are permissible.

STATE FIREARMS CONTROLS

General comment

The firearms laws of the various States are principally directed at concealable firearms, such as pistols or revolvers. While rifles and shotguns are included in the statutory provisions of many States, those firearms are regulated largely as to sale to certain persons (e.g., minors, aliens or convicted felons), discharge in certain areas and use in hunting.

Positive controls

(a) License to possess a handgun—One State: New York.

(b) Permit, or equivalent, to purchase a handgun—Nine States: Hawaii, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Virgina (certain counties).

(c) Waiting period between purchase and delivery of a handgun—Nine States: Alabama, California, Connecticut, Indiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee.

Also the District of Columbia.

(d) Registration of all firearms—One State: Hawaii.

(e) License to carry a handgun on or about the person—Twenty-nine States: Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming.

Also the District of Columbia.

(f) License to carry a handgun in a vehicle—18 States: Alabama, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Washington.

(g) License to sell handguns at retail—23 States: Alabama, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota (certain counties), Oregon (certain counties), Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia (certain counties), Washington, West Virginia.

Also the District of Columbia.

Negative controls

(a) Prohibition of the manufacture or sale of handguns—one State: South Carolina.

(b) Prohibition of the carrying of a handgun on the person—21 States: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas (as a weapon), Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota (with intent to assault), Mississippi, Missouri (in specified areas), Nebraska, New Mexico (loaded), North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee (with intent to go armed), Texas, Vermont (with intent to assault), Wisconsin.

MINIMUM AGE LAWS

Federal

No minimum age is specified for the various kinds of licenses under the national or Federal Firearms Act, or for the transportation, shipment or receipt of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce.

State

Minimum age for the purchase, possession, receipt or use of handguns varies from State to State. There is an even greater variance in the minimum ages that allow for the possession or handling of any firearm by a minor.

The majority of States provide that a person must be at least 18 or 21 years of age in order to acquire a handgun. As to rifles and shotguns, the minimum age frequently differs from that for a handgun; and sometimes none is specified.

Possession by aliens

Alaska (special stamp to possess any firearm), California (handguns prohibited), Colorado (all firearms), Connecticut (handguns), Delaware (all firearms), Hawaii (all firearms), Louisiana (enemy aliens), Massachusetts (possession of firearms permitted with temporary license), Michigan (cannot purchase or carry handguns), Minnesota (all firearms), Nebraska (all firearms), Nevada (handguns prohibited), New Hampshire (must have special permit to purchase firearms), New Jersey (rifle and shotgun prohibited; license required for handgun); New York (special license to possess any firearm); North Dakota (no hunting), Oregon (all firearms), Pennsylvania (all firearms), Rhode Island (all firearms), South Dakota (all firearms if no intent to become U.S. citizen), Tennessee (purchase of firearms prohibited); Utah (all firearms unless hunting or necessary part of employment); Washington (special license to possess any firearm); West Virginia (all firearms unless granted special hunting license); Wyoming (all firearms).

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, of particular significance are the two basic Federal firearms control statutes: the National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Federal Firearms Act of 1938.

It is these two acts that are to be amended by the pending bills before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING LAWS

Several witnesses in their testimony before the Senate Subcommittee and the House Committee suggested that a better job of enforcing the present Federal firearms statutes can be done. They have pointed out that the Alcohol and Tax Division of the Department of the Treasury is not adequately staffed to enforce the laws properly. Available manpower of the Division is primarily concerned with alcohol and tobacco problems and devotes relatively little time to firearms. It was further stated that many cases of violations of the laws are developed by Federal and State authorities but there is little enthusiasm by appropriate U.S. attorneys for prosecuting these cases. So, through the years since the enactment of these laws, relatively few convictions have been obtained under them.

Of particular concern to this Senator was the testimony before our subcommittee by the Chief of Police of St. Louis. Chief Brostron testified that St. Louis has a major problem with mail-order sales to individuals who had not obtained purchase permits as required by the Missouri State laws. Section 902(c) of the Federal Firearms Act provides that it is a violation of the act for any federally licensed dealer to sell a firearm to a person who has not complied with State permit laws. This would appear to be a significant opportunity for Federal enforcement officials to drive the unscrupulous mail-order houses out of business.

Since congressional attention has been focused on firearms matters, constructive steps have been taken under existing laws and regulations. About a year ago, the Department of Defense adopted a new policy in the disposition of its surplus firearms, thus drying up one source of the supply. The State Department has brought .22 caliber and smaller bored firearms under its import licensing provisions. At least now we will be able to get a more accurate picture of the commerce in starter pistols and similar weapons. However, much more remains to be done in enforcing existing Federal law.

PROPOSALS TO AMEND EXISTING FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS

There are four major bills pending before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee to amend existing Federal Firearms Control Acts. Three of these measures, S. 14, S. 1592, and S. 1965 would amend the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. The other measure, S. 1591, would amend the National Firearms Act of 1934.

A fifth measure has been introduced in the House by Congressman CASEY, of Texas; actually Congressman CASEY has introduced two bills. The first, H.R. 5642, would set a mandatory 25-year penal sentence for the use or possession of firearms that moved in interstate commerce during the commission of a robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, kidnaping, or homicide other than involuntary manslaughter. His second bill, H.R. 11427, would provide mandatory 10-year terms for the first offense where the above-mentioned crimes are committed using firearms, and 25-year terms for subsequent offenses.

S. 1592

This bill was introduced by Senator DODD on March 22, 1965, in behalf of the administration. The bill proposes major and significant amendments to the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. The bill would make five fundamental changes in existing law.

First. It would stop all interstate commerce in firearms except between federally licensed dealers, importers, and manufacturers.

Second. The bill would set limits on retail over-the-counter sales of firearms. A federally licensed dealer would have to conform in all standards with the State and local laws on the sale and ownership of firearms. He could not sell handguns to persons other than residents of his own State.

Third. The existing license fee schedules would be significantly increased.

Fourth. The Secretary of the Treasury's discretionary powers with regard to issuing licenses for manufacturers, importers, and dealers would be greatly enlarged.

Fifth. The bill would prohibit the importation of military surplus weapons and others not considered by the Secretary of the Treasury to be suitable for lawful sporting purposes.

There are other provisions of the bill which are important but which I shall not touch upon at this time.

It is a bill which I cannot in good conscience support. Mr. President, there are several basic reasons why I oppose this bill. At this point, I shall enumerate only some of the major arguments against the bill as introduced.

First. The bill includes rifles and shotguns as well as handguns. But it is the concealable handgun which is the primary tool of the criminal who uses a firearm in the commitment of a crime. If any legislation whatsoever is enacted, it should be limited to the handgun.

Second. The bill includes "destructive devices." These items should be treated separately in the National Firearms Act of 1934—as proposed in S. 1591.

I do not believe there will be too much difference of opinion in the committee or in the Senate. It is a matter of technical approach to securing an amendment to another act and that is dealt with in S. 1591.

Third. The bill proposes a total ban on interstate mail-order sales to individuals. Apparently it would not apply to intrastate sales. If intrastate sales are allowed, the effect of the ban would only be to redirect mail-order sales through outlets in each State. Large mail-order retailers such as Sears and Montgomery Ward's would have little difficulty adjusting, but hundreds of small businesses would be put out of business.

However, there may not be a meaningful distinction between "inter" and "intra" in this situation, depending on the way courts would interpret the bill. If there is a total ban on all mail-order sales, it would single out for elimination only one channel of the commerce in firearms while leaving other channels intact. For example, one would still be able to buy over the counter or from an individual as in the classified ads of the Washington Post, or any other of the Nation's newspapers. Thus, many avenues of access would be available to the potential criminal who desires to obtain firearms. If any legislation whatsoever is enacted it should impose reasonable controls on mail-order sales of handguns only, but should not eliminate them altogether.

Fourth. A ban on imports is proposed, save for minor exceptions. Imports have been characterized as military surplus "junk," flooding the market by the millions.

However, the actual import figures for 1963 and 1964 are less than half those claimed by some advocates of S. 1592. Most important is the fact that imports are not evil per se because they are foreign made or are cheap in some cases. A total ban on imports would be protectionist help to domestic manufacturers to eliminate major competition. Domestic firearms, new and used, come in just as wide a variety of size, kind, and prices as do imports. It may be that junk or unsafe weapons should not get into the hands of the sporting public. But to reach this situation, consideration should be given to establishing qualitative standards for all firearms—imports as well as those of domestic manufacture. This, S. 1592 fails to do.

Fifth. License fees for manufacturers, importers and dealers would be drastically increased. Most noxious is the $100 fee for dealers. This would eliminate thousands of small dealers such as country stores, gas stations, and other places of small merchandizing, which carry small inventories of firearms and ammunition as a convenience for their customers. A modest increase might be all right, but not those originally proposed in S. 1592.

Sixth. Licensing requirements would be severely tightened. The Secretary of the Treasury would be given broad discretion to issue or deny licenses for such things as the applicant is not "likely" to conduct his business in accordance with the act. Such unlimited discretion without standards or guidelines is objectionable.

Seventh. The bill is repugnant to the letter and intent of the second amendment to the Constitution.

Eighth. Much is being done and more can be done to enforce existing law without resorting to the drastic and objectionable provisions contained in S. 1592.

In addition to these arguments, Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD summary of arguments opposing S. 1592, as presented by several of the witnesses which appeared before the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS TO S. 1592 BY THE WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

1. The Institute supports in principle the objectives of S. 1592, it opposed the methods to be employed to gain those objectives.

2. The vesting of such broad discretionary powers to write regulations in the Secretary of the Treasury is a principal objection.

3. Vagueness and ambiguity of terms and the failure to provide adequate safeguards for the law-abiding citizen are other objections.

4. There should be some control of the sale of firearms to minors under certain age, but this control should be left to discretion of the parent and not be made a matter of Federal law.

5. Unlimited authority is delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury for issuing regulations concerning the purchase, shipment, transport, and sale of firearms and ammunition.

6. The definition of "destructive device" is so broad as to include antique firearms such as the muzzle loading rifles and pistols used by historical societies and organizations and other regular competitions.

7. The license fees are exorbitant, although a small raise in price is necessary in order to cover the administrative details in issuing same.

8. Those devices included in the definition of "destructive device" should be within the

purview of the National Firearms Act, not the Federal Firearms Act.

9. Section 414 of the Mutual Security Act should be studied to determine whether or not this section could be used to halt the flow of weapons of war into this country. If so, it should then be determined whether the administrators of that act have been derelict in failing to exercise their authority in this regard.

10. Additional Federal firearms legislation, if found to be necessary, should be limited in scope to concealable weapons; rifles and shotguns should be excluded.

11. The intent and content of H.R. 7472 would better handle the immediate problems involving mail ordered firearms rather than S. 1592.

12. The inconvenience that would be caused by the enactment of S. 1592 far outweighs its scant promise of effectiveness. The bill presents not so much a program for reducing armed crime as it is a threat to the recreational use of firearms. The Institute does not take the approach that the way to reduce crime is to drastically curtail the freedom of choice and the movement of law-abiding citizens.

Principal Objections to S. 1592 by Douglas R. Hellstrom, Executive Vice President, Smith & Wesson, Inc.

1. Many of the types of firearms that would be within the purview of the Federal Firearms Act because of the definition of "firearm" and of "destructive device" rightfully belong in the National Firearms Act.

2. Antique firearms should be exempted from the provisions of this bill. He recommends a particular definition of that term.

3. Such phrases as "for a lawful purpose," "authorized," "traveling in interstate or foreign commerce" are vague and indefinite and would require further definition by the Secretary of the Treasury, thus putting in the hands of that official a degree of optional control which is objectionable.

4. The matter of age limits for the purchase of a firearm would seem best left up to the several States since it can be argued that children in one State are better equipped to handle firearms than children in others.

5. An objection was made in principle and practice to any law which would provide an absolute prohibition against interstate sales of firearms to ordinary unlicensed individuals.

6. The vast increase in the various Federal firearms licenses for importers, manufacturers, and dealers is totally uncalled for, although some smaller raise in fees would be desirable.

7. The recommendation is made for a return to the principles and content of S. 14. The restrictions relative to the importation of firearms should be relaxed in order to allow for the importation of firearms for legitimate purposes.

8. Specific objections are raised to the refusal to issue licenses because of business experience, finances, or trade connections. A proper emphasis should focus on the character of the applicant, his business record, lack of a criminal record, and matters of that type. Refusal to issue a license should hinge on past performances, not on a presumption that the applicant might conduct his business outside of the law.

9. "Ammunition" should be deleted from all parts of this bill.

10. Those selections of the bill dealing with the importation of firearms should be rephrased to prohibit specific types and classes of firearms such as the cheap handgun rather than make a blanket prohibition of importation except in certain circumstances agreed upon by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Principal Objections to S. 1592 by National Rifle Association of America

1. Restriction of firearms delivery in commerce to licensed manufacturers, importers, or dealers would impose a real hardship on thousands of individuals in rural and semirural areas who do not have convenient access to licensed dealers.

2. The large increase in license fees far exceeds the costs for processing and issuance. In particular, the $100 fee for a dealer is prohibitory for the small dealer in rural areas or the small businessman in any area.

3. Certain key terms and phrases, such as "contrary to the public interest" and "lawful sporting purposes" are indefinite and susceptible to arbitrary use by the Secretary of the Treasury.

4. The definition of "destructive device" is too broad because many sporting arms and collectors' items are included. Such devices should come under the provisions of the National Firearms Act.

5. Omission of the exception in the present law applying to shipment of firearms to certain organizations and individuals by the Secretary of the Army would virtually end the civilian marksmanship program of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice.

6. All firearms ammunition should be removed from the purview of the proposed controls.

7. Transportation of a firearm in commerce if for "a lawful purpose" is vague and ambiguous.

8. Sale or disposition of firearms by manufacturers, importers, or dealers is subject to unrestricted regulation by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Principal Objections to S. 1592 by the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc.

1. The bills would ban all mail-order sales of firearms (including sporting shotguns and rifles) to consumers, although the majority of firearms used in crime are of the concealable type.

2. The proposed dealer's license fee of $100 is too high and would force thousands of small dealers to quit handling sporting firearms and ammunition, especially in rural areas.

3. Regulations on importation of firearms for lawful uses should be clearer.

4. "Destructive devices" would be more appropriate in the National Firearms Act which already regulates gangster-type weapons. The bill was written so as to lump missiles, bombs, and cannons in with sporting firearms.

5. There should be no regulation on interstate shipment and sale of any sporting ammunition.

6. Under reasonable, prescribed conditions a sportsman should be allowed to buy a handgun in a State other than his home State.

7. There should be no limitation on shipment of firearms for legitimate repairs, service, and modification and for recreational purposes.

8. The provisions, especially as to licenses, affecting more than 2 million people who reload ammunition are not clear and could work a hardship on them and others who use reloaded cartridges. It appears that in some cases individual custom gunsmiths would be required to obtain a manufacturer's license of $500 per year.

9. The bills would give the Secretary of the Treasury too much authority.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the summary of S. 1592 and the arguments that have been presented against it were directed to the bill as originally introduced. Senator DODD has circulated among members of the subcommittee drafts of an amended bill. The amendments purport to make concessions to those who oppose it. The fee schedules are revised downward somewhat and and some minor technical changes are made. But the essential provision of S. 1592 remain and in some cases are tightened. The amendments as I see it do not cure the several defects of the bill.

S. 14 AND S. 1965

Mr. President, I shall discuss S. 14 and S. 1965 simultaneously. I shall do so because both bills, with one important exception, are essentially similar. The exception is that S. 14, which is Senator DODD's original bill, applies to all firearms whereas S. 1965, introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and Representatives KING, of California, in the House of Representatives, applies only to handguns. The principal provisions of S. 1965—which also apply to S. 14 with the exception as noted—are as follows:

First. No carrier in interstate or foreign commerce may deliver any handgun to any person under 18 years of age.

Second. No manufacturer or dealer may ship any handgun in interstate or foreign commerce to any person, except a licensed manufacturer or dealer, unless that person submits to the shipper a sworn statement that the prospective recipient, first, is at least 18 years of age; and second, is not a person prohibited by Federal, State, or local law from receiving or possessing the firearm.

In addition, the statement must contain the true name and address of the principal law enforcement officer of the locality to which the handgun will be shipped.

Third. Prior to shipment, the manufacturer or dealer must forward the sworn statement by registered mail—return receipt requested—to the local law enforcement officer named in the statement containing a full description—not including serial number—of the firearms to be shipped, and must receive a return receipt evidencing delivery of the registered letter, or evidence that such registered letter has been returned to the shipper because of the refusal of the local law enforcement officer to accept such letter in accordance with Post Office Department regulations.

Fourth. No manufacturer or dealer may deliver any package containing a firearm to any carrier for transportation or shipment in commerce without prior written notice to the carrier.

Fifth. A person must be at least 21 years of age to obtain a Federal firearms license.

Sixth. The fee for a manufacturer's or pawnbroker's license shall be $50 a year; for a dealer's license $10 a year.

Seventh. Ammunition, ammunition components, and minor parts of a firearm—such as springs, barrels, sights and accessories—are removed from the application of the Federal Firearms Act.

S. 1965 has the endorsement of other sportsmen's groups and several other interested organizations. Mr. President, I would look upon this approach with favor. However, to make the bill effective, I would offer several amendments to strengthen it.

First. I would suggest that an over-the-counter purchaser of a handgun not a resident of the State in which the transaction occurs be required to submit the same sworn statement required of a purchaser by mail and undergo the same procedures as established for mail-order firearms transaction. This would, in effect, impose a waiting period and give notification to the purchaser's hometown law enforcement agency.

Second. I would propose that section 902(c) of the Federal Firearms Act of 1938 be broadened so that it would be a violation of the act for a federally licensed dealer or manufacturer to ship a firearm to a purchaser in violation of any State firearms control act.

Third. I would propose that the present $1 dealer fee be increased to $25 for the first year and $10 for subsequent years. The $25 initial fee would be applied to the cost of processing the initial application and of necessary investigation by the Treasury Department.

Fourth. I would propose that appropriate criminal penalties be provided for any person knowingly making a false statement in connection with the submission of the affidavit required for mail-order purchase of a handgun.

In my opinion such a bill would make a constructive and substantial contribution to the solution of what appears to be a significant problem in the firearms commerce in this country: namely, the mail-order purchase of handguns by convicted felons, certain juveniles and other irresponsible individuals.

S. 1591

The fourth major bill pending before the subcommittee is S. 1591, also introduced by Senator DODD. The bill would amend the National Firearms Act of 1934—the Machine Gun Act—to include the so-called destructive devices, such as crew-served items as bazookas, mortars, antitank guns and the like. Although the so-called destructive devices are not a significant factor in the commission of serious crime, as I have previously pointed out, this bill will receive my endorsement with minor qualifications. For it is not possible to argue rationally that such items have legitimate civilian purposes. It is true these items may have appeal to a few collectors and hobbyists; however, because of the potential dangers involved in the possession of these items, I shall support the measure. The National Rifle Association and other sportsmen's groups have also endorsed the bill. I would propose, however, that the definition of "destructive devices" be carefully considered and perhaps revised so that it cannot be construed as applying to sporting rifles and shotguns, model rockets and the like.

Any ordnance expert will tell you that virtually any sporting rifle can be easily converted into a grenade launcher—one of the items covered in the present definition of destructive devices—by simple modification, or in some cases none at all. It would be an absurdity to consider sporting rifles and shotguns as destructive devices for the purposes of this bill. But except for these reservations, I can support S. 1591.

THE CASEY BILL

Mr. President, I have no enthusiasm whatsoever for the so-called Casey bill in either one of its forms, H.R. 5642 or H.R. 11427.

First. It would have the effect of federalizing crimes such as murder, armed robbery, and the like where firearms are used. This would be a most dangerous precedent. It would call for a tremendous expansion of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to enforce the law and would be extremely costly.

Second. In short order, the Federal correctional institutions would be overflowing with inmates convicted under this bill at a tremendous cost and burden to the taxpayers.

Third. The bill does not represent a modern or enlightened approach to sentencing philosophy. It would make rehabilitation of convicted offenders virtually impossible.

Fourth. It would probably not be a significant deterrent to the commission of these crimes since many States have severe penalties for crimes committed with firearms. Yet those laws are violated constantly.

THE SECOND AMENDMENT

Mr. President, there are many sound and persuasive arguments against S. 1592. I have attempted to delineate some of them.

But even if these arguments were not present, there would still remain grave doubts about the constitutionality of this measure.

The second amendment to the Constitution reads:

> A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

There are two observations I want to make about this provision of the Bill of Rights. The first is its sweeping language:

> * * * the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

That is strong language. Nowhere in the Constitution can be found stronger wording. The second is the fact that it is the second amendment, not the fifth or the ninth. Its placement at the top of the list is indicative that our Founding Fathers considered this right of major importance—certainly not to be treated lightly by later generations and eroded away.

The comments and material presented by the Attorney General on the second amendment in the hearings are not persuasive.

Their main thrust seems to be that even though this bill totally bans interstate sale of firearms to individuals, it is not objectionable as an infringement on the right of the people to keep and bear arms because there would still be intrastate commerce in these items. This is totally without merit. It is as if one were to contend that it would not be a violation of the first amendment right of freedom of the press to bar further publication of the newspapers because the people could still read magazines and watch television newscasts.

It must be admitted that the case law on the second amendment is not particularly helpful. There have only been four Supreme Court decisions on this question since the founding of the Republic—hardly an overwhelming body of precedent. Three of the four cases, the Cruikshank, Presser, and the first Miller cases held that the second amendment placed limitations only on the Federal Government and not the States. This view is hardly in favor today. The rights of the first eight amendments have been applied to the States in a series of cases. To mention only a few that come immediately to mind: The Mapp case in 1961 held the 4th amendment's right to privacy against search and seizure was enforcible through the 14th amendment. In the Gideon case in 1963 the right to counsel in all criminal cases was made obligatory on the States by the 14th amendment. In 1964 in the Malloy case the 5th amendment's right against compulsory self-incrimination was protected by the 14th against abridgment by the States. All of these cases overruled prior decisions.

During the 1965 spring term, the Supreme Court held in the Griswald case that a State statute that conflicted with the "right of privacy," a right not specifically mentioned in the Bill of Rights, was unconstitutional. The right of privacy was made applicable to the States by the due process clause of the 14th amendment. Certainly, if the right of privacy can be made applicable to the States, the guarantees of the second amendment could also apply.

In the second Miller case in 1938, the Court for the first time passed directly on the second amendment as being applicable to Federal legislation. It upheld the National Firearms Act of 1934, as to the placing of limitations upon the use of sawed-off shotguns. The Court held that the second amendment did not guarantee the right to keep and bear such an instrument for the preservation and efficiency of a well-regulated militia. However, Mr. Justice Black writing in the New York University Law Review—1960—in discussing this case, commented:

> Although the Supreme Court has held this amendment to include only arms necessary to a well-regulated militia, as so construed, "its prohibition is absolute."

The quote emphasis is mine.

The Chief Justice of the United States, writing in a recent issue of the New York University Law Review—1962—article, discussed the formulation and adoption of the Constitution. He drew attention to the safeguards to the people contained in it. He then wrote:

> Despite these safeguards, the people were still troubled by the recollection of the conditions that prompted the charge of the Declaration of Independence that the King had "effected to render the military independent and superior to the civil power." They were

> reluctant to ratify the Constitution without further assurances, and thus we find in the Bill of Rights amendments No. 2 and 3, specifically authorizing a decentralized militia, guaranteeing the right of the people to keep and bear arms, and prohibiting the quartering of troops in any house in time of peace without the consent of the owner.

Hence, at least two Supreme Court Justices would seem to take a somewhat differing view from that of the Attorney General.

In my view the interpretation of the second amendment so narrowly as to limit its application to maintenance of a militia is not so settled as some would have us believe.

Perhaps the right of the people under the second amendment is outmoded in this day of the atom bomb and the large standing army. But perhaps in this day of organized and increasing crime the citizen who has a firearm and knows how to use it properly in defense of his family and property should be encouraged. To be sure, I am not suggesting for 1 minute that we return to the days of the vigilantes or suggesting that each man take the law into his own hands. But it seems to me that one reason that the armed robbery rate in cities is 19 times that in rural areas is because potential criminals probably know that most familes in less densely populated areas have and know how to use firearms.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would again quote from the writings of the Chief Justice when he advises us:

> We may happily note that the Constitution has remarkably weathered a variety of crises. Some were as acute as those we face today. Today, as always, the people, no less than their courts must remain vigilant to preserve the principles of our Bill of Rights, lest in our desire to be secure we lose our ability to be free.

Mr. President, that is the substance of my comments on the bill at this time, a bill which is shortly to receive the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill has been productive of much concern in many areas of the country where, since the beginning of our Republic—certainly since the beginning of the opening of the vast areas of the country starting, perhaps, at the western slope of the Alleghenys and continuing all the way to the Pacific coast—the right to the legitimate ownership and use of firearms has been looked upon with favor and with a great deal of jealousy, because from time to time efforts have been made to restrict unduly the rights that are inherent in that regard.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock Thursday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, March 17, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1966:

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Louis B Robertshaw
Rathvon McC. Tompkins
Paul J. Fontana
John H. Masters
George S. Bowman, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Raymond G. Davis
Edward H. Hurst
Charles J. Quilter
Donn J. Robertson
Lowell E. English
Alvin S. Sanders

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Russell A. Bowen

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Joseph Palmer 2nd, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, March 14 is an important day for Americans of Slovak origin. It is the anniversary day of Slovak national independence. Public ceremonies marking this day will be held in many communities throughout the United States.

Great credit must go to the people of Slovakia for their unbreakable attachment to liberty and their struggles for the right of self-government. This spirit prevails in Slovakia today despite foreign occupation, the denial of elementary human rights and organized programs to destroy the ancient culture of her people.

There is increasing evidence that the new chains of imperialism on the Slovak people are weakening under the popular pressure exerted by the people for freedom of expression and self-government. This is a tribute to their determination to reject foreign occupation and to fight on for a restoration of their national independence.

Mr. Speaker, anything we can do to encourage the Slovak people in this cause serves the cause of peace and world freedom. Over many years responsible national organizations have urged the Voice of America to establish a Slovak desk as a part of our international information program. I have supported that proposal because I am convinced the best way to demonstrate our friendship for the people of any foreign country is to speak to them in their own language, to recognize their cultural values, to encourage them in their just aspirations for self-government.

The Slovak people have always maintained a warm friendship for the people of our country and a keen admiration for our free institutions. It is time that we responded more fully to evidence our support for their struggles to regain their national independence. A Slovak desk in the Voice of America would provide comfort and encouragement to our friends in that unhappy land.

I salute the Slovak people on their Independence Day and join with their many friends in our country in the hope that they will soon regain their rightful place in the community of free nations.

John Baldwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, John Baldwin, another of our beloved colleagues, has left us. He was a gentleman in every sense of that great word. Calm, steadfast, true—a shining example of integrity at work. His word was his bond.

We mourn his passing and extend to his loved ones our deepest sympathy in this, their hour of sorrow.

A Patriotic Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I received a letter from the wife of a young man who had been drafted. Because of the short notice he received from his draft board, the young man was unable to give his landlord the 30-day notice required by his lease. Therefore, the landlord at first decided to hold the security deposit.

However, when I wrote to the company which owned the apartment house explaining the circumstances, I immediately received a check for the deposit by return mail, and I have sent it to the draftee's wife.

The owner of the apartment is Yorkview Corp. Since landlords are often considered hardhearted, I am pleased to disclose this fine gesture and commend the officers of the Yorkview Corp., and especially its president, Alfred Sanzari.

Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, once again as our country finds it necessary to bolster our Armed Forces, Selective Service—the draft—has had to increase inductions to supply the men we need. Throughout our history—in colonial times, in the Civil War, World War I, World War II, and in the troubled times since 1948—the country has had to call its young men to service through some form of selective service. It is a method vital to our survival. It is the only democratic and sure method we have been able to devise to insure that the Armed Forces have the manpower they need when they need it, without disrupting essential industry and agriculture.

The present system is not an experiment. It has evolved over many years and the lessons of the errors of the past, often painful ones as in the Civil War, are reflected in the present legislation, the regulations and the policies which guide the present operation.

However, no agency or institution acquires a character of its own. Its success and its philosophies and polices are those of the people who guide it. The Selective Service System over the years has carried on a vital national program which is not popular but has won and kept the confidence of the American people. No scandal has touched the System. On December 20, 1965, a poll taken by the Washington Post showed that the draft is favored by 90 percent of the public.

The Governor of each State and territorial possession is the nominal head of the Selective Service System in his State. The State director, local board members, medical advisers, appeal agents, and State appeal boards are recommended by the Governor and appointed by the President.

The various Government agencies could well take a lesson from the Selective Service System. They operate over 4,000 local boards with over 40,000 dedicated Americans who serve without compensation. They donate many hours of their time each month from their business, rendering service to their communities, State, and Nation, for which they receive a certificate of appreciation when they have served 5, 10, 15, 20, or 25 years. Many of these dedicated uncompensated local board members have served since the beginning of the System in 1940.

Because of the existence of Selective Service, the Armed Forces, with the cooperation of the Selective Service local board clerks and members, are able to maintain their authorized strengths. Since 1940, the Selective Service System registered and classified over 83 million men, inducted over 14 million and over 10 million volunteered, a total of 24 million who have served their country.

The Selective Service System provides the compulsion and many young men volunteer for the service of their choice when they are sent up for preinduction physical or just before being reached for induction by their local boards. Many local board clerks have been awarded certificates of appreciation by the various services for their assistance in recruiting.

The Selective Service System is blamed for many misunderstandings for which they are not responsible, such as the rejection of Cassius Clay and others. The Armed Forces establish the physical, mental, and moral standards and conduct the examinations. The Armed Forces examining and entrance stations determine whether a registrant sent by Selective Service is accepted or rejected for physical, mental, or moral reasons.

General Hershey is an administrator and carries out laws and regulations prescribed by Congress and the President. History will record General Hershey as the greatest manpower stabilizer of our time. He has provided necessary manpower for the Armed Forces, industry, agriculture, education, and research. I know of no man with a better appreciation of the individual's, the family's, and the community's deep concern with the way Selective Service operates; nor with a clearer insight into the demands of the national interest which the System must serve. Over the years, many Members of the Congress have come to know General Hershey and to appreciate his qualities and his wisdom which have been indispensable in the administration of the Selective Service System. The Congress and the public are fortunate to have this great American citizen still at the head of Selective Service in these uncertain days.

I commend General Hershey, his staff, local board clerks, and the uncompensated patriotic citizens for a job well done and at little cost to the Government.

Tribute to Two Outstanding Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to two outstanding American citizens, Mr. James G. Patton, retiring president of the National Farmers Union and Mr. Glenn Talbott, who is stepping down as vice president of the Farmers Union here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Patton is retiring from the presidency after 25 years of faithful and loyal service, and is not seeking reelection to the post.

When these two men began their careers, the traditional scene of American rural life was very difficult and farmers endured many hardships. But, through efforts of men such as Mr. Patton and Mr. Talbott, great advances have been made in rural life. The spirit and values made and contributed by these men, have given much to the people and for the betterment of rural life in the United States.

I send felicitations, as Congressman from the First District of Iowa, and from the citizens of southeast Iowa, to these fine gentlemen and heartiest congratulations for their years of dedicated service.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the peoples in the Balkan Peninsula is most characteristically marked by their subjugation to Ottoman Turkish despotism until the late 19th century. For more than 400 years these peoples, among the stanchest defenders of their freedom in Europe, lived under the ruthless regime of the sultans. The Bulgarian people suffered the same fate, and not until the 1870's were they able, with the effective aid of czarist Russia, to free themselves. This was accomplished during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. Then Turkey was defeated, and as one of the conditions of the ensuing peace Russia secured Bulgaria's freedom. Thus the peace treaty signed on March 3, 1878, terminating that war, marked Bulgaria's liberation from Ottoman Turkish tyranny, and since that day March 3 has become a Bulgarian national holiday.

Today when the Bulgarian people are deprived of their freedom once more and are suffering under Communist totalitarianism, which in many ways seems more callous and ruthless than the regime of the sultans, that memorable day of 88 years ago naturally looms large in their modern history. They rightly think of it as the day which ushered in a new era for them, marking an important turning point in their national political history. Since that epoch-making event the Bulgarian people have endured much suffering and misery. They went through the two World Wars, and in neither of these wars were they the gainers. Although they were the losers in both, their loss at the end of the last war was the more tragic because they expected, at the very least, to retain their freedom. The rudest shock they experienced was in 1945, when they found themselves imprisoned in their homeland, sealed off from the free world, and kept behind the Iron Curtain.

Since 1945 the Bulgarians have lived under a Communist regime imposed and maintained over them by the Kremlin. Sad and tragic as their lot has been for more than two decades, they have not given up their hope for freedom, their goal of national independence. On the 88th anniversary observance of Bulgarian Liberation Day, let us all hope that soon they will again attain their goal and live in peace in their homeland.

The 47th Anniversary of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion's National Commander L. Eldon James, in his acceptance speech to the convention delegates at Portland, Oreg., said:

> The responsibility we face now and in the months ahead is to back our Government's determined policy in South Vietnam and further—to help rally the first support of all Americans to the defense of freedom there. We shall do our determined best to support our Armed Forces in every way that will enable them to do their job and to return home.

With these words, Commander James echoed the pledge to safeguard justice, freedom, and democracy which the American Legion first made when it was founded 47 years ago and which it continues to uphold as a sacred trust today.

The American Legion has grown and prospered since it first came into being during the Paris caucus held March 15–17, 1919, and has become an organization which has served America patriotically and steadfastly over the years through three major conflicts, World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and now, the Vietnam conflict.

Such distinguished Americans as Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Bennett Clark, Eric Fisher Wood, and Henry D. Lindsley were among the 463 founding officers and men of the American Legion in 1919. This small group has grown today to a strength of more than 2,000,000 active members who play a vigorous role in promoting educational opportunities for our youth, in protecting the moral strength of our Nation, and in defending our country's security both at home and abroad.

From sponsoring high school oratorical contests to supporting the American Legion baseball program, from protecting the fallen and disabled veteran to initiating drives for passage of legislation as far reaching as the GI bill of rights, the American Legion has always stood for selfless service to all Americans. It has always done its utmost to protect the American way of life, and the great institutions of freedom, such as the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, that have served as solid foundations on which our country's greatness has been built.

Today, we celebrate the 47th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion. I want to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to the American Legion on reaching this milestone, and to wish its members Godspeed in many more years of useful service to our deserving veterans and to a grateful nation.

Cyprus Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the problem of Cyprus is one that has become complicated and involved because recent history of Cyprus has departed from the normal course of self-determination in consequence of the persistent denial of self-determination by the administering power concerned.

The Zurich and London agreements which were virtually imposed on the people of the island while they were still under colonial domination, produced a constitution unworkable in its basic structure. The United Nations mediator, who tried to find an accommodating solution, in his report described it as a constitutional oddity.

The constitution—to take one example—provided that in the House of Representatives of 50 members or more that 8 Turkish negative votes could defeat and negate 42 other affirmative votes in any fiscal or other important legislation, thereby stalling the whole financial machinery of government. This was surely not a constitution that has ever been, or could possibly be, applied anywhere. In addition to such imbalance, sharply divisive provisions of the constitution, creating the atmosphere of opposing ethnic camps set the stage for antagonism and friction.

Through dividing the towns and municipalities, that were never divided before in their long history, dividing the courts of justice in a way that actually has resulted in a denial of justice. Through many other provisions of separation and imbalance this basic legal framework inevitably led to the strife and trouble that erupted in the island of Cyprus in December 1963 with all the regrettable fighting and bloodshed that ensued.

Provisions in the Zurich and London agreements for intervention by three outside powers, Britain, Greece, and Turkey in the internal affairs of Cyprus and particularly the interpretation given by Turkey to such intervention as allowing it to use military force in violation of the charter, had further aggravated the situation.

The factors brought the danger of actual war between Greece and Turkey, with consequences of unknown gravity and extent. The United Nations Security Council on two occasions; namely, on December 27, 1963, and on March 13, 1964, and the U.S. efforts on the third occasion in June 1964, averted that dangerous development.

The United Nations force in Cyprus operating under the resolution of the Security Council of March 4, 1964, has done a most constructive work in preventing the recurrence of fighting and maintaining peace in the island.

The situation is now calm and peaceful, but the solution of the problem is not yet in sight. The Security Council resolution took care not only of the pacification of the island through a United Nations force, but also of the overall solution of the problem through the appointment of a United Nations mediator. According to the report of the Secretary General, however—December 1963—the peacekeeping endeavor of the United Nations has been successful, but not that of peacemaking. The reasons are:

First, that the long-awaited results of the United Nations mediation started by the late Mr. Touomioyia and continued by Mr. Galo Plaza, were brought to a standstill. The report of Plaza issued on March 26, 1965, a constructive document consistent with the principles and purposes of the charter, was rejected by Turkey, who also objected to the mediator continuing his work.

The Secretary General of the United Nations, however, in his introduction to the annual report on the work of the organization—A/6001/Add. 1—reaffirmed his confidence in the mediator and spoke of his report as "encouraging, because it envisaged a reasonable basis for a settlement of the problem." But the negative attitude of the Turkish Government toward that report has thus frustrated the whole mediation effort toward a solution.

The second reason is that the relations between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots have not shown any improvement according to the Secretary General's report. Some constructive steps toward easing the situation and a return to normality appear to have been taken by the Government of Cyprus, such as the unilateral dismantling of Government armed posts, the reconstruction of destroyed Turkish houses, the offering of amnesty and the declaration of intent regarding international guarantees of minority rights through the United Nations.

The armed Turkish Cypriots in cell groups operating under the organization TMT and directed by officers from Turkey, oppose any normalization move. In these enclaves, which cover hardly 1.8 percent of the territory of the island, thousands of Turkish residents are being segregated against their will by this Turkish organization and forbidden to return to their homes and villages or resume their normal occupations, in an effort to promote the purpose of partition. In these areas the arbitrary rule of intimidation and terrorism prevails. A number of Turkish Cypriots have escaped at the risk of being shot if caught in the act of escaping or of being kidnaped later.

In the rest of the territory of Cyprus, which is under the control of the Government, the rule of law fully applies and the administration of justice functions satisfactorily in unified courts, in which Greek and Turkish judges work together in full cooperation, and without discrimination. The chief justice is a Turk, enjoying general respect, who has been promoted to the post by the Government of Cyprus as presently constituted. But extremists in a civil disobedience injunction issued to the Turkish Cypriots forbid them to attend these courts for any of their business or to obey its summons.

These intimidations extend also to Turks living outside the enclaves, who on the threat of retaliatory punishment are forbidden to have any relations or trade dealings with their Greek compatriots, or even to speak to them. In this way it is sought to keep up division and strife in Cyprus and to prevent the return of normal relations to which the bulk of the Turkish Cypriots no less than their Greek cocitizens aspire.

It is this divisive policy that constitutes a main stumbling block to the solution of the Cyprus problem.

It is obvious that under such conditions there can be little progress toward negotiation for solution. It should be the duty, therefore, of all who realize the need for an early solution of the Cyprus problem, to see to it that deliberate obstruction to reconciliation by extremist methods, ceases.

The United States may not at this time wish to commit itself in favor of any particular solution of the problem. But the United States certainly can, and should, commit itself in favor of a just and democratic solution and particularly in support of a reconciliation and a better climate in the intercommunal relations in the island, as an indispensable prelude to a solution.

The United States must not permit the lack of payment of the United Nations peacekeeping forces in Cyprus to cause these forces to be withdrawn within the next several months. These forces are necessary for the protection of both the Greek and Turkish populations of Cyprus and for the security of the NATO forces, peoples, and powers in the Mediterranean area. I strongly recommend prompt and affirmative action be taken by this administration.

I feel deeply that such a positive stand is one that could well be taken by the U.S. Government in the best traditions of our Nation and in the sense of our responsibility as a leading world power.

Thy Brother Hungers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Agriculture Committee of the House, I want to emphasize the extremely high priority we must give the war on hunger program.

The food population crisis of the world is here today, and will be catastrophic tomorrow, unless massive worldwide efforts are used to alleviate the situation.

A low death rate coupled with a population explosion creates the problem.

The cruel, naked facts show that the world is rapidly facing its worst famines in history. Our world leaders are jittery over the bleak prospects of an early easing of the problem unless the complete resources of all nations are used. Experts estimate it will take 15 to 25 years just to slow down the rate of starvation.

The world food shortage has been growing since World War II. The population explosion is the heart of the problem. By 1980 the world's population will be 4.6 billion—today it stands at 3.4 billion. These 1.2 billion additional people will require a minimum of 200 million tons of grain per year; plus other agricultural products—over and above what is being produced in the world today.

Two-thirds of the world's people live in countries with nutritionally inadequate diets. These areas are: all of Asia, except Japan and Israel, all except the southern tip of Africa, the northern part of South America, and almost all of Central America, and the Caribbean. These people average 900 calories per day below the level of the one-third of the world living in countries with adequate national average diets; and 300 calories below the average nutritional standard for the food-deficit areas. The daily consumption of protein is less than two-thirds of the level in the food-adequate countries; and the fat consumption rate is less than one-third.

Red China's main interest today is food. She has as one of her goals the capturing of the vast fertile lands of the rice bowl of Vietnam. The full production from these lands could materially ease her critical food needs.

The food-deficit countries are poor and food shortages merely reflect the low level of living in general. Per capita income is only $97 compared to $1,074 in diet-adequate countries. These food deficit countries are already densely populated with 53 persons per 100 acres of agricultural land compared to 17 persons per 100 acres in the diet-adequate countries. And the population is increasing faster in the food-deficit countries.

The hard-core problem of the food deficit countries is one of productivity. The people are unable to produce enough food for themselves or produce enough other products to enable them to buy the food they need.

Throughout the world's history, the area of agricultural land has increased with population. New lands are no longer available at a reasonable cost in heavily populated food-deficit countries.

To produce more food on the same amount of land then, is to increase yields per acre. This is difficult to do when workers are illiterate, and lacking in capital, technical, and management skills for using modern farming practices.

The job becomes even more difficult. Not only is the extra capital for agriculture needed, but capital is also needed for the nonagriculture sectors of the economy.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

The nations of the world are made up of the "haves" and the "have nots." The gap in living standards between these two groups is increasing. This broadening gap creates the most colossal social, economic, and political problem of our times.

There are two approaches to the problem: reduce the birth rate, and increase agricultural production.

In the next 5 to 15 years both of these avenues will have to be used if population and food supplies are going to be kept in balance. These developments will be slow. Reducing the birth rate and increasing agricultural production are basic social changes, and they change slowly.

Family planning alone cannot do the job, and a more productive agriculture alone cannot do the job. Both avenues must be used effectively. If you look at the minute hand of the world's clock—the next 10 to 15 years—birth control cannot have a major impact. Therefore, a highly productive agriculture must be the all-important partial solution to the food-population problem during the next 10 to 15 years.

Birth rates could drop significantly during this period; but it will not have a major effect on food needs. However, after 1980, family planning will have to become the major factor, because agriculture cannot possibly keep up with the population increases.

Large increases in agricultural production can be achieved in most of the countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Crop yields are low in these areas; in many cases yields per acre are one-fifth to one-half the yields of North America, Europe, or Japan.

To get higher crop yields in these "have not" areas is a slow and difficult process. Several factors are involved: illiteracy of the people—they cannot read or write or do simple arithmetic, or understand plant biology; and vast shortages of capital and technical manpower are needed. The organizational problems involved in disseminating the knowledge, materials, and equipment needed is a gigantic job.

The food production in Africa, Asia, and Latin America can be improved. The time factor can be shortened if the "have" nations are willing to put money, materials, and manpower into a crash program.

Here are some recommendations:

First. Increase shipments of food under the food-for-peace program on a stopgap basis. There are only about 10 food-surplus countries in the world today. The United States produces about 60 percent of the total world food surplus.

Second. Send fertilizers and other agricultural production needs to food-deficit countries. This includes needed fertilizers, improved seed varieties, pesticides, and farm equipment. One ton of plant nutrients will produce about 10 tons of additional grain.

Third. Help food-deficit countries to produce their own agricultural needs. This means helping these countries to build factories, manufacture pesticides, and build equipment. The countries must be shown how to develop and produce improved seed varieties. Their irrigation, drainage, land clearance, and conservation problems must also be given a hand.

Fourth. Supply technical manpower. To get this extra agricultural production much technical manpower will be needed besides money and materials. It has been estimated that some 10,000 agricultural specialists would be needed to accomplish this herculean task of getting the world fed. There are less than 1,000 such specialists now in all of the "have not" countries from the "have" countries.

Fifth. Step up research on agriculture in the food-deficit countries. This means more research on agriculture in the tropics. Ninety-five percent of the research has been in temperate zones, and less than 5 percent on tropical agriculture.

ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Most would agree that:

It is true that man cannot live by bread alone, but he must have bread first, before he can aspire to things more venturesome.

Inadequate food supplies for people in underdeveloped countries are the primary cause for their political instability and social unrest.

A livable world cannot long exist where two-thirds do not get enough to eat and one-third are overfed.

During the past 20 years American foreign policy has been shaped by two rugged forces, namely communism, and the nuclear arms race.

Now the food-population situation is rising as a third major force. And as time moves on it may become the most powerful of these major forces.

Americans have a Christian trait of compassion for fellow human beings in need. Ten years ago the Congress enacted a food-for-peace program which is one of the most successful and imaginative efforts ever made by a nation to help less fortunate nations.

We must now help on even a more massive effort if we are to have well-being in this Nation in the years ahead.

It is paradoxical, but by helping the underdeveloped countries to increase their own productivity we help ourselves. This extra productivity translates itself into an extra demand for the products from our farms and factories.

The United States, with the help of other developed nations must assist the underdeveloped countries to increase their food production, through technology, capital, and equipment.

The challenge that faces us is to duplicate within the next 35 years everything that mankind has achieved since time began. The all-important word in this challenge is time—for the race is against time.

The United States cannot falter in this war on hunger. The whole situation is really a systems problem. All the factors are needed at the same time if the food production effort is to be fruitful.

These are the factors: Water, seeds, fertilizers, soil practices, insecticides and pest control, management, capital investment, credit, storage facilities, roads and transportation, communications, and education.

To help the underdeveloped nations to produce their own food is the most important facet of the overall problem. This will take a minimum of 15 years. And in the next 15 years the world will need a 50-percent increase in grain production just to keep even.

It has been estimated to accomplish this, a capital investment of $80 billion is required. A third of this would have to come from foreign aid from the developed countries.

The most critical problem of all is neither capital or foreign exchange—but managerial talent. This must be trained here and abroad.

To help close this food-gap, we are going to have to increase food production in this country. The food surplus problems we have been wrestling with for the last 20 years will be a thing of the past. Farmland that has been in conservation reserves will be gradually taken out and placed into production for the war on hunger. This will be done in an orderly manner, so that the marketing system will function properly.

The Callan strategic food reserve bill will be considered in this session of the Congress. This bill provides for basic food reserves for our country. In an all-out war on hunger, the reserves would assure us protection from basic food shortages in this country.

It is not enough to look at the world's food deficit only in terms of calories per person. The quality of food is very important. A shortage of protein for example in the diet weakens the body so that it easily falls prey to other diseases.

In the war on hunger we must gear some of our extra acres to the production of higher protein foods, as soybeans, and animal products.

How about more protein from the sea? The strange fact is that the oceans do not contain unlimited quantities of fish. Nations are now fishing actively in the better fishing areas. Man still depends on basic agriculture for 99 percent of his food.

While the agricultural program is being developed we must also help the underdeveloped nations in their family planning program—if there is a fighting chance to win the war on hunger.

We cannot neglect public health in the underdeveloped countries in favor of family planning. There is a direct relationship between birth rate and death rate, particularly in infant and child mortality.

In many countries a son is the only social security a couple has in their old age. The son provides for their well-being. This is the accepted custom in underdeveloped countries. Because of the high child mortality the average couple needs to produce many children, so that a son will survive. Whenever infant and child mortality can be decreased to a low enough level, the chances in an individual family that a male child will survive becomes very much greater. This would decrease the pressure to have more children. To win the war on hunger, the battle will have to be waged on two fronts—agriculture and population.

If thy brother hungers, feed him—for this is Biblical.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie Outlines Broad Program of Water Quality Control Before American Water Works Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier this month, the American Water Works Association, the oldest association of its kind in the field, conducted a public water supply seminar at the Sheraton Park Hotel. Featured among the participants, was the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], who is recognized as one of our most effective exponents for a more aggressive attack on problems of water pollution.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution since its organization under the knowledgeable and capable leadership of the Senator from Maine. His speech before the members of the American Water Works Association, "Water Quality and the National Interest," gives further evidence of the Senator's broad grasp of the field and his farsighted approach toward water resources planning. I commend this address to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Water Quality and the National Interest

(Remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, at the public water supply seminar, American Water Works Association, Washington, D.C., March 1, 1966)

President Baxter, officers, members, and friends of the American Water Works Association, I am glad to be able to join with you in your seminar on our public water supply requirements. The times are auspicious for such an occasion. On February 18 I introduced, on behalf of myself and a number of my colleagues—now 40 in number—amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. On February 23 the President sent a special message on our natural heritage of the Congress. Much of that message dealt with water pollution control and abatement. Yesterday legislation to implement the President's proposals was introduced in the Congress. Tonight President Baxter and I are scheduled to leave for Germany with Secretary Udall and other members of a special Presidential mission to study pollution and related matters.

No one can complain that water pollution is not getting its share of attention. The real test will come in seeing how well we translate words and aspirations into effective action.

The problems of pollution are not new. They have plagued man from the earliest civilizations. Man cannot live without creating wastes, and those wastes represent a potential threat to his health and to life itself.

But in recent years the threat has been magnified and has become, in effect, a new problem. Our population has grown to a point where our water needs are almost greater than the available supply. At the same we have succeeded in creating chemical and radioactive wastes whose characteristics have almost defied our efforts to clean them up.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 represented one of the major steps in a national effort to grapple with the fact that water is not an unlimited resource. As Abel Wolman has put it—in his imaginatively titled Scientific American article, "The Metabolism of Cities"—"As man has come to appreciate that the earth is a closed ecological system, casual methods that once appeared satisfactory for the disposal of wastes no longer seem acceptable. He has the daily evidence of his eyes and nose to tell him that his planet cannot assimilate without limit the untreated wastes of his civilization."

There are those who reject this approach. There are others who pay lipservice to the doctrine of pollution control and abatement—as long as it doesn't cost any money. But, fortunately for the conservation of our water resources, there is an increasing number of our citizens who are ready and willing to make the necessary investment in the improvement of water quality.

High quality water is more than the dream of the conservationists, more than a political slogan; high quality water, in the right quantity at the right place and at the right time, is essential to health, recreation, and economic growth.

This was the philosophy of the Water Quality Act of 1965, the basic purpose of which is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, our primary concern was with repairing past damage and slowing the advance of pollution. Now, we have turned the corner, to focus on tomorrow's needs as well as today's crises.

We know, for example, that our present national water use rate is in the vicinity of 350 billion gallons a day. Our total supply of water is 1,200 billion gallons a day. The most we can extract, economically, is about 550 billion gallons a day. By the year 2000, barring major advances in reuse, we will have a water deficit of 200 to 400 billion gallons a day. And that deficit will not be evenly divided.

The Water Quality Act is not the final answer to these needs. But it was designed to provide us with two important instruments for the establishment and implementation of a national water policy: (1) the new Water Pollution Control Administration, directly responsible to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and armed with a mandate to consider all aspects of water pollution control and abatement; and (2) the water quality standards section, designed to stimulate cooperative Federal-interstate-State-local water resources planning and aimed at improvement as well as repair of those water resources.

In addition, the act provided for modest increases in Federal authorizations for sewage treatment construction grants, a pilot program to deal with the problem of combined storm and sanitary sewerage, a bonus for regional planning of sewage treatment systems and a special enforcement provision for situations where shellfish harvesting is prevented as a result of pollution.

The act, as finally signed, was the product of a long struggle. There were times when we despaired of obtaining agreement. But the compromise achieved by the Senate and the House, was, in several respects, more effective than either the original Senate or House version.

Our success in implementing the Water Quality Act and in providing additional tools for the war against pollution will depend on our skill in identifying specific pollution problems, in planning the optimum utilization of our water resources, in making appropriate decisions on the construction of effective municipal and industrial waste treatment works, and in achieving scientific and technical advances in the removal of waste and the treatment of water for reuse.

The identification of water pollution problems is not as simple as it may seem. In the past we have concentrated our attention on what we might call "conventional" pollution—human waste, organic materials from food processing, suspended solids and toxic residues from industrial processes. For the most part those wastes could be traced and controlled. Now, however, in addition to attacking these wastes, we must cope with the impact of dispersed and persistent wastes which cannot be traced to individual plants or municipal sewer systems. The "new" wastes include fertilizers, herbicides, fungicides, insecticides, and irrigation residues from agricultural pursuits, detergents from homes, radioactive wastes from atomic energy and research plants, and salts and other materials which wash off highways, parking lots, garages, and buildings.

Many of these pollutants are not biodegradable. They defy conventional treatment and build up in water supplies, making them undesirable and dangerous for reuse. And, as we learn more about the dangers of long-term low level exposure to some of these materials we realize that no waste substance can be written off as harmless in our increasingly crowded society.

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution is aware that research in the area of detecting, identifying, controlling, and treating "dispersed" and chemically complex wastes must be accelerated.

The second major area of water quality activity must come in the acceleration of our waste treatment facility construction. Several steps were taken in the 1st session of the 89th Congress, including the temporary increase in sewage treatment grant authorizations, the bonus provisions for regional sewage treatment systems, and the research and development funds for improved methods of dealing with combined storm and sanitary sewage—all in the Water Quality Act, the water and sewage grants in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and the Public Works and Economic Development Act, and the new rural community water and sewer program under the Aiken act.

Any extension of the treatment systems, particularly on a regional basis, suggests the possibility of more integration between municipal and industrial treatment systems. We recognize that there are problems of waste compatibility, but there is evidence that in many areas economies could be achieved, to the advantage of industries and municipalities.

The final major area of concern is advance waste treatment and purification of water reuse. The drought which has affected the Northeast in the past few years has accelerated concern with water supplies. Technologically there are several ways of dealing with the problem. We can transport water from areas where the supply exceeds the demand. We can draw on the resources of the sea through delination plants. We can treat our waste water and reuse it to a much higher degree than we do today.

Each method has its disciples, and the discussions of the relative merits of each sometimes approach the level of a theological debate. The general approach our subcommittee has taken is that no one system provides the answer, but that a combination of all three will be needed to meet different circumstances in different parts of the country.

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution is endeavoring to meet each of these major concerns, with new programing and increased fund authorizations.

"Steps Toward Clean Water," a recent report by the subcommittee, documents the costs of launching an effective program of pollution control and abatement. For instance, the present level of Federal aid for treatment plants is $150 million a year. But the subcommittee has estimated that present needs in our major cities, alone, total more than $1.3 billion. In 6 years this total will double.

The subcommittee found that the national price tag for needed treatment facilities will be about $20 billion by 1972. This would provide secondary treatment facilities for 80 percent of the population, plus tertiary treatment for 20 percent of the population, including some joint industrial-municipal systems.

In our quest for clean water, we are in a race against the clock: a race we cannot afford to lose.

To meet this challenge there must be a greater effort by all levels of government. To beef up Federal participation and to stimulate our States and cities my subcommittee has made several recommendations.

These include increasing Federal authorizations nearly seven times, to a total of $6 billion through 1972; eliminating the present dollar ceiling for Federal grants for treatment facilities; paying 30 percent of the costs of treatment facilities, regardless of the individual project price; providing a bonus to projects in which the State matches the Federal contribution; providing Federal loans for cities when the States do not share in the cost; enabling cities to apply directly for Federal help when their States do not match Federal grants; and strengthening research and development efforts for advanced waste treatment and industrial-municipal systems.

All of these proposals would support an effective implementation of the water quality standards provisions of the act of 1965 and the development of sound water resource planning and development.

Since the enactment of the Water Quality Act of 1965, the members of the subcommittee have been concerned with the appointment of a Water Pollution Control Administrator. He has now been appointed. But there is still a period of administrative uncertainty ahead.

The President has proposed the transfer of the Water Pollution Control Administration to the Department of the Interior in a reorganization plan he submitted to the Congress yesterday. A number of us have reservations about the proposal. We must resolve our questions or act to disapprove the plan within the next 60 days.

In addition, the President has proposed organizing the water pollution control program along river basin lines. This proposal is based partially on the Water Quality Act of 1965 and partially on the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. It would, in effect, tie eligibility for Federal sewage treatment construction assistance to participation in a river basin plan which includes the use of water quality standards, expanded enforcement and long-term local financing arrangements.

A second major feature of the President's proposal is a tightening of enforcement procedures, including a reduction in the time required to implement enforcement actions under the present act, authorization for subpena powers for the Secretary in connection with enforcement procedures, provision for citizens' suits in Federal district courts where damage from pollution is alleged, and expansion of the authority of the Secretary in setting water quality standards.

Finally, the administration's legislation provides some increases in Federal assistance for sewage treatment construction, an increase in Federal assistance in State pollution control programs and an increase in the authorization for Federal water pollution control research.

The President's proposals are far reaching. They provide additional evidence of his concern with the conservation of the quality of our environment. Taken with the other proposal pending before the committee, they offer the Congress an opportunity to build an imaginative and sound water quality improvement program on the foundation of the Water Quality Act we developed and enacted last year.

But beyond the action of the Congress, beyond the recommendations of the President, the final responsibility for achieving our goals will rest with you who must labor in the field, helping to develop water quality standards to meet your local and regional needs, developing the specific sewage treatment systems, and administering control and abatement programs at the State and local level.

As we approach our hearings on the legislation before us, we shall solicit your counsel and advice on the most desirable and effective ways in which we can improve the Federal role in enhancing the quality of our water resources.

Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NEWSLETTER

MARCH 20, 1966.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am writing to give you personally the dates on new U.S. laws, and deadlines that are really important to each U.S. citizen and our families.

1. March 31, 1966: Deadline for application for new voluntary Federal health insurance program for our people 65 or older. If your older relative or friend can't make the application, make it for him. Get applications at Pittsburgh Social Security Office—915 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh. Benefits begin July 1, 1966.

This excellent economy program costs only $3 a month with good coverage for hospital and doctor bills. Sixteen million people have already applied out of 19 million eligible. The next chance will not come until October 1967, then protection won't start until July 1968 and premiums will be higher. If you have health insurance or Blue Cross already, sign up anyhow. Don't cancel Blue Cross or your health insurance policies. These are now being revised to fit the new law so no overlapping. Remember new law does not cover everything. Even if you have already sent in to the Social Security Office your choice as "no" on this program, you can now change your mind until March 31.

Note: For this voluntary program people can apply who are not retired or have never worked under social security system in any job. Whether you are working or retired under social security or not, railroad retirement, or Federal, State or local government, or company pension, sign up. Applications mailed and postmarked on March 31 are okay. If you are nearing 65, apply for the voluntary health insurance program in the period 90 days before your 65th birthday.

BENEFITS INCLUDE

(a) Doctor's bills: Program pays 80 percent of all doctor's bills (no maximum). Patient pays only first $50 cost each year (not each month and not each illness).

(b) Prepaid hospital care: For each illness, 90 days in semi-private room. Patient pays first $40 for all costs and after 60 days patient pays $10 a day of his bill.

(c) Outpatient services covered for 20-day period. Patient pays $20 plus one-fifth balance.

(d) Home care covered (after 3 days' hospital stay) up to 100 home visits, including part-time nurses, interns, physical therapists, etc.

This voluntary Federal prepaid health program is originally a Republican proposed program, and is now law through support of both parties and the unanimous support of all Pennsylvania Congressmen. It is approved by doctors and hospital organizations, as well as the Scranton administration. I opposed original "medicare" bill, but voted for this compromise.

I urge all people 65 and over to take advantage of this program.

As an extra service to my district, I have studied this program, consulted with officials, and have prepared this outline (not at Government expense) to make sure my friends know what it is.

P.S.—Birth certificate: Regardless of your age, be sure you get your birth certificate if you are not now getting benefits under social security. You will later have to prove your age and it gets harder to do each year for older people.

My advice: First write Office of BioStatistics, City County Building, Pittsburgh. If no record there, write Division of Vital Statistics, Post Office Box 90, Harrisburg, Pa. If you were born out of Pennsylvania, write to Governor of your State or mayor of town of birth for form of application. Or write your church pastor where you were baptized—a copy of your baptismal certificate certified by the pastor will help.

2. April 15, 1966: Final date for filing personal income tax returns. Do not let this slip as penalties are high—must be filed if you made $600 or more during 1965 if you are under 65, or $1,200 or more if 65 or older. Personal income tax return must be filed even if you had a loss from individual business operation, accident, or on sale of stock.

3. April 1966: New GI bill applications to be filed by veterans.

Vets discharged after January 31, 1955, make application for education benefits under new GI bill (which I cosponsored). Education benefits go into effect June 1, 1966, for 8 years, if vet discharged on or after June 1, 1966. Time limit for vets discharged before June 1, 1966, is May 31, 1974. First checks mailed July. GI bill covers vets (men and women) of all U.S. armed services with 6 months' active duty (but not including special 6-month Reserve programs). Vets can get applications at all VA offices, colleges, schools, etc.

Benefits calculated: 1 month benefit for each month service up to 36 months.

Amounts: $100 month—single vet; $125—one dependent; $150—more than one dependent.

Part-time training—can get part of benefits.

TELL YOUR U.S. SERVICE FRIENDS AND RELATIVES

(a) While still in service, men and women with 2 years' active duty can qualify for immediate benefits where they are stationed.

(b) Although no benefits for past schooling, there are graduate study benefits. A vet can take new courses.

(c) Home loan programs—for 10-year period. Vets can get VA guarantee for home loans up to $7,500 through banks, building and loans, etc.

(d) Veterans' Administration medical and hospital care are put on same basis as for all U.S. wartime veterans—including burial benefits.

(e) Veterans' preference for Federal employment renewed.

TO FAMILIES AND FRIENDS OF MEN IN UNIFORM

As a World War II vet myself, I am opposing administration proposals for deferment of hospitals and housing for military, in favor of Great Society spending programs. Also as the administration has forgotten U.S. military personnel in the current recommended Federal employee pay raise, I am insisting on equal treatment for our U.S. armed services for pay raises and increase of family housing and quarters allowances. Count on my full support.

TO PARENTS OF SCHOOLCHILDREN, SCHOOL OFFICIALS, AND TEACHERS

I have cosponsored the bill to block the Johnson administration's budget plan to cut back the Federal special milk program for schoolchildren from $103 million to $21 million this year, a cut of $82 million. This would be tragic as 806,253 Pennsylvania children in 4,855 schools are served milk each day under this program. I believe billions can be cut from the Federal budget, but clearly this is false economy in the wrong place. I believe that we in Congress can and should restore the program in full.

My advice: Do not cut your local school budget now as Federal funds are available to June 30, 1966. Wait to see how this fight turns out before next fall.

TO COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Make your plans to stay in school, do not plan to drop out because of the recent announcement that the President is terminating Federal loans to students under the national defense student loan program. I believe we in Congress will be able to block any action that cuts off your loans this fall under the present program until the new guaranteed loan program can be worked out.

I oppose strongly the policy that will give outright billions as handouts to "dropouts" from high schools and grade schools, when the administration then pulls tight its purse strings when it comes to lending college students a few dollars to get an education. We must be fair to both groups.

U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity states that the cost of keeping each boy in Job Corps camp is $9,120 a year, and $8,400 for each girl in camp (all free and 17 times price of regular schools). So much for so few.

I voted against increase this year of $1 billion in such programs.

Taxes: This month I have voted against President Johnson's proposal to raise excise taxes on cars, and telephones, which will be used on increased spending programs at home.

Spending: I am opposing $750,000 for building a new home for the Vice President (in addition to land value of several million). No wonder the budget is so high.

Present emergency: We are in a real war in Vietnam, as I reported on my return in December from my investigation and study trip in Vietnam and the Pacific area. So we must be very careful of the Federal budget to keep a sound U.S. economy and to back our men in the armed services with the most modern equipment, ammunition, and supplies. But we must be intelligent in using economy in the right places and cutting down strong on the inefficient and needless nonmilitary and subsidy programs, and just plain boondoggles.

Personal regards,

JIM FULTON.

President Johnson Receives the Order of AHEPA Socratic Award for 1966, the 145th Year of Greek Independence; Harold Harper, of West Springfield, Mass., Newly Elected Governor for Massachusetts District, Order of AHEPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 145th anniversary of the Greek War of Independence against Ottoman rule. Greek independence began on March 25, 1821, when Archbishop Germanos of Patras unfurled the national flag of Greece.

Since 1821 the people of the United States have followed the course of Greek history with keen interest. We have been intensely concerned with the safety and security of Greeks in their homeland and have helped them on more than one occasion to strengthen democracy in this birthplace of democracy. I am indeed glad that we have been able to do this, and on the 145th anniversary of Greek independence we are proud to have Greece as our loyal ally in defense of freedom in the world.

Mr. Speaker, last night I joined with my other colleagues in the House and Senate as an honored guest at the 17th national banquet in honor of Members of the 89th Congress, sponsored by the Order of AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, and held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel here in Washington. Joining me at the dinner were two of my good friends from Springfield, Mass., Harold Harper, who is the governor of the Massachusetts district of AHEPA, and James Mazarakos, a longtime member of Altis chapter No. 85, Order of AHEPA, of Springfield.

The Order of AHEPA Socratic Award and Scroll this year was presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson "for contributions and services during a lifetime to country and humanity; as a teacher in early years; as a young Congressman and a Senator from the great State of Texas; as a leader of men, learned in the ways of human nature and persuasive in complex idiosyncracies; as a world leader, with a clear mind, a stout heart, and a deep compassion for the underprivileged, the underfed, and the oppressed; as the organizer of the Great Society for humanity's sake; as the defender and the protector of all human liberties inscribed in blood and tears on the pages of history; as the husband and father and friend of loyalty and sincerity; for all these virtues and objects, which are basic in our Hellenic heritage and our American culture and fundamental in the life and record of the Archontic Order of AHEPA."

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY spoke at the banquet and thanked the members of AHEPA for the important role they played through the years in gaining support for the immigration amendments sponsored by our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and President Johnson, and enacted into law last year, which eliminates the heretofore offensive national origins quota system.

The word "Ahepa" itself explains the organization of Greek-Americans founded on July 26, 1922, at Atlanta, Ga., as follows: A—American, h—Hellenic, e—educational, p—progressive, and a—association. As an organization devoted to 40 years of programs and accomplishments in the fields of American citizenship, educational projects, and charitable endeavors, the AHEPA fraternity takes the opportunity at these national banquets to pay tribute to the Members of Congress for their devoted services to the welfare and progress of the American people and government.

Mr. Speaker, with permission I include with my remarks the salute to Congress by AHEPA, President Johnson's letter to AHEPA, the banquet program, and the head-table guests.

THE ORDER OF AHEPA 17TH NATIONAL BANQUET IN HONOR OF THE 89TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

OUR SALUTE TO CONGRESS

The Archontic Order of AHEPA, this American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, founded in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922, has over the years established an enviable record of good citizenship and public service. Never forgetting our blood ties with immortal Hellas, where our civilization was born, we, the members of the Order of AHEPA, the Daughters of Penelope, the Maids of Athena, and the Sons of Pericles, remain forever loyal and faithful to this young but universally respected country—the United States of America—where Western civilization has found its most ardent and sincere exponent and practitioner.

Every 2 years the members of the AHEPA family hold a grand banquet at which we render homage and respect to the honorable Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

This is our 17th banquet. The first in the series was held February 6, 1929. The then Supreme Governor George C. Vournas was its founder and first chairman.

Some 2,500 years ago, Pericles said to his fellow Athenians: "In a democracy there is not only an equality amongst all men in point of law for their private controversies, but in election to public office neither class nor rank is considered; each man is preferred according to his virtue or to the esteem in which he is held for some special excellence and so long as he renders good service to the commonwealth."

We hold the Members of our U.S. Congress to an esteem commensurate with their excellence and so long as they render good service to this—our blessed land.

And, 100 years later, Aeschylus wrote that "the pleasantest of all ties is the tie of host and guest."

And so, we invite you, Honorable Members of Congress, to let us be your hosts so that we may have the pleasure and the privilege to salute you and to entertain you as our guests.

We are looking forward to meeting with you around the banquet table in the "pleasantest of all ties of hosts and guests." We shall greet you warmly and wish you well.

KIMON A. DOUKAS,
Supreme President.
ANTHONY E. MANUEL,
Chairman, National Banquet Committee.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 3, 1966.

In honoring the 89th Congress, the members of the Order of AHEPA are extending well-deserved tribute. And as you acknowledge America's debt of gratitude to her forward-looking legislators, I want to acknowledge my appreciation for your alert and responsible membership.

The laws of any progressive government must be formed and directed to improve the life and objectives of all of its citizens.

They must be designed to assure equal opportunity for personal achievement—and they must stimulate the development of each man's talents to their fullest capacities.

Ancient Greece recognized these foremost principles of a democratic society. And Americans in 1966 sustain the legacy of your forefathers.

As an American society dedicated to these principles, the Order of AHEPA has adhered to the highest traditions of democratic citizenship.

I hope that your 17th national banquet will be an enjoyable one.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE ORDER OF AHEPA SOCRATIC AWARD PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

For contributions and services during a lifetime in country and humanity.

As a teacher in early years.

As a young Congressman and a Senator from the great State of Texas.

As a leader of men, learned in the ways of human nature and persuasive in complex idiosyncracies.

As a world leader, with a clear mind, a stout heart and a deep compassion for the underprivileged, the underfed and the oppressed.

As the organizer of the Great Society for humanity's sake.

As the defender and the protector of all human liberties inscribed in blood and tears on the pages of history.

As the husband and father and friend of loyalty and sincerity—

For all these virtues and objects, which are basic in our Hellenic heritage and our American culture and fundamental in the life and record of the Archontic Order of AHEPA.

This 1966 Socratic Award is presented with a scroll.

KIMON A. DOUKAS,
Supreme President.

Done, this 14th day of March 1966 in the city of Washington.

PROGRAM

Rendition: The Star-Spangled Banner, Ode to Liberty, O Canada.

Invocation: Anthony E. Manuel, chairman; the Honorable Gregory G. Lagakos, toastmaster.

Speakers:

Miss Elizabeth Athanasakos, grand president, Daughters of Penelope.

His Excellency Alexander A. Matsas, Ambassador of Greece.

The Most Reverend Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

The Honorable Donald M. Fraser, U.S. Representative from Minnesota.

The Honorable Philip A. Hart, U.S. Senator from Michigan.

Presentation: Presentation of the AHEPA Socratic Award for 1966 to the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States of America. Acceptance in behalf of the President by Mr. Mike N. Manatos, Administrative Assistant to the President.

Response: Kimon A. Doukas, supreme president, Order of AHEPA.

Benediction.

DAIS

The Most Reverend Archbishop Iakovos.

His Excellency Alexander A. Matsas, Ambassador of Greece.

Madame Alexander A. Matsas.

The Honorable Philip A. Hart, U.S. Senator from Michigan.

Mrs. Philip A. Hart.

The Honorable Donald M. Fraser, U.S. Representative from Minnesota.

Mrs. Donald M. Fraser.

Mr. Mike N. Manatos, Administrative Assistant to the President.

Mr. Kimon A. Doukas, supreme president, Order of AHEPA.

Mrs. Kimon A. Doukas.

Mr. Gust J. Herouvis, chairman, AHEPA supreme board of trustees.

Mrs. Gust J. Herouvis.

The Honorable Gregory G. Lagakos.

Mr. Nicholas D. Chotas, Mother Lodge, Order of AHEPA.

Mrs. Carmen Chotas Demos.

Miss Elizabeth Athanasakos, grand president, Daughters of Penelope.

Miss Cleopatra Notarides, grand president, Maids of Athena.

Mr. Louis N. Strike, supreme president, Sons of Pericles.

Mr. Anthony E. Manuel, chairman, AHEPA national banquet.

Mrs. Anthony E. Manuel.

Keynote Address of the Honorable F. Bradford Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the Record the attached keynote address of my colleague, the Honorable F. Bradford Morse, before the Massachusetts Junior Chamber of Commerce Governmental Affairs Seminar:

Keynote Address of Congressman F. Bradford Morse, Before the Massachusetts Junior Chamber of Commerce Governmental Affairs Seminar, Yankee Drummer Inn, Auburn, Mass., February 26, 1966

Anyone who read the newspapers this week had cause to be depressed about the State of the world and the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy. General de Gaulle announced that he would withdraw French forces from NATO and insist on national control of all military bases when the present NATO Treaty expires in 1969. Great Britain engaged in an acrimonious debate about the decision to reduce her defense establishment by one-third over the next 4 years. President Nasser of the United Arab Republic told a Cairo audience that it might be necessay for the United Arab Republic to wage a preventive war against Israel.

The failure of the United States to find a lost hydrogen bomb in the tomato fields of Palomares threatened to disrupt our defense arrangements with Spain and to complicate our efforts to reach agreement on a nuclear nonproliferation treaty in Geneva. Violence again shattered the fragile truce in the Dominican Republic. Military coups ousted governments in Syria and Ghana.

All of these things are cause for concern; yet I think they may be a hopeful sign. A sign that we will, as a nation, snap out of our total preoccupation with Vietnam and remember that the leader of the forces of the free world cannot forget its strategic responsibilities elsewhere around the globe.

It has been just about two decades since the leadership of the free world was thrust upon the United States. We did not seek that leadership. Indeed, throughout the 1930's we sought to avoid "entangling alliances"' as though the counsel of George Washington in 1796 was appropriate to the 20th century. Only slowly and painfully did we take even limited steps to assist the Allies in their struggle against Nazi domination in Europe. It was not until our own territory was brutally attacked at Pearl Harbor that we took decisive action.

World War II cost us heavily, yet it cost our European Allies much more; their homes and their cities, their industry and communications, in addition to their manpower. The United States went from war to a renewed prosperity as pentup demand for consumer goods made itself felt dramatically in the marketplace. Europe faced a long and grim struggle to rebuild—within the shadow of yet another aggressor—the Soviet Union.

In 1947, after the grim winter that nearly brought Europe to its knees—we knew that our interests and our obligations would prevent our total demobilization and would prevent our return to the isolationism of the past.

Czechoslovakia fell to the Communists; Greece faced Communist guerrilla forces in her hills; the historic Dardanelles were threatened once more.

The United States made a fundamental decision. Our national security would require a continuing presence around the world—not necessarily a military presence, but a moral presence. The prestige we gained in World War II as a global power; our economic power; our ideological commitment to self-determination, liberty, and world order under law, required that we declare and support our determination to guard the gates of liberty against the hostile forces of oppression—Communist as well as Fascist.

Beginning with the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine and the North Atlantic Treaty we pledged our substance for the defense of freedom. We publicly declared that our interests were engaged around the world. We agreed to meet aggression in Europe, in the Middle East, in Latin America, and in southeast Asia. The United States is a party to mutual defense pacts with more than 50 nations around the globe.

I recite this history not to defend the U.S. role as a kind of global gendarme, but to sober us in assessing our responsibilities. Can we afford the luxury of preoccupation?

If we have learned anything from our 20 years as a global power, we should have learned that our role demands flexibility of response. As we met challenges to freedom in Berlin, in Korea, in Suez, in Lebanon, in Laos, in Cuba, in the Congo, in the Dominican Republic, and now in Vietnam, we recognized that the maintenance of nuclear superiority alone could not preserve the peace. We expanded our capacity to defend against limited wars.

But flexibility means more than the deployment of forces and the balance of nuclear and tactical weapons. It requires a resilience of mind as well. Far too often we have been guilty of intellectual rigidity. Can it be said that our policymakers have become so absorbed in the crisis of the moment that they have lost perspective on the forces and the problems that will confront us for years to come?

We became so convinced that Great Britain would be admitted to the European Common Market that we failed to develop a plan for our relationships with Europe under other circumstances. We still tend to treat General de Gaulle as a temporary nuisance rather than a representative of the new dynamics of a new France.

We were so preoccupied with Europe and China in the 1950's that we virtually ignored Latin America until our Vice President was attacked in Caracas and the Soviet Union gained a foothold in Cuba. It was not until 1960 that President Eisenhower developed a new strategy for the Latin American social revolution which was already in progress.

We were so concerned about the nuclear capability of the Soviet Union that we failed to perceive the importance of the nuclear efforts going forward in France, in China, in India, and in Israel.

The telltale signs of singlemindedness appear today in the Vietnamese situation. I mentioned a few newspaper headlines of the past week. Each of them raises significant questions for U.S. foreign policy. I am concerned that our top policymakers appear to be giving insufficient attention to the answers.

What is the future of the Atlantic Alliance? As General de Gaulle correctly pointed out, the situation has changed dramatically since the signing of the NATO Treaty in 1949. But economic prosperity and talk of peaceful coexistence should not take us off our guard in Europe. And what of our own commitments? If France withdraws its troops and Britain reduces its entire defense establishment how much American effort will be required to take up the slack?

How long can a new arms race go on in the Middle East before the entire region is embroiled in combat? The resumption of President Nasser's bellicose statements against his Israeli neighbors practically coincide with a resumption of U.S. assistance to Egypt in the form of surplus food sales. Have we permitted short run changes in President Nasser's tactics to dim our view of his long-range intentions in the Middle East?

How did we happen to lose a hydrogen bomb in Spain? Will our inability to find it lead to Spanish efforts to force our withdrawal from strategic military positions in that country? Will the incident impair the effectiveness of our efforts at the disarmament talks in Geneva? Is there anything more important right now than the cessation of proliferation of nuclear capability?

It is now more than 10 months since the beginning of the crisis in the Dominican Republic. Yet the country is still in turmoil with the timetable for free elections seriously set back by a new outbreak of violence. Can we regard our intervention as entirely successful in light of recent reports that an important wing of a major political party has been taken over by Communist forces?

None of these questions has an easy answer. My concern is that we aren't trying hard enough to find the answers.

A nation—like a man—is as good as its word. Can our commitments be credible if we lack the resources to back them up?

What is the most appropriate allocation of our men and materiel? The distinguished military editor of the New York Times, Hanson Baldwin, wrote a most disturbing article last week in which he pointed out that "the Nation's armed services have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere." Of the 22⅓ available active divisions cited by the Secretary of Defense in his recent report on our military posture, only 2 or 3 are suitable for combat duty in Vietnam.

The shortages of manpower and equipment found all over the world raise questions about the adequacy of our military planning. They also suggest that shortsighted political thinking coupled with inadequate diplomatic planning may have contributed to our predicament.

If we permit our preoccupation to deepen and our concentration of resources to continue, we may, if confronted with a new explosion in Berlin, Cuba or the Middle East, be virtually incapable of effective response.

It is for this reason that I find the events of the past week hopeful. They demand our distraction and force us to face up to the large questions. Vietnam is today, indeed, the most dramatic and demanding challenge to the free world, but it is by no means the only one, and in the perspective of history it may not prove to have been the most important.

As Sir Winston Churchill remarked in 1947, when we were barely embarked on the new and uncertain adventure of the postwar period: "Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them."

Congressman William F. Ryan Asks: "What Is Our Franchise To Wage War in the Name of Peace?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago today, on January 16, WILLIAM F. RYAN, our colleague from New York, made a major foreign policy address at the Sane dinner. On that occasion the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy presented the annual Eleanor Roosevelt Peace Award to Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN in recognition of his significant efforts in the cause of peace.

During the course of his remarks Congressman RYAN raised a question which has special pertinency at this troubled time. He asked: "What is our franchise to wage war in the name of peace?" He suggested:

> America's experience in attempting to bring about peace is a history of efforts to achieve conditions which often reflect our aspirations and not, strictly speaking, our interests.

Congressman RYAN urged that we look beyond Vietnam to China and our relationship to Chinese aspirations and power. He said:

> Although we say—for purposes of convenience—that the near collision over the Cuban missiles was the critical impetus for the test ban agreement, we must remember that the lessons learned during long years of negotiations played a significant part in stabilizing the Cuban crisis. A comparable confrontation with China seems highly likely within the next decade; yet we have not initiated an equivalent dialog. In the Far East our real and attainable interests lie in heading off a war with China—in meeting the threat of famine, chaos, and civil breakdown in India—not in duplicating nature's disasters.

Mr. Speaker, these considerations are of the utmost importance, now, when critical decisions are still being made about our policy in the Far East. Congressman RYAN's speech is a valuable contribution to the debate that is taking place, and I want to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN DELIVERED AT SANE'S ANNUAL ELEANOR ROOSEVELT PEACE AWARD DINNER, JANUARY 16, 1966—AWARD RECIPIENT: SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN

In 1963, the French Government sent Da Vinci's "Mona Lisa" to the United States for a brief exhibition, chaperoned by André Malraux, the distinguished French author, art historian, and Minister of Cultural Affairs. In presenting the "Florentine Lady" to President Kennedy at Washington's National Gallery, Mr. Malraux added a small token of French civilization—an aphorism making up in elegance what it might have lacked in validity.

"Alone of all great nations," he said, "the United States has waged war without worshiping it." Then, his tribute finished, Mr. Malraux departed, leaving the Mona Lisa in the custody of an around-the-clock guard of Marines standing at parade rest in full dress uniform, their rifles pointing outward to the week-long crowds. Possibly the Mona Lisa had never been safer from her admirers, nor her expression so fitting.

The "Mona Lisa" is now back in the Louvre. Mr. Malraux is nearby, a member of the French Cabinet as before. But the Marines, if they are still in service, are very likely to be both out of dress uniform and out of their country, which has again called its young men to an unworshiped war.

We meet tonight against the backdrop of a somewhat eased domestic anxiety. In his state of the Union message President Johnson has outlined an economy which can support both guns and butter. He has displayed a diplomacy which seems willing and able to rain sticks, carrots, or both, on an adversary as the occasion demands. If there is a lingering suspicion that the butter will test out to be margarine and the peace offensive will yet be overshadowed by the unfolding of new war plans, there is still an abiding sense that President Johnson is a reluctant warrior. The crisis of confidence has been smothered in its infancy to the relief of the Nation which has looked on it as an unwanted child.

I believe that the current initiatives are born of a genuine desire for peace and that the President may be ahead of much of the country and many of its policymakers in wanting peace. What warrants skepticism is the values and policies which can bring a democratic leader, who has a distaste for war and the demands of international politics, to the brink of catastrophe abroad and a credibility crisis at home.

This is a question which may always be with us; perhaps it is beyond the power of any single generation to answer it or put it to rest. But tonight, and irrespective of any possible settlement in Vietnam, it has a special pertinence as the lull in this conflict allows us to see beyond to the potential collision between the United States and China.

What is our franchise to wage war in the name of peace? It is true that, for a violent people, the United States has often shrunk from the excesses of war in a way to command the respect of mankind. But it is a non sequitur to claim, therefore, to be respected as a peace-loving nation, much less to be a guardian of the peace. For a nation of our relative age in this changing world, our experience does not warrant that confidence.

We have had only one war, the Civil War, which ravaged our own country and brought anything like real hardship to its civilian population. The design for peace and reconstruction imposed after the war collapsed in just over a decade before sustained, but ineptly opposed, resistance. One hundred years later, the social dislocations of that war are considered by a majority of Americans to be their greatest domestic concern. Where the economic consequences of the war have been alleviated, the chosen means have often been unproductive: cotton output is heavily subsidized; tobacco's dangers are, like the writs of Caligula, posted nearly out of sight, and the South's industrial renaissance is strapped tightly to the engines of new wars.

Our record as a peacemaker in the wars of this century is incomplete, but no exceptional qualification for a preemptive right to police the world. In the aftermath of the First World War, the United States, like Russia, left Europe and the community of world politics. Russia was a broken country, reckoning its own devastation against the militant and internationally oriented ideology of the revolution. The United States, by contrast, was the strongest surviving power of the war. But it chose not to seek in the League of Nations some remnant of what Wilson had lost at Versailles. The treaty of peace, whose exacting terms far exceeded the capacity of the weakened League to enforce or temper it, degenerated into a de facto cease-fire. Its final breach came about to a considerable extent on the basis of a miscalculation of what the United States and Russia's response to that breach would be.

The United States cannot be faulted for its efforts during and just after World War II on behalf of a world organization. However, what it does stand accused of in Europe, and particularly in France, is the subordination of Europe's deepest concern to the cold war. Europe's deepest concern, of course, is Germany. The Russian and Eastern European solution to the German problem has been ruthless, but nonetheless consonant with Allied aims in World War II. American policy has been largely a contradiction of those aims as they were seen by Europeans and Russians.

West Germany has been co-opted as America's principal continental ally, a role which has allowed it to gain the present cash equivalent of many of its original war aims in this century. Reparations for Versailles would be a cheap price to pay for European stability, and the German-American alliance could be considered a diplomatic triumph if that were indeed the outcome. Unfortunately, prosperity is not necessarily pacification, and German prosperity is not the linchpin of a peaceful Europe. Stability in Europe has been sustained to a considerable extent by a balance of nuclear terror, a balance which American sympathy with German nuclear ambitions has threatened to upset. As long as those ambitions are treated as the natural yearnings of a people wishing to be sovereign, American policy in Europe may contribute more to the cohesion of the Warsaw Pact than to that of NATO. It will certainly not bring World War II closer to formal resolution.

It is fair to conclude, I think, that America's experience in attempting to bring about peace is a history of efforts to achieve conditions which often reflect our aspirations and not strictly speaking our interests. For where we have fallen short of achieving our aspirations, as in our own Reconstruction and Wilson's failure at Versailles, the outcome has often been a dismal alternative which we accept with indifference or alarm, but seldom with a desire to rectify it. As Prof. Stanley Hoffman, of Harvard University, has stated, we have tended to follow an erratic course of overinvolvement succeeded by periods of partial or complete withdrawal. I would add that, where we have stayed, as we have in Europe since World War II to pursue those aspirations against a former ally, we have compromised our original common interest in such a way as to revive rather than resolve the original conflict. In pressing for Japanese rearmament, we are taking the same path in Asia.

Whether we like it or not, nations put more faith in the constancy of others' interests than in their aspirations; and they put less faith than may be deserved in those who demonstrate the inability to discriminate between the two. This is important, I think, in understanding why we are so nearly alone in Vietnam, and why, in our isolation, we could become headstrong and lurch on to catastrophe.

We are in Asia seeking to protect what we call the freedom of self-determination. Our abstract of our own experience tells us that this is the preferred condition of mankind, that the evils of our own society are secondary and somehow acceptable in its presence, and that no legitimate society can emerge from any other sense of priorities. Terror or aggression, which threaten to eradicate this preferred condition, strike us as a consummate tragedy. And the power which threatens to bring it about becomes the closest thing on earth to consummate evil. The great danger in this is that no society—even the freest—has yet broken entirely free from the seemingly universal urge to meet consummate evil with the maximum violence. Our own civilization has often aggravated the tendency; the more we learn to abhor violence, the more we are inclined to impart an added sense of justice to those wars from which we do not shrink.

But, as against the tragedy of tyranny and the denial of human life it brings in its wake, we must weigh the excesses of our own efforts to avert it in southeast Asia. Indiscriminate warfare bordering on genocide is one. Another is the assumption that human nature is so malleable, and we speak so clearly for its essential qualities, that parts of the world we could not govern equitably ourselves must be brought to the point of effective, even democratic, self-government in a short period of time.

This is our noble aspiration and our stated reason for being in Vietnam. We have often settled for less, as we have in Laos and Cambodia, but in our present insistence on more for Vietnam we are running the risk of destroying what has already been achieved. Laos is once again a battlefield; the fragile but viable arrangement which has held that country together since 1962 is imperiled from both Vietnam—and now, apparently, Thailand. In the name of self-defense and the Geneva agreements, we risk setting off reactions which we cannot control and which could lead to renewed internal hostilities. Thailand's alleged strikes across the Laotian frontier are no less dangerous because the State Department says they are done without our direct assistance. Animosities between the Thais and the Laotians are ancient. Where an American-sponsored strike might be thought to have no territorial aim, an independent action by the Thais would surely be seen as a more serious incursion.

Cambodia—unified, independent, and struggling—also faces hot pursuit across its borders and is determined to resist. Assistance required for self-defense would be sought from the north, not from the east.

If the war widens into another Indochina conflict, a Vietnam settlement may lose its meaning. Even if it does not, turmoil in Laos could confront the United States once again with a challenge comparable to that faced by President Kennedy in 1961—when Laos displaced Vietnam in our concern for southeast Asia.

The risk of a wider war is, I believe, being weighed carefully in Washington. What may not be treated as candidly is the feasibility of inching our way to military victory in Vietnam. When President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, implied that we have reached a draw because each side has frustrated the other's aims, he was not describing an even exchange. In Vietnam, to have stalemated this guerrilla war is to have gained a tie in racing the crocodile to the swamp. North Vietnam has some 400,000 of the best troops in Asia of whom only a small part have been committed to the south. As the Mansfield report indicates, the massive increase in U.S. troops last year did not increase the percentage of the population under the effective control of the central government. Moreover, there are many who doubt that this control is effective in terms of our aim of self-determination. They feel that the gulf between the peasant population and the government has widened. The reported possibility of another military coup hardly suggests that this trend will be reversed soon.

On the evidence we now have, it would seem that one of our most realistic war aims in Asia is to gain time—time for others to change and time for us to change ourselves. Here our thinking must be really bold—even if painful. For possibly our greatest failure in the pursuit of peace during this century has been our squandering of time in dealing with China. Among the hard decisions which must be reckoned with is whether the opportunities we have missed are beyond recovery. In exploring past defaults, we should try to see the world as it was, as well as how it is now. It is interesting to discover, for instance, that Ho Chi Minh at one time hoped for U.S. assistance to help maintain his country's independence. It may also be important to recall that Sino-American affinities were once strong, and that the Western visitors to China report that they remain latent under the mutual avowals of enmity. And we should also reflect that during the last few years prior to the Chinese nuclear explosion, we were not without some opportunities to influence the directions of China's industrial development.

There can be no darker prognosis for America than that it should become the grand inquisitor of the world seeking out the Devil's disciples and assuming the task of destroying them on behalf of the timid, the powerless, or the indifferent. Yet our relations with the Chinese have been ominous. Like the doubting executioner we do not want to see their faces or have them described to us in vivid detail. Still less do we want to have our doubts aroused or confirmed by substained contact. Instead we have denied them the channels of diplomacy and condemned them for conducting diplomacy by other means.

China may prove to be an intractable and mortal enemy; the collision may occur for reasons beyond our influence. But we will never know the answer if we do not take some steps which leave that question open—even if we suffer abuse and ultimate frustration in the effort.

One such step in which we all have a particular interest would be a nonproliferation agreement. Despite the pall which Vietnam has cast over East-West relations, prospects for a nonproliferation agreement are not altogether dim. The obstacle to West Germany's participation in a multilateral nuclear weapons pool has been set aside for the second time in a year. Senator John O. Pastore—after consultation with the White House—is sponsoring a resolution supporting Presidential efforts to gain an agreement. This parallels a similar resolution at the onset of serious test ban negotiations and is widely interpreted as indicating the President's intent to spur negotiations. I plan to introduce a similar resolution in the House of Representatives.

The United States has indicated a willingness to have the Chinese participate. This may be an area in which the two countries can discover the threads of a common interest. China has not indicated a design or a desire to buy allies with nuclear weapons; to the contrary, she has urged other developing countries to match her achievements on their own. Nor is there reason to suppose that China does not want a nuclear monopoly within her present sphere of allies. Recent events in Indonesia indicate that she [China] would have long second thoughts about a different policy.

No one should imagine that getting Chinese agreement to formally forgo the spread of nuclear weapons will be either quick or easy. The lesson of negotiations with the Russians over disarmament and nuclear arms control has been one of patient efforts to persuade and educate. During that long history, proposal after proposal was discredited by being turned to propaganda purposes. But at all times, we and the Russians were learning about each other's theory of deterrence. Although we say—for purposes of convenience—that the near collision over the Cuban missiles was the critical impetus for the test ban agreement, we must remember that the lessons learned during long years of negotiations played a significant part in stabilizing the Cuban crisis. A comparable confrontation with China seems highly likely within the next decade; yet we have not initiated an equivalent dialog. To modify an historical truism—those who do not learn from their past successes are not destined to have those successes repeated.

In the Far East our real and attainable interests lie in heading off a war with China—in meeting the threat of famine, chaos, and civil breakdown in India—not in duplicating nature's disasters. There is a growing chorus of sanity in this country which reflects this—a chorus that unites those of us here with Julian Bond, of Georgia, whose campaign for reelection Sane has courageously decided to support. The hymn is simple and universal—"Build, don't burn." That is the mission of the man we honor; that is the legacy of the gallant spirit we remember tonight.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Albert).

Rev. Robert L. Alderman, minister of the Liberty Baptist Church of Appomattox, Va., offered the following prayer:

In God is my salvation and my glory: the rock of my strength, and my refuge, is in God.

Shall we pray:

Our Father, we pray that You shall forgive us for what we have been, that You shall correct what we are, and that You shall control what we shall be.

For those who lead us, we ask Your guidance. For those who mislead us, we ask Your mercy and Your correction.

In the name of Jesus we pray, whom to know aright is eternal life, whom not to know as Lord and Savior is eternal damnation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) entitled "An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2499. An act to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the House today glad tidings. Our distinguished and beloved Speaker who dearly loves this House, its Members, and its institutions and traditions is being given an unusual, but well-deserved, honor today in his home State of Massachusetts. First of all, the Speaker has been invited to address a joint session of the great and general court of his great State this afternoon. Earlier in life he served as a member of both houses of this distinguished legislative body. His appearance before the great and general court today will be an inspiration to those whom he addresses and to all young men and women in Massachusetts who aspire to high public office. In the second place, and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the great and General Court of Massachusetts has passed a resolution which I should like to read for the edification of the Members of the House. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Requesting the Governor To Issue a Proclamation Setting Apart March 16, 1966, as John W. McCormack Day, in Honor of the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully requests the Governor to issue a proclamation setting apart March 16, 1966, as John W. McCormack Day, in honor of the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and recommending its observance in an appropriate manner; and be it further

Resolved, That an engrossed copy of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to John W. McCormack, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and His Excellency the Governor.

Adopted by the senate March 1, 1966.

Thomas A. Chadwick,
Clerk.

Adopted by the house of representatives in concurrence, March 2, 1966.

William C. Maiers,
Clerk.

Attest:

Kevin H. White, III
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members rejoice with the Speaker and Mrs. McCormack in the honor that has been paid to the distinguished leader of this House. The events of this week in Massachusetts will reenact the glorious drama of America, a country where the humblest citizen of the land can reach the highest peaks of achievement.

Our Speaker is one of the great living men of our generation. More than that he is a man of noble and decent character, imbued with the highest ideals and traditions of our country and dedicated to the cause of freedom and justice for all men, regardless of race, color, or creed. We salute the Speaker and we rejoice with his friends and loved ones today.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, faith, hope, and charity—the greatest of Christian virtues—all are to be found in the character and the soul of our beloved Speaker, John W. McCormack. To these most cherished Christian virtues, I would also add courage, humility, nobility, sincerity, and dedication to the cause of freedom, and to the advancement and progress of this seat of human liberty, the United States of America.

We in this House are most fortunate—we are honored—to have a man of the noble character of John W. McCormack as our Speaker. John McCormack is in the greatest tradition of those loyal, devoted Americans who brought the highest qualities of Ireland to our land in years and centuries past. The history of our great Nation is replete with Americans of Irish ancestry who have shed their blood, given their lives, or devoted their lives, to maintain and preserve that liberty which we hold so dear. John McCormack is one of those Americans of the finest Irish heritage who has given of himself unselfishly for the betterment of our country, and I, as a fellow member of Irish ancestry myself, am particularly proud and pleased to salute our Speaker on this occasion.

Tomorrow not only is St. Patrick's Day throughout the world, but also it is John McCormack Day in the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Every Massachusetts Society of the Sons of the Emerald Isle is hosting a banquet in our Speaker's honor on St. Patrick's Day—and there is no more fitting day nor fitting tribute that could be given to one of the giants in American history of Irish ancestry, John W. McCormack. True to his nature, to his kind and thoughtful disposition and character, to his love of comradeship and of his friends, Speaker McCormack plans to attend every banquet to be hosted by an Irish society in his honor on St. Patrick's Day in the city of Boston and its environs. And his attendance will brighten them all, I know.

Our beloved Speaker epitomizes the highest qualities of Christian virtue in his own personal life, as well as his public life. No man of my acquaintance or friendship, in all my adult years, is closer to meeting the standards and virtues of St. Patrick than does John McCormack. His belief in the nobility of his fellow man, his devotion to and love of God, his firm conviction in the principles upon which this Republic was founded have been transmitted to this House and to every Member in it, and we are all the richer for the Speaker's being in our midst for some 40 years as a Member of the Congress.

For all this and more, we are blessed to have a great and devoted leader of the high caliber of John McCormack as our Speaker, and I am happy and proud to join in paying tribute to him on this greatest of all Irish feast days, St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House, Republican and Democrat alike, joins the Massachusetts Legislature in saluting our Speaker, John W. McCormack. Whoever comes to know John comes to love him. I count it a privilege to have had the good fortune to serve with him in the Congress. He is a politician of the "old school," and that is the best school. He is a politician in the best sense of the word—a master of the art of government. I offer my heartfelt congratulations to him on this day—John W. McCormack Day in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this splendid tribute to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I am sure he is beloved by all of us here. I think this is a proper recognition of the splendid service he has rendered as Speaker and as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a member of both houses of the State Legislature of the State of Massachusetts.

I am happy to add my few words of praise and appreciation to all that has been said by the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to agree with and be associated with the remarks made by our distinguished majority leader. I have often said that in our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives we have a great and good man. I have said this once or twice in his presence and each time he has replied that if he had a choice between the two, he would rather be a good man than a great man. That has always impressed me because in my book he is a great American. He is not only a great American but he is a good American, with a great heart, and certainly one who feels for his fellow man—a man who always tries to be fair and good at all times.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in a large deliberative body, as the House is, any unanimous opinion is exceedingly rare. But on the warm approval of our great Speaker there is, indeed, unanimity here. His goodness and his ability are admired by every one of us. The great State of Massachusetts does itself credit by honoring him today; and we are all grateful that they have done so. This statesman of our age is a credit not only to his home State but to the Nation as a whole; and we in Congress are very privileged to have him as our personal friend.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the 16th of March has always been a day of preparation in the great State of Massachusetts. The color of orange disappears and all colors seem to merge into a great green wave. All the Irishmen in the State prepare to salute the wearin' of the green. It is a grand and great occasion for the people who have given to us one of our greatest Speakers, JOHN W. MCCORMACK. The General Court of Massachusetts has proclaimed this day, the 16th, as John W. McCormack Day. Massachusetts now has a day for two great Irishmen—St. Patrick and JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

The Irish have a warm and wonderful toast for those whom they love and I should like to propose it to all of them, and to all of us who now share 2 days with them: May you be a half an hour in heaven before the devil knows you are dead.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the wisdom of the general court of the State which has given this House more Speakers than any other State in conferring this richly deserved honor upon my dear friend, my Speaker, my leader, JOHN MCCORMACK.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and our colleagues in rejoicing in the deserved recognition that has been bestowed upon our beloved Speaker by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I know our great Speaker, Mr. MCCORMACK, is today enjoying nostalgic memories of the days he spent in the Legislature of Massachusetts. I know his great work is still being felt in the service he rendered in the State legislature the same as his great service in Congress is felt around the world today. We all salute a great man. A recognition justly deserved.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine privilege to join our distinguished majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, and my colleagues in the House in expressing gratitude to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for this richly deserved tribute being bestowed today upon our illustrious Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Speaker MCCORMACK is a true statesman. He has devoted his life to public service. His unsurpassed dedication has benefited his home State, our Nation, the free world, and future generations yet to come.

Therefore, I salute the State of Massachusetts for recognizing the most distinguished Member of the House of Representatives.

May this day be the most enjoyable in the public service of our beloved Speaker.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Massachusetts is honoring today our beloved Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK. The General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has issued a proclamation setting apart March 16, 1966, as John W. McCormack Day.

Mr. Speaker, this testimony to the wisdom of the general court tenders a great and deserved honor to our Speaker. I would like to join with our distinguished majority leader in his tributes to one of the greatest Speakers in the history of our country.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK is a man who is not merely great, but a man who is good as well. A man whose leadership in this House and in our party we are proud and honored to follow. It is fitting and proper that March 16 be enjoined at midnight with the feast day of another great Irishman—St. Patrick.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is an extreme personal privilege and pleasure to join with our great majority leader and our colleagues here in congratulating our revered Speaker for the high honor being bestowed upon him today by the great and general court and all citizens of his home State of Massachusetts.

By appropriate legislative action the great and general court of the Commonwealth has proclaimed Wednesday, March 16, 1966, as John W. McCormack Day.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK eminently deserves this unique distinction because no man who ever served in any legislative body anywhere has more exhaustively, more conscientiously, more effectively, or more patriotically devoted his superior talents and abilities to the completely unselfish service of his country and his State than the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

For nearly 40 years, as an ordinary Member, majority leader, and Speaker, the dedicated hand and voice and heart of JOHN W. MCCORMACK has made a substantial contribution to the adoption and operation of every legislative proposal designed to promote the social welfare of his fellow Americans, expand their economic opportunities and to keep them secure from all enemies. His is an unparalleled record of constructive legislative service and his image will be forever enshrined in the most glorious pages of our national legislative history.

But above and beyond these accomplishments it is perhaps for the example of his high character that this Nation will remain forever indebted to him.

Throughout his life JOHN W. MCCORMACK has become universally recognized for not only his tolerance of the beliefs of others, but by his gentlemanly graciousness to others with whom he differs. He has presented his own beliefs with all the vigor and persuasion within his command, but he has been equally vigorous in proclaiming the right of others to freely and fully speak their own beliefs, and in the rare instance where his own causes could not prevail he has reserved no rancor. With his devout faith in God and his sympathetic understanding of his fellowmen, the spiritual nature of the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK, could not permit him to act otherwise.

He has, throughout his glorious career, consistently developed and demonstrated, in his public and private life, the basic virtues of indestructible integrity, unswerving patriotic devotion and unsurpassed competence in leadership. He is now and will ever be a legendary inspiration for all fellow Americans, and the general court and citizens of Massachusetts are rightfully and deeply proud of this native son who is, in truth, the personification of the traditional American without whose attributes this country could not have begun and only in the practice of which it can endure.

May the good, kind Lord continue to bless our distinguished colleague and his gracious wife with many more continuing good years of fruitful life and may divine providence bless us and this Nation with his continuing leadership in these perilous days of Communist challenge.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly glad to have this opportunity to join my many colleagues in the House in congratulating our beloved and respected Speaker on the high honor and recognition accorded him by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in proclaiming March 16, 1966, as John McCormack Day.

I know of no more appropriate day to be set aside in his honor, as preparation for the traditional St. Patrick's Day festivities reach their peak. I know of no more fitting or deserving Irishman to be honored in this manner. I know of no man who has greater love for and respect for our governmental institutions than the one so honored.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK's career will stand as a shining example of what can be accomplished by a man of courage, of integrity, who works hard and walks the path of righteousness and who loves his God and his fellow man. JOHN MCCORMACK's nobility of character has been an inspiration to us all who have had the high privilege of associating with him. His service of some 40 years in the House of Representatives is a monument to his character and his ability. The youth of America can look to this great leader, this great statesman for inspiration and as an example which they can strive to emulate. There is no man who has had a greater faith in the great democratic institutions of government than JOHN MCCORMACK. There is no man who has a greater respect for and who has worked more valiantly to protect and promote this great body as one of the great institutions of our American form of government.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is fortunate to have such leaders as JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts. May future generations be as blessed as we are. This great man, this man of humility, of patience, of loyalty and of devotion is beloved by us all. We all extend to him best wishes on this much-deserved honor accorded him by the citizens of his own great State.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of this honor being extended to our beloved Speaker.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MEANINGFUL VICTORY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a military victory in Vietnam will not be enough, the Marshall, Tex., News Messenger of March 2, 1966, makes plain. The paper points out:

> Such a victory would settle nothing unless a political victory accompanied it. This means in the final analysis that a government which attracts the allegiance of the Vietnamese people must be established before a military victory can be meaningful.

We are all concerned about economic and social reform measures, which have been much discussed, and I therefore am including this thoughtful editorial on the subject in the RECORD:

TWO VICTORIES

Some of the most persistent critics of President Johnson's policy in Vietnam insist, as they or others of a like mind did in Korea, that there is no substitute for victory. What kind of victory are these people talking about?

Most of them, it appears, mean military victory. If the conflict could be confined to Vietnam, a military victory is attainable. But no one can be sure that Red China would stand idly by and permit the collapse of the Communist regime in North Vietnam.

The simple truth is that a military victory in Vietnam is not enough. Such a victory would settle nothing unless a political victory accompanied it. This means in the final analysis that a government which attracts the allegiance of the Vietnamese people must be established before a military victory can be meaningful.

This is what Marine Gen. Wallace Green said recently after visiting Saigon: "You could kill every Vietcong and North Vietnamese in South Vietnam and still lose the war."

This is the meaning of President Johnson's renewed emphasis recently on economic and social reform in South Vietnam as a prerequisite for the establishment of a popular government. Without such a government, a military victory would be meaningless.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on the Federal-aid highway program and the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during general debate on the floor today, and for the balance of the week.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1328)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
WM. BROOMFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.
JOHN SPARKMAN,
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, report that the accompanying conference report recommends that the Senate recede from its amendments.

The managers on the part of the House pointed out that the amendment before the committee of conference dealt with matters which had not received consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs during its consideration of the bill nor had there been any discussion during debate in the House, but they recognized that this question deserved careful consideration. Because there has not been adequate opportunity to review in detail the full impact of the Senate provision, the managers on the part of the House were unwilling to accept the Senate language, but they agreed that the Committee on Foreign Affairs should look into the whole question during the consideration of the pending foreign aid bill.

In view of the general feeling that hearings should be held on this whole question, the managers on the part of the Senate receded.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
WM. BROOMFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE PUBLICATIONS DISTRIBUTION SERVICE

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1329) on House Resolution 776, providing additional compensation for services performed by employees in the House Publications Distribution Service, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 776

Resolved, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary to pay compensation to each employee of the Publications Distribution Service of the House of Representatives for all services performed by such employee in excess of the normal workday where such services are authorized by the Committee on House Administration. Such compensation shall be paid on an hourly basis at a rate equal to the rate of compensation otherwise paid to such employee, with a $2.25 minimum. This resolution shall take effect on March 4, 1966, and payments made under this resolution shall be terminated as the Committee on House Administration determines necessary, but not later than March 31, 1966.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for payment for a brief period of overtime work performed by employees of the Publications Distribution Service, that is, the folding room.

A backlog of about 3 weeks work has developed due to heavier and more frequent use of the folding room facilities by the Members themselves. To resolve the problem in the most feasible and economical manner, it has been determined to pay overtime to employees of the folding room to dissipate the presently existing backlog. A long-range plan has been developed to take care of the long-range situation. This resolution, however, authorizes extra pay to begin on March 4, 1966, to be terminated as the Committee on House Administration deems necessary. But under no circumstances later than March 31, 1966.

Overtime rates are to be paid on an hourly basis of straight time with a $2.25 minimum.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to submit to the gentleman that this situation ought not to have occurred. For this reason—that in my opinion the Clerk of the House ought to be armed with authority or the authority ought to be restored to him in a period where there is an extraordinary load of work to be done in his office or in any office under his supervision and that he have the authority to employ for a temporary period of time enough personnel to discharge the work of the House.

Had the Clerk been given this authority—and I believe he did have this authority at one time—this resolution might not be necessary. There is other work in the folding room in addition to that which comes under the jurisdiction of the Clerk of the House for which temporary employment is most necessary.

I submit to the House Administration Committee that this situation ought to be permanently cleared up with some authority—I do not mean wide-open and blanket authority necessarily to the Clerk of the House; but enough authority given to him to meet emergency situations.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I understand the point which the gentleman makes. However, I would point out that the folding room comes under the jurisdiction of the Doorkeeper rather than the Clerk of the House. I think the gentleman would be interested to know that during the time this backlog was building, the folding room was authorized 11 positions in excess of those actually filled. There were 11 vacancies. The Committee on House Administration has authority to establish temporary positions.

I think I might say further the problems of the folding room have been complicated by a critical space shortage and the continued expanded use by Members themselves. For example, in December 1960, the folding room handled approximately 3,700,000 pieces of mail. In December 1965, the folding room handled in excess of 22 million pieces of mail.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, this is a necessary action which should be taken at this time, and I urge adoption of the resolution. The folding room backlog built up and became serious a few weeks ago, as most Members know. We have been working on this, both the minority and the majority of the House Administration Committee, and we have had complete and full cooperation of the Speaker. This resolution is to help relieve the problem by putting people on overtime to take care of this backlog. It is my hope that the House Administration Committee will continue to observe the situation there and, if necessary, do as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] suggests and put on extra help when it is needed at peak times.

The situation has further improved in the folding room because some new equipment is now in operation there. They are starting to move the items more rapidly. So by March 31 we should see some light of day there and the situation in the future should be improved. But at the same time I think that the House Administration Committee, with the backing and support of the Speaker and others involved, should continue to watch the folding room production so that the situation will not become critical again and items will not have to be stacked up in great volume.

The folding room has a terrific responsibility. The employees are working hard. The Doorkeeper, Mr. William Miller, and manager of the folding room are cooperative and want to do a good job. This resolution will relieve the situation for the time being.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED $10 PER DAY TO EMPLOYEES ASSIGNED TO DUTY AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE OF THE U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10722) to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide authority for the payment of certain amounts to offset certain expenses of Federal employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands, and for other purposes', approved August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 745; 5 U.S.C. 70c), is amended by inserting after the word 'islands' the words 'or at the United States Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site, including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station,'.

"SEC. 2. Sections 2 and 3 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 2. (a) Each employee or former employee of the United States who was erroneously paid per diem in lieu of subsistence under section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 836) for the period he was assigned to one of the California offshore islands or the United States Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site, including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station, as his principal place of duty is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amounts of per diem in lieu of subsistence so paid.

" '(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the employee, former employee, or other appropriate party concerned, in accordance with law, all amounts paid by, or withheld from amounts otherwise due, an employee or former employee of the United States in complete or partial satisfaction of his liability to the United States for which relief has been granted by section 2 of this Act.

" 'SEC. 3. In accordance with regulations issued under the first section of this Act, the allowance authorized by such section may be made retroactively effective from the date erroneous payments of per diem in lieu of subsistence were discontinued as a result of the decision of the Comptroller General of the United States dated May 4, 1964 (B-153571), or as the result of administrative action taken by reason of that and similar decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States.' "

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10722 was passed by the House on October 18, 1965, and by the Senate with an amendment on March 2 of this year.

This bill will provide an allowance not to exceed $10 per day to about 100 employees of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Public Health Service who must travel unusually long distances from their homes to their work stations at the Nevada Test Site. As we all know, this is the continental location where our nuclear devices are developed and tested. The Comptroller General required that such payments need legislative sanction.

The Senate incorporated an amendment proposed by the General Accounting Office relieving certain employees who had received payments prior to the Comptroller's ruling from their liability to return items to the Government by making retroactive the benefits to be obtained from this bill. Otherwise the Comptroller feels compelled to move to recoup these funds. This, of course, would defeat the purposes of the bill. The amendment does not authorize a general or mandatory retroactive payment to all employees. We are informed that the erroneous payments may amount to about $175,000.

In view of the hardship which these employees have undergone, I am sure there will be no objection to this amendment. The explanation of the amendment follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

At least six Federal agencies have assigned Government personnel to duty at the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site including the Nuclear Rocket Test Station. The Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have not authorized the payment of per diem in lieu of subsistence under section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 836, to their employees when assigned to permanent duty at the test site. However, the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Environmental Science Services Agency, Department of Commerce, and the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, have designated Las Vegas, Nev., as the official duty station of their employees who are required to perform all or the major part of their duties at the Nevada Test Site and have authorized the payment of per diem in lieu of subsistence to such employees while they are on duty at that site. Under section 3 of the Travel Expenses Act of 1949, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 836, as implemented by section 6.8 of the Standardized Government Travel Regulations (Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A–7) and interpreted in the decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States, the permanent duty station of an employee is the place where he is required to perform the majority of his duties and per diem in lieu of subsistence may not be paid for duty performed at that place. In view of the legal requirements involved the General Accounting Office has stated that in the absence of a relief provision it will be required to take exception to the per diem payments in question and will require refund from the employees involved of the amounts erroneously paid.

During the 3-year period preceding June 1965 approximately 13 employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey performed their assigned duties at the Nevada Test Site but were officially assigned to Las Vegas. Such improper designation of duty station resulted in erroneous payments of per diem in the amount of $95,100. Approximately 13 employees of the Weather Bureau performed about 90 percent of their work at the Nevada Test Site although they also were officially assigned to Las Vegas. During calendar year 1964 $12,500 in erroneous per diem payments were made as a result of those erroneous assignments. The Geological Survey employed four persons for duty at the Nevada Test Site but designated Las Vegas as their official duty station. During the 14-month period ending in February 1965 such improper designation of duty station resulted in erroneous payments totaling approximately $4,000. Additional erroneous payments have been made by the agencies in question for periods not included above, however, complete information with regard to such payments is not available at this time. The General Accounting Office has estimated that erroneous payments of per diem to employees at the Nevada Test Site may amount to as much as $175,000.

The amendment would relieve the employees involved of their liability to refund to the United States the erroneous payments they have received and would provide for making refunds to the employees of any amounts they have paid in liquidation or partial liquidation of the debts which result from such erroneous payments. Similar relief was granted to employees of the Department of the Navy who were erroneously paid per diem while assigned to duty on the California offshore islands. Although there is no indication that the payment of per diem to the employees at the Nevada Test Site has been discontinued as the result of the decision of the Comptroller General of May 4, 1964 (B–153571), relating to the erroneous per diem payments to the Department of the Navy employees and similar decisions, the amendment would authorize but would not require retroactive payment of the allowance authorized in S. 2271 to any employee whose per diem has been discontinued as a result of such decisions. The amendment, therefore would provide relief for employees at the Nevada Test Site on the same basis as relief was granted to employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands by the act of August 31, 1964. The committee does not intend that any retroactive payments of the allowance be granted to employees of the three agencies who have not been authorizing per diem to their employees.

The title of S. 2271 is amended to reflect the additional provision contained in the amendment.

UNIFORM TIME ACT OF 1966

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 775 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 775

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6785) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 6785, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1404), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 6785 as passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 775 provides for consideration of H.R. 6785, a bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. After passage, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 1404; it shall be in order to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the House-passed language.

The purpose of H.R. 6785 is to establish uniformly the commencing and ending dates of daylight saving time. The further purpose of the bill is to allow each State through enactment of State law to exempt itself on a statewide basis from the provisions of the bill which establish daylight saving time.

It also provides that the States, by acts of their legislatures, can exempt themselves from participating in the daylight saving time. If the State chooses to pursue this course, the bill provides that the State will then be on standard time throughout the entire State.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 775.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in complete agreement with the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I think he has explained the resolution and the bill in a very able manner. I concur with the statements he has made.

The only thing which I would add, which I do not know whether he stated or not, is that the daylight savings dates will be identical throughout the United States. The last Sunday in April will be the start and the last Sunday in October will be the end of the particular period.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule; accordingly, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Abbitt
Baring
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Cabell
Clawson, Del
Collier
Craley
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Dickinson
Diggs
Dowdy
Downing
Fuqua
Griffin
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Holifield
Holland
Jennings
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
May
Miller
Murray
Nix
Pool
Powell
Reinecke
Roncalio
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Sisk
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Watson
Willis

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have received and I am receiving numerous telephone calls from Members of Congress and their constituents, who have been directed to call my office by the Members on the question of when the minimum wage bill will be introduced.

I am happy to announce that the minimum wage bill will be introduced this afternoon. I hope it meets with your favor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to commend the gentleman in the well. As a member of his subcommittee, I think he deserves the highest commendation from both sides of this House for working out a bill that is going to be introduced, that the committee will report out tomorrow.

It is a very difficult subject. I know that this gentleman has spent many man-hours in trying to work out an agreement on this bill. It is a bill which I think we can support.

I would like to congratulate the gentleman for the fine manner in which he has conducted himself in his committee in bringing together all sides on a bill which I think is going to be for the best interests of the country.

UNIFORM TIME ACT OF 1966

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6785), to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6785, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported H.R. 6785 and I speak in behalf of the bill as amended. This legislation is known as the Uniform Time Act of 1966. The purpose of the bill is to establish uniform dates for the commencement and termination of daylight saving time in all States and jurisdictions where daylight saving time is observed. In the event that a particular State prefers not to go on daylight saving time it would have to exempt itself on a statewide basis through enactment of State law. This is the chief distinction between the House bill and that enacted by the other body, S. 1404.

S. 1404 would leave the present permissive practice of observing or not observing daylight saving time to the individual States and the political subdivisions of the States. The only requirement that it would make would be that, if a State, county or town observed daylight saving time, such observance would be uniform, that is, any use of daylight saving time would commence at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and end at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October.

Under H.R. 6785, the Interstate Commerce Commission would be authorized and directed to foster and promote uniform adoption and observance of the same standard of time within each time zone. The Commission would also be empowered to apply to the various district courts of the United States for injunctive or other relief in the event of violations of the provisions related to daylight saving time.

This legislation would also establish three additional time zones primarily to cover Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and possessions of the United States.

In all proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Administrative Procedure Act requirements would be applicable.

This legislation has an effective date of April 1, 1967, subject to an exception that any observance of daylight saving time in 1966 shall commence at 2 a. m. on the last Sunday in April and end at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the subject of inconsistent and contradictory time practices has been a matter of congressional concern for many years. In the time that I have served, I don't believe that I can recall any other single subject which has brought about so much conversation and correspondence. I think that we are now in the position where we can take at least an important step toward solving the dilemma that we have all found ourselves in in traveling across the country when time practices have been so unrelated to each other from place to place.

My own State of West Virginia made daylight saving time mandatory on a statewide basis as recently as 1962. Until that time, and this appears in the committee report, you could travel for 35 miles between Steubenville, Ohio and Moundsville, W. Va., and go through seven different time changes. Obviously, this is a confusing situation for the individual traveler. Think what it does to the transportations system of the country, to the communication system of the country, and to the business and commercial world in general.

We received estimates indicating that the motorbus operators alone are spending some $250,000 each year in their effort to conform to the many time changes. The railroads estimate that their scheduling costs because of time inconsistencies are over $1 million annually. Air carriers, of course, are in the same predicament. I do not have a cost for the entire industry but a witness for the subsidized air carriers estimated that the additional schedules necessitated by time changes requires an outlay of between $150,000 to $200,000.

These are merely a few examples of the money and man-hours which must be wasted each year in an attempt to systematize transportation schedules. In addition, of course, there are any number of persons who are inconvenienced by mixups over departures and connections throughout the complex transportation system, handicapped as it is by the numerous localized time changes. And these inconveniences, of course, lead to missed revenues on the part of the common carriers who do not—oftentimes through no fault of their own—carry the passenger who misunderstood the departure times.

It is my belief that the people of this country should not be frustrated and confused by a continuance of a multitude of inconsistent time practices and I would point out that under the proposed legislation now under discussion it should be possible to eliminate unnecessary business costs without creating a need for increases in Federal appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of others who want to express their views on this important subject and I will close by urging support for and passage of H.R. 6785. as amended.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think it might be helpful during our consideration of this legislation to know of its status in both bodies as it is today. The other body already has passed a bill some time ago. That bill was in the very simplest form. It simply said just this: If a State chose to be on daylight time, it must begin at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of April and end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of October. That is the Senate bill. Now, what are the changes? I think this is what you want to know.

This bill is in effect mandatory. It will supersede any State law on this, with one exception, which I will state in just a moment. It says that you will be on daylight time beginning on the last Sunday of April and ending on the last Sunday of October. This bill goes into effect on April 1, 1967, except that if a State goes on daylight time this year, when the bill is not in effect, so to speak, then they must start on the last Sunday of April and end on the last Sunday of October.

Now, what can a State do to exempt itself from this piece of legislation? It can do just one thing. By passing a bill through the legislature of the State and having it signed by the Governor of that State, then that State may remove itself from the provisions of this legislation. But, if the State removes itself from the provisions of this bill, then the State has to be uniformly on standard time. They cannot grant local options so that various cities and subdivisions can go on daylight time. If any State seeks to take itself out from under this bill, then it is not on daylight time and no subdivisions and no part of that State can be on daylight time.

I think the best example, probably, of why this legislation is brought forward at this time is the State of Indiana. I thought the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden], a member of the Committee on Rules, asked some rather pertinent questions about this particular bill because of the situation in Indiana. Along the eastern edge of Indiana and the western edge of Ohio they have some communities that are on eastern time.

You had some of those municipalities adopting eastern daylight time, you had some of those communities adopting eastern standard time, while across the border from the time zone in the same State you had adjoining counties adopting central daylight time or central standard time.

So one can see that it was possible that in an area of a few miles to have as many as four different time zones.

Mr. Chairman, there is a specific reason up in the northeastern section of Indiana for this. They had a serious problem up there because they wanted to adopt Chicago time. This made it different from a lot of that surrounding territory which was on central standard time. Then they had the further complicating factor in the fact that Indianapolis was on double daylight time.

During World War II Indianapolis found that it liked daylight saving time. Therefore they adopted double daylight time in the winter as well as in the summer, and when the country went off it they just stayed on double daylight time in the summer and daylight time in the winter.

So, Mr. Chairman, one can see the area surrounding Indianapolis was in considerable confusion, but this was the situation as it existed in other States in the Middle West, and it presents to the Members of the Committee a picture of the confusion that can arise as a result of being located in dividing lines of time zones.

Mr. Chairman, of course this will make all those areas located in the time zone conform to that particular daylight time in the daylight areas from April to October, and standard time for the rest of the year.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that all of this operation lends itself to every single portion of a State, but it was felt that at least it would establish some kind of uniform time, unless the State felt that it did not want to be under it. We felt there ought to be at least some kind of a valve by which they could get out if a State did not want to conform with the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have recognized the rights of the States in this matter. We have not assumed that the Federal Government itself should dictate the time on which a State would be. However, we do say that in the absence of any positive action on the part of a State that this law shall be operative.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, may I propound this hypothetical question? State X at the present time has a daylight saving time law that provides for the observance of daylight saving time from Memorial Day until Labor Day. The legislature in State X does not meet before the end of April 1966. Assuming that this bill passes, will State X be obliged this year to go on daylight saving time statewide from the fourth Sunday in April to the fourth Sunday in October?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct; it will.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, having introduced H.R. 9152, I am pleased to see the House taking action this afternoon on this measure to establish a uniform period for daylight saving time.

Certainly, the public transportation companies and many industries suffer from the confusion caused by a variety of daylight saving times. I believe that the action of the House this afternoon is a very practical and long overdue step.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if anyone has been in local-State government, they know that when you get into this matter of daylight saving time, you really get into a hornet's nest. I personally favor daylight time in my congressional district. But there are some States that are long in area and the whole State may not want to be on daylight time. For example, the State of Nebraska is 500 miles from east to west and has two time zones in the State. Some portions of the State may want to go on daylight saving time and some portions may not.

I am definitely for the original Staggers bill to end some of the confusion that now exists in this field of daylight saving time. The original Staggers bill simply said that any community had to start at a certain date and quit at a certain date. Of course, this would be a great help to the transportation industry and to people in general. But then this was amended in the committee by a very narrow vote, an amendment to the effect that every State shall have daylight saving time unless the State legislature officially says that their entire State does not wish to have daylight time.

I would hope that this could be amended to strike out that provision because I think we ought to take this thing one step at a time. The original Staggers bill is a first step. I think if we can get that through then we can look at the bill, as amended, in the committee. But let us start with first things first because, as I said in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, when you get into the field of daylight saving time with so many different interests and so many people and industries and the economies of the various States involved you really get into a hornet's nest. I am fearful that the bill, as now presented will end up with no action being taken and that we will have no improvement in this confusing situation such as we have today.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 6785.

So far as I am personally concerned, it is not as strong a bill as I would have preferred. I thought that we ought to make the change at one time and have daylight saving time throughout the country on a uniform basis. But apparently that cannot happen at the present time under this bill. So I am willing to accept the best that we can get; namely, we will be on standard time or daylight saving time, it will be uniform to that extent. It will eliminate going on daylight saving time at different times during the year, which resulted in terrible confusion in certain localities.

I think one of the outstanding confusions was in connection with St. Paul, Minn., and adjoining territories of Wisconsin where at one time you had three different times within a radius of about 50 miles. This does correct that particular situation but it still leaves it so that some States may have daylight saving time and some States may have standard time.

Personally, I think most of the States have now adopted daylight saving, and I think it is up to Congress to set a uniform time just as we did when we established the various zones for standard time. That was through an act of Congress. We have that right; we have that responsibility, and we have that duty. I am glad that we are taking the action that we will take today.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that no Member of this body would argue the point that there is need for uniformity in daylight saving time nationwide.

The original Staggers bill sought to set dates of application and the date from which one would withdraw from daylight saving. It gave the States the right to accept those dates by an act of their legislature, if they wished. In no instance did this bill say, "This you must do." But it did set a standard that a State could come under if it wished to go on daylight saving, which, I believe, we would all agree, is a desirable objective.

The bill was then amended, an amendment to the Staggers bill, which would provide that the States would come under this bill's application, and the only way a State could get out was by an act of the legislature. I contended that the States, if they wished to have daylight saving time, would automatically begin to act to come under the provisions of the bill, and the great desirability was to set a uniform time that daylight saving would or would not apply and when it would expire, and this could be achieved in this Congress.

But when we employed the technique that seems to prevail so much at this time of saying, "This you must do," in my judgment we were throwing blocks in the way of a desirable objective which could be attained in this Congress.

So the bill was amended forcing the States under, whether they liked it or not, and they had then to act. An amendment was then adopted to make the bill apply not earlier than a time certain in 1967—April 1, I believe, was the date—and giving the State legislatures time to act.

I might point out that a little time is pretty important in something like this because knowing how long it takes to act around here, I can assure you that State legislatures sometimes need time also to consider these matters in representing the people back home.

However, we did add an amendment which I think is important, and I made a motion to reconsider after the bill had been voted on in order to bring it back for one amendment. That amendment would provide that if the State is on daylight saving time, it should be on a uniform basis within the State. In other words, there should not be four different dates of application within a State, but it would come at a time certain within each State.

I intend to offer an amendment to the bill, when we read the bill, that will set a time certain when these dates go on and go off and give the State the right to make that decision.

I might point out that there have been some observations made that I think need some attention. For example, on the last day in October the youngsters in the Midwest will be getting on their schoolbus in the dark. This is not so pleasant. The date is a little rough in some parts of the country. However, my amendment would not touch that point, though it is an important point.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Which do you consider better—for the schoolchildren to get on their schoolbus in the morning in the dark or come home at night in the dark?

Mr. NELSEN. Certainly the gentleman has the right to make his own determination about that. We are not arguing that point at this time; I merely wished to point out that it has been brought to my attention and there probably will be an amendment to that effect. My amendment would not disturb the desirable date which the gentleman from California seems to like. I will not argue with him about it.

But I merely wish to point out that my amendment would provide that the State would make the decision as to whether they wished to come under this bill or not. In my judgment, my amendment would advance the possibility of passage of this kind of legislation because, I think we must admit, it is necessary that there be some uniformity nationwide.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes any remarks that I wish to make at this time. I will offer the amendment when we are reading the bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his statement. I thoroughly agree with him. We have heard here today that this is a mandatory bill. We hear also that there are some exceptions that can be made. I, for one, do not like the choices that are left to the legislatures. I do not like the alternatives that are presented to them. Why should we force State legislatures to debate the question of daylight saving time, when great numbers of the States settled this question long ago?

I feel that the gentleman from Minnesota has a constructive amendment to offer, which provides that the decision as to whether a State desires to be brought into this bill will be left to the State legislatures.

This can be done without coercion, without this mandatory provision. If his amendment is adopted, the States can elect to come under the provisions of this bill. They can take affirmative action, not negative action as the bill presently provides. If this amendment is not adopted then I feel that we should adopt the original Staggers bill. This, in my opinion would be the logical, constructive step that should be taken at this time. I think this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to a member of the committee, our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to lend my endorsement to H.R. 6785 as legislation which is necessary if a great part of the confusion and unnecessary costs which ensue from the current conflicting time standards in the United States is to be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, the present unsystematic procedures in the observance of time standards have resulted in great confusion and unnecessary and wasteful practices in many areas of our economy. The most extreme problems are in the transportation industries where the railroads, bus operators, and airlines have wasted millions of dollars and man-hours in attempts to keep effective time schedules before the public. Similar problems are cited in the communications industries.

Apart from this—but no less important—are the problems experienced by the traveling public, those involved in communications, and those involved in commerce due to conflicting and confusing time practices. Such experience, no doubt, range from petty annoyances to tragic mishaps resulting from lack of uniformity in time practices.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the present bill reflects the best approach toward removing the long continuing, wasteful, and costly confusion in our country's time standards, and urge my fellow Members to act favorably on this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, if we divide the country into zones of 15 degrees of longitude each and base the eastern time zone on the 75th degree of longitude, then according to the sun the western edge of that time zone would be along the 82½ degree line. That 82½ degree line lies east of any part of the State of Michigan. Consequently, the State of Michigan, having been placed 30 years ago in the eastern time zone, is on daylight saving time the year around, as it is. We are already on year-round daylight saving time.

Back during World War II, when the President issued a proclamation moving all time ahead throughout the country for the duration of the war, the people of Michigan found that they were 2 hours ahead of the sun. The result was that the legislature took action to place Michigan on eastern standard time. However, according to the Federal law of 1918, which is referred to in this bill, the time zones are placed in the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, according to its time zones, placed the Lower Peninsula of Michigan in the eastern zone and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan in the central zone. Nevertheless, all of the State of Michigan is operating on eastern standard time now, by virtue of State law.

This bill, however, will supersede that State law and will provide that all of Michigan will go on eastern daylight saving time, but that the legislature may take the State out of the confines of the law.

What will the resulting situation be?

Presumably, during the summertime at least, the Lower Peninsula of Michigan will be on eastern standard time and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan will be thrown back on central standard time.

I bring this up simply to invite the attention of this committee to the fact that whenever an attempt is made to do anything as complicated as this bill, which attempts to regulate the whole matter from Washington and take it completely out of the hands of the States, and then it is turned back to the States with a provision that the State must operate only as a unit, more mischief is caused than is relieved.

That is the situation in Michigan, Mr. Chairman. If this bill should become law as it stands, Michigan will be placed in the same state of confusion that we finally worked ourselves out of 30 years ago.

When I was a boy we were on central standard time. In about 1931, because the Interstate Commerce Commission had moved the Lower Peninsula of Michigan into the eastern time zone, under its regulatory powers, all of the State joined the eastern time zone. We have not had any daylight saving time since. We have had no shifting of time since then. I believe there was only one exception, the first year after World War II, when Detroit thought it would go on eastern daylight saving time, but Detroit did that in only 1 year because the experience was so rough. Consequently, we have had no difficulty in our State of Michigan for 30 years. We worked ourselves out of this confusion.

This bill is going to make us go through all that difficulty again. We are going to have to battle this problem through the legislature once more. Consequently, I cannot support this bill as it stands. I only hope that the Members of the House, applying this to their own States, will appreciate the fact that Michigan is not a unique situation. You will find it true in the western reaches of almost every time zone.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to congratulate the gentleman and tell him that I concur with what he has said on the floor. I think that there are many people in our country who fail to realize that the State of Michigan is such a vast State and separated into the Upper Peninsula and the Lower Peninsula.

The distances between them may run 700 or 800 miles as between various spots. They are very vast distances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman that if this bill were to pass in its present form, it would appear to me that the only alternative unless the citizens wanted to accept the time that would be set forth in this bill, which would be contrary to their way of living for the last 30 or 40 years—the only alternative they would have would be to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and get them, somewhat hopefully, I think, to change the particular line. However, I think that would involve a great deal of optimism to think that the Interstate Commerce Commission would do that after all of these years.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I share the views of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON] and those of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY]. Let me ask this question: Does the present time zone line run down through the Straits of Mackinac? If so, what is the impact of that line?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The present time zone line—and I have the map before me—runs down around the community of Detour at the east end of the Upper Peninsula and then swings back through the center of Lake Michigan down to the Indiana border.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It does not divide our State, the Upper and Lower Peninsula?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes. The effect of it is that all of the Upper Peninsula is in the central time zone, and all of the Lower Peninsula is in the eastern time zone.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The net effect of that is, then, if this bill goes through as it is before us today, the Upper Peninsula will have one time zone and the Lower Peninsula will have another?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the Straits of Mackinac at their closest point are 5 miles across. So on one side of the straits you will have one time and on the other side of the straits the other unless the State of Michigan goes through one of two processes; namely, unless our State is able to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and get them to redraw the line as it affects Michigan, taking it over to the border of the Michigan and Wisconsin Upper Peninsula or unless we go through the process we did some 20 or 30 years ago.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I agree with the gentleman's assessment of the situation. It simply boils down to this point: This bill would, at least during the summertime months, require Michigan to make two choices and make them statewide: Either go on daylight saving time as provided in this bill or otherwise revert to the time as provided in the law of 1918, which is these time zones set forth on this map. Then the effect of it will be in the summertime at least the Upper Peninsula of Michigan will be an hour behind the Lower Peninsula of Michigan if the State legislature should decide to take Michigan out from under this law. If the State legislature should decide Michigan should continue under this law, then during the summertime at least the people will be living 2 hours ahead of the sun.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], a member of the committee.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] and with my other distinguished colleagues, who are speaking today on behalf of bill H.R. 6785. I rise as one who sponsored a similar measure, H.R. 7867.

It is patently clear to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is a highly constructive piece of legislation, one which will provide relief from many of the unfortunate byproducts of the basically sound concept of daylight saving time.

When Benjamin Franklin first set forth the daylight saving concept over 175 years ago, as he is reputed to have done, it represented another instance of the creative, energetic American spirit at work. Unfortunately, and through no conscious design, the implementation of that concept has become so fragmented over the years that certain safeguards have become necessary if we are to derive the full benefits of the device.

What is proposed by H.R. 6785 is a very basic and unduly restrictive approach to the problem. The bill provides only that if an individual State elects to go on daylight saving time, and this is entirely discretionary with the State, that it do so on a certain prescribed day of the year and that it return to standard time on a similarly proscribed day of the year. The bill further provides that if any State elects to go on daylight time, the entire State must adopt that method of reckoning time.

The bill is aimed at creating a uniform national approach to the problem so that there is a logical, consistent pattern to the country's timekeeping. At present, communities are free to do as they please in this respect and the result has been to put a genuine burden on interstate commerce in the true sense of that doctrine of constitutional law. All elements of the interstate shipping industry have had to bear the inconvenience and expense that the present arrangement entails, Mr. Chairman. This refers to those who ship, as well as the carriers, and it refers to passengers as well as to the transportation of freight. The evidence from each of these segments of the population clearly indicates the nationwide support for this corrective measure.

I strongly urge that the House adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and that it pass this measure. It is a constructive proposal, which establishes a national policy in an area where one is greatly needed.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to inform the House that at the hearings in the 89th Congress in support of this bill, 11 Congressmen, 8 associations and organizations, and some 80 other interested persons advocated uniform time throughout the United States. Fifteen Government agencies either supported the legislation before the committee or were neutral on the subject. There was not one single person that appeared before the committee in opposition to it.

Now, in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hutchinson], I would like to state this: This will not change your time zones in any way. You are still at the same place you are now. If you go on daylight saving time, the eastern zone will go on eastern daylight time and the central zone will go on central daylight time.

Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the gentleman that there are some inequities with reference to the sun in the manner in which it crosses this continent, and in the manner in which we set our clocks.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have any clock which has thus far been perfected which can keep precise time with the sun. We have never been able to make one of that type. What we do is take a mean time, a middle-of-the-road time, in each time belt.

Mr. Chairman, there are inequities, and this is one of them. However, this can be corrected the same as it could be corrected at any time when you are on standard time, by action of the ICC.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I am not certain that my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] understands as yet the situation which exists in Michigan. In the State of Michigan we have maintained a single time for the State of Michigan.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, I understand.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. We have done this with two time zones, but the Upper Peninsula of Michigan being a vast area, running 300 miles in length and 150 miles wide, by going on central daylight time and by the Lower Peninsula being on eastern standard time, this has been achieved. Therefore, during the year we have one continuous time zone for the entire State in that fashion.

The language as contained on page 6 of the bill would require the entire State to change, and would certainly put that in another area of the State. The Upper Peninsula of Michigan would not be able to have the same time. They would have an hour's different time than the Lower Peninsula.

That is the nub of the matter, or the crucial area involved here. That is section 3(a) to which I refer on page 6, which would require the entire State to change and which, I would point out to my Chairman, was not in his original bill. His original bill did not provide for this. This is the part that creates the hardship for the State of Michigan.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey], my distinguished colleague on the committee, and say to him that this does not change the time belt. However, it can be changed by the ICC changing the zone line. This is not the only condition which exists like this in the United States. There are many, many others. We have daylight saving time in one part of these areas, while the standard time is observed in other parts.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would be glad to yield further to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad the chairman appreciates and understands our somewhat unique problem which exists in the State of Michigan.

Mr. STAGGERS. Certainly.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And I wish we could find a way by which we could correct the situation without having to go through the time-consuming process, if this bill becomes law, of going to the ICC, which takes time and takes money, and which will cause great inconvenience to a great many people.

Further, we cannot even be sure that if this should be done. They might run into objections from people from the State of Wisconsin who might have some argument which would be against their wishes and desires.

Mr. Chairman, because of this problem I believe the wise thing to do would be to accept the chairman's original bill. I believe that would be very meritorious and that it would solve this most pressing problem, without getting us into some of these other difficult and unique and unusual problems that might be created through the passage of the bill now pending before us today.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I wonder if the difficulty in Michigan might be solved by simply eliminating the word "entire," so that the law provides that the State, including all political subdivisions, shall observe standard time. Their standard time divides the State already.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. YOUNGER. The only difficulty is that it is the entire State involved.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the situation in a State already in two time zones is not changed at all by the bill pending before us today. The State legislature would elect to take the entire State out from under daylight time only, and it would only be the application of daylight time. If there are two standard time zones, then there would be two standard daylight zones.

The State in its entirety would have to go under daylight time. It would advance in both zones.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I think I can clear up that point. The State of Michigan achieved the uniformity in time which they desired by the Upper Peninsula in one zone going on central daylight time, and by the Lower Peninsula in the other zone going on eastern standard time. So they had the same time under the clock all the way across the State of Michigan. This is what we want to attain and achieve. But we cannot do it under this bill because we will either all have to be under eastern daylight time or under eastern standard time.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not the case that Michigan at the present time through the legislature put part of the State in a different time zone than that allocated by the Federal law?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. The legislature has not done that. The ICC has done it.

Mr. MOSS. I think the action would come under the ICC to have them reconsider the situation.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. It is possible that the ICC will correct this, but this is hopeful on our part. It might also be possible the citizens of Wisconsin may very well object because it affects them, also.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The citizens of Wisconsin want Michigan to conform to the rest of the country and there will be no objection from the citizens of Wisconsin. I can assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6785, the uniform time legislation, which is before the House. I say it quite sincerely, that notwithstanding the tremendous record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, there are few measures in memory which have generated such spontaneous and sustained constituent interest from the Fourth District of Minnesota as has the legislation before us.

The last session of the Minnesota Legislature failed to resolve to the satisfaction of the State's city dwellers the problem of the State's daylight saving time law which imposes so-called summer time from the last Sunday in May to the Tuesday after Labor Day.

This period matches daylight saving time for no other area in the Nation. The business and transportation interests in several Minnesota communities in desperation, last year, prevailed upon some city governments to flout the State law and institute daylight saving time on a local basis.

For the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis the result was unadulterated chaos because while St. Paul went on daylight time her sister city did not. Intercity schedules for buses, schools, governmental offices, and businesses became hopelessly confused.

It was a favorite joke at the time of other catastrophes last year that a Minnesotan was one who had 5 feet of snow in his driveway, no roof on his house, 2 feet of water in his basement—and one who did not know what time it was. Certainly the environmental disasters were unavoidable and at least understandable, but the time confusion was completely man made and intolerable.

Quite frankly, the urban and suburban people in the metropolitan areas of Minnesota who are involved in business and transportation on a national scale are frustrated by a failure of their State legislature to meet their real need for time uniformity. The St. Paul area chamber of commerce, civic, and labor leaders, representatives of the air, motor, and rail industries, and many citizens have strongly urged me to help obtain relief for them through Federal legislation. It is the proper concern of Congress to accomplish this through powers granted in the Constitution, "To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States."

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia has for many years taken the leadership in advocating uniform time legislation in Congress. On becoming chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a few weeks ago, he called for hearings on pending time legislation and the committee quickly considered and reported favorably H.R. 6785.

Many people in Minnesota and other parts of the United States who perennially have suffered as the consequence of time confusion have reason to be thankful for the remedy this legislation provides.

For my part I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia and the members of the committee who favored bringing this legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], and the entire membership of his committee for the work they have done and time contributed in bringing this bill before the House.

Certainly this is a measure of some controversy. However, this is the place to debate the matter and seek accord.

Until recent years the overriding consideration in the issue of standard versus daylight time was local or area convenience. What sort of time best suited the people of one State or subdivision had little impact beyond contiguous areas.

However, as this Nation has grown at such accelerated pace in recent decades that the impact of local and area time observance has become profoundly pronounced and decidedly disruptive.

The hearings held by the committee this year and in years past have demonstrated and documented the confusion, monetary loss, and adverse effect on trade, commerce, and day-to-day living created by the present system of State and local option observance.

Year by year it has become more and more apparent that almost insurmountable circumstances prevent the States and localities from working in concert to bring order out of this annual time chaos.

Indeed, a great deal of effort has been made and some success marked in this field by the Uniform Time Committee under the direction of Mr. Robert Reding. However, the success they have achieved in their praiseworthy efforts to secure uniformity of observance of dates for going on and off daylight time is tempered by the fact that what has been achieved may be lost at any future time by legislation at the State level.

There is no reason today why the Congress should continue to ignore this situation whereby each of the 50 States and their political subdivisions are potentially free to observe time as they see fit within the existing framework.

This is not a question of denying to the States rights guaranteed them by the Constitution.

In this regard I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial by the Nashville Banner of March 10, 1966, entitled "To End Annual DST Chaos":

TO END ANNUAL DST CHAOS

> Nationwide daylight saving time—not piecemeal, with resultant chaos—is the formula of good sense respecting this annual business of changing the clock. The point gets the stress it warrants in renewed legislation to that end just approved by the House Commerce Committee.
>
> Nashville Representative RICHARD FULTON has battled for it, with a measure of his own, practically duplicated in major particulars by this new bill. The Banner has commended the Fulton plan as an acceptable solution to an annual nightmare.
>
> Tennessee got a bellyful of experimental nonsense in that protracted era of tampering with the clock—wherein each community set its own timepiece, impervious to that of its neighbors. The pandemonium of that that was ended only when State law was enacted forbidding daylight saving time.
>
> By and large, the objection is not to daylight time as such, but to the confusion of a crazy quilt time pattern—and the latter objection stands.
>
> A uniform application, for simultaneous adoption and ending, would avert the seasonal ordeal that otherwise ensues. If time zones have meaning, as they are intended to do, it must be for the public benefit; and that benefit adheres to the uniform observance.
>
> With regard to Federal authority in this particular, to correct a disparity magnifying hardship, Congressman FULTON recognizes a responsibility belonging to Congress. So does House Commerce Committee.
>
> The measure sought would be protective of the public interest, and should be passed.

The Nashville Banner has steadfastly been one of the strongest voices in support of States rights. Nonetheless, the Nashville Banner agrees that "with regard to Federal authority in this particular, to correct a disparity magnifying hardship, responsibility belongs to Congress."

The editorial also points out that the issue before us is not necessarily daylight or standard time. Rather, it is uniformity of observance. Whether or not one prefers one time or the other is a matter of personal preference.

My personal preference happens to be standard time, but I realize full well that over half the people in this Nation observe saving time during the course of the year and it well may be that the majority of those who do not would prefer to if permitted.

However, in all due respect to personal preference for whatever, the problem here is one of national interest transcending the consideration of individual convenience.

Should, however, there be strong sentiment within a State in opposition to daylight time this bill would permit the legislature of that State to give expression to that sentiment by establishing statewide observance of standard time throughout the year.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is fair, it would end the annual time scramble and resulting confusion and it would place jurisdiction of this matter where it belongs, in the hands of the Congress. It is a good bill and worthy of favorable consideration by the House.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my home State, the State of Texas, is a big State, and in the matter of time zones, it is asking a great deal to insist that all of the great State of Texas, nearly 900 miles from east to west, be compelled by Government edict to observe the same time zone. Two large counties of my part of the State are largely south of the State of New Mexico and extend half way across New Mexico in a westerly direction. This portion of the State, under the original time zone survey by the Interstate Commerce Commission, was placed in mountain standard time, which it observes today. Our State has extensive trade and cultural relations, and a great community of interest with neighboring New Mexico. Many people in El Paso County maintain that there is a distinct advantage to observing the same time as New Mexico. Recently our chamber of commerce and local newspapers conducted an informal poll to see whether or not the people of the city of El Paso wished to observe central time, the same as the rest of the State. The vote was heavily in favor of maintaining mountain standard time.

Mr. Chairman, without going into the merits of daylight saving time or of time zones in general, and without stating my personal preference, I believe that any legislation requiring the entire State to observe the same time zone is inadvisable in a State as large and with so many varied interests as the State of Texas. I believe the people of part of my district should be permitted to, at least, choose whether or not to remain in the time zone in which the Interstate Commerce Commission originally placed them.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, the principle of uniformity of time standards is long overdue, but I cannot support uniformity at the cost of the many young schoolchildren who will stand cold and lonely awaiting their schoolbus on rural roads throughout Iowa because this bill extends daylight time to the end of October.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the issue of daylight saving time is very confused and complex. This bill, H.R. 6785, will go far to straighten out the confusion. Indeed, the problem is so confusing that many will sympathize with the suggestion that we forget all about daylight saving and let those who want to get up early, do so.

The bill would make the dates for daylight saving time uniform throughout the United States. They provide that in those States and local jurisdictions where daylight saving time is observed, it shall begin at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and end at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October.

Any State which elects not to adopt daylight time would be required to use standard time.

The bill also establishes eight time zones instead of the present five. They would be Atlantic, eastern, central, mountain, Pacific, Yukon, Alaska-Hawaii, and Bering.

The bill would eliminate the greater part of the confusion and expense that arises from the present patchwork of time zones established by States, counties, and municipalities. This confusion afflicts the transportation industry, interstate business, and the traveling public.

Testimony before the Congress indicates that millions of dollars and thousands of man-hours have been wasted over the years in the effort by transportation companies alone to keep proper time schedules before the public.

I am glad to support this legislation and urge that it be passed by the House.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, the Uniform Time Act of 1966 on which we vote today, is clearly in the public interest and broadly supported by the people of America.

In my own State of Minnesota, where time confusion rules every spring and fall, public opinion polls show overwhelming support for uniformity. In a statewide Minnesota poll, 58 percent of the people interviewed were in favor of Congress setting uniform dates for starting and ending daylight time.

In the larger cities the support is even stronger. The people of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth spoke out for uniformity in the ratio of 61 to 34 percent.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I am very much impressed by the statements of the Federal agencies which sent comments to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The Budget Bureau expressed its support for a uniform law and referred to the "patchwork of different times," under our present system.

The Advisory Commission in Intergovernmental Relations brought out a very significant point when it stated:

> There does not appear to be any single agency or other central source of information available today that can with certainty provide information as to precisely what time prevails on a given date on a community-to-community basis.

Favorable statements were also made by the Department of the Navy, Department of Commerce, Department of the Interior, Postmaster General, Department of Agriculture, Federal Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I hope our vote today will reflect the will of the people of the United States, who are weary of the confusion caused each year as some parts of our country go on daylight time one month and others a month later. We can correct this situation in time to start together on the last Sunday of April 1966.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote no on this bill. I would have voted aye on the original bill which would have left to each State the determination of whether or not they would accept daylight saving time, but would have eliminated confusion by requiring all localities which had accepted it to enter upon and leave it at the same time.

To, in effect, require each State to adopt daylight saving time is to go too far. I opposed, while in the Oregon State Legislature, a bill which would have given to Multnomah County and contiguous counties the option to adopt daylight saving time. The confusion which resulted proved the wisdom of that vote. Oregon now has daylight saving time. Its effective date coincides rather closely to this bill, so the bill would have only a minimal effect on Oregon.

Nevertheless, the question of whether or not any one State should adopt daylight saving time should be decided by the voters of that State voting for daylight saving time rather than being required to vote against it—as this bill provides—in order to remain on standard time.

I therefore intend to vote no on this bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Uniform Time Act of 1966".

Sec. 2. It is the policy of the United States to promote the adoption and observance of uniform time within the standard time zones prescribed by the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States", approved March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261–264), as modified by the Act entitled "An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone", approved March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1446; 15 U.S.C. 265). To this end the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to foster and promote widespread and uniform adoption and observance of the same standard of time within and throughout each such standard time zone.

Sec. 3. (a) During the period commencing at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of April of each year and ending at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of October of each year, the standard time of each zone established by the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261–264), as modified by the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265), shall be advanced one hour and such time as so advanced shall for the purposes of such Act of March 19, 1918, as so modified, be the standard time of such zone during such period; except that any State may by law exempt itself from the provisions of this subsection providing for the advancement of time, but only if such law provides that the entire State (including all political subdivisions thereof) shall observe the standard time otherwise applicable under such Act of March 19, 1918, as so modified, during such period.

(b) It is hereby declared that it is the express intent of Congress by this section to supersede any and all laws of the States or political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or hereafter provide for advances in time or changeover dates different from those specified in this section.

(c) For any violation of the provisions of this section the Interstate Commerce Commission or its duly authorized agent may apply to the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurs for the enforcement of this section; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by writ of injunction or by other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining against further violations of this section and enjoining obedience thereto.

Sec. 4. (a) The first section of the Act of March 19, 1918, as amended (15 U.S.C. 261), is amended to read as follows:

"That for the purpose of establishing the standard time of the United States, the territory of the United States shall be divided into eight zones in the manner provided in this section. Except as provided in section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966, the standard time of the first zone shall be based on the mean solar time of the sixtieth degree of longitude west from Greenwich; that of the second zone on the seventy-fifth degree; that of the third zone on the ninetieth degree; that of the fourth zone on the one hundred and fifth degree; that of the fifth zone on the one hundred and twentieth degree; that of the sixth zone on the one hundred and thirty-fifth degree; that of the seventh zone on the one hundred and fiftieth degree; and that of the eighth zone on the one hundred and sixty-fifth degree. The limits of each zone shall be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and any such order may be modified from time to time. As used in this Act, the term 'interstate or foreign commerce' means commerce between a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States and any place outside thereof."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Within the respective zones created under the authority of this Act the standard time of the zone shall insofar as practicable (as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission) govern the movement of all common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce. In all statutes, orders, rules, and regulations relating to the time of performance of any act by any officer or department of the United States, whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government, or relating to the time within which any rights shall accrue or determine, or within which any act shall or shall not be performed by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, it shall be understood and intended that the time shall insofar as practicable (as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission) be the United States standard time of the zone within which the act is to be performed."

(c) Section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The standard time of the first zone shall be known and designated as Atlantic standard time; that of the second zone shall be known and designated as eastern standard time; that of the third zone shall be known and designated as central standard time; that of the fourth zone shall be known and designated as mountain standard time; that of the fifth zone shall be known and designated as Pacific standard time; that of the sixth zone shall be known and designated as Yukon standard time; that of the seventh zone shall be known and designated as Alaska-Hawaii standard time; and that of the eighth zone shall be known and designated as Bering standard time."

SEC. 5. The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001–1011) shall apply to all proceedings under this Act, the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261–264), and the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265).

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect on April 1, 1967; except that if any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, observes daylight saving time in the year 1966, such time shall advance the standard time otherwise applicable in such place by one hour and shall commence at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in April of the year 1966 and shall end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in October of the year 1966.

SEC. 7. As used in this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading of the substitute committee amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute committee amendment may be considered as read and be open for amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NELSEN

Mr. **NELSEN**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NELSEN: On page 6, strike out lines 11 through 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) Each State (including all political subdivisions thereof) shall observe the standard time established by the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261–264), as modified by the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265); except that any State may by law (applicable throughout such State) provide that, during the period commencing at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of April of any year and ending at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of October of such year, the standard time or times applicable in such State under such Act of March 19, 1918, as so modified, shall be advanced one hour."

On page 7, strike out lines 4 and 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "be inconsistent with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section."

Mr. **NELSEN**. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will provide that the States may elect to come under the terms of this law by an act of their legislature. The bill as drafted forces States in and only by an act of their legislature can they withdraw.

The final lines dealing with the language on page 7 refer to the language in the bill that supersedes the State law. My only plea is to give the State the right to make the decision as to whether they wish to come in under the application of this bill, and if we do this, I am sure we will gain much ground so far as support of the bill is concerned.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **NELSEN**. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Do I correctly understand that the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that every State would be compelled to conform with the time zones as they are now defined by the ICC unless the legislature should take subsequent action?

Mr. **NELSEN**. I do not think that that is exactly the correct interpretation. The amendment does not deal with time zones; it deals with the provisions of the bill that would give the State the right to make the decision as to whether they wish to accept national uniform daylight saving, which, as the bill would provide, would automatically force them under whether they liked it or not.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. If the gentleman will bear with me, while I do not have the text of his amendment before me, my recollection is that it starts out by saying that the time in each State shall be the time as delineated by the act of 1918—which is, of course, the act in which the boundaries are defined by the ICC. We start out with that, and the gentleman's amendment provides that that shall be the time in that State.

Mr. **NELSEN**. That is correct.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. I invite the attention of the gentleman to this: the effect of that provision would be—getting back to my State of Michigan—that whereas all of Michigan has been on eastern standard time the year round for 30 years, the gentleman's amendment would once more place the Upper Peninsula in a different time zone than the Lower Peninsula, and the State legislature would be without power to correct the situation. Only the ICC could do so.

There, again, we would be taking power away from the State.

Mr. **NELSEN**. The purpose of my amendment was to give the State the right to decide whether they wished to come in or wished to stay out. I do not dispute the argument that you advance. The original Staggers bill would have been closer to meeting the needs that you suggest. I do not take any position against the original bill. My purpose was to give the States the right to make this decision. I accept your argument that you do have a problem. It was not my objective to meet that one because I was not aware of it. But I did want the States to make the decision as to whether or not they wished to come under the provisions of this bill or whether they wanted to stay on standard time.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further brief observation?

Mr. **NELSEN**. I yield.

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. I understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment, but I respectfully suggest that its wording goes further than his stated purpose. The effect of his wording is to create a problem which otherwise would not exist.

Mr. **NELSEN**. It would exist under the bill, I am sure.

Mr. **SPRINGER**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **NELSEN**. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. **SPRINGER**. Would the effect of the Nelsen amendment be to install the provisions of the bill as it came over from the other body?

Mr. **NELSEN**. Not exactly, no. The original Staggers bill would have done that, as I recall. I was trying to go part way back, if it was possible, and I found myself without success in the committee to do even that. It was my feeling that to force the States to accept the bill without a decision on their part was not good finesse for any piece of legislation.

Mr. **SPRINGER**. Was not the purpose of the bill as it came over from the other body to give to the States a choice, and if the States made a choice, then it must be on the hour stated in the bill?

Mr. **NELSEN**. That is exactly right.

Mr. **SPRINGER**. Is that exactly the bill of the other body?

Mr. **NELSEN**. Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. **MOSS**. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman's amendment is rejected. The situation which occurs in this Nation each year, commencing on the last Sunday of April generally and continuing until the last Sunday of October, is one of complete and utter chaos. If you want to have a stimulating—yes, a challenging—experience, drive across the United States during this period. If you start out from town A at 6 a.m., you can arrive at another town at 6 o'clock, and still another at 6 o'clock, because in some of our States we have refined the torture of keeping time; we have double daylight saving time.

I believe the State of Indiana is a State where one can travel a great distance and still use no time. The traveler has not the remotest idea as to what the time might be.

I know that many of my colleagues in the House have had difficulty in determining when to place long distance telephone calls. This complicates, and incidentally imposes a rather heavy item of expense upon, the formulation of tables of bus transportation and for broadcasting. It makes far more difficult, without conferring any advantages on anyone, the life of a nation which has become closer in each and every year.

There are no new or novel precedents in the bill as it comes before this Committee today. There is no question of interfering with the rights of the States, because clearly the Federal Government took over the field of establishing time zones many years ago.

The question really is whether we are going to have a little bit more uniformity in our chaos, if the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is adopted.

We are going to have it all start at the same time, at least, and terminate at the same time. And that is all that will be achieved, unless each 1 of 50 jurisdictions decides that it wants to go a little further.

Mr. **NELSEN**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MOSS**. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that under the terms of this bill, which is not disturbed by my amendment, if the bill is passed there will be a uniform application of daylight saving time if a State chooses to be on daylight saving. Throughout the State that time will apply. This amendment does not disturb that.

The gentleman is the author of an amendment which would permit the State to act in its legislature to come out from under, if it wishes, which is an admission of the fact and a contradiction of his own argument.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman has not contradicted his own argument. The gentleman bowed to the oldest principle of legislating, the art of the possible. The gentleman offered in committee, and it failed passage by only one vote, an amendment to impose daylight saving time on every State in this Union, effective the last Sunday of April and continuing until the last Sunday of October.

I am convinced that is the rational approach to this problem. But I could not get the votes. Then, not in refutation of my argument but in recognition of the realities of what might be possible, I offered the amendment with—one might call it a sort of section 14(b) in it—a provision letting the States out if they choose to get out, not imposing it unless the States do.

If we go the other way around, we put to every legislature the question of whether they want to be covered under this. This is a thorny question in legislatures. I served in the legislature of California when we faced up to this problem and did something about it.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Moss was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I know it is a thorny problem. I know if we throw the burden back on the legislatures to affirmatively elect to come under daylight saving time, that we are going to have a long period of inaction, and the chaotic situation which exists as one travels across this country will continue and continue and continue.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Does not your amendment provide that the States will have the right legislatively to come out from under, if they wish?

Mr. MOSS. Yes. The emphasis is that they must act to exempt. Your emphasis is that they must act to cover. I think there is a great difference in the type of uniformity that we would achieve.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOSS. Yes.

Mr. NELSEN. If your statement was that this is our responsibility, then why do you have a loophole at all if you feel that this should be done?

Mr. MOSS. If I had had the gentleman's vote in committee, there would be no loophole for him to complain about. I did my very best to convince him of the wisdom of more uniformity in the policy, and I failed, and I apologize for my failure.

Mr. NELSEN. As I recall it, in the committee your original amendment provided that the State legislature would have the right to act to come out from under.

In my judgment, that is giving them an admission of the fact.

Mr. MOSS. No. The gentleman is mistaken. My original amendment said daylight saving time would be effective in every State of the Union beginning the last Sunday in April and continuing to the last Sunday of October. I was defeated on a vote of 8 to 9. If I had not been defeated, that would be my position. I still think I would support anyone's amendment to take that additional step, because I think that the Nation would bless all of us if we took that additional step.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman. I am sure he would agree it would be prety hard even for a member of the committee to recite all of the various different things that were done in the committee in their attempt to work this thing out. If I have misstated the gentleman's position, it is certainly not my intention to do so. However, I would like to state my amendment here would be conducive to a passage of this bill and completing action on it. That is my objective.

I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERRY

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BERRY to the amendment offered by Mr. NELSEN: On line 5, after the word "law" strike all that wording down through line 6 to and including the word "that" and insert in lieu thereof those words "exempt the State or any one of its time zones from the provision of this bill."

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, this I think will take care of the situation that we have in Michigan and certainly the situation that we have in my Congressional district in South Dakota where the time zone runs right down through the middle of my district. What it would do would be to permit the State legislatures to exempt the State or a portion of the State from the provisions of the act. I think that this would solve the problem that they have in Michigan and it would help to solve the problem that we have in my State of South Dakota where the time zone runs right through the middle of my district.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Does your amendment apply only to those States where there is a division in the present time zone?

Mr. BERRY. Yes, it would apply only to those States.

Mr. YOUNGER. Because we have States now where they have daylight saving time, such as Maryland. They have a State law there, but they exempt two counties. However, that has nothing to do with the time zone. It is just a local ground rule, so to speak. It should specify there, in my opinion, that it applies solely to those States where there is a division between existing time zones.

Mr. BERRY. With my amendment the wording of the Nelsen amendment would read as follows: "except that any State may by law exempt the State or any of its time zones from the provisions of the bill during the period commencing at 2 o'clock" and so on and so forth.

This amendment would help the Nelsen amendment and the Nelsen amendment would be a great help to the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to a lot of these arguments here. It seems that everybody admits daylight saving time is the thing that brings about confusion. I have contended that for years. All we are doing when we have daylight saving time is just confusing everybody. Those people who want to go to work early, let them do it. Those people who do not want to go to work early, fine. Just do away with the whole daylight saving time business, and you will solve the problem and you have nothing else to do. It is a crazy thing to start with. So I am going to vote against all of the amendments and I am going to vote against the bill. I hope some day we will get some sense in the people and they will realize how silly the whole thing about daylight saving time is.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I have not heard a reason given here for daylight saving time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have not, either. Everybody says that it confuses everybody. I grant you that. It got so confused down in my district the last year where we had a consolidated school district that embraced two small towns. One of them had daylight saving time and the other did not. The school adopted its own time. They split it down the middle and they had a 30-minute difference in time.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, regardless of what we are going to do here or what kind of a bill you might pass to try to save the daylight, the sun will just stay out so many hours a day, and there is nothing that Congress can do about it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is exactly right. Another example in the State of Missouri is where the city council in the capital city of Jefferson a few years ago adopted a resolution and passed an ordinance establishing daylight saving time. Well, the Governor of the State of Missouri was a very knowledgeable man and I think one of the smartest men I have ever known. He said, "Well, the city of Jefferson can have daylight saving time, but all of the employees of the State are going to stay on regular time."

The next day they called a special session of the council and repealed the ordinance, and sanity was restored.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that any time you get involved in daylight saving time you are just creating problems that you do not have to have.

So I would say, let us vote down the whole thing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very interested in this debate. I believe that if anyone will take a look at the State of Idaho they will find it is the only State in the Union that is divided by time zone boundaries, not into east-west areas, but into north-south areas. Therefore, perhaps for the sake of uniformity we could divide the United States up in that fashion, having the southern part of the United States in one time zone, and the northern part of the United States in a different time zone.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe that for the purposes of the record I should attempt to clarify what this particular piece of legislation will do in my own State of Idaho. I represent the only State that is sometimes referred to as having three capitals—Boise, Spokane, Wash., and Salt Lake City, Utah, and much of Idaho's business is oriented to these cities in adjacent States. You either have to go to Boise for your supplies or you have to go to Spokane or Salt Lake City.

Mr. Chairman, any time the State of Washington goes on daylight saving time and Idaho does not, it creates a local problem in north Idaho. The same is true with reference to the State of Utah and southern Idaho.

Because of the time zone division in Idaho, it is possible for the State to have four different times at the same time. We can have mountain standard time, mountain daylight time, Pacific standard time; and Pacific daylight time. In fact, this condition actually exists twice during each year.

But, again, Mr. Chairman, time measurement is complicated by one other thing. In the northern part of the State there are many towns in deep and narrow valleys in high mountains where the sun does not come up until about 10 o'clock, and then goes down about 2 o'clock. These people want mountain standard time the year around. They would not want to change when other parts of the United States change to daylight saving time. This is now possible thru local option.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we have railroad time in our area, which does not conform to the local time, as it is divided at locations other than at established time boundaries. For instance, Paradise, Mont., 100 miles east of the Idaho-Montana line is a division point on the Northern Pacific Railway and is the point where the railroad changes time.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, because this is the only way that I can see that all of the people of Idaho would be satisfied. I know that Shoshone County is not going to vote for daylight saving time, and I also know that other parts of the State are not going to do so. Mr. Chairman, if there is a chance for local option it seems like it should prevail in this particular instance.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the members of the committee for bringing the legislation before this body, but I think it will be improved through the adoption of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I might say for the clarification of the members of the committee that today 36 States in the Union, by their own wishes and votes, have some kind of daylight saving time. Two States have daylight saving time in reverse—parts of those States. Twelve States do not have any form of daylight saving time today.

Mr. Chairman, that is the reason that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has come to the conclusion that it is time for us to accept our responsibility and do our duty as we are supposed to do it, and to set some kind of uniformity in this Nation with reference to time.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is going to inconvenience some, and it is bound to do so. However, there has never been a law passed in this Congress which has not inconvenienced someone, or to which some were not opposed.

Mr. Chairman, that is the reason we have a democratic form of government, and that the principle of the majority rules.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to work out in the committee the best possible bill which we could write. This is an issue that has been confronting the American people for the last 30 years. The confusion has gotten so great and the problem today is so intense that those who have been opposed through the years to this legislation have come and said "Let us try to bring some order out of this confusion."

Mr. Chairman, in speaking of the problem which is existing in the State of Michigan I recognize that they do have a problem. However, I am certain that if this is brought to the attention of the ICC that it can be worked out, because time zones have been set by the Congress, then they are under the jurisdiction of the ICC and under the law action can be taken to correct inequities.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In your original statement how many States did you say had daylight saving time?

Mr. STAGGERS. I said that 36 States had some kind of daylight saving time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes, that is what I wanted to ask about. That means, of course, that these 36 States do not necessarily have statewide daylight savings time.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. You do not mean then that these 36 States have statewide daylight saving time?

Mr. STAGGERS. No. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In other words, some cities in the 36 States might have and other cities in these same States might not.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will let me explain it. There are 18 States in the United States that go on daylight saving time throughout the State as a whole. There are 18 more where they have portions of the State and different localities or counties or municipalities that go on daylight saving time, and that is what adds to the confusion across the country. It is the duty and responsibility of this Congress under the Constitution and by the precedents that have been established to set the time standards of the Nation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the chairman. I did want that to be clear for the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do you not think that we would eliminate the confusion if we would just forget about daylight saving time? Would there not be less confusion than we have now if that were done?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would agree with the gentleman. I would say that there has been action taken in the greater portion of this Nation to do something on the other side. What we are trying to do is to eliminate the confusion.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. As chairman of this great committee, it would seem that you would be encouraged to do that since you agree with me that it would eliminate the confusion if we do away with daylight saving time. Why do you not start with that?

Mr. STAGGERS. I think that when we have the representatives of the 36 States sitting here in this Chamber, I do not think that we would get very far with that.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that both of these amendments are voted down.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, it is rather ironic that our able and genial chairman and the members of our committee, in an effort to bring about more uniformity and eliminate confusion, apparently have caused a great deal of confusion. Witness this debate over the last few minutes.

I want to assure you as far as daylight saving time is concerned in South Carolina, we do not use it. Really it is not necessary down home. We have to start early. Whenever the sun rises, I would say to my dear friend, the gentleman from Florida, we start working then in order to try to keep up with you wonderful friends in the other States. So it really does not have any applicability to our particular State.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. Actually it will accomplish the desired result of this particular legislation. It will be uniform so far as the commencing date and the ending date in any State which elects to go on daylight saving time. I agree with that principle. I think it will bring about some degree of uniformity and clarification. Additionally, it will eliminate the fact that we have daylight saving time in some municipalities, in some areas of a State and do not have it statewide. With the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, it will still be applicable statewide.

As I understand it, his amendment simply provides this: It does not force the State to take affirmative action in order to remain on standard time; however, it must pass legislation to go on daylight saving time. We in this Congress have done a rather thorough job of eliminating a good many of the rights and prerogatives of the States. You might say that this is just a little consideration for them, yet I believe they deserve it and would be grateful for all small favors. Let us say to the States through passage of the amendment to this legislation—if you want to get on daylight saving time—if you think you are not getting up early enough—then you can take positive action and go on daylight saving time. If you do not take this affirmative action, then you remain on the standard time of your particular time zone. That seems to be a fair enough proposition. We are going to accomplish the same objective and without imposing an additional burden on the States. I can appreciate the position of my friend, the gentleman from California. In committee he tried to make it mandatory that all of the States go on daylight saving time during this uniform period.

Although such may be desirable, which I do not agree, it is going too far. Ultimately we might reach that particular objective, but right now I think the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is simply a proposition of whether or not you want to force a State to do something or whether you want to make it permissive for a State to do this. I think it is the better part of judgment that we try to operate in accordance with the principle of allowing a State to retain this particular right so long as they want it.

I would urge the Members to support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota because I believe it will accomplish the desired objectives of my esteeemed friend and our able and genial colleague from the great State of West Virginia.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the problem that has been set forth here with reference to the State of Michigan and now the States of Idaho and South Dakota was not thoroughly discussed in the committee. I am not a lawyer. I do not know if the language of the Berry amendment properly meets the problem. I hope it does.

I wish to say that if the Berry amendment meets the problem, I certainly would be most happy to accept it. I think something must be done to meet the problem that has been brought out on this floor by States such as Michigan and Idaho and South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Nelsen) there were—ayes 37, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cunningham: Beginning with line 20 on page 5, strike out all down through line 11 on page 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Uniform Time Act of 1966'.

"Sec. 2. It is the policy of the United States to promote the adoption and observance of uniform time within the standard time zones prescribed by the Act entitled 'An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States', approved March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261–263), and the Act entitled 'An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone', approved March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1446; 15 U.S.C. 265). To this end the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to foster and promote widespread and uniform adoption and observance of the same standards of time within and throughout each standard time zone as prescribed by such Acts.

"Sec. 3. (a) Whenever any State or political subdivision thereof or the District of Columbia adopts daylight saving time, such time shall commence at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in April and shall end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in October and shall advance the standard time otherwise applicable by one hour.

"(b) It is hereby declared that it is the express intent of Congress by this section to supersede any and all laws of the States or political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or hereafter provide for advances in time or changeover dates different from those specified in this section.

"(c) For any violation of the provisions of this section the Interstate Commerce Commission or its duly authorized agent may apply to the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurs for the enforcement of this section; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by writ of injunction or by other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining against further violations of this section and enjoining obedience thereto.

"Sec. 4: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 451; 15 U.S.C. 262), whenever any State or political subdivision thereof or the District of Columbia adopts daylight saving time consistent with the provisions of section 3 of this Act, in all statutes, orders, rules, and regulations relating to the time of performance of any act by any officer or department of the United States, whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government, or relating to the time within which any rights shall accrue or determine, or within which any act shall not be performed by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, it shall be understood and intended that such time during such period shall be said daylight saving time, and such time shall be the exclusive time within such State or political subdivision or the District of Columbia, as the case may be, for the transaction of all public business by any department, agency, or court of the United States, or by any officer, agent, employee, or representative of any such department, agency, or court.

"Sec. 5. (a) The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States', approved March 19, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261), is amended to read as follows:

" 'That for the purpose of establishing the standard time of the United States, the territory of the United States shall be divided into eight zones in the manner provided in this section. The standard time of the first zone shall be based on the mean solar time of the sixtieth degree of longitude west from Greenwich; that of the second zone on the seventy-fifth degree; that of the third zone on the ninetieth degree; that of the fourth zone on the one hundred and fifth degree; that of the fifth zone on the one hundred and twentieth degree; that of the sixth zone on the one hundred and thirty-fifth degree; that of the seventh zone on the one hundred and fiftieth degree; and that of the eighth zone on the one hundred and sixty-fifth degree. The limits of each zone shall be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers engaged in commerce between the several States and with foreign nations, and such order may be modified from time to time.'

"(b) Section of such Act (40 Stat. 451; 15 U.S.C. 263) is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 4. The standard time of the first zone shall be known and designated as Atlantic standard time; that of the second zone shall be known and designated as eastern standard time; that of the third zone shall be known and designated as central standard time; that of the fourth zone shall be known and designated as mountain standard time; that of the fifth zone shall be known and designated as Pacific standard time; that of the sixth zone shall be known and designated as Yukon standard time; that of the seventh zone shall be known and designated as Alaska-Hawaii standard time; and that of the eighth zone shall be known and designated as Bering standard time.'

"Sec. 6. The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1000–1011) shall apply to all proceedings under this Act, the Act entitled 'An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States,' approved March 19, 1918, as amended, and the Act entitled 'An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone', approved March 4, 1921."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, was the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska offered at any time in the committee while the bill was under consideration?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This amendment would do what the gentleman voted against.

Mr. MOSS. The answer is partly responsive. I seek in good faith to know whether it is something that was brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. You can reserve the right to object. I will respond at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's lack of courtesy in responding to a proper question, I must most reluctantly object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued and concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the objection by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] took so much time because I know the Members have other things to do.

This amendment is very simple. What this amendment does is simply go back to the original Staggers bill, which says that whoever wishes to be on daylight saving time shall begin at a date certain and go off at a date certain. That is the original bill.

We had no hearings on this other proposition, that everybody has to be on it unless the legislatures decide to take them off. There were no hearings whatsoever on this part of the bill.

I said on the floor, during general debate, that this matter is a very complex, confusing problem in many parts of the country. I was a mayor before I came here several years ago of a city of 330,000 people. Almost every year the matter of daylight saving time came up. The council chamber was packed with a lot of people who were in favor of it. I personally am in favor of it. But it has a lot to do with the economic situation in the various communities, particularly in the farming communities and many came to the council meeting to protest daylight time.

I believe that this bill in its present form is going to cause so much confusion that there will be a good chance that nothing at all will pass. So my amendment, if adopted, will go back to the original bill of our distinguished chairman [Mr. STAGGERS], and, repeating, to simply say that this would be a first step. Everybody who wishes to go on daylight saving time shall go on at a date certain and go off at a date certain.

This is not, in any way, shape, or form, a political matter. It is not a partisan issue. There are Members on both sides of the aisle, and I plead with them who have serious reservations about the committee bill and the confusion that will result if any such bill, as originally proposed here, is passed.

I hope that Members of both parties will not stand up, one side against the other, on this, because it certainly is not a partisan issue. There has been no pressure from the administration that I know of for the committee bill.

I personally favor daylight time. But Nebraska, where I come from, is 500 miles long, and it has two time zones. If this bill is passed, then the whole State would have to go on daylight time or get out from under daylight saving time. It would cause a great deal of unhappiness and confusion, because there are some cities in the eastern part of the State who may want daylight saving time. There are some in the central or western part who would not want it.

I hope that the Members will give serious consideration to going back to the original Staggers bill. Nationwide daylight time will cause much confusion, so let us take the first step as Chairman STAGGERS first proposed and get that through. Then, after that, we can go into these other facets of the matter and perhaps they can be worked out after full and open hearings. However, to put it all in one package is, I think, unwise. As I said, there were no hearings on the bulk of the bill, that is, the additions to it from the original Staggers bill. There were no hearings at all. It was brought up in executive session by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] with little discussion. Why he wants this is beyond me, but he has explained his position. I do not think a Congressman from California should legislate for all of the other communities and States in the Union. That is exactly what is being done if this bill is adopted in toto. So, Mr. Chairman, I would reiterate: Let us go back to the original Staggers bill as the first step. I think it will accomplish what we are seeking to do here, which is avoid confusion particularly in the transportation industry. There were no hearings on the matter of having everybody go on it unless the State legislature decides not to. And the vote in committee was close.

So let me say again that this is not a partisan matter. There has not been any arm twisting on this and there is no really big push behind this. Let us start in a small way by adopting this amendment and then go into the rest of it at some other time. Let us get a bill, a first step such as the other body has already done.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague from Nebraska in expressing regret that it was necessary to have his amendment read in its entirety. This is my 14th year in this House. Today was the first time I was confronted with such lack of courtesy that I was forced to withhold unanimous consent to a request of a colleague. I have never done that before.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. And I regret the discourtesy which was evidenced in declining to answer a question put respectfully to a colleague.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. And I will not yield now to that colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I rise here now to oppose an amendment which would reimpose a pattern of chaotic confusion on the time zones of this Nation. It would sanction the multiplicity of zones in the 50 States which we now encounter. The only thing that would be achieved constructively if the amendment should be adopted would be to have that confusion become effective on the last Sunday of April and terminate on the last Sunday of October. That is all in the world that would be achieved. It would not remove the economic impact of the great many schedules that have to be prepared for transportation companies across this Nation. It would not clear up the question of whether to phone town A at 7 in the morning to get them at 6 or to phone them at 6 to get them at 8. It would not clear up any of that confusion. It would really perpetuate an impossible situation.

Now, I think the amount of opposition to a standardized time in this country has been vastly overstated. Many years ago, 18 years ago, when I served in the Legislature of California, I know that the matter of time was a very lively issue, but our communications in the intervening years have improved tremendously. This Nation, from the standpoint of time, is much smaller and closer together. It is important that we have a more orderly pattern of time. I hope that we make that possible by voting down this amendment and adopting not the proposal of this gentleman from California but the proposal of the overwhelming majority of the members of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the overwhelming majority of the members on both sides of the aisle in that committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CUNNINGHAM) there were—ayes 14, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota: Page 6, line 12, in section 3, delete "last Sunday of April" and substitute "Memorial Day."

Lines 13 and 14, delete "last Sunday of October" and substitute "Labor Day," and make the same changes in section 6.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief.

Mr. Chairman, this is what happens when a bill like this fails to recognize local problems. Our country is a large nation. The hours of daylight vary. Certainly in North Dakota we do not have spots like those alluded to earlier in the great State of Idaho where the sun comes up at 12 o'clock noon and the sun sets at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

But, Mr. Chairman, we do have a much shorter period of daylight, particularly in the fall and spring, than other States.

Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this bill in the Northern States children will find themselves going to school in the dark. This is not good. They would be walking over city streets in darkness to school, or they would be waiting by the side of the road for schoolbuses in darkness.

Mr. Chairman, I believe as a matter of child safety, certainly of paramount importance, these dates should be changed to conform to the generally recognized summer vacation schedule of Memorial Day to Labor Day which is recognized all over this country.

My amendment does just that and I urge its adoption. Certainly it would be tragic to lose the lives of children because of failure to provide them with the best possible traveling conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARVEY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARVEY of Michigan: On page 6, line 20, insert "or any portion of such State" immediately after "exempt itself", and beginning in line 22 on page 6, strike out "but only if" and all that follows down through the period in line 25 of page 6.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes of the time of the Committee.

This, however, is what I call a Michigan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, those Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union who were on the floor earlier will recall that we pointed out the fact that the Upper Peninsula of Michigan is on one time zone, and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan is on another time zone, by virtue of the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this bill would require that all of the areas of Michigan either go on daylight saving time at a particular time, and go off daylight saving time at a particular time, but that the entire State must either accept standard time or daylight saving time.

Mr. Chairman, the State of Michigan has considered this problem several times and it did so long ago. As a State, we tried and we liked the idea very much of having the entire State on the same time. I do not see anything wrong with that at all. We thought we had resolved this problem. The manner in which we did it was to put the Upper Peninsula of Michigan on central daylight time, and put the Lower Peninsula of Michigan on eastern standard time. Thereby we made it possible for us in the State to enjoy one time, which we feel is a tremendous advantage to us in doing our affairs, and performing our business as we do, day after day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what would this bill do? It would prevent that from happening. It would separate one congressional district, I might point out, which would have one time zone in part of it, and another time zone in another part of the district.

Mr. Chairman, this would cause utter confusion in a particular part of the State, and in the entire State, for that matter.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of the Committee that my amendment will eliminate that problem. It would permit the State legislature to designate various portions of the State, if need be, to have either daylight saving time or standard time as they see fit. In that way the Upper Peninsula and the Lower Peninsula could continue to have the same time zone.

I cannot see anything wrong with that. I must admit I am bothered when anyone who is against this bill or against any part of it is supposedly accused of "reimposing a pattern of confusion" or causing confusion, because it seems to me the manner in which the bill is drawn is in itself causing the confusion. I see nothing wrong if the whole State of Michigan, which is 350 miles, roughly speaking, from its southerly boundary to its northern boundary and 300 miles from east to west decides it would like to have the same time zone and that it would like to be able to have telephone and transportation schedules and everything else on the same time zone, I think we should be commended and my amendment would permit it. That is why I call it the Michigan amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to be sure I understand the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. Would this be applicable solely to Michigan and its problems?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. No, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, it would not be applicable solely to the State of Michigan. Line 20, page 6, specifically provides that any State may by law exempt itself, or any portion of such State—which would mean any of the 50 States. I know of no way of writing the law, however, so that only Michigan would be covered.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, for whom I have a particular affection. But I would point out to him that if this is a Michigan amendment it is pernicious—although I am sure the gentleman's motives are of the best.

The result of the amendment he offers is to recognize, sanctify, and perpetuate exactly the chaotic conditions we have in this Nation today. The State of Michigan is not unique in being split into two time zones. Almost every part of this country has States which happen to be split into two time zones.

But the gentleman's amendment goes vastly further than he would have the House believe. What my good friend's amendment does is actually to permit the establishment of local option time or to permit the States to establish precisely the same patchwork that we are now seeking to legislate against.

The remarks that have been made here today about trying to establish uniform time and to retain the patchwork structure of time zones with which we now find ourselves afflicted in this Nation, I am sure were the same comments which were made in this body when the original legislation was passed a number of years ago to establish uniform time zones.

I would point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, and I think this is worthy of note by the Members of this body, that page 8 of the bill provides language under which the Interstate Commerce Commission may take steps to assure that peculiar local problems, the needs of local commerce and business, and the convenience of the traveling public are fully and adequately protected by authorizing the limits of each zone to be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am quoting from the bill now.

The bill reads as follows:

The limits of each zone shall be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and any such order may be modified from time to time.

I would point out to the gentleman from Michigan, I heard no great complaint from the citizens of the State of Michigan over being divided into two time zones. Our State has thrived under this.

My good friend's amendment does nothing more than authorize the perpetuation of the kind of situation I saw when I served in the U.S. Army some 20 years ago when within 10 miles from the Army post on which I served, we had no less than four time zones—eastern standard, eastern daylight, central standard, and central daylight.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I am not certain that my good friend from Michigan understands my point. I think I would agree with him that Michigan is not unique in having two time zones, but I think he would agree with me that Michigan is unique in the way they have solved this problem by deciding that they all want to be on one time. The Upper Peninsula, I will say to my friend, is on central time in one case and the Lower Peninsula is on eastern standard time. So that we in Michigan all want to go on the same time and I think that is unique.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further to my good friend because I notice my time is running out.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **CLEVENGER.** I am not so sure as to how well my colleague from the lower part of the State can speak of the Upper Peninsula. I do not know how great a uniformity we have in Michigan. Last week I was in a part of my district which I still believe is in Michigan. One town had a meeting at 3 o'clock and I called about a meeting in another town and they told me their time was 2 o'clock. So we do not have uniform time. There are times when we have differing times right now on the western end of the peninsula where one place it will be 3 o'clock and in another place 2 o'clock. The towns of Menominee, Laurium, and Ironwood are behind the time of the rest of Michigan. So I do not think there is any uniformity about the thing.

Mr. **DINGELL.** I would like to point out to my good friend that the amendment he talks about is not going to solve the problem we are discussing in the State of Michigan. It is simply going to sanctify the hodgepodge or patchwork. The gentleman's amendment raises conflicting ideas and contradictory time zones in every part of this Nation and in every part of this situation.

The perpetuation of that confusion and obnoxious situation would impose a tremendous difficulty upon our people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Chairman, I was here when the daylight saving time legislation came up for renewal each year, and I fully intended to support this bill until it becomes obvious that not a single amendment to improve it would be adopted.

I suggest that the confusion and chaos, about which we have heard so much, could have been cured if the committee had simply recommended Greenwich Mean Time for the entire Nation. We would then operate on the same time throughout the country. Some people might have had to go to work in darkness and there will be millions operating on that basis with this bill.

When you rejected the amendment to restrict the effective time of this bill, as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Andrews], suggested, from Memorial Day to Labor Day, that is when you lost my vote, for whatever it means, and it probably does not mean very much to you. The last Sunday in October 1971 will be October 31. I am not going to vote today to make myself a party to a tragedy on the highways of Iowa where schoolchildren, coming across the highway to catch a schoolbus in the darkness and semidarkness of late fall, are mowed down by a truck or car. It should not be necessary to remind you that the days and nights become equal in daylight and darkness on September 21.

I am not going to be a party to such tragedy, and that is what will happen eventually in Iowa, and elsewhere in the country, when you try to operate school buses in early morning darkness during the month of October in all kinds of weather—fog, sleet, rain, icy highways, and so forth. You are asking for it when you run the effective date of this bill, the closing-out date, to the last Sunday in October.

Let the blood be on your hands, not mine.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question now recurs on the committee amendment to the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair [Mr. Karsten], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6785) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 775, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. **HARVEY** of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 292, nays 93, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—292

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Chelf
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—93

Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bandstra
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Callan
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Colmer
Cunningham
Curtis
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Gathings
Gross
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hansen, Iowa
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Henderson
Hutchinson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
Love
McCulloch
McMillan
Martin, Nebr.
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Mosher
Nelsen
Olson, Minn.
Poage
Randall

Redlin
Reifel
Roberts
Roush
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Stanton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Waggonner
Watson
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams

NOT VOTING—48

Abbitt
Baring
Blatnik
Bolling
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Cabell
Celler
Clawson, Del
Collier
Conte
Culver
Dickinson
Dowdy
Downing
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Fuqua
Greigg
Griffin
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Herlong
Jennings
McCarthy
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Miller
Morrison
Murray
Nix
Pool
Powell
Reinecke
Roncalio
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Sisk
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Willis
Wolff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Greigg with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. **CURTIS** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. **HICKS** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 775, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Uniform Time Act of 1965."

Sec. 2. It is the policy of the United States to promote the adoption and observance of uniform time within the standard time zones prescribed by the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450), and the Act entitled "An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone," approved March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1446). To this end the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to foster and promote widespread and uniform adoption and observance of the same standards of time within and throughout each standard time zone as prescribed by such Acts.

Sec. 3. (a) Whenever any State or political subdivision thereof or the District of Columbia adopts daylight saving time, such time shall commence at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in April and shall end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in October and shall advance the standard time otherwise applicable by one hour.

(b) It is hereby declared that it is the express intent of Congress by this section to supersede any and all laws of the States or political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or hereafter provide for advances in time or changeover dates different from those specified herein.

Sec. 4. The second sentence of section 2 of the Act of March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 451; 15 U.S.C. 262), is amended by striking out "be the United States standard time of the zone" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and "insofar as practicable, be the prevailing established time (including daylight saving time where established) of the area".

Sec. 5. (a) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States" approved March 19, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261), is amended to read as follows:

"That for the purpose of establishing the standard time of the United States, the territory of the United States shall be divided into eight zones in the manner provided in this section. The standard time of the first zone shall be based on the mean solar time of the sixtieth degree of longitude west from Greenwich; that of the second zone on the seventy-fifth degree of longitude; that of the third zone on the ninetieth degree; that of the fourth zone on the one hundred and fifth degree; that of the fifth zone on the one hundred and twentieth degree; that of the sixth zone on the one hundred and thirty-fifth degree; that of the seventh zone on the one hundred and fiftieth degree; and that of the eighth zone on the one hundred and sixty-fifth degree. The limits of each zone shall be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers engaged in commerce between the several States and with foreign nations, and such order may be modified from time to time."

(b) Section 4 of such Act (40 Stat. 451; 15 U.S.C. 263) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The standard time of the first zone shall be known and designated as 'Atlantic standard time'; that of the second zone shall be known and designated as 'Eastern standard time'; that of the third zone shall be known and designated as 'Central standard time'; that of the fourth zone shall be known and designated as 'Mountain standard time'; that of the fifth zone shall be known and designated as 'Pacific standard time'; that of the sixth zone shall be known and designated as 'Yukon standard time'; that of the seventh zone shall be known and designated as 'Alaska-Hawaii standard time'; and that of the eighth zone shall be known and designated as 'Bering standard time.' "

Sec. 6. The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1000–1011) shall apply to all proceedings under this Act, the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended, and the Act entitled "An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone," approved March 4, 1921.

Sec. 7. This Act shall take effect January 1, 1966.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. **STAGGERS**. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1404 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 6785, as passed.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Staggers: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill, S. 1404, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Uniform Time Act of 1966'.

"Sec. 2. It is the policy of the United States to promote the adoption and observance of uniform time within the standard time zones prescribed by the Act entitled 'An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States', approved March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261–264), as modified by the Act entitled 'An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone', approved March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1446; 15 U.S.C. 265). To this end the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to foster and promote widespread and uniform adoption and observance of the same standard of time within and throughout each such standard time zone.

"Sec. 3. (a) During the period commencing at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of April of each year and ending at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of October of each year, the standard time of each zone established by the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261–264), as modified by the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265), shall be advanced one hour and such time as so advanced shall for the purposes of such Act of March 19, 1918, as so modified, be the standard time of such zone during such period; except that any State may by law exempt itself from the provisions of this subsection providing for the advancement of time, but only if such law provides that the entire State (including all political subdivisions thereof) shall observe the standard time otherwise applicable under such Act of March 19, 1918, as so modified, during such period.

"(b) It is hereby declared that it is the express intent of Congress by this section to supersede any and all laws of the States or political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or hereafter provide for advances in time or changeover dates different from those specified in this section.

"(c) For any violation of the provisions of this section the Interstate Commerce Commission or its duly authorized agent may apply to the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurs for the enforcement of this section; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by writ of injunction or by other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining against further violations of this section and enjoining obedience thereto.

"Sec. 4. (a) The first section of the Act of March 19, 1918, as amended (15 U.S.C. 261), is amended to read as follows:

" 'That for the purpose of establishing the standard time of the United States, the territory of the United States shall be divided into eight zones in the manner provided in this section. Except as provided in section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966, the standard time of the first zone shall be based on the mean solar time of the sixtieth degree of longitude west from Greenwich; that of the second zone on the seventy-fifth degree; that of the third zone on the ninetieth degree; that of the fourth zone on the one hundred and fifth degree; that of the fifth zone on the one hundred and twentieth degree; that of the sixth zone on the one hundred and thirty-fifth degree; that of the seventh zone on the one hundred and fiftieth degree; and that of the eighth zone on the one hundred and sixty-fifth degree. The limits of each zone shall be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and any such order may be modified from time to time. As used in this Act, the term "interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce between a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States and any place outside thereof.'

"(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 2. Within the respective zones created under the authority of this Act the standard time of the zone shall insofar as practicable (as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission) govern the movement of all common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce. In all statutes, orders, rules, and regulations relating to the time of performance of any act by any officer or department of the United States, whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government, or relating to the time within which any rights shall accrue or determine, or within which any act shall or shall not be performed by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, it shall be understood and intended that the time shall insofar as practicable (as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission) be the United States standard time of the zone within which the act is to be performed.'

"(c) Section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 4. The standard time of the first zone shall be known and designated as Atlantic standard time; that of the second zone shall be known and designated as eastern standard time; that of the third zone shall be known and designated as central standard time; that of the fourth zone shall be known and designated as mountain standard time; that of the fifth zone shall be known and designated as Pacific standard time; that of the sixth zone shall be known and designated as Yukon standard time; that of the seventh zone shall be known and designated as Alaska-Hawaii standard time; and that of the eighth zone shall be known and designated as Bering standard time.'

"Sec. 5. The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001–1011) shall apply to all proceedings under this Act, the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261–264), and the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265).

"Sec. 6. This Act shall take effect on April 1, 1967; except that if any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, observes daylight saving time in the year 1966, such time shall advance the standard time otherwise applicable in such place by one hour and shall commence at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in April of the year 1966 and shall end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in October of the year 1966.

"Sec. 7. As used in this Act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to promote the observance of a uniform system of time throughout the United States."

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to promote the observance of a uniform system of time throughout the United States."

A similar House bill (H.R. 6785) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, may I take a few moments to express my pleasure in supporting the joint resolution establishing an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

Those of us representing districts in the Thirteen Original Colonies have a period of particular pride ahead of us. The American Revolution was generated and was fought on the soil of our States. It belongs, happily, to all the United States but I know you will understand our feeling of special closeness to it.

Speaking from that feeling, I am emphatically pleased with the nature of the resolution before us. As President Johnson points out, the American Revolution was many things but above all it was an idea—the idea of freedom and opportunity on which democracy is built. It is this aspect of the Revolution which has given it such deep and enduring meaning, not only in our own land but around the world, and the proposed joint resolution fully recognizes this fundamental point.

The resolution specifically instructs the Commission to give due weight to the principles behind the Revolution in all its work. Of equal importance, it gets the work on the bicentennial underway now and not in 1976 when the anniversaries of the mere military aspects of the Revolution begin.

This is crucial because the ideas of the Revolution did not spring full-blown from the men who wrote the Declaration of Independence in 1776. They were a long time in germinating, and we want to note all the important steps in their development. In 1766, the repeal of the Stamp Act; 1770, the Boston Massacre; 1772, the foundation of the Committees of Correspondence; 1773, the Boston Tea Party—well before 1776, year after year, stirring events were occurring which set the patriots to thinking about the fundamental of good government and of a good society and which produced the remarkable body of literature that was climaxed by the Declaration of Independence.

Quite properly, during the whole decade before 1976, our American communities will be observing these events or planning celebrations and it will be exceedingly useful for this local initiative to have the help and the coordination of the distinguished Federal Commission envisaged in the resolution.

The chief figure of the Revolution, George Washington, delivering his first inaugural address, told us:

> The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican model of government, are justly considered as deeply, perhaps finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people.

The establishment now—and in the form proposed by the President—of an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission will do a great deal to help our people refresh their understanding of the full significance of George Washington's words.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to support enthusiastically the proposed joint resolution establishing an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

Each of our American communities will want to mark the anniversary in its own way, and many American towns and cities are already laying plans. That is just as it should be. But we will all benefit richly from the coordination and the added resources which a Federal commission can provide, particularly one of the distinction called for by this resolution.

My State did not have the privilege of participating in the Revolution as one of the Original Thirteen Colonies. But our devotion to what the Revolution stands for, and our enthusiasm to see to it that the bicentennial celebration is conducted at the highest possible level, merely underlines the universality of the principles of the men of 1776.

The authors of the Declaration of Independence did not say that some men—New Yorkers or Virginians or even all Americans—are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They declared something far more significant. They declared that all men, in and outside the United States, have these rights.

As Abraham Lincoln said, the leaders of the Revolution "set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and, even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere."

The American Revolution spoke to everyone and it continues to have important meaning around the world, particularly to the newer nations who are struggling to find their way, as we did, from colonial status to a powerful and prosperous nationhood, with social and economic opportunities for all citizens. No document in the history of Western civilization has been read more avidly by more people than the Declaration of Independence. Few leaders have been so closely studied as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and the other remarkable men who brought this Nation into being.

The world will be watching to see how we mark our greatest anniversary. We need this national commission to help make sure that what the world sees will do full credit to us and to these principles which, in the haunting words of Thomas Jefferson, we submitted in 1776 and have continued to submit with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the President of the United States, on observing the fifth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, emphasized our Nation's determination to continue in our cooperation with our sister nations in the Western Hemisphere to achieve a better life for all our citizens. The progress in the last 2 years in Latin America, on goals shaped by several Presidents, is strongly evident. To those critics who feel that the deeds of the United States have not matched the words, the statement of the President which follows is resolute and convincing.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY FOR THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

My fellow citizens of the hemisphere, since becoming President, I have often restated my own, and our country's resolute commitment to the goal of a better life for all the people of the Western Hemisphere.

Many Presidents have worked to shape that goal.

We are proud of the good neighbor policy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

President Eisenhower broke new and fertile ground with the Act of Bogotá in 1960—an act growing from the understanding compassion of one people for another.

President Kennedy built on these efforts and gave them increased emphasis with the announcement of the Alliance for Progress on March 13, 1961, 5 years ago.

Today, by word and deed, Americans are helping to fulfill the hopes of those who have little and pray that one day they can have more.

The Johnson administration seeks history's description as a time when, the dreaming and the planning have laid the foundations, the doing and building were underway.

The last 2 years of this vast cooperative effort between the United States and the nations of Latin America are solid evidence that deeds are matching our words.

During these 2 years Latin America has achieved a per capita growth rate of 2.5 percent. The average rate for the preceding 3 years was less than 1 percent. This recent increase of 150 percent is a fact which friends of the hemisphere must note with pride—and new hope for the future.

In fiscal years 1965 and 1966, those Latin American countries cooperating with U.S. programs of action are putting visible results before their people.

Together we are: Improving 7,000 miles of road, building 130,000 dwelling units, irrigating 136,000 new acres of farmland, adding 530,000 kilowatts to power generating capacity, providing classrooms for 1 million students, building 450 new health facilities, spending $200 million to provide financing for expansion and construction of over 5,000 industrial firms, spending $250 million in providing agricultural credit to 450,000 farmers.

Equally important, reforms are changing and modernizing these institutions in Latin America essential to the growth of a sense of community that stretches throughout the hemisphere.

Governments, business concerns, labor unions, and cooperatives are working with the people of our hemisphere to attain economic and social progress under free institutions.

We are building the machinery of cooperation through the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress.

We are enlisting the support of private groups and voluntary agencies in ever-increasing measure. The Peace Corps, Partners for the Alliance, Council on Latin America, AFL–CIO, private foundations, and universities are making vital contributions.

We are introducing the principle of mutual aid among the Latin American nations. We are giving new energy to economic integration within Latin America. The Economic and Social Act of Rio de Janeiro, approved last November, gives impetus to these concepts.

We recognize that fulfillment of all our goals will require continuation of our joint efforts beyond 1971. I said last November that the United States is prepared to extend mutual commitments beyond the period originally foreseen in the Charter of Punta del Este. Self-help and mutual aid will be yardsticks in determining the scope of our contribution.

In country after country, nations in the hemisphere are acting to mobilize resources for public and private investment—to reform and modernize the institutions—to expand trade and market opportunities within and outside the hemisphere—and to provide a solid base for the support and cooperation of imported capital and technical assistance.

External support is also coming in increasing measure from the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, and its affiliates and the United Nations. This support has increased by about $200 million in the last 2 years.

For its part, the United States has already committed nearly $5 billion to the nations of Latin America to assist them in their struggle to modernize and achieve a better life for their people. In recent months significant steps have been taken to give Latin America greater access to our markets:

This administration has insisted that our participation in the International Coffee Agreement be more effective.

This administration recommended the Congress withdraw the special import fee on sugar.

This administration removed the quota restrictions on lead and zinc.

After a temporary period of setback, there are now most hopeful signs of a renewal of large-scale private foreign investment in Latin American development, often in joint ventures with Latin American associates. Business leaders interested in Latin American investment have been invited to the Cabinet Room frequently to discuss steps to help the people of the hemisphere.

Three years ago the 19 Latin American countries were deeply concerned over their trade position in the world.

During the past 2 years the trend has changed.

Our experts now predict that export earnings for 1965 will show an increase of $1 billion over the 1963 level, providing additional resources for investment in development.

Yet we must do more than provide money and technical assistance and improve trade. Investments must be made directly in human beings. In every forum, I have advocated and directed that American resources be invested in education, health, and improved living and working conditions. Such efforts are not easy to organize. They require the mobilization of human resources in scarce supply. But they are among the most rewarding of all investments.

Today I want to issue a new call to our sister nations in the hemisphere to enlarge our truly revolutionary cause—the cause of enlarging the lives of all our people.

I am determined to contribute America's resources to this spirit of change—a spirit now slowly, surely, confidently growing in the Western Hemisphere.

All of us in the Organization of American States have seen and understand the lessons of history. Together we are strong. Divided we are weak. Together, we must shape the future to our hopes.

In every nation in the hemisphere the needs and the beliefs and the prayers are the same. We want peace and opportunity—the chance to live in dignity, to choose and plan and work and achieve the best for our families.

I believe that the next 5 years we will see a continent constantly growing in prosperity and in unity—growing in its capacity to meet the desires and needs of its own people—and in its contribution to peace and freedom in the world at large.

That is what Bogotá and Rio and Punta del Este were all about.

For my own part, I want to help make all this a reality and "to create out of the human spirit, something that did not exist before."

This is fulfillment. And this is our commitment.

GROWING MENACE OF ILLEGAL UNDER-THE-TABLE TAKEOVERS OF INDEPENDENT BANKS BY BIG CITY BANKS IS OF CONCERN TO CONGRESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, secret, under-the-table deals by large, big city banks to take over locally owned independent banks in small cities and towns all over the Nation continues to be a gnawing problem for the Congress.

A prosperous, dual system of independent banks is a well-established public policy in America and contrasts sharply with the highly concentrated commercial banking systems of foreign countries which in nearly all cases are nationalized or else controlled by a handful of large monopolistic institutions. We have decided, wisely I think, that free enterprise and our concern for the general banking public benefit from a system where competition among independent institutions responsible to local needs and preferences is the keynote.

Congress has enacted very important legislation to safeguard this system, such as the McFadden Act in 1927 to regulate branch systems, the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, to control holding company systems, and the Bank Merger Act of 1960, as amended, to control anticompetitive bank mergers. Just recently, the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported out a bill subsequently enacted into law requiring disclosure to Federal banking agencies of changes in the voting control of insured banks.

Yet, the problem of the disappearance of the hometown bank still plagues Congress which under the Constitution has complete responsibility for banking and monetary affairs. Unfortunately, banking is characterized by a "growth at any cost" attitude reminiscent of the roaring twenties. The big city banks, particularly those in nonbranching States, are willing to pay two or three times book value to take over smalltown banks and operate them as captive satellites. Federal banking supervisors just sit by and watch it happen as this "anything goes" attitude has spread to Washington. In fact, one informed and respected Federal banking official has accused these agencies of a competition in laxity to curry the favor of the industry they are supposed to supervise in the public interest. But Congress' hands are tied since these agencies are in effect self-proclaimed independent fiefdoms free of the responsibility of attitude and action that goes with having to justify to Congress expenditure of funds.

For instance, many national banks currently own stock in their country correspondents and control through absentee ownership the policies of banks located far away. The fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that national banks cannot acquire the stock of other corporations, other banks in particular, unless specifically authorized by Congress, does not seem to make any difference.

These are not scattered instances to which I refer—there are definite patterns and not restricted to any one area of the country. Immediately coming to mind are aggravated situations in California, Texas, Florida, and Virginia, just to name a few States. From one day to the next, local people have no way of knowing the identity, much less the character of the people they are banking with. Instead of a local group it is quite likely to be a big city bank or some syndicate of free-wheeling, jet age speculators looking for a fast buck at the expense of the banking public.

Studies and hearings by the Banking and Currency Committee conducted during the past few years point up the weaknesses in our banking laws which literally invite entry by those more interested in exploiting rather than building a community. Chain banking, the nominee system of stockholdings, loopholes in holding company legislation and poor agency enforcement are obvious weaknesses. The recent General Accounting Office report criticizing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation suggests that unless the situation improves the solvency of the deposit insurance fund could be affected. Too often in the past, it has been ridiculously easy for the financial parasites to move into a town and cause irreparable harm through an under-the-table takeover of a local bank.

Attached is a recent letter from the Honorable OMAR BURLESON raising this very same question, along with my own reply to Chairman BURLESON.

I am serving notice to my other colleagues and the banking public, just as I have pledged to Chairman BURLESON, that the Banking and Currency Committee does not intend to sit idly by while our cherished system of competitive, independent banking is dismantled, either by big city bankers or big city con artists. I suggest that these operators take note, for this committee is not at all hesitant in meeting its legislative responsibilities, whether in our committee room in the Rayburn Building or out in the grassroots where the predators are. In fact, failure by this committee to fully investigate at this time the bank takeover problem would amount to a dereliction of our duty. Independent banking is living on borrowed time unless we do.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. February 28, 1966.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While recently back in my district, minority stockholders in two different banks complained of the practice of large city banks purchasing control of small banks in small towns. They say this is a growing practice and that the banking interest is being centralized. It seems that a great many National and State banks have been purchased by larger institutions in the last year or two.

I know of nothing which prevents it, and particularly in the case of State banks, but did want to at least call it to your attention and to inquire if, first, there was anything which could be done about it and, second, if anything should be done.

With all good wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

OMAR BURLESON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1966.

Hon. OMAR BURLESON,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The questions raised in your letter of February 28, concerning the disappearance of small, independent, locally owned banks, are very serious indeed.

The number of total banking offices in the Nation has increased substantially in recent years, yet the number of separate banks has actually declined. While many new banks have been chartered by both State and Federal banking authorities, just as many have disappeared through mergers. This trend toward concentration in banking has also been further accelerated by the expansion of branch and holding company systems.

The great danger here, as I am sure you are aware, is that absentee ownership is frequently not responsive to local needs and convenience. Also, many people prefer to do business with a local bank rather than a branch of a large bank headquartered many miles way.

However, the larger banks are competing feverishly with one another in a growth at any cost attitude. They are willing to pay unrealistically high prices to stockholders of smaller banks as inducements to sell out. It is not unlikely that majority stockholders owning the controlling stock receive premiums for the sale of majority control not shared in by minority stockholders. The payment of such high prices to acquire a bank—either through merger or outright purchase—naturally results in higher interest costs to borrowers as the new owners seek to recover on their inflated acquisition cost. Of course, businessmen and consumers suffer. Unsound practices pursued by managements of newly acquired banks have resulted in numerous bank failures in recent years.

Your Banking and Currency Committee has investigated these problems in the past and continues to do so at present. In the 88th Congress, we reported out a bill subsequently enacted into law which requires disclosure to the appropriate Federal supervisory agency of any changes in the voting control of an insured bank (Public Law 88-593). In the 89th Congress, thus far we have reported H.R. 7371, a bill to plug numerous loopholes in the Bank Holding Company Act, which passed the House last September. Senate committee action is scheduled for this month. In addition, on February 21, President Johnson approved an amendment to the Bank Merger Act of 1960 in the same form as reported out of committee and passed by the House (Public Law 89-356). This law substantially tightens up the standards which the banking agencies must apply in considering merger applications. I am confident that this measure will in no small way stem the disturbing trend we have witnessed of small banks being gobbled up by their larger competitors.

While I personally feel that considerable progress has been made in the past several years to insure the maintenance of a healthy and prosperous dual system of independent banks, much work remains ahead of us. We are continuing our study of the performance of the regulatory agencies themselves and bills designed to reform and improve bank supervision are currently before the committee. These matters are very complex and there are many diverse points of view to be considered. But there is no question that improvement is necessary and it is now just a simple question of the appropriate time.

Since this matter involves State-chartered banks, I am taking the liberty of sending copies of both your letter and this letter to Hon. J. M. Falkner, Texas State banking commissioner.

I hope that this is responsive to your inquiry and welcome any further comments you may care to make.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.
Chairman.

NEW EXPORT QUOTAS ON CATTLE HIDES

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the new export quotas on cattle hides have been imposed, according to the Department of Commerce, to check an inflationary trend in leather prices. Figures indicate that in the absence of such controls the price of shoes at the retail level might increase as much as 50 cents a pair.

On balance, it appears to me that these controls are unwise and unnecessary. We have an opportunity for substantially increased exports of cattle hides this year. It is a temporary situation, and one that should correct itself within a year or so. In the meantime, the benefit from a balance-of-payments standpoint would be much more helpful, in my opinion, than the benefit of reduced prices for hides on the domestic market.

In the first place, the evidence indicates that the increased demand for exports is temporary, resulting from the drought in Argentina. The reduced exports of hides from Argentina last year are already being reversed. Argentina has traditionally supplied the world market with 10 to 12 million hides per year. Last year this figure was reduced to 6.7 million because of the problems resulting from the drought. It is expected that exports from Argentina this year will be 8 to 8½ million hides, and the figure will probably regain a normal range next year.

In the meantime, the United States has a golden opportunity to reap the benefits of the availability of markets. Livestock producers and meatpackers will reap the benefits of increased world prices, and the balance-of-payments position of the United States will be the beneficiary.

It appears obvious that the Department of Commerce is working at cross purposes with a longtime program of the Department of Agriculture, working with industry, to develop the export outlets that are now open to us.

I, too, am concerned about inflation. But I am also concerned about the economy of agriculture and the development of exports. I am concerned about the balance of payments. And I favor letting the law of supply and demand work in favor of the United States in world markets when the opportunity presents itself.

It seems to me that everybody benefits when higher prices are paid for hides on the world market and the demand is increased. The packer can pay the producer more for his cattle without passing the increase on to the housewife in the cost of meat. Economists estimate that the export quotas recently announced will have the effect of reducing exports from the 1965 level of 13.3 million hides to about 11.5 million hides this year. This is a 14-percent decrease, and is about the same level of exports which existed in 1964. Prior to 1964, exports in the past 10 years have ranged from a low of just over 4 million hides to a high of less than 8 million. The expected reduction in hide prices is expected to be in the neighborhood of 5 cents per pound as a result of the export quotas.

Since an average hide weighs 60 pounds, this is a reduction of about $3 per animal in the price paid to the producer, for it is the producer who will surely bear the brunt of any price reduction.

Obviously the Department of Commerce is taking this action to hold down the cost of raw materials for shoe manufacturers. Past experience is enough proof to me that there is no reason to believe that holding down the price of hides will hold down the price of shoes. Take the example we had just last year of holding down the price of wheat to bakers in order to prevent an increase in bread prices. As usual, it did not work. Fortunately for the wheat farmer, it was the Government which bore the cost of holding down the price of wheat. In this case, it is the livestock producer who is being told he must bear the burden of reduced prices for his product to hold down the price of shoes. I have seen no assurance, and I am more than confident that no assurance will be forthcoming, that the price of shoes will be held at present levels if the price of hides is held down by Government action.

It was only a few months ago that the Department of Commerce was telling cattle raisers not to worry about the high levels of meat imports, but to spend their time developing export markets. The cattle raisers have gone to work on improvement of exports, and now this same Department of Commerce tells them that they are imposing limits on the exports of a very substantial amount of cattle products.

I urge reconsideration of the export quotas. I urge the continued operation of a free and competitive market with the opportunity for a profit and an improvement in the U.S. balance of payments.

While I am sure that the export quotas are well intentioned, I believe they are unnecessary and unwise. The per capita use of leather for shoes in the United States is declining. A lot of hard work and good planning has gone into the promotion of our exports of hides. Let us not waste all the effort which has been put forth by imposing controls which are not needed.

PATMAN PLAN CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Department of Defense published a directive which, for the first time, establishes credit unions for servicemen stationed overseas. I cannot in this brief time tell you how important these credit unions will be in the life of our servicemen. For some 10 months the Domestic Finance Subcommittee has been investigating loan and finance companies which deal primarily with the military. Mr. Speaker, the results of our investigations, as I have discussed on the floor of this great body before, are shocking. Adequate credit sources are one of the greatest problems facing our noncombatant servicemen today. Servicemen overseas are even more handicapped by this problem and in order to obtain needed credit, must turn to high-rate finance companies.

The establishment of overseas credit unions will go a long way toward solving this problem. There were many people who were responsible for the issuance of this directive which will lead to credit unions for servicemen throughout the world. However, if it had not been for the efforts of the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, servicemen stationed outside of the United States who needed credit could look forward only to the prospect of obtaining funds at a high rate of interest. There have been earlier attempts by the Department of Defense to establish overseas credit unions. However, various legal problems have prevented the creation of these fine financial institutions. It was Chairman PATMAN who waded into this tangled field and came up with a plan which would cut through the legal and redtape morass that had blocked credit unions.

Because of his role in the establishment of overseas credit unions and his longstanding devotion to the credit union principles and his well-known stand on the rights of veterans and servicemen, I have today written Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara asking that military credit unions overseas become known as Patman plan credit unions. This, in some small way, will provide a fitting tribute to a man who has dedicated his life to helping little people.

A copy of the letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am certain that you are well aware of the many years that the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, has fought for the rights of servicemen. He was, of course, the author of the World War II Soldiers Bonus Act and, since that time, has supported and campaigned for every piece of veterans' and servicemen's legislation which has come before the House of Representatives.

The recent Department of Defense directive which, for the first time, establishes overseas credit unions for our servicemen is a direct result of the efforts of Chairman PATMAN. Had Chairman PATMAN not devoted all his energies to the establishment of these overseas credit unions, I am certain that these fine institutions would still be unavailable to our overseas servicemen.

When it appeared that the Department of Defense could not solve the legal problem surrounding the establishment of credit unions, it was Chairman PATMAN who presented a plan to the Department which overcame these legal obstacles. Therefore, I feel that it would be more than fitting if the new overseas credit unions were officially designated as "Patman Plan Credit Unions." This designation would serve as a glowing tribute to a man who has spent nearly 40 years fighting for the little man.

Sincerely,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Member of Congress.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Education Act has been helpful to thousands of college students in America. The way and manner in which it has been administered through the procedure of permitting the individual college to determine its policies has been desirable. To change this policy abruptly would, in my judgment, bring hardship upon many young, worthy students.

The aim of the administration to ultimately terminate this program and establish guaranteed loans by private financial institutions is commendable. I concur in the thought that the students, the Government, and our free enterprise system would best be served by this approach at the proper time.

To do this, however, as abruptly as has been proposed, would create problems which I believe could be obviated by a plan of gradual movement in the direction of the private Government-guaranteed loans to students.

At this time we have many uncertainties with reference to moving into the private financial sector of student loans. Some of these uncertainties are the lack of knowledge of the willingness of commercial lending agencies to participate in such a program and also the failure to know how extensively they would participate as far as finances are concerned.

Another uncertainty is the interest rate at which private financial institutions can handle such student loans in the light of the recent increases in interest rates being paid.

The encouragement which has been given to worthy students through loan programs has resulted in the education of many young men and women who otherwise would have been unable to attend institutions of higher learning. This type of encouragement should not be lessened at this time.

As one who found it necessary to borrow money in order to attend college and law school I can appreciate the value to the individual student of the availability of loan funds. Through this type of program the student is given an opportunity to acquire an education at his or her own expense rather than through a handout from the Government. The student's dignity is preserved through the realization that his educational expenses have been met through his own efforts.

I urge that full consideration be given to the phasing out of the National Defense Education Act program in such a manner as to bring about as little disruption of our educational program as possible. I commend those who desire to ultimately have the student loan program placed in the private financial area but express the hope that this will be through a transitional program rather than an abrupt termination of the National Defense Education Act program.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am offering a resolution to request the National Science Foundation to make recommendations concerning distribution of research and development funds among our several States.

Certainly this is an outstanding example of which comes first—the chicken or the egg. Government research funding has been going, in large measure, to areas where large research developments have already been underway. Since research is a key part of teaching, I think we must not overlook the fact that a reexamination of the placement of these funds is well in order to stimulate more opportunities for all our college students.

When I find that my home State of North Dakota receives less than one-third of Federal research funds per student in a college or university as the average, it seems to me, and I am sure it does to every thoughtful individual, that this is too great a disparity.

As has been well documented, the distribution of Federal funds for research and development has taken place on an uneven geographical basis. In fiscal year 1964, for example, half the States received over 96 percent of the prime contracts and grants awarded by the major Federal agencies funding research and development. Slightly over half of Federal research and development obligations were assigned to only three States. Moreover, in that same year, some 31 States failed to receive as much as 1 percent each of Federal obligations for research and development financing.

We may look at these obligations in still another way. Considering only research and development funds obligated to educational institutions, it may be noted that, while the west-north-central region in 1964 enrolled approximately 9 percent of the Nation's college students, the region as a whole received only slightly over 4 percent of Federal research and development obligations. In my own State of North Dakota, which accounted for approximately one-third of 1 percent of the total 1964 college enrollments, only one-tenth of 1 percent of research and development obligations were assigned to our educational institutions.

As I pointed out, North Dakota gets less than one-third as much funds per student as it would if it were receiving the average funding for the Nation's colleges and universities.

It is clear that imbalances in the dispersal of Federal research and development funds exist. I would hasten to add, of course, that there have been good and sufficient reasons for this imbalance. I believe that those responsible for allocating Federal research moneys have, on the whole, done a truly commendable job in searching out excellence and in doing so have helped our Nation to attain and to strengthen its unquestioned leadership in science and technology.

Yet, I also believe that the time is at hand when the Congress must give serious consideration to the necessity for conscious direction of at least a portion of the funds available for research and development to the States and regions so far somewhat less favored. Accordingly, I am introducing today a resolution calling upon the National Science Foundation to recommend to the Congress such changes in the laws or administration of the laws for Federal research and development funding as may serve to effect a wider distribution of those funds to institutions of higher education. This resolution is identical to one introduced in the other body on March 2 by Senator CURTIS and which has received bipartisan as well as wide regional support.

I should like to emphasize that this resolution, in calling for wider participation of educational institutions, does not specify other nonprofit or industrial or commercial organizations. As such, then, the resolution is aimed principally at strengthening higher education throughout the country. In particular, it is intended to help those States and regions which at present, and as a consequence of the imbalance in research and development fund distribution, have had difficulty in obtaining and retaining competent researchers and teachers. Taking cognizance of the potential for development of our many colleges and universities, this resolution looks to the realization of that potential both for quality education and for continuing scientific growth.

To be sure, additional research funding will not necessarily lead to better teaching, nor will it guarantee that individual institutions can compete more effectively for the distressingly short supply of qualified teacher-scientists. More equitable distribution of research obligations is a step, however, and it is one we cannot afford to ignore.

Finally, I would like to stress that this resolution does not call for a pork-barrel approach to the distribution of research funds. Our expenditures in this crucial area must, in general, continue to flow to our most competent investigators wherever they may be located. But we must, at the same time, give full opportunity for the important contributions that educational institutions in many of our smaller States and regions are capable of making. To that end, I propose that, should this resolution receive the support of the Congress, as I am sure it will, the National Science Foundation give consideration to designating a small portion of the total research and development budget as "risk capital" to be placed—to be invested, if you will—in institutions and with researchers whose potential may be considerable but who are, so far, overlooked in the distribution schemes presently in operation. The remainder of that budget would, of course, be directed as it must be to men of already demonstrated competence.

Our States and their educational institutions, I believe, wish to do their share in advancing America's scientific growth. This resolution, by recognizing their capabilities, and action later by the Congress to provide for more equitable geographic distribution of Federal research and development funds, will provide the opportunity.

The language of my resolution is, in itself, very simple—but very important:

> *Resolved*, That the National Science Foundation is requested to formulate and transmit to the Congress at the earliest practicable date its recommendations for such changes in—
>
> (1) The laws under which research and development funds are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by departments or agencies of the Government to institutions of higher learning for scientific or educational purposes; or
>
> (2) The administration of such laws; as may be necessary and desirable to provide for a more equitable distribution of such funds to all qualified institutions of higher learning to avoid the concentration of such activities in any geographical area and to insure a continuing reservoir of scientific and teaching skills and capacities throughout the several States.

BILL TO REVISE THE FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITION POLICY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to revise the Federal land acquisition policy. The present system is archaic, unrealistic, and unfair to thousands of persons whose property is taken each year under the power of eminent domain.

My bill, which would be known as the Fair Compensation Act of 1966, is based on the recommendations of a House public works task force which made an intensive review of Federal land acquisition policies in the 88th Congress. It has gathered dust and been ignored in Great Society circles.

The unfairness of the present policy has been made abundantly clear by the hundreds of requests for help I have received from residents in the Stockton and Kaysinger Reservoir areas, and others, who simply cannot replace their farms and other property with the dollars they are offered by the Corps of Engineers. Federal programs involved would be those that include reservoir acquisition, urban renewal, missile sites, and others involving Federal funds.

The more I have studied the problem the more I am convinced that the major problem is not so much with the interpretation of the law, as it is the law itself. People whose land is under threat of condemnation expect to receive fair market value for their property, but the term "fair market value" presumes a willing seller and a willing buyer. What about the times when the owner of property is not a willing seller, as has occurred in countless circumstances at Federal projects? I have example after example in my files of cases where a farmer who accepted a so-called fair market value offer for his property could not begin to replace his farm with what the Government paid him. He has to sell on terms the Government prescribes, and he has to buy on terms the free market prescribes, often on terms boosted up by land speculators. The average person in a Federal acquisition project is a man caught in the middle. He stands alone against the entire colossus of big government, and his bargaining position is pitifully weak considering the vast machinery of Government manpower and money that sits on the other side of the bargaining table. He may have opposed or not been consulted about the project. His disadvantage is further compounded by the fact that, in constrast to the vast amount of displacement and disruption in present-day programs, the market value standard, limiting compensation to the value of the property taken, was adopted by the courts in a comparatively uncomplicated time in our Nation's history, when land was plentiful, and Government acquisitions skirted cities and bypassed homes and businesses, causing few displacements and relatively little damage.

Nevertheless, the Federal courts have made it plain that they are bound by the established precedents, and that it is the responsibility of the Congress to determine whether other losses suffered by property owners by tenants should be absorbed by the public. The amount of disruption caused by Federal and federally assisted programs is astoundingly large. The accelerated pace of Government activity, supported by broadened concepts of public use make any lessening of current activity in the foreseeable future highly unlikely.

In each of the next 7 years, Federal and federally assisted programs are expected to require the acquisition of real property from 183,000 separate ownerships, and the displacement of approximately 111,000 households, 17,860 businesses, 2,310 farm operations, and some disruption of an additional 1,350 farms.

The market value standard of just compensation under the fifth amendment requires payment for the property taken, but does not provide for other losses or expenses, however severe, that may be incurred by property owners or tenants because of the taking of property.

Typical losses of this kind are:

Cost of moving personal property and the disconnecting, dismantling, reassembly, and reinstalling of structures, machinery, equipment, and so forth.

Transportation and other expenses to move a displaced family to replacement housing;

Transportation and other expenses in search of a replacement farm or other property;

Expenses in obtaining substitute real property, such as costs of appraisal, survey, financing, title examination, and closing costs; and

Expenses incident to the transfer of title to real property required for public use, such as recording fees, transfer taxes, clerk fees, and so forth.

Losses due to present capital gains tax, which requires reinvestment in like property.

Loss of crop income due to unreasonable closing dates.

Furthermore, most displacements affect low or moderate income families or individuals for whom a force move generally is a very difficult experience. The problem is aggravated for the elderly, the large family, and it becomes more so depending on the distance they must move to relocate. Here is a battlefield in the poverty problem that has been completely ignored by the poverty warriors in the White House.

It is time that concern for the effects of displacement by Government action is consistent with the policy of the Nation to assure economic and social opportunity for every citizen. A greater share of the economic costs of displacement should be borne by the public on a uniform basis, since it is the public interest which benefits from the use of the right of eminent domain in the first place.

My bill includes the following changes in policy:

First. Congress would declare that owners and tenants of property acquired for public programs, either Federal or federally assisted, shall be afforded fair and equitable treatment on a basis as nearly uniform as practicable; that owners and tenants shall be fairly compensated for their property and for other losses and necessary expenses incurred because of such programs; and that every reasonable effort shall be made to prevent hardships to persons caused to move from their homes, farms, or places of business, or to lose their employment, or to suffer other economic injury as a direct result of such programs, including planned retirement.

Second. That Congress establish a uniform policy to guide the land acquisition practices of all Federal agencies in order to assure consistent and equitable treatment. New practices would include:

Every reasonable effort to acquire real property by kindly and friendly negotiated purchase. Instead of threats and harrassment, which occur all too often under present law, we will insure bargain and barter.

Real property should be appraised before the initiation of negotiations, and the owner should be given an opportunity to accompany the appraiser during his inspection of the property.

Before the initiation of negotiations for property, the head of the Federal agency concerned should establish a price which he believes to be fair and reasonable consideration therefor, and should make a prompt offer to acquire the property for the full amount so established. The initial offer should not be less than the appraised fair value of the property as approved by the agency head.

The Federal agency should provide the property owner with reasonable information concerning its opinion of the value of his property

If a partial taking would leave the owner with an uneconomic remnant, the head of a Federal agency should take the entire property.

Congress provides a definition of "market value standard," which assures that the compensation required for property shall be the highest price which the property could reasonably be expected to bring if exposed for sale in the open market for a reasonable time, unaffected by the project.

The individual will be reimbursed for expenses incidental to transfer of the title to the United States.

Relocation payments be provided for all displaced persons on a uniform basis in all programs conducted by the Federal Government, or with the assistance of the Federal Government.

Congress provides that an owner of property taken for public use may defer any recognition of the gain on the transfer, if he reinvests the compensation received for the property in first, any real property; second, any property used in trade or business; and third, any property to be held by the taxpayer for investment.

Adoption of such comprehensive legislation no doubt would increase the costs of Federal land acquisition programs, but it will also have the effect of placing more pressure on the Director of the Budget to establish more selective priorities, and to make doubly certain that the public interest justifies the initiation of new programs. This, I think, would be a healthy development at a time when there is an acceleration of Federal land acquisition programs at the expense of private landownership.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE IN MONTANA

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is a dire situation in my State which forces me to this speech. For many years Congress has heard discussion about the boxcar shortage which was growing across the Nation. During all these years Congress has never acted, believing that the independent regulatory Commission which oversees the transportation industries would keep the situation from the crisis point while Congress took its time banging out a thorough piece of legislation dealing with the many factors which contribute to our boxcar shortage.

However, we have all been working under a delusion. A series of crises have occurred throughout my district, as in other districts, the last few days. We have all seen these coming; many of us have been trying to secure action. Adequate response has not been forthcoming from the regulatory agency; and the House is not scheduled to consider an already passed Senate bill which would ultimately relieve the boxcar shortage.

While the ICC and the Congress are doing nothing to bring order to the return of boxcars to the railroad of ownership, firms are going out of business in my district. Farmers cannot get their crops to the market to be sold; grain elevator operators are in danger of losing sales; exporters have ships arriving in port with no certainty of being able to load cargo; wheat sold to foreign countries may not be delivered.

I have received telegrams from ministers, publishers, State legislators, and men from many business firms. The shortage has reached such a critical point that many lumber mills are shutting down. This unemployment reaches to every business in my district because lumber and farming, together with mining which is also affected, are the basic industries in Montana. I have telegrams informing me of a dozen lumber operations which have been closed or curtailed leaving roughly 2,000 men unemployed. This is only in the primary industries. This can be multipled 10 times to measure the effects throughout the district.

This certainly meets the requirements for a disaster;the ICC has powers to deal with such a crisis. Yet the ICC has not taken adequate steps. Yesterday, Chairman Bush met with several interested parties and with many Senators and Congressmen to discuss this. I received the clear impression that the ICC is afraid to use its powers because it will anger several big railroads.

Why then do we have an ICC if not to deal with such a crisis? What good is a regulatory agency which refuses to regulate in times of regional disaster. The ICC can order cars owned by the railroads which serve this area to be delivered back to the owner. Yesterday, clear figures were presented demonstrating that the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific have such a small percentage of their total ownership of cars under their control that they clearly stick out when compared to all the rest of the railroads in the Nation. This situation could be evened out and the products which are clogging warehouses, storage bins, and elevators could be moved. But will the ICC use its power? When will it act? What greater degree of crisis is needed?

Yesterday and again today Mr. Charles Anderson and Mr. Mel Werner, of Great Falls; Mr. Ed Keil of Ledger, Mr. Richard Pennell, of Portland; Mr. John Locke, from Seattle; and Mr. J. Eldon of Opheim, representing all aspects of grain production, receiving storage, marketing, transportation, milling and exporting, informed members of the ICC of their plight. These gentlemen conducted an impressive meeting. Well prepared presentations demonstrated that the Great Northern Railroad has only 52 percent of its car ownership. The Northern Pacific has 54 percent. Only one other railroad in the Nation has under 80 percent while many railroads have over 100 percent. Certainly the ICC could legitimately order a more equitable distribution of boxcars. I am told that if the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific were brought up to 80 percent, the pileup would be eliminated.

The ICC must act forcefully and rapidly to eliminate this growing danger. The House also must act quickly to pass the boxcar shortage bill. People are out of work and businesses are shutting down. This is no time to continue dealing with this disaster in a picnic atmosphere.

COMPENSATION TO SURVIVORS OF OFFICERS KILLED APPREHENDING PERSONS COMMITTING FEDERAL CRIMES

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have just recently introduced H.R. 13219 which provides compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons having committed Federal crimes.

This bill is based on the fact that from the years 1960 to 1964, 225 policemen were killed in the line of duty, and there have been an additional 46 known killings thus far in 1965. FBI statistics show that 12 deaths were for the reasons stated in this bill. Of these, four officers were killed while attempting to stop fleeing bank robbers; two attempting to apprehend one in an unlawful flight to avoid prosecution; two responding to riot calls in Los Angeles; Officer Tippit in connection with the Kennedy assassination; one transporting an absent without leave prisoner, and two while searching for bootleg whisky.

The main purpose of this bill is to provide an income for the destitute families of the deceased officers for 8 years and to help educate their children. It is proposed that such funds will be made available only to families of officers who are killed while attempting to apprehend a Federal violator. At present there is no appropriation of Federal funds set aside for the use of any municipality for this purpose.

The wages of local law enforcement officers are, in most cases, lower than factory or industrial workers. It is a known fact that it is a very difficult task to recruit policemen in the cities, towns, and boroughs of every State. It has come to my attention that the District of Columbia is now paying a $50 bonus to any policeman who obtains a new recruit.

President Johnson has become alerted to the increasing problems of local law enforcement officers as evidenced by his recent bill seeking education for law enforcement officers.

The increased crime rate is of growing concern to all law-abiding citizens. However, it is difficult to convince good men that they should seek a career as a local law enforcement officer in view of the rise in crimes and little respect shown to the officers.

In view of recent editorials and TV programs depicting the policemen as almost fighting a losing battle, this seems like a propitious time to do something to elevate the status of the local enforcement officers, and this may also be an inducement to some jobseekers as it will at least show that their efforts would not be in vain. It is also believed the passage of this bill will bring about closer ties and more cooperation between local and Federal authorities.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, on roll 38, I was unavoidably away from the House Chamber. I ask that the Record show that had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative.

MISSISSIPPI TRADE MISSION TO WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last summer a group of 18 businessmen, industrialists, and producers from my State participated in the first official Mississippi trade mission to Western Europe. The purpose of the widely hailed trade mission, which was sponsored by the Mississippi Marketing Council, was to determine the potentialities which exist for exporting more of the State's products.

A comprehensive report just released by the Mississippi Marketing Council on the results of the mission indicates clearly that it was an unqualified success. The participating industrialists and businessmen report having already received orders for more than $3,500,000 worth of Mississippi-made goods. But, of even greater significance is the potential which was cultivated for future trade with European countries. A spokesman for one participating firm, for instance, stated that his company expected to sell at least $10 million worth of Mississippi goods in the areas visited within the next 2 or 3 years.

The firsthand knowledge gained by the mission members on subjects of variable tariffs, restrictions, governmental policies, and trading practices is second in importance only to the personal selling contacts that were established. Without exception, the participating businessmen indicated a much greater ability to both promote their products and compete successfully in these markets as a result of the trip.

The Mississippi Marketing Council, through this imaginative project, has done a magnificent job in stimulating interest in the exciting possibilities available to Mississippi producers in the overseas markets. The positive results of the trade mission establish beyond a doubt that Mississippi's forward-thinking industrialists and agricultural producers can compete successfully, not only in the domestic market, but abroad as well.

CHANGES IN RESPECT TO SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for 30 minutes today, which is to be followed by a special order of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland]. I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from Massachusetts, and he is agreeable to my present request.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland], be allowed to precede me on the special order, and that my time be extended from 30 minutes to 45 minutes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DAVID RUSS, OF KINGSPORT, TENN., WINS 1966 VFW'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its auxiliary chose as their 1966 Voice of Democracy national winner, David Russ, of my hometown, Kingsport, Tenn.

I am deeply proud of the honor which has been bestowed upon David, on my hometown, on the First District of Tennessee, which I represent in the Congress of the United States, and on the State of Tennessee.

A senior at Dobyns-Bennett High School, David is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Erwin Russ of 4634 Mitchell Road, Kingsport.

At the VFW's annual dinner, honoring the Members of the Congress who have served in the Armed Forces, David received a $5,000 scholarship to the college of his choice from National Commander Andy Borg. In behalf of the VFW, Secretary of State Dean Rusk presented David with a gold record of his speech. Also honored at that time was the distinguished Senate minority leader, the Honorable Everett Dirksen, who received the VFW Congressional Award for outstanding service to the Nation. Senator Dirksen lauded David's award-winning remarks as "a beautiful speech."

Others attending the dinner included the Vice President, Members of Congress, and the winners of the various State Voice of Democracy contests.

Special tribute goes to the VFW's Charles DeWitt Byrd Post No. 3382, of which I am a member, and the women's auxiliary in Kingsport, for sponsoring David. Post No. 3382 is one of the largest VFW posts in the entire country. We are all very proud of their activities.

The title of the VFW's 19th annual Voice of Democracy competition was "Democracy—What It Means to Me." David's complete speech appears in the February 24, 1966, daily Congressional Record on page A956; however, I would like to note again here the words in which David summed up his definition of democracy:

> I believe that democracy is more than a form of national government. It pervades all of life for those who live within its framework.
>
> I believe that this democratic form of government places more demands upon the individual than any other form of government because in granting freedoms it exacts compensating responsibilities—or, as John D. Rockefeller, Jr., put it, "Every right implies a responsibility; every opportunity, an obligation; every possession, a duty."
>
> I believe that I cannot separate myself from the processes of democracy and blame others for its imperfections. I believe that I must participate actively in our democratic government, and that I must prepare myself now for that participation.

David has been active in oratorical contests since he was in the seventh grade, and he acknowledged that his speech teacher, Mrs. Nancy Pridemore, and his mother deserve a great deal of the credit for his success. Mrs. Pridemore must be an outstanding teacher, for David is the third State winner to study under her.

David pointed out that his work as a student announcer for radio station WKPT also helped him.

I think his comments on what he had learned from his participation in the Voice of Democracy and other speech contests on citizenship and patriotism are of particular interest. He said:

> I'm convinced that the basic idea is individual responsibility, individual integrity, whether it's citizenship, patriotism, democracy or what.

I had the privilege of visiting with David while he was here in Washington, and we can all be extremely proud of him. He is an intelligent, vitally interested, and very personable young man, who, with great poise and humility, accepted the praises and honors heaped upon him for this commendable achievement.

David has expressed his gratitude to the VFW for giving him such a wonderful opportunity, and I feel that we, too, owe the members of this dedicated organization an expression of our appreciation for providing this outlet for our young men and women to ponder and to put into their own words what democracy means to them.

Over 350,000 students participated in the local contests, which led to the State and National competitions. These students will benefit from this experience in the years ahead, and, so too, will our Nation profit from their endeavors.

David himself commented, after having been told of his victory:

> We are all winners because of the experience and personal friendships we have gained.

I think one of the finest tributes paid to David was by his fellow students at Dobyns-Bennett. When the school was notified of his feat, over 350 students sent him a congratulatory telegram. The recognition and esteem of his peer group must truly be a deep satisfaction to him.

For the future, David plans on attending Florida Presbyterian College at St. Petersburg, and he hopes to pursue a career in either foreign service or radio broadcasting. To either field, he will bring those qualities which will make him a tremendous asset and an outstanding member.

I know David will continue to exemplify the virtues of which he speaks, and I wish him every success in his college work and thereafter.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 118th anniversary of the 1848 Hungarian revolution. This year is also the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian freedom fighters revolution of 1956.

The revolution of 1848 in Europe swept over the entire Continent like a forest fire. It was one of the most eloquent manifestations of man's relentless struggle for freedom and liberty. As the movement swept from one end of Europe to the other, all peoples were stirred and roused by the revolutionary spirit. The Hungarians were no exception; their leaders were so inspired and staged a revolt against the Austrian authorities in that eventful year.

At the time the Hungarian people were subjects of the Austrian emperors, and in the 1840's the oppressive regime under the archreactionary Metternich was holding them in check. Heretofore the Government in Vienna had successfully crushed all uprisings and subdued all revolutionary movements among Austria's unruly and restless subjects. But the year 1848 ushered in a new era for the Hungarian people. Early in that year, as the strong revolutionary wave reached Vienna, and as liberal elements there raised their cry against the Government, the authorities felt that their status was in jeopardy. Even Chancellor Metternich was seriously apprehensive of the approaching crisis. In March when the Hungarians became aware of the confusion in Vienna, their leaders held a meeting in Budapest, drew up a list of complaints against the Government in Vienna and demanded that they be given freedom. When the Austrian Government received the complaints of the Hungarian leaders, it acted in a most conciliatory spirit, found the Hungarian demands just and granted almost full freedom to the Hungarian people. This was done on March 14, in 1848, and since then that historic day has become a Hungarian national holiday.

I am proud to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in a commemorative tribute to Hungarian independence. The Hungarian people have always shown a love of freedom and independence, and they have been in the forefront in their fight for human liberty. Today we find the Hungarian people subjected to Communist totalitarianism, and suffering oppressive tyranny. Let us all hope that soon they will cast off their oppressive regime and regain their freedom.

CARPATHO-RUTHENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, among the many unhappy and tragic events that occurred immediately prior to World War II was the cruel and shameful treatment of the independence aspirations of the Ruthenians of the Czechoslovak Republic. The Ruthenians were a distinct national group, and preferred an independent state of their own or perhaps affiliation with people of their own cultural background rather than be subordinated to the original 1918 Czecho-Slovak Republic.

During the autumn of 1938 Ruthenia gained its autonomy within the Czechoslovak Republic. A constitutional law of November 22, 1938 provided for a three-member Cabinet and for a regional Parliament, elections for which were held on February 12, 1939. On January 1 the Cabinet adopted a decree changing the name of the territory to Carpatho-Ukraine.

Independence for Ruthenia lasted for such a brief period that the people were barely able to undertake any degree of reform or make any positive change in their lives. But it is certain that even though today they are subordinated by Communist power and intimidation, the taste of independence which they enjoyed for that fleeting moment in 1939 is still fresh and they await the opportunity to partake of that independence once again.

HE IS NOT DEAD

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently in a broadcast by NBC, there was depicted a scene on the campus of Emory College in Georgia, where the students were taught that God is dead and they were pictured in an auditorium chanting in the form and procedure of the Communists "God is dead, God is dead."

On Sunday, March 6, Rev. W. Paul Ludwig, pastor of the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church, delivered a sermon entitled "He Is Not Dead." It is a privilege for me, under leave to insert my own remarks and extraneous matter, to insert Dr. Ludwig's sermon.

HE IS NOT DEAD

We are in the season of lent—the familiar prelude to the day of resurrection. The music drifts in softly at this stage but we know it to be the quiet suggestion of Easter's blaring trumpets. Nevertheless, there are discords in the sounds we hear these days and the Christian world is wondering what its mood should be. Is this a time for gladness or for gloom?

As we look toward the garden, is it irrelevant of us to prolong the funeral music of the church and to come right up to the triumphant proclamation of the empty tomb with a dreary dirge of defeat and death?

Yet that is exactly what much of the church will have to do this Eastertide. For there are many in the Christian company who have nothing to celebrate but the death of God this Easter. In the midst of a season that shouts joyously of life, they see only the deadly, frozen hopes of men. For them, it is perpetual wintertide. The spring forgets to come.

But those who have been preparing for the burial of God have overlooked one significant aspect of His nature. In the midst of world revolution, the conflict of nations, the gluttony of the human animal, the shrieking sounds of brutality, and the curses of injustice and inequality—why does God keep so silent?

We mortals are forever talking, laughing, crying, meeting, building, planning, promoting, scheming, and doing. Why isn't God like that? Why isn't He an organization man? I have been just as deeply concerned with the psychological and spiritual causes of the contemporary rebellion against God, as with its intellectual formulations. I am convinced that many who are erasing Him today are basically and sometimes unconsciously motivated by the fact that God does not look nor act like us. The kind of God who looks and acts like us is dead. Let us make no mistake about that.

And the most serious aspect of it all is that so often He is hiding when we think He should be out front. Even the most religious of men—those for whom God is vividly real and personal—have found Him often fleeting and elusive.

"Lo, He goeth by me and I see Him not, He passeth on also, but I perceive Him not," cries Job. "Oh, that I knew where I might find Him."

Isaiah, as great a religious genius who ever lived, shouts, "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." "O that Thou wouldst rend the heavens and come down, that mountains might fall down at Thy presence, that the nations may tremble at Thy presence."

And what about the psalmist who has inspired so many with a feeling for the intimacy of God? Even he can sob: "As the heart panteth after the waterbrooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God, while they continually say unto me, where is Thy God?"

But when did you ever hear Isaiah, or the psalmist—or even Job—conclude that a God who had gone into hiding was therefore nonexistent. When dead theologians have been forgotten, God will still have the whole world in His hands.

Faith has many dimensions, many facets to be appreciated and treasured, like looking at the brilliant flashing of a diamond. Before we abandon it, we might do well to better understand what it is.

Faith is not sweet, blind, docile acceptance of God's mercy without a struggle. Faith is dialog with God. It is a process of getting our stubborn, selfish, sometimes stupid, wills into a kind of unity with His will. But in this confrontation with the eternal—this sometimes painful and discouraging struggle—we may turn our pleading, tearful eyes to Him and find only silence.

But we have to keep trying and asking questions—even at the risk of being disillusioned. We have to keep crossing the frontier of the noisy events that surge around us until we enter the stillness of God. He will not always be in dialog. He tires of argument. The most profound thing God, and the first dimension of His greatness to be grasped, is His silence.

One of the most sensitively discerning Christian women of our congregation asked me after a recent Sunday's worship: "Why must we spoil a great hymn by singing the phrase which extols the patience of unanswered prayer?" She is right: it is not unanswered prayer that demands our patience. It is the silence of God.

We assume so much about Him as if He owes us word for word on a contract basis. His coming into the world—and the cross and the resurrection and the promise of eternity—do these guarantee for me an effortless entrance into His peace? Since He has already done so much for me, shall I take for granted that I will also sit at His right hand?

Voltaire once cynically said of God's forgiveness "C'est son metier"—it is His job.

That tremendous German preacher, Helmut Thielicke, said: "It is in no sense the duty or obligation of Jesus to bear my sin and to take me through the black gate of death. If He does this, it cannot be taken for granted. And I make bold to say that even the most orthodox churchman will not enter the kingdom of heaven unless he is continually surprised that mercy has been shown him. Perhaps God has first to be jerked away from us complacent Christians of the Western world, like a rug from under our feet, if we are to be reawakened to this surprise."

Those of us who are parents are faced with the potential disaster of ignoring our children's questions. We can inflict great damage on an inquisitive youngster by being mysterious—by evading truthful confrontation. We may find it necessary to give only a partial answer within the limits of the child's ability to understand. But we dare not remain aloof.

The evangelist, John, in his 13th chapter, has Jesus saying to His disciples: "Thou shalt understand hereafter." "There are some things I can tell you now—other things you are not ready for."

So it is. When God is silent, let us be honest enough to confess that our capacity is limited, not God's. He is not dead.

I recently heard one of the ablest leaders of our congregation say that 95 percent of all the scientists who ever lived are alive today. This is an age of such vast probing that we are amassing truth at an unprecedented rate. The accumulation is mountainous and man kneels somewhat worshipfully before this impressive monument to his genius. We are so overwhelmed by what we know that we may give little thought to the infinitely greater degree of our ignorance. We have achieved only the merest iota of what there is to conquer and possess.

This is one of the hazards of our rushing technological process. It is not easy to remain humble; it is not easy to escape the temptation of assuming that we have at last displaced God in the order of things. The ablest scientist and the finest theologian will confess that there is much that he does not know—many questions to which God has remained silent. At this stage we are still creeping infants in the vast playpen of the universe.

Man's physical senses are not always to be trusted. A recognition of this fact should help further to save us from arrogance. Again and again things prove to be something other than what they appear. God uses our errors and limitations to praise Him and to bless us.

Dr. Leslie Weatherhead describes what happened one day when he went on a birdwatching expedition with a friend in Yorkshire, England:

"We watched some jackdaws," he recalls, "apparently building a nest in the crevices of an old ruined tower. They gathered their material and they pushed it into the crevices. Apparently they could not realize that it was dropping right through onto the floor inside the hollow tower. If they can feel frustrated, they must have felt terribly frustrated about that.

"Believe me or not, when we walked into the tower, there was a heap of nesting material almost up to my shoulders. But when we went to a farmhouse adjoining the ruins, an old lady, crippled with arthritis, came out and talked to us, and she said this, 'You know the jackdaws are doing me a wonderful service. They gather my kindling for me. I use what they push through the holes of that ruined tower to start my fire.'

And Weatherhead added, "I don't often write poetry, but that incident prompted me to compose these lines:

> " 'In my frustration make me sure
> That Thou, my God, art He
> Who buildest something to endure
> From what seems loss to me.' "

Now we know in part. But then—later on—the truth which the antennae of our eyes and ears and brain had failed to detect becomes clear. The God of truth breaks His silence and we enter into the mysteries of this life.

Martin Luther put it unforgettably: "God has led me indeed, but like an old blind horse." It does seem that way, doesn't it? So much of the time, we seem to be groping through the darkness. God appears to leave us to our own judgments. Things are not what they seem to be, and truth does not come easily. We stumble and fall, pick ourselves up again and inch our way forward.

Usually it is only a dim spot of light in the distant shadows that keeps our sense of direction, but God is in the shadow, silent and waiting, not erasing the struggle by which we grow nor granting us truth prematurely before we are strong enough to use it. I shudder to think what might have been if the atom bomb had been in man's hands 300 years ago—or even a century.

The unobtrusiveness of God, His hiddenness, His quiet waiting, encourage me to believe in His fatherly wisdom and His skillful love. Say not that He is dead; say only that he is permitting us to come alive.

Job said it well, when after his bitter lament about the hiddenness of God, he said, "But He knoweth the way that I take: when He hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold."

If we are to trust Him as children trust a father, it seems unlikely that we would do so unless God left room for trust by withholding some of the larger things for which we long.

If we are to love Him for Himself and not for what He gives us, He simply has to leave some of His best gifts unsigned, so that we will have to discover where they came from.

If God were too easily familiar to us, He would cease to have the stature of God. "A known God is no God," someone has said.

On the other hand, if He overwhelmed us with His irresistible Godliness, we would be crushed and have no room for personal growth.

"Thou art a God that hidest Thyself," crises Isaiah. And gratefully we should sing "Allelulia"—were it not so, God would be dead indeed. But when He flees out of my hands until I am fit to hold Him, I cannot ever destroy Him—and He is alive, everlastingly alive.

CORN PRICES HURT BY SOARING FEDERAL SALES

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture yesterday cited a statement by Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, as positive proof that the administration's blatant manipulation of the grain market by dumping Government-owned grain is for the purpose of keeping farm prices at a low level.

The task force quoted Chairman Ackley as stating in a TV interview last Thursday:

> For example, I mentioned the fact that increase in supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn, and we're trying to hold down the price of corn. The Government has acquired large stocks of corn in its past price support operation, now we're releasing them into the market.

This must be extremely embarrassing for the administration, because Chairman Ackley has candidly confessed what Secretary of Agriculture Freeman steadfastly refuses to admit in public. The Secretary maintains that recent heavy sales of CCC-owned corn have not been made to depress grain and livestock prices, and that anyone who says otherwise is making political noise.

A recent Wall Street Journal article carried the headline "Corn Prices Hurt by Soaring Federal Sales," and was pointed out by the task force as solid documentation of Secretary Freeman's determination to control the marketplace by using CCC stocks as a club to beat down farm prices. The article noted that:

> Surplus corn sales have been stepped up by the Government, a development which grain traders believe is part of the administration's effort to curb inflation.* * * The

> large Government sales, grain dealers agree, have influenced prices of corn. Prices have dropped since mid-February.* * * Keeping a lid on corn's price will help encourage greater livestock production, grain men note, which in turn would cause a downturn in meat prices.

It is clear from all this that the Department of Agriculture is deliberately setting the stage for a disastrous break in livestock prices, such as the experience 2 years ago which was triggered by heavy CCC dumping in 1961–62. Federal price-busting on this scale may wipe out the diligent efforts of individual farm groups working for higher farm prices through organization.

As the Agriculture Task Force pointed out last June, manipulation of farm commodity markets to maintain low prices and Federal control of American agriculture has become a way of life for the Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary of Agriculture is now asking for more authority in connection with the duties of the Commodity Exchange Commission—duties which, among others, are to prevent undue manipulation of markets.

The proposed bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, which is endorsed by the Secretary, defines "manipulate" as meaning the "exacting, causing, or maintaining of an abnormal or artificial price by any action or course of action which raises, depresses, fixes, pegs, or stabilizes the price at or to a level different than that which would otherwise prevail."

It is a unique request for the Secretary to have further authority over "manipulation" of markets when you consider the statement by the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers that actually admits the Government is trying to hold down the price of corn through the sale of CCC stocks. If that is not a violation of the "manipulation" rules, then I do not understand English.

MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY SIGNED 50 YEARS AGO

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call your attention today to the 50th anniversary of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act between the United States and Great Britian.

Prior to enactment of the Migratory Bird Treaty several valuable species of migratory birds had become extinct and many other species were so reduced in numbers that their extirpation seemed certain to occur within a few years.

On August 16, 1916, Sir Cecil Arthur Spring and Secretary of State Robert Lansing, meeting in Washington, D.C., signed the historic document which has been so important in our conservation history. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act takes note of the fact that many species of birds travel between Canada and the United States several times each year during the course of their migratory flights. It recognizes that many of these species are of great value as a source of food or in destroying insects which are injurious to forests, forage plants, and agricultural crops but that they are nevertheless in danger of extermination through lack of adequate protection in their nesting and wintering areas and while traveling along their migratory routes. The treaty therefore authori-izes the Secretary of the Interior to regulate the taking of migratory and insectivorous birds and to establish such regulations as he deems necessary for their protection. As a result, the treaty has made possible the recovery of populations of many species and lessened or retarded the decimation of others which are endangered.

In recognition of the anniversary of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act the Post Office is today issuing a commemorative 5-cent postage stamp which shows the white outline of two birds, one flying north and the other south at the Canadian border. Canada is shown in red and the United States in blue.

At a time when so many Americans are striving to eliminate the pollution of our lands and waters, protect and preserve our natural resources and restore the beauty of our countryside, it is indeed appropriate that we pause to commemorate this treaty and honor those whose foresight in enacting it has led the way for our country's conservation effort.

THE NEW STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF MEDICINE AT HERSHEY, PA.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kunkel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and particularly the central region of my State, will be enormously benefited by the new State University College of Medicine in combination with the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center at Hershey, Pa.

Anything that would hinder the development of these fine institutions would be a grave and serious blow. That possibility in fact, is raised by legislation now pending before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

In connection with this, I submit for the Record a copy of a letter written by Dr. George T. Harrell, dean of the new college of medicine and director of the medical center, to Senator A. Willis Robertson of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. One immaterial paragraph of the letter has been omitted in the interest of saving time and space.

The Pennsylvania State University, the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center,
Hershey, Pa., February 23, 1966.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
U.S. Senator,
Room 5241, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Robertson: I regret that I have not had the pleasure of meeting you personally. I am the dean of the new Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine and director of the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center in Hershey, Pa. I am taking the liberty of writing you because of my great concern over bills pending before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

I am sure you know of the establishment of the new Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine and the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center in Hershey, Pa., made possible by a generous allotment from the M. S. Hershey Foundation. Detailed planning for this vitally needed medical center has been underway for over a year. The foundation initially has set aside $50 million for the construction of the physical plant and an endowment to begin the operation of the center. The university received in January of this year a grant of $10.2 million from the U.S. Public Health Service for construction of the medical sciences building to implement the program as rapidly as possible. Ground breaking for the first stage of the medical school construction is scheduled for February 26. Later construction will include a 350-bed teaching hospital and the total expenditure is expected to exceed $38 million by the end of 1969. You can see that the foundation and the university have embarked on a major long-range project to train critically needed, additional physicians.

Mr. Arthur R. Whiteman, president of the Hershey Trust Co., which is the trustee for the M. S. Hershey Foundation, has told me of the pending bills S. 2353, S. 2418, and H.R. 7371. I have reviewed a legal interpretation of the effects of these bills on the college of medicine and the medical center through their impact on the M. S. Hershey Foundation, the Milton Hershey School, and the other Hershey interests. I can hardly overstate my great concern that the passage of any of these bills may destroy the unique relationship existing between the university and the foundation. The very unusual situation, which arises from Mr. Hershey's original trust agreements, has served as the basis for our entire long-range planning. The introduction of this legislation has come at a most critical time for the medical school, since we are just beginning our active recruitment of faculty. The personal interest and, indeed, emotional involvement of the officials of all the Hershey interests in the medical center has been of tremendous help to the university in its planning. The university and the foundation have held several lengthy legal conferences with counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be sure that the basis for establishment of the educational program meets Government requirements and is acceptable for the granting of construction and operating funds. In addition to the grant which already has been made, another is now pending and we expect action in June of this year. Another larger grant for help in construction of the teaching hospital will be submitted in June for action at the November 1966 National Advisory Council meeting. Any change in the legal basis might well delay our time schedule or prevent completion of this vitally needed facility to implement national policy.

* * * * *

I should be most happy to elaborate on any portion of these comments if you would like. We will be most grateful to you for your careful review of this legislation to insure that no damage is done to this nationally important project in medical education.

Respectfully,
GEORGE T. HARRELL, M.D.,
Dean.

HORTON BILL CREATES OFFICE OF ALCOHOLISM IN HEW, INCLUDES BOARD PROVISION FOR AID TO STATE, PRIVATE REHABILITATION AND RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to establish an Office of Alcoholism under the Surgeon General, thus enabling the Federal Government to undertake a broad attack on this problem. In recent years, the dimensions of the alcoholism problem have been brought to our attention through publications, newspaper coverage, conferences, and related efforts by public and private organizations. We have been made aware of the damaging consequences of alcoholism to the individual, the family, the community, and the country. The time has come to join the many forces which have been active in the field, in a nationwide effort to find a solution to this problem.

The pressing need for this legislation is easily demonstrable by an examination of the facts. Alcoholism is considered a serious public health problem, surpassed in magnitude only by mental illness, cancer, and heart disease. It is estimated that some 5 million persons are heavy drinkers who experience difficulties connected with their drinking to such a degree that they may be termed alcoholics. But whereas the three more prevalent diseases have received congressional attention in recent years through the passage of legislation, Federal programs to aid the alcoholic are minimal.

I do not mean to belittle the efforts of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the Public Health Service. Through the activities of the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation agencies, more than 1,000 alcoholics per year are provided with medical and vocational rehabilitation services and enabled to become productive members of their communities. The Public Health Service conducts and supports research, demonstration, and training projects in the area of alcoholism, with a total expenditure of more than $5 million. Under the legislation I propose today, these successful programs will continue and expand, but others will be added in order to provide the comprehensive action needed if we are to see a reduction in the number of alcoholics.

While the rehabilitation of over 1,000 alcoholics per year through Federal programs is an admirable accomplishment, it must be borne in mind that over 250,000 new alcoholic cases are added each year. At this rate of alcoholic addiction, our efforts are clearly insufficient to stem the tide, let alone decrease the number of persons afflicted and affected by this tragic disease.

Heavy and continuous use of alcohol causes damage to the brain and liver, resulting eventually in insanity or failure of the liver to function. The death rate among alcoholics is two and a half times that of the general population. The number of alcoholics in our State mental hospitals is increasing. The National Institute of Mental Health recently reported that 1 in 7 newly admitted patients is an alcoholic; this represents an 18-percent rise in 10 years.

The consequences to the members of the alcoholic's family are equally disastrous. Those who have studied the problem tell us that 97 percent of the alcoholics are employed men and women, businessmen, professional persons, white collar workers, and housewives. Only 3 percent fit the stereotype we ordinarily envision of the drunken bum lying in the gutter. Potential alcoholics come from all walks of life, most of them considered to be leading normal, stable lives. Twenty million Americans live in families affected by this disease. To them it means loss of income, family disintegration, broken homes, disturbed children—a wide range of emotional, social, and economic problems. Children living in this situation will probably receive irreparable emotional damage. The likelihood of their becoming alcoholics themselves is great. One study found that more than half of the alcoholics interviewed came from homes where at least one of the parents had been an alcoholic. Despite continuing and admirable efforts on the part of many voluntary organizations, the number of alcoholics continues to rise at an alarming rate.

The effects of this problem are also felt by the community, in terms of crime and traffic accidents. Between a quarter and a half of those persons imprisoned for felonies have histories of excessive drinking. The dire consequences of drinking drivers are well known to all. A recent survey revealed that half of a group of fatal auto accidents studied were caused by persons under the influence of alcohol.

These are the costs to society in terms of human lives. The economic costs are also shocking in their magnitude. The National Council on Alcoholism estimates that the loss to business and industry from absenteeism, accidents, and inefficiency on the part of employees who are heavy drinkers amounts to $2 billion annually. Of the 5 million alcoholics, about 2 million are employed, thus creating a problem for the companies where they work. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has placed the cost of care and treatment of alcoholics each year at one and a quarter billion dollars. A large part of this figure represents welfare payments made to the families of the alcoholics who can no longer take responsibility for their support.

Thus we see that we pay a high price indeed as a result of alcoholism. In contrast, the amount of money spent by Federal and State governments in seeking and effecting a solution has been inadequate. The total Federal expenditure for fiscal year 1966 is $6,780,000. State alcoholism programs received approximately $10 million from their legislatures. This means that we are spending between $3 and $4 per alcoholic on care, treatment, rehabilitation, as well as research into alcoholism's causes and cures. We can hardly expect dramatic results from such a small effort. Of course, we must recognize that many voluntary, private, religious groups are also active. They have been responsible for many successful recoveries, and also for efforts at prevention through education. But their necessarily limited resources have not allowed them to expand sufficiently to reach all who need help.

The bill I am proposing would set up an Office of Alcoholism under the Surgeon General within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This would seem to be a logical placement for such an office, which would be in a position to coordinate current activities in the Department as well as undertake new programs. In order to utilize experts throughout the country, this legislation authorizes the appointment of a nine-member Advisory Council.

Such a Council would include experts in the various aspects of alcoholism and would insure that representatives of the many excellent voluntary organizations would contribute their knowledge and experience.

The Office of Alcoholism would be authorized to undertake activities in the areas of research, education, and treatment. This would be done through grants to State and local public or private nonprofit organizations and agencies. Existing facilities and programs would be fully utilized, and new ones encouraged where needed.

Prime emphasis in this bill is put on facilities for alcoholics, which at the present time are woefully inadequate. In each State, the mental hospitals admit alcoholics, but often when they are in the advanced stages of the illness, when they have suffered irreparable brain or liver damage. Some States have been farsighted enough to plan and execute comprehensive programs including special wards in hospitals, clinics, halfway houses, rehabilitation units, and so forth. But too often State and local authorities have relied on the efforts of private groups who have been able to handle only a limited number of persons. Our prisons have been overburdened with the care of those arrested for drunkenness. There are one and a half million such arrests each year. Under the present system, we cannot expect our penal system to be able to provide the alcoholics with the complex and long-term services necessary to bring about their recovery.

In this area as in the case of many social problems, activities on the State or local level are often the most practical and effective. The bill I am introducing authorizes two types of grant programs to the States. The first program would be for the purpose of encouraging the

States to establish or expand their State alcoholism program.

Currently eight States have not yet established an alcoholism program. In 10 States, less than $50,000 is spent annually on the program. The grants could not be used as a substitute for State funds, but would be required to supplement them.

Major activities in the States would receive Federal assistance through the second type of grant program. The agency in charge of the State program would be able to apply for Federal money to support their comprehensive alcoholism program. In order to insure that this is used to supplement State funds, the legislation contains a provision that the State funds appropriated to the alcoholism program must be greater than the amount of money used for this purpose in the previous year.

I urge the Congress to give serious consideration to this legislation. It is designed to provide technical and financial assistance which will stimulate State and local governments, with the help of voluntary groups, to organize and operate effective and workable programs in an all-out effort to solve the problem of alcoholism.

WHY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST CHILDREN?

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, an interesting news item appeared in the Chicago Tribune of March 10 concerning the deletion of prayer "at all future commencements and at all other public school meetings" by the Niles Township, Ill., High School Board. When the school board handed down its ruling last December 13, Mrs. Victor Rasmussen, of Skokie, wrote to the clergymen of the various faiths in the area requesting their opinions of the ruling. The results were indeed provocative.

One clergyman stated:

> Public prayers are offered in the Halls of Congress at each opening session, in military camps and on board ship for our servicemen, at the Presidential inauguration ceremony, at national political conventions, at special civic and public functions, and even in our penal institutions. Why, then, in the name of commonsense, should an inspirational prayer of invocation be banned from public school commencement exercises?

As pointed out in the above statement, the practice of recognizing the Divine Creator and beseeching His assistance has long been a custom which fortunately influences every walk of American life. Why should children, then, be denied recourse to this edifying practice? If the U.S. Congress can invite Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish clergymen to open their sessions with a prayer, how can we justify discriminating against children by forbidding them access to the same source of strength and edification?

Although some people think this issue has been buried for all time, such an assumption is far from the truth. Judging from the unprecedented volume of mail received on Capitol Hill in favor of voluntary prayers in the schools, the American public is very much interested in this issue. I am sure the American people realize that there is something tragically wrong when their children cannot thank God in school for their daily bread, or if a young student, along with his classmates, is forbidden to ask divine safekeeping for American soldiers now fighting and dying in Vietnam.

It is indeed true that many and varied recommendations have been offered in Congress to clarify and remedy the confusion regarding the prayer issue. Still it cannot be denied that the citizens of this Nation have patiently granted ample time to resolve this problem as satisfactorily as possible.

Again in this, the 89th Congress, I have joined many other Members of the House in introducing measures which seek to reach a fair and satisfactory solution. Although some of these proposals differ in content, those of us who have legislation submitted for consideration realize that they are but vehicles to prompt further discussion and recommendations on this issue. As with legislation in the past, the finished product might differ appreciably with the initial proposal. I can think of no better guideline for a healthy and objective exchange of divergent views on this subject than the following statement by the Reverend Mr. Kool, one of the clergymen interviewed:

> Man should pray as he sees fit. No prayer is offensive. Protestants could be offended when rabbis leave out certain words, but they are not. As a person prays, this is a prayer to God which deserves respect and tolerance.

I ask that the news item, "Prayer Ban Stirs Reaction by Clergy," be inserted in the Record at this point:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune,
Mar. 10, 1966]

Prayer Ban Stirs Reaction by Clergy

(By Janet Voakes)

The 11 Protestant, 7 Jewish, and 6 Catholic clergymen in Niles Township have spoken out on the prayer ban issue.

Niles Township includes Skokie, Morton Grove, Niles Lincolnwood, and parts of Glenview and Golf Mill.

Mrs. Victor Rasmussen, 3839 Dobson Street, Skokie, has asked each clergyman his opinion of the December 13 Niles Township High School Board ruling that "at all future commencements and at all other public school meetings prayer shall be deleted."

TRIES TO GET REPEAL

Mrs. Rasmussen has been active in trying to get the ruling repealed.

A 16-year resident of Skokie, Mrs. Rasmussen has served on the elementary, high school, and district levels of the PTA. She has been publicity chairman and recording secretary for the Skokie Valley council and is a member of the Skokie League of Women Voters.

While the majority of the clergymen want to be able to pray at graduation commencements, they expressed varying reasons and conditions for supporting a repeal of the school prayer ban.

Five church leaders feel that prayers at public functions are traditional and represent the American way of life.

They are the Reverend Thomas Tivy, St. Lambert's Catholic Church, 8116 Karlov Avenue, Skokie; the Reverend C. Orville Kool, Crawford Avenue Baptist Church, 9800 Crawford Avenue, Skokie; the Reverend J. Flanagan, St. John Brebeuf Catholic Church, 8307 Harlem Avenue, Niles; the Reverend Theodore Paluch, Our Lady of Ransom Catholic Church, 8615 Normal Avenue, Niles; and the Reverend Raymond J. Wilhelmi, St. Martha Catholic Church, 8523 Georgiana Avenue, Morton Grove.

"WHY BAN PRAYER?"

Father Wilhelmi said: "Public prayers are offered in the Halls of Congress at each opening session, in military camps, and on board ship for our servicemen, at the Presidential inaugural ceremony, at national political conventions, at special civic and public functions, and even in our penal institutions. Why then, in the name of commonsense, should an inspirational prayer of invocation be banned from public school commencement exercises?"

According to two religious leaders, the school board ruling does not represent the feelings of the majority.

The Reverend Charles A. Williams, Westminster Presbyterian Church, 4950 Pratt Avenue, Skokie, said: "Most polls and surveys show that 95 percent of the people profess a belief in God. Therefore, it is my belief that the prayer ban does not represent the vast majority of the community."

The Reverend Charles W. Rose, St. Luke's United Church of Christ, 9233 Shermer Road, Morton Grove, said: "I feel the board has made a miserable mistake and should have felt out the community on this change of policy."

STRESS RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE

Three clergymen, who emphasized that religious tolerance is a must in today's society, are the Reverend Norman S. Roberts, St. Peter United Church of Christ, Oakton and Laramie Streets, Skokie; Rabbi Lawrence H. Charney, Northwest Suburban Jewish Congregation, 7900 Lyons Street, Morton Grove; the Reverend Warren E. Richardson, Holy Trinity Episcopal Church, 8301 Karlov Avenue, Skokie.

"I deeply regret that in our seeking to create a pluralistic society that we cannot respect and honor one another's faith, even though it may be different from ours," the Reverend Mr. Roberts said.

"Man should pray as he sees fit," said the Reverend Mr. Kool. "No prayer is offensive. Protestants could be offended when rabbis leave out certain words, but they aren't. As a person prays, this is a prayer to God which deserves respect and tolerance."

FIVE LEADERS AGREE

Five religious leaders do not feel the Constitution was set up to keep out prayers.

They are the Reverend David Cortisi, St. Joan of Arc Catholic Church, 9248 Lawndale Avenue, Skokie; the Reverend Mr. Williams; Father Flanagan; Father Paluch; and Father Wilhelmi.

The Reverend Mr. Williams said:

"Not only do I believe that prayer is desirable on commencement occasions, but it also is my belief that it is a lawful thing to do. If the Supreme Court can open its session with prayer, surely prayer is lawful at commencements."

"In our Constitution it reads 'In God We Trust,'" Father Paluch said, "Yet in the next move, we try to throw this out. 'In God We Trust' was the foundation of our country. Even all our currency is engraved 'In God We

Trust.' We should keep an open mind and not shut the door in our face."

SEEK END OF CONFLICT

Clergymen want the conflict to be resolved as soon as possible. They feel it is creating excessive tension within the community and poor publicity outside the community.

The Reverend Frank Countrman, Central Methodist Church, 8225 Kenton Avenue, Skokie, said: "It would not help the community to do away with the graduation prayer. The prayer said at a graduation exercise is good for the community and to do away with it would hurt the community."

The Reverend Steven Murphy, Lutheran Church of Resurrection, 7947 Kenney Street, Niles, said: "Needless to say, there are minor differences of opinion between all clergymen. However, we are all most interested in reconciling this conflict and in reducing community tension—particularly between different religious and racial groups."

SEE NOTHING WRONG

The Reverend W. James Krueger, St. Paul's Lutheran Church, 7870 Niles Center Road, Skokie, and the Reverend Q. Gerald Roseberry, Evanshire Community Church, 4535 Church Street, Skokie, see nothing wrong with prayers at graduation exercises. However, they no longer want to pray at school functions because of restrictions imposed on them.

Six Niles township clergymen preferred not to comment on the prayer ban issue. They are Rabbi Joel Lehrfield, Lincolnwood Jewish congregation, 7117 Crawford Avenue, Lincolnwood; the Reverend Ralph G. Ramseyer, Morton Grove Community Presbyterian Church, 3944 Austin Avenue, Morton Grove; Rabbi Milton Kanter, Skokie Valley Traditional Synagogue, 8840 Monticello Avenue, Skokie; Rabbi Karl Weiner, Temple Judea, 8610 Niles Center Road, Skokie; Rabbi Sidney J. Jacobs, Niles Township Jewish congregation, 4500 Dempster Avenue, Skokie; and Rabbi Lawrence Montrose, Skokie Central Traditional congregation, 4109 Main Street, Skokie.

Agreeing with the clergy forum who recently ruled there was nothing wrong with prayer at graduation are Rabbi Harold I. Stern, Congregation B'nai Emunah, 9131 Niles Center Road, Skokie; the Reverend Wayne R. Viereck, St. Timothy's Lutheran Church, 9000 Kildare Avenue, Skokie; and the Reverend Arthur Sauer, St. Peter's Catholic Church, 8140 Niles Center Road, Skokie.

DISCRIMINATION IN STATE DEPARTMENT ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been following with growing dismay the exchange of letters between the State Department, our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker], and the American Jewish Congress. The State Department had been accused of discriminating against Jews in its assignment of personnel to foreign service posts in Arab nations. I had hoped that the State Department would be able to deny this charge. It has not. Instead, the Department has played a word game, the net effect of which is an admission of discrimination against Jews because they would be ineffective diplomats rather than because of their religion.

> The Department does not practice discrimination in any aspect of its personnel policies—

Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur II wrote in a letter dated February 24, 1966. However, he went on to explain that the State Department—

> would not assign an officer to a post where for reasons beyond his control, he would not be effective or where his particular assignment might result in adverse reaction against him.

He denied that this policy is—

> tantamount to going along with the anti-Zionist practices of Arab countries.

In an earlier letter dated January 14, 1966, the State Department was more candid:

> Thus, while the United States does not normally take into account the religion of its employees in assigning them for duty abroad, this is regrettably a factor which cannot be ignored in the case of certain countries whose policies in this respect we cannot control however much we disagree with them.

Mr. Speaker, the Department's position is nothing more than the standard moderate rationale for discrimination. Ask a blue chip New York law firm why it does not hire Jews; ask a Birmingham bank why it does not hire Negroes. The answer is always the same. We have nothing against Jews, or Negroes, they will say. But our clients just would not deal with them, they explain, and we might lose a lot of business. Besides, the argument continues, they would not be happy here.

Those who oppose discrimination have never disputed the possible validity of these arguments. A firm's client may prefer not to deal with a Jew or a Negro. But then the client is wrong. The firm should not compromise principles for the sake of a client's bigotry.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has no higher principle than that of equal opportunity, the belief in the equality of all men. We cherish this ideal in principle, and we now attempt to enforce it in law. When we try to combat communism around the world, we do so most effectively when we describe our own system of democracy. At its most effective, the "Voice of America" is the voice of Thomas Jefferson; its words are the words of the Declaration of Independence.

During the past few years, Congressman after Congressman has stood up in this Chamber to denounce the fact and the picture of discrimination and police brutality in this country. We are fully aware of how Communists have made capital of the story of Little Rock and the pictures from Birmingham. At last this Congress has once and for all declared that no State and no employer may practice segregation or discrimination—no matter what the excuse may be. That is the law of the land.

Yet now we are told that the State Department of this great and free society practices discrimination in order to appease the Arab countries in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, this country should not be a party to the bigotry of its allies any more than it would tolerate the bigotry of its enemies. We are too great for that. The State Department of the United States should set an example for the world. It should practice what the "Voice of America" should preach.

I have today introduced a concurrent resolution, similar to the resolution previously introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker] expressing the sense of Congress that the President take all necessary steps to insure that U.S. personnel are assigned without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin.

It is time for the State Department to cease yielding to the bias of the Arab Nations. The Department must make it unmistakably clear that its employees will be assigned throughout the world without regard to religion, race, color, or national origin. I call upon the Department to demonstrate by action that religious discrimination is no longer to be tolerated in the assignment of its personnel. Otherwise, it only makes a mockery of our ideals as a nation.

EXPORT QUOTAS ON HIDES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boland). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Andrews] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, these are indeed strange days in the Great Society. Perhaps it should be better known as the "high society" because of the high-handed methods it is using to deal with the agricultural segment of our population. We are seeing funds for school lunch programs, school milk programs, REA loans, Extension Service, and land-grant college institutions all cut to make contributions to "high society" programs. By these, I mean the Job Corps, where individuals are trained at the high cost of $8,000 per person or per year; or the poverty program, which hires high-salaried politicians at the same sum of $12,000 to $14,000 a year to administer a program which sees very few benefits getting through to the people who need them.

One of the strangest and most contradictory things about the "high society" is that the left hand seemingly does not know what the right hand is doing. Consistency is something that has been completely forgotten. About 2 years ago, livestock farmers of this country were seeing their markets glutted by a wide-open import policy in which billions of pounds of beef were brought into this country, causing ruinously low beef prices and resulting in the loss of more than $170 million to the American farmer. Importing beef to America and breaking the farmers' market made about as much sense to me at that time as importing tens of thousands of Chinese coolies to provide cheap labor and break the laboring man's wage scale. The farmers rightfully rebelled. They loudly called attention to their plight in every way they knew possible, and Congress responded.

At that time, Mr. Hodges was Secretary of Commerce. He went out into farm areas and advised the farmers, and I quote, "to quit whining" and to go out and look for new foreign markets for ourselves. I would like to include for the RECORD now two news stories, one from the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune of January 19, 1964, and one from the Billings, Mont., Gazette of January 18, 1964:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Jan. 19, 1964]

BEEF IMPORTS "WHINING" HIT

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.—Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges said today he did not share Oklahoma Gov. Henry Bellmon's fears about beef imports.

At a news conference preceding Hodges' meeting with the Governor, the Cabinet member was reminded of Bellmon's efforts to curb beef imports and asked to give his own views.

Hodges said he knew beef imports had increased, but added, "I do not think it's gotten out of hand."

"We've got the best beef in the world. If we quit whining about the possibilities of what they [foreign beef producers] can do to us and go out and do it to them, we will be better off."

Bellmon recently asked the Tariff Commission to reduce the amount of beef and cattle shipped into the United States from abroad.

There was no indication that Hodges and Bellmon discussed the beef situation during their private meeting.

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette, Jan. 18, 1964]

HODGES URGES CATTLEMEN TO "CUT OUT WHINING"

FARGO, N. DAK.—U.S. Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges Saturday urged American cattlemen to "cut out our whining" about beef imports and get to work selling U.S. beef to other countries.

Product quality and imaginative merchandising is what is needed, Hodges said.

The Secretary was here for a dinner Saturday night honoring Senator QUENTIN N. BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota. His comments came at a news conference.

"We have not yet licked the problem of agricultural commodities in the Common Market," Hodges predicted, "they're going to have a terrible scrap before it's done." On foreign trade, Hodges pointed to the sales of wheat to the Soviet Union and Soviet bloc nations as a benefit to the United States and North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, in the intervening 2 years, foreign supplies of beef dried up, the imports dropped off, and the American consumer, as always, was provided with beef supplies by the American farmer at reasonable prices. The American cattlemen and the American livestock industry, moreover, took Mr. Hodges' advice and went out to develop export markets, not only for American beef, but for American beef byproducts as well.

With the advent of new synthetic substitutes for leather, it became doubly important to find new markets for hides, with the result that last year exports of cattle hides rose to 13.3 million. With a hide worth about $17 or $18 average, we were getting approximately one-quarter of a billion dollars from our hide exports. At a time when we were concerned about our balance of payments, which for 1965 showed a deficit of $1,300 million, and with a gold outflow to foreign countries in 1965 of $1,665 million, the livestock industry not only performed a service for the livestock producers by finding this new market for hides, but helped all Americans by aggressive marketing which had a favorable effect on gold outflow and balance of payments.

Imagine the shock and surprise to all of us when a new Secretary of Commerce last week announced he was going to impose export controls on hides, in order to "maintain existing domestic supplies" and to bring prices in line. There are, I am told, 25 pairs of shoes made from each animal hide. This means there is in the neighborhood of 70 cents worth of leather in each pair of shoes. Now, if the price of leather goes down one-fourth, the price of leather in a pair of shoes will go down only 20 cents. Does the Secretary really believe that this cost savings will be passed on to the purchaser of the pair of shoes?

I think, Mr. Speaker, anyone with a minimum amount of knowledge of marketing realizes that the domestic supplies are here, and the livestock industry would prefer, of course, to sell domestically and save the shipping costs, provided the domestic market would pay competitive prices. The Secretary of Commerce goes on in his press release to admit that the impact of the export control on live cattle prices is estimated to be about 5 cents per pound of hides. In the wake of the announced export controls, the market, as of Monday, had indeed dropped this 5 cents, and it looks like it will go down even more.

Now, what does 5 cents per pound of hide mean to the individual livestock producer? Well, 5 cents per pound amounts to about $3.50 to $4 per hide. A local packing company in my district said that their West Fargo, N. Dak., slaughtering plant employs 160 North Dakotans, and slaughters an average of 2,400 cattle per week the year around—2,400 hides at $4 per hide is nearly $10,000 lost in value to the North Dakota ranchers and cattle feeders in a week's time at this one cattle plant alone. In 1965, North Dakota cattlemen marketed 694,000 head of cattle. At $4 per head, this figures out to $2,776,000 loss of income. A lot of hide taken off our farmers because of one decision by the Secretary of Commerce.

My friend in the packing business was extremely frank when he pointed out that "these losses are always passed back to the original producer"—meaning no one but the farmer.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see the gentleman calling attention to this situation. The Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association telegraphed all of us in the Oklahoma delegation to the same effect; namely, that this is going to mean a considerable blow to the income of cattlemen in our State. I might add further that it is creating a considerable hardship for people who have been in the hide business and have had customers in Mexico. I say that because I know of a person who was caught with a considerable amount of hide accumulated for shipment to Mexico and really with no notice whatsoever of this export control being placed in effect.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out to my friend from Oklahoma and to other Members of the House that we are contacting the Secretary of Commerce and have invited him to come down and meet with a group of Members from both sides of the aisle in an effort to see what can be worked out with reference to this problem.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I, too, was very surprised to find this quota imposed last Friday.

I heard during the early part of the week that they were going to have licensing, but I had thought at that time—and it was my understanding—that was all they were going to do. Therefore, I was very much surprised in view of the fact that a couple of years ago they imposed quotas on walnut logs. Secretary Connor's predecessor did that. Within 3 weeks after Secretary Connor came into office those controls were lifted. I thought Secretary Connor had the viewpoint that is being expressed here today; that is, we should not have quotas on exports unless there is a very, very good reason for them.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Connor also was responsible for stepping up the attempt to get more export business for this country. So I was very surprised to find these export quotas imposed.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I made some statements on the floor of the House objecting to this imposition of quotas, and I also stated that I had received from the Department of Commerce an explanation of these quotas in justification of their action.

Mr. Speaker, several Members have asked to see these. Therefore I would like at this point in the RECORD to insert the comments from the Department of Commerce so that others may see their side of the story with which I certainly do not agree.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert these documents into the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[Release from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Mar. 11, 1966]

EXPORT QUOTAS SET FOR CATTLE HIDES, CALF AND KIP SKINS, AND BOVINE LEATHERS

The U.S. Department of Commerce, today, established export quotas for cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leathers, in a new move to provide adequate supplies for domestic needs.

The action, effective immediately, supplements that taken March 7, when the Department directed that shippers of these commodities to any destination in the world but Canada obtain a validated export license. The quota restrictions will not apply to Canadian shipments. The Department said that additional controls were needed because of the steady increase in exports during the latter part of 1965 and 1966. In the absence of quota restrictions, an estimated 14 million hides would be exported in 1966. On the basis of an estimated available supply of 21,100,000 hides and projected consumption of 23,800,000 hides, this would produce a shortage of 2,700,000 hides for domestic consumption. The effect of the restrictive export control action announced today will reduce the estimated shortage by 2,500,000 hides.

The new regulation was promulgated today in Current Export Bulletin No. 930, which established these quotas for the calendar year 1966:

Cattle hides, whole, 9,920,000 hides.

Cattle hides, except whole, 810,000 pieces.

Calf skins and kip skins, 2,140,000 skins.

Cattle hide and kip side, upper leather, grain, except patent and metallized and cattle hide, and kip side leather, not elsewhere classified, 10,800,000 square feet.

Cattle hide and kip side, sole, belting, welting, grain, offal, rough, russet and crust leather, 1,700,000 pounds.

Calf and whole kip upper leather, patent, and metalized; and calf and whole kip leather, not elsewhere classified except patent and metallized, 1,900,000 square feet.

Licensing will be conducted in two separate periods ending June 30, 1966, and December 31, 1966. The total to be licensed during the remainder of the year will be determined by subtracting from the specified quota the quantities exported since January 1, 1966, under general license G-DEST, including those shipments which were permitted to move under the saving clause announced on March 7.

The Department said that in order to avoid disruption of normal foreign markets for U.S. cattle hides, shipments of this commodity will be based on country allocations, and the exporters' allowances will be distributed on a country basis. The other quotas, which are essentially at 1965 levels, will be distributed on a global basis.

There will be no charge against quotas for any of the commodities that were not produced or manufactured in the United States; were imported into the United States under a warehouse entry; and were not and will not be entered under a U.S. customs consumption entry.

Licensing will be based on the past participation by exporters in exports of the commodities included in each of the quotas. The Department stated that this licensing method assures an equitable distribution among exporters of the available export quotas and helps maintain normal patterns of trade. Calendar years 1964–65 constitute the base period for the past participation requirements. Exporters must submit their past participation statements to the Department by April 4 and licensing is scheduled to begin on April 18. The Department indicated, however, that it would consider granting licenses before this date for emergency shipments.

Current Export Bulletin No. 930 incorporating the details of the quota regulations are available at 25 cents each from the U.S. Department of Commerce or any of its 42 field offices.

[From the U.S. Department of Commerce, Business and Defense Services Administration]

BASIS FOR IMPOSING SHORT SUPPLY EXPORT CONTROLS OVER CATTLE HIDES AND LEATHER

The statutory authority for export control of cattle hides and leather is the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, which provides the use of export controls to the extent necessary "to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scare materials, and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand."

On the basis of estimated imbalance of supply and demand the Department of Commerce determined that the calendar year 1966 export level (excluding exports to Canada) be reduced to the 1964 level; namely, 9,920,000 whole cattle hides and 810,000 pieces to be distributed in two semiannual license periods. This corresponds to the total export level in 1964 of 11,540,000 hides. In setting the quantities to be licensed in these two periods the quantities exported under general license in 1966 before imposition of controls will be taken into consideration. Canada would be treated on an "open border" basis with an arrangement that the Government of Canada would take such steps as necessary to prevent Canadian exports from frustrating U.S. controls. The 1964 whole hide exports to Canada were 700,000 hides. Country and exporter quotas on cattle hides will be imposed but only exporter quotas on other bovine hides and leathers. Without control of leather exports cattle hides could be put through the first stage of tanning and exported as leather.

The export quotas for other bovine hides and leathers are essentially holding actions rather than export reductions and are intended to forestall evasion of cattle hide controls. These 1966 quotas (ex. Canada) are 2,140,000 calf and kip skins; 1,900,000 square feet of calf and kip leather; 10,800,000 square feet of cattle leather as defined in schedule B–611.5010 and B–611.5050 and 1,700,000 pounds of other cattle leather in schedule B classes 611.5020 and 611.5040. These levels represent 1965 export levels except for the quota on the last group which is somewhat above the 1965 level. Patent and metallized leather are not subject to controls, but the Office of Export Control will maintain surveillance over these exports.

The quota level was determined to provide 2.5 million additional hides for U.S. consumers in 1966 to relieve an estimated shortage in 1966 of 2,700,000 hides. (See attached table A.) Adequate domestic supplies in 1966 stemming from export controls, will produce some reduction in the current levels of domestic hide prices. It is expected that export controls will permit domestic leather tanneries to continue at their current level of operations.

The 1965 export level was 76 percent above the 1961–63 level. Cattle hide prices in July–December 1965 were 57 percent above the 1963–64 average and now are 70 percent above a year ago.

A quota of 10 million total hides and pieces, including Canada was recommended by some industry groups. This was judged too restrictive because such a quota would result in a hide surplus above domestic needs and could exert a severe depressing effect on hide prices. The export quotas set for 1966 will permit the cattle hide industry to export hides at a level at least as high as the second highest export year.

QUANTITY OF CATTLE HIDE EXPORTS IN 1964

Increased U.S. exports have been in response to increasing needs of European markets, compared to their 1964 and 1965 import levels from the United States. Canada, Latin America, Asia, and Africa imported approximately the same from the United States in 1964 and 1965. The 1,900,000 increase in U.S. exports in 1965 was mostly due to increased demands of Western Europe, 800,000; Russia, 700,000; and Czechoslovakia, 200,000. These increases were due largely to decreases in exports from Argentina and to a policy of increased hide imports in the bloc nations to permit greater production of consumer goods.

Before 1964, exports were stable from 1957, slowly increasing from 6,500,000 to 8 million hides. Monthly exports of cattle hides in 1964 and 1965 show heavy increases. The last half of 1964 was 10 percent above the first half. There was another 10 percent increase in the first half of 1965 despite the strike at east and gulf coast docks.

In response to rising exports in the second half of 1964, wholesale cattle hide prices also rose from an index of 63 in the first half to 77 (23 percent higher). Prices then rose moderately to 80 in the first half of 1965, but increased rapidly again in the second half of 1965 for an average 114, which was a 43-percent increase over the first half of 1965. The projected U.S. shortage in table A would in itself account for the increase in prices which has taken place in the last 8 weeks. During this period European prices have risen somewhat more.

The export control action would result in the following balance. With a slaughter of 34,800,000 plus 100,000 imports minus 11,500,000 exports there would be an apparent supply of 23,400,000—still 400,000 hides under probable U.S. needs. The reduced exports under control in 1966 of 2,500,000 hides (14 million exports without control minus 11,500,000 exports under control) minus a 200,000 probable reduction in imports is 400,000 less than the expected shortage of 2,700,000. This errs on the conservative side because 1966 estimates must to some extent be flexible and a minor reduction in inventories is no doubt still possible.

This discrepancy between 1965 apparent supply of 21,800,000 hides and consumption of 23,400,000 hides is accounted for by reductions in stocks of hides held by U.S. packers, dealers and tanners. The tanners' 1965 drawdown accounted for 500,000 of the 1,600,000 inventory reduction. With stocks at the lowest level of the last decade, it does not appear feasible to attempt to rely upon a further reduction in stocks to fill the gap in 1966. The recent increases in cattle hide prices (now 70 percent over 1 year ago) reflect the exhaustion of prospects of further inventory reductions all over the world.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The impact of the export control on live cattle prices is estimated at about 5 cents per pound of hides, or a reduction of about 1 percent of their value of cattle.

The other departments of the Government are in agreement concerning these estimated economic effects and the most appropriate level of export controls. The slaughter data and estimates were obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The export and import data were published by the Bureau of the Census. The consumption of hides data were provided by the Tanners' Council of America. Other 1966 estimates were made by the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce.

TABLE A.—*Cattle hides*

[In thousands of hides]

	1965	1966 estimate	1966 controlled
Slaughter	34,800	34,800	34,800
Imports	300	300	100
Exports	13,300	14,000	11,500
Available supply	21,800	21,100	23,400
Consumption	23,400	23,800	23,800
Shortage	1,600	2,700	400

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, also I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of my letter that I sent to the Secretary of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

MARCH 14, 1966.

Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I received the "Basis for Imposing Short Supply Export Controls Over Cattle Hides and Leather" which I had requested the day export quotas were set for cattle hides. I have studied these justifications very carefully and respectfully suggest that some very important considerations were apparently not given much weight.

I urge reconsideration of this matter and a lifting of these export quotas for the following reasons:

1. There are an abundance of substitutes to cover any shortages that may temporarily exist either domestically or overseas as a result of the normal distribution which would occur under the free market system without export controls.

2. Due to a high number of cattle and temporarily low demand, prices have previously been very low. The recent increase in prices brought prices nearer to where they should be and was not a sign of a critical shortage.

3. The justifications do not give proper consideration to the fact that a high percentage of the hides sold overseas were of inferior quality which foreign consumers are more willing to use in lieu of substitutes than are our American consumers.

4. Americans are more willing to use substitutes, many of which are of very good quality, and it may be very beneficial to the United States to export more hides and make up the shortage with substitutes domestically. This determination can better be made by the price mechanisms than by artificial pressures which result from export controls.

5. The export quota reduces the price below what foreign customers are willing to pay and reduces our ability to lower the balance-of-payments deficit both because of reduced volume and reduced price.

6. The cost of the green hide in a pair of shoes is so small that even a sharp increase in green hide prices would raise the cost of a pair of shoes only a few pennies. Shoe prices increased $10 per pair while hide prices were going down.

7. The export order has resulted in a reduced price of about 25 cents per hundredweight on live cattle.

8. There is a considerable supply of processed leather accumulated in surplus which should be worked into the market while we have foreign customers.

Again, I respectfully urge you to very carefully consider this matter and the way that it conflicts with your previous programs to promote the export of livestock byproducts including hides, and to reverse the order.

Sincerely,

NEAL SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota very much for yielding, and I certainly do hope that other Members will try to get something done so that these quotas will be lifted.

Mr. Speaker, one other point I would like to make is this: The quota does not just affect farmers. We do not know for sure where this 25 cents per hundredweight on cattle is going to come from. Some of these people who are particularly interested in the consumers might be concerned with this question also, because we have a different situation in the meat industry than we had a few years ago.

Some of the retail merchants are able to sell at a price that has little relationship with the price which they paid for the meat. We find the packing industry is operating on about a cent per pound. They pay whatever they have to pay for the live weight. If, therefore, they cannot get as much out of the hides, they are are going to have add something onto the cost of the meat.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are not sure just where this 25 cents per hundred will be imposed in the price structure. Some of the consumers might be interested in this question.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his contribution. Actually, it is obvious to all of us that if it does not come out of the hides of the farmers, it will come out of the hide of the consumers. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, in a nation that needs a favorable balance of payments it is foolish to have export controls on a commodity that can move at a fair price into foreign trade.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to mention here that the imposition of export controls by the Secretary of Commerce in this dictatorial fashion not only is costing every farmer who has livestock $4 per head, but it is throwing the entire industry into turmoil, and can cost every consumer of beef and beef products in this country a considerable amount in their cost of living.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the licensing system has backed up hides at ports and has caused handlers costly delays.

Mr. W. Posen, vice president of Kaufman & Trading Co., New York exporter, said:

> We have a warehouse in New Jersey bulging with hides. We have some hides on trucks and some in rail cars that cannot be unloaded for lack of space.

A Houston exporter said 2,500 hides missed a boat to Belgium last week because an export license could not be obtained in time. He said that these will sit on the dock until the next ship to Belgium leaves. He further stated that, depending upon the weather, the hides could suffer damage and that they are bound to shrink.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the people in Europe who have begun to buy these hides from us must think of a nation which cannot decide whether it is going to continue to sell its products to them.

These markets were developed through a lot of hard work, and through the investment of a lot of money. It is tragic to see this situation develop.

This is indeed a strange way to treat an industry which has been doing an outstanding job of finding broader export markets for American products. The quota placed on exports for next year of 9,920,000 whole cattle hides and 840,000 pieces is a completely unrealistic figure when you look at it in relationship to the expected kill for 1966 and to the number of hides the domestic tanners can use. Livestock sources tell me that the kill for 1966 will be approximately 36 million head of cattle, excluding the calf kill. In 1965, the tanners used approximately 22½ million hides and probably could have used as many as 23½ million. Exporting only 10 million would leave a net oversupply of 12½ million hides which can only have one result. The market will continue in the downward spiral it has already started.

The actions of the Secretary of Commerce are difficult to understand for a number of reasons—and are made even more difficult when considered in light of his own statements made only a few months ago. Some of you will, I am sure, recall the controversy regarding export controls on—of all things—walnut logs. During this controversy, the Secretary wrote a letter dated September 22, 1965, to Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington, chairman of that body's Commerce Committee. This letter became a part of this committee's hearings in the matter, and I should like to read to you a brief segment of what the Secretary wrote:

> The short supply control authority in the Export Control Act should, in my opinion, be used to protect the overall welfare of the domestic economy and not be used as a price control device to benefit one or two segments of an industry to the detriment of other segments in that industry.

What has prompted the Secretary to change his mind?

Mr. Speaker, perhaps this strange action by the Secretary of Commerce could be the beginning of a back-door attempt to impose price controls by Government to stop the runaway inflation. If this is true, why does the White House not frankly admit it instead of singling out agriculture as the industry to take the first reductions. Certainly, this action which met, I am told, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, must be regarded as one of two things: First, a strange repudiation of the request the President has made to stimulate exports to stop our gold outflow and maintain a better balance of payments. Second, and perhaps even more important, it represents one more example of the antifarm direction this administration seems bent on taking; when, by one action of one Cabinet member, you can arbitrarily lower the value by $4, and perhaps more, of every head of livestock to be marketed during the next year.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. First of all, I think the gentleman is to be commended for taking the floor of the House to discuss this matter.

In this area of prices, in the justification which was mentioned by the Secretary of Commerce, he referred to the fact that there has been a 43-percent upsurge in prices over 1965—which is a realistic fact. But one thing he did not mention was that the average over 10 years had been at an alltime low and that the increase of 43 percent in one year still just brought it to the point where, in fact, it was profitable. Now I think we are left with the opinion by some that this great rise was what he was trying to stop.

Have you seen any justification in the order, I ask the gentleman, why Canada can still receive the exports of our hide but no other nation in the world has that same benefit?

Are they to be reshipped from Canada? I do not understand. Maybe the gentleman has some idea.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think I was as surprised as the gentleman and all America is and as shocked as this entire industry is. I think my friend from Montana realizes that is one of the reasons we want to get the Secretary of Commerce to sit down and talk with us about this strange and completely unprecedented action that he embarked upon last week.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the commendation expressed by the gentleman from Montana of the gentleman from North Dakota for bringing this matter to the floor and, of course, would commend the gentleman from Montana as well. I commend the gentlemen for bringing this matter before the House.

Mr. Speaker, export controls are something that has been very worrisome to me for a number of years. It is not a well-drafted law in the first place. It has three specific bases for operation. One has to do with national security, the other foreign policy, and the third has to do with short supply. I assume that the Department of Commerce is acting here under the power it has as affected by the matter of short supply.

There are a few guidelines in the statute, however. I think one of the most damning things about this whole thing is that the Department of Commerce has not even abided by the few guidelines that are in the law.

I refer to section 4(a) of the act which I would like to read, if the gentleman will permit me. It is as follows:

> Section 4(a). In determining what shall be controlled hereunder and in determining the extent to which exports shall be limited any department, agency, or official making these determinations—

And I want to emphasize this point—

> shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports.

Now the record shows, because I have checked on this, the announcement of the export controls on hides was made on Monday, March 7. The decision, incidentally, apparently was brought out during the preceding week. The State Department was consulted as of the date of Wednesday, March 2.

Now here is the thing that I am particularly interested in, being one of the four congressional delegates to the Kennedy round at Geneva.

The special trade representative was not consulted until Friday, March 4, when he learned about the extent of the Department of Commerce's decision by accident. He was not called in to consult by the Commerce Department as required by section 4(a).

It was then too late to influence the decision.

In other respects it is quite clear that the Department of Commerce did by no means consult with the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned on the aspects of this matter.

Second, I would point out the other standard set out in section 4(b), if I may read that section:

> In authorizing exports, full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchants, exporters, as well as producers and established and new exporters—

And here is what I want to emphasize—

> a provision shall be made for representative trade consultation to that end.

It is my understanding—and the gentleman can perhaps verify it—that the industry involved here; namely, the U.S. hide and leather producers, were not informed of this action until Friday, March 4, at this meeting to which they were called by the Office of Export Control.

As I understand it, the representatives got a little bit emotional there—in fact, that is putting it mildly—when they were confronted with a fait accompli. It was merely announced that this had been done. In other words, there was not any consultation.

It appears to me that the Congress had better amend the Export Control Act to establish proper procedures that are very clear so that the interests of our domestic industries and all concerned can present their case, have rights of appeal, and so forth. None of these provisions apparently exist, although I again point out there are some general guidelines in the law right now which clearly were violated. In other words, I think the Commerce Department acts are illegal. This is just one other example, I may say, of this administration using power that it does not have and not following the laws that are established where they might utilize certain powers.

The wage-price guidelines is another area; the use of stockpiles still another to enforce these guidelines.

I suspect that this is another way that this administration has of fighting inflation when they are trying to tell the country that inflation is only a threat, that it actually is not with us, putting off the evil day when they either have to cut expenditures or increase taxes—they ought to cut expenditures now—or they will probably have to go to direct controls by law, and not engage in this business of selecting some administrator to impose price controls in a specific area without a basis in law and proper procedures.

This is part of the whole pattern. I again commend the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House.

I wish to make one final reference. There is no question in my mind that these export controls are in violation of the spirit of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade—GATT—though possibly not the letter of GATT. They violate its spirit by interfering with the international market function which GATT is intended to strengthen and to safeguard—and here is what I would really get to the bottom of: What happens to our hide markets in Western Europe and Japan when this normal supply is shut off?

I call attention to a great exporter of hides and fur; namely, Soviet Russia. What is this? Is this an attempt to give Soviet Russia some American markets? Once these markets are disrupted by cutting off the normal supply from the United States, European and Japanese merchants will try to get hides where they can best get them, and it might be Soviet Russia. And I do not think that that would be to the advantage of the United States or the domestic hide industry.

But whether this is an accurate statement or not, the point remains that this is public business which should be conducted in public so that the people know and are made aware of what kind of deals are being made by the administration, and what the economic consequences of those deals are, and it should also permit those who have a point of view to express to have the proper forum to come before in order to express it.

I wish to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank my good friend from Missouri, TOM CURTIS, an experienced member of the important Ways and Means Committee, for this important contribution. Certainly, as he suggests, if the Great Society had been deliberately trying to create as much havoc as possible in an export industry, they could not have done a better job of it than to have this all of a sudden "kill 'em quick" decision made when hides were in transit, sitting on docks, and commitments were made to deliver to European purchasers. It just could not have been done in a manner more calculated to disrupt normal business channels developed only after a lot of hard work.

I would like to make one addition to that, along the line of what the Secretary of Commerce said earlier. It follows in line with what my good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] pointed out. The Secretary, on September 22 of last year, wrote to Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the other body's Commerce Committee and I quote:

> The short-supply control authority in the Export Control Act should, in my opinion, be used to protect the overall welfare of the domestic economy and not be used as a price control device to benefit one or two segments of an industry to the detriment of other segments in that industry.

I wonder what has prompted the Secretary to change his mind? My friend from Missouri has brought up several things that we should consider. But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the strange action by the Secretary of Commerce could be the beginning of a back-door attempt to impose price controls by Government, to stop the runaway inflation that it will not quite admit is here. If this is true, why does the White House not admit it, instead of singling out agriculture to take the reduction?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I have also taken note of the fact that he has informed the body of the impact that the action is having on midwestern cattle hide prices in the Chicago market area, and so on.

I would like to take a moment to inform the body of what is happening in my area, the Rocky Mountain area, because of this order of the Secretary of Commerce, but not before I join in the general commendation and rejoicing that many of us have expressed at the perspicacity of the gentleman in bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I think it is doubly good, because the Secretary of Agriculture, in the last few years, has been unwilling or unable to speak for the American farmer. I am glad that the gentleman from North Dakota is willing to.

During the few days since controls have been imposed, cattle hide prices have dropped $3 a hundredweight, from 17 to 14 cents per pound, which on a 75-pound heavy steer hide represents a reduction of about $2.25 per animal. We are concerned that hide prices will continue to drop as a result of these Government controls and there will be an even greater loss to the livestock and meat industries.

This is interesting. I think the gentleman from North Dakota will be interested in this comment.

Under OPS controls during the Korean war, hide prices were set in the neighborhood of 33 cents per pound. Thus, it cannot be maintained that hide prices in the United States at 17 or 18 cents were inflationary.

I think the gentleman from North Dakota has pointed out that prices in the last 2 years have been at an all-time low.

The imposition of Government controls on hide exports came as an unexpected bombshell. There is no justification for these controls. It is imperative that the burden imposed by the Commerce Department—with White House approval, obviously—be corrected at the earliest possible date.

Hide prices in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast States historically equaled the Chicago prices less freight of $2 per hundredweight. U.S. tanners are located in the Midwestern and Eastern States, so western hides have to be shipped to the Midwest for tanning.

With the development of the Japanese market, which took 3,810,000 U.S. cattle hides in 1964, the price of Rocky Mountain and west coast hides equaled or exceeded the price in Chicago. Furthermore, the export sales helped to maintain an adequate price for hides throughout the United States.

The livestock and meat industries urgently need all of the export demand we can get for our surplus American hides. It is incredible to us that our Government could work against us as they have through the imposition of export controls.

Another factor which should be called to the Government's attention is the low cost of meat and other foods in the United States in relation to the income of our citizens. It is significant that all food costs only 18 cents in our country out of each dollar of earned income after taxes compared to 26 cents just 15 years ago. American efficiency in production and distribution, if not unduly burdened by Government regulations and controls has proved that it can do a remarkable job for the benefit of both producers and consumers.

While food is costing 18 cents out of each dollar of income in the United States, it is costing from 30 to 50 cents in European countries and 60 cents out of each dollar of income in Russia.

Demand and supply is the best regulator of the economy that has yet been discovered and is the system which works to the best advantage of all the people. Unnecessary Government controls, on the other hand, foul up the economy and reduce our efficiency. Certainly we should have no Government controls unless they can be justified and the Government has failed to show any good reasons for the course of action it has taken to restrict hide exports under the present or foreseeable circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to make one closing point. I know there are other of our colleagues who want to join in this colloquy. In my State, we have a steel mill that employs 6,000 people. This steel mill is hard pressed now to compete with Japanese steel which is being exported to the United States. We have no import controls on Japanese steel.

In the last few years the livestock industry in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific region has worked hard to develop markets for the cattle hides in Japan and has succeeded. As I told you, in 1964, nearly 4 million hides were exported to Japan.

Now, we have no protection on the one hand to protect ourselves from Japanese steel being produced by mills that were built and financed by U.S. taxpayers through foreign aid. On the other hand, we built up what appears to be a reasonable and lucrative trade in cattle hides with Japan, and suddenly our own Government comes along and chops us off at the hip pockets. This is a time when the President of the United States a few months ago removed import quotas on lead and zinc. The Secretary of Agriculture is monkeying around now with import quotas on sugar. We have had a steady liberalizing of the import quotas on crude oil for the last few years. Now here is a limitation or a stop order on exports that the United States has. I think it is a shame.

Once again I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. It certainly is time for the Secretary of Commerce to change his hidebound policy.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I certainly appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what the gentleman from Utah said because there is another point on this that needs thinking about. We are supposed to be increasing our exports in order to meet our balance-of-payments deficit. This is certainly a shortsighted policy in that respect. This is probably the most crucial matter facing this country. Inflation is bad enough, but we lost $1.7 billion of gold in the year 1965, the greatest outflow since 1958. We are now in a position where we do not have the reserve metals available. The one way we are going to beat that is through exports. Now here this shortsighted policy cuts back on one place where we might get export dollars.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. It looks as though the Cabinet is not doing enough comparing of views when they hold their meetings. Certainly the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce are not speaking on the same wavelength as far as gold outflow is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Yes. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this policy of cutting down on exports in the face of the problem with our balance-of-trade deficit is not only shortsighted but is inexplicably contradictory on the part of the President of the United States. I cannot, for the life of me, understand how President Johnson can, on the one hand, urge businessmen of this country to export more in order to try to overcome the deficit in the balance of trade and then engage in an action of this kind. Perhaps it is proposed to recoup what they lose in deals of this kind through Secretary of Defense McNamara and others going over to the Swiss Alps on a skiing vacation. Perhaps McNamara and others will spend enough to take care of the loss that is sustained in this business. And this despite the fact that the President urged all Americans to spend their vacations in this country and cut down on the outflow of dollars. At any rate, to me it is totally inexplicable. I do not understand exactly what the Secretary of Commerce is up to.

I agree with the gentleman from North Dakota and commend him for bringing this subject to the floor of the House this afternoon. I want to join him in any invitation that is extended to get the Secretary of Commerce before interested Members of Congress to explain this action, if he has a valid explanation. At the same time I would like to question him or someone in the executive branch as to why the British, having bought the molasses crop of Communist Cuba, are now allowed to dump molasses in this country, injuring the market of the sugarbeet producers of this country. I would like to question him as to why this stuff is coming in, further beating off the ears of American farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for yielding to me.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contribution that my good friend from Iowa made. These certainly are strange times in the "high society." Things that go on are very difficult for most Americans to realize. This action met, I am told, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I believe it has to be regarded as one of two things: first, a strange repudiation of the request the President made to stimulate exports to stop our gold outflow and maintain a better balance of payments; or, secondly, and perhaps even more important, it represents one more example of the antifarm direction this administration seems to be bent on taking when by one action of one Cabinet member you can arbitrarily lower the value by $4 and perhaps more of every head of livestock to be marketed during the next year.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my colleagues who are today bringing to the attention of the House the completely arbitrary action of the Secretary of Commerce in driving down the price of hides and skins through establishment of export controls, and I am glad to join in protest of this recent action.

According to Department of Commerce press releases, Mr. Speaker, this action was taken "to provide adequate supplies for domestic needs." I seriously question that this is the real motive behind the move. I suggest, instead, that this move by the administration is merely the latest in a series of plays by White House string pullers who are bent on penalizing the farm segment of our economy by destroying farm income.

Let me very briefly cite some examples:

Last month the Department of Agriculture took some actions to allow unlimited imports of foreign sugar to the United States during the remainder of the first quarter of this calendar year. The Department announced its actions were taken with the prime objective of rolling back some sugar price increases in the Northeast—price increases which I might add were extremely modest. But the effect of the departmental action may seriously reduce the income on thousands of farms in more than half the States of our Nation.

In another move, the Commodity Credit Corporation has been making heavy sales of CCC-owned corn. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has maintained this practice is not to depress grain and livestock prices. But Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, says otherwise. In a television interview last Thursday, Mr. Ackley is quoted as saying:

> We're trying to hold down the price of corn. The Government's acquired large stocks of corn in its past price support operation, now we're releasing them into the market.

That statement, Mr. Speaker, was by the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and proves, as far as I am concerned, that the administration is manipulating the grain market by dumping Government-owned grain to keep farm prices at a low level.

In effect, that's what the administration has done with sugar. It has opened the gates to receive unlimited foreign sugar to the detriment of our domestic sugar industry.

And, in effect, that is what the administration is doing with regard to hides and skins. It is manipulating the export market which our producers have worked so hard to build up to get rid of our surplus hides. There had been a steadily declining market for hides and prices tumbled. Some of the reasons for this were that synthetic materials are being used more for shoes and other articles, while per capita consumption of beef has increased. The growing imbalance between supply and demand and the declining domestic market made development of overseas outlets necessary. These were carefully built up, and now, by stroke of a bureaucratic pen, are being destroyed and hide prices are tumbling.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the administration ought to admit what it is doing and why it is doing it. What we need right now is some truth in government.

Again, I commend my colleagues for their discussion today of the ramifications of the administration's action to break the price of hides and skins. The question might well be posed, what farm group, what part of our economy, will be next?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I would point out, as the gentleman from North Dakota so well stated, we are again witnessing another price control maneuver, a depressing maneuver, I might add, by this administration, insofar as the American farmer is concerned. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have today written our distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], as has the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], suggesting that perhaps the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture might very properly look into this action by the Department of Commerce to determine if it is in the public interest.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am certain you are aware of the recent action by the Department of Commerce, imposing export restrictions on hides and skins, except those going to Canada and shipments of $100 or less in value.

In my opinion, these controls will have a very depressing effect on an important segment of the agricultural industry, and I would, therefore, suggest that the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee hold hearings immediately to determine if the action taken by the Department of Commerce was in the public interest.

As a member of this subcommittee, I will certainly be pleased to assist in every way possible.

Sincerely yours,

BOB DOLE,
Member of Congress.

We are hopeful our distinguished chairman will see fit to have hearings immediately.

Mr. Speaker, many here may have watched the Today show Thursday morning, March 10. If so, perhaps you recall the interview featuring NBC's White House correspondent, Mr. Scherer, and Mr. Ackley, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. Ackley made it very clear, as you will note in my later remarks, that the administration, with the cooperation of various Federal departments and agencies, was making every possible effort to drive down prices. He specifically talked about corn and how surpluses were released to drive down prices—the prices received by the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, as I suggest in my remarks later, the administration is apparently bent upon nailing the farmer's hide to the barn door. The results remind me of a song—and while I do not recall the exact title—it goes something like this:

> Tan me hide when I'm dead, Fred;
> Tan me hide when I'm dead.
> So we tanned his hide when he died, Clyde;
> That's it hanging on the shed.

IMPOSITION OF EXPORT CONTROLS ON HIDES

Mr. Speaker, once again we are witnessing imposition of Government control by this administration. These controls will have an extremely depressing effect on an important segment of the agricultural industry. I speak of the drastic action taken on March 8, 1966, by the U.S. Department of Commerce, recommending export controls on all hides and skins, except those going to Canada and shipments of $100 or less in value.

This is another body blow to the American farmer and part of an organized effort by this administration to hold down prices the farmer receives. If there is any doubt about this statement, I would refer you to a statement by Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers on the "Today" show last Thursday, March 10. The following question was put to Mr. Ackley by Ray Scherer, NBC's White House correspondent:

> Mr. SCHERER. On this point, food prices, I know one housewife who tells me that every time she goes to the grocery prices seem to be up a little. Republicans are saying that's going to be their—perhaps their principal issue in the fall campaign. What are you doing really about food prices? What can the Government do?
>
> Mr. ACKLEY. In the first place, I—I've a wife who goes to the grocery store, too, and reports this. I think everyone tends to exaggerate the extent of increase in food prices. We remember the things that go up and we fail to remember the things that are lower.
>
> There aren't a great many things we can do. But we're trying to do everyone of them that is available. For example, I mentioned the fact that increase in supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn, and we're trying to hold down the price of corn. The Government acquired large stocks of corn in its past price-support operation, now we're releasing them into the market.
>
> We're selling various commodities out of our agricultural stockpiles. We're trying to avoid buying for domestic distribution programs, or overseas aid programs, those commodities that are in short supply on the farm side.

There is no doubt in my mind that Mr. Ackley, and other administration leaders, are doing everything possible to drive down farm prices, whether it be the price of corn, the price of wheat, or the price of hides. It would seem that this administration is bent on nailing the farmer's hide to the wall.

The administration apparently took this action because of the advancing hide market. For many years, cattle hides have been lower in price than at any time throughout recent history. With an increasing demand in recent years, hide prices have improved substantially, thus providing an important added source of income for farmers and cattlemen. Actually, hide prices are not high in relation to livestock prices, and certainly they are not out of reason when considering the historical relationship that has existed between livestock and high prices. It should be borne in mind that the price increases have been from an unreasonably low level—in fact, not long ago, produce dealers refused to accept hides brought in to them by farmers.

As one who represents one of the largest agricultural areas in the United States, I am keenly interested in efforts of the Department of Agriculture and independent organizations to develop new foreign markets for agricultural products, and the action of the Department of Commerce in shutting off exports of hides is therefore most disturbing. The Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, March 15, 1966, reported that at the close of the market on the preceding day, cattle prices showed the biggest decline in several years. The Journal reported that:

> Prices for live cattle at Omaha tumbled as much as $1.50 per 100 pounds. At Chicago, prices slumped 50 cents to as much as $1, which brought the 2-day price break there to as much as $2, sharpest for the period in nearly 4 years.

Some authorities contend this drop in live cattle prices is a direct reflection of the action by the Commerce Department in setting restrictive export quotas on U.S. hides.

In my opinion, it would be a serious setback to the livestock industry and agriculture generally, if the proposed export licenses announced by the Department of Commerce are permitted to remain in effect thereby removing an important source of income to agriculture.

Frankly, I have some difficulty determining how the export control law can properly be invoked in a case of this kind. It is my understanding that most of the products subjected to export controls are placed in that category for security reasons, or for reasons related to the foreign policy of the United States. The law does permit export controls to protect the economy in cases of short supply, but as was stated by a Member of the other body on March 8, 1966, page 5252 of the RECORD, only one other commodity—copper and certain copper products—are now subject to export controls under that provision of the law. By no stretch of the imagination can we say the hide situation is comparable to the copper problem. There is a real shortage of copper, but certainly no shortage of hides; for the yearend inventory of hides last December was not greatly reduced from the normal yearend inventory figures.

I continue to ask the question without receiving a satisfactory answer, "Is there a place for rural America in this Great Society?" If there is, let us hope that the ill-advised action taken under the Export Control Act of 1949 by the Department of Commerce will be rescinded forthwith.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his contribution. Certainly they might not have nailed these hides to the shed, but they certainly nailed them to the wharves in New York and Houston and effectively stopped their movement to foreign markets.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with the most pertinent remarks by my colleague and friend from North Dakota. He has rightfully alerted us to another effort by the Federal Government to control prices on an agricultural commodity that results in a loss of needed income to our farmers.

It certainly is no secret that the market for cattle hides has been depressed for a long time. Then, recently, prices rose somewhat. But those prices still are below what they should be. However, the Department of Commerce has seen fit to set export quotas on cattle hides with the purpose of curtailing exports. The result, of course, is a lowering of the price of hides.

There are serious questions to be asked over the Commerce Department claims of an inadequate supply of leather for the domestic industries. For instance, there is a considerable supply of processed leather accumulated in surplus which could be worked into the market while we have foreign customers. And there are an abundance of substitutes to cover any shortages that may temporarily exist either domestically or overseas.

Actually those synthetic substitutes for leather caused the domestic hide market to become depressed. These substitutes have gained wide acceptance in the United States and forced the domestic hide industry to look elsewhere for their markets. The industry, with cooperation from the Department of Agriculture, sought the development of markets in hide deficit areas of the world. Now, with those markets a reality, the Government wants to shut the door by curtailing our hide exports.

The loss to our farmers and to our meat processors is very real, estimated by some to approach $4 a head. This loss must either be assumed by the farmer and processor, or be passed on to the consumer through higher meat prices because the amount derived from the hide is still a part of the total money realized from each animal. Such a loss comes at a time when the domestic beef industry attempts to stabilize its income.

We should also note that hide exports accounted for a quarter of a billion dollars last year, which had a beneficial effect on our balance of payments.

Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues who believe that this further manipulation of a U.S. agricultural market is unwarranted. I urge that the recently imposed export quotas on cattle hides be rescinded.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing concern regarding this action taken by the Department of Commerce.

For the last two weeks I have been sitting in hearings on the budget for that Department. In agency after agency of the Department of Commerce they are requesting new employees for the purpose of beefing up—and I suppose that might be a proper word—the Departments, so that they can induce businessmen to export more. In their field offices throughout the country they want to have new employees, and in other areas of the Department of Commerce, for the specific purpose of trying to do something to alleviate what we call the balance-of-payments problem.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this is completely inconsistent. Also I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], in expressing concern regarding the trading in molasses where the British, as I understand it, purchased the total output of Cuba, and it is finding its way back into the United States. This is something that ought to be looked into.

Mr. Speaker, just this afternoon we have been listening to the Maritime Commission and to a task force of the Maritime Commission, who have recommended that we ought to give consideration to building maritime ships in foreign countries. We are subsidizing construction now.

Mr. Speaker, these policies are completely inconsistent. Certainly the administration should somehow review its ideas because there are so many conflicting policies within the administration on this very important subject. With reference to this export control order, in my opinion it is completely inconsistent with what they claim they have been trying to do in other areas in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg] for his contribution.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am glad to yield to my neighbor from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen].

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for bringing this disgraceful action to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it might be well to recall that just a few years ago we were confronted with an 80-percent increase of beef importations from Australia and New Zealand, in 1962. In 1963, it was up another 20 percent, and many of our cattle feeders went to the wall because of this action. Eleven percent of the beef consumed in this country was imported beef.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we find we have controls put on the export even of hides off domestically grown animals.

I might also point out that on the floor of the House last week our minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford], made comment about the dumping of corn on the market and thereby breaking the market. I joined the gentleman from Michigan in his comments. The Secretary of Agriculture, in a speech in Minneapolis—I believe on March 10—said my comments were political noise, and corn was worth $1.29 a bushel, which was a pretty good price. But I also call attention to the fact that on the same day a year ago it was $1.32.

Mr. Speaker, also I want to point out that the farmers' costs were up 11 points while the price of corn went down.

So I might say that this is sticky business with molasses and hides and political bunk, but to the farmer it is bad, bad news.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. It certainly is.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I would be glad to yield to my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join the others who have spoken on this subject. No other person in this body is more alert to the proposed actions of the departments of the Government or proposed legislation that might affect the farmer and his income than is the gentleman in the well of the House from North Dakota [Mr. Andrews].

Based upon the participation on both sides of the aisle in the discussion of this important subject this afternoon, one concludes that this is witness to the fact that he is a leader in this field in this regard in standing up to be counted in behalf of the American farmer.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the farmer has been taking an economic beating and now, literally, he is having it taken out of his hide.

According to the agricultural market service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, we in South Dakota slaughtered something like 575,000 head of cattle in 1965.

Now at $4 per hide, as you have outlined here, this would amount to a loss of about $2,300,000 to the cattle industry in my State in just one year.

Worse still is the observation of your friend in the meat processing business that this reduction of $4 per hide from each slaughtered beef animal would be levied against the cattle producer.

The gentleman from North Dakota is not only a cattle producer but a feeder and he knows what he is talking about.

The impact of a decision of this kind on the American cattle producers in your State and in my State, that is, in the State of the gentleman in the well and my State, where the livestock losses recently were devastating due to one of the severest storms in the history of our two States—as I say, in view of the impact that that has had on the incomes of our livestock raisers in these two States—this information is certainly not going to be welcome news.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank my friend from South Dakota for his contribution.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Andrews], for taking this time to bring to the attention of House Members this very serious matter which involves the use of extraordinary power by the administration to push down the price of cattle hides and cattle.

I share the concern of many Members from cattle-producing States who are alarmed by the two-pronged orders of the Department of Commerce—first requiring export licenses for hides moving out of the United States and, second, the order clamping export quotas on hides.

It seems that this was an unnecessary action which should be reviewed again by the proper administration officials and serious consideration should be given to rescinding those orders.

There are many who look upon the establishment of export quotas as a means of exercising price control by the Government. On the first day of market activity following the Commerce Department action, cattle prices experienced their sharpest break in nearly 4 years.

The livestock industry in Kansas, and across the Nation, experienced serious economic difficulties only a few years ago when cattle prices were depressed by substantial foreign meat imports. It took congressional action to provide relief for cattlemen; but now another administration action threatens that recovery.

The Department of Commerce explained that the additional controls "were needed because of the steady increase in exports" during 1965 and early this year.

However, at the very same time that one Federal agency slaps export controls on an agricultural product, another Government agency—the Department of Agriculture—is working with agricultural organizations and individuals to develop markets abroad for products of the livestock and meat industry. In fact, representatives of the livestock and meat industry are serving, by Presidential appointment, on a special beef committee to investigate opportunities abroad with a view towards providing needed assistance to U.S. cattle producers.

There is continuing concern, too, with the serious balance-of-payments problem. It is puzzling, indeed, to see the hide producing industry made the victim of a special exception to the general policy of encouraging exports to remedy the balance-of-payments situation.

Mr. Speaker, until recently hide prices have been at giveaway levels. Over a long period of time, there has been a steadily declining domestic hide market, partly because of the development of synthetic materials as substitutes for real leather.

The hide producing industry has sought to make up for this loss of business at home by developing foreign markets. This has been done, in part, with the assistance of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. According to recent estimates, 1965 exports of 13.3 million hides and 2.4 million calf and kip skins just about balanced the estimated volume of substitute materials used in domestic shoe production last year.

If these export controls were imposed to hold down costs for shoe manufacturers, what assurance does the administration have that the shoe industry will hold the line on the price of shoes?

It is the same old story. The farmer receives a smaller and smaller share of the consumer dollar, and it seems to apply to hides just as it does to other farm products.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, farmers are proud people. They are proud to be Americans, and America can well be proud of them. There is no nation that is as well fed as America. There is no nation where the individuals pay less, percentagewise, of their paychecks for food than here in America. If it were not for the capabilities and productive genius of the farmers of America, we could not possibly be the number one nation of the world today. Actually, the productive power of our farms and ranches may, in the long run, be the strongest weapon we have for world peace, if it can wisely be put to that use.

Certainly these same farmers who have made our Nation strong by giving us a dependable and adequate supply of that basic necessity—food—deserve more than the continual harassment this administration seems to be giving them.

Two years ago they were told to stop whining and find export markets. They found those export markets, Mr. Speaker, but now they are told to stop exporting. Where does this chain end?

I think Mr. Johnson would be well advised to tell Secretary Connor and Secretary Freeman that farmers are becoming impatient with mere lipservice and are becoming much more interested in performance than promises.

I think this goes for the American consumers as well who are vitally affected by this arbitrary decision.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I have today sent to the Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce:

MARCH 15, 1966.

Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I certainly want to express the hope that you will reexamine the drastic action you took in imposing export controls on hides. Not only is this discriminatory toward the farmers, costing them in the neighborhood of $4 for every head of cattle they market, but it certainly doesn't square with the President's announced decision to gain a more favorable balance of trade to stop the gold output.

Not too long ago your predecessor, Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, was in our area at the time we were concerned about imports harming our markets. His advice was to quit whining about the imports and go out and aggressively develop export markets. It seems strange that when that was done, his successor would arbitrarily destroy these new markets that have been developed by aggressive merchandising.

I certainly fail to see any justification for this imposition of controls unless it is a deliberate desire to freeze Americans out of European markets and allow the Russians to move in. Is this a first step in opening up East-West trade channels?

I sincerely hope that you will make a speedy reexamination of this decision and remove these controls for the benefit of not only the livestock industry, but for our entire economy.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

MARK ANDREWS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may appear in the RECORD following the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] following my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I have learned through recent newspaper reports, of a Department of Commerce order for export license controls on future shipments of cattle hides, calf and kip skins and bovine leathers destined for all countries except Canada.

Immediately following the publication of this order, I received telegraphed protest from Montana cattle producers and meat processors who point out the disadvantage to western packers who, historically, have moved hides for export, particularly from the west coast.

I am sure the Secretary of Commerce must have given the matter considerable study and thought, but I am at a loss to understand the logic or consistency for such an order. As I recall, both before, during, and since the debate on the unrealistically high rate of meat imports of 1963–64, the then Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, urged American cattlemen to "cut out our whining" about beef imports and get to work selling U.S. beef to other countries.

Following Mr. Hodges' statement at a dinner in North Dakota, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman issued a statement saying he had signed a cooperative market development agreement with the American Meat Institute aimed at building sales of U.S. livestock products in Western Europe and the United Kingdom. The Department of Agriculture and the American Meat Institute apparently have accomplished their purpose, at least insofar as hides are concerned.

As I understand it, the recent order will limit any increase of exports this year over the 1965 rate, a move intended, I presume, to preclude any further rise in the price of hides. I note also that the increase in prices last year has been referred to as a 43-percent "upsurge" which is possibly true of the increase over the 1964 price but is not a fair assessment when based on the last 10-year average. That average reflects a severely depressed price which was hardly above prewar prices of 1940–41.

Hide prices in 1963–64 were at the lowest level since the early 1930's and the only reason for higher prices in 1965 was because of the movement of surplus hides into the export market, the intended goal of the Department of Agriculture and the American cattle industry.

It is interesting to note also that during the all-time-high cattle slaughters of 1963–64, hide prices based on the 1957–59 price index of 100 were down to around 80 while the leather and leather footwear prices had risen to 108. Hide prices were down 25 percent while shoe prices were up. So it seems unrealistic, now that hide prices are back to a normal or profitable level, chiefly because of exports, that cattle producers should be penalized a few dollars added income for a live animal. Cattle producers, I might add, suffered from an extended and severe market depression during 1963–64 when not only did we have record domestic beef production, but meat imports—beef, veal, mutton, and lamb—also reached record levels of more than 10 percent of domestic production.

In reporting on my bill and others for the imposition of meat import quotas, the various departments denied any connection between the high rate of imports and the depressed cattle market. There was no voice raised, except in Congress, for the plight of the cattleman who would soon have been bankrupt had the flood of imports continued. So now an agricultural sector of our economy which has had only the crumbs of the Nation's longest period of so-called prosperity, at last is realizing a small share of the higher profits and wages labor and industry have enjoyed. But immediately the same Government officials who told the cattleman to quit whining and go out and sell his products to other countries now tell him he has been too successful and he can now go back to enjoying the former plagues of surplus and depressed prices.

I fail to understand the consistency of such a policy especially in view of the higher and higher percentage of synthetics or manmade leathers used in shoes and the continually rising price of shoes even when hides were cheap.

I believe any honest analysis of shoe prices will prove that by far the larger factor in the rising price of shoes is from labor costs and not hides.

And there is still another most important factor to be considered in this ill-advised and unwarranted action. The Treasury Department was at the same time announcing that net sales of gold from U.S. stocks amounted to $1.66 billion during 1965. Of this total, $1.54 billion went to foreign holders of U.S. dollars. So here we have on the one hand a declared policy of offsetting our outflow of dollars by encouraging exports and foreign credit, but at the same time penalizing an important segment of the agricultural economy by restricting exports. At the present rate, hide exports would have added some $130 million to the plus side of our balance-of-payments deficit this year.

I hope the Secretary will reconsider this discriminatory action against the farmers and ranchers of this country who are still struggling to attain parity prices of 20 years ago.

HALPERN BILLS TO INCREASE URBAN SHARE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills aimed at instituting a reallocation of funds under the Urban Mass Transportation Act and the Clean Air Act. I ask that the two bills, copies of which I have here, be inserted into the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

It is altogether clear that both these public laws seriously discriminate against densely populated urban centers which should be receiving the brunt of assistance.

My legislation repeals the 12½-percent State limitation which is placed on the disbursement of funds under the Clean Air Act and the Urban Mass Transportation Act. I am substituting a general guidance clause, to the effect that the departmental secretary concerned shall give priority to the urgency of need existing in the Nation's largest cities, and secondarily shall assure the widest possible State-by-State distribution of funds.

Under both these programs, addressed primarily to large cities, the highly urbanized States are not allocated a just proportion of available Federal funds. The 12½-percent State limitation is archaic, arbitrary, and discriminatory. It amounts to gross distortion, especially in view of the nature of the programs and the acute need existing in New York and other densely populated metropolitan areas.

Population trends are rendering this limitation even more invalid. In 1960, almost 70 percent of the Nation's total population was concentrated in urban centers; this will probably rise to 75 percent by 1970. Congress has in some fields recognized the special problems facing the Nation's cities. Both the mass transit and air pollution programs are mainly directed toward phenomenon characteristic of the urban complex. But this cumbersome State limitation prevents the proper and equitable extension of the funds appropriated. The country's largest cities are being choked and paralyzed by contaminated air and bankrupt forms of public transport. These two programs were designed to contend with these problems to some extent; but they cannot be of real, fundamental benefit unless the assistance authorized is generated in just proportion to those communities whose needs are most compelling.

New York State's share of the total U.S. population is 9.4 percent. On the face of it, if New York obtains the full 12½-percent allowance, you may say that it is getting a good deal. But it is not. New York State is one of the Nation's most highly urbanized States; we can point to Pennsylvania, California, and perhaps some others as having similar needs. Unless these regions obtain a share of the funds commensurate with their urbanization, the allocation formula is grossly unfair. Clean Air Act funds are extended on a project basis; but beyond the 12½-percent limit, there is no additional State allocation formula. Similarly, with the Urban Mass Transportation Act, project grants in any one State may not exceed 12½ percent, which is the only State ceiling formula.

The problems of air pollution and mass transit are predominately felt in compact population centers. These should receive a predominate share of assistance. Under the existing requirements, designed mainly to make the bills palatable to other areas of the country, New York City is suffering a manifest injustice.

The two bills I am today introducing will rectify this imbalance in two important areas. I urge the Congress to consider them and accord favorable action during this session.

H.R. 13698

A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to repeal the existing limit on the grant funds which may be used thereunder in any one State, and to provide for a more effective apportionment of such funds

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary shall give priority to the urgency of the need existing in the Nation's largest cities with high population density, while assuring the widest possible distribution of such assistance among the States."

H.R. 13699

A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the existing limit on the grant funds which may be expended thereunder in any one State, and to provide for a more effective apportionment of such funds

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 104(c) of the Clean Air Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In making grants under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the urgency of the pollution problem affecting the Nation's largest cities with high population density and extensive industrialization, while assuring the widest possible distribution of grant funds among the States."

THE ARMY ARSENAL SYSTEM AND THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY—SOME OF ITS HISTORY AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS—PART 3

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, following up on our promise to explore all facets of the decision to close the Springfield Armory, we want today to highlight for the RECORD some of the history and accomplishments of this great and historic Army facility.

Beginning in 1777, during the Revolutionary War in our struggle for independence, and throughout our military history ever since, the Springfield Armory has served as a major bulwark in the arsenals of democracy. In every national emergency, when our national security was threatened, the Springfield Armory has been there with the ready facilities and the immediate know-how to provide the essential small arms to our fighting men. Had not this facility existed at Springfield, it would have been necessary to have maintained its capabilities at some other point. Otherwise, we may very well have lost some of our wars, and history would have been quite different. The capabilities maintained at Springfield have never been and never will be maintained, in peacetime, as a part of the civilian economy. Without such facilities as Springfield, the art and technology of military small arms would have been lost during times of peace in the past. Our great concern now is for the future.

Please keep in mind that the primary function of the Army arsenal system has been to keep alive the know-how in the science of producing war materiel. This is to assure the existence of an available base of operations, during times of emergency requiring a large military buildup, which can both begin production and train personnel to establish and supervise the vast expansion of production facilities required to support a mobilization of the Nation's strength. There is no other sure and economical way to maintain and assure this essential capability in times of peace.

Getting back to the history of the Springfield Armory, this oldest of the arsenals was located at Springfield, Mass., originally because of the presence of a large number of skilled gunsmiths, blacksmiths, and craftsmen in that area. This general observation is still true today because the area readily accessible to Springfield is still a center for the supply and manufacture of small arms. Gen. Henry Knox, George Washington's top artillery officer, recommended the site. Later, General Washington visited the area and, in 1794, as President, recommended to the Third Congress that the Armory be established as a permanent Government arsenal. This was done by the Congress. As a military leader, President Washington recognized the need for developing a standardized military weapon and ammunition supply, which had been lacking during the Revolutionary War, with near disastrous results.

Mr. Speaker, following the Revolutionary War, as with most of our wars, almost all manufacturing of arms was stopped, but Springfield was retained as a storage depot. In 1795, however, with 40 people employed, the armory produced 245 muskets. As a production facility, the armory produced 276,000 rifles a year at the height of the Civil War; daily production of rifles was 1,500 during World War I; and during World War II more than 4 million Garand rifles were turned out for our fighting forces.

Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Armory has made a continuing contribution to the defense of this country during wars, but just as importantly, if not more importantly, in times of peace. This has been done by maintaining a mass production capability ready to go on a crash program basis, but, of even greater significance, first, by developing new weapons for manufacture by commercial producers, in times of emergency; and second, by keeping in being the capability for training key skilled personnel to man the plants of private industry as well as its own facilities for the mass production of weapons on a crash basis. The records are replete with armory accomplishments in this regard. And the best record for attesting to this has been military successes in all our wars.

Throughout its history and until this fateful order to close out Springfield, the armory has had the national mission of developing and manufacturing small arms, their components, accessories, and related equipment. During peacetime, the armory has conducted research, development, engineering, and pilot manufacturing to prepare, improve, and adapt the design and fabrication of assigned items for mass production. In every war the armory has had advance plans for industrial mobilization which were maintained in consultation with industry for mass producing required small arms in times of emergency. The recent buildup of our conventional Armed Forces and the current Vietnam war was no exception and the armory provided industry with the essential invaluable assistance to get production of small arms rolling. Now that industry is in production, camouflaged in the name of cost reduction, the armory is to be closed out, and even this shortsighted claim for cost reduction has been disproved. The cost reduction claim has been disproved but the closure order not yet forestalled. However, we will continue to do our best to rectify this mistake.

During its first few years of existence, from 1777 to 1780, the armory was called a laboratory with the function of preparing musket cartridges for distribution to Colonial troops. From 1781 to 1891, with all-out acceleration during times of war, the armory was assigned responsibility for evolving changes in weapons and the manufacture of those weapons for the troops. Shoulder weapons developed, improved, and produced during that century were the flintlock, the percussion with smooth bore, the percussion with rifled bore, and the breechloading rifle. Later the bolt action, the semiautomatic, and full automatic types of weapons were developed and produced. John C. Garand was one of the experts at the Springfield Armory kept working on weapon development during the lean years of the 1930's. We all know the results from the millions upon millions of M-1—Garand—rifles used during World War II and since.

Beginning in 1891, an experimental department was established at the armory. This was the forerunner of the modern research and development division. Thus, the modern era of research and development in small arms was begun. The armory was called upon to contribute to the mass production of these arms during each of the wars which have since been forced upon us.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years the armory has continued to be charged with the mission of developing, engineering, and manufacturing military small arms, including side arms, rifles, ground machineguns, automatic aircraft weapons, and related accessories. In addition to the design, fabrication, and testing of these weapons, the armory has had the function of assisting industry in the production of weapons, the development of better operating methods and technique, the initiation of pilot manufacturing to secure production knowledge, the development of cost data, specifications, and descriptions of modern manufacturing procedures. The armory is currently engaged in high-priority work in support of our troops in Vietnam which industry is unable to provide in time to meet schedules.

Some examples of the high-priority work being done at the armory, at the present time, are the following:

First. Manufacturing spare parts for the M-73 machinegun to bring this weapon into a state of readiness. An examining team from the weapons command had found these weapons in the hands of our troops not to be in a state of readiness. This work is progressing at the armory but will be finished by October 1966. The Defense Department has indicated that new commercial production lines will be established to take care of the wear out of this weapon. At what cost?

Second. Drum assemblies, the guts of the M-39 machineguns in use on ground support fighter planes in Vietnam, are in greater demand than the production capabilities of the armory can supply. The old production line for this machinegun and its supporting equipment in private industry has long been disassembled and in dry storage in a Government warehouse. With the expanding war in Vietnam, production of the entire machine may soon become necessary. Springfield is the only facility which could do this job without undue delay.

Third. The M-75 grenade launcher is in production at the armory until November 1966, when the Department of Defense says inventories will be great enough to meet demands until commercial production can catch up. Present indications are that commercial production may not meet the scheduled requirements and production at Springfield will need to be extended.

Fourth. The M-3 mount is in production at Springfield only and no commercial production is anticipated. It is expected that Springfield will supply all requirements before production ends.

Fifth. Springfield is producing 267 different types of repair part items, mostly of a job-shop variety and much of which is destined for Vietnam.

Sixth. Research and engineering at the armory on projects previously assigned such as the SPIW—special purpose infantry weapon—small-arms research, silent weapon systems, rapid-fire weapon systems, gun-type aerial weapons, F-111 gun pod development, and numerous helicopter weapon programs are going ahead as best as can be expected under the circumstances. In addition, the research and engineering division is working on technical data packages in support of many contracts for weapons and components. No new projects are assigned pending the ordered move to Rock Island so a static period for technological progress in the field of military small arms may be in the making.

These are just examples but they serve to show that the armory is still a very vital part of our war effort in South Vietnam.

THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is rare when an industrial institution is able to contribute to the social and spiritual welfare of a community on a par with the economic contribution it makes. Yet the history of the U.S. Armory in Springfield, Mass., is brilliant with such contributions.

The third in a series of articles appearing recently in the Gun Report magazine, entitled "The History of the Springfield Armory," written by Mr. C. L. Dvarecka, emphasizes some of the nonindustrial benefits and the wholesome, noneconomic impact, which this facility has brought to the city of Springfield and to the surrounding area.

This article also points up the great historical value of the armory's Benton Small Arms Museum as a repository of priceless relics and artifacts of America's turbulent and glorious past.

In this installment, author Dvarecka points up the armory's invaluable role during the Civil War in meeting the sudden, mortal needs of the embattled Union Armies; a role which the armory has assumed in every war in which the United States has been involved right down to our present conflict in Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent procedures, I include part 3 of the "History of the Springfield Armory" at this point in my remarks:

HISTORY OF THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY—PART 3

(By Christopher L. Dvarecka, information officer)

The armory's role as an influential social institution in the community is clearly evident when it is realized that most religious denominations established in Springfield were a direct outgrowth of the armory work community.

In 1811, the Baptists met occasionally for prayer and, by 1821, they managed to finance a small building located near the upper water shops.

The Methodists also organized near the upper water shops and in 1815, a society connected with the Tolland, Conn., circuit was reorganized under the ministry of William Marsh. In 1819 the armory hill shops area was added to the water shops sphere of influence and the minister preached alternately in Armory Chapel and at Methodist homes in the vicinity of the upper water shops. A new building was erected in 1844, and they finally abandoned the water shops meeting place.

The cradle of Episcopalianism in Springfield was the "U.S. Chapel"—a room on the second floor of the administration building at the armory. This area was set apart for religious purposes in 1817 by Lieutenant Colonel Lee. The chapel was dedicated in May of that year, but it was not until 1821 that the first rector was installed. Services were held here until 1838 when the place of worship was transferred to the town hall at the corner of State and Main Streets.

The first meeting of the Universalist Church in Springfield was held in 1827 in a chapel on the armory grounds in the office building called Government Chapel and later in Beacon Hall at the corner of State and Walnut Streets.

St. Michael's Cathedral on State Street is the outgrowth of meetings held in 1846 by the Roman Catholics of the town. For a few months they used Military Hall for their services and, early in 1847, they bought the then unoccupied Baptist Church building at the corner of Maple and Mulberry Streets. Their place of worship was later moved down to Union Street where it was christened St. Benedict's.

Armory superintendents in the period preceding the Civil War (1833 to 1860) were John Robb (1833–41), who was personally appointed to the post by President Andrew Jackson; Col. J. W. Ripley (1841–54); and Gen. James Whitney (1854–60).

During the superintendency of Colonel Ripley, construction of the main arsenal got underway. The building, long a Springfield landmark, was copied to some extent from the East India House in London, England. Construction began in 1846 and was completed in 1850.

The land in the rear of the main arsenal bordering on Byers Street and the lower tract along Pearl Street were purchased during Colonel Ripley's administration. Armory Square neatly laid out with walks and handsomely set with trees and shrubbery, can be attributed to the thought and care of Maj. Edward Ingersoll. Under his direction, the original landscaping of the grounds was done over a span of years. The work covered the tenures in office of several superintendents and commanding officers who were in charge during the major's 42 years' service as paymaster from 1840 to 1882.

When Sprinfigeld became a city in 1852, its adopted city seal included a view of the armory at that time. The complete seal pictures the city and, in the upper part of the seal, the main arsenal (building No. 13) appears just as it then existed and still exists to this day.

The imposing iron fence surrounding Armory Square was made from a supply of old iron cannon, some of which had seen service in the Revolutionary War. Work on the fence was begun in 1852 and completed about the close of the Civil War. Patterns for the fence were made at the water shops and practically all the casting was done at the Ames Foundry in Chicopee.

The city and the armory gained added national prominence in 1856 when "the Great National Horse Show" was staged in Federal Square. This was the first show of its kind in the United States and it attracted people from all over this country and Canada. Capt. George Dwight, who later served as commanding officer at the armory, was the chief marshal for the show.

It was during these years, 1843 to be exact, that Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, famous American poet, visited the armory. As the result of his visit, he penned a poem entitled "The Arsenal at Springfield."

After many years as a widower, Longfellow had married for a second time in July 1843. His bride was Miss Frances Appleton, the daughter of a prominent Boston merchant. As part of their honeymoon trip to various New England spots the couple came to this area to visit Mrs. Longfellow's relatives in Pittsfield. While passing through Springfield they decided to stop off and see the local arsenal.

It was Mrs. Longfellow's remark about how much the rifle stand in the middle arsenal resembled an organ that triggered Longfellow's poetic impulse. The arrangement of the shining gun barrels in a stand which covered the walls from floor to ceiling led to the opening lines of the poem: "This is the Arsenal. From floor to ceiling, like a huge organ, rise the burnished arms."

The middle arsenal off State Street where the organ was then located was built in 1830 for storage purposes and after the big fire of 1824 it is estimated that close to one-half million guns were stored there in several hundred racks of 2,000 rifles each. When this method of storing rifles became obsolete, someone fortunately remembered the great Longfellow's poem, and the Government ordered that one complete rack of rifles just as it was when Longfellow viewed it, be moved to the Armory Museum. It has proved a popular exhibit for many years.

At the Boston Tercentenary in 1930, the Longfellow legend was recalled to the minds of many when Springfield Armory was represented by two floats, one of which was a rifle organ composed of hundreds of "burnished arms" and glittering bayonets, swords, and other weapons. Brightly polished bolos and black bolos were used for the pedals of the organs. The first and last verses of Longfellow's poem were printed in large letters on both sides of the float.

The first percussion-lock musket appeared in 1837. At first, these weapons were modifications of previous models and, therefore, were all smoothbore. However, rifled flintlocks appeared in 1840 and this type of musket was used in the Mexican War.

Controversy exists as to definite models produced from 1837 to 1844, since the flintlock and percussion principles of ignition and the rifling of the bore were all involved. The percussion-type rifle musket appeared in 1842 and this date is established as the beginning of the percussion rifle era. Flintlock muskets dating back to 1821, were modified to percussion-type, and the manufacture of the flintlock was in progress until 1844, with modifications continuing until 1848. From this it is very likely that production of a completely new rifle did not seem justified until 1842, in view of the quantity of flintlocks available for modification. Records point to 1846 or 1847 as the date of adoption of the percussion lock by the Government. Manufacture of the percussion lock continued until 1855.

The model 1855, a tapelock musket referred to as the Maynard Primer, was the first issue of an all-new rifle of musket size. It began supplanting the smoothbore muskets in all branches of the service and no smoothbores were used after 1856. The 1855 model was used with good results by the Regular Army on the western and northwestern frontiers in engagements with the Indians. When the Civil War began, only about 40,000 rifles had been made and most of these had been distributed to the Army. Those remaining in stores were in use early in 1861, so that until the 1862 model made its appearance, the regulars and the volunteers used whatever arms could be procured either at home or abroad. Thus Enfields, "Austrians," "Belginas," flintlocks, fowling pieces—practically any gun that would carry a leaden ball when backed by powder, were used by the North when the Civil War began.

The advent of the American Civil War which marked with violence the first open economic and political conflict between the States was also a turning point in the overall administration of Springfield Armory. For it was the advent of the Civil War that really converted the Government to the policy of a military superintendency at Springfield Armory and also brought about the detailing of subordinate Ordnance Corps officers to the armory.

Shortly prior to the Civil War the old "civilian superintendency versus military command" controversy again cropped up (if it was ever buried) and caused much rancor in the town. Although the dispute was fairly well dispelled by the time the break between the States developed into open warfare, much bitterness existed and it forced the Government to take action for its own best interests.

This it did and, in 1861, the heads of Springfield Armory received the official designation of "commanding officer" and were chosen from the ranks of the military. Up to this time armory superintendents were mostly from civil life. From 1861 on, however, the men who have been at the armory's helm have all been officers of the Ordnance Corps.

Commanding officers in this period included: Col. I. H. Wright (1860–61); Capt. George Dwight (1861), a popular choice with the Springfield populace; Capt. Alexander Dyer (1861–64); and Maj. T. T. Laidley (1864–66).

A good deal of construction, particularly at the water shops, was carried out just prior to the Civil War. A new dam was built in this period and Mill Street was laid out along the canal. Buildings for forging, rolling, and other special operations were also completed about this time. In 1857, the lower and middle water shops were sold and all activities concentrated at the upper water shops. This is the site of the present water shops plant today.

Shortly prior to, and shortly after the beginning of hostilities, armory storage buildings at the hill and water shops were converted to manufacturing areas. During the Civil War period itself, what were known as the north and south shops and offices on the hill were united, and a third story was added to the entire structure. This building is the present-day main administration building. Several more buildings were erected at the hill and water shops in this period among which was a building used as a hardening shop and those for blacksmithing and farrier work.

Few notable additions of property have been made to the armory grounds since 1865; the only two of first-rate importance being the acquisition in 1870 of the stretch of land between Federal Square and St. James Avenue and the area known today as the Armory Railhead (off Page Boulevard), purchased a few years ago.

In the peak Civil War year of 1861, the armory employed 3,400 men and 276,000 arms were manufactured. It was in this year that the production was brought up to 1,000 muskets per day, 20 hours of the 24-hour day constituting the work day. When Fort Sumter was fired upon, about 1,000 guns were produced each month; 3 months later, this number was increased to 3,000 monthly; and gradually the output was increased until by 1864 1 day's production hit the 1,000 mark.

The Civil War also saw wages at the armory shoot sky high. In the 6 months between December 1863 and July 1864, the wage increase varied from 15 to 20 percent. A shortage of money repeatedly delayed payments to the workmen and led to some concern that workers might be lost. And, in fact, the labor turnover at the armory was high during this period. Labor pirating was widespread and the armory initiated drastic steps to prevent such worker losses. The draft of 1864 depleted the armory work force even more as several hundred workmen were called to the colors.

The 1861 model muskets appeared at the outbreak of the Civil War and were followed almost immediately by several other designs, all of which were based on the 1855 model. In general, the 1855 model, with modifications, was in vogue until 1873 when it was supplanted by the breech-loader. Modifications of the 1855 musket leading up to the 1873 model appeared in 1861, 1863, 1864, 1866, 1868, and 1870.

The percussion-type rifled musket, although in vogue only a few years, excelled all others in war service up to that time, since those years embraced the Civil War. This weapon, with various modifications, saw service in nearly every engagement from Fort Sumter in 1861 to the fall of Richmond in 1865. Furthermore, it saw service in both the Union and Confederate forces. No doubt, Appomattox saw some of these rifles stacked in surrender and others raised in salute. In addition, it played a part in settling the West as it was the weapon with which most of the troops west of the Mississippi were armed. It saw service at Wood Lake (1862), Whitestone Hill and Stony Lake (1863). It was with Commodore Perry at the opening of Japan in 1854 and at the Canton Forts in China in 1856. It was on the *Wyoming* at the fall of the Japanese batteries in 1863. It played a prominent part in the construction of the Union Pacific Railroad completed in 1869. Ironically enough, after years of service to the United States, its last appearance in an outstanding event in history was at the Custer massacre at the Little Big Horn in 1876.

The first breach-loading rifle with the firing pin in the block, appeared the year following the close of the Civil War in 1866.

In 1862 the Ordnance Office was apprised of a scheme to wreck Government munitions plants. Publication in the New York Times of a statement to the effect that the Springfield Armory could produce 25,000 rifled muskets each month, raised further fears for the safety of the plant. And, in 1864, an actual attempt to damage the main arsenal was made.

It happened one night that year when two men asked permission to climb to the top of the tower to see the panoramic view. The arsenal keeper, somewhat suspicious of the men, tried to discourage them. The strangers vociferously objected. "Not to go to the top of the world-renowned Springfield Arsenal when we are once in the building? Pooh. Of course we will take any amount of trouble, so as not to return home and say 'Yes, in Springfield we visited the armory, went through its workshops, saw the muskets in the arsenal, but did not think it worth the trouble to climb to the top of the tower.' No, we will go up, then we will be satisfied."

The two men then ascended the tower and, after a short stay up there, descended and left the grounds. A watchman on his night rounds later discovered a bundle wrapped in newspapers near the tower clock. He carried it downstairs and examined it. Deciding it presented some danger, he turned it over to his superiors.

The infernal machine was found to be made of iron covered with some substance which made the whole thing appear like a lump of anthracite coal, had a fuse, was hollow, and filled with powder. A pencilled inscription upon the newspaper wrapping indicated that the nocturnal visitors were from Canada and were undoubtedly sympathizers with the Confederate cause.

In itself, the bomb was harmless. What the men thought they could accomplish with such a homemade bomb remains a mystery.

Sabotage was one thing. However, it proved more difficult to ward off fires than to prevent destruction of the plant by the enemy. Constant vigilance maintained a fairly clear record until the summer of 1864 when two conflagrations broke out within 1 month. One blaze resulted in small damage. The second fire, however, resulted in the gutting of the polishing room at the hill shops during the evening of July 2, 1864. A spark from one of the polishing wheels or spontaneous combustion of emery dust, ignited the attic timbers and 280 feet of the building were destroyed before the flames were checked. The walls and the ground floor were saved, and the buiding was rebuilt at once.

The crisis of 1861 that began in Charleston Harbor and ended with the meeting of Generals Grant and Lee at Appomattox was echoed by the crisis facing Springfield Armory during these years. Much depended upon the armory as to the speed and dispatch with which the Union forces could be armed. The destruction of the Government's one other arsenal at Harper's Ferry in Virginia made the armory's load that much heavier. It is to the armory's credit—to its leaders and workmen—that it did not fail the Nation in its hour of need. This trait has since become traditional—a hallmark well placed in the annals of this country.

The enthusiastic, all-out effort which the armory contributed to the successful ending of the internecine warfare of the States, broke down any last vestige of restraint between the town and the plant. Since that time, the community has been a unit, economically and socially. The importance of the armory in the life of the city was now accepted by the whole populace.

As the city gradually attracted new and varied industries and outgrew its previous economic dependence upon the armory this installation assumed its position as the premier manufacturing center of the community. Young men entered the employ of the Federal service here for a lifetime of skilled service where their fathers had spent their own productive years. The constant succession of military executives enabled the permanent civilian staff to wield an influence rarely permitted to department heads in civilian life in those years.

The industrial revolution and progressive development in the Nation's capacity between 1840 and 1890 was strongly reflected at the armory. In this area, the armory during these years set the standard for working hours, employment conditions, and pay. It was a strong contributing factor in making Springfield the "city of homes"—a center of domesticity in contrast to the usual run of mill towns in other sections.

The idea of a repository for small arms at Springfield was first conceived by Col. J. G. Benton, commanding officer from 1866 to 1881. His idea eventually resulted in the establishment of an ordnance museum at the armory.

His first action along these lines appears to have been in 1866 in the form of a request to the Chief of Ordnance that specimens of small arms material reposing in the Washington Arsenal be furnished the armory for this purpose. The date of compliance with his request is not known. However, indications are that the museum was established about 1871.

Probably the original intention was to provide a museum for pieces representing only Springfield Armory manufacture. At least that was the idea presented to higher authority as old correspondence implies. The collection of rifles manufactured by individuals or by various contractors for the Government, including those of other government establishments, all of which were used by the Armed Forces at various times may or may not have been in Colonel Benton's mind at that time. However, he seized upon the opportunity presented by the Centennial Exposition held in Philadelphia in 1876 to further his plan. This exposition included samples of the progress made along mechanical lines throughout the world. Approximately 700 guns, representing not only the small arms manufacturers of this country, but those of the other leading nations were displayed. Through the efforts of Colonel Benton, this collection, almost in its entirety, was forwarded to the armory to constitute (with the addition of some rare guns already on hand) the permanent armory museum.

As time went on, the armory became the clearinghouse for all rifles having no further use, regardless of make, caliber, size, shape, or background with the result that the museum today represents, through the weapons exhibited, not only a complete picture of the activities of the armory from 1795 to date, but also gives a fairly accurate history of the small arms industry of the entire country. In addition, many weapons of foreign make, both modern and antique, have been added from time to time, and many other exhibits of related material have been collected for display. The armory museum today constitutes one of the most complete exhibitions of small arms in the world.

In 1866, the U.S. Army adopted the breech-loading gun with the firing pin in the block. The first of these guns were converted from the caliber .58 rifles of the previous decade. Improvement on these rifles was constant until 1873 when the caliber was reduced to .45 in a new model arm which became known the world over as the Springfield rifle. For nearly 20 years this rifle was the undisputed monarch among military arms. Its near approach to perfection seems to have resulted from a combination of favorable conditions. In the first place, the military superintendency, now well established, enabled armory officers to undertake and carry out long-term experiments. The whole period between 1866 and 1903 is notable for the amount and variety of experimentation which was carried out at the armory. The practice of convening boards of ordnance at the armory became habitual, and there was a long succession of them, working in cooperation with local armorers.

The activity was stimulated by the alert and expert fostering of Colonel Benton, who was, more than any other person, the "father of the Springfield rifle in 1873." Finally, when the armory might have been satisfied with its product and become complacent, a series of patent suits arose to thwart any such attitude. These actions, however unpleasant, spurred the armory to even higher quality work in order to avoid infringements upon the inventions of private individuals. It was this fine Springfield rifle which is generally credited with bringing about modern target practice. The establishment of the Creedmoor competition in 1873 was not accidental, but was a direct result of the new Springfield firearm.

Once a satisfactory breech-loading gun was in common use, its greater firepower over the muzzle-loading type urged still further improvements, and before the model of 1873 had been placed in the hands of all the troops a number of inventors had laid before the Ordnance Department models for magazine guns. Beginning in 1878, a long series of experiments on the relative merits of these weapons led to the adoption in 1892 of the Krag Jorgensen system. It marked the first time since the adoption of the French Charleville musket that a completely non-American model was adopted by the American Army. It involved a reduction of the caliber to .30—plans for which had been in the works since 1887, adoption of a new rear sight devised at the armory, and the use of a jacketed bullet with a charge of smokeless nitroglycerine powder.

Production output in these years was not too great. The output of the armory has varied in accordance with the amount of the annual appropriations for the manufacture of arms. When new models have been on the point of adoption, the number of arms made has usually dropped.

Actually, the Springfield 1873 model rifle, with modifications up to 1888, probably saw less service in point of engagements than any other type up to that time. Trouble with the Apaches (1883) and the Sioux Indian War (1890) probably saw some of these models in action, especially the 1873 carbine. Improvements on the 1873 rifle came rather rapidly, with the result that the 1873 model was superseded by other models, commonly referred to as the "45-70" system, which was in vogue until the appearance of the bolt-action rifle.

In June 1877, records show the transfer to Springfield Armory of about 30 enlisted men of the Ordnance Department from Rock Island, Frankford, Washington, Alleghany, and Watertown Arsenals to Springfield Armory. This contingent comprised the nucleus of a new military post detachment that existed here for many years.

In 1883, two members of the Bull family, a family group with a long and distinguished record of armory service, were members of a Massachusetts rifle team which accepted an invitation from England to fire a five-match international contest which was won by the American team. The Bull family's connection with the armory started in 1860 and only ended in recent years.

The hill shops area (today's three central buildings—101, 102, and 103) were constructed during the years 1887-90. The completion of the hill shops in 1890 signaled the fact that steam has become the principal source of power for the armory plant.

In April 1891, the experimental department of the armory—the forerunners of today's R. & E. division—was organized to carry out experiments in connection with small arms and ammunition. In past years, such work had been undertaken only on special orders. The move necessitated the employment of regular personnel in this field. In addition to the establishment of an experimental department, the proving of all small arms and ammunition used by the United States was also assigned to the armory in this period. Throughout this latter period—1881 to 1892—Lt. Col. A. R. Buffington served as commanding officer of the Springfield Armory.

In the year 1892 the National Armory at Springfield became the Springfield Armory—the name by which it is known throughout the world today.

Although Springfield weapons saw limited service in the years following the Civil War in 1898 the period of comparative peace was broken by the destruction of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor.

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY CAN SAVE IT FROM CERTAIN DEATH

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. **GUBSER**. Mr. Speaker, this is a story that may be happening in each of my colleagues' congressional districts just as it is happening in mine at this moment.

This is the story of the poverty program in Santa Clara County, Calif., as it is operated through the Economic Opportunity Commission. It is a story of grandiloquent promises to the poor which excited their hopes; a story of wrangling and jousting for the political power which goes with the right to disburse Federal taxpayers' money; and a story of dismal failure which has currently bogged down in bickering and dissension that ignores the needs of the poor. It is a sad story of hundreds of sincere and well-meaning citizens from all walks of life; including Republicans and Democrats, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, dozens of the clergy and others who have joined together in sincerity to try to make the poverty program work, and the story of how many of them have left it in frustration, disappointment, and disgust as they saw experienced, well-trained leftwing extremists of Santa Clara County move in to dominate the program and subvert it to their own purposes.

The story began with the formation of the Economic Opportunity Commission in Santa Clara County. It was a nonprofit corporation, answerable to no Government body, but empowered to accept and to spend about $2 million in Federal taxpayers' funds this year and probably $4 million next year.

At first the commission was to be broadly based. Five mayors from one section of the county were all told that each of their cities would have representation on the Economic Opportunities Commission. The board of supervisors of the county was to be included, the chamber of commerce, the Taxpayers Association, various church groups, labor groups, and the Farm Bureau. It was to be a broadly based and representative commission.

But then the rules were changed and the representation in the base was narrowed. Only one of the five mayors that were promised a seat got that seat, and other groups were asked to combine their representation into one person instead of having several. And about this time control passed to a small group instead of being vested in a broad-based, diversified group.

The Economic Opportunity Commission in Santa Clara County was ripe for a takeover by the leftwing extremists, the types who are always around to use every honest social program as a vehicle to build their own political power and prestige. And the ripe fruit fell into the waiting hands of Santa Clara County's leftwing extremists.

It all started with a plot to discharge a man by the name of Arthur Potts, who was the highly paid director of the Economic Opportunities Commission. Potts was a good administrator, but he was not adept at public relations and he could not work with the many fine Mexican-American groups who were an important part of the program.

These groups of Mexican-Americans, for reasons which I believe were valid, and in a proper manner, sought the dismissal of Mr. Potts. The struggle continued for weeks, with the program in a turmoil, and very little, if any, thought being given to the poor. The leftwing extremists, who always thrive upon turmoil and chaos, used the controversy to infiltrate into positions of power.

The decision to fire Mr. Potts is not the important issue. Actually, it was only the vehicle upon which the leftwing extremists rode to power. During the fiasco, the chamber of commerce withdrew its representation, not wanting to lend its name to commission activity. The Taxpayers Association did likewise. And the Economic Opportunity Commission president, a very well respected medical doctor, Dr. Stanley Skillicorn, broke a long silence to denounce the leftwing conspiracy and takeover.

Many other reputable citizens spoke out.

At this point I charged that the leftwing extremists had taken the program over and I asked for a complete investigation by Federal officials and a freeze of Federal taxpayers' funds until the mess was straightened out. Immediately I was accused of being anti-Mexican-American and against the poor, all of which is absolutely false.

I suspect that such charges were merely smokescreens to direct attention away from the charge I had made that leftwing extremists were attempting to take the program over. I voted against the Economic Opportunity Act when it was considered on the floor of this House of Representatives. I did so because I feared that it was hastily conceived, politically motivated, and was susceptible to the very thing which is happening today in my own congressional district. Time has borne me out.

But this Economic Opportunity Act is now the law of the land and, frankly, I would like to see it succeed, because its objectives are fair and honest.

So I have asked Mr. Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, to conduct a complete investigation of the situation in Santa Clara County, part of which is in my congressional district.

Although many persons do not want funds to be frozen pending outcome of the investigation—and perhaps they are right—most sincere persons in the area welcome the idea of an investigation and want it and have asked for it. For example, the Interfaith Committee on Social Justice, which is opposed to freezing funds, is strongly in favor of a complete, comprehensive, and thorough investigation of the Economic Opportunity Commission in Santa Clara County. So is the chamber of commerce, the Taxpayers Association, and individual members of the county board of supervisors, with whom I have talked. Individual members of city councils across my congressional district have expressed approval. The present Acting Director of the Economic Opportunity Commission would welcome an investigation.

I have received more than 100 telegrams within the last 4 or 5 days supporting my request for such an investigation.

Yet, since my request was made to Mr. Sargent Shriver on last Wednesday, I have heard nothing at all from him. But the criticism of the Economic Opportunity Commission is not ended. In fact, it is gathering impetus.

This morning's San Jose Mercury, one of the largest newspapers of central California, published the first of a four-part series by its very distinguished and respected political reporter, Mr. Harry Farrell. Mr. Farrell has thoroughly and objectively studied the Economic Opportunities Commission for a long time in Santa Clara County. I believe it would be useful to read his article, which was printed this morning, into the RECORD at this point. The headline is "A $4 Million Political Plum, Extremists Grab for Rich Poverty Pot":

Santa Clara County's war on poverty is a sitting duck, ready to be picked off by any band of schemers—left, right, or otherwise—

with perseverance and a talent for infiltration.

It is a tree laden with a potential $4 million worth of political plums, within the easy grasp of self-serving opportunists.

It is a jerry-built structure, erected on shifting political sands, to house a program which has a worthy aim. It is a centaurian agency—part public, part private—using Government money but subject only to a modicum of normal governmental safeguards.

It is run like a football game with an unlimited substitution rule, and a change of rules at the end of every quarter.

The great majority of the people in its paid and unpaid ranks are well motivated and sincere.

But it is also shot through with leftwingers—people who are not run-of-the-mill liberals but hardnosed activists of every leftist cause that has come along over the past half dozen years.

These are the FBI picketers, the get-out-of-Vietnam marchers, the ban-the-bomb boys, the dodge-the-draft set, the Stanton for assembly campaign architects, the apologists for Castro's Cuba, the admit-Red-China crowd, the four-letter-word enthusiasts, the foes of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the civil disobedience advocates.

The local antipoverty war has also been penetrated by the hard core of the rightwing.

Last December when John Birch Society section leader Ray Gurries was elected as a Gardner district poverty representative on the Economic Opportunity Commission, about half of the 34 votes he received were cast by his fellow Birchers. This is confirmed by a confidential source within the society. The Birch members, along with other militant conservatives, had been rounded up for the EOC election meeting via a telephone campaign. This was not essentially a Birch project, but involved a wide range of rightwingers.

In the wake of the recent forced resignation of EOC Director Arthur Potts, there have been charges that it was engineered by a small group of unnamed conspirators. Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER, Republican, of Gilroy, has called them a "leftwing clique."

There have been other public declarations that Potts was ousted by "the Mexican Americans." There has been talk, too, of an EOC staff revolt.

Finally, in answer to all such statements, the committee representing religious interests in the EOC held a press conference to proclaim that it had a part in deposing Potts, too, along with labor groups and EOC area service center officials.

In all these statements which are not necessarily contradictory, there are elements of truth.

The most valid generalization that can be made, based on evidence from widely diverse sources, is that Potts was forced out of office by a coalition which included Mexican Americans, church leaders, labor leaders, "palace revolt plotters."

Among these "others," in any truthful account, must be included the recognized leftwing establishment of Santa Clara County. Indeed there is a mass of evidence that the leftwing acted as the catalyst in Potts' downfall.

The most obvious manifestation of this evidence came at the EOC meeting of February 3, when the machinery for Potts' removal was set in motion. Significantly, the man who offered the first motion to fire him, by secret ballot, was Fred Hirsch, interim EOC delegate from South Central San Jose.

Who is Fred Hirsch?

A plumber by vocation, he has also been among the most vocal leftwing agitators in San Jose at least since 1960. Within the California Democratic Council he has advocated admission of Red China to the United Nations. He signed a 1960 newspaper ad assailing the HUAC. He was a member of the original San Jose Committee To Oppose U.S. Intervention in Vietnam." He was a bitter critic of the Kennedy administration when it got tough with Cuba. He bombarded newspapers with letters denouncing fallout shelters, when such denunciation was the pet project of the leftists in 1962. He ran the campaign that first elected leftwing assemblyman William F. Stanton the same year. He was a key organizer of the 3-day SNICK-CORE vigil outside the San Jose FBI office a year ago, demanding FBI intervention in the Selma, Ala., civil rights uprising. He is an expert picket-line organizer often showing up with a bull horn in the role of top sergeant. When Potts fired EOC staffer Edgar Cumings for insubordination January 28, a hostile picket line showed up outside the EOC office within a few hours, with Hirsch marshaling the troops.

The 25th Assembly District Democratic Club, recognized as the strongest bastion of the leftwing in the party hereabouts, was organized in Hirsch's home at a Stanton victory party, December 1, 1962.

Mexican-American leaders say they used Hirsch as their spokesman in their ouster of Potts because of his skill in parliamentary maneuvering. At the February 3 meeting his skill was supplemented by that of John Thorne, another recognized leader of the left, here and statewide. From the floor, Thorne jousted with EOC Chairman Stanley Skillicorn, pushing for action against Potts, and came forward at least once to counsel with Commissioner Hirsch while the meeting was in progress.

Thorne also signed the 1960 anti-HUAC ad and was also one of the original 14 members of the San Jose Committee Opposing U.S. Involvement in Vietnam. A year ago, when Stanton was under fire for asking Konni Zilliacus, a leftwinger in the British Parliament, to intervene against U.S. policy in Vietnam, Thorne sponsored a two-column newspaper advertisement supporting Stanton's position. Among its signers were at least 20 persons directly or indirectly involved in the current EOC skirmishing.

Currently, Thorne is the lawyer for two San Jose State College students, Phil Whitten and Dave Hanna, who are suing the U.S. Secret Service because they were bodily thrown out of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY's luncheon at the University of Santa Clara last December.

Whitten and Hanna, along with several other students, including Ira Meltzer and John Hansen, constituted the staff of the New Student, a rabble-rousing off-campus paper at San Jose State. Until it suspended publication recently, it specialized in anti-Vietnam propaganda and four-letter words.

In 1963 Hansen and two other members of the State college peace group were arrested for tearing down civil defense shelter signs (32 of these were found in their car) and pleaded guilty to petty theft. Last year Hansen ran for San Jose State student body president on the oddball platform of abolishing intercollegiate sports and providing easy access to contraceptive information.

For 2 months last summer he earned poverty war money on a work-study assignment to the Santa Clara County Boy Scout Council.

But Hansen is most interesting in his role as literary editor of the New Student—the person to whom its poetry contributors were advised to submit their efforts. One such contributor, whose works have created quite a sensation on the Spartan campus, is Emitt Wallace. His prize opus ran last January 17 and was titled "Magna Cum Lyndon." It was a savage attack on President Johnson, in gutter language, built around an allegorical act of sex perversion in Vietnam.

In last November 10 edition of the New Student, Wallace had a 33-line prose poem called "Free Speech, Babe," which cannot be printed in a family newspaper, but contained the well-known barracks' words for copulation, vagina, breasts, excrement, et cetera.

San Jose State College records indicate that Poet Wallace was hired under the antipoverty work study program last February 14 as a ward aid at the county hospital. He gets $2.50 an hour.

Hansen's wife, Anita, is also employed under the work study program, earning $2 an hour on assignment to the Family Service Association. She is the daughter of Joe Graham, also known as Morris Graham, who in 1960 took the fifth amendment before the HUAC when asked whether he was section organizer for the Communist Party in the Bay Area. Two years ago Graham became a storm center in the 25th District Democratic Assembly primary when Stanton's challenger, John McEnery, charged he was working for Stanton.

Meltzer, whose name topped the New Student editorial board, is a San Jose State sponsor of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), a group which fights the draft, and counseled with Roger Lette before his abortive draft-card burning stunt on the campus last October. For a period last month, Meltzer was working on a work study assignment to the Peninsula School in Menlo Park. He was supposed to be a laborer, but listed his occupation as "tutor."

Another San Jose State student drawing work study money is Jim Shaw, who organized an SDS bus trip to Berkeley for the Vietnam Day Committee's march into Oakland last November 20.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to make it known that immediately following these remarks, I will welcome all male representatives of the press and all male Members of the Congress in my office, to view the full text of these poetic efforts rendered by these employees of the poverty program in Santa Clara County. I would like to make them available so that all male members of the press, and all male Members of the Congress can see what Mr. Farrell was talking about in his news article.

It is disgusting, and it is shocking that a person who would write such perverted poetry defaming the President of the United States should be allowed to earn taxpayers' money in the war on poverty program.

Mr. Speaker, I make no blanket accusation against all people connected with the poverty program. Most of them—the overwhelming majority of them—are decent, honest, well-motivated, hardworking, good people. Many of them are wonderful, fine clergymen. But, perhaps because their political instincts have not been sharpened with experience, they just do not see the subtlety of the leftwing takeover which is occurring before their very eyes.

Most in the Economic Opportunity Commission are, as I have said, good, honest, decent, well-motivated, dedicated people. Only a few are contaminating the work of this commission with leftwing extremism.

There is much that is good in the poverty program, and this is true in Santa Clara County. The Headstart program has been a magnificent success;

so has the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is just getting started. This is true of the basic English class for those who do not speak English. The program administered by our local public schools is working and it is getting better.

But the community action program will never work unless support for it is broadly based. It must come from businessmen, from labor, from the professions, from the clergy, from our academic people, from the poor, from all ethnic groups, and all political groups of both parties. It must come from everywhere. Unless it is so broadly based, it has no chance whatsoever for the public acceptance which is necessary for its success.

But this base will not ever exist if the program is used as a tool by the leftwing extremists. How can the substantial of any community whose cooperation is so necessary if the poverty program is to succeed be expected to join in this work if it becomes a haven for known leftists, beatniks, and writers of obscene and sick poetry and prose that denounces much which is basic to Americanism?

We face certain defeat in the war on poverty in Santa Clara County unless we have a full-scale investigation which exposes what is happening and unless we clean up the program by taking the power away from leftists. Unless we do this we will not influence sound, substantial, and constructive people to remain active in it.

Far from wanting to kill the poverty program, I am trying to save it from certain death.

Once again I call upon Mr. Sargent Shriver to investigate the manner in which millions of Federal money which is derived from the U.S. taxpayers and comes from the Office of Economic Opportunity is being spent in Santa Clara County.

Mr. Shriver should not fear the truth, because only the light of truth will point the way toward bringing our local program out of the rut which is leading it to failure and put it on a path which will guide it to success.

For the sake of the poor whose hopes we have built up and whose expectations are being bludgeoned to bits by the conduct of the Economic Opportunity Commission in Santa Clara County, we must have a complete, thorough, unbiased, and honest investigation which seeks the truth.

ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, we who believe in the concept of helping the poor find their way out of the debris of despair are dismayed by the lavish spending and waste that have blocked the effectiveness of the present war on poverty. It is especially disheartening to see the great potential that lies within the antipoverty concept spend itself in needless bureaucratic confusion.

The time for this senseless spending to cease is long past. The administration's war on poverty is no longer in its infancy and the time for target practice is over. The program should be zeroed-in and hitting its mark. But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this does not appear to be the case.

Proponents of the administration's war on poverty would have us believe that the waste and abuses have stopped. They have not stopped, Mr. Speaker, and they should not have occurred in the first place. But we must be realistic. We must face facts. And the facts are that these incidents did occur—and at great expense to the weary taxpayer—and we must now do something to correct these wrongs before a great idea dies for want of proper guidance and implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully relate the case of the Job Corps enrollee who was enlisted at his home in Wisconsin and assigned to a Job Corps center only 90 miles away from his hometown.

Under these circumstances there appeared to be no problem, save the minor one of transporting the enrollee the 90 miles to his assigned Job Corps center. But not so. The wheels of bureaucracy began to grind and here is what came out at the end.

Before reaching his destination, the enrollee's travels spanned 2 days and more more than 400 miles. He had to be put up for the night and fed two meals, changed planes three times, took a bus ride and ultimately a car ride; all paid for with Federal funds.

The trip from Rhinelander, Wis., to Clam Lake Job Corps Center could have been much quicker and cheaper—$35—by taxicab, as the Job Corps was advised by its recruiting agency, the Wisconsin State Employment Service. The final touch of irony was that a free ride could have been secured for the enrollee with a Forest Service radio operator who travels daily from Rhinelander to Park Falls, Wis., which is very near Clam Lake.

The director of the Clam Lake Job Corps Center admitted that the route was a bit "circuitous." Here's the "circuitous" 2-day itinerary of the enrollee for February 4–5, 1966:

February 4, 11:20 a.m., departed Rhinelander, Wis., via North Central Airlines; 12:53 p.m., arrived Duluth, Minn.; 1:10 p.m., departed Duluth, Minn.; 1:55 p.m., arrived Minneapolis, Minn.; the enrollee spent the night in Minneapolis, where housed at a YMCA and given meal tickets by the Job Corps. February 5, 1 p.m., departed Minneapolis, Minn., via Zephyr Bus Lines; 5:25 p.m., arrived in Cable, Wis., where he was met by a car from Clam Lake Job Corps Center.

The young Job Corps enrollee traveled a total distance of 245 miles by air, 160 miles by bus, and a short distance by car to reach his final destination, which, before he got caught up in the Job Corps planned travel program, was only 90 miles away from his home. I feel that examples such as this case cannot help but raise serious fears that the Job Corps is long on planning and short on action and results.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a critic of this administration's war on poverty by choice but rather by conscience. I have long supported the concept of training young men in an environment away from home if such is needed. As far back as 1961, my colleague, the gentleman from New York, CHARLES GOODELL, and I offered legislation built on this concept of the Job Corps.

Let me call to the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the Quie-Goodell opportunity crusade is structured solely for the purpose of offering more effective implementation of sound antipoverty ideas. I strongly feel that this bill would correct the bureaucratic confusion and poor planning that is presently clogging the machinery of the war on poverty.

BLACKBIRD PROBLEM RECEIVES ATTENTION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, today the Department of Interior has announced the results of its study into the problem of blackbird and starling destruction of agricultural crops. This report is a comprehensive one, and I will be pleased to join in the introduction of legislation to implement their findings. The Interior Department does not have funds for the control of these birds, but it is my hope that the Congress will respond to this urgent need.

This report was prepared by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. James T. McBroom was very helpful in focusing attention on this problem. In my own section of Ohio the damage to crops by blackbirds has been very serious. Leadership has been given by Doyle Ditmars, of Holmesville, and Clayton Oyler, of Hebron, who have vividly presented the story of this menace to the farmer. North central Ohio has been particularly hard hit by blackbirds, and several Congressmen, including myself, asked the Agriculture and Interior Departments to investigate. I am including their report with these remarks.

Dr. John Stackhouse, director of the Ohio Department of Agriculture, took the lead in this issue, and the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center in Wooster studied the problem. Dr. Maurice L. Giltz prepared an excellent report on the nature and extent of the blackbird threat, which is also included with these remarks. The Ohio Farm Bureau played a very active part. Dean W. Simeral, associate director of public affairs of the farm bureau, also serves as chairman of the Ohio Coordinating Committee for the Control of Depredating Blackbirds, which is made up of representatives of many organizations and agencies of State government that are vitally concerned with this problem. In the Wayne and Holmes Counties area, a Bye Bye Blackbird Association was set up to seek collective action against the blackbird, the source of great economic loss to the farmers of that particular section. All in all, many of us have striven for an answer to this problem, and we now feel that we are ready to ask the Congress for assistance.

One hurdle seems to be solved. Great concern has centerd around the Migratory Bird Treaty Act with Canada. The Interior Department has determined that title 50—Wildlife and Fisheries provides ample latitude to handle this situation. Even though depredating blackbirds, cowbirds, and grackles are covered under the treaty, section 16, part 22, allows the killing of the various species of blackbirds when found committing or about to commit serious depredations upon ornamental shade trees or agricultural crops. Mr. McBroom made the following statement in a March 7, 1966, letter to me in response to my inquiry:

> We interpret these regulations to be significantly liberal to cause no problems to those farmers desiring to kill these birds in agricultural areas. We do not believe present regulations require changes to provide authority to control birds.

It is now evident that we can provide an effective Federal-State program to combat this threat to our agricultural products if we can succeed in getting an appropriation of approximately $1 million for control purposes. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the other Members of this body will join in this worthwhile effort to help the farmer do something that he cannot do himself. It will be a good investment in conservation and our natural resources, and I pledge my earnest endeavors to secure the passage of this legislation which Congressman Mosher and I will introduce.

The reports follow:

Appendix I

Some Blackbird and Starling Problems in the United States and Proposals To Deal With Them

(By the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Washington, D.C., March 1966)

FOREWORD

The great mass of the American people enjoy this Nation's native bird life, and our many species of birds provide countless hours of wholesome enjoyment as a part of the American resource heritage.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shares this interest. Beyond this, the Bureau has a conservation and management responsibility, particularly for waterfowl, but also including other birds, including game and nongame species. On occasion, however, for reasons described later in this report, native and introduced species get out of hand and it becomes necessary to manage a population to protect human health and safety, rural and urban facilities and the interests of the agricultural segment of the economy.

Problems have developed in certain localities of the Nation as a whole but with major attention focused on Ohio, because of serious blackbird depredations, especially to corn. As a result of this, Congressman Charles A. Mosher, and other responsible officials in Ohio, have expressed concern, and Congressman Mosher has "urgently requested" a report on the bird depredation problem over the Nation as a whole, together with steps that might be taken to alleviate the situation, including cost estimates. Since Congressman Mosher made his initial request, similar inquiries have been received from Congressman Morton, of Maryland, Congressmen Ashbrook, Latta, and Moeller, of Ohio, Dr. John Stackhouse, Director of the Ohio Department of Agriculture, and from the American Farm Bureau.

This report has been prepared as a service so that Congressman Mosher and others will be advised of the bird depredation problem and possible avenues to solution.

The report represents the results of a quick survey undertaken to comply with the requests noted above. It does not represent a comprehensive study of the national bird-damage problem and the resources used to cope with this problem.

I. INTRODUCTION

For convenience of discussion, a number of species of birds are lumped in the blackbird-starling grouping. The species whose numbers comprise about four-fifths of the grand total are the red-winged blackbird (Agelaius phoeniceus), starling (Sturnus vulgaris), common grackle (Quiscalus quiscula), and brown-headed cowbird (Mologhrus ater). Other species, together contributing the remaining fifth of the total, include the rusty blackbird (Euphagus carolinus), Brewer's blackbird (Euphagus cyanocephaulus), yellow-headed blackbird (Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus), boat-tailed and bronzed cowbird (Tangavius aeneus).

The starling is a European bird bearing the scientific name of Sturnus vulgaris. It was first successfully introduced by well-intentioned individuals into the United States in Central Park, New York City. On March 6, 1890, 80 birds were released and on April 25, 1891, an additional 40. From these early importations, the birds have now become continentwide in distribution. They now number in the scores of millions.

Blackbirds have always posed agricultural problems of one kind or another, but damage complaints have increased greatly in recent years. During the late 1940's only small flocks of starlings were observed on the west coast of the United States; about one-half billion blackbirds are now estimated to be present in the continental United States. While they are scattered throughout all the States, the largest winter concentrations are found in the lower Mississippi Valley.

During spring and fall months, starlings and blackbirds feed on a wide variety of fruits, vegetables, and cereal grains. Blackbird damage to corn is particularly severe throughout the Middle Atlantic States, the Great Lakes region, and in Florida. An equally serious problem occurs in rice and grain sorghum fields of Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Louisiana. Starling consumption of small fruits is becoming increasingly serious in various parts of the country, particularly in western New York, Michigan, Washington, Arizona, and California.

Large flocks of starlings gather at livestock feedlots where they not only consume but also contaminate great quantities of grain. It is suspected—but as yet uncertain—that they play a role in the spread of livestock diseases. In addition to blackbirds and starlings, finches, crows and English sparrows also draw the wrath of farmers. Although relatively few species are involved, the damage caused by them is widespread and of great economic significance.

II. NATURE AND EXTENT OF LOSSES AND DAMAGE

Agricultural losses

The total economic losses attributable to birds have not been accurately determined but they have been estimated to be between $50 and $100 million annually. Reports recently received from field offices of this Bureau indicate total damage by birds, other than game birds, of about $58 million annually.

Losses caused by birds in New Jersey have been estimated at $2½ to $4 million annually, with corn damage being the major item. Estimated losses in New York, on the basis of incomplete reports, were comparable to those in New Jersey, with damage reported to orchards, vineyards and corn. Arkansas' rice losses have reached nearly $1½ million. California reports an almost $8 million annual loss from bird damage, extending over one-half million acres of crops.

In Ohio, annual losses from birds are predicted at about $1 million annually, principally in cornfields. One report from Ottawa County showed a loss in corn of somewhat more than $100,000 in that county alone. Dr. Maurice L. Giltz, of the Ohio State University, recently reported that the value of corn sold for cash in that State, subject to damage by red-wing blackbirds, is estimated at $15 million annually. In addition, corn subject to damage and used as feed amounts to many additional millions. He also reported that many large sums are spent by farmers in an attempt to prevent the destruction of their crops. These efforts, in spite of the outlay, have been only partially successful. A recent survey conducted by Dr. Giltz indicates that an average of somewhat more than $5 per acre is spent to prevent destruction of the crop in those Ohio counties which experience persistent depredations. In addition to the direct damage to grain in the soft or milky stage, bird pecking is responsible for additional damage from molding, rotting, sprouting on the cob, and general failure of the grain to mature when direct damage reaches a critical degree.

Last year conventions of 15 Farm Bureaus passed resolutions urging assistance with bird problems. The American Farm Bureau Federation, at its national meeting in Chicago, Ill., on December 16, 1965, passed the following resolution, on which that organization is now acting:

"*Wildlife pests*

"Blackbirds, starlings, and similar pests are causing serious damage to crops and property in many areas. They are a hazard to aviation and a carrier of diseases to humans as well as livestock.

"This problem is increasing over a wide geographic area. Intensive research efforts at State and Federal levels and prompt use of all practical recommendations and methods to eradicate these pests are fully justified.

"We recommend an action program under authorized personnel to control wildlife pests. Adequate funds should be made available to the Department of the Interior for this program."

The Colorado Department of Agriculture conducted a starling survey in 1963. Of the 400 respondents reporting, 32 percent stated they had no problem, 45 percent had a slight problem and 23 percent have a major problem. They also predicted that the problem would become more serious in the future.

In 1962, 580 livestock operators in the north-central States were contacted through a random selection by county agents. Sixty percent of those returning questionnaires indicated that starlings were a problem in their feeding operations during the winter months. Forty-six percent of those replying reported appreciable consumption and contamination of livestock feed by starlings.

A similar questionnaire in Missouri yielded generally similar results. From 100 reponses, 55 percent reported that starlings were bothering their feeding operations during the winter months. Of those reporting starling damage, 48 percent reported an appreciable consumption and contamination of livestock feed. The information is significant because the response from the counties and feeders contacted was far greater than experienced in most surveys. It indicates much concern with the starling problem.

The October 1964 issue of the American Fruit Grower magazine states that growers in southwestern Michigan reported annual losses of about $2¼ million worth of fruit from starling damage. Blueberry and cherry growers bore the brunt of the loss. The Journal of Economic Entomology, volume 51, No. 1, in an article titled "Some Factors Influencing the Infestation in Corn in the Field by the Rice Weevil," states:

"The main predisposing factor which influenced rice weevil infestations in the field in this study was bird damage to the husk. Corn earworm damage alone was responsible for approximately 15 percent of the total damage, whereas the birds were responsible for 63 percent. The remainder of the damage was attributed to normal inherent characteristics of the corn."

In a letter to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife dated April 1965, Dr. George W. Cornwell, extension wildlife and outdoor recreation specialist of the Agricultural Extension Service, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, stated:

"Undoubtedly our $20 million estimate (of bird losses in Virginia) is conservative. Serious losses occur in poultry operations, fruit orchards, sprouting corn, ripening corn, grain sorghum, livestock feedlots, grain storage, seed storage, manufacturing plants, warehouses, homes, backyard gardens, horticultural plantings, truck crops, peanut fields, forest plantations, contamination of buildings, aircraft damage and many others."

Birds and aircraft

National attention on bird hazard to aircraft was brought into sharp focus following the tragic crash of a commercial jet airliner at Logan Airport in Boston, Mass., on October 4, 1960, with a loss of 62 lives. Since that time, a number of military jet aircraft have struck birds, causing a serious threat to human life and repair costs of considerable magnitude to the Department of Defense.

This problem is multiplied each time a new jet aircraft is used or an airport is opened to jet aircraft. Cost of repair averages more than $10,000 per engine and may often reach $50,000. If the plane must be replaced, somewhat more than a million dollars may be involved. In fiscal year 1965, records compiled by the Bureau from data submitted by the Air Transport Association and the military revealed a total of 1,030 bird strikes. Of this number, 398 involved civilian aircraft and 632 involved military planes (Navy and Air Force).

Birds in cities

Almost every large city has its bird problems, principally with starlings, pigeons, and sparrows. This type of damage receives considerable publicity. An example is the spraying of the parade route in Washington during presidential inaugurations. Thousands of dollars are spent each year on ineffective control and sanitation operations. Recent reports indicate that the starling problem is becoming increasingly severe in west coast cities as well as in the East and the Midwest. There is a tremendous demand for effective methods of preventing roosting of birds on ledges of buildings.

III. RESEARCH

Research in this field conducted by the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife centers around five main approaches: (1) inhibitors of reproductive capabilities (birth control); (2) management of birds around airports; (3) management of birds, particularly blackbirds and starlings destructive to crops or in feed lots; (4) management of starlings in urban areas; and (5) discovery and development of chemical compounds toxic to birds but relatively safe to mammals, both wild and domestic. Summaries of these activities are contained in the following paragraphs.

Inhibitor of reproduction: A compound coded as U-11, 555A was shown to inhibit egg laying in gulls for several days, both in laboratory and field tests. Another compound, coded as SC-12937, inhibited egg laying in Coturnix quail for several months. Cooperators at the University of Missouri have also tested SC-12937 on free-living pigeons. Both laboratory and limited field tests resulted in pronounced inhibition of egg laying.

Still another chemical, Sudan Black B, was shown to be an effective embryocide, both for gulls and Coturnix quail; hundreds of test eggs of gull and quail, known to be fertile, failed to hatch. The latter is nontoxic to adult birds, is not hazardous to other wildlife, can be included in the food of the target bird specie, and is not expensive. The bureau has conducted field tests with this material to determine more exactly its possible relationship to man, domestic animals, and wildlife. Sudan Black B has the added advantage of being nonlethal, thus eliminating the public relations problem of dead birds in epidemic numbers over the countryside. This material is now being field tested and may have application in certain situations.

Management of birds around airports: On Midway Island, the U.S. Navy, following recommendations of Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife biologists, reduced plane strikes from albatrosses ("goony" birds) about 78 percent by destroying nesting sites adjacent to runways and eliminating updrafts favorable to soaring. This was done by leveling and paving these areas with relatively low-cost "blacktop" road material. As a result, the "goonies" are nesting far enough from runways to insure relative safety to takeoff and landing planes. The project to devise ways of preventing bird strikes on aircraft is still in process.

Extensive investigation of gull movements along the New England coast has pinpointed three basic elements of the problem of overpopulations of these birds (principally herring gulls) around garbage dumps, fish wharves, sewer outlets, and airports:

1. The buildup of gull numbers since 1900 has resulted mainly from the increase in food supplies due to poor disposal of wastes;
2. Present-day gull populations are largely being maintained by these food sources; and
3. The logical approach to solution of this problem is elimination of food sources.

Where elimination is impossible or impractical, use of chemosterilants may be a feasible recourse, in the light of present knowledge. Also, the release of predators on isolated nesting islands has been shown to be highly effective with as high as 90 percent of the year's production discontinued.

Management of birds destructive to crops or in feedlots: Among birds in these categories, blackbirds and starlings are by far the most important, and it is for this reason that the main efforts of Bureau research have been on these species. The most potentially effective methods appear to be avicides, embryocides, and chemosterilants. The avicide DRC-1339 has withstood severe laboratory scrutiny and is being field tested for blackbird and starling control at feedlots. This compound is many times more toxic to blackbirds and starlings than to mammals, and has a wide safety margin so that accidental killing of mammals, including household pets, is virtually nonexistent when properly used. The species of hawks tested to date are so resistant to DRC-1339 that there appears to be no foreseeable danger to this group of birds through eating blackbirds or starlings killed by the compound. All game birds tested so far proved to be about three times as resistant to DRC-1339 as blackbirds and starlings, indicating that formulations for target species can be precise enough to safeguard desirable species. This compound, however, is effective only in situations where the birds can be concentrated to feed. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is continuing studies with blackbird and starling traps, distress calls, noisemakers, and other frightening devices. Under given conditions, all of these methods show promise. Considerable progress has been made on the development of a blackbird trap and techniques concerning its use.

There are several factors which have compelling and continentwide effects on blackbirds and starlings and which make the problem far more difficult. They include: (1) Relatively high reproductive potential of most species; (2) the vast, countrywide breeding range, with species adapted to many habitat types; (3) the migratory nature of blackbirds; (4) pronounced grain-eating habits of the most numerous species—redwings and cowbirds; and (5) the inherent wariness, pugnacity, and dominance of starlings, and their adaptability to urban as well as countryside range. The migratory habits complicate management. Complete elimination of a local breeding population would have little or no effect on the influx of blackbird hordes during the fall and winter from other widely scattered breeding locations where no control is practiced. The rate of progress in perfecting bird management techniques for this purpose has been hampered by a lack of knowledge on the behavioral traits and physiological peculiarities of the individual problem species. These must be probed in greater detail to learn the weaknesses in their physiology.

Bird management in urban areas: A nuisance-bird problem of considerable concern is that of city-dwelling starlings and pigeons. These birds are implicated or suspected of spreading parasites and a number of diseases such as encephalitis, ornithosis, pig dysentery to man and domestic animals, and histoplasmosis. Successful tests of starling-roost reduction techniques and reproductive inhibitors in pigeons offer hope for ultimate success in the control of these species.

Development of selective bird toxicants: One of the main objectives of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the development of animal control methods is the discovery or formulation of chemicals specific for the target species. Pursuit of this objective is necessarily a slow and tedious process, involving detailed screening of hundreds of candidate compounds. This must be followed, for the small number of qualifying compounds, by extensive laboratory and field testing before deciding that any given compound is safe for controlled or general use.

In spite of the research done, there is still no universally effective means of substantially reducing starling and blackbird damage to standing crops. Presently the decoy trap and some scaring devices offer the most hope for immediate but temporary relief.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Program needs

The 1966 budget of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife includes $660,000 for research on methods for preventing crop depredations and other losses caused by several different species of birds. In addition to this research effort, the Bureau is spending approximately $170,000 annually to alleviate the bird damage problem.

Research at the present level will eventually produce improved methods; but the scope of present needs compel that these efforts be increased to provide needed solutions. These methods must be demonstrated and otherwise properly introduced to the public. An experienced cadre with technical, demonstrational and investigative skills and experience is needed for this work. Accomplishment of these objectives would require an additional initial expenditure of $1 million and 50 biologists (10 additional biologists in research and 40 for field programs). Of this amount, $200,000 would finance additional control methods research, and $800,000 would finance programs for dissemination and demonstration of the knowledge and techniques now available. The $800,000 would be required in the first year, with $700,000 each year thereafter until a satisfactory solution to the problem is achieved. The research program would require further increments at the rate of $200,000 annually for an additional 4 years (total increase of $1 million over a 5-year period). This phasing of research would enable the recruiting of specialized talent as needed and the progressive expansion of new lines of investigation as basic information accumulates.

The Bureau does not accept responsibility for conditions leading to bird depredations, but it does accept responsibility for extending aid to minimize this danger. The most effective approach in alleviating the current problem and developing a long-range solution would be twofold:

1. A stepped up action program to reduce damage in critical areas, relying heavily on compound DRC–1339 and decoy traps.

2. A stepped up research program aimed at finding techniques, chemicals, and other materials useful in coping with a variety of species causing a variety of problems.

Relation to existing programs

A number of States, including Ohio, now have existing programs, through the Agricultural Extension Service, the State game department, and other agencies, to provide information to the public on ways to reduce damage from birds. It would be anticipated that any expanded program of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife would be closely integrated with these existing programs. The details of how this integration would be worked out are too encompassing to be spelled out here. In any event, there would be no duplication of effort or competition with present efforts. Any increase in the Bureau's resources for this program would be used to supplement and strengthen the overall effort by all concerned.

In all cases, the Bureau would embark on the program in a State only after receiving a formal request to do so from the Governor or an official authorized to represent him in this matter. Also, the program would be undertaken only after consummation of a master agreement with a State.

Public relations

If steps are taken to increase the activities, it will be essential to work very closely with conservation organizations to make certain that they are fully informed of the extent of the problem, the reasons for increasing control, and how this will be done. They should be fully informed before a program is proposed, and careful liaison maintained throughout the course of any action program. Any attempt substantially to reduce blackbird or even starling populations will meet with resistance unless a favorable public climate, based on a complete understanding, is developed.

Legal aspects

English sparrows and European starlings are not protected by Federal law and may be taken in accordance with State laws. Blackbirds, cowbirds and grackles, however, are included under the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703). Section 10.62, title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations, provides that "A permit shall not be required to kill yellow-headed, red-winged, bicolored red winged, tricolored red-winged and Brewer's blackbirds, cowbirds and all grackles when found committing or about to commit serious depredations upon ornamental or shade trees or agricultural crops." In some locations, State and local permits are required to take birds. These permits must be acquired before exercising the privilege conferred by section 10.62.

Bureau activities in animal control are carried out under statutory authority of the act of March 2, 1931 (7 U.S.C. 426), which specifies that the Secretary of the Interior is "authorized and directed to conduct such investigations, experiments and tests as he may deem necessary in order to determine, demonstrate and promulgate the best methods of eradication, suppression or bringing under control on National Forests or other areas of the public domain as well as on State, Territory, or privately owned lands of mountain lions, wolves, coyotes, bobcats, prairie dogs, gophers, ground squirrels, jack rabbits, and other animals[1] injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, wild game animals, furbearing animals, and birds, and for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies and tularemia in predatory or other wild animals; and to conduct campaigns for the destruction or control of such animals."

SUMMARY

Blackbirds and the introduced European starling probably number about one-half billion in the continental United States.

Although blackbirds have always been with us, reported losses from these indigenous species have increased tremendously during recent years as they come more and more into direct conflict with our expanding population. The phenomenal increase and spread of the introduced starling is due to its reproductive capacity, general hardiness, adaptability to changes in land use, and the success which introduced animals sometime enjoy in a new environment.

Losses to agriculture from birds are extremely serious and must be approached with positive action. Since the problem is varied, and includes all States, a national approach is required. Estimates show bird damage to agriculture amounts to about $58 million annually. Damage to buildings, hazards from bird associated diseases, and the possibility of air strikes increase this National problem.

Research has developed considerable information regarding numbers, characteristics and management techniques. Large-scale field tests indicate the value of a compound known as DRC–1339 to reduce bird losses to field lots. The decoy trap has been improved. This device works well in and around orchards and shows promise in the grain-growing areas. Repellents and scare devices have a place in bird management and can be used by the public. However, these techniques have not as yet been perfected to stop bird damage to standing crops.

The answer to many of the bird problems may come through use of antifertility agents to reduce reproduction and through roost reduction techniques. Both approaches need additional investigation. Greater focus must be placed on behavioral traits and physiological processes of problem species to find weak spots in their protective armor.

Known tools will not present losses to standing grain; however, the tools that are available will reduce damage and should be widely demonstrated to the public. It is estimated that a Federal program to do an effective job will require an additional initial expenditure of $1 million to meet the demands in this field. Of this amount $200,000 would be used in research and $800,000 for supervision and demonstration of techniques. The research activity will need increments of $200,000 annually over a 5-year period. Funds for the action program can be reduced to $700,000 annually after the first year until satisfactory results are achieved.

APPENDIX II

THE NATURE, EXTENT, AND THE STATUS OF CURRENT RESEARCH ON THE PROBLEM OF BIRD DEPREDATIONS OF AGRICULTURAL CROPS IN 1965

(By Maurice L. Giltz, the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center)

THE NATURE OF BIRD DEPREDATIONS

Bird depredations to agricultural crops have been a problem since man first cultivated crops. Since 1950 the damage that the red-winged blackbird does to corn in Ohio has been increasing and in 1965 it rated as the most serious of several threats to an agricultural crop. Recent surveys made in Ohio and Illinois indicate that the nesting population of the red-winged blackbird or redwing (Agelaius p. phoeniceus) has increased over 200-fold since the turn of the century. This increase is due to the introduction and development of alfalfa and clover into the Midwest and the red-winged blackbirds' adaptations to accept a better habitat than its native marshes, many of which were drained for agriculture. Following nesting the redwing spends a period of a few days a week in vegetation near its nesting site and then migrates along natural or manmade bodies of water on flyways similar to those used for centuries. It is here on its migratory flyways that it meets with some of our best cornfields and in a matter of minutes may be decoyed into a field and destroy an entire crop.

THE EXTENT OF BIRD DEPREDATIONS

In Ohio these red-winged blackbirds cross over 50 counties although the corn in only 30 percent of the areas of these counties received damage in 1965. The value of the corn sold for cash subjected to damage in these areas is estimated at $15 million annually. In addition, corn subjected to damage and used as feed amounts to many additional millions. In the past 25 years the impoundment of water in Ohio for flood control, wildlife reserves, and water supplies has provided the red-winged blackbird with a new habitat within its migratory flyway and also provided the farmer additional fields to grow superior corn in the vicinity of the water impoundments.

This combination of conditions is not unique to Ohio. The relatively recent drastic change in land use, higher value and specialized crops, lower margin of profit and the high costs of labor have made the depredations of corn by the red-winged blackbird a serious economic problem throughout the Eastern United States and Canada.

Many millions of dollars are spent by farmers in a partially successful attempt to prevent the destruction of their crop. A recent survey in Ohio indicates that more than $5 per acre are spent, on an average, in the counties subjected to constant, persistent depredations of the birds where deterrents must be employed to prevent total destruction of the crop. In addition to the direct damage to the grain while it is soft or milky, the bird is responsible for additional damage to the grain such as molding, rotting, sprouting on the cob, and a general failure for the ear of grain to mature when direct damage reaches a critical degree.

---

[1] The Solicitor of the Department of the Interior has concluded, after a review of the legislative history of the act of Mar. 2, 1931, that the term "other animals" includes birds.

RESEARCH ON BIRD DEPREDATIONS

Cooperative research has been going on between several branches in the U.S. Department of the Interior and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1963 a formal interregional project was approved by the Cooperative States Research Service in which various representatives of agricultural experiment stations and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife collaborated to devise ways and improve methods to protect corn and other grain crops from damage by the red-winged blackbird and associated species.

Research on the following agronomic features or treatments to prevent damage has been in the following areas: resistance in varieties of sweet and field corn, physiographic factors, plant, stalk or ear characteristics, stalk or ear density, various planting dates, weedy cornfields compared to "clean fields," visual and auditory scaring devices, chemical repellents, habitat manipulation including soil and moisture, diversion plantings, removing birds from the area, cropping systems and harvesting methods, methods of attracting and deterring birds.

In addition, research has been carried on to devise means of crop protection through fundamental studies of bird behavior, biology and physiology. Research that has been done on bird behavior, biology and physiology is as follows:

The various ages, sexes, and longevity of the redwing.

The flight patterns used in finding food, roosts, and migrating.

The reaction of redwings to various nesting and fledging habitats.

The extent of the migration and flyways used throughout the year.

The nesting behavior and range of the species.

The physiology of birds, especially the senses.

The effect of habituation and imprinting on behavior.

The effect of learning.

Feeding behavior.

The effect of chemicals on reproduction, food supply and associated animals.

The reaction of the birds to various visual and auditory stimuli.

The social behavior of redwings.

The parasites and diseases of blackbirds.

At this date, the research indicates that there are no agronomic practices or treatments which are effective in reducing damage except constant scaring device operation in the fields during all daylight hours while the corn is susceptible to damage.

CONCLUSIONS

A diagnosis of all research on the biology, behavior, and physiology indicates that there are millions of migrating red-winged blackbirds that move through Ohio following their nesting and that these linger long enough during the season when corn is susceptible to damage to destroy millions of dollars worth of corn and completely frustrate the farmers in their effort to prevent this damage.

The increasing number of redwings in recent years is the result of the adaptability of the redwing in accepting the alfalfa and clover meadows for nesting and utilizing the corn in harvested fields for food. The early mowing of alfalfa fields would result in reproductive failure for millions of redwings each year.

The redwing that damages corn in Ohio is a member of a population that comes to Ohio from the south in March, nests and begins a migration which might yet take it to Canada and return to Ohio before it departs in October for the wintering ground in South Atlantic and Gulf Coastal States.

Redwings are decoyed into a corn field or a decoy trap by other redwings already present. At least the first birds each day enter a few at a time. There are always a sufficient number of birds in their traditional Ohio migratory flyways to damage field corn or sweet corn while it is soft.

Since agronomic research has provided no practical economical or potential relief from damage and since studies of the red-winged blackbird's biology, behavior, and physiology presently offer no clues to practical methods of controlling damage to corn, it is proposed that the technology gathered in these studies be applied to the management of the population of red-winged blackbirds so that they do not endanger crops. In addition, it is proposed that other interrelationships associated with the species be studied to prevent undesirable effects on the balance of nature.

APPENDIX III

BLACKBIRD AND STARLING SITUATION

(Ohio Farm Bureau Report)

Farm bureau policies include the following statement regarding wildlife pests:

"Blackbirds, starlings, and similar pests are causing serious damage to crops and property in many areas. They are a hazard to aviation and a carrier of diseases to humans as well as livestock.

"This problem is increasing over a wide geographic area. Intensive research efforts at State and Federal levels and prompt use of all practical recommendations and methods to eradicate these pests are fully justified.

"We recommend an action program under authorized personnel to control wildlife pests. Adequate funds should be made available to the Department of the Interior for this purpose."

The policy statement adopted by the voting delegates in December 1965 reflects policy recommendations submitted by 14 different State farm bureaus, spread geographically from Oregon to Delaware. State farm bureaus submitting policy recommendations concerning this matter include the following: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and Virginia. Additional State farm bureaus have reported substantial interest in response to an inquiry conducted by the AFBF.

ECONOMIC DAMAGE

Damages resulting from bird pests might fall into several categories. These include, but are not limited to losses to crops and feed lots, potential spreading of disease, despoiling of urban property, and safety hazards to aircraft. The farm bureau policy statement reflects concern in each of these areas and we deem them all important. Our most direct concern, quite naturally, is in the area of loss to crops and agricultural products.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has rated blackbirds and starlings as by far the most important problem species with respect to crop and feed lot damages.

Specific dollar and cent losses appear to be difficult to document on a broad national basis. However, figures are available on a more limited scale which give an indication of the extent of damages incurred.

A story appearing in the September 28, 1964, issue of the National Observer reported losses to a 15,000 head feed lot running about $40,000 a year. This loss resulted from an estimated 3 million bird flock of starlings which destroyed 12 tons of cull potatoes daily. This same article reported the spread of enteritis among hogs by bird carriers as well as the loss of entire rice crops to farmers in the South.

In 1964, during a meeting attended by Representative E. C. GATHINGS of Arkansas and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife representatives, reports were presented indicating over $6 million in losses by bird depravation in Arkansas alone.

Dobney Taylor, writing in the November 1963, Western Livestock Journal, reported losses to Idaho cattle growers of over $1.85 million. This article further stated that a starling can eat his average weight (2½ ounces) in a day.

We have been unable at this time to obtain agency figures on overall losses due to the lack of availability of this information.

The most comprehensive data compiled by the AFBF was developed in 1962. Questionnaires were sent to each of our 48 contiguous State farm bureaus and Hawaii with the following results.

Forty-four of the State farm bureaus reported. Five did not.

Of the 44 reporting—35 reported damage in varying degrees—from light to very heavy, while 9 reported no damage or no problem.

Of the 35 States reporting damage—33 reported damage to crops—15 reported damage to livestock.

Thirteen of the reports gave estimates, based on studies, of annual losses from the ravages of these birds. They are listed below. The other 22 States reporting damage gave no estimate of annual loss.

The States reporting estimated loss are as follows:

Arizona	$2,885,000
Arkansas	5,677,409
California	703,410
Delaware	150,000
Florida	2,000,000
Idaho	1,850,000
Illinois	500,000
Louisiana	1,835,000
Maryland	400,000
New Jersey	5,000,000
Ohio (includes $750,000 in cities)	[1] 4,150,000
South Carolina	55,000
Texas	2,971,157
Total by States	28,176,976

[1] Estimate by a Department of Interior staff member in 1963. Every indication of more than twice this damage today.

The estimated losses reported by commodities are as follows:

Rice	$8,312,778
Grain sorghums	2,962,539
Livestock	2,967,826
Other (includes fruits, vegetables, holly, etc.)	9,452,560
Corn	3,731,273
Damage reported in cities	750,000
Total by commodities	28,176,976

On the basis of these figures, projected to 1966, it has been estimated that total annual loss due to bird depredations is somewhere between $30 to $50 million.

BIRD NUMBERS

An estimated half billion blackbirds and starlings are found in continental United States. This estimate is based on a nationwide cooperative winter roost survey conducted by the Patuxent and Denver wildlife research centers of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service during the last 5 years. Species whose numbers comprise four-fifths of the grand total are the red-winged blackbird (Agelaius phoeniceus), starling (Sturnus vulgaris), common grackle (Quiscalus quiscula), and brown-headed cowbird (Molothrus ater). Other species, together contributing the remaining fifth of the total, include the rusty blackbird (Euphagus carolinus), Brewer's blackbird (Euphagus cyanocephalus), yellow-headed blackbird (Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus), boat-tailed grackle (Cassidix mexicanus), tricolored blackbird (Agelaius tricolor), and bronzed cowbird (Tangavius aeneus).

Three-fourths of the total U.S. blackbird population is found in the relatively humid East; the comparatively arid West lacks the food, cover, and water to support a larger proportion of the population. The winter concentration of blackbirds and starlings in the lower Mississippi Valley is the largest found in any section of the United States at any season. An estimated 200 million blackbirds and starlings winter in that region, based on the estimated number of birds occupying roosts located in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee. The magnitude of that winter population is due to the incursion in late fall of hordes of northern birds and their progeny from the North Central States and prairie provinces, together with the resident population. Rice production, concentrated near the southern terminus of the Mississippi flyway, is an attraction to these birds.

The Atlantic coastal plain from the Chesapeake Bay southward, the southern Piedmont, the Texas coastal rice belt, and the great valley of California are other important winter concentration areas. Many multimillion-bird roosts have been located in each of these regions. North Carolina, with 15 major winter roosts and an estimated 50 million birds, has the largest wintering blackbird-starling population along the Atlantic coast. The largest roost known is located in the Dismal Swamp on the Virginia-North Carolina line about 20 miles south of Norfolk. This roost, containing some 25 million blackbirds and starlings, adjoins the leading peanut producing area of the Nation.

CONTROL EFFORTS

The control of bird depredation is a complex if not a new problem. Intense scientific study has been carried on for a relatively few years. State agricultural experiment stations, State conservation departments, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, USDA Public Health Service, FAA, and universities as well as private groups have joined into the research and control effort. Congressional appropriations of approximately $650,000 were allocated to bird control research in fiscal years 1965 and 1966 for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Department of Interior. A similar amount is recommended in the 1967 budget submitted by the President.

The burden of research responsibility has fallen to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and it is here that other interested agencies seek technical information.

Several methods of control have been used in basic research and field testings. Traps, sound devices, decoys, sparklers, shotgun experiments have not yielded a completely satisfactory control method to date, although some reduction in losses have been achieved. In 1964 an avicide DRC-1339 was developed in Denver which, according to the U.S. Department of Interior Circular 220, constituted "one of the major developments in bird damage control during recent years."

RECOMMENDED ACTION

In light of increasing losses resulting from bird pests, it is imperative that effective control programs be developed. The lack of positive control measure indicates that immediate emphasis needs to be applied in the area of basic research and practical field testing. We suggest increased cooperative efforts be encouraged among appropriate State, Federal, and local agencies in research and control efforts. We further recommend that the budget allocations for research and control in the Department of Interior, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife be increased sufficiently to bring about an aggressive program for effective control.

Farmers and ranchers share a deep interest in wildlife management of those species of wildlife that are of value to agriculture, sportsmen, and the public at large. We are in the business of producing food for people; not for feeding blackbirds and starlings.

MORE "POLITICAL NOISE" ABOUT GRAIN DUMPING BY CCC

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in a statement I referred to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's having termed "a lot of political noise" my concern over the price depressing effect of heavy dumping of Commodity Credit Corporation corn stocks on the feed market. I also made reference to Chairman Gardner Ackley of the President's Council of Economic Advisers having reported in a television appearance how the administration is holding down the price of corn by selling out of Commodity Credit stocks. I wonder if Mr. Freeman would call Mr. Ackley's admission, that "we are trying to hold down the price of corn" just "a lot of political noise."

Today, I will quote several other sources of information concerning the destructive effects of the CCC's dumping activities.

First, I quote from the Grain Weekly letter of March 11, 1966, published by the Commodity Division of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.:

> Government sales of corn continue to dominate the market. On Wednesday the agency sold between 6 and 7 million bushels. Trade has been expecting CCC to curtail its rate of sales, but thus far there is no significant evidence to that effect. Since mid-January, Chicago March futures lost about 10 cents while cash markets at major terminals, basis No. 2 Yellow, have declined 9 to 12 cents. CCC sales through March 4 are estimated at 308 million bushels, about 100 million ahead of last years. The large Government marketings added to the free available supplies suggest a free carryover on October 1 of between 350 and 400 million bushels compared to 237 million beginning this season. Apparently, the Government wants to encourage farmers to participate in the feed grain program. Early reports indicate that sign-up is running behind last year. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman recently warned farmers about increasing feed grain acreage in response to world food shortages.
>
> He pointed out that underdeveloped nations have problems of distribution and storage. Furthermore, the USDA wants to cut the cost of carrying inventory and discourage farmers who are inclined to switch bean acreage into corn. Taking a slightly different view was Congressman COOLEY from North Carolina who urged support for pending legislation to bring 50 to 60 million acres out of retirement for production of crops for the foreign aid program. House hearings are expected to be completed at the end of the week. CCC noncommitted inventory is estimated at about 250 million bushels, down approximately 520 million from a year ago.
>
> Wheat futures continued to decline with added pressure from heavy sales of Government corn. March has declined 14 cents from the season's high at mid-December and May is off as much as 11 cents.
>
> Heavy sales of corn by U.S. Government has had a significant influence on Winnipeg oats and barley.

I quote from the February 1966 issue of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association Digest:

> Heavy selling of corn by the Commodity Credit Corporation is another reason for our lower basis. As of February 17, the Minneapolis market for No. 2 Yellow corn is quoted at $1.20 to $1.20½ per bushel, down some 3 to 5 cents from our last writing.

I quote from the Wall Street Journal, March 15, 1966:

> Agriculture Department officials said they sold about 71.7 million bushels of corn from stocks to domestic users in the week ended March 4. This brought total sales for the season started October 1 to 265.8 million bushels, up from 168.2 million in the like year-earlier period.

The March 9, 1966, issue of the Feed Market News, which is compiled by the Grain Division of the Consumer and Marketing Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, reports that the average bulk prices for corn at principal markets as of March 8, 1966, was $44.10 per ton, which is $1.70 lower than the figure for February 1966, and $2.70 lower than the March 1965, price.

Mr. Speaker, these highly reputable sources cannot be considered "obstreperous," nor can their reports be termed "a lot of political noise."

As the Grain Weekly letter points out, these corn-dumping policies affect more elements of the agricultural economy than just the price of corn. They have already affected the wheat, oats, and barley markets. They also have a profound effect on the livestock situation. Livestock producers have not forgotten the years of 1963 and 1964, which were rough for them, largely because of CCC's heavy dumping of feed grains in 1961-62. The present dumping could very well promote another crash in the livestock market next year.

Yesterday I reported that the number of farmers who are signing up for the voluntary feed grain program is much lower than last year. The CCC is using its corn stocks to force more farmers into the program by depressing the market price of corn. We should remember that the sale of the CCC's stocks will not increase or decrease the total U.S. stocks of corn by one bushel. However, when the farmers take their corn to market, they find the CCC, the agency which was established in 1948 and charged with "stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices," there at the market ahead of them, dumping huge supplies of corn and depressing the free market price.

The recent CCC activities remind me of Secretary Freeman's statement last year before the House Agriculture Committee:

> We purposely sold in order to move our prices down far enough so that they would be

way below the support level, the loan level, so that we could thereby get compliance. That was the whole intent and purpose and thrust of the program.

Mr. Speaker, this Congressman will continue to bring such "political noise" to the attention of his colleagues until the Department of Agriculture remembers that its primary responsibility is to the American farmer.

DOES PUBLIC LAW 89-10 PERPETUATE INFERIOR SCHOOLS?

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a most thoughtful letter from Mr. Robert H. Norman, Superintendent of Faribault, Minn., Public Schools, commenting on the effect of title I, Public Law 89-10, upon the public schools of Minnesota. I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Norman's observations in view of the necessity to evaluate the program, and include his letter in the Record:

FARIBAULT PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Faribault, Minn., March 1, 1966.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: Because the present session of Congress will wish to evaluate title I of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I wish to make some personal observations to you on the effect of this law upon the public schools of Minnesota.

In this State, there are some school districts that have established excellent school systems. Taxpayers have been willing to support educational programs that attempt to meet the needs of all pupils. Other school districts, in order to save tax money, have neglected their schools. Public Law 89-10 favors the school districts that have not been willing to support good schools. With the help of Federal funds, they are able to establish educational programs that other school districts have been supporting locally. Programs already in existence are not eligible for Federal school aid under Public Law 89-10.

Minnesota has a number of small weak high school districts that should be reorganized into larger units. The effects of Public Law 89-10 is that it encourages the weak school districts to resist reorganization more than ever. Even with additional Federal funds to help "educationally deprived" children in these districts, the students in small school districts will be cheated out of an adequate education.

Although Public Law 89-10 was not intended to provide general Federal school aid, it actually is a general aid bill because over 90 percent of the school districts in the United States are eligible to receive funds. The worst feature of the law is the Federal redtape and interference in local school affairs in its administration.

It is unfortunate that this legislation was passed and its administration established without the advice and assistance of experienced, professional public school administrators.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT H. NORMAN,
Superintendent of Schools.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 17-23, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is rather startling that in all the current discussion about Vietnam and Red China the persistent and ugly plight of the captive nations and peoples—in Asia, in Eastern Europe, and in Cuba—is carefully skirted by the loudest of voices. How easy it is to forget or ignore this stark reality. Indeed, how unreflective this shortsighted indifference is of what our Nation stands for and also can mutually profit by in this enduring cold war.

While trial balloons are being hoisted for further appeasement of the totalitarian Red regimes, it is not too early to point to preparations now being made for the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week this coming July 17-23. As provided by Congress in Public Law 86-90, the week has developed into a wholesome and sobering reminder of the moral and political obligations of this Nation toward the captive peoples of North Vietnam, mainland China, Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine, Hungary and two dozen of others. Under the auspices of the National Captive Nations Committee, our people are once again being called upon to let the captive nations know that we have not deserted them to their tyrannical regimes and that concrete measures, such as the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, the creation of a Freedom Academy, the methodical development of a liberation policy, and many other measures, will continue to be advocated.

One among several appropriate themes of the coming week will be the significance of the captive nations for peace. In this respect I request that the full text of a recent "Manion Forum" program, titled "The Captive Nations—A Major Deterrent Against Global War" be printed in the Record. The observations made in this program by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a Georgetown University professor and the chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, go a long way to explain why we should rededicate ourselves more than ever to the principles for which our Nation stands in this eighth observance of Captive Nations Week:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) "Manion Forum," Feb. 6, 1966]

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—A MAJOR DETERRENT AGAINST GLOBAL WAR—"OPPRESSED PEOPLES COULD ALTER AGGRESSIVE DESIGNS OF RED REGIMES"

(Dr. Lev Dobriansky, Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee)

Dean MANION. With me here at the microphone today is Dr. Lev Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, in Washington. Dr. Dobriansky is a frequent witness before committees of Congress and is a recognized authority on the subject of international trade and commerce. He is also chairman of a distinguished group of prominent, patriotic people known as the National Captive Nations Committee. (Suite 514, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20036.) Dr. Dobriansky, welcome back to the "Manion Forum."

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. It's grand to be back with you, Dean Manion.

Dean MANION. Doctor, the fear of war and the hope for international peace is undoubtedly the overriding concern of all people today. At the same time, it is a confusing concern—we hear it spoken of as peaceful coexistence and other palliatives. What, in your observation and your judgment, is the possibilities of obtaining peace?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. The possibility of obtaining peace is a very real and promising one. However, we must distinguish carefully between what we in a free world regard as a genuine peace and what the various Red totalitarian regimes talk about, namely, peaceful coexistence.

As it has turned out, and as it will continue in the future, when the Red regimes speak of peaceful coexistence, they mean, actually, coexisting momentarily with the Western world, particularly the United States, and while doing so, carrying on wars of national liberation. These so-called wars of liberation are, in effect, infiltrations—subversion into many of the continents of the world, particularly Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In light of this, what we are really engaged in, fundamentally, is a political warfare on many of these continents.

So, although we do pray for peace in the sense of a concourse of peoples, an intercourse economically, politically, culturally in every measure—all the marks of what we consider peaceful coexistence. Actually, we have a peaceful coexistence that has been fomented primarily by Moscow, and which serves as a shield for its political subversion in other parts of the world. This in turn foments revolutions and turnovers. As a consequence, in the final analysis it brings American military power into play as a kind of last minute resort or reaction. We see this in South Vietnam. We saw it for a time in the Dominican Republic. We are very likely to see it in many areas on these three continents.

Dean MANION. We hear the division made between the free world and the Communist world; Dr. Dobriansky, who are the captive nations?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Well, the captive nations concept includes many nations in Eastern Europe, in Asia, and also in Latin America. When we talk about the captive nations, we must bear in mind that any appeal we make for the captive nations in the aggregate could be a great contribution to the possibility of peace. I have continually maintained that the captive nations, in the aggregate, in toto, constitute one of our major deterrents against a hot global war. Not only that, I would even go so far as to say that it's a major deterrent against some of these wars of national liberation.

The captive nations in Europe include not only those in central Europe with which most Americans are familiar, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, but also many nations—in fact, the majority of them—within the Soviet Union itself. Most Americans, unfortunately, have forgotten the three Baltic nations—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—who were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union at the beginning of the 1940's. Yet, they are part of the family of captive nations.

But over and beyond the Baltic nations, there are numerous other captive nations within the U.S.S.R., such as Baku and Ukraine, which is, incidentally, the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, with a population of 45 million. Then we have Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Armenia in the Soviet Union. There is the large nation of Turkistan in central Asia, and Idel-Ural.

In the Asiatic sphere, there is North Korea, Tibet, North Vietnam, and the huge area, mainland China. The Peiping regime is a junior partner, perhaps a very irascible one to Moscow—but the fact is, the underlying population, roughly 650 to 700 million Chinese, constitute a captive nation. Of course, we have our own captive nation in the Western Hemisphere; namely, Cuba.

So the list of captive nations is a long one. It is a list that began back in 1920 when the first family was brought into captivity as a result of Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism. It was expanded during World War II, and also at the end of World War II, so that we have, roughly, about 27 distinct captive nations. The big question is, Will this list be extended? The road that we are following, I am convinced, will lead to an extension of it. It may be South Vietnam, Thailand, Colombia, British Guiana, Ghana, or any place where there is Communist political warfare underway.

Dean MANION. We started off to explore the possibilities of peace. How can these captive peoples be instrumental in achieving international peace?

POPULAR MYTHS ABOUT RED EMPIRE

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. I would say first that we have to become instrumental ourselves by revising some of our notions with regard to the captive nations and with regard to what I call the entire Red empire. We're given to a number of myths that today circulate about. Let me just cite some of these notions or myths. One is that the captive nations are represented by their various Red regimes. Meaning, for example, the Gomulka regime in Warsaw.

The way some of our Americans think and talk, it would seem that the Gomulka regime is a popular regime, one that had been put into office through a national election on the part of the Polish people. This is grossly untrue. The plain fact, and a very crucial fact, is that all these regimes—the totalitarian regimes—have been imposed, and they work against the interest of the people. It is important for us to maintain this distinction, to make the constant appeal to the freedom aspirations of the underlying populaces—the Polish people, the Hungarian people, the Ukrainian people, even to the Russian and Chinese people in their fight for additional freedoms within their areas against their respective governments.

To the extent that we do this, to that extent we intensify the insecurity of each of these regimes. To the extent that we are successful in intensifying this insecurity, to that extent will we be able to cope with any aggressive designs on a scale of political warfare, or even direct, armed aggression by any of these regimes.

Dean MANION. Is this what the President means when he talks about "bridges of understanding" with Eastern Europe and the so-called Communist nations?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Not at all. The general notion of the bridges of understanding seems to rest on this myth and additional myths. The myth, first, of captive nations and the Red regimes being identical, and secondly, the nationalism that you have in the various satellite countries, and even within the U.S.S.R. The President, for example, speaks of a sweeping nationalism in Eastern Europe. This is true, but it's not new. Nationalism has always been there and the Red regimes use it, just as the Moscow regime within the U.S.S.R. has always used it, as a weapon against the people.

The point that I think should be stressed is that it is fine to build up bridges of understanding. I'm not against it and any friend of the captive nations is not against it, but we want to know what is at the other end of the bridge. Is it, as the President thinks, the totalitarian government—the Red government say, in Bucharest or in Budapest, or in Warsaw—or is it the people? I think the failure here of the entire policy is that the bridge leads to the government, to its entrenchment against the underlying populace

Dean MANION. Doctor, I know from your testimony and from your writings that you believe in international trade in general—you believe that we should trade with the Communist people, those of Eastern Europe and the other captive nations. What are the conditions of this trade, in your estimation, that would be proper?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. I'm glad you brought this up, because if the Communists can use trade as an instrument in their political warfare—as they have continually—there is no reason for the United States not to use trade as a weapon. However, many persons advocate unconditional trade. Meaning they think that on a commercial basis all we have to do is to trade with the various Red governments and that will contribute to amity and peace and a peaceful intercourse with the peoples involved. The fact is that such unconditional trade would lead to a buttressing of the economy of these various Red regimes, and very little in the way of a benefit would redound to the underlying populace.

There is a great danger here in connection with unconditional trade. We advocate instead a poltrade policy. Namely, trade on a basis of political concessions. Meaning, that if the Bucharest Government is interested in a chemical plant, we will consider it, provided we also will be able to realize certain freedom concessions—not only on the part of the Rumanians but from East Germans and others. It can be worked out in the sense of political bids against their commercial bids.

Dean MANION. And this would be the true way to edge toward the ultimate liberation of the people behind the Iron Curtain?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. It would certainly be one of the ways. There are many others—in the sphere of diplomacy, in propaganda, as connected with the Voice of America and numerous other media that we can use. But this requires a general psychopolitical warfare context, for which, unfortunately, I would say, we are totally unprepared.

Dean MANION. The Soviets and the Communists are constantly promoting revolutions on this side of the Iron Curtain. Do you think we should turn the trick and encourage liberation on their side of it?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Yes, and again I stress the paramilitary, the psychopolitical. Many persons think that when you speak of liberation it will mean a hot war or involvement, if you will, in a nuclear war. On the contrary, the appeal is made on political grounds and can sway and influence the various peoples throughout the entire Red empire. We have allies there—approximately 1 billion people—to whom we are making no appeal.

Dean MANION. We're making the mistake of appealing to governments instead of to the people who are oppressed by those regimes?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. That is correct, and that is one great fallacy underlying our present policy. I was very dismayed that in the state of the Union message the President made no reference to the captivity of the various people in the entire Red empire.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Dr. Dobriansky. I hope we will have an early opportunity to continue and further explore this most interesting subject of the captive nations.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. I look forward to it, Dean Manion.

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918, the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of the conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples, through an appropriate and official means, the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

FLORIDIAN CONSIDERED FOR DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress President Johnson's announcement of his intention to nominate the Honorable Cecil Farris Bryant, former Governor of the State of Florida, to be the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning with the Executive Office of the President.

Governor Bryant has an impressive background of education and public service which he brings to his new position of public service. Born in Ocala, Fla., he studied at Emory University and Harvard, receiving the B.S. degree from Harvard in 1938, the same year he was admitted to the bar of the State of Florida. He also holds honorary degrees from Florida Southern College and Rollins College. For 21 years he was engaged in private practice of law in Ocala until January 1961, when he was inaugurated as Governor. He served with the U.S. Navy from 1943 to 1946, attaining the rank of lieutenant. The Governor served in the Florida House of Representatives from 1942 until 1956. He was an able and dedicated speaker of the house from 1953 to 1954, when I had the pleasure of being a member of that house. He was elected Governor in 1960 and served exceptionally in that office until January 1965 when he returned to the private practice of law.

On confirmation of his appointment as Director, this learned civic leader will insure the further successful operation of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Gov. Farris Bryant with all his outstanding qualities of leadership is a splendid addition to President Johnson's official family.

BRITISH MOLASSES MONOPOLY DETRIMENTAL TO U.S. SUGAR INDUSTRIES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the entire Congress and the country have been, and will continue to be, deeply concerned with the U.S. and the free world commitment in South Vietnam. However, we must not let the intensity of our interest in this vital area of the world blind us or deter us from continuing interest and commitments equally as vital, but closer to our shores.

In recent meetings of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we reviewed in depth the actions of the recent Tricontinent Communist Conference held in Havana, Cuba. The meaning of this conference to the security of the Western Hemisphere is quite clear. The conference was a call for rededication of effort and a new emphasis on the effort of communism throughout Latin America, with Cuba as a base.

Despite Castro's difficulty with his Communist masters both in Peiping and Moscow, he has not lessened his hatred of the United States or his avowed desire to communize all of Latin America. The Communists of three continents who assembled in this conference gave their endorsement and continuing support to the project. It is clear, therefore, beyond any question, that the United States and the free world must continue every effort to eliminate communism from Cuba and to prevent its spread into other countries of Latin America.

For this purpose, many actions have been taken, all of which in some measure have been helpful. The OAS excluded Communist Cuba from the Inter-American system, and following recommendations of special committees, country sanctions have been applied and particular efforts made in member countries to cope with the subversive problem emanating from Cuba.

I have sponsored and supported all legislative and administrative steps in the United States to help the downfall of Castro and shall continue to do so. We started by prohibiting any assistance under the Foreign Aid Act to the present Government of Cuba and prohibiting assistance to any country which in turn furnished assistance to the present Government of Cuba. This was followed by legislative authorization which I sponsored and the Congress adopted for the establishment and maintenance of total embargo on all trade between the United States and Cuba. This provision was implemented by Executive order. We eliminated the sugar subsidy. Then, by legislation which I cosponsored, we prohibited assistance to any country which failed to take appropriate steps to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba. Among others, these at one time included the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Greece, and Italy. We then adopted legislation which I cosponsored closing and denying the ports of the United States to any vessel which insisted on continued trade with the Government of Cuba.

The American Government, through many announcements, made its policy eminently clear with regard to the necessity for the isolation of the Communist government in Cuba, the prevention of the spread of communism from Cuba as an operating base, and the downfall of the Castro Communist regime. U.S. policy has not changed. We requested friendly nations to take action to help carry out the announced policy of the United States. As a result, in 1965, free world shipping to Cuba declined 29 percent. Ships from non-Communist countries made 394 calls in Cuban ports in 1964 and only 282 in 1965.

It is regrettable, however, that ships from Great Britain continue to be the most active as they have in every year that a count has been made—44 percent, 125 of 1965 total, were British-flag vessels—55 came from Lebanon, 23 from Italy, and 22 from Greece. Three countries in 1965 disappeared from the list of countries whose flagships called at Cuban ports. Those countries are Spain, Norway, and Sweden.

Furthermore, United Kingdom exports to Cuba have been increasing since 1960 to a reported peak of $36.2 million in 1965. United Kingdom trade with Cuba in recent years assumes the following proportions:

United Kingdom Trade With Cuba

[In millions U.S. dollars]

Year	Imports from Cuba	Exports to Cuba	Total trade
1958	49.8	26.0	75.8
1959	28.5	42.6	71.1
1960	22.2	20.5	42.7
1961	15.0	12.4	27.4
1962	19.9	7.2	27.1
1963	34.7	5.8	40.5
1964	25.5	27.2	52.7
1965 (January–September)	10.4	36.2	46.6

In 1964 the United Kingdom exported to Cuba machinery, buses, chemicals, motor vehicles, textiles, electric machinery, and tools, among other things. Its total imports in 1964 were comprised of raw sugar, molasses, tobacco, and manufactures.

Recent reports of economic conditions in Cuba have pointed out the desperate situation of the Castro government. Lack of international credit, domestic failures, and other factors have aggravated the situation. Nevertheless, none of these has dampened the ardor of Castro's recent pronouncements and the course of communism as indicated in the recent Havana Conference.

Any diminishing of trade which brings about a reduction in or elimination of international credit or which would aggravate the local economic situation or which would prevent the diversion of effort and funds to the furthering of Communist doctrine and effort would be most welcome. And yet trade by our friends continues.

The British have been buying virtually the entire Cuban molasses crop each year, thereby sweetening the Castro Communist war chest from $10 to $25 million a year. All of this year's bumper supply of Cuban molasses was purchased by Britain at just about one-half of the price per gallon American firms pay for off-shore molasses. Ostensibly, this tonnage goes to England for consumption there. Perhaps much of it is converted into alcohol, which then competes in the free world market. More importantly, however, it does allow the United Molasses Co., Ltd., perhaps the largest such company in the world, through its subsidiary in the United States, the Pacific Molasses Co., to sell molasses from non-Cuban sources into the United States at prices below which our own American industry can compete. In this one instance, if not in others, trade by the United Kingdom with Cuba not only does not support U.S. policy, but actually is damaging to American industry. Furthermore, I have determined that no amount of representation on the part of our Government has been of any avail.

Equally vexing and paradoxical, Mr. Speaker, is the well-known fact that recently the United States has at the request of the United Kingdom voluntarily complied with their policy decision in Rhodesia. On January 30 of this year, the United Kingdom declared a total embargo on Rhodesia where there had previously been no restrictions. The United States was requested to follow suit and we have done so.

Those who would like to draw distinctions without difference will probably allege that the United States acted in the Rhodesian question in its own self-interests, without regard to the British request. Perhaps this is so. If it is, however, it is difficult to conceive that it is not in the national interest of the British to bring about the downfall of Castro's government in Cuba and to prevent the spread of communism throughout the Western Hemisphere.

If the U.S. embargo and policy on trade with Cuba were followed by the British, and they had purchased their sugar and molasses from non-Cuban sources, the economic result would be immediate and dramatic. U.S. molasses prices would then be more competitive in the feed markets, since it could be purchased at a competitive level with corn. It is estimated that this would boost the annual income of producers and growers in the United States by about $40 million and help restore order to the feed grain market. It is obvious that equally dramatic results could be obtained by eliminating trade in the other items.

The board of directors of the Florida Sugar Cane League at a recent meeting were unanimous in opposing the so-called triangular trading of molasses engaged in by the British molasses monopoly, United Molasses Co., Ltd., as being detrimental to the Florida sugar industry. The producers and processors of sugarcane in Florida, according to President H. T. Vaughn, have become increasingly concerned over the low price of molasses. For over a year now, the local f.o.b. molasses price of blackstrap molasses has been less than one-half of its equivalent feed value, when compared to the prices of other feed concentrates such as corn.

Mr. Vaughn further stated recently in a letter:

> In spite of the recent cutback in acreage with the resultant decrease in sugar and molasses production, the price of molasses deteriorated over the past 2 years. As example, the south Florida f.o.b. molasses price per ton was $29.92 as of February 1, 1964; $24.96 as of February 1, 1965; and $17.10 as of February 1966. We believe that a contributing factor to these low prices of molasses is the so-called triangular trading of molasses.
>
> The British molasses monopoly has steadily increased their purchases of Cuban molasses since Castro's takeover, and recently purchased the entire output from the current crop. This Cuban molasses apparently is being used for British domestic consumption and to supply other customers abroad and the free world molasses that this Cuban molasses displaces, is then shipped to the United States and dumped on our market. We are, in effect, under this triangular trading method, finding Cuban molasses competing indirectly with our own domestic molasses. With our costs for labor and supplies and equipment increasing at a rapid pace, the producers of molasses are concerned about anything that reduces their returns. Aside from the fact that triangular trading appears to circumvent our Government's embargo on Cuban molasses, the indirect effect of this on our molasses market is to hold down our molasses price far below what it should be, and there seems to be little hope of improvement as long as this practice continues.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to point out the international and the domestic difficulty encountered by the United States in attempting to carry out our announced policy with respect to the Communist government in Cuba. I have been assured that our Government has made strong representations to all our allies to assist us in this problem. Our own Secretary of State has pointed out that if practices such as I have outlined continue, there very well could be in the United States the immediate and strong consumer reaction. Perhaps this is the only answer.

All of this points out, of course, the complexity and the difficulty which the United States has in achieving its international policies. This is particularly true in the voluntary system of the free world composed of sovereign, independent nations with the right to their own opinions and policies. But it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the issue of the elimination of communism in Cuba and prevention of its spread in the Western Hemisphere is a fundamental one for the entire free world and it is tragic indeed that we are not absolutely united on this issue.

EMPLOYER-OF-THE-YEAR AWARDS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from Performance, the monthly publication of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. This item appeared in the February issue and graphically shows what can be done in a practical way to assist the retarded:

> NARC PRESENTS AWARDS TO EMPLOYEES OF RETARDED
>
> In recognition of its 25-year training and employment program for the mentally retarded, Hutzler's department store of Baltimore, Md., received the National Association for Retarded Children's Employer of the Year Award.
>
> Albert D. Hutzler, Jr., store president, in accepting the award, noted that Hutzler's is a pioneer in hiring the mentally retarded. Since 1940, in cooperation with the Baltimore city school system, the store has provided on-the-job training for more than 1,000 girls in special classes. Some have stayed with Hutzler's as full-time waitresses, others have gone on to better jobs in the company and in the community. Today there are 34 young ladies working in the store's Quixie restaurant.
>
> The silver certificate was awarded to the Honolulu Laundry Co., Ltd. Company President Hiroshi Mitsuda states, "These young people deserved a chance and I was fortunately able to present that opportunity. They turn in a day's work for a day's pay and earn their way." At present there are six mentally retarded employees in the laundry working as seamstresses and pressers.
>
> Remco Industries Co., received the gold certificate. Saul Robbins, president, said, "We have been hiring mentally retarded employees for the past 10 years—and we are sold on them. From a purely dollars-and-cents standpoint, they are unbeatable."
>
> The employer award program was established in 1964 by the NARC in cooperation with the President's Committee to give national recognition to employers who hire the mentally retarded. The awards are presented annually at the convention of the NARC to focus attention on the fact that the mentally retarded can do the job and that it is good business to hire them. Winner of the first annual award was the W. T. Grant Co.
>
> There are 2 million mentally retarded persons employed today. They work in shops, factories, offices, restaurants, and on farms, in jobs behind the scenes and with the public; as sales clerks, messengers, upholsterers, mechanics, stock boys, waitresses, painters, carpenters, and in many other capacities.
>
> More than 15,000 retarded persons will obtain jobs this year; 50 percent more than the 10,000 last year and more than double the 6,000 in 1960. But there are over a million who need jobs. The NARC is conducting an intensive 3-year campaign to promote training and hiring of the mentally retarded.

THE DECADE OF DEVELOPMENT AT MIDPOINT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, in launching the Alliance for Progress, dubbed the 1960's the decade of development.

We are now at midpoint in the decade of the sixties, and now is a good time to reflect on the Alliance for Progress, to determine the scope of its achievements, and to evaluate what it has done thus far; but even more this is the time to lay more plans for the future, to complete the task that has been started so well. The Alianza is a project of bold dimensions; it is confronted with staggering tasks; it is a program for men of great audacity and courage. I know that my colleagues will be interested in President Johnson's report on the progress of the Alliance in its first 5 years, and therefore I am asking that it be made part of the RECORD of today's proceedings.

President Johnson's reaffirmation of his belief in and support of the Alliance for Progress is clearly evidenced by the remarkable success of the last 2 years in this endeavor.

President Johnson's determination to succeed in this critically needed work is a most encouraging thing, for nothing succeeds like success, and President Johnson's determination to push the Alliance means success.

President Johnson's report follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY FOR THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

My fellow citizens of the hemisphere, since becoming President, I have often restated my own, and our country's resolute commitment to the goal of a better life for all the people of the Western Hemisphere.

Many Presidents have worked to shape that goal.

We are proud of the good neighbor policy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

President Eisenhower broke new and fertile ground with the Act of Bogotá in 1960—an act growing from the understanding compassion of one people for another.

President Kennedy built on these efforts and gave them increased emphasis with the announcement of the Alliance for Progress on March 13, 1961, 5 years ago.

Today, by word and deed, Americans are helping to fulfill the hopes of those who have little and pray that one day they can have more.

The Johnson administration seeks history's description as a time when, the dreaming and the planning having laid the foundations, the doing and building were underway.

The last 2 years of this vast cooperative effort between the United States and the nations of Latin America are solid evidence that deeds are matching our words.

During these 2 years Latin America has achieved a per capita growth rate of 2.5 percent. The average rate for the preceding 3 years was less than 1 percent. This recent increase of 150 percent is a fact which friends of the hemisphere must note with pride—and new hope for the future.

In fiscal years 1965 and 1966, those Latin American countries cooperating with U.S. programs of action are putting visible results before their people.

Together we are: Improving 7,000 miles of road; building 130,000 dwelling units; irrigating 136,000 new acres of farmland; adding 530,000 kilowatts to power generating capacity; providing classrooms for 1 million students; building 450 new health facilities; spending $200 million to provide financing for expansion and construction of over 5,000 industrial firms; spending $250 million in providing agricultural credit to 450,000 farmers.

Equally important, reforms are changing and modernizing these institutions in Latin America essential to the growth of a sense of community that stretches throughout the hemisphere.

Governments, business concerns, labor unions, and cooperatives are working with the people of our hemisphere to attain economic and social progress under free institutions.

We are building the machinery of cooperation through the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress.

We are enlisting the support of private groups and voluntary agencies in ever-increasing measure. The Peace Corps, Partners for the Alliance, Council on Latin America, AFL–CIO, private foundations, and universities are making vital contributions.

We are introducing the principle of mutual aid among the Latin American nations. We are giving new energy to economic integration within Latin America. The Economic and Social Act of Rio de Janeiro, approved last November, gives impetus to these concepts.

We recognize that fulfillment of all our goals will require continuation of our joint efforts beyond 1971. I said last November that the United States is prepared to extend mutual commitments beyond the period originally foreseen in the Charter of Punta del Este. Self-help and mutual aid will be yardsticks in determining the scope of our contribution.

In country after country, nations in the hemisphere are acting to mobilize resources for public and private investment—to reform and modernize the institutions—to expand trade and market opportunities within and outside the hemisphere—and to provide a solid base for the support and cooperation of imported capital and technical assistance.

External support is also coming in increasing measure from the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, and its affiliates and the United Nations. This support has increased by about $200 million in the last 2 years.

For its part, the United States has already committed nearly $5 billion to the nations of Latin America to assist them in their struggle to modernize and achieve a better life for their people. In recent months significant steps have been taken to give Latin America greater access to our markets:

This administration has insisted that our participation in the International Coffee Agreement be more effective.

This administration recommended the Congress withdraw the special import fee on sugar.

This administration removed the quota restrictions on lead and zinc.

After a temporary period of setback, there are now most hopeful signs of a renewal of large-scale private foreign investment in Latin American development, often in joint ventures with Latin American associates. Business leaders interested in Latin American investment have been invited to the Cabinet Room frequently to discuss steps to help the people of the hemisphere.

Three years ago the 19 Latin American countries were deeply concerned over their trade position in the world. During the past 2 years the trend has changed.

Our experts now predict that export earnings for 1965 will show an increase of $1 billion over the 1963 level, providing additional resources for investment in development.

Yet we must do more than provide money and technical assistance and improve trade. Investments must be made directly in human beings. In every forum, I have advocated and directed that American resources be invested in education, health, and improved living and working conditions. Such efforts are not easy to organize. They require the mobilization of human resources in scarce supply. But they are among the most rewarding of all investments.

Today I want to issue a new call to our sister nations in the hemisphere to enlarge our truly revolutionary cause—the cause of enlarging the lives of all our people.

I am determined to contribute America's resources to this spirit of change—a spirit now slowly, surely, confidently growing in the Western Hemisphere.

All of us in the Organization of American States have seen and understand the lessons of history. Together we are strong. Divided we are weak. Together, we must shape the future to our hopes.

In every nation in the hemisphere the needs and the beliefs and the prayers are the same. We want peace and opportunity—the chance to live in dignity, to choose and plan and work and achieve the best for our families.

I believe that the next 5 years we will see a continent constantly growing in prosperity and in unity—growing in its capacity to meet the desires and needs of its own people—and in its contribution to peace and freedom in the world at large.

That is what Bogotá and Rio and Punta del Este were all about.

For my own part, I want to help make all this a reality and "to create out of the human spirit, something that did not exist before."

This is fulfillment. And this is our commitment.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would make rather extensive amendments to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. The bill is designed to strengthen the Foundation and to facilitate its operations, making them both more effective and efficient.

This bill is the result of long and hard work on the part of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and of its Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development which it has been my privilege to chair.

We began work on a careful and general review of the National Science Foundation in the fall of 1964. We solicited the aid of the Science Policy Research Division in the Library of Congress in preparing extensive background material which our subcommittee then spent weeks in studying. We followed this with 7 weeks of hearings which included the testimony of more than 40 of the most knowledgeable people in the country, both in Government and out of Government, with regard to the Science Foundation.

The bill which I have introduced today is the result of those hearings and of lengthy consideration by the subcommittee following the hearings. It has been carefully drawn, with the aid and assistance of those in the executive branch as well as the legislative, and it represents the first comprehensive review of the Foundation which has been made by the Congress since the Foundation was formed 16 years ago.

This bill has the strong support of the subcommittee, and, while it has not itself been taken up before the full committee I believe it is important to note that the subcommittee's report leading to this bill did receive the unanimous backing of the full Committee on Science and Astronautics which adopted it as a House report on January 18, 1966.

We have scheduled hearings on the bill which are to begin on April 19 and have confidence that it will receive the bipartisan support of the full committee on Science and Astronautics.

The importance of the Foundation's work to the welfare of this country, its economy and its security, as well as its cultural status, can scarcely be overemphasized. I strongly urge every Member of the House to give his attention and support to this legislation.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 78 TO PROVIDE A 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today I submitted the following statement to the House Judiciary Committee in support of my resolution, House Joint Resolution 78, to amend the Constitution to provide a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER TO JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 78, TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION TO PROVIDE A 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 16, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a resolution to amend the Constitution to provide a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives in every Congress, except one, since I first came to Congress in 1947. In this Congress, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 78 for the same purpose.

Some years ago, I conducted a poll of the membership of the House and the result of that poll indicated that 319 Members were in favor of the 4-year proposal, with only 110 opposed. I believe that the principle of the 4-year term is overwhelmingly supported, not only by the Members of the House, but by the general public. The best way to find out would be to submit this resolution to the people in the States and let them ratify it or reject it, as they desire. I think there, too, the overwhelming action of the electorate will support the resolution.

The question has been raised whether terms of the Members of the House should be staggered so that one-half of the Members run each 2 years or whether all Members should run, as has been suggested by the President, along with the President every 4 years. I favor the President's idea to synchronize the terms of the President and the Members of the House.

I firmly believe that when we elect a person of one party as President, he ought to have the majority of his party in the Congress so that responsibility is on the party, if we believe in the two-party system. I know that it has occasionally happened that the President has been elected from one party while the majority from the other party are elected to Congress. In off years very frequently, the control will change in the Congress, so that we have a majority party different from that in the White House. But, if we really believe in and want a strong two-party system, then this is the only way to place the responsibility on a party. This precludes the device of denial of responsibility at election time. The man in the White House and the majority should be of the same party.

If the party in power does not live up to its pledges and does not do the job for which it was elected, the people should turn it out of office 4 years later. Divided responsibility should be avoided. The Members of Congress then cannot say: "We didn't have a member of our party in the White House." And, the man in the White House cannot say: "The Members in the majority are of the opposite party and they are not going along with me." This would make for stronger and more effective Government.

In closing, I would like to add that our people are not only entitled to fair representation but also to full representation. Fair representation requires that each man's vote shall be equal to his neighbor's. Full representation deals with the quality of that representation. We have solved, legislatively, the problem of fair representation. Let us also solve the problem of full representation.

An almost impossible burden is placed on a Member who must run for office every 2 years. With an election scheduled every 2 years, a Member must campaign constantly. He must keep "one face" back in the district ready to meet the demands for constant service by his people. He must answer thousands of letters, as well as telephone, wire, and personal requests on various and sundry subjects. He is faced with endless demands on his time, effort, and money for political activities.

All this is vital to his survival as a Congressman, but it has little to do with the legislative business of the House. It is true that in a democracy every elected official must periodically give an account of his stewardship to the people. They then either accept or reject him. This is as it should be. But to ask a Member of the House to do this every 2 years impairs his effectiveness in office.

I urge that the resolution amending the Constitution to extend the terms of Members of the House of Representatives to 4 years be reported favorably to the House for its consideration.

ABE SAPERSTEIN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Chicago, but more so the United States, lost one of its finer citizens yesterday with the sudden passing of Abe Saperstein, the owner-coach of the famed Harlem Globetrotters. He died last night in Weiss Memorial Hospital, Chicago, from an acute coronary attack.

I was privileged to meet Abe Saperstein and it was a wonderful experience. He was not a tall man but he stood tall in moral stature for you could not help but notice the kindness and understanding he had for his fellowman. He was a champion in the fight against oppression and hate and he did it by promoting wholesome entertainment. He was America's unofficial ambassador of good will, an original title he earned through his world travels with his famed Harlem Globetrotters.

For 39 of his 63 years Abe Saperstein was the delight of the sports world. He added a new dimension to the game of basketball. He assembled a group of outstanding Negro athletes that created an art in playing the game. By precision antics, the Harlem Globetrotters became the most unique sports team ever assembled. Their game was fun—all to the delight of the fans. And this exposure before the people of 87 countries in the world helped the United States to create an image of friendliness toward them. I believe that Abe Saperstein exemplified the saying:

> It's not whether you win or lose, but how you play the game that counts.

This was Abe Saperstein, not only in basketball, but in everything else he ever did.

Abe was undoubtedly one of the world's most respected citizens, welcomed wherever he went. He had no real enemies for anyone who came in contact with him could not help but feel kindly toward him. He helped many to achieve their place in society imparting in them the quality of goodness for he was the spirit of goodness.

Abe will never be forgotten. His Harlem Globetrotters are a permanent fixture in the world of entertainment and wherever they appear they will carry with them what Abe Saperstein stood for—friendship.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy in this, their hour of grief. I hope that time will ease their burden of sorrow. Although they are unfortunate in his passing they were fortunate that he was a personal part of their lives.

THE CREDIT ADDICT'S READY PROVIDERS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate CBS News and all who were associated with the production last night of "I O U $315 Billion." The program, featuring Alexander Kendrick's fascinating trip through the respectable byways as well as the incredible jungles of American consumer credit, gave every viewer, I believe, a better appreciation of the actual cost of borrowing and the need for reforms.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumers Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over consumer credit legislation, and as sponsor on the House side of Senator Douglas' truth-in-lending bill, I applaud the willingness of CBS News to air the program even without commercial sponsorship, after the intended sponsor indicated prior to broadcast that the firm was receiving some complaints from businesses with which it regularly deals.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to spotlighting the difficulty which confronts every user of credit in trying to determine what he is actually paying for this service, the program was most successful, I believe, in pointing up the phenomenon of what I have described in some of my speeches as the "credit addict," who cannot resist buying things he cannot afford so long as the providers of credit encourage and entice him to try to afford luxuries beyond his financial capacity. As the program demonstrated, this problem reaches through many income levels, not just the poor.

Credit is a wonderful tool when properly used. Our homebuilding industry has accomplished miracles, thanks to Federal mortgage credit programs. But, like a powerful drug, credit can be a destroyer of those who use it improperly, or to excess. CBS News was able to make this point convincingly. The more public awareness of the problems of misuse and abuse of consumer credit, the quicker Congress and the States will be able to act effectively to help solve the problems. So I appreciate the tremendous national exposure this network program gave to the consumer credit issue.

ACTION URGED

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Constitution praises the administration's efforts to control crime, and it adds that further delay in passage of a bill to control firearms sales is "inimical to the public welfare."

The paper hails the calling for more effective action against crime, for more efficient courts, improved corrective machinery, and comprehensive planning for major reforms.

Because the article sheds light on such a vital subject, I offer the editorial for inclusion in the Record:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 11, 1966]

CUTTING OUR CRIME BILL

President Johnson's message to Congress on control of crime is significant from several standpoints. In calling for more effective action, more efficient courts, improved corrective machinery and comprehensive planning for major reforms, he was reacting to the rapid increase in the Nation's crime bill.

If this crime toll, running into billions annually, can be lowered, the additional investment will be worthwhile. The President asked for increased appropriations for the 1965 Law Enforcement Act from $7.2 million to $13.7 million—a modest price to pay in relation to the crime bill.

The President does not propose to take over responsibility of local law enforcement agencies. He does propose to improve them through Federal programs in education and research into techniques. If carried out, these would result in a more uniform system of justice, administered by more capable officers.

Stressing rehabilitation programs, the President asked for consolidation within the Justice Department of Federal prison, parole and probation functions. And the Secretary of Labor was directed to develop "effective ways to provide correction institutions with job information for good-risk parolees."

As for the indiscriminate sale of guns, the President cited an urgent need for legislation to regulate the flow of firearms into dangerous hands. Here he should know whereof he speaks.

"There is no need to curtail the right of citizens to keep arms for such traditional pastimes as hunting and marksmanship," the President declared. "But there is a pressing need to halt blind, unquestioned, mail-order sales of guns and the over-the-counter sales to buyers from out of State whose credentials cannot be known."

Control of firearms sales is already before Congress. Further delay of its passage is inimical to the public welfare.

A MAJOR MOVE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has taken logical action in urging the creation of a Department of Transportation, the San Francisco Examiner believes. It adds that such a department can unify and coordinate the new agencies, activities, and problems associated with the movement of persons and goods.

Stating that special stress is placed by the President on safety, the paper adds:

> The Hearst newspapers, long and continuously active in further efforts to reduce the terrible traffic toll, are glad the President has given heavy emphasis to this problem.

This enlightening editorial on a matter of such grave concern is offered for the Record, in the belief that others may study its contents with benefit:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Mar. 7, 1966]

A MAJOR MOVE

President Johnson has taken logical action in urging Congress to create a Department of Transportation to unify and coordinate the new agencies, activities and problems associated with the movement of persons and goods. Travel by horseback and stagecoach no longer is the mode. We have become the most mobile country in history.

With our immense development in transportation by land, air and water, the complexities have become numerous and varied. Integration is essential to dissolve the major problems and bring method and system to transportation. It is a national interest of highest priority.

This is the intent of President Johnson's dramatic and forward-looking proposals. They embrace virtually all types of travel and shipment. And they seek to tie together many Federal organizations that now operate independently of one another though all are concerned with the common of transportation.

Special stress is placed by the President on safety. He is particularly concerned about highway carnage. The Hearst newspapers, long and continuously active in furthering efforts to reduce the terrible traffic toll, are glad the President has given heavy emphasis to this problem. Mr. Johnson gives industry an opportunity for further development of safety devices. In the event its efforts seem, after two years, to be inadequate, Federal standardization would be imposed.

There now exists a confusion of non-standardization in highway facilities of even such simplicities as signs as one drives from state to state. This item alone illustrates the current lack of and need for coordination.

The emphasis on highway safety is strikingly important at a time when the Nation has been agonized by a death toll of 49,000 in one year.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXPANDED

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Tunney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to vigorously protest the proposed cutback in title III of the National Defense Education Act. The administration proposes an appropriation of $150 million to continue National Defense Education Act loans through the 1967 fiscal year.

I would like to urge this committee to not only restore the proposed cuts but to expand the National Defense Education Act program.

The justification for such a cut is based primarily on the erroneous premise that specialized equipment is now eligible for purchase under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Even though some instructional items do qualify, under certain conditions, there is still a tremendous vacuum of need for equipment and materials for California's children and schools who do not qualify for assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Many of these needs are now being met through the efforts of the National Defense Education Act.

The State of California Department of Education has informed me that a decrease in the National Defense Education Act funds would severely damage the State's educational system. I have received similar protests from schools in my district.

The National Defense Education Act has been one of the most popular and successful federally financed programs in the history of California education.

In California, emphasis was placed upon curriculum development as a basic objective of the program so that grants for equipment and materials were made in support of specific instructional improvement rather than merely a method of acquiring material.

The National Defense Education Act experience in California has proven that it is possible to use Federal funds with a minimum of Federal control, while stimulating dramatic change in the directions desired by the authors of the Federal program.

One of the major advantages of National Defense Education Act has been to encourage innovation and experimentation on the part of the local school districts. The use of National Defense Education Act funds is for instructional equipment and materials has resulted in significant improvement of the instructional facilities made available to teachers.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds are basically designed for underprivileged areas, and the criterion for "underprivileged" is tied to the family income. While this fills a definite need, there are still many school districts in California with average or better family incomes, that are basically poor districts because of a large dependent military student population and little or no industry or business for taxable funds. In order for this type of district to conduct a quality type of educational program, it must often turn to National Defense Education Act as a source for assistance in acquiring equipment and materials necessary to keep up with changing education demands.

The philosophy of matching funds for educational programs is a healthy one. It contains the concept of incentive aid which has strong appeal to the public and educators. It leaves the local district as an active participant in the program, as well as in the control of funds, while at the same time includes the State as a partner for the improvement of instruction by means of Federal funds.

In California many school administrators if given their choice would prefer categorical aid similar to National Defense Education Act as proposed to lump-sum grants. The reason for this is that the lump-sum grants often become an expansion of a basic type program with little or no thought for experimentation or innovation, whereas categorical aid designed to improve definite subject areas often results in the creation of new ideas in education.

There is tremendous demand by school districts for existing National Defense Education Act funds. During the first 4 years of the administration of National Defense Education Act funds in California, the State department of education reported that approximately $10.9 million in Federal funds were granted to 887 school districts enrolling over 80 percent of the State's total average daily attendance. The demand for National Defense Education Act funds during the next 4 years increased at an even more appalling rate. The 1965–66 school year was an excellent example of this increased demand. While operating on a budget of less than $5 million, the California State Department of Education received approvable requests exceeding $13 million. It was impossible to even begin to meet these demands. This necessitated participants cutting back their original plans, thus suppressing some of the educational creativity and innovation developed by local districts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this information clearly shows the value of continuing the National Defense Education Act program. I am therefore opposed to any reduction of National Defense Educational Act appropriations under title III for the 1966–67 fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to present my views on the need for expanding the National Defense Education Act to include health, physical education, and recreation. Title III of this act was originally designed to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, and foreign languages. Since the National Defense Education Act became law in 1958, title III has been amended twice. In 1964 title III was amended to include English, reading, history, geography, and civics as critical subjects worthy of receiving financial assistance, and in 1965 economics and industrial arts were added to the list. I propose today that this list of critical subjects cannot be complete without the additional inclusion of health, physical education, and recreation.

The passage of the National Defense Education Act was occasioned by a sudden challenge to our scientific and technological supremacy—the launching of the Russian sputnik in 1957. We have since then attempted to meet the challenge of the space race and have even established the National Aeronautics and Space Agency to administer our space progress.

However, even before the advent of the Russian satellite, our Nation realized that we were lagging behind in another area, the area of physical fitness. In 1954 Drs. Hans Kraus and Sonja Weber announced the results of 15 years of testing with over 7,000 children in the United States, Austria, Italy, and Switzerland. Their findings indicated that over 35 percent of the American youngsters failed one or more of six tests given to measure strength and flexibility.

The results of this study gave impetus to the creation of the President's Council on Youth Fitness in 1956. President Eisenhower stated at his first Conference on Youth Fitness:

> National policies will be no more than words if our people are not healthy of body as well as of mind. Our young people must be physically as well as mentally and spiritually prepared for American citizenship.

The President's Council was later expanded in 1963 to also include adults and the name was changed to the President's Council of Physical Fitness.

Unfortunately, the President's Council on Physical Fitness cannot possibly reach every school system in the United States concerned with health, physical education, and recreation. According to a report to the President on 4 years of fitness from 1961 to 1965, 14 States did not even have a full-time person in their State education agency to provide leadership in health, physical education, and recreation; a shortage of health and physical education specialists was noted in the elementary schools; and many physical education teachers and recreation leaders were inadequately trained.

Many of these weaknesses could be alleviated under title XI of the National Defense Education Act. This title authorizes institutions of higher education to operate institutes for advanced study to improve the qualification of teachers. If title XI were expanded to include teachers of health, physical education, and recreation, we could eradicate President Kennedy's reference to "soft Americans."

The technology which originally grew out of our energy and skill now deprives us of the activity necessary to healthy physical development. It is therefore necessary to have better trained teachers, with a knowledge of new materials, to replenish the physical activity erased by an age of automation.

As recently as last year, tests were given to measure physical fitness of pupils in one-half of the Nation's schools. Of those tested, about one-third failed to achieve the desired level of performance. No matter what tests are used or where they are given, the results always tell the same story: Americans are not as fit as they were a generation ago, or as fit as the people of other lands today.

We cannot afford to sit and watch another generation of chairborne children. As a prominent New York doctor has stated:

> Educators sometimes lose sight of the body in their enthusiasm to develop the mind. A brilliant mind in a dead body isn't worth much.

In order to insure healthy minds and bodies to all Americans, I urge you to consider the expansion of the National Defense Education Act to include health, physical education, and recreation.

STEADY COURSE IN VIETNAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers are frequently filled with doubts and questions about what this country is accomplishing in Vietnam. Because the President very properly refuses to stir up false optimism, there are many who mistakenly believe that we are making no progress at all.

This morning's Herald Tribune carried a Washington column by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, one of America's most distinguished journalists, which should be read by all those who are concerned with Asia. In a few succinct paragraphs, Mr. Drummond makes it clear that the firm stand we have taken in Vietnam has had repercussions throughout Asia during the past 12 months—all of them advantageous to the free world:

Laos, Cambodia Cited: U.S. Cause on Other Fronts Advanced by Viet Showing

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—One thing the American people do not want about Vietnam is false optimism. We know the road ahead will be anxious and painful.

But since it became clear that the United States is prepared to stay the course in Vietnam, there have been heartening dividends.

What has happened during the past year following the strong stand—and successful battles—by the United States and South Vietnam?

The evidence is showing up in many nations in Asia and the far Pacific. When you add them up, they begin to show how significantly events have begun to move during the very period the once imminent Vietcong victory has been moving further away from their reach.

The record tells its own story:

Laos: Twelve months ago the Laotian Communists were a mounting peril to the Government. Today they are badly splintered.

Cambodia: Twelve months ago it seemed that Prince Sihanouk was trying to win merit points with the Communists as a hedge against the future. Today he is warning his own people that, if North Vietnam prevails, they can expect no mercy from their own Communist Party.

Philippines: Twelve months ago the Philippines were racked with riots in protest against even the small support the Government was giving to Saigon. Now the Government is preparing to send troops.

Korea: Twelve months ago Korea had contributed only token forces to the defense of South Vietnam. Now it is at the point of bringing the total of its combat troops there to 44,000—more, in proportion to its population of 28,500,000, than the United States itself.

Peiping-Moscow: 12 months ago the American and foreign critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam were in unanimous chorus declaring that one consequence of the U.S. decision to defend South Vietnam was bound to happen: it would end the Sino-Soviet feud and drive Moscow and Peiping back into each other's arms. It did just the opposite.

Japan: 12 months ago Japan was moving toward a new modus vivendi with Red China and was the center of harsh criticism of U.S. policy. Today the Japanese Government is helping to focus world pressure on Hanoi to accept peace talks.

Indonesia: 12 months ago the unpredictable Sukarno held total sway; he was surrounded by pro-Communist associates and buttressed by the third largest Communist Party in the world. Indonesian policy was pro-Red China and anti-Western.

Today Indonesian policy is anti-Red China and less anti-Western. The Indonesian Communist Party is no more. Sukarno has either lost most of his power to the anti-Communist leaders of the army—or all of it.

And on top of these events, not a single dissident South Vietnamese political leader who left Saigon for involuntary exile in protest against past regimes has given his support to the Vietcong.

I am not suggesting that the overturn in Indonesia or that all of the other events stem directly from the strong U.S. stand in Vietnam. That is honestly arguable. What I believe is not arguable is that the evident will of the United States to stay the course in Vietnam made these heartening dividends more attainable.

SUGAR INDUSTRY IN HAWAII SHOWS FURTHER GAINS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the solid foundations on which Hawaii's economy rests is its durable sugar industry. It is therefore with pride and satisfaction that I call the attention of Congress to the state of robust health of our island State's major industry.

In the year 1965 Hawaii registered an alltime record in per-acre sugar production. Exceeding the 1964 figure by almost half a ton, the 1965 sugar production was a record 11.11 tons per acre. This record tonnage exceeds the previous record of 10.84 tons per acre which was set in 1955. One sugar company on the island of Kauai recorded the highest figure ever registered by any plantation with 14.99 tons per acre.

Although comparable 1965 figures for the other domestic areas are not yet available, a cursory comparison with the official 1964 figures of the U.S. Department of Agriculture puts Hawaii well ahead of any other domestic sugar producing area. Louisiana produced 1.76 tons per acre; Florida, 2.61 tons; Puerto Rico, 3.26 tons; and the beet area, 2.38 tons. Since Hawaii's crop takes 2 years to mature, while the others mature in 1 year, the Hawaiian figure should be cut in half for fair comparison. Even then, Hawaii still leads in per-acre sugar production. Hawaii's producers deserve national recognition.

MSGR. ANTHONY DILUCA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week back in my district a joyous triple anniversary was observed, as the beloved pastor of the Holy Family parish of Nutley, Msgr. Anthony DiLuca, celebrated the 60th year of his ordination as a priest, the 33d year of his service to the communities of Belleville-Nutley and his 85th birthday.

Like so many of all faiths of northern New Jersey, I have been privileged to know the monsignor for many, many years. And though his principal work has been devoted to our Lord and the people of his parish, his wise counsel on all matters has so often been sought by men of all creeds. As the editor and publisher of the Nutley Sun, Frank Orechio, stated in an editorial in the current edition of his fine paper, the communities the monsignor "has served so well express their gratitude to one of God's greatest servants."

There is little I can add to Mr. Orechio's editorial accolade. Only the prayer that we may continue to be blessed with Monsignor DiLuca's presence among us for many years to come.

The editorial follows:

Msgr. Anthony DiLuca

The high calling of the priesthood is reserved for very few persons in this world. No greater privilege or blessing can God bestow upon mortal man.

The person thus chosen must possess unique attributes. He can be no ordinary man. Personal sacrifice is the order of the day for a priest.

Sixty years ago, there came to the priesthood in Italy a young man aged 25 whose eager face and hopeful eyes reflected the indomitable spirit of a later-day Christopher Columbus.

Anthony DiLuca, the boy, became Father Anthony DiLuca, never realizing that his deeds on earth were to exceed his childhood's fondest dreams.

A more humble man never walked this earth or wore the priest's collar.

His love of God and church is equaled only by his dedication to the people he serves.

In time the fantastic accomplishments of Father DiLuca, who took over a poor and insignificant "Italian" parish in 1933, came to the attention of the Vatican.

And to the gentle man who developed the "Miracle of Brookline Avenue" came the high honor of elevation to monsignor.

In the 33 years that we of the Nutley-Belleville area have enjoyed the special privilege of Monsignor DiLuca's friendship, inspiring leadership, and companionship, his holy family church complex has become one of the most outstanding parishes in the American branch of the Roman Catholic Church.

As Monsignor DiLuca relaxes to meditate upon his fruitful 85 years this Saturday, the communities he has served so well express their gratitude to one of God's greatest servants. Nutley and Belleville are better communities—because men like Monsignor DiLuca have walked among us.

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, March 16 is a date held dear by all our friends of Hungarian birth or descent. This day marks the 117th anniversary of Hungary's overthrow of the Hapsburg rule in 1849.

This anniversary has significance to all of us whether of Hungarian descent or not, because it reminds us of one of the great 19th century struggles for the type of freedom which America had long enjoyed and cherished. It is important to us because of the almost superhuman fight which a small band of liberty-loving Hungarian patriots waged against the powerful Hapsburg forces.

We read with deep emotion the story of Hungary's dramatic emergence as an independent nation after long centuries of rule by the Turks and Austrians. We are thrilled with the exploits of the young leader of the revolution, Louis Kossuth, who had dedicated his life to bringing independence to his country.

It is with sadness and regret that we are reminded that the coveted independence so loudly acclaimed by the world and so joyfully accepted by the Hungarian people was to be of such short duration.

For it was only a matter of a few short months before the Hapsburgs with the strong help of Russian troops defeated the defenders of the infant Republic. When this tragic blow struck, Kossuth and the other leaders of the new Government were forced to flee. In spite of their efforts while in exile, they could not summon sufficient strength to reestablish the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian people have been suffering a more recent tragedy as grave as that which faced them in 1849. Almost a hundred years later the same powerful Russians who helped them lose their republic, imposed a new form of subjugation and enslavement as they became a part of the area behind the curtain of iron lowered by the Russian Communist leadership. It was these same Russians who moved in with tanks and superior forces of men and guns to quell the short revolt of 1956.

This day commemorating the Independence of Hungary should remind us that the mothers and fathers, the brothers and sisters, the friends and relatives alike of thousands of our loyal American citizens still suffer the privations and loss of dignity resulting from Soviet domination and Communist control.

This important date should remind us, too, of the debt we owe our American citizens who are so proud of their Hungarian blood and heritage.

Their gifts of art, of music, and of drama are only a part of the magnificent contribution they have made to America. Because of these gifts, Americans must not cease in continuing every effort to bring to the people of Hungary a full realization of our love and admiration, and an assurance of our determination to do all in our power to restore the blessings of freedom to them.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] concerning the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, made in the Committee of the Whole, may be printed in the RECORD immediately following the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BYPASSING THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EMPLOYMENT SECURITY: A STUDY IN OBTAINING CONSENSUS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the Lengthy Ways and Means Committee hearings on the administration's bill to amend the unemployment compensation program (H.R. 8282) in August 1965, the Labor Secretary's misuse of proper procedures for administering the employment security program became evident. Under cross-examination it was made clear that the Labor Secretary had not consulted the organization—the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security—established by the 1933 Wagner-Peyser Act, and subsequent departmental reorganization, in making his Department's radical changes in the unemployment security program embodied in H.R. 8282. The Federal Advisory Council was established to insure that those who are affected by the unemployment compensation laws—labor, business, and the public at large—were also consulted both in administering and improving the laws. Thus the Council was established to make certain that the laws met the needs of the people they affect. The Federal Advisory Council has been prevented from performing this necessary and valuable function. The full Advisory Council has met only once since October 1963. This last meeting was held on January 5–6, 1966. At this meeting H.R. 8282 was discussed, but there was no formal resolution or action of any kind.

The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933—section 11(a)—provides for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security, and for State advisory councils. The function and organization of the Federal Advisory Council is not spelled out in the Wagner-Peyser Act, nor do the hearings on the Wagner-Peyser Act and the reports of the Senate and House committees express the intent of Congress in providing for the Council. But Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949 clearly assigns to the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security the responsibility of advising on the coordination and administration of the employment security program.

A clear precedent for the function and organization of the Federal Advisory Council is provided by the Labor Department's published guidelines for State advisory councils. These Labor Department guidelines specify both the function and organization of State advisory councils:

Function:

(a) The Federal guidelines provide that, in general, the functions of the Advisory Council should be to advise the administrative agency in formulating policies, in getting public understanding of the employment security program, and in insuring impartiality, neutrality, and freedom from political influence in the establishment and implementation of employment security policies.

(b) Among the specific functions of the State advisory councils is the requirement that they advise the State employment security agency in developing or revising policies in connection with the administration of the State unemployment insurance laws; also, to assist the State agency in developing a legislative program for improving the State unemployment compensation law to encourage acceptance by the State government of such a program and to cooperate with the State agency in promoting greater understanding and acceptance of the program by the public.

Organization:

(a) The Federal guidelines state that members of State advisory councils should be appointed for 2 years and that one-half of the council should be appointed each year.

(b) The guidelines state that the advisory councils should have regular meeting dates and should meet at least twice a year.

The Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security has begun noncompliance proceedings in specific instances where the composition of the State councils was felt to be improper. In other cases, where advisory councils were assumed to be not properly used by the States, informal pressures have been applied to secure compliance.

The Labor Department guidelines for State employment security advisory councils are a sound basis for evaluating the Labor Department's conduct of its official Federal Advisory Council.

The Labor Department's use of its own Advisory Council is deficient in the following respects when measured against the Labor Department's requirements of the States:

First. The full Federal Advisory Council has not met between October 24, 1963, and January 5, 1966. Its Committee on Employment Service met last on May 11, 1964. This means that the Council had no part in preparing H.R. 8282.

Second. As of the Ways and Means hearings on H.R. 8282 in August 1965, 12 seats on the Federal Advisory Council were vacant out of a total of 26. When the terms of five business, four labor, and three public members ended last June 1965, new members were not appointed. Since August 1965 one business representative has been appointed to the Council.

Third. And most important, the Federal Advisory Council was not consulted in the formulation of H.R. 8282. The meeting in January 1966 was held after the fact, and no recommendations were made to the Labor Department. Members of the Federal Advisory Council have stated that they were never asked to consider H.R. 8282.

The last point should be explored. When asked at the Ways and Means hearings why H.R. 8282 contained a provision for a new advisory committee when the existing one had not been used, Secretary Wirtz answered:

> I have found it, working with that committee, almost impossible to get away from the expression of straight institutional points of view.

Secretary Wirtz could not account for the fact that in many instances the State advisory councils, set up under the guidelines of his own Department, had functioned very effectively.

The Secretary admitted that the bill (H.R. 8282) "did not as such go through the Advisory Council." Contrary to his own Department's guidelines for the State councils the Secretary failed to hold meetings of the Council at least twice a year and failed to obtain the Council's advice on legislation which would alter the Nation's unemployment compensation law. The Secretary of Labor is in defiance of the Wagner-Peyser Act and certainly in violation of his own Department's guidelines in not having appointed members to fill promptly the seats vacated last June.

The Secretary of Labor's argument that the Advisory Council is useless because it represents institutional views is astonishing. Clearly, the purpose of the Wagner-Peyser Act in establishing an Advisory Council composed of labor, management, and public members was to insure that the people affected by unemployment compensation laws should have a means of expressing and eventually resolving their views so that the resulting laws should meet public needs. This function was the purpose for which Congress established the Federal and State Advisory Councils, but the Federal Council has not been given the opportunity to do its work. That the Labor Secretary saw fit to call another meeting of the Federal Council in January in the face of his own effort to bypass it indicates either that he has been impressed by arguments on its behalf, or that he wishes to mollify his critics when H.R. 8282 is next considered by the Ways and Means Committee.

In sum, the Labor Department has drafted H.R. 8282 without the advice of the Advisory Council established for the purpose, and it has not carried out the requirements of the Wagner-Peyser Act in allowing Council seats to remain unfilled. Clearly the Labor Department has applied a double standard: one standard of conduct for the States, and one for itself. Its practices constitute in effect noncompliance with a Federal statute.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. Ellsworth (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. Dickinson (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Rumsfeld (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Stalbaum, for 30 minutes, tomorrow; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Boland, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] follow his remarks.

Mr. Boland, for 30 minutes, tomorrow; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rooney of New York (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Kastenmeier (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga), for 10 minutes, on March 17, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Lipscomb (at the request of Mr. Duncan of Tennessee), for 1 hour, on Thursday, March 24, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mr. Duncan of Tennessee), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Duncan of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Edmondson, for 15 minutes, on Thursday, March 17, 1966.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Rogers of Colorado and to include his own remarks entitled "Save Your Vision Week, 1966."

Mr. Bennett and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bob Wilson.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Duncan of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Chamberlain.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Minish.

Mr. Cooley.

Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. Vanik.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2499. An act to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H.R. 12169. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 15, 1966:

H.R. 12752. An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

On March 16, 1966:

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; and

H.R. 8030. An act to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 17, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2196. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2197. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of diamond tools from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2198. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2199. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of opium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2200. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber (sisal)from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2201. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of crocidolite asbestos (harsh) from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2202. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of celestite from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2203. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2204. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2205. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WAGGONNER: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 776. Resolution providing additional compensation for services performed by employees in the House Publications Distribution Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1329). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-first report on water pollution control and abatement; without amendment (Rept. No. 1330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 13696. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 13697. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13698. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to repeal the existing limit on the grant funds which may be used thereunder in any one State, and to provide for a more effective apportionment of such funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13699. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the existing limit on the grant funds which may be expended thereunder in any one State, and to provide for a more effective apportionment of such funds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 13700. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13701. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13702. A bill to amend the District of Columbia's Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13703. A bill to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 13704. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 13705. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 13706. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to make provision for the appointment to the service academies of the sons of members of the Armed Forces killed in Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 13707. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13708. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13709. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13710. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H.R. 13711. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13712. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 13713. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 13714. A bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R.13715. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13716. A bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 13717. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13718. A bill to provide for the establishment of cooperative outdoor recreation research and training centers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13719. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 13720. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 13721. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 13722. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of an experiment and demonstration plant, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13723. A bill to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund created by the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to provide certain adjustments in amounts of group life and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 13724. A bill to provide a comprehensive program to combat alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 13725. A bill to provide for equitable acquisition practices, fair compensation, and effective relocation assistance in real property acquisitions for Federal and federally assisted programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 13726. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 13727. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at or near Fort Hood, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 13728. A bill to provide that whenever the United States constructs certain fishing vessels in foreign shipyards, equivalent vessels shall be simultaneously constructed in domestic shipyards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 13729. A bill to provide for a program to advance the humane care, comfort, and welfare of laboratory animals used in scientific study; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13730. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13731. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13732. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize additional annual appropriations for grants thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 903. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.J. Res. 904. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 905. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue annually a proclamation designating June as Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Con. Res. 617. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to discrimination in the assignment of U.S. employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H. Res. 780. Resolution requesting the National Science Foundation to study a more equitable distribution of research and development funds; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13733. A bill for the relief of Silvestre Bommarito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13734. A bill for the relief of Angela Maria Costanza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 13735. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Villanueva Samonte Leek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 13736. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene Florence Lamey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13737. A bill for the relief of Dr. Haroon M. Qazi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 13738. A bill for the relief of Stefano and Rose Perrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 13739. A bill to provide for the free entry of one broad range multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Chairman Patman Justly Criticizes Agency Action Overturning Congressional Policies of Over 30 Years' Standing Against Abuses of Commercial-Investment Banking Tieups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest financial reforms of the New Deal was cleaning up the mess in Wall Street from conflicts of interests and abuses inherent in banking-securities tieups.

The Banking Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940 are crystal clear that a clean break between the two industries was what Congress intended. Former Chairman Cary, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, in his 1963 congressional testimony spelled out in detail the tempting opportunities for self-dealing present in bank-sponsored securities operations.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are those who would turn back the clock over 30 years when the Wall Street slogan was, "There's a sucker born every minute." Both the Federal Reserve Board and the Securities and Exchange Commission are bending over backwards to accommodate the entry of First National City Bank of New York into the mutual fund field. Needless to say, their weak attempts to justify this in terms of law and policy do neither agency much credit.

Fortunately, at least one Member of Congress has sounded the alarm over this highly disturbing development, and I refer to our distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman]. Last Thursday, the SEC announced its decision to permit First National City Bank, a $14 billion Wall Street institution, to operate a mutual fund. Chairman Patman's statement in response to this news is "must" reading for all Members. With unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the Record his remarks of last Friday:

Statement by Hon. Wright B. Patman, Democrat, of Texas, Chairman, House Committee on Banking and Currency, on Securities and Exchange Commission Approval of Application by First National City Bank to Enter Mutual Fund Business

Yesterday's (March 10) split decision by the Securities and Exchange Commission, permitting establishment of First National City Bank's Mutual Fund, is truly astounding. Both the Federal Reserve Board and the Justice Department have specifically refused to say that such an operation by a member bank is not a criminal offense, punishable by fine and imprisonment.

Furthermore, when we enacted the Investment Company Act of 1940, Congress specifically provided that, in order to prevent repetition of grave abuses, self-dealing and conflicts of interest between banks and investment companies, hereafter no investment company could have a majority of its board of directors consisting of bankers. In this connection, former Chairman Cary of the SEC, in congressional testimony in 1963, again reminded the Congress of numerous conflicts of interest inherent in bank-sponsored securities operations. Therefore, the majority opinion of the Commission in approving First National City Bank's application to run a mutual fund is saying, in effect, that "Congress really did not mean what it said in 1940 and Chairman Cary was talking through his hat in 1963."

The Commission's weak explanation of its usurpation of congressional policymaking in granting this exemption is that the Comptroller of the Currency periodically examines national bank trust departments. But national bank trust departments have been examined by Federal supervisory authorities ever since national banks were first given trust powers back in 1918, long before Congress saw the necessity of preventing bank domination of mutual funds in 1940.

The entire opinion, except for Commissioner Budges' strong and convincing dissent, has a very strained and almost apologetic tone. But, of course, with the American Bankers Association at the very same moment pushing hard for a special interest bill that would take away all SEC jurisdiction over bank ventures into the mutual-fund field, I suppose SEC approval should not have been too surprising.

Save Your Vision Week, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 6 just ended the National Save Your Vision Week. I have a special interest in this observance. Two years ago I sponsored in the House the joint resolution which led to the President's declaring the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week. I might add that the then senior

Senator of Minnesota, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, introduced the resolution in the Senate.

The first Save Your Vision Week took place in 1927 and since then the several States Governors have declared statewide Save Your Vision Weeks. My home State of Colorado proclaimed a State Save Your Vision Week to impress the public with the importance of preserving individual eyesight. Based on my State's program, I was anxious to have this important message brought to all our country's citizens and worked for congressional passage of the National Save Your Vision Week.

Promotion of this notable week was initiated by optometry and has been supported by the optometric profession ever since. During this past week millions of people heard and saw carefully prepared, instructive, and educational material concerning visual care via radio announcements and television film clips as well as newspaper and magazine articles.

The most important educational material, however, was presented in personal or as group efforts by optometrists who took the time and made the effort to present the Save Your Vision Week message to local schools, safety groups, civic clubs, and other organizations concerned with visual care.

Our country is fortunate indeed that long ago some leaders in the optometric profession developed the idea for a Save Your Vision Week and continued their work until the idea became recognized and appreciated by Congress and all the capitals of our States and possessions. Through the years, the American Optometric Association has prepared and disseminated valuable educational materials to all communication media until today optometry is readily identified with the national interest in professional vision care.

In proclaiming the 1966 National Save Your Vision Week, President Johnson stated:

> I call upon the communications media, the medical, ophthalmological, optometric, and other health professions, and all agencies concerned with programs for the improvement and preservation of vision, to unite in public activities to impress upon the people of the United States the importance of good vision to their happiness and welfare, and to urge their participation in programs to improve and protect the vision of our people.

Furnished this official backing and fortified with excellent and well-prepared materials supplied by the American Optometric Association, optometrists across the Nation made much of the local news by their individual and collective information programs.

Thousands of schoolchildren in every State received vision screening, many for the first time; thousands of industrial people obtained literature and information designed to make them more aware of preventable hazards to their vision in the plant; thousands more learned of the need for perfect vision in driving; and many more thousands of adults saw and heard evidence which made them more aware of the need for professional eye care.

The week just ended completes the 1966 National Save Your Vision Week, but the value of the observance continues. Although we cannot now measure the impact of the program, I know firsthand of the long-term benefits to our citizens of the vision care information disseminated. I commend the members of the optometric profession and the American Optometric Association for their work in reminding all of us in this week just past to save our vision.

Hon. Henry Larcade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, the day after his passing away, it was my disheartening duty to announce to the House the loss of the beloved former Member, and one of my predecessors as U.S. Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, the Honorable Henry Dominique Larcade, Jr.

Today, as one who can claim the privilege of having been a fellow Louisianian and fellow American of Henry Larcade, it is with pride that I relate to you some of his honorable history and good deeds which command for him the respect and admiration of all Americans.

Mr. Larcade, statesman of the first rank and loyal American, was born in Opelousas, St. Landry Parish, La., July 12, 1890. Some 53 years later, Mr. Speaker, that distinguished member of the Democratic Party, Henry Larcade, was elected to membership in this Chamber and ably served as a Member of Congress during the 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st and 82d sessions, which covered the period January 3, 1943, through January 3, 1953. He chose not to be a candidate for reelection in 1952.

As a freshman Congressman and at the outset of his decade of dedication in the House, which spanned most of World War II, Mr. Larcade was appointed to six standing committees of the House which existed during the 78th and 79th Congresses. They were the Committees on Education, Flood Control, Patents, Pensions, Territories, and Rivers and Harbors. During the 79th Congress he was named chairman of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Territories in connection with its study and investigation of proposed statehood for the then Territory of Hawaii. In its report to the committee which followed, Mr. Larcade's special subcommittee recommended that immediate consideration be given to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

Following the reorganization of committees by act of Congress of 1946, Mr. Larcade continued his untiring labors during the 80th Congress as fourth-ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on Public Works as well as the ranking Democratic member of Subcommittees on Rivers and Harbors and Beach Erosion. For the 81st Congress the Public Works Committee merged its Subcommittee on Beach Erosion into that on Rivers and Harbors, over which Mr. Larcade presided as chairman; and he was at that time third-ranking Democratic member of the full committee.

During the last Congress of which Henry Larcade was a Member, the 82d, he had attained the position of second-ranking member of the full committee and continued his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors with distinction.

But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Larcade's service to his constituents and his country was not limited to that of the role of statesman, nor did he come to Congress uninitiated to the gravity and tragedy of war or the sacrifices attendant to the role of public servant.

Mr. Larcade served as a private in the 348th Infantry, 87th Division, U.S. Army, in World War I. Before the end of that war, he was commissioned second lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps, Officer Reserve Corps. During peacetime he was engaged in the banking and insurance businesses.

Henry Dominique Larcade, Jr., began his public service career in 1913, serving as a member of the St. Landry Parish School Board from that year through 1928. In 1928, he was elected from his district to the Louisiana State Senate and served through 1932. From 1936 through 1940 Mr. Larcade served as assistant clerk of the Louisiana State Senate. Not one to deprive his fellow men of his talents and energies, and following his strenuous 10 years as a Member of Congress, Henry Larcade was to return to Louisiana and offer 4 more years of his life to his beloved State by serving in the Louisiana Senate once more, from 1956 through 1960.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that, in the passing from this life of the Honorable Henry Dominique Larcade, Jr., the Nation, as well as the State of Louisiana, has sustained the loss of a noble and faithful son. I extend my deepest sympathies to Mrs. Larcade and suggest that she has much to be proud of in his record of achievement for his State, his country, and his fellow men.

Unemployment Compensation Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, public hearings are currently underway on H.R. 8282, the unemployment compensation

reform bill, in the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member.

Many issues have been raised in recent articles concerning this proposed legislation, which I feel needs additional clarification.

In this connection, I wish to insert, at this point in the RECORD, a recently completed study to answer, on a section-by-section basis, the questions which were raised in a recent Reader's Digest article on this legislation. The study follows:

THE ARTICLE	THE COMMENT
The article characterizes the bill as "* * * a shocking grab for Federal power * * *" and "* * * nothing less than total revolution in our system for giving benefits to the unemployed."	**There is no "grab" for Federal power, and 8282 is not a revolutionary federalization of the unemployment compensation system.** The unemployment compensation system was created not by the States, but by the taxing power of the Congress when it passed the Social Security Act of 1935. Even in 1935 the Committee on Economic Security said that the requirements which State laws on unemployment compensation must fulfill could at any time be increased or altered by Congress, to achieve needed improvements in State laws.
This is nothing less than total revolution in our system for giving benefits to the unemployed. Historically, we have always let each State lay down its own rules for dispensing such compensation. H.R. 8282 invests this vast power in the Federal Government.	There have always been certain standards in the Federal Statute that State laws must meet for employers in that State to receive **almost 90-percent credit against the Federal tax. H.R. 8282 would now provide some additional standards that State laws must meet** in the future for the full credit to be allowed.
Washington would set the standards which probably would become the accepted policy in each of the 50 States. For, although the new bill does not say that the States must **adopt its standards, certain tax penalties would be imposed on employers in any State** that did not meet every standard in 8282. These economic teeth could effectively force all the States to go along.	The bill imposes no penalties—it just contains provision for tax credit. And as several independent scholars have pointed out, the Federal Government **must be able to use some incentive to encourage the States to make needed adjustments within a reasonable length of time.** And it should be noted that the new Federal "standards" allow, as now, great initiative and variations to be made by the States.
If these Federal standards do become law, the benefit provisions involved would probably cost billions of dollars more than present compensation programs. And employers—who have always paid the bill—would be saddled with an estimated increase of 60 percent or more in payroll taxes.	**This statement creates a false impression about both present and prospective costs. Actually, benefits under State laws in 1965** totaled about $2.2 billion. Proposed improvements would have added less than another half billion dollars. One additional advantage of unemployment insurance taxes is that they are greater than benefits in **periods of high employment and, therefore, represent an anti-inflationary mechanism.** In poor times benefits exceed outgo from the fund, and the effect is an antirecession stimulation. In both respects unemployment insurance helps to stabilize our economic system.
Weekly compensation checks for many unemployed would double, or more, and in certain cases could be paid for as long as a year and a half.	**Only where a benefit is now so small that it represents less than a fourth of the worker's lost weekly wage could this possibly occur.** In such a case, the change is desirable. The bill does not require any benefit greater than one-half the former wage, and only then within the limits set **by the maximums. The duration of the benefit depends on the worker's previous work record and on whether he continues to** be able and available for work and registered for work. If he refuses a suitable job or appropriate training, his benefits will be discontinued.
In addition, H.R. 8282 would liberalize the ground rules for determining who's in or out of this benefit bonanza. It would open the floodgates for untold thousands of claims now outlawed by State statutes. It could make it easier for people to cheat in collecting benefits, and more difficult to punish the cheaters.	**The bill would strengthen administration by providing for training of State personnel so they will be better equipped to prevent fraud, properly apply eligibility and disqualification provisions of State laws, and insure that payments go only to a qualified and eligible unemployed workers.** H.R. 8282 in no way limits a State's ability to detect, prosecute and obtain criminal convictions for fraud, nor does it affect in any such provisions in State laws. In addition, H.R. 8282 allows for a benefit disqualification for fraud up to 3 years—greater than most States now impose. Because of a long history of increasingly restrictive and punitive State qualification laws (which, for example, in some States prevent a person from receiving benefits while attempting to go through training school in the evening!) it is the purpose of H.R. 8282 to
Such largess could further encourage a growing class in America—the voluntarily unemployed. Why keep on working, when it would be so easy to collect pay for not working? Especially since jobless benefits—in contrast to earned income—are not subject to any income or social security taxes, cannot be attached by creditors and are not subject to union dues.	
Weekly, there are still about 1 million pending claims. In a year the cost runs about $3 billion.	
At present, not one State meets all the standards laid down in H.R. 8282.	
In fact, many abuses would get the sanction of law if the bill is adopted. For instance: **Workers who voluntarily quit their jobs for any reason, including just plain laziness, could still get benefits.**	
Even most employees dismissed for outright misconduct could get compensation.	
Any jobless person offered a new job with both suitable wages and working conditions could turn it down—and still get compensation.	
Millions of workers would be able to take a year's "vacation" by quitting their jobs and collecting benefits at half their pay. After that, with just 1 more day's work, the jobshirker could be eligible for a further 26-week round of benefits at half pay. **In some States, certain older workers could actually make more money—for a time—by retiring early and adding tax-free unemployment compensation to their company pensions and social security benefits.** **At present, all States put a ceiling on weekly benefit checks. Alaska's top, for example, is $45. Under the new bill that State, by 1971, would have a maximum of $110 weekly, by the Labor Department's estimate.**	
H.R. 8282 is equally generous in the duration of payments. A common State-prescribed minimum now is 10 or 12 weeks—**with 26 the usual maximum. The new bill would set a usual minimum of 26 weeks for everybody covered by compensation.**	
Some claimants could qualify for 26 more weeks by working just 1 day between the 1st and 53d weekly benefit checks—which comes to 78 weeks of tax-free payments.	
To be eligible for the first 26 weeks of benefits, the new bill says a claimant must have worked 20 weeks "or the equivalent." Here is where the fancy footwork comes in. Actu-	

THE COMMENT

open the doors for more legitimate and honest claims.

In no circumstance would a claimant receive compensation for more than half his own weekly wage as a result of H.R. 8282. In addition to losing half his wage, he loses fringe benefits (under new contracts in the auto industry these add up to about $1 an hour) and all the amounts regularly added to one's social security accounts. And, of course, the right to collect unemployment compensation is only earned by working and by seeking work when unemployed.

The total amount of benefits paid varies greatly and with the number of persons unemployed. Only in 1958 and 1961 have benefit costs reached $3 billion. Under such circumstances, 2¼ million persons a month file claims. On the other hand, in recent months only about 1 million persons file claims weekly. Thus, while the system is needed and used in times of high economic activity as well as in times of recession, the state of the economy influences directly the extent to which it is used and the level of benefit costs. Wage insurance is responsive to need as well as stabilizing to the economy.

Nor is there any provision or change in H.R. 8282 which has not or is not being tried in some of the States.

H.R. 8282 does not require any State to pay benefits to any individual worker unless he is available for work, seeking work and willing to work, and provides further: Workers who quit jobs without good cause could be denied benefits for 7 weeks, a longer period than many States now provide.

Employees dismissed for misconduct could be denied benefits for 7 weeks, a longer period than many States now provide.

Claimants refusing suitable jobs without good cause could be denied benefits for 7 weeks, a longer period than many State laws now provide.

Even after 7 weeks, the disqualified worker will not receive benefits unless he is available for and seeking work, is willing to accept suitable work, and is eligible in all other respects.

H.R. 8282 neither requires nor contemplates the payment of benefits to any worker on "vacation." It requires payment only to workers with substantial past employment, and contains no provision that "1 day's work" qualifies an individual for benefits.

H.R. 8282 contains no proposal relating to older workers or those receiving pensions. Whatever effect there would be on the eligibility and benefits of such workers would be attributable only to provisions in State laws.

Regardless of the maximum, the bill does not require that any worker in Alaska (or in any other State) receive more than half pay. It does not require that any individual be paid $110 maximum unless his own regular weekly pay was $220 or more.

It certainly seems necessary to establish a minimum of 26 weeks, when 25 percent of the claimants in 1963 exhausted all their benefits before finding work.

As an example of the options left open to the States, if a worker does not accumulate enough weeks of work to qualify for 26 weeks of benefits, the States may pay him benefits on a graduated basis of their own determining.

The present provisions of State laws can be met occasionally by a person with an unusual work record of limited duration. In providing qualifying requirements in State laws, State legislatures obviously discounted the likelihood or frequency of such odd situations, and similar provisions in H.R. 8282 are merely adapted to existing State statutes.

To avoid substituting a uniform Federal formula for the individual State approaches, H.R. 8282 was drafted in terms of equivalents in order to accommodate the States' basic

THE ARTICLE

ally, as Gordon W. Winks, a Chicago lawyer representing the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, told Congress:

In 36 States a claimant being paid the statewide weekly average could satisfy the definition of equivalency by working only 5 weeks in a year, provided no more than 3 were in 1 quarter.

Many part-time workers could satisfy the requirement by working only 2 days a week for 20 weeks.

A well-paid entertainer could satisfy all the requirements by working one day in one quarter of the year and one day in another.

In the first place, the new bill would skyrocket the amount of payroll taxes earmarked directly for the Federal Government. This flat tax, levied on business, is now a maximum of $12 annually per worker; under 8282, this maximum would rise to $36.30, making an overall increase of $995 million per year. Payroll taxes for State compensation funds would also jump astronomically—to pay for the liberalized benefits and to cover the voluntarily unemployed pensioners and others now disqualified by State laws. Nobody really knows how much the whole works would add, but guesses range up to $2 billion—on top of the billions we are already spending on unemployment compensation.

All States now have a system for a sliding scale of taxes on employers. In most States an experience rating is kept for each company, to record how many compensation claims are filed by its former employees. Firms with a steady employment record pay less taxes than those with a high labor turnover.

H.R. 8282 does not go the whole way in giving the union leaders what they want in this respect. It would not abolish the experience-rating system, but it would make it possible to abolish experience rating with considerable ease. Under the provisions of the new bill, employers with a high labor turnover doubtless would join with the unions in pressuring their legislatures for uniform taxation of all employers. A system in which everyone paid at the same rate would of course reduce the high payroll taxes now paid by firms with bad experience ratings.

A cabal of labor leaders and Washington bureaucrats is now trying, quietly but with determination, to ram through the greatest raid ever aimed at this country's unemployment-compensation system.

THE COMMENT

types of systems for determining benefit entitlement.

Under present laws in 21 States, he could now meet the qualifying requirements for benefits and in 39 States he could do so by working 5 weeks for somewhat higher than average wages.

This would satisfy present qualifying requirements in 12 States, 6 of which require less than 20 weeks.

This could meet present qualifying requirements in 40 States. For example, under the present Illinois law to be eligible a person must earn a total of $800 in his base period, with $175 in a quarter other than his high quarter. The entertainer could meet this requirement by earning $600 for 1 day's work and $200 for another day in a different quarter.

The cost impact is grossly overstated. Actually, unemployment compensation protection is provided at bargain rates. In 1964 and 1965 the combination of State and Federal taxes averaged about 1½ cents per payroll dollar. Had H.R. 8282 been in full effect, the cost would have been about 2 cents.

The Federal share of the tax would rise to $36.30 by 1971.

H.R. 8282 merely surrenders to the State legislatures full control of their traditional rights to regulate State taxation and removes Federal restrictions on this process. It is a "giant step" away from the domination of the States, and it is a reduction of the monolithic government in Washington.

H.R. 8282 permits a State to keep its present experience-rating system if the State legislature wishes to do so. But the article does not trust State legislatures to evaluate experience rating on its merits, or to resist pressures of unions and some employers for another system. The writers apparently believe that it should defend at all cost, including the fullest use of Federal authority, maximum tax savings through experience rating for some employers, but that even minimum Federal protection for workers encroaches on the States' traditional rights.

The comments above should clear up some of the fallacies and distortions concerning unemployment compensation and H.R. 8282. Public understanding of the issues will come from a more rational debate of the issues than is reflected in the opposite opening sentence of the Reader's Digest article.

Sgt. R. D. Williams, Former House Page, Gave His Life Courageously for the Cause of Freedom While Serving as a Marine in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of great sadness that I pay tribute today to the late Sgt. Robert D. "Bob" Williams, of Fayetteville, Tenn., a former page of the House who was killed in Vietnam recently.

Bob Williams was a fine, patriotic, personable young man who saw his duty clearly. He heard his country's call and volunteered for service in the marines. He asked for service overseas. And, he volunteered for more active duty after being sent overseas.

Bob William's courage and dedication were in the great tradition of the Volunteer State of Tennessee and of our country.

This fine young American served as a page under my sponsorship during the 1961 session of Congress. He enjoyed Washington. He was keenly interested in political science, history, and Government.

He was active in my State in the Young Democratic Club and when then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was the featured speaker at a Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner in Nashville, Bob Williams was the first to shake the hand of the Vice President at the conclusion of his address.

President Johnson in a telegram to Mrs. Kathleen Williams, Bob's mother, said this:

> Yours has indeed been a deep personal loss but you may take pride in the knowledge that your son's services to his country contributed greatly to safeguarding the freedom cherished so dearly by peace-loving nations throughout the world. In choosing to serve in the Armed Forces of his country during these troubled times, your son demonstrated the love of country and devotion to duty of a true American.

I join the President and others who came to know Bob Williams in extending our deepest sympathy to his fine and courageous mother and to other members of the family. The greatness of America was never more apparent than in the sacrifice and patriotism of this fine young man who gave his life in the cause of freedom.

President's Vietnam Policy Supported by Representative Bob Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIGIO DE LA GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the President's policy in handling the crisis in Vietnam and southeast Asia. This is one of the most difficult problems in foreign policy our Nation has faced, and some of us believe the handful of critics have been given undue attention by the press.

Many of my colleagues have repeatedly expressed full support of our President's policy, but rarely does it get more than local attention. Because I feel the American people, and in particular my colleagues in Congress, should know that most of us have great confidence in our President, and stand with him on the difficult decisions he has had to make, it is my pleasure to bring to your attention the report of a speech made by my friend and colleague, Representative BOB CASEY, before the Houston Optimist Club.

The report is from the Southwestern Argus of March 3, 1966:

> BOB CASEY STANDS WITH L.B.J.
>
> Congressman BOB CASEY, who visited Vietnam in November, said in Houston Thursday that President Johnson's war policy has his full support.
>
> CASEY was sharply critical of recent attacks in Washington on our policy in Vietnam.
>
> Speaking before the Houston Optimist Club in the Rice Hotel, CASEY called the war "one of the dirtiest wars and also one of the most vital we have ever fought."
>
> "I have often differed with the President, but I am in full accord with his Vietnam policy," CASEY said.
>
> "The criticism in Washington adds fuel to the fires of criticism at home—the talk of withdrawal appeals to the mother whose son is about to go to Vietnam and to those who would have us withdraw into a shell."
>
> CASEY said he had recently received a letter from a constituent, a woman, "who wanted to know what we are doing over there, why we don't pull out and why does the President refuse to sit down at the conference table."
>
> "She and others like her are ignoring the President's every effort to mediate the the war, including the cessation of bombing, the many emissaries he has sent all over the world and his repeated invitations to the Vietcong to meet us at the conference table," the Congressman said.
>
> "This lady is willing to take the word of three men who, against the laws of this country, visited Hanoi and came back as mouthpieces for the Communists. She is willing to take their word against that of the President of the United States.
>
> "Let's consider what would happen if we did pull out.
>
> "The coalition Government in South Vietnam would fall almost immediately; the Vietcong would take over and reap revenge on every man who opposed them. You would see the worst blood bath in modern history.
>
> "Our presence in Vietnam encourages other Asian nations.
>
> "Other countries, not as advanced as ourselves, gain encouragement to take on a more democratic government.
>
> "We may not live to see it, but in time our sacrifices will bear fruit."
>
> Congressman CASEY said that he is sure that President Johnson is sensitive to the loss of American lives in the war, "more than any of us, I imagine, because he has to make the decision to send our boys over there."
>
> "It would be easy for the President to dodge this grave responsibility and leave the problem for the next President," CASEY said.
>
> "But with leadership comes responsibility—I don't envy the President."

Cincinnati Jaycees Place Second in Nation in Governmental Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recognition received by the Greater Cincinnati Junior Chamber of Commerce during the U.S. Jaycees fifth annual governmental affairs seminar recently held in Washington, D.C. The Cincinnati chapter was rated No. 2 in the Nation in the area of governmental affairs.

Chester T. Cruze, president of the Cincinnati chapter, received the award in behalf of the chapter. The award is well deserved and I particularly commend Mr. Cruze for his outstanding service.

In large measure the award was based on the work done by the Cincinnati Jaycees in setting up a local chapter of the Robert A. Taft Institute of Government. This project was accomplished with the help of the University of Cincinnati and the social studies, economics, political science, and civics high school teachers of the Cincinnati public schools.

The local chapter's goal—

As expressed by Cincinnati Junior Chamber President Cruze—

> is to inculcate a working knowledge of government in our educators by merging practicality and realism with political theory to produce an intellectual treatment of the institution of government in our classes that is to the traditional civics course as integral calculus is to object counting.

The programs set up by Dr. R. Eric Weise, professor of political science at the University of Cincinnati, who is codirector of the institute with Mr. Cruze, are designed to contribute to the knowledge of social studies teachers in practical politics through seminars presided over by experienced government and party officials ranging from U.S. Senators, Congressmen, State legislators, city councilmen, National, State, and county party chairmen to precinct leaders.

The programs, held at the University of Cincinnati Student Union Building one Saturday a month, are nonpartisan, embracing leaders from both parties at each session, usually one another's counterpart in office. Dr. Dieter Dux, head of University of Cincinnati's political science department, and Mr. John DeCamp, director of public relations, are the University of Cincinnati's advisers to the Cincinnati institute.

The official U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce organ, Future magazine, has stated:

> Perhaps no program of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce is as important as its efforts to bring a maximum number of informed, conscientious voters to the polls.

Dr. Weise stated in the 1966 Taft Institute program, published by the Cincinnati Jaycees, that—

> This program is part of a continuing effort to realize the objectives of the Robert A. Taft Institute of Government.

The institute, an outgrowth of a foundation in memory of the late Ohio Senator from Cincinnati, was founded in 1961 as a nonprofit, nonpartisan national educational corporation under a charter granted by the board of regents of the State of New York. Its major objectives are: First, to stimulate among Americans an understanding of the problems and processes of government in a free society; second, to inspire more active citizen interest and participation in government at all levels, and third, to advance the art of government and thus help our citizens meet more effectively the great problems now confronting the United States and Western civilization. Its work is keyed to these words of Senator Taft:

> Widespread education is essential to the maintenance of liberty. Freedom and government by the people cannot long survive or be intelligently administered unless the people are educated and have the intelligence and the character which only education can provide. * * * Education is essential if a free people is to remain free. * * * No man

> can be free if he does not understand the opportunities which lie before him.

Surveys made by the Taft Institute indicate that many adults lack political understanding. The Taft Institute's figures show that the best time to reach the citizen who does not understand or participate in politics is while he is in high school. The surveys also show that school administrators are avidly interested in strengthening citizenship education requirements and opportunities.

Future magazine reported:

> Its success in a brandnew field is startling. A new dimension is being added to the citizenship education offered in the junior and senior high schools. This new dimension is a fresh, nontheoretical understanding of the workings of our two-party system. It is the kind of understanding that cannot come from books. It flows from the extended and candid discussions between the teachers and their governmentwise lecturers.

The future voters educated by these Cincinnati educators under the direction of Cincinnati public school's Dr. Robert P. Curry, associate superintendent; Miss Helen Yaeger, administrative supervisor of secondary social studies; Miss Jean Tilford, supervisor; and Mr. Dean Moore, supervising teacher, who have given their time and talent to realize Mr. Cruze's ideal of a treatment both theoretically intellectual and realistically practical cannot help but improve our great democratic institution.

In addition to Mr. Cruze and Dr. Weise, several other Cincinnatians have lent their support to make this institute the success it is. Dr. Walter C. Langsam, president of the University of Cincinnati, Hon. Neil McElroy, former Secretary of Defense, and Hon. Robert Taft, Jr., are members of the institute's advisory council, and Hon. C. A. Harrell, former Cincinnati city manager, is general chairman.

This partnership—business, political, and educational—is strengthening the political fiber of a free society by producing the sine qua non of that free society—good, politically knowledgeable, responsible, and active citizens.

President Johnson Says Fight for Freedom Is American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson made a brilliant exposition of the domestic and foreign policies of his administration in a recent address following his acceptance of the National Freedom Award in New York City.

The President put the struggle in Vietnam in historical perspective, pointing out that it is the American tradition to fight for freedom.

Because of the great interest this speech will have to my colleagues and to Americans everywhere, I place this great speech in the body of the RECORD.

The address of the President follows:

Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Secretary, Senator KENNEDY, members of the fine delegation from New York, ladies and gentlemen at the head table, my fellow Americans, to be honored with this award by this organization is a very proud moment for me. I accept it with the gratitude of my heart and with renewed commitment to the cause that it represents, the cause of freedom at home and the cause of freedom abroad.

Twenty-five years ago, to a world that was darkened by war, Persident Franklin Roosevelt described the four freedoms of mankind: Freedom of speech and expression; freedom of every person to worship God in his own way; freedom from want; freedom from fear. Franklin Roosevelt knew that these freedoms could not be the province of one people alone. He called on all his countrymen—to assist those who endured the tyrant's bombs and suffered his opposition and oppression. He called for courage and for generosity, and for resolution in the face of terror. And then he said, "Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights—or keep them."

Wendell Willkie, Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in the campaign of 1940, shared his belief that freedom could not be founded only on American shores or only for those whose skin is white. "Freedom is an indivisible word," Wendell Willkie said. "If we want to enjoy it and fight for it we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

That was Republican policy 25 years ago. It was Democratic policy 25 years ago. It is American policy here tonight.

Then how well have we done in our time in making the four freedoms real for our people and for the other people of the world? Here in America we accord every man the right to worship as he wills. I believe we are more tolerant of sectional and religious and racial differences than we were a quarter of a century ago. The majority of our people believe that a qualified man or woman of any race, of any religion, of any section, could hold any office in our land. This was not so, not very clear at all in 1940. We are committed now, however great the trial and tension, to protecting the right of free expression and peaceful dissent.

We have learned to despise the witch-hunt, the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different. We have gained in tolerance, and I am determined to use the high office I hold to protect and to encourage that tolerance. I do not mean to say that I will remain altogether silent on the critical issues of our day. For just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I also believe in the President's freedom to attempt to persuade.

So let me assure you and my fellow Americans tonight that I will do everything in my power to defend both.

Twenty-five years ago freedom from want had the ring of urgency for our people. The unemployment rate stood at 14.5 percent. Millions of Americans had spent the last decade in the breadlines or on farms where the winds howled away any chance for a decent life. Tonight there are still millions whose poverty haunts our conscience. There are still fathers without jobs, and there are still children without hope. Yet for the vast majority of Americans these are times when the hand of plenty has replaced the grip of want. And for the first time in almost 9 years tonight the unemployment rate has fallen to 4 percent. This liberation from want, for which we thank God, is a testimony to the enduring vitality of the American competitive system, the American free enterprise economy. It is a testimony also to an enlightened public policy, established by Franklin Roosevelt and strengthened by every administration since his death. That policy has freed Americans for more hopeful and more productive lives.

It has relieved their fears of growing old—by social security and by medical care. It has inspired them with hope for their children, by aid to elementary and higher education. It has helped to create economic opportunity by enlightened fiscal policies. It has granted to millions, born into hopelessness, the chance of a new start in life by public works, by private incentive, by poverty programs. For the Negro American, it has opened the door after centuries of enslavement and discrimination—opened the doors to the blessings that America offers to those that are willing and able to earn them.

Thus we address the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, 25 years after his message to America and the world, with confidence and with an unflagging determination. We have served his vision of the four freedoms essential to mankind—here in America.

Yet we know that he did not speak only for America. We know that the four freedoms are not secure in America when they are violently denied elsewhere in the world. We know, too, that it requires more than speeches to resist the international enemies of freedom. We know that men respond to deeds when they are deaf to words. Even the precious word "freedom" may become empty to those without the means to use it. For what does freedom mean when famine cloaks the land, when new millions crowd upon already strained resources, when narrow privilege is entrenched behind law and custom, when all conspires to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?

I do not need to tell you how five administrations have labored to give real meaning to freedom, in a world where it is often merely a phrase that conceals oppression and neglect. Men in this room, men throughout America, have given their skills and their treasure to that work. You have warned our people how insatiable is aggression, and how it thrives on human misery. You have carried the word that without the sense that we can change the conditions of their lives, nothing can avail the oppressed of this earth—neither good will, nor national sovereignty, nor massive grants of aid, from their more fortunate brothers. You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies will change their destinies. Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, they will be eager—to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom. They will be able to look beyond the four essential freedoms—beyond to the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature; to the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease; to the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being.

This is what our struggle in Vietnam is about tonight. This is what our struggle for equal rights in this country is all about tonight. We seek to create that climate, at home and abroad, where unlettered men can learn, where deprived children can grow, where hopeless millions can be inspired to change the terms of their existence for the better. That climate cannot be created where terror fills the air. Children cannot learn, and men cannot earn their bread, and women cannot heal the sick where the night of violence has blotted out the sun. Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettoes of our own cities, the struggle is the same. That struggle is to end the violence against the human mind and body—so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom may be won.

We are pitting the resources of the law, of education and training, of our vision and our compassion, against that violence here in America. And we shall end it in our time.

On the other side of the earth we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling tonight to be free. It is about that commitment that I have come here to speak now.

Tonight in Vietnam more than 200,000 of your young Americans stand there fighting for your freedom. Tonight our people are determined that these men shall have whatever help they need, and that their cause, which is our cause, shall be sustained. But in these last days there have been questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, and these questions have been answered loudly and clearly for every citizen to see and to hear. The strength of American can never be sapped by discussion, and we have no better nor stronger tradition than open debate, free debate, in hours of danger. We believe, with Macaulay, that men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely. We are united in our committment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should ever mistake our arguments for indecision, nor our debates for weakness.

So what are the questions that are still being asked?

First, some ask if this is a war for unlimited objectives. The answer is plain. The answer is "No."

Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination. It is simply put, just to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

Second, some people ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is putting us headlong toward a wider war that no one wants. The answer, again, is a simple "No." We are using that force and only that force that is necessary to stop this aggression. Our fighting men are in Vietnam because tens of thousands of invaders came south before them. Our numbers have increased in Vietnam because the aggression of others has increased in Vietnam. The high hopes of the aggressor have been dimmed and the tide of the battle has been turned, and our measured use of force will and must be continued. But this is prudent firmness under what I believe is careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation.

Third, others ask if our fighting men are to be denied the help they need. The answer, again, is and will be a resounding "No." Our great Military Establishment has moved 200,000 men across 10,000 miles since last spring. These men have, and will have, all they need to fight the aggressor. They have already performed miracles in combat. The men behind them have worked miracles of supply, building new ports, transporting new equipment, opening new roads. The American forces of freedom are strong tonight in South Vietnam, and we plan to keep them so. As you know, they are led there by a brilliant and a resourceful commander, Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He knows the needs of war and he supports the works of peace. And when he asks for more Americans to help the men that he has, his requests will be immediately studied, and, as I promised the Nation last July, his needs will be immediately met.

Fourth, some ask if our men go alone to Vietnam, if we alone respect our great commitment in the Southeast Asia Treaty. Still again the answer is a simple "No." We have seven allies in SEATO, and we have seen five of them give us vital support, each with his own strength and in his own way, to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Fifth, some ask about the risks of a wider war, perhaps against the vast land armies of Red China. And again the answer is "No," never by any act of ours—and not if there is any reason left behind the wild words from Peiping.

We have threatened no one, and we will not. We seek the end of no regime, and we will not. Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply. We have measured the strength and the weakness of others, and we think we know our own. We observe in ourselves, and we applaud in others, a careful restraint in action. We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed.

Sixth, men ask if we rely on guns alone. Still again the answer is "No." From our Honolulu meeting, from the clear pledge which joins us with our allies, there has emerged a common dedication to the peaceful progress of the people of Vietnam—to schools for their children, to care for their health, to hope and bounty for their land.

The Vice President returned tonight from his constructive and very highly successful visit to Saigon and to other capitals, and he tells me that he and Ambassador Lodge have found a new conviction and purpose in South Vietnam—for the battle against want and injustice as well as the battle against aggression.

So the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open—to help the men of the north when they have the wisdom to be ready.

We Americans must understand how fundamental is the meaning of this second war—the war on want. I talked on my ranch last fall with Secretary Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, and in my office last week with Secretary Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, making, over and over again, the same central point: The breeding ground of war is human misery. If we are not to fight forever in faraway places—in Europe, or the far Pacific, or the jungles of Africa, or the suburbs of Santo Domingo—then we just must learn to get at the roots of violence. As a nation, we must magnify our struggle against world hunger and illiteracy and disease. We must bring hope to men whose lives now end at two score or less. Because without that hope, without progress in this war on want, we will be called on again to fight again and again, as we are fighting tonight.

Seventh, men ask who has a right to rule in South Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been for 200 years. The people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. So we will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi: Respect for the principle of government by the consent of the governed. We stand for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their result.

Eighth, men ask if we are neglecting any hopeful chance of peace. And the answer is "No." A great servant of peace, Secretary Dean Rusk, has sent the message of peace on every wire and by every hand to every continent. A great pleader for peace here with us tonight, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, has worked at home and abroad in this same cause. Their undiscouraged efforts will continue. How much wiser it would have been, how much more compassionate toward its own people, if Hanoi had only come to the bargaining table at the close of the year. Then the 7,000 Communist troops who have died in battle since January 1, and the many thousands who have been wounded in that same period, would have lived in peace with their fellow men.

Today, as then, Hanoi has the opportunity to end the increasing toll the war is taking on those under its command.

Ninth, some ask how long we must bear this burden. To that question, in all honesty, I can give you no answer tonight. During the Battle of Britain when that nation stood alone in 1940, Winston Churchill gave no answer to that question. When the forces of freedom were driven from the Philippines, President Roosevelt could not and did not name the date that we would return. If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may well be long. Our men in battle know and they accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much, because there is no computer that can tell the hour and the day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the steadfast and never to the weak in heart.

Tenth, and finally, men ask if it is worth it. I think you know that answer. It is the answer that Americans have given for a quarter of a century, wherever American strength has been pledged to prevent aggression. The contest in Vietnam is confused and hard, and many of its forms are new. Yet our American purpose and policy are unchanged. Our men in Vietnam are there. They are there, as Secretary Dillon told you, to keep a promise that was made 12 years ago. The Southeast Asia Treaty promised, as Secretary John Foster Dulles said for the United States—"That an attack upon the treaty area would occasion a reaction so united, and so strong, and so well placed that the aggressor would lose more than it could hope to gain."

But we keep more than a specific treaty promise in Vietnam tonight. We keep the faith for freedom.

Four Presidents have pledged to keep that faith.

The first was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his state of the Union message 25 years ago. He said: "* * * we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom."

The second was Harry S. Truman, in 1947, at a historic turning point in the history of guerrilla warfare—and of Greece, Turkey, and the United States. These were his words then: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

The third was Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his first inaugural address. He promised this: "Realizing that commonsense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed, all freeman, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

And then 5 years ago, John F. Kennedy, on the cold bright noon of his first day in office, proclaimed: "Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

This is the American tradition. Built in free discussion, proven on a hundred battlefields, rewarded by a progress at home that has no match in history, it beckons us forward tonight to the work of peace in Vietnam. We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high, hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy, and we are too young to be tired. We are too strong for fear and too determined for retreat.

Each evening when I retire, I take up—from a bedside table—reports from the battlefront and reports from the capitals around the world. They tell me how our men have fared that day in the hills and the valleys of Vietnam. They tell me what hope there seems to be that the message of peace will be heard and that this tragic war may be ended. I have read of individual acts of heroism—of dedicated men and women whose valor matches that of any generation that has ever gone before. I read of men risking their lives to save others—of men giving their lives to save freedom. Always among these reports are a few letters from the men out there themselves. If there is any doubt among some here at home about our purposes in Vietnam, I never find it reflected in those letters from Vietnam.

Our soldiers, our marines, our airmen, and our sailors know why they are in Vietnam. They know, as five Presidents have known, how inseparably bound together are America's freedom and the freedom of her friends around the world.

So, tonight, let me read you from a letter that I received from an American father, a warm friend of mine of many years, about his son, a young Army captain.

He said, "I have never known a man at war who showed less bravado in his communications with home. When he was not flying missions in his helicopter or working out of the battalion headquarters he and some of his buddies on their own visited the orphanages as individuals and played with the kids. He was deeply interested in the Vietnamese people, particularly the peasants, and he told me how sorely they wanted, more than anything else, to just be left alone in some semblance of freedom to grow their rice and to raise their families. This good young American, as thousands like him, was not on the other side of the world fighting specifically for you or for me, Mr. President. He was fighting in perhaps our oldest American tradition, taking up for people who are being pushed around."

The young captain described in this letter is dead tonight, but his spirit lives in the 200,000 young Americans who stand out there on freedom's frontier in Vietnam. It lives in their mothers and in their fathers here in America who have proudly watched them leave their homes for their distant struggle.

So tonight I ask each citizen to join me, to join me in the homes and the meeting places our men are fighting to keep free, in a prayer for their safety.

I ask you to join me in a pledge to the cause for which they fight—the cause of human freedom to which this organization is dedicated. I ask you for your help, for your understanding, and for your commitment, so that this united people may show forth to all the world that America has not ended the only struggle that is worthy of man's unceasing sacrifice—the struggle to be free.

Highlights of What the People Are Thinking Back Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the results of my annual questionnaire project have just been computer tabulated by Data Management, Inc., of Washington, and I believe that, due particularly to the emphatic responses given a number of the issues raised, they will be of interest to many of my colleagues.

While a special opinion poll is not necessary to indicate to Members of this House the deep concern of the American people over the war in Vietnam, it is nevertheless of no little significance, I believe that 70 percent of the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan who answered my poll favored doing whatever was necessary to win the struggle in South Vietnam. The personal comments accompanying this response repeatedly stressed the need to get the job done and as soon as possible. In addition 71 percent disagreed with the President's guns and butter policy of expanding domestic programs at a time when added tax revenue for war needs is required.

On the domestic side, in view of the industrialized character of much of the Sixth District, the fact that 66 percent opposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is certainly impressive. So, too, is the failure of key Great Society programs to gain broad support among respondents from Ingham, Jackson, and Shiawassee Counties, and Bath and DeWitt Townships of Clinton County. There were 69 percent who felt that the antipoverty program has been ineffective; 70 percent who said funds should not be provided for Federal rental subsidies for those eligible for public housing; and 65 percent who did not believe a new Federal Teacher Corps should be funded.

Not to be overlooked either, even though legislative action has already been concluded, is the resounding 74 percent who opposed the reimposition of automobile and telephone excise taxes.

These are but a few of the highlights of what the people are thinking back home and I know that all of the results will be of interest to my colleagues. I am pleased to make these views a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 89th Congress.

Questionnaire results, 1966

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Not sure
Should we—			
1. Provide a GI bill for Vietnam veterans (education and other benefits)?	93	5	2
2. Increase trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union?	36	54	10
3. Reimpose automobile and telephone excise taxes that were to be eliminated after 1965?	21	74	5
4. Repeal Taft-Hartley sec. 14(b) which permits States wishing to do so to enact right-to-work laws?	26	66	8
5. Change the minimum wage law to—			
Increase the rate from $1.25 to $1.75 per hour?	37	55	8
Expand coverage to farm workers, hotels, restaurants, and certain other businesses?	52	36	12
6. Have a 4-year term for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives?	55	40	5
7. Use stockpiles of strategic goods and surplus farm commodities as a means to control prices?	46	44	10
8. Permit a tax deduction or credit for parents paying college expenses?	67	29	4
9. Provide funds for—			
A new program of Federal rental subsidies for those eligible for public housing?	19	70	11
A new Federal Teachers Corps to be used in certain designated schools?	23	65	12
10. Has the antipoverty program been effective in reducing poverty?	9	69	22
11. Do you agree with the President's policy of expanding social programs at a time when war needs are becoming greater—having both "guns and butter"?	21	71	8
12. What should we do about Vietnam?			
Withdraw entirely 9			
Continue present policy 10			
Do whatever necessary to win 70			
Other 11			

Submarine Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the observance of Submarine Week, April 11–17 when the veterans of submarine warfare will commemorate the 66th anniversary of the first acceptance of a submarine by the U.S. Navy in 1900.

Special ceremonies are being held in my district by the San Diego Chapter of U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II. This observance is a fitting time to note the role the submarine has had in our past wars, and salute the Nation's first line of nuclear defense, which today patrols the seas and oceans.

There is no doubt that our development of the submarine as a deadly and efficient instrument of warfare has served as the major deterrent to aggression from some nations that would seek to enslave other peoples. The fact that our undersea Navy is on constant alert has made the cost too heavy for aggressors to make the major moves that have been their desire on several continents.

Aside from the pride and defense interests, I have a personal interest in the submarine Navy. My son-in-law's father, Capt. Wreford G. Chapple, was part of the Pacific submarine action during World War II, when he received several citations for valorous service as commander of the U.S.S. *S-38* in the Philippines Islands area. He also commanded the U.S.S. *Permit* and the U.S.S. *Bream* in heavy action in South Pacific seas. He is now living in San Diego, and I know that the special observance of Submarine Week will be of great significance to him and the many other veterans of the Pacific campaign who will meet at a number of functions.

The submarine has developed tremendously since it first joined the Navy in 1900. By next year, the United States will have 41 fleet ballistic missile submarines available. The Polaris missile has proven to be one of the most reliable and effective weapons in our arsenal. The submarine today is being used to protect amphibious assault forces, enabling them to increase maneuverability, travel light, hit hard and fast. The Poseidon missile, with twice the payload of Polaris will add new power to our far-ranging undersea striking force.

Our need now is for continued research and development of submarines. Adm. David L. McDonald, in testifying before the House Committee on Armed Services, warned that the Soviet Union has designs on the sealanes of the world. He stated:

> Soviet nuclear submarines are being built at a rate per year which may soon exceed our own. They will pose an increasingly grave threat.

The submarine service is a promising career for many young Americans. Developments in nuclear submarine propulsion have had advantageous spin-offs for industry and the advancement of peaceful harnessing of the atom.

As we honor Submarine Week in 1966, when our Nation has its broadest commitments for peace, and when the world offers peril on all sides, we can all be grateful to the courageous and competent men of the submarine fleet, who around the clock are our sentinels at the gate. It is proper that we think back to our last great struggle against aggression, and recognize the debt we owe those brave men who swept the Pacific, who risked much, and who fought furiously and victoriously for freedom.

Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn Addressed North Carolina Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina, addressed the North Carolina Annual Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in the Municipal Auditorium in the city of Raleigh on the evening of February 26, 1966. While our colleague spoke extemporaneously, someone was thoughtful enough to make a tape recording of his address. I submit for the Record a transcript taken from the tape recorder.

Congressman Dorn's speech was delivered to an audience of more than 1,500 citizens. He was frequently interrupted by applause. The speech was magnificent, comprehensive, and thought-provoking and I am certain that it will be read with great interest by our colleagues and our countrymen.

The best thing about Bryan Dorn is his lovely wife, Millie, a native North Carolinian, who has been his guardian angel during the many long years he has served in the House of Representatives.

Address of Representative William Jennings Bryan Dorn, Democrat, of South Carolina, North Carolina Annual Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Municipal Auditorium, Raleigh, N.C., February 26, 1966

Thank you, Bill Webb, for your very kind, gracious, and warm introduction. Governor Moore, Senator Ervin, Senator Jordan, Mr. Broughton, Mr. Hedrick, members of your distinguished congressional delegation, and my fellow Democrats, it is a great honor for me tonight to come back to North Carolina to address one of the greatest Democratic banquets held annually in the United States of America. [Applause.]

In 1946, after returning from World War II, I offered in the Democratic primary for the Congress of the United States from the Third South Carolina District. I remember campaigning up in a mountain area of my district. I had never been there before. I stopped at a weatherbeaten country store. There was a group of people gathered around out front. They were good people, but they were a little bit skeptical of people from my section. I talked to them about great Democratic programs such as social security, soil conservation, and rural electrification. I made them a little talk out in front of the store. None of them would look at me. They looked down. Finally, the leader of this group looked up and he said, "Young man, are you married?" I said, "No sir." He said, "You talk all right. I'll tell you what we'll do. We'll try you one time, but don't you go to Washington and marry no Yankee." [Applause.]

My fellow Democrats, I am in good standing in that area of my district today, having married a Tar Heel—a Democrat—a North Carolinian. [Applause.]

I do want to tell you how grateful the American people are, how grateful we are in the Congress of the United States to you Democrats in North Carolina for sharing with the whole Nation and the whole free world, men of the caliber, distinction, honor, and integrity of your two great U.S. Senators, Senator Ervin and Senator Jordan. [Applause.] I want to tell you how much I have enjoyed working in the House of Representatives over these years with some of the finest men it has been ever by privilege to know, great North Carolina Democrats, dedicated to the cause of freedom, dedicated to the development of our Southland and devoted to those principles and ideals that made this Nation the wonder of the free world—your illustrious and distinguished Democratic delegation to the U.S. House of Representatives. [Applause.]

You know, my wife has briefed me over the years on the history of North Carolina; and coming up here on the plane today she insisted I read a book about Governor Aycock of North Carolina. You have enjoyed good government in North Carolina. You are proud of it. Yes, good government in North Carolina since Governor Aycock's outstanding administration around the turn of the century—more than 65 years ago. With good democratic government, North Carolina took the lead in the Southland in job opportunity, in new industry—the finest public school system in the South for many years, a great system of State colleges, good roads, and lately the fabulous research triangle.

You have pointed out the way—the Democrats in North Carolina—you have provided good government in North Carolina from the state house down to the local level. [Applause.] The Southland is grateful for that national leadership provided by the Democratic leaders of your great State and not the least of them is your illustrious and able Governor Dan Moore who is serving North Carolina with such honor and distinction today—a great middle of the road Democrat around whom we can all unite.

My fellow Democrats, in the fall of 1951 it was my honor to visit London, England, with your late beloved Congressman Herb Bonner—our Democratic colleague here, Walter Jones, now represents his district. We called on the great Winston Churchill at 10 Downing Street. At that time, Mr. Churchill was Prime Minister of England, following 6 years of Prime Minister Atlee. As we left, he called me back and asked about old friends in South Carolina. Then, Mr. Churchill said that when a government goes too far to the left or right there is no return to good, sound, middle of the road government. Mr. Churchill suggested I go back to the United States and oppose all liberals in our country becoming members of one party and all conservatives becoming members of the other party. He emphasized that all liberals in one party and all conservatives in the other would be fatal for democracy in the United States and injurious to the cause of freedom throughout the free world.

Mr. Churchill said that England was the greatest power on the face of the earth just a few years ago. Britannia ruled the Seven Seas. The sun never set on British soil. British legal jurisprudence, law and order, democracy, Christianity, and culture were exported throughout the world. Today we are a second-rate power, impotent before the great Communist menace in Europe without the aid and help of the United States of America. The reason England is faltering, Churchill said, is because she made the mistake of having all liberals in one party and all conservatives in another. He said someday those extreme pseudo-liberals will get in power and there is no return to good sound democratic free enterprise government.

There is room, Churchill said, in both of your great American political parties for liberals and conservatives. You can afford diverse elements in both of your great political parties and particularly in your great Democratic Party. Your President Franklin D. Roosevelt [applause] with whom I worked during World War II expounded that theory.

Churchill said there is not one single thing I can do to undo national socialism and nationalization of industry fostered on the people of England by the Atlee government. Do not make that mistake in the United States.

We need balanced government. There is room in our great Democratic Party in the middle of the road for all of our people. We cannot move ahead to our destiny as a great party if we are in the ditch on the left-hand side of the road. Nor can we move ahead to the future salvation of our country and leadership of the free world if we are in the ditch on the right-hand side of the road.

The party founded by Thomas Jefferson was the party of all the people. Under that umbrella in the middle of the road all races, all creeds and all classes can unite and serve this Nation as we have in times past. This is a great challenge to the Democrats of North Carolina and of South Carolina and to Democrats throughout our Nation—to unite in the middle of the road, behind the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, private enterprise and those principles and that philosophy which made this Nation the heart and core of freedom and the arsenal of democracy throughout the world.

We can be proud of the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party has had a glorious history, dating back to Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. Thomas Jefferson opposed vested interests and class plutocracy. He believed that America could progress and carve out of the wilderness the great Nation we know today only if it included in the Democratic Party the man at the crossroads store, the small businessman, the farmer on the frontier, and the worker in the factories of that day. He had a vision. Thomas Jefferson dreamed dreams. He dreamed about a great nation stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the North to the South. He dreamed of a day when every American would have opportunity, education, and dignity. He was a builder who made his dreams come true. He knew that only through the Democratic Party, encompassing all elements of our population, could that party properly serve the American people. We can look back down through the corridors of history tonight and we know that Thomas Jefferson was right.

I think especially tonight of William Jennings Bryan, of Grover Cleveland and of those great Americans, great Democrats, like Alfred E. Smith who preserved a foundation of hope for the Democratic Party. I wore my first Democratic button as a kid at the Greenwood County Fair in 1928—when on the lapel of my coat I wore an Al Smith and Joe Robinson button. [Applause.] There were many great men who held the Democratic Party together in lean years; and it was principally this beloved Southland of ours that supported these great leaders. I remember reading about election after election when the Democratic nominee received virtually no electoral votes outside the South. We held the party together.

When 1932 came around the world was in revolution. Pause with me for a moment and think about the time of the Communist revolution in Russia in 1917 which resulted in a ruthless dictatorship under Lenin and Stalin. The whole world was aflame. Mussolini marched on Rome from Milano in 1922 and took over Italy eliminating freedom with black-shirt bigotry. Mare Nostrum became a reality and Il Duce a threat to world freedom. Yes, the war party took over in Japan and invaded Manchuria in 1931. The raving Hitler goose-stepped to power in Germany in 1933. The democracies were paralyzed with fear and apprehension. After a thousand years of feudalism in the world and class hatred, the democracy established by Thomas Jefferson and kept alive by Andrew Jackson and others was threatened with extinction from the face of this earth. But here in the United States under the leadership of the Democratic Party with our Constitution and private enterprise system, we were able to pull ourselves together and instead of goose-stepping to Washington with the hobnail boots of dictatorship, we gave to the people of the United States social security. Instead of blackshirtism and fascism we provided for them rural electrification, soil conservation, bank deposit insurance and social justice. Our country began to move forward with democracy, with freedom and representative government. We were faced a few years later with the combined military might of the Axis and those who sneered at democracy. Mussolini was reported as having contemptuously referred to the Congress of the United States as a bunch of "parliamentary charlatans." He said that men are cowards, flunkies, and traitors who can only be governed through their passions, their hatreds, and their bigotries. We overthrew this philosophy and democracy really began to come alive in the world under the leadership and under the banner of the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

Yes, I am proud of our Democratic Party. Then a few years later and a few years ago, Nikita Khrushchev stood in the kitchen in the Kremlin in Moscow and told a Vice President of the United States that "we will bury you. We will drive you off the markets of the world with agricultural and industrial production. America will be forced into a depression and the United States will have to adopt socialism and your children and grandchildren will live under socialism."

We are winning that phase of the cold war hands down. Under Democratic leadership it is no contest at all. Nikita Khrushchev was "sacked and fired" 16 months ago—a year ago last October—because he failed to drive America and the might of our democratic system, our private enterprise system, the capitalistic system, with its profit motive, from the markets of the world. Instead Khrushchev was sacked and fired in disgrace because this country moved ahead.

In 1961, in January, a young man stepped out in the snow in Washington to fill the office of President of the United States under a Democratic regime. Since that very day this Nation has had 60 continuous months of increased gross national product [applause]—the longest continuous cycle of prosperity any civilization the history of the world has ever known. Last year our gross national product increased $45 billion. Since 1961 our gross national product has increased $163 billion. Six million new jobs have been created. Unemployment has decreased from over 7 percent to a little over 3 percent. Profits have increased by 80 percent. This is the answer to socialism and fascism and communism. This is why the Communists are losing the cold war. They cannot compete with a democratic system sponsored and promulgated and led by the great Democratic Party with the principles and ideals of Jefferson and Jackson.

We are moving ahead. This is 1966. We are looking ahead to the year 2000. Some of you here tonight will go to the moon and other planets of the universe. Yes, this Nation is moving ahead, is solving our problems and is defeating the left and the right with democracy and freedom.

I want to report to you that we are going to win in South Vietnam. [Applause.] This is the greatest single issue facing the American people. This is the greatest single challenge facing the people of the free world today.

A few days ago I conferred with General Westmoreland, a Carolinian. I conferred with his second in command, Lt. Gen. Joe Moore, also a Carolinian and commander in chief of all the air forces in South Vietnam. There is always something behind good men. I was told that General Westmoreland and General Moore were Eagle Scouts together at the same time at Spartanburg High School, Spartanburg, S.C. [Applause.]

You can be proud of your men in South Vietnam. [Applause.] They are standing guard against aggression and terror. They have been sent there by our great leadership in Washington—a leadership which is following a course set by several administrations since World War II.

Lenin is reported as having said that the road to Paris is the road through Peiping. They have Peiping, China. They have had 17 years' time to liquidate our missionaries, to liquidate the educators, the lawyers, the doctors, and those who went to school around the world and those whom we trained. Now they are ready to move on that road to Paris as predicted and reported by Nicolai Lenin.

Why are they in South Vietnam? Why are the North Vietnamese there? They are making a cold, brazen bid for the oil, tin, the rubber, uranium, and manpower of southeast Asia. Their next step is India, then Saudi Arabia with 67 percent of the world's untapped oil. Commodore Perry, speaking before the National Geographic Society in New York City in 1856, 110 years ago, said that someday the forces of democracy and freedom will be locked in a death struggle in southeast Asia with the forces of totalitarianism, and freedom will hang in the balance. Teddy Roosevelt, more than 65 years ago, said if all Asia ever becomes united under the banner of totalitarianism, enslavement, and terror, then democracy would be in trouble.

Genghis Kahn, 500 years ago, conquered Asia and swept into Europe. Civilization and Western Europe would have passed from this earth but for the death of Genghis Kahn when almost at the gates of Paris. His son then withdrew to what is now European Russia.

I would like to say tonight, to France, that I wish the head of state in France, for whom so many Americans bled and died and for whom we spent billions of dollars—I wish he would go back and read the blueprint written more than 45 years ago about the road to Paris being the road through Peiping. The Communists are on that road today. If they overrun all of southeast Asia, they will conquer Asia and move into northern Africa. Western Europe is only a small peninsula on the Afro-Eurasian land mass. France is only a country on that small peninsula. With all of Asia and Africa in the hands of totalitarianism, Western Europe would be outflanked, and as Lenin predicted, would fall without firing a shot. America would be isolated and surrounded. Freedom in this world would be gone forever.

Our American men are fighting in South Vietnam for peace. They are fighting against totalitarianism. They are fighting to prevent the spread of war. They are fighting to prevent world war III. They are fighting—and I wish some in our own country would realize this [applause] they are fighting to prevent an escalation of the war. Those who want to appease the Communist aggressor are escalating the war. Those who want to collaborate and have coalition governments with the Communists are escalating the war. Those who want to withdraw are escalating the war. They are the ones who are preventing negotiation. They are encouraging Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung by their strange actions in the United States of America. I am in possession of some pretty reliable information that when the President extended the olive branch of peace, when he did everything humanly possible for peace in southeast Asia, that he could have brought Ho Chi Minh and the Hanoi outfit to the conference table but for the actions of certain people in the United States.

When in Saigon, I was told that some of the Vietcong captured in the jungles had pictures in their possession of peace demonstrations, beatniks and peaceniks in the United States. Therefore, they were encouraged to fight and to kill more American boys. I talked with a major from North Carolina—a Negro major—in one of the field hospitals of whom all Americans and Carolinians in particular can be proud. He said, "Congressman, we must win this war over these forms of terror and aggression." He introduced me to some of his patients and had me shake hands with them—some of whom had no hands to shake, no arms, no legs. They looked up and smiled. They said, go back and tell this story to those people in our own country who are causing escalation of the war by advocating withdrawal and appeasement. [Applause.]

Some people in the United States are demanding withdrawal. Where would they fight the forces of Communist aggression who are sworn to enslave and conquer the world. They say it's a long way from home, a nasty war, at the wrong time and in the wrong place. They say there are quagmires and monsoons. Where would they fight? Is the terrain any better in Oregon [applause] or in the Rockies? Where would these people make a stand. You are entitled to know. The American people are entitled to know.

This is a war of aggression—one of the most diabolical and sinister forms of aggression ever known in the history of the world. They are sending in terrorists under the ground. They have murdered 11,000 schoolteachers in South Vietnam. They have murdered mayors and members of the city councils. They are attempting to overthrow the government by terror, anarchy, and chaos.

We must stand firm. We must stand astride that road to Paris. Freedom indeed hangs in the balance today. The Communists have aimed two barrels, many tenacles all over the world, but two major barrels—one at the campuses of the United States, and the other at our men fighting in South Vietnam.

Ladies and gentlemen, do not take my word for it. J. Edgar Hoover said of the demonstration last April 17 around the White House that it was Communist inspired and Communist led. I wish you could have seen it. I went down and looked at it, Senator—green hair, purple toenails, and all manner of beatniks—some of whom needed a shower, some of whom were paid. [Applause.] J. Edgar Hoover said that group was led by the hard-core enemy of American democracy, that they were promulgated and led by the Communist Party, USA.

I asked our great Secretary of State, Dean Rusk [applause] a few days ago—who went to college at Davidson College, N.C. [applause], who was a star basketball player there, whose forebears built the old Stone Church at Clemson University in my district and another, Benjamin Rusk, who went to Texas and signed the Texas Declaration of Independence. I asked Dean Rusk what effect do these demonstrations have on the war effort in South Vietnam. He gave me a classic answer. He said, they have the same effect that 20,000 demonstrators marching around the palace of Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi, demanding that he pull out, would have on America. In fact, he said, if 20,000 persons paraded with signs around Ho Chi Minh's palace, the war would be over and the American people would know it.

We cannot withdraw. We cannot abandon this little nation. I talked with the South Vietnamese people. I saw an American doctor there amputating legs and arms of civilians. There is one thing I learned in South Vietnam—that when war comes to a country, the civilian population is hit the same as the military. I went into a Vietnamese hospital. There were flies, mosquitoes, and blood everywhere. One of the doctors there was from the Mayo Clinic in Minnesota and had volunteered to go to South Vietnam. He said, "Congressman, I want to show you something." He took me over and introduced me to a 10-year-old Vietnamese girl. She had seen her mother and her father killed in her front yard 3 days before by the Vietcong and all her older brothers and sisters liquidated by the Vietcong. She was shot through the chest. And do you know what she was doing? Listen, this is the spirit of the South Vietnamese people—she was crying to go home, pleading with the doctor to let her go back home and take care of her 2-year-old brother and 3-year-old sister.

Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot let these gallant people down. This Nation will not let them down. [Applause.] President Johnson made a wise decision last year [applause] in rushing in men and equipment just in the nick of time. I was told in Saigon and in Nha Trang, Da Nang, Pleiku, and throughout that country that if we had been a few days later, freedom would have perished from this key area of the world. The President acted in the nick of time. And I want you to know this, my friends, when we are in war we must support the Commander in Chief. I opposed World War II and objected to a resolution in the South Carolina Senate which would have endorsed certain actions of the administration in Washington because I thought it might be better to let Hitler and communism fight it out. But once that war was joined, I supported the President of the United States. I am proud and glad Bill Webb mentioned the fact that my six brothers and I served all over the world during World War II—and some of us will go back again if necessary. Unity is what we need in this country. We united behind Woodrow Wilson. The Congressman from my own district voted against World War I on April 6, 1917, but once that war started the American people united behind Woodrow Wilson and we brought the boys home in a minimum of time. [Applause.] We did the same thing when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor.

This is the greatest challenge the American people have ever faced. I came back and stopped on the island of Formosa where they are phasing out foreign aid on the 30th of June this year. I saw there happiness, prosperity, full employment, courage and saw there a powerful army made possible with the aid and assistance of the United States. We can and will do the same in South Vietnam. We are not going to turn the world back to totalitarianism and slavery.

The great Democratic Party of the United States has led our country in time of depression and in time of war. It has led us to victory. We will not fail the American people today. Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, and our President today [applause] have guided the ship of state through stormy seas. We are going to unite. The Democrats of North Carolina are going to unite. We are going to perform and fulfill our destiny. It is a great party. We have saved this Nation time and time again. There is no doubt in my mind about it. And we are going to go through this crisis we are in today and we are going to prevent another world war.

Appeasement. I remember looking at the newspapers in 1938 and there I saw a picture of Neville Chamberlain with his high top hat and his umbrella—with a document in his hand. He had returned from Munich where he collaborated with the infamous Hitler and Mussolini. He said my fellow Britons this means peace in our time—because he had Adolph Hitler's name on a slip of paper. He sold out Czechoslovakia, a little free nation, and was just as guilty of starting World War II as Adolph Hitler. A few months after Munich, Hitler's legions were pouring into Poland, another small free nation. Twenty-five million people died in World War II. Chamberlain was just as guilty as Hitler in this useless slaughter.

We are not going to make that mistake again. [Applause.] We are putting the dictators of the world on notice that America is going to fight and we will prevent world war III.

It is a great honor to be in North Carolina. It is a great privilege always to be among Democrats—those who can unite in the middle of the road for our country. Americanism and the preservation of freedom everywhere means more to me than anything. The Democratic Party, I believe in because it has done more to preserve Americanism and to spread freedom around the world than any other single factor in our history. [Applause.]

The textile industry is essential to national defense. We went to the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1956 and appeared before the platform committee. I introduced the president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute along with an employee in one of our mills.

We were well received. The Democratic committee adopted a plank in our platform which would have provided relief for our basic industry. The situation worsened and again we went back in 1960 before the Democratic platform committee meeting in Los Angeles. We were well received. John F. Kennedy, as our standard bearer assured us that the plight of our industry would receive his personal attention and top priority in his administration.

The great textile industry—the greatest single employer of people in North Carolina, South Carolina, and in the Southeast—was on the rocks. Unemployment was rampant. Mills were closing. Over 700 mills had closed since World War II and many of our towns were threatening to become ghost towns, yet our pleas had been falling on deaf ears from 1953 to 1961. I know that story well. I know what your North Carolina delegation did. I know what your Governors did during that period. We saved the textile industry.

There were those in Washington who thought the textile industry was expendable, that we should import textile goods from other countries at the expense of our own industry and employees. John F. Kennedy took the oath as President of the United States in January 1961 and a new day dawned. In the White House, a few weeks later, the President assured your distinguished and able Congressman Cooley and myself that he would limit imports of unfair, low-wage, foreign imports to 6 percent of the 1961 level. John F. Kennedy kept that promise. Lyndon B. Johnson assured us he would carry out the Kennedy program to get rid of the two-price cotton under which our textile mills had to pay 8½ cents more per pound for American cotton than our competitors in Japan, India, and throughout the world—the most unfair economic restriction ever fostered on any industry in any country in the history of the world. Your distinguished congressional delegation, every single one of them, worked with us night and day and we saved the textile industry through a voluntary agreement limiting imports, tax advantages, depreciation, and elimination of the two-price cotton. The textile industry in the South today is expanding. They are putting in air conditioning. I wish you could sit on the platform with some of us when a new mill or an expansion is announced when they announce air conditioning because of the splendid program inaugurated by Democratic administrations. They are enjoying these improvements made possible by a great Democratic administration. Now textile and related employees are on full time with time and a half for overtime. Expansion is the order of the day. Thirty thousand new jobs have been created in the textile industry since the elimination of two-priced cotton.

We are going to continue to move forward. The South is coming into its own—new factories with tax revenue for better schools. In High Point, where I spoke last week to 1,800 school students, I went on a tour of the surrounding area where they have gotten over a hundred new plants in the last few years. Unemployment? There is no unemployment—thanks to a great Democratic administration in North Carolina at the local and State level and to an administration in Washington that has taken business into its confidence and is putting emphasis on the private enterprise system as the way to employ people, provide opportunity, expand business, expand education and better hospitalization. I could talk to 12:00 o'clock about the great Democratic Party [applause]; however, I leave with you the eloquent words of a great Senator from a neighboring State who said: "He who saves his country, saves all things; and all things saved, will bless him. He who lets his country die, lets all things die; and all things dying, curse him."

The Democratic Party of your country and mine, the Democratic Party of your State and mine has done everything humanly possible and has made an admirable record in preserving those principles and ideals that made this Nation the wonder of the world.

Senate Committee Opens Hearings on Bank Holding Company Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency's Subcommittee on Financial Institutions today began hearings on legislation which would remove the exemptions to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

I congratulate the Senate committee and its distinguished chairman, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, who is also chairman of the full committee, for the work they are beginning on the bills before the committee, including H.R. 7371, which passed the House in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The bill, H.R. 7371, is a good bill and it is supported by the Federal Reserve Board, which has been trying to close the loopholes and exemptions in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 for the last decade. I am hopeful for positive and speedy action by the Senate on this important legislation. I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of my testimony before the committee and also the testimony of the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The statements follow:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES E. BENNETT, OF FLORIDA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 16, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee in support of H.R. 7371 as it passed the House or of as much of it as you feel can be made law in this session of Congress.

In 1933 banks were prohibited by statute from also doing nonbanking business, the purpose of the statute being to eliminate conflicts of interest and the evils of monopoly. In 1956 bank holding companies were similarly prohibited; but many exemptions were allowed in the new statute. The Federal Reserve Board has recommended ending all of these exemptions and that is what the House bill before you does. It does nothing more.

The report on H.R. 6227, 84th Congress, which became the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, outlines the reasons for requiring bank holding companies to divest themselves of nonbanking businesses, and I would like to quote from that report:

"The reasons underlying the divestment requirement are simple. As a general rule, banks are prohibited from engaging in any other type of enterprise than banking itself. This is because of the danger to the depositors which might result where the bank finds itself, in effect, both the borrower and the lender. It is for this reason, among others, that statutes limiting the investments of banks have been passed by both the Congress and State legislatures.

"The bank holding company is under no such restriction. It may acquire and operate as many nonbanking businesses as it has funds and the disposition to acquire. There are in the country today, as has been pointed out previously, bank holding companies which, in addition to their investments in the stocks of banks, also control the operation of such nonbanking businesses as insurance, manufacture, real estate, mining, and a number of others.

"Whenever a holding company thus controls both banks and nonbanking businesses, it is apparent that the holding company's nonbanking businesses may thereby occupy a preferred position over that of their competitors in obtaining bank credit. It is also apparent that in critical times the holding company which operates nonbanking businesses may be subjected to strong temptation to cause the banks which it controls to make loans to its nonbanking affiliates even though such loans may not, at that time, be entirely justified in the light of current banking standards. In either situation the public interest becomes directly involved.

In the course of the Senate hearings, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin, Jr., testified that:

"Existing provisions of law, originally enacted in the Banking Act of 1933, have proved entirely inadequate to deal with the special problems created by bank holding companies."

Senate Report No. 1095, 84th Congress, 1st session, on this legislation, said of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956: "It represents a compromise."

In signing the act into law, President Eisenhower said: "As a result of the various exemptions and other provisions, the legislation falls short of achieving these objectives. * * * The exemptions and other special provisions will require the further attention of the Congress."

In every annual report to Congress since the passage of the 1956 act the Federal Reserve Board has recommended that the exemptions contained in the 1956 act be eliminated. My amendment to H.R. 7371 accepted by the House on a rollcall vote does exactly that and no more. Let me briefly discuss the exemptions that the House bill, as now amended, would remove.

1. First, of course, it would remove the exemption for the Alfred I. du Pont Estate, the original sole purpose of H.R. 7371. This exemption is in general terms, applying to testamentary trusts and to community chests, funds, or foundations for religious, charitable, or educational purposes; but, in fact, the Du Pont Estate is the only known entity covered by the provisions of this exemption. My testimony, Mr. Chairman, is based on the principle of the banking acts passed in 1933 and 1956: It is not in the public interest to allow banks and nonbanking businesses to be under the same control and ownership and that it is desirable to remove all conflicts of interest and monopolies from banking businesses. Though the purposes for which the moneys of this estate are spent are worthy indeed, the public interest, as announced by the statutes in requiring separation of banking and nonbanking enterprises, applies as logically in this case as in any other. To hold otherwise would be as illogical as to say that all our antitrust laws would never apply when the profits go to charity. It is not that the recipients of the gains which are against the public interest but that the method of doing business is against the public interest, involving conflict of interests and monopoly.

The following are the exemptions eliminated by the amendment approved by the House by record vote before passage of H.R. 7371:

2. Where one bank is owned together with a nonbanking business. The logic of the principle of protecting the depositors from nonbanking involvements is just as applicable where there is only one bank as where there are two, the present number of banks required under the law. In fact, if a company controls only one large bank, that company's interests in extensive nonbanking businesses could lead to abuses even more serious than if the company controlled many small banks. An example of this would be a big rubber company such as Goodyear owning a bank or a big department store such as Macy's owning a bank. The Federal Reserve Board conducted a survey of organizations which might be covered under pending legislation and a large number of groups are included in a February 1966 report by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Moreover, it is not clear to me that without the adoption of this amendment there is not an open door in the statutes for a holding company to own a single large bank with many branches and with huge capitalization while at the same time engaging in extensive nonbanking business. This amendment would, by statute, close that door.

3. Where a company is a bank holding company which is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, and was so

registered prior to May 15, 1955, or which is affiliated with any such company in such manner as to constitute an affiliated company within the meaning of such act, unless such company or such affiliated company directly owns 25 percent of the voting shares of each of two or more banks. There is no reason why an investment company should not be restricted from owning or acquiring bank holding companies in the same way other bank holding companies are. The exemption relates primarily to Financial General Corp.

4. Where a company has at least 80 percent of its total assets in the field of agriculture. I understand that this was designed for one company, Consolidated Naval Stores, which has now gone out of business. The exemption should not continue as an invitation to others to exploit in the future.

5. Where a company which is a bank holding company holds shares acquired prior to the enactment of the 1956 act. The Trust Co. of Georgia is at the present time under the exemption, and it is my understanding that this company owns over $38 million in the Coca-Cola Internatianl Corp. I can see no reason for the exemption.

6. Where a bank holding company is a labor, agriculture or horticulture organization and is exempt from taxes under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Several labor organizations, including the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, which I understand owns the controlling interest in the Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank in Chicago and the Amalgamated Bank of New York, and the United Mine Workers, which I understand owns a controlling interest in the National Bank of Washington, D.C., fall into this category. There is obviously no valid reason for such an exemption.

I remember, when I was a little boy, living a little bit in the country—part of my life in Kentucky, in a very rural area, with no electric lights—when I would go outside at night to the barn, or somewhere like that and I would carry an old kerosene lantern. It used to scare me to death, all the shadows that I would see around me. I told my grandmother about that and she said: "If you will hold that lamp in front of you and look at the light, you will have no trouble with the shadows."

So I believe in these hearings we ought to look at the principle; that is the light in this hearing and the shadows will go away.

The principle should be applied to all those organizations now exempt under the act of 1956. The Federal Reserve Board since 1958 has recommended that the exemptions be wiped out. The Comptroller of the Currency, commenting on September 20, 1965, about the original bill, H.R. 7371, dealing only with the Du Pont Estate, wrote:

"The proponents of this legislation are frank to admit that it is aimed at only one existing situation, the Alfred I. du Pont Estate, a testamentary trust corporation.

"With regard to the intent of the bill as a whole, we do not believe it appropriate or desirable for Congress to amend a piece of legislation as important as the Bank Holding Company Act in order to take care of a single situation. The Federal Reserve Board and others have suggested amendments to the act of general application, having much greater importance in our opinion than the Du Pont Estate situation. Any unsolved problems of Government regulation inherent in the Du Pont Estate situation should, we believe, be handled only in the context of legislation which would have general application."

Some people say that it would be easier to pass this measure if it were directed at only one concern. They are clearly mistaken. In the first place, there is monumental opposition to a one shot approach in the House. It is led by the dean of the Florida delegation, Congressman ROBERT L. F. SIKES, and by the dean of the House, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York. The House debate shows this.

Although I would vote for the measure even if it covered only the Du Pont Estate, I believe that few in the Florida delegation would join me in that; and without that local support, usual procedures in the Congress would kill the bill automatically and immediately. Even a divided delegation might kill it. Moreover, the House has both in 1955 and in 1965 approved the elimination of the exemptions.

The record House vote on June 14, 1955, was 371 to 24; and the record House vote on September 23, 1965, was 199 to 178. There is no precedent for the one shot approach in either the House or the Senate. Finally, the entire elimination of all exemptions has already been passed by the House in this Congress; and if the Senate agrees on this measure there will be no conference between the Houses and the measure would become law immediately. Clearly, the broadest bill possible, within the framework of the amended House bill, has the best chance of passage.

The main headquarters for the Alfred I. du Pont Estate are located in Jacksonville, Fla., in my congressional district. Mr. du Pont died on April 29, 1935, and in his will he established a testamentary trust and directed his trustees to set up a corporation for charitable purposes to be designed and known as the Nemours Foundation.

At that time, 30 years ago, his widow, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont, was 51 years of age, Edward Ball, Mrs. du Pont's brother, trustee of the Alfred I. du Pont Estate, was 47. Under the will, upon the death of Mrs. du Pont, the entire income from the estate would go to the Nemours Foundation, after certain specific individual bequests were honored. Mr. du Pont gave his widow an option, however. He said that if she chose to create the Nemours Foundation during her lifetime that with her authority the trustees of his estate could immediately pay over to the foundation the sum of $1 million to embark it on its charitable function. Mrs. du Pont did that, and the foundation has been engaged in charitable works for the past 29 years.

In addition to the $1 million first payment to the foundation, Mrs. du Pont has made an irrevocable assignment of 12-percent of her income from the estate to the Nemours Foundation. This 12-percent is tax free, under the law, as the funds go to charity, primarily to assistance and research in the prevention of crippling in children. The remaining 88 percent (approximately $8 million annually) of Mrs. du Pont's income is taxable, and she annually pays some $5 million in taxes on this income. She has also made tremendous contributions to charities, particularly private colleges and universities.

The trustees of Mr. du Pont's estate were given power to engage in such business enterprises as they elected. Significantly, Mr. du Pont envisoned the management of the estate as a going concern, and as the annuities established by Mr. du Pont are fulfilled, 100 percent of the earnings of the estate will go to the Nemours Foundation.

The major enterprises in the Du Pont Estate of Florida are 30 banks of the Florida National group of banks with deposits of $700 million, the St. Joe Paper Co., which employs over 1,300 persons with an annual payroll of $7.5 million in Florida alone, and the Florida East Coast Railway. The estate also owns a small railroad and telephone company in northwest Florida. A million acres of property both in rural and urban areas are owned by the estate.

The moving personalities behind these substantial enterprises and the Du Pont Estate are Mrs. du Pont and her brother, Edward Ball. Their heritage included rich memories of dynamic Alfred I. du Pont, who pithily wrote on July 25, 1934: "My philosophy of life is exceedingly simple; be fair to everyone; do as much good as you can; be honest with yourself, which means, honest with everybcdy. * * * Competition is so bitter, and those who succeed have such a multitude of enemies that if one would keep one's head above water, one must struggle, and use such weapons as our Creator has provided."

The intelligent kindness and good works of Mrs. du Pont have been felt by millions of persons; while with independence, courage and intelligence Mr. Ball has given reality to the dual aspiration of Mr. du Pont to effectively assist in the building of a greater Florida and to provide for the charitable objectives of the will.

Mr. du Pont came to Florida as a permanent resident in the late 1920's. This was when Florida was suffering from an economic depression like that of which no other State in the Nation has ever gone through. He felt that the State had a great future, which many doubted at that time. He saw the bubble burst following the Florida land boom and he thought he could help shore up the faltering financial institutions in Florida and help the State through the deflationary period ahead. At this time half of Florida was insolvent. Not only individuals and corporations, but entire communities—municipalities, counties—eventually would be bankrupt and unable to meet interest on their obligations. Banks inevitably would go, one dragging down another.

During the summer of 1926, Mr. du Pont made up his mind to help rehabilitate Florida, and to spend the rest of his life at the task. He was 62 years old.

"We don't want any more money," Mr. du Pont said to Mrs. du Pont and to Ed Ball, "and we shall make none for some time. But in the long run the things we do, whatever they are, will have to pay. Profit is the water that turns the wheels of any sound economy. If what we do is to last it will have to be profitable for those who participate in it."

Mr. du Pont, as Marquis James pointed out in his excellent biography, "Alfred I. du Pont, the Family Rebel," was willing and ready to take the chance of building up Florida, and he quite plainly said: "We don't want any more money." When he died in 1935 he was reported to be worth between $55 and $65 million, and some $30 million went to Federal and State inheritance taxes. The Florida share of those taxes was paid ahead of schedule to assist the State in a financial emergency.

He was a rich man, but wealth was not an obsession. On January 15, 1935, he said: "It has been my firm conviction throughout life that it is the duty of everyone in the world to do what is within his power to alleviate human suffering. * * * It is, therefore, natural that I should desire after having made provision for the immediate members of my family and others whom I have seen fit to remember, that the remaining portion of my estate should be utilized for charitable needs."

At another time, Mr. du Pont told Mr. Ball and Mr. W. T. Edwards, a business associate: "Boys, we are now in Florida to live and work. We expect to spend the balance of our days here. We have all the money necessary for any reasonable effort to help Florida grow and develop. Our business undertakings should be sound, but our primary object should not be the making of more money. Through helpful works let's build up good in this State and make it a better place in which to live. In my last years I'd much rather have the people of Florida say that I had helped them and their State than to double the money I now have."

Mr. du Pont's intentions are well known; he and his estate have done much for Florida.

His primary interest in coming to Florida was banking. He gained control of the Florida National Bank at Jacksonville in 1929. At that time 80 banks of the 300 in Florida had failed. He acquired six other banks in Florida prior to his death in 1935: Lakeland and Bartow in 1929; Orlando, Daytona Beach, and St. Petersburg in 1930, and Miami in 1931.

Between 1929 and 1931, 119 banks closed in Florida and $30 million was lost. Mr. du Pont thought this was deplorable and that there should have been stronger restrictions on banks and bankers to insure against these failures in the future. He said in 1930: "Florida has lacked a conservative banking system. Banks are public trusteeships. Their primary object should be the safe custodianship of the money entrusted to them, not the making of money for their shareholders. If all Florida banks had had this in mind there would have been no failures."

Mr. du Pont was acclaimed far and wide for his banking intelligence. Winthrop W. Aldrich, president of the Chase National Bank, said: "I consider Mr. Alfred I. du Pont's banking activities in Florida one of the finest phases of banking organization I have ever known."

Time magazine reported: "When about two and a half years ago Florida's banking structure was toppling a strong man came to save it. He was Alfred Irenee du Pont, stormiest of the great Wilmington family. * * * To Florida he brought new, sound banks, all with the name Florida National."

In 1931 and 1932 the rest of the country felt what Florida had felt in prior years: Six hundred and fifty-five depositories failed and frightened patrons withdrew $400 million from those remaining.

His banking philosophy was in line with those who called for more control of banks to protect the depositor. He was for placing banks under Federal Reserve Board authority; stricter regulation of private banks; divorcing Federal Reserve member banks from investment affiliates; interest on demand deposits to cease; officers barred from borrowing from their own banks.

Mr. du Pont said in strong language for a multimillionaire: "I have always espoused the cause of a much wider distribution of national wealth, and the use of gibbet and halter on men of wealth, who, by virtue of their basic acquisitions and by the power vested in their possessions, only build toward their own aggrandizement. The handling of all funds of others, as in the case of bankers, should be based on the acceptance of such funds as a sacred trust, and any thought of any violation of this principle should not be tolerated."

In the 1930's Mr. du Pont began to invest in land in northwest Florida, which was then a vast wasteland. He also bought a million dollars worth of urban property in Florida.

Without knowing what could be done or how it could be done. Mr. du Pont came to the conclusion that northwest Florida held possibilities as a laboratory for an experiment at bettering the lot of unfortunate people, living in some cases amid conditions socially and economically lower than those of the peasantry of Western Europe. He felt there was a real challenge to improve the life of that area. At one time in Mr. du Pont's life he had 466,747 acres of land in northwest Florida. In 1934 and 1935 he sold 186,747 acres to the U.S. Government for inclusion in the Apalachicola National Forest. At his death he had 280,000 acres, an investment of $1 million.

His interests in the Panhandle section of Florida have meant much to the people who live there. His organization of the St. Joe Paper Co. in 1935 and the purchase of the rundown Apalachicola Northern Railroad Co. and the St. Joseph Telephone & Telegraph Co. spurred the development of northwest Florida. He had a great deal to lose in this endeavor but he was interested in seeing Florida grow and its people live a good life. With private capital in the 1930's he was developing a depressed area, not unlike what the taxpayer's dollars are doing today through area redevelopment in other areas of our country.

I have gone into this detail because I think there are few parallels in history of a wealthy man setting out to use his wealth so constructively for an adopted State. Florida had another such benefactor known and admired by Du Pont but of an earlier vintage Henry Flagler, who built the Florida East Coast Railroad, now owned by the Du Pont Estate. Marquis James, Du Pont's biographer, felt that Flagler's deeds were a part of the inspiration of Du Pont to undertake what he did in Florida.

The Du Pont Estate was exempted from the Bank Holding Act of 1956 because of its special nature as a testamentary trust. Congress felt that the exemption was right in 1956. However, the Federal Reserve Board, having observed the workings of this law enacted in 1956, felt that no exemptions should be allowed; and I share this conclusion. To allow this exemption to continue is to violate the principle underlying the 1933 act and also the 1956 act, namely that it is not in the public interest to have banking and nonbanking business in the same hand because of conflict of interest and monopoly.

It is my belief that if Mr. Alfred I. du Pont were alive today he would approve of the divestiture of the financial empire which bears his name and which now includes 30 Florida National Banks, the St. Joe Paper Co., the Florida East Coast Railway and a million acres of rural and urban land. Remember that Mr. du Pont said: "I have always espoused the cause of a much wider distribution of national wealth, and the use of gibbet and halter on men of wealth."

The process of divestiture can be very helpful to the general and local economy and to all involved.

Generally speaking, divestment under the Bank Holding Company Act has been beneficial to those stockholders concerned, and is best illustrated by the cases of General Bancshares Corp., First Security Corp., Transamerica Corp., and Financial General Corp. All of these divestments show definite profit return or promise of profit return to all parties concerned.

On December 31, 1958, General Bancshares transferred to a new holding company, General Contract Finance Corp., all shares of its directly held nonbanking subsidiaries (consisting of finance, loan, and insurance businesses). At the same time, all stock of the new holding company was distributed to the stockholders of the General Bancshares Corp. on a share-for-share basis. In the 1959 annual report to the stockholders, Arthur Blumeyer, chairman of the board of directors, made the startling admission that "with our activities now confined to management of the banks, it is not unreasonable to predict increased effectiveness in promoting their growth and power," clearly demonstrating the soundness of prohibiting banks from engaging in any other type of enterprise than banking itself. Even greater strength is added to the chairman's comment when we see the elimination here of the danger to the depositors' funds, which results where the bank is in effect both the lender and the borrower.

At the time of divestment General Contract Finance Corp. stock was market valued at $9 a share. Thus, from receiving a share of General Contract Finance Corp. stock for each share of General Bancshares stock held, the General Bancshares stockholder made an immediate profit of $9 on each share owned. The banks themselves also profited following divestment. Net earnings in 1958 from banking by General Bancshares were $1,917,000, but only 1 year later, after divestment of nonbanking business, profits from these same banks rose to $2,340,028, an increase of $123,028 over the previous year.

To carry out divestment of its finance, investment and agricultural businesses under order of the Federal Reserve Board, the First Security Corp. changed its name to First Security Investment Co. on September 15, 1959, and transferred to First Security Corp. all of its stock in banking subsidiaries, and received in return all of First Security's common stock. All of the First Security stock was distributed among the shareholders of First Security Investment Co. on a share-for-share basis. Immediately following divestment First Security Investment Co. stock held a market value of $7 a share, and First Security Corp. stock remained at $61.50, netting the stockholder of the old First Security Corp. a profit of $7 a share for each share formerly held. Furthermore, net earnings from First Security Co. banks in 1959 were $5,351,033. Net earnings for these same banks in 1960, 1 year after divestment of nonbanking business, were $5,691,561, an increase in profits over 1959 of $340,534.

On August 31, 1958, Transamerica Corp. controlled 23 commercial banks, with 322 banking offices, located throughout 11 Western States. It also owned machinery manufacturing, food packing, loan, finance, and insurance businesses. On September 1, 1958, Transamerica transferred to First American Corp., a newly formed holding company (shortly thereafter to be renamed Western Bancorp—the name it presently holds) all of its bank stock, in exchange for which it received all of First America's capital stock. Transamerica then distributed all of the shares it had received to its stockholders on a share-for-share basis. On the day of divestment Transamerica stock held a market value of $24.50 a share. The next day of business by the New York Stock Exchange Transamerica had risen $1.15 a share, and the new holding company traded for $19.25 a share.

Thus, from the seemingly unfortunate compulsory divestment action, there resulted a direct and immediate profit to each stockholder of $20.40 for each share of Transamerica previously held by him. But not only the stockholders profited from divestment. Net earnings by First America banks in 1958, following their divestment by Transamerica, showed a spectacular profit of $1,799,781 over net earnings from the same banks the year before. The tremendous sudden growth in profits by these banks was due in large part to the increase of nearly 82,000 deposit accounts with First American in its first 6 months of operation. This amazing 10-percent increase in patronage of the former Transamerica banks certainly seems to indicate large-scale approval of the change in ownership, and vividly demonstrates divestiture in this case made a great contribution to the future growth of these banks.

Financial General presently owns 26 subsidiary and affiliate banks with deposits totaling over $1 billion. Principal nonbanking business consists of underwriting nearly all types of insurance, clothing manufacturing, consumer credit plans, and the manufacture of numerous types of packaging machinery.

Last year, in hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Gen. George Olmsted, chairman of the Board of Financial General Corp., stated that inclusion of Financial General under the Bank Holding Company Act, and application of the divestment provisions, would "have a harsh effect upon innocent investors" and "could have far-reaching repercussions upon Financial General's 16,000 common stockholders and its security holders." But in the same year, a few months later, General Olmsted predicted that forced divestment of nonbanking business would increase the value of the corporations common stock from its present value of $15.35 (up $1.35 following the announcement) to around $35 a share; a tidy profit for the stockholders at the time of divestment.

While these are only a few of the divestments that have occurred or will occur through passage of amendments to the Bank Holding Company Act, these cases clearly illustrate the general pattern showing divestment under the Bank Holding Company Act is not necessarily detrimental, and is usually a profitable undertaking.

From these illustrations, and knowing the business and profitmaking abilities of the Du Pont Estate and the principal officers of the companies and banks its controls, I have little doubt that they could emulate the above illustrations. What we would then have, should the Du Pont Estate exemption be eliminated, is a banking group run by the estate, or the other businesses being run by the estate.

The economy of Florida is sound enough to support the separate entities of the Du Pont Estate, and I would expect if other huge banking and nonbanking establishments like those mentioned previously can make huge profits from divestiture, then the Du Pont trust companies can also expect to profit by a split up. One reason they will be able to profit is because Alfred I. du Pont helped Florida to become the State it now is—the fastest growing large State in the Union. Without the umbrella of the Du Pont Estate, the banks, the railroad, the paper company, the telephone company, the land interests can expect to grow with Florida just as they have since 1930.

I believe that the Du Pont Estate is violating the underlying principle of the banking act; that allowing banking and nonbanking interests to be held together in the same ownership is against the public interest. We must keep that in front of us.

To the extent possible we should include in this legislation an end to all of the exemptions covered by the amended House bill, not only because this increases the chances of the passage of the law but also because fundamentally we are dealing with a broad and sound principle; and as Mr. Ball himself said in the House hearings: "Why not make a general application and put everybody under it?"

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, JR., CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 16, 1966

The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 has two chief objectives. The first is to prevent undue concentration of control over banks in the hands of any holding company, and the second is to prevent any holding company from controlling both banks and nonbanking business. The act prohibits formation of a bank holding company without the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and prohibits existing bank holding companies from acquiring more than 5 percent of any bank's voting shares without the Board's approval. It also prohibits a bank holding company from engaging in any business other than banking, or acquiring more than 5 percent of the voting shares of any such business, and requires the holding company to divest any such interests previously acquired. In addition, it prohibits any subsidiary bank from lending to or investing in its parent holding company or any other subsidiary.

The principal issue presented by the bills before you this morning relates to the coverage of the Bank Holding Company Act. For every holding company now registered under the act, there are 10 or more that are exempt, chiefly because the act does not cover one-bank holding companies. The Board sees no basis in logic or equity for this exemption, and recommends its repeal.

While there would obviously be no need for the act to cover one-bank holding companies if its only purpose were to prevent any holding company from acquiring too many banks, it seems just as clear that coverage of one-bank holding companies is necessary to accomplish the act's second objective. In this connection, let me quote from this committee's 1955 report on the act:

"Bank holding companies should confine their activities to the control and management of banks and activities closely related to banking. They should not combine management and control of banking activities with management and control of nonbanking activities. The divestment requirements in this bill are designed to remove the danger that a bank holding company might misuse or abuse the resources of a bank it controls in order to gain an advantage in the operation of the nonbanking activities it controls." (S. Rept. No. 1095, 84th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 13–14.)

Abuses could come about "by requiring the bank's customers to make use of such nonbanking enterprises as a condition of doing business with the bank," as the committee report pointed out (p. 5), or they could take the form of denying credit to competitors of the bank's fellow subsidiaries. When a builder seeks a construction loan from a bank, the loan should be made or denied without regard to whether the applicant will buy his lumber from a supplier that is owned by the same holding company that owns the bank. When an automobile dealer seeks to discount his customers' paper at a bank, the bank's decision should not be complicated by questions of how it will affect the competitive position of another automobile dealership owned by the bank's parent company. If a holding company is a finance company, the bank's decisions as to whether it should make automobile loans directly should not be influenced by considerations as to whether its activities would take business away from its parent finance company.

If you ask whether the Board can cite specific examples of such abuses among the hundreds of one-bank holding companies in existence today, the answer is "No." Presumably, the organizers of these companies are neither more nor less scrupulous than their counterparts in other businesses. But for companies now registered under the act, no proof of actual abuses was required.

The Congress decided, and the Board agreed, that even in the absence of such proof, the potentiality for abuse in the relationships between holding company, bank subsidiary, and nonbank subsidiary was sufficiently great to require divestment of nonbank businesses. The Board believed then, and continues to believe, that this is just as true for one-bank holding companies as for two-bank companies. We subscribe to another principle laid down in your committee's report, that "in general all bank holding companies should be required to observe the same ground rules concerning formation and operation, insofar as Federal legislation is concerned" (id. at p. 14).

While it may be argued that multibank holding companies should be treated differently from one-bank holding companies because their operations have a greater impact on our economy, the facts are that a finance company with assets of $3 billion now controls a single bank with deposits of three quarters of a billion dollars; the total deposits of the banks shown on the list of one-bank holding companies recently published by this committee is about $15 billion compared with about $26 billion for the subsidiary banks of all registered bank holding companies. Moreover, about one-fourth of the one-bank holding companies on the list are found in one-bank towns. In such situations, it is particularly desirable that the bank's credit decisions be based solely on creditworthiness.

Let me turn now to questions of what kinds of organizations should be included in the definition of "company." At the outset, it may be asked why the act now covers only companies, and does not apply to control exercised by an individual. It is, of course, possible for an individual to achieve the sort of domination of a banking market that the act seeks to prevent a company from obtaining. The same conflicts of interest could also arise where an individual controls a bank and a nonbanking business. But the need to regulate this kind of activity on the part of individuals is not as great as it is for corporations, because individuals generally are more limited than are corporations in their ability to attract capital for expansion, and because control by individuals generally is diffused when they die.

The decision to cover corporations but exempt individuals entails some difficulty in deciding whether to cover holdings by groups of individuals associated together in some form other than a corporation. The act now covers many such forms of association by defining "company" to include (with certain exceptions) "any corporation, business trust, association, or similar organization." It excludes partnerships, however. The Board is not aware of any need to disturb this exclusion. Admittedly, there are exceptions to the broad generalizations that corporations have longer lives, and obtain capital more easily, than partnerships. But the Board is inclined to believe that the same reasons that support an exemption for individuals also support—though to a lesser degree—the exemption for partnerships.

The next question arises when an individual extends his control over banks beyond his death, as is commonly done through testamentary trusts established for the benefit of a widow or children. The Board sees good reason to exempt the ordinary family trust, which may be regarded as only a temporary extension of the control originally exercised by the individual who established the trust. But when a will creates a trust that is perpetual, with trustees who are not only replaceable but are authorized and indeed obliged to manage the trust's affairs so that it may grow and prosper, the Board believes that the line between control by individuals and control by corporations has been crossed, and that such a trust should be subject to the act just as a corporation should. Again, it is not easy to draw a line between trusts that should be exempt and those that should be covered. We believe, after further study, that the provision we originally suggested, which is now incorporated in S. 2353, would probably cover some family trusts that should be exempt, such as a trust for the benefit of surviving children who might not be named in the trust instrument. We now suggest, therefore, that the bill be amended to exclude from coverage trusts that must terminate within 21 years after the death of individual beneficiaries living when the trusts become effective.

By far the largest trust that would be covered by the bills before you is that established in 1936 under the will of Alfred I. du Pont. In testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee last year, Edward Ball, cotrustee of the Du Pont Estate, described the effect of Mr. du Pont's will as follows:

"In that will, after making some preliminary bequests, he established a testamentary trust, appointed trustees, and made his wife the beneficiary of the income from that trust as long as she lived. Mrs. du Pont is 81 years old. Upon her death, all of the income from the trust properties will be paid to the Nemours Foundation, which is the beneficiary of the trust. The Nemours Foundation is a tax-exempt, charitable foundation and provides care for crippled children, for incurables, and aged men and women. * * * It is a trust in perpetuity, and it is a charitable trust" (hearings on H.R. 7371, p. 44).

According to Mr. Ball's 1964 testimony before the same committee, the Nemours Foundation is a corporation, created in 1937, which embarked upon its charitable function with $1 million paid over to it from the Du Pont Estate. "Mrs. du Pont has made an irrevocable assignment of 12 percent of her income from the estate to the Nemours Foundation," Mr. Ball added. "Last year (1963) this amounted to $1,008,026.71. Upon her death, the additional 88 percent, which last year amounted to $7,384,862.57, will go to the foundation." (Hearings on H.R. 10668 and H.R. 10872, p. 227.)

The testimony further indicates that when the Bank Holding Company Act was enacted, the estate controlled 24 banks and 5 nonbanking enterprises, doing business in real estate, insurance, safe deposit box rentals, small resort operation, and the manufacture of paper and pulp products. One of the five nonbanking corporations, the St. Joe Paper Co., owned 100 percent of the stock of six other companies—including a railroad, a telephone and telegraph company, and a warehousing company—and 50 percent of the stock of a corporation that manufactured cardboard containers. It also owned 52 percent of the defaulted bonds of the Florida East Coast Railway Co., in receivership at the time. The railroad emerged from receivership in 1961, under the control of the estate. The banks in the Florida National group controlled by the estate expanded from 24 in 1956 to 31 last year; the number has now dropped to 30. These banks are listed on page 7 of the committee print of February 1966, listing the organizations covered by S. 2353.

A handful of other trusts are included in the published list. They include some employee-benefit trusts, which presumably are perpetual, and a few perpetual charitable trusts. We know very little about these trusts, and it is possible that some of them should not be on the list. In the survey we conducted at your chairman's request, on which this list is based, many other banks reported that 25 percent or more of their voting shares were held by trustees, but it is impractical to investigate each of these instances to determine whether the trust would be covered under the proposed amendment.

One of the bills before you, S. 2418, provides that where two trusts have a common beneficiary or trustee they shall be presumed to control each other unless the Board determines that the presumption should not apply. While this provision seems unnecessarily broad, the Board recognizes that coverage of trusts poses special problems in connection with the divestiture requirements of section 4 of the act, and that some provision may be needed to prevent a token divestment to a newly created trust controlled by the same trustees. We recommend that you consider amending section 4 by adding a provision to the effect that divestment to any trust having one or more trustees in common with the divesting trust shall not be considered as an effective divestment.

If the committee agrees that long-term trust should be covered, conforming amendments will be required, as indicated in the attachment at the end of my statement.

The third principal change in coverage recommended by the Board is to delete the present exemption for registered investment companies and their affiliates. This exemption is now enjoyed exclusively by the Financial General Corp., a company that is not, itself, registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, but is affiliated with Equity Corp., a registered company. The Board does not agree with the contention that because companies registered under the 1940 act are supervised by the Securities and Exchange Commission there is no need for regulation under the Bank Holding Company Act. The SEC has no authority to prevent an affiliate of a registered investment company from expanding its control over banks or combining banks with nonbanking businesses. SEC supervision of such affiliates is for an entirely different purpose, and is limited to dealings between the affiliate and the registered investment company.

Financial General now owns one subsidiary, Empire Shares Corp., which is a registered bank holding company owning three banks in New York. In addition, Financial General owns 18 other subsidiary corporations, each of which owns 1 bank; 2 of these banks are in the District of Columbia, 1 in Georgia, 4 in Maryland, 1 in Tennessee, and 10 in Virginia. Nonbanking interests of Financial General include firms engaged in life insurance, fire and casualty insurance, industrial and manufacturing activities, lease financing, and mortgage banking.

Financial General is exempt from the Bank Holding Company Act because of a provision in section 2(a) excluding from the definition of "bank holding company" any company "which is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, and was so registered prior to May 15, 1955 (or which is affiliated with any such company in such manner as to constitute an affiliated company within the meaning of such act), unless such company (or such affiliated company), as the case may be, directly owns 25 per centum or more of the voting shares of each of two or more banks." Under the Investment Company Act two companies are "affiliated with" each other if either owns as much as 5 percent of the other's stock. Financial General is "affiliated with" Equity Corp., because the latter owns approximately 15 percent of Financial General's stock. Neither Equity nor Financial General directly owns 25 percent of the stock of any bank, because in each case the bank stock is held by a separate holding company that is a subsidiary of Financial General.

This exemption has enabled Financial General not only to continue to operate banks and nonbank businesses, but also to expand its banking interests considerably since enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act. The company's latest annual report observed that it "is now the largest interstate banking group in the East, and sixth largest banking group in the United States." Of the 21 banks under its control, 15 have been acquired since enactment. This expansion took place in several different States, despite the fact that Financial General's principal place of business is in the District of Columbia. For companies covered by the act, acquisitions of a bank outside the holding company's home State are prohibited unless the acquisition is "specifically authorized by the statute laws of the State in which such bank is located, by language to that effect and not merely by implication."

Although only one company has thus far taken advantage of this exemption, it is available for use by others. Any company wishing to take advantage of this loophole may do so by acquiring 5 percent of the stock of any of the roughly 300 investment companies that were registered before May 15, 1955. The Board believes that this possibility for escaping regulation under the act should be eliminated by repeal of the exemption.

The Board also believes that nonprofit corporations engaged in charitable, educational, or religious activities should not be permitted to acquire banks free of regulation, or to combine banking and nonbanking businesses. We see no reason to assume that organizations of this kind are immune, because of their nature, from the potentialities for trouble that exist in the case of ordinary business corporations. The Board accordingly recommends repeal of the exemption for charitable, educational, and religious organizations now included in section 2(b)(2) of the act.

The original Bank Holding Company Act included tax provisions designed to make sure that those who are forced to dispose of property because of the divestment requirements of the act will not suffer unfavorable tax consequences. The Board believes that this same principle should apply to divestitures required as a result of the amendments now under consideration.

In addition to a broadening of the act to cover holding companies that are now exempted, the Board recommends changes with respect to dealings between subsidiary banks and their parent holding companies or fellow subsidiaries. Section 6 of the act prohibits any "upstream" or "cross-stream" loans or investments by a subsidiary bank—"upstream" meaning from the bank to the holding company, and "cross-stream" meaning from the bank to another subsidiary (which must, under the act, be another bank or closely related business).

The Board believes that this prohibition is too rigid, in that it prevents some portfolio adjustments between subsidiary banks that are legitimate and economically beneficial. We recognize the need for limits on upstream and cross-stream credit, and believe that this can be accomplished readily by applying section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act. Section 23A prohibits any bank that is a member of the Federal Reserve System from extending credit (through loans or investments) totaling more than 10 percent of its capital and surplus to any one affiliate, or more than 20 percent for all affiliates. We recommend that this limitation be applied to all insured banks (whether or not they are members of the Federal Reserve System) and that the definitions of "affiliate" be broadened to cover bank holding companies and their subsidiaries.

These are the principal changes involved in the bills before you. All three bills would cover long-term trusts and repeal the exemption for registered investment companies and their affiliates. In addition, all three bills would repeal the exemption for nonprofit charitable, religious, or educational organizations. S. 2353, introduced by your chairman at the Board's request, and H.R. 7371, which passed the House of Representatives last September, would also repeal an exemption for agricultural companies that is probably meaningless now although it was designed in 1956 to cover a special case, and would repeal two other special exemptions from the requirement that bank holding companies must divest their interests in nonbanking businesses. One of these exempts certain labor, agricultural, and horticultural organizations from the divestment requirement. The other allows a bank that is also a holding company to keep nonbank stock it owned before the act was enacted.

In sum, the Board recommends, and the House of Representatives has approved, extending coverage under the act in seven respects. Three of these changes are incorporated in S. 2418. The different effects of the three bills as to coverage are shown on page 2 of the committee print published by your committee in November of 1965.

In addition, S. 2353 would, as I have explained, substitute limitations on "upstream" and "cross-stream" credit for the prohibitions now contained in section 6 of the act. S. 2353 also includes a number of other amendments which are largely technical. These are explained in the memorandum that accompanied my letter to your chairman submitting the legislation; this memorandum is reproduced in the November 1965 committee print. Rather than taking your time now to go through the technicalities of these changes, perhaps I can best assist you by responding to questions you may have regarding the three bills.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO S. 2353

On page 5, strike line 24, and on page 6, strike lines 1 through 4, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)) is amended by striking the words 'for the benefit of the shareholders of such bank' at the end of clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'under a trust that constistitutes a company as defined in section 2(b)'."

On page 7, strike lines 20 through 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) shares held or acquired by a bank in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held under a trust that constitutes a company as defined in section 2(b);"

Explanation: Section 2 of S. 2353 would broaden the definition of "company" to include long-term trusts. The technical amendments above are conforming amendments, to make sure that the exemptions now contained in section 3(a) and section 4(c) of the 1956 act for shares held by a bank in a fiduciary capacity will not be construed to exempt any long-term trust where the trustee is a bank. These exemptions are needed to permit banks to continue to hold shares of stock in banks and other companies in the course of their trust business, but they should be limited to short-term trusts, such as those established by will to take care of the spouse and children of the testator.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, almighty Maker of heaven and earth, may Thy way be known among men and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. We stand to dedicate this day and all our powers to the extension of Thy kingdom in the world which Thou hast made.

We give Thee thanks this day for the safe return of our astronauts from their perilous mission in outer space. And we pray that we who have our daily missions and duties here on the familiar pathways of earth may manifest in our daily walk something of the courage, the devotion and self-discipline, which we today celebrate in these two astronauts.

For we too are on mission for the Nation: a mission to achieve equal justice under law, to recognize human dignity in every man, to express true brotherhood in every place, to manifest integrity in every relationship—and to join with men of good will the world around, not to escalate warfare into the dimension of space but to extend the blessings of peace to the ends of the earth.

So bless, we pray Thee, all efforts put forth for such high ends by men of understanding in this honored Chamber—and across the world—that Thy way may be known and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

In the Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 15, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10722) to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7141. An act for the relief of Ronald Whelan;

H.R. 8865. An act for the relief of Ronald Poirier, a minor; and

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 7141. An act for the relief of Ronald Whelan;

H.R. 8865. An act for the relief of Ronald Poirier, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

R. D. Pennewell, of Missouri, and A. Lars Nelson, of Washington, to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Lt. Gen. Alva Revista Fitch, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list, in the grade of lieutenant general; and

Maj. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dixon Donnelley, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CANADIAN UNIVERSAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stanley R. Tupper, of Maine, to be Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1038, H.R. 969.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOMPUTATION OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE ANNUITIES

The bill (H.R. 969) to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1069), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

Prior to the major amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act enacted in 1956, retired employees who were reemployed continued to receive their annuity payment but had their Federal salary reduced by the amount of the annuity during the period of reemployment.

In 1956 the act was amended to provide that when an annuitant whose prior separation was based on involuntary causes (reduction in force, etc.) was reemployed, he surrendered his retirement status and became a regular contributing member of the retirement program just as if he had never been retired. It was felt that this benefited the involuntarily separated employee whose career had been interrupted through no fault of his own.

The 1956 amendments provided that the voluntary separated employee who was subsequently reemployed would be entitled to a supplementary annuity based on his average salary during the period of reemployment. He was not, however, entitled to a "fresh start" as was the involuntarily separated employee.

On July 12, 1960, Congress amended the act to provide that the voluntarily separated employee who was reemployed for full-time employment for a period of not fewer than 5 years would be entitled, if he so elected, to a complete recomputation of his annuity based on the retirement law as it existed at the time of his final separation. In most cases, this amendment would benefit the reemployed annuitant by giving him a larger high-five salary as well as the benefits enacted in the Retirement Act subsequent to his original retirement.

On October 4, 1961, the act was again amended to extend this same benefit to any involuntarily separated employee whose original separation occurred prior to the effective date of the 1965 amendments, October 1, 1956. The purpose of the 1961 act was to put reemployed annuitants, regardless of the reason for their original retirement, on equal footing. The 1961 amendment was prospective, however, and it has come to the attention of the committee that there is a small group of involuntarily separated, reemployed annuitants whose service in reemployment commenced prior to October 1, 1956, and terminated between July 12, 1960, and October 4, 1961, who are not eligible for the recomputation rights established under the 1960 and 1961 acts. H.R. 969 amends the Retirement Act to extend existing benefits to that group if they so elect and if they make the necessary deposit into the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Public hearings were held on H.R. 969 on February 18, 1966. No opposition was expressed to the bill.

DEFINITION OF "CHILD" UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1746) to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "by", to insert "striking out the word 'four' in the third sentence and inserting the word 'five', and by".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1070), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would permit the natural child of a deceased Federal employee who dies without survivors eligible to receive a survivor annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund to share in the distribution of any money on deposit in the fund which belongs to the deceased employee.

STATEMENT

A lump-sum cash payment is payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund when an employee dies without title to an annuity or when an annuitant dies without any survivor who is eligible to receive a survivor annuity. The lump sum is any money in the fund contributed by the employee which has not been paid out in annuity checks.

Under present law, the children of a Federal employee who survive him are eligible to receive a survivor annuity if they are under the age of 18, between ages 18 and 21, and in a full-time course of education, or physically or mentally disabled prior to age 18.

For the purpose of determining eligibility for a survivor annuity, the Civil Service Commission treats illegitimate children the same as legitimate children if they were living in a normal family relationship and received at least 50 percent of their support from the employee.

For payment of lump-sum benefits, however, the law is not clear. When an employee or annuitant dies without survivors eligible for an annuity, the money which he has contributed is paid to his survivors according to the order of precedence set out in section 11 of the Civil Service Retirement Act. Whether natural children share in this settlement has been subject to question. To establish a uniform rule, give natural children the same benefit which they receive in regard to survivor annuities, and avoid occasional litigation based on varying State inheritance laws, the Commission has recommended enactment of legislation to include natural children as participants in such payments.

In many cases, such "children" are adults who are illegitimate because a prior marriage was not properly terminated by divorce prior to the employee's marriage to a subsequent spouse. The committee believes that equal treatment in the payment of lump-sum remainders under a Federal law and involving Federal funds should be accorded.

Public hearings were held on H.R. 1746, as referred, on February 18, 1966. All testimony favored enactment.

AMENDMENT

The committee has amended the bill as referred to extend the period of time during which a child-survivor of a Federal employee may be absent from a course of full-time study in school and continue to receive his annuity.

Children of a deceased Federal employee may receive a survivor annuity if they are enrolled in a full-time course of study in an institution of learning until the end of the school year following their 21st birthday.

Children are given the benefit of summer school vacations if they notify the Commission in writing that they intend to reenroll in school after a recess not to exceed 4 months.

When enacted in 1962, this amendment was designed to include any child-survivor who withdrew from school at the end of the spring term and intended to reenter in the fall term. Since 1962 however, many colleges and universities have adopted the trisemester program which can, in some cases, result in an absence from school exceeding 4 months. If the absence, for any reason, exceeds 4 months, the survivor annuity stops and cannot be resumed. Several cases have been brought to the committee's attention which indicate that some survivor-annuitant children withdraw from trisemester programs in order to secure summer employment and earn money to continue their education. Because of the scheduling of trisemester programs, many of these students are absent from school for a period slightly exceeding 4 months.

Section 1 of H.R. 1746, as amended, will resolve this immediate problem by extending the period of absence from 4 months to 5 months. Students receiving survivor annuities at this time can secure summer employment and still return to school in the fall of 1966, and subsequent years, and continue to receive their survivor annuity. In many cases, the Federal annuity makes the difference between continuing in school and having to withdraw permanently.

No additional cost is anticipated by the enactment of the provisions of H.R. 1746. However, to prevent the deprival of benefits to those entitled to payment should such cost occur, section 2 of the bill provides that the payment shall be made from the civil service retirement and disability fund notwithstanding any other provisions of law prohibiting such payment.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6926) to strengthen the financial condition of the Employees Life Insurance Fund created by the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to provide certain adjustments in amounts of group life and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance under such act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 2(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091, 68 Stat. 736; Public Law 84–598), is amended by inserting after the word "employment" in the proviso the following: "or solely because he was previously retired on annuity from Government civilian employment,".

(b) Section 6(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The life insurance (including additional group life insurance) of an insured retired employee who is reemployed under conditions which do not terminate his title to annuity shall cease if he again becomes eligible to be insured as an employee. Unless he gives written notice that he desires not to be insured, the amount of life insurance which shall be paid after his death shall in no case be less than the amount which would have been paid if he had not been reemployed."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 3(a) of such Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation;

(2) striking out "approximating his annual compensation not exceeding $20,000";

(3) striking out the insurance schedule included therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"If annual compensation is—		The amount of group life insurance shall be—	The amount of group accidental death and dismemberment insurance shall be—
Greater than—	But not greater than—		
0	$750	$1, 000	$1, 000
$750	1, 500	2, 000	2, 000
1, 500	2, 250	3, 000	3, 000
2, 250	3, 000	4, 000	4, 000
3, 000	3, 750	5, 000	5, 000
3, 750	4, 500	6, 000	6, 000
4, 500	5, 250	7, 000	7, 000
5, 250	6, 000	8, 000	8, 000
6, 000	6, 750	9, 000	9, 000
6, 750	7, 500	10, 000	10, 000
7, 500	8, 250	11, 000	11, 000
8, 250	9, 000	12, 000	12, 000
9, 000	9, 750	13, 000	13, 000
9, 750	10, 500	14, 000	14, 000
10, 500	11, 250	15, 000	15, 000
11, 250	12, 000	16, 000	16, 000
12, 000	12, 750	17, 000	17, 000
12, 750	13, 500	18, 000	18, 000
13, 500	14, 250	19, 000	19, 000
14, 250	15, 000	20, 000	20, 000
15, 000	15, 750	21, 000	21, 000
15, 750	16, 500	22, 000	22, 000
16, 500	17, 250	23, 000	23, 000
17, 250	18, 000	24, 000	24, 000
18, 000	18, 750	25, 000	25, 000
$18, 750	$19, 500	$26, 000	$26, 000
19, 500	20, 250	27, 000	27, 000
20, 250	21, 000	28, 000	28, 000
21, 000	21, 750	29, 000	29, 000
21, 750	22, 500	30, 000	30, 000
22, 500	23, 250	31, 000	31, 000
23, 250	24, 000	32, 000	32, 000
24, 000	24, 750	33, 000	33, 000
24, 750	25, 500	34, 000	34, 000
25, 500	26, 250	35, 000	35, 000
26, 250	27, 000	36, 000	36, 000
27, 000	27, 750	37, 000	37, 000
27, 750	28, 530	38, 000	38, 000
28, 500	29, 250	39, 000	39, 000
29, 250		40, 000	40, 000".

(4) by adding at the end of such subsection the following:

"(2) In addition to the insurance referred to in paragraph (1), each employee insured under this Act shall have additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance in the amount of $2,000."

(b) Section 4 of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "accidental death insurance" the words "(including additional group life and accidental death insurance)".

(c) The first sentence of section 6(b) and the first sentence of section 6(c) of such Act are amended by inserting after the words "life insurance" the words "(including additional life insurance)".

(d) Section 6(b) of such Act is further amended by inserting after the words "such insurance" in the first sentence thereof a comma and the words "other than additional group life insurance,".

Sec. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 5(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "During any period in which an employee is insured under a policy of insurance purchased by the Commission as authorized in section 7 of this Act, there shall be withheld from each salary payment of such employee, as his share of the cost of his group life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance, an amount determined by the Commission, to be at a biweekly rate, adjusted to the nearest cent, equal to three-fifths of the level cost of the insurance provided: *Provided*, That an employee who is paid on other than a biweekly basis shall have an amount so withheld, determined at a proportionate rate, which rate shall be adjusted to the nearest cent."

(b) Section 5(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "Commission, but not to exceed one-half the amount withheld from the employee under this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "Commission equal to two-fifths of the level cost of the insurance provided".

Sec. 4. (a) The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment, and shall be applicable in any case in which reemployment commences on or after such day, or in which reemployment commenced but has not terminated prior to such day.

(b) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance payable for the death or dismemberment of any officer or employee, the amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of section 2 of this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, but shall have no effect in the case of any officer or employee who died, or was finally separated or retired prior to such date. The amendments made by the remaining provisions of section 2 shall take effect the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than sixty days after the date of enactment, but shall have no effect in the case of any officer or employee who died, or was finally separated or retired prior to such date.

(c) For the purpose of determining the amounts to be withheld from an employee's salary or contributed from the respective appropriation or fund, the amendments made by sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than sixty days after the date of enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1071), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act was enacted by Congress in 1954 to provide an insurance program for all Federal employees on a cost-sharing basis. At the time of its enactment, the program provided insurance equal to the employee's annual basic salary (rounded off to the next higher thousand dollars) and charged the employee two-thirds of the cost of the insurance provided. A ceiling of $20,000 insurance, plus an equal amount of accidental death and dismemberment insurance, was established. The 1954 act set a maximum contribution of 25 cents for each $1,000 insurance to be paid biweekly by the employee. From the beginning, the Civil Service Commission has collected the maximum premium (25 cents from the employee, 12.5 cents from the agency).

At retirement or upon attaining age 65, whichever occurs later, the employee and the Government cease to pay for the insurance and it continues until payable to the beneficiary. However, beginning on the first month after retirement or reaching age 65, the value of the insurance begins to decline at the rate of 2 percent per month until 25 percent of the original face value remains. This minimum protection is reached 38 months after the reduction commences.

No significant amendments have been made to the act since 1954. In the meantime, however, insurance programs provided employees in the private sector of the economy have improved markedly. The following table shows six examples of insurance programs now in effect in major private enterprises. Evidence gathered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor shows that, in most cases, major employers in the private sector of the economy in 1936 offered life insurance programs significantly more liberal than the Federal employees' program is in 1966.

To keep pace with insurance programs offered employees and prospective employees in private enterprise, and to assist the Government in its effort to recruit and retain the highest quality personnel available, the committee has amended H.R. 6926.

As referred, H.R. 6926 would have increased the maximum amount of insurance from $20,000 to $30,000 (affecting only the highest grades of the pay schedules), and would have provided the Civil Service Commission the authority to increase the Government's contribution toward the cost of life insurance to an amount equal, if necessary, to the amount contributed by the employee. If this authority had been exercised by the Commission, an increase of 7.3 cents per $1,000 insurance would have provided full financing for the present life insurance program.

LEVEL COST OF THE LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM

When enacted in 1954, the act established 25 cents per $1,000 insurance as the maximum biweekly contribution by the employee. At that time, insurance actuaries believed that a contribution of 37.5 cents (including the Government's 12.5 cents contribution biweekly) would pay the level cost of the insurance for the foreseeable future. Certain minor liberalizations since 1954 have increased the cost of the program and, in light of present actuarial estimates, the actual cost of the insurance is 44.8 cents per $1,000 biweekly rather than 37.5 cents.

The problems of unfunded liability are well known to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Concern over the unfunded portion of the civil service retirement and disability fund has led to several congressional studies. At this time, the executive branch of the Government is proposing new legislation to prevent eventual exhaustion of the retirement fund. To avoid a similar future problem with life insurance, H.R. 6926, as amended, will require that the level cost of insurance, without regard to any biweekly maximum contribution, shall be paid. At any time that the Commission determines that the contribution rate should be increased or decreased, authority to do so will exist.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee has amended H.R. 6926, as referred, to provide three major improvements in the life insurance program.

1. The amount of insurance available to each employee will equal approximately 1⅓ of his annual basic salary, rounded off to the next higher thousand dollars.

2. Each employee will carry in addition to this basic insurance protection $2,000 insurance which will not be affected by the reduction after retirement.

3. The cost-sharing ratio will be changed from its present 2 to 1 to a new ratio of 3 to 2. Thus, the employee will pay 60 percent of the total premium and the Government will pay 40 percent of the total premium. This is a decrease of approximately 7 percent for the employee and an increase of 7 percent for the Government.

INCREASED INSURANCE

The committee believes it is both prudent and wise to increase the coverage available for all employees. Table I, above, demonstrates the amount of insurance which several major employers offer. Although not all major employers in private enterprise offer insurance programs as attractive as those illustrated, the six chosen for comparison are by no means isolated examples. They have been chosen at random to show prevailing insurance programs outside the Government. The committee believes that life insurance programs in private enterprise have increased their benefits in the 3 years since the Bureau of Labor Statistics study was made.

The committee amendment does not go as far as employee unions have urged, but it is a significant step forward. It will accomplish the dual objective of providing greater protection for lower echelon employees who can least afford to purchase insurance entirely at their own expense, and will also provide larger insurance protection for higher echelon employees where recruitment and retention in the Federal service is most difficult.

REDUCTION AFTER RETIREMENT

One of the major aims of employee organizations has been to revise the reduction-after-retirement formula. A career Federal employee who retires at age 65 with a life insurance policy valued at $6,000 has only $1,500 insurance protection 38 months later. Many proposals have been introduced to change this reduction formula so that employees would retain a minimum of 50 percent of the face value of their policy after a reduction period of 76 months. The committee has given very careful consideration to this proposal.

To revise the reduction formula so that the decrease would be 1 percent each month and provide a 50-percent remainder would increase the per-unit cost of insurance by 11 cents. Much of this objective can be accomplished by providing additional insurance which will not be affected by the reduction formula. The unit cost of an additional $2,000 insurance unaffected by the reduction would be only 4 cents. Because of the significant difference in unit cost to both the employee and the Government, the committee has chosen to provide an additional $2,000 of unreducing insurance and leave unchanged the reduction formula which applies to all other insurance.

For the employee in the lower levels, the $2,000 unit will provide almost as much after-retirement protection as the 50-percent remainder. Under the provisions of the committee amendment, an employee earning $6,750 annually will have $10,000 basic insurance, plus an additional amount of $2,000 insurance not subject to the reduction after retirement. After the full reduction, he will have $2,500, plus the unreduced $2,000. This total of $4,500 is only $500 less than 50 percent of the original $10,000 policy, and can be purchased for a much smaller relative cost over the long-term of the employee's service. It also provides valuable extra protection during the working years. For employees in the higher levels, the additional unit is not as attractive on a long-term basis as the 50-percent remainder, but the committee believes that upper level employees are more able to purchase insurance privately.

COST SHARING

The committee amendment revises the cost-sharing provisions of the act to increase the Government's contribution and decrease the employee's contribution. Under present law, the employee pays two-thirds of the premium and the Government pays one-third. At the time of enactment in 1954, this was a liberal cost-sharing formula. In more than a decade since enactment, however, cost-sharing programs in private enterprise have been liberalized significantly. Table I demonstrates cost provisions of six companies which generally represent prevailing programs in private enterprise.

Employee unions have urged that the Government pay at least half the cost of the program. The committee has instead approved an increase from 33 to 40 percent. The employee will continue to pay a majority of the insurance premium.

INSURANCE FOR REEMPLOYED ANNUITANTS

The committee amendment provides for insurance coverage for certain reemployed annuitants not now eligible for coverage.

An employee who is reemployed and does not surrender his annuity is not eligible for insurance coverage because by regulation the Commission cannot distinguish between reemployed annuitants who previously carried insurance into retirement and those who did not.

To remedy this inequity in the program, section 1 of the committee amendment provides that any reemployed annuitant who does not surrender his annuity will have an opportunity to enroll in the insurance program. If he previously carried insurance into retirement, his former insurance will cease and his new insurance will become effective. If he should die during his reemployment, the amount of insurance payable to his beneficiary will in no case be less than the amount which would have been paid had he not been reemployed.

A reemployed annuitant who surrenders his annuity upon reemployment presents no problem because he is treated like any other new employee for insurance purposes and is offered coverage.

For the purpose of creating additional life insurance of $2,000, and for the purpose of withholding amounts from an employee's salary or determining contributions to the program by Government agencies, the effective date shall be the first day of the first pay period beginning not less than 60 days after the date of enactment.

For the purpose of providing insurance coverage for reemployed annuitants, the act shall take effect upon the first day of the first pay period after enactment.

COST

H.R. 6926, as amended, will cost $183.2 million annually. This cost will be met by increasing the employee's contribution to the program by $95.1 million and by increasing the Government's contribution by $88.1 million.

Of this total cost, approximately $147 million will buy the additional insurance provided in the bill, as amended. The remaining $36 million will pay for meeting the present actuarial deficit existing in the life insurance program.

The present level cost of the life insurance program is $212.2 million annually. Contributions at present rates are $177.6 million annually. Thus a deficit of $34.6 million exists.

The bill will increase the annual level cost of the program to $360.8 million, all of which will be paid under the financing provisions included in this bill. The employees will buy $113.5 million and the Government will pay $147.3 million.

The total amount of insurance in force under the program will increase from its present level of approximately $18 billion to approximately $27 billion.

SAN ANTONIO 250TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

The bill (H.R. 7526) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1072), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 7526 was introduced by Congressman GONZALEZ on April 15, 1965. The bill passed the House on October 18, 1965.

The bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike and furnish to the San Antonio Fair, Inc., not less than 200,000 medals commemorating the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio community, Texas.

The bill provides that the medals shall be of such sizes, materials, and designs as the San Antonio Fair, Inc., may determine, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. No medal shall be made after December 31, 1968.

The medals will be of no cost to the United States, since, under the provision of the bill, no work may be commenced on the minting of the medals until the Secretary of the

Treasury has received security satisfactory to him for the payment of the cost of their production.

The committee expects that no precious metals including gold and silver will be used in these medals. Also the committee expects that the striking of these medals will not interfere with the normal activities of the mint.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 13546, which I understand was reported last night, or will be reported today, be made the pending business at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill is to be taken up at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that H.R. 12762, authorizing appropriations for the Coast Guard, which is to be reported today, may well be taken up on that day.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for several minutes beyond the 3-minute limitation.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT OF SENATORS NEUBERGER, McNAMARA, SALTONSTALL, AND SIMPSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the years, there have been learned discussions on whether or not the Senate, in a parliamentary sense, is a continuing body. Whatever variety of views may be held on that question, I think all of us share an awareness of its continuity in a personal sense.

The point is apparent in the case of the merging of new Members into the Senate. In short order, they are indistinguishable, as Senators, from those who have been here for years and even decades. And the point is driven home with a certain poignancy when Members who have been daily associates for many years announce their retirement from the Senate.

Such is the nature of this institution that one has to remind oneself that it is the Senate which is continuous not Senators.

Actually, Senators have been coming into the Senate and moving out of the Senate for a century and three-quarters. Some have stayed but a short time, others have remained for decades. In point of fact, 1,633 men and women have set in the Senate during the course of its history. Think of the immensity of their individual and collective contribution to the Government and laws of the United States, to the political leadership and evolution of the Nation. It is a thought which is enough to put our own brief spans of service in a restrained perspective.

These brief reflections, may I say, are occasioned by the recent announcements of four colleagues that they intend to retire at the conclusion of their present terms. There are two planned withdrawals from each side: Senators McNAMARA and NEUBERGER from among the Democrats, and Senators SALTONSTALL and SIMPSON from among the Republicans. The combined service of these four distinguished Senators totals about half a century. And it occurs to me, in passing, that I have been here long enough to have welcomed all of these Members, when they came into the Senate, except the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Senator SALTONSTALL who preceded me into this body by several years, is a great Republican as is attested to by his chairmanship of the Senate Republican Conference. Even more, Senator SALTONSTALL is a fine American of great dedication to his State and Nation. He is, in every sense, one of the balance wheels of the Senate. He has blended a profound knowledge of national defense with a deep interest in international relations, and out of the combination has contributed greatly to a structure of legislation which safeguards the Nation and its position in the world. Senator SALTONSTALL, moreover, has made this contribution in the highest traditions of patriotism under Presidents of both parties.

It is not surprising that the people of Massachusetts have insisted that Senator SALTONSTALL stay in the Senate for two decades. And I know that they will also understand his insistence that he now be relieved of the burdens of his office. We who are his colleagues understand it, even though the reality of his retirement is accepted with great reluctance.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] will have served two terms when he leaves the Senate. In recent years, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, Senator McNAMARA has been an integral part of the leadership of the Senate and the Nation.

He would be the last to claim credit for it, but he is, in fact, heavily responsible for much of the social legislation of the last three Congresses. In truth, there is not a single piece of such legislation in these Congresses of great social legislation which does not carry the imprint of his support. And, more often than not, these laws also bear the influence of his leadership which is born out of a deep dedication to human decency and dignity.

PAT McNAMARA is a man of immense heart and a burning sense of justice. He is, in my judgment, one of the great humanists of Senate history. He has never failed the people of the United States. He has stood for, by, and with the most humble of Americans. His absence from subsequent Congresses will be a heavy loss to them, to the Senate, and to the Nation.

It is a common and warranted practice not to refer to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] without making reference to her grace and charm as a woman. Mrs. NEUBERGER obviously lends these elevating characteristics to what would otherwise be the drab side of the Senate. We shall miss them sorely when she leaves.

Yet, in calling attention to Mrs. NEUBERGER's retirement at this time, I want to say that we shall miss her even more for other reasons, if that is possible. We shall miss her most as an able Senate colleague and a fine and decent human being. Senator NEUBERGER leaves a mark here not primarily because she is a woman, but primarily because of her dedicated labors on behalf of the people of her State and the Nation.

I think, particularly, of her persistent efforts in behalf of public health for the past half dozen years. I think of her work for the preservation of the beauty of the American landscape. These will remain as enduring contributions. They are the permanent gifts of service from a warm and sensitive woman and an able and conscientious Senator.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] has not been here a long time, as Senate service goes. Yet, in one term, in the short space of 6 years, he has gained the respect and affection of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I want to assure him that he has my personal respect and affection in full measure. I want him to know that his decency, his cooperativeness, and his conscientious work in the Senate will be missed immediately upon his departure and long remembered by all of us who remain.

I have been wanting to make these remarks, Mr. President, for some time. But it is not easy to accept the inevitability of changes of this kind. It is not easy to put into words one's feelings when confronted with individual retirements in a collective continuity. I do want to say to these four distinguished Members—to Senators SALTONSTALL, McNAMARA, NEUBERGER, and SIMPSON—that the Senate and the Nation owe you gratitude and respect for your work here. Speaking for myself and for all of your colleagues, I want you to know that you have, as Senators, added to the cumulative stature of the Senate by the quality and dedication of your service. We regret your impending departure even as we understand, sympathize, and acquiesce in your wishes. You will be missed as friends, as colleagues, and as distinguished Senators of the United States.

Mr. **SIMPSON**. Mr. President, I feel inadequate to respond to the generous words of the great American who is majority leader of the U.S. Senate. I certainly concur in the kudos delivered by my colleague from Montana on behalf of those Senators who, save me, have indicated that they will not seek reelection to the U.S. Senate. I would like to add just a brief thought to the Senator's comments on our colleague from Massachusetts.

When I was a young boy working on a ranch near Cody, a marvelous and inimitable set of circumstances gave me the opportunity in later years to attend that great eastern institution of learning, Harvard. Lev Saltonstall was some years ahead of me. He was senior to me at Harvard just as he is my senior in the Senate. However, I came to know him and his family while I lived in Cambridge, Mass.

To those who knew Lev Saltonstall, it was obvious that here was a man clothed in integrity but of a kind that was inside as well as outside. He had an indefatigable spirit when he captained the champion Harvard rowing team—a team which remained intact for half a century and returned to the Thames only 2 years ago to cleave the same waters in which it won the Henley regatta of 1914. He has the same indefatigable spirit today.

I recall also that the Saltonstall integrity sparkled when Lev was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1944, and I know he never regained the seniority that he lost in fulfilling the commitment he made to complete his last full term as Governor. Finishing his term caused him to reach the Senate a day late, which made him a junior to all those who had been sworn in the day before. But even at that, the Senator's honesty, integrity, erudition, and sagacity enabled him to reach a lofty pinnacle in Senate power and respect.

Lev Saltonstall and his lovely lady, Alice, have been a marvelous New England influence in the Nation's Capital, and their planned departure at the end of the year will leave a gap, not only in the ranks of Senate Republicans, but in the Nation's Capital.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Disposal of Certain Battery Grade Synthetic Manganese Dioxide From National Stockpile

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of battery grade synthetic manganese dioxide from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Secretary of Commerce

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Reports of Acting Comptroller General

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of audit of loan program financial statements for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964, Agency for International Development (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of possible savings in ocean transportation costs for surplus agricultural commodities donated under titles II and III, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Agency for International Development, Department of Agriculture, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for improvements in the management of moneys held in trust for Indians, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the relocation of railroad facilities, Walter F. George lock and dam, Fort Gaines, Ga., Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Settlement of Certain Claims by the Secretary of Commerce

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 Decennial Census (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Financial Statement of Boys' Clubs of America

A letter from the President, Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audited financial statement of that organization, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of the American Academy of Art and Letters

A letter from the assistant to the President, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that academy for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **PRESIDENT** pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"A joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to the full use of the natural resources in the national forests in the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas under the present rate of road construction, it will take 100 years to complete an adequate national forest conservation road transportation system: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact the necessary legislation to authorize the financing of primary National Forest Conservation roads from the general funds of the U.S. Treasury and to provide an appropriation commensurate with the urgency of the demonstrated need; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 507

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the U.S. Congress to discontinue further consideration of H.R. 11798

"Whereas the U.S. Congress is presently considering H.R. 11798; and

"Whereas although we recognize that as methods of business change to meet new situations our tax laws must keep pace with this progress, after serious deliberation we have reached a unanimous conclusion that H.R. 11798 will not materially aid in keeping pace with such progress but will constitute an unwarranted, unnecessary, and undesirable intrusion into the tax and fiscal jurisdiction of this State and our local governments and will be destructive of the principles of federalism enunciated by our Founding Fathers; and

"Whereas H.R. 11798 in its present form contains certain provisions which would result in different tax treatment of comparable business operations thereby creating inequities, and which would compound rather than resolve tax administrative problems, as well as provisions which are not sufficiently clear and certain as to their effect on business and governmental revenues and administration; and

"Whereas we believe that this State has voluntarily and in good faith achieved substantial progress in relieving the burden of taxpayers carrying on business in two or more States by:

"(*a*) Adopting the Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act recommended by the national conference of commissioners on uniform State laws;

"(*b*) Adopting provisions whereby credit is given against the State's use tax for sales or use taxes paid in another jurisdiction on transactions by which the property involved was acquired; and

"Whereas the legislature of this State is, based upon a formal study, presently considering an amendment to the State constitution which would permit the adoption of the U.S. income tax base as the State tax base on a current and prospective basis subject to the necessary adjustments thereto; and

"Whereas although progress has been made, we recognize that there are further areas in which tax compliance problems may be simplified by the adoption by the States of uniform statutory provisions and regulations: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas* (*the Senate concurring therein*), That the Kansas Legislature respectfully urges the U.S. Congress to discontinue further consideration of H.R. 11798 and give the State sufficient time in which to accomplish a resolution of problems in the area of State and local taxation of interstate business by which simplification, clarification, and uniformity could be achieved thereby assuring that such actions would be taken in an effective manner and with due consideration of practical administrative procedures and the economic impact upon the States and their political subdivisions; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state is directed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each of the members of the Kansas congressional delegation.

"I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body January 31, 1966.

"Clyde Hill,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"L. D. Hazen,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Adopted by the senate February 8, 1966.

"John Crutcher,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Ralph E. Zarker,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 3

"A memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation receding to the State of Colorado, jurisdiction over Fort Lyon, Colo.

"Whereas under the constitution and laws of the State of Colorado, employees of the Federal Government residing on the Federal reservation known as Fort Lyon, Colo., are not deemed to be 'residents' of the State of Colorado for the purposes of elections in this State; and

"Whereas the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation has recommended that citizens residing on Federal reservations be permitted to vote in State elections; and

"Whereas under the terms of the 1885 Act of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, presently appearing as section 143-1-19, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, which act ceded exclusive jurisdiction over the said Fort Lyon to the United States, the State of Colorado reserved jurisdiction only for the service of civil and criminal process in certain cases; and

"Whereas because of said exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, the residents of Fort Lyon, Colo., do not meet the residency requirements of the State of Colorado to vote in elections in this State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado* (*the house of representatives concurring herein*), That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact legislation receding to the State of Colorado, jurisdiction over the said Fort Lyon, Colo., for the purposes only of establishing residence of those persons living at Fort Lyon, Colo.; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and each Member of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"Robert L. Knous,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Mildred H. Cresswell,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Allen Dines,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
Evelyn T. Davidson,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 36

"House resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to legalize as the national anthem the words and music of 'The Star-Spangled Banner' as composed by Francis Scott Key and arranged by Thomas Carr.

"Whereas in the name of patriotism, and with traditional regard for honoring and protecting the historical customs and heritage of this country, we hereby propose that 'The Star-Spangled Banner' be legalized as the national anthem in the form in which the poem was written by Francis Scott Key and the music was adapted by Thomas Carr. The United States is about to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the writing and publication of our national anthem, and it would be eminently fitting and timely to have this great song legalized as the national anthem in the form in which it first was written and arranged; and

"Whereas following the writing of the poem which we now know as the national anthem, Francis Scott Key took his verses to Mr. Thomas Carr and requested Mr. Carr to set them to music. It is recorded that several arrangements were tried before concluding that the one we know of today was the best possibility; and

"Whereas at that time, Thomas Carr and his father, Joseph Carr, were in the music publishing business. Their work consisted of teaching music, composing music, adapting and arranging it and also the directing of choral music. Their place of business in 1814 was at 36 Baltimore Street in the city of Baltimore. When Francis Scott Key took his verses to Mr. Thomas Carr, the verses had no title and, of course, no musical arrangement. It was Mr. Carr who gave a title to these verses, arranged the music, and then published the new song. When it was first published, the sheet music from it carried the notation: 'Adapt. & Arrd. by T. C.'

"Whereas the verses of Francis Scott Key did not become a patriotic song or an anthem until they were set to music. The honor for the musical arrangement as well as the occasion for writing the verses belongs to the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland, as well as to the families of Mr. Key and Mr. Carr; and

"Whereas it is said that there now are several hundred arrangements and versions of the words and music of 'The Star-Spangled Banner.' Clearly, as the national anthem, Congress should specify the words as composed by Francis Scott Key and the music as adapted and arranged by Thomas Carr; and

"Whereas these words and music now are wedded in the bond of time. In respect to the great history and traditions of the United States, it is eminently fitting and proper that as our national anthem we should legally adopt the words and music of 'The Star-Spangled Banner' as originally composed by Francis Scott Key and as arranged and adapted by Thomas Carr: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland,* That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to legalize and adopt as the national anthem the words as first composed by Francis Scott Key and the music as first arranged by Thomas Carr; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution are sent to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and also to Senators Brewster and Tydings, and Representatives Fallon, Friedel, Garmatz, Long, Machen, Mathias, Morton and Sickles.

"By the house of delegates, February 17, 1966.

"Read and adopted March 16, 1966.

"Marvin Mandel,
"*Speaker of the house of delegates.*

"By order, James P. Mause, Chief Clerk,

"James P. Mause,
"*Chief Clerk of the house of delegates.*"

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"A Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

"A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the establishment of a national cemetery in central Massachusetts

"*Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary for the establishment of a national cemetery in central Massachusetts; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 9, 1966.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk.*

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 14, 1966.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"A Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

"A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation presenting to the States a proposed constitutional amendment permitting the recital of a nonsectarian prayer in the public schools

"Whereas in the recent case of Engel against Vitale, the Supreme Court of the United States declared the use of a voluntary prayer as prepared by the Board of Regents of the State of New York to be unconstitutional; and

"Whereas it is the will and desire of the majority of our citizens to recognize the existence of God and our dependence on Him; and

"Whereas it is their belief that there is a great need to instill in the hearts and minds of our youth proper respect and reverence to a Supreme Being; and

"Whereas the recital of voluntary prayers in our public schools will accomplish that purpose and will help maintain traditions cherished by so many of our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation presenting to the States a proposed consitutional amendment permitting the recital of a nonsectarian prayer in our public schools; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 17, 1966.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 21, 1966.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"A Resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

"A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that cancellation stamps on all mail contain the words 'for God and county'

"Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts enacted chapter 502 of the acts of 1965, legislation which provides that on every public school building within the Commonwealth there may be placed in a conspicuous location a suitable plaque which shall contain the words 'for God and country'; and

"Whereas veteran and patriotic groups and individuals are donating these plaques to schools and some of these groups are stamping their mail to members with the words 'for God and country'; and

"Whereas these words appearing on all U.S. mail would be an answer to atheistic communism and to the anti-Vietnam agitators and would serve as an inspiration to all American adults and schoolchildren: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that cancellation stamps on all mail contain the words 'for God and country'; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 18, 1966.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"A resolution relating to the proposed cutback of Federal funds for education in Federal impact areas

"Whereas the Federal Government currently provides funds to areas designed as Federal impact areas to assist States which have a heavy financial burden of educating children of military and civil service workers residing on or employed on Federal property; and

"Whereas approximately 31 percent of the schoolchildren in Hawaii from grades kindergarten through 12 are classified as students in Federal impact areas; and

"Whereas President Johnson's proposal to cut back funds in Federal impact areas would have a severe and damaging effect on the educational programs of this State; and

"Whereas Public Law 874 provides Federal funds to the department of education which are used to supplement State funds for operating budget expenditures; and

"Whereas these funds were earmarked to help pay the salaries of teachers and administrative personnel required to meet the heavy student enrollment anticipated for the school year beginning in September 1966; and

"Whereas the proposed cutback of Federal funds under Public Law 874 will result in an estimated loss of \$3½ million to Hawaii for the fiscal year 1966–67; and

"Whereas President Johnson in his state of the Union message delivered January 12, 1966, reaffirmed the Nation's commitment to Vietnam while recommending that the programs of the Great Society be continued and that Congress provide the resources to carry forward, with full vigor, the great health and education programs that were enacted into law last year; and

"Whereas President Johnson's proposal to cut back funds to States with designated Federal impact areas, reduces the effectiveness of his state of the Union promise to build a Great Society at home; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1966 (the Senate concurring), That President Johnson be and is hereby requested to withdraw his proposal to cut back Federal funds for education in Federal impact areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That Hawaii's delegations to Congress be and they are hereby requested to make all possible attempts to persuade the President not to cut back Federal funds to States with Federal impact areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson; the President of the Senate, Hubert H. Humphrey; the Speaker of the House, John W. McCormack; Senators Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye; Representatives Patsy T. Mink and Spark M. Matsunaga; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner; and the Honorable John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent Resolution 2

"A concurrent resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to continuity in the office of the President

"Whereas article II, section 1, of the U.S. Constitution, which deals generally with presidential inability and succession, but overlooks problems posed by a vacancy in the office of Vice President, has been a matter of uncertainty as to interpretation and application for more than 175 years; and

"Whereas the lack of clear provisions in the U.S. Constitution, as to who shall determine presidential inability and how a disabled President should resume his duties after his recovery, has deterred the effective assumption of presidential duties by Vice Presidents; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee continuity within the executive branch of Government, to provide that the United States shall always have a President or Acting President who is physically and mentally alert, and to assure that whoever the President or Acting President may be, there will be no question as to the legality of his authority to carry out the powers and duties of the office; and

"Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 1, approved by the 89th Congress, 1st session, reads as follows:

"'PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AND INABILITY, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"ARTICLE—

"'"Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"'"Sec. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"'"Sec. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"'"SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office of Acting President.

"'"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within 4 days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Budget Session of 1966 (the Senate concurring)*, That the article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as set forth in U.S. Senate Joint Resolution 1, dated July 6, 1965, be and it is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Administrator, U.S. General Services Administration, and that copies of this concurrent resolution also be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State or Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 3

"A memorial urging the Congress of the United States to oppose the Dodd bill or any other Federal legislation relating to regulation and registration of mail-order firearms sales

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas since the unfortunate and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy, considerable impetus has occurred for the passage of the Dodd bill relating to regulation and registration of mail-order firearm sales; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill (S. 1592), if enacted, will prohibit citizens from purchasing a firearm by mail, and give the U.S. Treasury Department such broad regulatory powers it could subject such citizens to police investigation and harassment and lead to registration of said firearms; and

"Whereas such requirements will cause an inconvenience, and an undue burden on, law-abiding people of this country, particularly in rural areas, and such legislation will open the door for the Treasury Department to regulate who may buy firearms; and

"Whereas the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States and article 2, section 26 of the constitution of the State of Arizona guarantee to its citizens the right to keep and bear arms, and the Dodd bill, if enacted, will be in direct violation of such guaranteed rights; and

"Whereas responsible organizations such as the National Rifle Association, National Wildlife Federation, and others have no objection to workable laws that will prevent the misuse of firearms by increasing penalties for crimes committed with firearms; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill, if enacted, will seriously hamper small industries that build fine custom rifles for mail-order trade throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas any restrictive legislation should be directed to merely requiring that shipments of firearms in interstate commerce be made in compliance with the laws of the State of destination; and

"Whereas since practically all States have laws regulating sale of firearms to juveniles, convicted felons, and incompetents and against carrying concealed weapons, and since there are already Federal laws which make it a crime for a convicted felon to transport firearms across State lines, no Federal law for regulation and registration of mail-order sales of firearms is necessary.

"Wherefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States take positive action leading to the defeat of the Dodd bill (S. 1592).

"2. That the Congress of the United States carefully examine and oppose any other Federal legislation relating to registration and regulation of firearms which restricts the rights of law-abiding citizens and usurps the police power of the States to control firearms, and that it urge the State Department to exercise more control under the Munitions Control Act of imports of cheap foreign pistols and military surplus.

"3. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 4

"A memorial requesting the United States to provide for the altering of Whitlow Dam to impound water for recreational purposes

"*To the Congress and Secretary of Interior of the United States of America:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas there is an urgent need for more recreational facilities within the State of Arizona brought about by the great influx of people in recent years into this State; and

"Whereas the Whitlow Dam was constructed for flood control purposes only under the supervision of the United States Army Corps of Engineers on Queen Creek, in Pinal County, Ariz., and is under the supervision of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the Whitlow Dam, if properly altered and provided with gates and a control tower, together with the filling of several sink holes with rock and concrete, could be made to impound water and the area could be converted to recreational use for very little cost.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress and the Secretary of Interior of the United States fully examine the urgent need for more recreational facilities within the State of Arizona and provide for the altering of the Whitlow Dam and reservoir area situated on Queen Creek in Pinal County, Ariz., so that water may be impounded and the area used for recreational purposes.

"2. The Secretary of State of Arizona is directed to transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation, to the Secretary of Interior of the United States, and to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers."

A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"STATE OF RHODE ISLAND RESOLUTION

"A resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States and the U.S. Senate, by the constitutional vote of two-thirds of each House concurring therein, did enact at the 1st session of the 89th Congress of the United States of America in 1965, a proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas said proposed amendment was submitted to the States for ratification and said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America is in the following words, to wit:

"'ARTICLE

"'SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"'SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"'SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"'SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice

President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within 4 days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.'

"Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations does hereby ratify the above proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and the Administrator of General Services of the United States."

A resolution of the Eighth Guam Legislature, relating to the creation of the Organic Act of Guam Revision Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Report of the Organic Act of Guam Revision Commission on the Bill To Establish the Guam Elected Governor Act

"Public Law 8–78, Eighth Guam Legislature, approved August 21, 1965, created the Organic Act of Guam Revision Commission for the purpose of examining the Organic Act to discover any defects and anachronisms therein and to recommend needed reforms. The commission consists of three members appointed by the committee on rules of the Guam Legislature and seven additional members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the legislature.

"The commission upon organization determined that it would be wise to confine initial studies to those changes proposed in the organic act by the elective Governor bill (H.R. 117765) pending before the Congress of the United States. The commission met a number of times in executive session to consider the bill and on January 21, 1966, held a public hearing thereon. The commission, taking into account the testimony offered by members of the public and its own studies, generally recommends passage of the bill but offers particularly the following recommendations:

"I. Under section 1 of the bill the term of office of the Governor would be 4 years, except that the initial term be for 2 years.

"Recommendation: (a) The commission recommends limiting the possible terms of office to two consecutive full terms. This, of course, would be in general conformity with the Constitution of the United States as it applies to the President.

"II. Section 2 of the bill provides that any Governor or Acting Governor might be removed by the President for cause or through a recall procedure.

"Recommendation: (a) The commission recommends deletion of the power of removal by the President. It was felt that this authorization is too similar to the present appointed Governor situation and that the recall provision alone should be sufficient protection.

"III. Section 4 of the bill which refers to a deletion of the first three sentences of paragraph (b) of section 9 of the Organic Act of Guam apparently is a typographical error and the correct reference is to paragraph (a) of section 9.

"IV. Section 5 of the bill would amend section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam so as to entirely delete subsection 26(c) which deals with the furnishing by the United States of transportation and housing for government of Guam employees whose homes are outside Guam.

"Recommendation: (a) The commission recommends that subsection 26(c) be retained in its present form. It was felt that in view of the tight financial position of the local government and the great expense involved in transporting and housing off-island hired employees, Federal assistance is necessary. To eliminate any objection on the grounds that this would enable the government of Guam to obligate the Federal Government without control it is recommended that hiring of eligible employees be subject to regulations of the Department of Interior or such other agency that the President might direct.

"The above report is respectfully submitted.

"Dated this 23d day of February 1966.

"Hon. Alberto T. Lamorena, Chairman, Member, Eighth Guam Legislature; Hon. F. G. Lujan, Member, Eighth Guam Legislature; Mrs. Margaret Karlins, Member, Businesswoman; Charles D. Anderson, Member, President, Guam Chamber of Commerce; Edward S. Terlaje, Member, Attorney-at-law; Hon. Frank D. Perez, Vice Chairman, Member, Eighth Guam Legislature; Judge Joaquin C. Perez, Member, Chief Judge, Island Court; Manuel L. Jose, Member, Publisher-Editor, Guam Times Weekly; Edward G. Camacho, Member, Manager, Calvo's Insurance Agency; and Richard D. Magee, Deputy Attorney General, Member."

A resolution adopted by the Democratic Party of Grant County, Wis., relating to a reduction in funds for the University of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts at New Orleans, La., favoring additional appropriations for the North Central Soil Conservation Research Center at Morris, Minn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., relating to the appropriation for the school lunch program and the special milk program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the city commission of the city of Melbourne, Fla., protesting against the removal of the manned orbiting laboratory program to the Vandenberg Air Force Bases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Hammers Corp. of Aberdeen, S. Dak., signed by J. E. Hammers, president, relating to the exemption of bank-operated investment funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of Discover America, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the activities of the President's Task Force on Travel; to the Committee on Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by the executive council of the AFL–CIO, relating to portions of the President's foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Second Special Inter-American Conference, at Rio de Janeiro, relating to parliamentary cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Rochester (N.Y.) chapter of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., relating to the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Democratic Party of Guam, favoring a popular election for the Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Linus Pauling, of Santa Barbara, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the mayor and aldermen of the city of Savannah, Ga., favoring the extension of the closing date of the Public Health Hospital at Savannah; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation permitting certain persons under the age of 65 to participate in the Federal medicare program. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of Rhode Island Resolution

A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation permitting certain persons under the age of 65 to participate in the Federal medicare program

Whereas on July 1, 1966, social security will start paying hospital bills and help defray other medical expenses for persons past 65; and

Whereas there are persons receiving social security because of permanent and total disability, under the age of 65; and

Whereas hospital bills and other medical expenses are difficult to meet by persons in this category: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island earnestly urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation permitting persons receiving social security because of permanent and total disability, and are under the age of 65, to participate in the Federal medicare program; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of State be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island, in the Congress of the United States requesting that each use every endeavor to carry out the purpose of this resolution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1074).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 2642. A bill to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1076).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 1488. A bill to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 50,000 tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 1075).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 12762. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 1077).

INCREASING THE LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 235); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to spend from the contingent funds of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

REPORTS ON EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Agricultural and Forestry, Appropriations, and Armed Services concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees in 1965 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator George McGovern:											
United Kingdom	Pound	44-7-5	124.24	40-8-4	112.64	17-17-3	49.91	4-10-1	12.60	107-2-13	299.39
France	Franc	441	90.00	265	54.00			29	6.00	735	150.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					8,386.40	2,096.60			8,386.40	2,096.60
Italy	Lira	77,500	124.00	74,000	118.40	210,614	336.98	4,750	7.60	366,864	586.98
Vietnam	Piaster	8,733	119.99	5,822	80.01	2,091	28.75	1,546	21.25	18,192	250.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	278.03	48.50	258.50	45.10	25	4.34	36.72	6.40	598.25	104.34
Japan	Yen					16,800	46.67			16,800	46.67
Total			506.73		410.15		2,563.25		53.85		3,533.98

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	3,533.98

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MARCH 16, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Norris Cotton:											
England	Pound	9-5-0	25.95	5-8-6	15.35	3-0-0	8.46			17-13-6	49.76
Germany	Mark	60	15.00	49	12.25	70	5.00	21	5.24	150	37.49
France	Franc	276	56.36	200	40.80	74	15.09	70	14.28	620	126.53
Transportation, round trip:											
Air	German mark					2,099.20	524.67			2,099.20	524.67
Ship	do					1,724.12	430.92			1,724.12	430.92
Do	Dollar						116.00				116.00
Senator Carl Hayden:											
Mexico	Peso	391,66	31.34	268.80	21.52	50.00	4.00	33.34	2.68	743.80	59.52
Panama			60.00		27.15		3.34		10.63		101.10
El Salvador	Colón	29.17	11.67	41.66	16.67			31.17	12.47	102.00	40.81
Costa Rica	do	154.74	23.45	165.00	25.00			39.60	6.00	359.34	54.45
Joseph L. Borda:											
England	Pound			4.10	12.55			3-6-9	9.54	7-6-9	22.09
	U.S. dollar		2.00		2.80						4.80
France	Franc	357.70	73.00	463.05	94.50	126.67	25.85	277.58	56.65	1,225	250.00
	U.S. dollar		4.00		54.09				4.00		62.09
Germany	Deutsche mark			87.00	21.75	21.00	5.25	52	13.00	160	40.00
	U.S. dollar		3.00		41.77				2.68		47.45
Transportation	Guilder					998.50	284.50			998.50	284.50
Return trip (air)	U.S. dollar						437.10				437.10
Robert B. Clark:											
Peru	Sol	1,340	50.00	804	30.00			886	33.06	3,030	113.06
Chile	Escudo	269	60.00	135	30.00			15	3.78	419	93.79
Argentina	U.S. dollar		64.40		37.00		14.50		48.00		163.90
Uruguay	Peso	1,134	18.00	566	8.99					1,700	26.90
Brazil	Cruzeiro	180,800	80.00	117,700	51.92	471,000	258.08			769,000	390.00
United States	U.S. dollar				3.00		2.50		3.00		8.50
Do	do						2.50		1.00		3.58
U.S. airline tickets	Dutch guilder					3,023.16	840.00			3,023.16	840.00

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Paul J. Cotter:											
Japan	Yen	4,384	12.18	3,230	9.00	432	1.20	1,843	5.12	9,900	27.50
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	275.90	48.00	174.35	30.40	55.63	9.70	82.76	14.43	588.64	102.64
India	Rupee	654.91	137.53	149.62	31.50	59.47	12.50	74.38	15.66	938.65	197.19
Pakistan	do	280.00	58.33	133.60	27.83	21.64	4.50	26.88	5.60	462.50	96.26
Lebanon	Lebanese pound	107.93	35.04	97.02	31.50	20.02	6.50	25.78	8.37	249.75	81.41
United Arab Republic	Egyptian pound	38.46	88.47	17.19	39.54	3.70	8.50	5.78	13.30	65.00	149.81
Italy	Lira	22,125	35.40	21,500	34.40	5,938	9.50	6,687	10.70	56,250	90.00
India (international airline transportation).	Rupee					90,265	2,023.90			90,265	2,023.90
England	Pound	31-8-3	88.00	24-6-0	68.06	4-6-0	12.00	7-0-3	19.94	67-0-6	188.00
Poland	Zloty	774	11.91	1,105	17.00			321	4.94	2,200	33.85
Germany	Deutsche mark	703.63	175.91	629.60	157.40	143.50	35.88	106.76	26.69	1,583.50	395.88
Austria	Schilling	415.50	16.14	181.21	7.04	32.80	1.28	77.22	3.00	706.80	27.46
Yugoslavia	Dinar	11,450	9.16	9,550	7.64			2,500	2.00	23,500	18.80
Greece	Drachma	2,874	95.81	1,998	66.62	1,376	45.83	228	7.60	6,476	215.86
Italy	Lira	46,055	73.69	54,695	87.51	7,731	12.37	10,314	16.50	118,795	190.07
Switzerland	Swiss franc	193.95	45.00	151.20	35.00	28.08	6.50	23.76	5.50	397.55	92.00
Spain	Peseta	2,950	49.16	1,350	22.50	150	2.50	435	7.25	4,885	81.41
France	Franc	687.92	140.39	375.85	76.50	44.10	9.00	81.13	16.56	1,188.0	242.45
International air travel	Polish zloty					36,363.60	1,515.15			36,363.60	1,515.15
Edward E. Davis:											
Mexico	Peso	116.67	9.33	237.70	19.01	50.00	4.00	33.33	2.66	437.70	35.01
Panama			30.00		16.00		3.33		14.51		63.85
El Salvador	Colón	29.17	11.67	41.66	16.67			31.17	12.47	102.00	40.81
Costa Rica	do	154.73	23.44	165.00	25.00			39.60	6.00	359.33	54.44
Roy L. Elson:											
Mexico	Peso	116.67	9.33	276.25	22.09	50.00	4.00	33.33	2.66	476.25	38.09
Panama			30.00		30.50		3.33		2.66		66.50
El Salvador	Colón	29.17	11.67	41.66	16.67			31.17	12.47	102.00	40.81
Costa Rica	do	154.73	23.44	165.00	25.00			39.60	6.00	359.33	54.44
Joe E. Gonzales:											
Mexico	Peso	934.85	74.75	426.75	34.14	100	8.20			1,461.60	117.09
	German mark					968	243.52			968.00	243.52
	Dollar				25.00		59.75		5.00		89.75
Spain	Peseta	2,995.50	50.00	898.65	15.00	8,184.30	136.61	298.85	4.98	12,377.30	206.59
	German mark					551.80	138.78				138.78
Gordon F. Harrison:											
Japan	Yen	61,200	169.98	59,400	165.00	23,400	65.00	21,680	60.30	165,680	460.28
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	762.09	133.00	641.76	112.00	328.65	57.10	382.50	66.64	2,115.00	368.74
Philippines	Peso	265.13	68.00	249.54	64.00	187.15	48.00	180.93	46.40	882.75	226.40
Round trip (air) transportation from Washington, D.C.	German mark					4,480	1,120.00			4,480.00	1,120.00
William J. Kennedy:											
Rio de Janeiro (Brazil)	Cruzeiro	44,100	20.00	33,075	15.00	13,230	6.00	19,845	9.00	110,250	50.00
Transportation from District of Columbia to Buenos Aires and return.	do					2,651,000	1,207.00			2,651,000	1,207.00
James Minotto:											
Argentina	Peso	47,231	276.92	67,903	397.12	25,138	147.00	11,657	68.08	151,929	889.12
Brazil	Cruzeiro	2,293,762	1,236.83	1,968,420	1,061.20	411,457	221.81	324,351	174.80	4,998,000	2,694.64
Chile	Peso	1,385.10	390.21	1,426.30	401.69	400.39	112.76	192.70	54.28	3,404.49	958.94
Costa Rica	Colón	346.50	52.50	320.10	48.50	56.10	8.50	79.20	12.00	801.90	121.50
El Salvador	do	100.00	40.00	120.00	48.00	20.00	8.00	25.00	10.00	265.00	106.00
Guatemala	Quetzal	294.20	294.20	292.95	292.95	26.50	26.50	65.36	65.36	679.01	679.01
British Honduras	do			8.00	8.00	60.00	60.00	7.00	7.00	75.00	75.00
Honduras	Lempira			35.00	17.50	10.00	5.00	30.00	15.00	75.00	37.50
Mexico	Peso	450.00	36.00	973.75	77.90	148.75	11.90	281.95	22.56	1,854.45	148.36
Nicaragua	Cordoba			84.00	12.00	49.00	7.00	133.00	19.00	266.00	38.00
Panama	Balboa	187.85	187.85	186.50	186.50	21.75	21.75	39.95	39.95	436.05	436.05
Paraguay	Guarani	2,920.00	23.18	3,945.00	31.31			1,045.00	8.29	7,910.00	62.78
Peru	Sol	6,781.47	252.60	6,633.40	248.41	3,093.07	114.70	1,845.00	69.10	18,353.00	684.81
Uruguay	Peso			950.00	15.90	6,825.55	117.18	2,425.00	41.29	10,200.55	174.37
Venezuela	Bolivar	745.00	170.00	638.50	145.00	102.00	23.18	198.00	45.00	1,683.50	383.18
Trinidad	British West Indies dollar.	58.00	34.11	40.83	23.75	8.50	5.00	5.95	3.50	112.83	66.36
Barbados	do	101.00	63.00	68.85	40.50	11.90	7.00	10.00	5.95	197.85	116.45
Transportation	German mark						4,784.06				4,784.06
J. Mark Trice:											
Germany (air)	Mark	69	17.25	66	16.50	2,099.20	524.67			2,234.20	558.42
Germany (ship)	do					1,724.12	430.92			1,724.12	430.92
United States	Dollar						122.00				122.00
Great Britain	Pound	6-15-0	18.90	5-0-0	14.00			2-18-6	8.54	14-13-6	41.44
France	Franc	200	40.82	265	54.08	125	25.51	30.0	6.12	620.0	126.53
Mary L. Vaughan:											
Japan	Yen	4,384	12.18	3,230	9.00	432	1.20	1,843	5.12	9,900	27.50
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	275.90	48.00	174.35	30.40	55.63	9.70	82.76	14.43	588.64	102.64
India	Rupee	654.91	137.53	149.62	31.50	59.47	12.50	74.38	15.66	938.65	197.19
Pakistan	do	280.00	58.33	133.60	27.83	21.64	4.50	26.88	5.60	462.50	96.26
Lebanon	Lebanese pound.	107.93	35.04	97.02	31.50	20.02	6.50	25.78	8.37	249.75	81.41
United Arab Republic	Egyptian pound.	38.46	88.47	17.19	39.54	3.70	8.50	5.78	13.30	65.00	149.81
Italy	Lira	22,125	35.40	21,500	34.40	5,938	9.50	6,687	10.70	56,250	90.00
India (international airline transportation).	Rupee					90,265	2,023.90			90,265	2,023.90
England	Pound	31-8-3	88.00	24-6-0	68.06	4-6-0	12.00	7-0-3	19.94	67-0-6	188.00
Poland	Zloty	774	11.91	1,105	17.00			321	4.94	2,200	33.85
Germany	Deutsche mark	703.63	175.91	629,60	157.40	143.50	35.88	106.76	26.60	1,583.50	395.88
Austria	Schilling	415.50	16.14	181.21	7.04	32.80	1.28	77.22	3.00	706.80	27.46
Yugoslavia	Dinar	11.450	9.16	9,550	7.54			2,500	2.00	23.500	18.80
Greece	Drachma	2,874	95.81	1,998	66.62	1,376	45.83	228	7.60	6,476	215.86
Italy	Lira	46,055	73.69	54,695	87.51	7,731	12.37	10,314	16.50	118,795	190.07
Switzerland	Swiss franc	193.95	45.00	151.20	35.00	28.08	6.50	23.76	5.50	39.755	92.00
Spain	Peseta	2,950	49.16	1,350	22.50	150	2.50	435	7.25	4,885	81.41
France	Franc	687.92	140.39	385.85	76.50	44.10	9.00	81.13	16.56	1,188.0	242.45
International air travel	Polish zloty					36,363.60	1,515.15			36,363.60	1,515.15

***Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965*—Continued**

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
William W. Woodruff:											
France	Dollar				62.25				23.90		86.15
Do	Franc	563	115.00			62	12.55			625	127.55
Germany	Dollar		10.00		60.98				32.80		103.80
Do	Mark	180	45.00	72	18.00	48	12.00			300	75.00
Transportation	Dollar						417.63				417.63

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	29,877.33
Appropriated funds:	
Government Department:	
State	3,635.54
Air Force	364.07
Army	1,169.02
Total	35,035.96

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard B. Russell:											
Antigua, British West Indies	Dollar		45.00		14.41						59.41
Santo Domingo	do				10.00						10.00
Senator Stuart Symington:											
Japan	Yen			35,000	97.22					35,000	97.22
Korea	Dollar		2.75								2.75
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.			656	113.43			142.75	24.91	798.10	138.34
Vietnam	Piaster			14,176	208.50					14,176	208.50
Thailand	Baht	1,100	53.27	965	46.73					2,065	100.00
Egypt	Pound			35	80.50					35	80.50
Senator Henry M. Jackson:											
Hong Kong	Dollar		46.20		18.15		1,242.00		12.35		1,318.70
Vietnam	do		36.35		45.20		25.30		27.15		134.00
Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr.:											
Great Britain	Pound	46-5-11	130.00	31-15-0	89.00	5-2-6	14.00	10-7-0	30.73	93-10-5	263.73
Denmark	Krone	345	50.00	212.73	31.40	63.23	9.00	9.10	1.16	630.06	91.56
West Germany	Mark	356.25	90.00	300.58	78.00	144	34.50	19.02	4.53	819.85	207.03
France	Franc	454.63	94.00	82.83	17.00	0		34.75	6.44	572.21	118.44
Italy	Lira	56,863	92.51	32,037.5	53.00	31,879	51.00	4,220.50	5.75	125,000	202.26
Spain	Peseta	2,553	43.00	1,358	24.43	600	10.20	375.50	5.80	4,986.5	83.53
Portugal	Escudo	810	28.40	477.08	16.63	260	9.10	90	3.15	1,637.08	57.28
Do	Dollar						1,207.55				1,207.55
William H. Darden:											
Antigua, British West Indies	do		45.00		14.41						59.41
Santo Domingo	do				10.00						10.00
Charles B. Kirbow:											
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	633	110.00	399.50	69.00	150	26.00	115	20.00	1,297.50	225.00
Vietnam	Piaster	2,720	23.00	10,600	90.00			1,234	10.85	14,554	123.85
Malaysia	Malayan dollar	123	40.00	138	46.00	30.50	10.00	12.10	4.00	303.60	100.00
Thailand	Baht	1,341.50	65.00	1,447	70.00	103	5.00	206	10.00	3,097.50	150.00
Spain	Peseta	2,700	45.00	2,391	40.00	599	10.00	300	5.00	5,990	100.00
England	Pound	39	110.50	40	112.00	7	20.00	8	22.50	94	265.00
Netherlands	Guilder					5,781.78	1,607.00			5,781.78	1,607.00
Hawaii	Dollar		34.00		20.00		4.00		6.00		64.00
Philippines	do		15.00		14.94				3.00		32.94
James T. Kendall:											
Manila	do		7.80		5.94				4.05		17.79
Vietnam	do		35.93		127.09				127.75		290.77
Hong Kong	do		31.48		29.98				4.64		66.10
Taiwan	do		17.25		20.23				26.94		64.42
Okinawa	do		2.67		4.14				1.70		8.51
Korea	do		12.55		30.61				5.40		48.56
Japan	do		28.42		93.62				49.84		171.88
United States	do						1,916.57				1,916.57
Samuel R. Shaw:											
Manila	do		10.30		5.95				29.23		45.48
Vietnam	do		30.05		96.19				101.84		228.08
Hong Kong	do		32.36		29.98				4.64		66.98
Taiwan	do		23.30		20.25				24.93		68.48
Okinawa	do		2.68		4.14				9.21		16.03
Korea	do		12.55		19.82				2.87		35.24
Japan	do		28.29		87.39				31.82		147.50
United States	do						1,916.57				1,916.57
Vietnam	do		74.00		74.00						148.00
Hong Kong	do		24.00		24.00						48.00
Taiwan	do		16.00		20.00						36.00
Japan	do		16.00		16.00						32.00
United States	do						2,152.55				2,152.55
Glenn A. Smith:											
Hong Kong	do		46.20		18.15		1,242.00		12.35		1,318.70
Vietnam	do		36.35		45.20		25.30		27.15		134.00
Switzerland	do		68.00		60.00				30.05		158.05
United States	do						382.20				382.20

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ben Gilleas:											
Germany	Dollar		290.47		242.18				181.20		713.85
United States	do						832.40				832.40
Manila	do		17.59		5.93				26.54		50.06
Vietnam	do		39.85		103.26				100.96		244.07
Hong Kong	do		50.94		28.81				4.64		84.39
Taiwan	do		17.83		20.23				24.94		63.00
Okinawa	do		2.68		4.14				5.01		11.83
Korea	do		12.55		14.18				2.86		29.59
Japan	do		23.72		95.71				45.55		164.98
United States	do						1,916.57				1,916.57
Stuart P. French:											
Germany	do		307.93		241.57				181.20		730.70
United States	do						832.40				832.40
Korea	Won			10,828	40.00			7,097	26.21	17,925	66.21
Do	Dollar				10.34						10.34
Japan	Yen	13,200	36.66	21,600	60.00			19,200	53.34	54,000	150.00
Do	Dollar						2.50		17.10		19.60
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	309.90	54.00	601	104.78			238.10	41.22	1,149	200.00
Do	Dollar						8.35		20.00		28.35
South Vietnam	Piaster	2,547	35.00	4,912	67.50			4,085	56.27	11,544	158.77
Do	Dollar						10.81		10.07		20.88
Thailand	Baht	929.25	45.00	619.50	30.00			516.25	25.00	2,065	100.00
Do	Dollar						12.50		5.00		17.50
Philippines	Peso	131.09	33.64	175.37	45.00			136.39	35.00	442.85	113.64
Do	Dollar						11.25		14.59		25.84
Hawaii	do		28.00		8.94		2.50		17.08		56.52
Gordon A. Nease:											
United Kingdom	Pound			4-0-0	11.20	1-19-0	3.10	2-15-0	7.80	7-16-0	22.10
Do	Dollar		2.30		4.80						7.10
France	Franc	199	40.70	259	52.90			37	7.50	495	101.10
Do	Dollar						3.00		4.00		7.00
Germany	Deutsche mark			230	57.50			90	22.50	320	80.00
Do	Dollar		20.35		14.50				3.00		37.85
Greece	Drachma	1,085	36.18	768	25.58			337	11.24	2,190	73.00
Turkey	Lira	386.50	42.95	342	38.00	9,039	1,004.30	31.50	3.50	760	1,088.75
Do	Dollar		2.00		11.50						13.50
Italy	Lira	12,031	19.25	14,688	23.50	51,250	82.00	9,281	14.85	86,625	139.60
Spain	Peseta	1,846	30.80	2,951	49.31	446	7.45	1,092	18.25	6,335	105.81
Do	Dollar				7.00		3.00		2.00		12.00
Senator Howard W. Cannon:											
Korea	Won			10,828	40.00			9,779	36.18	20,607	76.18
Do	Dollar				10.34						10.34
Japan	Yen	14,400	40.00	20,520	57.00			19,080	53.00	54,000	150.00
Do	Dollar						20.00		63.64		83.64
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	309.90	54.00	545.30	95.00			292.74	51.00	1,149	200.00
Do	Dollar						15.30		26.32		41.62
South Vietnam	Piaster	1,455	20.00	2,910	40.00			3,689	50.70	8,054	110.70
Do	Dollar				20.00		10.81		23.41		54.22
Thailand	Baht	1,032.50	50.00	619.50	30.00			413	20.00	2,065	100.00
Do	Dollar				15.00		15.00		27.85		57.85
Philippines	Peso	144.30	37.03	116.90	30.00			97.53	25.00	358.70	92.03
Do	Dollar				3.53		11.25		23.01		37.79
Hawaii	do		28.00		18.03		1.25		17.08		64.36
Senator Stephen M. Young:											
Korea	Won			10,828	40.00			9,779	36.18	20,607	76.18
Do	Dollar				10.34						10.34
Japan	Yen	14,400	40.00	20,600	57.00			19,000	53.00	54,000	150.00
Do	Dollar						20.00		29.88		49.88
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	309.90	54.00	546.60	95.00			292.50	51.00	1,149	200.00
Do	Dollar						15.30		26.31		41.61
South Vietnam	Piaster	1,454	20.00	2,900	40.00			3,800	51.00	8,154	112.07
Do	Dollar				20.00		10.81		23.41		54.22
Thailand	Baht	1,033	50.00	620	30.00			412	20.00	2,065	100.00
Do	Dollar						15.00		13.50		28.50
Philippines	Peso	144.30	37.03	200	51.32			240.25	61.65	584.55	150.00
Do	Dollar				3.53		11.25		20.92		35.70
Hawaii	do		28.00		14.86		1.25		17.08		61.19
Senator Daniel B. Brewster:											
Korea	Won							10,407	37.50	10,407	37.50
Japan	Yen	14,360	40.00	8,079	23.00			31,561	87.00	54,000	150.00
Taiwan	Dollar	432	11.00	640	16.00			928	23.00	2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	do	165	29.00	348	61.00			277.50	48.65	790.50	138.65
Vietnam	Piaster	7,250	99.50	2,800	39.00			4,504	61.50	14,554	200.00
Philippines	Peso	194.95	50.00	116.97	30.00			77.98	20.00	389.90	100.00
Germany	Mark					1,671.20	417.80			1,671.20	417.80
Hawaii	Dollar		51.00		38.00		6.00		7.00		102.00
Okinawa	do		4.00		10.00				1.50		15.50
United States (SAM)	do						78.00				78.00
Japan	do				20.00		5.73		3.00		28.73
Philippines	do		6.34		10.00		5.00		5.00		26.34
Senator John G. Tower:											
Netherlands	Guilder					5,781.78	1,607.00			5,781.78	1,607.00
Philippines	Dollar		5.10		2.35						7.45
South Vietnam	do				10.05				1.90		11.95
Thailand	do		27.90		27.39		1.00		3.70		59.99
Spain	do				8.05		1.20		2.10		11.35
United States/Guam	do		21.84		3.91		3.38		12.05		41.18
Hong Kong	do				24.80				11.40		36.20
Malaysia	do		29.15		5.10				4.85		39.10
England	do				6.55		3.55		7.90		18.00
Total			3,778.44		4,737.14		18,927.85		2,845.32		30,290.92

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	10,837.40
Appropriated funds:	
S. Res. 37	422.05
Government Department:	
U.S. Army	15,114.77
U.S. Navy	250.57
U.S. Air Force	3,666.13
Total	30,290.92

Richard B. Russell,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

March 11, 1966.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3090. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating Chautauqua; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pearson, and Mr. McCarthy):

S. 3091. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide additional authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to relieve the railroad boxcar shortage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of North Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Case, and Mr. Kuchel):

S. 3092. A bill to prohibit more effectively discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 3093. A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 19, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of North Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3094. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. Scott):

S. 3095. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Harris, and Mr. Dominick) (by request):

S. 3096. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts):

S. 3097. A bill to provide financial and other aid, under the Housing Act of 1949 and related Federal programs, to encourage and assist in the preservation and maintenance of historic structures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3098. A bill to promote and coordinate historic preservation activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, other public bodies, and private organizations and individuals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL:

S. 3099. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in an architecturally appropriate manner in the National Arboretum; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3100. A bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to supervisory educational agencies of State and local governments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Church, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 3101. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3102. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hill when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to designate the period beginning April 16, 1966, and ending April 23, 1966, as "National Coin Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

INCREASING THE LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 235) increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Russell of Georgia, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CHAUTAUQUA COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, a great country such as the United States, in its efforts for rapid progress in better government; better industries, economics, and standards of living sometimes is prone to forget former agencies and institutions which served a great purpose in the American way of life.

Mr. President, I speak specifically of a great Americana, the chautauqua.

Theodore Roosevelt was a great believer in chautauqua and said in words at least similar to these, "It is the most American thing in America." A former great judge stated that the American chautauqua could be listed as a fourth great character building agency.

Mr. President, I believe it is altogether fitting and proper to honor this great organization which was so close to the everyday life of the American citizen. I, therefore, am introducing a bill directing the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp in honor of chautauqua and request that the bill be appropriately referred.

I ask that a copy of the bill be printed in the Record following these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3090) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating Chautauqua, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3090

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp commemorating Chautauqua, a former American institution which in reality was a character building agency in the fields of education and the arts.

SEC. 2. Such postage stamp shall be issued in such denomination and design, and for such period as the Postmaster General may determine.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, in recent weeks and months knowledgeable agricultural authorities have spoken of the role our agricultural exports must play in meeting world food shortages. This important role is being made a keystone in planning the operations of our Federal farm programs and the food-for-freedom program which will be considered by Congress during the current session.

It appears now that it would serve little purpose to plan an expanded food export program until we have taken some positive steps to solve the chronic shortage of boxcars with which to move more grain and other farm commodities from our producing regions to the terminal elevators and ports. We have had an almost constant boxcar shortage for the past 25 years and the situation has continued to worsen year after year. At this time of the year, we normally expect no problem in having adequate railroad rolling stock to meet the demands of all shippers. For the week ending March 5, however, there was a shortage of over 12,600 grain cars per day. The greatest shortage in recent years occurred during October 1963 when we were short about 14,000 cars per day. That was during the peak of the movement of a record crop, however.

The present shortage of boxcars can be traced to a number of factors. We all realize that the expansion of the national economy is placing new demands on shipping capacity. Grain exports are at an alltime high as the United States is being called upon to provide more food aid to the hungry nations of the world. Dollar sales of export grain are also higher than ever before.

The war in Vietnam is taking more and more shipping capacity as the buildup of men and equipment there continues. These factors, plus the fact that boxcar construction simply has not kept pace with the need, all contribute to a dangerous situation.

At this time, Mr. President, I would like to point out that internal problems in the railroad industry have also been a contributing factor to the shortage of cars we now are experiencing in the grain-producing areas. The problem the western railroads face was stated very ably by Robert S. Macfarlane, president of the Northern Pacific Railway in a recent speech to the railway suppliers group in Chicago. He pointed out that many lines have not met their responsibilities in providing new cars and have depended upon other roads to provide the cars they need. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report of this speech carried in the March 11, 1966, issue of the Farmers Forum supplement to the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am today introducing a bill which will be a five-pronged attack on the shortage of boxcars. Briefly, this proposal contains the following provisions:

It directs the Interstate Commerce Commission to employ its emergency powers to provide immediate relief from the boxcar shortage in the grain-producing regions of the Nation.

As a part of the above section, the Commission would be permitted to set rental charges which must be paid on boxcars by nonowning lines at levels necessary to speed the return of these cars to the railroads that own them.

It provides for the doubling of penalties that the Interstate Commerce Commission can impose on railroads that fail to comply with car distribution orders issued by the Commission.

I recognize that this problem cannot be solved completely until additional boxcars are constructed. To encourage this, I am requesting in this proposal a doubling of the investment credit for money spent on the construction of grain and plain boxcars. Enactment of this legislation would speed a final solution to this problem by sharply increasing the number of cars built.

Finally, a provision is included requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate the issuance of loading orders for the movement of Commodity Credit Corporation grain stocks with the Interstate Commerce Commission. Unless this requirement were waived by the Commission, the Secretary would have to give it 30-day notice prior to issuing such orders. This would allow the Commission to keep abreast of the additional demands these orders create for boxcars and allow them to begin routing cars to the needed areas in advance of their need.

Mr. President, every possible avenue of relief has been explored. The Car Distribution Division of the Interstate Commerce Commission has worked long and hard to help meet the demands. We must act now to prevent a disastrous breakdown in our national transportation system. I feel the proposal I am offering will provide many answers to the problems we now face.

I want to take this opportunity to urge speedy action of this legislation. The present car shortage precludes any great expansion of our grain exports and could seriously hamper operations in many other areas of the economy. Strong action now can help ease the problem and eventually effectuate a solution. If allowed to continue, this shortage can and will have a devastating effect on the Nation's exports, the balance of payments, the war effort in Vietnam, and farm income.

Mr. President, I send this bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3091) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide additional authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to relieve the railroad boxcar shortage, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Farmers Forum, Mar. 11, 1966]

PRESIDENT OF NORTHERN PACIFIC CALLS ON OTHER LINES TO PROVIDE FAIR SHARE OF RAIL CARS

In calling for the railroad industry to acquire more freight cars, the president of the Northern Pacific Railway said "it is time we adopt drastic remedies at whatever cost and find a solution that will enable us to supply cars for loading for those who want to do business with us."

Robert S. Macfarlane, Northern Pacific president, spoke recently in Chicago to the railway suppliers group at the Union League Club. He pointed to the car shortage as a major railroad problem and called for a prompt solution.

"Northern Pacific is primarily a granger road serving a vast agricultural empire, and part of the greatest wheat-growing area in the country.

"The shortage of cars for the movement of grain during the harvest season works a major hardship on our railroad, even though the marketing pattern has changed over the years," Macfarlane said.

"In the bumper crop year of 1964, we could not obtain enough cars to adequately serve all of the requests that were made on us, and the shortage was carried over into 1965. As a matter of fact, we lost over $1.5 million in revenue during the first 5 months in 1965, due to the car shortage. Between November 23, 1965, and January 1, 1966, we had less than 60 percent of the boxcar fleet on our line.

"The low point was on December 13, when we had only 50.2 percent on our line and these percentages included foreign cars as well as our own. At the same time, a large number of roads had well over 100 percent of their ownership on line, one as high as 230 percent.

"In the fall of 1965, our territory once more had a bumper crop and again we were not able to provide enough cars, even with our very large ownership because such a high percentage were being used by other railroads.

"We simply do not have enough freight cars and there is only one answer to the shortage, and that is an ambitious car acquisition program entered into by all roads," Macfarlane said.

"It is no secret that some roads are providing more than their fair share of cars, while others are not. Northern Pacific, for example, has had a long-range building program going on and has provided more than its share.

"There were times when there was a surplus of cars and many cars were actually standing idle. It is interesting to note, however, that the periods of surplus are recurring with less frequency, due to the high level of business and the needs of a huge market for transportation.

"Right now," Macfarlane said, "in our case, at what used to be the slowest part of the year, from the standpoint of freight movement, we are faced with a shortage of cars. This is due in part to the fact that now the movement of grain is spread throughout the year. And if, as I believe, a sufficient number of cars is available to handle the needs of American shippers, the amount of business returning to the rails will lessen the possibility of surplus cars.

"A new freight car can cost from $11,000 to $32,000, depending on size, projected use and specialized equipment built into it. Some roads have found it more convenient and profitable to use cars belonging to other railroads, rather than their own cars.

"Thus, they can use their funds for maintenance, communications, right-of-way, signals and other improvements to their existing plants. I would be the last one to deny that expenditures must be made for these purposes, but I also believe it is folly to do so at the expense of the freight car supply.

"I do believe, however, that we should have an equalized car acquisition program based on the basic tenet that all roads should have enough of their own cars to handle the traffic on their own lines, which translates into car ownership equal to the amount of transportation a road performs.

"This should apply equally to all lines * * * transcontinental, bridge and terminating lines. All share in the division of revenues and all should share in the responsibility of providing the necessary freight cars for the haul from origin to destination.

"It is also my belief that a realistic per diem rate, which would include a profit incentive, based on the cost of cars, would be an economic stimulant that would add materially to the Nation's total freight car supply.

"To summarize, we must reach agreement on a practical plant to add to our total freight car fleet. We must have action, soon, on whatever plan is adopted. And above all, we must insist that our industry be equipped to handle a greater share of the Nation's transportation needs," Macfarlane said.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am quite interested in the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota relative to the shortage of boxcars in the northwestern part of our country. However, I cannot work up too much sympathy for the western railroads. It is true that there is an inadequate supply of boxcars in the northeastern part of the country, and it is also true that when some of our railroads get hold of some western boxcars, they hang onto them. But it is also true that the western railroads have lent support to opposition by the railroads in our part of the country to providing improvements in other forms of transportation. If they had not joined eastern roads in blocking water transportation development, perhaps they would have more of these boxcars for themselves.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, there is much truth in what the Senator from Vermont has said. The railroads have not done all they could, but the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific only have from 50 to 60 percent of their boxcars on line. They have built many boxcars, but it has done us no good when they cannot keep those boxcars on line. These are the only two railroads which have such a small percentage of the boxcars they own on line.

Mr. AIKEN. That situation could be helped if greater water transportation could be developed in the northeastern part of the country, particularly water transportation from the Hudson River to the St. Lawrence. The eastern railroads have persistently promoted opposition to the improvement of such facilities and they have blocked such improvement. In that opposition, they have had the sympathy, if not the active support, of the western railroads. That is why I cannot work up too much sympathy for the western railroads because the eastern railroads get their boxcars and hang onto them. Of course they do, but there is a way out.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think the American people are going to have to give more thought to a Department of Transportation in the United States. The railroad industry in this country is a free enterprise system. It is supposed to be efficient. Yet they are not as efficient as the nationalized railroads of Canada. If the free enterprise railroads want to stay that way, they had better do something about this problem.

Mr. AIKEN. Nearly 2 years ago a new water-compelled rate formula was developed by the Army Engineers and since that time not a single new waterway project has been approved.

This formula requires the use of new lower rates the railroads say they would have to adopt if a waterway were developed with which they would have to compete.

Of course, with those theoretical rates applied to the cost-benefit ratio, no new waterway is feasible.

This whole formula is rigged to insure the railroads against lower cost competition in the transportation field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I have good news in that I have reason to think that the rivers and harbors report will recommend expanded water transportation from Sioux City to Yankton in South Dakota on the Missouri River.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the recommendation of the improvement referred to by the Senator from South Dakota will be nationwide in its application and include the Northeast. Apparently, under the formula now used when a railroad says, "We will meet the rates of water competition," the proposed waterway improvements are turned down. Then it leaves the sky as the limit for the railroad rates. The railroads are sitting pretty. They have been successful in blocking improvement of other forms of transportation.

Mr. MUNDT. We are hopeful that the rivers and harbors report recommendation will prevail, and that there will be an extension to other waterways.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has referred optimistically to a recommendation favoring improvement of waterways in the South Dakota area. If that is so, I hope we in the Northeast can be included.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this has been a most helpful discussion of the shortage of boxcars and the need of waterway transportation. Certainly, with the growing population and the expanding economy, the two can go together. The Senator referred to the improvement of the waterway from Sioux City to St. Louis and down to the Mississippi.

That is the next step.

I would like to state to the Senator from North Dakota that I would appreciate it very much if he would add my name as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would be pleased and honored to have the distinguished majority leader as a cosponsor. No one is doing more to get relief on this boxcar problem than he.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not only are grain production facilities taxed by this shortage of boxcars but the lumber mills in the Northwest are likewise in a bind.

There was a very severe occurrence just this week. In western Montana, mills are going down by the bushel because they cannot get boxcars to take care of their needs.

At the St. Regis mill in Libby, Mont., 1,375 employees were laid off early this week because they did not have a boxcar on the siding. They had stacked what lumber they could in the yards. There was nothing to do but lay off the employees.

I am hopeful that meetings held with the Interstate Commerce Commission the other day, and again yesterday and today will be helpful so that people who depend on boxcars for grain and lumber shipments will be given their quotas that they need at this time.

I congratulate the Senator from North Dakota for taking the lead in this struggle.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Our area is the worst hurt because our rail lines, the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific, have consistently had less than 60 percent of their boxcar ownership on their own lines. We are hurt the most of any place in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to join in the well mentioned tribute by the distinguished majority leader to my friend from North Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor to the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I appreciate the comments of my friend from South Dakota and am always happy to be working with this effective battler for so many problems we have in common.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to explain in a little more detail the purpose of the remarks which I have made.

As some know I have advocated improvements of the Champlain waterway, not as a deep sea waterway but improvement of the existing shallow draft waterway from the Hudson River to the St. Lawrence River.

Our public-spirited railroads in the Northeast came before the hearings and testified that improvement of the waterway would take 7 million tons of freight away from them. So, the report of the Army Engineers turned down the proposal to improve the waterway on the grounds that there would not be business enough to warrant it. If one can add that up, he can do better than I can.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would like to associate myself with the views of the Senator from Vermont.

I recall the opposition to the St. Lawrence Seaway. The railroads, even with the seaway now in operation, have far more business than they can handle.

We need other transportation facilities.

Mr. AIKEN. We need all available transportation facilities. I think it is common knowledge, if one studies the situation, the development of waterways increases the business for the railroads by making it possible to develop industry, business, and agricultural production in the area.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I commend the Senator from North Dakota for adding a new dimension and a new possible solution to the shortage of boxcars in this country.

The Senator will recall last year the Commerce Committee reported, and the Senate passed a measure, providing that the Interstate Commerce Commission could set per diem rates and then persuaded eastern railroads to do two things: First, build more boxcars, and second, to send them back more quickly to the western railroads.

No one predicted at that time that this was the answer to the whole situation. It was one small step in seeking to alleviate the condition that has worsened with every year and a situation that has been before Congress for so many years.

I should like to not only compliment the Senator from North Dakota but ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of this measure.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would be happy to have the name of the Senator from Kansas added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. I wish to add that the comments of the Senator come to me as some surprise. I would accept anything that the Senator says with respect to agriculture as absolutely Gospel.

The fact that one transportation system may have deterred another may not, I think, be grounds to penalize the people who were hurt in this situation, and that is the wheat producer, who has no better and no greater advocate in the Senate than the Senator from Vermont.

It is the producers who are suffering today in getting their wheat from the fields, to the elevators and the markets.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Kansas must understand if the Senator from Vermont had his way the eastern railroads that have corralled the boxcars of the West would not be permitted to retain those boxcars to the extent that the wheatgrower of the West was seriously injured.

There is a solution. We could develop other forms of transportation in the East which would make it less tempting for the eastern railroads to grab so many western boxcars and hold them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his statement. The Senator from Kansas has been in the forefront of this fight for boxcars ever since he came to the Senate. He has been holding hearings, and he has been the sponsor of legislation, and has done everything humanly possible.

STRENGTHENING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, for myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], to tighten up on the provisions of Civil Rights Act of 1964 which deal with equal employment opportunity, and I ask that the bill be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3092) to prohibit more effectively discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3092

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 701(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by inserting "a State or political subdivision of a State or an agency of one or more States or political subdivisions and" after "includes".

(b) Section 701(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'employer' means (1) a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has eight or more employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, and (2) a State or political subdivision of a State, or an agency of one or more States or political subdivisions, but such term does not include the United States, or an Indian tribe: *Provided*, That it shall be the policy of the United States to insure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin and the President shall utilize his existing authority to effectuate this policy."

(c) Section 701 (c) of such Act is amended by striking out "or an agency of a State or political subdivision of a State,".

(d) Section 701(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "(A)" and all that follows down to and including "thereafter" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "eight or more."

SEC. 2. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by deleting section 706 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

"SEC. 706. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 703 or 704.

"(b) Whenever a written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any employer, employment agency, or labor organization has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall notify the employer, employment agency, or labor organization charged with the commission of an unlawful employment practice (hereinafter referred to as the 'respondent') of such charge and shall investigate such charge. If the Commission shall determine that there is not probable cause for crediting such charge it shall state its determination and notify any person claiming to have been aggrieved and the respondent of such determination. Each such determination shall be deemed to be a final order of the Commission. If the Commission shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done during and as a part of such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding.

"(c)(1) If within a period of thirty days after a charge is filed with the Commission, the Commission fails to secure an agreement between the parties for the elimination of such unlawful practice on mutually satisfactory terms, approved by the Commission, the Commission shall issue and cause to be served upon the respondent a complaint stating the charges in that respect, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than ten days after the service of such complaint. Whenever the Commission is required to endeavor to secure voluntary compliance with this title and it determines that circumstances warrant an early hearing, the

Commission may issue a complaint, in the same manner as provided in the preceding sentence, prior to the expiration of such thirty-day period. No complaint shall issue based upon any unlawful employment practice occurring more than one year prior to the filing of the charge with the Commission unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the period of military service shall not be included in computing the one-year period.

"(2) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such complaint and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

"(d) (1) The Commission or a member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any complaint, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

"(2) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

"(3) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon, except as a witness.

"(e) (1) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision and copies thereof shall be served upon the parties. The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice. In its discretion, the Commission upon notice may take further testimony.

"(2) With the approval of the member or designated agent conducting the hearing, a case may be ended at any time prior to the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission by agreement between the parties for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms.

"(f) If, upon the preponderance of the evidence, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that the respondent engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such respondent and other parties an order requiring such respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action as will effectuate the policies of this title, including, but not limited to, establishing on-the-job training for any persons aggrieved by such unlawful employment practice, or payment of damages, or reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without backpay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination): *Provided*, That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the backpay otherwise allowable. Such order may further require such respondent to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If the Commission shall find that the respondent has not engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such respondent and other parties an order dismissing the complaint.

"(g) From the time a hearing is held before the Commission, or in the case of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, from the time of the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission, until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(h) (1) The proceedings held pursuant to the preceding subsections of this section shall be conducted in public sessions and in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(2) In addition to the authority conferred upon the Commission by the other provisions of this title, the Commission is authorized, in carrying out its functions under this title to—

"(A) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, without condition other than that it be used in furtherance of the conditions of this title; and to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title; and

"(B) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 736–2) for persons in the Government service employed without compensation.

"(3) For the purposes of the preceding subsections of this section the Commission is authorized to utilize the available services of the Department of Labor and the employees thereof, with the consent of the Secretary of Labor, in (A) conducting a preliminary investigation with respect to any charge filed with the Commission, (B) endeavoring to secure voluntary compliance with this title, (C) conducting a hearing resulting from the issuance of a complaint by the Commission, and (D) obtaining advice and pertinent information concerning any occupational training programs financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government. Within the limitation of funds appropriated to the Commission, it may make agreements, with the Secretary of Labor, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, to the Department of Labor or the employees thereof, as the Commission deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph. For the purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and to provide such services as the Commission may request. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to authorize the Commission to delegate any of its authority to make determinations with respect to charges filed with it, to issue complaints, or to make final orders and findings of fact.

"(i) (1) Whenever the Commission makes a finding that any respondent has engaged in any unlawful employment practice and issues an order requiring such respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice or whenever the Commission has probable cause for belief that any respondent is not in compliance with the terms of any voluntary agreement for the elimination of an unlawful employment practice entered into pursuant to subsection (b), (e), or (g) of this section, the Commission shall have power to petition any United States court of appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order or voluntary agreement and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order and for the entry of an order directing the respondent to forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for any violation of such order of the Commission, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission or a true copy of such voluntary agreement. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(2) Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission or the voluntary agreement between the parties, or directing the respondent to forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for any violation of the order of the Commission, which penalty shall accrue to the United States. For the purposes of this subsection, each separate violation of such a final order shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through continuing failure or neglect to obey a final order of the Commission each day of continuance of such failure or neglect shall be deemed a separate offense.

"(3) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

"(4) The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

"(5) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent, and to be made a part of the transcript.

"(6) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

"(7) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(j) Whenever a written charge has been filed pursuant to subsection (b) alleging that any respondent has engaged in any unlawful employment practice and, after preliminary investigation, the Commission has determined that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, the Commission may petition any United States court of appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unlawful employment practice in question is alleged to have occurred, or wherein the respondent resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Commission, or the securing of a voluntary agreement between the parties under subsection (b), (e), or (g) of this section, with respect to the matter in question. Upon the filing of any such petition the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon the respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems just and proper. Such respondent shall be given an opportunity to appear by counsel and present any relevant testimony. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a temporary restraining order may be issued without notice if a petition alleges that substantial and irreparable injury to the alleged aggrieved party will be unavoidable and any such temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than five days and will become void at the expiration of such period.

"(k) (1) Any person or party aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any U.S. court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person or party resides or transacts business or the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsection (i), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioners or to the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(2) Upon such filling by a person or party aggrieved the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(1) The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

"(m) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order on the Commission, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115).

"(n) Petitions filed under this title shall be heard expeditiously."

SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 709(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and under which no person may bring a civil action under section 706 in any case or class of cases so specified,".

SEC. 4. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by deleting section 710 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"SEC. 710. (a) For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Commission, except that the attendance of a witness may not be required outside of the State where he is found, resides, or transacts business, and the production of evidence may not be required outside the State where such evidence is kept.

"(b) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Commission, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Commission."

SEC. 5. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SURVEY BY COMMISSION OF APPRENTICESHIP OR OTHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 717. (a) The Commission shall conduct a continuing survey of the operation of apprenticeship or other training or retraining programs, including on-the-job training programs, to determine if the employers, labor organizations, or joint labor-management committees controlling such programs are engaged in unlawful employment practices with respect to the operation of such programs.

"(b) Notwithstanding any provision of section 709, in conducting such survey the Commission shall at all reasonable times have access to any records maintained by an employer, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee pursuant to (1) the regulations prescribed by the Commission under the second sentence of section 709 (c), or (2) any fair employment practice law of a State or political subdivision thereof.

"(c) The Commission shall make a full and complete quarterly report to the Congress, containing the results of such survey during the preceding three months, and such report shall be made available to the public upon request."

SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall not affect suits commenced prior to the date of enactment of this Act by an aggrieved person pursuant to section 706(e) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or by the Attorney General pursuant to section 707 of such Act, and all such suits shall be continued by such aggrieved person or the Attorney General, as the case may be, proceedings therein had, appeals therein taken, and judgments therein rendered, in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is clear that title VII dealing with equal opportunity in employment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which has now been in effect for 8 months, is very much in need of strengthening due to the complexity and immobility of its provisions, as many of us in Congress well knew when we supported its enactment as the best that could then be enacted under the gun of a 3-month filibuster. The intervening period shows that much more needs to be done to insure equality of opportunity in employment. This is the point of the bill I am now introducing with Senators Clifford P. Case and Thomas H. Kuchel as cosponsors.

As part of the background for this bill, I have initiated what appears to be the first comprehensive survey by questionnaire of all State and local fair employment practice commissions and agencies to determine how effectively they operate. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is cooperating with me in this survey, I am most pleased to say, and has stated in its most recent newsletter to State and local agencies that these questionnaires will eliminate the necessity for EEOC's requesting similar information in the near future. The responses from the agencies are being received and analyzed and should be a valuable source of otherwise unavailable data for the subcommittee's consideration in conjunction with the bill now being introduced.

On June 14, 1965, I introduced S. 2134, a bill to amend four of the worst of these provisions: providing cease and desist order power, expanding coverage, strengthening investigatory power, and requiring a continuing survey of apprenticeship programs; a similar bill, H.R. 10065, has since been reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee and is on the House Calendar.

However, there has now been time to evaluate the first 6-month report of the EEOC. And the Commission's experience to date underscores dramatically the critical need for additional amendment to its basic charter in a number of important respects:

First. The basic orientation of the EEOC was never intended to be merely complaint-handling. Throughout the legislative history it was made clear that the Commission had to carry out an effective program of industrywide surveys and affirmative action, not merely react to complaints on a case-by-case basis. This was the reason for placing such great reliance—I believe too great reliance—upon enforcement in individual cases by State fair employment practice commissions, and for providing Federal enforcement power only over patterns of job discrimination.

But in the first 6 months the EEOC was swamped with 3,263 individual complaints, almost half of which required investigation, far more cases than the Commission expected, far more than it could possibly handle with its fiscal year 1966 budget of $2,225,000 and staff of approximately 160, and far too much to leave it with any time or manpower to undertake any affirmative program.

Thus, a major feature of the measure I am now introducing is a strong link for the EEOC with the nationwide resources of the Department of Labor, particularly the investigative manpower of the vast existing network of its Wage and Hour Division local offices, which now handle compliance surveys of some 30,000 companies each year. Another provision would also increase the resources of the Commision by authorizing acceptance of volunteer assistance, particularly from business and industry. Commissioner Richard A. Graham has stressed the need to use this latter resource.

Second. The Commission's affirmative action efforts are broadened by giving it the power to order the establishment of manpower training programs. Commissioner Samuel C. Jackson has sought to establish this link under present authority and a liaison has been initiated with the Manpower Administration. But it requires a firm statutory base, particularly in the context also of giving the EEOC the power to issue cease and desist orders.

Third. Once the Commission has cease and desist order power, there will be the danger that its complaint-handling function will be seriously hampered by the kind of dilatory technical proceedings which often plague other regulatory agencies. In the field of equal employment opportunity, justice delayed can be no justice at all, to paraphrase the maxim, since the economic pressure upon a minority group complainant will often require him to take whatever job he can, often making his case moot and, worse, often underutilizing his abilities. Accordingly, a number of proposed amendments would reduce the opportunity and incentive for delay during the administrative proceedings, such as the power of the Commission to seek interlocutory, or interim, relief in the courts in the case, for example, of dilatory tactics or repeated violations; the power of the Commission to award damages when such relief is called for; and the power of the courts to impose a civil penalty in appropriate cases.

Finally, even where the House-reported bill, H.R. 10065, takes a step forward, it does not do so strongly enough. For example, in extending coverage to employers of eight or more employees, the House bill delays the extension for still another year. Title VII itself was not operative for an entire year after enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and, because of the delay of the administration in appointing the Commissioners, was not really in operation until some months after its July 1, 1965, effective date. There is no reason to delay the extended coverage for still another year. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the extended act would cover 700,000 employers employing 40 million employees, or 21 percent of the Nation's employers and 54 percent of employees, whereas at its widest coverage—25 employees or more, on July 1, 1968—the existing law would include only 259,000 employers, or only 8 percent of the total, and 29 million employees, or only 40 percent of the total.

Equally significantly the House-reported bill entirely neglects the highly important area of coverage of State and local government employees. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in its November 1965 report on law enforcement in the South, made this recommendation:

> In order to help assure that justice is administered in a nondiscriminatory manner, employment in law-enforcement agencies should be available to all persons, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, providing for equal employment opportunities, does not cover public employment. Although discrimination in public employment can be challenged in private lawsuits, administrative and judicial remedies also should be provided. The Commission recommends that Congress consider amending title VII to extend its coverage to public employment.

I am very hopeful that hearings will be held on this bill in the very near future by the Senate Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am the ranking minority member. I have repeatedly requested such hearings on my earlier bill, S. 2134, and Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, subcommittee chairman, has assured me that they will be held this session. I note that he has this week reintroduced for consideration by our subcommittee the measure which our committee reported to the Senate with a large, bipartisan majority in 1963, S. 1937 of the 88th Congress, 2d session, as well as the title VII provision of the omnibus civil rights bill, S. 2923, introduced by Senator DOUGLAS, of which I am also a cosponsor. I look forward to the full discussion of the various provisions of these bills and the House bill, H.R. 10065, which hopefully will soon be considered and passed by the other body. It is also my hope that the administration will include a strengthened title VII in its expected omnibus civil rights measure, and that this proposal can also be considered by our subcommittee.

The bill I am now introducing makes the following amendments to title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964:

First. Gives the EEOC the power to issue cease and desist orders which all other regulatory agencies have, but also retains the power of the Attorney General under the existing title VII to initiate civil suits against patterns or practices of discrimination in employment. H.R. 10065 would permit such suits only at the request of the EEOC.

Second. Expands the coverage of title VII to employers and labor unions which have eight or more employees or members. H.R. 10065 would extend coverage to employers having eight or more employees only after July 2, 1967.

Third. Requires the EEOC to conduct a continuing survey of apprenticeship or other training or retraining progams and to report quarterly to the Congress its findings.

Fourth. Gives the EEOC the same investigatory powers which the Federal Trade Commission has under section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The following provisions are major improvements in title VII which are not reflected in H.R. 10065:

Fifth. Expands the coverage of title VII to employees of State and local governments, including State employment agencies. This is an important provision, especially in the area of State and local law enforcement agencies.

Sixth. Limits precomplaint investigation and conciliation to not more than 30 days after a charge has been filed with the EEOC. This would prevent dilatory tactics on a respondent's part from prolonging the precomplaint proceedings. Other regulatory statutes do not require such precomplaint proceedings, and in this field particularly there is a need for rapid relief if it is to be at all effective.

Seventh. Authorizes the EEOC to order affirmative action including the establishment of on-the-job training for anyone discriminated against. This is a significant remedy particularly where the defense is that there have been no qualified minority group applicants.

Eighth. Authorizes the EEOC to order the payment of damages. This is needed particularly where no other relief is available to a particular grievant found to have been discriminated against.

Ninth. Authorizes the EEOC to utilize the services of the Labor Department in conducting investigations, seeking voluntary compliance, conducting hearings, and coordinating training programs. This would help to overcome the serious limitations upon the EEOC's ability to handle its caseload, which has far exceeded expectations, by utilizing particularly the nationwide network of the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division local offices and staff, and the staff of the Manpower Administration.

Tenth. Authorizes the EEOC to receive donations of services and funds as so many other Federal agencies are authorized to do. This could be a highly useful source of expertise from the private sector.

Eleventh. Authorizes the EEOC to obtain interlocutory relief, a temporary injunction or restraining order, in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals prior to a final order to avoid dilatory practices or repeated violations of the law or to afford relief where otherwise there would be irreparable injury.

Twelfth. Authorizes the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals to order a civil penalty of no more than $5,000 in appropriate cases. The Federal Trade Commission Act provides a similar remedy.

Thirteenth. Makes judicially reviewable findings of "no probable cause" by the EEOC and requires that notice of such findings is given to complainants.

Fourteenth. Makes consent agreements enforcible in the courts as EEOC final orders.

Fifteenth. Requires complainants' consent to a finding of voluntary compliance prior to a hearing. It is now required only during a hearing.

Sixteenth. Permits a Commissioner who files a charge to participate as a witness in the hearing upon it, as is now authorized generally under the Administrative Procedure Act.

FURNISHING OF BOOKS AND OTHER MATERIALS TO THE BLIND AND OTHER HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, during the last two decades, Congress has passed legislation which has done much to bring books and people together, and the library administrations and the individual librarians in our States have worked with dedication and excellent effect to achieve this end.

The first Library Services Act, which was passed in 1955, authorized Federal funds to be made available to the States on a matching basis to strengthen rural public libraries.

This program met with extraordinary success and, in 1960, the Library Services

Act was amended to include aid to urban libraries and to provide for badly needed public library buildings.

In addition, Congress has provided for library resources in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and in the Higher Education Act of 1965. I have strongly supported all these measures.

Despite the increasing concern of the Congress and of the States with the necessity of providing adequate library service, a recent survey indicates that 69 percent of the public libraries of the Nation fail to meet the minimum standard set by the American Library Association for the number of volumes a library should have and that 97 percent of them fail to meet the minimum standard for general operating expenses. In these terms, in my own State of North Carolina, no one is yet receiving minimum adequate public library service. Despite the fact that there is public library service in all of the 100 counties of the State, in a few counties this service is so limited that there are still 83,492 people in North Carolina without any local public library service.

We have reason to be proud, however, that library service in North Carolina is much improved over what it was in 1960. With the aid of grants from the Library Services and Construction Act of 1960, 12 new public library buildings were constructed in the State during 1965 and 6 new projects have been approved in 1966.

Because of the promise such progress gives and because we need to keep up this fine work, I have cosponsored with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and other members of this body a bill to amend and extend the Library Services and Construction Act. Included in this bill under title IV, part B, is a provision to provide library service to a segment of our population which, with the exception of blind persons, heretofore has been almost completely neglected. Since 1931, by act of Congress, the Library of Congress has been providing books in braille and talking books to blind readers of the Nation through 32 cooperating libraries designated as regional libraries and machines equipped to play the discs through 54 State centers. The Regional Library for the Blind in Raleigh, N.C., serves the blind residents of North and South Carolina with talking books only. Braille and books on tape must be obtained from the Division for the Blind in the Library of Congress. The talking-book machines are distributed by the State Commission for the Blind in Raleigh.

There has, however, been practically no library service available to the 600,000 individuals whose eyesight is so poor that they cannot read newsprint, even with glasses, nor to the 4,700 persons who have lost both arms. Some 8,000 persons have lost all of their fingers, and 1,600 persons are in iron lungs or other respiratory devices which make ordinary reading difficult or impossible. In addition, there are about 751,000 victims of multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, Parkinson's disease, and other crippling ailments who are so disabled that handling and using books, magazines, and newspapers is impossible or extremely difficult. Altogether, including the 400,000 blind of the country, there are about 2 million physically handicapped persons in need of library service.

Part B of title IV, entitled "State Plans for Library Service to the Physically Handicapped," would enable the State Library agency and other public and nonprofit organizations in the States to provide improved library service to the blind and to other physically handicapped persons.

As a companion measure to S. 3076, I am today introducing a bill which would extend the use of reading materials now provided under the Library of Congress national books-for-the-blind program to all individuals certified by competent medical authority as unable to read normal conventional printed matter because of physical limitations.

This extension will, of course, demand increased efforts on the part of the States to provide adequate library service to the physically handicapped. Federal funds earmarked for library service to the physically handicapped authorized in S. 3076 should provide the needed impetus to the States to provide library services to these citizens and to improve and extend library services to their blind readers, for only about a fourth of the 400,000 blind are now receiving such services.

I cannot stress enough the importance of these two bills. No citizen should be denied the opportunity of free library service. It is in the national interest to have a vital nationwide public library system. This should also apply to citizens who cannot, because of physical limitations, read conventional printed matter. They should not, through our neglect, be second-class citizens in this respect. It seems logical to extend the use of the Library of Congress books-for-the-blind program to these individuals—many of whom are disabled as a result of their service in the U.S. Armed Forces.

The amount of money expended by the Federal Government for these library services seems small compared to the benefits that will be forthcoming. Each of these programs has already made great strides in bringing books to the people—in lifting their spirits as well as their educational levels—and I am confident that, with the passage of S. 3076 and the bill I have introduced today, more citizens will have the opportunity to receive adequate public library service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3093) to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 19, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons, introduced by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INSPECTIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS IN METALLIC AND NONMETALLIC MINES AND QUARRIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries. The Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is scheduled to begin hearings on similar legislation next Monday, March 21. The committee now has before it three different proposed metallic and nonmetallic mine safety bills. The bill which I introduce today is identical to that which was introduced in the 1st session of the 86th Congress by Senator Murray and cosponsored by me and several other distinguished Members of the Senate.

My purpose in introducing this particular bill today is to assure that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has before it for consideration every reasonable proposed legislative solution to the problems of metallic and nonmetallic mine safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3094) relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the authorization for Independence National Historical Park. The increase will permit the Department of the Interior to acquire some land necessary for the proper development of the park. Independence National Historical Park consists of 21.84 acres in the heart of old Philadelphia. Properties and buildings associated with the American Revolution and the founding and growth of the United States are preserved and interpreted for the more than 2 million visitors per year. Included are Independence Hall, Congress Hall, Old City Hall, and Independence Square, not to mention the new Independence Mall, which is provided for by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and which adjoins the Federal property.

The park was authorized in 1948 after Congress established the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission to investigate and study the matter of conserving the historical objects and buildings in old Philadelphia. The Commission filed its report to the Congress on December 29, 1947. The report recommended acquisition of four major sites—one of which, termed Project A, consisted of an area of three city blocks between Walnut and Chestnut and Fifth and Second Streets. In section 1(a) of the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), the Congress authorized acquisition and development of this area for the park.

All but one parcel within the original Project A has been acquired by the Federal Government with funds authorized to be appropriated in the 1948 act, and as it has been amended. Located at Fourth and Walnut Streets, this parcel consists of about one-half acre owned by the Reliance Insurance Co., of Philadelphia. The property, which houses a 16-story office building, is surrounded on 3 sides by parkland, and constitutes a modern intrusion on the historic mall.

I am advised by the owners that they have agreed to sell the property to the Department of the Interior for $3,250,000. However, the amount now authorized to be appropriated—$7,950,000—for property acquisition at Independence National Historical Park has been appropriated and expended. Therefore, an increase in the statutory ceiling is necessary if the property is to be acquired.

This last intrusion should be acquired so that the unbroken historic view of the park may be completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3095) to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. SCOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as the joint sponsor with former U.S. Representative Hardie Scott of the legislation which created the Independence National Historical Park, I am pleased to join my senior colleague from Pennsylvania in introducing this bill.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT, TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS THEREUNDER

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Mr. MAGNUSON, and myself, a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder and for other purposes. This bill, a part of the administration's legislative program, would extend the time for making grants-in-aid for airport development under the Federal Airport Act an additional 3 years. Without this extension, the program would expire June 30, 1967. The bill proposes only an extension of the existing program and aside from conforming amendments does not propose any substantive amendments to the Federal Airport Act.

The Federal Airport Act was first enacted in 1946 "to provide a system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics." The act recognized the necessity for national planning to insure the wisest and most efficient utilization of both Federal and local funds. Relative to total Federal investment, it is my firm conviction that few federally sponsored programs have proved as beneficial and successful as the Federal aid to airport program. Aside from providing consistency and efficiency in airport development, this program contributes immeasurably to guaranteeing the continued maintenance of an adequate airport system, the single most important factor in insuring air safety.

I would like to summarize briefly the principal features of the airport program and the proposed extensions contemplated by this bill:

First. Extend the Federal aid to airport program an additional 3 years, expiring June 30, 1970, at the existing $75 million annual level of authorization.

Second. Continue to limit Federal participation to items directly related to safety—such items as public parking lots, restaurants, and passenger terminal facilities, and so forth, are ineligible.

Third. Continue a special fund of $7 million a year for the development of general aviation airports, the essential purpose of which is to relieve congestion at high density airports.

Fourth. Funds allocated to any State under the area-population formula which are not obligated within 2 fiscal years would continue to revert to the discretionary fund.

Fifth. As a condition precedent to the receipt of Federal aid, airport authorities would continue to be required to make provision for the installation of certain specified landing aids—such as in-runway lighting, runway distance markers, and high intensity runway lighting—determined by the Federal Aviation Agency as necessary for the safe and efficient use of the airport. The Federal share of the cost for the installation of such specified aids may not exceed 75 percent.

Sixth. A special fund of $1,500,000 for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, because of their insular status and unique reliance upon air transportation, is left unchanged. Under this fund amounts made available to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are respectively $600,000, $600,000, and $300,000.

Seventh. With the exception of the special set-aside allocations, 75 percent—or $49,875,000—of the remaining annual authorization would continue to be allocated to the States on the basis of their area and population and 25 percent—or $16,625,000—is placed in a special discretionary fund to be used in any State at the discretion of the Administrator.

Eighth. As in the past, the Administrator would continue to be required to prepare a national airport plan specifying projects considered necessary to insure a system of public airports adequate to meet the needs of the various segments of aviation.

Ninth. Continues the requirement that as a condition precedent to any grant that the Administrator must satisfy himself that reasonable effort, including enactment of zoning laws, has been made to restrict use of land adjacent to airports so as to make it compatible with the operation of the airport.

Tenth. Authorizes grants for advance planning and engineering for airport development, the Federal share of which cannot exceed 50 percent.

Eleventh. Continues to make Guam eligible to participate in the discretionary fund.

Twelfth. Continues to require the Administrator, prior to project or planning proposal approval, to determine that the project or proposal is reasonably consistent with existing plans of public agencies for development of the area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with a letter from the Federal Aviation Agency Administrator, William F. McKee, requesting introduction, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I also request unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 10 days in order that Senators wishing to cosponsor this measure will have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 3096) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3096

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(d) of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1104(d)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(7) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in the several States, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $199,500,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $66,500,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968; June 30, 1969; and June 30, 1970, and shall continue to be so available until expended.

"(8) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $4,500,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $1,500,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968; June 30, 1969; and June 30, 1970, and shall continue to be so available until expended. Of each such amount, 40 per centum shall be available for Hawaii, 40 per centum shall be available for Puerto Rico, and 20 per centum shall be available for the Virgin Islands.

"(9) For the purpose of developing, in the several States, airports the primary purpose of which is to serve general aviation and to relieve congestion at airports having high density of traffic serving other segments of aviation, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act for such purpose, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $21,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $7,000,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968; June 30, 1969; and June 30, 1970, and shall continue to be so available until expended."

SEC. 2 (a) Section 6(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(a)) is amended by striking out "or 5(d)(4)" in the first sentence and inserting "5(d)(4) or 5(d)(7)."

(b) Section 6(b)(1) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(b)(1)) is amended by striking out "and 5(d)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "5(d)(4) and 5(d)(7)" and by striking out "5(d)(6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "5(d)(6) and 5(d)(9)."

The letter presented by Mr. MONRONEY is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft bill "to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes."

The bill would extend the Federal Airport Act to permit grants-in-aid for airport development at a maximum authorized level of $75 million for each of the fiscal years 1968, 1969 and 1970. This extension will assure continuation of the development of the Nation's system of public airports.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this proposal would be consistent with the administration's program.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator.

Mr. DOMINICK. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether I may be permitted to join as a cosponsor of his bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be happy for the distinguished Senator from Colorado to be a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] I introduce for appropriate reference two bills to accelerate our national program of historic preservation. I ask unanimous consent that both bills remain at the desk for 1 week to permit other Senators an opportunity to join in sponsoring the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 3097. A bill to provide financial and other aid, under the Housing Act of 1949, and related Federal programs, to encourage and assist in the preservation and maintenance of historic structures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3098. A bill to promote and coordinate historic preservation activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, other public bodies, and private organizations and individuals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, many of our buildings and sites, which are rich in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture, are threatened by bulldozers or neglect.

Already, half of our most historically significant structures have been destroyed.

If we wait another 5 years, there may be no need for this legislation. By then, most of the structures which could and should have been saved may have fallen.

My proposed legislation is designed to protect and restore those remaining from the accelerating pressures for cleared land and new construction.

A measure of that pressure is the prediction that America will see more construction in the next 40 years than we have witnessed in the last 200.

It is not the intent of this legislation to stifle progress. Rather, it is our desire to enrich our progress. It is our hope that with the incentive of this legislation, our past and future can live as neighbors and contribute jointly to the quality of our lives.

The proposal will help us save for the future the best of what we have inherited from the past.

With the increasing mobility of our society, tangible links with history become more meaningful.

Our landmarks lend stability to our lives. They are a point of orientation. They help establish values of time and place and belonging.

This legislation will find, survey, and register significant structures. A top level National Advisory Council would be created to give leadership to the program. There would be grants and loans for acquisition and restoration of registered buildings. Cities would receive credit for such work toward their noncash contributions for urban renewal. Architects and technicians would be trained to fill the critical shortage of professional personnel in the field.

In short, the energies and resources of both private and public organizations would be marshaled to save our heritage of stone and mortar.

We ask for $2 million for fiscal year 1967 to get this program underway.

The proposals in the legislation are based on recommendations by the Special Committee on Preservation. The recommendations are the result of a long and thorough study of the preservation needs of our Nation. The special committee is sponsored by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and it has been my privilege to serve on that committee.

Companion legislation is being introduced in the House by Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey. He also is a member of the special committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3097

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC STRUCTURES AS PART OF URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 110 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "and" immediately before "(2)", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (3) may include provision for the acquisition by the local public agency of structures which such agency determines to be of historic or architectural value and the sale or other disposition of such structures to public bodies, private organizations, or other persons which will renovate and maintain such structures for historic purposes".

(b) The first sentence of section 110(c) of such Act is amended by inserting after "rehabilitation or conservation" the following: "(including preservation of historic structures)".

Acquisition and rehabilitation of historic structures under urban renewal demonstration program

SEC. 102. Section 110(c)(8) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended—

(1) by striking out "of structures which are located in the urban renewal area and which, under the urban renewal plan, are to be repaired or rehabilitated for dwelling use or related facilities" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of structures, located in the urban renewal area, which (under the urban renewal plan) are to be repaired or rehabilitated for dwelling use or related facilities, or which are determined by the local public agency to be of historic or architectural value and (under such plan) are to be renovated and maintained for historic purposes"; and

(2) by striking out "for such purposes" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the purpose of repair or rehabilitation for dwelling use or related facilities".

Relocation and preservation of historic structures

SEC. 103. Section 110(c)(9) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(9) relocating within or outside the project area a structure which the local public agency determines to be of historic or architectural value and which is owned by or will be disposed of to a public body, private organization, or other person which will renovate and maintain such structure for historic purposes."

Local grant-in-aid credit for purchase and rehabilitation of historic structures

SEC. 104. Section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence the following new sentence: "'Local grant-in-aid' also includes the cost of acquiring and rehabilitating or restoring any structure located in the urban renewal area which is determined by such agency to be of historic or architectural value and which will be maintained on a nonprofit basis for historic purposes."

Grants to National Trust for Historic Preservation to cover restoration costs

SEC. 105. Section 115 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to the National Trust for Historic

Preservation from funds available for rehabilitation grants under subsection (a), on such terms and conditions and in such amounts (not exceeding $90,000 with respect to any one structure) as he deems appropriate, to cover the costs incurred by such Trust in renovating or restoring structures which it considers to be of historic or architectural value which it has accepted and which it will maintain (after such renovation or restoration) for historic purposes."

Urban planning grants for surveys of historical structures

Sec. 106. Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In addition to the other grants authorized by this section, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to assist any city or other municipality in making a survey of the structures in such city or municipality which are determined by its appropriate authorities to be of historic or architectural value. Any such survey shall be designed to identify the historic structures in the city or municipality involved, determine the cost of their rehabilitation or restoration, and provide such other information as may be necessary or appropriate to serve as a foundation for a balanced and effective program of historic preservation in such city or municipality. A grant under this subsection shall not exceed two-thirds of the cost of the survey for which it is made, and shall be made to the appropriate agency or entity specified in paragraphs (1) through (9) of subsection (a) or, if there is no such agency or entity which is qualified and willing to receive the grant and provide for its utilization in accordance with this subsection, directly to the city or municipality involved."

Loans for acquisition and rehabilitation of historic structures

Sec. 107. (a) Section 312(a) of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", by striking out the second sentence, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) To assist in the preservation of historic structures both within and outside of urban renewal areas, the Secretary is also authorized under this section to make loans to the owners or tenants of structures which are determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by him to be of historic or architectural value to finance the rehabilitation or restoration of such structures, and to make loans to other persons to finance the acquisition and rehabilitation or restoration by them of structures which are determined in accordance with such regulations to be of historic or architectural value.

"(3) No loan shall be made under this section unless the Secretary finds (A) that the applicant is unable to secure the necessary funds from other sources upon comparable terms and conditions, and (B) the loan is an acceptable risk taking into consideration the security available for the loan, the ability of the applicant to repay the loan, and the need for the rehabilitation or restoration involved.

"(4) Nothing in this section shall prevent a person from receiving a loan under this section with respect to property in connection with which he receives a grant under section 115 of the Housing Act of 1949, if and to the extent that such person is otherwise eligible to receive such loan under this section."

(b) (1) The heading of section 312 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Loans for rehabilitation or historic preservation"

(2) Section 312(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "or the urban renewal plan" and inserting in lieu thereof ", or the urban renewal plan if any,".

(3) Section 312(b)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "rehabilitation loan" and inserting in lieu thereof "loans".

(4) So much of section 312(c) as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is amended by striking out "rehabilitation loan" and inserting in lieu thereof "loan".

(5) Section 312(c)(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "The cost of rehabilitation" in subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof in each instance "the cost of the rehabilitation, restoration, or acquisition and restoration".

Preservation of historic structures under urban beautification program

Sec. 108. Section 706 of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", including provision for the acquisition of structures which are determined by the authorities administering such programs to be of historic or architectural value and the rehabilitation or restoration of such structures for maintenance for historic purposes"; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon in the second sentence the following: "and for the preservation of historic structures to the extent appropriate and feasible".

Fellowships for architects and technicians in historic preservation field

Sec. 109. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 annually, for a three-year period commencing on July 1, 1966, to be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the purpose of providing fellowships for the graduate training of architects and professional technicians in the field of historic preservation. Persons shall be selected for such fellowships solely on the basis of ability and upon the recommendations of the Historic Preservation Fellowship Advisory Board established pursuant to subsection (b). Fellowships shall be solely for training in public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education having programs of graduate study in the field of historic preservation or in related fields, which programs are oriented to training for careers in historic preservation and in the historic preservation aspects of urban renewal, community development, and related fields.

(b) There is hereby established the Historic Preservation Fellowship Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall consist of nine members to be appointed by the Secretary as follows: Three from public institutions of higher learning, three from private nonprofit institutions of higher education who are the heads of departments which provide academic courses appropriately related to the fields referred to in subsection (a), and three from national organizations which are directly concerned with problems relating to historic preservation. The Board shall meet upon the request of the Secretary and shall make recommendations to him with respect to persons to be selected for fellowships under this section. Members of the Board shall be entitled to receive transportation expenses and a per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized for members of advisory committees created pursuant to section 601 of the Housing Act of 1949.

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Establishment of Council

Sec. 201. (a) To carry out the policies set forth in this Act, there is established a National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of fifteen members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(3) The Secretary of Commerce.

(4) The Administrator of the General Services Administration.

(5) The Secretary of the Treasury.

(6) The Attorney General.

(7) Two appointed by the President from a panel of at least four Governors submitted by the Governors Conference.

(8) Two appointed by the President from a panel of at least four mayors submitted jointly by the United States Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities.

(9) One appointed by the President from a panel of at least two county officials submitted by the National Association of Counties.

(10) Four appointed by the President from among individuals in private life who are significantly interested or experienced in the matters to be considered by the Council.

(b) Each member of the Council specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) may designate another officer of his department or agency to serve on the Council in his stead.

(c) Each member of the Council appointed under paragraphs (7), (8), (9), and (10) of subsection (a) shall serve for a term of five years from the expiration of his predecessor's term; except that the members first appointed under such paragraphs shall serve for terms of from one to five years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment in such manner as to insure that the terms of not less than one nor more than two of them will expire in any one year.

(d) Any vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment (and for the balance of the unexpired term).

(e) The Council shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(f) Eight members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

Duties of the Council

Sec. 202. (a) The Council shall—

(1) advise the President and the Congress on historic preservation insofar as it affects the national welfare;

(2) assist in the development of a strong national historic preservation policy, and provide inspiration and leadership for the implementation of such policy;

(3) support and aid in the coordination of activities of Federal departments and agencies relating to historic preservation, and develop policies, guidelines, and studies for the review and resolution of conflicts between different Federal and Federally aided programs affecting historic preservation:

(4) encourage, in cooperation with appropriate private agencies, public interest and participation in historic preservation;

(5) make and publish studies in such areas as adequacy of legislative and administrative statutes and regulations pertaining to historic preservation activities of State and local governments, and the effects of tax policies at all levels of governments on historic preservation; and

(6) prepare guidelines for the assistance of State and local governments in drafting legislation relating to historic preservation.

(b) The Council shall submit annually a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the President and to the Congress, and shall from time to time submit such additional and special reports as it deems advisable. Each report shall propose such legislative enactments and other actions as, in the judgment of the Council, are necessary and appropriate to carry out its recommendations.

Powers of the Council

Sec. 203. (a) The Council or, on the authorization of the Council, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Council or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Council, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C., secs. 192–194, inclusive), shall apply in the case of failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Council is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Council, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

Compensation of members

Sec. 204. The members of the Council specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 201(a) shall serve without additional compensation. The members of the Council appointed under paragraphs (7), (8), (9), and (10) of section 201(a) shall receive $100 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Council. All members of the Council shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Council.

Staff and facilities

Sec. 205. The Council shall have an Executive Director, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to serve at the pleasure of the President, and who shall receive compensation at the rate provided for level 2 of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1965 (5 U.S.C. 2211(b)).

(b) The Council shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out its duties, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

(c) The Council may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the executive departments by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(d) The members of the Council specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 201(a) shall provide the Council with such facilities and services under their jurisdiction and control as may be needed by the Council to carry out its duties, to the extent that such facilities and services are requested by the Council and are otherwise available for that purpose. To the extent of available appropriations, the Council may obtain, by purchase, rental, donation, or otherwise, such additional property, facilities, and services as may be needed to carry out its duties.

Meaning of historic preservation

Sec. 206. For purposes of this Act, the term "historic preservation" includes the protection, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of communities, areas, structures, sites, and objects having historic, architectural, social, or cultural significance to the United States.

Authorization of appropriations

Sec. 207. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

S. 3098

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Declaration of purposes

Section 1. The Congress finds and declares—

(a) that the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic past;

(b) that the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people;

(c) that, in the fact of ever-increasing extensions of urban centers, highways, and residential, commercial, and industrial developments, the present governmental and non-governmental historic preservation programs and activities are inadequate to insure future generations a genuine opportunity to appreciate and enjoy the rich heritage of our Nation; and

(d) that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to accelerate its historic preservation programs and activities, and to assist State and local governments and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States to expand and accelerate their historic preservation programs and activities.

TITLE I—NATIONAL REGISTER OF SITES, BUILDINGS, AND OBJECTS SIGNIFICANT IN AMERICAN HISTORY, ARCHITECTURE, ARCHAEOLOGY, AND CULTURE

Sec. 101. (a) To carry out the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and maintain a national register of sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture. The register shall include the following three general categories of such sites, buildings, and objects—

(1) those of national significance identified in the surveys conducted pursuant to the Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461–467);

(2) those of national, regional, or State significance identified in the surveys conducted pursuant to section 301(a) of this Act; and

(3) those of local significance identified in the surveys conducted pursuant to section 301(a) of this Act.

(b) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall (1) publish from time to time, in such manner as he deems appropriate, the national register established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, and shall distribute copies of such register to the heads of all other Federal agencies; and (2) prepare for each State an inventory of sites, buildings, and objects within the State that are included in the national register established under subsection (a) of this section, and distribute such inventory to States, local governments, and interested public bodies, private organizations, and individuals.

Sec. 102. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE II—PRESERVATION OF PROPERTIES OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE INCLUDED IN NATIONAL REGISTER

Sec. 201. To carry out the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the ten succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of accelerating the historic preservation programs and activities authorized by the Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461—467). Sums appropriated under the authority of this section shall be utilized by the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of said Act, to preserve the sites, buildings, and objects of national significance that are included in the national register established under section 101(a) of this Act.

Sec. 202. The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted project in any State shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the project, take into account the effect of the project on any site, building, or object of national significance that is included in the national register established under section 101(a) of this Act.

TITLE III—GRANTS TO STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR SURVEYS, PLANS, AND PROJECTS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Sec. 301. (a) To carry out the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(1) to grant funds to States for the purpose of preparing comprehensive statewide historic surveys and plans, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, for the preservation, acquisition, and development of sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history and culture; and

(2) to establish a program of matching grants-in-aid to States for projects having as their purpose the preservation for public benefit of properties that are significant in American history and culture.

(b) As used in this title—

(1) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(2) The term "project" means programs of State and local governments and other public bodies and private organizations and individuals for the acquisition of title or interests in any site, building, or object that is significant in American history and culture, or property used in connection therewith, and for its development in order to assure the preservation of any such property for public benefit.

(3) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 302. (a) No grant for a project may be made under this title—

(1) unless application therefor is submitted to the Secretary in accordance with regulations and procedures prescribed by him;

(2) unless the application is in accordance with the comprehensive statewide historic preservation plan which has been approved by the Secretary after considering its relationship to the comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan prepared pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897);

(3) for more than 50 percent of the total cost of the project, as determined by the Secretary, and his determination shall be final;

(4) unless the grantee has agreed to make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require;

(5) unless the grantee has agreed to assume, after completion of the project, the total cost of the continued maintenance, repair, and administration of the property in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary; and

(6) until the grantee has complied with such further terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary or advisable.

(b) No State shall be permitted to utilize the value of real property obtained before the date of enactment of this Act in meeting the remaining cost of a project for which a grant is made under this title.

Sec. 303. (a) The amounts appropriated and made available for grants to the States for comprehensive statewide historic surveys and plans under this title shall be apportioned among the States by the Secretary on the basis of needs as determined by him.

(b) (1) The amounts appropriated and made available for grants to the States for projects under this title for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the States by the Secretary in accordance with needs as disclosed in approved statewide historic preservation plans.

(2) The Secretary shall notify each State of its apportionment, and the amounts thereof shall be available thereafter for payment to such State for projects in accordance with the provisions of this title. Any amount of any apportionment that has not been paid or obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which such notification is given, and for two fiscal years thereafter, shall be reapportioned by the Secretary in accordance with this subsection.

Sec. 304. (a) No grant may be made by the Secretary for or on account of any survey or project under this title with respect to which financial assistance has been given or promised under any other Federal program or activity, and no financial assistance may be given under any other Federal program or activity for or on account of any survey or project with respect to which assistance has been given or promised under this title.

(b) In order to assure consistency in policies and actions under this title with other related Federal programs and activities, and to assure coordination of the planning, acquisition, and development of assistance to States under this title with other related Federal programs and activities, the President may issue such regulations with respect thereto as he deems desirable, and such assistance may be provided only in accordance with such regulations.

Sec. 305. The beneficiary of assistance under this title shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the disposition by the beneficiary of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used; and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

Sec. 306. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and such sums as may be necessary for succeeding fiscal years. Such appropriations shall be available for the financial assistance authorized by this title and for the administrative expenses of the Secretary in connection therewith, and shall remain available until expended.

TITLE IV—GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 401. To carry out the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make periodic grants to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, chartered by Act of Congress approved October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 927), as amended, for the purpose of furthering the work of the National Trust in educational service, financial assistance to preservation projects, and in preserving and administering sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history and culture. Such grants shall be used by the National Trust in accordance with the provisions of the Act approved October 26, 1949, as amended. Any grant pursuant to this section shall not be used to finance more than two-thirds of the cost of any project undertaken by the National Trust. The remaining cost of the project shall be borne by the National Trust from funds, services, real or personal property, or any combination thereof obtained from other sources, the value of which shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and his determination shall be final.

Sec. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this title.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last December Mr. Thomas J. Walker, superintendent of the Coos County Intermediate Education District at Coquille, Oreg. brought to my attention a matter which disturbed him concerning the ineligibility of his school district to participate in the surplus property utilization program.

Upon receipt of his letter I communicated with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine if the matter was one which could properly be handled under the regulations issued by the Department. I was informed on February 18, 1966, by the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that it appeared no administrative relief could be found and it would therefore be necessary to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

It is for this purpose that I am introducing the bill which I now send to the desk for appropriate reference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, the letter from Mr. Thomas J. Walker, to which I have previously alluded, be printed at this point in my remarks, together with correspondence dated February 18, 1966, received from Under Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen and attachments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and correspondence will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3100) to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to supervisory educational agencies of State and local governments, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

That section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) The term 'school system', as used in this subsection, includes any agency of a State, or of a political subdivision of a State, which is engaged in the supervision of two or more tax-supported schools operated or administered by or within such State or political subdivision, in the coordination of educational programs of two or more such schools, or in the rendition of educational services for two or more such schools."

The letter and correspondence presented by Mr. Morse are as follows:

County of Coos,
Coquille, Oreg., December 22, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator, U.S. Congress,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Recently in Oregon most county school offices were designated intermediate education districts. Coos County Intermediate Education District is in need of certain surplus properties distributed by Surplus Property Utilization Division of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These properties are needed to assist Coos County Intermediate Education District in its effort to provide needed educational services to school districts in Coos County.

Coos County Intermediate Education District has been declared ineligible to receive surplus properties due to a technicality in interpretation of regulations describing recipients. I have found sympathy among those interpreting these regulations, but have been unable to find anyone with the authority to include intermediate education districts among authorized recipients.

I am enclosing a copy of a portion of the regulations regarding recipients along with a copy of a letter of denial received from Sol Elson, Chief, Surplus Property Utilization Division.

I feel that Coos County Intermediate Education District should be able to receive the benefits of surplus property for the following reasons:

1. Coos County Intermediate Education District is a service agency for Coos County schools presently offering services to improve education.
2. Coos County Intermediate Education District services almost 14,000 students in Coos County indirectly through 6 school districts.
3. The Federal Government is encouraging the development of "educational centers and services" through title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Coos County is attempting to establish an educational center.
4. Coos County Intermediate Education District is completely tax supported.
5. Coos County Intermediate Education District could make valuable use of selected surplus property to improve educational services at considerable saving to taxpayers in Coos County.

I hesitate to bring this problem to your attention, but I do not know where else to turn to see that needed educational services are provided for students in Coos County at the most reasonable cost possible to taxpayers. Perhaps you will be willing to initiate some action in this regard.

I will appreciate any assistance or suggestions you might give.

Very truly yours,
Thomas J. Walker,
Superintendent, Coos County Intermediate Education District.

How To Acquire Federal Surplus Personal Property for Health, Educational, and Civil Defense Purposes and Federal Surplus Real Property for Health and Educational Purposes

(From U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Field Administration, Surplus Property Utilization Division, Washington, D.C., in coordination with Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, March 1965)

Federal surplus real property to eligible health and educational applicants, at a price that takes into consideration any benefit which may accrue to the United States because of its use. No provision has been made in the law for the transfer of real property for civil defense purposes.

States as used herein means the 50 States the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

PERSONAL PROPERTY

Personal property includes all types and categories of property except real property, naval vessels, and records of the Federal Government. It embraces such items as handtools, machine tools, furniture, motor vehicles, communication and electronic equipment, construction equipment, X-ray machines, aircraft, small boats, hardware, office machines and supplies, textiles and many other types and categories of movable and usable property. It is offered on an "as is, where is" basis, without warranty of any kind.

WHO MAY ACQUIRE PERSONAL PROPERTY

Personal property may be acquired by approved or accredited tax-supported or nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, schools, school systems, colleges or universities; by tax-supported or nonprofit schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, and radio or television stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission as educational radio or educational television stations; and by public libraries. Nonprofit institutions must be exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code. Personal property may also be acquired by civil defense organizations of a State, or civil defense organizations of political subdivisions and instrumentalities of a State, which are established pursuant to State law. The act is specific with respect to the types of organizations which are eligible; types not mentioned above are not eligible to acquire Federal surplus personal property through the donation program administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A school (excepting schools for the mentally retarded and schools for the physically handicapped) means an approved or accredited organizational entity devoted primarily to approved academic, vocational, or professional study and instruction, which operates primarily for educational purposes on a full-time basis for a minimum school year, and employs a full-time staff of qualified instructors.

A school system means a group of approved or accredited tax-supported schools operating under one administrative organization.

A college means an approved or accredited institution of higher learning offering organized study courses and credits leading to the baccalaureate or higher degrees.

A university means an approved or accredited institution for instruction and study in the higher branches of learning and which is empowered to confer degrees in special departments or colleges.

An educational radio station or an educational television station means a radio or television station licensed by the Federal Communications Commission and operated exclusively for noncommercial educational purposes, the licensee of which is tax-supported or nonprofit and tax exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A school for the mentally retarded means a tax-supported or nonprofit and tax exempt facility or institution operated primarily to provide specialized instruction to students of limited mental capacity, operating on a full-time basis for a minimum school year prescribed for public school instruction of the mentally retarded.

A school for the physically handicapped means a tax-supported or nonprofit and tax exempt school organized primarily to provide specialized instruction to students whose physical handicaps necessitate individual or group instruction. The school must operate on a full-time basis for a minimum school year prescribed for public school instruction for the physically handicapped.

A public library means a library that serves free all residents of a community, district, State, or region, and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds.

A medical institution means an approved or accredited institution, facility, entity, or organization which has for its primary function the provision of medical services, or the promotion of health through the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, training, and demonstrations, relating to causes, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., December 9, 1965.

Mr. THOMAS J. WALKER,
Superintendent, Coos County Intermediate Educational District, Coquille, Oreg.

DEAR SUPERINTENDENT WALKER: We acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 2 regarding your desire to have the Coos County Intermediate Education District determined eligible for donations of Federal surplus personal property.

The donation legislation is very specific in identifying the types of educational entities to which donations may be made. These include tax-supported school systems, and tax-supported or nonprofit tax-exempt schools, colleges, universities, schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, radio and television stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission as educational radio stations or educational television stations. Donations of property for educational purposes may also be made to public libraries which serve free all residents of a community, district, State, or region and receive their financial support in whole or in part from public funds.

On the basis of the information furnished in your letter, we agree with the Oregon State Agency's determination that your organization does not meet the criteria of a school system or any of the other eligible types of educational entities provided for in the donation legislation.

We regret that we cannot be of assistance to your school district through the surplus personal property donation program under your present setup. However, if Coos County establishes an educational center and it is operated by your school district, we shall be glad to evaluate your organization's program again and reconsider the question of your eligibility.

Please keep the State agency for surplus property apprised of any changes in the program operations of your school district.

Sincerely yours,

SOL ELSON,
Chief, Surplus Property Utilization Division.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 11, 1966 concerning the eligibility of the Coos County Intermediate Education District, Coquille, Oreg., for donations of Federal surplus personal property under the program administered by this Department.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter of January 17 from Sol Elson, Chief of the Department's Surplus Property Utilization Division, to Mr. Walker, Superintendent of Coos County Intermediate Education District, regarding this matter.

Section 203(j)(3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)(3)), authorizes donations to specified categories of donees including school systems, schools, colleges, and universities. These categories of institutions are defined in the Department's regulations, 45 C.F.R., part 13, consistent with their meanings as reflected in the legislative history of the act. Section 13.1(aa) reads: "School system means a group of approved or accredited tax-supported schools operated under one administrative organization."

It is our understanding that the six school systems, or school districts, in Coos County, control and operate the tax-supported schools within their individual school districts, and that the Coos County Intermediate Education District is a county administrative or supervisory type organization coordinating the county program but not directly operating or controlling any schools in the county.

It appears that Coos County Intermediate Education District offers services to the separate independent school systems in a manner similar to the services which the State Departments of Education offer to the local schools and school systems within the States. A State Department of Education which functions as a service or administrative arm of the State Government which does not operate and administer individual schools, is not considered eligible for donations of surplus property. However, a State Department of Education which directly operates and controls a group of tax-supported schools or colleges may be considered as an eligible school system and thus qualify for donations of surplus property. The legislative history of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, indicates that it was the intent of the Congress that only those "school systems" which directly operate and administer schools, should be considered eligible to receive donations of surplus personal property under the Act.

In order to confer eligibility upon State Departments of Education and other tax-supported instrumentalities of government such as the Coos County Intermediate Education District, responsible for providing administrative services to school systems, it would be necessary to amend the above referenced section of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

If there are additional facts or information concerning the Coos County Intermediate Education District which have not been submitted to us, we would be pleased to receive them for further consideration of this applicant.

If we can be of further assistance to you in any way, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.

Mr. THOMAS J. WALKER,
Superintendent, Coos County Intermediate Education District, Courthouse, Coquille, Oreg.

DEAR MR. WALKER: Your letter of December 17, 1965, to the Commission of Education, has been referred to this office for action.

On the basis of the information contained in your letter, the Coos County Intermediate Education District does not meet the definition of a school system pursuant to the

Department's donation program regulations. As defined in the regulations, "a school system means a group of approved or accredited tax supported schools operated under one administrative organization."

We recognize that in some States the county board of education with the county superintendent of schools as chief administrator, actually operates and controls all schools within the county including such matters as the employment of teachers and other personnel, purchasing of equipment and supplies, etc. It is our understanding that such an organizational pattern does not prevail in Oregon and no evidence to the contrary has been presented.

However, if Coos County Intermediate Education District has the authority and responsibility to operate and control directly certain schools which are eligible on their own merits and in such capacity has the responsibility for acquiring and disposing of property for them, then the Coos County Intermediate Education District would be eligible to receive surplus property for the use and benefit of these institutions under its operation and control, and for its own administrative use.

Furthermore, if Coos County establishes an educational center which would qualify as an eligible school to serve students of the entire country, and it is operated and controlled by the Coos County Intermediate Education District, we shall be glad to evaluate your program again and reconsider the question of your eligibility as a school system.

Sincerely yours,

Sol Elson,
Chief, Division of Surplus Property Utilization

U.S. COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish the U.S. Committee on Human Rights.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3101) to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Clark (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of this legislation is to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year. It was designed to implement a recommendation made by the Citizens Panel on Human Rights, headed by Prof. Louis B. Sohn of Harvard, of the White House Conference on International Cooperation, which was held from November 29 through December 1, 1965.

In its report, the Sohn committee pointed out that the International Cooperation Year, which was celebrated in 1965, will be followed in 1968 by the International Human Rights Year, proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in honor of the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The committee suggested the creation of a representative body to prepare plans to enable the United States and the United Nations to enlarge the protection of individuals throughout the world against all forms of tyranny, injustice and discrimination.

If U.S. participation in the International Human Rights Year is to be meaningful and productive, advance planning is essential. This bill authorizes the creation of an 11-man committee, with members drawn from the Congress and private life, to engage in the planning and coordinating work necessary to make it a success.

The 27 Senators joining as cosponsors are: Gordon Allott, E. L. Bartlett, Daniel B. Brewster, Frank Church, Paul H. Douglas, Philip A. Hart, Vance Hartke, Daniel K. Inouye, Jacob K. Javits, Edward V. Long, Eugene J. McCarthy, Gale W. McGee, George S. McGovern, Lee Metcalf, Walter F. Mondale, Wayne Morse, Frank E. Moss, Edmund S. Muskie, Maurine B. Neuberger, Claiborne Pell, William Proxmire, Jennings Randolph, Leverett Saltonstall, Hugh Scott, Joseph D. Tydings, Ralph Yarborough, Stephen M. Young.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record, together with the names of the Senators cosponsoring it.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3101

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Section 1. That, in order to provide for effective and coordinated preparation for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968, designated by the General Assembly of the United Nations as "International Human Rights Year", there is hereby established an advisory and coordinating committee, to be known as the "United States Committee on Human Rights" (herein referred to as the "Committee").

MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 2. (a) The Committee shall consist of eleven members, as follows:

(1) Two Members of the House of Representatives, one from each political party, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(2) Two Members of the Senate, one from each political party, appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(3) Seven members appointed from private life by the President of the United States.

(b) The Committee shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) The Committee is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as it deems advisable to conduct its activities.

(e) Members of the Committee each shall be entitled to receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of the powers and duties of the Committee, including travel time, and may receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

POWERS AND DUTIES

Sec. 3. The Committee is authorized and directed to conduct studies and formulate plans for effective and coordinated participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year". In the conduct of its activities, the Committee is authorized to—

(1) conduct studies, seminars, and meetings with appropriate parties in order to provide for effective participation in the observance of International Human Rights Year at the Federal, State, and local levels of government in the United States;

(2) explore the role of the United States in defining, expressing, and expanding the application of human rights principles in the United States and throughout the world;

(3) review past and present policies of the United States with respect to the universal application and preservation of human rights principles; and

(4) take such other action and conduct such other activities as may be appropriate to provide a basis for the observance by the United States of International Human Rights Year.

COOPERATION WITH COMMITTEE BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Sec. 4. (a) The Committee is authorized to request any department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government to furnish suggestions and information to the Committee in carrying out the functions of the Committee under this Act. The head of each such department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such suggestions and information to the Committee upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(b) Upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Committee, the head of each department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government shall otherwise cooperate with the Committee in the performance of the functions of the Committee and shall provide the Committee with such additional assistance and services as may be available.

STAFF OF COMMITTEE

Sec. 5. (a) The Committee shall appoint an executive secretary without regard to the civil service laws, prescribe his duties, and fix his compensation at a rate not to exceed the maximum rate payable under the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (79 Stat. 1111; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)).

(b) The Committee is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, and fix the compensation, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such personnel as it deems advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Committee may procure, in accordance with section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts and consultants. Individuals so employed shall be paid compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Committee but not in excess of $100 per diem, including traveltime, and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

REPORT AND TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE

Sec. 6. (a) The Committee shall submit to the President, not later than July 1, 1967, for transmittal to the Congress, a report of the activities of the Committee under this Act together with its recommendations, including recommendations as to the manner in which the most effective and coordinated participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year" may be accomplished and including recommendations as to the means by which the United States may contribute most effectively to the acceptance, observance, practice, and enforcement of the principles of human rights throughout the world in International Human Rights Year" and thereafter.

(b) From and after the submission of its report to the President under subsection (a) the Committee shall, under the direction of the President, continue as an informational and coordinating clearinghouse and center of United States participation in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year" and, to carry out such purpose, shall perform such additional duties as the President may impose upon it.

(c) The Committee shall cease to exist at the close of December 31, 1968.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this Act.

ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL TRAINING ACT OF 1966

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill recommended by the administration, the proposed Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966. In introducing the legislation I want to make it clear that I strongly support the expansion of our capacity for training allied health professions personnel.

Although I am introducing the bill, I am not endorsing at this time provisions of the legislation that would amend the student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students. The proposed legislation would encourage students in need of financial assistance to obtain federally guaranteed and subsidized loans from non-Federal sources. Under existing law, Federal contributions to student loans funds are authorized.

As the Senate author of the National Defense Education Act, I have been highly pleased with the present program of loans for needy students.

I plan to give careful attention to the proposed change in financing student loans and I shall consult with students, colleges, universities, and representatives of the banking community prior to taking any final action on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the measure be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3102) to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. HILL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3102

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966".

ADDITION OF PART G TO TITLE VII OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 2. Title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"Part G—Training in the allied health professions

"Grants for Construction of Teaching Facilities for Allied Health Professions Personnel

"Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 791. (a) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated for grants to assist in the construction of new facilities for training centers for allied health professions, or replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities for such centers, such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the next two fiscal years.

"(2) Sums appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall remain available for grants under this section until the close of the next fiscal year.

"Approval of applications for construction grants

"(b) (1) No application for a grant under this section may be approved unless it is submitted to the Surgeon General prior to July 1, 1968. The Surgeon General may from time to time set dates (not earlier than the fiscal year preceding the year for which a grant is sought) by which applications for grants under this section for any fiscal year must be filed.

"(2) A grant under this section may be made only if the application therefor is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(A) the applicant is a public or nonprofit private training center for allied health professions;

"(B) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (i) for not less than ten years after completion of construction, the facility will be used for the purposes of the training for which it is to be constructed, and will not be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, (ii) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, (iii) sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the training for which it is being constructed, and (iv) in the case of an application for a grant for construction to expand the training capacity of a training center for allied health professions, for the first full school year after the completion of the construction and for each of the nine years thereafter, the enrollment of full-time students at such center will exceed the highest enrollment of such students at such school for any of the five full school years preceding the year in which the application is made by at least 5 per centum of such highest enrollment, and the requirements of this clause (iv) shall be in addition to the requirements of section 792(b) (2), where applicable;

"(C) (i) in the case of an application for a grant for construction of a new facility, such application is for aid in the construction of a new training center for allied health professions, or construction which will expand the training capacity of an existing center, or (ii) in the case of an application for a grant for replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities, such application is for aid in construction which will replace or rehabilitate facilities of an existing training center for allied health professions which are so obsolete as to require the center to curtail substantially either its enrollment or the quality of the training provided;

"(D) the plans and specifications are in accordance with regulations relating to minimum standards of construction and equipment; and

"(E) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on the construction of the facility will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subparagraph (E), the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), in the case of an affiliated hospital (as defined in paragraph (3) of section 724), an application which is approved by the training center for allied health professions with which the hospital is affiliated and which otherwise complies with the requirements of this section, may be filed by any public or other nonprofit agency qualified to file an application under section 605.

"(4) In the case of any application, whether filed by a training center or, in the case of an affiliated hospital, by any other public or other nonprofit agency, for a grant under this section to assist in the construction of a facility which is a hospital or part of a hospital, as defined in section 625, only that portion of the project which the Surgeon General determines to be reasonably attributable to the need of such training center for the project for teaching purposes or in order to expand its training capacities or in order to prevent curtailment of enrollment or quality of training, as the case may be, shall be regarded as the project with respect to which payments may be made under this section.

"(5) In considering applications for grants, the Council and the Surgeon General shall take into account—

"(A) the extent to which the project for which the grant is sought will aid in increasing the number of training centers for allied health professions providing training in three or more of the curricula which are specified in or pursuant to paragraph (1) (A) of section 795 and are related to each other to the extent prescribed in regulations;

"(B) (i) in the case of a project for a new training center for allied health professions or for expansion of the facilities of an existing center, the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding the capacity for the training of students in the allied health professions involved and in promoting an equitable geographical distribution of opportunities for such training (giving due consideration to population, relative unavailability of allied health professions personnel of the kinds to be trained by such center, and available resources in various areas of the Nation for training such personnel); or

"(ii) in the case of a project for replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities of a training center for allied health professions, the relative need for such replacement or rehabilitation to prevent curtailment of the center's enrollment or deterioration of the quality of the training provided by the center, and the relative size of any such curtailment and its effect on the geographical distribution of opportunities for training in the allied health professions involved (giving consideration to the factors mentioned above in subparagraph (i)); and

"(C) in the case of an applicant in a State which has in existence a State or local area agency involved in planning for facilities for the training of allied health professions personnel, or which participates in a regional or other interstate agency involved in planning for such facilities, the relationship of the application to the construction or training program which is being developed by such agency or agencies and, if such agency or agencies have reviewed such application, any comment thereon submitted by them.

"Amount of construction grant; payments

"(c)(1) The amount of any grant for a construction project under this section shall be such amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate; except that (A) in the case of a grant for a project for a new training center for allied health professions, and in the case of a grant for a project for new facilities for an existing center where such facilities are of particular importance in providing a major expansion of the training capacity of such center, as determined in accordance with regulations, such amount may not exceed 66⅔ per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as determined by the Surgeon General, of such project; and (B) in the case of any other grant, such amount may not exceed 50 per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as so determined, of the project with respect to which the grant is made.

"(2) Upon approval of any application for a grant under this section, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under paragraph (1); the amount so reserved may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as the Surgeon General may determine. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this subsection may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"(3) In determining the amount of any grant under this section, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (A) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by the grant under this section, and (B) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

"Recapture of payments

"(d) If, within ten years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit private training center for allied health professions, or

"(2) the facility shall cease to be used for the training purposes for which it was constructed (unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so), or

"(3) the facility is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"Grants To Improve the Quality of Trading Centers for Allied Health Professions

"Authorization of appropriations

"Sec. 792. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the next two fiscal years such sums as may be necessary for grants under this section to assist training centers for allied health professions to develop new or improved curricula for training allied health professions personnel and otherwise improve the quality of their educational programs.

"Basic improvement grants

"(b)(1) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), the Surgeon General may, for each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1967, and ending June 30, 1969, make to each training center for allied health professions whose application for a basic improvement grant has been approved by him a grant equal to the product obtained by multiplying $5,000 by the number of curricula specified in or pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) of section 795 in which such center provides training during such year, plus the product obtained by multiplying $500 by the number of full-time students in such center receiving training in such curricula.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall not make a grant under this subsection to any center unless the application for such grant contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that for the first school year beginning after the fiscal year for which such grant is made and each school year thereafter during which such a grant is made the enrollment of full-time students at such center will exceed the highest enrollment of such students in such center for any of the five school years during the period July 1, 1961, through July 1, 1966, by at least 2½ per centum of such highest enrollment, or by three students, whichever is greater. The requirements of this paragraph shall be in addition to the requirements of section 791(b)(2)(B)(iv) of this Act, where applicable. The Surgeon General is authorized to waive (in whole or in part) the provisions of this paragraph if he determines, after consultation with the Council, that the required increase in enrollment of full-time students in a center cannot, because of limitations of physical facilities available to the center for training, be accomplished without lowering the quality of training for such students.

"Special improvement grants

"(c)(1) From the sums appropriated under subsection (a) for any fiscal year and not required for making grants under subsection (b), the Surgeon General may make an additional grant for such year to any training center for allied health professions which has an approved application therefor and for which an application has been approved under subsection (b), if he determines that the requirements of paragraph (2) are satisfied in the case of such applicant.

"(2) No special improvement grant shall be made under this section unless (A) the Surgeon General determines that such grant will be utilized by the recipient training center to contribute toward provision, maintenance, or improvement of specialized functions which the center serves, and (B) such center provides or will, with the aid of grants under this part, within a reasonable time provide training in not less than three of the curricula which are specified in or pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) of section 795 and are related to each other to the extent prescribed in regulations.

"(3) No grant to any center under this subsection may exceed $100,000 for any fiscal year.

"Application for grants

"(d)(1) The Surgeon General may from time to time set dates (not earlier than in the fiscal year preceding the year for which a grant is sought) by which applications for basic or special improvement grants under this section for any fiscal year must be filed.

"(2) A grant under this section may be made only if the application therefor is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(A) it contains or is supported by assurances satisfactory to the Surgeon General that the applicant is a public or nonprofit private training center for allied health professions and will expend in carrying out its functions as such a center, during the fiscal year for which such grant is sought, an amount of funds (other than funds for construction as determined by the Surgeon General) from non-Federal sources which are at least as great as the average amount of funds expended by such applicant for such purpose in the three fiscal years immediately preceding the fiscal year for which such grant is sought;

"(B) it contains such additional information as the Surgeon General may require to make the determinations required of him under this section and such assurances as he may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this section; and

"(C) it provides for such fiscal-control and accounting procedures and reports, and access to the records of the applicant, as the Surgeon General may require to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section.

"(3) In considering applications for grants under subsection (c), the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative financial need of the applicant for such a grant and the relative effectiveness of the applicant's plan in carrying out the purposes of such grants, and in contributing to an equitable geographical distribution of training centers offering high-quality training of allied health professions personnel.

"Traineeships for Advanced Training of Allied Health Professions Personnel

"Sec. 793. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the next two fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to cover the cost of traineeships for the training of allied health professions personnel to teach in any of the allied health professions, to serve in any of such professions in administrative or supervisory capacities, or to serve in allied health professions specialties determined by the Surgeon General to require advanced training.

"(b) Traineeships under this section shall be awarded by the Surgeon General through grants to public or nonprofit private training centers for allied health professions.

"(c) Payments to centers under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions, as the Surgeon General finds necessary. Such payments may be used only for traineeships and shall be limited to such amounts as the Surgeon General finds necessary to cover the costs of tuition and fees, and a stipend and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for the trainees.

"Development of New Methods

"Sec. 794. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the next two fiscal years such sums as may be necessary for grants to public or nonprofit private training centers for allied health professions for projects to develop, demonstrate, or evaluate curricula for the training of new types of health technologists.

"Definitions

"Sec. 795. For purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'training center for allied health professions' means a department, division, or other administrative unit (in a college or university)—

"(A) which provides, primarily or exclusively, programs of education leading to a baccalaureate or equivalent degree or to a higher degree in the medical technology, dental hygiene, or any of such other of the allied health professions curriculums as are specified by regulations,

"(B) which provides training for not less than a total of 20 persons in such curriculum,

"(C) which, if the college or university does not include a teaching hospital, is affiliated (to the extent and in the manner determined in accordance with regulations) with such a hospital,

"(D) which is (or is in a college or university, which is) accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, and

"(E) in the case of an applicant for a grant under section 793, which, if the college or university does not include a school of medicine or a school of dentistry, as defined in paragraph (4) of section 724, or both, as may be appropriate in the light of the training for which the grant is to be made, is affiliated (to the extent and in the manner determined in accordance with regulations) with such a school,

except that an applicant for a grant for a construction project under section 791 which does not at the time of application meet the requirement of clause (B) shall be deemed to meet such requirement if the Surgeon General finds there is reasonable assurance that the unit will meet the requirement of clause (B) prior to the beginning of the academic year following the normal graduation date of the first entering class in such unit, or, if later, upon completion of the project for which assistance is requested and other projects (if any) under construction or planned and to be commenced within a reasonable time.

"(2) The term 'full-time student' means a student pursuing a full-time course of study, in one of the curriculums specified in or pursuant to paragraph (1) (A) of this section, leading to a baccalaureate or equivalent degree, or to a higher degree, in a training center for allied health professions; regulations of the Surgeon General shall include provisions relating to determination of the number of students enrolled at a training center on the basis of estimates, or on the basis of the number of students enrolled in a training center in an earlier year, or on such basis as he deems appropriate for making such determination, and shall include methods of making such determinations when a training center was not in existence in an earlier year.

"(3) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any training center for allied health professions means one which is a corporation or association, or is owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(4) The terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction' include (A) the construction of new buildings, and the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, replacement, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land (except in the case of acquisition of an existing building), offsite improvements, living quarters, or patient-care facilities, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings, whether or not expanded, remodeled, or altered."

PER DIEM FOR ADVISORY COUNCILS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 725(c) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100".

(b) Section 841(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "$75" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100".

LOAN REIMBURSEMENT PAYMENTS FOR HEALTH PERSONNEL

SEC. 4. (a) Section 741(f) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of a physician, the rate shall be 15 per centum (rather than 10 per centum) for each year of such practice in an area in a State which for purposes of this subsection and for that year has been determined by the Secretary, pursuant to regulations and after consultation with the appropriate State health authority, to be a rural area characterized by low family income; and for the purpose of payments pursuant to this sentence, an amount equal to an additional 50 per centum of the total amount of such loans plus interest may be canceled."

(b) Section 741 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) In order to encourage students who have obtained a loan under this part to refinance such loan through the student loan program carried out under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and likewise to encourage students to obtain new loans under such part B program in lieu of obtaining such loans under this part, a student who does so with the approval of the educational institution involved shall, with respect to so much of the loan under such part B as—

"(1) is a refinancing of a student loan made by the institution under this part, or

"(2) in the case of a loan under such part B obtained in lieu of a loan from the institution, does not exceed the amount which he was eligible to borrow from the institution,

be entitled, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, to have the following loan reimbursement payments paid to him by the Secretary: Whereas such person—

"(1) engages in the practice of medicine, dentistry, optometry, or osteopathy in an area in a State determined by the appropriate State health authority, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to have a shortage of and need for physicians, optometrists or dentists; and

"(2) the appropriate State health authority certifies to the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, that such practice helps to meet the shortage of and need for physicians, optometrists, or dentists in the area where the practice occurs, then an amount equal to 10 per centum of the total amount of each such loan shall be paid for each year of such practice, up to a total of an amount equal to 50 per centum of such loan. In the case of a physician, the annual amount shall be 15 per centum (rather than 10 per centum) for each year of such practice in an area in a State which for purposes of this paragraph and for that year has been determined by the Secretary, pursuant to regulations and after consultation with the appropriate State health authority, to be a rural area characterized by low family income, and for the purpose of payments pursuant to this sentence, an amount equal to an additional 50 per centum of any such loan may be paid.

No payment shall be made under this subsection for service performed more than fifteen years from the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing it."

(c) Section 823 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) In order to encourage students who have obtained a loan under this part to refinance such loan through the student loan program carried out under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and likewise to encourage students to obtain new loans under such part B program in lieu of obtaining such loans under this part, a student who does so with the approval of the educational institution involved shall, with respect to so much of the loan under such part B as—

"(1) is a refinancing of a student loan made by the institution under this part, or

"(2) in the case of a loan under such part B obtained in lieu of a loan from the institution, does not exceed the amount which he was eligible to borrow from the institution,

be entitled, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, to have paid to such student by the Secretary, as loan reimbursements, an amount equal to 10 per centum of the total principal amount of any such loan for each complete year of service as a full-time professional nurse (including teaching in any of the fields of nurse training and service as an administrator, supervisor, or consultant in any of the fields of nursing) in any public or nonprofit private institution or agency, up to a total of an amount equal to 50 per centum of such loan. No payment shall be made under this subsection for service performed more than fifteen years from the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing it."

(d)(1) The second sentence of section 435(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to the definition of "eligible institution") is amended to read as follows: "Such term also includes any public or other nonprofit school of health or school of nursing, and any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5)."

(2) Such section 435 is further amended by striking out all that follows subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The term 'school of health' means a school which meets the accreditation requirements of clause (5) of subsection (a) and which provides training leading to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, doctor of osteopathy, bachelor of science in pharmacy or doctor of pharmacy, doctor of podiatry or doctor of surgical chiropody, or doctor of optometry or an equivalent degree.

"(c) The term 'school of nursing' means a collegiate, associate degree, or diploma school of nursing.

"(d) The term 'collegiate school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

"(e) The term 'associate degree school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

"(f) The term 'diploma school of nursing' means a school affiliated with a hospital or university, or an independent school, which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to a diploma or to equivalent indicia that such program has been satisfactorily completed.

"(g) The term 'accredited' when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education.

"(h) The term 'eligible lender' means an eligible institution, an agency or instrumentality of a State, or a financial or credit institution (including an insurance company) which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State.

"(i) The term 'line of credit' means an arrangement or agreement between the lender and the borrower whereby a loan is paid out by the lender to the borrower in annual installments, or whereby the lender agrees to make, in addition to the initial loan, additional loans in subsequent years."

ENCOURAGING PRIVATE CAPITAL FOR LOANS TO STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE, OSTEOPATHY, DENTISTRY, PHARMACY, PODIATRY, AND OPTOMETRY

SEC. 5. (a) Part C of title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Encouraging Private Capital for Student Loans

"SEC. 746. (a) For the purpose of substituting for direct Federal support to the maximum extent practicable private and other non-Federal funds for student loans, the Secretary is authorized to provide the following forms of assistance, upon such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, for the benefit of students attending schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, pharmacy, podiatry, and optometry:

"(1) If such a school borrows non-Federal funds (or otherwise receives or makes available repayable non-Federal funds) for deposit in a student loan fund established under this part, the Secretary may (A) guarantee timely repayment of all or part of such funds (plus interest thereon), (B) agree to reimburse the school for up to 90 per centum of the loss to it from defaults on student loans made from such funds, and (C) agree to pay to the school the amount of the interest differential (as defined in subsection (c)) with respect to such funds.

"(2) If such a school arranges for a student assistance organization (as defined in subsection (c)) to make loans to students attending the school, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with the organization upon the terms set forth in section 740 and may (A) guarantee timely repayment of funds (plus interest thereon) borrowed by the organization for deposit in its student loan fund established under this part, (B) agree to reimburse the organization for up to 90 per centum of the loss to it from defaults on student loans made from such borrowed funds, and (C) agree to pay to the organization the amount of the interest differential with respect to such borrowed funds. A student assistance organization with which the Secretary makes an agreement pursuant to this paragraph shall be deemed to be a school described in section 740(a) for purpose of applying the other provisions of this part.

"(3) If such a school enters into arrangement with one or more lenders pursuant to which the lender makes loans (upon terms and conditions set forth in section 741) in such amounts and to such students as the school may determine on the basis of the criteria set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of section 741, the Secretary may (A) guarantee to the lender timely repayment of the loans (including amounts thereof which are canceled), and (B) agree to pay to the lender such amount as the Secretary determines will give the lender, considering the interest on the loan, a reasonable rate of return on such loan. The Secretary shall condition any such assistance upon agreement by the school to pay the Secretary promptly an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount paid by him to the lender on account of defaults on such student loans.

"(b) The assistance provided by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall be subject to the following limitations:

"(1) If the interest on an obligation is exempt from income taxation by reason of section 103(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Secretary shall not guarantee timely payment of that obligation except during such time or times as it is held beneficially by a holder which is exempt from income tax because it is a State or an instrumentality of a State or because of section 501(c) of such Code.

"(2) No payment shall be made under this section with respect to a loan if the rate of interest on that loan exceeds such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding as the Secretary (after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury) determines to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and the rate of interest the borrower pays or would have to pay with respect to other loans of a similar duration.

"(c) For purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'interest differential' means the excess of (A) the amount of interest paid by a school or organization with respect to sums deposited by it as capital contributions to a student loan fund established under this part, over (B) the amount of interest received by it on student loans made from such funds.

"(2) The term 'student assistance organization' means a nonprofit organization authorized to make loans to students in one or more schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, pharmacy, podiatry, or optometry.

"Revolving Fund; Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 747. (a) There is hereby created in the Treasury a separate fund (hereinafter in this section called 'the fund') which shall be available to the Secretary without fiscal year limitation as a revolving fund for making deposits into the student loan funds of schools which have agreements with the Secretary under this part but which for legal or other reasons are unable (as determined by the Secretary) to take adequate advantage of assistance under section 746. Deposits made from the fund shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem appropriate, and they may be made without regard to the allocation provisions of section 742(b). There shall be deposited into the fund all amounts appropriated pursuant to this section, all amounts appropriated pursuant to section 742(a) and not obligated prior to the date of enactment of this section, all amounts received by the Secretary as repayments of sums deposited by him in student loan funds, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations in connection with the fund, including any moneys derived directly or indirectly from the sale of assets, or beneficial interests or participations in assets, of the fund. There shall be paid from the fund all expenses and payments of the Secretary in connection with the sale (through the Federal National Mortgage Association or otherwise) of participations in obligations acquired under this part. If at any time the Secretary determines that moneys in the fund exceed the requirements of the fund, such excess shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated $22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and such sums for the succeeding fiscal year as may be necessary for making payments into the fund established under subsection (a).

"(2) In order to receive deposits from the fund (and notwithstanding section 741(g)), a school must agree to require each student who receives a loan financed from such capital contributions to authorize in writing assignment to the Secretary of the note or other evidence of that loan, and the note or other evidence of each prior loan made by the school to the student under this part, and the school must agree to assign to the Secretary so much of these notes or other evidence of loans as he may determine. The school shall continue to collect, as agent of the Secretary and for so long as he may determine, payments of principal and interest with respect to any such notes or other evidence of loans which may be assigned. Ten per centum of such payments with respect to notes or other evidence of loans which have been assigned shall be retained by the school and 90 per centum of such payments shall be paid to the Secretary.

"(c)(1) For any fiscal year, the aggregate of (A) the amount of loans which may be guaranteed under clause (A) of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) of section 746, (B) the amount of any other loans with respect to which the Secretary agrees to pay the interest differential authorized by section 746(a), (C) the amount of deposits to student loan funds made from the fund established under subsection (a), and (D) the amount of loans with respect to which the Secretary may be required, by virtue of section 741(j), to make loan reimbursement payments, may not exceed such maximum amount as may be authorized by an appropriation Act, except that this amount in turn may not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated for that year by section 742(a). Whenever a specified maximum amount is so authorized by an appropriation Act, there shall be established on the books of the Treasury as indefinite appropriations such sums as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Secretary to make payments required by a contract of guaranty or by any other undertaking made by him pursuant to section 746 with respect to such maximum amount.

"(2) For any fiscal year, the share of the maximum amount determined under paragraph (1) which shall be available for students attending any school shall be determined by the Secretary by allocating such maximum amount among schools and organizations with which he has agreements under this part in a manner which he deems to be consistent, considering the availability of student assistance under title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965, with the provisions of section 742(b)."

(b) Section 743(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) After September 30, 1966, each school with which the Secretary has made an agreement under this part shall pay to the Secretary, not less often than quarterly, 90 per centum (or such lesser proportion as the Secretary may deem to be equitable in light of the relative contributions to the loan fund) of the amounts received by the school after that date in payment of principal or interest on student loans made from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement, and the remainder of such amounts shall be retained by the institutions."

ENCOURAGING PRIVATE CAPITAL FOR LOANS TO STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS OF NURSING

SEC. 6. (a) Part B of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Encouraging Private Capital for Student Loans

"Sec. 829. (a) For the purpose of substituting for direct Federal support to the maximum extent practicable private and other non-Federal funds for student loans, the Secretary is authorized to provide the following forms of assistance, upon such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, for the benefit of students attending schools of nursing:

"(1) If such a school borrows non-Federal funds (or otherwise receives or makes available repayable non-Federal funds) for deposit in a student loan fund established under this part, the Secretary may (A) guarantee timely repayment of all or part of such funds (plus interest thereon), (B) agrees to reimburse the school for up to 90 per centum of the loss to it from defaults on student loans made from such funds, and (C) agrees to pay to the school the amount of the interest differential (as defined in subsection (c)) with respect to such funds.

"(2) If such a school arranges for a student assistance organization (as defined in subsection (c)) to make loans to students attending the school, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with the organization upon the terms set forth in section 822(b) and may (A) guarantee timely repayment of funds (plus interest thereon) borrowed by the organization for deposit in a student loan fund established under this part, (B) agree to reimburse the organization for up to 90 per centum of the loss to it from defaults on student loans made from such borrowed funds, and (C) agree to pay to the organization the amount of the interest differential with respect to such borrowed funds. A student assistance organization with which the Secretary makes an agreement pursuant to this paragraph shall be deemed to be a school of nursing for purpose of applying the other provisions of this part.

"(3) If such a school enters into an arrangement with one or more lenders pursuant to which the lender makes loans (upon terms and conditions set forth in section 823 (b)) in such amounts and to such students as the school may determine on the basis of the criteria set forth in section 823, the Secretary may (A) guarantee to the lender timely repayment of the loans (including amounts thereof which are canceled), and (B) agree to pay to the lender such amount as the Secretary determines will give the lender, considering the interest on the loan, a reasonable rate of return on such loan. The Secretary shall condition any such assistance upon agreement by the school to pay the Secretary promptly an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount paid by him to the lender on account of defaults on such student loans.

"(b) The assistance provided by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall be subject to the following limitations:

"(1) If the interest on an obligation is exempt from income taxation by reason of section 103(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Secretary shall not guarantee timely payment of that obligation except during such time or times as it is held beneficially by a holder which is exempt from income tax because it is a State or an instrumentality of a State or because of section 501(c) of such Code.

"(2) No payment shall be made under this section with respect to a loan if the rate of interest on that loan exceeds such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding as the Secretary (after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury) determines to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and the rate of interest the borrower pays or would have to pay with respect to other loans of a similar duration.

"(c) For purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'interest differential' means the excess of (A) the amount of interest paid by a school or organization with respect to sums deposited by it as capital contributions to a student loan fund established under this part, over (B) the amount of interest received by it on student loans made from such funds.

"(2) The term 'student assistance organization' means a nonprofit organization authorized to make loans to students in one or more schools of nursing.

"Revolving Fund; Appropriations Authorized

"Sec. 830. (a) There is hereby created in the Treasury a separate fund (hereinafter in this section called 'the fund') which shall be available to the Secretary without fiscal year limitation as a revolving fund for making Federal capital contributions to schools which have agreements with the Secretary under this part but which for legal or other reasons are unable (as determined by the Secretary) to take adequate advantage of assistance under section 829. Federal capital contributions made from the fund shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem appropriate, and they may be made without regard to the allocation provisions of section 825. There shall be deposited into the fund all amounts appropriated pursuant to this section, all amounts appropriated pursuant to section 824 and not obligated prior to the date of enactment of this section, all amounts received by the Secretary as repayments of sums deposited by him in student loan funds, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations in connection with the fund, including any moneys derived directly or indirectly from the sale of assets, or beneficial interests or participations in assets, of the fund. There shall be paid from the fund all payments to schools required by section 823(c) with respect to student loans financed from capital contributions from the fund, and all expenses and payments of the Secretary in connection with the sale (through the Federal National Mortgage Association or otherwise) of participations in obligations acquired under this part. If at any time the Secretary determines that moneys in the fund exceed the requirements of the fund, such excess shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and such sums for the succeeding fiscal year as may be necessary for making payments into the fund established under subsection (a).

"(2) In order to receive capital contributions from the fund (and notwithstanding section 823(b)(7)), a school must agree to require each student who receives a loan financed from such capital contributions to authorize in writing assignment to the Secretary of the note or other evidence of that loan, and the note or other evidence of each prior loan made by the school to the student under this part, and the school must agree to assign to the Secretary so much of these notes or other evidence of loans as he may determine. The school shall continue to collect, as agent of the Secretary and for so long as he may determine, payments of principal and interest with respect to any such notes or other evidence of loans which may be assigned. Ten per centum of such payments with respect to notes or other evidence of loans which have been assigned shall be retained by the school and 90 per centum of such payments shall be paid to the Secretary.

"(c)(1) For any fiscal year, the aggregate of (A) the amount of loans which may be guaranteed under clause (A) of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) of section 829, (B) the amount of any other loans with respect to which the Secretary agrees to pay the interest differential authorized by section 829(a), (C) the amount of capital contributions to student loan funds made from the fund established under subsection (a), and (D) the amount of loans with respect to which the Secretary may be required, by virtue of section 823(f), to make loan reimbursement payments, may not exceed such maximum amount as may be authorized by an appropriation Act, except that this amount in turn may not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated for that year by section 824. Whenever a specified maximum amount is so authorized by an appropriation Act, there shall be established on the books of the Treasury as indefinite appropriations such sums as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Secretary to make payments required by a contract of guarantee or by any other undertaking made by him pursuant to section 829 with respect to such maximum amount.

"(2) For any fiscal year, the share of the maximum amount determined under paragraph (1) which shall be available for students attending any school shall be determined by the Secretary by allocating such maximum amount among schools and organizations with which he has agreements under this part in a manner which he deems to be consistent, considering the availability of student assistance under title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965, with the provisions of section 825."

(b) Section 826(b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) After September 30, 1966, each school with which the Secretary has made an agreement under this part shall pay to the Secretary, not less often than quarterly, 90 per centum (or such lesser proportion as the Secretary may deem to be equitable in light of the relative contributions to the loan fund) of the amounts received by the school after that date in payment of principal or interest on student loans made from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement, and the remainder of such amounts shall be retained by the institutions."

(c) Paragraph (1) of section 806(c) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting "(A)" after "year" and by inserting the following before the semicolon at the end of such paragraph: ", or (B) a loan of $100 or more (i) pursuant to section 823(f) (except so much as refinances a loan) or (ii) pursuant to section 829(a)(3)".

AUTHORIZING LOAN INSURANCE FOR LOANS TO REFINANCE LOANS MADE FROM FEDERALLY ASSISTED STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

Sec. 7. A loan by an eligible lender (as that term is defined in section 435 of the Higher Education Act of 1965) shall also be insurable by the Commissioner of Education, or by a State or nonprofit private institution or organization, under the provisions of title IV–B of that Act if it is made for the purpose of enabling the borrower to repay one or more student loans obtained by him from a loan fund established under title VII or VIII of the Public Health Service Act. The Commissioner of Education shall promulgate such regulations as he may deem appropriate to assure that loans which are insurable by virtue of this section shall be used for the purpose for which they are made. A loan shall be insurable by virtue of this section only if it is evidenced by a note or other written agreement which meets the requirements of section 427(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, except that if the repayment period has begun for any loan which is to be repaid, the new loan may not be insured unless its repayment period begins when the loan is paid to the borrower.

The amount of any loan which is made insurable by virtue of this section shall not be included in determining whether a student has exceeded the annual or aggregate limits set forth in section 425(a)(1) or section 428(c)(1)(A) of such Act.

DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL COIN WEEK

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to designate April 16–23 as National Coin Week.

The Valparaiso, Ind., Coin Club, which has urged the naming of such a week, is only one of many numismatic clubs and societies which have promoted the hobby of coin collecting with vigor. Interest in this activity has grown rapidly in recent years, and because this is a hobby whose subject involves in part the history and development of our coinage system, its recognition in this fashion is appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 146) to designate the week of April 16–23 as National Coin Week, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REREFERRAL OF S. 3031 TO COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is the unit of the Senate that has initial responsibility for national historic sites, national monuments, national parks, and Federal recreation areas in general. Also this committee has jurisdiction over most of the activities of the Department of the Interior.

Since the National Visitor Center bill, S. 3031, will be under the administration of the Interior Department, the members of the Interior Committee feel it desirable that this committee also should consider the legislation which was properly referred to the Committee on Public Works on Monday, March 7. The Members of the Senate will recall that the sponsor of the measure, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] graciously acknowledged our interest in this matter.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, S. 3031, establishing a National Visitor Center in Washington, D.C., be rereferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs after the Committee on Public Works has completed its consideration of the measure.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOTYPE SAFE MOTOR VEHICLES

AMENDMENT NO. 506

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce an amendment to S. 3005, a bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries and property damage which occur in such accidents. The amendment which I propose would authorize $5 million for the use by a Secretary of Transportation yet to be created to pay up to 90 percent of the cost of carrying out State programs for the design, development, construction, and testing of passenger motor vehicles in prototype quantities.

I was quite pleased to hear in recent hearings before the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee that the State of New York under the bipartisan leadership within the State legislature of State Senators Speno and Leibowitz and through the efforts of the Republic Aviation Corp., which conducted the feasibility study, has already made a great deal of progress in the development of plans for the building of such a prototype car. The New York feasibility study showed that it is possible to build a prototype car which will prevent the majority of injuries and fatalities from occurring even at impact speeds of 50 miles per hour. This is particularly significant in view of the fact that 90 percent of auto fatalities occur at impact speeds of 40 miles per hour or less. The New York program or any program from any other State would be eligible for Federal assistance if this amendment is adopted. I am proud that my State has led the way and the Federal Government should now lend its support.

The President's proposed Traffic Safety Act of 1966 would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to undertake research, development and testing activities, including the fabrication or purchase of motor vehicles or motor vehicle equipment for research and testing purposes—section 104(b). I regard this language as authorizing the Secretary to construct or finance the construction and testing of prototype safety cars. Yet, after studying the President's bill, I must express my regret that it contains no clear provision for Federal-State cooperation in the building of a prototype safety car. I think the time has come for us to quit talking in the vague terminology of more research and instead get on with the job of designing and building a safer automobile; 1965 was yet another year in which American deaths continued to rise on our highways at an even more alarming rate. The figures look something like this: 49,000 killed; 4½ million injured; 8.5 billion lost in property damage and man-hours. It may be very difficult to control the human factor and thus prevent the accidents from happening in the first place. That is to say the death toll does not represent only bad drivers. For this reason, I believe greater attention should be directed toward minimizing the results of accidents which do occur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have become increasingly aware during the course of the traffic safety hearings before the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee presided over by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], that the Federal Government must increase its role in the field of traffic safety. At the same time, I believe that the States must do their part in this very important battle against a death rate of almost 1,000 per week. Accordingly, I support the President's plan for Federal grants to the States for highway safety research, but I firmly believe a specific program for the building of a prototype safety car should be included in the legislation.

I would hope that the automobile industry will voluntarily accept the challenge of supplying the American consumer with a much safer car. Certainly the automobile companies should devote far greater efforts than they have in the past toward that end, and some mandatory criteria may well become necessary. I hope the Members of the Senate will join me in supporting this Federal-State approach to the design, building, and testing of a prototype safety car.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed the Record.

The amendment (No. 506) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

"GRANTS TO STATES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOTYPE SAFE MOTOR VEHICLES

"Sec. 105. (a) Upon application by a State, the Secretary is authorized to make a grant pursuant to the provisions of this section for the payment of up to 90 per centum of the cost of a program to design, develop, construct and test fully operational passenger motor vehicles in prototype quantities embodying such safety features as the Secretary, after consultation with such State, shall prescribe. The purpose of such program shall be to obtain basic information toward the establishment of minimum safety equipment and design standards. Such application by a State shall—

"(1) designate, to carry out such program, a State agency that has demonstrated competence in the design, development and construction of such passenger motor vehicles;

"(2) set forth a detailed and comprehensive analysis of such program, including a cost analysis and a feasibility study;

"(3) contain assurances that the designated agency has authority to carry out such program in conformity with this section and the application, and that such State will pay from non-Federal sources the remaining cost of such program;

"(4) provide such fiscal control, fund accounting, and reporting procedures as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and

"(5) contain such further information and assurances as the Secretary may by regulation require.

"(b) The Secretary may approve any application which he determines conforms to the requirements of the preceding subsection."

On page 8, line 6, strike out "section 113" and insert in lieu thereof "section 114".

On page 10, line 17, strike out "Sec. 105" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 106".

On page 11, line 6, strike out "Sec. 106" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 107".

On page 12, line 7, strike out "Sec. 107" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 108".

On page 12, line 19, strike out "section 111(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 112(b)".

On page 14, line 2, strike out "Sec. 108" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 109".

On page 14, lines 2 and 3, strike out "section 107" and insert in lieu thereof "section 108".

On page 14, line 5, strike out "section 107" and insert in lieu thereof "section 108".

On page 14, line 16, strike out "Sec. 109" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 110".

On page 15, line 13, strike out "Sec. 110" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 111".

On page 15, line 15, strike out "section 107" and insert in lieu thereof "section 108".

On page 18, line 19, strike out "Sec. 111" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 112".

On page 19, line 23, strike out "Sec. 112" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 113".

On page 20, line 11, strike out "Sec. 113" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 114".

On page 20, line 17, strike out "Sec. 114" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 115".

On page 20, line 22, strike out "Sec. 115" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 116".

On page 20, in lines 24 and 25, strike out "$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 of which not to exceed $5,000,000 shall be for grants pursuant to section 105".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 142

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 142, which deals with representation in Congress for the District of Columbia, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** There being no objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill, joint resolution, and concurrent resolution:

Authority of March 8, 1966:

S. 3049. A bill to amend the Social Security Act in order to provide for a Talented American Senior Corps: Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Randolph.

Authority of March 9, 1966:

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

S. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution to express sense of Congress as to continuing the Small Business Administration as an independent agency: Mr. Dominick, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON S. 3046

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on March 7, 1966, I introduced for the administration S. 3046, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966.

Hearings on this measure are scheduled to take place before the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare starting March 31, 1966, at which time the subcommittee expects to take testimony from Secretary Gardner and administration witnesses. On Friday, April 1, Monday, April 4, and Tuesday, April 5 the hearings will continue with testimony to be taken from outside witnesses. I serve official notice in these remarks of the hearings scheduled as I have listed them.

If need is shown for additional time, the subcommittee tentatively plans to continue the hearings later in April.

I am announcing these hearings because I know that many Senators may wish to be heard on various proposals contained in the bill and because of the interest in it on the part of the educational community. Those who wish to submit statements or to be heard on the measure are urged to communicate by letter as soon as is conveniently possible with the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, room 4230, New Senate Office Building.

It is our hope that, as in previous years, it will be possible to arrange our witnesses in panels covering the areas of the bill, and while no limitation is placed on written statements for the record, in view of the large number of witnesses expected it is hoped that oral testimony can be kept within a 15- or 20-minute time limitation.

I can assure each witness that full and careful consideration will be given by me and my colleagues on the subcommittee to the written materials submitted.

Mr. President, I further announce that it is my intention to take testimony in conjunction with testimony taken on S. 3046 on the following bills:

S. 2778, introduced by Senator Montoya.

S. 2928, introduced by Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts.

S. 3012, introduced by Senator Hartke.

Many Senators have introduced or have indicated their intention to introduce extension legislation on the impacted areas. On the date to be announced later, when testimony will be taken from impacted areas school superintendents, I would be most pleased to hear the views of Senators touching upon legislation they have introduced so that in executive session the subcommittee may be able to give full consideration to these many amendments.

BRITISH SHIPS TO GET OUT OF NORTH VIETNAM TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently I commented on the Department of State's efforts to eliminate free world trade with North Vietnam and inserted in the Record on March 8 a letter I had received in reply to my letter of inquiry to Secretary Rusk.

I am further advised now that all British-flag vessels based in the United Kingdom are either out of trade or getting out of it. The number of Hong Kong-based British flagships, owned by non-Communists engaged in the trade, has also been reduced. These remaining British-flag ships are small coastal vessels owned and registered in Hong Kong by Chinese Communist operators.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1966.

Hon. Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate

Dear Senator Javits: I was pleased to note that you had my letter of March 4 published in the Congressional Record of March 8. You commented that the State Department's actions in eliminating free world trade with North Vietnam have been effective, but that there was no indication of progress being made in our talks with the United Kingdom.

I should like to take this opportunity to tell you of the progress we have made in removing British-flag vessels from the North Vietnam trade. According to our information all British-flag vessels based in the United Kingdom are either out of the trade or getting out of it. The number of Hong Kong based British flagships, owned by non-Communists engaged in the trade, has also been reduced. These remaining British flagships are small coastal vessels owned and registered in Hong Kong by Chinese Communist operators which I mentioned in my earlier letter to you. We have more information on this aspect of the problem which I shall be glad to tell you about if you have time for an appointment before your departure for Latin America.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you, and I trust that you will let me know if there are further questions.

Sincerely,

Douglas MacArthur II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

THE PURCHASING OF SURPLUS EQUIPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Chautauqua County, N.Y. regarding purchase of surplus property urging authority for municipalities to purchase surplus equipment prior to offering to public.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 61–1966

A resolution urging authority for municipalities to purchase surplus equipment prior to offering to public

Whereas the county of Essex has forwarded a resolution to Chautauqua County which reads as follows:

"Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be used for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

"Whereas, the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

"Whereas, the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

"Whereas, it is the consensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment should be available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Essex hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law, and other applicable statues to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it

"*Resolved,* That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment, at appraised value before the same are sold to the public, and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the clerk of this Board of Supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Supervisors' Association, Association of Towns, the County Officers Association, County Highway Superintendents Association, Town Highway Superintendents Association, Senator Ronald B. Stafford, Assemblyman Richard Bartlett, Congressman Carleton J. King, Senator Jacob Javits, Senator Robert Kennedy, and all other county boards of supervisors of the State of New York." and

Whereas the counties of Ontario and Dutchess have supported this principle, and

Whereas it seems that such procedure for surplus property as is outlined above would be advantageous to all municipalities in the State; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chautauqua County Board of Supervisors joins with the Boards above mentioned in requesting introduction and passage of a law to accomplish the same, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to County Officers Association and the various other named associations, also to the legislators representing this county both in the State legislative and the Federal legislative bodies.

Norman Bell.

Attest:

Marie E. Bemis,
Clerk of Board of Supervisors.

RETIREMENT OF DAVID DUBINSKY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I note with deep regret the resignation of David Dubinsky as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. No American labor leader has done more to bring to fruition the highest objectives of those who founded the labor union movement. For over 30 years David Dubinsky has exhibited to all the essence of honest, integrated, responsible unionism. The entire labor movement and the rest of the Nation are indebted to this imaginative man for his constant devotion to the highest interests of the American workingman. Certainly we hope for his continued counsel in the years ahead.

David Dubinksy passes on to his successors a great tradition and a great responsibility. Knowing them as I do, I am sure they will prove worthy of it. David Dubinsky's life story is also an inspiration to all Americans in that he has risen from immigrant boy to an outstanding national figure. Laden with honors and achievement, he richly deserves many years of enjoyable retirement.

I ask unanimous consent to insert an editorial from today's New York Times praising Mr. Dubinsky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pioneer in Union Statesmanship

In his more than three decades as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, David Dubinsky has made his own name and that of his union synonymous with social responsibility and creativity. His retirement at the age of 74 deprives the Nation as well as organized labor of one of its most constructive voices. The loss is particularly acute for New York City, where the garment union has long played a pivotal role in the city's biggest industry.

Mr. Dubinsky preceded Walter P. Reuther and George Meany in enunciating the concept that labor must go forward with the community and not at the expense of the community. He helped emancipate the workers of the old Jewish and Italian ghettos from the sweatshop, then turned to the still unfinished task of protecting a new generation of Negro and Puerto Rican workers from the erosive effect on union wages of competition from "runaway" employers in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the South.

A lifelong foe of union racketeers, he was a chief architect of the ethical practices codes of the AFL–CIO. When it became clear in the early scandals over maladministration of many union welfare and pension funds that labor could not do the cleanup job alone, he was principally responsible for persuading the rest of organized labor to abandon its traditional resistance to any form of Government help in eradicating abuses.

He has never lost the sense that unionism is a cause, not a business. He extended that conception into the political realm in the last municipal election by throwing his energies into John V. Lindsay's fusion campaign, instead of lining up with Mr. Meany and the Central Labor Council in ritualistic adherence to the old-line Democrats.

To all his activities he has brought excitement and imagination, and these qualities will be especially missed in a movement increasingly dominated by organization men. The union's sound policies undoubtedly will continue under Louis Stulberg, its dedicated and able secretary-treasurer, who seems virtually certain to move up to the top spot, but no one will be able to duplicate the Dubinsky gusto.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, today on the desks of my colleagues lie green carnations symbolic of the 17th of March—St. Patrick's Day.

This tribute comes from the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America and their ladies auxiliary.

The privilege is mine this year to sponsor the tribute because the national president of the Hibernians is a fellow citizen of my native Providence—William J. McEnery.

This is no small honor—for the membership of the Hibernians, including the ladies auxiliary, surpasses 197,000.

March 17 also happens to be my birthday.

How thrilled I have been to celebrate with my Irish friends this date—one of the most universally celebrated—observed all over the world—wherever sons and daughters of Ireland may gather to recall the glorious St. Patrick and his conversion to Christianity of the entire population of Ireland.

Patrick, born in the year A.D. 372 was brought as a captive slave to Ireland in his 16th year. He grew to love the land and the language.

Though he managed to escape after 6 years, he returned as a missionary at the age of 60 on his errand of religion and peace. St. Patrick saw the fruition of his work in this "isle of doctors and of saints." With his mission completed, St. Patrick's life ended at the Abbey of Saul and he was interred nearby at Downpatrick.

The faith that St. Patrick instilled in Ireland has survived every persecution—and exiled men of Ireland have carried to every clime the courage of those refusing to be slaves—the character of those determined to be free.

It was such a spirit that gave rise to the Hibernians of Ireland in 1562—over 400 years ago. They opposed a religion and a political domination alien to Hibernia—which was the ancient name of Ireland.

In 1836, a group of Irishmen in America sought authorization from the Ancient Order of Hibernians in Ireland for a counterpart in this land.

So—through various states—the Hibernian principles of friendship, unity, and Christian charity grew here in a loyalty to America that was not dimmed by a love for a remembered land.

Here in Washington we have visible evidence. The Catholic University of America has a Gaelic chair as the $50,000 gift of the Hibernians—and the ladies auxiliary has financed a similar gift to Trinity College.

There is here in Washington another gift of the ladies auxiliary of the Hibernians which holds a special appeal to me.

It is a most human memorial—a historic monument in one of the tiniest of national parks.

It is a Civil War memorial dedicated to the "nuns of the battlefield."

The monument stands before St. Matthew's Cathedral on a tiny triangle where M Street meets with Rhode Island Avenue.

It depicts nuns in the habits of 12 different orders who served on the battlefields of the Civil War from Gettysburg to Galveston.

They are largely nuns from Ireland—as history actually records the individual names and the places of their birth.

The ladies auxiliary of the AOH appropriated $50,000 for this monument. But the services of the nuns had to be documented in every detail before the Congress of the United States would accept it. The documentation was forthcoming—and the monument was granted its place in this national park.

My special interest in this monument is because the moving spirit was a Rhode Island woman, Ellen Ryan Jolly, of Pawtucket. Her studies to document history have been gathered in a volume now in the Library of Congress, printed at the solicitation of the then bishop of Providence, the Most Reverend William A. Hickey.

I have not meant to suggest—and the Hibernians would not like to have me suggest that the observance of St. Patrick's Day is exclusively theirs.

The hundreds of thousands of Hibernians are only part of the hundreds of millions of the Irish by birth and descent—and their admirers who will join in this day of tender tribute.

In my own Rhode Island there will be celebrations from one end of the State to the other. Parades, banquets, house parties, proclamations, sermons, religious observances will crowd the entire week—the Octave of St. Patrick's.

Toasts will be offered to the United States—to the church—to the day we celebrate.

Some will recall the 50th anniversary of the Easter uprising—some will recount their personal memories—some will record the part that sons and daughters of Ireland have played in American history.

Those pages turn from the time when the Galway seaman, Rice de Culvey, sailed with Columbus on his voyage of discovery down to these days when the grandsons of immigrants write in brave and bold letters the family name of Kennedy.

In my State and all over the world other nations join in the observance and sons and daughters of captive nations take hope from the history of Ireland that miracles of freedom may be waiting for their lands, too.

And there will be one place where Ireland and America and Italy will join in a tribute on this day which reaches into this very chamber—a tribute to a departed colleague.

In Italy's historic city of Parma—where cathedrals have been standing since before the 13th century—a new church is arising. It is named for St. Patrick and dedicated to the memory of President John F. Kennedy.

In its cornerstone today is being placed an urn wherein is mingled earth from St. Patrick's Hill of Ireland—and special earth from the Arlington grave of a youth whose voice once mellowed this Chamber.

From the Kennedy ancestral home of Dungastown, Patrick Kennedy bears the Irish earth.

The U.S. consul at Milan is the bearer from Arlington's mound. Bishop Michael Browne, of Galway, bestows the blessing.

And so St. Patrick's Day in Parma becomes a paragraph in the history of centuries past and centuries still to be—a paragraph on the same page as our humble words today—this 17th of March 1966.

Year after year this tradition of tribute will be paid as long as Irishmen remember—and the centuries tell us that Irishmen never forget. One poet has expressed it in these words:

An Irishman can ne'er forget
The land that gave him birth
Nor leave behind his Irish faith
When he leaves Old Erin's earth.

Does a lad forget his mother
Whate'er the years may bring?
No—for memories from mother's knee
Around his heart will cling.

And Ireland, you're the motherland
Each Irish heart your child;
Their memory's green for all you mean
Their faith is undefiled.

Their life and love they gladly give
To every flag neath which they live
But they can't forget that other land
No—Ireland, you're the motherland
Each Irish heart your child.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think it is most auspicious that the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island should give the St. Patrick's Day address in this Chamber. No one is better qualified than JOHN "O'PASTORE." The "O" is well earned, not only because his middle name is ORLANDO but because he exemplifies the finest qualities of a true son of Ireland.

Mr. President, I recall being in Ireland about 10 years ago, visiting some of my father's brothers and sisters, and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island was along.

When we first arrived they recognized me and greeted me in the fashion so typical of their graciousness, but as time wore on they became more and more enamored with the charm and fine character of the Senator from Rhode Island. He ended up being the prodigal relative returned, and I must admit I ended up being that other fellow who happened to come along on the visit. The visit was an experience we both recall fondly. The Senator from Rhode Island returned with a testimonial to the success of his charm and genuineness of their reception; he was initiated into the Irish Society. He has maintained his membership since that time and the Irish have maintained their love, affection, and admiration for their adopted son of Ireland.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall take 1 minute. I am now on my way to the St. Patrick's Day parade in New York City.

I certainly believe the RECORD today should contain some mention of the fact that we are celebrating St. Patrick's Day and that it is the Irish, who in their own struggle for freedom, have shown the world an example of how dearly won and how highly prized freedom is. At a time when so many are fighting in Vietnam for these values which we hold dear, their freedom is an inspiration to us all.

I think to the Irish people St. Patrick's Day stands for their struggle for freedom. St. Patrick's Day to them is the greatest day of the year. But Irish or not, we enjoy celebrating with them.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. It should be pointed out to Senators that as important a day as March 17 is, it also happens to be the birthday of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

We are all aware of his great ability in this body, his outstanding traits, and his fine character, and the fact that he is not only a distinguished and able politician, but he is also an outstanding statesman. His parents must have had politics in mind a long time ago when they arranged for the John O. Pastore anniversary to occur on March 17.

I submit, that is an unbeatable combination: the fine and able Senator's Italian ancestry, and born on St. Patrick's Day. That should be revealing enough to every Member of this body as to the real source of his ability.

Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague [Mr. MAGNUSON], whose wife is ill, and the Senator is therefore unable to be in the Chamber today, I wish to join him in wishing the Senator from Rhode Island a very happy St. Patrick's Day birthday.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. NELSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that St. Patrick's Day is one of the few days in which we can get every Senator to say good things about the Irish, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD may be kept open so that all other non-Irish Members may be able to pay tribute to St. Patrick, and to the Irish in particular, before the RECORD is closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we in Rhode Island are fortunate in being able to celebrate in double doses. And so on St. Patrick's Day especially—a day which means so much to so many residents of my State who look to Ireland as the land of their ancestors—we take special pride in marking also the birthday of my most distinguished senior colleague, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE.

Actually, it is most appropriate that these two anniversaries should coincide in the manner they do for there is a basic similarity between the men we salute so fondly on this day. St. Patrick, we remember, was a man of great persuasive powers for it was he who single-handedly converted a whole nation to Christianity. And we all know that JOHN PASTORE is endowed with similar powers and that he can and may perform equal feats by the sheer force of his persuasive abilities.

I salute him on this anniversary of his birth and wish him many long years of health and strength so that we in Rhode Island may continue to benefit from his service here. I am indeed glad that we are colleagues.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, while news of enmity between nations is often large in the headlines, progress in amity is being made quietly around the conference table—between the Irish and the English.

It gives me great pleasure on this St. Patrick's Day to commend and encourage the Anglo-Irish trade agreement negotiations recently concluded, which become effective on July 1, 1966.

This agreement is a significant achievement in the improvement of relations between two countries based on reason and economic self-interest, which opens a new phase of economic opportunity for Ireland in dealing with her closest neighbor. Such an effort might well be emulated by neighboring nations around the world who may for historic or traditional reasons maintain aloof or even hostile correspondence.

The principal effect of the new agreement is to provide for the removal over a period of years of substantially all restrictions on trade between Ireland and Britain. Both countries have abolished import quotas, and import duties. Ireland will grant tariff reductions on industrial goods in return for the grant by Britain of improved access and price arrangements for Irish agricultural products, and tariff advantages for those Irish industrial goods for which tariffs at present apply.

In the event of developments upsetting the balance of the agreement, the governments will consult with a view to seek an equitable and mutually satisfactory solution. It is certainly a positive move into mainstream of world trade for the people of Ireland, as well as a striking example of the possibilities of the conference table in minimizing the obstacles to international cooperation, between peoples whether traditionally friendly or often at loggerheads.

To the excellent record of 160 firms which established industries for the export market in Ireland since 1959, the new Anglo-Irish trade agreement will provide incentives to overseas firms to manufacture in Ireland. There is no limit to the possibilities for this plucky people in the years ahead. It is my wish today that the luck of the Irish will prevail in the satisfactory operation of this new trade agreement under their second program for economic expansion.

I could not conclude these remarks without giving credit to the great Irish poet and patriot, Padraic Pearse, who, in giving his life in the revolt of Easter Week in Dublin in 1916, proclaimed the Irish Republic and roused Ireland from her sleep of apathy. Turning dismal defeat into one of the most arresting examples of the triumph of failure, the poet's songs and stories captured the spirit of all those who had in past time fought to free their country and propelled them toward eventual independence and achievement in modern history.

These fiery words of Pearse on freedom plainly echo a universal cry:

And because I am of the people I understand the people,
I am sorrowful with their sorrow, I am hungry with their desire:
My heart has been heavy with the grief of mothers,
My eyes have been wet with the tears of children,
I have yearned with old wistful men,
And laughed or cussed with young men;
Their shame is my shame, and I have reddened for it,
Reddened for that they have served, they who should be free * * *
And I say to my people's masters: Beware,
Beware of the thing that is coming, beware of the risen people,
Who shall take what ye would not give.
Did ye think to conquer the people,
Or that Law is stronger than life and than men's desire to be free?

INDICATION OF DISTRESSING PROVINCIALISM IN NEW YORK TIMES, REPORTS MINNESOTA THEATER CO.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the New York Times of March 13, 1966, contained an interview with respect to the Guthrie Theatre in Minnesota.

The nature of the question asked of Mr. Campbell indicates the cultural provincialism of the New York Times reporter. Their question was whether he was happy in Minneapolis. Mr. Campbell assured the reporter he was quite happy personally and with regard to the activities of the Guthrie Theater.

Mr. President, for 3 years the cultural life of the people of Minneapolis, of Minnesota, and the Midwest has been enriched by the works of the Minnesota Theater Co. Its success is a repudiation of those who charged that Minnesota was a cultural wasteland in which the highest art forms could not survive.

The repertoire of the Minnesota Theater Co. has encompassed a full range of drama—from the Greek classics and Shakespeare to the work of contemporary playwrights. As a matter of fact, the program of the Minnesota Theater Co. has much more breadth and much more depth than has been the case of plays presented on Broadway in recent years. It has, I think, established clearly that the United States is ready for a truly national theater, rather than the kind of provincial one which now exists on the eastern coast.

An article entitled "Happy In Minneapolis?" written by Grace Glueck, and published in the New York Times of March 13, 1966, makes it clear that not only have the works of the theater been met with enthusiasm, but that the artists who perform for the Minnesota Theater Co. are equally enthusiastic about their residence in Minnesota and in the Midwest, as they hope and plan for the growth of such cultural activities in the central part of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 1966]

HAPPY IN MINNEAPOLIS?

(By Grace Glueck)

Can a promising Broadway actor find happiness in Minneapolis?

"Yes," says Douglas Campbell, the robust, red-haired Scotsman who recently succeeded Sir Tyrone Cuthrie as artistic director of the Minneapolis Theater Company. "Or at least steady employment. We don't have any trouble recruiting New York actors because we sign them up for nearly a year. Try and find that kind of security in the hit-or-flop economy of Broadway."

Campbell was in town recently to clinch contracts for the 1966 Minneapolis repertory season that begins May 31 with "As You Like It."

"About two-thirds of the players who were with us last year are coming back for the new season," he noted at lunch the other day. "And many are returning for their fourth season—Lee Richardson, Robert Pastene, Ruth Nelson, Ellen Geer, John Cromwell, and Paul Ballantyne. Nancy Wickwire is coming back for her second. And Zoe Caldwell, who was so good in 'Slapstick Tragedy,' will join us for the last half of the season."

But didn't actors find life bleak that far (1,200 miles) off Broadway? Campbell smiled. "Actors and companies gripe no matter where they are." (Campbell should know. His acting and directing career includes a stint at the Old Vic, 9 years at the Stratford, Ontario, Shakespeare Festival, and a New York appearance in the title role of "Gideon" in 1961. For the last 2 years he has been directing as well as acting in the plays of the Minnesota company.)

"The life of an actor is all hotel rooms, anyway. I've been married 18 years and altogether I've spent about 9 of them with my wife. One assumes it as a duty, like being a seaman."

The current company at the Tyrone Guthrie Theater numbers about 25 Equity members, plus 7 McKnight Fellowship actors—subsidized graduate students working for advanced degrees at the University of Minnesota. Junior Equity members get a minimum of $127.50 a week. "We consider that a living wage," says Campbell. "It's pretty well what a plumber earns. Of course, senior members get more. If they have wives and kids, you try to strike a reasonable balance."

But happiness, he agreed, is not just a thing called salary. "There are plenty of other inducements. The cultural attractions, for example. Minneapolis isn't the intellectual desert that some people think. There's a marvelous symphony orchestra and two excellent art museums. The avant garde one adjoins us—the Walker Art Center. In the off-theater season, they bring in opera, jazz, and dance concerts, chamber music and poetry readings." He paused reflectively. "There's also the feeling of welcome that Minneapolis projects—they're proud to have us there. The local people work hard for the theater, and they attend it. Their support gives us ambition to make a lot more happen. I don't ever feel we're doing quite enough."

One of things that Campbell would like to make happen is a training school for actors. Another Campbell dream is the development of a junior troupe for schools and touring.

Meanwhile, Campbell is now rehearsing his first touring group—junior and student actors—in a 90-minute version of Macbeth. "Thirty-eight school districts in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area raised money for it," he said. "They wanted 'scenes from,' but I hate that sort of thing. So we got Hugh Webster, an actor from the Stratford Festival, to write us a version as remembered by the drunken porter. I think the kids will love it."

EXPORTATION OF CATTLE HIDES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on March 7, the administration announced that exports of cattle hides, except for shipments to Canada and those valued at $100 or less, were to be placed under a complete licensing control under the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949.

On March 11, the U.S. Department of Commerce announced the imposition of export quotas on cattle hides aimed at cutting back calendar year 1966 exports to the 1964 level of 11.5 million hides. This is a reduction of about 14 percent below the 1965 export level, and about 20 percent below the estimated 1966 exports in the absence of controls.

On March 8, I wrote to the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable John T. Conner, asking for an explanation of why these controls were imposed and whether or not this action was in effect calculated to exercise control over prices.

Mr. President, I must say that I have not found the response from the Commerce Department to be satisfactory. It has, in fact, been evasive, less than candid, and inadequate in its justification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of my letter of March 8, 1966, to Secretary of Commerce Connor; the letter of March 11, 1966, to me, from Rauer H. Meyer, Director, Office of Export Control, with enclosures; and the letter of March 14, 1966, to me from Rauer H. Meyer.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 8, 1966.

Hon. John T. Connor,
Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: It is my understanding that export controls on animal hides were established on March 7 in the form of export licensing.

I would appreciate your outlining the reasons for these controls on hides and whether this in effect was calculated to exercise control over prices. Additionally, I would like to know whether the domestic hide situation is saturated or is presently facing a shortage.

The hide industry has been developing in recent years and promises to afford farmers and ranchers a new source of income.

I have received much correspondence from hide dealers and ranchers in Kansas and your response to these questions will provide me with the information to reply properly.

Very truly yours,

James B. Pearson,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Department of Commerce,
Bureau of International Commerce,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1966.

Hon. James B. Pearson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pearson: In your letter of March 8, 1966, you expressed interest in the recently imposed controls over the export of hides and skins.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of a press release describing the additional controls over exports of hides and skins which were put into effect today by the Department of Commerce. Also enclosed is a copy of a statement prepared by the Department which explains why these controls are necessary at this time.

If there is any additional information you would like to have, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Rauer H. Meyer,
Director, Office of Export Control.

[Press release from U.S. Department of Commerce, Mar. 11, 1966]

Export Quotas Set for Cattle Hides, Calf and Kip Skins and Bovine Leathers

The U.S. Department of Commerce, today, established export quotas for cattle hides, calf and kip skins and bovine leathers, in a new move to provide adequate supplies for domestic needs.

The action, effective immediately, supplements that taken March 7, when the Department directed that shippers of these commodities to any destination in the world but Canada obtain a validated export license. The quota restrictions will not apply to Canadian shipments. The Department said that additional controls were needed because of the steady increase in exports during the latter part of 1965 and 1966. In the absence of quota restrictions, an estimated 14 million hides would be exported in 1966. On the basis of an estimated available supply of 21,100,000 hides and projected consumption of 23,800,000 hides, this would produce a shortage of 2,700,000 hides for domestic consumption. The effect of the restrictive export control action announced today will reduce the estimated shortage by 2,500,000 hides.

The new regulation was promulgated today in Current Export Bulletin No. 930, which established these quotas for the calendar year 1966:

Cattle hides, whole, 9,920,000 hides.

Cattle hides, except whole, 810,000 pieces.

Calf skins and kip skins, 2,140,000 skins.

Cattle hide and kip side, upper leather, grain, except patent and metalized and cattle hide, and kip side leather, not elsewhere classified, 10,800,000 square feet.

Cattle hide and kip side, sole, belting, welting, grain, offal, rough, russet, and crust leather, 1,700,000 pounds.

Calf and whole kip upper leather, patent, and metalized; and calf and whole kip leather, not elsewhere classified except patent and metalized, 1,900,000 square feet.

Licensing will be conducted in two separate periods ending June 30, 1966, and December 31, 1966. The total to be licensed during the remainder of the year will be determined by subtracting from the specified quota the quantities exported since January 1, 1966 under the General License G–DEST, including those shipments which were permitted to move under the saving clause announced on March 7.

The Department said that in order to avoid disruption of normal foreign markets for U.S. cattle hides, shipments of this commodity will be based on country allocations, and the exporters' allowances will be distributed on a country basis. The other quotas, which are essentially at 1965 levels, will be distributed on a global basis.

There will be no charge against quotas for any of the commodities that were not produced or manufactured in the United States; were imported into the United States under a warehouse entry; and were not and will not be entered under a U.S. customs consumption entry.

Licensing will be based on the past participation by exporters in exports of the commodities included in each of the quotas. The Department stated that this licensing method assures an equitable distribution among exporters of the available export quotas and helps maintain normal patterns of trade. Calendar years 1964–65 constitute the base period for the past participation requirements. Exporters must submit their past participation statements to the Department by April 4, and licensing is scheduled to begin on April 18. The Department indicated, however, that it would consider granting licenses before this date for emergency shipments.

Current Export Bulletin No. 930 incorporating the details of the quota regulations are available at 25 cents each from the U.S. Department of Commerce or any of its 42 field offices.

Basis for Imposing Short Supply Export Controls Over Cattle Hides and Leather

(Statement prepared by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Business and Defense Services Administration)

The statutory authority for export control of cattle hides and leather is the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, which provides the use of export controls to the extent necessary "to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials, and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand."

On the basis of estimated imbalance of supply and demand the Department of Commerce determined that the calendar year 1966 export level (excluding exports to Canada) be reduced to the 1964 level; namely, 9,920,000 whole cattle hides and 810,000 pieces to be distributed in two semiannual license periods. This corresponds to the total export level in 1964 of 11,540,000 hides. In setting the quantities to be licensed in these two periods the quantities exported under general license in 1966 before imposition of controls will be taken into consideration. Canada would be treated on an open border basis with an arrangement that the Government of Canada would take such steps as necessary to prevent Canadian exports from frustrating U.S. controls. The 1964 whole hide exports to Canada were 700,000 hides. Country and exporter quotas on cattle hides will be imposed but only exporter quotas on other bovine hides and leathers. Without control of leather exports cattle hides could be put through the first stage of tanning and exported as leather.

The export quotas for other bovine hides and leathers are essentially holding actions rather than export reductions and are intended to forestall evasion of cattle hide controls. These 1966 quotas (except Canada) are 2,140,000 calf and kip skins; 1,900,000 square feet of calf and kip leather; 10,800,000 square feet of cattle leather as defined in schedule B–611.5010 and 611.5050 and 1,700,000 pounds of other cattle leather in schedule B classes 611.5020 and 611.5040. These levels represent 1965 export levels except for the quota on the last group which is somewhat above the 1965 level. Patent and metalized leather are not subject to controls, but the Office of Export Control will maintain surveillance over these exports.

The quota level was determined to provide 2.5 million additional hides for U.S. consumers in 1966 to relieve an estimated shortage in 1966 of 2,700,000 hides. (See attached table A.) Adequate domestic supplies in 1966 stemming from export controls, will produce some reduction in the current levels of domestic hide prices. It is expected that export controls will permit domestic leather tanneries to continue at their current level of operations. The 1965 export level was 76 percent above the 1961–63 level. Cattle hide prices in July-December 1965 were 57 percent above the 1963–64 average and now are 70 percent above a year ago.

A quota of 10 million total hides and pieces, including Canada was recommended by some industry groups. This was judged too restrictive because such a quota would result in a hide surplus above domestic needs and could exert a severe depressing effect on hide prices. The export quotas set for 1966 will permit the cattle hide industry to export hides at a level at least as high as the second highest export year.

QUANTITY OF CATTLE HIDE EXPORTS, 1964

Increased U.S. exports have been in response to increasing needs of European markets, compared to their 1964 and 1965 import levels from the United States. Canada, Latin America, Asia, and Africa imported approximately the same from the United States in 1964 and 1965. The 1,900,000 increase in U.S. exports in 1965 was mostly due to increased demands of Western Europe, 800,000; Russia, 700,000; and Czechoslovakia, 200,000. These increases were due largely to decreases in exports from Argentina and to a policy of increased hide imports in the bloc nations to permit greater production of consumer goods.

Before 1964, exports were stable from 1957, slowly increasing from 6,500,000 to 8,000,000 hides. Monthly exports of cattle hides in 1964 and 1965 show heavy increases. The last half of 1964 was 10 percent above the first half. There was another 10 percent increase in the first half of 1965 despite the strike at east and gulf coast docks.

In response to rising exports in the second half of 1964, wholesale cattle hide prices also rose from an index of 63 in the first half to 77 (23 percent higher). Prices then rose moderately to 80 in the first half of 1965, but increased rapidly again in the second half of 1965 for an average 114, which was a 43 percent increase over the first half of 1965. The projected U.S. shortage in table A would in itself account for the increase in prices which has taken place in the last 8 weeks. During this period European prices have risen somewhat more.

The export control action would result in the following balance. With a slaughter of 34,800,000 plus 100,000 imports minus 11,500,000 exports there would be an apparent supply of 23,400,000—still 400,000 hides under probable U.S. needs. The reduced exports under control in 1966 of 2,500,000 hides (14 million exports without control minus 11,500,000 exports under control) minus the 200,000 probable reduction in imports is 400,000 less than the expected shortage of 2,700,000. This errs on the conservative side because 1966 estimates must to some extent be flexible and a minor reduction in inventories is no doubt still possible.

This discrepancy between 1965 apparent supply of 21,800,000 hides and consumption of 23,400,000 hides is accounted for by reductions in stocks of hides held by U.S. packers, dealers, and tanners. The tanners' 1965 drawdown accounted for 500,000 of the 1,600,000 inventory reduction. With stocks at the lowest level of the last decade, it does not appear feasible to attempt to rely upon a further reduction in stocks to fill the gap in 1966. The recent increases in cattle hide prices (now 70 percent over 1 year ago) reflect the exhaustion of prospects of further inventory reductions all over the world.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The impact of the export control on live cattle prices is estimated at about 5 cents per pound of hides, or a reduction of about 1 percent of their value of cattle.

The other departments of the Government are in agreement concerning these estimated economic effects and the most appropriate level of export controls. The slaughter data and estimates were obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The export and import data were published by the Bureau of the Census. The consumption of hides data were provided by the Tanners' Council of America. Other 1966 estimates were made by the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce.

TABLE A.—*Cattle hides*

[In thousands of hides]

	1965	1966 estimate	1966 controlled
Slaughter	34,800	34,800	34,800
Imports	300	300	100
Exports	13,300	14,000	11,500
Available supply	21,800	21,100	23,400
Consumption	23,400	23,800	23,800
Shortage	1,600	2,700	400

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the plain and simple fact is that the administration took this action for the purpose of breaking the price on this important agricultural product. This was effectively pointed out last week by the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. It has been widely reported in the press as one of the measures that have been employed by the administration to fight inflation.

I shall discuss whether or not this action to lower hide prices, which, by the way, also has a depressing effect on live cattle prices, costing the farmer in the neighborhood of $4 to $6 for each animal he sells, was necessary. First, I resent the manner in which the Commerce Department has attempted to justify this action.

In the correspondence and materials that I have received from the Commerce Department and in the Department's official press release announcing the imposition of the quotas there is not one reference to the word "inflation." Indeed, except in one document the word "prices" is never even mentioned, and even then only incidentally.

Officially the Commerce Department has argued that this action was taken to prevent a threatened shortage in hides for domestic use. By alluding to certain provisions of the Export Control Act there has been an implicit effort to create the impression that there is a physical shortage of this commodity and that controls are necessary for reasons of national security.

Mr. President, if there is a significant physical shortage of cattle hides, the data supplied me by the Commerce Department fails to prove it. Indeed, the Commerce Department's own estimates of domestic production and consumption for 1966 show no change over 1965.

What is happening, of course, is that exports of American cattle hides have been increasing during the past year and a half and would probably increase somewhat in 1966 except for these controls.

This has meant that prices on hides have risen. Clearly it is for this reason that the administration has imposed the export quotas; by shutting off exports, domestic supply will rise relative to domestic consumption and thereby forcing prices down.

Mr. President, the Export Control Act not only empowers the administration to use export controls to "protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials," it also empowers the administration to use such controls "to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand."

If this is not a matter that can be properly placed under the category of an "excessive drain of scarce materials" why does the administration not publicly and forthrightly admit that it has taken this action to control prices?

Two reasons suggest themselves. First, this is but one example of a growing list of similar situations in which the administration officially claims on the one hand that price controls are not necessary and yet with the other hand arbitrarily is setting price limits on selected commodities.

Mr. President, another reason for the administration's lack of candor in this matter may be that it would be hard pressed to prove that, in fact, an "abnormal foreign demand" situation has developed.

Since the latter part of 1964, hide exports have been increasing. I might add parenthetically here that the Department of Agriculture over the years has been active in helping to develop foreign markets for hides and also that these increased exports have increased the flow of dollars into this country; a need that the Secretary of Commerce has frequently and rightfully pointed to.

This has meant some increase in cattle hides. But these increases must be kept in perspective.

A fundamental fact studiously ignored by the administration is that hide prices have only recently risen from disastrously low levels. In 1963 hide prices were at their lowest level since the depression years of the early 1930's.

Any significant improvement over depression-level prices will show up as significant percentage increases. But to jump from this to the conclusion that such an increase is inflationary is open to severe question.

This is true particularly in view of the fact that there is only about 70 cents worth of leather in a $20 pair of shoes. Certainly it is difficult to understand how prices for hides from heavy native steers at around 20 cents per pound can be considered inflationary when we remember that the official ceiling established by the OPS during the emergency conditions of the Korean war was 33 cents per pound.

Mr. President, this action by the administration to impose export quotas under the authority of the Export Control Act has had and will continue to have an adverse economic impact on the American farmers and American hide processors, both of which can ill afford economic reversals at this time.

Mr. President, I repeat that there are two questions of fundamental importance involved in this matter. First, is the question of whether or not the action was justified on any reasonable grounds. The second question involves the manner in which the administration has conducted this whole affair. To date, many parts of the answers have been inadequate.

The inadequacy of the answers as applied to this particular situation are sufficient grounds for the expression of congressional concern. But of even graver importance is the fact that this is but one example of a growing list of examples whereby the administration is acting to deliberately and arbitrarily control prices, while at the same time piously disclaiming the need for such controls.

Mr. President, I intend to document these examples at a later date and to demand that the administration abandon its policy of obsurantism and to adhere to a policy of responsible and honest candor.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR FONG

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I want to set the record straight concerning a newspaper article headlined "Gimmicks Raise Congressional Pay," in the Washington Post on March 14, 1966.

The headline makes it appear that through gimmicks Members of Congress are raising their pay.

The story mentions my name in connection with the new $200 a month State office rental allowance permitted for Members of Congress. The implication is that by this payment my pay has been increased by $200 a month.

The fact of the matter is, by law, Members of Congress who cannot be provided with space in Federal buildings in their home State are entitled to have their office space in a privately owned building paid by the Federal Government. Until October 1, 1965, the maximum rent allowed was $100 a month. Because Congress realized this sum was insufficient, it was increased to $200 a month by Public Law 89-211, approved September 29 last year.

As office space in the Federal building in downtown Honolulu is not available for my Senate staff, I rented space for my Honolulu office in the Finance Factors Building, which is located in the heart of the city, convenient to my constituents.

Space rented consists of four rooms occupied by my Honolulu staff and between sessions of Congress also by some of my Washington staff.

I, myself, have a personal office next door to the four rooms for my Senate staff members. Rental for my personal office is not paid by the Federal Government.

At the going rate in Honolulu for comparable facilities for my staff, the monthly cost would be $235.92. Until September 30, the Government allowance for space was only $100 a month. After Congress raised the rental allowance to $200 a month last year for all Members of Congress in recognition of actual market costs, the rent for my Honolulu staff office was increased to $200. Even with the increase to $200 monthly rental, the allowance is still $35.92 below that which is normally charged for comparable facilities in Honolulu.

Finance Factors Building, Ltd., which rents the space for my Senate office staff, is wholly owned by Finance Investment Co., Ltd. About 300 stockholders own Finance Investment Co., Ltd., of which I am president.

As there is strong demand for office space in downtown Honolulu, Finance Factors Building could easily rent my Senate staff office space to others at the going rate of $235.92 a month.

In view of these facts, it is absurd to imply that my congressional pay is being increased by the payment of the $200 rental allowance permitted by law for my Honolulu office staff.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that the morning hour has not been concluded, I may speak as long as necessary on the subject of dairy price supports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, earlier this month I joined several Senators representing dairy States in a discussion of the critical need for higher dairy price supports for the marketing year beginning April 1.

It is appropriate to discuss this serious matter further.

Milk shortages around the country point up the need for higher dairy supports. These shortages also point up the need to fulfill the legal requirements of the Agricultural Act of 1949 by setting higher dairy supports.

The law requires the Secretary of Agriculture to announce a support price before April 1 of each year that will assure an adequate supply of milk. It is clear that the present price of $3.24 a hundred for 3.7 test milk has not done this.

This supply problem is not unique to Wisconsin although my State, as the Nation's No. 1 milk producer, will be dealt a severe economic blow if dairy supports are not substantially increased. The problem is not limited, either, to the great dairy manufacturing area of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

This has become a national policy question, which probably explains why it has become entangled in arguments over inflation, food prices, wage-price guidelines, and so forth.

The result is the tendency to lose sight of the need for improving the economic situation dairy farmers have faced for years. Doing something about low dairy income, without a doubt, is the key to this important decision.

There are some, of course, who will propose that we merely assure dairy farmers that milk prices are too high already. But you cannot fool dairy farmers year after year. Thousands have already washed their hands of the whole dairy business and a good many more are thinking about it. Why should they not?

I have been on record since mid-February for an increase from $3.60 to $3.70 a hundred for 3.7 milk. This figure is not as high as it should be, or as high as Midwest dairy leaders think it should be, but it would help reverse the sharp and unexpected drop in production.

As production has skidded, the average price of manufacturing milk has risen well above the $3.24 per hundred support level. Manufacturing plants in milk-scarce areas have had the choice of paying higher prices or curtailing operations of plants that involve a regular work force, steady overhead, and sizable investments.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his leadership in this most important field and for pointing out the facts which the Nation must understand if we are to deal responsibly with this problem.

Manufacturing milk, accounting for over 85 percent of all milk production in Minnesota, has been in such short supply that butter-powder milk plants are bidding against cheese processors for available supplies. Since the cheese market is so strong, butter-powder plants are either forced to curtail operations, or eat into capital reserves to bid for their share of the manufacturing milk. At a time when the Government stocks of most dairy products are likely to be the lowest since the Korean war—1952—at a time when we are attempting to increase foreign cash markets for dairy products, when we are considering what our effort should be in alleviating the world hunger problem, we must have strong and adequate supplies of manufacturing milk so that our domestic plants are not cutting each others' throats for a short supply.

Not long ago I introduced an emergency food reserves bill, which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] has cosponsored. I had a tabulation printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, showing the minimum reserve level recommended for dairy products—the powdered milk level was recommended as 530 million pounds, when in fact, we will have an estimated 121 million pounds as of June 30, 1966. The recommended cheese level was 380 million pounds, when in fact, we will have on June 30, 1966, as estimated 2 million pounds. Butter will fast approach the minimum reserve level if present declines are not halted.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Scarcity also has resulted in higher prices in Chicago and other Midwest fluid markets. Even as early as mid-November the situation was considered so critical that the Department of Agriculture amended Federal orders in Chicago and 11 related Midwest markets to prevent prices from taking their usual seasonal drop.

Chicago dealers a short time later granted producers in that market a 32-cents-a-hundred superpool payment so they would be assured of an adequate supply of milk through 1966. This payment is in addition to the class I prices set by the Agriculture Department.

It is being argued by opponents that high prices caused by the developing milk scarcities should be sufficient to keep farmers in dairying. But to dairy farmers, seeing is believing.

They know from sad experience that prices can drop sharply as a result of some unforeseen development. They cannot afford to take chances when good income possibilities are available elsewhere. They need a guarantee, such as an increased price support level, so they can continue to invest the substantial capital and management required in dairying.

It also is being argued by opponents that higher support prices will force up consumer prices for butter, cheese, ice cream, and other manufactured products. As long as the present shortages continue, I do not see how higher supports would make any difference one way or the other.

The kind of scarcity of supply developing now will force prices up and keep them up.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Reduced milk production in Minnesota has already affected the consumer. An article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 6, 1966, by its staff writer, Robert Hinkley, shows that a check of retail groceries in Saint Paul revealed that prices on dairy products have gone up about 10 percent in the last 7 or 8 months. Russell Schwandt, Minnesota commissioner of agriculture, has warned of "serious complications for the consumer" if the trend toward greatly reduced milk production continues.

I think that it should be made crystal clear that, while an excessive rise in dairy price support level would tend to increase consumer prices to some extent, it is just as likely that a small or minimal increase will not check the decrease, and prices will climb very much higher as production declines.

The downward production is not easy to reverse. Dr. Gordon Sprague, economist for Land O'Lakes Creameries, has estimated that a 25-cent increase would only equalize the situation, while some increase approaching 50 cents would stop liquidation of dairy cattle, and allow a rising production once more.

The Department of Agriculture must find a balance between the extremes of inaction and too high an increase, but it is clear that either extreme will lead to higher consumer prices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the following: An article entitled "Delay of Dairying Causes Price Increases for Consumers in State," written by Bob Hinkley, staff writer, and published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on March 6, 1966; an article entitled "Substantial Boost in Dairy Support Price Is Expected," written by Dick Youngblood and published in the Minneapolis Tribune of March 6, 1966; and an article entitled "Rise in Supports Indicated," published in the Dairy Record of February 16, 1966.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, Mar. 6, 1966]

DECLINE OF DAIRYING CAUSES PRICE INCREASES FOR CONSUMERS IN STATE

(By Bob Hinkley)

Minnesota and the Nation are in the midst of a downward trend in the production of milk and dairy products.

The men who know—Government officials and dairy economists—are mostly agreed on the conditions causing the decline. They are not, however, in complete unison over the steps necessary to arrest the trend.

And, indications are that politics will hold an important hand in the game.

Will reduced milk production in Minnesota affect the consumer?

It already has.

Will reduced production affect dairy processors?

It already has.

A check of retail groceries in St. Paul showed that prices on dairy products have gone up about 10 percent in the last 7 or 8 months. These increases have been reflected in the housewife's grocery bill.

And the milk shortage, while it hasn't and won't affect milk for bottling purposes, is pinching some of the smaller plants which process grade B milk into butter, cheese, dry milk, ice cream, and other manufactured products.

Why a milk shortage in Minnesota, a State which ranked third in total milk production last year and second only to Wisconsin in 1964?

E. Fred Koller, professor at the University of Minnesota farm campus and nationally noted as a dairy economist, delineates the factors reducing milk production here into three areas.

"First, feed values are low because of the cool, wet summer in 1965," he said. Poor feed, especially due to a poor corn crop, has cut milk production per cow," he added.

"Secondly, prices to the dairy farmer have been very poor relatively during the last 8 months." He explained that high returns on beef and pork have drawn some dairy farmers in those directions.

"Thirdly, job opportunities are good enough now to attract some dairy farmers. Also, because of the good job market in urban areas, hired labor for farm work is difficult to obtain," said Koller.

Higher beef prices, he said, have made it more attractive for dairymen to cull marginal producers from their herds for sale as canners and cutters on the beef market.

This has contributed greatly to the reduced cow population in Minnesota along with the increasing trend of small dairy operators to get out of the business because of high overhead. Previously, the cow decrease was offset by higher production per cow.

George Pederson, general manager of the Twin Cities Milk Producers Association, agreed.

"The dairy farmer has found alternatives to dairy production more attractive. Also, dairy farming requires a tremendous amount of work, 7 days a week."

Pederson cited the high price of beef and pork as the "attractive alternatives."

Is the price of milk and dairy products high enough to provide dairymen with reasonable returns for their time and investment?

Definitely not, says Russel G. Schwandt, State agriculture commissioner.

"I would like to see the public cognizant of the fact that the producer must make a profit in order to stay in the dairy business," said the commissioner.

Expressing concern over the downward trend in production, Schwandt has invited agriculture commissioners from North and South Dakota, Wisconsin and Iowa to meet here Thursday.

Schwandt said total milk production in Minnesota declined 14 percent in January from January of 1965.

Blaming poor prices, he warned of "serious complications for the consumer" if the trend is not stopped.

And how can the trend be arrested?

"I would like to see the Federal price support on dairy products raised," says Schwandt. This sentiment, of course, is shared by the producers.

Gordon Sprague, economist for Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., also favors an increase of the present $3.24 a hundred support price.

The support price is that level at which the Federal Government buys the commodity, guaranteeing the farmer of selling at no lower price.

"An increase of 25 cents in the support level might offset the cost penalty the farmer is suffering now and stop the decrease in production. But, I consider this the very minimum increase—double that might be more realistic," he said.

He said that while a 25-cent increase would merely tend to equalize the situation, a 50-cent hike would stop liquidation of dairy cattle and allow the State to resume the rising production it previously enjoyed.

Professor Koller, while agreeing that "prices to the farmer definitely must be higher," warned that an excessive increase in the support level might price dairy products out of the market.

He recommended a more moderate support increase to bring the industry back into proper balance.

"Imitations to dairy products (margarine, cream, and ice cream substitutes, etc.) would become much stronger on the market if dairy prices are set too high," he said.

Koller said the price support must be raised at least 10 cents to maintain the Government's desired 75 percent of parity.

But Sprague feels that the 75-percent parity level is too low.

"That isn't high enough to keep the dairy industry growing. I would start with 80 percent and work upward from there until I reached a satisfactory point," he said.

The price support factor becomes complicated when transferred from the Midwest to Washington, D.C.

An increase must come from Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman who is being pressured by rural interests.

On the other hand, any increase above 9 cents would exceed President Johnson's 3.2 percent price-wage guidelines.

An increase satisfactory to dairy interests would far exceed the guide, supplying ammunition for already grumbling business and labor leaders.

What is the outlook for the dairy industry?

Brighter for 1966, says Koller.

"Some of the factors working against prices will decline in importance," he said. "Although the demand for beef will remain high during 1966 and probably into 1967 and 1968, we expect pork to become very ample in supply by this September which will diminish it as a pulling force against dairy farming."

The affect of poor quality feed on dairy production will become better known this spring when cows go back on pasture, according to Samuel T. Coulter, head of the dairy industries department at the university.

Good pastures, he said, could level off the downturn by June or July.

The law of supply and demand may play the largest role in turning the tide, according to Professor Koller.

"We had a surplus of milk until last December," he said. "Since then, as demand has exceeded the supply, prices have begun to rise again.

"I'm not holding that prices will come all the way back but prices for manufacturing milk now are running 25 to 30 cents (hundredweight) higher than a year ago and fluid prices are up 30 to 40 cents over a year ago," he said.

Koller predicts that prices will be stronger throughout the year.

While fluid milk supplies (grade A) remain more than adequate, milk for manufacturing products will be in short quantity in the future, said Prof. Coulter.

He predicted that surplus grade A milk will be shipped in greater quantity to out-of-State markets to alleviate other short areas.

The Nation's growing appetite for cheese has contributed to short supplies of butter and dry milk, according to Pederson. He said that cheese demand is great enough to upset the price differential between grade A milk and grade B milk, making grade A production unattractive in some areas.

This situation should alleviate itself, said Koller, as the cheese supply builds and demand drops allowing more milk to be channeled into butter and powdered milk.

"Cheese channels will fill up very soon," he predicted. "This has happened before and as the supply becomes ample the price will work downward."

Dry milk is now in short supply for foreign use, said Prof. Coulter. "There will be no shortage domestically, but there is a serious danger of a shortage to supply foreign sales and the Government's food-for-peace program," he said. The Government also needs huge supplies of dry milk to supply troops in southeast Asia.

Coulter said that as the demand for dry milk drives prices up, the Government will be forced to bid competitively for its supplies above the support level.

On one thing the experts are agreed. In the ups and downs of economics, a change—some change—is likely.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune Mar. 6, 1966]

Substantial Boost in Dairy Support Prices Expected

(By Dick Youngblood)

A substantial rise in the dairy support price, to head off a serious decline in national milk production, is expected to be announced this week by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, who with other upper Midwest Senators has been pushing for a large increase, said last week it likely would range from 25 to 30 cents a hundredweight.

This is in line with the predictions—though far short of the demands—heard in recent weeks from both the dairy industry and its supporters in Congress.

Manufacturing milk, which goes into butter, cheese, powdered milk, and other dairy products, is now supported at a national average of $3.24 a hundred.

But more industry leaders are betting the new support will be at, or slightly above $3.50 a hundred for the upcoming marketing year, which begins April 1.

Actually, the annual change in parity price levels, on which the law bases the minimum dairy support, would require only a 7-cent boost for the new marketing year.

But this, farm-State congressional leaders contend, would be inadequate to stem the "alarming" flow of farmers out of the dairy industry.

In fact, McGovern said last week, most of them agree with industry leaders who want a 50-cent jump in the support in order to stimulate the necessary production advances.

They base their argument on some disconcerting statistics:

National milk production in 1965 declined 2 billion pounds, about 1.5 percent.

A more accurate gage of the downward trend, which began about midyear, is the fact that national milk output in January 1966 was down 554 million pounds—5.2 percent—from a year earlier.

Total milk-cow numbers on January 1, 1966, were 985 million, or 5.7 percent, below the same date a year before. This represents an abnormally high liquidation of dairy herds.

In fact, all are unusually large shifts for a single year.

And the changes were even more worrisome in Minnesota, which took some of the sharpest declines of any major dairy State.

State milk production in 1965 dropped 443 million pounds, or more than 4 percent, from 1964.

In January 1966 it totaled 907 million pounds, a decline of 153 million pounds—14 percent—from a year earlier.

And dairy cow numbers on January 1 were nearly 100 million, or 7 percent, below January 1, 1965.

Nationwide, the result has been an increasingly tight supply situation.

Federal stocks of surplus butter are at rockbottom, and on January 1 the Government stopped the distribution of butter to needy families. Donations of butter to the school-lunch program have been halted since February 1.

Cheese stocks are similarly depleted, and the supply of nonfat dry (powdered) milk are well below a year earlier.

Several factors contributed to the production decline.

Low-grade feed, the result of unfavorable growing and harvesting conditions in many areas of the country last year, obviously contributed heavily to the downward trend.

But to McGovern and many others, the real reason is price.

Earnings of dairy farmers on an hourly basis long have been among the lowest in agriculture, and exceptionally high cattle and hog prices in 1965 no doubt lured many dairymen out of the business.

The same low returns, in relation to a booming economy, caused still others to ditch their dairy operations for a part-time job off the farm.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, Democrat, of Wisconsin, charged last week that these low prices pushed "12 Wisconsin farmers a day" out of the dairy business in 1965. The rate was nearly as high as Minnesota.

Federal farm officials agree—and it is for this reason that they are expected to boost the support price 25 to 30 cents.

But dairy industry leaders and their political backers argue that this is not enough.

Even as production trended downward, they point out the national average price of manufacturing milk has actually jumped 41 cents over the support price.

Obviously, they say, a lot more than a 30-cent increase is needed to reverse the trend. They mention 50 cents as a nice, round figure.

For several reasons, this is where Government officials balk.

Higher market prices have had no major impact on production, they argue, because producers know that they could drop sharply in a very short time.

But a meaningful increase in the support price—even of 30 cents—would provide the kind of assurance necessary to attract higher production.

There is also concern that milk prices much higher than this would adversely affect sales of many important dairy products.

A higher price on butter might send consumers scurrying after "that other spread," and nonfat dry milk might be priced right out of its very important export market.

And finally there is the familiar Government concern for the consumer—that is, the voter.

Since manufacturing milk prices are the basis for pegging fluid milk prices, Federal officials are leery of any move that might send retail prices any higher than they've gone in recent months.

To dairy State political leaders, this is the weakest argument in the chain.

"We should be ashamed to admit it," Nelson said in a speech in St. Paul last week, "but there are dairy farmers who receive as little as 50 cents an hour for their work."

Commented McGovern: "That's far below even the minimum standards for that kind of labor, and for people with that kind of ability.

"We're too sensitive about consumer food prices," he declared. "I think the average consumer would be willing to pay a fair price."

[From Dairy Record, Feb. 16, 1966]

Rise in Supports Indicated

During recent weeks we have had a flood of inquiries asking: (1) whether the support price on manufacturing milk would be raised on April 1 and if so, to what percentage it would be raised, and (2) is it not likely that the U.S. Department of Agriculture will increase support prices before the end of the present crop year that ends March 31.

To both questions, our answer is that we do not know what the plans of the USDA are with reference to raising the support price of manufacturing milk and butterfat or whether it has any plans to increase the existing 75 percent of parity.

Presumably, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and his staff have given considerable thought to the matter in view of the declining stocks of manufactured dairy products as well as the sharp declines in milk production which have taken place in the North Central States where the big bulk of manufacturing milk is produced.

We would seriously doubt that the administration has made any decisions as to whether the support price will be increased and if it is, how much the increase will be. As to the second question, we have serious doubts that the USDA would order an increase before the end of the present crop year, March 31.

As a guess, and we emphasize that it is strictly an off-the-cuff guess, we would surmise that if production of manufactured milk in the North Central States does not show a reversal of the downward trend, the USDA will increase the support prices in the hope that it will halt the decline. We can not foresee any hope of a reversal in the trend in the short time remaining before the end of the crop year so that it might seem a fairly safe assumption that the parity price will be increased on manufacturing milk and butterfat.

The question of whether USDA will or will not increase the parity price seems at this time to be purely academic. Present indications are that by next fall we could be running into a tighter supply situation than exists at the present time. This, of course, would strengthen prices to such an extent that raising the support prices would be meaningless for the short pull.

However, as it has been pointed out in these columns recently, if increased production of manufacturing milk is wanted by the administration, dairy farmers will want some assurance in the way of an increase in the parity price before they embark on a program of expanding their herds.

During the past 4 years, manufacturing milk and butterfat have remained at 75 percent of parity. The manufacturing milk areas of the North-Central States are not happy that their returns have been practically stationary while those producers in the fluid milk markets have from time to time had price increases, on one pretext or another. Obviously, there is not too much relationship between manufacturing milk and bottling milk.

Already there are demands that the support level for manufacturing milk be increased. The Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac, Wis., has asked that the support price be set at not less than $3.75 per hundredweight immediately. And it was interesting to note that the president of the Northeast Dairy Cooperative Federation, Inc., of Syracuse, N.Y., has predicted that support prices on dairy products will be raised to 85 percent of parity during 1966. The National Farmers' Union has asked that manufacturing milk be set at 90 percent.

Parenthetically, it might be mentioned in passing that the Northeast Dairy Cooperative, although originally organized as a bargaining organization for producers who supplied the New York-New Jersey fluid milk market, has two modern manufacturing plants and a greater percentage of its milk is going into manufactured products than is used for bottling purposes. And while milk receipts in the north-central area have shown steady declines recently, the Northeast Co-op expects to handle about 800 million pounds of milk this year, whereas it handled somewhat more than 600 million pounds during 1965.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it is inevitable that plants competing for short supplies will run the prices up. This chaotic situation will send low-capitalized manufacturing plants, including some operated by cooperatives, into bankruptcy at the same time.

The facts in this distressing situation are undisputed.

U.S. milk output dropped in 1965 by almost 2 billion pounds, with the downturn coming unexpectedly in the last 6 months of the year. Yearend reports of the Agriculture Department's Economic Research Service predicted this drastic supply drop will continue. The reports also indicated that the 4.5 billion pound carryover will disappear during 1966 if present production trends continue.

The predictions have been highly accurate so far. Production nationwide was down 5.2 percent in January and 5.8 percent in February.

In Iowa, milk production was 15 percent below levels of a year ago in January and 17 percent in February. In Wisconsin, 7 percent below in January and 8 percent in February. In Minnesota down 14 percent in both January and February. And in Michigan down 7 percent in both months.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, comparing the milk production for Minnesota and Wisconsin for the months of 1965 to the same months of 1964, Minnesota milk production was down 5 percent in September of 1964 and Wisconsin milk production was down 1 percent.

In October 1965 Minnesota milk production was down 7 percent, and Wisconsin milk production was down 6 percent.

In November 1965 Minnesota milk production dropped by 10 percent over the previous year, and Wisconsin milk production was down 7 percent.

In December 1965, Minnesota milk production was down 11 percent, and Wisconsin milk production was down 7 percent.

In January 1966, Minnesota milk production was down 14 percent from January 1965, while Wisconsin milk production was down 7 percent for the same period.

In terms of the 1959–63, 5-year average, butter production was down 7 percent in 1965. The production of cheese increased by 9 percent. Nonfat dried milk production was down 11 percent.

I think the statistics which reflect the number of milk cows being culled or slaughtered and the reduction in the number of heifers is very disturbing. The Minnesota statistics reflect the following relating to that matter:

Between January 1965 and January 1966, there was a reduction of 7 percent in the number of milk cows—down nearly 100,000 for milk cows 2 years old or older, slaughtered or culled in just 1 year.

The same general trend is reflected in heifer calves, which were down some 7 percent in the same year, or a reduction of some 15,000. Of course, this reflects the probability of a long-term reduction in milk production.

In the 1-year interval between 1964 and 1965, Minnesota milk production was down 4 percent, or a total of 443 million pounds of milk.

Mr. NELSON. The higher slaughter prices for milk cows have accelerated the already heavy culling of dairy herds.

Mr. President, this high culling rate is highly significant in this serious situation. It appears that tremendous culling, at a rate around 15 percent above a year ago, is continuing into this year. It should be clear to anyone, whether he is an economist or not, that this high culling rate means fewer milk cows and fewer milk cows means less milk.

Large numbers of dairy farmers also are quitting entirely, or switching to more profitable lines of farming.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. NELSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in Minnesota, the daily rate of farmers quitting production of milk is, as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, close to 12 a day on the average. I have received many letters from farmers and dairy processors on this score, indicating their concern.

I have selected a few of these letters from responsible sources. One is written by Jay H. Seymour of the Albert Lea Cooperative Creamery Association; one from F. D. Stone, General Manager of the Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc.; and the other from Walter Larson, president of Twin City Milk Producers Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBERT LEA COOPERATIVE
CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,
Albert Lea, Minn., February 21, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I believe it is important that early consideration be given to an increase in the support price of milk used for butter.

Dairy herds are being sold practically every day in our county, because other kinds of farming provide a better living and more income. Once a man is out of the dairy business, it seems they don't return to milking cows.

As secretary of the Albert Lea Cooperative Creamery, I am in contact with dairy producers every day. A familiar expression among them is, "When are you going to sell your cows and live?" Many of them are doing just that. According to my records, 30 herds were sold in the past year ending September 20, patrons of the Albert Lea Cooperative Creamery. The rate of selling has increased since September 30, 1965.

Many good dairy barns no longer have cows in them.

It appears that the only way to stop this trend is to increase the support price. Kindly give this bill your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JAY H. SEYMOUR.

LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 4, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We have repeatedly called attention to the situation which has developed with reference to dairy farmers since midsummer of 1965. We believe all the requirements needed for special action by the Secretary are fulfilled. Under pressure of several unfavorable conditions including high prices for cows and hogs and low prices for milk, farmers are selling their milk cows. It will take many months and perhaps years to repair the damage already done. Support prices for milk used for manufacturing should be raised in line with prices for other competing farm products immediately.

We believe that an increase immediately would take account of the lag in the existing support price as compared with 75 percent of parity. We believe that an additional price increase is needed to take account of the situation which exists in the North Central states, generally and particularly in Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota, where most of the milk for manufactured products originates. The feed crop produced in such an abundance last year is of poor quality and a large increase in quantity feed is necessary to maintain production. Production has not been maintained as compared with production a year earlier. The evidence we believe is as follows: Milk production in this area is down 10 to 15 percent from that of a year ago. Butter production is down more than 20 percent. Cheese production is down between 5 and 10 percent. Nonfat dry milk production is down more than 20 percent.

Large numbers of farmers report sellout of all or part of their herds and the stockyards at South St. Paul report an unusually heavy run of Holstein cows for the past 3 or 4 months. Reductions that have depleted dairy herds are not quickly replaced. We believe the situation into which we are moving will be with us for several months and perhaps years.

The Government has not been able to fill its requirements for either nonfat dry milk or butter.

The Department has recognized the need for price increase in many Federal orders but have not raised the support price for manufactured products.

The Secretary is aware of all the conditions which we have described. Our information comes mainly from the Department of Agriculture. Will you please give us your support in getting this urgently needed price increase?

Very truly yours,

F. D. Stone,
General Manager.

Twin City Milk
Producers Association,
St. Paul, Minn., February 11, 1966.

Hon. Walter Mondale,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Production of milk in this area is declining at a most alarming rate. This trend became progressively worse all through 1965, the last quarter of the year showing milk receipts of our 2,500 milk producers down approximately 11 percent from the same quarter of 1964. We thought production would at least level off in 1966, but we now have the figures for January and find that production from practically the same number of producers we had a year ago, is down 14 percent from January 1965.

We are of the opinion that it is imperative that something be done very quickly to check this downward trend in order to prevent catastrophic shortages next summer and fall. This explains the attached copy of a wire which was sent to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman today.

I am confident that you recognize the seriousness of this situation and will do everything in your power to influence the Secretary to act quickly in the establishment of price support levels for the crop year beginning April 1, 1966.

I realize that a purchase program for butter under the open market purchase authority of the 1965 Agricultural Act is in the works, and this will help some, but I still believe it is imperative that there be an increase in the price support also.

Sincerely,

Walter Larsen,
President.

February 11, 1966.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request immediate increase in price supports on milk to arrest downward trend in production which appears to worsen as we move into 1966 and could very well become disastrous by midsummer. Milk receipts from our approximately 2,500 dairymen in January were 14 percent below January of 1965. In our opinion an increase of at least 20 cents per hundredweight to be made effective at once is imperative if this downward trend is to be checked.

Twin City Milk Products Association,
Walter Larsen, *President.*

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this means breaking up the dairy herds and selling off milkers, bulk tanks, and other expensive equipment at a loss. Some of these trends, it must be pointed out, require something substantial if they are to be reversed.

Dairying requires competent hired labor, large amounts of scarce and expensive capital, and a hard, 7-day-a-week routine. Farm sales have been common all winter throughout the Midwest and it is estimated that 12 farmers a day quit dairying in Wisconsin in 1965.

Dairymen do not need to be told when they have reached the breaking point.

Dairy farm income is fantastically low, well below the so-called poverty index in thousands of cases, and has been for years. The 1964 Economic Research Service figures showing hourly earnings per dairy farmworker show this clearly.

The figures show that the average grade A eastern Wisconsin dairy farm with 33 cows, a total investment of $71,950, and gross sales of $16,906 returned only $3,591 to the operator and his family for their labor. The hourly return for managing this business enterprise was 84 cents.

The average hourly return for two other size categories of Wisconsin dairy farms—both with more than 20 cows and a sizable investment—were 36 and 30 cents hourly. One does not need to be an economist to see why farmers are getting out of dairying.

I think it is ironic to have a congressional committee reporting out a bill that would boost the minimum wage level in steps from the $1.25 an hour to $1.60 an hour by 1970 at the same time we have dairy farmers with a $72,000 grade A operation getting 84 cents an hour.

A short time ago I received a letter from a prominent Wisconsin dairy farmer who also enclosed a copy of his 1965 Federal income tax returns. The returns showed he owned and operated 125 acres of good farmland, had 34 dairy cows, had depreciable production items that cost $38,376, had $19,606 in gross farm income and netted $2,733.52.

This is one of those prosperous farmers we always hear people talk about when they point to a national need for 1.5 million farmers with gross income of $10,000 a year or more.

We ought to forget about gross income. This farmer paid out $16,873 of the $18,873.52 he took in and, as a result, had only a little more than $200 a month for living expenses. He wrote me:

> If this decline in dairy farmers doesn't stop soon, some people in this country are not going to enjoy all the good things that come from dairying, such as milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, etc.
>
> I shudder at the thought of the day when I should replace the items on my inventory sheet with the income I had in 1965. If anyone in Washington, D.C., can explain how I will be able to send my two sons and daughter to college some day with this kind of an income, I'm willing to listen.

Hired labor accounted for $560 of this farmer's expenses, bringing up another problem. Dairy farmers no longer can afford to pay wages that will lure workers away from industry. And the war in Vietnam is competing for the kind of young men who have been available as hired hands.

The competition from high-paid jobs in industry for five days of regular hours makes work on a dairy farm unattractive. Large numbers of dairy farmers are quitting or switching rather than continue the struggle to obtain competent hired help.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. One of the reasons for the decline that is significant is one related to me by George Daley, a widely respected dairyman in southern Minnesota, who said that dairy farmers simply cannot find qualified, experienced hired help to handle the larger, more efficient herds that are required today to break even or make a profit.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] once recounted the story of a dairy farmer in his county, who said that a dairy farmer needed no Sunday clothes, and hardly any everyday clothes.

That is so true—dairying is a 7-day, 15-hour-a-day occupation, and I can understand why they are quitting when their hourly return on their labor rarely is as high as $1.00 an hour.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from Mr. Winn F. Finner, staff economist, agricultural economics, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., which describes the very low hourly rate of the dairy farmers in Minnesota.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., November 19, 1965.

Mr. Gary D. Avery,
Research Assistant to Hon. Walter F. Mondale, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Avery: Mabel Snyder has passed on your letter of November 9 referring to my letter of last July concerning labor earnings of Wisconsin dairy farmers. I agree that the figure of 18 cents an hour looks ridiculous. Nevertheless, I believe it is a valid measure for typical farms of the size and organization described. The information we have used regarding such facts as production per cow, crop yields and prices received and paid are all taken from official reports or have been obtained in special field surveys which we conduct in some years.

Incomes, of course, would be different on farms having yields or obtaining prices differing from these averages. Many farms are smaller or larger than those covered in our analyses and this too may influence earnings appreciably, just as do differences in management ability from farmer to farmer.

As is set forth in more detail in the attached report, these data apply to typical dairy farms in Eastern Wisconsin selling Grade B milk and having a milking herd of about 22 cows. We estimate that the gross income of this typical farm in 1964 was about $9,770 and that operating expenses were near $6,440. This left a net income of $3,330. The net farm income represented a return to the farmer for two things: (1) interest on investment (whether the farm is fully owned by the operator or partly mortgaged) and, (2) the labor and management provided by himself and his family. To an owner-operator both represent a return, and no doubt some dairymen do not draw much of a distinction between these two, particularly if they have little or no mortgage debt and consequently have little interest to pay. Nevertheless, it is necessary to deduct a charge for capital before determining the amount left as a payment for the labor and management of the operator and his family, if one is to develop a true measure of labor and management income. That is to say, if a man has almost $50,000 invested (the typical farm represented an investment of $48,190) he should earn a return on this money in addition to his labor earnings.

I have given special attention to the above point because of the important effect it has on the hourly rate of return to labor and management. If it is assumed that a dairyman should earn the current rate of interest on his investment—5.5 percent—then the interest charge on the farm in question for the year would be $2,650. The deduction of this from his net income of $3,330 leaves a net return of $682 or 18 cents per hour for operator and family labor. If on the other hand, as is shown in the attached report, it is assumed that invested capital should earn a return of 4.1 percent (the 1940–60 average rate paid by farmers on outstanding debts held by Federal Land Bank) then the interest charge for capital is only $1,976 leaving a return to labor of $1,356 or 36 cents per hour.

Perhaps the foregoing may be of assistance in better establishing the basis for our conclusions. We would be glad to provide additional detail regarding any of the particular cost or income items about which Senator Mondale or Mr. Jorgens may have a question. It also may be worth noting that over the past several years, we have seen a decline in the number of dairy farms in the United States of about 80,000 per year. At least we are expecting the forthcoming census for 1964 to show between 600 and 700 thousand dairy farmers in the United States for that year as compared with 1.0 and 1.1 million farmers 5 years earlier. This rate of decline at least suggests that the earnings from dairying have been unfavorable. This is particularly so for producers with herds of under 25 head.

I would like to hear from you again if we can be of help on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

WINN F. FINNER,
Staff Economist, Agricultural Economics.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, there are serious implications for the future of the farm economy in this shift out of dairying.

The average age of dairy farmers in Wisconsin, the Nation's No. 1 milk producing State, is 55. Many of the older farmers have been unable, through long years of low milk prices, to increase their herds from 25 to 35 milk cows to the 50 to 60 that would be most efficient.

But young men who are trying to enter dairying under present price conditions are not any better off. Most are unwilling to borrow $50,000 or more to build up an efficient operation when they know the Government is unwilling to provide strong milk prices. And bankers, who know the score in rural areas, are not anxious to loan large sums to young men for investment in dairy operations.

What the dairy farmer needs now is a strong vote of confidence.

In addition, Government policies through the Eisenhower administration and continuing into the 1960's have encouraged dairymen in the fluid milk markets and left support prices low in the manufacturing milk areas. This has been done despite the fact that the Nation's low-cost milk, for the most part, is produced in the manufacturing areas of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

It does not seem to me to make sense, or to be in the national interest, to maintain price policies that shrink the dairy industry in the areas where milk is produced at the lowest cost.

This is not just a transient issue. Long-range implications are involved in this question of raising dairy support prices for the coming marketing year.

Are we going to provide an opportunity for young men to enter dairying so they can take up the slack from those in the fifties and sixties who have stuck it out through the years? Are we going to provide a price level that will make it possible for them to borrow enough money to expand to a profitable size dairy operation? Are we going to continue to phase out dairying in the low-cost areas and encourage production in the high-cost market order areas? Are we going to allow culling of dairy herds to the point where, in a national emergency, we could not get production back up at any price? Are we going to allow production to drop to the point where dairy products will no longer be available to the food-for-freedom program that most of us support? Are we going to allow production to drop to the point where high prices caused by scarcity will force up, and keep up, milk prices to consumers?

We have reached a critical point of decision in dairying. A higher support level is needed, and the sooner the better. A level of $3.60 to $3.70 would go a long way toward stabilizing production and bring some economic order to what is fast becoming a chaotic situation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the dairy farmers of the Nation, particularly in the Midwest, have experienced serious economic difficulties for many years.

Low prices and discouragement about future prospects have already forced many dairy farmers to quit operations.

The effects of depressed prices to dairy farmers have been reflected very clearly in recent months by the sharp decline in milk production and the decline in the number of milk cows on the Nation's farms.

Many cooperative dairy leaders and others involved in production, processing and distribution of milk and dairy products are seriously concerned by the present unsettled conditions in the dairy industry.

If present trends and conditions persist, the stability of the entire system will be threatened. These conditions have already had an adverse effect on the important contribution that milk products have made to American foreign policy in the food-for-peace program. Any hope of including dairy products in an enlarged food-for-peace program must fade unless the present downward trend in dairy production is checked.

There is temporary improvement for many producers because milk prices have improved in the face of threatened shortages, although the price level is still far short of parity for manufacturing milk, but the basic dairy problems are deeper and more serious, and it is my opinion that congressional review and action are urgently needed.

On the first of March the Department of Agriculture took the unusual action of suspending changes in the minimum class I prices paid to dairy farmers in 45 Federal milk order markets. This action prevents the seasonal price declines which otherwise would have gone into effect. In announcing the suspension the Department officials stated that the emergency action "was necessary because of present or threatened annual shortages of milk in these areas."

The Department also scheduled emergency public hearings to consider what would be the appropriate levels on class I prices to be effective in all 74 Federal milk order markets. These hearings were held last week in Washington, D.C., St. Louis, and Denver.

Dairy farmers in Federal milk order markets have enjoyed relatively good returns compared to those farmers whose production is used largely in other dairy products and for other purposes and who do not have the protection afforded by a milk order market. If there is a need for emergency action in Federal milk order markets, it is long past due for dairymen outside Federal order markets.

The fact is that dairy farmers have suffered from low returns for more than a decade. Farmers generally, of course, have not shared proportionately in the higher returns that other groups in the economy have received in recent years. But the Congress has acted in the past 5 years to revise and improve commodity programs for feed grains, wheat, cotton, and a number of other items. Only the dairy farmers have failed to receive an improved program. Some of the responsibility for this neglect must be shared by representatives of dairy producers who have not been in agreement on what to do. The administration has not pressed for new dairy legislation with the same concern as it has for wheat, cotton and feed grains. This does not excuse Congress. It is the responsibility of Congress to write a new program, and I regret that while many in the Senate and the House have tried to get action, we have been unable to secure support on a new dairy program. Many times since 1961 we pointed out that dairy income was dangerously low and warned on the floor of the Senate that trouble was ahead if adjustments and new procedures were not provided. In 1962 and again in October of 1963 I offered amendments to provide a voluntary dairy program with incentive payments. In my judgment adoption of a program of this kind would have prevented the serious difficulties we now have and would have improved the income of dairy farmers.

The statistics on milk production released last Friday by the Department of Agriculture highlight what is taking place.

Nationally, milk production dropped 1.5 percent in 1965 compared to 1964, and the decline is proceeding rapidly. In December 1965 production was 4 percent less than in December 1964. In January of this year national milk production was 5 percent below that of January 1965. Last month it was down 6 percent from February of 1965. The

February production represented the lowest output for this month for any year since 1959.

These national averages, serious as they are, do not adequately reflect the crisis in the Midwest, the area that is the major supplier of milk used for manufacturing dairy products.

In Iowa milk production was down 17 percent in February 1966, as compared to February 1965. In Minnesota the decline was 14 percent for February compared to February 1965. There was a 13-percent decline in North Dakota and in Nebraska, 11 percent in South Dakota, 8 percent in Wisconsin, 7 percent in Michigan, 6 percent in Indiana, 5 percent in Illinois, and 4 percent in Ohio.

Wisconsin is the largest milk producing State in the Nation. Minnesota was second in 1964, although it dropped to third behind New York in 1965. Minnesota and Wisconsin together produced more than 23 percent of the Nation's milk supply in 1965, with 19 billion pounds from Wisconsin farms and 10.5 billion pounds from Minnesota out of a total of 125 billion pounds produced in the United States. This is the region of the Nation where production is most efficient—and unfortunately where dairy farmers receive the lowest returns.

The recently published figures on dairy herd numbers show the same downward movement. In the long-range view, this trend is even more serious. The total cows and heifers 2 years or older kept for milk numbered 16,607,000 on January 1, 1966. This was 6 percent below a year earlier and it was the smallest number since 1900.

Dairy replacement heifers 1 to 2 years old were 4,068,000 on January 1, 1966, down 7 percent from the previous year. Heifer calves under 1 year being raised for milking purposes declined 5 percent between January 1, 1965, and January 1, 1966.

The decline in the number of cows has been offset somewhat for several years by the increased production per cow. The average production per cow increased in 1965 by 2.2 percent over the 1964 average, but this was the smallest yearly increase since 1954.

That the downward trend is not temporary is further indicated by the Department publication, "Dairy Situation," released on March 9. It states:

> Both commercial and Government stocks fell, each reaching the lowest yearend level since 1960. Output this year is expected to decline further and exceed commercial and farm use by less than in 1965, resulting in smaller CCC purchases. Low Government stocks of dairy products are sharply curtailing utilization under sales and donations programs. USDA carryover next January 1 likely will be negligible.

The Department has already taken action to hold hearings for class I milk used for fluid purposes in Federal order markets. By April 1 it must make an announcement on the price support for milk used for manufacturing purposes to reflect adjustments needed to maintain the price at 75 percent of parity. I am hopeful, in view of the situation, that Secretary Freeman will announce a substantial increase, and several weeks ago I urged him to take such action. I know that other Members of Congress have also done so, as have representatives of several producer and farm groups.

An increase of support level above the minimum of 75 percent will be helpful, but it will not, in my opinion, be sufficient. There is need for an extensive review of dairy legislation by the Congress and for adjustments and new programs in view of the greatly changed conditions and needs since Congress last wrote major dairy legislation.

The dairy problem is too complicated to be met only by a temporary increase in the basic support level. Dairying involves special conditions. Milk is highly perishable and cannot be stored on the farm. The supply on an individual farm tends to be quite variable, depending upon feed conditions. Although demand is relatively steady, it also has daily and seasonal variations and in any given area there must be a continuous reserve in order to maintain adequate supplies for fluid use. This reserve milk, when not required for fluid use, must be quickly converted into manufactured dairy products, and this in turn has an effect on supplies and on prices of milk produced principally for manufacturing purposes.

Artificial barriers to the free movement of sanitary milk in interstate commerce still exist. These are unnecessary as indicated by movement of midwestern milk to remote markets during present shortages. The competition of margarine with butter has created unresolved problems. The growth in demand for dried milk and in particular its importance for commercial sales in foreign markets has to be taken into account. The trend is to emphasize protein content rather than butterfat.

In addition, the nature of milk production makes its problems different from those of crop production. Once dairy herd numbers are reduced it takes several years to bring them back to adequate levels. Dairy farmers cannot be expected to make herd adjustments on a seasonal or yearly basis unless protected by carefully developed procedures to maintain their income.

There are two policy matters which are the responsibility of Congress.

One is the inferior status in legislation of milk produced primarily for manufacturing purposes. About half of the milk produced in the Nation is utilized for manufactured dairy products, the rest for fluid use. Fluid milk sold in Federal order markets commands a premium price. The surplus is marketed for use in dairy products at a much lower price. Last month, for example, the class I price—fluid use—in the Boston market was $5.93 a hundred, while the class II price—used for manufactured products—was $3.58. In some Federal order markets the surplus is more than 50 percent of the milk received in the market. This excess milk then becomes competitive with production which is primarily for manufacturing purposes.

The dairy farmers outside Federal order markets do not have the advantage of premium prices for a portion of their milk, yet their market is depressed by heavy supplies from Federal order market producers who can afford to take lower prices for class II milk. It is my view that adjustments should be made to provide an equitable program for milk produced prinicipally for manufacturing purposes.

The second problem is that over the years the use of dairy products, and of certain other farm products, in the food-for-peace program has been viewed as a surplus disposal plan. It is understandable how this tradition developed, but it can be justified only as a temporary expedient until a positive program is developed to guarantee adequate supplies and at the same time assure the producers of a fair return. Dairy and other farm products have been most effective instruments of foreign policy. In the foreign aid program we do not expect industry to take a loss on materials produced to assist other nations and we do not expect labor to be paid substandard wages for producing foreign aid materials. The time has come to review the place of food in the broad foreign aid program and to review in particular whether we are willing to compensate farmers with parity prices for their products used in the foreign aid program.

It is my hope that the Committee on Agriculture will schedule hearings on the dairy situation and request both the Department of Agriculture and representatives of various producer groups and farm organizations to make recommendations for a revision of dairy legislation and the establishment of a program responsive to current conditions and needs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the law is very clear in requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to announce a support price for dairy products that will assure to the American consumer an adequate suply of milk. It is perfectly obvious that the 75 percent price, which would be $3.35 per hundredweight will not achieve that aim.

The evidence that my colleague, Senator NELSON, and the Senators from Minnesota have already put into the RECORD on the floor of the Senate today shows convincingly that the dairy farmers are leaving the farm, literally by the hundreds every day, and that the supply of milk is not going to be adequate unless dairy farmers can be assured on a reasonable long-term basis that they can receive a price which warrants their staying in the business.

Obviously, such long-range assurance is in the interest of the dairy farmer. No one likes to be in a boom and bust business.

This is true although it is paradoxical that if the Secretary does not announce a higher price, in the area of $3.80 or $4 a hundredweight for the coming year, in my judgment, the market price may well go higher and much higher than this.

If this develops, obviously the dairy farmer will have a temporary windfall. He will enjoy a much higher net income than he has for many years and I am positive, Mr. President, as the senior Senator from Wisconsin, as one who has literally talked to thousands of dairy farmers directly and personally over the past 15 years, that Wisconsin dairy farmers do not want this kind of a boom which will certainly and inevitably result in a drastic bust.

Such a boom-bust development in the dairy industry will hurt everybody. The consumer, including millions of children in low-income families who depend on milk as the perfect food and will not get it if prices are too high, the dairy farmer who has worked so hard and so long for such a small reward, the vast business complex that supplies the dairy farmer, will all suffer.

Incidentally, the dairy farmer is without question the most important farmer in the country in terms of his impact on the rest of American business. Dairy farming is established in all of the 50 States. Dairying is the No. 1 cash crop. The dairy farmer contributes enormously to the prosperity of many, many industries and, of course, in my State of Wisconsin and in many other States, his prosperity literally determines the economic life and death of most of the small towns and villages. These small towns have been suffering for many years because of the exodus from the farm.

If the Secretary of Agriculture does not announce a reasonable increase in milk price supports for the coming year, that exodus will become a rush.

Let me simply add that the reason why dairy farmers have been leaving dairy farming in such numbers is because it is easier and far more profitable for the dairy farmer to become a hog farmer, a beef farmer, or to enter into an entirely different line, in view of the much higher prices for beef, hogs, and the relatively very high factory wages.

Throughout the dairy sections of our country, factories are clamoring for workers. In the Middle West, there is one of the most acute labor shortages that the country has seen in many years.

Under these circumstances, why should not the dairy farmer who is making only 50 cents an hour working his heart out, required to maintain a huge investment in his farm, averaging over $50,000 a year, and taking a big risk on that investment—why should not such a dairy farmer get out and go into industry.

The answer is that unless he has some assurance of an established support price, he will do exactly this.

Mr. President, the time is very short, April 1 is only 2 weeks away. The future of my State as a great dairy State depends most seriously on the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture. A substantial increase in dairy price supports will be in the national interest.

URGENTLY NEEDED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the U.S. consumer will be faced with a serious shortage of milk unless immediate action is taken to increase prices paid farmers.

In the Agricultural Act of 1949, the Congress delegated to the Department of Agriculture authority to guarantee farmers minimum prices up to 90 percent of parity, if necessary, to assure adequate supplies in the interest of consumers. For several years the country experienced surpluses of milk as it did other agricultural commodities. Prices were supported at or near minimum levels and the prevailing level of support price today is approximately 75 percent of parity.

The pendulum has been swinging from a surplus condition to a shortage condition in the dairy industry, which can only be corrected through an immediate increase of substantial proportions in the price support level. The change in the dairy business can be attributed to first, shortage of skilled farm labor; second, attractive prices for cull cows; and third, opportunities for farmers to use their resources and talents in other lines of farming, or elsewhere, rather than to continue milking cows 7 days each week.

The result of the changes taking place in the agricultural economy have been wholesale exodus of farmers from the dairy business, and the slaughtering of our national dairy herd.

To illustrate the seriousness of the situation, it need only to be pointed out that the number of milk cows on farms January 1 of this year were 6 percent below a year ago and the smallest on record since 1900. The number of replacement heifers were 7 percent below last year. All indications are that the cows numbers are much lower today, but the statistics have not yet been made available.

This decline is general throughout the Nation and is most severe in the dairy land of this country: in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and other States in this area. Milk production is down 7 percent in Wisconsin from last year. Down 14 percent in Minnesota and down 15 percent in Iowa.

Already we face a serious problem. If we do not keep herds of sufficient number to produce milk to meet increasing demands, we are going to find that we cannot increase production in the future. It takes little time to sell a herd for slaughter, but it takes at least 2 years to replace a dairy cow.

If these shortages are allowed to become critical we will see the housewife paying inflationary prices for milk and dairy products, and the Federal Government will be to blame for its shortsightedness, and hesitancy to act in face of facts which are clear.

All figures show that the farmer is on the bottom of the economic ladder.

This is particularly true of the dairy farmer.

Now while better opportunities are available he does not need to work 7 days a week and long hours each day just to stay in the dairy business. He can make a better living with less effort in some other way. To maintain the dairy herd and milk production higher prices are necessary.

And while milk production is going down, the requirements for milk and dairy products are going up. The population is increasing at the rate of nearly 3 million per year, purchasing power is at a high level and unemployment at the lowest level in recent years.

Unless milk production is increased we can expect serious shortages and extremely high prices at the consumer level. The maintenance of production is the only hedge the consumer has against inflation. If the production decline is to be halted, dairy farmers must be encouraged to remain in the business and dairymen must be encouraged to maintain on their farms milk cows headed for slaughter. Improvement in the dairy industry can result from an immediate increase in the price support level. This can be done under present law and time is of the essence. Each day of delay will serve to aggravate the problem and the Secretary of Agriculture should therefore act now.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORE SORROW THAN ANGER

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, President de Gaulle has given NATO its walking papers. Our reaction should be more sorrow than anger.

Our sorrow is for France, as De Gaulle wrenches her from the company of her friends. There will also be anger at such mischief. It has all the appearance of one attempting to feather his own nest at the expense of others. In reality, France is the loser: as she reneges on her part in the Atlantic Alliance, her own importance as an ally diminishes. She has already lost much in respect and confidence.

To Americans, what is of most consequence now is not that De Gaulle chooses to "go it alone" but that 14 staunch NATO allies remain determined to stand together. The Atlantic Alliance will endure, no matter what De Gaulle does, and France will be welcomed back as a full partner when the sober second thoughts of her people prevail.

Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, and our other allies are giving firm support to the Atlantic Alliance in all its basic aspects—including the international commands.

De Gaulle may bow out of the international commands. That is his decision. But the other allies consider the unified military commands at the very heart of the Alliance.

The principle involved in the international commands is clear—and proven. In the nuclear age, deterrence and defense require, in advance of any hostile move, effective peacetime unified commands and fully coordinated military forces and resources—which, by virtue of their instant readiness to respond appropriately in any emergency, strengthen the deterrent power of the Alliance.

FHA MULTIFAMILY PROJECTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss two more FHA multifamily projects, both of which were constructed in Newark, N.J., by Mr. Arthur H. Padula.

The first project, Weequahic Park Towers, was approved in 1958 with a final endorsement on May 4, 1962, insuring a $2,939,700 mortgage.

The second project, Weequahic Park Plaza, with the same Mr. Arthur H. Padula as president, was approved in 1963 with an FHA mortgage of $4,535,700.

At the time FHA approved the second mortgage for Mr. Padula his first mortgage was already in default. The local underwriters, appraisers, and land valuators had all strenuously rejected these projects on the basis that they were economically unsound.

On an appeal to Washington they were overridden, and the mortgages ordered to be approved.

In each instance the original cost of the land was ignored and a substantially inflated valuation allowed. The first project, with an original cost of land approximating $33,000 the FHA approved a valuation of $125,000.

On the second project, the Weequahic Park Plaza, the original cost of the land was $36,339, and the Washington office of the FHA approved an appraisal of $300,000, which was $50,000 more than he even asked for in his first application.

This higher valuation was arrived at in direct violation of all regulations and normal procedures as are supposed to be followed by the FHA and over the strenuous objections of their land appraisers and underwriters.

At the time the second project was being approved there were already five out of eight similar projects in the Newark area in default and the FHA was in the process of taking them over.

The Comptroller General upon my request investigated this transaction, and under date of March 10, 1966, submitted a report to Congress strongly criticizing the Department for its laxity in approving what was an obviously unsound project.

The FHA was organized for the stated purpose of aiding the American families in financing the purchase of homes on reasonable terms. It was thought that the most of these homes would be single family units, but provision was made for some to be apartments in a multifamily project. But at all times the duty of this Agency was to protect the individual homeowner and not to allow the program to develop into a shady moneymaking scheme for large promoters or builders.

Unfortunately, however, such has not been the result.

About 10 years ago Congress exposed the scandalous multimillion-dollar windfall projects that were being approved under loose FHA procedures.

Following this congressional investigation exposing these windfall profits we were told the program was being revised, presumably to provide greater protection for the taxpayers and the home buyers.

But there now appears to have developed a new scheme wherein once again wholesale approval is being given to economically unsound projects on terms that are designed to give the builders and a few high-powered promoters a quick profit with little or no thought being given to the plight of the home buyer or tenant who will pay the higher rents that are necessitated by the overappraisals of land and construction costs.

So-called nonprofit projects with 100 percent Government guarantee of both land and construction costs are being approved at appraisal rates that give the promoters an immediate windfall profit, and the most of these projects are in bankruptcy even before completion.

In many instances this is not the fault of the local underwriters and appraisers since they had warned both the local director and the Washington office that as financed these projects would be bankrupt before opening, but the Washington office in case after case has overruled the local underwriters and appraisers as well as the local director.

As an example of how careless the FHA is in approving multifamily projects I review what happened in Newark, N.J., with specific reference to two projects there, the Weequahic Park Plaza and the Weequahic Park Towers. The president of both these corporations is Mr. Arthur H. Padula.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for additional time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have several minor matters that will not take more than 5 minutes. I wonder how long the Senator seeks unanimous consent for in the morning hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. About 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I will reluctantly permit the Senator to continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The 3-minute rule has not been observed this morning. I have been here for an hour and a half waiting for Members on the Democratic side to finish so that a Senator on this side might proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Weequahic Park Towers, financed with a $2,939,700 FHA mortgage, was completed in 1962 and was in default throughout 1963 and 1964, at the time the FHA was approving the second $4½ million project for the same Mr. Padula.

First I shall discuss the second project, the Weequahic Park Plaza. This is the case examined by the Comptroller General.

An application was filed by Mr. Arthur H. Padula, president of the Weequahic Park Plaza, for a Government loan guarantee of $4,535,700 for constructing a 24-story air-conditioned apartment house consisting of 242 residential units in Newark, N.J.

This application was rejected on July 3, 1962, by a committee consisting of the director of the Newark office, the assistant director, the chief underwriter, the chief architect, and the assistant chief valuator. They unanimously recommended against the approval of this project on the basis that there were already too many such units in that area and therefore the project was not economically feasible.

On December 3, 1962, the chief appraiser in the Newark office sustained the rejection and also rendered an adverse report on the project and described it as not economically feasible.

Before this project was approved builders of other FHA insured projects wrote to the Newark office and protested the approval of this project on the basis that the area was already overbuilt, vacancies were high in existing apartments, and further construction would only accelerate failures in completed projects.

In May 1963 an examination of the records in the Newark office of the FHA showed that of projects surveyed vacancies were running as high as 22 percent, and 16 months later, a survey of those same projects showed vacancies as high as 35 percent. Vacancy rates in the other projects ran as high as 57 percent for efficiency and one-bedroom units.

The FHA records also show that as of September 30, 1963, these same eight projects, all of which were covered by FHA insured mortgages, three were in default and two were under modification agreements whereby payments of mortgage principal was deferred.

This represented defaults on five FHA projects out of eight, or an average failure rate of 62 percent.

Notwithstanding this background record of failures and notwithstanding the strenuous objections of all local officials, on October 24, 1963, the project was approved and a commitment issued to insure a $4,535,700 long-term mortgage on this project, the Weequahic Park Plaza.

Do not forget that the same Mr. Padula was already in default on a previously constructed FHA-guaranteed project and that this second approval was upon the orders of the Washington and regional offices over the strenuous objections of the director, the underwriters, and the appraisers of the Newark office.

By March 1964, brokers managing the five projects which the FHA had taken over in default in order to get tenants were granting a 1-month concession if in return the tenant would sign a 1-year lease.

With all this background of vacancies and failures on prior projects, one of which was owned by the same applicant, the FHA was still not concerned, and on April 13, 1964, proceeded to endorse the mortgage for $4,535,700 to enable Mr. Padula, the sponsor of the Weequahic Park Plaza, to proceed with construction.

This project was scheduled for completion by April 1965, and by that time rental conditions were even worse.

By June 30, 1965, there were nine section 207 projects in the city of Newark, N.J., with mortgages insured or held by FHA totaling about $20 million. Of these nine projects three were in the process of being acquired with insured mortgages of about $8.6 million; one insured mortgage for about $3 million was under modification agreement whereby payments on principal were being deferred; and one insured mortgage for about $2 million was in active default.

This represents five projects out of nine, with mortgages totaling $13.6 million, actually in default by the time this latter project was completed.

OVERAPPRAISAL OF LAND

Not only was the approval of the Weequahic Park Plaza project in violation of all sound business practices, but the manner in which the land values were appraised at nearly 10 times its original cost also raises questions of political favoritism or worse.

The FHA records show that the sponsors had purchased this land in June 1962. The original purchase price of the two parcels of land which make up this project site was $36,339. The sponsor claims that he spent another $59,601.74 for demolition and settlement of titles and for obtaining zoning of the area. On this basis he was claiming a total investment of $95,940.74.

The FHA, in a procedure which was completely different from those normally followed in such appraisals, arbitrarily raised the land valuation to $300,000, and it was on this basis that the mortgage was approved. This $300,000 land valuation was $260,000 over the original cost and $50,000 over what even the sponsor first asked for.

Commissioner Brownstein, in a letter dated April 15, 1965, confirmed that in reviewing this land valuation procedure his department questioned the allowance for land value and admitted that thorough documentation of the valuation decision was lacking.

The Comptroller General in his report of March 10, 1966, commenting on this same project likewise emphasized that the land valuation procedures were highly irregular and definitely were not in accord with the FHA regulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Comptroller General may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL IN HIS REPORT OF MARCH 10, 1966

Agency analysts, in reviewing the application for mortgage insurance, deviated from agency procedures, which contributed to estimates of project rental income and real estate tax expense that appeared to us to be overly optimistic. When overly optimistic estimates are used in analyzing applications for mortgage insurance, approval of insurance for projects which have a high degree of risk may result, thereby increasing the possibility of mortgage defaults and foreclosures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we find no justification for the Washington office's having overridden the local appraisers and underwriters in approving what was obviously an uneconomic project, and whoever made this blunder should be identified.

A pattern seems to be developing wherein many unsound projects in the various areas of the country are being approved by Washington headquarters, and the advice and recommendation of their own underwriters are being overridden.

I pay tribute to the many dedicated public servants who are trying to do a good job in this agency but rather than being supported they are being handicapped and ofttimes disciplined for trying to do their jobs, which is to protect the interests of the individual homebuyers and the taxpayers.

On the other hand, far too often we are finding that those who are responsible for overriding their recommendations and rendering these unsound decisions are being promoted.

I recommend that anyone interested in further examination of how this project was handled read the Comptroller General's report of March 10, 1966, in which he outlines the irresponsible manner in which one of these projects was handled.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated April 15, 1965, signed by Mr. Brownstein, along with two attachments outlining further pertinent facts concerning these same two projects.

There being no objection, the letter and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your recent letter in which you requested certain information concerning the following projects: Weequahic Plaza, Newark, N.J.; Weequahic Park Towers, Newark, N.J.

I have prepared and attached separate information sheets on each project, answering the questions in the order which you outlined in your letter.

Since your letter is restricted to multifamily housing projects and covers various phases of the processing of these projects, it might be of interest to note some developments within the agency relative to some of these matters. In reviewing various cases, it has appeared to me that while the appraisal techniques of the Federal Housing Administration are quite sound, problems that arise in the review of these cases stem largely from failure to document fully the basis for valuation decisions. This sometimes has made for difficulty in determining the validity of these decisions when they were reviewed at a later date.

For a number of months in various communications to the field offices, I have laid considerable stress on the importance of documentation. One of the most pertinent letters having to do with this matter was one of January 9, 1964, in which the field was instructed that acquisition cost of land being valued must be determined in all cases and that all factors influencing a valuation higher than the acquisition cost must be thoroughly and completely documented.

As I am sure you appreciate, value may accrue to land in a number of ways and the intent of the letter of January 9, 1964, is to be certain that these factors are completely spelled out in the file so that reviews of appraisals are facilitated and the basis for judgment will be completely available.

Sincerely,

P. N. BROWNSTEIN,
Commissioner.

WEEQUAHIC PARK TOWERS, PROJECT No. 031-00204

[Sec. 207, rental housing, Newark, N.J.]

1. Commitment to insure advances issued November 10, 1958, in the amount of $2,495,500. Commitment was reissued on March 2, 1959, and January 14, 1960, in the amounts of $2,499,500 and $2,778,500, respectively. Amended commitment in the latter amount was issued January 22, 1960, changing the plan of amortization. At final endorsement, on May 4, 1962, the insured mortgage amount was increased to $2,939,700. These increases over a 3-year period resulted from improved structural changes in the project plan and from revised estimated replacement costs.

2. The land was appraised at $3.03 per square foot for a total valuation of $125,000. FHA's estimate of fair market value of the project: $3,266,400.

3. Certified actual cost of improvements, including land valuations: $3,391,740. The land for this project was assembled primarily through third party transactions over periods dating back to 1951. County records indicate a total original cost of $33,000. The sponsor reports additional costs of nearly $200,000 incurred in connection with acquisition and holding of the land, and preparing it for project development.

4. Mortgagor: Weequahic Park Towers, Inc., Arthur H. Padula, president.

Mortgagee: Commitment for insurance issued to Alexander Summer Mortgage Co. Assigned to National Bank of Newark. May 3, 1962, mortgage transferred to National State Bank of Newark, trustee.

5. Interest rate: 5¼ percent.

6. No.

7. A payment to principal in the amount of $3,762 was made in August 1962. Subsequently, a series of modification agreements provided for deferment of payments to principal to March 1, 1965. The National State Bank of Newark has advised that the principal payment due March 1 has not been made. The March 1965 interest and accrual payments have been made.

As of March 15, 1965, the project was approximately 80 percent occupied.

WEEQUAHIC PARK PLAZA, PROJECT No. 031-00289

[Sec. 207, rental housing, Newark, N.J.]

1. Commitment for insurance of advances issued October 24, 1963, in the amount of $4,535,700. Total advances disbursed as of January 27, 1965, $3,374,882.96; undisbursed mortgage proceeds, $1,160,817.04.

2. The original valuation of this land was $123,750. This valuation was appealed by the sponsor on the basis of zoning variations which gave advantages to the project. The sponsor sought a value of $365,000, and the final FHA valuation was $300,000.

The problem of land valuation following zoning variances, which give certain advantages to a particular site, is a difficult one. There are many approaches to estimating these values, depending upon the absence or presence of comparable property. The ultimate finding is one of personal judgment on the facts assembled. In reviewing this case, we have questioned the allowance for land value. I feel that in this case thorough documentation of the valuation decision was lacking and the matter has been taken up with the individuals involved. The directive on documentation referred to in this communication will serve to help correct this problem in the future.

3. Certified cost of improvements has yet to be determined, project being only 64.5 percent complete as of January 27, 1965. Construction was started March 1964. The project is to be completed by October 1, 1965, per construction contract.

The sponsor reports that the purchase price of the two parcels of land which make up this project site was $36,339 and that additional costs of $59,601.74 were incurred for demolition, the settlement of title questions related to easements, the obtaining of zoning variances, test borings, interest and taxes, and the contesting of a taxpayer's suit related to the zone variance. On this basis, he claims a total investment of $95,940.74.

4. Mortgagor: Weequahic Park Plaza, Arthur H. Padula, president.

Mortgagee—original: Alexander Summer Mortgage Co., Newark, N.J. Present: John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.

5. Interest rate: 5¼ percent.

6. No.

AWARD OF NEW YORK INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR PRIZE TO SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on March 10, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] was the recipient of the New York International Trade Fair prize, awarded for "courageous and independent leadership in international relations."

The award was presented by Gottfried Neuberger, Director of the International Trade Shows. More than 30 countries participated in the current fair, including Europe from Spain to the Soviet Union, and Asia from India to Japan.

In accepting the award, Senator Morse took note of the leadership exerted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in seeking to open the whole subject of China to a fresh review.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The United States and Mainland China—A Time for a Change and a Plan for Action

(Address of Senator Wayne D. Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, before the International Toy and Trade Fair, Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y., March 10, 1966)

Mr. Chairman, exhibitors, friends, I am deeply honored to be with you tonight to accept the New York International Fair Prize, which you have so generously awarded to me. It is an occasion which I shall long remember and I shall treasure the award. I shall add it to the walls of my office in Washington as a reminder and memento of our meeting here tonight.

I am further very pleased to be able to speak from this forum, which comes most opportunely in light of the current hearings being carried on by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations respecting our relationships with China, to develop with you the reasons why now is the time to begin a process of changes in our relationships with China and to suggest to you some elements of a plan for action which it is my hope will lead to greater stability in our international relationships with this great area of the globe.

Never forget, despite the astronauts exploration into space, we share but one world and either we develop ways and means of doing this, if not amicably, at least peaceably, or we face the prospect, horrible to contemplate, of a virtual incineration of large areas of the earth.

In his historic foreign policy address at American University in 1964, President Kennedy gave some excellent advice on dealing with Communist nations. The late President urged us not to be blind to our differences, but also to direct our attention to our common interests and the means by which these differences can be resolved. Our relations with mainland China since then have offered ample evidence that we have remained well aware of our differences, but there has been little indication that we have made an honest effort to explore our common interests or the ways by which our differences may be resolved. On the contrary, there is still a crying need for a redirection of American foreign policy towards a realistic appraisal of our relations with mainland China. This statement is a plea for such a reappraisal and a suggestion of some of the ways in which we may employ our common interests with China to begin the first steps in resolving our differences.

A nation's foreign policy, like its government, is not an end of itself, but simply a means of better serving the interests of its citizens. In appraising our relations with other nations we must ask ourselves if we are pursuing the best possible policies to promote the national interest of the United States and the American people. To do so we must be flexible. We must be capable of adjusting to changes in the international environment. For the first lesson of international politics is that nothing remains unaltered by time; nothing is invulnerable to the law of change. Above all, there are no clear and immutable absolutes in relations among nations, and there should be none in their policies toward each other.

No reasonable man would dare argue that the international position of China today is comparable to the position of China 16 years ago, or even 6 years ago. Only 6 years ago China was considered an impoverished and overpopulated agrarian nation whose importance in international affairs came from her potential as the No. 1 ally of the Soviet Union. Today the nation Napoleon described as a "sleeping giant," has awakened. She is no longer a stagnant underdeveloped nation but a growing industrial power. And she possesses the atomic bomb. China is no longer a loyal ally of Russia but she is a major influence in the underdeveloped world and the predominant political power in Asia. Before very long she will be one of the world's greatest powers, and the Chinese will comprise one-half of the entire human race.

China's present and her potential offer an exceedingly complex and subtle problem for American foreign policy. It is important that we do not continue to deal with this problem in the simplistic terms of 16 years ago. Sixteen years ago our policy toward mainland China was built on the premise that the Communist regime was only a temporary interruption in the rightful occupation of power by the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek. Our attitude of not yielding an inch either in principle or practice hardened during the Korean war and remains unchanged today. Unfortunately, our rigidity toward Communist China has yielded no positive results. On the contrary, it has caused a minor rift in the Western alliance and repelled many Asians who have interpreted our attitude as fundamentally anti-Asian. Many of our allies simply do not understand our crusading attitude toward the mainland regime. To them the fact that China is Communist is only of secondary importance. They recognize and respect the power of the mainland regime and try to come to terms with it in accordance with their national interests. In other words, they accept the reality of China today.

They recognize that there is only one mainland China; that it is ruled by the Communists and is likely to remain so indefinitely. Moreover, they realize that China is the predominant political power in the Far East and Asia and that this political predominance is as much a fact of life as our own in the Western Hemisphere.

It is interesting to note that, despite their aggressive statements, the Communist regime has been notably realistic, even cautious, in pursuing its stated goals. The Chinese would like very much to remove all American military forces from the mainland of Asia and its adjacent waters and islands. They would also like to reassert China's traditional sway over all its smaller neighbors and regain what they regard as China's lost territories: Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macao, and parts of south Asia. These are not necessarily Communist goals, but the traditional national interests of a powerful China. Communism has simply given them a more spectacular image.

The fact is that China might like to do all sorts of things to satisfy her national ambitions but she is actually willing to attempt very little. After 16 years of power Chinese foreign policy has not been particularly aggressive or expansionist in traditional terms. When the Chinese have resorted to force, it has been used with clear limitations, or in response to what they considered a threat to their security. As Americans we would do well to heed the advice of our Japanese friends who tell us to study what China is doing or likely to do rather than what she says.

Now I think a flexible foreign policy, one that is capable of adapting to change, would take these factors into account after 16 years. First of all it would recognize China as the predominant political force in the Far East and Asia and as a growing great power. Second, it would assess our relations with her not in terms of ideologies and propaganda but on the basis of her actions and their relevance to the national interest of the United States. A foreign policy that is not able to adjust to changes—one that insists on an ideological rigidity—can get us nowhere.

Once we have made a realistic appraisal we should make every effort to open the door to greater political contacts with the mainland Chinese. Now I am not suggesting that this is going to be easy or that a great change can occur overnight. The Chinese have a good number of historical reasons for remaining hostile to the West and being nearly surrounded by U.S. military bases doesn't make their leaders any more friendly. Besides this there are certain ingrained traits toward reaction and overbearing diplomatic methods that would have made her difficult to deal with once she attained a little power in any case. When you add ideological and political motives for continuing to present the United States as the No. 1 enemy it is a difficult situation.

Nevertheless, we have faced similar difficulties with the Soviet Union and I doubt if anyone would say our efforts to increase contact have hurt us there. There is a terrific amount of ignorance of the United States in China, even among the leadership. (Mao himself has never been to the West.) I think whatever contacts we have will ultimately be to our advantage. As far as our own knowledge of China is concerned, increased contacts are essential. We simply cannot afford to continue to isolate ourselves from a nation of 800 million people indefinitely.

If we can establish a reasonable amount of personal exchange and communication with Peiping—not only among political leaders but also through newspapermen, businessmen, artists, and scientists—there is no reason why we cannot take the first steps to establish a mutually beneficial trade relationship. Of course this will require some rethinking about our present policies in this area, but I think it is time we began to do our rethinking. Naturally we are not going to export strategic materials to Communist China, but there are other commodities well worth considering.

Our allies are already way ahead of us here, too. Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Canada—most of our key allies—have sent trade missions to China. They have found that trade with mainland China is possible, practical, and can be quite profitable. In fact, NATO associated nations accounted for $223 million worth of imports from Communist China in 1964 alone.

I frankly cannot think of a single reason that can be given for our present policy of selling wheat to Russia which would not apply to trade with China. And in China there is the added moral factor represented by the desperate need of millions of undernourished people.

China can be an excellent market not only for our wheat surpluses but also for such things as lumber or just about any industrial product that does not contribute directly to military strength. In turn there are several products which we could import from the mainland; for example: silk, silk yarn, animal hides and skins, cashmere, tin, hog bristles, dressed furs, and essential oils, to name a few.

The Soviet Union has already shown us how ideological aggressiveness mellows when nations are able to supply their citizens' more basic needs. We also know that economic prosperity is the best known method of effective mass birth control, not to mention the fact that a well-fed China is less likely to launch a desperate drive to conquer the rice bowl of southeast Asia.

None of these things are going to be accomplished quickly or easily. That is why it is necessary to begin now before it is too late. There is an old Chinese proverb that says, "A journey of a thousand leagues must begin with a single step." China's importance as a great power is growing every day. It is time we made the first step.

I earlier said that I am grateful to you for the forum you have provided me tonight to discuss the China problem, and because through hearings which were opened earlier this week in the Senate under the leadership of Senator FULBRIGHT, in my judgment we are beginning to come to grips with the necessity for a change in our policy and the need for a plan of action which will in the best sense of the word safeguard our vital interests as a nation in this area of the globe.

No one who served in the Senate during the 1950's and the late 1940's needs to be reminded how fraught with emotion this subject is and how hard it is for anyone to talk about it with reason. This atmosphere is what has kept the subject a closed book in the State Department and in the White House for the past 17 years.

But keeping the subject closed has not changed the fact that it is there, and that events, conditions, and possibilities have shifted and changed as much in that area of our international relations as they have in every other area in these 17 years.

When I hear that Communist China is an aggressive, militant power that must be brought into peaceful coexistence by means of fear of American military power, I am reminded that, although we applied that principle to the Soviet Union with some success, we coupled it with many other policies toward Russia that are still missing from our policy toward China.

For example, we withheld diplomatic recognition from the Bolshevik government of Russia for about the same length of time that we have now withheld from the Communist government of China. But when the cold war began, and when it culminated in the Cuban missile crisis, our diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union were a key element in enabling us to judge for ourselves her interests and possible responses.

In fact, if we had not had diplomatic relations with Russia at the time of the October 1962 missile crisis, I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that we would have been at war with Russia. It was only because we had well-traveled diplomatic avenues open that it was possible for the President of the United States and the head of the Russian government to communicate with each other.

What is sorely needed at this critical time, when war clouds between the United States and China are gathering, is communication between the United States and China.

The presence of the Soviet Union in the United Nations has been another factor in exposing her leaders to world opinion and discussion, which is not present in the case of China.

Further, our trade and cultural and tourist exchange with the Soviet Union, including the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to this country, have had some slight effect in achieving the state of mind that enables the Soviet Union and the United States to think of each other as people, rather than as the disembodied dogmas that the Senator from Arkansas has talked about.

How well I remember the latter part of November, when, as chairman of the Senate delegation, we went to Hong Kong, because the administration had urged us to go to Hong Kong, for a briefing on Chinese problems. We had a briefing by our great Foreign Service officer there, the consul general, Mr. Rice. In our discussions we talked about China's economic conditions. In that briefing came the information that the Chinese people have not been as well fed in decades and decades and decades.

When a question was asked by one of our delegation as to whether there is not starvation in China, we were told there is not. In that briefing we were told that China has crop failures. There are areas of China that suffer from drought and failures because of weather conditions. But it was suggested that perhaps it would be a good idea to take my delegation to one of the largest Communist banks in Hong Kong. We were told they would be very proud to show it to us. We were told that that large Communist bank last year had an exchange benefit of more than one-half billion dollars. Then it was said to us, that is where they get the money to pay for Canadian wheat.

Then there was a little discussion about trade policy. No one could listen to it without recognizing the shortsightedness of American policy vis-a-vis China.

I come from the west coast. Business interests up and down the west coast have visited me for years, urging that we recognize the advisability of engaging in trade with China in nonstrategic goods. Canada does it, and Canada has taken away from the United States our historic wheat trade program with China.

As far as Asia is concerned, China was the chief purchaser of American wheat for years. Now Canada enjoys that benefit.

What are we gaining by it? What is this kind of economic isolationism leading us to? What is this kind of economic isolationism vis-a-vis China leading us to? In my opinion, it is contributing to an oncoming war with China.

I am proud to sit at the feet of the great Senator from Arkansas, who has the courage and the foresight to tell the American people, as they are being swept up in waves of patriotic hysteria—which is really false patriotism—that they are following a mistaken course of action in regard to United States-China relationships.

We will not be able to contain China with American bombs. We will not be able to contain China solely with American military forces. But it appears that we are ready to try.

These are times when Americans in seats of responsibility should be willing to give the American people that forewarning. I think it is the height of national stupidity to think we can win a peace after a war with China, for all that the hundreds of millions of Chinese will do will be to dig in for as long as it takes to throw the United States out of Asia.

The interesting thing is that is what most Americans would do if they were Asians in the same situation.

When are we going to learn that no Western power, including the United States—just as other Western powers have already learned—will be able to maintain a position of domination in Asia? That era is gone.

These are times when we had better take a look at what our future position is going to be vis-a-vis Asia and China, and recognize that the course of action the United States calls military containment is an insurance policy for war. That is going to be the end result.

Judging from the ease with which military solutions are talked up for every American difficulty in the Far East, one wonders whether we should not at least get to know China better before we have a war with her. Earlier this week, for example, we heard again, but this time from an administration confidant, the proposal that we mine the North Vietnamese harbor at Haiphong. With Americans, mining the harbor seems to be in somewhat the same class as bombing—it sounds neat and sanitary and seems to avoid the messy elements of war that are distressing to watch on television screens.

But no one has mentioned the fact that every navy that has minelayers has also minesweepers. The military technology of mines has not been discussed but it has been true in the past that mines can be swept as well as laid out. It may be that the United States has developed something new in this respect. But if we did place mines so as to intercept shipping into Haiphong, we would have to assume that Soviet or Chinese minesweepers would try to get rid of them.

I cannot imagine Soviet freighters, for example, going through a minefield without the Soviet Navy first trying to get rid of the mines. I cannot imagine the Communist flag of Russia lowering itself to a blockade of Haiphong, an American blockade of Haiphong.

That is a risk that, in my judgment, those responsible for the leadership of the United States should never run. That is a risk which, in my judgment, the leaders of this Government cannot justify taking in future American history. That is a risk that, in my judgment, augurs very well the terrible danger of a war with China and Russia. That is why I think we ought to heed the Senator from Arkansas when he is pleading with us to change our course of action from one obviously designed for unconditional surrender in southeast Asia to a program of accommodation, to a program of recognizing that Asia is entitled to exercise a voice in determining the policy of Asia.

There is no question about China's irresponsibility so far as her leaders are concerned. It saddens me, but I say it because I believe it: Her irresponsibility compares with our own irresponsibility. Her irresponsibility compares with the irresponsibility of our own leadership, for, in my opinion, our own leadership is taking us closer to a war with China.

I do not know whether it is possible to get Red China to assume some sense of responsibility, given the climate that prevails in the present administration I feel we must change our course of action, at least to the extent of adding to it the nonmilitary means of reaching a state of peaceful coexistence. That effort must be made. The great statesmen from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is trying to point the way to a program of statesmanship as a substitute for what I consider to be the military and political expediency on the international scene of our present administration.

Many of us have forgotten the open door policy for China which for many years was the mainstay of our relationships in that area. Is it not true that the purpose of the open door policy was to safeguard the commercial interests of the United States against the possibility that European extraterritorial rights in China might become the means of gaining trade privileges at our expense?

Let me recall for you the words of John Hay, a great Secretary of State, which defined that policy. In his circular telegram to our embassies in Berlin, Paris, London, Rome and

St. Petersburg, at the time of the China crisis of that day, John Hay said: "If wrong is done to our citizens, we propose to hold the responsible authors to the uttermost accountability. The purpose of the President is, as it has been heretofore, to act concurrently with the other powers first, in opening up communication with Peiping and rescuing American officials, missionaries, and other Americans who are in danger; second, in affording all possible protection everywhere in China to American life and property; third, in guarding and protecting all legitimate American interests; and fourth, in aiding to prevent a spread of the disorders to the other provinces of the empire and a recurrence of such disasters. It is, of course, too early to forecast the means of attaining this last result; but the policy of the Government of the United States is to seek a solution which may bring about permanent safety and peace to China, preserve Chinese territorial and administrative entity, protect all rights guaranteed to friendly powers by treaty and international law, and safeguard for the world the principle of equal and impartial trade with all parts of the Chinese empire."

Undoubtedly the American desire to keep all of China accessible to American interest served to offset somewhat the European demands for exclusive rights; but our motives were still those of self-interest and not motives for the benefit of China itself.

If we are going to further the cause of peace, an honorable peace, if we are going to further the cause of substituting the rule of law for America's military jungle law in southeast Asia, it is for us to recognize that the time has come for a change in American policy vis-a-vis China to recognize that, now, not the Chinese closed-door policy but the U.S. closed-door policy should be changed in China, and that we ought to recognize that an accommodation should be worked out.

As I have said so many times in this historic debate, these despicable Chinese leaders are going to leave the scene sooner or later. Time will overtake them. But the masses of Chinese people will carry on, and as enlightenment develops, as they become better and better informed and educated, perhaps through increased contacts with the West, as they enjoy greater benefits of economic freedom over the course of years, this great reservoir, now empty of United States-China good will, can be filled again. I am interested in filling that reservoir of United States-China friendship.

I still think that we ought to start filling that reservoir and therefore I add my voice in pleading with my Government that it stop a policy that obviously is designed to contain China through military force alone and face the fact that we can never militarily contain China, for if we follow that policy we will take America to a war that can lead not only to a war with China but the beginning of world war III. That is my plea.

SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from Mr. E. E. Halmos, Jr., president of the Commissioners of Poolesville, Md.

The letter relates to the question of legislative reapportionment and is so well written and sets out the facts so meticulously that I think it should be incorporated in the RECORD so that it will be available to others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSIONERS OF POOLESVILLE,
TOWN OF POOLESVILLE, MD.,
March 15, 1966.

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a resident and an elected official of a small community not too far from the National Capital, I personally would like to commend most strongly your efforts to permit the States to decide for themselves how at least one legislative body should be apportioned.

I feel that the wide, indiscriminate and rapid application of the inflexible population-only system is creating yet another disadvantaged minority in the United States: The residents of the small towns and rural areas, who will very soon be without any voice or influence in either National or State legislatures (and even in some counties).

Perhaps of greater danger to all of us is the fact that a legislature made up of members elected on a strict population basis in both houses will lose its function as a body in which our traditional checks and balances has functioned so well. There will be no check at all on vote attracting schemes that may be of some benefit to urban groups, but which may be of no value—or even detrimental—to the State as a whole and to rural areas in particular. Unless there is some point at which a thoughtful minority can say, effectively, "go slow—let's think this out," there will be no compromises for the good of all. The urban majority will simply be an apt example—and one easily observed. Ultimately, of course, this abuse of the democratic process will damage the well-being of every element in our society including the urban majority.

I know very well—and I do not defend—practices in many of our States in the past concerning legislative apportionment. But I do not believe that a complete swing from one side to the other—from complete rural to complete urban domination—is the proper way to right whatever wrongs may have been perpetrated.

The very small community which I have the honor to serve in an official capacity may be an apt example—and one easily observed, since it is within 40 miles of Washington, D.C.

Very briefly, the town of Poolesville is no "bedroom" community; it has existed astride its crossroads since the first John Poole settled there in about 1763. His descendants, and those of most of the other original settlers, still live and work in and around the community.

Because of its location a little off the beaten track, the community has changed little over the years, farming (cattle and dairy) is still a principal industry; less than half of our working population commutes elsewhere for work—and this is limited largely to Rockville, about 18 miles away.

We are not unaware of the fact that the urban explosion going on around Washington is reaching in our direction, and the members of our town government (all of whom serve without compensation) have been working long and hard over the past 4 years to prepare the community for orderly, healthy growth. We have modernized our zoning, building, and other ordinances to cope with growth problems, and have nearly completed construction of the town's first public utility—a sewerage system.

We are, however, on the far northern edge of a major, growing urban county (Montgomery) and I have found very often that our interests differ very considerably from those of the down-county residents in such areas as Rockville, Bethesda, Chevy Chase, or Wheaton. So long as we can maintain our local government, and some voice in county affairs, we can at least compromise matters that are of greatest interest elsewhere, in order to keep our own problems in proportion and without injuring the legitimate interests of others.

Perhaps an example of how we may become disadvantaged is visible in a proposal now being considered, under which our county council—now elected at large—would be elected from seven districts of relatively equal population. Each district would have to contain about 70,000 people—but it would be difficult to find even 10,000 from a very large area of the upper county.

So the answer would be quite simple: We in Poolesville would be brigaded with some more populous area (such as Rockville) in order to produce the required number of bodies. Rockville is a major city with problems, tax rates, and philosophies often far different from ours. But there is little doubt at to who would elect the councilman from such a district—and who he would feel called upon to represent.

Not by malicious intent, but simply as the result of an inflexible apportionment formula, we would be the small fish swallowed by a larger one. But the larger one, such as Rockville, in turn, on the State legislative level very probably would be swallowed by the largest fish of all in the State—Baltimore—and under the inflexible population formula Rockville could see its interests and problems lost in the maw of the whale.

As a civic official, I have had personal experience over the past 3 years in working with a central government agency, far removed from local conditions and attempting to impose standard conditions on everyone. Some of this experience could very well fill a book of frustration—but I won't burden you with it here. Suffice it to say that I'm rather too well aware of the fact that the farther away a government gets from the people it governs, the less responsive, the more rigid, and the less sensible it becomes.

I am very much afraid that something like this will be the result of a legislative body that is made up as onesidedly as now seems dictated.

In any case, I wanted to express my approval of your attempt to put through Senate Joint Resolution 103—and offer any help I may be able to render to put across the points in its favor to the public at large. I feel, with you and your colleagues, that this is a matter too important to be settled by fiat. It is a matter that the people themselves must be permitted to decide, after due and proper consideration.

Sincerely,

E. E. HALMOS, Jr.,
President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the General Federation of Women's Clubs have indicated, in a news release of March 14, 1966, their support for Senate Joint Resolution 103 on legislative reapportionment.

This is a far flung organization whose membership runs into the millions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this news release by the General Federation of Women's Clubs be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[A General Federation of Women's Clubs news release, Mar. 14, 1966]

In a statement issued today Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, said: "In June of

1965 at the annual convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, a resolution was unanimously adopted which 'urged the Members of Congress to enact legislation that would guarantee to the States the right to apportion their representation in legislative bodies.'

"This resolution was adopted because members of the Federation believe it is an inherent right of the people, by free and majority vote, to decide how they wish to be represented in their own State legislatures. The American people have exercised this right since the Constitution was founded and it is to have or not to have this right that is at issue today. It is not whether districts equal in population are or are not better but simply whether the people can continue to make the choice. To take away from the people of a State the right to decide how their legislature is to be established is to strike down a basic principle of democratic government.

"The General Federation of Women's Clubs is the largest organization of women in the world, and each and every member is grateful to the writers of the Constitution for giving the American people the right to amend the Constitution.

"Just as the 19th amendment gave American women the right to vote, the proposed reapportionment amendment, now before the U.S. Senate, would provide the citizens of each State the right to decide on whether they want both houses, or simply one house, of their legislatures composed on a population-only basis. Could anything be more fair than to let the people vote on this issue? It is difficult to understand why some people oppose this proposed amendment and that fundamental right.

"We have faith in the democratic process—that process which guarantees to the people the right to decide. That is all this issue is about—whether or not the people have the right to decide for themselves."

Dear Club President: On June 15, 1964, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down decisions dealing with the reapportionment of State legislatures. The decisions promulgated the broad rule that "* * * the Equal Protection Clause (of the 14th amendment) requires both houses of a State legislature to be apportioned on a population basis."

This action by the Supreme Court ruled as unconstitutional the long-cherished practice that a State could apportion one house of its legislature along geographical lines. It upset long-established institutions of government. It ordered an end to apportionment on a basis that reflects the various interests within a State. It restricted apportionment solely to the basis of population.

The impact was immediate in every State and has since led to confusion in the courts, legislative deadlocks, and general political uncertainty as to the legal status of political subdivisions of every kind, including the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

Concerned Americans, seeking to end this unprecedented chaos and to restore political order and truly representative government, are working to achieve adoption of a corrective constitutional amendment, popularly known as the Dirksen amendment.

At the General Federation of Women's Clubs Convention last June a resolution entitled "Legislative Apportionment" was unanimously adopted. The resolved of that resolution reads: "*Resolved*, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Members of the Congress to enact legislation that would guarantee to the States the right to apportion their representation in legislative bodies."

Senator Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, has introduced a constitutional amendment in the U.S. Senate (S.J. Res. 103) which has been cosponsored by members of both political parties and which has bipartisan support. Senate Joint Resolution 103 proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States "to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United Statets."

The enclosed pamphlet entitled "Let the People Decide" [not shown in Record] briefly but clearly explains how you and the members of your club can best make your voices heard on this most important constitutional question. I sincerely urge you to give it your very careful consideration.

My warmest regards to you and all the other members of your club.

Most cordially,

Mrs. William H. Hasebroock,
President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, over 500 State legislators have given new support to this legislative reapportionment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a release which deals with the support given to legislative reapportionment by State legislators.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[A Committee for Government of the People release, Mar. 16, 1966]

State Legislators Give Heavy New Support to Reapportionment Amendment

Some 500 State legislators from throughout the Nation have joined in urging passage of Senate Joint Resolution 103, the reapportionment amendment pending in the Congress, and have become members of the Committee for Government of the People, the bipartisan citizens organization conducting the national reapportionment campaign.

"These, the men and women thoroughly experienced in State government, are among the strongest leaders in every State in the campaign to let the people decide how their State legislature is to be apportioned." Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, chairman of the Committee for Government of the People, announced today.

"The reapportionment campaign," Dirksen said, "is spreading like a prairie fire throughout the States. The people of the country," he said, "are demanding in an ever-swelling chorus of voices that Congress take affirmative action on the reapportionment amendment and let the people of each State decide this vital question by majority vote."

Cochairmen with Senator Dirksen on the Committee for Government of the People are Senator Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho; Senator Spessard L. Holland, Democrat of Florida; Senator Roman L. Hruska, Republican of Nebraska; Senator Frank J. Lausche, Democrat of Ohio; Senator Hugh Scott, Republican of Pennsylvania; Representative Richard H. Ichord, Democrat of Missouri; Representative Carleton J. King, Republican of New York; Representative William M. McCulloch, Republican of Ohio; Representative B. F. Sisk, Democrat of California; and Representative William M. Tuck, Democrat of Virginia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not encumber the Record with the names of all the legislators.

THE FUTURE OF ASIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senate will consider on Monday the special appropriation for the Vietnam war. On that occasion I expect to speak, not briefly, but not at great length.

In thinking about this problem, I was interested to read in the Washington Post of March 16 a most interesting column by Joseph Kraft entitled "Four Pillars of Asia." It occurs to me that the point of view expressed by Mr. Kraft is well worth consideration by all Members of the Senate. I would even suggest that it might be worth prayerful thought by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense.

A witticism going around the Capitol these days is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff no longer do exactly what Joe Alsop wants them to do. It occurs to me that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of State might well do a little more: Do what Mr. Kraft would like to have them do. He points out that the central strategic reality in Asia is not Vietnam at all, and that the future of Asia is not going to be settled by that tiny, little, and relatively little unimportant country.

I am very fearful of that, because of our somewhat adolescent view that every endeavor we go into must end in complete victory, and because of an almost Chinese preoccupation with face on the part of a number of our rulers, we are getting lost so that we cannot see the Asian forest because we are looking all the time at the Vietnamese trees.

Mr. Kraft points out that Communist China is by far the most important country in Asia. He agrees, as I do, that the containment of China is important, indeed, a very important objective of our foreign policy until such time as the belligerence of the present phase of their Communist revolution fails.

Mr. Kraft points out also that, whereas for many generations, if not for many centuries, China was an impotent dragon, she has largely, since the Communists took power, become a major military, economic, and social power in Asia, as, indeed, she was the only important civilized country in the world a couple of thousand years ago.

Mr. Kraft suggests, and I agree, that what the United States really ought to be doing in Vietnam now is continuing a holding operation which will prevent China from spilling all over southeast Asia, but that really, because of our geographic position and many of the other disabilities which confront a white man when he engages in a land war on the ground mass of Asia, we are certainly not an ideal people to contain China in this regard, but rather, the countries which should be doing this are Japan, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan. Unfortunately, with the possible exception of Japan, none of those countries are presently geared up enough, either economically or militarily, to carry on the job of restoring the balance of power in Asia until such time as we can work out some sensible method under the rule of law and disarmament, and a less barbaric way, of keeping the peace than by maintaining a balance of power.

Mr. Kraft also points out that the major American interest should be in building up these four pillars of Asia. What concerns me is that in view of our preoccupation with Vietnam, we are going to devote so much of our wealth, so much of our foreign aid, and so much of our military efforts to Vietnam, and, as I say, to the Chinese effort to save face, that we will not adequately come into an appropriate economic and social alliance with those four pillars of Asia who, in the long run, are essential to the maintenance of the balance of power in that country.

Mr. Kraft poses a final question which I think we should be seriously considering here in the Senate, whether this country, in its executive branch, particularly in the Defense Department and in the State Department, has the brains and the brawn to play the role of a great power.

I think that is a matter that we should concern ourselves with as we debate the appropriation bill on Monday next.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Kraft's article entitled "Four Pillars of Asia," published in the Washington Post of March 16, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR PILLARS OF ASIA

(By Joseph Kraft)

The Indonesian upheaval, whatever its final outcome, serves to underline the strategic realities in Asia. It puts Vietnam and the war there in true perspective. And it poses the question whether this country has the wit, as well as the strength, to play the role of a great power.

The central strategic reality in Asia, of course, is not Vietnam. The enduring shape of things to come is not going to be determined by that tiny, little molehill of a country. On the contrary, it is going to be determined by the vast mountain ranges of countries that sprawl across the Asian mainland and its island fringes.

The most important of these great countries, by far, is China. China is important by reason of its immense population, its great size, its central location, its ancient traditions, and its skills and resources.

For many decades, China was in a state of political collapse. During that period, she lost her rightful place in the Asian sun. But in the course of the last two or three decades, this central political weakness has been largely overcome.

Now the Chinese are making their comeback. They are asserting themselves all over the world, but particularly against their immediate neighbors. And they are doing it in the spirit of revolutionary elan and boastful self-glorification that comes naturally to people long denied.

In the long run, the restraint of Chinese self-aggrandizement will have to depend on the neighboring great powers. Security, to put it another way, will have to rest on the four pillars of Asia.

Japan, because of its advanced technology, large population, and cohesive political structure, probably has the major role to play. As a close second, there is India, with its huge population, its unmistakably democratic political system, and its growing economic power.

In third position, comes Indonesia, the fifth most populous country in the world, and one of the richest in natural resources. And finally there is Pakistan, heavily populated, with a strong military tradition, and an economy that has, as the phrase goes, taken off.

For the time being, none of these countries is able to play its full part in dealings with China. All four have been afflicted by grave internal problems in the postwar era. They have had to concentrate on domestic matters, to the exclusion of a larger international role.

In these circumstances, with the four non-Chinese powers of Asia relatively prostrate, it has fallen to the United States to maintain the balance of power. That is why Americans fought in Korea, and policed the Straits of Formosa. And that is why—if there is any reason at all—Americans are now fighting in Vietnam.

But to say that is to say that in the strictest sense the Vietnam war is a holding operation. This country is holding the line against the day when the Japanese, the Indians, the Indonesians, and the Pakistanis are themselves strong enough to maintain a balance that will afford a measure of protection to the smaller states of Asia.

It follows, accordingly, that the major American interest lies not in Vietnam, but in building up the four pillars of Asia to the point where they can assume the burden this country has carried for so long. The more so as all four countries, and especially Indonesia now, seem to be moving to rid themselves of the shackles that limited their international role in the past.

But how well is this sense of the priorities understood in the United States? How many officials on how many occasions have made it plain that the United States had no great strategic interest directly at stake in Vietnam?

How many officials on how many occasions have indicated that this country was not fighting an ideological war against communism, but only acting to right a dangerous imbalance of power?

How many officials on how many occasions have pointed out that this country was fighting a holding action, not a war aimed at defeating the other side?

The answers that emerge when these questions are posed suggest that the national record, notably in recent weeks and months, is not brilliant. And that is why there remains the larger question of whether this country has the brain as well as the brawn to play the role as a great power.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE GODDARD MEMORIAL DINNER

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have long had an interest in the annual presentation of the Goddard Award. Dr. Robert H. Goddard, in whose memory the award is made, did much of his pioneer rocket work in New Mexico. At ceremonies at the White House yesterday, President Johnson received the Goddard Award. This was a fitting tribute to the President's leadership in space which runs back many years to his service in the Senate.

Vice President HUMPHREY, who is chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, addressed the Goddard Memorial Dinner last night in connection with the award ceremonies and I ask that his remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE GODDARD MEMORIAL DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 16, 1966

Today we commemorate the 40th anniversary of Dr. Robert Goddard's launching of the first liquid fuel rocket.

As we all know so well, Dr. Goddard's recognition came long after it should have come. But today there is no question of his role in moving man into space.

On the occasion of this anniversary, President Johnson today received the Goddard Award. I was privileged to take part in that ceremony, as chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

Tonight I particularly wish to commend the National Space Club—which already has done so much to open up the space age—on the award of its first annual Dr. Hugh L. Dryden Fellowship.

When I addressed you a year ago I confessed myself a newcomer in space, but I promised to be a diligent student.

I have not yet been put into orbit. However, I have logged over a quarter of a million miles in 80 missions here on earth—and many of those missions have included visits to NASA and Department of Defense field installations. I have also visited a number of private industry installations vital to our space effort.

And, of course, I have chaired a number of space council meetings and followed closely all aspects of our activity in space.

Let me share with you tonight—1 year later—a few of my thoughts concerning our space program. I will begin by saying that I have been deeply impressed by the dedication and high performance of those, both in Government and private sector, who participate in our national space effort.

Our space program is a superb example of the kind of creative partnership for progress between Government and the private sector which increasingly marks all areas of our national life.

I wish tonight to stress two things that have been very much on my mind regarding the space program.

First. I am impressed by the vital importance of maintaining the most meticulous standards of performance at every level of our space effort, from the worker on the shop floor right up to the top.

Although this tremendous enterprise involves hundreds of thousands of people, it is vital that each individual concerned in it fully recognize and fulfill his own individual responsibility for its success.

As you well know, the slightest slip-up, the smallest oversight, in any one of millions of processes and procedures can put critically important projects—and human lives—in jeopardy.

I know that I am preaching to the converted here. But I feel this cannot really be said too often.

Second. I feel the necessity for cost consciousness.

This is the need, to put it another way, of getting the most space for the tax dollar.

These are times when we must exert high discipline in public expenditure. And our space program cannot be exempt from that discipline.

In this connection, I was interested to note the theme of the Fourth Goddard Memorial Symposium, sponsored by the American Astronautical Society, which many of you have been attending for the past 2 days.

Last year I spoke of the "year 2000." But the symposium this year chose to focus instead on the theme, "The Space Age in Fiscal Year 2001."

Certainly, Federal appropriations today have an important bearing on where we will be in the future.

I have examined the fiscal year 1967 space budgets with the greatest care. I honestly believe that much can be accomplished within them although other priorities—notably our effort in Vietnam—have required postponement of some objectives.

I also believe that we can and will achieve the goal set by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson: a manned landing on the moon before 1970.

My own confidence in our rapidly advancing science and technology is such that I can visualize many more dramatic achievements ahead, although I will fix no timetable for them.

1. The exploration of the lunar surface, and possibly the establishment of one or more permanent bases there.

2. The development of a whole family of earth-orbiting stations, manned and supplied by regular ferry services.

3. The building of spaceports in a number of places in this country for the departure and arrival of spacecraft.

4. The development of recoverable and reusable launching vehicles, and maneuverable space vehicles, with a consequent drastic reduction in the cost of space travel.

5. The improvement of propulsion methods, with the use of nuclear as well as chemical energy, so that faster and more powerful rockets can make planetary trips in a week or less which today would require many months.

6. The launching of unmanned probes to every part of the solar system—and perhaps manned planetary expeditions as well.

We must not, however, become so totally fascinated by the wonders of outer space that we neglect the applications of space technology to a better life right here on earth.

A few days ago we orbited our first truly operational weather satellite—Essa II. I was pleased during my recent visit to the Goddard Space Flight Center to see the successful readout of the first weather pictures it sent back. This is a satellite the entire world can tune in on—not only governments but, with a relatively small investment, colleges or even individual citizens.

The time is not distant when we will be able to predict, and predict with accuracy, the weather everywhere on earth. We may even be able to control it—and thus open up many arid portions of the world to cultivation.

Global communication by satellites will become a fact in the very near future. It will be followed by direct broadcast of both voice and TV to home receivers throughout large sections of the world.

In the field of medicine alone, the benefits are already impressive. Improvements in medical instrumentation, resulting from electronic innovations in the space program, are already beginning to revolutionize the equipment of clinics and hospitals. It should be possible to monitor continuously and in detail the condition of hundreds of patients from a single location.

Other direct benefits will come in the form of wideband transoceanic communications, improved forest fire detection, and high-accuracy navigation.

We have already made fantastic strides in devising more effective, reliable, and compact electronic equipment with a wide variety of applications. We have developed improved alloys, ceramics, and other materials. And there have been other innovations, such as the accelerated use of liquid oxygen in steelmaking, new coatings for the temperature control of buildings, and filters for detergents.

Our progress in space has already contributed to our national security. The use of communications satellites is backing up our effort in Vietnam.

In addition to the support of our Armed Forces by better communications, our peaceful application of space competence for national security takes many other forms.

Among them are more accurate knowledge of the weather, more effective mapping, earlier warning of impending dangers, and the detection of nuclear explosions in space or in the atmosphere.

There are some who claim, with all sincerity, that the terrestrial relevance of space science and technology has been much exaggerated. Concerning this, I would make two comments:

One is to the skeptics outside this hall. I think they have forgotten the fact that this whole field is still only in its infancy. The best is yet to come.

The other is to you. As you constantly enlarge the horizons of space science and technology, I urge that you be everlastingly alert to recognize those discoveries and innovations which can usefully be applied here on our own planet.

Moreover, it is not only technology that we have developed. Perhaps even more important, we have called into being rich human and intellectual resources—methods, capabilities, insights, and management techniques which can be brought to bear upon problems far removed from space.

In this respect, I want to commend the initiative of private companies and of Governor Brown of California, who have shown the way toward focusing the talents of the aerospace industries on matters as important to our everyday living as traffic congestion and garbage control.

I believe the techniques of systems analysis—developed to its highest point so far in the aerospace industries—will be invaluable to us as we face up to the problems of urban life, to the pollution of our waters and our atmosphere, and to many other challenges of today and tomorrow.

I believe those of you here who are in the aerospace industry have a very real obligation to make your capabilities more widely known to State and local officials.

Why you? Because the technical and intellectual capabilities you possess in abundance were made possible by the tax dollars which have supported the space program.

Why you? Because your management and your workers are citizens of many of the communities which will directly benefit from such efforts.

Why you? Because it will be a practical demonstration to the world how democracy and free enterprise function effectively for the common good.

I shall conclude with a few observations on the international significance of the space effort.

I believe it is virtually impossible to overestimate the interest of peoples throughout the world in the unfolding space age.

For example, a USIA-sponsored space exhibit last month in Rangoon, Burma—a place most of us might have imagined to be remote from the space age—drew over 250,000 visitors. Astronaut John Glenn was there, and Astronauts Walter Schirra and Frank Borman are currently winding up a successful swing around the free Asian capitals, Australia, and New Zealand.

Many countries with little or no space experience are showing their interest in a very concrete and practical way. They have realized the need to engage in space programs to develop their own scientific competence, and we are helping them to do so. Already we are cooperating with about 70 countries, and the State Department and NASA are pressing forward with new initiatives in international cooperation.

For what I now say I may be accused of being something of a visionary—but I am encouraged to do so by being in the good company of other visionaries.

I believe that the exploration of space will have a profound effect upon how we look at our life here on earth. It will put all our affairs in a wider and more wholesome perspective.

Ever since Copernicus, we have known that our earth is a small planet in an immense universe. But while we have known this intellectually and theoretically, most of us have not really taken it to heart, not really felt it in the marrow of our bones.

As the full significance of that fact is brought home to us by the actual exploration of space, it will seem increasingly absurd that we have not better organized our life here on earth.

Our experience in space can be a powerful stimulus to all of us, wherever we live, to move toward the establishment of a world of law, where freedom and justice are assured to all—and where, in the words of the Prophet Isaiah:

"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT IN OPERATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Appalachian Regional Development Act was highly publicized during the congressional debate on the enactment of the authorizing legislation and in determining the amounts of money to be allocated by the Federal Government to carry out the programs authorized.

The New York Times on Sunday, March 13, carried a report on one small project which has been initiated under this act to benefit a West Virginia farmer.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES RISKS $1,091.85 ON MAKING A WEST VIRGINIA FARMER A LITTLE LESS POOR

(By Ben A. Franklin)

FRANKLIN, W. VA., March 12.—Six miles on the twisting blacktop from this mountain hamlet of 760 persons and a mile and a half off the hard road, the Federal Government is reaching out to give W. Walton Shrader a chance to change four generations of hard-earned poverty on a nearly spent Appalachian family farm.

It seems both a modest and a risky outreach. It is a gamble that a poor rural family, living in what would seem frontier conditions if the land were not already overgrassed and leached of life, can be a little less poor by enriching the sloping pasture with Government fertilizer.

It may mean an addition of four head to Mr. Shrader's herd of 17 Hereford beef cows and 100 sheep, which brought him a net income of $1,300 last year.

In a ceremony here yesterday afternoon, made awkward by a gathering of country men unused to their roles at such an occasion, Mr. Shrader received $1,091.85 under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to improve 50 acres of his 304-acre farm, the maximum area allowed each applicant.

According to Gus R. Douglass, the West Virginia Commissioner of Agriculture who came here from Charleston to officiate, the ceremonial writing of signatures, committing the Federal money, made the hefty, crew-cut Mr. Shrader the first farmer in the 13-State Appalachian region to receive such a recovery grant.

Few here, least of all Mr. Shrader, who looks older than his 31 years, expect to get rich. But against the topographic and economic forces that have cut farm employment in West Virginia in half since 1950, Mr. Shrader is staying.

"My great-great-granddaddy built the house," he said.

He has neither a telephone nor an automobile. The Appalachian development contract he signed will give him income over the next 5 years, earmarked for specific land stabilization projects, that is not quite equal to the net total he cleared last year to support his wife, his two children, his sister and a nearly blind uncle who shares ownership of the farm and lives with him.

Even more than in other, richer agricultural regions, farming in Appalachia, Commissioner Douglass said, must be "professional," scratching out the best possible economic use of the poor land.

The 6-year, $1.2 billion Appalachian Regional Development Act gives West Virginia $600,000 this year to accelerate 2 natural trends in the 13 Mountain States—the abandonment of marginal farming and the change in land use on remaining farms to grazing for cattle. In the 13 States, however, 70 percent of the potential pasture land is in need of conservation measures.

The staying power of farmers who remain here is strong. On the rocky slopes of Pendleton County, along the dark, deep-cut ravines that drop almost vertically from a timbered mountain skyline, the land has been inhospitable to economic agriculture for as long as anyone here can remember.

More than a third of West Virginia's farm acreage has a slope of from 25 to 40 percent, or a grade of from 25 to 40 feet of elevation for each 100 feet of expanse.

This county was settled 200 years ago and, starting with raids during the French and Indian War, it has had trouble. Isolation between the Shenandoah and Allegheny Mountains, near the headquarters of the Potomac River, still makes the region difficult to reach on winding roads. It has hampered farm market outlets.

And now, Commissioner Douglass said, it is even difficult for farmers here to sell produce locally. Buyers in Appalachia, as everywhere else, prefer the packaged foods available at supermarkets.

Mr. Shrader's $1,091 in aid will pay 80 percent of his costs in reclaiming, through aerial application of fertilizer, topdressing with lime and reseeding in orchard grass, 50 acres of pasture and meadowland. He will also get $150 to develop a spring, providing pipes and troughs to water his livestock.

He already has two 5-percent loans from the Farmers Home Administration, totaling $5,900.

An irony of the Appalachian farm recovery program, West Virginia officials said yesterday, is that it was watered down and renamed "land stabilization" when Congressmen from western and southern cattle districts objected that the original, more generous "pasture improvement" plan might subsidize beef competition for their own constituents.

VIETNAM—ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY TO COLUMBIA SCHOLASTIC PRESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on March 12, Vice President Humphrey made a statement on the Vietnam situation to the Columbia Scholastic Press Association in New York City. His remarks to these college students—delivered over the telephone because he was not able to leave Washington, D.C., at that time—will be of interest to many of my colleagues.

I should like unanimous consent that Vice President Humphrey's remarks be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Telephone Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey to Columbia Scholastic Press Association, New York City, March 12, 1966

I am sorry that I am not able to be with you in person today. The business of government keeps me in Washington. But I am happy to at least have the chance to visit with you by telephone.

I have spent much of my time in public life in the company of the press. But never have I been exposed to so many journalists at one time.

If it were possible, I would prefer to convert this telephone message into a press conference, and respond to your questions.

I know that they would be probing and pointed. And I know that most of them would focus on Vietnam.

I would like to address myself briefly to some of the questions I am sure you would ask.

I am sure you would begin by asking: Why are we in Vietnam?

We are in South Vietnam to repel and prevent the success of aggression against the Government and the people of that country.

We are there to help assure the South Vietnamese people the basic right to decide their own futures, freely and without intimidation.

We are there to help those people achieve a better standard of living for themselves and their children.

We are there to help establish the principle that—in this nuclear age—aggression cannot be an acceptable means either of settling international disputes or of realizing national objectives. If aggression is permitted to go unchecked, we cannot in good faith hold out much hope for the future of small nations or of world peace.

This is why we are in Vietnam.

We are not there to build an empire * * * to exercise domination over that part of the world * * * to establish military bases. We are not there to impose a government or way of life on other peoples.

The Government of South Vietnam faces a massive task in building a democratic society while meeting determined force and terror.

For many centuries, the Vietnamese people lived under Mandarin rule. Then came two generations of colonial domination, followed by 25 years of almost constant warfare. This is stony soil for democracy to grow in.

Moreover, illiteracy has been high, corruption all too common and public spirit all too rare, and the number of well-trained educated people all too small.

The peasants of Vietnam—and, indeed, of all Asia—are rebelling against the kind of life they have led for ages past. They want security. But they also want dignity and self-respect, justice, and the hope of something better in the future.

The Communists—in their drive for power—seek to use and subvert the hopes of these people. If they succeed, we could win many battles and yet lose the war.

That is why the Vietnamese Government, with our support, is pressing the "other war" with vigor—the war against poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance. This is the theme of the "Declaration of Honolulu"—and I believe that the Honolulu Declaration could be a milestone in the history of our policy in Asia.

The Government of South Vietnam is beginning in earnest the struggle to win and hold the allegiance of the people who live in rural South Vietnam, in more than 2,600 villages and approximately 11,000 hamlets.

Efforts are being made to give South Vietnam firm social and economic footing—and a sound democratic political system as well.

An Advisory Council for the Building of Democracy (including representatives of all the nationalist political tendencies) has been appointed. It is drafting a constitution, an election law, and regulations concerning political parties and the press. It will hold broad-scale consultations in formulating these documents and regulations.

Premier Ky has publicly committed himself to steps leading to free elections before the end of next year. As I left Saigon, a few days ago, Premier Ky told me: "We have begun 12 years late. But it is not too late."

Are these mere words, or will they be backed up by genuine commitment and participation by the people in translating them into deeds?

I think the most encouraging answer to that question is being given by the students of South Vietnam. They are young men and women who, for the most part, come from the more comfortable and privileged groups in the country, based largely in the cities.

Last summer some 5,000 young people voluntarily enrolled in the summer youth program. They went out to all portions of the country which are not under Communist control. They rolled up their sleeves and set to work with purpose and dedication. They helped erect schools, dug wells, built homes for the refugees, and carried out many other useful projects.

That program was scheduled for the 2 months of the school vacation. But it has been widely continued since.

When I was in South Vietnam, I visited a demonstration project staffed by teenagers in the Eighth District of Saigon—a badly rundown slum, the worst in the city. Under the leadership of the students, a group of refugees there had converted an abandoned and water-filled graveyard into an attractive, orderly neighborhood of new homes. A community center and a school were being built, and local officials had been elected.

Some 30 Vietnamese teachers of English have launched what they call a "new school" movement. They are seeking to stimulate a richer and more democratic extracurricular life for high school students. They are helping them to develop student government, debating societies, sports clubs, and—this will please you, I'm sure—student newspapers.

A number of youth organizations—Catholic, Buddhist, and others—are undertaking work and training projects throughout South Vietnam. Some are being assisted by the government, some are working with the fine group of men and women in Vietnam for the International Voluntary Service, and others are acting on their own initiative.

Young people like these offer the best hope for the future of a free Vietnam. Indeed, one of the tests of whether its government is making progress toward its goals in the social revolution will be the degree to which the government can attract and hold their allegiance and support.

Let me add a few words directed to you young people listening today.

We know much too little about Asia, and we need to know much more.

I hope that many of you will take the opportunity in college to learn more about Asia. For those of you who will continue as journalists, this knowledge will be essential. It will be important also to those of you who elect other walks of life—perhaps in your work, certainly as responsible citizens. Some of you may devote your careers to Asia—as diplomats, as businessmen, or as scholars.

We need to do our level best to stimulate wider American interest in Asia—including Communist China. I am delighted that

President Johnson has opened the way for our scholars to travel there. The Chinese leaders speak harshly of us but, as President Johnson has said:

"We can live with anger in words as long as it is matched by caution in deed."

I am convinced that—despite the shrill anti-American propaganda which is carried on by the Chinese Communists—there is still much friendship there for us among the Chinese people from our many previous years of fruitful and constructive work together.

We must be firm in resisting the expansionist designs of the present rulers of China. But we must take every opportunity to show our friendship for the Chinese people. We respect and value their learning, their skills, their arts, and their many contributions to civilization.

With the other peoples of Asia, I anticipate steadily growing friendship and cooperation. They are already an important part of the world of my generation. They are certain to be an even more significant part of yours.

Finally, may I say this: The next few years of human history will be dangerous ones. But they will also be years of opportunity.

For never has mankind ever possessed such power for good and for making the world safer and happier for hundreds of millions of people who have never had their share of anything but hunger, ignorance, and misery.

Your generation will have a large part to play in determining whether man destroys himself or whether he moves forward into a new age of peace and understanding.

The future is in your hands. I hope you will make the most of it.

MILWAUKEE SENTINAL COMMENTS ON SCHOOL MILK CUTBACK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an excellent article commenting on the administration's plans to cripple the special milk program for schoolchildren. This article appeared in one of the Nation's finest newspapers, the Milwaukee Sentinal, under the byline of the paper's new Washington correspondent, James Wieghart.

In my estimation this article sums up the issues at stake as well as any I have read since the school milk controversy got underway. First the story points out that the issue is "a Federal program which this year will make available more than 3 billion half pints of milk for millions of children in 94,000 schools, child care centers, settlement houses, summer camps and other nonprofit institutions that aid children."

The article then goes on to say:

> Under the program the Federal Government pays 3 cents a half pint for school milk. The remaining 2 to 4 cents is paid locally. The milk program is not compulsory, but is made available to all children in participating schools.

As my colleagues so well know the proposed 80-percent cut means that the children would have to pay the 3 cents now provided by the Federal Government unless they passed a means test or attended a school without a school lunch program. This does not sound like much money. But let us take a family with four children in school. Each child probably has milk in midmorning and midafternoon under the school milk program. This means 40 half pints a week. Without Federal help the parents of those children would have to pay an additional $1.20 a week or as much as $42 more a year. For a family with four children and moderate means this is a great burden.

The Wieghart article then goes on to quote many members of the Wisconsin delegation. For example he quotes Congressman Race as agreeing with President Johnson that lower priority domestic programs will have to be cut to finance the war in Vietnam but saying that the school milk program should not be considered "lower priority."

Representative Stalbaum is quoted as saying:

> I feel this program is perhaps the lowest price investment all of us could make to greatly improve the overall health of this country.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proxmire Gains Aid Against Milk Cutback

(By James G. Wieghart)

Washington, D.C.—A congressional revolt—less dramatic than the great debate on Vietnam policy—is being led by Senator Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, over the administration's proposed cutback of the highly successful school milk program.

Unlike the revolt against Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy, Proxmire's rebellion appears to be gaining enough Senate and House support to be successful.

At issue is the fate of a Federal program which this year will make available more than 3 billion half pints of milk for millions of children in 94,000 schools, child care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and other nonprofit institutions that aid children.

Under the program, the Federal Government pays 3 cents a half pint for school milk. The remaining 2 to 4 cents is paid locally. The milk program is not compulsory, but it is made available to all children in participating schools.

The administration announced last month that the Federal Government would cut spending on the program this year from the $103 million appropriated by Congress, to $100 million. For fiscal 1967, beginning July 1, the administration plans to cut spending on school milk from $103 million to $21 million.

Proxmire has attacked the administration's proposal as "phony economy" in a series of daily Senate speeches over the last several weeks.

He also has introduced a bill to enlarge the school milk program and make it permanent. Under the Proxmire bill, $110 million would be appropriated for the program in fiscal 1967, $115 million in 1968, and $120 million in 1969 and succeeding years.

Senator Nelson, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and 42 other Senators have cosponsored the Proxmire bill. Identical bills have been introduced in the House by Representatives Race and Stalbaum, both Wisconsin Democrats, and five other House Members.

"The administration's proposed cutback is a phony, fake, paper economy," Proxmire said Sunday. "Federal funds not spent on school milk will be spent under price support laws to buy and sell the same milk.

"Less milk will be used under the program because local school districts will have to assume an increased share of the cost of the program or pass it on to the children.

"This means that less milk will be consumed and more milk will have to be purchased by the Government under the dairy support program. In other words, instead of going into the children's stomachs, the milk will be powdered and stored in warehouses at Government expense," Proxmire said.

Nelson said Congress "is unlikely" to allow the budget cut to stand. He said the reduction would mean the end of the milk program which provides milk for 650,000 children, including those in Wisconsin schools.

"If this milk isn't purchased for the schools, it goes into butter, cheese, and dry milk and ends up in surplus under the price support program," Nelson said. "Then the Government has to buy it anyway, at almost the same cost."

Race said he agreed with President Johnson that "lower priority" domestic programs will have to be cut to finance the war in Vietnam, but he said the school milk program should not be considered "lower priority."

"The health and nutrition of our Nation's youngsters cannot be a matter of 'lower priority' in the wide-ranging concerns of our National Government," Race said.

Stalbaum, a member of the House Agricultural Committee, said that there is strong support for the bill to preserve the program among committee members.

"I feel this program is perhaps the lowest price investment all of us could make to greatly improve the overall health of this country," Stalbaum said.

Representative Thomson, Republican, of Wisconsin, who also supports the bill, said:

"It is absurd for President Johnson to ask for billions of dollars for vast, worldwide programs for social progress, while he denies milk for the schoolchildren of America."

Mr. Johnson, stung over the wave of criticism on the proposal, reportedly has directed his staff to prepare new legislation restoring some Federal support for the school milk and school lunch programs.

The President reportedly told representatives of the National Milk Producers Federation that his greatest volume of mail concerned the war in Vietnam and the cutback in the school program.

The administration's new proposal, however, reportedly will have a means test attached to it, limiting milk only to children of poverty stricken families.

Proxmire has indicated he would oppose such a measure.

"Nothing is more abhorrent in my mind than requiring first and second graders to give evidence that dad is too poor to pay for a half pint of milk, but this is exactly what a means test would require," Proxmire said.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR HARRY FLOOD BYRD

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to one of the finest gentlemen and finest Senators it has been my privilege to know, former Senator Harry Flood Byrd, who retired last November.

Long before I came to the Senate in 1959, I knew of Harry Flood Byrd; for over a period of many years he had been a symbol of fiscal soundness and financial responsibility in government. He earned this reputation as a successful farmer, as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia from 1926 to 1930, and as U.S. Senator since 1933.

His unflinching dedication to sound finance, his steadfastness against the fluctuating popular fiscal and economic breezes, and his refusal to be intimidated though outnumbered earned him fitting and enviable praise as a man of "absolute integrity, absolute honesty, and absolute courage."

We who served with Senator Byrd attest to the accuracy of this description by the eminent writer, William S. White.

Senator Byrd was never a faddist. He was a fundamentalist. And although majority sentiment might differ from his views, he never harbored rancor nor bitterness. He possessed the courage that is born of conviction.

When Senator Byrd announced his retirement, there were comments that an era in American history had ended. Perhaps in a sense this is so.

But the example that he set during his long public tenure will shine on and on for us and for generations of Americans to come: unselfish devotion to duty, unwavering allegiance to public office as a public trust, and tireless safeguarding of the people's money.

A poor boy who worked hard and became a prosperous apple grower and a successful public leader, Senator Byrd has earned a high place in history's rollcall of American statesmen and patriots.

The Commonwealth of Virginia can be very proud of one of its most illustrious sons. Virginia has lost a great champion in Congress and the U.S. Senate has lost one of its most notable Members.

I want to wish Senator Byrd good health and long life in his well-deserved retirement. Aloha, my friend.

WEST VIRGINIA'S SUMMERSVILLE DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the pace of activities attendant upon the development of the Summersville Dam and Reservoir project in Nicholas County, W. Va., including the recreational complex and airport facilities, is accelerating. On Wednesday, March 23, the tunnel releasing the water over the dam will be tested and bidding opened for contractors' services in seeding the 425 acres of uncovered earth left exposed following construction of the dam.

Meanwhile, West Virginians are eagerly watching the progress of this multimillion-dollar project, which combines flood control, increased water supply, pollution abatement, recreation, and fish propagation, and is ultimately expected to attract thousands of tourists annually to West Virginia.

The March 13 article by Mr. Harold C. Gadd in the Sunday, Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail State magazine, entitled "The Water That Isn't Going Over the Dam," describes this eagerness.

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WATER THAT ISN'T GOING OVER THE DAM

(By Harold C. Gadd)

About the first week of February, Summersville residents and motorists who had come from miles to see the new reservoir behind the Summersville Dam, gasped at the sight of the rapidly rising water level.

Since work on the three valve-controlled outlets was not completed—and would not be completed until sometime in April—was there danger that the unusually heavy snows of January would soon have the water pouring over the top of the dam? Wouldn't that be dangerous?

No, said a spokesman from the Huntington District, U.S. Corps of Engineers, in answer to the first question. Long before the water level could reach the top of the dam, the excess water would pour out over a spillway designed and built for just that purpose.

After that was published, the sightseers started looking for the "spillway." A lot of them couldn't find it.

As one motorist, who had driven up from Charleston to see the dam and reservoir, said:

"I looked all over and I couldn't find any spillway. But I'll tell them this: if that water comes up two more feet it is going to be over the highway."

Actually, the stretch of highway to which he was referring is the beginning of the spillway. It is a half-mile—or less—from the dam itself and you have to drive over it if you go to see the dam from the direction of Kessler's Cross Lanes.

On Thursday, March 3, the Gazette published a photo of water pouring over the spillway, but the caption writer—thinking, perhaps, that everyone was as familiar with the subject as he was—wrote:

"Over the top of Summersville Dam go millions of gallons of Gauley River water."

The caption writer was wrong. The Army engineers were right. The water was going over the spillway, not the dam.

Actually, once the outlets in the dam itself are completed, the spillway will probably never be needed as such again—despite a Summersville wag who was heard to remark:

"Them engineers just think that water will never go over the spillway again. They don't know the Old Gauley River."

Maybe they don't, but we know the Old Corps of Engineers and if those outlets aren't big enough to handle the old Gauley River once they are put in operation, we're going to be mighty surprised.

But, if they don't, it won't hurt anything for the spillway to be a spillway any time it is needed.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am shocked by the President's proposal to seriously curtail the school lunch and special school milk programs that have benefited America's children to such a great extent.

It does not seem right that the administration which proposes so much welfare legislation would reduce drastically or perhaps even cripple such beneficial programs as these to provide milk and school lunches for our schoolchildren. Recently the administration suggested a food-for-freedom program to feed the hungry of the world. While the idea's objective is laudable, I think that first we ought to be concerned with meeting the nutritional requirements of our own children.

For this reason, I have sponsored S. 2888, which would provide that milk and dairy products controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation be used in nonprofit school lunch programs without regard to priorities set up in other laws. I have also sponsored S. 2921, which would establish a permanent school milk program.

This latter bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage the consumption of milk by U.S. children in schools and other nonprofit institutions. In addition, it furnishes guidelines for expansion of the program beginning with the 1967 fiscal year, and authorizes the expenditure of the necessary funds for the program. Another feature would require the Department of Agriculture to reallocate funds which the Secretary determines will not be fully utilized by the State to which they were initially allotted.

Since 1936, the school lunch program has enabled millions of children to obtain hot, well-balanced meals they might not have enjoyed otherwise. In 1965, some 18 million children in 71,000 public and nonprofit private schools received lunches. The total average cost of 50 cents per meal has been divided among the Federal Government, the individual child, and the States and localities.

Wyoming, like other States, wholeheartedly approves the school lunch program. This past fiscal year, an estimated 31,906 of our children and 273 of our schools participated.

From the beginning, the program has been managed at the local level. The decision to participate, the responsibility for facilities, and the conduct of the program as set out by Federal guidelines are under local authority. Federal contributions are twofold: cash and food—either procured specifically for the program or through surpluses from the Department of Agriculture's price support or surplus removal programs.

The special school milk program was instituted in 1954 as a means of diverting surplus milk production from the ever-growing dairy products stockpile of the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the use of children. Originally limited to schools, the program was extended in 1956 to cover nonprofit camps, homes, and other children's institutions.

Under the program, each child pays 3 to 4 cents on the average for a half pint of milk costing a total of 6 to 8 cents. Wyoming had 314 schools taking part in the milk program this past fiscal year.

Both the school lunch and the special milk programs have been far more successful than anticipated. Not only have the health and well-being of our children been improved, but also a good market for our farmers, food industries, and local businesses has been developed. Vast amounts of surplus foods acquired by the Federal Government in price-support efforts have been utilized.

Despite the overwhelming benefits of the school lunch and special milk programs, the President now asks that they be reduced by $19 million—12 percent—and $82 million—82 percent—respectively, although school population continues to expand.

If the demonstrated advantages of these programs are to be maintained, there must be affirmative legislative action. Otherwise, our children, farmers and businessmen, including those in Wyoming, will suffer. I urge immediate consideration and approval of S. 2888, permitting the needs of the school lunch program to be met from CCC stocks, and S. 2921, establishing a permanent school milk prorgam. In support of my recommendation, I quote from the Senate Report No. 1218, on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964:

> No better investment can be made than to increase funds so that wholesome lunches and milk will be available to all children of school age.

VIETNAM IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the American people are today like the man who is asked to pick up a book and begin reading on page 179. They have difficulty identifying the characters, the setting, and the sequence. They must rely on others to tell them what transpired in the previous pages.

The book to which I refer is, of course, about Vietnam, and a man well qualified to explain what has gone before is John J. Fairbank, director of the East Asian Research Center at Harvard and author of numerous books and articles about U.S. relations with China.

As I have said on several occasions, it is immensely important for us to understand the Chinese cultural influence in southeast Asia, for, as Dr. Fairbank observes:

> Cultural differences lay the powder train for international conflict.

From his understanding of historical and cultural forces, Dr. Fairbank is qualified to discuss our present predicament in southeast Asia and how we should deal with China in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by John J. Fairbank appearing in the February 27 Washington Post, as excerpted from the New York Review of Books, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 27, 1966]

United States Fighting an Idea in Vietnam

(By John J. Fairbank)

(Note.—Fairbank is director of the East Asian Research Center at Harvard and author of "The United States and China" and "Chinese Thought and Institutions." His article is excerpted with permission from the New York Review of Books, 1966, the New York Review.)

The Vietnam debate reflects our intellectual unpreparedness. Crisis has arisen on the furthest frontier of public knowledge, and viewpoints diverge widely because we all lack background information.

"Vietnam" was not even a label on our horizon 20 years ago. It was still "Annam" (the old Chinese term), buried within the French creation "Indochina."

Our ignorance widens the spectrum of debate: Everyone seeks peace but some would get it by fighting more broadly, some by not fighting at all and some by continuing a strictly limited war. Everyone wants negotiations. But to get them, some would bomb North Vietnam and others would pause or stop.

Behind the cacophony of argument, some hold the Europocentric view that Vietnam is far away and in the Chinese realm, not in our realm. Others argue for a more global view that the balance of power and international order can be preserved only by containing the Chinese revolution as we are already doing in Korea and the Taiwan Straits.

Yet here the problem arises that it is not the Chinese whom we face in South Vietnam, but rather their model of revolution, Chairman Mao's idea. And how does one stop a revolutionary idea?

HISTORICAL GRAB BAG

How to deal with the Chinese revolution depends on how we understand it—specifically, what is the Chinese revolutionary influence in Vietnam? And behind that, what is the nature of the Chinese revolution itself? Can we ultimately deal with it in any way short of war? But where would war get us?

A long view is needed, a historical framework within which to see all the actors, including ourselves. (What are we doing so far from home?) Yet our knowledge of east Asian history is so meager it can mislead us. History is used as a grab bag from which each advocate pulls out a lesson to prove his point.

Some recall Manchuria in 1931: We failed to stop Japan's aggression and it led on to Pearl Harbor. Others recall our drive to the Yalu in 1950: We ignored China's vital interest in her frontier and got ourselves into a bigger war. Again, what was the lesson of Dienbienphu in 1954—were the French strategically overextended or merely tactically deficient in airpower?

History never repeats itself, means that one can never find a perfect 1 to 1 correspondence between two situations. Each must be viewed within the long flow of events, not as an isolated lesson. Brief articles (like this one) can offer only limited wisdom.

Nevertheless, certain main outlines emerge from a historical survey. The Vietnamese and Chinese have had their own specific ways and interests, traditions and attitudes, and their own east Asian pattern of contact, not in the Western style.

ANCIENT COMMON BOND

China's revolutionary influence on Vietnam comes from a long past. In the first place, Vietnam grew up as part of Chinese culture—the east Asian realm which included not only China in the center but also the peripheral states of Korea and Vietnam and Japan as well.

All these countries took over the Chinese writing system in ancient times and with it the Chinese classical teachings, the bureaucratic system of government, and the family based social order so eloquently advocated in the Confucian classics. These countries have an ancient common bond in philosophy, government, and cultural values.

In Vietnam's case, this Chinese heritage was imposed by a thousand years of Chinese rule in North Vietnam, the ancient homeland of the Vietnamese before they expanded southward into the Mekong Delta. Independence from Chinese rule was gained by fighting in the 10th century A.D., but Vietnam then continued for another thousand years to be independent only within the Chinese realm and tribute system.

Down to the 1880's, Vietnamese tribute missions, going over the long post route to Peiping, acknowledged the superior size and power, the superior culture and wisdom of the Chinese Empire and its rulers. This filial or younger brother relationship was broken only a few times when Chinese armies again invaded Hanoi (for example, in 1406 and 1789) only to be thrown out by the Vietnamese resistance, whereupon tributary relations were resumed.

There were only these alternatives: to be ruled by China or to be tributary, in the Chinese cultural-political-psychological sense, taking China as a model. This went to the point of using the same structure of government and copying the Chinese law codes verbatim, with the same terminology, in Chinese characters, which were the official writing system.

Vietnam's growth in the shadow of China was eventually balanced by the arrival of sea invaders from the West. The early Portuguese adventurers and the later Dutch and British East India companies landed their ships at Danang (Tourane), where our Marines are today. This sea contact with the expanding West climaxed in the French takeover of the 1860's and seventies. French colonialism during its 80 years brought both exploitation and modernization in a mixture that is hotly debated and can hardly be unscrambled.

We Americans have thus had predecessors (even the Japanese in 1940–45) on the long thin coast of Vietnam. We are sleeping in the same bed the French slept in, even though we dream very different dreams.

VIETNAM IN MIDDLE

Western seapower in southeast Asia goes back 450 years. Europeans expanded westward into the empty Americas very slowly. They went east into populous Asia more quickly and easily. The resulting colonialism in southeast Asia has now been superseded by the new relationships we are trying to work out in the name of national self-determination.

We are on an old cultural frontier between the international trading world and Asia's land-based empires. Vietnam, like Korea, has been caught in the middle and pulled in two.

Vietnamese patriots reacted against the French by learning modern nationalism from them. In so doing, they continued to be influenced by the Chinese example to the north. The Chinese reformers of 1898 had their counterparts in Hanoi. Sun Yat-sen operated from there in 1907–08. When his Chinese Kuomintang reorganized itself on Soviet lines in the 1920's, a Vietnamese Kuomintang followed suit.

In the same era, the Chinese Communist Party set a model for the growth of a Vietnamese Communist movement in the 1930's. The rise of Ho Chi-minh illustrates this trend. Both the French and Soviet Communist movements and Chiang Kai-shek's Whampoa Military Academy were in his background.

By the time the Chinese Communists came to power in 1949, they were in an even better position to give the Vietnamese the encouragement of example. Vietminh patriots of the united front were trained to fight against the French in the sanctuary of South China. When the People's Republic of North Vietnam eventually emerged in 1954 after the defeat of France, it was indebted to Chinese help but, most of all, to the Chinese Communist example.

Today in South Vietnam, the "people's war of liberation" has developed from the Maoist model that took shape in China during the struggle against the Nationalists and the Japanese. Mao's formula is to take power through a centralized Leninist party that claims to represent the people.

This begins with establishing a territorial base or "liberated area," inaccessible and defensible. From this base, the party organizers can recruit idealists and patriots in the villages and create an indoctrinated secret organization. Once under way, this organization can begin to use sabotage and terrorism to destroy the government's position in the villages and mobilize the population for guerrilla warfare.

Shooting down unpopular landlords or government administrators has a wide "demonstration effect." When guerrilla warfare has reached a certain level, it can escalate to fielding regular armies, strangling the cities and completing the takeover.

One appeal of this Maoist model is its do-it-yourself quality. The organizing procedure is carried out by local people with only a minimum influx of trained returnees and essential arms. The whole technique cannot be understood apart from the local revolutionary ardor that inspires the movement.

PRINCIPLE OF STRUGGLE

In China today, we confront a revolution still at full tide, an effort to remake the society by remaking its people. Chairman Mao spreads a mystique that man can overcome any obstacle, that the human spirit can triumph over material situations.

For 15 years with unremitting intensity, the people have been exhorted to have faith in the Chinese Communist Party and the ideas of Mao Tse-tung. With this has gone a doctrinaire righteousness that has beaten down all dissent and claimed with utmost self-confidence to know the "laws of history."

Mao's revolution puts great stress on the principal of struggle. The class struggle has made history. Each individual must struggle against his own bourgeois nature. China must struggle against Khrushchevian revisionism. The whole world must struggle against imperialism led by the United States.

Out of all this struggle among the 700 million Chinese has come a totalitarian state manipulated largely by suasion. Individuals work upon themselves in the process of thought reform, criticizing their own attitudes. Residential groups maintain surveillance on one another, as children do on their parents, as part of their national duty.

Terror is kept in the background. Conformity through a manipulated "voluntarism" fills the foreground. No such enormous mass of people has ever been so organized. The spirit of the organization continues to be highly militant.

The sources of China's revolutionary militancy are plain enough in Chinese history. The Chinese Communist regime is only the latest phase in a process of decline and fall followed by rebirth and reassertion of national power.

China's humiliation under the "unequal treaties" of the 19th century lasted for 100 years. An empire that had traditionally been superior to all others in its world was not only humbled but threatened with extinction. Inevitably, China's great tradition of unity, as the world's greatest state in size and continuity, was reasserted.

In this revival, many elements from the past have been given new life: the tradition of leadership by an elite who are guardians of a true teaching, the idea of China as a model for others to emulate.

Because the Chinese Empire had kept its foreign relations in the guise of tribute down to the late 19th century, China has had little experience in dealing with equal allies or with a concert of equal powers and plural sovereignties. Chairman Mao could look up to Comrade Stalin. He could only look down on Comrade Khrushchev. An equal relationship has little precedent in Chinese experience.

EARLY SOPHISTICATION

Because China has been a separate and distinctive area of civilization, isolated in east Asia, the Chinese people today have a very different political heritage from the rest of the world. The most remarkable thing about China's political history is the early maturity of the sociopolitical order.

The ancient Chinese Government became more sophisticated, at an earlier date, than any regime in the West. Principles and methods worked out before the time of Christ held the Chinese empire together down to the 20th century. The fact that this imperial system eventually grew out of date in comparison with the modern West should not obscure its earlier maturity.

As in her scientific discoveries and technology, China's inventions in government put her well ahead of Europe by the time Marco Polo saw the Chinese scene in the 13th century. Perhaps this early Chinese advancement came from the continuity of the Chinese effort at government, carried on in the same area century after century and dealing with the same problems until they were mastered.

In contrast, Western civilization grew up with a broader base geographically and culturally, but this very diversity of origins and the geographical shift from the Mediterranean to Western Europe may have delayed the maturing of Western institutions.

Thus the ancient Chinese had a chance to concentrate on the problem of social order, staying in the same place and working it out over the centuries. Their solution began with the observation that the order of nature is not egalitarian but hierarchic.

Adults are stronger than children, husbands than wives. Age is wiser than youth. Men are not equally endowed: "Some labor with their minds and govern others; some labor with their muscles and are governed by others." This commonsense, antiegalitarian approach tried to fit everyone in his place in a graded pyramid of social roles.

At the top of everything was the Chinese ruler, whose virtuous example commanded the respect and obedience of all beholders. The Chinese monarchy institutionalized the idea of universal kingship atop the human pyramid. The emperor functioned as military leader, power holder, and ethical preceptor at the apex of every social activity.

An able emperor would recruit the best talent, use men in the right jobs, render the legal decisions and even set the style of connoisseurship in art while carrying out the sacrifices to heaven and superintending all aspects of official conduct. The monarchy became omnicompetent, not equaled by any other human institution.

Even before the Chinese unification of 221 B.C., ancient administrators had worked out the basic principles of bureaucratic government. They selected for their ability a professional group of paid officials who were given overall responsibility in fixed areas, instructed and supervised through official correspondence and rotated in office. The Chinese Empire thus very early embodied the essentials of bureaucracy which the Europeans arrived at only in modern times.

One of the great inventions of Chinese Government was the examination system based on the Confucian classics. It produced an indoctrinated elite who could either provide local leadership as holders of imperial degrees or else could be appointed to official posts and carry on administration anywhere at a distance from the capital. In either case, the products of the examination system, versed in the classical principles of government, were supporters of orthodoxy and authority on established lines.

Other innovations, like the censors who functioned as a separate supervisory echelon, added to the devices of Chinese "statecraft." Chinese Government also used the family system, confirming the special status of parents and elders over the young and of men over women.

ANOTHER INVENTION

As the Chinese sociopolitical order matured and grew, its influence radiated outward over the "Chinese culture area." Because China was the center of civilization in east Asia, it served as the model for smaller states like Korea and Vietnam, whose rulers naturally became subordinate to the Chinese Emperor. The hierarchic relationship was expressed in the tribute system already noted.

But the rise of nomadic warriors like the Mongols on the grasslands of inner Asia posed a new problem, for they were non-Chinese in culture and yet their military capacity enabled them to invade north China and eventually conquer the whole empire. The result was another Chinese political invention under which it became possible for powerful non-Chinese peoples to participate in Chinese political life.

This they did either as allies and subordinates of strong Chinese rulers or, in case of Chinese weakness, as the actual rulers of China itself. Thus the ancient Chinese empire again showed its political sophistication. Invaders who could not be defeated were admitted to the power structure. The Mongols in the 13th to 19th centuries could even seize the imperial power, but they had no alternative to ruling China in the old Chinese fashion.

When Westerners arrived on China's borders in early modern times, they also began to participate in the Chinese power structure. They were generally given status as tributaries and until 1840 were kept under control on the frontier.

Thereafter, under the so-called unequal treaty system, the Westerners had to be allowed to participate in the Government of China. This they did with special privileges in treaty ports protected by their gunboats and under their own consuls' extraterritorial jurisdiction. In its beginning, this 19th century treaty system followed Chinese tradition.

PICKED AND CHOSE

Eventually, of course, Western contact brought in new ideas which undermined the old Chinese order, but not all the new ideas of modern times were wholly accepted. Christianity found only a limited following. Ideas of the sacred rights of the individual and the supremacy of law were not taken over. China picked and chose what it wanted to accept from the West.

Scientific technology and nationalism were in time taken as foundations of economic and political change. But Western-style republicanism and the election process did not take hold. As a political device to take the place of dynastic rule, the Chinese eventually accepted Leninist party dictatorship. On this basis, the Kuomintang rose to power in the 1920's.

Later, the Communist success established the doctrines of Marxism-Leninism and techniques of Soviet totalitarianism and industrialization. The Sino-Soviet split now represents a triumph for hypernationalism geared to a revolutionary faith.

Even a brief sketch of the historical experiences of the Chinese people indicates their cultural differences from the West. Some of these inherited differences have been selected and reinforced by the new totalitarian rulers.

Chinese tradition is, of course, very broad. It affords examples of a Confucian type of individualism and defiance of state control. Some day these examples may be invoked for democratic purposes, but that time has not yet come.

Today we see these cultural differences affecting the status of the Chinese individual. The old idea of hierarchic order persists. "Enemies" of the new order, as defined by it, are classed as not belonging to "the people" and so are of lowest status. On the other hand, party members form a new elite, and one man is still at the top of the pyramid. The tradition of government supremacy and domination by the official class still keeps ordinary people in their place.

The law, for example, is still an administrative tool used in the interest of the state; it does not protect the individual. This reflects the commonsense argument that the interest of the whole outweighs that of any part or person, and so the individual still has no established doctrine of rights to fall back upon.

As in the old days, the letter of the law remains uncertain and its application arbitrary. The defense of the accused is not assured, the judiciary is not independent, confession is expected and litigation is frowned upon as a way of resolving conflicts. Compared with American society, the law plays a very minor role.

The difference between Chinese and American values and institutions stand out most sharply in the standards for personal conduct. The term for individualism in Chinese (ko-jen-chu-i) is a modern phrase invented for a foreign idea, using characters that suggest each-for-himself, a chaotic selfishness rather than a high ideal. Individualism is thus held in as little esteem as it was under the Confucian order.

The difference is that where young people were formerly dominated by their families, who for example arranged their marriages, now they have largely given up a primary loyalty to family and substituted a loyalty to the Party or "the people." In both cases, the highest ideal is sacrifice for the collective good.

Similarly, the modern term for freedom (tzu-yu) is a modern combination of characters suggesting a spontaneous or willful lack of discipline, very close to license and quite contrary to the Chinese ideal of disciplined cooperation.

The cultural gap is shown also by the Chinese attitude toward philanthropy. Giving things to others is of course highly valued where specific relations call for it, as when the individual contributes to the collective welfare of family, clan or community. But the Christian virtue of philanthropy in the abstract, giving to others as a general duty, quite impersonally, runs into a different complex of ideas.

Between individuals, there should be reciprocity in a balanced relationship. To receive without giving in return puts one at a serious disadvantage: one is unable to hold up one's side of the relationship and therefore loses self-respect.

American philanthropy thus hurts Chinese pride. It has strings of conscience attached to it. The Communist spurning of foreign aid and touting of self-sufficiency fits the traditional sense of values. American aid does not.

CRITICS ARE ENEMIES

Cultural differences emerge equally in the area of politics. In the Chinese tradition, government is by persons who command obedience by the example they set of right conduct. When in power, an emperor or a ruling party has a monopoly of leadership which is justified by its performance, particularly by the wisdom of its policies. No abstract distinction is made between the person in power and his policies.

Dissent which attacks policies is felt to be an attack on the policymaker. On this basis, no "loyal opposition" is possible. The Western concept of disputing a powerholder's policies while remaining loyal to his institutional status is not intelligible to the Chinese. Critics are seen as enemies, for they discredit those in power and tear down the prestige by which their power is partially maintained. (This idea also crops up in Taiwan.)

Another difference emerges over the idea of self-determination. This commonplace of Western political thinking sanctions the demand of a definable group in a certain area, providing they can work it out, to achieve an independent state by common consent among themselves. This idea runs quite counter to the traditional idea of the Chinese realm that embraces all who are culturally Chinese within a single entity.

Thus the rival Chinese regimes today are as one in regarding Taiwan as part of the mainland. Both want to control both areas. Similarly, they are agreed that Tibet is part of the Chinese realm without regard for self-determination. A supervised plebiscite would seem so humiliating that no Chinese regime would permit it.

Both the Chinese party dictatorships of modern times are also believers in elitism and opponents of the election process, except as a minor device for confirming local popular acquiescence in the regime.

Elections on the mainland are manipulated by the party. Taiwan has developed a genuine election process at the local level, but the old idea of party "tutelage" is far from dead at the top. Here again, a case can be made for the Chinese practice. Our point is merely its difference from that of the West.

AN ANCIENT DEVICE

Perhaps the most strikingly different political device is that of mutual responsibility, the arrangement whereby a designated group is held responsible in all its members for the conduct of each. This idea goes far back in Chinese history as a device for controlling populous villages.

At first, 5-household groups, and later, 10-household groups, were designated by the officials, 10 such lower groups forming a unit at a higher level with the process repeated until 1,000 households formed a single group. In operation this system means that one member of a household is held accountable for the acts of all other members, one household for the acts of its neighbors and so on up the line.

This motivates mutual surveillance and reciprocal control, with neighbor spying on neighbor and children informing on parents. Communist China uses this ancient device today in its street committees and other groups. It directly denies the Western idea of judging a man by his intentions and condemning him only for his own acts.

Cultural differences lay the powder train for international conflict. China and America can see each other as "backward" and "evil," deserving destruction. We need to objectify such differences, see our own values in perspective and understand if not accept the values of others.

Understanding an opponent's values also helps us deal with him. The old Chinese saying is, "If you know yourself and know your enemy, in a hundred battles you will win a hundred times."

All this applies to our present dilemma in Vietnam, where our military helicopter technology is attempting to smash the Maoist model of "peoples' war." We face a dilemma: Appeasement may only encourage the militancy of our opponents, yet vigorous resistance may pose a challenge that increases their militancy. Fighting tends to escalate.

One line of approach, quite aside from military effort, should seek to undermine the militancy of our opponents. Why not pay more attention to their motivation and try to manipulate it? Having seen how Mao Tse-tung has manipulated Khrushchev and Chiang Kai-shek has manipulated us, can we not do some manipulating ourselves?

There are several elements to use. One is China's enormous national pride, the feeling in Peiping that this largest and oldest of countries naturally deserves a top position in the world. In the background lies the fact that China was indeed at the top of the known world for more than 3,000 years of its recorded history. The Chinese attitude of cultural superiority is deeprooted and still plays a part in foreign contact.

A second element is the need of any Chinese regime for prestige. Peiping rules an incredibly vast mass of people by means of an enormous and farflung bureaucracy. The prestige of the leadership and the morale of the populace and bureaucracy are intertwined. The rulers must seek by all means to bolster their public image, show themselves successful and make good their claims to wisdom and influence.

For 16 years Peiping has buttressed its prestige by attacking "American imperialism," but its need for prestige is more basic than any particular target of attack. Are there other ways to strengthen itself than by denouncing and "struggling against" the biggest overseas power?

Another element is the converse of the above—the accumulated fatigue of revolution. Chairman Mao's exhortations to continued struggle and austerity betray his lively fear lest the new generation grow tired of "permanent revolution." His eventual successors may respond differently to opportunities abroad.

Finally, there are the concrete problems of the Chinese state, its needs for foreign capital goods and food supplies, needs that may grow.

A program to take advantage of these elements, recognizing the realities of cultural difference, would seek to enlarge Peiping's international contact and work out a greater role and responsibility for China's rulers in the world outside. Many express this in wishful terms—"If only China would join the international world." Realists point out Peiping's reiterated refusal to do so on any feasible terms.

What I am advocating here is not a single gesture but a continuing program, not an alternative to present policies but an addition to them. It is too simple to say that one cannot oppose an avowed enemy on one front while also making an accommodation with him on other fronts. On the contrary, this is what diplomacy is all about.

The whole idea of manipulation is to use both pressure and persuasion, both toughness and reasonableness, stick and carrot, with an objective calculation of the opponent's motives and needs. This is not foreign to President Johnson's thinking.

A MOUSETRAP POLICY

What conclusion emerges from a survey of China's revolutionary history and the cultural differences that separate us?

First, we are up against a dynamic opponent whose strident anti-Americanism will not soon die away. It comes from China's long background of feeling superior to all outsiders and expecting a supreme position in the world, which we seem to thwart.

Second, we have little alternative but to stand up to Peiping's grandiose demands. Yet a containment policy which is only military, and nothing more, can mousetrap us into war with China. Our present fighting to frustrate the Maoist model in Vietnam is a stopgap, not a long-term policy.

We should add to this policy, and if possible substitute for it a more sophisticated diplomatic program to undermine China's militancy by getting her more involved in formal international contact of all kinds and on every level.

The point of this is psychological: Peiping is, to say the least, maladjusted, rebellious against the whole outer world, Russia as well as America. We are Peiping's principal enemy because we happen now to be the biggest outside power trying to foster world stability.

But do we have to play Mao's game? Must we carry the whole burden of resisting Peiping's pretensions? Why not let others in on the jobs?

A Communist China seated in the U.N. could no longer pose as a martyr excluded by "American imperialism." She would have to deal with U.N. members on concrete issues, playing politics in addition to attempting subversion (which sometimes backfires).

She would have to face the self-interest of other countries and learn to act as a full member of international society for the first time in history. This is the only way for China to grow up and eventually accept restraints on her revolutionary ardor.

SLIPPERY ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday night the Columbia Broadcasting Co. in its "CBS Reports" program carried an hour-long show entitled "I O U $315 Billion."

Throughout this analysis of the individual debt that Americans owe I felt that there were several economic statistical and philosophical omissions in the CBS report. However, in Wednesday morning's New York Times, H. Erich Heinemann, writing a review of the show, very succinctly touched on the major points that should have been at least mentioned.

I think the New York Times review of "CBS Reports: I O U $315 Billion" should have wider dissemination. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the review be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 16, 1966]

TV: "CBS REPORTS" EYES OUR I O U'S AND IS SHOCKED—NETWORK'S CONCLUSION: "IT COSTS TOO MUCH"—SOME STATISTICS REST ON A DUBIOUS BASIS

"CBS Reports" took an hour-long look at the role of individual debt in the American economy last night, and came to the not-too-surprising conclusion that the consumer needs to be protected from his own improvidence.

"Interest rates are higher than they need to be;

"The people who need credit the most find it hardest to get on terms they can afford;

"The patchwork of State and Federal regulations tends to favor the lender over the borrower;

"We would be on a sounder basis if people had a more accurate idea of the cost of credit."

All these conclusions, stated at the end of "I O U $315 billion" by Alexander Kendrick, are surely estimable. "CBS Reports" should be pleased with its firm stand against sin.

Less estimable, however, is some of the slippery economic analysis the Columbia Broadcasting System uses to reach this conclusion. Mr. Kendrick lays much stress upon the "mountain of debt" under which the American consumer is laboring. But he does not mention the value of the assets that the consumer owns, which far exceeds the $315 billion that he owes.

Mr. Kendrick puts much emphasis upon the heavy interest cost of total consumer debt. But he does not mention that in the fourth quarter of 1965 Americans were earning interest at the annual rate of $38.2 billion, while they were paying interest at the annual rate of only $11.6 billion.

Indeed, this latter point cuts to the core of the central criticism of "I O U $315 billion." Mr. Kendrick, and his editors at CBS have chosen to focus upon the aggregate of $315 billion, of which more than two-thirds is accounted for by mortgages on real estate—including more than $20 billion of debt on farm properties, which is essentially commercial.

Mr. Kendrick did not bother to tell us that well over half of total mortgage debt is held by nonprofit mutual financial institutions, which are owned by those who have entrusted their savings to them.

Thrift, Mr. Kendrick to the contrary notwithstanding, has not gone out of style.

Nor has the credit card brought us to the verge of a cashless society. Mr. Kendrick might be interested to know that an important preoccupation of the Nation's monetary authorities has been to try to explain why currency in circulation has been increasing more rapidly in recent years than has personal income.

So far, no simple answer has been found.

It is perfectly true, as "CBS Reports" maintains that the improvident and the reckless in American society are preyed upon by the demimonde of the credit world.

There is good reason to be alarmed at the sharply rising rate of personal bankruptcies, and at the steady climb in the rate of foreclosures on home mortgages.

But there is no easy economic transition from the steady and necessary growth in consumer debt to the inflationary problems that are confronting the economy, though Mr. Kendrick seemed to have little trouble in making that step.

Undoubtedly, some remedial legislation would be helpful in the consumer credit field. But there is serious question whether Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' "truth-in-lending" bill which obviously has delighted CBS, despite its many legal, administrative, and indeed constitutional problems, would prove a panacea.

We should not lose sight of the fact that debt, however onerous, is the other face of credit, which is the reward of thrift.

H. ERICH HEINEMANN.

WEST VIRGINIA SKI INDUSTRY UNDER STUDY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Economic Development Administration has recently approved $72,300 for a technical assistance study to determine the ski industry potential in West Virginia. This study, requested by the West Virginia Department of Commerce, offers hope that a new source of recreation and pleasure may be developed for winter sports enthusiasts. The ski industry in the Mountain State is still in a fledgling state, with a number of problems needing resolving.

Because of interest on the part of West Virginia sports lovers, and that of surrounding urbanites in neighboring States, that the ski industry be developed, this grant is being enthusiastically welcomed.

A recent newspaper article by Roger Morris, carried by the Sunday Gazette-Mail State magazine, Charleston, W. Va., relates the interest which is increasingly being manifested in this sport. Its title is "Little Switzerland—Without the Snow."

I ask unanimous consent that this March 13 newspaper article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE SWITZERLAND—WITHOUT THE SNOW

(By Roger Morris)

Skiers ask, "What good is a mountain in a winter that forgets to include snow?"

"It is an ill wind turns none to good," wrote Thomas Tusser back in the 16th century. If we may substitute the word "foul" for "ill," then we have an accurate description of the state of affairs in Charleston and this section of the Kanawha Valley.

While none can doubt that the wind over Charleston would turn the stomach of the stanchest fishmonger and by comparison make Liggett & Myers a clean air research group, the chemical industries which produce this enriched assortment of smokes and stenches as a public byproduct have blown a little fresh air into the city's insularity by way of their cosmopolitan personnel.

This has resulted in their contribution in the arts, government, and social concerns as patrons, performers, and planners. Often when persons of a different background cannot find facilities in a new town to further their avocational interests, they are either forced to quit the area (as was the case with scientists at the radio observatory at Green Bank) or else bring the mountain to Mohammed.

This was the dilemma of some ski enthusiasts of recent European extraction whose jobs were relocated here and who quickly found out that the State's nickname of "Little Switzerland of America" was a misnomer as far as winter sports facilities were concerned.

Together with some native residents, the ski buffs joined in 1956 to form the Kanawha Ski Club to see what might be done to keep their interests in slopes from declining. Ten years later and after some initial floundering, the Kanawha Ski Club has close to 100 members whose main concern during the winter months is to get out of the offices and birch-paneled kitchens as soon as possible on Friday afternoon and head for the nearest ski slope.

As a matter of fact, about 38 of them are at this moment out on the slope or engaged in some ski lodge chatter at the Seven Springs skiing area in Pennsylvania.

"We haven't had too much luck with West Virginia ski slopes," says one club official, "although we have used Bald Knob near Beckley and Weiss Knob near Davis in the past."

The trouble with the three State facilities centers around an absence of snow-making machines, adequate lodge facilities, challenging slopes for advanced skiers and ski lifts.

As a result, the ski club has had to look to weekend trips to Virginia and Pennsylvania, although the State's new recreational complex in the Canaan Valley promises to have good facilities in the next few years.

Quite naturally these excursions furnish the main part of the club's activities, and during the past season—a bad one as such things go—three such trips were made, two to Seven Springs and one to the Homestead in Virginia.

"Actually there isn't much of a ski atmosphere at the Homestead," says club vice president, Jae Ryder, "but we go there once a year, because they have different slopes for the different classifications of skiers."

While the outing to Virginia was by car, the two to Seven Springs were by chartered bus, a method which allows the older members to become acquainted with the novices. Although in some circles and in some resorts, skiing is very much a rich man's sport, the Kanawha club tries to keep expenses at a minimum so that everyone can join in the fun—skiing for the masses, so to speak. On Pennsylvania trips, for example, roundtrip bus fare, two nights' lodging, three meals, a dance, and the skiing facilities were provided for about $40. Rental equipment is another $6.

Most of the rest of the club's activities are conducted during the regular meetings at a member's home, which includes ski movies and slides of previous trips. In addition, an annual cocktail party is held in April or May, a sneaky way to get everyone together to pay dues.

Club members range in age from pre-teens to over 60 and in ability from non-skiers to advanced skiers. As the Kanawha Ski Club is a member of the Blue Ridge Ski Council, members have the opportunity to go skiing in Europe at reduced travel rates, a proposition that some have already accepted.

Ryder says that several plans are being made for next year, plus a request to the weatherman to have enough fall snow to insure a couple of trips before New Year's Day. Among these will be at least one each to the Homestead and Seven Springs and—cross your ski poles—possibly one to Michigan.

Another idea that is being considered is to enlarge the meaning of "ski" (in the club name) to include water skiing as well as snow skiing. Under this proposal, the group would have year-round continuity and activity, as members could shed their sweaters for swim suits and ski on liquid rather than frozen water. In addition, water skiing facilities on both rivers and lakes are more readily available in the Charleston area than are their mountainous counterparts.

But the big-daddy project is to get a small practice slope in operation in the Charleston area. The club already has a rope tow and is looking into the possibility of obtaining or using some land north of Charleston near the old Guthrie Air Force Base. Whether this will work out will depend upon the practicality of obtaining insurance for the venture.

But not everyone takes such an enamored view of skiing in the border States. In a recent articles in Sports Illustrated entitled "A No-Snow Slope to Nonsport," Bill Gilbert argues that snow machines, ski lifts and super-heated lodges have taken all the uncomfortable and strenuous edges off of skiing and has made it a nonsport. He commits the further heresy of implying that the modern skier cannot take the cold weather that is found in Colorado, Michigan and New England.

"The heart of the southern skiland is now located in the Potomac River Basin—southern Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia," he says. "Innovation is apparently more highly regarded than tradition in southern ski establishments, just as it is in motels and bowling alleys," he continues, pointing to the recreational attractions from golf courses to pony rides which surround the slopes.

Such insults, it should be pointed out, would make any Nordic-blooded ski devotee climb out of his indoor, pre-heated, Olympic-size, ski-lodge swimming pool and bury such writers with a blizzard of artificial, sprayed-from-a-nozzle snowballs.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, next Monday over 600,000 high school youths will start a 1-week observance of special importance, I feel, to all of us.

The week March 27 through April 2 is National FHA Week, honoring the Future Homemakers of America.

Started in 1945 as an incorporated nonprofit organization, it is supported by membership dues. It is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association. There are 11,000 chapters of the FHA in secondary schools throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, as well as at American Army post schools.

The FHA is a national organization of home economics students who are serious minded, community spirited, and concerned about the responsibilities of the future—and more importantly are doing something about it.

Kansas is proud to be represented on the FHA National Executive Council by Jim S. Solander of Garnett, Kans. This group leads the national organization.

A 4-year national work program is aimed at helping each young lady recognize her abilities, strive for full development, and participate actively in family, community, and world improvement projects. In Kansas some 8,854 young ladies participate in 151 chapters. Just a week ago they held their State convention in Topeka with 2,000 youngsters and 500 adults attending.

An idea of the FHA purpose and program can be seen by chapter activities. For example, at Frankfort, Kans., the chapter conducted a program on mental health featuring Dr. Robert Hughes, the Marshal County health officer, who was able to correct many misconceptions the students had regarding mental illness.

At Cimarron, the FHA chapter had a work day, in which chapter members worked with their younger sisters broadening their understanding of each other.

At Glasco, the chapter invited a minister to speak on morals and manners.

At Silver Lake, the FHA chapter staged a "dad and daughter" dinner for all the girls in the high school, which included a tour, dinner, and recreation afterward.

These are but a few examples of the manner in which the FHA is helping young girls become stable young adults.

Mr. President, at a time when we seem to be making so little progress in problems of youth despite numerous large-scale Government programs, it is more than reassuring to see the Future Homemakers of America continue to nurture the ideals necessary for a young woman to become a benefit to society—rather than just seeking benefits from it.

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the light of the current state of national opinion relating to the war in Vietnam, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the results of a recent public opinion poll conducted by seven social scientists at Stanford University in cooperation with the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. This national survey discloses that widespread public support exists for a more flexible American bargaining position in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANFORD.—Widespread public support exists for a more flexible American bargaining position in Vietnam, even among President Johnson's supporters, a new national survey showed today.

The privately financed, independent study was conducted by seven social scientists at Stanford in cooperation with the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago.

Based on 1,474 questionnaires administered in person from late February through early March, the survey revealed 88 percent of the adult population favors negotiation with the Vietcong if they are willing to negotiate; 70 percent would support a U.N.-negotiated truce; 54 percent would favor holding free elections in South Vietnam, even if the Vietcong might win; and 52 percent would be willing to see the Vietcong participate in a coalition government in South Vietnam.

Surprisingly, there is practically no difference between those who endorse the President's handling of the Vietnam situation and the general public on these positions, which have been advocated mainly by his congressional critics. (The corresponding percentages for the President's supporters on these four questions were 88, 71, 54, and 51.)

Contrary to press speculation, the new study shows those adults who are critical of the President on Vietnam are mainly "doves," not "hawks." These critics oppose a 500,000 troop commitment in Vietnam by a 2 to 1 margin and are against bombing North Vietnamese cities, 3 to 2.

Like previously published commercial polls, the independent survey shows 61 percent of the public favors President Johnson's handling of Vietnam, while 29 percent are opposed and 10 percent have no opinion.

However, more detailed questions disclose that the majority of Americans have reservations about continuing the war, when faced with its possible costs, both in money and manpower.

Thus, 4 out of 5 adults oppose cutting aid to education if necessary to continue the war. Two-thirds oppose cutting medicare. And two-thirds oppose raising taxes. Majorities also oppose introducing economic controls or reducing the war on poverty for this purpose.

So far as manpower is concerned, a majority (60 percent) would be willing to continue the war if it only required calling up the National Guard. But more than half would rather end the war than see full mobilization or accept several hundred American casualties weekly.

While Americans now are clearly opposed to major escalation of the conflict, they also oppose other extreme alternatives. Thus 4 out of 5 oppose unilateral American withdrawal followed by a Communist takeover, and a similar proportion do not want to see the United States abandon its commitment to other Asian countries.

A majority (56 percent) said they would continue the war if it meant fighting the Chinese in Vietnam. But more than half would rather end the war than bomb cities in North Vietnam (55 percent), fight a land war in China (60 percent) or wage atomic war with China (64 percent). In general, the greater the escalation, the larger the majority favoring an end to the war.

Reaction to one of the most likely steps—a 500,000 troop commitment—is evenly divided (46 percent oppose, 45 percent favor).

The "doves" who favor negotiation with the Vietcong and a coalition government "are not open to the charge of being soft on communism," the authors noted. "Overwhelmingly, these people maintain a firm anti-Communist policy elsewhere in the world." (More than 4 out of 5 in this group either favor present American policies toward Russia, China and Cuba or think our stand should be tougher.)

"If the Vietnam 'dove' turns out to be a hybrid, so does the Vietnam 'hawk,'" the authors observed. Among those who favor a 500,000 troop commitment, for example, 85 percent also favor negotiations with the Vietcong, 53 percent favor free elections, even though the Vietcong might win, and 49 percent favor a coalition government.

Only 6 percent of those interviewed took a consistent "hawk" position of more troops, bombing cities, and no free elections or coalitions with the Vietcong. This group supported the President's handling of Vietnam by a 3-to-1 majority.

At the opposite extreme, 14 percent of the public follows a consistent "dove" position on these same four items. More of this group opposed the President than approved his handling of Vietnam.

In conclusion, the researchers said:

"The American public is clearly concerned about Vietnam. Sixty-one percent say that they are worried about Vietnam—more than worry about any other public issue.

"But their opinions appear to be moderate and responsible. They do not want to pay the domestic costs of commitment in Vietnam, but this is consistent with their desire for a negotiated settlement.

"And though the settlement they prefer involves a willingness to deal with the Vietcong that goes beyond present administration policy, they reject those solutions that require irresponsible abandonment of our commitments."

Results were analyzed by Sidney Verba, Stanford professor of political science, in collaboration with Gordon Black, graduate student in political science; Richard Brody, assistant professor of political science; Paul Ekman, research associate in the Institute of Political Science (and associate professor of psychology at San Francisco State College); Norman Nie, Stanford graduate student in political science; Edwin B. Parker, Stanford associate professor of communication; and Nelson W. Polsby, fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (and associate professor of government at Wesleyan University, Connecticut.)

Sampling and fieldwork were done under the supervision of Director Peter H. Rossi and Senior Study Director Paul Sheatsley, both of NORC.

Costs were covered by contributions to NORC from over 200 San Francisco Bay area residents, mainly college faculty members, and from NORC itself.

AMERICA'S PARADISE LOST

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on many occasions last year, in this Chamber and elsewhere, I sought to direct attention to the question of the future political status of the people of Micronesia—that vast, far-flung and largely forgotten area known as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

As trustee of some 90,000 inhabitants of tiny islands scattered over a 3 million square mile ocean region, the United States is responsible for the administration of this non-self-governing territory, by agreement with the United Nations Security Council.

In order to stimulate a dialog and discussion on the question of Micronesia's future status, I have made numerous remarks and referred to appropriate literature about the trust territory.

I now wish to call attention to a book just off the press, "America's Paradise Lost," authored by Willard Price, and published by John Day Co. The book has been reviewed by a former Honolulu newsman, Robert Trumbull, who knows Micronesia intimately. Now the head of the New York Times Tokyo Bureau, Mr. Trumbull is the author of the book "Paradise in Trust: A Report on Americans in Micronesia."

Because Mr. Trumbull is a most knowledgeable observer of life in Micronesia, his review of Mr. Price's book should provide much food for thought on the subject. He states that Mr. Price's critical survey of U.S. administration of the trust territory is a "most damning indictment of American misrule in a paradisical part of the world."

In order that all relevant points of view in the continuing discussion on Micronesia's future be made available, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Mr. Trumbull's review which appeared in the March 13, 1966 issue of the New York Times book review.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Shocking Account

(By Robert Trumbull)

"America's Paradise Lost," by Willard Price. Illustrated, 240 pages, New York, the John Day Co., $5.95.

Americans who bleed, by tradition, for subject peoples under other flags should take a good look at our own desperate shortcomings in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Washington's contemptuous neglect of some 90,000 brown-skinned Micronesians ever since their welfare became an American responsibility more than 20 years ago should be a national scandal.

The islands are scattered over the Western Pacific, 3,000 miles west of Hawaii, 1,000 miles south of Japan and 2,000 miles east of Vietnam. Most Americans heard of these islands for the first time when our forces made bloody landings at such exotically named places as Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Peleliu, Saipan and Tinian; bombarded the Japanese bases at Truk, Yap, and Koror, and established our own enormous fleet anchorage in the vast blue Ulithi lagoon. In earlier times, the islands had belonged to Spain by right of discovery. When the Spaniards decided to pull out of the Pacific after losing the Philippines in the Spanish-American War, they sold the islands to Germany, Japan seized them at the outset of World War I, only to lose them to the United States in the next great war. ("We would like," said an island chief, "to be ruled by a country that doesn't lose wars.")

Willard Price's new book, aptly entitled "America's Paradise Lost," puts the blame for a disgraceful situation on Congress and the U.S. Department of the Interior, the agency responsible. His scathing work is the latest addition to a growing library of abrasive reports on the American failure in Micronesia, some of them by successive inspection missions from the United Nations Trusteeship Council. Mr. Price opens his shocking account of their shameful plight with the anecdote about an anonymous Congressman who was asked, "What are you going to do about Micronesia?" Said the Congressman, "Mike who?"

The author first visited Micronesia in 1935, when the 2,000-odd islands—"2,000 bits of heaven" of the Marshall, Caroline, and Mariana groups were run by Japan under a League of Nations mandate, the predecessor of the present U.N. trusteeship. If his subsequent book, "Japan's Islands of Mystery" did not tell the U.S. Navy most of what it knew about these highly strategic (and illegally fortified) Japanese outposts, at least it was required reading at Admiral Nimitz' Pacific Fleet Headquarters.

The latest survey, in demonstrating that there has been scant improvement in Micronesian life over the years, and even a sharp deterioration in some aspects of government, is a most damning indictment of American misrule in a paradisical part of the world.

A long list of paying industries developed by the Japanese—large-scale fishing, sugar growing, trochus shell work and pearl culture, to name a few—have virtually disappeared. Jungle grows where the Japanese had thriving towns with paved streets, and a once-profitable territory has become a deficit area. Where once the Japanese had paved highways, roads have been permitted to become all but impassable.

In the "strikingly beautiful" islands of Yap, where stone disks up to 12 feet in diameter still serve as money and "women are ashamed not to show their breasts," bridges have been left broken and canals clogged. One bitter chapter of the book is appropriately titled "The Rust Territory," in tribute to the dilapidated tin towns that are the principal monuments to American rule.

Lovely Palau, "a superb fling of islands," has become a spectacle of "decay at every turn." Says Mr. Price, "agriculture was in the doldrums. Farmers complained of the lack of incentive. Government help was not what it had been under the farm-minded Japanese. * * * Deep sea fishing * * * had sunk to the lowest ebb in 40 years."

On many islands, Mr. Price found, education is almost entirely lacking. Perhaps 2 percent of Micronesia's adolescent population ever looks inside a high school, although there are a half dozen at district centers, and "college, except for a favored few, is 'out.'" A teacher told Mr. Price that 15 Micronesians have now been graduated from American colleges, which would be fine except that "if there were the same proportion (of college graduates to population) as in the United States, we would have 760."

The construction of decent hospitals on two islands is listed as a gain; some other so-called hospitals, with broken screens letting in flies, are a disgrace. Some easily treated endemic diseases, such as yaws, have been almost eradicated, but the rampant tuberculosis is a different story.

For a place so often called a paradise, Micronesia has produced outstandingly macabre headlines since Americans took over. It was from Tinian, in the Marianas, that the atomic bombs were delivered to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Kwajalein and Eniwetok, after the residents were removed, became the bases for grisly experiments with superbombs. Another atoll in the Marshalls, after a particularly horrendous demonstration of destructive power, gave its name to a bathing costume—the Bikini.

The evacuation of numerous island dwellers so that their ancestral land could be blasted to irradiated powder was accomplished with quiet efficiency, although the results have been unhappy from the natives' point of view. Even less fortunate were the innocent Marshallese who were accidentally showered with the same radioactive dust that presumably killed the Japanese fisherman, Koboyama, of the hapless *Lucky Dragon*. The survivors have remained medical curiosities. The atomic testing has been stopped by international agreement, but the azure waters are still a missile range.

Naturally, the picture is not all dark. Ham-handed and ill-advised as the American effort has been in so many aspects, there have been successes in the fields of public health and local self-government. "We like to think we bring a magic touch to anything we undertake," says Mr. Price, but he felt compelled to conclude his survey with the remark that "When everything favorable that can be said has been said, the fact remains that the trust is progressing backward."

Presumably, under the United Nations trusteeship agreement, we are preparing the islanders for eventual independence. Speaking nine languages and scattered over 3 million square miles of sea, an area larger than that of the United States, the Micronesians themselves concede that their political future is a problem. Some would like to join the United States, in spite of everything.

From the beginning, the trust territory has been operated under a misconceived program with an absurd budget and an inadequate staff. As must be true of any such group, many of the Americans in charge are competent and dedicated men and women.

For 10 years, says Mr. Price, Congress allotted the trust territory a paltry $8 million. The sum was doubled in 1962, but the author notes that meanwhile the cost of operations had also doubled, leaving the situation where it was in the beginning. One of the consequences is that many islanders seldom or never see an American face, because of the shortage of transportation.

It is far too late, Mr. Price was assured by native leaders, for the Micronesian to revert to the simple life of the grass shack and outrigger canoe. "Gone too," he related, "is the more recent paradise of plumbing, refrigeration, the hot rod and money in the pocket under the stimulus of the Japanese and the opulence of the American military. Now a disillusioned but remarkably patient people hang in a state of suspended animation, unable to go back to the ancient simplicity, unequipped to go forward."

Such is the "bitter truth," Mr. Price concludes, of the "forgotten sisters of the richest nation on earth." Meanwhile, "America, traditional champion of independence, finds itself in the acutely uncomfortable position of holding down one of the last colonies on earth—and, what is worse, neglecting it shamefully."

DROUGHT OF FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDS IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, several of my distinguished colleagues earlier this month brought attention to a matter of special importance—the drought of Federal research funds in the Midwest.

As many may know, last year there was formed the Midwest Resources Association, with 13 States in the region participating. Six members of this body are members of the organization's leadership.

The Midwest Research Association has a simple but sincere and, I believe, extremely important purpose. We seek to better inform the national scientific community—private and public—of the facilities and intellect available for research in the Midwest.

Mr. President, some Federal grants and awards have been made to midwestern colleges and universities, for which we have been grateful. But, as has been ably pointed out, the total of these funds is small when compared to other sections of the Nation—particularly the east and west coasts. We do not feel this is equitable or desirable.

The research projects assigned to midwestern institutions of higher learning, and other research facilities, have been completed with precision and qualitative result. These scientists have demonstrated their abilities—proven their capabilities. But much more could and should be done by these and others in the region.

Midwest Resources Association is not seeking large-scale Federal handouts but only an equitable share of the available funds and projects.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska has reached to the crux of the situation with Senate Resolution 231, which seeks a clarification of the manner and policy in which Federal research grants, loans and contracts are disbursed. I feel this can do much to balance the research scales.

For this reason I am joining the Senator as a cosponsor of his resolution.

NEW HOPE IN CHILE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article in which Mr. Gary MacEoin said that the United States had managed to alienate the right, left, and center of the Latin American political spectrum. Perhaps Chile should have been eliminated from that judgment, because it is in Chile that Ralph Dungan is U.S. Ambassador.

A report from Santiago appearing in the March 9 Washington Post details the reasons for Dungan's success in a country burdened with tremendous problems but blessed with a progressive government. Dungan has taken the "risk of helping implant democracy by putting its power behind the democratic forces," Correspondent Georgie Anne Geyer reports.

It is Dungan himself who insists that President Johnson has changed nothing in the Alliance and often quotes some of the President's excellent speeches to prove his point about U.S. support of peaceful revolution.

Mr. President, good news travels slowly, but it should be welcomed when it arrives. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FRONTIER ENVOY TO CHILE HAILS COUNTRY'S PROGRAM OF REFORMS

(By Georgie Anne Geyer)

SANTIAGO.—"Your Ambassador," the big Chilean landowner told a visiting American, "he's a little pink, isn't he?"

The aristocrat bars of Santiago are filled with this kind of talk about Ralph Dungan, the most controversial American Ambassador in Latin America, and Dungan doesn't mind it at all.

"I want everyone to know where I stand," says Dungan, a burly, ruddy, vital New Frontiersman, and everybody does.

He is a bit of a dinosaur in Latin America today. A holdover from the Kennedy days, Dungan is the only American Ambassador in Latin America who is putting the Kennedy philosophy into practice in its pure form.

In Chile, a country now going through a profound peaceful revolution, Dungan has thrown the weight of the United States behind reform in no uncertain ways.

POINTED INTERVIEW

The recent flap over "the pink Ambassador" came when, in the midst of the Chilean fight over land reform, he gave a pointed interview to the influential Chilean magazine, Edcilla, in which he quoted some old New Frontier statements such as:

"Without deep changes, there will be no peaceful revolution, and without this, bloodshed will be inevitable.

"To carry out reforms in depth, there must be a revolutionary conscience at mass level, and

"Socially, private property is not an unlimited right."

The interview caused a stir of giant proportions with the old traditional conservative parties attacking Dungan for "unjustified intervention."

REVOLUTION WORKING

On the other hand, liberals who were not always friendly to the United States, partly because of its previous support of the big landowners, now see the United States with new eyes.

"This revolution is working, and Chile has a possibility of changing without violence," said Dr. Eduardo Hamuy, the top sociologist in Chile, "and do you know why? Because the United States has put its power behind it and broken the will of the right."

Dungan apparently thrives on the controversy. He heads an Embassy that is filled with vitality. He is on the closest possible terms with the Chilean President, Eduardo Frei, one of the emerging great statesmen of the continent.

He does not believe in nonintervention, but instead believes in the Kennedyian intervention on the side of liberalism and reform. "Any ambassador who is not intervening today is not doing his job," Dungan says. "He must be committed to certain principles."

Dungan personally is a vital, restless man, young (42) and direct. There is a boy-next-door quality about him, an engaging smile that doesn't quite mask a quick intelligence. He flings himself into a chair, throws a leg over the arm and talks from the hip.

Born in Philadelphia, Dungan got a master's degree in public affairs at Princeton and eventually ended up as a special aid to President Kennedy. He stayed on with President Johnson and was appointed Ambassador December 14, 1964, 3 months after Frei's election.

COMMITTED TO CHANGE

Dungan has been determined to present, as did President Kennedy, the picture of the United States as a country committed to revolutionary change and not as a people committed to moneymaking.

When he moved into the extraordinarily beautiful modern Ambassador's residence, which sits on a hill above Santiago, Dungan immediately set out to know the country.

One day he phoned a Maryknoll priest who is working closely with the poor and asked him to take him and wife Mary, mother of their six children, around to see the callampas (slums).

Dungan is supported by Washington, and he insists that President Johnson has changed nothing in the Alliance. Indeed much of what Dungan quoted in his controversial land reform interview ("no farmer should be the slave of a land he will never own") was from Johnson speeches.

What is unquestionably different is the qualitative difference between Chile, where the old Kennedy approach is in effect, and other countries in Latin America, where Washington's new pragmatic approach has taken over.

The old Kennedy approach, on the other hand, was based on the historic observation that Latin America must go to the left, as the masses become politicized. The correlates were that the United States should unqualifiedly back the forces of the future that U.S. power could help break the past and help capture the inevitable revolution for democracy before it happened.

Basically the philosophy—Kennedy's and Dungan's—is that it is not enough to "let things happen" in Latin America, that the United States must take the risk of helping implant democracy by putting its power behind the democratic forces.

"The big thing is to take the risk," says Dungan. "Democracy is risky."

INDIANA UNIVERSITY EMPHATIC ON NEED FOR CONTINUED NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT LOANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I spoke of the grave difficulties which our institutions of higher learning face if the discontinuance of National Defense Education Act loan funds is carried out according to the administration's plans. A letter from the Director of Financial Aid of the University of Notre Dame, Brother Sinnaeve, related the severe problem faced by that school. Whereas their need for next fall is anticipated as $400,000 for 500 students, under the proposal there will be only $100,000 available for about 125 students.

I have now received similar detailed comments upon the effect at Indiana University in a letter from its scholarships and financial aid director, Donovan J. Allen. At Indiana, current National Defense Education Act borrowers exceed 2,500, and they expect a total of about 4,000 will attempt to borrow under this program next year and under the health professions and nursing student loan program, now supplying 400 students.

Here are some of the effects at Indiana University as Mr. Donovan sees them:

"Significant numbers" of students "would not be able to continue" if these loan funds are withdrawn.

Termination will seriously hamper also the work-study and opportunity grant programs of the Higher Education Act, because of matching requirements.

There is "insufficient assurance" that the private loan program is an effective substitute.

Under the proposed conditions, the total Federal guarantee money to Indiana for 1966–67 will support only about $4½ million in loans—but Indiana University applications for next year already are close to $4 million.

Private loan sources will give preference to the good credit risk, but the greatest need is often for the high-risk student who will lose out under the change.

We have a moral obligation to the students presently financing their education with National Defense Education Act loans. We should not suddenly be required to inform them that they must find other means of support.

The guaranteed loan program does not guarantee that any loans will be made at all; with tight credit, the extent of help is indeterminable.

These are some of the points made by Mr. Allen, who presents them in a forceful manner in greater detail than I have done here. I believe he is correct, and that Brother Sinnaeve is correct, and that the increasing number of letters I receive on this subject are correct in urging that we halt this intended shortchanging of students who need to borrow from the National Defense Education Act loan funds. It was not our intention in passing the Higher Education Act to make it a complete substitute in title IV for these loans, but to expand the opportunity. To contract it, to offer it with one hand and then take it away with the other, is indeed a violation of our moral obligations and a disservice to the student and to the Nation, simply for the sake of an accounting advantage in budgetary considerations. The provision of these funds is not a net outlay; they are funds not for a giveaway, but for borrowing and repayment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter setting forth the Indiana University position may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
DIVISION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL,
Bloomington, Ind., March 14, 1966.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: The possible termination of the national defense student loan program has caused great concern to me and to financial aid officers generally. Many students here and in colleges and universities throughout the State and Nation would be adversely affected, in my opinion. Significant numbers of students would not be able to continue their education. Countless others would be severely hindered in beginning college.

Moreover, the national defense student loan program is essential to the successful operation of the college work-study and educational opportunity grant programs, and thus its termination or cutback would seriously limit these two programs. The college work-study and educational opportunity grant programs are but two of the three parts of the total Federal student assistance package. Without the third program; i.e., national defense student loans, the entire governmental participation will be reduced in effectiveness in helping students gain a higher education, and there is insufficient assurance of the effectiveness of the proposed substitute, the guaranteed loan program.

It is our understanding that the State of Indiana will have a State-controlled guaranteed loan program. It presently appears that the allocation of guarantee money from the Federal Government to Indiana will allow about $4.5 million to be loaned by private financial institutions under this program for the 1966–67 academic year, with none for part-time students or for those enrolled in summer. This amount will be clearly insufficient to meet the requests of all the students who need to borrow funds to attend college, even if all of it were available to them and none were made available to those wishing to borrow because of the preferred interest rate, or for the convenience of "spreading out" the cost of college, but whose financial need is not as serious as those who must borrow or fall out. And yet we are not convinced that lending institutions will loan to the "high risk" student from a poor background who has great financial need nearly as readily as to the "good credit risk." In fact, we anticipate the opposite.

The present financial aid program at Indiana University (and this is typical of many colleges and universities) attempts to meet the individual need of each student by a combination of aids. We package the aid by tying together gift aid of scholarship or grant with a loan and part-time employment. We feel that if the student is willing to work part time while in school and invest in his own future through borrowing, he better deserves help in grant form to cover the remainder of his need. The national defense student loan program is a key element of such a package award. It is basic to meeting the full need of the student. Some needy students at Indiana University prefer to borrow the total amount of their need. We feel this type of self-sufficiency should be afforded at as favorable loan terms as possible, and under the national defense student loan program we have been able to assure this.

There are over 2,500 students borrowing funds under the national defense student loan program at Indiana University this current academic year. An additional 400 students are borrowing from the health professions and nursing student loan programs. It is already clear that considerably more students (a total of approximately 4,000) will attempt to borrow funds under these programs next year. Our own applications for next year already total close to $4 million. Contrast the $4.5 million available for the entire State under a program which, unlike the national defense loan program, would give no priority to the really needy students.

It is our opinion that there is a moral obligation to the students presently financing their education, either wholly or in part, through national defense student loans. We should not suddenly be required to inform them that they must find other means of support. These students have staked their future on being able to complete their education through use of national defense student loans. Should the program be terminated or curtailed, we would in effect be jeopardizing the futures of our present students and reneging on a commitment. Likewise, those who wish to matriculate as freshman, graduate or transfer students and who need to use national defense student loans will be thwarted. The lack of adequate loan funds will inevitably deny many present and potential students the opportunity for further education. The situation is compounded by the fact that the guaranteed loan program does not guarantee that any loans will be made. Not only do the attitudes of banks vary on various aspects of student loans, but there is already a tighter credit situation throughout this region and probably the Nation than when the GLP was enacted only a few months ago.

It is important to stress, in addition, that the Higher Education Act of 1965 includes 2 programs, the educational opportunity grant program and the college work-study program, whose successful operation demands on this and many other campuses the continuation of the national defense student loan program. The educational opportunity grant program requires that grants awarded under it to an individual must be matched by at least an equal amount of institutional aid exclusive of funds earned under the college work-study program. At the same time, the institution must also maintain its present level of aid to students. We at Indiana University were planning to match the educational opportunity grants with an increased supply of national defense student loans, thereby meeting the matching requirement and also maintaining our student aid level average of the last 3 years. Students on the educational opportunity grant program must show "exceptional financial need." There is no way on earth to assure that these are the students who would meet favor when attempting to borrow from a commercial lending institution under the guaranteed loan program or any other loan program. Without increased national defense student loan funds we would be unable to control or assure the required matching, and with curtailed national defense loan funds we would not even be able to meet the institutional aid level maintenance requirement of the educational opportunity grant program.

With regard to the college work-study program, it must be remembered that the institution of higher education is committed, among other requirements, to meet the student's total financial need. The gift aid funds available at Indiana University for work-study students cannot possibly satisfy their remaining financial need. Yet since these, too, are needy students, economically deprived to a demonstrable degree, we think they also would be viewed as high risk borrowers by commercial lending institutions, even though they should, in our opinion, have the optimum opportunity to borrow at the preferred rate.

The termination of the National Defense Student Loan program would definitely and adversely affect the present and future student aid program for students at Indiana University. Even its curtailment would cause severe problems, the solution to which we do not now have. Our present need is to assist 4,000 students under the National Defense Student Loan program in 1966–67 including 1,000 students under the College Work-Study program and 1,360 under the Educational Opportunity Grant program. Our plans for meeting this would have to be dramatically revised downward. There is a distinct possibility we would have to cancel our application for educational opportunity grants and reduce our college-work study program.

Sincerely yours,

DONOVAN J. ALLEN,
Director.

FRAZAR B. WILDE—PROFILE OF A FINANCIER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on March 15, 1966, Frazar B. Wilde retired as chairman of the board of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Connecticut General is renowned for many things—but surely one of its greatest assets was Frazar Wilde. A man of imagination, of great social conscience, wisdom, and initiative, Frazar Wilde typifies the best of American business. He was never a man to neglect his fellow citizens—and served them in innumerable ways. During my years as Governor of Connecticut and at my invitation he responded time and again with his knowledge and experience on matters affecting the State of Connecticut. Under his leadership, the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. has grown to be one of the giants of the insurance industry.

A man may be measured by the length of his shadow—and Frazar Wilde casts a long shadow indeed—but he is also known by the illumination he provides to the world. Frazar Wilde has shed the light of reason on a wide variety of issues and lighted the hearts of his fellow men. I am proud to number him among my friends, and I join with the countless others who salute him on his retirement. We wish for him many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Hartford Times of March 15, "Profile of a Financier," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFILE OF A FINANCIER—AFTER 52 YEARS, WILDE SAYS GOODBY

(By Bill Ryan)

A short, older man today officially walked away from a giant of insurance that he—more than anyone else—helped create.

His name is Frazar Bullard Wilde. The company is the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. Their parting today—at the annual meeting of the company—was no ordinary retirement parting.

In many ways, Frazar Wilde has been the Connecticut General. The company is 101 years old this year. He has been with it more than half that time, was its president for 25 years, and has been its chairman for 5.

Someone who knows the insurance business thoroughly was discussing the Connecticut General the other day and put it flatly: "Frazar Wilde made that company what it is," he said.

What it is is a sprawling modern Goliath located in a parklike setting in Bloomfield. Out of its huge, airy offices radiates a business that reaches 6 million people in all 50 States. Its assets are more than $3.2 billion. Its life insurance in force is nearly $16 billion. It is the ninth biggest life insurance company in total assets, eighth biggest in insurance in force.

The man who was the field general of the company during its greatest expansion—and who was responsible for the big move out of Hartford to Bloomfield nearly a decade ago—was sitting in his office the other day, a few days before, as he put it, he would become a "free agent," and talking of, among other things, how he got into the insurance business.

His father, he said, had been an investment broker in Boston and in 1905 had been transferred to Hartford. He moved his family here and his son eventually went to Hartford Public High School and was graduated in 1914.

SHORT NEWSPAPER CAREER

After he was graduated, Frazar Wilde became a newspaper reporter, for the Hartford Courant, for a summer. "I was the shore reporter from Woodmont to New Haven. I'd ride the trolleys and get off at the beaches and pick up items. This was mostly on the social front."

Then he went to Connecticut General and he says he wanted to go into insurance because it was a business that did not appear to be what it really was. "I wanted to join a business that was an investment trust. To people on the street, the insurance business is a sales business and of course it does involve sales. But it's really an investment trust."

He joined as an office clerk. A few years later he took time off to go with Troop B Cavalry for service on the Mexican border. It was not the most pleasant of experiences.

"It was a rough go. There was no real danger but it was soldiering in 125 degrees of heat. It was dreadfully hot, the horses were not trained but the campaign was a good thing because the Army had a chance to get in some training for World War I which was coming up."

He was an enlisted man in the Mexican campaign. In 1918 he became an officer. He laughed. "I was one of those 90-day wonders out of Plattsburg." He went to France in July 1918, where he served with the 301st Field Artillery. He came back to Connecticut General the following year and became a field auditor. In 1924 he was named to head the claim department.

In was during the early 1920's that he first came into contact with something that he has come to be identified with over the years—as an outspoken enemy. This was inflation.

ROUGH DAYS RECALLED

"In 1920 we had 100-percent inflation. Eggs were selling for 10 cents apiece. When I went away you could buy them for 50 cents, or 40 cents a dozen. I could not buy Mrs. Wilde a winter coat. I took the camels hair lining out of a British trench coat and she wore it for a winter coat. Inflation is a terrible thing."

Talk on inflation led to talk on another subject on which Mr. Wilde has been outspoken over the years, and this is credit buying. He says he has not been a critic of credit buying, per se. But he hates to see it overdone.

"I have long since accepted the idea of installment purchasing, particularly on high-priced goods. It is nice our economic system has found a way to allow people, particularly young people, to buy a house. Where I quarrel with installment purchasing is getting people to overbuy. They go up in price class. If it comes to a $3,000 car someone can afford versus a $4,000 car, he is likely to take the $4,000 car. There is too much upgrading. Installment paying on overall necessities is basically a good thing, but it can be overdone."

He stopped for a moment. "And my pet hate," he said, "is going on vacations on the installment plan."

Inflation and credit buying are two facets of the gigantic field of money, its uses, its disuses, its ramifications and Frazar Wilde is acknowledged to be a monetary expert.

President Johnson last year named him to the Advisory Committee of International Monetary Arrangements. In 1951 he had been adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board. In 1958 he headed a commission on money and credit financed by the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Wilde, however, gets a chuckle out of being described as a monetary expert. "An expert normally is someone who knows so much about a subject that his recommendations are acceptable. But now the opinions of some are not accepted by other experts, so the question is, are any of them really experts?"

PAYMENTS PROBLEM

In any case, he has studied the questions of money for years, "And I understand it better than some, but I don't think I am an expert."

The expert who says he isn't an expert got to talking about the balance-of-payments deficit—the big gold question—and he said he had some thoughts on it that resulted partly from his studies of economics but partly as the result of his personal philosophy.

The balance of payments between countries is "such a bloody complicated thing," he said, but one modern-day factor must be considered in top priority. "It is a belief on the part of our country that we must be the major contributor in saving the free world. Between $4 and $5 billion goes out in economic and military aid. The balance of payments starts from that basic fact of sending $4 to $5 billion abroad each year.

"I don't think we've shipped too much gold overseas. Gold is just a pretty metal, after all. The only reason I don't like shipping gold is the lack of confidence shown in us. Foreign governments think our money is going sour, so they ask for gold."

In any case, the thing that troubles him most, he said, is that other governments have so little confidence in the American paper dollar today that they demand big gold shipments. He seems to almost regard it as an insult.

He got to talking about insurance now, however, and said that the big change in insurance sales over the past half century is selling policies to fit the needs of people, instead of just to sell policies.

"The phrase used to be that the insurance man was a policy peddler. Once, he'd sell a $1,000 endowment policy to a young man who needed a maximum of insurance, when he should have been selling $10,000 in term or ordinary life. Now he sells to suit the needs. The big change in insurance was after World War I when the Government insurance gave a new perspective. Then came the big flu epidemic. The Government insurance showed that man was worth more in terms of insurance, and the war and the epidemic showed that he can die young."

"Now we sell insurance to fit three basic needs. A plan of money to carry on a young family. Continuous income if disabled, and protection of property and liabilities."

SERVICE TO OTHERS

Outside of the immediate fields of insurance and finance, Mr. Wilde has contributed extensively to governmental groups, town, State, and National. He was once chairman of the West Hartford finance committee. He headed the Wilde committee survey of State highway needs, established in 1955. Since 1964 he has been one of 200 businessmen "devoted to preservation and strengthening of our free society" and known as the Committee for Economic Development."

He has also been a family man. Last Friday, he and his wife—the former Mildred Taylor of Hartford—celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. They have two sons, two daughters and nine grandchildren.

Completely outside the business of business, Frazar Wilde is a walker, a sailor, and as he described it, a "paddler." He likes to swim. He also is an advocate of just plain walking and for years would walk 10 miles a weekend, 5 miles on Saturday and 5 miles on Sunday. He also liked to sail and 10 years ago served as a crew member on a ship in the Bermuda Race. "I even did some cooking." He didn't mind the cooking, but it was a year when the race was held in unusually bad weather.

The past year has not been a very good one for the man who retired today. He was out several months for a series of major abdominal operations and then spent a period of convalescence in Jamaica. He returned several days ago. He appears younger than his years and in good health now, although he says he still does not have all his strength back. He thinks he will go south again for a while. Then, when he feels he is fit again, he hopes to continue some of his activities.

But not, of course, with the Connecticut General. At least not on a daily basis. This was retirement day. He won't go back to the office as a matter of habit, after today, even though it might seem natural after 52 years.

THE LURE OF SPRINGTIME IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the myriad attractions of the State of West Virginia for American tourists and sportsters are becoming more and more widely recounted.

The New York Times on Sunday, March 13, carried an article, "Searching Out Springtime in West Virginia," which eloquently extols these attributes.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEARCHING OUT SPRINGTIME IN WEST VIRGINIA

(By Martha P. Haislip)

PETERSBURG, W. VA.—When the first blossoms of spring appear in florists' windows, many city dwellers feel an uncontrollable urge to head for the countryside. And when an errant robin is seen among dusty sparrows on a city street, this growing restlessness usually sends the winter weary out on the highways in search of spring.

For such souls, West Virginia, only a half-day or so by car from many eastern metropolitan areas, offers an unspoiled region in which spring can be enjoyed. In more than a million acres of National and State parks and forests, mountainsides are covered with masses of redbud, snowy service trees, and dogwood as early as mid-April.

ENCHANTING CONTRAST

At that time, newly leafed-out trees provide an enchanting contrast to the rich green of native rhododendron, laurel, and conifers; streams run fast and clear and the air is fresh and redolent of the season.

One of the loveliest early spring areas in West Virginia is the valley of the South Branch of the Potomac. It is accessible from the northeast by way of the Pennsylvania Turnpike to Bedford and then U.S. 220 south to the Potomac.

There, between low foothills of the Appalachians, the valley stretches wide to the South Branch, whose waters irrigate the rich bottomlands. In spring, the rich brown of newly plowed furrows accents the sharp green of winter wheat against a backdrop of spring flowers.

"BUY NOW"

Historically, the area was traversed as early as 1725 by a trader from the Hudson Valley. Upon returning home, he advised friends to obtain lands in "The Trough," as it was the "finest body of land" he had ever seen.

The land was part of a grant from the King of England to Lord Fairfax, who leased it out for 2½ cents an acre to be paid annually on the Feast Day of St. Michael.

Later, as more settlers moved into the area, 400 acres near Moorefield were sold for $125, but under the stipulations that the new owner pay Lord Fairfax an annual rent of 2½ cents an acre and that he "never kill deer, elk, buffalo, beaver or other game." Not until after the Revolutionary War were the lands freed to ownership without stipulations.

Today, much of the land is owned and farmed by descendants of the original owners. Their families occupy the red brick, Georgian style mansions that overlook the fertile valley, and nearly every house contains priceless treasures, as well as the original deeds from Lord Fairfax.

Among the notable homes in the valley are Sunset View, The Meadows, Gamble House and Willow Wall. The last named is a magnificent example of Georgian architecture, and has a perfectly proportioned facade. In the hall of the house, wallpaper handblocked with gay hunting scenes is as bright today as it was when brought from England more than 100 years ago.

Moorefield, the seat of Hardy County and in the heart of the valley, is a charming small town. It was incorporated in 1777, and was occupied by both Union and Confederate soldiers during the Civil War. The Presbyterian Church there was used as a military hospital and, at one time, as a stable for horses. Moorefield is also well known as a fishing center, for the South Branch of the Potomac is noted for its bass and trout.

TREASURE HOUSE

More than 20 colonial homes in the area are interesting. These include the Alexander House; Mill Island, a treasure house of European furnishings, and the lovely little building that houses the town library. The library won an award this year for being one of the six best in the United States.

Every Wednesday, an agricultural auction is held in town, and livestock, country-cured hams, eggs, and antiques go on the block. The sale starts at 1 p.m.

Petersburg, about 10 miles from Moorefield, is reached by way of a beautiful drive through scenic countryside. Not to be missed along the route is Hickory Hill, one of Hardy County's most beautiful old homes. It contains solid mahogany interior paneling and woodwork and unusual hand-wrought brass hinges.

On April 1, 2, and 3, Petersburg will be the headquarters for the annual White Water Weekend. A highlight of the 3-day celebration is the national championship down-river race for canoes on April 2. The course follows the North Fork of the Potomac for 14 miles and is considered one of the most hazardous stretches of "white water" in the East. The race can be seen from State Routes 28 and 4.

Also of interest near Petersburg are the fish hatcheries. At one of them several years ago appeared a trout as yellow as gold. From it alone have been bred thousands of fish that now stock many of West Virginia's streams.

In its honor, a trout festival is held each year. This year's celebration will be on May 12 and 13, and prizes will be awarded for the best rainbow and golden trout caught during the festival.

AWE-INSPIRING

While in Petersburg, the motorist can drive to the junction of State Route 28 and U.S. 33 to view Seneca Rocks, one of the most awe-inspiring natural wonders in the State. Looking like a medieval castle 1,000 feet high, quartzite rocks stand boldly outlined against the sky. For those who want to climb to the summit, horses can be rented for the ride up a path in the rear of the rocks.

A few miles farther north on the route, a winding, tree-bordered side road leads to the summit of 4,860-foot Spruce Knob, the highest point in the State. The view from the top embraces miles of mountains, lowlands and forests and provides a panorama of dramatic beauty.

At Blackwater Falls, about 40 miles to the northwest, the water tumbles over rocks into a 1,000-foot canyon. In May, snowy bouquets of tree blossoms are intermingled with the spruce and hemlock along the canyon walls.

THROUGH THE WOODS

The drive to Blackwater Falls State Park from Seneca Rocks is via U.S. 33 and State Route 32, and passes through the Monongahela National Forest. In spring, the forest is a mass of wild, yellow-flowered spice bush, wild plum and blooms of service trees. Millions of wild flowers carpet the woods alongside the route.

During mid-May, a 3-day wild-flower tour of the region is conducted by garden clubs, with botany professors from West Virgina University acting as guides. More than 40 kinds of trees and almost 150 species of wild flowers have been cataloged in the area.

Since the tour covers several miles, buses are available for groups.

CONGRATULATIONS PFIZER

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Chas. Pfizer Co., Inc., is one of the largest employers in Connecticut, and for this reason I was very pleased to see that it has been selected to receive the St. Francis College 1966 Charter Award.

This is an award which is made each year to a business firm which has done the most for the city and port of New York and the people it serves.

The Norwich Bulletin, in an editorial last week entitled "Congratulations Pfizer" pointed out some of Pfizer's contributions to the economy of southeastern Connecticut.

I ask unanimous consent to have this Bulletin editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin,
Mar. 9, 1966]

Congratulations Pfizer

Over the years chemical and drug producers have assumed a very prominent position in the Nation's prosperous industrial picture. As a direct result of their dramatic technological advances they have been able to make magnificent contributions to mankind's longevity and health, mental as well as physical, and the end, fortunately, is nowhere in sight.

Playing a leading role in this field is Chas. Pfizer Co., Inc., which operates a plant in Groton. We make a point of this at this time because the company has been chosen to receive the St. Francis College 1966 Charter Award. The award is made annually to the business firm "which has done the most for the city and port of New York and the people it serves."

Founded in New York 117 years ago, the company, through a steady process of expansion and diversification, is now made up of 27 plants in the United States and 57 in 28 foreign countries. Sales of its numerous products, distributed on a worldwide basis, reached an alltime high of $543 million during 1965. This impressive financial success is supplemented by an outstanding record of scientific achievements which include the production of penicillin on a large scale and the discovery of Terramycin.

Pfizer not only plays a vital part in New York area life, but also occupies a key position in the neighborhood of 1,900 persons; has an annual payroll of some $15 million, and is well along with an expansion program that creates an even brighter picture for the future.

We extend our congratulations to Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., upon being named the recipient of this year's Charter Award. On the basis of its high degree of business success, its accomplishments in its various fields of endeavor and its service to the public, it is not difficult to understand why the firm has been selected for the honor bestowed on it by St. Francis College. Southeastern Connecticut is indeed fortunate to be the site of a plant that is making a sizable contribution to the overall progress of this thriving industrial complex.

THE ATLANTIC CONCEPT UNDER TEST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, next week the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will be holding hearings on the concept of Atlantic unity. Two recent moves by the President of France, Gen. Charles de Gaulle, openly challenge this concept. John Allan May, European economic correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, has recently reported on some of the implications of these developments.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Atlantic Concept Under Test

(By John Allan May)

London.—The Atlantic idea is rapidly approaching a crucial test. Fresh French moves to torpedo it are expected here.

The British have drafted a communique which they hope will be signed by the 14 other partners condemning France's withdrawal from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Britain, through diplomatic channels, also is repeating its intention never to join Europe except on terms that preserve the Atlantic concept. This is to be stressed particularly strongly in Bonn.

The Atlantic idea, of course, is of an integrated alliance between the United States, Canada, Britain, and Western Europe, standing as a single bastion against international communism.

It now is openly challenged by President de Gaulle on two fronts—in NATO and in the world of the International Monetary Fund.

Some strategic analysis here say that President de Gaulle's aim is to create a third force that would be independent of the United States and capable of reaching an understanding with the Soviet Union. That understanding can contain—"hold within fixed limits: restrain"—the two Germanys, East and West.

VISIT TO MOSCOW

Due to visit Moscow in June, the French President aims to sell this idea to the Soviet chiefs, according to this analysis. The Soviets, too, might be prepared to cooperate.

[The French viewpoint, on the other hand is somewhat different. It is that France will remain the "ally of her allies" and a member of the Western alliance. But General de Gaulle insists that the NATO integrated command is outdated because of changed defense needs. Therefore, he has said, France and Europe must be free of this integration in order to be more flexible in establishing contacts with the Communist nations of Europe.

[French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville told the United Nations General Assembly last fall: "Since the division of Germany is born of the division of Europe, the prerequisite condition for the elimination of one is the elimination of the other. This means a profound and necessarily gradual transformation of the present situation."]

The "third force" theory here is that reorganization of NATO, and of the standing group in Washington, is going to spotlight the special position of West Germany. Germany will become the strongest European member of NATO. It stands in NATO's frontline.

Can this Germany be denied an equal share in the planning of NATO strategy? Can it be denied an equal share in nuclear arms? Surely not.

But, on the other hand, will the Soviet Union allow such an upgrading of West Germany's status to go without a challenge? Surely not either.

A fresh Soviet-American confrontation would then be expected if West Germany were upgraded.

Nor is Britain prepared to allow a German "finger on the nuclear button." Thus the effect of President de Gaulle's squeeze play could spread, according to this theory. He intends, if he can, to accentuate the one important area of division between the views of the American and the British administrations.

At the same time, as the world has seen but perhaps not much noticed, President de Gaulle has vetoed an Atlantic solution to the international monetary problem. His insistence on gold as the essential basis of the world's payments system seems to be a tactic in a battle to "get the American dollar out of Europe."

PAWTUCKET, R.I., CONFERENCE of WATER SHORTAGE AND POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at 10:30 this morning, Mayor Robert Burns, of the city of Pawtucket, R.I., called to order a conference held in that city, to discuss the various aspects of water shortages and water pollution control. A subject which has vital importance to Rhode Island as well as the whole Northeastern section of our country, as we enter what could be a fifth year of drought.

The conference, which will include officials from many Rhode Island cities and towns, met with my enthusiastic approval, when the subject was first broached by Mayor Burns. I am pleased to have been able to arrange attendance at the meeting by Mr. Edward V. Geismar, Chief of the Water Quality Section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Geismar, a highly regarded expert in the field of water pollution, will discuss both the causes of this problem, and the means of clearing it up.

Conferences such as this, are valuable both on the local and national levels. One city, or one area, working alone, cannot meet the problem of pollution control. Concerted effort is needed by all the communities affected. In this specific case, those cities and towns in the Blackstone River Valley, are working and studying together. It is hoped that the example of Pawtucket will be followed by many other areas with the same type of problem.

I therefore salute the city of Pawtucket, and Mayor Burns, for having the foresight and initiative to call such a meeting, and wish the conferees success.

UTAH PILOT HERO OF A SHAU EVACUATION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, 1 week ago today, Maj. Bernard Fisher, an Air Force pilot, who was born and raised in Clearfield, Utah, distinguished himself as one of the real heroes of the Vietnam war. Major Fisher was piloting an A1E aircraft on a fighter-bomber mission during the crucial battle of U.S. Army Special Forces camp at A Shau, 50 miles west of Danang, South Vietnam, when he spotted a fellow pilot shot down by enemy ground fire. Without thinking of his own safety, Major Fisher landed his Skyraider aircraft on a bomb-scarred runway which was under heavy enemy fire, and literally plucked his fellow officer up by the seat of his pants and flew him to safety.

The rescued officer, Air Force Maj. Stafford M. Myers, had nothing but praise for the heroic efforts of Major Fisher.

Myers said:

> In my fondest dreams, I didn't believe anybody would land there to pull me out, not even a chopper.

Another Air Force officer was later quoted as saying:

> This is the most daring rescue I have heard of since World War II. I can't think of anything we did in Korea to match it.

Mr. President, I applaud the valiant efforts of Major Fisher and those of hundreds of other U.S. servicemen who daily are distinguishing themselves in battle in Vietnam. We should all be grateful for this courage and devotion to duty. I am confident that Major Fisher's heroic deed will not go unnoticed, either by his fellow servicemen, or by his Government.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a UPI news story which appeared in the March 11, 1966, Salt Lake Deseret News, and an editorial from the Standard Examiner, Ogden, Utah, dated March 12, 1966.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Deseret News, Mar. 11, 1966]

DYNAMIC RESCUE: "NOTHING LIKE IT"

Saigon.—"I'll bet nobody's ever seen an old man like me run like that," said U.S. Air Force Maj. Stafford M. Myers, as he recalled Friday how a fellow pilot rescued him under fire when he was shot down Thursday.

Maj. Bernard F. Fisher, 39, a native of Utah and whose wife and family reside at Kuna, Idaho, flew his A1E fighter-bomber through a hail of Communist ground fire and landed behind Myers during the battle at the U.S. Army Special Forces camp at A Shau, 50 miles west of Da Nang.

Myers, also 39, had crashlanded his own plane on the short dirt runway near the camp after being hit by enemy fire.

Myers' Skyraider was enveloped in flames as he hit the runway. The cockpit filled with smoke. He dived into the nearest ditch, only yards away from Communist gunners firing at other U.S. aircraft that were strafing the area around the besieged camp.

"In my fondest dreams I didn't believe anybody would land there to pull me out, not even a chopper," Myers said.

He said his eyes smarted from the smoke as he looked for cover, but then he saw Fisher's Skyraider roaring down the runway.

The downed pilot waved, and Fisher spotted him. It took him another 100 feet to stop his plane.

"He's crazy," Myers said he thought. "He shouldn't have done it. We'll never get out of here."

Myers leaped from the ditch and ran for his life. He reached the Skyraider, but "had a hard time getting up on the wing" because of the blast from the propeller.

Finally Fisher "pulled me up by the seat of the pants," he said. There was no time to talk, but Myers patted Fisher on the back a couple of times as the major gunned the plane. And hugged him as they taxied down the bomb-scarred runway.

Myers noticed that the plane's wing was full of holes, but somehow the Korean war-vintage plane held together as Fisher flew out of danger.

One Air Force officer later said "This is the most daring rescue I have heard of since World War II. I can't think of anything we did in Korea to match it."

Fisher gave a lot of credit for the daredevil rescue to the other three A1E pilots who were strafing the area all around Myers' downed Skyraider.

One Vietcong closed to within 20 feet of Myers as the Air Force major sprinted for the rescue aircraft. He was cut down by a burst from one of the Skyraiders swooping across the field at tree-top level.

[From the Ogden Standard-Examiner, Mar. 12, 1966]

UTAHAN BECOMES TOP VIET WAR HERO

The war in Vietnam, grim from the start, has produced few headlines about individual acts of heroism.

All men fighting and dying there are heroes in their own right. It's that kind of a war.

What we mean, however, is the type of exploit that fires the imagination and makes an American say: "That took a lot of guts."

That's what they're saying today about Utah-born Maj. Bernard Fisher.

He deliberately landed his old Skyraider propeller-driven fighter on the battered airstrip of the Shau Special Forces Camp, picked up a fellow pilot who had survived a crash and took off again while Vietcong troops fired at him.

Other Air Force fighter pilots helped the rescue by coming in low machinegunning enemy soldiers who were trying to stop Fisher and his passenger, Maj. Stafford M. Myers.

Fisher and Myers got away.

It's that type of bravery that inspires other fighting men to go all-out in service to their country.

It should be equally inspirational to we civilians at home.

If a pilot like Bernard Fisher is willing to brave the Communist guns to save the life of another U.S. aviator, the least we can do is to show appreciation for the risk he took.

Contrast this with the burning of a draft card or the ranting of Cassius Clay.

The Air Force should be mighty proud of Major Fisher.

So should the high school in Kaysville where he was graduated before he joined the Navy in World War II.

We know that his mother, Mrs. Levina Fisher of Ogden, is mighty proud of her flier son. So is his wife, now living in Kuna, Idaho, and his brothers and sisters in Ogden, Clearfield, South Weber and Boise.

Next time he's home on leave, we should proclaim a Maj. Bernard Fisher Day in Utah. He deserves to know, in person, how his fellow Utahians feel about his bravery.

RENDEZVOUS IN SPACE—ASTRONAUTS NEIL ARMSTRONG AND DAVID SCOTT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Nation and the space effort experienced one of its most anxious and exciting days on Wednesday, which culminated in the safe landing of Astronauts Neil Armstrong and David Scott.

They achieved a historic link-up in space, which was amazingly accurate with regard to rendezvous and docking maneuvers.

Unfortunately, the trip was only partially successful, and Astronauts Armstrong and Scott were put through some dangerously trying moments while they and the world held their breaths in fear of their safety. We rejoice with their families that, thankfully, they are in good health.

Their efforts under the direction of Flight Commander Armstrong demonstrated the importance of the extensive training and simulation which is so essential a part of our space program. Their courage and performance under stress also is a tribute to the design of the spacecraft and the training they have received, which involves the checking and rechecking and simulation of every detail of their prospective voyage into space. Yesterday America proved the value of building redundancy into our space vehicles because of our paramount regard for life.

Among the marvels of Wednesday's excitement was their unscheduled reentry, which was in every respect perfect and perhaps the best reentry the United States ever has accomplished.

While the rendezvous was only partially successful, it may prove that we will learn more from failure than from success in this instance as the voyage is studied and the data separated and analyzed and used to strengthen our future space ventures.

The Soviets were also busy in space on Wednesday. They completed a 22-day flight of two dogs, and this accomplishment indicates that we cannot slacken our efforts in space if we are to maintain leadership and progress in this field.

Mr. President, I also must observe that while these exciting events were taking place in different parts of this solar system, another milestone was reached in a remote section of the desert in my State of Nevada. I refer to the highly successful test of a nuclear engine at the Nevada Test Site of the Atomic Energy Commission. The engine was operated at significant power for 18 minutes, 13 minutes of which was conducted at full power. This achievement added to our national capability of one day being ready to send vehicles and man beyond the moon, and perhaps even beyond our own solar system. For it is commonly recognized now that nuclear power will be the only energy to take man to targets beyond our immediate planning.

In summary, Wednesday was a lucky day for two courageous American astronauts; it was a day not without significance for the Soviets in their space efforts; and it was a day fraught with meaning for our nuclear space effort which is certain to become more important as our program moves ahead.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the American people have taxed themselves heavily at the local level to provide high-quality education, but still additional revenues are needed. During the past decade Federal programs affecting public schools have increased in number and scope. This trend reflects a changed national posture toward the importance of education at the national level. "The Role of the Federal Government in Education" was the subject of an address by

James A. Turman, Associate Commissioner for Field Services, U.S. Office of Education, before a joint meeting of the Idaho School Trustees Association and State legislators on February 26, 1966.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Turman's fine address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

(An address by James A. Turman, Associate Commissioner of Education for Field Services, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.)

Unfortunately, neither our new U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe nor our Associate Commissioner for Federal-State Relations Wayne Reed could accept this engagement this morning because of prior commitments. Therefore, Mr. John Snider invited me to represent the U.S. Office of Education here in today's conference on the subject, "What Are the Proper Roles of Federal, State, and Local Educational Agencies?"

It is a pleasure for me, however, to have this opportunity to participate with you in discussing this all-encompassing topic. My assignment, mainly, is to discuss the role of the Federal Government in education.

I am especially pleased to see that this is a joint meeting of the Idaho School Trustees Association and the State legislators. Having been a member and speaker of the Texas House of Representatives, I realize the importance of involving legislators in our discussions on education.

There are some perfectly decent words that nice Americans seldom use together in the same phrase. "Education" and "politics" are two of them. While each word is quite alright on its own, the two in combination seem to conjure unhealthy, unrefined, even "propagandizing" images to many people.

Actually, the notion that politics and education should not have anything to do with each other is based on a misunderstanding both of politics and of the role of education in a democracy and how that role is determined. And the idea that they do not have anything to do with each other flies up in the face of the facts.

Public education is paid for by public funds, and public funds are raised, and allocated, through the political process. Through this process, the community—as small as the township, as large as the Nation—decides both the total amount it is prepared to spend for a host of public benefits, and how the total amount will be split up among all of them. In short, the political forum is where the citizenry fights about the things it cares about; it is where the public assigns priorities and establishes its values in rank order.

Not everyone comprehends this trading out of interests in the political marketplace. That is one reason why some political decisions may not in fact reflect accurately the most widely held public values, but do often reflect those of interests which understand the political process very well indeed. In these cases, where does the fault lie except with those who are either too lazy or too naive to press the case effectively for their own interests?

For the basic importance of the inseparability of politics and education is not the fact that public money supports public education, but it is what that fact represents: That the education of its youth is a primary interest of the Nation. And the Nation has many legitimate concerns—for defense, health, highways, and welfare, as well as education. The equitable allocation of resources in support of these interests is an extraordinarily intricate—and political—business.

Educational needs can no longer be, if they ever could have been, considered apart from society's other needs—or from politics. Education may be as deeply affected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the income tax laws or the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as by the education bills of 1965. Education is not a special need of a particular group in society. It is the business of everyone and affects everyone.

President Johnson, a former teacher, has taught the Nation that the American goal of a Great Society cannot be considered apart from its goals in education. And educational goals have to face these issues:

1. How best to fuse national interests with private, State, and local responsibility in providing both equality of opportunity and high quality of education;

2. How best to give proper weight to innovation and to the views of the scholars and other experts in the areas of knowledge that should be taught; and

3. How best to strengthen the machinery of government to relate educational policies and programs to other needs of the society.

The 88th and 89th Congresses wrote out in a series of new acts between 1963 and 1965 the national approach to these problems. These acts provide:

That the national interest in assuring equal opportunity for education is to be expressed by special programs for the economically, educationally, and physically disadvantaged—relying on local, State, and private funds for the management and funding of the regular budgets of schools and colleges. Programs are to be designed for the needy pupils, whatever their school, under public auspices—thereby setting a new pattern for local cooperation on the church-state issue.

That support of research, development, and innovation is a national responsibility, to be conducted by making grants designed to join the interests of scholars and school men in creating new and better curriculums, and finding better ways of preparing teachers and better ways of diffusing good practices. Contracts with industry for research are authorized in order to tap the energy and skills of the private sector of the economy.

That decisions on operating programs for the schools supported by Federal funds should be made by State authorities on the basis of local proposals, and that for this purpose Federal funds should be made available to the States for support of personnel and procedures to strengthen State departments of education.

That it is in the national interest to expand facilities for higher education to meet the demands of the onrushing generations, and to finance through grants, loans, and work-study programs the costs of such education for worthy students in need, and to help to provide college faculty. The use of higher education for helping to solve community problems is encouraged.

That a start be made in recording the results of these programs through establishment of advisory committees, several of which were directed to report to the President and the Congress.

That Federal expenditures should be over and above, not in place of, existing expenditures.

In short, the terms of a new partnership have been written. These actions, when seen in the longer perspective, are but another turning of the wheel, another revolution that started nearly two centuries ago. For the Federal Government has for many years compensated individuals for what they had given the Government or lost to it. Thus Federal funds for education have gone to veterans and their children, who have given something to the Government; and to Indians on reservations, who have had something taken away.

The Congress has also made expenditures which it thought would be in the interest of the Nation and its people as a whole. This second kind of Federal grant dates back to the first days of our Republic. The preamble to the Ordinance of 1787, for example, declared that "an educated populace being to the benefit of society," one section of every township carved out of the vast Northwest Territory should be reserved, tax free, for schools. Tax laws have long supported nonprofit educational enterprises.

The Smith-Hughes vocational legislation of 1917 stemmed at least partially from the Nation's wartime shortage of skilled mechanics. The National Science Foundation was established after World War II to meet a gap in the national resources just as the National Defense Education Act of 1958 won passage because threatening developments abroad convinced Congress that the Nation needed more persons trained in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

The focus changed as the national situation changed. Year after year, witnesses displayed pictures of hovels that passed for schoolhouses in some parts of the Nation. They cited figures to show that their part of the country could not raise enough taxes to build better schools or hire the teachers to staff them. While sympathetic, Congress has held to the position that since operation of the schools was State and local business, basic financing is as well.

In no case has Federal money been voted as aid in the usual sense of that word. The traditional thinking on Federal expenditures in the national interest still prevails. Hence to speak of "Federal aid" simply confuses the issue. It is more appropriate to speak of Federal support to special purposes. It might, indeed, be still more appropriate to think of Federal funds—or, for that matter, State or local funds—as an investment in education, an investment made by a partner who has clearly in mind the investments of other partners—local, State, and private.

For the past several years, the Federal contribution to the operation of our public elementary and secondary schools has averaged between only 4 to 5 percent, with all the rest of the support for this national enterprise coming from State and local sources. With the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it is estimated that the Federal share will increase during the first year (1965–66) to about 9.7 percent. The percentage for higher education is perhaps double that for the schools, but in neither area can Federal investment be described as the majority interest in the partnership.

The Congress has recognized and bolstered the policy that the structure of the American education must rest on a strong State foundation. Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Act, which provides Federal help to strengthen State departments of education is explicit evidence of its belief that the States are the basic instruments in the management of America's system of elementary and secondary education. The importance of this decision cannot be overstated.

We look to the States to respond to the educational needs of our time. This is the crux of the challenge. In education, the Nation looks to the States not merely as a matter of law or precedent, but as a matter of practical soundness and necessity. In a Nation of 50 States operating vast and independent enterprises for education, the Federal Government decided to help—as a partner, but only as a partner—and a somewhat junior partner at that.

State organization and State policies will need a thorough overhaul if the Nation is to assure the strength—perhaps even the viability—of America's decentralized system of public education. To bring about this change requires action on three key areas for improvement: (1) The need for better information on the condition of education within the States and among the States; (2) the need for stronger leadership and planning by State departments of education in relation to local districts; and (3) the need for innovation based upon sound research throughout the educational enterprise.

In each of these problem areas, the Federal Government may help—has been called upon to help—both in providing perspective and funds. But the strategic link between Washington and America's 26,000 autonomous school districts is within the States—and it is here that American education may ultimately meet or fail to meet the extraordinary challenges of our time.

We must now recognize across the Nation what our State agencies so clearly recognize: that we are woefully short of the basic information we need to carry forward our educational purposes, to set sound goals and work together to reach them.

If we intend to make the maximum use of our Federal educational programs, we need to constantly reassess the policies and procedures of the Federal partner to establish priorities, to review our national educational objectives.

Assistant Secretary for Education Francis Keppel is Chairman of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education. One of this committee's priority tasks is to examine both our old and our new Federal education programs so that we can see if they are really doing what we want them to do. It has been said that there is overlapping and duplication. This will be rigorously investigated.

The growth of Federal education programs has made it essential to provide for a regular thoroughgoing review. The interagency committee will serve as a forum for this purpose. Hopefully, it will resolve conflicts, avoid unnecessary complexities, and bring together a comprehensive and high level attention to the totality of our national educational needs.

It is the objective of this committee to attempt to reach agreement on program policies in the more than 40 Federal agencies that now handle funds that affect the schools and colleges, so that the policies will be consistent, noncompetitive, and equitable. The overriding goal is to employ Federal funds for the maximum contributions to all parts of the education structure.

I spoke earlier of the rapid and timely expansion of the Federal commitment to education, a commitment which comes to $8.7 billion this fiscal year.

Through this new emphasis on elementary and secondary education, on vocational and technical education, on research, and a broader range of subjects, the Federal Government is now providing seed money, planted where the needs appear greatest. Through this infusion of Federal funds, the Nation hopes to stimulate innovation and improvement in all those sectors of education that so urgently need to be improved. The challenges that confront us in education today are great, but the opportunities are greater still.

Education's needs today are indeed related, one to another. We cannot any longer separate our local goals from our national goals from our international goals. Our approach to our problems must be unified on a wide front by coordinated plans and by comprehensive effort.

In this partnership, it is you who are the senior members. In the past, State and local responsibility, State and local initiative have made American education great. Today you still hold the golden keys to success as we set out on the greatest educational mission of the 20th century.

"Only a junior partner." This is what Assistant Secretary for Education Francis Keppel has called the Federal Government; and in this telling phrase he has caught the whole tradition of the control and support of public education in the United States.

By this succint phrase he has suggested one inescapable fact. He has suggested that education in this Nation succeeds or fails on the basis of what happens or does not happen at the hands of the other partners: the State and that extension of itself by which it discharges most of its responsibilities for education on the local scene—the local board of education.

I have drawn you a rough profile of the assistance you have had from your Federal Government. In your own minds you see it as you review the several acts by which the Federal Government has become a partner in the educational enterprise. You see that each act is essentially considered an emergency measure. Each, therefore, is selective, not all-encompassing. To put it another way, the consistent role of the Federal Government has been to stimulate and support educational efforts in selected areas.

In contrast, the work of the State and the local community has been to carry out the overall, day-to-day, in-season-and-out, never-faltering business of seeing that balance is maintained and that school keeps. From the standpoint of money alone, the role of the State and the school district is patently paramount. The Federal Government, on the basis of what it contributes toward meeting the costs of running the elementary and secondary school could hardly claim more than a limited role, even though the usefulness of its contributions has been considerable.

The responsibility of the State and the local community is one which all of you here today share, whether you are members of a local school board or officials of a State government. You share it by a long series of precedents, legal as well as historical. Over the years the courts have repeatedly affirmed the idea that since school boards are created by the State and the State has delegated to such boards the powers necessary for the operation of the schools, local boards are extensions of the State government. In the end, the final responsibility for the quality of public education in each of the States comes home now, as it always has come home, to the State and local boards together—and to the people who select them.

If the new act for elementary and secondary education implies anything for this close partnership of yours, it implies this: that in the future this partnership must be even closer and stronger than it has been in the past. This is part of what I read between the lines in section 604 of this act, which prohibits your junior partner, the Federal Government, from coming between you. It says this:

"Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system."

By these words, the Congress of the United States has again expressed the Nation's will: that the heart of education be kept in your hands.

The State—I use the term now in a sense that includes the local school board—is the senior partner for at least three reasons: first, because the 10th amendment implies that the power of establishing and maintaining an educational system is reserved to the States; second, because the people's will, all through our history, has been to preserve a decentralized system of education; and third, because the State, when it delegates responsibility to local school boards, does not in truth relinquish any of its ultimate responsibility either for quality or for equity. In fact, the educational power of any State is greater than that of the Federal Government, subject of course to the limitations placed upon it by the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Federal Constitution—and by the bottom of its own pocketbook.

The Congress of the United States, responsive as it is to the people's will and committed as it is to the safeguarding of vitality of State action, places a premium on strength at the State level. It did so most recently in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in which, for the first time in history, it expressly stated its wish, as a matter of policy, that State departments of education be strong.

In other acts the Congress has implied this wish—but only implied it. In the National Defense Education Act, for example, it has given the State agencies funds to use in improving certain services—to expand their supervisory staffs for certain academic subjects; to improve their services in counseling and guidance; and to do a better job of collecting and reporting statistics. Now—I want to reemphasize this point—now, for the first time, the Congress says to State departments of education, in tones loud and clear: "Be strong. Gird yourselves for change and challenge. And here is money to help you do it."

State governments and their agents do indeed need strength for the decisions they must make and the work they must do in the crucial decade now beginning. What these decisions will be, and what priority they will have—this will be up to you—up to the States and the local communities—but I would like to suggest that at least three ideas will come high on the list.

First, the States will take a new measure of what it means to be responsible for a population largely urban. Not only will they consider what this means in terms of manpower needs and, therefore, in terms of educational institutions and curriculum, but they will consider what it means for the distribution of funds. They will ask, for example, whether their distribution of State aid recognizes the needs and requirements of its urban communities.

Second, the States will weigh once more the principle to which they have been so long devoted—the principle that the operating management of the schools should be delegated to local school districts. And the States will, I trust, find new virtue in the principle, now that bigness and consolidation rather than smallness and dispersion are growing more and more to be the rule in our great decentralized system.

Third, the States will become the master links in the communication process—a link not only between government and government, but also between school and school, and between the public and all its schools.

For the local school, the importance of having a good line of communication to a good source of information cannot be overestimated. Indeed, the local participants in the decisionmaking process as it affects education will be equal to their tasks only if they are in cooperation and coordination with other local decisionmakers and other levels of decisionmaking. If the State educational agency, by being a well-nigh infallible and completely generous communicator, can keep a multitude of local school decisional systems well informed, it will proliferate the choices open to local schools for solving their problems. If there is a goal more worth striving for, I don't know what it is.

For the State itself, of course, having information about every aspect of its schools and their work is the key to its strength.

If it does not have facts, it is like Samson shorn of his hair—almost powerless. And for the Federal Government, reliable information from the States is indispensable. Well supplied with the facts they need, the States and the Federal Government, working together, will be able to put their fingers on the weaknesses in our education system and devise ways of overcoming them. They will even be able to detect incipient weaknesses and to correct them before they grow into crises.

As we look into the future, we see it from the vantage point of the past, and we know we have a firm base on which to build. Behind us are a hundred years of experience in American education. Our forefathers did well indeed when they established a public school system with the idea that it be vitally enmeshed in the life of the community. Having its management in the hands of the people, and having its chief authorities and control decentralized in the governments of half a hundred States, this system has come far toward fulfilling all the hopes it has carried. This great free public school system, hospitable to all special interests and beholden to none, is the supporter of our prosperity, guardian of our liberties, and assurer of our well-being.

From these hundred years of rich experience we are learning how local, State, and Federal agencies can cooperate for the advancement of education. Now, more than ever before, our public school system, buttressed with appropriate Federal leadership and support, has an opportunity to prove that the great design behind it is equal to every change. A decentralized system, supported by local, State, and Federal agencies working in partnership—this is not merely part of our long tradition; it is also the best framework we can devise in which people of vision are free to experiment and to be creative. Without a framework so flexible, the educational leadership in our States and communities would be powerless to meet the demands of society today.

For society today makes complicated demands. Today it asks this leadership both to preserve the good things of the past and to create good things for the future.

Society says to you: Keep the American public school open to all. Preserve it as a moderator of conflicting issues. Do not let it be any less a training ground for leaders and citizens in a free and open society. Make it to continue as a guarantee that no central agency will control the minds of our children, and as a safeguard that if mistakes are made at the State and local level, they have a chance of being corrected before they become national mistakes.

But cope also with change, society says. Respond to the needs of our times. This is a double assignment, a pressing one, and only you can carry it out.

RIBICOFF-DOMINICK AMENDMENT TO TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the other day there was a rather extended and intense debate on the tax adjustment bill. Much of this debate was focused on the proposed Ribicoff-Dominick amendment to the tax bill which was an effort on our part to provide a tax credit for the cost of higher education.

I have stated publicly that, even though we were defeated on that particular amendment, I have no intention of giving up the fight for an education tax credit.

I wish to state for the record, that I am considering presenting the amendment again this year, in either the same or a different form, in an effort to obtain a more accurate test of strength for the amendment on its merits.

It was curious to me that, although several other amendments were added to the bill by the Senate, this particular amendment, which would not have affected the revenues of the Federal Government until 1968, was defeated.

I know that I personally received several calls from downtown asking if I was going to support the tax bill. However, no particular mention was made of the Ribicoff-Dominick amendment. I had suspected that a great number of other calls and personal contacts had been made from downtown to other Senators.

I was interested to see, following the vote on that particular amendment, that several people publicly, in the various newspapers and columns, remarked on the extreme pressure placed on Senators by the White House in an effort to defeat that proposal.

I have before me the Evans-Novak column which was published in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 13, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the article entitled "To the Rescue" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, a portion of the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Rescue

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, former top White House congressional lobbyist, was rushed into the breach in the Senate last week. He was called on to help defeat the amendment of Senator Abraham Ribicoff, Democrat, of Connecticut, to give parents a tax credit to offset the cost of college education.

Without O'Brien, the Ribicoff amendment was slated to pass by a 46-to-44 vote. When O'Brien and White House aids got through twisting arms, nine Senators who had planned to support the amendment were peeled away.

Through no fault of O'Brien's, the victory was pyrrhic. Angered by the high-pressure lobbying, the Senate went on an independence binge and approved two reductions in the President's $6 billion Vietnam war tax increase. Both amendments were ignored in the White House concentration against the Ribicoff amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the very distinguished writer, Mr. Lee M. Cohn, of the Washington Star, wrote an article entitled "Senate-Altered Tax Bill Goes to Conference," which also discusses the pressures applied by the White House in its successful effort to defeat the proposed tax credit amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the article dealing with the efforts of the White House to defeat the amendment be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate-Altered Tax Bill Goes to Conference—Amendments Cut Net Revenue Gain by $1.1 Billion

(By Lee M. Cohn)

The administration's battered tax bill was rushed to a Senate-House conference today in a drive to meet President Johnson's March 15 deadline for final action.

Two major amendments cut the bill's estimated net revenue gain from $5.9 to $4.8 billion over the next 15 months before the Senate passed it yesterday, 79 to 9.

One of the amendments would exempt local residential phone calls from the administration's proposed excise tax increase from 3 to 10 percent.

This amendment, approved 46 to 42 yesterday, reduced the revenue gain in the Senate bill by $315 million.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT

The other major amendment, adopted Tuesday, would give minimum social security benefits to persons 70 and older who are not now eligible. It would cost the Treasury $790 million a year, starting next July 1.

Since the phone excise is very unpopular on both sides of the Capitol, there is a good chance that the conferees will go along with the Senate.

The social security amendment is more vulnerable to dumping in conference because it is so sweeping and extraneous to the tax bill.

Despite the Senate's mutinous temper, hard lobbying by the administration beat a proposal to give tax credits to parents or others sending children to college at a cost of $1 billion a year to the Treasury.

SPONSORED BY RIBICOFF

The amendment, sponsored by Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff, Democrat, of Connecticut, would have allowed parents and others paying expenses of college tuition, fees, books, and supplies to subtract up to $325 a year from income taxpayments. It also was rejected in 1964, by a vote of 48 to 45.

This amendment was rejected yesterday, 47 to 37, after what one Senator called fierce pressure by the White House.

A supporter of the amendment said the White House "snapped the whip" and "lashed" Senators into line against the proposal.

White House pressure persuaded even some of the amendment's cosponsors to vote against it. This was the case with Democratic Senators Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Edward V. Long of Missouri, and Joseph M. Montoya, of New Mexico.

Supporters of the amendment figured that White House pressure switched seven votes in all.

Marvin Watson, President Johnson's appointments secretary, reportedly led the drive against the amendment, assisted by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, who formerly was in charge of congressional liaison, and Mike Manatos, legislative liaison man for the Senate.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, interestingly enough, the New York Herald Tribune published an article on March 10, 1966, written by Mr. Andrew J. Glass under the headline "Senate Cuts Tax Bill From 6 to 5 Billion—No Local Phone Rise," which also refers to the Ribicoff-Dominick amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CUTS TAX BILL FROM 6 TO 5 BILLION—NO LOCAL PHONE RISE

> The White House had mounted a hard-nosed lobbying effort against a plan by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, to offset in part the cost of a college education with up to $325 in tax credits.
>
> As a result, this $1 billion proposal was defeated, 47 to 37—even though its revenue-losing impact would not be felt until 1968.
>
> Senate sources reported that Presidential appointments Secretary W. Marvin Watson had called key legislators on the eve of the showdown and told them that "they were through" at the White House if they backed the Ribicoff plan.
>
> Mr. Watson, these sources said, emphasized that he was speaking for the President who, they said, was prepared to deal them out of all Federal patronage and projects if "you cross him on this vote."
>
> The anti-Ribicoff campaign apparently left the White House exposed and napping on the social security and phone tax proposals. "Lyndon Johnson outsmarted himself," an influential Senate Democrat said. * * *

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have deliberately placed these in the RECORD to show the extreme pressure applied by the White House to defeat the Ribicoff-Dominick amendment. I believe it is ironic that the White House should oppose this measure so strenuously when I was trying, in concert with Senator RIBICOFF and other Senators, to provide a mechanism whereby people could increase the opportunities for young people to go to college and, at the same time, increase the opportunities for colleges to receive more funds.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Colorado suspend for a moment?

The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, morning business is now concluded.

The Senator from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I think it was an important amendment, and I think it is a proposal which sooner or later will pass the Senate.

I was happy to note that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is on the floor at the moment, while opposing the bill last year and voting against it again this time, did not take an active part in the debate against the amendment, and I very much appreciate his courtesy in this regard.

It is a measure which, to me, is of extreme importance in that it supports diversity in education and provides an opportunity for private funds to enter the educational field, without involving ourselves in the church-state relationship.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank my friend, the Senator from Colorado. As he observed, I did not participate in the debate this year in opposition to his amendment, although I voted against it.

I represented the administration last time as leader in opposition to the Senator's amendment. I refused to function as leader in opposition to it this year, although I am still opposed to the amendment, provided the administration will provide for an adequate amount of aid to students who I think ought to go to college. I think it is possible to supply that aid to them on a more uniform and, I happen to believe, a fairer basis than the procedure provided for in the Ribicoff-Dominick amendment. But I could not, in good faith, speak against the amendment until at least there can be a clarification of where this administration actually stands on Federal aid to education. I say that because, as I said the other day, I stood in that managerial position over there in the majority leader's place, and have taken through the Senate, as the manager of education bills, one bill after another. I made the representations that the administration authorized me to make. I wish to say those representations cannot be reconciled with the President's budget message this year.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is the point I wished to bring out at this time, and I am glad that the Senator from Oregon has brought it up. Because, as a matter of fact, in a very great number of cases, to my knowledge—the impacted area bill, the National Defense Education Act loans, the cuts in the vocational education programs, and a few others which I added up last night—the difference between the proposals in the President's budget and the authorizations passed by Congress is more than $547 million.

I would suggest for the record, and to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who has worked so hard in the educational field and done such a fine job, that it is not the function of the White House or of Congress to try to balance the budget by depriving people of the opportunity for a good education.

That is exactly the effect these cuts will have, unless we can find some mechanism by which we can retain the ability of our universities to provide quality education, and of our elementary and secondary schools to continue with the fine standard of education that they have been giving our young people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree with the Senator more. The Senator is a member of my subcommittee and of the full committee. I simply want the RECORD to show that in my judgment, this administration has pulled the rug out from under us in connection with the representations we have made in the past, in speaking for the administration in support of education legislation. Until the administration restores those funds—and I shall fight hard to have them restored—and until the administration keeps faith with those of us who have put the past legislation through, I shall oppose the administration at every step on education legislation this year.

I preferred the approach we were making. I think the administration was sound in that approach, but it has left that approach, and that is why I could not, in good faith, support the administration in its opposition to the Senator's amendment, until the administration is willing to come back and support the program we had underway.

Look at the cuts the administration is making in the land-grant colleges of this country, and the effect that those cuts will have on the educational opportunities of many of our young men and women. I want the American people to know that notwithstanding what the President says, there is a great difference between his words and the proposed actions encompassed in his Bureau of the Budget report to Congress.

I pay no attention to a politician's words unless his words compare and square with his actions.

Mr. DOMINICK. I know what a valiant fighter the Senator from Oregon is, and I think this is due warning to the administration.

It still seems strange to me as a Senator to find that the administration will send to the Capitol two White House aids and the Postmaster General to defeat one bill on which Congress is supposed to be establishing policy. That is exactly what was done in the case of the tax credit proposal that we had before us in March.

I, for one, am still a believer that Congress is supposed to establish policy, that this is not, supposedly, either a one-party government or a one-man government, and until such time as we can establish this proposition and this principle, we are going to find more and more trouble in Congress being able to take its historic role as a policymaker, and to determine what legislation should be passed as desired by the people of this country, and not just as desired by the one man in the White House.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I turn to another matter, I wish to make a few additional comments about the Ribicoff-Dominick amendment.

I want the record to be perfectly clear that I would much prefer not to have the type of aid that is provided in the Dominick-Ribicoff amendment, if this administration will go forward and support adequate funds for the type of Federal education aid to students in this country which has been encompassed in the programs for which we have been working so hard for so many years in the Senate.

Of course, my view is well known. I think what we need to do is to provide the aid to those students who need it, who otherwise could not go to college. I think children from the families covered in the program that the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Colorado have in mind can best be helped by a general aid bill, with loan provisions, scholarship provisions, and work-study provisions. Furthermore, as I pointed out last year, I think that the aid that is sought to be offered in the Ribicoff-Dominick amendment is a form of class legislation, in that it provides tax benefits for a special class of parents in this country; namely, those who happen to have children who may wish to go to college. I do not believe that the amendment embodies that uniform principle of taxation which I think is fair and avoids the charge of being class legislation.

Nevertheless I have no hesitancy in saying that if we cannot have the other type of Federal aid for which I thought this administration stood until I read the budget message this year, then it is better to have this form of aid of the Ribicoff-Dominick amendment than none. At least the aid that will be provided under the Ribicoff-Dominick amendment will be of some assistance to some students, and that is better than no assistance at all.

Therefore, as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate, I raise my voice again in plea and warning to the President of the United States, that unless there is a return to the implementation of the aid program for which we have been fighting in past sessions of Congress, I shall fight in the Subcommittee on Education and in the full committee for necessary legislative amendments, and let the Members of Congress stand up and be counted, as to whether they will support the President in what I consider to be an inexcusable blow against the young people of this country by way of his budget recommendations on education. That will be my position in this session of Congress. If we get into a position where the only aid we can get—although I do not believe it would be the most preferable aid—for the benefit of the youth of this country is the kind of aid which the Senator from Connecticut, and the Senator from Colorado—in good faith, complete sincerity, and out of deep conviction—have been presenting for several years to the Senate, then, for the first time, I will vote to support it. I would rather have that than no aid at all.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Oregon for arguing that position. I do not wish to go into any debate on the merits of the particular proposal at this time, but I would say to the Senator, as he knows, that I have supported the higher education bill, led by the Senator from Oregon; and it seems to me that our proposal would be another leg on this same table. I am gratified to hear the Senator from Oregon state that if we are unable to get the other proposal put back, which he and I and other Senators have worked so hard for, he will be for this kind of proposal.

Mr. MORSE. That is my position.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] a few moments ago as he discussed the Kraft article entitled "The Four Pillars of Asia"—the four pillars involving our Asian policy.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Of course, I go much further than he does. I am glad that, at least, as the appropriation bill for the shocking war we are conducting in southeast Asia comes up for consideration next Monday, the Senator from Pennsylvania, as he indicated today, will have some reservations in respect thereto.

Mr. President, I am hoping that the appropriation bill may be the vehicle, at long last, which those in this body who have expressed great reservation to the administration's policy of conducting this war may use for the imposition of long past due and much-needed checks upon the administration in respect to the slaughter of American boys now taking place in southeast Asia. It is a slaughter which, in my judgment, cannot be justified, a slaughter which is involving us in a war in which we should never have been involved in the first place.

I was glad to hear the Senator from Pennsylvania point out that we should not be interested in saving face. I would add that we should be interested in saving lives.

I was also glad to hear the Senator from Pennsylvania point out that it was desirable we take a position which I would call a position of legitimate defense, a holding position—which will protect our boys, and also stop the killing of a large number of South Vietnamese which will take place if we continue to escalate the war—through such a holding action as General Gavin recommends it would be possible for other forces to come into the picture and seek to bring the war to an end by the imposition of a needed cease-fire order to be enforced by nations not involved in the war as combatants.

Mr. President, I wish to make these comments today because it needs to be constantly drilled into the thinking of the American people as to what the major premise of those of us opposing the war rests upon.

What is needed is to have a cease-fire order enforced against the United States, against the South Vietnamese, against the North Vietnamese, and against the Vietcong. In my judgment, if we leave this war to the United States, with its predominantly unilateral military action in southeast Asia, our country will lead the world into a massive war in Asia, and what may come out of that war is awful to even think about.

Therefore, I plead again that my country proceed to exercise its influence, its prestige, and its obligations as a member of the United Nations. In my judgment, there is not a good faith attempt being made in New York City to bring this issue out into the open with full Security Council debate.

In my judgment, the administration and our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, are not making the record that this country should make in seeking to bring this matter out into the open and find out exactly what the Security Council will or will not do.

I have some views as to why we are not doing it. Of course, I believe that our approach to the Security Council was a belated one. I pleaded 2½ years ago, and day after day during all that intervening period, that we should take this issue to the Security Council. Finally, there started developing across the country a wave of public opinion support for the senior Senator from Oregon. I happen to know something about that support, Mr. President, and I happen to know something about the intensity with which it was represented to the White House. In my judgment, the administration could not stand up any longer against a failure to take a resolution to the Security Council of the United Nations, for millions of American people were asking the question: "Why don't they take it to the United Nations?"

The sad thing is that our President sent the problem to the United Nations with an olive branch in one hand and bombs in the other. Behind the scenes in the United Nations, and in the cloakrooms there, most of the discussion since that time has been about the bombs and not about the olive branch.

Of course, if it is brought out into the full glare of world opinion for Security Council debate and discussion, as it should be, the United States will get taken to the international woodshed. We had better get that spanking or that whipping behind us now. Some others also will have to go to that woodshed; namely, all the combatants, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and the Vietcong—because those are the nations along with us which happened to be threatening the peace of the world.

We Americans do not like to face the fact that we are a threat to the peace of the world. But we are. We are acting, for the most part, on a unilateral basis. We should be insisting upon a multilateral approach to peacekeeping in southeast Asia.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I urge once more that my Government give evidence—clear, convincing evidence—that we are insisting that this matter come on out into the open for world debate. Let all criticism be put behind us, for in that Security Council debate the violations by the United States of the Geneva accords, section after section, will undoubtedly be made a matter of world record, for all the world to see. The interesting thing is that most leaders of most governments in the world already recognize it.

Travel with me, as I did last fall as a Senate delegate appointed by the administration, through Asia. We soon found that the leaders of the great Asian powers hold no brief for America's unilateral course of action in southeast Asia.

Let us get that record made and do our part in seeing to it that the violations of the Vietcong and North Vietnam are clearly made a part of the world record. Then, let us get on with the job of enforcing a peace in southeast Asia, and ending this slaughter. That is why I was so interested in the comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], which I interpret to mean recognition on his part that we need to take a holding position, a defensive position, which will protect our forces and protect our allies and bring an end to an escalating of the war.

The United States is following an expanding military policy which, as we expand it, endangers our becoming involved in a war with China which, in my judgment, will move into a war with Russia that will mean a third world war.

I think these are times when we ought to stop running these risks. I think these are times when the Pentagon Building should be put on a leash and have it made perfectly clear that to carry out its duty to defend the security of this Republic it is not entitled to follow a course of action that threatens to involve us in a massive war in Asia. Such a war will bog down hundreds of thousands of Americans for years and years, until, at long last, we will be put out of Asia. Let us face it, no white nation, including the United States, will be permitted to stay in Asia and exercise a role of domination in any part of Asia. That era is gone.

It is interesting that the other Western nations have learned that lesson, but not the United States.

We should follow the course of action which is clearly implied in the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], but if not, I assert it as my own. We should give the United Nations an opportunity to undertake the primary—and I underline the word "primary"—obligation and responsibility of the members of the United Nations, and that is to enforce the peace when a threat of war exists. That is the primary purpose of the Security Council.

It may very well be that the Security Council will fall down on that obligation, but I want to find out. I should think my Government would want to find out, instead of saying, as many have been heard to say, "Well, we are sure that France or Russia will veto such a proposal." We do not know until we find out. As I have said in the past, if either one of them does, then that country is on the spot, and the United States would be taken off the spot.

We would then be off the spot. We would then show the world that we seek a cease-fire order to be enforced by the United Nations.

Oh, I know that when we make statements of this kind, somehow, in some way, we are said to be aiding the enemy. We are supposed to be, somehow, in some way, letting down our boys in southeast Asia. I get lost in that jungle of fallacy. The truth is that those who want to follow the United States course of action now being followed in southeast Asia are the ones who are letting down our boys. Those of us who are seeking to try to stop the killing there are the ones who think it is our clear duty to insist on every possible procedure and avenue available to bring about the enforcibility of peace and the stopping of the making of war in southeast Asia.

I repeat again, and I want it in the RECORD, before we start the debate next Monday, that if France or Russia or any nonpermanent member of the Security Council vetoed the proposal for Security Council intervention in southeast Asia, we should then proceed to the next procedure provided for by the charter.

As I have been heard to say before, and as I said as recently as last night in St. Louis, I want my President to go to New York City—it is much more important to go there than to go to Honolulu. I want him to plead our desires for peace before an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I want him to make a plea to the world, in which plea he will announce that the United States will cooperate in the enforcement of a cease-fire order by the noncombatant members of the General Assembly of the United Nations on condition that they will agree to carry out their obligations clearly called for by the charter to send to southeast Asia whatever divisions of troops are necessary to separate the combatants and enforce the peace. The United Nations should make clear to both sides in the war that the shooting must stop and the war must stop. It must make clear that if either side fires upon the United Nations forces then and only then will United Nations forces fire back for further enforcement of the peace sought through a cease-fire order.

This will require, of course, the dividing of Vietnam probably into a number of buffer zones to be occupied by United Nations peacekeeping forces.

I happen to think that if there were a large number of nations that would get behind such a peacekeeping movement, all parties, including Red China, would think a long time before they would aline themselves against the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world.

Mr. President, it takes big statesmanship to carry out such an ideal. The world is entitled to look to our President for that statesmanship. That is why, Mr. President, you find me supporting the so-called enclave approach as the best approach for a desolution of the war. This administration is trying to misrepresent the enclave approach. The enclave approach is not a plan for us to run and get out. Nobody has suggested that. I have said we could not do that. I opposed our going into the war. But once in there, we have created a situation under which we cannot pull out. If we did we would probably start the bloodiest massacre and biggest human blood bath in the history of mankind. Whichever one of the two Vietnamese forces were predominant would kill the other and we would have to assume at least some moral responsibility for that occurrence.

So I am not asking that we pull out, but I am asking that we hold, as General Gavin has advocated, as Mr. Kennan has advocated. I interpret General Ridgway's letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], as being opposed to our escalating the war. We need a lull in hostilities until the other nations of the world become involved, not in war, but in bringing about a constructive peace. It is at least an avenue toward peace we have not traveled yet. It is one the President has the responsibility to travel before he proceeds to carry out the arbitrary, discretionary power which this Congress voted him last week—and in my judgment mistakenly and ill-advisedly—in the authorization bill to send 425,000-plus American boys to fight, and thousands of them to die in a war in southeast Asia.

As I have said before, he cannot justify sending thousands of boys into battle without a declaration of war.

I will not repeat today the many reasons I have given why I think this administration does not want to declare war, except to mention the main one. A declaration of war on our part would put us in great difficulty with many of our allies if we tried to enforce the declaration. We would find countries that we now consider to be allies would not respect our blockades, would not respect our mining of ports, and would not lower their flags to such war policies of ours. The first one of their ships that we sank, we would find ourselves in great international trouble with them. If one of those ships happened to be a Communist ship of the Soviet Union, we would then be at war with Russia, and also, in my judgment, with China if China sent her minesweepers into the Haiphong Harbor, as she undoubtedly would do, to sweep out any mines we might lay.

The trouble is, in these hours of war hysteria that are spreading across this country, and in which this administration, by its misinformation and propaganda pouring into American public opinion, the American public does not know the facts in respect to what the course of action of this administration is going to lead them into if the people do not stop this administration.

I am afraid that the only check that really is left is the American people, unless Congress wants to stop abdicating its constitutional responsibilities. We are headed for an enlarged war unless Congress wants to carry out the trust the Constitution bestows on its Members to check its President, in an executive war, an illegal war, and in an undeclared war. Unless Congress is willing to carry out its responsibilities, I say to the American people again, "You are going to have to do it, you are going to have to do it with your ballots, and you are going to have to start in the primaries just ahead, in the election next fall, in the primaries in 1968, and in the election in 1968."

Let me say, as a Democrat, that this issue is so far above partisanship that this Senator will never put his party first, because what I am pleading for is, in my judgment, the only course of action that will truly put my country first.

I am interested in my country following a course of action that will at least cause it to retrace its steps from the shocking course of action of immorality and illegality that we have been following since 1954 when we started violating the Geneva accords section by section.

Mr. President, there is growing interest in this country as to what the administration is leading us to domestically. We just had a colloquy between the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Oregon in regard to what the administration is doing on the domestic level in the field of education.

That is only one segment of our economy in which this administration is going to cut, cut, and cut in the name of supplying more. more, and more funds for its illegal and immoral war in southeast Asia.

But it is not willing to cut in connection with other foreign programs. We had a little taste of that the other day when we had a supplemental budget of $415 million for more foreign aid into southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and other areas listed in that bill.

The senior Senator from Oregon asked for a saving of at least that amount out of foreign aid elsewhere in the world. This administration not only would not go along with that proposal of the Senator from Oregon, but this administration has already sent up a budget message that increases its foreign aid in other parts of the world.

I wish to say to the American people: "Only you can stop it. Only you, by the exercise of your rights as free men and women, through the ballot box can stop this administration from that course of action."

I want to say that any aid that we have to give to this war torn area of the world in southeast Asia must be saved out of aid going into other parts of the world. It must not be saved in the cost of adequate support of what is known as the Great Society program, which I enthusiastically support.

I urge it for another reason. If this administration thinks there is domestic tranquillity at the grassroots of America, it could not be more wrong. The maintenance of tranquillity and security here at home is going to be dependent on our meeting the domestic needs here at home. We have made great progress in the field of civil rights but it is only the beginning. There is trouble brewing in America in the field of civil rights. Part of that trouble is brewing because to date there has not been carried out to the degree that, in my judgment, the people of this country have had a right to expect of this administration, the provisions of civil rights legislation already passed.

In my opinion this administration had better take a long, hard look at the grassroots of America and the evidences of growing dissension and trouble within our own country in respect to the failure of this administration to proceed as it should proceed in solving our domestic ills.

There is a much greater need for a domestic aid program than a foreign aid program at the present time.

I mentioned the other day, and I wish to make it a part of this speech, that certainly I am for milk for little boys and girls in impoverished areas and the backward areas of the world. It has been labeled for a long time, "Milk for Hottentots." I support it. We should continue it. But we should not discontinue the milk for thousands upon thousands of impoverished little boys and girls in this country. And yet, this budget message contains a cut in the school milk program. I do not understand it.

I do not know what is happening to us in regard to our obligations to a social conscience. I do not understand these cuts in the President's budget message in light of his proposal or proposals for expanding foreign aid.

As the Senate knows, I have tried for several years, and I shall never give up, to eliminate the corruption, the inefficiency, and the shocking waste of millions of dollars which have characterized the U.S. foreign aid program since 1946 when the American taxpayers have had more than $116 billion of their money spent in foreign aid. We know what the record shows.

As I pointed out the other day, we have a committee report from the Foreign Relations Committee that sets forth all the reservations along the lines I am pointing out in regard to the corruption involved in foreign aid, the waste involved in foreign aid. Yet it brought forth a committee report that had all of the language that, in my judgment, supported modification of the bill, but ended up recommending passage of the bill.

It is the old story of giving the American people the words but denying them the votes their protection calls for.

I say again to the American people in regard to foreign aid, you better make your views known. You better make clear to these politicians you send here to protect your interests and not to yield to political pressure of an administration that follows a course of pressure action such as the Senator from Colorado just described a few minutes ago on the floor of the Senate.

That is why I have been heard to say, and I say it again on the floor of the Senate, I think the American people would have been much better off in regard to the problems I am raising, if Barry Goldwater had been elected President.

Do you know why I say that? He would not have had a Republican Congress; he would have had a Democratic Congress. Many Senators now are expressing many reservations about the President's program. They are saying, in regard to the war in Vietnam, that they had not given the President the blanket authority that some seem to think they had given. They are now saying that they did not give him a blank check. In my judgment they have been voting for President Johnson's requests primarily out of partisan consideration. They would not have been in that whiplash partisan position had there been a Republican President elected in 1964.

President Johnson was elected during that campaign—and I believe the American people elected him during that campaign—primarily because of the position he took on foreign policy. His position on foreign policy during that campaign was supposed to be directly opposite to the position of Barry Goldwater. I have cited in some of my speeches during the last 2½ years on the floor of the Senate direct quotations from the President during the 1964 campaign—his New Hampshire speech, his Texas speech, and other speeches and references he made to the Goldwater position on the war in southeast Asia. They were completely contrary to the position he takes today. It was that position on foreign policy, in my judgment, that was the primary reason why President Johnson was elected by so overwhelming a majority vote over Goldwater.

I campaigned for him in 14 States, and I would do so again on the basis of the facts as of then. But I did not have the slightest idea when I campaigned for him that in a short time after he was elected, he would out-Goldwater Goldwater. With Goldwater in the White House, there would at least have been a check and control by Congress through a Democratic Congress. In my opinion, Congress would not have approved for Goldwater an escalation of this immoral, illegal war that this Democratic Congress is approving out of partisan consideration for a Democratic President.

Mr. President, we are going to have this out at the ballot boxes. We are going to have it out on the political front in this country. I am one Senator, as my colleagues know, who has always served in the Senate on the basis of the philosophy that I should consider each term my last, for I think that is the only way to serve in the Senate. But I shall always be perfectly willing to submit my record to the voters of my State, and I would be willing to submit it to them tomorrow, because the voters of my State know that I do not put partisanship first. I do not believe that I have any right, under my oath of office, to put partisanship first. I sit in the Senate representing everyone in my State, including those who voted against me as well as those who voted for me. I represent each of them to the same degree of responsibility.

I am sorry to say so, but I think the war crisis has reached the point where now the American people will have to answer for themselves. I believe that long since, their politicians have failed them. The American people will now have to exercise that precious check that the Constitution gives them—the check of the ballot box.

I hope that the American voters will watch the Senate very carefully next Monday, for they are entitled to be protected by the check of the purse strings. As I pointed out in a speech the other day, and as I quoted from the great constitutional debates that gave birth to this Republic, our constitutional fathers made perfectly clear that the Members of Congress were given the check of the purse strings so as to deny funds to a President who was following a policy that was not in the public interest.

With respect to the war in Vietnam, we would not let the boys down if we exercised the check of the purse strings. Rather, we would say to the President, "We are going to stop your killing so many; we are going to deny you the funds you are asking for." Thus, through that constitutional check, we would force the President, who has not yet even recommended a declaration of war, to fall back to a line of defense that would protect those boys and stop killing them in increasing numbers as a result of sending them into further aggressive expansive action in southeast Asia.

I made brief mention of some of the economic problems that confront us at home. It is interesting, is it not, that there are those who apparently have deluded themselves into thinking that we can expand the war in southeast Asia into an ever-increasing, massive war, but not be confronted with the legislative necessity of enacting a series of legislative, restrictive measures upon our economy which will protect the dollar of the American taxpayer? No one dislikes more than I do legislation that involves price controls, wage controls, rent controls, and the other necessary economic controls that it has been found must be imposed when the economy really becomes disrupted by war and ceases to be a peacetime economy. But we cannot continue to escalate the war without facing up to the fact that such controls will have to come.

Of course, if one makes even a suggestion of a tax that would seek to take some of the already excessive profits out of the manufacture of war goods, his loyalty is suspected. It is already time that we tried to limit the profits made from the manufacture of war materiel. Already fat profits are being made from the war effort in providing our boys with the war goods that they need in order to carry out the orders that the Commander in Chief has imposed upon them in this undeclared war. We had better take the blood money out of war profits.

I wonder, however, if anyone wants to suggest that we pass a bill to provide capital punishment upon a finding of war profiteering. As the Senate well knows, for religious reasons as well as for social reasons and legal reasons, I have always opposed capital punishment during my years as a Member of the Senate and prior to my coming here. So I would be opposed to capital punishment for war profiteers. But I have a little difficulty understanding a Vice President of the United States who seeks to justify the assassination of a profiteer in Saigon by rationalizing himself into believing or saying that the assassination was necessary in order to check profiteering in South Vietnam.

How absurd can we become? That killing was inhumane. It was uncalled for. But it was to be expected from the kind of military junta tyranny that this administration is supporting with millions of American taxpayers' dollars in South Vietnam. I have been warning the Senate for a long time that we are supporting a group of military corruptionists in South Vietnam. We already see that not too far beneath the surface in South Vietnam there is great trouble brewing. But such tyranny would not last 30 days if it were not being propped up by the United States, financed by the United States, and supported by the United States.

I am sorry that there seems to be a willingness on the part of the leaders of our Government to accept this example of man's inhumanity to man which is characterized by this public square assassination—for that is the proper description of it—of this shockingly crooked South Vietnamese profiteer. Are we going to take the position that cruelty is a substitute for justice?

I join with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] who, in my absence from the floor of the Senate, protested this shocking assassination. Of course, he should have been tried; and, of course, he should have been incarcerated, and for a good long period. But what has happened to us? We, in the midst of this blood splurge of killing countenance this kind of conduct on the part of a military junta government that some of our leaders praise.

Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand why this administration is following the course of action that it is following in southeast Asia.

I think the administration is going to discover that, as the American people come to reflect upon our course of action, they are going to repudiate this administration and its course of action in southeast Asia. And they should. If we do not stop this administration from continuing the course of action that it is following, in my judgment, we will write a shocking, sordid chapter of American history that American boys and girls 100 years from now will read and be so completely perplexed and astounded and dumbfounded by as to ask the question: "What happened in the period of American history in 1966?"

Mr. President, again I say that I never ask for agreement, but for thought on these matters, and I am satisfied that increasing thought is taking place across this country. I think that, in the not too distant future, this administration is going to either change its warmaking course of action or it is going to find itself without the sympathy of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN, THE NEGLECTED LEGION—EDITORIAL BY SENATOR PROUTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the ranking minority member of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is our very distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], who in our deliberations has been particularly solicitous in drawing to our attention the need for special education financial support.

I was most pleased recently to learn that he has become an editorialist in this area, since I found on my desk in the NEA Journal of March 1966 over his byline a guest editorial entitled, "Exceptional Children—The Neglected Legion."

I commend him for this editorial and I wish to repledge to him my own commitment to do what I can through legislation to give to exceptional children the special education they require.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have alluded be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Exceptional Children: The Neglected Legion

(By Winston L. Prouty, U.S. Senator from Vermont)

The mission of education ought to be to give each child the chance to work at his own level and to progress as far and as fast as his ability to learn permits. It follows that it should be the mission of this Nation to give the exceptional child at least the ordinary opportunities to learn even if this requires extraordinary measures. To the extent that America departs from this mission, our society can be neither great nor good.

In this country there are 6 million exceptional children—6 million boys and girls who differ from the so-called average enough to warrant some type of special school adjustment. Some are blind, some deaf; some have emotional disorders, some brain injuries; still others have multiple learning disabilities.

No picket signs proclaim their cause. No headlines herald their anguish. Yet many cannot communicate, even to their parents, their sense of hopelessness, frustration, and confusion, because they have not learned to speak or write.

Although some type of educational program for the deaf and blind appeared early in this country, only within relatively recent years have we recognized the special educational needs of the mentally retarded and the emotionally disturbed.

During the 19th century our attitude toward these children was benevolent and paternalistic. Various parent, church, and charitable groups tried to provide some type of care, usually in residential institutions away from the community.

The early 1900's saw the beginning of a trend which recognized that the similarities between handicapped children and those we label as normal were perhaps as important as the differences. Special schools and special classes began to emerge. A real effort was made to provide exceptional children with enough education to enable them to become productive members of society, rather than having them spend their lives in far-off institutions forgotten by the rest of the community.

It has only been within the past 25 years or so, however, that the public schools have really begun to assume responsibility for educating these children, and it was not until 1956 that Congress earmarked any aid for the education of the handicapped. As a result, States vary greatly as to the percentage of exceptional children enrolled in special education classes in the public schools.

In 11 States fewer than 10 percent are enrolled; in 14 States, between 10 and 20 percent; 14 have between 20 and 30 percent; 5 between 30 and 40 percent; and in only 6 States are as many as 40 to 50 percent enrolled.

In addition, barely one exceptional child in four has a properly trained teacher. These are only about 60,000 public day school teachers available in the field of special education, and some of them are only partially trained. To provide special education for all children who currently need it, we will require approximately 300,000 special education teachers.

We have, then, a national problem. Does it not seem to you, as it does to me, that exceptional children have become a neglected and lonesome legion in American education? Is it too much to ask that these 6 million boys and girls be given an educational bill of rights?

As the ranking Republican on the Senate Education Subcommittee, I solicit your advice and counsel on how this should be done. I also urge you to make your voices heard in Congress on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned under the previous order, until Monday, March 21, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dixon Donnelley, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

CANADIAN UNIVERSAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION

Stanley R. Tupper, of Maine, to be Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT).

Rev. G. Custer Cromwell, Rockville Methodist Church, Rockville, Md., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, who hast breathed into us Thy breath, so that we are Thy children; as we bow before Thee in humility and faith, we give Thee thanks for those blessings with which our lives are enriched, and pray that Thou wilt help us to use them in a way which will be helpful to others, pleasing unto Thee and satisfying to ourselves.

Enlighten by Thy spirit these servants of our Nation as they enact those laws which will govern us; support with Thy power those officials—from our Chief Executive unto the least—who will translate into action that which has been enacted; and endow with wisdom and integrity those who will enforce and adjudicate the laws of the land. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WILLIAM F. ARBOGAST

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, 35 years ago this week William F. Arbogast cleaned out his desk as city editor of the Covington, Ky., Times-Star, and started his career with the Associated Press. His first assignment was in Louisville, Ky., as correspondent. In October 1934 he was transferred to Frankfort and for the next 4 years covered the proceedings in the Kentucky Legislature. Bill's work was so outstanding that he was transferred to Washington in September 1938, where he was assigned to Capitol Hill as a regional correspondent, reporting on legislation of interest in Kentucky, Indiana, and Michigan. He was promoted to the AP general staff covering the House in December 1941, and has been chief of the House AP staff since December 1944.

I am sure that all Members of the House join with me in congratulating Bill Arbogast on this 35th anniversary of his service with the Associated Press.

Bill Arbogast knows and loves the House of Representatives. The news he reports shows his knowledge in depth about the legislative process. When his byline appears on a story you can be sure that it is accurate, objective, complete, and unbiased. And he has reported most of the headline news from the House Press Gallery since 1941. In addition, Bill has covered every national convention of both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party since 1938. He traveled with Senator Barkley's campaign tours, as well as those of Vice President Nixon and Senator Goldwater.

One of the stories that Bill wrote—and he admits it was about the hardest he ever had to write—was the death of our former beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, of Texas. He spent the last 3 weeks of Speaker Rayburn's life in Texas, back in 1961, gathering additional information that he had not already gotten from his close association with the man who had been Speaker of the House more than twice as long as any other Speaker in history. Bill's story on Speaker Rayburn was a masterpiece of journalism.

Once I asked Bill for a copy of a story he had written about the increase in the membership of the House Rules Committee from 12 to 15. The answer I got was as typical of him as anything I know. He told me he did not keep copies of stories he wrote because it would create a fire hazard at home.

The Arbogast family is a big one—in addition to his lovely wife, Eleanor, there are seven children and five grandchildren—at the last count. They include a son, Capt. William Regan Arbogast, U.S. Army, who has been fighting in South Vietnam and is now stationed at Okinawa; Ned Brooks Arbogast, studying for the priesthood at Xaverian Father's Seminary, Holliston, Mass.; a daughter, Sue Ellen, attending St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa.; David and Joseph in parochial schools in Alexandria; Julie Ann and Timothy, married and living in Virginia. Bill's parents, William H. and Willemenia Lorenz Arbogast, who have been married for more than 62 years, are also living very near him in Alexandria.

Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press should be congratulated on their choice of Bill Arbogast, for he is one of journalism's finest. And, Mr. Speaker, on this celebration of his 35th anniversary with AP, may I add that I think he is doing a great job for AP and for the House in presenting the news picture accurately.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Speaker of the House, Mr. MCCORMACK, may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, no man could serve an organization like the Associated Press for 35 years and not be an able newsman, an informed observer of public affairs and public men, alert to fast-breaking stories, and never breaking a confidence.

Bill Arbogast, today observing the 35th anniversary of one of the best employment decisions the AP ever made, does not just fit that description, he exceeds it by a few hundred light-years.

I have known him since he came to Washington, and his friendship is one that I treasure. He belongs to the old school, though he is young in heart, and modern in his methods. He is able, loyal, honest, dedicated.

He is a credit to the great news organization which has been fortunate to have him on the payroll for 35 years. He is a credit to his profession. He is the pride of a large family to which he is devoted.

Before he joined the Associated Press in March of 1931 he had been a star reporter for the Covington, Ky., Times Star. By 1934 he was assigned to the AP bureau at the State capital, Frankfort. In September 1938, he came to Washington to work on the AP regional staff. He was assigned to the general AP staff of the House of Representatives in December of 1941, and became chief of that staff in December 1944. He has been on that firing line ever since, doing the job of several men, and doing it better than any other man could.

He finds surcease from the hectic life that he knows and loves so well in the House of Representatives in his many activities at the St. Mary's Catholic Church in Alexandria. In the bosom of his beloved family it would be impossible to tell that he has ever had the confidence and the friendship of most of the Members of the House for most of the time since 1938.

It is likely that he will try to do an even better job for the AP during the next 35 years than he did for the last 35, but not even he will be able to succeed in that. On this occasion, I know that I speak for all who have known and respected him over the years when I say that our congratulations to him are from the heart.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Ford].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished majority leader yielding to me at this time, because I want to associate myself with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, some of us in politics make our mark by getting reelected every 2 years and having some small part in shaping the affairs of the Nation. Others—the men and women who sit directly above and behind the Speaker's rostrum with pencils and note paper—carve their niche by keeping the politicians honest and reporting our doings, both zany and sensible, to the peoples of the world. We regard the members of the news media highly because we know they do an important and consistently good job.

It is fitting today that we give special recognition to a particularly outstanding member of the Washington press corps, William F. Arbogast, chief of the Associated Press staff covering the House of Representatives. Bill is marking an anniversary, as the distinguished majority leader said, although he may not even be thinking about it. It was 35 years ago today that he began working for the AP, with an assignment in Louisville, Ky. He now is in his 28th year in Washington for the AP and has headed the AP's House staff since December 1944.

That really does not tell the whole Arbogast story, though, because Bill has been a working newspaperman for 37 years now. He started with the Covington, Ky., Times-Star in 1929, an otherwise black year for Wall Street and the rest of the country, and he's been going strong ever since.

Bill's a fine family man, too. He has seven children and five grandchildren. I also know he has a great sense of humor and he really likes people—two wonderful qualities in a man.

We cannot present Bill with a gold watch for service, but we can tell him what a tremendous job he has done during his years with AP and doff our hats to him on this special day. Bill Arbogast, we, the Members of the House, salute you.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for a very fine statement.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished majority whip [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, we are all the richer here at the Capitol of our country and in the House of Representatives because Bill Arbogast has served with us for so many years. As has been pointed out by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, today marks his 35th anniversary as a reporter for the Associated Press. I have been honored to have been a friend of his since he first came here to the House Press Gallery more than 20 years ago. I can assure you that it is a pleasure to pay tribute to him for the outstanding service which he has rendered not only to the House of Representatives, to the Nation, and the Associated Press, but also to all of the people of our country in informing them of this, the most representative body on earth. Your accurate, objective reporting of our activities for the past 25 years has given to the American people the very best view and understanding of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have long and close associations with the members of the press. I find that the members of the Washington press corps are responsible, intelligent, able, dedicated men and women. All of them make an outstanding contribution to this, the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. However, among them all I know of no peer to the man that we honor here today because no reporter has done more to foster the highest respect from the Members of this body for the profession of journalism than has Bill, who is celebrating this, his 35th anniversary with the Associated Press.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me say how proud I am to call him a friend. And I might say, without compromising his integrity or in any way that of any member of his profession or of the worldwide news service which he represents, he at the same time has done a great deal to build friendship between the Members of this body, and trust and confidence between the Members of this body and the press, which is so essential to the proper functioning of government.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for his fine statement.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, to have served 35 years as a reporter for the Associated Press and 25 of those years covering the House of Representatives is indeed an accomplishment. This in itself bespeaks the quality of the man and the quality of his reporting. Such is the accomplishment of Bill Arbogast and such is his high quality, as a person and as a journalist.

On this anniversary in his journalistic career I join with his multitude of friends on Capitol Hill in extending to him my heartiest congratulations.

It has been my privilege to know Bill Arbogast since he started to report the significant proceedings on this side of the Capitol. I consider him a personal friend of long standing, and in this I take considerable pride. But whatever friendship he may hold for me, or any one of us, Bill never allows it to influence him in reporting factually and objectively on any matter with which I, or any one of us is associated. He has adhered strictly to the code of his profession, with no ax to grind or cause to espouse, but solely to present the facts.

It is not only Bill's ability to find the story and to tell it concisely and accurately that distinguishes him.

In all my association with him not once has he betrayed a confidence. This is one of the reasons he enjoys the respect of all of us on both sides of the aisle. Sometimes he has had the news before it actually became news, but he reported it only when it was news as a fact, not before.

There is another reason why Bill Arbogast is recognized by all of us, as well as by the members of his own profession, as one of the best newsmen admitted to the House Press Gallery. He does his homework, so to speak. There have been many occasions when I have been impressed, in truth sometimes amazed, that he had such a detailed knowledge of the subject matter under discussion, in committee or on the floor. His queries were never extraneous or superfluous but invariably incisive and pertinent to the pending issue. He has that rare facility of going to the crux of the matter.

The tributes that have been paid to Bill Arbogast today are richly deserved. I wish for him, one of the finest of men and of reporters, the very best in the years ahead. I wish for him, as well as for ourselves, many more years with his being an observer and reporter of all our activities in the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my congratulations and best wishes to Bill Arbogast as he reaches this significant milestone in a long and distinguished career of reporting for the Associated Press.

The tributes being paid to Bill by Members of this body are richly deserved.

Bill is a pro in the best sense of the word—a reporter of unquestioned integrity and ability.

I suspect that covering the activities of the House of Representatives in a factual, objective way is not the easiest job in the world, and the very fact that Bill Arbogast has even survived this complex assignment for so many years is testimony to his character and his competence.

But Bill has more than just survived. He has earned the confidence and respect of the membership on both sides of the aisle as an impartial observer of the scene, dedicated to the always difficult work of digging for the truth, and separating fact from fancy.

As one who has known Bill Arbogast as a friend since his earliest days on the Hill, I salute him on this anniversary and wish him many more years of useful service in his chosen field.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Bill Arbogast on this his 35th anniversary with the Associated Press. His long and distinguished career in the challenging and demanding profession deserves our respect and commendation.

Mr. Speaker, the faithful and honest reporting of the news is a fundamental requirement for the success of the American system. In this respect Bill Arbogast has made a significant contribution to his country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope he will be with us doing the same work for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to consider him a friend.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I am happy to yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I think it can be said, without challenge, that concentrated here on Capitol Hill is the world's largest single segment of the information industry. In the newspaper, radio, television, and kindred fields I think you will find there are more people and more activity in the general field of information carried on here than any other place on earth.

Mr. Speaker, it is a major industry by any means one wishes to measure it. Engaged in this tremendous activity here are many, many individuals, and many levels of the information industry. Sooner or later, I believe, almost everyone in the world who takes any major role in information activities will find it possible to spend some of his active work here on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, in the activities of these people who work in the field of information I believe the most important work is the press. In the press they have an expression which describes one segment of their members, known as the working press.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to Bill Arbogast because I believe he epitomizes the very finest in this most important of all segments of the information industry known as the "working press."

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Bill Arbogast, and I hope we have many more like him.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and my colleague from the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as one who spent some years in the business of news reporting, it was a pleasure for me to meet Bill Arbogast when I first came to Congress 18 years ago. Through these years it has been a privilege to know him.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished majority leader for taking this time to pay recognition to Bill Arbogast, recognition which this able newspaperman so abundantly deserves.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our majority leader for the gracious and fitting tribute that he has led today in behalf of Bill Arbogast.

Bill Arbogast is a man of absolute integrity. He is a man who has distinguished himself as an American, a newspaperman, and as a friend.

I am delighted to participate in this tribute to him.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], for giving me the opportunity to join with him in paying tribute to the distinguished service of Bill Arbogast to the Associated Press, to the House of Representatives, and to his beloved country.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few people who have the opportunity to know this body as well as Bill Arbogast knows it. His knowledge of this body has led him, in my opinion, to do some of the most outstanding work in journalism which has been accomplished in this country in this century.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a real pleasure for me to know him, and I certainly share the expressions which have been made by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader as to his stature in his profession. I also express the hope that Bill Arbogast will be in the press gallery of the House of Representatives for many years to come. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that Bill Arbogast may well be in the press gallery when many of us have retired to our home district. As long as he is here, those of us who know him will always feel that we have an able and knowledgeable friend in the Washington press corps.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. FARNSLEY. I want to say I think he is a great man. I knew him in Kentucky when he worked for another agency.

For the record, this is the first time I have ever said anything in this House. That is how important I think he is.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, this being St. Patrick's Day, I would like to extend to Bill Arbogast an Irishman's wish:

May Almighty God hold you in the hollow of His hand. May the wind always stay at your back. May you live another 50 years. And when you leave this world, may you be in Heaven 3 days before the Devil finds out you are gone.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in the well-deserved tributes paid to Bill Arbogast, a newspaperman in the finest sense of the term.

The Associated Press has many fine and dedicated people, and good reason to be proud of them. Some of their finest work here in the Nation's Capitol, where the job of reporting the news is unusually challenging and difficult.

Here in Washington, it is particularly important to have news men and women who are both expert in their profession and diligent in their practice of that profession's high standards.

Such a reporter is Bill Arbogast of the Associated Press, who for 35 years has been a faithful searcher of truth and an equally faithful reporter of the news.

Bill Arbogast is a credit to journalism and the great news service which employs him. It is a pleasure to join in congratulating him today.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my own personal tribute and congratulations to William F. Arbogast, chief of the Associated Press staff covering the House of Representatives, upon the 35th anniversary of his service with AP.

In a way, I have a special claim upon Bill. At one time, he was city editor of the Covington, Ky., Times-Star. Covington is located in the Fourth Congressional District which I have the honor of serving here in the Congress. Bill's first assignment with the Associated Press was in Louisville, Ky., as correspondent. Louisville is the location of the orphans' home where I lived as a small lonely child.

For these reasons alone, I would have a certain feeling of common interest with Bill. However, in addition, my association with him here in the House has given me an opportunity to know him as a professional news specialist of rare ability, of the very highest integrity and consummate skill.

To his already knowledgeable background, he adds, for each story he writes, prodigious and careful research. Then through his easy and graceful facility with words, his news dispatches are communicative in an unusually meaningful way. His is reporting at the very best and he is my favorite reporter. Every word in his articles tells a story—sings a song, and does an act—need I say more of his talents?

Because of his outstanding ability and his personal integrity and affability, Bill Arbogast is a friend and newsman who is held in the greatest esteem and admiration by his myriad of associates both in the press and in the Membership of the House of Representatives. My heartiest felicitations are extended to Bill and my best wishes go to him for many more happy and productive years here in the Nation's Capitol.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the subject of the life and service of Bill Arbogast.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of finding out from the distinguished majority whip the program for the rest of the week and the schedule for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, there is no further business for the rest of the week.

When the House adjourns today, it will adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The program for the week beginning on Monday, March 21, is as follows:

On Monday, the Consent Calendar will be called.

Two bills are scheduled under suspension. They are:

H.R. 7423, permitting transfers of Post Office Department appropriations by Postmaster General; and

H.R. 13448, providing airlift to armed services post offices on a worldwide basis.

On Tuesday, we will call up the bill, S. 2394, authorizing an official residence for the Vice President. This bill will be debated under an open rule with 2 hours of debate, and making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week the following bill is scheduled: H.R. 10607, to reimburse certain moving expenses of Federal employees.

As usual conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the first two bills he mentioned scheduled for Monday will come up under suspension of the rules?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to yield to inform the House that on Thursday, March 24, I have a special order to eulogize our distinguished colleague, John F. Baldwin, who passed away last week.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am just a little bit surprised, if I may have the attention of the acting majority leader, that this bill to provide this mansion for the Vice President has been passed over until next week. Is there some reason why it could not be taken up today and have the decks cleared for more important business next week?

Mr. BOGGS. Well, the Vice President has gone on for well over 100 years without this mansion, as you describe it. I do not think a delay of another couple of days will make much difference.

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to hear that we have gone without this palace that many years. I would hope we could get along without it for an equal number of years.

Mr. BOGGS. Now the gentleman has changed his description of this house from a mansion to a palace in one breath. I think it is a house, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. For $750,000—what would you call it?

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today we honor St. Patrick. Were you in Boston, one would say, "Top of the morning to you." And your response would be, "And the rest of the day to you."

It was in the year 387 that St. Patrick came from Heaven on the mission for which he was preordained which was, of course, the conversion of the Irish people to the faith of Christianity.

At that time St. Patrick used the sprig of the shamrock as his symbol.

Today we have had shamrocks flown here to Washington from Ireland. They came as a courtesy of the Irish Embassy and to the Irish Embassy all of us are indeed grateful.

Last year Congressman JAMES BURKE read a little poem which I would like to read to you now:

> A little sprig of shamrock
> Is a symbol we hold dear
> A little sprig of shamrock
> When we wear it every year;
> A little sprig of shamrock
> So many things convey
> As it travels out across the world
> To be worn on St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, all of us today are wearing carnations and for these carnations we are extremely grateful because they were donated by the National Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

May I wish to all of you a happy St. Patrick's Day.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a tribute to the democratic spirit of the Irish that on St. Patrick's Day very few people indeed object to wearing something green. The pretense by men and women of good will throughout our great and free country that they, too, are Irish is a touching way of showing on this day that the Irish people have won their way to the hearts of many Americans of every ethnic background during the long years which have passed since the Irish came, famine stricken and desperately poor, to the blessed shores of the United States.

St. Patrick was one of the great men of all time, and the coming of St. Patrick to Ireland marked what is perhaps the greatest epoch of Irish history. It was an event which changed the destiny of Ireland forever.

St. Patrick first came to Ireland, as a captive, in about the year 389, during the reign of King Niall. It was 43 years later, in the year 432, during the reign of King Laoghaire, that St. Patrick came upon the momentous mission that was to change Ireland's destiny.

An ancient pagan prophecy attributed to Conn of the Hundred Battles said:

> With Laoghaire the Valiant will the land be humbled by the coming of the Tailcenn (i.e., Patrick); there shall be houses a-cross (i.e., churches); bent staffs shall pluck the flowers from their high places.

In his autobiographical work entitled the "Confession," St. Patrick stated that he was taken captive at "Bannaven of Taberniae." Some authorities believe that this refers to Dumbarton, in the most northern Roman province of Celtic Britain. Others believe that the reference is to the Celtic province of Brittany in France. St. Patrick's famous "Confession" contains internal evidence that supports either supposition.

The fact that St. Martin of Tours was his maternal uncle is one of the strongest points supporting the theory that St. Patrick's birthplace was on the continent. Patrick's father, Calporn, held the Roman municipal office of Decurion, a kind of magistrate. Patrick's mother's name was Conchessa. Patrick himself was christened Succat, which signifies "skillful in war."

It was from Brittany, from the home of his mother's parents where he was visiting, that he was taken as a captive. A raid by Irishmen sailing in a fleet of King Niall's resulted in Patrick's capture and sale as a slave to an Antrim chieftain named Miliue who set him to herding flocks of sheep in the valley of the Braid, near the foot of the mountain Sliab Mis.

During this time of trial, he experienced his great conversion. He wrote in his "Confession":

> Constantly I used to pray in the daytime and at night, in snow and frost and rain.

After 6 years, a voice came to him in his sleep and instructed him to escape from his bondage.

After an adventurous voyage on an Irish ship, and 28 days spent in an uninhabited area of France, Patrick returned to his home. Soon, however, the voices of his fellow slaves in Ireland came to him in a dream: "We beseech thee, holy youth, to come and walk among us once more."

He is believed to have spent the next 20 years studying for the priesthood in southern France. He then began his work in Ireland by replacing pagan idols with primitive churches. He was supported in his great task by the few Christian communities that already existed in Ireland.

One of his first missions was to the court of the High King at Tara. There he preached the Gospel, confounded the native Druid priests with "great signs and miracles," and won over many men of Erin to Christianity. It is said that he used the shamrock as an illustration of the mystery of the Blessed Trinity.

In the year 444, he founded a church at Armagh. He converted thousands upon thousands, and founded many other churches, but Armagh remained the primary see of Ireland.

Many famous legends are connected with his life and work. The best known concerns his driving the snakes out of Ireland. Another tells of his fasting 40 days and 40 nights on a mountain—now called Crough Patrick—in order to beg Almighty God for certain blessings. It is said that God granted that the sea would spread over Ireland in order to save its people from the terrors of the end of the world, and that St. Patrick also won the right to assist in the divine judgment of the Irish on the last day.

St. Patrick died in the year 461. He was probably buried at Saul on Strangford Lough, where he had founded his first church. St. Patrick, who referred to himself as "a sinner, most unlearned, the least of all the faithful, and utterly despised by many," was a saint of vast energy, unbending determination, and broad vision. He was a maker of history, and his historical greatness derives from his role as a pioneer missionary.

The greatest single tribute to this venerable saint, who personally impressed his converts to a degree perhaps unequaled by any other national apostle, is the unbroken bond that still unites him to his people. One thousand five hundred and five years after his death, St. Patrick is still cherished by the Irish throughout the world with a reverence that exceeds that accorded to any other saint of antiquity. Perhaps the ultimate explanation of this firm, unbreakable, and undying bond between the Irish and St. Patrick is to be found in his prayer:

> "May God never permit it to happen to me that I should lose His people which He purchased in the utmost parts of the world. I pray to God to give me perseverance and to deign that I be a faithful witness to Him to the end of my life for my God."

HOLDING THE CEILING ON GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point in three instances and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Federal Reserve Board last December launched our Nation on this spiraling rise in all interest rates, the hue and cry of the big banks has been to raise the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds. This gloom and doom bunch has issued warnings questioning the health and safety of the most secure market investment, Government bonds, because the interest rates by law are not permitted to rise above 4¼ percent on bonds of over 5-year maturity.

The Federal Reserve's tight money policy has only increased the ravenous appetite of the big bankers for more profits, their pound of flesh from a Nation already seriously pressed by wartime demands. Mr. Speaker, the proposed lifting of the rate ceiling flies in the face of 40 years of law. Woodrow Wilson initiated this 4¼-percent ceiling and attempts to lift it from time to time have been repelled, the latest attempt being in 1959 when President Eisenhower proposed a similar raising of long-term rates. But Congress has steadfastly refused to allow such a lifting of the ceiling.

We see and hear much support for a rise, but I was pleased recently to see an editorial in the Bond Buyer firmly opposing the raising of the 4¼-percent ceiling. Such an increase, the editorial stated, would further increase the burden of interest on Federal debt by $300 million a year and will seriously hinder the financing of our local and State governments. Our local governments are already in serious financial difficulty and an increase in the present ceiling will further hurt our localities' ability to provide service for their citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following editorial for all Members of Congress:

[From the Bond Buyer, Mar. 7, 1966]

Hang on to the Ceiling

Now that interest rates have risen so substantially over the past several months, we are treated to the usual pleadings that the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling be lifted on new U.S. bond issues, that is, on U.S. Government flotations with an initial term of more than 5 years.

We have never understood the arguments of those who would abandon this valuable statutory specific regarding U.S. financing, since it is, in fact, a finely-fashioned market regulator which serves two useful purposes: It saves money for the taxpayers as it prevents the issuance of long-term U.S. debt during periods of high interest rates; it keeps interest rates generally from moving even higher than they do during periods of financial stringency since it effectively removes from the long-term capital market one of the biggest borrowers of all—the U.S. Government—when other borrowers in the mortgage market, in the municipal market, and in the corporate bond market are already paying fancy prices for money.

Perhaps the advocates of an abandonment of the interest rate ceiling might illuminate their arguments with answers to some of these questions:

Why should the taxpayers be burdened with an additional $300 million in interest payments on the U.S. debt because the Treasury floats a $2 billion, 5¼-percent, 15-year bond (assuming the interest rate ceiling were removed) instead of waiting until the market was more propitious in order to float a $2 billion, 4¼-percent, 15-year bond?

And why should homeowners, States and municipalities, and corporations be obliged to pay even higher interest costs in periods of financial stringency because the U.S. Government could be competing for long-term credits if the ceiling were abandoned?

The only valid argument for a removal of the interest rate ceiling would be the proposition that long-term rates of better than 4¼ percent on U.S. bonds are here to stay for an inordinately long period of time. If any of the advocates believes this, it ought to be stated as the major premise rather than ignored.

Some of those who want to see the ceiling abolished argue that the Treasury needs to lengthen the debt from time to time. This argument has its main point at the other end. That the Treasury should not engage in debt lengthening during tight supply-demand periods in the capital market.

Others argue that ability to do long-term financing is less inflationary than short-term financing through the banking system as the issues can be placed with real savers. This is specious. It only applies to a situation where we are engaged in large-scale deficit financing, which is not the case today, and if we were to be engaged in such deficit financing, perhaps the answer would be for the advocates to go to the heart of the problem, which would be the deficit itself.

As for the secondary markets in all bond issues, if there were no ceiling—and investors and dealers had no assurance that the U.S. Government would not be issuing long bonds at, say, 5 to 5¼ percent—then it is a certainty that yields in the secondary market in U.S. bonds today would be higher than they are now.

And since the U.S. securities market is the queen on the bond markets' chessboard, it is also a certainty that yields in other secondary markets would be higher, too.

The advocates of abandoning the interest ceiling on U.S. Governments ought to find a better cause.

NEW YORK TIMES CHARGES REPUBLICAN-FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD TIGHT MONEY BINGES CAUSED RECESSIONS IN 1953, 1957, AND 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years I have not for one day let up in my efforts to impress upon my colleagues the fact that tight money and high interest rates always bring an end to prosperity and cause economic recession, unemployment, and poverty.

I suppose I have been particularly critical of the monetary policies during the Eisenhower administration when we had three serious recessions within the short span of only 7 years. While I made these charges not in anger and without bitterness, although the untold suffering caused by these policies still leave their scars, our friends in Wall Street reviled me as a western populist. That does not bother me even a little bit because this is how President Johnson describes himself, and I am glad to acknowledge that I agree with and support administration monetary and fiscal programs. Anyway, if a populist is one who considers first the best interests of the people, then I accept the label proudly.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record an editorial appearing in the March 13 New York Times, the voice of the eastern establishment, which lays the blame for the 1953, 1957, and 1960 recessions right at the feet of the Federal Reserve Board and the Republican-sponsored high interest philosophy. I am happy to have the concurrence of the New York Times with my own position on the vital matter of monetary policy.

TURN OF THE SCREW

The credit screws have been tightened another notch. The rise from 5 to 5½ percent in the interest rates that commercial banks charge the biggest and most credit-worthy corporations will be felt by every borrower.

It is unlikely that the tightening of credit has yet come to an end. The boom in business has triggered a swelling demand for credit. Corporations are adding to their inventories; they are facing a speedup in tax collections; and they are stepping up their spending on new plant and equipment. Their need for capital has put a squeeze on the banks and the money markets. And because money is tight, many corporations are prompted to borrow because they fear that rates will be higher and credit less readily available in the future, making credit tighter still.

A tightening of credit can help to curb inflationary pressures. But experience has demonstrated that relying on monetary policy to keep things in check can be dangerous if carried to far. The Eisenhower administration found that out in 1953, in 1957 and again in 1960. Each time, the turning of the screw resulted in denying credit to legitimate borrowers. Neither inflation nor speculation was effectively controlled; rising unemployment and sluggish growth were fostered.

There has been little to criticize in the performance of the Federal Reserve over the past 5 years. Even its December rise in the discount rate, which was deplored by administration officials as a breach in the coordination that had characterized monetary policy during the expansion, was neither rash nor unwise. The Federal Reserve recognized that inflation had become a threat and took what action it could to combat it.

The Federal Reserve cannot be blamed for the escalation in rates now taking place. Neither can the bankers. Demand for credit, promoted by the administration's own expansive spending program and the credit-tightening devices in its budget, is simply outpacing the supply. This imbalance is reflected in the Nation's financial markets, with prices of common stocks and fixed-income obligations both feeling the pressure of tightening credit and expectations of more of the same.

There is little danger that the latest turn of the screw on credit will cripple the expansion. The real danger is that the administration will continue to depend exclusively on the tightening of credit to contain inflation. This is precisely what the administration is doing in its request for a tax bill that has the effect of adding to the already heavy demand for credit.

Fiscal policy is going to have to be employed to slow the demand for credit and to relieve the strain in the marketplace. This can be accomplished in part by holding down Government spending especially on the space program and some aspects of military spending not connected with Vietnam. It also requires temporary suspension of the investment tax credit, which has done so much to stimulate corporate investment and is now no longer needed. The administration could be armed with additional insurance by making an all-out effort to acquire discretionary and temporary authority to raise or lower individual and corporate tax rates.

Such measures, not constant tightening of the credit screw alone, offer the best promise of keeping the expansion going.

ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT CALLED FOR IN ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I have filed the committee's report on the January 1966 Economic Report of the President, and on the report of the Council of Economic Advisers. It is indeed striking that the committee's report, which includes minority and supplemental views covering a broad range of topics, should contain such a great degree of unanimity.

While various aspects of the report are deserving of special comment and emphasis, I particularly wish to commend to the attention of the Congress and amplify upon that section of the majority report dealing with the maintenance of competition and enforcement of our antitrust laws.

In the Employment Act of 1946, Congress declared that it was the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government in maintaining and promoting maximum employment to foster and promote free competitive enterprise. The Council of Economic Advisers, a creature of that act, is specifically entrusted in section 4 of the act with the responsibility of evaluating the programs and activities of the Federal Government to determine whether such activities and programs are contributing to the achievement of the policy of the Employment Act. For over 75 years our antitrust laws have been a key program in the maintenance of our free competitive enterprise system. Yet the current report of the Council of Economic Advisers contains not a single reference to this vital program. We find in the report no advice to guide our legislative considerations as to whether or not programs of enforcement of the antitrust laws, being administered in the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, are contributing to the accomplishment of maximum employment in a free enterprise economy.

It is particularly important at this time, as we approach full employment, that we not lose sight of the absolute necessity of avoiding the pitfalls of monopoly. The continued prosperity of the Nation depends upon such vigilance. The monopolists always seek to justify increased economic concentration in the name of increased economic efficiency. Thus, similarly have tyrants ever decried democracy as inefficient. The keystone of our economic and political freedoms lies in assuring that the Nation's wealth be retained in the hands of the many, and not of the few.

The American economy, already highly concentrated, is steadily moving toward even higher levels of concentration. Although this characteristic carries with it the gravest political, social, and economic implications, it is doubtful whether the executive branch of the Government has given it the attention it properly requires. Certainly, there is nothing in the report of the Council of Economic Advisers to assuage these fears.

The uncontrovertible facts of concentration are striking and call for only brief recitation. It is important to recognize that the economy is already highly concentrated and is becoming even more so as the product of a virtually unopposed tidal wave of mergers. Of the nearly 200,000 manufacturing corporations in the United States, the 100 largest accounted for nearly half of all assets held by manufacturers in 1962. This represents a substantial increase compared with their relative position as late as 1950. In terms of other indicia, the role of the giant corporations is even more impressive. In 1962, the 100 largest manufacturing corporations accounted for nearly 60 percent of after-tax profits. These are the facts:

Between 1948 and 1964, according to the FTC, 720 large firms—each with assets of more than $10 million—disappeared through merger, and the number has been rising in recent years.

As a result of these mergers, the number of manufacturing companies with assets of $10 to $25 million was reduced by one-fourth.

Since 1950, the 200 largest manufacturing companies alone have bought more than 2,000 concerns with combined assets of $18 billion.

The trend to conglomerate mergers continues to accelerate. The 42 most active acquiring corporations among the 100 largest manufacturers made nearly 200 acquisitions between 1950 and 1963. Four out of five of the companies bought were in industries differing from that of the acquiring company.

Additional evidence was presented to challenge the assumptions that, first, concentration—bigness—is essential for technological innovation; and second, big, multiplant companies are more efficient than smaller firms.

Concentration in individual markets has not declined, but rather has tended to increase despite the fact that modern technology appears to have made smaller plants more efficient than larger plants.

While these immediate effects of this trend to an increasingly concentrated economy should not be overlooked, of even greater importance is the broader impact of such concentration on wages, prices, and economic growth. To maintain balanced growth without inflation is difficult enough, but it is made all the more complex where key manufacturing industries are controlled by a handful of large business firms. In concentrated markets, dominant corporations possess substantial power over price. In short, they have considerable pricing freedom which they can exercise in a manner inconsistent with larger economic objectives. To compensate for these pockets of private power, the Government is forced to rely more heavily on the instruments of monetary and fiscal policy than would otherwise be the case. In this context, market forces are inoperative. Economic concentration may motivate an increase in interest rates and be used to justify restrictive tax and expenditure policies in order to keep prices in line with the public interest. As best, such efforts are likely to be ineffective; at worst, they may bring about changes in the aggregate level of economic activity that are neither desirable nor essential. In order to achieve the goals of the Employment Act, a competitive, flexible economy is imperative.

If that objective is to be achieved, if economic totalitarianism is to be avoided immediate steps must be taken to reduce existing levels of concentration.

In the face of these considerations, a far more active antitrust enforcement program is needed than is now being carried out. At present the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division are doing very little to stop the tidal wave of mergers now in evidence. Small business is being engulfed in this avalanche of concentration.

In 1965, approximately 2,000 mergers were recorded. Together the FTC and the Antitrust Division challenged barely 1 percent of that number. What is even more important, no effort is being made to reduce concentration in those industries where a few needlessly large firms now control most of the output. Compared with the need, the Government's antitrust enforcement effort is grossly inadequate. The Council of Economic Advisers offers no remedy to this serious deficiency. According to the fiscal 1967 budget, neither the Antitrust Division nor the FTC has been authorized any increase in the number of permanent personnel. Moveover, the Antitrust Division has announced that it anticipates that it will file fewer cases in 1967 than in 1966. The FTC estimates that it will file only one-half as many complaints involving restraints of trade—monopolies, mergers, and the like—in 1967 as in 1966. Thus, we are faced with the facts of concentration and creeping monopoly and are told that we may not expect either vigorous or effective antitrust enforcement in the future.

If we are to fulfill the bold hopes of the American dream set forth in the Employment Act of 1946, we must have a stronger antitrust effort. A substantial increase in the resources of both the Antitrust Division and the FTC is but the first necessary and appropriate step. Most important, however, the leadership of the FTC and the Antitrust Division must be prepared to take a far more vigorous approach to their enforcement responsibilities. This will demand a sharp increase in the number of cases brought against mergers. Such a stepup in merger activity alone will not be adequate. A strong program designed to decrease industrial concentration in the American economy is required.

We have reached a crossroad in antitrust enforcement. It is necessary that we pause and reflect upon which road we shall take. To help us in this decision, the Joint Economic Committee should seek the counsel of those responsible for antitrust enforcement, and others, to determine whether existing antitrust laws are adequate to deal with the complex problems of economic concentration. At stake in this consideration is the issue of whether we can sustain full employment in a free competitive economy.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK ON THE OCCASION OF HIS ADDRESSING THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE LEGISLATURE AND THE DESIGNATION OF JOHN McCORMACK DAY, MARCH 16

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, in the best traditions of Massachusetts history, on Wednesday, March 16, the esteemed Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives JOHN W. McCORMACK, addressed the Massachusetts Legislature. This was was an honor, indeed. But above and beyond the honor to Speaker McCORMACK was the fact that he brought to the State legislature a stimulating and forceful address.

Speaker McCORMACK has served with distinction in both Massachusetts houses of the legislature; in the house of representatives from 1920 through 1922; in the senate from 1923 through 1926. The last 2 years he served as Democratic leader.

Speaker McCORMACK has brought to his post in the U.S. House of Representatives great skill as a presiding officer. He is admired on both sides of the aisle and presides with dignity and fairness over our deliberations.

Each Member of this Congress should take great pride in the fact that our Speaker has been so honored today by his native State.

Many honors have come to our distinguished and beloved Speaker during the years he has spent in public life, but I rather believe that his election as the 45th Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States was not only the greatest honor he ever received, but the fulfillment of his career and of all his earthly aspirations.

Yet he was not the first but the seventh son of Massachusetts to become Speaker, and it is Massachusetts which now pays him honor. The General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts declared March 16 to be John W. McCormack Day, and it is no accident that this day was observed in the Bay State just before St. Patrick's Day. The choice by the Massachusetts Legislature of this date is a tribute to the great tradition of those of Irish descent in the United States, and particularly in Massachusetts, exemplified by the career of achievement, integrity, loyalty, and devotion to country and to cause which has been JOHN McCORMACK'S. I may note that despite the eminence of our Speaker, it was impossible for the great general court to declare March 17 John W. McCormack Day, because St. Patrick had all the votes.

A few years ago, the Saturday Evening Post declared:

> Worldly Washington would be astonished to learn that the Speaker has no outside businesses or law clients and owns no earthly possessions except his clothing and furniture, an old car, and some government bonds. He gives much of his $45,000 annual pay to charity.

Worldly Washington may be astonished by this, but those who know this great man certainly are not; we find it possible to respect and to revere him even though he is not rich. Generally speaking, not being rich is an Irish-American characteristic.

One of those who know him well in Boston was quoted by the Post, and these remarks ring as true as a bell:

> Knowing what it is to be poor, JOHN has never moved away from his people. His birthplace is now the site of a public housing project he arranged. He's always helping some guy who's down on his luck, and he's never taken a dime. There'll never be another like him.

The Speaker has himself told us in the same Post article that:

> My father was a stonemason and bricklayer. He died when I was 13. The day I graduated from grammar school, I went to work as a Western Union boy at three dollars a week. A Sunday paper route, with the help of my two younger brothers, brought home another eight to ten dollars. Later I went to work in a law office and eventually learned enough to pass the bar exam. I kept the paper route for 6 months after I hung out my shingle.

He has always been a deeply conscientious Representative of the district that he loves so well, he has been a skillful and resourceful majority leader, and he is a very great Speaker.

It must move him deeply that his native State has shown him the great honor of declaring March 16 John W. McCormack Day. His beloved wife will share his pride on the occasion, but so many of the old familiar faces are gone. How proud they would have been. His two younger brothers, Edward and Daniel, have recently died.

He has worked hard all of his life. The State and the country of his birth are the better for the work that he has done. We wish him the best things in life and congratulate him on his achievements.

TRIBUTE TO HAWAII

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, Hauoli la hoomanao, seven times over, to Hawaii from the Ninth District of Missouri. Although it was not my privilege to serve in the House 7 years ago, and participate in that historic vote on March 12, 1955, I can well remember the pride I felt, as a private citizen, in Hawaii's admission to the Union as our 50th State.

Pride that the United States would now extend past "sea to shining sea," and that "America the beautiful" would now include one of the most naturally beautiful spots on earth.

May the decisions we make today, 7 years later, prove to be as wise, as beneficial to the country, and as great a source of pride, as the passage of that measure we now commemorate.

For Hawaii has proved to be perhaps our best link to the East, providing the Pacific with a showcase of all the best aspects of our democratic way of life, embracing peoples of all races and creeds in true equality.

Congratulations and aloha to my very able colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] and the charming gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

DAVID DUBINSKY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a long and noble chapter in thhe history of the American labor movement came to an abrupt but dramatic close yesterday with the surprise announcement by David Dubinsky that he was retiring as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union—ILGWU.

During the 34 years that Mr. Dubinsky has served as president of ILGWU, he "made his own name and that of his union synonymous with social responsibility and creativity," as an editorial in today's New York Times states so effectively.

For a young man who imigrated to this country in 1911 after escaping from a Siberian prison camp to which he had been banished for his labor activities, Mr. Dubinsky's accomplishments are truly inspiring.

Not only was Mr. Dubinsky a progressive and enlighted trade unionist, but his social idealism impelled him to enter the arena of politics where he also has made a significant and enduring contribution by nurturing the New York Liberal Party into a far-seeing and effective political organization. He has been a tower of strength in the Liberal Party.

As one of the Members of this Congress who proudly bears the designation "Democrat-Liberal," I have a particularly strong affection for David Dubinsky.

I commend to my colleagues in the Congress the articles in today's New York Times which offer excellent assessments of the accomplishments of Mr. Dubinsky. One piece is written by A. H. Raskin, assistant editorial page editor of the Times and for many years that paper's labor specialist. Another is an editorial. The third by Damon Stetson is the new account of the meeting where Mr. Dubinsky disclosed his decision:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1966]

DUBINSKY—AN ORIGINAL—HIS RETIREMENT IS DRAMATIC REMINDER OF THE CHANGE IN UNIONS AND UNIONISTS

(By A. H. Raskin)

The retirement of David Dubinsky provides a dramatic reminder of the speed with which the great union builders of the New Deal era are vanishing from the labor scene. John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, Sidney Hillman, William Green, and a dozen others whose names once appeared or the front pages almost as often as the President's have all preceded the little giant of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union into the files of history.

Labor's new men of power are a drabber lot, steeped in the intricate responsibilities of administering and conserving a movement that has become richer in funds, status, economic security, and political influence than in fresh ideas for organizing the millions of workers still outside union ranks. Mr. Dubinsky was always an original, as distinctive as Seventh Avenue and the polyglot army of cutters, pressers, and seamstresses he helped to climb out of the sweatshops and the steaming, tuberculosis-ridden "lung blocks" of the lower east side.

His surprise farewell at yesterday's meeting of the ILGWU general executive board in in the Americana Hotel was straight out of the old Yiddish Art Theater, complete with tears, laughs and a hug for his wife just out of the hospital after weeks of treatment for arthritis. It was the best show of its genre since Boris Thomashefsky and Maurice Schwartz surrendered Second Avenue to off-Broadway.

I HAD A UNION LIFE

When the union's secretary-treasurer, Louis Stulberg, who is the man most likely to succeed, led his stunned colleagues in trying to persuade Mr. Dubinsky to stay on, he replied; "I didn't have a life; I had a union life. I don't want to die in my boots. I'm not waiting for a free funeral. I want to be free."

He reminded them that they had tried 5 years ago to get him to take things easier by going on a 3-day week. That lasted just 1 week. "You know my nature," he said. "If I'm president, I can't only be president from morning 'til night. It has to be from morning 'til next morning." They still wouldn't take "no" for an answer, but they all left knowing his decision was irrevocable.

It will be a hard change for them and for him. It was not enough for him to be author of all the union's major policies and chief negotiator in every major contract. He was also, in the words of an intimate, "our best editor, best publicity man, best architect, best ticket taker, best seat arranger, best actor, and he had to do it all himself."

At the triennial conventions he was proud papa to the delegates representing the union's 447,000 members. In his major speeches he would range across the mountaintops of social idealism. And a minute later, while the mood of exaltation was still strong in the hall, he would scold some unwary unionist for stirring from his seat. He injected a note of high drama into every report and every talk.

Five Presidents, from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Lyndon B. Johnson, invited him to dine at the White House. His favorite stories there were of the days he spent in a czarist jail at the age of 15 after calling a strike against his father's bakery in Poland. For example, he would put a ring of water around his bed at night to keep off the roaches.

When he became president of the ILGWU in 1932, a disastrous internal war with the Communists had left the union so broke that it had to borrow money to pay its electric bill. But in recent years the hundreds of millions of dollars in its welfare and pension funds enabled it to make loans to the Rockefellers for civic betterment projects in Puerto Rico.

The prestige that accrued to his union caused other labor leaders to turn to him for guidance in creating a better image.

One such was James C. Petrillo, the salty leader of the American Federation of Musicians, in a period when his union was under widespread attack for insisting on the employment of standby musicians. A delegation sent by Mr. Petrillo learned that Mr. Dubinsky had no high-pressure publicity organization, but merely an editor for its internal publications. When the group asked the ILGWU head for his "secret," he told them: "Live right."

He practiced his own maxim in a thousand ways. Here is one he never let the public know about: In 1950, when the union was celebrating its golden anniversary, the executive board voted to authorize a $5,000 increase in Mr. Dubinsky's salary of $17,500. When he refused to take the money, the board insisted that the union buy him a summer home as a retreat from his arduous duties.

THEN A MODEST HOUSE

Over a 7-year period union representatives sought to interest him in one luxurious home or another, and he turned them all down as too lavish. Finally, in 1957, he was entranced by a modest house on Tiana Bay in the Hamptons. The union bought it for $17,500 and put $7,500 more into remodeling it. But just as the Dubinsky's were about to move in, the newspapers carried stories about the $160,000 home in Seattle that Dave Beck had acquired with funds of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

In great embarrassment the ILGWU chief informed the board that he could not accept the Long Island house, but the board unanimously rejected his declination. The impasse ended only when one vice president said: "If this will make Dubinsky unhappy, we must respect his wishes." Mr. Dubinsky then arranged to buy the house himself by paying the union the $25,000 in five annual installments.

He referred to the incident obliquely yesterday when general objection arose to his retirement. Without mentioning the house or anything else about the specific circumstances, he reminded the board that once before all the vice presidents had disagreed with a Dubinsky decision, but had decided in the end that they must respect his wishes. "I urge you now to comply with my wishes," he said simply. It was his swan song.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1966]

PIONEER IN UNION STATESMANSHIP

In his more than three decades as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, David Dubinsky has made his own name and that of his union synonymous with social responsibility and creativity. His retirement at the age of 74 deprives the Nation as well as organized labor of one of its most constructive voices. The loss is particularly acute for New York City, where the garment union has long played a pivotal role in the city's biggest industry.

Mr. Dubinsky preceded Walter P. Reuther and George Meany in enunciating the concept that labor must go forward with the community and not at the expense of the community. He helped emancipate the workers of the old Jewish and Italian ghettos from the sweatshop, then turned to the still unfinished task of protecting a new generation of Negro and Puerto Rican workers against the erosive effect on union wages of competition from "runaway" employers in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the South.

A lifelong foe of union racketeers, he was a chief architect of the ethical practices codes of the AFL–CIO. When it became clear in the eary scandals over maladministration of many union welfare and pension funds that labor could not do the clean-up job alone, he was principally responsible for persuading the rest of organized labor to abandon its traditional resistance to any form of Government help in eradicating abuses.

He has never lost the sense that unionism was a cause, not a business. He extended that conception into the political realm in the last municipal election by throwing his energies into John V. Lindsay's fusion campaign, instead of lining up with Mr. Meany and the Central Labor Council in ritualistic adherence to the old-line Democrats.

To all his activities he has brought excitement and imagination, and these qualities will be especially missed in a movement increasingly dominated by organization men. The union's sound policies undoubtedly will continue under Louis Stulberg, its dedicated and able secretary-treasurer, who seems virtually certain to move up to the top spot; but no one will be able to duplicate the Dubinsky gusto.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1966]

DUBINSKY RETIRES AS PRESIDENT OF ILGWU

(by Damon Stetson)

David Dubinsky, a spry, peppery 74 years old, jolted his colleagues and the garment industry yesterday by resigning as president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The short man with the gray crewcut invited a few old friends to drop in at the Biarritz Room of the Americana, where the union's general executive board has been meeting this week.

At 3:20 p.m. he turned from a discussion of the need for raising $300,000 for the fall congressional campaign to a matter that he said was important to him and to the union.

While he was reviewing his career in the union, Mrs. Dubinsky, wearing a green hat and a dark coat, quietly entered the room and took a seat beside her husband at the green felt-covered table.

Mr. Dubinsky, always noted for his sense of drama, said that only one board member, Louis Stulberg, the secretary-treasurer, was aware of what he planned to do.

Then the man who has served as president of his union since 1932, delivered his valedictory to an intent general board and to friends who said later that they felt they were witnessing the end of an era.

He said that early in his career he realized that a union leader couldn't be "just a dogooder."

"You've got to be a politician," he said. "I decided to be a politician, too."

He recalled several previous occasions when he had considered or threatened to resign but emphasized that this time he had put it in writing.

He asked Gus Tyler, his assistant, to read his formal letter of resignation and sat looking out at his board members and occasionally wiping his eyes with his handkerchief as Mr. Tyler read the six-page letter.

In the letter Mr. Dubinsky said that he had thought of resigning since 1959, but had felt that problems then facing the union required him to remain "irrespective of my personal needs and wishes."

Since that time, he said, the union has dealt successfully with an antitrust charge, an accusation of discrimination within the ILGWU, an effort to divide the union by formation of a "union within the union," and has also created a national retirement fund that he called a major landmark in the welfare program of the union.

He also noted that a master agreements department had been established to deal with the giant firms that have developed in the industry. Guidelines for future collective bargaining have also been adopted, he said.

"In the recent mayoralty election in New York," Mr. Dubinsky said, "elements hostile to our union and envious of its achievements—inside and outside the labor movement—tried to exploit differences of opinion among our top leadership. But we disappointed them by proving that we were right in our policy and by emerging from the experience solidly united."

Mr. Dubinsky remains as vice chairman of the Liberal Party, which supported Mayor Lindsay in last November's election.

"I leave the presidency of our union," he said in the letter, "with the conviction that it is strong, stable, influential, and widely respected, that it is firmly rooted in the ideals and principles of the pioneers who preceded me, who founded it and fought and struggled to build and preserve it. It is a union that is demonstrating its ability to adjust to changing conditions."

At the conclusion of the reading of the letter, several board members expressed shock and called the resignation a "bombshell." Mr. Stulberg immediately made a motion that a special committee be appointed to make an effort to get Mr. Dubinsky to postpone his decision to resign.

The motion was adopted unanimously, but Mr. Dubinsky said after the meeting that he had no intention of reversing his decision. The board is scheduled to meet again today and tomorrow and is considered likely to select Mr. Dubinsky's successor before the week is out.

The leading prospect is Mr. Stulberg, 64 years old, who has worked closely with Mr. Dubinsky since his election to that post at the union's 1959 convention.

Many in the industry were quick to praise Mr. Dubinsky.

Abe Schrader, president of Abe Schrader Corp., credited Mr. Dubinsky with "bringing the garment industry out of the slums. Louis Rousso, chairman, of Russ Togs, Inc., said: "Dubinsky got angry sometimes, but he never held a grudge. He never wanted strikes and always wanted to bargain collectively."

There were some critical comments from garment men, but none wanted to be quoted for fear of arousing the union's resentment.

MISSISSIPPI FREEDOM DEMOCRATIC PARTY WINS HISTORIC DECISION

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1966, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit handed down a unanimous decision which may stand as a landmark case in the codification of full democracy for all Americans.

In deciding a case brought by members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, the court invalidated a municipal election in Sunflower County, Miss., because newly registered Negro voters were excluded from the election.

In this case, within 3 weeks after a Federal district court order, which was entered on April 8, 1965, 306 Negro voters were registered to vote. However, because of two requirements of Mississippi law they were denied the right to participate in the June 8 municipal elections. State law required that voters be registered more than 4 months prior to the general election, and the general election was scheduled less than 2 months after they were registered. In other words, the effective cutoff date for registration was 2 months prior to the Federal court order facilitating Negro registration.

Also, State law requires that poll taxes be paid for the 2 years preceding the year in which a person desires to vote. As we all know, poll taxes are a means of depriving citizens of the right to vote.

Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer and other members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party asked for a stay of the election to allow due time for the legally registered voters to be able to meet the requirements and vote. They argued that denial of a stay would require them to wait 4 years before participating in our democracy and that they would be governed for 4 more years by officials who derived their office through arbitrary and discriminatory election procedures.

The Federal district court denied the request for a stay, and the elections were held.

Then on March 11, 1966, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit reversed the district court, invalidated the election and called for a new election. This decision brings new hope and inspiration to millions in America who are concerned with the state of our freedoms and the administration of justice in connection with civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the end of the story. It is shocking to note that there are no Federal examiners in Sunflower County and the prospects for further Negro registration remain dim. Mrs. Victoria Gray, director of the Washington office of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, has sent a telegram to the Attorney General requesting that Federal examiners be immediately assigned to effectuate the court's decision which allows time for further registration. I urge the Attorney General to do so.

I commend the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party for its perserverance in this case and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit for this very important decision which is another milestone in the road to equal justice and full equality for all Americans.

THE MISSION OF "GEMINI 8"

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I can bring you no news about the flight of *Gemini 8*. We sympathize with the two astronauts who had their trip curtailed. To some this appears to be an unsuccessful flight inasmuch as it had to be curtailed. The fact that we did dock two vehicles in space—we joined them and we disengaged them—gives us another great first, and in our apparent failure we can take cognizance of the fact the great team of NASA and private industry that put these vehicles together and planned their trips again demonstrates their competence in meeting conditions over which they had no control, and gleaning from defeat a great deal of information to help us in new flights. Above all, they brought our astronauts back safely. For this we thank God.

THE CHINA EXPERTS EXPOSE THE PRESIDENT'S CRITICS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been hearing and learning a great deal in the last few days since the congressional Foreign Relations Committees opened their China hearings. The China hearings have been an eye opener, and in some unexpected ways. Their stated purpose was "to provide a forum through which recognized experts and scholars can help increase congressional and public knowledge." Their contribution, it was added, would be "educational rather than political."

They have proved to be both. The Congress has heard the evidence of qualified witnesses, "recognized experts and scholars." Apparently those experts contradict some of the more vocal critics of our administration's policy relating to Vietnam and China.

The case is documented by another expert, Richard Wilson, of the Washington Star. He is widely esteemed as a man of reason and fair judgment, unfettered by liberal or conservative or any other tags. His reputation as one of Washington's most thoughtful analysts, is well established. In yesterday's Star he gave us a demonstration of that. His analysis of the China hearings is sane, solid, and eminently reasonable.

It sifts the evidence and renders three plain judgments.

First, expert witnesses agree that the Vietnam conflict is "an essential element in containing China." That containment is vital to U.S. interests.

Second, expert witnesses agree that it is possible and desirable to contain China "without isolating the Peiping government." Our future emphasis should and must focus on "whether or not we are doing enough to draw the Communist Chinese into respectable world society."

Third, and most tellingly, expert witnesses agree on the historical and political fundamentals that are contested, to varying degree, by the same critics of the administration's policy.

There is an even greater gulf between the experts' testimony and the untutored chants of poets, dramatists, novelists, humanists, and assorted self-appointed savants.

Mr. Wilson draws a central and compelling conclusion from the weight of evidence. It is one the American people will be glad to hear because the vast majority of them have anticipated it by their support of the President's policies in Asia.

The dominant result of the China hearings, writes Mr. Wilson, "is that President Johnson is finally getting his intellectual rationale for the war in Vietnam from highly qualified sources in the academic world."

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is as unexpected as it is significant. It must have given a shock to the fearmongers, and I believe is of interest to the entire Congress, that the China hearings have produced such a solid consensus of support from academicians and intellectuals for U.S. policy in Vietnam. The experts have exposed the President's critics and have upheld his basic thesis of defense of freedom in Vietnam.

I believe every Members of this body can benefit from reading the why and wherefore as Richard Wilson presents it. I include his definitive analysis, "The China Experts Versus the Critics," at this point in the RECORD:

THE CHINA EXPERTS VERSUS THE CRITICS

(By Richard Wilson)

An unexpected byproduct of Senator FULBRIGHT's China hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee has been an expression of academic and intellectual support for U.S. policy in Vietnam.

What is being brought into focus is the war in Vietnam as an essential element in containing China, the reasons for doing that and the importance of it. FULBRIGHT, perhaps, did not anticipate this result. His emphasis has all been on the risk of war with China, and the undesirability of taking that risk.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, as the administration's most articulate spokesman in this field, has taken advantage of this turn of events to dignify and clothe in logic a policy of containing China without isolating the Communist government. There is nothing new in this. It represents no shift in policy. The Vice President's words do not change any of the realities of the problem, which remain about the same as they were when John Foster Dulles was Secretary of State.

But the words the Vice President is using apparently fall softer on doubtful ears and this makes possible a rational discussion of the risk we are taking in Asia, and why we are taking it. Asian specialist and students from both Harvard and Columbia Universities have found an historical consistency in American action in Asia with that of other great powers in the past that have sought to enforce political stability so that economic expansion might be carried on.

These experts—A. Doak Barnett of Columbia, John K. Fairbank of Harvard and now also A. M. Halpern of Harvard—have their differing ideas on how China might be handled, but they all seem to agree that it is the interest of the United States to contain China.

There emerges therefore, from a respected academic world quite a different attitude than that expressed by Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, GRUENING, MCCARTHY, HARTKE, and a few others. No resemblance at all is found between the views of these experts and those of various poets, liberalists, humanists, drama critics, novelists and columnists who have been expressing their abhorrence of any kind of ground-based intervention in Asia.

The result is that President Johnson is finally getting his intellectual rationale for the war in Vietnam from highly qualified sources in the academic world.

This corresponds roughly to what samplings of opinion show to be the majority sentiment of the country, and it sounds also as if it might come from the lips of those well-indoctrinated American soldiers in Vietnam who simply cannot understand the protest movement at home.

From now on it appears that the argument will veer into the field of whether or not we are doing enough to draw the Communist Chinese into respectable world society. This concerns both Barnett and Fairbank. Far Eastern Expert Halpern thinks there is a good chance that Asia is settling down, and dramatic changes might make possible a military disengagement in a few years—but not now.

To those who say that we must now approach China with the olive branch, HUMPHREY has an impregnable answer. We have. We do so every month or two in talks with the Chinese Reds representative in Warsaw. The answer is always the same. Support the surrender of the government of Formosa to the rule of Peiping. When we say no to that the conversations come to an end.

To those who say let Communist China into the United Nations, HUMPHREY's answer is also impregnable. Communist China does not wish to join the United Nations as it is presently constituted. The charter must be amended and the Republic of China must be excluded before Peiping would accept an invitation to join. On the question of diplomatic recognition of Communist China, the Formosa problem again intervenes.

All the probes for a new understanding with China, like the President's peace overtures of earlier in the year, lead down a blind alley.

These aspects of the problem are now coming to the fore for closer public scrutiny as the dimensions of the risk of war with China are being measured. What the administration is getting out of the current debate is a better public understanding of what it is trying to do, and why.

The China hearings are therefore a definite plus for the administration so far, much to the discomfiture of FULBRIGHT and the others.

CLAIM THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS THE BEST MEDICAL AND HEALTH SERVICE IN THE WORLD

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a half hour special order today to discuss a speech by Mr. Francis Keppel, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, now Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in which he made the charge that it is an empty boast to claim that the United States has the best medical and health services in the world.

THE SALE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORN AT PRICE-BREAKING LEVELS

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I protested the sale of Commodity Credit corn at price-breaking levels. The Secretary of Agriculture maintained that my comments were a lot of "political noise."

I just received a telephone call from a country elevator, A. N. Timm & Sons, at Arlington, Minn., in an area that suffered a soft corn crop, where there will be need for commodities for farm needs and farm feed. In storage in their elevators were 15,000 bushels. Commodity Credit issued loading out orders, denying the warehouseman the right to buy it to supply the needs of the farmers in the area.

The elevator operator told me that his local needs amount to 80,000 bushels, and yet they have been denied the chance to buy 15,000 bushels much needed by the farmers in the area.

Mr. Timm advised me that Commodity Credit sold No. 2 yellow corn in Minneapolis last week at $1.17, which is far below the price that it ought to be. It is obvious that the Commodity Credit Corporation is breaking the market and at the same time denying the farmer a chance to buy in his local market.

I have received letters from a number of country elevator operators in the past fews days complaining of these Commodity Credit Corporation orders and I include these communications in the Record at this point in my remarks:

Adrian Cooperative Elevator,
Adrian, Minn., March 12, 1966.
Congressman Ancher Nelsen,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We have been informed that the Commodity Credit Corporation is calling in all stored corn and is not going to allow the elevators an option to buy.

We feel that we should be given the privilege to bid on it, as it is in great demand, having many big feeders. This corn was raised and stored in this community, why not be able to keep it here?

The corn in this area, as well as many others was hard hit last fall, with an early frost, resulting in a very poor quality and most of it had to be sold as it was of an inferior quality and not of much feed value. We will need the better quality corn for our summer feeding. We do not have any corn to speak of left in storage on the farms around here as our 1964 crop was also very short.

We will be very grateful for anything you may be able to do for us.

Sincerely yours,
Robert Fiegen,
Manager.

Farmers Cooperative Elevator Co.,
Luverne, Minn.
Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Nelsen: The latest loading order of the USDA on moving 20 million bushels of corn from the private storage in Minnesota and South Dakota without the option of purchasing this corn prompts this letter to you.

We are in an area where this corn will be needed by the farmers to feed their livestock. We feel that this order is a serious blow to our farmers. Much of this year's corn is wet and will have to be moved or sold before warm weather, with this corn gone what will the farmers have for feed?

I cannot see that the USDA is doing anything but hurting the farmers of our area with this order.

Anything that you can do to stop this movement of corn from our area will be greatly appreciated by the farmers.

Very truly yours,
Vance Ebert,
Manager.

Minneota, Minn.,
March 15, 1966.
Congressman Ancher Nelsen,
Washington, D.C.

Please take immediate action to investigate why CCC is taking corn out of feeding area that is short, selling it direct to commission firms, and bypassing local elevators. This corn has to stay in the community for feed.

Joe Gisleson.

Adrian Cooperative Elevator,
Lismore, Minn., March 12, 1966.
Congressman Ancher Nelsen,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have been informed that the Commodity Credit Corporation is calling in all stored corn and is not going to allow the elevators an option to buy.

We feel that we should be given the privilege to bid on it, as it is in great demand, having many big feeders. This corn was raised and stored in this community, why not be able to keep it here?

The corn in this area, as well as many others, was hard hit last fall, with an early frost, resulting in a very poor quality and most of it had to be sold as it was of an inferior quality and not of much feed value. We will need the better quality corn for our summer feeding. We do not have any corn to speak of left in storage on the farms around here as our 1964 crop also very short.

We will be very grateful for anything you may be able to do for us.

Sincerely yours,
Dale Rollag, *Manager.*

Gold Field Farms,
Darfur, Minn., March 15, 1966.
Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Nelsen: I am enclosing herewith commodity newsletter dated March 11 from the J & O Grain Co., Minneapolis, Minn. At the same time we received this letter we received word that we would be asked to ship out our Nos. 1, 2, and 3 corn which we have in our own private storage while there is still some corn in the Government bin site. We were told that we would not have the opportunity to buy this corn but that it must be shipped out. You know the kind of corn crop we had in southern Minnesota last year, most of it not suitable for storage so the farmers around here had to sell their corn and are buying back good corn for cattle and hog feed.

If our good corn is going to be shipped out it will mean that we will have to ship in some corn before another crop which may make pretty expensive feed. Years ago we bought and erected additional storage space with the understanding that we would be filled first before the Government bins and not emptied unless corn was going out of condition, this may have been changed since that time but it was the understanding when we added additional storage space.

This does not mean that the same corn had to be kept in storage all the time as we have emptied and refilled our storage space several times. We understood that the idea was to store the corn in the country where it could be had if needed by the farmers. We are not surprised at the above action as Mr. Freeman is running true to form and opposing the welfare of the farmer, maybe he wants us to get in on the welfare program as there are reports that he might take over the food program.

We have just had our directors' meeting and the board asked me to write you in regard to this matter.

Sincerely yours,
J. Arthur Johnson,
President.

J & O Grain Co. Commodity News Letter,
March 11, 1966

CORN

Corn prices declined further this week under a continuation of heavy commercial selling. Final closings for the week are unchanged to off one-half cent. Government sales continued, although not as heavy as during the previous week. Exporters were not buying so actively this week and the best buying came from commission houses. There seemed to be a feeling of discouragement over news from Washington warning farmers not to overplant feed grains and produce a huge surplus. A report said that the South African Government will shortly offer to resell a cargo of U.S. corn at a New Orleans elevator which disturbed longs. Late rains in Argentina helped their corn crop which is about ready to be harvested and they will have an exportable surplus of about 200 million bushels in the crop year starting April 1. Chicago stocks increased 979,000 bushels last week to 21.3 million versus 22.9 million on hand a year ago. Exports last week totaled 12.6 million bushels and since October 1 now total 300.2 million bushels compared with 194.9 million by this same time last year. The Kansas City CCC office announced today that they were again restricting sales to 50 carlot limits to any one firm per terminal market. The CCC today issued loading orders to country elevators involving over 50 million bushels of corn, which in some States will amount to 100 percent of the stock. Traders were of the opinion that most of this would apply on sales already made and therefore the market was not influenced by this news. It still appears as if Government selling is going to hold prices down.

BREACHING THE 4¼-PERCENT GOVERNMENT BOND CEILING RATE

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on the financial pages of the morning papers there appears a large ad announcing the sale by the Federal National Mortgage Association of $410 million in participation certificates. These come due serially over a period of 15 years. The maturities due in 3 to 7 years carry an interest rate of 5½ percent and none of them carry an interest rate below 5¼ percent. These rates substantially breach the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on Government bonds.

These participation certificates are not subject to the 4¼-percent U.S. bond rate limitation because they are not obligations of the U.S. Government. But they do bear the guarantee of FNMA and that guarantee in turn is supported by the unlimited right of FNMA to borrow funds from the U.S. Treasury in any amounts that may be needed to pay principal and/or interest on the certificates. As a recent article in the Daily Bond Buyer observes:

> If this isn't a Federal Government guarantee of an agency issue, what is?

I hold no brief for the 4¼-percent ceiling on Government bonds. But I would think that my good friends on the other side of the aisle, who hold a contrary opinion, would be most disturbed by this indirect breeching of the 4¼-percent Government bond interest ceiling which in some instances amounts to as much as 1½ percentage points above the ceiling. It is my understanding they have formed a committee of approximately 80 members to lead a "crusade" to maintain the 4¼-percent bond ceiling. This is an end-run around the 4¼-percent ceiling rate.

Mr. Speaker, this indirect breaching of the ceiling is but one of many basic policy considerations which the Congress will have to face when the administration submits its so-called sale-of-assets proposal greatly expanding participation sales by FNMA next year. There are other fundamental policy decisions that likewise will have to be made. I express the hope that when this proposal is received, the Congress will give it the searching and critical examination it deserves.

BREAD AND BUTTER CORPS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which, if enacted, would create a Bread and Butter Corps. Under the proposal, the Department of Agriculture would coordinate and accelerate the export of America's most valuable product—our farm "know-how" and "show-how."

The Bread and Butter Corps would consist of volunteers who are either formally trained in agriculture and home economics or have practical experience in these fields. These volunteers would be trained in cooperation with the land-grant colleges and other institutions of higher learning for service overseas in underdeveloped nations.

Under the bill, the Department of Agriculture would establish the standards for membership in the Corps, but the land grant and other colleges would do the training, conduct the educational institutes, and develop necessary research and demonstration programs.

I intend to offer this bill as an amendment to Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, now under consideration by the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member.

We have had a number of expert witnesses before our committee and, almost without exception, every single witness has stressed the need for increased technical assistance to developing countries. The proposals now before our committee do not make specific provisions for increasing this needed technical assistance. In an effort to come up with a sound proposal, I have in the past 2 months contacted the president of every land-grant college in America, every director of extension service, and, in addition, a great number of farm leaders throughout America. The response has been excellent, and I have attempted to incorporate the suggestions made into the proposal introduced today.

America must do everything in its power to ward off the tragedy of world famine that threatens. In our eagerness to provide humanitarian relief, however, we must not make the mistake of getting food-needy countries dependent upon us for continuous handouts—America's breadbasket is just not big enough to feed a hungry world for any substance of time into the future. My bill is based on a "self-help" concept, quite consistent with the American tradition of helping those in need to help themselves.

POVERTY MEMO NO. 3

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, this is poverty memo No. 3, reciting the problems with the poverty program. We will have these memos daily as we are able to present information to our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, payroll "ghosts" are haunting Boston's scandal-torn poverty program. The FBI now has some leads on the extent of mismanagement and fraud uncovered there several months ago.

Two hundred of the six hundred teenagers employed in the Action for Boston Community Development, Inc.—ABCD—Neighborhood Youth Corps last summer claim they received Federal income tax W-2 forms showing more income than they had actually received.

In other instances, the local poverty board, ABCD, has been unable to track down youths who were either signed up without addresses or who are nonexistent "ghosts."

U.S. Attorney W. Arthur Garrity said the FBI determined in February that it had Federal criminal jurisdiction over the case. One ABCD official said he was afraid the FBI will blow Boston's poverty program right out of the window.

This is not the first scandal for Boston's poverty program. Falsified and padded payrolls, forged identity cards and checks, political favoritism, sloppy administration, controversy and bitterness—all have been a part of Boston's poverty politics.

Federal funds were held up for 2 months, but on January 17, 1966, $1,503,670 was released to ABCD by the Labor Department and a spokesman said the Department was "satisfied with the administrative changes and improvements in ABCD."

They finally had to fire the Deputy Director, Arnold L. Schuchter, and the Director, Joseph Slavet, resigned under pressure. I understand Mr. Schuchter is now employed as a consultant for the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington.

The Quie-Goodell opportunity crusade would throw out the present war on poverty and replace it with a sensible, scandal-free program that would get the money and the help they need to the poor themselves.

THE INCREASING PROBLEM OF NARCOTICS ADDICTION AND FEDERAL COURT TREATMENT OF DRUG ABUSERS

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a series of legislative proposals on the subject of narcotics which has been the center of keen attention of my predecessor, John Lindsay, as well as the gentleman from New York, Congressman Ogden R. Reid, and a number of my other colleagues in the House and Senators Jacob K. Javits and Robert F. Kennedy from New York. This series of four bills seeks to combat and control the increasingly shocking problem of drug addiction and narcotics, which is a problem not only in New York City but also in the Nation and throughout the world.

The bills introduced today would—

First. In lieu of criminal prosecution, authorize the pretrial civil commitment, for medical treatment and probationary after-care, of those charged with narcotics offenses, except for sale with intent to resell where the fullest penalty of the law should apply. This has heretofore been delineated by trend-setting New York State legislation. This bill is designed after that principally sponsored by Senators Jacob K. Javits and Robert F. Kennedy in the Senate.

Second. Authorizes the appropriation of $15 million in each of the next 3 fiscal years for grants to the States to construct treatment and rehabilitation facilities for drug users. The Federal Government would pay up to two-thirds of the cost of these facilities.

Third. Establish a $7,500,000 annual program to support the programs of the States in providing job training, family counseling, psychiatric care, and a wide range of services. In other words, this bill would establish a Federal-State two-thirds, one-third matching grant program to provide a wide range of services to ex-addicts in order to facilitate their general rehabilitation and to allow them

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to once again engage in useful and productive roles in the community.

Fourth. Modify the present mandatory prison sentences imposed upon addicts to permit Federal courts greater discretion in the employment of probation and sentence suspension and programs of parole. The key provision in this specific legislation would be to end the existing 5-year minimum sentence imposed upon narcotic addicts. The mandatory sentence for narcotics sellers, however, would not be changed. This legislation is designed particularly to benefit the rehabilitation of the young first-time offender.

The interest in the field of narcotics addiction is not new. The problems of drug addiction know no party lines, and we must all join in bipartisan effort to solicit control for the problems and dangers presented by the addict. This legislation is of particular interest to New York City and indeed all urban areas because, in addition to all of the many problems connected with narcotic addiction, there has been a sharp increase in the incidence of crime—homicides and robberies—as a result of narcotics addiction. Moreover, the horrifying effects of drugs are unfortunately being introduced to the younger members of our society.

Mayor Lindsay, of New York City, in a statement made June 9, 1965, said:

> Homicide is the most spectacular symptom of the malignant drug traffic infecting our society. Not so well publicized are the thousands of robberies, burglaries, and assaults perpetrated as a direct result of the pernicious misuse of narcotics. Little attention has been paid, moreover, to the subtle manifestations of the disintegration of self through drugs * * * the addicted father, the addicted daughter, the addicted wife.
>
> According to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, almost 50,000 narcotics addicts live in the United States. This figure may be much too low; it has been estimated that 50,000 addicts are residents of New York City alone. Even the most conservative statistics place almost half the Nation's known drug users in New York.
>
> For too long, these unfortunates have been dealt with almost exclusively by the police, the courts, and the prisons. Existing Federal law provides severe penalties for narcotics pushers, those depraved purveyors of moral subversion. This is as it should be. But the law subjects addicts to prison terms almost equally severe.
>
> To my mind, this procedure has proven its inefficacy. The solution to drug addiction—as opposed to the exploitation of the addicts—will not be found in the prisons. It will be found in the clinics and hospitals.
>
> For although the drug user may become a criminal because of his addiction, he fundamentally is a sick person and should be treated as such. What should concern us most is not punishment, but the far more difficult process of ending the user's compulsion toward drugs and his dependence upon them.

Governor Rockefeller of New York has been working on a series of proposals on a statewide basis designed to deal with the vast problem of narcotics and the drug user. The legislation I have proposed today, it is hoped, will complement those efforts of the States and will match the State grants on a two-thirds to one-third basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that our Federal laws must be revamped in this crucial area. We must distinguish between the criminal pusher and the victimized addict who is in need of medical treatment, assistance, and rehabilitation. We must act without delay in this, one of the Nation's most severe problem areas.

TITLE III—REPEAL OF COMPLAINT REQUIREMENT

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, more than a decade has elapsed since the historic Supreme Court decision in Brown against Board of Education outlawed racial segregation in our American educational system. One year later the same principle was applied to segregation in other public facilities, such as State parks. Yet, in many places the mandate of the 14th amendment is not being fully observed and respected.

Two years ago, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was enacted. In titles III and IV the Congress recognized that it was unjust to compel private persons to carry the full burden of instituting lawsuits to end discriminatory practices in schools and public facilities. The 1964 act empowered the Attorney General to file civil actions in Federal court to enjoin such discrimination. However, his authority is limited and hampered by two important restrictions which render it much less than adequate to meet the need. First, the Attorney General may not institute proceedings unless he receives a signed written complaint alleging that the writer is being denied his constitutional rights with respect to schools or public facilities. Second, the Attorney General may not sue, even if he does receive such a complaint, unless in his judgment the writer is "unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings for relief."

These two restrictions unduly circumscribe the Attorney General's authority. The first restriction—receipt of a written complaint—is objectionable because in many areas persons who seek to exercise their rights are unfamiliar with the written complaint requirement and thus do not know what they must do to obtain the services of the Attorney General to sue on their behalf. In some places persons whose rights are denied are subjected to intimidation by threats or force or the environment is hostile to the assertion of constitutional rights by citizens. In such places, many Negroes are simply afraid to complain to the Attorney General. The anomalous result under present law is that the Attorney General may be powerless to act in the very areas in which Federal intervention is most needed.

The second restriction—that private persons must be unable to bring suit on their own behalf—conflicts in principle with similar authority granted to the Attorney General to bring suits to enjoin discrimination in public accommodations, employment, and voting. In these other fields he is generally free to sue whenever he deems the public interest to require it, whether or not private aggrieved persons might be able to sue. There is no good and sufficient reason to treat school and public facility suits differently. The present law, by emphasizing the private and personal nature of this kind of litigation, loses sight of the great public interest in achieving desegregation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to remove these artificial barriers to effective Federal action to secure these fundamental rights. As the Supreme Court has said, these rights are warrants for the here and now—not abstract and pious hopes for a distant future time. Action now by this Congress is required to make the 14th amendment a reality throughout the land.

A SOLDIER'S LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the Shreveport Times published an editorial on March 13, which I would like to bring to the attention of all the Members for it concerns itself with one of our young men, still in his teens, serving in Vietnam, who has made an indelible contribution to the glory of this Nation.

I speak of Leslie Wells of Shreveport, La. He is not, at least not yet, one of the fabled heroes of the war with a chest full of ribbons to testify to his heroic feats. He is one of the countless thousands, as the editorial says, "whose endless bravery lies in the unseen, and thus, unsung daily monotony of going forth into jungles morning and night, knowing that the stake is to kill or to be killed."

I am proud of this young man. The Nation is proud of him. I would hope that a portion of his calm dedication will rub off on those who, sadly enough, belittle this struggle for freedom thousands of miles from our shores and, in their whinings, sometimes aid and comfort the enemy. I want my fellow Members of this body to share my pride in this youth and I commend this editorial to their attention.

> The courage and heroism of many young Americans fighting in Vietnam stands out glowingly even on battlefields where courage and heroism are the order of the day. The bronze placed on their breasts testifies to this—13 marines from 1 outfit decorated for combat bravery in 1 day; three Medals of Honor (the Nation's highest combat award) in a few weeks; dozens of other medals and citations. These are the men tapped by fate to be seen and sung—their gallantry and their deeds reported, their bravery put into official records.

But there are also the tens of thousands of American boys—mostly still teenagers—whose endless bravery lies in the unseen, and thus unsung, daily monotony of going forth into jungles morning and night, knowing that the stake is to kill or be killed.

What are the thoughts of these kids suddenly become men—their thoughts as to the enemy, their country, their folks at home, their God?

One of these teenagers is a former Shreveport Fair Park High School student who volunteered in the Marines at 17, was in combat and wounded as he turned 18, and now is recovering in a hospital in Japan, probably to return to combat before he is 19. The Times presents below excerpts from some of this youngster's letters home. We do not do so because he is something above and beyond his comrades in arms, but because he is not. He is just an American boy, suddenly called on to kill—and perhaps die—in his country's service. And it is because there are so many tens of thousands of American boys just like him that our country is certain to win this war in Vietnam.

Leslie Wells was like a lot of other Shreveport teenagers. He went to Fair Park High School and rooted for the Indians against Byrd. In the summer, he raised rabbits, learned how to drive the family car, and mowed neighborhood yards for spare change.

Last summer—Leslie's 18th—wasn't spent at home, but on the sandy soil of Chu Lai in South Vietnam. Leslie went into combat with the 3d Marine Division and was part of the outfit that handed the Communist Vietcong their first licking in years.

Sometime in January Leslie's patrol came under fire and he hit the ground. Unfortunately, he fell on a poisoned Vietcong bamboo stake. Leslie's going to be all right and is now recovering in an American military hospital in Japan. He wants to rejoin his unit as soon as possible in Vietnam.

Leslie's parents, Mr. and Mrs. O. E. Wells of 1828 Vivian Street, have let the Times see some of the many letters he sent home while in combat. Here are excerpts—the thoughts of a Shreveport boy who enlisted (volunteered) in the Marines at 17, was in combat and wounded after barely turning 18, and probably will be back in combat again before he is 19:

"I think we are winning the war down here. In more ways than one. These people have had a taste of freedom. They like it. They will fight to keep it and we want to help them."

* * * * *

"In this war, you have to go and find the Vietcong. It just isn't that easy. It's not the same kind of war. It's entirely different."

* * * * *

"Every now and then we are called upon to go on patrol. I go on every one I can. Why? I don't know."

* * * * *

"Sometimes we receive some action on patrol. Sometimes we don't. Usually the action, if there is any, comes on night patrol."

* * * * *

"When I'm under fire, I think about a lot of things. But mainly I think about my family * * * the people I love. Some of my buddies don't come back. When they don't come back it hurts. It really hurts."

* * * * *

"Some of the Vietcong don't really want to fight us. They are forced to do it. Then you have the hard-core. They want to fight. These are the ones who hit you and then stay and fight. They don't hit and run."

* * * * *

"The thing that really depresses me are the draft-card burners and the anti-Vietnam demonstrators. They don't know what they are talking about. They really don't. They act like selfish children."

* * * * *

"How is old Candy doing?" (At home Candy was Leslie's dog.)

* * * * *

"I know that I am fighting for a good cause, and I'm proud to be able to help these people in an American way * * * in every way possible."

* * * * *

"When I got Dianne's (Leslie's younger sister) picture, we were in the middle of moving (chasing the Vietcong), and it was raining, and I had to throw it away. Send another one please."

* * * * *

"For a shower, the first 3 months, we got our bath out of our helmets. 'Horse-baths' were what we called them. Now we have a 50-gallon barrel mounted on a stand. You pull the nozzle on the hose and you get wet * * * and cold. But a lot of the units are still getting horse-baths."

* * * * *

"Being in Vietnam has taught me to be a man and act like a man. It makes me real proud to be living in a free country like the United States of America."

* * * * *

"On Sunday I make a special effort to go to church. It makes me feel better to go."

* * * * *

"At Chu-Lai, where I am, there is no such thing as 16:30 liberty for anybody. Really a person is on duty 24—might say 25—hours a day."

* * * * *

"When mail call is sounded, the war kind of seems to stop."

* * * * *

"I'm sure that all my buddies will back me up in saying thanks for all the support we're getting from everywhere—the blood donors, books, candy, letters."

* * * * *

"It's hotter than heck out here. Too hot. I had a mild case of sunstroke yesterday. Over and OK today."

* * * * *

"I can't seem to get clean. And this sand (around Chu-Lai) gets into everything. We have to clean our weapons constantly."

* * * * *

"The USO shows are always appreciated. I saw Bob Hope and he was great."

* * * * *

"Most people joke about my southern drawl. Call me such things as 'Swamp Rat' and 'Alligator Wrestler.' All in fun, of course."

* * * * *

"Are all the kids (Leslie has three sisters at home) making good grades?"

* * * * *

"It (the war) has taught me to carry my burden * * * to do my part. I sleep at night."

* * * * *

And Americans sleep better in their homes, too, because of Leslie Wells—and tens of thousands of American boys like him.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide that certain sick leave accumulated by the civil service employees shall be granted as creditable service for the purposes of computing retirement annuities for Federal employees.

We have heard often in recent year that measures are needed to help curb increasing abuses of sick leave benefits. We have also heard often that some form of reward should be given to employees who use their sick leave sparingly, saving the Federal Government money which would otherwise be needed to hire substitute employees.

My bill should assist greatly in reducing abuses and in rewarding loyal employees. The sick leave an employee accrues has value during his career as a form of income insurance. It does not have any residual value upon retirement and some employees retire with over 2,000 hours of sick leave for which they receive not a penny.

I think that this sick leave should have a residual value; not an immediate cash value which would be paid to the employee, but something more permanent as a reward.

The granting of this time toward retirement computations would not be very expensive for the Federal Government. For example, an employee with 2,100 hours of sick leave to his credit at retirement would receive an additional annuity which would be approximately 2 percent of his high 5-year average salary for each year of his life after his retirement. This is less than half what it would cost the Government if each employee used all of his sick leave during his working life.

I think this is a fringe benefit that our employees deserve. It should assist administrators in controlling abuses of sick leave privileges, yet will not cost the Federal Government great sums of money.

CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the announcement of the program made by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, I would like to advise that it was made subject to rules being granted. I now understand that only one of the rules mentioned for Wednesday and the balance of the week was granted, and we shall amend the program accordingly.

A rule was granted on H.R. 10607 to reimburse certain moving expenses of Federal employees, and this bill will be programed for Wednesday and the balance of the week. The others will not be on the program for next week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT STUDENT LOANS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, after the introduction of the the Higher Education Amendments of 1966, H.R. 13174 and H.R. 13237, the Special Subcommittee on Education began a series of public hearings to learn the views of the administration, our colleges and universities, and the banking community. This legislation contains the administration's recommendations for the extension and funding of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as well as certain amendments making considerable revisions in the National Defense Education Act, title II student loan program. John E. King, president of Kansas State Teachers College, representing the American Council on Education, described this latter provision as follows:

> At the risk of oversimplifying, we suggest that the basic proposition in the pending bill is to terminate, as quickly as possible—even this year if possible—the National Defense Education Act program and substitute for it a program in which all student loan needs would be met through the commercial lending market.

Many college presidents and student aid officers across the Nation have expressed deep concern about this proposed drastic change in the National Defense Education Act student loan program. Reflecting the viewpoint of many is this statement by a Georgia student counselor:

> The President's cuts in budget eliminating National Defense Education Act loans for college students has "panicked" some of my former counselees (now in college and borrowing National Defense Education Act funds) and some planning to enroll in college next year. At least two institutions have announced to their student bodies that no money will be available from this source next year. I cannot see cutting out this most worthwhile program in order to begin others of dubious quality and success.

It was not, however, until we heard the views of the representatives of the higher educational community this week that there was full appreciation of the extreme urgency of the situation. To demonstrate this urgency may I quote the statement of the American Council of Education:

> It is now mid-March. Colleges and universities have made moral commitments to hundreds of thousands of their students and must be in a position in 2 or 3 weeks to assure them of an ability to meet those commitments if the students do their part by maintaining satisfactory records. An ability to make firm commitments, also within the next 2 or 3 weeks, to prospective freshmen and transfer students is even more essential.

Witnesses following the council also drew attention to the fact that a decision was necessary within the next week or two. Telegrams and letters from college and university presidents, deans and administrators joined in this plea. The following telegram is indicative of ones received from colleges and universities in every area of the country:

> Urgently request on behalf of large number of our students that every possible effort be made to continue national defense student loan program full scale through next fiscal year. It appears to us simply impossible otherwise to avoid chaotic situation and severe cutback in educational opportunities for needy students both old and new. I assure you this is of major and serious importance. If planning could begin soon for fiscal 1968 it might be possible to be ready in time, but fiscal 1967 is already an emergency problem.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> Elvis J. Stahr,
> *President, Indiana University.*

At the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent to have other letters and telegrams made a part of the Record as well as much of the relevant testimony presented to the subcommittee.

These messages and pleas indicating that utter chaos would result on college campuses across the Nation, left the subcommittee with no alternative. It became abundantly clear that the subcommittee needed to act and act immediately.

In executive session today, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee unanimously adopted a resolution expressing the subcommittee's determination to continue the National Defense Education Act title II student loan program without revision for the next fiscal year at the full authorization of $190 million for Federal capital contributions to college and university revolving funds.

This will, hopefully, enable college and university student aid officers to make commitments to students during the months of March and April for next year as they have done in the past and must continue to do if needy students are to have opportunities for higher education. Unless the subcommittee took some affirmative step such as we did, this, according to all of the evidence, would not have been possible. The subcommittee views the Federal commitment to higher education with great pride, but also as a moral commitment to colleges and universities and to the youth of this Nation. The subcommittee could not allow the confidence our students and colleges have in the Congress and in the Federal program to be undermined nor could they participate in what could have developed into a congressional breech of faith.

The colleges and universities have made their position abundantly clear.

Under unanimous consent I include the following telegrams and letters:

Eugene, Oreg.,
March 14, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your vigorous support to preserve the national defense student loan program. To discontinue or change this excellent source of student financial aid without careful planning could be disastrous for Oregon students.

R. E. Lieuallen,
Chancellor Oregon State
System of Higher Education.

Eugene, Oreg.,
March 15, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Amendments to the national defense student loan program now being considered by your subcommittee leave institutions without sufficient loan funds at a crucial time in the financial aid calendar. Not only will students seeking loans for next year be left without definite sources of funds but also institutions will experience impossible problems in packaging financial aid as is required, for example, in the granting of educational opportunity grants. To amend the program now on without careful thought and planning will, throw Oregon's financial aid community into complete chaos and will render it incapable of serving students in their quest for educational funds. National defense student loans, a Federal commitment to students, must be preserved. Please support the program with all your energy and ability.

David Johnson,
Executive Secretary,
Oregon State Scholarship Commission.

Albany, N.Y.,
March 16, 1966.

The Honorable Edith Green,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of 157 colleges and universities in the State of New York urgently request national defense student loan program remain unchanged for this year continuing $190 million appropriation.

Lester W. Ingall,
Executive Secretary Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York.

Columbia, Mo.,
March 17, 1966.

Representative Edith Green,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly urge that the national defense student loan program be funded at the full $190 million authorized for 1966–67. A marked reduction at this time would cause widespread disruption and the students with the greatest need would be the ones hardest hit. In 1965–66, our Missouri banks are loaning more money to University of Missouri students than we have had available from NDSL. Hence if NDSL is continued as authorized and the banks pick up the ever-increasing demands for loans, we would have a working combination which would more nearly meet the students' needs.

Elmer Ellis,
President, University of Missouri.

Chicago, Ill.,
March 17, 1966.

Congresswoman Edith Green,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.:

The Association for Higher Education of NEA urges continuation of NDEA loan program for the coming year while thoroughly studying the feasibility of the administration proposal.

C. R. Carpenter,
Association for Higher Education.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
March 17, 1966.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I want to urge strongly that the NDEA loan program be renewed unchanged for next year as soon as possible. Colleges are already admitting new students for entrance in September and thousands of needy students across the country will be denied admission if the present uncertainties of the guaranteed loan program are allowed to affect admission and financial aid decisions.

FRED L. GLIMP,
Dean of Admissions and Financial Aids,
Harvard University.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
March 17, 1966.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Title II of H.R. 13174 seems to us an awkward and unduly complicated way to assure the availability of student loans for 1966–67 on national defense student loan program terms. We understand the need for these mechanisms would be obviated if Congress would appropriate for fiscal year 1967 the full amounts authorization by title II of the National Defense Education Act. It seems to us that the Office of Education, the banks, and colleges and universities are going to have more than enough to do in the year ahead to implement the insured loan program under title IV, part B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 without having to worry about discontinuity or cumbersome new features of the national defense student loan program. Accordingly, we urge that title II of H.R. 13174 not be enacted and that the full amounts authorized under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 be appropriated for fiscal year 1967.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
By DAVID B. H. MARTIN,
Assistant to the President for Government Relations.

MEDFORD, MASS.,
March 16, 1966.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Tufts University urges continuation of national defense loans at least at present level. As a director of mass help I have heard numerous representatives of banks express great doubt that they will be able or willing to meet student loan demands in present credit situation should National Defense Education Act be canceled or appropriation reduced. Since there will be no analysis of family need for guaranteed loans beyond $15,000 adjusted income determination, request for interest-free loans should rapidly rise far over present level. We think that lower income families are least likely to approach banks for loans or receive them if they do, in a scarcity situation.

Many colleges have demonstrated competence and skill in administering loans according to need. (Although Tufts has loaned over $1.5 million to 1,500 students, at last report only 21 Tufts students were $2,626 overdue on defense loans.) We urge that colleges be permitted to continue to assist deserving students by awarding air packages that include long-term loans, as well as scholarships and jobs.

GRANT E. CURTIS,
Director of Financial Aid,
Tufts University.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
March 17, 1966.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Essential that National Defense Education Act loan program continue unchanged. Commitments must be made immediately to assure financial support for deserving students.

H. E. LONGENECKER,
President, Tulane University.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
March 17, 1966.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge that present program of National Defense Education Act college student loans be continued. Prompt action on this program is necessary to clear up confusion among students presently applying for loans so they can make firm plans for their college education without financial hardship.

H. R. JOLLEY,
President, Loyola University.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 16, 1966.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Because of lateness of date and imminence of time for financial aid commitment by colleges and scholarship sponsoring agencies like ours, we urge that full National Defense Education Act student loan allocations be continued for the coming academic year. We also urge that direct allocations to colleges for student loans be continued permanently for low-income students.

RICHARD L. PLAUT,
President, National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students.

BLOOMINGTON, IND.,
March 15, 1966.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request on behalf of large number of our students that every possible effort be made to continue national defense student loan program full scale through next fiscal year. It appears to us simply impossible otherwise to avoid chaotic situation and severe cutback in educational opportunities for needy students, both old and new. I assure you this is of major and serious importance. If planning could begin soon for fiscal 1968 it might be possible to be ready in time, but fiscal 1967 is already an emergency problem.

Respectfully,

ELVIS J. STAHR,
President, Indiana University,

NOTRE DAME, IND.,
March 16, 1966.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Absolutely crucial that national defense loan program be continued one more year so as not to leave a complete blank this year. Ninety banks invited to discuss program and only two appeared.

Regards,

Father TED HESBURGH, CSC.

MOORHEAD, MINN.,
March 16, 1966.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you reestablish national defense student loans at full $194 million at least for this year. H.R. 13174 not practical. Too much redtape, private sector credit too tight. We need to commit financial aid now.

Guarantee loan program sounds interesting but to expect it to work this year is just not reasonable. Please advise me of your position.

EDWARD N. ELLENSON,
Director of Financial Aids,
Concordia College.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
March 16, 1966.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Scholarship and Loan Committee of the Ohio State University has requested that I inform you of our concern over the possible discontinuation of the National Defense Student Loan program. We do not believe that the bank programs for students can be fully operative in time to serve students next fall. We respectfully encourage you to consider a 1-year continuation of the National Defense Loan Program as it now exists and also suggest that procedures be established for an orderly transition to the Bank Loan Program.

NOVICE G. FAWCETT,
President, Ohio State University.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
March 14, 1966.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge congressional approval National Defense Student Loan program in present form for at least 2 additional years until realistic procedures can be developed for orderly phaseout in favor of proposed guaranteed loan program for students.

CHANNING M. BRIGGS,
Dean of Students.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
March 15, 1966.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Modification of present National Defense Education Act loan program detrimental to our financial aid operation. Strongly urge continuance of present program.

JAMES H. JENSEN,
President, Oregon State University.

EUGENE, OREG.,
March 17, 1966.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Member of Congress, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge continuation of National Defense Education Act loan program. If phaseout contemplated, urge delay of one academic year to permit developments of regulations and operational details and suggest 3-year operational period to permit most students presently financing college through the plan to complete study for degree sought.

HOWARD L. RAMEY,
Director of Financial Aid,
University of Oregon.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *March 15, 1966.*

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Believe certain proposals to national defense student loan program would be extremely detrimental to our financial assistance program. Our experience leads us to oppose any modifications in national defense student loan program as provided in Higher Education Act, 1965. Strongly urge therefore resistance to any changes now under discussion.

DAN W. POLING,
Dean of Men and Chairman Financial Aids Committee, Oregon State University.

Forest Grove, Oreg.,
March 17, 1966.

The Honorable Edith Green,
Congresswoman, State of Oregon, Room B346B, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Any assistance which you can give to clouded issue of national student defense loan program will be appreciated. Those of us working with students are very frustrated concerning the financing for next September. We need to make firm commitments now and are unable to do so under present conditions. Keep up the good work.

G. E. Reese,
Dean of Admissions, Pacific University.

Monmouth, Oreg.,
March 16, 1966.

Congresswoman Edith Green,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Green: I hope you will support NDEA student loans as they are, until actual establishment of an alternative guaranteed loan program. All indications are that such an alternative program cannot be established to protect students for fall of 1966.

Leonard W. Rice,
President, Oregon College of Education.

Portland, Oreg.,
March 15, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Congress, Washington, D.C.:

Cascade would encounter numerous problems with NDSL amendments. Strongly urge defeat. Thank you.

Thomas A. Leupp,
President, Cascade College.

Portland, Oreg.,
March 15, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Oregon financial aid officers need funds available at once under national defense student loan program as amended November 1965. Higher Education Amendments 1966 not feasible in time to save 1966–67 aid program.

Jean Hunt,
Financial Aid Administrator, Lewis & Clark College.

Portland, Oreg.,
March 15, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request your efforts to preserve existing national defense student loan program at $190 million. Very helpful here. Urge deletion National Defense Education Act provisions from 1966 amendments.

John R. Howard,
President, Lewis & Clark College.

Ashland, Oreg.,
March 15, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Nearly 10 percent Southern Oregon College students in all classes are depending on National Defense Education Act loans. At Southern Oregon College it would be catastrophic to lose this program. Institutionally we have no resources to fill even a small fraction of the need.

Mable Winston,
Associate Dean of Students Financial Aids Institutional Representative.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
March 14, 1966.

Representative Edith Green,
Washington, D.C.:

Very strongly urge continuation of present national defense student loan program. Amendments being considered detrimental to progress gained by Public Law 89–329. Present national defense student loan program designed to assist students. Vital to continue student emphasis.

Frank Jonasson,
Assistant Dean of Men, Student Loan Officer, Oregon State University.

Salem, Oreg.,
March 16, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The national events loans programs has worked well for our institution, would urge its continuance in its present form.

Richard Petrie,
Financial Vice President, Willamette University.

Portland, Oreg.,
March 14, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly favor continuation of NDEA loans for year or two, until guaranteed loans are available in the State.

Sister Marion Gerard,
Financial Aid Officer, Marylhurst College.

Mount Angel, Oreg.,
March 16, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.:

Extremely important that the National Defense Student Loan program continue for the next few years or until suitable agency has been established to replace it. It will be impossible for many of our students to attend college next year should the loan program be curtailed now. We strongly favor the continuance of the present program until another at least as adequate can be provided.

Sister Albert Dieker,
Mount Angel College.

Portland, Oreg.,
March 14, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge defeat NGSL amendment. Legislation present program great. We need it as it is.

Sincerely,

Miles H. Barbur,
Financial Aid Office, Cascade College.

La Grande, Oreg.,
March 14, 1966.

Congresswoman Edith Green,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Eastern Oregon College strongly recommends continuation of National Defense Education Act loans for 1966–67.

Roy L. Skeen,
Financial Aids Officer, Eastern Oregon College.

Klamath Falls, Oreg.,
March 14, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

At Oregon Technical Institute we are in dire need of national defense student loan funds for the next year as we are planning commitments on these types of loans at this time. This is our only source of long-term loan funds, therefore is very important to our students as a financial aid. Helping them in their educational endeavors your assistance in this respect will be greatly appreciated.

Frank D. Stanko,
Director of Placement and Director of Financial Aids, Oregon Technical Institute.

New York, N.Y.,
March 16, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Special Subcommittee on Education of House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request you use your best efforts to extend National Defense Education Act student loan program in present form for at least 1 year even if new form is desirable. Time is needed to perfect banking arrangements for our students who require commitments now or very soon. Current interest rate rise make situation more difficult.

James M. Hester,
President, New York University.

Tampa, Fla.,
March 17, 1966.

Mrs. Edith Green,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The University of South Florida has 900 students who borrowed $500,000 of National Defense Education Act loans this year. Next year we need $600,000 for 1,100 students. Total enrollment 8,000 this year 9,000 next year. Appreciate your support for continuing National Defense Education Act program.

John S. Allen,
President, University of South Florida.

East Lansing, Mich.,
March 16, 1966.

Mrs. Edith Green,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

We urge your committee to extend the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act for at least one more year.

John A. Hannah.
President, Michigan State University.

Bangor, Maine,
March 15, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Chairman, House Special Subcommitteee on Education, Washington, D.C.:

Husson College accredited by the accrediting commission for business schools participates in NDEA student loan program. We are opposed to its discontinuance. Many young people being educated who otherwise would not have opportunity.

James L. Wright,
Director of Guidance, Husson College.

Indianapolis, Ind.,
March 16, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.:

Urge continuation of NDSL in tax through authorization in amount of $194 million for 1967 fiscal year. Strongly recommend Congress appropriate such funds. H.R. 13174 not adequate substitute. Timing problems make section 202 and 203 provisions of alternate proposal impractical.

Mrs. Josephine Ferguson,
Executive Secretary, State Scholarship Commission of Indiana.

Brunswick, Maine,
March 15, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Colleges and universities administering National Defense Education Act loan programs gently involved in detailed planning for administration of program during academic year 1966–67 in view of the necessity for them to make operational plans and the lateness of the calendar, I urge continuation of National Defense Education Act loan program unchanged for coming year.

James S. Coles,
President, Bowdoin College.

Franklin, Ind.,
March 15, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge continued national defense student loan for $195 million. Sections 202 and 203 of H.R. 13174 will not be adequate to meet needs of students national defense student loans commitments already made by many colleges. Out of necessity, feel that sections 202 and 203 of H.R. 13174 for 1966–67 will hurt guaranteed loan plans through banks. At later date, recommended phaseout procedure as originally planned.

Wesley N. Ahines,
President, Franklin College.

Stanford, Calif.,
March 12, 1965.

Hon. Edith Green,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Green: I am writing to support you in your protest over the discontinuation of the National Defense Education Act loan program. I personally am not affected, but over 1,200 students now attending Stanford University will be, many of whom may not be able to return next year without the loans now available.

What kind of students are these? Many are from low-income families for whom these loans mean a chance to rise above the poverty of their childhood. There is a terrible hypocrisy in this situation when on the one hand the administration speaks on a war on poverty and on the other hand acts in direct opposition to its words. People are not so stupid that they will not see this for what it is. Many others are former servicemen who cannot qualify under present policies for educational benefits. Others are married men with families who can find no other source of income adequate to their needs.

Even if the alternative plan of Government-guaranteed loans were financially adequate, it would not be nearly as desirable as the present situation. Those who are in need of money have found the university a friend to deal with, a friend who understands their particular problems. I doubt whether private sources could assume this place.

I hope you will continue your attempt to force the continuance of this vitally important program. Without those funds, many thousands of students, and this is no exaggeration, will be unable to complete their education. You can be sure that the vast overwhelming bulk of the university and college population support your efforts.

Thank you very much for your defense of the loan program; I only hope you can succeed.

Sincerely yours,

Gordon I. Black,
Department of Political Science,
Stanford University.

California State Scholarship Commission,
Sacramento, Calif., March 8, 1966.

To: Congresswoman Edith Green.
From: Arthur S. Marmaduke.
Subject: Administration proposal for Federal student loans for 1966–67 (H.R. 13174).

On Thursday and Friday, March 3 and 4, I attended a meeting of the Advisory Committee on the National Student Aid Problems of the College Scholarship Service. The meeting was called originally to consider the consequences of the proposal in the Federal budget to terminate national defense student loans and to rely completely on guaranteed loans but was changed to review the new administration proposal introduced on March 1. The administration plan was presented by the Assistant Secretary for Legislation of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Associate Commissioner for Higher Education and was commented upon by the Director of the Commission on Federal Relations of the American Council on Education.

In this memorandum I will attempt to describe accurately and briefly the basic elements of the proposal without attempting a comprehensive analysis. H.R. 13174, in part, is a series of amendments to title II of the National Defense Education Act. Among other things, it contains the following provisions:

1. $190 million would be available for National Defense Education Act loans for 1966–67; $150 million of this would be for revolving fund capital advances to colleges and $40 million in loan guarantee assurances.

2. Colleges would be eligible to get Federal capital advances only if they could certify to the Commissioner of Education that they cannot borrow directly from lending institutions.

3. For institutions that are able to borrow directly from lending institutions, the Federal Government would subsidize the difference between the interest paid by the student and the interest which the college had to pay on the money.

4. The Federal Government would continue to pay one-half of the administrative costs up to 1 percent of the amount of the loans.

5. Each student borrower must assign the Federal share of all his notes, past and present, to the Commissioner of Education, who would then sell them to an organization such as the Federal National Mortgage Association. There seems to be some argument as to whether these funds in excess of $150 million would go directly into the treasury or whether they would be available for a loan revolving fund.

6. Colleges would be required to return all of the Federal Government's share of repayments to the Commissioner of Education.

7. There would be a new allocation procedure for national defense loans which would take into consideration the existence of a guaranteed loan program within a State, etc.

In addition, the U.S. Office of Education will write a letter of assurance to all colleges telling them that the Federal Government plans to maintain the flow of credit for students.

My brief and expurgated observations are these:

1. Colleges and students have placed great reliance on national defense student loans in the last 8 years.

2. Applications for national defense student loans were requested by the U.S. Office of Education as part of a tripartite application for loans, educational opportunity grants, and the work-study grants early this year. The U.S. Office of Education has promised to allocate these funds by March 30.

3. Some California colleges, placing reliance on the existence of the national defense student loan program, have promised loans to students already.

4. Virtually every 4-year college in the State has planned to give new and returning students assurances concerning their loans for 1966–67 during the early spring of this year.

5. A great deal of damage has been done. There is uncertainty among students and colleges as to how they will finance the academic year 1966–67. The problem is compounded because the Federal educational opportunity grants by law limited to one-half of the student's assistance and the other half must come from a scholarship or a loan. Many colleges have planned to match the educational opportunity grants with national defense student loans.

6. The time sequence for the administration proposal is tenuous and late. The bill must be heard in committees, passed by both Houses, and probably go to conference. Rules and regulations would have to be drawn and published in the Federal Register. It would take time for the colleges to comprehend the full meaning of the new plan (by the time it is passed it might be early summer) and colleges would have to go through the routine of attempting to borrow or certifying that they are unable to borrow funds and file new applications. The money or an allocation would probably arrive too late to allow students and colleges to complete their financial plans in any reasonable time prior to fall enrollment.

7. The administration proposal seems uncertain as to intent and implication and much too late to be fully analyzed and comprehended.

8. The representatives of the banks have indicated their uncertainty about the banks' capacity to handle the additional credit, the refinancing and the absorption of approximately $800 million in outstanding notes.

9. It seems to me the new administration proposal at this date at least is not a viable substitute for national defense student loans and there must be at the very least an immediate 1-year extension of the program so an orderly transition to guaranteed loans can be planned and the need for continuation in part of the national defense student loans studied.

I would recommend that the State and each segment of higher education take the initiative to contact our congressional delegation urging another year of the national defense student loans. I would further urge we support the position of the American Council on Education which plans to work with congressional committees and to ask for maintenance of the present program and $190 million in direct national defense loans for 1966–67 and the deferring of the refinancing and repayment proposals in H.R. 13174. I understand the American Council on Education has talked to the congressional leadership and is cautiously optimistic about maintenance of the present loan program in 1966–67 and a reasonably quick appropriation of funds.

Associated Students
University of Washington,
Seattle, Wash., March 7, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green: Upon receiving notice of President Johnson's intention of terminating the National Defense Education Act loan program, a petition was circulated in the University of Washington community.

The petition strongly urging that means be found to continue the loan services of the National Defense Education Act has been sent to the office of the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson. Endorsement of this petition has been expressed in the signatures of several thousand students, administration and faculty members of the University of Washington.

We support your efforts to achieve continuance of the essential and widely functioning National Defense Education Act loan services.

Yours truly,
National Defense Education Act Loan Petition Committee.
Jock Heverling,
National Defense Education Act Loan Petition Coordinator.
Judd Kirk,
Member of Associated Students University of Washington Board of Control.
Al Pick,
Associated Students University of Washington First Vice President.

McKenzie College,
March 12, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Green: May I add our voice to those urging a continuation of the national defense student loan program as presently constituted? McKenzie College is a nonprofit institution, accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools as a 2-year business school. We have been awarded a fund of $100,000 for the current college year under this program, and it has been put to excellent use.

Approximately 75 percent of the fund has to date been committed to about 100 students in McKenzie College. Since this institution has always catered primarily to young people right out of high school in the largely rural, and sometimes quite distressed, areas, I am convinced that these youngsters would not have been able to go to college anywhere were it not for this National Defense Education Act fund assistance.

We have applied for twice the above amount for next year because of the tremendous need in our section (it borders the Appalachian region). In our current recruiting program we are finding two to three times as many who will need this help as we did last year. In our function of locating bright, deserving young people in our area of service, we bring them into our community, train them in 1 to 2 years, and then help place them in good jobs. We are currently receiving around 10 calls for good jobs for every 1 person we have to send out. These young people, for the most part, have neither the time nor the funds for a 4-year college education. We are, therefore, filling a real need for the type of student for which many of the federally sponsored programs in education today are designed.

The guarantee loan programs enacted last year still have not been implemented, and we are unable to obtain any real information regarding them. Cutting off the National Defense Education Act program now would, therefore, work a real hardship on several hundred youngsters in this section who have been counting on this aid and who probably would be unable to attend without it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,
Roy McKenzie, Jr.,
President.

Oakland University,
Rochester, Mich., March 12, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Green: I wish strongly to urge your opposition to the phasing out of the National Defense Education Act loan program. From my work as financial aids officer at Oakland University, it is my conviction that our students will suffer enormously by the removal of this program, and it will indeed be our most needy students who will be the most hurt.

The dedication of the banks to their custom of approving loan requests on our Michigan Higher Education Assistance Authority program only for their own preferred customers; the bankers' candid lack of enthusiasm for the guaranteed loan program; and the banks' insistence on evaluating a student's application not in terms of the student's future but of his parents' past, all indicate the failure of the banks to share the view of the Government of the need to help make higher education available to all who qualify to pursue it.

It is, therefore, with most serious concern that I wish to urge you to work for the continuation of the National Defense Education Act loan program.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Gladys B. Rapoport.

County of Wallowa,
State of Oregon,
Enterprise, February 26, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congresswoman Green: A matter has been brought to my attention which I feel concerns every public-minded individual. I understand that the funds for the national defense loan program may be eliminated.

As a public official dealing frequently with young people, I cannot help but feel that as a nation we cannot make a much better contribution than that of contributing to the education of our youth.

As you probably know, I am not a supporter of government hand-out programs. For this reason, I have always supported the national defense loan program because it requires repayment of the funds by the individuals involved.

It appears to me that most of our programs now are aimed at aiding the wealthy and talented youngster and the poor and untalented rather than the average. I feel that we are overlooking our very best potential in America by doing this.

I will appreciate hearing from you in regard to this matter, and will most certainly appreciate your help in maintaining these funds for the education of our youth.

Sincerely yours,
S. J. Farris,
County Judge.

St. Benedict's College,
Atchison, Kans., March 14, 1966.

Representative Edith Green,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Green: As you well know, President Johnson is proposing a phase-out of the national defense student loan program.

It is my belief that the present system of loans is more than adequate; in fact, I am definitely opposed to any tampering with this highly successful program. I fear that this new section of H.R. 13174 would not only cripple the efforts of many colleges in their loan programs, but would kill them.

St. Benedict's College had no loan for students until the National Defense Education Act provided one.

One of the great strengths of the present system is the very efficient and inexpensive institutional handling of the loan funds. I feel that officials of the colleges are well qualified to manage student National Defense Education Act loans. I am convinced that the program as recently amended is the best means of really helping needy students get an education at extremely low cost to the Government.

The enclosed copy of the report of Senator Ralph Yarborough's viewpoint echoes my own.

Representative Green, your positive action against this section would greatly assist the work of higher education.

Sincerely,
Father Alcuin Hemmen, O.S.B.,
President.

University of Detroit,
Detroit, Mich., March 1, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congresswoman Green: It has come to my attention that the President is planning to completely eliminate the national defense student loan program. This is indeed an unfortunate decision. A college education is becoming more necessary every day while the price of this education is rising every year. Without the aid of these loans many students will be forced to drop out of school.

It must be remembered that this program is a loan program and that these loans are repaid with interest. The price of this program to the American taxpayer is small indeed compared to the price our country will have to pay if a college education becomes an education for the rich alone.

As a college freshman, I strongly urge you to vote against any bill to eliminate the national defense student loan program if such a bill should come before your special subcommittee on education of the House Committee on Labor and Education or if it should come before the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
Michael G. Carroll.

Centre College of Kentucky,
Danville, Ky., March 4, 1966.

Hon. Edith Green,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Green: You will find attached a copy of a resolution brought forth from a recent regional meeting of college and university financial aid administrators. It relates to the proposed shift of the National Defense Education Act and health professions student loan programs to the new program of federally guaranteed private loans. I am writing my personal support of the resolution, and request your earnest attention to the matter.

I cannot believe that Congress will allow any necessary tightening of the purse strings to be borne by our college students. The National Defense Education Act and the guarantee loan programs have different purposes; the first for the needy student with little or no family support, and the latter for the middle-income family who can support their children but may need help obtaining the funds at the exact time of college attendance. The two programs can and should be mutually supportive. Elimination of the National Defense Education Act plan will ax the needy student. This would be a direct reversal from what Congress has been building in the last several years.

If some higher education funds must be trimmed, would it not be wiser to hold back on building and research programs which can be picked up again later rather than to close out the prospect of college attendance to many eligible students.

A sufficient appropriation to support the continuance of the National Defense Education Act loan program is as important now as it ever was or shall be. Can Congress forget that the origin and purpose of the national defense student loan program was "to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation," and "to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States?"

Yours very truly,

W. BARRY DIXON,
Financial Aid Officer.

ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1966.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The Association of State Colleges and Universities, at its annual meeting in Chicago on February 16, 1966, adopted a resolution calling for the extension and adequate funding of the National Defense Education Act student loan program. (The Association of State Colleges and Universities is comprised of 194 institutions enrolling approximately 1 million students.)

Presidents of member institutions attending the meeting expressed grave concern over the proposed termination of the National Defense Education Act student loan program and the substitution for it of a new guaranteed loan program. They felt the existing program should be continued pending an adequate trial of the guaranteed program to see if it, in effect, is capable of meeting the need of students who must borrow money in order to attend college.

In any event, early action by Congress is imperative because the colleges need to know what kinds of program or programs will be in effect so they can properly advise students and their parents without further delay.

I know that both the colleges and the students will be most appreciative of your efforts to resolve this situation at the earliest possible date.

Please let me know if our association can be of assistance to you.

Cordially,

ALLAN W. OSTAR,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT OF HARRY BARD, PRESIDENT, BALTIMORE JUNIOR COLLEGE, BALTIMORE, MD., REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

Title II of the bill deals with the proposed plan to amend the National Defense Education Act student loan program, and to shift this program, as far as possible, to a system of private and State financing rather than financing by the Federal Government.

In general, we wish to associate ourselves with the position of the American Council on Education in this matter. It is our belief that any system of student loans should be administered primarily in order to assist as many needy young people as possible. The proposed new plan, at best, could not take effect in most States soon enough so that colleges could make a commitment to students, including entering freshmen, for the fall of 1966. As the American Council has pointed out, most colleges will notify students within the next 2 or 3 weeks whether they may anticipate borrowing funds for the coming academic year for their education.

There is no possible way in which Congress could act on this matter in time to safeguard the interests of these students nor the moral commitment which the colleges wish to make to them. Nor could State and local governments, colleges, nor lending agencies possibly act soon enough to protect the interests of hundreds of thousands of students this fall. As you know, in many States legislatures are not in sessions, and neither State nor local governments could act to establish the necessary machinery even if the Federal law were passed and signed today. The only fair and meaningful solution appears to be to continue the present program for the coming year, and to carry out a very careful and thorough study, including representatives of the educational community, of all the advantages and disadvantages of alternative methods of financing the costs of education to the student. If another method is to be proposed for the fiscal year 1968, the experience of the last few months shows clearly that substantial lead time is needed to permit everyone at the State, local, and private level to act appropriately.

TESTIMONY OF MR. GEORGE HOUSER BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the testimony of Mr. George Houser before the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, George M. Houser, executive director of the American Committee on Africa, was among the witnesses this week at the hearings on apartheid and American relations with South Africa being held by the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which subcommittee I am the chairman.

Because of the wide interest in the subject, and Mr. Houser's standing as an authority in the field and spokesman for a committee representing some 18,000 Americans, I am extending my remarks to include the complete text of his statement, which follows:

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE M. HOUSER BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

I speak as executive director of the American Committee on Africa. Ours is a national membership organization with some 18,000 Americans affiliated. Our national committee and executive board include many prominent Americans who have leadership positions in political life, religious movements, labor civil rights, and student organizations.

In the more than a decade we have been in existence, our basic purpose has been to give expression to American sympathy with African aspirations for freedom and equality. We have continually worked for a governmental policy that would reflect this purpose. This is why we are grateful that you, Mr. Chairman, have called these hearings on U.S. policy toward South Africa.

We trust these hearings will lead to practical actions, and that those in the executive branch of the Government who feel the United States has far too long had a hesitant policy toward South Africa, will feel strengthened by the interest and action in the legislative branch these hearings may inspire.

Let me at the outset express my dismay about American policy toward South Africa. At best, one can characterize it as being a policy of reluctant concern. The United States has reluctantly been pushed by the African countries to state an increasing concern about the injustices in South Africa. But the United States has dragged its heels at almost every point. As has been pointed out by others, the United States has initiated no resolution of any sort in the debates at the U.N., in spite of the fact that South African items have been on the agenda since 1946, and apartheid specifically since 1952. It wasn't until 1958 that the United States voted with the majority to state regret and concern over apartheid. The record of U.S. action has been too little and too late. In 1963 the United States announced a policy of barring arms shipments. We applaud this position, but the measure came after South Africa had already established her own arms industry to the point that outside help was not all that essential.

If one compares the statements made by American spokesmen now in the U.N. with those 7 or 8 years ago, it is obvious there has been a shift for the better. But during this same period, the injustices of the apartheid regime have not only increased, but have become better known by the world. The outraged people of Africa are asking for much more than mere verbal condemnation. The U.S. policy lags as far today behind the demand for action by the African people as it did a decade ago, although the whole debate is now on a higher scale. Whereas a decade ago the United States was abstaining on resolutions in the U.N. asking for South Africa to reconsider its apartheid policy and to observe the U.N. Charter, now the United States will condemn apartheid but will abstain or vote negatively on any form of economic sanctions.

I have read carefully the testimony of Gov. G. Mennen Williams and Mr. Alexander Trowbridge. They fall well within the policy of "reluctant concern." They point to some of the positive actions the United States has taken such as the arms ban; disapproval of American performers appearing before segregated audiences (I hope someone from the Government expressed strong disapproval of Jack Nicklaus' recent golf exhibition matches with Gary Player before segregated galleries—if so, nothing was made public); canceling operational calls at South African ports by U.S. naval ships and aircraft. This is fine as far as it goes, but it doesn't begin to meet the crisis.

The United States has a divided mind in its policy toward South Africa. On the one hand, eloquent condemnatory statements are made about apartheid. In the last U.N. General Assembly debate, you, Mr. Chairman, very capably presented U.S. policy in one discussion when you said, "The policy of apartheid, 'racist in its origin and arrogant in its implementation,' is a violation of the charter and the declaration of human rights, and contains all the elements of a racial conflict which could seriously trouble peaceful progress on the African Continent and throughout the world." And Governor Williams, in his testimony before this subcommittee, said, "Time and again in recent years attempts to shine the light of free discussion on at least the dark places of apartheid excesses and absurdities have been shut off by the police power or the behind-the-scenes pressure of Afrikaans organization," or again, "while accommodation of conflicting aspirations and interests is vital, the forces within South Africa making for such accommodation are being repressed."

But on the other hand, it is pointed out that South African ports are highly useful to the U.S. Navy, that the tracking station facilities are important, that American business provides a useful channel of communication with influential South African private and official circles, that disinvestment might harden South African policies, that in any event American disinvestment would have no effect on the South African economy.

Time and again our general policy statements are contradicted by our actions. This looks like hypocrisy to much of the world.

It is not true to maintain that the United States can't do anything about apartheid. Rather, the will to do something effective is absent. The United States is the most powerful country in the world economically and militarily. It sounds ridiculous to most of the world for the United States to say: "we can't do anything effective." This just isn't believed. Certainly it isn't believed by Africans who see such vigorous commitment in the Dominican Republic or in Vietnam.

The official U.S. position on economic involvement in South Africa is "we neither encourage nor discourage investment." This, at a time when practically 80 percent of the people of South Africa have no voice in government, when nonwhite political movements are banned, when there may be as many as 8,000 political prisoners, when writers who describe torture used to gain confessions are imprisoned and editors who dare to print such stories are faced with possible imprisonment.

We neither encourage nor discourage investments at a time when South Africa is openly violating what I hope is an important part of present American policy in Africa; namely, support of economic sanctions against Rhodesia. Let me note that, just as the U.S. Government has made known that American oil companies are complying with sanctions, a Johannesburg newspaper announced daily oil shipments from South Africa to Rhodesia are taking place.

We neither encourage nor discourage investments in South Africa at a time when the South African Government is attempting to impose the hoax of "national homelands" on the African people, the one example to date being the Transkei. In the Transkei there is heavier dependence on white officials than before the territory's legislative assembly was set up; the area is not economically viable (the Transkei Government is dependent on South Africa for four-fifths of its budget and the people of the territory are almost completely dependent on jobs outside if they are to maintain themselves); the appointed officials to the assembly outnumber the elected members by 15 votes; the assembly has no jurisdiction over 17,000 whites in the European urban areas of the territory; no white capital is permitted to invest.

We neither encourage nor discourage at a time when, according to an article in the Wall Street Journal of February 15, a large American-owned manufacturing company in Port Elizabeth must maintain "three separate cafeterias for hourly workers—one each for whites, Africans, and coloreds." There are also three locker rooms and two first-aid stations, with signs reading "whites" and "nonwhites." These examples are not isolated.

We neither encourage nor discourage investments when collective bargaining is denied African workers, when the average wage for African miners amounts to about 67 cents a day, with a European average some 15 times higher; when in the motor industry (which has heavy American involvement) the average wage for Africans annually is $590 as over against $2,881 for Europeans, and in the rubber industry (also great American participation) Africans average $571, Europeans $3,430.

Who can take very seriously our protestations against apartheid when nothing much is done to implement them?

I refer only briefly in this statement to total sanctions, but I do not want to be misunderstood. In the last few years there have been a number of careful studies made of sanctions as a strategy against South Africa. These studies have not come to the conclusion that sanctions cannot work. Rather, they point out that it is not easy, that it would be expensive, that the effort would have to be universal, not just unilateral, that sanctions would probably not work quickly.

Thus serious discussion of sanctions seems to have been shelved for the moment. I predict that sanctions will be discussed again and again as universal condemnation against apartheid grows and as other tactics for inducing change in the regime in South Africa are shown to be indecisive. The claim is not made by advocates of sanctions that economic measures alone will bring about the desired result. What is claimed is that sanctions could blunt the violence of the coming struggle, but that they can be augmented by other measures.

The United States cannot ignore the possibility of sanctions, for two reasons.

Firstly, with the judgment of the International Court of Justice in the South-West Africa case imminent, the international community may be called upon to take action under the U.N. Charter to implement this decision. Economic sanctions are one type of action available. For a long time, spokesmen for our Government have given as either a reason or an excuse for lack of initiative on South Africa, the fact that the South-West Africa decision was due shortly. Perhaps the most important test of U.S. policy toward South Africa will come soon after the International Court renders its decision.

Secondly, sanctions against Rhodesia is an officially stated policy of the United States. The measures are having some effect on the Smith regime. U.S. spokesmen state this. I do not take the view that, limited as these economic measures are, they are having no effect. I would not expect them alone to bring about the desired political effect. But they can help. The testing time is coming soon. Although Rhodesia is not South Africa, if sanctions work even partially in Rhodesia and even without being universally applied under the U.N. charter, they must be seriously considered as a strategy against South Africa.

I will not dwell further on sanctions in this statement because I want to put my primary emphasis on initiatives the United States can put into effect now—unilaterally.

The United States, we are told, is in a worldwide contest for the minds of men. If so, then we are in danger of scratching ourselves from the South African race. "Reluctant concern" and "neither encourage nor discourage" investments and trade are not calculated to gain the confidence of the downtrodden, the minorities, the black victims of apartheid.

If a battle comes in South Africa, which side will the United States be on? Will the South African struggle escalate into a major world issue? It well could. With the independence of Bechuanaland, Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia, attacks may well come from the borders, as well as inside. Does the United States have to wait for this to happen before making clear its policy in action, not just words? There will be no question where the sympathies of the Communist powers will be in this conflict. Where will the United States be? Will the United States take the view that South Africa is a bulwark against the spread of communism in Africa? Will the United States take the view that the rebels in South Africa are under Communist domination, and are therefore our enemies?

We wrote in a pamphlet of the American Committee on Africa a few years ago ("The South African Crisis and U.S. Policy"): "If there is any chance of this, then South Africa will become the cold war issue which will cause the United States to lose all support from African-Asian countries. Therefore, it is of ultimate importance for the United States to commit itself now to the position that the present South African Government must be weakened and displaced as soon as possible by hopefully democratic elements in South Africa. If there is equivocation on adopting this policy now, it will be much more difficult to make a clear-cut decision at a later stage when the struggle has reached major international proportions and the tendencies for cold war divisions become much greater."

I earnestly hope the struggle in South Africa is not violent. To avoid bloodshed, however, the United States and other powers must recognize their responsibilities now. I would not claim that the unilateral policies which I will recommend would magically change things in South Africa. But they would help strengthen the resolve of other countries; they would win universal acclaim in the nonwhite world; they would help to save the soul of our own country.

My specific recommendations are based on the position that the United States should begin the process of disengagement with South Africa. Both morally and strategically, disengagement represents a sound policy for the United States. Dr. Henry Van Dusen, former president of Union Theological Seminary, put the issue well in its moral dimension in a letter to the New York Times when he said, "Every American who is a stockholder or depositor in commercial firms doing business in South Africa is indirectly a participant in the cruel repression of the majority of the South African populace, in the aggravation of violence, bloodshed, and brutality which daily increases, and it may well be, in the ultimate loss of American financial investment." He went on to quote a South African businessman who had said to him, "So long as U.S. banks and business back us, we can go ahead."

The United States can make unmistakably clear an antiapartheid policy by moving rapidly toward disengagement. This would do very little harm to the American economy. Collective disengagement would undoubtedly be an outgrowth of this policy. Therefore, I suggest the following specific action for the United States now:

1. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD DISENGAGE ITSELF FROM THE SOUTH AFRICAN ECONOMY

Disengagement should begin where there is greatest involvement: in the economic sphere, which is significant, as Mr. Trowbridge pointed out in his testimony. U.S. investments, according to his figures, amount to at least $600 million. We think his estimate conservative—2 years ago South Africa claimed more than $800 million from the dollar zone. We shall nonetheless stick by the Department of Commerce figures for the sake of argument. The sum of $600 million is 11 percent of all foreign investment in South Africa. Some 240 American firms are represented by these holdings. The average rate of profit, according to 1963 Department of Commerce figures, was 17.1 percent, a sum exceeded only by gains from investment in West Germany. U.S. exports to South Africa last year approached half a billion ($438 million) and imports were $225 million. Thus there was a favorable balance amounting to more than $200 million.

This involvement indicates both that adopting a policy of discouraging trade and investment may find resistance, and tha such a course would have significant effects.

Our reasons for recommending this policy are as follows:

(a) Our present trade and investment helps the South African economy and encourages the architects of apartheid. As Dr. Van Dusen has pointed out in his letter quoted earlier, South African business says, "So long as U.S. banks and business back us, we can go ahead." Mr. Trowbridge, in his testimony, belittles the contribution of American trade and investment, and the effect it would have on the South African economy if it were ended. It should be noted that in 1964, South Africa exported 18 percent of her good to the United States. Between 17 and 19 percent of South African imports in recent years were from the United States. This is second only to Britain in South Africa's total volume of trade. Furthermore, the South African imports from the United States were in economically strategic commodities. For example, one notes almost $12 million in petroleum and petroleum products in the first 11 months of 1965; over $15 million in chemical elements and compounds (one wonders if any of this can be used for explosives); almost $125 million in nonelectric machinery and over $83 million in transport equipment (can any of this possibly be converted for military use?).

Mr. Trowbridge points out quite rightly that the bulk of capital formation in South Africa is derived from domestic savings. Between 1955 and 1963 the net outflow of new capital that went to South Africa was only $9 million. The rest was from reinvestment. The $9 million outflow shows how profitable apartheid is—so profitable that little new outside capital apparently has to be found. But C. S. Richards, professor of economics at the University of Witwatersrand, stated at a 1961 conference of the International Economic Association that "it has been on the basis of oversea risk capital investment that domestic investment has been induced and stimulated, and national income and standards of living greatly increased." He made this statement while showing that domestic savings were even at that time, "accounting for 90 percent of total requirements."

American companies are heavily involved in major industries in South Africa. The U.S. oil companies have almost 50 percent of South African refining capacity; U.S. motor companies produce about 60 percent of all vehicles; American rubber companies (Goodyear and Firestone) dominate rubber production with Dunlop, a British company, being a major non-American firm. An American citizen controls 15 percent of South African gold and 20 percent of South African uranium production. As a prominent member of the Transvaal and Orange Free State Chamber of Mines, he is to some extent responsible for the recruiting system and wage structure for African mine labor.

We are not claiming that a withdrawal of American capital alone would destroy the South African economy. We are saying that American trade and investment are and have been of great value to South Africa's economic development.

(b) Our present trade and investment in South Africa discourages the opponents of apartheid. To the extent that American capital is of assistance to those who maintain the racist system, it is looked upon as inimical to the cause of those who struggle to bring the system down. Conversely, opponents of apartheid would be heartened by a policy of disengagement.

(c) Our present trade and investment in South Africa involves American business in basic compromises with democratic standards. The South African economy is based on cheap nonwhite labor. Unskilled workers (nonwhites) receive only 20 to 30 percent of skilled pay rate as compared to 60 to 80 percent in most industrial economies of the West. Nonwhite labor is kept both cheap and unskilled by a complex system of legislation including job reservation (jobs are reserved by racial category), limitation on apprenticeship training for nonwhites, the almost total lack of pension and unemployment plans for nonwhites, no collective bargaining for nonwhites. These are conditions business accepts.

In his statement Mr. Trowbridge defended American business involvement in apartheid by saying that "the maintenance of a significant business community in South Africa may provide a useful channel of communication with influential South African private and official circles."

We ask for proof. When has such a significant dialog taken place? How did it affect nonwhites for the better? Year by year we see U.S. involvement becoming more obvious and year by year we see increases in political and social repressions. What a curious dialog must be taking place.

It is easy to find quotes from the lips of American businessmen on the confidence they have in South Africa. It is difficult to find critical statements. For example, Mr. Milton P. Higgins, chairman of the Norton Co., of Worcester, Mass., said on the occasion of opening a new abrasives factory near Johannesburg in January 1965, "I think South Africa is going to remain a strong country, led by white people. I think foreign countries should leave South Africa alone. If they leave you alone you will get on and do a great job."

Mr. J. H. Fulford, president of the Jeffrey Co., of Ohio, said, when opening a new factory in Germiston in February 1965, "We have complete faith in the soundness of the South African economy, full confidence in the stability of your country, and know that the substantial investment we have made in the past and the further investment we are presently making are all in good care."

Gen. Lauris Norstad, retired NATO Supreme Commander, now president of Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp., recently in South Africa to negotiate new investments announced, "we have full confidence in South Africa—not only we as individuals but the United States and the American people as well."

Remarks such as these reinforce the basic convictions of opponents of apartheid that the United States is a willing partner in racism. All the USIS libraries in Africa will not blot out this shame.

The South Africa Foundation is an organization whose mandate is to advertise South Africa abroad. We would ask how many American businessmen are members of this body and wonder why the Foundation as a reciprocal "channel of communication" has declined to testify before this subcommittee.

(d) Ending trade with and investment in South Africa would not essentially hurt the United States. Investments are only 1 percent of our total foreign investments. Our trade with South Africa amounts only to 2 pecent of total foreign trade. Compared with the losses countries like India and Kenya suffered when they cut off trade with South Africa, the United States would hardly feel the change.

To implement a policy of disengagement we suggest the following:

First, as in the Rhodesian crisis, let the Government call leading businessmen involved in South African trade and investment together and ask compliance with a governmental policy of disengagement, emphasizing that continued trade with South Africa is contrary to the U.S. national interests. Some would comply, some would not; but at least a policy would be set.

Second, the bulk of U.S. exports to South Africa should be placed under the provisions of the Export Control Act. At the moment the principal control of trade with the Republic is the license system of the Munitions Board falling under the State Department. We recommend that trade with South Africa be placed, like that with Bulgaria for example, under a licensing system operated by the Department of Commerce in order to prevent the export of all goods and commodities which might be used in the defense of the regime. Defense of the regime should be broadly interpreted as including many of the Government's nonmilitary activities.

Third, legislation should be passed making it illegal for U.S. firms abroad to practice racial discrimination.

Fourth, could a system be devised of taxing companies continuing to do business in South Africa, perhaps by a special levy on dividends of the parent body in the United States, the proceeds to be used to aid victims of apartheid?

Fifth, financial disengagement with South Africa, to be successful, involves coordinating action with other countries. Therefore, we recommend that steps such as those above, be carried out with other countries, and that the U.N. be the forum for planning joint strategy.

2. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD ELIMINATE ALTOGETHER THE QUOTA FOR SOUTH AFRICAN SUGAR

It is shameful that this Congress and this administration could have, a few short months ago, agreed to increase subsidies to South African sugar producers. The annual quota was raised from 20,000 metric tons to 48,000 tons—and that was a compromise with the administration, which had recommended a quota of 96,000 tons.

No South African sugars were imported into the United States before 1962. But between 1966 and 1971, South Africa will be the 10th largest quota sugar exporter to America. I might note that a considerably larger movement of this commodity enters this country (183,837 tons in 1964) in the nonquota category.

Even more amazing is that, in order to meet our quotas, South Africa has occasionally imported sugar from the Dominican Republic and elsewhere.

Congress could not have been altogether unconscious of these startling developments. Senator Morse drew attention to them only last fall when he proposed lowering the South African quota to 10,000 tons. His amendment was defeated by a voice vote. The lobbyist to whom part of South Africa's success must be credited was John R. Mahoney from the law firm of Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, in New York. In 1965, Mr. Mahoney received $19,320 from the South African Sugar Association. In 1964, the firm received a fee of $24,000.

May I remind this committee that one of the purposes of the Sugar Act was to "permit nearby friendly foreign countries to participate equitably in supplying the U.S. sugar market for the double purpose of expanding international trade and assuring a stable and adequate supply of sugar."

South Africa is not, by any stretch of the imagination, "nearby;" nor should it be considered friendly, and we certainly hope that Congress will not be a party to expanding international trade with her.

We strongly feel that, to use the words of Public Law 89-311, 89th Congress, "the continuation of a quota or a part thereof * * * would be contrary to the national interest of the United States," and that the President consequently ought to withhold or suspend the South African sugar quota.

3. POLITICAL ASYLUM FOR SOUTH AFRICANS AGAINST APARTHEID

The United States is unique among Western nations in having provided no official legal status for those seeking political asylum. In some cases, special acts of Congress have been passed to permit refugees from tyranny to reside in the United States; in other cases, a rather demeaning procedure involving deportation or the threat of deportation has been played out. The hundreds of thousands of Cubans, for example, are merely parolees, subject to the whims of the Federal authorities, forbidden to become citizens, people essentially without countries.

Refugees from Eastern Europe and China, on the other hand, are favored, but only as immigrants—and not as a special category of refugees from political persecution. I note, however, that the Federal Government does make special funds available through the State Department, which then in turn contracts with agencies, to facilitate the smooth flow of such political refugees to these shores.

South Africans, however, do not benefit from such Federal generosity and concern. In the first place, they have no way of getting here, except perhaps as students or as temporary visitors. They must then play out a customary battle against immigration authorities involving (1) an order for deportation; (2) an appeal to an immigration board or hearing officer based on the contention that, should the deportee be sent home, he will be subject to physical and mental persecution; and (3) a ruling by immigration authorities who follow the advice of the State Department. A person who goes through this procedure and is permitted to stay, then becomes subject to all sorts of discriminatory practices—he may not leave the country, he may not become a citizen and so on. But the worst is that, no matter how often such cases are brought before immigration, no general principle is ever established. Each deportee must prove anew he is in danger of life and limb if he were to return.

We have had experience in helping a number of political refugees already in this country from being deported. But we have never yet reached that final stage where the State Department admitted that apartheid is tyranny as far as black people go. In our most recent incident—involving five men who had come here as members of the cast of the play, "Sponono," the order to deport was suspended and they were permitted to stay here, but no State Department opinion was made known on the nature of the present South African regime.

We recommend that the same kind of aid extended to political refugees from East Europe be similarly applied to opponents of apartheid and racism. We would like to see Federal money earmarked for South African immigrants to this country passed through to religious and secular groups specializing in refugee programs, and we would like to see relaxation of immigration laws permitting more refugees to come.

4. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD GIVE MAXIMUM ASSISTANCE TO THE FORMER HIGH COMMISSION TERRITORIES, IN CONCERT WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, ENABLING THEM TO MAINTAIN SOME INDEPENDENCE FROM SOUTH AFRICA

These countries (Bechuanaland, Basutoland, and Swaziland), soon to be independent, are committed to nonracial democracy. The Assistant Secretary of State has commented that: "The degree to which they are successful in establishing themselves on this basis could have in time a significant impact on racial patterns in South Africa." We therefore should not rest with following developments in these countries with sympathetic interest and mere appointment of consuls, welcome though that measure is.

Basutoland is an unfortunate replica of colonial history and will remain very heavily dependent upon the Republic after independence and for the foreseeable future. Forty-three percent of local adult males are at work in the Republic and there seems little prospect of attracting them home. Agriculture is insufficiently developed to support the present permanent population and few projects for secondary industry are viable. There are no known mineral deposits.

Swaziland is similarly isolated, an island of nonracialism. Here though, private investment is booming—shown by the working projects of sugar, pulp, and mining companies and the attention of the Commonwealth Development Corp. While Basutoland would show few gains from the inflow of aid capital, Swaziland is viable enough to attract private enterprise to do the job of development. Thus for differing practical reasons, there may be negligible return in assisting either country in the economic sphere.

Bechuanaland might be economically assisted with demonstrable profit. Improvements in infrastructure and assistance in irrigation and education would enable Bechuanaland to become self-sufficient in food supply and to withdraw its migrant labor from the Republic.

We would recommend that:

1. For Basutoland and Swaziland, the United States should insist upon the freedom of access of nationals and visitors through or over South Africa and Mozambique to and from these countries.

2. For the three territories the U.S. Government should join with the United Kingdom in diplomatic initiatives to assure the sovereignty of the territories, and make it clear that any violation would be considered an unfriendly act.

3. Regarding Bechuanaland, the United States should cooperate with the United Kingdom in undertaking feasibility studies of the Okavango Swamp scheme and note the possibility of establishing communications between that high potential area and Zambia and South West Africa.

5. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD CATEGORICALLY DEMAND THE RIGHT TO PRACTICE INTEGRATION IN ITS OWN SOUTH AFRICAN FACILITIES

This means that on principle the United States cannot accept apartheid either in dealing with nonwhites in South Africa, or as regards American personnel serving in South Africa. In 1965 there was tension between the governments of the United States and South Africa on this point. Because of race restrictions, the aircraft carrier *Independence* did not stop at a South African port. The United States rejected the "whites only" demand of only white personnel manning the tracking stations in South Africa. The U.S. Ambassador was attacked for staging the annual July 4 interracial affairs. But beyond verbal exchanges, nothing was essentially done.

We recommend that:

1. Every American-sponsored event be looked upon as integrated, in line with U.S. Government policy.

2. Qualified Negro personnel be assigned to some posts in South Africa.

3. American officials be directed to pay South African employees without discrimination. If nonwhites do not hold the same jobs as whites, they should be paid whatever a white man would earn for doing the same work.

6. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD REMOVE THE TRACKING STATION FROM SOUTH AFRICA

The tracking stations in South Africa are an embarrassment to the United States. Since they are strategically important to the United States, they certainly should be located in a country that is much less controversial than South Africa. Because of the strategic character of the tracking stations, information about them is not made public. Highly competent scientists from whom I have received information, say that they see no essential scientific reason that the tracking stations must be in South Africa. Therefore, disengagement through removal of the tracking stations should be undertaken without delay.

7. THE U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION SHOULD CEASE COOPERATION WITH THE SOUTH AFRICAN ATOMIC ENERGY BOARD

In mid-1935 South Africa inaugurated its first nuclear reactor at Pelindaba near Pretoria. At that time the following facts came out: (1) many South African staff members were trained at Oak Ridge; (2) Oak Ridge supplied a consultant for the Pelindaba reactor; (3) the director of Oak Ridge was an honored guest at the inaugural ceremonies; (4) the United States supplied the enriched uranium to start the reactor; and (5) nine American organizations were involved in the project, the major contractor being Allis Chalmers.

Public announcements have assured all concerned that the South African reactor is not capable of producing fissionable material for use in nuclear weapons. But in such a highly secret field as this represents, suspicions are easily aroused. Why should the United States be so helpful to South Africa in such a sensitive project?

We recommend a congressional investigation about the extent of U.S. involvement in the Pelindaba project to gain assurances that fissionable material for weapons is indeed impossible.

8. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD LODGE STRONG DIPLOMATIC PROTEST EACH TIME SOUTH AFRICA REFUSES TO GRANT VISAS TO AMERICANS ON RACIAL GROUNDS OR BECAUSE OF THEIR VIEWS ON INTEGRATION

Many Americans are refused visas to South Africa. It is most unusual for a Negro American to be permitted to enter South Africa. Any American who is a known participant in civil rights activities here, would probably be refused a visa to South Africa. Yet there seems to be no limitation on white South Africans with the most vicious racist views coming to the United States.

The South African Government even refuses transit visas to some Americans merely wishing to cross a section of South Africa to go to one of the former High Commission Territories such as Basutoland. This has even led to distinguished American scholars being prohibited from essential research, or from discharging responsibilities toward institutions in the territories.

9. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD CONTRIBUTE GENEROUSLY TO THE NEWLY ESTABLISHED UNITED NATIONS TRUST FUND FOR SOUTH AFRICA

This fund was set up by action of the General Assembly in its 20th session. The purpose is to provide a channel through which governments can contribute for:

(a) Legal defense to prisoners charged under repressive legislation in South Africa;

(b) Relief of dependents of persons persecuted by the South African Government for opposition to apartheid;

(c) Education of prisoners and their children;

(d) Relief for South African refugees.

There are between 5,000 and 10,000 political prisoners in South Africa at present (the number fluctuates). It is estimated there are at least 20,000 dependents of prisoners. The need for legal defense and aid to dependents is estimated at between $600,000 and $700,000 in 1966. This is based on a food allowance of less than $9 a month per family, educational needs of children, and of prisoners, plus legal defense.

Last year, on the basis of a U.N. resolution asking for voluntary contributions to private funds, 12 countries gave about $300,000. This must be increased through the U.N. trust fund.

10. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD PLAN SPEEDY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT DECISION ON SOUTHWEST AFRICA

The U.S. contingency planning in anticipation of the International Court of Justice's decision in the Southwest Africa case, to assist the speedy implementation of the Court's decision if it favors the complainants should include the following:

(a) Continuing contact with the British to coordinate policy;

(b) Cooperation with, and assistance to, the OAU and its members in U.N. strategy;

(c) Preparing to take action in the Security Council under article 94 of the U.N. Charter, if necessary, to implement the Court's decision, and encouraging other members of the Security Council to support such action;

(d) Considering means by which the international community can share the economic burden of sanctions against South Africa if they are employed to implement the Court's decision.

A ST. PATRICK'S DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take the time of the House today, but I am reminded by the show of green everywhere that this is St. Patrick's Day and it is no time for a man with an apostrophe in his name to remain silent.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 16th St. Patrick's Day since first I came to the Congress and I can assure my colleagues, who are imbedded in my affection, that I have no intention whatever of being among the absentees in this historic Chamber next St. Patrick's Day.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORN SALES

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation's sales of corn have received much attention lately, especially from those of us who represent areas which, because of adverse weather conditions last year, could experience feed shortages this coming year. I have conveyed to the Secretary of Agriculture my concern that CCC stocks of corn be adequate in Minnesota to meet local demand in coming months. In response the Department has assured me that inventories of corn in Minnesota are sufficient to meet local demand. In addition to allay fears that corn supplies will be depleted in that area, their offerings for sale from bin site corn in my own State of Minnesota are being increased immediately by approximately fourfold. The on-farm stored stocks of corn held by the Commodity Credit Corporation in that area represent an insurance policy to meet any additional needs. We have an on-hand emergency reserve of 23 million bushels of corn in Minnesota and South Dakota which is on-farm stored from the crop year 1961 alone. So we have taken very adequate precautions to see we should have plenty of corn in that area for the coming year.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the morning hour on St. Patrick's Day is a fitting time to wish you all "top of the morning." It is good that we can take time to pay tribute to our fellow Americans of Irish descent.

Those of our friends who have Irish blood in their veins have contributed greatly to the making of America. They have fought valiantly in her wars, assisted immeasurably in the writing of her laws, and helped mightily in the maintenance of law and order.

Our brethren of Irish extraction have inspired us with their music, entertained us with their poetry and stories, and encouraged us with their optimistic outlook.

Above all, Americans of Irish ancestry are God-fearing and patriotic.

The beauty of the color green is more evident than ever on this 17th of March, when it is prominently displayed by both permanent Irishmen and those who are fortunate enough to be temporarily Irish on this happy day. Why should not green be an appropriate color to display on St. Patrick's Day? It is the color that the Creator chose to dress the trees and the grass to make the earth beautiful.

CURTIS AND WIDNALL INTRODUCE BILL TO ESTABLISH AN ECONOMIC COUNCIL TO ADVISE THE MINORITY

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, this year, at the 20th Anniversary Symposium of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am ranking House Republican, I proposed in a speech—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 28, pages 4209–4211—that a Minority Economic Council be established to enable minority party representatives in Congress to analyze and present better minority alternatives to administration economic policy decisions and to propose more creative, more comprehensive programs to meet the Nation's pressing needs.

The response to this proposal has been very gratifying. Therefore, today, I am introducing a bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish such a Minority Economic Council. I am pleased that my very able colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], who is a member of the Joint Economic Committee, and ranking Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee, is joining me in sponsoring this bill.

Mr. WIDNALL and I believe that a Minority Economic Council is an urgent need. It would enable minority party representatives in Congress to perform the necessary functions of developing sound legislation through the process of thorough study and informed debate accompanied by cross-examination and rebuttal.

The three-man Minority Economic Council would be appointed by and be responsible to a board of directors comprised of the leaders of the House and Senate not of the party of the President, and ranking members of the Joint Economic Committee, House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, and House and Senate Banking and Currency and Appropriations Committees not of the party of the President. For example, when one party controls both Congress and the White House, the control of the Minority Economic Council would go to the minority in Congress. But when one party controls Congress and the other controls the White House, the control of the Minority Economic Council would go to the majority party in Congress because it does not have access to the economic advisory resources of the President. When one House is controlled by one party, and the other House by the other party, the same rule applies: the majority in one House and the minority in the other House which are of the party other than that of the President, will control the Minority Economic Council.

The Minority Economic Council would be funded by Congress and would serve all minority Members in Congress with sound economic research and proposals. It would have headquarters in Washington and a full-time staff, and would establish continuing consulting relationships with academic and other economists from all sectors of the economy.

Debate on economic issues is today not extensive enough or thorough enough. Better debate requires a better informed, institutionalized challenger able to refine and clarify economic policy issues. The result of an organization created to assist the minority in Congress would be better national economic decisionmaking.

The size and diversity of the economy and of the Government's role in it require better means of understanding. The executive branch has at its command vast internal resources and a strong attraction for private advisers, but the minority party in Congress by comparison has no such resources, nor innate attraction.

In 1948, 2 years after the Employment Act when the economy had cooled off after the years of wartime spending, the gross national product—in 1958 dollars—was $323.7 billion and the fiscal year 1948 Federal administrative budget was $32.955 billion. In 1965 gross national product was $609 billion in 1958 dollars and the fiscal year 1967 Federal administrative budget is an estimated $112.847 billion. The budget for this tremendous amount, to which should be added for completeness trust fund account expenditures of $32.153 billion, is both an economic document of very great complexity and a political document of great importance. Adequate understanding of the economic impact of the budget as a whole is as important as understanding it program by program, item by item, yet congressional facilities do not exist for analyzing the effects of the total budget.

The Employment Act's sponsors correctly saw the need in 1946 for proper procedures through which to manage the huge new economic power of the Federal Government. Correspondingly, the President's Council of Economic Advisers has become accepted as one of the most important offices in the executive. Though the Council is itself small, it can draw on the almost limitless statistical and program resources of the other 14 executive departments and countless other agencies. The Council of Economic Advisers, rooted in academic institutions, has kept open its lines of communication with academic and other economic thinkers. It and the executive departments which also retain consultants are lodestones for professional economists throughout the country.

This is a problem of the preponderance of executive branch knowledge, combined with power, over the minority, and, essentially, this problem is an institutional one. The minority in Congress must have the research resources necessary to suggest workable alternatives to Government policy in all important economic areas. We believe there is considerable dissent in our society, within its broader consensus. Our problem is how to channel that dissent—to create a way to bring informed dissenters together to devise and propose creative alternatives based on their expert knowledge.

The losers under the present system, in terms of the better performance of our economy, are American men and women—scholars, workers, businessmen, and farmers. The effects of national economic decisions touch everyone, and everyone must be concerned that these decisions are the best decisions.

The legislative year 1946 was a time of great ferment. It saw passage both of the Employment Act and also of the Congressional Reorganization Act. Twenty years later the substantive and institutional problems facing us are as great as they were then—they require equally bold solutions, and we are convinced that what we propose would help solve them.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will soon be 4 years old. To date no tariff reductions have been made under this law. Negotiations in Geneva have been slow and halting, one of the principal causes being the difficulties encountered within the EEC countries, that is, the Common Market.

On the other hand the adjustment assistance provisions of the act have been well tested; so well in fact that we have been alerted in the Congress to amendments that will soon be sent up from the White House.

The act was so stringent in its requirements of proof of injury from imports as alleged by an industry, a company or a labor group, that not 1 case of the 18 that have been brought before the Tariff Commission survived. With one exception all the petitions were turned down by unanimous vote. Now, it seems, legislation will be sought to remove some of the stringency of the requirements.

Now comes the revelation that our official foreign trade statistics are deceptive.

This was exposed recently in an analysis prepared by the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy. This finding was to the effect that if our trade statistics were presented on a proper basis the handsome export surplus of the past 4 or 5 years, ranging annually from $4.5 billion to $6.7 billion, would vanish and be replaced by deficits.

The error, deception or concealment of the true state of affairs arises from the official statistical practices followed by our Government in reporting both imports and exports. Several colleagues have recently made statements to the House on this subject, namely the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WHALLEY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], and I feel therefore that I need not repeat the details. It is enough to say that our imports are recorded on their foreign value, as if it cost nothing to ship them to this country; 75 percent or more of our imports come to us on ocean-going cargo vessels, a large part of them from countries thousands of miles away. Therefore the freight and insurance charges are important items of cost.

Other countries include these charges in the computation of their imports. Our practice gives rise to a considerable discrepancy. When, for example, Japan records imports from us she adds ocean freight and insurance from New York or San Francisco or other point of shipment. When we record our imports from Japan, on the other hand, we use the foreign value, f.o.b. or f.a.s.—free alongside—foreign port, and do not add the costs of shipping to this country.

Thus our exports to Japan as recorded by us might be, say, $2 billion. Japan would record them as, say, $2,475 million, the increase representing the shipping and insurance costs. Assuming our imports from Japan as recorded by us at $2 billion, representing Japanese exports as valued at the Japanese port of export, we would record them at $2 billion and not at $2,475 million or some similar figure. We ignore the shipping costs.

Therefore, according to our reports, we would have had an even trade, that is, $2 billion in both directions. Actually we would have incurred a deficit of $475 million, more or less, in comparison with our exports. Had our shipping companies handled most of the merchandise in both directions, we would, of course, have gained by that much; but since 1958 we have been recording a deficit in international transportation charges, amounting in 1964 to more than $200 million.

The result has been, as stated by the other speakers, a bad distortion in our trade statistics. For 1965 the undervaluation of our imports of $21.3 billion was in the neighborhood of $3½ to $4 billion.

As if this distortion were not enough we include in our official export statistics issued periodically by the Department of Commerce, all sales and shipments made under our foreign aid and related programs, no less than "commercial exports" of highly subsidized agricultural items that would not find a market without subsidies. Thus we swell our exports by a margin roughly as large as the margin by which we undervalue our imports. Most of this is, of course, at the expense of the taxpayer. The total distortion is therefore in the magnitude of some $7 billion on the basis of last year's import-export volume. An error of 15 to 20 percent is by any measure a serious mistake or coverup or whatever else it might be called.

I believe that everyone will agree that we should have correct statistics when we legislate, especially when as much is at stake as in our foreign trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, with the adjustment assistance of the Trade Expansion Act having a batting record of zero in 3 years; with the 50-percent tariff cut looming as an unauthorized and unprecedented across-the-board venture with a bare minimum of exceptions, and, lastly, guided by seriously false trade statistics, I am wondering about the state of health of our trade agreements program.

It obviously needs a thorough overhauling and we should not proceed further under the Kennedy round, so-called, under the unpalatable conditions that are coming to light. It would be courting a national misfortune to do so. When we proceed under the assumption that this country is highly competitive in world markets, as indicated by our false statistical operations, when in fact we are competitively disadvantaged by high costs, and when we offer to cut virtually all tariffs 50 percent when in fact true trade statistics would reveal a trade deficit in terms of private unsubsidized transactions, we do indeed take the bit in our teeth and lay ourselves open to charges of irresponsible, no less than dangerous, economic recklessness.

I am more than happy to join in support of legislation that would correct the shocking statistical distortion under which we have been laboring. I am sure that the Ways and Means Committee will provide a green light.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, today, once again, we give special recognition to Ireland's patron saint—St. Patrick. The coming of St. Patrick to Ireland 15 centuries ago had a profound effect upon the destiny of that beautiful island.

St. Patrick gave to the Irish a deep and abiding faith in the teachings of Christianity. But he also gave them a passionate love of justice and freedom; and he gave them the love of knowledge.

When the dark ages settled over Europe, it was the enlightened sons of Ireland who turned their strength to the cultivation of letters and morals, to the preservation of ancient documents. From the fifth to the ninth century, Ireland led the nations of Europe in keeping bright the lamps of learning, and earned, indeed, their title of the "Island of Saints and Scholars."

The Irish have influenced many phases of American life—the church, the courtroom, the school, and the public platform. The untold contributions of the Irish people to our country cannot be measured.

But, today, as Americans of every racial background and national origin wear a bit of green, we remember with special gratitude the spirit of St. Patrick.

LA FEILE PADRAIG

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the anniversary of the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick. There have been many eloquent and moving tributes to the memory of this spiritual leader of the Irish people, and to the people themselves who have contributed so much to the mood and music of America.

On this occasion, the curious and warming nature of all things Irish come readily to mind, and we hear the lilt of an Irish ballad, or feel the rythmn of an Irish jig, or hear the blarney about which the poet John Millington Synge once said:

> There is no language like the Irish for soothing and quieting.

So on this occasion I would like to extend my sincere compliments to the Irish and to wish them a truly happy St. Patrick's Day. And, under unanimous consent procedures, I would like to include a traditional Irish blessing at this point in my remarks:

AN IRISH BLESSING

May the blessing of light be on you, light without and light within. May the blessed sunlight shine on you and warm your heart till it glows like a great peat fire, so that the stranger may come and warm himself at it, and also a friend. And may the light shine out of the two eyes of you, like a candle set in two windows of a house, bidding the wanderer to come in out of the storm.

And may the blessing of the rain be on you—the soft sweet rain. May it fall upon your spirit so that all the little flowers may spring up, and shed their sweetness on the air. And may the blessing of the great rains be on you, may they beat upon your spirit and wash it fair and clean, and leave there many a shining pool where the blue of heaven shines, and sometimes a star.

And may the blessing of the earth be on you—the great round earth; may you ever have a kindly greeting for them you pass as you're going along the roads. May the earth be soft under you when you rest upon it, tired at the end of the day, and may it rest easy over you when, at last, you lay out under it; may it rest so lightly over you, that your soul may be out from under it quickly, and up, and off, and on its way to God.

SEPARATE FUNDING FOR THE SMALL BUSINESS LOAN PROGRAMS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill —H.R. 13782—to increase the authorization of the Small Business Administration's loan programs, to establish separate funds for the regular business and for the disaster loan programs, and to provide for an early warning system to Congress and the small business community whenever 75 percent of any ceiling on outstanding obligations has been exceeded in either fund.

This marks the second time this Congress that I have introduced legislation to provide for increased disaster loan funds, and the separation of the disaster and regular business loan programs into two separate funds. Last January 14, 1965, I introduced H.R. 2860 to accomplish this purpose. It is my understanding that my original bill, together with other legislation that it has helped to generate, will be considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee next week.

The legislation I have introduced today is an expanded version of this original approach which has already been passed by the Senate, under the able sponsorship of Senators PROXMIRE, MCINTYRE, JAVITS, and RANDOLPH. At the request of the Senate subcommittee considering the bill, I testified on the problem of adequate and effective loan programs for small business, and submitted language to set up the SBA reporting system back to Congress, now included in the bill.

I have spoken a number of times in the past year on the unfortunate deterioration of the Small Business Administration programs. It has been my opinion all along that adequate funding, separate funds and a proper early reporting system to the Congress would avoid the present standstill in SBA operations, and the constant emergency authorizations and appropriations requested by that agency.

The legislation I have introduced today is representative of the bipartisan support the Small Business Administration programs have gained in Congress. For purposes of legislative history I believe it useful to include at this point my testimony before the Senate Small Business Subcommittee, Banking and Currency Committee, January 25, 1966, and my subsequent letter to the subcommittee chairman on February 7:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, OF NEW JERSEY, RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, HEARING BEFORE THE SMALL BUSINESS SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, JANUARY 25, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to come before this subcommittee and support a return to an approach of separate funds for the various Small Business Administration loan programs, an approach I have been advocating since 1962. Even more, I appreciate the fact that this subcommittee is giving serious consideration to the problem of developing a rational and adequate system of funding for Small Business Administration operations. I am sure that the Nation's small business community will be encouraged by your efforts, and I think you are performing a vitally needed service.

Before commenting on specific legislative proposals, I would like to briefly sketch some of the background that convinces me of the need for immediate action by Congress in this field. Since 1962, the Small Business Administration has been operating with a combined fund for regular small business loans, disaster loans, small business investment corporation program authorizations, and, most recently, small business poverty loans. During this past year and a half, the SBA has gone from crisis to crisis, switching funds, so it appears, from one hand to the other, first shortchanging the conventional small business loan sector, then delaying poverty loans, or scrambling to Congress for emergency disaster requests. As you know, the

SBA has for several months simply stopped accepting small business applications altogether for its regular loan program. It has been, and remains, a chaotic picture.

Perhaps no domestic program has ever received more bipartisan support than that for small business. Yet, in 1962, when Senate and House conferees agreed upon a combining of loan funds for SBA, the minority House conferees felt so strongly that this proposed departure from sound practice would injure the program that they refused to sign the conference report. I suggested to the House at that time that it was only commonsense to keep these funds separate. Otherwise there would be the constant temptation to sacrifice one program for the immediate needs of the other.

I think the events of the last 18 months have borne out the soundness of that position. In addition, I think that these events have shown that the hopes Congress placed in the 1962 Saltonstall amendment were unfortunately not realized. That amendment, as it came out of conference, required the SBA to notify the House and Senate Banking and Currency and Appropriations Committees whenever the estimate for regular business or disaster loans was exceeded. More importantly, it contained an expression of congressional intent that the Congress should be advised every 2 years of an estimate of future authorization needs. The chairman of this subcommittee explained its purpose at the time by stating on the floor of the Senate:

"This would provide for an orderly review of this program by Congress, and would avoid emergency appeals by SBA for additional authorizations."

Chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking and Currency Committee expressed similar views on the amendment, indicating a hope that this would avoid the situation "whereby appropriations action on the SBA budget request would have been dependent on almost simultaneous increases in the revolving fund authorization."

This congressional intent has not been followed. We had two appeals for extra authorizations last year, after the SBA badly underestimated the disaster fund needs, which itself may have been done in the hope of diverting funds to its stalled regular loan and poverty loan programs. In October, we had simultaneous authorization and supplemental appropriation action. During last year's hearings I could find no one who recalled SBA reports and estimates as suggested by the Saltonstall amendment. In fact, the best the SBA officials could say for themselves last year was that they considered the amendment a one-shot proposition, applying only to the first authorization needed after the 1962 bill.

Last January, I introduced a bill, H.R. 2860, which would provide an additional $200 million in a separate disaster loan fund, in effect, creating two funds again. Although I can report to this committee that interest was shown in this approach on a bipartisan basis by House colleagues, I drew no reaction from the SBA until May of last year. At that time, I was promised that on their very next appearance before the House Banking and Currency Committee, the SBA would have comments prepared on the bill. In October, when a new emergency request was made, no report on my bill was given by agency officials testifying before our committee. Since that time, however, S. 2729 has been introduced by Senator Proxmire and Senator McIntyre, and Congressman Jackson Betts, of Ohio, has received a November 29, 1965, letter from the Acting Small Business Administrator, stating: "We are giving serious thought to the proposal of Congressman Widnall and others, that we have a separate revolving fund for disaster loans." The action by this subcommittee in holding hearings will now provide Congress with an opportunity to see just how serious the Small Business Administration thinking has been.

I am sorry to take so much of the subcommittee's time reciting past events, but I wanted to make it fully understood why I feel so strongly on this matter and why I urge this subcommittee to view favorably legislation such as S. 2729. The setting up of specific funds for small business loans, disaster loans, and the small business investment program is clearly called for. I would suggest, however, that you give consideration to placing funds for the poverty program loans in a separate status, also. Given the events of this past year, I think neither the ordinary small businessman, nor the prospective businessman qualifying under the Economic Opportunity Act would be adverse to this type of approach, provided that both programs are adequately financed. When the Economic Opportunity Act was passed, no specific authorization was set up for poverty loans and disaster loan victims. Sometimes they have been given priority, sometimes they have only met with delay. I think a separate fund would be helpful.

Keeping funds separate for specific purposes would be an important step in preventing a recurrence of the present intolerable situation. Adequate financing is of course also necessary. My own bill would provide for a revolving fund of $200 million for disaster loans in addition to any amounts already outstanding for that purpose. We cannot predict natural disasters, but we certainly can anticipate them more adequately within the authorization process, to save a step or two when time is important and appropriations are needed.

There is another aspect that deserves exploration by this subcommittee. I very definitely believe that serious consideration should be given to placing into the law an automatic report and estimate of need requirement, that can be clearly understood by the agency. It should go into action anytime the moneys in a particular fund are committed to within a certain percentage of the total amount authorized or appropriated. During the past year, for example, the SBA came to Congress twice with respect to disaster loan money, but never asked for anything more for its regular and poverty loan function, despite a severe lack of funds. Had Congress, by law, specifically required the SBA to report within 10 days of the date when, say, 80 percent of the funds authorized or appropriated for that particular function had been committed, it is unlikely that the SBA today would still be refusing to accept applications for loans. Congress and the small business community would have known early enough where this fund stood, and could have then acted in appropriate fashion.

The specific time for reporting or the percentage of funds acting as a triggering device could certainly differ from what I have suggested in my example. The important point, however, is that despite the past notable lack of success on the part of the SBA with its predictions, I think we should return to the sound idea of advance notice of and planning for small business needs. Since the congressional intent expressed in 1962 has been ignored, I think we will have to spell it out in detail for the agency.

In summary, I think that separate funds for particular functions, adequately financed, with some type of built-in early warning system to allow for timely congressional action, are both necessary and appropriate. Senator Proxmire and Senator McIntyre have performed a significant service to the small business community by introducing legislation aimed in this direction. Hopefully, as a result of the interest generated by this subcommittee's action, House action on my own bill, H.R. 2860, will also be stimulated. Again, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you this morning.

February 7, 1966.

Senator William Proxmire,
Chairman, Small Business Subcommittee, Senate Banking and Currency Committee,

Dear Mr. Chairman: At the invitation of a member of your committee staff, Reginald Barnes, I am submitting suggested language to amend your bill S. 2729, in order to provide Congress with adequate reports as to the condition of the various Small Business Administration loan funds provided for in your legislation.

The language I proposed would provide for quarterly reports as to the status of the three revolving funds established by your bill, including a requirement that when the aggregate amount outstanding from any individual fund exceeded 75 percent of the total amount allocated to that fund, the SBA would be instructed to project future needs and make recommendations for necessary additional appropriations.

Second, should action by the SBA under the reallocation authority granted by your bill force the aggregate amount outstanding from any particular funds, to reach the 75-percent level, the SBA would be required to report, within 10 days, as to what reallocation action had taken place and the rationale behind it.

I believe that this language will more clearly spell out to the Small Business Administration its responsibilities with respect to keeping the appropriate committees of Congress informed. It will also provide Congress with the additional time necessary to take action in the future before a fund crisis arises, as has so often occurred in the recent past. I hope that this suggestion proves useful to your committee and I greatly appreciate the opportunity you have so generously provided me to express my views on this subject.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

William B. Widnall,
Member of Congress, Seventh District, New Jersey.

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION RECORD: 1ST SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would not agree that some light needs to be shed on a document published in October 1965, by the Democratic National Committee.

Although this compendium is fairly lengthy—168 pages—and quite heavy—1 pound, 10 ounces—every citizen should take a look at "The Johnson Administration Record: 1st Session of the 89th Congress," even if he does have to pay the $2 per copy charged by the Democratic Party. Incidentally, this happens to be in violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act (18 U.S.C. 608) which states:

> Whoever purchases or buys any goods, commodities, advertising, or articles of any

> kind or description, the proceeds of which, or any portion thereof, directly or indirectly inures to the benefit of or for any candidate for an elective Federal office including the offices of President of the United States, and Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or any political committee or other political organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.
>
> This subsection shall not interfere with the usual and known business, trade, or profession of any candidate.

Further, section 1913, title 18, of the United States Code states:

> No parts of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express atuhorization of Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in my remarks the text of the title page of the document to which I refer. This page clearly states the price charged by the Democratic National Committee.

> THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION RECORD: 1ST SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS, JANUARY 4–OCTOBER 23, 1965
>
> This factbook details the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress and the Johnson administration from January 4 through October 23, 1965, when Congress adjourned. It includes revised and updated material and supersedes the edition which appeared October 7, 1965.
>
> (Prepared by the Research Division, Democratic National Committee, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., price: $2 per copy.)

Mr. Speaker, the title indicates that this compendium is a record of the year 1965 and a recitation of the great benefits supposedly bestowed upon the Nation by the benevolent Johnson administration. Yet, quick perusal indicates that the document spends many of its pages—perhaps 55 percent—in a description of events which might more rightfully be attributed to the administration of the late President Kennedy, and even some pages on matters for which Republicans should be credited.

With respect to the latter, Republican accomplishments listed in this compendium, I have in mind the discussion of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. We agree that the act is beneficial, but I am sure that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], a Republican, would have appreciated a credit line since he authored the act. The same might be said of the only successful component of the war on poverty, Project Headstart. This program was first proposed several years ago by our Republican colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], but discussed in this publication as a Democratic proposal.

In about 6,000 lines of text and over 60,000 words, this administration record details the accomplishments of the recent past and outlines the administration's aspirations for the future. But, one might wonder if George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, is aware that only 3 lines of the 6,000 in the document—0.005 percent—were allocated to the President's announced heartfelt desire to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—and those lines were simply a repetition of the President's wholeheated, nay ferocious, statement that section 14(b) should be repealed so that we can "reduce conflicts in our national labor policy."

On the other hand, eight pages are devoted to the Johnson administration's achievements in improving natural beauty; and, as a matter of fact, this document is more enthusiastic—and more detailed—in its praise of the Anadromous Fisheries Act of 1965 than in its discussion of 14(b).

Was it Antony who said that Caesar should look to his friends—or vice versa?

There are many other matters which could be dissected if it were in the public interest—or worth any honest citizen's time and trouble.

We could talk about the general attitude in this book of giving credit to the present administration for legislative actions which President Johnson had originally opposed, such as the 1965 military pay raise averaging 10 percent.

The Democratic National Committee also gives the President credit for the beneficial actions of the various independent—or supposedly independent—regulatory agencies. I have in mind the praise given the Federal Communications Commission for telephone rate reduction. It is appalling to me that the Johnson administration would even think of taking credit for these actions of agencies designed to be independent of the executive branch. Is this an implicit admission of something lots of people have felt for a long time—that the Johnson administration may be using its awesome power to violate the independence—the very essence—of our bipartisan regulatory agencies?

Now, we get down to: "who paid for this massive compendium?" It is fairly evident that not all of the staff members of these independent regulatory agencies and the executive agencies and departments were just deaf-mute participants in the compilation of the material contained in this record.

It is a safe assumption that these public servants performed this Democratic Party work in their offices while they should have been conducting the people's business, not the business of a political party. Obviously the report in question is intended to influence public support for the Great Society programs.

I have no idea, Mr. Speaker, how much the research on this massive compendium cost the American people. I do know, however, that a skilled privately employed researcher of my acquaintance verified the factual data contained on only one page. In so verifying, he consumed 6.25 hours. Since he earns a salary of $10,000 per year, he cost his employer $34.38 in salary alone for one page of verification, not to speak of the cost of the original composition.

This project was apparently carried out in Government offices, however, so one may presume that the cost was about double—making a minimum total of $68.76 per page. Multiplied by 151 pages of research material, this would make minimal research cost to the U.S. Government, in terms of salaries alone, of $10,382.76—and that is obviously a conservative figure. Many private organizations charge more than twice the professional's salary for overhead; and the Federal Government's overhead has never been considered low.

Now in this connection, rule IV, section 4.1 of the Civil Service's publication "Political Activity of Federal Officers and Employees," has been interpreted by the Civil Service to prohibit executive department officers from requesting or requiring the rendition of any political service or the performance of political work of any kind by subordinates.

One revealing thing in this massive document emerges from the following set of facts:

First. The document purports to be a chronicle of "The 1st session of the 89th Congress and the Johnson administration from January 4 through October 23, 1965."

Second. Instead, the document relies heavily on various actions proposed or carried out under the administration of the late President Kennedy.

Third. The name of President Kennedy appears to be mentioned only once in the entire book of 60,000 words—and then only in a very indirect reference on page 146.

I would ask my colleague across the aisle if we are to draw from this set of facts the conclusion that perhaps the Johnson administration and the Democratic National Committee are avoiding reference to the Kennedy name?

The answers to these and other questions may just be contained in this handy Democratic Party research publication, now selling at the unbelievably low—but illegal—price of $2 a copy.

MILITARY DRAFT

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I joined 30 of my colleagues in issuing a statement urging a congressional investigation of Federal administration of the military draft.

Among the many excellent remarks which appeared in the national press concerning our statement was an editorial in the Lowell (Mass.) Sun. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial so that all Members might have the opportunity to read it:

A DRAFT RESTUDY

Congress and the administration should heed the demand of 30 Republicans, including Representative MORSE, of Lowell, for an investigation into the draft. It is an issue close to the hearts of the American people and discontent is rising across the Nation.

To charges that hundreds of thousands of potentially useful young men are escaping the draft through poorly drawn regulations, the Congressmen have added a sharply worded charge of bureaucratic bungling. Their statement declared: "According to figures supplied by General Hershey there are 545,000 men between 19 and 25 now classified 1-A. Of these, 117,825 have not yet been examined and another 279,676 are not available for the draft because their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline between local draft boards and Army induction centers."

Granting that draft officials should take time to be as fair as possible to the individual, the half-million men in 1-A would more than fill the manpower requirements for the next year. Congress will be justified in inquiring why fresh reclassifications have been set at such a high level when this reservoir exists.

Congress should also review Draft Director Hershey's proposed new program for massive interruption of college careers. The philosophy prevailing until now has been that college students earnestly and successfully working for degrees were a special kind of national asset in an era when demands for highly educated manpower are skyrocketing. If the military needs are judged to be sufficiently great, the students should be drafted as needed, of course. But the public deserves a clear showing that the need is valid, and not created by bungling in selective service.

We believe that General Hershey, President Johnson, and Congress should bear in mind that today's circumstances are far different psychologically from the circumstances of December 1941. Now there is no declared war, no manifest threat to the United States.

Criticism of the draft has been building up—increasingly insistent and increasingly pointed as to alleged inequities and faults in administration. Now is the time for the faults to be brought into the open, studied, and remedied.

DUBIOUS EXPORT SURPLUS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it has come as a shock to me as it will to many other Members, to learn that our export surplus, of which so much has been made in recent years, is not at all what it seems to be.

I have recently read news stories that impugn the accuracy if not the integrity of our official statistics on imports and exports. Whether intended or not, if the allegations are correct, the effect of these statistics is very misleading. They exaggerate our exports and undervalue our imports, with the result that the export surplus represents an unjustifiedly optimistic account of the competitive position of this country in world trade.

Many complaints have been heard in recent years that we are pricing ourselves out of the markets of the world. On the other hand this has been vehemently denied by others who point to the huge export surplus enjoyed by this country. They ask how such a surplus could be reconciled with the claim that our prices are too high to be competitive abroad.

Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that the news items are of great interest. If we do not enjoy an export surplus or if our apparent surplus does not reflect our competitive standing, those who point to this surplus as proof that we are not overpriced in world markets, will have to take another look at their evidence.

At this point, under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks a press release which was the source of the news item. It tells the story clearly and speaks for itself. It was released by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy:

Stubbornly clinging to a discredited statistical form, the U.S. Department of Commerce has issued another glowing report on our export surplus for the year just past. The figures are deceptively optimistic, and grossly overstate the competitive standing of this country in world markets.

Exports of merchandise are reported at $26.56 billion for 1965, against imports of $21.36 billion. The apparent surplus of exports was therefore $5.2 billion.

This surplus, though lower than that reported for 1964 is nevertheless very impressive if true. Unfortunately it is a figment created by the false statistical treatment of both imports and exports. The unpalatable fact is that we incurred a sizable deficit in our merchandise trade in 1965 so far as really competitive exports are concerned.

Our imports were not $21.3 billion but more nearly $25 billion, or some $3.7 billion more than reported.

This discrepancy follows from the failure of our official statistics to include ocean freight and marine insurance (cost, insurance and freight) incurred in shipping our imports from foreign points of shipment to our ports of entry. This has been estimated to represent an average expense of about 17½ percent for our total imports. The cost at foreign shipping point, such as is used by our official statistical reports (f.o.b.), is not the real cost; and very few other countries report their imports on the basis of foreign value, as we do. To follow our practice is analagous to valuing an automobile at its f.o.b. price, Detroit, when as everyone knows, the price paid by the buyer includes shipping charges to the point of purchase. This may be more than a minor item.

However, this is not all that makes our trade statistics unreliable. Our export statistics include all shipments (except military) made under AID (foreign aid) as well as the exports of highly subsidized farm products such as wheat and cotton. Last year such shipments in the aggregate were perhaps higher than in 1964 and in that year they reached a level of about $3½ billion. If these $3½ billion are added to the $3.7 the sum comes to $7.2 billion.

Set this against the apparent surplus of $5.2 billion, and our imports exceeded our commercial unsubsidized exports by $2 billion in 1965.

This is the true figure if we wish to test the competitive status of this country in world markets. Unquestionably we could expand our imports a great deal more if we elected to pay for them in whole or in part or to subsidize still more exports, so that we could meet world prices; but such transactions would be wholly deceptive as a measure of the competitive muscle of our industries.

The obvious remedy is to report our imports on a c.i.f. basis and to exclude from our exports the goods that we ship abroad under governmental programs.

Failure to halt the present misleading practice is attributable to official reluctance to face the undoubted effect of the facts on the tariff negotiations in Geneva under the Kennedy round. The plan is to cut all our tariffs by 50 percent with "a bare minimum of exceptions," as widely announced by the office of Christian Herter. A U.S. trade deficit of $2 billion is a far cry from the apparent export surplus of $5 billion, and knowledge of the facts would place the proposed U.S. tariff cut in an untenable position.

Mr. Speaker, if these statistics are correct they throw a very revealing light on our world trade. There is no longer any doubt that our true competitive status is not what we had thought it was. Whether the discrepancy is as great as that pictured by Mr. Strackbein is a matter that should be determined at the earliest possible date.

If the facts sustain his allegations with reasonable approximation, the implications for the Kennedy round of tariff reductions are unmistakable. If we are at present running a deficit in our commercial exports that do not owe their movement to subsidies, foreign aid, or giveaways and if our imports are several billion dollars higher than reported, as set forth in the Strackbein statement, we are in no position to offer the world another 50-percent tariff cut across the board, with a mere handful of exceptions.

There are those who lay our difficulty in exporting finished manufactured products to the high wages prevailing in this country. While this may be an explanation it is not an answer. We are faced with a condition and not a theory. Moreover, I ask those who point to the high wages what they would do for purchasing power sufficient to buy all the goods we are producing. Foreign wages are not high enough to buy many of our goods. To that extent we are priced out of important foreign markets so far as manufactured goods are concerned. This does not mean that we cannot sell at all abroad.

We are not frozen out. It does mean that we are being outstripped by other countries. Our share of the world market for manufactured goods, with the exception of machinery and a very few other items, has been shrinking in recent years. I can cite steel as a perfect example. Since 1958 imports have outstripped exports three or four to one.

Our machinery exports have boomed as a result of our high investments in foreign plants and production facilities. For a while this means more exports but that same machinery will supply many foreign markets from within. In time the effort will be to shrink these export markets. Automobiles are good examples. We now import more cars than we export. Our investments in automobile manufactories abroad has greatly shrunk the foreign market for U.S.-made cars.

Mr. Speaker, we will be ill advised to continue living on optimistic trade reports if the statistical foundations are unreliable, not to say false.

I am introducing a joint resolution calling on the Secretaries of Commerce and Treasury to place trade statistics before us that will reveal rather than conceal our competitive position in the world. I feel that this is a very serious matter because it underlies our foreign trade policy. The statistical foundation should not be in doubt. Early action is imperative because of the tariff negotiations in Geneva under the Kennedy round.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as a Republican I have always been a stanch advocate of economy measures in government. I have no objection to the administration requesting that economy be practiced in many areas of the national scene, but in my view cutting back the school milk program is not an appropriate way to economize.

The investment we make in this Nation's children is not measurable in dollars and cents. The school milk and lunch programs have operated successfully for more than a decade, providing free or nominally priced milk and lunches to schoolchildren and certain charitable agencies, such as the United Fund. The executive director of the Boys' Club of the City of New Bedford, for instance, has written me that the proposed cut will make it impossible for the local United Fund summer camp to keep its cost down to $10 per week per boy. This will result in many youngsters being deprived of attendance at the camp as the "camperships" provided by local service clubs will not be able to cover the cost increases for the same number of children as before—so many will lose out.

And in the schools, a means test will now be required to prove that a child is poor enough to receive this form of nourishment. In how many more areas are we going to require this indignity? A child does not understand the nuances of national economics. All he understands is that because he is different he is allowed charity unavailable to his more fortunate classmates. This program has never been a charity program. Besides the fact that it has provided an expanding market for U.S. milk producers and an outlet for the vast Government surpluses of food, it has also been instrumental in assisting local school districts to provide proper nutrition for all their pupils.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill entitled the "Children's Special Milk Act of 1966" that would provide funds for completing this year's milk program and thereafter place the program on a permanent basis.

THOMAS PATRICK SINNETT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCHISLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, today, March 17, is the birthday of one of the most respected and honored citizens of the 19th Congressional District of Illinois. Thomas Patrick Sinnett is celebrating his 86th birthday with family and friends in Rock Island, Ill., this St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, a privilege for me to recognize Mr. Sinnett's birthday here in the House of Representatives.

Thomas Sinnett is presently the oldest practicing attorney in Rock Island County. He is one of the legal profession's most distinguished members. He gave many years of fine service to the teaching profession, and he is a highly respected legislator.

Several of my fellow members of the Illinois delegation present this afternoon served with Tom Sinnett in our State legislature. In 1924 he was elected a member of the Illinois House as a minority representative from the 33d senatorial district. He was reelected to the house in 1926, 1930, 1932 and 1934, and served as majority floor leader of the 58th general assembly when the Democratic Party came into power. Previous to becoming majority floor leader, Mr. Sinnett had been prominent among the Democratic majority of the house and he was chairman of the majority committee from 1934 to 1936.

We in Illinois are fortunate to have had such an able representative in the State legislature. The measures he helped pass are still having their good effects today.

In 1928, Tom Sinnett pushed through a bill in the State legislature whereby Illinois purchased the area now known as Blackhawk State Park. This scenic and lovely spot, located along the Rock River near Rock Island has been preserved, largely as a result of Mr. Sinnett's work, so that today it is enjoyed by thousands.

In the thirties, Mr. Sinnett cosponsored the first bill in Illinois to clear slum areas and erect low-cost housing projects. The Honorable Roy G. Soderstrom, now president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor and CIO, was then a Republican legislator, and he sponsored this measure with Mr. Sinnett. Thanks to the foresight of these two legislators, enabling legislation necessary to initiate low-cost housing projects in our State was first passed in the early 1930's.

At that time, the housing situation in Illinois had become quite intolerable. The inhuman conditions led to the commission of criminal acts. A special session of the legislature was called to remedy the problems and Mr. Sinnett's and Mr. Soderstrom's bill was passed.

The original bill has been amended many times since its enactment into law giving more power to local bodies in the construction of low-cost housing. The pioneering efforts of Mr. Sinnett and Mr. Soderstrom have resulted in the erection of huge housing projects for our poor and needy and these same efforts have resulted in the employment of many thousands of laborers throughout the State.

Today we are still extremely interested in conserving our areas of natural beauty for all to enjoy, and in meeting the housing problems of the poor. How fortunate we were to have had men like Mr. Sinnett and Mr. Soderstrom pioneering in these fields so many years ago.

In 1936, Mr. Sinnett retired from public office to devote more time to his expanding law practice. He was made a member of the Governor's commission to present a program of revision of State prison laws and to investigate prison riots.

In 1929, Mr. Sinnett had become the senior member of the firm of Sinnett & Britton with offices in Rock Island, the work of Mr. Sinnett and his partner, J. Hays Britton, became well known. Their firm was to become one of the leading firms in western Illinois. Today Mr. Sinnett's firm, Sinnett, Rink, Coryn & Patton, is the successor to the law firm of Sinnett & Britton.

The big span of the Centennial Bridge arching across the Mississippi River in Rock Island has on its base the names of Sinnett and Britton in recognition of their work in initiating the project and carrying the project to its completion.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to share with my colleagues here today my deep feeling of respect for Tom Sinnett. His has truly been a life of dedicated public service, a life of high civic accomplishment for which we can all be grateful, and from which we all can take example. Thank you for this opportunity to recognize Thomas Sinnett's 86th birthday here with you today.

THE PROPOSED CUTS IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR SCHOOL MILK AND SCHOOL LUNCHES

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues may have the benefit of the thoughts expressed, I submit an editorial from the March issue of the Baltimore Sun on the subject of the cuts proposed in the appropriations for school milk and lunches.

I cannot comprehend why the Department of Agriculture undertakes to propose reductions in these valuable programs while at the same time the Department is making recommendations of a questionable nature which would cost the taxpayers inestimable amounts without any guarantee of return. In the school milk and lunch programs, we know where the money is going, and for whom. If only we could say the same about some other proposals by the Department of Agriculture.

GUNS OR MILK?

> As the 1967 budget made clear in advance, the President plans to cut back the school lunch program slightly and the school milk program drastically. Details were provided Tuesday in the health message the White House sent to Congress. The school lunch program will lose about $19 million in Federal aid and the milk program about $80 million. The first cut would mean lunches would go up in price about 1 cent, not enough, probably, to harm the program. The second cut would mean milk would go up 3 cents a half pint—double in price, in other words—and there seems little doubt that both the program and the diets of millions of children would be affected.
>
> The reason for the cutbacks is that about 1 million schoolchildren can't afford even the subsidized lunches and milk and the President wants to "provide food to those who need it most." That's noble, but why should a program that costs $50 million be financed by penalizing successful programs by $100 million? The President says we can have guns and butter, but this doesn't sound like it.
>
> Fifty million dollars is a modest sum, relatively. There is no reason to believe the Nation can't afford both the present milk program and the new approach to reach the poorest of the school population. The new approach involves new lunchroom and kitchen facilities for individual schools and strengthening educational agencies' nutrition staffs. It also calls for funds for free meals for the needy. Care will have to be exercised here in working out the administrative details. As Senator TYDINGS has said, if a means test is offensive in programs dealing with the elderly (an argument often made in championing medicare over the Kerr-Mills bill), it is even more so in programs dealing with children.

THE BIRTH OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago the late President Kennedy called on the peoples of the Western Hemisphere to establish an Alliance for Progress. He challenged North, South, and Central Americans to fight against the oldest enemies of mankind; hunger, disease, and ignorance.

On Monday President Johnson reaffirmed our commitment to that fight. He pointed out that the American nations have reason to be proud of the accomplishment of the alianza. The per capita economic growth rate exceeded the Punta del Este Charter goal of 2.5 percent in 1964 and 1965, as compared to a rate of 1 percent in the 3 preceding years. The United States and the Latin American nations are cooperating in building 130,000 new dwelling units, irrigating 136,000 acres of farmland, adding 530,000 kilowatts of electric power capacity, building 450 new health clinics and providing classrooms for over 1 million students. In accordance with the self-help provisions of the alianza many nations have passed comprehensive agrarian reform laws and are improving their tax systems. The organizational structure of alliance has been immeasurably strengthened by the creation of Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress, known as CIAP. CIAP is a nonrepresentational body of nine economic and technical experts which meets three times a year to take a hard look at the progress of the Alliance. The successful partners of the Alliance program has given individuals from all walks of life a chance to participate in the Alliance. My own State has a partnership with the nation of Colombia.

On this occasion I should like to reaffirm my personal commitment to the continued success of this great hemispheric experiment in human cooperation.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on St. Patrick's Day, people the world over, whether Irish by descent or not, unite to hail the blessed memory of that great saint and champion of freedom, Patrick, the apostle and patron saint of Ireland. With the green of shamrock in our buttonholes, or of clover doing duty for shamrock, with green neckties for the men and boys and green ribbons for the women and girls, we salute the memory of a great man, and the hard-earned liberty of a brave nation.

Patrick himself, seized and enslaved as a boy among the pagan Irish, and freed by the marvelous working of providence, returned as a missionary to spend his life in the voluntary service of the people among whom he had been a slave. This he did, both in obedience to the call of God, and in response to the generous promptings of his own noble heart. The story of his life, condensed into a brief chronology, as it has often been recited on this floor, is a triumphant tale of difficulties overcome and apparently impossible goals attained. We need not, in our matter of fact and skeptical day, take much account of the marvels that abound in the later legends of St. Patrick's career. We can perfectly well bottle up the fantasies, along with all the snakes that never were in Ireland, and cast them into the sea. But we should, while discarding the embroideries of invention, keep well in mind the necessary foundation in reality. Chesterton well said, in his satiric poem, "The Myth of Arthur.":

> Say, have you thought what manner of man it is of whom men say, "He could strike giants down"?

We see the figure of St. Patrick larger than life, across the ages, like the shadow of a man striding along a mountaintop. We can know that there is something of heroic stature, of magnificence of character, in a man whose memory is cherished through many centuries by a nation, and by the farflung descendants of that nation. But it is the great good fortune of all who have lived in the ages since St. Patrick's death, even down to our own time, that we have his life, in his own words, and his own character as plainly shown in his writing. In what St. Patrick has told of his own life and actions, in what he has disclosed of his motives and intentions, and in what he has written for the teaching and correction of his people, we see clearly the simplicity of soul, the humility, and the driving force of faith in God and love of the people and land of Ireland, that brought him to the pinnacle of glory that he occupies today in the hearts of the people he delighted to serve and to lead. May the memory of St. Patrick, in America as in Ireland, be green forever.

RESOLUTION TO LOWER VOTING AGE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the first session of this Congress, a number of resolutions were introduced to seek a constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18. Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a similar resolution, which reflects my firm belief that the right to vote has been denied for too long to Americans of 18, 19, and 20 years of age.

I introduce this resolution in the hope of correcting this injustice, for there is no more cherished possession in this country than the right to vote, and certainly there are no more deserving recipients of this right than our young citizens of today.

The responsible young adult of today is better educated, better informed, and better prepared to assume the full duties and rights of citizenship than any of his predecessors. Every current survey indicates that today's young adults read more newspapers, magazines, and books than did their fathers or grandfathers.

The young citizen is not deserving of the franchise merely because he is well informed or well educated; he also deserves that right because he has been given and has accepted the duties and responsibilities that go with citizenship. An 18-year-old American cannot be classified as a junior citizen. He is recognized as an adult by life insurance companies, taxed at the same rate as adults, can be arrested and tried as an adult, can marry and raise a family. Consider, too, the significant contributions made to this Nation by teenaged Peace Corps volunteers. And remember that 21 is not the cutoff age used when we send soldiers to fight and die in Vietnam.

These views, Mr. Speaker, have been and are shared by many respected Americans of both political parties. Among those who are on the record as favoring a lower voting age are the late President Kennedy, former President Eisenhower, Vice President HUMPHREY, Governor Rockefeller, and Supreme Court Justice Douglas.

Resolutions seeking a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age were introduced in past Congresses by two outstanding Michigan Congressmen, both now deceased. The late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, a Republican, introduced such a resolution in 1943, and the late Senator Blair Moody, a Democrat, offered an identical resolution in 1952.

Senator Moody, in offering his resolution 14 years ago, commented:

> If young men of 18, 19, or 20 years of age are considered old enough to fight in defense of their country, for the preservation of its ideals, they should also be considered old enough to help select the leaders of their country who control their destiny.

The President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation also recommends lowering the voting age. In a report discussing voter apathy, this Commission made an important point. It noted that high school represents the last formal education that many Americans will ever receive. Between the time they graduate from high school and the time they can cast their first vote is a period of about 3 years. During this time, a kind of political vacuum develops, and through stagnation, frustration, and apathy, the Nation is denied a substantial number of potential lifetime voters. This fact is shown in statistics which indicate that the 21- to 30-age group ranks among the lowest in voting participation.

By granting the right to vote to those 18, 19, and 20 years old, we would help correct this trend by permitting citizens to begin voting at the peak of their political interest—an interest stimulated in the civics and government classes of high school.

Twenty-one was established as the minimum voting age more than 150 years ago by our Founding Fathers. It was an arbitrary decision based on archaic ideas with roots in the Middle Ages. Even at that time, many prominent Americans attained to great heights while still in their teens. George Washington was a major in the Virginia Militia at 19; Alexander Hamilton was writing widely read political booklets before he was 15.

And as I have pointed out, today's youth certainly has more opportunities and privileges than did their counterparts of 150 years ago.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we demonstrate to the youth of this Nation that we are not bound by tradition, that we do appreciate their contributions to our country, and that we do recognize their ability to think and act as adults. I urge each of my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to give the right to vote to every citizen over the age of 18, in local, State, and Federal elections.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recently, by colleague from New York, Representative JAMES H. SCHEUER, introduced a bill to amend the Full Employment Act of 1946. I am proud to join him in cosponsoring that proposal.

The bill is the product of long, careful work by a group of our colleagues who share a concern for the limited employment prospects of lower income groups, particularly the youngsters. This measure would give special assistance to developing career positions in the subprofessional category of jobs. It would also stimulate social services which would not otherwise be available.

I commend my colleague from New York and those who participated in this study under his chairmanship. If enacted, this proposal could do much to alleviate grinding poverty and, at the same time, bring hundreds of thousands of people off the demeaning public assistance rolls and permit them to achieve the dignity of self-support.

THE HERITAGE OF ST. PATRICK

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today is one of the few days this year, as it is every year, when all the Members of this great body, no matter their home State or party, stand in agreement on the principal subject of the day: the commemoration of the death of a man of God whose influence has spread from a small section of a small island to the far reaches of the earth in the 1,505 years since he passed to his eternal reward. The beloved bishop of Armagh is indeed the apostle and patron saint of the Irish people, no matter where they may live. But more than that, St. Patrick remains a living symbol of hope amid despair, of humaneness amid barbarism, of freedom amid tyranny.

It is sometimes easy to forget the conditions of living that St. Patrick found when he came to the Emerald Isle. Cut off from the Roman heart of civilization by invasions of the western coast of Europe and the island to the west of the channel between, the Irish light of Christian culture burned only dimly, but it burned. And tended by the divinely inspired bishop of Armagh, it remained the vigil light for all of western Europe.

Perhaps it is a little less easy to forget the later invasion of Ireland by the allegedly civilized neighbors to the eastward. In all the chronicles of human history, no persecution, no pogrom, no inquisition, no genocide surpasses that visited upon Ireland by her English rulers.

Yet, through all the centuries of her tortured turmoil, Ireland and her people kept faith with the principles of freedom and justice until, at last, today freedom and justice themselves prevail in the land of St. Patrick.

Let St. Patrick and his people serve as an example to those everywhere in the world who suffer today as they have suffered in the past. As they were a milenium and a half ago, Christian principles and cultures are again under attack by atheistic barbarians. And even as the Irish people fought the harder when adversity was greatest, let all freedom-loving people remain uncompromising to the principles that stem from the social justice of natural law.

And let us here, where freedom and justice abound, stand firm in our condemnation of tyrannical aggression, without regard for geographical boundaries. Let us keep the faith and spread the faith and fight for the faith as the bishop of Armagh did—the faith that all men are created free and equal and are to live as they are created.

It is a proud and glorious day, Mr. Speaker, for you and all our fortunate colleagues who can trace your history back to Erin. But those of us who may not share your blood will always share your heritage. For though he may once have been Ireland's, St. Patrick is now the world's.

THE PRESS VERSUS THE MILITARY IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I join in the accolades of the majority floor leader and the minority floor leader paid to Bill Arbogast earlier today. I hope that what I have to say now does not detract from the tributes which have been paid to him.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I have to say to you vitally affects the security of our country and I believe—although I hope my remarks are not miscontrued—they should be made in the interest of the security of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the highly respected Columbia Journalism Review points up a problem which has been of great concern to me as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services; namely, the adequacy and objectivity of the coverage of the Vietnam war by the American press.

Mr. Speaker, the article which I shall request permission to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks is entitled "Press Versus Military in Vietnam: A Further View by Martin Gershen," feature writer for the Newark Star-Ledger.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gershen, who covered the Vietnam conflict for his paper last year, suggests that the controversy of press censorship by the military authorities in Vietnam is a result not of arbitrary news management by the authorities, but rather of irresponsible reporting by a group of young, inexperienced, and emotionally committed correspondents.

These correspondents seem to take the view that the American war in southeast Asia is not only against communism, but against the entire U.S. Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, the Gershen article, and others similar to it, point out some aspects of a problem which has vexed our national effort in Vietnam since its inception.

The problem, bluntly stated, is that neither in terms of adequacy of journalistic coverage nor objectivity are the American people being given a complete and fair picture of the Vietnam situation by the communications industry, and according to Mr. Gershen much of the explanation for this regrettable state of affairs lies in the fact that it is very expensive to send an experienced correspondent to Saigon to cover the Vietnamese war. For to many newspapers, the solution has been to hire the budget-priced, ambitious, young "stringers" who have paid their own way to Saigon and who, in Mr. Gershen's words, will "work for peanuts." In many cases these young correspondents are foreign nationals who are emotionally opposed to the American presence in southeast Asia.

This provocative article, Mr. Speaker, dealing with a matter so vital to the security of our Nation, has prompted me to make inquiry into its validity.

Mr. Speaker, I have concluded that there is great cause for concern. It is revealing to note that, according to the Department of Defense sources, of the 360 American correspondents accredited by the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, only 141—only 141—are U.S. citizens.

One hundred and forty-five of these correspondents are neither U.S. citizens nor Vietnamese.

Mr. Gershen in his article speaks of one experience with one of these foreign correspondents, and I quote from the article:

> I remember meeting one of these non-American U.S. correspondents the day after the Cam Ne incident. We both were leaving Da Nang. He was carrying a pouch of television film, which he was bringing to Saigon. I was returning to Pleiku.
>
> We were picked up at the press camp by two U.S. enlisted men who were ordered to drive us to the airfield where we were to catch a military flight south.
>
> On the way to the airfield my colleague began berating the two enlisted men over the Cam Ne operation.
>
> He implied that the marines were no better than the Gestapo.
>
> "Imagine you Yanks burning a village. I never saw anything like that in my life," said this correspondent, who obviously was too young ever to have covered a war before.

That is the article from the Columbia Journalism Review.

Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon public information officials were so concerned about this problem, that is about the lack of experienced correspondents covering the Vietnam war that they offered to pay all expenses for a 10-day tour of the area for newsmen.

Eighty-four correspondents went to Vietnam under this program. According to Department officials, the result has been some upgrading in the caliber of the newsmen being sent to Saigon.

As we all realize, Mr. Speaker, the American people do have questions about our participation in the Vietnam conflict. Therefore, it seems to me to be especially important that the American people be provided with the best possible information on the situation in Vietnam.

So long as this war is to be a subject of extensive public debate and soul searching, it is vital that the information, the input upon which this process operates, be as extensive and as accurate as possible.

The extensive role of television, Mr. Speaker, in the coverage of the Vietnamese war has created some new and different problems for the news media. This is the first armed conflict in our history in which television has had a substantial role to play in reporting news. As a communication medium, there is no question that television has an impact far stronger and more immediate than anything that has ever been used before.

This provides an opportunity for vivid and hard-hitting reporting from battle zones, reporting which is unprecedented in wartime news coverage.

Unfortunately, however, careless use of this medium has the capacity to shock and appall rather than to inform. There have been more instances when it has seemed to me that television reporting has featured the sensational and the shocking to the detriment of presenting an accurate and balanced report. It is a medium of such great impact that it must be used prudently and with factual balance.

Yet another disturbing aspect of the news coverage of this war is that so many of those who are responsible for keeping the American people informed have engaged in destructive criticism of our efforts, both military and civilian, in Vietnam. Criticism, Mr. Speaker, by the press is indeed most valuable when it clarifies and enlightens or presents thoughtful alternatives. It is very easy, however, for observers to slip into a pattern of negativism in which every action is criticized without consideration of positive alternatives.

This, I am afraid, is what has happened with respect to some coverage of the Vietnam conflict.

The choices which we must make in these efforts are not easy. Any relatively close decision will have its proponents and opponents. The issue, therefore, may be closely balanced. This is the way it always is with difficult problems. Therefore, criticism of decisions cannot be constructive unless balanced against alternate decisions which might have been reached.

Too many of the press critics in Saigon and in Washington, too, for that matter, have been content solely to attack the ultimate decisions taken without either measuring them against the proposed alternatives or proposing new alternatives. This kind of criticism contributes nothing to rational debate.

I should emphasize at this point that I recognize fully the difficulties the press has in covering Vietnam, with fronts and battlefields difficult, if not impossible, to define. Presenting a totally balanced picture of what is happening out there is an immense and, I am sure, often a frustrating job. But it is precisely because this war is so complex and perplexing that the press owes to the American people a higher degree of responsibility than ever before.

As I suggested earlier, our efforts in Vietnam are subject to one of the greatest public debates ever to accompany an American military conflict. If the public is to come to a rational and sound conclusion on what the American role should be in southeast Asia, it is more important than ever that they be provided with the most complete and accurate news reporting.

Mr. Speaker, I am a fervent believer in freedom of the press. But freedom of the press has never meant license for the press to follow irresponsibly a path that is detrimental to the national interests. It has been traditional and justifiable that in times or in areas where our national security has been endangered some limitation has been placed on the operation of the news media.

In wartime there have always been limiting procedures which the press have been required to follow in its coverage. But there has been no permanent damage to the rights of the press as a result of these procedures, and I believe that it is undeniable that the higher interests of our country and the American people have been well served by such limitations on press coverage.

At the present time restrictions on the press in Vietnam are relatively minimal. No true type of wartime censorship has been put in force, despite the fact that we are involved in immense military operations there. I for one hope that it does not become necessary to impose total censorship on Vietnam news. I believe that the American press can act responsibly and report the news accurately without endangering national security.

But if the news media do not demonstrate the responsibility and voluntary self-restraint of which I know they are capable, then we must be prepared to consider some form of wartime news censorship, which would include a more stringent policy toward accreditation of correspondents, a limitation in access to battle zones, and a scrutiny of the copy filed.

Over 200,000 young Americans, Mr. Speaker—almost 300,000—are committed to the Vietnam struggle. Vast amounts of our wealth and resources are being and will be dedicated to combating aggression and protecting our interests and those of the free world in southeast Asia.

We cannot fool ourselves about the fact that the prestige, the honor, and the security of the United States are involved in every decision made, in every word written or spoken word regarding American policies in Vietnam. The country simply cannot afford distorted, biased, inaccurate, incomplete, or irresponsible war news coverage.

If a responsible press operating in a free society is not capable of providing news coverage that meets these basic standards, then it can truly be said that our society and our free traditions are in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the article written by Mr. Martin Gershen, entitled "Press versus Military in Vietnam: a further view," from the Columbia Journalism Review, in the Record immediately following my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Press Versus Military in Vietnam: A Further View

(Note.—Martin Gershen, who wrote the following observations, is a feature writer-photographer for the Newark Star-Ledger, on leave to study in Columbia's advanced international reporting program. He covered the war in Vietnam last summer.)

There is a basic law of journalism which says that every story should have at least two sides.

Yet, in too many reports involving censorship in Vietnam, the press seems to have the last word.

And that word leaves the reader—or viewer—at home no alternative but to assume that the American war in southeast Asia not only is against communism, but against the entire U.S. Military Establishment.

In an article, "Censorship and Cam Ne," by Richard Rustin, which appeared in the fall 1965, issue of the Columbia Journalism Review, the writer made some attempt at giving both sides of the controversy that continues between the press and the brass.

But one had to read carefully and dig deeply to learn that the possibility exists that the press may be partly to blame for its troubles with the censors.

Edward P. Morgan suggested this possibility when he was quoted as saying there was a "passel" of young stringers in Vietnam who are trying to become the Ernie Pyles of this war by baiting military officials at press briefings.

But generally the article seemed to consist of quotations from one famous byliner after another who self-righteously attacked censorship in Vietnam and blamed the military for shackling the free press.

One of the more disturbing quotations was reported to have been made by UPI foreign news analyst Phil Newsom, who said: "It is doubtful * * * if the story of U.S. Marines burning a village near Da Nang ever would have come out if newsmen had not seen it."

Newsom, of course, was referring to a CBS television report of the burning of Cam Ne—a report which aroused much controversy at home because it suggested that marines arbitrarily burn Vietnamese villages. He implied that a hard-digging U.S. press corps took on a hard-to-get-along-with U.S. Marine Corps and uncovered a terrible secret.

If this were true, then bully for the newsmen.

But it wasn't true. The fact is that it is doubtful if newsmen ever would have seen the village razed if it weren't for the U.S. Marines inviting them to the burning.

I was at the Da Nang press camp when the Marine invitation was extended. I turned it down because I had a previous commitment to go on an air raid aboard a B–57 fighter bomber. The squadron took newsmen on flights one day a week.

The real reason for burning Cam Ne, of course, was that it was a Vietcong stronghold and William F. Buckley, Jr., who also was quoted in the Rustin article, made this point clear.

To report properly the story of the Marine operation at Cam Ne would have meant explaining that villages and their civilian populations play a key role in guerrilla warfare.

This is the why of the story, which of course is too complicated to make a good lead.

One of the major problems facing U.S. forces in Vietnam is being able to distinguish friend from foe.

The Marines, like all the services there, are aware too that they must win the people if they are to win the war and they lean over backward to avoid antagonizing local populations.

It must have taken Marine intelligence a long time to determine for certain that Cam Ne was a Vietcong stronghold.

Then, when they decided to destroy the village, they invited the press to come along.

Is it any wonder that they became annoyed when stories of their operation depicted marines as no better than SS troops who burned villages and pushed around women, children, and old men?

But even more annoying to military men in Vietnam is the caliber of many of the correspondents out there.

A ranking Pentagon officer observed recently that editors told him they were having difficulty getting good newsmen to cover Vietnam.

The problem. he said, was money. It costs about $1,300 round trip to fly a newsman to the other end of the world and for that amount of cash you would expect him to stay for a while.

But if he is an experienced newsman he has a wife and family so the news service would have to bring them along and settle them in Hong Kong or Bangkok.

Add periodic trips for the newsman to his family, additional life and accident insurance, education expenses for the kids and war becomes an unprofitable news story.

As a result, the Pentagon officer said, "American news services are hiring people out there they would never touch at home."

It's obviously cheaper to pick up a passel of young stringers who have already paid their way to Vietnam and who will work for peanuts.

In an effort to encourage the U.S. press to cover the war in Vietnam, the Defense Department last year flew 84 newsmen to southeast Asia.

"We did it, frankly, to prime the pump," the Pentagon officer said.

The military believed that by encouraging more newsmen to come to Vietnam, competition would become keener, resulting in less sensational stories and in more straight reporting.

The project was discontinued last summer as escalation of the war began in earnest because "we reasoned the American press was interested enough to pay its own way to Vietnam."

It didn't work out that way.

Of the 106 civilian news organizations from around the world who were represented in Vietnam last August, about 40 were American. Of the 260 newsmen present, approximately 175 were American.

Three months later, in November, the number of news organizations in Vietnam had increased to 136 but the proportion of U.S. services to the total rose less than 10 percent while U.S. troop strength had increased by the tens of thousands.

Of the 296 accredited newsmen covering the war, fewer than half were Americans. Foreign newsmen were hired by nearly all the American media. In some of the larger organizations 20 to 60 percent of the staff was foreign.

In the last 2 weeks of 1965, the number of U.S. services and staffers had begun to increase slightly, according to a Pentagon official.

Obviously, a certain number of foreign newsmen are needed on American staffs to overcome language barriers. The rest probably are hired to overcome budgetary problems.

I remember meeting one of these non-American U.S. correspondents the day after the Cam Ne incident. We both were leaving Da Nang. He was carrying a pouch of television film, which he was bringing to Saigon. I was returning to Pleiku.

We were picked up at the press camp by two U.S. enlisted men who were ordered to drive us to the airfield where we were to catch a military flight south.

On the way to the airfield my colleague began berating the two enlisted men over the Cam Ne operation.

He implied that the Marines were no better than the Gestapo.

"Imagine you Yanks burning a village. I never saw anything like that in my life," said this correspondent, who obviously was too young ever to have covered a war before.

Enlisted men are taught to treat civilians with respect, especially if they are from the press. The two GI's looked at each other but said nothing.

I tried, at first, to keep from getting involved, because we newspapermen have to stick together even if we're wrong.

But his criticism continued and finally I said, "For Christ's sake, shut up."

He looked at me in surprise. Then he said, partly as an explanation, partly as an appeal to my journalistic loyalties and partly to get the last word in:

"But I actually saw a Marine push an old man around."

I thought of the night I had spent with a Marine company surrounded in a jungle outpost by 300 Vietcong. I remembered the next morning walking down a road with a Marine sergeant who smiled at all the villagers he met because he couldn't tell the good guys from the bad guys and he didn't want to antagonize friendly Vietnamese.

I thought what a crazy, mixed-up war this is, where you can't tell the front from the rear, Vietcong from Vietnamese, civilians from soldiers. I turned to this young correspondent and very gently said:

"Look, it was a Vietcong village. How did you expect the Marines to handle that situation?"

He hesitated for a moment, then said, "Why don't you Yanks get out of Vietnam?"

And if he is typical of U.S. press representation in Vietnam, then the military people there have been very kind to us.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY, CALIF.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to the House yesterday in a special order, the poverty program in Santa Clara County, part of which I am privileged to represent, is in danger of ending in dismal failure, due to the fact that it has been infiltrated by leftwing extremist groups.

As a result of this infiltration, responsible, substantial, and capable citizens, without whom the poverty program cannot possibly succeed, are leaving the program in frustration and in disgust.

In an effort to do something to assure that the worthwhile objectives of the poverty program can be achieved and save it from failure in Santa Clara County, I asked the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Sargent Shriver, on last Wednesday, to thoroughly investigate the program in Santa Clara County. As yet I have not received a reply from Mr. Shriver.

I would point out that the criticism leveled at the poverty program in Santa Clara County has not diminished, while Mr. Shriver has been considering my request for a thorough, complete, impartial, and unbiased investigation of the program.

Yesterday I read into the Record an article by Mr. Harry Farrell, the distinguished political reporter for the San Jose Mercury and News, which was the first of a four-part series. Today, as further evidence in the continuing exposé of a left-wing and right-wing infiltration into the poverty program in Santa Clara County, I would like to read the second of that series into the Record. I quote from the article which appeared in this morning's San Jose Mercury in San Jose, Calif.:

> The doorbell rang on February 23 at the Sigma Pi house, in the "fraternity row" district east of San Jose State College, and was answered by one of the brothers, 19-year-old Garth Steen.
>
> Thereupon began one of the wackiest episodes in the whole Alice-in-Wonderland existence of the Santa Clara County Economic Opportunity Commission.
>
> The caller was a war-on-poverty canvasser, assigned to go door to door, turning out the poor for a meeting that night at EOC headquarters.
>
> Fraternity man Steen estimates that the annual income of his family, in the Central Valley, is probably in the five-figure range. But since he himself is a college kid not regularly employed, his personal income last year was only around $800. That made him poor in the eyes of the EOC.
>
> It is one thing for San Jose State College students to receive poverty war work study jobs, to help them work their way through college. It is quite another thing for these youngsters—including undergraduates not yet old enough to vote—to be voted onto the boards which actually call the shots for the EOC.
>
> Yet that is what is happening and the radical fringes of the San Jose State College student body are moving into the program like gangbusters.
>
> Because Steen had heard a lot about the war on poverty and had some questions about it, he decided to attend the meeting to which the canvasser invited him.
>
> When he showed up that evening, it turned out that the business at hand was to elect the representatives, delegates and alternates for the EOC in two subareas in East San Jose's area 4. These people would help run the area 4 service center, with a budget of about $122,000 and the stated purpose of coordinating all services for the poor within its territory. They would also elect the area 4 poverty representatives on the countywide EOC board.
>
> Steen learned that his fraternity house residence was in subarea 13, bounded by East Santa Clara, 10th, William and 17th Streets, which had an estimated population of 3,975.
>
> According to EOC philosophy, the spokesmen for the poor in this subarea, embracing 35 city blocks, should have been chosen by the town meeting techniques of pure democracy. The policy was to have the broadest possible participation.
>
> Well then, what teeming masses turned out for the subarea 13 election?
>
> They consisted of exactly three men: Steen; Donald Kantor, a San Jose State College freshman from Atherton; and William T. Fitzhugh of 485 South 12th Street.
>
> Since there were three EOC jobs to be filled—representative, delegate, and alternate—it was just a matter of dividing the spoils.
>
> Steen, who had scarcely given the local antipoverty war any serious thought before he went to the meeting, returned to the Sigma Pi house that night as the EOC's subarea 13 representative, duly elected for a 3-year term. By the time it ends, he will be old enough to vote.
>
> Kantor became Steen's alternate, and Fitzhugh became the elected delegate to help choose the area 4 spokesman on the countywide EOC board.
>
> The real irony lies in the past political affiliations of Steen and Fitzhugh.
>
> Steen is a stalwart of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF). He says he is essentially an average Republican (or will be, when he's old enough), but at YAF headquarters, where the prevailing attitude is somewhere to the right of Goldwater, they're chuckling about how they got "their man" into the EOC without even trying.
>
> Fitzhugh, by contrast, last year offered the use of his home and telephone to the "Individuals for Non-Violent Revolution." INVR put out an "end the draft" dodger about the time of the Vietnam Day demonstrations in Berkeley, assailing the Selective Service Act as a violation of the constitutional ban on slavery and involuntary servitude. The dodger bore the same address and telephone number now listed for Fitzhugh in EOC records: 485 South 12th Street, 295-3407.
>
> "Bill Fitzhugh" also appears as a signer of the "Support Stanton on Vietnam" ad that ran last year when Assemblyman William F. Stanton's opposition to the war was a flaming issue. The advertisement, as mentioned Wednesday, was sponsored by Attorney John Thorne, who was active in concert with Fred Hirsch in the maneuvering that ousted former EOC Director Arthur Potts. Hirsch's wife, Virginia, works in the Thorne-Stanton law office, incidentally.
>
> If the EOC election in subarea 13 was a farce, the one for subarea 9, just to the west, appears to have been—in the famous phrase of Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty—"stacked, rigged, wired, and packed."
>
> About a dozen persons showed up for the subarea 9 meeting, held concurrently with the subarea 13 election. Most of them were recognized as the inner circle of campus radicals at San Jose State: the "friends of SNICK," the antidraft "Students for a Democratic Society (SDS)," the bearded beatnik types.
>
> Steen asked some of these SNICK people if they knew Hirsch, who by this time was popping up everywhere in EOC affairs, and they said, "Sure, he's working with us all the time."
>
> One of those who turned out for the subarea 9 election was John Hansen, mentioned Wednesday as the literary editor of the leftwing "New Student," and admitted destroyer of civil defense shelter signs.
>
> The outcome of the subarea 9 election was predictable: The college leftists took over.
>
> Elected to the 3-year term as representative was goateed Raymond Ashley, who was one of the recent antinapalm demonstrators against United Technology Corp. The chosen delegate was Tom Linebarger, well known campus leftist.
>
> Ashley's alternate for subarea 9 is Irene Clark, a graduate student at San Jose State College.
>
> Thus Ashley, Miss Clark, and Linebarger constitute the EOC representation of the poor for an area of about 50 city blocks, with a population of 4,916.
>
> Since these Spartan students were elected to represent the poor in the poverty war, the students, as such, were theoretically without representation. So it was decided that the area 4 board should have a student at large too. He is Armando Velez.
>
> But there was still another opening for a representative at large on the board, and this also was snagged off by a student, Billy Bates Cole. Last year he was treasurer of SNICK, in which Hirsch is so active, and he took part in the antinapalm demonstration at UTC.
>
> Cole pops up all over in the war on poverty, both as board member and beneficiary. In his role as a student, he has been assigned under the work-study program to assist the Mexican-American project of the community council at $2 an hour.
>
> Another San Jose State College student with more than one poverty war capacity is Lee Garrett, who served on the EOC's area 4 planning and work committee. He is also on a work-study assignment to the University of California Institute of Governmental Studies. He was another signer of the "Support Stanton on Vietnam" ad.
>
> If the far-left establishment has scored some notable successes in capturing sensitive outposts of the antipovery war, the rightwing-conservative establishment has demonstrated the same capability.
>
> Last year when the EOC set about organizing its area 6 committee to fight poverty in Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos, Cupertino, Campbell and way points, the conservative element so active in that part of the county got busy with a telephone campaign.
>
> Insiders insist that no formal or deliberate action was taken, within any organized Republican or conservative group regarding intervention in the EOC. But as one source said, "it is true that friends will call friends," and there was at least one caucus among conservatives where a plan of action was worked out."
>
> The end result of this action was that when the first area 6 KOC council was elected last November 22 its 18 members included at least 16 Republicans of varying degrees of conservatism.
>
> Among them were five members of the Cupertino Republican Assembly (who statewide parent organization is currently run by the rightwing), including three of the group's board members: Charles Hinton, Fumio Toya and Wally Phelps.
>
> The conservative United Republicans of California (UROC) was also represented with at least three delegates: Vera Ladd, Bill Ellis, and Wendell Hammon.

> One delegate elected from the Saratoga area was Mrs. Diane Ravizza, whose husband Eugene, was Santa Clara County cochairman of the Goldwater-for-President campaign.
>
> Accordingly to knowledgeable sources, possibly 2 of the 18 EOC board members chosen in the November 22 area 6 election were members of the John Birch Society. The one known member is Max Kernaghan, a Birch chapter leader.
>
> One other delegate, Mrs. Mary Rice, is the wife of a former Bircher, Houston Rice, though she is not a member of the society herself. There is also one delegate who has attended some Birch meetings but has not joined the society.
>
> For a number of reasons, the EOC refused to recognize the controversial board which included these people. A new area 6 ad hoc committee was formed to get the West Valley program back on the track. It is still trying.

That concludes the second installment on the poverty program in Santa Clara County as written by columnist Harry Farrell for the San Jose Mercury and San Jose News. I read it into the RECORD to emphasize again the point I have been trying to make repeatedly in past weeks, namely, that this program in my congressional district is in a turmoil. It is fast losing the respect of the substantial element of the community without which it cannot operate successfully. I repeat again the point I made yesterday which I hope Mr. Shriver will read that far from trying to kill the poverty program in Santa Clara County, I am trying to save it from certain death. I repeat my plea to him. Come into this county and investigate this thing from top to bottom. Make it honest, impartial, and complete.

Let us find out what is really happening and why the leftwing extremists have been allowed to dominate this program and spell its certain death. Let us clean it up. Let us get on with the job of fighting poverty instead of engaging in the political wrangling and fighting to control the right to disburse political slush which has characterized the war on poverty in my congressional district.

Yesterday I had still another person in a position of importance in the war on poverty in my county add his voice to the request for such an investigation. Yesterday Mr. Luis Juarez was in my office. He happens to be vice president of the Economic Opportunity Commission and he told me he would welcome the very investigation I am asking Mr. Shriver to perform. His name can be added to a long list which includes the EOC itself, the Interfaith Committee for Social Justice, city and county officials, members of the clergy, and others.

Many persons involved in the program and many who honestly desire an investigation do not want funds frozen pending the outcome of the investigation which I have asked for. So in the interest of achieving some unanimity, I am willing to withhold on my request that funds be frozen if only we can get a clear, impartial, honest, and unbiased study of what is actually happening in Santa Clara County.

I repeat—such a study is the only thing that can save this program and keep it from ending in a dismal failure. I call upon Mr. Shriver to recognize realities and to give us the investigation that is required and in so doing save this poverty program in my congressional district.

HIGHER SUPPORT PRICES FOR DAIRY FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps nothing in the farm field at the present time which should cause the American consumer as much concern as the drop in dairy production.

We are witnessing this throughout the country and particularly in the Middle West.

Just by way of background, I wish to point out that we saw in 1965 a rather good production in the first part of the year and a very sharp and continuing drop in production in the last part of 1965 and now continuing into 1966.

As an example, in my own State of Wisconsin, production in September was down only 1 percent from a year ago. By October, however, it was down 6 percent. In November it was down 7 percent and in December it was down 7 percent.

As we move into 1966, production in Wisconsin is 7 percent below January of a year ago and 8 percent below February of a year ago.

Neighboring States have shown even more marked drops than this.

In January, Iowa milk production was down 15 percent from a year ago and in February it was down 17 percent from a year ago.

In Minnesota, January production was down 14 percent and the same drop of 14 percent applied in February.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to point out to the Members that these three States—Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa produce about 30 percent of all the milk produced in the country. When we start talking of drops of 15 percent in States such as Iowa and Minnesota and the impact that this can have on the national milk production, we are heading for a serious crisis unless something is done about dairy prices throughout the United States and particularly in the Middle West.

Many of my colleagues have come forward with recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture earnestly requesting that he increase, and sharply increase, price supports from the present level of $3.24 to a level of approximately $3.60 or to $3.75.

I also wish to point out that I have felt in my own mind that the proposals to increase supports for 1 year are not adequate in the dairy industry because a change in dairy production cannot be made in 1 year.

So a week ago I recommended to the Secretary of Agriculture that he offer some encouragement, some inducement to the dairy farmers to keep prices up for the next 3 years. I suggested that when he made the price support announcements this year, that he state if production did not swing up he would increase them further in 1967, and if that did not do it, that he would increase them further in 1968. I have not as yet had an opportunity to receive a reply from the Secretary. Not much time has elapsed. But I would hope that he would seriously consider some type of encouragement to the dairy farmers that price supports are not going to be raised for 1 year and then may be arbitrarily dropped back at the end of that particular year. It is important that the dairy farmer know over a period of time that prices will hold up if we are going to reverse this downward trend in dairy production that we are seeing.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague on the Agriculture Committee yield to me?

Mr. STALBAUM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. I merely wish to say that what the gentleman is saying has been said over and over again in the mail that is coming to my office these days. I brought with me a letter just received yesterday from a consumer, not from a farmer. I just want to repeat in his words what the gentleman so adequately said:

> Farmers are in tough shape. Sure, hog and beef prices are up, and you mark my words, if we don't watch out, in 2 years milk will also be sky high as dairyman after dairyman is selling out.

We cannot afford to have the farmers subjected to the kind of feeling that he surely will be subjected to by the consumer if the price of milk for those who remain in the industry goes up to the point where the consumers really feel that they cannot afford to have this product available to them at prices they can pay. This is happening in other areas.

You and I, sitting on the Agriculture Committee, discussing these questions, know that price fluctuation is not what helps farmers, but a decent level of prices is what we want and what the American family farmer wants. It does not do any good to have these high spots which actually cut off markets, and especially in a dairy. We have discussed this in our Dairy Subcommittee for a long time, and we certainly agree on this point, I know, that unless we bring the level of support up and offer some assurance to the dairy farmers that it will be worth their while to stay in this game, just as surely, as this consumer points out, and as you have documented, we will lose continually in cow numbers until dairy prices will indeed be priced out of reach for a vast number of consumers in this country. And this goes for all the other programs, and for the Federal Government-sponsored programs as well.

We try to furnish adequate amounts of these products for programs such as school lunches and all of the other charitable programs and overseas programs, which actually build markets and help everyone.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for the presentation he is making. I feel it is one that should have the widespread attention of everyone who is concerned. It is not just a position that the American dairy farmer is seeking relief from. We indeed must be concerned that everyone has the protection to be assured this most healthful and nutritious product will continue.

Mr. STALBAUM. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for those very kind remarks and his pointing out that consumers are now concerned about the possibility of a further shortage. This is the very thing I am hopeful we can head off. With a modest increase in price supports we can get some stability and offer encouragement to dairy farmers to continue in the dairying industry, thus avoiding a fluctuation in prices such as my distinguished colleague from Minnesota has mentioned.

He mentioned the problem of what could happen in 2 years. That, again, buttresses my argument that the Secretary must give dairy farmers encouragement for longer than a 1-year price support announcement if we are going to see a change in the drop of production.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STALBAUM. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding to me. As he knows, I represent that district in Wisconsin and the district in Congress that produces more milk and cheese than any other congressional district of the 435 here in the Congress. I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture has been negligent in failing to announce a price support for the marketing year which begins on April 1.

The confusion that exists in dairy markets, whether you look at the butter market in Chicago or the cheese market in Green Bay, has been evident for the last 3 or 4 weeks and has had a very bad effect upon the dairy producers in our State.

There have been all kinds of rumors. It was rumored, just 3 weeks ago, that the Secretary had decided to go to $3.50 for milk with a 3.7 butterfat content per hundredweight. The current price support level is $3.24 for milk, with 3.7 butterfat content.

According to the change of method in calculating the parity equivalent for manufactured milk of April 1 automatically the price will have to go up to $3.31 for milk with an average butterfat content of 3.7, because that is the national average. As the gentleman from Wisconsin knows full well, pay prices to farmers in Wisconsin, Minnesota, New York, and in all the States of this Nation are based on a 3.5 butterfat content for milk.

What is happening here? Because of the failure of the Secretary of Agriculture to make his price support announcement, which is long overdue, not only have the markets reflected this confusion, but also it has put them into a position where contract after contract is not being filled as far as manufactured milk is concerned, because these people are unable to bid on contracts for delivery after the first of April with this uncertainty that exists today.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin knows, the Secretary seems to be going along now to continue the 75-percent level, as far as manufactured milk is concerned—the continuation, as I call it, of the Johnson-Freeman program to liquidate the dairy farmer.

It seems to me that those who were willing to criticize this same program a few years ago should be willing to criticize it today.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a point there?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STALBAUM. I do not fully endorse the statements of my colleague on the Secretary of Agriculture, but I am disturbed by the rumors we are now hearing, to which my colleague has made reference, that there is a possibility there will be no increase in price supports, that there is a prevailing thought that a price support increase at this time would add to the inflationary impact we are all discussing.

Mr. LAIRD. Just the opposite is true, I am sure.

Mr. STALBAUM. If the gentleman will allow me to finish on this point—and this is by way of background here so that Members will know the position we are taking—the argument is being made that this will be an inflationary point. I want to point out later in my remarks, and apparently my colleague is anxious to concur in them, that just the opposite is likely to occur. I want to elaborate on this further.

I do not want to take away some time which my colleague might want to use, but I wanted to get this clear for the RECORD, that we are now more disturbed about some rumors we hear that there may be no price increases, than we were about the delay. This is the reason why I have taken the time today.

Mr. LAIRD. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin agree, though, that evidently the $3.50 announcement which was going to be made a few weeks ago has been held up on advice of the President's economic advisers?

Mr. STALBAUM. I would have to say that these are the rumors which I have heard. I have attempted to track them down. It is not that easy for a newcomer in Washington to get to the base of all these, but in my own mind I am satisfied that is the reason it is being held up. I have heard enough fragments of information to come to this conclusion.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman also knows that unless we get to $3.68 for 3.7 milk, it will have no effect on the market as far as butter, powder, and cheese are concerned.

Mr. STALBAUM. At this moment.

Mr. LAIRD. It will have no effect on the market as of this time.

Mr. STALBAUM. As of this time.

Mr. LAIRD. There would not be a single pound of cheese, butter, or powder purchased during the next marketing year.

Mr. STALBAUM. I will not say for the next marketing year, certainly as of now, anything under $3.68 would not require the Government to move in and make purchases. That is correct.

Mr. LAIRD. As the gentleman knows, there are three basic causes for the growing shortage of milk in the United States:

First. Many farmers are leaving dairying because of the growing difficulties that a continuing cost-price squeeze presents.

Second. The high competitive milk prices that are now in effect are damaging the financial condition of many dairy plants.

Third. The severe culling of dairy cows in some areas because of weather conditions and their effect on feed.

The gentleman also knows how many farmers are leaving farms in Wisconsin because of this cost-price squeeze they are going through at the present time. The cost of things they have to purchase is continuing to go up, up, up.

Mr. STALBAUM. It is not only in Wisconsin. The last figures point out, nationally, production is down 6 percent, and this is from Agriculture Department figures. It points out that there were gains in only 9 of 50 States, and these were not, as I look them over, major dairy States. Forty-one States show a reduction in production.

There was a story on this in the Washington Post only the day before yesterday entitled, "Area Dairymen's Ranks Are Thinning."

While we are most concerned about Wisconsin, this is not a provincial problem that you and I are discussing today but, rather, a national problem.

Mr. LAIRD. No. I think the gentleman knows and all dairy farmers in Wisconsin knows the dairy price-support law of 1939 states that the price of milk, manufactured milk, will be supported at from 75 to 90 percent of parity in order to insure an adequate supply. The basis of the flexible price-support program was to give to the Secretary of Agriculture that flexibility which would be necessary in order to insure an adequate supply.

Mr. STALBAUM. So he would raise supports when supplies are running short.

Mr. LAIRD. And when supplies are going down the idea of that program was to give him that latitude so that he could insure an adequate supply of milk.

Mr. STALBAUM. That is correct. It is the full intent of the law.

Mr. LAIRD. And there is no legislation needed by the Secretary of Agriculture to carry through on that mandate in the present law. Is that not correct?

Mr. STALBAUM. That is correct. However, the point I want to make, getting back to the brief discussion we had on the failure to raise supports, is that it was done because they felt it would be anti-inflationary. This is not true. Now permit me to point out this action which will take place. I think my colleague and others would agree that we are going to have inflation in dairy product costs if the product becomes scarce or short. This is the surest way to get increased food costs to the American consumer. If we set the price-support level at some point where the dairy farmer is encouraged now—and that is why I asked for this for more than 1 year—if he is now encouraged to reverse this downward production trend, this would be the best thing that we could do to stop any inflationary long-term effect on the costs of dairy products. I say this because the farmer is a realistic sort of person. We have all heard of the farmer who wants to see something in black on white. He wants to have proof of things. Unless we give him proof that dairy prices will continue to hold, he is not going to be encouraged to go into dairying. We have many old dairy farmers, but we have very few young ones, because they are not interested in going into the field of dairying. Only through the encouragement of the type shown by an increase in price supports, I contend, can we avoid the fluctuation that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON], referred to a few moments ago, which would be worse both for the consumer and for the dairy industry.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STALBAUM. I will be happy to yield to another colleague from the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague [Mr. STALBAUM] regarding the urgency for increased price supports for dairy products.

I represent one of the heaviest, per capita, milk-producing districts in the United States. And I can tell you of my personal knowledge that unrealistically low price-support levels for milk have caused a situation of danger, distress, and alarm.

Dairy farmers by the thousands in my district no longer are waiting for realistic recognition of their financial problems by the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, they cannot wait. They are deserting their dairy farms altogether, or are changing to other types of farming as a matter of economic survival.

Yesterday, the President of the United States announced to the world that "we intend to land the first man on the surface of the moon and we intend to do this in the decade of the sixties."

That's fine, Mr. Speaker. I hope we do. But we cannot do it at the expense and sacrifice of our dairy industry. I cannot emphasize too strongly that refusal of the U.S. Government to take a realistic approach to dairy price supports is crippling the dairy industry and sowing seeds for a gigantic shortage of dairy products.

Somehow, the President and the Secretary of Agriculture have got to be made aware in clear, unmistakable terms that this Nation faces a grave, impending threat by an accelerating deterioration of the dairy industry. Every day that this deterioration is permitted to continue will make it more difficult to reverse.

I agree with my colleague, now is the time for the Secretary of Agriculture to raise the price-support level for dairy products.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STALBAUM. I yield to still another colleague of mine, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM], for taking this time and directing the attention of the Congress to this very important crisis in the production of one of our most important foods, milk.

Mr. Speaker, it is not always the case that producers and consumers in a given action are both advantaged by change in policy or by legislative action in a particular field.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman has demonstrated by his observations and his analysis of this question that here is a case in point where the increase of support prices for dairying could both be of benefit to consumers and producers.

While those of us who tend to represent dairying districts are in large measure speaking here this afternoon, I believe that this is in the common good for the consumers throughout this country.

Mr. Speaker, also I would like to add a personal note, and that is this: I believe the gentleman in the well [Mr. STALBAUM], and his extremely able leadership in this field in his first term in Congress is deserving of the especial commendation. The gentleman from Wisconsin is doing the State of Wisconsin proud.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I assume from his remarks that the gentleman concurs in this fact: It would be better to give a modest or basic price-support increase at this point than to allow the supplies or dairy products to continue to reduce and thus to get prices into erratic fluctuations. Such fluctuations I believe could drive up the cost of this very important item in the American consumer's food basket to unknown heights.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STALBAUM. I yield further to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the gentleman on this point. An economic scarcity is not indicated here. What the gentleman is implying or suggesting now as a course of action, I do concur in.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STALBAUM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a dairy farmer myself, and have lived on a farm and had a dairy herd for many, many years.

I believe the point that my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, MEL LAIRD, brought up is a very significant one; and that is the need for some statement or some announcement at this point from the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe this to be very important.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows what will be done. The market would fluctuate because of this uncertainty. There would be an uncertain market. One of the tragedies in the grain marketing facilities of our country has been the fact that no one knows from one day to the next what the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary of Agriculture may do. The dairy industry for the same reason suffers at this point.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM], stated that some long-range announcement needs to be made so that we know where we are going and what is going to happen, as far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. STALBAUM. Does the gentleman from Minnesota concur in my efforts to suggest that the Secretary of Agriculture announce further increases a year from now, if he is not obtaining the desired results?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would suggest that the Secretary needs to make an announcement on a long-term basis so that we may know where we are going.

I believe if the farmer knew what were to happen he might be more inclined to stay in business, more so than presently.

Further on that point, herd after herd of dairy cattle are being sold because of the fact that the dairy farmer cannot know for sure what future market conditions will be.

Mr. Speaker, I have never advocated a too-high level of support. I believe the purpose of support prices is for the stimulation of production whenever the supply needs stimulation.

At the same time, all of recognize that if the price goes too high, certainly the consumer might suffer. But the price has not been adequate.

I believe a market at a higher level of support and some long-term statement needs to be made by the Secretary so that we know where we are going.

Mr. STALBAUM. In other words, the gentleman from Minnesota is in full accord with my request to the Secretary of last week, that if by his announcement this year we are not getting enough production increases to meet our needs, both domestic and export, that he at this time announce whether he would consider setting a higher price support a year ahead from now?

Mr. NELSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe we need some kind of announcement on a longer time basis than we have been accustomed to receiving.

Mr. STALBAUM. I thank the gentleman for supporting my effort for a long-range announcement.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STALBAUM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I can well understand the gentleman's interest in having a long-term, perhaps 3-year announcement made. Personally, however, I would like to get the announcement made for the next marketing year.

It is all right to talk about a 3-year announcement, but as the gentleman from Wisconsin well knows, an announcement would have no effect if it were announced for 3 years in advance, because the law is very clear that it can only be announced for 1 year, and during that 1-year announcement the Secretary of Agriculture can increase prices during the 12-month period. But he cannot reduce prices during that same 12-month period.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to see done is for the price-support program to be reviewed every 3 months. I would like to have a hearing in Wisconsin every 3 months, where the farmers would have an opportunity to present their views to the Secretary of Agriculture on this important matter, and so that the farmers would be able to come before the Secretary of Agriculture and give him their views on this most important matter.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard even for a Wisconsin farm representative to get in to see the Secretary of Agriculture about this important question right now. He has delayed the announcement for 6 weeks already.

Mr. STALBAUM. I want to point out to my colleague that I think we are working for a common purpose. I suggest that the administration will be in power certainly in 1968 and he could give us some indication now although he could not make a firm announcement on price supports after April 1, 1967. I agree technically that my colleague is right that the announcement could only be made from April 1, 1966 to April 1, 1967, with a proviso to be increased above it during that year but not dropped below it. But the Secretary could as a statement of policy indicate at present that if on April 1, 1967 the support prices in effect are not getting the increase in production that we need that he will go further. This I grant would not be a firm announcement—it could not be—but certainly it would be an encouragement to the American dairy farmers to get into the dairy business.

Mr. LAIRD. I am glad the gentleman agrees and I think we are in agreement on this that any announcement that does not go to at least $3.68 will have no effect upon the market.

Mr. STALBAUM. At this point, I think we are in some disagreement as to what may happen through the year.

Mr. LAIRD. Does the gentleman feel that through the year it may have some other effect?

Mr. STALBAUM. Come May or June it could be possible that at the $3.68 level there would be commodities that might have to go into storage, but I do not envisage this for the greater part of the year.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you not think it would be a good idea for the school milk and other school lunch programs?

Mr. STALBAUM. I am for it but I am of the opinion that at the $3.68 level, as you state, there would not have to be any commodities bought through most of the year. I would not expect that.

Mr. LAIRD. But, of course, on this projection of production and perhaps these projections may be wrong, but the gentleman's projections which he used earlier I think bear this out, that in January production was down about 5.3 percent, as compared with January a year ago. If you take the projections for February, April, March, and May, these projections show an even more drastic reduction. You go from 5.3 percent in January to 6 percent, down, in February. If you look at these projections, I think you will find they are going down.

Mr. STALBAUM. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for joining with me in these remarks and also to say that we are in general agreement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of price supports under my special order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE ARMY ARSENAL SYSTEM AND THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY (ITS CAPABILITIES)—IV

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, we have talked about the history and accomplishments and some of the background of the decision to close the Springfield Armory. Today we want to discuss the capabilities of this historic facility.

The Springfield Armory is unique in many respects. It is equipped with certain types of special purpose machinery ready to perform crash production of urgently needed weapons parts. Private industry cannot be expected to maintain such machinery for uncertain requirements. This is not the way profits are made, but it is the way our troops are supported when an unexpected need arises, as it always does.

Another unique aspect of the armory is its versatile and flexible direct labor force. Machine tool operators are trained for and required to operate a wide variety of production equipment. When production lines are closed down the personnel remaining are hard core, well trained, versatile experts capable of carrying a component along through several operations. These people act as the backbone of a production force needed in a hurry in times of national emergency. These people also provide essential jobbing shop services vital to the support of product research and development as well as manufacturing development.

Pilot line production capability, such as that available at the armory, is essential to the final evaluation of a new weapon from the standpoint of costs, reliability, and adaptability to mass production. It also provides for the development of technical data and specifications preparatory to contracting for the weapon or weapons system from industry. Pilot production at the armory on the M14 rifle, the M60 machinegun, and the M79 grenade launcher, in recent years, assisted greatly in production of these essential weapons by private industry as the needs of the Vietnam war developed. Pilot production frequently provides the initial limited quantities needed for training key combat units and sometimes, as in the case of M14, M60, and M79 programs, serves as an emergency source of production to provide critical needs when commercial sources have difficulties meeting initial program deliveries. Now it is said, private industry has the capability and the armory is no longer needed. I can only ask what happens next time around?

Pilot production will be required in the future, from some source, on a number of weapons that are now in the development stages, such as the SPIW system—a new rapid fire special purpose infantry weapon—the XM140—30 millimeter automatic gun—XM23 and XM24 subsystems—helicopter machineguns—the low and high velocity launcher programs, and the M73 fixed-ejector weapon conversion. If industry is the only source for doing this type of job, it is almost certain that the costs will be high and the individual companies will strive to serve their own interests. This is the nature of competitive private industry. Such industry always needs the prod of competition.

Mr. Speaker, the armory has served and can continue to serve as a weapons overhaul center, a function for which private industry is seldom equipped or competent to perform. As an example, the armory overhauled 175,822 M1 rifles during fiscal year 1964 for our military assistance program. Work is continuing on the overhaul of this and a number of other weapons. The role played by the Springfield Armory in this vital overhaul work is possible only because of the experience and technical capability of its long-term personnel. These are assets not maintained by private industry which must make a profit in order to exist.

Misguided people may sometimes compare pilot line production costs with mass production costs on a direct unit cost basis. This, of course, should never be done. Pilot line production costs can be indicative of what mass production costs should be, but it is never a direct yardstick for measuring such costs. Unfortunately, for the Springfield Armory, direct cost comparisons of this type have been made for the justification of eliminating production at Springfield. However, when one looks at the last time Springfield Armory was called upon to mass produce a weapon—the M1 rifle in 1954–55—unit costs at the armory were substantially less than those of private industry, $64 per unit compared with $85 and $86.50 per unit by the two commercial producers.

Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Armory represents an investment of over $65 million with a replacement value of around $130 million. The armory utilizes 333.57

acres—of which 222.75 acres are in the Watershops Pond. There are 68 buildings and structures, primarily of brick masonry, of which 16 are manufacturing buildings. Some people think that because the armory has been in existence for nearly two centuries the facilities are obsolete and inefficient. This is not the case. Many of the buildings are of relatively recent vintage and the machines and equipment are modern and efficient. The personnel are highly trained and competent.

The manufacturing and shop capabilities at the armory are especially valuable during peacetime when private industry has little interest in the small quantities required by the military. However, Springfield is also a research and development center for small arms, without equal. It is a part of this capability which has been proposed to be transferred to the Rock Island Arsenal in Illinois. But only a part of this capability is proposed for transfer, because there would be lacking the pilot production and related capabilities so essential to the development and proving of new weapons systems.

It will cost a great deal to duplicate the research, development, and engineering capabilities and competence at a new location, once Springfield is closed. Springfield now possesses unique capabilities for specialized weapons research in the areas of: first, mechanical research for weapons development pertaining to springs, flash suppressors, gun barrels and mounts; second, materials research pertaining to metallurgy, nondestructive testing, packaging, lubricants, plastics, metal finishing, welding, and joining; third, weapons systems development involving system design for future weapons, system analysis for proposed weapons and the construction of simulators; and, fourth, engineering photo analysis involving high-speed photography, ultra-high-speed photography, and data reduction of film.

Aside from earlier accomplishments, the Springfield Armory has proven modern development capabilities as demonstrated in recent years by the work performed on: first, hand and shoulder weapon design, such as the M14 rifle, the M60 machinegun, the M79 grenade launcher, and the special-purpose infantry weapon—SPIW; second, vehicle weapon design, such as the M73 machinegun, the M85 machinegun, and the M60 machinegun version for vehicles; third, spotting rifle designs of various types and calibers; and fourth, aircraft weapon system design and adaptation, especially for the helicopter and troop aircraft support.

The armory has proven and demonstrated engineering capabilities, for the present and the future, in the areas of: first, technical data packages; second, product engineering; third, preparation of specifications and standards; fourth, value engineering; fifth, packaging engineering; sixth, weapons maintenance engineering; seventh, development of engineering records for future reference; and eighth, contract supervision.

There are unique capabilities seldom if ever duplicated by private industry and never maintained by industry in times of peace when military weapons procurement is slack. It is almost beyond belief—and I would not believe it possible if it had not been ordered—that a facility so important to our military readiness should be closed especially in the present period of national peril.

THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY—NO. 4

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the fourth in a series of articles entitled the "History of the Springfield Armory," written by Mr. C. L. Dvarecka for the Gun Report magazine, traces the development of two of this country's greatest infantry weapons; perhaps two of the greatest ever developed—the Springfield model M1903 .30-caliber rifle, and the M1 Garand rifle.

The famous '03 rifle was the standard U.S. Infantry weapon throughout World War I and for many years thereafter. It is still regarded by experts as one of the finest all-round military and target pieces ever developed. And sporterized Springfield '03 models are still among the most sought-after hunting rifles in the world.

The M1 Garand rifle, of course, was the standard of the world during the Second World War. Its semiautomatic, self-loading features, together with its accuracy and reliability, made it the most formidable single small arm for a generation.

The invention and development of these two weapons are among the proudest chapters in the history of the Springfield Armory. They are integral parts of the tradition for craftsmanship, know-how, and production genius inherent at the armory. The skills which went into these two first-rate weapons are a distillate of the generations of experiences and devoted service of the craftsmen employed at the armory. These skills and experience will not easily be replaced or matched anywhere else in the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent procedures, I include part 4 of "The History of the Springfield Armory," by Christopher L. Dvarecka, at this point in my remarks:

HISTORY OF THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY—PART 4

(By Christopher L. Dvarecka, information officer)

The 28 years spanning the period 1892 to 1920 saw the Springfield Armory again become a focal point of arms-making activity as the Spanish-American War and World War I uprooted the Nation from its everyday peacetime pursuits. The former conflict in 1898 followed closely by the Philippine Insurrection in 1899 and the Boxer Revolt in China in 1900 saw the work force here temporarily increased. However, in overall numbers of workmen and from a production standpoint, the Spanish-American War brought about no great changes at the armory.

In 1892, the first bolt-action rifle appeared on the American scene followed by improved models in 1894, 1896, and 1898. The large caliber, single loaders were supplanted in 1898 by the light, small-caliber, magazine-fed rifle known as the Krag-Jorgensen. This was produced in two models—the rifle which was 40.14 inches long, and the carbine—40.9 inches long. Some of these rifles were on the *Maine* when she was sunk in Havana Harbor. They saw service in the Spanish-American War when Teddy Roosevelt's "Rough Riders" stormed San Juan Hill, and in the Philippines and China in 1899 and 1900. Certain modified 1873 models also saw service in the war with Spain. Further service was precluded by the adoption of an improved model in 1903.

The basic design of the U.S. rifle, caliber .30 M1903, was taken from the German Mauser. This design combined the rifle and carbine characteristics of the 1898 model with a view to providing a weapon suitable for both foot and mounted troops. In point of functioning, accuracy, and general serviceability as an all-around military and target piece, it is considered by experts as one of the finest weapons ever made.

At about the same time the Springfield '03 rifle was adopted, the Ordnance Department first began considering the idea of a self-loading rifle for military use. Commercial manufacturers had been experimenting along these lines for some time. The idea, developed along military lines at Springfield Armory, eventually led to the adoption of the M1 rifle.

No significant changes in buildings and grounds were made at the hill shops after 1893 until World War I. The water shops facilities also remained much the same from Civil War days until the era following the Spanish-American War when, in 1902, an act of Congress saw funds appropriated for the enlargement of the buildings at the water shops and the installation of additional machinery. These additions to the water shops plant were completed by 1906 at a total cost of $300,000.

Four Ordnance Department officers served as commanding officers during these years: They were Col. Alfred Mordecai, 1892–98; Lt. Col. Isaac Arnold, 1898–99; Lt. Col. Frank Phipps, 1890–1907; and Col. Stanhope Blunt, 1907–12.

Prior to the advent of World War I, army rifle requirements were light and the 110 guns produced daily were not only sufficient to supply the Regular Army and the National Guard, but also to create a reserve in supply depots. However, when war was declared in April 1917, the whole plant was galvanized into action to meet the needs of the large wartime machine. Furnaces at the water shops burned night and day; machinery at the hill shops hummed around the clock. New buildings went up, were quickly equipped, and put into operation. A machinegun school was established. All types of small arms manufactured in this country were tested at the armory. A small arms proving ground for ammunition was also established. The tremendous increase in production and resultant expansion was made somewhat difficult by the physical layout of the plant. The biggest problem was the maximum utilization of existing floor space. This was solved by the policy of replacing machinery which could not justify its usefulness with modern automatic machines as rapidly as they could be obtained and installed. By studying and applying systems of handling and routing material and components, the production per unit floor space and per operator was greatly increased.

Between August 1, 1914, and April 1, 1917, total allotments for orders were about $6 million with total expenditures at the $2.5 million mark. Between this latter date and November 15, 1918 (19 months), the allotments for orders placed with the armory totaled $24.7 million with disbursements at the $17.1 million level.

The following buildings were constructed: a metallurgical laboratory, new building for small arms and machinegun experiments, addition to the administration buildings, addition to the milling shop for inspection purposes, addition to proof-firing rooms, and barracks for guard organizations. During World War I the armory was guarded by an Army military contingent, a civilian guard force, and by local police. A plant for the Parker rustproof process was installed. This was an important development which replaced the old sand-blast method, revision of heat treating apparatus, including modern furnaces, oil-circulating system and power handling of supplies. Advantage was taken of the development of the electric power system to install this type of drive, replacing the steam engine by turbogenerators. The group method of machine drives was also adopted.

The small arms proving ground, a ballistic station for long-range work with machineguns, was set up at Borden Brook—26 miles from Springfield. Many very valuable discoveries and developments were made there. It was at Borden Brook that the important machinegun tests of May 1917, were made. In these tests the Browning machinegun proved its superiority over anything yet seen in that line.

When the United States entered the war in April 1917, the armory was employing 1,377 persons. The largest number of employees on the rolls in World War I was in November 1918, when 5,381 workers were employed here. At the time of the armistice there were 5,328 civilians—650 of these being women. There were more than 100 officers on duty here (prior to the transfer of the machinegun school in 1918) and nearly 100 enlisted men. A body of 1,000 troops (2d, 6th, and 8th Infantry, Massachusetts) was camped on the armory grounds and at one time during the war a regiment of heavy artillery was also stationed here.

Commanding officers during war years were Lt. Col. William Pierce, 1912–18; Col. Jay Hoffer, 1918 (Lt. Col. George Stewart served as acting CO in 1918 and later served as commanding officer here during part of World War II); and Lt. Col. Lindley Hubbell, 1918–20.

World War I peak production, starting in June 1917, with an average daily production of 175 rifles, was gradually increased until November 1918, when the average daily production hit a total of 1,500 guns. In the 19 war months, the armory work force turned out 266,638 completed rifles—enough to equip 15 frontline divisions at that time. In addition they turned out thousands of sabers, pistols, bayonets, machinegun parts, bolos, plus weapons parts and repairs.

With the advent of the machinegun as an important weapon of modern warfare, it became necessary to train soldiers in its care, operation, repair, and handling. On the Mexican border in 1916, the distressing fact that American machineguns had apparently fallen down on the job was believed to be due less to the design of poor quality of the gun than to ignorance in its use on the part of operators who had no specific training and little experience with this type of weapon. To rectify this situation, a machinegun school was set up at Harlingen, Tex., in the summer of 1916. A direct outgrowth of this school was a similar school established at the armory shortly after.

The requirements of our Army brought about a need for 200,000 machineguns and operating crews. From the recently established officers' training schools throughout the country came the vanguard of instructors to Springfield to form the nucleus of the machinegun army. At one time 250 men and 60 officers were in training here. The course covered all types of machineguns then in action and proved of paramount importance to the Army. In April 1918, this school was transferred to the Ordnance School at Camp Hancock, Ga., along with its military and civilian personnel. Prior to its transfer the school had trained 353 men who had gone on to camps and cantonments as instructors, some as expert armorers, and others overseas to combat zones.

There was only one instance during the entire war period when anything approaching a disaster was experienced at the armory. This occurred when a bearing on one of the main driving shafts went out of commission during the height of production in September 1918. It was reported that emery dust had been placed in the shaft bearings by German sympathizers. Investigation failed to show any basis for such a report. The overworked bearing simply wore out. The break occurred before the hill shops were completely electrified. The broken shaft supplied power for the machine and milling shops and transmitted it through the old tunnel under Federal Street to the shops. When it went out of commission it slowed up the entire plant. To repair it without loss of production seemed impossible. Unless some means of solving the emergency could be found, it would have been necessary to close the shops temporarily. However, among the old relics at the armory which had never been dismantled was an old Civil War walking beam compound engine. It had been condemned for years, but had never been dismantled. It offered a slight ray of hope. Engineers went to work and after 6 hours of labor it was set in motion, hooked to other power units, and production was resumed with only a slight delay.

With the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918, a heavy demobilization of the work force began. Night shifts were eliminated; women factory workers released; and the heavy guard discharged in December. The gradual reduction in force was slowed somewhat by the cleaning and repairing of small arms and machine guns coming back from camps and fighting zones in 1919. The conversion from feverish wartime production to peacetime missions was accomplished without incident.

An interesting sidelight of those war years was the appearance of a plant magazine, the Armorer, published during 1918. It was the armory's first house organ and the forebear of today's installation newspaper.

[From 1918 Armorer]

"GENERAL PERSHING ASKS SPRINGFIELD ARMORY TO GO OVER THE TOP WITH SPARE PARTS FOR SPRINGFIELD RIFLES"

"General Pershing cables that there is an urgent need for spare parts for the Springfield rifles carried by our boys in France. So great and so immediate is the need that Springfield has been requested to devote every available moment for a period of 40 days to the manufacture of rifle parts only for shipment abroad. At the expiration of this period, we will again devote every effort to the assembly of rifles; not at the old pace of 1,000 per day, but at the rate of at least 1,200 per day.

"The American troops are now occupying frontline trenches; daily there are encounters with the Hun; American soldiers are killed and wounded, by rifle, machinegun and shellfire. Not only the soldier, but his equipment comes in for casualties. A German bullet strikes a Springfield rifle: Zip, some part of that rifle is damaged. It must either be repaired or replaced with a new one. In order that all of our boys are equipped with good guns, spare parts are necessary for repairs.

"When the spring opens and Fritzie makes his big attempt to crush our troops in France, the need for repairs will be increased a hundredfold. Men and women of Springfield Armory, we must give them the greatest production of parts ever scheduled. We must never allow it to be said that American troops were forced back by the enemy because there were not enough spare parts to repair rifles broken in service. We must not allow our boys to face the Kaiser's army with clubbed guns, as did the Russian soldiers in the beginning of the war, because their guns would not shoot.

"Springfield has never failed, and in this crisis, when we are putting out the maximum number of every component every day, we can be assured that history will tell the story of the 'Armorers who answered the summons,' to service faithful and true, with one voice, 'We will do our best.'

"There are only 40 days to supply parts for hundreds of thousands of rifles. It is now up to us to 'go over the top' with the greatest number of parts ever produced at Springfield Armory in that length of time."

INVENTION OF GARAND RIFLE BOOSTS PRODUCTION TEMPO

The era between the end of World War I and the commencement of the second great worldwide conflict of the 20th century saw Springfield Armory primarily engaged in the all-important development of a semiautomatic rifle for our ground forces.

Production of other ordinance items during these years was limited and the work force sharply reduced from its 1918 peak of 5,381 workers. By 1921 only 265 employees were on the rolls here. This small force was increased slightly in the next several years until 1929 when employment hit the 450 mark. Employment figures for 1934 show 850 working here. By 1936, however, with the acceptance that year of the M1 rifle, the work force jumped to 1,114. This total was gradually increased to 1,550 persons by 1938 and 1,700 by 1939. The appropriation of funds for the manufacture of the M1 brought the armory work force to 2,850 in June 1940 as production of the new rifle reached 240 guns per day.

In these depression years of the late 1930's, a large WPA work force was also assigned to the armory for renovation of buildings and grounds improvements.

The 17 years between 1918 and 1935 were uneventful from an historical standpoint with the single exception of the development of a semiautomatic rifle for our Armed Forces.

A few events, however, are of passing interest. In 1930 the removal of the Ordnance Company from armory duty left this installation without a Regular Army detachment for the first time in 53 years. The military unit stationed here was known until 1921 as an ordnance detachment, when it was changed to the 14th Ordnance Company.

Prior to World War I the average strength of the detachment at the armory was 63 men—NCO's and privates. During World War I the detachment numbered about 250 men. Finally, in 1930 the unit was deactivated.

Another longtime armory tradition—the firing of the sunrise and sunset cannons was abolished 3 years later in 1933.

A fire breaking out near a workman's bench on the second floor of the small arms museum here shortly after 10 p.m., October 11, 1931, caused extensive damage to the museum's famous collection of weapons.

The destructive fire was discovered by a watchman when he saw flames shooting from the windows on the west side of the building. He quickly gave the alarm. Springfield firemen responded in fast order and had the blaze under control in about 15 minutes thus saving the greater part of this valuable collection.

However, an irreplaceable rack of rifles which represented about every type of small arms used by the Allies and Central Powers during World War I was completely destroyed. The well-known rifle "organ" of Longfellow fame also suffered slight damage. Many other valuable weapons, including some medieval armament, were partially destroyed. One of the pieces partly spoiled in the fire was a piece carried by Jefferson Davis, President of the short-lived Confederate States.

Funds were later allocated to rebuild the damaged portion of the museum.

World War I emphasized the desirability of a semiautomatic rifle—the tactical advantage of which consists in reducing to a minimum the interval between aimed shots. In a report as far back as 1902 the Chief of Army Ordnance had observed:

"The only radical improvement in muskets which is now known to be under study is the application to these arms of the automatic principle to the extent of causing the musket itself to effect its own reloading upon discharge. The principle has already been applied with some success to pistols, and its advocates claim that it is logically in the line of development of the magazine rifle. Up to the present time mechanical invention has not solved its part of the problem, and no rifle of the class has been presented to the Department for examination and test, although its willingness to take the subject up has been signified whenever occasion has offered."

Finally, in 1921, competitive tests to which inventors were invited to submit models were publicly announced. Competitive tests were again thrown open to small arms inventors 8 years later in July 1928.

Full requirements for the weapon were listed by the Ordnance Department. There were eight principal requirements that designers were called upon to meet: The rifle had to be of the self-loading type, adopted to function with the .30-caliber service cartridge; its weight could not exceed 9 pounds; it had to be well-balanced and adapted to shoulder firing; it had to be simple, strong, and compact, and adapted to ease of manufacture; it had to be so designed that the magazine could be fed from clips or charges; it had to be entirely semiautomatic—so fashioned as not to fire more than one shot with each squeeze of the trigger; the mechanism had to be so designed as to preclude the possibility of premature unlocking; and the use of special oil, grease, or other material applied to the cartridge should not be necessary to the proper functioning of the weapon.

During this decade-long era of research and development many designs were investigated including those of Pederson (an armory employee), Thompson, Colt, Remington, Johnson, and a host of other weapons embodying every conceivable principle of operation. It was in such a competitive atmosphere that John Garand entered his design in competition with the world's leading ordnance engineers.

An inventor since boyhood, John Garand patented a telescopic screw jack at the age of 13 and followed this soon after with an automatic painting machine for bobbins. He held patents on motorcycle engines, attachments for machine tools, and many other inventions—all in his early youth.

John Garand was born in St. Remi, Quebec, moving to this country in 1899 when he began employment as a bobbin operator in a cotton mill at Jewett City, Conn., at the age of 12. His mechanical ability was quickly evident and he was transferred to the machine shop. His proven ability as an inventor brought him to Providence, R.I., where he entered the employ of a welding company there. His development of new tools and machines was recognized by Brown & Sharpe Co. and he then entered that firm's laboratories. This work was later followed by employment at the Federal Screw Co., of Providence.

Shortly after the start of World War I in 1914, Mr. Garand moved to New York City to work in a micrometer plant. When he heard that the Government was experiencing difficulty in developing a satisfactory machinegun, he submitted his first gun design to the Government in 1916. He was subsequently employed at the Bureau of Standards to build a rifle which was later demonstrated at the Army War College and to the Ordnance Department. The Government's decided interest in the quiet retiring Garand's inventions brought about his assignment to Springfield Armory in 1919.

The new armory engineer was quickly commissioned to solve the problem of the semiautomatic rifle that had been before the Army for many years. During the next 5 years many designs were tested and found wanting in some respect. The problem seemed insurmountable and, in 1924, authorities began probing the use of a caliber smaller than that of the standard .30 caliber service round. It was finally decided that the caliber .276 cartridge developed enough power for a shoulder weapon and that the use of this smaller cartridge would facilitate the design of a reliable and durable self-loading rifle. In a major test of several models submitted, Army officials settled on two—both the brain children of armory employees, John Pedersen and John Garand. A number of each were made and submitted for further tests. Both performed well. However, to adopt a weapon of this caliber complicated the supply problem through the introduction of another type of ammunition.

In the meantime, Garand had also completed a test model of a semiautomatic rifle designed to function with the caliber .30 cartridge. The rifle looked so promising that a decision to adopt the caliber .276 was held up. The latter project was abandoned entirely when the caliber .30 rifle, developed by Garand, was accepted by ordnance officials after some debate in military circles.

The M1 "Garand" rifle was accepted as the standard shoulder arm of the Army in January 1936, and by the Marine Corps in 1940. The first production models were completed and delivered to troops in August 1937. The new weapon increased the firepower of an infantry company almost five times over that of the old 1903 Springfield.

An Army captain who was in the battalion engaged in the fleet landing maneuvers at Panama reported the following observation on the Garand to the Chief of Infantry in May 1938.

"The M1 rifles with which the battalion was armed, were a revelation to the troops. They were most reliable in their functioning, even after some of the rifles fell into the water and sand when landing on the beach. The troops were highly enthusiastic about their performance as antiaircraft weapons against low-flying planes. Four times as many hits were made on the target towed by plane than have been possible with the Springfield rifle."

Production of the new weapon was slow at first. Congress then appropriated large sums of money to push production of the new rifle to fully equip the Nation's standing Army, then numbering about 165,000.

It was at this point World War II exploded across the horizon and Springfield Armory was faced with its greatest challenge in its entire history.

A PLEA FOR ACTION ON H.R. 13313, A BILL TO KEEP OUR LAKES FREE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. Mr. Speaker, a number of bills, including H.R. 13313 which I have introduced, are now pending in the House, calling for repeal of Federal authority to levy entrance and admission fees on most of the Nation's Army Engineers lakes and reservoirs.

Introduction of these bills followed the announcement of the Secretary of the Army, only a few days ago, that entrance fees will be charged for the first time in history at outdoor recreational areas of 95 lakes and reservoirs, beginning on Memorial Day.

Unless H.R. 13313 is passed, or some bill similar to it is adopted, the Army Engineers will begin on Memorial Day to collect fees of 50 cents per person from each person entering these reservoir recreational areas, including persons merely seeking access to the waters, but necessarily passing through a land recreational area.

Mr. Speaker, it will come as no news to many in this great legislative body that I am opposed to these entrance fees.

In 1964, when the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considering the land and water conservation fund bill which authorized such fees for the first time in history, I opposed the fees in that great committee.

With the committee, I endeavor to strike all authority for entrance and admission fees on lakes and reservoirs of both the Army Engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

When the fight was lost in that great committee, a number of us on the committee renewed the effort to kill the fees on the floor of the House itself.

On July 22 and 23, 1964, we debated the proposition.

On the 23d of July, by a relatively small margin of votes, the Edmondson amendment to remove such lakes and reservoirs from the fee system was defeated.

A partial victory was won on that day, however, with the adoption of the Aspinall substitute for another Edmondson amendment, with the Aspinall substitute reading, as follows:

> Strike all of the Edmondson amendment and insert the following in lieu thereof at the place where the first of the Edmondson amendments would be inserted: "No fee of any kind shall be charged under any provision of this act for use of waters that are in fact navigated by commercial freight-carrying vessels or at any reservoir or lake constructed or authorized to be constructed without expense to the United States on account of recreation or the enhancement of fish and wildlife and pursuant to legislation providing specifically that water areas shall be open to public use generally, without charge."

When the other body considered this measure, somewhat different language along similar lines was adopted, and the final language was drafted in conference.

For well over a year, following passage of this bill, the Secretary of the Army delayed imposition of any fees at lakes and reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers.

I believe that delay was largely the result of honest differences of opinion within the Army, both as to the practicality of such fees at the great reservoirs of the country, with their many points of access, and also as to the propriety of any fees at some reservoirs where only relatively small allocations of Federal funds have been devoted to recreational facilities.

On Friday, March 4, the delay ended and the Secretary of the Army announced the fees to be imposed and the 95 lakes and reservoirs to be initially covered.

The complete list of those lakes and reservoirs, in 24 States, is provided at the conclusion of these remarks.

Virtually all of them were constructed primarily for some major governmental purpose aside and apart from recreation. On some, like Tenkiller and Fort Gibson in Oklahoma, the principal purposes were flood control and hydroelectric power. On others, like Lake Eufaula, navigation was a major purpose.

Outdoor recreation, in virtually all of the 95, was an incidental benefit which this Congress, when the dams were first authorized, had guaranteed would remain free to the public.

The language of that guarantee, as described on July 22, 1964, will bear repeating:

> The water areas of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs shall be maintained for general public use.

The language of our Democratic platform of 1960, also cited on July 22, 1964, will also bear repeating:

> The new Democratic administration will develop balanced land and forest policies suited to the needs of a growing America.
>
> This means intensive forest management on a multiple-use and sustained-yield basis, reforestation of burntover lands, building public access roads, range reseeding and improvement, intensive work in watershed management, concern for small business operations, and insuring free public access to public lands for recreational uses.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late to honor these commitments of our great Party and of this Congress.

The fees announced on March 4 have not yet become effective.

The bill to stop those fees is before the Congress.

Similar bills have been introduced by other Members of the House—by our colleagues Congressmen MILLS and TRIMBLE, of Arkansas; Congressmen WRIGHT and ROBERTS, of Texas; Congressman WAGGONNER, of Louisiana; Congressman ROUSH, of Indiana, and by others. In the other body, both Senator MONRONEY and Senator HARRIS have introduced bills to block entrance fees.

H.R. 13313 does not prevent the application of the land and water conservation fund provisions on lakes and reservoirs where outdoor recreation is the dominant public purpose—as it is in our national parks. It will block such fees on lakes and reservoirs primarily constructed and operated for other governmental purposes, and on such lakes and reservoirs we have a covenant with the people of America—to keep the waters free.

Let us honor that covenant, and keep our waters free.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the Secretary of the Army's announcement follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS

(Designated areas under Executive Order No. 11200 and Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, approved February 14, 1966.)

General: The following dam and reservoir projects have been approved as "designated areas" for the year April 1, 1966, to March 31, 1967, at which admission fees are charged in accordance with signs posted at each corps-operated public access area 30 days in advance of the date a permit is required for entrance. The following types of permits are applicable:

Annual (gold) permit at $7.

Temporary (green) permit at $3—30-day for vehicle and all occupants.

Temporary (green/diagonal) permit at $1.50—30-day, individual with or without vehicle.

Day use (blue) permit at $1—1-day, for vehicle and all occupants.

Day use (blue/diagonal) permit at 50 cents—1-day, individual with or without vehicle.

Sale of permits: All types of permits will be available at District Engineers' offices, project offices of "designated areas," and from uniformed rangers in the course of performance of their general duties. Admission fees will be applicable at the "designated areas" from Memorial Day to and including Labor Day except where the District Engineer determines that a longer period is warranted by a public use comparable to the summer season. Admission fees are not applicable to overlook areas at damsites or to public use areas outgranted to States or others for non-Federal operation.

LIST OF DESIGNATED AREAS BY STATES, PROJECT, AND RIVER

Alabama: Demopolis lock and dam, Tombigbee River; Jackson lock and dam, Tombigbee River; Warrior lock and dam, Black Warrior River.

Arkansas: Beaver Reservoir, White River; Blue Mountain Reservoir, Petit Jean River; Bull Shoals Reservoir, White River; Dardanelle Reservoir, Arkansas River; Greers Ferry Reservoir, Little Red River; Lake Greeson (Narrows), Little Missouri River; Lake Ouachita (Blakely Mountain), Ouachita River; Nimrod Reservoir, Fourche La Fave River; Norfork Reservoir, North Fork (also Missouri).

California: Black Butte Reservoir, Stony Creek; Coyote Valley Reservoir (Lake Mendocino), East Fork Russian River; Harry L. Englebright Debris Basin, Yuba River; Isabella Reservoir, Kern River; New Hogan Reservoir, Calaveras River; Pine Flat Reservoir, Kings River.

Florida: Lake Seminole (Jim Woodruff), Chattahoochee River (also Georgia and Alabama).

Georgia: Allatoona Reservoir, Etowah River; Columbia lock and dam, Chattahoochee River; Hartwell Reservoir, Savannah River, (also South Carolina); Lake Sidney Lanier (Buford), Chattahoochee River; Walter F. George Reservoir, Chattahoochee River.

Idaho: Albeni Falls, Pend Oreille River.

Iowa: Coralville Reservoir, Iowa River.

Kansas: Council Grove Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River; John Redmond Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River; Kanopolis Reservoir, Smoky Hill River; Pomona Reservoir, Hundred and Ten Mile Creek; Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Big Blue River; Wilson Reservoir, Salina River.

Kentucky: Barkley lock and dam, Cumberland River; Barren River Reservoir, Barren River; Buckhorn Reservoir, Middle Fork of Kentucky River; Lake Cumberland (Wolf Creek Dam), Cumberland River; Nolin River Reservoir, Nolin River; Rough River Reservoir, Rough River; Markland lock and dam, Ohio River.

Mississippi: Arkabutla Reservoir, Coldwater River; Enid Reservoir, Yocona River; Grenada Reservoir, Yalabusha River; Sardis Reservoir, Little Tallahatchie River.

Missouri: Clearwater Reservoir, Black River; Pomme de Terre Reservoir, Pomme de Terre River; Table Rock Reservoir, White River (also Arkansas); Wappapello Reservoir, St. Francis River.

Montana: Fort Peck Reservoir, Missouri River.

Nebraska: Harlan County Reservoir, Republican River.

North Carolina: W. Kerr Scott Reservoir, Yadkin River.

North Dakota: Garrison Reservoir, Missouri River.

Oklahoma: Canton Reservoir, North Canadian River; Eufaula Reservoir, Canadian River; Fort Gibson Reservoir, Grand River; Fort Supply Reservoir, Wolf Creek; Heyburn Reservoir, Polecat Creek; Hulah Reservoir, Caney River; Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River; Lake Texoma (Denison Dam), Red River; Oologah Reservoir, Verdigris River; Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir, Illinois River.

Oregon: Cottage Grove Reservoir, Coast Fork of Willamette River; The Dalles lock and dam, Columbia River (also Washington), Lake Celilo.

South Carolina: Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River (also Georgia).

South Dakota: Big Bend Reservoir, Missouri River; Fort Randall Reservoir, Missouri River; Lewis and Clark Lake (Gavins Point), Missouri River (also Nebraska); Oahe Reservoir, Missouri River (also North Dakota).

Tennessee: Center Hill Reservoir, Caney Fork River; Cheatham lock and dam, Cumberland River; Dale Hollow Reservoir, Obey River (also Kentucky); Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River (also Kentucky).

Texas: Bardwell Reservoir, Waxahachie Creek; Belton Reservoir, Leon River; Benbrook Reservoir, Clear Fork of Trinity River; Canyon Reservoir, Guadalupe River; Dam "B" Reservoir, Neches River; Garza-Little Elm Reservoir (Lewisville), Elm Fork of Trinity River; Grapevine Reservoir, Denton Creek; Hords Creek Reservoir, Hords Creek; Lake O' the Pines (Ferrells Bridge), Cypress Creek; Lavon Reservoir, E. Fork of Trinity River; Navarro Mills Reservoir, Richland Creek; Proctor Reservoir, Leon River; San Angelo Reservoir, North Concho River; Sam Rayburn Reservoir, Angelina River; Texarkana Reservoir, Sulphur River; Waco Reservoir, Bosque River; Whitney Reservoir, Brazos River.

Virginia: John H. Kerr Reservoir, Roanoke River (also North Carolina); Philpott Reservoir, Smith River; J. W. Flannagan, Pound River.

Washington: Chief Joseph Dam (Rufus Woods Lake), Columbia River; Ice Harbor lock and dam, Snake River.

West Virginia: Sutton Reservoir, Elk River.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, who, back in 1964, when this matter was under debate, was one of those who spoke out forcefully and strongly against these fees, although none of these lakes and reservoirs are located in the district which he represents.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has stated well the case for repeal of the authority granted to the Corps of Engineers to assess entrance fees to these stated places. The point was well made at the time we considered this legislation that we had an obligation to maintain free access to these areas, but we were unable to convince at least the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, and, of course, they had the same difficulty in the Senate. But I believe that we still have the same obligation we have always had to maintain free access to these areas.

I personally appreciate the leadership provided this Congress by the gentleman from Oklahoma in an effort to repeal this authority. He is to be commended for it. I support this effort and hope that we will soon be able to bring to the floor of the House this legislation and revoke this authority to assess entrance fees.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much. I believe the speech which he delivered in 1964 was one of the finest arguments on the subject I have read. I just wish that every Member of the House could have heard it at that time.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend him for his stand on this matter. I want to associate myself with his remarks and with his position.

I feel that we have a commitment to keep to our people. I feel that we are not keeping that commitment when we charge a man, who wants merely to drive his family through a reservoir area to see a lake, 50 cents for that privilege.

If we are going to devote these facilities to public use and get the maximum public use from them, then I think the charging of a fee is unconscionable. I am very happy to stand with the gentleman on this matter.

I hope that under his leadership we will be successful in the passage of the bill which he has proposed, and which I have proposed, and which others of our colleagues have proposed.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for that statement. I note that on the list which we have before us, we do not have any lakes or reservoirs in the State of Indiana which are listed in the group included by the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. ROUSH. The only reason why they are not on that list is that they are not open yet. They are under construction. They will be open. I have been informed an agreement is nearing completion under which fees will be charged on Salamonie Reservoir, on the Mississinewa Reservoir and the Huntington Reservoir, all of which happen to lie in my congressional district.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman. He is taking a position which he took 2 years ago. It was a good position then, and I think it is a good position now.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and I hasten to add my name to those others who have submitted companion bills. Mine was submitted today.

I want to qualify myself by saying that within 100 miles of my home, there are 11 hydroelectric or conservation or flood control projects, both public and private, 9 of those are Corps of Engineers impoundments.

I, too, have opposed this user's fee for access to the water. I believe that this is the part of the general increase or tax grab that this Nation is undergoing, albeit for the use allegedly of the land use and conservation fund. I am very firm in the belief of the riparian right of people to water. I have little faith that they are not being charged for the use of the water when they are excluded from access to it.

I would also point out, as I did on the floor of the House the other day, before the companion bill to that of the gentleman from Oklahoma was submitted, that probably the reason that this has been held off for this year is because of the Secretary of the Interior's insistence and his closeness to the ear of the President, vis-a-vis the Corps of Engineers reluctance to impose the $7 annual fee, or the 50 cents per visit fee.

It is going to be almost impossible to collect these fees. Actually only an honor system is going to be applied by the Corps of Engineers. There will be nothing to preclude anyone from floating down a tributary as long as he does not have to have land access to the water. There is also an exclusion for the State and municipal areas, so that if one comes on to the impoundment through these areas, he will not be eligible to be taxed.

It seems to me that this is an additional funding of taxes, as beneficial as the land use and conservation fund might be, if we are going to require a tax or limit our people from access to the land, from their naturally assumed use of the water, as well as the congressionally indicated use of the impoundments, when we still have control in the Government of 34 percent of the acreage in the United States, whereas at one time we developed laws in order to get people to control the land privately.

I congratulate the gentleman on his bill and on his statement on the floor today. I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman. I am very pleased to hear that he has introduced a similar bill. I hope we can work together to get early consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, of course the gentleman knows of my high esteem for him and for the great contribution that he has made to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, particularly in this area of conservation and recreation.

I do have a question or two about some of the remarks that were made. The first is, if your bill should pass and if these funds, which are now contemplated to be collected for the use of these areas, are not put into the conservation land and water fund, where then will it get the necessary money to fill the commitments that have been made by this Congress against that fund?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman will recall that when the Rockefeller Commission, which investigated this matter at some length, first reported on its investigation, its report favored the use of general revenues for this purpose.

It only proposed other avenues be explored if it were impossible to get general revenues for it. The gentleman will also recall the position of that commission, generally speaking, was against entrance and admission fees. They proposed use fees limited to the actual use of facilities.

The gentleman will also recall that the enabling legislation to which he refers provides revenues running well over $100 million a year from the sale of surplus property and from the dedication of motor fuel taxes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of each year, we are witnesses to appalling increases in the number of deaths and injuries due to accidents involving the automobile. Various efforts to stem the increased slaughter on our highways have not been met by marked success. There is, however, one program that has met with outstanding success in the prevention of traffic accidents and deaths and merits particular recognition for this singular achievement. This exemplary organization is the School Safety Patrol.

Founded in Chicago in 1916, the School Safety Patrol grew nationally since 1922 under the sponsorship of auto clubs associated with the American Automobile Association. Currently, there are over 900,000 school patrol members in some 40,000 schools throughout the United States. An additional 156,000 patrol members are located in 20 foreign countries. These patrols are organized by school officials with the cooperation of local police officials and motor clubs affiliated with the American Automobile Association.

The membership of the patrol is made up of boys and girls from the upper elementary and junior high school grades. Wearing bright orange or white identifying belts and badges, the patrol member is a familiar sight as he guides and protects his fellow students at intersections around our schools. These devoted youngsters are required to stay on the curb in the performance of their duties and, under the patrol rules, are prohibited from directing traffic. Since the safety patrols were established, the traffic death rate of school-age children has dropped nearly one-half while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled.

Since the inception of the school safety patrol, more than 16 million youngsters have participated in this fine organization. Over 19 million schoolchildren, daily, are protected by the patrol.

In the performance of his duty, each patrol member pledges to observe the following rules: report for duty on time, perform duties faithfully, strive to prevent accidents and strive to earn the respect of fellow students. Because of their unfailing efforts, municipalities across the land are spared the costs of additional policemen who would otherwise be needed to guard these school crossings.

The lifesaving results of this program are worthy of great tribute. Each year the AAA presents gold lifesaver medals to those young patrol heroes who have actually saved the life of a schoolmate in traffic danger. Last year these awards were presented by President Johnson at a White House ceremony and I point with great pride to three young Wisconsin citizens so honored: Bruce Pauls, of Madison; and John Ahrens and Stuart Meyer, of Prairie du Chien. Bruce saved the life of a 3½-year-old boy near his Atwood Avenue duty station in Madison by rushing into the street and pulling the confused youngster out of the way of oncoming traffic. John and Stuart pulled a 6-year-old out of the way of a train near their patrol station in Prairie du Chien. The boy had wandered onto the tracks and became paralyzed as the train approached.

This type of courage and devotion to duty is typical of the youth who are members of the school safety patrol. Mobilizing these efforts for the safety of students walking to school is a fine example of AAA efforts.

Because of their unselfish devotion and dedication in their performance of an outstanding public service, Congress should pay tribute to the school safety patrols by proclaiming the second week of May each year as National School Safety Patrol Week.

I am accordingly introducing the following resolution today:

H.J. Res. 911

Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"

Whereas more than an estimated forty-nine thousand Americans died in traffic accidents on the Nation's highways during the year 1965 and the prevention of such accidents has become a problem of major concern; and

Whereas the school safety patrols, since their organization on a national scale in the early 1920's, have played an important role in the reduction of highway accidents involving school-age children; and

Whereas more than nine hundred thousand safety patrol members are now serving forty thousand schools in all fifty States, protecting nineteen million children; and

Whereas the school safety patrols are a cooperative program sponsored jointly by American Automobile Association motor clubs, local schools, and police; and

Whereas more than sixteen million Americans have served as safety patrol members during the more than forty years since the program was established; and

Whereas the traffic death rate of school-age children since 1922 has dropped nearly one-half while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled and the efforts of the school safety patrols have been a contributing factor in this reduction; and

Whereas the lifesaving efforts of the school safety patrols play an increasingly important role in the nationwide campaign to reduce traffic accidents and this program should receive public attention and citizen support; and

Whereas the second week of May of each year provides an opportunity for due recognition of the foregoing achievements, accomplishments, and needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second week of May of each year is hereby designated as "National School Safety Patrol Week" and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all people of the United States for the observance of such a week with appropriate proceedings and ceremonies.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of legislation being introduced today by myself and many of my colleagues to designate the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week.

The School Safety Patrol was first established in 1916 by the Chicago Motor Club which is located in my congressional district. While the idea for a school safety patrol was initiated in Chicago, it has grown rapidly, and today there are over a million patrols both in the United States and abroad who are daily protecting the lives of their fellow classmates. As a result of their efforts, the traffic death rate for schoolchildren has decreased almost 50 percent, while the rate for other groups has mounted steadily.

In 1930 I served as captain of the School Safety Patrol for Manley Junior High School, located at Sacramento and Polk Streets in my congressional district. As a result, I know firsthand of the invaluable contributions made by school patrols who have actually risked their own lives in saving the lives of schoolmates in traffic which grows heavier and more dangerous with each passing day.

It is altogether fitting that recognition and encouragement be extended to these gallant youngsters, and I urge my colleagues to join in passage of legislation to designate the second week in May as National School Safety Patrol Week.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable Robert Kastenmeier, in introducing a resolution to designate the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week.

I am sure all of us, at one time or another, has seen these youngsters, regardless of weather, standing on street corners, keeping a watchful eye on their younger schoolmates, making certain that they can cross heavily trafficked streets in safety. They are to be commended for learning, so early in life, the need to serve their community.

Today there are some 900,000 patrol members serving in 40,000 schools in all 50 States of this country. Some 156,000 patrol members serve in 20 foreign countries. As a result of their efforts since 1922, the traffic death rate of school-age children has dropped nearly one-half, while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled.

Much is said and written today about juvenile delinquency and the irresponsible teenager. But so long as we have children in the elementary and junior high school grades, those bordering teenage, who are aware of their responsibilities, and assume them as members of the safety patrol, we can be certain that as they reach teenage they will continue to serve as model citizens of this country.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, there is an all too common tendency to accept the continued success of a particular program or effort as the natural course of events. In doing so we overlook the most important fact and that is the maintenance of this success is wholly dependent upon the continued effort. The effort is recognized only once, when success has been achieved.

I think this has been, to some degree, the case when we consider the success of a program first instituted 50 years ago in one particular area and adopted nationally 44 years ago.

I refer to the school safety patrol program. A mark of its great success can be found in the statistics which reveal the traffic death rate of schoolchildren has been cut almost in half over the years while the death rate of other age groups has doubled.

Therefore, I feel it appropriate today to join with my colleagues in submitting a joint resolution to pay appropriate tribute, annual tribute, to the school safety patrols. We can do this by designating the second week of May each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

It will serve the purpose of not only recognizing the continued and successful efforts of the more than 900,000 safety patrol members but renewing the resolve each motorist has to exercise extraordinary care in traveling through school areas.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES HAS THE BEST MEDICAL AND HEALTH SERVICES IN THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARNUM). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an eminent Swedish physician, Dr. Waldo von Greyerz, a delegate to the World Medical Association, declared some time ago that anyone who uses a comparison of vital statistics in an attempt to prove that one nation is healthier than another or has better medical care is little more than a headline hunter.

Statisticians and health experts—those who are honest and objective, at any rate—have repeatedly demonstrated that comparisons of such things as infant mortality and life expectancy are unreliable in measuring the general level of health or the quality of medical care among nations.

Mr. Francis Keppel, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and now an Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has joined the ranks of the headline hunters.

I do not object to Mr. Keppel getting his name in the papers. I do object to his grabbing for headlines by misusing health statistics to discredit the health professions and to downgrade the United States.

Mr. Keppel mounted a public platform on February 14, 1966, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., at the opening session of a 4-day session sponsored jointly by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor on the theme of job development in the health service to charge that it is an empty boast to claim that the United States has the best medical and health services in the world. We are slipping, he said, because we do not have the lowest infant mortality rate, because we do have a lower life expectancy than most other large industrial nations, because we have the highest heart disease rate on earth, and because we have a higher mortality rate in the age group 40 to 54.

Mr. Keppel concluded with that familiar and tiresome refrain of the social planners—solve everything with numbers. All we need to make people healthier and longer lived is a million more doctors, nurses, dentists, technicians, and so forth.

If sheer volume were the answer to the problem, one would suppose that Washington, D.C., would be the best place in the country to live, since the District of Columbia has more doctors per capita than anywhere else in the Nation, two and a half times the national average. And yet Washington has a high crude death rate compared with other sections of the country.

Washington has more than 360 physicians per 100,000 population. Alaska has about 65 physicians per 100,000 population. But the crude death rate in Alaska is less than half the crude death rate in Washington, D.C.

People who are prone to manipulate statistics might well conclude from this evidence that Alaska is a healthier place to live than Washington because Washington has too many doctors.

This is patently absurd. Nevertheless, the same kind of numbers game is being played by Mr. Keppel and others who try to discredit the health professions in this country by misusing vital statistics.

I do not intend to argue that there is no room for improvement in American medicine or that we do not need more doctors and nurses and dentists and technicians. But I strongly protest when officials of the Federal Government imply that medical and health services in this country are inferior to those in European countries and recite infant mortality rates and life expectancy figures as proof.

According to Dr. Stanley S. B. Gilder, a British physician and executive editor of the World Medical Journal:

> There is simply no correlation between health statistics of the United States and those of Europe. To argue statistics from one country to another is ridiculous.

More than one authority has agreed that there are an infinite variety of problems in the interpretation of these statistics because of differences in methods of collecting and recording information, differences in definitions, differences in the time of registering deaths and births, and differences in the completeness of statistics.

It is a well-documented fact that under certain circumstances a birth recorded in one country as a live birth will be listed in another as a stillbirth. The Netherlands, which boasts the lowest infant mortality rate in the western world, does not list among its infant deaths those babies who die before the birth is registered. If they die within 3 or 4 days they are recorded as stillbirths. If a liveborn infant of less than 28 weeks gestation dies before registration in the Netherlands, the event is not recorded in either birth or death statistics. Each of these events would be recorded as an infant death in this country and be reflected in our infant mortality statistics.

An infant mortality study published in 1963 in the American Journal of Public Health, repeatedly warning of pitfalls in comparing statistics, pointed out that differences in definitions and statistical practices in Sweden and the Netherlands could well understate infant mortality rates by one to three points compared with the United States, perhaps even more.

Is it unreasonable to suggest, considering the degree of uncertainty, that this understatement might be four or five points?

It does seem odd that these critics of American medicine are blind to all evidence except that which serves their purposes—whatever they may be. Without exception, they willfully neglect to point out that the statistical evidence indicates that the United States has a better record than the majority of other nations in saving the lives of mothers during childbirth. It appears to be of no interest at all to them that statistics also show that more babies die unborn in other countries than in the United States. They will talk all day about infant mortality rates being lower in Sweden and never mention the important fact that abortion is legal in Sweden and not in the United States. The legalized destruction of fetuses must have some influence on the infant mortality rate in Sweden.

Anyone who puts his mind to it can indulge in all sorts of statistical nonsense. According to the United Nations Demographic Yearbook, most of the nations of Western Europe have a higher suicide rate than the United States. Now, as we all know, a sick man is not a happy man. Does it not logically follow, therefore, that more Europeans than Americans commit suicide because they are sicker than we are? Does that not prove that Americans get better medical care than Europeans?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is no more ridiculous than implying that inferior medical care is the reason Americans have a higher death rate from heart disease. It is a scientific fact that the causes of heart disease are not well understood. There is considerable evidence to support the theory that Americans have more heart attacks because they live too high on the hog—they eat too much, smoke too much, get too little exercise, and live at too fast a pace. If this is true, we are dying from too much wealth, not from too little medical care.

When we talk about who lives longer, Europeans or Americans, we are talking about economics as well as medicine. If more Americans are eating themselves to death, it is also true that more of them are slaughtering each other on the highways—and these fatalities are an important factor in lowering life expectancy.

Frankly, I do not know whether Europeans live longer actually or only statistically. I doubt that the quality of medicine has much to do with it. The statistical Swede in Sweden, we are told, lives 2.7 years longer than the statistical American in America. But it is also a matter of record that a Swede in Minnesota outlives a Swede in Sweden. I suppose Mr. Keppel, to be consistent, would have to argue that that proves the Minnesota Swede gets better medical care than the Swede in Sweden.

I would also ask Mr. Keppel, and his like-minded critics, why they are so reluctant to measure the quality of medicine in terms of medical progress? I challenge them to name one country that can match the record of medical progress of the United States.

The United States, which Mr. Keppel claims has slipped so badly, has made more important drug discoveries in the last 20 years than all the rest of the world combined—broad-spectrum antibiotics, steroids, tranquilizers, radioactive materials, and polio and measles vaccines. And let me ask where open-heart surgery and a good many other surgical techniques were developed and perfected?

I am compelled to question the motives of those who try to discredit American medicine, and who downgrade the United States in the process, by the device of selective statistics, knowing full well the dubious validity of these statistics. I believe their motives are clearly suspect when they purposely ignore far better tests of the quality of medical and health services.

Cancer is a good example. The death rate for cancer in this country is well below that of any other Western nation. Since many cases of cancer are treatable, the lower death rate in this country strongly suggests, if it does not prove, that medical treatment of this leading killer is better here than in other countries.

The same holds true for other diseases—tuberculosis, pneumonia, strokes, and influenza, for example. All these are treatable, and all of them result in fewer deaths per capita in the United States than in Western Europe.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us ignore the statistics that do not suit us, as Mr. Keppel does, and let us forget about the possibility of statistical error. Let us talk about cancer and strokes and pneumonia; let us talk about maternal death rates and fetal death rates; let us talk about new drug discoveries and open-heart surgery. Is there any doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we have proved statistically that we have the best medical care in the world right here in these United States?

Statistics, Mr. Speaker, are no substitute for honesty and commonsense. I think it is high time some of our Federal officials were made aware of it.

This becomes highly significant in light of the fact that this country is about to embark upon a very radical experiment in health care in our society. With the adoption of the Federal program for medical care treatment for older people, we indeed are radically changing our medical system. As I said in a speech before the American Bar Association last August, we here have the highest standard of medical care and treatment in the world, based upon the traditional American system. It therefore places an awesome burden upon those who have been responsible for this radical innovation, which I am sure they feel will actually improve health care for the older people, and all of us.

But it places an awesome burden on them in radically changing this system to preserve the quality we have and go on to the further progress that the system unchanged radically promised that we would have.

Is it possible that Mr. Keppel is merely sounding the beginning note for some of these people in the administration who are having sober second thoughts on this awesome responsibility that they have assumed, to hedge on this responsibility. What they might be engaged in is trying to denigrate American medicine so that as this novel program develops and the quality of medical care for all of us, including the older people, declines, they will not be held responsible for making American health care second best. Well, if that is their objective, I wish to make it quite clear that I intend to follow their statements and to make them prove each point as they go along.

The record already shows that Senator RIBICOFF, when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Secretary Celebrezze, when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said in public hearings, under my interrogation, in answer to this question, "Is there any question that the United States has the greatest health care system in the world and the finest health treatment?" that there is no question, indeed, that we do have the finest health care system in the world.

My concluding remarks are, that this is not complacency that I am expressing. Because we have the best does not mean we are not a long way from having a perfect system. We need continuing innovation and improving of quality. This is what I am most fearful of with this radical change, that we hit at the very thing that has produced this great quality, the innovation and experimentation provided by the great free system of medicine.

There is one other point. I am deeply disturbed already to have reports come in that many older people are holding off on needed operations and needed medical attention at this time. They are waiting for June 1966, when the Government programs will take over. This, if true, is undermining already the quality of health care that our older people should have right now. But it is also going to impose a very aggravated burden on our limited health facilities—hospitals, nursing homes, and, above all, on our limited skills—doctors, nurses, and hospital technicians. This thing will come about in the months following June.

As we who thought that it was ill advised to adopt a federalized, socialized system of the health care for the aged, have pointed out, the problems in health care for the aged and problems of health care in our society—and there has been for a number of years—had been a lack of sufficient facilities, a lack of hospitals, a lack of equipment, and a lack of skills—doctors, nurses, and technicians. It was not lack of money. It was lack of training in the schools and all that goes with moving a society forward in these important areas—and our society was moving and doing things. We had developed and were developing in increasing fashion health insurance to cover older people. Health insurance had reached the point where it was covering some 60 percent of the older people. The records indicated that this was going to become almost a complete coverage in the foreseeable future through the traditional American system.

At the same time we were and we did have an adequate system to take care of those older people who could not afford health insurance for medical care. There were some 15 or 20 percent of the aged in this category. But here we have radically changed the system which was serving so well 85 percent of our older people, most of the people in our society, too, in order to try to solve a problem of the 15 percent.

We wanted to improve the system for the 15 percent. But not to alter the system that proved so satisfactory for the 85 percent. We thought we had moved forward to do so, and felt that it was unnecessary to basically alter the system as we have done. Time alone will tell the outcome.

The article referred to follows:

INTERNATIONAL TRENDS IN INFANT MORTALITY AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES

(By Sam Shapiro, F.A.P.H.A., and Iwao M. Moriyama, Ph.D., F.A.P.H.A.)

(NOTE.—A report is presented of international comparisons made to assess the trend and level of the infant mortality rate in the United States. Even when corrections are made for difference of definition and reporting, it appears that part of the excess in the neonatal mortality rate in the United States is real. Various aspects of the findings are discussed.)

The virtual halt in the downward trend of the infant mortality rate during the 1950's in the United States has been noted,[1] as well as the unfavorable position of this country with respect to the infant mortality problem as compared with the situation in other countries.[2]

---

[1] Moriyama, I. M., "Recent Changes in Infant Mortality Trend," Public Health Rept. 75, 5: 391–405 (May), 1960.

For many years health authorities have pointed with justifiable pride to the high rate of decrease in the mortality loss in infancy. When the rate of decline first started to slow down this was not viewed with particular alarm. The change could be interpreted as inevitable since the steep decline could not continue indefinitely. But, the extent and duration of the slowdown has caused concern and sharpened interest in additional analysis of the course of the infant mortality rate.

The purpose of this paper is to examine international trends in infant mortality in greater detail to see whether the trend for the United States reflects a general phenomenon, and to see if the experience in other countries encourages hope for further important reductions in the infant mortality rate for the United States.

The infant mortality rates for the following countries were included in the study: Australia, Canada, Denmark, England and Wales, Finland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. These countries are characterized by comparatively low infant mortality rates for a long period of time.[2a] All of them have had for many years a well developed vital registration system, and the definition of live birth and the reporting requirements for early infant deaths have been stable.

Data for these countries represent the most favorable set of statistics for study of comparative trends. However, there are certain problems of interpretation of the levels of mortality arising from differences in definition of live birth and fetal death, and from differences in statistical practice. In order to assess this problem, a questionnaire was sent to the countries included in the study to bring up to date the information on definitions and registration practices current in 1950 as reported by the United Nations Statistical Office.[3] With a few exceptions, the definitions and practices remained as they were in 1950.

There are some differences in the criteria for the registration of an event as a live birth. The effect of these differences is to register an event in some countries as a live birth and an infant death, whereas in others a similar event would be registered and counted as a stillbirth. Although this difference has little effect on the live-birth statistics, it could affect the infant mortality rate and, particularly, the neonatal rate.

In most countries, "any sign of life" is taken as one of the criteria. In the United States, the criteria for registration specify a range of alternative evidence, such as breathing, heart action, pulsation of umbilical cord, movement of voluntary muscles, and so forth, whereas in most of the other countries the definitions lack specificity. Whether or not the specification of the various signs affects registration of live births is not known, but it is probably minimal compared with other registration problems. A more important problem is the more restrictive definition used in Sweden wherein breathing is taken as the only criterion of life. An infant born that did not breathe but showed other evidence of life would be counted as a stillbirth in Sweden up to 1960.[3a] In the other countries represented in the study, this infant would be counted as a live birth and an infant death.

In a survey of lying-in hospitals in Sweden in 1956 reported by Soop,[4] some 17 percent of the registered stillbirths showed other signs of life but did not breathe. This represented about 0.1 percent of the live-birth total which is almost identical with the proportion found in about 20,000 live births that occurred in 1959–61 in selected hospitals in the United States.[4a]

On the basis of these figures, it would seem that the infant mortality rates for Sweden would be at least one point higher if the more inclusive definition of live birth adopted by other countries were used. For example, on a comparable definition of live birth, the infant mortality rate for Sweden in 1959 may be 17.6 per 1,000 live births rather than the rate of 16.6 which was recorded for that year. The effect may actually be greater, but as a maximum it probably is not much more than two or three points.

There is a problem in the interpretation of the infant mortality rate for the Netherlands. This involves the statistical practice of excluding from birth or death registration a live-born infant of less than 28 weeks gestation that dies before registration. If these deaths are included in the computation of rates, the neonatal mortality rate for the Netherlands in 1960 is 13.5 per 1,000 live births rather than 12.1, the recorded figure.[4b] The corresponding figure for the total infant mortality rate is 17.9 instead of 16.5.

Another problem relates to differences in the registration requirements for fetal deaths. All of the States in the United States require registration of all fetal deaths or those of 20 weeks or more gestation, whereas the other countries confine registration to dead fetuses of 28 weeks or more gestation. Other things being equal, the effect of this difference in definition would generally be to record fewer fetal deaths in these other countries because of the tendency to underestimate gestation age slightly over 28 weeks to avoid registration of the fetal death.

One indication of this may be found in the experience in the United States. In the years past, the various States have changed from time to time the requirements for the reporting of fetal deaths. In general, the effect of the revision was to require registration of dead fetuses of lower gestation age. For example, in the early 1950's, seven States revised their laws to make reportable all products of conception regardless of gestation age. Prior to this, the law required the registration of dead fetuses after at least 20 weeks of gestation.

The effect of such changes in registration requirements has varied. In general, the number of fetuses, say, 20 weeks and over, increased after the change in the definition of a reportable fetal death. For the seven States referred to above, the increase varied from 0 to 50 percent, and the average was 17 percent.

It is difficult to assess precisely how many fewer fetal deaths of 28 weeks or more gestation would be registered in the United States if the laws required registration only of fetal deaths of at least this gestation age. However, the differences in registration requirements between the United States and other countries will probably have the effect of substantially fewer fetal deaths of 28 weeks or more being recorded in the foreign data. On the other hand, there is indication of substantial underregistration of fetal deaths in the United States.[5] This may very well be true for other countries, but no study of the fetal death registration problem has been made elsewhere.

In summary, the differences in definitions and statistical practices in two countries, Sweden and the Netherlands, may result in an understatement in the infant mortality rate of one to three points as compared with that of other countries, including the United States. There is greater uncertainty about measures of fetal loss. This, of course, also affects the perinatal mortality rate. Any international differences in these measures must be viewed with caution.

FINDINGS

Infant mortality

The infant mortality trends over the past 25 years are characterized by major declines in all countries included in this study (see table No. 1). The progress in the reduction of infant loss does not reflect consistent and continuous decreases over the whole period. For some countries it is clear that wartime conditions exerted a great influence on the infant mortality rate, while for others it is not so certain why some of the reversals occurred. Other periods of stability or increases in the rate are also found. This makes difficult assessment of infant mortality rates over a short run. Nevertheless, certain time periods stand out as of particular importance in interpreting the course of the infant mortality rate.

In the United States, the infant mortality rate decreased at a rate of over 3 percent per year during the period 1935–50. Beginning about 1950 the rate began to level off. At first, it might have been dismissed as another temporary change, but this has persisted for a decade. Between 1950 and 1960, the total decrease in the rate was only about 10 percent, and the annual rate of decrease was about one-third of the rate of decline in the previous period. The provisional figure for 1961 represents the lowest infant mortality rate ever recorded for the United States. However, neither this rate nor the preliminary returns for the first 8 months of 1962 give a clear indication of resumption of a significant downward trend.

The mortality trends for a number of countries of low mortality were interrupted by World War II. The wartime increases in the infant mortality rate were particulary severe for the Netherlands, Finland, and Norway and to a lesser extent for England and

---

[2] Progress in reducing infant mortality (table). Children 9, 5: 201 (September–October), 1962.

[2a] Another country which recorded low infant mortality rates for years is Iceland. Because of the small frequency of infant deaths (64 in 1960), the rates are subject to wide variations. Therefore, data for this country are not included in this study.

[3] United Nations Handbook of Vital Statistics. "Studies in Methods," Series F, No. 7. New York, N.Y.: Statistical Office of the United Nations (April), 1955. Differences in definitions and practices exist not only among countries but in the United States, Australia, and Canada; there are also differences among States or Provinces in definitions and practices.

[3a] This situation may also have been true until recent years in several of the Provinces of Canada. However, the effect on the rates for Canada as a whole is believed to be negligible.

[4] Soop, Erik. "Sweden's Infant Mortality and the Definition of Live Birth," Svenska Läkartidningen 55, 16: 1148, 1958.

[4a] These provisional and unpublished figures were provided through the courtesy of the collaborative project sponsored by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness on cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and other sensory and nervous system disorders of infancy and childhood.

[4b] Data provided through the courtesy of the Central Bureau of Statistics, The Hague, the Netherlands.

[5] In New York City, where registration of all fetal deaths was promoted for years and where fetal death registration may be expected to be better than most areas, Baumgartner, L.; Wallace, H. M.; Landsberg, E.; and Pessin, V. ("Inadequacy of Routine Reporting of Fetal Deaths." A.J.P.H. 39: 1549–1552 (December), 1949) found 14 percent of fetal deaths in the 3d trimester were not reported. Including unknown gestation age, the corresponding figure is 23 percent. This study was based on data for 1943–45, but it is not likely that significant changes have occurred since that time.

Wales. Major reductions in the infant mortality rate occurred in many countries the year after the war ended. This was followed by a period (1946–1950) of important decreases in all areas. The greatest reductions occurred in England and Wales, the Netherlands, Norway, and Finland (6 to 9 percent per year). The infant mortality rates for Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland declined at a rate of about 5 percent per year. For Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States, the rate of decrease was somewhat lower, but still significantly high (3 to 4 percent per year).

The leveling off of the infant mortality rate in the United States very early in the decade past is not matched by the experience of any other country. However, a slowing down or cessation in the decline of the rate in more recent years may be observed for a number of other countries such as Australia, England and Wales, New Zealand, Norway, and Sweden. For example, the infant mortality rate for New Zealand has been virtually flat since 1953. In England and Wales and Australia, the rate of decline slowed up markedly beginning about 1955 to 1956. No clear, rapid downward movement in the infant mortality rate is evident in the past few years for Norway and Sweden.

Some of these changes may be the beginning of a period of prolonged stagnation in the infant mortality rate. However, it seems significant that the leveling off of the infant mortality rate for the United States started considerably earlier than in the other countries, when, in fact, some were still experiencing a major decline in the rate. The infant mortality rate for the United States would have to start decreasing much more sharply in the future to reverse the strong impression that the United States is lagging behind many countries in reducing the loss infancy.

What makes the preceding much more important is that the comparisons involve countries with low infant mortality rates. Otherwise, one might be tempted to attribute the greater decline in the rates for the other countries to a period of "catching up." While differences in definition and reporting practices create certain difficulties for international comparisons, the infant mortality rates for Australia, Denmark, England and Wales, Finland, New Zealand, and Switzerland are almost certainly lower than that for the United States, and the rates for the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden are very definitely lower.

TABLE 1.—*Infant mortality rates: Selected countries, 1935–60 (exclusive of fetal deaths. Rates per 1,000 live births)*

Year	Australia [1]	Canada [2]	Denmark [3]	England and Wales	Finland [4]	Netherlands	New Zealand [5]	Norway	Sweden	Switzerland	United States
1960	20.2	27.3	----------	21.8	21.0	16.5	19.7	----------	16.6	21.1	26.0
1959	21.5	28.4	22.5	22.2	23.6	16.8	19.9	18.7	16.6	22.2	26.4
1958	20.5	30.2	22.4	22.5	24.5	17.2	19.4	20.0	15.9	22.2	27.1
1957	21.4	30.9	23.4	23.1	27.9	17.2	20.0	20.5	17.8	22.9	26.3
1956	21.7	31.9	24.9	23.6	25.4	19.0	19.4	21.2	17.3	25.8	26.0
1955	22.0	31.3	25.2	24.9	29.7	20.2	20.1	20.6	17.4	26.5	26.4
1954	22.5	31.9	26.9	25.5	30.6	21.2	20.0	21.4	18.7	27.2	26.6
1953	23.3	35.6	27.2	26.8	34.2	22.2	20.1	22.0	18.7	29.8	27.8
1952	23.8	38.2	28.9	27.5	31.8	22.6	21.8	23.7	20.0	29.1	28.4
1951	25.2	38.5	28.9	29.8	35.4	25.1	22.8	25.7	21.6	30.1	28.4
1950	24.5	41.5	30.7	29.9	43.5	25.2	22.7	28.2	21.0	31.2	29.2
1949	25.3	43.3	34.5	32.7	48.3	26.8	23.8	27.7	23.3	34.3	31.3
1948	27.8	43.7	35.3	34.5	51.9	29.3	21.9	29.6	23.2	35.9	32.0
1947	28.5	45.5	40.4	41.8	58.5	33.5	25.0	34.6	25.4	39.3	22.2
1946	29.0	46.7	45.8	40.9	56.2	38.7	26.1	34.6	26.5	39.2	33.8
1945	29.4	51.3	48.3	47.0	63.2	79.7	28.0	36.4	29.9	40.7	38.3
1944	31.3	54.7	47.7	44.5	68.6	46.3	30.1	36.7	31.1	42.2	39.8
1943	36.3	53.7	44.8	48.9	49.5	40.1	31.4	35.4	28.9	39.8	40.4
1942	39.5	53.8	47.0	49.5	67.2	39.5	28.7	35.9	29.3	38.3	40.4
1941	39.7	59.7	55.0	59.7	59.2	43.6	29.8	43.0	37.0	41.1	45.3
1940	38.4	56.4	50.2	57.4	88.3	39.1	30.2	38.7	39.2	46.2	47.0
1939	38.2	60.7	58.1	50.8	69.6	33.7	31.1	37.2	39.5	42.6	48.0
1938	38.3	63.3	58.7	52.7	67.8	36.5	35.6	37.3	42.5	42.8	51.0
1937	38.1	75.8	66.1	57.6	68.5	38.1	31.2	42.0	45.2	46.7	54.4
1936	41.2	66.1	67.3	58.5	65.9	38.9	31.0	42.0	43.4	46.5	57.1
1935	39.8	71.0	71.0	56.9	66.8	40.0	32.3	44.2	45.9	47.9	55.7

[1] Excludes fullblooded aborigines. Data tabulated by year of registration rather than occurrence.

[2] 1935–49 excluding Yukon, Norwest Territories, and prior to 1950 Newfoundland which became the 10th Province, Apr. 1, 1949. Data include events among Canadian residents temporarily in the United States. Exclude events among U.S. residents temporarily in Canada.

[3] Excluding Faeroe Islands 1932–48: Faeroe Islands and Greenland starting 1949.

[4] Prior to 1951 data are for Finnish nationals in Finland only. Beginning 1951 data are for nationals temporarily outside country.

[5] Excludes Maoris. By year of registration rather than year of occurrence.

Sources: Files of the Statistical Office of the United Nations and annual volumes of the National Vital Statistics Division, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Neonatal, fetal, and perinatal mortality

To clarify the nature of the differentials in trends and levels of the infant mortality rates discussed above, the loss during early infancy and subsequent mortality during the first year of life have been examined separately. Mortality shortly after birth is heavily influenced by prenatal circumstances with postnatal environmental conditions responsible for a small but significant part of the total mortality in this period. Before the end of the first year of life the relative importance of prenatal and postnatal factors and their effects on mortality rates is reversed.

For purposes of the present discussion, time interval selected for the "early" deaths is the neonatal period (i.e., the first 28 days following birth). The loss during this period has for years acounted for two-thirds to three-fourths of the total mortality during the year following birth in the United States and most other countries. Accordingly, much of what has been said about the trend patterns in infant mortality holds for neonatal mortality (table No. 2). Perhaps the outstanding difference is the fact that the total infant mortality rates have generally undergone greater relative decreases.

TABLE 2.—*Neonatal mortality rates: Selected countries, 1935–60 (exclusive of fetal deaths. Rates per 1,000 live births)* [1]

Year	Australia	Canada	Denmark	England and Wales	Finland	Netherlands	New Zealand	Norway	Sweden	Switzerland	United States
1960	14.6	17.6	----------	15.5	14.4	12.1	14.5	----------	13.9	----------	18.7
1959	15.3	18.4	16.2	15.9	15.7	12.0	13.9	12.4	13.0	----------	19.0
1958	14.5	19.3	16.1	16.2	15.4	12.0	13.6	13.3	12.1	16.4	19.5
1957	15.4	20.2	16.3	16.5	16.6	11.9	13.9	12.3	13.5	16.6	19.1
1956	15.6	20.1	17.7	16.8	16.4	13.0	13.3	12.4	13.2	18.9	18.9
1955	15.5	19.3	17.9	17.2	18.6	14.1	14.0	12.5	12.9	18.9	19.1
1954	16.2	19.3	18.0	17.7	19.3	14.7	14.3	11.8	13.8	19.9	19.1
1953	16.5	21.4	18.6	17.7	19.7	15.0	14.3	12.6	13.8	21.2	19.6
1952	16.6	22.7	19.3	18.3	19.1	15.1	15.1	14.1	14.9	20.2	19.8
1951	17.5	22.6	18.3	18.9	19.7	16.8	16.2	14.4	15.9	21.3	20.0
1950	17.4	24.4	18.2	18.5	21.8	16.4	16.6	14.7	15.3	21.1	20.5
1949	18.0	24.1	19.1	19.3	23.1	16.8	17.0	14.5	16.2	23.6	21.4
1948	19.6	25.6	19.1	19.8	23.6	17.4	15.8	15.7	16.8	24.9	22.2
1947	20.5	26.5	22.0	22.8	24.9	18.5	18.1	17.5	17.5	25.8	22.8
1946	21.2	27.2	23.6	24.2	25.9	20.9	19.1	16.9	18.1	25.9	24.0
1945	21.8	28.6	24.9	24.9	26.0	29.8	19.6	18.1	19.1	26.4	24.3
1944	22.0	29.1	24.2	24.2	26.4	23.0	20.6	18.3	19.7	25.8	24.7
1943	24.0	29.6	22.9	25.2	22.9	20.4	21.3	18.0	18.4	25.8	24.7
1942	25.3	28.1	23.6	27.1	24.5	21.0	18.7	17.8	17.9	25.1	25.7
1941	26.6	30.6	23.7	28.9	24.7	22.7	20.0	20.0	21.4	27.9	27.7
1940	25.5	29.7	25.2	29.7	30.4	21.4	22.0	20.5	23.5	27.0	28.8
1939	25.8	30.7	27.5	28.3	28.0	19.8	21.8	20.4	24.2	27.7	29.3
1938	26.0	31.7	27.2	28.3	29.7	20.5	24.1	20.2	25.2	26.2	29.6
1937	26.3	34.2	29.0	28.8	29.4	20.9	22.2	22.9	25.0	28.0	31.3
1936	27.5	33.5	29.1	30.2	27.3	21.5	22.3	22.3	23.2	28.2	32.6
1935	27.5	35.0	29.1	30.4	30.2	22.5	22.0	21.6	25.6	29.3	32.4

[1] For general notes see table 1.

TABLE 3A.—*Fetal death ratios: Selected countries, 1940–60 (fetal deaths of at least 28 weeks gestation or unknown gestation per 1,000 live births)* [1]

Year	Australia	Canada	Denmark	England and Wales	Finland	Netherlands	New Zealand	Norway	Sweden	Switzerland	United States [2]
1960	------	13.3	------	19.8	15.1	14.9	14.2	------	13.6	------	------
1959	14.0	13.5	14.6	20.8	13.4	15.8	14.4	13.2	14.8	11.9	11.7
1958	14.1	14.1	15.5	21.5	13.4	16.7	15.0	14.3	15.6	12.4	11.9
1957	15.3	14.4	15.3	22.5	14.1	16.9	15.8	14.7	15.6	14.1	12.0
1956	15.3	15.2	17.4	22.9	15.1	16.9	16.7	15.2	16.7	13.5	12.1
1955	15.2	15.4	17.9	23.2	14.4	17.0	15.7	14.9	16.7	14.3	12.6
1954	15.7	16.3	19.3	23.5	17.6	17.4	17.7	14.4	16.9	15.4	12.9
1953	16.4	16.5	19.0	22.4	17.6	17.5	18.8	15.5	17.9	15.1	13.4
1952	17.0	17.7	17.5	22.7	18.9	18.3	17.9	15.3	18.3	15.1	13.8
1951	18.6	18.1	18.3	23.0	18.0	18.3	17.7	16.1	19.3	15.8	14.3
1950	19.0	19.0	18.5	22.6	18.5	19.3	19.1	16.2	19.9	16.8	14.6
1949	19.2	19.5	16.8	22.7	17.3	19.3	17.8	16.4	20.1	16.6	15.1
1948	20.3	19.3	17.9	23.2	17.6	18.9	18.5	17.7	19.4	17.0	15.5
1947	21.3	20.4	17.4	24.1	19.1	20.1	19.9	18.4	21.2	16.0	16.1
1946	------	21.1	18.7	27.2	19.3	20.2	21.8	18.8	21.7	15.6	17.2
1945	27.3	22.6	19.4	27.6	21.1	19.2	22.8	19.9	24.0	16.1	18.5
1944	27.3	23.0	19.6	27.6	20.2	18.5	23.2	19.6	23.1	16.4	19.0
1943	27.4	23.4	21.3	30.1	20.9	18.5	26.2	20.7	21.8	16.5	19.3
1942	27.7	25.5	20.9	33.2	22.1	19.3	25.9	20.2	22.4	16.5	20.1
1941	27.5	26.2	23.0	34.8	20.9	21.3	26.9	20.6	24.5	18.5	------
1940	27.0	26.4	25.2	37.2	20.6	25.1	28.6	22.0	28.6	20.5	------

[1] For general notes see table 1.

[2] For 1942–59. data include fetal deaths of at least 28 weeks' gestation and a proportionate number of fetal deaths of unknown gestation. For 1940–41, available data include all reported fetal deaths and are therefore not shown.

As in the case of the infant mortality rate, the neonatal loss rate in the United States declined fairly steadily from about the mid-1930's until 1950 or 1951. Since then it has remained virtually stationary. In most of the other countries, the rate of decline spurted near the end or immediately after World War II, although the drop was not as sharp as for the total infant mortality rate. The decline persisted, in general, well beyond the year that the rate leveled off in the United States and, in fact, there are several countries where the rate seems to be continuing its descent (Canada, England and Wales, Finland, and Switzerland). In all of the others, a leveling off has occurred.

Because of the differential rates of decline there has been a major shift in the relative levels of the neonatal mortality rates. When the decline in the United States rate started to taper off (1950–51), the neonatal rate in five countries (Canada, Denmark, England and Wales, Finland, and Switzerland) closely approximated the figure here. But now, the neonatal rates for all of the foreign countries shown in table No. 2, except for Canada, are well below the rate for the United States.

As indicated previously, some care has to be taken in interpreting the significance of the large margin between the neonatal rate in the United States and the rate elsewhere because of variations in registration requirements and practices. In this connection, it is useful to consider the relative levels of fetal mortality rates (28 weeks or more gestation) and then to examine the perinatal mortality rates.

The need for bringing into the picture fetal loss becomes readily apparent when international comparisons of neonatal mortality rates are placed side by side with comparisons of fetal death ratios. In the United States, fetal death ratios have been substantially below the ratios in almost all the other countries, but the reverse is true for neonatal mortality rates. It is not certain whether differences in registration requirements and definitions are entirely responsible for this situation. It may be that some of the pregnancies that are destined to end in a neonatal death in the United States terminate in a fetal death in other countries. The perinatal mortality rate takes care of both sources of incomparability. What it cannot do is to make allowance for differential rates of reporting completeness of fetal deaths.

Before turning to the perinatal mortality rate, it is worth noting that during the 1950's, the fetal mortality ratio for the United States continued to decline slowly but steadily in contrast to the virtual halt in the decline of the neonatal rate (table 3–A). This decrease, although quite modest (about 2 percent per year), equaled or exceeded the relative decline in most of the other countries during the same period.

With regard to perinatal mortality rates, the margin among most of the countries, including the United States, has for years been quite small (table 3–B), and in view of the variation in registration completeness that may exist, it is difficult to attach great importance to some of the observed differences. It is significant, however, that whereas the rate for the United States in 1950–51 was at the lower end of the range of perinatal mortality rates, now it is at the upper end of the range. (In 1950–51, the rate was lower only in Norway; in 1959–60, the rate was higher only in England and Wales.) Furthermore, this reversal can be attributed to the fact that the United States did not fare as well as other countries during the 1950's in reducing neonatal mortality.

The primary reason for examining perinatal mortality rates has been to search for artifacts that might explain the comparatively high neonatal mortality rate for the United States. From the preceding, it would seem reasonable to conclude that part but not all the excess could be attributed to registration practices, and it is highly likely that the United States has at present a less favorable mortality experience shortly after birth than most of the other countries studied.

TABLE 3B.—*Perinatal mortality rates—Selected countries, 1940–60 (neonatal deaths plus fetal deaths of at least 28 weeks gestation or unknown gestation per 1,000 live births plus specified fetal deaths)* [1]

Year	Australia	Canada	Denmark	England and Wales	Finland	Netherlands	New Zealand	Norway	Sweden	Switzerland	United States [2]
1960	------	30.7	------	35.0	29.2	26.8	28.5	------	27.3	------	------
1959	29.1	31.7	30.5	36.3	29.0	27.6	28.1	25.4	27.6	------	30.5
1958	28.3	33.1	31.3	37.3	28.7	28.6	28.4	27.4	27.5	28.6	31.2
1957	30.5	34.3	31.3	38.5	30.4	28.6	29.5	26.8	28.9	30.4	30.8
1956	30.7	35.0	34.8	39.3	31.3	29.7	29.9	27.4	29.7	32.1	30.8
1955	30.4	34.4	35.5	40.0	32.7	30.9	29.5	27.3	29.4	32.9	31.4
1954	31.7	35.3	36.9	40.8	36.7	31.9	31.8	26.1	30.5	35.0	31.8
1953	32.6	37.5	37.2	39.7	37.0	32.2	32.8	27.9	31.5	35.9	32.7
1952	33.4	40.0	36.5	40.6	37.6	33.1	32.8	29.2	32.9	35.0	33.4
1951	35.8	40.3	36.3	41.5	37.4	34.8	33.6	30.3	34.9	36.8	34.0
1950	36.1	42.9	36.4	40.7	39.9	35.4	35.4	30.6	34.8	37.6	34.8
1949	36.9	43.1	35.6	41.5	40.0	35.8	34.5	30.7	36.0	39.8	36.2
1948	39.5	44.4	36.6	42.5	40.8	36.0	34.0	33.1	35.9	41.5	37.3
1947	41.4	46.3	39.0	46.4	43.5	38.2	37.6	35.5	38.3	41.4	38.5
1946	------	47.7	41.8	50.7	44.6	40.7	40.4	35.4	39.4	41.1	40.8
1945	48.4	50.5	43.8	51.8	46.5	48.4	42.0	37.7	42.6	42.1	42.4
1944	48.7	51.5	43.3	51.1	46.1	41.1	43.3	37.6	42.3	41.8	43.3
1943	50.7	52.3	43.7	54.6	43.3	38.5	47.0	38.3	39.9	41.9	43.5
1942	52.4	52.9	44.0	59.4	46.1	39.9	44.1	37.7	39.8	41.2	45.2
1941	53.4	56.1	46.2	62.7	45.1	43.5	46.4	40.2	45.4	45.9	------
1940	51.8	55.3	49.8	65.7	50.3	45.9	50.0	42.1	51.5	47.0	------

[1] For general notes see table 1.

[2] For 1942–59, fetal deaths include fetal deaths of at least 28 weeks' gestation and a proportionate number of fetal deaths of unknown gestation. Comparable data are not available for 1940–41.

Postneonatal mortality

All the qualifications inherent in any discussion of differences in the loss in early infancy may be discarded when considering events after the first month of life. Comparisons can be made in a straightforward way not only of relative rates of decline but of the rates themselves. Review of the course of the postneonatal mortality rate in the United States indicates that a major reduction in the rate started several years before this country's entry into World War II (table 4). Little change occurred during the war years, but in the 1 year following the war (1945–46), the rate dropped by about 30 percent, probably due to the general availability of antibiotics. The decline definitely slowed down thereafter and has been at a complete standstill since 1954. This change in the trend of postneonatal mortality rate should not obscure the fact that today the rate is less than a third its size 25 years ago.

Major reductions in the postneonatal mortality rates have been quite general. The outstanding exception is New Zealand, where the rate 25 years ago was by far the lowest in the world. The rate of decline in this country has been negligible as compared with what has been happening elsewhere, although its loss rate is still one of the most favorable in the world.

Leaving aside New Zealand, patterns of change in the postneonatal mortality rate have varied appreciably among most of the countries. One point of similarity in several countries is the sharp drop in the rate immediately following World War II. The fundamental difference between the course of the rate in the United States and its course in all countries other than Australia and New Zealand is that while the rate of decline slowed down here toward the end of the 1940's and finally came to a halt, the decline has continued at a brisk pace in these other countries.

As a result of the greater relative decreases elsewhere than in the United States starting the end of the 1940's, the postneonatal mortality rate in the United States must now be ranked as close to the highest in the group of low infant mortality countries under study. The rate for Sweden is less than half the figure for the United States, and the rate for the Netherlands is far below ours. It is only in Canada where the rate is still appreciably higher. This is in sharp contrast with what existed 10 years earlier. Then, Denmark, England and Wales, Finland, Norway, and Switzerland, as well as Canada, recorded higher rates than the United States. Also, the excess in the mortality rate for these countries as compared with the United States was substantial.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

International comparisons have been made to assess the trend and level of the infant mortality rate in the United States. Countries selected for analysis have recorded the lowest infant mortality rates in the world for a long time.

In summary, the infant mortality rate in the United States dropped substantially over a 15-year period, until about 1950 when it started to level off. Other countries have also experienced a large-scale decline in their infant mortality rate with the downward trend continuing well into the 1950's for most of them. The rates for several countries besides the United States now appears to be leveling off.

TABLE 4.—*Postneonatal mortality: Selected countries, 1935–60 (exclusive of fetal deaths. Rates per 1,000 live births)* [1]

Year	Australia	Canada	Denmark	England and Wales	Finland	Netherlands	New Zealand	Norway	Sweden	Switzerland	United States
1960	5.5	9.8	------	6.3	6.7	4.5	5.1	------	2.7	------	7.3
1959	6.2	9.9	6.3	6.3	7.8	4.8	6.0	6.2	3.7	------	7.4
1958	6.0	10.9	6.4	6.4	9.1	5.2	5.8	6.7	3.8	5.9	7.6
1957	6.0	10.7	7.0	6.7	11.3	5.2	6.1	8.2	4.3	6.3	7.3
1956	6.1	11.8	7.3	6.8	9.2	6.0	6.0	8.9	4.1	7.0	7.1
1955	6.5	12.0	7.2	7.6	11.1	6.1	6.1	8.0	4.5	7.6	7.3
1954	6.3	12.7	8.9	7.7	11.3	6.4	5.7	9.6	4.9	7.3	7.5
1953	6.8	14.2	8.6	9.1	14.5	7.2	5.8	9.4	4.9	8.6	8.2
1952	7.1	15.5	9.6	9.2	12.7	7.5	6.7	9.5	5.1	8.9	8.6
1951	7.7	15.9	10.5	11.0	15.7	8.3	6.6	11.3	5.7	8.8	8.4
1950	7.1	17.1	12.5	11.3	21.7	8.8	6.2	13.5	5.7	10.1	8.7
1949	7.3	19.2	15.4	13.4	25.2	10.1	6.8	13.2	7.1	10.7	9.9
1948	8.1	18.0	16.2	14.8	28.3	11.9	6.2	13.8	6.4	11.0	9.8
1947	8.0	19.0	18.4	19.0	33.6	15.0	7.0	17.1	7.9	13.5	9.4
1946	7.8	19.5	22.3	16.7	30.3	17.8	7.0	17.8	8.4	13.3	9.7
1945	7.6	22.8	23.4	22.1	37.2	49.9	8.4	18.2	10.9	14.3	13.9
1944	9.3	25.5	23.5	20.3	42.2	23.3	9.5	18.3	11.4	16.4	15.1
1943	12.2	24.1	21.9	23.6	26.5	19.7	10.1	17.4	10.5	13.9	15.6
1942	14.2	25.7	23.4	22.4	42.7	18.5	10.0	18.1	11.4	13.2	14.7
1941	13.1	29.1	31.3	30.7	34.4	20.9	9.8	23.0	15.5	13.3	17.7
1940	12.9	26.7	25.0	27.8	57.9	17.8	8.2	18.2	15.7	19.2	18.3
1939	12.4	30.1	30.6	22.4	41.6	13.9	9.3	16.8	15.3	14.9	18.7
1938	12.3	31.6	31.5	24.4	38.0	16.1	11.5	17.1	17.3	16.6	21.4
1937	11.8	41.6	37.0	27.9	39.1	17.2	9.0	19.0	20.1	18.7	23.2
1936	13.7	32.6	38.2	28.4	38.6	17.3	8.7	19.8	20.1	18.4	24.6
1935	12.3	36.0	41.9	26.5	36.6	17.6	10.2	22.6	20.3	18.6	23.3

[1] For general notes see table 1.

A similar pattern is found in the trends of the neonatal mortality rates. In the case of the postneonatal mortality rate, a slowdown in the rate of decrease may have started in the United States even before 1950, following a long period of sharp decline. Elsewhere, with few exceptions, the postneonatal mortality rate has continued to undergo important reductions, until the present.

An increasing number of countries have been experiencing lower infant mortality rates than the United States. Also, the gap between the rate for the United States and the figures for countries with the most favorable experience has widened. The situation is generally similar for both the neonatal and postneonatal mortality rates. Some question can be raised about the reality of the gap between the neonatal mortality rate in the United States and the rates elsewhere. International differences in reporting requirements and practices could result in some live-born infants who die very soon after birth being classified as an infant death in the United States but as a stillbirth in other countries. Perinatal mortality rates, which combine neonatal deaths and fetal deaths at or after 28 weeks gestation, show much smaller differences among the countries than the neonatal mortality rates. However, the United States is at the upper end of this narrow range of rates and we can conclude that part of the excess in the neonatal mortality rate in the United States is real.

There is no comparable reason for questioning the magnitude of the differences observed in the postneonatal mortality rates. What might be asked is whether these rates have not already reached such a low point in most countries that small absolute differences appear large when expressed in relative terms. This holds for some of the differentials found, but the gap between the rate for the United States and those for a few countries is substantial even on an absolute basis.

The reasons for the leveling off of the infant loss rate in the United States at a higher point than in many other countries are not readily apparent. However, since both the neonatal and postneonatal rates are involved, prenatal as well as postnatal circumstances are implicated and deserve attention. Certainly, highly intensive studies within the United States are called for. It would also appear that a useful approach would be to investigate differences in current practices among countries in the care of pregnant women and the newborn.

An additional approach would be to conduct a major study of the potential in reducing mortality from infectious diseases which still rank high among the causes of death after the neonatal period. Included among the environmental conditions that might have to be examined would be the emergence of resistant bacterial strains cited elsewhere as a possible deterrent to further decline in infant mortality due to infectious diseases.[1] In any event, an inquiry into international trends of mortality rates by cause of death would be a starting point. This would have to go beyond published data, since diagnostic practices and the reporting of cause of death information may vary greatly among countries.

The effort required would be substantial. But, given the lag in reducing the infant mortality rate in the United States, such an effort appears warranted. The fact that there are other countries with much lower loss rates suggests that even without a major breakthrough in medical knowledge, a rapid reduction in infant mortality rates in the United States from the present level of 25 to 26 per 1,000 to a point below 20 per 1,000 is a realistic goal.

NOTE.—Mr. Shapiro is director, Division of Research and Statistics, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, New York, N.Y., and Dr. Moriyama is chief, Office of Health Statistics Analysis, National Center for Health Statistics, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

(This paper was presented before a joint session of the Food and Nutrition, Maternal and Child Health, and Statistics Sections of the American Public Health Association at the 90th annual meeting in Miami Beach, Fla., October 15, 1962.

(This investigation was supported (in part) by a U.S. Public Health Service grant

---

[1] See footnote 1, p. 6200.

(GM 08262-02) from the Division of General Medical Sciences to the American Public Health Association for a series of monographs on vital and health statistics.)

CUTBACK OF FUNDS FOR POULTRY INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in his effort to manipulate the 1967 budget to make it appear trimmer, the President has condoned a number of drastic cutbacks in funds earmarked for research in the field of agriculture. Without this research, carried on at our land-grant colleges and universities, much of America's astounding agricultural progress would have been impossible. Our present abundance is dependent on the fact that many diseases have been curbed almost entirely, allowing far greater returns to the individual farmer. Without these returns, our farm population would undoubtedly have dwindled even more than it already has.

One specific example of a foolish research cutback can be seen in the poultry industry. The disease known as airsaculitis—most prevalent in turkeys—has not yet been controlled, and it is estimated that last year alone the turkey industry lost some $2 million in condemned turkeys at processing plants. Presently, research programs totaling $77,800 in grants have made much progress in controlling the disease. The President's budget, however, eliminates all of this money, thus undoing both past and future benefits. The research was carried on at five land-grant institutions: in Georgia, Maine, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. The loss of these funds will mean important changes in these educational institutions.

At a time when food and meat prices are going up, it is very important that we in the Congress continue to support endeavors to improve quality and output. It is in the best interests of the economy and of the agricultural community if the moneys used in improvement research are reinstated in the 1967 budget.

I suggest that the consumers will not sit by while they are forced to pay the expenses of uncontrolled airsaculitis in the form of higher poultry prices any more than they will sit by and absorb the public health expenses now borne by the Government. Food is the common denominator of all family budgets, and the rising cost of food can least be borne by those who are the purported beneficiaries of the very programs that are replacing such stalwarts as the agricultural research and the school milk and lunch programs.

SUBSTITUTE OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE FOR THE WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. Quie, and I take the floor today because of our deep distress and concern over the developing crisis in the urban poverty areas contributed to by the high promise and low performance of the war on poverty. What I say today is concurred in by my colleague, Mr. Quie. This is a joint statement for the Record. It is still not too late to launch an opportunity crusade as a complete substitute for the war on poverty.

The riots in the Watts area of Los Angeles on Tuesday of this week have resulted in a renewal of concern over conditions which have contributed to this and similar incidents. We all search for causes of these expressions of dissatisfaction with prevailing conditions and hope to find solutions to problems which exist not only in Los Angeles but in many other critical areas of the country.

During the past 6 months, investigators of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the War on Poverty have reported to me many situations which warn us of potential trouble in the form of possible violent demonstrations by groups that have long been exploited and denied a meaningful voice in the affairs of their communities, especially concerning what they consider their own critical problems. The protests of minorities and low-income people in Watts; Chicago's west side; the Hough area of Cleveland; Gary, Ind.; Oakland, Calif.; and in the Nation's Capital, have been loud and clear regarding their dissatisfaction with the failures of the antipoverty program to alleviate to any degree conditions which accompany poverty. The problems of the impoverished are the same in all of the above cities: Unemployment, slum housing conditions, inferior education, lack of suitable health facilities, rats in the homes, and garbage and debris in the streets and alleys.

The poor complain they have been promised a major role in the antipoverty program. They believed they would be involved in the program at levels where they could speak out; sit on boards of directors; help form policies; make decisions; and plan programs they felt would solve many of their problems.

In January of this year, we talked to numerous people in the Watts area. They all expressed resentment of the city-hall-controlled antipoverty program which had received almost $30 million and had failed to bring about noticeable improvement in the plight of the unemployed and underfed residents of the Watts area. At that time, plans had been made to conduct elections of seven representatives of the poor to the board of directors of the Economic Youth and Opportunities Agency, Los Angeles antipoverty organization. Provisions had been made to district Los Angeles County in such a manner as to completely frustrate a substantial part of the county's poor populace. There was substantial objection that the Watts district was set up so that there was a strong possibility no representative of the Watts area would be elected to the board of directors.

Mr. Quie, upon returning from the Watts area in January of this year, pointed out there was danger of renewed riots in Watts, especially if Watts was denied a representative on the board due to the gerrymandering of the districts. In the elections, no representative of Watts was picked. The riots occurred on March 15.

Unless something is done differently, there are going to be more. The election in Los Angeles of so-called representatives of the poor was ridiculous and anybody who took the trouble to talk to the poor in Los Angeles would realize it. Practically everyone in Los Angeles knew it.

This was a major concern to the poor and to many people who headed up agencies which had been serving the poor in Watts. Many expressed their disgust at the failures of the Los Angeles program. After 18 months and $30 million, the EYOA was still gearing up for the war on poverty.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that less than 1 percent of the poor people in Los Angeles County voted in the elections to the board of directors which were held on March 1 of this year. Last week, Mr. Archie Hardwick, executive director, Westminster Neighborhood Association, which is located in the heart of Watts and which administers a $1 million community action and youth development program, delegated by the community action agency of Los Angeles, stated the people in Watts did not respond to the elections for the following reasons:

First. They are disgusted with the phony antipoverty program the mayor is running in Los Angeles.

Second. It was in the nature of a protest by the poor of Watts because of the manner the election districts were set up—no community identity involved.

Third. The day selected for the elections, March 1, 1966, was the day welfare checks were distributed and the recipients were occupied with many other things to do.

In Los Angeles four highly placed officials in the community action agency stated there has been very little progress of meaningful antipoverty programs in Los Angeles and many of the programs have been of the research and organization type.

In Chicago last month, similar complaints were heard from residents on the West Side of Chicago who commented the situation there is extremely tense and would lend itself to expressions of violence if relief did not come soon for the misery, despair, and hopelessness which prevails in the ghettos. Dr. Martin Luther King's top aid, Rev. Andrew Young, stated conditions on Chicago's West Side were critical, the antipoverty program had done very little to remedy the problems and Dr. King planned to remain in Chicago for as much as another 12 years in an effort to help solve some of the poor's problems in that area. It was noted recently the United Auto Workers made arrangements to furnish Dr. King with 100 community workers to assist him in this endeavor. One highly placed official in the Chicago Community on Urban Opportunity, Chicago's antipoverty program, expressed his fears Chicago's West Side would "blow" if tensions were not released.

Representatives of the poor in the Hough area of Cleveland have on three occasions in the last 5 months contacted members of the Anti-Poverty Subcommittee and expressed their complete dissatisfaction with the power structure's control of the antipoverty program in Cleveland. They complain about lack of genuine representation on the community action agency's board of directors and long delays in approving programs which would help solve some of the problems of the disadvantaged in the Hough area.

In Gary, Ind., there was evidence of discrimination in employment, despair and apathy of the poor in view of no prospect of employment and better living conditions. The antipoverty program in the Gary, Ind., area was hopelessly mired in a struggle for control of the program, which included the cities of Gary, Hammond, and East Chicago. There was no indication there would be programs operational before 1966.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, the Economic Opportunity Act has been a sputtering, ineffective, and confused program which the poor say has done little to help them. The poor complain "the money is being spent but where is it going?"

In January representatives of the poor explained the problems in Oakland are very much the same as those in Watts: Unemployment, inferior education, and poor housing. Further, we were told many of the inhabitants of Oakland and Watts are closely related and a substantial number of former residents moved from Oakland to the Watts area during the past year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the keys to the solution of poverty problems is for responsible public officials, church leaders, and community leaders to include the poor in discussions and listen to their analyses of their plight and their suggested programs to combat poverty conditions.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I have been pointing out the severe mistakes which have occurred under the so-called war on poverty. We believe that the poor should have a chance and that is why we have developed and introduced our bill, the Opportunity Crusade of 1966 to replace the war on poverty.

Among other things the opportunity crusade would avoid community dissention and give hope to the poor by assuring them real expression through real representation on community action boards. This can be done by neighborhood meetings and elections in concentrated areas of poverty. Poverty elections in Huntsville, Ala., resulted in a turnout of 14 percent of the eligible voters. In Cleveland over 11 percent of the eligible voters in the two poorest districts voted.

The opportunity crusade will provide a program which we feel will bring effective relief to low-income families and bring them the dignity and hope they have long been seeking.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is superfluous to point out that today is St. Patrick's Day, a day dear to the heart of the Irish and near-Irish. One has only to look around this Chamber and note the abundance of green ties and carnations for it to be obvious what today is.

Several times in the year, I have taken the floor here, Mr. Speaker, to offer a salute, praise, homage, if you will, to groups of Americans whose ancestors reached these shores from any one of a dozen countries. I have been happy and proud to do so. But I would be somewhat less than candid if I did not admit that today gives me a certain special feeling.

It is a grand thing, Mr. Speaker, and one peculiar to this country, for a man to be able to be an American and at the same time lay claim to all the prerogatives and fame of the Irish. Thus when I am out of sorts I am able to say that I am not being grouchy but merely exemplifying Irish mysticism. When I am irate it is my Irish temper. But it works the other way, too, Mr. Speaker, for if by some smiling of the gods I am able to do something right politically, it becomes the luck of the Irish. So be it.

It is said that every Irishman has in his veins the blood of kings. And it is not for me to say that this is false. But I would say that if our ancestors were indeed kings they left precious little in the treasury in the way of things financial. But they left another treasury that is in the end much more important. They left us a spiritual heritage which has served us well in our wanderings. Does it surprise anyone that an O'Higgins was the leader in the fight for South American Independence, that a County Derry man, Charles Thomson, was the Secretary of the Continental Congress, or that Washington's army was more than one-third Irish and that John Barry of Tacumshane was the father of the American Navy? A hundred yars ago almost 44 percent of the foreign-born population of this country was Irish. And the mass immigration of those seeking relief from starvation and persecution was just hitting its stride.

In time the Irish were to build the railroads, dig the canals and fight their way from the east coast slums into a prominence in letters and science and the professions. But it was no easy fight and we can perhaps note with a left handed pride that the Irish were the first immigrants to bear the lash of prejudice.

What is the Irishman Who can say? To me it is Ellen Fitzsimons of County Leitrim and James Rooney of County Sligo—my mother and father. Proud of their heritage and anxious to retain it, yet prouder still, if that were possible, of their new country.

On St. Patrick's Day, it is said that all Irishmen wear something green. This is not necessarily so, Mr. Speaker, some of us just wear a smile.

POLITICAL NOISE SUPPORTED BY FACTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman sluffed off my criticism of recent heavy dumping of Government corn supplies by the Commodity Credit Corporation as merely "political noise."

This week I have placed in the RECORD various reports and letters from farmers, country elevator operators, administration officials, farm organizations, and grain futures market firms which agreed with my brand of "political noise." Apparently, the Secretary is not yet convinced as the CCC is still dumping.

I now have permission to insert data gathered from the 1966 weekly issues of the Grain Market News, which is published by the Grain Division of the Consumer and Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture.

The data follow:

Chicago price for No. 2 Yellow corn

	1965	*1966*
Jan. 6	1. 29	1. 31
Jan. 13	1. 29	1. 34–1. 35
Jan. 20	1. 28–1. 29	1. 33
Jan. 27	1. 30	1. 31
Feb. 3	1. 31	1. 32
Feb. 10	1. 32	1. 33
Feb. 17	1. 30–1. 31	1. 32
Feb. 24	1. 30	1. 29
Mar. 3	1. 30–1. 31	1. 25–1. 26
Mar. 10	1. 33	1. 26–1. 27

CCC domestic sales and dispositions

[All data in 1,000 bushels]

1965

Week ending:	*Season totals*
Jan. 8	44, 147
Jan. 15	63, 636
Jan. 22	79, 617
Jan. 29	89, 945
Feb. 5	104, 592
Feb. 12	122, 492
Feb. 19	138, 987
Feb. 26	150, 735
Mar. 5	168, 280

1966

Week ending:	*Weekly sales*	*Season totals*
Jan. 7	5, 240	20, 056
Jan. 14	16, 254	36, 640
Jan. 21	15, 570	52, 210
Jan. 28	18, 967	71, 177
Feb. 4	28, 940	110, 117
Feb. 11	23, 320	123, 436
Feb. 18	30, 977	154, 413
Feb. 25	38, 116	194, 069
Mar. 4	71, 771	265, 841
Mar. 10	23, 764	289, 726

As the data show, the CCC unloaded over 23 million bushels of corn last week for a total of almost 290 million bushels since the beginning of the crop year last October 1. This amounts to an increase of over 100 million bushels during the same period last year. The results are obvious. The 1966 corn prices were holding up pretty well when compared to 1965 until the heavy dumping started. As late as February 17, the 1966 price was above the 1965 price. Then the deluge began. Since the middle of February, the CCC has sold nearly 165 million bushels of corn. The price of No. 2 Yellow in Chicago has dropped during the same period from $1.32 per bushel to $1.26–1.27 per bushel. Are these figures published by the Department just more "political noise"?

The preamble of the 1933 farm act set parity as the goal of Government farm programs, and that preamble has never been repealed. Under the present administration's policies, we are going in the wrong direction.

As I have demonstrated this week, I am not alone in my criticism. The Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, which has generally supported the policies of the present Secretary of Agriculture, has criticized the CCC's market activities which "depress prices and bypass farmer cooperatives and the free market system." The GTA continued in its Digest of May 1965:

> The complaints on this operation, which come from all sides, are economic and not political. Many of the critics are dedicated supporters of farm programs, interested only in improving them to benefit farm families.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the recent destructive practices of the Department of Agriculture when I remember what President Johnson told this Congress in his farm message on February 4, 1965: "Our objective must be for the farmer to get improved income out of the marketplace, with less cost to the Government. To do this, I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to so utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation as to make the free market system work more effectively for the farmer. We must encourage the private segment of our economy to carry its own inventories, bought from farmers, rather than depending on the Government as a source of supply. We must urge the private sector to perform as many services as possible now performed by Government agencies."

Apparently the Secretary of Agriculture did not hear the President's request. I have received a copy of a very well-documented letter sent to Mr. Freeman by Mr. Roger W. Krogstad, manager of the Bird Island Grain & Feed Co. in Bird Island, Minn. Mr. Krogstad suggests:

> There might just be a little more than noise in these statements which Representative Ancher Nelsen and others have made.

I include Mr. Krogstad's letter and one I received from Mr. Winfield Forsberg, an accredited farm manager from New Ulm, Minn., as these are fairly typical of letters I have been receiving.

The letters follow:

Birch Island Grain & Feed Co.,
March 11, 1966.

Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Freeman: The enclosed clipping from last evening's Minneapolis Star indicates your calling criticism of Commodity Credit Corporation's corn selling program "a lot of political noise." I don't think you were misquoted by the paper, as I heard your reply to this criticism over WCCO radio on March 9, following your Farm Forum appearance.

I have jotted down a few figures, which should indicate that there might just be a little more than noise in these statements which Representative Ancher Nelsen and others have made.

On March 9, you indicated that corn was selling for $1.29 in Chicago, which, by the way, is almost 500 miles from where this letter is being written. Freight charges on corn to Chicago would run up close to 20 cents per bushel, which means we could net out at $1.09. The Chicago March futures price on corn on March 9 closed at $1.22¾, or if my arithmetic serves correct, is 6¼ cents less than the figure you quote.

As to the 2-cent drop in the market price of corn you mention, I have a few more figures which contradict your statements. On January 11, 1966, we bought from CCC 15,410.52 bushels of corn which had been stored in our warehouse. This was No. 4 Yellow corn, and the purchase price was $1.19¼. Chicago March corn that day closed at $1.28⅞, or 5⅛ cents more than on March 9. The second lot of corn which we purchased from CCC on February 1, was sold to us for $1.13½ (this was again No. 4 Yellow corn) covering a total of 21,879.29 bushels. Again, my arithmetic indicates that the price on the second lot was 5.75 cents less per bushel. Chicago March corn on February 1 was selling at $1.28, or 5¼ cents more than on the date you appeared in Minneapolis, talking about political (meaning, no doubt, Republican) noise.

In light of the above figures, you may ask why we bought this corn from CCC, instead of shipping it out as the two loading orders were issued. We have at least two answers to this: first, it has been our understanding that CCC would rather have country warehouses buy this corn; second, with all the CCC-owned grain moving, there simply are not boxcars available to ship this grain. A case in point is the local binsite loading order which we received on January 24, 1966. This order called on us to ship to the Minneapolis branch office of USDA a total of 37,000 bushels of corn. This would amount to 18 carloads. As of the time of this writing, we have shipped 17 cars. Had the cars been available, our loading facilities would have permitted us to have all this corn out of here in well under 2 weeks. Therefore, in an effort to cooperate with CCC, and hoping to make at least our normal margin in selling back this corn to our customers, we purchased the two corn loading orders which I have mentioned.

In case you might question my having picked the above figures out of the air, the prices I have quoted have all appeared in the Daily Market Record, printed in Minneapolis, on the dates I have mentioned. I have all the records in my files to substantiate the prices I have quoted regarding the purchases of corn which we have made from Commodity Credit Corporation in the past 2 months.

Very truly yours,
Roger W. Krogstad,
Manager.

Forsberg Agricultural Service,
New Ulm, Minn., March 8, 1966.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: I want to protest in the strongest terms possible the unwarranted and unnecessary dumping of corn by the Commodity Credit Corporation in an obvious attempt to browbeat farmers into signing up in the current feed-grain program. Corn prices today decline several cents at the very time that producers are being forced to sell corn in this State because of extremely high moisture content. There is no reason in the world for sales at this time by the Commodity Credit Corporation because their corn supposedly is in good condition and could and should be held until next summer when sales would not compete so strongly against the farmer now forced to sell his corn. The experts at the USDA, if they are at all knowledgeable about farm conditions should realize that we harvested a corn crop with extremely high moisture last fall in all of the northern Corn Belt. Therefore, we must either feed this corn before spring arrives or sell it to the elevators where it can be dried and stored. Therefore, dumping by the CCC at this time is extremely harmful to farmers who have already suffered much from the very poor corn crop of 1965.

I realize that the USDA is seemingly unaware of the fact that we harvested last fall one of the poorest crops in recent history in much of Minnesota. However, if they would take the time to check with the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, they would realize the true situation and not be talking about a large crop in this State last year. I mention this because the poor quality of the corn last fall makes it necessary for us to sell at this time.

Therefore, I would urge all efforts at your command to persuade the CCC to halt all sales of corn until next summer.

Sincerely yours,
Winfield Forsberg,
Accredited Farm Manager.

LETTER OF PROTEST FROM DR. JOACHIM PRINZ TO SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by Chairman Tom Murray that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has requested reports from the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission on House Concurrent Resolution 595 which I have introduced to prevent religious or racial discrimination in the assignment of U.S. employees.

I am hopeful that the administration will support this measure even though the Department of State has admitted to me that race and religion are factors which are sometimes taken into consideration in assigning U.S. employees to posts in foreign countries.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a letter of protest recently sent to Secretary of State Dean Rusk by Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress:

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS,
March 7, 1966.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: The letter of January 14 of Mr. Douglas MacArthur II, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, to Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania, has just come to my attention. Mr. MacArthur responded to inquiries about the alleged exclusion of American Jews from appointment to U.S. diplomatic posts in Arab countries with the following observations:

"In recognition of the fact that any government can refuse to accept an employee officially assigned by another government through the simple expediency of declaring him to be persona non grata, the United States tries not to assign any employee to a country where he will be unacceptable to the host government. To violate this assignment policy would not succeed in fulfilling his functional obligations in the interest of the United States. Thus while the United States does not normally take into account the religion of its employees in assigning them for duty abroad, this is regrettably a factor which cannot be ignored in the case of certain countries whose policies in this respect we cannot control, however much we disagree with them."

We are astonished that the State Department should adopt this view. Mr. MacArthur's position necessarily embroils the Department in inquiries into religious belief which under our Constitution can lawfully be none of its concern and which tend to compromise all appointments to the Foreign Service.

The implications of the attitude expressed by Mr. MacArthur are thoroughly unacceptable. Once we concede the right of foreign governments to exclude an American representative solely because of his religion, especially when it is not demonstrably related to his professional tasks and obligations, then ultimately only a certain kind of moral, political and ethnic neuter will be found eligible for diplomatic assignments. Certainly we must reject the assumption that a citizen of this country who is Jewish and who is found qualified for designation by the United States to serve abroad will not with complete and absolute fidelity serve his Government and carry out its instructions without regard to any private sentiments of his own. It is to be assumed that every American harbors a dislike for authoritarian and dictatorial government, yet I suppose it does not thereby follow that we cannot be represented in countries subject to this form of rule.

Mr. MacArthur's position is all the more deplorable since it reverses and repudiates policies that characterized the Department at least during some earlier periods of its history. Thus, the position taken by President Grover Cleveland in a case almost exactly in point is instructive.

In May, 1885, President Grover Cleveland appointed Mr. Anthony M. Keiley of Virginia, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Vienna. The United States was informed however that Mr. Keiley would be unacceptable to the Austrian Government because "the position of a foreign envoy wedded to a Jewess by civil marriage would be untenable and even impossible in Vienna." (Foreign Relations, page 48.)

Secretary of State Bayard replied in unmistakable language:

"The supreme law of this land expressly declares that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States,' and by the same authority it is declared that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'

"It is not within the power of the President nor of the Congress, or of any judicial tribunal in the United States, to take or even hear testimony, or in any mode to inquire into or decide upon the religious belief of any official, and the proposition allow this to be done by any foreign government is necessarily and a fortiori inadmissible.

"To suffer an infraction of this essential principle would lead to a disfranchisement of our citizens because of their religious belief, and thus impair or destroy the most important end which our constitution of government was intended to secure." (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 48.)

The Austrian Government thereupon changed the ground of its opposition to a supposed "want of political tact evinced on his (Mr Keiley's) part on a former occasion, in consequence of which a friendly power declined to receive him; and upon the certainty that his domestic relations preclude that reception of him by Vienna society, which we judge desirable for the representatives of the United States with which power we wish to continue the friendly relations existing between the two Governments." (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 55.)

This country, however, was not deceived by these representations and refused to appoint an envoy in Mr. Keiley's stead. The position of this Government was that the acts of Austria and her ministers in this case would require this country to agree to permit Austria to reserve for herself the right to prescribe a religious test for office in the United States and that this could never be found acceptable by the people of this country. In his annual message to Congress, December 8, 1885, President Cleveland reviewed the entire case:

"Question has arisen with the Government of Austria-Hungary touching the representation of the United States at Vienna. Having, under my constitutional prerogative, appointed an estimable citizen of unimpeachable probity and competence as minister at that court, the Government of Austria-Hungary invited this Government to take cognizance of certain exceptions, based upon allegations against the personal acceptability of Mr. Keiley, the appointed Envoy, asking that, in view thereof, the appointment should be withdrawn.

"The reasons advanced were such as could not be acquiesced in, without violation of my oath of office and the precepts of the Constitution, since they necessarily involved a limitation in favor of a foreign government upon the right of selection by the Executive, and required such an application of a religious test as a qualification for office under the United States as would have resulted in the practical disfranchisement of a large class of our citizens and the abandonment of a vital principle in our Government.

"The Austro-Hungarian Government finally decided not to receive Mr. Keiley as the Envoy of the United States, and that gentleman has since resigned his commission, leaving the post vacant. I have made no new nomination, and the interests of this Government in Vienna acting as chargé d'affaires ad interim." (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. iv.)

Unquestionably the qualification of an ambassadorial appointee depends in considerable measure upon his standing in the country in which he is designated to serve. It is not diplomatic custom for any State to impose an unwelcome envoy upon another. This country nevertheless felt that the exercise of religious prejudice in the Keiley case was a matter of sufficient importance to override all considerations of diplomatic practice. The religious beliefs of citizens of the United States can be of no business of the Arab countries and it is a gross invasion of the constitutional guarantees of religious freedom for any agency of this Government to agree to the exclusion of Jewish public officials of any rank, from acting on behalf of their country anywhere in the world.

It is plainly no argument to allege, as Assistant Secretary MacArthur alleges, that restrictions are imposed by the Arab countries are "regrettably a factor which cannot be ignored in the case of certain countries whose policies in this respect we cannot control however much we disagree with them." Matters that impinge so directly upon the welfare and liberty of American citizens cannot thus be so immunized from American intervention.

On other occasions in order to guard against racial or religious injustice, the United States has not been unwilling to instruct its diplomatic emissaries abroad to take action that entails criticism of the internal activities of another state. This, too, is a time honored principle of the Department. On November 22, 1881, Secretary of State Blaine, in seeking to persuade Great Britain to join in protest against Russian anti-Semitism wrote to the U.S. Minister at London:

"It becomes in a high * * * sense a moral duty to our citizens and to the doctrines of religious freedom we so strongly uphold, to seek proper protection for those citizens and tolerance for their creed, in foreign lands, even at the risk of criticism of the municipal laws of other states." Kohler, "The United States and German Jewish Prosecutions," pp. 40–41.

There can be no doubt that our national self-respect would best be served by this country's firm refusal to accept religious or racial grounds as a legitimate reason for exclusion or rejection of a properly designated emissary of the United States by a sovereign anywhere at any time. In any case, however, it is certainly not the business of the Department of State in this country to seek to accommodate foreign prejudices by adjusting our appointive policies to the odious practices of some other government. Should a specific American appointee be unacceptable to a foreign state and be declared persona non grata for a specific assignment then that is a matter to be handled in due course. But for the State Department to assume for itself the task of advance religious screening is unthinkable.

In comparable circumstances some private employers in the past have attempted to claim exemption from the requirements of the State Fair Employment Practices Law, arguing that the inability of prospective Jewish employees to obtain visas for travel to company installations in Arab countries justified inquiries into religion on job application forms. In its final opinion in a case involving the Arab Aramco Oil Co., the New York State Commission for Human Rights declared:

"(Aramco) acts in this regard as an agent for a foreign power, implementing a policy inimical to our democratic principles, contrary to our law. * * * While we condemn the practice of the exclusion of Jews from

Saudi Arabian shores, we acknowledge that its Government may exclude whom it will. It may not, however, empower respondent to ask prohibited questions and to exclude persons of the Jewish faith from employment here in New York. If the issue is of such great import to Saudi Arabia, it must pursue its disreputable course from start to finish and process its visas as it will.

"It may not choose this respondent as its 'cat's-paw.' * * * Nor does respondent's argument that no person of the Jewish faith will be admitted to Saudi Arabia, despite our decision, bear weight. Admitting the fact does not make the issue academic and unimportant. * * * The preservation of the majesty of the law transcends in importance the collateral effects of its application."

If we truly oppose the efforts by Arab countries to engage in religious discrimination against some groups of American citizens, the very least we can do is to force them to carry on this ugly practice by themselves and without lending them our facilities and cooperation. If Arab countries wish to suffer the embarrassment that must flow from an arbitrary rejection of a qualified American representative solely because he is Jewish, then let them do so. Perhaps it may not be too much to hope that potential international discomfiture that would follow from such an open declaration of anti-Semitism might dissuade these countries from continuing to act in furtherance of their religious bias.

We note that a resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives on February 21, 1966, to induce the State Department to alter its current practice. We cannot believe that the Department will act only under this kind of legislative compulsion. Failure to perceive the overriding moral issue inherent in this matter necessarily detracts from the confidence American citizens should be able to invest in high officials of their government. We therefore urge the Department to announce the abandonment of this nefarious policy so that all Americans may be reassured of fairness and justice at all levels of their government.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Joachim Prinz,
President.

RECORD ROLLCALLS ANSWERED BY CONGRESSMAN LINDLEY BECKWORTH, VETERANS LEGISLATION, OTHER LEGISLATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Beckworth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have been at my post of duty:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Attendance record of Hon. Lindley Beckworth on rollcall votes taken in the House from 1957 through February 1966

	Total rollcall votes	Answered yea or nay	Not voting
85th Cong., 1st sess., 1957; duration, 239 days; ending Aug. 30, 1957	100	100	0
85th Cong., 2d sess., 1958; duration, 230 days; ending Aug. 24, 1958	93	93	0
86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959: duration, 252 days; ending Sept. 15, 1959	87	87	0
86th Cong., 2d sess., 1960; duration, 240 days; ending Sept. 1, 1960	93	93	0
87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961; duration, 268 days; ending Sept. 27, 1961	116	114	(1)
87th Cong., 2d sess., 1962; duration, 277 days; ending Oct. 13, 1962	124	124	0
88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963; duration, 356 days; ending Dec. 30, 1963	119	119	0
88th Cong., 2d sess., 1964; duration, 270 days; ending Oct. 3, 1964	113	105	(2)
89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965; duration, 293 days; ending Oct. 23, 1965	201	201	0
89th Cong., 2d sess., through Feb. 1966; duration, 49 days; ending Feb. 28, 1966	14	14	0
Total	1,060	1,050	10

[1] May 24, 1961, announced for; May 25, 1961, announced against.

[2] Aug. 4, 1964, general pair; Aug. 4, 1964, paired for; Aug. 7, 1964, paired for; Aug. 7, 1964, paired against; Aug. 7, 1964, paired for; Aug 8, 1964, paired against; Aug. 8, 1964, paired for; Oct. 3, 1964, general pair.

Mary D. Arthur,
American Law Division, Mar. 15, 1966.

In the period referred to below I was in four congressional races. I was in Congress from January 1939 to January 1953—14 years. I returned to Congress in January 1957. As of March 4, 1966, there have been a total number of record votes of 1,060 since January 1957. You will note I answered 1,050—all except 10. My father was operated on in May 1961. He and his wife, Miss Pearl, passed away in the July–October period of 1964. The House adjourned October 23, 1965, and convened January 10, 1966. I was in Texas while the House was not in session.

Neither of the votes I missed out of a total number of rollcalls of 1,060 was a vote on veterans' legislation. In the 24 years I have served in Congress I have tried to help all our veterans, their widows and dependents, all service people and their dependents—I voted for the service people's pay raise on July 20, 1965. I favor raising the pay of our service people at this time. Also I have tried to help our aged and others.

I am 52 years of age and have held elective legislative offices 26 years—one-half of my life. I have represented the Third Congressional District 24 years. I was in the Texas Legislature 2 years.

Our present Third Congressional District is to be abolished as of January 3, 1967. A new Third Congressional District is to be located in the western part of Dallas County and will border Tarrant County of which Fort Worth is the county seat—as of January 3, 1967. The 1960 population of the Fourth District was 216,371; the 1960 population of the First District was 245,942; the 1960 population of our Third District was 293,942. Five of the nine counties of our Third District—the five with county seats are Camp—Pittsburg; Panola—Carthage; Rusk—Henderson; Shelby—Center; Wood—Quitman—are to be placed in Congressional District No. 1 which has in it Paris, Marshall, and Texarkana.

Four of our nine counties—the four with county seats are Gregg—Longview; my home county of Upshur—Gilmer; Smith—Tyler; and Van Zandt—Canton—are to be placed in Congressional District No. 4. Neither the First nor Fourth District lost a county.

I have undertaken at all times to cooperate with the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion.

I quote part of a letter written December 31, 1945, which I received from Mr. Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Kansas City, Mo.:

> I have the page from the Congressional Record reprinting your remarks and the various communications you have received in connection with your activities in behalf of veterans and their dependents, and I wish to express my appreciation for your efforts along this line.

Also I quote a part of a letter which was written to me March 13, 1963, by one of the outstanding leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

> You are known to have supported all veterans' legislation.

As a former teacher, I have always favored and I strongly favor educational benefits for our servicemen and veterans. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 7724, "a bill to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term 'change of program of education or training' as used in such section." A favorable report was given on my bill by the American Legion on July 15, 1959.

I quote the pertinent part of a letter written to Representative Dorn by Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, of the American Legion:

> In connection with H.R. 7724, while we have no resolution on the subject matter, I would advise that the American Legion's rehabilitation representatives feel such an amendment to section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code is desirable. We, therefore, trust the subcommittee will favorably consider H.R. 7724.

The Veterans' Administration gave a favorable report on my bill. The bill was reported favorably by the Dorn subcommittee on July 21, 1959, and its provisions have now become law.

I supported the so-called GI bill for Word War II veterans and I always have favored and do favor generous pay and benefits for service people and their dependents, and generous benefits and pensions for veterans and their dependents. I supported the most recent GI legislation, H.R. 12410 and S. 9, which passed the House February 7, 1966.

I introduced my bill, H.R. 162, January 9, 1963—more than 3 years ago—"to amend chapter 33 of title 38 to make the educational benefits provided for therein available to all veterans whether or not they serve during a period of war or armed hostilities."

Certain letters and certain statements of mine were in the April 25, 1947, Congressional Record. I include some of them:

TERMINAL LEAVE FOR ENLISTED MEN AND LETTER ENDORSING BECKWORTH'S BILL—H.R. 1160

(June 7, 1946)

Mr. Beckworth. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1943, I introduced a bill (H.R. 3875) to provide terminal leave for enlisted men. On January 8, 1945, I introduced H.R. 1160, a slightly modified form of my first bill. The national legislative committee of the American Legion endorsed my bill H.R. 1160. Several Members of Congress and I appeared before the House Millitary Affairs Committee urging the passage of the terminal-leave legislation. I include at this point the endorsement of the American Legion:

"The American Legion,
"National Legislative Committee,
"Washington, D.C., October 24, 1945.

"Hon. Lindley Beckworth,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D.C.

"My Dear Congressman: We are, as you know, vitally interested in your bill, H.R. 1160, which provides terminal leave to enlisted men in the same manner as is now given to officers, except that it also provides that the compensation to which the soldier is entitled shall be paid in a lump sum, which, of course, is a very good idea.

"Demobilization is taking place at such a rapid rate at the present time that unless this is enacted into law quickly it is not going to benefit very many GI's.

"It does not seem to me as though it is a very controversial issue and that the House Military Affairs Committee could make up its mind very readily as to how they feel about it. We shall appreciate very much if action can be had on this matter.

"Sincerely yours,
"John Thomas Taylor,
"Director, National Legislative Committee."

I was one of 218 Members of the House to sign the petition—the 218th signature was obtained April 17, 1946—which authorized the bringing of the legislation to the floor of the House. I shall vote for the legislation today.

For some time I have had a bill before the Congress that would give all World War veterans and widows of World War veterans pensions not less in amount than those now received by Spanish-American War veterans. I shall continue to urge in the future this legislation. Note the position of the American Legion, Department of Texas, concerning my present bill, H.R. 360. I quote from a letter written me May 19, 1945, by Mr. Harry E. Rather, department adjutant, the American Legion:

"H.R. 360 is the very important legislation which sounds like the kind of legislation that you are always sponsoring, Lindley. We know that we can always depend on you. We are delighted that you are back in the harness and on the right side, as usual."

I quote part of a letter I received from Mr. Rather after he resigned his work with the American Legion, dated January 22, 1946:

"Appreciate your every courtesy, many, many times. Your cooperation was everything that I could want and expect and I shall miss you but I know that you can be counted on being in there doing your part in every worthwhile matter. We who know you are proud of you and your record."

On January 3, 1945, I introduced H.R. 361 which would make eligible a World War I or II veteran for a pension, if that veteran could not qualify for Government or private employment, the nature of which required only reasonable physical standards.

On June 21, 1945, I introduced H.R. 3526, which would extend the GI bill of rights to widows of veterans and the wives of certain totally and permanently disabled veterans.

On June 26, 1945, I introduced H.R. 3592; this is a bill to help concerning housing problems for veterans. This bill, be it noted, was introduced some 6 months before the real effort to meet the veterans' housing problems got under way in the Congress. I quote from a letter written me November 27, 1945, by Mr. Harry E. Rather, department adjutant, the American Legion, Department of Texas, concerning my effort to help our veterans obtain houses:

"We know that we can depend on you to do everything you possibly can on the housing situation, which is most critical."

The Congressional Record will show that I was one of the Members of Congress, although we were in the minority at times, that supported every effort to provide housing for veterans.

Last year, October 1, 1945, I introduced H.R. 4219, a bill that would permit a man or woman in service to carry his immediate family with him at Government expense to the place where he was stationed, where practicable, even outside of the United States; too, I provide that the Government will furnish adequate housing for such families; this legislation will do for enlisted men that which has for a long time been done for some of our officers. I am glad to note recently that the Army and Navy are beginning to carry out this objective which I sought to attain by my bill.

I was nominated as a Democratic candidate for Congress in August 1938—3¼ years before Pearl Harbor—and from that time on I always have supported legislation to strengthen and keep strong our country.

It is true on February 23, 1939—51 days after I became a Congressman—I voted to fortify Guam; I voted for the Selective Service Act and the extensions of the act; the first extension passed the House by only one vote—a vote, according to President Roosevelt, the Secretary of War, and General Marshall—which saved the Army of the United States. I voted to arm our ships; I voted to permit our ships to go to any place conducive to the success of our war effort—this measure, although backed strongly by President Roosevelt, passed by only 18 votes, 3 weeks before Pearl Harbor.

I have supported all legislation coming before the House to bring about an enduring peace, and all legislation providing for the participation of the United States in this effort.

From January 1939—when I first went to Congress—until June 1946, with the exception of some 6 months, Congress was in session all or part of every month. I was at my post of duty in Congress which is exactly what was requested of the membership of Congress by our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy.

I quote the pertinent part of a letter I received from Hon. Stephen S. Jackson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, which was written me June 9, 1958:

Dear Mr. Beckworth: At a recent hearing before the Davis subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, you questioned the late Assistant Secretary Francis regarding age limits for civil service employment in the Department of Defense.

There are no maximum age limits for any noncompetitive civil service positions in the Department of Defense, and the vast bulk of civilian positions in the Department are in the competitive civil service.

The 46-year-old woman to whom you referred undoubtedly applied at Barksdale Air Force Base, which is one of the recruiting points for Air Force overseas positions, for a teaching position in the Air Force overseas dependents schools.

Although younger women do tend as a group to adapt more readily to the changes in living conditions which are involved in employment in foreign areas, it is recognized that many older women also can successfully make the adjustment. The Air Force plans, therefore, in recruiting for the 1959-60 school year to increase the age limit for overseas schoolteachers to 60.

We share your concern that qualified older workers not be denied opportunity for employment solely because of their age, and assure you that Department of Defense practices are to make fullest practicable use of older workers in jobs for which they qualify.

Also I include some of my remarks in the Congressional Record, June 27, 1958:

The lady referred to in the letter lost her husband. There are many such ladies in our land and they deserve to have employment opportunities. The same is true with reference to older men.

As the father of five children, I believe I am able to look at the employment problems of older people and handicapped people objectively. Boys and girls who finish high school and college, or who are not privileged to finish, need employment opportunities. To this end I have always worked.

The problems of America are many and great. We can more effectively solve them if we utilize the services of all capable people—even though some are older and some handicapped, such as injured veterans, those people afflicted from birth, or by crippling diseases or accident. All these worthy people must not be forgotten, but must be given the opportunity to work, to learn, to improve their skills rather than to be what many detest—dependent.

I have consistently supported the conservation, preservation, development, and proper utilization of our natural resources such as water and soil. This refers particularly to the Sabine, Neches, Trinity, and Red Rivers.

In 1949 the Corps of Army Engineers wrote me at least four letters about efforts I was then making to get money to complete the Sabine and Neches Rivers surveys. I quote from a letter written me by Col. Lewis W. Prentiss, of the Corps of Army Engineers, August 3, 1949, about the Sabine River:

Corps of Engineers,
Office of the Division Engineer,
Southwestern Division,
Dallas, Tex., August 3, 1949.

Hon. Lindley Beckworth,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Beckworth: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated July 29, 1949, wherein you have expressed your interest in the completion of the survey of the Sabine and Neches River area, and your desire for information as to whether any request has been made for additional funds for those rivers.

The following amounts were appropriated for the survey of the Sabine River: 1959, $20,000; 1960, none; 1961, $40,000; 1962, $65,000; 1963, $95,000; 1964, $95,000; 1965, $130,000; 1966, $145,000.

The following amounts were appropriated for the survey of the Neches River: 1959, $20,000; 1960, $9,800; 1961, $19,500; 1962, $85,000; 1963, $75,000; 1964, $75,000; 1965, $132,000; 1966, $100,000. I appeared annually in behalf of money for both rivers. Seventy-five thousand dollars is budgeted for the Sabine River in fiscal year 1967. Seventy thousand dollars is budgeted for the Neches River in fiscal year 1967. These latter two amounts are sufficient to complete the surveys. The total of the above sums is over $1 million.

My wife and I are the parents of five children whom we are rearing and schooling—Gary and Mary are in Texas University and Carter is in John Tarleton—Linda in Texas attends Gladewater High and John in Texas attends Union Grove, Gladewater Route 2—and we wish the doors of economic opportunity to be open for them and all Texas children who desire to make their homes in Texas. I always have worked to bring industry to our area and to Texas.

ELECTRONIC SNOOPING

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that electronic eavesdropping is an insidious and growing menace which must be curbed. Laws presently existing against wiretapping are entirely inadequate to cope with the problem because they cover only telephone conversations.

Although the Congress can cope with and regulate activities of Government officials, it lacks clear constitutional authority to enact laws aimed at private snoopers.

In this electronic age, no one is immune from having his private conversations heard by hostile ears. Because this spying and prying is so alien to the American way of life, I have asked the legal research section of the Library of Congress to prepare a brief for me as to whether or not the U.S. Congress can legislate in the area.

I believe that State legislatures do have the authority to make electronic snooping a criminal offense, and I hope that substantial action will be taken in the various States.

MASSACHUSETTS PROCLAIMS JOHN W. McCORMACK DAY: VENERABLE SPEAKER ADDRESSES JOINT LEGISLATIVE SESSION ON BEACON HILL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add my voice to those of my colleagues who pay tribute to our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Boston, Mass. Yesterday was indeed a great day for JOHN McCORMACK in Boston. He made a sentimental return journey to the state house on Beacon Hill and addressed a joint session of the Great and General Court of Massachusetts, where he began his brilliant and distinguished public career 46 years ago as a State representative from South Boston. And yesterday was John W. McCormack Day in Massachusetts, by proclamation of Gov. John A. Volpe on request of the State legislature.

Speaker McCORMACK, who served in both the Massachusetts house and senate before coming to Congress in 1928, spoke to the legislature in tones reminiscent of the late President John F. Kennedy's famed "City on a Hill" address in January 1960, before assuming the Presidency. The venerable Speaker told the legislators the eyes of mankind are upon the public officials of Massachusetts, and he urged them to "try again and again with vision and courage to be worthy of the trust and responsibilities placed upon us."

Our great Speaker certainly deserves the tributes that have been paid him by the Massachusetts Legislature, Governor Volpe, and Members of Congress. JOHN McCORMACK was a member of the Massachusetts *Constitutional Convention* in 1917–18, a member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1920, 1921, and 1922, and the Massachusetts Senate in 1923, 1924, 1925, and 1926, the last 2 years as Democratic leader. JOHN McCORMACK is a great, and good and humble man, and a great and good and patriotic American. He has devoted his life to his fellow man in the public service. I know that it was a proud moment for Speaker McCORMACK's gracious and beloved wife, Harriet, as he stood before the assembled legislators in the historic house chamber on Beacon Hill to deliver his memorable address.

Mr. Speaker, I include a news story from the Springfield Daily News of March 16, containing excerpts of Speaker McCORMACK's address, with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

STATE LEGISLATORS HONOR REPRESENTATIVE JOHN W. McCORMACK—SPEAKER OF NATIONAL HOUSE GUEST AT SPECIAL EVENTS IN HIS HOMETOWN

BOSTON.—House Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, son of a South Boston hod carrier, made a sentimental return today to the Massachusetts Legislature where he began one of the Nation's most distinguished political careers 46 years ago.

McCORMACK, 74, who served in both chambers of the legislature in the 1920's, addressed a joint session of the house and senate for the first time since his election to Congress in 1928.

EYES OF MANKIND

The venerable lawmaker, in a speech reminiscent of the late President John F. Kennedy's famed "City on a Hill" address, told the legislators the "eyes of mankind are upon the public officials of Massachusetts." He urged them to "try again and again with vision and courage to be worthy of the trust and responsibilities placed upon us."

Kennedy, shortly after he was elected President in 1960, appeared before the legislature to remind solons to "always consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill—the eyes of all people are upon us."

The legislature honored McCORMACK by declaring today "Speaker John W. McCormack Day." He was feted at a noon luncheon at the Sheraton Boston Hotel by a number of high-ranking State officials.

President Johnson also joined in paying tribute to the man who for more than a year after Kennedy's assassination stood next in the line of succession to the Presidency.

HIGH REGARD

Johnson conveyed his high regard for Speaker McCORMACK in a message from Washington.

In his address, McCORMACK reflected back on the events which have changed the world during his lifetime.

"These years have been active, trying, sometimes disappointing, but I think on the whole they have been great years for our people and the human race."

He warned that today, however, the human race faces its greatest danger—virtual extinction—to make liberty prevail.

Looking back at the bloody conflicts which have torn the world, McCORMACK said World War II might have been averted "if the leadership of Britain and France had been leadership of action instead of inaction.

"If we should learn one thing from that period of history, it is that the militant aggressor considers weakness and fear as an invitation to make greater and greater demands.

"A basically comparable situation exists today. Their strategy and purpose is and has always been to subvert, divide, and conquer, and I say to you here today that under the leadership of action of President Lyndon B. Johnson, this they shall not do," he said.

ST. PATRICK

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, It was St. Patrick's own prayer that the bond between Irish people and the Catholic religion might be indissoluble:

> May God never permit it to happen to me that I should lose His people which He purchased in the utmost parts of the world. I pray to God to give me perseverance and to deign that I be a faithful witness to Him to the end of my life for my God.

The "utmost parts of the world" to which St. Patrick referred in this prayer meant Ireland. St. Patrick's apostolate in Ireland opened up new horizons for the Catholic Church.

In an autobiographical document called his "Confession," St. Patrick has described for us his belief that his life truly began in a spiritual sense with his captivity, the event which first brought him to Ireland. He wrote that, "as a youth, nay, almost a boy not able to speak," he was kidnaped by Irish raiders.

He was carried off as a slave to Mayo where he labored as a shepherd. In the midst of stress, solitude, and complete separation from all that was familiar to him, he underwent the most significant religious experience of his life, the personal discovery of God. To this revelation he attributed his later career.

His vocation to the apostolate of Ireland was given to him in a mystic experience, an overpowering vision, in which he heard "the voice of the Irish crying out with one mouth," asking him to walk among them once more. He later wrote:

> Thanks be to God, after many years the Lord gave them according to their cry.
>
> I was not worthy that the Lord should grant * * * me so great a grace in behalf of that nation—a thing which once, in my youth, I never expected nor thought of.

St. Patrick began his apostolate in 432 A.D., the first date known with certainty in Irish history. He preached throughout the length and breadth of Ireland, and of his preaching he wrote:

> We are witnesses that the Gospel has been preached unto those parts beyond which there lives nobody.

Like most great national apostles, he was a foreigner to the people whom he evangelized:

> I am a servant of Christ to a foreign nation for the unspeakable glory of everlasting life.

In his apostolate to Celtic Ireland, St. Patrick revealed his courteous and magnanimous spirit. By the standards of Roman civilization of the fifth century, Ireland was a barbarian land, virtually untouched by the classical culture of the Roman Empire, of which it had never been a part. St. Patrick recognized at once the cultural differences between Celt and Latin. Yet he also saw that this lovely island, though never Romanized, had a highly developed culture of its own that was clearly reflected in its law, sagas, and arts.

He respected this culture. He felt under no obligation to uproot and destroy it in order to preach the Gospel. Unlike many foreign missionaries before and after him, he preserved the native culture of the land which he evangelized. At the same time, he laid the foundation for a future synthesis between what he found and what he brought.

In St. Patrick's concept of Christianity, Catholic and Celtic influences could stand side by side, could grow together and influence one another. For him, Irish poetry and Irish art were compatible with the Christian religion. The subsequent development of Celtic art, for example, in the "Book of Durrow" and the "Book of Kells," shows an almost perfect harmony and blending of the two cultures, the old and the new, the Celtic and the Latin. Even the ancient laws of the Brehons, after modifications to bring them into closer harmony with Christian charity and mercy, were left in force.

St. Patrick's ordination of St. Benignus, the first Irish priest and Patrick's successor in the see of Armagh, began the great tradition of the Irish clergy who soon supplanted the British and Frankish missionaries in Ireland. Thus it was that St. Patrick's successful blending of Celtic and Catholic cultures produced a church for the Irish nation. The bond between St. Patrick and the Irish is one that will last forever.

DRUG SAFETY INVESTIGATION BY FOUNTAIN SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, under the able leadership of my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the Honorable L. H. FOUNTAIN, has been diligently investigating the manner in which the Food and Drug Administration is carrying out its responsibility for regulating the safety and effectiveness of drugs.

The subcommittee has been particularly interested in determining whether FDA's implementation of the drug amendments of 1962 has been in keeping with the intent of the Congress in passing this legislation. Although the investigation has proceeded with little fanfare, a great deal of useful information has been brought forth showing that due to administrative deficiencies in the agency the American public has not been receiving the kind of protection it deserves and was led to expect when the 1962 amendments were passed.

In an editorial of November 2, 1965, the Raleigh, N.C., News & Observer commented:

> FOUNTAIN's quiet probing of FDA may result in the investigative sensation of the next session of Congress. Certainly any substantial disclosures of laxity in the enforcement of drug control laws will be sensational and should result in sensational correction.

As a prognosticator the News & Observer should rank high, for in the few short months since this editorial appeared there has been an almost complete changeover of personnel in the upper echelons of the Food and Drug Administration, due in part, no doubt, to the diligent work of my able colleague and his subcommittee. And last week, when the new and energetic Food and Drug Commissioner, Dr. James L. Goddard, first appeared before the subcommittee, he acknowledged that the agency had been lax in administering certain portions of the 1962 amendments and outlined a number of steps he intends to take to remedy the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the previously quoted editorial from the Raleigh News & Observer and a few articles concerning the Fountain subcommittee's recent hearings by outstanding journalists, including the Washington Post's Morton Mintz, who broke the original Thalidomide story leading to passage of the drug amendments of 1962, and who is the author of a recent book on drugs entitled "The Therapeutic Nightmare." I recommend these articles to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1966]

FDA SAYS DRUG MAKER BROKE LAW—FINDING OF CANCER IN TESTS DELAYED, HOUSE UNIT TOLD

(By Morton Mintz)

The Food and Drug Administration told a House subcommittee yesterday that a leading drug maker violated the law by delaying a finding of breast cancer in four dogs heavily dosed with its experimental oral contraceptive.

Commissioner James L. Goddard told reporters that if an investigation warrants a criminal prosecution of the firm, Merck & Co., he will recommend one.

He and FDA counsel William W. Goodrich said the agency had been unaware of the delay until Wednesday, when it was first reported by FDA inspectors.

TISSUES EXAMINED

The delay was a month long. But there was an earlier delay of 4 months before the tissues of the sacrificed dogs were examined under Merck microscopes.

The firm said in a statement that it "acted responsibly and as promptly as warranted." It said the delay in reporting was needed for expert assessment of findings that originally were tentative. Then, Merck said, it ordered human trials stopped, notified FDA and undertook a continuing surveillance of the fewer than 500 women getting the pill.

Goodrich testified, however, that alarming findings must be reported at once.

FDA's own role in the case drew criticism from Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, and Delphis C. Goldberg and W. Donald Gray of his House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee staff.

CHAIRMAN COMMENTS

Summing up his inquiries into FDA's Investigational Drug Branch, FOUNTAIN said the adequate protection Congress intended to provide the public has been undermined—by failures in FDA, by companies that withhold essential data from the agency, and by physicians who endanger patients with thoughtless, unauthorized use of experimental drugs.

FOUNTAIN praised Dr. Goddard, who took over FDA only 7 weeks ago, for "taking steps to bring this alarming situation under control.

Dr. Goddard agreed with FOUNTAIN that more must be done to assure that human testing does not begin until it is fully justified by tests in animals.

The oral contraceptive involved was MK-665, made by the Merck Sharp & Dohme Division of the parent firm. One of its two ingredients, mestranol, has been used for years in other birth control pills. The other, a hormonal agent called ethynerone, is in no other oral contraceptive.

TESTING HALTED

A total of 515 other women, however, were found to be taking another experimental drug chemically very similar to MK–665. The discovery was made by Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, head of the investigational branch, in a search of FDA files last month. FDA halted the testing.

The MK–665 dogs in which breast cancer was found were killed for study last July. Merck said a preliminary examination of the tissues disclosed no hint of the disease.

Close study, however, was delayed until late November. The reason given by Merck, Dr. Joseph F. Sadusk, Jr., FDA's Medical Director, testified, was the vacation period. Subcommittee investigator Gray contended that this delay was a separate violation.

The tentative cancer finding was made last December. Merck did not notify FDA until January 21. At that time, FDA understood that 340 women were taking the pill.

Last Monday, however, Merck told the agency that 127 others had been receiving it, starting 9 months ago, from 2 of its investigators. They had not been authorized by Merck to do this testing, but Merck did not act to block it. No trace of cancer has been detected in any of the women.

FDA assured the subcommittee 2 years ago that it had a firm policy to require separate animal tests for a drug and for combinations containing it. A combination may cause effects not caused by any ingredient when used alone.

But questioning yesterday developed that FDA violated its policy in the case of MK-665. The agency justified the departure on the basis of scientific judgment.

REPORT PRODUCED

The result of the policy violation was that human testing of MK-665—a combination—was allowed by FDA to proceed with no animal tests to show it was safe. The animal data in hand indicated safety only for the ingredients separately.

But the subcommittee produced a Merck report citing a consensus of experts that the cancer in dogs may have been caused either by the interaction of the ingredients or by ethynerone alone. Initial reports last month indicated that the new ingredient alone may have been responsible.

In an exchange with Medical Director Sadusk, investigator Gray pressed for controlled studies that could determine whether long-sold oral contraceptives can cause disabling and fatal blood clots and strokes. Such studies have not been done, despite urging by many authorities.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1966]

FDA ADMITS ERRORS ON NEW DRUG—DR. KELSEY RAPPED OVER HANDLING OF CURE-ALL DMSO

(By Morton Mintz)

The Food and Drug Administration acknowledged yesterday that its handling of a hazardous, cure-all drug had been sloppy.

Its self-criticism deeply involved Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, heroine of the thalidomide episode. She heads the FDA branch that had direct responsibility for the experimental drug, DMSO.

The admissions were made before a House subcommittee by FDA's new Commissioner, Dr. James L. Goddard, and its medical director, Dr. Joseph F. Sadusk, Jr.

But the day-long hearing held by Representative L. H. **FOUNTAIN**, Democrat of North Carolina, was an unhappy event not only for Dr. Kelsey:

FDA indicated that criminal prosecutions may face at least 3 of the 13 firms authorized to test DMSO.

Drs. Goddard and Sadusk denounced excessive publicity about DMSO. They said unnamed lay and medical publications excited doctors and laymen to the point that between 20,000 and 50,000 persons were getting it from authorized and unauthorized investigators. Usually, clinical trials involve only about 100 persons.

FDA said the users had taken risks although there is substantial doubt about its efficacy and relative safety.

DMSO (dimethylsulfoxide) is an industrial solvent—a 99-year-old byproduct of papermaking. Applied to the skin, it seeps swiftly into the body. Publicity about its purported wonderdrug properties led to the creation of a gray market. Patients wanted it for everything from arthritis to headaches and nervous disorders.

FDA suspended clinical testing—by an estimated 1341 authorized investigators—last November 10. It has made an exception for a rare, serious skin disease for which no effective treatment is known.

The agency now has received 24 reports of eye damage in humans—and says there may be more. A death in Ireland has been linked to DMSO. Other deaths in users are known.

The initial notice of planned human testing was filed in October 1963, by the Crown-Zellerbach Corp. Drs. Kelsey and Sadusk conceded under questioning that it had never submitted animal data sufficient to justify extensive trials in humans. The trials began simply because FDA allowed the situation to drift.

FOUNTAIN brought out that it takes 2½ weeks for mail to move from the mail room to her Investigational Drug Branch—a reduction of 1½ weeks from a year ago. The situation is being improved further.

FDA did not respond to the notice for 5 months. During that period and afterward, the paper company and six drug firms were left almost free to do as they wished.

Subcommittee investigators developed that three companies alone, Merck & Co., E. R. Squibb & Sons and Syntex Corp., gave the go-ahead for various kinds of testing to 1,206 physicians.

The agency told Crown Zellerbach that its human trials were to be limited to applications to the skin. Questioning developed that FDA never enforced this.

FDA also failed to enforce its own recommended limits on numbers of patients, on duration of testing and on testing of DMSO in combination with other drugs.

Chairman **FOUNTAIN** said the result was that the investigators had carte blanche. He suggested that enforced waiting periods may be necessary hereafter.

Dr. Kelsey acknowledged uncertainty about whether all 13 firms had been told not to try DMSO in women of child-bearing age, although her branch had reports of birth defects in animals treated with the drug.

Dr. Sadusk testified that in May and again in June 1965, Merck reported eye changes in dogs on DMSO. But, he said the significance of this was not immediately noted by FDA. Nor, he said, was special attention directed by the agency to possible serious implications for humans.

He emphasized that Dr. Kelsey's branch was overloaded with work and even now has only half its authorized complement of physicians.

"Just about everything that could go wrong, did go wrong," Dr. Goddard said.

Dr. Goddard said that some thoughtless physicians used in humans a grade of DMSO suitable only for animals.

He also said that one or more of the investigators or test sponsors—

Unjustifiably and grossly expanded human testing on the basis of inadequate studies in animals;

Distributed DMSO to physicians who were unauthorized to have it, who wanted it simply for therapy and who exercised none of the necessary safeguards;

Exported substantial quantities of the drug without regard to the requirement of the law;

Failed to report new investigators; and

Encouraged use of DMSO by mouth, injection, bladder irrigation and application to the eyes and mucous membranes—all without FDA clearance.

Dr. Goddard said the law requires immediate reporting to FDA of adverse effects.

But he testified, the changes in the eyes of dogs that one firm, Wyeth Laboratories, knew about late in 1964 were not reported for a year. He said Merck withheld similar reports for 8 months—until it filed an application to market DMSO.

Dr. Goddard's performance in his first 7 weeks as Commissioner drew frequent praise from the subcommittee.

He disclosed that he has arranged to have 100 Public Health Service physicians and pharmacists detailed to FDA.

He also announced a reorganization of the Bureau of Medicine that will eliminate the investigational drug and new drug branches. In their place he will have teams dealing with a drug from start to finish, on the basis of its relation to gastrointestinal and other organic groups in the human body.

This will eliminate the much-criticized duplication under which an experimental drug is first handled by Dr. Kelsey's group, then, when an application is filed for marketing, by an entirely different group.

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, Nov. 2, 1965]

DRUGS AND DUTY

Congressman L. H. **FOUNTAIN**, of Tarboro, has made few headlines in the past 2 years, but he well deserves wide recognition for his diligent probing into the Food and Drug Administration. His Subcommittee on Government Operations has sought to learn how well the FDA is enforcing the strong drug control laws enacted in 1962. It has come upon some disturbing doubts, to say the very least.

One strange case documented by the New Republic a few weeks ago and reprinted in this newspaper showed the FDA restricted purchase of the antinausea drugs meclizine and cyclizine to prescription only because there was reason to believe indiscriminate use had related to birth deformities. This was forceful, deliberate action by the FDA. Yet in an unexplained turn-around the FDA rescinded its order and allowed the drugs to be sold over the counter with only a warning label. In this case Congressman **FOUNTAIN** learned that the FDA provides no hint of drug protection for women who know they are nauseated, but do not know they are pregnant.

A weekend report from Washington indicates **FOUNTAIN**'s quiet probing of the FDA may result in the investigation sensation of the next session of Congress. Certainly any substantial disclosures of laxity in the enforcement of drug control laws will be sensational and should result in sensational correction. The lives and good health of millions of Americans are dependent on the diligence of the FDA and its determination to enforce laws protecting the public from untested drugs and drugs with harmful side effects.

When the FDA fails in its duty the protection of the people becomes dependent on men of Congressman **FOUNTAIN**'s alertness and ability.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1966]

DRUG AGENCY HEAD CONCEDES LAXITY—TELLS HOUSE UNIT TESTING OF TWO PREPARATIONS WAS FAULTY

(By Jane E. Brody)

WASHINGTON, March 9.—Commissioner James L. Goddard, of the Food and Drug Administration, acknowledged today that his agency had failed properly to enforce existing drug laws with regard to testing of the proclaimed miracle drug DMSO.

The Commissioner then outlined a number of remedial measures intended to enhance the agency's effectiveness in assuring safe use of drugs in man. The measures included a larger force to evaluate investigational and new drug applications and a reorganization of the bureau that reviews these applications.

Dr. Goddard's testimony came before the House Subcommittee of Intergovernmental Relations, headed by Representative L. H. **FOUNTAIN**, Democrat, of North Carolina.

The subcommittee today opened a 2-day hearing on the agency's implementation of the investigational drug provisions of the 1962 Kefauver-Harris drug amendments.

The hearings are focusing on regulation of two drugs recently withdrawn from tests in humans because adverse effects were noted in animals.

The drugs are DSMO, or dimethylsulfoxide, once hailed as an all-purpose drug, and MK–665, a birth control pill.

ACKNOWLEDGES LAXITY

Dr. Goddard's acknowledgment of laxity on the part of his agency represented something of an about-face from the tone of former hearings on procedures held by the Fountain subcommittee.

Former Commissioner George P. Larrick had left most of the testimony before the subcommittee up to the agency's medical director, Dr. Joseph F. Adusk, Jr., who was reluctant to admit to failings on the part of the agency.

Today, however, Dr. Sadusk apparently succumbed to the force of the new Commissioner's frankness and presented evidence that clearly showed the agency had been in the wrong at times.

Since taking office on January 17, Dr. Goddard has taken several major actions to halt illegal drug practices. Mr. FOUNTAIN today praised the Commissioner for the skill and vigor with which he has approached his new responsibilities.

In describing the agency's handling of the DMSO experiments, Dr. Goddard and Dr. Sadusk acknowledged that investigation of the drug had got out of hand. Sponsors testing the drug had received a go-ahead in March 1964, only for external application to several hundred patients under the supervision of a small number of physicians.

UNCONTROLLED TESTS

It was not until September 1965 that the agency publicly recognized that DMSO was being distributed in an uncontrolled manner and contrary to the plans originally approved by the agency.

A report in the New York Times in August had revealed that some 20,000 Americans, under scrutiny of about 800 medical scientists were involved in testing DMSO.

Human tests of the drug, known for 50 years as an industrial solvent, were halted in November after the agency received belated reports that the drug caused damage to the eyes of experimental animals. Wyeth Laboratories first noted this side effect in September 1964, Dr. Sadusk said, but did not report it until November 1965.

Under law, drug investigators are required to report adverse effects of drugs as soon as they are noted.

Mr. FOUNTAIN concluded, from the evidence presented today, that the DMSO incident "illustrates a combination of carelessness and error on the part of the FDA, the sponsoring companies, and some of the physicians who were using the industrial grade of the product."

To help avoid future incidents, Dr. Goddard proposed that the agency force of field inspectors be expanded and that their activities be increased to be sure the sponsor's investigational drug plan is being carried out as approved.

He noted, however, that here still must be considerable dependence on the inherent honesty and integrity of the pharmaceutical industry to do what is in the public interest.

The Commissioner said he has marshaled the support of physicians and pharmacists of the Public Health Service to help review applications for investigation and approval of new drugs.

He has also enlisted similar support from Georgetown University Medical School, and he said he planned to expand this program to other schools.

The Bureau of Medicine, which now is divided into an investigational drug branch and a new drug approval branch, will be reorganized into specialized units that will follow new drugs from animal tests to approval for market, Dr. Goddard said. This is to avoid duplication and error in review of test results.

[From The New York Times, Mar. 11, 1966]

Birth Pill Tests Viewed as Faulty—Both FDA and Merck Seen Remiss in the Handling of Experimental MK–665—House Panel Critical—Testimony Indicates Delay in Report to Agency of Cancer Tissue in Dogs

(By Jane E. Brody)

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Testimony before a House subcommittee today indicated that both a major drug company and the Food and Drug Administration were remiss in their handling of an experimental birth-control pill, MK–665.

The pill, tested on several hundred women, was developed by Merck Sharp & Dohme of Rahway, N.J. Human tests were halted January 18 after cancer symptoms were discovered in 4 of 6 experimental dogs.

All the women who took the pill are being closely observed, for the appearance of any similar symptoms.

When Commissioner James L. Goddard announced last month that tests on the pill had stopped, he praised the Merck Co. for its prompt and responsible action.

Today, however, evidence presented to the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations showed that Merck researches had taken 4 months to find the cancer evidence.

The animals had received up to 40 times the human dosage of the drug for a year.

In addition, the company delayed for 5 weeks its report of these alarming findings to the drug agency, according to Dr. Joseph F. Sadusk, Jr., the Medical Director.

DELAYS NOT ACCEPTABLE

Dr. Goddard said, "I don't believe that these kinds of delays are acceptable. I don't believe any kinds of delays are acceptable."

The Commissioner has been in office only 7 weeks. He indicated that he planned to tighten regulation of drug investigations and more stringently enforce existing drug rules.

The subcommittee, headed by Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, noted that two Merck investigators had gone ahead with human tests of MK–665 reportedly without the company's knowledge and without notifying the agency of what they were doing.

Under the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments of 1962, neither companies nor investigators are permitted to perform human tests with any new drug until a detailed plan for such tests has been submitted to the drug agency.

Mr. FOUNTAIN concluded from the hearings that the drug amendments and agency's investigational drug regulations are not working to afford adequate protection of the public.

He praised Dr. Goddard for taking steps to bring this alarming situation under control and to bring FDA's performance in the investigational drug area into conformity with Congress' intent in passing the drug amendments.

COMPANY DEFENDS ACTIONS

The Merck Co. said, in a statement, that when the dogs were killed in July, an examination of their organs revealed no lesions.

As a result, it said, "preparation of approximately 1,000 slides and the reading of the slides was not given other than routine priority because the evidence had provided no reason to do so."

It was during a microscopic examination, in December, that "our scientists first observed tissue abnormality," the statement said. Further checking was made and the FDA was notified promptly, it said.

"We believe that Merck acted responsibly and as promptly as warranted in reporting to the FDA the microscopic findings of localized cancer in two laboratory animals receiving continuous high doses of the test agent," the statement said.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 10, 1966]

The Drug That Was Used Too Soon

(By David Hoffman)

WASHINGTON.—A startling medical story involving a dozen of the Nation's largest drug houses, thousands of human guinea pigs and a wonder drug gone awry in the hands of overzealous physicians was told yesterday in a House committee room.

The narration was by top officials of the Food and Drug Administration, including its tough new Commissioner, Dr. James Goddard, and its Medical Director, Dr. Joseph Sadusk. Sitting side by side, they admitted:

That the much-ballyhooed wonder drug dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO for short) had been distributed in an uncontrolled manner for use by unauthorized doctors until November 11, when the FDA belatedly called a halt to human testing.

DMSO is a common industrial solvent, a byproduct of paper pulp manufacture first synthesized in 1867. Through some unknown process, it can seep through the skin as if were a sieve and carry piggyback into the bloodstream potentially useful drugs. According to Dr. Sadusk, the FDA had authorized certain doctors to apply the drug to the skin of volunteer patients, but many were injecting it or allowing patients to swallow it contrary to agency instructions.

The drug is designed as a relief for arthritis and other diseases.

That Merck Sharp & Dohme and Wyeth Laboratories, two of seven drugs houses authorized to sponsor human tests, were informed as early as September 1964, that when DMSO was applied to the skin of rabbits and dogs, a kind of scar formed in their eye lenses, impairing vision.

Wyeth, Dr. Sadusk testified, did not report this information to the FDA until November 10, 1965, the day the agency ordered the drug houses to quit testing the drug on patients. Merck did not report the adverse animal reactions until May 28, 1965. Armed with evidence that DMSO was impairing the eyesight of the animals, the companies nevertheless continued to sponsor human tests for as long as 14 months.

That investigators, furnished DMSO by the seven drug houses, gave it not to a few hundred patients, as authorized by the FDA, but to several thousand; and that in fact the investigating doctors had begun massive human trials when these were not authorized by the agency.

Next Monday, Dr. Dan Gordon, a Cornell Medical School ophthalmologist will tell the New York Academy of Sciences that he applied DMSO directly to the eyes of 115 patients for up to 15 months. Reporting no eye damage whatsoever, Dr. Gordon said in a telephone interview yesterday that he had been led to believe by Crown-Zellerbach, a paper pulp manufacturer, that first proposed medical use of DMSO, that such tests had the FDA's blessing.

Dr. Sadusk told the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House:

"As a result of excessive publicity about the value and safety of DMSO and of unwarranted enthusiasm among some physicians what was approved as a limited study involving the cutaneous application of DMSO to a few patients, rapidly grew to a widespread use of DMSO alone and in combination with a variety of other drugs for the treatment of several diseases.

"This was apparent to our medical officers as early as the late spring of 1965, but immediate action to bring the situation under control was not taken."

All of this happened before Dr. Goddard became the FDA's Chief 7 weeks ago. Nevertheless, he also criticized the drug houses and their doctors for disseminating glowing reports of the speculated value of the drug, for distributing DMSO to physicians who wanted it to treat patients not enrolled in any experimental test program, for exporting substantial quantities of DMSO without regard to the law and for failing to report that the drug was being injected into and swallowed by patients without FDA authorization.

So flagrant were the abuses, Dr. Goddard said, that "we are investigating possible criminal violations" in testing DMSO.

Human tests of an investigational new drug (IND in FDA shorthand) go through three phases. Phase 1 involves tests on normal volunteers to determine the drug's impact on the system. Phase 2 involves tests on sick patients, perhaps as many as 50, to gain preliminary evidence that the drug works. Phase 3 involves widespread human tests on hundreds or thousands under the supervision of investigators, doctors working with the drug house.

Dr. Goddard testified yesterday that some drugs such as DMSO have managed to slip from phase 2 to phase 3 before the short-staffed FDA had a chance to review results of phase 1 and 2 testing. He indicated he agreed that long-term animal tests of an IND should be completed before long-term human tests involving many patients are begun.

Under questioning, the FDA officials admitted that drug manufacturers can begin limited human testing as soon as they're certain the FDA has received their IND application. Yet on the average 2½ weeks elapse before the FDA's medical staff has time to review the company's paperwork.

In an appendix to his prepared statement, Dr. Goddard listed 12 drug firms or subsidiaries which hold plans of investigation on file with the FDA and were actually in the business of clinically testing DMSO. These are: Ayerst Laboratories; Geigy Chemical Corp.; Eli Lilly & Co.; Merck Sharp & Dohme; Charles Pfizer, Inc.; Procter & Gamble Co.; Sandoz Pharmaceuticals; Schering Corp.; Squibb & Sons; Syntex Laboratories, Inc.; White Laboratories, Inc., and Wyeth Laboratories, Inc.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 11, 1966]

SIX-MONTH DELAY IN DETECTING LAB DOGS' CANCER

(By David Hoffman)

WASHINGTON.—The investigators of a House subcommittee asked the Food and Drug Administration a curious question yesterday.

If a major drug house tests a new birth control compound on dogs, and then slaughters the dogs, how long should it take drug house doctors to find cancer in the cadavers? A day? A week? A month?

It took Merck Sharp & Dohme 6 months to determine that two of six beagles given MK 665, the company's experimental oral contraceptive, had developed breast cancer, the subcommittee was told.

And, according to the FDA, Merck investigators began giving the new pill to several hundred women even before the compound had been tested on animals for safety. In addition, FDA officials said, the company proposed widespread human trials, trials involving as many as 2,000 women, while the cadavers rested, unexamined, in the Merck laboratory.

But why that 6 months' delay between slaughter of the beagles and the discovery of cancer in their tissues?

The question had been put to Merck by the FDA's field office in Philadelphia. In a memo to headquarters, FDA investigators said Merck excused the lag because this was a (company) vacation period and because a batch of dogs sacrificed 6 months earlier had not developed cancers despite high dosages of MK 665.

Closing a 2-day hearing on drug safety, Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, summarized his findings.

It is quite evident, he said, that the 1962 amendments to the Pure Food and Drug Act, amendments pushed through Congress by the late Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, are not working. Representative FOUNTAIN criticized the FDA for its tardiness in reviewing new drug applications, the drug houses for withholding vital information on side effects and broadening human tests without permission, and the doctor-scientists for thoughtlessly giving out experimental drugs and thus exposing patients to possible serious harm.

Forty beagles had been given high dosages of MK 665 by Merck as part of a single test. The first group, 23 animals, was slaughtered after 6 months and tissue analysis revealed no alarming side effects. It took Merck about 6 months to reach this conclusion and forward it to the FDA.

The remaining 17 dogs were sacrificed on July 30, 1965. Not until November 29 did company doctors begin their analysis of the dead dogs' tissue. By December 17, at the latest, the doctors confirmed that two of the six beagles given the highest dosages had developed breast cancer.

But this fact was withheld from the FDA until January 21, even though drug houses are instructed to report "alarming findings" immediately, FDA officials testified. On January 18, Merck called a halt to human tests after giving MK 665 to at least 340 women.

In a statement issued after the hearing, Merck said it "acted responsibly and as promptly as warranted in reporting to the FDA the microscopic findings of localized cancer." It said that interpretation of such abnormalities was a "delicate and sensitive scientific task."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 11, 1966]

MERCK MAY FACE CHARGES ON TIME IT TOOK TO SAY BIRTH DRUG CAUSED CANCER IN DOGS

WASHINGTON.—The Food and Drug Administration, in a surprise disclosure, announced that it was investigating Merck & Co.'s experimental testing of a new birth control drug for possible violations of a food and drug law.

The Merck drug, known as MK 665, was given to 340 patients before the company voluntarily halted testing on January 18 after two test animals showed malignant growths. At the time, and again earlier this week, the FDA praised Merck for following proper test procedures.

But FDA officials announced yesterday at a congressional hearing, which is studying overall FDA administrative policies, that within the past 2 days new information had come to light requiring the investigation for possible criminal violations of the food and drug law.

William Goodrich, the agency's General Counsel, said two issues were involved in the Merck company: The company's failure to immediately report the alarming results of the animal studies in dogs and the company's initiation of broad clinical studies in humans before the proper documents were filed with the FDA.

MERCK REPLIES

Merck said in a statement yesterday: "We believe our clinical trials were warranted by the evidence available. It was proper that animal studies be continued while human trials were in process. It was also prudent to terminate the human trials on the basis of evidence provided by our chronic toxicity studies in animals, in which continuous high dosages of the drug were administered."

The company claimed that it acted responsibly and as promptly as warranted in reporting to the FDA the findings of cancer in the two test animals.

Investigators from the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations said they were equally disturbed with Merck's 4-month delay in completing the dog studies. The required 1-year feeding period for long-term animal toxicity studies was finished on July 30, 1965, and the dogs were killed. However, Merck didn't start with the necessary pathological examination of animal tissue until November 29, 1965, according to the FDA.

DELAY FROM SUMMER HOLIDAYS

The FDA said the company told agency investigators that the delay resulted from summer vacations of its personnel and its observations that already-completed, shorter-duration dog tests hadn't shown any danger.

Mr. Goodrich said the delay in starting the tissue examination didn't constitute a violation of law. However, the agency official said, the FDA's drug-testing regulations require that companies report alarming findings immediately to the agency. The FDA said the company discovered on December 17 that two of the dogs, being fed on the highest dosage schedule of the MK 665 for 1 year, had developed breast cancer.

The agency wasn't informed of this finding, or of Merck's discovery that cellular changes had occurred in two other animals, until January 21. This was 3 days after Merck voluntarily directed four physicians who were conducting trials in women to halt their work.

Dr. James Goddard, the new FDA Commissioner, said: "I don't think these kinds of delays are acceptable. Nor do I believe that any scientist would agree that these are acceptable."

MERCK'S TIMING AT ISSUE

The second legal issue involves the timing of Merck's initiation of broad clinical tests of MK 665. Under FDA regulations, producers are required to submit plans for each stage of a new drug trial. Animal tests come first. Then limited tests are conducted in humans to determine proper dosage, and finally broader human trials are undertaken to develop the necessary information on safety and effectiveness.

Once the required plans are filed with the FDA, producers are free to move ahead with the particular stage of the drug trial involved without further authorization from the agency. The FDA can step in and stop the study, however, if its review of the plan shows deficiencies, if the tests aren't carried out as proposed, or if hazards develop.

FDA officials said that Merck didn't file all the required information for starting broad human drug trials, known as phase 3 testing, for MK 665 until December 28, 1965. Merck's proposal called for 2 physician-investigators to test the compound in a total of up to 300 patients.

But the agency said it discovered this week that Merck began phase 3 testing in June 1965. The FDA declared that one of Merck's investigators tested the compound in 112 women between June and November and in an additional unknown number of women after November. The FDA said the other investigator administered MK 665 to 15 women, starting in August 1965.

Under FDA statutes, the maximum penalty is a $1,000 fine and a year imprisonment for any such violation.

SURPRISE AT HEARINGS

The questions raised about Merck's conduct on its MK 665 testing came as a major surprise at the House hearings, Dr. Joseph Sadusk, Jr., director of FDA's Bureau of Medicine, in a formal statement to the committee that was prepared before the agency doublechecked on Merck's tests, noted that "appropriate actions concerning this drug have been taken by the sponsor and that followup should be monitored closely."

FDA officials said their investigation of Merck will continue before a decision is made on whether to proceed with legal action. However, Commissioner Goddard declared that if evidence showed willful withholding of "alarming" information, the agency unquestionably will move ahead with legal action.

The number of persons taking the Merck drug was small; furthermore, hazardous effects in animals don't always demonstrate human dangers. The company has also promised to conduct necessary followup studies on women who took the drug. But the congressional committee, headed by Representative FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, appeared particularly concerned with the broader issue involved: How adequately do FDA's policies and procedures for experimental drug testing protect the public?

Dr. Goddard said he was convinced that the agency cannot currently afford to sit back and accept industry drug-testing plans at face value without its own followup review. He said the FDA must insure that required animal tests are carried out on time as promised and that the agency knows about their results.

FORTY DOGS USED IN TESTS

Of particular concern to the FDA and the congressional investigators was the timing of Merck's completion of the long-term animal tests. A total of 40 dogs received the compound. The short-term 6-month feeding tests were completed on 23 animals on February 5, 1965, and the tissue examination completed 2 days later didn't show any abnormalities, the FDA said.

The long-term feeding tests on 17 additional animals were completed on July 30. It was in this group of animals that cancerous lesions were later discovered in two dogs receiving the highest dose levels of MK–665—ranging from 25 to 50 times the amount administered to humans.

According to FDA's chronology, the first tissue examinations for the long-term tests were conducted from November 29 through December 9, at which time Merck determined there were cellular changes that required further examination. On December 17 two dogs were found to have had cancer. Subsequently, Merck consulted with outside experts on the significance of these findings and then called the trials off and informed the FDA.

The company, in its statement, said it first observed tissue abnormalities in early December but it said that "interpreting these abnormalities is a delicate and sensitive scientific task. Before reaching any conclusion as to the significance of the observation, we had to determine the nature of the cell changes."

MICROSCOPIC EXAMINATIONS

Merck claimed that the microscopic examination of the tissues in December was actually the second step in the pathological examination and that earlier gross, or less detailed examination of all organs of the animals hadn't shown any lesions. The preparation of the 1,000 slides required for more detailed microscopic study and their examination was "not given other than routine priority because the evidence had provided no reason to do so. Thus the time lapse after animal sacrifice was purely circumstantial," Merck said.

MK 665 is a form of synthetic female sex hormone, known as ethynerone, which hasn't been used in other widely marketed birth control pills in which dangers of malignancy haven't developed. It was given along with another female hormone, Mestranol, which has long been included as a component of contraceptive pills currently on the market.

In their testimony, FDA officials also indicated that Dr. Frances Kelsey, of the agency, had been checking other drugs undergoing tests. Dr. Kelsey found two that were chemically similar to the Merck compound. The two companies testing the drugs were asked to halt testing, and they did so, the FDA officials said. The officials didn't identify the concerns.

It was learned, however, that the two organizations were the Ortho Pharmaceutical division of Johnson & Johnson and the Wyeth Laboratories division of American Home Products Corp. An executive of the Johnson & Johnson division said the FDA did note a similarity between the division's compound, designated ORF 5402, and the Merck compound, and asked that testing be halted. He said testing was halted pending further animal studies.

"It must be emphasized" the Johnson & Johnson executive said, "that ORF 5402 has not been implicated directly. In subacute toxicity trials in dogs of about 13 weeks duration, the doses exceeded the human dose by 5,000 times, according to weight. There have been no growths or microscopic evidences of (cancerous) changes."

Charles J. Kern, vice president for research and development for American Home Products Wyeth Laboratories, said that "we went to the FDA" following announcement of the toxicity of the Merck compound "and we voluntarily halted testing" of a similar compound. He said Wyeth had tested its compound, WY–4355, in dogs and rats for up to 4 months and at doses from 100 to more than 1,000 times the equivalent human dose. He said there had been no evidence of cancer. There was some hyperplasis—abnormal cells—but this was to be expected, he said.

Both Johnson & Johnson and American Home stated that there has been no evidence of cancer in the women receiving their drugs. Johnson & Johnson declined to indicate how many women had received its drug. A company executive said the drug was being tested as a potential oral contraceptive. Mr. Kern said over 200 women had received the American Home Products drugs; the drug was being tested as an agent against abnormal uterine bleeding, although it could also be used as a contraceptive, he said.

The FDA officials said Johnson & Johnson has been testing its compound in 225 patients and American Home has been testing its in 290 patients.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 10, 1966]

FDA TO BEGIN CHECKS ON NEW DRUG TRIALS; CRIMINAL CHARGES STUDIED IN DMSO TESTS

WASHINGTON.—Food and Drug Commissioner James Goddard announced significant steps to tighten Federal control over the experimental testing of new drugs on humans.

Dr. Goddard also disclosed that the Food and Drug Administration is investigating possible criminal violations by drug companies or researchers in the experimental testing of the drug dimethyl sulfoxide, known as DMSO, which has been widely heralded as a pain reliever and antiarthritic agent. The FDA last November abruptly halted all clinical trials of DMSO, involving several thousand patients, because potentially harmful changes were observed in the eyes of test animals.

The FDA Chief told Congress yesterday, "speculation and enthusiastic promotion (of DMSO) both to the profession and to the public was substituted for scientific inquiry and deliberate evaluation of evidence. This resulted in unwarranted distribution for use as a therapeutic agent by many physicians, before the animal or human studies had established either safety or efficacy. Plainly, the plans submitted to us didn't cover what was actually being done, nor did the data available to us or to the sponsors provide an adequate basis for the broad-ranging distribution of this investigational new drug."

FIRMS AUTHORIZED TO EXPERIMENT

The FDA said it had authorized the following drugmakers to conduct experimental DMSO tests: E. R. Squibb & Sons division of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.; Merck & Co.; Syntex Corp.; Wyeth Laboratories division of American Home Products Corp.; Ayerst Laboratories division of American Home Products Corp.; Eli Lilly & Co.; Chas. Pfizer & Co.; Schering Corp.; Sandoz, Inc.; Geigy Chemical Corp.; and White Laboratories, Inc. In addition, Crown Zellerbach Corp., the bulk supplier of the compound—a refined grade of a commercial solvent—Procter & Gamble Co. and scientists at the National Institutes of Health were authorized to conduct experimental tests.

The agency didn't specify which companies were under investigation.

Each year pharmaceutical concerns test hundreds of new compounds with human volunteers. Many of these drugs are never marketed because they prove unsafe or ineffective. But the trials themselves can pose human hazards, as frequently thousands of patients are exposed to risk before a drug's danger is sufficiently documented to halt the test.

MEASURES OUTLINED

Dr. Goddard outlined a number of measures to give the public better protection. Some may bring sharp protests of Federal interference from private physicians, who conduct most of the tests under arrangements with the drug producers.

The FDA's own investigators will begin to check on the conduct of drug trials to insure that all necessary precautions are used and that drug companies' testing plans, which must be submitted to the FDA, are faithfully followed. Dr. Goddard also disclosed that the FDA may, if it cannot make the current investigational drug system work, seek even broader Federal powers. The added authority would be a requirement that drug makers obtain advance FDA approval before starting drug trials in animals or before gradually extending the tests to humans.

Currently, such advanced approval isn't needed. Manufacturers, however, must submit a plan for experimental drug testing showing what is currently known about the properties of the compound, the qualifications of the medical men who will carry out the tests, and other information. Once a plan is filed, the company is free to go ahead with its tests, unless FDA experts find fault with their proposals or hazards appear to arise.

The big bottleneck is the agency's lack of sufficient staff and an inability to quickly review such filings; more than 3,000 have been submitted since the procedure was begun in 1963. This burden, Dr. Goddard conceded, has "impaired the exercise of judgment and delayed necessary actions." As one solution, the FDA is borrowing a team of Public Health Service medical men and pharmacists to help clean up the backlog of unreviewed filings.

TESTIMONY ON BIRTH CONTROL PILL

Much of the testimony by Dr. Goddard and Dr. Joseph Sadusk, Jr., Director of the FDA's bureau of medicine, dealt with the DMSO withdrawal and a more recent voluntary termination by Merck & Co. of experimental tests of a birth control pill known only as MK 665.

MK 665, a combination of synthetic female sex hormones, was being given experimentally to 340 women when the results of separate animal tests indicated the potential of human hazard. Of 30 test dogs receiving the compound, two developed breast cancer, a third demonstrated precancerous tissue changes, and the fourth developed a benign tumor. All the animals had received 25 to 30 times the dosages being used with women in the clinical trials. One component of the pill, ethynerone, hadn't been used in any of the other birth control pills already safely sold for many years.

The FDA officials did not find any fault with Merck's conduct of the trial and noted that the company is committed to followup studies of the women who took the drug to quickly detect hazard, if it occurs.

This was in marked contrast with FDA criticism of DMSO's handling. Dr. Goddard declared that in the 2 years of experimental DMSO testing, one or more companies or individual physician investigators disseminated glowing reports of the speculated value of the drug; submitted reports of animal studies that didn't warrant extension of the trials to human subjects; distributed the drug to many physicians for treating patients instead of for testing purposes; exported substantial quantities of the drug without regard for legal requirements or FDA reporting; undertook broader clinical studies of the compound than those originally proposed to the FDA without telling the agency; failed to undertake the comprehensive animal studies that had been requested by the FDA before beginning wide human testing; encouraged use of the drug in different ways, for different ailments, and in combination with other compounds without suitable safety data or without informing the FDA.

Dr. Goddard said he has authorized limited use of DMSO by a few investigators with about 50 patients who had been receiving the compound and who appeared to be particularly benefiting.

CROWN-ZELLERBACH MENTIONED

The FDA officials generally didn't single out individual companies for criticism. But Dr. Sadusk noted that Crown-Zellerbach's authority to test DMSO was terminated in September 1965 because "DMSO was being distributed in an uncontrolled manner and contrary to the submitted study plans." Dr. Sadusk said the FDA had information suggesting that other sponsors of DMSO trials were doing the same thing and the FDA began field investigations. Eye hazards then came to light, bringing a quick halt to all testing.

Crown-Zellerbach declined to comment on Dr. Sadusk's statement.

Dr. Sadusk also said that Wyeth Laboratories had received a report of the eye difficulties from one of its physician investigators in December 1964, but didn't submit this information to the FDA until a Government meeting with industrial representatives in November 1965.

Dr. Sadusk also offered some self-criticism; he said his bureau's medical officers in the late spring of 1965 were aware that DMSO was being widely distributed for unauthorized uses, "but immediate action to bring the situation under control was not taken." Dr. Sadusk added that there were sufficient legal grounds at that time to halt DMSO testing.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Mar. 9, 1966]

House Probers Cite Risks—Drug Test Gaps Charged to FDA

(By Leslie H. Whitten)

Washington, March 9.—House investigators called on the Food and Drug Administration today to explain why two controversial drugs—one an oral contraceptive—were tested on humans before animal tests were completed.

In both cases, serious side effects on the animals were reported: Breast cancer with the contraceptive MK–665 and eye damage with the much bally-hooed drug DMSO. No human cancer has turned up, but three humans reportedly died after DMSO was administered to them.

The hearings today were before the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, headed by Representative L. H. Fountain, Democrat, of North Carolina.

On the carpet were FDA Commissioner Dr. James L. Goddard; FDA Medical Director Joseph F. Sadusk; and Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, investigational drug chief who kept the baby-deforming drug thalidomide off the American market.

Dr. Goddard, who succeeded the much-criticized George P. Larrick only a month ago, had new proposals ready for the committee today to protect humans from potentially dangerous experimental drugs.

They would tighten up FDA regulations to make sure thorough animal testing was completed before humans were used as guinea pigs for new and experimental drugs.

The committee, in preliminary probes, showed little or no basis for the general public belief that dogs, rabbits, pigs, and other animals are always studied for new drug reactions before humans get the drugs.

The committee probers developed for the 2 days of current hearings these facts, many of them already made public by the FDA.

The MK–665 contraceptive was given to 30 dogs in doses 20 to 40 times bigger than human dosages by weight. After 27 weeks, six dogs were examined and there was evidence of abnormal cell growth, but no cancer.

After 52 weeks, six more dogs were examined; two had breast cancer, a third a benign tumor and a fourth abnormal cell growth. But 340 women already had been given the pill in four different cities—some as long as 6 months before the drug was withdrawn.

The pharmaceutical firm which made MK–665 plans a followup study on the women. Chemical makeup of the pill is different from pills now on the market.

DMSO was hailed only 3 years ago as a miracle drug for arthritis, skin diseases, headaches, and as a piggyback drug for getting other medicine into the system.

More than 1,000 medical investigators were using it experimentally on 50,000 or more people when an English laboratory discovered rabbits, dogs, and pigs got serious eye disorders after taking DMSO.

WORLD FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in the years before World War II, Asia, Africa, and Latin America supplied the industrial countries of the Northern Hemisphere with about 11 million tons of food products a year. Today, the industrial north supplies the underdeveloped southern part of the world with more than 25 million tons of grains annually.

This complete reversal of international trade in food products underlines a fundamental fact in the world today. That fact is, that the poor nations of the world are getting poorer in their ability to feed themselves.

Today, the only significant exporter of grains other than the United States and Canada, are Australia and New Zealand, and these two countries are farming at near capacity. The conclusion is that the North American farms have become the world's last granary.

This has ominous forebodings for the undeveloped countries of the world, and the leaders of these areas are painfully aware of the impending food shortage which they face.

But even for America, the world's food shortage has a great meaning, for the test of a nation's power in the years to come may be determined as much by its capacity to produce food, as by its ability to manufacture arms. The United States has been called a great power because of its vast industrial strength. Yet, in many ways, the power to produce food is just as important.

But, Mr. Speaker, while there is a growing responsibility upon the North American farmer; there is a great danger that our great capabilities will be not enough to meet the need of the future.

The food output per capita in the last 5 years has dropped 3 percent in Asia, and 7 percent in Latin America. If this trend continues, our farm surplus will be wiped out, and our productive capabilities will be severely challenged.

In light of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time to take a long, hard look at the restrictions we have imposed upon our farmers. Perhaps the time has come for production incentives, rather than production restraints. The standard of living of the American farmer is our first loyalty. But America cannot and will not, stand aside while the rest of the world suffers in mass starvation.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS BOOKS-FOR-THE-BLIND PROGRAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend title 2, section 135, of the United States Code, which authorizes a program to provide reading materials for the blind of the United States, its territories, and possessions.

This program, which is administered by the Library of Congress, has been in existence since 1931. It reaches into and renders a fine service to every one of our States, as I know from my longtime experience as chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library. It is a highly appreciated program, through which books in raised characters—chiefly in braille—and "talking books"—books recorded on disks or on magnetic tape—and the machines on which to play the records are procured by the Division for the Blind of the Library of Congress.

The books are distributed through 32 cooperating libraries designated as regional libraries. The Texas State library serves the blind of my State. The machines are lent to the blind by State agencies for the blind. In Texas this is done by the State commission for the blind. The materials and the machines are lent without charge and the books may be sent free through the mails, because this is a service to the blind which Congress decided many years ago should be made possible by the Federal Government.

Over the years, the act has been amended to cover blind children as well as adults and to provide additional types of materials, such as talking books—as well as books in braille, which older people have difficulty in learning to read—musical scores, and instructional texts.

There is nothing wrong with this service as far as it goes—quite the contrary—but Members of Congress have been hearing from many sources that it does not go far enough. Under the present act, not even the near blind are eligible to use materials produced for the books-for-the-blind program; and other handicapped persons who, for a variety of reasons, cannot read or use conventional printed materials unfortunately are also excluded.

According to figures obtained from the National Center for Health Statistics and various national foundations concerned, there are about 2 million persons in this country who cannot read ordinary printed books, magazines, and newspapers because of impaired eyesight or other physical factors which make them unable to manipulate such materials. There is no national reading service they could use except for the embossed and recorded books provided through the Library of Congress, but unless they are blind they are not at present eligible. There is practically no library service available to the 600,000 individuals whose eyesight is so poor that they cannot read newsprint, even with glasses. About 4,700 persons have lost both arms or the use of them. Some 8,000 persons have lost all their fingers, and 1,600 persons are in iron lungs or other respiratory devices which make ordinary reading difficult or impossible. There are also about 750,000 victims of multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, Parkinson's disease, and other crippling ailments who are so disabled that handling books, magazines, and newspapers is impossible or extremely difficult.

It is shocking—a case of sad neglect—that, as the law stands now, only the 400,000 blind out of those 2 million handicapped persons are eligible to be served through the national books-for-the-blind program.

Several bills to extend that service to the near-blind, to quadriplegics, and to various other handicapped groups have been introduced during the 89th Congress and are now before us. The amendment I propose today would accomplish, I believe, the major aims of these bills. It would permit the Library of Congress to procure reading materials in appropriate forms, and the necessary machines for their use, and to distribute them to nonprofit agencies and organizations in the States for loan to any person so physically handicapped that he cannot read or use the kind of printed materials you and I can borrow from our local public library. To prevent any possible abuse of the program, the amendment provides that this disability be certified by competent medical authority, just as blindness must now be certified.

The amendment would also permit the Library of Congress to contract with agencies or organizations in the States when services could not otherwise be provided. Such contracting would probably not be necessary; however, if the same kind of incentives are given the States to provide library services to the handicapped as have been given them under the Library Services and Construction Act to improve regular public library services, first in rural areas and then throughout the States.

The bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act that has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Fogarty (H.R. 13697) contains provision for "State plans for library services to the handicapped." Senator Lister Hill's bill (S. 3076), introduced in the other body, contains the same provision. Under such plans, States would receive Federal grants to help them inaugurate or expand such services to meet the needs of the 2 million unfortunate handicapped I have described. Although the blind have had service through the cooperating State and local libraries, those libraries have had to bear the entire cost of staff, equipment, and buildings, even though the books for the blind are free. As a result, the service, with the best will in the world, has often been of uneven quality because there have been many unfilled needs for library service and the blind have had to compete for their share. Only about 100,000 of the 400,000 blind in the country now benefit from the program. In Texas, for example, the number of blind using the program increased 30 percent last year, but, even so, this represents use by only 16 percent of the estimated 30,500 blind in my State. More of the blind throughout the country would like to have this library service and those who now have it need more reading materials and better service. Passage of Representative Fogarty's and Senator Hill's bills would, upon approval of State plans, obligate the States to step up their library services to the handicapped in general and would earmark for this certain supporting Federal funds.

This provision in Representative Fogarty's and Senator Hill's bills make introduction of my amendment particularly timely, and even necessary, because the reading materials for the handicapped would largely be furnished through the Library of Congress. But, whether or not this provision becomes a part of the Library Services and Construction Act, and I hope it does, I believe that the act governing the Library's books-for-the-blind program should be amended to make it possible for the Library to furnish reading materials and machines to the States for the use of the physically handicapped who cannot use conventional books, magazines, and newspapers.

In our concern for improving the welfare and education of all our citizens, we must not neglect the needs of these handicapped to whom the information, the solace, and the inspiration from reading can mean so much.

OF THREE POSSIBLE ENDINGS TO PRESENT WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA ONLY ONE WILL BRING PERMANENT PEACE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished citizens of Florida who has been a longtime and eminent leader of the United Nations Association and a strong supporter of the United Nations is Col. Frank M. Dunbaugh. Colonel Dunbaugh is a man of broad knowledge of and deep interest in international affairs. He is a student of the world and has traveled extensively abroad, recently in Asia. Colonel Dunbaugh on January 31 delivered an able address to the Miami-Coral Gables United Nations Association. I believe that address deserves the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues and of all those who read this Record. I, therefore, place Colonel Dunbaugh's address immediately after my remarks:

Of Three Possible Endings to Present War in Southeast Asia Only One Will Bring Permanent Peace

(Speech to Miami-Coral Gables United Nations Association by Frank Dunbaugh, Jan. 31, 1966)

Now that immediate peace through negotiation appears to be eluding us, the war in Vietnam offers three possible endings. Of these only one will bring permanent peace to southeast Asia.

The total population of this turbulent area exceeds those of the United States and Canada combined.

On a recent trip I found Filipinos ready to fight Malaysia and Indonesia over Borneo but fearing an attack from Red China because of our using bases in the Philippines to bomb North Vietnam. Cambodia is on the brink of war with South Vietnam and the United States because of border infractions by both sides. Despite impressive U.S. military support Thailand is plagued by infiltrations and revolutions in its northern provinces. Laos is already a battleground. Riot and revolution drove our party out of Indonesia. We found the airport in Rangoon jammed with Indians being driven out of Burma by the pro-Communist government. Many Burmese and Indonesian families are quitting southeast Asia in fear of turmoil and terror.

With disorder and unrest spreading from Bali to Burma a U.S. military victory in South Vietnam may prove to be only a pause.

What shall we in the United States do in this situation?

Roughly stated, we have three choices:

SOLUTION NO. 1

We can decide that southeast Asia is not our affair. Its problems are too complex, too far away. Orientals do not think as we do. Pull out of Vietnam. Pull out of southeast Asia. Leave them to handle their own affairs.

Suppose we follow solution No. 1 which has great appeal for many of us, what will happen? Our President's advisers believe that Red China will get its clutches on all of Indochina. Then Mao will grab India to the west, the Philippines, Indonesia and even Australia to the southeast. Thus Communist China will blow itself up into an unbeatable empire, the most gigantic in all history, an octopus holding more than half the world's population in its tentacles.

I am not in accord.

Communism will gain ground throughout Asia of course, but I do not believe that the peoples of southeast Asia, after throwing out the Japs, then the French, then the Americans will submit slavishly to domination by the Chinese, whom most of them loathe. One Vietcong leader said to an American war correspondent, "If the Chinese try to take us over we shall fight them just as we are fighting you now."

What our quitting southeast Asia will bring about is fantastic confusion, plus several curious varieties of local communism in Burma, Cambodia, Laos, both Vietnams, Indonesia, probably Thailand and the Philippines. It will breed continued strife between petty dictators, internecine slaughter, spasmodic rebellions and finally chaos. Our whole world will worsen as a result.

SOLUTION NO. 2

Fight the war in Vietnam through to victory, whatever it costs. Then under the guise of advisers we can station U.S. troops in North and South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, Thailand, possibly Indonesia until these states are ready to function as democracies in the western sense of the word. Some spokesmen in our State and Defense Departments are already talking of our occupying southeast Asia for 20 years.

What does history tell us about such operations?

The Romans distinguished themselves as wise and able administrators of conquered territories and yet the Bible reveals how fervently they were hated. The same may be said of the British and the French. They transformed India and Indochina from a hassle of barbaric tribes into a group of reasonably well governed states. Yet the hatred they generated more than half a century ago is a burning force in Asia today.

We stationed U.S. Marines in Haiti from 1915 to 1936; in Nicaragua from 1912 to 1925; in Santo Domingo from 1916 to 1924. What have been the results? Haiti has dropped back into government by voodooism. The other two became military dictatorships soon after we left. We all know what has been happening recently in Santo Domingo. Meanwhile our actions engendered fear and dislike throughout Latin America.

As Christians and truly patriotic Americans, let us make sure that we do not drift into solution No. 2 just because we have not planned ahead.

Before discussing solution No. 3, let us review briefly the background of the present situation in southeast Asia.

Southeast Asia's history has always been one of wars, conquerors, slaves in rebellion against emperors and priests. During the early 19th century new invaders, lordly white Europeans, sailed into southeast Asia with powerful weapons and advanced techniques. The native populations accepted the shackles of these overbearing white masters as the will of the gods. Then during World War II the Japanese drove the white men out of southeast Asia in one swift, brutal sweep.

That ended Asian awe of the whites. When Japan was finally defeated, Indochina refused to put its neck back into the yoke of French colonialism. Meanwhile India obtained its independence from Britain. We gave independence to the Philippines. The United States and the United Nations persuaded the Dutch to turn political control of Indonesia over to the Indonesians.

Frankly none of these areas was ready for independence. Today jingoism, communism, even beatnikism are breezing across southeast Asia ferreting out pockets of discontent. The whole area gives ugly indications of increasing turmoil in the years ahead. Walter Lippmann maintains that we are confronted by one of the greatest upheavals in the history of mankind. Back of it is the undisciplined determination of the people of southeast Asia to rid themselves of outside control.

Solution No. 3, does not contemplate turning any part of southeast Asia over to the Communists, nor even letting up on the prosecution of the war in South Vietnam. It does involve using Christian and Buddhist ethics to bring about lasting peace throughout the entire region.

Jesus taught his followers, "Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself." Buddha taught, "Forgive your enemies. Be friendly toward all."

Instead of relying wholly on annihilating the Vietcong armies in battle, this solution suggests that we urge the United Nations to start now helping southeastern Asians organize teams of Christians and Buddhists who will confer with officials, priests, teachers, farmers in Laos, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, Cambodia, both Vietnams explaining how peaceful cooperation can bring about a better life for every man, woman and child in southeast Asia.

While laying this groundwork among those who can obstruct or aid us, and who have the most to gain from genuine peace, let us quietly urge that the United Nations assemble a group of nonpolitical leaders of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam, plus observers from other nations, inviting Communist China to send representatives. Even though North Vietnam and Red China may refuse to cooperate, the impetus toward forging a genuine and permanent peace will have a telling effect because this effort will be spearheaded by people from southeast Asia not other parts of the world. These leaders will start at once making preparations for creating one of the world's great agricultural centers out of nature's bounty on the peninsula and islands of southeast Asia. First of course, will be the Mekong Valley project which will bind Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam together in one enormously productive rice bowl.

Native Indochinese speaking local dialects will use slides, radio, movies, pamphlets, Punch and Judy shows, the new TV telecasts from planes—and most of all their own personalities—to spark the imaginations of the ordinary people of southeast Asia with what they can create themselves with help from their neighbors through the United Nations.

To woo the Vietnamese away from the Vietcong leaders we must make it plain to them that this will not be a U.S. aid program. It will be an international missionary effort in the highest tradition of Christianity and Buddhism a truly Godly undertaking.

Any help we give will be through the United Nations and its affiliates. The U.N.'s Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East has already pushed the Mekong valley project beyond the planning stage. Meetings are also already being held to further the establishment of an Asian Development Bank similar to the Inter-American Development Bank in the Western Hemisphere.

By showing what the Mekong River project can accomplish in boosting rice production and other aids to the economy it may even be possible to convince the rulers of Communist China that they can obtain more food for their people through peaceful cooperation with the independent nations of southeast Asia than they can by spreading war and pestilence throughout the area fighting to gain political control.

To summarize: Our involvement in southeast Asia can be resolved in three ways: (1) We can pull out leaving the entire area open to internecine slaughter or domination by Red China; (2) we can fight through to total victory whatever the cost, then police 230 million people for at least a generation; (3) while continuing to prosecute the war in South Vietnam to the fullest, we can spark the United Nations into laying the groundwork for peaceful cooperation in rehabilitating southeast Asia with the people of that area working together, aided by the United Nations.

In this way we shall undermine the hold of the Vietcong on the people of southeast Asia by convincing farmers and villagers that the defeat of North Vietnam and Vietcong forces will not lead to a U.S. military dictatorship, but to a southeast Asia for southeast Asians living in peaceful independent freedom.

In judo you use your opponent's strength to overthrow him. This program uses the emotions which started the war to end it.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BOLAND, for 30 minutes, on March 21; and to revise and extend his remarks.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODELL, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GUBSER, for 60 minutes, on Monday, March 21.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUILLEN.
Mr. MATHIAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGARTY.
Mr. MOSS.
Mr. RYAN.
Mr. DANIELS.
Mrs. SULLIVAN.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 21, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES DURING 1965 AS REQUIRED BY THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 86-472 AND BY PUBLIC LAW 86-628

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds.

The required reports for travel during 1965 are submitted herewith:

In further compliance with the provisions of House Resolution 605, there follows from the accounting furnished the committee by the Department of State a list of the individual Members and staff members who traveled overseas, the cost of overseas transportation furnished by public carrier, and the identification of the agency of the U.S. Government furnishing transportation while overseas:

MR. POAGE

1. From the United States to Europe and return to the United States (commercial airline, paid in Dutch guilders by U.S. State Department)	$1,374.91
2. From Athens, Greece, to Turkey and return to Athens, U.S. Navy aircraft	---------
3. From Cairo, Egypt, to Aswan and return to Alexandria, Egypt, U.S. Navy aircraft	---------
4. From Alexandria, Egypt, to Malta and Rome, Italy, U.S. Air Force aircraft	---------
5. Local transportation at the London, England, Airport ($4.07), Hungary ($11.28), and Greece ($17.27) was paid by the U.S. Embassy in each nation	---------

Please note that Mr. POAGE returned his commercial air ticket with a total of $94.90 unused, and he incurred an unreimbursed personal expense of $20 for railroad transportation from Budapest to Bucharest.

MR. PURCELL

1. From the United States to Europe and return to the United States (commercial airline, paid in Dutch guilders by U.S. State Department)	$1,356.66
2. From Athens, Greece, to Turkey and return to Athens, U.S. Navy aircraft	---------
3. From Cairo, Egypt, to Aswan and return to Alexandria, Egypt, U.S. Navy aircraft	---------
4. From Alexandria, Egypt, to Malta and Rome, Italy, U.S. Air Force aircraft	---------
5. Local transportation at the London, England, airport ($3.35) and Hungary ($11.28) was paid for by the U.S. Embassy in each nation	---------

Please note that Mr. PURCELL did not use all of his commercial air ticket and is now undertaking to return the unused portion. He also incurred an unreimbursed personal expense of $20 for railroad transportation from Budapest to Bucharest.

MR. DOLE

1. From the United States to Rome, Italy, and return to the United States (commercial airline, paid in Dutch guilders by U.S. State Department)	$1,305.75
2. From Rome to Athens, Greece, and return to Rome (commercial airline, paid in Italian lire by U.S. Embassy in Rome)	[1] 165.90
3. From Athens to Skopje, Yugoslavia, and return to Athens, U.S. Navy aircraft	---------
4. From Rome to Florence and Anzio and return to Rome (automobile transportation) paid in Italian lire by U.S. Embassy in Rome	[1] $130.04

MR. OLSON

1. From the United States to Rome, Italy, and return to the United States (commercial airline, paid in Dutch guilders by U.S. State Department)	$641.97

MR. TEAGUE

1. From the United States to Madrid, Spain, and return to the United States (commercial airline, paid in Dutch guilders by U.S. State Department)	$1,034.10

MR. MATSUNAGA

Overseas transportation provided by U.S. Air Force	---------

GEORGE MISSLBECK (COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBER)

1. From the United States to Cairo, Egypt, and return from Rome, Italy, to the United States (commercial airline, paid in West German deutsche marks by U.S. State Department)	$1,185.50
2. From Cairo, Egypt, to Aswan and return to Alexandria, Egypt, U.S. Navy aircraft	---------
3. From Alexandria, Egypt, to Malta and Rome, Italy, U.S. Air Force aircraft	---------
4. From Rome to Athens, Greece, and return to Rome (commercial airline, paid in Italian lire by U.S. Embassy in Rome)	[1] 165.90
5. From Athens to Skopje, Yugoslavia, and return to Athens, U.S. Navy aircraft	---------
6. From Rome to Florence and Anzio and return to Rome (automobile transportation, paid in Italian lire by U.S. Embassy in Rome)	[1] 130.04

HYDE MURRAY (COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBER)

1. From U.S.A. to Cairo, Egypt, and return from Rome, Italy, to U.S.A., (commercial airline, paid in West German deutsche marks by U.S. State Department)	$1,185.50
2. From Cairo, Egypt, to Aswan and return to Alexandria, Egypt, U.S. Navy aircraft	---------
3. From Alexandria, Egypt, to Malta and Rome, Italy, U.S. Air Force aircraft	---------
4. From Rome to Athens, Greece, and return to Rome (commercial airline, paid in Italian lire by U.S. Embassy in Rome)	165.90
5. From Athens, to Skopje, Yugoslavia, and return to Athens, U.S. Navy aircraft	---------
6. From Rome to Florence and Anzio and return to Rome (automobile transportation, paid in Italian lire by U.S. Embassy in Rome)	[1] 130.04

---

[1] One-third of total transportation for Mr. Dole and committee staff members George Misslbeck and Hyde Murray.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 605, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. W. R. Poage		Nov. 8	Nov. 23	15		750.00		274.47				274.47
Hon. Graham Purcell		do	do	15		750.00		353.65				353.65
Hon. Spark Matsunaga		Nov. 10	Dec. 12	33		1,592.00		1,414.00		442.85		1,856.85
Hon. Alec Olson		Nov. 22	Dec. 5	13		650 00		368.00		44.01		412.01
Hon. Charles Teague		Dec. 29	Dec. 31	3		150.00		81.00				81.00
Hon. Bob Dole		Nov. 20	Dec. 5	15		750.00		391.00		61.77		452.77
Mr. George Missilbeck (committee staff).		Nov. 13	do	22		1,100.00		530.04		41.45		571.49
Mr. Hyde Murray (committee staff).		do	do	22		1,100.00		529.71		38.83		568.54
Total						6,842.00		3,941.87		628.91		4,570.78
Hon. W. R. Poage:												
Czechoslovakia	Crown	Nov. 8	Nov. 9	1	717.5	50.00	264.5	18.85			264.5	18.85
Hungary	Forint	Nov. 9	Nov. 11	2	5,000	100.00	2,100	31.25			2,100	31.25
Rumania	Leu	Nov. 11	Nov. 12	1	350	50.00	0		0		0	
Bulgaria	Lev	Nov. 12	Nov. 14	2	30,000	100.00	0		0		0	
Greece (Athens)	Drachma	Nov. 14	Nov. 15	1	1,500	50.00	1,280	42.66			1,280	42.66
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 15	Nov. 20	5	108.7	250.00	86.25	197.37			86.25	197.37
Malta	do	Nov. 20	Nov. 21	1	16.6.0	50.00	0		0		0	
Italy	Lire	Nov. 21	Nov. 23	2	62,500	100.00	93.750	150.00			93.750	150.00
Subtotal												440.13
Deduct personal check to U.S. Treasury, December 1965												−165.66
Total						750.00		440.13				274.47
Hon. Graham Purcell:												
Czechoslovakia	Crown	Nov. 8	Nov. 9	1	717.5	50.00	122.5	8.54			122.5	8.54
Hungary	Forint	Nov. 9	Nov. 11	2	5,000	100.00	1,600	31.25			2,141.6	31.25
Rumania	Leu	Nov. 11	Nov. 12	1	350	50.00	0		0		0	
Bulgaria	Lev	Nov. 12	Nov. 14	2	30,000	100.00	0		0		0	
Greece (Athens)	Drachma	Nov. 14	Nov. 15	1	1,500	50.00	1,350	45.00			1,350	45.00
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 15	Nov. 20	5	108.7	250.00	88.0	202.81			88.0	202.81
Malta	do	Nov. 20	Nov. 21	1	16.6.0	50.00	0		0		0	
Italy	Lire	Nov. 21	Nov. 23	2	62,500	100.00	93,750	150.00			93,750	150.00
Subtotal												437.60
Deduct personal check to U.S. Treasury, March 1966.												−83.95
Total						750.00		437.60				353.65
Hon. Spark Matsunaga:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	300.00	108,000	300.00	57,96	161.01	165,960	461.01
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	100.00	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26.00	0	0				
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	200.00	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	100.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	150.00	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	200.00	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	200.00	473.81	100.00	313.00	66.08	786.81	166.08
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.28	100.00	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50.00	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245.00	150.00	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
United States	Dollar	Dec. 12	Nov. 10	1		16.00	0	0				
Total						1,592.00		1,414.00		442.85		1,856.85
Hon. Alec G. Olson:												
Italy (Rome)	Lire	Nov. 22	Dec. 3	11	343,750	550.00	192,500	308.00	22,275	35.64	214,775	343.64
France (Paris)	Franc	Dec. 3	Dec. 5	2	490	100.00	294	60.00	41	8.37	335	68.37
Total						650.00		368.00		44.01		[1] 412.01
Hon. Charles M. Teague: Spain	Peseda	Dec. 29	Dec. 31	3	9,000	150.00	4,860	81.00			4,860	81.00
Hon. Bob Dole:												
Italy	Lire	Nov. 20	Nov. 23	11	343,750	550.00	304,650	487.44	25,000	40.00	329,650	527.44
Do	do	Nov. 26	Dec. 4									
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 28	Nov. 26	3	4,500	150.00	2,170	73.33	653	21.77	2,823	95.10
Spain	Peseda	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	3,000	50.00	1,560	26.04			1,560	26.04
Subtotal												648.58
Deduct personal check to U.S. Treasury, February 1966.												−195.81
Total						750.00		586.81		61.77		452.77
George F. Missilbeck:												
Portugal	Escudo	Nov. 13	Nov. 14	1	1,429	50.00	743.08	26.00	85.74	3.00	828.82	[2] 29.00
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 14	Nov. 20	6	130.44	300.00	57.42	132.00	5.78	13.65	63.20	145.65
Malta	do	Nov. 20	Nov. 21	1	16.6	50.00						
Italy	Lire	Nov. 21	Nov. 23	10	312,500	500.00	171,250	274.00	15,500	24.80	186,750	298.80
Do	do	Nov. 26	Dec. 4									
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 23	Nov. 26	3	4,500	150.00	2,160	72.00			2,160	72.00
Spain	Peseda	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	3,000	50.00	1,560	26.04			1,560	26.04
Total						1,100.00		530.04		41.45		571.49

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 605, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hyde H. Murray:												
Portugal	Escudo	Nov. 13	Nov. 14	1	1,429	50.00	743.08	26.00	85.74	3.00	828.82	[2]29.00
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 14	Nov. 20	6	130.44	300.00	57.42	132.00	6.03	14.23	63.45	146.23
Malta	do	Nov. 20	Nov. 21	1	16.6	50.00						
Italy	Lire	Nov. 21	Nov. 23	10	312,500	500.00	171,250	274.00	13,500	21.60	184,750	295.60
Do	do	Nov. 26	Dec. 4									
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 23	Nov. 26	3	4,500	150.00	2,150	71.67			2,150	71.67
Spain	Peseda	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	3,000	50.00	1,560	26.04			1,560	26.04
Total						1,100.00		529.71		38.83		568.54

[1] Issued full per diem rate upon arrival and made refund of unexpended amounts of foreign currency as per receipt upon departure.

[2] Reflects reduction of $21 paid by personal check to U.S. Treasury, January 1966.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture.

MARCH 10, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Defense Subcommittee	Dollar											21,320.59
Foreign Operations Subcommittee	do											14,115.12
Independent Offices Subcommittee.	do											2,384.75
Labor-HEW Subcommittee	do											796.60
State, Justice, Commerce and Judiciary Subcommittee.	do											3,199.84
Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee.	do											4,192.85
Surveys and investigations staff	do											14,707.90
Subtotal												60,717.65

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Robert L. F. Sikes:												
United States	Dollar		Dec. 5	2								36.69
Republic of Philippines	do	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	3								34.60
Singapore	do	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1								35.50
Vietnam	do	Dec. 11	Dec. 15	5								129.20
Thailand	do	Dec. 15	Dec. 17	2								65.10
Hong Kong	do	Dec. 17	Dec. 18	1								27.50
Round-trip transportation	do											2,044.66
Subtotal												2,373.25
Hon. Daniel J. Flood:												
Mediterranean area [1]	Dollar											[1]686.00
Round-trip transportation	do											1,226.00
Subtotal												1,912.00
Hon. Glenard P. Lipscomb:												
Japan	Dollar	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1								20.80
Hong Kong	do	Dec. 2	Dec. 5	3								71.85
Thailand	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 7	2								50.31
Singapore	do	Dec. 7	Dec. 10	3								81.37
Vietnam	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 14	4								71.57
Round-trip transportation	do											2,572.44
Subtotal												2,868.34
Hon. Charles Joelson:												
United States	Dollar	Dec. 14	Dec. 3 Dec. 15	2								36.85
Japan	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 8	5								121.20
Hong Kong	do	Dec. 8	Dec. 10	1								26.50
Vietnam	do	Dec 10	Dec. 14	4								126.10
Round-trip transportation	do											2,236.60
Subtotal												2,547.25

[1] Note this travel was aboard ship. No onshore overnight accommodations were utilized and therefore no records of expense were maintained by country.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Clarence Long:												
United States	Dollar		Nov. 24	1								18.65
Israel	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	2								34.00
India	do	Nov. 29	Dec. 6	7								116.50
Pakistan	do	Dec. 6	Dec. 7	1								3.50
Singapore	do	Dec. 7	Dec. 10	3								86.75
Vietnam	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 15	5								155.45
Thailand	do	Dec. 15	Dec. 17	2								51.50
Hong Kong	do	Dec. 17	Dec. 18	1								26.50
Round trip transportation	do											3,936.78
Subtotal												4,429.63
Hon. William E. Minshall:												
United States	Dollar	Dec. 14	Dec. 16	3								48.95
Japan	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1								23.80
Hong Kong	do	Dec. 2	Dec. 5	3								87.96
Thailand	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 7	2								52.80
Singapore	do	Dec. 7	Dec. 10	3								103.30
Vietnam	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 14	4								124.30
Round trip transportation	do											2,240.38
Subtotal												2,681.49
Frank Sanders:												
United States	Dollar		Dec. 5	1								14.00
Philippines	do	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	3								18.95
Singapore	do	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1								14.00
Vietnam	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 14	4								56.50
Round-trip transportation	do											1,974.14
Subtotal												2,077.59
R. L. Michaels:												
United States	Dollar		Nov. 30	2								36.10
Japan	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1								21.80
Hong Kong	do	Dec. 17 Dec. 2	Dec. 18 Dec. 5	4								83.52
Thailand	do	Dec. 15 Dec. 5	Dec. 17 Dec. 7	4								68.29
Singapore	do	Dec. 7	Dec. 10	3								85.53
Vietnam	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 15	5								109.50
Round-trip transportation	do											2,206.30
Subtotal												2,431.04
Grand total												21,320.59

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Otto E. Passman:												
Switzerland	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	2								87.05
Lebanon	do	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	2								147.75
Thailand	do	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2								94.50
Hong Kong	do	Nov. 25	Dec. 1	6								190.65
Taiwan	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	2								51.25
Okinawa	do	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	1								2.00
Japan	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2								66.30
United States	do											142.80
Round-trip transportation												2,062.90
Subtotal												2,845.20
Hon. Garner E. Shriver:												
Switzerland	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	2								69.75
Lebanon	do	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	2								79.25
Jordan	do	Nov. 21	Nov. 21	1								18.50
Thailand	do	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2								70.35
Hong Kong	do	Nov. 25	Dec. 1	6								150.10
Taiwan	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	2								41.25
Okinawa	do	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	1								2.00
Japan	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2								54.25
United States	do											98.25
Round-trip transportation	do											2,169.15
Subtotal												2,752.85
Hon. Silvio O. Conte:												
France	Dollar	Dec. 8	Dec. 10	3								130.00
Poland	do	Dec. 11	Dec. 12	2								43.00
Austria	do	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	2								65.00
Italy	do	Dec. 15	Dec. 16	2								66.00
Spain	do	Dec. 17	Dec. 18	2								50.00
United States	do											31.00
Transportation (car) [1]	do											105.80
Subtotal												490.80

See footnote at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Mark Andrews:												
Colombia	Dollar	Nov. 30	Dec. 2	3								109.00
Peru	do	Dec. 3	Dec. 5	3								92.00
Chile	do	Dec. 6	Dec. 9	4								124.00
Brazil	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 15	6								151.00
United States	do											11.00
Round-trip transportation	do											715.00
Subtotal												1,202.00
Hon. Edward P. Boland:												
France	Dollar	Dec. 8	Dec. 10	3								127.50
Poland	do	Dec. 11	Dec. 12	2								42.00
Austria	do	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	2								63.50
Italy	do	Dec. 15	Dec. 16	2								65.00
Spain	do	Dec. 17	Dec. 18	2								56.00
United States	do											33.00
Transportation (car) [1]												98.46
Subtotal												485.46
Hon. Julia Butler Hansen:												
Colombia	Dollar	Nov. 30	Dec. 3	4								116.00
Peru	do	Dec. 3	Dec. 6	3								88.50
Chile	do	Dec. 6	Dec. 11	5								147.25
United States	do											16.25
Round-trip transportation	do											715.00
Subtotal												1,083.00
Hon. Jeffery Cohelan:												
England	Dollar	Nov. 26	Nov. 27	2								32.00
Turkey	do	Nov. 28	Dec. 2	5								123.00
United Arab Republic	do	Dec. 3	Dec. 6	4								70.00
Pakistan	do	Dec. 7	Dec. 11	5								71.00
India	do	Dec. 12	Dec. 16	5								69.00
Thailand-Laos	do	Dec. 17	Dec. 22	6								65.00
Round-trip transportation	do											2,224.50
Subtotal												2,654.50
Francis G. Merrill:												
Switzerland	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	2								69.50
Lebanon	do	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	2								78.75
Jordan	do	Nov. 21	Nov. 21	1								18.50
Thailand	do	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2								70.60
Hong Kong	do	Nov. 25	Dec. 1	6								145.35
Taiwan	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	2								41.10
Okinawa	do	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	1								4.00
Japan	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2								52.55
United States	do											114.21
Round-trip transportation												2,006.75
Subtotal												2,601.31
Grand total												14,115.12

---

[1] Round trip transportation by Government owned aircraft.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Independent Offices, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. George E. Shipley:												
France	U.S. dollar	June 17	June 21	5								175.00
Round trip transportation	do											774.40
Subtotal												949.40
Hon. Robert N. Giaimo:												
France	U.S. dollar	June 17	June 21	5								175.00
Round trip transportation	do											774.40
Subtotal												949.40
Hon. William E. Minshall:												
France	U.S. dollar	June 17	June 21	5								98.75
Round trip transportation.[1]	do											387.20
Subtotal												485.95
Grand total												2,384.75

---

[1] Returned by military aircraft.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John E. Fogarty:												
Switzerland	U.S. dollar	May 6	May 12	6								105.50
Italy	do	May 13	May 15	2								94.35
Ireland	do	May 16	May 20	4								100.15
Transportation [1]	do											98.30
Subtotal												398.30
Hon. Melvin R. Laird:												
Switzerland	U.S. dollar	May 6	May 12	6								209.10
Italy	do	May 13	May 15	2								90.90
Transportation [1]	do											98.30
Subtotal												398.30
Grand total												796.60

[1] Transportation to and from Geneva, Switzerland, furnished as members of delegation to World Health Assembly.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John J. Rooney:												
Italy	U.S. dollar	Nov. 26	Dec. 8	12								362.45
Israel	do	Dec. 8	Dec. 12	4								119.35
France	do	Dec. 12	Dec. 15	3								95.50
Round trip transportation	do											1,031.17
Subtotal												1,608.47
Jay B. Howe:												
Italy	U.S. dollar	Nov. 26	Dec. 8	12								354.40
Israel	do	Dec. 8	Dec. 12	4								114.45
France	do	Dec. 12	Dec. 15	3								91.35
Round trip transportation	do											1,031.17
Subtotal												1,591.37
Grand total												3,199.84

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Sidney R. Yates:												
France	Dollar	Oct. 23	Oct. 26	4								149.00
Belgium	do	Oct. 27	Oct. 28	2								54.00
Netherlands	do	Oct. 29	Oct. 31	3								98.00
England	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 3	4								89.00
Round-trip transportation	do											880.65
Subtotal												1,270,65
Hon. Silvio O. Conte:												
France	do	Oct. 23	Oct. 26	4								149.00
Belgium	do	Oct. 27	Oct. 28	2								54.00
Netherlands	do	Oct. 29	Oct. 31	3								98.00
England	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 3	4								116.00
West Germany	do	Nov. 3	Nov. 4	1								26.00
Italy	do	Nov. 4	Nov. 10	5								127.00
Round-trip transportation	do											891.10
Subtotal												1,461,10
A. A. Gunnels:												
France	do	Oct. 23	Oct. 26	4								149.00
Belgium	do	Oct. 27	Oct. 28	2								54.00
Netherlands	do	Oct. 29	Oct. 31	3								98.00
England	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 3	4								116.00
West Germany	do	Nov. 3	Nov. 4	1								26.00
Italy	do	Nov. 4	Nov. 10	5								127.00
Round-trip transportation	do											891.10
Subtotal												1,461.10
Grand total												4,192.85

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Surveys and Investigations Staff, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
C. L. Bennett:												
France	Dollar	Sept. 7	Sept. 10	3¾		14.00		52.50		1.40		53.90
Do	do	Sept. 10	Sept. 13	3¼		22.00		71.50				71.50
Germany	do	Sept. 14	Sept. 19	5¾		16.00		92.00				92.00
Italy	do	Sept. 19	Sept. 23	4		18.00		72.00		1.20		73.20
Round trip transportation	do									476.10		476.10
Hawaii	do	Oct. 10	Oct. 20	10¼		16.00		164.00				164.00
Japan	do	Oct. 21	Oct. 26	5		18.00		90.00				90.00
Korea	do	Oct. 26	Oct. 28	2¼		14.00		31.50		1.00		32.50
Japan	do	Oct. 28	Oct. 29	1		18.00		18.00				18.00
Round trip transportation	do									1,062.20		1,062.20
Subtotal								591.50		1,541.90		2,133.40
Charles Bolz:												
France	Dollar	Sept. 6	Sept. 10	3¾		14.00		52.59				52.50
Do	do	Sept. 10	Sept. 13	3¼		22.00		71.50				71.50
Germany	do	Sept. 14	Sept. 19	5¾		16.00		92.00				92.00
Italy	do	Sept. 19	Sept. 23	4		18.00		72.00				72.00
Round trip transportation	do									476.10		476.10
Subtotal								288.00		476.10		764.10
W. Dana Carson:												
France	Dollar	Sept. 7	Sept. 10	3¾		14.00		52.50				52.50
Do	do	Sept. 10	Sept. 13	3¼		22.00		71.50		1.40		72.90
Germany	do	Sept. 14	Sept. 23	9½		16.00		152.00				152.00
Round trip transportation	do									434.10		434.10
Hawaii	do	Oct. 10	Oct. 20	10¼		16.00		164.00				164.00
Japan	do	Oct. 21	Oct. 26	5		18.00		90.00				90.00
Korea	do	Oct. 26	Oct. 28	2¼		14.00		31.50		1.00		32.50
Japan	do	Oct. 28	Oct. 29	1		18.00		18.00				18.00
Round trip transportation	do									1,062.20		1,062.20
Subtotal								579.50		1,498.70		2,078.20
Leo E. Conroy:												
France	Dollar	Sept. 7	Sept. 10	3¾		14.00		52.50				52.50
Do	do	Sept. 10	Sept. 13	3¼		22.00		71.50		1.40		72.90
Germany	do	Sept. 14	Sept. 19	5¾		16.00		92.00				92.00
Italy	do	Sept. 19	Sept. 23	4		18.00		72.00		1.20		73.20
Round trip transportation										476.10		476.10
Hawaii	Dollar	Oct. 10	Oct. 20	10¼		16.00		164.00				164.00
Japan	do	Oct. 21	Oct. 26	5		18.00		90.00				90.00
Korea	do	Oct. 26	Oct. 28	2¼		14.00		31.50		1.00		32.50
Japan	do	Oct. 28	Oct. 29	1		18.00		18.00				18.00
Round trip transportation	do									1,062.20		1,062.20
Subtotal								591.50		1,541.90		2,133.40
Edward J. Hayes:												
Hawaii	Dollar	Oct. 10	Oct. 17	7		16.00		112.00				112.00
Okinawa	do	Oct. 18	Oct. 20	2		16.00		32.00				32.00
Japan	do	Oct. 20	Oct. 27	7		18.00		126.00				126.00
Round trip transportation	do									1,105.80		1,105.80
Subtotal								270.00		1,105.80		1,375.80
Coy M. Ivy:												
France	Dollar	Sept. 6	Sept. 3	3¾		14.00		52.50		1.40		53.90
Do	do	do	do	3¼		22.00		71.50				71.50
Germany	do	Sept. 13	Sept. 23	9¾		16.00		156.00				156.00
Round-trip transportation										419.20		419.20
Hawaii	Dollar	Oct. 10	Oct. 17	7¼		16.00		116.00				116.00
Okinawa	do	Oct. 18	Oct. 20	2		16.00		32.00				32.00
Japan	do	Oct. 20	Oct. 27	7		18.00		126.00				126.00
Round-trip transportation										1,105.80		1,105.80
Subtotal								554.00		1,526.40		2,080.40
John G. Quinn:												
France	Dollar	Sept. 7	Sept. 10	3¾		14.00		52.50				52.50
		Sept. 10	Sept. 13	3¼		22.00		71.50		1.40		72.90
Germany	do	Sept. 14	Sept. 23	9¼		16.00		148.00				148.00
Round-trip transportation										434.10		434.10
Hawaii	Dollar	Oct. 10	Oct. 20	10¼		16.00		164.00				164.00
Japan	do	Oct. 21	Oct. 26	5		18.00		90.00				90.00
Korea	do	Oct. 26	Oct. 28	2¼		14.00		31.50		1.00		32.50
Japan	do	Oct. 28	Oct. 29	1		18.00		18.00				18.00
Round-trip transportation										1,062.20		1,062.20
Subtotal								575.50		1,498.70		2,074.20
Harvey C. Wright:												
France	Dollar	Sept. 6	Sept. 13	3¾		14.00		52.50	}	1.40		125.40
Do	do	do	do	3¾		22.00		71.50				
Germany	do	Sept. 13	Sept. 23	9¼		16.00		148.00				148.00
Round-trip transportation										419.20		419.20
Hawaii	Dollar	Oct. 10	Oct. 17	7		16.00		112.00				112.00
Okinawa	do	Oct. 18	Oct. 20	2		16.00		32.00				32.00
Japan	do	Oct. 20	Oct. 27	7		18.00		126.00				126.00
Round-trip transportation										1,105.80		1,105.80
Subtotal								542.00		1,526.40		2,068.40
Grand total								3,902.00		10,715.90		14,707.90

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st Session, 89th Congress, Committee on Armed Services, recapitulation, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Subcommittee to inspect military installations in Western Europe						2,800.00		2,680.00		4,929.90		7,609.90
Subcommittee to South Vietnam						2,500.00		1,869.09		11,137.21		13,006.30
Subcommittee to Western Europe						4,300.00		3,245.62		4,503.94		7,749.56
Subcommittee to Far East						2,950.00		2,190.12		8,148.50		10,338.62
Subcommittee on Military Airlift						1,000.00		966.62		2,240.30		3,206.92
Subcommittee on Special Investigations						11,900.00		1,114.36		3,931.21		5,045.57
Full committee (members traveling individually)						4,450.00		3,881.90		8,889.65		12,771.55
Total						31,700.00		24,796.27		72,864.06		97,660.33

RECAPITULATION

	Amoun
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	42,808.99
Government Department: Military departments	54,851.34
Total	97,660.33

L. **Mendel Rivers**,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

March 8, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Special Subcommittee to Inspect Military Installations and Activities in Western Europe, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Lucien N. Nedzi:												
France	Franc	Apr. 15	Apr. 19	5	1,225	250.00	1,127	230.00			1,127	230.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Apr. 19	Apr. 22	3	600	150.00	600	150.00			600	150.00
Holland (transportation to Europe and return).	Guilder								2,955	821.65	2,955	821.65
Subtotal						400.00		380.00		821.65		1,201.65
Hon. G. Elliott Hagan:												
France	Franc	Apr. 15	Apr. 19	5	1,225	250.00	1,225	250.00			1,225	250.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Apr. 19	Apr. 22	3	600	150.00	600	150.00			600	150.00
Spain	Peseta	Apr. 22	Apr. 24	2	5,991	100.00	5,991	100.00			5,991	100.00
Holland (transportation to Europe and return).	Guilder								2,955	821.65	2,955	821.65
Subtotal						500.00		500.00		821.65		1,321.65
Hon. Charles H. Wilson:												
France	Franc	Apr. 15	Apr. 19	5	1,225	250.00	1,225	250.00			1,225	250.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Apr. 19	Apr. 22	3	600	150.00	600	150.00			600	150.00
Spain	Peseta	Apr. 22	Apr. 24	2	5,991	100.00	5,991	100.00			5,991	100.00
Holland (transportation to Europe and return).	Guilder								2,955	821.65	2,955	821.65
Subtotal						500.00		500.00		821.65		1,321.65
Hon. Robert L. Leggett:												
France	Franc	Apr. 15	Apr. 19	5	1,225	250.00	1,225	250.00			1,225	250.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Apr. 19	Apr. 22	3	600	150.00	600	150.00			600	150.00
Spain	Peseta	Apr. 22	Apr. 24	2	5,991	100.00	5,991	100.00			5,991	100.00
Holland (transportation to Europe and return).	Guilder								2,955	821.65	2,955	821.65
Subtotal						500.00		500.00		821.65		1,321.65

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Special Subcommittee to Inspect Military Installations and Activities in Western Europe, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. E. S. Johnny Walker:												
France	Franc	Apr. 15	Apr. 19	5	1,225	250.00	1,225	250.00			1,225	250.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Apr. 19	Apr. 22	3	600	150.00	600	150.00			600	150.00
Holland (transportation to Europe and return).	Guilder								2,955	821.65	2,955	821.65
Subtotal						400.00		400.00		821.65		1,221.65
Philip W. Kelleher:												
France	Franc	Apr. 15	Apr. 19	5	1,225	250.00	980	200.00			980	200.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Apr. 19	Apr. 22	3	600	150.00	508	127.00			508	127.00
Spain	Peseta	Apr. 22	Apr. 24	2	5,991	100.00	4,373	73.00			4,373	73.00
Holland (transportation to Europe and return).	Guilder								2,955	821.65	2,955	821.65
Subtotal						500.00		400.00		821.65		1,221.65
Total						2,800.00		2,680.00		4,929.90		7,609.90

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	7,609.90
Total	7,609.90

LUCIEN N. NEDZI,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, special subcommittee to South Vietnam, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Otis G. Pike:												
South Vietnam	Piaster	June 12	June 16	4	14,554	200.00	14,129	194.16			14,129	194.16
Thailand	Baht	June 16	June 18	2	2,065	100.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	June 18	June 19	2	576	100.00	576	100.00			576	100.00
Japan	Yen	June 19	June 21	2	36,000	100.00	31,201	86.67			31,201	86.67
United States	U.S. dollar									2,230.38		2,230.38
Transportation to southeast Asia and return.												
Subtotal						500.00		480.83		2,230.38		2,711.21
Hon. Richard H. Ichord:												
South Vietnam	Piaster	June 12	June 16	4	14,554	200.00	8,912	122.47			8,912	122.47
Thailand	Baht	June 16	June 18	2	2,065	100.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	June 18	June 19	2	576	100.00	576	100.00			576	100.00
Japan	Yen	June 19	June 21	2	36,000	100.00	30,500	84.72			30,500	84.72
United States	U.S. dollar									2,230.38		2,230.38
Transportation to southeast Asia and return.												
Subtotal						500.00		407.19		2,230.38		2,637.57
Hon. William G. Bray:												
South Vietnam	Piaster	June 12	June 16	4	14,554	200.00	8,724	119,88			8,724	119.88
Thailand	Baht	June 16	June 18	2	20,65	100.00	624	30.22			624	30.22
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	June 18	June 19	2	576	100.00	267	46.38			267	46.38
Japan	Yen	June 19	June 21	2	36,000	100.00	14,421	40.06			14,421	40.06
United States	U.S. dollar									2,215.69		2,215.69
Transportation to southeast Asia and return.												
Subtotal						500.00		236.54		2,215.69		2,452.23
Hon. Charles E. Chamberlain:												
South Vietnam	Piaster	June 12	June 16	4	14,554	200.00	7,852	107.90			7,852	107.90
Thailand	Baht	June 16	June 18	2	2,065	100.00	1,944	94.14			1,944	94.14
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	June 18	June 19	2	576	100.00	173	30.02			173	30.02
Japan	Yen	June 19	June 21	2	36,000	100.00	15,000	41.67			15,000	41.67
United States	U.S. dollar									2,230.38		2,230.38
Transportation to southeast Asia and return.												
Subtotal						500.00		273.73		2,230.38		2,504.11

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, special subcommittee to South Vietnam, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ralph Marshall:												
South Vietnam	Piaster	June 12	June 16	4	14,554	200.00	12,429	170.80			12,429	170.80
Thailand	Baht	June 16	June 18	2	2,065	100.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	June 18	June 19	2	576	100.00	576	100.00			576	100.00
Japan	Yen	June 19	June 21	2	36,000	100.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
United States (transportation to southeast Asia and return).	U.S. dollar									2,230.38		2,230.38
Subtotal						500.00		470.80		2,230.38		2,701.18
Total						2,500.00		1,869.09		11,137.21		13,006.30

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,869.09
Appropriated funds: Government department: Army	11,137.21
Total	13,006.30

OTIS G. PIKE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Special Subcommittee to Western Europe, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. L. Mendel Rivers:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	300	75.00	50	12.50	350	87.50
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	3	735	150.00	671	137.00	309	63.00	980	200.00
Italy	Lire	June 21	June 22	1½	46,875	75.00	46,250	74.00	16,250	26.00	62,500	100.00
United States (transportation to Europe).	U.S. dollar									126.00		126.00
France (transportation to Italy).	Franc								445	90.82	445	90.82
Italy (transportation to United States).	Lire								292,938	468.70	292,938	468.70
Subtotal						325.00		286.00		787.02		1,073.02
Hon. Philip J. Philbin:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	325	81.25	75	18.75	400	100.00
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	3	735	150.00	637	130.00	98	20.00	735	150.00
Italy	Lire	June 21	June 22	1½	46,875	75.00	45,000	72.00	8,125	13.00	53,125	85.00
United States (transportation to Europe).	U.S. dollar									126.00		126.00
France (transportation to Italy).	Franc								445	90.82	445	90.82
Italy (transportation to United States).	Lire								292,938	468.70	292,938	468.70
Subtotal						325.00		283.25		737.27		1,020.52
Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr.:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	300	75.00			300	75.00
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	625	127.60			625	127.60
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		202.60		234.00		436.60
Hon. Bob Wilson:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	300	75.00			300	75.00
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	855	174.50			855	174.50
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		249.50		234.00		483.50
Hon. Charles S. Gubser:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	300	75.00			300	75.00
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	805	164.30			805	164.30
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		239.30		234.00		473.30
Hon. Alexander Pirnie:												
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	725	147.97			725	147.97
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									108.00		108.00
Subtotal						200.00		147.97		108.00		255.97

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Special Subcommittee to Western Europe, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Lucien N. Nedzi:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	180	45.00			180	45.00
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	573	117.00			573	117.00
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		162.00		234.00		396.00
Hon. William J. Randall:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	84	21.00			84	21.00
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	343	70.00			343	70.00
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		91.00		234.00		325.00
Hon. Robert L. Leggett:												
France	Franc	June 16	June 24	9	2,205	450.00	2,205	450.00			2,205	450.00
Holland (transportation to France and return).	Guilder								1,857	516.35	1,857	516.35
Subtotal						450.00		450.00		516.35		966.35
Hon. Donald J. Irwin:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	300	75.00			300	75.00
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	855	174.50			855	174.50
United States (transportation to Europe and return)	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		249.50		234.00		483.50
Hon. Floyd V. Hicks:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	205	51.25			205	51.25
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	510	104.10			510	104.10
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		155.35		234.00		389.35
Hon. Santiago Polanco-Abreu:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	300	75.00			300	75.00
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	855	174.50	75	15.30	930	189.80
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		249.50		249.30		498.80
Earl J. Morgan:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	260	65.00			260	65.00
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	880	179.60			880	179.60
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		244.60		234.00		478.60
James A. Deakins:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 16	June 18	2	400	100.00	230	57.50			230	57.50
France	Franc	June 18	June 21	4	980	200.00	870	177.55			870	177.55
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	U.S. dollar									234.00		234.00
Subtotal						300.00		235.05		234.00		469.05
Total						4,300.00		3,245.62		4,503.94		7,749.56

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	5,049.56
Appropriated funds—Government department: Air Force	2,700.00
Total	7,749.56

L. Mendel Rivers,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

March 8, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Special Subcommittee to Far East, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. L. Mendel Rivers:												
Korea	Won	Sept. 29	Oct. 2	3	40,560	150.00	34,530	127.70			34,530	127.70
Japan	Yen	Oct. 2	Oct. 5	3	54,000	150.00	48,195	133.87			48,195	133.87
Taiwan	Taiwan dollar	Oct. 5	Oct. 7	2	4,000	100.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Hong Kong (includes South Vietnam).	Hong Kong dollar.	Oct. 7	Oct. 12	5	1,440	250.00	1,380	239.65	230.00	39.94	1,610	279.59
Thailand	Baht	Oct. 12	Oct. 14	2	2,065	100.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Philippines	Peso	Oct. 14	Oct. 15	2	389.70	100.00	363.87	93.35			363.87	93.35
Transportation to Far East and return.	U.S. dollar									2,027.14		2,027.14
Subtotal						850.00		794.57		2,067.08		2,861.65

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Special Subcommittee to Far East, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr.:												
Korea	Won	Sept. 29	Oct. 2	3	40,560	150.00	7,504	27.75			7,504	27.75
Japan	Yen	Oct. 2	Oct. 5	3	54,000	150.00	46,300	128.61			46,300	128.61
Taiwan	Taiwan dollar	Oct. 5	Oct. 7	2	4,000	100.00	2,250	56.25			2,250	56.25
Hong Kong (includes South Vietnam).	Hong Kong dollar.	Oct. 7	Oct. 12	5	1,440	250.00	1,271	220.53			1,271	220.53
Thailand	Baht	Oct. 12	Oct. 14	2	2,065	100.00	1,605	77.73			1,605	77.73
Philippines	Peso	Oct. 14	Oct. 15	2	389.70	100.00	71.95	18.46			71.95	18.46
Transportation to Far East and return.	U.S. dollar									2,027.14		2,027.14
Subtotal						850.00		529.33		2,027.14		2,556.47
Hon. Speedy O. Long:												
Korea	Won	Sept. 29	Oct. 2	3	40,560	150.00	15,900	58.80			15,900	58.80
Japan	Yen	Oct. 2	Oct. 5	3	54,000	150.00	38,365	107.32			38,365	107.32
Taiwan	Taiwan dollar	Oct. 5	Oct. 7	2	4,000	100.00	3,190	79.75			3,190	79.75
Hong Kong (includes South Vietnam).	Hong Kong dollar.	Oct. 7	Oct. 12	5	1,440	250.00	1,440	250.00			1,440	250.00
Thailand	Baht	Oct. 12	Oct. 14	2	2,065	100.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Philippines	Peso	Oct. 14	Oct. 15	2	389.70	100.00	69.40	17.80			69.40	17.80
Transportation to Far East and return.	U.S. dollar									2,027.14		2,027.14
Subtotal						850.00		613.67		2,027.14		2,640.81
Gen. Mark Clark:												
Hong Kong (includes South Vietnam).	Hong Kong dollar.	Oct. 7	Oct. 12	4	1,149	200.00	734	127.76			734	127.76
Thailand	Baht	Oct. 12	Oct. 14	2	2,065	100.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Philippines	Peso	Oct. 14	Oct. 15	2	389.70	100.00	96.90	24.79			96.90	24.79
Transportation to Far East and return.	U.S. dollar									2,027.14		2,027.14
Subtotal						400.00		252.55		2,027.14		2,279.69
Total						2,950.00		2,190.12		8,148.50		10,338.62

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,230.06
Appropriated funds: Government department: Army and Air Force	8,108.56
Total	10,338.62

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Airlift, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Charles H. Wilson:												
Japan	Yen	Dec. 3	Dec. 6	3	54,000	150.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 6	Dec. 9	4	1,146.50	200.00	1,146.50	200.00			1,146.50	200.00
South Vietnam	Piaster	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	3,639	50.00	3,639	50.00			3,639	50.00
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	2	2,065	100.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 12	Dec. 14	3	93,750	150.00	93,750	150.00			93,750	150.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 14	Dec. 16	2	5,991	100.00	5,991	100.00			5,991	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 16	Dec. 19	3	735.00	150.00	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
Transportation to Far East and Europe.	Deutsche mark								7,214	1,803.20	7,214	1,803.20
Transportation to United States.	U.S. dollar									397.00		397.00
Subtotal						900.00		900.00		2,200.20		3,100.20
Hon. William G. Bray:												
Japan	Yen	Dec. 3	Dec. 6	3	54,000	150.00	23,115	64.21			23,115	64.21
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 6	Dec. 9	4	1,146.50	200.00	755.50	131.20			755.50	131.20
South Vietnam	Piaster	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	3,639	50.00	3,639	50.00			3,639	50.00
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	2	2,065	100.00	1,643	79.56			1,643	79.56
Italy	Lira	Dec. 12	Dec. 14	3	93,750	150.00	82,750	132.40			82,750	132.40
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 14	Dec. 16	2	5,991	100.00	3,391	56.59			3,391	56.59
France	Franc	Dec. 16	Dec. 19	3	735.00	150.00	500.00	102.00			500.00	102.00
Transportation to Europe	Deutsche mark								7,234	1,808.00	7,234	1,808.00
Transportation to United States.	U.S. dollar									397.00		397.00
Subtotal						900.00		615.96		2,205.00		2,820.96

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Airlift, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Earl J. Morgan:												
Japan	Yen	Dec. 3	Dec. 6	3	54,000	150.00	50,700	140.83			50,700	140.83
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 6	Dec. 9	4	1,146.50	200.00	1,146.50	200.00			1,146.50	200.00
South Vietnam	Piaster	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	3,639	50.00	3,639	50.00			3,639	50.00
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	2	2,065	100.00	1,565	75.79			1,565	75.79
Italy	Lire	Dec. 12	Dec. 14	3	93,750	150.00	93,750	150.00			93,750	150.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 14	Dec. 16	2	5,991	100.00	5,991	100.00			5,991	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 16	Dec. 19	3	735	150.00	735	150.00			735	150.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 20	Dec. 21	2	400	100.00	400	100.00			400	100.00
Transportation to Far East and Europe.	do								7,214	1,803.20	7,214	1,803.20
Transportation to United States.	U.S. dollar									437.10		437.10
Subtotal						1,000.00		966.62		2,240.30		3,206.92
Total						2,800.00		2,482.58		6,645.50		9,128.08

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	7,896.98
Government department: Air Force	1,231.10
Total	9,128.08

MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Airlift.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Special Investigations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr.:												
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 30	Dec. 1	2	900	100.00	900	100.00			900	100.00
Italy	Lire	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	3	93,750	150.00	81,750	130.80			81,750	130.80
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 4	Dec. 9	5	1,000	250.00	678.21	169.57			678.21	169.57
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	5	1,225	250.00	1,081.40	220.69			1,081.40	220.69
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 18	5	89-4-1	250.00	51-4-1	143.93	33-5-0	92.80	84-9-1	236.73
Transportation to Turkey	Guilder								2,219	617.00	2,219	717.00
Transportation in Europe and return to the United States.	U.S. dollar									1,083.28		1,083.28
Subtotal						1,000.00		764.99		1,793.08		2,558.07
Hon. Otis G. Pike:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 17	Nov. 18	2	36,000	100.00	29,500	81.97			29,500	81.97
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 22	4	1,147.50	200.00	1,147.50	200.00	65.00	11.29	1,212.50	211.29
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 23	1	2,000	50.00	1,091.50	27.29			1,091.50	27.29
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	2	7,277	100.00	5,597	76.91			5,597	76.91
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	2	2,065	100.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Ceylon	Rupee	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	2	475.75	100.00	325.35	68.39	356.93	75.02	682.28	143.41
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 30	Dec. 1	2	900.00	100.00	664.00	73.78			664.00	73.78
Italy	Lire	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	3	93,750	150.00	93,750	150.00			93,750	150.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	5	1,225	250.00	1,225	250.00			1,225	250.00
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 18	5	89-4-1	250.00	62-8-5	175.43			62-8-5	175.43
Transportation to Far East, Europe, and return to the United States.	U.S. dollar									3,734.49		3,734.49
Subtotal						1,400.00		1,203.77		3,820.80		5,024.57
Hon. Charles S. Gubser:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 17	Nov. 18	2	36,000	100.00	9,600	26.72			9,600	26.72
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 22	4	1,147.50	200.00	1,147.50	200.00			1,147.50	200.00
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 23	1	2,000	50.00	1,399	34.97			1,399	34.97
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	2	7,277	100.00	3,842	52.80			3,842	52.80
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	2	2,065	100.00	1,470	71.19			1,470	71.19
Ceylon	Rupee	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	2	475.75	100.00	475.75	100.00	356.94	75.02	832.69	175.02
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 30	Dec. 1	2	900	100.00	323.50	35.94			323.50	35.94
Italy	Lire	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	3	93,750	150.00	73,050	116.88	10,450	16.72	83,500	133.60
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 4	Dec. 9	5	1,000	250.00	678.19	169.57			678.19	169.57
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	5	1,225	250.00	1,130	230.61			1,130	230.61
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 18	5	89-4-1	250.00	26-9-5	76.34			26-9-5	76.34
Transportation to Far East, Europe, and return to the United States.	U.S. dollar									3,734.49		3,734.49
Subtotal						1,650.00		1,115.02		3,826.23		4,941.25

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Special Investigations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Alexander Pirnie:												
Japan	Yen	Nov 17	Nov. 18	2	36,000	100.00	6,000	16.72			6,000	16.72
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 22	4	1,147.50	200.00	1,099.50	191.66			1,109.50	191.66
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 23	1	2,000	50.00	765	19.12			765	19.12
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	2	7,277	100.00	2,122	29.16			2,122	29.16
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 26	Nov. 27	1	1,032.50	50.00	801.90	38.83			801.90	38.83
Ceylon	Rupee	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	2	475.75	100.00	345.75	72.68	356.93	75.02	702.68	147.70
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 30	Dec. 1	2	900	100.00	475	52.78			475	52.78
Italy	Lire	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	3	93,750	150.00	78,450	125.52			78,450	125.52
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 4	Dec. 9	5	1,000	250.00	687.19	169.57			678.19	169.57
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	5	1,225	250.00	725	147.96			725	147.96
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 18	5	89-4-1	250.00	42-6-5	119.04			42-6-5	119.04
Transportation to Far East, Europe, and return to the United States.	U.S. dollar									3,734.49		3,734.49
Subtotal						1,600.00		983.04		3,809.51		4,792.55
John T. M. Reddan:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 17	Nov. 18	2	36,000	100.00	17,500	48.66			17,500	48.66
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 22	4	1,147.50	200.00	848.50	148.02			848.50	148.02
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 23	1	2,000	50.00	920.00	23.00			920.00	23.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 24	Nov. 27	3	3,097.50	150.00	2,668.50	129.23			2,668.50	129.23
Ceylon	Rupee	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	2	475.75	100.00	345.75	72.68	356.93	75.02	702.68	147.70
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 30	Dec. 1	2	900	100.00	490.00	54.44			490.00	54.44
Italy	Lire	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	3	93,750	150.00	81,200	129.92			81,200	129.92
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 4	Dec. 9	5	1,000	250.00	678.19	169.57			678.19	169.57
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	5	1,225	250.00	1,060.40	216.41			1,060.40	216.41
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 18	5	89-4-1	250.00	48-4-1	135.57			48-4-1	135.57
Transportation to Far East, Europe. and return to the United States.	U.S. dollar									3,734.40		3,734.49
Subtotal						1,600.00		1,127.50		3,809.51		4,937.01
Walton Woods:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 17	Nov. 18	2	36,000	100.00	9,664	26.09			9,664	26.09
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 22	4	1,147.50	200.00	687.50	120.11			687.50	120.11
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 23	1	2,000	50.00	1,750	43.75			1,750	43.75
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 24	Nov. 27	3	3,097.50	150.00	2,897.50	140.31			2,897.50	140.31
Ceylon	Rupee	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	2	475.75	100.00	323.90	68.09	356.93	75.02	680.83	143.11
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 30	Dec. 1	2	900	100.00	570	63.33			570	63.33
Italy	Lire	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	3	93,750	150.00	78,750	126.00			78,750	126.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 4	Dec. 9	5	1,000	250.00	678.19	169.57			678.19	169.57
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	5	1,225	250.00	795	162.24			795	162.24
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 18	5	89-4-1	250.00	28-3-5	79.69			28-3-5	79.69
Transportation to Far East, Europe, and return to the United States.	U.S. dollar									3,734.49		3,734.49
Subtotal						1,600.00		990.18		3,809.51		4,808.69
John J. Ford:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 17	Nov. 18	2	36,000	100.00	9,950	27.69			9,950	27.69
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 22	4	1,147.50	200.00	747.50	130.53			747.50	130.53
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 23	1	2,000	50.00	1,242	31.05			1,242	31.05
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 24	Nov. 27	3	3,097.50	150.00	2,555.80	125.08			2,555.80	125.08
Ceylon	Rupee	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	2	474.75	100.00	355.75	74.78	356.94	75.02	712.69	149.80
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 30	Dec. 1	2	900	100.00	617.25	68.58			617.25	68.58
Italy	Lire	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	3	93,750	150.00	82,750	132.40			82,750	132.40
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 4	Dec. 9	5	1,000	250.00	678.19	169.57			678.19	169.57
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	5	1,225	250.00	1,195	243.88			1,195	243.88
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 18	5	89-4-1	250.00	48-3-8	135.54			48-3-8	135.54
Transportation to Far East, Europe, and return to the United States.	U.S. dollar									3,734.49		3,734.49
Subtotal						1,600.00		1,139.10		3,809.51		4,948.61
Raymond H. Luchin:												
Japan[1]		Nov. 17	Nov. 18	2								
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 22	4	1,147.50	200.00	1,070.90	185.90			1,070.90	185.90
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 23	1	2,000	50.00	1,060	26.50			1,060	26.50
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 24	Nov. 27	3	3,097.50	150.00	2,480.50	120.12			2,480.50	120.12
Ceylon	Rupee	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	2	475.75	100.00	369.65	77.70	356.94	75.02	726.59	152.72
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 30	Dec. 1	2	900	100.00	801	89.00			801	89.00
Italy	Lire	Dec. 2	Dec. 4	2	62,500	100.00	50,500	80.80			50,500	80.80
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 4	Dec. 9	5	1,000	250.00	678.19	169.57			678.19	169.57
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	5	1,225	250.00	1,210.30	247.00			1,210.30	247.00
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 18	5	89-4-1	250.00	41-6-3	117.77			41-6-3	117.77
Transportation to Far East, Europe, and return to the United States.	U.S. dollar									3,734.49		3,734.49
Transportation rom Turkey to Italy.	Lira								1,096	121.70	1,096	121.70
Subtotal						1,450.00		1,114.36		3,931.21		5,045.57
Total						11,900.00		8,446.96		28,609.36		37,056.32

---

[1] No Government funds expended.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	9,831.61
Government department: Air Force	27,224.71
Total	37,056.32

PORTER HARDY, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Special Investigations.

MARCH 7, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 118, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. William H. Bates:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 6	Dec. 8	2	400	100	300	75.00			300	75.00
France	Franc	Dec. 8	Dec. 13	5	1,225	250	787	160.61			787	160.61
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 17	5	89-4-1	250	44-4-1	124.41			44-4-1	124.41
Transportation to Europe and return.	Guilder								2,984	829.90	2,984	829.90
Subtotal						600		360.02		829.90		1,189.92
Hon. James A. Byrne:												
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 26	Nov. 26	2	5,991	100	5,991	100.00			5,991	100.00
Portugal	Escudo	Nov. 26	Nov. 28	2	2,871	100	2,871	100.00			2,871	100.00
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 28	Nov. 30	2	5,991	100	5,991	100.00			5,991	100.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 1	Dec. 7	6	1,200	300	1,191	297.53	348.40	87.08	1,539.40	384.61
Italy	Lira	Dec. 7	Dec. 10	4	125,000	200	125,000	200.00			125,000	200.00
France	Franc	Dec. 11	Dec. 11	1	245	50	245	50.00			245	50.00
Transportation to Europe and return.	U.S. dollar									1,258.04		1,258.04
Subtotal						850		847.53		1,345.12		2,192.65
Hon. Richard H. Ichord:												
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 3	Dec. 6	3	8,987	150	8,987	150.00			8,987	150.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 6	Dec. 8	3	93,750	150	93,750	150.00	8,883	14.21	102,633	164.21
Greece	Drachma	Dec. 8	Dec. 10	2	3,000	100	3,000	100.00	812.00	27.07	3,812.00	127.07
Transportation to Europe and return.	Deutsche mark								4,511.60	1,087.52	4,511.60	1,087.52
Subtotal						400		400.00		1,128.80		1,528.80
Hon. Lucien N. Nedzi:												
France	Franc	Dec. 8	Dec. 10	3	735	150	735	150.00	90.65	18.50	825.65	168.50
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 10	Dec. 13	2	6,500	100	6,500	100.00	715	11.00	7,215	111.00
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	2	2,576	100	2,576	100.00	178.50	6.93	2,755	106.93
Italy	Lira	Dec. 14	Dec. 16	2	62,500	100	62,500	100.00	16,750	26.80	79,250	126.80
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 16	Dec. 18	2	5,900	100	5,900	100.00	539	9.00	6,529	109.00
Transportation to Europe and return.	U.S. dollar									1,595.86		1,595.86
Subtotal						550		550.00		1,668.09		2,218.09
Hon. Alvin E. O'Konski:												
France	Franc	Dec. 8	Dec. 10	3	735	150	735	150.00	90.65	18.50	825.65	168.50
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 10	Dec. 13	2	6,500	100	6,500	100.00	715	11.00	7,215	111.00
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	2	2,576	100	2,576	100.00	178.50	6.93	2,755	106.93
Italy	Lira	Dec. 14	Dec. 16	2	62,500	100	62,500	100.00	16,750	26.80	79,250	126.80
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 16	Dec. 18	2	5,900	100	5,900	100.00	539	9.00	6,529	109.00
Transportation to Europe and return.[1]	U.S. dollar											
Subtotal						550		550.00		72.23		622.23
Hon. Philip J. Philbin:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2½	500	125	500	125.00			500	125.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	4	980	200	980	200.00	245	50.00	1,225	250.00
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	1½	26-15-80	75	26-15-80	75.00	4.0	11.20	30-15-8	86.20
Transportation to Europe and return.	Guilder								2,849.11	792.30	2,849.11	792.30
Subtotal						400		400.00		853.50		1,253.50
Hon. William J. Randall:												
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 15	Nov. 17	3	8,986.50	150	4,193.70	70.00			4,193.70	70.00
Italy	Lira	Nov. 17	Nov. 21	4	125,000	200	98,350	157.36			98,350	157.36
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 21	Nov. 28	7	1,400	350	587.98	146.99			587.98	146.99
Transportation to Europe and return.	Franc								2,537	517.65	2,537	517.65
Subtotal						700		374.35		517.65		892.00
Hon. L. Mendel Rivers:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2½	500	125	500	125.00	100	25.00	600	150.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	4	980	200	980	200.00	245	50.00	1,225	250.00
England	Pound	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	1½	26-15-80	75	26-15-80	75.00	4	11.20	30-15-8	86.20
Transportation to Europe and return.	Guilder								2,849.11	792.30	2,849.11	792.30
Subtotal						400		400.00		878.50		1,278.50
Total						4,450		3.881,90		8,889.65		12,771.55

---

[1] Round trip transportation by Government-owned aircraft.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	8,321.79
Appropriated funds, Government department:	
Army	1,258.04
Air Force	3,191.72
Total	12,771.55

MARCH 7, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 613, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

FULL COMMITTEE (EUROPEAN TRIP)

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Frank Annunzio:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 29	Dec. 5	6	31,250	50.00	178,000	284.80			178,000	284.80
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 5	Dec. 7	2	2,995	50.00	5,990	100.00			5,990	100.00
Switzerland	Franc	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	215.67	50.00	419.90	97.35			419.90	97.35
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	3	200	50.00	577	144.25	4,378.8	1,094.43	4,955.8	1,238.68
Netherlands	Guilder	Dec. 12	Dec. 16	4	180	50.00	690.84	191.90			690.84	191.90
United Kingdom	Pound	Dec. 16	Dec. 19	4	17-1-0	50.00	58-15-5	172.35			58-15-5	172.35
Hon. Del Clawson:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 29	Dec. 5	6	31,250	50.00	174,625	279.40			174,625	279.40
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 5	Dec. 7	2	2,995	50.00	5,528.7	92.30			5,528.7	92.30
Switzerland	Franc	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	215.67	50.00	394.89	91.55			394.89	91.55
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	3	200	50.00	531.60	132.90	5,213.6	1,303.07	5,745.20	1,435.97
Netherlands	Guilder	Dec. 12	Dec. 16	4	180	50.00	675.54	187.65			675.54	187.65
United Kingdom	Pound	Dec. 16	Dec. 19	4	17-1-0	50.00	63-0-4	184.80			63-0-4	184.80
Hon. Joseph Minish:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 29	Dec. 5	6	31,250	50.00	162,031	259.25			162,031	259.25
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 5	Dec. 7	2	2,995	50.00	5,990	100.00	4,800	80.12	10,790	180.12
Switzerland	Franc	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	215.67	50.00	360.17	83.50			360.17	83.50
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	3	200	50.00	548.20	137.05	4,007.80	1,001.70	4,556	1,138.75
Netherlands	Guilder	Dec. 12	Dec. 16	4	180	50.00	712.80	198.00			712.80	198.00
United Kingdom	Pound	Dec. 16	Dec. 19	4	17-1-0	50.00	60-4-0	176.54			60-4-0	176.54
Hon. Thomas McGrath:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 29	Dec. 5	6	31,250	50.00	165,937	265.50			165,937	265.50
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 5	Dec. 7	2	2,995	50.00	5,840.25	97.50			5,840.25	97.50
Switzerland	Franc	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	215.67	50.00	358.02	83.00			358.02	83.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	3	200	50.00	558	139.50	4,007.8	1,001.70	4,565.8	1,141.20
Netherlands	Guilder	Dec. 12	Dec. 16	4	180	50.00	522	145.00			522	145.00
United Kingdom	Pound	Dec. 16	Dec. 19	4	17-1-0	50.00	61-7-0	180.00	4-3-5	11.63	65-10-5	191.63
Curtis A. Prins:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 27	Dec. 3	7	31,250	50.00	209,375	335.00			203,125	335.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	4	2,995	50.00	11,980	200.00			11,980	200.00
Switzerland	Franc	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	215.67	50.00	431.35	100.00	296.45	68.73	727.80	168.73
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	3	200	50.00	600	150.00	4,128.96	1,032.24	4,728.96	1,182.24
Netherlands	Guilder	Dec. 12	Dec. 16	4	180	50.00	658.51	191.91			651.60	191.91
United Kingdom	Pound	Dec. 16	Dec. 20	4	17-1-0	50.00	51-2-6	150.00			51-2-6	150.00
Richard K. Cook:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 29	Dec. 5	6	31,250	50.00	150,000	240.00			150,000	240.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 5	Dec. 7	2	2,995	50.00	4,492.5	75.00			4,492.5	75.00
Switzerland	Franc	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	215.67	50.00	431.35	100.00			431.35	100.00
Germany	Dentsche mark	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	3	200	50.00	600	150.00	4,094.16	1,023.54	4,694.16	1,173.54
Netherlands	Guilder	Dec. 12	Dec. 16	4	180	50.00	615.40	170.00			615.40	170.00
United Kingdom	Pound	Dec. 16	Dec. 19	4	17-1-0	50.00	47-14-4	140.00			47-14-4	140.00
Total, European trip								5,826.00		6,617.16		12,443.16

FULL COMMITTEE (ASIAN TRIP)

Name and country	Name of currency	Arrival	Departure	Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. William A. Barrett:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 19	Nov. 25	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00			108,000	300.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	286.88	50.00	1,434.40	250.00			1,434.40	250.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 29	Dec. 2	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00	66.70	1.67	4,066.70	101.67
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 2	Dec. 4	3	195.37	50.00	586.12	150.00	147.51	37.75	733.65	187.75
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2	1,032.50	50.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Netherlands	Guilder								9,733.98	2,705.25	9,733.98	2,705.25
Hon. Paul A. Fino:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 19	Nov. 25	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	231,520	643.04	339,520	943.04
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	286.88	50.00	1,434.40	250.00	157.00	27.50	1,591.40	277.50
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 29	Dec. 2	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00	66.66	1.67	4,066.66	101.67
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 2	Dec. 4	3	195.37	50.00	586.12	150.00	147.51	37.75	733.63	187.75
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2	1,032.50	50.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Netherlands	Guilder								4,967.65	1,381.44	4,967.65	1,381.44
Hon. Richard Hanna:												
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 28	Dec. 2	5	286.88	50.00	1,433.15	250.00			1,433.15	250.00
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	5	195.37	50.00	976.87	250.00	245.86	62.92	1,222.73	312.92
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar	Dec. 8	Dec. 10	3	2,000	50.00	6,000	150.00			6,000	150.00
Korea	Won	Dec. 11	Dec. 15	5	13,520	50.00	60,013	221.94			60,013	221.94
Japan	Yen	Dec. 16	Dec. 20	5	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								6,786.72	1,696.26	6,786.72	1,696.26
Hon. Abraham Multer:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 23	Nov. 26	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00	[1] 368,700	[1] 1,024.17	440,700	1,224.17
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 26	Dec. 1	4	286.88	50.00	1,147.50	200.00	[1] 859.90	[1] 149.34	2,007.41	349.34
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	4	195.37	50.00	781.50	200.00	[1]12,907.30	[1] 330.33	13,688.80	530.33
Hon. Leonor Sullivan:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 20	Nov. 25	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	206,350	573.20	296,350	823.20
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	286.88	50.00	1,434.40	250.00			1,434.40	250.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 29	Dec. 2	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00	66.66	1.67	4,066.66	101.67
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 2	Dec. 4	3	195.37	50.00	586.12	150.00	147.51	37.75	733.63	187.75
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2	1,032.50	50.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Netherlands	Guilder								4,816.18	1,338.20	4,816.18	1,338.20

[1] Transportation charges above are full sums paid out and do not show amounts due for refunds on unused tickets not yet received, and which will be paid directly to Treasury Department.

NOTE.—Refund submitted to Treasury Department Mar. 17, 1966, in the amount of $1,103.90.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 613, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kenneth Burrows:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 19	Nov. 25	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	91,760	254.89	199,760	554.89
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	286.88	50.00	1,434.40	250.00	135,000	23.45	1,569.40	273.45
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 29	Dec. 2	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00	66.66	1.67	4,066.66	101.67
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 2	Dec. 4	3	195.37	50.00	586.12	150.00	147.51	37.75	733.65	187.75
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2	1,032.50	50.00	2,065	100.00	2,800	135.59	4,865	235.59
Netherlands	Guilder								8,892.42	2,471.24	8,892.42	2,471.24
Mary W. Layton:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 19	Nov. 25	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	151,450	420.69	259,450	720.69
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	286.88	50.00	1,434.40	250.00	257.80	4.77	1,692.20	254.77
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 29	Dec. 2	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00	66.66	1.67	4,066.66	101.67
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 2	Dec. 4	3	195.37	50.00	586.12	150.00	147.51	37.75	733.63	187.75
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2	1,032.50	50.00	2,065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								5,403.17	1,350.45	5,403.17	1,350.45
Total (Asian trip)								6,021.94		14,789.83		20,811.77

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent), total European and Asian trips	33,254.93

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency.

MARCH 15, 1966.

Report of expenditures of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 596, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John H. Dent:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 15	Nov. 19	5	18,000	$50	90,000	$250	7,200	$20.00	97,200	$270.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 20	1	2,000	50	2,000	50			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 20	Nov. 23	4	2,868.75	50	1,147.50	200	112	19.48	1,259.59	219.48
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 23	Nov. 24	1	1,032.50	50	1,032.50	50	450	22.50	1,482.50	72.50
India	Rupee	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	2	236.87	50	473.74	100			473.74	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 26	Nov. 29	3	1,500	50	4,500	150	866	28.87	5,366	178.87
West Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 29	Dec. 3	5	200	50	1,000	250			1,000	250.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	5	31,250	50	156,250	250			156,250	250.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	2,995	50	5,990	100			5,990	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	4	245	50	980	200			980	200.00
Subtotal						50		1,600		90.85		1,690.85
Dave Martin:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 29	Dec. 3	5	200	50	1,000	250		514.50	1,000	764.50
Italy	Lira	Dec. 3	Dec. 5	2	31,250	50	156,250	250		88.20	156,250	338.20
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 5	Dec. 9	6	2,995	50	5,990	100			5,990	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245	50	980	200		81.50	980	331.50
Subtotal						50		800		684.20		1,533.20
Augustus F. Hawkins:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 15	Nov. 19	5	18,000	50	90,000	250	7,200	20.00	7,200	270.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 20	1	2,000	50	2,000	50			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 20	Nov. 23	4	286.875	50	1,147.50	200	112	19.48	1,259.50	219.48
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 23	Nov. 24	1	1,032.50	50	1,032.50	50	450	22.50	1,482.50	72.50
India	Rupee	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	2	236.87	50	473.74	100			473.74	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 26	Nov. 29	3	1,500	50	4,500	150	866	28.87	5,366	178.87
West Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 29	Dec. 3	5	200	50	1,000	250			1,000	250.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	5	31,250	50	156,250	250			156,250	250.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	2,995	50	5,990	100			5,990	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	4	245	50	980	200		69.60	980	269.60
Subtotal						50		1,600		160.45		1,760.45
William Ayres: Japan	Yen	Nov. 15	Nov. 19	5	18,000	50	90,000	250	7,200	1,585.50	97,200	1,835.50
Patsy T. Mink:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 15	Nov. 19	5	18,000	50	90,000	250	7,200	20.00	97,200	270.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 20	1	2,000	50	2,000	50			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 20	Nov. 23	4	286.875	50	1,147.50	200	112	19.48	1,259.50	219.48
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 23	Nov. 24	1	1,032.50	50	1,032.500	50	450	22.50	1,482.50	72.50
India	Rupee	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	2	236.87	50	473.74	50			473.47	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 26	Nov. 29	3	1,500	50	4,500	50	866	28.87	5,366	78.87
West Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 29	Dec. 3	2	200	50	400	100		437.00	400	537.00
Subtotal						50		850		437.00		1,327.85

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 596, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—**Continued**

FULL COMMITTEE (EUROPEAN TRIP)—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
William Ford:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 15	Nov. 19	5	18,000	50	90,000	250	7,200	20.00	7,200	270.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 20	1	2,000	50	2,000	50			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 20	Nov. 23	4	2,868.75	50	1,147.50	200	112	19.48	1,259.50	219.48
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 23	Nov. 24	1	1,032.50	50	1,032.50	50	450	22.50	1,482.50	72.50
India	Rupee	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	2	236.87	50	473.74	100			473.74	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 26	Nov. 29	3	1,500	50	4,500	150	866	28.87	5,366	178.87
West Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 29	Dec. 3	5	200	50	1,000	250			1,000	250.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	5	31,250	50	156,250	250			156,250	250.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	2,995	50	5,990	100			5,990	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	4	245	50	980	200		37.60	980	237.60
Subtotal						50		1,600		108.45		1,728.45
Robert E. Vagley:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 15	Nov. 19	5	18,000	50	90,000	250	7,200	20.00	97,200	270.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 20	1	2,000	50	2,000	50			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 20	Nov. 23	4	2,868.75	50	1,147.50	200	112	19.48	1,259.50	219.48
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 23	Nov. 24	1	1,032.50	50	1,032.50	50	450	22.50	1,482.50	72.50
India	Rupee	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	2	236.87	50	473.74	100			473.74	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 26	Nov. 29	3	1,500	50	4,500	150	866	28.87	5,366	178.87
West Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 29	Dec. 3	5	200	50	1,000	250			1,000	250.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 3	Nov. 7	5	31,250	50	156,250	250			156,250	250.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	2,995	50	5,990	100			5,990	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	4	245	50	980	200			980	200.00
Subtotal						50		1,600		90.35		1,690.85
Charles Radcliffe:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 15	Nov. 19	5	18,000	50	90,000	250	7,200	20.00	97,200	270.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 19	Nov. 20	1	2,000	50	2,000	50			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 20	Nov. 23	4	286.875	50	1147.50	200	112	19.48	1,259.50	219.48
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 23	Nov. 24	1	1,032.50	50	1,032.50	50	450	22.50	1,482.50	219.48
India	Rupee	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	2	236.87	50	473.74	100			473.74	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 26	Nov. 29	3	1,500	50	4,500	150	866	28.87	5,366	178.87
West Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 29	Dec. 3	5	200	50	1,000	250			1,000	250.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	5	31,250	50	156,250	250			156,250	250.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 7	Dec. 19	2	2,995	50	5,990	100			5,990	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	4	245	50	980	200			980	200.00
Subtotal						50		1,600		90.35		1,690.85
Total						50		9,900		3,247.15		13,258.00

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	13,258.00
Government Department: Defense (Air Force)	145.03
Total	13,403.03

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.
JOHN H. DENT,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education.

FEBRUARY 3, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 616, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 6

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. James G. O'Hara:												
Netherlands	Guilder								1,816.55	[1] 503.20	1,816.55	503.20
United Kingdom	Pound	Dec. 27	[2]Dec. 31	5	17-17-2	50	40-10-8	124.80			44-10-8	124.80
James B. Harrison:												
Netherlands	Guilder								3,195.39	[1] 885.15	3,195.39	885.15
United Kingdom	Pound	Dec. 27	[2]Dec. 31	5	17-17-2	50	71-13-4	200.72			71-13-4	200.72
Total						100.00		325.52		1,388.35		1,713.87

---

[1] This amount was for the purchase of airplane tickets for the entire trip. The tickets were purchased through the State Department and the American Embassy in the Hague.

[2] The trip continued in the United Kingdom, and to Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, beyond Dec. 31, 1965. The 1966 expenditures (except for air fare, which is included here) will be reported at the appropriate time.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,713.87
Total	1,713.87

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.
ELMER J. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Labor, No. 6.

FEBRUARY 8, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 84, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Thomas E. Morgan:												
France	Franc	Dec. 8	Dec. 10	3	245	50	735	150.00	90.65	18.50	825.65	168.50
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 10	Dec. 13	2	3,250	50	6,500	100.00	715	11.00	7,215	111.00
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	2	1,288	50	2,576	100.00	178.50	6.93	2,754.50	106.93
Italy	Lire	Dec. 14	Dec. 16	2	31,250	50	62,500	100.00	16,750	26.80	79,250	126.80
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 16	Dec. 18	2	2,995	50	5,990	100.00	539	9.00	6,529	109.00
Subtotal								550.00		72.23		662.23
Hon. Clement J. Zablocki:												
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 10	Dec. 13	2	3,250	50	6,500	100.00	715	11.00	7,215	111.00
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	2	1,288	50	2,576	100.00	178.50	6.93	2,754.50	106.93
Italy	Lira	Dec. 14	Dec. 16	2	31,250	50	62,500	100.00	16,750	26.80	79,250	126.80
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 16	Dec. 17	1	2,995	50	2,995	50.00	1,317.80	22.00	4,312.80	72.00
Subtotal								350.00		66.73		416.73
Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher:												
Switzerland	Franc	Sept. 14	Sept. 16	3	215.63	50	646.90	150.00			646.90	150.00
Do	Guilder								2,892.00	804.23	2,892.00	804.23
Subtotal								150.00		804.23		954.23
Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	2	31,250	50	62,500	100.00			62,500	100.00
Tunisia	Dinar	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1½	26.050	50	39.075	75.00			39.075	75.00
Ethiopia	Ethiopian dollar.	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	2	124.06	50	248.12	100.00			248.12	100.00
Kenya	East African shilling.	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	354.68	50	709.36	100.00			709.36	100.00
Uganda	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	354.35	50	354.35	50.00	158.37	22.04	512.72	72.04
Congo (Léopoldville)	Franc	Dec. 6	Dec. 7	1	7,500	50	7,500	50.00			7,500	50.00
Nigeria	Pound	Dec. 7	Dec. 8	2	17–14–2	50	35–8–4	100.00			35–8–4	100.00
Ivory Coast	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	12,250	50	12,250	50.00			12,250	50.00
Senegal	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	2	12,250	50	18,375	75.00	6,818	27.81	25,193	102.81
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 12	Dec. 13	2	2,995	50	5,990	100.00	2,383	39.78	8,373	139.78
Subtotal								800.00		89.63		889.63
Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	3	31,250	50	93,750	150.00			93,750	150.00
Tunisia	Dinar	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1½	26.050	50	21,075	40.45			21.075	40.45
Ethiopia	Ethiopian dollar.	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	2	124.06	50	248.12	100.00			248.12	100.00
Kenya	East African shilling.	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	354.68	50	709.36	100.00			709.36	100.00
Uganda	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	354.35	50	354.35	50.00	158.37	22.04	512.72	72.04
Congo (Léopoldville)	Franc	Dec. 6	Dec. 7	1	7,500	50	7,500	50.00			7,500	50.00
Nigeria	Pound	Dec. 7	Dec. 8	2	17.14.2	50	35.8.4	100.00			35.8.4	100.00
Ivory Coast	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	12,250	50	12,250	50.00			12,250	50.00
Senegal	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	2	12,250	50	18,375	75.00	6,818	27.81	25,193	102.81
Do	Deutsche mark								3706.0	926.50	3706.0	926.50
Subtotal								715.45		976.35		1,691.80
Hon. Clement J. Zablocki:												
England	Pound	June 11	June 12	2	17.17.11	50	35.15.10	100.00	8.19.5	25.00	44.15.3	125.00
Poland	Zloty	June 12	June 19	7	3,250	50	13,000	200.00	32,254.4	1,140.70	45,254.4	1,340.70
Do	British pound	do	do				17–17–11	50.00			17–17–11	50.00
Do	Koruna	do	do				1,435	100.00			1,435	100.00
Czechoslovakia	do	June 19	June 21	1	187	50	718	50.00	179.38	12.50	897.38	62.50
Austria	Schilling	June 21	June 23	2	1,286	50	2,752	100.00	851.60	32.70	3,423.6	132.70
Italy	Lira	June 23	June 25	3	31,250	50	93,750	150.00	66,173	105.88	159,923	255.88
Subtotal								750.00		1,361.78		2,066.78
Hon. Edward R. Roybal:												
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 9	Nov. 14	5	204	50	[1] 840	205.88	475	116.42	1,315	322.30
Peru	Sol	Nov. 14	Nov. 16	2	1,310	50	2,620	100.00			2,620	100.00
Dominican Republic	Peso	Nov. 16	Nov. 19	3	50	50	150	150.00			150	150.00
Do	Guilder	do	do						3,850.24	1,070.70	3,850.24	1,070.70
Subtotal								455.88		1,187.12		1,643.00
Hon. Wayne L. Hays:												
France	Franc	May 3	May 6	4	245	50	980	200.00	2,378	485.20	3,368	685.20
England	Pound	May 7	May 8	2	17–16–3	50	35–14–6	100.00				100.00
Hon. Vernon W. Thomson: France	Franc	May 3	May 4	1	245	50	239.60	48.90				48.90
Boyd Crawford:												
France	do	do	May 6	4	245	50	980	200.00	2,378	485.20	3,368	685.20
England	Pound	May 7	May 8	2	17–16–3	50	35–14–6	100.00				100.00
Subtotal								648.90		970.40		1,619.30
Hon. Wayne L. Hays: Bermuda	Pound	Feb. 23	Feb. 28	6	17–17–2	50	107– 3–0	300.00	18–15–0	52.50	125–18–0	352.50

---

[1] Reflects return of $44.12 (180 escudos).

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 84, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. F. Bradford Morse:												
Peru	Sol	July 14	July 15	1	1,340	50	1,340	50.00			1,340	50.00
Do	Deutsche mark								2,508	627.00	2,508	627.00
Switzerland	Franc	Aug. 27	Aug. 31	5	215.70	50	1,033.5	239.63			1,033.5	239.63
France	do	Aug. 31	Sept. 1	1	245.00	50	245.0	50.00			245.0	50.00
Do	Dutch guilder								3,024	840.93	3,024	840.93
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 7	Nov. 12	5½	204.00	50	818.50	[1] 200.61	475.0	116.42	1,293.5	317.03
Do	Dutch guilder								2,593.9	713.00	2,593.9	713.00
Subtotal								540.24		2,297.35		2,837.59
Hon. E. Ross Adair:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	2	31,250	50	62,500	100.00			62,500	100.00
Tunisia	Dinar	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1½	26.050	50	39.075	75.00			39.075	75.00
Ethiopia	Ethiopian dollar.	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	2	124.06	50	248.12	100.00			248.12	100.00
Kenya	EA shilling	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	354.68	50	709.36	100.00			709.36	100.00
Uganda	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	354.35	50	354.35	50.00	158.37	22.04	512.72	72.04
Congo (Leopoldville)	Franc	Dec. 6	Dec. 7	1	7,500	50	7,500	50.00			7,500	50.00
Nigeria	Pound	Dec. 7	Dec. 8	2	17-14-2	50	35-8-4	100.00			35-8-4	100.00
Ivory Coast	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	12,250	50	12,250	50.00			12,250	50.00
Senegal	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	2	12,250	50	18,375	75.00	6,818	27.81	25,193	102.81
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 12	Dec. 13	2	2,995	50	5,990	100.00	2,383	39.78	8,373	139.78
Total								800.00		89.63		889.63
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	2	31,250	50	62,500	100.00			62,500	100.00
Tunisia	Dinar	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1½	26.050	50	39.075	75.00			39.075	75.00
Ethiopia	Ethiopia dollar	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	2	124.06	50	248.12	100.00			248.12	100.00
Kenya	EA shilling	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	354.68	50	709.36	100.00			709.36	100.00
Uganda	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	354.35	50	354.35	50.00	158.37	22.04	512.72	72.04
Congo (Leopoldville)	Franc	Dec. 6	Dec. 7	1	7,500	50	7,500	50.00			7,500	50.00
Nigeria	Pound	Dec. 7	Dec. 8	2	17-14-2	50	35-8-4	100.00			35-8-4	100.00
Ivory Coast	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	12,250	50	12,250	50.00			12,250	50.00
Senegal	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	2	12,250	50	18,375	75.00	6,818	27.81	25,193	102.81
Spain	Pesta	Dec. 12	Dec. 13	2	2,995	50	5,990	100.00	2,383	39.78	8,373	139.78
Total								800.00		89.63		889.63
Hon. John C. Culver:												
Philippines	Peso	Oct. 18	Oct. 20	3	194.85	50	584.55	150.00			584.55	150.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Oct. 20	Oct. 22	2	287.25	50	575.50	100.00	143.25	26.56	728.75	126.56
Vietnam	Piasters	Oct. 22	Oct. 27	4	3,830.0	50	14,554	200.00			14,554	200.00
Thailand	Baht	Oct. 27	Oct. 30	4	1,042.5	50	4,130	200.00			4,130	200.00
India	Rupee	Nov. 1	Nov. 4	4	236.81	50	430.01	91.34			430.01	91.34
Lebanon	Lebanese pound	Nov. 7	Nov. 10	3¼	130.0	50	487.5	159.05			487.5	159.05
Israel	Israel pound	Nov. 10	Nov. 12	3	150.0	50	300.0	100.00	206.9	68.97	506.9	168.97
	Dinar				17.825	50	.400	1.15			.400	1.15
	Deutsche mark								8,512.2	2,127.52	8,512.2	2,127.52
Total								1,001.54		2,223.05		3,224.59
Hon. Edna F. Kelly: Bermuda	Pound	Feb. 23	Mar. 1	7	17/17/2	50	125	350			125	350
Total								350				350
Hon. Clement J. Zablocki:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	76,020	211.18	184,020	511.18
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			270.41	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.35	115.79	1,231.15	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	626.00	132.15	1,099.81	232.15
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.28	32	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	3	245.00	50	490.00	100.00			490.00	100.00
Total								1,390.00		559.00		1,949.09
Hon. Wayne L. Hays:												
Colombia	Peso	Jan. 24	Jan. 28	5	650	50	3,250	250.00	1,564	120.38	4,164	370.38
Mexico	do	Jan. 29	Feb. 1	4	624.50	50	2,496	200.00	828.61	66.50	3,326.61	266.50
Transportation	Deutsche mark								3,202.60	805.69	3,202.60	805.69
Boyd Crawford:												
Colombia	Peso	Jan. 24	Jan. 28	5	650	50	3,250	250.00	1,546	120.38	4,164	370.38
Mexico	do	Jan. 29	Feb. 1	4	624.50	50	2,496	200.00	828.61	66.50	3,326.61	266.50
Transportation	Deutsche mark								3,476.00	874.47	3,476.00	874.47
Subtotal								900.00		2,053.92		2,953.92
Hon. Harris B. McDowell, Jr.:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	76,020	211.18	184,020	511.18
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	626.00	132.15	1,099.81	232.15
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.28	32	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245.00	50	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
Subtotal								1,440.00		559.09		1,999.09

[1] Reflects return of $74.39 (303.5 escudos).

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 84, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. William Murphy:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	76,020	211.18	184,020	511.18
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	626.00	132.15	1,099.81	232.15
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.28	32	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245.00	50	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
Subtotal								1,440.00		559.09		1,999.09
Hon. Ronald B. Cameron:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	76,020	211.18	184,020	511.18
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00	700.00	33.90	4,830.00	233.90
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	626.00	132.15	1,099.81	232.15
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.28	32	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245.00	50	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
Subtotal								1,440.00		592.99		2,032.99
Hon. Donald M. Fraser:												
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 7	Nov. 14	7	204.00	50	1,212.00	[3] 297.08	475.00	116.42	1,687.00	413.50
Peru	Sol	Nov. 14	Nov. 16	2	1,310.00	50	2,620.00	100.00			2,620.00	100.00
Dominican Republic	Peso	Nov. 16	Nov. 9	3	50.00	50	61.00	[4] 61.00			61.00	61.00
Do	Guilder								3,271.64	909.80	3,271.64	909.80
Subtotal								458.08		1,026.22		1,484.30
Hon. Dante B. Fascell:												
England	Pound	Jan. 28	Feb. 2	6	17.18.0	50	107.8.7	299.82	76.2.6	212.46	183.11.1	512.28
Italy	Lira	Feb. 3	Feb. 6	4	31,250	50	125,000	200.00	35,910	57.45	160,910	257.45
	Netherland guilder.								2,666.15	742.25	2,666.15	742.25
Marian A. Czarnecki:												
England	Pound	Jan. 28	Feb. 2	6	17.18.0	50	107.8.7	299.82	76.2.6	212.46	183.11.1	512.28
Italy	Lira	Feb. 3	Feb. 6	4	31,250	50	125,000	200.00	35,910	57.45	160,910	257.45
	Netherland guilder.								2,731.66	760.48	2,731.66	760.48
Subtotal								999.64		2,042.55		3,042.19
Hon. William S. Mailliard: Bermuda.	Pound	Feb. 23	Mar. 1	7	17.17.2	50	125	350			125	350
Subtotal								350.00				350
Hon. William S. Mailliard: Brazil.	Cruzeiro	Nov. 14	Nov. 30	16	110,190	50	1,763,040	800.00	928,650	508.85	3,691,690	1,308.85
Subtotal								800.00		508.85		1,308.85
Hon. William Broomfield:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	76,020	211.18	184,020	511.18
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	626.00	132.15	1,099.81	232.15
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.28	32	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245.00	50	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
Subtotal								1,440.00		559.09		1,999.09
Hon. J. Irving Whalley:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	76.020	211.18	184,020	511.18
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	626.00	132.15	1,099.81	232.15
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.26	34	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245.00	50	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
Subtotal								1,440.00		559.09		1,999.09

---

[3] Reflects return of $52.92 (216 escudos).

[4] Reflects return of $89.00 (89 pesos).

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 84, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Vernon W. Thomson:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	76,020	211.18	184,020	511.18
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	744.50	157.15	1,099.81	257.15
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.20	32	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245.00	50	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
Subtotal								1,440.00		584.09		2,024.09
Hon. Wayne L. Hays:												
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 7	Dec. 12	6	285	50	1,721.25	298.93	6,103.00	1,059.92	6,665.50	1,358.85
Thailand	do	Dec. 13	Dec. 15	3	285	50	855	149.34			855.00	150.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 16	Dec. 17	2	31,250	50	62,500	100.00				100.00
England	Pound	Dec. 18	Dec. 22	5	17-16-3	50	89-4-0	248.94	30-7-1	85.00	119-10-1	333.94
Boyd Crawford:												
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 7	Dec. 12	6	285	50	1,721.25	298.93	6,103.00	1,059.92	6,665.50	1,358.85
Thailand	do	Dec. 13	Dec. 15	3	285	50	855	149.34				150.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 16	Dec. 17	2	31,250	50	62,500	100.00				100.00
England	Pound	Dec. 18	Dec. 22	5	17-16-3	50	89-4-0	248.94	30-7-1	85.00	119-10-1	333.94
Subtotal								1,595.74		2,289.84		3,885.58
Hon. James G. Fulton:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 15	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	39,900	110.84	147,900	410.84
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	313.00	66.08	786.81	166.08
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.26	32	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	2	245.00	50	490.00	100.00			490.00	100.00
Subtotal								1,390.00		392.68		1,782.68
Philip B. Billings: Bermuda	Pound	Feb. 23	Mar. 1	7	17.17.2	50	125	350.00			125	350.00
Subtotal								350.00				350.00
Harry C. Cromer:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	76,180	211.63	184,180	511.63
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00	8,825.00	220.63	10,825.00	320.63
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	1,318.52	278.23	1,792.33	378.23
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.28	32	306.56	64.00	140.00	29.55	446.56	93.55
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245.00	50	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
Subtotal								1,440.00		955.80		2,395.80
John P. White:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	6	18,000	50	108,000	300.00	579.60	161.01	165,960	461.01
Korea	Won	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	13,520	50	27,041	100.00			27,041	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1		26		26.00				26.00
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	194.95	50	779.80	200.00	451.36	115.79	1,231.16	315.79
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 23	Nov. 25	2	2,000.00	50	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	3	286.87	50	860.63	150.00	575.65	99.97	1,436.28	249.97
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	826.00	50	4,130.00	200.00			4,130.00	200.00
India	Rupee	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	4	118.50	25	473.81	100.00	313.00	66.08	786.81	166.08
Pakistan	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	2	153.28	32	306.56	64.00			306.56	64.00
Turkey	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	1	450.00	50	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
France	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	3	245.00	50	735.00	150.00			735.00	150.00
Subtotal								1,440.00		442.85		1,882.85
Franklin J. Schupp:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	2	31,250	50	62,500	100.00			62,500	100.00
Tunisia	Dinar	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1½	26.050	50	17.163	32.94			17.163	32.94
Ethiopia	Ethiopian dollar.	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	2	124.03	50	248.06	100.00			248.06	100.00
Kenya	East African shilling.	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	354.68	50	709.36	100.00			709.36	100.00
Uganda	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	354.35	50	354.35	50.00	158.37	22.04	512.72	72.04
Congo (Leopoldville)	Franc	Dec. 6	Dec. 7	1	7,500	50.	7,500	50.00			7,500	50.00
Nigeria	Pound	Dec. 7	Dec. 8	2	17-14-2	50	35.8.4	100.00			35-8-4	100.00
Ivory Coast	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	12,250	50	12,250	50.00			12,250	50.00
Senegal	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	2	12,250	50	18,375	75.00	6,818	27.81	25,193	102.81
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 12	Dec. 13	2	2,995	50	5,990	100.00	2,383	39.78	8,373	139.78
Subtotal								757.94		89.63		847.57

Report of expenditures of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 84, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Louise O'Brien:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	2	31,250	50	62,500	100			62,500	100.00
Tunisia	Dinar	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1½	26.050	50	19.075	36.61			19.075	36.61
Ethiopia	Eth dollar	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	2	124.06	50	248.12	100			248.12	100.00
Kenya	EA shilling	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	354.68	50	709.36	100			709.36	100.00
Uganda	do	Dec. 5	Dec. 6	1	354.35	50	354.35	50	158.37	22.04	512.72	72.04
Congo (Léopoldville)	Congo franc	Dec. 6	Dec. 7	1	7,500	50	7,500	50			7,500	50.00
Nigeria	Pound	Dec. 7	Dec. 8	2	17–14–2	50	35.8.8	100			35–8–8	100.00
Ivory Coast	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	12,250	50	12,250	50			12,250	50.00
Senegal	do	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	1½	12,250	50	18,375	75	6,818	27.81	25,193	102.81
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 12	Dec. 13	1	2,995	50	5,990	100	2,383	39.78	8,373	139.78
Subtotal								761.61		89.63		851.24
Nicholas Feld:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	2	31,250	50	62,500	100.00			62,500	100.00
Tunisia	Dinar	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1½	26.050	50	20.218	38.81			20.218	38.81
Ethiopia	Eth dollar	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	2	124.03	50	248.06	100.00			248.06	100.00
Kenya	EA shilling	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	354.68	50	709.36	100.00			709.36	100.00
Uganda	EA shilling	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	354.35	50	354.35	50.00	158.37	22.04	512.72	72.04
Congo (Leopoldville)	Congo franc	Dec. 6	Dec. 7	1	7,500	50	7,500	50.00			7,500	50.00
Nigeria	Pound	Dec. 7	Dec. 8	2	17.14.2	50	35.8.4	100.00			35.8.4	100.00
Ivory Coast	Franc	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	1	12,250	50	12,250	50.00			12,250	50.00
Senegal	Franc	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	2	12,250	50	18,375	75.00	6,818	27.81	25,193	102.81
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 12	Dec. 13	2	2,995	50	5,990	100.00	2,383	39.78	8,373	139.78
Subtotal								763.81		89.63		853.44
Melvin O. Benson:												
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 7	Nov. 14	7	204	50	1,351	[3] 331.12	475	116.42	1,826	447.54
Peru	Sol	Nov. 14	Nov. 16	2	1,310	50	2,640	100.00			2,620	100.00
Dominican Republic	Peso	Nov. 16	Nov. 19	3	50.00	50	150.00	150.00			150.00	150.00
Do	Guilder								3,271.64	909.80	3,271.64	909.80
Subtotal								581.12		1,026.22		1,607.34
Marian A. Czarnecki:												
Japan	Yen	Oct. 24 Nov. 6	Oct. 25 Nov. 7	3	18,000	50	54,000	150.00	7,560	21.00	61,560	171.00
Thailand	Baht	Oct. 25	Nov. 2	9	1,032.5	50	9,292.5	450.00	595.6	24.00	9,788.1	474.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 2	Nov. 6	3	286.88	50	860.64	150.00	200.00	34.85	1,060.64	184.85
Do	Deutsche mark								6,566.44	1,641.20	6,566.44	1,641.20
Subtotal								750.00		1,721.05		2,471.05
Marian A. Czarnecki:												
England	Pound	June 11	June 12	2	17-17-11	50	35-15-10	100.00	8-19-5	25.00	44-15-3	125.00
Poland	Zloty	June 12	June 19	7	3,250	50	22,750	350.00	23,254	1,140.70	55,004	1,490.70
Czechoslovakia	Krona	June 19	June 21	1	718	50	718	50.00	179.38	12.50	897.38	62.50
Austria	Schilling	June 21	June 23	2	1,286	50	2,572	100.00	851.60	32.70	3,423.6	132.70
Italy	Lira	June 23	June 25	3	31,250	50	93,750	150.00	66,173	105.88	159,923	255.88
Subtotal								750.00		1,316.78		2,066.78

[3] Reflects return of $18.88 (77 escudos).

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	60,583.76

THOMAS E. MORGAN, *Chairman.*

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name	Appropriated funds, U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem, U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation, U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total, U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
MASTER RECAPITULATION BY SUBCOMMITTEE				
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman	103.45	852.31	2,196.78	3,152.54
Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman		1,505.01	2,599.38	4,104.39
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman	3,591.75	9,800.37	14,325.41	27,717.53
Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, Hon. John S. Monagan, chairman		5,650.00	7,796.64	13,446.64
Total	3,695.20	17,807.69	26,918.21	48,421.10

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	44,725.90
Appropriated funds	3,695.20
Total	48,421.10

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 18, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Elmer W. Henderson, counsel:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 11	Nov. 17	7		50	85,000	236.11	15,069	41.89	100,069	278.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	3		50	595	103.00	50.63	9.56	645.63	112.56
India	Rupees	Nov. 19	Nov. 26	8		50	1,050	220.50	271.25	56.70	1,321.25	277.20
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 26	Nov. 30	5		50	280	70.70	74.00	18.73	354.50	89.43
France	Franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 5	6		50	1,085	222.00	220.00	45.00	1,305.00	267.00
Round-trip air transportation for above trip, purchased by the Department of State, Washington, D.C., prior to departure.										2,024.90		2,024.90
Total						50		852.31		2,196.78		3,049.09

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	3,049.09
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 109, 89th Cong	103.45
Total	3,152.54

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Military Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Subcommittee recapitulation:												
Hon. William S. Moorhead								718.67		1,271.90		1,990.57
Mr. Herbert Roback								786.34		1,327.48		2,113.82
Subtotal								1,505.01		2,599.38		4,104.39
Hon. William S. Moorhead:												
Japan (returned 24,300 yen: $67.50).	Yen	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	2	18,000	50	11,700	32.50			11,700	32.50
Thailand (returned 26 baht: $1.26).	Baht	Nov. 29	Dec. 1	2	1,032.50	50	2,039	98.74			2,039	98.74
Philippines (returned 187 pesos: $47.98).	Peso	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	4	50.12	50	594.50	152.51			594.50	152.51
Vietnam (returned 7,000 piasters: $96.19).	Piaster	Dec. 4	Dec. 7	4	3,638.50	50	7,554	103.81			7,554	103.81
Hong Kong (returned HK $10: $1.74).	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2½	285	50	678.25	117.79			678.25	117.79
India (returned 440 rupees: $92.44).	Rupee	Dec. 10	Dec. 12	3	238	50	271	56.93			271	56.93
Karachi (returned 107 rupees: $22.23).	do	Dec. 12	Dec. 14	1	240.50	50	132.50	27.54			132.50	27.54
United Arab Republic (returned 2.30 Egyptian pounds; $5.30).	Egyptian pound	Dec. 14	Dec. 15	1¼	16.950	50	22.70	52.32			22.70	52.32
France (returned 115 francs: $23.47).	Franc	Dec. 15	Dec. 16	2	245	50	375	76.53			375	76.53
Airline transportation furnished by the Department of State for above itinerary—Manila to Saigon to Hong Kong to New Delhi to Karachi to Cairo to Paris, to New York, to Washington, D.C.										1,271.90		1,271.90
Subtotal						50		718.67		1,271.90		1,990.57
Mr. Herbert Roback:												
Japan (returned to Embassy representative, 61,500 yen: $170.83).	Yen	Sept. 19	Sept. 24	6	18,000	50	46,500	129.17	11,640	32.33	58,140	161.50
Taiwan (returned to Embassy representative, 2,523 dollars: $63.08).	New Taiwan dollar.	Sept. 24	Sept. 26	2	2,000	50	1,477	36.92			1,477	36.92
Hong Kong (returned to State Department, $100.00).	Hong Kong dollar.	Sept. 26	Sept. 29	4	285	50	576	100.00			576	100.00
Singapore (returned to Embassy representative, 135.00 Malay dollars: $44.29).	Malay dollar	Sept. 29	Oct. 1	2	151.80	50	168.50	55.71			168.60	55.71
India (returned to Embassy representative, 200.00 rupees: $42.02).	Rupee	Oct. 1	Oct. 5	3	71.17	15	13.52	2.84			13.52	2.84
Israel (returned to Embassy representative, 320 pounds: $106.67).	Israel pound	Oct. 5	Oct. 8	4	125	50	280	93.33			280	93.33
France (returned to Embassy representative, 400 francs: $81.63).	Franc	Oct. 8	Oct. 15	6	245	50	1,070	218.37			1,070	218.37
Great Britain (returned to State Department representative $150.00).	Pound	Oct. 15	Oct. 21	6	17-7-1	50	53-5-3	150.00			15-5-3	150.00

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Military Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Con.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mr. Herbert Roback—Con.												
Round-trip airline transportation, furnished by Department of State, reading Washington, D.C.; Tokyo; Taipei; Hong Kong; Singapore; Tel Aviv; Paris; London; and return to Washington.										1-295-15		1,295.15
Total								786.34		1,327.48		2,113.82

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
SUBCOMMITTEE RECAPITULATION												
Hon. John E. Moss								350.00		794.40		1,144.40
Vincent J. Augliere						13.75		350.00		794.40		1,158.15
Hon. John E. Moss						715.60		1,240.00		2,532.95		4,488.55
Hon. Robert P. Griffin						715.60		650.00		1,130.40		2,496.00
Hon. Torbert H. Macdonald								650.00		1,143.25		1,793.25
Hon. Henry Helstoski								1,431.00		1,046.71		2,477.71
Vincent J. Augliere						715.60		1,250.00		790.20		2,755.80
Michael Gasso						715.60		1,250.00		790.20		2,755.80
Anton Papich, Jr.						715.60		1,250.00		790.20		2,755.80
Hon. David S. King								567.37		2,290.30		2,857.67
Louis I. Freed								812.00		2,222.40		3,034.40
Total						3,591.75		9,800.37		14,325.41		27,717.53
Congressman John E. Moss:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 20	4		50.00		200.00				200.00
England	Pound	June 20	June 22	3		50.00		150.00				150.00
Round-trip airline transportation, Washington, D.C., to England to France and return, for Congressman Moss, furnished prior to departure, by Department of State.										794.40		794.40
Subtotal						50.00		350.00		794.40		1,144.40
Vincent J. Augliere:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 20	4		50.00		200.00				200.00
England	Pound	June 20	June 22	3		50.00		150.00				150.00
Round-trip airline transportation, Washington, D.C., to England to France and return, furnished by Department of State prior to departure, for above itinerary.										794.40		794.40
Subtotal						50.00		350.00		794.40		1,144.40

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,144.40
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 109	13.75
Total	1,158.15

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

JULY 1, 1965.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John E. Moss:												
France	Franc	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	245	50.00	980	200.00	1.281.28	261.54	2,261.28	461.54
Great Britain	Pound	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	3	17-16-9	50.00	53-10-3	150.00	107-6-6	300.98	160-16-9	450.98
Ireland	do	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1	17-16-8	50.00	17-16-8	50.00	39-18-11	112.00	57-15-7	162.00
Denmark	Krone	Nov. 19	Nov. 21	3	344.28	50.00	1,032.84	150.00				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50.00	1,682.34	244.49	2,370.90	344.49
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	200	50.00	1,000	250.00				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50.00	646.86	161.72	1,446.86	361.72
Italy	Lira	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	31,250	50.00	156,250	250.00				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50.00	129,656	206.65	254,156	406.65
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 29	Dec. 1	2	1,500	50.00	3,000	100.00				
Returned to U.S. Embassy, Athens, unused.							311	−10.00	1,575	52.50	3,214	142.50
France	Franc	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	245	50.00	735	150.00				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50.00	768.92	156.93	1,258.92	256.93
Madrid (Spain)	Peseta	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	2,995	50.00	5,990	−100.00				
Returned to U.S. Embassy, Madrid.								50.00	2,995	50.00	5,990	100.00
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2	1,429.50	50.00	2,850	100.00	5,600	195.94	8,459	295.94
Transportation furnished by Department of State for above itinerary (excluding that furnished by the military).										790.20		790.20
Total								1,240.00		2,532.95		3,772.95

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	3,772.95
Appropriated funds: Government Department: Defense (transportation)	715.60
Total	4,488.55

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Robert P. Griffin:												
Great Britain	Pound	Nov. 22	Nov. 25	4	17.16.8	50	71.6.8	200			71.6.8	200.00
Italy	Lira	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	31,250	50	156,250	250				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50	80,625	129.00	205,625	329.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 29	Dec. 1	2	1,500	50	3,000	100	1,575	52.50	4,575	152.50
France	Franc	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	4	245	50	980	200				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50	777.62	158.70	1,512.62	308.70
Transportation furnished by Department of State for above itinerary (excluding that furnished by the military).										790.20		790.20
Total								650		1,130.40		1,780.40

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,780.40
Appropriated funds: Government Department: Department of Defense	715.60
Total	2,496.00

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

CXII——394—Part 5

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Torbert H. Macdonald:												
Malaysia (Singapore)	Malayan dollars	Nov. 16	Nov. 19	3	151.5	50	454.55	150.00			454.55	150.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 21	Nov. 22	1	1,032.5	50	1,032.5	50.00	600	29.06	1,632.50	79.06
Australia	Pound	Nov. 24	Dec. 3	9	22-5-8	50	201-1-2	450.00			201-1-2	450.00
Commercial airline transportation furnished by Department of State reading Saigon-Singapore; Singapore-Sydney; Sydney-New York; New York-Boston, in the amount of.	Guilders								4,006.61	1,114.19		1,114.19
Total								650.00		1,143.25		1,793.25
Congressman Macdonald undertook investigation on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations—Saigon as per above accounting.												
Hon. Henry Helstoski:												
Italy	Lira	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	31,250	50	125,000	200	17,528	28.05	142,528	228.05
Yugoslavia	Dinar	Nov. 15	Nov. 17	2	62,500	50	125,000	100			125,000	100.00
Bulgaria	Leva	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	3								
Hungary	Forint	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	4	2,400	50	9,120	190	480	10	9,600	200.00
Austria	Shilling	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	4	1,287	50	5,148	200	952.10	36.99	5,184.99	236.99
Czechoslovakia	Krown	Nov. 29	Dec. 2	4	717.50	50	2,654.75	185	215.25	15	2,870	200.00
U.S.S.R	Ruble	Dec. 3	Dec. 5	3								
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 6	Dec. 13	8	3,250	50	26,000	400	950	14.62	26,400	414.62
Germany	Mark	Dec. 14	Dec. 15	2	200	50	320	80	80	20	400	100.00
		Dec. 16	Dec. 16	1	200	50	132	33	68	17	200	50.00
The Netherlands	Guilder	Dec. 17	Dec. 17	1	1,385	50	1,365.61	43	19.39	7	1,385	50.00
Round-trip airline transportation furnished by the Department of State, prior to departure, for above itinerary. Original first-class air transportation furnished Congressman Helstoski in the amount of $1,201.15. Economy class transportation used instead reducing transportation cost to $741.30 plus first-class fare from Amsterdam to New York in the amount of $156.75 for a total of.										898.05		898.05
(Unused airline ticket being returned to Department of State for refund credit to Committee on Committee on Government Operations.)												
Total								1,431.00		1,046.71		2,477.71
Vincent J. Augliere:												
France	Franc	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Great Britain	Pound	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	3	17-16-9	50	53-10-3	150.00			53-10-3	150.00
Ireland	do	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1	17-16-8	50	17-16-8	50.00			17-16-8	50.00
Denmark	Krone	Nov. 19	Nov. 21	3	344.28	50	1,032.84	150.00			688.56	100.00
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50.00				
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	200	50	1,000	250.00			800	200.00
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50.00				
Italy	Lira	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	31,250	50	156,250	250.00			125,000	200.00
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50.00				
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 29	Dec. 1	2	1,500	50	3,000	100.00			3,000	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	245	50	735	150.00			490	100.00
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50.00				
Madrid (Spain)	Peseta	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	2,995	50	5,990	100.00			2,995	50.00
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50.00				
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2	1,429.50	50	2,859	100.00			2,859	100.00
Transportation furnished by Department of State for above itinerary (excluding that furnished by the military).										790.20		790.20
Total								1,250.00		790.20		2,040.20

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,040.20
Appropriated funds; Government Department; Department of Defense	715.60
Total	2,755.80

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Per diem rate			Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael Gasso (assigned staff member):												
France	Franc	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	245	50	980	200			980	200.00
Great Britain	Pound	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	3	17.16.9	50	53.10.3	150			53.10.3	150.00
Ireland	do	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1	17.16.8	50	17.16.8	50			17.16.8	50.00
Denmark	Krone	Nov. 19	Nov. 21	3	344.28	50	1,032.84	150				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50			688.56	100.00
Germany	Deutsche mark.	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	200	50	1,000	250				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50			800	200.00
Italy	Lira	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	31,250	50	156,250	250				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50			125,000	200.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 29	Dec. 1	2	1,500	50	3,000	100			3,000	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	245	50	735	150				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50			490	100.00
Madrid (Spain)	Peseta	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	2,995	50	5,990	100				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50			2,995	50.00
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2	1,429.50	50	2,859	100			2,859	100.00
Transportation furnished by Department of State for above itinerary (excluding that furnished by the military).										790.20		790.20
Total						50		1,250		790.20		2,040.20

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,040.20
Government Department: Department of Defense	715.60
Total	2,755.80

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Anton Papich, Jr. (assigned staff member):												
France	Franc	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	245	50	980	200			980	200.00
Great Britain	Pound	Nov. 15	Nov. 15	3	17–16–9	50	53–10–3	150			53–10–3	150.00
Ireland	do	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1	17–16–8	50	17–16–8	50			17–16–8	50.00
Denmark	Krone	Nov. 19	Nov. 21	3	344.28	50	1,032.84	150			688.56	100.00
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50				
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	200.00	50	1,000.00	250				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50			800.00	200.00
Italy	Lira	Nov. 25	Nov. 29	5	31,250	50	156,250	250				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50			125,000	200.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 29	Dec. 1	2	1,500.00	50	3,000.00	100			3,000.00	100.00
France	Franc	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	245	50	735	150				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50			490	100.00
Madrid (Spain)	Peseta	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	2,995.00	50	5,990.00	100				
Reimbursement to U.S. Treasury.								−50			2,995.00	50.00
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 4	Dec. 6	2	1,429.50	50	2,859.00	100			2,859.00	100.00
Transportation furnished by Department of State for above itinerary (excluding that furnished by the military).										790.20		790.20
Total						50		1,250		790.20		2,040.20

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,040.20
Government Department: Defense (transportation)	715.60
Total	2,755.80

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. David S. King:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 28	Nov. 30	3	18,000	50	40,500	112.50	13,050	36.25	53,550	148.75
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	286.63	50	792.30	138.26	50.50	8.77	842.80	147.03
Vietnam (Saigon)	Piaster	Dec. 3	Dec. 9	6	3,638.50	50	9,656	132.69			9,656	132.69
Thailand (Bangkok)	Baht	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	2	1,032.50	50	2,065	100.00	472.50	22.88	2,537.50	122.88
Singapore	Malayan dollar	Dec. 10	Dec. 12	2	151.80	50	254.60	83.92			254.60	83.92
Airline transportation furnished by the Department of State for travel Baltimore-Singapore, returning to Baltimore for above itinerary.										2,222.40		2,222.40
Subtotal						50		567.37		2,290.30		2,857.67
Louis I. Freed, staff member:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	18,000	50	54,000	$150.00			54,000	$150.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	286.63	50	859.90	150.00			859.90	150.00
Vietnam (Saigon)	Piaster	Dec. 3	Dec. 9	7	3,638.50	50	15,406	312.00			15,406	312.00
Thailand (Bangkok)	Baht	Dec. 9	Dec. 10	2	1,032.50	50	2065	100.00			2,065	100.00
Singapore	Malayan dollar	Dec. 10	Dec. 12	2	151.80	50	303.60	100.00			303.60	100.00
Airline transportation, round-trip, Baltimore, Md.-Singapore, returning to Baltimore—furnished by the Department of State prior to departure on trip.										2,222.40		2,222.40
Total						50		812.00		2,222.40		3,034.40

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Subcommittee recapitulation:												
Hon. John S. Monagan								900		1,102.42		2,002.42
Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher								350		1,102.42		1,452.42
Hon. John G. Dow								900		1,102.42		2,002.42
Hon. William L. Dickinson								900		1,102.42		2,002.42
Hon. John N. Erlenborn								800		1,182.12		1,982.12
Miles Q. Romney								900		1,102.42		2,002.42
Norman G. Cornish								900		1,102.42		2,002.42
Total								5,650		7,796.64		13,446.64
Hon. John S. Monagan:												
Venezuela	Bolivar	Nov. 7	Nov. 9	3	224	50	672	150			672	150.00
Colombia	Peso	Nov. 9	Nov. 12	2	892.5	50	1,785	100	195	10.92	1,980	110.92
Peru	Sole	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	1,340	50	5,360	200			5,360	200.00
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 15	Nov. 16	1	204	50	204	50			204	50.00
Argentina	Peso	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	9,000	50	18,000	100			18,000	100.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Nov. 18	Nov. 22	4	110,000	50	440,000	200			440,000	200.00
Trinidad	West Indies dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2	85	50	170	100			170	100.00
Round-trip airline transportation furnished by Department of State for above transportation, Washington, D.C., to South America trip, and return to Washington, D.C.[1]										1,091.50		1,091.50
Subtotal						50		900		1,102.42		2,002.42
Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher:												
Colombia	Peso	Nov. 9	Nov. 12	3	892.5	50	2,677.5	150	195	10.92	2,872.5	160.92
Peru	Sole	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	1,340	50	5,360	200			5,360	200.00
Round-trip airline transportation furnished by Department of State for Latin America investigation [1]										1,091.50		1,091.50
Subtotal						50		350		1,102.42		1,452.42
John G. Dow:												
Venezuela	Bolivar	Nov. 7	Nov. 9	3	224	50	672	150			672	150.00
Colombia	Peso	Nov. 9	Nov. 12	2	892.5	50	1,785	100	195	10.92	1,980	110.92
Peru	Sole	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	1,340	50	5,360	200			5,360	200.00
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 15	Nov. 16	1	204	50	204	50			204	50.00
Argentina	Peso	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	9,000	50	18,000	100			18,000	100.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Nov. 18	Nov. 22	4	110,000	50	440,000	200			440,000	200.00
Trinidad	West Indies dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2	85	50	170	100			170	100.00

[1] Unused portions of airline ticket have been returned to the Department of State for credit to the committee's account.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 110, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Round-trip airline transportation furnished by Department of State for above transportation.[1]										1,091.50		1,091.50
Subtotal						50		900		1,102.42		2,002.42
Hon. William L. Dickinson:												
Venezuela	Bolivar	Nov. 7	Nov. 9	3	224	50	672	150			672	150.00
Colombia	Peso	Nov. 9	Nov. 12	2	892.5	50	1,785	100	195	10.92	1,980	110.92
Peru	Sole	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	1,340	50	5,369	200			5,360	200.00
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 15	Nov. 16	1	204	50	204	50			204	50.00
Argentina	Peso	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	9,000	50	18,000	100			18,000	100.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Nov. 18	Nov. 22	4	110,000	50	440,000	200			440,000	200.00
Trinidad	West Indies dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2	85	50	170	100			170	100.00
Round-trip airline transportation furnished by Department of State for above itinerary—Washington, D.C.–South America trip, and return.										1,091.50		1,091.50
Subtotal						50		900		1,102.42		2,002.42
Hon. John N. Erlenborn:												
Colombia	Peso	Nov. 9	Nov. 12	3	892.5	50	2,677.5	150	195	10.92	2,872.5	160.92
Peru	Sole	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	1,340	50	5,360	200			5,360	200.00
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 15	Nov. 16	1	204	50	204	50			204	50.00
Argentina	Peso	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	9,000	50	18,000	100			18,000	100.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Nov. 18	Nov. 22	4	110,000	50	440,000	200			440,000	200.00
Trinidad	West Indies dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2	85	50	170	100			170	100.00
Round-trip airline transportation furnished by Department of State for transportation for trip.										1,171.20		1,171.20
Subtotal						50		800		1,182.12		1,982.12
Miles Q. Romney:												
Venezuela	Bolivar	Nov. 7	Nov. 9	3	224	50	672	150			672	150.00
Colombia	Peso	Nov. 9	Nov. 12	2	892.5	50	1,785	100	195	10.92	1,980	110.92
Peru	Sole	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	1,340	50	5,360	200			5,360	200.00
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 15	Nov. 16	1	204	50	204	50			204	50.00
Argentina	Peso	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	9,000	50	18,000	100			18,000	100.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Nov. 18	Nov. 22	4	110,000	50	440,000	200			440,000	200.00
Trinidad	West Indies dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2	85	50	170	100			170	100.00
Round-trip airline transportation furnished by Department of State for above transportation, Washington, D.C., to South America trip, and return to Washington, D.C.										1,091.50		1,091.50
Subtotal						50		900		1,102.42		2,002.42
Norman G. Cornish:												
Venezuela	Bolivar	Nov. 7	Nov. 9	3	224	50	672	150			672	150.00
Colombia	Peso	Nov. 9	Nov. 12	2	892.5	50	1,785	100	195	10.92	1,980	110.92
Peru	Sole	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	1,340	50	5,360	200			5,360	200.00
Chile	Escudo	Nov. 15	Nov. 16	1	204	50	204	50			204	50.00
Argentina	Peso	Nov. 16	Nov. 18	2	9,000	50	18,000	100			18,000	100.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Nov. 18	Nov. 22	4	110,000	50	440,000	200			440,000	200.00
Trinidad	West Indies dollar.	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2	85	50	170	100			170	100.00
Round-trip airline transportation furnished by Department of State for above transportation.										1,091.50		1,091.50
Subtotal						50		900		1,102.42		2,002.42

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 35 and H. Res. 335, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harley O. Staggers:												
France	Franc	Oct. 22	Oct. 24	3	245	50	735	150.00			735	150.00
Greece	Drachma	Oct. 31	Nov. 1	1	1,500	50	14.50	48.33	250	8.33	1,700	56.66
Hong Kong	Dollar	Nov. 16	Nov. 20	4	286.87	50	850.61	148.45	209.82	36.61	1,060.43	185.06
India	Rupee	Nov. 9	Nov. 12	2	236.87	50	313.75	66.39	35.50	7.04	347.25	73.43
Iraq	Dinar	Nov. 8	Nov. 9	1	17.82	50	2.32	6.72			2.32	6.72
Italy	Lira	Oct. 26	Oct. 28	2	312.50	50	606.25	97.00	115.47	18.48	721.78	115.48
Japan	Yen	Nov. 21	Nov. 26	5	18,000	50	90,000	250.00	48,580	134.95	138,580	384.95
Jordan	Dinar	Nov. 3	Nov. 5	2	17.83	50	25.65	71.96	5	14.02	30.65	85.98
Lebanon	Pound	Nov. 6	Nov. 8	2	153.25	50	301.30	98.30	76.08	24.82	377.38	123.12

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 35 and H. Res. 335, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harley O. Staggers—Continued												
Malaysia	Dollar	Nov. 14	Nov. 16	2	151.51	50	243.55	80.77			243.55	80.77
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 24	Nov. 26	2	215.92	50	431.85	100.00			431.85	100.00
Syria	Pound	Nov. 5	Nov. 6	1	200	50	153	38.25			153.00	38.25
Taiwan	Dollar	Nov. 20	Nov. 21	1	2,000	50	1,255	31.37			1,255	31.37
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 12	Nov. 14	2	1,032.50	50	2,065	100.00	1,600	77.48	3,665	177.78
Turkey	Lira	Oct. 28	Oct. 31	2	450	50	890	98.88	180	20.00	1,070	118.88
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 1	Nov. 3	2	21.70	50	36.90	84.87			36.90	84.87
United Kingdom	do	Oct. 17	Oct. 22	5	17-16-9	50	78-11-9	220.22	23-2-0	64.68	101-13-9	284.90
Vietnam	Dollar	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1	3,639	50	1,255	31.37			1,255	31.37
Do	Lira								19,576.90	2,174.10	19,576.90	2,174.10
Subtotal								1,730.92		2,580.51		4,311.43
William L. Springer:												
France	Franc	Sept. 18	Sept. 19	2	245	50	490	100.00			490.00	100.00
Do	Deutsche mark								3,321.20	830.09	3,321.20	830.09
Switzerland	Franc	Sept. 20	Sept. 26	7	215.18	50	1,169.00	273.46			1,169.00	273.46
France	do	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	2	245	50	490.00	100.00			490.00	100.00
Do	Deutsche mark								1,782.40	445.49	1,782.40	445.49
Switzerland	Franc	Dec. 1	Dec. 6	6	215.58	50	970.69	225.00			970.69	225.00
Subtotal								698.46		1,275.58		1,974.04
Oren Harris:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 21	5		50	605	124.00			605	124.00
Do	do	Sept. 18	Sept. 19	2		50	290	59.18			290	59.18
Switzerland	do	Sept. 20	Sept. 23	4		50	509	119.59			509	119.59
Do	Deutsche mark	June —	June —						3,169.20	797.08	3,169.20	797.08
Do	do	Sept. —	Sept. —						3,321.20	830.00	3,321.20	830.00
Subtotal								302.77		1,627.17		1,929.94
Walter Rogers:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 21	5	245	50	1,225	250.00			1,225	250.00
Do	Deutsche mark	June —	June —						3,177.60	799.20	3,177.60	799.20
United Kingdom	Pound	Oct. 22	Oct. 24	3		50	38.6	108.14			38.6	108.14
Austria	Shilling	Oct. 25	Oct. 28	4	1,287	50	5,150	200.00			5,150	200.00
Switzerland	Franc	Oct. 29	Nov. 2	5	215.87	50	1,079.35	250.00			1,079.35	250.00
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 3	Nov. 6	4		50	11,982	200.00			11,982	200.00
Portugal	Escudo	Nov. 6	Nov. 7	1	1,428.50	50	1,428.50	50.00			1,428.50	50.00
Do	Deutsche mark	Oct. —	Oct. —						4,318.20	1,079.28	4,318.20	1,079.28
Subtotal								1,058.14		1,878.48		2,936.62
Samuel Friedel:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Apr. 25	Apr. 26	2		50	35-14-11	100.00	4.10	12.58	40.00	112.58
Do	Deutsche mark									474.28		474.28
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 29	Oct. 31	2		50	5,991.00	100.00			5,991.00	100.00
Italy	Lira	Oct. 31	Nov. 1	1		50	31,250	50.00			31,250	50.00
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 1	Nov. 4	4		50	71-6-4	200.00	1-18-8	5.30	73-6-2	205.39
France	Franc	Nov. 5	Nov. 9	5		50	1,224.50	250.00			1,224.50	250.00
Israel	Pound	Nov. 10	Nov. 13	3		50	450	150.00			450.00	150.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	Nov. 13	Nov. 19	7		50	2,008.13	350.00	380.8	66.13	2,388.93	416.13
Japan	Yen	Nov. 20	Nov. 26	7		50	126,000	350.00	7,040	19.56	133,040	369.56
France	Franc	Apr. —	Apr. —							367.95		367.95
Do	Deutsche mark	Oct. —	Oct. —							3,015.25		3,015.25
Subtotal								1,550.00		3,961.14		5,511.14
Samuel Devine:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 21	5		50	915.00	186.73			915.00	186.73
Do	Deutsche mark								3,177.60	799.20	3,177.60	799.20
Subtotal								186.73		799.20		985.93
David E. Satterfield:												
Hong Kong	Deutsche mark								7,072.56	1,767.70	7,072.56	1,767.70
Do	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	2	286.88	50	560.63	97.73	182.47	34.76	743.10	132.49
Japan	Yen	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	3	18,000	50	38,957	108.21	21,990	61.09	609.47	169.30
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	194.95	50	681.75	174.83	47	11.97	728.75	186.80
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	1	2,000	50	1,600	40.00			1,600	40.00
Subtotal								420.77		1,875.52		2,296.29
Horace R. Kornegay:												
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	2	286.88	50	544.58	94.90	225.07	42.22	769.95	137.12
Japan	Yen	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	3	18,000	50	40,800	113.13	21,990	61.09	62,790	174.22
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	194.95	50	734.15	188.28	47	11.97	781.15	200.25
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	1	2,000	50	1,680	42.00			1,680	42.00
Do	Deutsche mark								7,149.57	1,786.95	7,149.57	1,786.95
Subtotal								438.31		1,902.23		2,340.54
Willard Curtin:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 21	5		50	825.00	168.37			825.00	168.37
Do	Deutsche mark								3,177.60	799.20	3,177.60	799.20
Do	Franc	Oct. 27	Oct. 29	2		50	335.00	68.37	322.54	65.82	657.54	134.19
Switzerland	do	Oct. 29	Nov. 3	4		50	568.60	131.70	444.40	102.97	1,013.00	234.67
Denmark	Krone	Nov. 3	Nov. 6	3		50	1,033.30	150.00	320.54	46.20	1,353.84	196.20
October, 1965	Guilder								3,038.26	844.90	3,038.26	844.90
Subtotal								518.44		1,859.09		2,377.53

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 35 and H. Res. 335, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Glenn Cunningham:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 21	5		50	1,025.00	229.12			1,025.00	229.12
June, 1965	Deutsche mark								3,177.60	799.20	3,177.60	799.20
Subtotal								229.12		799.20		1,028.32
Fred B. Rooney:												
France	Franc	Nov. 17	Nov. 22	5	245	50	1,215	248.00	255	52.00	1,470	300.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2	200	50	400	100.00			400	100.00
Austria	Schilling	Nov. 24	Nov. 29	6		50	7,722	300.00	1,373.25	53.39	9,095.25	353.39
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 29	Dec. 3	4		50	12,000	200.00	3,392	56.62	15,392	256.62
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 3	Dec. 8	5		50	7,147.50	250.00	2,900	101.47	10,047.50	351.47
Do	Guilder								3,228.36	889.05	3,228.36	889.05
Subtotal								1,098.00		1,152.53		2,250.53
John Murphy:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 21	5	245	50	1,225	250.00			1,225	250.00
Do	Deutsche mark								3,169.20	797.08	3,169.20	797.08
Subtotal								250.00		797.08		1,047.08
W. E. Williamson:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 21	5		50	1,055.00	236.00	70	14.00	1,125.00	250.00
June 1965	Deutsche mark								3,169.20	797.08	3,169.20	797.08
France	Franc	Oct. 20	Oct. 24	4		50	890.00	182.00	90	18.00	980.00	200.00
Switzerland	do	Oct. 24	Oct. 26	2		50	431.85	100.00			431.85	100.00
Italy	Lira	Oct. 26	Oct. 28	3		50	74,100	118.56			74,100	118.56
Turkey	Pound	Oct. 29	Oct. 31	2		50	870	96.67			870.00	96.67
Greece	Drachma	Oct. 31	Nov. 1	2		50	2,150.00	71.67			2,150.00	71.67
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 1	Nov. 3	2		50	35,000	88.48			35,000	88.48
Jordan	Dinar	Nov. 3	Nov. 5	3		50	32,975	120.56			32,975	120.56
Syria	Pound	Nov. 5	Nov. 6	1		50	85.00	21.25			85.00	21.25
Lebanon	do	Nov. 6	Nov. 9	2		50	302.00	93.94			302.00	93.94
Austria	Schilling	Nov. 9	Nov. 11	2		50	2,462.00	95.57			2,462.00	95.57
October 1965	Lira								11,913.40	1,323.70	11,913.00	1,323.70
Subtotal								1,224.70		2,152.78		3,377.48
Andrew Stevenson:												
Austria	Schilling	Oct. 26	Oct. 28	2	1,287	50	2,405	93.40	170	6.60	2,575	100.00
Czechoslovakia	Crown	Oct. 24	Oct. 26	2	718	50	1,133	78.95	302	21.05	1,435	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Oct. 31	Nov. 1	1	1,500	50	1,480	49.33	420	14.00	1,900	63.33
Hong Kong	Dollar	Nov. 16	Nov. 20	4	286.87	50	993.38	173.34	137.05	23.88	1,130.43	197.22
India	Rupee	Nov. 9	Nov. 12	2	236.87	50	168.72	35.87	59	12.44	227.72	48.31
Iraq	Dinar	Nov. 8	Nov. 9	1	17.82	50	2.12	6.00	2	5.74	4.12	11.74
Japan	Yen	Nov. 21	Nov. 26	5	18,000.00	50	87,800	244.00	7,200	19.89	95,000	263.89
Jordan	Dinar	Nov. 3	Nov. 5	2	17.83	50	25.65	71.96	5	14.02	30.65	85.98
Lebanon	Pound	Nov. 6	Nov. 8	3	153.25	50	358.50	116.96	66.87	21.82	425.37	138.78
Malaysia	Dollar	Nov. 14	Nov. 16	2	151.5	50	239.55	79.45	10.00	3.30	249.55	82.87
Netherlands	Guilder	Oct. 22	Oct. 24	2	180.00	50	284.00	78.89	76.00	21.11	360.00	100.00
Syria	Pound	Nov. 5	Nov. 6	1	200.00	50	90	22.50			90	22.50
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 20	Nov. 21	1	2,000.00	50	1,100	27.75			1,100	27.75
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 12	Nov. 14	2	1,032.50	50	1,910	92.49	155	7.51	2,065	100.00
Turkey	Lira	Oct. 28	Oct. 31	3	450.00	50	870	96.67	110	12.22	980	108.89
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 1	Nov. 3	2	21.70	50	31	71.30	1	2.30	32	73.60
United Kingdom	do	Oct. 17	Oct. 22	5	17-16-9	50	78-11-9	220.22	23-2-0	64.68	101-13-9	284.90
Do	Lira								19,516.50	2,168.50	19,516.50	2,168.50
Subtotal								1,559.08		2,419.06		3,978.14
Kurt Borchardt:												
France	Franc	Sept. 17	Sept. 18	2	245	50	290	59.18			290.00	59.18
Supplemental fare, Paris to Baltimore, stretcher case.	do								413.00	84.29	413.00	84.29
Switzerland	do	Sept. 18	Nov. 19	62	216	50	5,334	1,236.65			5,334.05	1,236.65
September 1965	Deutsche mark								3,312.80	827.99	3,312.80	827.99
Subtotal								1,295.83		912.28		2,208.11
William J. Dixon:												
France	Franc	June 17	June 21	5	245	50	1,225.00	250.00			1,225.00	250.00
Do	Deutsche mark								3,169.20	797.08	3,169.20	797.08
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	2	286.88	50	550.63	95.49	182.47	34.76	733.10	130.25
Japan	Yen	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	3	18,000	50	38,000	105.56	21,990	61.09	59,990	166.65
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	4	194.95	50	770.55	197.61	47.00	11.97	817.55	209.58
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	1	2,000	50	1,762	44.05			1,762	44.05
Do	Deutsche mark								7,072	1,767.70	7,072	1,767.70
Subtotal								692.71		2,672.60		3,365.31
Total								13,253.98		28,664.45		41,918.43

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	41,918.43

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MARCH 9, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 593, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. William T. Cahill:												
Switzerland	Franc	May 3	May 8	6	217.17	50.00	1,303.05	301.07			1,303.05	301.07
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	286.88	50.00	1,147.50	200.00			1,147.50	200.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	4	3,851.00	50.00	11,554	150.00			11,554	150.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 18	Nov. 21	3	1,032.50	50.00	3,097.50	150.00			3,097.50	150.00
Japan	Yen	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	4	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Netherlands [1]	Guilder								9,895.37	2,750.85	9,895.37	2,750.85
Less travel refund									(2,860)	(792.30)	(2,860)	(792.30)
Subtotal								951.07		1,958.55		2,909.62
Hon. Frank Chelf:												
France	Franc	Nov. 2	Nov. 3	1	244.50	50.00	244.50	50.00	230.00	46.94	474.50	96.94
Italy	Lira	Nov. 3	Nov. 10	8	31,250	50.00	250,000	400.00	66,842	106.95	316,842	506.95
Germany	Mark	Nov. 10	Nov. 18	8	200.00	50.00	1,600.00	400.00	2,383.65	595.78	3,983.65	995.78
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 18	Nov. 27	9	215.77	50.00	1,942.10	450.00			1,942.50	450.00
		May 6	May 12	7	217.12	50.00	1,519.25	350.00			1,519.25	350.00
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 30	Dec. 1	2	2,995.50	50.00	5,991.00	100.00			5,991.00	100.00
Netherlands [1]	Guilder	June —							3,038.26	843.96	3,038.26	843.96
Subtotal								1,750.00		1,593.63		3,343.63
Hon. Harold D. Donohue:												
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 28	Dec. 28	4	215.77	50.00	828.00	200.00	404.00	93.61	1,232.80	293.61
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 2	Dec. 3	2	200.00	50.00	400.00	100.00	3,556.40	888.88	3,956.40	988.88
Italy	Lira	Dec. 4	Dec. 9	6	31,250	50.00	165,500	264.91			165,500	264.91
Ireland	Pound	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	3	17–16–0	50.00	53–9–2	150.00			53–9–2	150.00
Subtotal								714.91		982.49		1,697.40
Hon. George W. Grider:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 1	Nov. 2	1	11,435.00	31.76	11,435.00	31.76			11,435.00	31.76
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 2	Nov. 14	13	1,678.00	23.08	21,831.00	300.00			21,831.00	300.00
Netherlands [1]	Guilder								6,529.12	1,815.66	6,529.12	1,815.66
Subtotal						54.84		331.76		1,815.66		2,147.42
Hon. Carleton J. King:												
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Nov. 30	Dec. 10	11	110,250	50.00	1,214,600	550.00			1,214,000	550.00
Argentina	Peso	Dec. 11	Dec. 15	5	9,400	50.00	47,000	250.00			47,000	250.00
Germany [1]	Deutsche mark								2,200.00	550.00	2,200.00	550.00
Subtotal								800.00		550.00		1,350.00
Hon. Clark MacGregor:												
Switzerland	Franc	Apr. 30	May 5	6+	217.15	50.00	1,302.90	301.04	153.30	35.42	1,455.20	336.46
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 27	Nov. 27	½	17–16–8	50.00	0–7–9	21.03	5–3–8	14.45	5–11–05	35.48
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 27	Dec. 1	5	215.85	50.00	1,079.25	250.00			1,079.25	250.00
Lebanon	Pound	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1¼	150.00	50.00	177.50	57.91			177.50	57.91
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 3	Dec. 3	½	1,032.50	50.00	490.00	23.73			490.00	23.73
South Vietnam	Piaster	Dec. 3	Dec. 6	3½	3,638.5	50.00	10,694	146.98			10,694	146.98
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 6	Dec. 7	2	286.63	50.00	286.63	100.00			286.63	100.00
Japan	Yen	Dec. 7	Dec. 8	2	9,000	50.00	33,600	93.33			33,600	93.33
Netherlands [1]	Guilder								2,966.17	823.93	2,966.17	823.93
Subtotal								994.02		873.80		1,867.82
Hon. William M. McCulloch:												
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 28	Dec. 2	4	215.85	50.00	379.25	87.81	509	117.93	888.25	205.74
Germany	Deutsche mark	Dec. 2	Dec. 4	3	200.00	50.00	400.00	100.00	3,526	881.28	3,926.00	981.28
Subtotal								187.81		999.21		1,187.02
Arch A. Moore, Jr.:												
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 12	Nov. 15	4	286.88	50.00	1,147.50	200.00			1,147.50	200.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	4	3,851.00	50.00	11,554.00	150.00			11,554.00	150.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 18	Nov. 21	3	1,036.50	50.00	3,097.50	150.00	3,380.00	163.68	6,477.50	313.68
Japan	Yen	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	4	18,00	50.00	72,000	200.00	39,340	109.28	111,340	309.28
Netherlands [1]	Guilder								9,935	2,762.79	9,935.00	2,762.79
Less travel refund									(3,005)	(832.40)	(3,005)	(832.40)
Subtotal								700.00		2,203.35		2,903.35
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 7	Nov. 11	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	4,260.00	11.83	94,260	261.83
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 11	Nov. 15	5	286.88	50.00	1,434.38	250.00			1,434.38	250.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	4	3,851.00	50.00	1,554.00	150.00			11,554.00	150.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	2	1,032.50	50.00	2,065.00	100.00			2,065.00	100.00
Switzerland	Franc	May 3	May 8	6	217.12	50.00	1,302.72	300.00			1,302.72	300.00
		Nov. 29	Dec. 4	6	215.77	50.00	1,295.15	300.00	2,151.00	498.38	3,446.15	798.38
Israel	Pound	Dec. 4	Dec. 8	3	150.00	50.00	450.00	150.00			450.00	150.00
Jordan	Dinar	Dec. 7	Dec. 7	1	17.825	50.00	17.825	50.00			17,825	50.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	2	31,250	50.00	62,500	100.00			62,500	100.00
Netherlands [1]	Guilder	Apr. —							2,964.90	823.58	2,964.90	823.58
		Nov. —							9,843.00	2,737.21	9,843.00	2,737.21
Subtotal								1,650.00		4,071.00		5,721.00
Hon. Byron G. Rogers:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 7	Nov. 11	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	59,730	165.91	149,730	415.91
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 11	Nov. 15	5	286.88	50.00	1,434.38	250.00			1,434.38	250.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	4	3,851	50.00	11,554	150.00			11,554	150.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	2	1,032.50	50.00	2,065.00	100.00			2,065.00	100.00
India	Rupee	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	3	236.79	50.00	710.37	150.00	19.27	4.05	729.64	154.05

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 593, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Byron G. Rogers—Con.												
Israel	Pound	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	1	150.00	50.00	150.00	50.00			150.00	50.00
Jordan	Dinar	Nov. 25	Nov. 26	1	17.825	50.00	17.825	50.00			17.825	50.00
Lebanon	Pound	Nov. 26	Nov. 28	3	150.00	50.00	450.00	150.00	63.20	20.62	513.20	170.62
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 30	2	450.00	50.00	900.00	100.00			900.00	100.00
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 3	4	215.77	50.00	863.10	200.00			863.10	200.00
Netherlands [1]	Guilder								7,509	2,088.15	7,509	2,088.15
Subtotal								1,450.00		2,278.73		3,728.73
Hon. Herbert Tenzer:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Oct. 15	Oct. 20	6	17-16-9	50.00	107-0-6	300.00			107-0-6	300.00
Poland	Zloty	Oct. 20	Oct. 24	5	1,200.00	50.00	4,800.00	200.00			4,800.00	200.00
Italy	Lira	Oct. 24	Oct. 28	5	31,250	50.00	156,250	250.00	9,870	15.79	166,120	265.79
Israel	Israeli dollar	Oct. 28	Nov. 2	5	150.00	50.00	900.00	300.00			900.00	300.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 3	Nov. 5	3	1,032.00	50.00	2,065.00	100.00			2,065.00	100.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 5	Nov. 10	6	286.87	50.00	1,721.25	300.00	300.00	52.10	2,021	352.10
Japan	Yen	Nov. 10	Nov. 16	7	18,000	50.00	126,000	350.00	63,420	176.17	189,420	526.17
Less per diem refund								(150.00)				(150.00)
Subtotal								1,650.00		244.06		1,894.06
Hon. William C. Cramer:												
Italy [1]	Lira								381,787	610.86	381,787	610.86
Turkey	do	Nov. 18	Nov. 21		450.00	50.00	1,350.00	150.00				150.00
Lebanon	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 24		150.00	50.00	300.00	100.00				100.00
Jordan	Dinar	Nov. 26	Nov. 28		17,750.00	50.00	53,240.00	150.00				150.00
Israel	Pound	Nov. 28	Dec. —				2,250.00	750.00				750.00
Subtotal								1,150.00		610.86		1,760.86
Donald Benn:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 7	Nov. 11	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	4,260	11.83	94,260	261.83
Hong Kong	Hong Hong dollar.	Nov. 11	Nov. 15	5	286.88	50.00	1,434.38	250.00			1,434.38	250.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	4	3,851	50.00	11,554	150.00			11,554	150.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	2	1,032.50	50.00	2,065.00	100.00			2,065.00	100.00
India	Rupee	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	3	236.79	50.00	710.37	150.00			710.37	150.00
Israel	Pound	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	1	150.00	50.00	150.00	50.00			150.00	50.00
Jordan	Dinar	Nov. 25	Nov. 26	1	17.825	50.00	17.825	50.00			17.825	50.00
Lebanon	Pound	Nov. 26	Nov. 28	3	150.00	50.00	450.00	150.00	63.20	20.62	513.20	170.62
Turkey	do	Nov. 28	Nov. 30	2	450.00	50.00	900.00	100.00			900.00	100.00
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 3	4	215.77	50.00	863.10	200.00			863.10	200.00
Netherlands [1]	Guilder								7,509	2,088.15	7,509	2,088.15
Subtotal								1,450.00		2,120.60		3,570.60
Garner J. Cline:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 7	Nov. 11	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	4,260	11.83	94,260	261.83
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 11	Nov. 15	5	286.88	50.00	1,434.38	250.00			1,434.38	250.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	4	3,851.00	50.00	11,554	150.00			11,554	150.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	2	1,032.50	50.00	2,065.00	100.00			2,065.00	100.00
India	Rupee	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	3	236.79	50.00	710.37	150.00			170.37	150.00
Israel	Pound	Nov. 24	Nov. 25	1	150.00	50.00	150.00	50.00				
		Dec. 4	Dec. 8	3	150.00	50.00	450.00	150.00			600.00	200.00
Jordan	Dinar	Nov. 25	Nov. 26	1	17.825	50.00	17.825	50.00				
		Dec. 7	Dec. 7	1	17.825	50.00	17.825	50.00			35.650	100.00
Lebanon	Pound	Nov. 26	Nov. 28	3	150.00	50.00	450.00	150.00	63.20	20.62	513.20	170.62
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	1	450.00	50.00	450.00	50.00			450.00	50.00
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 29	Dec. 4	5	215.77	50.00	1,078.85	250.00	405.70	93.74		
		Apr. 30	May 12	13	217.12	50.00	2,822.56	650.00	971.00	224.98	5,278.11	1,218.72
Italy	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 9	2	31,250	50.00	62,500	100.00			62,500	100.00
Netherlands [1]	Guilder	Apr. —							3,038.26	843.96		
		Nov. —							7,509.00	2,088.15	10,547.26	2,932.11
Subtotal								2,400.00		3,283.28		5,683.28
Allan D. Cors:												
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Nov. 30	Dec. 10	11	110,250	50.00	1,214.600	550.00			1,214,600	550.00
Argentina	Peso	Dec. 11	Dec. 15	5	9,400	50.00	47,000	250.00			47,000	250.00
Chile	Escudo	Dec. 16	Dec. 19	4	210	50.00	630	150.00	1,000	276.24	1,630	426.24
Germany	Deutsche mark								2,200	550.00	2,200	550.00
Subtotal								950.00		826.24		1,776.24
Charles J. Zinn: India [2]	Rupee	May 20	May 20	1	17.00	3.58	17.00	3.58			17.00	3.58
Subtotal						3.58		3.58				3.58
Total								17,133.15		24,411.46		41,544.61

[1] Travelers did not visit the country indicated. Funds shown were used for transportation.
[2] This charge was made by the American consulate in Madras to the American consulate in Calcutta.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	41,544.61

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

MARCH 15, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 151, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Ludlow Ashley:												
Great Britain	Pound	Mar. 31	Apr. 10	10	17-17-2	50	178	500			178	500.00
Do	German mark								3,010.40	752.60	3,010.40	752.60
William S. Mailliard:												
Great Britain	Pound	Apr. 3	Apr. 10	7	17-17-2	50	125	350			125	350.00
Do	German mark								3,010.40	752.60	3,010.40	752.60
Paul S. Bauer:												
Iceland	Kroner	May 24	June 2	9	2,153	50	9,351	217	9,420	219.00	18,771	436.00
Do	Dutch guilder								7,640	402.00	7,640	402.00
Edward A. Garmatz:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 6	Nov. 8	3	18,000	50	54,000	150	11,100	30.83	65,100	180.83
Do	German mark								6,630	1,664.50	6,630	1,664.50
J. Russell Tuten:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 6	Nov. 8	3	18,000	50	54,000	150	9,960	27.66	63,960	177.66
Do	German mark								7,180	1,802.40	7,180	1,802.40
Bernard J. Zincke:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 6	Nov. 8	3	18,000	50	54,000	150	12,600	35.00	66,600	185.00
Do	German mark								6,690	1,680.10	6,690	1,680.10
Thomas Ludlow Ashley:												
Australia	Pound	Nov. 25	Dec. 2	7	22-17-1	50	155-19-7	350			155-19-7	350.00
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 3	Dec. 5	3	195.37	50	586.12	150			586.12	150.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Dec. 5	Dec. 8	4	1,894	50	7,277	200			7,277	200.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 8	Dec. 11	4	286.62	50	1,146.50	200			1,146.50	200.00
Japan	Yen	Dec. 12	Dec. 14	3	18,000	50	54,000	150			54,000	150.00
Do	Dutch guilder								7,810	2,173.30	7,810	2,173.30
Total						550		2,567		9,539.99		12,106.99

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	12,106.99

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

JANUARY 18, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 595, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James M. Hanley:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 15	Nov. 17	2	17-17-2	50	35-13-6	100			35-13-6	100
Netherlands	Guilder	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	180	50	360	100			360	100
Norway	Kroner	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	356	50	1,424	200			1,424	200
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 23	Nov. 30	7	200	50	1,400	350	2,378	594	3,778	944
Switzerland	Swiss franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 5	5	216	50	1,080	250			1,080	250
France	Franc	Dec. 5	Dec. 7	2	245	50	490	100			490	100
Ireland	French franc	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	3	245	50	735	150			735	150
Total				25				1,250		594		1,844
Charles H. Wilson:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 17	5	17-17-2	50	89-3-9	250			89-3-9	250
Netherlands	Guilder	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	180	50	360	100			360	100
Germany	Deutsche mark.	Nov. 19	Nov. 24	5	200	50	1,000	250	2,044	511	3,044	761
Total				12				600		511		1,111
Arnold Olsen:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 17	5	17-17-2	50	89-3-9	250			89-3-9	25
Netherlands	Guilder	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	180	50	360	100			360	100
Norway	Kroner	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	356	50	1,424	200			1,424	200
Do	Deustche mark.	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	200	50	200	50			200	50
Germany	do	Nov. 23	Nov. 30	7	200	50	1,400	350	2,682	670	4,082	1,020
Switzerland	Swiss franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 4	5	216	50	1,080	250			1,080	250
Total				22				1,200		670		1,870
Douglas Mode:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 17	5	17-17-2	50	89-3-3	250	[1] 400. 5. 4	1,150	496-8-7	1,400
		Dec. 13	Dec. 17	5	17-17-2	50	53-11-4	150			53-11-4	150
Netherlands	Guilder	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	180	50	360	100	1,676	466	2,036	566
Norway	Kroner	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	356	50	1,424	200	4,546	637	5,970	837
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 23	Nov. 30	7	200	50	1,600	400	3,069	767	4,469	1,167
Switzerland	Swiss franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 5	5	216	50	1,080	250	1,377	319	2,457	569
France	Franc	Dec. 5	Dec. 9	4	245	50	1,125	250	735	150	1,715	400
Italy	Lira	Dec. 9	Dec. 13	4	31,250	50	125,000	200	156,250	250	281,250	450
Total				36				1,800		3,739		5,539

[1] Includes local transportation for entire congressional delegation.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 595, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
William A. Irvine:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 17	5	17-17-2	50	89-3-9	250			89-3-9	250
Netherlands	Guilder	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	180	50	360	100			360	100
Norway	Kroner	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	356	50	1,424	200			1,424	200
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 23	Nov. 30	7	200	50	1,400	350	2,670	667	4,067	1,017
Switzerland	Swiss franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 5	5	216	50	1,080	250			1,080	250
France	Franc	Dec. 5	Dec. 9	4	245	50	1,225	250			1,225	250
Italy	Lira	Dec. 9	Dec. 17	9	31,250	50	250,000	400			281,250	400
Total				36				1,800		667		2,467
Thaddeus J. Dulski:												
Italy	do	Nov. 8	Nov. 14	6	13,625	21.66	81,200	130	16,402	26	97,602	156
Great Britain	Pound	Nov. 14	Nov. 17	3	8-18-6	25	26-14-0	75			26-14-0	75
West Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	50	12.50	100	25			100	25
Round trip transportation:												
To Europe	Guilder								3,720	1,032	3,720	1,032
To Vietnam, furnished by Department of Defense.	U.S. dollars									2,207		2,207
Total				11				230		3,265		3,495

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,288
Appropriated funds:	
Government Department: Department of Defense	2,207
Total	3,495

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 595, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James H. Morrison:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 17	5	17-17-2	50	89-3-9	250			89-3-9	250
Netherlands	Guilder	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	180	50	360	100			360	100
Norway	Kroner	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	356	50	1,424	200			1,424	200
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 23	Nov. 30	7	200	50	1,400	350	2,670	667	4,070	1,017
Switzerland	Swiss franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 5	5	216	50	1,080	250			1,080	250
France	Franc	Dec. 5	Dec. 9	4	245	50	980	200			980	200
Italy	Lira	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	4	31,250	50	125,000	200			125,000	200
Total				31				1,550		667		2,217
John H. Martiny:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 17	5	17-17-2	50	89-3-9	250			89-3-9	250
Netherlands	Guilder	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	180	50	180	50			180	50
Norway	Kroner	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	356	50	1,424	200			1,424	200
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 23	Nov. 30	7	200	50	1,200	300	2,287	571	3,487	871
Switzerland	Swiss franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 5	5	216	50	1,080	250			1,080	250
France	Franc	Dec. 5	Dec. 9	5	245	50	1,225	250			1,225	250
	U.S. dollar									37		37
Total				28				1,300		608		1,908

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,871
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 595	37
Total	1,908

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 595, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Albert W. Johnson:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 17	5	17. 17. 2	50	89. 3. 9	250			89. 3. 9	250
Netherlands	Guilder	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	180	50	360	100			360	100
Norway	Kroner	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	356	50	1,424	200			1,424	200
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 23	Nov. 30	7	200	50	1,400	350	2,287	571	3,687	921
Switzerland	Swiss franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 5	5	216	50	1,080	250			1,080	250
France	Franc	Dec. 5	Dec. 9	5	245	50	1,225	250			1,225	250
Total				28				1,400		571		1,971

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 595, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joe R. Pool:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	17-17-2	50	59-6-8	166	17-0-8	47	76-7-2	213
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 23	Nov. 30	7	200	50	1,530	384	2,132	533	3,662	917
Switzerland	Swiss franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 5	5	216	50	1,080	250			1,080	250
France	Franc	Dec. 5	Dec. 9	5	245	50	1,225	250			1,225	250
Total				21				1,050		580		1,630
Dominick V. Daniels:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 17	5	17-17-2	50	89-3-9	250			89-3-9	250
Netherlands	Guilder	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	2	180	50	360	100			360	100
Norway	Kroner	Nov. 19	Nov. 23	4	356	50	1,424	200			1,424	200
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 23	Nov. 30	7	200	50	1,400	350	2,670	667	4,070	1,017
Switzerland	Swiss franc	Nov. 30	Dec. 5	5	216	50	1,080	250			1,080	250
France	Franc	Dec. 5	Dec. 9	4	245	50	980	200			980	200
Italy	Lira	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	4	31,250	50	125,000	200			125,000	200
Total				31				1,550		667		2,317

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Vice Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MARCH 4, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 273, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John C. Kluczynski:												
Peru	Sol	May 15	May 21	7	1,340	50.00	9,380	350.00	3,555.02	132.65	12,935.02	482.65
Germany	Deutsche mark								2,753.60	692.21	2,753.60	692.21
Kenneth J. Gray:												
Peru	Sol	May 19	May 21	3	1,340	50.00	4,020	150.00	3,555.02	132.65	7,575.02	282.65
Germany	Deutsche mark								2,704	679.74	2,704	679.74
Frank M. Clark:												
Peru	Sol	May 15	May 21	7	1,340	50.00	9,380	350.00	3,555.02	132.65	12,935.02	482.65
Germany	Deutsche mark								2,704	679.74	2,704	679.74
Landon Mitchell:												
Peru	Sol	May 15	May 21	7	1,340	50.00	9,380	350.00	3,555.02	132.65	12,935.02	482.65
Germany	Deutsche mark								2,704	679.74	2,704	679.74
Subtotal								1,200.00		3,262.00		4,462.03
George H. Fallon:												
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 29	Oct. 29	6	2,995.50	50.00	17,973.00	300.00			17,973.00	300.00
Do	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 1									
Do	do	Nov. 14	Nov. 17									
France	Franc	Nov. 2	Nov. 3	1	244.50	50.00	244.50	50.00	136.27	27.81	380.77	77.81
Italy	Lira	Nov. 3	Nov. 10	8	31,250.00	50.00	250,000.00	400.00	70,312.50	112.50	320,312.50	512.50
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 13	3	215.78	50.00	647.34	150.00			647.34	150.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								4,825.92	1,206.18	4,825.92	1,206.18
Robert E. Jones:												
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 29	Oct. 29	2	2,995.50	50.00	5,991.00	100.00			5,991.00	100.00
Do	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 1									
France	Franc	Nov. 2	Nov. 3	5	244.50	50.00	1,225.00	250.00	136.27	27.81	1,361.27	277.81
Do	do	Nov. 14	Nov. 17									
Italy	Lira	Nov. 3	Nov. 10	8	31,250.00	50.00	250,000.00	400.00	70,312.50	112.50	320,312.50	512.50
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 13	3	215.78	50.00	647.34	150.00			647.34	150.00
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 18	Nov. 21	4	17-16-3	50.00	71-7-3	200.00	21-17-6	61.05	93-4-9	261.05
Scotland	do	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	3	17-16-3	50.00	53-10-5	150.00			53-10-5	150.00
Ireland	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 26	2	17-16-3	50.00	35-12-3	100.00			35-12-3	100.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								4,431.20	1,107.53	4,431.20	1,107.53
John C. Kluczynski:												
France	Franc	Dec. 8	Dec. 10	3	245.00	50.00	735.00	150.00	90.65	18.50	825.65	168.50
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 10	Dec. 13	2	3,250.00	50.00	6,500.00	100.00	715.00	11.00	7.215.00	111.00
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	2	1,288.00	50.00	2,576.00	100.00	178.50	6.93	2,754.50	106.93
Italy	Lira	Dec. 14	Dec. 16	2	31,250.00	5.000	62,500.00	100.00	16,750.00	26.80	79,250.00	126.80
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 16	Dec. 18	2	2,995.00	50.00	5,990.00	100.00	539.00	9.00	6,529.00	109.00
William C. Cramer:												
Spain	do	Oct. 29	Oct. 29	2	2,995.50	50.00	5,991.00	100.00			5,991.00	100.00
Do	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 1									
France	Franc	Nov. 2	Nov. 3	1	244.50	50.00	244.50	50.00	136.27	27.81	380.77	77.81
Italy	Lira	Nov. 3	Nov. 11	8	31,250.00	50.00	250,000.00	400.00	70,312.50	112.50	320,312.50	512.50
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 11	Nov. 18	7	1,500.00	50.00	10,500.00	350.00	1,576.50	52.55	12,076.50	402.55
Germany	Deutsche mark								2,449.40	612.35	2,449.40	612.35
John C. Kunkel:												
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 29	Oct. 29	5	2,995.50	50.00	14,977.50	250.00			14,977.50	250.00
Do	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 1									
Do	do	Nov. 14	Nov. 16									
France	Franc	Nov. 2	Nov. 3	1	244.50	50.00	244.50	50.00	136.27	27.81	380.77	77.81
Italy	Lira	Nov. 3	Nov. 7	5	31,250.00	50.00	156,250.00	250.00	70,312.50	112.50	226,562.50	362.50
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 12	Nov 14	2	215.78	50.00	431.56	100.00			431.56	100.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								4,945.92	1,236.17	4,945.92	1,236.17

***Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 273, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965*—Continued**

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Richard J. Sullivan:												
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 29	Oct. 29	2	2,995.50	50.00	5,991.00	100.00			5,991.00	100.00
Do	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 1									
France	Franc	Nov. 2	Nov. 3	1	244.50	50.00	244.50	50.00	136.27	27.81	380.77	77.81
Italy	Lira	Nov. 3	Nov. 10	8	31,250.00	50.00	250,000.00	400.00	117,012.50	187.22	367,012.50	587.22
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 12	2	215.78	50.00	431.56	100.00			431.56	100.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 12	Nov. 13	1	200.00	50.00	200.00	50.00	4,280.40	1,069.46	4,480.40	1,119.46
Landon Mitchell:												
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 29	Oct. 29	6	2,995.50	50.00	17,973.00	300.00			17,973.00	300.00
Do	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 1									
Do	do	Nov. 14	Nov. 17									
France	Franc	Nov. 2	Nov. 3	1	244.50	50.00	244.50	50.00	136.27	27.81	380.77	77.81
Italy	Lira	Nov. 3	Nov. 10	8	31,250.00	50.00	250,000.00	400.00	70,312.50	112.50	320,312.50	512.50
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 13	3	215.78	50.00	647.34	150.00			647.34	150.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								4,750.92	1,187.43	4,750.92	1,187.43
Clifton W. Enfield:												
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 29	Oct. 29	2	2,995.50	50.00	5,991.00	100.00			5,991.00	100.00
Do	do	Nov. 1	Nov. 1									
France	Franc	Nov. 2	Nov. 3	1	244.50	50.00	244.50	50.00	136.27	27.81	380.77	77.81
Italy	Lira	Nov. 3	Nov. 10	8	31,250.00	50.00	250,000.00	400.00	117,012.50	187.22	367,012.50	587.22
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 12	2	215.78	50.00	431.56	100.00	1,906.00	441.61	2,337.56	541.61
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 12	Nov. 13	1	200.00	50.00	200.00	50.00	2,415.60	603.75	2,615.60	653.75
Total								6,650.00		8,781.92		15,431.92

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

MARCH 10, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 112, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George P. Miller:												
France	Franc	July 18	July 21	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
United Kingdom	Pound	Oct. 20	Oct. 21	2	17-17-0	50	35.15	100.00			35-15-0	100.00
Ireland	do	Oct. 22	Oct. 24	3	17-17-0	50	53-11-0	150.00	21.9	59.44	75.0	209.44
Total												509.44
Olin E. Teague:												
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 13	Nov. 16	4	286.8	50	1147.5	200.00			1147.5	200.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 17	Nov. 20	4	3,638.5	50	14,554	200.00			14,554	200.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 21	Nov. 22	2	1,032.5	50	1548.7	75.00	2,550	123.49	4098.75	198.49
India	Rupee	Nov. 25	Nov. 26	1	236.8	50	236.8	50.00			236.8	50.00
Lebanon	Pound	Nov. 26	Nov. 28	2	155	50	262.5	85.64	138.5	45.19	401	130.83
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	1	450	50	450.0	50.00			450	50.00
Italy	do	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1	31,250	50	31,250	50.00			31,250	50.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	2995	50	8985	150.00			8985	150.00
Total												1,029.32
Charles A. Mosher: France	Franc	July 18	July 21	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
E. Q. Daddario:												
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 13	Nov. 16	4	286.8	50	1,147.5	200.00			1,147.5	200.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 17	Nov. 20	4	3,638.5	50	14,554	200.00			14,554	200.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 21	Nov. 22	2	1,032.5	50	1,548.7	75.0			1,548.7	75.00
India	Rupee	Nov. 25	Nov. 26	1	236.8	50	236.8	50.00			236.8	50.00
Lebanon	Pound	Nov. 26	Nov. 28	2	155	50	262.5	85.64			262.5	85.64
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	1	450	50	145	16.11			145	16.11
Italy	do	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1	31,250	50	31,250	50.00			31,250	50.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	2,995	50	8,985	150.00			8,985	150.00
Total												826.75
Richard P. Hines:												
Switzerland	Franc	Sept. 11	Sept. 12	2	215.52	50	431.15	100.00			431.15	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Sept. 13	Sept. 17	5	1,500	50	6,750	225.00			6,750	225.00
Italy	Lira	Sept. 18	Sept. 20	3	31,250	50	93,750	150.00			93,750	150.00
Spain	Peseta	Sept. 20	Sept. 21	1	3,000	50	2,390	39.90			2,390	39.90
Portugal	Escuda	Sept. 22	Sept. 23	2	1,500	50	2,394	83.77			2,394	83.77
United Kingdom	Pound	Sept. 24	Sept. 25	2	17.17	50	35.14	100.00	35.14	100.00	71.8	200.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								4,737.6	1,184.10	4,737.6	1,184.10
Total												1,982.77

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 112, 1st sess., 89th Cong., Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
J. Edward Roush:												
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 4	Nov. 5	2	2,995	50	5,991	100.00			5,991	100.00
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 5	Nov. 6	1	22.5	50	3.9	8.99			3.9	8.99
Ethiopia	Dollar	Nov. 7	Nov. 8	2	57.7	23	114.14	46.00			114.4	46.00
Kenya	Shilling	Nov. 8	Nov. 9	1	184.35	26	184.35	26.00			184.35	26.00
South Africa	Rand	Nov. 10	Nov. 12	3	15.6	22	46.8	66.00			46.8	66.00
Australia	Pound	Nov. 13	Nov. 21	9	22.10	50	200-10-10	444.37			200-10-10	444.37
Netherlands [1]	Guilder								7,974	2,217.46	7,974	2,217.46
France	Franc	July 18	July 21	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Total												3,108.82
Lester L. Wolff: France	Franc	July 18	July 21	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Edward J. Gurney: France	do	do	do	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Brock Adams: France	do	do	do	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Joseph E. Karth: France	do	do	do	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Joe D. Waggonner, Jr.: France	do	do	do	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
George E. Brown: France	do	do	do	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Gale Schisler: France	do	do	do	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Bob Casey:												
France	do	do	do	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	Nov. 13	Nov. 16	4	286.8	50	1,147.5	200.00			1,147.5	200.00
Vietnam	Piaster	Nov. 17	Nov. 20	4	3,638.5	50	1,455.4	200.00			1,455.4	200.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 21	Nov. 22	1	1,032.5	50	1,032.5	50.00	600	29.06	16,325	79.06
Total												679.06
J. E. Wilson:												
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 4	Nov. 5	2	2,995	50	5,991	100.00			5,991	100.00
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 5	Nov. 6	1	22.5	50	3.9	8.99			3.9	8.99
Ethiopia	Dollar	Nov. 7	Nov. 8	2	57.7	23	114.14	46.00			114.14	46.00
Kenya	Shilling	Nov. 8	Nov. 9	1	184.35	26	184.35	26.00			184.35	26.00
South Africa	Rand	Nov. 10	Nov. 12	3	15.6	22	46.8	66.00			46.8	66.00
Australia	Pound	Nov. 13	Nov. 21	9	22.10	50	200-10-10	444.37			200-10-10	444.37
Netherlands [1]	Guilder								7,974	2,217.46	7,974	2,217.46
France	Franc	July 18	July 21	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Total												3,108.82
Peter A. Gerardi:												
France	Franc	July 18	July 21	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Switzerland	do	Sept. 11	Sept. 12	2	215.52	50	431.15	100.00			431.15	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Sept. 13	Sept. 17	5	1,500	50	6,750	225.00			6,750	225.00
Italy	Lira	Sept. 18	Sept. 20	3	31,250	50	93,750	150.00			93,750	150.00
Spain	Peseta	Sept. 20	Sept. 21	1	3,000	50	1,991	33.23			1,991	33.23
Portugal	Escuda	Sept. 22	Sept. 23	2	1,500	50	2,294.5	80.29			2,294.5	80.29
United Kingdom	Pound	Sept. 24	Sept. 25	2	17.17	50	35.14	100.00	35.14	100.00	71.8	200.00
Germany	Mark								4,737.6	1,184.10	4,737.6	1,184.10
Total												2,172.62
W. H. Boone:												
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Nov. 13	Nov. 16	4	286.8	50	1,147.5	200.00			1,147.5	200.00
Vietnam	Piasters	Nov. 17	Nov. 20	4	3,638.5	50	14,554	200.00			14,554	200.00
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 21	Nov. 24	4	1,032.5	50	3,613.7	175.00	600	29.00	4,213.7	204.00
India	Rupee	Nov. 25	Nov. 26	1	236.8	50	236.8	50.00			236.8	50.00
Lebanon	Pound	Nov. 26	Nov. 28	2	155	50	262.5	85.64			262.5	85.64
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 28	Nov. 29	1	450	50	250	27.78			250	27.78
Italy	do	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1	31,250	50	31,250	50.00			31,250	50.00
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	2,995	50	8,985	150.00			8,985	150.00
France	Franc	July 28	July 21	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Total												1,167.42
Chas. F. Ducander: France	Franc	July 18	July 21	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
H. A. Gould: France	do	do	do	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
J. M. Felton: France	do	do	do	4	245	50	980	200.00			980	200.00
Ken Hechler:												
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 4	Nov. 5	2	2,995	50	2,891	48.00			2,891	48.00
United Arab Republic	Pound	Nov. 6	Nov. 6	1	22.5	50	3.9	8.99			3.9	8.99
Ethiopia	Dollar	Nov. 7	Nov. 8	2	57.7	23	114.14	46.00			114.14	46.00
Kenya	Shilling	Nov. 8	Nov. 9	1	184.35	26	184.35	26.00			184.35	26.00
South Africa	Rand	Nov. 10	Nov. 12	3	15.6	22	46.8	66.00			46.8	66.00
Australia	Pound	Nov. 13	Nov. 21	9	22.10	50	113-4-11	250.38			113-4-11	250.38
Netherlands [1]	Guilder								7,974	2,217.46	7,974	2,217.46
Total												2,662.83

---

[1] Travel not accomplished in the Netherlands. Transportation to above-listed countries charged by State Department against Netherlands excess currencies account.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	19,447.85

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

MARCH 10, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Cecil R. King:												
England	Pound	Oct. 25	Nov. 15	22	18	50	200	558.19		[1] 832.60		1,390.79
Do	do	Nov. 26	Dec. 16	20								
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 15	Nov. 26	11	216.50	50	1,511	350.00				350.00
Paul Kaplowitz:												
France	do	Nov. 10	Nov. 15	5	250	50	1,250	250.00		[1] 828.20		1,078.20
Switzerland	do	Nov. 15	Nov. 16	1	216.50	50	216.50	50.00				50.00
Total								1,208.19		1,660.80		2,868.99

[1] Round trip.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,868.99

W. D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

FEBRUARY 24, 1966.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Cecil R. King, Member of Congress, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
England	Pound	Oct. 25	Nov. 15	22	18	50	200	558.19		[1] 832.60		1,390.79
Do	do	Nov. 26	Dec. 16	20								
Switzerland	Franc	Nov. 15	Nov. 26	11	216.50	50	1,511	350.00				350.00
Total								908.19		832.60		1,740.79

[1] Round trip.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,740.79

FEBRUARY 24, 1966.

CECIL R. KING,
Committee on Ways and Means.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Paul Kaplowitz, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
France	Franc	Nov. 10	Nov. 15	5	250	50	1,250	250		[1] 828.20		1,078.20
Switzerland	do	Nov. 15	Nov. 16	1	216.50	50	216.50	50				50.00
Total								300		828.20		1,128.20

[1] Round trip.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,128.20

FEBRUARY 8, 1966.

PAUL KAPLOWITZ,
Committee on Ways and Means.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Interparliamentary Union Conference, Ottawa, Canada, Sept. 7–17, 1965, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Alexander Pirnie: Canada	Dollar	410.00	382.53	66.70	62.23			13.90	12.97	490.60	457.73
W. R. Poage: Canada	do	190.00	177.27	98.99	92.35			24.45	22.80	313.44	292.42
Paul C. Jones: Canada	do	209.00	195.00	63.32	59.07			34.85	32.50	307.17	286.57
Emilio Q. Daddario: Canada	do	357.00	333.08	113.17	105.58			32.15	30.00	502.32	468.66
Edward J. Derwinski: Canada	do	133.00	124.08	91.68	85.53			27.05	25.23	251.73	234.84
B. F. Sisk											
Canada	do	190.00	177.27	115.83	108.06			20.00	18.66	325.83	303.99
United States	U.S. dollar								67.93		67.93
E. Ross Adair: Canada	Dollar	171.00	159.54	99.73	93.03			34.00	31.72	304.73	284.29
Robert McClory: Canada	do	190.00	177.27	120.65	112.56			30.00	27.99	340.65	317.82
Clarence D. Long:											
Canada	do	190.00	177.27	88.71	82.76			38.35	35.77	317.06	295.80
Do	U.S. dollar						46.10				46.10
Catherine May:											
Canada	Dollar	120.00	111.96	93.71	87.43	60.00	55.98	39.62	39.96	313.33	295.33
United States	U.S. dollar								153.18		153.18
Eligio de la Garza: Canada	Dollar	38.00	35.45	3.10	2.90					41.10	38.35
Dr. George B. Galloway: Canada	do	250.00	233.25	175.84	164.05			23.80	22.20	449.64	419.50
Katharine St. George: Canada	do	150.00	139.95	22.04	20.56			16.98	15.84	189.02	176.35
Dr. Charles Gellner: Canada	do	120.00	111.96	54.23	50.59			32.70	30.50	206.93	193.05
Donald R. Morris: Canada	do	130.00	121.30	62.92	58.70			26.03	24.29	218.95	204.29
Delegation expenses:											
Auto and taxi hire, Canada	Dollar					622.18	580.14			622.18	580.14
Chauffeur hire, Canada	do					1,291.53	1,204.28			1,291.53	1,204.28
Baggage trucks, Canada	do					38.07	35.52			38.07	35.52
Cartage of furniture, Canada	do					84.00	78.37			84.00	78.37
Furniture rental, Canada	do							57.50	53.64	57.50	53.64
Typewriter rental, Canada	do							42.00	39.17	42.00	39.17
Telephone calls, installations, Canada.	do							207.83	193.91	207.83	193.91
Office supplies, signs, Canada	do							27.35	25.52	27.35	25.52
Office rental, Canada	do	450.00	419.85							450.00	419.85
Embassy employees overtime, Canada.	do							337.04	314.26	337.04	314.26
Embassy staff expenses, Canada	do					7.60	7.09	20.00	18.66	27.60	25.75
Staff, delegation meals, Canada	do			494.14	461.20					494.14	461.20
Hotel, Embassy receptions, Canada.	do			807.95	753.82					807.95	753.82
Newspapers, Canada	do							73.32	68.39	73.32	68.39
Gratuities, Canada	do							97.25	90.73	97.25	90.73
Miscellaneous expenses, Canada	do							69.05	64.42	69.05	64.42
Total			3,077.03		2,400.42		2,007.48		1,460.24		8,945.17

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	8,677.46
Appropriated funds: Other	267.71
Total	8,945.17

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, spring meetings, Interparliamentary Union, Dublin, Ireland, Apr. 18–25, 1965, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Alexander Pirnie: Ireland	Pound	51–19–6	145.54	47–1–3	132.09			4–17–6	13.64	103–18–3	291.27
Paul C. Jones: Ireland	do	55–19–6	156.78	27–17–9	78.19			1–1–7	3.01	84–18–10	237.98
Emilio Q. Daddario: Ireland	do	51–19–6	145.54	23–10–6	65.97			0–2–11	.40	75–12–11	211.91
Thomas N. Downing: Ireland	do	51–19–6	145.54	28–15–4	80.66			0–2–1	.29	80–16–11	226.49
Edward J. Derwinski:											
Ireland	do	51–12–6	144.56	9–13–1	27.04			0–17–16	2.54	62–3–11	174.14
Do	U.S. dollar				30.85				8.10		38.95
E. Ross Adair: Ireland	Pound	56–5–3	157.64	24–3–8	67.82			2–4–3	6.20	82–13–2	231.66
Robert McClory: Ireland	do	56–5–3	157.64	43–17–0	123.09			6–1–1	16.97	106–3–4	297.70
John S. Monagan: Ireland	do	51–19–6	145.54	15–12–9	43.89			1–7–7	3.85	68–19–10	193.28
Otis G. Pike: Ireland	do	51–19–6	145.54	25–0–10	70.21			0–2–3	.31	77–2–7	216.06
Dr. George B. Galloway: Ireland	do	55–19–6	156.78	33–6–7	93.45			1–4–3	3.40	90–10–4	253.63
Katharine St. George: Ireland	do	26–8–0	73.94	1–10–9	4.29			1–10–5	4.25	29–9–2	82.48
Dr. Charles Zinn: Ireland	do	37–2–6	103.96	11–13–10	32.79			0–0–7	.21	48–16–11	136.96
Elmore Jackson: Ireland	do	51–19–6	145.54	22–18–6	64.19			2–1–7	5.82	76–19–7	215.55
Delegation expenses, Ireland and United States:											
Hotel office rental: Ireland	Pound	103–15–6	290.60							103–15–6	290.60
Transportation costs:											
Ireland	do					611–2–10	1,710.97			611–2–10	1,710.97
United States	U.S. dollar						4.10				4.10
Embassy employees' overtime: Ireland	Pound							198–9–10	554.01	198–9—10	554.01
Ceremonial wreath: Ireland	do							4–4–0	11.76	4–4–0	11.76
Official reception, meals: Ireland	do			326–17–10	915.28					326–17–10	915.28
Do	U.S. dollar				56.00						56.00
Gratuities: Ireland	Pound							42–0–0	117.60	42–0–0	117.60
Miscellaneous: Ireland	do							16–0–4	42.84	16–0–4	44.84
Total			2,115.14		1,885.81		1,715.07		797.20		6,513.22

RECAPITUALTION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	6,414.17
Appropriated funds:	99.05
Total	6,513.22

Thomas E. Morgan,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, House of Representatives Delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Robert N. C. Nix, Chairman: Mexico.	U.S. dollar		67.96		35.33		12.58		20.30		136.17
Hon. Harris B. McDowell: Mexico	do		102.33		35.91		10.00		10.00		158.24
Hon. James C. Wright, Jr.: Mexico	do		103.14		31.00		7.50		4.50		146.14
Hon. Ronald Brooks Cameron: Mexico	do		73.06		24.18		165.00		59.46		321.70
Hon. Henry B. Gonzalez: Mexico	do		59.72		28.35		15.40		66.16		169.63
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski: Mexico	do		108.40		45.40		63.12		9.20		226.12
Hon. William L. Springer: Mexico	do		111.04		63.52		12.10		1.70		188.36
Hon. F. Bradford Morse: Mexico	do		110.26		53.19		7.00		17.55		188.00
Hon. James Harvey: Mexico	do		110.28		49.30		4.80		24.07		188.45
Hon. Alphonzo Bell: Mexico	do		59.06		30.78				17.00		106.84
Albert C. F. Westphal: Mexico	do		70.37		32.15		8.10		12.50		123.12
Helen L. Hashagen: Mexico	do		56.02		14.20		5.00		8.00		83.22
Delegation expenses, House share									564.06		564.06
Total			1,031.64		443.31		310.60		814.50		2,600.05

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Other (Public Law 86-420)	2,600.05

Robert N. C. Nix,
Chairman, House Delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, House Delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1965

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mark Andrews: Canada	Dollar		57		7.39				1.25		65.64
Donald M. Fraser: Canada	do		78		5.20		12.80				96.00
Cornelius E. Gallagher: Canada	do		190		19.19		60.00		8.95		278.14
Harold T. Johnson: Canada	do		79		6.55				5.50		91.05
William T. Murphy: Canada	do		78						.25		78.25
Armistead I. Selden, Jr., Canada	do		79		6.00						85.00
Robert T. Stafford: Canada	do		73		12.13						85.13
Vernon W. Thomson: Canada	do		57		9.59				1.50		68.09
Stanley R. Tupper: Canada	do		57		12.99				.40		70.39
J. Irving Whalley: Canada	do		96		6.23				.20		102.43
Sidney R. Yates: Canada	do		38		2.50						40.50
Albert C. F. Westphal: Canada	do		62		3.65						65.65
Louise O'Brien: Canada	do		62		4.25				4.30		70.55
Delegation expenses	do								316.76		316.76
Total			1,006		95.67		72.80		339.11		1,513.58

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-42	1,513.85

Cornelius E. Gallagher,
Chairman, House Delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

March 1966.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2206. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Dolores project, Colorado, pursuant to the provisions of 53 Stat. 1187 (H. Doc. No. 412); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2207. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the statistical supplement, stockpile report, for the period ending December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79-520; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2208. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 312(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2209. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2210. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2211. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according the beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification under the act, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2212. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a substantive portion of a final report on a long-range economic development plan for the territory of Guam, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-170; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES IN PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7423. A bill to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13448. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. 1965 Report of Statistical Activities of the Federal Government: Personnel, Equipment, and Contract Costs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Economic Committee. Report on the January 1966 Economic Report of the President; without amendment (Rept. No. 1334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-second Report—Federal Reserve System—Check Clearance Float; without amendment (Rept. No. 1335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5533. A bill for the relief of Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8219. A bill for the relief of Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8833. A bill for the relief of Serafina Antonietta Corea; with amendments (Rept. No. 1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10220. A bill for the relief of Abdul Wohabe; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 13740. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13741. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13742. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 13743. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 13744. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13745. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 13746. A bill to provide for the best care, welfare, and safeguards against suffering for certain animals used for scientific purposes without impeding necessary research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13747. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 13748. A bill to amend title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide employment opportunities for unemployed, low-income persons in subprofessional services careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13749. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13750. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13751. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to further promote and assist in modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities through grants for amortization of indebtedness incurred for that purpose, direct loans, and guarantees of loans, and through grants for the planning of such modernization, and to authorize grants for development of new technology systems and concepts in the provision of health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13752. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 13753. A bill to establish a "Bread and Butter Corps" for the purpose of implementing the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening the agricultural economies of friendly nations, improving agricultural skills and knowledge in such nations, promoting world peace and friendship, and combating the threat of world food shortages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 13754. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain sick leave as creditable service for annuity computation under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 13755. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 13756. A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the travel allowance of grand and petit jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13757. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to correct an inequity with respect to survivor annuities of certain students by reason of the 4-month interim period requirement between school years; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13758. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to require additional labeling on some types of airplane glue and other products containing certain highly toxic substances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 13759. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 13760. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 13761. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13762. A bill to authorize civil commitment in lieu of criminal punishment in certain cases involving narcotic addicts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13763. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to assist them in the construction of facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13764. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to assist them in establishing treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abusers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13765. A bill relating to the penalties for violations of certain narcotic and marihuana laws of the United States, and to the treatment of narcotic addicts and other persons suffering from a mental or physical condition committed to the custody of the Attorney General; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 13766. A bill to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to title II of the compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 13767. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 13768. A bill to authorize the disposal of celestite from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13769. A bill to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber (sisal) from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13770. A bill to authorize the disposal of crocidolite asbestos (harsh) from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13771. A bill to authorize the disposal of diamond tools from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13772. A bill to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13773. A bill to authorize the disposal of opium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13774. A bill to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13775. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 13776. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 13777. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 13778. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 13779. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 13780. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 13781. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13782. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 13783. A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 19, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 13784. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for a Minority Economic Council; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 13785. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 13786. A bill to promote the advancement of science and the education of scientists through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities of the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 13787. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 13788. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to protect any veteran against a loss of pension as a result of enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 13789. A bill to carry out the provisions of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for regularly staggered 3-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13790. A bill to provide financial and other aid, under the Housing Act of 1949 and related Federal programs, to encourage and assist in the preservation and maintenance of historic structures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13791. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for a Minority Economic Council; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 13792. A bill to promote and coordinate historic preservation activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, other public bodies, and private organizations and individuals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.J. Res. 906. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.J. Res. 908. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a study of the marlins, sailfishes, and related species of interest to the recreational fishermen of the United States, its territories, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.J. Res. 909. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide 3-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.J. Res. 910. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.J. Res. 911. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 912. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.J. Res. 913. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 914. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.J. Res. 915. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 916. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 917. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.J. Res. 918. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 919. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.J. Res. 920. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 921. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 922. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 923. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.J. Res. 924. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.J. Res. 925. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 926. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.J. Res. 927. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 928. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 929. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 930. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.J. Res. 931. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.J. Res. 932. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 933. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.J. Res. 934. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.J. Res. 935. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.J. Res. 936. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 937. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.J. Res. 938. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.J. Res. 939. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.J. Res. 940. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 941. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RACE:

H.J. Res. 942. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 943. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 944. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.J. Res. 945. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 946. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.J. Res. 947. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.J. Res. 948. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.J. Res. 949. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 950. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.J. Res. 951. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.J. Res. 952. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.J. Res. 953. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.J. Res. 954. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 955. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 956. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Con. Res. 618. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the 7-day period beginning March 27, 1966, as National Biddy Basketball Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13793. A bill for the relief of Salvatore and Domitella Barone and minor child Josephine Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13794. A bill for the relief of Salvatore and Vincenza Coico and minor children Francesca and Luigi Coico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13795. A bill for the relief of Trifun Pavlovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 13796. A bill for the relief of Allan Robert Speevak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 13797. A bill for the relief of Orlando Fidel Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 13798. A bill for the relief of Sheng Tong and Sheng Mee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13799. A bill for the relief of Caterina Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 13800. A bill for the relief of Sp. Ronald J. Olson, U.S. Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 13801. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to the estate of C. Bland Jamison a new and correct patent to certain lands in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13802. A bill for the relief of Mr. Michael Valle Velasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13803. A bill for the relief of Teresina Del Toro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

United States Must Expand Domestic Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Food and Drug Administration approve the use of fish protein concentrate for human consumption. Approval of this concentrate would give many benefits, a major one being the expansion of the U.S. fishing industry.

The United States has now slipped to fifth place among fishing nations of the world. It is ridiculous that this Nation should rank behind Peru, Japan, Red China, and Russia as a producer of seafoods. Even more absurd is the fact that nearly 62 percent of the seafood eaten by Americans is imported from foreign nations.

Each year Americans spend up to $600 million for imported seafood, and the State Department has allowed Soviet sales of seafoods in this country.

In view of the increase in Cuba-based Russian fishing trawlers operating in the South Atlantic and Gulf areas near Florida, I just wonder whether these Soviet seafoods sold in the United States will be taken from grounds once dominated by Florida fishermen?

American fishermen now take only 5.1 percent of the total fish caught throughout the world. Russia's catch is almost double that of this Nation. In addition, the U.S.S.R. is placing a greater national priority on its fisheries, while U.S. fishing is declining.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, as a first step toward revitalization of the American fishing industry I urge the Food and Drug Administration to approve the production of fish protein concentrate, or fish flour. This concentrate, which is produced by pulverizing the entire fish, sanitizing it, further reducing it to fine white powder, would then be used as an additive to human foods. It has been suggested that the cereal and grain industries use the additive to fortify their products. Also, markets for such product in undeveloped nations could be quite large.

Studies show that if only the unharvested fish caught from U.S. coastal waters were used for fish concentrate, sufficient high quality protein would be provided to balance the diets of up to 1 billion people for 300 days. This diet supplement could be accomplished at a cost of approximately one-half cent per person per day.

And if the FDA approved fish concentrate the U.S. fishing industry could sell over five times more fish than it is selling today.

Certainly a seafood producing State such as Florida would feel the immediate impact of this new market.

Congress and the Health of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech I delivered at the seminar on science, public policy, and public information, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md., on October 28, 1965:

CONGRESS AND THE HEALTH OF THE PEOPLE

(Address by the Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat of Rhode Island, chairman, House Subcommittee on Appropriations, at the seminar on science, public policy, and public information, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md., October 28, 1966)

Dr. Shannon, Dr. Sessoms, Dr. Masur, ladies and gentlemen, I am impressed indeed with the number and quality of ladies in this group. I am sure that if the President could be here this evening, he'd stop threatening to fire his information staff and replace them with Johnson City High School kids.

I am very glad to have this opportunity to address this meeting on the interplay of science, public policy and public information. It provides me with the first opportunity I have had to explore the state of the art of public information with those who are expert in the translation and interpretation of science, medicine, and related fields for the general public.

As all of you know, it has been my privilege to have had something to do with the field of medicine—particularly medical research—over the past 20-odd years. In that brief span, medical schools have gradually added the missing link in their communications with the community and the press; and the government agencies—which formerly refused either to hire public information specialists or, if they did, took care to phony their titles or otherwise hide them—have come out into the open and assigned them important responsibilities.

The results, of course, have been dramatic. No longer is it necessary for a reporter to make a dozen calls to a medical school to track down a needed bit of information. No longer is the Federal health agency operated like a close corporation: its business is virtually conducted in public. But the most heartening development of all has been the change in attitude on the part of the scientists and practitioners of medicine. Attitudes ranging from unresponsiveness and complete distrust of so-called outsiders has been changing to those of cooperation and helpfulness. You here tonight—and your associates in the several media—have played a large part in these changes and you are to be congratulated for it.

But with the expression of new emphasis on the service aspect of modern medicine and all that this implies in terms of needed facilities and professional manpower, it is more vital than ever before that there be no failure in communication with the general public. NIH is to be commended for calling this seminar—to enable you representatives of the academic world to meet and exchange views with your counterparts here at NIH. Your involvement in the shaping of public policy is great—and in my opinion is going to become much greater.

Let me tell you why: the 1st session of the 89th Congress has provided the basic framework for vast new gains in health and medical education. I am very proud to have played a part in this, but I am convinced that only the right combination of public awareness and public support made it possible.

We have torn down some of the economic barriers separating our older citizens from the care they need.

We have taken steps to assure that top-quality medical care may be obtained in every region of our country by authorizing the bringing together of the worlds of medical research, medical education, and medical practice.

We have greatly strengthened the ability of our health professional schools to prepare greater numbers of better trained practitioners to serve the medical, dental, nursing, and public health needs of the present and the future.

Further, Congress has extended and expanded the vaccination assistance and support of migrant health services, extended and expanded the health research facilities construction program, permitted Federal funds to support staffing of community mental health centers, and provided for a greatly improved system of medical libraries around this Nation. We have done all these things while at the same time providing the largest—but still inadequate—appropriation for medical research in history.

Now, this is an outstanding record, and all of us in the Congress are proud of it.

But we know that all of this was possible only because there was sufficient understanding and awareness among the people of this Nation of the possibilities for better health. Thus we in Congress were able to give these programs the boost they needed. Public policy and practical action came together in a happy meeting.

We in the Congress have a responsibility—and the power—to promote the general welfare; but we cannot discharge the responsibility or exercise the power in a vacuum.

This is where you—as public information people in government and in the academic community—come into the picture.

The newly authorized and expanded programs of the 89th Congress represent a considerable investment on behalf of the American people. Thus, the taxpayers not only have a right to know of the results of their investment but—in certain of the programs—an adequately informed public is an absolute necessity if the program is to succeed.

For example, a tremendous task lies ahead in seeing that the public is adequately informed about the many aspects of the heart disease, cancer, and stroke program. The NIH public information staff—as well as you, at the medical colleges and other institutions—will have this job. In this instance, it will be particularly important to see that the public does not receive the wrong information. All of this means one thing: added responsibility—a phrase you have heard numerous times in the past.

I am aware that already—by the very nature of your functions—you are involved in a wide array of activities.

I know, for example, of the fundraising some of you must do to help your institutions as they improve their facilities. Earlier this month I was at the University of Utah for the dedication of the university's new medical center—the largest public building in the State. That center cost more than $15 million, and, while State and Federal appropriations covered some of the construction costs, a considerable amount still had to be met by fundraising. And just last week I learned of the University of Chicago's plan for raising $160 million.

I am also aware of the amount of effort many of you devote to student recruitment programs, continuing professional education programs, and straightforward community relations projects.

You may be concerned at times at the seeming fragmentation of your efforts, but I would hope that you can continue to meet your current responsibilities and at the same time interweave new responsibilities in such a way that—regardless of the task, directly or indirectly—you contribute to an increased public understanding of science and medicine in today's and tomorrow's society.

Easier said than done, you say. And I must agree. But a start must be made. Perhaps the most important area to consider is that of human resources needed to do the job. Now if your field is typical, you might first start by asking yourselves where the new freshly trained manpower is coming from? I understand that NIH has a modest training program for young people entering this field but that its handful of vacancies has never been filled at any one time because sufficient numbers of qualified people simply have not been available.

You might ask yourselves whether there is sufficient awareness of the needs and opportunities in the field among students.

You might determine whether the journalism school in your area is aware of the extent to which science and technology pervades our daily lives and what the school is doing in response to it. And while you're at it, you might determine whether your journalism school is even teaching its students to write. If there is substance to the charges in the current issue of Harper's, I wonder whether the journalism schools—with the exception of a handful—can be regarded as a reliable source of basically trained manpower for the health information field.

One more question on human resources. Has anyone posed the outside possibility that the science departments and the medical schools should teach their students to write in a concise and orderly fashion? This would not only improve communications in a number of ways, but you might even be able to interest some of the science students in the health information field.

Now let me pose a question or two on the physical resources of the information business. I know you have progressed a long way from the days when the news release went out and the job was considered finished. Today you are using a wide variety of audio and visual materials to tell your stories. But don't forget that the tool department is being changed as much and as rapidly as the main areas of your interest—science and medicine.

Just one example—and you are all equally aware of it, I know: Color television. There is no doubt that it is here to stay. Expanded color programing coupled with recent surveys that put science and medicine at the top of the public's interest list—aside from spy stories—means a tremendous opportunity for all of you.

Thus, the question: How many of you are geared to acquiring and making available materials for use in color TV? Let me phrase another question on your total activities. How many of you have a budget against which you can plan your projects and programs over a period of time? This approach—as many of you have demonstrated—permits the generation of new ideas and development of new approaches. Or do you find yourself passing the hat when a new emergency arises?

A third element—the substantive content of your strictly public information activities—concerns me.

It has long worried me—and it worries me more and more—that the public seems to have so little idea about the nature of the research process. It needs to be educated to realize that medical advances are the result of long and patient labor over a period of years—rather than the result of pouring a few million dollars over a few gifted scientists working in well-equipped laboratories to produce instant cures.

I am concerned about the amount of science-fiction that is being given the public today in the guise of science reporting. This is the science news story without any perspective. The public needs to know—for instance—the difficulties in the way of developing the first successful implantation of a permanent, artificial heart at the same time that we hold out the promise of such a development.

Now let me turn to a fourth element, namely, cooperation. The fact that you are here, ready to consider, as a group, some of the factors that are important to your work, is commendable. If I have any criticism, it is that this meeting did not take place a year or two or three ago.

A closer involvement of public information people—a closer identification by you and your staffs at universities and medical schools all over the country with national goals—is called for. A closer coordination of your efforts with those of the National Institutes of Health is also highly desirable if you are to make your major contribution to the dialog between the citizen and his government that is the hallmark of democracy.

We have been fortunate in the past 20 years, in this regard. We launched a post-World War II expansion of the National medical research effort largely upon the wave of public confidence that followed the successful scientific achievement of releasing nuclear energy.

To my mind, what has been made possible by the actions of the first session of the 89th Congress is an expression of a new wave of public confidence—a wave of confidence that expresses satisfaction with and approval of our national efforts in medical science but indicates that the service aspects of medicine require greater attention.

Now if this wave is to be sustained we must satisfy the general public's right to know of the results of their investment, and, as I have said, in certain programs the public's right to begin to benefit directly from them through enlightened involvement.

You ladies and gentlemen, as representatives of highly respected institutions, and your colleagues at NIH can—between you—accomplish much of the education job that needs to be done. You and your staffs at the medical schools and universities can help shape the public policy goals of a modern, scientifically literate society.

Erin Go Bragh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the feast day of St. Patrick, the patron saint of the Emerald Isle, truly as the old song says, "It's a great day for the Irish." But it is typical of the Irish that they share their great day with people of all nationalities and as I look around the Chamber, it is easy to see that on this wonderful day when we commemorate the memory of the apostle to the Irish, everyone is an Irishman for the day.

Ireland is a small country as countries go but Ireland is not merely the 4 provinces and the 32 counties that lie between Cobh on the south and Belfast on the north. Rather Ireland is the millions of persons of Irish descent whose ancestors left Hibernia—a name which is of Latin extraction, I might point out—during one of the times of "throuble" and settled in the United States, the Dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and other places throughout the world. With them the Irish took their love of home and of God and a pride in their Celtic heritage.

An indomitable race, the Irish have always exhibited a patriotism and pride in their adopted lands which is second to none. Indeed. in every one of our wars, the presence of the Celt has always been more than evident.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation on this day, owes much to its citizens of Irish extraction. I join with Irishmen everywhere in a fervent, Erin go bragh.

National School Patrol Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to cosponsor a joint resolution providing for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Patrol Week.

I believe that this honor is richly deserved by our students, who come to school a bit early, stay a little later, and give up some of their free time so that they can contribute to the protection of their fellow students.

This resolution honors the members of the school safety patrols throughout the Nation, but I would like to note here that I am particularly proud of the members of my district, who do such a wonderful job for their schools and cities.

Their love and devotion to duty will long be remembered, and a special tribute is in order to each and every one.

The American Automobile Association, a joint sponsor of these programs along with the schools and local police forces, awards the young patrol members, who have actually saved a life, with Gold Lifesaver Medals, and I feel that we, too, should recognize the great contribution that all of these fine young boys and girls unselfishly make to our society by designating this week as National School Safety Patrol Week.

The selfless consideration of their fellow man, which these students exemplify, is a quality which we strive to instill in our young citizens, and the safety patrol offers one avenue to achieve this objective.

I am hopeful that this resolution will be passed in the near future so that this year's week will coincide with the national school safety patrol parade, which will be held here in Washington on May

14, and in which more than 30,000 boys and girls from 25 or more States are expected to participate.

I am extremely pleased to join with my colleagues in requesting that this recognition be given to the members of our school safety patrols.

The Economic Development of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the story of economic development in Puerto Rico is one of the great success stories of this decade. It is a tale of which that island can well be proud; and the citizens of the United States, who have helped to make that progress possible, can share in her pride.

In a speech in Washington on February 24, 1965, the Honorable SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, compresses the island's history into a very few, eloquent paragraphs. Our colleague notes in his conclusion:

> In the 5 years since Castro has ruled rich Cuba, its per capita income has declined by 15 percent. During these same 5 years, Puerto Rico's per capita income has risen by more than 50 percent. I can think of few statistics which are more sobering.

The progress of Puerto Rico is indeed sobering. It is also heartening. Our distinguished colleague, Mr. POLANCO-ABREU, has told it well. The text of his speech follows:

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF PUERTO RICO

(By SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU)

There is probably no group in the world which is more dedicated to the goal of economic development of less wealthy nations than the membership of this society. I feel very much at home with men who are personally and professionally wrapped up in the vast problems of the two-thirds of the world who still live in great poverty.

Certainly all of us are perturbed by the enormous gulf which separates the "have" from the "have nots" nations, and even more perturbed by the fact that this gulf seems to be growing, rather than diminishing.

Happily, there have been some noteworthy exceptions to this trend of the rich getting richer, while the poor get poorer or barely hold their own. The rates of economic growth in Japan, Israel, and Puerto Rico, for example, are now much higher than the growth rates of more highly developed countries. In contrast with most underdeveloped countries, moreover, their growth has been nothing short of spectacular. Today, Japan, Israel, and Puerto Rico are on the other side of the fence, sending their technicians and providing technical assistance to their less fortunate neighbors.

Recognizing that Puerto Rico is no more a typical case than Japan or Israel, it is nevertheless worthwhile, I believe, to understand something of its economic development history in order to see more clearly some of the problems characteristic of underdeveloped countries and some of the solutions that have proved workable in Puerto Rico.

In 1898, when Puerto Rico was ceded by Spain to the United States, the island was indeed underdeveloped. Most people lived in poverty on small subsistence farms. Families were large and few children could be educated. Coffee was the only important export, and the total volume of overseas trade was small, indeed. The beginning of a modernized Puerto Rican economy was the development of sugar as a major export industry.

Growth of the sugar industry provided a necessary base for the more diversified economic development that was to come much later. The method of its development, however, was most damaging to the people of Puerto Rico. The sugar industry, largely owned by U.S. interests, took out from Puerto Rico far more in profits than the amount it invested or reinvested.

The depression of the 1930's hit Puerto Rico with great severity. Sugar and coffee prices tumbled to ruinous levels. Many coffee plantations, which had been severely damaged by hurricanes in 1928 and 1932, were not replanted. Everywhere there was deep social and political unrest. Puerto Rico was on the brink of revolution. Federal relief programs, although substantial in size, were not sufficient to offset the collapse in the economy.

When it did come in 1940, the revolution was a peaceful one. A newly-formed political party, led by Luis Muñoz Marin, won a slim victory at the polls. Muñoz had campaigned, not on the traditional basis of Puerto Rico's political status, but on immediate and pressing economic and social issues. He promised bread for the hungry; land for the landless peasant; and freedom from political domination by the absentee sugar companies. His victory brought hope to a people that had for many years been mired in hopelessness.

During the war years, Muñoz and his new Popular Party administration laid the groundwork for the economic and social development programs which were later to be put into high gear. They also had a revenue windfall of $160 million from countervailing excise taxes on rum, which sold in large quantities in the United States during the war. And although this was badly needed for public assistance and a score of urgent, immediate problems, the Government made the decision to invest this revenue in a number of public corporations intended to spearhead Puerto Rico's economic development.

Included among these publicly-owned corporations were utility companies in the fields of power, water supply, transportation, and communications. There were five others that had specific economic development objectives—the Government Development Bank, the Industrial Development Company, the Land Authority, and the Agricultural Company. Today, there are 22 public corporations in operation. Most of the larger ones are self-financing and today their assets total well over a billion dollars. Their establishment early in the program and their continued record of sound and constructive management have been major factors in the success of the development program as a whole.

To appreciate the strategy of the development program that was being planned and started in the 1940's, one needs to know something about Puerto Rico and its resources. The island is only about 100 miles long and 36 miles wide. We have sunshine, beaches and the sea, mountains, and a tropical rain forest.

Coffee and tobacco, and fruits and vegetables are grown in the mountains; and we have a rapidly-expanding livestock and poultry industry, which produces about as much farm income as sugar cane, our traditional crop.

It began to be clear even in the 1940's that Puerto Rican economy could not depend primarily on agriculture. The entire surface of the island has less than an acre of land per person and only about a third of its is suitable for crops of any kind. Even forestry is limited by the rugged terrain and by the great variety of trees and undergrowth typical of forests in the tropics. Prospecting for minerals started years ago and continues actively, but none has yet proved exploitable.

With limited land and no commercial resources of fuel or minerals, industrial development has had to be the key element in Puerto Rico's economic development program. But there were many people in the 1940's, including some of the experts, who believed that an industrial program was doomed to failure in a small agricultural country with such limited physical resources. In any case, it seemed quite clear that private investors would not initially undertake so rash a venture unless the government functioned as a very active catalyst.

At first the government constructed and operated five factories, but it soon became evident that it would be impossible for the Industrial Development Company to create jobs for Puerto Rico's rapidly rising population by this method. Some way had to be found to enlist private capital on a large scale in the industrial program. A sound program of tax exemption, which was legislated in 1948, has proved to be the key incentive necessary for the development of private industrial enterprise in Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico's program of tax incentives and assistance to private industry rests on two basic elements in Puerto Rican-United States relations. In accordance with its association with the United States, Federal taxes (with minor exceptions) do not apply in Puerto Rico and there are no tariffs or other restrictions on the flow of trade and money between the two areas. Since most Federal taxes, including the Federal corporate income tax do not apply in Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rican Government, by exempting a corporation from its own taxes, is able to grant complete tax freedom. Under present legislation, it does so for manufacturing and hotel enterprises for a period which ranges from ten years of tax exemption in the San Juan metropolitan area to 17 years in less-developed parts of the island.

Free trade with the United States, the other key element in United States-Puerto Rican relations, meant that a manufacturing operation in postwar Puerto Rico was not limited to what was then a very small local market. A plant efficient enough to compete with U.S. producers and also able to pay ocean freight costs, was in a position to sell without any other restrictions in what was, and is, the world's largest common market.

Our promotion efforts were at first slow in yielding results. By 1950 only about 80 new, privately operated plants had been promoted, and most of them were relatively small. By 1955, 300 new privately owned factories had been established. Today, 10 years later, there are more than a thousand new, privately owned factories operating in Puerto Rico. Most of them are affiliates of U.S. manufacturing concerns.

These factories produce over 300 different products. Apparel, textiles, electronics, machinery, and petrochemicals are among the largest and fastest growing of the new Puerto Rican industries. About three-quarters of their output is exported, mostly to the United States. Last year (1963–64), exports of the new industries totaled $556 million, more than three times the value of our shipments of sugar and other agricultural products. Manufacturing industries now employ 105,000 workers at an average wage of $1.15 an hour.

Puerto Rico is no longer a one-crop agricultural economy, moreover. Agricultural production has continued to expand and diversify. The value of livestock and poultry products, for example, is now about equal to sugar. But even with a growing total of agricultural production, manufacturing is today more than twice as important as agriculture as a source of income and as a stimulus to the general economy.

To develop manufacturing to the point it has already reached has taken considerably more than tax exemption, free trade, and promotion. The Puerto Rico Economic Development Administration and our vocational educational system have had to train thousands of workers and supervisors. Many manufacturers have needed and have received marketing, engineering, and other forms of technical assistance, as well as laboratory and testing services. For nearly a decade, the Industrial Development Co. has maintained a stock of about 50 new factory buildings throughout the island ready for immediate occupancy. The company and the Government Development Bank stand ready to participate in almost any kind of financing arrangement that seems mutually beneficial to the prospective manufacturer and to the people of Puerto Rico.

Tourism development was another logical target for Puerto Rico. The island's kind climate, its golden beaches, and its beautiful scenery provided the natural resources on which a major tourist industry could be built. Nevertheless, tourism was a relatively slow starter.

But in the past 7 years the growth of Puerto Rican tourism has been spectacular. We have about 7,000 hotel rooms, two-thirds of which have been built within this 7-year period.

Primarily because of the swift expansion of manufacturing and tourism, the growth of the Puerto Rican economy as a whole has been among the most rapid anywhere in the world. Discounting price increases, the increase in real Commonwealth gross product during the past 5 years was 58 percent, an average of 9.5 percent, compounded annually. The largest gains in real gross product or real national income recorded elsewhere by the United Nations were 9.6 percent for Israel between 1952 and 1960, and 9.5 percent for Japan between 1954 and 1960.

It is, of course, a great flow of capital investment that accounts for Puerto Rico's record, or near-record rate of economic expansion. For 7 years, gross investment in fixed capital has been 20 percent or more of Commonwealth gross product. Last year it was 24.6 percent. Such a high rate of investment is characteristic of highly developed countries like Holland, Sweden, Canada and the United States but not of underdeveloped countries where capital is ordinarily very scarce.

Recognizing the high productivity of new investment in our economy, Puerto Rico has not only welcomed but actively promoted the investment of outside capital. As a result, about half of the funds invested in Puerto Rico have come from external sources, mainly the United States. There are three principal channels through which these funds flow in: first, direct investment, mainly in factories, hotels, and commercial establishments; second, the sale of bonds and other obligations of the Commonwealth and municipal governments and the public corporations; and third, the purchase of Federal Housing Administration guaranteed mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association (called Fanny May) and other investors outside Puerto Rico.

Direct investment of externally owned funds in Puerto Rican factories already exceeds half a billion dollars. Outstanding obligations of the Commonwealth and municipal governments and of Puerto Rico's public corporations total nearly a billion. Nearly two-thirds of this is accounted for by the public corporations, of which the Water Resources Authority is the largest.

I have been speaking in economic abstractions. Now let me translate this into human terms. In 1940, Puerto Rico's per capita income was $121. By 1950 it had inched up to $279. In 1964 it reached $832, almost triple the figure of 14 years earlier. Even allowing for price increases, this meant that real per capita income had more than doubled in the past 14 years. In 1950, per capita income in Puerto Rico was barely 18 percent of the U.S. average, but by 1960, it had risen to 30 percent. So even in comparison with the United States, the gap has been closing rapidly. These per capita figures have, of course, deep human meaning. They mean that a man who was worried about being able to afford a pair of shoes 25 years ago, now worries about finding a parking space for his Chevrolet; and that the woman who then wondered if she could feed her children, now is concerned with providing them with high school or college education.

Let me cite some revealing indexes of this new, relative prosperity. In only 6 years, the people of Puerto Rico raised their per capita consumption of animal proteins from 54 percent of the U.S. average to 82 percent. In these same 6 years, the registration of motor vehicles increased twofold, while the number of telephones has doubled in only 3 years. University enrollment is twice that of 9 years ago, and per capita expenditures for public health are now about the same in Puerto Rico as in the United States. One of the most dramatic results is that a Puerto Rican baby at birth can now expect to live to 70 years.

All these are impressive gains, but it is certainly logical to ask how much of Puerto Rico's experience has any relevance to the needs of other developing areas, and how much is peculiar to its own special conditions. Primary among these, of course, is the special economic-political relation with the United States.

Let it be said from the outset that Puerto Rico's spectacular growth could never have been achieved without its special relationship to the United States. But it is equally true that this relationship did not automatically give Puerto Rico a passport to prosperity. The fiscal and trade relations with the United States which exist today are almost precisely the same as those which existed from 1898 to 1940. Yet prior to 1940, the economic situation of Puerto Rico was desperate. The great change in productivity and per capita income has taken place only in recent years, and despite the fact that the economic intrinsics have not changed. "Why?" you may ask.

And here let me say frankly that I will give you a personal opinion, rather than a scientific evaluation. I believe that the heart of Puerto Rico's spectacular growth lies in the sterling quality and unshakable stability of its Government; in its true, genuine concern for social as well as economic development, and in its constant consideration of the human element.

Puerto Rico has been fortunate in having a stable, dedicated, democratic local Government, whose chief executive and leading figure was Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín until his retirement this year. It has been a government characterized by unfaltering devotion to the public welfare, by noteworthy sentiment of honesty, and by the tireless participation of a number of men of unusual competence and imagination.

Secondly, the Puerto Rican Government never lost sight of the fact that its economic development programs were for "people," and that they had to be translated into social and economic benefits for people as rapidly as possible. The people, in turn, having confidence that the Government was deeply responsive to their needs and hopes, were willing to make necessary sacrifices over many years while the development programs were getting slowly underway. It was essentially a political challenge and, in all developing areas, one of the most critical and most difficult—to provide inspiration and hope of the type which unleashes a sustained, creative outpouring of energy, even when early, visible returns are meager. Providing this kind of inspiration was one of the outstanding accomplishments of Governor Muñoz-Marín and his government.

Finally, both in Government and in other fields, there has been an extraordinarily rapid accumulation of education, of expertise, and of skills. Barely 15 years ago, there were virtually no industrial skills or tradition in Puerto Rico, for example. Today, most of the highly sophisticated industrial plants have Puerto Rican managers, to say nothing of Puerto Rican engineers and technicians. A whole new generation of industrial and commercial entrepreneurs has sprung up with astonishing speed. This is only one facet of Puerto Rico's vast effort in education.

In sum, the basic reason for Puerto Rico's rapid growth has been good government, a genuine concern for people, and a passion for education. Stirred together, these have accounted for the explosion of energy which has allowed Puerto Rico to tackle successfuly a job which many regarded as impossible.

Indeed, it is fair to say that the economic benefits of Puerto Rico's special relationship with the United States have barely compensated for its dearth of raw materials, lack of local market, and its former lack of industrial tradition or capital. These special benefits merely gave Puerto Rico a fighting chance. Many other developing countries have, on balance, a far more promising pattern of intrinsic circumstances than Puerto Rico has, even today.

In final analysis, which countries succeed and which ones flounder, usually reduces itself to the human element. The great natural riches of any country, in the absence of good government, are only a mockery. Yet basically poor countries can, with good government, achieve remarkable feats, seemingly in defiance of the laws of economic gravity.

Although perhaps the case of Puerto Rico is unusual, this, in my opinion, is the really important lesson of Puerto Rico's development. There are, of course, a number of specific Puerto Rican techniques and experiences which could be studied—and are studied—by other developing countries. I refer, for example, to Puerto Rico's highly effective promotional techniques for attracting maximum amounts of investments and tourists, and the mechanism of the Economic Development Administration for translating these into income and jobs at an accelerated rate. But in essence, these techniques are meaningless unless there is honesty, dedication and competence in government, to provide overall planning and leadership. Alongside such prime requirement, all else pales into insignificance.

While the Puerto Rican experience merits the study of underdeveloped countries, in my belief, it also illustrates a very valuable lesson for developed countries. It is these countries which are asked, through various channels, to help finance the development of the poorer countries. For them to do so willingly and enthusiastically it is useful to be able to appeal to their self-interest, as well as to their conscience.

For years the theory of development has been that, once an area was well on the way to higher income, it would become a sufficiently attractive market that the countries contributing to its development would profit economically, as well as morally and politically. Here Puerto Rico has become a telling example.

In 1940, when its per capita income was only $121, Puerto Rico's outside purchases were negligible. Today they are well over $1 billion a year from the United States alone. The 2,500,000 people of Puerto Rico buy nearly as much from the United States as the 56 million people of highly developed West Germany and the 53 million of Great Britain. They buy substantially more than any other European country, and in fact more than any other country in the world except Canada and Japan. Puerto Rico's purchases in the United States now generate substantial amounts of income and create many thousands of jobs in dozens of States of the United States.

In sum, a formerly poor area was an insignificant market. As a direct result of its rapid economic development, however, it has become one of the really important world markets, despite its small size and population. This suggests that, if other underdeveloped countries could also increase their per capita income, even at a much more modest rate, the growth in new and profitable markets for the developed nations could become almost staggering in scale.

I would like to end on a frankly political note. In the Caribbean, historically, Cuba has been a rich island, happily endowed with great expanses of fertile fields, raw materials, and other natural blessings. Puerto Rico has been the poor cousin, whose heavy population pressure against scarce natural resources is one of the most unfavorable in the world. Yet in the 5 years since Castro has ruled rich Cuba, its per capita income has declined by 15 percent. During these same 5 years, Puerto Rico's per capita income has risen by more than 50 percent. I can think of few statistics which are more sobering. And, for developing areas, I can think of none that are more meaningful.

Miss May V. Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the many friends of Miss May V. Harris of Bethesda, Md., were deeply saddened by her death last month at the age of 77.

During her lifetime, Miss Harris compiled a long and notable record of patriotic service. A descendant of Philip Freneau, the American poet of the Revolutionary period, she was extremely active in the Descendants of 1776 chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. From 1943 through 1946, she served as regent of that chapter, and also became State chairman of the Americanism committee of the DAR, and an officer of the State officers club.

As a tireless member of the Red Cross, Miss Harris gave a great deal of time and energy to the bloodmobile projects during World War II. She received a decoration from the Paderewski Society for her work during that period at the embassy of the Polish government-in-exile.

High among Miss Harris' many interests were music and literature. Having studied music in New York and Connecticut, she sang with the Washington Opera Society and in two church choirs. She also found time to write children's stories, usually emphasizing the theme of international friendship, and published the book, "Carnival at Stroebeck," in 1938.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the countless friends and admirers of Miss May Harris in tribute to her many accomplishments, and I extend my deep sympathies to her surviving sister, Miss Florence E. Harris.

The Need for Tire Safety Legislation, and a Tribute to Ken Roberts for Pioneering Leadership in Auto Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday morning to appear before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at hearings presided over by Chairman Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia, to urge prompt action on H.R. 688, a bill which I introduced on the opening day of the 89th Congress, and which former Congressman Ken Roberts and I jointly sponsored in the 88th Congress, prohibiting the manufacture and sale in interstate and foreign commerce of unsafe automobile tires.

Under the legislation, the Secretary of Commerce would be directed to determine standards for safety in automobile tires and these standards, after a necessary transition period, would become minimum mandatory standards for interstate commerce in tires.

Since this bill was originally introduced—it was the first such bill in either House—many Members have sponsored similar bills or others going to the question of safety in all components of automobiles. The interest in this subject is now so widespread and intense that I am extremely hopeful we can enact legislation in this session. The Senate Commerce Committee has approved a safe tire bill and President Johnson, in his message on transportation, specifically called for passage of such a bill along with other legislation on traffic safety.

THE ROLE OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IS OFTEN IGNORED

In my testimony before the committee yesterday, I felt it only fair to give credit where due on this issue—to Ken Roberts, who pioneered the crusade in Congress for safety on the highways. No Member of Congress worked harder or accomplished more in this field than our former colleague from Alabama. My reference to Mr. Roberts obviously touched a very responsive chord in the hearts of many of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who felt, as I did, that too often the work done by conscientious and dedicated Members of Congress as pioneers in a new field is too quickly forgotten or ignored once they leave the House.

Even while we are still here, our efforts are sometimes lost sight of when—after a long battle to break through the apathy on some new issue—the results are just taken for granted, and those officials who administer the programs, or the experts who participate in the conferences and seminars and discussions in connection with the operation of the laws, often seem to be completely unaware of the part played by the Congressmen who pioneered the whole thing.

I think the sensitivity of Members of Congress to this sort of thing was evident from the comments of members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on my references to a former colleague. I had no idea he would be present in the hearing room when I made my statement, but I was indeed glad to discover after I testified that Mr. Roberts had been sitting in the back of the room—once again demonstrating his great interest as a citizen in legislation he did so much to help shape in the field of automobile safety while a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record my testimony yesterday on tire safety legislation, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN ON H.R. 688, HER TIRE SAFETY BILL, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON AUTO SAFETY LEGISLATION, TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1966

Chairman Staggers and members of the committee, I am deeply grateful to the chairman and to the members of this committee for turning your attention once again as a committee to the dangers which confront every American on the highways of this country, and to legislative solutions for the frightful harvest of death and crippling injury in traffic accidents.

Countless Americans today owe their lives to legislation handled by this committee—in the whole broad field of health. And, to the extent that we now have Federal standards of safety and performance for automotive parts and accessories—particularly seat belts and brake fluid—this committee is responsible.

For a long time, the leadership on the committee in this field was taken by Congressman Kenneth Roberts, of Alabama, as chairman of the subcommittee which had jurisdiction. His defeat in 1964 in the startling Republican sweep of Alabama was a blow to all of us who admitted the conscientious manner and the effective manner in which he pursued the goal of greater highway safety.

As a matter of fact, the bill for which I testify here this morning was originally drafted by Ken Roberts. He and I had discussed the mounting toll of highway crashes directly or indirectly attributed to defective automobile tires and I asked him to have an effective bill drafted which I could cosponsor, if he agreed with me that the question of tire safety was serious enough to warrant this kind of legislation.

When introduced by Mr. Roberts and myself in the 88th Congress, this was the first piece of legislation introduced in either House, I believe, to prohibit the manufacture and sale in interstate commerce of unsafe tires, and to require the Government to establish standards which tire manufacturers must adhere to.

If Congressman Roberts had returned to the 89th Congress, I am sure he would have reintroduced the measure and pushed it vigorously. When I reintroduced it on the opening day of the new Congress, I was proud to put my name to the bill—and I am proud now to speak for it—but I have always felt that Mr. Roberts' authorship of the measure should be made clear.

Since he and I took this initial step on tires, many, many additional proposals have been introduced in the Congress to assure greater safety on our highways, and to set up Federal programs to protect the public from bad drivers and faulty equipment. I am sure that no matter how much legislation we pass, however, or what standards are set, we will still have traffic accidents and traffic fatalities, for a weapon as powerful as the modern automobile—and it is a weapon under the right circumstances—is not easily controlled by laws. The youth who drives too fast, the salesman or truckdriver who drives long distances without sufficient sleep, the driver—male or female—who daydreams about personal problems while at the wheel, the individual who uses pep pills or other drugs which have dangerous potential on the highways—all confront us when we get in our cars to go across town or across the country.

MURDER BY TIRES UNSAFE ON THE DAY THEY WERE MADE

They are hazards enough for us to contend with. But when you have to gamble, too, with the possibility that a 2- or 3- or 10-ton projectile hurtling in our general direction in the next lane, or across a level median strip, at 60 or more miles an hour may suddenly go out of control because of mechanical deficiencies in the structure of the vehicle, I think we are entitled to more protection.

As I have followed the controversies over the years on automobile design and construction, it is obvious that no automobile which will travel at turnpike speeds can be made completely safe and foolproof under all circumstances.

But what excuse is there—what possible excuse—for permitting on such vehicles tires which will explode or collapse at prolonged high speed, turning the automobile into an unguidable torpedo which could kill any of us who might happen to be on the same highway at that exact moment?

The Federal Trade Commission has spent years investigating the merchandising jungle of new automobile tires—the misleading quality designations which trick the customer into buying a tire which cannot possibly be safe over its tread life at the speeds at which it will probably be driven. To say to the customer: "Buy a better tire; pay more and be safe" often is not the answer, either.

But tire prices would have a greater relationship to tire quality if there were clear-cut Federal standards for tires, and if unsafe tires could not be manufactured and sold under any circumstances, for use on highway vehicles.

As the members of this committee all know, I have introduced many bills over the past 14 years which have come before this committee dealing with the health and safety of the American people. Many of those proposals eventually became law, but only after years of consideration, review, discussion and debate. It is well to have patient and painstaking investigation of the need for legislation, before acting on it; but sometimes the needs are so overwhelmingly evident—so compelling—as in this instance, that to delay would be to make Congress, in effect, an accessory to every murder by automobile caused by tires which were unsafe on the day they were made. Let's stop that kind of unnecessary carnage.

National Traffic Safety Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the subject of traffic safety is one to which increasing attention is being paid, with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce holding hearings on a number of traffic safety bills this week.

One of the sponsors of a bill to create a National Traffic Safety Agency, my able colleague and good friend, the Honorable JAMES MACKAY of Georgia, delivered an address on "The Need for Effective National Traffic Safety Legislation," on March 8, 1966, to the Third Annual Conference of the Southern States-Armed Forces-Federal Regional Traffic Safety Workshop, at Chattanooga, Tenn. The address contains a fine historical summary of efforts to do something about the traffic safety problem, and deals incisively with the principal issues. The speech follows:

THE NEED FOR EFFECTIVE NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY LEGISLATION

It is a pleasure to be here in Chattanooga today to participate in this workshop because the simple fact that you are assembled here this morning from all over our region is evidence of your determination to continue and accelerate efforts to reduce mounting losses of life and property associated with traffic accidents.

It was my privilege to attend your first meeting in Atlanta. At that time I was a member of the Georgia Legislature and I there expressed concern over the fact that our State legislatures were failing to act in concert to build a safer traffic environment, and, indeed, were almost failing to act at all. My concern was justified because, notwithstanding considerable interest, the States are moving at a snail's pace, if at all. Georgia drew a blank in the last two sessions although more than 40 safety bills were put in the legislative hopper.

NEED FOR TRAFFIC SAFETY LEGISLATION

Today I have been asked to speak to you about the need, as I see it, for effective traffic safety legislation by Congress. I speak as an advocate and not as an observer because the bill I prepared which would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency was introduced in the House and Senate on February 3 of this year. Twenty-five Members of the House have joined me as cosponsors and 15 Senators led by Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, sponsor the bill in the Senate.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE HEARINGS MARCH 15

The House bills are pending in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on which I serve and the Senate bills have been referred to the Senate Commerce Committee. Chairman STAGGERS will open hearings on March 15 on these bills and on the administration bill which was sent over last week at the time the President delivered his message on transportation, including traffic safety.

Chances are that this 89th Congress will enact the most significant traffic safety legislation in the 90-year history of the automobile. I hope so, and I intend to do all within my power to see that we get positive results out of this session. We are going to have to act together positively and cooperatively to build a safer traffic environment or we are going to die separately as a result of our inaction.

EDITORIAL CONDEMNS LEGISLATORS

Politicians are accustomed to criticism and to the impunging of our motives. This is the way a free society works, but now and then you read an editorial that astounds you. Such a one I found on the front page of Barron's, the business weekly.

The editorial was captioned: "Traffic Safety, Politics and Prejudice in the Driver's Seat." The editorial charged that the reason why the Congress is taking an interest in the death toll on our highways this year is that it, "like lung cancer and poisoned wells * * * constitutes what politicians call a gut issue, that is, one in which emotion tends to prevail over reason." The editorial goes on to say, "Contrary to the sweeping charges, the Nation's automotive safety record is nothing to be ashamed of in this imperfect world. It happens to be far better than most of its counterparts abroad, where safety supposedly comes ahead of style, and it has shown vast improvement over the years". The editorial concludes that, "None of the foregoing is likely to stop muckraking writers or political demagogs, who know pay dirt when they strike it * * * whatever Albany or Washington may pretend, highway safety hangs primarily on individual responsibility. No Federal program will ever get from here to there."

I don't intend to offer a rebuttal to this superficial editorial, or to try and defend Congress. Instead I want to relate to you some of the legislative history of the subject of traffic safety and why so many of us in this 89th Congress are determined to get the Federal role in traffic safety explicitly defined by an appropriate act of Congress this year.

WHY THIS YEAR?

A legitimate question might be asked at this point. Why this year? Why has concern and talk of legislation suddenly mushroomed? After all there has been concern about traffic accidents since the advent of the motor vehicle. Thirty years ago J. C. Furnas wrote a stem-winding article in the Reader's Digest entitled, "And Sudden Death," which should have stirred people to action then. Why the furor now?

The best answer I can give you is to say that a number of people in public and private life have become aroused because it is dawning on them that this problem has had national attention for 40 years but that whatever we have done to date has not sufficed. A review of the work of private groups and organizations, and our public efforts discloses how enormous energies devoted to solving a complex problem can be subverted, sidetracked and rendered ineffective by limited thinking, by fetishes, by special interests, by failure of people to work closely together, and by individuals riding forth in all directions.

THREE CANARDS

Much of the effort has gone stale. It is heartbreaking to realize that people continue to view the traffic accident phenomenon from the point of view of 50 years ago. This fact is illustrated by three frequently heard canards. First, it is said that the American people are indifferent about the loss of human life on our roadways. Second, it is said that we gladly pay the price in human life for the thrill of speed. And third, it is said that people don't want anything done—that safety is not marketable and that people don't want any restraints—that death on the highway is just one of the risks you take for the convenience and pleasure of driving where you want to go.

How did these ridiculous propositions gain such wide currency? The answer is twofold: Because of the special nature of the traffic accident, and because of the methods we have used to achieve a safer traffic environment.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENT—AN INDIVIDUAL OCCURRENCE

The traffic accident is an individual occurrence. It is undramatic except for those immediately involved. It does not have any unfavorable economic consequences except to the victims—at least that is the popular view.

What if it were not an individual occurrence? Let me try this on you. Next month we expect, and hope that 52,000 men, women, and children will be in our new Atlanta stadium for the opening game of the Atlanta Braves. What if some new kind of catastrophe engulfed these people in violent, sudden or agonizing and in some instances flaming or lingering death. Our Nation would mobilize as never before because in our Judeo-Christian culture we do value human life.

The same result happens on our highways but in a different way. These accidents occur one by one, around the clock, around the calendar and around the country. Show me the American who shrugs his shoulders when he hears about the death of another human being in a traffic accident in his neighborhood and he will be the exception—not the rule. We do care. It is easy to dismiss traffic accidents as the product of speed. How many times have people said to me: "Isn't it the nut behind the wheel or isn't it just speed?" The truth is that no one can give you absolute answers because the shameful fact is that we just don't have accurate data on which to make firm judgments. In our society which has done so well generally in data gathering, data processing, and computerizing almost everything, we have failed to gather accurate, uniform and sufficiently detailed information concerning causal factors in traffic accidents and in resulting deaths and injuries.

NOT ALL DRIVERS ARE NUTS

But even with the partial data at hand you can't dismiss our enormous losses by just blaming the driver. Some people who die are nuts behind the wheel but most are prudent, responsible men and women who perish in split second situations. They are not all nuts.

CRASHWORTHY AUTOMOBILE

Ralph Nader, an able and angry young attorney who has written the thought-provoking book, "Unsafe at Any Speed," stated recently in his testimony before a subcommittee chaired by Senator Ribicoff which is holding hearings on traffic safety, "The plain fact is that it is faster, cheaper, and more enduring to build operationally safe and crashworthy automobiles that will prevent death and injury than to build a policy around the impossible goal of having drivers behave perfectly at all times under all conditions in the operation of a basically unsafe vehicle and under often treacherous highway conditions."

And further, Col. John Paul Stapp, the noted Air Force authority on the durability of the human body, tells me that more than 42 percent of all traffic fatalities occur under survivable conditions—that is to say that speed does not account for the deaths. This, translated into last year's statistics says that perhaps more than 20,000 lives might have been spared.

THE ACCIDENT—COMPLEX PHENOMENON

One other comment about the nature of the accident. It is often a complex phenomenon occurring in a complex environment, investigated in many cases by inadequately trained men, and re-examined in most instances by insurance men and lawyers to fix legal liability—not to determine true causation. Thus far, we see only the top of the iceberg, and often not that much.

The nature of the traffic accident in part accounts for our difficulty and lack of success in coming to grips with it as the number one killer of young Americans between 15 and 25 and the fourth killer of Americans of all ages.

AN UNBELIEVABLE TANGLE

The history of our attack on the traffic accident, the record of our public and private attempts to create a safe traffic environment, have resulted in an unbelievable tangle. Our problem here is something like the population explosion. A chap told me that everybody is doing something about it but nobody is getting results.

A NICKEL PER CASUALTY

The motor vehicle and the airplane have been treated differently. Everybody knew that a craft heavier than air was unsafe and so great precautions were taken. The Federal Government controlled the air space and the licensing of the aircraft for airworthiness and of the operator—in other words, the total environment. Concern for air safety has advanced to the point that when my wife drops me at the airport she doesn't worry about me getting to Washington; I worry about her getting back to our home safely. And we have gotten results. We have set standards and we have enforced them. We spend over $700 million a year and we employ over 40,000 people primarily to watch over the safety of our air passengers. Last year, 1,300 people died in aircraft accidents—about 14 for each 10 billion miles flown. We do all this yet less than 12 percent of our people fly each year and only 40 percent have ever flown. And we spend $100,000 per victim to discover the causes of airplane accidents but less than a nickel per casualty on traffic accident research.

A LOCAL CURIOSITY

The automobile, when it took to our streets, was little more than the familiar wagon with a motor on it and no horses up front. They called it a horseless carriage and that's where we got the name horsepower.

It was strictly a local phenomenon. City councils put the first legal restraints on it with such ordinances as ones restricting it from going over 5 miles per hour or requiring that someone precede it on foot to see that pedestrians were warned of its approach. And one other fact made the picture simple then. The motor vehicle was a curiosity owned by the town's rich boy or eccentric.

The States got into the act as they developed a road system to accommodate the car and they adopted rules of the road together with a few safety requirements such as the headlight, the horn, the brake, and in some cases, the fire extinguisher.

Long before the automobile, ship and train wrecks had resulted in national legislation to require safety performance standards to prevent the loss of life on these two means of public transportation.

OTHER TRANSPORTATION REGULATED

The Federal Government has regulated interstate commerce and protected the general welfare by stringent laws and executive action to protect the interstate traveler in all interstate transportation other than the individually owned passenger vehicle. Even the bus and truck have been regulated for safety and the casualties have been strikingly low by comparison. Five passengers die for every 10 billion miles traveled by train, 13 die for every 10 billion miles traveled in buses, while 570 die for every 10 billion miles traveled by car.

Even after you consider all of the reasons, and they are many, it is hard to understand why there has been such a good response to other transportation hazards and such a poor response to the virulence of the traffic accident.

So far as we know, the first traffic fatality occurred when a lady stepped off a street car and was struck down by a motor vehicle in 1899. As the number of vehicles increased the number of deaths increased steadily. In 1917 deaths exceeded 10,000. In 1924 they almost reached 20,000.

LIFE AND DEATH MEETING

Thus, it was not until after a quarter of a century of steadily incerasing deaths that this new phenomenon received national recognition. Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover convened in 1924 the first National Conference on Street and Highway Safety. The conference was termed a life-and-death meeting.

In the usual manner a report, long since buried, was issued. In 1926, the conference was reconvened and it approved a model for a uniform vehicle code dealing with the rules for registering a car, the licensing of operators, and the rules governing the operation of vehicles on highways. The model code was hailed as the outstanding achievement of the two conferences, yet to this day none of the States has undertaken to adopt this code in toto. Furthermore, rather than being promoted at the Federal level, the maintenance and updating of this code is done by a small group of professionals who constitute the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, financed in part by Federal funds and in part by contributions from industry. This organization is just one of a myriad which have attempted to fill the void at the national level to combat the traffic accident.

COBWEB OF CONFUSION

Unfortunately, because of their number and because they each struggle with only one small portion of the problem, not with the total environment, they form a cobweb of confusion both for the layman interested in becoming an informed citizen and for the public official who wants to take action.

In 1936, 38,000 died. That year Congress acknowledged the problem of the traffic death toll for the first time by requesting the Bureau of Public Roads to make a comprehensive report on the various elements of traffic safety. The report dealt with such problems as the nonuniformity of State traffic laws, the need for skilled investigation of traffic accidents to understand their true causes, and inadequacy of traffic accident research and inaccuracy of the statistics. (Incidentally, today, 30 years later, we are still complaining that these very needs have been largely unmet, and that national legislation is required to assure that they will be.)

The Bureau of Public Roads report lay dormant until after World War II. In 1946 an attempt was made by the Chief Executive to pull together the diverse interests to get effective action. President Truman called a Highway Safety Conference to study and make recommendations. This conference adopted an action program which has been called "a positive and practical, balanced program of measures necessary in the interest of highway safety." The Conference continued to meet periodically to revise its program and to issue annual reports of progress.

GROWING JUNGLE

In 1954 President Eisenhower convened the White House Conference on Highway Safety. Apparently this was required to revitalize the group's interest on highway safety. A result was the formation of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety to serve as a continuing body to promote and update the action program developed in the late 1940's. In essence this program is designed to serve as a guide to State and local action for traffic safety, but there are no provisions, other than by promotion, by which the Committee can effectuate the program. The Committee can only encourage "the formation or strengthening of State and local organizations devoted to the application of the techniques of traffic safety set forth in the action program."

And so the jungle grows. Among the 37 traffic safety organizations serving on the Committee's advisory council are the American Automobile Association, the Association of Safety Council Executives, the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee, the Automotive Safety Foundation, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, the National Highway Users Conference, and the National Safety Council.

SMOKE BUT NO FIRE

Who can keep all these organizations, their functions, and their purposes straight? This is not to say that there is anything wrong with expressed concern about traffic safety as represented in all these groups. It is merely to say that there is lots of smoke being created but there is no fire being lit by all the energy. Today, more than 20 years after the conception of the action program, the President's Committee reports that the States and major cities have really failed to measure up to the minimum traffic safety guidance program. How long does it take to get action out of the action program?

FLICKER OF INTEREST

The Congress has not been much more successful than the executive branch in its traffic safety efforts. In 1956 Representative Kenneth Roberts began his series of traffic safety hearings which lasted until 1963. The most comprehensive of these hearings was held in 1956 and they served as a catalyst to the executive branch to designate units within the Federal Establishment to be concerned with the protection of the American citizen on the Nation's roadways. In that same year the Congress directed that a report be prepared by the Secretary of Commerce on action the Federal Government should take to promote the public welfare by increasing traffic safety. Although timid in its recommendations, this report has served as one of the few comprehensive sources of information on the problem. But, the report and the flicker of interest in the executive branch were the only concrete actions which developed.

LIMITED LEGISLATION

Since 1961 several specialized pieces of legislation have been enacted by Congress, but unfortunately they have been severely limited in scope or almost totally ineffective. The enactments include the national drivers license register, seat belt and brake fluid standards, minimum standards on federally purchased cars, and the Baldwin amendment, which, unfortunately was changed to say "should" instead of "must."

RIBICOFF RESOLVE

We come back to the question: Why is the subject of traffic safety currently experiencing national focus in the form of 55 bills introduced in the Congress since January 1965, a Presidential recommendation in the state of the Union message, inclusion in a special Presidential message on the new Department of Transportation and almost constant attention by the national press? Because, as I mentioned the other day on the floor of the House of Representatives, we have such men as Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, who is a modern Paul Revere in his constant plea for congressional action on this subject, men who stake themselves out with perseverance to conquer the apathy.

Last summer Senator RIBICOFF attempted to get an amendment added to the excise tax cut bill that would have authorized the use of some of the excise tax funds for traffic safety purposes. His proposal was voted down. This defeat strengthened his resolve to dig into the causes of the whole problem and we have seen just that in the continuation of his traffic safety hearings last July and again this winter.

OTHER ADVOCATES

And there are others. There is Ralph Nader, whose book "Unsafe at Any Speed," has been referred to as "Unfair at Any Rate" but it has not been refuted. I have already mentioned the valuable role played by my friend Ken Roberts, of Alabama. My colleagues SAM FRIEDEL, of Maryland, and JOHN BALDWIN, of California, have also been innovators in the field, as has Senator GAYLORD *NELSON in his efforts to assure that only* decent tires can be sold on the market.

MACKAY COMMITMENT

My own role has been to carry out my long-standing commitment to myself to legislate on this question and to express myself as the angry man that I am when I see magnificent people snatched from our midst unnecessarily. I have attempted to study the complexities of the problem and propose an effective program that goes to the heart of the issue. With Ken Roberts' unfortunate defeat, and with JOHN BALDWIN'S illness, there have been few men in the House highly motivated to action. For that reason, I have attempted to sound the alarm and to be prepared to shepherd through an effective piece of legislation, regardless of whose name is attached to it.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY

My proposal is to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency. We decided, after considering the evidence, that, as a result of *better roads and faster automobiles,* we now have a national traffic environment, that no individual State can build a national traffic environment by itself, that traffic losses have become a national problem profoundly affecting interstate commerce and that there should be a national response to the problem, that there should be national leadership in building a safer traffic environment, that we have been working here and there on specific facets of the problem, but that we have failed to develop an approach to the total traffic environment. We reached the conclusion that any action short of a congressional response to the traffic problem would be less than what is desirable.

That is why we propose a National Traffic Safety Agency. The purpose of the agency is clearly spelled out in the bill itself which states that it is, "to reduce the extent of death, injury, and loss of property resulting from traffic accidents by providing the means for a concerted attack on the problem through the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency headed by a highly qualified administrator; the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Center which shall bring together public and private information and research; and through a national program for traffic safety which shall seek to achieve a uniform national traffic safety environment by means of the vigorous application of knowledge as to the principal causes of traffic accidents, deaths, and injuries."

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

We believe that the President's proposed legislation is a long step in the right direction, but both his bill and our bill need deep study and the legislation Congress should pass has not yet been perfected. Among other issues that will have to be considered in committee hearings are: the most desirable method of financing the agency, how performance standards for new automobiles can most effectively be determined and administered, what the timetable for action should be, and how specific the legislation should be in its direction to the executive. These are difficult questions indeed.

There is now an absence of positive national leadership for traffic safety. I believe that the State legislatures and local governing bodies will respond to the leadership proposed in our bills. My own State senator said he thoroughly approved of the idea of a uniform legal environment but he did not know where to turn to find out about what should be uniform.

ONLY TWO DEPARTMENTS INVOLVED

I predict that this Congress will act to *correct these weaknesses in our traffic safety* policy which are so apparent. It will be derelict in its duty if it does not act. An *agency that can serve as the center for traffic* safety activity in the Federal Government is desperately needed. Through my study of the problem I have found that it is not accurate to say that 16 Federal agencies have some part of the overall responsibility for traffic safety. In fact, most of them deal primarily with training and limited research for internal operating reasons. Actually there are only two major departments involved.

The Public Health Service has a Division of Accident Prevention but it has no specific statutory authority other than that contained in the broad duties of the Surgeon General under the Public Health Service Acts. Its 1966 budget is less than $2¼ million, and about three-fourths of this amount is awarded in individual research grants on the human factors in traffic accident injuries. In the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Public Roads maintains an office of highway safety which is authorized to operate under general references to highway safety. Its 1966 budget is less than $6 million, and it is primarily concerned with safety of highway construction and design.

INDUSTRY A BIT HYSTERICAL

The reaction of the automobile industry is crucial to the achievement of good legislation. Some of its leaders have been a bit hysterical because the industry has been severely and perhaps unfairly criticized. I told one of the industry representatives that an elected politician knows that abuse is part of life and that his industry should be mature enough to make an intelligent response to the present situation.

The automobile industry should be at the forefront of efforts to build a safer traffic environment, should accept the necessity for the Federal role in defining safety performance standards, and should not obstruct solutions, but should help construct them.

The easy out so long used that, "It's just the nut behind the wheel" won't work anymore. We, the people, just don't accept this.

THE TIME IS NOW

I have been in Congress long enough now to have developed a profound respect for the Members of our national legislative body. And I have known many in your ranks for many years. I believe in you.

The time has arrived for action. We are not looking for scapegoats. We are trying to prevent 50,000 men, women and children a year from becoming sacrificial lambs to our collective social negligence.

I solicit your positive action and support in helping this 89th Congress enact effective traffic safety legislation.

Slogans won't do it. Sophisticated, dedicated political action on the part of our citizens and their elected representatives can make Government serve our needs. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the sole purpose of government."

Let us then, achieve this purpose.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 21, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Avraham Soltes, Temple Emanuel, Great Neck, N.Y., and chaplain, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O God of mind and heart: as we turn our hearts toward the challenge of this new day, we thank Thee for the power planted within us to renew the world with each day's dawn.

Give us wisdom, we pray Thee, to see in our problems a tribute to our talents—the creative skill Thou hast granted us to make order out of chaos and reason out of confusion.

Give us heart, we pray Thee, to treat the shortcomings of our fellows with the charity we would seek for our own.

Give us courage, we implore Thee, to believe that we possess the power to shape our universe more closely to Thy sacred vision; that the world may gaze upon our handiwork this day and give thanks that Thou hast made us in Thine own image. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 17, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 15, 1966:

H.R. 12752. An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

On March 16, 1966:

H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

On March 17, 1966:

H.R. 1918. An act for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello;

H.R. 2627. An act for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to misinterpretation of certain personnel instructions;

H.R. 3076. An act for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased;

H.R. 3236. An act for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski;

H.R. 4995. An act for the relief of Muhammad Sarwar;

H.R. 5231. An act for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker;

H.R. 5973. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Hower;

H.R. 7667. An act for the relief of Donald F. Farrell; and

H.R. 10338. An act for the relief of Joseph B. Stevens.

On March 18, 1966:

H.R. 5530. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert A. Ethridge; and

H.R. 12169. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 969. An act to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants; and

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1746. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act; and

H.R. 6926. An act to strengthen the financial condition of the Employees' Life Insurance Fund created by the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to provide certain adjustments in amounts of group life and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance under such act, and for other purposes.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress wish New York's mayor well in the task he sought of governing one of the world's great cities. We realize how important efficient government is to the metropolis and to the areas adjacent to it.

But I cannot go along with Mr. Lindsay's proposal to include commuters in his city income tax, many of whom live in my district. I believe the mayor's proposal would set a dangerous precedent for the Nation.

Many suburban residents make their living in New York City but they also leave substantial amounts of that income in the city's shops, theaters, and restaurants. The businesses themselves, many of which are owned by commuters, are also taxed heavily. The commuter pays as does the city resident for city transportation.

What would the commuter from Manhasset, Westchester, or Montclair get in return after paying a percentage of his income to the city of New York on top of all the other tax burdens he carries?

Do his children receive educational benefits in the city?

Does his family receive welfare coverage through city agencies?

Is his home protected against fire by city fire departments, and does the city provide police protection for his family at home?

The obvious answer to these fundamental questions defeats the arguments of those who would levy a further tribute on the commuters who already provide a large measure of the financial and intellectual lifeblood of the city.

Our suburban residents sympathize with the mayor's efforts in New York City, even though we do not have an opportunity to vote in city elections.

But this Nation fought a war almost 200 years ago to prove that taxation without representation is intolerable.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO LESSEN FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly about the serious railroad boxcar shortage.

As the Members of the House know, railroad freight movements are running 11 percent above last year and in the meanwhile there is a crippling shortage of railroad boxcars in the West which is causing serious delays in the delivery of freight. As a result, the Pacific Northwest faces serious shortages of equipment and materials and 12 lumber mills in Washington and Oregon, I am informed, are being forced to close because they cannot ship their products.

Last week, following an emergency session, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued an order requiring return of all Great Northern and Northern Pacific boxcars. But this is only a temporary 60-day measure and fails to offer any long-range solution to the problem. What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is passage of Senate bill 1098 to raise the per diem rental charge on freight cars so that there would be a greater incentive for individual railroads to build and own their own boxcars rather than to use those that belong to other railroads.

Apparently certain large eastern railroads, especially the New York Central and the Pennsylvania Railroad, have been successful in keeping Senate bill 1098 from reaching the floor, although it passed the Senate and was favorably reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. In the meanwhile, western lumber and grain industries are in serious jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time the national interest is recognized and selfish interests refrain from blocking this legislation.

CAPT. ROBERT D. THORSON

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, officials of the Navy League of the United States have advised me that Captain Thorson, commanding officer, Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, Calif., has acted far above and beyond any ordinary expectations in his concentrated efforts to be of service in the initiation of a sea cadet program for the Ventura County, Calif., area.

In these troubled times, there is much widespread confusion among the youth of our country as to the ideals and leadership worthy of emulation. It is the opinion of the Navy League and that more public recognition is warranted when an officer of the U.S. Navy is so dedicated to the fostering of our American heritage that he will give unlimited time and tireless effort to a program which offers boys an opportunity to develop a sense of duty and responsibility to serve their country.

On March 26, 1966, the U.S. Naval Sea Cadets, U.S.S. *Norton Sound* Division, will hold its commissioning ceremony. At that ceremony, Captain Thorson will be honored for his immeasurable contributions to the Navy League and the whole community.

I am sure that all of my colleagues join me in commending their fine Navy officer for his outstanding service to our youth.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS AND RESTORATION OF EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. **OLSEN** of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1647) to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "1965" and insert "1966".

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SERVICES FOR THE LATE MRS. EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to advise the House that Mrs. Emanuel Celler, wife of the beloved and distinguished dean of the House of Representatives, passed away this morning at about 1 a.m.

I am advised that the services for Mrs. Celler will be Wednesday at 12 noon at Temple Beth Elohim, Eighth Avenue and Garfield Place, Brooklyn. The body will lie in repose at the Riverside Chapel, 1 Ocean Parkway, Brooklyn.

I know that I express the feeling of all Members when I say that our hearts go out to the distinguished gentleman who has served with great distinction in the House for so many years and to all of his loved ones.

PRESERVATION OF THE BENEFITS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954, AND THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959 FOR CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES RECEIVING CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL STAFF FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10553) to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "1965" and insert "1963".

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSUMER INTERESTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 41]

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Bandstra
Baring
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bray
Burleson
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Curtin
Davis, Ga.
Devine
Diggs
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Farnum
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Karsten
Keogh
Kornegay
Kupferman
Landrum
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McClory
McDowell
McFall
McVicker
Macdonald
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
May
Mize
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pirnie
Pool
Powell
Quillen
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Scott
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Van Deerlin
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wydler
Yates

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall, 308 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONSUMER INTERESTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 413)

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The consumer's interest is the American interest.

In guarding it, in promoting it, we improve the lives of every man, woman, and child in our Nation.

Consumers are all the people—the worker, the farmer, the businessman, and their families.

Every domestic program of the Federal Government in a very real sense is directed toward the consumer. When we work to stem pollution, improve transportation, or rebuild our cities, we promote the welfare of the American consumer.

The consumer has a right to a dollar of stable purchasing power.

I pledge to defend that right with all the ability and determination at my command.

All Americans can take pride in the economic record of recent years.

We are in the 61st month of unparalleled prosperity—the longest in our peacetime history.

A year ago 5 percent of our workers were unemployed. Now only 3.7 percent are out of work.

Today, our programs to provide better training and wider educational opportunities are supplying thousands of trained workers for our expanding economy.

Our standard of living has never been higher. Real consumption per capita—the way the average standard of living is measured—has advanced nearly 10 percent in the past 2 years—as large a dollar gain as in the preceding 8 years combined. That record could not have been achieved if inflation had eroded the value of the dollar and undermined the foundation of our prosperity.

This administration intends to maintain that record.

A new and progressive program is needed if we are to protect the American consumer's rights in the marketplace—his right to be informed, to choose, to be protected from unsafe products, and to be heard in the councils of government.

I recommend that the Congress enact comprehensive measures to secure these rights.

The American consumer has tremendous impact on the variety and quality of the goods and services available on the market.

The consumer buys what he wants. He cannot and should not be told what to buy. But he must be told what is available for purchase.

If the consumer is to be a wise sovereign in our progressive market economy, he must be fully informed. Free consumer choice—indeed, our free enterprise system—must rest on a firm foundation of reliable information on the costs and contents of the products we buy.

Today I renew my request that the Congress enact legislation to strengthen this foundation in two critical areas—lending and packaging.

I proposed legislation in these areas 2 years ago. President Kennedy made a similar recommendation 4 years ago. We have learned much from careful study of these proposals by the Congress and the public. Everything we have learned reaffirms my conviction that—

We can have equitable and effective laws on lending and packaging;

We can protect both the consumer and the overwhelming majority of honest businessmen from the minority of producers who would compete unfairly and infringe the rights of the consumer and their fellow businessmen;

We need reform in the credit area and we should encourage States to enact legislation to correct abuses;

We need such legislation urgently. We can now act wisely without further delay.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Every consumer and every business in America benefits from our system of consumer credit. Credit and the economy have grown together. Last year merchants, lending companies, and financial institutions extended about $75 billion in new installment credit to consumers.

Consumer credit—

Permits purchase of many of the goods and services which enrich the quality of American life—the homes, the automobiles, and household appliances we buy.

Finances the costs of higher education, travel, and other activities which broaden and develop the human spirit.

Relieves suffering and distress by spreading major medical expenses over a period of time.

Enables our young families to acquire and furnish homes early in life when good housing is most needed and best enjoyed.

Over the years, this system has worked well. Lenders charge reasonable rates. Borrowers repay their debts promptly. But a minority of unscrupulous operators charge all that the traffic will bear. They wring from the unwary purchaser a price far higher than the credit market requires.

The right of the consumer to know the actual cost of his credit has been ignored for too long. Credit is a commodity. The consumer has just as much right to know the cost of borrowing money as to know the price of any other article he buys.

Credit charges are a key item in the consumer budget. They totaled $24 billion last year. It is important that consumers be able to plan their budgets wisely—and prudently—in this important area.

Yet, many consumers had no information on how these credit costs relate to the cost of the article being financed.

They were confused by statements of credit rates described in unusual or even misleading terms.

They unknowingly paid higher prices for credit than reputable lenders were charging.

We must protect and inform the consumer in his use of the consumer credit system. Our credit structure will be sounder when the consumer has this information.

I therefore renew my recommendation for legislation requiring lenders to state the full cost of credit, simply and clearly, and to state it before any credit contract is signed.

This legislation will help consumers—

Budget their incomes more intelligently, because they will know the price of credit in the same clear terms as the price of milk or gasoline.

Compare credit costs so they shop for the best combination of quality and price—including all of the charges involved.

Avoid unscrupulous lenders who use excessive credit charges and other sharp practices.

This legislation will also help the legitimate lender by offering protection against any competitor who seeks to gain business by misrepresenting credit costs. It will insure the fair and effective competition that legitimate lenders desire.

It will not regulate the cost of credit itself, or interfere with existing laws.

It will not reduce the volume of credit.

It will not dampen the vigor of consumer buying.

This legislation will right the balance of legal protection between lenders and borrowers.

I urge the Congress to act to insure that the American consumer is given a clear price tag when he shops for credit.

FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING

Americans can choose among an unprecedented assortment of products when they go shopping.

In the average supermarket today, the housewife finds 8,000 items—more than five times the 1,500 items she found just 20 years ago. She also does an increasing amount of shopping in the self-service store—a product of efficiency in distribution. But with more products to choose from and fewer sales people to answer her questions, the housewife relies heavily on the package itself as her source of information in making a choice.

American industry has made enormous strides in providing attractive and informative packaging. American manufacturers maintain one of the highest standards of quality in the world. They know that packages which accurately and fully describe their wares are the best salesmen.

Nevertheless there are instances of deception in labeling and packaging. Practices have arisen that cause confusion and conceal information even when there is no deliberate intention to deceive. The housewife often needs a scale, a yardstick, and a slide rule to make a rational choice. She has enough to do without performing complicated mathematics in the stores.

It is not enough to hope that such practices will disappear by themselves. The Government must do its share to insure the shopper against deception, to remedy confusion, and to eliminate questionable practices.

I urge the Congress to enact fair packaging and labeling legislation to—

1. Require that each package provide simple, direct, accurate, and visible information as to the nature and quantity of its contents, including ingredients where this is important.

2. Keep off the shelves packages with deceptively shaped boxes, misleading pictures, confusing or meaningless adjectives, inappropriate size or quantity markings, and promotional gimmicks that promise nonexistent savings.

3. Provide for the establishment of reasonable and appropriate weight standards to facilitate comparative shopping.

This legislation will not make packaging less attractive or less efficient. It will not prevent economies of scale in packaging, nor will it impose costly restrictions.

An accurate and informative package and label need not add to the producer's cost. It will add to the welfare of the American consumer.

PROTECTION FROM DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES

The consumer must not only be informed. He must also be protected from dangerous drugs, foods, and other substances.

Our ability to conquer pain and disease has increased dramatically. But we must not allow the development of new drugs and nutrients to outstrip our capacity to test and certify them for safety and effectiveness.

I recommend three related items of legislation to reinforce consumer protection.

THE CHILD SAFETY ACT

Children must be our first concern. They are our hope and our future.

Too many children now become seriously ill—too many die—because of accidents that could be avoided by adequate labeling and packaging of dangerous substances. This is senseless and needless tragedy.

Most drug manufacturers have taken responsible action in providing appropriate warnings on drug labels. The Food and Drug Administration has accomplished much in reducing the incidence of these private tragedies. But both have been greatly handicapped by gaps in the laws dealing with hazardous substances and materials.

It is still true, for example, that present law nowhere provides for inspection of unpackaged toys and novelties that may be poisonous to children.

To extend legal protection for the safety of all our citizens, especially our children, I recommend legislation to—

Bring all hazardous substances, regardless of their wrapping, under the safeguards of the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act;

Ban from commerce those household substances that are so hazardous that warning labels are not adequate safeguards;

Ban the sale of toys and other children's articles containing hazardous substances, regardless of their packaging;

Require labels to warn consumers against possible injury from drugs and cosmetics, and from food in pressurized containers;

Limit the amount of children's aspirin available in retail packages;

Require certain potent drugs attractive to children to have safety closure caps.

DRUG SAFETY ACT

Each year the Food and Drug Administration receives over 4,000 requests for study and approval of new drugs. Each new product is carefully analyzed and tested. This process is a basic consumer protection in which the United States leads the world.

But it is just as basic that the law require more accurate and detailed labeling of dangerous drugs—and that it deal specifically with drugs whose period of potency and purity is limited.

To make these improvements, and to protect the lives of all of our citizens, I recommend legislation to—

Authorize the Government to require records and reports of experience and to require labeling changes on any drug, whether old or new;

Require certification of all drugs whose potency and purity can mean life or death to a patient, thus extending the law which now applies to insulin and antibiotics; and

Control the unsolicited distribution of drug samples.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND COOPERATION AMENDMENTS

The task of protecting the consumer cannot and should not be left solely to the Federal Government. The Government can and should provide creative Federal leadership to help States and local communities in their own constructive and determined efforts.

As a step forward, Federal assistance is needed to strengthen and enlarge State and local professional staffs in the food and drug areas.

To begin to meet our Federal responsibility, I recommend legislation authorizing expansion of the Food and Drug Administration's training programs for non-Federal officials. This will be the first in a series of measures to broaden Federal-State-local cooperation in this vital field.

REVITALIZING THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

In addition to these legislative proposals, I pledge continued efforts to revitalize the Food and Drug Administration. This process is already well underway.

This agency has performed notably in the past. Yet the scope of its responsibility has been considerably broadened in recent years. The public interest demands that it receive the additional support it needs to perform its many new functions.

I recently appointed a new Commissioner of Food and Drugs to give the agency new leadership and new direction. I have directed him to conduct a thorough review of the agency's roles and missions and to move purposefully toward a new structure fitted to the demands of the times. I have also asked him to recruit personnel with the most outstanding backgrounds in science and public service.

The responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration are heavy. But they will be met.

To strengthen the Food and Drug Administration, I have proposed, in the fiscal year 1967 budget, the largest single increase ever requested for this agency.

I believe that the interests of the Nation fully support this request. I urge the Congress to provide the necessary funds and enact the recommended legislation to enable this important agency to fulfill the needs of our people.

COSMETICS AND MEDICAL DEVICES

Assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the drugs we buy has the highest priority. But further action may be necessary to protect the consumer against harmful cosmetics and against medical devices that are neither safe nor effective.

I have asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to begin a thorough analysis of the legislative authority now available and to recommend new steps that may be needed to close the gaps in the laws dealing with cosmetics and medical devices.

THE PROGRESS WE HAVE MADE

Since my message on consumer interests in 1964, much has been accomplished.

The Federal Trade Commission has launched an intensive program to protect consumers from unfair marketing practices. It has established a Consumer Complaints Bureau in the District of Columbia and is prepared to help the States develop such programs of their own.

The Federal Power Commission's Natural Power Survey estimates that by 1980 as much as $11 billion per year can be saved in the cost of electricity for Americans. The Commission stemmed the rising cost of natural gas and retroactively reduced rates. As a result more than $650 million has been refunded and annual gas costs to consumers have been reduced by $130 million.

The Department of Defense has issued an important directive designed to protect servicemen as consumers, with special emphasis upon full disclosure of credit charges.

The Department of Agriculture has established a Consumer and Marketing Service to coordinate the Department's many and varied consumer services.

The Department of Commerce has taken steps to assure a greater consumer voice in the development of product standards, and has adopted improved procedures for product standardization.

These are but a few actions of the many Federal agencies which protect the interests and serve the needs of the consumer.

TO HELP THE POOR FAMILY

I have instructed the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to give particular attention to the consumer needs of our poverty-stricken families.

Studies have shown that they suffer most cruelly from lack of consumer protection and lack of buyer know-how. I consider this the most urgent challenge in the field of consumer information and education.

We must deal with the fact that today 34 million Americans—7 million families—must try to stretch poverty-level incomes to meet living costs. Studies show that these people are plagued by consumer problems unknown to the affluent majority.

They are unable to shop effectively for bargains or to buy in economical quantities.

They are often victimized by excessive costs of credit and merchandise.

They are subjected to countless fraudulent and deceptive marketing and financing practices.

Most of these problems are symptoms of the basic maladies which we are attacking in the war on poverty. Programs of consumer information and protection cannot cure them—but such programs can lessen their impact.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has already made 56 grants totaling almost $3 million, to support consumer education and related programs throughout the country. In the future, this Office will become a clearinghouse for distribution of educational materials to the poor. It will be a powerful source of incentive and support to the poor in their efforts to achieve fairplay in the marketplace.

I pledge the all-out effort of the Federal Government to help our poorest citizens to spend their limited funds more efficiently as we work to enhance their incomes.

Credit is a particular problem for the poor. Often it is available only at high interest rates, and its overextension can lead to the garnishment of wages and the loss of jobs. The situation is particularly severe because the poor are susceptible to emergencies that eliminate any limited financial reserves they may have.

Cooperative sources of low-cost credit, such as credit unions, combined with sound and impartial debt and financial counseling, and with legal services, can be of great benefit to the poor.

I am directing the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and my Committee on Consumer Interests to intensify their efforts to encourage the development of such services in community action programs.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The measures I have recommended—truth in packaging, truth in lending, and the others—will help protect the consumer in the marketplace.

But beyond this there lies an even more important concern—that the consumer continue to have a dollar of stable purchasing power. Even the wisest consumer laws will not help the American public if their hard-earned dollars and savings are eroded by inflation.

The rewards and challenges of prosperity are central to the consumer's interest today. For the past 5 years, the American consumer has participated in and contributed to an unparalleled and uninterrupted economic advance.

This has been the most inflation-free expansion in the history of our Nation. Apart from the improvements in quality and the benefits of new goods, the upward drift in prices has been only one-fourth as rapid as the growth in the real income of consumers. The healthy growth of consumer income has been built on—

Rapid technical advances by business;

Productivity gains from the greater skill and diligence of labor;

Cooperation among labor, management, and Government;

Prudent fiscal policies;

The careful efforts of consumers to get the most for their money.

The success of our efforts to bring full prosperity to the American economy has sharpened the challenge of maintaining price stability.

We are determined to have the benefits of both full employment and price stability—not one at the expense of the other.

That environment of stability is strengthened whenever responsible action is taken on prices and wages.

It is strengthened when we support a pay bill for Federal workers consistent with the administration's wage-price guideposts.

It is strengthened when businessmen lower prices to share the benefits of lower costs and rapid productivity gains.

It is strengthened when unions bargaining for wage increases stay within the bounds of productivity gains, as they did in many industries last year.

On many occasions, I have asked management and labor to make their price and wage decisions with full regard to the interest of the entire Nation in price and cost stability. I renew that request today.

The consumer's interest is broad in scope. So are the effects required to promote and protect that interest. The recommendations I have made will require action on many fronts by many groups.

The Congress holds the key to historic achievements in areas of consumer information and safety. This administration will marshal its forces to promote consumer welfare in close cooperation with the States and local governments.

Yet the basic job of furthering the consumer cause lies in the hands of private citizens—the consumers themselves. With the full cooperation of all, we can look ahead toward an ever-rising standard of living for American consumers.

Together, we can achieve a free marketplace where better goods can be bought, where real incomes continue to increase, and where the dollar's purchasing power remains firm and stable.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 21, 1966.*

The SPEAKER. The message is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to know of the continued strong support of President Johnson for the kind of consumer legislation which I have been seeking to have enacted into law. His message today on consumer interests is an excellent presentation of the issues which confront us as consumers, and I congratulate the President and his Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, the Honorable Esther Peterson, who is also Assistant Secretary of Labor, for their dedication and efforts devoted to this cause.

The truth-in-lending bill, pioneered by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, would give the consumer facts on which to base credit decisions. Credit is an essential tool of our economy today; no one wants to interfere with legitimate credit activities. But the consumer deserves to know the facts. I have been proud to sponsor the Douglas bill in the House as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE LEGISLATION ON FOODS, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS

Mr. Speaker, I particularly appreciate the strong position taken by the President on necessary reforms in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. I have sponsored safe cosmetic legislation for 14 years, and, for the past 5 years, have incorporated such a provision in my own omnibus bill, H.R. 1235, which covers all of the many loopholes which still exist in the 1938 act. The President's message clearly points up the need for such improvements.

As one who has devoted so many years to consumer causes in the Congress, I am proud of what has been achieved so far, but deeply concerned over the gaps which still remain in our laws. That is why, 5 years ago, on the opening day of the 87th Congress, I introduced H.R. 1235 as an omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

Nearly all of the proposals made by President Johnson in his consumer message today for improvement or strengthening of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act are contained in H.R. 1235, so I am hopeful that we can finally have action on this broad-gaged legislation. I hope that, in keeping with the President's instructions to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare "to begin a thorough analysis of the legislative authority now available and to recommend new steps that may be needed to close the gaps in the laws dealing with cosmetics and medical devices," the HEW will now find that H.R. 1235 either meets its requirements or can easily be amended to carry out administration policies.

INTEREST RATES RISING ALARMINGLY—SHOULD BE REVEALED

The President's message on consumer interests reaffirms the support President Johnson has personally and consistently given to consumer interests and the dedicated efforts made by Mrs. Peterson to coordinate and give guidance to the multitude of activities carried on by Government agencies which are intended to help consumers.

With interest rates rising so alarmingly, as has been pointed out many times by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, who has dramatized for us what this means in terms of lowered consumer purchasing power and higher Federal debt service, it is more important than ever for the consumer to know what credit actually costs him.

WHAT WOULD TRUTH IN LENDING DO?

The truth-in-lending bill would require that all lenders and all merchants, selling on credit, fully disclose the finance charges to the borrower or buyer before the sale is completed or the contract is signed.

Under present trade practices, the consumer is often not told what his use of credit will cost, either in terms of the dollars-and-cents charge or in terms of the annual percentage rate. Lenders often quote deceptively low interest rates to consumers. That is to make them believe they are paying less for credit than they actually are paying.

The consumer is being gouged, bilked, fleeced—pick your own word for it—and the people who are doing it to him do not want him to know how badly they are actually skinning him.

Now let me tell you, with a few examples, how truth in lending would work. Suppose you were to borrow $1,800 to buy a car. Under present practice you might be told you would have to pay $59.22 a month for 36 months, including "6-percent interest."

Under truth in lending: You would be told an investigation fee would be $8, interest would be $324, making a total finance charge of $332, or an 11.3 percent annual rate on the declining balance.

Under present practices: On a TV set, say you borrow $180 to finance it. You might be told you would pay $11.30 a month for 18 months, including "carrying charges."

Under truth in lending: You also would be told you would pay $23.40 interest, or a 15.8 annual percentage rate on the declining balance.

Under present practices: On a house, say you borrow $15,000 at 6 percent for 25 years. You might be told you would pay $96.65 a month for 25 years, including principal and interest.

Under truth in lending: You would be told you would pay $14,025 interest over the life of the loan, or a 6-percent annual rate on the declining balance.

Under present practices: On department store revolving credit, say you charge $700 worth of purchases. You might be told that you would pay a small service charge for each month that you owed money to the store.

Under truth in lending: You would be told that the store's finance charges were at the rate of 18 percent per year and you would receive a monthly statement showing the dollars-and-cents costs for credit during the previous month.

Truth in lending would not in any way control the terms or costs of credit use. It would merely require that the borrower or buyer be fully informed about the finance charges so that he could make an intelligent choice about where to borrow money, whether to pay cash or buy on credit, and, if on credit, where to do so.

LEGISLATION ON COSMETICS

In 1938, cosmetics came under Federal supervision in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. This legislation was enacted only after numerous women had been blinded by unsafe eye preparations. However, several loopholes still exist:

The burden of proof, for example, is still on the Government in the law's sections relating to cosmetics. There is no requirement that cosmetic manufacturers must pretest their products for safety. Thus, the consumer can become an unknowing guinea pig on a new cosmetic item. When, and only when, enough consumers get hurt—burned, scalped, disfigured, scarred, or infected—from a new cosmetic, can the Government move in and remove the product from the market. We have had several tragic examples in cosmetics to illustrate the inadequacies of this law: Several years ago, it was discovered that some false fingernails when removed would also remove the user's real nails. Also, several hair dyes have made women bald or nearly bald.

The only significant improvement made in the cosmetic section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act came in the law on color additives enacted in 1960. This law related to the coloring matter used in foods, drugs, and cosmetics. Under this act, a color additive must be proven safe in the manner used before incorporation into a cosmetic.

But outside the coloring matter, no other ingredients of cosmetics have to be pretested for safety or subjected to any preclearance by the Government before use.

The burden of proof that a cosmetic is unsafe or contains unsafe ingredients is required before the Government can act, and this standard of proof is quite difficult: Proof must be beyond a reasonable doubt, and there must be actual legal proof of harm.

In the case of hair dyes, it does not matter how dangerous they are. They can be sold anyway, as long as the label clearly warns the purchaser that the product may be dangerous to use. The question is: In a beauty shop, how many women ever get to see the labels on the bottles or the drums in which hair dyes are shipped?

In addition to requiring that all ingredients in a cosmetic be safe, it is also necessary to require that significant ingredients of a cosmetic item be revealed on the label. Actually there are a few secrets in the cosmetic industry; most competing products use similar basic ingredients. But for the woman who is allergic, there is no way but through painful trial and error in finding a suitable product, when certain chemicals are used to provide a distinctive selling point for a product.

Also, under present law, soap and hair dyes are exempt from coverage. There is no logical reason why these two products should be exempt from coverage.

ANALYSIS OF 14 SECTIONS OF H.R. 1235 IN RECORD

The complexity of modern cosmetics is such that only some one with a degree in medicine or chemistry can really determine the safety of most cosmetics. The Government has a responsibility to afford American women a degree of protection which very few are in a position to supply for themselves.

For those readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who are interested in knowing about H.R. 1235 in more detail, I am placing in the RECORD today a separate statement containing a discussion and analysis of each of the 14 sections of the omnibus bill.

PACKAGING

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my full support for the President's fair packaging bill. The packaging industry has grown to a $20-billion business. The result has been many welcome improvements in the quality, freshness, and convenience of many of the items we buy. Where changes in packaging have brought a better product, consumers have always been happy to pay for it. Most buyers also are willing to tolerate the cost of certain frills and gimmicks associated with the American system of merchandising.

But when these frills and gimmicks are designed to conceal the true costs of merchandise, shoppers have a legitimate complaint.

It has reached the point now where even college-trained shoppers familiar with their own stores are not able to determine comparative costs of the items they buy.

As a result, they have to pay far more than they would otherwise do.

In a recent survey, intelligent women shoppers wound up paying about 9 percent more than they needed to, largely because of the confusion of package sizes. A group of college-trained housewives, trying to choose the most economical package of 20 different items in a supermarket, failed in 43 percent of the cases.

This would indicate that the average shopper pays quite a bit extra through no choice of her own. If even college-trained women pay more than they need to, it is obvious that less educated shoppers must suffer a real inability to determine comparative costs. As a result, the people who are paying the highest premiums are probably the ones who can least afford it.

Is this really necessary? Does the American economy have to operate on such deception and waste? Is it unfair to ask business to make it easier for shoppers to compare prices?

I think it is about time that we do something for the American consumer so that he or she can make easier price comparisons.

By making that possible, the fair packaging bill may cut substantial amounts from grocery bills for the average family. This would be a particularly useful accomplishment in a period of rising prices.

The cost of the packaging bill itself would be negligible. But the saving to the average housewife would be considerable; according to Senator HART, as much as $250 per year per family.

This factor alone ought to be enough to commend overwhelming support for the fair packaging bill.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF OUR STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, today is the 20th anniversary of our Strategic Air Command. It was born out of our experiences in World War II. It had its beginning with only 600 propeller-driven bombers, 3 jet fighters and little more than 35,000 service personnel.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I salute the Strategic Air Command. We cannot fail to recognize that SAC has been a major deterrent to aggression. Its very existence has been an effective instrument for the maintenance of world peace.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, whose computers already failed to give him the right answers on several military matters, notably in connection with Vietnam, would have us believe that there is no longer any need for a long-range bomber. He would have us place sole reliance on missiles. He would have us put all our eggs in one basket. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is the B-52 bomber flown from distant Guam, not missiles, that we are obliged to rely on in Vietnam.

The mere fact that we recently were obliged in a matter of days to rush through the Congress as emergency measures multibillion authorization and appropriation bills to meet our military needs for Vietnam somewhat belies the computer wisdom of Secretary McNamara's long-range defense planning.

It is significant our military needs for Vietnam did not become known to us until after the regular budget had been prepared.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great concern to me, as it is to the entire Committee on Armed Services, that we have not had a bomber replacement program and we do not have new bombers in production. The B-52 bombers are of 1956 vintage. We have about 600 of them, and they, along with the B-58, are being phased out.

Missiles are an important item in our defense arsenal, but they are not, nor by their very nature can they be, an effective substitute for the bomber. Nor is the controversial F-111 an effective substitute.

On this 20th anniversary of our Strategic Air Command I remind the House of the importance of this arm of our defense, and I remind the House that we have the duty and responsibility of maintaining it. It is the Congress—not the President nor his Secretary of Defense—which has the constitutional right and duty to determine the kind of defense we should have.

I salute the Strategic Air Command by renewing my determination to give it new life that it may continue, as before, to provide our people with a balanced defense, second to none.

AN AWESOME LOOPHOLE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of President Lyndon Johnson's outstanding message on consumer protection. I applaud this kind of leadership and this concern for the average American citizen.

Too often we hear of what this or that special group needs, but we do not hear often enough what all Americans need. I think in this message today we have found the spirit of national concern for a national problem—and we have also found recommendations for a national answer.

I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a particular section of this message that bears our closest scrutiny. It is that section dealing with hazardous substances.

I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that many unpackaged toys, pieces of costume jewelry, and other novelty items are on the market today and that they contain or carry toxic chemical residues or edible poisons.

I am also informed that these unpackaged items are beyond the control of the Government because of an inadequacy in present law. There is a loophole and that loophole must be closed.

This is no longer a matter for lawyers to discuss and split hair about, Mr. Speaker. This is a matter that involves the lives of children who accidentally chew on these things or eat them or otherwise use them in such a way that injury and even death ensues.

We have heard the word "loophole" before, Mr. Speaker, and we sometimes grow tired of it. It sometimes seems that every law has a loophole and every loophole must be closed. But I urge my colleagues not to take this particular matter lightly. We are today speaking of a small loophole that has very large and awesome consequences. We are speaking of a quirk in the law, a quirk which indirectly takes the lives of children and throws American families into grief and mourning.

It is incumbent upon the House of Representatives to move deliberately and swiftly in this matter. I strongly urge that we extend coverage of the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act so that it will allow the Food and Drug Administration to monitor all hazardous substances and materials, regardless of their wrapping or their lack of wrapping.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am completely in agreement with the President's message on the need for consumer legislation. For, the rights of the American consumer in the marketplace—the right to a variety of products from which to choose, the right to information about these various products as well as his right to be protected from products detrimental or fatal—are privileges I have long respected. Therefore, I welcomed and wholeheartedly support the President's request to Congress that these rights be secured by comprehensive legislation passed in this session.

Two main areas which are in need of vast improvement were cited by the President in his recent message. They are lending and packaging of consumer items. Protection has been sought for the consumer by lawmakers for decades, even before the corner store mushroomed into the block-long, self-service shopping center. But the dishonest practices of moneylenders and the false advertisement promoted by those too eager to sell a faulty product have necessitated a complete revamp of protective measures.

The public must be informed that credit is a commodity as much as is the product which they are buying on credit. And most important, they must know how much this commodity costs. The poor, apprehensive of being able to afford even the necessities of life are most often duped in the process of buying on credit. Thus, I am in complete support of the President's recommendation for legislation requiring lenders to state the full cost of credit, simply and clearly and to state it before any credit contract is signed.

I know we are all aware of the deception which is practiced in the misleading packaging of products found in our supermarkets. This is more than an economic question. It is a question of safety. Harmful products should not be allowed to appear on the market. This protection falls within the realm of the Food and Drug Administration, which President Johnson has ordered expanded. Actually this expansion has already begun; however, legislation authorizing training programs for non-Federal officials would add needed support, thus, broadening Federal-State-local cooperation in this field.

In this same general area, the President has asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct an analysis of the legislative authority now available and to recommend new steps that may be needed to close the gaps in the laws dealing with cosmetics and medical devises. This analysis I will anxiously await and I look forward to a remedy to the despicable condition of trading on the illnesses of the public and the desperation of the sick.

The individual taxpayer will benefit greatly by the studies and improvements proposed by the President. The citizen's economic situation will be stabilized. As a result, the national economy will be strengthened.

The recommendations will require cooperative action in many areas by many people; but the laws governing these improvements must be made here and I propose we begin.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to President Lyndon B. Johnson on his message on consumer interests which was submitted to the Congress today.

The war on inflation is completely related to these efforts to bring quality merchandise to the consumer at a fair and reasonable price.

Credit is the most important commodity in modern American life. The consumer is entitled to know what part credit plays in the ultimate item which he purchases. The current action of the Federal Reserve which resulted in higher interest rates was a step which multiplied the cost of credit to every American consumer. It seems to me that our national interest is vitally related not only to the quality of credit or the truth in its actual cost but there also must be assurance that an adequate quality of credit is made available to the consumer. The ultimate cost of credit to the consumer is a vital matter for national policy.

The consumer price index is fatally defective in that it fails to include the cost of the credit to the consumer. In my community some people spend as much as 25 or 35 percent of their monthly income on installment credit. The cost of this credit is multiplied through Federal Reserve policies, which have an immediate inflationary effect upon the consumer. Unfortunately the low income groups are compelled to buy more credit at higher prices which are commanded by these unfortunate policies.

While the posting of the actual cost of credit would be a desirable thing in every sales contract, such posting will not of itself reduce the cost of the item to the consumer. Today's laws which require the posting of automobile prices serve in effect to perpetuate a hoax on the consumer. The posted price is utilized as a gimmick to convince the consumer that he is making a real buy when the posted price in fact represents a convenient rallying point for the automobile dealer. The posted price is inflated at the source so that it can provide the dealer with a convenient trade-in margin of almost 25 percent on which he can negotiate the prospective car buyer into a scheme of purchase. The posted automobile price bears little relationship to the ultimate purchase price. Today's purchase of an automobile is still a game of chance. The posted price is inflated at the time of printing and the dealers seasonable discount is still the Nation's most highly guarded secret.

The publication of credit costs will inform the consumer—but care must be taken to insure that the publication is not used as a tool to validate exorbitant credit charges.

All of the wisdom and judgment of the ages which established laws against usury and its abuses have been completely discarded during recent years. State laws have legalized interest rates of 36 percent per year to the small loan operators. Department stores throughout America have established interest rates of 18 percent as a convenient carrying charge rate established not by act of law but by custom in the trade.

The public must be protected from usurious practices which have destroyed ancient civilizations. The use of money has a maximum fixed value in any age at any time and under almost any circumstance. The rule of the marketplace which covers the price of so many other items cannot be accepted as a substitute for laws of usury which were founded on justice and reasonableness. Therefore, Federal monetary policies must be developed which preclude the advance of usury. Credit can be restrained in many ways other than the increase in its cost. Steps must be taken to achieve these procedures.

The President's recommendations substantially support the proposals of Senator Paul H. Douglas and pays tribute to the valiant fight that he has waged over the years in this area. The President's recommendations on the Fair Labeling and Packaging Act recognize comparable efforts by Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, who has contributed so much to the cause of honest packaging.

President Johnson's proposals in the Drug Safety Act, the Child Safety Act, and the proposed dangerous substances legislation dynamically brings the Federal Government face to face with the real problems which confront the consumer. With the enactment of this legislation the 89th Congress could be labeled as the "consumer-minded Congress," a fitting designation in these days of inflationary pressure.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the message sent today by the President about enactment of consumer protection legislation.

This message again reflects the deep concern President Johnson has for all of the people of America. In my judgment, speedy enactment of this legislation can be the single most important anti-inflationary measure that this Congress can pass. Previous speakers and the message clearly indicate the extent to which people—and too often it is the people who can afford it the least—are exploited in their purchases by unscrupulous practices.

Mr. Speaker, I say that today should be a great day for the senior Senator from Illinois, Paul Douglas. I say this because the President in recommending enactment of the truth-in-lending legislation has now given full support to a measure that the senior Senator from my State, Paul Douglas, wished to achieve and a struggle which he waged at first singlehandedly for many years.

It appears that today finally this great effort of his and his determined fight to protect the consumers of America is getting unified support from the Presidency on down. It is my hope that the Senator will find a great deal of comfort, aid, and courage today in his long effort to give the consumers of this country the protection that they need.

PACKAGING

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to dispel any impression that American business is solidly against any bill requiring more complete disclosure of product information on packages.

This is simply not true.

Many of the business spokesmen who testified on the fair packaging bill agreed with the general principles of the bill, while finding fault with one small part of it. Others agreed entirely with the bill, but have chosen not to say so publicly for reasons of their own. This silent support may be substantial.

For example, a recent poll of small businessmen showed considerable support for the principles of the packaging bill. And it is the smaller, independent businessmen who account for the bulk of the business firms in the United States. They represent—often better than the larger firms—the essential virtues of the American free enterprise system.

I am referring to a poll taken by the National Federation of Independent Business, an organization of more than 200,000 individual business and professional people throughout the 50 States. The results of the federation's poll were presented at earlier hearings on the packaging bill by George J. Burger, vice president of the federation, which has offices in Washington, D.C., and San Mateo, Calif.

Members were given the principal arguments for and against the packaging bill and then asked if they agree or disagree with the purposes of the bill. A total of 79 percent agreed, 18 percent disagreed, and 3 percent had no opinion.

Mr. Burger, in reporting these results, said:

> I urge your close consideration to the outcome of this vote. That this is a matter of great importance to small business is clearly shown by the overwhelming majority in favor of same. That the needs of small business must be given utmost consideration is clearly shown by the fact that our surveys this year indicate that the Nation must rely heavily on this segment of our economy to provide the new job openings which are needed to provide work for our growing population. We urge your approval of the measure.

In testifying for the packaging bill last year, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor spoke out for the benefits the bill would bring to business itself:

> While many businessmen may well question the need for this type of legislation—

He said—

> I am sure that many businessmen will themselves recognize in this proposed legislation a desirable measure of protection for their own businesses against the questionable practices of a few.

This prediction has been borne out. The packaging bill is not proconsumer and antibusiness. It will benefit both. I urge its support.

CREDIT

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, long-term consumer debt—primarily in the form of home mortgages—amounts to $196 billion and short-term and intermediate-term consumer debt is $79 billion. The total is $275 billion—almost the size of the entire national debt.

More startling is the dramatic rise in consumer debt in the last 20 years—long-term consumer debt has increased 943 percent, while short-term and intermediate-term consumer debt has increased 1,247 percent. At the same time, the national debt has increased only 18 percent. Equally startling is the amount of interest paid on consumer debts; $20 billion a year.

Thus, consumer credit has become big business. Yet, this tremendous growth of credit has been marked by many abuses. Among the major abuses are:

First. Often, no rate at all is quoted to the consumer. The borrower is told to pay $10 down and $10 per month, but is not told how long he must pay.

Second. The borrower is rarely told that the interest rate quoted applies to the original amount of the debt and not to the declining or unpaid balance, as is the consumer practice in business credit, Government loans, or mortgage transactions. In other words, the borrower is asked to pay interest on amounts that he has already repaid.

Third. Alternatively, the discount rate method is often used. In this case, the borrower pays on a loan of $100 but receives only $94 or less.

Fourth. In retail transactions and small loans, revolving credit plans are often used. In this method, the finance rate is represented as being 1, 2, 3, or 4 percent per month. Yet, the annual rate is 12 times the quoted figure—or 12, 24, 36, or 48 percent per year.

Fifth. Sometimes lenders compound the camouflaging of credit by loading on all sorts of extra fees, including exorbitant fees for credit life insurance and fees for credit investigations, processing and handling. Some dealers are unwilling to use the word "interest." They prefer to call it a "small monthly service charge."

Translated into concrete examples, these practices mean:

The 4½-percent new car financing plan of some commercial banks is really 9 percent per year.

The advertised 5-percent rate on home improvement loans is not less than a 6-percent first mortgage, but nearly twice as much—10 percent.

The so-called 6-percent rate for financing used cars offered by some used car dealers is at least 12 percent, and sometimes 18 to 25 percent.

The cost of teenage credit now advertised by retailers as "pennies per week" is sometimes as high as 80 percent.

The wise use of money by consumers is particularly important in view of the recent price rises. No one can accurately measure the extent of economic waste when consumers pay more for credit than they would if they were better able to shop around for lower credit rates. More disclosure thus can contribute to the growth of the economy. In turn, the more efficient use of money takes on new importance as the price spiral continues to rise. Less and less can the average consumer afford to waste money.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in lauding the President's message on consumer interests.

In a very real sense, we are a nation of consumers. The products of our national industry and prosperity today are available to us in unprecedented quantity and quality. When we go to the marketplace to make our choice of the specific product to fit our needs, however, the task of making the right selection often is not an easy one. Instances of deceptive and false packaging are experienced by all consumers at one time or another. When this occurs, we as consumers are robbed of a fundamental right—the right of free choice based on the truth.

As the President has stated:

> If the consumer is to be a wise sovereign in our progressive market economy, he must be fully informed. Free consumer choice—indeed, our free enterprise system—must rest on a firm foundation of reliable information on the costs and contents of the products we buy.

The truth to which consumers are entitled in packaging, as our President suggests, ought to be extended to lending, for consumer credit forms the very basis upon which our American economy rests. Truth in lending is just as vital and necessary as truth in packaging.

Mr. Speaker, our President has pointed the way with clarity and vision to legislation which is needed to protect consumers in these and related fields. It behooves us as responsible legislators to pass appropriate legislation to protect such consumer interests at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in commending the President for the many fine recommendations included in his message on consumer interests.

As President Johnson has pointed out, all Americans are consumers. We all are united in our right to receive our money's worth in the items we buy to sustain our lives or to make them more comfortable and enjoyable.

"Let the buyer beware," might have been a suitable slogan in the days when most people grew their own food and made their own clothing and built their own furniture. But today we live in a highly complex civilization in which few if any of us can provide for ourselves the necessities of life.

We buy our food at the supermarket or grocery store. We buy our clothing at department stores. We buy our furniture at large retail outlets.

These transactions must be based on trust. The buyer does not have the time to weigh his box of breakfast cereal to determine if there is, indeed, a pound. He does not carry a slide rule to ascertain if a regular size can at 49 cents is more for his money than the giant economy size at 87 cents.

Further, many of today's purchases are made on credit. This too is a symptom of our increasingly complex society. The methods by which credit charges and interest are figured often are very complicated.

Because of these complications, because we consumers do not have the time or the inclination to figure whether every penny is being spent as it should be, we must trust those with whom we do business.

Fortunately, the great majority of our businessmen are honest and seek to give the consumer his money's worth. But there are a few producers who seek to take unfair advantage of the consumer and their fellow, honest businessmen.

Thus it becomes necessary to give Federal attention to truth in labeling and truth in lending.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear that the honest businessmen have nothing to fear from such legislation. They are dedicated to truth in their business. They cannot be hurt by laws which demand honest disclosures; rather, they will be put in a more competitive position with those unscrupulous dealers who seek to keep the public in ignorance.

President Johnson is to be commended too for making his message a multifaceted, rounded program of aid to consumers. We must protect our children from harmful substances. We must protect all America against dangerous drugs, food, and other materials.

Ours is a nation of consumers. Irregularities, unfair practices, and dangerous methods which affect this area of life strike to the heart of society. So long as an American citizen cannot be sure that what he is buying is adequately labeled, safe, and worth his money, we have not achieved a just society.

For some years I have believed that Congress should act to protect our consumer rights, and have introduced legislation for that purpose. It is gratifying indeed, therefore, to see the administration taking a position of leadership in this effort.

It is my firm hope that Congress will now act decisively to implement many of the proposals which President Johnson has made today.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

NAME BUILDING IN HONOR OF THE LATE FRITZ GARLAND LANHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10284) to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10284

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Texas, and scheduled for completion in 1966, shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947. Any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT SALT LAKE LANDS, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1791) to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

TRANSFERS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7423) to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7423

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2201 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before the word "Congress"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation available to the Post Office Department for each fiscal year may, when so specified in an appropriation Act, be transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other appropriation or appropriations available to such Department for such fiscal year. Whenever the Postmaster General submits a request for the approval of the Bureau of the Budget of a transfer of any appropriation under this subsection, he shall furnish a copy of such request to the respective Committees on Appropriations and on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives.".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to report that H.R. 7423 was reported unanimously by the full committee. This legislation is recommended by the administration.

The amendment which has been offered was suggested by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. It will make it clear that this legislation is intended to authorize the appropriation acts for the Post Office Department to include authority for the Department to transfer funds between appropriations.

A transfer would be permitted only when authorized in an appropriation act and when approved by the Bureau of the Budget. When the Postmaster General submits a request for the approval of a transfer to the Bureau of the Budget, a copy of the request must be furnished to the appropriate congressional committees, the Committees on Appropriations and on Post Office and Civil Service.

The official report of the Bureau of the Budget states that the nature and size of the postal operations make it desirable for the Department to have the flexibility, within limitations, to make transfers among appropriations to meet changes in operating conditions.

The Post Office Department has had appropriation transfer authority in annual appropriation acts, with two exceptions, since 1948. The transfer authority was omitted during fiscal years 1951 and 1952, when the appropriation structure for the Department changed the number of appropriations from 58 to 4. However, it soon became apparent that the need for the authority to transfer funds, even with only four appropriation accounts, was still needed.

During the House consideration of the 1966 fiscal year appropriation act, a point of order was raised and sustained against the transfer authority language being included in the appropriation bill, on the basis that it was legislation in the appropriation bill. Subsequent action by the Senate, which was concurred in by the House, did include the transfer authority in the 1966 appropriation act.

This legislation follows the procedure that should be followed in a case of this nature and provides the basic authorizing legislation which will assure the Department of having the necessary flexibility in the use of their appropriations in order to meet the emergencies that continually arise in the postal service, and will permit, as has been done in the past, such language to be included in annual appropriation acts.

As a result of the hearings held by my Subcommittee on Postal Operations, the members of our committee became convinced that the transfer authority is needed to provide flexibility in funding the operations of the postal service. Without this authority the Department would be required to follow the supplemental appropriations procedure. We are convinced that the Department needs to have both avenues available for their operations.

The supplemental appropriation process is available, and properly so, to meet the unexpected cost increases imposed upon the Department by legislation such as pay increases or new employee benefits that are imposed by the Congress following consideration of the appropriations. On the other hand, the transfer authority is just as urgently needed to cover emergency situations that continually arise in the Department.

The Post Office Department budget cannot possibly provide for every eventuality and the supplemental appropriation process cannot possibly be followed to meet emergency situations due to adverse weather, epidemics, riots, strikes, all of which have a costly effect on the mail-handling operations of the Post Office Department.

A quick review of the analysis of transfers for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966, as of March 1, 1966, which is set forth on page 3 of the committee report, will allay any suspicions that the transfer authority has been used to excess.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of years since 1948 has confirmed any suspicions and should have removed any doubts that the flexibility needed in funding the accounts of the Post Office Department requires legislative transfer authority. I urge favorable consideration of this proposal here today.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7423 and the amendment. I agree with the reasoning and the comments included in the statement by our distinguished subcommittee chairman [Mr. Dulski]. I also am a member of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations which gave favorable consideration to this proposal.

For many years the Post Office Department has had authority to transfer funds between appropriations under provisions included each year in the annual appropriation acts. The provisions were subject to a point of order on the floor of the House because there was no legislative authorization to include such provisions in an appropriation act.

Our Subcommittee on Postal Operations, at the request of the Post Office Department, considered the matter and came up with a bill that will enact in permanent legislative language the authority for provisions to be included in the appropriation acts to transfer amounts between appropriations not in excess of 5 percent.

We believe the bill contains the necessary adequate safeguards. First, the transfer authority must be included in an appropriation act. Second, the transfer can be made only with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Third, when a request for approval is sent to the Bureau of the Budget, a copy of the request must be sent to both the Appropriations and the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

In addition to being an extremely useful tool of management in meeting the cost of handling the growing volume of mail, the transfer authority serves several other valid purposes.

First. Transportation patterns and requirements may change after annual appropriations have been enacted. The transfer authority would permit the Department to use the transportation media most conducive to the efficient and expeditious handling of the mail.

Second. Utility rates may be changed and the transfer authority affords the Department an opportunity to absorb the cost of increased rates or to transfer funds to other appropriations if the rates are reduced.

Third. The regulatory agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission may create additional demands on the Department's appropriations, which can be financed by transfers.

Fourth. Additional cost of operating the postal service due to an unanticipated increase in mail volume quite frequently can be covered, provided the Department has the transfer authority.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in the minds of the members of our committee that the transfer authority is needed by the Post Office Department, as well as the usual procedure to be followed in requesting supplemental appropriations.

I urge the favorable consideration of H.R. 7423.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7423 as amended, would authorize the inclusion of legislative language in appropriations acts to transfer, with approval of the Bureau of the Budget, up to 5 percent of any Post Office Department appropriation available to the Department to any other departmental appropriation.

Transfer authority was first included in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal 1948. At that time there were 58 separate accounts within the Post Office Department. In 1951 these were consolidated into four accounts and Congress felt it would no longer be necessary to provide the transfer authority. However, by 1953, it became apparent that this authority was necessary to the operation of the Department, and language to provide this was included in the 1954 Post Office Department appropriation. There are presently six accounts within the Post Office Department.

The transfer authority was subsequently included in all Post Office Department appropriations until last year, on a point of order, when it was removed on the House floor. The Senate-passed bill included a provision which provided 5 percent transfer authority, and the House-Senate conferees agreed to a 2½ percent transfer provision.

A committee amendment provides that whenever the Postmaster General requests approval of the Bureau of the Budget of any transfer of funds, he submits to the Post Office and Civil Service and the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate a copy of his request. This amendment was unanimously adopted by the committee.

The amendment will insure that Congress be informed of all appropriations transfers.

It is necessary to provide for the authorization of a 5-percent transfer of funds if the efficient and economical operation of the postal establishment is to be insured. The transfer of funds can provide needed moneys to cope with fluctuations in mail volume, which otherwise would adversely affect the postal operation.

Unobligated funds can finance the installation of modern equipment, leading to speedier mail service and significant savings in the future.

Transfer of funds can also be used to finance rate changes granted by regulatory agencies, which would otherwise create serious demands on postal appropriations.

The Honorable Ralph W. Nicholson, Assistant Postmaster General, in testimony before the Post Office Committee stated:

> Without the ability to make limited transfers, one or another of the following would apply:
>
> (1) We would require a supplemental appropriation from Congress.
>
> (2) We would violate the Anti-Deficiency Act.
>
> (3) An opportunity to take constructive, efficient action would be lost or postponed.

This legislation will not grant any authority to the Post Office Department which it has not had previously, nor will it increase the cost of operation of the Department.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only that I support this bill with the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] which brings the Post Office Department to the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of obtaining approval for the transfer of funds.

Members of the House should understand that this transferability authorization could involve many millions of dollars each year.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the committee has offered the amendment which provides for close scrutiny and approval by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. With this amendment, I can support the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7423, as amended.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAILING PRIVILEGES OF MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13448) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13448

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4169(a) of title 39, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking out "First-class letter mail, including postal cards and post cards, shall be carried as airmail, at no cost to the sender, when mailed by—" and inserting in lieu thereof "First-class letter mail, including

postal cards and post cards, and sound-recorded communications having the character of personal correspondence shall be carried, at no cost to the sender, in the manner provided by section 4303(d)(5) of this title, when mailed by—";

(2) by striking out, in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), "the letter is mailed" and inserting in lieu thereof "the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed"; and

(3) by striking out, in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2), "The letter is mailed" and inserting in lieu thereof "the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed".

SEC. 2. Paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 4303(d) of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(5) There shall be transported by air, between Armed Forces post offices established under section 705(d) of this title which are located outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States, or between any such Armed Forces post office and the point of embarkation or debarkation within the forty-eight contiguous States, on a space available basis, on United States-flag carriers with the total annual volume to be equally divided, to the extent practicable, among such carriers serving each area, at rates fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board in accordance with section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), the following categories of mail matter:

"(A)(i) first-class letter mail (including postal cards and post cards),

"(ii) sound-recorded communications having the character of personal correspondence,

"(iii) second-class publications published once each week or more frequently and featuring principally current news of interest to the general public, and

"(iv) parcels of any class of mail not exceeding five pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined,

which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office; and

"(B) parcels of any class of mail exceeding five pounds but not exceeding seventy pounds in weight and not exceeding one hundred inches in length and girth combined which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office where adequate surface transportation is not available.

Whenever adequate service by United States-flag carriers is not available to provide transportation of mail matter by air in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, the transportation of such mail matter may be authorized by aircraft other than United States-flag carriers. This paragraph shall not affect the operation of section 4169(a) of this title.

"(6) Paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection shall be administered under such conditions and regulations as the Postmaster General and the Secretary of Defense severally may prescribe to carry out their respective functions under such paragraphs.".

SEC. 3. Section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Post Office Department, out of any appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense, as a necessary expense of the appropriations or funds and of the activities concerned, sums equal to the expenses incurred by the Post Office Department, as determined by the Postmaster General, in providing air transportation of mail between Armed Forces post offices established under section 705(d) of this title which are located outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States, or between any such Armed Forces post office and the point of embarkation or debarkation within the forty-eight contiguous States."

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **CORBETT**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13448 was reported by unanimous vote of our committee. The purpose of this legislation is to provide the benefits of faster, more efficient and less expensive mail service for our servicemen and certain civilian employees of the U.S. Government stationed overseas.

Last year our committee was instrumental in initiating enactment of Public Law 89-315, which authorized free letter mail for members of the armed services in combat areas and permitted parcels not exceeding 5 pounds, addressed to servicemen in combat areas, to be transported by air between the United States and the combat area.

The President has implemented this public law by orders which permit the domestic transportation of the letter mail to the servicemen in the combat areas to be by air transportation.

Several members of our committee last year supported the position that all mail addressed to or mailed by the servicemen overseas should be transported by air. They did not favor at that time that the benefit be limited solely to servicemen in combat areas, and made the promise to study all aspects of the problem and, if the facts were justified, to take action early in this session to extend the benefits to all servicemen overseas.

H.R. 13448 is designed to fulfill the committee's commitment of last year and the recommendation in our report on the postal systems of the U.S. Armed Forces, House Report No. 1226, to enact legislation to require faster mail service to our servicemen overseas.

This legislation will improve mail service to the Armed Forces overseas post offices in several significant respects.

First, it amends last year's law, Public Law 89-315, by adding "sound recorded communications having the character of personal correspondence" to the free mailing privileges of servicemen in combat areas. Last year's law granted the free mailing privilege only for letter mail.

Second, this legislation will require transportation by air between Armed Forces post offices overseas and the United States authorized to use the APO service, including servicemen, dependents and certain civilian employees. This is not free mail service. The regular postage will be required, such as 5 cents in the case of a letter. The classes of mail to be included are:

First. Letter mail;

Second. Voice recordings of personal messages, commonly referred to as the GI tapes;

Third. Newspapers and magazines having current news value;

Fourth. Small packages not exceeding 5 pounds.

Also transportation by air will be provided for the larger packages mailed to remote areas where adequate surface transportation is not available.

Mr. Speaker, the method of transporting mail to our personnel overseas has been left to the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department.

Air transportation now is used for first-class mail and small parcels to the far Pacific, and worldwide to Navy and Marine Corps personnel on sea duty and to all personnel in remote areas where adequate surface transportation is not available. Surface transportation is used for mail going to other areas which varies from a delivery time of 29 days to England to 55 days to Pakistan or to 2½ months to India.

Our committee believes that faster delivery service should be provided for these certain classes of mail to all overseas personnel—not just to a few of them.

The legislation requires a low priority of air transportation by specifying a space-available basis on U.S.-flag carriers and that the volume be divided equally among the carriers serving each area. It is expected that all carriers will be treated on an equal basis and that the final delivery of the mail to the addressee will not be delayed unduly by any division requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the administration favors most provisions of this bill but still has reservations about the advisability of extending the airlift on a worldwide basis for the newspapers and magazines and the small parcels. Their objection is based on the additional cost involved.

Our report shows an additional cost of $10.9 million. I believe our overseas personnel are entitled to faster mail service and I believe this additional cost to provide faster service is justified.

I urge your favorable consideration.

Mr. **MORRISON**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **DULSKI**. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. **MORRISON**. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13448. I introduced an identical bill, H.R. 13454, for the sole purpose of providing faster mail service to our servicemen overseas.

I have visited a lot of servicemen during my time in Congress and last fall several members of our committee were in Europe. No matter where we went or who we talked to, there was one common complaint—give us faster mail service.

The usual delivery time for letter mail to Europe by surface transportation is about 1 month. Here in the States we complain when the delivery of a letter takes 1 week—and we should complain.

In my opinion it is time we did something about the overseas delivery time to our servicemen. This legislation is intended to do just that.

This bill will permit a mother in my 6th District of Louisiana to post a letter to her son in Germany with a 5-cent stamp and, after it arrives in New York, have it transported by air to Germany in 1 day rather than 1 month by ship, as now required.

The same air transportation will be provided for the other classes of mail mentioned in the bill which include newspapers, voice recordings, and small packages up to 5 pounds.

Under present law members of the Armed Forces stationed in combat zones are entitled to air transportation for letter mail and small packages. Also, the Department of Defense is using air transportation for mail to Navy and Marine Corps personnel on sea duty and to personnel in remote areas.

It is true that there now is authority for the Department of Defense to provide air transportation for all overseas mail but, because of the cost involved, they are using air transportation for only a portion of the mail.

We cannot accept this policy. Our committee believes that air transportation should be provided for many classes of mail to all overseas personnel.

This is why we urge you to act favorably on this legislation here today.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us are in accord with the general purposes of the bill. As stated on the first page of the committee report, the purpose of the bill is to provide faster, more efficient, and less expensive mail service to our servicemen. We are all in accord with that. On the second page of the committee report, reference was made to General Lemnitzer's opinion that the one single thing that would boost and maintain the morale of troops in Europe would be faster communication between them and their homes.

We are also in accord with that. But I am fearful, Mr. Speaker, that the bill may not fully accomplish these objectives due to certain language in the bill. I direct my question to the gentleman from New York to help me clear up this language which I think may be somewhat ambiguous, and that is the language on page 2 of the bill, beginning on line 22, where it states in part that this mail will be transported: "on United States-flag carriers with the total annual volume to be equally divided, to the extent practicable, among such carriers serving each area."

We are all for equal treatment. But what about the cases where there might be 15 or 20 flights by one airline going into a certain area every day, and where another airline may have one flight into that area every other day. Both airlines would be serving the area. The bill calls for equal treatment, but it also says "to the extent practicable." I am wondering whether that would give the Postmaster General sufficient leeway to do something along lines of not dividing mail equally between these two carriers due to the fact that it could cause delay in transporting the mail to do so. Under the existing postal regulations, insofar as the dispatch of regular airmail is concerned, it says:

> Airmail for competitive points shall be divided equally between competitive flights if such flights arrive at the airport of destination within one hour of each other. When one carrier operates multiple competitive flights scheduled to arrive at an airport within one hour of a competitive flight or flights of another carrier, the airmail shall be divided equally between air carriers rather than by flights.

What about the leeway that the Postmaster General would have in making this equal distribution without undue delay, which the committee refers to rather repeatedly in its report, because I am certain it is not the intent of the committee that there be any undue delay so far as the members of the Armed Forces receiving their mail as a result of the attempt to equally divide the shipments among the various airlines?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The language, I think, is excellent, really, if the gentleman from Virginia will look at it. It says, "on a space available basis." So you see it is up to the airlines to make the space available. If they have too much at any one place, then the post office will do the best they can to divide it equally among all the air services on a space-available basis.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Space might be available on another airline that has one flight per day, which may cause a 12- or 18-hour delay in the arrival of that mail at its destination. This space might be available on the one-flight airline, but undue delay could result in light of the phrase "to the extent practicable." I wanted to get something in the record which would give the Postmaster General some clarification of how much leeway he would have.

Mr. DULSKI. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Virginia, I refer him to the bottom of page 4 of the report where the following language appears:

> The annual division among these carriers on an equal basis should give consideration to expeditious delivery of the mail on a "space available basis." In attempting to give equal treatment to the U.S.-flag carriers serving each area, the committee feels that the final delivery of the mail to the serviceman should not be delayed unduly by reason of any division.

So that matter would be within the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is the point I wanted to make. My understanding of what the gentleman is saying is that the Postmaster would have some leeway in maybe having unequal division of the mail due to the number of flights and the time they would arrive at their destination.

Mr. DULSKI. The gentleman is correct in saying that the Postmaster General has some leeway but the division should be as equal as possible.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for a second question?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. What about the rerouting of mail being necessary in order to bring about equal distribution? I will state a hypothetical case. For example, suppose mail is brought to the port of San Francisco destined for the Far East, and there are flights going out of Seattle on, let us say, Northwest Airlines. To bring about an equal distribution, would that mail be routed to Seattle in order to get to its destination, or would it be on the basis of flights leaving San Francisco?

Mr. DULSKI. That would be within the discretion of the Postmaster General. If he wanted to move the mail from San Francisco to another point, it would be within his discretion to do so. But there is no language in the bill that would require him to reroute in order to get equal distribution.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That would be within the province of the Postmaster General.

The third question I should like to ask is also hypothetical. I believe at this time Pan American World Airlines is the only competitive airline which serves Saigon. There is no other airline, unless other charters are granted, that would divide the mail between Pan Am and any other airline. Would the mail that Pan Am carries into Saigon be charged against Pan Am, under this equal-distribution-of-mail clause, in relation to mail going into Tokyo, where there might be another airline having one or two flights a day into that city?

Mr. DULSKI. Yes, it would be. The term "area" is understood to mean each of the three geographic areas—transatlantic, transpacific, and United States-Caribbean-South America—as ordinarily encompassed in Civil Aeronautics Board route renewal and investigation proceedings. So that would be charged up to that airline.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. You say it would be charged up to that airline?

Mr. DULSKI. Yes, it would be. Again, however, that question would lie within the discretion of the Postmaster General to divide the volume.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. You say it would be within the discretion of the Postmaster General to divide the volume. You are also saying that the mail in the situation which I stated would be charged against Pan Am, so that they would get perhaps half the total of the mail and maybe another airline serving Tokyo along with Pan Am would be getting all the airmail service coming into Tokyo?

Mr. DULSKI. To answer the gentleman's question, the bill as written does include every airline that goes into all parts of this area which is called the transpacific area. So I would have to answer "Yes." It would be charged up to Pan Am if it is the only airline going to Saigon.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Going back to the answer to the first question, the Postmaster General would still have authority within this act to take into consideration the number of flights that both airlines are flying into Tokyo in order not to have the flights into Saigon, where Pan Am has exclusive rights, charged against them?

Mr. DULSKI. The answer is this, Mr. BROYHILL: All we are doing is laying the guidelines for the CAB, and it covers all areas of the transatlantic and the transpacific, and we are attempting to see that the mail is not delayed unduly by reason of any division.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. If the gentleman from New York will refer again to that language about which he has spoken, he will see that the main thrust of the bill is to serve the servicemen overseas. That is the main thrust, and that is what the Post Office Department is supposed to do and, as well, they are supposed to divide the mail as best they can. But the main thrust of the bill is to serve these servicemen overseas.

Mr. DULSKI. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation to provide the benefits of faster and more efficient and less expensive mail service to our servicemen stationed overseas. This bill before the House attacks what is probably the most universal and chronic complaint of servicemen overseas—the long delays in mail service between them and their families and friends back home.

I have discussed this problem in Europe. I was in company with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] on that trip to Europe last fall. We talked with General Lemnitzer, supreme allied commander, Europe, who said that in his considered opinion the one single thing that would boost and maintain the morale of troops stationed overseas would be faster communication between them and their homes.

This legislation has been favorably reported to the House by our committee. This year's legislation is an extension of the committee's action last year in providing airlift of certain mail to servicemen in combat areas.

Mr. DULSKI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do not see anything ambiguous about the language on page 2 of this bill, lines 22 and 23.

Under the terms of this bill and the intent of the House of Representatives, mail to military personnel throughout the world is to be moved by the Postmaster General by the most expeditious and economical means available. I am confident that is what the Postmaster General will do, and I support the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I notice the gentleman from New York made a statement that if one airline had exclusive control of the place where they had a lot of mail, like Saigon, that would throw the airline out of proportion in the equal division, and it would be charged up to that airline in the overall division.

Mr. DULSKI. That is true, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am a little worried. I know we are all for this bill and we will vote for it in whatever shape it comes through, but I would just like to make a little legislative history.

The primary purpose of this bill, as the gentleman from New York has said, is to get this mail quickly to our soldiers overseas. Suppose that there is so much mail going to one place, and one airline has that exclusive. That might eat up the one share of the division. If the mail goes into other quotas, and that line has the best service there and the quickest transportation and the earliest departures for the mail, is the mail to be held back until the other fellow catches up?

Mr. DULSKI. It is not held back. It is to be divided on an equal basis for each area so long as there is no undue delay.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. But it would be charged up?

Mr. DULSKI. To the transpacific.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The transpacific line, yes. But apparently it is provided that one line has an exclusive in Vietnam. That is probably where half the mail goes. What are they going to do about that, if there is mail waiting at some port while that line has a plane ready to depart?

Mr. DULSKI. It is not to be delayed for any reason as far as distribution is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That seems to me to clarify what we are driving at. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially gratifying to rise in support of the airlift legislation before us today, for it represents the harvest of legislative seeds planted last October.

Members will recall that during consideration of legislation to provide airmail service to and from members of the Armed Forces in combat zones, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DULSKI] readily agreed to my request to conduct further hearings into the subject of a worldwide mail airlift to all military personnel serving overseas. I believe we all owe him a vote of thanks for the faithfulness and effectiveness with which he fulfilled this agreement in having caused this legislation to be brought before us at this early date.

The legislation, H.R. 13448, is the result of comprehensive study and extensive hearings. The bill provides for the air transportation to and from servicemen overseas, at a lower rate of postage, of first class letter mail, including postal cards and postcards, sound recorded communications having the character of personal correspondence, second class publications published once a week or more frequently and featuring current news of interest to the general public, parcels of any class of mail not exceeding 5 pounds and 60 inches in length and girth. I think it should be emphasized that this legislation establishes a system of transporting mail to and from members of the Armed Forces swiftly, efficiently, and inexpensively. The user of the mail will pay the regular surface rate but will have the mail transported by air. The Government will avoid excessive costs by permitting such mail to be transported on a space available basis which effects a cost reduction as compared with higher priority airmail service.

I believe that the beneficial effect from the standpoint of improved morale among the members of our Armed Forces that will be the result of this legislation cannot be overemphasized. To the serviceman overseas, a letter, package, or hometown newspaper is invaluable as a morale booster. We, in Congress, can help by shrinking the distance between the overseas post and home through the use of air transportation. Congress has already acted to provide the servicemen in designated combat zones with prompt airmail service. I suggest that this privilege should be extended to all servicemen overseas regardless of their duty assignment. There is no logical reason for discrimination when it comes to providing fast and efficient mail service to the members of our Armed Forces overseas.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13448. In view of the very fine explanation of the bill by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, I shall not take the time of the House to discuss the obvious merits of this bill. I would, Mr. Speaker, like to commend the gentleman from New York for not only sponsoring this bill but also for conducting speedy hearings on this badly needed measure. Our young men serving overseas are very fortunate to have the gentleman from New York looking out for their interests.

As one who sponsored legislation identical with the bill being considered today, as a member of the Postal Operations Subcommittee which considered this subject, I have a continuing interest in this bill. Members of our subcommittee were shocked at the slow mail service which our servicemen overseas are receiving. This bill is intended to correct this situation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater source of encouragement that our young servicemen can receive than a letter from home. Surely, there is no greater morale booster. This bill will enable the families and friends of our servicemen to communicate on a more frequent basis with our fighting men serving outside the limits of the continental United States. For this reason, this legislation deserves the support of every Member of this House. I strongly urge its passage.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13448.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 304, nays 0, not voting 127, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—304

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—127

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Boggs
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Curtin
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Diggs
Donohue
Downing
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gilbert
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Henderson
Hicks
Holland
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Karsten
Keogh
Kornegay
Kupferman
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McDowell
McFall
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
May
Mize
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Brien
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pirnie
Pool
Quillen
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Scott
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Sweeney
Talcott
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Van Deerlin
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wydler
Yates

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Monagan with Mrs. May.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Pirnie.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Bray.

Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Curtin.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Karsten with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Mathais.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Foley.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Watts.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. McFall.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Cameron with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Irwin.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Vivian.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Hagen of California.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. McVicker.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Rees.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Grabowski.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Cooley.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kornegay.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES ON HIS 75TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, one of the giants of American Government, the Chief Justice of the United States, celebrated his 75th birthday, and I wish to pay tribute to him on this happy occasion.

In his 13 years on the Supreme Court bench, Earl Warren has distinguished himself as the most outstanding Chief Justice in our Nation's history. He has led the Court in a series of landmark decisions which has given new life and strength to our Constitution. If any one man has breathed meaning into the words spanning the top of the marble courthouse, the words "Equal Justice Under law," it has been Chief Justice Warren.

As a Californian who saw Earl Warren thrice elected Governor of our State and who watched our State grow and prosper under his progressive leadership, I shared California's pride when he was appointed to the highest tribunal in the land in 1953. My admiration for him then was great. But in these past 13 years, my esteem for Earl Warren has reached new heights as the Court has continued to hand down decisions affirming the constitutional guarantees of equality and the inherent worth and dignity of the individual.

When Earl Warren opened his first Court term in the fall of 1953, American justice under law clearly was not the same for everyone. "Equal justice" was an empty phrase to a Negro schoolchild, an urban voter, a penniless prisoner, a child whose religious beliefs differed from those of his classmates.

The Warren Court has handed down decision after decision—Brown against Board of Education, Reynolds against Sims, Gideon against Wainwright, Engel against Vitale—to extend equal justice under law to all Americans. As a result of these decisions, the doors of public schools are opening to all our children regardless of their color; indigent defendants are guaranteed the right to counsel when brought to trial in a State court on a criminal charge; rurally dominated State legislatures are being reapportioned to give every vote equal weight; and freedom of religion under the first amendment is being preserved in the public schools.

Most certainly, decisions rendered by the Warren Court have filled in the void between the words and the reality. They have bridged the chasm between the Bill of Rights and those who seek to ignore or subvert these most fundamental rights.

Americans long will be indebted to Chief Justice Warren for his faithful adherence to the concept that certain rights are indeed inalienable and must be upheld and protected against any attempts to erode them. The phrase, equal justice under law, no longer is a string of words etched in stone across graceful Corinthian columns. Earl Warren has carved these words upon the face of America and made them a viable part of our daily lives. Today, thanks to Earl Warren, the classic beauty of the Supreme Court Building is more than a shrine to justice—it is the seat of the justice and liberty upon which our great democracy rests.

I salute the Chief Justice on his 75th birthday and wish him many more years of service to our Nation.

LOCAL BANKING MUST BE PRESERVED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record the address of March 14, 1966, by Gov. George W. Mitchell of the Federal Reserve Board at a meeting of the Independent Bankers Association in San Francisco, Calif., entitled "Will Small Banks Survive?" This article might also be entitled "Who Serves the Financial Needs of Local Communities," for as local banks are acquired by absentee landlords or become mere branches of large financial complexes such banks become less and less concerned with the needs of that community. Those interested in the preservation of local banking institutions are not so dedicated because of some romantic notion of conserving archaic institutions for posterity as an historical curiosity. The considerations involved here are not akin to the preservation of the whooping crane or the American buffalo. Local banking is more than a phase in the economic evolution of this Nation's financial institutions.

As the problems of big-city slums are frequently complicated by the fact that many slum properties are owned by absentee landlords who have no interest in either the community or the people involved, so do local communities suffer from absentee bank ownership. As absentee slum landlords are interested only in the profits they derive from their properties, similarly, we have found that absentee bank ownership leads to a decreased regard for the needs of the community that the bank serves.

Governor Mitchell's remarks clearly define the problem and the considerations involved:

Will Small Banks Survive?

Commercial banking in the United States is as old as the Nation, but in a real sense the banking system collapsed and was reborn in the early 1930's. Its rebirth was a partial reincarnation of earlier institutional forms and arrangements but in the wake of the drastic economic contraction of the late twenties the structure and the ideology of banking was transformed and a chastened ultra-conservative spirit dominated its operation for most of the next 2½ decades.

We are now witnessing another banking transformation brought on by a new banking ideology, a largely unforeseen technology revolution in credit and settlement accounting, and a large and steady flow of savings from a prosperous American economy.

In this latest maelstrom of change there is apprehension in some quarters about the survival of the small or moderate-sized community bank. Will it suffer the same eclipse in economic significance as the corner grocery and independent merchant? Will it be replaced by a branch of a large banking institution? Will it be loosely linked in affiliation with other like banks in some central organization, such as a holding company, that provides portfolio management, personnel training, computer facilities, and other overhead services? Or will it somehow struggle through these new challenges and emerge onto the new frontiers of banking, modernized but still preserving the sturdy independent tradition?

Before turning to a discussion of these questions, some helpful background will be provided by considering how the evolutionary changes of recent years show up in an overall look at the structure and business of banking. Forty years ago banking services for the United States were provided by 32,000 offices, operated by 29,000 banks. At that time there was a banking office for every 3,700 people and banking was enjoying a golden age of prestige and affluence. The structure of banking that came out of the wringer in the early thirties, though modeled on that of the twenties, had but half the number of service facilities previously available; there were now about 8,000 persons per banking office. Since that time, banking offices have increased steadily and somewhat more rapidly than population. Today there are 29,300 offices serving the general public, operated by 13,800 commercial banks. The scale of banking today provides an office for every 6,700 persons.

These persons are at least 10 times as rich as 1934's banking customers and they use a great deal more credit—165 times as much bank installment credit, to take an extreme example. Or to employ a more representative comparison, all of the banking system's loan customers—corporations, businesses, and individuals—have recently been using as much as $200 billion or 13 times as much bank credit as they drew down in the mid-thirties.

As banks' customers have grown in number, affluence and readiness to use the banking system's credit facilities one might have expected their checking account balances to have grown proportionately.

But, as you know, this has not been the case—the overall figures show only about an eightfold increase in demand deposits since 1934. In recent years banks have sought to offset, in some measure, the slower growth rate in demand deposits by stepping up their efforts to attract time accounts. Today, the balances in these accounts are 11.5 times as large as in 1934, indicating that bankers' efforts in this direction have met with considerable success. Of course, success has had its price. In 1965, banks paid their time depositors nearly 5¼ billion in interest; the average rate paid to savers was about 3¾ percent. In the late thirties, banks made interest payments of about $225 million at an average rate of 1.5 percent.

The overall statistics I have been reciting are reassuring, for they suggest banking has regained a position of size and influence in the national economic community. But they don't tell us much about banking's ups and downs in the past 30 years nor do they reveal changes—and very important changes they are—taking place within our economy and within the banking and financial structure itself. Some of these changes have important implications for the community bank.

The diverse population trends in the United States are a case in point. Where people stay or move to is fundamental to community banks since such banks are basically oriented toward individuals and small business enterprise customers.

Population in the United States in the past 30 years has been on the move. Despite eddies and backflows, the predominant movement have been from the East and the North to the West and South, from the farm to the city, and from the central city to the suburbs. Since established banks in many sections of the Nation, particularly in the Midwest, the South, and the East, are tied to their original location these population movements have had widely disparate influences on bank growth. The bank fortunate enough to serve a growing area prospers from the flow of new investment, larger payrolls, and aggressive-minded business community.

The bank unfortunate enough to serve a stagnant or declining community is hard pressed to hold its position, let alone grow. The poor prospects for the community limit the number of bankable local loans and, correspondingly, the bank's participation in the economic life in the community. If declining economic conditions continue, it becomes increasingly difficult to replace the bank's management when that necessity arises even though the community continues to need a banker and banking services.

Growing urbanization in the United States is a threat to community banks as we have known them because so many are located in stagnant small towns or in shrinking agriculturally orientated communities. To give a pertinent statistical fact, in the 10 years between 1950 and 1960 population declined 10 percent or more in nearly 50 percent of the 830 counties of the United States having 10,000 or fewer persons.

In the United States there are, outside of standard metropolitan areas, 7,700 cities or towns with only a single bank. There are 1,800 places where there are only 2 banks. In the one- and two-bank towns are found three-fourths of the banks in the Nation. Most of these towns are small—one-half of them have populations of less than 1,000; only 10 percent have populations of over 5,000.

The number of these rural towns or places has changed hardly at all since 1940. The total population in the places of less than 1,000 population declined 7 percent and in places between 1,000 and 2,500 increased 11 percent. But in the country as a whole population increased 36 percent in the same period, and in the standard metropolitan areas where nearly two-thirds of our citizens now live, it increased 50 percent.

Thus, the overwhelming proportion of our community banks are in towns that have ceased to grow or are losing population, or are growing very much more slowly than the urban areas. While there are places where credit needs and business investment grow, despite a lagging population trend, the outlook for a community bank by its very nature is ordinarily closely linked to people, more people and richer people. Failing this prospect, unit banks, anchored to the community they serve, face a future of limited opportunity.

For this very unfortunate reason then, most of the small banks in the country have little cause to fear or expect that statewide branching systems or holding companies will swallow or annex them. Such managements with aggressively expansive intentions have little interest in areas showing less than average growth. And for large numbers of our community banks the perils of encroachment from the outside are insignificant compared to the perils of economic stagnation and decline coming from within their historic service areas. Yet few of them seem apprehensive about these environmental trends and they do not complain to the Federal Reserve or to the Congress, as far as I am aware. I presume this means they enjoy a pace of life and a peace of mind that their growth-minded counterparts in the cities have forgotten exists.

Let me turn then to the problem of the community banks in cities, towns and metropolitan areas where a substantial growth pattern is embedded in the economic environment.

My 4-year experience in passing on bank merger and holding company cases brought before the Federal Reserve Board has convinced me that an important factor accounting for the failure of well-located and well-operated community banks to resist the trend toward larger branching and holding company systems springs, in important part, from the lack of broadbased local support of community banking. Seldom, indeed, do the submissions to the merger record before our Board contain evidence of community preference for a locally owned and operated institution.

On occasion we do get a vigorous advocate of local banking, but it is usually a one-man crusade. Let me quote from portions of correspondence I had with a businessman with strong convictions about a community bank that had been merged into a statewide branching system. This was his opening shot:

"An alarming situation with growing intensity is developing in America. It is threatening the very foundation of our community life.

"Community banks were organized for the purpose of serving the people, by groups of public spirited men, not for profit. Great sacrifices of time and effort went into the organization and operation of the banks for the good of widows, orphans, small depositors and small borrowers, at reasonable rates. These men even pledged themselves to double jeopardy (twice the value of their stock) to assure the success of the bank. The bank was likened to the church, the school, service clubs, and other community benefits.

"I am sorry to say the Federal Reserve has been a party to the gradual destruction of this beautiful community-bank-local-citizenry relationship by submitting to wholesale mergers throughout the Nation.

"For example, a big, big bank sent their cleverest persuaders to the bank in our small town 4 years ago. They found an aging president and cashier. Question: Do you have a pension system? Answer: No. Question: How would you like to be pensioned under our retroactive pension plan? Answer: Obvious. Question: Do you own much stock in your bank? Answer: Quite a lot. Question: Would you sell it or accept our stock at nearly twice the value of your stock? Answer: Obvious.

"The new management is far removed, 50 miles, from us. Local directors were replaced by 'advisory boards': puppets.

"A local man can no longer prove his worth as able and capable of showing proficiency in his own business and to build good will among once local directors, who now live in a far off city, and who can never know his problems or those of the community.

"Gone. Gone is the legal rate; gone is the local touch, gone is the desire to serve; gone is a way of life."

My reply was as follows:

"As one member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, I recently read your letters about bank mergers. Although you have already received an official reply I thought I might add an additional personal note.

"I assure you that the displacement of locally owned and operated banks by branches of large institutions with nonlocally determined policies is a matter of concern to me and other Board members.

"The possibility that a given merger will lead to adverse consequences of the kind that concern you is a matter that is reviewed in every case that comes before the Board. Our examiners look carefully into facts touching on this possibility, such as the quality and cost of existing banking services in the area, and the attitude of banking customers in the community toward the proposal. The records before the Board in merger cases frequently show beyond any reasonable doubt that the affected communities will be better served after the merger than before.

"There is a great deal to be said, in my opinion, for protecting and fostering local institutions, and especially those having to do with the extension of credit. But you put a very typical case when you referred to the bank whose owner-manager, aging or in poor health, is looking for someone to take over. The record often shows that he looks in vain locally for successor management or ownership. I think you will agree that this presents an especially perplexing situation.

"People in the local community who feel as you do, and who may have organized the bank in the first place, should know firsthand when new bank management and ownership is becoming a critical problem. If they want their bank to be a local institution, they should act to renew or replace its management and they should formally oppose merger until they have had a chance to do so.

"There is another alternative, namely, chartering a new institution. But in many small communities there isn't enough business for two banks, and this makes timely action to retain local control of the existing bank most important.

"We are certainly aware that good banking services are essential to any community's welfare. To the best of our ability this is what we are trying to safeguard. But we must act on the facts laid before us by the applicant, the community, and our examiners. It is in this light that our decisions under the Bank Merger Act of 1960 are made."

And here is his "last" word.

"While I felt my letters would be shown the Board, I am more than gratified to get a reply from one of the members.

"It grieves me to know that for 3 years so many of our people could have been so downright apathetic. Many complain orally, because they find it too late; some through fear, some for lack of prior notice. Others may say: 'Oh, what's the use, or 'Let George do it,' I do not know.

"The aging president of the previously referred to bank, held a large block of the bank's stock, perhaps typical of other small banks. The sale of his bank stock held a much keener temptation than transferring his job to a younger man.

"The scores of smaller stockholders had looked to him for years to run the bank and were easily swayed. And let us not forget, the big city banks have highly skilled and well-trained persuaders to approach the little bank and to approach your Board. They come to you with hat in hand, but return to the small community with a determination to get every drop out of that community—and do.

"I do wonder in 3 years how many outside the benefited parent bank have sent letters of praise to your Board for merger approvals. 'Little Red Riding Hood' learned the hard way, so did the people of Hamelin."

My correspondent may have exaggerated—and I have deleted some of his more colorful language and ideas—but most of us would grant that he speaks for a part of our banking system we would like to see preserved—even if partly because of nostalgic associations.

Can the community bank in a growing area compete with large branching systems and proposer? We see plenty of evidence that it can be and is being done; there also are numerous cases where it is not being done.

If the community bank is strongly rooted in the area it serves I am sure you know better than I that the typical individual and small business customer will usually prefer it to the branch of a nonlocal bank. This is a great and a dependable natural advantage for the community bank.

On the other hand, there are some disadvantages of smaller size—mainly that certain banking features, such as trust services, cannot be offered because they are too infrequently demanded to warrant the cost of furnishing them and, secondarily, the inability of small banks to realize, on the cost side, economies of scale that large banks enjoy. However, in theory and actual practice a community bank often needs no more than a well integrated correspondent relationship to secure the accounting services, the portfolio management, and other facilities that cost-wise must be spread over a larger volume of business than a community bank can generate.

In many, many cases the demise of the community bank is tied to the lack of community support—a fact that my correspondent so bitterly decried. I have the feeling that this lack of community support is related to the concentration of ownership in small banks. There is much concern about concentration in banking and concentration of ownership in certain large banks but perhaps not enough attention has been given to the concentration of ownership in small banks.

When a branching system sets out to buy up a small community bank of the kind my correspondent described, how many stockholders are there to sell on the idea? Not many, to judge from the best evidence we have. From a survey taken of some 5,600 member banks in 1962, we estimate that 20 or fewer—and I emphasize "or fewer"—stockholders hold 90 percent or more of the shares in one-half of the country's smallest banks—those with less than $5 million in assets.

From the same source we can estimate the degree of ownership concentration more strikingly if we group what appear to be common stockholders' interests. Assuming that individuals with the same name and living at the same address can be regarded as a single "stockholder interest" the survey indicates that in the same group of small banks the average amount of stock held by the three largest identifiable stockholders is 55 percent.

These figures show an extremely limited community participation in the ownership of local banks. In many cases it is evident from the addresses of the owners that, while at one time they may have been active residents of the community, they are now absentee owners whose local interest is diluted by inheritance, distance, retirement, or greener pastures.

Given these facts, it does not seem surprising to me that community banks fail to generate a ground swell of local opposition to mergers with nonlocal interests. Frequently, the only change is the substitution of one group of abstentee owners for another. Frequently, the performance of the local bank in meeting community needs is too flabby and too backward to arouse anything but negative enthusiasm. Frequently, the outside bank imports better services, more credit, and competitive prices and terms.

The answer to the survival of the small bank in the growing community, if there is one, may well lie in making the local bank a truly community institution with a wider ownership among the businesses and citizens in the area and a wider participation by the bank in financing local operations and activities. This is the kind of bank we see in our mind's eye when we seek to preserve local management and local administration of credit resources. But perhaps we ought to look around and see if the bank we have in our midst resembles the image in our mind's eye—if it does not, this may be the clue to measures needed to insure survival of our community bank.

CREDIT UNIONS AND CHURCHES WORKING HAND IN HAND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my contention that next to the church, credit unions have performed more worthwhile services than any institution in the United States. So it is not unusual that churches and credit unions have joined together to offer a combined helping hand.

Thousands of churches across the United States have formed parish credit unions. Typical of the work performed by church credit unions is the case of a physician who went to the pastor of a church to inquire about a patient of his who was a member of the church who apparently had no will to live. In several conferences the patient revealed to the pastor that he owed every small loan company in the city and was "beyond hope." The church credit union lent the patient money to pay all of the loan companies. The former patient has paid all his loans and now has $350 in credit union savings.

There are many, many more stories that I could cite of the outstanding work done by church credit unions, but these credit unions take no bows, but rather work as silently as the church in accomplishing their wondrous deeds. I am including in my remarks three articles from prominent church publications, Catholic, Baptist, and Lutheran, discussing the role of the credit union in the church. I am certain that every church member can benefit from these articles:

[From St. Joseph magazine, May 1965]

Cash When It's Needed—Parish Credit Unions Offer Help to the Financially Afflicted

(By S. T. Hayrinen)

Despite general prosperity, there will always be people who find it necessary to borrow small amounts of money.

"You can't do much talking to a man about his soul when his stomach is empty," Father Murray often remarks. The Reverend Charles J. Murray, S.J., who is pastor of Mount Carmel Parish, Pueblo, Colo., found many empty stomachs in Pueblo when he arrived there in 1942. Employment was booming due to World War II, but many families were still struggling with obligations left over from the depression years. Others, especially among the Spanish-speaking communicants, were finding it difficult to cope with sudden prosperity. Moneylending abuses were prevalent, especially among the Spanish-Americans.

Before the year was up, Father Murray and a few parishioners started a credit union in the parish. Today, Mount Carmel Credit Union serves over 7,000 members in 14 parishes in the Pueblo area. Assets total over $4.5 million. The members are so proud of their credit union, that they regularly spend some of their education budget to tell Catholics all over America about their good fortune, urging organization of more Catholic credit unions.

What is a credit union, and why is the Catholic church so interested in the personal financial affairs of its parishioners?

Let's start with the last part of the question first. Father Murray answered it very well when he spoke of "empty stomachs" interfering with the Gospel. His writings indicate a broad meaning for "empty stomachs," ranging all the way from actual hunger through the numerous financial problems which may beset a family. The Catholic church has long recognized this relationship and as a result there are over a thousand credit unions among Catholic parishes in the United States.

The parish church provides an excellent common bond of membership for the credit union and allows its name to be used by the credit union for identification purposes. Otherwise, the credit union is an independent operation. The priest and other parish leaders become members and support it as interested individuals. Being friends, neighbors and like believers becomes one of the advantages which make credit unions so successful. Some form of common bond of association, such as working for the same employer, belonging to the same church or labor union, or living in the same community, is always deemed necessary to obtain a charter and start a new credit union.

What is a credit union?

A credit union is an association of people with a common bond, who save their money together and lend it to each other for productive and provident purposes at a moderate rate of interest. The members are all owners, with one vote each, who share, at an equal rate, in the proceeds. The borrowers furnish all the income via the interest they pay. That rate is never more than 1 percent per month on the unpaid balance, which comes to about $6.50 per $100 borrowed and paid back monthly over a year's time.

Every borrower and saver must be a member. All this takes is a small (usually 25 cent) membership fee and arrangement to deposit at least one $5 share in the credit union, either at once or gradually in small sums. The goal here is to promote the habit of saving. Many members have never saved a dime before. But—"they won't stop once they get started," many credit union treasurers have testified. It is from this pool of savings that the loans are made.

Credit union rules specify that a loan must be for a provident or productive purpose. Most loans are granted for the common purposes of paying bills: for autos, appliances, furniture, weddings, funerals, taxes, vacations, and the like. The credit union interest rate is often only one-third of that available elsewhere, and there are no extra charges of any kind.

Besides the common reasons, there are many cases in which loans cover the unusual, the desperate, the compassionate gesture. A recent survey of Catholic credit unions uncovered cases like these:

A member of St. Patrick's Federal Credit Union, McCook, Nebr., who was serving in the Armed Forces, had his money stolen. It was recovered, but he could not get it back until after the trial. A loan from his credit union was granted to tide him over.

A parishioner facing foreclosure on his home slashed his wrists in a suicide attempt. The credit union arranged consolidation of all his bills, and payments are coming through regularly now. His wife and children thank their parish credit union in Maine.

A loan of $600 was granted by St. Rocco's Credit Union, Cleveland, Ohio, to a member to get him back on his feet financially when no one else would loan him the money. It was paid back within $30 of the total when he died, and the credit union insurance on the loan paid up the balance. "At least he died knowing he was on the upward climb," the treasurer wrote.

Character is the most important security for a credit union loan, made possible by the common bond in which members know each other. Granting of credit is handled by an elected credit committee. The details are kept strictly confidential.

One of the reasons saving is so easy at the credit union is that even small amounts are accepted. Members are also urged to save even as they pay back on a loan. Many Catholic credit unions have junior departments, in which the children are taught to save, usually a nickel or more a week. These savings are often substantial by the time college comes.

Is the money safe? Yes. The treasurer and any other employees are bonded, there are regular examinations by State or Federal examiners and by a committee elected by the members. The credit union operates under either State or Federal charter, and under provisions of law, spelled out as carefully as for all financial institutions. A small sum is also set aside each year to be placed in reserve against bad loans. These are few—less than one-fifth of 1 percent on a national basis.

Incidentally, costs of operation are very reasonable. In starting out, all officers and committee members served without pay. Later on, as the credit union grows and more help is needed, only the treasurer and other employees are paid. Other costs are limited to rent and utilities if any, forms and supplies, educational materials, and insurance premiums. Most credit unions provide a special insurance without cost to the member, covering loans and savings.

After these expenses are paid, the leftover funds are distributed to the savers as a dividend on their shares. Dividends range from 3 to 6 percent, averaging about 4 percent. If there is still some left over, it may be returned to borrowers as a refund on the interest they paid on their loans.

As Father Murray indicated, the church benefits from a credit union. Hungry or troubled parishioners do not respond well to the Gospel, nor can they fulfill the demands of their conscience in the support of their church. The credit union helps them to help themselves. It puts money into the proper perspective; no longer a false token of status, but rather an instrument for the common good. The credit union also fosters a respect for the sacredness and importance of the individual, and emphasizes the parishioners' responsibility for the material as well as spiritual well-being of each person. Problems of one are the problems of the group, without violating anyone's privacy.

Charity takes on an added dimension, of helping people to help themselves, via an extension of brotherly love. The credit union doesn't consider a person dishonest just because he is broke. Besides loan service, a rapidly developing financial counseling program is also a modern feature of credit unions. The job of the credit union is not to sit in judgment, but to see what can be done to help the errant member.

The Catholic Church leads all denominations in the United States in the number of credit unions among its members. Page after page of testimony has been given in strong support of credit unions by priests, monsignors and bishops. And we read directly from a letter sent by the Secretary of State for His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, to Rev. John Peter Sullivan, S.J., Kingston, Jamaica.

"His Holiness has been informed of the praiseworthy work being accomplished by the credit union movement * * * and he directs me to send you this expression of his paternal interest and encouragement.

"Always solicitous for the material as well as the spiritual welfare of his children, without distinction of religion, race or color, the Holy Father could not fail to derive comfort from the knowledge of the meritorious achievements both economic and social, of the credit union movement in pursuance of the laudable purposes for which it was founded.

"As a pledge of that heavenly favor and in further token of his paternal interest and benevolence, the Pontiff cordially imparts to you and your collaborators in the credit union movement his paternal apostolic benediction."

Pope John XXIII had further warm words for cooperative endeavor of the laity, though never getting around to specify the various types, such as credit unions, by name.

There is cause for great pride in this support, but the still-underdeveloped field for more church-sponsored credit unions is so vast as to beggar description. However, the desire for help must sprout among the prospective members, to start a successful credit union. The sprouting can, of course, be helped along a bit.

It is easy to start a credit union, if the desire is there. Only a handful of members are needed to apply for a charter, but a minimum potential of a hundred members is considered desirable to begin operations. They need not all be from one parish.

Plenty of technical help is available. Credit unions are organized into chapters which feature educational programs on a city or county basis. They also pay dues to statewide leagues, and member leagues in turn pay dues to CUNA International, Inc. (formerly Credit Union National Association) at Madison, Wis. Together the leagues and CUNA provide technical help and services that are continually building and strengthening the worldwide credit union movement. CUNA International now provides services to 72 member leagues throughout the world.

League fieldmen are available to give the full credit union story, without charge to any interested group. For a free list of the State leagues and their addresses, write to CUNA International, Inc., Box 431, Madison, Wis., 53701.

Finally, we like the perspective into which the successful Mount Carmel Credit Union in Pueblo has placed its financial activities and pass it on as a closing thought. The quotation is from the back of its annual report:

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph were a family not unlike many of our families. They worked, they played; they knew both sorrow and joy. Mount Carmel Credit Union is dedicated to and has as its patrons the Holy Family of Nazareth. The credit union pledges its efforts to helping relieve the temporal distress of Pueblo Catholic families, thereby giving those families a greater opportunity and time to emulate the Holy Family by keeping the ideal of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph always before them."

[From the Baptist Watchman Examiner, Oct. 22, 1964]

A Financial Ministry

(By S. T. Hayrinen)

"A physician sought our pastor's counsel in behalf of a patient who had no will to live. In several conferences the patient revealed to the pastor that he owed every small loan company in the city and was 'beyond hope.' Our credit union lent him the money to pay all of them. He has paid up his loan and now has $350 in shares."

So wrote the treasurer of a Baptist Church credit union in response to a recent survey conducted by the Credit Union National Association (CUNA), Madison, Wis. Baptist Churches sponsor the second largest group of church credit unions in the United States, numbering 137 at latest count. Credit unions, of course, are universal, counting among their sponsors such other groups as unions, employers, fraternal and community groups.

The credit union is a nonprofit association of individuals chartered under State or Federal law, who save money together and lend it to members for worthwhile purposes. There is no profit to anyone, so the cost of borrowing is low. Its popularity is attested by the more than 21,500 credit unions in the United States, with some 15 million members. But the credit union is not yet available to every church member or every citizen, so the job of telling about it must go on.

Where word has reached Baptist members that a credit union can broaden their good works, they have been impressed by the local autonomy feature, just as in their church. Like their church, however, the credit union can and does join freely with others of its kind for specific purposes of common concern. CUNA, for example, is the worldwide service organization of credit unions, geared to the local credit unions' bidding. Leagues on a statewide basis complete the picture. "Missionary work" is one of CUNA's tasks.

A strong concept of freedom in the credit union is also in line with Baptist principles. Each believer in the credit union, as in his church, has an equal voice.

A PROPER CHURCH FUNCTION?

But, there is more to determining whether a credit union is a proper function for a church to sponsor. Would it be bringing "the moneychangers back into the temple?" Baptist congregations sponsoring credit unions agree that the opposite is true. For the Biblical moneychanger made fantastic profits, while the credit union makes none. Today, we still have a modern equivalent in the many "easy credit" plans with very subtle approaches but very high rates. Their influence does reach inside the temple, in lessened contributions to the church collection.

Church and credit union leaders are quick to point out that the church or its brotherhood acts only as a sponsor, providing the common bond that is a requirement for a credit union. The church takes no direct part in the business function of a credit union, but the church does receive many indirect benefits from a credit union. For instance:

Financially strengthened members make for congregational stablility.

Reduced local charity.

Experience gained in running the credit union develops better lay leadership for the church.

The credit union may be the spark needed to interest the partially active church member in the total program. He may even be slack because of money worries.

Credit union's assistance with members' financial problems may help reduce the pastor's counseling load. The credit union will not stand in judgment of a financial mess, but will try to help, and usually can.

Surely a credit union can help dispel a false, un-Christian pride in money. Not social status and prestige, but basic human good arises from nonprofit use of money.

Finally, the credit union embodies respect for the sacredness and importance of each individual.

EXAMPLES

Let's take a look at a credit union within a Baptist congregation in one of the depressed areas of our country. To avoid any embarrassment, we'll not name it. The treasurer wrote: "Fifteen students from our culturally deprived congregation have completed college through credit union loans to their parents. From a group made up of domestic servants, factory workers, and people on relief, we are developing young teachers, social workers, physical therapists—by wise loaning. The young professionals are now members, looking forward to educating their children."

The Baptist Ministers Credit Union in Covina, Calif., lists unusual humanitarian loans such as these: to finance an airplane for a missionary group; to finance earth-moving equipment to dig lakes in the desert area; to help a Latin-American couple over-generous in helping new immigrant families.

Most credit union loans, however, serve ordinary needs of families—doctor and hospital bills, taxes, automobiles, furniture, etc. The above credit union at Covina is one of the largest Baptist units, with an outstanding growth record. Within 6 years after organization they reached $1 million in assets, and $1½ million a year later. They call this service part of their ministry.

The majority of credit unions are small, but effective operations, with assets of $100,000 or less. A minimum of 100 members is urged as a base of starting a credit union today, but they need not all be from one congregation. The California group serves ministers and members over a wide area. In the past, many credit unions have started much more modestly. A Baptist credit union in Cleveland, now the largest Protestant credit union in the State, started with "20 persons and $200, operating in a classroom, with our supplies in a drawer in the minister's office." Today it even has a Junior Credit Union for youngsters from 11 to 17. The 600 boys and girls proudly tell of assets totaling $8,638.32.

To repeat, a credit union takes in members' savings and lends money to those members that need it—at low cost. Any money left over, after expenses of operation are covered, is divided among the savers as a moderate rate of interest. Sometimes the borrowers get a bit of refund, too, to cut the rate of interest they paid. The members run the organization, with one vote apiece regardless of their investment. They select a board of directors, a credit committee to pass on loan applications, and an auditory supervisory committee.

Through CUNA Mutual Insurance Society, a CUNA affiliate, the credit union provides life insurance that pays off the loan if the borrower dies. Also usually provided is life insurance matching the amount of a member's savings (up to $2,000). The premium for both is paid by the credit union.

HOW TO ORGANIZE?

A congregation interested in organizing a credit union should discuss the idea freely. Progress is usually more rapid if one of the church organizations takes the lead. Keep in mind that the mutual interest and cooperation of lay members and pastor are vital.

Get up a committee to gather all necessary information. It's not difficult to find a few individuals who are willing to contribute time that's needed.

Exact details are easily available. Field men of State credit union leagues will be glad to come and explain the procedure. For a list of the managing directors of all State credit union leagues, and a free brochure, write to Organization Department, Credit Union National Association, P.O. Box 431, Madison, Wis., 53701.

As Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the powerful House Committee on Banking and Currency, said: "Every person in the United States ought to have the opportunity to join a credit union. Not that every person will want to, but he should at least have the opportunity."

We conclude with the special prayer used in the meetings of a New York City Baptist credit union, based on their experiences:

"Our Father God:

"We thank Thee for the credit union movement and what it has meant in helping the peoples of the world to a larger life.

"We thank Thee for the labors of the great host of workers who have unselfishly spent their time in creating and maintaining this movement.

"We thank Thee for the way that credit unions transcend those differences of creed and color that often divide our society.

"We thank Thee for the fact that this movement helps greatly to relieve the insecurity and poverty that are so frustrating to multitudes.

"We pray Thee our Father that credit unions may grow in strength and influence; that they may be courageous in opposing those forces that through ignorance or selfishness are at times arrayed in opposition; and that they may become stronger in the underprivileged areas throughout the world.

"We pray Thee that its workers may avoid the temptation to put money and things above human values, and that increasingly those of us who are a part of this movement may realize our opportunities and discharge our responsibilities in working for the brotherhood of man.

"In the name of our Lord Jesus, we ask it. Amen."

[From the National Lutheran, May 1964]

TO HELP "BEAR ONE ANOTHER'S BURDENS": A CREDIT UNION IN OUR PARISH

(By S. T. Hayrinen)

"One of our members had a death in the family (one of the children). Shortly after, the father was laid off. Our church had no funds available, neither was there anyone in the congregation who could help financially. Our pastor, and some of the members then organized this credit union—so that we might be of help."

So wrote the treasurer of a Lutheran parish credit union in a recent survey conducted by Credit Union National Association, Madison, Wis. While not typical of the reasons for starting parish credit unions, it is illustrative of the noncharity aspect of the credit union.

The growing interest in parish and brotherhood credit unions among Lutherans is paralleling and complementary to the growth of the Parish Conservation Service of the American Lutheran Church. For the credit union does indeed help conserve the parish by strengthening its members financially, at the same time conserving economic resources for the church.

It is important to note that while cases of real distress, such as above, highlight a credit union's service, it is of genuine assistance to the everyday financial problems of families, and these form the bulk of its business.

And, while the credit union will not do away with charity, it can reduce the need for it. Even in countries receiving U.S. foreign aid (and church mission and world service aid), credit unions are starting people on the way to eventual solvency via a trickle of coins. It is surprising how soon the trickle grows to a stream, and then to a full-flowing river.

A credit union can be a modern counterpart to the passage from Acts 4: 32–35: "And there was not a needy one among them, for as many as had possessions sold them and brought the money and laid it at the apostles' feet, and distribution was made to such as had need." In today's complex world, the credit union, which is operated "Not for profit, not for charity, but for service," fills the bill.

It was in fact a Lutheran, Friedrich Wilhelm Raiffeisen, mayor of a famine-stricken village in southern Germany, who conceived the idea and started the first credit union, back in 1849. Credit societies bearing his name continue to flourish there today.

A PROPER CHURCH FUNCTION?

A credit union takes in members' savings, and loans out money to those that need it among them—at low cost. Any money left over, after expenses of operation are covered, is divided among the savers as a moderate rate of interest. Sometimes the borrowers get a bit of refund too, to cut the rate of interest they paid. No individual makes a profit on this transaction.

Members run this thrift organization, with one vote apiece, regardless of their investment. They select a board of directors, a credit committee to pass on loan applications, and a supervisory committee to audit the books regularly. Through CUNA Mutual Insurance Society, a CUNA affiliate, the credit union provides life insurance that pays off the loan if the borrower dies. Also usually provided is life insurance matching the amount of a member's savings. The premium for both kinds of insurance is paid by the credit union.

Is all this proper for a church to sponsor? Many other church groups investigated this question years ago, and will reply today with a resounding yes. Lutheran churches have now had enough experience with credit unions so that in 1961 the Church Council of the American Lutheran Church adopted a position statement on credit unions, concluding with:

"For congregations, conferences, institutions, and agencies of the American Lutheran Church to sponsor credit unions for their members or employees is an action thoroughly consistent with their Christian allegiance. If they decide however, to sponsor a credit union they must zealously guard that it meet and maintain highest standards of performance, genuinely serve the otherwise unmet needs of the members, and remain a unifying factor in the life of the organization to which the credit union is related."

Contrary to early critics in some parishes who feared that this would "bring the moneychangers back into the temple," the credit union quickly proved that it does the opposite. For the Biblical moneychangers made fantastic profits, the credit union none. Today, moneychangers still do abound, in the loan sharks found everywhere, preying on parishioners outside of the temple.

Church and credit union leaders are quick to point out that the church or its brotherhood acts only as a sponsor, providing the common bond that is a requirement for a credit union. The church takes no direct part in the business function of a credit union.

HOW THE CU HELPS

But a church does receive many indirect benefits. For instance:

Reduced local charity.

Financially strengthened members promote congregational stability.

The credit union enlarges the area of personal responsibility in the group. From the common pool of funds, the savings of friends are being lent. This is truly "bearing one another's burdens."

Through regular saving and systematic borrowing at low cost, the economic fiber of members is improved. They don't fall so easily for the overwhelming offers of "easy payment" plans which are not easy. Family bankruptcies have been increasing at an alarming rate, as the bombardment by TV, radio and newspaper advertising has piled up these plans one atop the other to an impossible degree for many who are unwary—young couples especially. On the other hand, sound credit via the credit union enables families to enjoy modern conveniences long before they could do so on a strictly cash basis.

Experience gained in running the credit union develops better lay leadership for the church.

The credit union may be the spark needed to interest the partially active church member in the total program. He may even be slack because of money worries.

Credit union assistance with member's financial problems may help reduce the pastor's counseling load. The credit union will not stand in judgment of a financial mass, but will try to help, and usually can.

Surely a credit union can help dispel a false, un-Christian pride in money. Not social status and prestige, but something for the common good arises from nonprofit use of money.

Finally, while it works for the common good, for brotherhood, the credit union also embodies respect for the sacredness and importance of each individual, and for the community's deep responsibility for each person.

TYPICAL EXPERIENCES IN PARISHES

Let's take a look at a credit union in a rural Lutheran parish, and another in an urban parish. Enthusiasm and growth runs high in both cases.

At Decorah, Iowa, the Lutheran Credit Union actually serves the members of 40 congregations in six counties. It is an integral part of the parish conservation program. Loans are made to help keep farms in Lutheran ownership during a sale; or to keep a family from giving up, by financing improvements. These loans fill a gap that land banks and production credit associations are unable, by their rules, to bridge. There's a 10-year maximum term on the bigger loans. Not 1 cent has been lost in bad debts in the 5 years of operation. Over a dozen farms have already been kept "in the family." Membership is now 550, with a potential of over 5,000. Assets increased 50 percent last year, are close to $200,000 now.

At Minneapolis, University Lutheran Church of Hope's problems of parish conservation are never ending. Many members working for the State university have to come and go in job advancement, and other parishioners working in industry are on the move because of industrial ups and downs. Here, the more common types of credit union loans are the rule: for debt consolidation, automobiles, appliances, education, vacations, medical bills, and so on.

Pastor David Preus is highly enthusiastic about the good work of the credit union. Younger parishioners had been falling prey to "easy payment" plans, resulting in personal financial messes which often added to the pastor's counseling load. The parish credit union has helped relieve this situation considerably, the pastor said. A few gripes about moneychangers and about locating the credit union office in the education unit of the church building have evaporated.

Organized in 1960, Hope Church's credit union also had a 50-percent increase in assets in the past year, and was recognized by the Minnesota League of Credit Unions with an award for the best educational program in credit unions under $100,000.

Credit union loans furnish many poignant case histories. Here is one, from another credit union:

"Our very first loan was most interesting, since it required a series of refinancings because we were not large enough to handle the needs of this family at any one time. The family was the victim of a series of serious illnesses and mishaps over the years. * * * We financed their obligations to the tune of $4,000, and put them on a budget. The plan was working along rather successfully, when like a bolt out of the blue, the husband was seriously injured last year on the job, which ultimately resulted in his total disability. CUNA Mutual paid off the balance, and to us in this relatively new credit union this was without doubt the crowning success story of our career."

HOW TO ORGANIZE A CREDIT UNION

A congregation interested in organizing a credit union should discuss the idea freely. Progress is usually more rapid if one of the church organizations takes the lead. Keep in mind that the mutual interest and cooperation of lay members and pastor are vital to success.

Appoint a committee to gather all necessary information. It's not difficult to find a few individuals who are willing to contribute time that's needed to get the credit union going. At least 100 members are usually considered a minimum, but they need not all be from one parish.

Exact details are easily available. Field men of State credit union leagues will be glad to come and explain the procedure. For a list of the managing directors of all State credit union leagues, and a free brochure, write to Organization Department, Credit Union National Association, Post Office Box 431, Madison, Wis., 53701.

There are over 18 million members in nearly 30,000 credit unions, in every State and province, and many foreign countries. Many of them function under church sponsorship. Your parish, too, may find a credit union to be a helpful arm of brotherly responsibility.

COURAGE AND STATESMANSHIP

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Governor of the State of West Virginia, the Honorable Hulett C. Smith, for his courage and statesmanship in taking a firm stand to control strip mining. In a statement which Governor Smith made on March 8 to his task force on surface mining, he sounded a clarion call for action, placing West Virginia in the forefront of the States which are determined to regulate and control this menace.

Governor Smith has recognized that one of West Virginia's most precious natural assets is her natural beauty—and he has taken positive steps to protect that beauty. The jobs of the people who work in the strip mines are important, but not nearly as important as protecting West Virginia against the ugly scars which have defaced our hillsides and polluted streams, encouraged floods as topsoil is washed away, and depressed property values. Governor Smith has stated:

> This must—and will—stop.

Governor Smith has outlined a 10-point program to combat this menace. He concluded his remarks with this statement:

> The time has come for West Virginia to meet this obvious problem head on. Affirmative and decisive action is imperative in our coordinated efforts to beautify our State, to enter the competitive field of tourist development, to create a better and healthier environment, and to make West Virginia the great State which we all want.

Nothing which Governor Smith has done in recent months has rallied so much enthusiastic support as his statement on strip mining. I am pleased to include with my remarks to the text of Governor Smith's remarks to the task force on surface mining, as well as several editorials from West Virginia newspapers praising Governor Smith's action:

EXCERPTS OF PREPARED REMARKS BY GOV. HULETT C. SMITH, MEETING OF TASK FORCE ON SURFACE MINING, TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1966

Thank you for accepting appointment to this task force on surface mining.

This is our first meeting, and the job—the real job—is just beginning. The work that comes from this task force in the months ahead can have a profound effect upon the growth, the economy, the appearance—in fact, the future greatness of this State.

I have called this task force into being for one reason: to bring about a long-range solution to one of the most serious problems we face. And I see this task force as the best vehicle for obtaining a comprehensive evaluation of the need for reform of our surface mining laws.

The rape of West Virginia has occurred. This is a fact.

And in a sense, this meeting is a long past-due, ex post facto conference.

For more years than we care to admit, West Virginians have planned, hoped, proposed, suggested and wished their way into a state of virtual inaction in regard to surface mining damage.

This is not a blanket indictment. There are wide variations to this problem. There are responsible firms and individuals that comply with present statutes. But there are far too many who have operated in the past, and who are now operating on the borderline of the law.

This must—and will—stop.

The devastation of the terrain came from unregulated or inadequately regulated surface mining of coal prior to passage of our 1963 law is known to every West Virginian who has ever gazed at our once beautiful, but now desecrated mountains.

Streams, which once ran pure and provided sport and recreation for our families, are now sterile from acid pollution.

The likelihood of floods increases, as valuable topsoil is removed, and land will not absorb water. Streams are further polluted and filled with sediment because of those losses of topsoil.

The value of land for agricultural and lumbering purposes, in a State where agriculture and timber production constitute an important part of the economy, is destroyed.

Property values are impaired, or even wrecked.

And perhaps as important as any of these is the fact that promiscuous surface mining strips a beautiful State of its inherent esthetic values.

Efforts toward conservation of our natural resources are handicapped.

On one hand, we're expanding our parks program, creating new tourist attractions, and making new accommodations for a growing tourist industry.

On the other, we are permitting the creation of eyesores that should be alien to any State committed to full-scale tourist programs. This is particularly true for a State that has won national honors for its clean-up campaigns. Our clean-up campaign should be extended to our mountainsides, as well as our communities and highways.

West Virginia is not investing $27 million in a major parks expansion program just so families and visitors can look upon mountains of gob piles, instead of hills of majesty.

In this, as in any competitive enterprise, we must not only promote, but we must protect and preserve the beauty we extol.

How did all this happen?

Many people may not remember, for memories are often short, but there were many reasons for the growth of surface mining in our State—and good economic ones at the time.

There was a war to be won, and coal was a major source of energy needed to provide power for our war effort.

The mining industry turned to surface-mined coal.

Winning the war was the first consideration.

Land reclamation—the practice of restoring once-fertile and useful land to its original condition—was a secondary consideration.

This was one of the prices of war.

But that war ended 20 years ago. And in the 20 years since, we have learned a great deal about this enormous task of reclaiming damaged land.

The reclamation division of our department of natural resources estimates that since the beginning of surface mining in West Virginia, approximately 192,000 acres of our land have been disturbed by this process.

Of this total, only about 50,000 acres have been successfully reclaimed.

As you know, under present State law, firms that wish to surface mine in West Virginia first must obtain a permit, at a price of $100, from the department of mines. In addition, they are required to post $150 bond per acre for reclamation purposes, and $30 per acre for the special reclamation fund. The $150 bond is returned to the mining company if the restoration meets requirements set up by the department of natural resources. The minimum bond posted by a company wishing to surface mine must be $1,000.

The $30 fee goes into a special fund used to reclaim the thousands of acres of land that were disturbed before meaningful mining laws were enacted in our State.

One of our major problems arises from the fact that occasionally an operator will begin surface mining operations without obtaining a permit. Only when confronted by a mining inspector will they pay the permit fee and post the necessary bond that is required. So it would appear that many of our difficulties are due to weaknesses at the beginning of this process. But it is also obvious that the entire matter of surface mining in West Virginia must be carefully examined.

Therefore, I am proposing a 10-point program for you to consider as you go about your duties on this task force.

First, I ask that you determine whether a preplanning program should be initiated in the State of West Virginia. This would require new legislation, which I would not hesitate to propose should you recommend such action. Such a preplanning system would require all surface mining firms to submit a detailed plan of their proposed operations before they shove the first spadeful of dirt from the ground. All requirements would have to be met before a permit could be issued.

Such preplanning should include three basic provisions.

First, the surface mining firms would detail how much stripping they would plan to do, and provide a timetable for reclamation.

Second, they would be required to submit a drainage plan, detailing draining operations that would bring about the least pollution possible.

And third, they would be required to spell out their plans for reclaiming the land once the mining has been completed.

Revised plans could be submitted, should the original plan change once the mining operation is underway.

Second, I am asking you to consider whether each State agency concerned with surface mining should have the authority to stop any illegal operation, and, if the situation warrants, authority to prosecute. Under the present system, two departments of State government and one Federal agency are involved—the department of mines, the department of natural resources, and the State soil conservation district.

Along this line, you may also want to consider whether West Virginia should have a total reclamation law. Surface miners are not the only ones involved in these projects. Oil and gas companies, lumbering operations, telephone companies and others often become involved in work that disturbs the land. At present, there is no law that requires reclamation in these projects, although most of the firms in this category have displayed an admirable desire to restore land that their operations have disturbed. Yet if a firm were to tear up the land, there is not a statute on the books that could make it reclaim the land.

Third, the present amount of bonds posted by surface miners is $150 per disturbed acre. I am asking you to explore whether this fee should be changed. Is $150 adequate? Will $150 reclaim areas that have been disturbed by modern mining equipment, especially the larger sized shovels that dig deeper into the soil than the ordinary mining equipment used when this law went into effect?

Also, you may wish to look into the process of bond forfeiture, and whether these procedures can be streamlined.

Fourth, the 100,000 acres of land that were distributed by surface mining before enforcible laws were passed are in need of continued treatment. Under our present laws, the $30 fee required for issuance of a permit is dedicated to this purpose. The ceiling on this fund is $900,000. Some of this money has already been spent on reclamation projects. You should explore whether this program should continue after the $900,000 ceiling is reached. In short, will $900,000 do the job?

This $900,000 ceiling was based on an estimate that there were approximately 30,000 acres of disturbed and unreclaimed land in this State before the most recent laws were passed. But a recent survey by the Department of Natural Resources shows that this figure is more than three times that amount—in excess of 100,000 acres.

Fifth, I ask that you examine the staffing situation in both the Department of Mines and the Department of Natural Resources. You are to determine if an increase in staffs would insure more effective enforcement of present laws, or new laws, should they be enacted. As an example, there are over 2,000 mines in this State. There is only one person presently assigned the responsibility of overlooking the acid mine drainage control programs in all 2,000 mines.

Sixth, I ask you to examine the feasibility of West Virginia joining the interstate mining compact. This compact is proposed for the purpose of creating uniform reclamation programs in all States affected by surface mining, and is a nonregulatory body.

Seventh, I ask that you examine present regulations regarding backfilling, giving particular attention to the high wall that is left after a surface-mining project is completed. The key point at issue here is whether such a program would be economically feasible in West Virginia, a State characterized by unusually steep terrain.

Eighth, in the general field of mining, you should examine whether deep mine coal operators should have the responsibility to reclaim and rehabilitate areas outside of the mine that are disturbed during the deep mining process.

This would include whether mine tipples should be dismantled once the operation is completed. All across this State, abandoned coal mine tipples and other remnants of the mining process constitute a sorry sight, and are detrimental to the goals of our clean-up program. This is a particular problem in southern West Virginia.

If such action is taken, should it be retroactive to cover those firms that are no longer mining a particular area, but whose rusting tipples remain as a safety and health hazard?

Ninth, I ask that you look into the possibility of controlling those smelly, obnoxious heaps of mine refuse known as "gob piles." Those gob piles are health hazards, because they pollute the air, and pollute water as it travels through them toward our streams. In addition, they are eyesores we don't need.

Some companies have devised methods to get around this problem by covering this mining refuse with a layer of clay.

You should examine whether legislation is needed to establish proper means of disposing of mining refuse.

You will also want to explore Federal efforts and possibilities in this regard. The Federal Government has already set up a test project on acid mine water drainage, reclamation, mine sealing and gob piles in this State.

This is one area of many in which there is an urgent sense of a need for cooperation between the Federal and State governments.

Tenth, I realize there are those who would advocate the total abolishment of surface mining in this State. You may also wish to look into this possibility. But I would remind you that we are dealing with the livelihood of 2,100 West Virginians and their families, and an industry which produces 11 million tons of coal a year, so one can see how important this industry can be to our State.

Surface mining is also an important source of tax revenue, so the long-range economic impact must be taken into consideration.

Nevertheless, it must not make its contribution—no matter how great—at the expense of our other natural assets and resources.

These are the 10 areas in which I ask that you concentrate your efforts. However, I do not want you to feel tied to these 10 points. I want you to feel free to examine whatever you want in this general field of surface mining.

What this task force should do, then, is make a total evaluation of the present process of surface mining in West Virginia. If new laws are needed, or if improvements can be made within the framework of our present laws, this should be very clearly pointed out.

Once you have met with leaders in and out of the mining industry, with leaders in agriculture, conservation, community development, and other elements of the State's economy; once you have examined our State laws; once you have decided whether these laws are adequate or antiquated; once you have decided if there is room for a more strict enforcement of present laws—in short, once you have examined the whole scope of this complex problem, then I will expect your report.

As I said, this is no easy task.

But you will have the full cooperation of State government as you undertake these efforts.

The time has come for West Virginia to meet this obvious problem head on. Affirmative and decisive action is imperative in our coordinated effort to beautify our State, to enter the competitive field of tourist development, to create a better and healthier environment, and to make West Virginia the great State which we all want.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Mar. 10, 1966]

SMITH SHOULD KEEP IDEA OF OUTLAWING STRIP MINES

It was a rare piece of statemanship, delivered in Governor Smith's finest hour. It was a courageous speech, unpadded with platitudes, free of wishy-washiness and bulging with the rewards of research and thought.

It also was hard to believe. Smith stood there in a committee room in the State capitol and declared that West Virginia had been raped by strip miners. He asked for careful study, to be followed by recommendations for laws and regulations that would help correct the evil.

In stronger language than any Governor had dared use before, he said he realized that some persons would advocate total abolishment of strip mining. This is a possibility that could be explored, he suggested.

To his credit, the Governor minimized glorification of those strippers who actually obey the law, pay their taxes and employ men who have families.

He dwelled instead on the devastation and lack of reclamation. He stirred visions of green hills and clear waters known by previous generations and ruined by the strip mining industry. He aroused hope that those visions can become real again, within reasonable limitations.

How long, oh how long, have the people of West Virginia waited for this kind of talk from their Governor and others in responsible public positions of leadership? There is only one answer: too long.

The Governor's unprecedented 25-minute address was delivered at the first meeting of his new task force on surface mining a 27-member group that include representatives of the coal industry, government, labor, conservation organizations and other interests.

He outlined a 10-point study program that embraces evaluation of results under the present strip mining law and examination of the laws and practices in other States. It's a challenging program that will require complete dedication by the task force.

Possible pitfalls are immediately in evidence.

One is the simple fact that another of a disgustingly long list of State studies must be undertaken before anything can be recommended, much less done.

Another is that all of the study under the sun, followed by the writing of perfect sets of laws and regulations, won't solve West Virginia's strip mining problem—unless arrangements are made for enforcement.

Enforcement invariably means more investigators, a bigger and better qualified staff. It means more money.

There are those who believe West Virginia has just as good a strip mining law as any State in the Nation, if it could be enforced, if there were a larger and better paid staff of enforcement officers.

Some officials in high places have pointed out that the 1963 West Virginia statute for control of strip mining is a model law, often recommended for study by other States. They say it compares favorably with highly touted laws in Kentucky and Pennsylvania.

It's hoped the studies suggested by Smith can be completed as soon as possible and that specific new laws, if needed, will get through the legislature no later than next year.

Meanwhile, the Governor should never let go of a realization he has permitted to dawn in his mind. It is an intriguing idea often espoused by ardent conservationists, somewhat silly lovers of beauty and plain people who have grown eye weary of seeing eyesores on the mountains. It may be expressed this way:

Strip mining in ravaged West Virignia should be outlawed.

If Smith ever gets around to making that kind of recommendation for instant strip mine control, he will certainly be well embarked on the road to national fame and reelection.

[From the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News, Mar. 18, 1966]

Governor Smith Picks Up Hot Coal Issue

Governor Smith, the News feels, is to be congratulated for taking the initiative on the stripmine issue.

For "more years than we care to admit," as the Governor put it in a recent speech, "West Virginians have planned, hoped, proposed, suggested and wished their way into a state of virtual inaction in regard to surface mining damage."

As a result, there are 143,000 acres of stripped-over land in need of reclamation in this State with no immediate prospect of their restoration, and more thousands threatened.

This, if the Governor makes good his promise, will be changed. To that end a task force assigned the responsibility will have ready for consideration by the time the legislature assembles next January, we are assured, concrete recommendations.

Pending the appearance of these recommendations, it is possible only to applaud the Governor's boldness in bringing out into the open an issue most of his predecessors have been disposed to sweep under the rug.

It remains to be seen what the task force comes up with. It has some excellent examples and the benefit of spadework done in our neighboring States, plus the trend of a powerful public opinion going for it. Both the States of Ohio and Pennsylvania have updated their surface mining laws of late, fitting them with new and sharper sets of teeth. Carrying the idea a step further, the Pennsylvania Legislature appears on the verge of enacting a law writing the principle of surface property protection from subsidences into the mining regulations.

Coal mining is important to the economies of all three States, perhaps relatively more so in West Virginia than in either of her neighbors. It is necessary, then, that nothing be done to hamper coal production unnecessarily, whether we are dealing with surface or deep-mine extraction. But the public welfare is paramount to that of any individual industry. And public welfare demands both that the owner of surface property be protected from damage resulting from the removal of another man's property in the form of coal which may lie beneath it, and that the whole surface be protected from despoling where the coal is removed by stripping.

If the Governor and his task force come up with a measure capable of protecting the legitimate interests of the parties involved in this matter—the whole public on the one hand, the coal industry on the other—they will merit the support of all right-thinking citizens.

The issue very well may become one of the most important before the 1967 legislature.

[From the Point Pleasant (W. Va.) Register, Mar. 18, 1966]

Ugly Scars on the Landscape

Governor Smith is to be commended for his forthright declaration on the need for West Virginia to take new firm steps to deal with the strip mine problem.

In the strongest speech ever made against the ugly effects of strip mining, Governor Smith told his new task force on surface mining, "The rape of West Virginia has occurred."

He pointed out that the State has a $27 million park expansion program underway while permitting the creation of eyesores by strip mining. The State isn't investing in the parks program just so tourists can look up at the mountains and see gob piles, he added.

The task force on surface mining will study the whole scope of the problem and make recommendations to the legislature. Governor Smith went so far as to acknowledge that there are those who advocate total abolishment of strip mining in the State. He said the task force could look into this aspect if it so desired.

Despite all of the talk about the evils of strip mining in West Virginia over many years the record shows that there has been more dialog than action. Since the beginning of strip mining in West Virginia during World War II, approximately 192,000 acres of land have been disturbed by the industry. Of that total, approximately 50,000 acres have been reclaimed. This is a sorry record indeed.

The whole country has gone on a beautification binge today and it would be tragic for West Virginia to allow the ugly scars of strip mining to remain unattended. This State has been blessed with some of nature's most beautiful scenery and we have been neglectful in protecting this great asset. We are hopeful that the Governor's task force will not shirk its duty. Where bold action is required we must have it.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Advertiser, Mar. 13, 1966]

Those West Virginia Hills Getting Overdue Attention

(By John W. Glancy)

"Oh, those West Virginia hills,
  How unchanged they seem to stand
With their summits pointed skyward
  To the Great Almighty's Land.
Many changes I can see,
  Which my heart with sadness fills,
But no changes can be noticed
  In those West Virginia hills."

Look again. There have been some changes.

Nearly 150,000 once green acres have been ripped open by strip mine shovels and left yawning skyward since the State's song was written in 1879.

As Gov. Hulett C. Smith puts it: "The rape of West Virginia has occurred."

The Governor has pledged to stop irresponsible strip mine operators who are ravaging the State under a weak surface mining law.

He has charged a task force on surface mining with the job of studying the present law and making recommendations for its reform. On this blue ribbon panel are representatives of the coal industry, legislators, conservationists, wildlife enthusiasts, labor, garden clubs, and agriculture. Its chairman is David C. Callaghan, the Governor's administrative assistant.

"I have asked this task force to come up with a more comprehensive law than we now have—one that will prevent future damage and one that will clean up past mistakes," the Governor said.

How strong a law does he want?

"I will support whatever recommendations this group comes up with. If they recommend doing away with strip mining altogether, we'll do it. If they want strip mining on a restricted area basis, we can consider that," he said in an interview.

It's not likely the task force will recommend abolishing an industry which employs 2,100 West Virginians and pays State taxes on 11 million tons of coal a year.

However, the Governor will get strong recommendations from some of his task force members:

"I think we should have a law equal in scope to the new Kentucky legislation," said Grover C. Little, Jr., State president, Izaak Walton League's 1,450 members.

"We must take action to save our State and land," insists Mrs. C. Manning Smith, president of the 7,719-member West Virginia State Garden Clubs.

"I am in full accordance with the Governor's wishes," said Joseph N. Bowenmaster, president of the West Virginia Wildlife Federation. "Unscrupulous operators are destroying wildlife habitats and their food and polluting our streams and killing our fish." The federation has 11,000 members.

Callaghan also expects the panel to come up with potent recommendations:

"It will take a fairly strong bill to do everything the Governor would like to see done," he said.

He cited the present $27 million park expansion program the State is engaged in and said devastated lands around them must be reclaimed before tourists can be attracted.

Smith asked his task force to complete the study and to make recommendations to him this fall before the legislature meets in January of 1967.

The present strip mine law passed just 3 years ago is a weak sister stacked up against the bolder legislation other States are now passing.

A firm wishing to surface mine in West Virginia obtains a permit for $100 from the department of mines. It must also post a $150 bond per acre with a $1,000 minimum to insure funds for revegetating and reclaiming the land. The bond is returned to the firm if the department of natural resources approves restoration methods. An additional $30 per acre goes into a special fund used to reclaim acreage spoiled before the law was passed.

The great weakness in the law is the complete absence of any preplanning requirements. This is the heart of Kentucky's new legislation which will become effective in June. It requires all surface mining firms to submit minutely detailed plans of proposed operations including reclamation steps to be carried out.

Governor Smith is willing to ask for necessary legislation to require preplanning, should the task force recommend it.

"This is the heart of our law," says Elmore C. Graham, director of the Kentucky Division of Strip Mining. "An operator must show us exactly what he proposes to do before we issue him a permit."

Any Kentucky strip mine operator who does not carry out his operation as outlined will be subject to a suspension of his permit and prosecution in the courts.

Kentucky also has 150,000 acres which need reclamation and is presently restoring about 2,000 acres yearly, Graham said. The State's new law is considered second only to Pennsylvania's in toughness.

Governor Smith suggested preplanning might include:

1. A detailed plan showing how much stripping a firm plans to do along with a timetable for reclamation.

2. A plan detailing drainage operations to minimize pollution.

3. Detailed proposals for reclaiming the land once the operation is underway.

The Governor also asked the panel to consider suspension and prosecution procedures.

He requested the task force determine whether or not the $150 per acre bond fee is adequate. Kentucky's fee is $100 to $500 with a minimum of $2,000.

He also questioned whether the $30 fee used to reclaim previously pillaged acreage is adequate:

"The ceiling on this fund is $900,000. Some of this money has already been spent on reclamation projects. You should consider whether this program should continue after the $900,000 ceiling is reached."

The $900,000 limitation was based on an early estimate of 30,000 acres of disturbed and unreclaimed land in the State when it is actually somewhere between 100,000 and 150,000 acres.

He proposed an examination be made of the staffing situation in the department of mines and the department of natural resources, both presently concerned with enforcing surface mining regulations. One man is now responsible for inspecting the acid mine drainage control programs of some 2,000 mines.

The panel will also look into whether deep mine coal operators should have the responsibility of reclaiming and rehabilitating areas outside mines which they disturb.

"I ask that you look into the possibility of controlling those smelly, obnoxious heaps of mine refuse known as gob piles." The Governor called them health hazards, polluting the air and water as well as being eyesores we don't need.

Members of the task force found Governor Smith's charge 66 forceful and frank.

"For more years than we care to admit, West Virginians have planned, hoped, proposed, suggested, and wished their way into a state of virtual inaction in regard to surface mining damage," he told them. He said this must and will stop.

Smith hopes his remarks will not be construed as a blanket indictment of the strip mine industry:

"There are responsible firms and individuals that comply with present statutes. But there are far too many who have operated in the past, and who are now operating on the borderline of the law."

He blamed most of the spoilage on the war effort when winning the conflict was the first consideration and land reclamation only a secondary concern.

"But that war ended 20 years ago. And in the 20 years since, we have learned a great deal about this enormous task of reclaiming damaged land."

The Governor feels the time has come for West Virginia to meet the strip-mine problem head on.

He is calling for "affirmative and decisive action." This is imperative, he says, if West Virginia is to become the great State "which we all want."

Vacation farms last year received an average of eight inquiries from listings in the State farm vacation folder alone. Farms reported from 1 to 50 visitors each, except for one heavily visited vacation farm. It would have competed in visitors and income with some of our finest resorts, according to Commissioner of Agriculture Gus Douglass.

Farms averaged $216 in vacation income, but the amount ranged from $35 to $800 per farm.

Fifty-six farms registered in the 1965 farm vacation program, and it is hoped that 65 to 70 will take part this year.

"We believe this effort to be one of the finest opportunities to show off our innate hospitality, as well as to upgrade income of our attractive rural areas," Douglass commented. He said vacationers generally have had great praise for the program.

A person to whom 4-H Club work has been a guiding light is Mrs. Kenneth G. Brown, of Milton. She was named one of the 1965 State winners in the 4-H alumni recognition program by the Cooperative Extension Service.

She received a burnished copper plaque mounted on walnut from the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., the alumni program sponsor for 13 years. The national program honors former 4-H'ers who are community leaders for both youth and adult groups and who are successful in their chosen careers.

Mrs. Brown is a home economics teacher at Milton Junior High School and adviser to the Future Homemakers of America. "My club work was so rewarding that by the time I reached college age I had decided to be a 4-H Club agent," she said. She chose college courses related to the field.

During her 10 years in 4-H in Cabell County, the former Yvonne Spurlock was a national recreation award winner, an all-star and a member of the University 4-H Club. She was Wayne County extension agent and assisted with music and recreation classes at 4-H camps. She is all-star life membership chairman in the county.

After marriage and two children, she received her master's degree at Marshall University. She earned her B.S. degree at West Virginia University.

Pike County agricultural agencies organized a countywide tree-planting program. The 1966 goal is 1 million trees.

Program officers are: Millis Newsome, chairman; Mason Morrison, vice chairman, and David Gillespie, secretary. Committees are: Glen McDowell, Walter Ellison, Tommy Taylor, James Foster, Mason Morrison, publicity; Herman Gillen, Tommy Taylor, Millis Newsome, Mason Morrison, Oscar Howard, W . D. Williams, Oliver Hall, tree orders; W. D. Williams, Oliver Hall, Ray Bevins, John Griffith, Gillen, delivery.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 19, the Chief Justice of the United States celebrated his 75th birthday. I rise today to pay tribute to this remarkable man.

Earl Warren had compiled a distinguished record before he ever came to the Supreme Court in October of 1953. As district attorney in my home county in California, and as Governor of the State of California for 11 years, his record and his accomplishments were more than enough to satisfy most men for a lifetime. His widespread and bipartisan support at the polls during his three terms as Governor was clear evidence of the respect and esteem with which he was regarded by the people of California.

But Earl Warren will best be remembered for his courageous service to our country as Chief Justice of the United States.

No dozen years in our history have seen a Court plunge so vigorously into the great legal and constitutional issues of our time.

When Chief Justice Warren came to the Court, racial segregation, thinly guised under the veil of "separate but equal," had plagued our land for three-quarters of a century. The Warren Court struck down the myth that "separate" could mean "equal," in the historic school decisions of 1954.

When Chief Justice Warren came to the Court, gross inequities in State apportionment existed and were permitted under the guise that they lay beyond Federal judicial jurisdiction. The Warren Court ruled firmly that these practices violated fundamental constitutional rights and that, accordingly, the Court did have jurisdiction.

The Warren Court ruled that violations of the fourth amendment, pertaining to the admissibility of evidence at the State level, could not be permitted out of deference to "State rights," and it dealt firmly and fairly with church-state relations in the public schools.

Prof. Fred Rodel, of the Yale Law School, in a recent article in the New York Times, described Earl Warren as being squarely in the bold, activist tradition of John Marshall. In the same article, Professor Rodel pointed out that Chief Justice Warren's "deep respect for the dignity and the equal rights of every human being is probably the top tool in his arsenal, the essence of his influence, the crux of his credo."

Professor Rodel rates Earl Warren as the greatest Chief Justice in our Nation's history, and I would like to add my full concurrence with this conclusion.

The people of the United States have indeed been fortunate to have this great man in their highest judicial post. We wish him many more years of active public service.

I enclose the article by Professor Rodel, which appeared in the New York Times magazine of March 13, as a further tribute to this remarkably able and dedicated American:

[From the New York Times magazine, Mar. 13, 1966]

AS THE CHIEF JUSTICE REACHES HIS 75TH BIRTHDAY THERE IS LITTLE DOUBT THAT IT IS THE EARL WARREN COURT

(By Fred Rodell)

"To the Birchers and churchers,
Earl Warren
Heads a Court only fit for
abhorrin';
As he hunches up there
Like a big grizzly bear,
They're convinced he's the bear that is foreign."

Nor is it the Birchers and churchers alone who have, for some years now, been chucking brickbats at the big, bluff, friendly 14th Chief Justice of the United States and at the Court which he has finally come to lead toward the deeply democratic and libertarian ends he has long believed in. Thus, the Harvard Law School's Prof. Paul Freund, disciple of the late Felix Frankfurter, has accused the Warren Court of "a tendency to make broad principles do service for specific problems that demand differentiation, a tendency toward overbroadness that is not an augury of enduring work." Thus, Barry Goldwater recently intoned: "Of all three branches of government, today's Supreme Court is the least faithful to the constitutional tradition of limited government and to the principle of legitimacy in the exercise of power." Thus, a former Frankfurter law clerk, now teaching at Yale, has wailed: "The Court seems to lack a sense of the limitations of the institution, a sense of what it can do single handedly. If it tries to take on too much all at once, it will only undermine public confidence and damage its effectiveness." More bluntly, and certainly less evasively, a group that stretches from southern racists to scared State legislators to little old ladies with Reds under their beds and tennis shoes at the ready, has been chanting for several years: "Impeach Earl Warren."

If that sturdy Californian—that one-time local prosecutor, district attorney, State attorney general, three-term Governor and defeated candidate for the U.S. Vice-Presidency—is bothered by any of this hullabaloo, he does not show it. As he celebrates this week his 75th birthday, he seems more mellow, more gently sure of himself, more immune to sideline criticism than ever before.

Maybe he remembers that no less a critic than Thomas Jefferson once wrote of John Marshall and his Court: "An opinion is huddled up in conclave, perhaps by a majority of one, delivered as if unanimous, and with the silent acquiescence of lazy or timid associates, by a crafty Chief Judge, who sophisticates the law to his mind, by the turn of his own reasoning"—and that Marshall is known universally today as "the great Chief Justice." Surely Earl Warren knows that his own conduct of the Court is squarely in the boldly activist tradition of John Marshall—and that those bookish folk who purport to revere John Marshall, long dead, while reproaching a very live Earl Warren for not respecting their own anemic, academic, and fast-fading philosophy of "judicial self-restraint" are contradicting and fooling none but themselves.

By contrast to his pretentiously professional detractors, such as one who bewailed that Warren "never had an abstract thought in all his life"—a comment intended as an insult but perhaps a tribute to Warren's realism—the Chief Justice is not one for self-delusion. He is well aware of his own strengths and disarming about what many might deem his weaknesses.

He has long conceded that he makes no claim to being an intellectual in the look-it-up-in-the-library sense that characterizes many of his colleagues. Indeed, his first great and famous school desegregation opinion, *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, was almost unique in its offhand dismissal of mountains of legal and historical research from both sides and in its pragmatic dependence on the present-day results of separate schools.

When, as so often, Warren bends his bulk over the High Bench to ask some prosecutor, defending an appealed conviction with citations and precedents and principles, "Yes, yes—but were you fair?" the fairness he refers to is no jurisprudential abstraction. It relates to such practical matters as methods of arrest, questioning of suspects, police conduct, trial tactics—matters which Warren understands as intimately as when he himself was doing the prosecuting back in Alameda County, Calif., 40-odd years ago.

In the course of a recent conversation with me, the Chief expanded on his nonintellectual, unabstract slant toward the job of judging and stressed some of the more positive facets of his philosophy. He does not consider himself, he said, much of a muchness as a writer; several brethren—unnamed—were more facile with words. What he cares about are results, and preferably unanimous or near-unanimous results, rather than fine or fancy phrases which may trigger dissents. It is not too hard to guess that both the first desegregation decision and the second ("with all deliberate speed"), a year later, were worked over and over in their wording by Warren in order not to lose a single vote—although Warren, of course, did not tell me this, nor did I ask him.

And it was neither Warren nor any of his colleagues, past or present, who told me some years ago (law clerks occasionally talk out of school) that a bare minimum of four votes brought the Brown case to the Court—by what lawyers call a grant of certiorari, after years of denying certiorari to similar school desegregation cases—and that in conference at least three Justices came close to dissenting until their new Chief put on all the pressure he could wield. I tell this tale—and let him who can prove it wrong deny it—to illustrate the result-minded pragmatism and power of Earl Warren.

It is precisely that sort of pragmatism that a Supreme Court Justice most needs today—when half the cases the Court hears deal with some new issue or new angle of individual rights and liberties, subjects which took up barely 2 percent of the Court's calendar 30 years ago. Further, almost every case the Court now deals with is a public law case, involving, if not a constitutional question, the interpretation of a statute or the overseeing of an administrative agency.

That is why Justice Brennan, who spent 7 years on various New Jersey courts, dealing with private litigation over wills and property rights and torts and trusts and such, laughs at the notion that prior judicial experience is worth 2 cents to a Supreme Court Justice, except in learning how to put on a robe. That is why such learned legal scholars as Holmes and Cardozo made their greatest contributions on State courts, not on the Supreme Court. And that is why such politically minded realists as Marshall and Warren might have been failures as State—or even lower Federal—judges but can become giants as Supreme Court Justices.

Warren, like President Johnson, is no scholar. What both have working for them is the kind of devastating drive that less dedicated folk just plain succumb to. Warren, like Johnson, uses scholars. Black—and to a slightly lesser extent, Douglas—along with bright young law clerks—have given Warren the precedents, the library references, the footnotes, when he wanted them. It is important to remember that if there were not legal learning on both sides no case would ever reach the Supreme Court. An honest judge—and Warren is one—passes over such matters lightly. He cares about results. Just as Marshall, no legal "scholar" either, sometimes depended on Justice Story to make him sound more learned, so Warren may depend on a colleague or a clerk. The one was—and the other is—more concerned with creating the stuff of future scholarship than borrowing book learning ready made from the past.

Going back to the Chief's own appraisal of his limitations and his virtues, I recall that he told me—quietly suggesting my question was moronic, which indeed it was to a confirmed judicial realist—that, of course, a man's early life and experiences could not but affect his views and votes on the Court. Thus, when a Federal Employers' Liability Act case comes up for consideration, Warren still sees, mirrored in his mind, the tragic accidents in which railroad workers, of whom his father was one (though he escaped injury), were crippled or killed. "Safely city-bred judges can't evision such tragedies—or what they mean to a whole family," he exclaimed.

Not entirely irrelevantly, he granted that the city boys knew far more about money matters and financial stuff than he. Thus too, California's fear of—and discrimination against—orientals, which offended even the adolescent pure-white Warren, laid the early background for his tough attitude toward southern segregation. The fact that, as attorney general of California, he pressed the uprooting and confinement of the State's Japanese residents can perhaps be explained by the emotional atmosphere of wartime. At the least, by contrast, it provides a measure of his subsequent growth.

But it is in the field of civil liberties as applied to criminal suspects that Chief Warren, for two decades a prosecutor, and so overseer of police activities, feels most at home, most confident of his own solid knowledge. As his Court, term by term, extends the protection of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and eighth amendments to the Constitution—as the guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures, the privilege against self-incrimination, the right to counsel, and other measures of fairness are given ever wider scope—Warren beams with a special pleasure and pride. For he will tell you that police and prosecutors, if they are at all efficient, do not have to cut corners or wink at rules—and that, when they do so, they are proclaiming their own laziness or stupidity.

He will tell you, too, that never once in his 20 years as a prosecutor did he have a conviction reversed for unfair treatment, in any form, of a criminal defendant. The charge against the current Supreme Court that Warren most deeply resents, because he knows from experience its falsity, is that of "coddling criminals."

Strangely—or perhaps not, in light of the man's result-oriented realism—his favorite decision during his tenure as Chief is none of the libertarian "criminal-coddling" extensions of the Bill of Rights, nor any of the equally libertarian first amendment rulings on free speech, press, or free assembly that have led to charges that the Court is also coddling Communists. It is not even, as most people would probably assume, the first big desegregation case, *Brown*, in which Warren, less than a year on the Court performed the near-miracle of achieving not only a unanimous vote but a unanimous opinion—and through which the Court took the lead over a reluctant executive (Eisenhower came close to disowning the decision) and a Dixie-dominated Congress (there would be no new Civil Rights Act if the "least dangerous branch" had not spoken out) in doing away with racial discrimination.

No, the Chief Justice did not hesitate a split second when I asked him to name his most important opinion. "*Reynolds* v. *Sims*, of course," he said. *Reynolds* v. *Sims* was the Court's second major voting-reapportionment ruling, built on *Baker* v. *Carr*, 2 years before. *Reynolds* v. *Sims* was technically not one case but six, all decided together, all applying the new constitutional cliché: "One man, one vote."

Expanding and expounding this principle so as to require every State legislature, in both houses, to be roughly proportionate to population, Warren wrote, though not this time for a unanimous Court: "Citizens, not history or economic interests, cast votes." And, again: "Legislators represent people, not trees or acres."

As in *Brown*, just a decade earlier, Warren was quite unworried that legislative history, dug from a library, might not support his reading of the "equal protection" clause of the Constitution on which the decision formally rested. Hence, he ignored rather than answered Justice Harlan's disturbed and scholarly dissent—much as John Marshall used to brush off pedantic impedimenta to the results he felt was right.

It is the new apportionment formula, out of *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, that Senator DIRKSEN is trying to reverse, in part, by constitutional amendment. DIRKSEN is well aware that throughout most of the Nation the old disproportionate systems of electing legislators heavily favored rural rubes over city slickers—and that most rural rubes are Republicans. Senator DIRKSEN will, as he should, fail; too few people other than the rural representatives and their country constituents care. But the Sentaor might well consider for a second the man whose work he is trying to undo, the man who rates reapportionment and its equalizing of voting rights as his finest achievement.

It happens that Earl Warren is country-bred and a Republican. But Earl Warren's deep respect for the dignity and the equal rights of every human being—country-bred or city-bred, Republican or Democratic, black or white—is probably the top tool in his arsenal, the essence of his influence, the crux of his credo.

Three of the nouns most often used to describe the Chief are graciousness, warmth, and strength. Thus, Judge Simon Sobeloff, a former U.S. Solicitor General, once remarked: "Few men in or out of government can equal the Chief Justice in human warmth. He will be distinguished in history as a great and gracious jurist."

No one who has ever watched as Warren, of a Monday morning, welcomes new members to the bar of the Court can discount the genuineness with which he performs this little gesture—pronouncing every name precisely, smiling as unaffectedly as if he were greeting an old friend.

But Warren, no wishy-washy charmer, is capable of anger even in public. On April 24, 1961, not half an hour after the welcome-to-the-bar-of-this-Court ceremony, Judge Black announced a 5-to-4 decision in the civil liberties field and Justice Frankfurter, speaking in dissent, began to ridicule in open Court the decision which had not gone his way. Chief Warren, who had voted with Black, turned crimson, then almost purple, as he waited for Frankfurter to finish. Then in quite unprecedented fashion, he turned on the second senior Justice:

"That was not the dissenting opinion that you filed. That was a lecture—a closing argument by a prosecutor to a jury. It might properly have been made in the conference room but not in this courtroom. As I understand it, the purpose of reporting an opinion here is to inform the public and not for the purpose of grading this Court."

Late that afternoon Warren was again his old, easygoing self as he took on questions—some sharp, some stupid, all politely parried or handled head on—from a law-school class. He dismissed the morning's already front-paged incident with a reminder that even Supreme Court Justices are human and may lose their tempers from time to time.

What more is Earl Warren than—as already noted—big, friendly, bold, unbookish, libertarian, equalitarian, gracious, warm, strong—and human? With frank immodesty, let me quote here what I wrote of him 11 years ago, in the middle of his second term on the Court:

"Indeed, the most hopeful and happy omen of them all is the apparent judicial character of the new Chief Justice. Unblinded by the tweedledum-tweedledee twaddle of much that passes for learned legal argument, unblinkered into the narrow vision so often so typical of those with past judicial experience, he seems essentially a direct, plain-spoken politician who knows that his is primarily a political job. Of such, when they combine humanity with honesty, are judicial statesmen made. Not so wise as Holmes, not so intellectually daring as Black, not so dedicated as Brandeis or Douglas, not so independent as the 19th-century's Johnson or Miller or Harlan, and clearly not so liberal as any of these, he comes closer to resembling a might-be 20th century Marshall. The same easy strength is there, and the same earthy approach to the esoterics of law. But where Marshall's achievement was to protect a weak nation, as a nation from its people, Warren's opportunity is the precise opposite: It is to protect the people, as people, from their strong nation. Given the will and the good will to do it, he can succeed."

Eleven years after, still immodestly, I stick rather proudly to my prognosis, in which not one of my colleagues in constitutional law then joined. I stick, that is, with two minor amendments: "Clearly not so liberal as any of these" should go; Warren has proved more militantly liberal than about half of them, most notably than the above-the-battle Holmes. And I should not say today that "he can succeed"; I should say that he has spectacularly succeeded.

It cannot have been easy. When Warren came to the Court in the fall of 1953, so suddenly that he had to borrow a robe to be sworn in as Chief, the high tribunal was clearly at its lowest ebb since the "four horsemen of reaction" were leading the "nine old men" of the thirties into stubborn, antisocial economic decisions. Now the crusading zeal of the New Deal Justices, spent in overturning old economic roadblocks to progress, had largely waned. The Court had been encumbered in its work and in its vision by Truman's inept quartet of appointed cronies: Vinson (as C.J.), Burton, Minton, and Clark.

After the deaths of Wiley Rutledge and Frank Murphy—both dedicated libertarians—in the summer of 1949, Hugo Black and William O. Douglas remained as a sort of rear guard for civil rights and liberties; for 4 years "Justices Black and Douglas dissenting" became as common in constitutional cases as "Justices Holmes and Brandeis dissenting" had been a generation before. I believe I violate no confidence when I report that both Black and Douglas talked to intimates—perhaps just to let off steam—of resigning from the Court in disgust and despair.

Into this sticky atmosphere (some of the Justices would not even lunch with some of their brethren) stepped the big, bland, blond Scandinavian (the family name was originally Varran) who had never sat on a court of any kind before. Uninformed rumor has long had it that Eisenhower appointed Warren to the Nation's second most important post in gratitude—or even as a deal—for Warren's releasing the California delegation to Ike at the Chicago convention in 1952. Untrue. The most urgent backers of then Governor Warren for the Chief Justiceship were Richard Nixon and William Knowland, both anxious to control California's Republican Party and aware that they had no chance until Warren was out of the way. (Since Warren went to Washington, incidentally, the Democrats have controlled California.)

When Warren took the center seat on the bench and the end seat at the conference table, the intellectual leader of the Court was unquestionably that pseudoliberal lightning bug, the late Felix Frankfurter. Black—now followed, now led, by Douglas—had been able to challenge Frankfurter's widely conceded hard-core conservatism, especially in the field of individual liberties, until Murphy and Rutledge died, thus diluting most Bill of Rights dissents from four men to two.

Frankfurter, a disciple—as was his hero, Learned Hand—of the "leave it all to the legislature and don't stick your judicial neck out" philosophy of the 19-century law professor James Bradley Thayer, favored an almost parliamentary form of government. (Douglas, in dissent, once chided him: "The philosophy of the opinion that sustains this statute * * * give supremacy to the legislature in a way that is incompatible with the scheme of our written Constitution. * * * By proclaiming it we forsake much of our constitutional heritage and move closer to the British scheme.") So it was that, during the height of the McCarthy witch hunt, the Court, led by Frankfurter, upheld the whole nasty network of "loyalty" and "security" laws, over Black-Douglas dissents.

Not that Frankfurter approved of these laws; as a legislator he would have voted against them. But as a judge, weaned on the hands-off slant of Thayer and Hand plus a misreading of Holmes (to whom the freedoms of speech and press were matters of judicial moment), Frankfurter cornered himself into a crusade for logical consistency in constitutional law. If courts ought not to interfere with legislative judgments in the economic arena, why in the field of civil liberties?

Black's and Douglas's best dissents spell out the answer: majority rule alone does not make a democracy; the other essential is the protection of primary rights of individuals and minorities against majority rule—and only the courts can provide this. Furthermore, Frankfurter was afraid that if the Court overused its power, it would, under Congress's knife, lose its power—a circular and self-defeating argument. Let's-not-use-it-lest-we-lose-it scarcely differs from let's-give-it-up. Pragmatists can catch this point while scholars scratch their heads; Warren, no scholar, caught it quickly.

It did not seem to matter much, in 1953, in which camp Warren would land. Technically, a Chief Justice is only the administrative head of a court of equals. Unless he is a personally powerful figure—a Marshall, a Taney, a Hughes—he wields no more influence than any eloquent associate. Thus, at best, libertarians ruminated, Warren might change unfortunate rulings from 7 to 2 to 6 to 3. That is precisely what Warren did—but not immediately.

Such is the prestige of the Chief Justice, in majority or dissent, that both Frankfurter and Black badly wanted him on their side and recruited him, from conference sessions to Court corridors to chats in the chambers. But the more perceptive among the Court's personnel soon began to notice that, after argument or conference discussion of a tough constitutional twister, Frankfurter would be knocking at the Chief's door; the Chief would later be knocking at Black's. Statistics tell the story: During Warren's first term, he and Black were on opposite sides of split decisions 22 times; during Warren's second term, he and Black differed 12 times; in Warren's third term, his votes varied from Blacks just twice.

Statistics do not, of course, tell the whole story. They do not tell, for instance, how Warren, at the spectacular school-desegregation end of his first term, managed to keep unanimous, in word as well as deed, eight associates of whom five had not wanted even to take on the issue, while three kept threatening to bolt into dissent. Was it perhaps by leaving the actual desegregation orders until the following term, and even then watering them down in the fatuous phrase "with all deliberate speed"—obviously inserted to satisfy some malcontent?

At any rate, in the antidiscrimination field, as it has spread from schools to buses and theaters and swimming pools and supermarkets and restaurants and all the rest, Warren has kept his Court well-nigh unanimous in case after case for close to 12 years. More than that, he has dragged both Presidents and Congresses along the desegregation trail—an astonishing feat of practical politics.

Progress in the two other fields where the Warren Court has made a major on the law of the land came more slowly. (The first amendment separation-of-church-and-State cases, banning Bible reading and prayers in public schools, scarcely rate as major matters, despite the emotional to-do they caused.) For the two other big blows for liberty and democracy struck by the Warren Court—widespread extension of constitutional fairness to criminal suspects or defendants, and radical reapportionment of voting rights and representation—had to await further changes in the membership of the Court itself.

Warren's appointment had raised the libertarian minority from the despairing Black-and-Douglas duo to three. In 1956 William J. Brennan, Jr., despite the fact that he had once studied under Frankfurter at Harvard, disappointed his former professor by joining, on most constitutional counts, the Black-Douglas-Warren bloc. Two years later, when Potter Stewart, as the most junior Justice, refused to aline himself regularly with Frankfurter (or with Black), the stage was set for the Warren Court to go slowly to town.

The change began with the Bill of Rights cases, ranging from the first amendment freedoms, to which the Vinson-Frankfurter Court had been almost stone deaf, through the fourth to eighth amendment cases, calling for decency toward criminal defendants and dealing now with the extension of these decencies—the right to counsel, reversal of convictions based on illegally seized evidence and the like—to State, not only Federal, prosecutions. Justice Stewart, wetting his toes in the waters of constitutional controversy (although his record on the Federal Court of Appeals in Ohio had more than hinted that he would not be a blind follower of Justice Burton, also from Ohio, whom he replaced), started, a bit cautiously at first, to follow more often than not the Black-Douglas-Warren-Brennan line. That (date it around 1959) was the end of Frankfurter's dominance of the Court; it had lasted precisely a decade since, in 1949, Murphy and Rutledge died. This was also, the desegregation cases aside (and they were rather special, for who, once forced to vote with no procedural escape, would vote for segregation?), the time when Earl Warren took effective charge of the Court he had formally headed since 1953.

Yet it was not until 3 years after that (date it precisely March 26, 1962) that the big blow fell. Then was when the Court, in *Baker* v. *Carr*, handed down the first of its revolutionary reapportionment holdings, overruling an old Frankfurter hands-off decision, wading with eyes wide open into the "political thicket" against which Frankfurter and his ilk had long warned, forcing the ex-professor into an eloquently despairing swansong of dissent. There are those who believe that this case, in which Frankfurter's whole philosophy of government and law was discarded, contributed to the stroke which he suffered shortly thereafter—a stroke that led to his retirement and subsequently to his death.

There can be no doubt that the Court, in open hearing and in conference, has been a quieter, calmer place since Frankfurter left. Chief Warren, who never raises his voice, even in anger or annoyance, told me last fall that no voices had been raised in conference for the past 3 years. And I could not help remembering the two or three times when I had waited for Warren in his office just outside the inner sanctum of the conference room and had heard—though I caught no words—the shrilly rising decibels of a peeved and petulant Justice Frankfurter.

When Arthur Goldberg succeeded to the Frankfurter seat on the bench, that one sometimes crucial vote could not have changed more radically. By contrast to Frankfurter's insistence on self-restraint, Goldberg was so aggressively activist in his anxiousness to have the Court do good that the tale went around Washington that Black and Douglas were trying to hold Goldberg back. It is not just a tale but a fact that in Goldberg's first Court term the Court split 5 to 4 in 10 cases dealing with civil rights or liberties, and that, with Goldberg's vote, the libertarians carried all 10.

Justice Abe Fortas, who has now replaced Goldberg, is less of a whirlwind, but he has just as little sympathy with the keep-away credo of Frankfurter and his kind; it was Fortas who argued and won the celebrated *Gideon* case, in which the Court discarded an old Frankfurter ruling in extending to indigent State defendants the right to counsel in criminal cases.

At any rate—even without the support of Justices Harlan (Frankfurter's softspoken, gentlemanly but rarely affective follower toward a take-it-easy trend), Clark (far more articulate and able than when Truman named him, but still pogo-stick unpredictable), White (incredibly cautious for a Kennedy man, often a technical nit-picker) and Stewart (who fits no pattern save that of journalist turned judge, but still at heart a journalist)—even without these, the Court is now Earl Warren's court and, without arrogance, he knows it. Some might call it Black's or Black's and Douglas' court, as Vinson's court belonged to Frankfurter. But I think I said it not too badly, again 11 years ago:

"Today it would be a tragedy if the Black and Douglas dissents—which are rather affirmations of a faith—should prove a dirge for the bravest dream of all. For under the inspiration of those two great Justices and the aegis of a potentially great Chief Justice, the American dream of freedom may be reborn."

There is no longer any question of potentially great. I doubt that any non-Bircher or nonchurcher who knows the man and his work would fail to accord him—along with Marshall, Taney, and Hughes—the accolade of greatness. Personally—and not just as a bauble for his 75th birthday—I happen to rate him the greatest Chief Justice in the Nation's history.

His job has been tougher than Marshall's. Marshall had no Frankfurter, complete with followers, to try to hamstring him; only Jefferson's man, Johnson, so much as spoke up against Marshall. We should recognize, while he is still working for us, the rare strength and courage and wisdom of Earl Warren.

Exuding, as he does, quiet and confident power, the Chief feels no need to throw his weight around. Last fall I was chatting with the newly named Justice Abe Fortas in his Court chambers when his secretary suddenly announced, over the phone: "The Chief Justice is here, Justice Fortas." Warren had not summoned freshman Fortas, 20 years his junior, to his own office. He had done Fortas the courtesy of coming through the corridors to see Fortas. As he entered, he saw me also.

"Could I have a couple of minutes with you in private, Abe," he asked, "or would you rather I waited until Fred leaves?"

That, too, is the 14th Chief Justice of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STILL OPENED WITH A PRAYER DESPITE SUPREME COURT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, amid the plaudits I just heard with respect to the 75th birthday of the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, I only want to say that I am pleased the House of Representatives can still be opened with a prayer each day in which it is in session.

LEGISLATION TO FURTHER THE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND ENGINEERING PROGRAMS OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been firmly convinced that our postal service cannot possibly meet the challenges posed by the skyrocketing mail volume of the space and missile age without placing greater emphasis upon research and development.

It is highly essential that we begin to provide postal employees with better and more efficient tools if they are to do the job we expect of them in giving the American people the very best possible postal service. Frankly, I feel that if something is not done immediately we could possibly be faced with a complete breakdown in our most vital communications network.

My studies of this problem now make it evident to me that basic to any acceleration of research and development programs, we must first provide the Post Office Department with the organizational structure it needs to more effectively carry on these programs.

Accordingly, I have today introduced legislation that is designed to assist the Department by expanding, strengthening and improving the administration of the Department's research, development, and engineering programs.

My bill will create, for the first time in the history of the Post Office Department, a new position of Assistant Postmaster General to head up a new Bureau of Research, Development, and Engineering. Additionally, it provides for the establishment of several new positions in the Bureau, in order to give the new Assistant Postmaster General the highest caliber of personnel to assist him in carrying out these important responsibilities.

On a recent inspection trip of European postal facilities, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization, my colleagues and I witnessed, not an overnight transformation of mail handling operations, but certainly an object lesson in what strong research and development programs can produce.

We saw an array of time-tested, proven, modern machinery steadily and efficiently moving the mails in most of the foreign post offices we visited. We learned that in each country mail distribution and delivery problems differed due to such factors as geograpical locations and/or population density. We also were made aware of the fact that our own postal problems dwarfed those of any country we had an opportunity to survey.

While it may be contended that our present mail service is good, compared to the sheer magnitude of our system, there is no question but that we have simply got to be prepared for the future—for the unparalleled crisis now facing the mail service.

Top level technical guidance is vital. We must have expanded and dynamic research and development programs in order to develop new systems, to reevaluate old concepts, and to provide the new tools we will need to keep pace with the mail explosion. We must have the best guidance and the best direction in this field that our Nation can offer.

My bill, I am confident, will help accomplish these goals and lay the foundation for giving the American people the type of postal service they need and deserve.

Essentially, my bill will:

Create a sixth Assistant Postmaster General, in lieu of the present five, to spearhead the research, development, and engineering programs of the Department;

Establish two directorships, one heading Research and Development and one as Director for Construction Engineering;

Authorize the Postmaster General to establish and fix compensation for three additional scientific or professional positions in the Post Office Department, each such position being established to effectuate those research, development, and engineering functions of the Department which require the services of specifically qualified personnel.

I am hopeful that we can begin hearings on my bill in the very near future. I anticipate that these hearings will deal very extensively with all aspects of this important problem.

RECENT BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT EXEMPLIFIES THE CREAM OF AMERICAN MANHOOD

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I address the House with pardonable pride and with abundant respect for my able colleagues from the great States of Kentucky, North Carolina, and Utah.

Mr. Speaker, based upon personal observation I can report that three great universities, Duke, Kentucky, and Utah, sent here to the Metropolitan Washington area this past weekend some sterling examples of the cream of American manhood and outstanding demonstrators of the well-recognized skill of the great American game of basketball.

No one can detract from their magnificent performance—except to say that for every Goliath there is a David.

From the city of El Paso, Tex., my home, came the Texas Western College Miners. It is a small college of good quality, enrollment just over 7,000, a branch of the University of Texas, not given much chance to capture the national crown.

There is no act of mankind that so touches the human soul as the courage and perseverance of a determined group to win against seemingly impossible odds. There is no finer example of nobility in the human spirit than the will to win or fight despite the most discouraging circumstances, and despite the voiced expectations of almost all spectators and opponents.

When humans do so fight and win in fact or in moral victory, they are immortalized.

For example, close to the heart of every Texan is the gloried episode of the Alamo where but a few withstood beyond belief the overwhelming assault of the enemy, and died to a man to buy needed time and liberty for other fellow Texans.

Saturday, March 18, 1966, in the annals of El Paso, Tex., another great act was consummated by a team whose true potential was never fully realized even by their own admiring fans. In true championship style throughout the entire season, they toppled giants and deservedly won the national basketball championship in the NCAA playoff at the University of Maryland.

It was apparent from the beginning of the final game that it was no happenstance that they took the field in their final battle, and defeated such great teams as those of the University of Kentucky, till then rated No. 1 and the heavy favorite, and Utah.

The Texas Western College team, coached by such outstanding men as Head Coach Don Haskins, Trainer Ross Moore, and Mo Iba, brought 14 men to the NCAA playoffs: Harry Flournoy, Orsten Artis, Bobby Joe Hill, Willie Cager, Willie Worsley, Louis Baudoin, Togo Railey, Dick Myers, Jerry Armstrong, Nevil Shed, David Lattin, and David Palacio. They are indeed champions.

Let all Americans take this same renewed example, that good discipline, teamwork, humility, a will to win, blended with polished skill can surmount apparently awesome obstacles; that the word "can't" is a foolish refuge for any endeavor.

All Texans are immensely proud of this first Texas team to bring home the richest and most coveted trophy in college basketball, the NCAA basketball championship. This is one of El Paso's finest hours.

The Texas Western College basketball team is indeed No. 1.

SHORTAGE OF ADEQUATE RAILROAD BOXCARS

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly enjoy addressing this body on a matter which shows every indication of assuming the proportions of national shame, but I must. This great Nation of ours is the wealthiest land in the world. Estimates are that last year the United States produced about one-half of the world's wealth, yet in my region of the country there are plants being shut down.

The plants are not closing because they lack markets for their wares—they have backlogs of unfilled orders. They are not closing due to labor problems, or because they lack raw material. They are closing because they have no means to ship their products to eastern markets.

A number of Congressmen have been watching with alarm the decline in the number of boxcars available to shippers over the past decade. This downward trend has been especially vexing when coupled with the steady rise in the Nation's productivity, as evidenced by the growth in the gross national product. In recent years the shortage of boxcars was most severe during certain seasons, particularly during grain harvest and, in my part of the country, for several weeks before and after the California inventory tax date.

The gravity of the situation comes to the fore with the realization that the scarcity of boxcars is no longer seasonal, but year-round. And matters are going to get worse before they get better. This decline, which has been in excess of 1,500 boxcars per month, must not only be halted, but must be reversed.

There have been several reasons for the boxcar shortage. The cars loaded on originating lines are switched through to their destination, sometimes across roadbeds of several other lines. Once a car gets off the owner line, this owner line loses control of the car, which may be loaded and sent to new destinations several times before it gets back to home country.

Since the railroads are regulated industries, the Interstate Commerce Commission sets the per diem rates to be charged for using these off-line cars. The per diem being charged is less than the cost of car ownership and maintenance. It is quite apparent, then, that if a rail line can manage to handle its business using cars belonging to other railroads, it is encouraged to do so by the per diem system as enforced. Such a railroad would scrap its wornout boxcars and not order replacements.

I believe that we, as a nation, are at the end of the rope on surface transportation. When the arteries carrying our wealth harden, the affected portions of the Nation are going to suffer. We of the Northwest are already suffering.

I believe there are two basic parts to this problem. First, the gross national product is going up with a concurrent decrease in the number of boxcars available to shippers. Second, we do not have available current information on commodity shipping practices and on rail car location, movement, or availability predictions. I have been told that the rail car data they are using at this moment is February 1 data. I cannot see how, using February 1 figures, sound decisions can be made to regulate a kaleidoscopic industry.

I urge that the Federal Government undertake a comprehensive study of our surface commodity transportation systems, to include the possibility of using computer systems to keep track of current rail car locations and destinations. I also urge that we direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to change its policy on setting per diem rates to a system which would encourage, rather than discourage, the railroads to build and own enough rolling stock to meet its own needs, by passing promptly S. 1098.

Even if these measures are undertaken immediately, I believe the constricting shortage of adequate rail cars will not be ameliorated for over 2 years. For this reason, I suggest that we hesitate no longer.

LOUIS STULBERG SUCCEEDS DAVID DUBINSKY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday David Dubinsky, who has served for 34 years as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, dramatically announced his retirement. Under his leadership ILGWU has been an enlightened force not only in the trade union movement but in our society as a whole. I am happy to note that, as honorary president, he will remain very much a part of the ILGWU's activities.

On Friday, March 18, Louis Stulberg, secretary-treasurer of the ILGWU since 1959, was named to succeed David Dubinsky as president. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Stulberg and wish him great success. David Dubinsky said that he has all the qualifications that make a good union president—sincerity, devotion, responsibility to the membership and the community, a straightforward approach, and a "heart and soul." That is a ringing endorsement by one who knows. I want to call to the attention of my colleagues two articles, one by Damon Stetson, which appeared in the New York Times on March 19, 1966. The articles follow:

Stulberg Named Head of ILGWU—Elected by Union Board To Finish Dubinsky's Term

(By Damon Stetson)

Louis Stulberg, a 64-year-old former garment cutter, was elected yesterday to succeed David Dubinsky as president of the 447,000-member International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Mr. Stulberg, described by colleagues as a superb administrator and dedicated trade unionist, had served as secretary-treasurer of the union for the last 7 years.

He was elected unanimously by the ILGWU general executive board, meeting at the Hotel Americana. He will complete the term of Mr. Dubinsky, who stunned the union and the garment industry last Wednesday by announcing his resignation. The term expires in the spring of 1968.

A special committee of the board, including Mr. Stulberg, met four times with Mr. Dubinsky in an unsuccessful effort to get him to change his mind about leaving the office he had held since 1932. The committee was able, however, to persuade him to postpone the effective date of his resignation from April 12 to June 15, the anniversary of his taking office.

HONORARY EXECUTIVE

Mr. Dubinsky, who will be honorary president, remained very much in charge during the board meeting at which Mr. Stulberg was elected and formally installed.

When Mr. Stulberg first attempted to speak in praise of the outgoing president, Mr. Dubinsky put him off while he made a few more comments on his retirement.

Then Mr. Stulberg said, jokingly, "Have I got to assert myself?"

Mr. Dubinsky said, "I'm sorry," and gave him the floor.

"You'll always be their president," Mr. Stulberg declared.

He praised Mr. Dubinsky's battles against corruption and against Communist influence in the union in the 1920's and 1930's. He noted that the union had grown from a position of "no influence" and "no affluence" to its present membership of nearly half a million and with $571,352,141 in general and retirement funds, health and welfare reserves, severance money and other funds.

A LIVING LEGEND

In his tribute to Mr. Dubinsky, the president-elect thanked him for having given him his first job and said that the retiring leader had become a "living legend."

"Long ago," Mr. Stulberg said, "I hitched my star to his kite, or was it my kite to his star?"

Mr. Dubinsky talked at length of the qualities that made a good union president—sincerity, devotion, responsibility to the membership and the community, a straightforward approach and a "heart and soul."

"Louis Stulberg has all these qualifications," Mr. Dubinsky asserted.

The two men embraced after Mr. Dubinsky—or "D. D.," as he is called—had sworn in Mr. Stulberg.

Mrs. Stulberg, wearing a yellow knit dress, was at her husband's side during the ceremony. Mr. Stulberg brought a roar of laughter from the executive board members by recalling one of his "fights" with his former chief.

"Remember?" he asked.

"You snatched my secretary as your wife," Mr. Dubinsky shouted.

After the meeting the new president said it would be "almost impossible" to fill Mr. Dubinsky's shoes, but said he hoped to carry on where his predecessor left off.

The biggest job ahead, he said, will be to reexamine the union's position in organizing the unorganized in the garment industry.

"A lot of people are still unorganized," he said. "Some employers are looking for cheap labor or moving out of organized areas. It's our job to follow them."

Mr. Stulberg was elected secretary-treasurer of the union—a $26,000-a-year position—at the 1959 convention. Although he will not formally assume the presidency until Mr. Dubinsky's retirement in June, he will be carrying most of the load in the weeks ahead. The retiring president is planning an extended European trip this spring.

Modern Union Chief—Louis Stulberg

The newly elected president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union is an articulate, businesslike man with a great capacity for the painstaking work that is required to run the complex of a 447,000-member union. He has little inclination for table-thumping or bombast, but approaches union problems like a professional administrator who cares about people. Louis Stulberg, the graying, 64-year-old successor to David Dubinsky, is definitely low key—a man who carries on quietly, tactfully, and efficiently under pressure. In some ways he and Mr. Dubinsky are opposites. The former head of the union is outgoing, bubbling with enthusiasm, imaginative, explosive. Mr. Stulberg is retiring, meticulous, almost placid by comparison.

"Stulberg has had to work in a giant shadow," an ILGWU colleague said, "but that has never diminished his own."

It is perhaps a sign of the changing labor movement that the union, born in the sweatshops of an earlier era, turned from an ebullient, dynamic personality to a man schooled in the intricate business details of present-day union administration, the management and investment of huge funds and the complexities of modern labor contracts.

"But, above all," a vice president of the union said, "Louis is suited for the office because he has had a good teacher. He was groomed for the office by President Dubinsky."

The emphasis of Mr. Stulberg's technical and administrative talents does not imply, his colleagues hasten to add, that he lacks personal warmth. Those who have worked closely with him extol his sensitivity to the needs of those about him, his sympathetic understanding and his considerateness.

SEEKERS AFTER HELP

All day long people troop into his office with problems—and not all are union problems. Some may be purely personal ones—a boy who needs help getting a job, a woman who needs surgery but cannot get a hospital bed, a problem child, an elderly person with a pension problem.

"He always tries to help," one of Mr. Stulberg's friends said.

It has been a long road for the new president of the union—from a teenage cutter in Toronto, where he arrived 3 years after his birth on April 14, 1901, in Poland, to his new position which will pay him a salary of $31,200 a year.

He was blacklisted in Toronto for union activity and subsequently moved to Chicago, and later to Toledo, Ohio. But he managed during these early years to finish high school and 1 year at the University of Chicago.

During his Chicago years he was more successful financially on the semipro baseball diamond as a shortstop than at the cutting board. For a time, in fact, he considered a baseball career, but nowadays he rarely sees a ball game.

His principal exercise now is walking, which he credits with helping to keep his weight down. He weighs 168 pounds and stands 5 feet 9. He does not smoke, watches his diet carefully and is fond of golf, but rarely plays except when he is at Unity House, the union's resort in the Poconos.

"You want to know my handicap?" says with a grin. "It's my clubs."

Mr. Stulberg (pronounced STOLE-berg) started his union career as an organizer in Toledo and the Middle West. He came to New York in 1927, got a job as a cutter and joined Cutters Local No. 10.

DIFFERENCE OF OPINION

At the 1928 convention of the union in Boston, Mr. Stulberg was a delegate. Mr. Dubinsky was then the manager of local No. 10, and his candidate for president of the union was not Mr. Stulberg's candidate. Mr. Dubinsky tried unsuccessfully to swing Mr. Stulberg to his man, warning him that he was jeopardizing his future by supporting the wrong man.

"Until hair grows on the palm of my hand," Mr. Dubinsky said, "you won't get a job on the staff of the union."

By the following year, however, Mr. Dubinsky had become so impressed by Mr. Stulberg's ability and promise that he made him a business agent. When Mr. Dubinsky told him of his appointment Mr. Stulberg smiled and said, "Let me see the palm of your hand."

In 1945 Mr. Dubinsky brought Mr. Stulberg into the union's general office as assistant executive secretary. Two years later he became manager of Undergarment Workers Local No. 62. In 1956 he was appointed executive vice president of the international to relieve Mr. Dubinsky of some work pressures, and in 1959 he was elected secretary-treasurer.

STRENGTHS OF OUR DEMOCRACY

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address by Hon. JOE L. EVINS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD the attached address of my colleague, the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, of the Fourth District of Tennessee, before the Optima Club at the Mount Vernon Seminary and Junior College.

Mr. EVINS discusses the strengths of our democracy which have enabled the United States to be a bulwark of freedom for nearly 200 years. He outlined the historical development of the checks and balances of our federal system, the flexibility of the Constitution, the right of dissent, the search for consensus, a tradition of nonpartisan foreign policy, the independence of each branch of Government, and the strengths inherent in each branch.

He considers how these and other concepts within the federal system have allowed our Nation to meet the complex problems caused by a growing mobile society. He concludes by urging the students of Mount Vernon to fully utilize their education as they join hands with millions of fellow Americans in the fight to preserve and promote liberty and freedom.

I am pleased to commend Mr. EVINS' speech to the attention of my colleagues and to all Americans:

THE ENDURING STRENGTH OF OUR GOVERNMENT

(Remarks by Hon. JOE L. EVINS, Optima Club, Mount Vernon, Mar. 3, 1966)

Although you live in Washington and are a most knowledgeable and sophisticated group of young ladies, I know you are interested in many aspects of the work of Congress and our Government—and I want to talk with you for a few minutes about our Government—the enduring strength of our Government.

As I think of the interrelation of Government and education, and of the increasing need for scholars in Government, I am reminded of the story told by one of my colleagues after visiting and touring a great educational institution, the campus of one of our great western universities.

He watched construction work underway on half a dozen new buildings, including a new gymnasium and stadium. He inspected laboratories and modern study rooms. He saw the beautiful trees that lined the campus and was much impressed.

He turned to the dean and exclaimed: "My what a great institution; how many students do you have here?"

The dean answered slowly and thoughtfully: "I'd say about one in a hundred."

I know this situation doesn't apply to Mount Vernon as all members of Optima are not only students, but scholars.

I never enter a campus of a great school—such as Mount Vernon—that I do not think of a comparison that was once made in a chapel program of my own school, Vanderbilt University, which I attended.

The chancellor always compared a university or college to a great circus. He said that there are many sideshows in both.

The sideshows are represented by fraternities and clubs, football, dances, and extracurricular activities. Then the speaker stressed the point that there is also a main ring in the circus: The ring of academic attainment and the main tent of scholarship. He urged that we not be led astray into the sideshows but that each student stay in the main ring—the main show—the tent of scholarship.

I feel that is what you of Optima are doing—emphasizing scholarship—and I congratulate you for it.

Permit me, my friends, one more story about education.

According to an ancient fable, three horsemen were riding across a desert. As they crossed the bed of a river at about dark, a voice called out, "Halt." They obeyed. The voice then told the horsemen to "dismount, pick up a handful of pebbles, put them in your pockets and remount."

The voice then said, "As you have done as I commanded tomorrow you will be both glad and sorry."

Mystified the horsemen rode on into the night. When the sun rose they reached in their pockets and found that a miracle had happened. The pebbles had turned into diamonds, rubies, and precious stones.

They remembered the warning. They were both glad and sorry. Glad they had taken some. Sorry they had not taken more. This is the story of education.

So take as much education as you can—while you can—and you will be more glad than sorry.

I know that you have been taught in your classes in civics and history of our balanced system of government. Our forefathers provided for coequal branches of the government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial.

These three branches were designed to be coequal in a finely balanced system of checks and balances. Each was to serve as a check against the other. The States were to serve in this system of checks and balances against excesses of the Federal Government.

More than this: In our democracy, the people serve as an additional check against any excesses of the three branches of the Federal Government and the State governments.

We must, of course, realize that government is not a cold, impersonal force but is administered by a body of men and women of varied individuality and characteristics.

Changing conditions and changing officials have both influenced the development of our Government—as officials change and conditions change, the balance of power inevitably changes.

Fortunately, the Constitution was so written as to provide flexibility and adjustment within its broad principles. As the Nation has grown in population and become more complex, Government programs have broadened as answers to national problems.

The Congress—the legislative branch—enacts laws in response to the public will. The executive branch—the President and the departments—executes and carries out the laws; and the judicial branch interprets our laws. Some have thought that the Supreme Court is the last word—but remember, the people can overrule, amend, or bring about a revision of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Our Founding Fathers, in creating this extensive system of checks and balances, intended for our Government to be enduring and so they provided for a finely balanced system that has worked remarkably well. These are elemental principles which you have been taught in your classes but they are important and enduring principles.

Over the years, however, the three coequal branches have not always been equal or in balance. In the early history of our country the several States were considered to be most important. During the administration of Abraham Lincoln, the executive branch of the Federal Government became all powerful and dominant and strong.

During the period of the Civil War—the tragic period in our history when our Nation was divided—proclamations were issued which were very far reaching and which many felt were unconstitutional.

In this period, the executive branch was strong and dominant. With the administration of Andrew Johnson, Lincoln's successor, the Congress became all powerful and dominant.

During the post-Civil War period—the Reconstruction period—the legislative branch drew up charges of impeachment against the President. The Congress endeavored to convict the President of the United States and remove him from office. This was a period in which the legislative branch asserted itself strongly.

The administration of Woodrow Wilson represented an era in which the executive branch was considered very strong when many of the new freedom reforms were enacted into law.

The administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt were recognized as a period of strong Chief Executive power. President Roosevelt was elected for a third and a fourth term, the only President ever to be elected for more than two terms.

Later the Congress and the country passed legislation and adopted a constitutional amendment to limit the term of the President to two 4-year terms—an example of a check on the executive branch in an effort to maintain our constitutional balance.

During the administration of President Eisenhower, a great war hero and a great general, neither the Congress nor the Executive was considered dominant and the U.S. Supreme Court moved in to fill this vacuum.

During this period, the Supreme Court handed down far-reaching decisions—far-reaching in their social implications—including the overruling of the longstanding "separate but equal" doctrine in the matter of public school education, thus bringing about integration of the public schools of the Nation. The Court also ruled that dependents of servicemen and former servicemen could not be tried by court-martial.

And thus, my friends, one or the other of the three so-called coequal branches of the Federal Government has, in fact, been stronger or more dominant in various periods of our Nation's history.

The present administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson is again being acclaimed a period of strong Executive power. The Congress, during the last session and during the current session, has asserted and is asserting itself in many fields of legislation. Much legislation recommended by the President has been passed, A number of legislative items recommended by the President have been defeated. This 89th Congress contrary to some statements in the press, is not and has not been a "rubberstamp" Congress. While there have been many legislative accomplishments and new enactments, there have been many notable examples in which the Congress has failed to pass legislation recommended by the President.

Some of these examples of congressional independence are:

Proposed abolition of the Reserve Corps and the merger of the National Guard—not enacted;

Pay raise legislation for veterans and servicemen—both increased beyond what the President recommended;

Appropriation cuts made in the President's budget proposals; and

The proposal to delete section 14(b) from the Labor-Management Act; was defeated.

So, the Congress as a coequal branch has asserted itself—has imposed its own judgments and imprints on current legislation.

Today, we hear much about "consensus" and "consensus government." A consensus, of course, is a general agreement among the three branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. Today, we do have a large degree of "consensus" in our Government. To me this is one of the most significant aspects of our time. Today all three branches of our Government agree philosophically and in the main on general objectives. All are moving in the same general direction. The Congress in the main is progressive. The executive is liberal and progressive, and the Supreme Court is handing down liberal decisions. All three branches seem to be moving in the same general mainstream of progressive thought and action.

This general agreement is indeed a rare occurrence in the history of our Federal Government. I must point out in this context that this consensus can be attributed in great measure to President Johnson who strives to arrive at agreement and consensus.

In addition to guiding the Nation through an era of consensus government, the President has—to a remarkable degree, it seems to me—achieved much agreement between the various elements of our society.

The President tries to make it clear to business, to labor, to industry, to all elements of our democracy that general progress means progress for each group.

This is difficult. This is hard. This is an almost impossible achievement, but the President has done remarkably well.

In carrying out its obligations and responsibilities, the Congress basically is concerned with three areas of activity—legislation, investigation, and appropriation.

By legislating, we make our laws. Through investigating we get the facts and information upon which our laws can be intelligently enacted. In appropriating, we provide the funds to support and maintain our Military Establishment—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—and all the Government agencies and departments, their services and operations.

The real work of the Congress is done in the committees of the House and the Senate. I have been fortunate in my committee assignments.

I serve as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business—an appointment made by the Speaker. The function of this committee is to investigate and report to the Congress the problems confronting American small business and our free enterprise system.

I have also served as a member of the 50-man Committee on Appropriations. Legislation often is of no value unless funded by appropriations.

I recently was designated as chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations. This subcommittee has under its jurisdiction some 25 boards, bureaus, and commissions, and independent agencies of the Government under Cabinet level.

We are concerned with the operations of these important agencies—all of which affect the lives in one way or another of most of our citizens. Included among these agencies are:

The Federal Communications Commission—concerned with radio and television and the granting of franchise in the communications field;

The Interstate Commerce Commission—concerned with the regulation of railroads, truck, and buslines—the surface transportation of the Nation;

The Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board—concerned with air transportation;

The Veterans' Administration—concerned with our extensive veterans' benefits programs;

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration—concerned with the exciting new field of science and space exploration; and a number of other agencies.

A most important area of congressional study and action is foreign policy. Currently, as you know, the Congress is concerned with debating our Nation's foreign policy—the issues of war in Vietnam.

During times of war and emergency—during periods of great national emergency—there is always a tendency to unify and solidify—to sacrifice at whatever the cost.

We have our debates and differences on domestic matters but in time of crisis national unity usually emerges and we cease our differences at the water's edge.

As Stephen Decatur said: "Our country, may she always be in the right—but our country, right or wrong."

One of the strengths of our Nation is its recognition of the right of people to dissent—to disagree. Currently we are seeing the doctrine of dissent amply demonstrated in the Vietnam debate. Many feel, however, that this dissent misleads our enemies and encourages them to hold on, hoping dissention will weaken our determination. If we can be united at this time, the Nation's purpose will become crystal clear to our enemies, and to all the world.

Actually, I believe that the great majority of our people support the President's Vietnam policy. But the minority is vocal and makes headlines.

The current situation—of dissent and disunity—is unusual—as we have generally had unity in matters of foreign policy.

I recently had the privilege of hearing Vice President HUMPHREY's report on Vietnam and his trip to the Far East. The Vice President at the White House briefing to Members of Congress pointed up a strange paradox. The morale of our troops in Vietnam is high, he said, but the troops are concerned over the morale of the people at home. They want to know what is the matter with the dissenters at home.

VIETNAM CRISIS

"Why are we in Vietnam?" we are often asked. A quick answer is to halt the onrush and spread of communism and that we are fighting in Vietnam to stop the spread of communism. When a fire and a conflagration is spreading, we want to stop it. We are helping freedom-loving people to preserve their freedom and liberty. The Marshall and Truman plans saved European nations and Greece and Turkey from communism. The policy we are pursuing today is the same that has been pursued in similar instances—in Greece and Turkey, in Korea and elsewhere.

In 1945 President Truman said: "We shall refuse to recognize any government imposed on any nation by force of a foreign power." This is the policy under which the United States helped to overcome the blockade in Berlin in 1948. It is the same policy and basis of which the United States resisted Communist aggression in Korea. It is the same policy reiterated by President Kennedy in his memorable inaugural address, in these dramatic words:

"Let every nation know that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and success of liberty."

In applying this philosophy to southeast Asia, the Congress last year passed a resolution—504 to 2—in both Houses of Congress. The resolution read, in part:

"The United States is therefore prepared as the President determines to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Our policy, in short, is to resist aggression against free nations not only to preserve freedom for others, but to safeguard our own safety.

Congress has again reaffirmed this policy just yesterday by an almost unanimous vote in both Houses.

I am frequently asked: "How do you go about making up your mind on these and other important issues? How do you decide?"

This is a matter of exercise of judgment—keeping in mind always the best interests of the United States—what is best for our people and our country. It is not always difficult with respect to matters of foreign policy and foreign affairs. As I have said, on foreign affairs, the Congress is most generally united.

On domestic legislation, there are many influences, many factors that go into the making of decisions as bills are debated. These include the influence and activities of constituents, committees, lobbies, the leadership and parties, and a Member's own experience and philosophy. And thus we get the facts and make our decisions.

Down through the generations that have passed since the Constitution was written, the framework of our Government has withstood the impact of personality and crisis.

There have been changes, but we have had continuity as the people have willed it. As one of our great Chief Justices, John Marshall, once said:

> "Our Government is the Government of all the people; its powers are delegated to all; it represents all; it acts for all."

This is the secret and the strength of our Nation and our Government—a strength that has grown stronger through the years in the crucible of trial at home and abroad.

As young citizens, I hope you will continue your education and grow up to participate in government as good citizens—preserving, promoting, and perpetuating our liberty and freedom and our cherished American way of life.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address myself to the great honor which has been bestowed upon our distinguished leader, Speaker JOHN WILLIAM McCORMACK.

As it is now well known, in response to a resolution adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Governor of that State issued a proclamation setting apart March 16, 1966, as John W. McCormack Day in honor of our beloved Speaker.

Coming from a State which has furnished this Nation with a host of distinguished sons and daughters in all walks of life, Speaker McCORMACK has added still great luster to the highest ideals and traditions of his own State of Massachusetts and of this country. In truth, our Speaker belongs not only to his own State, but also to the United States of America. There is no question among the knowledgeable that JOHN W. McCORMACK will go down in history as one of the most honored men of this century. The greatness of this man is evidenced in his own assertion that if given a chance he would rather be known as a good man than a great man.

Hawaii, which is linked by history to Massachusetts, is deeply grateful to this native son of one of the Original Thirteen Colonies for his stand on statehood for the distant islands to which many of his forebears had journeyed. As the then majority leader of this great body, Speaker McCORMACK played a leading role in the admission of Hawaii to the Union. To him Americanism transcended "noncontiguity" and other arguments raised by opponents of statehood for Hawaii.

Speaker McCORMACK's interest in Hawaii has extended beyond his leadership to make it a State, for he has been extremely helpful in guiding and assisting Hawaii's Representatives in Congress toward greater effectiveness. Personally, I know I shall never be able to repay him fully for the kindnesses and courtesies he has extended me. Although weighted by his heavy responsibilities, he is one man who never says he is too busy to lend a helping hand. He is undoubtedly the most beloved man on Capitol Hill.

I am indeed privileged, as a Representative from a State whose admission he strongly advocated, to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our illustrious Speaker, upon whom the State of Massachusetts has bestowed this richly deserved honor, for here is a man whose greatness is rendered unchallengeable by his goodness.

EULOGY TO THE LATE HONORABLE HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the State of Hawaii joins the Members of Congress and the people of Louisiana in mourning the passing of an outstanding statesman and great American, Henry Dominick Larcade, Jr.

Mr. Larcade will always be remembered with respect and affection by the people of Hawaii. He was in every sense of the term a true champion of statehood for the islands. He broke the ice, so to speak, to win southern support for Hawaii's long struggle to be admitted into the Union.

I shall never forget my first confrontation with this exceedingly able legislator. Mr. Larcade had arrived in Honolulu on Sunday, January 6, 1946, with members of his subcommittee of the House Committee on Territories to hold hearings on statehood for Hawaii. Hearings, which commenced the following day, were held every day of the week, including Saturdays and Sundays, until the subcommittee left on January 19, 1946, to return to Washington. I was among those who were privileged to testify before Mr. Larcade's subcommittee. My recollection is that Chairman Larcade presided over the hearings in a manner which bespoke his courtly southern background and his years of public service.

The report of the Larcade subcommittee included extensive findings and conclusions and ended with the terse but highly significant recommendation:

> It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that since the days that these legislative Chambers were graced by Mr. Larcade's presence, Hawaii has always enjoyed the support of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

To this beloved son of Louisiana, the people of Hawaii and of this Nation are deeply indebted. But I, as an individual, shall always cherish the memory of the chairman of the congressional subcommittee who gave an attentive ear to my pleas for statehood for Hawaii.

I extend to the members of former Congressman Larcade's family my deepest sympathy in this period of sadness.

THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY (SOME OF THE EVIDENT DISADVANTAGES IN ITS CLOSING)—V

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week I presented a series of statements in opposition to the proposed closing of the Springfield Armory. Today, I am pointing out some of the evident disadvantages of this proposed closing as these disadvantages were stated by an official Army study of the problems involved. I have tried to be entirely objective in this statement as well as in the others I have made on this subject.

Comparing these disadvantages with the so-called advantages as developed by this Army study, it will be readily seen that the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages.

In February 1964 the Army Weapons Command was directed to conduct a study to evaluate alternative methods for performing the missions of the Springfield Armory in the event the armory was closed. The problem as assigned to this study group was:

> (a) To determine reassignment of missions from Springfield Armory to other elements of the Army Weapons Command or the Army Materiel Command.
>
> (b) To develop a time phased plan to close out Springfield Armory and determine its disposition.

The guidance assumptions given this study group were:

> (a) Springfield Armory will be closed.
>
> (b) There is a continuing Department of Army requirement to perform the missions currently assigned to Springfield Armory.
>
> (c) The mass production capabilities of Springfield Armory cannot be justified under current policy guidance.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident from the guidelines given to this study group that the decision to close Springfield was made before the evidence was in. This study group dutifully followed instructions and sought ways to justify the decision previously made by higher authority to close Springfield. However, the group hedged somewhat on the position which they took for reasons which will become obvious as you follow my statement today. To pass the problem back to higher authority the group proposed alternate plans for cutting back on work at the armory. The first plan proposed was to eliminate all mass production capability at the armory and transfer the remaining research, development, and engineering mission of the armory to the Rock Island Arsenal. The second plan was to eliminate all mass production from the armory but to retain the remaining research, development, and engineering at the armory much as they are at present. Higher authority subsequently decreed that the first plan would be followed.

Both plans were formulated to comply with the stated Army policy that mass production be accomplished insofar as possible by contract with commercial sources. Nevertheless, despite this Army policy, the Army study group found that some of the present production work at

Springfield could not be economically placed on contract. We at Springfield were well aware of this and we also know that this situation will continue into the future.

The Army Weapons Command study group certainly did not find that all of the evidence was in support of the proposed transfer of these vital R. & D. functions to Rock Island. On the contrary, a look at the study group's statement of advantages and disadvantages to this plan will readily show that there had to be other considerations involved in this proposed move. Accordingly, the study group came up with an estimated annual cost saving under the plan as the principal justification for the move. Aside from the estimated cost saving, the group cited the principal advantages to be realized by this move to Rock Island as:

1. Cost of administering the mission would be reduced. (This is a part of the cost reduction estimate.)

2. Missions would be in close proximity to NICP (National Inventory Control Point) and NMP (National Maintenance Point) at Headquarters Army Weapons Command.

3. Expansion capability of the Rock Island installation is good.

4. Some skills in small arms development are already on the Rock Island rolls.

These are not very significant advantages for supporting such a far-reaching proposal. Now contrast these so-called advantages with the following disadvantages of this move from Springfield to Rock Island as stated by this same Army study group:

1. An estimated 75 percent of the skilled R&D personnel currently employed at Springfield would be lost through failure to transfer with their functions. This would hamper mission accomplishment for an undetermined period of time which could well exceed 3 years.

2. The distance of Rock Island Arsenal from the majority of commercial small arms producers (New England area) presents some rather considerable problems in monitoring commercial production, particularly for pilot lot runs where close coordination between the producer and government engineering personnel is always important and sometimes critical.

3. The local labor market in the Rock Island, Illinois area is not particularly good for recruiting professional personnel of any type and such personnel with small arms experience is even more limited.

4. Providing adequate R&E test facilities comparable to those available to Springfield would be quite expensive and time consuming. Particularly, the problem of locating outdoor test facilities as free from firing restrictions as those at Camp Edwards is a problem which has not yet been completely solved, although it appears that facilities at Savanna Army Depot, 70 miles north of Rock Island Arsenal, are adequate to most requirements and that other facilities can be arranged for the remainder.

Mr. Speaker, from a comparison of the statements of advantages and disadvantages by this official Army study group, it is evident on its face that the disadvantages of closing Springfield and moving to Rock Island far exceed any advantages for such a move. Accordingly, the study group, in order to follow the guidelines given it, that Springfield would be closed, had to develop a justification for this position. The only basis which the group could come up with was an estimate of possible cost reduction to result from the move. Ignoring or understating many cost elements involving closing Springfield, such as early retirement for many discharged employees and resettlement costs for others—as examples—the study group came up with an estimated annual saving as a result of the closing of $4,629,000. Later, this estimate was increased by about $1 million, but this increase was in turn offset in large part by the admission of overlooked savings which would result from the plan to keep the same functions—proposed for transfer to Rock Island—at Springfield. A very competent study group, organized locally by the Springfield people, refuted these cost savings figures by developing their own well-supported estimates of the costs. These estimates showed that instead of savings over a period of 20 years, the move from Springfield would actually cost an average of $500,000 a year. The Department of Defense sponsored study by the private firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton also found "that the proposed move of nonmanufacturing functions is distinctly marginal from a saving-cost standpoint."

The conclusions and recommendations of this Weapons Command study group were obviously hedged so as to pass the horrendous aspects of the final decision on to higher authority. These conclusions were summarized in the report as follows:

(a) In order to achieve the greatest possible savings Springfield Armory, in its entirety, would be declared excess to the Army's needs, and mass production requirements for small arms would be filled through contract with private industry. All other mission functions would be assigned to the Rock Island Arsenal. This plan would be relatively costly but it is anticipated that resultant operating savings would amortize the onetime expense in less than 2 years after full implementation. There are several disadvantages involved in such a plan, the most serious of which is the probable temporary reduction of in-house research and engineering capability effort. It may be assumed, however, that the longrun economics involved will ultimately offset this handicap.

What they are saying is that the risks are great but in order to make a showing in the cost reduction program we are willing to take such risks. Everyone else that has reviewed this proposal—even the private firm hired by the Department—has come up with no savings for the move, so, in view of the risks involved, what is the point in going ahead with the planned closure. Where does this leave the current war effort and the future security of the Nation? Now let me give you the remainder of this summary of conclusions and recommendations:

(b) It is recognized that political consideration, localized economic impact and/or the temporary reduction of mission effectiveness may militate against the complete closure of Springfield Armory. In that event the current manufacturing capability of the armory could be eliminated, Federal Square and the watershops be declared excess of Army requirements and the remaining mission activities consolidated in Armory Square and the railhead. This arrangement would cost less than half as much to implement, initially, as would the complete closeout of the armory but would result in only about 70 percent of the continuing operating economics. The primary attraction of this approach from a missions standpoint is that the R & E effort would not be impaired, even temporarily, as a result of its adoption.

The study group went on to recommend that:

(a) Springfield Armory be declared excess to the Army's needs and the missions transferred to Rock Island Arsenal; or, if this is not deemed desirable, that

(b) The manufacturing area of Springfield Armory be declared excess to the Army's needs and the missions consolidated in the remaining portions of the armory.

It is shocking to me to think that there would still be any question about the inadvisability of the complete closure of Springfield. This is especially true since any and all claims for cost savings, which was the only real justification for the closure, have been completely discounted and eliminated.

This Nation is facing a crises period of great danger. These are critical years when the military cannot afford a loss or delay in research and development work on the arms upon which our individual fighting men depend for their lives. We are engaged in a big build-up for the war in Vietnam and threatened with a massive ground war by Communist China. We are voting billions of additional funds to provide the weapons our fighting men are currently using. These same fighting men are crying for new weapons and new concepts to fight the unconventional type of war in which we are engaged. Are we willing to lose 3 years or more at this critical time in research and development on such weapons in order to force the closing of Springfield?

Mr. Speaker, we of the Massachusetts congressional delegation have protested and protested this action. We have about exhausted ourselves, our finances, and our resources in the endeavor to reverse this decision. We believe that now it is time the committees of jurisdiction become interested in this case, as it affects our national security. Mr. Speaker, this is not just another base closing, it is a very serious development involving the future security of the Nation.

THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased and proud to join with my good friend and distinguished colleague, the Honorable ED BOLAND of the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts, in recent days to try to lay certain facts before the Members of this body with respect to the U.S. Armory at Springfield, Mass.

Our aim has been to show the indispensable nature of the armory's current capacity and output, as well as to trace the history and development of the unique skills that underlie the armory's present level of performance and efficiency.

It is my firm conviction, and I am sure I speak for my colleague as well, that the Springfield Armory occupies a unique and invaluable spot in the defense readiness posture of this Nation. Its role in this regard is perhaps equaled, in one sense, only by its role in the social and economic complex of western Massachusetts and of the entire New England region.

To slam the door on nearly 200 years of experience and service to the Nation by the employees of the Springfield Armory, by the engineers, the artisans, and the craftsmen, will deal a critical and unfair blow to our national security and to the immediate welfare of the families who have made the armory their life's work.

The Defense Department plans to do just that, however. To slam the door in the faces of these people, to rip out an institution that has been a way of life to New England craftsmen and engineers for generations. It is being done in the name of economy, but it is the kind of economy a man might work on his own bloodstream by cutting off his right arm.

It is false economy in the extreme. And one wonders at the wisdom behind the stubborn insistence of the Defense Department in clinging to its original plan to close the armory in spite of the mountains of evidence against such a course which, incidentally, Defense officials have never even tried to dispute.

I have been pleased to insert several articles from the pages of the Gun Report magazine in the Record in recent days which trace the history of the armory since its founding more than 170 years ago. These articles clearly underscore the vital contribution made by the armory both to the security and military strength and to the economic and social vitality of the Greater Springfield community.

In the fifth and last of this series entitled "The History of the Springfield Armory," by Mr. Christopher L. Dvareck, information officer for the armory, we are brought from the dark days before World War II, up to the present time.

This last, and in many ways most significant installment deals with the almost incredible production record of 4 million Garand M–1 rifles compiled during World War II—more than all the previous shoulder weapons produced at the armory from 1794 to 1940. The article describes the impressive employment record of women during the national emergency, of the advanced labor and training innovations, and of the technical skills and experience that are already producing results in another new kind of warfare by developing special armaments for helicopters and slow-speed conventional ground-support aircraft.

Under unanimous-consent procedures, I now insert at this point the fifth and last in this series of articles and respectfully commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

History of the Springfield Armory—Part V

(By Christopher L. Dvarecka)

Although the atomic bomb brought about the cessation of hostilities in World War II with unmistakable finality, the war itself was fought and won on the beaches of Pacific islands and plains of Europe by the "queen of battles"—the infantryman. He fought and made his contributions to victory with a Springfield Armory product—the Garand rifle. Once armed with this fine weapon the American fightingman quickly proved his worth in many diffuse combat zones.

Supplying our millions of troops with the new Garand rifle, however, is another story that can only be told by visiting the Springfield Armory in those hectic war years. It was here that the rifle was developed and it was here that more than 4 million Garands poured off the assembly lines between 1940 and the end of the war. This enormous total of rifles produced here proved more than the aggregate total of all shoulder arms manufactured here from 1794 to 1940.

The cloud of criticism which initially arose from rival gun designers and other groups over the adoption of the Garand rifle, brought about temporary difficulties in Congress over an appropriation of $2 million in 1941 for quantity production. It was not until the Battle of Bataan in 1942 that the Garand rifle was tested in actual combat. It performed so well that all criticism was muffled. Gen. Douglas MacArthur went out of his way to praise the weapon's outstanding performance. His comments were later to be echoed by another illustrious leader, Gen. George Patton, who said, "I consider the M–1 the greatest weapon ever made."

Once mass production got underway, rifles came off the assembly lines by the thousands. As previously mentioned, the total output of all shoulder arms at the armory up to 1937 was 3,821,743 pieces. Early in 1944, Garand rifle No. 2 million was manufactured here. By July 1944, rifle No. 3 million was made. By the war's end more than 4 million Garand rifles had been made here and placed in the hands of American fighting men.

This excellent production record saw the Springfield Armory awarded the Army and Navy "E" citation several times—the first citation coming in September 1942. In commenting on armory production, Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson said, "The high and practical patriotism of the men and women employees of the Springfield Armory is inspiring and heartening."

The key to this amazing production record was people. Thousands of people from all walks of life, men and women who had never before seen the inside of a factory, tell the story of success pounded out on forges at the water shops and machined at the hill shops.

From a work force of approximately today's size—2,850 people in June 1940—the number of employees rose to 6,000 in May 1941. Three months before Pearl Harbor the work force stood at 7,500 persons. In April 1942, the total went over 10,000 and, in March 1943, total employment hit an all-time peak of 13,762 persons. This total is the largest number of jobs ever provided in any plant in the history of the city.

One of the most noticeable transformations occurring at the armory was the huge influx of women warworkers into the shops. First employed here in limited numbers in World War I, they soon comprised nearly 70 percent of the work force in World War II.

On November 22, 1941, 15 days prior to Pearl Harbor, the armory hired its first women war workers in over two decades. On that day, 14 women were hired for jobs ordinarily handled by men. The group included a forewoman, six drilling machine operators, four milling machine operators, and three punch press operators. Before reporting here for work, the women underwent courses at the local trade high school.

All told, 8,667 women were hired between Pearl Harbor and June 1943—more than 7,000 of which worked in shop production areas. They performed with praiseworthy efficiency. As a group they provided only one problem—a high turnover rate readily attributed to domestic problems and fatigue.

Some of the women hired had worked at the armory in World War I. Their reaction to the changes at the armory in the quarter-century since they left is interesting. They all agreed that working conditions were improved over those of 1918. Lighting facilities, ventilation, equipment, and above all, the attitude of men toward women shopworkers, all had changed for the better.

Women from every stratum of society did their bit. A woman college professor worked as a lathe operator, a Gold Star Mother was employed as a woodworker, a well-known opera singer worked as a short-order cook in the cafeteria, and a Springfield woman, the mother of 18 children, operated a machine. The first girls to be hired as gage checkers in the long history of the armory, nine young college girls, were employed here in this period. In fact, women handled all types of jobs except those in the higher skilled trades and those of a heavy nature.

During these war years the armory scene was one of feverish activity, and many changes in shop and offices took place. New buildings went up on the hill. Building 104 and 111 were erected to house the milling shop, metallurgical and chemical laboratories, a gage lab, and machine and stocking shops. An addition to the research and development facility was also constructed. In 1941 work was begun on a field service building (now building 20). However, on January 30, 1942, with the building two-thirds completed, a disastrous fire broke out, resulting in $150,000 damage to the structure. Firemen battled the spectacular blaze for 2 hours before it was brought under control. Every available piece of equipment in the city was pressed into service. The Springfield civil defense firefighting unit also fought the blaze. The damaging fire was attributed to the accidental upsetting of a lighted salamander by a workman. The salamander ignited a canvas tarpaulin and the structure was a blazing inferno in a matter of minutes. The building was restored by May 1942, however.

Other innovations during these years included the establishment of an apprentice school in 1939. The first class was graduated in 1943. In 1940 a Springfield Armory Credit Union was formed. The creation of a new industrial relations office was announced in 1941. It was under the direction of this department that a plant magazine, the Armory News, was first published in March 1941. A Springfield Armory Athletic Association was organized and placed armory teams in competition in many area sports. In May 1942, the Springfield Armory cafeteria opened its doors and operated around the clock as shop machinery hummed on a three-shift basis.

The hectic night-and-day pace brought about the necessity of many leasure-time activities. The Springfield Armory employees' fund sponsored many mammoth outings—picnics at Riverside attended by thousands, dances, dinners and the like. Special entertainments were provided for homefront morale—name bands such as Benny Goodman and others played at armory gatherings. To describe the armory work scene as a boomtown within a community would be an accurate summation.

By July 1944, the job was nearly done. Although the war lasted another year, production began to slow down and some cuts were made in the work force. Between January and October 1944, employment dropped from 12,500 to 9,300. The 3 to 11 p.m. shift was discontinued. However, much still remained to be done and the overall work force remained at relatively high figures into 1945.

Springfield Armory workers were the recipients of much praise for their yeomanlike performance and so was the man responsible for the gun that again brought the armory into the national limelight. On March 28, 1944, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, on behalf of the U.S. Government, presented the first civilian Medal of Honor to John Garand for "exceptionally meritorious service" to his country. This Medal of Honor for civilians is the equivalent of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded in rare and exceptional cases to soldiers, sailors, and airmen. Many other awards were heaped upon the deserving shoulders of the armory inventor.

In 1945 Mr. Garand became the first employee at the armory to be granted a special increase in pay and promotion in standing under authority granted by a special act of Congress. In tribute to Mr. Garand, the New York Herald Tribune once said: "With great success finally in his hands, he turned the M-1 rifle over, for no great pecuniary reward, to the people of the United States; stuck to his lathe and sticks to it with the superior shrewdness of the man who knows that an opportunity to give to the world out of his unusual gifts is much rarer than the most tempting opportunities to make a lot of money."

The inventiveness of John Garand and the patriotic devotion to duty of thousands of armory employees helped to bring the world's greatest global conflict to a successful conclusion. The defeat of the Nazi war machine in May 1945, and the capitulation a few months later of the Japanese ended another stirring chapter in the already well-crowded history of the Springfield Armory.

The end of World War II hostilities brought about far-reaching changes in the Springfield Armory employment and work picture. There was an abrupt cancellation of a large number of production orders with a resultant drastic reduction in the armory work force.

A few months prior to V–J Day, as the result of the successful conclusion of the European conflict, the armory was faced with the problem of converting from large-scale production of the M–1 rifle to the production of various small arms parts and accessories. The downfall of the Japanese war machine brought about further changes in plant operations. It was not long after V–J Day that most of the work in the production shops consisted of inventory of components, cleaning the shops, and preparing them for standby.

Thus, with the end of World War II, the mission of the armory changed from that of mass production to concentration on remanufacture and preparation for storage of many types of small arms returning from the various combat theaters. New manufacturing was limited to spare parts, or parts required for modification of weapons.

With this sharp drop in actual production, a drastic cutback in the work force took place. From a high of nearly 14,000 employees during the peak war year of 1944, some 5,000 war service appointees were released immediately after V–E Day. This brought the work force to about 9,000 persons. By V–J Day this total was cut in half. A further reduction in 1945 of some 3,300 workers brought employment down to 1,700 and, of this number, some 250 were on furlough status. It was about this time that the plant went back to a straight 40-hour week.

The greatest cutback was effected in the manufacturing departments which had 3,400 active employees on a three-shift basis as of June 30, 1945, and had dropped from this figure to a low of 745 on one shift by December 1. It was during this period of drastic change over that many veterans returned to armory employment. In fact, during the early part of 1946, hiring was mostly restricted to returning veterans. However, production orders increased in April, necessitating the hiring of several hundred additional employees. Employment of production workers steadily increased from about 650 in January to 1,450 by the end of June. Total employment by June 1946 stood at 2,586.

The next 3 years—1947, 1948, and 1949—saw a gradual increase in the work force. In March 1948, world conditions led to an announcement at the armory of plans for an accelerated defense program. The need to step up production of the M–3 machinegun for jet planes led to the hiring of additional shop help. Canning operations on the M–1 rifle, underway since the end of the war, were completed during this period and the switch to full-time M–3 machinegun production got underway.

The American foreign policy of containment of aggressive forces throughout the world brought increased demands for weapons and, by July 1951, the armory work force was over the 6,000 mark. Women workers again came onto the local industrial scene and by mid-1951 numbered over 2,000. The Korean police action by United Nations' forces brought armory employment to its peak in this era when it rose over 7,700 in the middle of 1952.

The expansion of the armory's research and development mission saw the construction of a large testing facility in East Springfield in 1953. In addition to the new building (building 300), storage buildings were also erected in the new Page Boulevard location.

Following the cessation of fighting in Korea, the work force again began to decline as war production slackened. The gradual reduction in numbers was in contrast to the abrupt reductions in force following World War II. The work force eventually reached 2,500 employees by 1956—a point where it has remained fairly constant the present year.

In recent years, armory gun technicians and scientists have made many invaluable contributions to the field of air and surface armament.

These include the M–14 rifle which has already proved its ability to replace the M–1 rifle, the BAR, the carbine and the M–3 submachinegun; the M–60 machinegun which has replaced three hitherto workhorse machineguns—the heavy water-cooled, the light air-cooled and the M–1919A6 machineguns.

Also a new development has been the M–9 grenade launcher designed to assist troops to ferret those blind pockets which previously had been either too far away for a hand-thrown grenade or too close to safely allow for mortar support.

The Springfield Armory's role has become significantly more important as the 1960's have progressed.

Today, not only individual weapons are designed, pilot-lined and proofed, the field has expanded to research and development, engineering, and pilot-line fabrication for vehicular weapons such as the M–85 tank machinegun for the M–60 tank; and weapons systems for armored vehicles as well.

The third, and most important mission responsibility challenge to the ingenuity of Springfield Armory technicians and scientists, is the field of aircraft armament. Hot wars throughout the world require defensive armament for slow flying aircraft. This is provided by the Springfield Armory in a host of ideas and developments which have placed the Springfield Armory into the future with seven-league boots.

Truly an idea factory for want of a better expression, this dean of all U.S. arsenals continues to meet the challenge of the future with the same spirited animation which the first Springfield Armory employees exhibited in 1777.

The Springfield Armory, technical and scientific center for American military weapons ranging from pistols, rifles, and machineguns to aircraft armament, this year observes its 170th anniversary.

Its historic role resulted in its designation on April 2, 1962, as a national registered historic landmark.

The day of the continent supplied by armament from the arsenal at Springfield might be a matter of history. History is currnetly being made by the modern Springfield Armory in its support of the armament needs required by the soldier on the ground, the marine on the high seas, and the airman in the "high blue yonder."

This same Springfield Armory which met the needs of the past, overcame the challenges of the times and sought new fields to conquer, continues its traditionally critical role of constantly being ready with the blueprints for utilizing the Nation's might in the event of an emergency.

It is perhaps due to this reason—the melding of the past standards of accomplishments with the newer challenges of tomorrow—that the military services continue to look to the Springfield Armory for their needs in weapons and weapons systems.

The Springfield Armory has never let them down.

POVERTY PROGRAM IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY, CALIF.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday and Thursday, I took special orders to tell of the developments in the war on poverty in my own congressional district, particularly in Santa Clara County.

This has been the amazing story of subversion of a high and moral cause, to serve the purposes of a leftwing extremist minority. These purposes are to control the disbursal of millions of dollars in Federal taxpayers' money and to gain the political power which goes with such control.

As I have repeatedly stated, the great majority of persons active in the local war on poverty program are sincerely and honestly motivated, but they are lacking in political experience and therefore cannot detect the subtleties of this conspiracy.

Last week, I placed in the Record two of a series of four articles by the distinguished political reporter for the San Jose Mercury and the San Jose News, Mr. Harry Farrell.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, under the permission which has been granted me to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert the third in this particular series of articles into the Record. It appeared in the San Jose Mercury under date of Friday, March 18:

Left, Right Vie

(By Harry Farrell)

There has been a lot of talk (many well-meaning people think too much talk) about the role of the Mexican-American community in the local war on poverty and the downfall of Economic Opportunity Commission Director Arthur Potts.

Part of what has been said is true in the fullest sense.

Part of it, while true, does not tell the whole truth.

Part of it is not true at all.

From all evidence available, it appears accurate enough that up to a point, most of the vocal groups in the Mexican-American community were united in the feeling that Potts was giving them short shrift.

It is also correct that the anti-Potts feeling was not restricted to Mexican-Americans alone, but was shared by many persons in the unions, the religious community, and other groups.

It is not true, however, that Potts shut Mexican-Americans out of his program or restricted them to token representation. Early last November, when the central EOC staff consisted of 47 full-timers, 9 of them (or almost one-fifth) had Spanish surnames. The monthly salaries of these nine ranged from $378 to $1,080; six made over $600 a month; four made over $800.

It is not true, either, than any small group can claim to speak for the whole Mexican-American community here on any issue.

Anyone who has watched the scene in Santa Clara County for any length of time knows that local Mexican-American politics shares some of the volatile aspects of Mexican politics south of the border. Today's allies are tomorrow's foes. Factions come and go. Splinter groups proliferate. Outsiders of both major political parties and many other Anglo factions have tried, from time to time, to use the Mexican-Americans for their own purposes.

In 1964, a bitter power struggle developed within the Mexican-American Political Association here, during the 25th Assembly District Democratic primary between Leftist Assemblyman William F. Stanton and his challenger, John McEnery. At stake was the MAPA preprimary endorsement. MAPA began to fill up—even before this time—with Anglos who had been publicly identified in every camp from the Communist Party to the John Birch Society.

From the leftwing came Peter Szego, Francis Fink, and James R. (Bob) Lindsay, Fred and Virginia Hirsch, and John Bernstein.

Fink and Szego had been identified as Communists before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1960 though Szego has specifically denied it. So had Lindsay (under the name "Albert Bob Lindsay"), who was later to run for the San Jose City Council as a self-proclaimed Marxist in 1965.

Bernstein, a wheelhorse of the Thorne-Stanton faction in Democratic politics for years, just last week made news by denouncing Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach for his attack on the Communist-fronting W.E.B. DuBois Clubs.

From the rightist end of the political spectrum came Bill Ellis, Verlyn Wolf, and Birch Society Leader Ray Gurries. From the McEnery camp came E. Wallace Esler, Jack Kennon, Don Cornish, and Jackson Faulkner.

Of these Anglos who have worked their way into MAPA, at least five have since been directly linked with EOC affairs in one way or another: Fred and Virginia Hirsch, Gurries, Ellis, and Esler. Others have been very close to the picture, though not direct participants.

MAPA President Isaias Aguilera today faces impeachment charges specifically because he voted, in his role as an EOC commissioner, for the retention of Potts.

He says he has been tried in MAPA by a "kangaroo court," bolstered by five paid EOC staffers who had all been active in the palace revolt against Potts. He names them as Dr. Edgar Cumings, Tom Frontiera, Jose Lopez, Sylvia Torres, and Beatrice Gonzales.

Further, Aguilera charges that MAPA's ranks were swelled, just before the meeting where he was censured, by a flood of new and reinstated memberships, including those of Fred and Virginia Hirsch, Bernstein, EOC Commissioners Al Pinon and Jose Martinez, and Szego.

The latter's MAPA membership was renewed via a dues check paid by Edmundo Mercado; Szego and Mercado are political allies, and last year the former quit the Democratic county central committee to let the latter take his place.

The first motion to impeach Agustiera was offered by John Castro, plumber and head of the Gardner District EOC Council, who ran against County Supervisor Sam Della Maggiore in 1964. It was seconded by Mercado. The MAPA executive board action that finally commenced impeachment proceedings was taken at the home of Dr. Arturo Cabrera, San Jose State College professor who was widely mentioned as a possible successor to Potts but now seems out of the running. Aguilera was assailed by Pinon, now widely mentioned as a successor to the EOC's pro-Potts chairman, Dr. Stanley Skillicorn.

It would be far-fetched to dwell at such length on Mexican-American politics, in discussing the EOC, if it were not for these factors:

The poverty war involvement of certain Mexican-American groups is interwined with the maneuvering of the EOC staff, the Anglo left wing, and the Anglo right wing, including an occasional John Bircher. Oftentimes these are the same people wearing different hats.

With respect to the activists, it may not be possible to document any full-blown plot in their EOC involvement, but the same people have worked together time after time in a whole series of undertakings. Let's examine a few of them:

When Gardner District EOC Council President Castro ran for supervisor in 1964, his campaign committee included the following persons who have figured in EOC affairs: Aguilera, Bernstein, Cabrera, the Reverend George Collins, Dr. Ernesto Galarza, Fred Hirsch, Jose Lopez, Max Ruiz, Emerson Street, Wester Sweet, Szego, and John Thorne.

To those already—mentioned as having been identified as Communists must be added Street, County Central Labor Council business representative and ex-EOC member. He was so identified by two House Un-American Activities Committee witnesses in 1957 and one in 1960, though he flatly denies it.

Leftwingers on the Castro campaign committee also included Patrick Hancock, aid to Congressman Don Edwards and invoker of the 5th amendment before the State senate un-American activities committee during a communism probe in 1953; Harry Branch, whose office was the scene of a contested election wherein Hirsch became president of the Ninth Congressional District Council in 1964; and Mrs. Emma Gelders Sterne, mother-in-law of avowed Marxist Lindsay.

Next, let's take a look at the 42 sponsors named on Stanton's 1964 campaign brochure. They include Galarza, Thorne, the Reverend Mr. Collins and Ruiz, plus the following others who have been involved in EOC matters: Commissioner Louis Bosco, Frank Crosby, John Hayakawa, Reed Searle, Louis Zarate, and ex-Commissioner Robert Caredio.

Just last January, Hirsch appeared before the city council to suggest a slate of candidates for candidates for the San Jose Public Housing Authority. Whom did he suggest? The lineup is familiar: Castro, Thorne, Branch, Hancock, and his own wife Virginia Hirsch.

The "Support Stanton on Vietnam" ad that Thorne ran last year was signed by Fred and Virginia Hirsch, EOC's Area 5 Board Member Billy Cole, Mrs. Cole, Marxist Lindsay, Mrs. Lindsay, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Fink, Szego, Hancock, the Reverend Mr. Collins, Castro, Crosby, Caredio, Mrs. Caredio, Branch, Mrs. Branch, EOC Area 4 Planning Committeeman Lee Garrett, Subarea Delegate William Fitzhugh, Jeff Boehm of the Gardner District Neighborhood Council, Mrs. Boehm, Mrs. Stern, Area 4 Senior Citizens' Representative Leah Leppert (mother of Democratic Congressional Candidate George Leppert), and Hayakawa.

The original San Jose Committee To Oppose U.S. Intervention in Vietnam, formed last July, consisted of 14 members, including Fink, Mrs. Sterne, Mercado, Thorne, Lindsay, and Hirsch.

On May 9, 1960, an ad assailing the House Un-American Activities Committee, and calling for cancellation of its then-approaching hearings, ran in San Jose newspapers.

Its signers included Branch, Caredio, Crosby, Vivian (Mrs. Francis) Fink, Hayakawa, Fred and Virginia Hirsch, James and Barbara Lindsay, Ruiz, Patricia (Mrs. William F.) Stanton, Mrs. Sterne, Wester Sweet, Thorne, and several others involved in EOC affairs such as Staffer Louis A. Barozzi.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I include the fourth and concluding article of the series which appeared in the San Jose News on Saturday, March 19, 1966:

Plots Abound in EOC

(By Harry Farrell)

To say that the whole Economic Opportunity Commission of Santa Clara County is conspiracy controlled is a generalization which—for the moment at least—seems extravagant. There are too many factions, all at each other's throats.

It is self-evident, however, that the EOC is intrigue-ridden. Plots come along like streetcars, and their goals are often achieved:

The San Jose State College radicals did succeed in electing several of their number to responsible EOC positions in area 4.

A meeting loaded with John Birch Society members did succeed in choosing Birch section leader, Ray Gurries, as EOC Commissioner for the Gardner District.

Anonymous members of the EOC staff did attack their former director, Arthur Potts, in an unsigned five-page memo last January. Ostensibly a confidential report, it was duplicated and leaked to the news media on the day of the January EOC meeting.

The Economic Opportunity Commission is intrigue ridden because, by its very nature, it is conspiracy-prone.

It has some $3 million, mostly in Federal money, to dispense, and it is seeking an additional $1.4 million. It has a potential 100 or more full-time jobs to hand out, many of them in the $10,000 and up range, plus several hundred hourly jobs. There are only the flimsiest safeguards against the filling of these on an out-and-out patronage basis.

Thus the EOC is a tempting target for any group with a yearning to seize the community's political reins, whether it be the Communists, the Birchers, the Republicans, the Democrats, or the Mafia.

This is the opinion of Arthur Potts, who presided over the EOC machinery until he was deposed last month.

"If this program were used for political purposes by any group, or controlled by any single group, it could be used to the disadvantage of the poor," Potts says. "If any one group gets hold of this program, they can use the staff, the semiprofessionals (hourly EOC workers) and their leadership role to accomplish any political purpose, if that is what they want to do—they could even elect me dog catcher."

In fairness, it must be noted that the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity is trying to tighten down on politicking by antipoverty war personnel.

On March 3, a new regulation was promulgated, reading:

"Employment in a political action program may not be offered as a consideration or reward for political support of any political party or candidate for public office, nor may any person, as an employee, engage in partisan political activity."

About the same time the foregoing rule was handed down, 25 U.S. Senators including George Murphy, Republican, of California, cosponsored a bill which would bring many poverty program employees under the Hatch Act. This law, which has covered most Government workers for years, prohibits partisan political activity.

Nonetheless, it is indisputable that the EOC's internal affairs and the politics of the community at large have overlapped.

For example censure and impeachment actions have been initiated against Mexican-American Political Association President Isaias Aguilera, with EOC officials and staffers leading the attack, specifically because he voted for Potts in his role as EOC Commissioner. And MAPA exists for the stated purpose of engaging in political activity, including endorsement of candidates, both partisan and nonpartisan.

NO RULES

One of the reasons that the EOC is so vulnerable to political tugging and hauling is that neither the rules nor the players will stand still.

The governing bodies of normal political agencies—city councils, boards of supervisors, school boards, State legislatures—are fixed by constitutions, charters, and statutes, with regard to membership, composition, and apportionment. Their members are elected by the people for fixed terms. It is true that in any such elective process, one pressure group or another can occasionally capture the machinery. But with strong laws and clear rules, this is hard to do, and there is always the threat that the people will turn the rascals out at the next election.

By contrast, the EOC has the power to alter its own membership almost at will, within broad Federal guidelines, by changing its bylaws. The commission is not a political body at all, but really the board of directors of a private, nonprofit corporation.

NOT U.S. AGENCY

Though its current activities are financed 90 percent by Federal funds, it is not really a governmental agency.

(The Federal contribution will drop to 50 percent on July 1, 1967 without further action by Congress, in which case the local financial burden of the program will increase fivefold, from 10 to 50 percent.)

Unpredictable shifting of the EOC membership is not just a hypothetical concern. For a variety of reasons, generally legitimate, the local EOC membership has been in almost constant flux for months now.

Originally there were 15 commissioners, representing diverse segments of community interest. Then, in line with Federal policy, three more seats were created for representatives of the poor, and the commission numbered 18.

Next, about the time the Mexican-Americans demanded more representation, the Office of Equal Opportunity handed down a new directive. There was to be a representative of the poor from each of the EOC's nine poverty target areas in the county, said the program's regional director, Melvin Mogulof.

What's more, this commission overhaul had to take place within 30 days.

GROWS

So suddenly the EOC grew to 27 members—one-third from community organizations, one-third from agencies (governmental units, etc.), and one-third from the poor.

Since there was not time to set up democratic procedures for choosing the poverty spokesmen, the commission was loaded with interim representatives (Commissioner Fred Hirsch, who brought about Potts' downfall, was one of these).

Gradually, the interim commissioners are being replaced with permanent ones, but the result of all this jockeying is that for many months, the commission's makeup differed constantly, from one meeting to the next.

The hope is now that it will remain stable for awhile. But if past experience is any test, there is no assurance of this. What has happened once can happen again.

At lower echelons in the poverty war apparatus, opportunities for juggling and rigging of area boards and various ad hoc committees are even more evident.

STILL DISPUTED

In the West Valley, they're still arguing about who outsmarted whom when the conservatives elected virtually all 18 members of the area 6 EOC board, only to find that they were denied recognition by the central EOC office. Those who were elected contend that all legal procedures were followed; their foes argue otherwise.

A comparable situation developed during the reorganizaiton of the EOC last fall, pursuant to Mogulof's order. Commission Chairman Stanley Skillicorn named an ad hoc (special committee to suggest the new lineup). It was chosen from the EOC's broadbased community advisory board and included 20 members.

When the group convened, however, one member demanded that 10 additional people—generally representing minority groups—be added to the committee Skillicorn had named. After a hassle, this member prevailed.

The committee in final form thus consisted of not 20 but 30 members, as clearly shown by EOC documents. EOC Chairman Stanley Skillicorn flatly declares the 10 supernumeraries were added "without proper authority."

In short, EOC procedures are so sloppy and flexible that anything can happen and often does.

Until the whole apparatus is tightened up and tuned up, the end of strife is not in sight. And those who will go on suffering most—as from the beginning of time—will be the poor.

Mr. Speaker, all of the evidence which I have tried to present and which has appeared in these four newspaper articles by Mr. Farrell clearly shows that the the poverty program in Santa Clara County does not command the broadly based respect which it must have if it is to succeed. I asked Mr. Sargent Shriver, on Wednesday, March 9, to conduct a complete, unbiased, and impartial investigation of the poverty program in Santa Clara County. As of today, I have not received a response from him.

I can understand the problems that Mr. Shriver is confronted with in considering whether such an investigation should be conducted. First of all, if it is to be conducted by local individuals, it is obvious that the controversy is so heated and there is so much emotion connected with it that objectivity would be difficult. It cannot be conducted by the regional office of the war on poverty program because local citizens in Santa Clara County are practically unanimous in their lack of confidence in the regional office. If it is to be conducted by Washington personnel directly out of Mr. Shriver's office, then this would seem to contradict a principle of the poverty program which he has advocated, namely, that we should have local control of the program.

I also suspect Mr. Shriver might fear that there might be political overtones to such an investigation.

Realizing all of these problems, I have a suggestion to make which I think will solve them and still provide an impartial investigation by an experienced body in which everyone concerned can have confidence. I propose that the investigation be made by the Stanford Research Institute at Menlo Park, Calif. This is a recognized research group which has done a great deal of work for the Office of Economic Opportunity. In fact, some of their studies have formed the basis of the Economic Opportunity Act first passed in 1964. There is no more respected organization or research group in the entire country. The Stanford Research Institute is interested in doing the job and on March 10 Mr. R. L. Johnson of the management and social systems of S.R.I. wrote to Dr. Stanley Skillikorn, chairman of the Economic Opportunity Commission, Santa Clara County.

I request permission to include this letter as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
Menlo Park, Calif., March 10, 1966.

DR. STANLEY SKILLICORN,
Chairman, Economic Opportunity Commission of Santa Clara County, San Jose, Calif.

DEAR DR. SKILLICORN: The need for, and desirability of an objective and unbiased investigation of the economic opportunity program in Santa Clara County has received prominent mention in the press. There is real danger that Federal funds may be cut off if an investigation is not made soon. Unfortunately, the emotional and political factors are such that the motivation of any government or citizen group investigations will be suspect and its efforts degraded by other groups. If the results of an investigation are to be credible and acceptable to the general public and to members of the several interested groups involved, the facts must be collected and analyzed by an independent organization with no special interests and with a reputation of service in similar situations.

Stanford Research Institute specializes in finding, analyzing, and interpreting facts. The institute is an independent, not-for-profit corporation dedicated by charter to "the improvement of the general standard of living and the peace and prosperity of mankind." SRI conducts scientific research and applies science in projects of prime national concern and in areas where major contributions may be made to social improvement. The institute has an established reputation in research, as demonstrated by the high percentage of continuing clients—commercial, industrial, government, and foundation—in the United States and in foreign countries.

The management and social systems staff, composed of professional analysts with wide and varied experience in economics, management, sociology and political science, has had extensive experience in the research and solution of problems associated with passage of the Economic Opportunity Act and the implementation of its provisions at all levels of government.

Much of the data and experience gathered in previous research is available to the staff in future projects. This experience and data bank is one of SRI's most valuable assets in service to its clients. SRI would appreciate an opportunity to discuss with you the application of our experience and research talents to your current problem. I will telephone you within the next week or you can contact me at 415-326-6200, extension 2388 to arrange a meeting to discuss the problem and to explore ways in which we might be helpful.

Yours truly,

R. L. JOHNSON,
Management and Social Systems.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, this will conclude the series of special orders which I have taken in an effort to offer constructive criticism and some factual material about the war on poverty as it is being conducted in my congressional district. I regret that some of the facts revealed may have been unpleasant and that it was necessary to reveal them. I fully realize some persons will challenge my motivation and consider my approach as negative and against the war on poverty. Quite to the contrary, I believe that my criticisms and these three special orders which I have taken were constructive because they will draw the attention of those concerned to the glaring faults which exist in the war on poverty program in Santa Clara County. We all know that early detection of cancer increases the chance of a cure. We all know that early warning of a missile attack increases the chance of successfully defending our shores. This is true in the war on poverty program also. By facing up to its faults, by looking at its errors and mistakes honestly and objectively, we can then give the administrators of the program an opportunity to correct those faults before it is too late.

The war on poverty program cannot possibly be successful unless it commands a broadly based respect in every community in which it operates. It is not enough to have support of just the Mexican-Americans or just the social workers or just the clergy. It is absolutely necessary that the war on poverty be conducted by a cross section of the community, including its business community and other substantial elements. Unless we root out the evils, the wrongs, and the conspiracies which I have pointed out in these past 3 days, I say that the war on poverty in Santa Clara County, has absolutely no chance of being successful.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is in a constructive sense that I reveal these things, in the sincere hope that Mr. Shriver will assume the responsibility of urging an investigation by the Stanford Research Institute, and that he will urge the Santa Clara County Economic Opportunities Commission to arrange such an investigation. And, Mr. Speaker, when this has been completed and when we have the facts before us I hope and I trust that all concerned will sit down and reason together in an effort to come up with a program which will be, not a conspiracy by the left wing, not a design to grab political power through the ability to disburse Federal taxpayers' funds, but will truly be an honest and a sincere attack upon poverty.

DIVERSION OF ANTIPOVERTY FUNDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, today I want to bring to your attention another example of extravagant diversion of antipoverty funds into the pockets of Democratic politicians. The case I speak of is related to the site of the Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston, W. Va., and the recipient of the windfall of Federal dollars is the Democratic commerce commissioner, State of West Virginia. I bring this to the attention of the House so that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity Mr. Shriver, may see it in the RECORD and respond to it when he comes before the Committee on Education and Labor again.

Mr. Speaker, our investigations have revealed that in the spring of 1965 a construction consultant, an employee of a firm retained by OEO, on two separate occasions surveyed the Kanawha Hotel, Charleston, W. Va., to determine its suitability for a Women's Job Corps Center. Both times, despite pressure to approve the site, the consultant recommended against the use of the hotel, reporting among other things the building would be too expensive to rehabilitate.

Mr. Speaker, I visited the Charleston, W. Va., Center in December 1965. I felt the individuals hired to run the Center were doing an acceptable job, in fact, the morale among the girls seemed quite high, so nothing I say today casts aspersions on the girls at the Center. I was shocked, however, at the financial arrangements that had been made with the Kanawha Hotel Co., whose president was Angus Peyton, prominent West Virginia Democrat and commerce commissioner of that State.

The rundown hotel, which was used for Democratic presidential campaign headquarters in 1960, was assessed at $87,000 prior to occupancy of the Women's Job Corps in August 1965. It was subsequently raised to $115,000. Estimates of reliable real estate brokers in Charleston placed the value of the hotel at $250,000.

Under the OEO contract, the Kanawha Hotel Co. will receive $94,800 annually and all taxes, insurance, utilities, and repairs will be paid by the sponsor of the Center. In addition to a 40-percent annual guaranteed profit, I found more than $225,000 Federal funds had been expended to renovate the building and these improvements would accrue to the Kanawha Hotel Co.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this as a case of excessive profiteering on a guaranteed, no-risk investment and point out obvious political implications of the arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, for many months Members of Congress have been receiving complaints from constituents expressing their disapproval of excessive salaries and expenditures in other areas of the antipoverty program. Our taxpayers complain that millions of Federal dollars are being dissipated and, instead of helping the poor, the money all too frequently is going into the pockets of politicians who exploit the poor and take advantage of the antipoverty program to enrich themselves.

Testimony at hearings currently being held by the Education and Labor Committee has revealed the estimated costs of maintaining one Job Corps enrollee for a year ranges from $8,500 to $13,000. Educators gasp at these figures and taxpayers question the justification for such an expensive program. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the necessity for the Job Corps program and agree with the concept that will provide an opportunity for disadvantaged young men and women to acquire basic skills; however, the program was not designed to be a windfall for the wealthy with influence.

I consider the terms of the Kanawha Hotel contract outrageous and feel this kind of irresponsible spending has caused grossly inflated prices for antipoverty facilities. It is this kind of waste of Federal funds that taxpayers object to so strenuously and which must be stopped if the antipoverty program is to be effective. The Subcommittee on the War on Poverty of the House Committee on Education and Labor should look into all private facilities used for Job Corps centers to determine whether the taxpayers of this country are getting their money's worth.

A MEASURE OF CONCERN TO THE ENTIRE NATION

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today in order to discuss with my colleagues a proposed measure of concern to the entire Nation; namely, H.R. 8282. This bill, as filed, contains objectionable features which I believe should be analyzed. But before looking at the specifics, it is well to consider the general concept of unemployment compensation in its historical context.

Over 30 years ago, the Congress enacted the Social Security Act of 1935. This famous measure, which is considered the grandfather of all modern social legislation, made possible unemployment compensation. As an enabling bill, it was permissive in nature and wise in approach. It offered the States an opportunity to set up unemployment compensation programs by allowing certain tax benefits as an incentive. The result was the Federal-State cooperative arrangement which exists today.

While unemployment compensation was a child of the depression, in 30 short years it has matured into a sophisticated, well-administered, full-grown remedial program. Each State has been left free to develop its own system within the general requirements of the Federal law. Thus the States, in addition to establishing the amount and duration of benefits paid employees, have been allowed to set the qualifying requirements for receiving these benefits. This is as it should be.

However, H.R. 8282 would impose new requirements and standards upon the States with respect to these matters. Failure to meet these requirements or standards could result in an increase in the taxes paid by employers within the State or disapproval of the State's program by the Secretary of Labor, in which event all employer tax credits and administrative expenses for the State would be withheld.

Of course, the States could not absorb this expense and therefore, would have no choice but to submit to the dictates of the Federal statutes. This provision and others of the same type would completely undermine the State programs and, in addition, have disastrous side effects.

Two points are of primary concern to me and I would like to discuss them in their order of importance. The first is the "experience rating" and the second is "disqualification standards."

As we are all aware, Mr. Speaker, "experience rating" is currently recognized in the laws of all the States under which employer tax rates for unemployment compensation vary in proportion to the benefits paid to their former employees. The Social Security Act of 1935 set "experience rating" as the sole criteria to be used by the States in determining the employers' rate of tax. The reasons for making this the sole standard were not arbitrary but were based on sound considerations in keeping with the overall philosophy of the act. Remarking on the wisdom of this provision in 1935, Senator La Follette stated:

> Under the (individual experience rating) amendment, unemployment compensation will tend to stimulate the regularization of employment, without which the reverse effect will result (when) employers must pay the same rate of contribution, whether they have much or little unemployment, there is no incentive at all to reduce unemployment.

This statement goes to the heart of the problem. The idea of an incentive to reduce unemployment was wise then and is wise now. In addition, the practicability of experience rating is beyond question.

There is no doubt that if this experience provision is abolished, employers with a high labor turnover will start pressuring their State legislatures for uniform taxation of all employers. Such a result is objectionable, not only from the standpoint of equity, but with regard to the overall unemployment situation as well.

Our primary objective should be to stimulate employment and reduce the possibility of long-term unemployment. Experience rating does just that in rewarding the employers who do maintain steady employment. The elimination of this reward will remove a built-in employment stabilizer and, in effect, encourage labor turnover.

Also, experience rating makes it economically feasible for employers to put into practice job stabilization techniques which could not be justified financially without the benefit of anticipated unemployment tax savings. It discourages these same employers from the temptation to save payroll costs by using the unemployment fund to finance its labor reserves. Furthermore, it makes it worthwhile for the employer to be completely honest in reporting an employee's separation since it could be subject to disqualification.

Through the years, experience rating has proven its justification. The States strongly endorse it as the only fair test. I believe that it must be retained.

The other area of great concern to me is the proposed change in policy which H.R. 8282 manifests with regard to the disqualification standards for receiving benefits.

Historically, the test used to determine eligibility for unemployment compensation has been whether the individual is "unemployed through no fault of his own." Based on this test the States promulgated certain qualification standards intended to discourage unemployment and control abuses. Many changes have taken place over the years with the result that unworkable and ineffective standards have been discarded and replace with efficient, feasible ones. The existing State law provisions deter individuals from performing acts resulting in disqualification and also serve as an incentive to get others back on working payrolls. H.R. 8282 would invalidate these time-tested standards, as well as having the effect of rejecting years of experience. It would make obsolete—through no fault of his own—the test which, incidentally, was the very test used for the severance pay provision of the Federal pay bill passed by the Congress during the last session.

Presently, disqualifications apply to an individual who first, quits voluntarily; second, refuses a suitable job; third, is unable to work due to pregnancy or maternity; fourth, receives retirement benefits under a private plan or social security; or fifth, is discharged for misconduct. H.R. 8282 would prohibit the States from disqualifying an individual for any of these reasons.

I cannot accept the premise that an individual who voluntarily quits his job is entitled to compensation. This would do no more than encourage laziness. Why should a man work if he can get almost as much income by not working? There is, of course, no good answer to this question.

Furthermore, at a time when there is an immediate danger of inflation, we are called upon to enact a measure that embodies the very essence of inflation—rising prices. This bill will greatly increase the cost of doing business. In my home State of New York, employer payroll taxes will be increased by almost 60 percent. Inflation is, in my opinion, our most pressing domestic problem and should be attacked rather than promoted.

H.R. 8282 is a drastic measure. It contemplates federalization of a program that has, since its inception, worked effectively through Federal-State cooperation. It supersedes State laws developed through years of experience. It discards, as outdated, a public policy that only a few short months ago was upheld. It will stimulate rather than curb inflation. For these reasons, I call upon my colleagues to join me in preserving a program that has long served the needs of the Nation effectively and resist the unsound approach which H.R. 8282 represents.

THE TRANSPORTATION, SALE, AND HANDLING OF ANIMALS

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, recent developments indicate that this House will soon be asked to approve a woefully inadequate bill to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of animals intended to be used for research and experimentation. There is a crying need for prompt enactment of meaningful animal protection legislation.

But the bill recently reported to the Agriculture Committee by one of its subcommittees is most unsatisfactory. It would not prevent the very abuses which have so shocked and enraged our citizens. It would indeed be a cruel hoax on animal lovers to pass such a meaningless bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13720, which I have introduced, would provide effective protection to dogs and cats while not hindering important research efforts. It is a strong bill which will meet the problem head on. I urge my colleagues to study carefully the provisions of this measure. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] has demonstrated important leadership in this drive to obtain effective animal legislation and my bill is similar in many respects to his—H.R. 10743. For the benefit of my colleagues I insert at this point in the RECORD a summary of my bill—H.R. 13720—together with a summary of the major differences between this measure and H.R. 10743. I urge the Members to support legislation of this type rather than meaningless measures such as the one reported last week to the Agriculture Committee.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 13720

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes

Section 1: Finding that it is essential to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, and handling of dogs and cats by persons or organizations engaged in transporting, buying, or selling them for use in research or experimental purposes, in order to protect the owners of dogs and cats from theft of such pets and to prevent the sale or use of stolen dogs and cats for purposes of research and experimentation.

Section 2 defines the terms "person," "Secretary," "commerce," "dog," "cat," "research facility," and "dealer." "Research facility" is broadly enough defined to mean "any school, institution, organization, or person that uses or intends to use dogs or cats in research, test, or experiments, and that (1) purchases or transports such dogs or cats in commerce or (2) receives any funds from the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof to finance its operations by means of grants, loans, or otherwise." "Dealer" means "any person who, for compensation or profit, delivers for transportation, transports, boards, buys, or sells dogs or cats in commerce for research purposes."

Section 3 makes it unlawful for any research facility to purchase or transport dogs or cats in commerce for use in research or experimental purposes except from a dealer licensed under this act.

Section 4 makes it unlawful for dealer to sell, offer to sell, transport to research facility any dog or cat, to buy, sell, offer to buy or sell, transport or offer for transportation any such dog or cat until such dealer shall have obtained a currently valid license from the Secretary.

Section 5 provides for Secretary to promulgate standards for "humane care" which shall mean type of care which a responsible and conscientious owner would ordinarily provide for a dog or cat kept as a household pet to prevent its suffering, sickness, injury, or other discomfort and shall include housing, feeding, watering, handling, sanitation, ventilation, shelter from weather or temperature, extremes, separation by species, sex, and temperament both in dealer's facility and transportation. Sale, transportation, or offer of either, of any sick, injured, unweaned or pregnant dog or cat is expressly forbidden.

Section 6 requires photograph or other humane and painless identification as Secretary may prescribe for all dogs and cats transported, purchased, or sold to research facilities.

Section 7 requires records be kept for 2 years by research facilities and dealers with respect to purchase, sale, handling, and transportation of dogs and cats. Shall include bill of sale, collars, tags, or other identification equipment which accompanied dogs or cats. Any bill of sale which is fraudulent shall be grounds for prosecution and revocation of license. Records shall be open at all reasonable times to representatives of Secretary or any police officer.

Section 8 authorizes Secretary to cooperate with officials of the States in effectuating purposes of this act and any State, local, or municipal legislation or ordinance on same subject.

Section 9 prohibits dealer from selling or disposing of dog or cat within period of 5 business days after acquisition.

Section 10 prohibits their sale at public auction or by weight.

Section 11 authorizes Secretary to issue licenses but only after applicant shall have demonstrated that facilities comply with standards promulgated by Secretary pursuant to section 5. Also authorizes issuance of licenses as dealers to persons who do not qualify as dealers within meaning of act, upon their compliance with requirements of act and agreement thereto in writing.

Section 12 authorizes Secretary to promulgate rules, regulations, and orders in order to require compliance with standards for humane care called for in section 5. Requires inspection of dealer facilities at least six times a year and a regular inspection of transportation.

Section 13 provides imprisonment for not more than 1 year or fine of not more than $10,000 and revocation of license for person convicted of violation of this act.

Section 14 places responsibility for employee's violation upon employing dealer or research facility as well as upon employee.

Section 15 empowers Secretary to suspend dealer's license temporarily if he has reason to believe dealer has violated this act, and after notice and opportunity for hearing to revoke license if violation is found to have occurred. Secretary shall also suspend temporarily the license of any dealer prosecuted for cruelty under the laws of any of the States and, in event of conviction, shall revoke dealer's license.

Section 16 provides that if any part of this act shall be held invalid, the remainder shall not be affected thereby.

Section 17 empowers the Secretary to charge reasonable license fees in order to finance administration of this act. All such fees to be deposited in a fund which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for use in administering provisions of act together with such funds as may be appropriated thereto; authorizes appropriation of such funds as Congress may from time to time provide.

Section 18 establishes effective date as 120 days following enactment.

Principal Differences Between H.R. 13720 by Mr. Schweiker and H.R. 10743 by Mr. Helstoski

1. Schweiker bill covers dogs and cats. Helstoski bill covers dogs, cats, and "any vertebrate animal."

2. Section 3 of the Helstoski bill would make unlawful the purchase of a covered animal from other than a licensed dealer by "any research facility." Schweiker bill adds the phrase "for use in research or experimental purpose" to make certain that the legislation would not prevent an individual from purchasing a pet from other than a dealer.

3. Section 7 of the Schweiker bill adds the phrase "at all reasonable times" to the requirement that records be open to inspection.

4. Section 8 of the Schweiker bill omits the Helstoski provision that "the Secretary shall take such action as he may deem appropriate to encourage the various States of the United States to adopt such laws and to take such action as will promote and effectuate the purposes of this act." The Schweiker bill adds to section 8 of the Helstoski bill's provisions that the "Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the officials of the various States in effectuating the purposes of this act and any State legislation on the same subject" the following: "any State, local, or municipal legislation or ordinance on the same subject."

5. Section 9 of the Schweiker bill omits the Helstoski provision that "representatives of the Secretary, any police officer or agent of any legally constituted law enforcement agency shall assist any owner of any animal who has reason to believe the animal may be in the possession of a dealer in searching the dealer's premises, after obtaining the proper search warrant from the local authorities in whose jurisdiction the dealer's premises are located."

6. Section 11 of the Schweiker bill (no similar provision in Helstoski bill) authorizes and directs the Secretary to issue licenses to dealers upon application provided that no license shall be issued until the applicant has demonstrated that his facilities comply with the standards promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to section 5.

7. Section 17 of the Schweiker bill, unlike the Helstoski bill, provides that fees collected shall be deposited in a special fund which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for use in administering provisions of the act.

EVER-INCREASING INFLATION

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Dickinson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, as every Member of this House knows, this Nation is faced with an ever-increasing inflation. We have just had one tax increase in which many of last year's tax reductions were wiped out in a now-you-see-it, now-you-don't manner.

We have recently been warned by the ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, John W. Byrnes, of Wisconsin, that we can expect another tax raise this year even though every effort is obviously being made to hold it until after this fall's elections.

The old, tired New Deal motto under which the people's money is used to buy the people's vote has been revived: "Tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect." And once again, under this credo, the spiral of increased costs is squeezing the people.

I am not one of the experts called in by the administration to find out how to deal with the increasing inflation. One thing does seem obvious to me: The simplest thing to do in this period of artificial boom would be to stop spending for a nonexistent depression. I am willing, however, to leave it to the experts how to solve the problem of braking the car while the accelerator is on the floor.

One of the most respected financial sources is the Wall Street Journal. With unanimous consent, I introduce a recent editorial from that publication which deals with this subject:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 16, 1966]

The Joke's on the People

Economists of practically every political hue are advocating tax rate increases on top of the tax juggling Congress is now completing, and it's hardly surprising. After all, a tax boost is the best way to combat inflation, isn't it?

Is it? Despite the great consensus on the subject, it may be one of those assumptions which many people automatically accept without really thinking about, and which in fact may not be true at all.

The ease with which the assumption is made is understandable. If the Government takes another bite out of your income, it follows as the night the day that you are going to have less money to spend. From that it should follow, in seeming logic, that there will be a lessening of the pressure of the demand which has been bidding up prices against a finite supply of goods and services.

One difficulty with the neat theory is that people do not always respond so tidily to Government actions. A tax increase is in itself no guarantee that spending will dry up, any more than a reduction can be positively counted on to send consumers on a spending orgy. In the event of an increase, the buying public still has credit to fall back on.

But let us grant for the sake of argument that people by and large will restrain their buying urge. A still more imposing trouble remains to beset the notion that tax boosts, however unpalatable, are the right medicine for inflation; it concerns what the Government does with the increase.

If the Federal authorities were to use the additional revenue to balance the budget or lower the public debt—or if they just put it under the mattress—then there most probably would be a diminution of demand and to that extent the procedure might well have anti-inflationary effects.

Naturally the Government cannot be expected to do anything of the sort. In these enlightened days the customary course is for the officials to regard the extra tax money as a warrant to raise their own spending.

The ordinary citizens may thus be buying fewer autos but the Government will without doubt be buying more military trucks or dispensing more political handouts to this or that favored segment of the population. Demand, in other words, will have been rerouted, its totality not necessarily lessened one whit.

The prospect of continued inflation is all the more likely if the money managers, while raising Federal spending, also go on pursuing their present policies of running budget deficits and otherwise pumping up the money supply beyond the needs of the economy. Should the inflation persist after a tax increase, the next step (the way governmental minds work) is presumably the imposition of direct price and wage controls.

Now we realize that Treasury Secretary Fowler is one of the few men currently contending that the inflation is not serious enough to call for either drastically higher taxes or direct economic controls. And it may be that the Government will refrain, for political if no other reasons, from those moves; we aren't trying to foretell the future.

What we are saying is merely that if tax hikes do come in the guise of inflation-battlers, it will be a crude and cruel joke on the people. For the inflation has been produced in the first place by the self-same Government. Its fiscal and monetary policies over the past 5 years have been frankly labeled expansionary, which is a euphemism for inflationary, and it is still on the same kick.

The bungling of economic policy, indeed, can be on such a scale that it would be quite possible for the Nation to be saddled simultaneously with inflation, higher taxes and controls. We may all hope it won't come to that, but when officials inflate it's the people who pay.

HIDE EXPORT CONTROLS A FURTHER BLOW TO U.S. AGRICULTURE

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from the legislative counsel to the President, along with an enclosure outlining the Council of Economic Advisers' justification of the recent order to control exports of cattle hides.

The memorandum from the Council of Economic Advisers brazenly admits that "export controls on hides were imposed to roll back hide prices." And as I pointed out to the White House in my reply, this kind of price controls seems to be Government policy these days. It is another round in the admitted policy of this administration to keep farm prices down.

The justification of the order to curtail hide exports, as outlined by the Economic Advisers, comes shortly after the Chairman of those Advisers admitted on nationwide television that Government stocks of corn were released into the market for that same purpose, to hold down prices.

All of us remember the critical low level of beef prices in this country a couple of years ago when foreign imports of beef were flooding our markets. There was bitter opposition registered from the administration when we in this Congress tried to curb the damaging foreign imports. In fact, the Secretary of Commerce told the beef industry to "quit whining" and go out and look for new foreign markets of their own. This is just what the beef industry did, and they found ready markets in other countries after the domestic market for hides was greatly reduced due to the popular acceptance in America of synthetics in place of leather. But now that there is a demand for American hides and a desirable price has finally been achieved, the U.S. Government again interferes. This makes our beef producer the subject of a very one-sided concern by his Government that results in great financial loss.

It would seem that the American producers of food and fiber, in their compliance with endless restrictions and regulations, and at prices that have consistently been inadequate, might be entitled to more favorable concern. Unfortunately, it seems to be a crime these days for a farmer to receive an honest return on his investment.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great benefits of living in a democracy is that the population can have a difference of opinion without anyone being sent to Siberia or being shot at sunrise. In fact, we consider a difference of opinion healthy to our Government. This difference is many times reflected in the outcome of legislation before this Congress. This was emphasized when I received the results of a questionnaire distributed this year in my Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota. The Control Data Corp. tabulated the answers and the results are most interesting.

I would like to share the results with my colleagues. If there is no objection, the tabulation will follow at this point in the RECORD:

Results of 1966 questionnaire of 7th Congressional District in Minnesota

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Has the United States pursued the wisest policy or course of action in Vietnam?	31	54	15
2. Should the present foreign aid program be reduced or redirected?	86	6	8
3. Sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permits States to adopt right-to-work laws. Should it be repealed	16	76	8
4. Should the Federal minimum wage be increased and extended to farms and small businesses?	28	69	3
5. Can the United States afford to continue the present policy of deficit spending?	6	91	3
6. Should the Commodity Credit Corporation be permitted to sell surplus grains as a means of controlling market prices?	27	63	10
7. Do present farm programs serve the best interests of U.S. agriculture and the Nation's economy?	12	79	9
8. Should we rely more on domestic growers rather than foreign producers for our sugar?	91	6	3
9. Do you believe that the antipoverty programs will substantially reduce U.S. poverty?	10	86	4
10. Should Congress act to amend the Constitution to give States the right to apportion one house of their legislatures on factors other than population?	58	29	13

ROBERT LaFOLLETTE BENNETT NOMINATED AS COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, for those who did not notice page 403 of the weekly "Compilation of Presidential Documents," I would call to their attention the fact that the President announced on March 18, 1966, that he will nominate Robert LaFollette Bennett, of Alaska, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Bob Bennett will become the first Indian to be named Indian Commissioner in 97 years and the first career-service Commissioner in several decades. He is an Oneida Indian from Wisconsin and has been with the Bureau for 29 years. He has served as Deputy Commissioner during the last year.

Commissioner Bennett has served in a number of area offices across the Nation, including the Aberdeen, S. Dak., area office.

The only other Indian ever appointed Commissioner was Eli Samuel Parker, a

Seneca of the Wolf Clan from New York State, who was appointed in 1869 and served until 1871.

We who have known Commissioner Robert L. Bennett for a number of years commend the President on this appointment. We feel he will do an excellent job.

FINANCIAL REPERCUSSIONS OF NEW YORK TRANSIT STRIKE

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, recently, there was a great deal of talk about the financial repercussions of the New York transit strike. The estimated daily business loss totaled $100 million. Included in this figure are millions of dollars of lost wages to workers who could not work through no fault of their own.

Many employers argued that putting pressure of wage earners—no show, no pay—increased the prospect of ending the strike. The financial hardships to this unfortunate group, most of whom had little liquid capital to draw upon, was significant and irreparable. Low income employees of New York companies paid on a piecework basis were most directly hit by the strike. After the first week of the strike, claims for unemployment benefits ran about 50 percent over the same period last year.

Small businessmen found assistance through such public units as the New York offices of the Small Business Administration. Funds from Washington enabled SBA's New York office to stay open over a weekend and process hundreds of applications. However, individuals faced with loan payments and no income had no avenue of relief open to them. No one knows how many small debtors had loans defaulted because of the strike.

Mr. Speaker, this situation in New York is only one event which can plague our citizenry. Natural disasters, civil disorders, and labor-management disputes frequently adversely affect the low income group through no fault of their own. Often personal emergencies hit this group, and there is no avenue of fast assistance.

I am today introducing legislation enabling the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to make loans to individuals in certain of these cases. It is my intention that a revolving fund of $2.5 million be authorized for making individual loans of up to $300.

This program is not to be considered a social welfare program since the loans are to be repaid with a 2-percent interest. The operational guidelines should be established by the Office of Economic Opportunity which will use the 50 existing SBDC for implementing the program.

Unlike the existing OEO programs, this phase of assistance would be conducted on a 100-percent Federal fund basis. It is also necessary to extend SBDC authority to make loans to individuals.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the bill in the Record at this point:

H.R. 13809

A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize the Director to establish a small loan program for individuals

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—SMALL LOANS FOR INDIVIDUALS

"Loan authority

"Sec. 801. The Director shall establish a program of loan assistance for individuals who are members of families or households the annual income of which is less than $3,000. Loans made pursuant to such program shall be made in accordance with regulations of the Director by the local agencies which conduct the loan program authorized by title IV of this Act, entirely from funds allotted to such agencies by the Director out of the revolving fund established pursuant to section 802. Such loans shall bear interest at a rate of 2 per centum per annum, and shall be collected by the local agency and repaid to such revolving fund on such terms and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Director. The total outstanding balance of loans made to any individual under this section may not at any time exceed $300.

"Revolving fund

"Sec. 802. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500,000 to establish a revolving fund for the purpose of carrying out section 801. Expenditures may be made from such fund only for loans made by local agencies under section 801, and for the payment of the expenditures of the Director for administration of this title and collection of loans made under this title. Payments from the fund to local agencies for such loans may be made in advance, or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments for overpayments and underpayments."

THE FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA REACH A MILESTONE

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the first occasion I have ever had to congratulate 600,000 young ladies upon the observance of their 21st birthday—and I would not miss it for the world. During the week of March 27 to April 2 the Future Homemakers of America will celebrate the anniversary of their founding and certainly the standards and ideals of this exceptional groups of girls should be fully appreciated and recognized. Theirs is a story that should be told, for so much of all that is good and great in our Nation has sprung from the heart of the American home and truly, the Future Homemakers of America are dedicated to the principle that this strong heritage of ours must and will survive.

The Future Homemakers of America is a unique organization. Its members are students of home economics in junior and senior high schools throughout the land. Incorporated in 1945, it remains a nonprofit organization, wholly supported by membership dues. Membership is voluntary and today there are 600,000 members in 11,000 chapters in each of our 50 States, in Puerto Rico, in the Virgin Islands and in American Army post schools. Americans, wherever they are and whatever their circumstances, have always cherished their homes and their family ties. The preservation and sanctity of the home was uppermost in the thoughts of those who founded our Nation. Our laws were then, and are still, carefully designed to protect the family unit. Time and events, as well they would, have brought many changes to our country and to our way of life, but the basic premise that the home is the origin of love, understanding, and guidance remains steadfast.

The Future Homemakers of America believe in the importance of the family home. Good family relations through communication is the first objective of their national program of work for the next 3 years. There are eight other steps in this program—nine building blocks in all—and each of them is equally important in the development of our future homemakers. The challenges of citizenship are stressed as well as the positive aspects of good health, morals and manners, constructive leisure time, and individuality. Understanding of neighbors both near and far is encouraged and money management and future careers are studied. This is an ambitious program and one which will challenge the resources and imagination of each member.

The Future Homemakers of America are typical American girls—spirited and fun loving. At the same time they realize that theirs is to be a great responsibility; they know—as perhaps no other generation has been called upon to know—that as adults they will have the obligation to maintain and uphold the dignity and integrity that gives our way of living its meaning and direction.

These, then, are the Future Homemakers of America. They are the future mothers, wives, teachers, jobholders, voters, and opinion molders of this great land of ours. On their 21st anniversary, I applaud their maturity; their grace and, as it is so beautifully stated in their creed, their determination to "face the future with warm courage and high hope."

THREE DECADES OF PROGRESS OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION IN FLORIDA

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the great strides made in soil and water conservation in Florida in the past nearly three decades have been made by the people of Florida. Conservation is people. People working together for the common good.

Soil and water conservation districts in Florida are founded on the golden principle that free people can govern themselves wisely. That is why districts have expanded into the powerful force for conservation widely recognized today. Districts depend on people.

Local subdivisions of government, all 60 of Florida's soil and water conservation districts, were organized only after a petition to the State of Florida by local people, a public hearing, and a favorable referendum.

After each district was voted into existence by local people, five landowners living within each district were elected as supervisors to govern its affairs. These men have to be dedicated to the job at hand because they are unsalaried.

This chain of actions which laid the foundation for soil and water conservation on the farmlands of Florida was given first impetus when on February 26, 1937, the President of the United States wrote to the Governors of all the States recommending that each State legislature pass enabling acts permitting landowners and occupiers to form units to be called soil conservation districts. The State of Florida, under the able leadership of Gov. SPESSARD HOLLAND, was prompt to act on the President's suggestion when the 1937 legislature passed the State's first Soil Conservation Act. Before that year had ended, the Holmes Creek Soil Conservation District had been organized.

As of January 1, 1966, 24,883 farmers, ranchers, grove owners, and other landowners who own 11,653,800 acres of Florida land were cooperators with Florida's 60 soil and water conservation districts. The 60 districts include 64 of Florida's 67 counties.

Florida's soil and water conservation districts have asked for and received technical assistance from USDA's Soil Conservation Service. The Soil Conservation Service is responsible for developing and carrying out a national program of conservation for land and water resources. This responsibility was assigned to the agency by the Congress under Public Law 46.

Normally one or more competent technicians are assigned to assist each district by the State office of the Soil Conservation Service. Most of these men are graduates of the University of Florida. They are also backed up by a technically trained State staff.

Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress of the United States enacted Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act which gave the Soil Conservation Service administrative leadership for Federal assistance to local organizations for planning and carrying out small watershed projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

This program of assistance to landowners in small watersheds supplements the large programs of the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District and the recently created Southwest Florida Water Management District. The drainage area involved in a single small watershed project cannot, by law, be more than 250,000 acres in size.

The Florida State Soil Conservation Board has been delegated certain State responsibilities concerning the small watershed program under Public Law 566. The Board receives and acts on all applications and recommends priorities for planning to the Soil Conservation Service. Finally, it reviews all completed watershed work plans and approves or disapproves for the State of Florida.

Florida now has two fully staffed watershed planning parties. One of these parties is financed by the State of Florida, and one is financed by the Soil Conservation Service. This is an excellent example of State and Federal coordination for the common good of the people.

Since January 1, 1955, the board has received and processed 62 watershed applications covering 4,736,230 acres of Florida land.

Fourteen of these projects, including 857,000 acres, have been authorized for construction with a total cost of $25,353,128. Construction work completed or under contract on nine of these projects amounts to $2,264,974. This expenditure of funds not only provides local works of improvement, but channels this money into local areas to provide greater local prosperity.

Undoubtedly the greatest benefit of small watershed projects to local areas has been to prevent local damage by flooding. However, water control provided by the projects is of untold benefit to Florida's farmers, ranchers, and growers. Other benefits of watershed projects are outdoor recreation and municipal water supply.

Small watershed projects, like soil and water conservation districts, are entirely governed by the wants and needs of local people. They are not Federal projects, although the local, State and Federal Government make technical and financial assistance available after the people decide what they need.

Our generation is sharing in the present day benefits of soil and water conservation in our land. These benefits are not always self-evident, but they include an increased value of the land, which in turn increases the tax base. They include increased yields of crops produced at a lower cost to the grower which is reflected in a lower cost to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that each of the 13 counties of my Eighth District is included in a soil and water conservation district, and I am even more proud of the great accomplishments these districts have made in the last three decades.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 20 to 26, the week during which the first day of spring arrives, is National Wildlife Week. First proclaimed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1938, National Wildlife Week has served since that time to focus public attention on the importance of natural resource conservation and to highlight specific conservation issues.

Protection of natural beauty is the theme for the 1966 observance selected by the National Wildlife Federation. Members of civic, fraternal, and women's groups, as well as conservation and farm organizations can join teachers and school administrators, affiliates of local, State, and Federal governmental agencies, and individuals in taking steps to preserve natural beauty.

What are some of the problems that National Wildlife Week brings to our attention? To begin with, water pollution damages the natural beauty of lakes and streams and bays. Controlling water pollution would be a real contribution to conservation—and to the preservation of natural beauty. When distasteful sights and smells are removed from rivers through water pollution control, natural beauty is restored and preserved, fresh water is supplied, and recreational values enhanced.

The natural beauty of lakes and streams, fields and forests, and grasslands and wetlands enriches our lives. However, these assets are in real danger of being damaged or lost in the growing competition from other uses of lands and waters. The problem will continue to grow as the Nation's human population mounts. But we can plant trees and shrubs and grasses to restore part of our lost beauty that has resulted from mining or highway construction or overgrazing or forest fires, or the erosion that takes away our topsoil.

Wilderness areas and wild rivers, seashores and lakeshores provide beauty and offer valuable recreational opportunities to millions of people. We preserve these areas when we save endangered species of wildlife or set aside wild rivers for protection.

We can, of course, restore and enhance natural beauty in other ways—by taking positive steps to that end. We can pick better places to dump our debris and junk. If we cannot always remove these unsightly sores, we can often screen them by planting trees and shrubs around them. We can direct urban and rural planning so as to preserve the most pleasing natural views.

It is important to note, that public officials, in the final analysis, can only encourage action; but if we are to be effective it will be up to all of us as citizens to work on this job together and individually.

In this connection, I think we should all be grateful to the National Wildlife Federation for its devotion to this important undertaking. The National Wildlife Federation is a privately financed organization with headquarters in Washington, D.C. First organized in 1936, it now represents some 2 million persons in State conservation organizations, associate members, and individual contributors. It publishes several periodicals in addition to the colorful National Wildlife magazine. It provides several services as part of its educational program including the award of annual fellowships to college students majoring in conservation.

So we observe National Wildlife Week this spring, and place particular emphasis on the theme of protection of natural beauty, in large part because of the continuing concern and the fine organizational drive of the National Wildlife Association.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 570 TO REQUIRE A CERTIFICATE OF FITNESS BY THE MANUFACTURER OF A MOTOR VEHICLE

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1966, I submitted the following statement to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of my bill, H.R. 570, which would require a certificate of fitness by the manufacturer of a motor vehicle before it can be moved in commerce:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER TO COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 570, TO REQUIRE CERTIFICATE OF FITNESS IN SALE OF AUTOMOBILES AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, MARCH 15, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to express my views in support of my bill, H.R. 570.

The bill requires a certificate of fitness by the manufacturer of a motor vehicle before it can be shipped, sold, transferred, or otherwise moved in commerce. The certificate must state that (1) the motor vehicle and all parts and accessories have been inspected and found in good working order, safe and ready for operation on the public highways and in complete accord with all specifications, as set forth in all descriptive and advertising matter; and (2) that the vehicle has been road tested and found in good operating condition after having been so road tested. The bill prescribes a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year or both and becomes effective 90 days after enactment.

If enacted into law, this bill should prevent "lemons" from being delivered to customers. The requirement that the vehicle be road tested and found in good operating condition after having been so road tested assures that the vehicle will be in good operating condition when it is sold to the customer.

The bill also requires that all the parts and accessories of the motor vehicle have been inspected and found in good working order, safe and ready for operation on the public highways. We have all heard about instances in which the steering gear came off in the hands of the operator or the motor literally dropped out or a defective wheel collapsed, as in the case of *MacPherson* v. *Buick Motor Co.* (111 N.E. 1950 (1916)).

Under the bill a motor vehicle and all its parts must be in complete accord with all specifications as set forth in all descriptive and advertising matter. Some advertising has gone beyond "puffing" and no longer represents the product accurately.

Not only is this bill in the public interest but, in the long run, it is also in the interest of the manufacturer, the car dealer and, more immediately, in the interest of the car purchaser.

The certificate of fitness in this bill is analogous to the certificate of air worthiness required by the Civil Aeronautics Authority before a plane is allowed to take to the air. Motor vehicles of present power can easily become dangerous instrumentalities and more effective measures must be found to insure that mechanically the dangers from latent defects are reduced to a minimum. My bill is a step in that direction.

My bill would help to prevent accidents due to defective cars and parts. To that extent, it would protect the public from physical injury by preventing the accident in advance, rather than to compel them to resort to courts for legal redress for injuries, after the accident. Money can never compensate for a maimed body or for the death of a loved one.

My bill would put responsibility for a new car where it belongs—on the manufacturer. At present, if a purchaser gets stuck with a "lemon," he just stays stuck. In many instances the dealer is unable to iron out the mechanical bugs. This bill takes the onus off the dealer, and places it on the manufacturer. It is easier for the manufacturer to check for and eliminate any defects that may develop in the course of the manufacture of the vehicle than it is to discover and remedy a defect after it is in the hands of the purchaser. Common business prudence would indicate the course prescribed by the bill.

It is unfair to require the dealer to correct latent defects in the manufacture of an automobile. It is unfair to subject the dealer's good name and reputation to the derelictions of the manufacturer.

This bill is in the public interest. The safety features embodied in this bill are needed. I have been interested in this bill for many years. Now is the time to enact it.

I urge this committee to report favorably on H.R. 570.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 12905, TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1966, I submitted the following statement to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of my bill, H.R. 12905, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency in the Department of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER TO COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 12905, TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, MARCH 15, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity afforded me to express my views on my bill, H.R. 12905, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency.

I shall not burden the members of this committee with the many technical aspects of this bill, which I am sure, have by now been fully discussed by the sponsor of H.R. 12548, and many of our other colleagues who have also introduced identical bills.

In general, this bill would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency in the Department of Commerce. Its purpose would be to provide national leadership to reduce death, injury and property damage on our highways by intensive research and vigorous application of remedies. It would provide the means for a concerted attack on the problem of death and mayhem on our highways.

The Agency would be headed by an Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and would contain a traffic safety center that would research the problem of traffic safety, whose findings would be used to establish national safety standards.

The national traffic safety program to be established would among other things conduct engineering studies and establish safety standards.

Our motor vehicle manufacturers could certify for labeling and advertising purposes that their products meet U.S. safety standards upon adequate proof of compliance.

Grants could be made to States of up to 30 percent of the cost of traffic safety programs established by them.

The need for this bill must be apparent. The number of deaths on our national highways amounts to a national scandal; 49,000 of our fellow Americans met their deaths on the highways in 1965, a new record for 1 year. This carnage on our highways must stop.

While we recognize the need for national safety programs in the case of air travel, we continue to view highway myopically. The Federal Aviation Agency employs 47,000 people to protect the 12 percent of our people who fly each year. No similar agency of the National Government performs such function for our vastly larger number of highway travelers. It just doesn't make sense for us to continue to ignore the problem of highway travel at the national level.

Individual States cannot legislate safety features into automobiles without creating chaos in the industry. To establish a uniform system of highways, we must have national standards. This bill does not seek to supplant existing public and private agencies in the field. It seeks only to provide aggressive national leadership so that uniformity of action can be achieved by all agencies of State and local governments, members of industry and other public or private organizations that are concerned with the problem.

We either travel together in safety on the highway through national leadership and common effort by all the interested parties or we travel separately on the highway, each in his own way to face, as best he can, the death and mayhem that lurks there.

I urge the committee to favorably report H.R. 12905.

NORTHEAST IOWA OEO RECORD

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CULVER**. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is important that we continually concern ourselves with the proper implementation of the programs established by the Congress to insure that they are administered in an efficient and effective manner.

I have recently completed a study of the early operation of the economic opportunity program in the Second Congressional District of Iowa, and would like to take this opportunity to bring the results to the attention of my colleagues.

I have requested that this report be inserted in the Record at this point:

Operation of the Economic Opportunity Program in the Second Congressional District of Iowa

INTRODUCTION

The enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 marked the commitment of the Nation to the difficult, though promising, task of attacking for the first time in its history the root causes of poverty. Because of the enormity of the undertaking and the adoption of a new approach to the most complex social, economic, and political problems, it is not altogether surprising that administrative difficulties have arisen and mistakes have occurred. At this time, however, it is vital to the successful development of the program that we pause to constructively evaluate efforts to date, and locate those areas where greater attention is needed to overcome possible instances of waste or inefficiency.

This report presents an analysis of the successes and shortcomings of the economic opportunity program during the first year of operation in the Second Congressional District of Iowa, together with recommendations for improving implementation of the program. The report is based on three factors:

1. The discussion conducted at a districtwide conference held in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in January 1966, to review the experiences of officials of local community action organizations and Project Headstart programs, and over 150 participants in these programs from each of the 11 counties in the district.
2. Responses to a questionnaire evaluating the economic opportunity program which was mailed to approximately 1,200 participants in the district.
3. Letters from and personal discussions with individuals having experience with the economic opportunity program in the second district.

SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCES IN THE SECOND DISTRICT

Community action programs are largely in developmental stages and, at this time, applications have been approved for only two counties. Five other counties have submitted applications, and plans are underway in the remaining four counties.

Project Headstart was operated in eight counties in the summer of 1965. A total of 1,113 children participated in the programs in 52 centers.

One county organized a short-term Neighborhood Youth Corps during the serious spring floods of 1965, and a grant was recently approved to establish a 1-year Neighborhood Youth Corps project for out-of-school enrollees age 16 to 21 in a second county. College work-study programs have been established in two counties. One county has been granted approval for Operation Medicare Alert (which will involve four neighboring counties outside the Second District).

SUCCESSES

In spite of organizational and administrative difficulties, it was generally observed that the development of community action programs accomplished the following results:

1. Definition of the major problems and needs of the community and the beginning of a public recognition and understanding of the problems.
2. Mobilization of community resources for the betterment of the community.
3. Stimulation of heretofore untapped human resources which, now activated, will be available for future participation in other areas of community action.

Evaluation of Headstart programs was overwhelmingly favorable, although suggestions for improvement were made. Whereas community action programs are for the most part still in formative stages, Project Headstart was fully operative and the positive effects of the program have been noted in the subsequent adaptation and behavior of participating children during the school year. These include:

1. A growing social awareness and markedly improved ability to communicate, together with a feeling of personal security.
2. Intellectual stimulation and increased readiness for formal education.
3. Positive health benefits, including medical and dental treatment as well as better nutrition.
4. Development of favorable personal habits and manners.

SHORTCOMINGS

Since the experience with the economic opportunity program in northeast Iowa is less than a year, its lasting effects cannot be reliably foretold. However, certain identifiable problem areas have been observed in the Second District at this early date.

1. Bureaucratic complexities, delays, and a lack of communication between levels of operation: The delay in processing applications for programs was a major source of frustration encountered in almost every area. A corollary problem stems from the extreme complexity of the application process. It was generally felt that instructions and requirements were more numerous and complicated than necessary, leaving too little discretionary authority with local agencies.

Concern in this area has been further intensified by an alarming lack of communications and resultant inability of local officials to learn the status of pending applications without direct contact with the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, usually through the intervention of the Congressman. One telling example of this problem lies in the experience of a local agency which at the urging of OEO officials spent several months planning a Neighborhood Youth Corps project and preparing an application meeting the elaborate Federal requirements. When the otherwise meritorious application was turned down after considerable delay because funds were unavailable for the program, disillusionment at the local level was significant and a great effort was required to rebuild enthusiasm for the entire program.

It has also been suggested that assistance in implementation of the broad range of community programs encouraged under the Economic Opportunity Act could be provided through a greater coordination of the efforts of the various Federal agencies having responsibilities in this area. In this respect, the point was made that the preference component concept, while valid in principle, has not proven an effective means of expediting consideration of components by other Government agencies.

2. Lack of operational knowledge and preparation: Too often during the past year the emphasis has been placed on immediate implementation of programs on a nationwide basis to the exclusion of more desirable initial limited experimentation. Proceeding without sufficient planning and preparation and lacking practical knowledge has in many instances contributed to delays in certain local projects, while forcing implementation of others (notably Project Headstart and Operation Medicare Alert) on a crash basis.

3. Identification and involvement of those most in need of programs: A key difficulty lies in identifying the disadvantaged, a problem perhaps more acute in rural areas where different criteria must be used and pockets of poverty are not found in the usual sense. Once identified, an involvement of these individuals is often blocked by traditional derogatory connotations associated with the term "poverty"—that is, a lack of initiative and ambition, social inferiority, and low intelligence.

The importance of voluntary participation and involvement was particularly noted in Project Headstart where parental interest was a significant factor in the success of the programs. Teachers emphasized the vital importance of promoting continuity in programs beyond Project Headstart to reach the child in his total environment.

4. Inadequate use of existing local agencies and expertise: It was suggested that new approaches, initiative, and attacks on community problems should be combined with the experience of local welfare agencies, trained social workers, and specially equipped schoolteachers and administrators. While the success of these new programs is geared to moving away from the traditional dole concepts of assisting the disadvantaged, it is thought that existing agencies and professionals can provide valuable assistance in identifying needy individuals, building community rapport, and developing specific programs to supplement efforts of the community action agency.

5. Lack of general public understanding of the objectives and accomplishments of the program: The difficulties in countering local disapproval or disinterest and stimulating community involvement were commonly related to a general misunderstanding of the causes of poverty and the nature and intent of the economic opportunity program. Contributing to these difficulties is the failure of local officials to adequately publicize the positive accomplishments and objectives of their programs and to fully utilize the news media in doing so. Until there is greater information available on these matters, it will be virtually impossible to achieve the degree of community interest and concern essential to the long-range objectives of the program.

The economic opportunity program in the Second District has made a successful beginning. Tangible results are evident from Project Headstart, and positive efforts have been made in identifying local needs and stimulating community activity. More importantly, perhaps, a strong basis for future accomplishment has been established through involvement of a particularly impressive number of dedicated and capable residents of the district in the administration and operation of the program at the community and county level.

At this early date, three areas are most in need of improvement.

Communication: Internally, between levels of OEO and the local agency; locally between the agency and those to whom it is directed; and externally in generally informing the public of the purposes and progress of the program.

Administration: At the Federal level, in planning and proposing projects, establishing guidelines, and processing applications; at the local level in identifying eligible individuals and properly utilizing existing agencies and expertise.

Involvement: Of the disadvantaged and of the community as a whole.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recognizing the difficulty of making specific suggestions to improve programs which depend so heavily upon the adaptation to local situations, the following recommendations are offered on the basis of experience in the Second District of Iowa:

1. Applications should be encouraged by OEO only when that Office or the appropriate agency is fully prepared at every level to process and fund such applications. Once accepted, applications must be expedited and local officials advised of the progress.

2. Where possible, new programs or projects should be first developed as pilot or demonstration projects which, after reasonable experimentation, can be more widely funded and tailored to local needs.

3. Specific requirements on the day-to-day administration and operation of programs should be kept to an absolute minimum to permit the greatest possible adaptation to local situations.

4. The complementary nature of various components of a community action program should be recognized. For example, the opportunities provided through Project Headstart could be built upon through tutorial teaching, Neighborhood Youth Corps, youth centers, and other programs appropriate to the community.

5. To encourage participation and public acceptance, emphasis should be placed on the opportunity offered by these programs, and their identification with poverty minimized.

6. Community action programs should be encouraged to utilize more fully the experience of interested local agencies and experts. Project Headstart should coordinate its program with local school officials so that the benefits of the preschool experience will carry over into the formal school situation.

7. Greater efforts should be made to offset irresponsible public criticism and common misunderstandings by calling attention to the positive accomplishments of the program at the local level.

8. Local officials should attempt to increasingly involve the community as a whole through invitation to observe, participate in, and constructively comment upon, local programs.

Finally, the desirability of encouraging continued internal appraisal and constructive criticism of the program should be reemphasized. Experience in the Second District indicates that future planning in this area can be importantly assisted through an effective exchange of ideas among officials and participants in various programs among local areas, throughout the State, and across the Nation.

THE LATE HONORABLE REVEREND BERNARD BRASKAMP, D.D.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREIGG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the honored tradition of this body, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of the memorial service held for our late beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, at the Sixth Presbyterian Church here in Washington on February 25, 1966, as conducted by Pastor Benjamin E. Sheldon:

WITNESS TO THE RESURRECTION

(Funeral service for the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D., February 25, 1966, Sixth Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., conducted by the Reverend Benjamin E. Sheldon, pastor of Sixth Presbyterian Church, assisted by the Reverend Henry A. Baumann, pastor of Fairfax, Va., Presbyterian Church, and the Reverend Tracy K. Boyer, pastor of Silver Spring Presbyterian Church.)

Organ prelude of hymns: "Sun of My Soul," "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," "Jesus, Savior, Pilot Me," "O Love That Wilt Not Let Me Go," "Hark! Hark, My Soul!"

CALL TO WORSHIP BY MR. SHELDON

"I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whoever lives and believes in me shall never die."

"Come to me, all who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

"Our help is in the name of the Lord who made heaven and earth."

HYMN OF PRAISE, "BLESSING AND HONOR AND GLORY AND POWER"

"Blessing and honor and glory and power,
Wisdom and riches and strength evermore
Give ye to Him who our battle hath won,
Whose are the Kingdom, the crown, and the throne.
"Soundeth the heaven of the heavens with His name;
Ringeth the earth with His glory and fame;
Ocean and mountain, stream, forest and flower
Echo His praises and tell of His power.
"Ever ascendeth the song and the joy;
Ever descendeth the love from on high;
Blessing and honor and glory and praise—
This is the theme of the hymns that we raise.
"Give we the glory and praise to the Lamb;
Take we the robe and the harp and the palm;
Sing we the song of the Lamb that was slain,
Dying in weakness, but rising to reign."
Amen.

PRAYER OF CONFESSION

Eternal Father, guardian of our lives: we confess that we are children of dust, unworthy of thy gracious care. We have not loved as we ought to love, nor have we lived as thou hast commanded, and our years are soon past. Lord God, have mercy upon us. Forgive our sin and raise us into newness of life, that as long as we live we may serve thee until, dying, we enter thy presence; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

ASSURANCE OF PARDON

"Hear and believe in the good news of the gospel."

"Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted."

"God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness."

"The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting. I declare unto you, in the name of Jesus Christ, we are forgiven."

Amen.

DOXOLOGY

READING FROM THE WORD OF GOD BY MR. BAUMANN

The Old Testament

Psalm 90

"Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations.

"Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, from everlasting to everlasting thou art God.

"Thou turnest man back to the dust, and sayest, 'Turn back, O children of men!'

"For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, or as a watch in the night.

"Thou dost sweep men away; they are like a dream, like grass which is renewed in the morning: in the morning it flourishes and is renewed; in the evening it fades and withers.

"For we are consumed by thy anger; by thy wrath we are overwhelmed.

"Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance.

"For all our days pass away under thy wrath, our years come to an end like a sigh.

"The years of our life are threescore and ten, or even by reason of strength fourscore; yet their span is but toil and trouble; they are soon gone, and we fly away.

"Who considers the power of thy anger, and thy wrath according to the fear of thee?

"So teach us to number our days that we may get a heart of wisdom.

"Return, O Lord! How long? Have pity on thy servants!

"Satisfy us in the morning with thy steadfast love, that we may rejoice and be glad all our days.

"Make us glad as many days as thou hast afflicted us, and as many years as we have seen evil.

"Let thy work be manifest to thy servants, and thy glorious power to their children.

"Let the favor of the Lord our God be upon us, and establish thou the work of our hands upon us, yea, the work of our hands establish thou it."

Psalm 46

"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.

"Therefore we will not fear though the earth should change, though the mountains shake in the heart of the sea; though its waters roar and foam, though the mountains tremble with its tumult. Selah.

"There is a river whose streams make glad the city of God, the holy habitation of the Most High.

"God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved; God will help her right early.

"The nations rage, the kingdoms totter; he utters his voice, the earth melts.

"The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge. Selah.

"Come, behold the works of the Lord, how he has wrought desolations in the earth.

"He makes wars cease to the end of the earth; he breaks the bow, and shatters the spear, he burns the chariots with fire!

" 'Be still, and know that I am God. I am exalted among the nations, I am exalted in the earth!' The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge. Selah."

Psalm 121

"I lift up my eyes to the hills. From whence does my help come?

"My help comes from the Lord, who made heaven and earth.

"He will not let your foot be moved, he who keeps you will not slumber.

"Behold, he who keeps Israel will neither slumber nor sleep.

"The Lord is your keeper; the Lord is your shade on your right hand.

"The sun shall not smite you by day, nor the moon by night.

"The Lord will keep you from all evil; he will keep your life.

"The Lord will keep your going out and your coming in from this time forth and for evermore."

Psalm 103

"Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name!

"Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits, who forgives all your iniquity, who heals all your diseases, who redeems your life from the Pit, who crowns you with steadfast love and mercy, who satisfies you with good as long as you live so that your youth is renewed like the eagle's.

"The Lord works vindication and justice for all who are oppressed.

"He made known his ways to Moses, his acts to the people of Israel.

"The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love.

"He will not always chide, nor will he keep his anger for ever.

"He does not deal with us according to our sins, nor requite us according to our iniquities.

"For as the heavens are high above the earth, so great is his steadfast love toward those who fear him; as far as the east is from the west, so far does he remove our transgressions from us.

"As a father pities his children, so the Lord pities those who fear him.

"For he knows our frame; he remembers that we are dust.

"As for man, his days are like grass; he flourishes like a flower of the field; for the wind passes over it, and it is gone, and its place knows it no more.

"But the steadfast love of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon those who fear him, and his righteousness to children's children, and those who keep his covenant and remember to do his commandments.

"The Lord has established his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom rules over all.

"Bless the Lord, O you his angels, you mighty ones who do his word, hearkening to the voice of his word!

"Bless the Lord, all his hosts, his ministers that do his will!

"Bless the Lord, all his works, in all places of his dominion.

"Bless the Lord, O my soul!"

Psalm 23

"The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want; he makes me lie down in green pastures.

"He leads me beside still waters; he restores my soul.

"He leads me in paths of righteousness for his name's sake.

"Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil; for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me.

"Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of my enemies; thou anointest my head with oil, my cup overflows.

"Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I shall dwell in the house of the Lord for ever."

GLORIA PATRI

READING FROM THE WORD OF GOD BY MR. BOYER

The New Testament

I Corinthians 15

"For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve. Then he appeared to more than five hundred brethren at one time, most of whom are still alive, though some have fallen asleep. Then he appeared to James, then to all the apostles. Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me.

"Now if Christ is preached as raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised; if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain. We are even found to be misrepresenting God, because we testified of God that he raised Christ, whom he did not raise if it is true that the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised. If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins. Then those also who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. If for this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most to be pitied.

"But someone will ask, 'How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?' You foolish man! What you sow does not come to life unless it dies. And what you sow is not the body which is to be, but a bare kernel, perhaps of wheat or of some other grain. But God gives it a body as he has chosen, and to each kind of seed its own body. For not all flesh is alike, but there is one kind for men, another for animals, another for birds, and another for fish. There are celestial bodies, and there are terrestrial bodies; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for star differs from star in glory.

"So it is with the resurrection of the dead. What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. As was the man of dust, so are those who are of the dust; and as is the man of heaven, so are those who are of heaven. Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven. I tell you this, brethren: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable."

Romans 8

"We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose. What then shall we say to this? If God is for us, who is against us? He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all, will he not also give us all things with him? Who shall bring any charge against God's elect? It is God who justifies; who is to condemn? It is Christ Jesus, who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? No, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us. For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Revelation 21

"Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more. And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband; and I heard a great voice from the throne saying, 'Behold, the dwelling of God is with men. He will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself will be with them; he will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain any more, for the former things have passed away.'

"And I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the almighty and the Lamb. And the city has no need of sun or moon to shine upon it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb.

"There shall no more be anything accursed, but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it, and his servants shall worship him; they shall see his face, and his name shall be on their foreheads. And night shall be no more; they need no light or lamp or sun, for the Lord God will be their light, and they shall reign for ever and ever."

John 14

" 'Let not your hearts be troubled; believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many rooms; if it is were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? And when I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, that where I am you may be also. And you know the way where I am going.' Thomas said to him, 'Lord, we do not know where you are going; how can we know the way?' Jesus said to him, 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father, but by me.' "

HYMN: "O GOD, OUR HELP IN AGES PAST"

"O God, our Help in ages past, Our hope for years to come,

"Our shelter from the stormy blast, And our eternal home."

Amen.

THE WITNESS TO THE RESURRECTION

(Message by Mr. Sheldon)

Death forces us into silence. Somehow there seems little we can say. All that the poets and philosophers and preachers have said seems hollow and vain when we face death.

It is then that we echo the age-old question of the Patriarch, Job, when he said: "If a man die, shall he live again?"

But God does have a word for us: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. Yea, blessed indeed," says the Spirit, "for they rest from their labors and their works do follow them." (Rev. 14:13) And our blessed Lord Jesus Christ further declared: "Because I live, you shall live also." (John 14:19)

This is the word in the face of the silence. This is our witness to the truth of the resurrection, to the truth of the Christian Gospel.

Do not be deceived. Our beloved father, friend, pastor, counselor does not lie in this casket here before us. He lives because Jesus lives. This was his hope. It is our hope today. He is now gazing into the face of the One whom so faithfully he served, whose truth he declared, of whose Gospel he was a bondservant.

Therefore, today we join the witness of the believers in all ages and say: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." And in believing this we find comfort. Let us confess our faith together:

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth; And in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting."

Amen.

PRAYER

God of all grace, who in Jesus Christ our Savior brought eternal life to light: we give thee thanks that by his death he has destroyed the power of death and sin, and by his resurrection opened the kingdom of heaven to all. Grant us to know that because he lives, we shall live also, and that neither death nor life, nor things present, nor things to come, shall be able to separate us from thy love, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

O Thou before whom the generations rise and pass away: we praise thee for all thy servants who, having lived this life in faith, now live eternally with thee. Especially do we thank thee for thy servant Bernard Braskamp, for the gift of his life, for thy grace given him, and for all that in him was good and kind and faithful. We thank thee for his loyal devotion to Jesus Christ; the years of his service as a faithful minister of Jesus Christ; the many lives he touched and the souls he brought closer to God and his selfless devotion to his duties as pastor, father, and husband. We thank thee that for him death is past and pain is ended and that he has entered the joy which thou hast prepared; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

HYMN: "THOU HIDDEN SOURCE OF CALM REPOSE"

"Thou hidden source of calm repose,
Thou all-sufficient love devine,
My help and refuge from my foes,
Secure I am while thou are mine;
And lo! from sin, and grief, and shame,
I hide me, Jesus, in Thy name.

"Thy mighty name salvation is,
And keeps my happy soul above:
Comfort it brings, and power and peace,
And joy, and everlasting love:
To me, with Thy great name, are given
Pardon and holiness and heaven.

"Jesus, my all in all Thou art:
My rest in toil, my ease in pain,
The healing of my broken heart,
In war my peace, in loss my gain,
My smile beneath the tyrant's frown,
In shame my glory and my crown,

"In want my plentiful supply,
In weakness my almighty power,
In bonds my perfect liberty,
My light in Satan's darkest hour,
In grief my joy unspeakable,
My life in death: my all in all."

Amen.

BENEDICTION

Hear the words of our Lord Jesus Christ: "Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you: not as the world gives, do I give to you. Let not your hearts be troubled, neither let them be afraid."

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all. Amen.

BULOVA'S INTERNATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is rightfully proud of the historic spirit of cooperation which has been so much a part of Government and industry in the United States. It is, therefore, with great pleasure that I call the attention of the House to the dynamic and cooperative programs initiated by a firm in my home district, the Bulova Watch Co.

For many years, this organization has been a leader in training handicapped people in this country and providing them an opportunity to become some of this Nation's most productive and useful citizens. Today, I particularly want to call attention to the commendable forward-looking leadership demonstrated by Mr. Harry B. Henshel, Bulova's president, in carrying out imaginative international training programs.

Four years ago the 91-year-old company established an international exchange scholarship program open to foreign students. Appropriately called Project Pride, the program offers 2-year scholarships at the world-renowned Bulova School of Watchmaking where students are trained to be highly skilled watchmakers. Upon graduation, the students are obligated to establish a similar training program in their native lands, thus generating a broad base of highly skilled workers. The Bulova school, in cooperation with the World Rehabilitation Fund and other international rehabilitation agencies, has graduated students from Hong Kong, Israel, Lebanon, and Taiwan.

Recently, as an extension of Project Pride, the company announced the establishment of a horological scholarship program for citizens of the Virgin Islands. While the Virgin Islands are known primarily for tourism, it is significant to note that a young watch industry is fast developing there. Already its 14 companies employ nearly 700 Virgin Islanders. Commenting on this potential, Mr. Henshel observed that "the full development of the young Virgin Islands watch industry is contingent upon the development and maturing of local talent into topranking managerial roles."

To help make this a reality, Bulova is setting up a scholarship program in cooperation with the Virgin Islands Department of Education to train students to be qualified watchmakers. After completion of training, the graduating scholars will be eligible to compete for top technical positions in the local watch industry. While only two scholarships will be initially offered—each worth $10,000—the program marks a beginning in the development of a pool of local talent for managerial and technical administrative positions.

This example of the resourcefulness and cooperation of industry in helping people to be self-sufficient is in the finest traditions of our free enterprise system.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF UNITED STATES

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday morning it was my distinct pleasure to accompany several members of the Italian-American War Veterans from my district to a wreath-laying ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

The ceremony was but one part in a 4-day conference held by this wonderful organization, but I must say, it was a most impressive part. Thought provoking prayers were offered at that time by Msgr. John Positano, from Vineland, N.J. Monsignor Positano is national honorary chaplain of the Italian-American War Veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly interested in the conference held here because last year I introduced a bill which is elementary to the activities of the Italian-American War Veterans. My bill will officially recognize the Italian-American War Veterans in claims before the Veterans' Administrator.

The goals and ambitions of this patriotic organization can best be summed up in the words of two eminent gentlemen, Mr. John Nave, who is a former national commander, and who, incidentally, comes from my district; and Mr. Anthony Lo Popolo, the present national commander:

SPEECH OF PAST NATIONAL COMMANDER JOHN F. NAVE, OF SYRACUSE, N.Y., CHAIRMAN IV WASHINGTON CONFERENCE, AND CHAIRMAN NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COORDINATION COMMITTEE, ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 19, 1966

Honorable Members of Congress, distinguished guests, friends and members of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, we are again privileged to meet—for the fourth time in 16 years to be exact—in our Nation's Capital to restate and reaffirm in a more clear and precise manner the aims, policies, and beliefs of our great veterans' organization.

To begin with, it is important that the Members of the Congress, officials in Government, and the public in general have a proper and correct image of our group, and ones similar to us.

In the past we have been identified with such barbs as being "split" and "hyphenated." Nothing could be further from the truth. Our organization is strictly American, and made up wholly and without exception of honorably discharged American war veterans. Also, it pursues a strict policy of being nonprofit and nonpolitical, coupled with works of charity and benevolence.

Then, how does it differ from other similar veterans' groups? I have coined the phraseology that in the United States of America we can separate our large interstate veterans' organizations into international and national types, rather than "split" ("hyphenated") and "nonsplit" ("nonhyphenated") ones.

Groups like the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, and its Polish, French, and other counterparts are internationalized types of veterans' groups, interested in bridging the gap between the United States of America and countries of antecedency so as to promote peace and prosperity.

It is interesting to note that where we have internationalized types of veterans' groups in the United States of America we have a democratic country of antecedency, or one friendly to same. One exception: Poland. Yet, there is widespread belief that if the Poles could vote in a free election they would vote democratic and be on the side of liberty and freedom.

In 1948 the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States joined in a great effort to convince people of its antecedency that the preservation of democracy in their homeland (Italy) against communism was of great value to freedom thinking and desiring people. Democracy won out. One desirable effect: the United States of America budget for defense did not have to be hiked as would have been the case if this country of antecedency had been lost to communism. Only an internationalized type of American war veterans' group could have performed so well.

By contrast we find ourselves embroiled with Communists and unfriendly forces in Cuba, Far East, and many parts of Latin

America and Africa. Research indicates we have no internationalized types of American war veterans' groups to bridge the gap between the United States of America and these countries. Part of this can be laid to a very poor immigration policy, just recently corrected, that has hovered over our country for the past 40 years or so.

Thus, up to this point one can safely surmise that internationalized types of veterans' groups tend to be more liberal in their philosophies as they affect people in the world community. And this, of course, is generally true. The fight for immigration reforms is a classical example. The internationalized types of veterans' groups fought for it; while the others took a much more conservative and negative view.

A good immigration policy makes for sound foreign relations. As the immigrants become citizens, they bridge a gap between our country and the country of their antecedency. Some of them become war veterans and find themselves doing this work through internationalized types of war veterans' organizations. And the same goes for their children and descendants. The end-result is the great tendency toward peace and prosperity between the new homeland and the homeland of antecedency.

As the world shrinks through faster means of communications and transportation, the importance of internationalized types of war veterans' group like the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States thus takes on added meaning.

It is ironic that several States in the Union where such organizations are active and well known have recognized them through the enactment of proper State laws. Yet, the Congress which should foster these groups all the more because of their international value, as well as domestic, seem to have developed a blind spot. Only recently has the U.S. Senate been liberalizing its attitude toward them. This perhaps may prove a new beginning of understanding. On the other hand, the House of Representatives through its judiciary committee still remains negative save for a few Members.

In general all veterans' organizations, irrespective of type, agree on the certain basic rights and principles concerning veterans, their widows, children, and dependents. Also, they are patriotic and loyal. The big difference between them lies in the manner and ways of achieving these aims. Fortunately, each contributes by going its separate merry way. This is another way of spelling democracy and freedom of action and obtainment. America is fortunate and strong because of this. However, it can become stronger and more fortunate when it discovers the greater role internationalized types of war veterans' organizations can play in community life here and abroad by fostering them more and removing the current misunderstanding about them.

Let us never forget that members of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, and its counterparts, seek only the best interest and welfare of the country. They are not "split" nor "hyphenated," but just plain 100-percent Americans.

Address of Anthony V. Lo Popolo, National Commander of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at the Fourth Washington Conference, Washington, D.C., March 18, 19, 20, 1966

The Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., was incorporated on February 20, 1932, in the State of Connecticut. Since that time we have been incorporated in the States of Florida, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Ohio, Massachusetts, California, New Jersey, and New York. We are also active in the State of Illinois. Since our birth 34 years ago we have been diligently working for official recognition by the Veterans' Administrator of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States for the prosecution of veterans' claims. The Veterans' Administrator has the power and authority to recognize our organization under 38 U.S.C. 3402. Yet we are still awaiting official recognition after numerous conferences with the Veterans' Administrator. On March 7, 1966, I brought this problem to the attention of President Lyndon B. Johnson with the following letter.

March 7, 1966.

President Lyndon Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson: Jack Valenti, your special assistant, advised me on February 28, 1966, that a short conference with you was not possible on any of the dates of March 17, 18, 19, 1966, and I certainly can't understand this. It was my intention to present a crucial problem of our organization to you personally through a short conference while our organization held its special national executive committee meeting on March 17, 18, 19, 1966, at the Hotel Dupont Plaza, Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C.

The crucial problem besetting our organization today and for 34 years is the lack of official recognition by the Veterans' Administrator of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., for the prosecution of veterans' claims. The Veterans' Administrator has the right under the law to recognize our group and any veterans group for the prosecution of claims. Last year the Veterans' Administrator informed us at our last conference in Washington on March 13, 1965, that he would recognize us for this purpose if he received instructions from the President to do so or by an act of Congress. We informed him then that we would take this up with the President. This is what we are now doing. We feel that you, as President, would want the same equal treatment given to our veterans' organization as to that given all other veterans' organizations.

Our organization was incorporated on February 20, 1932, in Connecticut. Since then we have been incorporated in the States of Florida, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Ohio, Massachusetts, California, New Jersey, and New York. Our organization has among its members such esteemed members as Gov. John Volpe from Malden, Mass., Gino F. Merli, Congressional Medal of Honor winner, Judge William F. Cercone, of the Allegheny County Court of Pittsburgh, Pa., Peter F. Rodino, Congressman of New Jersey, Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, Dr. Edward Re, and Raymond Pettine, U.S. attorney for the State of Rhode Island. Yet whenever any of our members want us to service their claim with the Veterans' Administration, we are officially denied this right as we are not officially recognized by the Veterans' Administrator for this purpose. This is the problem that we would ask you to correct after 34 years and with no cost to the Government and with no increased budget. We know our organization can depend on you for equal treatment.

Very truly yours,
Anthony V. Lo Popolo,
National Commander.

As yet I have not received a reply.

For years we have also attempted to accomplish this recognition by the Veterans' Administrator by the introduction of numerous bills. In the 1st session of the 89th Congress the following bills were introduced: H.R. 571, H.R. 7001, and H.R. 6517 to accomplish this purpose. But these are still resting in committee. As I indicated to President Johnson in my letter of March 7, 1966, this official recognition will not increase the budget of the Veterans' Administration as it is without cost.

For a veterans' organization to adequately exist it must be able to present the claims of its members when needed to the Veterans' Administration. To deny this right to us and to grant it to other veterans' organizations is to discriminate against us and to deny us the right of the equal protection of laws to which we are all entitled. We have petitioned the Congress. We have petitioned the Veterans' Administrator. We have petitioned the President.

If these fail we must petition the courts for redress. Freedom and the guarantee of equal rights is a never-ending struggle between the oppressor and the oppressed. Vigilant and careful we must always be otherwise we lose these rights.

We are here this week to attempt to secure the rights given to others but denied to us. Our success in this endeavor depends upon the combined efforts of us all, members and friends alike.

Some of the other rights granted to other veterans' organizations but denied to us are:

1. The printing of annual national convention proceedings as a House Document under 44 U.S.C. 27B.
2. The acquisition of rifles for funeral ceremonial and other purposes under 10 U.S.C. 4683.
3. Incorporation under a Federal charter.
4. Erection of a national shrine.

Bills have been introduced in the 1st session of the 89th Congress attempting to secure these right enumerated above but all the bills presently rest in committee. It becomes our job but all the bills presently rest in committee. It becomes our job to convince the Congress of the justice of our cause in granting these to others and withholding them from us. This is why we are here, to push these bills into law. The Italian-American War Veterans of the United States Inc., has no paid lobbyist to advance its cause at Capitol Hill. Our case for the acquisition of these rights depends upon the justice of our cause and that right will prevail.

A NATIONAL POLICY ASSURING A FULL AND EQUAL EDUCATION TO ALL OF OUR NATION'S YOUNGSTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Holifield). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a joint resolution which would for the first time establish a national policy that every citizen is entitled to an education from nursery through graduate school without financial barriers and limited only by the desire to learn and ability to absorb such education.

This joint resolution is being introduced in order to establish a national goal in education. It in no way infringes on the rights of local communities to determine their own standards and goals.

I strongly believe that the basic decision affecting education must be made by local communities for it is only by leaving these decisions to local communities that we assure pluralism in American education.

This resolution is designed to put greater emphasis on the availability of education to youngsters, particularly in those cases where, because of lack of financial resources, gifted youngsters are denied an opportunity to develop their capacities to their fullest extent.

My resolution would help strengthen existing programs of assistance and would call for aiding the vast network of privately endowed educational institutions which are now doing a magnificent job within a framework of increasing financial difficulties.

In the last few years we have seen the Federal Government's contribution to local communities increase from approximately $400 million a year in 1960, to more than $13 billion in 1967. It appears to me that with such expenditures, there is a need for a national policy which would be a guideline for Federal assistance programs.

Oddly enough, while each of the bills providing Federal aid to education carries its own preamble and guidelines for that particular legislation, there is no broad, general, national policy dealing with aid to education.

This resolution, however, does not attempt to spell out how the national goal should be attained.

This would be left to the Congress and local school authorities.

However, it would, for instance, give emphasis to the growing belief among educators that formal education of our Nation's youngsters should begin as early as the nursery-age level. I have previously recommended that we extend the very successful Headstart program, now limited to preschool children of poverty-stricken families, to all preschool children of America.

I firmly believe that the day is not far away when American children will begin their formal education at the conclusion of their third birthday and complete high school by the time they reach their 16th birthday. After graduation from high school, the youngsters will then be able to decide whether they want to go on to college or go in other directions, including vocational education. My resolution today will help make such goals possible.

This country is now embarked on a vast program of assistance to youngsters seeking higher education, including low-interest loans, Federal scholarships, and university scholarships. As a matter of fact, while in 1940, out of a total high school graduating class of 1,221,000 only 34 percent or 418,000 youngsters went on to college; in 1965, out of a total 2,688,000 high school graduates throughout America, 54 percent or 1,442,000 went on to higher education. From these figures, it appears that much has been done to help assure youngsters a college education, including graduate work. It is at the other end of the spectrum, the early formative years, that I fear we experience our greatest shortcomings. Extension of Headstart to all youngsters at the age of 4 would, in my judgment, help close that gap.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is the outgrowth of recommendations made by the President's Commission on Automation. Mr. Joseph A. Beirne, a member of the President's Commission and president of the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, is the leading spokesman for translating the Commission's recommendations into a formal national policy through adoption of a joint congressional resolution. I believe Mr. Beirne is to be congratulated on his interest in the young people of America, and I am happy to introduce today a resolution which he has helped stimulate.

The resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Resolved by the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress reaffirms as a matter of highest priority the Nation's goal of equal educational opportunity. That the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States of America that every citizen is entitled to an education from nursery through graduate school without financial barriers and limited only by the desire to learn and ability to absorb such education. Our Nation's economic, political and social security demands no less.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Fountain (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business in district.

Mr. Todd, for 2 weeks, on account of personal business.

Mr. Cameron (at the request of Mr. Charles H. Wilson), from today, March 21, through April 5 on account of official business (International Economic Conference).

Mr. Gurney (at the request of Mr. Arends), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mr. MacGregor), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pucinski, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. Sullivan in two instances.

Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Tenzer.

Mr. Miller.

Mr. McCarthy.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MacGregor) and to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Lipscomb.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Vigorito) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cooley.

Mr. Morrison.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts.

Mr. Dow.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia.

Mr. Rooney of New York.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 969. An act to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants;

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio; and

H.R. 10722. An act to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada test site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12169. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 22, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2213. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of the Committee on Water Resources Research of the Federal Council for Science and Technology; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2214. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the 10th annual report on Reserve Forces for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 279, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2215. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1965 to January 1966, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2216. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of February 1966, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1966 and to the President's determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2217. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting AID reply to the Comptroller General relative to his report on unnecessary dollar grants to Iran under the foreign assistance program (B–133258), dated February 26, 1965; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2218. A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of the

National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of its charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

2219. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the National Capital Housing Authority for "Operation and maintenance of properties," for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2220. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting three drafts of proposed legislation to be known as Drug Safety Act of 1966, Child Safety Act of 1966, and Professional Training and Cooperation Amendments of 1966; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report on missile and space ground support operations, 23d report; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 781. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10607, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1341). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary, S. 518. An act for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 13804. A bill to equalize the rates of disability compensation payable to veterans of peacetime and wartime service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13805. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate the differential between the wartime and peacetime rates of disability and death compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 13806. A bill to increase the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13807. A bill to increase the rate of pension payable to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, their widows, and certain other dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13808. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13809. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize the Director to establish a small loan program for individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 13810. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to increase from $17,500 to $20,000 the general limitation on the maximum amount of a mortgage which the Federal National Mortgage Association may purchase under its special assistance functions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 13811. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 13812. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 13813. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13814. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 13815. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 13816. A bill to make overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense eligible for assistance under titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13817. A bill to amend section 301(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any person who is a national and citizen of the United States at birth under section 301(a)(7) of that act shall not lose his nationality and citizenship if the alien parent is naturalized while such person is under the age of 16 years and such person begins residing in the United States permanently while under the age of 16 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 13818. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 13819. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13820. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 13821. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists, and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 13822. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Postmaster General to further the research and development and construction engineering programs of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13823. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to June 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 13824. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 13825. A bill to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.R. 13826. A bill to establish and maintain orderly marketing conditions for processing pears in the interest of producers and consumers, and an orderly flow of the supply thereof to market throughout its normal marketing season to avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supplies and prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 13827. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 13828. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13829. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend certain mailing privileges with respect to parcels to members of the Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel in Vietnam and other overseas areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 13830. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize additional annual appropriations for grants thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 13831. A bill to amend title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to determining the number of handicapped children for whom each State provides education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 13832. A bill to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 13833. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 13834. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 13835. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 13836. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 13837. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13838. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13839. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 957. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.J. Res. 958. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 959. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 960. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 961. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 962. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 963. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 964. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 965. Joint resolution providing for a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 966. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 as "National UNICEF Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. Res. 782. Resolution authorizing reprinting of House Report No. 1219; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 783. Resolution authorizing reprinting of House Report No. 1236; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 784. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Res. 785. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 786. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12453) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to help train and otherwise provide professional health personnel for health work abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

423. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the proposed Allen Camp Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

424. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to opposing enactment of H.R. 11798, the proposed Federal Interstate Taxation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

425. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to opposing enactment of H.R. 12367 relating to increases in size and weight of packages shipped via the U.S. mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

426. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi transmitting a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 109 passed March 10, 1966, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 13840. A bill for the relief of Kyung Hee Park Grady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13841. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos Kaperonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13842. A bill for the relief of Sofia and Christos Ikonomou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 13843. A bill for the relief of Walter A. Radeloff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13844. A bill for the relief of Mohsen Nikazmerad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13845. A bill for the relief of John P. Ramoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13846. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aniela Musial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13847. A bill for the relief of Maria Julia Roque; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

351. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to providing parks for peaceful assembly, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 21, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Richard Stephenson, minister, Columbia Baptist Church, Falls Church, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who art the source of all life and wisdom, we ask now Thy blessings upon these on whose hearts lie the hopes and aspirations of so many.

We are full of gratitude that Thou hast given to us another day of opportunity to serve Thee and the cause of our common humanity. We ask that no dullness of perception, no slowness of will, no selfish interest will prevent the fulfillment of our responsibilities on this day.

We would confess our need for Thee. The world is so big and our hearts are so small. Fears and anxious thoughts often cloud over our clearest moments of vision and we are left with a spiritual astigmatism. We pray for the corrective power of faith that will make distinct our finest thoughts and make possible our most urgent hopes. In these days of darkness and doubts, may the light from Thee shine on us all.

O God, Thou hast given to our Nation great wealth, give to our people a spirit within to match the resources without. Give now to Thy servants who govern hearts of discernment and wills that are decisive.

The world presses down upon us from all directions. We need the sense of Thy presence that inner peace may reign even in the midst of outer conflicts. We need the strong power of deep conviction and the gift of courage that comes from truth firmly held.

Make this day a day when the spirit triumphs over the flesh and the cause of justice is tempered with mercy and our frantic world moves toward a calmer peace for all.

In the name of our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 17, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 18, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1666) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

TRUTH IN LENDING AND PACKAGING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 413)

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Senate today a message from the President of the United States on truth in lending and packaging. I ask unanimous consent that the message be printed in the RECORD without reading, and be jointly referred to the Committees on Commerce, Banking and Currency, and Labor and Public Welfare.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The consumer's interest is the American interest.

In guarding it, in promoting it, we improve the lives of every man, woman, and child in our Nation.

Consumers are all the people—the worker, the farmer, the businessman, and their families.

Every domestic program of the Federal Government in a very real sense is directed toward the consumer. When we work to stem pollution, improve transportation, or rebuild our cities, we promote the welfare of the American consumer.

The consumer has a right to a dollar of stable purchasing power.

I pledge to defend that right with all the ability and determination at my command.

All Americans can take pride in the economic record of recent years.

We are in the 61st month of unparalleled prosperity—the longest in our peacetime history.

A year ago 5 percent of our workers were unemployed. Now only 3.7 percent are out of work.

Today, our programs to provide better training and wider educational opportunities are supplying thousands of trained workers for our expanding economy.

Our standard of living has never been higher. Real consumption per capita—the way the average standard of living is measured—has advanced nearly 10 percent in the past 2 years—as large a dollar gain as in the preceding 8 years combined. That record could not have been achieved if inflation had eroded the value of the dollar and undermined the foundation of our prosperity.

This administration intends to maintain that record.

A new and progressive program is needed if we are to protect the American consumer's rights in the marketplace—his right to be informed, to choose, to be protected from unsafe products, and to be heard in the councils of government.

I recommend that the Congress enact comprehensive measures to secure these rights.

The American consumer has tremendous impact on the variety and quality of the goods and services available on the market.

The consumer buys what he wants. He cannot and should not be told what to buy. But he must be told what is available for purchase.

If the consumer is to be a wise sovereign in our progressive market economy, he must be fully informed. Free consumer choice—indeed, our free enterprise system—must rest on a firm foundation of reliable information on the costs and contents of the products we buy.

Today I renew my request that the Congress enact legislation to strengthen this foundation in two critical areas—lending and packaging.

I proposed legislation in these areas 2 years ago. President Kennedy made a similar recommendation 4 years ago. We have learned much from careful study of these proposals by the Congress and the public. Everything we have learned reaffirms my conviction that—

We can have equitable and effective laws on lending and packaging.

We can protect both the consumer and the overwhelming majority of honest businessmen from the minority of producers who would compete unfairly and infringe the rights of the consumer and their fellow businessmen.

We need reform in the credit area and we should encourage States to enact legislation to correct abuses.

We need such legislation urgently. We can now act wisely without further delay.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Every consumer and every business in America benefits from our system of consumer credit. Credit and the economy have grown together. Last year merchants, lending companies, and financial institutions extended about $75 billion in new installment credit to consumers.

Consumer credit—

Permits purchase of many of the goods and services which enrich the quality of American life—the homes, the automobiles, and household appliances we buy.

Finances the costs of higher education, travel, and other activities which broaden and develop the human spirit.

Relieves suffering and distress by spreading major medical expenses over a period of time.

Enables our young families to acquire and furnish homes early in life when good housing is most needed and best enjoyed.

Over the years, this system has worked well. Lenders charge reasonable rates. Borrowers repay their debts promptly. But a minority of unscrupulous operators charge all that the traffic will bear. They wring from the unwary purchaser a price far higher than the credit market requires.

The right of the consumer to know the actual cost of his credit has been ignored for too long. Credit is a commodity. The consumer has just as much right to know the cost of borrowing money as to know the price of any other article he buys.

Credit charges are a key item in the consumer budget. They totaled $24 billion last year. It is important that consumers be able to plan their budgets wisely—and prudently—in this important area.

Yet, many consumers had no information on how these credit costs relate to the cost of the article being financed.

They were confused by statements of credit rates described in unusual or even misleading terms.

They unknowingly paid higher prices for credit than reputable lenders were charging.

We must protect and inform the consumer in his use of the consumer credit system. Our credit structure will be sounder when the consumer has this information.

I therefore renew my recommendation for legislation requiring lenders to state the full cost of credit, simply and clearly, and to state it before any credit contract is signed.

This legislation will help consumers—

Budget their incomes more intelligently, because they will know the price of credit in the same clear terms as the price of milk or gasoline.

Compare credit costs so they shop for the best combination of quality and price—including all of the charges involved.

Avoid unscrupulous lenders who use excessive credit charges and other sharp practices.

This legislation will also help the legitimate lender by offering protection against any competitor who seeks to gain business by misrepresenting credit costs. It will insure the fair and effective competition that legitimate lenders desire.

It will not regulate the cost of credit itself, or interfere with existing laws.

It will not reduce the volume of credit.

It will not dampen the vigor of consumer buying.

This legislation will right the balance of legal protection between lenders and borrowers.

I urge the Congress to act to insure that the American consumer is given a clear price tag when he shops for credit.

FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING

Americans can choose among an unprecedented assortment of products when they go shopping.

In the average supermarket today, the housewife finds 8,000 items—more than five times the 1,500 items she found just 20 years ago. She also does an increasing amount of shopping in the self-service store—a product of efficiency in distribution. But with more products to choose from and fewer sales people to answer her questions, the housewife relies heavily on the package itself as her source of information in making a choice.

American industry has made enormous strides in providing attractive and informative packaging. American manufacturers maintain one of the highest standards of quality in the world. They know that packages which accurately and fully describe their wares are the best salesmen.

Nevertheless there are instances of deception in labeling and packaging. Practices have arisen that cause confusion and conceal information even when there is no deliberate intention to deceive. The housewife often needs a scale, a yardstick, and a slide rule to make a rational choice. She has enough to do without performing complicated mathematics in the stores.

It is not enough to hope that such practices will disappear by themselves. The Government must do its share to insure the shopper against deception, to remedy confusion and to eliminate questionable practices.

I urge the Congress to enact fair packaging and labeling legislation to—

1. Require that each package provide simple, direct, accurate, and visible information as to the nature and quantity of its contents, including ingredients where this is important.

2. Keep off the shelves packages with deceptively shaped boxes, misleading pictures, confusing or meaningless adjectives, inappropriate size or quantity markings, and promotional gimmicks that promise nonexistent savings.

3. Provide for the establishment of reasonable and appropriate weight standards to facilitate comparative shopping.

This legislation will not make packaging less attractive or less efficient. It will not prevent economies of scale in packaging, nor will it impose costly restrictions.

An accurate and informative package and label need not add to the producer's cost. It will add to the welfare of the American consumer.

PROTECTION FROM DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES

The consumer must not only be informed, he must also be protected from dangerous drugs, foods, and other substances.

Our ability to conquer pain and disease has increased dramatically. But we must not allow the development of new drugs and nutrients to outstrip our capacity to test and certify them for safety and effectiveness.

I recommend three related items of legislation to reinforce consumer protection.

THE CHILD SAFETY ACT

Children must be our first concern. They are our hope and our future.

Too many children now become seriously ill—too many die—because of accidents that could be avoided by adequate labeling and packaging of dangerous substances. This is senseless and needless tragedy.

Most drug manufacturers have taken responsible action in providing appropriate warnings on drug labels. The Food and Drug Administration has accomplished much in reducing the incidence of these private tragedies. But both have been greatly handicapped by gaps in the laws dealing with hazardous substances and materials.

It is still true, for example, that present law nowhere provides for inspection of unpackaged toys and novelties that may be poisonous to children.

To extend legal protection for the safety of all our citizens, especially our children, I recommend legislation to—

Bring all hazardous substances, regardless of their wrapping, under the safeguards of the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act.

Ban from commerce those household substances that are so hazardous that warning labels are not adequate safeguards.

Ban the sale of toys and other children's articles containing hazardous substances, regardless of their packaging.

Require labels to warn consumers against possible injury from drugs and cosmetics, and from food in pressurized containers.

Limit the amount of children's aspirin available in retail packages.

Require certain potent drugs attractive to children to have safety closure caps.

DRUG SAFETY ACT

Each year the Food and Drug Administration receives over 4,000 requests for study and approval of new drugs. Each new product is carefully analyzed and tested. This process is a basic consumer protection in which the United States leads the world.

But it is just as basic that the law require more accurate and detailed labeling of dangerous drugs—and that it deal specifically with drugs whose period of potency and purity is limited.

To make these improvements, and to protect the lives of all of our citizens, I recommend legislation to—

Authorize the Government to require records and reports of experience and to require labeling changes on any drug, whether old or new;

Require certification of all drugs whose potency and purity can mean life or death to a patient, thus extending the law which now applies to insulin and antibiotics; and

Control the unsolicited distribution of drug samples.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND COOPERATION AMENDMENTS

The task of protecting the consumer cannot and should not be left solely to the Federal Government. The Government can and should provide creative Federal leadership to help States and local communities in their own constructive and determined efforts.

As a step forward, Federal assistance is needed to strengthen and enlarge State and local professional staffs in the food and drug areas.

To begin to meet our Federal responsibility, I recommend legislation authorizing expansion of the Food and Drug Administration's training programs for non-Federal officials. This will be the first in a series of measures to broaden Federal-State-local cooperation in this vital field.

REVITALIZING THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

In addition to these legislative proposals, I pledge continued efforts to revitalize the Food and Drug Administration. This process is already well underway.

This agency has performed notably in the past. Yet the scope of its responsibility has been considerably broadened in recent years. The public interest demands that it receive the additional support it needs to perform its many new functions.

I recently appointed a new Commissioner of Food and Drugs to give the agency new leadership and new direction. I have directed him to conduct a thorough review of the agency's roles and missions and to move purposefully toward a new structure fitted to the demands of the times. I have also asked him to recruit personnel with the most outstanding backgrounds in science and public service.

The responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration are heavy. But they will be met.

To strengthen the Food and Drug Administration, I have proposed, in the fiscal year 1967 budget, the largest single increase ever requested for this agency.

I believe that the interests of the Nation fully support this request. I urge the Congress to provide the necessary funds and enact the recommended legislation to enable this important agency to fulfill the needs of our people.

COSMETICS AND MEDICAL DEVICES

Assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the drugs we buy has the highest priority. But further action may be necessary to protect the consumer against harmful cosmetics and against medical devices that are neither safe nor effective.

I have asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to begin a thorough analysis of the legislative authority now available and to recommend new steps that may be needed to close the gaps in the laws dealing with cosmetics and medical devices.

THE PROGRESS WE HAVE MADE

Since my message on consumer interests in 1964, much has been accomplished.

The Federal Trade Commission has launched an intensive program to protect consumers from unfair marketing practices. It has established a Consumer Complaints Bureau in the District of Columbia and is prepared to help the States develop such programs of their own.

The Federal Power Commission's natural power survey estimates that by 1980 as much as $11 billion per year can be saved in the cost of electricity for Americans. The Commission stemmed the rising cost of natural gas and retroactively reduced rates. As a result more than $650 million has been refunded and annual gas costs to consumers have been reduced by $130 million.

The Department of Defense has issued an important directive designed to protect servicemen as consumers, with special emphasis upon full disclosure of credit charges.

The Department of Agriculture has established a Consumer and Marketing Service to coordinate the Department's many and varied consumer services.

The Department of Commerce has taken steps to assure a greater consumer voice in the development of product standards, and has adopted improved procedures for product standardization.

These are but a few actions of the many Federal agencies which protect the interests and serve the needs of the consumer.

TO HELP THE POOR FAMILY

I have instructed the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to give particular attention to the consumer needs of our poverty-stricken families. Studies have shown that they suffer most cruelly from lack of consumer protection and lack of buyer know-how. I consider this the most urgent challenge in the field of consumer information and education.

We must deal with the fact that today 34 million Americans—7 million families—must try to stretch poverty-level incomes to meet living costs. Studies show that these people are plagued by consumer problems unknown to the affluent majority.

They are unable to shop effectively for bargains or to buy in economical quantities.

They are often victimized by excessive costs of credit and merchandise.

They are subjected to countless fraudulent and deceptive marketing and financing practices.

Most of these problems are symptoms of the basic maladies which we are attacking in the war on poverty. Programs of consumer information and protection cannot cure them—but such programs can lessen their impact.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has already made 56 grants totaling almost $3 million, to support consumer education and related programs throughout the country. In the future, this Office will become a clearinghouse for distribution of educational materials to the poor. It will be a powerful source of incentive and support to the poor in their efforts to achieve fairplay in the marketplace.

I pledge the all-out effort of the Federal Government to help our poorest citizens to spend their limited funds more efficiently as we work to enhance their incomes.

Credit is a particular problem for the poor. Often it is available only at high interest rates, and its overextension can lead to the garnishment of wages and the loss of jobs. The situation is particularly severe because the poor are susceptible to emergencies that eliminate any limited financial reserves they may have.

Cooperative sources of low-cost credit, such as credit unions, combined with sound and impartial debt and financial counseling, and with legal services, can be of great benefit to the poor.

I am directing the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and my Committee on Consumer Interests to intensify their efforts to encourage the development of such services in community action programs.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The measures I have recommended—truth in packaging, truth in lending, and the others—will help protect the consumer in the marketplace.

But beyond this there lies an even more important concern—that the consumer continue to have a dollar of stable purchasing power. Even the wisest consumer laws will not help the American public if their hard-earned dollars and savings are eroded by inflation.

The rewards and challenges of prosperity are central to the consumer's interest today. For the past 5 years, the American consumer has participated in and contributed to an unparalleled and uninterrupted economic advance.

This has been the most inflation-free expansion in the history of our Nation. Apart from the improvements in quality and the benefits of new goods, the upward drift in prices has been only one-fourth as rapid as the growth in the real income of consumers. The healthy growth of consumer income has been built on—

Rapid technical advances by business.

Productivity gains from the greater skill and diligence of labor.

Cooperation among labor, management, and Government.

Prudent fiscal policies.

The careful efforts of consumers to get the most for their money.

The success of our efforts to bring full prosperity to the American economy has sharpened the challenge of maintaining price stability.

We are determined to have the benefits of both full employment and price stability—not one at the expense of the other.

That environment of stability is strenghened whenever responsible action is taken on prices and wages.

It is strengthened when we support a pay bill for Federal workers consistent with the administration's wage-price guideposts.

It is strengthened when businessmen lower prices to share the benefits of lower costs and rapid productivity gains.

It is strengthened when unions bargaining for wage increases stay within the bounds of productivity gains, as they did in many industries last year.

On many occasions, I have asked management and labor to make their price and wage decisions with full regard to the interest of the entire Nation in price and cost stability. I renew that request today.

The consumer's interests is broad in scope. So are the efforts required to promote and protect that interest. The recommendations I have made will require action on many fronts by many groups.

The Congress holds the key to historic achievements in areas of consumer information and safety. This administration will marshal its forces to promote consumer welfare in close cooperation with the States and local governments.

Yet the basic job of furthering the consumer cause lies in the hands of private citizens—the consumers themselves. With the full cooperation of all, we can look ahead toward an ever-rising standard of living for American consumers.

Together, we can achieve a free marketplace where better goods can be bought, where real incomes continue to increase, and where the dollar's purchasing power remains firm and stable.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 21, 1966.*

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under rule VIII, I ask unanimous consent to waive the call of the calendar of measures that are not objected to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Farris Bryant, of Florida, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of R. D. Pennewell, of Missouri, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1972.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Lars Nelson, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1972.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1043 and 1044.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSAL OF BAUXITE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1488) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 50,000 tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "approximately", to strike out "fifty thousand" and insert "one hundred twenty-six thousand, three hundred long calcined"; on page 2, line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "other"; and at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "particularly those"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, at the fair market value thereof, approximately one hundred twenty-six thousand, three hundred long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite now held in the national stockpile. Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, relating to dispositions on the basis of a revised determination pursuant to section 2 of said Act, to the effect that no such dispositions shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition, but in such disposition the Administrator of General Services shall comply with the provisions of such section 3, which require that the plan and the date of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1075), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

The purpose of the amendments is to increase the amount of the material that may be disposed of and to clarify the wording of the measure.

It has been determined that there is an excess of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite in the national inventory, whereas the measure as introduced would permit the disposal of only a portion of the excess. It is believed that the committee amendment will eliminate the necessity for other piecemeal legislation.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite now held in the national stockpile and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approach is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of refractory grade bauxite is based on a determination by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning that the quantity of the material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because it is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

Approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite in the national stockpile are excess to stockpile needs. This quantity of bauxite has become excess as a result of a revised determination, based upon reduced requirements, made by the Office of Emergency Planning pursuant to section 2 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98a, with respect to the quantity of bauxite to be stockpiled. The current stockpile objective is 173,000 long calcined tons, whereas the inventory is 299,279 long calcined tons.

Information on material

Refractory grade bauxite is a clay-like material, dull white in color, that has been calcined. The principal use is to produce high alumina refractories.

Data is not readily available for world production of refractory grade bauxite since many of the producing countries do not maintain records which segregate the various grades.

U.S. consumption of bauxite for refractory purposes in 1963 amounted to approximately 115,000 long calcined tons and increased to approximately 141,000 long calcined tons in 1964. It is understood that during 1965, industry received only 75 percent of its requirements and the situation will remain critical through 1966 and 1967. Of the total consumed in these years, approximately 85 percent was of foreign origin, principally from British Guiana.

Rate of sale

The General Services Administration plans to make the excess bauxite available for disposal over a period of years. During the first year GSA expects to dispose of approximately 40,000 long calcined tons; however, the quantity and timing of disposals will be determined after an evaluation of sales results and current market conditions and trends.

Financial information

The approximate acquisition cost of refractory grade bauxite is about $37.92 per long calcined ton. The present market value is estimated to be approximately $42 per long calcined ton.

DISPOSAL OF PLATINUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (S. 2642) to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately three hundred sixteen thousand three hundred ounces of platinum from the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

SEC. 2. The platinum covered by this Act, materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061–2166), and materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (7 U.S.C. 1740(b)) the disposition of which has been or may hereafter be authorized pursuant to law, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value in payment of the purchase price and other expenses of acquisition (including transportation and other accessorial expenses) of palladium for the national stockpile.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1076), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately 316,300 ounces of platinum now held in the national stockpile; (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before disposals from the national stockpile may be accomplished; and (3) permit the platinum covered by this act, materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, materials in the national stockple and the supplemental stockpile which have been authorized for disposal by law, to be available for transfer at fair market value for the acquisition of palladium for the national stockpile.

EXPLANATION

Why congressional action required

Under existing law congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of platinum named in this bill is based on a determination that the quantity of platinum in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because they are obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize the immediate disposal of this platinum by waiving the normal requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The aggregate quantity of platinum in inventories (the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile) is approximately 316,300 ounces in excess of the stockpile objective for platinum established by the Office of Emergency Planning.

The use of platinum by our domestic consuming industry has expanded spectacularly in recent months. The main users are the chemical and electrical industries. Use by the petroleum industry is rising particularly rapidly. This increase in consumption has not yet been matched by supply availability, with the result that the supply-demand situation for platinum is out of balance. The satisfaction of current needs by the proposed disposal is therefore timely and desirable.

Palladium shortage

The quantity of palladium in the stockpile fails to meet the stockpile objective by 562,063 ounces and the Office of Emergency Planning advises that for a number of years they have not had the funds for the purchase of additional supplies. It should be pointed out, however, that the Department of Agriculture has contracted for the delivery to the supplemental stockpile of 100,000 ounces of palladium by barter for surplus agricultural commodities and another 100,000 may be obtained in the same manner later in the year.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize the use of materials which have been authorized for disposition in the acquisition of palladium, the quantities of which in General Services Administration inventories are below the stockpile objective. Indications have been received from industry that palladium would be available in exchange for platinum or other materials which the General Services Administration has been authorized to release.

Financial information

The approximate acquisition cost of specification grade platinum in the national stockpile was $79.40 per troy ounce. The present producers' price for platinum is reported to be $97 to $100 per troy ounce.

DEATH OF GREGOR MACPHERSON, CHIEF OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with profound sadness that I note the passing, last Friday, of Gregor Macpherson, Chief Official Reporter of Debates for the Senate.

Mr. Macpherson served the Senate with great diligence and conscientiousness for 28 years. He was one of the outstanding shorthand reporters in the history of the Senate. When he succeeded to the post of Chief Reporter in 1963, Mr. Macpherson took over responsibility for the efficacy and efficiency of the reporting of the debates. The accuracy of this reporting during his tenure as Chief Reporter is testimony to his personal dedication and his capable and understanding guidance of the able reporters, transcribers, and clerks who served with him.

Mr. Macpherson was an honorable, loyal, and devoted worker. He was a great admirer of the U.S. Senate and, in turn, was greatly admired by the Senate. He was a modest and unassuming man who struggled against a severe physical handicap during the last years of his life. And he had a special affinity for those similarly afflicted. I am told that he returned as often as possible to the veterans hospital in the District, where he had undergone amputation earlier, to give gifts to the patients and the great gift of an understanding encouragement to other amputees.

Gregor Macpherson would have been embarrassed by a lengthy eulogy, so I will close by saying that the Senate will miss greatly this loyal and faithful employee.

I extend Mrs. Mansfield's and my condolences to his wife and members of his family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point articles from the Washington Post and Washington Evening Star on the passing of Mr. Macpherson.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 19, 1966]

SENATE DEBATE REPORTER MACPHERSON DIES AT 69

Gregor Macpherson, 69, chief of the reporters of Senate debate, died yesterday at George Washington University Hospital of complications following a gall bladder operation.

Mr. Macpherson, who joined the corps of Senate debate reporters in 1934, had been chief since 1958 and was responsible for the accuracy and content of the debates printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Known as "Mr. Mac," he was a familiar figure on the Senate floor for more than 30 years. Like all debate reporters he covered the floor taking notes in rapid shorthand for 10-minute periods, then went back to his office to transcribe the text. As chief he no longer worked on the floor but took charge of checking all the material gathered by other reporters.

His energy was all the more amazing since he had lost a leg many years ago. Once a month he visited amputees in the Veterans' Administration hospital to cheer them and show them they could still lead productive lives.

Mr. Macpherson had many stories to tell of his years in the Senate. One was about the Bible-quoting Senator who visited his office one day and insisted on replacing an old well-thumbed Bible with a new, expensive one. The reporters used their Bible to check the not always accurate Biblical quotations of Senators.

He liked to play chess. A passage in the book "A Man Called Peter" described a chess game between Mr. Macpherson and former Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall.

A native of Canada, Mr. Macpherson was educated in Denver and attended the University of Colorado. He began his career as a freelance reporter in the Washington courts and as a reporter of Senate committee debates.

In 1955 he was Grand Master of the Masons in the District of Columbia. He lived at 1100 Sixth Street SW.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1966]

GREGOR MACPHERSON, 69, SENATE REPORTER, DIES

Gregor MacPherson, 69, chief of the official reporters of debates in the U.S. Senate, died yesterday in the George Washington University Hospital of complications following a gall bladder operation.

MacPherson, of 1100 Sixth Street SW., joined the corps of Senate debate reporters in 1934. He had been chief since 1958 and was responsible for the accuracy and content of the debates printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Known as "Mr. Mac," he was a familiar figure on the Senate floor for more than 30 years. Before becoming chief, he covered the floor taking notes in rapid shorthand for 10-minute periods, then went back to his office to transcribe the text. As chief, he was in charge of checking all the material gathered by other reporters.

LOST LEG IN 1950

His energy was all the more amazing since he lost a leg in 1950 through a circulatory disorder. Since that time he visited amputees in the Veterans' Administration Hospital to cheer them and show them they could still lead productive lives.

MacPherson was an avid chess player. One of his games with former Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall was described in the book "A Man Called Peter."

Born in Moose Creek, Ontario, Canada, MacPherson moved to Denver, Colo., with his family as a very young boy. He was educated in Denver schools.

FREE-LANCE REPORTER

He came to Washington in 1916 and joined the Department of Agriculture. He was a free-lance reporter in the Washington courts before he was appointed official reporter of debates in the U.S. Senate.

In 1954, he was named grand master of the Grand Lodge of Masons of the District of Columbia. Long active in the Masons, he previously had been deputy grand master. He also was worshipful master of the Chevy Chase Masonic Lodge in 1942, a member of the Singleton Chapter of the Royal Arch Masons, and a member of the Washington Commandery, Knights Templar.

MacPherson also was a member of the National Association of Court Reporters and was a member of the Christ Methodist Church, Town Center Plaza and Fourth Street SW.

SERVICES MONDAY

MacPherson's first wife, Edna, died in 1964. He leaves his wife, Helena Loney MacPherson of the home; a son, Alan C. of 2311 William and Mary Drive, Alexandria; a daughter, Mrs. Glen G. Gerard of 407 Branch Drive, Silver Spring; a brother, Russell C. of Greeley, Colo.; a sister, Mrs. Ray Findley of Ashville, N.C.; and five grandchildren.

Masonic services will be at 8 p.m. Monday at Hines Funeral Home, 2901 14th Street NW. Regular services will be at 10 a.m. Tuesday, also at Hines. Burial will be in Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first let me associate myself with the observations made by the distinguished majority leader with respect to Mr. Macpherson.

I would include, as the matter comes to mind, a tribute and a testimony to all of the Official Reporters of the Senate. It is a demanding job, to say the least, and along with everything else, it requires a certain deftness and skill to take what is often so rapidly uttered on this floor, and weave it into a coherent speech. There is such a tendency to leave sentences dangling in the air, to leave participles roaming around in orbit, and to split infinitives; and I know from long experience what a task it really is to make the speeches readable—in fact so readable that they usually sound quite eloquent.

So as I pay tribute, along with the distinguished majority leader, to Mr. Macpherson, I also pay tribute to all of the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate.

I came to know Mr. Macpherson rather well, and I found in him a whimsical streak and a jocular sense that was something of a tonic for every day, as he undertook to share, with one Member and another, some little whimsy, some anecdote that had come to his attention. In so doing, he not only lightened the burden, but left a little light in dark corners. We salute his memory.

With my family, I join in an extension of sympathy to the Macpherson family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes being paid to Gregor Macpherson.

Mr. Macpherson served with great ability and distinction in the Senate as an Official Reporter, and lately as the Chief Reporter. We have appreciated his character and his great qualities. It was my privilege and honor to know him, as well as the members of his family.

I pay tribute to him and express my sympathy to the members of his family.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation for the Post Office Department for "Operations," for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriations for the Post Office Department for "Transportation," for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and Army General Staff, as of December 31, 1965 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of diamond tools from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the effects of foreign currency sales on commercial sales of wheat to the United Arab Republic, title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for improved procedures for determining ability of patients and responsible relatives to pay for care at St. Elizabeths Hospital, Department of Public Health, District of Columbia government, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the management of inventories by the Army Map Service, Washington, D.C., Department of the Army, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION ON ST. THOMAS SEA WATER DISTILLATION PLANT

A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Virgin Islands Corporation, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the St. Thomas Sea Water Distillation Plant, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND RECLASSIFICATION, GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, NORTH DAKOTA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Garrison Diversion Unit, Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED FREE ENTRY OF CITIZENS OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS INTO THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions which had been approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 801. A bill to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures (Rept. No. 1078).

Mr. BOGGS subsequently said: Mr. President, I appreciate very much the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency has reported favorably my bill, S. 801, which would improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures. I thank the chairman, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and his colleagues on the committee.

As the committee report notes, the bill has the approval of the General Counsel of the Treasury, the Department of Agriculture, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Department of State, in addition to the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill would provide on a permanent basis the authority which the Congress has provided on an annual basis for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 by the inclusion for both years of an appropriate provision in the Public Works Appropriation Acts.

As the General Counsel of the Treasury notes in its report:

> The use of this authority has made it possible for the Treasury to utilize for current expenditures foreign currencies formerly required to be held in segregated accounts for special purposes, thus making them unavailable for use to meet current U.S. Government obligations abroad.
>
> By virtue of this authority it has been possible to defer or avoid the purchase for dollars of a considerable amount of foreign currencies, resulting in a significant, beneficial contribution to the balance-of-payments situation.

In brief, Mr. President, my bill provides a bookkeeping change which allows the United States to make current use of reserved foreign currencies, while at the same time not interfering with the future use of those currencies for the purposes intended.

Mr. President, any step which we can take to relieve the balance-of-payments pressure on this country should be taken. We should not leave this sensible provision subject to the necessity of annual action by the Congress. It has worked well. It should be permanent. It is my hope that the Senate will speedily approve it.

An identical bill which I introduced passed the Senate during the 88th Congress but was not acted upon by the House.

I am hopeful the additional experience with this provision will lead to favorable action soon in the other body.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 3103. A bill for the relief of Kim Tae Sunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 3104. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant patents to certain lands under the provisions of the Color of Title Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 3105. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a seperate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3106. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto L. Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr JACKSON (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 3107. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3108. A bill for the relief of Aleksandra Grozdanic; and

S. 3109. A bill for the relief of the children of Mrs. Doris E. Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3110. A bill for the relief of Jose R. Cuervo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 3111. A bill for the relief of John W. Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 3112. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the Act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the Act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUSKIE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3113. A bill for the relief of Jimmy Yuk Lan Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3114. A bill for the relief of Maria do Carmo Almeida Brito (Silva); and

S. 3115. A bill for the relief of Henri P. Boutin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3116. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution expressing endorsement of Congress for the establishment under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution of an International Center for Advanced Study in the Nation's Capital; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO EXPRESS SENSE OF CONGRESS ON AGREEMENTS REDUCING DUTIES ON IMPORTED ARTICLES UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and Mr. TALMADGE) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) to express sense of Congress on agreements reducing duties on imported articles under certain conditions, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. RIBICOFF, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT "DIGEST AND ANALYSIS OF COLD WAR GI BILL"

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted a resolution (S. Res. 236) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print "Digest and Analysis of the Cold War GI Bill," for use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. YARBOROUGH, which appears under a separate heading.)

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, by request, for myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, during fiscal year 1967.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter of transmittal requesting introduction of the legislation and explaining the purpose be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. Russell of Georgia is as follows:

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, March 15, 1966.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. President: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1966. The Bureau of the Budget advises that its enactment would be in accordance with the program of the President.

This legislation would authorize military construction urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in essential prior construction authorizations. Appropriations in support of this legislation are provided for in the Budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1967.

Titles I, II, III, and IV of this proposal would authorize new construction for the Active Forces totaling $505,554,000, of which $161,200,000 is for the Department of the Army, $126,835,000 for the Department of the Navy, $211,644,000 for the Department of the Air Force and $5,875,000 for the Defense agencies, respectively.

Title V contains legislative recommendations considered necessary to implement the Department of Defense family housing program. Title VI contains general provisions generally applicable to all construction authorized by titles I through V. Section 502 authorizes an appropriation of $521,900,000 for all costs of family housing for fiscal year 1967.

Title VII totaling $17,200,000 would authorize construction for the Reserve components, of which $5 million is for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,900,000 is for the Air National Guard, and $3,300,000 is for the Air Force Reserve. These authorizations are in lump sum amounts in accordance with the amendments to chapter 133, title 10, United States Code, which were enacted in Public Law 87–554.

All authorizations for military construction contained in the acts of August 1, 1964, and September 16, 1965, would remain in effect until October 1, 1968, by this legislative proposal.

Sincerely,

Cyrus Vance.

NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators Magnuson, Anderson, Moss, Metcalf, Morse, and Neuberger, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill establishing a National Water Commission to undertake a comprehensive review of national water resources requirements and supplies.

As Members of the Senate will recognize, this bill is in furtherance and fulfillment of a part of President Johnson's message of February 23 on preserving our national heritage, wherein the President called for the establishment of a National Water Commission to review and advise on the entire range of water resources problems.

The bill I am introducing was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and would carry out the President's recommendation. It would provide for the establishment of a seven member commission of distinguished citizens outside of government and would direct them to consider all aspects of present and anticipated national water problems.

The continuing presence of phenomena such as flood, pollution, and drought, confronts the Nation with incredibly complex and interrelated water problems. The problems are national, not local in character. Their impact is felt far beyond the specific river basins and regions of the country in which they occur. The choice we make of means to solve these problems also will have an impact far beyond the immediate areas of crisis. These decisions can exert a profound influence on the growth and prosperity of every region of our country.

Government must be wise, indeed, when we act with so much at stake. We should not be satisfied with merely building bigger projects or expanding on the works of the past. When we build we must avoid creating new maladies of the future as we try to heal the disorders of the present.

More imaginative solutions and better plans are needed if we are to meet critical water needs of the future. We can take a bold step in this direction by establishing a National Water Commission with broad vision capable of exercising independent judgment.

Last year, Congress enacted a landmark piece of legislation—the Water Resources Planning Act—to harness together the activities of government in the attack on the water crisis. This measure established the Water Resources Council to coordinate the work of Federal agencies. It provided for the formation of River Basin Commissions which will be unique joint undertakings of State and Federal Government.

The National Water Commission proposed in the bill introduced today will perform another important function. The Commission will bring independent judgment to bear on our water resource endeavors.

Its work and recommendations should help assure that water resource development will be carried on in recognition of the full range of alternatives available, the latest technology, and the overall impact on our society and economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget explaining the bill and the text of the proposed legislation be printed in full at this point in the Record.

I also ask that the bill lie at the desk for 5 calendar days to enable additional cosponsors to sign the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk for 5 days as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The bill (S. 3107) to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3107

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Water Commission Act."

THE NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

Sec. 2. (a) There is established the National Water Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members, who shall be appointed by the President. Members shall serve at the pleasure of the President. No member of the Commission shall, during his period of service on the Commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or retired civilian employee of the United States.

(c) The President shall designate a Chairman of the Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman") from among its members.

(d) Members of the Commission may each be compensated at the rate of $100 for each day such member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission. Each member shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The Commission shall have an Executive Director, who shall be appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the President and shall be compensated at the rate provided by law for Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The Executive Director shall have such duties and responsibilities as the Chairman may assign.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission shall (1) review present and anticipated national water resource problems, making such projections of water requirements as may be necessary and identifying alternative ways of meeting these requirements—giving consideration, among other things, to conservation and more efficient use of existing supplies, increased usability by reduction of pollution, innovations to encourage the highest economic use of water, interbasin transfers, and technological advances such as desalting and waste water purification and reuse; (2) consider economic and social consequences of water resource development, including, for example, the impact of water resource development on regional economic growth, on institutional arrangements, and on aesthetic values affecting the quality of life of the American people; and (3) advise on such specific water resource matters as may be referred to it by the President and the Water Resources Council.

(b) The Commission shall consult with the Water Resources Council regarding its studies and shall furnish its proposed reports and recommendations to the Council for review and comment. The Commission shall submit to the President such interim and final reports as it deems appropriate, and the Council shall submit to the President its views on the Commission's reports. The President shall transmit the Commission's final report to the Congress together with such comments and recommendations for legislation as he deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission shall terminate not later than five years from the effective date of this Act.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission may (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949; as amended: *Provided*, That not to exceed five persons may be employed and their compensation fixed at salaries not in excess of GS–18, without regard to such laws; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; (7) enter into contracts or agreements for studies and surveys with public and private organizations and transfer funds to Federal agencies and river basin commissions created pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act to carry out such aspects of the Commission's functions as the Commission determines can best be carried out in that manner; and (8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this title.

(b) Any member of the Commission is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CHAIRMAN

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to general policies adopted by the Commission, the Chairman shall be the chief executive of the Commission and shall exercise its executive and administrative powers as set forth in section 4(a)(2) through section 4(a)(8).

(b) The Chairman may make such provision as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance of any of his executive and administrative functions by the Executive Director or other personnel of the Commission.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall, to the extent practicable, utilize the services of the Federal water resource agencies.

(b) Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency or river basin commission created pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act is authorized (1) to furnish to the Commission, to the extent permitted by law and within the limits of available funds, including funds transferred for that purpose pursuant to section 4(a)(7) of this Act, such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with this Commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(c) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services: *Provided*, That the regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46e) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: and *Provided further*, That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1966.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In his February 23, 1966, message to Congress on preserving our natural heritage, the President recommended the establishment of a National Water Commission. I am transmitting herewith draft legislation to carry out this recommendation. I urge that it be given early and favorable consideration.

A bountiful supply of clean water is essential to our health, to our industry, to our farms and to the well-being of all Americans. It sustains our prosperity and stimulates our growth. This is a basic truth that the President has emphasized many times before. It is a truth that the administration shall continue to emphasize.

Yet, we are confronted with critical water shortages in many sections of our country. We are faced with the grim fact that pollution infests virtually every river system. No region is immune—from the Pacific, to the Southwest, to the Great Lakes, to the Northeast. These problems grow more complex and more difficult with each passing day.

Water resource problems do not end at local, county, State or even regional lines. Their dimensions are truly national in scope. They require intelligent long-term planning and the assessment and development of a whole range of alternative solutions. They require thorough and systematic analysis to assure that the programs undertaken by the Federal Government contribute to the soundest long-range water objectives.

The National Water Commission bill proposed today provides a new way to meet these urgent needs. It will do more than give us a vital instrument in our search for imaginative ideas. It will help us develop the blueprints for our long-range water resource plans and goals. It will help us assure that the dollars we spend are wisely spent. In the words of the President, the Commission will "review and advise on the entire range of water resources problems * * *. It will judge the quality of our present efforts. It will recommend long-range plans for the future. It will point the way to increased and more effective water resource measures by the Federal Government, working in close cooperation with States, local communities, and private industry."

Bringing the Commission into being is an important step that should be taken without delay.

The Commission would consist of seven members appointed by the President from distinguished Americans outside the Federal Government. These members would advise the President and the Water Resources Council. In carrying out its responsibilities the Commission would:

1. Identify alternative ways of meeting water requirements, making such projections of water demand as may be necessary and giving consideration, among other things, to conservation and more efficient use of existing supplies, increased usability by reduction of pollution, innovations to encourage the highest economic use of water, interbasin transfers and technological advances such as desalting and waste water purification and reuse.

2. Consider the economic and social consequences of water resource development, including the impact of water resource development on regional economic growth, on institutional arrangements and on esthetic values affecting the quality of life of the American people.

The National Water Commission would be aided by existing Federal agencies in the water resource field and by river basin commissions created pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act.

It would also work closely with the Water Resources Council, complementing its activities; cooperate with State and local agencies concerned with water resource development, seeking their advice and assistance; utilize panels of specialists to assist it in its studies of particular problems.

The creation of the National Water Commission will bring the very best minds and the most creative talents in the Nation to bear on our water problems. We need this help if we are to reduce progressively the pollution of our waters and to insure a plentiful supply of water for our commerce, for our daily lives, and the lives of our children.

We recommend early enactment of the legislation.

Sincerely,
CHARLES L. SCHULTZE, *Director*.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on March 18, President Johnson transmitted to the Congress a long-range water research program prepared by the Committee on Water Resources Research of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. This report is most timely in view of the current attention being focused on our national water problems.

This morning the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs began 3 days of hearings on weather modification and its possible effect on our water supplies.

I introduced in the Senate today along with several of my colleagues a bill to establish a National Water Commission, whose task it will be to take a thorough and objective look at our Nation's water problems and suggest solutions.

I think it is encouraging to note the interest in and awareness of these important issues relating to this essential national resource. The projected program submitted by the President will contribute immensely to our final goal of finding answers to our water problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from President Johnson transmitting the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 18, 1966.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last year, through my Special Assistant for Science and Technology, I asked the Committee on Water Resources Research of the Federal Council for Science and Technology to speed the development of a comprehensive, long-range water research program.

That task has now been completed.

This report "A 10-Year Program of Federal Water Resources Research," is the result of our efforts.

The growth of our population and industry has placed new demands on our water supplies. We are confronted with water shortages in many sections of our country. Today, virtually every river system in America is touched by pollution. This menace grows more serious each day.

As I have said before, we must combine all of the means at our disposal—Federal, State, local and private—to meet the challenges posed by our water resource problems. The Water Resources Planning Act and the Water Pollution Control Act, passed at the last session, and the Clean Rivers Demonstration Act now pending in the Congress are important steps forward.

We must seek the knowledge and understanding essential to support our efforts.

We must apply the very best of science and technology to solve our mounting water resource problems.

We must continue our search for bold, new ideas.

A strong, well planned program of research has now become a national necessity. The growth of knowledge in this vital area is important to our future.

The 10-year research program outlined in the report—which will be refined and revised as the future state of our knowledge grows—establishes a guideline for action. The report pinpoints those areas of research in need of immediate attention and specifies research goals in over 40 important categories. It has been used as a basis for preparing our fiscal year 1967 budget requests.

I recommend that the various committees of Congress concerned with our water resources carefully consider what this report has to say.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMENDMENT OF CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BAYH, HARRIS, MOSS, RANDOLPH, and TYDINGS, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes.

The bill has two principal features.

First. It increases the annual authorization for air pollution control and abatement programs to $46 million a year for the next 6 years.

Second. The legislation would permit 50–50 matching grants to air pollution control agencies and three-fifths matching grants to intermunicipal and interstate agencies for maintaining control and abatement programs. These new grants are in addition to the existing two-thirds matching grants to air pollution control agencies and three-fourths matching grants to intermunicipal and interstate agencies for developing, establishing, or improving such programs.

The provision for matching grants to maintain air pollution control and abatement programs corrects a hardship which the Clean Air Act, by omitting such grants, unintentionally worked on communities and regions.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3112) to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

SEASONAL HOUSING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to authorize FHA insurance on seasonal housing; namely, single-family dwellings which need not be designed for year-round occupancy.

In doing so, I have in mind, especially, the encouragement of housing construction in those sections of our country which may be remote from centers of population, schools, public facilities, and so forth, and which, nevertheless, offer enormous attraction. I am in no sense thinking of luxury housing. I have placed a $15,000 limitation on the principal obligation. But for those areas of our country such as portions of the New England States, Appalachia, the upper half of Michigan, where summer visitors—and now, increasingly, winter visitors—offer one of the chief sources of revenue, this legislation offers real economic stimulus.

This program should also mesh well with the economic programs available through the Economic Development Administration and rural areas development of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It is my intent, Mr. President, that if this provision is enacted into law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development would require through appropriate regulation, as a condition of insuring, that adequate provision be made for maintaining the natural setting and scenic values and for assuring adequate lot size and other subdivision and zoning standards.

I also take note of the fact—and am grateful to the junior Senator from Maine—that we now have in the basic housing law a requirement with respect to pollution control. This requirement would, of course, apply to this section.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I would hope that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee would give consideration to it when it takes up this year's housing legislation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3116) to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3116

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(l) The Secretary is authorized to insure under this section any mortgage meeting the requirements of subsection (b) of this section, except as modified by this subsection. To be eligible, the mortgage shall involve a principal obligation not in excess of $15,000 and not in excess of 90 per centum of the appraised value of the property, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance. The mortgage shall cover a dwelling designed for single-family occupancy which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction. The dwelling need not be designed for year-round occupancy, but it shall meet standards prescribed by the Secretary. The dwelling shall be located in an area where the Secretary finds (1) it is not practicable to obtain conformity with many of the requirements essential to the insuring of mortgages on housing in built-up urban areas, and (2) the property with respect to which the mortgage is executed is an acceptable risk.".

INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators SALTONSTALL and FULBRIGHT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution expressing an endorsement of Congress for the establishment under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution of an International Center for Advance Study in the Nation's Capital.

I am submitting with the joint resolution a statement giving briefly the background on the proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution and the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 147) expressing endorsement of Congress for the establishment under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution of an International Center for Advanced Study in the Nation's Capital, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 147

Whereas the libraries, laboratories, museums, archives, universities and research institutions located in and around the city of

Washington, District of Columbia, constitute a major resource for the advancement of science and learning; and

Whereas thousands of scholars and students from this Nation and all parts of the world are attracted to Washington by these resources; and

Whereas the Congress seeks to provide for the continued progress of our Nation's Capital as a world center of learning through the participation of such scholars in its institutions of higher learning and research: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby endorses the proposed establishment, under the Smithsonian Institution, of an International Center for Advanced Study, including facilities for study at the highest levels of science and scholarship, appropriate living quarters, and a clearinghouse through which information may be made available on opportunities for advanced study and research in the National Capital region and elsewhere. The Congress urges the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to stimulate interest in and support for this International Center for Advanced Study.

The statement presented by Mr. Anderson is as follows:

Smithsonian Institution—Proposed Joint Resolution Authorizing Establishment of an International Center for Advanced Study

The scholarly and scientific resources of the Washington area are unparalleled. Our great libraries, museums, archives, and laboratories attract thousands of the most distinguished scholars from throughout the world. But it is painfully clear that these resources, both human and material, are not being used to the best advantage. Scholars come to Washington, pursue their researches, and then leave, having neither contributed substantially to the intellectual life of the Capital, nor benefited substantially from it. Many from this country and from the rest of the world are simply not aware of the materials and the people that are available to them in Washington; many others, although aware of what is here, have no way of taking advantage of it. Clearly, this is a situation in which everyone loses: the scholars themselves; the Nation's Capital, which needs and deserves an intellectual community of the highest excellence and effectiveness; and, indeed, the entire world of learning.

To meet this need, the Smithsonian proposes the establishment, as a largely independent bureau of the Institution, of an International Center for Advanced Study. The activities and facilities of the Center would be of three closely interrelated kinds: First, and as a prerequisite to all its other activities, it would directly stimulate and support scholarly activity at the highest level of excellence, concentrating on areas of knowledge and intellectual problems of the most critical importance. Second, it would serve as a focal point and an intellectual home for the large and distinguished group of scholars employed in and around Washington, both in Government agencies and in independent research establishments. Third, it would offer hospitality and services and lodging to the scholars and scientists who come from all parts of the United States and the world to use the rich research resources of the Washington area.

Upon being advised of the plan for a center for advanced study developed by a group of learned associations and research organizations in Washington, the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution recommended that a joint resolution be introduced. It would express the sense of the Congress that an international center for advanced study should be established in Washington as a bureau of the Smithsonian. In October of 1965 President Johnson endorsed the concept of an international center for advanced study before a gathering of the world's scholars on the occasion of the Smithsonian bicentennial. The joint resolution will encourage further discussion. Its passage would be a prelude to efforts to raise operating funds from private sources and would enable the needs of the Center to be taken properly into account in urban planning in Washington.

Meanwhile, plans are well underway for the remodeling of the west end of the original Smithsonian Building to serve as a temporary home for the Center. An appropriation is now available for restoration and renovation of the building. The new quarters, including dining room, lounge, library, seminar rooms, and offices, should be ready for occupancy in the autumn of 1968.

PROTECTION OF THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN SETTING TRADE POLICY

The RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to protect the role of Congress in setting trade policy, and ask that it be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the genius of our constitutional system is that it separates executive and legislative power and provides for two coequal branches of Government. This is a great strength of our Nation and it should not be diminished. However, if the system is to work effectively, both branches must fully exercise their constitutionally assigned functions.

The establishment and review of our national trade policy is a basic responsibility of the Congress. The raising or lowering of tariffs is a legislative function, just as the imposition of other taxes is a legislative function.

The national policy of the United States since 1934 has been a continued expansion of international trade by the application of the most-favored-nation principle. The enactment by the Congress of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 specifically provided for the extension of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment which has presumably been a cornerstone of our trade policy ever since. It is this legislation which put this country on a trade policy which led directly to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and our participation in the Kennedy round of the GATT negotiations at Geneva.

This Congress has seen that national policy seriously eroded. The Automotive Products Agreement between the United States and Canada, signed and implemented last year is a clear departure from the policy expressed in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It was a clear violation of our GATT commitments which required the United States to secure waivers from the other GATT nations. It is a return to the bilateralism which characterized trade policy in the pre-1934 era.

But I am not here to quarrel now over the policy of that agreement. I am here only to state that such a major departure from past policy should be fully considered by the Congress before, not after, commitments are made by our Government.

That agreement raised another serious question for the legislative branch. It is without precedent in American history. Never before has the executive branch changed a tariff in this manner.

I strongly feel that such a procedure dangerously weakens the separate legislative function of the Congress.

I do not question the way the President discharges his responsibilities. My point is that Congress must be equally diligent in exercising its own.

The Committee on Finance has already requested a comprehensive tariff investigation by the U.S. Tariff Commission to provide the Senate with a complete, objective report on the many valuation problems which exist in the tariff field. The Commission's preliminary report is due no later than June 30, 1966, with the final report requested as soon as practicable thereafter, but no later than February 28, 1967. This report will be of great assistance to the Congress in judiciously fulfilling its responsibilities to the American people.

The President now has broad existing authority to negotiate rate reductions under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. In view of this congressional action authorizing the tariff-cutting negotiations at Geneva, the entire Kennedy round should be conducted within the authority of that legislation. The negotiations should encompass neither reductions in excess of 50 percent nor changes in method of valuation without obtaining specific legislative authority from the Congress in advance.

I have, therefore, introduced this resolution expressing the sense of Congress that no tariff changes, either in rates or methods of valuation, be made prior to June 30, 1967, except in accordance with specific legislative authority delegated by Congress in advance.

The responsibility of Congress for the initiation of legislation has already waned. Its prerogative to consider legislation must therefore be the more vigilantly protected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution remain at the desk for 5 calendar days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 83

Whereas since 1934 Congress has delegated to the President, authority to reduce tariffs for the purpose of expanding international trade through the application of the most-favored-nation principle but has reserved to itself the establishment of limitations within which such reductions must be made, and

Whereas the Trade-Expansion Act of 1962 provides broad authority for multilateral reciprocal tariff reductions on a most-favored-nation basis, and

Whereas, the Automotive Products Agreement between the United States and Canada, a bilateral agreement signed January 16, 1965, violated the most-favored-nation principle enunciated in that Act, and

Whereas tariff reductions prescribed under that agreement exceeded the tariff reducing authority delegated by Congress in that Act, and

Whereas that agreement could not be implemented within the authority granted in that Act, but had to be submitted for implementation to Congress and was in fact submitted as a fait accompli, and

Whereas the Committee on Finance has resolved that the United States Tariff Commission should make a comprehensive investigation of the method of valuation used by the United States and its principal trading partners, and report its conclusions and recommendations not later than February 28, 1967: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that no international agreement or arrangement for reducing the amount of duty assessed on any imported article be entered into prior to June 30, 1967, except in accordance with legislative authority delegated by Congress prior to the entering into of such agreement or arrangement.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE "DIGEST AND ANALYSIS OF THE COLD WAR GI BILL (S. 9, 89TH CONG., AS ENACTED)"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit, for proper reference, a resolution to authorize the printing of 18,000 additional copies of a committee print entitled "Digest and Analysis of the Cold War GI Bill (S. 9, 89th Cong., as Enacted)."

The original printing of this document numbered 9,000, and initial distributions in reply to requests exhausted this printing within 2 weeks.

The law is of far-reaching effect. By 1970, there will be nearly 6 million persons who will have served on active duty during the period of the cold war, and most of these veterans will be eligible for the benefits of the law. For these reasons, I ask that additional copies of the print be made available now.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 236) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare eighteen thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Digest and Analysis of the Cold War GI Bill (S. 9, 89th Congress, as Enacted)," prepared by its Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS AND BILL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator Murphy be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) to establish May 8–14, 1966, as National School Safety Patrol Week.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 85) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 3066) to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes, my name be added as a cosponsor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and concurrent resolution:

Authority of March 14, 1966:

S. 3076. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act: Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Hart, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morton, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Russell of South Carolina, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Sparkman, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

Authority of March 9, 1966:

S. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution commemorating the fifth anniversary of the Peace Corps and commending past and present members thereof: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGee, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Yarborough.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS RELATING TO HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on April 19, 1966, on S. 2842, S. 2977, S. 2978, the President's 1966 housing proposals, S. 2804 and S. 2935 on mass transportation, S. 1915 on Alaska housing and other measures pending before the subcommittee. The hearings, expected to last 2 weeks, will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will commence at 10 a.m. each day.

Persons wishing to testify on these measures should contact Mrs. Dixie T. Lamb, Housing Subcommittee, room 5228, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be U.S. Governor of the Asian Development Bank; William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the Asian Development Bank; and Bernard Zagorin, of Virginia, to be U.S. Director of the Asian Development Bank.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10553. An act to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 969. An act to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of Annuities of certain reemployed annuitants;

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio; and

H.R. 10722. An act to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

NEW POLARIS SUBMARINE "JAMES K. POLK"

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the 35th Polaris nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *James K. Polk*, has successfully completed its first sea trials.

As has been his custom, Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover has submitted a biography of the person for whom this submarine was named.

Apparently, James K. Polk did not receive proper recognition in history for his own greatness as President.

Let me say that if this submarine turns out to be nearly as good a submarine as James K. Polk was a President, according to this biography, then we will have a splendid addition to our nuclear fleet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the biography printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S.S. "James K. Polk,"

At Sea, North Atlantic, March 14, 1966.

Dear Senator Aiken: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 35th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *James K. Polk* was built by the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn. We also have in operation 22 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 57.

This ship is named for James K. Polk (1795–1849), ablest President between Jackson and Lincoln, and one of the few who rose from log cabin to White House. Born in North Carolina, the eldest of 10 children of a plain farmer, Polk grew to manhood in Duck River, Tenn., a rude frontier settlement on the edge of the wilderness. His ancestors were Scottish Covenanters who migrated to Ireland early in the 17th century and to America a hundred years later, settling first in Maryland and later moving westward in search of a freer and better life. The future President's family found in Tennessee the hoped-for Land of Promise where unremitting toil was all that was needed to attain prosperity and an honored place in the community. Young Polk worked long hours on the farm and, since there were no schools, was taught the three R's by his parents. He was good at mathematics and liked to read. When he reached 17, his father was able to grant him his wish for an education leading to a professional career.

Though never in robust health, Polk was all his life a prodigious worker. He accomplished much because he had enormous drive and great talent for systematic and sustained mental labor. It took him but 3 years of formal instruction to make up his educational deficiencies. At 20, he was admitted to the University of North Carolina with sophomore standing, graduating with first honors in mathematics and classics. He read law and, before he was 26, had become one of the leading practitioners in Columbia, Tenn., as well as a promising candidate for public office.

After one term in the State legislature, he entered the U.S. House of Representatives where he served from 1825 to 1839, the last 4 years as Speaker and leader of the Jacksonian forces. Polk would have preferred to remain in Congress but was drafted by his party to run for Governor of Tennessee, to save the State for the party. Elected in 1839, he lost in 1841 and 1843—the only setbacks in an otherwise uniformly successful career. In those days, rival candidates used to travel the country together, putting up at the same inns, often sleeping in the same bed, taking turns addressing the same meetings to which voters flocked from distant parts, as much for entertainment as for political discussion. Polk ran on his record as Governor. He had given his State an excellent administration, rescued it from near bankruptcy, and initiated significant reforms. His rival, semiliterate but shrewd, never discussed issues but took pains to amuse the audience. He won, it seems, chiefly because he was the better storyteller.

Polk was being considered for Vice President when the Texas and Oregon issues burst upon the country causing a deadlock that could be broken only by nominating Polk as a compromise candidate for President. The 1844 election was one of the most hotly contested the Nation had ever experienced. The issues between Democrats and Whigs were sharply drawn, feelings ran high, the country was almost evenly divided. Odd as it seems today, the candidates for the Presidency did not campaign actively since it was then considered unseemly to give the appearance of seeking this high office. Polk won with 170 electoral votes to 105 for Clay. Though at 49 he was the youngest President, he was committed to a more ambitious, more precisely stated administration program than any of his predecessors. All of it was carried out in the single term to which he had limited himself voluntarily when accepting the nomination of his party.

In the domestic field, Polk's achievements proved ephemeral, but his views, consistently Jacksonian, still have historic interest. He was a strict constitutionalist because he was certain this alone could preserve the Union. He opposed the protective tariff because he deemed it "unjust to tax the labor of one class of society to support and fatten another." He feared that Federal funds for internal improvements would destroy State sovereignty. It was better "to live as freemen in a trackless wilderness than ride as vassals down a broad highway." He wanted Federal funds kept separate from the private banking system to prevent their being used for credit expansion and cheap money. The Federal Government, he thought, should be brought back to "what it was intended to be, a plain economical government." In the foreign field, Polk's success was both spectacular and of enduring importance to the Nation. An ardent expansionist, as was natural given his pioneer background, Polk added more territory to the United States than any previous President except Jefferson.

He settled the 40-year-old Northwest boundary dispute by skillful diplomacy and admirable nerve in face of a possible two-front war, inducing Britain to relinquish her long-standing demand for a boundary along the Columbia River, which would have cost us the State of Washington, in exchange for abandonment of our claim to what is now British Columbia. On the basis of discovery and settlement, this was the most we could justifiably ask or, for that matter, realistically hope to obtain without resorting to war. Our Southwest boundary was moved to its present location as a result of Polk's able management of the Mexican War and the ensuing peace negotiations. Mexico was generously compensated for the loss of California and New Mexico though not of Texas which had been lost 10 years earlier in exactly the same way as Mexico herself had been lost to Spain—by a successful indigenous revolt. We paid Mexico considerably more per acre than Napoleon had charged us for the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. When Polk left office, the United States stretched from "sea to shining sea."

Polk stood out among leading figures of his day in his unfaltering devotion to the national interest, uninfluenced by personal or parochial considerations, yet most 19th century historians accused him of precipitating the Mexican-American War in the interest of slavery expansion. This verdict has since been reversed in consequence of the publication early in this century of relevant official documents from the archives of Texas, Mexico, and Great Britain, which made it possible to see the issue more accurately. When Polk took office, the annexation of Texas was already an accomplished fact. Having warned us she would consider this "equivalent to a declaration of war," Mexico promptly severed diplomatic relations. Both sides moved troops to the Mexican-Texan border. Unfortunately, the two countries disagreed as to whether the Rio Grande or the Nueces constituted the boundary. It was in the disputed territory between these rivers that hostilities broke out spontaneously and a war that neither country really wanted began.

That Polk was able to execute his entire domestic and foreign program is the more remarkable in that he was neither a charismatic leader identified with some great popular movement, nor a politician adept at manipulating people and events. How he was able to resolve the great issues pressing upon him can best be understood by reading the diary he kept while in office.

The President emerges from its pages an able and astute administrator who approached every problem with a logical mind and a keen sense of political realities, who gained his objectives by stating them with precision and justifying them with well-reasoned argument. One cannot but feel that he understood the issues he dealt with better than most of his experts, whether they involved war strategy, military supply, diplomatic negotiations, or how to get congressional approval for his measures when the nominally dominant Democrats were so rent by faction that every executive request was attacked by at least one element in his party, enthusiastically supported by the Whigs.

Written for personal use, as a reminder of the official happenings crowding his overfull days, the diary gives an intimate glimpse into the executive office during a transitional period in our history; a time when, as a result of war, technological change, and the physical growth of the country, certain aspects of the democratic process, certain political habits had become outmoded, but the American people were not yet prepared to relinquish them. Take the fine old tradition that every citizen has access to the President.

It had become an intolerable burden, for the business of the Nation was now so large it demanded all a President's time and energy. Polk found that "no President who performs his duty faithfully and conscientiously can have any leisure." He rarely took even a brief vacation and often had to toil far into the night to complete official tasks for which he found no time during the day, so besieged was he with people wanting to shake his hand or pay their respects, and with officeseekers and patronage-soliciting politicians who, as he wryly put it, seemed to feel that providing jobs was "the chief end of government."

Or take the persistence of divisive geographic and ideological interests which, in Polk's time, tended to take precedence over the national interest. So much so that politicians in all sections of the country indulged in the mischief of threatening to break up the Union whenever national action went against their parochial interests. The well-publicized quarrels in the Senate, which were caused by intrusion of these divisive factors into every foreign policy issue, were a serious handicap to Polk when he was engaged in difficult negotiations with Britain over Oregon, or sought by diplomatic means to end the war with Mexico. The American people and their leaders had not yet accepted the maxim we now take for granted that "politics end at the water's edge."

One cannot read Polk's diary without warming to this thoughtful man of uncompromising integrity whose political philosophy, as he once said, "was not of yesterday," but "formed upon mature consideration," and adhered to whether it was expedient at the moment or not. Having achieved the objectives of his administration, he refused renomination and retired to private life. He died 3 months after leaving the White House.

Respectfully,

H. G. Rickover.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week, I received an interesting letter from Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover indicating that the nuclear submarine *James K. Polk* had just completed its first sea trials. This is our Nation's 35th Polaris nuclear submarine. It will add further

muscle to an extraordinary fleet of great importance to our nuclear deterrent.

The most fascinating part of the letter, however, did not concern itself with the power and intricacy of this modern scientific miracle. Admiral Rickover, instead, outlined the fascinating career of the ship's namesake—President James K. Polk. To me, this was a fitting reminder of the maxim "all our past acclaims our future." For President Polk was one in that great line of men who added to our national strength, making it possible for the vessel bearing his name to protect our present and our future.

SHARP DROP IN HOUSING STARTS, RAW MATERIAL PRICE CATCH UP—SUGGEST CAUTION ON TAX HIKE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, neither Congress nor the President seems to be stampeded toward a hasty and big tax increase by the inflation cries of newspaper "nervous nellies."

It may be necessary for the President to make such a recommendation later in the year. But, for the time being, the economic signals continue to be highly mixed.

Just this morning, the Wall Street Journal reported that housing starts fell to a 3-year low last month. When we recognize that January's rate of housing starts was already low, and that February skidded by a flat 17 percent below January, we can gain some idea of the clear consequences of tight money on the economy.

Mr. President, when we combine this with the recent cancellation of 10 bond issues by municipalities, and the deferral of the construction for which the bonds were to be issued, we can see that the vital construction part of the economy—which has regularly been the prime economic determinant of growth, jobs, and general expansion—is anything but inflationary.

Mr. President, add to this the report of last week that business is not—I repeat not—increasing its accumulation of inventories; that there is none of the usual inventory hoarding psychology; consider that plant expansion has been so sharp and dramatic that industry is still not crowding capacity; recognize that the speedup in training of manpower and upgrading of skills is meeting the skilled manpower bottleneck remarkably well and that the work force continues to grow at a relentless and huge pace every week—do this, and the specter of inflation seems less sure and certain.

Once again, Mr. President, the likelihood that the obligational authority of the Federal Government will drop next year may signal in a few months the end of wholesale price increases. This is precisely what happened during the Korean war. This suggests that wholesale prices are now at or near their peak, not poised for a big breakthrough. These developments all indicate the wisdom of President Johnson's careful and tentative approach to the massive dose of a big tax increase.

It is true that last week the wholesale price index report for February was announced as seven-tenths of a percent higher in that single month. But the Department of Labor also disclosed that from mid-February to mid-March there had been no rise at all.

Mr. President, Dr. Gardiner Means has taken a professional and perceptive look at the nature of the recent price performance, and in a memorandum he argues that we are not suffering and are unlikely to suffer general inflation. Mr. Means contends, and to quote him:

> The price rise has been selective, and just such a rise as could be expected as an integral part of the recovery process. It suggests that demand and production could continue to be expanded at the average rate of the last 2 years for perhaps another year or so as to reduce unemployment by another half million or more without generating general price inflation.

Mr. Means shows that the index of crude industrial materials in the past 2 years, including such items as scrap iron and steel, lead, zinc, and natural rubber rose 4½ percent, while the intermediate product index rose just over 2 percent, and the wholesale index of finished consumer goods—other than foods—rose only about 1 percent.

This rise in the so-called raw material prices could be construed as catching up with the general price level. These prices had fallen way behind the general price level. The catching up could be called not inflation, but Mr. Means chooses to call it reflation.

This may be little comfort for the housewife who is paying more, except that there would seem to be a reasonably sharp, sure, and definite limit to the catching up process.

Because food is so sensitive to this catching up process in farm prices, the rise here is especially revealing.

Mr. Means points out that commodities except food have risen only 1 percent in the 2 years from January 1964 to January 1966 at wholesale and retail; but that food has risen 8.1 percent at wholesale in this 2-year period, and 5 percent at retail. Services have gone up 4.8 percent in this period.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum by Dr. Means and the article showing the sharp drop in housing starts from the Wall Street Journal printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION OR REFLATION

(By Gardiner C. Means)

At the recent economic symposium celebrating the 20th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946, inflation was a constantly recurring theme. There was strongly expressed opinion that inflation was under way and that we were faced with an immediate problem of a trade-off between a further reduction in unemployment accompanied by a mild though possibly accelerating inflation and a continuance of the present levels of employment without significant inflation.

It is the purpose of this article to question whether we have yet reached the point to which this trade-off decision applies. Analysis of recent commodity price movements indicates that, in essentials, the price rise has been selective and just such a rise as could be expected as an integral part of the recovery process. Further, it suggests that demand and production could continue to be expanded at the average rate of the last 2 years for perhaps another year so as to reduce unemployment by another half million or more without generating general price inflation.

It used to be believed that all important price movements were general and that therefore any important increase in the price index was probative evidence of inflation. But this was before the structure of prices and the anatomy of recession and recovery were well understood.

That there is a structural difference among prices is now well recognized. Most farm prices and the prices of many industrial raw materials are made in markets in which current supply and current demand are equated by changes in price. For such commodities, prices are highly flexible and are sensitive to changes in demand.

At the other extreme, most industrial prices are administered, closely related to costs, relatively inflexible and not sensitive to changes in demand. The demand for steel can drop 20 percent with no significant reduction in price and then recover 20 percent with no significant rise in price.

Between these two are many cases, particularly among processed foods and intermediate industrial materials, in which a flexible raw material price dominates the price of a fabricated product and makes the price of the latter intermediately sensitive to changes in demand.

This price structure provides the normal anatomy of price adjustment to the changing demand of depression and recovery. When aggregate demand falls off, flexible market prices fall. At the same time, the insensitivity of administered prices converts the fall in aggregate demand into a reduction in sales, production, and employment. Conversely, in a normal recovery, the expansion in aggregate demand necessary to reduce unemployment can be expected to raise flexible prices and increase employment where prices are administered and inflexible.

Since the rise in flexible prices is a necessary part of the process of reducing excessive unemployment, such a selective rise is often called reflation in contrast to inflation in which administered prices rise along with market prices. The price rise in the First World War and that after the Second World War were both true inflations with flexible and administered prices rising about equally. In contrast, the price rise which occurred in the recovery from the great depression was an almost perfect reflation in which flexible prices rose and administered prices rose little.

Let us look first at the wholesale price index to see how much of the 3.6 percent price rise of the last 2 years has been a matter of selective reflation and how much a matter of inflation. Almost half of the 2-year rise in the index, and two-thirds of the rise in the last year, are accounted for by farm products and processed foods even though these commodities constitute only a quarter of the index. These movements will be considered after examining industrial prices. Finished producers' machinery and equipment will also be considered separately.

The remainder of the items in the wholesale price index, constituting two-thirds of the index, can be grouped into (1) crude materials, most of whose prices are made in the market, (2) intermediate products, most of whose prices are administered though they may reflect in some degree changes in raw material prices, and (3) finished consumer commodities whose prices are mostly administered and relatively insensitive to changes in demand.

TABLE 1.—*Wholesale price changes, by product groups, January 1964 to January 1966*

	Percent
Crude materials	4.5
Intermediate products	2.0
Consumer nonfoods	1.0

The 2-year rise in these three indexes is shown in table 1. As can be seen, the rise in this main part of the wholesale price index was an almost pure reflation. The index of crude industrial materials which includes such sensitive items as scrap iron and steel, lead, zinc, and natural rubber rose 4½ percent while the intermediate products index rose just over 2 percent and the wholesale index of finished consumer goods (other than foods) rose only 1 percent. This movement of prices with flexible prices rotating upward in relation to the least flexible administered prices and intermediate prices in an intermediate fashion is the characteristic of reflation.

Even the 1-percent rise in the index of finished consumer commodities is consistent with reflation. Around 22 percent of the items in this index declined in the last 2 years, 20 percent were stable and 58 percent rose. A few of the latter were sensitive in price such as standard textile items; others, though administered, were influenced by the rise in intermediate product prices and still others reflected the normal divergence of behavior which even in a stable economy would cause some prices to rise and others to fall. The rise of the latter would offset the fall of other items while the reflation effect on the remainder would give a small increase to the index as a whole.

The reflation effect is even more strikingly brought out by comparing the behavior of three wholesale price indexes charted by the Federal Reserve Board. One index reflects the movement of sensitive crude and intermediate industrial products. The second reflects the movement of insensitive crude and intermediate industrial products and the third represents finished consumer products other than foods. These indexes are reproduced in chart II from 1957 to January 1966 and cover the same commodities that are represented in table 1 though the crude and intermediate products are grouped differently. They represent two-thirds of the wholesale price index. Chart II (not printed in RECORD) also contains the index for finished producers' equipment and two indexes for foods which will be considered later.

The contrast in the behavior of the two industrial indexes is striking. The sensitive index tends to follow the fluctuations in business activity, down with the recession of 1957–58, up with recovery, down again with the 1960 recession, and up in the recovery to the present. Also since 1960, it mirrors even more closely the fluctuation in unemployment. Unemployment (seasonally adjusted) declined by a million just following a rise in the sensitive index. Then both remained relatively unchanged until the latter part of 1963. Since then the sensitive index has climbed steadily as unemployment steadily declined. By January 1966, the sensitive index was 8 percent higher than in January 1961. But after this rise it was at just about the same level as at the beginning of 1960 and lower than at the beginning of 1957.

In this same period the index for other industrial materials, mostly with administered prices, showed very little change after 1957. It did not go down with recessions or up with recovery. Indeed, in January 1966 it was at practically the same level as in January 1961. These two indexes beautifully reflect the anatomy of recession and recovery. They show the differential deflation of recession and the reflation of recovery.

The index of finished consumer commodities (exclusive of foods) has been even more stable than the insensitive index for industrial materials. In the last 6 years it has varied within a range of less than 1 percent from its average level. In January 1966 it was only 0.7 percent above its level of 5 years before. This is a remarkable degree of stability.

Thus, so far as the industrial segment of the economy is concerned the relevant wholesale price indexes show no indication of inflation. Nor do the indexes show any evidence of an acceleration in the reflationary price rise in recent months. The reflation in sensitive industrial prices has mostly occurred in the last 2 years during which the major reduction in unemployment took place and the index shows no recent acceleration. The reflation in the insensitive groups has lagged and up to January had been going on for only about a year but again the published indexes for the last 3 or 4 months have seen no acceleration. Thus according to these indexes, the rise in wholesale prices for this large segment of the economy has been a pure reflation.

Of course, one can question the reliability of these indexes. It is well recognized that indexes of administered prices are less reliable as indexes of actual transaction prices than the sensitive index. For example, when the demand for steel is low there is likely to be more freight absorption and other fringe benefits than when the demand is high. Also, while the BLS index reflects changes in standard discounts from book prices, it certainly misses special discounts which are likely to be more frequent at low levels of demand than at high. On the other hand, the improvement in products, particularly the more complex consumer commodities, are difficult to take into account in the price indexes and, in a period of rising prices, the improvement in products tends to offset the inability to take into account the shrinkage in special discounts as demand increases. The price indexes thus appear sufficiently reliable to validate their evidence of reflation and the absence of inflation.

This brings us to farm and food prices. Here it is useful to use two indexes, one for crops and their products and a second for livestock and livestock products. Both are given at the bottom of chart II.

The crop price index shows the general trend of increase that is to be expected of flexible prices as aggregate demand increases toward full employment. By January 1966, this index was 7 percent higher than in January 1961. This compares with the 8-percent rise from January 1961 in the index of sensitive industrial materials. But weather and seasonal conditions make for such variation in farm and food prices that no clear short-run pattern of the price effect of increasing demand is evident. What one can say is that the rise in the 5-year period of recovery is quite consistent with the reflation of sensitive priced commodities.

The behavior of the index for livestock and products is spectacularly different. Its recent behavior is dominated by movements in the price of meat which are in turn dominated in this period by the hog cycle in which farmers first over-produce hogs and drive down hog and meat prices and then under-produce because of the low prices and force up hog prices to repeat the cycle. In 1963 and 1964, hog production was high with resultant low prices. The low prices discouraged production to such an extent that hog deliveries to maket dropped nearly 23 percent in 1965 and in the last year the rise in meat prices carried the livestock and products index up by 20 percent.

To some extent the high level of the index in January 1966 must reflect the recovery increase in demand. But the spectacular rise of the last year is not primarily the result of increased demand but the scarcity in supply due to the hog cycle and its effect on all meat products. This abnormality in supply is so great that it obscures the effect of reflation. What is clear is that the recent rise in this index is not the product of a great increase in demand but a great shrinkage in supply and therefore unrelated to inflation. At a later stage in the hog cycle, meat prices should decline.

One final group of items in the wholesale price index remains to be considered, producers' finished equipment. This group is made up of machinery and equipment used in further production. The price index for such producer equipment is given the middle panel of chart II (not printed in the RECORD) and shows a rise of approximately 3 percent in the last 2 years.

This rise is difficult to interpret because of the constant improvement in the design and quality of equipment and the difficulty of reflecting this improvement in the price index. Much of the equipment included in the index is sold at administered prices and most of the high fluctuations in the demand are met by lower or higher rates of production and the shortening or lengthening of delivery time rather than by price fluctuations. It is quite possible that a price index corrected for quality (and for special discounts) would show a decline in the recovery period as a whole and no significant rise in the last 2 years. In the absence of evidence of inflation in the main part of the price index, the rise in the index for this group cannot be taken as evidence of inflation.

The conclusion seems justified that the recent rise in the wholesale price index is an integral part of the process of reducing unemployment. It represents selective reflation not inflation.

Is this conclusion supported by the behavior of the Consumer Price Index? This index has risen 3.4 percent in the last 2 years. But if we look back of this index the behavior of commodities at retail parallels their behavior at wholesale as is indicated in table 2.

TABLE 2

[In percent]

Consumer goods	Price change, January 1964–January 1966	
	At wholesale	At retail
Commodities except food	+1.0	+1.0
Food	+8.1	+5.0
Services		+4.8

Source: Wholesale prices, Federal Reserve Board; retail prices, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The index for commodities other than food has gone up little and that for foods by a considerable amount though not as much as at wholesale. The actual figures for consumer commodities are somewhat distorted by the successive reductions in specific excise taxes. For example, the tax reductions which went into effect January 1, 1966, reduced the consumer index by 0.1 percentage point. However, adjustment for the tax reductions would still leave the increases in consumer commodities at retail very much what one would expect in the light of the reflation in wholesale prices plus the effect of the hog cycle on meats.

Only in the case of services does the rise in the price index, 4.8 percent in 2 years, appear to be inconsistent with reflation. But here there are two factors which in combination help to explain the rise which is a continuation of a longer run trend.

First there is the fact that the opportunities for increased productivity tend to be less in the service industries than in manufacturing or raw material production. And second the services tend to require a high labor input as compared with commodity production. Barbering has yet to be automated and most of the charge for a haircut is labor income to the barber. If wage rates generally go up 3.2 percent a year to reflect a national increase in productivity and barbers are already as efficient as their job allows, the price for a haircut should appropriately go up by about the same amount.

How much of the rise in the index for consumer services arises from the high labor content and the low opportunities for increased productivity is difficult to determine but it must be considerable. Indeed, it seems likely that if the indexes for commodities at both wholesale and retail were kept stable at high employment, the Consumer Price Index would continue to rise because of a rising index of services. In any case, the rising index of services does not significantly conflict with the conclusion that the rise in both wholesale and consumer price indexes is not primarily a matter of inflation.

What of the future? Can aggregate demand be expanded further without generating inflation? To answer this question we have to understand more clearly why industry has reacted to the general increase in demand by selective reflation rather than by a general rise in wholesale prices. Again leaving food for later discussion, how can it be that the prices of finished consumer goods at wholesale have risen so little? Raw materials have gone up in price, the productivity of newly recruited workers is likely to be low, particularly because of lack of experience and the cost of training, plants with high operating costs have had to be brought into production as demand increased, the cost of overcoming bottlenecks has presumably become more important and in other ways operating costs have risen. Have there been other factors which have offset these cost increases and kept total costs stable?

So far as labor costs are concerned, there are two major factors which explain why labor costs have not forced general price increases.

The first is the gradualness in the rise in wage rates. In the last 5 years, average money wage rates for production workers in manufacturing have risen at the rate of 2.9 percent a year, slightly less than the average increase in productivity. Even when increases in fringe benefits are taken into account, the average cost of labor per hour cannot have risen significantly faster than productivity. Also, there is no sign of acceleration in the rate of wage increase in manufacturing. From January 1965 to January 1966, wage rates rose 3.1 percent, just about the average for the 5-year period. Thus, wage rate increases have put no general pressure on prices.

The second major factor giving stability to labor costs is the effect of overhead labor on the labor cost per unit of output. A significant part of the labor employed in industry is overhead labor which does not increase in proportion to increases in the rate of operation.

This is particularly true of white-collar workers. Whether a company works at 80 percent of capacity or 90 percent, the office force is not likely to increase in anything like the same proportion. Even for blue-collar workers, many are engaged in maintenance work and other activities which go on at essentially the same pace whether a plant is operating at 80 or 90 percent of capacity. As this overhead labor is spread over a larger volume of product, the overhead labor cost per unit of output goes down. This tends to offset the lower productivity of the additional workers necessary to operate at a higher rate.

These two factors have resulted in great stability in the average labor cost per unit of output in manufacturing. According to a recent BLS study, the average cost per unit of manufacturing output declined 1.3 percent from 1961 to 1964 and preliminary figures suggest that the average cost was about the same in 1965 as in 1964. And since the rise in wage rates has shown no tendency to accelerate, it is highly unlikely that there has been any increase in average labor cost per unit in the last 2 years to generate a general price increase.

This leaves material costs and general overhead to be considered. Material costs per unit of output clearly rose. But the nonlabor overhead cost per unit of output must have declined. Such items as depreciation and real estate taxes do not go up because a plant is operated at 90 rather than 80 percent of capacity. As a result these costs per unit of output go down as a higher rate for operation spreads these costs over a larger volume. In the case of nonfood manufacture, this reduction in unit overhead costs must have just about offset the rise in the cost of crude materials and components so that here again there was no significant general pressure on prices. Only in the case of foods did the increases in the flexible-priced farm products put significant pressure on the prices of finished consumer goods both at the wholesale and retail levels.

The conclusion that there was no general upward cost pressure on the prices of finished consumer commodities other than food is given support by figures on manufacturing profits. According to a recent McGraw-Hill sampling study, corporate profits increased more than sales during the last year so that profit margins per dollar of sales must have increased. This may account for all or most of the small rise in finished consumer commodities (other than foods) and suggests that, on the average, total costs per unit of output remained fairly constant, though, of course, for some consumer commodities costs and prices rose, and fell for others.

Here then we have a clear explanation of why the great increase in aggregate demand in the last few years has brought about no inflation but only a selective reflation in prices commensurate with the increase in employment.

This brings us to the really crucial question, Can aggregate demand be increased further and unemployment be further reduced before shifting to a stabilizing policy needed to avoid general inflation? Since there has so far been no price evidence of general inflation, it seems reasonable to expect that until clear evidence does appear, if a steady rate of expansion in demand could be maintained, there could be continued price reflation and further reduction in unemployment. The index of farm crops and products could be expected to inch up somewhat while that for farm animals and products would probably decline as increased hog production brought down meat prices. Some further rise in industrial raw materials could also be expected but total manufacturing costs per unit of output could on the average be expected to continue relatively stable unless labor broke sharply away from the general guideline policy or the bottlenecks created by a high rate of industrial operation produced substantial cost increases. Likewise, with industrial costs per unit remaining stable, unless management used its market power to widen profit margins per unit, the price index of finished consumer commodities other than foods should remain stable both at the wholesale and the retail levels.

This means that the real threat of inflation comes from two main sources, (1) a breakaway from the guidelines by either labor or management, and (2) the high costs of bottlenecks.

The maintenance of the guidelines for both wages and prices, say for another year, should not be too difficult. Labor's interest in high employment is so great that the real problem is to establish a guideline rate of increase in wage rates that is fair and equitable. For management, the interest in avoiding inflation and recession is important, and responsible management should see that its longrun interest is in adhering to the guidelines. If profit margins are not increased, there will still be increase in profits as the rate of operation is increased somewhat further.

The more serious problem is that of bottlenecks. According to Business Week, manufacturing in January 1966 was operating, on the average, at 89.5 percent of rated capacity, up from 83 percent of capacity at the end of 1961 and 85 percent of capacity 2 years ago. Such a high average rate means that some industries are already working at close to full capacity or even over rated capacity while others are well below capacity. In the last year, manufacturing capacity has increased around 6 percent and on the basis of construction now underway and plans already adopted, capacity is expected to increase another 7 percent in 1966.

Also the preferred rate of operation for particular industries was reported as averaging 92 percent of capacity. If the expansions in capacity have been well planned, they should reduce or eliminate most of the bottlenecks arising from lack of manufacturing capacity even when aggregate demand is somewhat further expanded, and allow a higher proportion of all industry to operate at its preferred rate.

Industrial raw materials constitute a second source of bottlenecks. Their response to higher prices is slower than, say, hogs or farm crops.

Finally, lack of skilled workers creates difficulties. It takes time to train new workers or upgrade the skills of workers already employed. Likewise, it takes time to break down jobs so that parts of a particular job can be handled by less skilled workers.

This whole problem of bottlenecks constitutes a major challenge to American industry. In the past it has shown great adaptability. The superb job it did at the end of World War II in converting from war to peacetime production shows what it can do. If progressive management sets out to deal with the bottlenecks arising from a higher rate of employment without inflation, there is little reason to think this could not be done.

With substantial adherence to the guidelines and a will to break bottlenecks without inflation, reflation could probably be continued for another year without inflation, reducing the official unemployment figure to somewhat less than 2.5 million, or around 3 percent of the labor force.

At some point, the shift to a stabilizing policy will be necessary. The first signs of true inflation will appear in the movement of administered prices, particularly those of finished consumer goods. But until such signs appear, there is no necessity of making a trade-off decision between a combination of reduced unemployment accompanied by mild inflation on the one hand and an existing level of unemployment with no inflation on the other. The decision does not have to be made until reflation ceases and signs of inflation appear. Then, if unemployment is sufficiently reduced, say below 3 percent of the labor force, the decision should probably be made to adopt a stabilizing policy without inflation. To stabilize before this point is reached is to place a burden on the unemployed, and the underemployed, achieve a lower level of welfare than is possible and prevent the extra profits which could be made at a higher rate of production.

This conclusion does not mean that there is no need for restraining action to limit the rate of growth in aggregate demand. In the last 4 months, fiscal, monetary, and other policies have accelerated the rate of growth in demand so that it has exceeded the average rate of growth of the last 2 years.

Some shift in policy is now needed to limit the rate to the earlier rate. Also, as the turning point from recovery to long run growth is more closely approached, a slowing up in the rate of increasing demand would be required. What is important is that the price rise shown in the indexes has been a reflation, not inflation, that the reflation is not yet complete and that with due care the corner to stable growth can be rounded without inflation.

Housing Starts in February Fell to a 3-Year Low—Durable Goods Orders Off; Inflation-Wary Government Economists Welcome Drops—Builders Decry Tight Money

WASHINGTON.—Housing starts in February plunged 17 percent from January's reduced rate to a 3-year low, and new factory orders for durable goods declined slightly from January's record, the Census Bureau said.

Inflation fears reversed the usual assessments of such developments, and Johnson administration economists welcomed the reports, viewing them as easing the pressure for an income tax increase to slow the surging economy.

But the housing report was understandably unwelcome to the National Association of Home Builders. Association analysts blamed the downturn completely on the "tight money" situation that they said is keeping many prospective buyers from obtaining mortgages. Because the administration fears that business' extensive factory-building plans will overtax the construction industry, however, the analysts don't harbor much hope that the Government will do anything to shore up the sagging housing sector.

Starts in February were down to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1,318,000 units, the Census Bureau estimated, the lowest since the 1,303,000 pace of January 1963. The latest rate was 11 percent under the 1,482,000 of February last year.

TWO-YEAR HOUSING DOWNTREND

While starts have been in a general downtrend for about 2 years, the slide accelerated in January with a drop of about 12 percent to a 1,584,000 rate. Initially, the January drop was estimated at an even steeper 13 percent to 1,537,000 at an annual rate. But the December rate subsequently was revised upward slightly to 1,769,000 from the previous estimate of 1,763,000.

The sharpest drops in February took place in the North Central region and in the Northeast, with a somewhat milder one in the West and a slight increase in the South.

The pace at which home construction permits were issued by the 12,000 localities requiring them also slumped in February, prompting one analyst to call the starts outlook for the next few months "pretty rotten." At a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1,145,000 units, permits were issued at a pace 9 percent below the upward-revised January rate of 1,262,000 and 6 percent below the 1,224,000 level of February last year. The steepest declines in permits were also in the Northeast and North Central areas, with slight drops in the South and West.

Permits for new single family homes nationally were issued at a 644,000 annual rate, down from 709,000 a month before and 713,000 a year before. The permit rate for units in larger apartment buildings to house five or more families declined to 432,000 from 471,000 a month before but was only a shade below the 433,000 of a year before. The permit rate for units in two- to four-family buildings fell to 69,000 from 82,000 in January and from 78,000 in February 1965.

DECLINE OF 5 PERCENT EXPECTED IN YEAR

Michael Sumichrast, an economist for the homebuilders group, said the outlook currently is for a decline of "at least 5 percent" in starts this year from 1965's total of 1,503,000. As recently as the yearend, he said, the association's view was that starts would hold level this year; last fall the forecast was for a slight increase in 1966. He said the key problem is that higher interest rates and larger downpayment requirements prevent many would-be new home buyers from obtaining the necessary mortgages. Either inability to muster larger amounts of cash or handle higher monthly payments are blocking so many sales, he said, that builders are cutting back their own plans. Some Government men who only a few weeks ago were forecasting that mortgage money would fall about 5 percent short of demand, he said, currently think the short-fall could be as much as 7 to 10 percent.

In its other report, the Census Bureau said durable goods makers in February received a seasonally adjusted $23.5 billion of new orders, down about $300 million from the upward-revised record $23.8 billion of January. Initially, the January inflow was placed at $23.6 billion.

Declines affected most major industry groups, the Bureau said, more than offsetting a $400 million spurt in primary metals orders to $4 billion. New orders for machinery dropped by $300 million to $6.6 billion and those for transportation equipment were down by the same amount to $6.4 billion. Orders for the defense products category, including aerospace, ordnance and communications equipment, fell by $700 million from the month before to $2.8 billion in February; they were nevertheless $300 million more than December and $400 million ahead of February last year.

DURABLE GOODS SHIPMENTS

Factory shipments of durable goods were estimated at a record $22.6 billion, up slightly from the downward-revised previous record $22.5 billion of January. The January total initially was estimated at $22.7 billion. The slight gain "reflected a moderate increase in shipments of primary metals, while other major industry groups remained near the levels set in January," the Bureau said.

Primary metals shipments in February were $3.6 billion, up $100 million from the month before. Machinery shipments declined to $6.4 billion, and transportation equipment shipments rose about $100 million to $6.1 billion.

The backlog of orders, watched closely for signs of bottlenecks, didn't rise as strongly as the month before. At a seasonally adjusted $64.7 billion at the end of February, backlogs were up $900 million after a $1.3 billion gain in January. The latest total was $9.6 billion higher than that a year before.

The primary metals backlog rose by $300 million from the month before to $6.1 billion, and the transportation goods backlog rose by $300 million to $26.9 billion. The machinery backlog, which spurted by $500 million during January, grew only $200 million further to $20.8 billion at the end of February.

WEST GERMAN FIRM TO SUPPLY $150 MILLION STEEL PLANT TO RED CHINESE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am greatly disturbed that the West German Government has given full backing to a deal between a West German firm and Communist China to supply a $150 million steel plant to the Red Chinese. I am shocked that no formal protest has been made by the U.S. Government.

Reports of this deal were published Thursday. These reports related that the West German Government has pledged $87.5 million as a guarantee for the deal that involves various plants for Red China's steel industry. The plants would be built by an international consortium headed by DEMAG of West Germany and reportedly including firms in France, Switzerland, Great Britain, and Italy.

Although news of this multimillion-dollar deal which would greatly bolster Red China's steelmaking ability and thus strengthen its warmaking capability was widely published 5 days ago, no formal protest has been made by the U.S. Government.

We have heard from our State Department that much of our trouble in Vietnam is due to the Red Chinese.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have been told repeatedly by our military leaders that the bulk of the war materiel going to the Vietcong to kill American fighting men is supplied by Communist China. More than 2,000 Americans have died in Vietnam.

Yet, according to the New York Times, the U.S. Government has taken the position it cannot approve, disapprove, encourage, or discourage the Red Chinese steel deal. Why cannot our State Department raise its voice to reflect American disapproval of a deal that can endanger American lives?

Even a leading West German newspaper, De Velt, suggests that the American people, whose sons are fighting Red Chinese-supplied Communists in Vietnam, are being sabotaged.

This steel deal, coupled with shipments of other supplies to North Vietnam on British and other free world ships, raises serious doubts on the validity of our mutual defense agreements with our European allies. It also fans the fires of resentment by the American people against American foreign aid which eventually can be turned into aid for America's enemies.

As I have noted before, in the last quarter of 1965, 44 ships flying allied flags delivered supply cargoes to the enemy in North Vietnam. Thirty-five of these 44 ships were British.

Nearly a million of our American young men are now on duty in 31 nations, many having been drafted for this purpose. A quarter million of them are in West Germany protecting her borders against Communist invasion. They are at these far-flung posts to defend the free world.

We have given $125 billion in foreign aid since World War II. Of this, $50 billion has gone into building prosperous economies in Western Europe—more than $5 billion to West Germany alone. Britain, long an American ally, has been given $9.4 billion in U.S. aid, including a $3.7 billion British loan on which the British have paid neither principal nor interest for 2 years.

If our allies would not supply troops to fight side by side with Americans in South Vietnam, we can at least expect them to refrain from aiding the enemy.

And most certainly we have a right to expect our Government to speak out loud and clear against deals by allied governments, which deals are undermining our war efforts in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Newport News, Va., Daily Press, entitled "A Steel Mill for Communist China."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STEEL MILL FOR COMMUNIST CHINA

West Germany has in recent years been one of the United States' most reliable allies, which makes the more disturbing the decision of the Bonn cabinet to approve a French-German deal to build a $150 million steel complex for Communist China.

American officials were well aware of the project before it was announced this week, and reminded the West German Government that the United States prohibits trading with Red China and obviously would prefer its friends do likewise.

But the Government that has been protected and was put on the road toward economic recovery from World War II by the United States turned a deaf ear to these protests, thus clearing the way for a project which, when completed, will be the biggest boost for the Peiping economy ever engineered in the West.

This will be a joint French-West German venture, with the German share of the cost running to about $75 million. Of course there's no question of whether President de Gaulle will approve participation by French firms; for some time he has been ardently encouraging business and industrial deals with Communist China.

It is reported that some British interests also will join in this arrangement, which lamentably is hardly surprising. Just about all responsible officials in the free world agree that Red China is the most dangerous threat of all, but few nations are prepared to help cope with it.

One German newspaper, Die Welt has expressed some awareness of the American attitude toward the steel plant deal. In an editorial, it stated this week:

The American soldiers fighting in southeast Asia consider Communist China as their main enemy behind the Vietcong and the soldiers from North Vietnam * * *. The word "steel" makes them—and with them a large segment of the American public—think of weapons directed against them.

Precisely. But if the same thought occurred to the members of Chancellor Ludwig Erhard's government who decided in favor of helping Peiping at this most unpropitious moment in history they dismissed it from their minds for the sake of economic benefits.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I associate myself with everything that the distinguished Senator from Virginia has just said.

Only last Saturday morning a newspaperman of the local press in my State asked me what my reaction to the steel deal was.

I said at that time:

> If it is morally right for our allies to build a steel plant which could make casings for bombs, missiles, cannon, guns, and bullets, then our policy toward Red China is wrong. And, if our policy toward Red China is right, then this consortium is wrong.

This situation presents a paradox which is intolerable. We have hundreds of thousands of our boys fighting in Vietnam to defend American freedom. We have hundreds of thousands of our boys in West Germany to fight off communism. It strikes me that when we are committing American blood and wealth to defend the security of their nation, they should not be supplying materiel which can be used against our boys in Vietnam.

This steel mill will have the capacity to produce steel which could be used to manufacture bombs, missiles, guns, and bullets to be used against American boys. This country should protest it. If the administration does not do so, then I think Congress should do something about it.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Virginia for making this statement.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am very proud to be standing side by side on this matter with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia. He has brought a needed message to this body. When we talk about our allies with respect to Vietnam, we are talking about paper allies. In some cases they seem to be neutral on the other side.

I think our Government should speak out on the matter of the steel mill in the type of language which is understood in West Germany. I think they should think twice, or perhaps three or four times, about the fact that our boys are being shot at and are dying over in South Vietnam, and that American soldiers are stationed in West Germany to protect that country against communism. It seems to me ridiculous that while we are having our men stationed in West Germany as part of an effort to resist Communist aggression, that country should provide a steel mill to be constructed in Red China that will construct weapons of war that will eventually be found in the bodies of American boys.

I congratulate the Senator from Virginia for making this statement. I also join the Senator from Rhode Island in his observation that if the administration does not do anything about it, Congress should do something about it.

RELEASE OF COPPER FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I applaud the action taken today by President Johnson to authorize the sale of 200,000 tons of copper from our stockpile. The national interest has been served wisely and well.

For some time now, the demand for copper has been steadily on the rise throughout the world.

As our economy expands, this vital material becomes more and more important to our own industry. It is used in the manufacture of a wide variety of products—our cars, our trucks, our electrical equipment. Defense requirements for copper are also increasing. Copper is essential to the production of the ammunition, the bombs, and the aircraft for our fighting men in Vietnam.

While the demand for copper has been rising, world production of copper has not kept pace. Many of our own copper producers are operating at peak capacity. Yet there is still not enough copper to assure an orderly market.

To compound the problem, large world sources of copper are subject to frequent interruption or danger of interruption. Due to the crisis in Rhodesia, for example copper production in Zambia is in a continuing state of peril. The Chilean copper supply has been disturbed by a series of long strikes in that nation's copper mines. And there is no way of knowing how soon these dislocations will be ended.

Under these circumstances, the shortage of copper now poses a strong threat to our defense efforts and to our general economic well-being.

Inflationary pressures in the copper market have developed. Speculation in the copper market has intensified.

We are now at a critical turning point. We could sit idly by and permit the situation to worsen. But I do not believe the American people would want us to adopt a do-nothing attitude.

Our strategic and critical materials stockpile contains quantities of copper acquired for use—and which should be used—in precisely the kind of situation that has developed.

Copper that lies idle in our stockpile will not help our men in Vietnam.

Copper that lies idle in our stockpile will not contribute to an orderly copper market.

The national interest and the common defense firmly support the President's decision to sell the 200,000 tons of stockpiled copper. Just as 200,000 tons of copper were released from the stockpile last November, similar action was needed today—and was taken.

I am pleased to note that the release of stockpiled copper will be accompanied by vigorous efforts to encourage additional domestic copper production, and that the Government has retained the option to replenish the stockpile as soon as feasible.

The steps taken by the President were essential to preserve the vigor and health of our economy. They were needed to insure the uninterrupted and orderly supply of copper for our defense needs. They were proper. And they were right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand if the 200,000 tons are released, first of all, they will endeavor to spread that fairly over our industries which are in need of copper, and that our defense industries particularly will actually have priority.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand also that if 200,000 tons are released we shall still have 400,000 tons in the stockpile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And that according to military authorities ought to be ample to see us through.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator stated in capsule form what the facts are in this situation.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to put in my word of commendation for the action the President has taken today in releasing 200,000 tons of copper from the national stockpile. I commend the majority leader for his excellent statement on this point. Such action is both wise and necessary if we are to balance the availability of supply with the demand for copper in an ever-tightening market. It will be widely hailed, I believe, in my State of Utah which is the number two copper producing State in the Union.

Although the Kennecott Copper Co. in Utah is engaged in a $100 million expansion program, and many other companies are also gearing themselves to increase production, it is impossible to keep up with the demands of copper. This demand stems not only from the increasing production of items for domestic use in our great era of prosperity, but from space age demands—from demands for missiles, for rocketry, and for hardware for the Vietnam war.

I feel that domestic copper companies cannot only live with this release, but will welcome it because it will relieve a very tight copper market.

It is apparent, moreover, that we must continue every effort to expand our domestic production of copper—to meet the heavy demands of today and—to build again our stockpile for some future need which may arise.

I believe the action of the President is wise, and, indeed, was essential in order to provide an adequate supply of copper, and to look ahead to expand copper production in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I should not say anything at this stage, but to be perfectly honest with myself I must say that I do not altogether share the enthusiasm exhibited here about drawing down our stockpile of copper this low. Four hundred thousand tons of copper is a very small amount when we have great demands made upon us. If another war in addition to the one now in progress in Vietnam were to break out it would not take us long to run out of copper.

I have no objection to subsidizing local production of copper if that is necessary. I am willing to vote for an appropriation for that purpose.

But I have some grave misgivings about bringing the stockpile down to 400,000 tons. I have greater misgivings about the fact that this copper is to be used for all purposes and not only for the purpose of national defense.

I have had no opportunity since this matter arose to reexamine the laws, but I was of the opinion that if the President authorized disposal of a material in the stockpile without approval of the Congress it must be his judgment that the release is required for defense purposes. But the distinguished majority leader indicates it is to be used for a variety of nondefense purposes—production of all kinds of civilian goods and other products.

I hope this will work out all right. I am sure the disposal has been given careful study. I have no facts to controvert what has been said here. I know, however, that if there are two or three essentials in our country, in a war, they are copper, lead, and steel. If this stockpile of copper becomes much lower than it is now we will be in a dangerous condition.

I do not know why it was once thought we needed 800,000 tons. I do not know why we accumulated that much, if 400,000 tons is now adequate when we are engaged in war. A year ago there was concern whether the inventory we had then was adequate to meet stockpile objectives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My understanding is that there is authority in existing law for the issuance of this order and that——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I did not challenge that. I said I had not had an opportunity to study it. I had a vague impression that the law said the President had a right to release any of the stockpile without approval of the Congress when in his judgment the release is required for defense purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. My understanding could be in error. It could be that the law permits release for automobiles, copper pans, or civilian consumption.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand they got an opinion from the Attorney General that this could be done.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not impressed by that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Secondly, every agency that has any identity with it was consulted and asked to make a survey before they hit on this amount and the method of distribution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, once again we have been given an opportunity to observe the vital importance of maintaining national stockpiles of strategic materials.

In the past few weeks, the free world's supply of copper has become critical. This affects not only the cost of this essential metal—tending to force it up—but also has a very direct bearing on our efforts in Vietnam.

Without stockpiles, we would be helpless pawns in the world arena of supply and demand.

Fortunately, however, this is not the case. As the Senator from Montana has stated, President Johnson announced today the release of up to 200,000 tons of copper from our strategic and critical materials stockpile. This will assure our supporting our Defense Establishment—industries—especially those industries of a continuous supply of copper.

The President's action was timely and necessary. He is to be congratulated on taking this step.

But, I believe congratulations are also due to those farsighted Members of Congress following World War II who established our stockpiles just for such an emergency as this. It is an irony of history that the President, while serving as a Member of the Senate, was one of the leading advocates of stockpiling critical materials. Today he is able to reap the harvest of seeds well sown.

WISCONSIN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS OPPOSE PUTTING SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM ON MEANS TEST BASIS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is the third month in which I have been speaking out daily on the floor of the Senate against the administration's proposed 80 percent cut in the special milk program for schoolchildren. During that time a great groundswell of support for the program in its present form has developed. I have been joined by 66 of my colleagues in a bill to make the school milk program permanent and to increase Federal participation in the program. Almost 50 bills of a similar nature have been introduced in the House of Representatives. Daily I receive dozens of letters criticizing the proposed cutback. Editorials in the country's leading newspapers have supported the school milk program as it is presently administered.

But of all the indications of support and approval for the program in its present form none are more important to me than the letters I receive from State and local program administrators. These are the men who run the present programs—who must run any new program Congress may enact. Without exception they have condemned the administration's proposal to provide school milk only to the needy and those who attend a school without a lunch program.

I would like to quote two Wisconsin administrators today, because I think their professional evaluation of the impact of the proposed program will be of interest to every Member of the Senate. I. W. Lauscher, president of the Wisconsin School Food Service Association, states it this way:

> As I see it we, as administrators, would be called upon to establish some sort of criteria by which we would determine whether or not a pupil would be financially able to pay for a half pint of milk. Please remember that in schools having a food service, whether it be the school lunch program or any other type of food service, the pupils who are able to pay would be required to pay the full price of the milk, since there would be no Federal subsidy available. The subsidy would apply only to the milk served to pupils who would be determined unable to pay the full price. I do not believe that as administrators we would want to endorse a program of this nature. I believe you will agree with me that we have considered the school lunch and special milk programs as nutrition programs in our schools and that we have been operating them for the benefit of the health of our pupils without regard to ability to pay. Calling upon parents or pupils to demonstrate inability to pay for a half pint of milk is an absurdity.

That was an excerpt from a letter Mr. Lauscher wrote to school administrators in my State of Wisconsin. I would now like to quote a few lines which go to the heart of the matter from a letter sent to me by John Gehn, superintendent of Wisconsin's Joint School District No. 2.

> To think of changing these fine programs to include only needy children would be a big mistake. The proposed change will greatly increase the cost of lunches and milk. The needy children are already served free under the existing programs. The children from families with good incomes will be able to afford an increase in the lunch and milk prices. The big problem will arise with the middle and lower middle and marginal income family with a number of children in school.

Mr. President, these letters speak for themselves. They need no comment. However they raise one very interesting question. How effectively would a school milk means test program be administered when the very men and women charged with this duty have no confidence in such a proposal?

DISPOSAL OF GRAIN STOCKS BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in my supplemental views which accompanied the report of the Committee on Agriculture on the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965, I pointed out that present law permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of feed and food grain stocks for as low at 105 percent of the loan price plus reasonable carrying charges. With a loan price of $1 per bushel on corn, this would permit a resale price by the CCC of $1.05 plus carrying charges, which are usually computed at 1½ cents per month commencing in October.

I stated also that the Secretary of Agriculture has made it clear that he fully intended to use his power to so dispose of CCC stocks as a means of depressing the grain market, when he testified before the House Agriculture Committee as follows:

> We must not yield to the temptation to make prices so high that the programs become unworkable.

And again:

> To interpret the feed grains situation, we must remember that in 1961 and 1962, heavy sales of feed grains by Commodity Credit Corporation were an integral part of the program.

Because parity had been averaging only 77 since October of 1962 and because farmers had not been sharing fairly in our national net income, some of us sought to change the law to raise the price at which CCC stocks could be disposed of to 115 percent of the loan price. We were unsuccessful in our efforts, because the administration wished to be able to continue to have the power to depress the grain markets to, so it was said, force farmers to "voluntarily" come into the feed grains program.

Last year 67 percent of our Iowa farmers signed up for the program—a far higher percentage than the national figure. I pointed out at the time that this was as high a percentage as the Department could expect to obtain, because some farmers have a low feed grains base and are not interested in coming into the program; others have small farms and cannot afford to cut back their production in the face of marginal income; and a good many farmers prefer to feed their own grain and take their chances with the livestock market.

I have set forth in a table the pattern which reveals the obvious efforts of the Department of Agriculture to depress the grain market for corn, for example, in line with the announced policy of the Secretary to use this power to force farmers into the so-called voluntary program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the table prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year and month	CCC sales (bushels)	Lowest weekly price for No. 2 corn at Chicago
1961—December	73, 977, 718	$1. 10
1962—January	109, 121, 759	1. 09
February	113, 850, 496	1. 08
March	214, 091, 495	1. 10
April	159, 351, 950	1. 12
December	44, 041, 933	1. 12
1963—January	62, 297, 911	1. 18
February	87, 654, 186	1. 20
March	152, 999, 412	1. 21
April	96, 224, 108	1. 21
December	13, 510, 265	1. 20
1964—January	24, 159, 603	1. 24
February	27, 358, 474	1. 21
March	19, 058, 069	1. 24
April	13, 563, 048	1. 24
December	4, 855, 740	1. 24
1965—January	25, 497, 367	1. 29
February	61, 440, 178	1. 30
March	55, 129, 660	1. 31
April	63, 962, 681	1. 34

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, we now find a similar pattern developing during 1966. For the month of January, the CCC unloaded 61,686,140 bushels of corn, and Chicago prices varied between $1.30½ and $1.32. For the month of February, the CCC dumped 138,381,089 bushels of corn, and Chicago prices varied between $1.29½ and $1.32½. As if this were not enough, during the week ended March 4 CCC disposed of 79,196,109 bushels, the highest amount for any week since 1961, and this had its effect as shown by the weekly average price on the Chicago market of $1.26¾.

Possibly such activities will force more farmers to "volunteer" to sign up for the feed grains program, but the depressed market has cost Iowa farmers and feed grains and livestock farmers in other States millions of dollars, this at a time when the cost-price squeeze has been depriving them of a fair share in the increasing national net income.

For the year 1965, parity average 77, considerably under the figure of 81 for December of 1960, the last month before this administration took over the reins of government. Last year the costs of farm production increased almost $1 billion, and a good share of this can be traced to inflation, which is caused by the multi-billion-dollar deficit spending of the Congress.

I can understand the concern of the administration over the soaring consumer price index. But why must the farmer be the victim of action taken to hold down the cost of living while his costs of production are going up?

It appears to me that the Secretary of Agriculture is looking out for the consumer more than he is looking out for the farmer. The consumer, assuredly, needs someone to look out for his interests, but that is not the primary job of the Secretary of Agriculture. It really is the primary job of Congress, and the best way in which Congress can fulfill this responsibility is to have a majority of the Members stop their policy of spending billions of dollars more than is taken in, year after year, so that inflation will stop. Once this is done, the consumers will not be faced with ever-rising costs of living.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Corn Prices Cut by Soaring Federal Sales Amid Strong Demand, Farmers' Holdback," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 7, 1966. The article discloses that the CCC grain supply has been reduced from 700 million bushels a year ago to 361.7 million bushels as of February 18 of this year, this at a time when there are indications that our domestic consumption and export requirements for 1966 will increase.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMODITIES: CORN PRICES CUT BY SOARING FEDERAL SALES AMID STRONG DEMAND, FARMERS' HOLDBACK

The Government's rapidly accelerating disposal of surplus corn is putting downward pressure on prices.

In recent weeks the corn sales by Federal farm-surplus managers have increased to a fire-sale pace, a sharp turnabout from earlier predictions. The Agriculture Department forecast in December that corn requirements in the crop year begun October 1 "can be met largely out of the 1965 crop, with only limited amounts of corn expected to be made available from [Government-owned] stocks.

Sales in December were limited to 8.4 million bushels, compared with 50.6 million a year earlier. But Federal disposals in January expanded more than sevenfold to 62 million bushels, about matching the year-earlier sales. And in February, Government corn sales ballooned to 140.2 million bushels, highest for any month in 4 years, and more than double the 63.1 million bushels sold in February 1965.

Last week, the sales accelerated an even greater volume as the Government unloaded 72 million bushels of corn. Most of the surplus grain has been bought by domestic users. In February, for example, the Government sold 122.9 million bushels for domestic use and 17.3 million bushels for export.

EFFECT ON PRICES

The large Government sales, grain dealers agree, have influenced prices of corn. Prices have dropped since mid-February. No. 2 yellow corn, a key grade, now sells in Chicago at $1.27 a bushel, down from $1.33 about 3 weeks ago.

On the Chicago Board of Trade, prices of corn sold for future delivery have taken an even sharper slump in the wake of expanded Government sales. Corn for delivery later this month closed Friday at $1.23 a bushel, down 8 cents from mid-January.

Agriculture Department officials won't discuss their reasons for increasing sales of corn. They do, of course, have the duty of selling surpluses, which are costly to maintain, whenever it's advantageous to do so.

Grain traders find several reasons for the expanded U.S. sales. A combination of strong domestic and export demand and reluctance of many farmers to sell has made a ready market for the Federal corn, they say.

Corn disappearance, domestic use plus exports, in the quarter through December rose 7 percent from a year earlier to a record 1.2 billion bushels. The Government has pegged total disappearance in the current crop year at more than 4.1 billion bushels, up 5 percent from the prior year. That would be only 30 million bushels shy of the record 1965 corn crop. But many private forecasters currently are predicting this year's disappearance as high as 4.3 billion bushels, which would exceed the 1965 production and eat into the carryover from prior crops.

FARMERS HOLD BACK SUPPLIES

Many farmers have been withholding corn from market in expectation of higher prices later. The higher-than-expected rate of corn use and increasing concern over the food shortage in many parts of the world is encouraging the holdback, market analysts say.

Corn exports are getting a lift from expansion of livestock herds abroad. The Agriculture Department expects corn exports this year to reach a record 675 million bushels, up from 570 million in 1964–65. Exporters say the total may exceed 700 million bushels if supplies are available at ports. The principal buyers are Western European lands and Japan, but some orders have come from Communist satellites, including Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Bulgaria.

Some grain traders figure the expanded Federal corn sales are part of the Government's broad efforts to curb inflation. Rising prices for food, especially meat, have exerted a strong upward pull on the cost of living in recent months. Keeping a lid on corn's price will help encourage greater livestock production grainmen note, which in turn would cause a downturn in meat prices.

Traders also contend that high corn prices would tend to lure farmers out of the Federal feed grain program for controlling production of corn and other feed grains. As this is the time of year farmers are asked to sign up under the acreage-controlling plan, "we can only suspect the corn disposal has the aim of discouraging a large corn acreage this year," one grainman comments.

The heavy sales of corn by the Government are rapidly reducing the size of the Federal surplus. As of February 18, the Government-owned supply of corn had shrunk to 361.7 million bushels from 700 million bushels a year earlier. It was as high as 1.5 billion bushels at its peak in late 1960.

The speedy disappearance of the once mountainous corn holdings is spurring speculation in the grain trade that Uncle Sam won't be such a prime market influence in the future as in the past." If this continues, the Government will be running out of ammunition," observes one trader. "It looks like the Government won't be as much of a price-making factor next year."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1045, H.R. 12762.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12762) to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and the construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this is the third time a bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard has come before the Senate. Previously, budget requests for the Coast Guard were sent directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. Three years ago, this method was changed, and there is every reason to believe that a highly useful purpose was served thereby, in respect to the modernization of the Coast Guard's fleet and offshore facilities.

Prior to the adoption of this procedure, we all recall that, in a sense, the Coast Guard was the orphan of the military services.

The bill now before the Senate provides an authorization of $126,079,000. Of this amount, $63,210,000 would be used for the construction of vessels; $29,144,000 would be used for aircraft; and $33,725,000 would go for the construction of shore facilities. The Senate Committee on Commerce accepted, without changing a single dollar item, the House figure in respect to this authorization.

I should like to point out that the Coast Guard is now in the process of taking over all the Navy icebreakers, five in number. Two of them have already been acquired; the remaining three will be taken over by November of this year. It is felt that this action will promote efficiency and will result in some saving of money. This has been done by reason of an agreement reached between the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury.

It is interesting to note that the bill contains an item of $1,750,000 for the design of new icebreakers. The newest icebreaker now in service was built in 1955; the remaining icebreakers were built during World War II.

The Committee on Commerce was encouraged by Admiral Shields' testimony that a conventional icebreaker, according to preliminary figures, would cost $50 million, but that a nuclear-powered icebreaker would cost only $65 million. This difference of only $15 million, demonstrates the great advances in nuclear energy technology.

Senators may recall that 26 82-foot patrol boats of the Coast Guard were requisitioned by the Navy and taken to Vietnam, where they are performing valiant service.

On the very day that the Commerce Committee considered the authorization bill, a wire was sent to one of the Coast Guard patrol boats by the commander, Coast Guard Squadron I, the chief Coast Guard officer in Vietnam. The telegram reads as follows:

> You and your crew are commended for your outstanding performance in engaging and stopping a Vietcong junk on the night of March 9. Your alertness, high state of readiness, and professional skill have resulted in a junk sunk, at least 8 Vietcong killed in action, 4 Vietcong captured and wounded in action at no personnel or equipment loss to the United States.
>
> For Lt. E. J. Hickey: Your constant devotion to duty and total personal commitment for 11 months has resulted in the faultless performance of you and your cutter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my understanding, from sitting on the Committee on Appropriations in the last few years, is that the Coast Guard, in establishing these stations in various sections of the Atlantic and Pacific, is rendering a service that is of great benefit for the safety of air travel today. I assume that this protection extends as far as Greenland and the far North.

I understand from the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations that these items are contained in the budget request this year.

Mr. BARTLETT. Some of these items are not contained in the budget request. The request is for only $103 million for the various categories which I have mentioned and the committee bill is in the amount of $126 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. However, it is a very substantial request.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. The judgment of the House and Senate committees is that the amount should be increased to $126 million so that we may have the benefit of this construction and the Coast Guard can engage in the activities to which I have referred and certain vessel improvements may be made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From my experience in listening to the testimony, there is much merit contained in the authorization request.

I merely question how much money should be included in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1967. I believe in the merit of what the Coast Guard is doing in taking over from the Navy and performing additional duties. I merely question how fast we should go in trying to build up the Coast Guard.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have a decided personal opinion on this matter, having acted as chairman of the subcommittee each time the authorization bill has come before the committee, and also having had the privilege of serving under the senior Senator from Virginia on the Appropriations Subcommittee. That decision is that the Appropriations Committee would indeed be well advised to appropriate every cent of the more than $126 million asked for in the bill, because even then we actually would not be modernizing this essential establishment as rapidly as we could and should.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what is the time involved in the program?

Mr. BARTLETT. It is a 10-year vessel procurement program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 12762) was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, having conducted the Senate Commerce Committee hearings on Coast Guard authorization for fiscal year 1967, I take special interest in the passage of the authorization bill, H.R. 12762, today. The bill, as passed, authorizes $126,079,000 for replacement and augmentation of vessels, aircraft, and shore establishments of the Coast Guard. This figure compares with a fiscal year 1966 authorization of $120,150,000.

The Secretary of the Treasury in a communication to the Congress on February of this year requested introduction of a bill authorizing only $103 million for fiscal 1967 Coast Guard needs. Both the House and Senate committees found this request, which was 10 percent below the 1966 appropriation and which includes an item of $8.8 million made necessary by the transfer of the fleet of Navy icebreakers to the Coast Guard, below the minimum needs of the Coast Guard upon which steadily increasing demands have been placed by the people of the United States and their Government.

The expanding population of the United States and the expanding needs of world commerce for protection against disaster combine to place heavy burdens upon the capabilities of our Coast Guard. In recent years, too, we have experienced an almost fantastic increase in our pleasure-boating population.

Not only is the constant readiness of the Coast Guard to respond to crises relied upon here at home in connection with national disasters such as floods and hurricanes but Coast Guard readiness is also called upon in other types of national emergencies.

For example, at the present time, 26 82-foot patrol boats and approximately 450 Coast Guardsmen are participating in operation "Market Time" in southeast Asia. Their mission is to interdict the sea supply routes of the Vietcong. Coast Guard advice is being provided on the scene for the security of the ports used by U.S. forces.

Also in connection with U.S. activities in southeast Asia, Coast Guard port security contingents have been augmented at certain Pacific coast ports to supervise round the clock ammunition loading of ships bound for Vietnam. Further, the increased southeast Asia marine traffic from west coast ports has proportionately increased the work of Coast Guard marine inspection.

Another example of Coast Guard response readiness occurred last fall in the straits of Florida when Fidel Castro unexpectedly authorized the departure of disillusioned patriots from Cuba. The Coast Guard stepped in when it learned Cubans were fleeing their country by any type of floating craft which became available, regardless of the perils to be faced on the open sea. During the period from September 28 to November 12, 1965, 4,910 persons in transit from Cuba to Florida were assisted by the U.S. Coast Guard.

The increased demands we are placing on our Coast Guard at home and abroad require that they make every effort to become more efficient and effective. At the same time, we must supply the Coast Guard with the modern up-to-date equipment it needs to meet modern demands.

The bill we pass today authorizes the expenditure of $63,210,000 for procurement and improvement of vessels for the Coast Guard fleet. In authorizing this amount we increase from three to four the number of high-endurance cutters to be constructed. The committee believes this increase is necessary because the vessel replacement program is far behind schedule. In addition, the funds will provide for the preliminary design work on an icebreaker to replace the *Wind*-class icebreaker, a new oceanographic cutter and a small cutter of intermediate size between the present patrol boats and medium endurance cutters. The bill also authorizes the procurement of 28 aircraft, including 3 C–130 aircraft to replace the 2 C–123B and 2 HU–16 aircraft stationed at Kodiak, Alaska. The increased requirement at Kodiak has been made necessary by the urgent demands for search and rescue in the Kodiak area and by the need for adequate law enforcement and surveillance of foreign fishing activities in the North Pacific.

The remaining $33,725,000 will be utilized for shore facilities. In addition to authorizing construction and procurement of certain facilities, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to lease housing facilities where there is a lack of private housing. This authority is similar to that permitted the Secretary of Defense. It has a 2-year limitation. Providing the leasing authority and the authorization to purchase approximately 350 family quarters. Also included in this bill is the least we can do, I feel, when the record shows that at least 8,800 of 15,000 Coast Guard families are at present inadequately housed.

Mr. President, we can all appreciate the need to keep expenditures at the minimal level. We all realize the situation in southeast Asia requires that we step up our procurement of guns and correspondingly reduce our spending for butter. In the case of the Coast Guard, however, which has already provided 26 vessels and 450 men for Vietnam duty, we are spending in effect for guns.

Therefore, I feel that the more than $23 million the Congress has added to the fiscal year 1967 Coast Guard authorization is completely justified. It is my hope that the full amount will be appropriated and expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the legislation which will be pending at the conclusion of the morning hour, the supplemental defense appropriation bill (H.R. 13546) take place not later than 5:15 this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

FULBRIGHT IS IN RIGHT SPOT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President in the Plain Dealer, nationally known newspaper published in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, there appeared an article in the publisher's column entitled "Fulbright Is in Right Spot." The article was written by Thomas Vail, editor and publisher of the Plain Dealer.

I first knew Thomas Vail not too many years ago when he was a political reporter on the Plain Dealer. Mr. Vail is now editor and publisher of that great newspaper. He was recently a guest of our President and First Lady at the White House. Upon his return to Cleveland, he wrote an article concerning the hearings recently conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, dealing with Vietnam and China. He stated that the hearings were of tremendous importance to Congress and to the entire Nation. His article pays tribute to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who is a great scholar, a great patriot, and a beloved colleague of ours in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fulbright Is in Right Spot

(By Thomas Vail)

As he has been so much in the news lately, a close look at Senator J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas, is of some interest and importance.

Fulbright's approach to government and even his manners and dress are so English-oriented he is at times hard for the American public to understand.

A Rhodes scholar, Fulbright has the easy cosmopolitan and literate air of the Oxford graduate.

He is as ideally suited to be chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as he is unlike the State which elects him.

Fulbright's powerful position in itself is a political phenomenon, as the leadership of congressional committees is based on tenure rather than talent. Only occasionally does a chairman have both, as has the Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Through his hearings on Vietnam and Communist China, Senator Fulbright is following more the example of English parliamentary open debate rather than the usual American legislative system of private negotiation behind closed doors.

No one is more surprised at the fuss he has stirred up than Senator Fulbright.

A mild-mannered, literary, gentlemanly figure, Senator FULBRIGHT confides to friends that he is not trying to make the policy of the Government, but rather to illuminate problems.

Publicly and privately, he professes amazement that President Johnson, a fellow Democrat, takes a dim view of the hearings. The Senator persistently states he only wishes to bring the Government's policies on Vietnam and Communist China out into the open for free and realistic discussion.

That he has succeeded in part was made evident when Vice President HUMPHREY recently indicated a new administration evaluation of our attitude toward Communist China looking toward more contacts.

Obviously the Vice President was given the nudge from President Johnson to float a trial balloon on Communist China policy to test public opinion for new Johnson administration policies in the months ahead.

In his cultivated low-key way Senator FULBRIGHT questions Secretary of Defense McNamara's professed "certain" knowledge of the political objectives of Communist China, based mainly on McNamara's quotes from a recent public policy statement by the Chinese defense minister.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by conducting the hearings, is doing President Johnson a great favor, for the committee is providing a safety valve which can avoid more concrete dissents at the ballot box.

FULBRIGHT, a man who just missed being secretary of state under President Kennedy because of the Senator's conservative stand on civil rights, is ideally suited by education, experience, interest, and talent to be an important figure in foreign affairs.

The hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Vietnam and China are unusual, interesting, nonconclusive, and represent the civilized reflections and personality of the powerful chairman.

COMPENSATING VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am very pleased at the increasing attention that is being paid to the need of our society to make some equitable provision for those innocent victims who suffer loss as a result of crime. Following the recent examples of England and New Zealand, I have sponsored a bill, S. 2155, establishing a plan for compensating the victims of criminal violence where the crime occurs in areas under Federal police jurisdiction. The response to and interest in this proposal has been most encouraging.

I believe this legislation should be passed by the Congress, and serve as an inspiration to the States to pass similar legislation. My bill, S. 2155, is patterned after the plans recently set up in England and New Zealand, so its success can be predicted from the success with which these plans are meeting in those countries.

A report on the first 14 months' operation of the British plan is found in the March 1966 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. The article, "Compensating Victims of Violence," by David L. Foulkes, concludes that the plan has been working successfully in Great Britain, and provides an interesting discussion of the British experience and operations. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Bar Association Journal, Vol. 52, March 1966]

COMPENSATING VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

(NOTE.—In 1964, the British Government created the Criminal Injuries Compensation scheme, by which damages may be awarded to victims of criminal violence in Great Britain. Mr. Foulkes discusses the scheme and the experience under it so far. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has introduced a bill in the Senate to set up a similar plan in the District of Columbia. The Yarborough plan is intended as a model for the States.)

(By David L. Foulkes, lecturer in law at the Welsh College of Advanced Technology (Cardiff))

Those who are concerned with devising more effective methods of dealing with the convicted criminal are often charged with having a greater concern for the well-being of the criminal than for his victim. As far as Great Britain is concerned, this charge can now to some extent be met by pointing to the scheme for the compensation of victims of crimes of violence which came into force there on August 1, 1964.

The root of the problem is of course that when a person is proceeded against criminally it is only his liability to punishment that the court is concerned with. It cannot award compensation to the victime who must, if he wants redress for the wrong done to him, bring separate civil proceedings. The layman is justified in asking whether the victim ought to be required to bring separate proceedings and whether it might not be possible for the court by which a person is convicted to be empowered to award the victim a sum to compensate him for his injuries. There are in fact in England some circumstances in which this can be done, but the court's powers are severely limited and arise largely only with respect to damage to property rather than to the person. In view of the difficulties involved in considering civil and criminal liability in the same trial—difficulties arising from the rules of procedure and evidence—it was not to be expected that reform in this matter could come along the lines of an extension of the powers just referred to. Even if such a scheme were possible, it would not meet the case where the assailant is unknown or impecunious; if a scheme for compensating victims of violence is to deal with such circumstances it would seem that it must be made possible for claims to be asserted against the state. It has indeed been suggested that the state has a duty to protect its citizens from violence and that when a person is subjected to violence the state ought to compensate him for having failed in its duty toward him. The desirability of a scheme of compensation is not to be measured by the acceptability of that argument.

The desirability of such a scheme has been urged in Great Britain for some time, and after much discussion both inside and outside Parliament of various kinds of schemes the Government accepted the idea.

In March 1964, it published a white paper setting out a draft scheme.[1] In it the Government rejected the view that the justification for such a scheme lies in the state's duty to protect its members from violence. It preferred to base its approval of a scheme on the ground that "the public does * * * feel a sense of responsibility for and sympathy with the innocent victims and it is right that this feeling should find practical expression in the provision of compensation on behalf of the community." It pointed out that there was no experience to draw on in assessing how a compensation scheme would work and that it was impossible to forecast with any degree of assurance how many people would apply for compensation and in how many of such cases a payment out of public funds would be justified.[2] For these reasons it was important, the Government suggested, to regard the scheme as experimental.

The proposed scheme was debated in both houses of Parliament. In the light of what was then said, the Government made a number of amendments to its draft scheme, although the essentials were not affected.

As already stated, the scheme came into force on August 1, 1964. Because of its experimental nature, it is on a nonstatutory basis, as this permits flexibility. That is to say, it has been established not by an act of Parliament but by administrative arrangement, although the approval of the Commons to the necessary expenditure is obtained. The scheme provided for the creation of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board. The members of the board are appointed by the Home Secretary after consultation with the Lord Chancellor. All the members of the board, of whom there are six, are legally trained.

THE SCOPE OF THE SCHEME

In regard of what events can application for compensation be made? The applicant must have suffered personal injury directly attributable either (1) to a criminal offense or (2) to an arrest or attempted arrest of an offender or suspected offender or (3) to the prevention or attempted prevention of an offense or (4) to the giving of help to any constable who is engaged in arresting or attempting to arrest an offender or suspected offender or attempting to prevent an offense.

It will be noticed that the scheme does not specify a list of crimes in respect of which compensation is payable. The board in its first report[3] has doubted whether a comprehensive list could ever be finally settled. Compensation has been paid for personal injuries arising out of offenses not only against the person but also against property where injury is caused, as, for example, robbery and murder in the course of theft. The board takes the view that the schemes does not cover injuries resulting from a breach of statutory duty imposed by the Factories Acts, though such a breach may of course lead to criminal penalties.

The injury must have occurred in Great Britain—the scheme does not apply in northern Ireland—or on a British ship or aircraft. It need not have been the subject of criminal proceedings in the courts, but if it has not, it must have been reported to the police without delay.

Motoring offenses are excluded except where the vehicle has been used as a weapon, i.e., in a deliberate attempt to run down the victim. Offenses committed against a member of the offender's family living with him at the time of the injury are also excluded. Compensation has thus been denied to a woman who was assaulted by the man with whom she had been living for 4 years at the time of the offense, but granted to a woman who was attacked by her husband from whom she was separated.

A child under 10 (in Scotland 8) cannot commit a crime in the eyes of the law, so compensation cannot be paid when the assailant is of that age. This decision will probably be reconsidered.

---

[1] Cmd. 2323 (1964).

[2] In New Zealand the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1963 came into force on Jan. 1, 1964. Obviously there was too little experience in its operation to judge its suitability, but the British scheme seems to resemble it closely.

[3] Cmd., 2782 (1965).

The board must be satisfied that the injury is directly attributable to a criminal offense. Where the assailant is convicted of an offense sufficiently connected with the incident this is bound to be established. In one case a boy of 15 fired an air rifle into the air. A girl standing nearby but not in the line of fire was by a mischance struck in the eye by a pellet. The boy was convicted of an offense connected with the possession of the airgun. The injury was held to be only indirectly attributable to the offense for which the boy was fined, and no award was made. Where the charge is dismissed this is almost bound to lead to a denial of compensation, unless the board thinks that the assailant was guilty of some other offense. In the case just mentioned it thought the boy not guilty of a common assault. In another case compensation was given although the verdict at the assailant's trial (in Scotland) was "Not proven." And the fact that the police take no proceedings against a known assailant does not preclude the board from making an award. A difficult case which went to a hearing concerned an incident in which a boy of 8 was struck in the eye by an arrow shot by a boy of 14. No proceedings were taken by the police. The board found in a long report that assault and battery had been committed.

Even in those cases where the assailant is not traced, compensation may be paid in reliance perhaps on the evidence of witnesses or on the nature of the injuries. In other cases of course the nature of the injuries is equivocal: they might have been caused by, say, the applicant falling or being struck by a vehicle. In one such case the board concluded, "The reason the applicant was assaulted will always remain a mystery, but in the boards' opinion the fact that he was the victim of a criminal assault could not be gainsaid and there was no evidence to suggest that he was in any way responsible for the assault." The board has incidentally said in its annual report that very few applications give rise to a suspicion of fraud.

Compensation is paid ex gratia. There is no legally enforceable right to it, but the board is, in its own words, "instructed and compelled to make payments to all who come within the ambit of the scheme."

BASIS OF COMPENSATION

Compensation is assessed on the basis of common law damage and takes the form of a lump sum payment (subject to special arrangements in the case of infants). An interim payment can be made when, for example, only a provisional medical assessment can be given in the first instance. In assessing compensation, however, the rate of loss of earnings to be taken into account cannot in any case exceed twice the average of industrial earnings at the time the injury was sustained, as published in the Ministry of Labour Gazette, and there is no element comparable to exemplary or punitive damages.

When the victim has died no compensation is paid for the benefit of his estate but claims can be made by those members of his family entitled to claim under the Fatal Accidents Acts, and the principles determining the amount of compensation under those acts also apply in this case.

Compensation is liable to be reduced by two other factors—where the applicant has received some payment out of public funds (e.g., national insurance benefit) and where, by his provocation or otherwise he bears some responsibility for his injuries—by, for example, being a "willing participant" or showing a "disposition to fight." No compensation is paid unless the injury gives rise to at least 3 weeks' loss of earnings or is one for which at least £50 would be awarded.

There is no provision enabling the board to claim from the assailant the sum which it paid out to his victim. The board is keeping records to see whether any of the assailants might be worth powder and shot, and suggests that few cases would be worth pursuing. It would of course be improper for anyone to get both common law damages and compensation from the board, so anyone who is compensated is required to repay the board from any damages or settlement he may obtain as a result of a common law claim.

THE BOARD'S PROCEDURE

Application for compensation has to be made to the board as soon as possible on the form issued by it. Apart from particulars of injury, treatment, etc., the applicant is required to authorize the medical authorities, the police, and his employer to give the board relevant information. The initial decision whether to allow the application (and if so the amount of award) or to reject it is made without a hearing by one member of the board. If the applicant is not satisfied with the decision he is entitled to a hearing before three other members. When a single member thinks he cannot reach a just and proper decision by himself he can refer the application to a hearing. At a hearing the applicant can be represented by a lawyer or by a friend. Both he and the board may call witnesses. The board must disclose to the applicant all the information it has on the matter and must reach its decision solely on the evidence brought out at the hearing. The hearing is in private, in order, it is said, to preserve the anonymity of the claimant, but it is difficult to see that this is in general necessary. The hearings are informal, and the board does not consider itself bound by the rules of evidence. There is no appeal, either to the courts or to the Home Secretary.

Every month the board issues a summary of cases decided except for those where less than £150 general damages has been awarded. The summary of a case disposed of by a single member runs to between 75 to 100 words. Summaries of hearings are considerably longer, running in one case to three foolscap pages.

These reports have been criticized as not giving enough information on either procedural or substantive matters, and it is said that therefore "no confident advice can possible be given to a prospective applicant upon the chances of his success."[4] It is difficult to believe, however, that a lawyer with a knowledge of the scheme, the principles on which common law damages are awarded, and of the criminal law (a knowledge that his client is entitled to assume he has) could not advise his client as confidently as he ever can as to the outcome of litigation.

In the board's first 14 months it received approximately 1,500 applications and paid compensation totaling £185,000. Six hundred and nine applications were decided by a single member, 17 awards were made after a hearing, 86 applications were disallowed, and 741 applications were still under investigation. The board, it appears, is in danger of being overwhelmed by its success.

DALLAS MORNING NEWS ENDORSES NEW GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on March 3, 1966, President Lyndon Johnson signed the cold war GI bill into law. Since the time of that signing many newspapers have given their editorial approval of this worthy bill. One such editorial appeared in the Dallas Morning News of Monday, March 7, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent that that editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GI BILL

The GI bill, now law, is the attempt of a grateful Nation to express its thanks for a job well done. The citizens who have continued to enjoy the freedom, comfort and security of their homes can help the young men who have given up their own comforts and risked their lives to defend freedom.

As Texas' Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Representative OLIN TEAGUE and others have pointed out, the bill also promised to benefit the Nation itself. By providing the veterans opportunity to achieve the skills and higher training needed by America, the measure will increase the prosperity and well-being of the entire country.

The return of these young men to the colleges and universities of the Nation should have an immediate and beneficial effect there. Having seen something of life—and death—the veterans will bring maturity and a sense of direction and responsibility to a college generation which needs these qualities.

JIM PATTON RETIRES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Jim Patton is stepping down. After 25 years as leader of the Farmers' Union he is moving on to other pastures. I personally feel a sense of loss, for I have worked with Jim Patton during the years I have been in the Senate, and his advice and counsel have always been valuable to me. We did not always agree, but we nearly always did. I found that he would evaluate the situation at hand fairly and objectively, regardless of whether one agreed with his position.

Jim Patton has a vision of an abundant American agriculture which can provide a just return to the farmer for his efforts and at the same time provide each American with the benefits which he should receive from this most productive sector of the American economy. Jim has been perhaps the Nation's most articulate advocate of sensible cooperation in agriculture between the Government and the people for the purpose of improving the health of agriculture and of improving the life of the American farmer. May he continue to be so for many, many years.

TEXAS WESTERN—NCAA BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texans are justly proud of many different things about the Lone Star State, but I am sure that today the one thing that has buttons popping off of vests all over the State is the great victory that our Texas Western Miners achieved in winning the National Collegiate Athletic Association basketball championship Saturday night at College Park, Md.

---

[4] Tapper, *C.I.C.B. Releases,* 28 M.L.R. 460. The same writer also says "many more applications are refused than accepted" and "the only details given are details of successful applications." Neither of these statements is true.

I congratulate the NCAA for running a magnificent tournament. I extend the best wishes of the people of my State to the other fine universities in the finals—Kentucky, Duke, and Utah. They are a credit to basketball and to the athletic programs of our universities.

Most of all I wish to congratulate the players and coaching staff of Texas Western for a splendid job.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS BEGINS TO SHOW RESULTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, President Johnson has been able to report that after an initial period of uncertainty, the Alliance for Progress is beginning to show concrete results of the type envisioned by its founders. The chief of these results is reflected in the achievement of a growth rate of 2.5 percent in Latin America for the last 2 years as compared to only 1 percent for the preceding 2 years. These and other indications of progress were contained in a statement which the President made on March 14, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the Alliance.

When viewed against the backdrop of ills and needs in many parts of Latin America, the gains may seem small. Modest though the results may be, they are still a source of satisfaction. These results begin to replace the hopelessness, the stagnation, and the incipient chaos which characterized much of Latin America at an earlier time.

In addition to helping achieve the goal of a 2.5-percent growth rate which was set during the time of President Kennedy, the Johnson administration is working on the following specific goals for fiscal years 1965 and 1966: It is contributing to the construction of classrooms for 1 million students, improvement of 7,000 miles of road, extension of agricultural credit to 450,000 farmers, construction of 450 new health facilities, expansion of power generating capacity by 530,000 kilowatts. These and many other projects offer visible proof of progress to the Latin American people and of the interest of this Nation in progress not only at home but throughout the hemisphere.

The export earnings of Latin America, according to the President's report, increased by $1 billion in 1965 over 1963 figures, thus providing additional resources for reinvestment in local economies. A judicious blending of administration and congressional efforts helped to produce this welcome trend in Latin American external commerce.

Continued cooperation in trade and other economic matters is imperative, and I am confident that it will be forthcoming as we enter the second 5 years of the Alliance for Progress. Insofar as President Johnson is concerned, he has long had and continues to have a deep interest in Latin America and a warm affection for its people. Both are expressed in his personal attention to the problems and affairs of the Alliance for Progress. And they are expressed in his determination to see the Alliance succeed, to the end that the lives of people throughout the hemisphere shall be enriched with greater social and economic benefit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's message on the fifth anniversary of the alliance be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY FOR THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

My fellow citizens of the hemisphere, since becoming President, I have often restated my own, and our country's, resolute commitment to the goal of a better life for all the people of the Western Hemisphere.

Many Presidents have worked to shape that goal.

We are proud of the good neighbor policy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

President Eisenhower broke new and fertile ground with the Act of Bogotá in 1960—an act growing from the understanding compassion of one people for another.

President Kennedy built on these efforts and gave them increased emphasis with the announcement of the Alliance for Progress on March 13, 1961, 5 years ago.

Today, by word and deed, Americans are helping to fulfill the hopes of those who have little and pray that one day can have more.

The Johnson administration seeks history's description at a time when, the dreaming and the planning having laid the foundations, the doing and building were underway.

The last 2 years of this vast cooperative effort between the United States and the nations of Latin America are solid evidence that deeds are matching our words.

During these 2 years Latin America has achieved a per capita growth rate of 2.5 percent. The average rate for the preceding 3 years was less than 1 percent. This recent increase of 150 percent is a fact which friends of the hemisphere must note with pride—and new hope for the future.

In fiscal years 1965 and 1966, those Latin American countries cooperating with U.S. programs of action are putting visible results before their people.

Together we are: Improving 7,000 miles of road, building 130,000 dwelling units, irrigating 136,000 new acres of farmland, adding 530,000 kilowatts to power generating capacity, providing classrooms for 1 million students, building 450 new health facilities, spending $200 million to provide financing for expansion and construction of over 5,000 industrial firms, spending $250 million in providing agricultural credit to 450,000 farmers.

Equally important, reforms are changing and modernizing these institutions in Latin America essential to the growth of a sense of community that stretches throughout the hemisphere.

Governments, business concerns, labor unions, and cooperatives are working with the people of our hemisphere to attain economic and social progress under free institutions.

We are building the machinery of cooperation through the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress.

We are enlisting the support of private groups and voluntary agencies in ever-increasing measure. The Peace Corps, Partners for the Alliance, Council on Latin America, AFL–CIO, private foundations and universities are making vital contributions.

We are introducing the principle of mutual aid among the Latin American nations. We are giving new energy to economic integration within Latin America. The Economic and Social Act of Rio de Janeiro, approved last November, gives impetus to these concepts.

We recognize that fulfillment of all our goals will require continuation of our joint efforts beyond 1971. I said last November that the United States is prepared to extend mutual commitments beyond the period originally foreseen in the Charter of Punta del Este. Self-help and mutual aid will be yardsticks in determining the scope of our contribution.

In country after country, nations in the hemisphere are acting to mobilize resources for public and private investment—to reform and modernize the institutions—to expand trade and market opportunities within and outside the hemisphere—and to provide a solid base for the support and cooperation of imported capital and technical assistance.

External support is also coming in increasing measure from the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, and its affiliates and the United Nations. This support has increased by about $200 million in the last 2 years.

For its part, the United States has already committed nearly $5 billion to the nations of Latin America to assist them in their struggle to modernize and achieve a better life for their people. In recent months significant steps have been taken to give Latin America greater access to our markets:

This administration has insisted that our participation in the International Coffee Agreement be more effective.

This administration recommended the Congress withdraw the special import fee on sugar.

This administration removed the quota restrictions on lead and zinc.

After a temporary period of setback, there are now most hopeful signs of a renewal of large-scale private foreign investment in Latin American development, often in joint ventures with Latin American associates. Business leaders interested in Latin American investment have been invited to the Cabinet Room frequently to discuss steps to help the people of the hemisphere.

Three years ago the 19 Latin American countries were deeply concerned over their trade position in the world.

During the past 2 years the trend has changed.

Our experts now predict that export earnings for 1965 will show an increase of $1 billion over the 1963 level, providing additional resources for investment in development.

Yet we must do more than provide money and technical assistance and improve trade. Investments must be made directly in human beings. In every forum, I have advocated and directed that American resources be invested in education, health, and improved living and working conditions. Such efforts are not easy to organize. They require the mobilization of human resources in scarce supply. But they are among the most rewarding of all investments.

Today I want to issue a new call to our sister nations in the hemisphere to enlarge our truly revolutionary cause—the cause of enlarging the lives of all our people.

I am determined to contribute America's resources to this spirit of change—a spirit now slowly, surely, confidently growing in the Western Hemisphere.

All of us in the Organization of American States have seen and understand the lessons of history. Together we are strong. Divided we are weak. Together, we must shape the future to our hopes.

In every nation in the hemisphere the needs and the beliefs and the prayers are the same. We want peace and opportunity—the chance to live in dignity, to choose and plan and work and achieve the best for our families.

I believe that the next 5 years we will see a continent constantly growing in prosperity and in unity—growing in its capacity to meet the desires and needs of its own people—and in its contribution to peace and freedom in the world at large.

That is what Bogotá and Rio and Punta del Este were all about.

For my own part, I want to help make all this a reality and "to create out of the human spirit, something that did not exist before."

This is fulfillment. And this is our commitment.

FUNDS FOR FEDERALLY IMPACTED SCHOOLS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned over proposals to reduce the program of aid to federally impacted areas.

Public Law 874 has been in existence for 16 years. Through this program, payment is made to individual school districts for children whose parents work for the Federal Government and/or live on Federal property.

During the last fiscal year, a total of $416 million was given to 4,200 local school districts for pupils who are federally connected.

This program has aided and improved our school system by helping to maintain our high standard of education. It has enabled the communities to expand their educational programs without cutting back on quality. The Federal Government should provide at least a part of this money since the installations produce no direct tax benefits for support of the schools or the communities.

Education is essential in today's complex society. The program has provided necessary funds for more qualified teachers and better school facilities. We all know the difficulties which communities face in raising enough revenues to support necessary services. This is especially true in Maine where the property tax has for many years been under severe pressure.

The proposed cutback in the federally impacted school aid program from $416 million to $183 million, about a 44-percent cutback, would be detrimental to our educational system and the Nation as a whole. It would hit many communities hardest that can least afford any reduction in Federal aid funds.

In Maine, if the President's proposal is upheld, the reduction would be from the scheduled $3.2 million to $1.2 million, or about 60 percent. Presently, 69 Maine school districts are eligible for help. However, under the new proposal, 13 of these districts would be dropped from the program and in many of the remaining communities, help would be meaningless. For instance, 3 communities would receive $98 and 12 communities would be allotted less than $1,000 each. Thus, local governments would have to assume the costs of education for a number of children of Federal employees and individual tax rates would rise.

Public Law 874 supplies a vital need for thousands of communities throughout the United States. Other bills are designed to meet the educational requirements of needy students. To cut back this important program would serve to create more educational problems for communities in which the Federal Government bears a direct and legitimate responsibility. This program has worked well for the last 16 years. It should be continued.

RESCISSION OF ORDER FOR VOTE ON SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the order providing for a vote not later than 5:15 this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESCISSION OF ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to vacate the order that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until Thursday, March 24, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I make no objection to what the majority leader is asking. I just hope there will be some way that all Senators will be notified that the order is rescinded, because I believe it has been announced, and Senators expect to vote at 5:15.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure that on the Republican side, every Senator's office will be notified, and notification of Democratic Senators is being taken care of.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So we will not vote on this matter this afternoon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think so.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think I owe it to the majority leader to state that the request he has just made was made at my request, and that I alone am responsible for it, and not the majority leader.

The facts are that there are a number of Senators who wished to be heard on this bill, some of them at some little length. I, myself, have a number of questions I wish to direct to the manager of the bill, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I have a rather extensive speech I wish to make. I believe there are others.

I had not been given any advance notice of the request the majority leader made, nor was anything put in the RECORD on Thursday. I am not blaming anybody; I wish to make that clear. And I alone am responsible for what the majority leader has just done. I thank him for his never failing courtesy.

PRESS VERSUS MILITARY IN VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the winter issue of the Columbia Journalism Review is an article by Martin Gershen entitled "Press Against Military in Vietnam: A Further View." Anyone who feels confused over some of the press reports from Vietnam would do well to read this article, because it helps to explain the reason for some of the confusion—and the reason, Mr. Gershen points out, lies with a few of the members of the press themselves. During my recent trip to South Vietnam, I had occasion to discuss this problem with some of our military commanders. Their comments were uniformly to the effect that the great majority of members of the press handled themselves and their reporting commendably, but there were always a few who had to abuse the situation. Mr. Gershen's article gives examples of the "abuse." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS VERSUS MILITARY IN VIETNAM: A FURTHER VIEW

(NOTE.—Martin Gershen, who wrote the following observations, is a feature writer-photographer for the Newark Star-Ledger, on leave to study in Columbia's advanced international reporting program. He covered the war in Vietnam last summer.)

There is a basic law of journalism which says that every story should have at least two sides.

Yet, in too many reports involving censorship in Vietnam, the press seems to have the last word.

And that word leaves the reader—or viewer—at home no alternative but to assume that the American war in southeast Asia not only is against communism, but against the entire U.S. Military Establishment.

In an article, "Censorship and Cam Ne," by Richard Rustin, which appeared in the fall, 1965, issue of the Columbia Journalism Review, the writer made some attempt at giving both sides of the controversy that continues between the press and the brass.

But one had to read carefully and dig deeply to learn that the possibility exists that the press may be partly to blame for its troubles with the censors.

Edward P. Morgan suggested this possibility when he was quoted as saying there was a "passel" of young stringers in Vietnam who are trying to become the Ernie Pyles of this war by baiting military officials at press briefings.

But generally the article seemed to consist of quotations from one famous byliner after another who self-righteously attacked censorship in Vietnam and blamed the military for shackling the free press.

One of the more disturbing quotations was reported to have been made by UPI foreign news analyst Phil Newsom, who said: "It is doubtful * * * if the story of U.S. Marines burning a village near Da Nang ever would have come out if newsmen had not seen it."

Newsom, of course, was referring to a CBS television report of the burning of Cam Ne—a report which aroused much controversy at home because it suggested that marines arbitrarily burn Vietnamese villages. He implied that a hard-digging U.S. press corps took on a hard-to-get-along-with U.S. Marine Corps and uncovered a terrible secret.

If this were true, then bully for the newsmen.

But it wasn't true. The fact is that it is doubtful if newsmen ever would have seen the village razed if it weren't for the U.S. Marines inviting them to the burning.

I was at the Da Nang press camp when the marine invitation was extended. I turned it down because I had a previous commitment to go on an air raid aboard a B-57 fighter bomber. The squadron took newsmen on flights only 1 day a week.

The real reason for burning Cam Ne, of course, was that it was a Vietcong stronghold and William F. Buckley, Jr., who also was quoted in the Rustin article, made this point clear.

To report properly the story of the Marine operation at Cam Ne would have meant explaining that villages and their civilian populations play a key role in guerrilla warfare.

This is the why of the story, which of course is too complicated to make a good lead.

One of the major problems facing U.S. forces in Vietnam is being able to distinguish friend from foe.

The Marines, like all the services there, are aware too that they must win the people if they are to win the war and they lean over backward to avoid antagonizing local populations.

It must have taken Marine intelligence a long time to determine for certain that Cam Ne was a Vietcong stronghold.

Then, when they decided to destroy the village, they invited the press to come along.

Is it any wonder that they became annoyed when stories of their operation depicted Marines as no better than SS troops who burned villages and pushed around women, children, and old men?

But even more annoying to military men in Vietnam is the caliber of many of the correspondents out there.

A ranking Pentagon officer observed recently that editors told him they were having difficulty getting good newsmen to cover Vietnam.

The problem, he said, was money. It costs about $1,300 round trip to fly a newsman to the other end of the world and for that amount of cash you would expect him to stay for a while.

But if he is an experienced newsman he has a wife and family so the news service would have to bring them along and settle them in Hong Kong or Bangkok.

Add periodic trips for the newsman to his family, additional life and accident insurance, education expenses for the kids and war becomes an unprofitable news story.

As a result, the Pentagon officer said, "American news services are hiring people out there they would never touch at home."

It's obviously cheaper to pick up a "passel" of young stringers who have already paid their way to Vietnam and who will work for peanuts.

In an effort to encourage the U.S. press to cover the war in Vietnam, the Defense Department last year flew 84 newsmen to southeast Asia.

"We did it, frankly, to prime the pump," the Pentagon officer said.

The military believed that by encouraging more newsmen to come to Vietnam, competition would become keener, resulting in less sensational stories and in more straight reporting.

The project was discontinued last summer as escalation of the war began in earnest because "we reasoned the American press was interested enough to pay its own way to Vietnam."

It didn't work out that way.

Of the 106 civilian news organizations from around the world who were represented in Vietnam last August, about 40 were American. Of the 260 newsmen present, approximately 175 were American.

Three months later, in November, the number of news organizations in Vietnam had increased to 136 but the proportion of U.S. services to the total rose less than 10 percent while U.S. troop strength had increased by the tens of thousands.

Of the 296 accredited newsmen covering the war, fewer than half were Americans. Foreign newsmen were hired by nearly all the American media. In some of the larger organizations 20 to 60 percent of the staff was foreign.

In the last 2 weeks of 1965, the number of U.S. services and staffers had begun to increase slightly, according to a Pentagon official.

Obviously, a certain number of foreign newsmen are needed on American staffs to overcome language barriers. The rest probably are hired to overcome budgetary problems.

I remember meeting one of these non-American U.S. correspondents the day after the Cam Ne incident. We both were leaving Da Nang. He was carrying a pouch of television film, which he was bringing to Saigon. I was returning to Pleiku.

We were picked up at the press camp by two U.S. enlisted men who were ordered to drive us to the airfield where we were to catch a military flight south.

On the way to the airfield my colleague began berating the two enlisted men over the Cam Ne operation.

He implied that the Marines were no better than the Gestapo.

"Imagine you Yanks burning a village. I never saw anything like that in my life," said this correspondent, who obviously was too young ever to have covered a war before.

Enlisted men are taught to treat civilians with respect, especially if they are from the press. The two GI's looked at each other but said nothing.

I tried, at first, to keep from getting involved, because we newspapermen have to stick together even if we're wrong.

But his criticism continued and finally I said, "For Christ's sake, shut up."

He looked at me in surprise. Then he said, partly as an explanation, partly as an appeal to my journalistic loyalties and partly to get the last word in:

"But I actually saw a Marine push an old man around."

I thought of the night I had spent with a Marine company surrounded in a jungle outpost by 300 Vietcong. I remembered the next morning walking down a road with a Marine sergeant who smiled at all the villagers he met because he couldn't tell the good guys from the bad guys and he didn't want to antagonize friendly Vietnamese.

I thought what a crazy, mixed-up war this is, where you can't tell the front from the rear, Vietcong from Vietnamese, civilians from soldiers. I turned to this young correspondent and very gently said:

"Look, it was a Vietcong village. How did you expect the Marines to handle that situation?"

He hesitated for a moment, then said, "Why don't you Yanks get out of Vietnam?"

And if he is typical of U.S. press representation in Vietnam, then the military people there have been very kind to us.

—Martin Gershen.

A BUSINESSMAN'S FORMULA TO HEAD OFF INFLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the March 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report appears a timely article entitled "A Businessman's Formula To Head Off Inflation." This contains excerpts from a recent address by Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp. and one of the most progressive, clearest thinking members of the business community. Mr. Blough points out precisely what the Republican section of the Joint Senate-House Economic Report for 1966 points out; namely, that restraint in spending on the part of Congress holds the key to stopping inflation.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Businessman's Formula To Head Off Inflation

(Can the United States fight the war in Vietnam and still avoid shackling industry and labor with controls over prices, wages, and materials? Yes, says one of this country's business leaders—but only if Congress "stops pouring on the coal" under the economic boiler. Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp., calls for efforts to hold prices and wages in check, and for postponement of some nonmilitary programs that would involve billions of dollars in new spending at a time when inflation threatens.)

(Excerpts from an address by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp., delivered in St. Louis, Mo., February 19, 1966)

There is one basic point, I believe, upon which true Americans can never disagree: that everything needed to protect the lives of our soldiers in Vietnam shall be provided to the limit of our national resources, both material and human. If the sacrifice of economic freedom will, in fact, hasten the winning of the peace in Vietnam and reduce our casualties there, there can hardly be any "loyal opposition" to such a sacrifice. But if, on the other hand, the economic freedoms which have made this Nation the most productive in the world are—as I believe them to be—a unique source of our military and economic strength, then we should, and must, defend and preserve them in the national interest.

In short, the question before us is: To what degree may we assist in the fight for freedom by relying upon freedom—freedom in production, freedom to buy and sell and freedom in occupation? Or must we revert to wartime types of wage controls, or price controls, materiel controls and even controls of movement among occupations, in order, as a nation, to wage the defense of freedom?

In World War II and again during the Korean conflict, controls were imposed upon production, distribution, wages and prices in order to channel the necessary portion of our gross national product into the war effort. How then do conditions today compare with those that existed before?

Well, at the peak of World War II, defense expenditures averaged about 84 billion dollars a year and exceeded 40 percent of the total gross national product. At the height of the Korean war, they were almost 49 billion and accounted for 13⅓ percent of the gross national product.

During the present year it is estimated that our total defense expenditures may rise to $60 billion, which would still be less than 8½ percent of the anticipated gross national product; and they would have to mount to an astronomical $100 billion in order to reach the 13½ percent rate that prevailed at the height of the Korean war. That is far beyond any projected requirement of the action in Vietnam.

As for manpower, it must be noted here also that the national labor force has substantially increased in numbers during the past 20 years.

At the end of World War II, there were 11.5 million men in our Armed Forces—or 17½ percent of the total labor supply. During Korea, there were 3.5 million men in the military, representing over 5 percent of the labor force, and about 475,000 of these were actually engaged in Korea.

Last year, some 2.8 million men were in the Armed Forces, and this accounted for only 3.6 percent of the labor supply. Future requirements, as presently projected, could call for an additional 300,000 men in the services; but even if that number were to rise to 500,000, the military drain on the national labor force would amount to only about 4 percent as compared to more than 5 percent during the Korean conflict.

So it is evident, I think, that Vietnam is not the primary source of the economic pressures we are experiencing. Vietnam may provide an excuse for the advocacy of controls. But it is not a reason for them; and if we seek out the major cause of these pressures, we must look to the unusually rapid rate of our economic growth in the nonmilitary areas.

Last year, the American economy grew at a greater rate than that of any other major industrial nation in the world. After correcting for rising prices, the "real" rate of growth was 5½ percent; and all of this new activity increased the demand for manpower, and the upward pressure on wages and prices.

During the 1960's, the expansion of the supply of money and credit has been at twice the rate prevailing in the late 1950's. Government expenditures at all levels—Federal, State, and local—have increased 65 percent since Korea, even though there has been no appreciable rise in military outlays. Thus, virtually all of this increase has occurred on the nondefense side of the ledger.

As a result, a head of economic steam is building up to a point which is beginning to cause national concern lest it break out in a burst of rising wages and prices.

Trying to find out how long we can contain this mounting head of steam while continuing to heat up the boiler is something like playing Russian roulette. Certainly we cannot continue indefinitely, no matter how hard we try, to hold back the hand on the pressure gage. For the present, we are pinning our faith upon the willingness and the ability of both industry and labor to comply voluntarily with the governmental guideposts established some years ago; and while a considerable degree of price stability has been achieved during this period—especially in the more "visible" industries where a certain amount of "persuasion" could be applied—the boiler is clearly beginning to leak.

For the entire nongovernmental sector of the economy, employee compensation per man-hour has risen more than output per man-hour in each of the past 3 years; so unit labor costs have kept mounting.

Under the pressure of these rising costs and of the increased economic activity generally, the consumer price index has risen 11 percent since 1957–59, and the tempo has accelerated recently.

Further energizing this trend toward higher wages and consequent rising prices is the fact that we now have practically full employment, and there is an actual shortage of skilled workers * * *. Among married men, unemployment is now down to 2 percent and is still declining.

Under all of these circumstances, it will clearly become increasingly difficult to maintain an acceptable degree of wage and price stability through the publication of guideposts and the powers of presidential persuasion; and the question arises: "What next?"

THE ROAD TO CONTROLS

So the situation that confronts us today is much like that which prevailed at the end of 1950, when the United States had started down the road to wage and price controls. Then, as now, the road was paved with requests for a voluntary freeze; and standards for the freeze were being drawn up. Under the pressures of that day, the prices of many products were rising; and the prospect of price control, itself, added greatly to these pressures, as producers and merchants sought to cover their rising costs before the freeze hit them. Production shifted from lower price lines to more expensive, and more profitable, goods; and retailers built their inventories to a record high, thus adding to demand in an already over-heated economy.

But before we travel that road again, let us stop, look and listen, for it is one thing to talk of controls and quite another thing to survive them. There is no doubt that for a limited period they can and do hold down the lid on prices. There is also no doubt, however, that they create scarcity and thus add to the economic pressures that caused their adoption in the first place.

Some of us whose memory goes back to the controls of 20 years ago will recall the butter that was sold from under the counter to favored customers, and the deterioration in the quality of merchandise that occurred as producers and merchants were often forced—at the peril of their own survival—to pay higher-than-ceiling prices on purchases in order to get the materials to keep their businesses running.

Then, too, there is the wasteful deployment of manpower at a time when a shortage of manpower already exists. Under the normal operation of a free market, the people themselvs—as buyers—determine what manpower will be allocated to what production. If they do not choose to buy a certain product, then that product will no longer be made and the manpower will go elsewhere to produce what is wanted and needed.

Controls not only wipe out this self-adjusting, competitive mechanism, but—by their almost unbelievable complexity—they create enormous new manpower demands in the administration and the application of the regulations.

But, you may ask, can the Defense Department—in the absence of controls—get what it needs to carry on its military efforts? The answer is that it can and it does. We already have a system of priorities under which defense has first claim on essential production.

But will not the Government have to pay more than it should? And the answer to that is also simple; for the Government is the sole buyer of war material, while there are many sellers competing for its business. Thus we have the opposite of a monopoly—a monopsony. And as a monopsony, the Government imposes conditions of purchase under which it exercises the right to renegotiate contracts and to reclaim an adjudicated part of the purchase price if the profits on the sale are deemed too large.

But then, you may ask: How about the average fellow, the pensioner, or widow living on a fixed income? Without controls, is there any better way of keeping prices from skyrocketing? * * * There must be better solutions; and I believe that there are.

In the first place we must recognize that our productive capacity in America is expanding substantially every year; so there is an ever-increasing supply of goods and services to meet our Nation's demands, both military and civilian.

The President has called upon business to exercise restraint in its pricing policies; and has asked labor unions to keep their demands within certain bounds. Here it must be said that the two problems are somewhat different. Among businesses there is a high degree of competition which tends to repress prices; but among unions there is also a high degree of competition—more in the nature of political competition—which tends conversely to escalate wages.

It is the inescapable obligation of business managers to keep their enterprises healthy and to generate the profit necessary to keep America's industrial facilities modern and competitive—not only in the interest of the owners, but in the national interest as well. So there must be some wage and price flexibility to accommodate the myriad changes that occur from day to day. Yet I believe that the wiser heads in the leadership of both labor and business will recognize that the exercise of restraint in the highest possible degree is imperative at a time when the probable alternatives are rising costs and runaway prices or disruptive controls.

HOW CONGRESS CAN EASE THE PRESSURE

But restraint is not a one-way street, and no matter how diligently and patriotically business and labor may try to plug the leaks in the economic boiler, they cannot succeed unless someone stops pouring on the coal. And that, I believe, is where Congress comes in. On the monetary side, the Federal Reserve Board is authorized and equipped to retard the expansion of currency and credit; and I would not anticipate that Congress would seek to oppose the necessary exercise of these powers.

On the fiscal side, Congress can ease the pressure by the judicious use of taxation; and the President has already recommended the reinstatement of certain excise taxes and a speedup in the payments of personal and corporate income taxes.

But it is in the area of restraint in appropriations and other legislation that the hardworking "men on the Hill" (Congress) face both their most difficult problems and their greatest opportunity to prevent a further heating up of the economy; for it is they who control the purse strings.

It is their prerogative to authorize expenditures. It is their obligation to view the economic picture as a whole and act in their own best wisdom.

This is a plea to recognize the free-market economy for what it is—the most efficient, productive source of our material freedom; and to acknowledge that interference with the market's operation leads to inefficiency, inequity, and to shortages. In a word, it is a plea to defend freedom with freedom.

VIETNAM AND RED CHINA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Des Moines Register for March 17 appears an excellent and timely article by the knowledgeable and able columnist, Richard Wilson, entitled "Fulbright's China Hearings Give Viet Policy a Boost." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record so that the readers will have a better perspective of the scare talk which has been making the rounds over the threat of Red China coming into the war in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fulbright's China Hearings Give Viet Policy a Boost

(By Richard Wilson)

Washington, D.C.—An unexpected byproduct of Senator Fulbright's China hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee has been an expression of academic and intellectual support for American policy in Vietnam.

What is being brought into focus is the war in Vietnam as an essential element in containing China, the reasons for doing that and the importance of it. Senator Fulbright perhaps did not anticipate this result. His emphasis has all been on the risk of war with China, and the undesirability of taking that risk.

DIGNIFY, CLOTHE

Vice President **Humphrey**, as the administration's most articulate spokesman in this field, has taken advantage of this turn of events to dignify and clothe in logic a policy of containing China without isolating the Communist government.

There is nothing new in this. It represents no shift in policy. The Vice President's words do not change any of the realities of the problem, which remain about the same as they were when John Foster Dulles was Secretary of State.

But the words the Vice President is using apparently fall softer on doubtful ears and this makes possible a rational discussion of the risk we are taking in Asia, and why we are taking it.

HISTORICAL CONSISTENCY

Asian specialists and students from both Harvard and Columbia Universities have found a historical consistency in American action in Asia with that of other great powers in the past which have sought to enforce political stability so that economic expansion might be carried on.

These experts—A. Doak Barnett, of Columbia, John K. Fairbank, of Harvard, and now *also A. M. Halpern, of Harvard*—have their differing ideas on how China might be handled, but they all seem to agree that it is in the interest of the United States to contain China.

Thus there emerges from a respected academic world quite a different attitude than that expressed by Senators **Fulbright**, **Morse**, **Gruening**, **McCarthy**, **Hartke**, and a few others. No resemblance at all is found between the views of these experts and those of various poets, liberalists, humanists, drama critics, novelists, and columnists who have been expressing their abhorrence of any kind of ground-based intervention in Asia.

INTELLECTUAL RATIONALE

The result is that President Johnson is finally getting his intellectual rationale for the war in Vietnam from highly qualified sources in the academic world. This corresponds roughly to what samplings of opinion show to be the majority sentiment of the country, and it sounds also as if it might come from the lips of those well-indoctrinated American soldiers in Vietnam who simply cannot understand the protest movement at home.

From now on it appears that the argument will veer into the field of whether or not we are doing enough to draw the Red Chinese into respectable world society. This concerns both Barnett and Fairbank. Far Eastern Expert Halpern thinks there is a good chance that Asia is settling down, and dramatic changes might make possible a military disengagement in a few years—but not now.

To those who say that we must now approach China with the olive branch, Vice President **Humphrey** has an impregnable answer. We have. We do so every month or two in talks with the Red Chinese representative in Warsaw. The answer is always the same: Support the surrender of the Government of Formosa to the rule of Peiping. When we say, "No," to that, the conversations come to an end.

DOESN'T WISH IT

To those who say let Red China into the United Nations, **Humphrey's** answer is also impregnable. Red China does not wish to join the United Nations as it is presently constituted. The charter must be amended and the Republic of China must be excluded before Peiping would accept an invitation to join. On the question of diplomatic recognition of Red China, the Formosa problem again intervenes.

All the probes for a new understanding with China, like the President's peace overtures of earlier in the year, lead down a blind alley.

These aspects of the problem are now coming to the fore for closer public scrutiny as the dimensions of the risk of war with China are being measured. What the administration is getting out of the current debate is a better public understanding of what it is trying to do, and why.

The China hearings are therefore a definite plus for the administration so far, much to the discomfiture of Senator **Fulbright** and the others.

POEM BY MARINE LANCE CPL. CHARLES R. ALLEN

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the anguish of Vietnam is felt in many homes throughout this Nation.

There have been families who have lost a son, a husband, a father, or a relative in that far-off land. And there are others with someone near and dear to them fighting there.

A great debate has been and is being waged over why we are there, why so many have to give their lives for a cause, it seems, so little understood by so many. Why are we there?

One youth who knew was Lance Cpl. Charles R. Allen, whose mother lives in St. Louis, Mo., and whose aunt, Mildred L. Davis, lives in Sioux City, Iowa.

In a poem written to his mother last Thanksgiving, Corporal Allen said:

And as long as freedom rings in hearts of men,
South Vietnam freedom we will help defend.

To this man—and he was a man—freedom meant the opportunity to live in peace, but he knew that peace could not be unless one was willing to lay down his life so that all could enjoy it.

For as he wrote:

For men who died here didn't die in vain,
But, died for freedom and died in fame.

And as this Marine declared:

To preserve world freedom we must pay the price.

Mr. President, Marine Lance Cpl. Charles R. Allen paid that price.

On January 1, a few hours after the birth of a new year and only a few days after he turned 21, Corporal Allen was killed in action in that far-off land where he felt a stand had to be taken to preserve freedom.

Did he die in vain?

I do not think so for he knew that—

Even our forefathers died to keep freedom alive,
And in Vietnam we will make sure it survive.

I think the draft-card burners, the demonstrators, and others could learn a lesson from Lance Cpl. Charles R. Allen.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire poem, entitled "The U.S. Forces in Vietnam," be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE U.S. FORCES IN VIETNAM

(By Lance Cpl. Charles R. Allen)

Some people think to fight here is wrong.
But, we must fight here or fight at home.
For Communist Victory in this torn land.
Will encourage them to fight in other lands.
Many people talk about our dying sacrifice.
But, to preserve world freedom we must pay the price.
Just look at the accidents on a holiday.
Then our total dead won't seem bad in any way.
For men who died here didn't die in vain.
But, died for freedom and died in fame.
Even our forefathers died to keep freedom alive.
And in Vietnam we will make sure it survive.
To Vietnam the President has given his word.
And this message all the world has heard.
"We will help Vietnam to defend,
Their homes and freedom to the end."
The U.S. Forces in South Vietnam today.
Know this must be done and without delay.
Most of us hated we were selected.
But, since we been here I'm sure none has objected.
And as long as freedom rings in hearts of men.
South Vietnam freedom we will help defend.

RED CHINA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I note in today's edition of the Washington Evening Star an article on the front page under the caption "**Fulbright**, 198 Experts on Asia Urge Two Chinas." The article points out something that does not seem to confirm the caption when it talk about 198 experts, because it points out that this particular Asian policy statement was signed by 198 members of the Association for Asian Studies.

The article points out, further, that the document was circulated among the 2,700 members, whose membership ranges from laymen to college professors.

There is no indication that the 198 members consisting of laymen or college professors fall into what might be considered experienced persons who could be called experts on Asia.

I think it well to point out, Mr. President, that while this article states that the Asian policy group advocates admission of Red China into the United Nations, there is nothing to indicate that the Asian policy signed by the so-called experts suggests that the charter of the United Nations be amended so as to delete that portion of the charter which provides that membership shall be open only to peace-loving nations.

It may be that the group of so-called experts wish Red China to become a member of the United Nations. If so, they should issue a policy statement recommending that the Charter of the United Nations should be amended, deleting this requirement. Then, if a majority of the members of the United Nations wished to do so, a recommendation for the admission of Red China would be in order.

As it is now, I do not think the group is being very helpful in making such a statement.

I suggest that the caption is rather misleading when it refers to the group as experts. I, for one, recognize that experts disagree in different areas, but it seems to me that down through the years, both Democratic and Republican administrations have stoutly adhered to the Charter of the United Nations. There is nothing really wrong with the Charter of the

United Nations. What is wrong is the failure of some members to live up to the charter. But, as I have said, if there are some so-called experts who feel the charter should be violated, they ought to say so; and if they do not want the charter to be violated, they ought to withhold until that amendment to the charter is adopted. Then, and not until then, should they suggest that Red China be admitted into the United Nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, a portion of which I have just referred to, as well as another article on the subject, be printed in full in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fulbright, 198 Experts on Asia Urge Two Chinas—Openly at Odds With Administration, Senator Calls for Reversal of Policy

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee resumes hearings on China today with Chairman J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, now openly at odds with the administration over whether Red China should become a member of the United Nations.

Fulbright called for an end to U.S. efforts to keep Peiping out of the United Nations yesterday about the same time as nearly 200 Asian experts backed the admission of Red China to the world body.

The Johnson administration position—as restated on Friday night by Joseph Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations—is to oppose Peiping's admission on grounds that the Chinese Government has not demonstrated a willingness to abide by the U.N. Charter.

Both Fulbright and the Asian experts subscribe to the so-called "two China" policy under which the Nationalist Chinese government on Formosa, which is recognized by the United States, would not be expelled from the United Nations if Peiping were admitted.

PEIPING, FORMOSA BACK

Neither Peiping nor Formosa, however, has shown the slightest willingness to abide by a "two China" policy. Both insist that Formosa is an integral part of China, and that only "one China" should be in the United Nations—theirs.

The administration in the past has shown some intrest in probing a possible "two China" policy to see if it is feasible before the U.N. General Assembly votes for Red China's admission. The United States is particularly concerned that the United Nations not vote to expel Formosa and grant the Peiping government a seat on the Security Council.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk was asked about Red China's admission to the United Nations on a television interview program yesterday. He said that Red China has shown no interest in coming into the United Nations so long as Formosa is there, and in fact, had spurned all U.S. attempts at opening up a meaningful dialog.

He added that the United States has had more contact with Peiping than any Western country that has full diplomatic relations with it.

The Asian policy statement was signed by 198 members of the Association for Asian Studies. The document was circulated among the 2,700 members of the group, whose membership ranges from laymen to college professors. Some Government experts are in the group, but the list of signers does not contain any recognizable administration specialists.

In addition to seating Red China in the United Nations, the statement called on the United States to negotiate with Peiping while at the same time maintaining relations with Formosa.

"China may reject the U.S. offer, but this is not an argument why it should not be made," the statement said.

It also called on the United States to seek more bilateral discussions with Red China, and to publicly state its willingness to admit Red Chinese newsmen, scholars, and others to this country. The administration already claims to have done the latter.

The statement also calls for an end to the total U.S. trade embargo on China.

FEDERAL ASPECTS OF INDUSTRIAL WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 19, I had the privilege of addressing the first Waterbury Conference on Waste Disposal at the Waterbury State Technical Institute in Waterbury, Conn. The conference, arranged under the sponsorship of the Waterbury branch of the American Electroplaters' Society, brought together leading members of Connecticut industry who are concerned about the industrial waste disposal, both in their jobs and as citizens.

The stated aim of the conference was to provide a cross section of current information on waste disposal, for, as Quentin A. Dietz, general chairman of the conference stated, "to assure the continued growth of the metal finishing industry, it is imperative to have sufficient waste disposal capacity."

I salute the American Electroplaters' Society for a constructive contribution to the cause of pollution control, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Aspects of Industrial Waste Disposal, by Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff

When settlers came to the shores of America and began their westward march to the Pacific, they found a land of great natural beauty. There were vast stretches of forest and prairie, streams of pure water, and clear, blue lakes. There was no problem of waste disposal, if for no other reason than there were so few people.

Urban industrial centers sprang up, first in the East, and then along the banks of our great rivers. Industry has always required ready amounts of pure water and the rivers were the country's highways of commerce.

The crowding of an expanding population into our industrial towns and cities created a waste disposal problem which was overcome in traditional ways—by dumping these wastes into streams and rivers where hopefully they would be carried away and forgotten.

The problem of disposing of wastes and pollutants arises naturally in any technological society. Urban and rural areas alike disperse quantities of unwanted and often toxic materials onto the land and into the air and water around us. We have come to learn over the years that these materials can affect the quality of life of people far removed from their source.

The dimensions of this waste and pollution problem are staggering. We are dumping sewage into our waterways each year at a rate equal to the raw sewage from some 50 million people. In addition, we must try to deal with 125 million tons of solid wastes such as garbage, paper, metal, and glass.

Each year we must dispose of 12 million tons of scrap metal, including 4 million tons of junked automobiles. At the same time, we must find some place to dump 48 billion cans, and billions of dollars worth of other packaging materials that no longer have any economic value.

We have not yet reached the point where our total environment is so polluted and contaminated as to threaten our very existence. But we do know that there is a disturbing increase in the number of local situations where air pollution has caused death, where lakes and rivers have become so contaminated that they no longer support life, where pesticides have accidentally injured fish and wildlife.

Pollution knows no political boundaries—it leaps State lines. The Federal Government, with its own pollution producing activities, its responsibility to preserve and improve our natural resources, its technical and financial resources—can and must take the lead in a national attack on the problem of pollution and waste disposal. But the States and municipalities have an important role and responsibility too.

This cannot be a piecemeal effort. Only if we begin to view the problem in terms of our whole environment—the air, water and land around us—can we deal with it effectively. Our approach, in the past, as we shall see, has been to divide up the pollution problem and deal with each part separately. This will no longer do.

Today, I will discuss the Federal aspects of this program.

The Federal Government first moved against water pollution. In 1956 Congress passed a law authorizing grants to municipalities for construction, enlargement and modernization of their waste treatment plants. During the following 5 years these grants stimulated a 62-percent increase in such construction, with contract awards rising from an annual average of $226 to $432 million.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act was amended in 1961, when I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to increase the total amount of Federal funds available, to increase maximum grants for individual projects, and to encourage communities to construct joint rather than separate projects.

As a result, construction expanded again, reaching $539 million in 1961, $654 million in 1962, and $815 million in 1963, dropping to $600 million in 1964. (The 1963 figure of $815 million reflects the additional $108 million granted under the accelerated public works program.)

Nevertheless, construction did not reach the level necessary to bring the municipal waste pollution problem under control during the present decade. According to a recent survey, 1,342 communities are presently discharging raw sewage from a combined population of 11 million.

An additional 1,337 cities and towns require new or enlarged facilities for their population of 17 million. And 2,598 unsewered communities require sewer systems and sewage treatment plants for a population of 511 million. Many municipal waste-treatment works currently in operation must be replaced because of obsolescence.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 took these circumstances into consideration by increasing from $100 million to $150 million the annual authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1966 and 1967, the remaining 2 years for which Federal waste treatment works construction grants are authorized.

Congress found that need for waste treatment plants was particularly great in populous areas. Congress responded to this need in three ways. It doubled the maximum amount for a single project from $600,000 to $1.2 million, it doubled the amount for a multimunicipal project from $2.4 million to $4.8 million, and it made an additional $50 million available to States on a straight population basis.

Last year Congress went beyond encouraging the cleaning up of polluted water. It established a procedure for preventing pollution. The new law gives the Secretary of HEW authority to set water quality standards for interstate waters. Once the standards have been established, any discharge which reduces the quality of the water below the established standard may be prevented by the Secretary, who may request the Attorney General to bring suit to halt the pollution.

The setting of water quality standards is a great step forward. It will encourage voluntary compliance by letting water users know what they can and cannot do. This provision will help preserve the quality of relatively clean waters and in progressively restoring polluted waters to a degree of reasonable purity.

All of these actions have accomplished a great deal. From the beginning of the program to September 30, 1965, a total of 6,351 projects were approved for Federal grants of $678 million. Local communities contributed an additional $2.5 billion to meet the total project cost of $3.2 billion. Approved projects will serve 53 million people and will improve the quality of water in 55,000 miles of streams.

Connecticut has benefited from these programs. In December 1963 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare called a conference on the pollution of the interstate waters of the Connecticut River and its tributaries.

At that time it was estimated that $20 million would be needed to clean up the river. More than $2.6 million has been spent to clean the river, and some municipalities and industries have complied with the conference recommendations.

President Johnson has asked Congress to substantially strengthen the Nation's pollution control laws. He proposed a $50 million clean rivers demonstration program, which I hope will include the Connecticut River, an expanded research project and strengthened enforcement procedures, including a requirement that all existing or potential polluters register and Federal officials be given the right to inspect such sources.

But in my view we are still not doing enough to meet the challenge we face. The plain fact is that we are only 14 years from a water crisis that will make today's shortage seem insignificant.

By 1980 national water consumption can be expected to rise up to 600 billion gallons per day. But our projected dependable supply of fresh water will be only 515 billion gallons.

We must recognize that despite the promise of desalinization and improved impoundments, our only salvation lies in water reuse. Thus water pollution control is not merely a matter of esthetics, it is a matter of life and death.

The magnitude of the task before us was emphasized by a 1965 report of the conference of State sanitary engineers. They found that there is a backlog of 5,277 communities with sewage treatment needs that alone will cost $1.86 billion to fill. The engineers recommended a $4 billion program over the next 5 years to clean up the Nation's waterways. Already we have fallen behind the $800-million-a-year pace they advocated.

I believe it is a national necessity that we meet this goal. Accordingly, I have introduced a bill to raise the Federal contribution to State and local waste treatment plant construction programs to $400 million a year. Further, the bill would increase the maximum grant allowed each community from 30 to 50 percent and remove the maximum dollar limitations now in the law. By State and local matching of these funds we will double the Federal authorization and so reach the $800 million total needed to bring our communities' treatment facilities up to date.

Incidentally, I have little sympathy for the suggestion that we adopt the so-called effluent charge which is popular in some countries of Western Europe. Taxing or otherwise charging a special fee to an industrial firm which discharges untreated waste into a stream is little more than legalizing pollution.

Our purpose should be to eliminate pollution, not put a price tag on it and permit it to continue.

But Government funds to combat pollution are only half the answer. There must be an affirmative program to prevent pollution of our waters. A large part of this job must be done by private industry. We cannot simply point the finger at private industry and say, "You are causing some of the pollution—do something about it." We must recognize that the purchase and installation of equipment to control pollution is a big expense. However, unlike capital outlays that ultimately produce new profits, these costs basically serve the health and safety of the public. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that there be some public sharing with private industry of the economic impact of these expenditures.

Our tax laws already provide economic incentives in related areas—like developing mineral resources. That is what my bill will do. It will help us obtain cleaner water by permitting taxpayers who buy expensive treatment equipment to deduct its cost over 36 months.

Under present law, a taxpayer who buys equipment designed to abate air or water pollution may take a depreciation for much equipment; that is, he may deduct its cost over the same period of years as the useful life of the equipment.

However, since some of this equipment has a useful life of 20 years or more, in many cases it will be a long time before the deductions taken for tax purposes are equal to the expenditure outlays made by the taxpayer. The bill provides that a taxpayer may elect to deduct the entire cost of the treatment equipment acquired over 36 months rather than over its useful life.

All these laws to reduce and fight pollution will be of little value unless they are effectively administered. Unfortunately, arrangements to deal with pollution have grown on a piecemeal basis, with organizations, programs, and legislation created when problems become evident or critical. With this background it is not surprising that current organization is a hodgepodge, with responsibilities widely separated among Government agencies, and some unassigned.

Some pollutants are dealt with on the basis of the environmental medium in which they occur, for example, pollutants in air and water; others are dealt with on the basis of the kinds of effect they have, for example, toxic materials in food; some are dealt with on the basis of their sources, for example artificially radioactive materials.

With some pollutants there is no Federal authority to act until a problem exists.

Such is the case with water pollution and air pollution. With some pollutants there is no Federal authority to act at all, as is the case with pesticide residues on tobacco. With some pollution problems, existing Federal authorities constrain the type of action that can be taken, as with water pollution problems that can be approached by the Corps of Engineers only through providing excess water storage for low-flow augmentation (usually a costly and inefficient process). With some pollutants such as radionuclides, extreme caution is exercised to assure that unwanted effects in the environment will be prevented; with other materials, such as pesticides, consideration of side effects has been scant in the past.

We must give much greater attention to the organization and coordination of pollution-related activities in the Federal Government. We must insure that the pollution laws are effectively and efficiently administered.

President Johnson recognizes this problem and has moved to strengthen our water pollution efforts by transferring most of the functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in pollution to the Department of the Interior. This will bring the water pollution program under the same management as the water conservation and use programs. This is an important step in the direction of better administration of our water laws.

AIR POLLUTION

The Federal Government did not begin a major campaign against air pollution until 1963. In that year Congress enacted legislation which laid the foundation for a comprehensive national program for the prevention and control of air pollution. This law authorized $95 million for a 3-year program (1) to initiate and support an expanded research and development effort in the field of air pollution control; (2) to provide for grants-in-aid to help local, State, and regional air pollution agencies to begin or improve their programs; and (3) to take action to secure the abatement of specific air pollution problems that are endangering the public health or welfare.

I sponsored this legislation and believe its emphasis on a regional approach to air pollution control was a major advance over prior law. This approach recognizes that particularly here in the east coast area single communities, and in some cases even single States, cannot deal effectively with air pollution problems since often they affect communities over a large geographic area.

The act singled out two of the major unsolved air pollution problems for special attention—motor vehicle exhaust and air pollution from fuels containing sulfur. It directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to work with the automobile and related industries to develop devices to control motor vehicle pollution.

It further directed the Secretary to initiate a research program to find improved methods of removing sulfur from fuels at a reasonable cost.

Finally, the act authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to engage directly in abatement and enforcement activities on his own initiative or at the request of a State, in instances of interstate pollution.

Last year Congress strengthened the Clean Air Act by giving the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare more authority to control air pollution from new motor vehicles, investigate, and prevent new sources of air pollution from being created, and construct, staff, and equip the research and test facilities needed by the Department to carry out its increased responsibilities under the amended law.

As a result of this new law, Federal standards for motor vehicles emissions will become effective for gasoline-powered vehicles by the 1968 model year (fall of 1967). Standards for diesel-powered engines are being developed. Thus in just 18 months effective national action will be underway to reduce automobile smog—one of the major sources of air pollution.

The act adopts an initial voluntary approach to the prevention of industrial air pollution. It authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to investigate and hold public conferences on potential air pollution problems in areas where a discharge is likely to affect adversely the public health or welfare. If the Secretary finds evidence that a discharge would likely contribute to an air pollution problem subject to abatement under the act, he may send his findings and recommendations to the persons responsible for the potential pollution and to the control agencies in the area. This procedure encourages those likely to pollute to abide by the law and take the steps necessary to comply with it.

I am pleased to be able to tell you that Connecticut has a vigorous air pollution control program. Middletown, Bridgeport, Fairfield, and Stratford have programs. Hartford and Stanford have applied for funds with which to begin their efforts. In the past year Connecticut has increased its air pollution budget over 250 percent and now ranks 11th in the Nation in terms of amounts budgeted for State programs. This is a record we can all be proud of and shows that our State is doing its part in the battle against air pollution.

But as in water pollution, governmental efforts are not enough. Private industry must do its share too. I believe the Federal Government has a responsibility to help businesses meet this obligation. Industries which may discharge air pollutants no less than those which may discharge pollutants into the water should receive Federal tax incentives to help them prevent pollution.

Accordingly, I have made by bill to permit the amortization of abatement equipment over 36 months applicable to air pollution equipment as well as that for water pollution.

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

The problem of solid wastes collection and disposal is one of the neglected areas of pollution control. Studies conducted by the American Public Health Association and the Public Health Service shows that less than half of the cities and towns in the United States with populations over 2,500 have approved sanitary methods of disposing of the estimated 90 million tons of refuse they produce each year and which must be removed and disposed of either through burning, burial, or conversion into forms of organic matter for final disposition or put to useful purposes.

State and local programs to stimulate local improvements in solid wastes storage, collection and disposal are lacking. In 1964, only 12 States reported to the Public Health Service that they had identifiable solid waste activities, while 31 indicated no program at all.

At the Federal level, activities have been meager in relation to the size and scope of the problem. Although the Public Health Service has, for many years, encouraged and supported research on solid waste problems, its efforts would appear to fall far short of research needs. The Public Health Service's total expenditure in fiscal year 1964 in this field was about $430,000, of which $360,000 was used to support research projects carried out by non-Federal institutions.

To meet this problem Congress passed a Solid Waste Disposal Act last year. The act authorizes the basic kinds of activity for the Federal Government—research and training, and grant support for demonstrations and planning of local and State programs.

The research need is chiefly to find and perfect methods that effectively dispose of solid wastes while avoiding environmental contamination and, hopefully, permit the recovery of the vast amounts of salvagable materials now being lost through primitive disposal practices. This is an economic as well as an engineering challenge, for new methods of handling solid wastes must be capable of reducing the present high cost of refuse collection and disposal, a cost which is among the major drains on municipal resources.

Obviously, the development of promising new techniques will be of little real benefit so long as there is a critical shortage of trained personnel to apply them to the solid waste disposal problem. Therefore, it is imperative that additional skilled manpower be available to direct municipal and State solid waste disposal programs.

Balancing the research and training efforts which the Federal Government will undertake, the Solid Waste Disposal Act provides a means of stimulating State, regional, and local agencies toward developing and operating more sanitary, efficient, and economical waste disposal programs. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide financial and technical assistance to public agencies—and to institutions and individuals engaged in research—to promote research, demonstrations, surveys, and training concerned with the operation of solid waste disposal programs. Grant funds are available to pay up to two-thirds of the cost of construction associated with a grant-supported demonstration project.

The Secretary is also authorized to make grants to State and interstate agencies of up to 50 percent of the cost of conducting surveys of solid waste disposal practices and problems within the jurisdiction of the applying agency and of developing solid waste disposal plans for the area under jurisdiction of the applicant.

To carry out these new activities, the Solid Waste Disposal Act authorizes the appropriation of more than $92 million over the 4 fiscal years of 1966–69—$60 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and $32 million for the Department of the Interior to carry out a related program concerned with the disposal of wastes resulting from the mining and associated processing of minerals and fossil fuels.

CONCLUSION

Last year one commentator had the following vision of America's future: "As the population grows, as the power demands per capita increase—the amount of waste poured into the (environment) by these activities will far exceed its capacity to diffuse and remove it, and the (environment) will grow progressively more polluted until, a century from now, it is too toxic to permit human life. All of civilization will pass away, not from a sudden cataclyms, but from the gradual suffocation by its own effluents.

Such a prospect is not pleasant to face, and so we shall not face it and do something about it, but instead will let it creep up upon us, and only when it has progressed to the point where it will be extremely difficult and expensive to take any steps to combat will the public be aroused to demand that something be done. And even then people will be unwilling to have any of their own activities curtailed or to have their own taxes increased to pay for the effort to prevent the disaster.

I am not so pessimistic. I believe the public is alert to the danger of pollution. My mail shows a great concern with this problem. This conference here today demonstrates that you in the metal finishing industry are reacting responsibly to overcome pollution.

At the Federal level I know that the executive and legislative branches of Government are aware of the threat to our society from pollution. The legislation enacted in the last 5 years proves that the Federal Government is committed to keeping our environment safe and livable.

But Federal action alone cannot bring us to our goal. It will require the cooperation and coordination of every level of Government and the best efforts of private industry. I want to congratulate all of you here today. You are doing your part. The Federal effort will not slacken. Together and with State and local action, we can and will lick this problem and so make America the magnificent land we all want it to be.

SELECTING A HOME FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the House Public Works Committee voted on March 3 to approve a bill introduced by Representative GRAY of Illinois, authorizing the construction of a new home for the Vice President of the United States on a 10-acre portion of the Naval Observatory tract here in Washington. It is my understanding that Congressman GRAY's bill has been granted a rule and is expected to go to the House floor shortly.

As the author of one of the two bills on this subject which were introduced in the Senate on August 11 of last year, it is my opinion that the approach taken by Congressman GRAY is eminently sensible and deserving of support. It will achieve the purpose of providing a suitable home for our second in command in a more expeditious manner than the alternative approach adopted by the Senate last year. On October 21, 1965, the Senate adopted S. 2394, a bill sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], which authorized an expenditure of up to $1 million to provide a home for the Vice President and established a three-member commission to select a suitable residence or site therefor.

My bill, S. 2390, proposed utilizing the principal residence on the Naval Observatory grounds as the home for the Vice President. However, I stated in testimony last September 14 that I supported my colleague's bill and would support that legislation which answered earliest and best this long unfulfilled need.

As I testified last year, my bill had several immediate advantages:

One, it selected property already owned by the Federal Government and therefore, offered greater economy;

Two, S. 2390 would permit the establishment of a home for the Vice President in a minimum period of time, thereby achieving further economy;

Three, the functions of the Naval Observatory would not be impaired, since only such land as is actually needed for the Vice President's home would be utilized;

Four, the Naval Observatory site is ideally situated on Embassy Row—in the heart of the diplomatic area and relatively near the heart of the Federal City;

Five, the 60-acre Naval Observatory site lends itself readily to proper security measures.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the bill now pending before the House embodies most of these advantages. It has the further advantage of leaving custody of the admiral's house, the principal residence on the tract, in the hands of the Chief of Naval Operations, as has been the custom for many years.

I hope the House will act promptly to approve the bill offered by Congressman GRAY and that the sponsor of S. 2394, the able Senator from Oklahoma, will accept that bill. And in order to assure that all interested parties are satisfied, I would further recommend that the bill be amended to permit the National Capital Planning Commission to be consulted in the preparation of site plans and architectural planning for the new construction, confining its report to a period of not more than 60 days after preparation of the drawings.

This would permit orderly review without sacrificing the project to the inordinate delay which I fear might result from the Commission approach.

I need not burden the Senate with a lengthy summation of evidence that Vice President Hubert Humphrey is, as Richard Wilson described him in a column of March 9, 1966, "the busiest Vice President in history." Senators well know that the office of Vice President has become more important in every succeeding year since World War II. The Vice President's role was underscored last October when President Johnson was hospitalized. It was dramatized again, but in different form, only a few weeks ago when Mr. Humphrey acted as one of our most effective peace emissaries.

It should be apparent now, more than ever, that action should be taken without further delay to provide the Vice President with a suitable official home.

This is not a partisan issue. The proposal has had the blessing of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and it was endorsed more recently by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, according to an article in the March 3 edition of the Washington Post.

Nor can it be properly argued that the bill offered by Congressman Gray is an unnecessary expense in view of the Vietnam war. For, as I understand it, the only sum that would be expended immediately would be approximately $45,000 to prepare plans.

Congressman Gray has given the matter some intensive study and has reviewed alternative sites along with Lawson B. Knott, the Administrator of General Services. I sincerely believe the approach taken by Congressman Gray is sound and infinitely preferable to a protracted study which would require still further congressional approval.

Lord Halifax said:

> He who leaves nothing to chance will do few things ill, but he will do few things.

Mr. President, I think we have the opportunity here to do something well—with very little chance—and to do it now.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the Congressional Record at this point articles which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 3, 1966, and in the March 3 and 4 editions of the Washington Post:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 3, 1966]

MANSION BILL GAINS: VEEP HOME A STEP NEARER

(By Isabelle Shelton)

The House Public Works Committee today approved a bill to erect a house for the Vice President on the grounds of the Naval Observatory on upper Massachusetts Avenue.

The bill, introduced by Representative Kenneth J. Gray, Democrat, of Illinois, authorizes an expenditure of a maximum of $750,000. It specifies that 10 acres of the 60-acre Observatory site should be set aside for the project.

The measure asks that $45,000 be appropriated this year for architect's drawings. An appropriation for the balance needed would be sought in about a year, after the plans are complete, Gray said.

The Democratic majority on the committee turned back a Republican move to substitute a measure that would merely have authorized the General Services Administration to make a "space needs survey," reporting back to Congress on the need for a house, where one might be purchased or built, and the approximate cost.

Representative William C. Cramer, Republican, of Florida, ranking Republican on the committee who introduced the substitute, said the Republican House leadership will continue to fight the proposal on the floor.

"This is no time, when the Vietnamese war is making us take school lunches away from needy children and reduce Federal funds to land-grant colleges and federally impacted school areas, to spend money for a house for the Vice President," Cramer said.

Representative Gerald R. Ford, House minority leader, expressed similar sentiments earlier this week.

Gray said he did not "regard this as a guns-or-butter issue at all.

"All we're asking now is the architect's fee of around $45,000," he said. "The Appropriations Committee can take another look at the whole thing in a year when the plans are brought in and we see how the war looks then. If the big, rich Government of the United States can't spend $45,000 for plans, I'll take up a collection on the floor."

Gray added that he has hopes that part or all of the cost of the Vice-Presidential house may be underwritten by private citizens.

PRIVATE DRIVE SUGGESTED

Gray contended that there is no need for the GSA to draft new specifications for a Vice-Presidential house, as Cramer's amendment proposed, because these already have been worked out by him, with the unofficial advice of GSA experts, in order to arrive at the cost figure of $750,000.

The house Gray envisages would have four stories (including a full basement) and a total floor space of about 16,000 square feet, roughly 4,000 square feet per floor.

Living quarters on the second floor would contain "everything that goes to make up a six-bedroom, six-bath house, except the kitchen," Gray said. A big first-floor kitchen, where food would be prepared for entertainment functions to be held in the first-floor public rooms, would service family meals to the Vice President via a dumbwaiter.

If passed by the House, the bill then would go to the Senate, which took a different approach to getting the Vice President a house in legislation passed last year. The Senate bill provides for a three-member Commission to be appointed by the President to find or build a house, and would give the Commission 18 months and $1 million to accomplish the task.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 3, 1966]

NIXON SAYS: BUILD HUBERT A HOUSE

(By Winzola McLendon)

The United States should provide an official residénce for its Vice President, a man who should know said yesterday.

Richard M. Nixon added his name to the list of those approving such a residence, saying that he thought it "very important."

He also approves building the house from the ground up—a provision of the bill introduced by Representative Kenneth Gray which will go into executive session this morning.

"Unless you find an old house that really fits the requirements and the needs," said Nixon, "it would be better to build one."

He noted that experience had taught him that it costs more in the long run to do over an existing house. Because, he said, renovation is extremely costly and "runs more than the estimates."

If the present bill is passed, Representative Gray has said that he will ask General Services Administrator Lawson B. Knott to interview both former President Harry Truman (a former Vice President) and Nixon to find out what they think the functional requirements of a Vice-Presidential residence are.

Under the Gray bill, General Services would be responsible for finding an architect and for the building of the residence which would be located on 10 acres of the Naval Observatory grounds, just off Massachusetts Avenue and 34th Street.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1966]

HOUSE BILL GETS A HOUSEWARMING

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

To speed up plans for an official residence for the Vice President, the House Public Works Committee yesterday approved the bill passed by the Senate.

But the bill was recognizable as the Senate version only by its title and number. All of its provisions were the provisions of the House bill, on which its author, Representative Kenneth Gray, Democrat, of Illinois, held hearings last week.

Gray's bill proposes construction of a $750,000 Embassy Row mansion on 10 acres of the Naval Observatory grounds, with General Services Administration overseeing the planning, design and construction.

The original Senate bill, which will be now recorded as approved by the House committee, called for Presidential appointment of a three-man commission to select a site and decide what the design should be. It provided $1 million for site acquisition, purchase of an existing building or construction of a new one.

Representative Gray said yesterday he was "elated" over swift committee approval of his proposal.

He hoped, by substituting the title and number of the Senate's Monroney bill, to get the measure through Congress quickly without the machinery of a conference by the Public Works Committees of the two Houses.

Gray said a "substantial number of the 34 members of the House committee approved his proposal which envisions a modern three-story residence with six bedrooms on its second floor.

He said a beginning authorization of $45,000 to $50,000 will be asked to begin the architectural design. This, he said, will take from a year to 18 months, and if the economy is a "guns" rather than "butter" one at the time, public contributions may be sought to reduce the amount of an appropriation for construction.

For this reason, the bill was amended in committee to authorize the General Services Administrator to accept cash gifts for constructing as well as furnishing the mansion.

Gray, incidentally, said he does not think of the proposed building as a "mansion." It has only six bedrooms, he explained, and his own home, with five, is "quite modest."

The Vice-Presidential residence would have an entire first floor for official entertaining.

The bill was also amended to provide the General Services Administrator some leeway in setting the boundaries of the 10 acres.

Senator A. S. **Mike Monroney**, Democrat, of Oklahoma, upon learning that the drastically modified version of his bill was now ready to be called up on the Unanimous Consent Calendar of the House, commented that to speed up completion of a home for the Vice President is the purpose of both pieces of legislation.

This was taken as an indication that if the House accepts the measure without further changes he would not object to its being called up on the Senate floor with the request that the upper body concur with the House changes.

If there were objections, the two Public Works Committees would have to confer to reconcile differences between the two proposed methods.

The Senate committee decided on a commission when there was disagreement on whether to use the Navy land or Tregaron, $6 million estate of the late Ambassador Joseph E. Davies on Woodley Road.

The Navy had vehemently protested when a Senate bill proposed conversion of Admiral's House, home of the Chief of Naval Operations, for Vice-Presidential use. So far the Navy has not objected to releasing the 10 acres required by the Gray bill.

During **Gray**'s hearings on his bill several other sites were proposed.

Among them were the Alva Belmont House on Capitol Hill, one-time home of Jefferson and Madison's Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin; part of the Glover tract on Ward Circle and any integrated area, such as upper 16th Street.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I strongly favor S. 1592, a bill amending the Federal Firearms Act and providing for a degree of Federal control over interstate and foreign shipment of firearms.

During the hearings on S. 1592, held by my Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, a staggering amount of evidence was presented supporting the enactment of this measure.

The subcommittee received evidence that in 1963 some 1 million dangerous weapons were sold by mail order. Over a 3-year period in Chicago alone, about 4,000 persons bought weapons from only two mail-order dealers; of these purchasers one-fourth had criminal records.

Evidence was also adduced, showing that more than half of the 8,500 murders each year are committed with firearms; half of the 20,000 suicides each year are committed with firearms; in the last year 26,000 aggravated assaults were committed with firearms; in the past 4 years, 216 law enforcement officers were murdered with firearms—compared with only 9 by other means.

Testimony of law enforcement officers from across the Nation persuasively portrayed the need for Federal participation in this area. They noted that present State laws and local ordinances have been unable to cope with the increasing number of crimes in which firearms are used. Unanimously, they agreed that one of the chief causes of this problem is the relative ease with which any person can acquire firearms, especially rifles and shotguns.

Last fall, the International Association of Chiefs of Police voted to support congressional efforts to provide stricter control of firearm traffic. This eminent body specifically urged support of S. 1592.

A tragic example of the easy availability of these lethal weapons occurred recently in my State. A young man purchased a high-powered rifle from one of the local firearm dealers and used it to snipe at motorists passing below his hilltop perch. Before he could be apprehended, a policeman was shot dead, one woman was seriously wounded, and five other persons received gunshot wounds. This one sale brought grief and suffering to seven persons and their families.

If this bill had been in effect at the time, the sniper, whose police record had prohibited a pistol permit in Honolulu, would have had extreme difficulty in purchasing a rifle.

Another incident that occurred in my State further highlights the need for S. 1592. While answering a call, firemen found an arsenal in an apartment in which a minor fire had broken out. The items included several automatic weapons, a Russian-style burp gun, a .30 caliber machinegun, a single-barreled shotgun, boxes full of gun barrels and parts and thousands of rounds of ammunition. A policeman observed that if the fire had set off just one round of ammunition, the whole building could have been destroyed.

No doubt many other States have experienced similar tragic or potentially dangerous incidents involving firearms because of their availability. During the congressional investigation of the Ku Klux Klan, a Klan arsenal was discovered in Georgia. Among the weapons seized were three submachine-style guns.

During the Los Angeles riot, the sale of pistols in southern California rose 250 percent—from 860 guns to 2,038. While many of these guns were purchased by law-abiding citizens seeking to protect their homes, the others were bought by potential rioters, adding to the already large inventory of firearms in their arsenal.

Fortunately, during the riot no one was killed by a bullet fired from a rioter's gun; however, scores of individuals were wounded as a result of the gunfire exchange between the rioters, police, and National Guardsmen. Moreover, guns in the hands of the Watts citizens aggravated an already dangerous situation and, as the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut reported in a Senate speech on March 10, 1966, they were instrumental in prolonging the violence by frustrating the efforts of the legal authorities to restore order.

Under our present Federal firearms laws, guns can be purchased almost as easily as a set of golf clubs. This fact was recently demonstrated by a New Jersey newspaper which selected a mail-order firearms distributor at random and submitted an order for a .38-caliber pistol. This distributor filled the order even though, first, the alleged purchaser had a suspiciously notorious name; second, the required gun purchase permits were not enclosed with the order, and, third, many inconsistencies were evident on the order.

Thus, potential snipers, rioters, and other criminals need only obtain a firearms catalog and send a cash on delivery order through the mail, or walk up to a counter in a gunshop and hand over the purchase price. In either transaction, these individuals will receive the firearm of their choice.

Some communities have attempted to augment their laws through voluntary agreements. For example, a majority of the gun dealers on the island of Oahu in my State agreed to institute a program which broadened controls over firearms by expanding them to cover rifles and shotguns and by requiring prospective purchasers to obtain a copy of their records from the police before a sale could be made. Under this voluntary agreement, which has been in effect since August 1965, 19 individuals who attempted to buy a weapon have been denied service after an investigation showed that they had had criminal records, or had made threats of violence or suicide, or appeared mentally disturbed.

Such conscientious efforts by local dealers are highly commendable and indeed noteworthy. But there are essentially two difficulties with this approach. First, all dealers and manufacturers in the community and in the State must participate in the volunteer program. One reluctant dealer or manufacturer can nullify the objectives of the whole program.

Second, there is no control of mail-order firearms under this method. Local citizens have no authority to regulate the U.S. mail directly. Either dealers and manufacturers must voluntarily establish a nationwide pact among themselves to prohibit the sale of firearms through the mail; or the Congress must enact a a law that will regulate interstate or foreign firearms trade.

A nationwide pact among firearm dealers and manufacturers would be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. Obtaining unanimous participation is a problem even on the municipal level. Moreover, the administrative task of enforcing a national voluntary agreement would be a monumental one. Under the present situation, the only immediate, effective solution lies in the enactment of S. 1592.

This bill is not a panacea to the complex firearms problem, but it will help to limit the number of guns and rifles in the possession of minors and persons with serious criminal records.

S. 1592 would require all manufacturers, importers, dealers, and pawnbrokers who make, ship, or sell firearms in interstate and foreign commerce to obtain a license from the Secretary of the Treasury. All licensees must then maintain a record noting the importation, production, shipment, receipt, and sale and other disposition of firearms that they handle.

The bill would also require the licensees and private individuals to submit a written notice before each interstate or foreign shipment containing firearms is made. In this way, a reasonable system of checking the distribution and disposition of firearms is established.

S. 1592 contains other regulatory provisions. It would forbid licensees from selling firearms to nonresidents who are not eligible to purchase such guns in their State of domicile. Firearms passing through interstate and foreign commerce must have their original, unobliterated serial number on them. Also, the purchase of firearms through foreign markets is prohibited except under prescribed conditions, one of which is the legal use of such import.

The bill then sets forth minimum standards for the sale of firearms to prevent any licensed dealer, manufacturer, importer, and pawnbroker from selling firearms indiscriminately over the counter or via the U.S. mail. Before a sale may transpire, the prospective buyer must be identified and his place of residence disclosed.

The buyer must not be under indictment or have been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year, or be a fugitive from justice. The buyer must be over 21 years old to buy a pistol and over 18 years old to purchase a rifle or shotgun.

Significantly, S. 1592 would include certain destructive devices within the definition of "firearms." Enumerated under this definition are explosives, bombs, rockets, and weapons having a barrel bore of one-half inch or more. Thus, not only small arms, but lethal weapons of mass destruction will also be regulated and their availability to minors and potential lawbreakers will be restricted.

In addition, the bill would, first, provide for public notice and hearing prior to the promulgation of any regulations by the Secretary of the Treasury; second, provide a penalty for persons who knowingly furnish false statements or identification to a gun dealer in obtaining a firearm; third, make it a criminal offense for a person to ship or transport in interstate or foreign commerce a firearm intended for use in the commission of a felony; and, fourth, prohibit carriers from delivering firearms to persons under age or not eligible under State law to possess firearms.

The legislation would not have the following effects:

First. It would not injure sportsmen, collectors, or others who legitimately own or use firearms.

Second. It would not prohibit a person not in the firearms business from lawfully transporting, shipping, or receiving firearms, nor will it require such a person to obtain a Federal license.

Third. It would not restrict the free movement or sale of ammunition—except ammunition for bazookas, cannons, and similar weapons.

Fourth. It would not prohibit a citizen who can lawfully purchase or possess a rifle or shotgun in the place where he resides from going to another State and purchasing a rifle or shotgun and returning with it to the place of his residence.

Fifth. It would not preclude a citizen who complies with the laws of his State from establishing a bonafide firearms business, nor will it place confiscatory licensing fees on such businesses.

Sixth. It would not place an unreasonable burden on dealers to ascertain the identity of purchasers or upon carriers to ascertain the identity of recipients.

S. 1592 is a meritorious measure that is vital in the fight to contain the criminal use of firearms. It is designed to strike at the heart of the problem noted during the hearings of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The startling statistics on the rising incidence of crime in the Nation reported by President Johnson in his message on crime renders the passage of S. 1592 an urgent matter.

I believe the bill would correct an inadequacy in the Nation's control over lethal weapons so tragically evident in the sorrowful events at Dallas in November 1963.

I join the President, along with Senators who have cosponsored this measure, in urging that S. 1592 be enacted without delay.

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM—AN ESSAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, draft-card burners have had their day and student demonstrations against our Nation's activities to keep communism from spreading throughout Asia and the free world have only given comfort to the enemy. Amid such shameful incidents, which will soon be forgotten, however, there is heard the voice of a young Ohio schoolgirl who speaks of patriotism.

Mr. President, this little girl is the daughter of the Honorable Robert Netzley, a member of the Ohio Legislature, and is a student in the West Milton, Ohio, local school. Her name is Carol Anne Netzley.

In order that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read Carol's essay on "What My American Patriotism Means to Me," I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MY AMERICAN PATRIOTISM MEANS TO ME

(By Carol Anne Netzley)

My patriotism comes from my realization that all of the great and good things that have occurred in this Nation, the greatest Nation the world has ever known, have happened because of the devotion and dedication of its people to God and to a spirit of liberty.

It means that I, and others of my generation, have more opportunities than anyone ever had in all the history of the world. We have more material wealth and luxuries than ever has been known. Even the poorest of us have radios, automobiles, electricity, plumbing and heating facilities, and many other conveniences that even royalty of a half century ago could not possess.

We not only have material opportunities but we also have the chance to eliminate all ignorance, most disease, and to satisfy the want of basic necessities that have plagued man since the beginning of time.

These are our opportunities; we will either fail or succeed depending how well we adhere to the dedication to God and liberty that our early patriots and founders of this country displayed.

All the great civilizations of the world have, through apathy, complacency, and moral decay, crumbled and passed from existence; destroyed by their own weaknesses and self-indulgences which they refuse to admit or recognize. In all likelihood our own Nation is now experiencing this repeated self-destruction which history has so often recorded in the past.

The cycles of the rise and fall of the world's great civilizations are recorded as beginning with an original state of bondage. From bondage a people will turn to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith they receive courage, with courage they gain their liberty, from liberty comes abundance, and abundance brings security. Security leads to apathy and complacency, apathy causes dependency, and dependency results in a return to bondage. Thus the cycle is complete. If we trace the history of this Nation we cannot but help to see how our early settlers began as an oppressed people. They had a deep spiritual faith or else they could not have endured their hardships. They were willing to risk everything for the Liberty which was achieved on July 4, 1776. Progress through the cycle from there was swift. Where we are today in the civilization cycle can easily be established by each of us.

In order to prevent history from repeating itself and to preserve our Nation from falling into bondage at the hands of the atheistic Communists, we must turn immediately about and return to the spiritual faith and moral concepts of our patriotic Founding Fathers.

President Kennedy said it somewhat differently when at his inauguration he asked the people of this Nation to make necessary sacrifices to keep this country free or to "ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." In our own lifetime and with our great abundance most of us have the feeling that freedom is a right that is owed to each of us and that it came to us cheaply.

Let us stop for a moment and look back on July 4, 1776 and see what has brought us this great Nation and bought for us our freedom. Let us see if the price was right and if it was a bargain to the 50 gallant men who signed the Declaration of Independence on that fateful day.

What they signed on that immortal day ended with these words, "and for support of this declaration—with a firm reliance on the protection of a divine providence—we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. These were not glowing words of oratory. They meant every word of it.

This was treason! Punishment for treason was forfeiture of all property, torture and death. Let us now look at the price paid by the 50 men who brought our liberty. Five were captured, tortured, and died; 12 had their homes looted and burned; 2 lost sons; and 9 died in the war. How can we dare to think that freedom comes cheap or that patriotism is an antiquated relic of a bygone day.

We should look to world history and remind ourselves that a great democracy has yet survived to the completion of its second century. We should remember that 90 miles south of Florida the destructive forces are now moving closer in an ever-tightening circle. We need only to pick up tomorrow morning's paper to know that our Nation is the only factor that prevents each of us from losing our freedom and being subjected to the bondage of the atheistic Communists.

The American boys dying today in Vietnam are the patriots of our generation and like Nathan Hale, "have but one life to give for their country." I thank God that today we have hundreds of thousands of American patriots. It is most regrettable, however, that today with all of our knowledge of past history, our extreme abundance of worldly goods, and almost 200 years of spiritual and moral heritage that we must still have our

Benedict Arnolds and destructive opportunists who assist and plot with the enemy for our destruction.

I stated in my opening remarks that ours was the generation of opportunity. It will be and can be if we meet the challenge of the destruction about us with the same determination as our early patriots did.

We must meet the ruinous forces of socialism and communism with the same firm reliance on the "protection of a divine providence" that gave courage to the signers of the Declaration of Independence. We must conquer the destructive forces. We must prevent the completion of the world civilization cycle. We must continue the growth and progress of this Nation. If we are to succeed we need to grasp this opportunity and meet our challenge with the same patriotic passion and desire for liberty that enabled Patrick Henry to inflame the hearts of this Nation with these immortal words:

"Gentlemen may cry: peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war has actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Our brethren are already in the field. Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." Only action such as this will prevent our destruction. Edmund Burke once said, "All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win the world, is for enough people to do nothing." We cannot afford to do "nothing." We must take our opportunity and accept the challenge to preserve freedom for future generations. This is what American patriotism means to me.

THE RECREATION POTENTIAL OF THE ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Don McBride, on the staff of my senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], is one of the outstanding American authorities in the field of the development of America's natural resources to the fullest. Don McBride was head of the Planning and Resources Board in Oklahoma, was an official in the National Reclamation Association, and served for 14 years on the staff of the late distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr, before he joined the staff of Senator MONRONEY. No man ever served his State and country with greater dedication and humility and with a more thorough knowledge in his special field of competence, than has Don McBride.

Most lately, Mr. McBride delivered an excellent address on the recreation potential in the Arkansas River Basin. The address was delivered on March 11, 1966, to the annual meeting of the Arkansas Basin Development Association, which met in Tulsa.

Because the speech and its contents are of such great importance to so many Members of the Senate and others, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY MR. DON McBRIDE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, TULSA, OKLA., MARCH 11, 1966

Mr. Moderator, it is with mixed emotions that I find myself on a panel with such a distinguished moderator and with three such knowledgeable panelists. However, the Good Book says something about "the first shall be last and the last shall be first."

Exactly 5 years ago today I stood on this very platform and addressed the annual meeting of the Arkansas Basin Development Association on the same subject assigned to me today. The memory of man being what it is, I dare say few, if any, will know whether or not I am using the same speech.

Well—I can proclaim today that "recreation development is big business," and it is getting bigger. The impact of recreation can hardly be overstated, but it has become one of the big influences of our economy and will become even bigger. There is no indication that the growth rate of recreation has reached its peak or when it will do so.

Since 1961, a completely new policy of recreation has been developed by the Federal Government.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was established in the spring of 1962 to provide a focal point in the Government for the Nation's outdoor recreation activities. Although located in the Department of the Interior, it has Government-wide responsibilities.

The Bureau was created as a result of recommendations which the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission submitted to the President and Congress on January 31, 1962, after a 3-year study. The Commission recommended (1) establishment of a national outdoor recreation policy; (2) guidelines for management of outdoor recreation resources; (3) expansion, modification, and intensification of outdoor recreation programs; (4) establishment of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; and (5) a Federal grant-in-aid program to the States.

A Presidential message on conservation transmitted to Congress on March 1, 1962, announced that a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation would be established in the Department of the Interior. The message directed that the Bureau "serve as a focal point in the Federal Government for the many activities related to outdoor recreation and * * * work and consult with the Departments of Agriculture; Army; and Health, Education, and Welfare; the Housing and Home Finance Agency; and with other governmental agencies in implementing Federal outdoor recreation policies."

On April 2, 1962, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall complied by establishing the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. He assigned the new Bureau responsibility for promoting coordination of Federal outdoor recreation programs, State assistance, research, encouragement of State and regional cooperation, recreation surveys, and formulation of a nationwide outdoor recreation plan.

An act of May 28, 1963 (77 Stat. 49), authorized the Secretary of the Interior to perform several functions which are vital if the Nation is to provide effectively for its outdoor recreation needs. These authorities subsequently have been delegated to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. They provide that the Bureau:

1. Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory of the outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States;
2. Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources;
3. Formulate and maintain a nationwide outdoor recreation plan;
4. Give technical assistance and cooperate with the States, their political subdivisions, and private interests;
5. Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation;
6. Sponsor, engage in, and assist research and education programs;
7. Encourage interdepartmental cooperation and promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation, and
8. Accept and use donations for outdoor recreation purposes.

The Organic Act of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation gives strong congressional approval to major recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resouces Review Commission. Section 1 of the new law states:

"That the Congress finds and declares it to be desirable that all American people of present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources, and that it is desirable for all levels of government and private interests to take prompt and coordinated action * * * to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people."

This was followed by Public Law 88-578, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which set up a revolving fund into which will be deposited fees collected at all Federal recreation areas, if the possibility of the sum of such fees will be greater than the cost of collection. It includes the $7 recreation conservation sticker. The appropriations from this revolving fund will be used for purchase of land and development of recreation areas.

On July 9, 1965, the President signed Public Law 89–72. The policy statement of this act is as follows:

"That it is the policy of the Congress and the intent of this act that (a) in investigating and planning any Federal navigation, flood control, reclamation, hydroelectric, or multiple-purpose water resource project, full consideration shall be given to the opportunities, if any, which the project affords for outdoor recreation and for fish and wildlife enhancement and that wherever any such project can reasonably serve either or both of these purposes consistently with the provisions of this act, it shall be constructed, operated, and maintained accordingly."

This is the evolution of a new recreation development policy. It will be subjected to lots of change in the next few years, but as of today it forms the policy under which we must operate. These are the building blocks with which the future development will be constructed.

"The demand for outdoor recreation is surging. Whatever the measuring rod * * * visits to Federal and State recreation areas, number of fishing license holders, number of outboard motors in use * * * it is clear that Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before. And this is only a foretaste of what is to come. Not only will there be many more people, they will want to do more, and they will have more money and time to do it with. By 2000, the population should double; the demand for recreation will triple."

The economic impact of recreational development at reservoir projects was summarized by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission in 1961 as follows:

"Reservoirs provide a new opportunity for capital to be profitably used in developing the recreation business, and in closely associated activities. The necessary capital appears, almost all of it from sources outside the communities themselves, and the communities begin the process of growth which local leaders had so long sought from other sources."

What this "process of growth" can amount to was indicated by Economist Arthur L. Moore in a study prepared for the same Commission, when he said: "In some reservoir counties, outdoor recreation has changed almost the entire way of life. New schools and better public services have, in turn, brightened other economic prospects."

We are going to try to see how these generalities apply in the specific cases of the Federal reservoir and water-resource programs in Arkansas and Oklahoma.

The first thing to note is that the original source of all such economic impact is the recreational attendance, the visitor-days of recreational use, at the water projects. By noting the attendance at Arkansas and Oklahoma reservoirs, we have the basis for our economic-impact outlook.

In the State of Arkansas, the Corps of Engineers has seven reservoirs with recreational development. All but 2 of these had attendance greater than 1,400,000 in 1964. The total attendance for all 7 was slightly over 10 million.

The State of Oklahoma had 12 Army Engineer reservoirs in operation. Only 3 had attendance of more than a million, but they included Lake Texoma, which alone had more than 8 million. The total attendance at all 12 Oklahoma Army reservoirs was about 17 million.

Reservoir attendance for the Little Rock district projects for calendar year 1965 was about 2.4 million above that reported for 1964. This increase was due primarily to the addition of Beaver Reservoir on White River and Dardanelle on the Arkansas River. Otherwise, visitation for 1965 was about the same as for 1964, with variations between projects being within the normal range of year-to-year fluctuation.

In the Tulsa district, reservoir attendance for 1965, with a few exceptions, followed along the same curve as established in 1964. The addition of Council Grove, Eufaula, John Redmond, and Keystone accounted for 4.2 million of the 5.3 million visitor increase in 1965. Denison, for the third time, had in excess of 8 million visitors. There were 8 million in 1957, 8.2 in 1964, and 8.9 in 1965. The new lakes at Keystone, Eufaula, and Oologah should show substantial increases in attendance in 1966. This is normal for new projects, and the curve should go up quite rapidly for 6 to 10 years before peaking.

When you consider how large cities will mortgage their futures and invest huge sums to attract a major league baseball or football team that will draw at most about 2 million people a year, you can appreciate the value of attractions like these reservoirs.

That is the present situation. In addition, Arkansas has six more reservoirs under construction, and an additional seven authorized but not yet begun. And Oklahoma has 4 reservoirs under construction and 14 more authorized for Corps of Engineers construction.

Thus, taking the 2 States together, we have 19 reservoirs completed or at least partially in operation with a total 1965 attendance of well over 30 million, plus 19 more Army reservoirs soon to be finished and 21 more in the program. When finished, the presently authorized Army program will see 50 reservoirs in these 2 States in place of the present 19. I do not hesitate to suggest attendance in the 100 million visitor-day range by the time all authorized projects are built.

Thanks largely to these reservoirs, Oklahoma in 1961–62 ranked 11th, and Arkansas a close 12th, among the States in the number of paid fishing-license holders. Each sold about 260,000 licenses for a combined revenue of about $2¼ million. Even more significant from the standpoint of economic impact is the fact that both States ranked even higher in the number of nonresident fishing licenses issued—Arkansas sixth and Oklahoma ninth. The Oklahoma Industrial Development and Park Department reports its 21 State parks (most water oriented) added more than $61 million to the State's economy in 1965.

Some people believe that as more and more reservoirs are completed, a sort of law of diminishing returns will operate to reduce attendance at each. But I believe that other trends will more than offset any such tendencies.

Our population is expected to double by the end of the century. Recreation use-days will triple. This alone virtually guarantees continued and expanded recreational use of our reservoirs. Incomes will probably be higher, so that people will have more money to spend on recreation. If the gross national product grows at an annual rate of 3.5 percent, disposable consumer income should double by 1976 over 1960, and quadruple by the year 2000. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which compiled these estimates, computes that about 90 percent of all Americans already participate in some form of outdoor recreation, and that by the turn of the century the number of occasions of such participation will increase three-fold. And it adds that about three-quarters of all outdoor recreation is water-oriented.

Mr. Moore has pointed out that the economic benefits of reservoir recreation keep accumulating in a series of progressive phases, or stages. The first two phases consist of economic benefits of the construction job at the reservoir and the accompanying increase in land and real estate values. Next come three other phases more closely related to the specific function of recreation. The first of these is the development of revenue at the lake itself by lodges, restaurants, resorts, boat docks, and the like. Next is the development of indirect or secondary benefits in widening circles around the lake, as nearby towns change in character from strictly farm towns to resort towns serving the more sophisticated and expensive tastes of tourists. The final phase is the development of home sites as city people build summer cottages, or retired people put up houses for year-round occupancy, in the lake area. This phase brings still further land value enhancement plus a greater increase in the tax base.

In the case of the Arkansas River basin, I think it is of particular interest to this audience today that in the Little Rock district the non-Federal investment on Government-owned lands around the presently operated reservoirs is in excess of $6.5 million, while the estimated value of development on adjacent lands is in excess of $66.5 million.

In the Tulsa district, the non-Federal investment on Government-owned lands adjacent to the lakes is in excess of $32.5 million, while the estimated value of development on adjacent lands is in the neighborhood of $50 million. Together, this means that in the Arkansas River basin in the non-Federal investment in capital facilities based upon recreation totals more than $156 million upon which counties are collecting taxes.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that, according to the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the effects of outdoor recreation are most striking when large-scale expenditures come to a relatively underdeveloped area. An example followed completion of seven large reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Arkansas-White-Red River basins in States of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Missouri.

Three of these reservoirs have been established for 15 years, three for the past 8 years, and one was opened in 1960. With one or two exceptions, the reservoirs were studied, and comparisons were then made with eight adjacent counties that did not have shoreline on these reservoirs. Population growth, per capita income, annual wages, retail sales, bank deposits, taxes, and investment were considered.

In the 10-year period ending in 1960, all counties in the study lost population, but the 17 reservoir counties lost only 8.5 percent in contrast with the 25.1 percent loss in the nonreservoir counties. From 1949 to 1959, annual per capita income of the reservoir counties in Arkansas increased from $669 to $1,053, or 57 percent, in contrast to an increase of $349 to $431, or only 23 percent, in the nonreservoir counties.

The gain in bank deposits also favored reservoir counties:

In 1949 some 17 reservoir counties had $82.6 million, in 1958, $130.0 million.

In 1949 some eight nonreservoir counties had $15.1 million, in 1958, $21.2 million.

The growth of local tax collections points up the value of business generated by reservoir recreation. From 1945 to 1956, 10 Oklahoma reservoir county tax levies increased nearly 64 percent. Two selected Oklahoma nonreservoir county collections were up only 3.8 percent for the same period. In that period, school taxes were up 296 percent in the reservoir counties compared with 190 percent in the nonreservoir counties.

Another aspect of the effect of reservoir recreation has been the steady annual increase of investment in overnight accommodations from an initial investment in 1945 of $1.4 million to the 1959 total of $20.8 million in the 14 reservoir counties for which data are available. These capital expenditures are, of course, in addition to income generated by visiting recreation seekers.

Still another element of capital investment has been the increasing annual expenditure on private homes and cabins near the reservoirs. This type of investment, in the 14 counties for which data are available, had grown from $86,000 in 1945 to $25.7 million by 1959. The current average expenditure in this form of investment is about $3.2 million annually.

While all the economic gains in the reservoir counties may not be directly attributable to the new lakes, it is undoubtedly true that outdoor recreation has had a dramatic beneficial effect. Almost every economic sign indicates that the reservoir counties are better off. Indeed, in some it has changed almost the entire way of life, as the stimulus offered by the recreation dollars has had far-reaching ramifications. New schools and better public services have, in turn, brightened other economic prospects.

I have calculated that more than 400 new cabins or residences are being built at Oklahoma reservoirs each year. And judging from the best information available, it looks like most of these 400 structures are presently being built around Keystone and Eufaula reservoirs. For the most part, these will not be subject to homestead exemption.

One could speculate as to what this development will eventually approach, but let us say now that many, many people employed in Tulsa and making an income as great as $7,500 per year are potential customers for a cabin site on Lake Keystone.

In the year 1959—when attendance at Lake Texoma was around 6 million instead of more than 8 million as at present—visitors to that lake spent almost $21 million in four Oklahoma counties and one Texas county. No wonder the U.S. Department of Commerce has stated that "If a community can attract a couple of dozen tourists a day throughout the year, it would be economically comparable to acquiring a new manufacturing industry with an annual payroll of $100,000." Yet in these two States, reservoirs are attracting not just a "couple of dozen" tourists a day, but at present a year-round average of some 75,000 per day with the prospect of continued large increases in the future.

Regarding land values, when the Corps of Engineers was acquiring land for Lake Texoma it paid an average of $28.98 per acre. Now in 61 subdivisions established around that reservoir, the land that is available at all has a market value of $3,000 per acre or more. At Fort Gibson Reservoir, the average value per acre before the project was built was about $40; while now lots in the 60 subdivisions around the reservoir will average well over $2,000. Around Canyon Reservoir on the Guadalupe, the County

Judge of Comal County in Texas has found that assessed valuations have increased by $3,500,000 in that one country, and that land which originally sold for $50 an acre is now bringing as much as $12,000 an acre.

I suspect that many of us don't realize how many people are willing to pay considerable sums to obtain their water-based recreation. For example, I wonder if we all realize, at first glance, the implications of those 920,000 fishing licenses sold by our two States. The Interior Department reports that the 50 million Americans who went fishing or hunting in 1960 spent $4 billion on those sports, which averages out to $80 apiece. At this rate, our 920,000 fishing-license holders were worth more than $70 million in revenue to the people who served them. The TVA found that fishermen and hunters in its area are now spending about $62 million a year and estimates that by the end of the century the expenditure will double.

Or take boating. The Outdoor Boating Club of America and the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers in a joint study estimated that the 39 million people who participated in recreational boating in 1959 spent about $2.5 billion at retail for their sport—which represented an almost threefold increase in a decade. I suspect that the increase in the 7 years since then has been at least an equal rate. I am told that in some areas bank loans for boat purchases rank second only to auto loans.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report, which is the most authoritative study ever made of outdoor recreation in America, has given us a figure embracing all forms and aspects of recreational use. It found that the average recreational visitor to a reservoir spent $9.75 per day at the site. And this is a conservative estimate. It included, for example, only $1 a day expenditures at restaurants; only 50 cents for lodging; and only $1 for gas and oil. Obviously it did not include secondary expenditures in areas nearby the reservoirs.

If we apply this Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission figure of $9.75 per day to the present 30 million visitor-days at Army reservoirs in our two States, we find that those pools are worth well over a quarter of a billion dollars to us each year on recreational business directly at the reservoirs right now—plus uncounted more millions in secondary benefits—plus the fact that 2.5 times as many reservoirs are authorized for eventual construction as we now have—plus the fact that with the growth of population and increased leisure, the use of each reservoir could easily triple by the end of the century. I do not think it is too strong to say that our Corps of Engineers reservoirs constitute a business asset with more that a billion-dollar-a-year potential for our two States.

However, one more thing needs to be said, and it is perhaps the most important thing of all.

Everything I have said so far relates to the potential economic impact of reservoir recreation. The Federal Government by and large fulfills its function by helping to create this potential. It is up to the State and local and private interests of the area to transform the potential into actuality.

We have learned by experience in many parts of the country that neither the creation of a lake, nor even the provision of simple basic facilities at a lake, will attract visitors immediately in large numbers.

Let me cite some contrasting examples. First, take three older reservoirs built before the recreational function was as well appreciated as it is now. Dale Hollow Reservoir in Tennessee and Kentucky was provided with only limited public areas and difficult access. It was 15 years before the attendance at that reservoir reached a million a year. Center Hill Reservoir nearby, with slightly better conditions, reached 1.5 million visitors within 10 years. and Wolf Creek Reservoir in Kentucky, still better equipped, reached 3 million within 10 years. In each case it took a decade or more for the recreation benefit to become well established.

By contrast, down in Georgia, Hartwell Reservoir attracted more than 2 million visitors in its second year of operation. And Buford Reservoir, also in Georgia, received 7.5 million during its third season. These latter projects were equipped from the start with attractive recreational facilities, adequate shoreline lands for public use, plenty of good access roads, and large-scale and varied tourist accommodations available almost from the opening day.

I have purposely gone outside the Arkansas Basin for my examples. Perhaps I could have found equally good ones here. The record proves that by and large we have done well in this basin in taking advantage of our recreational opportunities. My purpose now is to stress the need to do at least as well, and if possible better, as new reservoirs and impoundments are provided in the future. With the experience we have gained and the lesssons we have learned in the past, we should be able and ready to plan our recreational developments in time and step with the water-resource construction programs, so that as each new lake is opened, it is opened fully ready for business by all concerned. The new legislation that has been discussed at this meeting will assist and facilitate this process, and I know the Corps of Engineers will do their part. If we of the States and localities do our parts as well, I haven't the slightest doubt that recreation at our dams and reservoirs is going to be one of the Arkansas Basin's greatest, richest, and most lucrative businesses in years to come.

MEDAL OF HONOR TO SGT. LARRY S. PIERCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on February 24, I had the pleasure of attending the awarding, posthumously, of the Medal of Honor to S. Sgt. Larry S. Pierce. His wife, Mrs. Pierce, accepted the award.

As my colleagues may know, Sergeant Pierce was the soldier who with complete disregard for his own safety and life threw himself on a mine and thereby saved the lives of the other members of his squad. Men like Sergeant Pierce are not replaceable. Yet in this single act of natural courage, Sergeant Pierce has joined sacred lists of Americans whose devotion to duty and love of country are greater than life itself. I know all Americans are proud of Sergeant Pierce. We Californians are particularly proud and salute his gallantry and share with his family the sorrow of his death. I know that the family's pride in the heroic act will help to sustain them during this difficult and trying period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the press release of the White House together with the full citation awarding the Medal of Honor to Sergeant Pierce be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[A White House press release, Feb. 24, 1966]

The President, in the name of Congress, today presented the Medal of Honor (posthumous), to Mrs. Larry S. Pierce, of Wasco, Calif.

Mrs. Pierce, widow of Sgt. Larry S. Pierce, U.S. Army, accepted the award made to her late husband who was killed in action against hostile forces in the Republic of Vietnam on September 20, 1965.

The medal was awarded to Sergeant Pierce for "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his own life above and beyond the call of duty."

This award, second Medal of Honor awarded for action in Vietnam, recognizes Sergeant Pierce's "indomitable courage, complete disregard for his own safety and profound concern for his fellow soldiers" in averting loss of life and injury to members of his squad.

During the action for which the medal is being awarded, Sergeant Pierce was leading his reconnaissance squad in action against hostile forces near Ben Cat, Vietnam. He threw himself on a mine just as it exploded, thereby sacrificing himself to save the members of his squad.

Mrs. Pierce was accompanied by her three children, Theresa 5, Kelley D., 4, and Gregory A., 18 months.

The last Medal of Honor awarded by the President was presented to U.S. Army Capt. Roger H. Donlon on December 5, 1964, in recognition of his conspicuous gallantry in the defense of Camp Nam Dong, Vietnam, on July 6, 1964.

Sergeant Pierce was born in Wewoka, Okla., on July 6, 1941.

His mother, Mrs. Lillie Pierce, of Crayana Valley, Calif., attended the Presidential ceremony with other members of the family.

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of the Congress the Medal of Honor, posthumously, to S. Sgt. Larry S. Pierce, U.S. Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty.

S. Sgt. Larry S. Pierce distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life above and beyond the call of duty while leading a squad against hostile forces near Ben Cat, Republic of Vietnam, on September 20, 1965. Sergeant Pierce was serving as squad leader in a reconnaissance platoon when his patrol was ambushed by hostile forces. Through his inspiring leadership and personal courage, the squad succeeded in eliminating an enemy machinegun and routing the opposing force. While pursuing the fleeing enemy, the squad came upon a dirt road and, as the main body of his men entered the road. Sergeant Pierce discovered an antipersonnel mine emplaced in the roadbed. Realizing that the mine could destroy the majority of his squad, Sergeant Pierce saved the lives of his men at the sacrifice of his own by throwing himself directly onto the mine as it exploded. Through his indomitable courage, complete disregard for his own safety, and profound concern for his fellow soldiers he averted loss of life and injury to the members of his squad. Sergeant Pierce's conspicuous gallantry, extraordinary heroism, and intrepidity at the cost of his own life, above and beyond the call of duty, are in the highest traditions of the U.S. Army and reflect great credit upon himself and the Armed Forces of his country.

TRIBUTE TO TONY T. DECHANT, AS PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the National Farmers Union, which has done so much for protection of the family farm and for equity in the marketplace for the small farmer, has undergone a change in command.

At their national convention which has just concluded in Denver, the delegates of the National Farmers Union have elected Mr. Tony T. Dechant to succeed Mr. James Patton as their president. After 25 years in that demanding position, Mr. Patton decided not to seek reelection.

I wish at this time to pay tribute to Mr. Patton for his untiring efforts to bring the problems of rural America to the attention of the public at large. Recognition for a job well done must also go to Mr. Glenn Talbott, vice president of the NFU, who also retired from office.

It is reassuring to know that the leadership of this great organization has been entrusted to a man of the experience and training of Mr. Dechant, who has been an executive of the NFU since 1943 and has worked closely with Mr. Patton through all of those years.

Like Mr. Patton and Mr. Talbott before him, Mr. Dechant has a difficult task ahead of him, but I am sure he will be equal to it.

He has my best wishes.

JOINT DECLARATION OF 14 NATO MEMBERS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, despite De Gaulle's announced intention to pull out of the defense organization of the Atlantic Alliance, 14 NATO allies remain determined to carry on the Atlantic Alliance and its system of international commands and joint defense planning as essential to their security. The resolute position of the 14 members was affirmed in a joint declaration issued on March 18, 1966.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the declaration be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Joint Declaration Agreed Upon by 14 Member Nations, March 18, 1966

The following declaration has been agreed between the heads of governments of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States:

"The North Atlantic Treaty and the Organization established under it are both alike essential to the security of our countries.

"The Atlantic Alliance has insured its efficacy as an instrument of defense and deterrence by the maintenance in peacetime of an integrated and interdependent military organization in which, as in no previous alliance in history, the efforts and resources of each are combined for the common security of all. We are convinced that this Organization is essential and will continue. No system of bilateral arrangements can be a substitute.

"The North Atlantic Treaty and the Organization are not merely instruments of the common defense. They meet a common political need and reflect the readiness and determination of the member countries of the North Atlantic community to consult and act together wherever possible in the safeguard of their freedom and security and in the furtherance of international peace, progress and prosperity."

GREEN BERETS INSPIRE THE GOLD BERET

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn of the moral support students of the Maple Heights High School, Maple Heights, Ohio, are giving to our men in Vietnam through the student body's newly formed organization, the Gold Beret.

I commend the students in Maple Heights High School for their patriotic gestures and I hope that the Gold Beret will be an inspiration for others and that it will spread throughout the land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the March 11 edition of the Maple Heights Press commenting on the Gold Beret be printed at this point in the body of the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial ordered to be printed in the Record, follows:

Green Berets Inspire Youth Support: The Gold Beret

(By Dan Brubeck, editor)

"Fighting soldiers from the sky." So goes the first line of a runaway best selling record that is rapidly making the Special Forces of the U.S. Army—the men of the green berets—the most immortalized group of fighting men since the French Foreign Legion. The ballad, sung by Special Forces Staff Sergeant Barry Saddler, has captured the imagination of a nation fighting a bloody jungle war against the Communist Vietcong.

Admiration for the fighting men in South Vietnam—particularly the Green Berets—coupled with disgust over youthful demonstrators undermining troop morale has motivated a group of Maple Heights young people to form the Gold Beret.

The organization, started 3 weeks ago by 17-year-old DeeDee Syntax, 5339 Cato Street, has expanded to 70 members and is still growing.

The joint purpose of the gold berets—taken from their bylaws—is: "To be of service in a way to encourage our fighting men in their battle to free men and women oppressed by hordes of Communist rule" and "To help refugees of war-torn Vietnam with some of the basic needs of life."

The outward identification of members is a gold beret styled after the green berets worn by special forces. The berets will be worn to and from school.

Prime projects assigned members will be to write letters to servicemen to boost morale and collect clothing for distribution by troops in South Vietnam. Many troop units have "adopted" orphanages, and, do their best to provide clothing and food to the children.

In a definite switch from the usual, the gold berets plan no street demonstrations or parades commonly associated with activist groups. They support troops and people. Political support of administration policies is not the real intent.

Said DeeDee, "We feel that our Government has made a commitment and our young men are there to fulfill this commitment. We in turn feel we should be an encouraging factor in this cause." Recently small groups of young people received much publicity wearing black armbands protesting the war in Vietnam. It was reaction to this on other protests that inspired DeeDee and like-minded teenagers from Maple Heights High School to organize. "The soldiers will think no one supports them and morale will go down," she explained.

DeeDee herself writes to three servicemen so far and hopes to be writing to more soon.

Gold was picked, she said, "because it signifies value," and she added, "we value our freedom and liberties endowed by our forefathers." The men are fighting for these values, she feels.

It is simple to become a Gold Beret. All that is necessary is to say the pledge of allegiance and further make the "Pledge of the Gold Beret":

"I pledge my sincerity, allegiance, and willingness to serve to my flag and my country, and to our organization, the Gold Beret, in full support of the Green Berets, in any way or manner; at anytime in which I am needed to be of service for the expansion and the progression of our supreme goal: to be of service in any way we can to our fighting men in Vietnam and to those refugees who need the things which they have lost—the basic needs of life.

A Green Beret—an 8-year veteran of the special forces—is coming to speak to the 70-member organization. This is being coordinated by Sgt. Wells Collar, local Army recruiter. Sergeant Collar has been enthusiastic about the Gold Beret.

He told the Maple Heights Press that special forces camp at Fort Bragg, N.C., has inquired about them.

Sergeant Collar was asked whether such efforts are appreciated by the troops. An unqualified "yes" was his answer.

ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the complexity of urban problems in modern-day America is challenging the ingenuity of our architects, engineers and city planners as never before. Moreover, there is an urgent need for ever-increasing numbers of professionally trained specialists who are prepared to devote their talents and energies to the task of rebuilding our older cities and restoring them to their rightful prominence in American life.

The task of providing us with these specialists falls heavily on our professional schools of architectural education. As pointed out in a recent article in the New York Times, these institutions are facing a serious shortage of funds for expansion and upgrading of programs and curriculum.

A fund raising campaign, under the leadership of John L. Loeb, is now seeking to raise $11.5 million for Harvard's Graduate School of Design. Mr. Loeb is an outstanding individual, devoting his time and energy to constructive and worthwhile causes. I regard this campaign as a most important effort which warrants recognition. This and similar campaigns in behalf of other institutions deserve generous public support.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article of February 20, 1966, by Ada Louise Huxtable, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Revamping of Architectural Education Being Pressed in Nation

(By Ada Louise Huxtable)

American architectural education, scored by critics as still following 19th-century methods and ideas, is moving to meet the 20th-century crisis of cities.

Objectives and curriculums considered by experts to be far behind the needs of the times are being revamped by some of the country's leading professional schools. The purpose is to produce designers and planners equipped to deal with the increasingly complex building and renewal problems of cities on today's unprecedented scale.

Harvard University, which has been a leader in the field of architectural education through its top-ranking Graduate School of Design, is about to inaugurate an $11.5 million campaign to enlarge the school's scope and activities and redirect its aims with an Advanced Program of Environmental Studies.

Harvard led an architectural revolution in the 1930's under the direction of Walter Gropius as dean of the graduate school, that was virtually responsible in this country for the breakthrough for modern architecture. Thirty years later, it finds its program lagging behind radically changed environmental needs.

Other schools across the country are facing the same inadequacies in programs and funds. Concurrent with changes at Harvard, the University of California at Los Angeles is establishing a completely new school of architecture, to open this fall, to meet the new needs. The university is State financed.

The Harvard fund drive will aim for a $6 million building to house its school, a $2.5 million endowment for four professorships in advanced environmental studies, $2 million to strengthen existing curriculums, and more than $1 million for workshops and laboratories in architectural technology, computer techniques and comprehensive design.

The campaign is under the leadership of John L. Loeb, chairman of the schools development program. Mr. Loeb, a principal of the New York investment concern of Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades and Company, has made substantial university donations, including Harvard's Loeb Memorial Theater and New York University's Loeb Student Center.

Two million dollars are already pledged to the 2-year campaign, which is just getting under way. An additional $2 million Federal grant for building purposes will be available under the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Half of the Harvard program will be devoted to a new kind of advanced work on the doctoral level dealing completely with problems of the environment.

Significantly, only one of the four new professors in this program in environmental studies will be an architect or designer. The other three will be a scientist specializing in resources and ecology, or the forces of the natural environment; an authority in decisionmaking, or programming through computer and other modern mechanical techniques, and either an economist, a lawyer or a public administrator.

GOAL IN CORRELATION

The objective of the program will be the correlated use of these interdisciplinary sciences and techniques, all of which are involved in modern building and planning dealing with large-scale problems of the environment.

Approximately 10 fellowships will be given in Harvard's advanced program of environmental studies. They will be similar to Niemann fellowships for journalists and those being sponsored by Harvard's Kennedy Institute that permits established professionals to return for specialized work, writing and research.

The second half of the program, on the undergraduate and master's level, will be a thrust to update education in architecture, landscape architecture and urban planning and design, largely through training with existing problems, aided by specialized laboratory techniques. Workshops and laboratories will be emphasized in subjects such as computer graphics and building technology and structure. Field experiences in urban renewal will be integrated into the curriculum.

The program at UCLA, developed by the new school's dean, George Dudley, will have an equally farsighted base. It will consist of studio work coordinated with the social, behavioral and technological sciences, engineering, economics, law and fine arts. The degree will be in urban design.

MEDICAL TRAINING CITED

Existing UCLA facilities, such as the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering and the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, will also figure in the new architectural training. The graduate is expected to bridge the concerns of the architect dealing with single structures and the planner involved with the broad range of modern urban problems.

Experts in the fields of architecture and planning point out that the education revolution is long overdue. They stress a similar revolution in medical education in this country in the 1920's, set off by the Flexner report prepared on the subject for the Carnegie fund in 1910.

The Flexner report scored the traditional system of part-time lectures by respected practitioners aimed at passing on existing knowledge and experience to students. It led to intensive curriculums of coordinated laboratory work and practical training in dual research and teaching programs, with the objective of producing new knowledge and progressively trained graduates.

Architectural education still follows the 19th-century master-student formula, with emphasis on present practice rather than the methodology of future solutions. The semester problem of a single building type or a grandiose architectural complex in pure design terms is still common.

Associate Dean William A. Doebele, Jr., of the Harvard Graduate School of Design deplores the lag.

"It is a tragic social waste, in this period of urban crisis, to spend time and resources on this kind of teaching," he says. It has also been pointed out that through lack of funds and facilities architecture and planning schools are unable to meet today's challenge, not only in terms of the quality of their graduates but also in quantity. They are failing to produce enough of the urgently needed properly trained personnel for urban work.

Particularly in planning, most schools estimate that two to three times as many qualified applicants could be accommodated as present means can support, with a good proportion turned away and lost to the profession each year.

A $100,000 study in architectural education being made now by the American Institute of Architects finds reevaluation and revision of curriculums to be the trend in many schools, of the approximately 80 architecture schools in the country, 60 that have been consulted are concerned with changing teaching tools and goals.

The study project has already advised the Universities of Maryland and Tennessee and Ball State University at Muncie, Ind., on setting up architecture schools according to the new interdisciplinary criteria. Cornell University has similarly assisted the University of Puerto Rico.

According to Deal Dudley, who has spent 2 years investigating architecture programs here and abroad, "We have nothing comparable to present laboratory research and testing techniques in the physical and social sciences for architecture and urban design.

"Private industry is making the breakthrough in technology that leads to the breakthrough in design that should be coming from university programs.

"This is where you must begin in education today. This is the basic involvement of the university in society."

RESTORE THE SCHOOL LUNCH AND MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, from throughout the country all of us in the Senate are being deluged by mail from an irate public which is growing increasingly concerned over President Johnson's threatened termination of school lunch and school milk programs.

I for one cannot understand why the administration is choosing to curtail old, solid programs that have proved successful, yet decides to pour millions into new and failing boondoggles that are steeped in controversy.

The rising concern over President Johnson's threatened termination of school lunch and school milk programs was the subject recently of an excellent editorial appearing in the Wyoming State Tribune. The writer, James Flinchum, calls attention to the efforts of several Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, to obtain a reversal of this shortsighted and misconceived proposal.

In essence, Mr. Johnson has proposed that the school lunch and school milk programs be curtailed so that Government assistance can be channeled into a poverty pocket, the dimensions of which the President declines to spell out.

Under our current policies, the school lunch program serves a nourishing meal to about 18 million of our young children. The school milk program, which was begun during the administration of President Eisenhower, has diverted milk surpluses into healthful refreshment for about 25 million children. This is the present posture of both programs, but the President's budget proposal has marked them for assault under the war on poverty.

The Johnson administration's current budget request calls for cutting $101 million for these programs. As indicated in the editorial, the effect of such a proposal will be to slam the door on hot lunch programs in many of our public schools.

Among the leading voices raised against this clumsy effort to discriminate among our Nation's schoolchildren has been that of my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. As a former Governor of that great State, Senator SIMPSON is critically aware of the disastrous local effects of this latest administration proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial entitled, "From the Mouths of Babes," be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Mar. 3, 1966]

FROM THE MOUTHS OF BABES

When President Johnson approved the fiscal 1967 budget, he doubtless had little inkling of the furore that would be created by the Budget Bureau's reduction of $101 million in the school lunch and school milk programs.

In his January 24 budget message, the President said: "The school lunch and special milk programs will focus more on the needy children, helping to provide them with adequate and well-balanced meals."

The trouble is, the administration has not spelled out how it will determine which children are needy and which are not. And, as House Agriculture Committee Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, has said, "All our children need these programs. * * * I shall oppose any shifts that will convert them to poverty program only."

The school lunch and milk programs had their genesis in the early New Deal, and one would think that as canny as President Johnson is supposed to be he would realize that to remove something so long standing—and especially to take food from the mouths of babes, as it were—would be certain to provoke a storm of criticism of unparalleled proportions.

Although the school lunch and milk cutbacks have not received any degree of attention in the press and other news media compared with the great debates on Vietnam, Congressmen almost universally have cast their weather eyes on this matter, and being storm-sensitive people, they have strongly announced their opposition to the Johnson proposals.

In Wyoming, the State board of education said recently that it felt the cuts would cause some Wyoming schools to lose their hot lunch program; and it pointedly asserted its belief that the health and welfare of all American schoolchildren should be considered before U.S. food surpluses are sent to foreign countries. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON has assailed the reduction on several occasions recently.

Not only are Republicans highly critical of the school lunch and milk cuts, but so are Democrats. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Wisconsin Democrat, made a series of speeches in the Senate commencing in mid-January in an effort to get $3 million restored to the milk program for the present fiscal year which had been chopped out by the Budget Bureau in December.

The school lunch program started in 1936 and was made permanent by the National School Lunch Act of 1946; thus it is some 30 years old. The milk program commenced in 1954 as a result of rising dairy surpluses.

Under the former, hot lunches are served to about 18 million children in 71,000 schools at a cost of about 27 cents per lunch per child. Last year, the lunches included 3 billion half pints of milk. An additional 3 billion half pints of milk went to about 25 million schoolchildren for 3 to 4 cents per half pint under the special milk program in 1965.

Chairman HARLAN HAGEN of the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee said on February 18 that the prospects appeared excellent for reversing the administration's plans to make the school lunch and milk programs a poverty project only.

Mr. HAGEN may have spoken too soon, however, because at about the same time, President Johnson was telling a school administrators' convention in Atlantic City that he intended to ask Congress to enact the Child Nourishment Act of 1966 which would authorize hot lunches for needy children "without subsidizing those who can afford to buy their own."

But to date there have been no guidelines for selecting needy children. In the meantime, the prospects increase that some schools may be forced to close down their hot lunch programs under the Johnson proposals. This can be certain to bring the mothers of America collectively down on the neck of Lyndon B. Johnson.

If the administration persists in this course, the Republicans should abandon any concern about other domestic political issues. It will have one, a powerful, overriding one, readymade and just begging to be used.

"DISLIKE HIM FOR THE RIGHT REASONS"

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, recently I was an honored guest at the annual brotherhood dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews held at the Fontainebleau Hotel in Miami Beach. An outstanding address on the meaning of brotherhood was delivered on this occasion by Dr. Henry King Stanford, president of the University of Miami. I was particularly impressed by the clarity of expression and practicality of the approach taken by Dr. Stanford. Because I thought his remarks were of particular value in the quest for better human understanding, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Dr. Henry King Stanford, entitled "Dislike Him for the Right Reasons," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISLIKE HIM FOR THE RIGHT REASONS

(Talk to the National Conference of Christians and Jews annual brotherhood dinner, Fontainebleau Hotel, February 21, 1966, by Henry King Stanford)

Please listen to these pronouncements on brotherhood from a number of reputable sources:

Confucius, sixth century B.C.: "To one who loves to live according to the principles of true manhood without external inducements, and who hates all that is contrary to the principles of true manhood without external threats of punishments, all mankind seems but like one man only."

Buddha, sixth century B.C.: "Pity and need make all flesh kin. There is no caste in blood, which runneth of one hue, nor caste in tears, which trickle salt with all."

Malachi, fifth century B.C.: "Have we not all one Father? Has not one God created us? Why then are we faithless to one another, profaning the covenant of our fathers?"

Jesus, first century A.D.: "For you have one teacher, and you are all brethren. And call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father, who is in heaven."

Mohammed, seventh century A.D.: "Mankind was but one people."

Thus the world's major religions have uniformly proclaimed the common brotherhood of humanity. From these fountainheads of inspiration and insight have flowed exhortations to us laymen to regard our fellow man as a brother, the assumption being that, if we are all children of one God, the Father, then we are members of one family and are, therefore, brothers.

There are only two main observations I wish to make about brotherhood this evening. All else is subheading. The first is to point out the tremendous gulf between precept and practice in the religions even as they espouse the noble sentiments of brotherhood. The second is to modify the definition of brotherhood to deal with men as they are on their present low rung on the ladder of spiritual evolution.

It is easy to be cynical about religion. Voltaire ridiculed the priesthood, or the rabbinate, or the pastorate, by saying once that the "first divine was the first rogue who met the first fool." The implication here is that institutionalized religion is the result of the victory of chicanery over stupidity.

Clergymen have no monopoly on hypocrisy. Laymen, themselves, fare no better from cynical analysis. A friend of mine, a kind of Voltaire reincarnate in the person of a smalltown businessman, made this trenchant observation about a mutual friend: "He prays to God on Sunday and on the public the balance of the week."

Both of these evaluations of religion in action, by the French philosopher and by the smalltown businessman, have the common denominator of betrayal. Ideals, grandiloquently expressed in institutions of religion, have been betrayed by practitioners, among both the clergy and the laity. In fact, I consider the contrast between outward allegiance and inward betrayal to be one of the most serious problems religion faces today or has ever faced over the millenniums.

What comfort can oppressed minorities take from lofty declarations about brotherhood if the sentiments fade into oblivion with the sound of the prophet's voice? Can we blame the reviled and downtrodden for despairing when religion, having become institutionalized following the founder's pronouncements actually rationalizes the existence of caste systems. There are Hindus who defend on religious grounds unconscionable systems of caste and untouchability.

But we need not confine our examples to India. I have heard segregation defended by professing Christians as a divine order. Slavery itself was endorsed by the United States by some clergy and laity as reflecting the will of God. You need only substitute the word "segregation" for the word "slavery" in the newspapers of the South during the period 1850–60 to bring their rationalization of a caste system up to date 100 years later. Reinhold Niebuhr has concluded that in the Western World, "there is no social evil, no form of injustice of the feudal or capitalist order, which has not been sanctified in some way by religious sentiment and thereby rendered more impervious to change."

The challenge to us brotherhood diners, as it is to every apostle of brotherhood, is simply to practice it. Intellectual assent, which we all freely give when we are caught up in the warm glow of the banquet table or the stirring eloquence of pastor, rabbi, or priest, is a passive concept. It is just acceptance. It is belief unignited. Our challenge is to transform this belief into faith, for faith is demonstrated when the concept becomes act; when what we say we believe becomes part of our daily living.

Now this is hard to do, man being what he is. And I come to the second broad observation. Can we not reason together about brotherhood in such a way that, instead of mouthing pious platitudes or swallowing saccharine tablets of good will, we try to make the concept account for man's baser nature as well as his nobler nature?

"What is man that Thou are mindful of him?" is the psalmist's cry to God. It is a petition for understanding, as incisive as it is humble. The question carries the seed of its answer, namely, that God is mindful of man, and the psalmist proceeds to define man's physical-temporal location as a little lower than the Divine, with dominion over the world and its creatures.

But the psalmist really does not answer the question completely. During the ages since the psalmist first appealed for insight, man has been analyzed and evaluated by poets, artists, philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, and a host of others. Some see in man, as his dominant nature, the superstition of the savage; others, the greed of the animal; others, the sexually obsessed phantom of Freud; others, the clever animal of Darwin; others, the economic puppet of Marx; others, the reward seeker of Skinner. Perhaps man is one and all of these things, depending upon the particular facet that the light of inquiry touches.

I attribute man's tardy spiritual development to his basic animal instincts. The urge to survive drives every organism or creature to preempt what it needs to survive. Egocentricity in man has its roots deep in the vestigial remains of his animal existence. How natural for him to be greedy. How understandable for him to be selfish. How logical for him to bristle at the slightest attack, or what he conceives to be the slightest attack upon his ego. We can try to explain the origin of these characteristics without condoning their presence.

Civilization is in continuous battle with the baser instincts of man. Tolerance, a quality certainly prerequisite to the establishment of brotherhood, is an acquired characteristic, not an inherited one. It has to be taught ever anew with each generation.

H. L. Mencken wrote bitingly: "It is a sin to believe evil of others, but it is seldom a mistake." I doubt that man's nature will be dramatically or drastically changed soon. I doubt that we are destined to experience any sudden or rapid progress in the application of Jesus' exhortation. To love one's enemies is a decree of almost incredible demand and of almost impossible fulfillment.

Given this state of human nature, when men often respond to the drives and instincts of a subhuman past, what practical application can we make of brotherhood? I have a down-to-earth suggestion: As you go on disliking your fellow man, by all means try to dislike him for the right reasons. We can hardly restrain our contempt for dishonesty, perfidy, immorality, conceit, and a variety of ungracious and ugly traits. Personalities are bound to clash. Competition provokes animosities. When we feel wronged, it is extremely difficult, nearly impossible, for most of us to turn the other cheek.

But don't dislike your fellowman for the wrong reasons: that he is a Jew, a Negro, a Cuban, a Gentile, a Catholic, or a Protestant. We all know how tempting it is to dislike a man because he is different. His separateness in appearance and in social and religious tradition invites prejudice, because we are creatures of the herd. Animals, which are markedly different, are shunned and ostracized by the group. Their differentness disqualifies them immediately for herd membership. So it is with intuitive responses of human beings. And the individual outside the herd makes such a convenient scapegoat on whom, consciously or unconsciously, to heap our frustrations and place the blame for our failures.

Yet ill will, based upon something so superficial as a different skin color or a different religious commitment, is surely the most illogical of all the prejudices we can muster. I am saying, simply, that what a man is, is what counts. Therefore, dislike him if you have to, but for what he is, and not for how he looks or worships.

These words sound like the disillusionment of a cynic. Let me reassure you. I have boundless faith that men are improving. Slowly, subtly, almost imperceptibly, man is becoming more sensitive and responsive to the agony of his fellow man. I still think man's history on this globe, in spite of all his shortcomings, in spite of all his malevolent disgressions, looks like spiritual as well as biological evolution. With Humanist Herbert J. Muller I marvel at the "wondrous capacity of rickety, forked animal to know a cosmos, and then to feel his way outside it, beyond time and into space, infinity." As he gropes and feels his way along today's dark corridors of human relations, he is approaching ever so slowly the light that is his destiny.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF GUAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in November 1963, the territory of Guam was devastated by Typhoon Karen, a storm of unprecedented severity which inflicted extensive property damage upon the military, civilian, and governmental sectors of the Guam community.

To aid the citizens of Guam in rebuilding their homes and commercial establishments and to assist the island in reconstructing the facilities damaged during World War II, Congress enacted Public Law 88–170, authorizing not to exceed $45 million in loans and grants to provide for the rehabilitation of the Territory.

Section 6 of the 1963 act provides for the creation of a joint Federal and Guam Government Committee to prepare a long-range economic development plan for the island. Under date of March 14, 1966, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall transmitted the major portion of the final report on long-range economic development of Guam, and I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's letter, together with the communication from Robert M. Mangan, Chairman of the Federal-Territorial Commission, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith is the substantive portion of a final report on a long-range economic development plan for the territory of Guam as called for in section 6 of Public Law 88–170, the Guam Rehabilitation Act.

In an interim report of April 6, 1965, we informed you that a Federal-Territorial Commission had been created to supervise and coordinate the preparation of the required economic development plan. The resulting report consists of a three-volume study prepared by a private consulting firm under contract, supplemented by a letter of transmittal from the Commission setting forth specific comments on certain portions of that study. The final volume, consisting of supporting economic and statistical data, is not enclosed but will be transmitted as soon as received from the printer.

Both Governor Guerrero and I accept the analysis, findings, and recommendations of the contractor study, as modified by the comments of the Commission. We consider it an informative and fruitful basis for future private investment and governmental action looking toward Guam's economic development. We recognize, however, that we are dealing with a very dynamic aspect of territorial life and that many of the actions to achieve full economic development will be multilateral, involving the private business community, the local government of Guam, and the Federal Government. We would regard any economic plan, therefore, as a set of guidelines or feasible opportunities for business expansion which must be applied in a flexible manner, tested, modified, or even, in some circumstances, rejected as time and experience dictate.

We also recognize that the plan, to retain its usefulness for the longest possible period, must be reviewed periodically and evaluated in terms of operating results. To that end, the Governor and I have agreed to maintain close, independent surveillance over developments in Guam over the next 12 or 15 months, specifically in terms of the objectives set forth in the planning report. At the end of that period, we are further agreed to undertake a joint review of actions taken and, if indicated, to decide upon any redirection of emphasis which seems necessary.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE FEDERAL-TERRITORIAL COMMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A LONG-RANGE ECONOMIC PLAN FOR GUAM

Subject: Economic development plan for Guam.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.
Hon. MANUEL F. L. GUERRERO,
Governor of Guam.

Section 6 of the act, "To provide for the rehabilitation of Guam and for other purposes," approved November 4, 1963 (Public Law 88–170) requires the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Guam to prepare a long-range economic development plan for Guam and to transmit interim and final reports thereon at specified times.

On April 6, 1965, Secretary Udall forwarded to the President and the two Houses of Congress an interim report which described the contract procedure which had been agreed upon to produce the required plan. That report also indicated the kind and scope of study being conducted by the research contractor and the general status of the project at that time.

The contractor, Planning Research Corp., has now completed its work and submitted a final report. The resulting document, in three parts, has been thoroughly reviewed by the Federal-Territorial Economic Planning Commission. In fact, the Commission was in very close touch with the contractor throughout the study and, in particular, met frequently with the research team during the months when the report was being written. Two of the three volumes (those containing the narrative description, analysis and recommendations) are transmitted herewith; the third, an appendix document containing supporting statistical and other data, is in process of publication and will be forwarded as soon as received.

The Commission recommends that the report of Planning Research Corp. be accepted as the basic planning instrument upon which Guam's economic future can be plotted. In so doing, however, we find it necessary to comment briefly or to express reservations on certain of the recommendations contained in the report itself. As so modified in this letter of transmittal, therefore, we urge that the enclosed volumes be submitted in compliance with the statutory directive that a "report on the plan" be submitted to the President and the Congress.

This report does not attempt, Soviet-style, to set forth a precise blueprint for investment, development and production over a specified period of time. We do not believe that planning of that kind is possible in a free enterprise system, and we do not think that Congress had that concept in mind when it directed that a plan be prepared. Rather, the report analyzes, both generally and specifically, the opportunities which are open to private entrepreneurship in the territory, and the measures which Government (both Federal and territorial) must take to foster and sustain such efforts. As such, we think it provides a realistic and highly useful set of guidelines for economic growth.

If one were required to identify in one phrase the single most critical factor affecting Guam's economic future it would have to be distance and isolation. All discussions begin and end with the importance of transportation and communications. Guam is literally at the end of a 6,000 mile lifeline for the majority of its requirements. For that reason, we regard as highly unrealistic and unacceptable the suggestion made in the report that the Government of Guam be relieved of a burdensome function by leasing port operations to a private firm. The lessons of post-World War II Hawaiian experience are still too close to be dismissed lightly. The threat of widespread bankruptcies, economic collapse and even starvation arising out of a dock strike is real and immediate in an island economy. Operation of this critical link by Government, using civil servants, is the only known device for protecting the public interest.

To a somewhat lesser degree, we have some doubts on one of the tax incentive suggestions presented in the report. The authors indicate that, since the Federal excise tax on articles manufactured in Guam is at the ultimate disposal of the territoral government, it might be waived or remitted to the manufacturer as an incentive to locate on the island. We are by no means sure that this is legally possible under existing law. But, even if it were, the whole question of excise taxes in the revenue structure of all the territories must be reexamined before reaching a decision on this matter. At the moment, we are inclined to believe the policy implications of the proposal for other areas would substantially outweigh any benefit to Guam. At best, therefore, this item must be deferred for more careful evaluation.

In accordance with the specifications provided to the research contractor, this report concentrates on the opportunities which exist for the development of a healthy, job-producing private economy and governmental policies and actions having a direct bearing thereon. Some of the governmental actions, especially in the field of education, will involve substantially increased expenditures for which additional revenues must be found. There must, therefore, be a heavy involvement of the Guam Congress, as well as the Governor, in discharging the responsibilities of government with respect to Guam's economic well-being. In the period since the Organic Act became effective, Guam has not relied exclusively on the revenues it derives from Federal tax collections, but has imposed substantial local levies to meet its needs. However, as the territory moves toward mainland standards of public service, it must also expect to assume a local tax burden comparable to that prevailing in mainland communities. Most immediately, this requires a reexamination of the relatively modest property tax rate now in effect.

Our final point of necessary comment involves an area omitted by the contract survey report—the adequacy of private lending resources. The report, not at all improperly, emphasizes the opportunities which will attract outside capital and management to add economic strength to the territory. At the same time, however, provision must be made for the expansion of existing enterprises to the extent that they are able to participate in the general growth pattern. A shortage of locally available capital has penalized such expansion possibilities in the past. The reasons for this deficiency and the extent of capital needs for existing enterprises are not identified in the report; nor is there any discussion of the part which might be played by a development bank of the kind that has proved highly useful in the more undeveloped areas of the world. Perhaps, as the economy expands as outlined in the report, there will be greater evidence of confidence on the part of existing banking institutions in making more capital available to local entrepreneurs. However, we regard this as a part of the economy requiring more thorough study and we have urged that the Governor concentrate his own resources on it in the immediate future.

The preceding comment is illustrative of the fact that no economic study or plan should be regarded as final or static. It can only be a picture of the situation at a given time, to be regarded as a base document upon which to build dynamic action programs which will themselves change the economic picture portrayed in the study. Even as this research effort was being carried out, for example, the Guam community made significant economic decisions on its own motion, both public and private. Creation of a Guam Economic Development Authority, with broad powers to attract new industries, is a major example of this forward momentum. Legislative action to impose reasonable production quotas on certain items eligible for duty-free entry into the mainland market is also worthy of note. Within the past several days, it was announced that basic economy fares had been reduced by more than 10 percent ($295 to $265) for the Guam-Honolulu segment of trans-Pacific air travel. Thus, one of the objectives sought by the report has been achieved, at least in part.

We should expect that change will be the hallmark of the time for Guam's economic life, especially if this report is to have the impact we anticipate. Change may, and undoubtedly will, involve errors as well as wise judgments. Moreover, as the report points out, economic improvement for the community of Guam need not depend entirely on a gross increase in the level of business activity; replacement of alien labor by locally developed skills, substitution of locally produced goods and services for imports, and normal patterns of outmigration will all have a favorable influence on job opportunities in Guam. This is the way of a free economy and is to be encouraged rather than feared or subjected to excessive controls.

In the period immediately ahead, however, trends in the Guam economic scene should be watched very carefully both by the Government of Guam and the Department of the Interior. We would urge most earnestly that a follow-up evaluation of the island's progress be conducted at the end of a year or 15-month period. Such evaluation should be conducted jointly by the Secretary and the Governor in order to assess the progress made in implementing this report as well as to determine whether further measures are required to realize its goal and objectives.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT M. MANGAN,
Chairman
(For the Commission).

L.B.J.'S FIGHT FOR TRUTH IN LENDING NOW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I was delighted to note that President Johnson emphasized the need for truth-in-lending legislation in today's consumer message. Interest costs are a key topic of conversation among economists today. The Federal Reserve Board recently used an increase in interest rates as a potent economic tool. Yet, as the consumer message pointed out, many consumers have no information on how credit costs relate to the cost of the article being furnished. Many others pay higher prices for credit than reputable lenders are charging.

Legislation to require lenders and merchants to disclose to borrowers and customers what the finance charges are—in dollars, and in terms of an annual percentage rate that everyone can understand—has been pending in Congress for more than 6 years.

It has been considered by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee at considerable length. There have been exhaustive public hearings on the bills which have been introduced and reintroduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The pros and cons have been thoroughly aired.

Now is the time for action.

President Johnson, in his recent annual Economic Report to Congress, stressed that business and labor both have a responsibility for preserving the stability of costs and prices. He emphasized, too, that the consumer also has a responsibility for holding the price line.

The President went on to say:

> While the growth of consumer credit has contributed to our rising standard of living, confusing practices in disclosing credit rates and the cost of financing have made it difficult for consumers to shop for the best buy in credit.

He followed up with this statement:

> Truth-in-lending legislation would provide consumers the necessary information, by requiring a clear statement of the cost of credit and the annual rate of interest.

Opponents of this legislation have raised a hue and cry about the difficulty merchants and lenders would have in telling their customers what the finance charges are, in dollars and in terms of an annual percentage rate. This, of course, is nonsense.

The same tired old arguments are always trotted out when Congress has before it legislation such as the Douglas bill. Members of Congress were told, back in the 1930's, that passage of legislation setting up the Securities and Exchange Commission would ruin the stock market. We got the same fearful story when Congress, in the 1930's, considered and passed the Wool Products Labeling Act. We heard the same tales when it came to legislation prohibiting the interstate shipment of highly flammable fabrics, and more recently, when Congress was engaged in giving the consumer greater protection against untested and improperly labeled drug products.

We have, of course, a responsibility to hear out the arguments against all legislation. However, the interests of the consumer must not be subordinated year after year to the vocal fears and apprehensions of merchants and lenders. We have listened to them—and found their fears groundless, their arguments unconvincing. The interest of the public should now prevail.

Legislation requiring full disclosure of finance charges, whether in the purchase of goods or the borrowing of money, is long overdue. The time for action is now.

PREVENT THESE TERRIBLE DEATHS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I rise in support of President Johnson's excellent proposals in the area of consumer protection. I fully share his concern for the health and safety of all our citizens.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleagues have before them legislation, S.

2404, which I introduced in the 1st session of this Congress that comes to grips with one of the key problems mentioned by President Johnson in his message to us today. I refer, of course, to the problem of proper labeling and packaging of children's aspirin.

The Food and Drug Administration has told us that 125 little children each year—sometimes more than that—die from accidental overdoses of aspirin.

Why should this situation prevail? Why should our children be exposed to such a possibility as accidental death from aspirin? The answer, Mr. President, lies in the fact that the packaging of children's aspirin does not take into consideration the curiosity of children and the simple wish on the part of children to eat candy or anything that is candy-like.

Here is where legislation is needed. We must give the Food and Drug Administration the kind of support it needs to prevent this terrible incidence of children's deaths. We can do this by authorizing limitations on the size of retail packaging of children's aspirin. As I have said before we should move promptly to limit these needless deaths.

THE PROPOSED FIREARMS LEGISLATION—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this week the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency is meeting in executive session to consider several bills concerning firearms legislation. The subcommittee has a difficult task because of the confusion and emotionalism that have attended this subject.

The proponents of this antifirearms legislation have said, in effect, stop the sale of guns and you will stop crime. Well, that reasoning just does not correspond with the facts. The FBI's 1964 uniform crime report indicates firearms were involved in the commission of approximately 4 percent of the 2.6 million serious crimes committed in this country in 1964.

Thus, even were the proponents of this legislation to eliminate all the firearms in the country, the serious problem of crime in our streets would still be present. Moreover, the same report indicates that most of these serious crimes involving firearms were committed in the big cities. Therefore, I cannot support any legislation that purposes to curb, from coast to coast and from border to border within this Nation, the existence and enjoyment of firearms in the hands of responsible citizens and careful sportsmen.

My own State of Nebraska is 1 of 13 States wherein our legislature has adopted and sent to the Congress a resolution in opposition to this proposed gun legislation.

There is no disagreement that guns should not be sold to persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, drug addicts, and so forth. And there is no disagreement that the sale of firearms to juveniles should be subject to parental consent. But these are areas where legislation by the States can be encouraged without being unduly harsh with the American sportsmen.

Finally, when I entered this body, I took a solemn oath to support the Constitution of the United States. Right at the very top of the list of amendments to that Constitution are the words "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." This is a fundamental right, and a personal freedom guaranteed to all of the people of the United States. This right should not be denied to our citizens of good repute so long as they use their firearms in lawful pursuits.

And when, and if, a limitation of this constitutional right becomes necessary in the public interest, such limitation should be based on the circumstances involved in a particular State, or city, and accomplished by appropriate State or local legislation.

I ask that the resolution adopted by the Nebraska Legislature relating to this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 50 OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA, 75TH SESSION

Whereas antifirearms legislation now being considered by the Congress if adopted will seriously impair the rights of legitimate hunters and target shooters to enjoy their chosen sports; and

Whereas the history of such legislation is that the criminal and psychotic elements are little affected thereby; and

Whereas the second amendment to the U.S. Constitution sets forth the rights of citizens who have not lost their civil rights to keep and bear arms; and

Whereas tight controls on firearms as attempted in New York and Puerto Rico have not deterred the criminal classes but have only served to disarm the law-abiding citizen; and

Whereas a situation in which our law-abiding citizen would become effectively disarmed by administrative action of governmental bureaus or by the necessity of complying with complicated and obtuse administrative procedure would be intolerable in these United States; and

Whereas control of crime and misuse of firearms is best accomplished by a combination of effective and stringent law enforcement and justice directed against the criminal himself, not the weapon, coupled with education and alleviation of the known factors that cause crime; and

Whereas no nation in modern times has fallen to tyranny without first imposing upon itself a strict system of firearms controls and registration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled: That this body, (1) is opposed to Federal legislation which interferes with the rights of our law-abiding citizens under the second amendment to the U.S. Constitution or which interferes with the rights of such citizens to transport sporting arms and ammunition in interstate commerce; (2) favors enforceable legislation at the Federal level which provides stringent and enforceable penalties against the criminal misuse of firearms and ammunition shipped in interstate commerce.

The legislature directs the clerk of the legislature to spread this resolution upon the journal of this body and to furnish suitably prepared copies thereof to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to the Nebraska congressional delegation, and to Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut.

PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
President of the Legislature.

Attest:

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

NEED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT LOANS AT PURDUE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have recently entered in the RECORD the emphatic statements of officers of Indiana University and of Notre Dame concerning the need for continuance at full strength of the National Defense Education Act loan program. I have now received a similar letter from L. J. Freehafer, vice president and treasurer of Purdue University. His letter indicates the following problems with the situation in its present state:

There is great urgency for resolving present uncertainty.

The time is extremely short for matching fund arrangements, needed for the substitute of private loans.

Availability from banks, and availability in time, is questionable.

The shift to banks hampers financial counseling by the school.

Commitments have been made to National Defense Education Act which should be honored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freehafer's letter may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Lafayette, Ind., March 16, 1966.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: President Hovde is away from the campus for several days, and your letter has come to my desk for reply. I have consulted with our financial aid officers relative to your inquiries and relate to you the reaction I have received from them.

Some of the problems that are anticipated and the disrupting effects on our financial aid program are as follows:

1. At this very time we should be advising our students and prospective students as to the amount of aid they might expect. Presently, we are not able to give the slightest indication that financial aid may be forthcoming.

2. The timing problem is compounded by the need to match educational opportunity grants with other institutional financial aid funds. We are not likely to get bank commitments in time to serve the matching function, and our own funds are not sufficient to meet the matching requirement.

3. There is serious doubt that the commercial bank loan program can be successfully launched in time to serve the students' need by September 1. Another critical situation, locally at least, is the reluctance of banks to invest their moneys in student loans. The return on their investment is far less than can be realized by investing elsewhere.

4. The commercial bank loan program is removing the important phase of counseling from the campus to the hometown bank, and

we believe that it is fair to say that the banks are not generally as aware as our financial aid officers of the unique circumstances of college students.

5. We have made commitments, though not legally binding, to many of our students; should the national defense loan program be discontinued, we must withdraw these commitments. Just how many students would be able to continue with their education, and the number that would be required to drop out, would be pure speculation. Just one withdrawal, because of lack of financial assistance, would be too many.

6. Through the Higher Education Act of 1965, institutions are charged with the challenge of seeking out capable high school students to continue their educational pursuits by making conditional commitments of financial aid. Certainly the institution is in no position to assure a promising high school student that his hometown bank will give him financial assistance 2 or 3 years hence.

We here at Purdue University have been quite pleased with the national defense student loan program. We would like to see many, many more needy students gain the benefit of the program. Definitely we are not in favor of discontinuation of the program.

One final comment concerning this pending legislation. Should the national defense student loan program be discontinued, we strongly urge that it be "phased out" rather than abruptly halted. Too many of our students are dependent upon these loans to enable them to complete their education.

If we may provide you with additional information or comments, please call on us.

Yours very truly,

L. J. Freehafer,
Vice President and Treasurer.

ESSAY ENTITLED "WHAT HANDICAPPED WORKERS ARE CONTRIBUTING TO MY COMMUNITY"

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, each year State committees on employment of the handicapped sponsor an essay contest calling on young people to express for themselves and for the total community the valuable contribution which handicapped workers are making to our society. Certainly we need to be reminded often of the high level of skill and understanding which handicapped people have attained by asserting great personal strength of character against awesome physical disabilities which, happily, most of us are spared. It always needs reemphasizing that the handicapped have proven themselves excellently equipped to fill a wide variety of jobs. America should be both thankful for and proud of the high quality contribution made by these men and women who have refused to be defeated by the unusual hardships life has thrown in their paths. The triumphs of the handicapped are triumphs of the spirit translated into productive activity in the mainstream of social life. This year Idaho's winner in the Ability Counts contest is Ingrid Peterson, a Boise High School senior who has written a perceptive and forceful essay about how handicapped workers are contributing to her own community.

I ask unanimous consent that her essay be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Idaho's First-Prize-Winning Essay, 1966: "What Handicapped Workers Are Contributing to My Community"

(By Ingrid Peterson, Boise High School senior)

A typical weekday in my community begins.

The busy executive of the large corporation jots down in his notebook a point he particularly wishes to discuss at the local school board meeting that evening and then attacks the mountain of work before him.

In the studio downtown, the stocky announcer takes a deep breath, smiles into the black eye of the television camera, and confidently begins his daily newscast.

The employee in the office of the State penitentiary answers the phone with a cheerful "good morning," efficiently handles the caller's inquiry, and resumes his typing.

In other locations across the town, the Lieutenant Governor is presiding at a dedication ceremony; the owner and manager of the rapidly expanding chain of service stations is directing the operation of his flourishing business; the graying middle-aged woman is guiding the sorting of donated articles; a young girl is working at household chores under the supervision of her employer; the talented artist is adding the final shadings to her oil painting that will be displayed in the local art show; and the linotype operator is setting the type for the tickets ordered by a local amateur acting group.

Yes, this is a typical working day in my community. But in some ways these workers are atypical. The school board president and the Lieutenant Governor walk with braces on their legs; the television announcer is a polio victim; a seeing-eye dog lies patiently at the feet of the employee in the penitentiary office; the service station manager exists in an iron lung; the sorting director and the artist are both victims of cerebral palsy; the household helper returns each evening to the State hospital for the mentally retarded; and the linotype operator never hears his noisy machine.

These people represent a variety of social, intellectual, cultural, financial, and political interests. Each is an active, and, in most cases, a self-supporting individual who has accepted his limitations and risen above them. Each has shown his ability, enthusiasm, determination, and willingness to work. As each overcame his handicaps, he removed himself from the group of handicapped workers who need the protection of the altruistic organizations of our town. This in itself is a real achievement requiring partisan self-reliance and repeated solid attempts. In his new hard-earned freedom from disability, he is today a citizen contributing to the work-a-day world, leading in the business, political, and cultural life of our town, sharing responsibility for the good life of the community.

In some ways, the handicapped worker is superior to the able-bodied worker. The noise of a busy shop doesn't distract the deaf, and the sensitive fingers of the blind handle delicate precision parts with extra care. The handicapped worker often has a special spirit that, once he has overcome the physical and psychological problems, remains with him. This spirit serves as an incentive to others who feel that they have been afflicted with more than their share of disadvantages. In reality, each of us is handicapped in some way. Perhaps we are forced to wear glasses to improve our eyesight, or a hearing aid to sharpen our hearing. Some of us have a harder time learning or remembering. For all of us, the spirit shown by the handicapped worker of accepting his disabilities and capitalizing on his assets is a valuable one.

So please do not underestimate the performance, loyalty, spirit, and service of the so-called handicapped. Give them the honor and recognition they so richly deserve. By the way, Mr. Able-bodied Worker, what is your contribution to your community?

EXTENSION OF HATCH ACT TO EMPLOYEES OF COMMUNITY ACTION AND VISTA PROGRAMS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, support continues to grow for my bill, S. 2908, which would amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to extend the Hatch Act to the employees of the Community Action and VISTA programs, who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal funds.

On February 25 the Los Angeles Evening & Sunday Herald Examiner in a most persuasive editorial supported my amendment. I agree with the editorial that "the Johnson administration, should support the Murphy amendment. Political looting and efforts of politicians to improve their patronage could wreck the entire program beyond repair. We cannot afford to play politics with poverty."

In addition, Mr. President, I might say I have received correspondence from citizens across the Nation expressing approval of the Murphy amendment. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Herald-Examiner be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Poverty War Politics

Senator George Murphy has introduced a bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in an effort to discourage politics in the war on poverty. This bill would bring employees of the community action program and Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) under the Federal Hatch Act.

The Hatch Act specifies that persons who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal funds are prohibited by law from engaging in any political activity. Most Federal employees are covered by this law.

The importance of Senator Murphy's bill lies in the fact that it would tend to prevent administrators of the war on poverty from using their power to build up their political patronage by promising jobs to friends or political associates.

It would prevent them from announcing candidacy for any national, State, county, or municipal office. It would prohibit their canvassing or soliciting support of their candidacy or the candidacy of others. It would not allow them to solicit, collect, receive, or disperse or handle political contributions.

The Johnson administration should support the Murphy amendment. The war on poverty was an administration-sponsored program from the start. Political looting and efforts of politicians to improve their patronage could wreck the entire program beyond repair. We cannot afford to play politics with poverty.

CHEERS FOR SENATOR JACKSON

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun printed a very perceptive editorial on Saturday, March 12, praising

Senator Henry M. Jackson for his speech urging Congress not to undervalue the importance of the Atlantic Alliance as the center of world power.

As the editorial points out, Senator Jackson's speech makes an effective rebuttal to the latest pronouncement of President de Gaulle of France. The Sun has done well to focus our attention on the Senator's praiseworthy advice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Cheers for a Senator," in the March 12, 1966, edition of the Baltimore Sun be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cheers for a Senator

Senator Jackson, of Washington, deserves the cheers of citizens who believe that Western Europe is an important part of the world—more important to America than southeast Asia, if a comparison must be made. Senator Jackson, who has taken a useful part on other occasions in drawing attention to major questions of foreign policy, made a speech in the Senate Thursday in which he joined the respectable company of Americans who think we may be so preoccupied with Vietnam that we are magnifying its importance to us (and to the rest of the world) and are neglecting other areas which demand continuing attention. It is possible not only to take such a position and support President Johnson's policy of firm restraint in the conduct of the war, but to argue that the eventual settlement of the war will be facilitated—and on terms we can accept—if we keep it in perspective.

Mr. Jackson's advice to other members of Congress—and it might be noted that his remarks apply to fellow Democrats more than to Republicans—was to "stop talking so much about Vietnam." He suggested that the Atlantic community "is still the decisive area and needs our national attention." He noted that "America and Europe, linked in the Atlantic Alliance, are the center of world power—the great power against which the Communist so-called 'wave of the future' can be broken."

President de Gaulle apparently inspired the Senator's speech by his moves to reshape the Atlantic Alliance in his own image. The United States, Canada, Great Britain, Italy, West Germany, and other NATO members, quite properly, do not agree with de Gaulle's proposals to give France a special status, but they must exercise an initiative of their own to adapt NATO to changing conditions.

COLUMNIST'S STORY: HER EMPHYSEMA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a columnist for the Wilmington, Del., Morning News, Mrs. Constance Brown, of Georgetown, has written a series of four clear and informative articles on her experience with emphysema.

This is a disease, she points out, which few people had heard of as recently as 5 years ago. Unfortunately, it is apparently on the increase, with smoking and air pollution both being cited as causes.

Mrs. Brown is a well-known and respected newspaperwoman, and her well-written articles have helped public understanding of emphysema. In the interest of seeing that more people have the benefit of her information, I ask unanimous consent that her articles from the Morning News be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Mar. 7, 1966]

Columnist's Story: Her Emphysema

(Note.—This is the first of a four-part series in which Constance Brown, a Morning News columnist, describes her experiences with emphysema.)

(By Constance Brown)

I was halfway down the staircase at the Dover store during the height of the Christmas rush when I knew I did not have the strength to go farther.

I could neither continue to the bottom nor turn around and climb back to the top. So I stood quietly where I was, my hand resting on the railing.

There was no spasm of gasping for breath, no dizziness—just an exhaustion greater than I had ever known.

A group of little boys, faces glowing with mischief, were romping up the stairs. When they encountered me, they quieted down and walked up soberly.

Two women asked me if there were anything they could do but I shook my head and put on my Mona Lisa smile, having long ago been convinced that the mysterious smile on that famous portrait was simply stuck there by the sitter while her mind wandered off where it chose.

I forced myself to breathe the stale air out from my lungs, over and over, taking slow ingoing breaths through my nose. When I was able, I went on down to the bottom of the stairs where I put a pill under my tongue.

WON'T ATTEMPT THAT ANYMORE

As I walked off into the crowd, however, I chalked off one more activity from the blackboard of my life and knew that I would not attempt to shop by myself in crowds again.

For I am one of the 1,000 or so Delawareans suffering from a respiratory ailment known as emphysema, and their biggest burden is the slow shrinking of their circle of activity through debilitation and exhaustion.

When I first realized the extent of my disability I wouldn't go anywhere outside my home and familiar territory for fear I might become ill in public among strangers. I soon learned that strangers are as kind as friends in time of trouble if the problem is quiet and simple.

As I tottered over to the millinery counter in that Dover store and stood there, staring at the hats, I realized I was getting my own taste of the sights and sound of Christmas but seemingly from a different world.

I thought of two people I had known who were alive last Christmas but who had emphysema and now were dead.

One was Vollie C. Gray, Sussex County coroner, who died in July after many years of misery. He was only 52 and was the first person I knew who had the disease.

It was about Christmas time in 1964 that I saw him last, in the corridors of the Sussex County courthouse. He had come there to be sworn in after his reelection as coroner but told me he found he couldn't go up the stairs to the judge's chambers. The judge had told him he would perform the ceremony downstairs.

LIFELONG FRIEND LOSES STRUGGLE

The other person was a lifelong friend who moved with my family from Portland, Oreg., to Indianapolis at a time when the soft coal smoke hung in ribbons in the air. All six of us developed bronchial trouble which remained with us all our lives. He died in May after the usual long years of struggle.

During the last few years, there have been a surprising number of Delawareans stricken with emphysema and many earnest people are devoting themselves to a study of how it can be prevented and eventually cured.

As it is, there is no sure cure and thus the disease drags on and on.

When you first tell people you have it, there is expression of shock and concern but when the months and even years roll by and you do not seem any worse nor yet any better, you begin to feel embarrassed.

EMPHYSEMA WAS AN ENIGMA

What is emphysema? Few people, including myself, had heard of it 5 years ago. My large dictionary, printed in 1954, gives "heaves" as one of the definitions. Under "heaves" it says "a disease of horses in which breathing is difficult."

The problem results from the simple fact that the human body needs oxygen and must get rid of used air. Though long ago man began the study of what sort of food to eat and how to fight constipation, the faithful lungs were performing their functions unnoticed.

Automatically and steadily the lungs brought in the vital oxygen and pushed out the carbon dioxide which might otherwise be poisonous.

But in emphysema, the unappreciated lungs stop fulfilling their function. They lose their elasticity much as does the elastic in underclothing that has been washed too often or in water too hot.

You can throw the underclothing into the trash can and buy something new. But you are stuck with the damaged lungs for the rest of your life.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Mar. 8, 1966]

Often Reflects Cosmopolitan Life—Smoking, Pollution Spur Emphysema

(By Constance Brown)

Just as ulcers are considered a status symbol for busy executives, it seemed for a while that emphysema was a symbol of the vigorous cosmopolitan life.

Some emphysema patients I know were newspaper people or those in professions that scorned the disciplined life. They might even, in the creative glow of their prime, have felt it worthwhile to continue as they were even if they knew that emphysema would be the result.

My grandfather, who was a Congregational minister and in good health until his death at 95, often remarked, "The devil has no happy old men."

I feel sure he would say that emphysema is the payoff for too much smoking and drinking and sitting up all hours in smoke-filled rooms, for pushing through snow drifts without proper boots and for ignoring the need for regular eating and sleeping hours.

But none of this is strictly true, though the great majority of emphysema sufferers have been heavy smokers. The patient for whom I feel the greatest sympathy is an elderly Sussex woman who never smoked a cigarette in her life and, like my grandfather, considers the Bohemian life the work of the devil.

There are different types of emphysema, as I understand it. Mine is the garden variety, following years of chronic bronchitis.

Without any medical experience I believe I can point out those who are heading toward emphysema. They smoke incessantly and have deep coughs which they pass off lightly as "only a cigarette cough."

Early diagnosis is perhaps more needed in emphysema than in many other ailments and you can get it now. A few years ago, if you complained of shortness of breath, a physician probably would say, "Go home and lose 20 pounds" or something of the sort.

But now, physicians are fully alert to the menace. If there is something lacking in the present picture it would seem to be in the area of mental therapy, both for the patient and for his family.

It is bad enough for everyone to know that adjustments must be made for a year or so in lung cancer, with possibilities of successful surgery, but it is much worse to face indefinite years of slow deterioration.

Sometimes it is difficult for families to realize how tired the victim feels and they wonder at what appears to be laziness, extreme irritability and lack of interest.

Most emphysema patients would, I believe, rather do something useful if it is within their capabilities. One man I know scorned any type of kitchen work when he was at his productive best. After contracting emphysema, he cheerfully offered to wash the dishes for his household and they let him do it, giving him all the time he needed for sitting down occasionally.

One of the reasons for the earlier detection of the disease and its subsequent improved treatment is the fact that the Delaware Tuberculosis and Health Society has fought emphysema and some other lung impairments along with its tuberculosis campaign. Proceeds from Christmas seals are used for this purpose.

It has sponsored research, distributed literature and purchased equipment and has aided the respiratory disease unit of the Emily P. Bissell Hospital.

Most of the authorities now state that heavy cigarette smoking is a probable cause of emphysema. There are other likely causes also listed, including employment where there is much dust or fumes or other types of air pollution.

Emphasis is placed on cigarette smoking, since this is the first generation to grow old as heavy smokers. It is also the first generation to grow old on automobile exhaust fumes, atom bombs and pesticide sprays.

But since smoking is under the control of the individual, it gives something tangible with which to work.

Every physician will ask at once how much you smoke. Medical authorities say 20 years of heavy smoking is enough to put your lungs in pretty bad shape.

I have smoked about two packs a day for more than 45 years and may provide something of a record for a woman. I learned to smoke when I was overseas in World War I.

But at that time, emphysema was known only as a word in a medical dictionary.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Mar. 9, 1966]

DETECTED IN TIME EMPHYSENA CAN BE HALTED—IF

(By Constance Brown)

If emphysema is detected early enough a physician can control it by prescribing medication and a few simple breathing exercises.

Most cases, however, aren't caught until they are beyond this easy treatment stage and they eventually require a visit to a pulmonary function laboratory for elaborate tests.

There are several such laboratories on the peninsula but I was sent to the one which probably is best known, at the Delaware division of the Wilmington Medical Center. It is headed by Dr. James M. Hofford.

I have had dozens of physical examinations of the type in which you wind up on a precariously high table clutching a sheet. Nothing like that in a pulmonary laboratory. Just an array of mysterious gadgets all of which I held in some degree of awe.

I already had used the wrong entrance to the hospital and then the wrong elevator so by the time I arrived at the laboratory I felt I had done my exercises for the day.

When Miss Geraldine Wozniak, a nurse at the lab, asked me to warm up by walking up and down the hall blowing into a balloon, I flatly refused.

This firmly established me as an uncooperative and temperamental patient who had to be humored and paved the way for my nervous questions whenever a new gadget was introduced.

My fear of unfamiliar medical practice stemmed from my childhood when I had a tooth pulled by a strange dentist in a small town where the train on which I was traveling made a long stop.

"This won't hurt you a bit," the dentist told me, and then proceeded to yank out my tooth without benefit of pain killer.

I kept as quiet as I could during most of the processes at the Delaware division but protested feebly when they clamped a mysterious gadget on my ear. This, as was patiently explained to me, is an oximeter which uses light beams to measure the amount of oxygen in the blood.

There also is the spirometer to measure breathing and the balloons to measure ventilation. Later, you have sessions with the physical therapy department which teaches you exercises in breathing.

Through all this I was an outpatient, which means you report each day and, after the tests, leave the hospital for whatever roost you have provided yourself.

My daughter accompanied me and engaged a room for us at the Hotel Du Pont.

"We will have a wonderful time," she said. "We will do a lot of shopping and you can go anywhere you wish—to the University of Delaware, the State chamber of commerce office, the News-Journal office. It will be like old times."

I had mentioned to her that Tom Malone occasionally had written about the Brandywine Room and she said "we will invite him here to have a drink with us."

The way it turned out, when I got back to the hotel each day from the hospital I simply flopped into a chair and refused to move.

The only shopping we did was when I remembered that I had forgotten my tooth brush and the only telephoning we did was for room service.

As I sat there I might have thought how delighted I would have been only a few years ago to have been just where I was and to have had so much free time at my disposal.

Or I might have thought that this probably would be the last time I would embark upon a festive junket and that hereafter I would stick close to my own home.

But actually I thought neither of these things. I just sat there like the mountain man who remarked, "Sometimes we set and think and sometimes we just set."

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Mar. 10, 1966]

IN EMPHYSEMA TWO VOICES BOSS SUFFERER

(By Constance Brown)

In the privacy of my own home, I have become two people.

One is a fatalistic disbeliever in all things medical, who would like nothing better than to lie quietly on a couch and let nature take her own course.

The other is a whip-cracking boss who is constantly barking, "Take your medicine," "Do your breathing exercises," "Eat your spinach," etc.

The boss wins out as a rule, but now and then I am able to sneak in a lazy day on my own.

When I first realized I was ill with emphysema, about 5 years ago, we built a downstairs bathroom with stall shower. It is large enough for a cot and the one I had was deliciously soft and swayback and I could lie comfortably on it watching television through the door.

However, I now have daily breathing exercises—while walking, climbing stairs, sitting down, and lying prone. So I have grudgingly put a board between the mattress and the springs. It makes a perfect work table but is a little hard on the comfort.

I also figured out that I could combine the sitting-down exercises, in which you exhale, bend at the waist and then inhale, with somewhat slovenly cleaning by vacuum or wet mop.

But the lying-down exercises require all my attention. I have not yet worked out any way to accomplish any simple duty of life while lying prone with a 5-pound bag of sugar on my diaphragm.

The therapy departments usually provide a 5-pound bag of sand when you exercise under their care, but they said any similar setup would be all right and the sugar works out nicely.

I keep a balloon at my desk and stop now and then as I type and blow into it. This is a big help in getting rid of the carbon dioxide and it amuses any visiting children.

I use only basic exercises, but I have a booklet depicting a wild assortment which would keep me busy all day and use up most of my declining energy. In one of these suggested exercises, you beat your chest like Tarzan.

As in heart trouble, it's hard to know just how much exercise to take, though extreme shortness of breath is a good red light.

I have to crack the whip at myself in the matter of regular living, too. Good general health is important in all circumstances, though I completely ignored this in my days of vigor.

Meat and potatoes had been my main diet, eaten when and where I chose. Now I force myself to consume "rabbit's food" and at reasonably regular hours. I also try to go to bed and to get up at scheduled hours.

"What on earth is the use of all this self-discipline, this changing of my pattern of living for the doubtful purpose of prolonging a little longer a life that is only half a life anyhow?" I will ask myself.

Then I remember that the study of emphysema is only now beginning in earnest and that many sincere people are devoting great scientific knowledge and energy trying to learn how to control and eventually to cure it.

The Delaware Tuberculosis and Health Society is sponsoring research within the State, donating valuable equipment to hospitals and will join the national society in an upcoming all-out campaign.

Though new cases of emphysema are discovered every day even in a small State like Delaware, new ways to help also are being discovered.

I recently acquired an intermittent positive pressure breathing machine in my home. These are used mostly in hospitals but the treatments there, unless you are hospitalized, are not frequent enough to be of great value.

Perhaps I am concentrating too hopefully on such a gadget but hope itself has considerable therapeutic value.

It is interesting to have been a part of this tidal wave of emphysema sweeping the country, and I hope still to be there when it is under control.

PACKAGING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most vexing promotional devices in the American marketplace is the "cents off" deal.

Consumers writing to Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson's office register many complaints about such arrangements. Sample letters sound like this:

> Can you enlighten me as to why there are numerous products on the supermarket shelves with labels noting that this or that product is 2 cents, 3 cents, 5 cents off? My question is "off what?" I believe that the consumer should definitely know what the true or real price of a product is before the so-called discount is noted. I have yet to be told what the price of any product or item is before the "discount." It would be a great service to the consumer if this were properly investigated.

The truth-in-packaging bill would curb this kind of device to confuse and exploit the American consumer. The bill would grant the FTC power to ban certain "cents-off" promotions when there is strong evidence that the advertised reduction is not actually passed on to the consumer.

This is only one of the many such devices which the bill would curb or eliminate—to the lasting advantage of American consumers. This proposal has the overwhelming support of the vast majority of American housewives. I believe that it should also have ours.

HAWAII AND EAST-WEST CENTER READY TO SERVE SOUTHEAST ASIA IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on February 8, following conferences in Hawaii between the President of the United States and the Chief of State and Prime Minister of South Vietnam, the declaration of Honolulu was issued.

In this significant declaration, the two heads of state pledged themselves not only to defense against aggression and to the unending quest for peace, but also to the work of social change, to the goal of free self-government, to the attack on hunger, ignorance, and disease.

There is widespread agreement that peace and pacification in South Vietnam must be accompanied by progress and hope for a better life of millions of South Vietnamese if peace is to endure and freedom flourish.

With the Honolulu conferences came a decided emphasis on increased U.S. assistance to South Vietnam in the fields of education, health, agriculture, and economic development.

About this same time, the Congress was taking action on legislature to authorize U.S. financial participation in the Asian Development Bank, a new instrumentality established to promote economic development in nations of southeast Asia.

These examples are concrete evidence of the firm and sincere desire of the people of the United States to help the peoples of southeast Asia to develop their resources, to stabilize their economies, to produce more food, to build schools and educate their children, to eradicate disease, to imbue them with hope for a better life for themselves and their families.

This is an immense undertaking, for in many respects southeast Asia with its millions of people has been slumbering in the primitive past, far from the mainstream of world progress.

This is an imperative undertaking, for advancement of freedom and the attainment of peace in that vast portion of the globe depend upon strong, viable, and independent nations in southeast Asia.

This is a noble undertaking, for it stretches out the hands of the strong to help the weak in the true spirit of the brotherhood of man.

In the total effort to help southeast Asia, the people of the mid-Pacific State of Hawaii are equipped to make special contributions. Because of their multiethnic background, multicultural society, and multilingual capability, the people of Hawaii stand ready to serve in the vital role of establishing rapport with our neighbors in southeast Asia. We can serve as bridges of understanding and communication.

Because Hawaii is located in the subtropical zone, our State has many experts in the field of tropical agriculture and horticulture, who can give urgently needed assistance to nations of southeast Asia having similar climatic and other farm conditions.

Hawaii has fine educators, public administrators, doctors, nurses, public health personnel, businessmen in many fields, financial experts, and many other specialists whose skills could be imparted to people in southeast Asia.

There is located in Hawaii an ideal instrument to serve as coordinator of these efforts and as a solid link in the chain of effort moving between the United States and southeast Asia. I refer to the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West, authorized by Congress in 1960 and already an established institution.

I want to urge the President and the Secretary of State to make fullest possible use of the East-West Center in the program for socioeconomic improvement for South Vietnam and in the program to promote development of southeast Asia.

Against the long sweep of history, the people of America finally came to recognize the importance of a strong friendly Western Europe to our national security and prosperity. After World War II, our Nation rendered substantial aid to the devastated countries of Western Europe, and they became strong nations once again and members of the Western European alliance with us. There have been no major wars there in the past 21 years.

But in the Asia-Pacific area, our Nation has been involved in two costly wars during the past 15 years. By now it should be clear that it would be to our distinct advantage to build strong, friendly nations in Asia so that we can have the opportunity for peace in that hemisphere.

It is time America turned its eyes and its brains to the task of developing southeast Asia as a bulwark of peace. To ignore the unrest of millions of people weary of centuries of hopelessness and abject poverty would be too shortsighted, indeed, for the area would continue to be the spawning ground for turbulence and war.

I strongly urge the administration to draw upon the resources and capabilities of the people of Hawaii, who are specially qualified to serve in this good cause and upon the East-West Center which already has ties of good will and friendship with many nations in the Asia and the Pacific area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a resolution on this subject recently approved by the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 12

Whereas the tide of events in southeast Asia presses heavily for world attention; and

Whereas those nations of the world that have learned how to organize human and material resources in ways to produce an abundance have recognized the human imperative of helping the peoples of other nations break the shackles of hunger and poverty; and

Whereas the President of the United States in his recent Honolulu Conference with the leaders of South Vietnam has reaffirmed this imperative and pledged the United States to a new and effective effort to help the peoples of southeast Asia achieve a better life; and

Whereas government-to-government assistance alone may not be understood, and contributions of material goods alone may not introduce new ways in cultures strange to such ways; and

Whereas the values at stake in southeast Asia call for all people, each in their own way, to contribute what they can best contribute; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii, fortunate in their multicultural and multilingual background, can make unique contributions to the cause of economic and social progress in southeast Asia; and

Whereas Hawaii by reason of both its people and its geographic location offers a felicitous meeting ground for people from both East and West who seek to understand one another and work together in a common cause; and

Whereas the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii is uniquely constituted to bring together cultural leaders, scholars, educators, and technicians from both East and West for purposes of mutual understanding and joint effort, having in residence a nucleus of such cultural leaders, scholars, educators, and technicians and having also an alumni of such leaders in many parts of the world; and

Whereas the East-West Center is known both East and West as a place of sanctuary for candid expression and joint efforts between peoples of both East and West: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1966, respectfully suggests that the East-West Center promptly initiate all appropriate actions to bring together a widely representative work force of cultural leaders, political scientists, technicians, businessmen and others from both western and southeast Asian nations for the purpose of developing comprehensive guidelines to the ways and means for achieving economic and social advancement in southeast Asia, including such people-to-people programs as may be needed to help the people of southeast Asia achieve a better life; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of

1966, that the executive branch of the State extend all possible cooperation and assistance in implementing this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the chancellor of the East-West Center and to the congressional delegation from Hawaii.

THE MARINES' YEAR

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Baltimore News-American has appropriately called attention to the fine job the U.S. Marines are doing in Vietnam.

After my visit to Marine Corps installations in South Vietnam last fall where I observed the leathernecks in combat, I was confident that they were equal to the difficult task we have assigned them.

I ask unanimous consent that the News-American, March 15, 1966, editorial entitled "The Marines' Year" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARINES' YEAR

The U.S. Marines have marked their first anniversary in Vietnam in appropriate, marine-like fashion: they have nearly obliterated a strong, determined enemy force.

The occasion was the Marine Corps action near Quang Nai, where some 6,000 Leathernecks, plus Vietnamese units, launched a shattering assault against a regular regiment of the army of North Vietnam.

More than 1,000 enemy dead were counted and the enemy force is believed out of action as a cohesive unit. The Marines, reports indicate, also suffered considerable casualties.

This is the way of the Marine Corps—as always in the front line of upholding the Nation's honor.

Our congratulations, then, to the gallant Marines in Vietnam on their year in that cruel land, and in their manner of celebrating this historic dateline.

PROTECTION OF LIVES AND PROPERTY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the citizens of Wallingford, Conn., can be proud of their police department, which has just published a booklet, "Guardians of Your Property and Welfare," for distribution to the people of Wallingford. They can also be proud of the American Cyanamid Co., which has underwritten the distribution of the booklet as a public service.

This small booklet will alert and inform the people of Wallingford. It contains information, suggestions and recommendations which—if acted upon—will help protect the lives and property of all law-abiding citizens. The war against crime must be based on an informed and concerned citizenry. I salute the Wallingford Police Department and the American Cyanamid Co. for doing their part and striking a blow against crime in our society.

This booklet could well serve as a model for other communities across our Nation and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the booklet be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the booklet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUARDIANS OF YOUR PROPERTY AND WELFARE

The Wallingford Police Department is a community service as well as a law enforcement agency. It is the guardian of your property and welfare. When law breakers infringe upon your security, it is the department's main function to provide protection of life and property and to apprehend the criminal. Equally important, too, is the obligation and desire of the police department to continue its work in the prevention of crime.

Much can be done in law enforcement and crime prevention through good cooperation between the citizens and the police department. The first step is a complete understanding of the police department duties and the services it is prepared to give. It is desirable that every resident of our community know what he can do to help the police, and himself, in the event of an emergency or in a general program of crime prevention.

This publication contains important information concerning the activities of your police department and some of the measures which contribute to your safety. We are grateful to the American Cyanamid Co. for making possible the publication of this booklet. It will be a valuable possession in every Wallingford home.

CARL A. GRASSER,
Chief of Police, Wallingford, Conn.

THE CITIZEN'S PART IN CRIME PREVENTION

How you can cooperate

You can aid in the detection and suppression of crime and thus protect your property and welfare by being alert and telephoning the police whenever you observe suspicious persons or happenings or hear unusual noises, either at your home or in the neighborhood. Do not attempt a personal investigation, nor turn on additional lights in the house or make a lot of noise. That will only put the person in question on guard and prevent his capture if he is a criminal. This is especially true if you return home and find that the lighting arrangement has been changed during your absence.

Don't delay. Don't look for an officer in the vicinity. Go to a telephone and quietly say to the operator, "Wallingford Police Headquarters, emergency," or call 269-4451. When connected with your police department, state clearly and quickly:

1. The location where police are needed.
2. What has happened.
3. Your name, address, and telephone number from which you are calling.

Your call will remain anonymous to the public.

If possible, obtain description of the person or persons involved. If known, give names, sex, color, age, height, weight, clothing worn, etc.

If an automobile has been used, secure the registration number, make and type of car, color, and number of occupants.

Cover as many of the above facts as you can. Additional ones are always useful. Be observant; in getting a description always look for distinctive marks and peculiarities of physical appearances, manner, voice and dress.

When your call is received by the police, squad cars are immediately directed to the scene by radio. No time is lost. A radio car will be at your doorstep shortly after you have hung up the telephone receiver. If the information has been received in time, there is a very good chance to apprehend the person or persons sought.

If you witness an accident or crime, don't take it for granted that the police have been called. Telephone your police headquarters if no officers are about. No harm has been done if the incident has already been reported. If it was unreported, your action in telephoning may prevent or clear a crime, or even save a life.

Suspicions are always valuable

If you have a "hunch" that something is wrong, call the police. Whenever persons loiter about your house or neighborhood and it appears to you that they should be investigated, do not hesitate to telephone the police at once. When something looks suspicious, do not wait until the damage has been done, but quickly communicate your suspicions to the police. Impress upon your family the necessity for cooperation by telephoning immediately. It's for your protection.

As the result of such cooperation, persons with criminal intent may be apprehended before they have had an opportunity to commit the crime. In some cases persons thus apprehended are found to have been responsible for other crimes.

Suggestions to householders

If you return home and find evidence that your home has been entered during your absence, please disturb nothing. Telephone the police at once from a neighbor's phone. Leave everything exactly as you find it because you might destroy valuable evidence, such as fingerprints, before the police arrive. A good rule to remember is "keep your eyes open and your hands in your pockets," until the arrival of the police.

When leaving for the evening

1. Leave a light burning in the house. A second light upstairs is very helpful.
2. Do not pull down window shades.
3. Do not leave notes indicating the time you will return.
4. Do not leave your key under the mat, over the door, or in the mailbox.
5. Be sure that all doors and windows are securely locked. Get in the habit of double-locking the doors.
6. Close the garage doors. Open doors reveal your absence.
7. Tell your neighbor how long you will be gone. Ask him to keep an eye on your house but not to divulge the information to anyone else.

When leaving for an extended period

1. Do not have the newspapers publish the fact that you are leaving.
2. Stop the milkman and newspaper carrier from making deliveries.
3. Tell the mailman to hold or forward your mail or deliver it to a neighbor.
4. Arrange with a neighbor to remove advertising matter and other articles which may be left on your porches. Such articles only advertise an unoccupied house and invite burglars.
5. Notify the police when you are leaving the premises and the approximate date of your return so that a special watch may be made during your absence. We will check your residence daily or more often.
6. Advise the police where you may be reached in an emergency.
7. Remove all money, valuable jewlery and other articles that can be taken easily by a burglar. Don't hide money or other valuables under rugs, behind pictures, in the crockery, or in any mattresses, as these are the first places a thief will look. Instead, remove them from the house and put them in a safe place.
8. Inspect all doors and windows before leaving to make certain they are securely locked.

PRECAUTIONARY ADVICE

Door locks and window fastenings

First of all, consider whether there are any outstanding door keys in the possession of former tenants. They could easily have duplicate keys and return at any time to commit a crime.

Carefully examine the defenses of your home. Close inspection may convince you that they are inadequate.

Doors should be equipped with modern and efficient locks. Cylinder locks with the deadlock feature are recommended. Avoid locks of the old bitkey type. They are of such simple construction that they are easily opened. All doors should be carefully examined to see whether it is possible to insert a knife blade or thin strip of celluloid behind the door-stop and thus push back the nose of the lock bolt. This can be remedied by using a safety strike to replace the strike now employed, or by driving a metal wedge or corrugated wood fasteners between the door-stop and the strike plate. Always make it a practice to double-lock doors when going out.

It may be advisable to place chain or bar guards on the inside of all outside doors. These inexpensive little devices are excellent protection for a woman, yet they enable her to open the door and see who is there without danger of the person outside forcing his way in.

Catches are available for window sashes which allow the window to be opened just so far. They are inexpensive and may be applied easily.

Solicitors and peddlers

There are many fine companies whose representatives are of sound character and who serve the community with very good products. These people are proud to quickly and fully identify themselves and the companies they represent.

However, many daylight burglaries in residential districts are committed by unknown solicitors who enter homes which they find are unoccupied. They have an apparently legitimate excuse for being in the neighborhood, and for that reason it is extremely difficult for the police to catch them in the act. Large companies may use 25 or more persons in a neighborhood on one day, canvass it thoroughly and move on to another locality the second day. Sometimes among their solicitors are persons of criminal tendencies who do not hesitate to "prowl" a house.

Extreme caution should be used in paying money in advance to any improperly identified solicitor. He may not deliver the article you ordered.

Never permit an unidentified solicitor or other stranger to enter your house, but make him transact his business on the porch or doorway, preferably with the inside chain on the door. Don't let him stand in the open doorway while you go into another part of the house for your purse. Shut him out and then go for your money.

Buy no merchandise from strangers who give the impression that the goods offered are a great bargain. Many times they will be found to be faked or stolen property. In this case, it is advisable to call the police at once.

Beware of strangers with pretexts

Demand to see the credentials of any unknown man who represents himself as a public utility employee and wants to enter your home. If in doubt, call the police. Remember that today's crook does not look like a thug. Don't trust persons with whom you come in contact because they are prosperous looking, are smooth talkers and have polished manners. Under no circumstances should you inform strangers of your neighbor's absence.

Watch your money

Your purse may be stolen if you lay it down on counters while examining merchandise. Hold your purse tightly while walking on the street or it may be taken by purse snatchers before you realize it. Most of them are young men or boys. One may remain at the wheel of a getaway car while the other gets out, asks you some questions, then grabs your purse. Call for help loudly.

Pickpockets are active in crowds of all kinds. Watch your valuables if anyone pushes or jostles you, or places a newpaper close to your face.

Do not cash a check if you have any doubt. If a person offers a personal check for business dealings, do not accept for amounts of more than the value of goods purchased. Identifications of questionable persons may be made by checking your telephone book or city directory. Know your endorser. Signature or endorsements should be made in your presence, even if the check has to be re-signed or reendorsed.

Questionable charitable organizations

Beware of unscrupulous promoters who solicit you by telephone, mail, or in person, requesting that you contribute toward a charity or benefit sponsored by some obscure organization. Do not respond with money to telephone solicitations. Ask the party who telephones you for a reputable local reference and satisfy yourself of the merit of the proposal before committing yourself. If solicitation is made in person, ask for an identification card. Otherwise, check with the police department.

Don't make these mistakes

Many overcoats and hats are stolen from restaurants. Watch yours.

Small articles should not be carelessly allowed to remain on the sidewalk, lawn, or porch, or other places easily accessible to the general public. Children are tempted to take such articles when the opportunity presents itself. Don't tempt anyone.

Never leave valuable clothing, furs, or rugs on the line to be aired when you are going out. They may not be there when you come back.

When you are having parties or entertaining guests, do not leave pocketbooks, coats or other valuables lying in the bedroom or other downstairs rooms unless you are positive that the windows are securely locked and that no intruders can gain unobserved entrance into the room.

Don't invite burglars by leaving your watch or rings where they may be seen from a window after washing your hands or dishes.

Keep a list of your valuables

Make a record of the number, monograms, initials and jewelers' scratch marks on your valuables. Have an accurate description so that if stolen, there will be a better chance to identify and recover them. Also, keep records of the numbers on automobiles, firearms, watches, bicycles, and electric motors of all kinds on washers, fans, sweepers, etc. A record of your savings bonds should also be kept in a place other than with the bonds.

Your duty in the prosecution of offenders

In many fields, particularly that of lasciviousness and other sex offenses, witnesses or complainants are sometimes reluctant to appear when trial is necessary. Sex offenders have been classified as physical cowards or persons of unbalanced or deficient mentality. These characteristics make them particularly dangerous if their careers are not checked by arrest and conviction. Failure to press cases and testify when necessary may result in continuance of the career of one of these until serious harm or death may be inflicted upon some hapless child. If you have facts concerning one of these matters, it is your duty to testify. The department will respect your confidences, and it is the usual practice of the local press to withhold names of witnesses and others innocently involved.

You and your automobile

Lock your car when parking to prevent auto thefts. Stolen cars are used in most major crimes today. Lock your car doors to prevent the theft of packages while you are gone. When putting the car away, lock the car as well as the garage doors.

Motorists should frequently check on their spare tires, license plates, and other accessories and see to it that they are securely fastened.

Motor vehicle laws are made to prevent loss of life, limb or property. Highways are unsafe if the public fails to cooperate. Every officer has cooperation in law observance as his objective. He wants your cooperation to prevent violations. By giving continuous attention to this policy, you may contribute to the saving of human life. Failing to do so, you may share a tragic responsibility.

We're holding your son

"We're holding your son" or "Your daughter has been hurt" are just as dreaded calls for the police to make as for you to receive. But, unfortunately, such calls are on the increase and teenage drinking is primarily to blame. Youth, automobiles, and drinking form an unholy trio closely alined with shame, pain, and death. What can be done about the curse of teenage drinking and driving? It's hard to say. Maybe it's closer family unity—warm hearts, fair minds and understanding to prevent such situations; plus stern, exacting discipline when this illness of youth starts.

Your relationship to juvenile delinquency

Most murderers and other felons have a crime record from small offenses during childhood. Setting a good example is a great force in the lives of young people. Every citizen should give special heed to his conduct when in the company of young folks. A poor example of lack of restraint, indulgence in petty gambling, irresponsibility or intemperance, sets a poor standard for the observant youngsters. His imitation of his elders in that respect may start him toward the career which makes it necessary for the community to have a constant armed guard over the lives and property of its citizens. Be a good pal to youngsters.

Warn children against sex offenders

Tell your children not to be friendly toward strangers and to shun any advances made toward them. Boys and girls should be warned not to accept rides from strangers under any circumstances. Report license plate numbers of those who try "pickups." Any young person who has to walk through any lonesome, sparsely populated area at any time of the day or night should take a companion along. If you learn of any accosters, notify the police at once and cooperate with them fully.

Protect your child

Highway accidents to pedestrians are not always the motorist's fault. But, any injury, no matter how caused, can bring untold grief to the family. Please insist that your children do not play on the street. Schools and police teach safety, but it is the parents who can best influence the child to practice the rules of safety at all times. Remember—there are no spare parts for the human body.

If stopped by police

Do not be offended if questioned as to your identity and business by a police officer. His assignments and routine duty often require the identification of persons. Be glad that he is on the job. Remember, his job requires that he risk his life if necessary to protect you. Reputable persons have nothing to fear from the police.

Your police department is anxious to give you the maximum protection possible with the personnel and equipment available. We solicit your cooperation in assisting the police department to keep Wallingford a respected and law-abiding community.

CARL A. GRASSER,
Chief of Police.

TOWN OF WALLINGFORD

William De Forest Bertini, mayor.

Town council: David S. Ferguson, chairman; Alexander S. Kovacs, Maurice J. Lynch, Thomas J. Wall, Jr., John J. Centner, Jr., Vincent J. Wasilewski, Joseph C. Carini, Harry D. Pattee, John J. Van Deun.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE SERVICES

Chief: Carl A. Grasser.

Deputy Chief: John N. De Lucia.

Captains: John P. Reynolds, George T. Williams.

Detective bureau: Lt. James Correia, Sgt. Joseph J. Bevan, Detective John J. Cei, liaison officer.

Lieutenants: Louis L. Gariepy, George J. Cyprinski, Joseph A. Farkas, Theodore J. Kowalski.

Sergeants: Frank A. Orosz, Adolf F. Wolcheski, Raymond H. Lefebvre.

Patrolmen: Edward A. Zolkiewicz, Edward J. Donofrio, Adam H. Plotkin, John J. Orlando, Dominic R. Massaro, Frank F. Moscato, James F. Dunn, Richard J. Danio, John P. Juliano, Robert B. Daly, Ronald R. Kling, Joseph J. Dsupin, Peter A. DiStasio, David S. Hopkins, Robert J. Getchell, Murtiford Howard, Darrell E. York, Willam R. Andrews, Jr., Anthony H. Baylow, William H. Birney, Jr., John Drescher, Robert W. Birks.

Policewoman: Sgt. Dorothy A. Powers.

Clerk: Marion Kahl.

COMMUNITY SAFETY IS EVERYONE'S BUSINESS

American Cyanamid Co. is very proud to be associated with the Wallingford Police Department in making this booklet available to all the families in the town of Wallingford.

We urge each citizen to take the time to read this booklet and follow its suggestions toward a better and safer community.

R. C. BACHER,
Plant Manager, Wallingford Plant, Cyanamid Co.

MRS. TATNALL DIES; FOUNDED SCHOOL IN WILMINGTON, DEL.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a gracious and distinguished lady of Delaware died last week. She was Mrs. Frances Darr Swift Tatnall, 91, founder and principal emeritus of the Tatnall School in Wilmington.

Her husband, Henry Lea Tatnall, died in 1943. They were the parents of 10 children, 9 of whom are still living. Mrs. Tatnall is also survived by 27 grandchildren and 60 great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Tatnall founded Mrs. Tatnall's School for Girls in her home in 1930. It began with 23 pupils and 5 teachers, and has expanded to 530 students and nearly 90 faculty members today. It now has both boys and girls.

Mrs. Tatnall's personality and her school have favorably affected the lives of thousands of Delawareans. Some measure of the esteem in which she was held is reflected in editorials which appeared in the Wilmington Morning News and Wilmington Evening Journal. Out of tribute to this grand lady in the field of education in Wilmington, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials mentioned be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Mar. 21, 1966]

THE GRACEFUL, HUMBLE LIFE

It was the custom at the Tatnall School, after the retirement of Mrs. Henry Lea Tatnall as principal in 1949, to invite the school's founder and namesake back for a party on her birthday.

These were nostalgic occasions, with Mrs. Tatnall sitting in splendor upon a chair in the assembly room and greeting the children as they came forward to present her with gifts and cards or to sing a song of good cheer. This was followed by the three-story cake, corsage, message from the student association, and brief speech. And then finally when the formalities were done, the older and more self-conscious students would ease up to the elderly lady to extend a hand and say hello before she became the property of the faculty, which would swarm in to laugh and reminisce about days past.

No matter how long or familiar the program, Mrs. Tatnall never lost her serenity. And it always seemed that as far as she was concerned the particular program at hand was the most important yet. For every word, she had a gracious reply, for each honor there was a sincere thank you. And when she could be coaxed to talk about her day, she would speak in a modest tone and in such a way as to flatter those who were now part of the modern and dynamic institution that was so different from the Tatnall School for Girls she founded for 23 students in 1930 at her Rodney Street home. Her only regret, she would say, was that she no longer knew the name of every Tatnall student.

Now that Mrs. Tatnall is dead at 91, it seems important that the community remember these birthdays, which so delighted the students and teachers who were privileged to have shared them. For while Mrs. Tatnall undoubtedly made a significant contribution to Wilmington education by starting a school that has grown into an important institution, she did something that is much more valuable. She demonstrated that there is always a place in education for the encouragement of the graceful act and the humble spirit. The birthday parties which nurtured the seed that Mrs. Tatnall planted will be no more, but the tradition she established seems firmly rooted in the school on Barley Mill Road. And the community is the better for it.

[From the Evening Journal, Mar. 19, 1966]

FRANCES SWIFT TATNALL

In Delaware the name Tatnall is a distinguished one. From away back it has marked one of the principal streets of downtown Wilmington. For the past 36 years the name has identified the school founded by a leading lady of education who has died at 91.

It was in 1930 that Frances Swift Tatnall undertook to carry on the tradition and work of the Misses Hebb's School, which did not outlive its founders. (They were two West Virginia sisters whose memory is still revered by a band of former students.) "Miss Hebb's" was a select school for girls. Mrs. Henry Lea Tatnall was herself an exemplary product of a late-Victorian regimen which set the highest standards of the day for feminine manners and virtues as well as scholarship. Young ladies were expected to do well in English composition and literature, in French and math—and not to "cross their knees" when seated.

Not many of them, certainly, took up teaching. Mrs. Tatnall did. After rearing a large family, she became an occasional member of the Misses Hebb's faculty. Hence it was natural enough, on the encouragement of Mrs. E. Paul du Pont and other alumnae, that she embarked on a career as the head of the school bearing her name. Under her guidance the Tatnall school settled into the same kind of respect its predecessor had enjoyed—while keeping pace with the 20th century's changing guides for elementary secondary education.

To the end of her life, Frances Tatnall's dedication to her calling and her affection for the school never faltered. It was a major milepost when, after her retirement, W. W. Laird's interest in it resulted in the move to Barley Mill Road. Did the advent of coeducation faze her? If so, friends of the school were not aware of anything but her ultimate satisfaction in the departure.

As a lady of the old school—literally and figuratively—this wise and sweet woman had always been on the side of progress as her own bright lights illuminated it.

Even as her years accumulated, she delighted in visiting the school on her birthday—and greeting the pupils, especially the young children, at assembly programs in her honor. They loved her. We like the true story of the child overheard talking to a friend from another school after one of those visits.

"We've got somebody you haven't got. We've got a Mrs. Tatnall. You haven't got any Mrs. Tower Hill, have you?"

CITIES AND MAN

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Baltimore News-American discussed the relationship of cities to man.

The editorial comments on a new department of urban anthropology being established at New York University.

We live in the most rapidly urbanizing nation in the world. Urban growth is literally swallowing up thousands of acres of farm and forest lands each year. This uncontrolled growth is resulting in an unplanned urban environment which will force our society to conform to its limitations. Man has lost much of his control over his urban environment, but it is not too late to make amends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this timely editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore News-American, Mar. 15, 1966]

CITIES AND MAN

As man's environment changes, so does man. The extent to which this occurs, and will occur, as urbanization becomes commonplace is going to be examined in many cities, both in the United States and other world areas, by a new department of New York University.

The first of its kind, this unique and far-ranging inquiry into urban anthropology has a major importance as more people—at least in this country—leave the pastures for the populated centers, as the census grows and cities virtually merge into extensive megalopoli.

The people involved fit, or fail to fit, into conditions that require perhaps radical change in habits, outlook, conduct and even physical aspects.

Apart from ordinary sociological concerns, the broad studies will be concerned with the effects of urbanization on individuals in an age when citification of population is attended with sometimes overwhelming problems of crowding, delinquency, inadequacy of public services and other circumstances that did not confront man when people were relatively few and habitation was in forests.

Anthropology, which has found much of the dramatic in the development of men, individually and as community or race components, is engaged, in this new venture, in a project that may result in significant conclusions.

These, in time, may be of great moment in helping society adjust to the consequences of urbanization of those who have been urbanized.

RETIREMENT OF JAMES G. PATTON AS PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, AND DAVID DUBINSKY AS PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, last Wednesday two national leaders retired from the presidency of the organization which each had served for more than a quarter century.

In Denver, James G. Patton retired as president of the National Farmers Union, a position he has held since 1940.

In New York City, David Dubinsky announced his retirement as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, the position to which he was first elected in 1932.

The groups which Mr. Dubinsky and Mr. Patton served are in great contrast. The center of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union is in the most concentrated urban region of the Nation. The Farmers Union members are farm families located on individual farms in the vast wheat, feed grain, and other crop areas of the country. But there is much in common in the careers of the two leaders.

Both men provided leadership for members who were suffering from serious economic difficulties. Both of them assumed office when their groups were disorganized and threatened with bankruptcy. Both provided the leadership that made their groups efficient and effective organizations.

Mr. Patton and Mr. Dubinsky are both men of strong character and strong personality, colorful leaders who never hesitated to speak out vigorously against discrimination and economic and social abuses and who were also ready to stand up and be counted in defense of new programs and procedures.

Each knows and respects politics and each sought and got political support for programs in which they believe.

Both were proud of the work of the members they served, and by their leadership helped to develop pride in their memberships and in their organization and demonstrated what can be done by working together.

While they served their own groups, both have a deep concern for the common good and gave their support for programs to protect and safeguard the rights of all people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the news story about Mr. Patton by Donald Janson, and the column by A. H. Raskin on Mr. Dubinsky, be printed at this point in the RECORD. Both reports appeared in the New York Times, on March 17.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1966]

PATTON QUITS POST WITH FARM UNION

(By Donald Janson)

DENVER, March 16.—James G. Patton retired tonight as president of the National Farmers Union after 25 years in the post.

The 63-year-old farm leader, distinctive black patch over one eye, passed the gavel of office to Tony T. Dechant at the banquet ending the organization's 64th annual convention.

Mr. Dechant 51, was elected earlier in the day in balloting by delegates representing the group's 225,000 members in 40 States.

Mr. Patton, a crusader for liberal causes since the New Deal era, said that world peace was the No. 1 job of mankind and he would fight for it in retirement.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman praised Mr. Patton's accomplishments and termed the Administration's pending Food for Freedom program "fulfillment of a dream" for Mr. Patton.

The program would make farm commodities and technical agricultural aid available to underdeveloped countries on an expanded basis.

The convention adopted a policy statement urging Congress to enact the program without delay.

Government purchases for such exports, the statement said, should not be limited to surplus commodities, as in past programs.

WOULD AID BACKWARD LANDS

The proposed program would help stave off famine while aiding backward countries to build viable agricultural economies of their own.

The secretary praised Mr. Patton as an "architect of an eventful era in American agriculture."

The retiring farm leader, son of a labor union official, has alined the general farm organization with gains of organized labor and with Democratic administrations and programs since he assumed office in 1940.

BACKED MANY PROGRAMS

He fought successfully for price-support acreage-control plans to increase income of family-sized farms, for legislation guaranteeing equal job opportunities, for the food for peace plan that expires this year, and was instrumental in founding the world food program of the United Nations in 1961.

Under the leadership of Mr. Dechant, secretary-treasurer of the Farmers Union since 1946, some observers expect the organization to enter a period of consolidation devoted to building a membership that will encompass more nonfarmers in the rural communities than in the past as the technological revolution in agriculture forces more marginal farmers off the soil.

Also retiring today was Glenn J. Talbott, 65, vice president of the organization since 1958. Edwin Christianson, president of the State affiliate in Minnesota, was selected to succeed him.

In its statement of policy, the group also called for setting aside emergency stocks of grain and cotton, restoration of cuts in the school lunch and school milk funds, legislation to bar packers and food chains from farming operations, and Federal aid to provide 2 years of free college education for all students.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1966]

DUBINSKY—AN ORIGINAL: HIS RETIREMENT IS DRAMATIC REMINDER OF THE CHANGE IN UNIONS AND UNIONISTS

(By A. H. Raskin)

The retirement of David Dubinsky provides a dramatic reminder of the speed with which the great union builders of the New Deal era are vanishing from the labor scene. John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, Sidney Hillman, William Green, and a dozen others whose names once appeared on the front pages almost as often as the President's have all preceded the little giant of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union into the files of history.

Labor's new men of power are a drabber lot, steeped in the intricate responsibilities of administering and conserving a movement that has become richer in funds, status, economics security and political influence than in fresh ideas for organizing the millions of workers still outside union ranks. Mr. Dubinsky was always an original, as distinctive as Seventh Avenue and the polyglot army of cutters, pressers and seamstresses he helped to climb out of the sweatshops and the steaming, tuberculosis-ridden "lung blocks" of the Lower East Side.

His surprise farewell at yesterday's meeting of the I.L.G.W.U. general executive board in the Americana hotel was straight out of the old Yiddish Art Theater, complete with tears, laughs and a hug for his wife just out of the hospital after weeks of treatment for arthritis. It was the best show of its genre since Boris Thomashefsky and Maurice Schwartz surrendered Second Avenue to off-Broadway.

"I HAD A UNION LIFE"

When the union's secretary-treasurer, Louis Stulberg, who is the man most likely to succeed, led his stunned colleagues in trying to persuade Mr. Dubinsky to stay on, he replied: "I didn't have a life; I had a union life. I don't want to die in my boots. I'm not waiting for a free funeral. I want to be free."

He reminded them that they had tried 5 years ago to get him to take things easier by going on a 3-day week. That lasted just 1 week. "You know my nature," he said. "If I'm president, I can't only be president from morning till night. It has to be from morning till next morning." They still wouldn't take no for an answer, but they all left knowing his decision was irrevocable.

It will be a hard change for them and for him. It was not enough for him to be author of all the union's major policies and chief negotiator in every major contract. He was also, in the words of an intimate, "our best editor, best publicity man, best architect, best ticket taker, best seat arranger, best auditor, best economist, and best dramatic actor and he had to do it all himself."

At the triennial conventions he was proud papa to the delegates representing the union's 447,000 members. In his major speeches he would range across the mountaintops of social idealism. And a minute later, while the mood of exaltation was still strong in the hall, he would scold some unwary unionist for stirring from his seat. He injected a note of high drama into very report and every talk.

Five Presidents, from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Lyndon B. Johnson, invited him to dine at the White House. His favorite stories there were of the days he spent in a czarist jail at the age of 15 after calling a strike against his father's bakery in Poland. For example, he would put a ring of water around his bed at night to keep off the roaches.

When he became president of the ILGWU in 1932, a disastrous internal war with the Communists had left the union so broke that it had to borrow money to pay its electric bill. But in recent years the hundreds of millions of dollars in its welfare and pension funds enabled it to make loans to the Rockefellers for civic betterment projects in Puerto Rico.

The prestige that accrued to his union caused other labor leaders to turn to him for guidance in creating a better image.

One such was James C. Petrillo, the salty leader of the American Federation of Musicians, in a period when his union was under widespread attack for insisting on the employment of standby musicians. A delegation sent by Mr. Petrillo learned that Mr. Dubinsky had no high-pressure publicity organization, but merely an editor for its internal publications. When the group asked the ILGWU head for his "secret," he told them: "Live right."

He practiced his own maxim in a thousand ways. Here is one he never let the public know about: In 1950, when the union was celebrating its golden anniversary, the executive board voted to authorize a $5,000 increase in Mr. Dubinsky's salary of $17,500. When he refused to take the money, the board insisted that the union buy him a summer home as a retreat from his arduous duties.

THEN A MODEST HOUSE

Over a 7-year period union representatives sought to interest him in one luxurious home or another, and he turned them all down as too lavish. Finally, in 1957, he was entranced by a modest house on Tiana Bay in the Hamptons. The union bought it for $17,500 and put $7,500 more into remodeling it. But just as the Dubinskys were about to move in, the newspapers carried stories about the $160,000 home in Seattle that Dave Beck had acquired with funds of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

In great embarrassment the ILGWU chief informed the board that he could not accept the Long Island house, but the board unanimously rejected his declination. The impasse ended only when one vice president said: "If this will make Dubinsky unhappy, we must respect his wishes." Mr. Dubinsky then arranged to buy the house himself by paying the union the $25,000 in five annual installments.

He referred to the incident obliquely yesterday when general objection arose to his retirement. Without mentioning the house or anything else about the specific circumstances, he reminded the board that once before all the vice presidents had disagreed with a Dubinsky decision, but had decided in the end that they must respect his wishes. "I urge you now to comply with my wishes," he said simply. It was his swan song.

EXPORT QUOTAS ON CATTLE HIDES, CALF AND KIP SKINS, AND BOVINE LEATHERS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Department of Commerce recently announced that it was imposing export quotas on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leathers. The Department states that this represented a "new move to provide adequate supplies for domestic needs."

This action raises a number of questions, and I have written to Secretary Connor about the policy. One question in the beginning of the inquiry is whether a need exists or whether a shortage exists. Another is about our general trade policy and the effort which we have been making to expand exports, particularly of farm products. In addition, there is the serious consideration of the effect of this action on income to farmers.

In my judgment, any action which moves in the direction of holding down farm income—whether it involves hide sales or selling CCC stocks of corn or wheat—must be weighed against the fact that farmers have been receiving depressed prices for many years and that the last general average of farm prices, February 15, stood only at 83 percent of parity. Farm income has been improving in recent months, but it comes very late and it is not yet sufficient.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by James J. Nagle about the hide export controversy, appearing in the March 20 issue of the New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEAT GROUP ASSAILS HIDE EXPORT QUOTAS

(By James J. Nagle)

The meat industry is up in arms over the export quotas for hides that the Department of Commerce has established to head off a domestic shortage. The quotas supplement a system of compulsory export licenses established earlier.

The American Meat Institute challenged last weekend the Department's contention that a shortage is possible, pointing to the fact that about three-fourths of the 625 million pairs of shoes made in 1965 had soles made of materials other than leather, and that 20 percent had uppers made of leather substitutes.

The institute also charged that the quotas were in sharp conflict with the policies of the Agriculture Department, which had been seeking to build markets for American agricultural products. It characterized the move as "an attempt by the administration to roll back prices to a depressed level."

The industry had been encouraged by the Department of Agriculture, the institute said, to overcome the loss of shoe-industry outlets in this country by developing foreign markets. Thus, in 1965, exports of 13.3 million hides and 2.4 million calf and kip skins about balanced the estimated amount of substitute materials used in domestic shoe production during the year.

According to the Tanners Council, cattle hide production last year totaled 34 million skins, compared with 33.2 million in 1964 when 11.4 million were exported. Judging by volume for the first 2½ months, exports would have totaled more than 16 million in 1966 if the quotas had not been imposed.

The institute also challenged the Government's contention that Federal controls were necessary because of recent advances in prices of cattle hides. Price increases for hides have not been excessive, the institute said. The relationship of hide prices to steer prices has gone down considerably in recent years—to about 71 percent now, compared with 90 percent in the 1945–49 period and with slightly less than 200 percent in the early 1920's, when there were few substitutes for leather.

However, according to the Tanner's Council, hides of heavy native steers are averaging 19 cents a pound, compared with 10 cents at about this time in 1965. Hides from light native cows are averaging about 22.6 cents compared with 13.3 cents in 1965. Calf leathers are selling for $5.06 cents a skin, compared with $2.69 a skin in 1964.

PRICES ONCE LOW

Hides prices have not always been so high, however, and there have been periods when cattle slaughterers have been reluctant to even enter the market. The hides are a byproduct of beef.

Obtaining the hides in a marketable condition, it was pointed out, is a delicate operation and costs slaughterers several cents a pound. This, plus the cost of distribution, could mean that, if hide prices went too low, it would be uneconomical for the slaughterers to even worry about the hides.

In recent years, however, they have had no such worries and are producing the hides in increasing amounts. But at the same time they are exporting more each year. The Government says they are exporting too much while the American Meat Institute says this is not so.

Cattle hides and calfskins are the most important leather raw materials both in volume and in value. Next are the skins of sheep and goats. Pigs, horses, deer, kangaroos, ostriches, and many reptiles also are listed as leather suppliers.

The domestic livestock industry, principally the large packing houses, supplies more than 75 percent of the cattle hides and skins tanned in the United States. Most of the imports are supplied by Canada and Argentina. Calfskin leather is lighter in weight and finer-grained than cattle-hide leather.

Partly because it is spongier and more easily stretched, leather made from sheepskin and lambskin is not so widely used as calf or cattle leather, according to the Tanners Council. In this area, tanners rely on imports for about 50 percent of their needs. New Zealand is the largest supplier.

Kidskins are imported from virtually every country that raises goats as a source of milk and meat, with India, South America, Central Africa, and China the important producing areas.

MOBOCRACY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an address given by the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Member of Congress from the 11th Congressional District in Illinois, at the annual meeting of the National Fraternal Congress last fall. Its text appeared in the Fraternal Monitor in a recent issue which dealt with some of the proceedings before that national convention which was held here in Washington, D.C.

His remarks are a thoughtful and incisive analysis of some current events and thinking. His analysis comes from one who has lived closely to the local as well as the national scene. Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI's speech was well received. As the only other "ROMAN" serving in the Congress at the present time, it is this Senator's pleasure to call it to the attention of our colleagues and for a wider readership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOBOCRACY: AMERICA'S MOST SERIOUS THREAT TO DEMOCRACY

(NOTE.—One of the featured speakers at the 79th annual meeting of the National Fraternal Congress of America was the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Member of Congress, 11th Congressional District, Illinois. His speech, the text of which follows, was heavily punctuated by the applause of the audience.)

Gentlemen, in the 355 years since we decided to settle this unbelievably abundant continent, we have found comfort and strength in the fraternal concept of individuals uniting for the greater stability and progress of the United States.

By channeling constructive individual efforts to achieve common goals—whether it be debating a school bond issue, helping a bewildered immigrant understand that he, personally, could enrich America's cultural heritage, or raising money for an urgently needed church or hospital—our fraternal organizations remain one of our greatest strengths.

Our freedom has been expanded, protected and preserved in large measure by the men and women who have recognized their responsibilities to their country.

In many communities throughout America today, however, this concept is undergoing a subtle change. Rather than the old principle of rolling up your sleeves and plunging into a project with all your heart, today we find increasing numbers of people who permit themselves to be led, to be manipulated, to be virtually enslaved by those who preach the ancient, uncompromising doctrine of mob rule to achieve the ends which they proclaim worth while.

IN THE WORDS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

In reviewing today how well we have protected democracy, let us pause to remember the words of Abraham Lincoln, spoken 127 years ago in Springfield, Ill., when he said that danger to America will never come from without and he warned that if our freedom is ever to be destroyed, the destruction will spring from among us. Lincoln said:

"At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some transatlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never. All the armies in Europe, Asia, and Africa combined could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years.

"At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer that if it ever reaches it must spring from amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be the authors and the finishers.

"As a nation of freemen, we must live through all times or die by suicide. Let reverence for the law be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in the schools, in the seminaries, and in the colleges. Let it be written in primers, in spelling books, and almanacs. Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice; and, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation, and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly at its altars."

These words are as alive today as they were in 1838 when this Nation was threatened with destruction from within.

TRAGEDY OF MOB RULE

The alarming growth and tendency in our Nation today toward what many of us call "mobocracy"—government by mob rule—should be of deep concern to all Americans. It is a growing tragedy that in our Nation governed by the most complicated system ever devised by man, there are those who turn to mob rule because they seek expediency based on impatience and a desire to resolve all matters hastily, without concern for the rights of others.

We are living in an era that tests the very strength and courage of our Republic. We need from our people today a depth of understanding unparalleled in the history of this Nation. We have had too many examples in recent years of "mobocracy"—the most morbid enemy of constitutional government.

Too often we associate mob rule and demonstrations with race conflicts and disturbances. It should be of deep concern to all of us that the mania for taking the law into their own hands is spreading today into many areas which have nothing to do with racial disturbances. The increasing violence of demonstrations on college campuses is but one example of mob rule.

Nowadays, the prevailing principle appears to be action, not thought. If one doesn't pick up a sign, or obstruct a roadway or lead a march for peace, or for war, for a soft policy, for a hard-line policy, one is somehow un-American and uninvolved in the great issues of the day. To be law-abiding is to be lacklustre, by today's standards.

It can be clearly shown that even in the civil rights struggle, 90 percent of all the gains made in this country within the last two decades have been made through the orderly processes of legislation and judicial review. We have a right to question whether the great harm being done to America and its image abroad justifies mob rule and violence for the remaining 10 percent of gains.

I hope the day will never come when the American people will be compelled to march in single cadence like the people behind the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain in Red China. I hope the day will never come when the people of this country will not be permitted to exercise their right to be different; to exercise their right to disagree.

But I also hope the day will never come when the impatience with the seemingly slow-moving pace of our democratic process will overwhelm the people, and they will try to find more expedient ways of giving meaning to their views by mob rule or other violent changes.

A WISER SOLUTION

I have faith in our Constitution. I have faith in the democratic processes of this Nation. I have faith that the American people will take the trouble to learn the complex structure of the world situation today, and then with dignity and order manifest their views to their respective representatives. Great civilizations have fallen to mob rule. God grant that our land shall never meet this fate.

By individual and collective self-discipline and an acceptance of the responsibilities which are an intrinsic part of true liberty, we give living meaning to a social order which we hope ultimately will inspire the entire world.

When the day comes when we convince our neighbors on this small planet that we mean what we say and we practice what we preach, war will no longer be accepted as inevitable among men and nations.

We cannot, no matter how noble our declarations, expect men less blessed with the God-given resources we Americans have in such abundance, to resolve their problems without resorting to violence, if in our own Nation the principles of respect for the freedom and integrity of others is tested daily through unruly demonstrations and examples of mob violence and personal injustice.

GOAL OF UNIVERSAL PEACE

Know it well—we Americans are being judged daily as a people and a Nation by every civilization on earth. There is no area of this world which is not keenly interested in our ability to make democracy work within our own borders. Our responsibility to one another and to the goal of universal peace is inescapable.

There will be peace—be it in India, Pakistan, Africa, Asia, or Latin America—when we are observed flouting respect for the law and the rights of others. Indeed, it is time we renewed our pledge to be our brother's keeper.

No amount of social legislation, of concern with eradicating poverty as an inevitable condition of existence for certain of our countrymen, will blot out the effects of one example of violence and terror to achieve a stated goal, regardless of the goal.

The price for participating in the settling and civilizing of America is hard work—and the reward is self-respect and a free human soul.

By expanding the goals of human achievement, let us build in the United States a lasting monument to the collective spirit of man.

We have every tool, every resource available to us. The most important ingredient, the mortar with which to bind our ideals into a unified whole, is individual responsibility. As Jean Jacques Rousseau said almost two centuries ago:

"Where is the man who owes nothing to the land in which he lives? Whatever the land may be, he owes to it the most precious thing possessed by man—the morality of his actions and the love of virtue."

WEST VIRGINIANS OPERATE RADIO MARS FACILITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Register, Point Pleasant, W. Va., on Saturday, March 12, carried an article concerning the operation of a radio MARS facility in Mason County, W. Va., which serves faithfully to deliver messages—particularly those not of an emergency nature—between servicemen and their family members. The Mason County network is not the sole one in West Virginia, however, as is pointed out in the article, "Mason County Man's Radio Serves GI's in Vietnam," prepared by the Register's staff writer, Jean Warner.

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS AFFILIATED WITH "MARS" SYSTEM—MASON COUNTY MAN'S RADIO SERVES GI'S IN VIETNAM

(By Jean Warner)

While there are those on the homefronts who thrive on draft card burning and other moral depressants, there are others who care enough for U.S. servicemen to give many hours of volunteer service.

Through a sincere desire to lift the morale of those on the frontlines and other servicemen away from home, a dedicated group of West Virginians has joined forces in setting up a Military Affiliated Radio System known as MARS.

One such station is located right in the midst of Mason County, high on a hill above New Haven. The facility is owned and operated by Jesse Harrell on Haven Heights.

In addition to his own station, Mr. Harrell is manager of the West Virginia Network that boasts 15 operators in a six-county area.

Mr. Harrell, a disabled veteran, had 6 years of active duty with the U.S. Army and after serving 9 months in Korea during the crisis there, knows what it means to receive word from home.

He began amateur radio work in 1960 and then less than a year ago became associated with the MARS project.

Mr. Harrell explains that the MARS network is a backup communication system to the U.S. Air Force in Mason County and more specifically in West Virginia. Headquarters are located at Westover Air Field, Mass.

The system provides instant communication for military commanders in the United States and overseas, in case of a national emergency.

The MARS network assists Red Cross chapters in delivering messages to servicemen, especially those that are not of emergency nature. Mr. Harrell related "We are happy to take a message to any serviceman, any place in the world free of charge, at any time."

Due to the heavy volume, he said the network group requests that messages be kept to 20 words or less. All messages must be in writing and signed by sender and dated.

Harrell related that messages to servicemen should include his full and complete address and he revealed that all messages are confidential.

Mr. Harrell disclosed that the MARS network also relays messages for civilians, of a third party nature and are of the noncommercial type.

As a general rule MARS operators only broadcast at a specific time. Mr. Harrell uses the call letters AFB8OVT and operates his set between 8 and 9 p.m.

In the event a message of an emergency nature or priority is received they are sent at any time. To do this operators check in on a transcontinental network, which operates 24 hours a day. All other messages get routine handling.

This also is proving to be a speedy way of getting word back and forth between servicemen in Vietnam and their families.

Messages are getting through with a return in a maximum of 72 hours through the MARS facility.

Since there is only one station in Vietnam at Saigon, this is the only place contact can be made.

Mr. Harrell, said however, many messages are relayed through by other means to the frontlines for those in combat.

In Saigon the call letters are AI8AIR. The first three indicate the country and the last three designate the Air Force call letters.

Since the MARS station here has been in operation less than a year, already approximately 700 servicemen have been contacted from the six-county area.

Mr. Harrell has confiscated one room in his home for the worthwhile hobby that offers so much to those away from home. He says his equipment is valued at approximately $4,500. Most hobbyists operate with equipment ranging from $1,500 to $2,000. The average station broadcasts with 100 watts, although they are allowed up to 1,000 watts.

Persons interested in becoming MARS operators must hold a Federal Communication Commission license of technician or higher.

Once operators show a genuine interest in this communication type work, with active participation of 6 months, certain equipment and supplies are available from the armed services.

Mr. Harrell noted that the system in Mason County went into operation less than 2 months after installation began.

Approximately 15 operators are working in a 6-county area with the MARS network. This includes Mason, Jackson, Tyler, Roane, Wood, and Putnam Counties. In addition there are two other networks, one in Charleston and the other Huntington.

Continued expansion goes on with the MARS network. The West Virginia Vocational Rehabilitation Center located in Fairmont, in conjunction with the Marion County School system, will be setting up a U.S. MARS station. The coordinator in charge will be Harold B. Lawson.

PROSPECTING IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the American public is accustomed to tales of prospectors seeking riches in mines in the Old West. The dreams of fortunes in minerals, ores, and jewels which men have pursued have resulted in many fascinating chapters of our national history. One such dream resulted in the exploration in Jackson County, W. Va., for silver.

An account of this exploration and similar ones within the State was provided by William C. Blizzard in the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., State magazine on March 20.

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jackson County's Silver Dream

(By William C. Blizzard)

No one knows, for sure, how Jackson County's silver dream got started. Perhaps local residents had ingested too many Horatio Alger novels and the dream of sudden wealth was the mental burp arising from such rich literary fare.

But grandiose post-Civil War dreams in the United States, based upon what seemed to be the limitless natural riches of the New World, were not confined to Jackson County, or even to the new State of West Virginia. It was the time of the robber barons, the beginnings of the great American fortunes, and it was un-American to suggest that every man could not, by hard work coupled with a little luck, become a millionaire.

It was this great American faith, of course, that gave rise to the Horatio Alger series of nonsensical novels, and not the other way around. Most men believed that great wealth might be theirs next year, or, at the very least, the year following. The earth which enclosed the natural resources of the United States was a gigantic slot machine, and you never knew when you might pull the right handle at the right time.

Fortunes were made often enough to keep the dream alive. As many of these fortunes were garnered neither by great natural ability nor great learning, the average man felt that his chances were as good as the next fellow's.

Sometimes this naive belief led to naive adventures. One of these adventures occurred in Jackson County shortly after the Civil War. Men not only believed that great veins of rich silver ore were in Jackson County a few miles from Ripley; they also spent thousands of dollars in sinking shafts hundreds of feet deep in search of the precious metal.

The search for silver in Jackson County was not made by simple, uneducated folk, but apparently by sensible, hard-headed businessmen who organized corporations for the purpose. They seem to have relied upon the advice of well-known geologists and chemists.

Perhaps the geology of the area had not been determined at the time, or perhaps scientific judgment had become clouded by the national optimism. Today, geologists will tell you that it is elementary that the occurrence of precious metals such as gold and silver is virtually impossible in the sedimentary strata which underlie, for the most part, the surface of the Mountain State.

Nevertheless, the records show that in 1866 and 1867 no less than three mining companies, two foreign to West Virginia and one domestic, leased property in Jackson County and bordering Mason County for the purpose of mining for silver and such other minerals as might be found. They were the Pittsburgh Exploring, Developing, & Mining Co., the Pomeroy Silver Mining Co., and the Point Pleasant Silver Mining & Exploring Co.

The first company, as the name indicates, had headquarters in Pittsburgh, the second in Meigs County, Ohio, and the third in Point Pleasant, W. Va. Recordc of leases between the two former companies and David Woodruff and wife, Elijah Staats and wife, Benjamin Flowers and wife, Abijah Hunt and wife, Thomas Hartley, may be found in files in the Ripley courthouse.

The fact that the Point Pleasant Silver Mining & Exploring Co. existed is recorded in the September 19, 1867, issue of the Weekly Register of Point Pleasant, a Democratic newspaper edited and published by a George W. Tippett.

Tippett lists the officers of the company, and wishes the venture every success. He writes:

"We understand that through the energy of Messrs. John O. Butler, G. J. L. Hantschke and Stephen Comstock, in procuring leases in the lower end of the county, a company has been organized with a capital of $300,000, by the name of the Point Pleasant Silver Mining and Exploring Co., for the purpose of mining for silver, gold, etc., on the farms of Maj. John O. Butler and others in that part of the county.

"The company is composed of 16 members of whom Prof. William Eickhoff is one—he having partially examined and explored the lands of the company became satisfied that they were the richest in this part of the State—the rich deposits of gold and silver fully warranting him in giving the company a large bonus, together with the advantage of his scientific skill, in order to become a member. The professor will be here today, when he will immediately proceed to locate the different veins of gold and silver on the lands of the company, the depth of which, we are told, will not exceed 300 feet."

Many leading Mason County citizens belonged to the company, but a principal feature of its membership was the large number of officials of German descent. Indeed, G. J. L. Hantschke is listed as company interpreter, a fact which leads the historian to believe that Prof. William Eickhoff spoke little or no English.

The fate of the Point Pleasant Mining & Exploring Co. is unknown to me, but it is virtually certain that, like similar ventures in Jackson County, it ceased operations without striking anything of greater value than the silver in Professor Eickhoff's hair.

As to the Jackson County operations, an account in Hardesty's Historical and Geographical Encyclopedia of 1883 reads:

"About the year 1872, a great excitement was created by the report that silver had been discovered at a point on Big Mill Creek, about 1 mile from the village of Angerona. A company of Pittsburgh capitalists at once organized to develop this reported Eldorado, but after a shaft had been sunk to the depth of 400 feet, and several entries driven, the enterprise proved to be but another 'South Sea Bubble,' and the operators with less money but more experience abandoned the undertaking, and silver prospectors, especially those looking for it underground, have been remarkably scarce in Jackson County ever since."

The West Virginia Geological Survey, County Reports, 1911, sheds further light on the Jackson County silver mines:

"In 1877 a shaft (J–47) was put down on the Woodruff farm, Mill Creek, Union district, N. 1 degree E., 1 mile from Angerona, for the purpose of testing for silver.

"Several years before a well had been drilled for salt water to a depth of 200 to 400 feet, and it was reported that some silver ore was found. In fact, some of the ore reported as occurring in the well (but more probably dropped into it surreptitiously) was sent away for analysis and found by the chemist to be rich in silver; hence a company was organized with Pittsburgh capital and this shaft was sunk. The depth of the shaft was about 500 feet * * *. No silver was found in the shaft and it was finally abandoned."

The Geological Survey calls this the Woodruff Shaft, as the Woodruff family owned the property. A photograph of what is left of this shaft appears with this article. The Survey also comments on another silver mine called the Shinn Shaft, not far from the Woodruff operation:

"Another shaft (J–49) was put down on a farm owned by Albert Shinn of Cow Creek, Union district, S. 45 degrees E., 1½ miles from Angerona. This shaft was sunk about the same time as the Woodruff shaft and to a depth of about 350 feet. As no silver was found, this shaft, too, was abandoned."

The area around the old Shinn Shaft is still called Silver Valley, although only the oldtimers know why.

Present-day geologists find it difficult to explain why men of a scientific bent could be persuaded that silver or gold ore might be mined in commercial quantities in Jackson County. Not even coal exists in any significant amount. Jackson County was and remains an agricultural area.

But back in the days following the Civil War men were willing to believe a lot of things. For instance, the Point Pleasant Weekly Register of October 17, 1867, told its readers:

"We met recently with a gentleman of our acquaintance who has closely observed the mineral developments in our neighboring county of Jackson for over a year, and from evidences of assays by competent chemists in this country, one of which is a gentleman of no less notoriety than Dr. R. Owen, professor of chemistry in the Indiana State University, and other assayers of notoriety. The statements of these scientific gentlemen assure us that valuable minerals exist in that locality of our State.

"We were also shown a specimen of pure white marble, and letters relative to it say that it far exceeds anything of the kind ever discovered on the western continent, equaling in every particular the celebrated Carrara marble."

Needless to say, no marble quarries yet exist in Jackson County, and little marble exists in the Mountain State (the West Virginia Guide asserts that a large supply is in Pocahontas County).

With more haste than real knowledge, the Register of September 26, 1867, announced the discovery of "a good vein of lead ore" in Lincoln County, on 4-Mile Creek, a tributary of the Guyandotte. Nevertheless, lead ore in commercial quantities has not yet been located in West Virginia.

Perhaps men who sought silver in Jackson County were influenced by old legends which have not yet fully died out. One such was the legend of Cannelton Mountain, which lies across the Great Kanawha from Montgomery. A Capt. Phil Thurman was supposed to have found silver there, and left the secret of its location with his father-in-law, Benjamin Jones, of Crown Hill.

Another story has it that a man named Field Hudnall discovered a silver vein on Rich Hollow of Kellys Creek, a vein presumably mined by Indians. The finds of both Thurman and Hudnall were supposed to have been in the decade after the Civil War. Geologists are skeptical, in the extreme, of both stories.

But such tales, reinforced by others, could have contributed to the silver fever in Jackson County. It is probable that one tale, more than any other, had something to do with the post-Civil War search for silver in the vicinity of Ripley.

J. H. Kidwell gave national circulation to the story in 1927 in his book, "Silver Fleece." Kidwell, who was not from this area, made a sort of semifiction book about a legend which is supposed to have begun at Alexandria, Va., in the 1760's.

At that time and place an Indian, the story goes, appeared with a necklace of silver. Some white men asked about the source and apparently got some general directions. A group headed by a Jonathan Swift, the others known only as Staley, Ireland, McClintock, and Blackburn, searched for and found a rich silver vein.

The Swift party made four trips, smelting out about $200,000 worth of silver crowns and bars. But they were often pursued by Indians and were forced to cache their heavy loads of silver in various hiding places. Most of this hidden silver, if you believe the story, has never been found, and the source of the silver has also been lost.

In his book, J. H. Kidwell quotes from what he says is the Swift journal, kept during the original search:

"We started on the 25th of June 1761, from Alexandria, Va., and came to Leesburg, thence to Winchester, thence to Littles, thence to Pittsburgh, thence to the headwaters of Wheeling Creek, thence to the Little Kanawha, thence to the Great Kanawha, thence to the Guyandot, thence to the Great Sandy Creek, thence to the great ridge running in a southwestern direction, and thence to a large river, the name of which was unknown to us, and from there to a large and very rocky creek, and thence to the mines where we remained from the 18th of July to the 26th of October 1761. When we left the mines we returned over the same way we had taken to come out."

Although following these directions would take you, according to my calculations, somewhere in Kentucky, or even farther south, West Virginia terrain figures prominently in the route.

I have no way, at present, to check the authenticity of Jonathan Swift's journal as given by J. H. Kidwell. True or not, the story was another which tempted men to dig for silver in such unlikely spots as Jackson County, W. Va.

Around Ripley, oldtimers appear to know few details concerning the old silver mines, or are reluctant to discuss them. The concensus appears to be, however, that they were "salted," and that investors lost heavily because of someone's dishonesty, or because of a prank that got out of hand.

But there may yet be a few who believe that gold or silver lies under Jackson County soil. Most who so believed lie under that soil themselves, buried with a dream that enriched their lives, if not their pocketbooks.

A "FOURTH" LOOK AT WELFARE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 20, 1966, the Washington Post in its Potomac magazine carried an article entitled "Three Looks at Welfare." A sub-headline on the article read, "Public Assistance and Its Problems Look Different, Depending on Your Point of View."

Because I believe the importance of this program has been misconstrued and because I also believe that the people who carry it out are honest and hard working, I will endeavor here to offer a fourth look and, I hope, an accurate one at the criticism offered.

Most unfair is this statement made by Mr. Jesse W. Lewis, Jr.:

> One of its aims: to gather information on women who may violate the man-in-the-house rule, adopted in 1965. This regulation denies assistance to a family if an employable man lives in the home.

Mr. President, to correct the public record, may I say that records of the Department of Public Welfare clearly indicate that the substitute parent provision—sometimes misnamed the "man in the house" rule—was adopted by the Department in 1955, not 1965.

Moreover, the Department has often stated emphatically, that the regulation does not deny assistance to a family if the employable man is the father, grandfather, brother, or son of the woman who receives the aid.

It is a matter of public record that when the man living in the home maintains the role normally occupied by a husband and is incapacitated, the family including himself, is eligible for assistance.

Finally, no mention was made, in the article, of the temporary assistance program for families of unemployed parents which was established to provide for the needs of children when the parents or parent, or other recognized heads of households, are employable but unemployed and are actively seeking employment or are awaiting acceptance in training under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.

REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by the Senator from New Mexico on the report of the Office of Water Resources Research, with the letter of transmittal by the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the statement, letter of transmittal, and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON ON REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

Among the notable achievements of the 88th Congress in natural resources legislation is the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 329). That act authorizes a continuing program of support for non-Federal research and training of scientists in the fields of water and of resources which affect water. As expressed by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, who under the law administers the program:

"The Water Resources Research Act of 1964 is a major forward step in natural resources conservation and development. It makes possible full engagement of the Nation's intellectual capabilities in meeting the Nation's water problems. New and improved means of dealing with water problems of local, State, regional and national levels will result from enlisting the competence of the universities and other research entities."

The Water Resources Research Act is indeed a significant innovation; yet it is one enacted only after long and careful study by the Congress. Following the studies of the Select Committee on National Water Resources in 1959 and 1960 and its report in 1961, an initial version of the proposed legislation (S. 3579), introduced July 27, 1962, was widely studied by the scientific community and others concerned with water resources problems. Aided by the comments and advice thus secured, 20 other Senators joined with me in sponsoring a revised and improved version of the bill (S. 2), in 1963. Hearings were held by the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives during 1963 and 1964, and the bill was enacted July 17, 1964.

We are now able to make a first appraisal of how the act is working. Recently, the Senate received the first annual report of the Secretary of the Interior on this cooperative program of water resources research and training. The accomplishments of even less than a single year's operation are reassuring evidence of the wisdom of the legislation. I call to the attention of each Senator the annual report of the Office of Water Resources Research which can be readily secured from the Interior Department. I quote from Secretary Udall's letter of transmittal to the President of the Senate:

"During the first year, pursuant to statutory authorization, a water resources research center in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico formulated an approved program of research and received an initial allotment of Federal grant funds. Already these 51 research institutes have started working on several hundred new projects. In addition to strengthening research itself, the impetus of the new program has strengthened and enlarged university faculties and curriculums in water resources-related subjects. Part-time employment as research project assistants and technicians is enabling several hundred students to continue their training for professional work in the water resources field."

The annual report referred to discusses in some detail the more than 300 new water research projects undertaken at the State water resources centers. They constitute an important contribution of knowledge to the improvement of methods for dealing with water resources problems. Scientists, engineers, and water resources officials among the constituents of Senators will recognize, I am confident, that these many new research projects that have been started as a consequence of the congressional authorization will in fact significantly improve the means of dealing with urgent national water problems.

There is another matter of special interest. One of the purposes of the Water Resources Research Act was to aid in the widespread distribution throughout the United States of centers of competence in water resources matters, so scientists would be available to solve local as well as national problems. In furtherance of this purpose, the act authorized a continuing annual allotment of Federal funds to one water resources research center in each State and Puerto Rico. As reported by the Secretary of Interior, each State has established such a center, formulated a water research program, and received an allotment toward its support.

The fact that every State in the Nation responded to this bill the first year it was in effect is a very significant indication of the spread of water problems and concern over them in our country.

Each one of the centers is now carrying on an effective program of research projects on water problems of special significance to its State and region. This impressive progress is so clearly evident in the programs of the 51 State water resources research centers that I ask unanimous consent to include at the end of these remarks listings by States of the titles of the individual research projects now receiving support under the Water Resources Research Act of 1964.

It is not often that a Member of the Senate has the opportunity of observing in 1 short year such productive fruition of his efforts. The Congress acted wisely in enacting the authorization. The Department of the Interior and its Office of Water Resources Research are vigorously and diligently carrying out the purposes of the congressional enactment. The scientists and engineers on university campuses throughout the Nation are wholeheartedly responding in the execution of research projects.

On July 17, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson said:

"Water Resources Research Act of 1964, which I have approved today, fills a vital need."

The 1965 Annual Report of the Office of Water Resources Research is evidence which fully sustains the President's view.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
January 21, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is my first annual report to the Congress of activities authorized by the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 329), as required by section 104 of the act.

The program of supporting non-Federal research and training in the field of water resources is authorized as a means of strengthening the Nation's capability in water resources conservation and management for assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population. Even the first year's operation of the program provides abundant grounds for optimism that it will be successful in furthering the objectives of the authorization.

Promptly responsive to passage of the act, there has been widespread high-quality participation by scientists and engineers representing many of the disciplines of the natural, life, and social sciences. Academic and nonacademic scientists and engineers throughout the Nation are evidencing their readiness to help develop the knowledge and understanding that are essential for effective solution of the critical problems of these States, regions, and the Nation.

The program of research and training has broadly based support—in the Congress, among the executive agencies, by the scientific community, by State and local public officials, and citizen organizations of all kinds. This widespread involvement lends confidence in the continuing vigor of the program, its balance of the many scientific and practical components of water resources problems, and its focus on problems of urgent public concern.

During the first year, pursuant to the statutory authorization, a water resources research center in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico formulated an approved program of research and received an initial allotment of Federal grant funds. Already these 51 research institutes have started working on several hundred new projects. In addition to strengthening research itself, the impetus of the new program has strengthened and enlarged university faculties and curriculums in water resources-related subjects. Part-time employment as research project assistants and technicians is enabling several hundred students to continue their training for professional work in the water resources field.

Progress also has been most encouraging on another one of the objectives of the Water Resources Research Act: improvement of coordination of research. An extensive network of formal and informal communication among the 51 research centers, the Office of Water Resources Research, and Federal, State, and nongovernment research organizations, is facilitating and expediting mutual awareness of current work among all who are engaged in water resources research.

With the cooperation of other Federal agencies and in collaboration with the Science Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution, the Office of Water Resources Research published the first volume of the "Water Resources Research Catalog," which presents information on some 2,000 current research projects dealing with water problems. Ready access to information about who is doing what has already demonstrated its value in minimizing unproductive duplication of research.

Recognition of effectiveness of scientific communication in increasing the productivity of research manpower and funds encourages the Department of the Interior to proceed now with a strengthened and expanded water resources scientific information center that will serve the 51 State research centers, the agencies of the Department of the Interior, and other Federal or non-Federal organizations as they may request.

Operation of this water science information center, employing laborsaving procedures and equipment, should significantly reduce the unproductive drain on manpower and funds that is consequent to decentralized, frequently duplicative and inefficient literature search by individual investigators, and laboratories.

Attached hereto is the report and recommendations of the panel of scientists, engineers, and other persons experienced in public affairs related to water resources. It is a highly knowledgeable examination of the first year's activity in the new program. It identifies accomplishments and also points to gaps on which attention must be focused promptly. Especially noteworthy in the panel's report is that, while warmly commending the Office of Water Resources Research for its first year progress, the panel finds that the Office of Water Resources Research should give more attention to the breadth and balance of the total program and its relevance to the most important local, State, and regional water problems needing research. Immediate steps are being taken to meet these suggestions.

The panel report also points out that "the water research effort and the training of water scientists are being gravely restricted by the failure of the Water Resources Research Act to enlist, on a par with the land-grant colleges and universities, the contributions and talents of other well-qualified institutions, individuals, and agencies." The panel correctly states:

"The enormous dimensions and complexity of the Nation's oncoming water supply problems, and the urgency of solving them in time, demand that we use the best-trained scientists and facilities available, wherever they are."

I am fully in accord with the panel's emphasis on the pressing need to amend title II of the Water Resources Research Act at the earliest possible hour and thereby to implement fully the program that President Johnson has termed "vital."

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

[From the Office of Water Resources Research]

LIST OF RESEARCH PROJECTS BY STATES, UNDER ANNUAL ALLOTMENT PROGRAM (SEC. 100) APPROVED IN FISCAL YEAR 1966

[Proposal number, title, and principal investigator]

ALABAMA

A-001-ALA: Evaluation of earthy materials for use in decontamination of water, Dixon.

A-002-ALA: Biological and chemical oxidation of selected organic pesticides, Leigh.

A-003-ALA: A reconsideration of flow of liquids in open channels, Shih.

A-004-ALA: Water resources nematology, Cairns.

A-005-ALA: Correlation between soil surface characteristics and rainfall-runoff-antecedent moisture relationships on agricultural watersheds on Coastal Plain soils, Hendrick.

A-006-ALA: Studies on the interactions of bacteria and aquatic nematodes, Wilt.

ALASKA

A-002-ALAS: Dissolved organics in Interior Alaska ground water, Birkholz.

A-004-ALAS: Inherent and maximum microbiological activity in Smith Lake, Burton.

A-005-ALAS: Analysis of Salmon capabilities in steep fish ladders, Behlke.

A-006-ALAS: Evaluation of water resource research needs in Alaska, Behlke.

A–007–ALAS: Kinetics of vitamin-limited microbiological activity, Button.

A–008–ALAS: Interstitial waters of glacial-marine sediment, Hoskins.

A–009–ALAS: Study of methods of elimination of ice jamming on northern streams, Cook.

A–010–ALAS: Effects of water quality and quantity on the fauna of nonglacial Alaskan rivers, Morrow.

A–011–ALAS: The distribution and succession of aquatic vascular plant communities in relation to physical-chemical characteristics of various lakes and ponds of the Tanana Valley, Alaska, Harmes.

A–012–ALAS: A study of the freezing cycle in an Alaskan stream, Benson.

ARIZONA

A–001–ARIZ: Development of surface storage facilities for paved catchment runoff water, Fogel.

A–002–ARIZ: Artificial ground water recharge of paved catchment runoff water, Wilson.

A–003–ARIZ: Selection and testing of materials for surfacing watershed areas, Fogel.

A–004–ARIZ: Development of methods for making potable water from paved catchment runoff water, Fogel.

ARKANSAS

A–001–ARK: Environmental changes produced by cold-water outlets from three Arkansas reservoirs, Strawn.

A–002–ARK: Development of automated subirrigation system, Bryan.

A–003–ARK: Quantitative analysis of stream flow rate extremes, Heiple.

A–004–ARK: Interaction of inorganic and organic fertilizer materials with pesticides as related to water quality in soils, Brown.

A–005–ARK: Virus movement in groundwater systems, Drewry.

A–006–ARK: Water resources research needs in Arkansas, Sparks.

CALIFORNIA

A–002–CAL: The impact of water export on the area of origin: A case study in the Owens and Mono Basin, Parsons.

A–003–CAL: Systems analysis for ground water basin management, Todd.

A–004–CAL: The management of surface water hydrologic system for water quality control, Orlob.

A–005–CAL: The acceptability of mineral taste in domestic water, Knutson.

A–013–CAL: The persistence of residues and the fate of herbicides in rice fields and rice field effluents, Seaman.

A–014–CAL: The municipality as a water policy determining entity, Crouch.

A–015–CAL: Problems in water transport through porous media, Perrine.

A–016–CAL: Relationship between the anomalies of the Pacific Ocean temperatures and those of California rainfall, Bjerknes.

A–017–CAL: Reducing the pollutional burden of food plant wastewaters, Hart.

COLORADO

A–001–COLO: Changes in the physical and biological characteristics of ground water reservoirs and adjacent surface waters, Morrison.

A–002–COLO: Surface water managment, Simons.

A–003–COLO: Water storage management, Yevdjevich.

A–004–COLO: Atmospheric water, Riehl.

A–005–COLO: The economics of administration of water resources, Barkley.

CONNECTICUT

A–001–CONN: Individual waste disposal systems, Wheeler.

A–002–CONN: Diffusion through multiperforate septa, Lee.

A–003–CONN: Response of fish to controlled pollution, Whitworth.

A–004–CONN: Relation of bedrock fracture systems to underground water supplies in the Stafford Springs, South Coventry, Spring Hill, and Westford Quadrangles, Aitken.

A–005–CONN: Rate and direction of ground water circulation in close spaced bedrock and gravel wells under the influence of nonsynchronous pumping time and rates, Frankel.

A–006–CONN: The role of regional planning in the public management of water resources: The case of the Farmington River Basin, Kasperson.

A–007–CONN: Correlation of trace elements in ground waters and aquifers within the Connecticut River Basin, Liese.

A–008–CONN: Analysis of quasi-periodic weather data, Posey.

A–009–CONN: Reverse filter erosion protection, Posey.

A–10–CONN: The determination of the engineering thermophysical properties of solutions containing dissolved solids, Fisher.

A–011–CONN: Reduction of river heat pollution by turbulence stimulation, Scottron.

DELAWARE

A–001–DEL: Increased gas transfer in biological reactors of interest to waste water reclamation, Zandi.

A–002–DEL: Increasing water use efficiency by altering plant growth, the plant microclimate, and the method of irrigation, Fieldhouse.

A–003–DEL: Investigation of the economic, governmental, and other social aspects of water resources development in Delaware, Overman.

A–004–DEL: The ground water flow system in the Delmarva Peninsula, De Wiest.

A–005–DEL: Mass transfer rates in structured media with emphasis on systems of interest in water conservation and reuse, Metzner.

FLORIDA

A–001–FLA: A comprehensive study of Florida water law, Maloney.

A–002–FLA: Factors affecting accelerated eutrophication of Florida lakes, Putnam.

A–003–FLA: Irrigation efficiency, Myers.

A–004–FLA: Rate of solution of limestone in the Karst Terrane of Florida, Brooks.

GEORGIA

A–001–GA: The monitoring of integrated light levels and average temperatures in lakes, Birkebak.

A–002–GA: Adsorption of ions in trace concentrations on soil and silt particles, Eichholz.

A–003–GA: Method for predicting the effects of pollutants on the dynamic oxygen balance of a water, Gates.

A–004–GA: Tracing storm and base flow to variable source areas on forested headwaters, Hewlett.

A–005–GA: Biological, chemical, and physical factors controlling the concentration of manganese in the hypolimnion of impoundments, Ingols.

A006–GA: The artesian system in Georgia; stratigraphy and hydrology of the Ocala, Rich.

A–007–GA: Determination of the content and behavior of specific trace cations in ground and surface waters, and their adjustment to passage in or on subsurface geologic formations of contrasting chemical and mineralogic compositions, Salotti.

A–008–GA: The extraction of potassium from fresh and saline waters by clay minerals, Weavers.

A–009–GA: Efficient design and utilization of rainfall networks, Snyder.

A–010–GA: Survey of the nature and magnitude of the water research needs of the textile industry of Georgia, Hyden.

HAWAII

A–001–HI: Pollution effects on ground water recharge in Hawaii, Lau.

A–009–HI: Feasibility of seismic exploration for ground water, Cox.

A–010–HI: Pilot evapotranspiration investigation, Ekern.

A–011–HI: Hydrologic conversion of the Ewa Beach Testwell, Cox.

IDAHO

A–003–IDA: Effects of stream sedimentary deposits on the distribution and metabolic activity of the bottom fauna in Coeur d'Alene Lake, Idaho, Ferguson.

A–008–IDA: Study of solid-liquid phase precipitation measuring device, McKean.

A–009–IDA: Canal seepage and ground water, Peebles.

A–010–IDA: A critical study of the Idaho Code and Laws together with various agencies and their functions in the field of water resources, Walenta.

A–011–IDA: Detailed ground water investigation of the Moscow Basin, Idaho, Jones.

A–012–IDA: A microclimatic profile from the Snake River to the Clearwater Mountains, Day.

A–013–IDA: A lethal index for classifying chemicals which affect water quality for aquatic life, MacPhee.

A–014–IDA: Characteristics of major forest and range experiment stations in Idaho, Tisdale.

A–016–IDA: Hydrology of frozen ground floods, Robertson.

A–017–IDA: Economic value of water in different uses within agriculture, Folz.

ILLINOIS

A–001–ILL: Influence of turbulence on surface reaeration, Holley.

A–004–ILL: Effect of organic compounds on the ion exchange adsorption of radioactive cations on clays, Ewing.

A–005–ILL. Occurrence of nitrate in water wells, Larson.

A–006–ILL: Microscopic determination of tractive force distribution in free-surface water conveyances, Wenzel.

A–010–ILL: Basic study of jet flow patterns related to stream and reservoir behavior, Maxwell.

A–011–ILL: Development of drainage assessment procedures based on physical features in Illinois, Jones.

A–012–ILL: Quantitative measurements of precipitation of Lake Michigan, Changnon.

A–013–ILL: Geologic controls on ground water discharge in selected small stream basins in Illinois, Farvolden.

INDIANA

A–001–IND: Estimation of runoff from small watersheds, Delleur.

A–002–IND: Statistical analysis of ground water use and replenishments, Johnson.

A–003–IND: Hydraulics of flow in meandering rivers with flood plains, Toebes.

A–004–IND: Characterization of the rate of water infiltration into soil, Swartzendruber.

A–005–IND: Effect of pesticide residues and other organotoxicants on the quality of surface and ground water resources, Monke.

IOWA

A–001–IA: Economic factors in the establishment of water quality stream standards, Dougal.

A–002–IA: Evaluation of flood damage to corn from controlled depth and frequency of flooding, Beer.

A–003–IA: Moisture movement to vertical sinks in water—unsaturated soil, Kirkham.

A–004–IA: Recession characteristics of Iowa streams, Howe.

A–005–IA: Competitive recreational uses of selected Iowa lakes, Haugen.

A–006–IA: Discharge valley form relationships of selected Iowa streams, Salisbury.

A–007–IA: To collect, characterize, and study the biodegradability and the chemical oxidation of carbon-adsorbed materials from effluents from sewage plants, Sletten.

A–011–IA: Movement of radionuclides through soil formations, Oulman.

A-012-IA: Geology of the regoloth aquifers of the Nishnabotna Basin, Hussey.

A-013-IA: Properties of tile drainage water, Willrich.

A-014-IA: Influence of geohydrology on landscape and soil formation, Ruhe.

A-015-IA: Laboratory investigation of flow in river bends, Rouse.

A-016-IA: Reoxygenation of Iowa streams, Smith.

KANSAS

A-001-KAN: Evaluation of an index for viral pollution, Loehr.

A-002-KAN: Numerical modeling of ground water flow, Weinaug.

A-003-KAN: Derivation of continuous basin hydrographs by routing, Smith.

A-004-KAN: Integrated soil moisture measurement using radio waves, Eagleman.

A-005-KAN: Micrometeorological investigations of the energy budget as related to water loss, Bark.

A-006-KAN: Financing water resource facilities, Daicoff.

A-007-KAN: Value of water for irrigation in the Kansas River Valley, Pine.

A-008-KAN: Pollution from animal feedlots, Larson.

A-009-KAN: A study of energy dissipation devices to control erosion resulting from the discharge of flow from conduits into open channels, Haynie.

KENTUCKY

A-001-KY: Economic analysis of alternative flood control measures, James.

A-002-KY: A study of the persistence of pesticides in impounded waters, Lauderdale.

A-003-KY: A field and laboratory study of factors controlling porosity and permeability in the Curdsville member of the Lexington Limestone, MacQuown.

A-004-KY: Mathematical description of transpiration of water as affected by soil, plant, and environmental factors, Ligon.

A-006-KY: The economic impact of flood control reservoirs, James.

A-007-KY: An ecological study of the effects of strip mining on the microbiology of streams, Weaver.

LOUISIANA

A-001-LA: Study of measures to be taken to accomplish protection of the ground water supply of the Baton Rouge area from degradation due to the intrusion of saline water into area of offtake—legal aspects, phase 1, Hardy.

A-002-LA: Fresh water storage in saline aquifers, Kimbler.

A-003-LA: The effect of selected herbicides upon the growth of planktonic freshwater algae and their persistence in surface waters, Wasmer.

MAINE

A-001-ME: Basic water research on New England soils, Struchtemeyer.

A-002-ME: Disposal of agricultural product wastes through the soil, Rourke.

A-003-ME: Effect of nitrification of organic wastes on waters in the natural environment, Keshavan.

A-004-ME: Removal of viruses from water, Sproul.

A-005-ME: Pattern of precipitation dispersion as affected by different vegetative covers in Maine, Schomaker.

A-006-ME: Chemical contaminants found in surface and subsurface water as related to soil and climatic conditions, Rourke.

A-007-ME: The effect of salts applied to highways on the infiltration and percolation of water through the soil banding the highways, Hutchinson.

A-008-ME: Water conservation in food processing, Highlands.

MARYLAND

A-001-MD: Simulation of water resources regimes, Green.

A-002-MD: Effects of thermal pollution on productivity and stability of estuarine communities, Mishursky.

A-004-MD: Disposal of waste from swine-feeding floors to minimize or eliminate stream pollution, Green.

A-005-MD: Treatment of liquid waste from food processing plants, Kramer.

A-006-MD: Comparison of various forages for agricultural waste water disposal, Kresge.

A-007-MD: Improvement of quality of water resources by a threefold attack: adsorption, sedimentation, and mixing, Wockenfuss.

A-008-MD: An investigation of factors affecting the intensity of use of water recreation facilities, Volk.

MASSACHUSETTS

A-001-MASS: A survey and evaluation of small artificial recreational ponds in central Massachusetts, McCann.

A-002-MASS: The ecology of the young fishes of the Weweantic River estuary, Cole.

A-003-MASS: Hydrological studies in Massachusetts, Higgins.

A-004-MASS: Pilot study of the occurrence and characteristics of shallow-aquifer contamination in Massachusetts, Motts.

A-005-MASS: Development of methods for increasing the efficiency of water use in cranberry culture, Norton.

A-006-MASS: Relation of sediment load to hydrological characteristics of Connecticut River between Northfield and Springfield, Mass., Hayes.

A-007-MASS: The ecological significance of cellulolytic bacteria in Quabbin Reservoir, Reynolds.

A-008-MASS: Adsorption of pesticides on earth materials, Baker.

A-009-MASS: Closed systems for animal sewage treatment, Clayton.

A-010-MASS: Pesticide occurrence, concentration, and degradation in free water systems, Gunner.

A-011-MASS: Effects of organic deposits on water quality in impoundments, Feng.

A-012-MASS: Thermodynamic relationships within the system "Sediment-Water-Air," Zajicek.

A-013-MASS: The effects of climate upon the work capacity and cardiac and opercular cycles in fresh water fish, Roberts.

A-014-MASS: Conference on applied geology in Massachusetts, Farguhar.

A-015-MASS: Subsurface irrigation of turf areas, nozzle design and spacing, Whitney.

A-016-MASS: Small watershed storage increase using low dams, Hendrickson.

A-017-MASS: The mechanics of fluid transport in vegetation, Harris.

MICHIGAN

A-001-MICH: Ground water recharge, dynamics of ground water flow systems, and methods of delineating glacial drift aquifiers, Hinze.

A-003-MICH: Water movement in unsaturated soils, Kunze.

A-004-MICH: Diffusion of water from the plant canopy in different atmospheres and diffusion of water in the soil-root zone, Harrington.

A-005-MICH: Application of systems and optimization analysis to water quality problems in Michigan, Milstein.

A-006-MICH: Seasonal movement of percolating waters to the ground water table under upland hardwood forests in southern Michigan, White.

A-007-MICH: Biological recovery of waste water, Schulze.

A-008-MICH: Toxic action of water soluble pollutants on fresh water fish, Fromm.

A-009-MICH: Determination of intensity-duration-frequency-areal coverage of intense summertime storms, Wheaton.

A-010-MICH: Biotic response to pollution reduction in a river, Lauff.

MINNESOTA

A-001-MINN: The effect of pothole drainage upon ground water resources, Manson.

A-004-MINN: Factors influencing soil freezing in forests and the importance of their effect on surface runoff, Thorud.

A-006-MINN: Water adsorption and its interactions with clay and quartz, Blake.

A-007-MINN: Studies on the use of planktonic desmids as indicators of the trophic status and water quality in fresh water lakes, Brook.

A-008-MINN: Water quality, organic productivity and the distribution of organisms in Minnesota lakes, Wright.

A-009-MINN: Ground water contribution to streamflow and its relation to hydrogeologic basin characteristics and recharge rates to aquifiers in Minnesota, Ackroyd.

A-010-MINN: Analysis of factors affecting aquifer test results under induced streambed infiltration conditions with electric analog computers, Walton.

A-011-MINN: Study of the open water distribution and abundance of net-plankton as an index of eutrophication in Lake Superior, Olson.

A-013-MINN: Review of analysis of precipitation and runoff data for selected watersheds in Minnesota, Bowers.

MISSISSIPPI

A-001-MISS: Precipitation probabilities in Mississippi, McWhorter.

A-002-MISS: Water resource characteristics of the Town Creek watershed as an attraction for industrial users, Peden.

A-003-MISS: Factors affecting the removal of iron and manganese from ground water, Robinson.

A-004-MISS: Decontamination of low-level radioactive waters with Yazoo and Zilpha clays, Middlebrooks.

A-005-MISS: Ground water regulation in the coastal flatwoods of Mississippi, Miller.

A-006-MISS: Law of water resources of the State of Mississippi: a multifactoral, policy-oriented study of legal prescriptions relating to water use and control, Vinson.

A-007-MISS: The effect of a new high temperature sewage stabilization process on enteric pathogens and viruses, Brown.

A-008-MISS: Local action and acceptance of watershed development, Wikinson.

A-009-MISS: An inventory and study of beaver-impounded water in Mississippi, Arner.

MISSOURI

A-001-MO: Availability, distribution, quality, and quantity of water resources in carbonate karst terrain, Maxwell.

A-002-MO: Systems approach to river basin development, Ray.

A-003-MO: Determination of yields of water to be expected from different land areas in Missouri for the climatic patterns characteristic of the area, Woodruff.

MONTANA

A-001-MONT: Water resources of Montana: basic hydrologic studies of two selected Montana watersheds.

A-002-MONT: Problems and opportunities of water resources utilization in the Upper Columbia and Missouri Basins, Huffman.

A-003-MONT: The application of geophysical instruments and procedures to ground water research, Groff.

A-004-MONT: Water, soil and plant relations, Taber.

A-005-MONT: Water quality in Montana, Taylor.

A-006-MONT: Hydrogeology of the Great Falls area, Montana, Goers.

A-007-MONT: Procedures for developing public interest and for the training of ground water scientists and technicians, Groff.

NEBRASKA

A-001-NEB: Energy sources for evapotranspiration in the plains regions, Rosenberg.

A-003-NEB: Engineering phases of land shaping for soil and water conservation, Wittmus.

A-004-NEB: Input-output analysis of water use for Nebraska industries, Epp.

A-005-NEB: Internal water status of plants, Kinbacher.

A-006-NEB: Mechanics of bank seepage in natural streams during flood flows, Sarpkaya.

A-007-NEB: Brackish water purification by biological fuel cell powered electrodialysis, Scheller.

A-008-NEB: A legal-economic analysis of administrative and market procedures used in the transfer of water rights, Yeutter.

NEVADA

A-004-NEV: Demand for water-based recreational activities in Nevada, Wyckoff.

A-006-NEV: Transpiration of plants under natural conditions, Went.

A-007-NEV: Hydrologic aspects of pre-Lahontan sediments in Nevada, Mifflin.

A-008-NEV: An engineering-economic model for waste water reclamation and reuse, Orcutt.

A-009-NEV: Ground water flow system analysis in mountainous terrain in Nevada, Mifflin.

A-010-NEV: Nevada resources data center, Maxey.

A-011-NEV: Humboldt River surface water analysis, Maxey.

A-012-NEV: Evapotranspiration map of the State of Nevada, Maxey.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

A-001-NH: Relationship of yield of ground water from drilled wells and types of bedrock in New Hampshire, Stewart.

A-002-NH: Chemical character of ground and surface waters in relation to soil weathering process, Hall.

A-003-NH: Atomic fluorescence spectroscopy—a potential tool for trace analysis, Ellis.

A-004-NH: Impact of copper sulfate treatment on some of the limnological characteristics of Winninquam Lake, Belknap County, N.H., Sawyer.

A-005-NH: Nitrogen content of drainage water, litter and soils in the vicinity of alder and white pine sites, Peterson.

A-006-NH: The survival of enteric bacteria and viruses in stabilization ponds, Slanetz.

A-007-NH: Numbers and types of microorganisms in stabilization pond effluents, Slanetz.

NEW JERSEY

A-001-NJ: Water law of New Jersey, Morreale.

A-002-NJ: Drought frequency, intensity and duration: Its correlation to streamflow and its impact upon synthetic hydrology, Snow.

A-003-NJ: An investigation of analog computer simulation of stream, pollution dispersion models with chemical reactions, Davidson.

A-004-NJ: Water conservation through filtration of gelatinous sludges in industrial waste treatment, Dittman.

A-005-NJ: Turbulent dispersion in waterflow systems, Peskin.

A-006-NJ: Petrology of aquifers of New Jersey Coastal Plain, Martens.

A-007-NJ: Water well yields in the New Jersey Highlands in relation to geologic environment, Smith.

A-008-NJ: Vegetation influences on water yield on the Lebanon Forest experimental watersheds, Buell.

A-009-NJ: The impact of suburban development on the water resources of New Jersey, Nathan.

A-010-NJ: Industrial water and waste disposal requirements in New Jersey, Granstrom.

A-011-NJ: Hydrologic analysis of the Millstone River Basin, New Jersey, DeWiest.

A-012-NJ: Evaluation of phenol water quality, Faust.

A-013-NJ: Preliminary investigation of the perception of flood hazard in the Delaware Valley, Beyer.

NEW MEXICO

A-001-NMEX: Synthetic hydrology, Viesman.

A-002-NMEX: Gas chromatographic evaluation of bacterial stream pollution, Garner.

A-003-NMEX: The effect of water quality and environmental factors on the distribution of freshwater vertebrates in the Rio Grande River, Whitford.

A-004-NMEX: The effects of soil properties on the retention, percolation, and runoff of precipitation, Anderson.

A-005-NMEX: Plant composition and soil properties as affected by irrigation water quality, Dregne.

A-006-N MEX: The effect of irrigation method, and moisture and fertility levels upon maximizing water use efficiency and quality cotton fiber production, Williams.

A-007-N MEX: Inventory of irrigation areas and determination of consumptive uses by areas, Henderson.

A-008-N MEX: Geohydrology of the lower Rio Grande Valley and adjacent intermontane areas of New Mexico, King.

A-009-N MEX: Economics of alternative pricing systems to allocate scarce water supplies, Long.

A-010-N MEX: A comparison of the aquatic beetles in the five major watersheds of New Mexico with special emphasis on the family Dytiscidae, Zimmerman.

NEW YORK

A-001-NY: Water supply demand, Allee.

A-002-NY: Determining optimal policies for operating water resources systems, Lynn.

A-003-NY: Water and related land resources law and political institutions I, Farnham.

A-007-NY: Eutrophication of water resources in New York State, Barlow.

A-008-NY: The hydraulics of channels, connecting two reservoirs, Graf.

A-009-NY: Hydrologic systems analysis of the Great Lakes, Brutsaert.

NORTH CAROLINA

A-001-NC: Runoff from rainfall and topographical data and the routing of flow in streams, Amein.

A-003-NC: Primary productivity studies in North Carolina salt marshes, Cooper.

A-004-NC: A comparison of State water pollution control laws and programs, Heath.

A-005-NC: Solubility equilibria involving metal oxides and corresponding aqueous metal perchlorates, Hentz.

A-007-NC: Diffusion and dispersion in porous media, Kashef.

A-008-NC: The movement and storage of water in North Carolina soils, Lutz.

A-009-NC: Ground water yields in Raleigh Quadrangle, North Carolina, Parker.

A-010-NC: The effect of different low-flow hydrologic regimes on water quality management, Sherwani.

A-011-NC: Criteria for evaluating the quality of water based recreation facilities, Stott.

NORTH DAKOTA

A-001-N DAK: Closed circuit water systems for livestock production, Pratt.

A-002-N DAK: Treatment of lye peel potato wastes by coagulation, Fossum.

A-003-N DAK: Microbiology of sewage-lagoons, role of purple-sulfur bacteria in stabilization of industrial wastes, Vennes.

A-004-N DAK: Water quality in relation to productivity of Lake Ashtabula Reservoir in southeastern North Dakota, Whitman.

A-005-N DAK: Effect of water quality and management on chemical and physical properties of selected soils under irrigation, Schroer.

A-006-N DAK: The biogeochemistry of Devils Lake, N. Dak., Tubb.

A-007-N DAK: Mussels and pollution in the Red River drainage, North Dakota and Minnesota, Cvancara.

A-008-N DAK: The determination of suitable average values of meteorological data for use in estimation of evapotranspiration from free water surfaces and soil surfaces, Schwendeman.

OHIO

A-001-OHIO: Development of a natural laboratory for study of acid mine drainage, Smith.

A-002-OHIO: A study of the microbial flora of acid waters, Dugan.

A-003-OHIO: A biological survey of acid mine waters, Dambach.

A-004-OHIO: A study of groundwater contamination due to saline waste water disposal in Morrow County oil field, Lehr.

A-005-OHIO: Alternative economic responses to the acid mine drainage problem in southeastern Ohio, Tybout.

OKLAHOMA

A-001-OKLA: Ecological factors affecting turbidity and productivity in prairie ponds in the Southern Great Plains, Dorris.

A-002-OKLA: Chemical and thermal characteristics of Keystone Reservoir, Dorris.

A-003-OKLA: Development of design criteria for individual domestic water supplies from surface impoundments, Daniel.

A-004-OKLA: Reduction of water application losses through improved distribution channel, Garton.

A-005-OKLA: Water yield as influenced by watershed characteristics and small upstream reservoirs, Garton.

A-006-OKLA: The mechanism of direct surface runoff from rainfall, Garton.

A-007-OKLA: Enzymes and catalysts for purification of industrial waste water, Fulton.

A-008-OKLA: Oxygen diffusion in semiquiescent waters, Gaudy.

A-009-OKLA: Thermodynamic properties of brine, Rowe.

OREGON

A-001-OREG: Hydrology of water yield prediction, Krygier.

A-002-OREG: Appraisal of water management institutions, Clark.

PENNSYLVANIA

A-001-PA: Sewage oxidation rates in neutralized acid mine water stream, Kountz.

A-002-PA: Crushed limestone barriers for neutralization of acid stream, Kountz.

A-003-PA: The effects of nutrients additions and stream dynamics on stream eutrophication, McDonnell.

A-004-PA: Removal of both metal and detergent contaminants in streams by foam fractionation, McLean.

A-005-PA: The carbonate hydrogeologic environment, its relationship to land use, water resources development and management., Parizek.

A-006-PA: Characteristics of streamflow of small watersheds in Pennsylvania and influencing factors, Sopper.

A-007-PA: An economic analysis of water utilization in Pennsylvania, Blood.

A-008-PA: An evaluation of the significances of escherichia in sewage effluence and water supplies, Glantz.

A-009-PA: A water-supply demand analysis in Clinton County, Pa.—study in economic hydrology, Raphael.

PUERTO RICO

A-001-PR: Determination of safe levels of pollution in Puerto Rico, Santiago-Vazquez.

A-002-PR: Quantitative analysis of water use patterns in Puerto Rico, Santiago-Vazquez.

A-004-PR: Development of ground water control methods for the heavy soils in Lajas Valley, R. Vazquez.

A-005-PR: Water requirements by sugarcane under irrigation, R. Vazquez.

RHODE ISLAND

A-001-RI: Water loss through interception by mixed oak forests in Rhode Island, Brown.

A-002-RI: Structural chemistry of yellow organic matter in fresh water, Felbeck.

A-003-RI: Movement of manganese into ground water supplies, DeLuise.

A-004-RI: Analysis of the effluent from a nuclear fuel recovery plant, Blecharczyk.

A-006-RI: Static and dynamic behavior of soils, Nacci.

A-007-RI: The effect of obstructions on the reaeration of flowing streams, Hagist.

A-008-RI: Potential ground-water hydrologic characteristics of glacial deposits as determined by electric resistivity criteria, Fisher.

A-009-RI: The water economy of turfgrass, Stuckey.

A-010-RI: Variations in water consumption based on economic and social characteristics of the household, Spaulding.

A-011-RI: Analysis of natural radioelements in raw water, Rose.

A-012-RI: Scale reduction in desalination by calcium sulfate solubility inversion, Thompson.

A-013-RI: An investigation of the interrelationship of organic matter and trace elements in fresh water, Corless.

A-014-RI: Development of methods for controlling the copper content in water, Mairs.

A-015-RI: Oxygen transfer in aeration process, Poon.

SOUTH CAROLINA

A-001-SC: Effect of pesticides on the ecology of fresh water organisms, Reed.

A-002-SC: Study of relationships between pollution and industrial development in South Carolina, Stepp.

A-003-SC: Hydrology of the root zone, Lambert.

A-004-SC: Bedrock influence on sediment load of selected Hartwell Reservoir tributaries, Brown.

A-005-SC: Temperature study of ground water—surface water relationship, Law.

A-006-SC: Relation of soil properties to evaporation of water from soils, Peele.

A-007-SC: Water quality and waste assimilation capacity studies of an impoundment of recent origin, Wallace.

SOUTH DAKOTA

A-001-SDAK: Economic potentials for water resources development on South Dakota, Helfinstine.

A-002-SDAK: Water quality and primary production of South Dakota lakes, Schoenthal.

A-003-SDAK: Investigation of the influence of waste disposal practices on ground water qualities, Anderson.

A-004-SDAK: Determination of porosity and permeability of selected sandstone aquifers, Gries.

A-005-SDAK: Correlating soil moisture conditions and microclimate with evaporation losses and water requirement of plants, Horton.

A-006-SDAK: Influence of low rates of water application by sprinklers on the microclimate, Wiersma.

A-007-SDAK: Apparent viscosity of fine material concentration as it affects sediment transport and velocities in open channel flow, Alger.

A-009-SDAK: Establishment of water quality laboratory and systems for storage and retrieval of information for the South Dakota State University, Wiersma.

TENNESSEE

A-001-TENN: Fundamentals of turbulent mixing, Peebles.

A-002-TENN: Factors affecting water yields from small watersheds in Tennessee, Shelton.

A-003-TENN: Small reservoir sealing, Sewell.

A-004-TENN: An investigation of surfactant removal, Whatley.

A-005-TENN: A study of the survival of bacterial indicators of pollution in natural waters, Womack.

A-006-TENN: An investigation of the effect of controlled releases on the physical, chemical, and bacteriological characteristics of Fort Loudon Reservoir, Larson.

A-007-TENN: Seminars and conferences, Larson.

TEXAS

A-001-TEX: Future agricultural water requirements, Smerdon.

A-002-TEX: Morphology of precipitation and runoff, Clark.

A-003-TEX: Influence of fatty alcohols and acids on the clarity and biota of impounded reservoirs, Davis.

A-004-TEX: Development of optimization-system analysis techniques for Texas water resources.

A-005-TEX: Status evaluation of surface waters in Texas, Clark.

UTAH

A-001-UTAH: Cultural, social organizational, and social psychological factors associated with proposed changes in water usage patterns, Bylund.

A-002-UTAH: Instrumentation and development of techniques to measure and evaluate meteorological properties important to hydrology, Ashcroft.

A-003-UTAH: A study of the biological, chemical, and physical nature of water quality factors under Utah conditions, Neuhold.

A-004-UTAH: Evaluation and development of advanced spectral photographic methods for determining relative water use by vegetative cover on natural watersheds, Haws.

A-005-UTAH: Identification and planning of water research needs, Peterson.

VERMONT

A-001-VT: Limnology of Lake Champlain, Potash.

A-002-VT: Role of basin phusiography on the runoff from small watersheds, Ragan.

A-003-VT: Bottom sediments of Lake Champlain, Hunt.

A-004-VT: Physiology and ecology of nematode fauna of Lake Champlain, Fisher.

VIRGINIA

A-001-VA: Concentration of phosphate sludges, Parsons.

A-002-VA: Fundamental study of multicomponent mass transport in aqueous and membrane systems, Wills.

A-004-VA: Evaluation of geohydrologic factors in estimation of runoff coefficients in watershed embracing multiple geologic terranes, Cooper.

A-005-VA: Evaluation of the effects of trace elements on the activity of microorganisms with special emphasis on the lactic streptoccocci, Benoit.

A-006-VA: Flood damage abatement study for Virginia, Walker.

A-007-VA: Queueing model for pollution transport in streams, McJunkin.

A-008-VA: Study of water resources laws for Virginia, Walker.

A-009-VA: Relation of selected engineering land treatments to soil water storage and rainfall use efficiency by crops, Lillard.

A-010-VA: Water quality in relation to aquatic plants and their control, Evrard.

WASHINGTON

A-001-WASH: A study of infiltration beneath a forest floor, Campbell.

A-003-WASH: Simulation of a water resource system, Bevan.

A-004-WASH: A comprehensive study of the fluid mechanics of downstream migrant fish passage structures, Richey.

A-005-WASH: Some effects of water impoundments on waterfowl populations and reproduction on the Snake River, Wash., Buss.

A-006-WASH: Drainage theory for removing excess water from irrigated lands, Jensen.

A-007-WASH: Methods of investigating ground-water recharge near the margins of plateau basalts, Crosby.

A-008-WASH: Evaluation of factors affecting stream self-purification, Proctor.

A-009-WASH: Determination of flows for ungaged streams, Bender.

A-010-WASH: Distribution of planktonic fish eggs, Saunders.

A-011-WASH: Distribution and ecology of nematodes in irrigation water, Faulkner.

A-012-WASH: Effect of dam construction on downstream water temperature, Nece.

A-013-WASH: The role of industrial process changes in affecting water requirements, Iulo.

WEST VIRGINIA

A-001-WVA: Ecological and physiological relationships of Monongahela River fish populations to acid mine pollution, Benson.

A-002-WVA: Acid mine drainage microbiological studies, Wilson.

A-003-WVA: Runoff studies on small watersheds, Burchinal.

A-004-WVA: The hydrologic design of small drainage structures in West Virginia, Burchinal.

A-005-WVA: An investigation of the distribution and abundance of vascular aquatic plants in the Monongahela River Basin above Point Marion, Pa., with special reference of the influence of water quality on these plants, Clarkson.

A-006-WVA: Influence of topographic features on rainfall in West Virginia, Dickerson.

A-007-WVA: Algal relationships to the recovery of acid mine streams, Bennett.

A-008-WVA: Geochemical behavior of iron and manganese in a reservoir (Lake Lynn, W. Va.) fed by streams containing acid mine drainage, Corbett.

A-009-WVA: Geochemical and sedimentological analysis of the Tygart River Reservoir, Collin.

WISCONSIN

A-001-WIS: Use of lake sediment cores to estimate the rate of eutrophication of lakes, Lee.

A-002-WIS: Biological aspects of eutrophication on Lake Mendota, Crystall, and Trout Lake, Wis., Hasler.

A-003-WIS: Methods for harvesting or control, aquatic plants, Grant.

A-004-WIS: Circulation and mixing processes in lakes, Hoopse.

A-005-WIS: Unsteady flow of ground water and dispersion in ground water movement, Monkmeyer.

A-006-WIS: An investigation of the relationship between the filtering properties of particulates in water and the filter medium as applied in water reuse system, Polkowski.

A-007-WIS: A model to estimate the economic effects, water-based recreation projects, on local political subdivisions, Lord.

A-008-WIS: Legal-economic analysis of irrigation in Wisconsin, Rose.

A-009-WIS: Water quality management on the Wisconsin River, a model study of the technical, economic, legal, financial, and administrative aspects, Beuscher.

WYOMING

A-001-WYO: Water resource operations study, Bellamy.

EDWIN CHRISTIANSON ELECTED VICE PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the delegates at the annual convention of the National Farmers Union, held last week in Denver, elected Mr. Edwin Christianson as the new vice president of the organization.

I have known Ed Christianson for many years. He has been president of the Minnesota Farmers Union since 1950 and he is one of the distinguished farm leaders of the State. I know of his concern for the welfare of farm families and of his many efforts to develop practical programs, both within his own organization and also at the national level, to improve economic and social conditions for farm families and rural communities.

The election of Ed Christianson is a tribute to his record, and it is an honor for him and for the farm families he has worked with in Minnesota for many years. I am sure that he will bring to the National Farmers Union, as its new vice president, the same enthusiasm and dedication for improving farm and rural conditions as he has demonstrated over the years in Minnesota.

WILL CLAYTON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, when Will Clayton died last February 8, the Nation lost one of its greatest men. Will Clayton had that rare combination of qualities which enabled him to succeed in all his endeavors and to retain the respect and high regard of all who ever knew him.

He succeeded in his role as father of a fine family. He succeeded in the development of an enormously profitable business establishment. He succeeded as a statesman and a servant of his country in many difficult and challenging assignments. No man could have been more faithful and diligent in the use of his talents and in the devotion of his efforts to the building of a better world.

Will Clayton was still at work at the time of his sudden and fatal illness. During the week prior to his death, he participated in conferences of the Atlantic Council and the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. Both of these organizations seek the further development of ideas and programs conceived by Will Clayton during his service as Assistant Secretary of Commerce and as Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs over 20 years ago.

I considered Will Clayton a friend since the day I met him in the forties. I knew him as a private citizen and as a Federal official. I knew him as a selfless servant of his country, always eager to share his time, his talent, and his personal fortune in the interest of his fellowmen and in the interest of international peace and prosperity. The Nation will not soon replace Will Clayton.

Will Clayton had an unusual talent in dealing with people. He was soft spoken, pleasant, and unobtrusively persuasive. I have a personal reason to be in his debt. But for his assistance in persuading a reluctant and obtuse Member of the other body, the Student Exchange Act of 1946 probably would not have been enacted. His talent for reconciling different views, of achieving agreement among men of diverse opinions was unsurpassed. In a word, he understood human beings and knew how to lead them to cooperation rather than conflict.

Will Clayton's children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren have a proud heritage. I extend to them my profound sympathy in this time of grief. All the Nation grieves with them. All the Nation is grateful for the life and work of Will Clayton. May we all be worthy heirs of the contributions of this great man.

VIETNAM—LETTER BY PROF. BERNARD FALL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the March 11 issue of the New York Times there appeared a letter to the editor by Bernard Fall. Professor Fall, a French citizen now a resident in Washington, is a renowned expert on Vietnam. He has written extensively on the subject and has appeared recently on many television programs. Few men, if indeed there are any at all, know more than he does about the past and present of this embattled land.

During the recent hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee on the war in Vietnam, Gen. Maxwell Taylor appeared as a witness. He testified on February 17. In his prepared statement read at the beginning of the hearing he said:

> The Vietminh won more in Paris than in Dienbienphu and believe that the Vietcong may be as fortunate in Washington.

Now this remark of General Taylor was important because it implied that the French lost the war in Indochina because of political dissension at home and that, consequently, dissension in Washington was dangerous because it could have the same effect.

Professor Fall's letter disputes General Taylor's statement. Professor Fall states categorically:

> The hard and brutal fact is the French lost the Indochina war in the field.

He then describes the military situation in which the French found themselves despite the fact, and it is an important fact in the context of the subject of the letter that—

> Year after year, the Communists and a few of their associates excepted, the French Parliament voted the credits for the war and voted for the reinforcements which could be squeezed out of a weakened postwar France.

There are two other sentences in Professor Fall's letter which I would like to quote. The first is the following:

> I have read every French parliamentary debate on Indochina since 1945 and they make instructive reading as bewildered but honest men were faced, on one hand, with glowing reports that the war was being won and, on the other, with new requests for more funds and troops.

I have only one comment, perhaps an obvious comment, to offer on this sentence. We are also bewildered but honest men. We are faced with reports that the war is being won and with simultaneous requests for more funds and troops. Let us hope, and pray, that this is where the analogy ends.

The second sentence in the letter that I would like to quote reads as follows:

> It is rather curious, finally, to see observers who, for two decades, have berated the French Army for all sorts of true or imagined failings, now resort to the German stab-in-the-back myth to club their own opposition here.

I think that this sentence can stand without comment as the last word on General Taylor's remark.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Fall's letter to the editor in the March 11 issue of the Times be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRENCH IN INDOCHINA

To the EDITOR.

C. L. Sulzberger's editorial page column of February 25 somewhat lacks the serenity and even urbanity which I have come to associate with him. But the point which concerns us here is whether such a war as that in Vietnam can be lost by debate, and whether—as Gen. Maxwell Taylor said, and Mr. Sulzberger says is true—the French lost the Indochina war in Paris, or in the field.

The hard and brutal fact is the French lost the Indochina war in the field. One year before the battle of Dienbienphu the ratio between French and Communist forces had finally dropped to 1.2 to 1 in a situation where (as is visible today) a 5-to-1 ratio even with all the firepower in the world gives rise to little optimism, and 10 or even 20 to 1 is considered a useful superiority level.

By that time also (spring 1953) the Vietminh had conquered all of Tonking (North Vietnam) shy of the Red River Delta, a fortified "enclave" in which the French controlled 1,800 vilages out of 5,000. All of northern Laos had fallen to Giap in one swift offensive.

VIETMINH HOLDINGS

In South Vietnam an unbroken expanse of Vietminh territory existed from a few miles south of Danang to almost the gates of Saigon save for yet another French "enclave" in the mountain plateau area. Beyond the Mekong Delta, Camau Peninsula, and the whole Cardamom Mountain chain of Cambodia were in Vietminh hands.

The French Army had failed in every one of its offensives in which it attempted to "find, fix, and destroy" the enemy—although it, too, could point to reassuring casualty statistics. A 25,000-man stab into the northern hinterland netted a few hundred dead in late 1952; an airborne attack on the Chinese border in 1953 found a few tons of weapons but no troops; a 20,000-man operation near Hué brought in 76 weapons.

By 1954 the French Army had lost 1,500 officers (including over 1,100 platoon commanders) and was exhausted—even without the Dienbienphu disaster. No French politician did that; the war did it, because it's that kind of war.

In fact, year after year, the Communists and a few of their associates excepted, the French Parliament voted the credits for the war and voted for the reinforcements which could be squeezed out of a weakened postwar France.

I have read every French parliamentary debate on Indochina since 1945, and they make instructive reading as bewildered but honest men were faced, on one hand, with glowing reports that the war was being won and, on the other, with new requests for more funds and troops. Even when the United States made available to the French in 1953–54 almost unlimited funds and in many fields, more equipment than they could usefully handle, the war was not being won on the battlefield.

ONLY ARMY LIMITATION

The only political limitation on the French Army was that it could not, after 1950, use draftees in Vietnam until the much-maligned Mendès-France, after Dienbienphu, threatened to use two divisions with draftees from France. And considering that the French, like King Canute, were fighting the combined waves of Vietnamese nationalism and communism, a Parisian show of unity or even the sending of draftees would have made little difference.

It is rather curious, finally, to see observers who, for two decades, have berated the French Army for all sorts of true or imagined failings, now resort to the German stab-in-the-back myth to club their own opposition here. Surely there must be better arguments than that to justify the war in Vietnam.

BERNARD B. FALL.

WASHINGTON, *February 25, 1966.*

THE PEIPING ENIGMA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the March 11 issue of the New York Times contained an article by Mr. Tom Wicker entitled "The Peiping Enigma." In the article Mr. Wicker commented on the fundamental contradiction between the statements of administration officials on China and the statements of the renowned China experts before the Foreign Relations Committee last week. Mr. Wicker remarked that the recent statements by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense "have pictured a relentlessly expansionist China, dedicated to spreading communism and Chinese power throughout the world, advancing toward threatening nuclear strength, and needing to be stopped now—in Vietnam—as the world should have stopped Hitler on the Rhine." Thus, Mr. Wicker continued:

> The United States not only refuses to recognize Peiping and accede to her membership in the United Nations but also regards China as a pentup aggressor waiting to spring upon the world.

On the other hand, Mr. Wicker pointed out:

> Quite a different picture of China is being painted, however, by American scholars in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Wicker said that these scholars "saw the policy of isolating China as working against the sensible long range objective of bringing her into peaceful relations with the world."

He noted that Professor Fairbank "pictured China as more Chinese than Communist, more frustrated than expansionist, seeking leadership and the world's deference more than new territory and using Communist rhetoric and theory to explain how the imperialist had destroyed what ancient China considered for hundreds of years her rightful preeminence in the world." Professor John Fairbank and Professor Barnett advocated "a policy of drawing China into international affairs, from sports to the United Nations, while the United States competed sharply with her over the model to be followed by developing nations and met any military adventures with adequate force." In short, as Mr. Wicker commented in his concluding paragraph, the view expressed by Professors Fairbank and Barnett "suggests that an effective approach to the conflict in Vietnam can only grow out of a hard-eyed resolution of the question of whether modern China represents aggressive, expansionist communism or an ancient culture seeking to reestablish itself and its influence."

Mr. President, I have never been to China and I do not pretend to be an expert on China. I do not think that any of us in the Senate can claim to be. It is for this reason, because all of us in the Senate and I believe all but a few Americans need to be educated on the subject of China, that the Foreign Relations Committee is holding hearings.

But it has struck me forcefully, as it has struck Mr. Wicker, that the experts on China have a view of China, and of what would constitute a wise policy toward that country, that is totally different from the view of our senior administration officials. It seems to me that if the experts are right about China, and their opinions are based after all on profound knowledge of the country, our leading officials must be wrong. They both cannot be right because they disagree fundamentally. I would hope that this fact would give the administration some cause for concern. It certainly disturbs me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wicker's article of March 11 from the Times be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1966]

THE PEIPING ENIGMA—ADMINISTRATION AND SCHOLARS EMBRACE CONFLICTING VIEWS OF CHINA'S INTENTIONS

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Will the real Communist China please stand up?

That question has suddenly arisen here, providing a welcome intellectual diversion from the Capital's fixation on the war in South Vietnam and, for those willing to accept it, a new perspective on that war. On the one hand, recent statements by President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara have pictured a relentlessly expansionist China, dedicated to spreading communism and Chinese power throughout the world, advancing toward threatening nuclear strength, and needing to be stopped now—in Vietnam—as the world should have stopped Hitler on the Rhine.

In Honolulu, for instance, Mr. Johnson said, "In the forties and fifties, we took our stand in Europe to protect the freedom of those threatened by aggression. Now the center of attention has shifted to another part of the world where aggression is on the march. Our stand must be as firm as ever."

A PLEDGE AGAINST PEIPING

Mr. McNamara, in Senate testimony, described the Vietnamese war as "a test case of the Chinese Communist version of the so-called 'wars of national liberation,' one of a series of conflicts the Chinese hope will sweep the world."

Mr. Rusk called a recent speech by Lin Piao, Peiping's Minister of Defense, "as candid as Hitler's 'Mein Kampf.'" And in Australia, Mr. HUMPHREY made a ringing pledge that Chinese expansionism would be halted because "the United States of America and its allies will not let it win."

Thus, the United States not only refuses to recognize Peiping and accede to her membership in the United Nations but also regards China as a pent-up aggressor, waiting to spring upon the world, and has openly expressed the determination to stop her with as much force as necessary, in Vietnam, Korea or elsewhere.

Quite a different picture of China is being painted, however, by American scholars in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

OPPOSITION TO U.S. POLICY

Both A. Doak Barnett of the East Asian Institute at Columbia University and John K. Fairbank of the East Asian Research Center at Harvard saw the policy of isolating China as working against the sensible long-range objective of bringing her into peaceful relations with the world.

Mr. Fairbank, an outstanding Asian scholar, testified today and pictured China as more Chinese than Communist, more frustrated than expansionist, seeking leadership and the world's deference more than new territory, and using Communist rhetoric and theory to explain how the "imperialists" had destroyed what ancient China considered for hundreds of years her rightful preeminence in the world.

Mr. Fairbank supported the war in Vietnam but not as a barrier to inevitable Communist aggression. He saw it rather as a direct clash of cultures and a "focus of power politics," between the Western World and the one major nation that had not yet succumbed to what he called "Europeanization."

In his view, the United States is the modern exponent of the age-old process of spreading European values and culture throughout the world that began with the Portuguese voyages to the East. He described foreign aid and other forms of economic assistance as the American method that had replaced the colonial warring of the 19th century.

A resurgent China, anxious to regain world status by exporting a Chinese model of cultural values and social organization, is actually in competition with the United States model, Mr. Fairbank said, and does not represent "international or Chinese communism on the march," a quest for more territory or blind aggression.

He advocated, like Mr. Barnett, a policy of drawing China into international affairs, from sports to the United Nations, while the United States competed sharply with her over the model to be followed by developing nations and met any military adventures with adequate force.

In Vietnam, he said, the key question is whether the United States can be more constructive than destructive; whether it can effectively help the Saigon regime to "do something worth doing" for the South Vietnamese people, while limiting the warfare as much as possible.

The Barnett and Fairbank testimony will probably have little direct effect on Johnson administration policy. No movement toward recognition of China or her admission to the United Nations is contemplated here, and Mr. McNamara, in particular, has made plain his belief that China is an aggressive menace.

REPUBLICAN PLANS SPEECH

Nevertheless, the hearings are bound to have an educational effect.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, was effusive today in thanking Mr.

Fairbank for adding to his "very skimpy background" on China. Such a hard-liner as Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, welcomed Mr. Barnett's call for a reappraisal of the isolation policy. And a leading Republican Senator, long an advocate of being tough with Peiping, is preparing a speech for delivery next week in which he will urge the administration to seek some means of accommodation with China.

All this is bound to have an impact on public opinion, frozen since the days of the Communist takeover of China and the investigations of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. Thus, the hearings may move the China question off dead center and out of the realm of the "unthinkable," which is what Senator FULBRIGHT set out to do.

The Fairbank-Barnett view, posed against the administration thesis, also suggests that an effective approach to the conflict in Vietnam can only grow out of a hard-eyed resolution of the question of whether modern China represents aggressive, expansionist communism or an ancient culture seeking to reestablish itself and its influence.

THE LATIN AMERICAN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point translations of an editorial in La Tribuna of Lima, Peru, and of an editorial column in La Nación of Santiago, Chile.

La Tribuna is a journal which reflects the views of the APRA party—American Revolutionary Popular Alliance—and La Nación reflects the views of the Government of Chile.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From La Tribuna, Lima, Peru, Sept. 17, 1965]

THE LATIN AMERICAN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, has leveled hard criticism at the North American policy in regard to Latin America. He has urged that there be a modification in that "conservative, rich, and comfortable condition" that does not allow a clear view of the progress of a non-Communist revolution that tries to break hemispheric ties; ties that at least one Latin American government has felt too tight for social and economic development, so urgent in this part of the world.

Senator FULBRIGHT has cited the agreement between the country to the south of us and the new conditions under which the great copper mines will be developed, giving the Chilean State a direct hand and giving the Chilean workers (laborers and white collar), who run this vital industry, a quota. The North American legislator remarked that this agreement would not have been possible with the conservative and ultramontane nor with the Communist-Socialist front who disputed the electoral victory in the elections of September 1964. The new mining policy is fundamentally the result of a realistic insight, adds FULBRIGHT, toward movements of the democratic left.

Other financial and commercial circles of the United States have backed the Aprista plan for preferential custom tariffs. However, in the very legislature of the United States there is strong pressure from the producers of low-grade minerals in the United States who want protective measures and subsidies from the Government. These groups demand this type of State aid because they are the guardians of strategic reserves that play a great role in the military industry as well as in the lowering of prices in the international market. This is true now with copper, zinc, lead, tin, iron, and other minerals. Lately the United States has flooded the market with great quantities of these products and in this way the present price has been maintained in London and in the United States. The Latin American producers have been forced to accept the price given them for their mining export products.

In this interjection, Senator FULBRIGHT has only mentioned copper, but products such as sugar, cotton, and coffee also require another commercial agreement within the hemispheric policy. As a tacit recognition of this we have what Senator FULBRIGHT refers to concerning the trip of the Chief Executive of Chile to the Old World in search of new markets and he said: "I believe this is a constructive and intelligent step."

From La Nación, Santiago, Chile, Sept. 19, 1965]

DECLARATIONS OF SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Senator JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, is not a politician who speaks with "tongue in cheek." On the contrary he is a man of a clear, frank, and direct language. Consequently he belongs to that type of person who represents, in so many ways, the best of the North American spirit. Furthermore he is an intellectual (a graduate in history and political science). Three years before the birth of the United Nations he introduced a bill so that his country would support the creation of an international organ to maintain peace.

In March of last year FULBRIGHT started a great controversy by proposing in the Senate that the United States take the initiative in renegotiating the Panama Canal Treaty, and revise its policy toward Cuba (accepting the Communist regime in Cuba as an unfortunate reality).

At the end of July in the same year, he published a book that stirred great controversy (it could be no other way): "Old Myths and New Realities." In the book (good God Almighty) he proposed the participation of the United States and Russia in constructing a new interoceanic canal. In March of the same year, speaking at the University of Pennsylvania, he reaffirmed this idea and in fact amplified it, indicating the degree to which this would reduce international tension, by the joint participation of the two Governments in projects to help the underdeveloped countries which could give "a broader margin to the revolutionary, new attitudes of the world."

Now the Senator is creating more controversy by affirming, without beating around the bush, that the North American intervention in Santo Domingo was an error.

He blames the "inadequate advice and assessment given to the President by his representatives in the Dominican Republic, at the moment of the crisis." "We made an error," he continues, "in the Dominican Republic, as we did in the Bay of Pigs, in Cuba in 1961; but one lone error of insight does not constitute a doctrine for the conduct of future policy, and we will continue in our dedication to the principles of the Alliance for Progress."

If it is remembered that in Latin America (shaken by the unilateral intervention of the United States) a Johnson doctrine was being referred to, that seemed to be a regress to the interventionist policies overcome long ago; these words brings great comfort. Also comforting are his words that the United States "is not and will not become an enemy to the social revolution in Latin America."

As an illustration of these words concerning the Latin American social revolution, he pointed out that the Christian Democrats, of a leftist leaning, enjoy popular approval, have squashed the reactionaries at the polls, and have been able to reach an agreement with the copper companies, "something that the previous conservative government was unable to do and that a Communist government should be unwilling to do."

Now that some in Latin America pretend to solve certain political problems by means of violence and through other ways that do not utilize the international organs, the words of Fulbright take on great value. They indicate that in the United States there is an understanding of the need to make the social revolution under the banner of liberty and that those of us who want it that way are not Communists and that we have the support of the people behind us.

CARLOS NAUDON.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING BILL WOULD ENABLE CONSUMERS TO MAKE RATIONAL BUYING DECISIONS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, that President Johnson saw fit to support the truth in packaging bill in his consumers message should come as no surprise to anyone. Twice before this year in messages to Congress—the economic and the state of the Union—he has supported the bill.

What is significant at this time—merely hours before the Senate Commerce Committee is scheduled to consider the bill—is that the President makes clear his support for the bill in its entirety.

The bill's opponents in recent weeks—apparently fearing the inevitability of some truth in packaging bill—have been campaigning for a much weaker bill than the one proposed.

But the fact of the matter is that this bill is the outgrowth of 5 years of work and thinking. It is the considered opinion of its supporters that the bill, as amended through the years, represents the best way to enable consumers to make rational buying decisions in the supermarket.

Just how difficult these decisions are today was well demonstrated by a study done at Eastern Michigan University. Here 33 college-trained housewives were given a list of 20 common items to buy at a supermarket with which they were all familiar. The women were asked to do a seemingly simple thing: Buy the most economical package of each item.

Yet these college graduates chose the right package in only 56 percent of the buying decisions they made. None of them was able to choose the lowest cost detergent. Only one chose the lowest cost bleach. Only three picked the best buy in paper towels. Only six discovered the least expensive cola.

On the other hand, none of the 33 made a mistake in choosing granulated sugar or solid vegetable shortening. Sugar is sold in 1-, 5-, and 10-pound packages, and shortening comes in standard 1- and 3-pound cans.

Now I am as aware as are American housewives—and opponents of the truth in packaging bill—that price is not the only detriment in supermarket shopping decisions. Quality must be considered and greatly influences each selection. However, it is necessary first to know how much better quality costs before any shopper can decide if it is worth it.

One of the main reasons for the failure of the shoppers in the study is the fantastic array of odd weights which dominate the supermarket. These too often seem to be designed more to confuse than to inform.

It should be pointed out that marketplace confusion is not good for the competitive system. For business competition ultimately depends on the discrimination of buyers, on their ability to choose so as to reward the efficient producer and force the others to upgrade or get out.

Unfortunately today, practices in the supermarket are causing consumers to reward the manufacturer who is best at slight of hand.

American consumers and good manufacturers deserve a sensible set of ground rules which will make supermarket decisions easier.

Economists have testified that a family of four striving to make the most economical buy could use the protection of the truth in packaging bill to cut their budget by $200 a year. That is a significant amount of money for example, to the poor, and to our senior citizens—two groups forced to live on minimum and less-than-minimum-standard incomes.

How significant the senior citizens themselves think this bill has been amply demonstrated. Last week, in summarizing the supporters of the bill, I mentioned the National Council of Senior Citizens, which represents 2 million consumers. Two other groups—the Retired Teachers Association with 180,000 members and the American Association of Retired Persons with 850,000 members—were omitted from the list. It was thought the membership of these two might in great part duplicate that of the National Council of Senior Citizens. We have since been informed that this is not the case.

The senior citizens, the poor, and the average consumer all would benefit from the truth in packaging bill. I thank the President for his interest in this bill and urge Congress to delay no longer in its enactment.

Manufacturers who are fearful of the truth in packaging bill should be reassured by the experience of some honest horse traders. Proof that honesty does pay off was brought to my attention recently in an article in the March 4 issue of "The Chronicle of the Horse," which described a Maryland horse auction experiment where each animal's faults were detailed in the sales catalog.

According to the article, full disclosure in the sale of horses did not adversely affect the market. Instead, the sale brought higher prices than were thought possible—higher even than if the bad points had been concealed.

For example:

Maroma: This mare requires an individual paddock.

But Maroma nevertheless brought $31,000 seconds after the bidding opened.

Rose Fern: This mare's foals are subject to jaundice.

Rose Fern sold for $77,000.

Ambernash: Operated on for sesamoids in July 1965.

The price: a hefty $25,000.

Alto Ribot: This colt has a chronic, injured stifle.

He was nevertheless sold for $30,000.

Nothing about horses was written into the truth in packaging bill, but it seems to me that the lesson to be learned here can be applied to the sale of any product: Virtue is its own reward. But it is not necessarily the only reward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHRONICLE OF THE HORSE

TRUTH IN LABELING

There was a fine moral in the huge prices brought by the Foxcatcher Farms sale, in that the catalog in many instances specified exactly what was wrong with a horse—and every offering, listed thus, fetched a whopping price.

Hip No. 1, the broodmare Maroma, had the notation. "This mare has required an individual paddock." Within seconds after the bidding opened, it became obvious that a lot of people felt they were capable of coping with this problem, she brought a fast $31,000 from Walter J. Salmon.

Other such notes were: Rose Fern—"This mare's foals are subject to jaundice," The price, $77,000.

Ambernash, a 4-year-old son of Nashua-Parlo—"Sesamoids operated on in July 1965." His sale for $25,000 prompted the remark: "That's another record set tonight—highest price ever paid for a stallion with a broken sesamoid."

Alto Ribot, a 2-year-old by Ribot-Parlo—"This colt has a chronic injured stifle." He went to Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Tyler McConnell for $30,000.

AFL-CIO STATEMENT ON RIGHTS OF LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, at the recent AFL-CIO Executive Council meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla., a statement was adopted on "Rights of Local and State Government Employees."

In Michigan, the State legislature enacted last year a public employee law that many consider to be a model for the country. As a result, public employee organizations have been expanding rapidly in many parts of the State. This is a movement which I am sure we can all welcome as it will be one of the most important single factors in upgrading the employment conditions of our public service employees.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the AFL-CIO Executive Council resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON RIGHTS OF LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 28, 1966

The AFL-CIO notes the growth of organization among local and State government employees. This growth has been accompanied in some of the States by legislation recognizing these workers free right to organize into unions of their own choice, election and certification procedures for the choosing of exclusive bargaining agents, and for the development of free collective bargaining.

Additionally, a number of local and State governments have adopted executive procedures in an effort to provide collective bargaining mechanisms.

These developments underline the need for impartial mediation facilities, contract enforcement and methods of avoiding work stoppages.

There is substantial evidence that such methods as unilaterial appeals procedures and compulsory arbitration do not solve the legitimate grievances of the affected workers and add to the frustrations of both management and labor.

Repressive State statutes designed to punish employees of local and State government who withhold their work have proved to be a barrier to reasonable negotiation and an added impasse to the collective bargaining process.

The AFL-CIO reasserts its support of the right of State and local government employees to organize into unions of their own choice and to be recognized for the purpose of collective bargaining. We also reassert our belief that the realistic vehicle for State and local government labor-management relations is collective bargaining, together with effective mediation and fact-finding procedures, including the use of impartial panels with authority to make recommendations for settlement.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order entered on Thursday, March 17, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations recommends concurrence in the House allowance of the budget requests totaling $13.1 billion for those programs included in the supplemental defense appropriation bill, 1966. Of this amount $12.7 billion is for programs and activities of the Department of Defense directly related with combat operations in southeast Asia. The balance of $415 million is for economic aid.

The requests of the Department of Defense were considered by the Department of Defense Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] and the economic aid requests were considered by the Deficiencies and Supplemental Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]. These gentlemen will explain their respective sections of the bill.

Mr. President, there are two committee amendments which will restrict the availability of special authorities to the current fiscal year. Under the House bill one of these special authorities was made permanent law and the other was made applicable to fiscal year 1967. These provisions are discussed on pages 25 and 26 of the report.

I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 7, line 15, after "Sec. 101.", to strike out "After June 30, 1965" and insert "During the current fiscal year".

On page 8, line 4, after the word "fiscal", to strike out "years" and insert "year", and in the same line, after "1966", to strike out "and 1967".

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee has made only a very brief report, and I know that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] has a more detailed report.

Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement with regard to the economic aspects of the bill now pending before the Senate.

The portion of the bill for which I am responsible contains two items; namely, supporting assistance and the general contingency fund.

For these items, the President requested $415 million, of which $315 million is for supporting assistance and the remainder of $100 million for the general contingency fund. The House has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate for both items, and the Committee on Appropriations recommends that the Senate concur with the House.

The funds appropriated for supporting assistance are being provided for four countries; namely, South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, and the Dominican Republic. Almost 90 percent of the $315 million, or $275 million, will be used in South Vietnam. Laos and Thailand will each obtain $7,500,000 and the Dominican Republic will be the beneficiary of $25 million.

Mr. President, supporting assistance funds are used primarily for the purchase of raw materials and other essential imports which the recipient country is unable to finance from its own foreign exchange earnings. The private exporter, which normally will be a U.S. firm, provides the commodities and is paid in dollars. The local importer pays the full value in local currency to his government, which then uses the funds to finance defense or other programs of mutual benefit to the recipient country and our own country. In this bill, $175 million of the amount provided for South Vietnam will be used to acquire essential imports. In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a list of the commodities that will be imported by South Vietnam printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Commodity list for South Vietnam funded in supplemental defense appropriation bill, 1966

	(In thousands)
Rice	$21,000
Raw sugar	600
Fertilizer	4,500
Medicines and pharmaceuticals	9,000
Chemicals	2,500
Yarn and fabrics	7,400
Pulp and paper	500
Coal	8,000
Petroleum products	12,000
Nonmetallic minerals	21,000
Iron and steel	50,000
Nonferrous metals	1,000
Industrial machinery	16,000
Vehicles and parts	9,000
Tires and tubes	3,000
Other	9,500
Total	175,000

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in addition to financing commodity imports, supporting assistance funds are also used for the direct financing of specific projects. In these instances, it is similar to technical cooperation and development grants in that it finances technicians, training, and other project costs. The difference is that supporting assistance projects are primarily for security or political purposes, while technical cooperation and development grants projects are for economic development. In the pending bill, $100 million of supporting assistance funds is being furnished South Vietnam to finance such projects, which embrace public safety activities, logistics management, public works, refugee relief, construction, welfare, and development.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is necessary for me to comment extensively on the general contingency fund. As everyone knows, this fund enables the President to meet emergency requirements that occur fortuitously in any area of the world. I believe that there is no better testimony, attesting to the need for a $100 million contingency fund, than that presented in the schedule I hold in my hand, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Agency for International Development schedule of uses—Fiscal year 1966 contingency fund to date programed through Mar. 10, 1966

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Amount	Purpose
Total	[1] 55,978	
Africa	1,419	
Somali Republic	264	Public safety (grant).
Zambia	1,000	Airlift of petrol and oil products (grant).
Do	155	Road maintenance.
NESA: Ceylon	7,500	Commodity financing (loan).
Latin America	44,725	
Bolivia	1,000	
British Guiana	528	Public safety (grant).
Colombia	1,475	Do.
Dominican Republic.	300	Do.
Do	35,859	Budgetary support (grant).
Do	1,163	Commodity procurement (grant).
Panama	3,500	Budgetary support (loan).
Peru	900	
Nonregional	2,334	
W. W. disaster relief.	1,405	Includes 250 for Ambassador's fund and 50 allocated to State IO for pledge to ICRC.
Reserve	929	Current unprogramed balance of the contingency fund.

[1] Represents total estimated availability for the year. Actual availability as of this date is $54,314,000 against which $53,345,000 has been allotted and allocated.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this schedule shows the uses to which the President has put the moneys appropriated to him in the contingency fund thus far this year, thus indicating possible future uses during the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. President, that concludes my formal remarks. If there are any questions, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This report, which the Senator is submitting, is a unanimous report. We had a rather full discussion in the executive session of the committee on certain pros and cons, and we had quite a long explanation of the original amendment which was put in but left out by the conferees in the authorization bill. This is a correct statement, is it not?

Mr. PASTORE. That is absolutely correct, and I thank my distinguished friend and colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, for his fine contribution.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, as will appear from the bill which is on the desk of each Member, the Subcommittee on Appropriations considering the budget request for the Department of Defense has considered supplemental estimates totaling $12,720,719,000 and has approved these estimates in toto.

Of this amount $12,345,719,000 is for military functions of the Department of Defense and $375 million is for military assistance.

This is a considerable sum of money but I do not believe that any Member of this body could claim surprise at this amount of these supplemental requests.

During the last session of Congress smaller supplemental estimates for southeast Asia were submitted and approved. In discussing one of these supplementals for $1,700 million for the cost of operations in southeast Asia, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] stated that it must be recognized unless the situation changes suddenly and drastically, next January will find us faced with substantially larger requests for supplemental funding.

I had the temerity on one occasion on a television program to suggest that the estimate would run more than $10 billion. I was criticized for making such extravagant predictions.

It appears now that my predictions were on the conservative side, because even the amounts that have been heretofore appropriated, added to the amount that is contained in this bill, may not be adequate to defray the costs that have been incurred by our military actions in southeast Asia.

The $12.3 billion is for the following purposes: Military personnel, $1,620 million; operation and maintenance, $2,316,269,000; procurement, $7,019,400,000; research, development, test, and evaluation, $151,650,000; military construction, $1,238,400,000; and $375 million to reimburse the Department of Defense for stocks transferred to the military assistance program from the regular stocks of the Department of Defense during fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

During the course of my discussion of the bill, if any Member of the Senate has a question with respect to any of the items, I shall be happy to undertake to answer him.

As is well known, there has been a considerable increase—453,000—in the overall military strength of our active Armed Forces. The largest item of increase is 281,000 in the Department of the Army. The next largest increase is 85,000 additional members of the Marine Corps.

Provision is made for $440 million in new obligational authority, in lieu of a transfer of a like amount from the various working capital funds of the Department of Defense. As is customary, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for 1966 authorized the transfer of $470 million from the working capital funds to the military personal appropriations, in lieu of new obligational authority. However, the additional requirements imposed on these working capital funds by combat operations in southeast Asia have allowed the transfer of only $30 million of the $470 million authorized. Money simply was not available to make the transfers, so we must therefore make these additional appropriations, which amount to $440 million.

It might be well to invite the attention of the Senate to a recent development with respect to the strength of the Army and the Marine Corps. It now appears that the Army and the Marine Corps will be able to increase their strengths faster than was originally planned, and the Secretary of Defense has authorized them to do so. However, it is possible that the faster buildup will require some additional funding during the current fiscal year.

I should also invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the estimates and the funds carried in the bill do not include the $761.1 million required for increases in military pay, authorized in the Uniform Services Pay Act of 1965. These funds were requested in House Document 405 and will be considered in connection with the next general supplemental bill.

The supplemental estimates provided by the bill for operation and maintenance total $2,316,269,000. These funds will be used to meet the following actual costs:

Costs relating to the increase of strength of the Active and Reserve Forces, such as unit activation costs; induction center costs; training costs; personnel processing costs; and items of that nature.

Funds are also included to cover costs relating to increases in the number of personnel deployed in southeast Asia, such as transportation of equipment and supplies, overhaul and rebuilding of equipment and weapons, additional medical costs, and additional civilian personnel to support these forces. The logistics of supporting a large number of armed men 10,000 miles from our shores becomes a very expensive procedure.

We also are involved in the support of the South Vietnamese and other free world forces that are employed in South Vietnam. That subject may be discussed in more detail before this bill has been passed.

I should also state that these estimates do not include the $102,400,000 required for civilian pay increases under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1965. These funds, likewise, are requested in House Document 405 and will be included in the next supplemental appropriation bill.

By all odds, the largest single item of this $12,750,000,000 appropriation is for procurement. It is for the procurement of ammunition, aircraft, vehicles, electronics, communications, and a vast number of incidental items that are necessary for the support of troops in today's modern warfare. A further breakdown of these figures will be found on page 12 of the committee report.

The bill provides considerable funds for research and development, tests, and evaluation. That amounts to $151,600,000. Generally speaking, all of these funds are requested for programs related to our operations in southeast Asia. They include such programs as malaria research undertaken to deal with a new and very virulent form of malaria which has incapacitated a number of our fighting men. It includes limited war laboratory programs, the development of light-armored assault vehicles, and the development and improvement of aircraft and missiles for the Navy and the Air Force.

The bill contains supplemental estimates for military construction totalling $1,238,400,000.

The committee report also contains a breakdown indicating where these funds will be expended among the several services.

It will be noted that the total requests indicate that $561,600,000 will be spent for construction in South Vietnam and that $63,400,000 is for construction in the United States.

That is dealt with in more detail on page 18 of the committee report.

The supplemental estimate of $375 million for military assistance is to reimburse the Department of Defense for the amount transferred to the military assistance program during the fiscal years of 1965 and 1966.

Section 510 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides that up to $300 million worth of defense articles, to be found in the military stocks and defense services, may be ordered in any one fiscal year for military assistance purposes, subject to reimbursement from subsequent appropriations made available for military assistance in the event the President determines such orders to be vital to the security of the United States.

The President made two such determinations with respect to this power. He authorized $75 million to be made available in the fiscal year 1965, and $300 million to be made available during the fiscal year 1966. The item of $375 million is to reimburse the Department for these orders. There are some general provisions of the bill that I should perhaps discuss very briefly.

Section 101 contains a provision dealing with the working capital fund cash balances. The pending bill amends the existing law with respect to the cash balances that must be maintained in the various working capital funds of the Department of Defense. At the present time adequate cash must be maintained to cover accounts payable. Under this provision a cash requirement will be maintained at the level required to cover cash disbursements.

This provision also authorizes unlimited transfers between these funds. The purpose of the provision is to obtain a greater use of our cash available. The Secretary of Defense has stated that if this provision is not adopted, it will be necessary to appropriate at least $325 million in addition to provide capital for these working funds. The House bill authorizes this change on a permanent basis.

However, the committee recommends to the Senate that the provision be adopted so as to be applicable only to the current fiscal year in order that the operations of these funds under this new procedure may be reviewed annually.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is it not the opinion of the chairman of this extremely important committee that if we were to do otherwise Congress would lose practically all control of the capital funds if the Secretary of Defense were able to move them anywhere he wanted?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think if Congress is undertaking to supervise to any degree the expenditure of these vast funds and all the ramifications of the transfers, it is absolutely necessary that this not be made permanent legislation. It would be very unfortunate for that to be done. There should at least be the most thorough and exhaustive hearings so that the entire Congress would be apprised as to what the effect of that transfer would be.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We set up the capital funds a comparatively few years ago with the idea of having a more efficient and quicker action, because the money was appropriated for these purposes and came back into the account. Those are very substantial sums of money.

If we were to give the Secretary this authority, we would lose control of very large funds for all of the three services.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think we would lose control of very large sums and it is altogether possible that even larger sums would be involved in future years.

I would be very much opposed to this being made permanent legislation in the absence of the most thorough and careful scrutiny by the proper committees of Congress. Though I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations and happen to be chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill, I do not think that this should be done without apprising the other committees of this fact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the senior Republican member of the committee, I agree with the chairman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I noted that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee called to the attention of the Senate that a major portion of the funds sought in the bill, over $7 billion, was to provide needed aircraft and weapons and ammunition.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct. That would be military hardware that would be mainly utilized in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. COOPER. Considering the fact that it will take a considerable time to procure all the equipment that will be needed, would there be any period of time when there would be a shortage of the needed equipment in Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We were assured that there would not be. The contracts for a great deal of this procurement, particularly of ammunition and weapons, have already been negotiated. We have done everything we could to assure that adequate supplies of all kinds, medical, sustenance, ammunition, and weapons, would be available to those who are serving our country so far from home, to maintain this country's position is an very unusual, dirty war.

I would be very much disappointed if those assurances did not prove to be accurate. I will not say that there may not be shortages, but we have had more trouble in distribution really than in shortages with respect to a great many of these items. We did not have the facilities in South Vietnam to unload the ships rapidly enough. When we did have the facilities, we did not have warehouses in which to store the equipment, but had to stack the equipment on the shore.

There was naturally a great deal of confusion and some loss; and even in such rudimentary and essential items as cleaning oil and patches for cleaning rifles, losses were involved and we had to fly the material out there for the Marine Corps.

Mr. COOPER. I had an opportunity to be in Vietnam in December and in January. I took note of the supply situation when I was there.

Statements have been made in the newspapers that there have been shortages of needed aircraft, particularly helicopters, and that there have been shortages of spare parts and of ordinary ammunition for rifles, and other weapons.

These matters are of concern to all and I have received letters from parents of soldiers fighting in Vietnam. Does the Senator believe, from his wide knowledge in this field and from facts adduced in the hearings, that with this appropriation, the Department of Defense can provide the equipment anticipated to be necessary?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not think there is any question that we will have ample supplies. However, whether there will be complete and perfect distribution of the supplies is another matter.

We have had some shortages of helicopter parts. I understand that has now been remedied. We are greatly increasing the number of helicopters being employed in Vietnam. Were it not for these helicopters, we would have had more difficulty in seeing that our men were supplied with food and ammunition.

Mr. COOPER. I am not much interested in trying to place the blame on what has been done in the past. We are interested now in seeing to it that there is sufficient equipment for our forces.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. There have been shortages. I have read statements made by responsible Members of Congress to the effect that last year the Defense Department reviewed and rejected the efforts of the Senators of the committee to provide helicopters and other needed aircraft and weapons.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. There was a small reduction in the procurement of helicopters in 1965. That could have affected the situation there. But the First Cavalry Division had more helicopters when they went into Vietnam than the entire U.S. Army had some 10 or 12 years ago; and those have been supplemented by procurement of a number of others. The number of helicopters assigned to each military unit on a permanent basis is being increased.

Mr. COOPER. I know the Senator is always very tough with the Defense Department if it does not recommend what he believes to be sufficient equipment and ammunition. Does the Senator feel comfortable about the sufficiency of the proposed procurement?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. My primary concern, as to the Department of Defense, the taxpayers, or anything else, is to see that we do not send one American boy out to fight under the flag of the richest nation on earth without his being better supplied than a soldier of any other nation.

Mr. COOPER. I agree. Let me ask the Senator one more question: Can he give figures on the strength of the forces, say, what they were 1 year ago, what they are today, and what is projected for the end of the current calendar year, to show the buildup?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes, we have that.

Mr. COOPER. What are the numbers?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We plan to increase the Army by a net total of 280,589, the Navy by 43,025, the Marine Corps by 84,994, the Air Force by 44,225. That is an overall net increase in strength of 452,833 personnel.

It is estimated that these goals will be practically met by June 30 of this year.

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator, does the administration intend to secure the additional strength by means of voluntary enlistment and the draft alone?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Kentucky knows, of course, that every time you increase the draft by one, you bring 3 or 4 volunteers into either the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force, because the young men like to select the branch of service in which they are to perform their duty; and when they see the draft approaching, it has a very salutary effect on increasing enlistments in all branches of the service.

For that reason, there has been a slight reduction in the quota of draftees for next month, because enlistments were greater than had been anticipated.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I must say, for myself, that I feel very safe with the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts handling this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts and I will do everything within our power and within our knowledge to see that our fighting men have everything in the way of equipment and supplies that they may need. It it not always possible to get it to them in exact amounts and on exact schedules; and, of course, the C-ration is not the most palatable dish for human consumption over a period of time—it is all right for a day or two, but can get extremely tiresome.

But we are certainly doing all that we can to measure up to our responsibilities to the Senate, to give the Senate a chance to vote for adequate funds to take care of these men, who are not in Vietnam of their own volition, but who are there under the command of the properly constituted authorities of this country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief additional statement?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened to what the chairman of our committee has said, and agree with him entirely.

I would simply add this: The Preparedness Committee, of which I am a member, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], has heard from the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force on their supplies and equipment in Vietnam today. I think especially as to ammunition, which the Senator from Kentucky mentioned, there are ample supplies, and there is simple buildup going on now behind the lines to keep the supplies adequate.

To add further to what the Senator from Georgia has said, I call to the attention of Senators that the so-called Red Ball Express has been rejuvenated and is now in operation, and is making it possible to repair an ordinary helicopter and put it back in service again, I believe, well within 48 hours from the time it needs repair.

Mr. COOPER. My inquiries are prompted, of course, by my own desire for information and assurance, but they have also been sparked by a remark the distinguished Senator made on the floor this morning at the time the proposed order of the President to dispose of some copper from the stockpiles was discussed. The Senator stated, I recall, that he did not like it, because the supplies were not very large, and that the disposal of scarce copper at this time could be a very critical matter if fighting should be extended.

In the event of an extended war, does the Senator believe that there are critical materials available to manufacture the weapons which unfortunately will be needed?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. As I have stated, I have made no exhaustive study of this question, but testimony has been given us in years past that about 800,000 tons of copper was a reasonable stockpile, and, since the President's order would decrease the stockpile to 400,000 tons, I feared, if there should be some escalation of this war, or another war of similar nature were to break out elsewhere, that we would be hard pressed for copper.

I have made no study of it. I intend to, because I am certainly as anxious to maintain adequate raw material reserves—and it is just as important—as to have the ammunition itself.

I am sure that, so far as the fighting in Vietnam is concerned, we have an adequate stockpile of copper; but if difficulty should break out elsewhere, I think we might be in a very shaky position with respect to our copper reserves. I say that without having studied the matter, merely because we have been told in the past that about 800,000 tons was a proper amount of reserve for us to maintain.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the Senator and his committee will look into this question and others dealing with critical materials.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I was dealing with the question of military assistance. Section 102 of the bill is in accord with a similar provision in the recently approved authorization act to authorize the use of funds appropriated for the support of U.S. forces to support the South Vietnamese and other military assistance recipients fighting in South Vietnam.

The House bill authorized this change on a permanent basis. However, the Committee has recommended that the provisions be amended so as to be applicable only to the "current fiscal year" in order that the operations of these funds under this near procedure can be reviewed annually.

SEC. 102—SUPPORT OF SOUTH VIETNAMESE AND OTHER FREE WORLD FORCES

This provision is in accord with a similar provision in the recently approved authorization act to authorize the use of funds appropriated in the regular Department of Defense appropriations for the support of the South Vietnamese and other military assistance forces fighting in South Vietnam. The budget estimates include $203.7 million for this purpose. However, under this authority more could be used if it is determined that it is in our interest to do so.

The purpose of including these funds in this bill is to eliminate the requirement for separate accounting of military equipment purchased with Military Assistance appropriations. Under this provision, General Westmoreland can provide equipment to our forces and the South Vietnamese without regard to the source of funding.

The House bill included this authority for the current fiscal year and fiscal year 1967. The committee recommends that the provision be restricted to the current fiscal year.

SEC. 103—INCLUSION OF THE VALUE OF "EXCESS MILK" IN THE COMMUTED RATION ALLOWANCE

Prior to fiscal year 1966, milk served to enlisted personnel in excess of the statutory and executive order ration of 8 ounces was paid for with funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture. During this time the value of the excess milk was not included in the "commuted ration" allowance that is paid to enlisted men who are authorized to mess separately or who are on leave. The Department of Agriculture Budget for fiscal 1966 did not include funds for this excess milk, and the Department of Defense appropriation was amended to authorize the Department of Defense to purchase the excess milk. The amendment in the 1966 act was written so as to exclude the value of this milk from the commuted ration allowance. Section 103 would include the value of the excess milk in the commuted ration allowance. Under this amendment the commuted ration allowance in the United States will increase from $1.10 to $1.17 per day. Overseas it will increase from $1.14 to $1.17 per day. While these are small increases, the Department of Defense has advised that the estimated cost of this amendment for a full fiscal year is $19.7 million.

Mr. President, I will be glad to respond to any questions that Members might have with respect to the Committee's recommendations totaling $12.3 billion for the Department of Defense.

I believe that is all I have to say at this time with respect to the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am happy to yield now to the Senator from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has yielded to me at this time. Let me add that the committee was unanimous in making this additional money available during this fiscal year.

As we proceed with the consideration of this proposed legislation I think it is imperative that we all remember what this legislation would do and what it would not do. H.R. 13546 provides supplemental appropriations for the Defense Department totaling $13,135,719,000; $12,345,719,000 for military functions, including items for military personnel, operations and maintenance, procurement, and research and development test and evaluation amounting to $11,107,219,000. In addition, it includes for military construction of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense agencies a total of $1,238,400,000, the amount of the budget estimates for the military. There is also included in the bill, $375 million for military assistance and $415 million for economic assistance programs directly connected with our operations in southeast Asia.

It will be recalled that in the first session of this Congress, funds were provided especially for southeast Asia in the amount of $700 million in the form of a defense supplemental for the fiscal year 1965, and amendments or supplements to the 1966 budget for both military functions and such civilian operations as economic assistance, USIA activities, and so forth. As recently as September 21, 1965, Congress completed action on the regular Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1966, which included $1.7 billion for the special cost of our military operations in South Vietnam. At that time, it was understood that additional funds would be needed. However, it was not then possible to make any reasonable, accurate forecast of specific requirements. Last year, when we considered the regular Department of Defense appropriation bill, I estimated that the military would request between $10 and $12 billion in additional funds early in the calendar year 1966. The accompanying bill represents the present estimate of the additional needs for fiscal year 1966. Perhaps some of these funds might have been deferred to the regular fiscal year 1967 estimates without adverse effect.

I believe that the chairman would agree with me we felt that time was of the essence, as was pointed out in colloquy with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and that, therefore, it would be better to go ahead with these appropriations now rather than wait for the regular appropriation bill which might be delayed until next August or September.

However, total requirements are so evidently large that they should be provided promptly. The major items provided in the bill are:

First. Increases in numbers of both military and civilian personnel and increases in the operation and maintenance cost of men, machines and structures.

I would agree, as the Senator from Georgia has stated, that there is no money in this bill for the increased pay. It is my understanding that it will be in the next supplemental bill, in an amount approximating $751 million more. That is the only item, I am informed, for military purposes in the next supplemental bill, although I believe that the chairman will agree with me that possibly another supplemental bill will be submitted before the first of July for additional expenses in this fiscal year.

Second. Production of aircraft, ordnance, ammunition, and other materiel.

Third. Military construction projects.

Fourth. Selected and specialized research and development programs.

Fifth. Economic assistance.

The budget estimates for the military operations of the Defense Department amount to $12,345,719,000. The majority of the amounts provided outside of personnel requirement will be devoted to the procurement of military hardware with short leadtime items, such as ammunition, as well as long lead items, such as jet aircraft.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation should be supported by every Member of the Senate, and I so urge. I join the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriation in urging the passage of this legislation. I feel that the funds are urgently needed to back up the over 200,000 American fighting men now engaged in military operations in southeast Asia. I believe that we should provide this support for our fighting men as soon as possible. We will have ample opportunity to review the request for new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1967, but I believe that the immediate passage of this supplemental appropriation bill should be expedited.

Mr. President, I join wholeheartedly with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has gone into this subject with a great deal of care. As I say, it was a unanimous report of the Appropriations Committee. It was also a unanimous report of the Committee on Armed Services on the military authority required for the bill, and I hope that it will be passed immediately.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I have a number of questions I should like to develop. It occurred to me that since the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Georgia are both in the Chamber, the Senator from Massachusetts would be willing to answer some questions with the help of the staff. I do not wish unduly to fatigue anyone.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should be very glad to try to answer them, but the chairman of the committee is here. Perhaps I should join with him in any answers, but I am always sensitive to the fact that the Democrats are in control of the Senate and therefore the immediate responsibility is with the Senator from Georgia, but I will be glad to try to answer any questions the Senator may have.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. After that "nonpartisan" statement, I suppose I should undertake to answer them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We will both do it.

Mr. CLARK. I know that I am rash to undertake to take on both Senators at once. I am perfectly happy to try, because really what I am trying to do is elicit information.

Let me ask my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, perhaps first—although if he chooses, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and it is quite all right with me—concerning the committee report, on page 4, which states in part as follows:

> The planned end strength increase over the original fiscal year 1966 submission is 452,833 for the active forces, and 41,000 for the Reserve forces.

Mention is also made of the substitution of civilian for military personnel. Then, as the Senator knows, this is broken down into succeeding sections, into increases for the Army, for the Navy, for the Marine Corps, for the Air Force, and to some extent for the Reserves.

I do not think it is necessary to stop on those more specific increases, because my first question is, can the Senator relate that 452,000——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator means 452,000 men, does he not?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, the increase in men. Can the Senator relate that to the potential buildup of our strength in South Vietnam? In other words, out of that number of 452,000, how many does the Pentagon estimate could be put into South Vietnam and increase our present force there?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My understanding is—and it is only my personal understanding—that there are some 220,000 men there, or over 200,000. I will not state an exact figure.

Mr. CLARK. That is only the Army; is it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is all military, I am informed—Army, Marines, and so forth.

Mr. CLARK. Does that include the Air Force and the Navy?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. A total of 300,000.

Mr. CLARK. So that is the total military——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No; this 235,000 figure is in the U.S. Forces in South Vietnam. There are some large contingents in other, surrounding areas. They consist of 35,000 to 50,000 of our personnel. So that there are almost 300,000 there.

Mr. CLARK. Does that include the Navy and the Air Force?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. That is close to 300,000.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes. It might be slightly more than that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was going to say it is my personal understanding that there is a hint—and I want to say it is only a hint—that the buildup will be substantially more than it is at present.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that when and if the bill passes—and I shall vote for it—there will be 452,000 additional personnel.

My question is, Is it our best judgment that they will be used to build up the force in South Vietnam if it became desirable to do that?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will try to answer that question on my own personal judgment. There are available a number of divisions in the United States and there are available a number of divisions in deployment in other overseas areas.

Mr. CLARK. And two in Korea.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And two in Korea. I know what we are trying to do is to get some assistance from other countries.

Mr. CLARK. I know——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One division has just come in from Korea. The Australians are building up their force. We read in the newspapers—and there is some testimony to that effect, although it is not firm—that the Philippines may send some troops. So we are trying to get more help from allies rather than send in more of our own men.

Mr. CLARK. I understand, and I am very sympathetic with that effort; but if we have 300,000 men there and we are providing now for 452,000 more—that would set a ceiling—assuming movements among divisions in Germany and possibly Japan—of about 750,000 troops for South Vietnam. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. As a matter of mathematics, the Senator may be correct, but that is not the idea of the buildup. The idea of the buildup is to replace men who have gone out of this country and to make allowance for additional personnel who may go. As a practical matter, we have practically denuded our strategic reserve of trained combat troops. But the main purpose of this increase, as I see it, is to replace the strike forces that have been practically eliminated from this continent. Their assigned purpose is to put out fires, and they have been employed against the fire in Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. But essentially it is to build up the Ready Reserve primarily in this country?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is to replace combat-trained men in this country who have been sent to Vietnam, because we have the cream of the crop there. We have the 1st Cavalry there. We have the 1st Infantry Division there.

We have a marine division. The 25th Division, which was stationed in Hawaii, is there. I do not recall the others that we have there. This proposed increase is to get trained men to replace them and be available here.

Frankly, it may be said, in all candor, they will not only be replaced, but there will be a margin to be used for our depleted strike forces in the United States. We could never pin the officials down as to how many they were going to send out there or how many they needed. They said they were going to send as many as they needed. That was as near as we could get to a definite number. But we can say that the purpose is to supply replacements for forces that are out of the country, so that units can be trained as speedily as possible to be available in this country for any contingency elsewhere in the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am glad to call the Senator's attention to the testimony of Secretary McNamara before the Committee on Appropriations and Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CLARK. To what page does the Senator refer?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Page 7 of the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services. I will read only this portion. Secretary McNamara said:

> Since my appearance here last August, our requirements in support of the military effort in Vietnam have continued to grow. We have already deployed a total of about 190,000 U.S. military personnel to South Vietnam. And we must be prepared to deploy even more forces if the Communists choose to expand their operations in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. This was back in January.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On January 20, 1966.

Mr. CLARK. We have had a buildup since then.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We have sent nearly two divisions out there since then.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD that part of Secretary McNamara's statement which appears on page 7 of the hearings.

Mr. CLARK. Should not that request include over to the top of page 8, to complete the statement?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that extract from Secretary McNamara's statement from the hearings be placed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AUGUST 1965 FORCE AUGMENTATIONS

> Since my appearance here last August, our requirements in support of the military effort in Vietnam have continued to grow. We have already deployed a total of about 190,000 U.S. military personnel to South Vietnam, excluding the elements of the 7th Fleet now operating off the coast of Vietnam. And we must be prepared to deploy even more forces if the Communists choose to expand their operations in South Vietnam.
>
> The force augmentations approved in August included—
>
> For the Army: An increase of one division force, three brigade forces, and a large number of aviation companies.
>
> For the Marine Corps: An increase of two heilcopter training squadrons and additional communications, engineer, and military police battalions.
>
> For the Navy: An increase of 25 active ships in the fleet plus 4 for MSTS, for a total of 29.
>
> For the Air Force: An increase in airlift aircraft utilization rates, from 5 to 8 hours per day for Military Airlift Command (formerly MATS) aircraft, and from 1.5 to 5 hours per day for C–130E's in other commands.
>
> For all the active forces: Additional personnel to round out the manning of units to be deployed in Vietnam and for increased training and logistic support.
>
> For the Reserve components: Additional drill pay space to raise the manning and readiness levels of 3 divisions and 6 brigades and necessary supporting forces in the Army Reserve components, 24 squadrons in the Air Force Reserve components, and the Marine Corps Reserve division-aircraft wing.
>
> An additional 340,000 military and 36,000 direct hire civilian personnel were approved to support these force increases.

Mr. CLARK. My question is designed to try to find out—and, from what the Senator from Georgia said, I have an idea that maybe we cannot—what is the ceiling, if the bill is adopted and implemented, in the number of men that we might expect to go to South Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I could not supply that information, because we could not get any definite estimate from the Secretary of Defense or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. They did state they were going to supply what General Westmoreland needed.

Mr. CLARK. And he did not say what is needed.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. They did not tell us what he needed.

Mr. CLARK. Maybe he does not know.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Of course, they are available. If you want to strip other places you can send 1 million additional men to South Vietnam, but I have no idea on earth there will be any such buildup as that. I have personally, as an amateur, never thought the total number of men we would have there would run over 400,000.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will recall that one of his colleagues on the committee was asked how many additional men would be needed, and he was quoted as saying he thought it might go as high as 600,000.

I take it the Senator thinks that that is high.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is somewhat high. It was the highest maximum fixed by one witness, but that witness was not one who makes policy, I might say.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I might add that I heard no testimony that I would have confidence in that would lead, at the present time to our having anything like 600,000 men in Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not see that now, but I do not want to be put in the position of excluding that possibility.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not either, but not now.

Mr. CLARK. Is there a logistical limitation on the number of troops we could adequately support in South Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We are rapidly remedying that. We are building large harbor facilities there at a tremendous cost. I think we will be able to support a much larger force with these new facilities.

Mr. CLARK. Would it be a fair summary of the views of the two Senators as of now, recognizing that the military situation might change, that we can look forward with reasonable confidence to a ceiling of not more than 400,000 on the number of troops in the four armed services which will be deployed in South Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I speak only for myself. I would not wish to put that ceiling on it if the Senator is going to include all four armed services, the Navy at sea, the Air Force, and the adjacent areas. I do not think it will. But in any one of a number of contingencies, depending on what will happen, it might exceed that.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Massachusetts care to add to that?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. I agree with the Chairman. We cannot definitely foresee what is going to happen, but at the present time I would agree with what the Chairman said.

Mr. CLARK. Essentially, we have an open-ended situation, do we not, as perhaps the majority leader indicated in his report?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think any war is open ended, as far as I have ever been able to ascertain.

Mr. CLARK. And so this one is, too.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not know of any way you can prescribe rules of war, or whether the other side is going to expand; but until you do that, any war is open ended.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have any idea as to the amount of uncommitted PAVN forces there are in the North? How many trained divisions do they have in reserve, not committed? Does the Senator have any idea?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We received some testimony as to that, but it was classified when it was given to us. I do not know why. Certainly Hanoi knows how many divisions they have. They have a large number of divisions, greater than they have already committed.

Mr. CLARK. That is good enough for me.

I have a good many questions, but the Senator from Rhode Island may wish to ask a question.

Mr. PELL. No. I was listening.

Mr. CLARK. In the opinion of the two Senators, are we going to be able to commit this large sum of money before the end of this fiscal year?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It will be obligated. It will not be expended, but the Secretary of Defense testified it would be all obligated or programed before the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. CLARK. And it cannot be obligated before it is appropriated.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct. So, if we are going to supply these goods and furnish these supplies to the men in South Vietnam, it is necessary that these appropriations be made.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Georgia agree with me that the comments made by some of our friends on the other side of the aisle that some of this money was put into the fiscal year 1966 to make the deficit less in 1967 is not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not agree with that statement. I have scanned this budget estimate with great care. There was one item for development of a ship I believe, $10 million that might be carried over. But out of a $13 billion appropriation that is insignificant.

This whole idea comes out of a very vague statement in the report of the committee of the other body which says there was the feeling on the part of some of the members that there was a possibility some of these funds could be carried over. I think that is splitting hairs.

We are either going to support these men in Vietnam or bring them back, and bring them home.

Here is the language:

> If there is one reservation felt by many members of the committee regarding the necessity for this legislation, it arises from the possibility that many of the items involved, in all three categories of procurement, research and development, and construction, may simply have been moved from the regular 1967 authorization to this supplemental 1966 authorization without any real program for acceleration.

It goes on to say:

> Obviously no military advantage would be gained by such a bookkeeping situation.

But it is an "iffy" statement unless based on hard testimony.

As I say, if there is any one man who is careful about scrutinizing the budget it is my distinguished friend from Massachusetts with whom I have been honored to work for so many years. He did not come up with any specific item that he thought could go over, other than this $10 million vessel.

I agree it was possible that could go over but I saw no real reason for carrying it over.

In my opinion all of this appropriation is absolutely necessary. Some of these items have a very long leadtime. It takes months to construct some of these items, and I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did not vote for this appropriation. If we are not going to support those men, we should bring them home.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to add to that?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. The implication is that colleagues on my side——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I did not say that.

Mr. CLARK. In the other body.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the other body. I beg your pardon. I agree with what the chairman said.

In addition, the chairman and I went over these appropriations requested before we went to the full committee. We went in there heartily in accord with each other that we should appropriate the full amount.

The $10 million which the chairman described I brought up in that committee, we agreed it should go in. That $10 million is for the planning and designing of a new logistical ship. To hold it over would delay construction of the ship which is a new type and a way of doing it. Outside of that, I would say all of these items were necessary.

I personally asked the question whether any of these items should go over, and I determined, in my opinion, speaking as one individual, that they should not go over because they were long leadtime items. It was essential that we should get started.

Mr. CLARK. I thought Secretary McNamara's testimony on that was very convincing.

Would the two Senators mind turning to page 56 of the hearings, where Secretary McNamara stated that South Vietnam has about 640,000 total effectives in Regular and paramilitary activities.

I believe that goes all the way down to the local police whose duties are much less onerous in terms of the chances of their getting shot than the Regular Army.

I take it that figure is pretty well substantiated in the minds of the two Senators. That is on page 56.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is the best testimony we could get. That is the opinion of the intelligence sources and includes not only those on full-time duty but also the regular militia who guard the villagers.

Mr. CLARK. I imagine that the method of keeping a census of military personnel in South Vietnam is not too highly developed. Would the Senator agree?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is true. I must say that there has been quite a high turnover in some of the combat areas.

Mr. CLARK. What information did the committee receive about the desertion rate among the South Vietnamese? It has been published in the newspapers, and I wonder if this is substantially in accord with the testimony that the committee received, that in 1965 there were, as I recall, a gross number of 113,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese armed forces. Many of them, of course, were paramilitary troops, a good many were draftees, and so forth. Nevertheless, if that figure is anywhere near correct—and I ask the two Senators if it is—it seems to me that that is a desertion rate high enough to give us much concern. I wonder if either Senator would comment on that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not recall that that figure was included in the testimony. I have read it in the press. The desertion rate has been quite high. There is no blinking at that fact. It is most remarkable that most of the desertions do not occur at the height of the fighting, according to the uncontradicted testimony. It is at times when the men are in rest camps, or similar areas, that they leave. Some of them come back in a short time; some of them are gone for a number of months before they report back to their units.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps it is a little easier to get away when one is in a rest camp than when he is under the eye of a sergeant.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I should say that is true. Sometimes men have great reluctance to leave those with whom they have been trained, especially when they are under fire. The Senator knows that from his own experience. A man wants to stay with his own unit.

General Johnson testified that in the course of the last year there had been an improvement in the desertion rate; but unquestionably, it has been high.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. COOPER. When I was in Saigon, I spoke with the military staff about this very issue—the rate of desertions. I was told that the rate was high, but a part of the explanation given my staff may be of interest.

I was told that the South Vietnamese forces have no regulation that deals with men absent without leave, such as is applied to our own forces. And, furloughs or leaves of absence are not granted.

Mr. CLARK. Certainly the men are paid very little.

Mr. COOPER. They are fighting, anyway. But when the men enlist or are drafted, they are not given leaves or furloughs; they are in for the duration. As a result, there are many cases of men absent without leave. I was told that men absent themselves in these circumstances to go home to help with the crops and be with their families. Sometimes they return to the same unit; sometimes to another unit.

Mr. CLARK. Sometimes they stay home.

Mr. COOPER. Sometimes they stay home.

But the point was made that despite the high rate of desertion there had been no known defectors of a military unit, even of a squadron or a platoon, of South Vietnamese forces to the North Vietnamese forces. I thought that was a rather significant statement.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I find that the Secretary did delete the number of desertions that occurred in 1965, out of the total force of more than 640,000. The number was omitted as being classified. However, it involves a large number of men.

As I have said, the South Vietnamese military organization is not identical with ours. It would be a mistake to write off the courage and the fighting power of those troops, because at times they have shown themselves to be superior in combat. They have demonstrated great valor and ability.

Going home to see one's family is not a new thing. Neither is it confined to the Vietnamese Army. Some of the best soldiers in the Civil War left their organizations and went home to see their wives and children and to help to gather the crops. For a while, some of them were shot; but eventually the point was reached where their punishment was mitigated, so as to induce them to return.

Mr. CLARK. Someone told me that the total number of desertions on both the Union and Confederate sides during the Civil War was 2 million.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I have read that figure somewhere, but I believe that those who were absent without leave were included.

Mr. CLARK. The purpose of raising this particular line of questions was to get the judgment of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts as to whether the high rate of desertions—and I am taking my figures from the newspapers; I suspect they are not very different from the figure deleted from the testimony—raises any concern in the minds of the two Senators as to whether the fighting effectiveness and the morale of the South Vietnamese forces is increasing or decreasing, or is remaining about what it was when the South Vietnamese were on the verge of defeat, and we really went in and saved them.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I concur in the Senator's last statement. At the time our troops went into action in South Vietnam, I do not believe the South Vietnamese forces would have lasted another month, because they were on the verge of disintegration.

It is difficult to answer the Senator's question categorically, but I should say that all the evidence tends to show that the South Vietnamese have been fighting much better since we sent considerable forces of our own into South Vietnam. Certainly they are fighting much better than they were just before our troops arrived there.

Mr. CLARK. A very ugly story was published in the newspapers a few days ago. When the Vietcong overran one of our special forces camps, it was stated that the officers actually had to shoot some of the South Vietnamese troops to prevent them from hanging on to the helicopters that were trying to remove the wounded from the scene. I suspect that that incident occurred after the hearings were closed. But it was a disturbing story.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I read that article in the press. It was indeed a most disturbing story. I intend to examine into it fully and ascertain the facts. I have not had an opportunity to do so until now. I know that the Senator from Massachusetts has read it and is likewise concerned about it. That occurred at one of the special forces camps, where we were trying to train the Vietnamese. I do not know the degree of training they had received.

Mr. CLARK. *As I understand, it was quite far out in the jungle.*

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It was.

The Senator asked about morale. General McConnell testified:

> The Vietnamese Air Force is very high. Since we started pretty extensive bombings over there, the Vietnamese ground forces morale has continually gone up, and I think they are in much better shape now than they were 5 or 6 months ago.

That would have been about the time that we went into Vietnam in force. There is no question in my mind that the morale of the South Vietnamese forces has improved.

There are many reasons why the average Vietnamese soldier should not have felt enthusiastic about the war. Much favoritism had been displayed in taking men into the forces and commissioning them as officers. There was irregularity in the pay, and the food was of poor quality. On top of that, there was a good deal of tough fighting.

Mr. CLARK. And some corruption.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is what I meant to imply by referring to the food and to the pay. A number of things have tended to shake the morale of the very best fighting troops. Nothing in the world is more destructive of morale in any armed force in the course of history than the feeling that one group is being given favoritism and soft jobs while another group must do the dirty work.

I think that feeling was prevalent at one time in the South Vietnamese forces. I understand that the Vietnamese leaders are making every effort to straighten that out.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps this is not pertinent. However, it was my feeling from the testimony we received that improving the social and economic conditions in the villages and giving some confidence to the leaders that they will not have their heads chopped off has increased the spirit of the fighting men.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that is true. However, the number of villages which we completely control is subject to some question. It was only about a month ago that I read about a splendid village leader who had been enticed to return to his home village and the Vietcong surrounded him and promptly killed him.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. He was attending a funeral.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. He was attending a funeral. I wonder in that regard whether the Senators have any information as to whether we have not about reached the bottom of the barrel as far as increasing the number of effectives is concerned and whether we would not be fortunate if we were able to hold the total of effectives to the figure of 630,000.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The testimony tended to support an affirmative answer to the question of the Senator. But in all *fairness it is inconceivable to* me that they have reached the bottom of the barrel in a nation having from 14 to 15 million people.

I think that if the Vietnamese will go back over all of their rolls and get all of those who have avoided duty, and who should be doing duty, and get all of them into the service the South Vietnamese can not only maintain this ratio but also increase it.

It must be said that a number of the so-called militia and paramilitary men are over the suitable age for active duty in the field of battle day and night. They are defense troops. However, there have also been stories about the number of young men in the two or three cities of the country who have seen no duty and have not yet been called on.

In my opinion, if they really summon their people to the colors without any partiality and distribute the burden of this war equally among all the South Vietnamese, probably two or three additional divisions of young men could be brought into their armed forces.

Mr. CLARK. We must remember that the amount of actual real estate which we control, as opposed to that which is either held by the Vietcong or is contested, puts some limitation on the power to draft people outside of the area which is secured.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is the view of the Vietcong that they can take people who are able to walk and put them at some kind of duty, digging tunnels, if nothing else.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that one test of the effectiveness and morale of the South Vietnamese Army might come from taking a look at the situation in the Mekong Delta as it is today, as opposed to what it was a year ago.

It is my understanding that we do not have any American troops of any number in the Mekong Delta and that that operation is being conducted almost entirely by the South Vietnamese Army.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Very few troops, other than South Vietnamese, have been in the Mekong Delta according to my best information.

Mr. CLARK. The Senators have seen the rather unsatisfactory maps in the newspapers and in the Defense Department. They would not declassify them, and they said they were no good.

As shown on page 145, 146, and 147 of the hearings, Secretary McNamara did finally present a map before the committee.

The map did not show much as to whether the situation in the Mekong Delta had improved. According to the newspaper, the situation is not any better than it was a year ago.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I cannot say that it is any better throughout the country as far as the territory we are permanently holding is concerned. We have not undertaken to fight that kind of war. We have not enough soldiers with which to fight that kind of war. We are not able to garrison a locality and then move on to another place.

That is the reason that the so-called search-and-destroy tactics are employed. *They try to find the enemy and* destroy his forces and sources of support. They have not undertaken to hold the ground that they have taken. We have taken some areas two or three times.

Mr. CLARK. We move out and do not garrison it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Do we not always turn it over to the South Vietnamese in the hope that they can garrison it, and too often they do not?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We turn it over to the South Vietnamese, but sometimes the forces are not very formidable. We appoint the Governor of a village and give him a half dozen armed villagers, and they do not last too long if the Vietcong come back.

The Senator from Massachusetts has shown me some of the testimony. The Senator has read the testimony and is familiar with the testimony of the Secretary of Defense in which he said:

> I think if you applied the definition of control that our field representatives do, both the political and military representatives in South Vietnam, they would say that the Government controls today 53 percent of the population of the country, the Vietcong control about 23 percent. That makes a total of around 76 percent, and the remaining 24 percent is in the disputed areas. I think that Ky's estimate is a much more realistic appraisal of Government control than is the 53 percent.

I would say with all candor that I think the numerical superiority we enjoy is due to the fact that we hold the large cities.

Mr. CLARK. General Ky said that only about 25 percent of the population was sufficiently free from coercion as to be able to engage in free elections without intimidation. I think that is what the Secretary was referring to when he referred to General Ky's statement. It is contained on page 109.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is also on page 146. Secretary McNamara testified:

However, this morning, earlier, I gave an estimate of Prime Minister Ky to the effect that his government controls only 25 percent of the population. Now, these figures are not necessarily contradictory because of the difference in the definition of "control." Prime Minister Ky, when he gave the figure 25 percent as being controlled by the government, was thinking of the population that could participate freely and without coercion.

Mr. CLARK. "Could vote freely."

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. "Participate freely" means "vote freely."

Mr. CLARK. The same testimony appears on page 109.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That was a repetition of something that he testified to that morning.

Mr. CLARK. Secretary McNamara testified on page 144, that of the 235,000 enemy effectives in South Vietnam, only 15,000 were PAVN or North Vietnamese regulars.

I take it that the Senator has no reason to question the testimony of the Secretary of Defense in that regard.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No; I do not. That has been increased somewhat since this testimony was given, but I doubt if it has increased more than enough to replenish the losses they have suffered in battle.

Mr. CLARK. It is probably less than 10 percent of the total effectiveness, is it not, that is, 15,000 out of 235,000?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes; that is correct. Understand, of course, they sent down the best troops they had.

Mr. CLARK. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. These were the best they had available.

Mr. CLARK. There are no Russians and no Chinese fighting in South Vietnam, as far as the Senator knows?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. None. I have asked that question. They have never found a dead Chinese or a dead Russian in any of the death counts they have made after any of the conflicts.

I may say, there has been testimony that a number of Chinese engineer forces have been engaged in North Vietnam, repairing railroad and highway bridges. But as far as combat is concerned, there has been no indication of any Chinese participation.

Mr. CLARK. So that actually, the number of North Vietnamese troops, while it represents, of course, the best they have, is a pretty small percentage of the total force.

If the Senator will look at page 62 of the committee hearings, he will note that Secretary McNamara stated that a majority of the Vietcong are individuals who were born in South Vietnam, or who came there as part of the Viet Minh during the war with the French.

Then, if the Senator will turn to page 341, he will see that Secretary McNamara testified that 80 percent of the Vietcong are recruited in the South.

I take it the Senator has no reason to question that testimony, does he?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No; I am not in a position to question that.

Mr. CLARK. The thing that concerns me——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not know. The Secretary of Defense should have better means of information that I have.

Mr. CLARK. Than any Member of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes. There is no question but that a tremendous number of South Vietnamese are fighting under almost incredible odds, not having any air force whatever to protect them, but they are fighting, and fighting very bravely.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is also that the strength of the Vietcong has more than doubled during the last 12 months, from 103,000 to over 235,000. If we subtract the casualties and the desertion of defectors, and if we add the infiltrators and the 15,000, more or less, in their regular forces, it would seem to me that Secretary McNamara's conclusion that 80 percent of the recruits in the Vietcong forces come from South Vietnam is pretty well substantiated.

That causes me to raise the question—and I should like the Senator's observation on it—that perhaps the Secretary of State is not entirely correct when he says this is not a civil war. In large part, it looks very much like a civil war to me—a civil war which is supported on one side by the United States of America, and on another side with troops from Hanoi, with material and equipment from China, and with some help from Russia; but that fundamentally it is a civil war. I wonder if my friends will comment on that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. This war does have a great many of the aspects of a civil war. But I am sure that it is a civil war that could be brought to a conclusion if the Vietcong would be willing to arrange some reasonable plan of elections in South Vietnam that would enable us to determine the relative strength of allegiance to either the Saigon government or the Communist government.

Of course, there is a long history involved, as the Senator well knows. There is the background of the long struggle that took place for several years between all of the forces, whether they were North Vietnamese, South Vietnamese, or Vietcong—they were all called Vietminh back in those days—against the French. Under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh and General Giap, they finally defeated the French at Dienbienphu; the French people were tired of the war and wanted to get out of it, and they withdrew their forces from southeast Asia, and agreed to the Geneva accords.

One group undoubtedly wished to follow the leadership of Ho Chi Minh. He was the popular idol of the hour when the French were defeated. The French had selected about as poor a character as they could have, in Bao Dai, to rule over the country; he was ruling from Cannes or somewhere on the French Riviera, and naturally had no chance on earth of capturing any respect of his people.

I think that a good deal of the Vietcong affiliation is a legacy from the war against the French, where Ho Chi Minh was the leader of what they believed, with considerable reason, was a war of liberation.

Of course, we supported the efforts of the French with substantial funds for military assistance. But I do not know just how much the Vietcong support is because of a firm belief in communism as a system of government, or even any understanding of communism, and how much of it is really dedication to Ho Chi Minh. I rather believe that a greater part of it is personal affection, respect, and admiration for and belief in Ho Chi Minh, rather than any set of political principles.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator think that at least until a few months ago, both the Vietcong and Hanoi were convinced they were going to win, and drive us out?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. CLARK. That is one reason why they fought so well.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. And there is no question in my mind that whatever the genesis of these Vietcong troops, wherever they may have originated, that the war is being directed out of Hanoi.

Mr. CLARK. But the Senator will agree, will he not, that if our pounding of those people with our enormously severe firepower, particularly since we have built up our forces, has had any effect at all—and I would think it would have—the conviction that they are going to win must be slowly but surely ebbing from the minds of the Vietcong?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I would think their leadership, at least, would begin to doubt it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Carrying forward what the Senator from Georgia has said regarding control of the Vietcong from the north, one thing that has appealed to me all through this matter, as I have stated when I have been asked that question a number of times, is the fact that we do not know today—unless the Senator from Pennsylvania knows through his Foreign Relations Committee—who the leader of the Vietcong is.

How are we ever going to get to him? I do not wish to get into a diversion, but how can we arrange for peaceful negotiations with the Vietcong, when we do not know where their leadership is? Everything we have read indicates that their leadership is coming from the north.

Let me quote one paragraph, one point Secretary McNamara made, shown on page 343 of the hearings:

> It may have some of the aspects of a civil war but, in my opinion, these are of little importance compared to the initiatives taken by the North Vietnamese Government to organize the movement, to supply it, to expand it, and to turn it into a military aggression against the political institutions of the South. These facts we have documented through prisoner reports and through other forms of intelligence and through, as a matter of fact, the oral and written statements of the political leaders of the North.

Again he said, as shown on page 344:

> There is no individual in this Government that I know of, who has studied the relationship between the Vietcong and the associated forces in the South and the North Vietnamese, who believes other than: (1) that they are under the direct supervision and hour-to-hour control of the North; (2) that without that control, they could not possibly accomplish militarily what they are presently capable of; (3) that without the North's support of the Vietcong, the South Vietnamese Government forces would be capable over a reasonable period of time, of suppressing the aggression being directed against it. I think this is such an important subject that, if there is any doubt on this question, I would hope that the committee would call on those who are experts in this field.

Again I repeat, out of my own personal knowledge—and that is all, and I do not say that I am thoroughly informed—who is the Vietcong leader we can say is leading the civil war, or who could end the civil war by sitting down at the negotiating table? In all the testimony to which I have listened, I have not heard that statement answered. If I may proceed——

Mr. CLARK. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would invite the attention of the Senate to page 25 of Secretary McNamara's testimony on the subject of desertions of the Vietcong. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I do not know whether he wishes to read it into the RECORD at this time, but I believe it would be a good quotation.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I would be glad to have the Senator from Massachusetts read it. It shows that there has been an increase in desertions in the Vietcong, but it also shows that there has been an increase in desertions in the South Vietnamese Army, too.

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe that is a very happy statement to make, but I have no objection to having it included in the RECORD.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will not take the time of the Senate to read it into the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to make this observation, with respect to what the Senator from Massachusetts has just stated: I would, with deep regret, take issue with him about the situation respecting the Vietcong. This does not come from anything I have learned——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania kindly repeat that?

Mr. CLARK. With all deference to the Senator, I would take issue with him on the statement he has just made, about our not knowing who is running the Vietcong.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have heard that the Foreign Relations Committee does know, but I make that statement because I have never heard it said before our committee, and I have never seen any sign of it in the newspapers.

Mr. CLARK. If the committee knows, it has not told me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There we are.

Mr. CLARK. And I am a member of the committee. But, I have heard it said by individuals who I believe know something about the situation, and whose veracity I have no reason to doubt, that there are at least six Vietcong missions in various European and African capitals with whom we not only could talk but also, in fact, have been talking off the record from time to time, and that the Vietcong have had three separate leaders in the last year or so. One of them, I believe, was killed. The next one was dismissed because his wife had fallen into the hands of the South Vietnamese and he was therefore thought to have somewhat of a conflict of interest. The third, whose name I do not have or I would be happy to give it to the Senator right now, is a relatively—and I use that word "relatively" with great emphasis—reasonable fellow with whom, if he could be convinced that their side is not going to win, and that we are not going to let them throw us out, it might be possible to do some business.

I would make this comment and then ask for observations and from my friends: I believe that everyone in the Armed Services Committee, and everyone in the Senate, would like to see this war over with just as quickly as possible on some honorable basis. I do not believe there is a single Senator who wishes to fight this war to total victory and the complete destruction of Vietnam.

The way I would analyze the situation—on which I should like to have the comments of my more experienced friends—is that Peiping is never going to talk, because Peiping will fight to the last Vietcong and the last American. Hanoi appears to be, at the moment, rather under the domination of Peiping, although we would hope that there might be some slippage there. My understanding is that there is a "dove" party in Hanoi, just as there is a "hawk" party in Hanoi. But the much more belligerent group is in control. We had hoped that Russia might help. There was a period when it looked as though Russia would help, but recently they have taken the line that they do not wish to join with England in calling the Geneva Conference back into session.

Thus, it seems to me that the only way we will ever get peace in South Vietnam will be to talk to the Vietcong. But that is the one thing we will not do. I cannot see why we are so unwilling to talk to these people on what seems to me to be the legalistic ground that they are not a government, that no one has recognized them as a government, that they are the arm of Hanoi. I do not deny that Hanoi has given enormous assistance to the Vietcong, but I also suspect that they have not given the Vietcong anything like as much assistance as we have given to the Army of South Vietnam and its people.

As I stated earlier, Russia, China, and Hanoi are helping the Vietcong, and we are helping the Vietnamese Army; but the soldiers who are killing our boys are largely, although not entirely—because there are some regular North Vietnamese troops there—South Vietnamese.

Many a guerrilla war has been ended in the past by getting into communication with the enemy at battalion level. I believe that we are making a grave mistake in this insistence by the Department of State asserting that under no circumstances will we negotiate or talk with the Vietcong.

I point out that, of course, the Vietcong are disreputable characters. I have no doubt that they have their fair share of murderers and unreliable individuals. This was true in North Korea. With all due deference to the Senator from Georgia, I suspect that during the Civil War the same was thought to be true of Union forces by the Confederate forces, and vice versa; but in the end, if we wish to stop this war, we have got to talk with those who are doing the shooting. I hope the Senator would respond to that observation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the observation was directed to the Senator from Georgia, I will not speak. If it was directed to me——

Mr. CLARK. Both Senators.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would just say that——

Mr. CLARK. The twins—the bipartisan twins.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield there?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The two Senators from Georgia and Massachusetts, I am sure, are tired. Perhaps I should get into this colloquy and make an observation.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator should.

Mr. PASTORE. What does the Senator from Pennsylvania believe the President means when he says that this issue is not insurmountable?

Mr. CLARK. Personally, let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, that I have some confidence that in the not too distant future—and this is not based on any inside information—the President will come around to the point of view which I have expressed, and which the Senator from Rhode Island has expressed. My controversy—if it is a controversy—is with the Secretary of State.

Mr. PASTORE. I make the point to the Senator that I do not believe we should be picayune concerning those with whom we are willing to talk. But, to come back to what the Senator from Massachusetts said about our contacts, we will get a response from Hanoi. For instance, when Linus Pauling, the great pacifist and physicist who had so much to do with the development of the atomic bomb, made a direct appeal to Ho Chi Minh—I believe it was the latter part of last year—an authoritative answer came back from Ho Chi Minh. He did not say, "Now take this up with the Vietcong." He did not say that. He enunciated, I believe at that time, his four points——

Mr. CLARK. That is right.

Mr. PASTORE. One of the major points was that there would be no discussion of the whole matter unless we recognize the Vietcong as the sole spokesmen for South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. That is absurd. We will never do that.

Mr. PASTORE. The point I am making is rather subtle, that every time we get a response from the other side, the answer comes from Hanoi—it comes from Ho Chi Minh. I might say that I am one of those who feel that the Vietcong should be invited to the conference table, if we can ever find who the responsible authority is. I believe that we should talk to anyone, provided we can reach a peace agreement predicated upon nobility. It must always be upon that basis. There is no question about that. I am inclined to feel, no matter what has been said heretofore, that there is a strong inclination on the part of this Government to sit down as responsible people and talk with those who have the responsibility in this whole matter, in the hope that we can resolve it.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Rhode Island, but the factual question is whether control of Hanoi over the Vietcong is as absolute as we have been told by the State Department. Before the Senator from Rhode Island came into the Chamber we had observed that 80 percent of the members of the Vietcong army are South Vietnamese.

Mr. PASTORE. I was here. I was in the Chamber. I have been here for a long while.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to be corrected. The Senator has been very quiet.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. If I may interpolate here, I merely wish to say this, in reply to the Senator's observation, it seems to me that the President of the United States has done almost everything he can possibly do to find a responsible person with whom to discuss an honorable settlement of the conflict in South Vietnam.

Starting with his Johns Hopkins speech, and repeated time and again since then, he has said the question is open for discussion; that he will discuss it with anyone who is in a position of responsibility that will enable us to bring this matter to an honorable conclusion.

Mr. CLARK. I agree.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not see how the President can go further than that. He cannot bring in some little Vietcong prisoner in black pajamas and say to him, "I want to talk to you about ending the war in Vietnam." This prisoner, who may be a private first class in the 3d squad in the 2d Company, may say, "I cannot do anything about it. You have taken me as a prisoner, and the war is ended as far as I am concerned."

Until the President can get someone to sit down and talk, who has enough influence to deliver whatever he agrees to, I do not see how the President can proceed any further.

Ho Chi Minh has said this country must withdraw. We have to even get out of the country before he will talk. He said we must abandon those people to their fate and bring all of our people home. Then he might, if we conform to the other three conditions, deign to talk about peace.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Ho Chi Minh has never said, "Talk to so and so, who is the head of the Vietcong." He has never said that. He has always answered. He is acting as the kingpin. As the President said, "I am a pretty good cowboy from Texas, but I cannot lasso anybody to talk to."

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I assume every normal person in this country wants to bring this war to a conclusion as soon as it can be done honorably. Certainly, we do not stand to gain one thing over continuing the war. We cannot possibly enhance our wealth, prestige, or position internationally, by carrying the war on any further or by completely destroying both North and South Vietnam. It would not help us. In fact, it would injure our cause and all we stand for.

But here is the President of the United States, who is really, in a way, not authorized to speak for General Ky and the South Vietnamese Government; but he says that so far as our position is concerned and our participation in the war is concerned, we are willing to talk to anyone, anywhere, anytime, and he repeated it recently in a speech in New York.

So, until someone is willing to talk, other than our surrendering unconditionally before they will discuss it, we are somewhat handicapped in our efforts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, assuming for the purpose of the question that someone could sit down and talk, is Ho Chi Minh going to be bound by what that man says for the Vietcong? As a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Subcommittee on Appropriations, I listened for days to the testimony. We still do not know who the Vietcong are. In answer to questions by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], Secretary McNamara said:

> Well, again this is a foreign policy question I think should be addressed to the Secretary of State. The President and the Secretary of State have both made public statements on this matter.

The chairman of the committee brought that out.

> They have said that we would deal with any government that is represented in the conflict and that other parties could find means of being represented.

What is "any government?" Is the Vietcong a government, and if so, who are its leaders?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will permit me to answer the question somewhat obliquely, in the first place, I do not disagree with a single word that any one of my three distinguished colleagues has said about the attitude of the President of the United States, and particularly what was so eloquently said by my friend, the Senator from Georgia. I agree with that 100 percent, but in the meanwhile the Secretary of State is saying we will never talk with the Vietcong because they are only the tools or instruments of Ho Chi Minh. The Vice President has said we will never sit down with those murderers and talk with them.

My point is that the only avenue we have not explored, and which I urge be explored—and I think our intelligence sources know this already—is whether there is not some method by which we could get the leadership in the Vietcong divorced from Ho Chi Minh, in view of the fact that his interest is in a united Vietnam, while the others want an independent South Vietnam. I do not think we have explored the possibility of getting next to the Vietcong, and bypassing North Vietnam, China, and Russia. At this time we find great difficulty with the Government of South Vietnam, which is even more belligerent than the Secretary of State, because General Ky is strongly of the view that he will never sit down and talk with the Vietcong.

I wonder if the Senator has any thoughts on that aspect.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I cannot answer the question. I do not want to say anything here that is likely to cause embarrassment to our allies in this war. Some of us have had a specific interest in the war there, other than a general, patriotic interest. But I do not, for the life of me, see how we can deal with anyone to bring this war to a conclusion unless Hanoi is willing to participate. We do not know who the Vietcong are. I think the Vietcong are somewhat in the position of General Ky, and that if we wanted to make peace on certain terms over there, General Ky would eventually see the light and go along and agree with what we found was an honorable peace. I think if Hanoi would agree to something, the Vietcong would then see the light and would say it was an honorable peace. But I do not think there is anyone we can talk to in the Vietcong, if we made an agreement, that will take the hand of Ho Chi Minh off a majority of the Vietcong. I do not know with whom we could deal. If anyone other than Ho Chi Minh were willing to sit down and talk, I do not think he could deliver on anything, when it came to the point of delivery, because these people are attuned to Hanoi, which they have been for 20 years, to the people running North Vietnam.

Russia at one time indicated it was interested in bringing this matter to a conclusion, but then the Chinese made a renewal of their charges that Russia had sold out on them; that it had gone back on the principles of Marxism and Leninism, and Russia withdrew such good offices as she had extended.

We cannot as a Nation unite South Vietnam. That has got to be done by the forces of that contiguous area and the people of that nationality. We cannot do it.

This matter of people coming in from the outside and imposing their will is gone. I think sometimes it is a little too fast in some areas of colonialism, but when we went in the business of getting the world out of colonialism we moved with tremendous rapidity and effectiveness, and we got them out.

I think perhaps in Sukarno's Indonesia and perhaps the Congo we would have done well to let them stay there a few more years. We would not have had as much trouble.

I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I do not yield to anyone in wanting to bring this matter to a conclusion. But for the life of me I cannot see any reasonable prospect of ending that war over there by talking to the Vietcong when we do not know who they are, where they are, or what they are or how they can bring into reality any agreement they might sign.

Mr. CLARK. In the last analysis this is a matter of judgment and I have no assurance that my view is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is our trouble about the entire matter. We do not know the facts about who is in control of the Vietcong.

Mr. CLARK. My own view would be that Ho Chi Minh would be quite reluctant to make peace now.

My view would be that if we had a government in Saigon more interested in bringing the war to an end instead of saving face——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Did it ever occur to the Senator that those in control in Saigon might be in the same predicament as those in Hanoi, or the same predicament as Ho Chi Minh? They have people on both sides of the issue there, and some power over and above General Ky or whoever succeeds him as the head of their government. Someone else is going to take the initiative in bringing this war to a conclusion because some of the leaders of their military forces are not too anxious to bring it to a conclusion.

Mr. CLARK. This is what concerns me. Some of the military leaders are not interested in bringing it to a conclusion.

Perhaps other Senators wish to interject further.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to make a comment.

After I went to Vietnam in December and January, I felt, as the Senator feels today the Vietcong should be included in negotiations. The main bulk of the forces fighting against our forces are the Vietcong and South Vietnamese, even though trained in the north, and brought back to the south, they are chiefly South Vietnamese and do the fighting.

It is my view, as I said on January 10, and later in the Senate, that if we can reach negotiations, that the Vietcong would have to be included.

That is entirely different from talking about the National Liberation Front.

The National Liberation Front is an arm of North Vietnam, it is a political and propaganda front attempting to speak for the Vietcong.

If we negotiated with them it will be because we are negotiating with North Vietnam.

But when I was there I found it was very difficult to find out who the leaders of the Vietcong are.

So I would say to my good friend who serves on the Foreign Relations Committee, and has every opportunity to secure all information, to find out if he can, if anyone knows who these leaders are.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. If anyone knows who they are, it would be valuable in any approach to negotiations.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, would the Senator yield?

I am in favor of any additional effective action on our part.

Mr. CLARK. That is the problem. Look at the test ban treaty. In the end we seemed to work it out.

Mr. PASTORE. I agree the commitment in Vietnam is great on the part of America. I think we are being picayune when we say we will talk to A but will not talk to B.

I agree, although I must say in sincerity it strikes me that the strategists of the north are in Hanoi. There is no doubt about it.

I think it is just as much a mistake to leave the impression with the American people that because we have not come out categorically and said we will deal with the Vietcong that that is the reason why this struggle continues.

I think that we simplify it too much. I take the position if President Johnson will say tomorrow, "I will talk to the Vietcong," that will not be the end of it.

I think that would be too naive.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I think stories are being exaggerated in Hanoi. Ho Chi Minh is doing it. He has indicated it in everything he has done.

I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that we ought to take a more flexible position in saying "Yes, we will deal with Hanoi and they can bring along whomever they want." I think the President has said that. He said that the problem is not insurmountable. I do not know how else he can say it.

Mr. CLARK. I am not asking the President to say anything other than what he said. I am asking the Secretary of State to change his tune. I am saying there is a potential which has not been adequately explored at the grass roots in South Vietnam. This must be a question of judgment. I have no reason to contend that I am right and that anyone else is wrong. The Senators are 3 to 1 against me. Maybe they are right.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct. It would be naive. I would go further and say if the President of the United States said that it would be an interpretation that all we have done over there is of no avail.

I am sure that the Senator from Pennsylvania has read it, but I believe the President's speech in the Heritage of Freedom in New York, was the best expression of our position in this country that I have seen.

He said he would sit down with the leadership. He said he would sit down with the leadership of the North Vietnamese and they could bring whom they wanted, which the Senator from Rhode Island said.

But to sit down with the Vietcong without the North Vietnamese—it would seem to me, using the word of the Senator, naive.

Mr. CLARK. Naive is a very good word in that institution of higher learning to which we both went. It is a sophisticated word.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator did not include the Senator from Rhode Island in that category. I never went to college.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator used the word.

Mr. PASTORE. I read the dictionary, not at Yale or Harvard, but I read it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator read it well, too. The Senator is one of our most eloquent orators.

I believe we should try to see what can be done. Some of our intelligence people might explore this matter further.

I would like to turn to the problem of what territory in South Vietnam is still sufficiently under our control and the control of the South Vietnamese Government, to make it possible to promote and carry into effect social and economic programs, of which so much was made at Honolulu.

The other day the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare returned from Vietnam. I read his statement as indicating substantial reservations as to whether much could be done with this program in the foreseeable future.

This gets back to the maps, about which I have had a friendly disagreement with Mr. Bell and Secretary McNamara. However, they finally displayed a map in the Committee on

Armed Services. I had been told that the Vietcong control a substantial amount of the real estate, but that the real estate is not heavily populated; and that also there are other areas where the Vietcong are in control at night, and we are in control in the daytime. I should think it would be difficult, indeed, to make a social and economic program work if we hold territory only during the daytime.

I ask the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts if they can give us any information as to the areas in South Vietnam, outside of Saigon, outside of Danang, and outside of Cam Ranh Bay, in which we can really put substantial amounts of money to work to turn the minds and hearts of the South Vietnamese people our way, through taking care of their basic physical needs.

My suggestion is—and perhaps the Senators will rebut it—that not much terrain is really that secure and that we are not going to be able to do a great deal to keep the South Vietnamese economy from collapsing, under the threat of inflation and the shortage of rice and of other items, and to help the people who are still under the control of our allies.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator's committee reported the authorization for the economic aid in the bill; it did not come from the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CLARK. We could not get anything out of that committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. In my judgment, while I do not question at all the good faith of the offer, there is a great deal of psychological warfare involved in all of these commitments. That is true with respect to the President's offer of $1 billion to remake North Vietnam, as well as South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. Through the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It has a great deal to do with the Asian Bank. We have put some hard money in Vietnam, and it will do great good in some areas.

But so far as making permanent investments in outlying villages in Vietnam is concerned, I think that would be foolhardiness on our part, because we would really be helping our enemies, the Vietcong.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania well says, we do not now have adequate forces to hold the different areas. I do think that we can offer medical aid and provide food for those who are starving, and in that way generate, perhaps, some appreciation and gratitude, although that is something we do not even find, as we go through this life, in other areas. Even within this country, it is a rather scarce commodity at times. But we are dealing with human beings; certainly we can bind up their wounds; we can provide assistance to their children; we can cure many of the diseases. That is about all we can do there now, in my opinion, in the way of rebuilding, because we have no firm base on which to start to rebuild. So I believe that a good deal of psychological warfare is involved.

We should tell the Vietnamese to come in and help us to clean up their country; to get the people to understand that they must work with them; that in many instances, the people whom they are fighting are their blood brothers; that they all ought to work together; and that the United States will help them—and we will. We have helped everybody else in the world; there is no reason why we should draw any line where the Vietnamese are involved.

Very frankly, I consider this to be an activity in the nature of psychological warfare. We will deliver when we have a place to spend the money and know that it will reach those who are trying to help themselves. But I would not advocate spending money on permanent improvements now.

Mr. CLARK. In the foreign aid authorization bill, which is funded in the bill which the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts are presenting to the Senate today, $175 million was authorized for expenditures which, in my judgment, although Mr. Bell did not entirely agree, were to bolster the South Vietnamese economy. Mr. Bell told us in the opening session that inflation since the first of this year had increased the price level in Saigon by about 10 percent, and that most of the $175 million was really a rescue operation to keep the South Vietnamese economy from collapsing. The other $100 million was supposed to go into rural areas and into villages.

A number of us raised a serious question as to how that money could be spent. We tried to get Mr. Bell to show us some maps which might be of use in deciding that question. He was not willing to do that, so we had to take his statement on faith.

I supported that bill. Indeed, I shall support this bill. But I am worried about whether we are appropriating large sums of money that cannot be spent, so far as aid is concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add to what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said. I listened to Ambassador Lodge several times when he spoke on this subject. I feel certain that the Senator from Pennsylvania believes that Ambassador Lodge feels we should go into the communities and give the people confidence and help them socially and economically.

I shall quote a statement by General Greene of the Marine Corps. We are all proud of the Marine Corps. In response to a question by me, which appears on page 275 of the hearings, General Greene said:

> Well, taking our own area as a specific example, the I Corps area, we have three perimeters there established now, as you know, sir. These three perimeters actually only encompass a small portion of the total population in I Corps area. Some 2 million Vietnamese live in that area.
>
> Within the enclaves that have been established by our forces in the I Corps, pacification is well underway. In other words, we have separated the Vietcong from the villages in which they have been living for years and we have pushed them outside, either into the unoccupied territory outside of the perimeters or into the mountains and jungles back from the coastal plain, and they don't want to be pushed into these areas, because their entire concept or philosophy is based on mingling with the people, getting the people's support, getting their rice and food from the people, putting taxes on the people, and organizing them as Communists, and we are separating them from the people, Senator, like fish from the sea.

General Greene also said, as appears on page 278 of the testimony:

> Well, we aren't executing this program by the rifle and the sword as far as the civic action program is concerned. Right today we are treating in our frontline aid stations over 2,000 cases every single 24 hours, Senator. These are the cases in which we are curing skin diseases, eye diseases, among the men, women, and children that are within our area. That is the sort of program, just one part of it, that we are doing.
>
> There is no gun or sword attached to this. We are distributing food, we are distributing clothing, we are distributing tools. We are helping these people to help themselves to restore their villages and to rebuild their economy and some sort of a political entity.

That is some of the best and most helpful testimony that the committee received. As I recall—and I hope the Senator from Georgia will check me on this—the marines control about 100 square miles of territory. That is the area or district for which the marines are responsible.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to no man in my admiration for the U.S. Marines. I have no doubt that wherever they have the opportunity, they are doing magnificent work. The Senator from Massachusetts just read a very appealing excerpt from General Greene's testimony.

But I pointed out that the South Vietnamese general in charge of the First Corps area has been dismissed. One must only assume that the dismissal was for incompetence. He almost started a revolution to overturn the Ky Government, but finally decided not to. If he had been an effective military man, I should think he would still be commanding the First Corps.

More than that, if the Senator from Massachusetts will look at a map of the terrain, he will find that a majority of the individuals who are being cared for, as the general said, are refugees who came in off the land, such as Da Nang and Cam Ranh Bay, which we control. I doubt whether there is much of an area in which we could place a school or a housing development. What does the Senator say about that?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I think that we must make haste slowly. We must get the people to be sympathetic with us. There is no better way to get people on our side than to treat their skin diseases and eye troubles and make them healthy.

I think that a well person is a happy person. If the people are happy, they will be on our side and this will be accomplished in a very simple manner.

Mr. CLARK. If we can get to them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we can get to them. We must get to them.

Mr. CLARK. That is my problem. If the Vietcong controls so much of the real estate, how will we get to them?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I state to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Pennsylvania that I appreciate very much this opportunity to engage in colloquy with them. I always try to work with the chairman of the committee in an effective and nonpartisan manner at all times.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should be terribly disappointed if the Senator from Massachusetts were to leave. I have a few more questions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not think of leaving.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senators will look at page 116 of the hearing, they will see that General Wheeler testified, in the presence of Secretary McNamara, that the object of the war is to cause the Vietcong and primarily Hanoi to cease and desist their aggression in South Vietnam.

Secretary McNamara said that our policy is to achieve our limited objective with the fewest personnel losses possible.

Then, on page 171, General Wheeler said:

> I believe that this is a war that we can win. I believe this, and if I did not believe it, I never would have recommended it to the Commander in Chief that we put our ground forces in there, or any forces, for that matter, at the beginning.

I wonder if the Senators would agree with me that General Wheeler is using the word "win" in connection with our policy and our objective, which is to cause the Vietcong and primarily Hanoi to cease and desist their aggression. He does not mean total victory resulting in the destruction of the enemy. Would the Senators agree?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think in the whole context of his testimony, and the testimony of the Secretary of Defense, it is quite clear that when the general uses the expression "win the war," he means to force Hanoi or any other proper and responsible representatives of the enemy forces in Vietnam to come to the conference table and agree on an honorable peace.

Mr. CLARK. I would agree with that objective.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That was the tenor of their testimony throughout. Nobody ever talked about going in there and destroying North Vietnam or South Vietnam. Of course, as long as the war is being waged over any piece of ground, there will be terrible destruction and a good many innocent people will be killed.

There is one difference, however. The people whom we kill are killed by accident. The people who are killed by the Vietcong are killed with premeditated brutality.

Mr. CLARK. The statement which I read from page 120 of Secretary McNamara's testimony refers to achieving a limited objective with the fewest personnel losses possible.

My understanding is that our present military policy—and I ask the Senators to comment on this—is to engage in a series of operations known as search and destroy, in the carrying out of which we place large numbers of American troops in the field with their magnificent firepower in an effort to search out and kill Vietcong, to destroy their morale, and to cut their fighting effectiveness. However, this inevitably has resulted, I should think, in a very substantial increase in the rate of American casualties. This has been more and more obvious in the last 2 months. Our casualty rate has accelerated quite substantially.

I appreciate that nobody in the Pentagon Building or on the Armed Services Committee agrees with General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan that the proper policy would be to stay where we are and make do with what we have.

I recall that the Senator from Georgia made a comment in the testimony. I do not have the page number at this time, but perhaps he will recall his statement in which he indicated, at least in part, that such a policy would substantially decrease our casualties.

Frankly, I am very concerned over the way in which the American casualty rate is increasing. I am concerned as to how long the American people will stand for an increasing casualty rate.

I ask the Senators whether, in their opinion, there is not some way in which our limited objective could be achieved with the fewest possible personnel losses, as Secretary McNamara has said, without sending our boys into the elephant grass and jungle, and incurring casualties, from the 3d of January 1966 to the 7th of March 1966, of 848 combat deaths, and 139 deaths from accidents which resulted outside of combat. That is a total of 987 casualties in 2 months.

The casualty rate seems to be increasing as our search and destroy policy takes hold. I wonder if the Senators would comment on my concern over the heavy rate of American casualties.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I sincerely regret the American casualties. So far as the Massachusetts boys are concerned, it hurts me every time I write a letter to the parent or wife of a boy who has been killed.

It is not our objective in using the words "win the war" to do nothing other than to make sure that the representatives of North Vietnam and Hanoi will sit down at the conference table. At the present time that has not been done. With regard to holding these areas along the seacoast, as General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan have mentioned, I think from everything I have heard that Gavin has been misinterpreted.

It seems to me that we must carry on the fight. We must make it clear that we are there to force these people to come to the conference table.

We are in the effort so far now that we cannot turn around, even with the increased casualties and the increasing amount of materiel that we bring to Vietnam, but the most serious thing is the increased casualties.

Mr. CLARK. The figures which I quoted did not include the wounded, which are usually far greater in number than those who have been killed.

Turning to page 266 of the testimony, I find myself in complete accord with what the Senator from Georgia said.

I read from the testimony:

> General JOHNSON. I do not believe that what General Gavin proposed would accomplish anything beyond what Senator SYMINGTON said, tying down forces.

I interpolate that Senator SYMINGTON is a strong, and from his point of view, quite effective opponent of General Gavin's theory.

I continue to read from page 266:

> Chairman RUSSELL. Our people would not be captured and killed if they had these enclaves there and could defend them by air and by artillery and by the Navy.
>
> General JOHNSON. But we would be serving no useful purpose in enclaves.
>
> Chairman RUSSELL. No. We would be serving no useful purpose, but we would be serving a useful purpose in saving our people from being killed—

There is then a security deletion, as is so often the case when the testimony begins to get interesting.

I continue to read—

> and our forces who were there would think that was a pretty useful purpose.
>
> I remember when I first came here, I was talking big to Senator Gore, the blind Senator from Oklahoma, and something came up about the Spanish-American War. I said that wasn't much of a war. There were 748 people killed in the whole war.

I interpolate that there were 987 Americans killed in the last 2 months in South Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I said 348. That was the number that was killed in the Spanish-American War.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I continue to read from the statement of Senator RUSSELL:

> There were 748 people killed in the whole war, and there were more than that killed at Manassas.

Manassas is sometimes known, north of the Mason-Dixon Line, as Bull Run.

I continue to read:

> Old Senator Gore said: "Well, I guess that 748 thought it was a pretty big war." Since then I have been more careful about my estimate of things.

I must say that I find myself in accord with the statement of the Senator from Georgia, who may or may not want to make any further comment. If not, I shall go on to something else.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I was being more or less a Devil's advocate there, in seeing what General Johnson, the Chief of Staff of the Army, thought about that situation.

Of course, I do not want one single American boy to spill one drop of blood over there unnecessarily; and I grieve with those who do, and particularly with their families, especially of those who leave young ones behind.

When we talk about search and destroy, I think the whole purpose of that is to make this war so unpopular and so devastating for the Vietcong that they will eventually be compelled to quit it.

We cannot wage any other kind of war, unless we go into the enclaves. We do not have the men or the equipment to hold the territory that we take. We can take it all right, but we cannot hold it, because we do not have a sufficient number of men there.

But when we search and destroy, that does not mean just destroy the Vietcong; that means destroy their system of tunnels, it means destory their rice supplies, it means destroy their munition dumps, and the things with which they wage war.

I have concluded that the American people will not tolerate indefinitely the kind of war that we are waging over there now. I think we must hit the North Vietnamese hard enough to make them come to the conference table, whether they want to or not—to make them forget those four conditions they have imposed.

Personally, I have come to the conclusion that we should close the port of Haiphong, and that we should push this war until the North Vietnamese would be willing at least to permit their alter egos or "Charlie McCarthys," or whoever they are, in the National Liberation Front, to join them at the conference table and bring this war to a conclusion.

If they are correct in their insistence that a majority of the people in South Vietnam want their form of government, let them come and have an election, and, if the majority of the people there vote for that form of government, I say let them have it, because, if there is any one principle to which this Nation has been dedicated in its relations with all other countries on earth since our very beginning, it is the principle of self-determination.

But I do not think we can afford to let this war drift on and on as it is now. Search-and-destroy tactics may, after 10 or 12 years, bring the Vietcong to their knees; but the American people are going to be very unhappy about it, and someone who comes along and says, "I will go in there and clean this thing up in 6 months," will, I am afraid, have some advantage over the Senators who say, "Let's play this thing along for 10 or 12 years, as we are going now."

Because this is not a popular war, gentlemen; we can bear that in mind right now. The average American has a sense of national pride that will not let him tuck in his tail and run there in South Vietnam, but he wonders, every time he thinks about it, why we are there; and I must confess that I share that feeling at times myself.

It is going to be necessary to have a change in policy in some direction in the very near future, in my opinion, or this war will assume political proportions that will absolutely force it upon any man who has to go before the electorate of this country and seek public office.

Mr. CLARK. Two things concern me about the position taken by the Senator from Georgia, with which I would ordinarily have great sympathy, because I, like most Americans, tend to be impatient and wish to get things over with pretty quickly, and do not like these halfway measures.

But I would be concerned, with respect to the Senator's view, with two things: First, how much longer will the American people be content to put up with the present casualty rate? I remind the Senator that, while we like to be statesmen while discussing this sort of matter, there is an election coming up in November, with which we should naturally be concerned.

After all, in the case of Korea, the people got pretty tired of that war, and many people believe President Eisenhower was elected because he undertook to go to Korea and stop it, and he did.

The other thing that concerns me is whether the more provocative policy which the Senator from Georgia thinks we may have to follow involving an escalation and acceleration of the war might bring the Chinese into the war against us.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Of course that would be most unfortunate, and I should hope that would not happen. But, as the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, we took a calculated risk when we put the first man in uniform in South Vietnam. We did not know what the response of the Chinese would be. We did not know what it would be when we added to that, and built our airbases in surrounding areas. We did not know what the response of the Chinese would be when we started bombing North Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. And we do not know yet.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. But my own opinion—and not as one posing as an expert, by any means, on Chinese affairs—is that as long as we do not land forces near the Chinese border, we will probably not bring the Chinese into the war. If we were to land forces near the Chinese border, I think we would undoubtedly bring them in. If we were to attack China somewhere, I think we would undoubtedly bring them in. But I cannot see why the Chinese would permit us to bomb up to within 2 or 3 miles of their borders, and knock out railroad bridges and road bridges, and not come into the war, and then come into the war because of something that is clear across North Vietnam from the Chinese boundary.

I concede it is a calculated risk, but we have taken calculated risks before, and we will be compelled to take calculated risks if we are ever to bring this war to a conclusion.

I am in favor of taking the next step now, and closing Haiphong, saying, "We are going to put a stopper on this bottle; you are not going to pour any more munitions in there to go down through the many prongs of the Ho Chi Minh trail and kill American boys."

That is my own individual view, and I have urged it at the very highest levels. If we cannot, in any other way, get these people to do the very elementary thing that has prevailed since the stone age, of men who are at loggerheads sitting down and discussing their differences—if they are not willing to do that, I do not see that we have any other option but to try and put them in such a position that they are compelled to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has a few remarks he wishes to make on the pending bill. I have a few more questions I should like to put to my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, but I should like to yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I had no particular remarks I wished to make. I did have a few more questions that I should like to have raised, either for the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Georgia, with reference to the bill.

One question relates to the proposal that has been made by a number of people about the possible sealing of the port of Haiphong.

It has been my understanding that the Senator from Massachusetts would know more about this than I would: that there is a sense in which both the major cities in the south and those in the north are held hostage by the other side. In other words, the Vietcong, with the help of North Vietnam, are in a position to do great damage to the port of Saigon. It is my understanding that that port is reached through a river that it would be quite possible to close off by the sinking of a single ship.

Various other things could be done, through terror, to cause great difficulty in Saigon. We have also understood that one of the reasons why steps of that kind have not been taken is the fact that, so far, we have stayed away from bombing or mining Haiphong, or other principal cities in North Vietnam. I am wondering whether—if we were to take that step, let us say, to mine or bomb the key port of Haiphong—we could not anticipate severe reprisals on the part of the other side against Saigon, which is an essential port in terms of our supply situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say that my knowledge of this subject is not completely fundamental, but it is my understanding that Saigon harbor has a channel which could be mined very easily, but that it has not been mined. The ship which was hit the other day went out of the channel in order to keep the channel clear. We did receive testimony that if we mined Haiphong—and it would have to be done by mines, not by a blockade or other way— there could be an opportunity for the opposition to drop mines and make it more difficult for us on the scene. There was general and little testimony, really, on this subject. I know that some military chiefs feel we could go further regarding the mining or bombing of Haiphong; but, of course, there is a difference of opinion on that subject. They have to take their orders from the Commander in Chief.

Mr. McGOVERN. Does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that might be a possible response which we would have to anticipate, if we were to extend the war by attacking Haiphong or other principal cities of North Vietnam, that there would then be an increase in the activities of the other side in reprisals?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Just speaking as one individual—for myself, and myself alone, and that is all I can speak for—that is probably the reason the present administration has not allowed the military chiefs to go as far as they might like to go. However, I emphasize that I am speaking only for myself when I say that.

Mr. McGOVERN. With regard to the general policy of bombardment in the North, there has been a considerable amount of discussion on that question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator will yield right there, it has been called to my attention that the feeling is we would not gain enough by mining Haiphong to make it worth while.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator.

In addition to possible reprisals against Saigon, would not it also raise all kinds of problems with reference to some of our allies——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It might very well.

Mr. McGOVERN. And other international problems?

With regard to the overall policy of bombing, particularly the bombing of the north, this has been going on now, as I understand it, for a year. It began in February of 1965, I believe. It is my further understanding that the theory behind the bombing was possibly twofold; one, that it would interdict the flow of manpower and supplies from North Vietnam into the south; and, two, it might bring the kind of pressure to bear on Hanoi which would lead them to the negotiating table.

If I properly state the purpose of the bombing—and I am not sure that that is the reason for it, having watched that as a member of the Armed Services Committee for the past year—would the Senator say that, in general, the bombing has been a success, judged by any reasonable standards?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe that we could say the testimony we have heard shows it to be a reasonable success. I would not say it has been a tremendous success. It is my understanding that there is a great difference between bombing Hanoi and the bombing of Germany in World War II. During World War II, Germany's industrial facilities were in an area which, by bombing, prevented the Germans from building materials of war. In the case of Hanoi, very little materiel goes to the Vietcong and into South Vietnam from Hanoi which is built or made there. I believe they have a steel plant in that area. How big it is, I do not know. I believe that there is a difference of opinion, there again, about the oilfields around the outskirts of Hanoi. The feeling has been not to bomb Hanoi and kill and mutilate civilians. What we wish to do is bomb the Ho Chi Minh trail and the railroads that come from China into North Vietnam. In other words, to bomb the areas of transportation.

As Secretary McNamara pointed out, it is almost impossible to bomb successfully a comparatively small number of tons of supplies coming down the roads. But now the supplies for the Vietcong being built up are between, I believe it is 12 to 18 tons a day—perhaps more. Therefore, we can successfully bomb the roads by making the Ho Chi Minh Trail inoperable and preventing the movement of the railroads. In other words, Vietcong supplies have been built up as they come down, and now it is worth while to try to stop them on the roads. That is the essential goal of our bombing, as I understand it, at the present time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Can the Senator from Massachusetts tell me whether there is anything in the supplemental bill which would lead anyone who would vote for it, or who supports it, into the position that he would seem to be endorsing an increase or an acceleration of the bombing attacks, and other efforts of that kind which we are carrying on in Vietnam?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not believe that we could answer that question categorically. I believe that what we are trying to do in this bill is to supply enough ammunition, supply enough planes, supply enough manpower, if we will, and operation and maintenance, to carry on the Vietnamese war in the way the leadership of our country and the chiefs of staff believe to be the wisest under the determinations which they may make from time to time.

Mr. McGOVERN. If I could be a little more specific about that, one of the things I have been very much concerned about is trying to do whatever I can, as one Senator—and I know there are other Senators who feel the same way—to stop this war from widening.

The President has stated that he seeks no wider war, that he wants to do what he can to restrict it. Could it be said that the funds contained in the bill, or any of the funds in the bill, will be earmarked, let us say, for extending the bombing attacks into Cambodia, sending troops into Laos, or bombing the mainland of China and hitting areas which would significantly expand the theater of operations?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. Let me say again that we cannot be categorical on this point, but the purpose of the bill is essentially to supply our 200,000-odd men in Vietnam, and to make it possible for them to gain victory.

Mr. McGOVERN. But it does not constitute, in the Senator's view, funds for a major buildup, that it is something in the nature of a holding operation—and I am not referring to the "enclave theory"—but to holding the present level of military activity, or at least not to expand it in any major or substantial way?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I could not truthfully answer that question by the Senator in a way which he would want; namely, as a "No, it does not" answer. I do not believe that today the Senator or I, the Chiefs of Staff, or the President of the United States could say that that was the fact. We have got to be guided by circumstances. We have got to do what we believe to be necessary. I do not believe that we can be categorical in saying what the pending bill will do, and what it will not do.

What it will do, in effect, is make it possible for our men who are over there to fight to the best of their ability and as safely as possible to bring about the results that we want.

Mr. McGOVERN. If I read the report and bill correctly, there is a considerable amount of funds provided both for increased artillery shells and bombs. I think I remember the figure of about $100 million a month in ammunition and artillery of different kinds, and perhaps $110 million a month in bombs. So there is something like $200 million a month every month spent for those purposes at the present level.

I am wondering whether, in the kind of guerilla war we are now engaged in, where the enemy and soldiers are intermingled with civilian population, how we can use that kind of firepower without killing many civilians, children, and defenseless men and women, who I think would become the victims of firepower on that scale.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the first place, a substantial amount of ammunition is being used. I do not have the figure per month in mind with respect to what is being used.

Mr. McGOVERN. These are Secretary McNamara's figures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I would say what the Senator has quoted is correct.

I may mention that in the Preparedness Subcommittee, under the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], as I said before the Senator from South Dakota entered the Chamber, we have received testimony which seemed to indicate that there was enough ammunition over there to supply our needs in all forms and that we were building up our supplies at home to keep them up to what we need.

So far as concerns killing civilians, I have never seen any figures of the number of South Vietnamese civilians who have been injured or killed as a result of our bombing or shooting.

I think the Senator is making an understatement of the activities involved in South Vietnam when he says it is guerrilla warfare. I think it ceased to be guerrilla warfare with the number of regiments that have come down into South Vietnam from the North, and with our search and destroy activities, going into underground trenches, to destroy tons of rice, and so forth. I hope I have answered the Senator's question. I have tried to the best of my ability to do so.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

One further question. Up until about a year ago, the estimates—and I think these estimates came out of the Defense Department as well as from other sources—were that about 80 percent of the weapons that were used by the Vietcong were American weapons that they had captured or stolen or bought in the black market or obtained in various fashions from the troops we had equipped in Vietnam. I am talking about a year or a year and a half ago. In other words, in a sense, we were acting as a supply source for both sides.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that is one statement I can categorically deny——

Mr. McGOVERN. As far as today is concerned?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, because weapons made in China or Russia were brought into our committee. As far as could be determined, the enemy did not have any of our weapons. I will not say that they do not have, because they must have, but I think essentially they are being supplied from those other two sources.

Mr. McGOVERN. I wish to thank the Senator for his patience in answering these questions as a member of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is a subject matter we are all interested in. We all ought to know as much as we can about it. I appreciate the questions of the Senator. I have tried to answer to the best of my ability.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the pending bill. My vote will be cast against this legislation because it provides the means of conducting a war that is unauthorized through our constitutional processes.

We are not acting in immediate self-defense in Vietnam; we are not in a condition where the President must act precipitately to repel a sudden armed attack. We are planning, managing, organizing, and conducting a war effort of a magnitude exceeded only a few times in our history. To do that requires a declaration of war by Congress, under our Constitution.

Supporters of the war who seek to justify an exclusively executive war fall back upon the old saw: Who would we declare war on? My answer is, whoever we are fighting, and that surely is the National Liberation Front and North Vietnam.

The only reasons given for not declaring war on them are that it would be degrading for the United States to declare war formally on such puny adversaries, and secondly, that our relations with other countries would suffer. But we are making war and the same disadvantages are accruing to us, anyway.

I am not for a declaration of war in Vietnam. I do not believe there are sufficient grounds for it.

I do not think there is any justification for an executive war in Vietnam. But neither are there grounds for an American war to destroy the Vietcong and reestablish General Ky and his cronies as the undisputed masters of South Vietnam. To the extent that we continue to do that, we are only replacing the French in Vietnam and will suffer all the disadvantages and debilities that the French suffered.

However different our motives may be from those of postwar France, we still are trying to remake a country to suit our hollow interests. How hollow our purposes are. We say first we are there to preserve the blessings of freedom for the people of South Vietnam, and then we announce a vast program to reshape the political, social, and economic institutions of that sad, unfortunate, war-torn country.

The plain fact is we are in South Vietnam for purely American interests and no one else's. We will remain as long as necessary to protect U.S. interests as we see them, and we are not interested in any cessation of the fighting unless American security interests are first guaranteed, irrespective of what happens to the people of South Vietnam.

My objection to this bill go to the objectives for which we say we are in South Vietnam, and the fact that we are pursuing them without regard for the constitutional processes which are supposed to govern the conduct of war by the United States.

The bill carries the money not only to hold on where we are in South Vietnam, but to expand the war into Thailand, Laos, and elsewhere in southeast Asia where the Defense Department sees fit. We are doing all this in the name of containing Communist China. But China has no men in Vietnam, and has expended little money, relatively speaking, in support of the fighting.

Indeed, once we began in 1962 to build up our airbases deep in the heart of Thailand and naval bases on her seacoast, the threat of guerrilla subversion of Thailand began to grow. Prior to 1962, there was virtually no mention of any subversive or guerrilla threat to Thailand. Today in this bill, we are called upon to provide tens of millions of dollars to forestall a threat to Thailand that we did as much as anyone to instigate and create in the first place.

Thailand has become an American military sanctuary and we had no right in the first place to turn it into an American military sanctuary. Neither had we any right to send a single boy to South Vietnam in violation of the Geneva accords of 1954; nor any legal or moral right to send a single tank, a single airplane, a single piece of warmaking materiel into South Vietnam, to say nothing of establishing in South Vietnam our first puppet, by the name of Diem, and each and every puppet we have financed and militarized since we proceeded to violate the Geneva accords of 1954, section after section, article after article.

The $13.1 billion of this bill, plus the $1.7 billion of last year, is all for expenses for the Vietnam war for fiscal year 1966. This total of $14.8 billion is in addition to the regular Defense Department budget. As described by the committee report, the money is needed not only for what it calls "continued support of operations in southeast Asia." The committee says:

> It includes increases in the size of our Armed Forces; additional funds for the maintenance and operation of new and enlarged bases; stepped-up supply and depot operations; procurement of a variety of aircraft, missiles, munitions, vehicles, and other equipment; increased research activities related to the Vietnamese requirement; construction of bases, depots, troop housing facilities, airfields, and other facilities both in the United States and abroad; military assistance funds to reimburse the military services for the procurement of goods provided, and economic assistance to foreign countries.

This money will carry us until June 30, 1966.

It is impossible to find any witnesses from the administration who are willing to say what the costs will be next year. It is impossible to find any witness from the administration who is willing to say what the cost will be less next year.

Let me say to the American taxpayers: Get ready for more. Let me say to the American taxpayers: As this administration, outside the Constitution, escalates this war and sends additional thousands of American boys to be slaughtered in South Vietnam, the war bill will go up.

That is why I said last Thursday, in preparation for this speech today, that the American people are the only ones left to check this administration, for I am satisfied that Congress never will. I am still waiting for my colleagues in Congress, who keep telling me that they are waiting for the proper vehicle to check this administration, for the proper vehicle in which they can express themselves. The country is still waiting for them to name what they consider to be the proper vehicle to check this President.

I say regretfully that, in my opinion, they are never going to find such a vehicle; they are never going to name one. They are just going to hope and hope that in some way, somehow, this ungodly slaughter will disappear from the face of the earth. In my judgment, it will not disappear until we formally change America's policies. That is why we ought to proceed, legislatively, to exercise those checks that our constitutional forefathers left to us to exercise when a President proceeds to follow a course of action that this President has followed since he was elected in 1964 on pledge after pledge, and on the representation to millions of Americans who voted for him, that he opposed the warmaking policies of Barry Goldwater. As I said last Thursday, he has out-Goldwatered Goldwater.

In my judgment, the American people now have to check the President, they are going to have to check him by exercising the precious right that they have—the free ballot. They are going to have to hold politically responsible those who are not willing to check him, and to proceed to demonstrate their disapproval of the slaughter that is taking place in southeast Asia.

This fund is necessary to carry out a war effort said to be mounted by North Vietnam, whose annual gross national product has been estimated at under $1 billion. It has been stated in the Committee on Foreign Relations hearings on China that the real challenge to us in Vietnam is to find the ways and means to bring together the factions that could provide it with a stable government. But that challenge is derided by administration spokesmen as being tantamount to putting a fox in charge of the chicken coop—which was an insult to our intelligence, by the way. No doubt it is undiplomatic to point out that the fox is already in charge of most of the area of the chicken coop, and in charge of many of its people. It is also undiplomatic these days to point out that South Vietnam is apparently regarded by the administration as "our chicken coop" for they take upon themselves the right to say who shall run it and who shall not.

If that is not a substitution of American interests for French interests, I do not know what is. If General Ky is a more viable head of state than Bao Dai was, there is no evidence to support it. Ky consumes vastly more American financial and military support to hang on even to a vestige of authority than Bao Dai required of the French.

Today's New York Times carries a letter to the editor by Robert S. Browne, a one-time American aid official in South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Browne's letter be printed in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. In his letter, Mr. Browne points out:

> If the administration were really interested in an honorable solution in Vietnam it would revise its 11-year-old policy of blind and total support for tyrannical Vietnamese opportunists and have the courage to throw its support behind some sort of coalition government of popular groupings in South Vietnam. If we would permit such a government truly to assume the reins of power (a reasonably satisfactory method of selecting representatives could be worked out) we might have, for the first time since Vietnam has been independent, some effective channel for the expression and assessment of popular feeling in South Vietnam. It would be the proper province for such a government, rather than for ill-formed U.S. politicians, to decide whether or not it wished to go into coalition with the National Liberation Front.
>
> The Ky government, which rules only because of its unlimited support from the United States, unabashedly denies any expression of Vietnamese popular feeling as regards the question of war or negotiations. Yet the President of the United States chooses to fly 7,000 miles to demonstrate his support of this tyranny, while straightfacedly proclaiming our objective as being that of self-determination for the people of Vietnam.

I point out that Mr. Browne was one of the men in charge for a good many years of our aid program to South Vietnam. He is aware of the tyranny that we have supported with the expenditure of millions of American taxpayers' dollars. He is aware of the duplicity of our whole American program in southeast Asia. He is aware of the difference between the talk of our Government leaders and their acts. He is aware of the speech of the President of the United States at the so-called freedom banquet in New York in which he said to the American people, and through that program, to the world, that we seek no American base in southeast Asia. Is that so? Well, I want to say that will be surprising news to the major Asian powers and, for that matter, to the leaders of the governments of the world.

As I went with a Senate delegation through Asia last fall, I soon discovered that the Asian leaders are well aware of the bases that the United States has built and is building in southeast Asia.

We are not going to spend these hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars for American bases in southeast Asia and walk out on them, and everybody knows it.

These bases are being built for U.S. military presence in southeast Asia for years to come, until finally Asia throws us out, which is what will happen in the due course of time. For, as I have said so many times in my speeches here on the floor of the Senate, no Western power is going to be allowed to maintain and dominate footholds in Asia. All the other Western powers that have tried it have learned through bloodletting that sad lesson, except the United States.

We are apparently slow learners, we Americans. Apparently it is going to take us a much longer time than it took the other powers who have already learned this blood lesson, that Asia is not going to let the United States maintain and dominate for long a military foothold, or, for that matter, economic foothold in Asia.

We do not like to talk about colonial policies. We like to attach that term only to European nations. But come with me through Asia, and when we talk about the imperialistic policies of the United States in Asia, that means the new kind of colonialism that the United States seeks to impose upon Asia, a military and economic colonialism in form after form.

Mr. President, the repeated claim by the U.S. Government that we are in South Vietnam to preserve freedom of self-determination for its people is perhaps the most patently farcical of all our public pronouncements on that subject, and there are many. We have the Vice President's word for it that we—the United States, the administration, the White House, the Pentagon, and the State Department—do not intend to let anyone into the Government of South Vietnam who does not have our blessing.

Where did we get that power from on high? The United States should stop playing God in Asia. The leaders of our Government should stop playing God in Asia. We ought to recognize also that most Asians do not have faith in our God.

Mr. President, the determination for South Vietnam lies with Government officials in Washington, D.C., and not among the people of South Vietnam. It is our chicken coop, said the Vice President in his unfortunate use of that figure of speech, and we will have in charge whom we please, no matter how long it takes.

That is the story of this administration. But it does not make it right. It does not make it defensible. It does not make it justifiable, for it is a wrong policy.

This unilateral, American dictatorial attitude toward southeast Asia cannot be reconciled with the glorious, historic record of this Republic.

That is why I find myself so completely at a loss to understand what has happened to our ideals in America. What has happened to our professings about believing in the application of the principles of morality to our relationship with foreign peoples.

Mr. President, we cannot square our course of action in southeast Asia with principles of morality. As the American people come to understand it, they are going to make very clear to this administration that it had better get back inside of the framework of the Constitution and the framework of our country's morals.

Mr. President, I do not doubt that out of our wealth and power we can sustain this war in South Vietnam, and probably in North Vietnam, too, so long as there are any people left to fight in either place. But we are not creating anything, even with the billions we are being asked to spend to remake the social structure of South Vietnam. What we are creating is a social and political desert that the United States will have to occupy and govern for the foreseeable future.

This is now being elevated into an elegant new version of the "white man's burden." It is talked up as an obligation to the yellow races of Asia that are as deserving of American help as are the white races of Europe. But it is not help in a common purpose. It is the enforcement of American goals upon people who have little or nothing to say in the matter. Our commitment to South Vietnam was made in Washington to people in Washington who were then sent to South Vietnam to enforce it, and who are still being sent there to enforce it. That is a commitment to ourselves, not to the people of South Vietnam.

No doubt Ho Chi Minh says with equal fervor that he, too, has a commitment to the people of South Vietnam to finish the unifying of Vietnam that was short-circuited by the halt in the election in 1956. I do not know of any opportunity the people of the south have had to make themselves heard or to manage their own affairs at all.

For the people of South Vietnam, there is no hope of peace in this bill. There is no hope of an end to war, only the promise of more war. We are told in support of mass bombing by B-52's that it was good for the morale of the Ky government; but the introduction of helicopters in 1961 did wonders for the morale of the Diem government for a few months, and the introduction of American jet bombers into the fighting did a lot for the morale of the government that preceded General Ky's. Somehow the morale always needs a new shot in the arm, like a drug addict who requires bigger and bigger doses to get the same lift.

This bill will increase the level of the fighting, the number of Americans to do the fighting, and the extent of the territory made subject to warfare.

There is no declaration of war, which could state the objectives and purposes of the United States in fighting, even as Woodrow Wilson asked for a declaration of war "to bring the Imperial Government of Germany to terms and end the war."

We have no such objective or purpose in Vietnam. No one in the administration is talking about ending the war or how it can be ended. We are being told only of how it can be prosecuted, not how it can be either won or ended. It is increasingly fashionable, too, to berate Americans for wanting quick solutions, as though to drag on a war for 5 or 10 or 20 years is more likely to secure the peace of Asia than a settlement would.

As a final exhibit to these remarks, I call attention to the article appearing in the current issue of Frontier magazine by

Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho. It is a review of "Vietnam and the United States," by Prof. Hans Morgenthau, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as exhibit 2 at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as exhibit 3 to my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 19, entitled: "Congressional Abdication."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MORSE. As exhibit 4, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the close of my speech this afternoon, from today's issue of the New York Times, a statement of outstanding scholars and authorities on China, signed by 180 of them, proposing drastic changes in American foreign policy toward Communist China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I know full well that voting against this appropriation bill will stir up the superpatriots in this country, all those who seem to think that flag waving is a substitute for reason, those who feel that the best way to show your patriotism is to drain, several times a day, your adrenal glands and respond emotionally—I full well know the tactics they resort to. They have used them on the senior Senator from Oregon before. They are using them now in my State, Mr. President. In fact, I think when I finish this speech, I shall call the Chief Justice of the United States and goodnaturedly suggest to him that he move over; because those superpatriots are circulating buttons, on which there is printed, "Impeach Morse."

Mr. President, they are also circulating petitions in my State. They started with petitions to recall me, not knowing anything about constitutional law—which is so characteristic of this breed of patriots. They learned from their legal advisers that they were without legal authority to recall a U.S. Senator, so they changed the petition and are circulating them now, to be sent to the Senate, to have me expelled from the Senate.

Many of my friends have called and asked me if there was anything I wanted them to do. I said, "There is nothing I want you to do." I said, "Let those people do it. They have the right, and I would stanchly defend their right to get up any petitions they wish. It is a constitutional right; let them exercise it. I am perfectly willing to let the people of Oregon answer them."

But their line is based upon the charge that those of us who are opposed to this legislation are in someway, somehow, supposed to be letting down the boys in southeast Asia. They say, "They propose to vote against the appropriation to escalate and expand the war." And that is exactly what I propose to do, as a constitutionalist.

A Hamilton, a Madison, a Gerry—all the great constitutional fathers of this form of government, Mr. President—wrote that check into the Constitution. It is known as the check of the purse strings. They wrote check after check into the Constitution, to check a President of the United States when he seeks to exercise such unchecked power as this President is exercising, and has succeeded thus far in getting the Congress to go along with him in exercising. They wrote into the Constitution the check of the purse strings, which means, Mr. President, that no President of the United States can initiate a foreign policy that requires funding without an authorization bill. He cannot implement and effectuate such a foreign policy without the appropriation to carry it out. To deny him the authorization is what two of us sought to do on this floor not so many days ago, when we voted against that $4.8 billion proposal for supplementary authority to expand this war in southeast Asia.

Some of my colleagues tried to argue that it authorized no new policy. I could not believe my ears. To rebut them, all one had to do was read the bill and the committee report.

That bill authorized the sending of more than 452,000 additional boys into southeast Asia, whenever the President should decide to exercise the discretion of doing it. I said then and repeat today, I would never vote to give that arbitrary discretionary power to any President, I do not care who he is. It takes a President only 20 minutes or less to get up here from the White House to present his proof of the need for any specific amount that he needs from time to time.

I warn the American people again, "If you don't stop your Congress from abdicating their checking responsibilities under the Constitution, you will be led into a government of executive supremacy in this country."

That great basic abstract principle of freedom is pretty vital in these critical days.

But that is not the only new policy in that $4,800 million bill.

As I pointed out in that debate that bill provided new policy in the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars for the building of permanent military bases throughout southeast Asia, Thailand, South Vietnam, Laos, the Philippines, and any place else the Secretary of Defense, in his discretion, decided it was necessary to build them.

What unchecked power? The constitutional fathers wrote the authorizing bill procedure into the Constitution, to check that kind of discretion. Congress waived it, in effect. But that is not the only thing the bill did.

That bill also authorized payment by the American taxpayers of the costs of all the military mercenaries being supplied to the United States by South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, and—as I said in debate—if Australia and New Zealand decide to submit a bill, the Government can pay for its soldiers, too. This is a blanket coverage for the cost of the military operations of these so-called allies in South Vietnam, not one of them a major power, not one of them an independent power; each and every one of them, really little but a dependency of the United States. It is the U.S. taxpayer who is paying their bills. That new policy was authorized in the bill.

Then, to my great regret, the bill also provided $100 million in a supplemental authorization—$100 million as a contingency fund for the President of the United States, granting him vast discretion and the unchecked power which goes with a contingency fund where, last year, in the general bill, the President received $50 million for the contingency fund. That was $50 million because I, assisted by 2 or 3 other Senators in the Committee on Foreign Relations, presented a case that caused the majority on the Foreign Relations Committee to cut the contingency fund to $50 million.

Oh, Mr. President, we did not exercise that check which the Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution with regard to authorization legislation. Thus, today, I talk about the check of the purse strings.

Who is letting our boys down in South Vietnam?

Not those of us who are making the argument that we should exercise the check on the purse strings.

Do not forget that the funds are there to protect the boys as of now, until the President has time to follow a course to action of restriction in South Vietnam, which would be necessary if we denied him the funds under the appropriation bill, or cut them back.

That means, in my judgment, that this check is important because, as I have been heard to say before—as I said in New Hampshire this morning, and in Manchester, N.H., last night—if we follow the course of action that I am proposing, we will provide that lull period. We will provide the necessary procedure to make it possible for the noncombatant nations of the world to give further consideration to an obligation of theirs of making clear to the combatants that the war must be stopped. To that end, they should propose to enforce the stopping of it, propose a fair cease-fire order and assure the combatants in the war, including the United States, that they will enforce it and send over whatever divisions of men necessary to enforce it, as they mark out in South Vietnam the buffer zones necessary to separate the combating forces.

I know that it will be said it will not work. Whenever we do not wish to meet an issue on its merits, it is easy to say that it will not work. But there is no question as to what the commitment of the noncombatant nations is. The signatories to the United Nations Charter assumed the responsibility, when they signed it, to meet a threat to the peace of the world, no matter what nation or combination of nations joined in creating that threat to the peace of the world.

In this instance, the United States is one of those nations.

That is why I have been heard to say on the floor of the Senate, and across the country, that there is a great speech which I should like to hear my President make. I should like to have my President make perfectly clear to our Ambassador at the United Nations that all the influence and prestige of this great country shall be brought to bear on the Security Council to have it proceed with the world debate necessary on this issue, and then come to a vote and find out who it is in the Security Council that might veto it—and put that country, or countries, on the spot, and take my country off the spot.

But I would also have my President make clear to our Ambassador at the United Nations that he should make clear to the members of the Security Council that we are not going to wait indefinitely, that we are going to clear up the reports coming out of New York City, that no real serious attempt is being made by any country, including our own, to force a consideration of this matter before the Security Council and bring it to a vote.

Thus, I would have my President make clear to our Ambassador at the United Nations that we are not going to wait indefinitely, that we are going to exercise the rights we have under sections of the Charter. If the Security Council is not going to face the issue, then we are going to call upon the General Assembly of the United Nations to proceed to carry out the commitment and the obligation of each signatory to the Charter to enforce the peace and to lay down a cease-fire order.

I would have my President then go to an extraordinary session of the General Assembly and pledge to the world that this great and powerful Nation of ours will cooperate in carrying out that cease-fire order.

If the world were assured that the United States really wants a cease-fire order enforced, then, for the first time, as the President is so prone to quote, the nations of the world might sit down at the United Nations and reason together. For there is a growing recognition on the part of the nations of the world that the holocaust in southeast Asia cannot continue to expand to an even greater and greater holocaust, because if it is not stopped, it can end only in a massive war in Asia.

Already, we have Mr. Maxwell Taylor—who has ill advised our Presidents for a long time in this country—without even a declaration of war, taking the position last week that the United States should mine the Haiphong Harbor.

Well, Mr. President, we cannot mine the Haiphong Harbor without greatly increasing the risk of world war III.

In my judgment, we cannot mine the Haiphong Harbor and have the flags of many nations respect the mining.

I wish to say, as I proceed to close my speech, that I would have the American people watch the propaganda coming out of the Pentagon, for it usually is the first signal of what the administration is up to.

What is the latest propaganda coming out of the Pentagon?

Why are they trying to poison further the thinking of the American people?

Why is the Pentagon seeking to mislead the American people once again, as Secretary McNamara has so many times?

Some way, somehow, they must find some propaganda that can meet the undeniable fact that up until now this Government cannot produce a top military adviser of this country in the years gone by who will testify that we can successfully fight a war against China.

The testimony, without exception, is that we must not bog down an American ground force in Asia. Generals MacArthur, Eisenhower, Bradley, Collins, Vandenberg, Marshall, and Ridgway—great military leaders of this Republic—have warned the American people that we must not bog down American ground forces in Asia. This administration is doing it. This administration already has a minimum of 235,000 American boys in southeast Asia, with an additional 100,000 American boys in that area when we take into account Thailand, the naval forces off the area, and the soldiers who are waiting for orders.

The body of evidence against fighting a war with China has to be answered by propaganda, and the Pentagon Building is busy with the propaganda. So last week we got the first installment.

But let me tell the American people, it is only the beginning. The first installment says China is an aggressor.

It was not so many years ago that the German people were fed the big lie technique, and that technique led them into a holocaust, with all the terrible consequences that history records.

Let me say from the floor of the Senate this afternoon that the big lie technique of the Pentagon Building and the State Department, if the American people do not negate it, will lead millions of Americans to their death in a massive war that will result from the conduct of the warmongers in the Pentagon Building and the State Department.

Mr. President, who is letting down the boys in southeast Asia? The officials of this administration who are proposing to send thousands more there to die. They are the ones who are letting down the boys.

I would not think of trading the objective judgment and clearheadedness of a General Gavin, of a General Ridgway, and of a George Kennan for the whole caboodle of the military advisers of the President of the United States at the present time, adding to them his Secretary of Defense, his Secretary of State, and his Ambassador to Vietnam, Mr. Lodge.

I am not happy to find myself in such irreconcilable disagreement with my President and his advisers.

In 1964 I was proud to urge his election because, as I said across the country, the election of Goldwater, in my judgment, would endanger the security of my country and augered a massive war in Asia.

I quoted the President's statements in that campaign. They left no room for doubt of his complete and total disagreement with the foreign policy of Goldwater.

I pray that my President returns to the policy that he enunciated from coast to coast, from north to south, which, in my judgment was the primary issue of the campaign, and because of which, in support of his representations, millions of Americans voted for him for President and gave him a mandate.

It is not too late for either the majority party in the Congress or the President of the United States to carry out that mandate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 21, 1966]

SETTLEMENT WITH VIETNAM, NOT CHINA

To the EDITOR:

All the thinking Americans must certainly welcome the belated attention the Senate is directing toward our China policy, exemplified by the recent hearings with Profs. A. Doak Barnett and John K. Fairbank.

Nevertheless, there is a danger that this focusing of public attention on China will further strengthen the erroneous belief that the cessation of the Vietnamese war must somehow depend on our reaching an overall accommodation with China.

Despite the widespread acceptance of this view, which has been assiduously propagated by the administration, there is little evidence to support it. It is certainly not the view articulated by the Vietnamese people generally, nor even by so responsibly situated a person as Tran Van Do, the current Foreign Minister of the Saigon government.

Despite Washington disclaimers, the basic quarrel in Vietnam remains an all-Vietnamese dispute, with the U.S. presence creating the sole significant internationalization of the conflict. Any lasting settlement of this quarrel must of necessity be a Vietnamese settlement, not one manufactured in Washington or Peiping.

SUPPORT FOR COALITION

If the administration were really interested in an honorable solution in Vietnam, it would revise its 11-year-old policy of blind and total support for tyrannical Vietnamese opportunists and have the courage to throw its support behind some sort of coalition government of popular groupings in South Vietnam.

If we would permit such a government truly to assume the reins of power (a reasonably satisfactory method of selecting representatives could be worked out), we might have, for the first time since Vietnam has been independent, some effective channel for the expression and assessment of popular feeling in South Vietnam. It would be the proper province for such a government, rather than for ill-informed U.S. politicians, to decide whether or not it wished to go into coalition with the National Liberation Front.

POPULAR FEELING IGNORED

The Ky government, which rules only because of its unlimited support from the United States, unabashedly denies any expression of Vietnamese popular feeling as regards the question of war or negotiations. Yet the President of the United States chooses to fly 7,000 miles to demonstrate his support of this tyranny, while straightfacedly proclaiming our objective as being that of "self-determination" for the people of Vietnam.

I submit that if we took steps to permit the Vietnamese people genuinely to say what they want, the war could begin to move toward a settlement—quite independently of any grand design on the part of either Washington or Peiping. Indeed, any "deal" struck by the United States and China can hardly be considered as self-determination for the

Vietnamese, nor is it likely to bring any real stability within Vietnam itself.

ROBERT S. BROWNE,
Assistant Program Officer, U.S. Economic Aid Mission to Vietnam, 1958–1961.

TEANECK, N.J., *March 11, 1966.*

EXHIBIT 2

[From Frontier, March 1966]

ON THE ROAD TO NOWHERE IN VIETNAM

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH)

("Vietnam and the United States" by Hans Morgenthau. Public Affairs Press. 112 pp. $2.)

Hans J. Morgenthau must be a lonely man. His dissenter's role is not to be coveted in these drab days of consensus and conformity. With criticism of American foreign policy confined mostly to the campuses, debate over the basic premises underlying our posture in Asia has all but disappeared within the Government.

The cloak of "bipartisanship" has smothered organized dissent; it is no longer fashionable for the opposition party to oppose. The American people have been pretty much persuaded that, whatever differences may exist between the two political parties on domestic questions, they should stand together where foreign policy is concerned. Constantly we are admonished that argument among us must stop at the water's edge.

The desultory effect of all this has been to transform Washington into what Mr. Patrick O'Donovan, a keen British observer, has called a "one-man, one-policy town," where any discussion on the only topic that really matters can be stopped dead with the question, "Well, what else would you do?"

In "Vietnam and the United States," Professor Morgenthau defines what else we might have done to have avoided the present tragedy in southeast Asia. Anyone looking for that elusive escape hatch through which we might now catapult ourselves free from the consequences of our past mistakes, will not find it in this book—or any other. But those who search for the fundamental fallacy in our Asian policy will find this book illuminating and instructive.

As Morgenthau sees it, we have been the bull in the Asia ring, while China has played the matador. Charging furiously into the red cape dangled before us, we pursue a mistaken target. We confuse the suppression of communism in South Vietnam with the containment of China. "The United States can no more contain Chinese influence in Asia by arming South Vietnam and Thailand," Morgenthau writes, "than China could contain American influence in the Western Hemisphere by arming, say, Nicaragua and Costa Rica."

We would do well, in this regard, to reflect upon the direction of Russian diplomacy in Asia. The Soviet Union, with even greater reason to fear Chinese expansion, practices her "containment" in the king's row, by strengthening at Tashkent the peace between India and Pakistan. We play the game in the pawn's row, by mixing into a Vietnamese war in "the Balkans of Asia."

There, in the name of defending Asia against China, we fight against North Vietnam. We insist that Ho Chi Minh is our enemy, the very man who won independence for all of Indochina by driving out the French. Charging him with aggression, we bolster Saigon's collapsing resistance with a huge American fighting force, brought from the opposite side of the globe. Into a region which has just freed itself from Western rule, we import new legions of white troops to fight the natives.

And still we are confounded by the failure of other countries to rally behind us. Even the white nations in closest proximity—Australia and New Zealand—send us only token help, while South Korea, dependent on us for sustenance, remains the only other Asian country to contribute a substantial number of fighting men.

As for our European allies, they have been so mystified by our deepening involvement in Vietnam that we are now explaining it to them in terms of the importance of keeping our word. "It is the integrity of the American commitment which is at stake," Dean Rusk has solemnly warned. Traveling to Europe to plead for better understanding among our NATO allies, the Secretary of State repeatedly compared Saigon to Berlin—an equation which had never occurred to the Germans. If the United States failed to keep its pledges in southeast Asia, the Secretary demanded, how could we be trusted to keep our pledges in Europe? Surely this will go down as one of the strangest diplomatic missions in our history.

So we find ourselves practically alone waging a war on the mainland of Asia. The illusion that we are thereby thwarting China, or even the belief that we are holding a line in Asia against communism, are notions not likely to survive a careful reading of "Vietnam and the United States."

But the reader will not be left devastated and forlorn; rather, he will be left rewarded with a better insight into the nature of our past mistakes in Asia, and with a set of logical guidelines toward a more realistic American policy in the future.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 21, 1966]

CONGRESSIONAL ABDICATION

The most hopeful significance of the hearings conducted by Senator FULBRIGHT may well be that more Members of Congress are beginning to take a belated but proper interest in foreign policy. If so, it's high time. "Debate over the basic premises underlying our posture in Asia has all but disappeared," Senator CHURCH said recently. He might well have agreed with a British observer that Washington is a "one-man, one-policy town."

There has been foreign policy debate of a peripheral sort, especially in connection with the voting of money for arms and aid. And some administration decisions have been discussed after the event. But there has been little of the searching examination which illuminates fundamentals, informs the public, prevents mistakes and brings reason to the support of action. Instead, there has been an almost abject acceptance of administration initiatives, covered by the false argument that foreign policy is exclusively the President's concern. Criticism and dissent have been left to a few, mostly outside the Government. And those few often have been regarded with coolness and even suspicion.

Without this failure of interest—and courage—how could the United States have become increasingly involved in Vietnam despite confusion as to its interest and its purpose? And has there been much more clear-sightedness about involvements in other parts of the world?

Whether the concern was with Soviet Russia or Formosa, or Guatemala, or the Middle East, or the Dominican Republic, the majority in Congress accepted the administration's explanation, the managed news and the secrecy imposed in the name of security. Why?

McCarthyism, of course, contributed to the shaping of this timidity by threatening honest questioners with ostracism. Yet McCarthyism was made possible by the timorousness which for a time it intensified. The "mysteries" of scientific weaponry also contributed to the abandonment of discussion. Often they had to be taken on faith—and the word of the administration. And the absence of information made it easier for special interest groups such as "the China lobby" to spread their propaganda.

Granted, it is not easy for Members of so large and cumbersome a body as Congress to be efficient in searching for the essential facts. Senators and Representatives, further, are concerned with many other matters, large and small—including political campaigns. It is easier—and more expedient—to support the administration. It helps to have the door of the White House open, rather than closed. In any case, isn't it probable that the President is right—at least most of the time?

Such an attitude, however, is no real favor to the President. At best, it deprives him of the constructive criticism which enables him to test his own conclusions and the advice of his associates. At worst, it may encourage a dangerous self-assurance and the manipulation rather than the enlightening of Congress and the Nation.

Coequal with the executive, Congress should be the agency for national participation in shaping policies. This does not preclude Presidential leadership, nor does it forbid a reasonable degree of Presidential discretion. It does recognize, however, that democratic government involves more than the support of decisions after they have been made. There has been too little of this participation on Capitol Hill. The Fulbright hearings may be the sign of a happy change, of a revulsion from government in a "one-man, one-policy town."

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1966]

EXPERTS ON CHINA URGE UNITED STATES TO SEEK A PEIPING ACCORD—DECLARE IT IS NECESSARY FOR WASHINGTON TO DROP ITS OPPOSITION TO U.N. SEAT

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—A large group of scholars on Asian affairs declared today that "it is up to the United States to try to move the Chinese to a greater acceptance of the principles of coexistence in the emerging world community."

This would be "a long and difficult process," the scholars contended. To begin it, they urged Washington to drop its opposition to admitting Communist China to the United Nations and to open negotiations for the establishment of formal diplomatic relations with Peiping.

They also recommended American efforts to begin negotiations on such matters as arms control. They called for an end to the total trade embargo now imposed on Communist China, and advocated cultural, educational, and social exchanges between the two countries.

PLAN FOR TAIWAN

The Nationalist Chinese regime on Taiwan, they suggested, should be supported but regarded only as the Government of Taiwan, not as a potential ruler of mainland China.

These changes in the "out of date" American policy toward China, the scholars said, "will not solve the major political and military challenges to the United States in Asia, but they can improve the ability of the United States to deal with these problems and reduce the likelihood that a crisis could turn into a major military confrontation."

In an interview today on the Columbia Broadcasting System television program "Face the Nation," Secretary of State Dean Rusk said that repeated U.S. efforts to attempt to narrow the differences with China were met by invariable instransigence. On the question of admitting Peiping to the United Nations, the main obstacle is the insistence by the Communists that this must involve the ouster of the representatives of Nationalist China, he said.

The document was signed by 198 academic experts on China, including such leading figures in the field as John K. Fairbank of the East Asian Research Center at Harvard and Alexander Eckstein of the University of Michigan. Both recently testified in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearings on China.

All the signers, ranging from private citizens and high school teachers to university professors, were members of the Association for Asian Studies, among whose membership of about 2,700 the document was circulated.

The principal authors of the paper and the prime movers in its publication were Harold Taylor, the former president of Sarah Lawrence College, and Mrs. Betty Goetz Lall of Cornell University's School of Industrial and Labor Relations.

Mrs. Lall, who formerly was a State Department arms control expert and the staff director of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on Disarmament, said about 300 scholars had responded to a request for endorsement of the statement on China.

Of these, 198 signed it, 60 approved generally, but not in every particular, 18 approved it but did not sign, 19 opposed all or part of the recommended policy changes, and 5 gave no opinion.

Mrs. Lall said the document had been written by a small group of China scholars, who consulted with such experts as Morton H. Halperin of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard, John H. Lewis, an associate professor of government at Cornell, both signers, and A. Doak Barnett of Columbia University's East Asian Institute.

Professor Barnett said today he was "extremely sympathetic" to the document's recommendations. He did not sign it because when it reached him, he was "in the process of formulating a statement of my own precise views."

In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 8, he urged the seating of Communist China in the United Nations and an American policy toward China of "containment but not isolation."

The recommendations will be submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mrs. Lall said the Council for a Livable World, a Washington-based political action organization, had agreed to undertake further circulation of the document and to seek official and public consideration of the views expressed in it.

Five "factors on which United States policy on China should now be based" were put forward by the China scholars. They were as follows:

Communist China is a "reality of international politics" of growing importance and therefore "there is increasing danger in the isolation of the United States from China and of China's relative isolation from other nations and international institutions."

Hostility to the United States has become "a cornerstone" of Chinese foreign policy.

Despite this hostility, which will not soon be changed, Washington can still hope to convince Peiping that "while prepared to respond when challenged, the United States is at the same time interested in exploring areas of mutual interest and normalizing relations wherever possible."

The future of the National Chinese can only be as a Government for Taiwan, not of mainland China.

The major problem for the United States in Asia is to help Asian countries to develop economic and social stability; this problem arises "from factors independent of communism" although the existence of "an expansionist Communist force in Asia" intensifies it.

HOSTILE OPINIONS CITED

In a long "position paper" accompanying the statement, it was suggested that a hostile opinion in the United States was one factor "inhibiting" Washington's view of China.

"Therefore," the position paper said, "it is important through discussion and sober exchanges of views to persuade the Government that there is widespread support for a change in its policy toward China and that the United States by changing its policy within parameters dictated by its own best interests can contribute ultimately to an improvement in relations between the two countries."

On the question of Chinese admission to the United Nations, which is of immediate concern in Washington, the scholars suggested not merely acquiescence in other countries' insistence but that the United States should "cease to use its influence" to keep Peiping out.

The position paper said this would improve Washington's relations with other United Nations members since "the United States pays a heavy price in good relations with some countries by its pressure on them to vote against China."

The position paper also suggested that the problem of Peiping's opposition to having "two Chinas" in the United Nations might be solved through an agreement that the future of the Taiwan regime would be negotiated by Peiping and Taipei and guaranteed by an international arrangement.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1966]

TEXT OF STATEMENT AND EXCERPTS FROM POSITION PAPER BY EXPERTS ON CHINA POLICY

WASHINGTON, March 20.—Following is the text of a statement on China policy supported by 198 Asian scholars and excerpts from the position paper on which it was based:

STATEMENT

We, the undersigned, submit the following statement for the consideration of the executive branch, the Congress, and members of the public.

That the formal China policy of the United States has long since been out of date is widely recognized and tacitly accepted even by officials of the American Government. Changes in this policy will not solve the major political and military challenges to the United States in Asia, but they can improve the ability of the United States to deal with these problems and reduce the likelihood that a crisis could turn into a major military confrontation.

We believe that the following represent accurately factors on which U.S. policy on China should now be based.

1. The People's Republic of China with its capital at Peiping is a reality of international politics, whose importance to the course of international affairs will grow. There is increasing danger in the isolation of the United States from China and of China's relative isolation from other nations and international institutions.

2. The People's Republic of China is now committed to a policy of hostility to the United States and has made opposition to U.S. policies a cornerstone of its foreign policy.

3. In the immediate future the United States is unlikely to persuade Peiping that it is not its most implacable enemy. But the United States can hope to convince Peiping that, while prepared to respond when challenged, the United States is at the same time interested in exploring areas of mutual interest and normalizing relations wherever possible.

4. The Government of the Republic of China on Taiwan will be a member of the international community for the indefinite future, but only as the Government of Taiwan, and not as a potential government for mainland China.

5. The major problems for the United States in Asia have to do with establishing stable and mutually satisfactory relations between the United States and Asian national governments, while helping to develop social and economic viability within Asian countries through technical and economic aid programs. Although the problems are intensified by the existence of an expansionist Communist force in Asia, they arise from factors independent of communism itself and must be dealt with in the context of the total situation.

ADOPTION IS URGED

In the light of these principal factors and others, we urge that the U.S. Government adopt the following policies:

1. The United States should cease to use its influence to prevent the admittance of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and other international bodies. In the interests of international peace and the national interests of the United States, the government at Peiping should be accepted into these institutions, without conditions posed by us or by Peiping.

2. The U.S. Government should announce that it is prepared, while maintaining relation with Taiwan, to enter into negotiations regarding the establishment of full and formal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China.

3. The United States should propose to the People's Republic of China an opening of a new phase of bilateral negotiations at which the following items would be discussed:

(a) Exchange of diplomatic representation;

(b) Renunciation of force as an instrument of policy:

(c) Arms control including problems of the control over nuclear weapons.

4. The United States should announce that it is prepared to accept accredited newspapermen, scholars, and others from the People's Republic of China and call upon the People's Republic to reciprocate. American willingness to accept Chinese visitors should not, at least in the short run, depend on reciprocation.

5. The United States should end its total embargo with Communist China and permit the importation and exportation of nonstrategic materials.

We believe that the measures suggested here would only initiate what must be a long and difficult process leading, we hope, to the normalization of relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China and a reduction of hostilities between the two countries. We believe, despite the antagonism shown by the Chinese Government, that it is up to the United States to try to move the Chinese to a greater acceptance of the principles of coexistence in the emerging world community.

THE ASIAN SCHOLARS

Arizona

University of Arizona, Tucson: Earl H. Pritchard, chairman, Committee on Oriental Studies; Arizona State University, Temple; Guilford A. Dudley, associate professor of history.

California

California State College at Los Angeles: D. F. Gleming, professor of international relations; Sam Stanley, associate professor of anthropology; California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo: Francis V. Catalina; Claremount Graduate School and University Center, Claremount; Cyrus H. Peake, professor of East Asian history; Los Angeles Valley College, Los Angeles; Maria Naidis, associate professor of history; Mills College, Oakland; Edward Le Fevour; Pomona College, Claremont; Charles Leslie, San Bernardino Valley College, San Bernardino; William J. Moore, chairman of the political science department, Stanford University, Stanford; Harumi Befu, department of anthropology, Mark Mancall, assistant professor of Asian studies; Harold H. Fisher, professor of history and chairman emeritus, Hoover Institute and Library; G. William Skinner, professor of anthropology; J. T. Wixted, Department of Asian languages.

University of California, Berkeley: Gerald D. Berreman, associate professor of anthropology; James Cahill, department of art; Chauncey D. Leake, University of California, San Francisco Medical Center; Joseph R. Levenson, professor of history; J. M. Potter, assistant professor of anthropology; University of California, Santa Cruz: Bruce D. Larkin, assistant professor of international relations; University of California, Los Angeles: Michael Moerman, assistant professor of anthropology; Nikki Keddie, assistant professor of history; University of Southern California, Los Angeles: George O. Totten, associate professor of political science; A. Elgin Heinz, high school teacher, San Francisco; J. P. Richards, Berkeley; Mrs. Beryl F. Zimberoff, Los Angeles; William P. Norberg, Ackerman, Johnston, Johnston & Matthews, San Francisco.

Connecticut

Yale University, New Haven: Harry J. Renda, Department of History; Kenneth Scott Latourette, professor of missions and Oriental history, emeritus; Arthur F. Wright, Charles Seymour, professor of history; Mary C. Wright, professor of history; John de Francis, Madison.

Washington, D.C.

American University, School of International Service: Millidge P. Walker, associate professor of Southeast Asian studies; Howard University; Irene Tinker, assistant professor of department of government; Barbara Rieman Alperovitz, Arms Control Division, the Bendix Corp.; John Melby; Andrew E. Rice.

Florida

Mortimer Graves, Key West.

Hawaii

Institute for Student Interchange, East-West Center, Honolulu: Robert Aitken, evaluation of alumni liaison officer; University of Hawaii, Honolulu: Willard D. Keim, department of political science; Oliver M. Lee, assistant professor of political science; Elizabeth Wittermans, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West; John Singleton, associate director, Information Development Fellowship and Seminars, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West; George H. Gadbois, Jr., associate director, Exchange of Persons Programs, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West.

Illinois

Bradley University, Peoria: George E. Stoner, Jr., instructor in geography; Knox College, Galesburg: M. Hane; Northern Illinois University, De Kalb: James R. Shirley, department of history; Northwestern University, Evanston: James E. Sheridan, department of history; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: H. B. Jacobini, professor of government; University of Chicago: Clifford Geertz, department of anthropology; Benson Earl Ginsburg, associate dean of the college; McKim Mariott, professor of anthropology; Manning Nash, professor of anthropology; Melford E. Spiro, department of anthropology; Frederick M. Asher, Chicago; Douglas Wayne Johnson, Rockford; Norman J. Palmer, De Kalb.

Indiana

Earlham College, Richmond: Jackson Bailey, associate professor of history; Indiana School of Religion, Bloomington: Harold E. Hill, associate professor of Old Testament language and literature; Indiana University, Bloomington: Leon M. Zolbrod, assistant professor of East Asian languages and literatures; Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College, Bloomington: Sister Mary Gregory, S.P., director of Asian studies.

Iowa

Drake University, Des Moines: C. Walter Clark, Jr., political science department; Barbara Teters, Ames.

Kentucky

University of Kentucky, Lexington; Walter Langlois, associate professor of modern foreign languages.

Louisiana

Tulane University, New Orleans: Henry Orenstein, associate professor of anthropology.

Massachusetts

Boston University, Boston: Amiya Chakravarty, professor of comparative Oriental religions and literature; Harvard University, Cambridge: Robert N. Bellah, associate professor of sociology and regional studies; Jerome A. Cohen, professor of law; Albert Craig, department of history; Rupert Emerson, professor of government; John Fairbank, director, East Asian Research Center; Morton H. Halperin, Center for International Affairs; Donald W. Klein, East Asian Research Center; Ezra F. Vogel, East Asian Research Center; Edward Wagner, associate professor of Korean studies; Massachuetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge: William N. Locke, director of libraries; Tufts University; Melford: Freeland Abbot, chairman, department of history; Allan B. Cole, professor of East Asian Affairs, the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; Wellesley College, Wellesley: Paul A. Cohen, department of history.

Michigan

Alma College, Alma: Edwin C. Blackburn, associate professor of history; Oakland University, Rochester: Sheldon Appelton, associate professor of political science; David C. Potter, associate professor of political science; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor: J. H. Broomfield, associate professor of history; Jason L. Finkle, consultant, Ford Foundation, associate professor population planning; Alexander Eckstein, professor of economics; Victor Kobayashi, associate professor of education; Stephen S. Large, student of China and Japan; Rhoads Murphey, department of geography; Wayne State University, Detroit: Shanti S. Tangri, associate professor of economics; Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo: Chester L. Hunt; Charles O. Houston, associate professor, Institute of International and Area Studies; Alton L. Becker, Ann Arbor; Mr. and Mrs. Seymour Kavesky, Madison Heights; Ronald N. Montaperto, Ann Arbor; C. P. Paul Siu, Harper Woods.

Minnesota

Carleton College, Northfield: Tetsuo Najita, associate professor of history; Bardwell L. Smith, associate professor of religion; Robert E. Will, department of economics; University of Minnesota, Indianapolis: Joseph E. Schwartz, department of geography; Romeyn Taylor, department of history.

Missouri

University of Missouri, Columbia: James W. Hamilton, department of sociology and anthropology; University of Missouri at St. Louis: Lyman Tower Sargent, assistant professor of political science; Washington University, St. Louis: N. J. Demerath, professor of sociology; social sciences consultant, Ford Foundation, New Delhi; Donald A. Gibbs, assistant professor of Chinese; Webster College, St. Louis; Sister M. Bernard Barbato, S. L., department of history.

Montana

Montana State University, Bozeman: Richard B. Landis, assistant professor of Asian history.

Nebraska

Robert H. Stoddard, Lincoln.

New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire, Durham: Allen Linden, department of history; W. Findley Guffey 3d, Exeter.

New Jersey

Drew University, Madison: Changboh Chee; Charles W. Estus, instructor in sociology; Robert Friedricks, professor of sociology; Newark State College, Union: Howard Disbury, professor of history. Princeton University: William W. Lockwood, professor of politics and international affairs, Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Katharine S. Diehl, assistant professor of library science; Charlotte Furth, Princeton; Jesse G. Lutz, East Brunswick; Lawrence H. Mandel, Parsippany.

New York

Brooklyn College: Brijen K. Gupta, department of history; Charlton M. Lewis, department of history; Colgate University, Hamilton: Theodore Herman, chairman, department of geography; Kenneth W. Morgan, professor of religion.

Columbia University: Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Allen, department of anthropology; William R. Bryant, graduate student; L. Carrington Goodrich, professor emeritus of Chinese; Frank Kehl, graduate student, East Asian Institute; Joan P. Mencher, research associate, department of anthropology; Wayne Wilcox, department of government; Cornell University, Ithaca: Knight Biggerstaff, professor of history; Alice Cook, professor of industrial and labor relations; Claire Holt, research associate, Asian studies; Lauriston Sharp, professor of anthropology; John W. Lewis, associate professor of government; Dutchess Community College, Poughkeepsie; Carolyn C. Landau, associate professor of political science; Hamilton College, Clinton: Edwin B. Lee, associate professor of history; Long Island University.

Brooklyn: Khalil A. Nasir, associate professor of history and political science; New York University: James T. Crown, associate professor of political science; State University College, Oswego: Johnson G. Cooper, professor of non-Western history; State University College, Potsdam; Luther H. Gulick, Jr., chairman, department of geography; State University College, Genesco: Donald Innis, chairman, department of geography; State University of New York, Albany: Dewitt C. Ellinwood, associate professor of history; State University of New York, Stony Brook: Charles Hoffman, professor of economics; Union College, Schenectady: Malcolm Willison, assistant professor of sociology; Union Theological Seminary: Herbert C. Jackson, professor; Edward P. Gottlieb, national chairman, War Resisters League; Thomas L. Havill, Syracuse; Chang Hsin-hai, Great Neck; Eileen Koppelman, Bronx; Prafulla Mukerji, Brooklyn; Richard and Elsie Orb, Keuka Park; Romesh Shah.

North Carolina

Meredith College, Raleigh: Lillian Parker Wallace; University of North Carolina, Raleigh; W. L. Highfill, department of philosophy and religion; Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem: Robert G. Gregory, associate professor of history.

Ohio

Denison University, Granville: Louis F. Brakeman, chairman, department of government; Maylong H. Hepp, professor of philosophy; James L. Martin, coordinator of non-Western studies; Miami University, Oxford: John H. Badgley, department of government; Ohio State University, Dayton; Byron S. Weng, instructor in government; Ohio University, Athens: John F. Cody, professor of history; Western College for Women, Oxford: T. A. Bisson, chairman, department of intercultural studies; Robert Brank Fulton, associate professor of intercultural studies.

Oregon

Lewis and Clark College, Portland: Hideo Hashimoto, professor of religion; University of Oregon, Eugene: Kathleen G. Aberle, research association in anthropology.

Pennsylvania

Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh: M. Bronfenbrenner, Graduate School of International Affairs; Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster; Thomas Hopkins, associate professor of religion; Gettysburgh College: John Roger Stemen, department of history; Haverford College: Holland Hunter, chairman of department of economics; Ohio Methodist Theological School: Ernest E. Best, associate professor of theology; University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia: Derk Bodde, professor of Chinese; F. Hilary Conroy, professor of history; Leigh Lisker, professor of linguistics; Jonathan Mirsky, oriental studies; Donald E. Smith, associate professor of political science; Wilson College, Chambersburg: Roswell G. Townsend, professor of economics; Helen Lee Jones, Frederick Gaige, Philadelphia; A. Gutkind Bulling, Philadelphia.

Tennessee

Memphis State University: Ram Mohan Roy, department of political science.

Utah

Brigham Young University, Provo: Paul Hyer, coordinator of Asian studies; University of Utah, Salt Lake City: Helmut G. Callis, chairman of Asian studies, professor of history and political science.

Vermont

University of Vermont, Burlington: Horrace Briggs 2d, instructor, department of political science.

Virginia

Sweet Briar College: Richard C. Rowland, department of English; University of Virginia, Charlottesville: Richard J. Coughlin, professor of sociology; Maurice Meisner, associate professor of East Asian history.

Washington

Eastern Washington State College, Cheney: Charles H. Hedtky, division of history and social science; Gonzaga University, Spokane: Jack D. Salmon, assistant professor of political science; University of Washington, Seattle: Paul R. Brass, assistant professor of political science; Charles F. Keyes, assistant professor of anthropology; Marwyn S. Samuels, modern Chinese studies.

Wisconsin

University of Wisconsin, Madison: Eugene Boardman, professor of history; Ripley Moor, assistant professor of Indian studies.

Canada

University of Toronto: Donald E. Willmott, associate professor of sociology.

Ceylon

University of Ceylon: Gananath Obeyesekere, lecturer in sociology.

France

T. D. Long, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, directorate for scientific affairs, Paris.

India

Margaret L. Cormack, director of U.S. Educational Foundation in India.

Japan

Tokyo University: Toshio Ueda, professor emeritus.

Taiwan

Mark Selden, Taipei.

POSITION PAPER

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to set forth reasons supporting certain recommended changes in United States policy toward China. It is hoped that the paper will contribute to a growing consensus within the United States that our China policy should be modified, that our Government should indicate willingness to undertake changes, and that these proposed changes should be debated and discussed increasingly by citizens throughout the country.

There are occasions when policymakers in government are reluctant to embark on a given policy change because they think such a change would not be supported by the public. With respect to U.S. policy toward China it appears that this factor is one of those inhibiting United States governmental action. Therefore, it is important, through discussion and sober exchange of views, to persuade the Government that there is widespread support for a change in its policy toward China and that the United States, by changing its policy within parameters dictated by its own best interests, can contribute ultimately to an improvement in relations between the two countries.

General considerations

The United States has always been opposed to Communist expansionist and aggressive policies. In the past the Government has also refused to deal with Communist governments. We have believed communism to be an antidemocratic force, inimical to the growth of freedom and self-government, and bent on the destruction of those governments whose economic systems were based on a measure of free enterprise and capitalism. At times we assumed that Communist governments wanted to destroy any society or government that was not Communist.

Because of the above considerations the United States waited for 14 years before it established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1933, and then the fact of recognition in no way implied approval of its Government policies, but rather acceptance of the Soviet Union as a government in control of a large population and important territory.

After World War II, while the United States never severed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, our Government, nevertheless, felt that the Soviet Union had to be contained in what we believed were aggressive and expansionist policies. Today the Soviet Union has given indications of changes in its foreign policies and many of its internal characteristics, so much so that the United States and the Soviet Union have reached mutually satisfactory relationships on a variety of subjects.

U.S. relations with China, in contrast to U.S. relations with the Soviet Union and Communist States in eastern Europe, have grown from bad to worse. Whereas shortly after the Communists came to power in China in 1949, the United States stated that it did not intend to take further sides in the civil war between the Communists and the Nationalists and appeared to be actively considering recognition of the Chinese Communist regime, today there is increasing hostility between the two countries.

Beginning with the Korean war in 1950 it is not difficult for a U.S. citizen to construct excellent arguments as to why the deterioration of relations with China has been the fault primarily of China, but conversely it does not take a lot of imagination to construct a Chinese viewpoint to the effect that the cause of bad relations has been mainly the responsibility of the United States.

RECOMMENDED POLICY CHANGE NO. 1

The United States should cease to use its influence to prevent the admittance of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and other international bodies. In the interests of international peace and the national security of the United States, the Government at Peiping should be accepted into these institutions, without conditions posed by us or by Peiping.

1

The United Nations ought to be a universal organization. Its main purpose is to maintain international peace and security and its effectiveness to do this will be limited, if not drastically curtailed, as long as important nations are not members. China, the largest country in the world populationwise and one of the great powers in Asia, should be permitted to become a United Nations members and encouraged to assume all the obligations and responsibilities that membership entails.

Some argue that China does not qualify for membership because Article 4 of the United Nations Charter states that:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

Leaving aside the legal argument, the question remains as to whether China is able and willing to abide by the obligations of the United Nations Charter as stated in Article 2. These obligations include willingness to settle disputes by peaceful means, to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, to give every assistance to the United Nations in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and to refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

2

Peace and security in Asia will be more difficult to secure and maintain with China outside rather than inside the United Nations; thus, the security interests of the United States are better served if China becomes a United Nations member.

If the restoration of peace and security in Asia is made difficult or impossible in some cases because China is denied admission to the United Nations to present its case, to negotiate there to end the dispute, or to hear the complaints of others, then the security of the United States, with its widespread commitments in Asia, is also threatened.

Whether the Chinese, once admitted to the United Nations, would do all in their power to wreck it would seem to depend on how such behavior hurt or helped its foreign policy interests. If the Chinese want to win friends among the nonalined countries of the world they would not act to alienate these countries by improper behavior in the United Nations. If the Chinese want to trade and have normal relations with countries in western Europe and elsewhere they may not want to antagonize them by attempting to obstruct progress in various areas of international cooperation.

3

U.S. interests in the United Nations would be better served if the United States removes its objections to membership for China than if China is admitted over the negative vote of the United States.

4

The United States would have a better chance of securing a balanced settlement over the future of Taiwan if it accepted China in the United Nations.

Many countries, especially several in Latin America and Africa, refused to vote a seat for China because the wording of the proposed U.N. resolution simultaneously would have evicted the Chinese Nationalist regime on Taiwan. Had that resolution been worded differently there are some observers who feel that a majority vote in favor of Chinese admission would have occurred.

RECOMMENDED POLICY CHANGE NO. 2

The U.S. Government should announce that it is prepared, without prejudice to the maintenance of its relations with Taiwan, to enter into negotiations regarding the establishment of full and formal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. By indicating that it is prepared to recognize and have diplomatic relations with the present Government of China, the United States would be taking a first step toward normalizing its relations with China. China may reject the United States offer, but this is not an argument why it should not be made.

1

The main reason why the United States should try to have formal relations with China, through recognition of its government, is that world peace will be jeopardized more by the continued hostility and lack of contact between these two countries than by increased contact. While the recognition in no way assures a steady improvement of peaceful relations, it would signify that the two countries were attempting to reduce tensions between them.

2

Recognition of China by the United States, if reciprocated by China, would mean that contacts at various levels might be made. While some U.S. citizens could be permitted to travel to China and Chinese citizens permitted to travel to the United States, this would be very limited if there were no diplomatic relations between the two governments. Contacts at various levels—scholars, Government officials, journalists, scientists, artists, businessmen, and so forth—would permit renewal of exchange of information about life, conditions, and thought in the two countries.

3

Recognition offers a means of conducting business and settling disputes. It provides a channel by which the countries can reach formal agreements about such matters as trade, exchange of persons, and political problems. Some might argue that the United States and China have reached agreements and resolved differences before without resort to recognition; the case most often cited is the negotiation to end the Korean war. Furthermore, some officials argue that the current occasional meetings between a U.S. and Chinese representatives at Warsaw provide a channel through which disputes can be settled.

RECOMMENDED POLICY CHANGE NO. 3

The United States should propose to the People's Republic of China an opening of a new phase of bilateral negotiations at which the following items would be discussed:

(a) Exchange of diplomatic representation;

(b) Renunciation of force as an instrument of policy;

(c) Arms control including problems of the control over nuclear weapons.

Discussions on the exchange of diplomatic representatives might include such matters as how each Government was prepared to treat citizens of the other traveling within its boundaries. Some issues left over from 1949, such as economic arrangements, might be usefully treated. Similar talks with generally beneficial results took place between officials of the United States and Soviet Governments prior to U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933.

A discussion of the renunciation of force as an instrument of policy is of concern to the United States in view of the implications of the Chinese policy to take Taiwan by force and to support so-called wars of liberation in the developing nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. To the United States, the Chinese position suggests that the Chinese will be fomenting revolution, subversion, and violence in as many parts of the world as it can. The Chinese, for their part, try to justify such wars on the ground that the people in these countries are being oppressed, usually with the help of the imperialist United States.

In the United States view the Chinese Government's sanction of force labels it as an enemy of peace and it is the principal reason today for the large U.S. military presence and involvement in Asia. Before the United States could consider any significant withdrawals of its military power from Asia, it would want an understanding that Chinese policy would not encompass military aid to Communist subversion groups in other areas.

It is unlikely, however, that there is much the United States can do at this juncture to persuade China to drop its policy of supporting, in principle at least, wars of liberation. But what would be desirable is an agreement to the effect that China would not supply arms to revolutionary groups and the United States would not use military force to thwart every attempt to install a Communist government into office.

Bilateral discussions over arms control issues including the control over nuclear weapons should not be regarded in any way as a substitute for international discussions. Such bilateral discussions are thought to be advisable because they could provide an opportunity for the United States and China to exchange their views on the subject without having them subjected immediately to public reaction.

As stated earlier, the main benefit to be expected from exchanges of persons in different fields is that the degree of ignorance about the society in the two countries would be reduced. Increased contact does not always result in improved relations or understanding, but it usually succeeds in reducing misconceptions.

RECOMMENDED POLICY CHANGE NO. 4

The United States should announce that it is prepared to accept accredited newspapermen, scholars, and other from the People's Republic of China and call upon the People's Republic to reciprocate. American willingness to accept Chinese visitors should not, at least in the short run, depend on reciprocation.

It has been stated earlier that the full implementation of this recommended change in U.S. policy for all practical purposes depends upon the success in negotiations over recognition and an exchange of Ambassadors. Some exchanges, nevertheless, could occur while such negotiations were being undertaken or even before they were convened. The United States refused to undertake an exchange of newsmen at a time when the Chinese were receptive to such a step in the mid-1950's. When the United States decided a few years later that this might be a good step, the Chinese retracted their offer.

As a result, no Chinese from China come to the United States and practically no Americans visit China. There is evidence that limited exchanges could now take place prior to diplomatic recognition if this could be done quietly and without extensive publicity.

RECOMMENDED POLICY CHANGE NO. 5

The United States should end its total trade embargo with Communist China and permit the importation and exportation of nonstrategic materials.

In the past few years 10 West European countries have sent trade missions to China (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and West Germany). Japan and Canada have also sent missions. The results have not been substantial and it is not likely that a great deal of trade can be developed immediately between the United States and China; a start, however, could be made. This would be another channel for opening up contacts.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, with regard to the pending business, we discussed this matter at some length in the authorization stages only a few days ago. I supported the authorization because of the necessities of supporting the Army in the field in Vietnam.

The point that was of concern at that time was a question of our policy in Vietnam and also in China, about which we are now holding hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee.

These hearings, in my opinion, have opened the subject up for healthy debate. There are some differences of view among the committee members as well as among the witnesses.

I am hopeful that as a result of these deliberations by the committee members, the public, the Senate, and by the administration, a more effective policy, taking account of the very obvious changes that have taken place in Asia, as well as in other parts of the world, will be developed.

In Western Europe, for example, the attitude on the part of our closest allies under NATO has certainly undergone some change recently as announced by the consortium which negotiated to supply a steel plant to mainland China.

In a way, this entire procedure reminds me very much of the policy we followed after World War I in regard to Soviet Russia.

I think it is high time we reevaluated our policies, considered them objectively, and, if changes are warranted, that they be made.

I believe some changes are warranted; although there are differences of opinion in the committee, and I am sure in the administration, which is quite natural, healthy, and proper in our system of government. I am hopeful that we will move toward modernizing our policy as a result of this reevaluation.

I think all of us would agree that, regardless of our views, we should work for restoration of the peace.

The difference is how we achieve that common objective. It is said that there are people who advocate preventive war. No one appeared and testified before our committee to that effect. These rumors about extreme views are always current.

There may be something to them, but I do not believe responsible, influential members of either the executive or the legislative branches would support such an extreme position. They may get impatient with our present policies. But that is natural.

By voting in favor of this appropriation, I consider it a vote to support our Armed Forces in the field. I do not consider it an endorsement of our past or current policy in South Vietnam. I thoroughly disapprove of the course of events which has led us into the situation in South Vietnam. It is very difficult to say how we should extricate ourselves. I believe we made a great and serious mistake in becoming involved in a colonial war on the side of a colonial power in 1950. I do not want to review all this; it has been covered before. But I do believe we made a mistake in renewing that involvement in 1954.

I remind Senators that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the ranking Democrat said at that time that they considered it involvement in a minor way. But now, having become greatly involved, we have become involved in a way I do not agree with. But the difference is not a matter of principle; it is largely a matter of degree. In any case, I want to make it plain that I am not objecting to our present situation so long as it does not become an expanded one.

I would like to see more effort made to find ways to end the war. If the war is expanded in a major way, engaging hundreds of thousands of troops, there is always a danger, whether we like it or not or plan it or not and whether the President wishes it or not, that due to miscalculations, accidents, or to other unforeseen incidents, the war may become a major war, which would probably be a nuclear war.

We can never forget what happened in 1914. I do not really believe that any of the major countries wished to have the kind of world war that followed. But the plans got beyond their control, and they came very close to disaster. Certainly that war maimed the most advanced civilization of the Western Europe of that day, and the countries of Europe have never recovered. Yet it was really an accident, or in part an accidental war. What happened was ridiculous. There were no really serious grievances. The differences that were said to have caused that war were all trifling; particularly the issue concerning the assassination of the heir to the throne of the practically extinct Austro-Hungarian Empire by an irresponsible private citizen.

Nevertheless, I shall support this appropriation to pursue the war, much as I regret having to do so. The war is terribly expensive. It will certainly infringe upon our domestic programs, about which we were so enthusiastic only a year ago. As I recall, I supported all of the administration's programs in the domestic field.

Within a year, however, we are feeling the pressure. Talk of inflation is beginning. Undoubtedly, some measures will be taken to restrain its occurrence and, indeed, those measures may threaten a recession. Whether the domino effect exists in foreign policy, it certainly exists in domestic policy, when applied to our economy. I deeply regret it.

My only interest in holding hearings and having a discussion is to try to make an improvement so that we may better understand our policies. It is my hope that they may bring this very tragic war to some kind of conclusion through negotiations and, at the very least, to limit its extent and thus the amount of damage it will do and is doing not only in South Vietnam but to our economy at home.

Finally, I have been anticipating for several years, because of the cold war, a time when we could concentrate on our domestic affairs. I made two or three speeches last year and the year before in which I said that the time had come for us to become more preoccupied and to give more attention to our domestic affairs. We have allowed our cities, our schools, our streams, and our air to deteriorate through neglect—both of attention and of money. It is a great tragedy that just as we thought we were making this breakthrough in the quality of our living at home, the war in southeast Asia arose to interfere. If the war is not stopped, I predict that we shall further deteriorate domestically; and our example to the world as a great and successful democratic nation will be drawn into question, which after all, is the strongest appeal we can have to other peoples, to other lands. In conclusion, our concept of society and the validity of our approach to the solutions of the many problems of society rest on the resolution of the conflict in southeast Asia.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator knows that I am generally in accord with the views he has just quite eloquently expressed. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is in the Chamber, and he, too, is one who thinks we cannot unilaterally pull out of Vietnam. I am sure that all three of us are most anxious to see this war brought to an end under terms which will be, as it is said, honorable to the United States.

I sometimes wonder if we do not identify "honorable" with "saving face." Perhaps we do; perhaps we do not.

Also, the Senator from Oregon is of the view that we had best get out of this war, a war which I think all three of us agree we should never have gotten into, through the good graces of the United Nations. I have been somewhat skeptical as to whether that agency as presently situated is in any position to be of much use in bringing the war to an end.

My question to the Senator is: How would he propose that we bring the war to an end and reach some sort of a solution which we could persuade the people of the United States was in their interest, and save face in South Vietnam?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Pennsylvania does me great honor even to insinuate that I have a solution to this problem at the tip of my tongue. There is no simple solution. The problems are complex and involved. But what strikes one who evaluates our policy is not any specific program that went particularly bad but rather a general attitude that one assumes to be present. It developed in our hearings. It seems to me that implicit in this attitude is the necessity of requiring a complete surrender of the opponents. That attitude says, "We do not want any compromise. You must surrender, quit doing what you are doing, and come to the conference table ready to surrender and apologize. Then we shall work out the details of ending hostilities."

The Senator said "saving face" or "saving honor." In dealings between nations, face is always being saved. There is constantly an interaction of friction between great nations; they are always saving face. That is a part of diplomacy.

That is what diplomacy is for. It is to allow people to compromise their differences in an honorable way. There is nothing wrong with saving face, which is actually compromise or accommodation, if you like. In certain circles, these words all take on a kind of ominous meaning. To me, they do not. The point is to get a settlement in which the faces of both sides are saved. It is an endeavor to see if a ceasefire can be brought about, and then to see if negotiations can be had with an open mind, with the idea of allowing the area to determine its own future, in the kind of society it desires to have.

We say we believe in self-determination. That is supposed to be one of the principles of our foreign policy. If it is—and I believe it ought to be—we should seek some adjustment by which this action could be brought about. I suggest, though I do not pretend it is the only answer, that we should give consideration to a form of neutralization of Vietnam, and then to look forward to the neutralization of Thailand and the perimeter of what was formerly Indochina. This possibility should be examined and analyzed. There may be difficulties. But there are grave difficulties in any suggestion that I have come across.

Once people start to fight, their tempers are flared; they develop an attitude that is uncompromising. So it is a war to the death; it is unconditional surrender, which is what we had in the last war. It created more problems than it solved. And I am merely trying to approach the matter in this way.

In doing so, I realize that it is difficult to cite a historical example of a powerful country like the United States not proceeding to complete victory. I am also quite certain that in nearly every case such action has created more problems than it has solved. It is not a satisfactory way, and much less so with nuclear weapons in the offing.

I do not know whether the words "face saving" are bad words. Perhaps we could think of a better term.

In a total victory, one side abjectly surrenders and the other side dictates the terms. Then the side that surrendered lies awake at night to find a way by which they may breach that agreement. And they will find a way. It has happened every time.

It will happen this time unless we choose to stay there to enforce neutrality. I do not know how long we would be able to maintain this kind of operation either physically, financially, or morally. I do not know whether the people would tolerate it.

I would not like to be driven out for any of those reasons. I would prefer to find a voluntary solution where we might enter into an agreement with the other side. I believe such an agreement might have a chance of survival, at least for a generation or two. That is all that we can expect in this kind of world. I would not like to see any agreement break down in 4 or 5 years.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will recall that we did not fight the Korean war to a total victory. Quite the contrary, we had total victory within our grasp at one point, but we did not seize it. The Chinese then came in with their "volunteers," and, in the end, we stabilized the lines of the contending parties about where they should have been in the first instance.

That would be more difficult to do in Vietnam for a variety of reasons that I shall not go into.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is a much more complicated situation.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to have the observation of the Senator on this matter. I do not believe that the Communist Chinese at this point will encourage Hanoi to talk and to settle the matter, for, after all, they are fighting to the last American and to the last North Vietnamese. They are not losing any of their own people. I think they are quite happy with the situation. Judging from the belligerent conduct of the Chinese leadership, I see very little prospect that they would be willing to discuss the kind of settlement in Vietnam which the Americans would consider.

Nobody knows the extent to which Ho Chi Minh and North Vietnam are under Chinese domination. There can be two schools of thought on that. My own view is that at the moment it is not very likely that Hanoi would be willing to talk, because they are not yet convinced that they and their allies, the Vietcong, are not going to win and drive us out.

They have the view, I fear, that we may get tired, and I think some of us who have been opposing the present policy in Vietnam may lend some, but not much, credence to that view.

The one thing that disturbs me is that the Secretary of State and others in high authority—although the President has not been as clear on this as have the others—have said that we will not talk to the people who are shooting American boys.

I think the soundest way of eventually arriving at a satisfactory solution would be to make every earnest effort to get the Vietcong leaders to negotiate. I have great difficuly in believing that we do not know who those leaders are. I have equal difficulty in believing that it is not possible to get Hanoi to sit down and see if this thing cannot be worked out. Actually, I hope that a negotiation between either ourselves and the Vietcong—or, if we can only get a government in South Vietnam which would be willing to talk with their own fellow countrymen—would offer the best hope for an immediate solution, and, in fact, at the moment practically the only hope to prevent this war from not only continuing for a good long while, but also accelerating.

What are the views of the Senator from Arkansas on that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct that we should be examining all of these approaches. It is not quite accurate to say that the administration or even the Secretary of State would not talk to the Vietcong.

They have said that they would tolerate them at a conference at which Hanoi would be the principal party. They would be given a place at the table, however. These differences, on a purely rational basis, do not have great appeal.

I think the excuse for taking such a position is that it would undermine the stability of the South Vietnamese Government. The South Vietnamese Government has been quite a disappointment; not only to the present administration, but also to the former one. Surely we should be able to influence that government. We are supporting it very strongly, and they are threatened with some difficulty now arising out of this new change.

I agree with the Senator that the Vietcong leaders are well known. Mr. Fall in a private session with the committee gave us résumés and biographical sketches of the leading figures in the Vietcong. I do not think it true that these people are not known.

For instance, one of the leaders is a well known and formerly, highly regarded nationalist lawyer from Saigon. He fell into disfavor with the tyrannical rule of the late Diem. At one time he was a non-Communist. I am not sure that he is a formal member of the Communist Party. In any case these people are known and can be found if we wish to find them.

Mr. CLARK. They have diplomatic groups abroad.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. There was some discussion in the committee this morning about Hanoi and China. There is a difference of opinion among the experts.

And I can only judge on the basis of the testimony from the experts who study this matter. Dr. Zagoria, of Columbia, stated only this morning that he felt there was more ill feeling toward Hanoi on the part of the Vietcong than is generally understood.

Dr. Zagoria mentioned particularly the fact that Hanoi had betrayed them after the 1954 agreement and that Hanoi had sold them out. He feels that they could be disposed to negotiate on their own. He is not positive of this. These are estimates based upon past connections and past differences.

Mr. CLARK. That is also the view of Bernard Fall, I believe, judging from a private conversation I had with him last week.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under certain circumstances. I do not believe that these men actually know. This is their best judgment about the situation.

We do know that priority of punishment has gone to the Vietcong. They are being killed and bombed and attacked by the full force of our power. Surely, they do not enjoy that. Next are the North Vietnamese. And, of course through all of this China, as the Senator said a moment ago, is having a free ride.

I do not know whether it is proper to say that they are happy. I do not know how even the Chinese could be happy about this situation. I do feel that they think it serves their long-term purposes, because we are obviously spending our material resources and our moral resources. We are beginning to be very abrasive with some of our best allies in complaining about their policies, such as their policy of trading with China. I believe they feel it suits their policy. I think that we are the only losers.

I judge that China is not inclined to seek any negotiations, or even to approve any negotiations. Judging from the testimony we have heard I do not believe that, on balance, this necessarily controls either the Vietcong or Hanoi. If it is made to appear to their interests, if we could ever make them believe that we mean what we say, and if we say the right thing, it might be different. I realize that is a lot of "ifs." That is why one cannot be dogmatic about it.

There is certainly a great problem of convincing them that we mean whatever reasonable proposal we make—not so much because of our past connections, but because of the way they have suffered since World War II in the betrayal that has been mentioned. In 1954 they also think they were betrayed; and I think they were in 1946. After actions which would lead a reasonable person to believe the French were going to peacefully give up their colonial power, the French reneged on their agreement, and resumed the war to establish their control.

That creates suspicion, and what is generally called a credibility gap that applies to us even though we are not responsible for having created it—certainly not wholly if at all. We have been a party, with the French, in helping them to reestablish their control. Anyway, that is ancient history, although I think it is significant in explaining the attitudes and the difficulties that we now face.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending supplemental defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1966, which ends on June 30, includes a total of $13,135,719,000. This is the amount requested by the President, and is also the amount provided by the House of Representatives.

It is broken down as defense appropriation bills are usually broken down, but generally speaking, the bill provides needed funds for continued support of operations in southeast Asia for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

There is also in the bill, in addition to the normal military categories, something in excess of $400 million for economic assistance to foreign countries, the major part of which goes to South Vietnam, and results from an authorization measure approved by the Congress which came out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee not too long ago.

With this supplemental appropriation, the combined total for the Department of Defense which Congress will have appropriated for fiscal 1966 amounts to $60,868,733,000, excluding military assistance to foreign countries.

That is a sizable amount of our gross national product to devote to the military. I regret that it needs to be so large; and yet I see no alternative except to vote for the bill. Nevertheless, I wish to be quite specific about my reservations in backing the military to this extent, and about a number of the policies of the State Department and the Department of Defense.

I am concerned about the war hawks in the press and one or two of them in Congress. Senators will recall that the phrase "war hawks" was originally applied to several young Congressmen, notably Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun, when they practically forced the Congress and the country into the War of 1812—a war which I think most historians now view as having been quite unnecessary. It resulted in the burning of Washington and of the Capitol, and that is about all that it did effectuate, although there was some diminution in the arrogance of the British in attacking our merchant shipping after the war was over.

But I do not believe the war hawks then turned out to be very good prophets. I do not believe they are turning out to be very good prophets now. I hope very much, and in fact I believe that the President of the United States will not accept the advice of the war hawks of the press, supported as they are by some, but certainly not all of the military, and by a few but not many of the Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I am prepared to support the President of the United States in his onerous task as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. I hope that he will continue to heed the advice of those who advocate caution, of those who are opposed to a unilateral escalating of the war on our part.

I hope that he will discard the advice of those few warhawks who have no fear of the possibility of becoming involved in a war with Communist China which might easily turn into a nuclear war and pose a grave threat to civilization as we know it.

But in order to indicate my reservations with respect to our present policy and my hope that the President will give careful consideration to these reservations, I should like to state my position as explicitly as I can.

First, I see no alternative but to vote for the bill. The lives of our men are in jeopardy in South Vietnam. As long as a peace there seems a good ways off, I could not with good conscience do anything except to give them, by my vote, the money which the Commander in Chief, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Defense think is needed to maintain them and to minimize their casualties.

Second, we should never have been in South Vietnam in the first place. It was a grave error, which brought over 200,000 of our Army into that small and unfortunate country. How we got there is well enough known, and I shall not dwell on it at any length. The French empire in Indochina was broken up by the Japanese during World War II; but after V-J Day and total victory on the part of ourselves and our Allies, the French went back, only to be thrown out by an indigenous revolution headed by Ho Chi Minh, the father symbol of Vietnam, south as well as north.

That revolution was a cruel one, it resulted in many casualties and vast bad feeling and, in the end, while France was not actually driven out of the country by military means, her position after Dienbienphu became untenable. She was wise enough to enter into negotiations which resulted in her withdrawal from North Vietnam and in turning South Vietnam over to a puppet, who turned out to be quite incapable of governing the country.

At that point, we intervened and in effect put our own man, Ngo Dinh Diem into the leadership of South Vietnam.

For a while, all seemed to go well; but in short order he turned out to be a ruthless totalitarian with no real interest in the democratization of his country or in carrying through the social and economic reforms which were essential to bring in a species of freedom and well-being, much less democracy, to South Vietnam.

In due course, he was assassinated by his own original supporters.

A series of ineffective governments succeeded each other, one general or one civilian head after another being unable to maintain themselves in power in Saigon and having no effective control over the countryside.

These governments also pretty well alienated the peasants in South Vietnam. It was not too long before, the commitment made to have free elections in South Vietnam having been violated by Diem, a civil war broke out, which has continued to this date.

The result has been the progressive deterioration of the economy and of the South Vietnamese society.

The unfortunate people of South Vietnam have really lived under wartime conditions since the Japanese first moved in, in 1941.

The American commitment made originally to Diem, who was actually installed as the head of South Vietnam under the prodding of some very important Americans, not all of them in public life, was to give assistance to the Diem government in terms of advice, economic assistance, and some training of troops to enable the South Vietnamese people themselves to put down the civil war which had broken out—in large part, I suggest—as a result of the cruelty and the ineffectiveness of the Diem government.

Our assistance, both economic and technical, including technical military assistance, continued to grow. But as late as September of 1963 President John F. Kennedy stated—and I paraphrase what he said—that this was a war for the South Vietnamese to win or lose. It was not our war. We could help with money. We could help with technical advice, military assistance, training of their troops; but it was their war, not our war.

At that time we had no more than 10,000 Americans in uniform in South Vietnam. Unfortunately, the Saigon government was unable to put down the guerrilla war which, to a very substantial extent, was supported, and to some extent, unquestionably, was controlled, by Hanoi, where Ho Chi Minh was head of state.

By the time the end of 1964 rolled around, it was quite apparent that the South Vietnamese Army was about to collapse; that the Vietcong, supported by Hanoi, were about to overrun the country; and that we had to make a basic policy decision—intervene with massive American troops or see the country taken over by the North Vietnamese, who were, to all intents and purposes, Communists, as were most, but not all, their South Vietnamese allies. And so President Johnson moved in massively.

Our troop strength on the ground, consisting of Marines and Army units, increased from the approximately 10,000 which were there at the time of President Kennedy's speech to what is now around 220,000 members of the Armed Forces, Marines, and Army, in South Vietnam.

In addition, there are perhaps a total of upward of 80,000 additional Air Force and Navy military personnel engaged in assisting land forces in their battle against the Vietcong, and those regular army troops of North Vietnam known as PAVN, which have been identified as fighting in South Vietnam against us and against the forces of the Saigon Government.

The results of this escalated war have been, first, that we did prevent the Vietcong and Hanoi from taking over. The South Vietnamese forces have rallied. In many parts of the country they are fighting gallantly. We turned the tide. Now, we have arrived at a point that is something of a stalemate in Vietnam.

My view is that without an unacceptable rate of American casualties, a rate far higher than the expanded rate we are now sustaining, we cannot win that war in the sense that we can clear out the countryside of the Vietcong and the troops of Hanoi, and pacify it, and create a free and hopefully democratic government in South Vietnam.

I do not believe that such a result is feasible, except, as I say, at a cost of American casualties at a rate which I, for one, would not be willing to accept.

On the other hand, it is becoming increasingly clear, particularly since the first of this year, that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are not going to be able to win the war either, and that we cannot and will not be driven out, despite the criticism which has come from a number of Members of the Senate about our policy in Vietnam, and the desirability of arriving at some kind of sensible compromise and solution under which the shooting could be stopped and peace brought to that tortured land and its economy revived with our help.

In order to achieve all of these results I believe we are going to have to find some way of getting into negotiations with the opposite side and bring them to the conference table.

In my judgment, neither our national honor nor our national security are involved in Vietnam, despite the strong statements to the contrary by members of the administration.

With respect to our national honor we made no commitment to anybody other than that we would help with money, with military equipment, and with military advice.

Most of the individuals to whom we originally made that commitment are dead, and the governments they represented have been overthrown. We have expended $2 billion of our fortune and the lives of a good many American boys in order to keep that quite informal commitment, never really formalized in any treaty.

Now, it is said that the SEATO Treaty binds us to do what we are doing in Vietnam. With that I strongly disagree. The SEATO Treaty, reduced to simple terms which nonlawyers can understand, merely obligates us to confer with the other parties to that treaty to see what kind of action, conformable to the constitutional processes of each of the signers might be desirable under whatever circumstances we might find ourselves, if the Geneva agreements were upset, as indeed they have been upset, in my opinion, by both sides, and not only by the Vietcong and Hanoi.

So while a case can be made, and the American Bar Association did make such a case, to the effect that our intervention in South Vietnam with a massive military force is perfectly legal—and with this the able Senator from Oregon disagrees and has made a powerful legal argument to the contrary—nevertheless, while possibly legal it is quite clearly not a treaty which required us to do what we are doing.

I take the strong position that our national honor would not be involved by reason of the SEATO Treaty or by reason of the informal comitments we made to long-dead leaders of the South Vietnamese Government, if we were to terminate the war and withdraw.

Similarly, I place no reliance at all on the argument that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution requires us to do what we are doing.

In my opinion, it did no such thing. Actually, the Gulf of Tonkin resolution did not add one iota to the already existing powers of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

He could have done just what he did without the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. He acquires no new stature; his powers are not expanded by reason of that resolution. Moreover, the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was applicable to a situation entirely different from the one which confronts us now.

At that point there had been an armed attack on naval vessels of the United States which the President quite properly resisted. He struck out against not only the North Vietnamese Navy, but by bombing certain installations in North Vietnam in retaliation for what was done.

At that point there was no thought, on the basis of what was done, that we would have committed 300,000 Armed Forces and personnel to South Vietnam.

I say again that neither the SEATO Treaty nor the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, nor the informal exchanges of correspondence between President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson with various and constantly changing leaders of the Saigon government affect our national honor.

Equally clearly I would think national security is not involved by the situation in South Vietnam. South Vietnam is a tiny country in terms of the huge land expanse of Asia. Only about 7 percent of the population of Asia is in that country.

Its economy is primitive. Its natural resources are largely a rice bowl. At one point, Vietnam exported rice overseas. The devastation caused by the present war has resulted in Vietnam's becoming a rice deficit country instead of a rice surplus country. Its economy is paralyzed. It is being held up only by a massive injection of American economic aid. To give one small example, prices in Saigon have risen 10 percent since January 1 of this year. There is substantial doubt whether the South Vietnamese economy can be made to survive, even with more massive help from us.

If we were to win a total victory from the Communists in South Vietnam, we would be confronted with a massive bill to rehabilitate the country. Indeed, we have already committed ourselves to the Southeast Asia Bank and have put our hard cash on the line to develop that part of Asia. Moreover, we are in a position where we shall certainly be called upon to make massive additional contributions to the economic and social well being of the country in the foreseeable future.

Yet if we were to lose all of South Vietnam, in my judgment, the domino theory would not take hold. China could nonetheless be contained. Our vital interests, our security, are not involved.

A few days ago, I had occasion to point out on the floor of the Senate that the four pillars of Asia, which in the long run must be called upon to contain Chinese expansion, are Pakistan, India, Indonesia, and Japan. We shall have to hold the fort for a while until their own economies and possibly their military strength are augmented to a strength capable of enabling them to contain Chinese expansion southward. Yet I am of the view, particularly so as a result of having listened, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to the testimony of a number of Chinese experts with respect both to the intentions and the capabilities of the Chinese Communist government, that that government has very little power to take offensive military operations beyond its own immediate borders.

I am also convinced that the Chinese Communist government is primarily preoccupied with its own serious domestic problems and has no real stomach for military adventures overseas.

To me, it is reasonably clear that Chinese efforts to expand that country's influence, and with it the peculiar Chinese brand of communism, are pretty well confined to encouraging wars of national liberation in other countries, wars to be fought without any Chinese economic involvement and with no Chinese military involvement, but merely to give Chinese advice and technique as to how to conduct a war of national liberation.

I should say, furthermore, that the economic, social, and political conditions in the countries where China would like to foment a series of national liberations are entirely different from the conditions in China at the time the Communists defeated Chiang Kai-shek and took over Mainland China.

So the advice that China is giving to other underdeveloped countries is fundamentally wrong and has proved to be wrong. In country after country the Chinese effort to create Communist parties, such as are proposed to take over the governments of countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, has turned out to be a disaster.

So I suggest that we need not be too much concerned, in terms of our national security, by the danger that China would be able to move south and take over, effectively, countries which have hated China for well over a thousand years.

The three countries in southeast Asia which have been most successful in resisting a Communist takeover have been countries where not a single American soldier was involved, where not a single American soldier was ever asked for or given. Those are the countries of Burma, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

U Thant, the able Secretary General of the United Nations, said not long ago that if any Burmese Government had requested the intervention of American troops to prevent a military takeover by Communists, either now there would be raging in Burma the kind of vicious civil war that is now taking place in South Vietnam or, in the alternative, the Communists would have taken over the Government of Burma, and communism would then have appeared further, beyond the boundaries of India.

I do not imagine that any Member of the Senate thought that an anti-Communist revolution in Indochina could be successful without the intervention of $1 of American money or one American soldier; yet that happened. Indonesia now has a strong anti-Communist military government, and the United States did not do anything to help them.

Similarly, while we gave substantial economic assistance and some military hardware to the Philippines, the Filipinos were able to put down the Communist revolution of the Hukbalahaps without the intervention of a single American soldier.

So I suggest that the precedents are strongly against our national security being involved by continuing a massive military intervention in South Vietnam.

Thus, I conclude that we should never have been in South Vietnam. Our principal objective now should be to get out of there as promptly as we can, with some reasonable compromise which will give that war-torn country some chance to lick its wounds, pick itself up from the floor, and attempt to become a viable, and, hopefully—possibly—democratic state.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, early today, the able majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] obtained from the Senate an agreement to set aside the earlier agreement to vote at 5:15 o'clock today.

I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, in view of the opportunity now provided for him to bring to the attention of the Senate before it votes tomorrow, his own views, would be in a position to agree that we should vote at not later than 2:15 o'clock p.m. tomorrow on the pending matter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I have no question of that suggestion if I am given the opportunity to complete my remarks, which I shall be unable to do tonight, and ask some further questions of the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], which might take as much as half an hour.

I would suggest that perhaps we could agree to come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning and I would undertake to resume the floor as soon as the morning hour is over in order to complete what I have to say and possibly the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts would be willing to come into the Chamber. In that event, I would have no objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, but I do not wish to be rushed. I have perhaps 2 hours of material and it will take me 2 hours to present matter which I have not yet had an opportunity to present to the Senate.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there is only one dilemma which confronts us. A very dear friend of all of us died in the last few days, and many of us desire to pay our respects tomorrow at his funeral. I refer, of course, to our able chief reporter and good friend, Mr. Gregor Macpherson.

For this reason I believe that we should seek to develop an agreement which would avoid the early convening of the Senate. Yet, certainly, we must insure that the opportunity which the Senator from Pennsylvania seeks is accorded him.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder whether we could not solve this, as one of the able members of the Policy Committee staff has suggested, by recessing tonight, instead of adjourning, in which case we would have no morning hour and, subject to the pending request of the Senator from Michigan, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow at noon I may have the privilege of the floor not to exceed 1 hour, for the purpose of completing my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HART. If the Senator would further yield to me, in view of that understanding, I renew the request: Is it agreed that we shall vote at not later than 2:15 o'clock tomorrow on the pending matter? This request, of course, I make on behalf of the able majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania, is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, assuming that the request includes the request that I be allowed the privilege of the floor when the Senate comes in tomorrow, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the proviso stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania, is there objection that the Senate vote no later than 2:15 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. HART. It having been agreed, Mr. President, I understand, that we shall recess tonight?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Is there objection to the proposal made by the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Tuesday, March 22, 1966, immediately after the prayer the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] shall be recognized for not more than 1 hour for further debate of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, and that the Senate proceed to vote on the final passage of the bill not later than 2:15 p.m. on that date.

MARCH 21, 1966.

RECESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the unanimous-consent agreement earlier entered into, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to and (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 22, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 21, 1966:

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Robert LaFollette Bennett, of Alaska, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

THE JUDICIARY

William N. Goodwin, of Washington, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern and western districts of Washington to fill a new position created by Public Law 87–36, approved May 19, 1961.

U.S. MARSHAL

Harry M. Miller, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be U.S. Governor of the Asian Development Bank.

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the Asian Development Bank.

Bernard Zagorin, of Virginia, to be U.S. Director of the Asian Development Bank.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21, 1966:

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Alva Revista Fitch, O18113, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, U.S. Army.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

R. D. Pennewell, of Missouri, to be member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for term expiring March 31, 1972.

A. Lars Nelson, of Washington, to be member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for term expiring March 31, 1972.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Intergovernmental Cooperation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, few of the measures which come before the Congress have the support of all the groups which are affected by the proposed legislation. When such consensus exists, it is obvious that the provisions of the legislation represent some commonly agreed-upon policies which should demand the interest of all Members.

Such is the situation with regard to the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act which is currently awaiting the House approval on Government operations. This bill is designed to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities between the levels of government in order to improve the operation of our federal system. To demonstrate what I mean when I say that this bill has the united support of all the groups and individuals concerned, let me list a few of the supporters of this proposal:

President Johnson has called for the enactment of this bill in his 1967 budget message as follows:

> Favorable action should be taken on the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, already before the Congress. This act would improve the administration and facilitate congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid. It would also provide a means for coordinating intergovernmental policy in the administration of grants for urban development.

Forty-three Members of the Senate from both sides of the aisle cosponsored the bill and it passed the Senate unanimously.

The four national groups which represent State and local governments—the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the Council of State Governments, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors—have made clear their unified support for it.

It has the full endorsement of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a body created by Congress in 1959 to study intergovernmental relations and problems and on which representatives of all levels of government sit.

Many national groups concerned with the sound development of our urban areas have endorsed the measure.

Following is a summary of its provisions:

Assure that Governors could obtain full information on grant programs in their States for budgetary purposes. This title, prepared by Bureau of the Budget staff, also provides a uniform method of handling grant funds and scheduling Federal transfers to the States; and allows the waiving of the single State agency provision and use of other suitable administrative arrangements subject to Federal approval.

Establish a congressional policy to reexamine new grant programs after 5 years that do not otherwise provide for a termination date.

Authorize Federal departments and agencies to render technical assistance and training services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis. This will enable State and local governments to avoid the expense of unnecessary duplication of specialized or technical services, and permit more economical use of Federal facilities.

Establish a coordinated intergovernmental urban assistance policy. It grants priority to general local governments in eligibility for Federal aids, and requires that applications for Federal loans or grants affecting urban development be reviewed by general local governments and metropolitan area planning agencies for consistency with existing plans and objectives.

Prescribe a uniform policy and procedure for urban land use transactions undertaken by the General Services Administration. Acquisition, use, and disposal of land in urban areas by this agency shall be consistent, to the extent possible, with local zoning regulations and development objectives.

In addition to S. 561, the Senate-passed version of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, H.R. 6292 which I introduced, and a number of similar bills introduced by other congressmen, are pending before the House Committee on Government Operations and we anticipate early conclusion of the hearings on these bills, including H.R. 10212 introduced by my colleague from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES]. That bill contains an additional title seeking action to meet the problems of hardship and inequity due to the lack of consistency in the relocation provisions of Federal urban development grant programs. It establishes a uniform policy for the treatment of people and businesses displaced by direct Federal and grant-in-aid programs. Uniformity would apply to relocation payments, advisory assistance, and assurance of the availability of standard housing on a basis generally similar to those in the present Federal urban renewal program.

The proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act favors no one group over another, no one region over another, no one program over another, and has, as it had in the Senate, bipartisan support, I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

President Johnson Acts on Congressman Tenzer's Jet Noise Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, this is the 12th time I have addressed my colleagues in the House of Representatives on the problem of aircraft noise—on each previous occasion I appealed for Federal action and now for the first time, the President of the United States has answered my plea and has gone on record as favoring Federal action.

On March 2, 1966, the President in his transportation message to Congress, announced that he had directed his science adviser, Dr. Donald F. Hornig, to work with the Administrators of FAA and NASA and the Secretaries of Commerce and of Housing and Urban Development to "frame an action program to attack this problem."

On March 18, 1966, the White House released the summary report entitled "Alleviation of Jet Aircraft Noise Near Airports," prepared as a result of the White House Conference on Jet Aircraft Noise held on October 29, 1965, under the direction of Dr. Hornig. On August 19, 1965, I wrote to the President recommending the appointment of a Presidential Commission to study the jet noise problem and recommend action to alleviate this problem. The October conference was called as a result of my request and I am most gratified that the panel has acted in a constructive and encouraging forward-looking manner. On March 18, 1966, simultaneously with the release of the panel's report I received the following letter from the President:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, March 18, 1966.*
>
> Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
> *The House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Today we released a report prepared under the direction of my Science Adviser, Dr. Donald F. Hornig, on the "Alleviation of Jet Aircraft Noise Near Airports." This report provides a valuable starting point for a concerted effort to meet the problem of jet aircraft noise.
>
> I want to thank you for your initiative in presenting many aspects of the jet aircraft noise situation to me and to my Scientific Advisory Committee.
>
> I know that with continued support of outstanding Congressmen such as yourself, we will find new and better ways to improve the quality of the environment in which we live.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Upon receipt of the President's letter, I sent the President the following telegram:

> I acknowledge your letter informing me that you have today released Dr. Hornig's report of the White House Conference on Jet Noise. I especially thank you for giving recognition to my efforts in bringing jet noise into proper focus as a problem national in scope meriting your personal attention. Mr. President, you have earned the everlasting gratitude of my constituents and all citizens throughout the Nation who reside in the vicinity of our airports.
>
> HERBERT TENZER,
> *Member of Congress.*

The major recommendations contained in the aircraft noise report are:

Initiation of federally supported studies of the expected scope of the noise problem through 1975 and of the public and private programs which will be needed to combat the problem.

Creation of a high level Federal task force to undertake, on an urgent basis, a "systems" type analysis of the problem in the vicinity of the Kennedy, O'Hare, and Los Angeles Airports, the analysis to be extended to other affected areas as soon as practicable.

Development of valid, broadly applicable standards of noise measurement.

Pursuit of a definitive technical study pointed toward a reduction in noise levels produced by jet engines and by aircraft, together with a determination of the costs associated with the various levels of improvement which may be technologically possible.

Establishment of a task force to investigate methods for Federal participation in a coordinated program for compatible land utilization in the vicinity of airports.

Starting an effort to identify and place into effect any modifications to operating procedures and takeoff or landing techniques that would reduce noise without compromising safety.

I have made 11 statements in the House on jet noise and introduced two bills to provide coordination of research in aircraft noise abatement and provide Federal funds to reimburse local governments and industry for the cost of land acquisition and implementation of other techniques for reducing jet noise.

It is with a deep sense of gratification that I refer to the letter from the President which culminates 14 months of continuous effort to obtain widespread recognition that jet noise is a national problem. I agree with the President that today's actions provide an invaluable starting point and I will continue to do everything in my power to alert my colleagues in the House to the need for appropriate legislation. I invite all local organizations and elected officials to join with me in a concerted effort to achieve the desired result—the reduction of aircraft noise.

I intend to work as closely as possible with the President's Science Adviser and task force as they develop the action program which the President has directed them to frame. The importance of alleviating the jet noise problem will become much clearer to my colleagues in the House as the number of airport servicing jet planes increases from 75 to 400 in the next few years as a result of the increased use of smaller jet aircraft which can take off and land at airfields with shorter runways.

H.R. 7981 and H.R. 7982 which I introduced May 6, 1965, provides for most of the items contained in the recommendations of the President's Panel. I will renew my appeal to all persons, local elected officials, and organizations interested in the problem of aircraft noise abatement and control to send me their recommendations and suggestions to help perfect the legislation to the end that we may be able to present a common effort to the solution of a common problem.

The time for action is at hand for if we wait until these 400 airfields are servicing jets, it will be too late to develop the action program which the people have demanded. If we are to improve the quality of our environment as the President wants to do, we must begin now.

On March 18, 1966, Dr. Donald F. Hornig also wrote to me and I insert the text of his letter at this point:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 18, 1966.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TENZER: At long last, I am pleased to send you a copy of the summary report of the Jet Aircraft Noise Panel, "Alleviation of Jet Aircraft Noise Near Airports." Also, I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your interest and your helpfulness during our many discussions of the subject.

I look forward to continuing contact with you as we attack the problem and develop the plans and actions which will be needed to produce much-needed progress.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD F. HORNIG,
Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

The action of which Dr. Hornig speaks in his letter refers to both administrative and legislative action. The executive or administrative action which can be implemented quickly and without legislative authority may be developed by the further studies—and the "systems" type analysis of the problem which will be conducted in the vicinity of the Kennedy, O'Hare, and Los Angeles Airports.

I believe the legislative action should begin at the earliest possible time. I have introduced two bills which if enacted would place the additional authorization in the hands of the Federal Government to back up the attack on this problem with Federal funds and with enforcement authority. The solution cannot be found or implemented until such time as Congress passes legislation placing the responsibility on industry and Government. Then and only then will the economic barriers be torn down and will the road to progress be cleared and the scientific and planning resources of the United States released to attack the problem without restrictions.

I urge my colleagues to review H.R. 7981 and 7982 and join me in calling for congressional hearings on legislation designed to alleviate the jet noise problem so that we may act now for the benefit of the millions of Americans who reside near our airports.

Legislation To Increase the Per Diem Expenses for Mobile Employees of the Post Office Department Is Certainly Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for mobile regular and substitute employees assigned to road duty. The last time an adjustment was made in travel allowance for mobile employees was in Public Law 68, effective on June 10, 1955.

We are all aware that living expenses have increased considerably since 1955, at home and while traveling away from home. Other Federal employees in a travel status have had the maximum per diem raised to $16—3 years ago—but no adjustment was made at that time for mobile employees of the Post Office Department.

Mobile employees eat in the same restaurants and except where they, as a group, maintain their own quarters at their outer terminal, they stop at the same hotels and pay the same rates.

If this bill is enacted it would mean that if a mobile employee is away from his headout for more than 10 hours, he would receive $3 instead of $2.25 for each 6 hours he is away from home. This adjustment would provide that the mobile employee would be eligible for per diem expenses on the same basis as all other Federal employees.

I feel that this change in the law is necessary and equitable.

Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, proposals to reduce agricultural appropriations for fiscal year 1967 affect numerous vital and worthwhile programs. The Soil Conservation Service, which is responsible for protecting and improving our soil and water resources, is one such program making great contributions to progress in rural America.

I would like to share with my colleagues a statement I presented to the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations urging full support for the Soil Conservation Service.

STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BY MASTON O'NEAL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SECOND DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, Georgia is one of the leading States in the Nation when it comes to efforts to protect and improve our soil and water resources. All of our farms, for example, are in organized soil conservation districts. More than 100,000 of our farmers are cooperating with these districts. More than 89,000 of these cooperators have developed basic conservation plans for their land. These plans cover nearly 17 million acres of land.

And Georgia stands near the top among all the 50 States in its interest and active participation in the small watershed program.

Georgia is second in the United States in the number of applications for assistance in watershed projects. We are second in the number of watershed projects authorised for planning assistance. We are third in the number of watershed projects authorized for operations.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this entitles Georgians to a prominent voice in the budget proposals for the Soil Conservation Service, especially the items relating to technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts, and small watershed projects.

I am particularly concerned about restrictions proposed in the budget for watershed projects. The proviso that only 35 watershed projects can move into the construction stage in 1967, compared to a current rate of 80 per year, would be a great setback to this worthwhile program if approved. I hope your committee will delete this restriction.

Similarly, the budget proposes to restrict to 50 the number of watershed projects that can be authorized for planning in 1967, compared to a current rate of 100 per year. The current rate should be continued. I hope your committee will eliminate the proposed restriction.

I wish also to express my opposition to the budget proposal to reduce soil survey work of SCS by $3.6 million in 1967. This would be a definite step backward, for soil surveys are the key to virtually all of our soil and water conservation efforts.

I urge your committee to restore the reduction proposed in this important item.

Mr. Chairman, the Soil Conservation Service, furnishing as it does technical assistance is one of the most important activities of our time—the preservation and improvement of our soil and water resources for the future of this Nation—deserves the full support of this Congress. I hope you will see fit to provide for a continuance of this great work at a rate no lower than the present level.

Resignation of David Dubinsky as President of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker. David Dubinsky, one of the true titans of the American labor movement, has stepped down and he will be hard to replace. For 34 years he has been president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and under his direction the union workers and the industry have prospered.

In 1932 when he assumed command of the union it was bankrupt and the sweat shop was a way of life in the industry. Today the ILGWU has almost a half million members and finds itself financially in the position of lending money to the Rockefeller interests for civic projects in Puerto Rico.

In his years as president, the little giant of the ILGWU fought and defeated a strong Communist element that sought to bleed the union and which had brought it to the verge of extinction. He fought for and won a host of social reforms in the industry including better working conditions, reduced hours, retirement and medical benefits and low rent housing. The union built, under David Dubinsky's leadership, an orphanage in China, a trade school in France, and lent large amounts of money to the fledgling Israeli Nation, while at the same time fostering training and apprenticeship programs for American workers. Last year, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion while in Mondello, Sicily, to visit an orphanage and school known as Instituto Franklin D. Roosevelt, a project heavily supported by the ILGWU. I wish that every Member here could see the fine work that is being made possible to a large degree by the ILGWU support of this orphanage and school.

In New York the garment industry is a major industry and around the world, the New York garment center is regarded as the pacemaker. But it could not be so without the stability that Mr. Dubinsky and his union have provided to the industry.

Today's new labor leaders, Mr. Speaker, are not of the Dubinsky heritage, and in fact how could they be? They did not have to fight in the streets for what are now considered the normal rights of the workingman nor did any of them spend time in a Czarist jail in Poland for leading a strike against their father's bakery. This is not meant to denigrate today's labor leaders, it is just that, as it always must, the old order changeth.

I have been privileged over the years, Mr. Speaker, to make many friends within the ILGWU. I am sure they join me in a genuine sadness at the sight of David Dubinsky stepping down and I am also sure that they join me in wishing David Dubinsky an affectionate mazel tov.

Financing Steel Mill for Red China Like Helping Burglar Buy Better Tools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have requested the State Department to make a formal protest against the plans of five free world nations to lend Red China $150 million and provide the technical know-how for construction of a mammoth new steel mill.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has criticized the plan because it would "add to the strength of Peiping" but indicated that the Government would probably go no further than expressing its opposition informally to our allies.

We should emphatically go on record as formally protesting and opposing this scheme to add 2 million tons of steel a year to the industrial capacity of Red China.

It is quite apparent that the primary purpose of such a steel mill would be to enhance Red China's war potential. This could prove catastrophic at a time when the belligerent Peiping warlords are menacing many nations and constitute the major threat to world peace.

It has been reported in the news that a consortium of West German, Swiss, French, British, and Italian firms were negotiating to sell the giant steel plant to Communist China.

A spokesman for the West German ministry of economics at Bonn was quoted as announcing that his Government would guarantee an $86 million credit being extended to Peiping by two German manufacturers of steel mill equipment.

China's Communist comrade, Soviet Russia, has obviously refused to provide this steel mill because the men in Moscow mistrust the motives of the Peiping regime.

Financing this steel mill for Red China would be like lending money to a bank robber so he can buy better burglary tools.

It is fantastic that nations which have benefited handsomely from American economic aid, and which profess to be friends of the United States should even consider such assistance to a regime which boasts that brute force and violence are instruments of its national policy.

Although I have been informed that the United States could not block the transaction, even so, we have a moral obligation to our soldiers in Vietnam—many of whom have been killed by guns and ammunition supplied to the Vietcong by Red China—to make a formal protest against this strengthening of an international bully.

Red China is now controlled by a fanatically aggressive group of arrogant troublemakers under whose leadership their nation is devoting a larger percentage of its productive and scientific capacity to military purposes than any other country in the world.

To assume that they want a great new steel mill to provide their peasants with autos, washing machines, and kitchen cabinets would be the height of folly. They obviously want more steel for tanks, guns, warships, and rocket launchers.

By lending Peiping the money to buy this mill, the five countries involved are endangering every neighbor of Red China, and also endangering world peace.

Resolution Urging Embargo on Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by its initial declaration in support of Great Britain and its first steps to carry it out, our Government recognized the gravity of the Rhodesian rebellion.

We believe those first steps were more symbolic than definitive. We believe further, that the time is here for the imposition of any sanction within our power, short of intervention by the Armed Forces of the United States.

We urge an embargo on all trade with the rebel group which has seized the Government of Rhodesia, including products and raw materials of every description. We urge specifically the shutting off of oil shipments and the enlistment in this project of the full cooperation of all companies and nations now engaged in the furnishing of oil to Rhodesia.

We believe, further, that there is precedent in both our past practice and in our national traditions and policies for lending assistance to nations which may feel impelled to launch military moves against the Rhodesian regime.

The whole world knows that the Rhodesian rebellion against Great Britain is based, without pretense or apology, upon the perpetuation of naked racism. The Rhodesian white minority of approximately 5 percent of the population has not only excluded the black 95 percent from any voice in government today, but has declared its intention to deny the black Rhodesians any voice "in our lifetime."

This deprivation, based openly and unilaterally on race, could precipitate a race war, whose consequences, if not its actual conflicts, would penetrate and poison every area of the world.

The black and brown peoples of the world have provided too much evidence of the falseness of the inflammatory doctrine of white supremacy to sit idly by while it is used as a spur to racist demagogs across the world and as a vehicle to oppressive power. Even under the handicaps inherited from a colonial system, the progress of the new African nations has already refuted the assumptions of Rhodesian racism.

Our country, the United States of America, can have no part in abetting the ugly business of racism. We must sever all economic as well as diplomatic relations with a regime of rebels—one dedicated not to the attainment of freedom from oppression, but to the imposition of the most rigid control, based upon the meanest and most fearful of grounds: the color of a man's skin.

Urgent: The Need for Changes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act To Protect Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as I told the House today in my remarks immediately following the reading of the President's message on consumer interests, I welcome with all my heart the renewed expression of Presidential support for legislation to further protect the American consumer.

In this statement, I now want to outline in more detail the provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 which urgently need amendment or improvement, as proposed in the omnibus bill which I first introduced in the 87th Congress in January 1961, and which I changed and reintroduced again on the opening days of the 88th and 89th Congresses under the same bill number, H.R. 1235. It is my hope that when hearings are scheduled on the proposals made in the President's message today on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, that all of the sections of H.R. 1235, except the one which has already become law in this Congress, will now be given full consideration.

Only once in the six sessions in which this omnibus bill has been pending has there been any committee hearing on most of these proposals, and that was for a brief few days in 1962 prior to the thalidomide episode. After the disclosures about thalidomide, there was renewed attention paid to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in the 87th Congress but the hearings were restricted only to prescription drugs. Last year, hearings were held only on the barbiturates and amphetamines. So, in six sessions, we have passed what were two of the key provisions of the original H.R. 1235 of 1961 but nothing else in the omnibus bill has been touched on in legislation.

Because of the importance of the subject matter, and in view of the President's reiteration today of the support of his administration for many, if not most, of the reforms which I have called for in H.R. 1235, I am sure the Members will want to study the approach of this bill and derive a better understanding of the scope of the problems it covers.

PURE FOOD AND DRUG LAW OF 1906

The Food and Drug Act of 1906 was our first foray into protecting the American consumer against adulterated or unsafe American products in the two fields of foods and drugs. It took a scandal involving the sale to the Army of meat treated with formaldehyde, and revelations about tonics and medicines—supposedly for women but consisting mostly of alcohol or opium or other ingredients no lady would have knowingly used—to spur the public into demanding remedial legislation and Congress to pass it.

COSMETICS REGULATION BEGAN ONLY 28 YEARS AGO

But cosmetics did not come under Federal supervision until only 28 years ago, in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, after numerous women had been blinded by unsafe eye preparations. If you read the old congressional debates on that bill—a milestone piece of legislation then, but terribly outmoded today—you will come across speeches predicting that the measure would bankrupt every business in the field, discourage research in medicines, and make every woman get permission from some bureaucrat in Washington before she could powder her nose or use lipstick.

LOOPHOLES IN THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

The 1938 act was a good law for its time, but time quickly eroded holes in it, through court decisions and changes in technology. Not all of those holes have been repaired. Other loopholes still in the act were deliberately put there when it was originally passed, in order to assure neutrality on the bill on the part of some business interests, like the soap manufacturers, for instance, who otherwise would have joined in the bitter battle to defeat the controversial legislation in 1938. I will mention later a few of those special exemptions dating back to 1938.

But what about the loopholes Congress did not anticipate, and had no intention of creating? One of the first bills I introduced in my first term in the Congress was directed at closing such a gap created by court decisions. The courts had ruled that the Government's food and drug inspectors could not inspect the operations of a plant if the owner or manager did not want to admit them. Well, this was not the intent of Congress at all, so we had to amend the law to make it explicit.

In 1954 we first took notice of the great danger of our food supply which was developing from unregulated use of pesticides on raw agricultural commodities—that was only 12 years ago.

UNTESTED CHEMICALS IN FOOD

It was only 16 years ago that the Delaney committee in the House, a special committee headed by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, of New York, first spotlighted the dangers to consumers from a proliferation of new chemical additives being used in food processing without prior testing and certification as to their safety. It took Congress 8 years thereafter to act on the Delaney committee revelations in the Food Additives Act of 1958, which I cosponsored. By then, responsible leaders of the food industry were acknowledging the need for corrective legislation, but the battle over the details of the bill were often bitter ones. The 1958 act was a great forward step. Under it, the manufacturer now has to prove an additive is safe before he can use it in foods. Previously, the burden of proof had been on the Government; if the Government could not provide legal proof that the additive was harmful, the manufacturer could continue to use it, even if the weight of scientific evidence indicated the safety of the product was seriously in doubt.

BURDEN OF PROOF ON COSMETICS SAFETY IS ON GOVERNMENT

The burden of proof, however, is still on the Government in the law's sections on cosmetics. There is no requirement that cosmetic manufacturers must pretest their products for safety. The consumer thus can easily be a guinea pig on a new cosmetic item. If enough consumers get hurt—burned or scalped or disfigured or scarred or infected from a new and untested cosmetic—the Government eventually hears about it and moves against the product and takes it off the market. But, oh, the agony in the meantime. Remember the false fingernails which caused such anguish several years ago, when it was discovered that removing them could also remove the nails? Or the hair dyes which made women bald? These things can happen under our present law on cosmetics.

So I say to women in this country: "This is an area in which every woman—every woman—had better begin to play politics in every way she knows how, because your skin and your hair and your nails and your eyebrows and your lips and even your lives may be at stake some day."

COSMETIC COLORS MUST BE SAFE—BUT NOT IN HAIR DYES

The only significant improvement made in the cosmetic sections of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in the last 28 years had to do with the coloring matter used in cosmetics. How it came about is a long story, and a somewhat ironic one, but color additives must now be proved safe in the manner used before incorporation in a food, drug or cosmetic. Even if considered safe in the manner used, a color additive can still not be approved if it could cause cancer in man or animal. That is the so-called Delaney clause, which we also wrote into the law on food additives in 1958.

But outside of the coloring matter, no other ingredients of cosmetics have to be pretested for safety or subjected to any preclearance by the Government before use. Only when the Government can produce legal proof that a cosmetic is unsafe or contains unsafe ingredients can it act against it. Legal proof, as you can guess, must go far beyond reasonable doubt as to safety—it must be proof of harm. And often that is impossible to ascertain without years of laboratory research.

In the case of hair dyes, it does not matter how dangerous they are—they can be sold anyway, as long as the label clearly warns the purchaser that the product may be dangerous to use. That is all the law requires. In a beauty shop, how many women ever get to see the labels on the bottles or drums in which hair dyes are shipped?

GAPS IN OUR FOOD LAWS

The law we passed in 1960 on cautionary labeling of hazardous household products such as bleaches, paints, insecticides, and so on, does not apply to foods, drugs, and cosmetics; including those packaged in pressurized containers, which can be dangerous when carelessly handled. Furthermore, the section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act dealing with informative labeling of foods—giving the consumer information she is legally entitled to have—has been held by the courts to be too vague to prevent some processors from hiding the information in tiny type in a cluttered panel, or in pastel inks on noncontrasting backgrounds, defying the housewife's efforts to find the information on weights, ingredients, and so on.

I am not a lawyer, so I cannot argue with the judges on whether the present language on labeling is too vague. It sounds clear enough to me. It says the required information on a food label must be "prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness—as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling—and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use."

READ THE LABEL—IF YOU CAN

As I said, that sounds pretty clear and straightforward to me. But the courts have nevertheless blocked Food and Drug Administration efforts to crack down on some flagrant violators. The law therefore needs a simple amendment authorizing the Government to issue regulations specifying—as is done now in the prescription drug sections of the law—how the required label information must be presented on the label—the location of the data on weights and on ingredients, the comparative type sizes to be used, and so on.

Otherwise, the housewife will continue to find it difficult, if not impossible, to find the net weight on some bags or boxes, or cans or bottles, if only to try to figure out the better buy between different sizes of the same brand. And she will continue to find it a real challenge to find the listing of ingredients to make sure the contents do not include anything to which some member of the family is allergic.

There is not widespread enough violation of the spirit of the labeling law to an extent that it is a serious national crisis, but violations are common enough to constitute an unpardonable nuisance to the careful- label-reading shopper—who must take extra hours to do her marketing. These violations also victimize the casual shopper who is quickly discouraged from making the complex price computations to determine the more economical among competing products or among different size packages of the same product. So she buys the "large economy size" on faith that it is the better buy—and often it is not as good a buy as a smaller size—believe it or not.

LOOPHOLES ENDANGERING HEALTH

Much more serious, however, are the gaps in the food, drug, and cosmetic law which affect not your pocketbook and disposition so much as your life and safety. I have described the free and easy manner in which cosmetics can be manufactured and put on sale without pretesting or clearance for safety and the fact that coal tar hair dyes are subject to no regulation, no matter how dangerous, as long as the label warns you of the possible consequences of using them. The cosmetic and hair dye manufacturers won these special exemptions for their products during the battle over passage of the original act in 1938.

They have been successful ever since in fighting off attempts to make them prove the safety of their products before marketing.

THERAPEUTIC DEVICES

Let us look at another loophole in the law. Therapeutic devices—medical devices of all kinds—can also be marketed, as cosmetics are, without safety clearance, and can be removed from the market only if proved dangerous or fraudulent. In this case, we should require not only proof of safety but also proof of effectiveness, too—particularly when someone with a serious illness or disability delays seeking medical attention in the hope some useless machine or device can cure him. But the problem is serious also in the devices and materials used in good faith by physicians and dentists. What a tragedy it has been for some patients who underwent surgery involving the use of artificial bone material only to have the material deteriorate in the body; then they have had to go through the ordeal all over again—merely because the material used had not been sufficiently tested for safety and effectiveness before being put on the market.

H.R. 1235, AN OMNIBUS BILL TO REWRITE THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

Rather than catalog all of the possible dangers of living in today's fast-changing world with its amazing new technology, I would like to list what my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 would actually do. Its number is H.R. 1235. I introduced it originally on the opening day of the 87th Congress, in January, 1961, 5 years ago. Brief hearings were held in June 1962 on the whole range of issues covered in the omnibus bill, after President Kennedy's consumer message that year endorsed most of its provisions. As originally introduced, the bill provided the procedures later adopted by Congress to safeguard prescription drugs, in his historic Drug Control Act of 1962 which was enacted after the thalidomide tragedy came to public attention.

IT HAS EVERYTHING IN IT, INCLUDING THE KITCHEN SINK

I revised and reintroduced the bill in the 88th Congress, 3 years ago, but no action occurred in the House on any of its features. I have now reintroduced it in this Congress, bringing it up to date once again. It is 45 pages long and covers everything you eat, all the medicines you use, anything rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced into, or otherwise applied to the human body for the purpose of cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance, to give you the official definition of a cosmetic; it applies also to therapeutic devices, fake cancer cures, worthless ingredients in special dietary foods; over-the-counter drugs, animal feeds.

In other words, it has everything in it, including the kitchen sink, along with the refrigerator, the bathroom medicine cabinet, the dressing table, and the nursery. I am going to spell out some of the provisions, Mr. Speaker, so that the Members can decide whether the loopholes which this bill would close are serious enough to warrant action. I also hope that through publication of this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, many citizens, particularly women, are able—through newspapers, radio, and television programs, magazine articles, and through their churches and clubs and organizations—to learn more about the need for this legislation, for I am convinced that they then will insist and demand that Congress act.

As I have told consumer groups repeatedly, along those lines, if enough women are made aware of the deficiencies in our basic consumer law and are encouraged to write to their congressional delegation about these deficiencies and the need for corrective legislation, such legislation will be enacted promptly. As I explained, "Congress is like the accelerator of your car—that is, very sensitive to pressure. You make it go by putting your foot down."

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF H.R. 1235

Now here, in the order in which they are covered by H.R. 1235, are some of the things on which all of us, and particularly the women of this country, must put their foot down hard.

Section 1 is the title of the bill.

MAKING THE LABEL SERVE ITS FULL PURPOSE

Section 2 deals with amendments to the required labeling provisions of the present law—to make sure the consumer can readily find the net weight and ingredients and other information she is entitled to have on food, drug, and cosmetic labels; also to require cautionary labeling on pressurized food or cosmetic containers so as to prevent accidents, and on medicines and drugs to prevent unsafe use by children or by adults with pathological conditions. Labels would have to carry instructions for first aid treatment, when necessary.

For instance, in the case of cosmetics which are frequently swallowed by children, the doctors just have to guess as to what is in the products. This section would also apply to hair sprays, which are usually dangerously flammable—but you see women using them while smoking, and in the beauty shops you see clouds of the spray with no one apparently aware of the fact that they can be dangerous to inhale.

Section 2 also removes a 28-year-old loophole put in by the dairy industry, exempting butter, cheese, and ice cream from having to reveal on the package or label the presence of artificial color. Every other food label must show the presence of artificial color; why not butter, cheese, and ice cream? Of all of the provisions of my bill, I guess this one on artificial color in dairy products is probably the least urgent from the standpoint of health and safety, but I included it because this exemption is typical of how every industry wants to hide from the consumer facts which are perhaps a little embarrassing—such as the fact that the beautiful yellow color which butter claims as its own is often put there with a chemical.

Some consumers, for reasons of their own—and sometimes they are good reasons—want to avoid artificial coloring matter in food whenever possible. The color additives in use in food are proven to be safe in the manner in which they are used, but it should be remembered that the law had to be changed several years ago to repeal a previous requirement that these colors must be absolutely and completely harmless under any and all circumstances. The Government discovered that many of the coal tar colors were no longer able to pass this requirement of the 1938 act because the testing devices, like those used to find pesticide residues in milk, were so much improved and so extremely sensitive.

SPECIAL DIETARY FOODS

Section 3 of my bill deals with worthless ingredients in special dietary foods. This is a very controversial issue among health food manufacturers. It prohibits the use in a product represented as a special dietary food of exotic-sounding ingredients which have never been shown to have the least nutritive value, or any dietary usefulness whatsoever. Sale of the ingredients themselves would not be touched; the bill would apply only when the products are represented as having special dietary value.

PRETESTING OF MEDICAL DEVICES FOR SAFETY AND EFFICACY

Section 4 applies to the pretesting of therapeutic devices for safety and proof of effectiveness before they can be sold. I covered that earlier.

CERTIFICATION OF ALL ANTIBIOTICS

Section 5 requires the certification by the Food and Drug Administration of the purity and potency of veterinary antibiotics, similar to the requirement we wrote into the law in 1962 applying to antibiotics intended for use by man. When these powerful, and often unstable, drugs are used on meat animals, we should be certain they are from certified batches, tested and approved by Uncle Sam.

THE MIND-AFFECTING DANGEROUS DRUGS

Section 6 deals with the barbiturates, amphetamines, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulants—the sleeping pills, and the pep pills, the "goof balls" and "bennies," and other drugs which were so widely bootlegged as to constitute a national menace. How many deaths on the highways that can be attributed to the use of these pills we can never know. They are dangerous, and doctors who prescribe them treat them with respect. We passed this provision of H.R. 1235 last year in a separate bill, H.R. 2, which became Public Law 89–74.

FAKE CANCER REMEDIES

Section 7 of H.R. 1235 deals with fake cancer remedies, and drugs or devices intended for the prevention or cure of cancer. This is an area of widespread trickery and fraud, and it is tragic. On the other hand, we do not want to discourage the search for any really effective treatment for this disease, on which so much research money and time and effort are now being spent.

This is a section of my original bill of 1961 which I have retained in succeeding versions of the measure, even after the passage of the 1962 Drug Control Act which covered the testing of new prescription drugs in comprehensive fashion. I left this section in, however, because I think that in evaluating drugs or devices intended to prevent or cure cancer, the Government must have every possible assistance—the complete facts—everything about the treatment—without any holdback of information, so a determination can be made of the circumstances under which it can be tested and used. This section, by the way, would apply primarily to racketeers in health, not legitimate researchers.

PRETESTING COSMETICS INCLUDING A DELANEY ANTICANCER CLAUSE

Section 8 is the basic foundation on which the rest of the omnibus bill was originally built 5 years ago: the pretesting of cosmetics for safety. It contains an anticancer clause such as we have in the food additives and color additives acts—under it no ingredient could be used in a cosmetic if it could cause cancer in man or animal. The law on cosmetics does not now say that. Under the present law, the Government, as I noted, must prove a cosmetic harmful in order to block its sale; under H.R. 1235, the manufacturer would have to prove the product is safe to use, and, in addition, that it does not contain any carcinogens, whether used in a safe fashion or not.

THE SOAP AND HAIR DYE EXEMPTIONS

This section would also repeal the old special interest exemption for soap, which, since 1938, has been held by the law not to be a cosmetic. Soap manufacturers are therefore subject to nothing more than their own consciences and the risk of possible damage suits for what they might include among ingredients of a soap, and they do not even have to tell you the net weight of a bar of soap.

More importantly, this section of H.R. 1235 also repeals the hair dye exemption now in the law. Hair dyes, too, would have to be proved safe for use before being placed on sale.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS

All of the significant ingredients of a cosmetic item would have to be revealed on the label under H.R. 1235. Actually, there are few secrets in the cosmetic industry; most competing products use similar basic ingredients. But for the woman who is allergic, there is no way but painful trial and error—and sometimes it is very painful—in finding suitable cosmetics. When a formula is suddenly changed in a product she has been using, she is back in the dark, and perhaps also back in the doctor's office. Even the Food and Drug Administration sometimes has to guess what is in a particular cosmetic. The Government should be informed about ingredients, and so should the buyer.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPENAS

Section 9 provides for administrative subpena powers, particularly in developing information for the establishment of food standards. Food standards issued by the Government, in cooperation with the processors, spell out exactly what ingredients must be included in a processed food once it is covered by a particular standard. Subpena power may be needed, too, in pesticides hearings.

CARRIER'S EXEMPTION IS TOO BROAD

Section 10 repeals an exemption enjoyed for many years by the railroads, trucking firms, and other common carriers, which are now relieved of responsibility under the act for transporting adulterated foods, drugs, or cosmetics even when the adulteration occurred as a result of their own actions or omissions. Under my bill, the carriers would continue to be exempt only in those cases where they did not cause the adulteration.

A TOUGH FACTORY INSPECTION PROVISION

Section 11 is a tough factory inspection amendment, giving to the Food and Drug Administration stronger powers in inspecting facilities used and methods used in the manufacture, processing, warehousing, packaging, and distribution of foods, cosmetics, and nonprescription drugs. The Food and Drug Administration already has these stronger factory inspection powers in checking on prescription drugs, under the 1962 act. These powers include the right to see all relevant files, including complaint files, and to check on the professional qualifications of personnel responsible for performing certain technical functions in the plant. Factory inspection is a vital area of consumer protection, even though food and drug inspectors can still touch only a tiny fraction of the existing plants in the country each year. But when they do go into inspect, the inspectors must have sufficient powers to determine whether the products are made in a sanitary, wholesome, or safe manner and if the production controls are adequate to maintain the necessary standards.

CANCER-CAUSING COLORING MATTER IN MEAT ANIMAL FEEDS

Section 12 repeals a special interest exemption in the law for cancer-causing coloring matter used in animal feeds. I have never been able to get an understandable story from anyone on why this exemption was written into the law or what purpose it is to serve. If the Government finds any residue of a cancer-causing feed ingredient in the carcass of meat animals it can order a halt to the use of the animal feed responsible; and it is on this basis that the growth stimulant hormone stilbestrol is now widely permitted to be used in animal feeds. But why should we permit the use of cancer-inducing coloring of animal feeds? The coloring matter serves no nutritive purpose, and no economic purpose. It is certainly not intended to make the feed more appetizing to the steer. It merely helps the farmer to identify different feeds by color. But permitting the use of carcinogenic coloring matter for this purpose is a completely unnecessary and unjustifiable additional hazard. H.R. 1235 repeals this glaring exemption.

U.S. INSPECTION OF FOREIGN FACTORIES

Section 13 would require foreign manufacturers of foods, drugs, or cosmetics who export substantial quantities of their products to the United States to permit on-the-scene inspection by U.S. officials of their plants overseas. At present, only a small percentage of the food, drug, and cosmetic imports into this country are inspected on arrival—on a sampling basis, but not necessarily a random one—to make sure they are safe, wholesome, uncontaminated, and otherwise eligible for admission under our laws. This spot check at the docks is often concentrated on the exports of firms whose products have frequently reflected a high percentage of violations. Under H.R. 1235, the United States could send inspectors to inspect the plants of foreign firms it has reason to believe are not observing proper sanitary or production control practices on foods, drugs, or cosmetics sold here. We would inspect on the same basis as we now inspect American plants. If the foreign plant cannot pass our domestic inspection requirements, or if it refuses to permit our inspectors to enter on request, its products would be denied admission to this country. I think this is a useful reform.

A BAN ON FLAVORED ASPIRIN FOR CHILDREN

Section 14 of H.R. 1235 prohibits the sale in interstate commerce of flavored or sweetened aspirin. This is a new provision, just put into the bill last year for the first time. It grew out of a letter from a St. Louis resident on a completely different matter, but in checking into some facts on household accidents in connection with inquiries made in that letter, I discovered to my amazement and horror that candy aspirin, the special baby aspirin, is far and away the leading cause of accidental poisoning of children under 5.

Aspirin poisoning is the most frequent cause of death among young children from accidental ingestions. The children learn to regard flavored aspirin as candy, and thousands of them each year risk death by eating an entire bottle of flavored aspirin in the belief it is candy. If the mother or the babysitter discovers the empty bottle in time, the child's life is saved, but in 125 to 150 instances a year, the child dies.

There is no reason in the world why a parent cannot crush half of a regular aspirin tablet on a spoon, using the bottom of the bowl of another spoon to do the crushing, and then add sugar and water, or jelly or some other sweetener to the crushed aspirin to help push the medicine down, if the child needs aspirin. The child would at least know this was medicine, not candy. If a smaller dose is desired, there can be "baby" aspirins, but not sweetened to resemble candy.

Since adding this aspirin provision to H.R. 1235, I have heard from mothers from different parts of the country telling me of hair-raising experiences in their homes when children or grandchildren found the flavored aspirin bottle, pried off the so-called safety cap, and ate the contents.

If there were no chance whatsoever of the product being misused by preschoolers—who, after all, cannot read warnings on labels—my bill would permit certain exemptions and waivers under this provision, but otherwise flavored aspirin could not be sold in interstate commerce, except for stocks manufactured prior to a specified date.

CONSUMERS MUST MAKE THEIR VOICES HEARD

I do not think the aspirin makers will like section 14 of H.R. 1235, just as the cosmetic manufacturers do not like section 2 or section 8, and other affected interests do not like other sections of H.R. 1235. The big question to me, however, is whether the people of this country like this bill—enough to join me in fighting for it.

Consumer battles can be won in the Congress only when consumers make it clear they want them won, and will work at it. I call upon consumers everywhere to help pass this urgent legislation, by making their voices heard.

From Cracker Barrel to Computer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a speech presented by our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, at the International Consumer Credit Association Conference on February 20, 1966, at Sacramento, Calif.

Congresswoman MAY's speech, entitled "From Cracker Barrel to Computer," presents a timely and informative discussion of the consumer in America today at the food market.

She points out that modern packaging and marketing have resulted in large-scale gains to the consumer in improved products and lower costs, and that the vast majority of those in the industry are conscientiously and sincerely trying to do the best job possible in serving the public.

I invite attention to Congresswoman MAY's speech. She does an excellent job of "setting the record straight":

FROM CRACKER BARREL TO COMPUTER

(Address of Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, International Consumer Credit Association, 29th Conference, Credit Women's Breakfast Club, Sunday, February 20, 1966, Sacramento, Calif.)

First of all, may I say thank you for this opportunity to participate in the International Consumer Credit Conference. You in your profession have been working with the consumer for many years. So, we have something in common. I was in Congress when the Government discovered the consumer. This was a fascinating experience, especially for a housewife who had been naively assuming that I had been around all the time. Today, however, I can proudly announce to you without fear of contradiction that Mr. and Mrs. Consumer of America have the Government seal of approval and are now officially in existence.

At this point, may I say that my attempts at levity in these opening remarks are only partly serious. I realize that many people view the consumer movement today with both cynicism and suspicion. This is certainly not to be wondered at because so many self-appointed spokesmen for consumers just don't seem to know what they are talking about and so many self-appointed protectors of the consumer have proposed a number of very impractical—even improbable—legislative solutions. But, nevertheless, the consumer movement gains its impetus and popularity because of a vacuum in consumer information—because the abundance of our age has quite honestly brought bewilderment and confusion to the men and women who shop our fabulous modern-day stores. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the food industry. So, this morning I'm going to talk about the consumer and her grocery store.

The National Commission on Food Marketing was created by Congress in 1964 for the purpose of making an 18-month study of our entire food marketing structure. I am a member of this Commission and I have found that one of the most absorbing aspects of the study has been in the area of the tremendous changes that have come about in the way we get food from farm to dinner table as compared to 20 years ago. A little recognized but very important fact is that one day back in 1953 the United States became the first country in the history of the world to develop to the point at which a larger percentage of its work force was engaged in the tasks of distributing goods and performing services than were engaged in the tasks of producing goods. Modern home economists point out that their jobs have changed because the home has ceased to be a production unit and has become instead a consumption unit. What is true for the American home today is also true of the American economy. In the sense of the employment of most of our population, we are a consuming and a marketing nation, not a producing nation and there is a very big difference, which is dramatically illustrated in what has happened to our food industry. In a few short years we have come to the place where only 8 percent of our population is engaged in producing food—and fewer than 10 percent of all the farms in America account for fully half of total American farm sales. In this same span of time, we have seen the disappearance of corner grocery stores—known as the "Ma and Pa" stores—as they are being replaced by the huge one-stop convenience shopping centers. Change in this field is still occurring rapidly and we have no idea yet what the future will bring.

Come to think of it, maybe we do have some idea and I'm not sure that the prospect is so pleasant if it goes this far. I read the other day about a new supermarket in West Germany which has become fully automated. Everything is displayed behind glass. The customer presses a button when she comes in the store. This button turns a turnstile and gives milady a shopping token. She wanders through the aisles looking at the various displays. When she sees something that strikes her fancy as a good idea for the family dinner, she drops the token into the vending machine, punches a button and the machine delivers the product while marking the price on the token. When all her various food items have been chosen, she drops the token into a payment slot and receives her bill. She then puts her money into another machine and it delivers her change. The owners pointed out that this automated type of shopping protected the little woman from "temperamental clerks, coupons, salesmanship, and shoplifting temptations." Columnist Phyllis Battelle made a whimsical comment on this store in one of her columns the other day when she said, "drop your token in the slot and don't be surprised if you hear, 'I'm sorry; the calf's liver you have dialed is not a working liver—please dial a pork roast'."

Well, however little the prospect of this type of progress may please—in food shopping we have come from cracker barrel to computer. And, in the process, the great public issue called consumerism has had a meteoric career.

I think most of us thought we were pretty well off until our protectors began to tell us that our supermarkets are jungles and our department stores usurers. Now people are lining up to get the chance to protect us from all this—and from ourselves. For a number of reasons that I will spell out in some detail here today, I'm beginning to believe that we may need protection from them.

This is not to say that these self-appointed consumer spokesmen are not sincere and nobly motivated. Yet I think that in their zeal to protect us all in the marketplace, they have failed to grasp a number of fundamental truths about the way in which our economy works, and about the nature of poverty, which many of their actions are said to alleviate.

Turning to the marketplace first, it seems to me that my protectors have failed to recognize either the motivations or limitations on businessmen in a consumer-driven society.

Businessmen are not, we should all understand, either better or worse, or more honest or less so, than any other group of human beings. The vast majority are simply trying to do an honest job for their companies, and to earn a profit by performing a service for which a number of people will pay. There are, of course, some quick-buck operators who profit by deceit. There always will be. But most are not dishonest, and much of the appeal of the so-called consumer spokesmen is based on the misconception that most businessmen are cheats.

By the same token, these critics of business have, I believe, badly underestimated the practical, existing legal, and competitive limitations on the ability of a businessman seeking long-term growth for his company to do so through deception.

It should be pointed out for the record that our Nation today is not without laws designed to protect consumers in the marketplace. The Federal Government is involved in 296 programs to help the consumer—118 of these activities directly protect and advance consumer interest. Costs of these programs total over $100 million a year and employ over 7,000 Federal workers full time.

Just as an example, the Federal Trade Commission, after testifying in support of a new packaging and labeling legislation because, according to its Chairman, it was powerless to act in the field, found only a couple of months ago that it has always had, after all, the power to stop cents-off labeling when its effect is misleading.

Important as these existing legal restraints are, however, of equal importance is the power of free choice in a competitive, consumeristic economy.

Most consumer goods industries today are highly competitive and individual items usually earn very small profits per unit of sale. I'm told that in the food industry, for example, it takes 3 years for a typical new product to earn enough money to pay off the initial investment and begin to generate a real profit.

This means that selling this item just once isn't going to get anyone anywhere.

Enough consumers must prefer it over alternatives and choose it regularly—not just once—in order for the manufacturer to get his money back. In other words, it's repeat business—not the one-shot sales—that pay off. And I am convinced by my own experiences as a shopper that businessmen try hard to earn this repeat business, and that those who do not earn it don't get it.

This protection, regulated by competition in the consumer interest, is the very heart of our free enterprise system. I think it's a good system, and one that works.

Yet it is precisely this system which the consumer spokesmen so distrust that they would substitute for it their own judgment about what it is that I, as a consumer, most want. I do not question their sincerity of purpose. I do question their ability to make my value judgments for me. And when faced with a choice between regulation by a system and regulation by men, I'll take the system. It's slow and cumbersome, in many cases, but it is not susceptible to whim or prejudice, and it works.

The second truth about the marketplace that our new consumer spokesmen have often failed to grasp—and this is the reason I'm afraid we may need protection from them—is that it is possible to get more consumer protection than we are willing to pay for.

For another built-in protection we get from our system has resulted from the development of efficient, high-speed machinery and other cost-cutting manufacturing procedures designed to bring consumers the things they want at low unit costs. Since many of the self-styled improvements consumer spokesmen say they want me to have would arbitrarily overturn many of these economies, they would add to the cost of the merchandise I buy. This might give me more protection and certainty, but I question whether it's really worth it.

For example, mass production techniques require that packages be filled and weighed in bulk, rather than individually. This means that 100 1-pound packages of something will weigh 100 pounds, but each individual package may weigh slightly more or less. Actually, in practice, many manufacturers tell me that they purposely overfill their packages so that any errors will be more likely to occur by overfilling than by underfilling. One cereal manufacturer adds a pound of product to every 24 pounds, so that the total weight of a case of any of his products will actually weigh more than the total listed weight of the contents.

Most regulatory agencies have recognized that this mass weighing is an absolute necessity if we are to have the cost-cutting benefits of mass production. It is a compromise that I find easy to understand, but many consumer spokesmen have labeled it a form of economic cheating. In some cases, movements have been started to abolish the current systems of tolerances. I don't think it's worth the cost.

Another example has to do with the size of consumer packages and their net contents. Few consumer spokesmen seem to recognize the fact that the system I find doing so well, and they find so dangerous, has built a high degree of standardization in package size. Again, the reason businessmen have done so is to give their companies—and, because of competitive forces, the consumer—the full benefits of mass production.

Let me give you one classic example on this point. In an attempt to drum up support for Federal control for packaging and labeling one of our chief spokesmen for the consumer in Government refers to a survey she made some time ago. She sent a number of housewives out and asked them to choose from a supermarket the cheapest—in terms of price per ounce—products in several categories. These ladies found a lot of trouble when it came to buying tunafish and now this is being used as an illustration of packaging fraud. I'll be the first to tell you that when you stop by the tunafish display in the average market you are going to have to make some decisions on selection because there are so many different kinds of packs of tuna. And the reason there are so many different kinds is because one is designed to one job and another, another. I buy one kind of tunafish for salad and another type if I am going to use it in a creamed dish. The tunafish packer knows that this is what I want in the way of selection. So, he packs tuna in whole pack and chunks, in oil, and in brine. But each of these different kinds of products is put in the same size can. Naturally, the weight between cans is going to vary because of the way they are packed. Whole tuna in oil, for example, will have a different weight than chunk tuna in oil, even though they are both in the same size can. Why do manufacturers do this? Well, simply so that they can get maximum use out of their can making and can filling machinery and still offer variety to consumers. This makes for good consumer values. Yet, many of the consumer spokesmen cry that this causes confusion and that the weight should be standardized instead. And, they make no mention of the fact that this will add to costs. Again, I question whether this kind of protection is worth the price.

The main thing here is that there has been a sizable and regrettable misunderstanding in the minds of these very well-meaning people about what consumers actually want in terms of value. Most of the consumer movement today is involved in trying to push through legislative and administrative measures to assure that consumers can always find the thing that costs them least per ounce.

But speaking for myself—and, I believe, most other shoppers—I can assure them that, while price comparisons are important, they are only part of the way in which I judge value. Of far greater importance, it seems to me, is the intangible, subjective question of whether or not a product is going to satisfy myself and my family.

If we want bran flakes, for example, the fact that oatmeal may (or may not) be less expensive per pound doesn't really make any difference to me. The value really lies, in that case, in the more expensive product. And making it easier for me to make this—to me—essentially meaningless comparison isn't going to earn my appreciation, especially if doing so has raised the cost of both products.

But, the consumer spokesmen say, this is of vital importance to the poor, and should be done for them. Yet while it is unquestionably true that helping the poor get more for their money is a worthy enterprise, I sincerely question whether the mass of consumer protection ideas will really do the job.

I question this because I believe that the most common consumer protection measures are designed to solve essentially imaginary problems, ignore the real problems, and in any case, mistakenly assume that treating poverty's symptoms will somehow cure the disease.

It is a fact, I believe, that supermarket shopping today does present some problems. But the problems are not those of simple price comparisons. A more basic problem is the fact that businessmen's sheer inventiveness and ingenuity has spawned such a great variety of new and tempting products that how to best use them presents some very real shopping problems.

These are problems of abundance, not foisted off on an unsuspecting public, but offered us in an atmosphere of free choice. Many consumer spokesmen say this itself is a bad feature of the American marketplace and that the confusion this creates should be diminished by somehow restricting the number of new products that come on the market. How this would be done, I do not know. I am convinced that shoppers are more grateful to the businessmen who found they could package au gratin potatoes in convenient packages than they are to their spokesmen who, in the hysterical discovery of the obvious, complain that the packaged form is far more expensive than the ingredients.

The real problem is not standardizing boxes or contents. The real problem is educating and training people to make the best use of the abundance that is available to them. And solving the problem begins with an effort directed at the people, rather than at the products.

The fact that a shopper can instantly recognize the lowest cost item available to her in a certain category is meaningless if she hasn't got enough money to buy the product in the first place. The fact that a buyer of something on credit can instantly recognize a high rate of interest is meaningless to him if he needs the product and can't get the credit at a lower interest rate.

Concerning credit, the pressure is building for passage of credit control bills.

You should know and be pleased that your California statute regulating credit and installment sales of goods and services, which I believe is known as the Unruh Act, is looked up to nationally as a model law. In it, we see reasonable legislation that has met the needs of the consumer and industry exceptionally well. It has furnished to the consumer adequate information upon which to make a decision on choosing the businessman to whom he will offer his credit.

Likewise, conformity with the law has presented no problem to the seller who wishes to follow the precepts of good business. The proof of the Unruh Act's sufficiency is in the fact that it has withstood the acid test of years. Proposals to amend it—allegedly for greater protection of the consumer—have been rejected when the spotlight showed up the fuzzy thinking behind such proposals. These, in fact, were poorly concealed efforts to put a straitjacket on the granting of credit to service retailing's customers and to facilitate merchandising.

For many Americans, poverty is a very real and grinding truth. What can be done to mitigate it should and must be done. But careful listing of price comparisons or interest rates are of little help to someone who can't read or judge. And it seems to me that if anywhere near half the effort currently being expended in the name of consumer protection were spent instead on educational efforts aimed at helping make smart shoppers out of today's buyers, something far more valuable would be accomplished.

Supermarket people tell me that the real secret to wise buying in their stores involves simply building a shopping list around a set budget, and then sticking to the list when you get to the store. Additionally, a recent U.S. Department of Agriculture study shows that shopping a store's specials will allow a consumer to chop 16 percent a year off of her food expenditures.

My point is that manufacturing and retailers, competing for our patronage, offer us values. We will be best off as we best learn to turn these honest competitive efforts to our own advantage, turning the attributes of the system to our own use. Only this way can we get the protection we really need.

I think by now you have gotten the point that I do not believe that we should look at today's supermarkets as a vast wasteland. As consumers we should look with grateful eyes on the supermarket as a bountiful, even though often confusing and bewildering, symbol of the inventiveness and ingenuity of the food industry and the abundance of the Nation's farms. In trying to make a balanced judgment of value, I ask myself, "Am I willing to pay the price of some confusion and doubt for the tremendous variety of wonderful food that is being brought to me and my dinner table in an ever-increasing palatable and convenient form?" My answer is, "Yes, sir," without qualification. I'm glad to pay the price of some doubtful decisions rather than have our American farmers pay the high prices of seasonal and sharply reduced markets. And, as a working wife myself, I would be the last to suggest to 8 million women who divide their time between a home and a job that they can't have the convenient food forms that make their tasks less burdensome. And those are only a couple of the alternatives that would arise if some of the regulators of the marketplace had their way.

Instead, there is a very practical and possible way to reduce the price of confusion in choicemaking—not by turning the Nation's supermarkets into a stultifying panorama of bland similarity but rather educating consumers to the point that they can best use the variety which is offered.

There is a great challenge here to many persons in our country—to the food editors, to the home economists, to our schools, and to our consumer education services at various levels of our government. Too few people are trying to help our consumers buy wisely in relation to their needs. One housewife's "giant economy size" can easily be another housewife's waste. Consumer education should be oriented more to the buying and using of foods than to cooking. Formalized education in our schools has a tremendous challenge to keep pace with new products and services and changing methods or distribution. In only a few schools are they meeting this challenge. As one critic commented the other day, "Virtually all courses in the field are cup-and-teaspoon oriented while we live in a thaw-and-serve age." Yet, just last year, half the population of the United States became 25 years old or younger—40 percent of our population is under 20. Studies show that 80 percent of all teenage girls shop for their family's food and spend one-fourth of the entire family food budget—97 percent of them help plan the meals and help cook them. This is a real challenge in consumer education starting at the teenage level.

And I would like to give the knuckles of industry a gentle rap in this connection. What are they doing in the field of consumer education? As one industry spokesman admitted the other day. "We have, perhaps, become so interested in engineering change that we have neglected to tell anybody about the significance or implications of the changes in terms of the basics of shopping cart and kitchen economics, rather than dated statistics."

The whole point I am trying to make is that an educated consumer is a protected consumer. And a dynamic, changing, keenly competitive food industry makes a happy and fortunate consumer.

To quote myself from a speech made some time ago:

"All the government officials and all the government laws in the world are as nothing compared to the impact Mrs. America has on Mr. Manufacturer and on Mr. Storekeeper when she makes up her mind to buy one brand over another. And when she makes that decision, no power on earth can save the businessman or the producer of the product who made the mistake of displeasing her. She has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring, and in regulating American business enterprise.

"And, to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more government regulations and laws—I want to protect her freedom of choice."

Will Russia Win the Wet Space Race?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, increasingly evidence is mounting that this Nation's merchant marine and fisheries industries are in trouble. In shipbuilding, the United States now ranks 12th among the shipbuilding nations.

Of the fish consumed in this country, 62 percent are imported. That means $500 million flows out of this country to pay for fish imports each year. America's fishing industry is now catching only the same amount of fish that it did in 1948.

My distinguished colleagues on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, of Florida, and Representative HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts, recently studied the marine, oceanographic, and fisheries efforts of the Soviet Union and Poland.

The findings of this firsthand study are laid out in a fine article by Representative ROGERS in the March 1966 issue of Under Sea Technology magazine. The facts in this article clearly show that the United States is facing stiff competition from Russia in the "wet space race."

Mr. Speaker, 71 percent of the earth's surface is water, and we cannot ignore the competition of the Soviet Union for leadership in the productive use of the high seas.

WILL RUSSIA WIN THE WET SPACE RACE?

(By Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, of Florida)

More and more attention is being focused on the race between the United States and Russia for conquest of outer space. While many of our national resources have been diverted toward America's flight into space exploration, there remains an equally vital area of discovery which is virtually untapped.

The exploration of the seas represents a reservoir of benefits which lay at our feet. We have only to walk to the shores of the United States to have access to waters which, with technological effort, will yield countless advantages.

The Russians are already running in this race for ocean conquest. It is time this Nation quickened its pace. Progress in the "wet space race" is swift, and unless we move with new fervor soon we may be too late.

Congressman HASTINGS KEITH, Republican, of Massachusetts, and I reached the above conclusion after a recent inspection tour of ocean science, fisheries, and merchant marine installations behind the Iron Curtain. The inspection was made at the request of Chairman EDWARD GARMATZ (Democrat, of Maryland), of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Russia's progress in the ocean has been phenomenal. Since World War II the Soviet Union has emerged as a powerful maritime nation. Shipbuilding has become a matter of such high priority in Russia since the war that today nearly 90 percent of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old. By comparison, the United States has declined as a maritime power, and today almost 90 percent of our commercial fleet is 20 years older or more.

Shipbuilding is of such low priority in the United States that last year this Nation fell three places in world rank to become 12th among shipbuilding nations.

Today more than 24 percent of the ships are being built for the Soviets. As of last October, 1965, the U.S.S.R. had 464 merchant ships of 1,000 gross tons or more under construction or on order. As of this same time, the United States had only 39 such vessels on order or under construction. Pathetically, our shipyards are operating at half capacity.

But shipping capacity is only one aspect of Russia's progress in the seas. Below the surface the U.S.S.R. is making strides which must be brought closer examination.

The Soviet Union has placed a very high importance on oceanography. Although there are a number of phases of ocean science in which the United States is clearly ahead, we must be aware that the Soviets are not complacent. On the contrary, oceanography is fast becoming a major scientific effort in the Communist world. Centrally directed by the state, Soviet sea scientists are dedicating themselves to firmly establishing Russia as the ruler of Neptune's kingdom.

Just how does the United States measure up to Russia in the science of the seas? Russia claims some 1,500 oceanographers backed up by 7,500 or more men and women working full time in the field. The status of sea scientists is being upgraded, and the field is being made more appealing to young people. It should be mentioned also that the Soviet Institute of Oceanography has been expanded five times its original size in the past 15 years.

It has been estimated that the United States has approximately 700 oceanographers with some 2,000 to 2,500 full-time technicians supporting them. We are increasing our ranks by approximately 10 percent per year. Soviets may actually be increasing 15 percent per year. In any event, it must again be emphasized that the Soviets are not complacent, but eager for growth in oceanographic personnel. Neither must be satisfied, and we must take steps to make ocean science a more popular field.

As for organization, the U.S. Government operates oceanographic programs from 18 or 20 Federal agencies. Of course universities, laboratories, and industrial research supplements the Federal effort. By comparison, the Soviet Union places all oceanography under the control of the state. However, it was stated during our visit in Moscow that 8 to 10 organizations were involved in the marine science field.

In our discussion with the Russians, it was revealed that a reorganization in the ocean science field is in progress. A National Council for the Utilization of the Resources of the Sea has recently been created. A new director of the Institute of Oceanology, Dr. A. S. Monin, has been appointed, and I think we can predict a greater emphasis is to be given to basic research.

While the United States has maintained a lead in basic scientific research, it has been generally regarded that the Soviets have emphasized the applications of research, rather than basic investigations. In certain phases of applied research the United States maintains a lead. The field of oceanographic instruments is one in which this Nation is ahead. Also, the use of computers applied in the assemblage of marine science data is an American achievement, though under study in the Soviet Union today.

In discussion, Soviet authorities noted that the Institute of Oceanology is becoming more interested in sea-air interactions, particularly in support of weather services. The institute's new Director Monin is a specialist in this field.

In the U.S. Government we have just witnessed the establishment of the Environmental Science Services Administration within the Department of Commerce. ESSA now combines various functions within the U.S. Weather Bureau and U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey. Also newly created within ESSA is the Institute for Oceanography, under the capable supervision of Dr. Harris B. Stewart, Jr.

The United States can also claim a lead in deep-sea mining, drilling, and deep-sea research vehicles. However, the Soviets maintain a fleet submarine, the *Severyanka*, for fisheries research. The vessel is fitted with floodlights, portholes, and closed-circuit TV for observing undersea life, and also monitors the operation of fishing gear.

It is evident that the U.S.S.R. has taken a clear lead in the important field of fisheries. Numerous imaginative experiments have been conducted by Soviet fisheries experts, one of which involves the use of explosives detonated near the ocean floor to bring food to the surface, replenishing exhausted food sources.

In short, the Soviets have made fishing a science. By application of ocean science data, the U.S.S.R. landed 4.48 million tons of fish in 1964, increasing nearly one-half million tons over its 1963 catch. Conversations with officials of Soviet Ministry of Fisheries brought forth that the 1965 catch reach 5.6 million tons. The 1966 goal is 6.2 million tons, with 1967 having even a higher goal.

By comparison, the U.S. fishing industry has declined in relation to those of other nations. Our catch today is about what it was in 1948. Our share of the total world catch has slipped from 12.4 percent in 1948 to less than 6 percent today. Furthermore, 62 percent of the fish consumed in this country is imported, and each year Americans spend over $500 million on fish imports.

The Soviets have also experimented with "fish farming." One of their achievements involved the airlift of 60–70 million pink salmon eggs and fingerlings from the Far East where they were transplanted in the Barents Sea. Also, work was underway in 1965 to transplant the king crab.

The Soviet fishing fleet makes extensive use of refrigerated and canning equipped mother ships which accompany trawlers to sea. The catch is tranferred from the trawler to the mother ships, which are, in effect, floating fish factories. Processing the catch at sea also enables the trawlers to remain at the fishing grounds for extended periods instead of returning to port to offload the catch in order to avoid spoilage.

Approximately 80 percent of the Soviet catch is obtained on the high seas, and 20 percent from inland waters. Concentration on the seas appears assured as information gained on our tour suggests that the U.S.S.R. will expand operations in tropical waters. The increasing number of Soviet trawlers in the South Atlantic, Caribbean, and Gulf of Mexico near Florida and Cuba offers additional evidence of this phase of Soviet fisheries operations.

Pollution of inland waters is a concern in the U.S.S.R. just as it is here in the United States. However, in Russia water pollution is a criminal offense. Authorities cited a case involving a plant which dumped improperly treated waste into a nearby stream, killing sturgeon fingerlings. The plant manager was jailed.

The Soviets have been successful in fisheries because they have applied to their fisheries operations the tools learned in marine research. With this success, they are encouraging more oceanographic effort.

In the United States today there is an emerging awareness on the part of the public, the Congress, and the industrial community that the oceans represent a vast untapped resource. This emerging awareness is greeted by an enthusiastic community of scientists and ocean technologists eager to move into a concentrated campaign to promote full utilization of the seas.

The Congress has completed all but final action on legislation which will provide an overall national survey, or inventory, of our oceanographic capabilities. If the United States is to move ahead in sea explorations, it is advisable to know in which direction. Once our national inventory has been completed, the legislation requires that specific recommendations for (1) goals to be reached, (2) an organizational plan, and (3) funding be made to the President and the Congress.

About 71 percent of the earth's surface is water, yet today we know more about outer space than the earth's inner space. This Nation stands at the threshold of man's final conquest of his environment. Is a man on the moon more vital than man in the sea? Will these men be Americans, or Russians?

The crucial question is one which must be answered. The answer must come soon. Our very survival may depend on what that answer is.

Financing of Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable W. R. "BOB" POAGE of Texas addressed the 24th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at Las Vegas, Nev., on February 15. Our colleague, who is vice chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, is one of the great and dedicated champions of REA, that agency of national policy that turned on the lights in rural America. There is now before the Nation and the Congress an issue on the future financing of REA undertakings. Mr. POAGE, in his February 15 speech, explored this issue and other aspects of REA with such understanding and in such depth that it is my thought each Member of this body should have the opportunity to study his discussion as we prepare to deal with matters relating to this agency. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I am inserting Mr. POAGE's speech in the RECORD. The text follows:

FINANCING OF ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

(Speech of Congressman W. R. POAGE at National Rural Electric Cooperative Association annual convention, Las Vegas, Nev., Feb. 15, 1966)

It has been a good many years since I have had an opportunity to speak to the representatives of the rural electric cooperatives of this country, although I have done so many times in years gone by. I have always enjoyed the opportunity to meet with you and I am happy to be able to exchange views with you today.

In the past it was always in order to review the fine repayment record of the cooperatives. It is still in order and that record is still just as impressive—99.99 percent of all outstanding REA electric loans are today current or paid in advance. Out of almost $6 billion loaned to electric cooperatives, REA has, since its inception more than 30 years ago, lost less than $40,000—only $37,230 to be exact. And on January 1, 1966, there was only $106,707 due by cooperatives which was delinquent. These are still impressive figures. I doubt that they can be equaled by any lending agency of comparable size. The only trouble is that the public—including the private utilities who so long predicted financial disaster—has come to accept this really magnificent achievement as routine—but I still think that the co-ops are entitled to a word of commendation for a great performance, and I congratulate every one of you on a job well done.

For my discussion I have been assigned one of those all inclusive titles: "A Congressman Looks at the Rural Electric Program." Maybe we should have said that Congress or a congressional committee is going to look at the rural electric program, for that is what I expect will happen.

I don't have the answers. I just know, as you know, that we better come up with some good answers as to how we expect to finance our program in the future. I know that some committee of the Congress is very likely to look at the program. I think that the Credit Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture is the logical committee to do this. It was the predecessor of this subcommittee which, under the Honorable Stephen Pace, of Georgia, established the 2 percent interest rate. I was a member of that committee. I am chairman of the present Credit Committee. I know that we face some difficult decisions, but I hope that they are referred to our subcommittee. We can't promise any miraculous solutions, but we can promise a sincere concern and a deep desire to solve these problems. We can assure you of a fair hearing.

Basically, the problem of REA financing is: How can the thinnest areas pay the same rate for capital as can be paid by the high density areas? You understand this problem and so do the private utilities, but when the private companies advertise the fact that they are paying 4 or 5 percent for money and that the REA-financed cooperatives are paying only 2 percent, the uninformed citizen is sure to feel that he, as a taxpayer, is being mistreated, and he is very likely to pass that feeling on to his Congressman, who, even today, is far more than likely to come from an urban area, and after a few years of the so-called one-man, one-vote mandate of the Supreme Court, there will be very few rural Congressmen indeed.

The thing which both the taxpayer and the Congressman is likely to overlook and the thing the private utility is certain to ignore is the fact that the electric cooperatives have an average load factor of just under 3 customers per mile, while the private utilities have a load factor of just over 30 customers per mile—more than 10 times that enjoyed by the co-ops. Of course, there are extra costs associated with these heavy loads, but I have yet to hear any reputable engineer suggest that it was not far cheaper to serve 30 customers with 1 mile of line (expensive though that line must be) than it is to have to build 10 miles of line to serve 30 customers.

The brutal fact is that the co-ops always have, and still do, serve the highest cost areas of the nation. A possible solution, but one which would hardly be acceptable to the private utilities, might be to raise REA interest rates and let REA-financed cooperatives serve the more populous cities. I am not suggesting this as a solution, but I think that if it is to be rejected, that the co-ops are entitled to some more constructive suggestions from the utility companies than anything I have yet heard; and if they refuse, then I feel that we should give real serious consideration to bringing the co-ops into town.

The next item which both taxpayers and Congressmen are so likely to overlook—and which no power company is ever going to explain—is the fact that private power companies do not pay interest. Their customers do, but not the stockholders. I don't say this critically and I would not want to leave this statement to be interpreted as a half-truth. What I am pointing out is that under our "utility concept" the private utility has the right to charge a rate high enough to pay a fair return on all of its investment—and I am not finding fault with the concept. I am only pointing out that the greater the investment ("prudently made"), the greater the charge which the company can demand and collect.

Why then should the stockholders of a private utility be relucant to invest an extra million dollars? The cost of that money is a cost of doing business and will be paid by the customers—not the stockholders. And if the company loses money serving these rural areas, all it has to do is to charge those losses to its city customers, not to the stockholders.

In the case of the rural cooperative there are two deterrents. First, of course, is the fact that their stockholders and the customers are one and the same people and they must, therefore, pay all of the service charges on the borrowed money which the stockholders in the private utility pass on to their customers; and, second, and often even more important—with the very thin customer per mile ratio on the rural lines, these extra costs are very likely to drive the price of the service to the point of diminishing returns.

As I see it, the costs of a rural electric cooperative will fall into three categories, each of which will account for roughly one-third. These are: (1) The cost of electricity, whether purchased or produced. (2) The cost of labor. And, finally, (3) the capital costs which are represented by debt service. Certainly, I am not saying that debt service is going to represent exactly one-third of every co-op's costs, but over the country it won't miss it very far. If these interest costs were doubled or tripled, as some suggest they should be, it is obvious that all of the weaker co-ops would succumb.

There are, undoubtedly, some REA financed co-ops which could function on 4-percent interest. But there are mighty few who could today borrow in the money market at 4 percent. Most of the very strongest cooperatives would more likely have to pay 5 percent and the weaker ones would likely have to pay 6 percent. There are a number of co-ops who could doubtless adjust their rates so that they could pay 3 percent, but there are still a great many who must either continue to get 2 percent money or get help from some other source. I do not know just how many will fall in each group and I doubt that anyone knows until we try a change in rates. Of course, everybody will try to prove that he cannot pay the higher rates, but I think that we must demand fair and realistic cooperation from REA borrowers, just as we should require it of the private power companies.

It has long been suggested that the rural electric cooperatives should get their financing just like other farm co-ops do—through the banks for cooperatives. This is a very attractive line of thought and it has been considered by our subcommittee in the past. I think it will be given further study in the future. Probably no one feels that the existing banks for cooperatives could make these loans, but could we not create a new entity on this general pattern?

The real problem is: Now do you transfer such a bank to private ownership? Presumably it would be set up with Government capital as all of the existing farm credit institutions were. How, then, do you pay out the Government capital? All of the farm credit institutions are cooperative in nature. The land banks were at first capitalized with Government money, but they charged enough interest to make a profit. That profit was used to pay off the Government stock. They are today wholly farmer-owned. The FFCA's and the Intermediate Credit Banks have had a rather similar experience, except that they have deliberately added to their rather high interest rates and have sold extra stock to their customers for the specific purpose of retiring the Government's investment and today they are on the verge of complete farmer ownership. There are some electric cooperatives which could buy some of this stock, but unfortunately, most cooperatives have no reserves to invest in such stock.

For many years we all believed that it was impossible for the banks for cooperatives to charge enough interest to pay out any stock, but after we finally undertook the change, we were all happily surprised. The banks for cooperatives are now moving toward user ownership with surprising rapidity. It seems to me that this indicates that there is a real opportunity to apply the same principles to a system of cooperative credit for the long-time financing of the rural electric cooperatives.

Doubtless one approach would be for the Government to guarantee the debentures of such a credit bank. This would enable the bank to get money a little cheaper. Historically, we have charged one-half of 1 percent for such a guarantee. It would seem to me that in the face of such an enviable repayment record as I quoted a while ago, that the Government would do well to forgo this charge. This would give us cheaper money but it would still leave the cost far too high for many co-ops, and would seem to offer very little opportunity for the bank to pay out the Government stock.

I know that your association, as well as the REA itself, has been working on these and similar ideas. I hope you will bring them before our committee. We will be glad to consider them and to try to work with you to foresee any pitfalls and to suggest any refinements.

One of the features of our legislative process of which I am most proud is the opportunity afforded by our committee system to secure the combined knowledge, judgment, and experience of legislators and laymen as well as that of the experts. I can again assure you that our subcommittee welcomes the opportunity to study these problems with you, and for that matter, with any sincere representatives of the private power industry.

Maybe there is another and a better approach than that of a cooperative credit bank. If there is, we want to study it. If we are to use cooperative credit, we know, as you know, that there must be realistic appraisals of the interest-paying ability of different cooperatives. Can this ability be fairly appraised? Can it be classified? Can we avoid hurt to the needy cooperatives? Just what rates can different cooperatives pay without putting an unfair burden on their members as consumers? How fast should we try to transfer stock from the Government to the cooperatives? And just how will the less profitable cooperatives ever acquire membership and stockownership in such a bank?

Surely, you can see the multitude of questions which must be answered. You have an obligation to help find the answers, but the obligation is not yours alone. REA has long recognized its obligation, and Mr. Clapp will follow me at this rostrum. I am sure he will make suggestions. Every citizen taxpayer has an obligation and an opportunity to serve himself by serving his country, and possibly, above all, the private power companies here probably have their last chance to prove their sincerity by coming forth with some real broad-gaged suggestions.

They have as much at stake as you do. The time is long since past when they can holler "subsidy" as if that were enough to condemn any other supplier. Surely the day has come, or is about to come, when the public is to understand that no matter how they get their power—whether from a public or private system—that the public must pay all costs, and that the ability of the private companies to lump all costs and a fair profit into the customer's bill can result in just as burdensome subsidy as a favorable Government interest rate. Surely the consumer is more interested in the results reflected in his monthly bill than he is in the name applied to the process used in the billing.

Remarks of the President on Receiving the 1966 Goddard Trophy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday a group of distinguished Americans met at the White House to witness the reception by the President of the 1966 Goddard Trophy Award.

That was a day of great achievement in our national space program. Astronauts Neil Armstrong and David Scott took off on their historic flight into space, a flight that proved to be a demonstration not only in the achievement of our planned objective, the docking of the Agena, but of the outstanding professional capabilities of the two astronauts in overcoming a very hazardous situation. I need not go into the details of the flight because I am sure that we are all familiar with them.

What is important is that the President again reaffirmed our principal objectives in exploring that were enunciated first by President Kennedy in May 1961. The President said:

> In accepting this award this morning, I want to declare once again that so long as I am in public office, I am going to do everything within my power and my capability to prevent us from falling behind. We intend to land the first man on the surface of the moon and we intend to do this in the decade of the sixties.

I think the President has made it clear in no uncertain terms to the rest of the world that we are not faltering in the achievement of our goals in space, and that we remain just as determined as we were in the beginning in the great adventure of landing a man on the moon before the end of this decade. I feel that it is a great privilege to place in the Record the remarks of the President delivered on the occasion of the award of the trophy. These are the words of our President in action. They clearly show the intent of the American people that space will be explored for peaceful purposes, for the benefit of all mankind, and for a future that is made more secure for the generations to come.

The remarks of the President follow:

Remarks of the President on Receiving the 1966 Goddard Trophy Award

Mrs. Goddard, Dr. Pickering, Mr. Webb, Mr. Vice President, Congressman Miller, distinguished guests, I have been visiting with our Ambassador from France, who has just returned. We were just watching the space shot and wondering how Jim Webb was making out. We didn't realize that we were going to detain you.

Mrs. Goddard, we know this is a very happy occasion for you. Back in 1926 your husband with you at his side, launched the world's first liquid fueled rocket on his Aunt Effie's farm in Auburn, Mass.

I have always felt that we have some things in common. My wife has always been at my side in every endeavor of any moment that I have ever undertaken. We had our Aunt Effie and she just came back from her farm in Alabama last week.

Today, exactly 40 years later, you and the billions of people of the world, could see this morning, just a few moments ago, another vindication of the great hopes and great dreams of that great man to whom you were married.

I sat there with the Secretary of State and the former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and others, as we saw this rocket based upon the principles that he discovered launch men into a new space adventure.

I never see one of these shots without crossing my fingers and saying a prayer for Jim Webb and the men in his organization, because we never know what the outcome will be. I think if I were writing my own epitaph this morning I perhaps would prefer to be remembered for the period I was Vice President more by this one thing than any other.

President Kennedy asked me to attempt to organize and give direction to the Space Agency. I interviewed about 19 men throughout the United States and finally selected Jim Webb. I prevailed upon him to come and begin this undertaking. I remember calling President Kennedy from my office in the Capitol and I said, "I think we have the man. His name is Jim Webb."

He said, "Bring him on in and we will announce it in a few minutes." Within 15 minutes from the time I called the President originally, Jim Webb was out here being announced as the new Space Administrator. I have been very proud of that announcement every moment since.

Your modesty, humbleness, your great executive ability, your great courage, your Marine spirit and determination have made us the envy of all the world, Mr. Webb, and we salute you publicly.

Dr. Goddard was a great prophet, a true prophet. To some it seems almost incredible that a year before Lindbergh had ever flown the Atlantic he was dreaming and working to take us up into the stars. Like so many prophets, he was long without honor in his own country, but he never lost faith because his faith was founded on fact. He could turn aside the rebuffs of the shortsighted; he could laugh at the jokes of his detractors. I just wish today that he could be here with us to observe what we have just seen. I don't think he would be the least surprised by the progress we have made. I think that he would be very proud.

This is a very proud moment for me, too, Mrs. Goddard, and you have helped make it so. I never had the scientific vision that your great husband had. I did not foresee the Space Age nearly as early as he did. I am rather glad I didn't because I was the subject of enough rebuffs and talks about basketballs and things like that that I did many years later. But when it did become apparent that the space age was upon us, I did, with the help of Congressman Miller and the Vice President and others, try to do something about getting this Nation interested.

I was looking at some of the columns the other day written by our leaders in Government commenting upon our meeting of the Democratic caucus where we devoted our entire caucus to the subject of space and its future. I remember how complimentary they were about that particular meeting. They still are being published, too. They appear in the papers every now and then, these same people.

We said to our Senators, then, that we had to make up for a lot of lost time, time that was lost in part, because this Nation would not listen to your husband. We have not wiped out all the deficiencies in our program yet, but we have caught up and we are pulling ahead.

In accepting this award this morning, I want to declare once again that so long as I am in public office, I am going to do everything within my power and my capability to prevent us from falling behind. We intend to land the first man on the surface of the moon and we intend to do this in the decade of the sixties.

The whole Nation now understands the true significance of America's space efforts. The story of man's advancement down through the ages is, of course, the story of his victories over the forces of nature. The health and comfort he enjoys, the leisure he possesses, the abundance of food he eats, all of these are the result of his unending determination to probe the secrets of the world around him.

In 1958 when we introduced the legislation to create the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I said in the Senate at that time, "I believe that the development of the space age will bring the beginning of the longest and greatest boom of abundance and prosperity in the history of man."

Time is bringing out that belief. The future belongs to those of faith, daring, and vision. I am proud, today, to be in the presence of the men who represent that future and who have come here to be with us on this occasion: Vice President Humphrey, who has given great seriousness and vital leadership to our space program in the Nation; Congressman Miller, who from the very beginning has been in on the first launch; Senator Anderson, who is not with us; Congressman Albert Thomas, who left us just a few days ago.

All of these men had the faith, daring, vision, and the spirit of adventure that has brought us where we are.

Dr. Pickering, I believe this is the real meaning of the space age which we are in. I thank you and Mrs. Goddard for making this event possible.

Now as we return to our schedule for the rest of the week, I know that each of us is saying a silent prayer for Scott and Armstrong. May God be with you and them.

Superior Testimony Cites Need for National Traffic Safety Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the forthright and meaningful testimony of our distinguished colleague from the Fourth District of Georgia, Mr. James A. Mackay, before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which recently held hearings on legislation to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency.

His testimony not only clearly assesses the need for Federal responsibility to curtail the traffic murders on our highways, but he also articulately focuses on the need for rapid expansion of research and laboratory facilities. His testimony pinpoints the necessity of coordination and cooperation among all levels of government and private industry in order to meet successfully the growing public demand for action.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Record Mr. Mackay's testimony urging the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency for all to read in its entirety:

The Case for a National Traffic Safety Agency

(Statement of Representative James A. Mackay, Congressman from the Fourth District of Georgia, March 15, 1966, before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear before our committee this morning to present arguments in support of the 29 bills which have been introduced in the House of Representatives which would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency.

I point out that this proposal also has been sponsored by 15 Members of the Senate, making a total of 43 Members of this Congress who favor our approach. The support for our bill is bipartisan in both the House and in the Senate and the Members represent all parts of the Nation. They come from 28 of the 50 States. A list of them is attached (marked exhibit A).

That there should be such widespread support for this new approach to the old problem of what to do about losses from traffic accidents on our streets and highway is in itself significant.

It is significant, in my opinion, because it reflects a widespread feeling inside and outside of the Congress that whatever we may have done to date by public and private means has not sufficed, that we can do more, that we must do more, and that this Congress should act now to curb and reverse the accelerating death, destruction and disaster which are reported in the daily press as commonplace occurrences.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation currently before this committee is a vital step in the right direction, but it is only the first step if this 89th Congress is going to enact the most significant traffic safety legislation in the 70-year history of the commercial automobile. And it is toward this end that I have labored.

We do not know all the answers. The bills we are considering all need deep study and review by the committee and by appropriate witnesses. There are many questions that remain unanswered.

Nevertheless, we must not permit this legislation to lapse into the void which has swallowed up so many prior attempts. It is almost inconceivable that for over 40 years programs of national action to combat the traffic accident have been proposed by the executive and legislative branches and the result has been only a few minor laws dealing with limited aspects of the total picture.

THE LOSSES

There is no longer any doubt in the minds of our citizens or of the Members of this Congress that the carnage on our highways cannot continue. The National Safety Council reported recently that last year 49,000 American citizens—men, women, and children—were killed as a result of traffic accidents, 180,000 received disabling injuries, and direct economic losses totaled $8.5 billion. Little comfort can be taken from a slight decline in the rate of deaths and injuries when you consider that over 9 million new cars entered our streets and highways last year, and even more will probably be added this year.

The death toll for last December alone was 4,940, up 10 percent from December 1964, and was reported to be the worst single month on record.

In spite of the concern and work on the part of many organizations and individuals there is no reason to believe that these losses will remain steady or will decline without more positive action. After years of effort the President's Committee for Traffic Safety reports that a study of 49 States shows that only 72 percent of what has been called a minimum traffic safety program has been attained; and that 782 cities having a population of over 10,000 show an average performance of only 56.1 percent of the minimum program.

Perhaps the most conspicuous reason for our tragic losses is the fact that not in city, State, or Federal Government are we doing the minimum of what should be done based on our present knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, our present predicament must be considered in the context of the traffic accident, its history, and the nature of our attempts to deal with it.

THE NATURE OF THE TRAFFIC ACCIDENT

The traffic accident is perhaps the most unanalyzed phenomenon in our society. While we have data gathered, data processed and computerized subjects from how to run a railroad to how to select a date, we have failed to gather, process and make use of computers in getting at the primary causes of traffic accidents. Our investigations, such as they have been, have often been made by individuals without adequate training, and their investigations have been considered in the main by insurance officials, lawyers, and police who seek to determine legal liability, or law violations, not true causation.

Furthermore, the traffic accident is usually an individual occurence involving only a few people, one, two, or three vehicles and is undramatic except for those immediately concerned. These accidents occur around the clock, around the calendar and around the country. But they are cumulative.

Someone pointed out recently that if we had a major air crash every day in the year, in which 100 lives were lost, the toll would fall far short of our present traffic losses.

Next month we hope to have 52,000 men, women, and children in our new Atlanta stadium for the opening of the Atlanta Braves. If some unprecedented catastrophe engulfed these people in violent, sudden, agonizing and in some instances flaming or lingering death, we would mobilize our Nation as never before. The same result will happen this year on our highways but the mere fact that these deaths do not occur simultaneously and have had "precedents" seems to account for our inaction.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the traffic accident is the result of the interaction of complex factors in a complex environment. When an accident occurs on a busy roadway, the policeman on duty must contend with such problems as medical care for those injured, maintaining the flow of traffic, removal of the debris and preparation of accident report forms. He has little time to be concerned with the psychological, physical, emotional, engineering, and environmental factors that lead to an accident and little training to aid him in identifying them. Without basic data prepared by highly qualified individuals or even by teams of experts true analysis is not possible.

THE TRAFFIC ACCIDENT—THE BLOODY RECORD

Traffic accidents have quite a history. Although a few motor vehicles were around in the 19th century, the traffic accident was not much of a factor because there were so few vehicles. The first fatal accident is reported to have occurred in New York City in 1899 when a gentleman helping a lady to get off a street car was struck down.

The following tabulation prepared by the Public Health Service shows the steady increase in fatalities although the rate per 100,000 population has declined after reaching a high of 30.8 in 1937:

Motor vehicle deaths

		Rate per 100,000 population
1915	(6,600)	5.8
1925	(21,900)	16.8
1935	(36,369)	28.6
1945	(28,076)	21.2
1955	(38,426)	23.4
1965	(48,000)	24.7

Projection of these figures even with some decline in the rate indicates that by 1975 we may sustain at least 70,000 deaths a year, according to the National Safety Council. It should be noted that the traffic accident has become the greatest killer of youth between 15 and 25 from all causes including war. And the traffic accident is the fourth killer of Americans from all causes—only heart disease, stroke, and cancer take precedence.

WHY WE HAVE FAILED—DEATH BY COMMITTEE

Students of safety say that the traffic accident slipped up on the blind side of the American people and that the appropriate Federal role has been long delayed for the same reasons.

From the beginning rail, ship, and air passengers were obviously traveling on public transportation in interstate commerce. Wrecks were spectacular. Lives were lost while in the custody of others. There were immediate economic consequences to the carriers if speedy action was not taken to prevent recurrences. The Federal Government adopted and enforced rail, ship, and air safety standards. There was public clamor for action. The carriers looked to the economic consequences of inaction and impressive results were obtained. It is no accident that all deaths in interstate transportation other than traffic deaths last year were less than 4,000, while deaths from traffic accidents pressed toward the 50,000 mark.

Illustrated another way the rate can be shown as follows:

Deaths per 10 billion miles traveled

Train	10
Bus	10
Air	14
Automobile	570

The history of what government has done in response to the automobile is interesting. From the beginning, rules and regulations enacted for traffic safety were done in the village, city, county, or State. Local ordinances regulated speed and later States took a hand in adopting rules of the road, licensing and road construction.

Not until 1924, when the traffic accident claimed nearly 20,000 lives, do we find the National Government taking note of the need for protection from this deadly weapon. Then it was that Secretary of Commerce Hoover called the first National Conference on Street and Highway Safety. That Conference was called a "life and death" meeting. In 1926, the Conference was reconvened, and it approved a model for a uniform vehicle code. It was hailed as an outstanding achievement, but to this day no State has adopted it in toto.

Twelve years later in 1936, when 38,000 died, Congress took note of the traffic death toll by requesting the Bureau of Public Roads to make a comprehensive report on the various elements of traffic safety. The report touched on the same deficiencies that plague us today—the inadequacy of statistics, of research, of uniformity of laws, the need for skilled investigation.

That report lay dormant for 12 years, until the end of World War II. President Truman then called a Highway Safety Conference, which adopted a so-called action program. Eight years later President Eisenhower called a White House Conference and established a President's Committee for Traffic Safety which has sponsored periodic conferences and published reports, the last of which I would like to submit for the committee to consider. Thirty-seven traffic safety organizations serve on the advisory council.

Many worthwhile voluntary organizations under the leadership of the National Safety Council and various State and local groups have talked and worked for traffic safety. The very existence of so many groups dedicated to safety belies the charge that the American people are apathetic.

It is more appropriate to say that all of our efforts put together, no matter how favorably evaluated, cannot contradict that the risk of death, injury, disability, or economic loss from the traffic accident is a serious daily exposure for every citizen who ventures forth from his home and we have not achieved an environment as safe as anyone would desire or as safe as many intelligent people believe we can attain.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE FEDERAL ROLE

What then is the Federal role? Thus far it has been limited, poorly defined, inadequate and inconsistent with the realities of today's world.

In other years traffic accidents could be said to be purely local phenomena. However, with the development of a National System of Highways, with the improvement of motor vehicles, and the extension of the driving environment far beyond the village, city, county, or even State, the traffic accident has become a national phenomenon, a national problem, a destructive factor in interstate commerce, and one that clearly deserves the vigorous attention and response of the National Legislature.

Thus, the 89th Congress must decide through legislation what the national response should be, how the Federal role shall be defined by law, and what resources shall be committed to the effort to reduce these giant losses, which in terms of human suffering and loss of human potential have become incalculable.

PAST ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY AND LEADERSHIP

An examination of the United States Code and the activities of the Federal Government discloses that there is not now and never has been any clear assignment of responsibility.

On March 3, 1959, Speaker Rayburn received House Document No. 93, entitled "The Federal Role in Highway Safety." Secretary Strauss of the Commerce Department transmitted the report on the investigation and study made to determine what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States, pursuant to section 117 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, and under the general authority of section 307 of title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways."

In that report there were only two specific proposals for Federal action. Both have been carried out. A driver records clearance center was established and an Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board was established. The latter was set up in response to the statement that, "A pressing need exists for greater national stimulation of official highway safety efforts. The establishment of an effective national focus of leadership, guidance, and a degree of coordination among the many phases of the official highway safety efforts is justified by the large accumulating toll of life and property lost in street and highway accidents." That was in 1959. The Interdepartmental Board was established in 1960 when the death toll was 38,000. In 1965 the death toll was 49,000. These same pressing needs are with us today.

I point out that the establishment of this Board was by Executive order and not by act of Congress.

The report also states that 16 Federal agencies are charged with highway safety responsibilities but on examination you find that only two departments of Government and one independent agency have done much with regard to the general problem. The others are primarily concerned with safety for internal reasons.

The most explicit responsibility is given the Secretary of Commerce who is directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Committee for Highway Safety and administratively there has been established an Office of Highway Safety in the Bureau of Public Roads. This office, which is concerned primarily with safety in highway design and construction, has had little visibility.

The Division of Accident Prevention of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, received an assignment to work on human factors in traffic safety after the Roberts hearings in 1956. It should be pointed out that former Congressman Kenneth Roberts, of this committee, conducted definitive hearings on traffic safety in 1956, since which time Congress has not clearly defined the Federal role in traffic safety and during which period more than 350,000 more men, women, and children have died.

Characteristic of what I call an oblique approach to traffic safety we passed the Baldwin amendment to the authorization act for Federal-aid highway funds in which the House of Representatives authorized the Secretary of Commerce to withhold funds if the States did not enact comprehensive traffic safety programs by December 31, 1967. The conference committee watered the amendment down by susbtituting the words "should" for "must," and removing the provision under which funds could be withheld.

WHO SETS THE STANDARDS?

The 1959 Department of Commerce report to the Congress stated that, "Another particular need lies in the area of standards, specifications and criteria applicable to the numerous official highway safety functions." Today this responsibility is vested only in the General Services Administration which can determine standards for federally purchased motor vehicles. We merely hope that the industry will incorporate these standards for all automobiles manufactured. I realize that the setting of Federal standards is of vital concern to the automobile industry, but it is also of great importance for the purchaser because he cannot hope to judge whether the car he buys is safe. I have proposed that the standards be for performance of the automobile, not for its total design, because this kind of test places the least restriction on the industry and yet fulfills our need.

Perhaps the members of the committee have noted that our bill does not define crimes or establish sanctions for the setting of standards. Considerable study and thought was given to this issue and resolved in favor of leaving the matter to subsequent sessions of Congress. The plain truth is that data are so inadequate that it is not possible or fair to attempt hard judgments without it. We must avoid recriminations and enlist the support of all who have any part in the total picture. The approach we make is not to look for scapegoats but to recognize that all of us are negligent. The real need is to bring an end to a situation in which thousands of men, women, and children are sacrificial lambs going to slaughter because of our collective social negligence.

WHAT WE SHOULD DO NOW

It is now apparent that this Congress should fix responsibility and establish national leadership for traffic safety. To accomplish this, it is proposed in 44 bills before the Congress that a National Traffic Safety Agency be established.

The purpose is clearly stated in the bill: "It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to reduce the extent of death, injury, and loss of property resulting from traffic accidents by providing the means for a concerted attack on the problem through the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency headed by a highly qualified Administrator; the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Center which shall bring together public and private information and research; and through a national program for traffic safety which shall seek to achieve a uniform national traffic safety environment by means of vigorous application of knowledge as to the principal causes of traffic accidents, deaths, and injuries."

What are some of the things the bill would do?

It will clearly assign responsibility and define the Federal role for the first time in the history of the automobile.

It will personify the leadership in this field through the office of a National Traffic Safety Administrator.

It will provide a National Traffic Safety Center which can bring together information which is now scattered, and conduct and contract for research which is long overdue. It can establish the standards, the criteria, the elements of legal and physical uniformity we must build into a safer national traffic environment.

It will continue to operate a National Drivers License Registry to protect the properly licensed driver from the driver whose license has been revoked.

It will provide such an agency whether or not the proposed Department of Transportation becomes a reality this year.

It will provide for the definition of safety performance standards for motor vehicles so that the car owner can be on notice concerning many fine points of safety which he could not be expected to grasp as a layman.

It would provide Congress with an agency which can be accountable to it and to the American people, and which can update safety standards as our technology advances and changes.

Finally, it will provide an instrumentality for an attack on the traffic accident problem—something sorely lacking now. The bill does not attempt to set forth details. It sets forth an approach.

It does not take away from the States; it provides State and local officials something they do not now have—a place to turn with certainty and assurance—for recommendations for local action which will fit in with a national pattern.

President Johnson is to be commended for his expressed concern in this area and for his executive action in trying to fix responsibility, administratively, now.

But only the Congress can do what should have been done long ago. Unless it takes action, we will continue to be fearful each time we venture forth from our homes that this time we may not return.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today. The challenge of traffic safety is before this Congress and I am proud to serve on the committee that has the major role in the development of this legislation. There is no doubt in my mind that the sooner we activate a National Traffic Safety Agency, the sooner we can expect to have a safer traffic environment.

EXHIBIT A

COSPONSORS OF BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Robert T. Ashmore, Democrat, of South Carolina (H.R. 12553).

Frances P. Bolton, Republican, of Ohio (H.R. 12921).

James C. Corman, Democrat, of California (H.R. 12786).

John C. Culver, Democrat, of Iowa (H.R. 12709).

Harold D. Donohue, Democrat, of Massachusetts (H.R. 12556).

Charles P. Farnsley, Democrat, of Kentucky (H.R. 13267).

Sam M. Gibbons, Democrat, of Florida (H.R. 12592.

George W. Grider, Democrat, of Tennessee (H.R. 12557).

John R. Hansen, Democrat, of Iowa (H.R. 12550).

Julia B. Hansen, Democrat, of Washington (H.R. 12558).

William D. Hathaway, Democrat, of Maine, (H.R. 12554).

Paul J. Krebs, Democrat, of New Jersey (H.R. 13475).

Rodney D. Love, Democrat, of Ohio (H.R. 12551).

Richard D. McCarthy, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 12900).

Hervey G. Machen, Democrat, of Maryland (H.R. 12559).

James A. Mackay, Democrat, of Georgia (H.R. 12548).

Spark M. Matsunaga, Democrat, of Hawaii (H.R. 12560).

William E. Minshall, Republican, of Ohio, (H.R. 13003).

John E. Moss, Democrat, of California, (H.R. 12549).

Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 12905).

John M. Murphy, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 13575).

Edwin Reinecke, Republican, of California (H.R. 12561).

Fernand J. St Germain, Democrat, of Rhode Island (H.R. 12674).

William St. Onge, Democrat, of Connecticut (H.R. 12552).

William F. Ryan, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 13488).

James H. Scheuer, Democrat, of New York (H.R. 13154).

Russell Tuten, Democrat, of Georgia (H.R. 12555).

J. Irving Whalley, Republican, of Pennsylvania (H.R. 12802).

Charles L. Weltner, Democrat, of Georgia (H.R. 12562).

SENATE (S. 2871)

Gordon Allott, Republican, of Colorado.

E. L. Bartlett, Democrat, of Alaska.

Birch Bayh, Democrat, of Indiana.

Alan Bible, Democrat, of Nevada.

Joseph Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois.

Ernest Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska.

Vance Hartke, Democrat, of Indiana.

Daniel K. Inouye, Democrat, of Hawaii.

Gale W. McGee, Democrat, of Wyoming.

Lee Metcalf, Democrat, of Montana.

A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma.

Joseph M. Montoya, Democrat, of New Mexico.

Frank E. Moss, Democrat, of Utah.

Claiborne Pell, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

Housing Problems and Human Problems—Speech Before National Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure and a privilege for me last night to join with our colleague from Georgia, the Honorable Charles L. Weltner, and two outstanding U.S. Senators who formerly served in the House, Senators Margaret Chase Smith and Lee Metcalf, in a panel of the annual meeting of the National Housing Conference.

I have received many comments from housing and redevelopment experts who attended the meeting, on some of the statements I made in my talk, and I therefore believe it will be of sufficient general interest to the Members of Congress to be placed in the Congressional Record. I discussed not only the problems of rehousing the people in our slum areas but also the problems of building human values to go with the higher real estate values. We are already engaged in St. Louis in a project to try to renew the lives of those on public assistance or in need of special help, by providing training in new job opportunities, particularly for the mother on aid to dependent children whose youngsters are old enough to spend most of the day in school. This is one of the issues I discussed.

My statement before the National Housing Conference is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE THE 35TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SUNDAY NIGHT, MARCH 20, 1966

It is always a pleasure for me to attend and participate in the meetings of the National Housing Conference, because so much of my time and effort as a Member of Congress is devoted to the study of legislation in which this organization and its members are vitally interested. It is a particular pleasure for me to be here tonight on the same program with a young colleague on the Committee on Banking and Currency whose political horizons, I am sure, are unlimited, on the basis of outstanding performance already, and also to join with two of the most distinguished alumni of the House of Representatives now serving in the U.S. Senate.

My colleague, Congressman Charles Longstreet Weltner, of Georgia, gave the House one of its most memorable moments of high drama during my whole 14 years there when he went to the well of the House in 1964 to announce that he would vote for the conference report on the Civil Rights bill, and, in a short but truly eloquent speech, explained why. He has done many fine things since then, but that moment in his career will stand out for most of us no matter to what heights he may rise. He is a man of courage.

Senator Metcalf, of Montana, was a first-rank leader in the House, serving on our most important committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, before he followed another Montanan from the House to the Senate, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. Those of us who served with Lee Metcalf in the House will always remember his parliamentary skill and his courage, too.

Courage also distinguishes the political career of Senator Margaret Chase Smith, and it is a delight to share this platform with her. I remember a cartoon I saw a long time ago, back in the forties, showing a newly elected male Senator wrapping a Roman toga about his shoulders and picking up his suitcase to go from the House of Representatives to the Senate, meanwhile waving a farewell to some of the three-name glamorous women then serving in the House—Margaret Chase Smith, Clare Boothe Luce, Helen Gahagan Douglas and, I think, Emily Taft Douglas—and saying "Sorry girls, but woman's place is in the House." Well, as we all know, Helen Gahagan Douglas was Nix-ed in her try; Emily Taft Douglas never tried for herself but helped elect her husband to the Senate instead; while MARGARET CHASE SMITH made it agayne, and agayne and agayne, as FDR would have said it, and every woman in public life is proud of what she has accomplished. She certainly proved the validity of the Civil Rights Act prohibition against discrimination by reason of sex in employment, for no Member of the Senate is more conscientious, or, in fact, has as good a record as she does for attendance and faithfulness to duty.

Thus woman's place is both in and out of the House; woman's place I am happy to add, however, is very much in housing, as Marie McGuire has demonstrated, and as many other women active in this field have also shown, and as our presence here tonight attests. I am wondering if any women were engaged in the General Accounting Office study of the alleged extravagance of having balconies attached to public housing units. As I think all of you know, I would prefer to see public housing units intended for families with children built close to the ground—I shudder at the high-rises—but if you have to build them at all for families with children, then a balcony is no extravagance at all if it can be included within the limitation imposed on public housing unit costs. I'm sure it doesn't take a woman to recognize the validity of this point, but I'm sure that any GAO panel which studied the issue would have difficulty reaching any other decision if a woman, or some women, were helping to make the judgment.

The Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee has been engaged since late February in daily hearings on new housing legislation, and we still have a week to go. Your president, Nathaniel S. Keith, appeared on March 9, and made an excellent witness, as always, even if he did startle us a bit by suggesting that the entire $2 billion $300 million called for in the proposed demonstration cities program should be authorized to be made available immediately upon the enactment of the legislation, at one fell swoop. That is quite a fell swoop.

Nevertheless, it is clear to all of us serving on the subcommittee that the programs envisioned under the Demonstration Cities Act are going to take a lot of money in order to make a dent in the problems of our cities. Pretending that this is going to be just some kind of small-scale pilot project to cost a few dollars here or there would be completely unrealistic. Of course, considering how our gross national product has leaped and soared in recent years, it is obvious that our economy can withstand tremendous additional demands for those public services which are, in effect, self-liquidating or which contribute to further economic strength, but this is always difficult to get across.

The original Urban Renewal Act, back in 1949, was held up to scorn as a budget-buster and economy-wrecker, and yet look at what it has accomplished for the economy of this Nation. If any of you want some more dramatic illustrations of that than you may find in your own cities or in the surrounding areas, come to St. Louis and see what has been done there. We were not a dying city when our renewal began, but we were limping pretty badly in many respects. Using a map of the United States as a dart board, you could hit almost any major city or any one of hundreds of smaller communities with a dart thrown at random and find other illustrations of this same wonderful phenomenon.

But problems remain, and multiply. We have not—not any of us—reached Utopia in urban living. If the traffic doesn't kill us, or the air pollution strangle us, or the polluted water poison us, or the garbage engulf us, or the slums break our hearts, rampant crime always offers us other pathways to violent death.

When we hid our slums away in shantytowns and ghettoes, the so-called respectable elements of the community could breathe easy and pay little attention to the misery in countless slum homes where parents might be trying with all of their strength and cunning to make a warm and decent home for the children. Now, however, the once hidden slums are visible throughout our cities, because we were never able over the years since 1937 to catch up with the need for adequate housing in a greatly expanding urban population. We can see them, we can smell them, and each time we do we can recognize how far we have fallen behind in solving our housing problems.

Let me make it abundantly clear, however; what we did do and what we are doing in the housing field has not been wasted effort. Without those efforts of the past three decades, our cities today would be uninhabitable. But we've got a long way to go to make them pleasant, happy places in which to live. And we have no choice but to try—and that means to continue to experiment with new ideas and new concepts.

But while we use bricks and mortar and cement in new ways, or in improvements on old techniques, we still require a mammoth attack on human apathy—we have got to renew people as well as buildings and neighborhoods.

We all say that, and I'm sure we all agree with that and mean it, but our progress in carrying it out is terribly discouraging. The demonstration cities program would certainly help to dramatize the attack, by providing a more coordinated strategy against want and deprivation and lack of opportunity and neglect of opportunity, and ignorance of opportunity, but even without that far-reaching legislation, look at all the tools we already have that we have been using with too little imagination or commitment. We have permitted people to wallow in misery when a little guidance, or a little push—or some tough-talking insistence on opening their eyes to the opportunities around them could help perform miracles of self-help.

I am aware that the officials who run public housing projects have their hands full with all sorts of problems—leaky faucets, trash in the entranceways, vandalism, missing light bulbs in the corridors, Saturday night obstreperousness, and so on—and probably there aren't enough hours in the day to do all of these chores and still be educational guidance counselor, social worker, home economics demonstration agent, after-class elementary or high school tutor, recreation leader, college counselor, marriage counselor, etc., etc. But there are resources of that nature in the community, if the people who need them are made aware of the services available to them and how to obtain them, and—particularly—are encouraged to want them.

We have manpower development and training; we have adult education; we have vocational rehabilitation; we have the Land-Grant College Extension Service; we have all of the paraphernalia of the war on poverty; we have the visiting nurse service, the Salvation Army, the free inoculation of children against the crippling diseases, the multitude of new educational programs. Are we making sure that every problem family we touch during our day's work—and some of us touch a lot of them—is guided to take advantage of the advantages of living in an American city in the 1960's?

I know that in my case, a major share of my time each day—every day—is spent answering letters from people with problems who are bewildered about their problems and unable to solve them and unaware, in most instances, of the existence of help available to them, whether it be in food stamps, welfare, disability benefits, artificial limbs, training or retraining, scholarships, loans, hospitalization, credit advice—you name the program, Federal, State or local, public or private, which can help people and I am involved in it as a regular thing, directing people who need help to the help available to them. The war on poverty program was set up to do many of these same things, but no matter how much appears in the newspapers or on radio or television about the agencies available and the help they can give, countless people just don't know—don't get the word. Many of them must be taken by the hand and half pushed, half dragged and continuously reassured and encouraged to seek help. How much of this do your people do? Do you feel it is enough? The parents in some families may not always be the best material in the world to work with on the family's upgrading, but if there is any chance at all of reaching the kids to encourage them to try to make their way, it's worth it.

In this day and age, in an economy expanding so fast we are being told in some quarters that it may be "overheating," and with unemployment low enough to worry some experts that we may run out of manpower, I think we have to get a little tougher about redirecting some of our welfare attitudes. You don't dump people out to sink or swim, for those who are career dependents upon the public charge will only sink—and be heavier financial burdens on the public as a result. But once the children are all old enough to be in school most of the day, the mother who has been scraping out a disastrously inadequate living on aid to dependent children should be shaken up enough by someone in authority to want to work and to learn to do worthwhile work. I am afraid we will never see the day when public assistance in most States will meet minimum needs. Therefore, the more we can encourage—push—able-bodied aid-to-dependent-children mothers into contributing to the work force when jobs are abundant at good pay—by teaching them skills to assure a decent wage and good working conditions—the better favor we are doing them and their children, if the community will only provide some after-school supervision and recreation.

I repeat that I am a firm believer in the mother of young children being at home with them. But as the President's Commission on the Status of Women so clearly proved in its report to President Kennedy a few days before his death, most women do work during much of their adult years, with those having the higher skills being most likely to work longest. The big problem in this connection which none of us has solved and which must be solved to get career aid-to-dependent-children mothers out of the house and into the work force, where they can earn decent livings and live like free Americans once all of the youngsters are in school most of the day, is to make sure they have and can afford a decent place to live if they do work. I am thinking now particularly of the family in public housing. What incentive is there for a mother to find a job which will not pay her enough to afford a decent dwelling unit in the private real estate market, but will pay her just enough to make her ineligible any longer for public housing and push her back to the slums? Can we work on that? I think it is urgent that we come up with answers.

Much of our affluence today rests on double breadwinners in many families—husband and wife both working, both earning. Whether we approve or disapprove of this, it is an economic fact of life today. This undoubtedly leads to some child neglect which is visible and deplorable, and probably to a lot of psychological damage not readily seen.

We must recognize the price we pay for things. But with so many families having two incomes in order to achieve what we call the American standard of living, it is almost impossible for a woman on aid to dependent children ever to earn enough to make working worthwhile to her or her children if she is untrained, uneducated and unmotivated. So it is no wonder she may be content—if that is the word—to continue to drift where she is.

For such women and for all so-called "disadvantaged" Americans, to the extent that we can reach them—and many of us can reach many of them—we should knock ourselves out trying to get the word across: the word that there is opportunity today for those who would make themselves receptive to it. There are free classes to learn how to speak in preparation for numerous job vacancies in which good voice and diction are essential; there are free courses in every skill in demand; there is even financial maintenance while learning; there is a crying need for people with warmth and human kindness in all of the disciplines related to health care; there is reward, too. But when the family's standard of living must inevitably fall in its most essential feature—in housing—once the income should go up just a bit, well, we aren't going to accomplish this objective of upgrading very easily. Public housing tenant incomes must have limits and ceilings; but then comes this gap. May I ask a question: Are you "selling" the concept of rent supplements and other ideas of that nature with enough zeal in your communities?

As passed by Congress, rent supplements now may go only to those who are already in the public housing income brackets. So the gap persists. My bill for 3 percent direct loans to nonprofit organizations to enable them to rehabilitate older housing for sale to low-income families covers the same income range as the rent supplement programs. At present, only the below market interest rate FHA loans take things several steps further for the inbetween public and private housing tenants. My next question is this: Are public housing authorities sharing their expertise with, and encouraging, private groups in the community to get into this field to serve families just above the public housing income level but too low for full-cost private housing?

The more I learn about housing, after 12 years on the subcommittee, the more impressed I am on the need for more generalists as well as specialists in the field; for people who when faced with a problem involving a family needing help, will get on the telephone and call around to as many different agencies as can contribute anything at all toward the solution of the problem or problems; people who will come to the conclusion, if no satisfactory solution is found, that new laws or new programs must be enacted to meet unsolved problems; and who will then make sure that those of us who have responsibility for passing the laws—Federal, State, and local—are made aware of the needs and are pressured into doing something about them, if new laws can be of any use in a particular situation.

A lot of you here fit into the category of the kind of good-doers I described. I would like to see the day when everyone who deals with the public in any capacity, as public official or private businessman or worker, would do more than just shrug at a problem he didn't know how to solve for some despairing human being standing before him. If everyone meeting the public and dealing with the public would only recognize that there are people who would be willing to tackle the problem and help solve it—and would intelligently direct the poor soul to someone who would try, at least, to invent a solution if none existed—I think our cities would be far less of a jungle, and far more of a community. Thank you.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 1966

(Legislative day of Monday, March 21, 1966)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. John R. Claypool, D.C., minister, Crescent Hill Baptist Church, Louisville, Ky., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we come into Thy presence now to acknowledge Thy priority in all things and to give thanks for every shape of goodness that comes to us from Thy hand.

Open our eyes, O God, to what Thou art doing in our world, and enable us to join Thee as colaborers in the task of humanizing humanity and bringing every man to the fullness of his personhood.

Guide now the deliberations of Thy servants in this place, and grant to them wisdom and courage and insight as they lead our Nation in the living of these days.

We pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. PROXMIRE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 21, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7423. An act to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations;

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947; and

H.R. 13448. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 7423. An act to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations;

H.R. 13448. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, March 22, 1966, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 969. An act to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants;

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio; and

H.R. 10722. An act to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce the appointment of Senators NELSON and FANNIN to the 50th session of the International Labor Conference, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, June 1 through June 23, 1966.

The Chair also announces the appointment of Senator BYRD, of West Virginia, to attend the dedication of the Honolulu Memorial on May 1, 1966.

The Chair further wishes to announce the appointment of Senators WILLIAMS of New Jersey and JAVITS to the 19th Assembly of the World Health Organization, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, May 3 through 21, 1966.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. PROXMIRE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement to recognize the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Delaware may address the Senate briefly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEWSWEEK SUGGESTS THE CURTAILMENT OF GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the March 28 issue of Newsweek there appears an article by Henry Hazlitt entitled "Slash the Spending." This article points up one of the major causes of inflation—namely, Government extravagance and deficit spending—and makes the constructive suggestion that instead of planning a tax increase the first step should be to curtail expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLASH THE SPENDING

(By Henry Hazlitt)

For the last 5 years the new economists have denied that their policies led to more inflation. Now that they are at last forced to recognize this, they are proposing one of two cures, or both. The first is price and wage controls; the second is another tax increase. The first is not a cure at all but merely an additional disease. The second is harmful and unnecessary.

The simple cure for inflation is to stop inflating. The direct cause of inflation is the increase in the quantity of money and bank credit; the direct cure is to stop this increase. In order to make this possible we must stop the budget deficits. There are two ways to do this. One is to increase taxes; the other to cut expenditures.

But a further tax increase, on top of the $5 billion annual increase in social security taxes that went into effect January 1, and on top of the $6 billion increase just enacted, i.e., on top of the unparalleled tax burden of $145 billion that the American people already carry for 1967, would discourage production and constrict the economy. No one has been more insistent on this result in the last few years than the new economists themselves. They supported a tax reduction when we could not afford it. As we already had an inflationary deficit, the tax cut simply made it greater. It was therefore a sham tax cut. It merely substituted inflation, which President Johnson has called "the most unjust and capricious form of taxation," for other taxes.

HUGE NONDEFENSE COST

And it was the wrong kind of tax cut, both politically and economically. If everyone's taxes had simply been cut by an equal percentage, it would now be politically easy to restore them by a corresponding percentage. But proportionately the tax cuts were greatest on the low-bracket incomes, making income-tax rates even more steeply progressive than they already were. The administration and Congress would therefore not dare now to restore personal income tax rates to their previous levels because they would be accused of making the increase greatest on the lower incomes.

Yet with the clear threat of further inflation, it is imperative that we reduce or eliminate the inflationary gap, i.e., the excess of expenditures over revenues. The best way to do that is to reduce expenditures.

We are being told that this cannot be done, because the present huge spending is necessary to pay for the war in Vietnam. But this is not so. In the cash budget for the fiscal year 1967 total national defense expenditures are estimated at $60.5 billion. Nondefense spending comes to $83.6 billion. If we compare the 1967 budget with 1956, we find that defense costs in this 11-year period have risen only $20.5 billion while nondefense spending has increased by $52 billion. The way to prevent further inflation is to start slashing this enormous nondefense total.

SAVING $10 BILLION

How many billions need to be slashed off? Technically, the 1967 cash budget is already estimated to be in balance. But if (allowing for the dubious accounting gimmicks and the probable underestimate of expenditures) we assume that the real deficit will be at least $5 to $10 billion, then this is the amount that expenditures should be cut.

Anyone who thinks there is anything unreasonable or impossible about a cut of these dimensions need merely look at the increase in nondefense spending in the last few years. For 1967 it is $12 billion more than in 1965, $23 billion more than in 1963, and $32 billion more than in 1961. All we have to do to cut out even $10 billion is to cut out the new spending programs added since 1965 alone. If we don't want to do it that way, we might do it by slashing one or two of the more dubious categories of spending such as the $4 billion for foreign aid, the $3 billion for farm subsidies, the $4 billion for the most expensive roadbuilding program in history, the $4 billion for putting a man on the moon, or part of the $46 billion of welfare spending.

But don't let anyone tell you that we need to levy $5 billion or so of increased taxes (on top of $145 billion already there) to "prevent inflation" or to pay for the Vietnam war. The money is "needed" only to pay for the extravagant Great Society programs of the last few years.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT INDICATING MISMANAGEMENT IN AID AGENCY SHOULD BE RECLASSIFIED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, during his recent testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee Mr. David Bell, the Administrator of the AID program, was asked why so many of the Comptroller General's reports pointing up mismanagement in his agency were given the "secret" classification. I quote the question and Mr. Bell's answer:

> Senator AIKEN. I have just one more question which does affect your territory. That is, Why is it that when the General Accounting Office makes a report on mismanagement of an AID program, that all the vital parts of that report are stamped secret?
>
> Mr. BELL. I am delighted to answer that, sir, because that is not so about the economic assistance program. All of the economic assistance program reports, every one without exception so far as I am aware, is an open report and can be published.

Notwithstanding this clear statement by Mr. Bell another Comptroller General's report was sent to the Foreign Relations Committee with a confidential or secret classification. This report was a devastating document outlining a glaring waste and mishandling in the distribution of food in a South American country under Public Law 480 programs. To prevent its release to the public the State Department has classified this document as secret and confidential.

The Foreign Relations Committee noting Mr. Bell's clear promise that such documents would not be classified, unanimously adopted a motion asking Mr. Bell, Director of the AID program, to remove the classification of this document in order that it could be released to the Congress and the public. In his reply on March 4 Mr. Bell refused to declassify this report. With specific reference to the Comptroller General's report in question Mr. Bell stated that it "makes disclosures of such a sensitive political nature that not only was its classification deemed necessary by the GAO and the concerned agencies, but also its distribution was severely limited to minimize the possibility that its existence might become public knowledge. The reasons which indicated classification continue to prevail; publication at this or any time in the foreseeable future of this information would be strongly adverse to the interests of the United States."

Mr. President, I have read this report, and there is nothing contained therein which would in any way jeopardize the security of the United States of America. There is much in the report, however, that would jeopardize the security of some public officials who have abused their office and condoned and approved the improper, if not actually illegal, distribution of these food products which were intended to be distributed as aid to the people in that country.

It should be noted also that the GAO classifies these reports only upon the request of the agency or department affected.

Once again I suggest that the State Department consider removing the cloak of secrecy from this report, and if such action is not taken this question will again be brought up for consideration when the foreign aid authorization bill for 1966 is before the Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement of the Senate to recognize the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM TEACHES GOOD NUTRITION HABITS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, perhaps the most important feature of the special milk program for schoolchildren is the good nutritional habits it teaches the children when they are at the most impressionable ages. It teaches children to drink and enjoy milk—nature's perfect food—rather than soda pop. It inculcates good nutritional habits that will last virtually a lifetime.

The administration's plans to cut the school milk program by 80 percent will have just the opposite effect. Millions of children will stop drinking milk when the program is cut by 80 percent. Freed from the obligation of spending their money to buy a milk ticket which enables them to receive federally supported half pints, they will either not be able to purchase any beverage or will spend their nickels and dimes on soft drinks and pizza.

I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an address given by Dr.

Elizabeth Todhunter, dean of the University of Alabama's School of Home Economics. She states:

> Nutrition education is needed to guide families in wise selection of foods, and this education needs to be in terms of foods rather than specific functions and requirements of each nutriment.

What better way to educate children in good nutritional values than to accustom them to drinking milk, with its outstanding nutritional values?

This point is reiterated by Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor emeritus of the American Medical Association, when he states:

> The answer X—to unsound nutritional practices—must lie in education, in expanded nutritional education of children.

Mr. President, I hope and believe that Congress will continue to teach children the value and healthfulness of a balanced diet by continuing the school milk program at its present level as a minimum. To do otherwise would be to encourage the type of bad nutritional practices that the school milk program was devised to combat.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for not to exceed 1 hour, for debate on the bill H.R. 13546.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor, for an insertion in the RECORD and to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CLARK. I would be happy to do that, but I do not personally require the calling of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, but I think that should be done.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE CRISIS IN ASIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], at the 21st Annual Conference on Higher Education in Chicago, Ill., on March 14, 1966.

The title of the speech is "Higher Education and the Crisis in Asia," and I think it is well worth the time of all Senators to read and study most carefully.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE CRISIS IN ASIA

(Statement by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, before the 21st National Conference on Higher Education, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., Mar. 14, 1966)

A society has the right to ask two great services of its educational institutions: the cultivation of those qualities of the mind which will help the society to avoid misfortune and the cultivation of those intellectual qualities which will advance the public happiness. What the community expects of higher education at any given time is determined by the extent to which it feels itself endangered or secure. There is a kind of Gresham's law of public policy: fear drives out hope, security precedes welfare, and it is only to the extent that a country is successful in the prevention of bad things that its institutions of learning are set free to concentrate on those pursuits which bring happiness and beauty and fulfillment into the lives of the people.

For a whole generation our country was greatly preoccupied with external dangers and, accordingly, neglectful of those aspects of the public happiness which require organized public programs and sizable public expenditures. The reason for this, of course, was the exacting demands of two World Wars and an intractable cold war, which required the massive diversion of resources from community life to national security. We felt ourselves compelled to turn away from our hopes in order to concentrate on our fears and the public happiness became a luxury to be postponed to some distant day when the dangers besetting us would have disappeared.

In 1961, a trend and an event coincided which seemed to promise a new era in our national affairs. The trend was one toward relative stability in international relations, based on a fragile, tacit agreement between the great powers to live together in peaceful, or competitive, coexistence. The event was the coming to office in the United States of a creative new administration, eager to strengthen the developing detente with the Russians and eager as well to use a respite from international crisis to devise imaginative new programs for the betterment of American life. During the 3 years of his administration, President Kennedy put forward imaginative and well-conceived plans for the improvement of health and education, for the conquest of poverty, pollution and blight, and for the spiritual enrichment of American life.

President Johnson embraced and expanded upon these innovations. Elected in 1964 by a great popular majority and supported by a great congressional majority, President Johnson was able to utilize his own extraordinary political talents to make the 1st session of the 89th Congress the most productive in a generation. Vigorously executed and adequately funded, the legislation adopted in 1965 can open the way to an era of abundance and opportunity for all of our citizens. It seemed, a year ago, that at long last our fears could give way to our hopes, that we had indeed crossed a new frontier and were in sight of the Great Society.

Then came Vietnam. The war had been going on for many years but before 1965 it had been a small and distant war and, as our leaders repeatedly assured us, a war which would be won or lost by the Vietnamese themselves. Then about a year ago it became clear that the Saigon government was about to lose the war and we radically changed our policy. Intervening with a large army of our own, we changed our role from adviser to principal belligerent and expanded what was essentially a civil war into a contest between the United States and Asian communism.

As a result of this radical change in American policy in southeast Asia, we must now, after so brief an interlude, turn back once again from our hopes to our fears, from the advancement of the public happiness to the avoidance of international disaster. The President has been compelled to divert his principal energies from implementing the Great Society to the supervision of bombing missions over North Vietnam; the Congress has been diverted from debating future needs in education and urban renewal to debating the American involvement in a land war in Asia and how we can control it; the American people have been diverted from community and family life to preoccupation once again with foreign dangers, casualty lists, and the fear of a wider war.

What does all this mean for higher education? I most emphatically do not think that the university must act like a recruit called to the colors. I do not think that the humanities must now give way to military science, that civil engineering must give way to military engineering, or that history and philosophy must give way to computerized "war games."

Unless it conceives itself as nothing more than the servant of the party in power, the university has a higher function to perform. The university, it is true, cannot separate itself from the society of which it is a part. Like the rest of us, it must now divert some part of its energies from the enrichment of the life of the individual to the preservation of the life of the Nation. But the community of scholars must do more than accept misfortune and consider how it can be overcome. It must ask how we came to misfortune and whether we need have. It must ask what has been done wisely and what has been done foolishly and what the answers to these questions imply for the future. It must ask how it came about that we have had for so long to devote so great a part of our resources to war and its prevention and it must ask whether we are condemned by forces beyond our control to continue to do so. It can, like the Secretary of State, ask what is wrong with the "other side," but it must not fail to ask as well what is wrong with our side, remembering always that the highest devotion we can give is not to our country as it is but to a concept of what we would like it to be.

Whatever the circumstances of the moment, whatever the demands of government and industry on the universities—and whatever the rewards for meeting these demands—the highest purpose of higher education is the enrichment of the life of the individual and the advancement of the eternal effort to bring reason and justice and humanity into the relations of men and nations. It is the further task of higher education to analyze existing public policies with a view to determining whether they advance or retard the realization of basic human objectives and whether and how they should be changed.

Applying these principles to the war in Vietnam, it would seem to me that the major service the university can perform for the community is to seek answers to some elemental question about means and ends.

The politician is usually preoccupied with technique rather than purpose and with immediate pressures rather than long-term needs. His concern is largely focused on the tactical questions of the war: What are the probable effects of bombing or of not bombing North Vietnam? What degree of escalation is likely to bring the Chinese into the war? What concessions, if any, are likely to induce the enemy to negotiate?

The scholar, on the other hand, must provide the historical and philosophical foundations on which wise political decisions can be based. His proper concern is with questions of means and ends, of motive and purpose: To what extent is the war in Vietnam a civil war, to what extent a war of international aggression, to what extent a conflict of ideologies? Does the American military intervention in Vietnam strengthen our alliances throughout the world, as the administration believes, or does it weaken them, as General de Gaulle's recent statement would seem to indicate?[1] And perhaps the most important questions of all: does this war advance the freedom of southeast Asia or make a mockery of it by subjecting the region to great power domination? Does it increase the security of the United States by proving our resolve or reduce it by draining our material and moral resources?

---

[1] Press conference of Feb. 21, 1966, in which he expressed fear that America would drag her European allies into non-European conflicts.

The universities have a critical responsibility to meet in the crisis of our country's relations with Asia. I believe that students and professors all over the country have acknowledged that responsibility and are responding to it. I think that the student protest movement, despite certain excesses, has had a healthy effect in stimulating informed discussion and awakening the national conscience. But the more significant contribution of the university is made in the library and the classroom, by teachers who teach and students who study, by the raising and answering of elemental questions about means and ends.

Our prospects for a decent and lasting settlement in eastern Asia depend in great part on our ability to apply the kinds of insight and understanding that only broadly based liberal education can provide. We must bring to our efforts for peace in Vietnam and to our long-term relations with China some of the perspectives of history and philosophy and psychology. We must apply the experience of the past with intelligence and discrimination, separating those experiences which seem to have general application from those which are unique or accidental. We must recognize that history can be misleading as well as instructive, and we must avoid the pitfall of simple and literal analogy—such as the eternally repeated example of Munich, which is so often cited as an object lesson for cases which it resembles only slightly or superficially. We must utilize our knowledge of man and his past in the only way it can be utilized, not as a source of detailed prescriptions for specific maladies but as a source of general insight into the kinds of efforts that are likely to succeed and the kinds that are likely to fail, the kinds of policies that are likely to advance peace and human welfare and the kinds that are likely not to.

We must be prepared to examine each situation and each problem on its merits and we must be prepared, as only educated men can be, to discard old myths in the light of new realities. More important than any single policy decision that we might make is the strengthening of our capacity to reconsider established policies in the light of changing facts and circumstances.

It is not so much change itself that the universities can usefully encourage as the capacity for change. Even in the case of those of our present policies which are perfectly sound, it is not at all certain that we would be prepared to alter these policies quickly in response to a wholly new situation or an unforeseen opportunity. One of the basic problems of our policy is thus intellectual rather than political. It is the problem of freeing our minds from the dead weight of habit and prejudice and stereotype and of bringing to bear on foreign policy the rich and diverse resources of liberally educated men.

A related problem—and one for which the solution, if there is one, can only come from higher education—is the retention of the capacity for honest individual judgment in a large organization in which the surest route to advancement is conformity with a barren and oppressive orthodoxy. There are many intelligent, courageous, and independent-minded individuals in our Foreign Service, but I have had occasion to notice that there are also sycophants and conformists, individuals in whose minds the distinction between official policy and personal opinion has disappeared. The universities—and especially those schools and departments whose graduates tend to enter public service—have a special obligation to train potential public servants in rigorously independent thinking and to acquaint them as well with the need for reconciling loyalty to an organization with personal integrity. It is an extremely important service for the universities to perform because the most valuable public servant, like the true patriot, is one who gives a higher loyalty to his country's ideals than to its current policy and who therefore is willing to criticize as well as to comply.

In recent weeks the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has engaged in an experiment in public education. With results thus far that seem to me highly satisfactory, the committee has made itself available as a forum for the meeting of politicians and professors and, more broadly, as a forum through which recognized experts and scholars can help increase congressional and public understanding of the problems associated with our involvement in Vietnam and our relations with Communist China.

I believe that the public hearings on Vietnam, by bringing before the American people a variety of opinions and disagreements pertaining to the war, have done far more to strengthen our country's position than to weaken it. The hearings have been criticized on the ground that they conveyed an image of the United States as divided over the war. Since the country obviously is divided, what was conveyed was a fact rather than an image. The question arises whether those who believe the hearings should not have been held would have preferred to maintain the image of unity even though it were a false image, maintained at the cost of suppressing the normal procedures of democracy and at the cost of denying both our people and our Government the advantages of a full, free, enlightened, and responsible discussion of a national issue of the greatest importance.

No one challenges the value and importance of national consensus, but consensus can be understood in two ways. If it is interpreted to mean unquestioning support of existing policies, its effects can only be pernicious and undemocratic, serving to suppress differences rather than to reconcile them. If, on the other hand, consensus is understood to mean a general agreement on goals and values but not necessarily on the best means of realizing them, then and only then does it become a lasting basis of national strength. It is consensus in this sense which has made America strong in the past. Indeed, much of our national success in combining change with continuity can be attributed to the vigorous competition of men and ideas within a context of shared values and generally accepted institutions. It is only through this kind of vigorous competition of ideas that a consensus of values can sometimes be translated into a true consensus of policy.

The hearings on Vietnam were undertaken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the hope of helping to shape a true consensus, even at the cost of destroying the image of a false one. They were undertaken in the belief that both the American people and their Government would profit from an airing of views by forceful advocates from both within and outside the Government. They were undertaken in the belief that the best way to assure the prevalence of truth over falsehood is by exposing all tendencies of opinion to free competition in the marketplace of ideas. They were undertaken in something of the spirit of Thomas Jefferson's words: "I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion." [3]

Many times in the past the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has served as the forum for a national debate and in some instances its proceedings have had the effect of translating a consensus of values into a consensus of policy as well. One notable instance was the debate on the nuclear test ban treaty in the summer of 1963. For 3 weeks the Foreign Relations Committee, with members of the Committee on Armed Services and Atomic Energy also attending, met in open session to hear vigorous arguments for and against the treaty by witnesses from the Government, from the universities, and from other areas of private life. My only feeling at the time was that the non-Government scientists and professors of politics, as disinterested individuals, were more influential than the Government witnesses, who of course were committed to the administration's policy. Each day's discussion was transmitted to the American people through the press. The result was that the Foreign Relations Committee was able to serve simultaneously as both an organ of Senate deliberation and a form of public education. In the course of those 3 weeks and the Senate floor debate that followed, support for the treaty steadily grew and the treaty was finally ratified by a vote of 81 to 19. Through the medium of open discussion and debate an existing consensus for peace as an objective was translated into a policy consensus for the test ban treaty as a means of advancing it.

The committee is now once again drawing on the resources of both Government and the community of scholars, this time in the hope of increasing public knowledge of China and of helping to lay the foundations for a true consensus about our relations with China. It is our expectation that these discussions will generate controversy, possibly a great deal of controversy, and no doubt the committee will be criticized for fostering it. It is perfectly true that we are fostering controversy and, for my own part, I do so without apology, because there is nothing wrong with the honest and responsible airing of differences and, more important, because controversy is the condition of intelligent decisionmaking and the crucible in which a consensus as to objectives may be translated into a consensus of policy as well.

It is of great importance that we try to learn something more about the strange and fascinating Chinese nation, about its past and its present, about the aims of its leaders and the aspirations of its people. Before we can make wise political—and perhaps military—decisions pertaining to China, there are many questions to be asked and, hopefully, answered: What kind of people are the Chinese? To what extent are they motivated by national feeling? To what extent by ideology? Why are the Chinese Communist leaders so hostile to the United States and why do they advocate violent revolution against most of the world's governments? To what extent is their view of the world distorted by isolation and the memory of ancient grievances? And to what extent, and with what effect on their government, do the Chinese people share with us and with all other peoples what Aldous Huxley has called the "simple human preference for life and peace"?

We need to ask these questions because China and America may be heading toward war with each other and it is essential that we do all that can be done to prevent that calamity, starting with a concerted effort to understand the Chinese people and their leaders.

---

[3] Thomas Jefferson, letter to William Charles Jarvis, Sept. 28, 1820.

Higher education has a vital role to play in this inquiry into our relations with China and Asia. The testimony of a necessarily few experts before congressional committees is obviously a limited channel for the resources of our community of scholars, although it is an exceedingly valuable one for politicians like myself who do not have nearly the time we wish we had to study those matters of history and national character and aspiration which are so pertinent to the decisions we must make. But beyond their direct communications with politicians and policymakers the universities have the higher responsibility of the classroom.

The ultimate source of wisdom in public policy is, I feel certain, education at every level. To a certain degree a U.S. Senator can point the way toward intelligent and creative policies as he sees them; to a much greater degree the President of the United States can do so; but the ultimate answer to the challenge of excellence lies with public school teachers and university professors, with writers and scholars and all those who in one way or another help to shape the minds, or fail to shape the minds, of young Americans. "A teacher affects eternity," wrote Henry Adams; "he can never tell where his influence stops." [3]

The highest duty of higher education toward the community is to keep faith with its own essential purposes, which are the disinterested pursuit of knowledge and the cultivation of the free and discriminating mind. None of us—professor, politician, or private citizen—truly serves the interest of the community by uncritical support of the policies of the moment. All of us have the responsibility to act upon a higher patriotism, which is to love our country not as it is but as we would have it be. And, in the words of Albert Camus, "if at times we seemed to prefer justice to our country, this is because we simply wanted to love our country in justice, as we wanted to love her in truth and in hope." [4]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION, 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, despite the agreement entered into yesterday, which entitles me to the floor for 1 hour when the Senate comes in today, that I may yield for 3 minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], and that the time not be charged to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHOOLS FACE CUTBACK IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a recent proposal by the administration to cut back school milk rations by $82 million has received considerable attention in the newspapers.

An article published in the Dallas Morning News treats this subject and points out the difficulties the school lunch program will face if this proposal is implemented.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News, Mar. 13, 1966]

Schools Face Possible Cutback—Plan Would Hurt Lunch Program

(By Dorothy Lillard)

Austin, Tex.—Many Texas school officials may be crying over spilled milk and empty platters if the Federal Government decides to withdraw from their lunchrooms next year.

The basis for concern is President Johnson's proposal to cut back school milk rations by $82 million and emphasize the needy youngster in the school lunch program.

The Dallas independent school district, which long has spurned the so-called Government platters and milk doles, would have reason to be smug if the revised Federal plan places other districts in a bind. Some observers say, however, that many Dallas civic leaders recently have exerted more and more pressure for participation in the Federal aid program.

If the Children Nutrition Act of 1966, the President's plan, passes, Dallas school officials could feel even greater pressure to seek aid for low-income youngsters.

Meanwhile Charles Hicks, school lunch coordinator for the Texas education agency, foresees serious curtailment of Texas programs in the near future.

Instead of a nickel reimbursement per lunch, Uncle Sam might have to offer an average 3 cents to the participating school districts.

Milk reductions could force schools to charge students 7 cents instead of 3 to 4 cents per half pint.

Last year, Texas schools served 128 million hot lunches in about 1,300 school districts. In addition to the milk served with the lunches, 94.5 million extra half pints were served.

Currently Dallas, Highland Park, Richardson and Garland schools are joined by San Antonio, Houston, and Fort Worth schools in rejecting the national lunch program. Unlike Dallas, the other three big schools do participate in the milk programs. Fort Worth and San Antonio schools also receive surplus Government food.

The President's program, said to face serious opposition in Congress, calls for milk subsidies to go to 3 million youngsters from the neediest families rather than all the 18 million children who received it last year.

School lunch programs aided by low-cost surplus food in Federal stock (a decreasing supply) are expected to continue unchanged. Free breakfasts are to be served in poverty area schools, which are also scheduled to receive money to equip kitchens and cafeterias.

Some have termed the "unchanged" description of the lunch program deceptive. While the President has asked for $50 million more in special assistance, his proposals cut the actual cash and commodities by $19 million. The special grants are intended for use in needy districts mainly.

"The cash provided in the lunch appropriation and proposed Child Nutrition Act will not be enough to meet these demands," explained Hicks.

"The proposals do not provide for growth and expansion of the local program."

"And I am very apprehensive of the situation which would develop if Houston, San Antonio, Fort Worth, and Dallas should decide to participate in the lunch programs," he added.

These areas represent more than 650 schools and administrators would be hard pressed to redistribute decreased funds to an increased number of schools. Districts already dependent upon the Federal lunch program will face a fund reduction without the addition of the four most populous cities in the State.

Hicks noted that Texas always refused to administer on a variable cost basis—5 cents on a lunch in district A areas and 2 cents on the same lunch in district B areas.

"We will cut uniformly when necessary," Hicks said. "We now are experimenting with the special assistance programs for the most needy schools as one solution."

Annual funds for the special assistance, which help pay up to 15 cents on a lunch, will amount to $72,900 this year in Texas. If the State receives proportionately the same amount with the proposed $50 million increase, Hicks can count on about 12 times as much or $875,900.

With this amount, administrators could avoid elimination of the program in the better off school districts, and just reduce the reimbursement fee. The special assistance funds would handle the bulk of the extra emphasis on the needy.

The milk slashes will affect more schools than the main lunch program. Under the act, the cheap half pints are intended strictly for the needy.

The milk program, which was started in 1954 because of heavy dairy surpluses, had $103 million allocated to it last year. President Johnson has called for only $21 million in his budget. Federal officials contend that most schools should be able to pay the extra cost and not the children. Districts usually receive 1 cent for handling, which the Government says is usually more than needed. Children pay 3 to 4 cents for half pints costing 6 to 8 cents.

Hicks said some districts take 1½ cents extra for handling, but often use the extra to pay for free half pints given to needy children.

"Cuts in the milk program will eliminate it for most school districts in Texas or limit it to schools within a district with a large number of low-income children," said Hicks.

Actually the milk program could end up operating only in south Texas and those schools attended predominantly by Negroes in low-income areas.

Ironically some Congressmen point out that if the program is limited to low-income areas, poor children in wealthy school districts would have to do without milk, unless provided from some other source.

Also, poorer Negro students, transferred into formerly all-white districts by Federal civil rights campaigns, might lose out on free lunch and milk programs or be embarrassed by accepting Government handouts where other students do not.

One educator cited an example in south Texas where students who paid their own way ate chicken while the free lunch students ate inexpensive meat loaf the same day.

Hicks said the State is experimenting with providing breakfast free to children in some Austin schools and elsewhere.

"It is my understanding that most schools serving free breakfasts use milk as the mainstay," he said. "If the milk supply is curtailed seriously, it will have an adverse effect."

---

[3] "The Education of Henry Adams," ch. 17.

[4] Albert Camus, "Letters to a German Friend, in Resistance, Rebellion, and Death" (New York: Random House, Inc., 1960), p. 10.

Hicks said the President's proposal to extend the feeding service to nonschool activities (camps, nurseries) might be longer coming to Texas.

"I am happy to see that funds are being made available for equipping lunchrooms and also to assist the State in administering the programs," he commented.

The State pays only costs of administering the national lunch and milk programs. Some States appropriate additional funds to help the local districts pay for the actual lunches.

One of the most vocal congressional critics of the bill offered by the administration is Representative J. J. PICKLE, of Austin, a former member of the Texas Employment Commission.

PICKLE testified before the Ways and Means Committee last year and urged changes that would protect the rights of State governments in this field. He plans to give his views anew to the committee and to the House when the bill reaches the floor.

The Federal lunch program, begun in 1946 under the National School Lunch Act, reimburses public and nonprofit schools about 5 cents a lunch. The children are charged from 25 to 35 cents for the lunch. The remainder of the cost is absorbed by the district, with the addition of surplus Government foods from the Department of Agriculture. Hicks estimated that these supplies contribute 10 cents to the average meal cost.

Many children receive a free daily meal. Local school authorities determine the needy children and shoulder the extra expense.

Hicks said 6 to 7 percent of the daily hot lunches are provided free in Texas. In addition, more free lunches are financed through title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Districts qualify for money on the basis of the number of low-income families in their area.

Noting a current shortage of agricultural supplies, Hicks said he recently was notified that butter may not be available for school consumption. The U.S. Department of Agriculture said it had been unable since February to purchase supplies on the open market in enough quantity to provide for the schools.

"At this point, we don't know what to do about the schools," wrote the Agriculture officials.

EXPORTS TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a penetrating editorial was published in the Austin American on March 14, 1966, which concerns our exports to Communist countries.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD, so that I may share this perceptive observation with my colleagues.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Mar. 14, 1966]

A STRATEGIC QUESTION

State Secretary Dean Rusk in February submitted to Congress the Department's 1964 report on operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 also known as the Battle Act, the U.S. law barring shipment of strategic goods to Communist countries.

The report shows that exports to Communist countries in 1964 more than doubled over the 1963 level, rising from $167 million to almost $340 million. (U.S. trade with Communist China, Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam is, with minor exceptions, prohibited.)

This expansion resulted primarily from increased shipments of wheat but included also other agricultural products. The report showed that total free world exports to Communist countries rose sharply from $5.6 billion in 1963 to $6.7 billion in 1964.

General U.S. imports from Communist nations, according to the report, rose from $85 million to $102.5 million in 1964, while total free world imports from these countries rose slightly from $6.2 billion to $6.8 billion.

The report said the rise of more than a billion dollars in Communist purchases from the free world in 1964 was the largest increase in any year since World War II. The report said the balance of foreign trade between the free world and the Soviet Union shifted favorably in the direction of the free world. It added that the largest single gains were in exports and imports from Communist China. Chinese exports for the first time exceeded $1 billion.

It would be interesting to learn precisely what goods are exported to Communist nations.

The law says that no goods of a strategic nature can be exported to Communist countries. But practically all goods have some strategic value.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I continue with my speech, which was interrupted last night by the recess of the Senate around 7 o'clock.

At that time, I had made two principal points. First, that I found myself compelled to vote for the pending defense appropriation bill, on the ground that I could not conscientiously vote to deny money needed for the safety of American troops overseas. Second, that, in my opinion, we should never have been in Vietnam in the first place, committing large numbers of American troops to a land war on the ground mass of Asia.

I should now like to make my third point: that, as of today, our military, economic, and social posture in South Vietnam is far from favorable. We have eliminated the danger of losing the war, but we have not—at least, on the surface—started to win it.

I quote from page 266 of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee, in response to a question from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as to whether we had improved our position in South Vietnam during the past year, had slipped back, or are today about the same as we were a year ago, and General Johnson, Chief of Staff of the Army, replied:

> I would say that we are about the same as we were a year ago with regard to control.

His answer contains a couple of deletions, but at a later point he stated—and I paraphrase him—that by reason of our improved firepower we show some improvement on total balance, but not on provable results.

The status in South Vietnam at the moment involves the vexing question of how much terrain we and our allies control. In this regard, it has been extremely difficult to get any categorical answer out of either the Secretary of Defense or the AID Administrator, to whom this question was addressed at the time of the hearings on the supplemental foreign aid bill. There has been great complaint as to whether an effective map could be produced. Nothing really effective in the way of such a map was produced before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

However, on page 145 of the hearings of the Armed Services Committee, a map was produced before the committee which, of course, is not copied in the testimony.

Secretary McNamara made this point with respect to who controlled the terrain: The important points to note, he said, are that the population is concentration in Saigon and the areas south of Saigon, the rice bowl, the delta area, and along the coast in these areas. He made the further point that the area fully controlled by the Vietcong was, to some extent, sparsely populated.

Nevertheless, it is perfectly clear that the Mekong Delta, where a substantial part of the wealth of the country is located, has not been pacified. It is equally clear that the area adjacent to a number of American bases has not been pacified.

We find that in many of the areas where, as a result of our search and destroy tactics, we occupy the land as a result of a successful assault, we are compelled shortly thereafter to vacate the terrain we have taken, and in many instances the Vietcong have moved back in short order.

Thus, I would raise the question, with some confidence, that there is more than a majority of the land mass in South Vietnam and, possibly, even a majority of the densely populated land mass which is not really secure for either ourselves or our South Vietnamese allies.

An additional important question is, Who controls the population?

This is a rather deceptive matter because of the huge number of refugees who have left the land and moved into the more densely populated areas, particularly Saigon, and have no visible means of support and, generally speaking, are on the South Vietnamese equivalent of relief.

Nevertheless, I read from page 146 of the hearings where the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] ask the question of Secretary McNamara:

> How much of the population does the Vietcong control?

Secretary McNamara answered:

> Well, the figures we have received from South Vietnam say 23 percent of the population.

Then he continued:

> However, this morning, earlier, I gave an estimate of Prime Minister Ky to the effect

> that his government controls only 25 percent of the population. Now, these figures are not necessarily contradictory because of the difference in the definition of "control." Prime Minister Ky, when he gave the figure 25 percent as being controlled by the Government, was thinking of the population that could participate freely and without coercion.

Then he continued:

> I think if you applied the definition of control that our field representatives do, both the political and military representatives in South Vietnam, they would say that the Government controls today 53 percent of the population of the country, the Vietcong control about 23 percent. That makes a total of around 76 percent, and the remaining 24 percent is in the disputed areas.

Then he added this significant statement:

> I think that Ky's estimate is a much more realistic appraisal of Government control than is the 53 percent.

The importance of the discussion of the terrain and population is clear when we recall that we have recently approved a substantial appropriation for economic aid to South Vietnam, $175 million, which will be used largely, although not entirely, to bolster the South Vietnamese economy, which is showing signs of sagging, and the other $100 million is to be used largely, though, again, not entirely, to go ahead with the economic and social programs which President Johnson stressed so much at the Honolulu meeting and thereafter.

It will be recalled that in the follow-up on the economic and social development program, on which the administration, correctly, in my judgment, lays great stress, the President sent the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. John Gardner, to Vietnam to do everything possible to expedite the aid program. The aim of this program is not only the pacification of the countryside, but to use a cliche which has been used so much in connection with Vietnam, the job of winning, or winning back, the hearts and minds of the people of South Vietnam, who were so badly alienated by the activities of dictator Diem and those who followed him in the government of South Vietnam.

I would make the point, on the basis of the hearings of the Armed Services Committee, that there is precious little terrain where the pacification and economic and social justice program can take effect, because there is so little of the land we really control, and that as to the population where the program can be carried out we are dealing, to a large extent, with homeless refugees and people in cities who, in many ways, are far more in need of economic aid than the peasants in the hamlets and villages.

So I would say, in summary, that because of our lack of control over the terrain and the population, and because of the sagging condition of the South Vietnamese economy, there is not much prospect that, in the immediate foreseeable future, we will be able to make much progress in our economic and social aid program to South Vietnam.

I turn now to the military situation. There was developed at the hearings before the Armed Services Committee the fact that the total number of effectives of those who were enlisted under the banner of the Saigon government was 630,000. This quite large number includes the local police. It includes the militia. It includes several hundred thousand military personnel who are not of the highest caliber in terms of their effectiveness, or, indeed, of their fighting capacity.

South Vietnam put on a serious drive last year to increase this total of military personnel which would be available to fight the Vietcong, and it had modest success. So the figure I have given is up by several tens of thousands over what it was a year ago.

It was said yesterday by the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] that, in his judgment, perhaps two or three more divisions of South Vietnamese could be drafted or recruited and trained and put into the military services. Most of these would come from cities.

Without questioning the judgment of the Senator from Georgia, I would have grave doubts as to whether a substantial additional number of South Vietnamese who are not already in the armed services could be made into effective fighting forces.

I think we would be wise to realize that the present effective strength of the South Vietnamese is about as high as it can become in the foreseeable future.

It must be pointed out that the desertions of South Vietnamese have been extraordinarily high. While the rate stated in the hearings was deleted for security reasons, the figure has been published by the press, and there was no denial by the administration. It was stated the gross number was 113,000 South Vietnamese who had deserted. It should be pointed out that these are not defections, in that they did not go to the Vietcong. They merely sneaked away from their units, went back home or to the farm, or merely disappeared. Nevertheless, 113,000 desertions out of a total of 630,000 must, by any standard, be rated high.

The fact is that not long ago the South Vietnamese Army was very much demoralized. As the chairman of the committee [Mr. RUSSELL] said yesterday, if we had not gone in with a massive commitment of some 200,000-plus American soldiers, in his judgment, the South Vietnamese would not have been able to fight off the Vietcong for more than another month.

Whether this is true, I have no way of knowing, but I have a great respect for the judgment of the Senator from Georgia.

So the South Vietnamese forces are still struggling under the impact of an almost catastrophic defeat.

While I hope that their effectiveness will improve in the months and years ahead, I for one will not be too confident that they could fight by themselves with effectiveness. I read recently in the papers of an incident involving the camp at Ashau, which was overrun, and helicopters were being used to take them out. There were wounded there who should have been removed, but they had to resort to shooting at their own men in order to carry out an evacuation in an orderly manner. That may be only an incident, but I think it illustrates that we cannot rely too strongly on the South Vietnamese being able to reconquer that part of their country which they have lost and to subdue the Vietcong.

As I said earlier, there are 300,000 American personnel committed to the war in South Vietnam. This includes Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force personnel.

When this bill is passed there will be authority and there will be money to increase the overall size of our Armed Forces by 452,000 men.

I endeavored to find out yesterday from Senators on the Armed Services Committee what portion of those 452,000 men it was contemplated would be committed to Vietnam. They said they had been entirely unable to get any sort of figure from the Secretary or the Joint Chiefs.

I can understand this because the policy is to give General Westmoreland what he wants, and General Westmoreland has not indicated and perhaps cannot indicate how many more troops he will require.

It is true that of this new 452,000, probably none of them would go to Vietnam. The existing well-trained divisions in this country, possibly Germany, and possibly elsewhere would be shifted to South Vietnam either in cadres or units, and the newly recruited men would be used as fillers for those units which are presently outside South Vietnam.

I, therefore, note that almost a million men are now committed to South Vietnam, if we add our allies and the South Vietnamese to our own forces; there is a possibility, which this bill would allow, of sending several hundred thousand additional American troops to South Vietnam; and there is not much chance that the South Vietnamese troops will be increased.

There is also the possibility that some of our allies will be less reluctant than they were in the past to increase their forces. We know that Australia is sending a few more men, Korea another division, and the Philippines may send a unit or two. But I do not believe that we can look forward with much confidence to augmentation of forces of our allies in South Vietnam.

I turn now to the military situation with respect to the Vietcong. I note that on page 62 of the hearings the Secretary of Defense indicated that the Vietcong army was in the neighborhood of 235,000 strong. The same testimony appears at page 144, where it is reiterated. To this should be added some 15,000 PAVN or regular North Vietnamese troops, making the total effective force about 250,000.

To me, the interesting thing about this figure of 235,000 for the Vietcong is that it is more than twice the effective strength of the Vietcong forces a little over a year ago. At that time our estimate of the total Vietcong effectives was 103,000. It has now gone up to 235,000.

It is not much of an exercise in primitive mathematics to take that 103,000 of a year ago, deduct casualties, deduct defections, of which there are some, add the infiltration from the north, which is reported by the Secretary of Defense at about 20,000 last year, and conclude at the end of that exercise that they did not have as many Vietcong as they had at the end of the year. So where have all of these other people—more than 100,000—come from?

It is very clear to me that they come from South Vietnam. In fact, the Secretary of Defense testified that 80 percent of the Vietcong force are South Vietnamese, either individuals who were born in South Vietnam or who have moved down there.

I can see no other logical explanation for this huge increase in the Vietcong force over last year except that this is a civil war. If it is not a civil war why should individuals from South Vietnam take up arms against their legitimate government?

To me, this, in and of itself establishes the fact that the Secretary of Defense is not entirely correct when he keeps reiterating that this is not a civil war. In my judgment this is clearly a civil war.

How about Hanoi? That is a good question. There is not a shadow of a doubt that Hanoi is strongly supporting the Vietcong, not only with technical assistance, not only with platoon and company commanders, but with military supplies, and with at least 15,000 of their own crack troops.

But we, on the other hand, are helping our South Vietnamese allies with 300,000 troops, so that it occurs to me to say that regardless of the assistance given by Hanoi, which is countervailed to a much larger extent by us, one cannot say this is anything but a civil war.

I recall that the able Senator from Georgia, whom I see on the floor of the Senate, stated in colloquy yesterday that in his judgment in many respects this was a civil war. I think I quote the Senator correctly.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think I said it has many aspects of a civil war.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. It has many aspects of civil war. Substitute the word "aspects" for the word "respects."

If this is a civil war I suggest we should analyze, as best we can, how we can bring it to an end. I shall do that in a moment or two.

First, I would like to move to my fourth point with respect to what our immediate objective is in South Vietnam. That objective has been stated many times by the Secretary of State and also by the President, but I found no better statement of it than the statement by General Wheeler which appears at page 116 of the hearings, and by Secretary McNamara at page 120.

General Wheeler said:

> We have been proceeding, as Secretary McNamara outlined earlier, on the basis of a limited political objective laid down by President Johnson; namely, that the object is to cause the Vietcong and primarily Hanoi to cease and desist their aggression in South Vietnam.

Then Secretary McNamara said, as appears on page 120 of the hearings:

> Or to put it another way, it is our policy to achieve our limited objective that I referred to a few minutes ago with the fewest personnel losses possible.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I wonder if the Senator would agree that the best way to achieve our objective, if at all possible, would be at the negotiating table?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CHURCH. Is not this also the stated purpose of the President, as the Senator from Pennsylvania understands it?

Mr. CLARK. It is, indeed. It is also the objective of the Secretary of State, although I do not think he has exhausted every possibility to get to the negotiating table.

Mr. CHURCH. It is this aspect of the situation that puzzles me. As the Senator from Pennsylvania well knows, the position of the Secretary of State seems to be that, although we would welcome Hanoi to the negotiating table, we are prepared to deal with the Vietcong only if their representatives come as a part of the Hanoi delegation—that is to say, as agents of Hanoi. This means, does it not, that we impose a condition upon the Hanoi government; for if the Vietcong were to come as members of the Hanoi delegation, then, in effect, Hanoi would be conceding that the Vietcong have no independence whatever, a status we assign to them, but one which Hanoi has consistently denied?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Idaho will permit an interjection, I do not believe it is the case. I think his position is very unwise if his objective is—and I have no reason to question his sincerity—that we would like to end this war by negotiation. I think there is a grave doubt that Hanoi completely dominates the Vietcong; but this is the position that the Secretary of State has taken for some time. I hope that some day in the near future he will be willing, because he is a splendid, mature gentleman, to revise his estimate in light of the figures I have given in this speech.

Mr. CHURCH. Let us assume, for the purpose of the discussion, that the Secretary of State is correct in his assessment of the situation. Does not this still leave the question of whether it serves the American interest to demand that Hanoi concede it, as an admission price for coming to the negotiating table?

Mr. CLARK. I entirely agree.

Mr. CHURCH. I, for one, have never received a satisfactory answer to this question, even though every highly placed spokesmen in the administration have acknowledged that, in effect, our position does require Hanoi to admit precisely that which Ho Chi Minh has thus far been determined not to admit; namely, that the Vietcong are agents of Hanoi. If our requirement served some American purpose, I would not hesitate to endorse it; but I fail to see—and no one has yet supplied me with a satisfactory answer—what possible purpose it serves.

Mr. CLARK. In my opinion, the position of the Secretary of State in this regard—of not being willing to talk to the group which is fighting Americans—is as unsound in its concept as is the countervailing position of Ho Chi Minh, which is that the National Liberation Front must be recognized as the sole government of South Vietnam, an obviously incredible position to ask us to accept.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, with that I fully agree. But, again, I emphasize that the record simply furnishes no answers to the question I have raised. Sometimes to be sure, spokesmen for the administration have emphasized that the Vietcong are assassins——

Mr. CLARK. So were the North Koreans.

Mr. CHURCH. And that their terrorism has been reprehensible. This is plainly true; but then, certainly, the Hanoi government is subject to the same indictment. They, too, have been assassins, and their tactics have been equally reprehensible. Yet we hold to the position that we will deal with Hanoi, but with the Vietcong only if they come as a part of the Hanoi delegation, as confessed agents of the Hanoi government.

I should think that, since our purpose is to reach the bargaining table, we ought to remove from our path those obstacles that clearly constitute impediments.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator. Yesterday in the debate a point was made that we do not know who the Vietcong leaders are. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in an excellent speech that he made toward the close of the day, and in response to a question from me, pointed out, as appears on pages 6415 and 6416 of the RECORD, that we know very well who the leaders of the Vietcong are. We know that they have so-called diplomatic missions established in a half dozen European and African capitals.

We have had advice right inside the Committee on Foreign Relations, in an informal way, to be sure—I did not attend the session and was not aware of this until the Senator from Arkansas brought it up yesterday—that the names of the Vietcong leaders are well known all over South Vietnam. So I completely agree with the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I have in my hand an interview of Prof. Bernard B. Fall, which was published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 14, 1966. Professor Fall is one of leading authorities on Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Idaho will permit an interjection, Professor Fall is also the same gentleman who told the Committee on Foreign Relations the names of the Vietcong leaders.

Mr. CHURCH. I noticed a comment by Professor Fall on the question that we have been discussing. It reads as follows:

> On the other hand, to go on saying that the Vietcong doesn't exist and to force Hanoi in advance to speak for it in one form or another, is begging the question. In 1954, the United States did not object to the presence at first of some pretty phantom-like "Pathet-Lao" and "Free Khmer" (Cambodian) delegations. As the conference settled down to some serious bargaining, those

delegations dropped out by mutual consent and the Laotian and Cambodian cease-fire accords were signed, for the Communist side, by North Vietnam.

As long as those various "unconditional" offers to talk peace contain the advance condition to drop one of the participants under the table—and the Vietcong has 200,000-southerners under its control and not 3,000 to 4,000 troops, like the Pathet-Lao—there is very little chance of getting anywhere at all, except into a bigger war.

I wonder if the Senator from Pennsylvania would be good enough to give me his own appraisal of this statement by Professor Fall.

Mr. CLARK. I am completely in accord with it. As the Senator knows, it is pretty close to the position taken before the Committee on Foreign Relations by General Gavin, and former Ambassador Kennan; and now I note another distinguished American soldier, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, has taken pretty much the same position in an article appearing in Look magazine, entitled "Pull Out, All Out, or Stand Fast in Vietnam."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pull Out, All Out, or Stand Fast in Vietnam?

One of our most deeply embedded traditions asserts the supremacy of the civilian authority over the military. It follows that the only justification for a military policy is to support and execute the policies decided by our civilian authorities. Military effort must always be so closely tied to the political objective that at no time do we risk a mushrooming, unlimited war, while the political goal remains definitely restricted.

What troubles many good citizens, people who support the President as I do, is exactly where the balance lies between our military and our political objectives in Vietnam, and whether, in fact, the military effort may soon be dominant, if, indeed, it is not already so.

The cry of "Why are we in Vietnam?" echoes two of the questions I heard from soldiers and civilians in December 1950, when I took command of a defeated and dispirited army. "Why are we in Korea?" and "What are we fighting for?" were the queries then. As the new commander intent on rebuilding confidence and the offensive spirit, I had to answer.

I told our troops that we were in Korea because we had been ordered there by properly constituted authorities. The loyalty that we gave and expected barred any questioning of those decisions. As to what we were fighting for, my answer was essentially this: "The real issues are whether Western civilization shall defy and defeat communism. This has long ceased to be a fight for freedom of our Korean allies alone. It has become a fight for our own survival in an honorable, independent national existence."

Today, in Vietnam, I think questions like these are rarely asked. Our combat forces seem to have a better understanding of why they are fighting than do many people at home. The soldiers draw no parallel with the Korean war, for many of them hardly recall that conflict. They know that we are using armed force to repel an armed aggression that seeks to impose Communist control over people who reject that tyranny. In Korea, our obligation was a moral one. In Vietnam, we have a treaty obligation: The Southeast Asia Treaty of 1954 and its protocol commit us to help with armed force when a nation in the treaty area asks for our aid, as South Vietnam has done.

It should be perfectly clear, then, that the President has but one basic course to pursue. He must honor our treaty commitment while concurrently making an intensive effort to find some honorable and acceptable solution. He must also enlist the greatest possible support—diplomatic, economic and military—from the greatest possible number of nations, to bring the fighting to an end and to lessen the danger of drift into a catastrophe of unimaginable proportions.

Currently, a great deal of loose talk in the United States tends to increase the probability that our military effort will become divorced from the political objective and we will stray toward nuclear disaster. When presumably responsible citizens urge upon the Nation, "Let's get it over with now. Let's plaster Vietnam and China too," or "Let's bomb North Vietnam back into the stone age," the danger of our losing all sight of our political objective becomes very real. These hardy folk, who, like Omar Khayyam, are ready to "take the cash and let the credit go, nor heed the rumble of a distant drum," would be talking sense only if our political objective were unlimited—the imposition of a Pax Americana upon the entire world—and if we confessed no national morality whatever.

We cannot ignore this moral question. Otherwise, we retreat overnight to the jungle from which the human race took millennia to crawl. The civilian authorities themselves bear much responsibility for the widespread confusion among well-meaning people over the military situation and our political objectives. Within the past 2 years, pronouncements on our military efforts by highly placed authorities have ranged from rosy euphoria to grim forboding. As for our political aims, we have been chided for not grasping "the simplicity of our basic objectives" in Vietnam. Yet we have been given numerous definitions of those objectives: to contain communism; to halt aggression; to prove to Communist leaders that aggression cannot be made to pay off; to support "the right of a people to choose their own government"; to help the South Vietnamese realize their desire to "live in the way they prefer"; and to assist a helpless people "to advance toward economic prosperity and social improvement." As recently as December 7, 1965, Senator J. William Fulbright called for the negotiation of "an honorable compromise." On the same day, Secretary of State Dean Rusk was quoted: "There is no room for compromise" on Vietnam.

Our military objective has been frequently and beguilingly described as "victory." This word always rings gladly on American ears. What American does not want to win any fight he gets into? It is a deeply ingrained national trait to go all out for victory, using whatever force we possess. There is, we are told, and we foolishly agree, "no substitute for victory." But we are not dealing with a lawsuit, a prize fight or a football game. We live in a world very unlike the one we were raised in. We have a potential for wholesale destruction so indescribably vast that many words, including "victory" lose their meaning. It would hardly be counted a "victory" if one football team were to defeat another through the use of knives; neither would we savor triumph in "victory" that would reduce three-fourths of the civilized world to rubble.

With no clear-cut limit upon our immediate military objective, we commit ourselves to an upward-spiraling course that may approach annihilation. If we decide to employ whatever force is needed (and no one is wise enough to estimate now how much that will be) to achieve victory in Vietnam, do we double, then triple, then quadruple our ground forces? And if victory even then eludes us, do we extend the war to wider and wider arenas? And if we still fail to eliminate all resistance, do we then use nuclear weapons?

We cannot thus engage to achieve victory at whatever cost unless we have already announced an unlimited political objective: i.e., the complete subjection of the outside world to American domination. And I cannot see in the current situation anything to justify the setting up of so rash a goal as that. But if, in the light of their greater knowledge of the situation, our highest civilian authorities believe that something like this should be our goal, then the public should be told immediately. If our policymakers do not believe in aiming for such a goal, and there is certainly no indication that they do, then a halt should be called soon to control our military buildup.

In my opinion, it is the immediate duty of our civilian authorities to define more precisely and pragmatically just what is our political goal—assuming it is something less than global defeat of all resisting forces. At the very least, we should have what Senator Karl Mundt called for recently in a TV debate moderated by Eric Sevareid: "A declaration of policy from the White House to the Senate, where that policy can then be debated." With that objective precisely fixed, the size of the military effort needed to attain it could be clearly determined. With our aims loosely described only as "freedom for the people to choose their way of life" or as "standing up to communism," we have drifted from a point where we were told, a scant 2 years ago, that our military task would be largely accomplished and our troops withdrawn by December 1965, to a point where the faint outline of a half-million troop commitment becomes a distinct possibility. And even that commitment is not offered as a final limit. The situation remains, to use Senator Mike Mansfield's apt phrase, "open ended," and we have made, to date, I believe, an unconvincing argument to our people that our goals lie within the zone of vital national interest that cannot be compromised. The falling-domino theory—if Vietnam fails, then Laos, Thailand, and all south Asia will collapse—is a theory I have never accepted. Like many other premises upon which people tend to rest their position, it is deserving of more searching analysis than it generally gets.

I am fully aware that I am speaking in generalities. Whatever course I propose or whatever action I oppose, I still cannot deal in specifics. The plain truth is that no individual, outside of the top levels of Government has, or should have, access to enough inside information to do otherwise. I have no private sources of top-level intelligence and no access to top-level military plans. Yet the proper functioning of a democracy demands that the conscientious citizen speak his carefully considered views. Only then can patriotic and competent officials, civilian and military, who bear the ultimate responsibility for decisions, find the guidance they must have. The recent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee served an admirable purpose in stimulating public thought and discussion of one of the most difficult problems this country has had to face.

Many of those who have thoughtfully endorsed a widening or an intensifying of the war have spoken, I believe, from the conviction that they have been applying the lessons learned in Korea. Lessons can be learned from Korea. But there are far more dissimilarities between the two actions than there are parallels. In South Korea, we had a workable government, led by a fiercely patriotic and powerful civilian leader whose opposition to communism was widely known and who held the allegiance of the majority of his people. We acted in concert with many nations and had been deputized by the United Nations to repel the aggressor in its name.

Relatively little terrorist activity occurred in South Korea. United Nations personnel rode in open jeeps throughout our zones without ever drawing an assassin's fire. Our power easily contained guerrilla activity, even though our forces were neither as well-equipped nor as mobile as they are in Vietnam. A unified military command kept both United States and ROK Armies under the direct control of the U.S. commander. In short, our line of battle was well-defined, the enemy clearly identifiable, and the political divisions were sharp.

None of these conditions holds for Vietnam today. Yet we do have a "right" to be there, for our treaty obligation is clear and specific. I think we should take care, however, not to misread history in an effort to justify unlimited military effort. Most people will agree that we face confused, complex, and unpredictable situations. Most people will agree that each contains potential perils of great and undetermined extent.

Confronted with such circumstances, would we not be wise to avoid further dispersion of our already overextended resources? Would it not be sound judgment to husband our strength and to refuse further far-flung commitments in an "open-ended situation" until we can discern more clearly the shape of things to come?

Again, we hear talk of "sanctuaries." Yet the bombing of sanctuaries never turns out to be a simple matter. During the Korean war, the Manchurian bases, the so-called sanctuary, were indeed wide open to attack from the air. We deliberately refrained from bombing them, as we refrained from taking out the vulnerable Yalu bridges. The advisability of carrying this war over the border into Manchuria in this manner was considered in the highest councils of our Nation. The decision not to bomb the sanctuary was made for reasons that seemed then, and still seem, wise to me. Had we attacked mainland China through air raids we would have unleased a war of unknowable dimensions. Not one of our major allies would have approved this adventure, and the coalition formed to stop Communist agression would have dissolved. Furthermore, our "shoestring" air force (this was Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg's own description) would have dwindled, through combat losses and natural attrition, to a shadow. We would have been left without power to honor the many IOU's we had extended on a worldwide basis. The time then required to rebuild sufficient strength to honor our obligations would have been 2 years.

Nor should it be forgotten that the United Nations forces had their own sanctuary during the Korean conflict, just as we have one now in South Vietnam. Both China and the United States operated under self-imposed limitations as to the bombing of hostile bases. The Chinese air force in Manchuria and other nearby bases was strong enough to have done us major damage, not only in South Korea, but in Japan. Similarly, Red China now may possess the power to destroy Saigon and inflict heavy damage on our South Vietnam port facilities in one swift strike should we carry our air attack close to her own vitals.

China has the strength, too, to reopen the Korean front. Should we, in that instance, oppose her there, or should we withdraw to more defensible positions to the south and east, an unthinkable abandonment of our Korean allies? An attack upon mainland China might well bring Soviet Russia into the fray, with Western Europe open to immediate invasion. Where do we draw our line of defense then, and what weapons do we use? And where do we concentrate our strength?

These questions suggest the immensity of the problem the President and his advisers now wrestle with. Those men in public life who urge prompt and unlimited escalation of the war are neither diminishing the problem nor strengthening the President's arm. They only make it even more difficult for the President to steer the Nation on that careful course between duty and disaster.

And those who call for immediate disengagement from Vietnam, as if it had all been a mistake, likewise make the President's path more difficult. We cannot escape now from the obligations we took upon ourselves when we first pledged out word to the South Vietnamese. One lesson to be drawn from Korea is that we cannot pull out of a sticky situation without regard for those who have fought at our side.

During the Korean war, soon after the Chinese launched their New Year's offensive in January 1951, serious thought was given in Washington to our abandoning the peninsula and pulling our forces back to Japan. (I opposed this strongly.) It quickly became clear that such a withdrawal would require the evacuation of a least a million South Koreans, those who had been our battlefield allies or had worked with us since the invasion. To have left them to the vengeance of the Communists would have been an infamous betrayal.

We are under similar obligation in Vietnam not to abandon the hundreds of thousands who have been our allies there. We cannot pick up and run home without making extensive and permanent provision for all the Vietnamese who have supported our arms. A concept like the one discussed by Gen. James Gavin, for holding fast to our defensive enclaves, would enable us to fulfill our obligation to our Vietnamese allies, before committing ourselves to unlimited military effort, while we continue to seek an honorable solution.

Korea also taught that it is impossible to interdict the supply routes of an Asian army by airpower alone. We had complete air mastery over North Korea, and we clobbered Chinese supply columns unmercifully. Unquestionably, we inflicted serious damage upon the Chinese and greatly complicated their problems of reinforcement and supply. But we did not halt their offensive nor materially diminish its strength. The Chinese, like the Vietnamese, traveled light, with each man carrying his ammunition, his food, and his weapon on his back. They moved at night or on hidden footpaths and goat tracks, immune from air attack. And where we did find their concentrations and strike them, we still could not force them off the disputed ground. In Korea, I saw whole sections of railroad bombed into scrap iron by aircraft, and yet the enemy rebuilt the tracks in a single night, and the trains ran the next day. After the Chinese repulsed the ill-fated advances to the Yalu, Gen. Douglas MacArthur himself expressed disillusionment with the value of tactical airpower. It could not isolate the battlefield, he said, and its effectiveness had been greatly overrated. It is easy for the civilian mind to be seduced with talk of "easy" conquest through airpower. But the crucial battles are still won by foot soldiers.

There is yet another lesson etched by our experience in Korea: It is folly to base military strategy upon our interpretation of enemy intentions. As our forces pushed toward the Yalu in the Home by Christmas offensive of November-December 1950, the high command assured all doubters that the Chinese had no intention of intervening in force because the psychological moment for this had passed, because "no commander in his right mind" would send his forces across the Yalu at this season and because of various other reasons understood only by those who had made a study of the Oriental mind. We knew, however, that the Chinese were capable of dealing us a mighty blow along the Manchurian border, where our forces would be strung out almost haphazardly, without mutual support between commands and without supplies enough to sustain more than a light engagement. We knew that close to a hundred thousand well-disciplined and well-armed Chinese troops were mobilized on the other side of the river. We knew that Chinese volunteers had already appeared in force south of the Yalu, for we had suffered severe attacks from them and had taken prisoners from units known to be in the Chinese order of battle.

Yet, despite this intelligence, we hurried forward in pursuit style, our forces thoroughly dispersed and improperly clothed for fighting in subzero temperature. We knew the Chinese were bluffing, and we knew they would never commit more than a token force of volunteers. We abandoned elemental prudence. Instead of being guided by enemy capability, we divined the enemy intentions. The mistake cost us very dearly in American lives and took us close to disaster. It might be pointed out, too, that MacArthur's earlier brilliant coup at Inchon, where he cut the enemy's lifeline in one spectacular and surprising strike, succeeded in large part because of his stated reliance on the enemy's assumption that no commander would risk the monstrous tides, the tortuous channel and the 2-mile mud flats outside Inchon harbor. Custer likewise knew that the Indians would not attack at Little Bighorn. And the French knew that Wolfe would never be fool enough to try to scale that precipice guarding Quebec.

We should be wary of experts who feel they can correctly interpret Chinese intentions and can predict how they will react to any move of ours. We know what the Chinese are capable of in southeast Asia. This is the knowledge that should guide us in appraising our strategy.

The one final important lesson we can draw from what happened in Korea is that we cannot enter into agreements with the Communists unless we have iron-clad sanctions, underwritten by the world's major powers, including, if possible, the Soviet Union. Vietnam, as Senator JOSEPH CLARK pointed out in that TV debate I referred to previously, is only an incident. The major threat to our security and our way of life still comes from Red China and the Soviet Union. It is with our eye upon them that we must plan our global strategy. To do that calls for the best minds we can assemble in far-sighted statesmanship and creative thinking.

Finally, I want to put proper emphasis on one aspect of the whole military and political problem that tends too often to be either minimized or ignored—that is the moral factor. In June, 1955, when I was chief of staff of the Army, I had occasion to address a letter to the Secretary of Defense regarding the military defense of the United States. My conviction, pressed in that letter, remains unaltered:

"Just as the ultimate and most deadly threat of communism is the destruction of the religious and moral principles which * * * have guided man to new heights of dignity and self-respect * * * so also do we find the same threat in the increasingly significant ignoring by our planners of the consequences of omitting the moral factor in considering the use of the immense destructive capability which now exists in the world."

It is my firm belief that there is nothing in the present situation or in our code that requires us to bomb a small Asian nation "back into the stone age." While we should be prepared to pay any price in order to live up to our obligations, there must be some moral limit to the means we use to achieve victory. A victory that would require the wholesale devastation of a country by nuclear arms because it would not yield to conventional force would be the ultimate in immorality.

General Ridgway's Nine Points for Vietnam

1. We should emphatically reject the two extreme courses—"Pullout" or "All-out war"—that have been advocated by certain groups.

2. We should give our full support to the President's determined efforts to fulfill our treaty obligations and to honor our pledges, while at the same time seeking an honorable solution of the basically political problem in Vietnam.

3. With due regard for diplomatic secrecy, our Government should spell out, more specifically and pragmatically, our immediate and long-range political objectives, firmly rejecting any unlimited political objective that might entail unlimited military effort.

4. We should also reject any political involvement that might gradually commit us to military efforts that would jeopardize our basic security and those vital American interests that cannot be compromised.

5. Once having announced our political objectives within the framework stated above, we should then employ whatever force is needed to attain them.

6. We should categorically reject "preventive" war, employing nuclear weapons, the use of which would be, in my opinion, a deliberate move down the road of international immorality past the point of no return.

7. We should enter into formal agreements with the Communist leaders of southeast Asia only after establishment of enforcible sanctions to guarantee the permanent protection of the South Vietnamese people.

8. We should sign no instrument with those leaders without prior agreement in good faith among a group of nations, including, if possible, the Soviet Union, to join in fairly sharing the task of applying proper sanctions.

9. We should repose complete confidence in the capability of our military leaders in southeast Asia to accomplish any mission they may be assigned, for these men are among the best that our Nation has produced.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, with regard to including the Vietcong at the bargaining table, I associate myself with the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. In demanding that they come only as agents of Hanoi, it seems to me that we interject a needless impediment to whatever prospect there may be for negotiations.

It is realistic to recognize that the Vietcong are the principal fighting force with which we contend in South Vietnam, and therefore to continue an attempt to exclude them from the negotiating table appears to be an unnecessary and unwise policy.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho would agree with me that talking to the Vietcong is our best chance at the moment of getting to the negotiating table and achieving peace. And the reason I say that, before my friend answers, is that, as I analyze the situation, Peiping is not going to want to talk about negotiations. They are only too content to have us fight to the last American and to the last Vietnamese. Hanoi appears to be quite intransigent at the moment. At least one belligerent statement follows another.

We had hoped for a while that the Russians would help us, but they will not.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] thought that the United Nations would be a place to settle this dispute. However, the United Nations seems to be to a large extent immobilized because of peculiar conditions within the United Nations with which the Senator from Idaho is familiar.

The International Control Commission, consisting of Poland, India, and Canada, seems to be unable to enter into the picture with any hope of success.

Russia has steadfastly refused to join with Great Britain as cochairman of the Geneva Conference for the purpose of calling that Conference back into being.

The only hope I see of getting negotiations started is for us to reverse our policy of not being willing to talk to the Vietcong and at the same time to single them out and impose upon them our greatest possible military strength in an effort to persuade them that never, never, never are we going to be thrown out, and that never, never, never will we get out unless and until we achieve a peaceful South Vietnam, which does not necessarily mean keeping the Ky government in charge of the future of that country.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree. And it is for the latter reasons that I shall vote for the pending measure.

I think, given the existing circumstances, that Congress must not only support the American fighting men who are now in the field, but we must also make it plain to Hanoi that we will not permit ourselves to be forced from South Vietnam under the military pressure of the Vietcong.

However, I agree with the Senator that we should at least experiment with the possibility of reaching the negotiating table through the process of initial dealings among the Vietnamese themselves. If, for example, preliminary talks between representatives from Saigon and representatives of the Vietcong were to get under way, then it is quite possible that Hanoi would feel free to come in and strongly support the Vietcong spokesmen in the bargaining position they take, while we would be free to come in and give equally strong support to the Saigon representatives in the position that they take. This approach might prove to have a catalytic effect, opening the way to a general international conference of the kind that will doubtless be necessary if satisfactory political settlement is to be reached.

Mr. CLARK. The position of the Senator is completely logical, and I am in accord with it. However, I point out to him the grave difficulty of getting the present Saigon government into the frame of mind in which it would be willing to negotiate or even participate in negotiations with the Vietcong.

The belligerent statements coming out of Saigon are equaled only by the belligerent statements coming out of Hanoi. I would be fearful that, unless we can get in South Vietnam some civilian government composed of more mature and farsighted individuals representing the Saigon government, we would have little luck along the lines advocated by the Senator.

I point out to the Senator that in the end we have the power, because that government could not last a month if we were to withdraw. This might be power that we would be reluctant to use, but I think that, through Ambassador Lodge, Secretary Rusk, and our own diplomatic establishment, this is an end for which we should press.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree. I concede that there are great difficulties in the way of progress in this direction. However, I reiterate that I do not think our own policy should preclude this course of action to the United States, but that, on the contrary, our own position should be such as to encourage this development in every way that we possibly can.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his very helpful interjection.

I find myself completely in accord with his views. As a result of my colloquy with the Senator from Idaho, I have pretty well covered my fourth point, which was our immediate objective in South Vietnam, and my fifth point, which was to discuss our ultimate objective, which, I take it, is to settle the war in South Vietnam as quickly as we can with honor, and to leave a country which will have some chance of developing its own future through free elections.

The people of South Vietnam, who have been at war for well over 25 years now, from the time of the Japanese invasion, would be enabled to start up the long, hard road which confronts them in turning their country, or at least that area—whether it is a country or not is somewhat dubious—into a peaceful place in which men, women, and children would have some chance of leading the good life.

My sixth point, which is closely akin to my fifth one, concerning our ultimate objective, is that we should get back to the island barrier which, in my opinion, we should never have left.

The island barrier, of course, starts at Japan, and runs through Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, and now, thank goodness, Indonesia, Borneo, Malaysia, Australia, and New Zealand. I add Malaysia, because although it is a peninsula, it is in many ways an island, certainly around Singapore.

Before World War II, who would have thought that the United States of America would have a permanent foreign policy of maintaining troops on the land mass of southeast Asia? Who would have thought that we would have had an island barrier? The limit of our ambition was to operate diplomatically across the Pacific, from Honolulu, to the island of Guam. It was almost a phobia with us. But we now suggest that we are an Asiatic power. That seems to me to be entirely unwise. The two most unwise things about it are, first, that we seem to believe that white men, fighting on the land mass of Asia, can change the hearts and minds of the people of that area to the direction in which we would like to see them go.

The second fallacy, as I see it, is that the inevitable result is a constantly increasing escalation of American casualties, in a war whose result is far from sure, and which in my opinion will in all likelihood end in a stalemate; whereas, if we base our forces on the island barrier, we have not only our diplomatic potential, but we also have our airpower and our seapower. In my opinion, the combination of diplomacy, airpower, and seapower gives us as much overall power as is needed to assure, to the extent that our national security requires it—and that, in my opinion, is not much of an extent—that American interests in that part of the world are adequately protected.

I turn now to my seventh point, which is that if we can get into communication with the Vietcong, who then can bring to the conference table the other interested parties to a settlement, it should be possible to achieve a reasonable settlement in South Vietnam, which will enable us to depart with honor in due course.

Yesterday the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and I had a discussion on the floor as to what if anything was the difference between honor and saving face. Senator FULBRIGHT thought there was very little. I happen to think there is quite a good deal, because a mere effort to save the face of our military leaders or of our State Department, to me, is not an adequate reason for continuing the slaughter of American boys.

On the other hand, it is clear to me that we cannot scuttle and run and leave the people of South Vietnam to be taken over by Communist Hanoi and Peiping, but we do have an obligation to see that the shooting stops, the country is pacified, and a reasonable chance is given for those people, as I said earlier, to live out their lives as they wish.

That will, of course, call for an interim government, from which I do not believe we can foreclose other interested parties. It should call for free elections—although I point out that free elections are hardly a normal part of the institutional history of the South Vietnamese. It will raise the question as to whether there shall be two Vietnams, or only one. It will raise a host of other questions, including to what extent international forces should be brought in to supervise the pacification of the country.

But in my opinion, it is premature to discuss all of those subjects now. We do not wish to tip our hand before we go to the negotiating table. There is a wide range for flexibility in determining, once we start to talk, just what sort of a settlement, satisfactory to us, can be worked out. We certainly do not want to give our case away before the negotiations begin.

My eighth point, which I shall not dwell upon at length—because it must be obvious to everybody—is the domestic cost of this war. It is sufficient to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee, as does the present occupant of the chair, on the Interior Committee, as does the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], or on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, with its Education Subcommittee and its Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment, as I do, to know full well what is happening to the Great Society program because of the war in Vietnam.

We also know the substantial likelihood, that a substantial tax increase will be required. We are aware of the threat of inflation, as the distinguished occupant of the chair knows so well as a member of the Joint Economic Committee of the House and the Senate. And regardless of what the budget says—and I agree that the present budget does provide a significant amount of money to continue the Great Society programs—we all know education is being cut back, the program of training manpower is being cut back, the program of rebuilding our cities is being almost abandoned, the water and air pollution programs we passed with such gusto last year are being cut back. There is a huge dam in Huntingdon County, Pa., the Raystown Dam, which is put on the shelf because of the economy drive. We are in desperate need for an appropriation to acquire land for the Tocks Island-Delaware Water Gap Recreational Area. That money is not available largely because of the war in Vietnam. Meanwhile, the price of the real estate the Government will have to acquire is mounting and mounting, until in the end, the price will be two or three times what it would have been if we could have moved ahead this year or last year.

But I shall not dwell on the domestic cost, because it must be obvious to everybody.

I come now to my conclusion and my ninth point.

Everything I have said thus far I think may be summarized as follows: It befits a great nation, headed by a great President, to be wise enough and mature enough to acknowledge when a mistake has been made, to cut our losses, to achieve as many of our immediate and ultimate objectives as possible, and to return to a southeast Asia policy which is practical and pragmatic, which will not result in the unnecessary death and wounding of thousands of young Americans and will enable us to move full speed ahead on the Great Society program which has been interrupted, and if not killed at least scotched by the war in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, may I address an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall be happy to undertake to answer any question the Senator wishes to ask.

Mr. CLARK. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered last night, I am obligated, in a few minutes, to yield the floor. I wonder if the Senator from Georgia would be willing to take the floor, and allow me to address one or two inquiries to him, unless there is somebody else who wishes to speak.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have assured the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] that he would be permitted to have at least 10 minutes on this issue, and I would have to check such an arrangement with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have, for over 2 years, voiced my opposition to our military intervention in southeast Asia.

When I first voiced my opposition and my plea that the United States cease and desist from its unilateral intrusion into a situation which in nowise menaced our security, it was, in the oft-quoted phrase, "a cloud no bigger than a man's hand."

It would have been relatively easy to achieve an honorable settlement at that time, over 2 years ago. Instead, by move after move, the administration has steadily escalated a minor presence into a major war. Step by step we are getting in deeper and deeper, steadily widening our commitment and modifying our justification with each such step, for each of which its advocates promise results which are not fulfilled.

The premises alleged for our presence have been false from the beginning. We were not asked by a friendly government to come in and help it repel aggression. We asked ourselves in. We are the invaders, the intruders in a civil war.

The Eisenhower administration offered only economic aid and that with conditions that were never fulfilled.

The Kennedy administration, following the bad advice of Secretary McNamara, increased our participation by sending in advisers, to the number of 15,000. But, not until this administration, were our men sent into combat and aggressive warfare waged by American troops.

So we are engaged in a ground war on the continent of Asia which not only President Kennedy, but such outstanding military leaders as Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Matthew Ridgway warned us against.

When the myth of our having a solemn commitment made by three Presidents was shown to be a myth, the SEATO Treaty was then invoked to justify our armed intervention, but the SEATO Treaty gives us no such right. In the first place, it specifies that only peaceful means shall be used. In the second place, under article 4, which is pointed to for justification, consultation by all the signatories is required before joint action, and then only by the constitutionals means prescribed for each country.

There never was any consultation. There never was any joint agreement. The constitutional means required by us, had these other conditions been fulfilled, would have required a declaration of war by Congress.

In further alleged justification that we are fighting for the freedom and democracy of the South Vietnamese people, we are supporting unworthy puppets who impose themselves by means of coups on the South Vietnamese people. There have been nine of these administrations since Diem's tyrannical performance rendered him useless as our instrument and led to his disposal.

The idea that we will achieve freedom and democracy through these self-imposed characters is farcical. Last year, there were 96,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese Army. Thus, we have to send our boys to die for those who will not fight for their cause. Nor can we blame the South Vietnamese wholly for not fighting for the self-imposed corrupt exploiters of their own people.

Much more can be said to demonstrate the folly and lack of justification for our intervention in that Asiatic area. While we are expending lives and billions of dollars our domestic programs are being drastically curtailed. It will be said that a vote against this mammoth appropriation will be a denial of aid to our boys at the front. On the contrary, it will be a vote of protest against an undeclared Executive war and a vote to end the needless and ever-increasing slaughter of our young boys and of the Vietnamese people.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement with respect to some of the arguments which have been made on the floor of the Senate on the pending bill.

First, a great deal of this discussion has gone rather far afield. We have gone into the areas of philosophies of governments, systems of governments, and matters not really within the purview of the proposed legislation.

I have no particular complaint to make as to that, because I have never thought we should have a rule of relevancy in Senate debate. But, I do observe that there has been practically no discussion of the pending bill; namely, whether the Senate should appropriate the sum of $12,700 million for the support of combat operations of U.S. forces in southeast Asia, and $415 million for economic aid for South Vietnam and other countries.

I wish to clarify the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have stated this war has some of the aspects of a civil war.

That is true. Every revolution has some aspects of a civil war, whether directed from outside or inside the country. Indeed, the war between South Vietnam and North Vietnam would, in a certain sense, be a civil war, because both those countries have the same stock of people, they are all related, have the same backgrounds, the same history, the same traditions, and the same religions. But this is not a strictly civil war, despite the fact that General Ky, the head of the South Vietnam Government, was born in North Vietnam. We hear from one source that the head of the Vietcong is a man who calls himself Tran Nam, but many of the captured Vietcong insist that the leader of the Vietcong is actually Lt. Gen. Tran Van Ira, a Deputy Chief of Staff of the North Vietnamese Army and a member of the central committee in the Hanoi party.

I cite this to the Senate to show the absolute impossibility of consummating any proposal that we negotiate directly with the Vietcong in an effort to bring the war to a conclusion. Here, the only man we know of in this faceless group of leaders is a member of the staff of the North Vietnamese army, and directly under the command of Ho Chi Minh.

It is manifestly impossible for the President, however much he might desire to negotiate with anyone, anywhere, at anytime, to undertake to bring this war to a conclusion by negotiating with the Vietcong. Their eyes are fastened on Hanoi. Their ears are attuned to orders from Hanoi. They are directed from Hanoi. They are supplied from Hanoi.

Until Hanoi is willing to participate in peace negotiations, any efforts this country might make would be completely vain, foolish, and unworthy of the dignity of a great power.

We are asked: What are our objectives? Our objectives in South Vietnam have been stated time and again by the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense.

We wish to carry out the commitment of three American Presidents, that the people of South Vietnam will have an opportunity to decide their own destiny.

I assume that that means they are entitled to a free and untrammeled election in the selection of their officials, and in determining the form of government they will have.

That is our objective.

We are all hoping and praying that we will have peace, and that we can bring our men home.

I have been interested in the statement, which has been reiterated here, that we have no business in South Vietnam.

There was a time when I expressed that opinion vigorously. I believed it at that time. But after we got into South Vietnam, I stopped debating the wisdom of whether we should be there or not because, at this time, I can see no point in lengthy discussions of this point.

Mr. President, I do not believe it helps anyone except our enemies. I do not believe that it contributes to the cause of peace. I also do not believe that it contributes to the restoration of order in South Vietnam and the opportunity for those people to select the form of government under which they and their children will live.

We are now in South Vietnam. If it were based on no other premise, I would support the proposed legislation as an obligation which I owe to the more than 300,000 youths of this land who are in South Vietnam, or in the areas and waters contiguous thereto.

To me, Mr. President, it is incomprehensible that anyone would say he was going to bring this war to a conclusion by starving 300,000 Americans to death, or by leaving them naked and unarmed in the face of their enemies who would kill them, and when we know that the enemy is equipped with the latest and most lethal weapons.

I told many Senators about the exhibit of weapons which was on display in the Appropriations Committee during the hearings on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967, weapons which were captured by the 1st Cavalry Division in the battle in the central highlands. The enemy had .50-caliber machineguns, .30-caliber machineguns, and what we call a short burpgun, which, in some respects, are superior to those which our forces are using. They have had every weapon necessary for the kind of war they are waging there.

The only advantage that we have is in control of the air, but with the system of tunnels the enemy has, and the heavy foliage covering thousands of miles of jungle, that air advantage is greatly minimized.

Mr. President, as I see it, we have no alternative but to continue the war with increasing force and power until Hanoi is willing to treat with us, and the other nations who are interested, with the signatories to the Geneva Convention—which, incidentally, we did not sign but later said was acceptable to us—and bring this tragic situation to a conclusion.

Mr. President, there is no question that Hanoi is directing this entire effort.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks an article by Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts, which appeared in the Washington Post of Friday, March 18, discussing an article by George A. Carver, Jr., printed in Foreign Affairs magazine, which is the publication of the Council on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE DETAILS HANOI'S CONTROL OF NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The National Liberation Front in South Vietnam is described in an article published today as a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots and subject to the ultimate control of the North Vietnamese Communist Party in Hanoi.

The article, by George A. Carver, Jr., appears in the prestigious quarterly, Foreign Affairs, the publication of the Council on Foreign Relations. Carver is described as a "student of political theory and Asian affairs" with degrees from Yale and Oxford. He is currently an officer of the Central Intelligence Agency.

His article details and documents, in effect, the Johnson administration's contention that the National Liberation Front is simply a tool of the Hanoi regime. Carver agrees that while the Vietcong organization is unquestionably a major factor in the South Vietnamese political scene, it has no serious claim to recognition as the sole legitimate voice of the South Vietnamese.

The article concedes that there are unquestionably many non-Communists heroically serving in various components of the National Liberation Front out of a desire to redress genuine grievances or in the honest belief that they are thereby helping to build a better political structure.

Carver traces the history of Ho Chi Minh's Indochinese Communist Party since 1930, the creation of the Vietminh to harass the Japanese and later to seize power in Hanoi and to fight the French.

The National Liberation Front was created in December 1960, with the People's Revolutionary Party (PRP) as its controlling element. On behalf of Hanoi, says Carver, it acts as the southern branch of Ho's Communist Party.

Field control over the Vietcong military units, writes Carver, is held by faceless men of whom few have been identified. The overall commander is almost certainly a man who uses the name Tran Nam, but several captured Vietcong cadre members insist he is really Lt. Gen. Tran Van Tra, a Deputy Chief of Staff of the North Vietnamese Army and a member of the central committee in the Hanoi Party.

"There is no such thing," the article states, "as a Vietcong military unit of any size independent of the (PRP's) political apparatus or free from tight political control. Probably no more than a third of the Vietcong forces are party members, but by virtue of its organisational mechanism the PRP controls the liberation army in the same way that it controls the National Liberation Front."

The key elements in this control are the more than 50,000 persons infiltrated into the south since the Hanoi Party's 1959 decision "to pursue its objective of political conquest by waging insurgent war." Until late 1963 these infiltrators were mostly southerners who had been regrouped in the north after the 1954 Geneva agreements split the country.

The image-building campaign to win for the National Liberation Front acceptance as an indigenous South Vietnamese political coalition has been aided by missions in numerous non-Communist capitals as well as in Communist nations.

One of the most effective of these representatives has been Huynh Van Tam in Algiers where, says Carver, "he devotes considerable time to cultivating Western newsmen, deceiving some of them about his own political background and the true nature of the organization he represents in a manner reminiscent of [Red China's] Chou En-lai's similar success during the mid-1940's" in China.

Carver's article, because of its detail, is likely to add new weight to the administration's attack on those who suggest that the National Liberation Front should be given an independent place at any negotiating table. In 1955 Carver wrote, also in foreign affairs, a highly regarded article on "The Real Revolution in South Vietnam," a study of that nation's search for "a real national entity."

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope we may be able to vote on the bill. There is no doubt in my mind that the Senate will vote overwhelmingly for it, because we are in a situation where Senators must support their own flesh and blood, those who are in the war zone.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Farris Bryant, of Florida, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Georgia would be willing to respond to a series of questions.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, if I am able to give any information that will shed any light on this subject, I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. CLARK. I refer to page 26 of the hearings. In the report which was submitted to the committee, it is stated that there was no deep-seated resentment or hatred of either the South Vietnamese or Americans because of the bombings. This is a part of the research report that was placed in the record by the Secretary of Defense.

I wonder if the Senator from Georgia knows whether it was an independent research organization that produced this report and who it was.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is my understanding that it was the Rand Corp.

Mr. CLARK. Therefore, it is not a CIA report?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, it is not a CIA report. It was a report prepared by a researcher for a private corporation.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is it resulted from interrogation of PAVN and Vietcong prisoners.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is true. They interrogated a large number of prisoners.

Mr. CLARK. I have been concerned that these bombing attacks and artillery barrages, which of necessity we use in connection with our search and destroy and clearing operations, might have caused some adverse reaction to the Americans among the people of South Vietnam who would come under the bombing attacks or artillery fire, and also, whether this would result in adverse propaganda reaction abroad because of the almost inevitable killing of civilians in the course of these attacks.

I wonder if the Senator or the committee has any information as to the number of civilians killed during any particular period as a result of the bombing and artillery fire of our troops?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, I do not believe any witness gave us any number. Unquestionably some civilians were in the villages and have been killed both by air attacks, not only by B–52's but other airplanes, and artillery fire.

However, let me add that our commanding officers in South Vietnam have taken steps so that no village will be bombed or fired upon until the people are notified by loudspeaker from the air of our purpose and intent in order to give all noncombatants an opportunity to leave the village. Even under those circumstances probably some of them have been killed.

As I stated yesterday, any that we killed have been killed accidentally, whereas we know thousands of these people have been killed with premeditated brutality by the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think our people have taken almost every precaution possible in the effort to minimize the deaths of civilians. War is a cruel thing. You cannot fight a war without everybody suffering, and the people in the area where the war is being fought will, of course, suffer the most.

I think we have taken about every precaution possible to minimize deaths of the civilians and the innocent. It is undoubtedly having some effect because for the first time now the civilians are showing a willingness to tell us the location of Vietcong units, and to help us avoid the many ambushes into which our forces have stumbled, which is one of the principal causes of battle losses we have suffered.

Mr. CLARK. This would seem to indicate that there has been no permanent alienation of the local people as a result of the bombing or artillery fire.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I would not make that categorical statement. If I were in a village that was bombed, I would be outraged at the moment. I am sure that most human beings would react in the same way.

I think we have tremendously changed the attitude of the civilian population by the extreme measures we use to minimize the suffering of the civilian population.

Mr. CLARK. Which is in striking contrast to that used by the North Vietnamese.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will turn to page 128 of the hearings, in view of the fact that chemical defoliants have only limited capability against so-called double canopied jungle vegetation and growth, is it fairly clear that we are using these chemical defoliants largely for crop destruction, as we see in the newspapers?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think it has been used for both purposes, as I recall the testimony. But as I recall it, we have used them in an effort to locate the many different prongs of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, which is a series of connecting roads. We have on occasion used defoliants to prevent the Vietcong from gathering rice crops that were about to ripen.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have any idea of the extent to which we used the chemicals in destroying rice or other food supplies?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, I am afraid I cannot answer that question. I do not know how many acres are affected. I do not think it is a considerable amount when measured against the total rice production capabilities of South Vietnam.

The Senator knows prior to the war they were a great exporter of rice to the Asiatic world. But now we are exporting rice from Louisiana and Arkansas to help feed them.

Mr. CLARK. What does the Senator think is the principal cause for the decline in rice production; the fact that the fields have been constantly fought over?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think the fact that the man that planted his crop saw that the odds were 4 out of 5 that he would never be able to gather it for his own use is the major cause. I understand on occasion Government troops have made levies on the rice.

It is difficult to force a man to plant and gather a crop that he is not going to be able to eat or sell himself. That, in the simplest terms, is the condition that exists in vast areas of Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator completely. It occurs to me that using chemicals to destroy crops might well be counter productive on our part on the ground that it would clearly alienate the peasants whose crops are being defoliated, and I wonder whether the denial of the crops destroyed to the Vietcong is worth the psychological impact of alienating the farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not sure that I recall this from the testimony or conversations I had with members of the staff of General Westmoreland, but it is my recollection that no defoliants have been used on any rice fields where there was any hope whatever that the rice could be harvested by the South Vietnamese. It was used only on areas where there was no possibility of anyone except the Vietcong benefiting from the harvesting of the rice.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] who has spent some time in South Vietnam.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Much of this information with respect to defoliation has been classified, but I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania that the primary interest in this particular defoliation is for clearing the jungles, in order that our people know what they are attacking when they attack such targets as the Ho Chi Minh Trail to prevent ammunition, troops, and food from coming down said trail to help the Vietcong in their attacks against us.

Based on testimony received, the control of the use of these defoliants is very tight. I believe the Senator would be satisfied if he obtained the classified testimony, that there has been relatively little of it used for destroying any crops.

The testimony supplied me at this moment by a member of the staff is interesting, but I observe there have been too many deletions to make it useful.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am happy to have the Senator from Missouri confirm what I have said. I said that a small proportion of defoliation had been on crops, and only in instances where we knew that the harvesting of crops would rebound to the benefit of the Vietcong by supplying them with essential food.

It is very true that our position in the war and the mistakes we have made have been magnified all over the world. The news photographers of television networks have been permitted to accompany our people. The tragic pictures of little children who have been wounded, of mothers weeping over their dead, and of those who are binding up their wounds have been transmitted all over the world.

For every one of those instances there have been a dozen instances in which the Vietcong have deliberately done what we have done accidentally, but we have not had the means to present that to the world. That is one of the disadvantages of living in an open society.

Frankly, I think that in some cases the disseminators of news should have been more judicious in the showing of some of these films and in the statements that accompanied the films that indicated that our soldiers were careless and were deliberately killing the civilian population.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from Georgia. One of the tricks the Vietcong has been using is to wait until crops were ready for harvesting, then to go into the fields and cut the men, women, and children to pieces as they were working to bring in the grain.

One of the chief reasons why it has been necessary for the United States to export grain to South Vietnam are the clever ways in which the Vietcong have combined to destroy both the people and the grain when the people have attempted to harvest it. I associate myself with the statement of the Senator from Georgia concerning how little of this story has been told in various films and other media when they have been shown to the American people.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that in many instances the Vietcong prefer to extort a tax from the people as a condition to letting them eat or market their grain, as opposed to destroying it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, to permit me to reply?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In many places the Vietcong do impose a tax. The tax apparently has been custom. It was one of Ho Chi Minh's customs, when he started his building of communism in Vietnam long ago. It was part of the effect to destroy all the people above a certain economic level by imposing a confiscatory tax in North Vietnam and South Vietnam. In many places, if anybody argued against the tax, he would, in typical Vietcong fashion, be destroyed.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I recall that in many areas the farmers were compelled to abandon their crops to avoid being forced to harvest it, and were thus unable to take it with them. The Vietcong collected the tax and left the civilian population there without any means of support, even though they had harvested the crop. That has had a terrific effect on the production of rice in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. To return briefly to the question of chemical warfare, the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Missouri are aware, I know—the Senators have said so—that war is a nasty business. It is not always possible to fight a war according to the Marquis of Queensberry rules. The use of gas by our troops in South Vietnam enabled the Russians to mount a propaganda offensive at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva last week. They spent the better part of a day, together with one or two of their Communist allies, castigating the United States for violating the Geneva Convention in connection with the use of gas and chemical weapons.

It may well be that the use of gas is reasonably humane—at least as humane as shooting the enemy with artillery or dropping bombs on them. It may also be necessary. But I do point out the adverse propaganda effect.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Pennsylvania well knows that the Russians are masters of propaganda. They can seize a little, isolated incident, take it out of context, and make it appear to be a terrible crime against humanity. That was what I had in mind when I was discussing the news releases and matters of that kind.

The fact is that there is not a country on earth that is not using this type of gas against its own people. The type of gas we have used against the Vietcong is what is referred to as "tear gas." This type of gas is used by the police forces of every country to restore order when matters get out of hand.

When it was announced that we were using tear gas, naturally the Russians seized on that and said that the United States was using lethal gases in this war. I have inquired into this matter and have been told that we have used only tear gas. We possess lethal gases, and we have them in large quantities. They have destruction powers almost beyond description. But we have not sent one container of lethal gas out of this country, much less used it against the Vietcong in South Vietnam. The gas we have used is the same kind of gas that the police force in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, or here in the city of Washington has available to enable it to maintain order.

Mr. CLARK. What is the view of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Missouri with respect to the effect on personnel of the chemical defoliants which we are using? Do they have an adverse or lethal effect on the personnel?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I doubt whether it has any serious effect on personnel. If we happen to be fortunate enough to expose a vehicle on a road or to pick up a few trucks coming down and can knock them out, the defoliant has an adverse effect on that immediate contingent of troops or truck drivers. But I doubt whether the defoliant itself has had any lethal effect on the Vietcong personnel. As a matter of fact, I think we have done a great many things in Vietnam that have been said to have a tremendous effect, but that have been magnified out of reasonable proportion.

Mr. CLARK. I invite the Senator's attention now to the question of our bombing and the contemplated bombing of North Vietnam. I am glad the Senator from Missouri is in the Chamber, because this is a subject in which he has interested himself deeply.

Referring to page 42 of the hearings, do the Senators accept the statement of Secretary McNamara?

> The quantities of men and the quantities of materiel involved in the infiltration into South Vietnam are small.

I recall some statements in the newspapers that the rate of infiltration of men from the north was about 4,500 a month. On the other hand, the Secretary testified that throughout all of last year only about 20,000 men infiltrated from the north, with the exception of the regular army battalions. The Secretary said, as shown at page 42 of the hearings, that he thought the infiltration from the north was small.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It all depends on what figure one regards as being small.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Georgia agree that 4,500 a month would be about the correct figure?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I should think that that is a fair estimate of troops coming down from North Vietnam at the present time.

Mr. CLARK. The 4,500 has reference to personnel.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I understand, of course, that they carry supplies at least sufficient to support the personnel.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Not only for the 4,500, but also to supply the 250,000 Vietcong and North Vietnamese regulars who are engaged in the war.

Mr. CLARK. I have heard it said that the amount of tonnage coming down the Ho Chi Minh trail this year is quite insignificant. As I recall, the committee had testimony to that effect. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri will recall that testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Much of the tonnage came on bicycles.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not agree that the amount is small or insignificant. That is not my own estimate of the situation. I have read everything that has been written on the war between Vietminh and the French, and the amount of materiel of war that those people were able to move around on their heads and backs, on bicycles, and in baskets is absolutely staggering to the human imagination.

An occidental army could not begin to exist if it were forced to supply itself in the manner in which the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are compelled to do today. I think that they move a considerable quantity of supplies. I believe that we have slowed them down somewhat by this bombing. But we have not interdicted them completely, and we never will. That is why I have advocated closing the Haiphong Harbor in addition to knocking out the two railroads from China.

Mr. President, I yield to my friend, the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this discussion is interesting. I happen to have a very high regard for the fighting characteristics of the American military. They have been sent to South Vietnam to defend the United States. They cannot ever expect success on a man-to-man basis because there are so many millions of people out there able to fight in this war. Therefore, they see quality as their only hope, quality of munitions, quality of supplies.

It is interesting to watch the development of these curious discussions in the newspapers and on the radio and television in the United States, concerning what we should or should not supply in the way of quality in our supplies, so as to help these young men to be successful in what they have been sent out there to do.

I am in complete agreement with my colleague from Georgia on the importance of destroying the docks at Haiphong. Nobody knows what and how much is coming through that harbor.

It is little more than some 150 miles at the most to Haiphong from Red China. It is a relatively simple trip, one which can be taken, and is being taken by many ships, ships owned by countries not friendly to the United States, as well as ships by countries that are friendly to the United States. But what worries me most is this slow but steady effort to denigrate the qualitative advances which, as a highly industrialized nation, we can offer our forces.

Nobody has considered the use of nuclear weapons. Nor should they. But many people apparently are worried about the amount of bombing we are doing in Vietnam. They are also worried about this limited defoliation. They ask about the use of gas, as the Senator from Georgia pointed out, a gas that does not permanently hurt people, one used all over the United States by policemen, in carrying out their duties in our cities.

People are worried about the type and caliber of our airplanes. They wonder whether these airplanes are too big, or too fast. Perhaps the words airplane, bomb, chemical defoliators and other words expressing our quality will be established soon as dirty words. What will the result be?

I have seen many rifles that were manufactured in China and Russia. These rifles are placed in the hands of the Vietcong and people from the north who live on a small amount of rice, have never had a good life and never expect much change.

We take a college graduate from the United States and put him in the jungle. He has a rifle. The Vietcong referred to has a rifle which is just as good as the rifle manufactured in the United States.

If the situation continues to develop as it is developing, soon the only way in which we will be willing to defend freedom will be by putting our men out with rifles to fight with their men with a rifle. It would then become a numbers game, a game which, in my opinion, our position would be hopeless from the standpoint of success; and it would also involve heavy additional casualties.

Mr. President, I have a statement I would make if the Senator from Georgia would yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania had the floor for an hour, that he had asked for an hour.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator would yield, I thought the Senator from Georgia had the floor, was so told by a member of the staff.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri, but I should like to have the Record show that, having completed my comments in something less than an hour, I yielded the floor. Several other Senators took the floor.

I came back and asked if the Senator from Georgia would be willing to answer a few remaining questions which I had not had the opportunity to ask him yesterday. He very graciously said that he would.

We were in the middle of that colloquy when the Senator from Missouri came in.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I do appreciate the Senator yielding to me. There are only 20 minutes remaining before the vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Missouri so that he may make a short statement without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, during recent weeks and months, there has been much discussion on this floor of the various Communist units, political and military, in North Vietnam and South Vietnam, primarily the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front; also others.

Many different statements and interpretations of the structure and functioning of these units have been made a part of the Record—to the point where, frankly, I have been somewhat unclear about the history and the actions of these various components.

Now, and perhaps for the first time in summarized fashion, a clear and concise presentation has been made by a scholar of political theory and Asian affairs, who also has served in Vietnam.

Anyone who wants better understanding of what has been and is going on in the relationship between the Ho Chi

Minh government of North Vietnam and the Communists of South Vietnam will be intensely interested in this article. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that an article "The Faceless Vietcong" by George A. Carver, Jr., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Foreign Affairs, April 1966]

THE FACELESS VIETCONG

(By George A. Carver, Jr.)

"We [the Lao Dong (Communist) Party] are building socialism in Vietnam, We are building it, however, only in half of the country, while in the other half, we must still bring to a conclusion the democratic-bourgeois and anti-imperialist revolution. Actually, our party must now accomplish, contemporaneously, two different revolutions, in the north and in the south. This is one of the most characteristic traits of our struggle."

—HO CHI MINH, June 1959.[1]

The present struggle in South Vietnam is in essence the third act of a continuous political drama whose prologue spanned the 1930's, whose first act was played in the years between 1941 and 1945, and whose second encompassed the 1946–54 Franco-Viet Minh war. The scene of major action in this drama has shifted several times, as have the identities of the auxiliary players (e.g. the Chinese Nationalists, the British, the French, the Chinese Communists and now the Americans) and the political guises of some of the principals. Throughout its course, however, the unifying theme of this drama has been the unrelenting struggle of the Vietnamese Communist Party to acquire political control over all of Vietnam. Its chief protagonists, furthermore, have always been and are today the small, dedicated and doctrinaire group who, under Ho Chi Minh's guidance and direction, organized and nurtured Vietnam's Communist Party during the 1930's, usurped the nationalist revolution after World War II and subverted it to their ends. They are the same men who run the Communist state already established in North Vietnam and who are now directing the insurgency designed to bring the southern part of the country under their domination.

The term "Vietcong" came into circulation around 1956 as a means of distinguishing some of the players in the current act of this ongoing political drama from the players in act II. "Vietcong" is a contraction of the phrase "Vietnam Cong-San," which means, simply, "Vietnamese Communist(s)." It is a descriptive term, not necessarily pejorative except, perhaps, in the sense of "If the shoe fits. . . ." It is a useful, precise and, as we shall see, accurate generic label for the individuals leading the present insurgent movement, at all levels, and for the organizational structure through which that insurgency is controlled and directed.

Not surprisingly, the reactions of many whose concern with Vietnam is of recent origin are analogous to those of theatergoers who walk into the middle of the third act of an extremely complex drama ignorant of what has gone before. To understand the Vietcong insurgency, its relationship to the North Vietnamese regime in Hanoi (the D.R.V.) and to the National Liberation Front and the People's Revolutionary Party in South Vietnam (and "their" respective interrelationships), it is essential to appreciate the historical setting within which the Vietcong movement developed and the ends it was created to serve.

Throughout their almost four decades of unremitting struggle for political power, the Vietnamese Communists have demonstrated great skill in coping with new problems and great tactical flexibility in pursuing unwavering strategic objectives. Yet, though skillful in learning from past failures, they have often become the victims of previous successes. For the past quarter-century the Vietnamese Communists have been doctrinally addicted to the political device of a broad front organization, dominated and controlled from behind the scenes by disciplined Communist cadres, but espousing general sentiments to which persons of all political inclinations can subscribe (though the formulation of these sentiments has invariably involved a special lexicon of key terms to which Communists and non-Communists attach radically different meanings). They have always rigidly subordinated military activity to political ends, and employed it not to inflict strategic defeat on enemy forces in the conventional sense, but as an abrasive to wear down their adversaries' will to fight and force their enemies to accept interim political settlements favorable to the continued pursuit of Communist political objectives.

Because of this Vietnamese Communist penchant for repeating political and military stratagems, a knowledge of recent Vietnamese history is particularly helpful in understanding the present insurgency. Although westerners may be largely ignorant of the scenario and detailed plot development of the previous acts of Vietnam's continuing political drama, the Vietnamese most decidedly are not. Virtually all politically minded Vietnamese have spent at least their adulthood, if not their whole lives, during the Communist struggle for power. Few indeed have not had their lives altered, conditioned or shaped thereby. Without appreciating what the Vietnamese have lived through and without recognizing some of the things they know intimately—often from all-too-firsthand experience—Westerners cannot hope to understand the attitude of Vietnamese now living south of the 17th parallel toward the insurgency, the Vietcong, the National Liberation Front and the Communist regime in Hanoi.

II

Under the direction of the man who now calls himself Ho Chi Minh, the Indochinese Communist Party was organized in January 1930. For the next decade the Vietnamese Communists concentrated on perfecting their organization, jockeying for position within the rising anti-French nationalist movement and attempting to undercut nationalist leaders or groups whom they could not subvert or bring under Communist control, using any means available, including betrayal to the French.

In 1941, the Vietnamese Communists joined a nationalist organization called the League for Vietnamese Independence (Vietnam Doc Lap Dong Minh Hoi—or Vietminh) which was sponsored by the Chinese Nationalists as a vehicle for harassing Japanese forces in Indochina but swiftly subverted by the Vietnamese Communists to further their own political objectives. By 1945 the Vietminh movement was under complete Communist control, despite the continued presence and subordinate participation therein of non-Communist nationalist elements whose names and talents the Communists were more than willing to exploit. In the chaotic aftermath of Japan's precipitate surrender, the Communists used the Vietminh as a device for seizing power in Hanoi and (on September 2, 1945) proclaiming the existence of the "Democratic Republic of Vietnam" under the presidency of Ho Chi Minh.

On November 11, 1945, in an effort to make the Vietminh government more palatable to non-Communist Vietnamese and to the Chinese Nationalist forces then occupying Vietnam down to the 16th parallel, Ho formally "dissolved" the Indochinese Communist Party, though the impact of this gesture on the discerning was considerably attenuated when the same day witnessed the formation of a new "Association for Marxist Studies." Complete control over the Vietminh and the subsequent resistance struggle, however, remained unchanged in essentially the same hands as those which control North Vietnam and the insurgency below the 17th parallel today.[2]

By the late spring of 1946, the fact of Communist control over the Vietminh (despite the "nonexistence" of the party) was becoming increasingly apparent, as was the fact that Ho's political maneuvering and stalling negotiations with the returning French were not going to work. In preparation for the inevitable struggle, Ho endeavored to broaden the Communists' base of nationalist support. In May 1946 he announced the creation of a new "popular national front" (Lien-Hiep Quoc Dan Vietnam), known as the Lien Viet, whose announced objective was the achievement of "independence and democracy." The Vietminh was merged with, and eventually absorbed by, the Lien Viet, though its name remained to serve as a generic label for those who participated in the subsequent armed struggle against the French. The Communists also brought into the Lien Viet two other small splinter parties which by then were under complete Communist control: the "Democratic Party," designed to appeal to "bourgeois elements" (i.e. urban trade, business, and professional circles), and the "Radical Socialist Party," designed to enlist the sympathies of students and intellectuals.

The war with the French broke out on December 19, 1946, and its general course is sufficiently well known to require no rehearsal here. The northern part of Vietnam constituted the principal theater of military operations; the struggle in the south, though intense, was primarily a terrorist and harassing action designed to keep the French off balance and prevent them from concentrating either their attention or their forces on the war in the north. Though the Vietminh achieved these objectives, their efforts in South Vietnam were beset with a continuing series of problems. French control of the sea, air, and major overland routes left the Vietminh in the south dependent for supplies, reinforcements, cadres, and communications on a tortuous set of jungle tracks running through Laos (along the western slopes of the Annamite Chain) which came to be known, collectively, as the "Ho Chi Minh trail." Saigon politics were considerably more complex than those of Hanoi, and non-Communist Vietnamese political groups were both more numerous and more powerful in the south than they were in the north. Furthermore, the Communist leaders of the Vietminh had a series of command and control problems with their southern organization which took several years to resolve.

In 1945, the senior Vietminh representative in southern Vietnam was a Moscow-educated disciple of Ho Chi Minh and the Third International named Tran Van Giau, whose blatant ruthlessness and indiscriminate terrorist tactics alienated key groups that the Vietminh were anxious to bring into their fold, such as the Hoa Hao, Cao Dai and Binh Xuyen. Giau was accordingly recalled to Hanoi in January 1946 and his duties as Vietminh commander in the south were assumed by Nguyen Binh. Although eminently successful in harassing the French and furthering the cause of the nationalist revolution, Binh—a former member of the Communists' most militant nationalist rivals, the VNQDD—was never fully trusted by the Communist high command in the north and came to be considered excessively independent. In 1951 he was replaced by Le Duan, a charter member of the Indochinese Communist Party who is now first secretary of the Communist Party in North Vietnam and one of the most powerful figures in the Hanoi regime. Until 1954, and perhaps even later, Le Duan continued to play a major role in developing and directing the Vietminh organization in the south and in ensuring that it remainded under firm Communist control. However, in late 1952 or early 1953 he was apparently compelled to share his authority with Le Duc Tho, the present head of the North Vietnamese Communist Party's Organization Bureau and also a member of its Politburo.[3]

---

[1] From a Hanoi interview by two correspondents of the Italian Communist Party journal Unita, published in Unita on July 1, 1959, and in the Belgian Communist paper Le Drapeau Rouge on July 10, 1959.

[2] Despite the Vietnamese Communists' claim that their party did not "exist" under any name from 1945 until 1951, on Aug. 31, 1953, the Cominform journal noted that Vietnamese Communist Party membership increased from 20,000 in 1946 to 500,000 in 1950.

The 1949 Communist victory in China had a profound influence on the course of events in Vietnam, particularly after the Vietminh offensive in the fall of 1950 cleared the French out of the frontier area and gave the Vietminh a common border with their new Communist neighbor. The military consequences of ensuring Chinese Communist support to the Vietminh cause are fairly well known. The political consequences, less well known in the West, were of at least equal significance. With an increasingly powerful fraternal ally in immediate proximity, the Communist leadership of the Vietminh became progressively less dependent on the good will and support of non-Communist Vietnamese nationalists. The mask could now be slipped. The fact of Communist direction of the Vietminh no longer had to be concealed, the instruments of Communists control could be made more effective, the nature of that control more rigid and its extent more pervasive.

The first major step in this direction was taken on March 3, 1951, when the Indochinese Communist Party reappeared as the Dang Lao Dong Vietnam, or Vietnamese Workers' Party. The Lao Dong swiftly assumed a position of absolute political primacy within the Lien Viet front, though for appearances' sake the "Democratic" and "Socialist" Parties mentioned above were kept in existence. The overt reconstitution of the Communist Party was doubtless prompted by a variety of considerations, of which the most important was probably the fact that covert domination of the Vietminh movement via a clandestine apparatus whose very existence had to be concealed was an awkward and inefficient process. It necessitated reliance on persuasion as well as coercion and, further, complicated the task of advancing Communist political objectives within those areas under Vietminh control.

The Vietminh was ostensibly a purely national movement dedicated to the twin goals of independence and democracy; its stated objective during the first phase of the armed struggle (1946–51) was simply to throw out the French. The emergence of the "new" party, however, brought forth a new slogan: "The anti-imperialist and the antifeudal fights are of equal importance." What this meant became increasingly apparent during the course of a systematic program which the Communists soon initiated and took 5 years to complete. It was designed to make the party itself more doctrinally orthodox and to restructure the whole society, at least of North Vietnam, along lines consonant with Communist dogma. This program was conducted in five stages, each carefully prepared and each preceded by intensive sessions of "thought reform" for both party and nonparty cadres to insure that they would in fact execute the orders they were about to receive.

The first or "economic leveling" stage, launched in 1951, was designed to ruin the wealthier peasantry and the urban businessmen (to the extent that French control of the towns permitted this) through a complicated system of arbitrary and punitive taxes patterned on Chinese Communist models—as, indeed, were all phases of this Vietnamese Communist program.[4] The second stage was a short, sharp wave of terror launched throughout large parts of North Vietnam one evening in February 1953, a week before Tet, the lunar new year, and sustained for precisely fifteen days.[5] The patent objectives of this terror campaign were to cow the populace, in preparation for what lay ahead, and eliminate all potential centers of effective resistance. When the terror was shut off after accomplishing its purpose, Ho Chi Minh made one of his celebrated weeping apologies.

The next phase of the Communist program, implemented during 1953 and 1954, was euphemistically labelled "Land Rent Reduction." Carefully selected and specially trained teams of hardcore Communist cadres (some of which almost certainly had Chinese "advisers") went quietly to each village, made friends with the poorest therein, organized them into cells and helped them to draw up lists classifying their more prosperous neighbors with respect to wealth, status, political leanings and revolutionary zeal. Once all was in readiness, the "land reform battalions" came out in the open, set up kangaroo courts and administered summary "people's justice" to "exploiters" and "traitors." Each land-reform team had a preassigned quota of death sentences and hard-labor imprisonments to mete out and these quotas were seldom underfulfilled. In addition to calculated and extensive use of terror, the Communists marshalled all the pettiness, jealously and vindictiveness of village life to serve their political ends. The punishments carried out extended not only to those actually convicted of "crimes" but also to their families, who were stripped of their possessions, turned out of their homes, denied means of obtaining a livelihood and deprived of the documentation (e.g., ration cards) essential to existence in a Communist-controlled society. They became, officially, "nonpersons" whom it was a crime to succor. The fact that many of those convicted and far larger numbers of their immediate relatives who suffered the attendant consequences had taken an active part in the resistance against the French was considered immaterial and irrelevant. No one was safe or immune from the judgments of the "people's courts," not even life-long members of the Communist Party.

Despite its incredible barbarity and violence, the land rent reduction campaign was but a preliminary—and a mild one by comparison—to the land reform campaign proper which followed, and which lasted from 1954 until 1956. Essentially the same methods and techniques were employed but on a much larger scale (e.g. the mandatory quota of death sentences and imprisonments for each village was increased fivefold). No one will ever know the exact human cost of these two campaigns, but the number of people killed was probably on the order of 100,000, and the number who suffered dire personal hardship was probably about half a million. Since North Vietnam has a population of about 18 million, these campaigns had a political impact roughly equivalent to that which would be felt in America if the U.S. Government deliberately engineered the murder of over a million American citizens.

The rationale for this politically motivated slaughter was rooted in the dogmatic fanaticism of the Vietnamese Communist leadership. The fact that only a small percentage of the party membership had genuine proletarian or "poor peasant" origins was doctrinally embarrassing and made a purge doctrinally madatory. Dogma required that the "feudal-landlord" class be eliminated. Though no such class really existed in North Vietnam, it had to be created so that it could be destroyed. The object of the exercise was to purge the party, restructure North Vietnamese society, smash all real or potential opposition, and impose an iron grip of Communist control. The excesses, however unfortunate, were "necessary."

Once the land rent reduction and land reform campaigns had accomplished their objectives, the Lao Dong in 1956 opened the final phase of its five-step program. It was known as the "Rectification of Errors" and designed to restore North Vietnam to the Communist version of "normalcy." The excesses of the recent past were officially admitted and, by implication at least, apologies were tendered. Ho wept (again). Truong Chinh resigned as Secretary-General of the Party (though he remained as member of its Politburo); so too did the DRV's vice minister for land reform. General Giap made a speech to the 10th Congress of the Party Central Committee during the course of which he acknowledged a long list of "errors" and mentioned that 12,000 Party members had been released from jails to which they had been unjustly consigned. (How many were imprisoned in the first place was never stated.) The apologies and explanations, however, provided an overwhelming body of irrefutable evidence regarding what had actually transpired and made it abundantly clear that throughout the whole process the party (as one of its spokesmen admitted) had been guided by the principle that "it is better to kill ten innocent people than to let one enemy escape."[6]

---

[3] During the Viet Minh era Le Duan and Le Duc Tho apparently had a violent quarrel over tactics which Ho Chi Minh himself had to settle. The details of this dispute are still obscure, but the resultant enmity between these two men has never been completely dissipated.

[4] North Vietnam had virtually no large businesses in the Western sense; Vietnamese termed "capitalists" by the Lao Dong were generally what we would term small businessmen or merchants. Though there were inequities in land ownership in North Vietnam, the Red River Delta had the most extensive pattern of private ownership to be found anywhere in Asia and there were virtually no large "feudal" holdings of the kind that existed in pre-Communist China, or even in the Mekong Delta region of South Vietnam.

[5] Tet is the most important traditional Vietnamese family and religious holiday. Launching a terror wave just before Tet in Vietnam is like launching one a week before Christmas in the United States.

[6] Hoang Van Chi, "From Colonialism to Communism." London: Pall Mall, 1964 (also Praeger, New York), p. 213. This detailed study of the events we have outlined by a Vietnamese scholar and former Vietminh cadre merits the careful attention of anyone interested in Vietnamese affairs.

III

In the midst of the events we have so briefly described, the 1954 Geneva Conference brought the Franco-Vietminh war to a close and ended the second act of Vietnam's present political drama. This conference produced a set of four interrelated documents known collectively as the Geneva accords. Three were cease-fire agreements (one each for Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam) and the fourth an unsigned "Final Declaration," whose juridical status is open to dispute. A variety of external political considerations and pressures (including French domestic politics) had considerably more influence on the language of the accords than the objective realities of the situation in Vietnam. The problem of extricating France from her Indochinese entanglements as gracefully as possible was effectively solved and the shooting was temporarily halted, but more fundamental questions regarding Vietnam's political future were ignored or swept under the rug. At the time, the accords' crucial lacunæ and ambiguities seemed relatively unimportant, since most of the conference's participants considered it virtually inevitable that all of Vietnam would soon be ruled by a Vietminh regime headed by the benign and (so it was thought) universally esteemed "Uncle Ho." Their significance did not become manifest until several years later.

Although the legal predecessor of the present Saigon government attended the conference (as the "Associated State of Vietnam"), none of the documents emanating from Geneva mentioned it by name or assigned it any rights or status. The Vietnam cease-fire agreement was signed by a French general on behalf of the "Commander in Chief of the French Union Forces in Indochina" and by the DRV's Vice Minister for National Defense on behalf of the "Commander in Chief of the People's Army of Vietnam." In discussing "political and administrative measures in the two regrouping zones" (art. 14), it makes a passing reference to "general elections which will bring about the unification of Vietnam," a theme amplified but not clarified in the conference's "final declaration" (which set a July 1956 deadline). Nowhere was it specified what precisely the Vietnamese were supposed to vote on or how the rights of various elements within the Vietnamese body politic were to be protected. Not surprisingly, the Saigon government objected formally and strenuously to these vague and airy dicta concerning Vietnam's future fate, stressing that it was not a party to these agreements and hence could not consider itself bound by them.[7]

Some of Ho's lieutenants felt that the Geneva settlement had cheated them of the full fruits of their victory, but on the whole the Communists had no reason to be dissatisfied with the results. The land-reform program was then in full cry and consolidation of Communist control over the north was the task immediately at hand. The south could wait, particularly since its chances of survival as an independent political entity seemed nil at the time.

The Lao Dong leadership went through the motions of overt compliance with the provisions of the Vietnam cease-fire agreement, though in doing so they took a number of steps to preserve a subversive potential in the south and thus insure themselves against unfavorable political contingencies. In accordance with the agreement, some 50,000 Vietminh troops were regrouped in specified areas below the 17th parallel and taken north, along with 25,000-odd Vietminh adherents and supporters. The Communists were very careful, however, to leave behind a network of cadres, which were instructed to blend into the scenery, deny Communist affiliation and agitate in favor of the scheduled elections. They also left behind a large number of weapons caches (3,561 of which were discovered between September 1954 and June 1959) against the day when their southern apparatus might have to augment political action with armed forces. The composition of the units taken north was also carefully structured with an eye to possible future needs. The Communists made sure that many of the persons involved were young, employing both coercion and impressment to get the kind of people that they wanted. Before they departed, personnel designated for regroupment were strongly encouraged or, in many cases, directly ordered to contract local marriages and family alliances in South Vietnam. These would stand them in good stead if they ever had to return.

In the aftermath of Geneva, the area south of the 17th parallel was in a state of political chaos bordering on anarchy. Ngo Dinh Diem, who became Premier on July 7, 1954, had only the shell of a government, no competent civil service, and a far from trustworthy army. In addition to all its other difficulties, the Diem government was also soon faced with an unexpected problem of major magnitude: refugees from the north. The myth that the Vietminh was a purely nationalist movement to which virtually all Vietnamese freely gave their political allegiance and that "Uncle Ho" was almost universally loved and esteemed by his compatriots was rudely shattered soon after Geneva by what became, proportionately, one of history's most spectacular politically motivated migrations.

Article 14(d) of the Vietnam cease-fire agreement promised that civilians could move freely to whichever "regrouping zone" they preferred. The Communists accepted this provision with a notable lack of enthusiasm, hindered its implementation in a variety of ways and eventually, when its application became altogether too embarrassing, flagrantly violated it. Despite all Communist intimidation, obstruction and harassment, however, some 900,000 people fled from the north to the south uprooting themselves and their families in order to avoid living under Ho Chi Minh's Communist regime. (Given the relative population sizes, this was the political equivalent of 9 million Americans leaving the United States.) As many as 400,000 more wanted to leave, and were entitled to do so under article 14(d), but were not permitted by the Communist authorities to depart.

The 2-year period from 1954 to 1956 was one of political progress and achievement in South Vietnam that would have been considered impossible at the time of Geneva. The situation which prevailed in the summer of 1956 forced Hanoi to take stock of its prospects. The rather pro forma protests made by North Vietnam at the passing of the Geneva election deadline suggest that Hanoi's rulers were not so perturbed by the fact that the elections were not held as they were over the increasing disparity between political life north and south of the 17th parallel, a contrast considerably less than flattering to their regime. The north was just emerging from the throes of the land-reform campaign and was in a state of economic turmoil, while the south presented a picture of increasing political stability and incipient prosperity.

Hanoi accordingly recognized that more decisive action would be required if the south was to be brought under its control. Instructions were transmitted to the Communist network left behind in the south directing these cadres to begin agitation and political organization. The Lao Dong Party set up a department of its central committee called the Central Reunification Department, which was made responsible for all matters concerning individuals who had been regrouped to the north during the post-Geneva exchange of forces. The following year (1957) a PAVN major-general named Nguyen Van Vinh, who had served in various responsible posts in the south during the Franco-Vietminh war, was named chairman of this Reunification Department, an office he still holds.

The 1956–58 period was unusually complex, even for Vietnam. Diem, in effect, reached his political high-water mark sometime around mid-1957. After that, his methods of operation, traits of character and dependence on his family became set with ever increasing rigidity along lines which ultimately led to his downfall. Despite the undeniable progress of its early years, his government was never successful in giving the bulk of the South Vietnamese peasantry positive reasons for identifying their personal fortunes with its political cause. The administrators Diem posted to the countryside were often corrupt and seldom native to the areas to which they were assigned, a fact which caused them to be considered as "foreigners" by the intensely clannish and provincial peasantry. Land policies, often admirable in phraseology, were notably weak in execution and frequently operated to the benefit of absentee landlords rather than those who actually tilled the soil.

Such factors as these, coupled with the still manifest consequences of a decade of war, generated genuine grievances among the peasantry which the Communists were quick to exploit and exacerbate. Communist cadres began their organizational efforts among the disgruntled and the ill-served. They harped on local issues and avoided preaching Marxist doctrine. Cells were formed, village committees established and small military units organized. A pattern of politically motivated terror began to emerge, directed against the representatives of the Saigon government and concentrated on the very bad and the very good. The former were liquidated to win favor with the peasantry; the latter because their effectiveness was a bar to the achievement of Communist objectives. The terror was directed not only against officials but against all whose operations were essential to the functioning of organized political society: schoolteachers, health workers, agricultural officials, etc. The scale and scope of this terrorist and insurrectionary activity mounted slowly but steadily. By the end of 1958 the participants in this incipient insurgency, whom Saigon quite accurately termed the "Vietcong," constituted a serious threat to South Vietnam's political stability.

Despite the increasing trouble that Vietcong bands were causing and despite the Vietcong's initial success in organizational work, Hanoi was far from satisfied with the pace of Vietcong progress and was particularly chagrined at the movement's failure to win a really significant political following.

---

[7] The American position was formally enunciated by President Eisenhower in a July 21, 1954, statement, which said in part: "* * * the United States has not itself been party to or bound by the decisions taken by the conference, but it is our hope that it will lead to the establishment of peace consistent with the rights and needs of the countries concerned. The agreement contains features which we do not like, but a great deal depends on how they work in practice.

"The United States is issuing at Geneva a statement to the effect that it is not prepared to join in the conference declaration, but, as loyal members of the United Nations, we also say that, in compliance with the obligations and principles contained in art. 2 of the United Nations Charter, the United States will not use force to disturb the settlement. We also say that any renewal of Communist aggression would be viewed by us as a matter of grave concern."

Several Vietcong cadre members who were subsequently captured have reported that in late 1958 Le Duan himself was sent on an extensive inspection trip in the south, and that upon his return to Hanoi in early 1959 he presented a list of recommendations subsequently adopted by the Lao Dong Central Committee and referred to in Vietcong cadre training sessions as "Resolution 15." These recommendations laid out the whole future course of the southern insurgency, including the establishment of a National Liberation Front to be controlled by the Central Committee of the South Vietnamese branch of the Lao Dong Party and supported by a South Vietnamese "liberation army." The Front was to be charged with conducting a political struggle, backed by armed force, designed to neutralize the south and pave the way for "reunification," i.e., political domination by Hanoi. We can be certain that some such decisions were made about this time, for in May 1959 the Lao Dong Central Committee declared that "the time has come to struggle heroically and perseveringly to smash [the GVN]."

The consequences of these Hanoi decisions became increasingly apparent during the 18 months which followed the Central Committee's May 1959 meeting. The scale and intensity of Vietcong activity began to increase by quantum jumps. Communist military moves in Laos secured the corridor area along the North Vietnamese border and infiltrators from the north began moving down the "Ho Chi Minh Trail": a few hundred in 1959, around 3,000 in 1960, and over 10,000 in 1961.

During 1959 and 1960 further evolution of the various stresses within the South Vietnamese body politic occurred. Diem's military establishment had been designed to counter the threat of conventional invasion and proved ill suited to cope with insurrectionary warfare. The quality of government administrators grew worse rather than better as Diem became increasingly inclined, in making key appointments, to put loyalty to himself and his family ahead of ability. His agrarian policies, particularly the disastrous "agroville" program of 1959, provided fresh sources of rural discontent. The Vietcong were quick to take advantage of the government's errors and steadily heightened the intensity of their terrorist activity. To complicate matters further there were rising political pressures within the non-Communist camp and a growing feeling that Diem had to be ousted before his methods of government made a Communist victory inevitable.

During the 1958–60 period, Hanoi's hand in southern troubles was quite imperfectly concealed. In August 1958 Hanoi radio, billing itself as "the voice of the Liberation Front," broadcast instructions to the Vietcong armed forces and village cadres directing them to adapt themselves to the requirements of the South Vietnamese political situation in order to carry out their missions. In October 1958, it openly appealed to the highland tribes to revolt, noting that "the government of our beloved Ho is standing behind you." In September 1959 and again in February 1960, Hanoi commented on recent Vietcong military forays by terming them "our attacks" and praising the "skill of our commander and the good will of our soldiers."

In September 1960 an almost open official seal was affixed to Hanoi's plans for southern insurgency when, at the Third National Congress of the Lao Dong Party, Le Duan made a lengthy speech in which he stated: "The present National Congress * * * will define for the whole party and the whole people the line for carrying out the socialist revolution in the north, for the completion of the national people's democratic revolution throughout the country, for the struggle to achieve national reunification." In this speech Le Duan made a public call for the creation of a "broad national united front" in the south. In effect, he was making public the policy decisions which the Lao Dong Party had made during the preceding months. From the tone and temper of Le Duan's address it was apparent that the Vietcong insurrection was about to move into the stage of open war.

IV

Toward the end of January 1961, Hanoi radio announced that "various forces opposing the fascist Ngo Dinh Diem regime" had formed a "National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam" (NLF) on December 20, 1960, and that it had issued a manifesto and 10-point political program. The language of both, as broadcast by Hanoi, made the Front's political parentage abundantly clear. The program's fourth point, for example, was "to carry out land rent reduction, guarantee the peasants' right to till their present plots of land, and redistribute communal land in preparation for land reform." To knowledgeable Vietnamese, such words as these made it chillingly obvious who was behind the Front and what lay in store for South Vietnam should it ever come to power.

On February 11, 1961, Hanoi devoted a second broadcast to the NLF's manifesto and program, blandly changing the language of both to tone down the more blatant Communist terminology of the initial version. However, even the milder second version (which became the "official" text) borrowed extensively from Le Duan's September speech and left little doubt about the Front's true sponsors or objectives.

After the Hanoi radio announcements, the Vietcong immediately began consolidating all of its activities—military as well as political—under the NLF banner and conducting intensive organizational activity in its name. A propaganda outlet, the Liberation News Agency, was promptly established and began pouring forth announcements and stories (replayed by Hanoi and by Communist media throughout the world) designed to portray the Front as a spontaneous, indigenous coalition of South Vietnamese nationalists. For the first year of its alleged existence, however, the NLF was a shadowy thing with no definable structure and a faceless, unidentified leadership.

The Front was but one of the two organizational instruments Hanoi had deemed essential to the successful pursuit of its political objectives south of the 17th parallel. The other—designedly less well known in the West but more important within South Vietnam itself—was first brought to light in a Liberation News Agency broadcast on January 13, 1962, which announced that a "conference of Marxist-Leninist delegates" had met in South Vietnam "during the last days of December 1961," and decided that "to fulfill their historic and glorious duty * * * workers, peasants and laborers in South Vietnam need a vanguard group serving as a thoroughly revolutionary party." Accordingly, the conference had established the People's Revolutionary Party (PRP), which came into official existence on January 1, 1962.[8] The founders "warmly supported" the program of the NLF and "volunteered to join its ranks." In point of fact, the PRP immediately took complete control of the Front ("assumed the historic mission of playing the role of vanguard body to the southern revolution") and is currently referred to by Hanoi as "the soul" of the NLF.[9]

Captured Communist documents have since made it abundantly clear that the creation of the PRP involved what would be termed in American business parlance the "spin-off" of a wholly owned subsidiary. The PRP was and is, in fact, simply the southern branch of the Lao Dong. As one pertinent party directive put it: "The People's Revolutionary Party has only the appearance of an independent existence; actually, our party is nothing but the Lao Dong Party of Vietnam (Vietminh Communist Party) unified from north to south under the direction of the central executive committee of the party, the chief of which is President Ho."[10] The PRP serves as the principal vehicle for maintaining Lao Dong—i.e., North Vietnamese—control over the Vietcong insurgency.

As the organizational structure of the Vietcong movement has expanded over the past 4 years, its general outlines have become fairly well known. In the insurgency's initial phase (1954–59), the Communists retained the Vietminh's division of what is now South Vietnam into "interzone V" (French Annam below the 17th parallel) and the "Nambo" (Cochin China), with each area under Hanoi's direct control. In late 1960 or early 1961, this arrangement was scrapped and field control over all aspects of the Vietcong insurgency vested in a still existing, single command headquarters, originally known as the Central Office for South Vietnam (or COSVN)—a term still in circulation) but now usually referred to by captured Vietcong as simply the PRP's Central Committee. This command entity, which also contains the headquarters of the NLF, is a mobile and sometimes peripatetic body, usually located in the extreme northwestern tip of Tay Ninh Province in prudent proximity to the Cambodian border. Under this Central Committee headquarters, the Vietcong divide South Vietnam into five numbered military regions and one special zone for Saigon and its immediate environs. Each of the five regions, in turn, is divided into provinces; each province into districts; and each district into villages.[11] The Vietcong's provinces, districts, and villages are administratively comparable and roughly equivalent in area to those of the South Vietnamese Government. But their boundaries do not coincide, thus complicating Saigon's administrative problems in reacting to insurgent activities.

Though the outlines of the Vietcong's organizational structure are fairly well known, the identities of its leaders are not. They are faceless men, veteran Communist revolutionaries who have made a lifetime practice of masking their identities under various aliases and noms de guerre and who take particular pains to stay hidden in the background in order to support the political fiction that the insurgency is directed by the NLF and the Front's ostensible officers.

---

[8] The only two of these "delegates" who have been subsequently identified are Vo Chi Chong, now a vice chairman of NLF's presidium and member of the PRP's executive committee, and Huynh Van Tam, now the NLF's representative in Algiers, where he devotes considerable time to cultivating Western newsmen, deceiving some of them about his own political background and the true nature of the organization he represents in a manner reminiscent of Chou En-lai's similar successes during the mid-1940's.

[9] These phrases appear in "The Vietnamese People's Revolutionary Party and Its Historic Mission of Liberating the South," an article in the January 1966 issue of the Lao Dong Party's theoretical journal Hoc Tap. The same article notes: "The experiences of the world and our country's revolutions have shown that in order to win the greatest success, the national democratic revolution must be led by a workers' revolutionary party"—i.e. a Communist Party.

[10] This particular document, dated Dec. 7, 1961, was captured in Ba Xuyen Province. Its text may be found, among other places, in the Department of State's white paper, "Aggression From the North."

[11] In Vietnam, a "village" is not a cluster of huts but an administrative entity roughly comparable to an American township.

At the 1962 Geneva Conference on Laos, a member of the North Vietnamese delegation inadvertently commented that the published roster of the Lao Dong Party's Central Committee did not include some members whose identities were kept secret because they were "directing military operations in South Vietnam." One of the four examples he cited was "Nguyen Van Cuc,"[12] which is one of the aliases used by the chairman of the PRP. This Lao Dong Central Committee member, whose true name we do not known, is probably the overall field director of the Vietcong insurgency in South Vietnam. The overall commander of Vietcong military forces (who would be a subordinate of Cuc's within the Communist command structure) is almost certainly the chairman of the (PRP) Central Committee's Military Committee—a man who uses the name Tran Nam Trung but whom several captured Vietcong cadre members have insisted is actually Lt. Gen. Tran Van Tra, a Deputy Chief of Staff of the North Vietnamese Army and an alternate member of the Lao Dong Central Committee. The director of all Vietcong activity in Vietcong Military Region 5 (the northernmost third of South Vietnam) is Nguyen Don, a major general in the North Vietnamese Army and another alternate member of the Lao Dong Central Committee, who in 1961 was commander of the North Vietnamese 305th Division but came south late that year or early in 1962. In short, not only does the PRP control all aspects of the Vietcong movement, including the NLF, and not only is it a subordinate echelon of the North Vietnamese Lao Dong Party, but the PRP's own leaders appear to be individuals who themselves occupy ranking positions within the Lao Dong Party hierarchy.

As indicated above, for the first year of its existence the NLF was as shadowy and faceless an organization as the PRP is today. It was allegedly created "after a conference of representatives of various forces opposing the fascist régime in South Vietnam," but the identities of these representatives or the "forces" they represented were never specified. The myth of the Front was not fleshed out with public organizational substance or overt leadership until after the PRP was presented as its vanguard element. The NLF now claims to be a coalition of over 40 "associated organizations" which, collectively, purport to represent virtually all shades and strata of South Vietnamese political and social life. This coalition includes three "political parties": the PRP, the "Democratic Party" and the "Radical Socialist Party." (The latter two bear almost exactly the same names as the two minor parties allowed to exist in North Vietnam and are obviously intended to play similar roles.) In their present name or form, virtually none of its affiliated organizations antedates the founding of the NLF itself, many almost certainly exist only on paper, and a careful analysis of the NLF's own propaganda makes it clear that a goodly number have identical officers, directorates, and staffs. Some of these organizations, however, have acquired substance after the fact, as it were, and now play important roles in the NLF's efforts to organize and control the rural populace.

It is fairly easy to devise an organizational structure capable of lending verisimilitude to a political fiction, doubly so if one is trying to deceive a foreign audience unversed in local political affairs. Fleshing this structure out with live, known individuals to occupy posts of public prominence is considerably more difficult. The Vietcong obviously hoped to attract to the NLF South Vietnamese of personal stature and renown, preferably individuals not immediately identifiable as Communists or Communist sympathizers, who could enhance the Front's prestige and political attractiveness and provide a more or less innocent facade behind which the NLF's Communist masters could operate in secure obscurity. To date the Vietcong have been notably unsuccessful in this regard, though the full measure of their failure is far better appreciated within South Vietnam itself than it is abroad. No Vietnamese of what could accurately be described as significant personal prestige or professional standing—not even one of known leftist persuasion—has ever been willing to associate himself publicly with the NLF or lend it the use of his name.

The NLF's first Central Committee was not announced until March 1962, well over a year after the Front's supposedly spontaneous creation. Though the committee purportedly had 52 members, the NLF was able to come up with only 31 names, most of which were virtually unknown even within South Vietnam. The 41-member second (and current) Central Committee, announced in January 1964, is equally lacking in distinction.

The Chairman of the NLF's Presidium and Central Committee is Nguyen Huu Tho, a former provincial lawyer with a long record of activity in Communist-sponsored causes but of little political repute or professional standing among his former colleagues at the South Vietnamese bar, who generally categorize him as having been an "avocat sans brefs." The NLF's present Secretary General (also the Secretary General of the "Democratic Party" and the Chairman of the NLF's Saigon Zone Committee) is Huynh Tan Phat, usually described in NLF propaganda as an "architect," though one would be hard pressed to point to any edifices he has designed. From 1945 until 1948 he apparently served as a member of the Vietminh/Vietcong Executive Committee in Nambo and as the Communists' propaganda chief for their Saigon Special Zone. The NLF's First Secretary General (also the Secretary General of the "Radical Socialist Party") was Nguyen Van Hieu, now its principal traveling representative abroad. A former journalist and teacher (some say of biology, some of mathematics), Hieu has been a Communist propagandist since the late 1940's. The Chairman of the NLF's External Relations (i.e. foreign affairs and propaganda) Committee is Tran Buu Kiem, a Central Committee member who served briefly as Secretary General after Hieu and before Phat. Described in official NLF biographies as an "intellectual and ardent patriot," Kiem has spent most of the past two decades as a leader in various Communist-front youth groups. Such figures as these are the best the Front has been able to come up with to staff its most prominent public offices. Their organizational and revolutionary talents may be impressive, but their personal stature and prestige among the South Vietnamese people are not.

V

Over the past 4 years the Vietcong have labored mightily to improve their image beyond South Vietnam's borders and to enlist a broad spectrum of international support for their cause; to develop their organizational structure within South Vietnam, thus strengthening their internal political position; and to expand their military effort, to facilitate achievement of their political goals and if possible to generate an aura of invincibility capable of breaking their adversaries' will to continue the struggle.

The image-building campaign abroad has been designed to publicize the NLF and inflate its prestige and reputation. Its goal has been to get the NLF generally accepted as an indigenous South Vietnamese political coalition (admittedly with some Communist members) which sprang up spontaneously to combat the harsh excesses of the U.S.-supported Diem regime, and which seeks only peace, democracy and reunification as provided for in the Geneva agreements. Though moral—and, to some extent perhaps, physical—support may be afforded by North Vietnam and other fraternal socialist states (so the argument runs), the NLF is basically an independent political entity with a policy and will of its own. This campaign has been waged through the propaganda disseminated by the Liberation News Agency, replayed and echoed by Communist (and non-Communist) media throughout the world; through a steady flow of messages from the Front to foreign governments and heads of state (particularly of neutralist Afro-Asian nations); by ever increasing attendance at foreign conferences and meetings (generally Communist or leftist sponsored) by a small handful of indefatigable NLF representatives; and by the establishment of permanent NLF "missions" in Havana, Peiping, Moscow, Prague, East Berlin, Budapest, Cairo, Djakarta, and Algiers. All of this activity has profited from the fact that knowledge of the realities of political life in South Vietnam does not extend much beyond its frontiers; all of it has been guided by a keen awareness of the effectiveness of incessant repetition in converting myth to assumed reality.

Throughout South Vietnam, the Vietcong have developed and employed the NLF apparatus in their intensive effort to organize the population (especially the rural population), involve it in their insurgency campaign and bring it under their political domination. The detailed application of this effort varies from locality to locality, and is materially influenced by such local factors as the relative degree of Vietcong strength in the area. The objective, however, is always to secure total participation and total involvement on the part of the local population in order to establish total Vietcong control. They endeavor to persuade—and, if conditions permit, compel—every inhabitant of a given area to join and work actively in some NLF component organization. Farmers are encouraged or forced to join the Liberation Peasants' Association; women, the Liberation Women's Association; children, the Liberation Youth Association. Where Vietcong control is strong, no one escapes the net. Physically fit males not sent off to some other Vietcong military unit serve in the local militia squad or self-defense platoon; women, children, and old men help make bamboo stakes and traps or dig up roads to harass government forces. They serve as informants and couriers, or go on purchasing expeditions to nearby government-controlled market towns. Everyone participates and ensures that his neighbor does so as well. All of this activity is coordinated and directed by local NLF committees which where circumstances permit, assume the prerogatives and functions of local government. These local committees in turn are directed by superior echelons, capped, at least ostensibly, by the central committee of the NLF itself.

The NLF's organizational structure is paralleled and controlled at each echelon by a complementary PRP structure. Under the general command of its central committee, the PRP is organized on a geographic basis through the various regions, provinces, and districts down to the village level. Each geographic echelon has a directing committee responsible for controlling all PRP—hence all Vietcong, including NLF—activities within its area. These committees vary in size and organizational complexity, even among equivalent geographic echelons, but each one has a single chairman and several subordinate members or subcommittees with specific functional responsibilities. The number and nomenclature of these functional subcommittees also varies from area to area, but they normally cover military affairs, economic and financial affairs, and what the Communists term "front affairs and civilian proselytizing," whose chairman is responsible for controlling all NLF activity in that area. If the PRP organization at that echelon is sufficiently well developed, he in turn will have subordinate members of his PRP subcommittee to direct each of the local associations affiliated with the NLF. Though captured documents indicate that the Vietcong try to keep the level of overt PRP participation below two-fifths of the total membership of any given NLF component, the organizational structure we have just described (reinforced by a network of covert PRP cells throughout the NLF) keeps all components of the NLF at every level under complete PRP control.

---

[12] P. J. Honey, "North Vietnam's Workers' Party and South Vietnam's People's Revolutionary Party," Pacific Affairs Quarterly, winter 1962–63, p. 383.

The Vietcong's terrorist and military apparatus was developed and is directed by this same organizational structure, which insures that armed activity at all levels is rigidly subordinated to political objectives and kept under tight party control. The Vietcong military establishment now has over 90,000 full-time troops (including over 12,000 North Vietnamese regulars) augmented and supported by something over 100,000 paramilitary personnel and part-time guerrillas. This whole force, however, was built up for political reasons, to serve political ends. The Vietcong political apparatus was at work laying the foundations for insurgency long before there was even so much as a Vietcong hamlet self-defense squad.

The director of the military affairs subcommittee (mentioned above) is frequently also the commander of the Vietcong force attached to that geographic echelon. Village directing committees have village platoons under their control; district committees, district companies; provincial committees, provincial battalions. Regional committees have forces of regimental and multiregimental size at their disposal, and the whole Vietcong military establishment is subject to the direction of PRP's Central Committee. Throughout this military structure, the same basic principles of organization and command relationship are uniformly applied. There is no such thing as a Vietcong military unit of any size independent of the party's political apparatus or free from tight political control. Probably no more than a third of the Vietcong forces are party members, but by virtue of its organizational mechanism the PRP controls the "Liberation Army" in the same way that it controls the National Liberation Front.

An understanding of the Vietcong's organizational structure enables us to recognize the real significance and function of the more than 50,000 persons infiltrated into South Vietnam since the Lao Dong Party's 1959 decision to pursue its objective of political conquest by waging insurgent war. Until mid to late 1963 these infiltrators were virtually all ethnic southerners drawn from the pool of regrouped Vietminh forces and supporters taken north in 1954. They were not foot soldiers or cannon fodder (at least not until Hanoi began sending in whole North Vietnamese units in late 1964 or early 1965). Instead they were disciplined, trained and indoctrinated cadres and technicians. They became the squad leaders, platoon leaders, political officers, staff officers, unit commanders, weapons and communications specialists who built the Vietcong's military force into what it is today. They also became the village, district, provincial, and regional committee chiefs and key committee members who built the Vietcong's political apparatus.

The earlier arrivals had had at least 5 days of indoctrination and training in North Vietnam, or elsewhere in the Communist bloc, before departing on their southern missions; some of the later arrivals have had nearly a decade of such preparation. Until the recent sharp rise in Vietcong battlefield casualties, approximately a third of all the personnel in Vietcong military units at and above the district company level were "returnees" trained in the north. At least half of the membership of most PRP district committees, and an even larger proportion at higher echelons, also appear to be "returnees." Without this infiltration from the north, in short, the present Vietcong organization could never have been developed.

VI

The Vietcong insurgency is clearly a masterpiece of revolutionary organization, but its total effectiveness and real political strength are extremely difficult to assess. The bulk of the Vietcong's organizational efforts have been expended in rural areas and it is there that they are strongest. (The government controls all of the cities, major towns, and provincial capitals and all but a handful of the district seats.) There are indications, however, that sharply rising Vietcong taxation rates, increasingly frequent, resort to impressment to secure troops, and the Vietcong's manifest inability to deliver on political promises of earlier years are all beginning to erode their base of rural support. During the past year nearly 800,000 refugees fled from the hinterland to the vicinity of government-controlled towns. Some of these were fleeing from natural disasters, some from the simple hazards of war (though the direction in which persons of this category opted to flee is significant), but many were obviously endeavoring to get out from under the Vietcong. Furthermore, in assessing Communist claims of control it should be noted that over half of the rural population voted in the May 1965 provincial elections, despite Vietcong orders to boycott them.

In the cities, the Vietcong have an obvious terrorist capability but are politically quite weak—a fact of which they are aware and which, according to captured documents, causes them considerable embarrassment. They have been unable to turn the urban political ferment of the past 3 years to any obvious immediate advantage. None of the participants in the genuine social revolution now taking place in the urban areas of South Vietnam has sought Vietcong support or entertained overtures of political alliance. Though they have undoubtedly penetrated such groups as the Buddhists and the students, the Vietcong have made no visible headway in subverting or bringing them under the NLF banner. Just how weak the Vietcong are in the cities was demonstrated twice last fall (on Oct. 15 and Dec. 19) when two public calls by the Vietcong for a "general strike" went totally unheeded and produced no visible change whatsoever in the pattern of urban life.

Despite its leaders' obvious organizational talents and revolutionary skills, the Vietcong movement is beset with a number of fundamental weaknesses. It has no universally appealing theme in any way comparable to the Vietminh's espousal of anti-French nationalism. Persistent propaganda efforts to portray the Americans as successor imperialists to the French have simply never taken hold. The concept of reunification has relatively little appeal for peasants who regard someone from the next province as an alien. The idea of reunification does appeal to politically minded urban elements, particularly to refugees from the north, but within such circles there is a great reluctance to accept the Vietcong's identification of reunification with political domination by the present Hanoi regime. Having lived through the sequence of historical events we have outlined, politically conscious Vietnamese are not easily deceived by the NLF's pretensions to independence and freedom from northern control, particularly since the military side of the Vietcong insurgency is now being waged with an ever larger number of North Vietnamese troops.

The current struggle in South Vietnam is a historically rooted, political phenomenon of infinite complexity, particularly since it involves an externally directed Communist drive for power interlarded with a genuine indigenous social revolution. In analyzing such a phenomenon, "truth" is often a function of one's angle of vision, and myth is not always easy to distinguish from reality. Despite the fact that there are many aspects of the current situation in Vietnam concerning which confident assertion is a mark of ignorance or disingenuous intent, there are certain aspects of the insurgency, and of the Vietcong structure through which it is being waged, which are not open to intellectually honest dispute.

There are unquestionably many non-Communists heroically serving in various components of the National Liberation Front out of a desire to redress genuine grievances or in the honest belief that they are thereby helping to build a better political structure for their native land. As an organization, however, the NLF is a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots, subject to the ultimate control of the Lao Dong Party in Hanoi.

The relationship between the Vietcong and the DRV is not that of politically like-minded allies. Instead, it is essentially the relationship between a field command and its parent headquarters. Such relationships are never free from elements of tension and discord. Within the Vietcong movement, and even within its controlling hierarchy, there are unquestionably varying judgments (at least privately held ones) about the wisdom of present tactics and the best course of future action. (There are obvious differences of opinion regarding the struggle in Vietnam even within the Lao Dong Party Politburo.) Nevertheless, the whole Vietcong organizational structure and chain of command has been carefully designed to minimize the risks of insubordination. Though for tactical reasons the overt propaganda outlets and spokesmen of the NLF sometimes take political positions which differ at least in emphasis from those emanating from Hanoi, the chances of the Vietcong's developing or adopting a genuinely independent political line in opposition to orders received from North Vietnam through the Lao Dong Party apparatus are slight indeed.

Finally, although the Vietcong organization is unquestionably a major factor in the South Vietnamese political scene, the NLF mechanism which it controls has no serious claim to being considered, as Hanoi insists, the "sole legitimate voice of the South Vietnamese people." Were it ever to be accepted as such, the record of what has happened in North Vietnam in the years since 1951 makes it abundantly clear what lies in store for the more than 16 million Vietnamese who live south of the 17th parallel, especially for those who have resolutely fought against the Vietcong insurgency from its inception.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield on the same terms to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall of course vote for the pending bill. I supported the bill in committee. I support the bill now.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, spoke at the Governor's Day luncheon of the Florida Citrus Showcase sponsored by the Florida Citrus Mutual in Winter Haven, Fla., on Friday, February 18, 1966, just a week after his return from Vietnam. His speech related in the main to his observations in Vietnam, with particular reference to food and the agricultural situation there.

I feel that Secretary Freeman's speech throws much light on conditions in Vietnam which are directly related to the contents of the pending bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the Secretary's speech printed in the RECORD in full at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN'S SPEECH AT THE GOVERNOR'S DAY LUNCHEON OF THE FLORIDA CITRUS SHOWCASE, SPONSORED BY THE FLORIDA CITRUS MUTUAL IN WINTER HAVEN, FLA., FEBRUARY 18, 1966

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished officers and leaders of Citrus Mutual, of the Citrus Showcase, the mayor of this lovely community, members of your State cabinet, your State treasurer, your commissioner of agriculture, members of the State legislature, leaders of the citrus industry, ladies, and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here. I am flattered that you would ask me back again. I was here with you about a year and a half ago and enjoyed it thoroughly and am certainly pleased to be here once again.

I want, today, to talk to you a little bit in broad terms about agriculture in the world in which we live. Agriculture is the key to world peace. Agriculture is the key to the victory in Vietnam.

First, however, I want to express my most sincere commendation to you, your organizations and to this industry, to the leadership, the foresight you have shown, to your excellent job of marketing. I remember quite vividly about a year ago, when your distinguished executive vice president, Bob Rutledge, who serves you so effectively, came to my office and reviewed and discussed with me some of your marketing plans. And I listened with special interest because I have been concerned. You had learned how, as our agriculture has generally, to produce mightily. Sometimes that really challenges us in this country.

It is a blessed thing for which we ought to be truly thankful, but we haven't always learned how to live with that abundance, how to market it, and how to effectively get it where it is needed at the terms and conditions and at the price where people will utilize it. And so to note the excellent progress in your new plant, the fine reception of the new concentrate, to note some of the good work you have done in marketing abroad, I am glad to have the chance as the Secretary of Agriculture to come here and say to you, well done.

A week ago today, I was in a little village in South Vietnam at a training camp called Vung Tau. I was sitting on a folding chair beside a canal listening to one of the most impressive men I have ever heard in my life. Dressed in a simple, black pajama, he outlined for me the course of training of the rural construction cadres, made up of peasant boys who volunteered to go back into their home provinces and villages to hold those villages, to pacify those villages, after the military has taken them away from the Vietcong.

He was a tremendously impressive fellow. Some had likened him to a saint. He said in a very soft voice that these young boys are looking for some meaning in their lives which had been wrecked by war. All their lives had been spent in a nation engaged in war. They have been pretty cynical, generally, as to their stake in its future. And he told a little legend, very simple, about the beautiful lady and the dragon and how an accommodation between the lady and the dragon was developed and sustained. The spiritual side of life was the beautiful lady, the materialistic and powerful side of life was the dragon, and the harmony of the two was what gave meaning to life.

He went on with some other legends, and then said in a soft voice, "to the Vietnamese, this is much more understandable than the material of communism. The boys who have gone out of here have learned to be for something. They go out to secure and to hold these villages and fight to hold them if necessary."

And then he developed some of the symbolism which was a powerful part of this training course. He gave me one of their graduation pins. It has a T–H symbol on it, somewhat like our own 4–H Club symbol. He drew a hammer and a sickle on the blackboard, and then put the T–H over it. The hammer and the sickle were obliterated and he said these boys are obliterating that hammer and sickle everywhere around Vietnam.

We then looked at the rifle range. These men, he told me, fire more ammunition than the regular troops that are trained for actual battle. Then we saw the classrooms where they get general exposure to health, vocational, and agricultural training.

At the conclusion of their rural construction training, the night before they graduate, they sit out all night long and make up their minds whether they want to take a pledge which is part of the graduation ceremony next day, and take on the responsibility for caring for the ideals which he outlined; self-discipline, service, honesty, mercy to the old, the sick and the needy. This was couched in the traditional Vietnamese terms rather than ours but the meaning was exactly the same.

He said that during the new year celebration, the big ceremony of Vietnam, down the road in a single military camp they had 50 percent AWOL; in a military police training school they had 25 percent AWOL. But there wasn't a *single* man in the rural construction cadre who left. I was tremendously interested in this training center, because they have a workable system and it's based on hard experience that can win peasant support and ultimately win the war in Vietnam.

The military struggle is a bitter, difficult, complicated one. You don't know who the enemy is a good share of the time. We have the power and the resource and the fighting capacity to win the fighting war. But that doesn't do much good if a week later the Vietcong infiltrate the area and take the village all over again. And that's what is happening. What's got to be done is this: We've got to win the hearts and minds of those poor people who have been promised and promised and promised and abused and decimated all these years.

Last year, 1,500 local government officials were brutally murdered, some of them tortured and captured, simply because they were doing a good job. The Vietcong is on an organized, purposeful program of terror and destruction. This would be the equivalent in the United States of 50,000 mayors and county commissioners. Now if 50,000 local officials in this country were murdered in one year—it's anybody's guess as to what it would mean. Now these boys who go out of this camp are to work with the military in areas being pacified or already pacified. They are to go into an area in teams of 59 men. They are highly trained; highly armed. They know how to use those weapons. They are highly motivated to help the peasants, but they are ready to fight. But they don't go into the countryside to fight, they go there to build.

And as Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang, Minister of Rural Construction, a very impressive young Vietnamese general, said to me, "we don't go to hit and run, we go to hit and stay." And they go to the villages—their home villages in many cases—and they seek to get close to where those people live; to let them know that their government believes in them, wants to help them, to give them a stake in life.

I said to the general, "Well, now, I am the head of a cadre and I'm going into a village that has just been reclaimed. What's the first thing I do?" He said to me, "You keep your mouth shut." I thought that was a pretty good answer. He said when those folks want some help, you help them to help themselves. You don't give them anything; because if you give them something, it's not really theirs. If the Vietcong destroy it, it is not their loss. But if you help them build something and the Vietcong destroys it, then it is their loss.

About 20,000 have been trained already, and their training will be stepped up. The Vietnamese Government has selected a number of villages to be pacified with the help of these cadres. This is a hardheaded, hard-hitting, systematic job of pacification. And it is, as I say, a thoroughly planned and purposeful one. It carries within it, I think, the formula of victory.

Now this is the meaning of the spirit of Honolulu. I have just been back a few days and I have been rather shocked to find a good bit of cynicism about this in some quarters. I have difficulty understanding that because in Honolulu the President dramatized for the attention of the entire world the best in principles, the best in standards, that this Nation has; that we built ourselves to greatness with service, humanitarianism, concern for the people.

This is a second front of a two-front war. We have to win the tough, hard, difficult military part of this war. But of equal importance has to be the second part, what they call a social revolution in Vietnam. The word revolution has a much more positive cast to it, and it is broadly used, to give an identity, to give a meaning, to give a purpose to the lives of those people so that when the Vietcong come in, the people will notify the authorities so they can be rooted out. If they hide the Vietcong, if they protect them, if they don't report them, then it is an almost impossible task. So there is a two-front, sharp, clear objective—an objective in which I think we can *feel pride*, that we as a nation go out not only to stop the onrush of communism, but also go on to start and carry forward the onrush of human and social betterment.

I submit to you here today that that won't be done if agriculture is not in the forefront in that effort. I said when I returned that in this war, fertilizer is just as important as bullets, and so it is. The essentials for effective agricultural production are ready, and we can make striking progress in agriculture in Vietnam.

What I found, really, was far beyond my expectations in light of the hardships under which those people live. If you ever wanted to see a justification *for* some of our dollars to be spent on helping other people, take a look at agriculture in Vietnam. It has only been 10 years and yet those little farmers, most of them tenants, or landowners with very small holdings, are using very modern practices of improved seed, fertilizer, chemicals, and pesticides, disease control in animals, and all the rest, whenever they can get it. They don't want it free. They want to buy it. But so far we haven't done as good a job as we should, in making it available. But where it has been available, they make every effort to get it.

I talked to one peasant who walked 15 miles with a basket on his head to buy 50 pounds of fertilizer and get a little package of seed and walked 15 miles back to his little hamlet. He knew about fertilizer. He knew about improved seed. All he wanted was a chance to use them, because, when he does, his yield of rice goes up 50 percent. And when yields go up 50 percent, he can buy his kids some clothes, and they have a little money in the village to build a little school. They then build a little better home. Then they have a stake in something. Then when the Vietcong come in after it, they are prepared to fight, and inform, and resist. What we need to do is to integrate agriculture effectively in the forefront of the second front of this two-front war.

Last Sunday, I was on the coast about in the midlands in Vietnam in an area called Phan Rang. I stood on a little plot of land on the coast that was plain sand. It had been sand dunes. It had been government land. It had been levelled off. Chinese technicians from Taiwan were there. They worked with the Vietnamese farmers on new techniques in growing vegetables. An onion, an adaptation of the Granex onion out of Texas that had been adapted by one of our plant technicians—took them 4 years to do it—was being planted on that hectare of land the peasant had gotten as a part of the land reform program. He netted on that 2½ acres 200,000 piastres—that's $2,000 in American money. Growing rice in the same area, they were netting about $20 an acre.

That peasant had a little irrigation system. He and a dozen others had gone together to buy a little gasoline engine pump for a shallow well. They had put in a little irrigation works—some shallow ditches. We saw the water flowing out. Onions, garlic and other kinds of vegetables were growing profusely. I had a picture taken with him with a basket of onions and vegetables besides, of all things, a bright red motorbike. He had made a little money, the first thing he wanted was a motorbike. Comparatively, you'd buy a Cadillac. And maybe he will one day, too. But a motorbike is a desirable status symbol; it means transportation.

And in this same area, I went to the village where he lived. They had a little self-help program to build a warehouse. The material was made available to them by the Vietnamese Government with our help. The people built the warehouse themselves. They were renting space in it to dry garlic. The rent was being paid. The village had made a little money and they were putting it in a school and a health clinic.

This was the only place I went in Vietnam where the province chief could travel at night out in the countryside. Most of the time they would go to see the people during the day. This fellow said to me, "I don't bother these people who are working in the fields by going to see them in the daytime. I go out and see them in the night, when they are available."

He was able to do that because his area was pacified. If the Vietcong move into that area he would be notified. He was a tough soldier but he was very good with these people, and it is not a normal mandarin attitude, you know, to say, "I adapt myself to the people." Politicians do that in the United States. They do not normally do that in Asia. But this philosophy was going forward. He could go out at night, because if anybody infiltrated that area, he got the word. And when he got the word, he got the troops out there and the Vietcong didn't last very long. This was an example of what can be done. It isn't easy.

These peasants have been promised to death. They are pretty skeptical; pretty cynical. They have been terrorized, brutalized, murdered, taxed by both sides, run off their land, run back on their land, and they have been in this war for 20 years. But I feel, really, that the sense of hopelessness and complacency that seems to permeate some parts of this country is not permanent. There is a base, for real hope; that we can win this war; that we can help these people. This nation can be a real bastion for freedom if we remember that this is a two-front war, that force alone is ineffective, that to go along with it you have to have service, accomplishment, and build a stake in society.

A lot of people have asked me, "What about these young generals? Do they mean it and will they do it?" It's hard to tell. You can only make a judgment.

I spent 3 hours in an airplane with General Ky. He is 35 years old. He is the Prime Minister. He was the commanding general of their air corps; very colorful, very smart, no particular background in government as such. I met all the corps commanders and all the top generals. The ruling group is about a dozen. I found them, without exception, bright and alert. They said the right words, and they said them with feeling.

For example, General Ky said a number of times: "It is a military war and a war for the hearts of our people. We cannot win one without winning the other. But the war for the hearts of the people is more than a military tactic. It is a moral principle. We are trying to bring about a true social revolution. We are instituting a program for a better society."

He then went on to say, "I think that the present government by and large has the confidence of the people. I think it has a greater measure of support than any of the previous governments. But that's not enough. We must have a government which has been freely elected by the people. Despite the many tasks we have on our hands today, I feel we can take on one more. And one, which next to winning the war I speak about, is most important and that is building democracy in Vietnam."

Prime Minister Ky said extemporaneously when the Vice President left Saigon: "I am sure Mr. HUMPHREY, prior to his visit here, was not convinced of the ability of the young generals, sometimes called the young Turks, to rule our nation. I'm sure that now he must recognize that we are more civilian than the civilians, and we love freedom more than freemen and desire democracy more than you do in the United States."

The Prime Minister grabbed a microphone in Honolulu at the conclusion of the press conference and said, "I'm not a war lord. I'm tired of fighting. I've been shot at all my life. I risk assassination every day. I want to win this war and help my people." He said, "I don't have a car. I don't have any property," and went on to say that his stake was one of service.

Only time will tell how sincere and effective these young generals are.

I was impressed with them, with their ability and their dedication but also with the fact that they are a smart, tough bunch. They had to be to survive. Some of them have been wounded six times. They were fighting in the jungles almost before they could walk. To survive that and the political wars, the coups and the rest, they have to have something on the ball. And they know as sure as day follows night that they can't win that war, repel that invasion, and make Vietnam a free nation unless they can earn the support and loyalty of their people. And so for that reason if for no other reason, they are going about their business. They don't do it always like we do. They are not as efficient and effective as your Commissioner of Agriculture here, for example, and your State Treasurer. Not as experienced in government, but they are tough minded, alert, and determined.

I went to Vietnam and took with me at the President's instructions 10 of the best agricultural specialists in this country in the fields of crops, chemicals, livestock, irrigation, and fishing—and we came back feeling positive; not overwhelmingly optimistic, building glowing word pictures, but feeling that there is a real purpose and that this is not a hopeless morass, that this war can be won and that it is vitally important that it should be won. We also felt real pride in our own profession of agriculture, because it is the key. Agriculture is the key in Vietnam, as it is the key around the world in the great race taking place between food and people.

On February 10, the President sent to the Congress a great message, a food-for-freedom message, calling on this Nation to mobilize its agricultural resources and to wheel them into action to help those nations who would help themselves so that this race can be won and the world will be able to feed itself. This is the greatest challenge we face down the road.

All of us who work in this great area, then, work not only to serve our Nation and our communities. We stand right at the heartbeat of the future well-being of mankind. A world that isn't fed, a world plagued and dogged by famine and desperation and malnutrition, is never going to be a peaceful world. So as you skillfully carry forward your work in this great industry, we join in seeking to use the power that comes with this great capacity to produce and as a great free Nation to use it effectively, so other people can have as great a stake in freedom as we have and there is no stake where there is no food.

The challenge down the road is a great one but is one that I think we can meet. I came back from Vietnam challenged but reassured. We'll win this one as we have won them before.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania permit us to have the yeas and nays on final passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there has been some discussion in the last couple of minutes about the possible bombing or mining of Haiphong Harbor. I should like to call to the attention of the Senators the statement made by Secretary McNamara on page 177 of the record where he testified that since the tonnage required for the support of enemy troops in South Vietnam is relatively small, the function of mining the harbor of Haiphong—and I imagine it would be the same result from bombing the harbor of Haiphong—would not materially affect the course of the war itself.

I wonder if the committee is in accord with the view of the Secretary, that it would not presently be useful from our overall point of view to attack Haiphong either by bombing or mining.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That view was stated in an indirect fashion by General Wheeler, as I recall, in his testimony before the committee. I must say, with all due respect to General Wheeler—and I do have very genuine respect for him—that in my opinion it flies in the face of commonsense to say that the closing of the harbor at Haiphong has a lower priority than the bombing of the petroleum dumps, the petroleum for which has come in through Haiphong Harbor.

It seems to me it would be self-evident even to a lay mind that it would be more effective to close the stopper of a bottle than to pour out the contents and set the bottle back down to be refilled. That is all that would be accomplished by clearing the petroleum dumps, because the next day a tanker could come into Haiphong and replenish these dumps.

There are a number of ways to close this harbor other than bombing. I am not committed altogether to closing the harbor by bombing. It so happens that there is a narrow waterway leading into the harbor. Two dredges work there constantly. Those dredges could be sunk by naval gunfire to close the harbor for a short period. It could be mined, or it could, if desired, be bombed; or a naval blockade could be established with a half dozen destroyers.

But I think it is self-evident that the closing of the harbor itself would be more injurious to the war effort of the North Vietnamese than bombing supplies, even as important as a petroleum dump, which can be immediately replenished by another tanker coming into that harbor. It simply does not make sense to me to say that closing the harbor has a much lower priority than these petroleum dumps.

Mr. CLARK. So to that extent, the Senator disagrees with Secretary McNamara?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Oh, yes, indeed, I disagree flatly with him on that point, and also disagree with General Wheeler.

I wish to add that at one time all the Chiefs of Staff thought that closing the harbor at Haiphong should have a very high priority, and it is only of late that there has been any disagreement among the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Gladly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Georgia brought up the point I intended to bring up, there is disagreement in testimony before the committee. So I hope the American people will be informed, and information not classified. There is disagreement among the military as to the importance of closing the harbor at Haiphong.

Why should they not close that harbor? Only two railroads come down from China. One which we have not been hitting since the resumption is the railroad from the industrial section of Manchuria into Vietnam. The other railroad comes from west to east. From the standpoint of commonsense and economy, why would they use that? But we have been hitting that latter railroad. There are a few roads which in the main I understand are not in too good shape.

But nobody could know what is coming through the Haiphong Harbor. Testimony before the committee admits, a very large majority of the oil moving into North Vietnam comes through the harbor at Haiphong. Obviously, those trucks that go down the Ho Chi Minh Trail must have that oil to be used. Statements have been made that it is thought relatively little ammunition comes through the harbor; but who knows what is in the boxes on the docks of that harbor? There is no reason for anybody to extrapolate what the many ships going into that harbor have on them. Anybody who looks at the map knows the Haiphong Harbor is the easiest, least expensive, and most effective way of getting in the tremendous amounts of supplies coming into North Vietnam to kill our troops in South Vietnam. If anybody does not think most of it is coming through the harbor, where else it is coming from?

The answer we hear is, "They don't need very much." But I was down in the Mekong Delta in recent weeks, and saw hundreds of magnificent weapons—made mostly in China, but also quite a few from Soviet Russia—on exhibit in the center of the town square in Can Tho. That exhibit showed to my satisfaction where those weapons were coming from. If they do not come over the railroad we are not attacking, and if they do not come from the harbor, where are they coming from? As we know, the Communists do not have any logistic support in the way of air power.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my friend, the Senator from Georgia, I have only one or two questions more. The hour is getting late; we are almost ready to vote. I should like, if I can, to finish it up.

On page 178, the Secretary of Defense testified that the industries in North Vietnam contribute very little to the supplies used in the south for the prosecution of the war.

He also said that wiping out the entire industry of North Vietnam would have no measurable effect upon their capability to furnish the supplies they are presently supplying to the Communist forces in South Vietnam.

Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No; I do not agree with it in toto. I think it is substantially correct. But I have information and we have had some evidence that there is an iron foundry in the vicinity of Hanoi, which manufactures literally millions of hand grenades that are being used in this war.

With that exception, I think that the Secretary's statement is approximately correct.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his patience. I have one final question.

It appears in the hearings that if we were to destroy the petroleum depots in North Vietnam, and they got no fuel for their trucks in the south, they—that is, the enemy—could move the quantities of supplies now being moved by animal and by manpower. At page 299 of the hearings, Admiral McDonald asserted that the Vietcong in South Vietnam need few petroleum items, because they walk everywhere.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Well, that is true when one measures their equipment against the vehicles that are operated in modern warfare.

But petroleum is still a very essential element of war. Most of the materiel that is carried from Haiphong down into South Vietnam over the many branches of the Ho Chi Minh trail is carried by trucks. We have had the good luck once or twice lately to find a truck convoy exposed on the roads and attack it from the air, and have destroyed a great many of the trucks.

Those people, however, are resourceful. We had evidence before the committee that they were using elephants to carry supplies, and that they were using large numbers of people, bearers, who can carry three or four times their own weight.

Mr. CLARK. And bicycles.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes; that they would put on a bicycle 300 or 400 pounds of equipment, and push it along.

They are very resourceful people. They have been engaged in a war of this nature now for more than 20 years.

Mr. CLARK. Since the Japanese moved in.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. They have had a great deal of experience in it, and are probably the most efficient guerrilla fighters on earth today, and would compare favorably with any in recorded history.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend the Senator from Georgia, and I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request, and yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I mention to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] asked a question which has not been answered, and I would appreciate the help of the Senator in supplying an answer.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator for the compliment implied.

Mr. SCOTT. I am sure the Senator has information which would be helpful and useful.

The reference made by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania was to page 178, the testimony of Secretary McNamara, wherein he stated:

> The industry in the north is so small that it plays a very little role in the economy of the north, and I think any of the analysts who have studied the problem would say it could be completely eliminated and not reduce in any substantial way the contribution of the North to South Vietnam.

Paraphrasing the Senator from Missouri, he said that if they are getting their material through Haiphong, it does not amount to anything, and if North Vietnam is not contributing anything of substance to South Vietnam, meaning to the South Vietnamese, the anti——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Vietcong.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, the Vietcong, in other words—then said the Senator from Missouri, where are the Vietcong—if I can paraphrase him further—where are the Vietcong getting their supplies from?

What would the Senator from Georgia say to that?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I would say that they are getting it from a great many sources. As I stated a few moments ago, undoubtedly thousands of hand grenades are being made in North Vietnam. An iron foundry, I believe, is located on the outskirts of Hanoi, or it could be on the outskirts of Haiphong, but they do have one iron foundry which does make some equipment; but, the great bulk of their equipment, all of their sophisticated equipment, such as 50 caliber machine guns, 55 millimeter recoilless rifles, their burp guns, and rifles—some of which have telescopic sights which can be favorably compared to any weapons we turn out, the great bulk of them come either from China or from Russia. Most of those which come from Russia are actually made at the Skoda Works in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. SCOTT. Therefore, they have to come down from China, not from Russia. Earlier testimony indicates that the bulk of petroleum comes in through Haiphong, yet I am told to ignore that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It practically all comes in through Haiphong. Most of the weapons come in through Haiphong. That is the reason why I say that we should close the port at Haiphong. It is a natural step for us to take.

Mr. SCOTT. I completely agree with the Senator from Georgia that it should be closed in one of the several ways the Senator has mentioned, but we are asked to believe something which, to me, is a semantic impossibility. We are asked to believe that North Vietnam contributes nothing to South Vietnam, that anyway it does not matter if petroleum does come in, although it does come into Haiphong from Russia, that the economy of North Vietnam really contributes nothing to South Vietnam and therefore we should not worry about it. Admiral McDonald clarifies the situation further by saying that it does not matter about motorized transportation because everyone in Vietnam walks, anyway. He goes on to explain that last statement by saying that they walk from the 19th parallel but use motorized transportation from the north. If they use motorized transportation from the north, let me observe that I know very little about motors but I do know that they require fuel, lubricants, gasoline, yet we are told that while this comes entirely from Russia yet the contribution from North Vietnam really amounts to nothing to South Vietnam. Now, let me say to the Senator from Georgia, the more testimony I read, the more confused I get. Can the Senator help me find my way through this morass of semantics?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I had assumed that the statement referred to by the Secretary referred mainly to principal weapons which might be manufactured in North Vietnam. I do not believe that the Secretary would take a position the weapons did not come through, because North Vietnam is the only place they could come from. I believe that he is referring to sources of production more than he is referring to sources of supply.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will recall in one of the hearings that captured North Vietnamese weapons were displayed as coming from China or Russia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly, none of them was manufactured in North Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. But they had to come in through North Vietnam.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, if the contribution of North Vietnam to South Vietnam is not worth anything, in the words of the Secretary—if the Secretary is right—"it could be completely eliminated," referring to the industry of the north, "and not reduce in any substantial way the contribution of the North to South Vietnam."

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. He is bypassing the fact that the North Vietnamese people are receiving oil and Chinese and Russian weapons; is that not a fact?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. As I stated, I thought the Secretary was referring to sources of production and not sources of supply.

Of course, North Vietnam has a very limited industry. They do manufacture some weapons, but the principal weapons being utilized against us are made in China or sent from Russia. They are the two principal sources of supply. They are supplying them with vast quantities of sophisticated, deadly, and lethal weapons.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the appropriation for military construction requested in this supplemental bill amounts to $1,238,400,000, distributed among the services as follows: Department of the Army, $509,700,000; Department of the Navy, $254,600,000; Department of the Air Force, $274,100,000; and Department of Defense, emergency fund, $200 million.

I would like to point out that this is only a further increment to military construction funds for southeast Asia. To date we have already appropriated for southeast Asia, approximately $417,700,000, distributed as follows: Army, $162,200,000; Navy, $117,600,000; Air Force, $137,900,000.

By the way of explanation, I would like to point out that funds spent, funds available, and the funds presently in this bill will make a total appropriation for military construction, southeast Asia, amounting to $1,656,100,000.

In view of the urgency of this construction money for southeast Asia, the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, did not review the many projects in this bill in our usually thorough manner, meaning that we did not go into a detailed review of each individual project and the holding of extensive hearings. A great deal of the information concerning these projects is classified; however, the Department of Defense and the military services did furnish the subcommittee with classified information as to the location of projects and the intended scope of construction.

This bill contains language which will insure that the Congress will be fully informed as to how the Department of Defense and the military services expend these appropriations. I am sure everyone in this body knows my views concerning the constitutional responsibility of the Congress in matters of defense policy. There is in this supplemental bill, section 102, subsection B, language which reads as follows:

> (b) Within 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall render to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, a report with respect to the estimated value by purpose, by country, of support furnished from such appropriations.

I wish to point out to my colleagues of the Senate that part of this construction money will be expended on permanent facilities both in the United States and overseas; for example, money will be spent for construction on bases for Guam, Okinawa, Wake Island, and in the United States which I will discuss later in this presentation.

A major construction effort is required to provide the proper logistic base from which to project our military operations in South Vietnam. The major portion of the military construction funds in this bill amounting to $736,600,000 is for construction in South Vietnam; approximately $325 million is for facilities outside of South Vietnam to support our logistics and communication bases; and $63,421,000 is for construction in the United States, which is solely to support our southeast Asia operations. As further examples, we plan to spend approximately $36 million in the Republic of the Philippines mainly for supply and operational facilities including hospitals and utilities. Thirteen million, six hundred and ninety thousand dollars is earmarked for Guam for hospitals and medical facilities, operational facilities and troop housing.

I would like to close, Mr. President, by saying that the effectiveness of our highly trained forces with their modern equipment will be greatly enhanced when the items contained in this military construction program begin to be used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Senate will now proceed to vote on H.R. 13546.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Gruening
Morse

NOT VOTING—11

Bayh
Gore
Hill
Javits
Kuchel
McNamara
Miller
Montoya
Pastore
Russell, S.C.
Sparkman

So the bill (H.R. 13546) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] again has used his unmatched military expertise and his strong and articulate advocacy to obtain the Senate's overwhelming approval of the defense supplemental appropriation.

Again, that outstanding statesman has won for our fighting men, whose vital needs he knows so well, the decisive support they deserve so much. All America is grateful for his deep and abiding devotion. For all America recognizes that he, more than anyone, has assured the reality of his avowed objective: To see that our soldiers are better supplied than any other fighting men on earth. No man has worked harder to achieve that goal.

The success of this vital appropriation was due also to the efforts of the Senate's highly able patriarch, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] who backed this measure with the wise advocacy which has characterized his many decades of outstanding service in this body. To the distinguished senior Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and from Missouri [Mr. Symington], a debt of gratitude is owed for their strong and articulate support.

Additionally, we are indebted as always to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] for his cooperative support. The eloquent plea for swift and decisive Senate action by the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee helped immensely to assure this great success.

We appreciate too the help given by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and by the junior Senators from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] and Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], whose analytical discussions were typically provocative and enlightening. To the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] goes high commendation for again applying his cooperative efforts to assure the prompt and orderly action of the Senate on this important measure.

Finally, I personally am grateful to the Senate as a whole both for its swift and efficient action and for giving its unequivocal backing to those brave fighting men who deserve it so much.

DEATH OF MILTON KELLY, OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just noticed on the AP ticker a news item to the effect that an old and good friend, Milton Kelly, Associated Press reporter since 1930, died today in George Washington Hospital after a long illness.

I have known Milton Kelly for many years. He was a man of sound integrity. He was a fair man. He did his job well.

I have watched him in his illness over the past several years. I have noticed him come back time after time after time, always with a cheery smile. He always did a good job. He was always considerate of others.

It is with deep sadness that I note the passing of Milt Kelly. Mrs. Mansfield and I extend our deepest sympathy to his family. Milt was a good friend and a good man.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will permit me to associate myself with all he has said with respect to Milton Kelly.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to deal with hundreds of members of the press during my public career, which has stretched over a number of years, but I have never known a man I trusted more completely in discussing matters that would help him with the story, but were not for publication, than I did Milton Kelly. He was indeed a gentleman to the manner born, a man of integrity and courage. We mourn his passing, and extend our sympathy to his family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I, too, wish to associate myself with the remarks just made. It was with sadness that I learned about the passing of Milt Kelly. I knew him as a fine, searching newspaperman, a fine reporter, a man of great integrity and character.

I am saddened to hear the news of his death. I am sure all of us extend to his family our feelings of deep sadness and affection.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn of the passing of G. Milton Kelly. Milt Kelly, as he was affectionately known, was a highly respected and capable journalist whose pleasant and affable way won many friends for him in his tenure as an Associated Press reporter assigned to the U.S. Senate.

His coverage of some of the most controversial and heated investigations which took place in the Senate during his service here was noted for its objectivity and fairness to all sides. Milt will be sorely missed by the Members of the Senate, his many friends, and by his colleagues in the journalism profession.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, FILE REPORTS, AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIRE SAFETY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when S. 2669, the tire safety bill, is reported from the Committee on Commerce it be made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The bill just read is to be the pending business on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Montana expect disposition of that bill on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill as being reported by the committee has been worked over, and practically all of the committee is unanimous in the reporting of the bill. Several sections were modified and amended. I do not expect too much opposition to the bill as reported. The bill merely affects uniform tire safety as against another bill on which we are holding hearings which deals with automobile safety.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator anticipate a rollcall vote on Friday?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would like to have a rollcall vote on the bill when we are all through with it. That depends on how far we get with the bill on Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator insist on a rollcall vote?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would not insist on a rollcall vote.

Mr. MORSE. I think if the Senator wants it we should have it. It may be necessary to rearrange our programs so that those of us who do not wish to miss rollcall votes may be present.

I do not understand why we quit on Tuesday and reconvene on Friday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This bill has not been reported. We are working on the report. I believe it will be filed late today. It is doubtful. It may be tomorrow morning. I would be glad to accommodate any Senators if there is sufficient interest in a rollcall vote and the leadership says we will vote on it at a time certain on Monday.

Mr. MORSE. I am not speaking for myself, although I am included in what I say, but I am advised that several Members of the Senate plan to be away on Friday for various party affairs—I mean political party affairs—and perhaps we could have a vote on Monday and not have a vote on Friday, in view of the fact that there is this long postponement from Tuesday until Friday when we are ready to stay here during the week and do business. I am ready to stay Friday, but I wish to know if it is necessary to cancel my engagement on Friday to be here to cast my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I would not say that. We will see what we can do. I am certain this can be worked out to the satisfaction of all Senators.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Washington would be the last to suggest otherwise.

USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1046, Senate 801.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, S. 801, to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 801

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency of the Government may be used by Federal agencies for any authorized purpose, except (1) that reimbursement shall be made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned, and (2) that any foreign currencies so used shall be replaced when needed for the purpose for which originally reserved or set aside.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1078), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to permit Federal agencies to use any authorized foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency of the Government. The bill would require that reimbursement must be made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency seeking the funds and foreign currencies so used must be replaced when needed for the purpose for which originally reserved or set aside.

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 801 was introduced by Senators BOGGS and DOMINICK on January 28, 1965, and was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. Comments from the following agencies were requested: Treasury, State, Agriculture, and General Accounting. All of these agencies have submitted favorable reports. No objections to the bill have been brought to the attention of the committee.

An identical bill, S. 2115, 88th Congress, was considered by the committee and reported to the Senate on March 3, 1964 (S. Rept. 932). S. 2115 passed the Senate on March 6, 1964. The bill was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, but no action was taken before adjournment.

S. 801 would provide on a permanent basis authority which Congress has provided on an annual basis for the fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 by the inclusion of an appropriate provision in the Public Works Appropriation Act for those fiscal years.

The following excerpt from the statement made by Senator BOGGS when he introduced the earlier bill explains clearly the way S. 801 is intended to operate:

"If we had a million lire in an Italian bank and the money was earmarked for an educational exchange program, for instance, the lire would simply lie there until a program was begun requiring use of the lire.

"Under the change I propose, the disbursing officer attached to our Italian Embassy could draw out that money to pay authorized U.S. obligations. Whether he drew out 100,000 lire or 500,000 lire, or the whole amount, the educational exchange program in question would still be credited with a million lire on U.S. Treasury books. When the program needed the money, it would be provided either from lire on hand or lire purchased with dollars.

"The Embassy, on the other hand, would have had its account lessened by the amount of lire spent. The net effect of this bookkeeping and banking interchange would be to use the available foreign funds and keep U.S. dollars in U.S. hands."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader for bringing up S. 801 at this time. It will be of substantial importance in solving the balance-of-payments problem. It occurs to me that it is a step that should have been taken much earlier. I hope that it will be possible for the House to press forward early enough so that action on the bill in that body can be taken in this session.

Again, I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana for having brought the bill up at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was a pleasure to do so.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT ENTITLED "RESPONSES TO INQUIRIES ABOUT THE NORTHEAST POWER FAILURE"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1079)

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted an interim report of that committee entitled "Responses to Inquiries About the Northeast Power Failure November 9 and 10, 1965," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, with the rank of admiral;

Capt. William B. Ellis, Capt. Douglas B. Henderson, Capt. Russell R. Waesche, Jr., and Capt. Mark A. Whalen, for promotion to the grade of rear admirals.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3117. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Utah State University; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3118. A bill to permit the city of Senatobia, Miss., to count certain expenditures as a local grant-in-aid to the east Senatobia urban renewal project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3119. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, so as to prevent the loss of veteran pension benefits as the result of increases in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3120. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Pigford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3121. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3122. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended;

S. 3123. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes; and

S. 3124. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. TOWER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. DOMINICK:

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF ANY MATTER PERTAINING TO THE DISPLAY AND USE OF THE U.S. FLAG

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 237) to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study and investigation of any matter pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. TOWER, which appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE DISPLAY AND USE OF THE FLAG

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, present law governs the display of our flag, which stands as a symbol of our great Nation, of our heritage of liberty and justice for all. One of the primary purposes for the law, is of course, to insure that our flag is properly displayed and properly respected.

In recent years, the Congress has drawn together "the existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag," which can be found in Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and in Public Law 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. In my opinion, a further review of such customs and rules is now necessary in order to insure continued proper respect for our flag.

I am, therefore, today submitting a resolution authorizing a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to the display and use of our flag, with a view to determining the need for, or the desirability of enacting new legislation with respect to display and use of the flag.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD and lie on the table for 10 days so that others may cosponsor it if they desire.

In recent years there have been abuses in the display of the American flag and in the use of the flag in design and decoration of items of clothing. While none of these instances has involved intentional disrespect to the flag, I believe rules and regulations for flag use and display should be further studied and clarified.

Congress has previously drawn together the rules and customs pertaining to display of the flag as the symbol of our Nation, our heritage of liberty and our devotion to justice for all. It is fully consistent for Congress now to check those rules to see if an updating would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The resolution (S. Res. 237) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. RES. 237

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States with a view to determining the need for or the desirability of enacting new legislation with respect to the display and use of the flag of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

THE FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS—AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 507

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce an amendment to S. 3034, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility investigation of certain water resource development proposals. The bill, which was introduced by the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, was made necessary by enactment of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act of 1965. Section 8 requires that after July 1, 1966, the Secretary of the Interior cannot prepare feasibility reports under reclamation law for water resource projects without specific legislative authorization.

I offer an amendment to S. 3034 for the purpose of including two irrigation pumping units, Fort Thompson unit and Grass Rope unit, one on each side of the Missouri River in central South Dakota. Both projects were included in the South Dakota pumping division, a part of the Missouri River Basin project as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Four other pumping units were previously included in S. 3034. All of these irrigation pumping units were part of the "Report on South Dakota Pumping Division, South Dakota Missouri River Basin Project" prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1959.

The Fort Thompson irrigation pumping unit is located in Buffalo County, S. Dak., and lies in the Crow Creek Indian Reservation. The Grass Rope unit is in Lyman County, S. Dak., and is situated in the Lower Brule Indian Reservation.

Fort Thompson would provide irrigation for some 7,500 acres—2,300 of which is Indian land. The Grass Rope unit consists of 4,500 acres of which 3,500 acres is either Indian tribal land or Indian allocated land. Both units are particularly important to provide a needed impetus to the economy of these Indian reservations; they lie in a semiarid region, where the average annual precipitation varies from 15 inches to about 24 inches. The predominant crops are wheat and other small grains. With irrigation, this would switch to corn and forage crops. The assurance of a steady feed supply would result in more livestock raising and fattening.

Without an assured water supply, these lands produce only a fraction of their potential. Irrigation would increase production on the lands irrigated and permit more efficient use of the adjacent dry lands. The stabilized production on the irrigable acres would have a general stabilizing effect on the economy of the whole area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 507) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 14, 1966, the names of Mr. Simpson and Mr. Thurmond were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3081) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to impose sanctions against its members for exceeding production quotas, introduced by Mr. Dominick on March 14, 1966.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Mr. Gross of Iowa had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, vice Mr. Corbett, of Pennsylvania, excused.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 10553) to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships, and it was signed by the Vice President.

WHERE DOES DE GAULLE GO FROM HERE?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, all of us are here becoming increasingly apprehensive about the actions being taken by the head of the French Government, Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Where Does De Gaulle Go From Here?" published recently in one of America's great newspapers, the Kansas City Star, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Where Does De Gaulle Go From Here?

The myth that Charles de Gaulle is the only practical major statesman in the Western world dies hard, but that it is dying, of this there now seems little serious doubt.

The President of France professes to believe, in effect, that the postwar threat of Communist aggression—whether from the Soviet Union or Red China—no longer requires coordinated precautionary action on the part of countries dedicated to the twin principles of human freedom and national independence. Since 1958, therefore, he has gradually geared his foreign policy to liberate the French people from any form of what he likes to call "vassalage" to the United States, based on the persistence of that threat.

In Europe, De Gaulle's "realism" apparently demands that France at the earliest opportunity renounce the fundamental commitments it assumed 17 years ago with respect to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This opportunity will be presented in 1969, when the 20-year treaty automatically comes up for revision. The Organization's 14 other members already are on notice that France then intends to withdraw from all integrated defense arrangements, which lie at the core of the NATO concept, offering, as a substitute, to enter into a system of bilateral military alliances of the conventional type.

In Asia, this same political philosophy has led De Gaulle to shatter any possibility of a common Western front designed to contain the expansionist ambitions of the Chinese Communist Government. (These are currently disguised as the promotion of "wars of national liberation," but only the other day they were nakedly revealed along India's northern frontier.) French policy presupposes no need to avoid another Munich-type appeasement in Vietnam, evidently on the theory that Red China is not embarked on any course even remotely resembling Nazi Germany's of a generation back.

At first, and for some time thereafter, the President of France had articulate disciples throughout the West who welcomed his essentially nationalistic approach as a refreshing exercise in commonsense, as opposed to the dangerously fuzzy internationalist point of view. More recently their voices seem to have grown less confident. At least, the chorus of praise certainly has not swollen, nor has any other responsible Western statesman joined the De Gaullist camp. And last week's exchange of messages between Paris and Washington came close to giving the game away.

De Gaulle, it appears, makes a sharp distinction where NATO is concerned. France, he has indicated, is willing to preserve the outward facade of the organization as a regional defense arrangement within the framework of the United Nations Charter. What it will not tolerate after 1969 is a continuation of NATO's inner structure, providing for the integration of all military forces assigned to the organization and for the stationing of foreign units on French territory without being directly under French command.

There cannot be the slightest question as to what acceptance of this requirement would entail. The function of NATO, as originally conceived, was to create something heretofore unknown in peacetime, a wholly cohesive multinational defense force, with land, sea and air arms, ready at a moment's notice to repel an attack on any member. In substance, De Gaulle would have that instrumentality replaced by an assembly of strictly national components (or components under the command of the country where they happened to be deployed), with what would amount to loose coordination at the policy level.

Here, by general admission, is the difference between day and night. De Gaulle rationalizes his proposition on the twin assumptions that the peril of a Communist attack on Western Europe has diminished since 1949 to a point where a capacity for instant response is no longer necessary and that France's sovereignty on its own soil must be upheld at any cost to the efficiency of that response. On the first of those assumptions the French President may be right or wrong. Neither the United States nor, presumably, any of France's other NATO partners is prepared to run the tremendous risk involved in a misjudgment.

On the second assumption, however, De Gaulle has implicitly undermined his own case by asking for a military alliance with this country. For if France is capable—as it was not in two previous world wars—of meeting its own security needs after the disemboweling of NATO, why such a request to be allowed to remain under the defense umbrella of the United States? Was it not precisely recognition of this country's primary role in NATO that produced the talk of intolerable subservience for a proud people?

The conclusion becomes inescapable that De Gaulle wants to have his cake of precommitted American protection but to eat it at the same time in a more palatable form which will permit him to pose as independent of all such international nonsense. The difficulty with that ingenuous gambit is, as President Johnson promptly informed him, that France cannot have the confection he seeks. The United States simply will not fall in with a fragmentation of its responsibilities to the Atlantic community.

From the very narrowest interpretation of France's self-interest, moreover, De Gaulle's proposal for gutting NATO must look to a friendly outsider like folly compounded. That organization does not merely represent a mechanism for deterring an armed assault against his country from any direction and thus forestalling the necessity to improvise a collective defense after the fact, as has arisen twice in living memory. (In both instances there was time for such a luxury, which may not be available on the next occasion.)

NATO also has turned out simultaneously to supply the French another and more particular safeguard. The integration of West Germany's total military establishment into a regional structure, thereby precluding its use hereafter as a threat to any other NATO partner, constituted an almost miraculous dividend for a neighboring country which the Germans had invaded three times in the last century. The possibility of a revival of the militaristic spirit has worried many liberal Germans since the end of the Second World War, to say nothing of the West at large. But no country, obviously, has a bigger stake than France in averting such a development.

What, then, is to be made of a proposition that would destroy this procedure for giving a major nation the physical security it has every right to possess, without conferring upon it, once more, the capability of separate aggressive action? Surely even De Gaulle cannot expect successfully to claim privileges for his country and deny them to West Germany. Has the president's self-deception over the greatness of France (in physical terms) at last blinded him to a still greater potential immediately to the east? Has his sense of history so far deserted him that he no longer shares his countrymen's ancient nightmare?

Or does De Gaulle think that his proposed American alliance would be sufficient for all eventualities, so that he can dream in peace of a time when France's spiritual image will dominate the world? The mystical strain in this distinguished Frenchman, which rendered him such a difficult colleague in the recent wartime alliance, may not bother those who have pronounced him today the most down-to-earth leader of the free world. It has, however, grown into a steadily increasing source of anxiety and exasperation for everyone else, including a considerable number of his own compatriots, chiefly because of a geographical accident which has given France a wholly disproportionate power to disrupt cooperative planning, whether in NATO or the European Common Market.

Thus far the President of France appears to have had his way in blocking any advance, through the second of those institutions, toward a United States of Europe. But on the Atlantic front last week he was finally confronted by a long-delayed moment of truth. Firmly, if politely, President Johnson told him that while revision in the North Atlantic treaty was susceptible to negotiation, the United States would not be party to any eviscerating operation or, equally, any decisions not taken in full consultation with all members of NATO. (Long ago, it may be remembered, De Gaulle had proposed a British-French-American triumvirate to run the organization.)

Where does De Gaulle go from here? It is a nice question, of interest to the entire

West. As for Asia, De Gaulle might reasonably conclude he has done fairly well. In place of a former, and deeply tarnished, French presence he has substituted what might be described as a French individuality, completely disassociated from those of France's traditional allies, the United States and Great Britain.

De Gaulle (the practical man) advocates the evacuation of all American forces from South Vietnam, in return for an unenforceable neutralization of all southeast Asia—mainly, it would seem, through the device of coalition governments in which the Communists are to participate. He apparently has managed to sell this unattractive idea not only to many nonalined nations but also to a substantial number of Western European countries preoccupied by their own affairs and anxious to avoid any involvement at so great a distance.

The chance that Red China, with a rocket-deliverable nuclear armament, might ultimately prove a direct menace to France seems to have eluded his imagination. Or it may be that, at least subconsciously, he feels free to suggest so perilous a course, knowing that it will probably never be implemented. Nevertheless, there are signs that even here his advice is making little or no progress among Asian peoples who have the most to lose and who grow more and more skeptical of Chinese Communist motives. How strong his support has been in Western Europe remains debatable, apart from an understandable desire—in the light of postwar exhaustion and end-of-colonialism confusion—to keep aloof.

At home De Gaulle's backing has begun to fluctuate. There is a little more vocal criticism of his foreign policy, especially in relation to the European and Atlantic communities. But the President seemingly continues to be regarded by a majority of his countrymen as indispensable. However much some of them may personally disagree with his international program, they clearly tend to consider its acceptance as a lesser evil than the constant fear of a reversion to the kind of feeble government France experienced prior to 1958. Furthermore, many Frenchmen presumably emerged from the trauma induced by the traitorous surrender of their country and its costly aftermath with a natural hunger to be left alone.

Unfortunately, the contemporary world, as seen from this side of the Atlantic, is not one in which any country can retire behind a maginot line and believe itself safe by strictly minding its own domestic business. Still less can it expect indefinitely to receive the benefits of a free world order, without offering full reciprocal contributions. In essence, this is what President Johnson pointed out to De Gaulle last week. Where the President of France will go from here no one can foretell. But he has now been warned that, as far as the United States is concerned, at present he is going exactly nowhere—either in Europe or in Asia.

UNIFORM DATES FOR DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Uniform Time Act of 1966".

Sec. 2. It is the policy of the United States to promote the adoption and observance of uniform time within the standard time zones prescribed by the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States", approved March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261–264), as modified by the Act entitled "An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone", approved March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1446; 15 U.S.C. 265). To this end the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to foster and promote widespread and uniform adoption and observance of the same standard of time within and throughout each such standard time zone.

Sec. 3. (a) During the period commencing at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of April of each year and ending at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of October of each year, the standard time of each zone established by the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261–264), as modified by the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265), shall be advanced one hour and such time as so advanced shall for the purposes of such Act of March 9, 1918, as so modified, be the standard time of such zone during such period; except that any State may by law exempt itself from the provisions of this subsection providing for the advancement of time, but only if such law provides that the entire State (including all political subdivisions thereof) shall observe the standard time otherwise applicable under such Act of March 19, 1918, as so modified during such period.

(b) It is hereby declared that it is the express intent of Congress by this section to supersede any and all laws of the States or political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or hereafter provide for advances in time or changeover dates different from those specified in this section.

(c) For any violation of the provisions of this section the Interstate Commerce Commission or its duly authorized agent may apply to the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurs for the enforcement of this section; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by writ of injunction or by other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining against further violations of this section and enjoining obedience thereto.

Sec. 4. (a) The first section of the Act of March 19, 1918, as amended (15 U.S.C. 261), is amended to read as follows:

"That for the purpose of establishing the standard time of the United States, the territory of the United States shall be divided into eigth zones in the manner provided in this section. Except as provided in section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966, the standard time of the first zone shall be based on the mean solar time of the sixtieth degree of longitude west from Greenwich; that of the second zone on the seventy-fifth degree; that of the third zone on the ninetieth degree; that of the fourth zone on the one hundred and fifth degree; that of the fifth zone on the one hundred and twentieth degree; that of the sixth zone on the one hundred and thirty-fifth degree; that of the seventh zone on the one hundred and fiftieth degree; and that of the eighth zone on the one hundred and sixty-fifth degree. The limits of each zone shall be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and any such order may be modified from time to time. As used in this Act, the term 'interstate or foreign commerce' means commerce between a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States and any place outside thereof."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Within the respective zones created under the authority of this Act the standard time of the zone shall insofar as practicable (as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission) govern the movement of all common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce. In all statutes, orders, rules, and regulations relating to the time of performance of any act by any officer or department of the United States, whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government, or relating to the time within which any rights shall accrue or determine, or within which any act shall or shall not be performed by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, it shall be understood and intended that the time shall insofar as practicable (as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission) be the United States standard time of the zone within which the act is to be performed."

(c) Section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The standard time of the first zone shall be known and designated as Atlantic standard time; that of the second zone shall be known and designated as eastern standard time; that of the third zone shall be known and designated as central standard time; that of the fourth zone shall be known and designated as mountain standard time; that of the fifth zone shall be known and designated as Pacific standard time; that of the sixth zone shall be known and designated as Yukon standard time; that of the seventh zone shall be known and designated as Alaska-Hawaii standard time; and that of the eighth zone shall be known and designated as Bering standard time."

Sec. 5. The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001–1011) shall apply to all proceedings under this Act, the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261–264), and the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265).

Sec. 6. This Act shall take effect on April 1, 1967; except that if any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, observes daylight saving time in the year 1966, such time shall advance the standard time otherwise applicable in such place by one hour and shall commence at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in April of the year 1966 and shall end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in October of the year 1966.

Sec. 7. As used in this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to promote the observance of a uniform system of time throughout the United States."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], who had a great deal to do with the bill, not only the drawing of the bill but the problems involved. He spent a great deal of time with witnesses in order that we might come out with a bill we think is uniformly acceptable to the people of the United States. There may be some exceptions, but in the main this is correct.

I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for that purpose.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will concur in the amendment of the House to S. 1404. Before the question is put, I wish to offer a brief explanation of the bill as it now comes before the Senate.

What will the bill do if, as I hope, it is approved today and is signed into law by the President?

In 1966, it will mean that any State, city, town, or political subdivision that chooses to observe daylight saving time shall go on daylight saving time at 2 a.m. on April 24 and stay on daylight saving time until 2 a.m. October 30.

In 1967 and thereafter—and this provision was added by the House—it will mean that everyone will observe daylight saving time from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October, with the exception of those States—and it must be the entire State—where the legislature decides to remain on standard time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a more detailed summary of the provisions of S. 1404, as amended by the House.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the bill is a giant step toward the elimination of the manifold problems which have arisen because of the clock confusion existing in this country for many of the past years.

Testimony presented to our committee has indicated that just to revise and republish the schedules and timetables of the buses, airlines, and railroads costs millions of dollars a year in added costs because of the confusion resulting from daylight saving and standard time. The estimates put these annual costs at close to $5 million a year. Most, if not all, of these extra and burdensome costs will be eliminated by the enactment of this bill.

In addition, and more important, the bill will go a long way toward the elimination of the confusion, frustration, and bewilderment which have afflicted millions of Americans as a result of being an hour late or an hour early for a train or a plane, or for an appointment or a meeting. These enormous hidden costs are the price we have paid for our clock confusion. They will be substantially eliminated by the enactment of the bill.

Obviously, the enactment of the bill will cause some areas and some communities to change the time practices which they have followed in recent years. Considering the wide-ranging variety of dates during which daylight saving time is observed—there are as many as 23 combinations of dates for beginning and ending daylight time in some States—I think it is fair to say that the bill has been drafted to create as little disruption among affected States and communities as possible.

In this connection, I point out that the Interstate Commerce Commission still retains, under the bill, the authority it now has to fix, and to move if necessary, the boundaries of the standard time zones. Some of the problems which might arise under the bill can be resolved by adjustment of the time zone boundaries by the ICC.

These are the reasons why I urge the adoption of the motion to concur in the House amendments.

I wish to make perfectly clear the difference between the provisions of the Senate bill and the House bill as amended. As passed by the Senate, the bill merely made uniform the dates on which States and communities that elected to have daylight time should start and finish daylight time. In other words, the Senate bill would have eliminated the confusion that arose from 23 different dates when States went on and came off daylight time. The Senate bill did not in any way affect the rights of any State, county, city, or political subdivision to make its own selection.

The House added to the bill a provision that I honestly believe is highly desirable. It went one step further and provided that after 1967—which provides ample time for State legislatures to act—daylight saving time, beginning in April and ending in October, on the same dates, shall be the time throughout the Nation, except in States whose legislatures determine that they shall remain on standard time during all the year or during that portion of the year between the dates in April and October when daylight saving time is in effect.

The only point on which there could be some objection to this agreement—and I want to be perfectly frank about it—is that the bill provides that the entire State must act as a unit. In other words, under the bill, a legislature could not vote to have part of the State be on daylight saving time and a part of the State on standard time.

There is one saving feature, however. The bill leaves unimpaired in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to change existing time zones. So if there should be any States in which it is desired that a part of the State be on daylight saving time and a part of the State be on standard time, because to require uniformity would impose a hardship, recourse may be had to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a change in time zones, which might overcome the objection. Of course, as a rule, the time zone boundaries run north and south, not east and west, so there are some limitations to that recourse.

But essentially the provision added by the House is that daylight saving time shall be in effect between April and October, beginning and ending on fixed dates all over the country, except in States where the legislatures vote to continue on standard time.

I trust that the passage of the bill will be a giant step toward the establishment of uniform time throughout the country. I hope that the Senate will concur in the House amendments and will take a step which will be of immense public benefit thoughout the country.

Exhibit 1

Purpose and Summary of the Bill

The purpose of the bill is to establish uniform dates for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in all States and jurisdictions where it is observed. The further purpose of the bill is to allow each State through enactment of State law to exempt itself on a statewide basis from the provisions of the bill which establish daylight saving time. Any State which elects to exempt itself and not follow daylight saving time would be required to observe standard time as provided for by the act of March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261–264).

Thus the bill is designed to eliminate at least the greater part of the confusion and unnecessary costs which ensue from the current conflicting time standards which exist in the United States.

The bill would—

1. Establish a policy of the United States to promote the adoption and observance of uniform time within the standard time zones prescribed by the legislation.

2. Implement this policy by authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to foster and promote widespread and uniform adoption and observance of the same standards of time within each standard time zone.

3. Require that all observance of daylight saving time commence at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and end at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October.

4. Allow any State to exempt itself from the daylight saving time provisions but only if the State, through legislative action, provides that the entire State shall observe the standard time otherwise applicable under this legislation.

5. Express the intent of Congress that the section dealing with daylight saving time and the exception providing for any States remaining on standard time (sec. 3(a)) supersedes any laws of the States or political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or in the future provide for time changes different from those in section 3(a).

6. Empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to apply to the district courts of the United States for injunctive or other relief in the event of violations of the provisions related to daylight saving time.

7. Add 3 new zones to the existing zones, primarily to provide for Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and certain possessions of the United States.

8. Make the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001–1011) applicable to all proceedings under the legislation.

9. Provide that April 1, 1967, be the effective date of the legislation except that any State or political subdivision thereof observing daylight saving time in 1966 shall commence such observance at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and end it at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire stated that some States are divided on this issue. Missouri is one of those States. St. Louis is in the eastern half of Missouri; Kansas City, another great city, is in the western part of the State. Traditionally, there has been widespread opposition to uniform time in Missouri. Last year, the legislature attempted to establish a statewide uniform time rule in the State, and the opposition was so serious that the proposal was defeated.

Traditionally, St. Louis, in the eastern half of the State, is on daylight saving time, because most of the trade from St. Louis moves to the East.

From Kansas City and the western half of Missouri, the trading area traditionally goes West.

The people of Missouri have become accustomed to following in their own part of the State the time that they have used there for many years.

To change that time and make the time uniform on a statewide basis instead of giving the State the right of local option would be terribly disruptive from a business and industrial standpoint in Missouri. It would be very harmful to our community and social activities in the State if this ruling were forced on us at this time. In my opinion, it is unrealistic to force an entire State to choose one system or the other.

On yesterday 10 of the Missouri State senators introduced a resolution in the Missouri Senate to declare that the official policy of Missouri is to allow local option on daylight saving time.

I believe that the question of daylight saving time should be left as it is now, a matter of State or local option. Actually that is what we have here, but we are saying that it is to be on a State-by-State basis. However, we would be unable to split the State in two.

Missouri is in an unusual situation because, as I have said, the eastern half of Missouri belongs to the East and the western half belong to the West.

For that reason I urge that the Senate reject the House amendment and that we insist on the Senate-passed bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague. There is strong disagreement in Missouri over daylight saving time. St. Louis and the surrounding metropolitan area follow daylight saving time. Based on the correspondence that we have received, the people are very anxious to continue with that program. Kansas City and the balance of the State favor standard time.

Legislation was introduced in the 1965 session of our State legislature to establish uniform time. However, so much opposition arose that the bill was tabled.

It was then clear that the people of Missouri prefer to decide this matter locally, as they have done for many years. Regardless of whether a general vote would decide for or against daylight saving time, a great many people would be inconvenienced. Cultural and recreational programs, as well as business activities, would be disrupted.

The people of Missouri are unable to reconcile the two time zones and have expressed their desire to continue to have a choice in this matter.

I therefore hope that the Senate will vote against the House amendments to S. 1404 and insist on the bill as passed by the Senate last summer.

It is with regret that I see a bill that was passed by the Senate on a basis that was satisfactory to my State, amended in the House. I am sorry that more of my colleagues are not present, because I believe if they were here my distinguished colleague from Missouri and I might convince them that the Senate bill was a better bill.

Mr. President, with that in mind, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to say to both distinguished Senators from Missouri that our committee was thoroughly cognizant of the situation, not particularly with reference to Missouri, but with reference to the possibility of this situation arising. We discussed asking for a committee of conference instead of moving to concur.

The reason that we are moving to concur in the amendments of the House is that the House approved their bill by a vote of 292 to 93. Various amendments were offered to the House bill. Those amendments were voted down. One of those amendments was the very amendment in which the Senators from Missouri are interested. That amendment concerned the partition of States, rather than having statewide control. Because of the rather overwhelming vote of the House, we decided to move to concur.

In fairness to the distinguished Senators from Missouri, when we presented the bill to the Senate, it was originally the bill of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and myself. It was a bill that I had worked on for several years. We very carefully took one step at a time and tried to make uniform the date of opening and closing of daylight saving time and not interfere in any State, although we felt that probably it would be inevitable that this would happen.

A bus, a train, or an automobile passed through seven time changes while traveling 35 miles a couple of years ago. We had the situation in which community X and community Y would be on and off daylight saving time and the next community would be on daylight saving and the next community would be off.

I had hoped that this could have been taken care of by permitting States to vote to split their State in half, so that there would not be such a hodgepodge situation.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I think we could agree if that could be done. That would be what we would need.

Mr. COTTON. We were not trying to force this situation on any State. We considered the overwhelming vote in the House and the fact that an amendment embodying the desires of the two Senators from Missouri was voted down. That was the reason that we voted to move to concur.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What was the vote when the Senate passed the measure?

Mr. COTTON. There was no rollcall vote.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, it was unanimous in the Senate, but some one-third of those voting in the House voted against the amendment.

I have great confidence in the conferees on this legislation because I know what a superb committee it is. The distinguished Senator for Washington [Mr. Magnuson] is chairman of the committee, and the distinguished ranking minority member is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton].

I know my friend from New Hampshire is very sympathetic to the concept of local option.

With all due respect to the situation in which there were seven time changes in 35 miles, one would have to go several hundred miles in the State of Missouri to encounter a change.

We hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will take this measure to conference rather than give up at this time.

This is a very important matter to the people of Missouri. The thinking of the people in Missouri is sharply delineated. One could almost draw a straight line down our State to show the division on this subject.

I ask that the bill be taken back to conference to establish what the people of Missouri desire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator. Were I on a committee of conference, I should try to come back with a compromise that would permit States to determine whether they wanted local option and not permit States to have more than two time zones.

I think that would be a reasonable ground of compromise. I have the feeling that my distinguished chairman and the others on our committee might well feel the same way.

I have not discussed the subject with them. We simply voted as we did because of the overwhelming vote in the House. I would be the last one to try to have the Senate push down the throat of any State something that was an inconvenience or a hardship. I am not arguing contentiously on this matter.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the distinguished chairman feels the same way about it, and would take it to conference, I am sure that the people of Missouri and my colleague and I would be entirely willing to accede to that and have two time zones in the State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish that the distinguished Senator and his colleague, the two able Senators from Missouri, would not ask to send the bill back to conference. It is my belief that it would not change what the Senate is attempting to do now.

I would point out that there is an option in the House-passed bill which I think would fit in with what the Senators from Missouri are so valiantly and so doggedly trying to accomplish, and that is a right to petition to the ICC, which could take into consideration an effective case of this kind, as I understand the bill, and perhaps give the Senators an outlet and make it possible for them to achieve the objective they desire.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. That is a perfectly natural inference for the distinguished majority leader to draw, but I am afraid, in fairness to the Senators from Missouri, that recourse to the ICC would not take care of their situation, because Missouri is right in the middle of a time zone. May I make this suggestion: We do not need to go to conference. Would the Senators from Missouri be satisfied—I think we have an amendment to this effect; we have been working on it—if instead of agreeing to the House bill as passed, we agree to it with one amendment, and that is that States could only be split into two parts?

Mr. SYMINGTON. We would take that.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Yes, Mr. President, we would accept that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We could send it back to the House, but, of course, the whole purpose for having this bill is to get some uniformity through the country, and we were hoping that, if the Senate passed the bill with the House amendment, by 1967 the Legislature of Missouri will say, "Well, let's not be different from everybody else; we will come along."

The House deliberately pushed it up for a year, until the legislature in the Senators' State meets, as I understand. But I can also understand how controversial and deepseated this time business becomes in a State legislature, particularly where you have people who are from nothing but the rural areas, as against the people in the cities. I know the problem.

I have no objection to doing what the Senator from New Hampshire suggests. I am hopeful, though, that we will retain the part of the bill that says in 1967 or later that the States will come along, so that we can get this uniformity. I do not know whether the House will accept that. I do not think they have too deep feelings about any one State, but that they would want to make it uniform.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the committee is being very fair. I think what the able ranking Member, the Senator from New Hampshire says is very logical. It is not, in our case, just a matter of the country against the city. We have two large cities which feel differently.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We are early in the session now. We have had very little trouble with the bill thus far. We will be here for many months. I appeal to the distinguished chairman to give this matter full consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think what the distinguished majority leader meant was that there is provision for an appeal to the ICC in this case, but the Senator from New Hampshire suggests that it would be highly improbable that the appeal coming from Missouri, situated as it is, would be favorably received. But you can appeal to the ICC.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is not a more fair and just man in this body than the Senator from New Hampshire. I appreciate his suggestion.

I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am in accord with the statements made by the Senators from Missouri, because I have the same problem.

I wish to mention another problem that deals along the same line. Kansas is a State that has a time zone change. When you run into time zone difficulties, you can have some real problems. We have a division between central time and mountain time, and I do hope that the Interstate Commerce Commission, if we cannot obtain the amendment suggested, which might be helpful even in our own State, will give some consideration to the problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They will still have the right to move the time zones. As a matter of fact, I am not sure that some of the time zones should not be moved, to make them correspond more nearly to the traffic and the growth of population.

When the time zones were first set out, they were more or less arbitrarily selected. There was not too much testimony or consideration of the problem.

Mr. CARLSON. It can create a real problem, as the distinguished Senator from Washington knows. I am fairly in accord with the positions taken by the Senators from Missouri. I sincerely hope their problem can be taken care of.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not see any other Senators on the floor from the Far West. Yes, there is one over there. But we would like the bill to stay as it is. It would save us considerable trouble.

I think in some cases there is 3 or 4 hours difference in the time. That means that many times people, at the wrong time of the evening, try to get in touch with one about some very important matter, and they forget about the change in time, and cannot understand why they have difficulty.

But uniformity is even more vitally necessary for people who travel. The situation as it exists is a most confusing thing, and I am hopeful that the State of Missouri will see the light and come into the fold with the rest of us.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I am not exactly sure what the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is. We have a problem in Tennessee; most of the State is on eastern time, but a portion is on central time. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it would mean we could have four different times in Tennessee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. BASS. Will the Senator explain what his amendment would do?

Mr. COTTON. The suggested amendment is this: I fear that all the Senators do not have copies of the bill, but on page 6, the bill provides that all States shall be on daylight saving time, except that any State may by law exempt itself from the provisions of this subsection providing for the advancement of time, but only if such law provides that the entire State, including all political subdivisions thereof, shall observe the standard time.

Now, my suggested amendment would be to strike out the word "entire" and insert in lieu thereof "or a single contiguous part thereof," which would mean that any State could select any part of the State—it would not have to be just half, it could be a third or any part of the State—and retain standard time for that part, but all the rest of the State would have to be on the other time; you could not have four or five or six different times.

Mr. BASS. And that would have to be done by the State legislature?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. That is right.

Mr. BASS. In other words, where we have two time zones now, if the eastern part of the State is on eastern standard time, the rest of the State, even though part of it might be on central time, would have to go to daylight saving time?

Mr. COTTON. It would have to advance the clock 1 hour from whatever time it was on, except for one section of the State, one contiguous part thereof that the State legislature could act upon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire that the amendment suggested, we think, would be very fair to Missouri. Our situation is very unusual, with industries on both sides of the State and the time zone line nearly down the center. If that could be split to not over half, it would certainly be a move toward uniformity.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Record will be clear that when the Senator from New Hampshire uses the word "contiguous," he means that literally, because one of the important reasons for this bill is that small areas can have different times. But if you have one area which is contiguous, which would be a large area in the Senator's State, it is not as bad as having a number of time zones arranged in spotted or patchwork fashion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, with an amendment which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, line 16, strike out the word "entire" and after the word "State" insert the language "or a single contiguous part thereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] to concur in the House amendments with amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

SHIPPING JAM IN VIETNAM

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, one of the great problems in Vietnam is in the shipping and unloading end of our supply chain. It seems that we do a fairly good job in moving the supplies as far as the harbor areas of South Vietnam but at that point, due to a lack of unloading equipment and facilities, the ships pile up in great numbers and wait for long periods of time in order to be unloaded. I have reports that some ships have waited an excess of 100 days in the Vietnam harbors in order to be unloaded.

Approximately $1 million a day is being lost because of this jam. Recently 100 ships were waiting in South Vietnamese ports to be unloaded and another 100 were standing by in either the Philippines or Okinawa to proceed to Vietnam as soon as room could be created for them to anchor and unload.

Such a shipping jam creates considerable hardship in a number of areas. For instance the crews of these ships oftentimes are not able to take shore leave, some spending as much as 65 days in the harbor before being able to go ashore. In an area where daytime temperatures sometimes approach 120° onboard the ships, this creates a tremendous morale problem. The United Seaman Service is very concerned about this morale of our seamen in Vietnam. This agency has centers throughout the Pacific. Prior to recent times, however, they had none in South Vietnam. One has been established in Saigon since Christmas of last year and the service is attempting to establish more. They have been assured by the Army that one is in the works in the Cam Ranh Bay harbor construction project. They are attempting to get final Army approval to establish one at Da Nang and one at Qui Nhon.

In addition, it creates a problem from the standpoint of having enough available vessels to ship not only to South Vietnam but to other parts of the world. For instance, at the present time, when the Nation is engaged in the most serious freight car shortage in its history, huge numbers of freight cars are piled up in west coast ports, unable to be unloaded because there are no available ships on which to place their cargo. This, I hope, will be partially rectified by the announcement last week by the Maritime Administration that some 86 ships are being taken from the Government's reserve fleets and assigned to steamship companies for operation on behalf of the Military Sea Transport Service. I understand that an additional 25 reserve fleet ships are now undergoing reactivation, or are scheduled for breakout in the next few months.

In addition to that, two Maritime Administration employees are being assigned to South Vietnam to coordinate the handling of these ships. It is hoped that they will supplement the efforts of general agents, subagents, and shipmasters in the Vietnam area to assure logistic support for all general agency ships. These men will also coordinate the efforts of the military and the agents to provide expeditious cargo discharge and turnaround of all general agency ships. Unfortunately, however, I believe this is insufficient to solve the problem. We need great additional numbers of barges, tugs, and floating cranes to supplement those there in the unloading of the ships.

Airpower has become increasingly important in recent years and is particularly important in recent years and is particularly important in South Vietnam. However, two out of every three soldiers fighting in Vietnam were moved there by ship and 98 percent of the supplies to support our troops in Vietnam have been transported by ship. When this is realized then it becomes obvious that our merchant fleet is still a subject of tremendous importance not only to our economy but to the defense of our country.

Some improvements in the loading time have been made recently in Saigon. I am informed that military supplies are removed at Saigon in 4 to 5 days and that nonmilitary supplies, such as provisions under our AID program, are unloaded in 12 to 14 days. However, as late as last week, there were 25 bags of mail undelivered to seamen. Thinking back to the time when I was in the military service during World War II, I can conceive of nothing more damaging to morale than nondelivery of mail to our people overseas.

Mr. President, to further compound this shipping problem and to rub salt in the quick, we have the allied problem of ships of the free world servicing North Vietnam and the Vietcong. The Department of Defense admitted publicly that 119 free world ships entered ports servicing the Vietcong during 1965. These ships carried a total of $12.2 million worth of goods, including some military supplies. Mr. President, it is indeed ironic that, at a time when Great Britain, for instance, is soliciting our support in her boycott of Rhodesia, ships flying the British flag are carrying supplies to aid and abet our enemies.

Mr. President, let me say that from reading a recent Washington Post article, we have found a quotation from Foreign Secretary Stewart of Great Britain. He says:

> The principle of preserving free trade is important to us as a trading nation.

The article states:

> But there are no signs that the Government is planning any action to outlaw the business transacted with the Hanoi regime.

The Foreign Secretary further states:

> We have not got the legislative power to order these ships not to trade (with North Vietnam) except when it comes to strategic goods, nor can we stop them from flying our flag. No case has yet been made out for us to introduce new legislation.

Mr. President, it was not until the middle of February when our Government finally decided that we should boycott these ships. Since that time, ships carrying cargoes to North Vietnam have been prohibited from carrying the U.S.-sponsored cargoes. But even this boycott only runs to the individual ships. It does not run to the parent company owning the ship.

Mr. President, our armed services have been called the best equipped troops in the world. However, it is impossible for them to maintain this position unless they get the supplies and equipment they need to fulfill their mission. I, therefore, hope a thorough investigation can be made to survey the transportation requirements for Vietnam by land, sea, and air to insure that every necessary and possible step is being taken to get our men in and out of Vietnam on time and with whatever arms and supplies necessary.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. BASS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe that the Senator from Tennessee has made a timely speech as well as a splendid suggestion. The Senator is speaking about a matter which is complicated from a military standpoint, as well as from the point of view of the rest of the traffic there. I hope that he will follow up on his own thoughts and suggestions, which will be rendering a fine service to the country.

Mr. BASS. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, because of his important position on the Armed Services Committee and his keen awareness of the needs of our troops in Vietnam.

SALE OF PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES IN FNMA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed a bill to amend the Small Business Act.

During debate, the proponents of the bill in speaking on behalf of the administration insisted that the extra interest charges by selling these small business mortgages would be less than one-quarter of 1 percent. We who opposed this bill insisted that the interest charge would be at least one-half of 1 percent higher, thereby representing an extra charge to the taxpayers.

It is interesting to note, that the following day after the enactment of the bill, the Federal National Mortgage Association sold $410 million worth of participation certificates. The interest rates they paid was 0.6 percent higher than the interest rates for corresponding Government issues.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of that sale, appearing in the Wall Street Journal of March 17, be printed in the RECORD, followed by a list of quotations of Treasury bonds, along with the interest rates on that same date.

There being no objection, the announcement and quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES OF $410 MILLION IN THE GOVERNMENT MORTGAGE LIQUIDATION TRUST, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TRUSTEE

(New issue, dated April 4, 1966, due April 1 as shown below)

The participation certificates are serial certificates issued in registered form only, in denominations of $5,000, $10,000, $25,000, $100,000, $500,000, and $1 million. The amounts, maturities, interest rates, and offering prices of the participation certificates are shown below. The principal, together with the last installment of interest, is payable at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York upon presentation at such bank and surrender of the certificates. The interest is payable by check, semiannually, on October 1 and April 1 in each year. The participation certificates are not redeemable prior to maturity. This advertisement is neither an offer to sell nor a solicitation of an offer to buy any of these securities. The offering is made only by the prospectus, which may be obtained from such of the underwriters as are registered dealers in securities in this State.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *March 17, 1966.*

Amount	Due Apr. 1	Interest rate	Price [1]
$20,000,000	1967	5.40	100
20,000,000	1968	5.45	100
20,000,000	1969	5.50	100
20,000,000	1970	5.50	100
20,000,000	1971	5.50	100
20,000,000	1972	5.50	100
20,000,000	1973	5.50	100
20,000,000	1974	5.50	100
20,000,000	1975	5.50	100
20,000,000	1976	5.45	100
42,000,000	1977	5.45	100
42,000,000	1978	5.40	100
42,000,000	1979	5.35	100
42,000,000	1980	5.30	100
42,000,000	1981	5.25	100

[1] Plus accrued interest from Apr. 4, 1966.

GOVERNMENT, AGENCY, AND MISCELLANEOUS SECURITIES

Over-the-counter quotations: Source on request.

Decimals in bid-and-asked prices represent 32ds (101.1 means 101 1/32). (a) Plus 1/64, (b) yield to call date, (c) approximate yield at maturity.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1966.

Treasury bonds

	Bid	Asked	Previous bid	Yield
3¼s, 1966, May	99.26	99.28	99.26	4.38
3s, 1966, August	99.6	99.8	99.5	4.83
3⅜s, 1966, November	99.1	99.3	99.0	4.78
2½s, 1962-67, June	97.21	97.23	97.21	4.40
3⅝s, 1967, November	98.1	98.3	98.1	4.83
3⅞s, 1968, May	98.28	97.30	97.28	4.90
3¾s, 1968, August	97.6	97.8	97.6	4.97
3⅞s, 1968, November	97.9	97.11	97.9	4.95
2½s, 1963, December	94.15	94.17	94.14	4.64
4s, 1969, February	97.19	97.21	97.19	4.78
2½s, 1964-69, June	93.20	93.22	93.18	4.62
4s, 1969, October	96.29	96.31	96.29	4.94
2½s, 1964-69, December	92.20	92.26	92.20	4.65
2½s, 1965-70, March	92.13	92.17	92.13	4.57
4s, 1970, February	96.20	96.24	96.21	4.92
4s, 1970, August	96.10	96.14	96.11	4.91
2½s, 1966-71, March	91.0	91.4	91.0	4.51
4s, 1971, August	95.14	95.18	95.15	4.94
3⅞s, 1971, November	94.13	94.17	94.15	5.00
4s, 1972, February	94.28	95.0	94.30	4.99
2½s, 1967-72, June	88.16	88.20	88.22	4.61
4s, 1972, August	94.12	94.16	94.15	5.01
2½s, 1967-72, September	88.0	88.14	88.16	4.58
2½s, 1967-72, December	88.0	88.4	88.6	4.57
4s, 1973, August	93.18	93.22	93.18	5.03
4⅛s, 1973, November	93.31	94.3	94.0	5.07
4⅛s, 1974, February	93.28	94.0	93.28	5.05
4¼s, 1974, May	94.24	94.28	94.24	5.02
3⅞s, 1974, November	92.6	92.14	92.6	4.96
4s, 1980, February	92.20	92.28	92.12	4.70
3½s, 1980, November	87.22	87.30	87.20	4.64
3¼s, 1978-83, June	83.4	83.12	83.0	4.66
3¼s, 1985, May	82.26	83.2	82.22	4.59
4¼s, 1975-85, May	93.6	93.14	93.4	4.78
3½s, 1990, February	83.4	83.12	83.0	4.66
4¼s, 1987-92, August	92.30	93.6	92.28	4.70
4s, 1988-93, February	90.2	90.10	89.30	4.63
4⅛s, 1989-94, May	90.28	91.4	90.26	4.70
3s, 1995, February	79.12	79.20	79.10	4.23
3½s, 1998, November	82.2	82.10	81.28	4.54

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this points out very clearly what some of us argued at that time—that in order to camouflage the true deficit, this administration is selling its assets and by so doing, is paying an extra one-half percent in interest rates. This means that over the life of the $4.7 billion in securities, the administration plans to sell altogether it will cost the American taxpayers $600 million. To cover up the true deficit, this administration is selling its assets and using the proceeds thereof to defray the normal operating costs of the Great Society programs.

It is comparable to selling part of the furniture to pay for the cost of groceries.

STATEMENT BY UTAH COUNCIL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Salt Lake City was one of the first cities in the country where hearings were held on the draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations suggested by the Department of Commerce to implement the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. More than 100 witnesses appeared at the hearings held on March 1 and 2—most of them in opposition. It was the general consensus that the guidelines were far too stringent—in fact, that if put into operation as drawn, they would practically abolish the outdoor advertising industry.

The largest area of dissatisfaction was in the regulations proposed for industrial or commercial areas, rather than those suggested for advertising on the open highways. The definition of industrial and commercial areas was questioned, and there was great discussion of the so-called setback restrictions which defined how far back from the street a sign must be, what its height could be, and how near the intersection it could be placed.

One of the best statements submitted was that of the Utah Council of Outdoor Advertising. I ask that this statement be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UTAH COUNCIL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

Reduced to its fundamental thrust, Public Law 89-285, known as the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, provides that States that fail to control outdoor advertising (U.S.C., title 23, sec. 131) and junkyards (U.S.C., title 23, sec. 136) are subject to a penalty of 10 percent each of the participation of the Federal Government in its partnership with the States on their roads program.

The act provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall reach an agreement with the several States in three principal categories, so far as the outdoor advertising industry is concerned:

1. They shall determine and define an unzoned commercial or industrial area.

2. They shall establish standards for the control of the advertising permitted in the commercial and industrial zones and areas, and

3. They shall provide for signs within the right-of-way for areas at appropriate distances from interchanges on the Interstate Systems on which signs giving specific information with respect to food, gasoline, and lodging, including specific brand names, may be erected.

The act and its legislative history show an intent to protect our areas of natural beauty and scenic interest in the rural areas but to leave the urban areas to present customary use. Otherwise, this legislation would destroy outdoor advertising and not control its orderly development as the act requires. The clear command of section 131(d), title 23, United States Code, is that standards to be established after consultation with the States with respect to size, lighting, and spacing shall be consistent with customary use. The statements by Senator Moss, and Senator RANDOLPH on February 4, and Senator MUSKIE on February 16, which establish this intent beyond argument, are annexed in the appendix.

The act also provides that before the Secretary promulgates standards, criteria, rules and regulations in carrying out his agreement with the States with respect to a definition of unzoned areas and regulation of size, lighting, and spacing in the controlled areas, that public hearings in each State shall be held for the purpose of gathering all relevant information on which to base such standards. Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor wrote a letter on September 14, 1965, to the Senate Subcommittee on Public Works from which we quote:

"The policy of the Bureau in reviewing State determinations of unzoned commercial or industrial areas would be developed only after full consultation with the States as well as with interested private business, and every effort would be made to achieve equitable treatment.

"The criteria to be followed in setting the standards for billboards in both zoned and unzoned areas, designated as commercial or industrial, would be designed to assist the advertising industry to achieve an orderly development of this important and legitimate business enterprise."

Notwithstanding the clear legislative intent that the doctrine of customary use shall be followed in urban areas, the Bureau of Public Roads, a division of the Department of Commerce, proffered in the Federal Register of January 28, 1966, six categories of draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations which are not only inconsistent with the doctrine of customary use but are radically violative of it and would completely destroy outdoor advertising industry.

The evidence adduced at the public hearings March 1 and 2 abundantly disclosed this proposition. We shall hereafter refer to this in somewhat more detail.

A particularly disturbing aspect of this legislation lies in the following unusual concept; the Federal Government here does not legislate directly upon the people affected, thereby escaping some of the direct whiplash of public opinion and indignation, but rather tells the State, in this case the State of Utah, that unless you do as we say, we shall withhold funds from you—a loss which our State can ill afford. This is the use of raw economic power unmasked and is subject to ruthless abuse. The beginnings of abuse have been evidenced already, because there is absolutely nothing in the act that authorized the Secretary to proffer draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations in advance, as he did; and published rules restricting the public hearings to comments and criticisms relevant to the issues as established by him, as he did; and nothing in the act permitted the Bureau of Public Roads to further restrict the scope of these hearings to comment and criticism on the proffered criteria, as it did.

Section 303(a) of title 23, United States Code, requires that before promulgation of these standards necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary shall hold public hearings in each State for the purpose of gathering all relevant information on which to base such standards, criteria, rules, and regulations. The clear language of the act and the exclusionary conduct of the Department of Commerce are to be compared, noted, and condemned.

OMISSIONS AND FAILURES OF THE SECRETARY'S PROFFERED STANDARDS, CRITERIA, RULES, AND REGULATIONS

The evidence produced at the hearings raises some problems obviously not fully appreciated before by the Department's planners, some of which are:

1. Standards for size, spacing, and lighting accommodating the principle of customary

use is utterly impossible of linear delineation unless a different set of criteria is established for areas that vary within themselves, as many have been shown so to do.

2. Any definition of an unzoned area that restricts itself to buildings rather than use of land area will produce anomalous and ridiculous results.

3. The planner for the Secretary obviously failed to take into consideration such legitimate needs of the highway traveler as (a) on the primary system small towns such a Smithfield, Richfield, Logan, Vernal, and Grantsville are set in rural areas which run to the very boundary lines of the town. Yet the approaches for 2, 4, 6, and as much as 10 miles prior thereto have historically been used for advertising. Travelers depend on these signs for a multitude of reasons. Many businesses within these towns are completely dependent on this type of advertising. No provision has been made for this need. (b) Some of these areas are now zoned agricultural with sign structures permitted, yet under this act and rules and regulations no such signs would be permitted. (c) Many Utah communities located more than one-half mile off the interstate were shown to have desperate need to advertise reasonably on the highway in order to avoid a financial hardship and ruin, yet the planners have made no provision for any such advertising.

The inherent vice in the Secretary's planners' approach to this problem in all categories has been their failure to realize that a single set of standards are not capable of universal application because of the variety of needs found from area to area.

Historically in America business and trade have followed the building of cross-country highways and the transcontinental railroads. Through our cities and towns these "main highways" have carried the freight of the Nation and along them have grown up the highway service businesses for the convenience and requirements of the traveler and of the people who reside there. In Utah all but the five or six largest cities are what might be called "one-street towns" insofar as the business district is concerned, with a concentration of stores and office buildings in the central business area and other highway related businesses extending each way to the outskirts of town. The main highway has become the business street and residential areas have been built away from main street in the quieter parts away from the noise and confusion of trucks, buses, and interstate commerce. It is only in the larger cities that trucks are diverted onto truck routes and bypasses from the main street. This is the primary system—not the interstate.

On these one-street towns it will be seen that the street runs through a central built-up business district, but with business also extending from the center for several miles along the highway in each direction out of town into the country where you will find service stations, drive-ins, bowling alleys, bottled gas plants, dairies, cattle barns and sheds, potato storage bins, loading docks, fruit stands, and so on. The traveler is often several miles out of town before he enters the truly rural scene. The Secretary's standards do not provide for any advance advertising in these approaches, if rural, and not subject to his definition of an unzoned commercial or industrial area.

Customary use in these areas has been in accordance with local zoning provisions which have permitted advertising signs in agricultural zones. Such signs require no extension of city services such as water, sewer, garbage collection, etc., so have been considered to be located in the public interest where they perform a service in bringing valuable information to the traveler well in advance of his having to make a decision. By means of these advertising displays he could know what type of eating establishments were available, the brands of gasoline he could buy and the character of the hotels and motels in the town. All of this information is appreciated by the traveler.

The intersection restriction prohibiting signs from within 250 feet of an intersection is not consistent with customary use. Often that frontage near an intersection is frequently the only available space in a given block, often occupied by a service station exposing a wall or a low building affording a roof built upon which an off-premise as well as an on-premise sign is found. This again is customary use in Utah.

If a potential location does exist in the middle of the block, it is usually because a building top view can be obtained. The 30-foot height limitation makes this impossible or nearly so, unless the buildings in the foregoing are all very low. A structure on a roof would very likely extend more than 30 feet up from the ground level.

Common and customary practice in the outdoor advertising business has been to build low ground structures in small towns at or within 3 or 4 feet of the property line to allow work room around the structure and to prevent too long an extension into a farmer's field where it would interfere with hay or grain cultivation and watering.

Customary practice in the larger towns and cities has been to follow the building code and zoning laws of the city, which with few exceptions allow an advertising sign to be built with the same setback as any other structure. In the commercial and industrial zones there is no setback required for any type of structure, hence signs have equal treatment with buildings, factories, stores, garages, etc. We consider this fair and equal treatment with other business use.

The proposed size limitation of 300 square feet within 150 feet of the property line does not recognize customary use in the industry for the painted bulletin which has been a standard structure for more than 50 years. These bulletins have a basic size of 12 by 50 feet, but with embellishments sometimes have an area of almost 1,000 square feet. They are built on preferred locations on high traffic arterials of the larger cities. The standard highway bulletin of 12 by 42 feet is used for particularly good locations on the main traveled highways.

The proposed spacing provision of 500 feet between signs eliminates the customary practice in urban areas of building two 24-sheet panels in a facing. The 500-foot spacing provision limiting the number of advertising structures to one in any block is contrary to customary use in urban areas.

The Secretary's planners have proceeded on the assumption that animation, flashing lights, moving lights tending to direct, etc., are evil per se. The evidence and photographs submitted show that this is not the case, but are only hazardous when improperly used.

It would be incomplete to fail to point out that the evidence shows that in the urban areas of Salt Lake City, Provo, and Ogden that some 88 percent of all outdoor advertising is on-premise advertising, not regulated by this act. The remaining 12 percent blends into the dynamics of metropolitan life so as to be indistinguishable from the whole. The Secretary planners would exclude more than 40 percent of one company's poster panel facility, although such facility is in customary use and all respects comparable to the on-premise advertising in the same area with respect to size, lighting, and spacing.

We suggest that from the criticism of the proffered standards and the evidence adduced by the advertising companies in Utah showing customary use, and the evidence adduced by the Motel Association, the Restaurant Association, the local civic planners from the rural areas of Utah, and the chambers of commerce, and many other interested and effected persons, two central themes emerged: One, the concept of linear dimension proffered by the Department's planners is unwise, unworkable, discriminatory, and satisfies no one; and, two, a concept in which the Department acting in the role of a counselor and supervisor encouraging the States to adopt machinery that relies on local boards applying local zoning to effectuate the purposes of the act, and realizing that a continuing educational process placing confidence upon the integrity of local officials will in due course produce the laudatory purposes of this act without violent dislocations to any segment of our Great Society.

The evidence received by the hearing examiner designated by the Secretary of Commerce on March 1 and 2, 1966, unequivocally established the following two basic propositions: (1) That the regulations as proposed by the Secretary of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on January 28, 1966, substantially thwart the intention of the Congress in the adoption of the Highway Beautification Act and substantially deviate from the comments made by the Secretary of Commerce in outlining his intentions prior to the adoption of the legislation. (2) The only regulations which the Secretary of Commerce could properly adopt which would conform to the spirit, intention, and language of the act would be designed to incorporate the principles of customary use and local zoning.

It is, therefore, submitted and we believe that an equitable approach better serving all of these interests would be for the Secretary to require that the several States do establish an authoritative body politic whose function would be to counsel and guide the appropriate local political subdivisions now having zoning power to evaluate and determine unzoned commercial and industrial areas along the interstate and primary road systems, and to hold public hearings in making these determinations so that all interests can be heard. This authority would be expected to establish a permit system allowing for and regulating signs in the controlled areas, and denying permits to such signs not meeting the standards with respect to hazards to public safety or which would obscure any area of unusual natural beauty or unusual scenic interest or would tend to cause a proliferation of signs.

The Secretary would be a supervisor and counselor assisting in the control and regulation of this industry and allowing for its orderly development in the spirit and purpose of the act, and would reaffirm the salutary established principle of the Federal Government cooperating with rather than dictating to local government in the solution of problems that are national in nature as well as local in scope and operation.

NORTH AMERICAN WATER AND POWER ALLIANCE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, because there are some officials in the Dominion Government in Canada, and in the provincial governments, who oppose in principle transporting surplus water from Canada to the United States, and because their objections have made many headlines in the past, there has been some doubt in some quarters in the United States about the future of the North American Water and Power Alliance, or the NAWAPA project, as it is better known. There has been a tendency to brush it off as an impractical dream at least until there is a change of heart and attitude in Canada.

It was encouraging, therefore, to read in the Albertian Editorial, a daily newspaper published in Calgary, in the Province of Alberta, that Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin, the recently appointed Minister of Canada's new Department of Resources and Energy, has no built-in reservations whatsoever about exporting water to the United States, and sees no reason why this should not be done, "If Canada can spare it and we can get a good fee for it."

Mr. Pepin, a former political science professor, who in his new post will have considerable influence on policies on the use and development of Canada's natural resources, frankly labels himself as a "continentalist." He says furthermore that he can see no point in not doing something simply because it has never been done before. He indicates that he is willing to take an objective look at water exportation, which is, of course, the heart of the NAWAPA plan.

Mr. Pepin's attitude is most refreshing, and a hopeful sign for the future of NAWAPA. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Albertan Editorial, which appeared on March 1, 1966, be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also ask permission to have carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 13, which outlines some of the water problems of the Great Lakes, and discusses how the NAWAPA project would bring relief to that area.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Albertian Editorial, Mar. 1, 1966]

MUCH DEPENDS ON JEAN-LUC PEPIN

(By Peter Newman)

OTTAWA.—It's doubtful if any member of the Pearson ministry is charged with decisions that will have more impact on Canada's future than Jean-Lue Pepin, the ebullient former political science professor who was unexpectedly promoted to the new Department of Resources and Energy in last December's Cabinet shuffle.

As a fledging Minister in a precedent-setting portfolio Mr. Pepin must formulate the long-term policies which will govern the eventual limits of Canadian nationhood, by deciding how much of our natural resources—particularly water—will remain under our own jurisdiction and what proportion will be shared with the United States. His Department will also direct the future development of atomic energy in this country, plan the eventual construction of a national power grid, and deal with the tricky jurisdictional decision of how minerals in the underwater shelves around our coasts are to be developed.

Mr. Pepin's pronouncements on the continental sharing of resources have been limited to the witty but vague observation: "I am a continentalist, if it's in the national interest." What he really believes is that the question must be approached without any political or economic prejudices.

"There was a time in Canadian history," he told me, "when those who advocated the export of coal, oil, electricity, and just about every other resource were thought of as traitors. If it should be proven to the Government's satisfaction that we can spare water and get a good fee for it, I don't see any reason why we shouldn't export. After all, that's the traditional Liberal position. You don't deny something new, just because it's never been done before. You look at each new proposition with total objectivity."

Mr. Pepin's pragmatic approach to what will surely become the central issue in Canadian-American relations over the next decade also applies to domestic constitutional problems. He is one of the few Pearson Ministers from Quebec—or from any other Province, for that matter—who is convincingly optimistic that the current impasse in Federal-provincial relations will be resolved without a major constitutional convulsion.

He recognizes no contradiction in the idea of the governments in Quebec City and Ottawa both attempting to aggrandize their power, providing collaboration and cooperation between them become the rule rather than the exception.

"The two jurisdictions," he says, "are bound to overlap, but the objective in government action must always be the common good, not the purity of the Constitution." Mr. Pepin believes that the Canadian constitution should be treated as a point of arrival, not a point of departure, and certainly not as a political document. "The writing of a constitution should take place only after we've negotiated all of the necessary compromises and not before. That's why the kind of constitutional conference John Diefenbaker is advocating would be the greatest circus in our history—it's a ridiculous suggestion."

Mr. Pepin's background as a professor of political science (he also has degrees in law and philosophy) shines through his discussion of Federal-provincial relations. It was Mr. Pepin who provided the theoretical backing for the Liberals' cooperative federalism approach in a lengthy academic paper presented to the Quebec Institute of Public Affairs in the fall of 1964. Now, he's elaborating his "vacuum theory," which holds that governments must move into every area of social activity not adequately occupied. "But there is no reason," he says, "for the Federal Government to remain in areas which are either in the letter or the spirit of the constitution essentially provincial. This includes such fields as education and social security, all of which the Provinces should be allowed to occupy."

At the same time, Mr. Pepin sees the need and desirability for more Ottawa initiatives in such areas of national concern as the erection of a cross-country power grid, the treatment of polluted rivers, and exploitation of the Continental Shelf. "It's one thing to insist that the underwater minerals belong to the Provinces," he says, "but what about the fishing, navigation, and defense activities that take place on the water's surface? These are Federal concerns, and any solution can't exclude the Federal Government."

In his approach to these and other questions, Mr. Pepin is definitely on the side of the New Guard from Quebec, but unlike such colleagues as Messrs. Sauve, Marchand, Trudeau, and Pelletier, he is not a man of the left. His political coloring is closer to that of Jean Lesage or even Lester Pearson, with pragmatism always taking precedence over ideology.

"What I like about Mr. Pearson," says Mr. Pepin, "is the complete denial of fanaticism in his approach to problems. He is also one of those rare English-Canadian politicians who understand the special position of French-Canadians and the frustrations of being a French-speaking Canadian in Ottawa."

The fact is that Mr. Pepin is one of those rare French Canadians with whom Mr. Pearson has achieved total personal rapport.

Despite his comparative youth (he's only 41) and inexperience (he's been in practical politics for only 3 years), Mr. Pepin has so far handled himself in his difficult new job with exquisite savoir-faire. But as he himself knows, he has yet to be tested in a real confrontation with the parliamentary opposition or to take the kind of decision which will reveal exactly where he stands on the fundamental issues facing his department and his country.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 13, 1966]

THIRSTY NATIONS SEEK ANSWER—WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE?

("That which no King before me had done, I did * * * great canals I dug * * * and brought abundant waters to all the people.")

(By John Ludwigson)

So boasted one of the most powerful monarchs of the ancient world, Nebuchadnezzar II of Babylon. His irrigation works, filled with water from Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, made Babylon the garden spot of the Middle East.

Yet today Babylon is a desert. Nebuchadnezzar's mightiest works lie buried beneath centuries of dust and silt.

What happened?

Years of war and strife took the toll, but the end came finally when, as the neglected canals choked up with silt, Babylon ran out of water.

Yet, water is plentiful on earth.

Even as the Babylonians watched their once-green city dry up, abundant water flowed on in the rivers.

The United States, particularly the northeast, is one of the best-watered countries on earth. Yet last year the northeast found itself in a drought.

Official reports traced much of the trouble to neglect—the same problem that ended the glory of Babylon.

Though New York, indeed, had a splendid water supply, leaky mains and careless users brought the city to the brink of disaster. City planners, who had been boasting of an insured supply for the foreseeable future, ate crow while preparing to tap the Hudson River.

Cleveland, with one of the largest lakes in the world on its doorstep, is in a little better position. As Water Commissioner Thomas E. Stanton observed recently, Lake Erie is a nearly inexhaustible supply.

But rapidly increasing numbers of users and galloping pollution may eventually strain even that source.

Great Lakes water levels are in such a delicate state that lawsuits are now pending to force the city of Chicago to end diversion of Lake Michigan waters which it uses to flush its sewage down the Illinois River.

Last year, Lake Erie was about 18 inches below normal, but the Army Corps of Engineers bulletin on lake levels predicts a rise in all the lakes this year to nearly the all-time average levels.

Rainfall dumps an average 4.4 billion gallons of water on the United States every day. In a year, at that rate, we would all be wading through an average depth of 30 inches of accumulated water.

Actually only about 1.1 billion gallons a day finds its way into rivers and lakes. It is used over and over again for a total water use of some 360 billion gallons a day in this country alone.

Since most uses of water don't actually consume it—the water runs back into rivers and lakes through sewers and natural runoff—the supply could, potentially, be stretched even further. It could; that is, if Americans were not so accustomed to the idea of free, fresh water.

Water extracted from someone else's sewage, no matter how pure, isn't John Doe's idea of what he wants to drink.

And so, as 29,920 gallons a second of somewhat used water flowed past in the Hudson River, New Yorkers rationed water in a full-fledged drought.

Meanwhile, in sunny and dry California, with half as much rain as New York, life went on as usual.

Ever since 1913 when Los Angeles' first aqueduct, 215 miles long, opened, the area has understood the need for advanced water planning and careful use of the water available.

Even as the Californians chuckled over the drought in New York, they were planning to tap new sources of water for their mushrooming population.

With all relatively nearby sources already spoken for, the thirsty Californians have been thinking big—on a continental scale. And that is where Cleveland comes in again.

For a scheme proposed by a Los Angeles engineering firm would not only supply California but 32 other States, 7 Provinces, and 1 territory in Canada and the 3 northern States of Mexico.

Its originators, the Ralph M. Parsons Co., named the grandiose scheme the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA) in honor of its international character.

NAWAPA would take water from the Yukon, Peace, and Fraser Rivers in northwest Canada. The water would be stored in a 500-mile-long reservoir in the Canadian Rocky Mountains.

Canals would carry the stored water to the southwest, of Columbia River and—of interest to Cleveland—to the Great Lakes.

"This diversion canal would alleviate falling levels and pollution of the Great Lakes," Parsons reported. "It would also augment the power potential of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers.

"It is possible to develop this canal so it would be navigable * * * to the heart of Alberta * * * a transcontinental waterway could be developed * * * with its western terminus at Howe Sound, British Columbia."

For a cost of around $100 billion, the plan would provide water enough for the next 100 years, Parsons engineers estimated.

Water brought south in the system would irrigate a strip of land 2,500 miles long and 35 miles wide—86,300 square miles, including an area in Mexico equal to eight times that watered by the Aswan High Dam in Egypt.

Of course, in doing this, the plan would also inundate thousands of square miles of this continent's most beautiful scenery. But conservation groups have been slow to rally to defense of the forests.

David Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club, one of the Nation's foremost outdoor and conservative organizations, explained:

"This is something that will need a great deal of study. We would be quite concerned about the scenic resources that would be inundated.

"But we are fighting three major battles now (concerning the California redwood trees, damming of the Grand Canyon and the Columbia River) and just haven't had the time for it."

"It seems to us," Brower observed, "there would be a great advantage in having people go where the water is and in becoming less enamoured with increasing the population of one area."

In 1964, the Special Subcommittee on Western Water Development of the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works prepared a report on NAWAPA.

The subcommittee, headed by Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, concluded, in part:

"Water shortages are not peculiar to the western portion of the United States. The East has its problems and so does the South. But these problems take a different form. Mostly it is a question of being able to use what is available. Standard of water quality is the biggest problem east of the Mississippi.

"But in the Western States and to a degree in the Midwestern States even the highest water quality standards won't produce enough water. It just isn't there. And the problem will get worse."

On September 1 last year, Senator Moss introduced a resolution urging United States and Canadian studies of the water resources that would be involved. The resolution now is before the Public Works Committee.

Since it would be principally their water that would be involved, Canadian approval of NAWAPA is essential. That approval seems unlikely, at least right away.

Official comments north of the border have ranged from a flat "no" from the Premier of British Columbia to a cautions "maybe" from Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

A Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, newspaper quoted Pearson: "This can be one of the most important developments in our history. We will be discussing this with the United States."

Yet, former Conservative Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, pledging his party's opposition to the plan, accused the Liberals (Pearson's party) of willingness to "pull the plug on one of our most vital resources."

A Vancouver, British Columbia, paper, noting comments of Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, took what may come to be the prevailing Canadian stand:

"Governor Hatfield said that from the point of view of economics the people and industries that needed the water should simply locate in Oregon, not spend billions moving Oregon water south.

"It is difficult to argue with his economics and logic. They apply as strongly to British Columbia, which would suffer considerably if most of its major valleys were flooded out, turning them into a giant conduit to California."

But perhaps the final solution to the world's water problems will come straight out of a space capsule.

Astronauts on their way to the moon and Mars will have only a small, fixed amount of water for all their needs. To make it last, space capsules will be equipped with complex recovery systems that will extract drinking water from sewage.

In a crude way, that is what present-day municipal sewage and water purification plants do. In the future—perhaps not very distant future—much more efficient methods may have to be employed to provide water for our burgeoning population.

In the form of desalinization plants which make potable water from sea water, these plants are here already.

They are not limited to sea water, however.

One could, for example, produce drinking water from Cuyahoga River, if it became necessary.

PROPOSAL TO MERGE ARMY RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a very serious question has been bothering me since the introduction of the new budget for fiscal 1967. This question has to do with the reappearance in the Defense budget of Secretary McNamara's proposal to merge the Army Reserve and the National Guard by transferring all of the Army Reserve drill pay strength to the National Guard.

Why has the Secretary of Defense come back to Congress with an identical version of this merger plan after Congress had so emphatically stated its position last year?

What is behind Mr. McNamara's new move after this same Army Reserve reduction-merger proposal blew up in the face of its advocates last year?

It should have been dropped forthwith in the interest of the military services and national defense. To the contrary, it is back again in the same old form, and it is my understanding that, notwithstanding the strong position taken by the Congress last year, the Army has issued instructions to its commands in the field regarding it. These instructions say that the original plan of last year was being reintroduced and would be scheduled for execution beginning July 1 of this year, with the major part of the reorganization being accomplished in the period from July through September and the entire reorganization to be completed by December 31, 1966.

Now it seems to me that this is presuming a lot toward the Congress—in fact it presumes a complete change of congressional mind as to the validity of the discredited proposal of last year. And further, it presumes that Congress is going to change the law to permit the Defense Department to accomplish what it could not do by circumventing the law through Executive mandate.

The reorganization of the Army's Reserve components announced by the Department of Defense on December 12, 1964, would have reduced the authorized paid drill strength by 150,000; it would have inactivated 21 divisions—15 National Guard and 6 Reserve—and would have placed the management of all paid drill units under the National Guard Bureau and the 52 States and Territories of the Union. This administrative shuffle, despite claims that it would promote streamlining, efficiency, and economy, leaves something to be desired. Among other things it replaces supervision of the Army Reserve by full-time Army professionals with part-time personnel who participate only in weekly drills.

My immediate concern is what such a reorganization would do to our military posture. It is possible to recover from bad management over a period of time, but a wrong decision affecting national security could be irretrievable.

The complete waste of manpower in the direct reduction and discard of 150,000 trained personnel, and the reduction of 21 combat divisions, has serious implications with respect to our military posture.

Today we are deeply committed in Vietnam. We have forces deployed to the Dominican Republic. We are maintaining major forces along the Iron Curtain in support of NATO.

Still fresh in our memories are the missile crisis in Cuba in 1962 and Khrushchev's threat in 1961 to come to terms with East Germany thus triggering a crisis over Berlin. Reservists were called to the colors on both of those occasions. But an even greater Reserve response was required in 1950.

Should we become engaged in an operation approaching the size of the Korean war, we would, under the Department of Defense merger proposal, encounter considerable difficulty in the deployment of trained forces of the same magnitude as we had in that conflict. During the Korean war we committed eight Army divisions and one Marine division. Supporting us were an international division of three brigades—Australian, British, and Turkish—and 14 Korean divisions.

We must remember that the new proposal of the Department of Defense calls for only six deployable combat divisions from the Reserve component of the Army. These, together with the 16 provided in the Active Army create a total of 22 deployable combat divisions, other than Marines, available on relatively short notice.

Now of this total of 22, we have 5 divisions committed in Europe and 2 in Korea which are not redeployable. The net remaining is 15 divisions, the equivalent of which are 3⅓ currently in Vietnam.

But suppose, as has been conjectured by more than one member of the Congress, that Vietnam requires an effort much like that in Korea. If this should be the case and would require eight Army divisions in Vietnam, that would leave a strategic Reserve of only seven, six of them National Guard.

Are these enough?

I think there is reason to cast serious doubt upon the adequacy of this figure. If I may use a term favored by the Secretary of Defense, the "options" open to the other side are too many.

Berlin, Cuba, Korea represent points where pressure can be applied by the other side, for example, and I am not at this time prepared to accept the thesis that we can meet any likely combination of contingencies with a maximum deployable strength of only 15 divisions.

I say this while recognizing full well the additional strength available in our Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, together with their Reserve components. But how are we to know that the ax which has been sharpened for the Army Reserves is not also being honed for the reservists of the other services.

Another disturbing factor is the loss of trained personnel voluntarily serving in the Army Reserve that would occur through the merger.

In peacetime the National Guard occupies a dual role. It is a State force available to the Governor for any emergency in his State such as riots, strikes, disaster, and civil defense. In time of war, when available, it augments the Active Army.

Reservists cannot be assigned to National Guard units without their consent. They must volunteer for the Guard. The Army Reserve contains many highly qualified personnel in the executive, technical, and management world. The dedication of these individuals to service of their country when needed is beyond question. But they would not be prone to serve voluntarily in units that are subject to peacetime callup for emergencies that States often face.

I think the Senate would find it illuminating to inquire as to the success which the National Guard has had in affiliating these Army reservists who were disenfranchised from paid drilling units as of last December 31, and I hope that this subject will be gone into during committee hearings on the budget and legislating affecting the Reserve components.

You will recall that in the Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1966 the Congress provided money for both the Army Reserve and the Armory National Guard but with provisos that the Army Reserve shall be programed for an end strength of not less than 270,000 during the fiscal year and the Army National Guard for an end strength of not less than 380,000. This action fully supported the conclusions of investigative bodies and both Houses which found that the merger would be inimical to national interest; would cause a serious loss of combat readiness in the affected Reserve units; and would, for all practical purposes, destroy the Army Reserve by transferring all of its organized training functions to the State Guard organizations.

Despite this congressional action of last year, and in the face of the deferral request by all members of the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the Department of Defense, nonetheless, proceeded a short time later to issue an order reorganizing the Army Reserve. This order involved the inactivation by December 31, 1965, of 6 Reserve combat divisions, 4 divisional headquarters commands, and others, for a total of 751 units having 55,000 personnel in paid drill.

Concurrently with this reorganization there was created a selected Reserve force with increased training, manning levels, and equipment priorities.

I think the selected Reserve force, in its concept, is excellent and deserves wholehearted support, but it does not go far enough. It should be extended to include all paid drilling units of the Army Reserve.

Instead, however, this selected Reserve force consists of three divisions and six independent brigades from the National Guard, with supporting units from both Reserve and National Guard. A total of 976 company and detachment size units are involved, of which 744 are from the National Guard and 232 from the Reserve.

The 55,000 personnel lost to paid drill status in the Army Reserve reorganization presumably were to be used to improve manning levels in the remaining Army Reserve units and the selected Reserve force. It is claimed that personnel released will enable the selected Reserve force units to be brought up to 100-percent manning level and the immediate Reserve—high priority—units of the Army Reserve to be brought up to the 80-percent manning level.

The facts are that the inactivated units in many, many cases are not located in the same geographical area as are the selected Reserve force or the immediate Reserve units which could employ their talents. And in those cases where selected Reserve force units of the National Guard are nearby, the reluctance to join for the reasons stated earlier is, I understand, holding down enrollment of these disenfranchised reservists.

Why has the Department of Defense persisted in this reorganization plan, after Congress has disavowed it?

Why has Secretary McNamara by decree moved to obtain what Congress would not give him?

And is the abolition of paid drill for Army reservists in favor of the National Guard in the next budget an effort to validate this earlier action?

And will Secretary McNamara attempt to shift the blame to Congress if the administrative reorganization he has already placed into effect is not supported in the budget?

It is a matter of record, Mr. President, that elements in the Pentagon for the past several years, have been engaging in a persistent fight to reduce the Reserves. The record also shows that Congress, which has the Constitutional responsibility to establish troop levels and military policy by law, has been just as determined to maintain the strength of the Reserves.

The efforts to cut back the Reserves have been accompanied by some very questionable practices—withholding of funds, denial of equipment and support, neglect and indifference toward the programs. The Pentagon cannot deny that the Reserves have been undermanned, underequipped and undertrained—because the Defense Department leadership did not carry out the will of Congress.

The Reserves are among the best bargains that the taxpayers can buy. Of course, it is expected that the Defense Department and the military services will make recommendations for changes in Reserve programs. These are necessary to prevent stagnation. But I believe that the executive branch should support the law of the land, or, if not satisfied with it, seek to have it changed through recommendations to the Congress where the issues can be fully explored.

It is a breach of good government to persist in a course of action which has been unacceptable to the Congress.

I hope that the legislative branch this year will succeed in ending the turbulence in Reserve programs which has been created by this attitude of the Defense Department so that the reservists can get back to their business of preparing themselves for the time when their country needs them.

MRS. IRENE FLETCHER SELECTED AS UTAH "MOTHER OF THE YEAR"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Utah has selected its "Mother of the Year." Her name is Mrs. Irene Fletcher, widow of Dr. Calvin Fletcher. Not only is Mrs. Fletcher a charming and worthy choice, but she is the sister-in-law of the current "American Mother of the Year," Mrs. Harvey Fletcher.

I congratulate both Mrs. Fletchers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a news story and an editorial regarding Mrs. Fletcher from the Salt Lake Tribune.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Utah Mother of the Year—Widow of USU Professor Wins Title

A woman who claims she is not a public person, Friday was catapulted into the public spotlight when she was named Utah's Mother of the Year for 1966.

Mrs. Irene Thompson Fletcher, Logan, a sister-in-law of the reigning American Mother of the Year, Mrs. Harvey Fletcher, Provo, was selected by the Utah Mothers Committee from a group of nine finalists.

REALLY SURPRISED

Widow of Prof. Calvin Fletcher, former head of Utah State University department of art, the State's 1966 Mother of the Year said Friday she was really surprised at her selection.

"I'm not very much of a public person," she said, "and have not taken part in public activities very much. I haven't done as much as some of the other women, so I was really surprised when they chose me."

Mrs. Fletcher said she never expected to get out of Logan in the competition.

CONSIDERED REFUSING

Her name was entered in the contest by the Logan Jaycee Jills, she said, and after their first request to enter her name, she thought she would refuse.

"But the children were such good children and I was afraid they would think I was ashamed of them, so I let them (Jaycee Jills) enter my name," she said.

For a woman who is not a public person, Mrs. Fletcher has made a number of public contributions.

An artist, she has painted a mural in the children's section of the Cache County public library in Logan and teaches an art class weekly in her studio.

PAINTINGS DISPLAYED

Her paintings have been displayed at the State capitol, in a State fair collection, at Utah State University, and in several schools in Logan.

Active in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Mrs. Irene Fletcher was a genealogy missionary and on the Logan and Mount Logan IDS Stake primary boards. She has held offices in the Daughters of Utah Pioneers and is a member of Utah Creative Arts.

Two alternates also were announced Friday. They are Mrs. Leland Monroe (Minnie Lewis) Angus, Roosevelt, and Mrs. David L. (Mildred Pinnock) Sargent, Cedar City.

TWO HAVE 16 CHILDREN

Mrs. Angus is the mother of seven children and Mrs. Sargent has nine children.

Mrs. Fletcher is stepmother of eight children and mother of six.

"We always felt the children should have a responsibility—outside busy work—to the family," she said. A lot of the credit for the success of the family goes to the children, she said. "They made the task easy."

Another Mrs. Fletcher

"We had a happy home life." In these words are found the key to the success of Mrs. Irene Thompson Fletcher, of Logan, Utah's 1966 Mother of the Year.

This simple sentence is about her own family life as a child. But it is often repeated today by 14 children, 6 her own and 8 who were left motherless by the deaths of her husband's first 2 wives and were reared by Mrs. Fletcher.

Using as a standard her own happy home life, Mrs. Fletcher drew close around her all 14 children—all of whom have achieved success in their chosen fields, ranging from wives and homemakers to professional careers—and created for them also a happy home life.

Yet, somehow, with a dozen plus two children about, Mrs. Fletcher still found time to be active in church work, PTA, and a number of civic and professional groups. Somehow, also, she found time to paint. Accomplished artist that she is, she has works in numerous public buildings as well as in private collections.

The home life of the Fletchers—he died in 1963—was marked by firm but kindly discipline, a daily program of work, high personal standards of conduct for each member, weekly checkup meetings, and a weekly program of home and fun evenings. And, of course, love. These, of course, are simple virtues and simple principles that anyone can practice—and must—to achieve a happy home life.

Congratulations to Mrs. Fletcher. She will be a worthy candidate for the national Mother of the Year title, currently held by her sister-in-law, Mrs. Harvey Fletcher.

(At this point, Mr. Bass took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

A RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I urgently hope Congress will move ahead in this session on plans for a permanent Vice-Presidential residence.

I am convinced that there is a clear need for a Vice-Presidential residence, a need that actually should have been met years ago. It makes no sense to postpone action on this matter, because the need will only grow as the country grows with each succeeding Vice President.

Although I have had the privilege of living next door to the Vice President for the past 9 years, in Chevy Chase, I want to make it clear that I do not speak at his suggestion. Indeed, every time I have tried to discuss this subject with him, he has found some way to abruptly change the conversation to some other theme. Actually, he is too busy and too dedicated a public servant to worry about house plans and where he is going to live.

It is equally clear that the greatest country on the face of the earth ought to be able to provide adequate quarters for its Vice President, even if he prefers not to discuss the subject, or even if he recommends against it.

Although I would personally hate to lose the Humphreys as neighbors, I am concerned about their security, their convenience, and their capacity to meet their expected obligations in their present location.

Their home is located virtually on the curb of a very busy street, where traffic is bumper to bumper during the rush hours, and where, with comparative ease at any time of day, a disturbed person could throw an explosive into their home.

Every time the Vice President steps out his front door, before he can get to his car, he is surrounded by friendly people. He is such a warm and engaging person that he cannot resist such affection. However, it hampers his every move.

His house, which is an approximate twin to mine—we live on Coquelin Terrace where all the houses are very similar—was a modest structure to begin with. Now the basement has been occupied by the Secret Service. Mrs. Humphrey's secretary has taken over the den. Officials often claim the living room. It seems that the Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey will soon be confined to the kitchen.

The Vice President says he is perfectly happy where he is. That is irrelevant, for all the reasons I have suggested. I think Vice President Humphrey would be happy in a one-room hut as long as he were permitted to continue in public service. The question is not the happiness of any one Vice President, but whether, after nearly two centuries of nationhood, the United States should delay any longer providing suitable quarters for its Vice President.

As for the argument that the United States cannot afford to build a vice-presidential home, that makes little sense to me. If we can afford an aquarium to take care of the fish here in the Nation's Capital, we can surely afford an adequate home for the Vice President—the second most important official in this great country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was once my privilege to own a home in the same block as the Senator from South Dakota and the then Senator from Minnesota, who is now the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am sorry that the Senator moved away.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was a nice neighborhood with good neighbors. I would say at the time we came here that was about as much home as we could afford. As we grow older we are able to do a little better in life.

I know that the Vice President built a room or two onto his home to try to make it adequate for his needs.

The Vice President should have a home, not for the Vice President but for the United States, where he could take some of the entertainment burden off of the President of the United States, as he is asked to do from time to time with visiting dignitaries from foreign lands and those who visit the Capital.

It is fine to make a showing of having high officials of very modest means. On the other hand, people who come here, especially from foreign lands, are asked to visit with the Vice President because of the burdens on the Presidency. I imagine they are somewhat shocked to find they are driven out to Coquelin Terrace to share the modest means that the Vice President has available.

It would be appropriate that he have a home in keeping with those who have some of the better homes in Washington, D.C., not for himself, but for the Nation.

It would be well that he be able to entertain as well as the Chief of Naval Operations. I am not trying to root the Chief of Naval Operations out of his home, but the Navy has some land at the Naval Observatory at Massachusetts Avenue and this would make a couple of acres available. Maybe he could find space where a few people could park their cars in front of his home and there would be room for the Secret Service to protect the Vice President. After all, he is only a heartbeat away from the Presidency, and this Nation should have facilities for the Vice President.

As the Senator well knows it is not unusual for a person to be appointed as a member of the President's Cabinet, or to a high executive position, who has great means. Sometimes they are millionaires many times over. Such people can come to town and lease a home that would be adequate for one of the embassies of a major country. They can entertain and carry out all of the functions expected of a great country in the way of receiving, entertaining, and providing official receptions for foreign visitors, as well as important Americans.

It would be appropriate that the Vice President could do so as well. We do not expect the Vice President to be a man of wealth and great means. The American ideal is that he not be that. I think it would be very fine if we should insist the Vice President have an adequate residence.

I believe that I once heard a replay of the Vice President's speech at the Gridiron Club where he stated the only home he was interested in trading for was one with large columns and a large lawn, in the heart of the city, but he was saying that as a matter of jest, I am sure. It would be very appropriate that we insist the Vice President be in a position to carry out effectively all of the burdens that both his job and the Vice-Presidency imposes upon him.

I second the motion by the Senator. We should insist that the Vice President have an adequate residence.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is well taken.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, we annually appropriate assistance for a good many countries all over the world. I have always supported those programs, or the bulk of them, but many of the countries we are assisting would not waste a moment's time questioning the need for an adequate home for their Vice President or their other high officials.

We are not talking about one particular individual, Vice President HUMPHREY. We are talking about a permanent home for the Vice President who would be the President of the United States if anything should happen to the President.

As the Senator stated so well, we have in our present Vice President a man who could do a splendid job representing this country with foreign countries, foreign visitors who come here, and he could take some of the responsibility off of the President.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will act on this matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has been my privilege to visit many countries of the world. I have not visited all countries of the world by any means, but I have visited quite a few countries around the world in Western Europe, Central America, South America, and Japan, and I know of no Ambassador who represents this country who has facilities any more modest or nearly as modest as the Vice President of the United States.

While it is true that Ambassadors technically represent the President of the United States, the Vice President, in a great many cases, represents the President of the United States. He is the President's alter ego in many respects when he is representing the President and receiving people in this country.

His requirements, I believe, are even more important than a great number of our Ambassadors, for many of whom we have provided very adequately, indeed.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I believe I have been in a position, perhaps a unique position, to watch the coming and going of the Vice President in recent years and during the time he was in the Senate.

I do not know of anyone in public life who works harder and puts in longer hours. I think that the Vice President has probably saved the Government enough money in overtime labor, for which no claim has been put in, to finance a good residence.

I hope, because of the needs of our Vice President and for the permanent good of the Nation, that we will not delay on this matter longer. Much time has passed already. I hope we will act in the near future. There is nothing to be gained by further delay.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish the Senator had moved on this subject sooner because this Senator has children about the same age as some of the children of the Vice President. I imagine if it happened many years ago they could have been invited to very nice parties for the children of Senators and Congressmen, as well as foreign visitors, and the children of the Senator from Louisiana, in their younger years, might have been invited.

I appreciate the Senator's sentiment because the Humphreys are wonderful hosts.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have not discussed this matter with the Vice President because he refuses to talk about it. I did not tell him I would discuss it on the floor of the Senate today. Indeed, I have taken the floor with some hesitation, knowing that he does not want to make a large issue of the matter. But this is a responsibility we ought to move on and resolve as expeditiously as possible.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT VOLUNTARY PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of Senators CURTIS, MUNDT, THURMOND, SIMPSON, McCLELLAN, BENNETT, ALLOTT, LAUSCHE, WILLIAMS of Delaware, COTTON, CARLSON, JORDAN of Idaho, PEARSON, TOWER, MURPHY, and DOMINICK I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary participation in prayer in the public schools, and ask that it be printed under the rule.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie on the desk through Friday, April 1, 1966, to permit additional Senators to append their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 148) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution is short and simple, and reads as follows:

> Nothing contained in this Constitution shall prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, educational institution or other public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds from providing for or permitting the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer. Nothing contained in this article shall authorize any such authority to prescribe the form or content of any prayer.

The motivation for this resolution stems from three court decisions which provoked a king-sized protest throughout the land and was followed by the introduction of more than 150 resolutions in both branches of the Congress.

The first of these was the Engel against Vitale case in the U.S. Supreme Court, commonly referred to as the Board of Regents case in New York. The board, created by the constitution of New York, acting officially recommended a prayer composed for or by the board and directed that it be recited aloud, in the presence of the teacher. Suit was filed against School District No. 5 in Hyde Park, N.Y. On appeal, the case went to the U.S. Supreme Court, which sustained the plaintiffs in the case and invalidated the action of the school and the board.

The second case was that of the Abingdon School District in Pennsylvania against Schempp and involved a State statute enacted in 1959, requiring that 10 Bible verses be read without comment at the opening of each school day in every Pennsylvania public school. Children could be excused on the written request of the parent or guardian. This too was struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The third case, that of Stein against Oshinsky was tried in the U.S. District Court of New York and then went to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. It did not go to the U.S. Supreme Court. Mr. Oshinsky, principal of School District No. 184 in Whitestone, N.Y., ordered teachers who were instructing kindergarten classes to stop them from reciting a simple, ancient prayer with their morning milk and cookies which went as follows:

> God is great, God is good,
> And we thank Him for this food.

The teachers were also instructed or ordered to stop the recital of an afternoon prayer, also of ancient origin, which read:

> Thank You for the world so sweet,
> Thank You for the food we eat,
> Thank You for the birds that sing,
> Thank You God for everything.

Finally, teachers were ordered to permit no prayers in any classroom in District No. 184.

Parents of children of various faiths sued to enjoin school officials from preventing recital of prayers on the children's initiative.

I may say, parenthetically, that the suit embraced some 21 children who were of the Jewish faith and also of the Protestant faith, by denomination, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and others.

The U.S. district court sustained the parents. The U.S. circuit court overruled the district court.

Basically, these cases hinged upon the first amendment to the Constitution which states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;". The 14th amendment came into play because these commands—that is, in the first amendment—were held applicable to the States as well.

There was a storm of protest over these decisions. For a time it subsided. But it is gathering again in all parts of the Nation.

The fears which these decisions have inspired, the implications which they contain, and the results which might accrue make it imperative that Congress take cognizance of this matter and begin to concern itself with a sustained course of action.

We might yet see school Christmas programs without the use of the word Christmas. Not even "Xmas" would do since it is but an abbreviation of Christmas. Santa Claus may become a memory and we may have to settle for Jolly Mr. Nick. Christmas carols might be excised from the school songbooks. The star which guided the Wisemen might have to recede into orbit. The Nativity scene may have to vanish from school programs, as evidenced by the advice tendered to the Gateway Union School in suburban Pittsburgh—incidentally, advice given, I think, by the district attorney—that if there were to be a Nativity scene, it might be proper and legal only if presented in "a cultural vein."

If the profound legalisms of the courts are carried to a logical conclusion, and to be fully consistent, perhaps God should be removed from the court crier's exhortation at the opening sessions of the U.S. Supreme Court when he says, "God save this honorable Court." But God also appears in the oaths which Senators take. His name appears on our coinage. Every witness who is sworn before testifying before a congressional committee ends his oath with "So help me God." Presidents, from Washington to Johnson, have implored God's help in their inaugural addresses and state of the Union messages. Perhaps it must be stopped. Perhaps the Judicial Code must be amended so that jurors who are sworn will not be required to say, "So help me God." Army, Navy, and other service chaplains may have to be admonished how far they can go in invoking God's grace. Even that sacred document—the Declaration of Independence—may have to be modified, for in it, Jefferson used terms as "Nature's God," "The Creator," and concluded with the affirmation, "With a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence."

I propose a simple amendment. It is voluntary. It is permissive. It places the responsibility upon local school authorities. It gives no authority to an official body to dictate the form or content of a prayer. Such authority may provide for or permit voluntary participation only. And that is the whole of it.

Since the court decisions referred to earlier have been handed down, millions upon millions of words have been written on this subject. Polls have been taken. Insofar as I can determine, more than 81 percent of the people disagree with the courts. Two weeks ago, one man came to Washington and dumped 52,000 original letters of protest on my desk. Prayer groups are organizing. Sooner or later, Congress must come to grips with this matter.

What I propose is no disrespect to the Court. It is only that I disagree. Lincoln accepted but stoutly disagreed with the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott decision. It remained for blood and for the 13th amendment to overturn that decision. In 1913, Congress and the people reversed the Court in the imposition of a tax on incomes. But for that, there would hardly be a Great Society today because it takes money to run the Great Society.

In all of the prayer cases, the decisions were based on an interpretation of the Constitution. That Constitution was ordained by the people. Moreover, the people reserved the right to amend it. The issue from here on is therefore quite clear. Shall the people be afforded an opportunity to act on language which will clarify this vexing problem before it is carried to ridiculous extremes by other suits which may be filed? I do not now propose to repeal the first amendment to the Constitution. I do not propose to reverse the Court. I do propose a clarification so that these decisions and their possible implications will not hover over every teacher, every principal, and every educator in the land as well as over the school boards and authorities who are charged with administering our public educational system.

It will be noted that the amendment contains the words "providing for or permitting." It may be contended that to provide for voluntary participation in prayer is also offensive since it must mean in a tax-supported public school. Just how offensive is it?

The Court crier who asks God to save this honorable Court every time he opens a session across the way does so in a magnificent marble building constructed with public funds. The Chaplains of the House and Senate offer their prayers in the people's own Capitol, built with public funds. In that Capitol is a prayer room where Members may go and it was designed and built from public funds appropriated by Congress. Every U.S. vessel, every Government-owned camp, cantonment, barracks, chapel, or other building where prayer is offered by service chaplains has been erected with public funds. The prayers pronounced over the caskets of the young dead coming back from Vietnam are said by chaplains who are paid from public funds. Any argument against providing a place for voluntary prayer because it takes place in a structure built with public funds would sound rather hollow in the face of reality.

To all this, I add a few personal thoughts. A thousand years before the Galilean was born—yes, and perhaps several thousand years—the original parents were warned about the "tree of knowledge of good and evil." They were warned only that to touch it or eat of the fruit meant death. But the tempter serpent beguiled Eve, and she took of the fruit and shared it with Adam. There was no compulsion. There was complete freedom of choice and, having chosen, they must bear the consequences. This, then, is the foundation for the whole doctrine of vicarious atonement. This freedom of choice not only in the spiritual but the material world as well has been eroding and with it come the vexations, the frustrations, and the desperations which mark the lives of so many.

Man must look to a God for comfort, for solace, for consolation, for guidance, and for hope. Glibly and superficially, it is argued that the place for this is the church which children attend once or twice each week, or in the home where the preschool hours are given to preparing for school, the after-school hours in unleashing youthful energy, and the early preretirement hours with books and television and the other diversions of the day.

The really alert hours—perhaps 6 or 7—are spent in school. These are the formative years for 50 million youngsters. These are the hours when the habit of prayer can best be nurtured.

Prayer is the roadmap to God. It should become the greatest adventure for young minds. Each must find the way for himself. This takes some doing—the development of right habits, the building of spiritual muscle. This can come only from practice and rehearsal day after day when young minds are alert.

How strange that we spend hundreds of millions of public funds every year to develop physical fitness and harden the muscles of American youth, but when it comes to hardening the spiritual muscles through the practice and rehearsal of prayer, it becomes enshrouded in quaint legalism and the jargon of church and state.

Mr. President, I finish by saying: Give Caesar what he requires, but give God a little also.

I hope that this measure will commend itself to many Senators so that they may append their names as cosponsors in addition to those names that have already been reported.

STUDENTS TALK 15 HOURS FOR VIETNAM RELIEF FUND

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, much is said these days about the inability of American teenagers to identify with something of substance. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the March 2 Laramie, Wyo., Daily Boomerang under the headline "Students Talk 15 Hours for Vietnam Relief Fund."

As reported by my longtime friend and Laramie, Wyo., legionnaire, Ward W. Husted, the teenagers, spearheaded by Tom Mast, Lew Roney, and Jim Ginther, spent some 15 hours speaking over radio station KLME on behalf of the American Legion's Vietnam Relief Fund. The students were responsible for collecting nearly $470 for the fund. They "identified" that day with a cause of great substance.

I ask that the article be printed in the Congressional Record with my remarks, as one more indication, not only of the measure of support which Americans give to the very dirty but very necessary war in Vietnam but as an indication of the translation of that support into action by a group of high school students in Laramie, Wyo.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Students Talk 15 Hours for Vietnam Relief Fund

Laramie High School students, spearheaded by their own student council talked for over 15 hours Saturday.

With the cooperation of station KLME and its manager George Blum, the teenagers proved to the world that they were for something, and that they were solidly behind the American service men and women who are fighting for liberty and freedom in Vietnam.

Under the chairmanship of Tom Mast, and Lew Roney and Jim Ginther as cochairmen, 200 LHS students worked and performed from 9 a.m. Saturday until 12:35 a.m. Sunday broadcasting and collecting for the American Legion Vietnam Relief Fund. Many local business and professional men were interviewed during the day, live entertainment was brought in from all parts of the city, and records spun between acts.

All through the day and evening calls came into KLME offering subscriptions to the fund, and within minutes a LHS collector was at the door to pick up the donation. When the LHS team called the show off early Sunday morning they were happy at the $475.07 that had been contributed to the fund.

Legion Commander Doris Christ, of Albany County Post 14, expressed the thanks of all Legionnaires to the students of Laramie High School and to radio station KLME for the fine demonstration of public service last week. In this era of "demonstrations" this was one that brought credit to Laramie and all its people, she said. Station KLME will continue to receive contributions to the Vietnam Relief Fund.

A bright spot of the campaign is that every penny donated will find its way to Vietnam, to back up U.S. servicemens' civic action work among the Vietnamese people. All administrative costs will be paid by the national organization of the American Legion, Mrs. Christ said.

THE KANSAS MILLING INDUSTRY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the economy of the milling industry of Kansas, indeed much of the economy of the Midwest relating to processed agricultural products, faces a threat because of a disparity in freight rates to the east and south, that is to say, a disparity in the freight rates from the sources of agricultural production to the great metropolitan areas of consumption.

The solution to this problem relates to freight rates, but the eventual solution, if there is to be one, lies in the fundamental forces of competition between regions, each exercising to its fullest capacity its natural advantages.

No one in the State of Kansas has dealt more intelligently or with greater dedication with regard to this problem than Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State University. He serves as a chairman of a 12-State Governors' committee to examine ways of maintaining the strength of the agriculture industry in the Midwest and in Kansas. As an educator he has educated; as an administrator he has dealt with a large body of complicated facts in a precise and excellent manner; and as a concerned citizen he has sought not to shun controversy but to manage it for the welfare of Kansas, the Midwest, and indeed the Nation.

Mr. President, an editorial in the Kansas City Star entitled, "Middle West in Throes of Regional Competition" expresses these sentiments and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Middle West in Throes of Regional Competition

Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State University, has been performing a valuable service to the economy of this part of the country. He has done so through his efforts to inform the public on the problems faced in preserving and extending markets for our processed agricultural products.

The crux of the dilemma seems to be that this trade territory, which is strong on agricultural production, does not have many big centers of population. Thus the products of the farm must be shipped either in raw or processed form to places where they will be consumed. For employment and business expansion in our area, we need to maintain processing industries.

McCain's interest in the subject was heightened, when he was named chairman of a 12-State Governors' committee to examine ways of "saving" the flour milling industry in Kansas and other Middle West States. The threat to that industry came from a disparity in freight rates to the East and Southeast as beween wheat and flour. Rates were reduced on wheat but not on flour, putting Kansas mills at a disadvantage.

After many hearings and much study, McCain has come to some conclusions which are important to Middle West area problems and not alone on flour milling. One judgment is that the area can't logically complain about technical progress, even when it interferes with traditional trade patterns. As an example, the mills shouldn't protest because the railroads have found cheaper methods to transport wheat. The difficulties lie in the fact that less expensive transportation has not also been developed for flour or that when it has been provided, the savings have not been passed on in reduced freight rates for flour.

Freight rates can ultimately determine where livestock shall be fed, whether where the livestock is grown, as in the Middle West, or where the meat is consumed, as on the west coast, McCain points out. The Kansas State president insists that producers in this area must maintain the highest possible level of efficiency in order to insure the lowest possible costs of production and a quality product. It follows that processors also must have maximum efficiency to get the end product to consumers at a competitive price. Dr. Elmer H. Kiehl, dean of the college of agriculture at the University of Missouri, has been saying essentially the same thing.

This is not the kind of a problem that can be solved by the adoption of resolutions or even legislation. McCain is emphasizing that there are some areas where complaints on freight disparities might logically be made. Also, freight rates are extremely important to the Middle West's overall economy. But eventually the solution, if there is to be one, lies in meeting competition with other regions. It means exploiting our natural advantages to the hilt and creating others. It is his conclusion that the Middle West can compete, but it won't be easy.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SUPPORTS TRUTH IN LENDING AND TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, for 6 years Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, has fought unceasingly and tirelessly for truth in lending.

Repeatedly he has taken the floor and worked in committee to prevent deception practiced on unknowing and uninformed borrowers who, when buying on the installment plan, are paying far more in interest rates than they know. Actually, installment buying has become the merchandising of indebtedness. Men and women, millions of them, who desire to improve their standard of living, are being misled, and paying heavily for this deception.

The courageous Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] has actively led his Senate troops through the muddy fields of the truth-in-lending battle on behalf of the consumers of America. The 87th Congress had been in session for less than 4 months when 21 Members of this body joined Senator Douglas in sponsoring S. 1740, the truth-in-lending bill. I am proud to say that I was among the original cosponsors. At that time Senator Douglas said, on April 27, 1961:

> The testimony before the committee (the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency) revealed a number of major abuses in the field of consumer credit.

And so the testimony had.

As President Johnson observed in the opening sentence of his message on truth in lending and packaging, and other matters of interest to consumers, which he sent to Congress yesterday, March 21, 1966:

> The consumer's interest is the American interest.

And so it is.

Paul Douglas reintroduced his truth-in-lending bill in the 88th Congress and again in the 89th Congress. I supported his bills.

The concept of truth in lending now has the warm support of President Johnson, just as it had the support of the late President Kennedy, and I am hopeful that positive action can be completed this session of the Congress.

Unfortunately, much as I applaud and approve of the President's support, I believe it fair to point out that in his message to the Congress concerning truth in lending, there are areas which can be strengthened. Indeed, the full cost of credit should be stated simply and clearly before any credit contract is signed as the President has stated, but I hope the bill which comes before the Senate will specify that the disclosure of the credit cost be required annually. It makes a difference to the consumer, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has long pointed out.

The champions of the consumer deserve our deep appreciation because we are all consumers.

The able Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has long advocated truth in packaging and the far-sighted Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has been the champion of the long-suffering housewife who finds it difficult to know the difference, if any, in king size, super size, or double economy size.

Senator HART has fought for truth in packaging, and in his message on consumer interests Monday, March 21, the President called for fair packaging and labeling which would—

> First. Require that each package provide simple, direct, accurate, and visible information as to the nature and quantity of its contents, including ingredients where this is important.
>
> Second. Keep off the shelves packages with deceptively shaped boxes, misleading pictures, confusing or meaningless adjectives, inappropriate size or quantity markings, and promotional gimmicks that promise nonexistent savings.
>
> Third. Provide for the establishment of reasonable and appropriate weight standards to facilitate comparative shopping.

As the President correctly points out:

> An accurate and informative package and label need not add to the producers' cost. It will add to the welfare of the American consumer.

We owe much to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who have given so tirelessly of their time to bring to the attention of the American public the need for truth in lending and fair packaging and labeling.

For example, Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, has persisted successfully in her efforts to make food, drugs, and cosmetics more safe.

In her floor remarks yesterday she cited examples of how truth in lending would help the consumer. It is pertinent to repeat this one example:

Said Representative SULLIVAN:

> Under present practices: On department store revolving credit, say you charge $700 worth of purchases. You might be told that you would pay a small service charge for each month that you owed money to the store.
>
> Under truth in lending: You would be told that the store's finance charges were at the rate of 18 percent per year and you would receive a monthly statement showing the dollars-and-cents costs for credit during the previous month.

The truth will free the consumer from being overcharged or short-weighted.

President Johnson has further enhanced his great record in the field of domestic legislation. It has been a record unequalled in presidential history.

PRESENTATION OF SAM RAYBURN GOLD MEDAL IN BONHAM, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Friday, March 18, 1966, was Sam Rayburn Gold Medal Day in Bonham, Tex., as declared by the mayor of Bonham, Mr. John M. Crockett, in honor of the presentation of the Sam Rayburn Gold Medal which was authorized by a joint resolution of Congress in 1962.

It was my honor on that day to present the Gold Sam Rayburn Medal honoring the late Sam Rayburn "For services rendered to the people of the United States" to his two surviving sisters, Mrs. S. E. Bartley and Mrs. W. A. Thomas in the public ceremony held in front of the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham.

We were honored on that occasion to have with us Miss Eva Adams, Director of the U.S. Mint, the Honorable Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and the Honorable Robert Bartley, member of the Federal Communications Commission and the nephew of the late Sam Rayburn. In addition, there were several Texas Congressmen, U.S. Circuit Judge Homer Thornberry, U.S. District Judge Sheehy, and a large crowd of the late Sam Rayburn's friends at the public ceremony.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution declaring March 18, 1966, as Sam Rayburn Gold Medal Day, a copy of the program, the remarks of Miss Eva Adams and the remarks of Robert A. Wallace, and my remarks be printed at this point in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, on the 26th day of September 1962, by joint resolution, authorized that a gold medal be struck and presented to the estate of the late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, "for services rendered to the people of the United States;" and,

Whereas said gold medal has been struck and will be presented to the recipients thereof in Bonham, Tex., on March 18, 1966, at 2 p.m., in a public ceremony on the grounds of the Sam Rayburn Library; and,

Whereas on said occasion, we will be honored with the presence of many distinguished citizens and public servants, especially the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator from Texas, who authored the resolution for the striking of said medal, the Honorable Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and the Honorable Eva Adams, Director of the U.S. Mint; and,

Whereas we are again honored through the life of Sam Rayburn, our fellow citizen, though he be dead, and we are further honored as a community by the presence of such distinguished company as will be in our city: Now, therefore,

I, John M. Crockett, mayor of the city of Bonham, do hereby designate Friday, March 18, 1966, as Sam Rayburn Gold Medal Day in the city of Bonham, Tex., and call upon all of the citizens of this community to bear witness to the importance of said occasion and assist all visitors to our city on that occasion in every way possible.

Witness my hand and the seal of the city of Bonham, on this the 3d day of March 1966.

JOHN M. CROCKETT,
Mayor, City of Bonham.

PROGRAM: PRESENTATION OF SAM RAYBURN GOLD MEDAL, THE SAM RAYBURN LIBRARY, BONHAM, TEX., MARCH 18, 1966, 2 P.M.

Master of ceremonies: Buster Cole, secretary-treasurer, the Sam Rayburn Foundation.

Invocation: Rev. William Cheatham, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Bonham.

Welcome address: Gene Danner, member, Bonham City Commission.

Introduction of distinguished guests: Buster Cole.

Remarks: Miss Eva Adams, Director of U.S. Mint.

Remarks: Hon. Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Presentation speech: Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator from Texas.

Acceptance speech: Hon. Robert Bartley, member, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

Benediction: Rev. Jack Carson, pastor, First Baptist Church, Bonham.

THE SAM RAYBURN GOLD MEDAL

(Remarks by the Honorable Eva B. Adams, Director of the Mint, at the presentation ceremonies of the Sam Rayburn Gold Medal, the Sam Rayburn Library, Bonham, Tex., 2 p.m., March 18, 1966)

One hundred and ninety years ago on the 25th of this month, the Continental Congress of the United States rendered George Washington a great honor. For wise and spirited conduct in the siege and acquisition of Boston, General Washington was tendered a gold medal expressing the thanks of the Congress, in their own name and in the name of the Thirteen Colonies whom they represented. This was the first gold medal awarded to a citizen by our Government.

Since then we have honored our Presidents by striking gold and bronze medals bearing their likeness on the obverse, with appropriate symbols, words, and motifs on the reverse. We have also honored Secretaries of the Treasury, Directors of the Mint, and those generals and admirals who rendered outstanding service in the defense of our country.

Today we honor a man who was none of these.

Today we honor a man who was a private citizen, a representative of the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas. So in this respect the occasion that brings us here is unique.

The Congress of the United States has not frequently bestowed such an honor on a private citizen. On fewer than 12 occasions has Congress passed a resolution authorizing the U.S. Mint to strike a gold medal honoring a private citizen with the simultaneous striking of bronze medals for sale to the public. The two Americans immediately honored before Mr. Rayburn were Dr. Thomas A. Dooley III, and Robert Frost—the former a great humanitarian physician, the latter a great poet of the American people.

Bronze medals of Sam Rayburn, identical to the one struck in gold, are now available for sale. These may be purchased by writing directly to the Superintendent of the U.S. Mint in Philadelphia.

The supply of medals in any given category that we offer to the public is dictated by demand. Replacements are manufactured only as required. The medal program of your U.S. Mint, I would like to emphasize, is operated in conjunction with, rather than in opposition to, the mint's primary purpose—which is to fulfill the Nation's needs for coins.

The obverse side of the Sam Rayburn gold medal was designed and engraved by Mr. Frank Gasparro at our Philadelphia Mint. A full-face likeness of Mr. Rayburn is in the foreground, while in the background is the Capitol of the United States, where he spent so much of his life. His name is engraved around the top, and the year of his birth and death on the right.

The reverse side was designed and engraved by Mr. Phillip Fowler. In the center is a gavel—symbol of the position which Mr. Rayburn occupied for so long: Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States. Across the gavel lies a sprig of blue bonnets—your lovely State flower. Encircling the gavel and the blue bonnets the following words are engraved: "For Services Rendered to the People of the United States."

The medal is striking for its simplicity of design and the power and strength that emanates from the remarkable portrait of Mr. Rayburn. This is as it should be; for these were qualities that characterized the man we honor here today.

The Good of Man Must Be the End Result of the Science of Politics

(Remarks by the Honorable Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of Treasury, at the presentation ceremonies of the Sam Rayburn Gold Medal; the Sam Rayburn Library, Bonham, Tex., 2 p.m., March 18, 1966)

Each time I return to the Southwest where I was born and where I lived the first 20 years of my life, I feel a deep surge of pride. Here is the pioneer tradition—the tradition of accomplishment by hard work and perseverance. My grandfather, John Milton Stewart, was the chief machinist at the S. L. Irvin Co. at nearby Honey Grove, Tex. He was also a railroadman, farmer, and businessman, possessing the versatility necessary to the taming of the prairie wilderness when the Cheyenne territory was opened in southwestern Oklahoma in 1893.

This is also ancient land. Here the roots of our history run broad and deep. Here the cultures of many people met—Indian, Spanish, Mexican, and American. One complemented the other. Each contributed to the cultural heritage of the past which we presently enjoy.

The man we honor here today was both a product of this rich, diversified culture and a contributor to it. Conscious of the land's history, understanding of its people, Sam Rayburn reflected in his long life of political purpose and purposeful action their aspirations and their dreams. The land and its people are both richer for his having lived.

The strength and dignity of any movement, whether it is a library fashioned of wood or a statue carved from stone, is derived not from the wood or marble of which it is built, but from the man in whose name it was erected. The strength of Mr. Rayburn was as the strength of the land which he loved. His dignity was the dignity of the people whom he served for over half a century. Both the Sam Rayburn Library and the principles of the man which give it strength and dignity are now a meaningful portion of the cultural legacy future generations will share.

The gold medal presented here today honors Mr. Rayburn as an outstanding representative of his people before the greatest political tribunal of our land. It is also a testament wrought in gold of his country's appreciation and indebtedness. In creating this symbol of unselfish service to the people he represented, the country he served, and the democratic principles in which he believed, we follow a tradition as old as our government—a tradition that recognizes a citizen's contribution to the preservation of those ideals and principles that are the cornerstones of our democratic institutions and which give substance and meaning to democracy itself.

Aristotle taught that "the good of man must be the end of the science of politics." It was this principle that guided Sam Rayburn throughout his illustrious life. He was eminently successful in bringing together diverse political elements in our complex political structure. Out of this political synthesis, this crystallization of intellectual ideas from all portions of our country, came laws that strengthened the fabric of our society and enriched the lives of our people. The laws that he helped fashion reflect his belief that the good of man must be the end result of political thought and action.

It is extremely important that we never lose sight of this principle when we formulate laws, enforce them, and interpret them within the framework of contemporary thought and belief. In every facet of our undertakings today, in our endeavor to create a great society at home and a good society of nations throughout the world, we are conscious of this principle—that the good of man must be the end result of political thought and action. It guides our course of action in Vietnam where we seek to restore peace and order in a troubled land so that free people may choose a government and a way of life of their own free choice. It guides our course of action here at home in our efforts to rebuild and dignify our cities, preserve our country's beauty and safeguard our natural resources, eliminate social ills that degrade and destroy fellow Americans, expand and improve our educational systems, and alleviate prejudice and bigotry so that all of us—regardless of his race, religion, or color—may live in harmony and work in unison with each other to achieve goals and dreams we share.

President Johnson, in his message to Congress on American cities, talked about answering an ancient dream: "That dream is of * * * a land * * * of promise, of hope, where it could truly be said, to every man his chance, to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity, to every man the right to live and to work and to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him."

There are few Americans who have not shared this dream. It is a recurrent dream, because the moulding of a society where the good of man is the end result of political thought and action is a continuous process. It develops through succeeding generations, and each generation enriches or distorts this dream in proportion to its attitude and approach to solving the innumerable problems we face in our communities and our country. The complexity and enormity of the problems that surround us at home and abroad preclude to any of us the luxury of leisure or indifference in our search for solutions. It is a search in which all must participate, for all are affected.

Here in Bonham and as a Congressman and Speaker of the House of Representatives in our Nation's Capital, Sam Rayburn continually sought opinions of people in all walks of life to help guide his thought and direct his actions. For he realized that democracy to live and flourish must reflect and mirror the thoughts and aspirations of peoples of varied backgrounds, different nationalities, and diverse interests. He realized that to the extent political action reflects the best thought which can be brought to bear on any given problem, to that extent do political laws enrich the lives of human beings and contribute to democracy's growing legacy. He was fortunate to see within his own lifetime the beneficial effects of numerous social and economic laws he helped formulate and bring to fruition—laws that enriched the lives of all Americans and strengthened the democratic principles upon which our society rests. By his life and actions he contributed toward the fulfillment of the American dream and enriched our common heritage.

Remarks of Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, Bonham, Tex., Friday, March 18, 1966, in Presenting the Sam Rayburn Gold Medal to Mrs. S. E. Bartley and Mrs. W. A. Thomas, Surviving Sisters of Speaker Sam Rayburn

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Thomas, Mrs. Bartley, Judge Thornberry, Judge Shiehy, Secretary Wallace, Director Adams, Commissioner Bartley, General Carr, colleagues in the Congress, fellow Americans, fellow Texans, friends, this Nation, this Government, this people have sent these representatives from Washington today to honor the memory and the unselfish achievements of the greatest legislator the American people have ever produced.

Sam Rayburn was not born to be Speaker—he achieved it himself.

William Arbogast, chief Associated Press staff writer, covering the House of Representatives, wrote:

"The story of Sam Rayburn is the story of a lonely little boy helping grub a living out of Texas cotton land and dreaming of a future in politics.

"It is the story of a dream come true in the face of adversity and obstacles which would have discouraged a less determined man.

"Sam Rayburn wasn't born to be Speaker of the House. He got there on his own.

"He was born to be a farmer, and at farming he spent his early life, first in his native Tennessee and then in Texas, which his father adopted as permanent home for the Rayburn family of 11 children.

"As a boy, Sam Rayburn's life was one of toil and monotony.

"'When I was a boy,' he once said, 'I would sit on a fence on Sundays and wish that somebody would ride by on a horse—just anything to relieve the monotony.'"

But Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn came from good stock, from fine people, good in intellect and character and faith—diligent in work, fair in their dealings with all people.

Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn was eighth in a family of 11 children born to William Marion Rayburn and Martha Clementine Waller Rayburn. Born in Tennessee, he came with his parents to Fannin County in 1887 at the age of 5—and it was this land, this people, this area, this Fannin County, this Red River country, that shaped his life of honor and service, and gave him an opportunity to develop both.

He went to school at Burnet and Flag Springs, then to Mayo Normal at Commerce. He taught school at Greenwood, Hopkins County, at the age of 19; he received his B.S. degree from Mayo Normal, now East Texas State College, at 21; taught school for 3 more years; then surprised everyone by announcing for the legislature at age 24.

He won, and at the age of 29, was the youngest Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives in history up to that time. He studied law at the University of Texas and was admitted to the bar.

At 30, Sam Rayburn achieved his ambition—election to the U.S. House of Representatives. He became a Congressman the year Woodrow Wilson became President.

He became chairman of the powerful Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee 2 years before F.D.R. was elected President, and 6 years later was House majority leader. In 1940, he first became Speaker of the House. Ten times he was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, where he served as Speaker longer than any other man, more than twice as long as Henry Clay.

This remarkable man we honor today was not a passive Speaker—he was an activist. He was no mere moderator. He was his party's leader. He was constructive in his leadership. When the opposing party had the Presidency, as was the case with President Eisenhower, Speaker Rayburn was no mere obstructionist. If it was good for the country, Sam Rayburn was for it. This was his attitude with all the eight Presidents with whom he served.

Sam Rayburn made it clear that he served "with" those Presidents, not "under" them. He strove to maintain the coequal nature of the Congress and the executive in a Government designed to be a government of checks and balances.

Rayburn's service in the Congress was liberal, enlightened, and progressive. He went to the Congress the year Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated, and supported Wilson's new freedom program. Woodrow Wilson wrote a letter of admiration and congratulations to the young Congressman for his skill in steering through the House the stock and bond bill.

Leading columnist, Marquis Childs described how Sam Rayburn was "a partner with F.D.R. in bringing about the New Deal." He was the friend and confidant of President Harry Truman—and pushed Truman's Fair Deal. And speaking of his support for John F. Kennedy's New Frontier, Ralph McGill of the Atlanta Constitution wrote: "This son of the old frontier played a powerful role in the new."

Were he alive today, Sam Rayburn would be the leading architect of L.B.J.'s Great Society.

Sam Rayburn achieved an unmatched legislative record, so astounding in its massive accomplishments that biographer Dwight Dorough called it, "An inconceivable record." It would take hours to chronicle that record. Suffice it to say that it was recognized in his own lifetime.

Honorary degrees were bestowed upon him by Muhlenberg College in Pennsylvania, East Texas State Teachers College, the University of Maryland, Austin College, National University in Washington, Tusculum College, the University of West Virginia, and Syracuse University.

He was elected an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa and of Phi Delta Phi.

He received the Collier's magazine award of $10,000 for distinguished service.

Christian Science Monitor called him, "The tallest Texan of them all, a solid unfrilled citizen."

He was a strategy leader for John Nance Garner's campaign for the Presidency in 1932, and steered Garner into the Vice-Presidency, the first Texan ever to be Vice President of the United States.

Rayburn's chance to be Vice President came in 1944, but it was canceled out by the opposition of reactionaries in his own State, who were fighting his reelection at home.

Rayburn, more than any other person, was responsible for Justice Tom Clark's appointment by Harry Truman to the Supreme Court—the only Texan ever to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 1960, Sam Rayburn was a guiding genius behind Lyndon Johnson's drive for the Presidency, which led to Johnson's election to the Vice-Presidency—from which position fate placed him in the President's chair—the first Texan President.

So Sam Rayburn's political genius was a main factor in placing in high Federal office: First, Texas' only two Vice Presidents; second, Texas' only Supreme Court Justice; third, Texas' only President.

More than 200 Congressmen gave tributes to him on the floor of the House; legislatures and city councils passed resolutions in his memory, and the congressional assemblies of nine nations passed resolutions in his honor.

Four Presidents of the United States came to Bonham to honor his memory that sad November day of his funeral here.

John F. Kennedy said of Rayburn: "Immeasurable is your devotion to cause and country and immeasurable is the respect, esteem, and affection which all of us who have served with you hold for you."

Lyndon Johnson said of him: "He was as old as Thomas Jefferson, and as young as John F. Kennedy. Our Democratic Party is the oldest political party in the world because men like the Speaker keep it loyal to the old traditions—and forever alert to new ways to serve social progress and human freedom.

"He was younger than any of us—there was one thing he disliked more than old fogies, and that was, as he put it, 'young fogies'."

Among the honors our people and institutions have bestowed upon Sam Rayburn, the following stand out:

1. Sam Rayburn's oil portrait hangs in the Speaker's Lobby in the Capitol in Washington.
2. Rayburn's life-sized statue is in the Rayburn Building in Washington.
3. The massive Rayburn Building in Washington, named in his honor.
4. Rayburn Reception Room in the Capitol, dedicated to Sam Rayburn.
5. Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River in Texas, named by an act of Congress.
6. Sam Rayburn Oak Tree on the Capitol Grounds in Washington.
7. The Sam Rayburn Library at Bonham, Tex.
8. A Sam Rayburn oil portrait officially hangs in the State capitol in Austin.
9. A Sam Rayburn oil portrait officially placed in East Texas State College.
10. A U.S. Rayburn commemorative postage stamp.
11. A Sam Rayburn Gold Medal, struck by the U.S. Mint by resolution of the Congress of the United States, to be presented in a few minutes to his surviving sisters.

These honors are more than have come to many Presidents, yet all combined are small in comparison with the esteem the American people feel in their hearts for him.

Today, as many times before, you have heard Sam Rayburn eulogized for the great American that he was. As long as there is recorded history, and as long as memories remain sacred, "Mr. Sam" will remain an inspiration. Many an aspiring young man will turn to "Mr. Sam" for his ideals, his determination, and his quiet patience in his long years of apprenticeship.

This Sam Rayburn Medal, this beautiful and enduring Sam Rayburn Library here in Bonham, the Sam Rayburn Building in Washington, and all the other monuments named, all stand as monuments, visible to the sight of all Americans, of the love and respect which his fellow citizens held for Sam Rayburn. But perhaps the most significant memorial of all is the Sam Rayburn scholarship program, where more than 200 distinguished Americans have provided the funds for a program that will encourage the outstanding young people of this Nation to seek careers in public service. There is no better way to memorialize this great man than to encourage others to emulate his great career of distinguished service, accomplishments, and dedication. It is most fitting that these scholarships will emphasize the teaching of government and government service in the Halls of Congress to which Sam Rayburn devoted his lifetime.

As I present this medal honoring Sam Rayburn "for services rendered to the people of the United States" to his two surviving sisters, Mrs. S. E. Bartley and Mrs. W. A. Thomas, who are represented by Sam Rayburn's nephew, the Honorable Robert Bartley, it is my hope that it will be a symbol of our determined dedication to the principles which Sam Rayburn's life illustrated. With Sam Rayburn as a model for the future political leaders of this Nation, the United States will continue on its path of greatness.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Friday, March 25, is the 145th anniversary of the beginning of the valiant struggle of Greece to free itself from the oppressive domination of the Ottoman Empire, when Americans join with freedom-loving people all over the world in paying tribute to the independent spirit and the courage of the Greek people.

It is entirely appropriate that free people everywhere should acknowledge their debt to a nation which has contributed so much to the development of democratic ideals.

The concept of democracy which lay at the foundation of the government at Athens more than 2,000 years ago constitutes the basis of democracy as we now know it. The methods and practices of the city-State government necessarily have been modified to fit the demands of modern society, but the primary emphasis on the worth and dignity of the individual and on the rule of law have remained unchanged.

Greek contributions to our society have not been confined, of course, to our political institutions. In architecture, literature, philosophy, and sculpture, the imagination and creativity of the Greeks has served as a source of inspiration to all of us over the years. But it is for their contributions to democratic political thought that I especially commend them today.

The struggle for freedom in Greece was not won easily. Nor has it been easy for the Greeks to maintain the freedom thus achieved. Because geographically Greece is a gateway between Europe and Asia it has been the locale of many serious armed conflicts, all of which have done great injury to the economic and political structure of the land but none of which has dampened the spirit of the Greek people.

Today Greece stands practically on Russia's doorstep as a constant reminder and symbol of a people that successfully resisted the clutches of the Kremlin. The Greek people are continuing to strengthen the economic and social fibers of their nation and are a valuable and trusted ally in the NATO pact of nations.

We Americans can never completely repay our debt to a nation and people who have contributed so significantly to the development of democratic ideals and institutions. We are indeed proud of and grateful to the more than 1½ million Americans of Greek descent who have done so much to strengthen democracy and freedom in our own land.

In my own State of Massachusetts we have a sizable Greek community to which I wish to pay tribute. Their influence is widely felt throughout the Commonwealth, and they have provided constructive leadership in many aspects of our community life.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in recent months I have received a good deal of mail concerning H.R. 8282, the bill to revise the unemployment compensation laws. The issues are important, and highly technical.

H.R. 8282 is the bill proposed by the administration. Before it comes to the floor of the Senate it must be reported by the House Ways and Means Committee, passed by the House of Representatives, and considered by the Senate Finance Committee. It will undoubtedly undergo considerable change as it moves through the legislative process. My vote will depend upon the exact shape of the bill that comes before the Senate. While comments upon specifics are premature, it is possible to discuss my reaction to the philosophy of H.R. 8282.

This is an appropriate time to consider changes in our unemployment compensation law. Enacted during the depression years, when millions of men were unemployed simply because our entire economy had faltered, this statute has been on the books for 30 years without any basic changes. Today the unemployment problems we face are very different in both quantity and quality.

The curse of unemployment now falls upon a relatively few Americans. Joblessness is at a 12-year low. Our economy is booming. Indeed, many segments of the economy face severe labor shortages, particularly in skilled trades and white-collar jobs. Those who cannot find work fall into three basic categories: those who live in areas—such as Appalachia—where jobs of all kinds are scarce; those who lack the skills to compete effectively in the labor market; and those who are discriminated against on account of age, sex, or color. For these individuals, and their families, unemployment is basically a long-term chronic condition.

Any reform of our unemployment compensation system must balance two critical factors: the need to provide a reasonable level of wage insurance for those who are willing to work but are unable to find suitable employment, and the need to bar those who do not want to work from using their unemployment checks as a substitute for a job. Benefits must not be raised to the point where they would kill or weaken the incentive to work. But they should be high enough to enable a conscientious and industrious person to meet his and his family's immediate, minimum needs during periods of unemployment.

Those who oppose reform of our unemployment compensation system sometimes use real or imagined cases of fraud as a reason to oppose any change. Despite popular misconception, there is actually very little chiseling. Only 12 of every 1,000 beneficiaries were found to have made fraudulent claims in 1964. Only 31 cents of every $100 in benefits was an overpayment for fraud, and almost two-thirds of this amount was recovered. Nor is the current level of benefits a widespread invitation to goldbricking. Maximum benefits range from $30 per week in Mississippi to $65 in California. Nationally, the average benefit paid is about $37 per week. This is less than $2,000 per year, far below the poverty level.

Where fraud, loopholes, and goldbricking exist, they should be rooted out. I support such reforms. But I do not think it fair or accurate to charge our entire unemployment compensation system with sheltering loafers, welfare chiselers, and misfits. Under recession conditions only 65 percent of the unemployed draw benefits. In better times, such as the present, this drops to 40 percent.

H.R. 8282 proposes to meet modern unemployment problems with three fundamental reforms:

First. Establishing minimum Federal standards governing the level of unemployment compensation in each State.

Second. Extending coverage to workers not now entitled to unemployment compensation.

Third. Extending the duration of benefits for workers who are unemployed for long periods of time.

First. H.R. 8282 would establish Federal benefit standards by requiring that the minimum benefit be one half of the worker's weekly wage, with a maximum benefit of not less than two-thirds of the State's average weekly wage. For example, if the average wage in a State is $100, the statewide maximum must be set at $67. Then an $80-a-week worker must receive at least $40—half of his wage loss—a $100 worker $50 and so on until a $134-a-week worker hits the maximum of $67. All who work for a wage higher than $134 would also be limited to $67.

Under present law, the States have great leeway in setting benefits, and the level of unemployment compensation varies widely. In Maryland, for example, the maximum weekly benefit is $46, slightly less than half of our average wage. But in neighboring West Virginia it is $35—slightly more than one-third that State's average weekly wage. In Iowa it is only $30, or less than one-third of Iowa's weekly wage. In Hawaii, it is $55, or roughly three-fifths of the weekly wage there.

I support the concept of minimum Federal standards, although I am not able to say whether I think the levels of compensation proposed in H.R. 8282 are appropriate until I can study the testimony and the reports of the House and Senate committees. In a highly integrated and mobile economy, as ours has become, it is desirable to have some degree of uniformity among the States. Otherwise, States can compete for industry in terms of which imposes the lowest tax and provides the lowest level of benefits. Lack of uniformity may also encourage workers to relocate based upon the level of benefits rather than the availability of jobs.

Second. H.R. 8282 would extend coverage to an estimated 5 million workers, including those in small establishments, in nonprofit organizations, on large farms and in agricultural processing companies. I support this provision. In addition to a worker's own family the entire economy suffers when any substantial group is unemployed and also unable to maintain even a fraction of its normal purchasing power to buy the goods and services others produce.

Third. H.R. 8282 would extend the duration of unemployment compensation by providing a Federal "long-term adjustment benefit" for those who use up their State allowances. In most States this is 26 weeks. Under the proposed bill, payments would continue at State levels for an additional 26 weeks, if needed, so long as the worker maintains his eligibility. An important change would permit these benefits to be paid during a period of approved training or retraining.

For example, a jobless worker may now draw $35 a week for 26 weeks, and then his benefits expire under State law. If his past earnings record and continued availability for work make him eligible, H.R. 8282 would permit him to apply for Federal adjustment benefits—through the State employment office. He would be entitled to his first check on the 27th week of unemployment, also at $35, and he would continue drawing until he finds work or until the 52d week. If, during this time, he participates in an approved training program, he continues to draw benefits. If he refused approved training or suitable work he can be denied benefits.

With the increasing pace of automation, the unskilled or semiskilled worker who is laid off today has a far harder job in finding new employment than in his father's day. He needs a longer period of assistance in which to relocate, obtain training, or find a new job. Congress recognized this need by temporarily extending the benefit period during the 1958 recession, and again in 1961. I think it is appropriate to meet the problem of long-term unemployment on a permanent basis. Again, I reserve judgment as to the specifics.

There are other provisions of H.R. 8282 which are of doubtful utility. H.R. 8282 proposes to scrap the experience rating system, under which each employer is encouraged to achieve employment stability. I am not aware of any reason to abandon this feature of the present law.

H.R. 8282 also proposes to prevent States from disqualifying employees, for more than 6 weeks, except in the case of fraud, labor disputes, or conviction of a crime connected with his work. This means that those who voluntarily quit, or are discharged for misconduct will be entitled to unemployment benefits after 6 weeks. I am not sure this is a long enough period to discourage those who would use the unemployment compensation system as a long-term dole instead of a temporary crutch.

Mr. President, I intend carefully to follow this legislation. I hope there will emerge from the House of Representatives and from the Senate Finance Committee a sound, constructive bill that will merit the support of employers and employees.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT FUNDS IN INDIANA COLLEGES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is good news to many of us that the House Education and Labor Committee has received a unanimous recommendation from its education subcommittee that the full $190 million authorized for National Defense Education Act loans for the coming fiscal year should be appropriated and spent for that purpose.

The original intention of the administration, as evidenced in the budget figures submitted, was to eliminate all new funds for National Defense Education Act loans. But undeniable evidence has gathered that the proposed shift to private guaranteed loans under title IV of the Higher Education Act will not serve the purpose. The administration has consequently proposed a 1-year extension and the use of $150 million in loan funds.

But we need the entire $190 million. I agree with the House subcommittee, and I sincerely hope that in both houses we will conclude to restore the full amount. To deprive even one student of his education for next year by denial of these loan resources is to put an unconscionable burden on that student for the costs of Vietnam.

I have previously cited the specific situation of three Indiana schools faced with this problem. Besides Notre Dame, Indiana University, and Purdue, I have heard from a number of others.

President Robert H. Reardon, of Anderson College, Anderson, Ind., writes:

> We would estimate that about 50 students would have to discontinue or could not enroll as freshmen even if the guarantee program was fully operative. We believe there is a significant need for some national defense loans to low-income families in addition to the guarantee program.

President Alan C. Rankin, of Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Ind., writes:

> We are greatly concerned over a recent administrative decision to phase out immediately the national defense loan program and the health professions loan program. If our university is to participate in the packaging of financial aids, as provided in the Higher Education Act of 1965, it is essential to have the above-mentioned loan funds available to use.
>
> We believe it would be difficult for the banking institutions to provide the training necessary for member banks and adequate funds for the 1966–67 school year. Moreover, to withdraw the above two programs immediately would be a breach of our obligation to students who are borrowing from these programs to see them through to graduation.

President O. P. Kretzman of Valparaiso University in Valparaiso, Ind., notes that the problem is aggravated in the case of a school which has a national rather than a local constituency. His letter is as follows:

> Valparaiso University,
> *Valparaiso, Ind., March 14, 1966.*
>
> Hon. Vance Hartke,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Senator Hartke: We would like to encourage you to support the appropriation for $150 million to continue the National Defense Education Act loans for the coming fiscal year. If the national defense student loan program were cut back now, before the various State plans are fully implemented, it would put a burden on our students which we, at least at the present time, do not feel we could assist them in carrying.
>
> One of our problems in this regard is that we have a national constituency. We would normally expect to receive students from 44 to 50 States. We find it impossible, at the present time, to advise students all over the country what is being done to assist them in their particular State. Their local bankers will not presently be advised and be able to supply them with definitive information permitting them to plan their financial program.
>
> In subsequent years, after the arrangements for commercial loans have been completed and put into effect, we would encourage their use especially for freshmen students each year.
>
> We would respectfully request that you use your influence to continue the appropriations for 1966–67 at the current level and then suggest reductions in subsequent years which would be equivalent to the amounts loaned to seniors and others leaving campus. In this way, the students on campus in the fall of 1966 would be furnished loans for this and the next 3 years under the present program which would permit them to complete 4 years of schooling. Those entering in the fall of 1967 and subsequent years would be furnished loans under commercially financed loan plans.
>
> It was very nice to have you on the campus some time ago, and we hope that you will return often. With kind personal regards and every good wish to you in your important work in the U.S. Senate, I am,
>
> Sincerely,
> O. P. Kretzmann,
> *President.*

Finally, there is a letter from Stanley P. Frankewich, director of the national defense student loan program at St. Francis College in Fort Wayne, Ind.:

> St. Francis College,
> *Fort Wayne, Ind., March 17, 1966.*
>
> Hon. Vance Hartke,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Senator Hartke: We at St. Francis College are quite concerned with the discontinuance of the national defense student loans. This discontinuance places a burden on the college in finding other financial aids on such short notice for students who were formerly granted the student loan.
>
> During the past 3 years, we granted loans to 380 students. For next September, we estimate 225 students applying for this loan. Our scholarship, college loan, and work-study programs will provide aid to approximately 50 students. Thus 175 students are dependent on this loan or some equally attractive substitute, because many students applying for a loan do not qualify for a scholarship.
>
> If a substitute program is not available, the students will be faced with the choice of commercial loans at higher interest rates, postponement of their education, or discontinuance of their education.
>
> May we suggest that all efforts possible be made to continue the loan program at least this year and thus give the colleges time to change over to the proposed guaranteed loan program through commercial sources.
>
> Yours very truly,
> Stanley P. Frankewich,
> *Director, National Defense Student Loan Program.*

EXPORT QUOTAS ON CATTLE HIDES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, when the Department of Commerce recently announced that it was imposing export quotas on the export of cattle hides, I was much surprised as well as dismayed.

It has been my understanding that we are doing whatever possible, as a nation, to increase our exports, especially our exports of farm products. We are now, and have for some time been in a serious deficit in our balance of payments; our gold stocks are being depleted. We have committed ourselves in word, at least, to resort to stronger measures in order to create a better situation in this regard.

However, when it comes right down to taking the necessary steps to improve this situation, we balk. It is no longer a question of choice. We must do all we can to halt, and even reverse, the gold outflow.

Therefore I am in disagreement with the Department of Commerce actions to hamper our exports of hides.

The Commerce Department claims there would be a shortage of 2.7 million hides for domestic use this year in an industry which uses 23.8 million hides annually. I submit, however, that the way to increase production of hides is not to hamper the market. Depressed prices will not result in increased production. If there is a shortage of hides now, in the short run, temporary higher prices will increase production.

While there are a number of reasons why the Department's action is poor economics, these recent moves are also wanting on other grounds. Why penalize hide producers from seeking and selling in their best market?

They should be as free to seek their best profits, just as any other segment of American industry should be free. Moves such as this one, which aim at one particular industry, should be protested by every industry. They strike at the heart of our freedom to trade.

I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of my letter protesting this action to the Secretary of Commerce at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> U.S. Senate,
> Committee on Banking and Currency,
> *March 22, 1966.*
>
> Hon. John T. Connor,
> *Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Mr. Secretary: Recent actions by the Department of Commerce with regard to the export of cattle hides have raised some serious questions concerning our announced national policy of seeking to increase our foreign trade.
>
> In view of our continuing balance-of-payments deficit, I regard it of utmost importance that we seek every means possible to increase our exports. I believe that this is the announced intention of our foreign commercial policy and a vital part of our attempt to reverse our present adverse gold flow. This aim is valid in my opinion, and I have long supported such policy. In view of the Department's March 11 action in imposing export quotas on cattle hides, and in view of the Department's earlier ruling requiring export licenses for hides leaving the United States for all countries except Canada, it appears that the Department has reversed somewhat its previous position. I believe these actions, which are designed to

inhibit the export of hides, are contrary to announced policy.

I urge the Department to reconsider this action in the light of the following: (1) The Department's action has backed up hides at ports and caused costly delays; (2) the system of export quotas has been found to lead to abuses and often profiteering by favored firms; (3) stopgap measures to hold down prices, in this case the price of shoes, eventually lead to shortages in materials and even higher prices in the products in the long run; (4) normal exporting of hides will help improve our balance of payments and result in the export of less gold.

While these economic arguments are surely reason enough in themselves for a reevaluation of the Department's action, much could be said for the rights of sellers, in this case the cattle and hide industry, to be free to seek their best price in their best market.

I urge that the Department reevaluate its action in setting export quotas for cattle hides, and formulate a policy which will not hamper the necessary and beneficial export of cattle hides.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN TOWER.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE MEETING OF THE ESTES KEFAUVER MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, on January 17 a reception was held in the caucus room of the Old Senate Office Building. Gathered there were the friends of one of the great men of the Senate, the late Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee.

They were gathered in memory of this man, who had more political courage than anyone I have ever known, whose great heart and great mind were on the right side of every issue he faced in the House or the Senate, regardless of the political consequences.

These people were gathered that January evening not just in memory of him, but to be certain that the ideals for which he stood lived on after him. They heard encouraging reports on the memorial which is being established for him—a library wing at the University of Tennessee where his papers will be stored for the use of future political scientists and historians, numerous scholarships for young men and women at universities and colleges around the country, and awards for those who show the genius of Estes Kefauver in his chosen fields.

One such award was announced that evening—a $50,000 endowment by the Edward J. Meeman Foundation to endow a $6,000 triennial award "to the person who does the most to bring about a union of the free peoples of the world," a cause that was dear to the heart of Estes Kefauver.

The Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY spoke and announced this award. Mr. Meeman, the donor, who was present, responded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speeches of both Vice President HUMPHREY and Mr. Meeman appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and response were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY TO THE ESTES KEFAUVER MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 17, 1966

We meet to help establish a living memorial to a great man and a good friend.

It is fitting that we meet here, in this caucus room, where Estes Kefauver so ably conducted hearings of great value for the forgotten man in our economy—the consumer.

Estes Kefauver believed in people, and the people believed in him.

He believed that everyone—the worker, the small farmer, the small businessman—should have a fair chance in life and a fair share in America's abundance.

He believed in helping those who could not help themselves—the aged, the children, the sick, the weak.

And the people believed in him. They elected him repeatedly to the House of Representatives and to the Senate, and twice a great many of them did their level best to elect him to the highest office in the land.

From his first day in Congress to his last—the day before he died—he worked, spoke, voted, and fought for the public interest.

He fought for civil rights and civil liberties; for public health; for public power and the Tennessee Valley Authority; for aid to the depressed areas of our country; for a genuinely free and competitive economy; and for many other good causes.

He fought against organized crime; against political bossism; against racist immigration laws; and against monopolists and price-fixers.

Some battles he won, others he lost. But he never let defeat embitter or discourage him; instead, he just came back to fight harder.

Estes Kefauver was tireless in seeking out the voters, in every highway and byway of America. But he also gave generously of his time and energy to causes where no votes were to be won, because he felt it to be his duty.

That is the mark of a statesman—and Estes Kefauver was a statesman of real vision and commanding intellect as well as a master politician, and a master of the common touch.

I think of his work as a young Congressman on congressional reorganization and the achievement of more effective and productive relations between the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government.

I think of his work as a Senator for closer cooperation among the free nations of the Atlantic—his stanch and active support of NATO, and his tireless efforts to endow it with economic, social, and political as well as military significance.

He was capable of high and lonely courage; he took orders from no one but his conscience.

He was gentle, as only the strong can be gentle. He was infinitely patient and persistent in pressing for these things he deemed right, and immovably stubborn in resisting those he deemed wrong. Yet, at all times—even in the heat of battle—he was courteous, kind, considerate, and generous.

He was a giant of a man—and, like the giant of Greek mythology, he drew fresh strength from each contact with his native earth, the good earth of Tennessee.

It is fitting that he rests there eternally—and it is fitting that we, his friends and colleagues, have gathered here to bear witness that America—and the American people—are better for the life he lived and the example of selfless service he set.

And now it is my privilege and pleasure to make an important announcement on behalf of the Estes Kefauver Memorial Foundation. For this purpose, I would appreciate it very much if Mr. Edward J. Meeman, editor emeritus of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, would join me at the microphone.

There was a long history of relationship between Ed Meeman and Estes Kefauver.

They fought many a battle together—battles I already have alluded to: for the independence of TVA and the proving of the public power concept; for equal rights for all men at a time when such a fight wasn't popular or easy; for the right of dissent, even during those times when such rights weren't easily secured; for, what Estes used to call, "the little people."

Therefore, I think it is most appropriate that today his old friend and collaborator—Ed Meeman—is here to announce an endowment to the Estes Kefauver Memorial Foundation to carry on the purposes for which the two jointly strived.

Mr. Meeman is giving the foundation $50,000 to endow an award to be given triennially to the person who has done the most during the past 3 years to establish a union of the free nations—the "Union of the Free Award."

Teamwork among the free is more important than ever—and Estes would have hoped that the United States would be the Nation to show the way. I am honored to be associated in this occasion.

RESPONSE OF EDWARD J. MEEMAN, EDITOR EMERITUS OF THE MEMPHIS PRESS-SCIMITAR, TO VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY'S TRIBUTE TO ESTES KEFAUVER AND HIS ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE ESTES KEFAUVER UNION OF THE FREE AWARD, JANUARY 17, 1966

Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for these great words about a great man.

It is a trusim that a statesman must first be a good enough politician to get elected.

The late Senator Estes Kefauver was a remarkably successful politician. Indeed, Senator Kefauver was so unusually successful as a politician that this success has, in a good many minds, obscured the fact that he was far more the statesman than he was the politician.

A politician in public office seeks to know what the majority of his constituents want, and strives to meet those needs. The statesman does that, but he does more than that. He studies fully, deeply, and earnestly what the needs of his constituents are, needs of which the majority are not yet aware, and has the courage to work to meet them even before the majority can be persuaded that they exist. This takes intellect, industry, and courage. Estes Kefauver had all three, and became a statesman whose stature as such is increasingly becoming recognized.

As an editor in Tennessee who supported him I had an opportunity to observe this.

Estes Kefauver took a stand for the equality of the Negro long before the majority of the people of his State were willing to do so. Yet that same majority elected him decisively although they did not agree with him on this vital issue. He proved by defeating anti-Negro opponents that although the majority was not ready to be pro-Negro it was no longer possible to win by making race prejudice the issue. Demagoguery could not upset Tennessee, although it had been a member of the Confederacy, as it did some other States. Estes Kefauver's courage had a wholesome historic effect. Tennessee accomplished the great change brought by the Supreme Court decision of 1954 and the civil rights laws in good order and set an example which mitigated the turmoil which plagued neighboring Southern States.

A parallel was his bold advocacy of a federation of the democratic nations which have a long history of self-government and guarantee their citizens their personal freedom. These nations happen to lie mostly in Western Europe and North America, but the proposed federation would not be limited to these. When his interest in this idea and program was sought by Edmund Orgill, successful wholesale hardware merchant of Memphis, he gave it careful study, found it sound, embraced it, and worked and fought for its realization.

Here, as in the case of civil rights, Estes Kefauver was far ahead of his constituents. His great moral courage carried him forward. When he had an invitation to speak anywhere in the country, and he had many, he often chose this as his theme. When, in running for reelection, his opponent sought to make political capital out of it in a nationalist State—Tennessee is the Volunteer State—crying that "Kefauver would surrender our national sovereignty"—Kefauver did not waiver. He stood by his guns. He explained that he believed that only through federation could the democratic nations be strong enough to survive in a world of dictatorships—only thus could they guarantee the sovereignty of the free citizen over his own life. As in the case of civil rights, the majority of Tennesseans trusted the man they loved, and gave him their votes, even though they had not yet become wholly convinced that federation was the thing to do.

And so, the Estes Kefauver Union of the Free Award, a prize of $6,000, will be given every 3 years to the person who in the preceding period "has best served the cause of democracy by effective efforts to bring about the union of the self-governing peoples of the world who guarantee the freedom of choice and action of the individual in the spirit of Estes Kefauver, who advanced this cause effectively, persistently, and nobly."

The fund which supplies these prizes will be administered by the Edward J. Meeman Foundation, Memphis, Tenn. But it is part of the Estes Kefauver Memorial, in which cause we are gathered here tonight. I prefer to think of it as the Estes Kefauver carry-on—a carry-on to greater success of the purposes and enterprises which he advanced so far.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PEARSON TO AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of the statement I made before the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator James B. Pearson, of Kansas, to Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, March 22, 1966

Soil and water conservation accomplishments in fiscal year 1967 must—in my opinion—advance at a more rapid rate than in 1966; just as I would presume that the conservation accomplishments this year are greater than last, and last year's greater than the year before. This is how we progress—by building and multiplying our accomplishments.

In soil and water conservation this progressive improvement is absolutely essential if we are to correct past mistakes of soil and water misuse, adequately protect these resources, and wisely develop them for the benefit of the American people, now and in the future. Each year must show more progress than the year before.

This is what I would hope to see reflected in the budget for soil and water conservation work, so that the going programs may be accelerated and the serious backlog of uncompleted work may be reduced. As presented, the budget is not adequate to assure the needed accomplishment in fiscal year 1967.

The budget provides for a reduction of $3.6 million in soil survey funds. This is at a time when the importance of testing and mapping soils for sound land use planning and development is becoming more widely appreciated in the rural fringe areas where the Nation is undergoing its most spectacular growth. In Kansas alone, the soils on more than 20 million acres remain to be surveyed.

The proposed cut in Federal support funds would seriously delay the mapping of the Nation's soils. I feel strongly that this money should be restored in the appropriation.

Moreover, I believe that Federal assistance funds for conservation operations of the Soil Conservation Service should be increased to $120 million, to permit acceleration of soils mapping and application of conservation measures on the land.

Watershed planning and development is another area where the backlog of work needing to be done approaches staggering proportions. A modest increase in funds—to $10 million for watershed planning, and to $80 million for watershed protection—would help give this program the added impetus it needs.

I know that this committee is well aware of the benefits of the small watershed program, particularly the multiple-purpose projects that have contributed so much to the concept of local self-help in developing the Nation's water resources for the benefit of the community.

I can tell you that in Kansas we have made impressive progress in many watershed areas under this program. Yet, of 236 watersheds that need attention—and there are others that would benefit by further protection and development—only 21 watershed projects have been authorized for operations assistance. There simply has not been sufficient money made available to do the needed job. Watershed protection and development requires more substantial Federal support of local cooperative efforts, as a matter of growing national concern.

In Kansas, and in nine other Western States, the Great Plains conservation program has given new life and hope to a vast region of great potential. I am happy to say that in Kansas at the beginning of the current fiscal year more than 1,725 farms and ranches with a total of 1,660,000 acres were being operated under Great Plains conservation program contracts. But throughout the Great Plains States, approximately 5,000 applications for assistance under the program have not yet been serviced. I believe this program has proved its worth beyond any question of a doubt, and that it should be accelerated, as, indeed, the economic life of the Nation in general is being accelerated in this period of dynamic national growth.

An increase in Federal support of the Great Plains conservation program to $20 million would help reduce the backlog of pending applications, and thereby bring the Nation that much closer to solving its soil and water conservation problems.

I believe these suggested increases in the budget of the Soil Conservation Service are fully justified to assure the protection, development, and proper use of the Nation's soil and water resources, in order to meet the long-term needs of the American people.

A COMBAT VETERAN SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an excellent article by Jim Morris, who had served for 5 years and 8 months in the Army, was a captain of the Green Berets in Vietnam, and was wounded three times in action against the Vietcong, appears in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

No one can question his credentials. His article points out some of the numerous follies which we have been and are continuing to commit in our undeclared war in southeast Asia.

He also makes the very pertinent observation in the first paragraph of his article, which I quote:

> Our men are most efficient in killing, but we can kill every North Vietnamese and Vietcong soldier in South Vietnam, and still lose the war.

I have been saying that for over 2 years now.

The facts he sets out just add up to further evidence of the complete unjustification and unwisdom of our being there militarily. Unfortunately, the Nation has now been committed by Executive act to this undeclared war and thereby condemned an increasing number of our fine young men to slaughter.

I ask unanimous consent that the article: "We Must Colonize Vietnam," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We Must Colonize Vietnam

(By Jim Morris)

(Note.—The author, 28, served 5 years in the Army, with two tours—8 months—as a captain in the Green Berets in Vietnam, where he was wounded three times in action against the Vietcong. He left the Army last June and now lives in Oklahoma City.)

Day after day I hear our military's reports about how many Vietcong have been killed, and it dismays me that so few Americans realize killing alone does no real good. Day after day I hear of the legislators and diplomats squabbling over Vietnam policy, and I wonder if they are talking about the same country where I served with the special forces—the Green Berets. Our men are most efficient in killing, but we can kill every North Vietnamese and Vietcong soldier in South Vietnam, and still lose the war. Our military and Government leaders meanwhile ignore a basic fact. Escalation is not the answer. South Vietnam is a country whose Government is totally dependent on us. But its leaders are running the place corruptly and stupidly. We must force them to reform or else forfeit the hope for a real victory.

The two most stable democracies in Asia—Japan and the Philippines—were created within forms molded by the American military. But the billions of dollars we pour into Vietnam go to a regime whose principal characteristics are inefficiency and corruption. None of this will change of its own accord; nor will more planes and tanks and men, more Presidential conferences or Vice Presidential tours, change the situation.

We are going to have to impose rule on this country. We must use the only real weapon we have: money.

Let me stress that I speak without anger toward the U.S. Army, in which I served with pride for more than 5 years, or special forces, which is as much my religion as my former outfit. But Green Berets live and fight with the people, and so they acquire experiences unavailable even to the highest American officials, who make their tours under the guidance of the Vietnamese mandarins. The Vietnamese Government, since its inception, has been the private preserve of these mandarins, who comprise one of the most detestable oligarchies in the world. The late President Ngo Dinh Diem was one of the mandarins, and control has remained within the Vietnamese Establishment, which contends with Vietcong for the support of the people. Some choice. On one side is Saigon and on the other the Vietcong, who would organize the country into a system of interlocking informants so tight it would make "1984" look like an anarchy.

Since returning home, I have often heard Americans talk offhandedly of the "corruption" and "misunderstanding" in places like Vietnam, but I do not think they understand what it really means in this war. In the spring of 1964 the Rotary Club of Hawaii donated a load of presents to the people of Vietnam. For some reason it was decided to give it all to the Montagnards of Phu Thien district, Phu Bon Province, in the Central Highlands where our strike force was operating. In short order the donation turned into an extravaganza. Officials of the Hawaii Rotary were flown in to make the presentation. Gen. Paul D. Harkins himself flew down by helicopter to make a speech. A large crowd of Montagnards was gathered at the speakers' stand.

Back in Ceo Reo, the province capital, meanwhile, the local Agency for International Development representative was frantic. He had examined the cargo. In a society where soap is just beginning to catch on, there is a limited demand for 3,000 Barbie dolls.

In order to save the United States from embarrassment, the AID man denuded his warehouse, collecting all the farm implements he could find, along with wheat and blankets.

The gift giving was a huge success, and the VIP's departed in an orgy of mutual congratulations. The day after, as we later learned from our friends in the village, the district chief, a lieutenant in the Vietnamese army, seized all the farm implements and other useful merchandise (the dolls were spared) and had them loaded on a truck, donated to him by the U.S. Army, and shipped to Pleiku, where they were sold.

This chief and another not far away had a more regular system of acquiring income. This technique was to move villages. Each time a village family is resettled it is entitled to 1,000 piasters (officially about $14) to establish its new home. But the villagers received only 200 piasters, and the chiefs kept the rest. Several times we tried to acquire evidence to prove this corruption—but who is going to testify against a man whose duties include those of judge, jury and executioner?

We figured that those two swine were each worth a battalion to the Vietcong.

Although upper class Vietnamese officials give lipservice to winning the people, they are usually incapable of understanding the respect for human dignity which this requires. About 2 months after the Rotary Club incident, two of the Vietnamese guards on the Ca Lui bridge decided to get a little carbine practice. For their target they chose an old lady in a village about 200 yards away. They started kicking up dust at her heels with their bullets. She ran across the field toward her home and began climbing the notched log that Montagnards use for ladders on their stilted houses.

She was halfway up the ladder when one of the bullets killed her. I don't think the guards really meant to kill her; their marksmanship isn't that good. One of our strike force company commanders was a nephew of the old lady, and he reported the incident to us. My detachment commander and the province adviser, an American major, went to the province chief and told him the story. The chief responded with an elegant shrug, a legacy from the French, and said that he doubted that it was true, but if it was, there was nothing he could do about it, and why bother? It was just another savage.

This is the way the mandarins normally treat the Montagnards, who are 95 percent of the population of the Central Highlands. The Montagnard tribes have had wars among themselves for many years, but they share a hatred of the ethnic Vietnamese. The Montagnards fight the VC now because it pays pretty well, and because they like Americans, but all they need do is stop fighting the VC, and the Highlands—the middle half of Vietnam—is lost. Should all the VC be killed today, the Montagnards would launch their own war for some form of autonomy. The Hoa Hao and Cao Dai are religious sects whose hierarchies want to carve their own feudal fiefdoms out of the country. The Khmer Serei, a group of ethnic Cambodians, wait the chance to reannex to Cambodia six of the southern provinces along the Mekong. All these groups have well-trained military units, currently serving under the Vietnamese and fighting the VC. The idea that the Vietnamese mandarins can, without reform, mold these people into a nation is a mirage.

Of course there are competent people in Vietnam now, but few have any chance to rise to power, and we must force the mandarins to give them the chance. There was a second lieutenant named Luan in the Vietnamese special forces. The first time we went on patrol together he had a flunkie carry his pack and he walked gaily along leaning on a staff. He wore tailored camouflage fatigues and dark glasses. He was elegant. Eight miles down the trail the flunkie was still carrying his pack, but Luan was carrying the pack of a private who couldn't make it. He had guts and he was smart. If we suggested something in the afternoon, Luan had already done it in the morning. If it was advised in the morning, he had accomplished it in the afternoon before. He would have been an outstanding soldier in any army in the world.

I made the mistake of mentioning to his higher headquarters that he was a good man. Two days later he was whisked away, into some limbo that the Vietnamese army maintains for pro-American lieutenants, and replaced by a man who read maps upside down and parades around with a rusty sword. He is a lieutenant, and his father is wealthy. In Vietnam, talent is dangerous, for it threatens the establishment.

We brought in a prisoner once, a pretty nice old man, the chief of a Vietcong-controlled village. As a conversational opener, the commanding officer asked him if he knew Diem was dead.

He said no, but he was very sorry.

The commanding officer thought he had misunderstood and asked the question again and the answer came back the same.

The village chief thought Diem was a friend of the commanding officer and he was sorry his friend had died. He himself had never heard of Diem, or Vietnam either, although he knew who the Vietminh were and in his extreme youth had been to Pleiku and seen a Frenchman. People like this aren't worried about the Premier, whether he be called Ky or Diem or Khanh. To them, the district chief is the government. We have counted on the Saigon Government to win the districts, and they have failed. Yet Americans acquire the friendship of these people because they tender their own friendship honestly.

Recently, our attention has been drawn to the large-scale attack forces we have assembled to sweep valleys and hillsides, and the suggestion is that we are mounting an offensive that can finally "win." In fact, the infiltration of North Vietnamese units has distracted American forces into a gaudy, but essentially diversionary, war. An insurgency is a very special kind of war: A significant portion of the population must find the government despicable; there must be a countryside to hide in; and there must be help from the outside.

At no time within memory have the conditions for guerrilla war been met so fully as in the Republic of Vietnam. Thus the new, escalated American attacks bring a danger that we will delude ourselves with shows of strength—a very real danger, for most American commanders, as well as most generals giving advice back in the States, were schooled in World War II and Korea. The ramifications of guerrilla warfare do not come easily to soldiers trained to think in terms of real estate. We may conquer real estate, kill Vietcong by the thousands, and still lose the support of the people and thus lose the war.

Yet the situation is not hopeless, in my opinion. We have a dependency named South Vietnam. So far it is a disaster. Now we must get tough with the Saigon government.

Our entire AID and military advisory effort has been run from the top down, meaning that we have entrusted the funds to the mandarins. This has been a drastic mistake we must rectify.

One of the Vietcong's principal techniques is the creation of a shadow government. For every government official they have an equivalent VC official. The French called this system parallel hierarchies. The Americans have created a parallel hierarchy too, with the AID and military-advisory effort. But our parallel hierarchy cannot force changes in the Vietnamese Government.

I am not suggesting that we use our parallel hierarchy to get rid of inept administrators by assassination and terror, as the VC do. But I do recommend that Province AID representatives should have final veto on any money or goods which are distributed within the Province. They should be encouraged to use this leverage to insist on honesty, fair treatment, and the replacement of corrupt officials. Whenever possible, the replacement should be a respected local leader. Our military advisers should have all pay and supplies in their possession until they are issued to the troops. It has always been that way in the Special Forces, and in our detachment the VC-kill ratio between our troops and all other troops in the Province, man for man, was 33 to 1 in our favor. The people supported us because they respected us, as they despised the mandarins.

In this way, in a sense, we will be running the country altogether—and such a program may take a generation to succeed. But the country cannot run itself, and it is our responsibility. It is axiomatic in revolutionary warfare that an insurgency can be resolved in one of two ways. Either the legitimate aspirations of the people are satisfied, or a regime so cruel and oppressive is established that the mere utterance of an antigovernment remark results in prison or death. Unless we force Saigon to provide the former, the North Vietnamese will establish the latter.

We are successful at the killing, and well-meaning about the diplomacy. But we must accept this country on its own terms. An Australian colonel, chosen for Vietnam duty because of his knowledge of the language, of the people and of guerrilla warfare, once summed it up well: "The Vietnamese have a proverb which they don't quote to Americans. 'He who gives and asks nothing in return is despised.' "

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF BYELORUSSIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, this week marks the 48th anniversary of the liberation of Byelorussia from domination by the Soviet Union. Sadly, here independence was shortlived lasting less than 3 years. This is a very short time to be free when you have fought and struggled for freedom for so long. Having been exposed to, and having experienced freedom, the Byelorussian people, I am convinced, will not lose faith and will continue in their struggle to regain their independence.

The history of this small but brave nation offers clear and convincing evidence that the right to self-determination is an aspiration that all oppressed peoples share. Further, the oppressed people of the world long for the day when freedom once again will flourish in their countries and will cast asunder those totalitarian chains that will exploit a nation's economic resources and oppress the spirit and body of the people.

It is important for us as free Americans to remember, Mr. President, that all the peoples of the world are not free. Many are struggling to achieve liberation from the yoke of oppression and persecution; others are striving valiantly to maintain their freedom.

Mr. President, we should particularly remember that no one came to the aid of Byelorussia in its struggle for independence and today there are many small countries that will fall to the same fate without the support of the free world. That is why our Nation is in Vietnam today.

The history of the United States shows that the securing of freedom does not come easy or cheap, but as all Americans know, the blessings of a free society are well worth the price. The prayers and thoughts of the American people, Mr. President, are with the oppressed people of the world and we sincerely hope that all people will soon enjoy freedom and independence.

A COMMONSENSE APPROACH TO SOLVING CRIME

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as we all know, the crime problem in our country has reached a point where many people worry about leaving their homes at night for fear of being harmed.

We all need to look at this problem and its effects on ourselves, our families, our friends, and our property.

Some of the best "down to earth" advice on the subject came Monday, March 21, 1966, from Deputy Chief Lawrence A. Hartnett, who is chief of detectives for the Metropolitan Police Department.

Chief Hartnett spoke to the American Newspaper Women's Club in Washington. Because the advice he offered appears to hit at the center of the problem, I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the RECORD for others to read in its entirety.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An increase in crime is being experienced throughout the United States and the District of Columbia has not been spared in the general increase.

The impairment of the security of person and property is a matter of major concern.

There are no quick or easy answers. A tremendous effort must be exerted to identify and eliminate the causes of criminal activity.

There has been in recent years much talk, but little constructive action to deal with the increase in crime.

Fortunately, since the President of the United States has voiced his concern, more interest and action has been generated to seek a solution than ever before.

For too long, too little serious attention, and too low a priority have been given to our methods and agencies of law enforcement.

The policeman, the frontline soldier in the war against crime, has been waging a lonely battle. His burdens have been increasing each day.

Police work and policing is no longer merely the presence of a uniform policeman on the beat. It is a complex, involved professional position, requiring utilization of the latest scientific detection, understanding, and a willingness to work under rules and decisions which would have confounded policemen of yesteryear.

What is police work?

Primarily, the police are responsible for preservation of the peace, protection of life and property, preventing and detecting crime, and apprehending violators.

In addition to these principal duties, there are other diversified responsibilities, requiring an exceptional amount of police services, all of them manpower consuming.

Prevention and detection of crime is constantly a battle of wits with the criminal element, with the police bound by rules, but the criminal bound by no rules whatever.

One of the most disturbing trends today is the overzealous pity for the criminal and an equivalent disregard for his victim.

There has to be a change in the thinking of those who are always seeking justification for the criminal deeds.

The public will have to become nauseated by crime and vomit forth the criminal instead of digesting him.

Unfortunately, it appears that the public may be coming to accept widespread lawlessness as an unavoidable adjunct to our way of life.

What has happened to the civic pride? The righteous indignation of otherwise respectable citizens who turn their backs on helpless victims of beatings, robberies, and sex crimes?

Public indifference in combating crime is the real culprit.

This incredibly indifferent attitude can have a disastrous effect on law and order in a community.

Crime is a social problem and a community responsibility which crosses all walks of life.

Law enforcement cannot succeed without the sustained and informed interest of all citizens. It is not enough to reflect our concern over the rise in crime by seeking out single answers or simple answers.

They do not exist.

The people will get observance of the law and enforcement of the law if they want it, insist on it, and participate in it.

Criminal laws have been interpreted more toward strengthening the rights of the criminal and restricting the powers of the police, but the decline of citizens' support for law enforcement is more damaging.

Fear of getting involved and public apathy have rendered too many citizens blind and deaf to incidents of crime; they go to great extremes, even to deliberately lying, to avoid being called as a witness to a criminal act or give information about it.

Unless citizens are willing to testify in court or answer the call for jury duty, we cannot expect the intent of the law to be fulfilled.

It should be remembered that quick detection, vigorous and prompt prosecution, and adequate and certain punishment fitted to the crime, constitute a definite deterrent to the commission of crime and contributes to the reduction of crime.

This is a recognized fact, but it brings our attention to another problem related to effective law enforcement, that I will briefly comment on. That is the courts—the courts that have traditionally been the symbol and guardian of our cherished freedoms; but local criminal courts are so overloaded with cases, understaffed both as to prosecutors and judges, that their functioning is impeded and their effectiveness weakened—all to the advantage of the criminal.

There are many contributing causes to crime, but so often these are used just as excuses for committing crime.

I believe that man is responsible for his actions and, except in a few insanity cases, is a free agent being confronted with a choice between right and wrong and freely makes his choice.

There are some who look at crime and see only the effects of one's physical environment, such as a broken home, slums or poverty, as a cause for all crime. According to this philosophy, a defendant is not responsible for what he has done. Although it may be true that these elements are conditions of crime, the criminals are not all helpless slaves of their environment. I see in many criminal acts the free will choices of men who would rather rob and steal than work, cut or shoot than discuss differences.

Defendants have many champions. Pity should not be for defendants, but for victims.

Every figure in the criminal offenses statistics is, in effect, a violation of some individual's right to peace and security.

Citizens who are indifferent to crime and the general safety of their community are as much an ally of the criminal as someone who provides a hideout for a wanted man.

We need alert citizens who are willing to take positive action, including the reporting of criminal acts and testifying about them in court. Until all honest citizens become involved in the fight against crime, there is little likelihood that our crime rate will cease to grow.

Call the police if you have the slightest suspicion that a crime has been or is about to be committed. We now have a new police emergency telephone number, easy to remember—444–1111.

Of all the suggested causes of crime, I believe the home is a major factor in crime problems.

The family is the first great training school in behavior or misbehavior. Children develop a sense of right and wrong. The home becomes their first classroom and the parents serve as the first teachers. In the home the child learns that others beside himself have rights which he must oftentimes respect. Here the spadework is laid for instilling in the child those values which will cause him to develop into an upright, law-abiding wholesome citizen. He must learn respect for others, respect for property, courtesy, truthfulness, and reliability. He must learn not only to manage his own affairs but also to share in the responsibility for the affairs of the community. He must be taught to understand the necessity of obeying the law.

These qualities, of course, are transmitted to the child only if they are exemplified and taught within the family circle.

Such conditions as homes broken by divorce—separation, inadequate home, neglectful parents, unsound discipline—too little or none, or occasionally—too severe, immorality, intemperance, gambling, vice, illegitimacy, criminality in the home, lack of religion.

Most crimes are spur-of-the-moment happenings. Few of the average criminals plan their actions in advance, in other words, their victims aren't "chosen." Victims become vulnerable many times due to their own carelessness. They invite trouble by their own actions. Thieves thrive on their victims' mistakes.

Everyone should make it as difficult as possible for the criminal to operate.

If you can recognize your own vulnerability you will have taken a large step toward protecting yourself.

Your best defense against crime is doing all in your power to prevent it from happening.

Crimes that women would most likely be victims of are: Robberies, in the form of pocketbook snatchers; molesters, usually seeking some type of sexual contact; housebreakers, ordinarily they attempt to avoid any direct contact.

However, factors in any of these circumstances can easily project these crimes into the rape or murder category.

A lesser crime that is mentally disturbing, rather than physically dangerous, is the obscene phone call, and these can be a frightening experience.

Let me suggest a few ideas to help prevent them happening to you.

MOLESTERS

Don't be on the streets alone at night, but if you can't avoid walking alone at night: Stay away from dark, lightly traveled streets, even if it means walking out of your way. Stay on main thoroughfares; notice what stores are open should you need to ask for help.

Don't assume that every man walking behind you is following you.

Do be aware of the sound of footsteps; do look over you shoulder occasionally. If your suspicions are even slightly aroused, change your direction.

Use good sense alone in public places. At the movies, try to find an aisle seat next to another woman, a family or a couple. Don't sit near men who are alone and groups of teenage boys.

Don't let loneliness make you careless. A lonely woman who decides to have a drink alone in her neighborhood bar is inviting trouble.

Don't let strangers into your home when you're alone; make no exceptions. If the stranger is a salesman whose product interests you, tell him to return when a male friend or relative can be present. If the stranger is making an unexpected delivery, have him leave the package outside your door; if the package—or telegram, etc., must be signed for, have the form slipped under the door.

Don't hire men who come to your door looking for work. When you need a job done, hire from a reputable agency or ask a friend to recommend someone.

Don't be immodest before workmen, grocery boys, etc.

A man doesn't have to be a rapist to be stimulated by a scantily-clad woman, and, too, many men believe that a lack of modesty is an open invitation to an advance.

Self-service apartment house elevators are notoriously dangerous areas for a woman alone. The rule here is simple; don't step into a self-service elevator at night with a man you don't know or don't recognize as a tenant of the building. Day or night, don't take a self-service elevator alone to the basement.

Whenever you are in a self-service elevator alone, stand next to the control buttons and switches. If a strange man gets on and does anything frightening, press the alarm switch immediately. Always keep both of your hands free as you ride in a self-service elevator. If you're carrying packages, place them on the floor.

Don't hide a key to your house under a door mat, in a mailbox, etc. These tricks are known to just about everyone and are simply another way of inviting trouble.

PROTECTING YOURSELF

Use your entire hand against just one of your assailant's fingers. Grab his finger with your whole hand; make a fist; bend his finger backward with every bit of your strength.

Use the outside edge of your hand to hack at an assailant's windpipe or at the side of his neck.

Gouge at an attacker's eye. If you have fairly long nails, use them as claws to rake and tear at your attacker's eyes.

Use the heel of your shoe to kick and grind at the bone on the bridge (top) of an assailant's foot.

Use your knee—or, if you have the room, your foot—to kick an assailant in the groin. If your handbag is fairly heavy or you are carrying a book, and are grabbed from behind, swing the handbag or book backward as hard as you can to hit your assailant in the upper groin and if you catch him right, he will release his hold, then you run.

WHEN TO—AND NOT TO—FIGHT BACK

There is only one situation in which you should struggle with a man—if he makes a move to do you bodily harm. To put it simply, give up your purse, your jewelry, etc., without a murmur, but fight like a tiger for your life. Some men are interested only in money when they apprehend a woman. Such a man will take whatever money, jewelry, or furs a woman has, then beat a hasty retreat without touching her.

If a mugger or molester moves toward you, or refuses to let go of you after he's taken your possessions, scream—long and loud. If you can break loose, run. If you can't break loose, fight as described earlier.

HOUSEBREAKERS

The housebreaker usually attempts to avoid any direct contact.

Install good locks on doors and windows.

Have good locks on porch and patio doors. Check to see that outside hinges on doors are installed so that the pins cannot be knocked out—not much use having good locks if the hinge pins are accessible from outside.

Most people are lax about locking windows. Just as you lock each of your doors upon leaving the house, lock each of your windows.

Give special attention to windows that are particularly vulnerable—for example, windows in the basement and on the ground floor at the rear of your house.

Something else to consider is "turn-screw" locks for bedroom and other windows that you leave open often. With a turn-screw lock, a window may be opened wide enough to permit air and ventilation, then locked so it cannot be raised higher.

Upstairs windows are accessible to housebreakers known as "cats" or "climbers" who climb ladders, trellises, trees, etc., to second floor windows.

One of the best ways to protect your home is with light—a lot of light, both inside and outside. The last thing any would-be housebreaker wants is to be seen. He depends on darkness for protection. He needs the cover of darkness to sneak in and out of your home without being observed.

Always leave a light on inside—downstairs and upstairs—when you go out at night. Consider installing a new automatic device that turns lights on and off at whatever hours you specify, no matter whether you are at home or away.

PRECAUTIONS WHEN YOU'RE AWAY

A majority of people go on vacations and other trips without taking special steps to protect their homes.

Tell delivery men in person when to discontinue service, instruct the post office to hold your mail until you return, ask the telephone company to switch your calls to the home of a close friend or relative. Don't tell strangers (for example, a gas-station attendant) that you're leaving town; do notify your local police precinct that you plan to be away.

Put jewelry and other valuables in a safety deposit box when you know you're going to be out of town. Have furs put in storage or take them to the home of a close friend or relative.

WHAT TO DO IF YOU'RE BURGLARIZED

If you are at home and awakened by an intruder, do not try to apprehend him. When he has gone, call the police immediately.

Do not touch anything until the police arrive. Leave everything exactly as the housebreaker left it.

If you find your home has been broken into while you were out, do not enter the house; rush immediately to the nearest phone and call for police assistance.

Whenever you come home, make it a habit to look for signs that your house may have been entered—forcibly or otherwise—a door that is slightly ajar, an open window, etc.

Fight with a housebreaker only if he attacks you (or if you're certain he is moving to attack you).

APARTMENTS

Extra locks on doors.

Duplicate keys out to many—get new locks; keys in general (house, auto, apartment; don't have your address on them). (Better to have house and car keys separate.)

Windows—lock, especially first floor—open on fire escape, terrace balcony, or garden.

Peephole in door.

Always lock door, even to go to get mail—to the incinerator, etc.

Don't use full name on door or lobby mailbox.

SAFETY IN YOUR CAR—BASIC SAFEGUARDS

Every time you get into your car, follow this simple, but important, procedure: lock all doors; roll up all the windows, except those you need open for ventilation.

If you own a convertible, use good sense about driving with the top down. For example, a woman out alone at night should never keep the top down. Too, night or day, it is wise to put up the top when driving in a bad, could-be-dangerous neighborhood.

Keep alert when you're driving. If a car seems to be following you, detour immediately to a more heavily traveled street. Look for help at a gas station.

Never pick up hitchhikers, women as well as men, teenagers as well as adults. If a motorist flags you to ask for help, be wary as you pull to a stop.

Don't get out of your car (make him, or her, walk over to you); roll your window down just enough so you can hear. If the motorist wishes to borrow a tool, pass the key to your trunk—not your entire key chain—through the window. Do not get out of the car yourself. As innocent as a motorist in distress may appear, remember that getting help on the road is a favorite gambit of muggers and thieves. Promise to stop at the next gas station or garage and send help back.

WHEN YOUR CAR IS PARKED

Always lock your car—to protect any valuables—to prevent someone from getting into it and hiding in the back seat.

Don't keep an extra ignition or trunk key "hidden" anywhere in your car. Even amateur thieves know to look for duplicate keys in the ashtray, under the rug or rubber floor mat, on the back of a sun visor, in the glove or armrest compartment.

OBSCENE TELEPHONE CALLS

Listing in directory—plain; don't list on personal stationery that you might scribble notes on. Hang up—don't listen.

Blow whistle.

Don't be giving out information on the phone.

PICKPOCKETS AND PURSE SNATCHERS

Keep a separate list—at home—of the serial number of credit cards, hospitalization insurance, your driver's license, social security card, automobile registration, charge plates.

Never carry large amounts of cash on your person.

Don't display large bills in public.

Don't ever put down your purse on the counter of a store, leave it in a supermarket shopping cart, put it on the floor of a movie theater, place it on an empty seat alongside you on a bus. In short, keep your hands firmly on your handbag whenever you are in a public place.

In an office—do not leave your purse on your desk. We have what are known as sneak thieves who prey on office buildings and every one of them knows that most secretaries keep their handbags in the lower right hand drawer of their desks.

When you walk down the street, grasp the handle of your bag firmly, tuck it tightly under your arm.

CONCLUSION

All of these are general suggestions. Each individual will respond differently. No one really knows what they may do if attacked. Isn't it ironic to be telling law-abiding citizens don't, don't, etc., when basically you should feel free to engage in any of your normal activities without any fear whatsoever.

The President has indicated that he wants the police of the District of Columbia to be the pride of and the example for the Nation. He also wants everyone to be able to walk any street, enjoy any park, drive on any highway, and live in any community at any time of the day or night without fear of being harmed.

I am sure it will be much easier to accomplish his first aim than it will the second, but I am sure you will, and I know I will, pray that he will be successful in both.

HISTORIC "1,000-YEAR-OLD MAGNOLIA" IN BIG THICKET IS DEAD—MESSAGE OF DEAD TREE IS FOR A NATIONAL BIG THICKET PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently a historic tragedy struck the Big Thicket area when one of the most notable trees of east Texas, a venerable giant known as the 1,000-year-old magnolia died unexpectedly.

Unfortunately this tree died mysteriously at the time when the Department of the Interior was studying the Big Thicket area so that a report could be made pursuant to my intention to introduce suitable legislation to preserve the Big Thicket area as a natural area for this and future generations.

The death of this tree lends emphasis to my efforts to have this area permanently preserved for the future; if one tree has died mysteriously, there is a danger that more giant trees in the area will die if some course of action is not followed in the immediate future to preserve and protect the Big Thicket area.

I ask unanimous consent that an account of the death of this tree in the Kountze, Tex., Pine Needle of March 17, 1966, entitled "Famed Tree Dies Suddenly" be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with an editorial from the Houston Chronicle of Wednesday, March 16, 1966, entitled "Message of a Dead Tree" emphasizing the urgency of some measure to protect and preserve this historic area.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pine Needle, Hardin County, Kountze, Tex., Mar. 17, 1966]

BIG THICKET FAMED TREE DIES SUDDENLY

(By Louis Hofferbert, Chronicle Reporter)

One of the notable trees of east Texas, a venerable giant known as the "1,000-year-old magnolia," is dead.

It died unexpectedly, swiftly, mysteriously.

There are indications that it was killed deliberately by systematic injection of a metallic poison, possibly lead arsenate.

Its death removes one of the prize attractions of the Big Thicket, now under study by Department of Interior experts as a possible national park.

IRONIC DISCOVERY

By coincidence, its death was discovered because U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who will tour the Big Thicket early next month, had asked particularly that a visit to the giant magnolia be included in his itinerary. He will be taken to see the ragged remnants instead.

Dempsie Henley, mayor of Liberty and president of the Big Thicket Association, said today he is convinced that historic magnolia was killed by poison, but added that he is unable to conceive of a motive.

The giant tree, also known as the county line magnolia and as the three-pronged magnolia, stands at the intersection of Liberty, Polk, and Hardin Counties. It is deep in the "tight-eye" heart of the Big Thicket, several miles northeast of the tiny community of Fuqua, and is an area so isolated that the tree is rarely seen except by naturalists, surveyors, and timber cruisers.

EXACT AGE UNKNOWN

It is (or was) more than 100 feet high, with a main trunk more than 4 feet in diameter at the base. This trunk divides into three "prongs," each leaning toward a different county.

Its age is not known exactly, but has been estimated at 500 to 1000 years. It has been referred to as the "1000-year-old magnolia" for more than 100 years. It was cited as a "witness tree" when the line was surveyed in 1846 to create Polk County from the northern section of Liberty County.

And 11 years later, in 1857, when Hardin County was created from parts of Liberty and Jefferson Counties, the survey for the Liberty-Hardin line was started at the giant tree.

It does not stand precisely on the three-county corner. It is about 30 feet into Liberty County, with a huge blaze in the shape of a cross on its trunk, pointing toward the ancient heart pine stake and the more modern iron pin that mark the exact intersection.

Henley told today how the mysterious death of the old tree was discovered:

"Last week I received notice that Justice Douglas had asked to see the tree. To be sure we would not miss it, I went into the Big Thicket and searched out the tree. I was astounded to find it completely dead, with every appearance of having been dead for several years.

"But I knew it could not have been dead long. We made a movie in the Big Thicket little more than a year ago, and the magnolia was vigorous and in perfect condition at that time."

Convinced the tree did not die naturally, Henley returned to it last weekend with Lance Rosier of Saratoga, the Big Thicket naturalist, and Bruce A. Macko, of Cleveland, ranger in charge of the Big Thicket district of the U.S. Forest Service. Both are recognized experts on trees of east Texas.

The party went by jeep as far as possible, then on foot through the tangle of underbrush to find the tree. Its appearance was an incredible contrast to the pictures made only a few months ago.

BARE, LIMBS FALLING

The tree was bare, its three prongs shedding branches by their own weight. The ground was littered with dead limbs and Spanish moss, the tops were broken out until the prongs were no more than 75 to 80 feet high. There is every indication that the first strong wind will bring the whole tree down.

Deterioration of the tree fiber is astonishing. It is soft and pithy, with the appearance of a tree dead for at least five or six years.

Rosier examined the base carefully and pointed to a series of small holes.

"These, I think, are drill marks," he said. "It appears that some poison has been forced into the tree. I would guess lead arsenate."

Rosier said the poison might account for the unusually rapid breakdown of the wood fiber, creating the illusion of long decay.

"A tree like this would not die all at once," Rosier said. "If its death was natural, it would have been slow. Each year over a long period the tree would show a little less green. More and more dead limbs would have been observed until finally it would fail some year to put out any new leaves. Then it would be dead.

"But this tree was vigorous and fully leafed a short time ago, as the movies prove. My opinion is that it was deliberately poisoned."

Henley said that "as far as I am concerned, these experts have removed any doubt that the tree was killed deliberately. But the motive for such a thing is an absolute mystery."

He added that "commonsense tells us nobody wandered that far into the woods and poisoned a tree at random. So the poisoner had to know where the tree was, and to have a reason for wanting it destroyed."

Henley said there is some local opposition to the plan for a national park in the Big Thicket, but that it is "pretty far fetched" to think this opposition would lead to such vandalism.

LOSS GREAT

"But you cannot escape the fact that killing the magnolia has taken away a major attraction of the area," he said. "It points up the need to hasten our plans to preserve the special features of the Big Thicket, and at the same time raises some fear as to other notable trees of the area."

Henley listed as possible objects of sabotage the holly tree near Hardin recognized as the world's largest, the huge oaks at the Sam Houston homestead north of Liberty and on the Henley ranch near Clark, the world's largest dogwood near Woodville, and a gigantic but little known cypress in the Neches River bottomland near Fred.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Mar. 16, 1966]

Message of a Dead Tree

The unexpected and unexplained death of a notable magnolia tree in the depths of the Big Thicket is more than a simple forest tragedy. Whether the giant tree, marking the common corner of three counties, was taken by age or was deliberately killed, as there is some reason to believe, is less important than the fact that another priceless and irreplacable bit of "old" Texas is gone.

Whatever the cause of its death, such a historic tree should not have been allowed to die. Moreover, other famous trees of east Texas should not be allowed to die, either of neglect or sabotage. The death of one points up the danger to others and again emphasizes the need for action now, if many natural attractions of east Texas are to be saved for future generations.

Efforts to establish a national park in the Big Thicket have been carried on for many years. There is now some hope for success, possibly even an entirely new concept in national park planning, and all Texans should support the movement.

The various historic trees, including several largest in the world of their species, make up only one of the many facets of natural history in the Big Thicket that should be preserved. Its wildlife in terms of flowers, shrubs, birds, insects, mosses and many others is astonishingly diversified. Some of it is unique, found nowhere else in Texas.

These special features make the Big Thicket one of the few spots in the United States that remain suitable for national park status. It will not remain so very long. It is being steadily eroded; one by one of its most valuable features are disappearing. Once it embraced millions of acres, now only a quarter of a million. Once virtually a trackless wilderness, it no longer qualifies under the National Wilderness Act because no single area of 5,000 acres remains unspoiled.

However, there still is much of the Big Thicket that can be saved, and it should be saved. Like the giant magnolia, once gone it can never be recalled.

As nothing else could, the death of this notable tree reminds us dramatically that the Big Thicket, unless it gets help from us, will have no tomorrow.

THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President I am deeply concerned about the administration's proposal to vitiate the national defense student loan—NDSL—program and the consequent effect upon needy students who are dependent upon those loans to complete their education.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled the "Loan Crisis," which appeared in the Pit News of the University of Pittsburgh be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Loan Crisis

A travesty is being committed against American education by the failure to continue the national defense student loan (NDSL) program in the Johnson's administration's 1967 fiscal budget.

Since the National Defense Education Act established the loan program in 1959, NDSL has provided innumerable people the opportunity of a college education. Students who did not have the immediate financial resources, but possessed good academic potential, could borrow money from the Federal Government and pay it back at low interest rates over a reasonable period of time. University students have benefited by more than $1 million per year over the past 5 years.

If the proposed 1967 fiscal budget remains unchanged, 50 State legislatures and innumerable State banking and loan agencies with many other areas for profitable investment will have to be convinced of FIL's profitability before September.

If Congress fails to reinstate the $180 million National Defense Education Act program, we fear that students will be fair game for many murderous loan agencies with high interest rates. While the State legislatures and banking and loan groups are being told about FIL, students may be forced to go to such loan agencies to secure their education.

March 15 is the deadline for Congress to act on the Johnson budget. We believe Congress has no alternative but to reinstate the $180 million National Defense Education Act program. We heartily urge that the following action be taken to speed revision of the Johnson budget and reinstatement of the National Defense Education Act program:

A pro-National Defense Education Act letter writing campaign to all legislators in Washington, D.C., by all students, faculty, parents, and administrators who believe in higher education. Out-of-State students at the university should write to their home State Senators and Representatives and urge their parents to take similar action. Pennsylvanians should write their local representatives and Hon. Joseph Clark, U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Hugh Scott, U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Student government and faculty senate resolutions urging the reinstatement of National Defense Education Act in the national budget, with copies being sent to all U.S. Senators and to local newspapers.

A personal visit to Harrisburg by Mr. Critchfield and acting chancellor David Kurtzman expressing their support of the National Defense Education Act.

A strong, continuous exercise of public opinion in favor of the National Defense Education Act's reinstatement is the only way to insure congressional revision of the Johnson budget. Everyone at the university should act now to support these measures if he wants and supports education.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] has performed a valuable service in bringing before the country some of the unfortunate practices which exist in packaging and labeling, and has sought to correct those practices through his truth-in-packaging bill, S. 985, which is now before the Committee on Commerce of the Senate. President Johnson this week has called for a strong fair packaging bill in his excellent consumer message.

The respected weekly, Commonweal, concisely summarizes the problem and recent developments in an editorial in its issue of March 11. After telling of the results of a study conducted by Eastern Michigan University, and describing some of the unfortunate practices, the editorial points to the very substantial money savings which rational packaging would make possible. The editorial concludes as follows:

> Senator Hart has held hearings on truth in packaging for years, during which time the food and household goods companies have made virtually no efforts to put their own house in order. His bill should be passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Packaged Truth

In a recent study conducted by Eastern Michigan University, 33 college-educated housewives were asked to buy the most economical package (largest quantity for the price) for each of 20 products on sale at a selected supermarket. The women made 660 separate buying decisions, of which 284 were wrong. That is, in better than 2 out of 5 cases, fairly well educated women were unable to unravel the tangle of misleading claims in packaging. As a result they paid 11 percent more for their shopping than they had to, a margin which can be chalked up to the gouging of tricky packagers.

The shabby practices by now are well known: odd number weights, often fractional, that make calculation of real value difficult; "cents off" offers that are sometimes fraudulent; deceptive and overlarge air space packaging; and the abuse of ordinary language (one manufacturer of loose-leaf filler promises 300 pages for 59 cents, but delivers only 150 sheets—both sides of a sheet are counted as pages). The most common products come in a bewildering variety of weights—a check of one market showed 28 different weights in a section of detergent products. In some cases, contrary to claims about the large economy size, housewives were actually paying more per ounce on larger sizes than on smaller noneconomy sizes. What we need here is a rational system of weights and measures to serve the consumer and make it possible for him to approach the A. & P. without a slide rule.

The President's consumer counsel, Mrs. Esther Peterson, has said that the increase in the cost-of-living index "is insignificant compared to the savings that appear possible through more rational packaging." To organized labor, whose gain in collective bargaining often amounts to a raise of 1 or 2 percent, she pointed out that "what is won at the bargaining table can easily be lost at the bargaining counter."

In his state of the Union address, President Johnson asked Congress to "act to prevent the deception of the American consumer, requiring all packages to state clearly and truthfully their contents." The reference is to the bill prepared for that purpose by Senator Philip Hart, of Michigan. Senator Hart has held hearings on truth in packaging for 4 years, during which time the food and household goods companies have made virtually no efforts to put their own house in order. His bill should be passed.

PROPOSED CUT IN IMPACTED AREAS AID

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am shocked and astounded to learn that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is about to ask Congress to slash the amounts available to school districts by Federal activities in many parts of the country to meet the burdens imposed on local school systems.

For my own State of Maryland these budget cuts would exceed $7 million—a cut of almost 40 percent. Nationwide the cuts HEW is requesting amount to more than $200 million—almost two-thirds of the entire program of Federal aid to federally impacted school areas under Public Laws 874 and 815.

Through these two laws Congress has acted to meet the needs of local school districts in which either the presence of Federal employees overcrowds the local school facilities or the existence of Federal reservations in a school district deprives the school district of a sufficient tax base to meet its school needs.

These are not new laws. Both Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 were enacted in 1950. Both have been amended and extended several times. School districts all across the country have come to rely on the funds these two laws provide to help meet the school needs created by the activities of the Federal Government.

School officials from all across my State have contacted me to express their deep concern about the affect this drastic cut HEW has requested will have on their school construction and operation plans.

I want to announce right now my strenuous opposition to these drastic budget cuts and my intention to see that the federally created school problems of Maryland are adequately met by Federal assistance.

GOOD RADIO PROGRAMING HAS PUBLIC SUPPORT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in recent years there has been much criticism of the quality of programs broadcast by radio and television stations of America. Much of this comment has been justified, and should result in better programing.

In the Midwest, those who listen to radio station KMOX of St. Louis believe that Robert Hyland, general manager of that station and vice president of CBS radio, is daily solving the problem of how to provide more interesting and worthwhile programs for the hundreds of thousands of listeners to that station.

Through dynamic leadership in electronic communications and for his many services to his community, Bob Hyland has won many awards and honors, professional and civic. The degree of public support for the type of information and public participation programs offered at KMOX is worthy of consideration.

Because of the great interest in this subject all over the United States and particularly in the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Saturday-Sunday issue of March 19–20, entitled "The Man Behind the Voice of St. Louis" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN BEHIND THE VOICE OF ST. LOUIS

(By Ted Schafers, Globe-Democrat public affairs editor)

Seven years ago many people in the broadcasting business thought that Robert Hyland, general manager of radio station KMOX and vice president of CBS radio, had a short-circuit in his airwaves.

This was when Mr. Hyland announced that all weekday afternoon musical record programs on KMOX were being dropped for a new format of "information" shows with audience participation.

Scoffers labeled the move as a temporary publicity gimmick by KMOX designed to stand out from the bedlam of rock 'n' roll disc jockeys, radio contests, and teen platter parties, then saturating the air waves.

Bob Hyland knew that his novel experiment involved risks. But it had been well planned and supported by several years of intensive research of what his audiences indicated they wanted. He knew that success would put KMOX ahead of the crowd, not only locally but nationally.

The new type of show succeeded beyond his fondest dreams. Not only has KMOX become the most successful radio station in the CBS network but audience ratings repeatedly have given it the highest of any radio station in the Nation.

Mr. Hyland shows up at his desk every morning 7 days a week at 6 a.m. He has neither eaten breakfast at his home nor taken a single vacation since taking charge of KMOX 11 years ago.

That kind of pace would seem to tire any man but it apparently doesn't tire Mr. Hyland.

If you want to talk about the radio business or KMOX's participation in world and community affairs through "At Your Service" programing, you will find this attractive, personable, dynamic man ready to do so at any time.

But getting Bob Hyland to talk about his role in making himself a local and national personality is another story.

So we went to St. Louis business, political, labor, and community leaders for the story. Here is what they had to say:

James P. Hickok, board chairman of the First National Bank in St. Louis and head of the Civic Center Redevelopment Corp., whose own civic accomplishments won him the 1965 Globe-Democrat Man of the Year Award, said:

"Bob Hyland not only gives greatly of himself to every worthwhile project, but throws the resources of his station behind them. He is a great human being, never pushes but persuades. One of my greatest fears is that someday St. Louis will lose him to some national post."

PAEANS FROM LEADERS

"A community to be great must have assets and resources of many kinds. I happen to believe that Bob Hyland is one of the great human assets of St. Louis," says August A. Busch, Jr., president and board chairman of Anheuser-Busch, Inc., and the St. Louis Cardinal baseball team.

"It's no accident that Bob Hyland is asked to become involved in almost every project of major importance to the St. Louis community. It's no accident that he is held in such high esteem by so many different segments and groups in this community.

"He is always outspoken and forthright, a quality which in many persons, is a sure-fire formula for making enemies. In the case of Bob Hyland, however, there usually is only respect for his integrity and his point of view."

David R. Calhoun, president of St. Louis Union Trust Co., and another of the city's top civic leaders, is equally effusive when he speaks of Mr. Hyland.

"Bob Hyland's contributions to the civic life of St. Louis," Mr. Calhoun says, "have been tremendous. Far too little of his work is publicly known because he shuns personal limelight."

Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., president of St. Louis University, is another admirer of Mr. Hyland. "I have been very favorably impressed with the efforts initiated by Bob Hyland in trying to make St. Louis a real community by providing open forums of various kinds in which opinions can be presented and all possible answers evaluated," says Father Reinert. "The 'At Your Service' programing he initiated has been a tremendous contribution in this area."

William (Bill) Bidwell, vice president of the St. Louis football Cardinals, feels much the same way. "Bob," says the football executive, "is one of St. Louis' most outstanding men, a great spokesman for our city. He works constantly to promote the community's interest and radiates confidence in its future."

Former Mayor Raymond R. Tucker thinks Mr. Hyland has contributed greatly to the spiritual, cultural, and commercial development of St. Louis. "I've had the privilege of knowing Bob for years," says Mr. Tucker. "St. Louis is fortunate in having him as a citizen."

A leading public relations counselor whose advice has been sought by many major St. Louis companies and organizations for many years, said recently:

"Hyland never fails to amaze me. He seems to be involved in almost everything. He never seems tired. He is available regardless of what hour you call. It has gotten so that nothing is started of a civic or charitable nature here anymore without someone in the meeting saying: 'We better ask Bob Hyland about this before we go ahead.' "

A DEVOTED CIVIC LEADER

Two leading labor leaders also were quick to praise Mr. Hyland.

Harold J. Gibbons, president of the Teamsters Joint Council, which represents 40,000 members, had this to say:

"He (Hyland) has always used his persuasive personality and radio facilities to bring about a better understanding of the important issues facing people today."

Joseph Clark, president of the St. Louis Labor Council agreed, was just as complimentary:

"Bob Hyland has always been a perfect gentleman," he said. "Bob has a passionate interest in seeing that all issues are fairly presented and his amazing energies certainly help St. Louis."

Mayor Alfonso J. Cervantes confessed it was difficult to describe adequately a man of so many capabilities as Bob Hyland.

"He is a dynamic doer whose contributions to his city, his station and his industry are too numerous to mention," was what the mayor said.

"At Your Service" programing is one of the major keys to Bob Hyland's success at KMOX. In the pargon of radio it is called "talk" format. It is used to air the problems of the day in political, civic or economic fields and on every conceivable topic affecting the daily lives of listeners.

But those who have watched and marveled at the amazing success of this formula know that this just didn't happen without a great deal of planning.

Promptly at 7 o'clock each morning Bob Hyland summons his staff to review the program strategy of the day.

"We work something like an electronic newspaper—city desk style, reviewing National, State and local figures in the news and digging up fresh surprises for our listeners," said Mr. Hyland.

"Keeping your audience interested, your program fresh and retaining a high degree of believability in everything you broadcast requires constant attention—like a day-old baby."

Since its initiation in 1960, KMOX's "At Your Service" programing has been extended until now it comprises 54 hours per week, broadcasting from 7 to 9 a.m. and from noon to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday; 9 a.m. to noon on Saturday and 8 a.m. to noon on Sundays.

TWENTY THOUSAND PHONE CALLS

Success brings imitators. All six other CBS-owned radio stations now follow Mr.

Hyland's format. So do nearly 1,000 other radio stations in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Europe, Japan, and Australia.

Some have gone heavily into panel discussions while others telephone people in their homes and discuss problems of the day. But none exercises the high degree of control insisted upon by Mr. Hyland and that is regarded the key to its amazing success here.

"Ask your doctor, lawyer, priest, minister, rabbi, mayor, Governor, police chief, reporter, get snickers from some rivals but the audience ratings prove their popularity. Special guests range from public officials or individuals involved in highly controversial subjects to timely topics on everyday problems.

When two Fontbonne College nuns, Sisters Ernest Marie and Thomas Marguerite, went to Selma, Ala., early last year to lead a civil rights march, they accepted Mr. Hyland's offer to explain their mission and answer questions on KMOX. A record 20,000 phone calls swamped all lines during the 5 hours they submitted to listener questioning.

Fifteen special lines have been installed to handle the telephone inquiries. Serving as moderators are KMOX staffers Rex Davis, Bob Hardy, Jack Buck, Jim Butler, and Roy McCarthy, whose voices in special news programs and sports broadcasts have been favorites for years.

Mr. Hyland acknowledges the danger of some telephone caller sneaking in a vulgar or libelous statement, but points out this is controlled by a 4-second delay in the time the statement is made and it is broadcast over the airwaves.

Asked if he does not worry that listeners may not tire of "talk" programing, he replied:

"Not if properly presented, and balanced with other offerings, such as the best in sports, hard news presentations, periods of music, and the best of religious subjects.

"The important thing is never to underestimate your audience or its desire to know. This thirst for knowledge, information, personal growth, and civic activity has never been greater. We program with a purpose of educating, informing, and serving as a clearinghouse for ideas. To become a voice of, by, and for the community in whatever type of programing we offer," he said.

FRIEND OF BASEBALL PLAYERS

Mr. Hyland's community activities read like a directory of every worthwhile organization in St. Louis. The writer stopped counting after passing more than 80 in which he is either an officer, board member, or holder of some important job by reason of past service.

He is president of the Knights of the Cauliflower Ear, president of the newly organized Stadium Club, second vice president of the Municipal Theater Association; cochairman of the Repertory Committee and the Bicentennial Committee, a member of the board of the Jefferson National Expansion Association, Cardinal Glennon Hospital, St. Louis Symphony Society, and past president of the Advertising Club of St. Louis.

Bob Hyland is a personal friend of hundreds of major league baseball players. His father, Dr. Robert F. Hyland, Sr., for many years was team physician for the Cardinals and his son began hanging around the dugouts since he was in knee pants.

When Bob Hyland decided he wasn't cut out to be a professional baseball player he made up his mind to become a doctor like his dad, "but I didn't have the right equipment," he said. The kind of "equipment" he did possess led him into radio.

Radio always fascinated him. While attending St. Louis University he got started in programing on station WEW, while still finding time to be sports editor of the college newspaper, cocaptain of the baseball team and president of his junior and senior class.

After graduation he went to station WTAD at Quincy, Ill., where he worked for $25 a week.

There he did everything "but sweep the floors." He returned to St. Louis to work for WEW after he found out that the girl he decided to marry had too many other suitors.

"It was tough enough living on $25 a week without driving home each weekend to restake my claim," he recalls with a smile.

With the outbreak of World War II, Bob Hyland was commissioned an ensign in the Navy and returned to St. Louis after the war to work at KXOK for a time. Then he left a good job to join WBBM in Chicago, "because I had always wanted to become associated with CBS."

He made such an excellent record there that he was sent to St. Louis in 1952 as assistant sales manager of KMOX. Later he was promoted to the two top jobs he holds today.

How Mr. Hyland accepted his challenges is illustrated in the number of "firsts" he has helped his station achieve.

KMOX was the first St. Louis radio station and first CBS-owned facility to editorialize. This was in 1958.

He masterminded KMOX's successful campaign to be the first radio station to gain access to the Missouri Legislature where an entire session was broadcast. KMOX followed this with another "first." It pioneered live broadcast of the board of aldermen meeting in St. Louis.

Tall and handsome, Mr. Hyland carries his 180 pounds well on a 6-foot-2-inch frame. He lives with his wife, the former Patricia Ann Soule, their 2½-year-old son, Matthew, and infant daughter, Molly. His two older children, sons of the late Martha Ann Claiborne Hyland, are Robert Hyland III, a recent graduate of the University of Missouri, and Claiborne Hyland, a student at Lake Forest College near Chicago.

A LIGHT SLEEPER?

Bob Hyland's 12- to 16-hour schedules permit little time for relaxation. His only hobbies are walking and collecting Steuben glass animals.

Members of his staff of about 50 permanent employees use such terms as "driver," "firm," and "demanding" when speaking of the boss. But all of them say he is fair at all times and extremely concerned about their welfare.

News Director Rex Davis and Farm News Director Ted Magner have completed more than 20 years at KMOX, "of which they have been closely associated with Mr. Hyland. Jack Buck, Harry Caray, Globe-Democrat Executive Sports Editor Bob Burnes, and Harry Fender have been familiar personalities for more than 10 years, as has John McCormack who takes over after midnight when Mr. Hyland is supposed to be asleep.

However, Mr. Hyland startled his engineers not long ago by commenting on a "30-second miss at 3 a.m."

Some of his staff claim he can rattle off "1,000 telephone numbers without looking at a phone book."

KMOX, under Mr. Hyland, has won so many awards that the walls of his outer office has run out of space to display them.

One he especially prizes is the University of Missouri Honor Award for distinguished services to journalism. When KMOX received this award in 1963 it was the first time a radio station had received it in 54 years.

Some claim that Mr. Hyland's revolutionary and successful programing was born of a desperation to keep alive a media threatened by television. It is no secret that television is a word rarely mentioned on KMOX.

But people who know Bob Hyland well say he has a deeper purpose than material success for his radio station.

It is reflected, they say, in his continuing drive to raise the information levels of his radio audiences.

"If our city, State, and Nation are to prosper," says Mr. Hyland, "in fact if mankind is to survive, that survival may well depend more on communicators, than on engineers, physicists and technicians in laboratories."

Bob Hyland works hard to fulfill radio's role in this crusade and has found out it has made him the radio "voice of St. Louis."

NEW POLICE COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK CENTERED IN PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a dramatic new weapon against crime has been added to the resources of local law-enforcement personnel throughout the Nation.

A new fully automatic teletypewriter network known as LETS—for Law Enforcement Teletypewriter Service—will soon link local and State police authorities much closer together in time. Messages that once required hours will shortly take only minutes.

I am proud that the headquarters for this new communications service is located in Phoenix, Ariz., and further, that among the dedicated law-enforcement officers who helped develop this new high-speed network is G. O. Hathaway, for many years the superintendent of the Arizona Highway Patrol.

The service is described in detail in an article published in the March 1966 issue of the Police Chief, official magazine of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. I want to commend the IACP, the Bell System, and all those who helped put this new system together, and in order that LETS may receive the wider publicity which it merits, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW POLICE TELETYPEWRITER NETWORK

Law-enforcement communications is taking another dramatic step forward this year when a new, fully automatic teletypewriter network is placed in operation to permit closer coordination between law enforcement agencies across the country.

The new teletypewriter network will link police authorities throughout the United States by a unified communications system that will enable message time between participating agencies to be reduced from days and hours to just minutes.

Known as Law Enforcement Teletypewriter Service (LETS), the network was developed by Bell System in cooperation with local and State police authorities to provide better communications between law enforcement agencies. The IACP Communications Committee also contributed to its development.

The increasing mobility of today's law breakers, coupled with the Nation's growing crime rate, created a greater awareness for the need of fast, efficient communications between State and municipal law enforcement agencies, reports Bell System. Participation in this new network will enable police officials to operate more effectively by having an extensive, direct communications service at their disposal.

The type of information to be transmitted via LETS includes bulletins on stolen property or missing persons, description of criminals and information on crimes, such as burglary or robbery, etc., automobile registration and drivers' license checks, details on hit and run and other automobile accidents, as well as administrative messages.

Headquarters for the network will be located in Phoenix, Ariz. This control center will be designed to automatically route messages and maintain a speedy, efficient flow of LETS traffic. It will include switching equipment capable of sending a single message simultaneously to multiple addressees, holding a message until a busy line becomes available for traffic and giving transmission precedence to priority messages.

Another feature of the LETS network will be the fully automatic police teletypewriter which will enable all stations to communicate with a minimum of human effort. This eliminates the need for an attendant at either transmitting or receiving locations to stand by for message pickup and delivery, enabling more efficient use of personnel.

The LETS network also will provide instant all-station broadcast of urgent messages, secrecy in transmission, 24-hour operation, and reduction in the chance for human error. In addition, it will provide selective station calling to enable law enforcement agencies to pinpoint receiving stations.

According to the Bell System recognizing the need for fast, efficient, written communications among law enforcement agencies in the United States led to the first LETS systems. By the mid-1950's a number of intrastate systems were in use. These developed into interstate arrangements which aided law officers in keeping ahead of criminals using fast transportation to outdistance communications. With circulars concerning stolen cars and other criminal activities still requiring 2 or 3 days for distribution to nearby States, the next logical step was expansion of LETS to regional networks.

The new LETS network will join these regional communications systems to provide police with a completely automatic nationwide law enforcement network.

PROPOSED SALE OF STEEL COMPLEX TO RED CHINA

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I was extremely dismayed to learn that the West German Government has approved the plans of a French-German group to sell a $140 million steel complex to Red China.

It is also my understanding that the French Government is expected to approve these plans by the end of the week.

It is common knowledge that Communist China is supplying tons of equipment to its North Vietnamese allies—equipment which is being used against our own American soldiers. Construction of such a large steel complex in Red China will directly enhance Peiping's ability to threaten its neighbors in southeast Asia and to supply weapons to its henchmen in North Vietnam.

This steel mill will not materially contribute to better relations between China and the free world and could be detrimental to the chances for peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I strongly suggest that West Germany and France use their productive capacity to supply equipment to the forces of freedom in Vietnam, and not to the enemy. It is high time that nations like West Germany and France realize that their peace and security—as well as ours—are at stake in southeast Asia.

My good friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], has just returned from a special mission to West Germany and finds approval of this steel complex an incredible development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MUSKIE's comments on this proposal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE ON THE APPROVAL BY WEST GERMANY OF A GERMAN-FRENCH CONSORTIUM TO BUILD A STEEL COMPLEX FOR COMMUNIST CHINA, MARCH 18, 1966

Last week I returned from a presidential factfinding mission in West Germany. In Germany, I met with several high-ranking government leaders, including Chancellor Erhard. They expressed strong support for American policy in Vietnam.

For this reason, I find the approval by the West German Government of the decision by a German-French consortium to build a $140-million steel complex for the Chinese Communist Government, an incredible development.

Such a plant is clearly related to the war-making capacity of the Chinese Government, to its ability to produce armaments and to its capacity to supply the North Vietnamese Government with arms.

The construction of the steel mill cannot contribute to the interests of the free world in reaching an honorable and peaceful solution to the Vietnam crisis.

I recognize that the French Government has no interest in coordinating their actions with us, but the consortium agreement is not consistent with the expressions of sympathy and support for U.S. policies in Vietnam and southeast Asia which I received from German officials and citizens during my recent trip to that country.

The timing of the West German Government's decision to approve the steel deal could not be worse. It suggests that short-term economic gains are more important to the West German Government than support of our policies in Vietnam.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, West Germany's decision to allow construction of a steel complex in Red China is particularly interesting in light of other West German sales of arms and strategic commodities. Recently I became aware of a proposal by West Germany to sell Hispano-Suiza 20-millimeter automatic weapons to the U.S. Department of Defense for use by our Army. American producers, such as the Springfield Armory in Springfield, Mass., can produce competitive weapons.

If the West Germans want to get into the business of exporting strategic commodities, Mr. President, then I think that they should take a good hard look at who their customers are. No nation which is arming our declared enemies should expect this Nation to be a willing customer.

I am today drafting letters to President Lyndon B. Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk urging them to exert our influence with the West German Government and any influence we still have with the French Government to bring about a reversal of this deplorable act. I will urge the President and the Secretary of State to take stern measures against these Governments if they decide to go ahead with their plans to allow construction of this steel complex.

A LESSON DRAWN FROM MEXICAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post is an article by Walter Lippmann on Mexico, which exhibits the wisdom, thoughtfulness, and comprehension that are characteristic of that distinguished columnist.

Mr. Lippmann reviews the history of Mexican-American relations and points out that after the Mexican revolution, while the Wilson administration had intervened during its violent phase on two occasions—in the bombardment and seizure of Vera Cruz in 1914 and in the pursuit of Pancho Villa in 1916—subsequent administrations showed restraint in the face of great pressure from various vested U.S. interests to intervene and impose our will by force of arms upon the Mexican people, and did not yield to that pressure.

Walter Lippmann quite properly pays tribute to Ambassador Dwight Morrow, who reversed the policy previously followed, first by Woodrow Wilson's interventions; second, through the nonrecognition of the Obregon government by the Harding administration; and, third, by sending—after recognition—a totally uncomprehending Ambassador who was completely out of sympathy with the Mexican revolution.

Dwight Morrow, who followed this period of interference in Mexico's affairs, being a member of a Wall Street firm, had credentials in the eyes of American business which could not be challenged, and managed, through sympathy and understanding of Mexico's problems, to change U.S. policy. But an even greater service was rendered subsequently by another American Ambassador, Josephus Daniels, in a more difficult period. This was after President Lazaro Cardenas had expropriated the holdings of American oil companies, which thereupon carried on an active campaign for military intervention. It probably would have succeeded but for Josephus Daniels and his close personal relationship with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The claims of the oil companies were highly extravagant and inflated, but they were repaid for their actual investment and Mexico established a sound policy of control of its own natural resources by legitimate means.

The result of the Mexican revolution is visible today in Mexico's stability, and in its progress toward realization of the purposes of its political and social revolution, begun in 1911.

The Mexican revolution continues as evolution and is still far from its hoped for goals, but the relations between our two countries are better than they ever have been, and are a contributing factor to the fulfillment of Mexico's aspirations.

What is clearly implicit in Walter Lippmann's fine article is that we ought to display a wisdom similar to that of the Roosevelt administration in place of our contemporary military ventures.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Mexico Revisited" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mexico Revisited

(By Walter Lippmann)

During the past fortnight I have been in Mexico, which I last saw nearly 40 years ago. At that time the Mexican revolution had been underway for some 15 years. The United States had invaded Mexico twice, once by sea at Vera Cruz to avenge an insult to the flag and once by land in a punitive expedition commanded by General Pershing. He was in pursuit of the guerrilla fighter Pancho Villa, who was indistinguishable from a bandit, had raided Columbus, N. Mex., and had killed a score of Americans.

In the twenties there was a mounting agitation in this country to occupy Mexico and suppress the revolution. It was a bloody revolution, replete with atrocities, ambushes, guerrilla raids, kidnapings, executions, looting, burning, the rape of nuns and the sacrilegious destruction of churches. The revolution was a class war against the landlords, Mexican and foreign, and there was expropriation of foreign enterprise and of oil and mineral concessions. Moreover, during the First World War, the Mexican revolution sided with Germany, and was accused of conspiring with the Kaiser's government to regain the American Southwest in the event of a German victory.

The provocation to the United States to intervene was very great, and very powerful business interests and church interests were demanding intervention. Yet, except for the two short-lived episodes at Vera Cruz and under General Pershing, the U.S. Government held its hand and did not involve itself in the task of occupying and governing Mexico, an operation which at the time was said to call for half a million men. In 1916 intervention was made impossible by our involvement in the European war. But by the middle twenties, our hands were free and large masses of trained veterans were available.

The President at this critical time was Calvin Coolidge, a man who had no pretensions to greatness but who had the great virtue of humility—and was lucky. He was particularly lucky in having as his closest adviser Dwight Morrow, an old friend from Amherst College, a lawyer, a profound student of English political history, and a partner in the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. Dwight Morrow persuaded Coolidge that the right course was to avoid intervention and to negotiate a settlement with the Mexican revolution. The President sent Morrow to Mexico City as his Ambassador.

Shortly after that, Morrow invited me to visit him in Mexico City, and for a while I watched him negotiating the oil and mineral and land problems with the revolutionary President, Gen. Plutarco Calles, and on the side—with an assist from the Vatican—mediating the conflict between the revolution and the Catholic Church. To make a gesture of good will to the Mexican Government, Morrow persuaded Lindbergh—for whom at the time he was acting as a financial adviser—to fly his plane to Mexico City. He did not anticipate that after the visit Lindbergh would marry his daughter.

Revisiting Mexico last week, I could not help seeing it as a monument to the wisdom and restraint of a great power which resisted all manner of provocation and temptation. The settlement which Coolidge and Morrow made with the Mexican Revolution has paid handsome dividends, and the country which was racked with violence and disorder is today a remarkable example of stability and enterprise which are generating Mexico's own economic development.

The party which governs Mexico today descends directly from the revolutionary leaders, from Madero, Carranza, Obregon, and Calles, and, so far as one can see there is now internal peace. The Mexican peso has been stable for 12 years, and it is now, or is very close to being, one of the hard currencies of the non-Communist world. While Mexico still has a long way to go before it conquers the universally difficult problem of rural poverty, its industrial development is spectacular.

The biggest dividend of all is that we have for a neighbor a strong country which is at once independent and yet our friend. This may come to have great significance in middle America—in the Caribbean region from the Texas border to Panama. For the existence of a Latin country of the stature and caliber of Mexico opens up the prospect of a regional understanding and organization in what—as would be apparent if there were a military intrusion by a non-American power—is in the last analysis a sphere of vital U.S. interest.

Some Mexicans think that the time may not be too far off when all this will begin to show in the relations between Cuba and the rest of middle America. Mexico, as we know, has never broken relations with Cuba, and there is an operating airline between Mexico City and Havana. The Mexican regulate the traffic strictly but it is kept open for official intercourse. The Mexicans say that they are maintaining a "bridge," and they say further that there are accumulating signs that Castro, whose regime is working so badly, is beginning to act like a desperate man.

If only, say the Mexicans, he were deprived of the support which comes from being surrounded by enemies, if only he had to face his own people directly, we would probably find that the Cubans are tiring of him. So, the Mexicans say, we are keeping open the bridge, and we hope you understand why.

THE RACE BETWEEN FOOD AND POPULATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on March 7, Secretary of State Dean Rusk submitted a statement to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry emphasizing the serious problem which the underdeveloped nations of the world face in dealing with their food and population crisis. In clear and unequivocal language, Secretary Rusk pointed out:

> We cannot realistically face the food crisis without simultaneously looking at the population problem. In country after country, impressive increases in food production have been offset by population growth.

Mr. President, this statement is a welcome affirmation from the highest official in our Government concerned with foreign policy that rapid population growth is jeopardizing both economic development and international security in many areas of the world. As Secretary Rusk stated:

> The race between food and population is a critical one.

Although the subject may not make a headline every day in the press, our handling of it will, as the Secretary emphasized, "have a significant impact upon our own and future generations."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the Record, the text of the statement by the Secretary of State before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on Monday, March 7, 1966.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, Before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, March 7, 1966

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you this morning the problem of food and population—a problem which has been receiving high priority from all of us in the executive branch who are concerned with matters of international well being. It is a subject which doesn't make the headlines that Vietnam does day after day. Nevertheless, it is of very great importance. Our handling of it will have a significant impact upon our own and future generations.

The root of the problem is clear enough: In many parts of the world, food production is beginning to lag behind population growth. As Secretary Freeman has said, "The less developed world is losing the capacity to feed itself."

The problem of growing enough food to meet the need is not new. What is new is the dimension the problem has assumed as we look at the next decade. With the continuing and sudden sharp rise of population throughout much of the world, this food crisis demands urgent attention. Fortunately, there is a growing world recognition of this problem, which may in itself be the first step toward its elimination. It has prompted activity within the highest councils of this Government—reflected by the President's recent message to the Congress on food for freedom, as well as related legislation which has been referred to this committee.

Before World War II, the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America were exporting sizable quantities of grain to the more economically advanced nations. In the 1930's, for example, Latin America exported more grain than any other region of the world. Today, for the most part, the laden grain ships are sailing in the opposite direction—and nearly three times as many are required to do the job. As an illustration, more than 30 million tons of grain probably will be shipped this year from the industrialized to the nonindustrialized countries. This amount is more than double the magnitude of annual shipments of the 1950's, and an increase of more than 50 percent just in the past 5 years. And even with these enormous imports—much of them in the form of food aid—and with some developing countries already straining their port capacity, there are many countries in which the food intake per individual was less this year than last year, less last year than the year before. Unless this disturbing trend can be reversed, it will soon have profoundly deteriorating effects. There is a very real relationship between hunger and political instability. There is also a very real relationship between the ability to meet elementary human needs and economic and social development. In coming years, the problem we discuss today, unless curbed, could become a serious obstacle to important foreign policy goals of the United States.

What can be done? Throughout history, the hungry man often solved his problem—when it was solved—in one of two ways. He either cultivated new lands or migrated to a region of the world with greater opportunities. The latter alternative no longer exists today as it did in the past. Although less than a tenth of the earth's land surface currently produces crops, the new supply of potentially productive land is severely limited. The only other alternative was starvation, an alternative which is unacceptable in today's world.

In what other direction can we turn? First, we cannot realistically face the food crisis without simultaneously looking at the population problem. In country after country, impressive increases in food production have been offset by population growth. However, a number of countries have come to recognize that the food problem cannot be solved without addressing themselves to both sides of the food/population equation. The race between food and population is a critical one.

Nevertheless, even with the most optimistic of achievements in family planning, we realistically face the fact that such measures cannot prevent the serious threat of hunger in the next decade.

With limited land availability, our best hope is to obtain more food from lands already under cultivation, and from the sea. We have known for a number of years that better seeds, fertilizers, flood control, irrigation, pesticides and other miracles of technology can multiply food production many times. However, the benefits of such techniques have largely been confined to the already-rich nations. In the United States and Canada, for example, yield per acre in the last quarter century has been increased over 100 percent—compared with only 8 percent in the less developed world. Secretary Freeman often describes his grandfather's farm which operated in the days when the American farmer could feed himself and three others. In contrast, the American farmer today feeds himself and 32 others. The prime reason is modern technology which enables the American farmer to grow six times as much corn on an acre of land as does a farmer in India.

How do you best encourage such an increase? How do you best transfer a technology which we know exists and can work? How do you encourage the needy countries to face up to this problem and solve it with their own resources? How can we make the most effective and, at the same time, the most economical contribution to such an effort?

These are the questions to which the administration has addressed itself. No one has been more aware of the gravity of the situation than the President, and his deep, personal concern is reflected in the legislation which is now before your committee.

Last year, President Johnson requested a thorough analysis of the situation, and the bill we are discussing today is the culmination of more than a year's intensive study by the executive branch. It adds a new dimension to an effort which has been evolving over the past two decades.

The bill gives recognition to the importance of food as an integral factor in a country's life and growth.

The bill recognizes the gravity of the food problem, certainly the most critical many countries will be facing over the next decade.

The bill correctly suggests that the only solution to the food problem will be through the increased agricultural production of the developing countries themselves, and that we should make efforts to assist that process.

The bill proposes that our own agricultural effort be directed not only to domestic needs, but also to our participation in overseas requirements through both commercial and assistance channels.

Mr. Chairman, there are four aspects of this legislation to which I would like to direct your special attention.

First, is the emphasis placed on self-help. There is little question that the final resolution of the world food problem must come from the developing nations themselves. Yet, in many ways, agriculture has been the weakest rung in the ladder to development. In many countries it has been short changed, time and again, in favor of more glamorous industrial projects. Today, a new philosophy is emerging. Now there is a growing recognition that a strong agricultural base is a prerequisite to development. The concept of self-help is inherent in this legislation, and any food assistance on our part will be directly related to the extent of these efforts. We will carefully assess the self-help efforts by the recipient countries to assure that they are doing everything possible to increase their own productive capacity.

The second point I would like to call to your attention is the transition from sales for local currencies to sales on dollar credit terms. Some criticism has been leveled over the years—perhaps some of it justified—that certain recipients of our food aid had assumed that our food assistance would continue indefinitely, and thus encouraging them to neglect their own agriculture for other priorities. Some may have felt they were doing us a favor by taking our so-called surplus problem off our hands. With this new provision, and the fact of our disappearing surpluses, food will be provided on the same terms as development loans—and will highlight the fact that food aid has the same value as aid in other forms.

Third, I would like to point out the emphasis of this legislation on combating malnutrition. This is a new dimension to the food problem, which was barely recognized in the early days of Public Law 480. Scientific findings of the past few years emphasize the fact that the kind of food we eat is often more important than how much we eat. We now realize that protein malnutrition, especially among young children, can result in both physical and mental retardation. Indeed, as the President has said on a number of occasions, the problem of malnutrition could well become one of the basic obstacles to the entire development process. At a conference of the National Academy of Sciences, it was pointed out that our approach to this aspect of the food problem could have a direct effect "on what our civilization looks like, acts like, and thinks like in 1984."

Fourth, and perhaps the most dramatic element in this new program, is the concept of growing to meet the need. This is a positive and logical extension of previous food aid efforts. It provides a link between domestic farm programs and overseas commercial and assistance requirements which cannot help but make a more effective use of our magnificent agricultural capacity.

I do not pretend to possess expertise in a field which you gentlemen have studied for many years. However, in addition to the foreign policy implications which I know are very serious, the domestic economic benefits of the Food for Freedom Act are readily apparent to me. Time and again, we see evidence that the developing nations are important potential customers. As their economies grow, their dollar purchases increase. What we're really suggesting, aside from the obvious humanitarian and foreign policy features of the legislation presented here, is that we are helping to build bigger dollar markets more quickly. Food is a stimulus which can help, and has helped, to expedite the arduous development process.

I would like to stress, Mr. Chairman, that our food aid program has been a valuable foreign policy tool because it is directed toward positive changes—strengthening democratic governments, promoting political stability, encouraging economic stability, assisting national development. Our food has been and will continue to be used in the cause of peace. On certain occasions our donation programs, especially child-feeding programs, have continued in countries when all other forms of formal relationships were ruptured.

Our pattern of operation necessarily is different in different countries. The quid pro quo, for example, often is different as relationships with countries differ. But what I want to emphasize is that our food programs are important components of our overall bilateral relationships. In each case, as we negotiate agreements, we consider the U.S. national interest, just as the other country considers its national interest.

The legislation before you is based on two American traits—a compassion for fellow human beings in need, and a technical skill and productivity in agriculture which must surely be considered as one of the great success stories of modern history. These two threads of American greatness were woven together by this committee during the 83d Congress more than 10 years ago, with the enactment of Public Law 480. As you well know, the evolution of the bipartisan food-for-peace program over the years has made it one of the most successful and imaginative of our overseas assistance programs.

The achievements of food for peace have been many, and we have learned much during the decade of Public Law 480. The new legislation takes advantage of this experience. It is adapted to the needs and conditions of today.

President Johnson has proposed that "* * * the United States lead the world in a war against hunger." I view the legislation being studied by your committee as supporting this goal.

As I said at the outset, we are dealing with a problem of immense proportions. From my desk at the State Department, where rarely a day passes in which I am not involved in some food-related issue, it looms as one of the major problems our Nation will be facing during the coming decades. A major attack on the problem today can prevent serious political, economic and social turmoil in many countries within a very few years.

I recommend to you the attack on hunger as proposed in the Food for Freedom Act and its companion legislation as being in the best interests of the foreign policy of the United States.

HOUSTON ORGANIZATIONS HONOR CONGRESSMAN ALBERT THOMAS THROUGH RESOLUTIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the recent death of Congressman Albert Thomas was a great loss to us here in Washington, but even more so to the area which he represented. The feeling for Albert Thomas that was held by the people of Houston is as close as any constituency can have for their Congressman.

To illustrate their respect, admiration, and devotion to this great man, I ask unanimous consent that resolutions passed by the Houston Democratic Women's Club and the Houston Area Federal Business Association be printed at this point in the Record, together with the names affixed thereto.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of Houston Democratic Women's Club

Whereas Hon. Albert Thomas, since first entering the House of Representatives in 1937 from the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, has given leadership which has brought distinction to him and to the Democratic Party, which he has faithfully represented, and benefit and recognition to his constituency; and

Whereas he has been among the men, few in number, but irresistible in purpose, upon whom have rested the responsibility and burden of guiding our Nation in times of peace and war, from the past into the limitless expanse of space, and has been one of the most prominent individual members of the U.S. Congress to support and guide the Nation's vast and growing space program; and

Whereas however hard-pressed by official duties, Albert Thomas has always found the time and the energy to be of help to any individual citizen who has come to him with a problem of any kind, and has given unstintingly of his time and his position always to be available to any constituent who has sought his counsel, and has truly proved himself a friend to every citizen; and

Whereas Albert Thomas, throughout his tenure covering 15 terms in the House of Representatives, has been an outstanding member of the Democratic Party, has given that party wise leadership and faithful support at all times, and has worked in and through the party to accomplish progress for the entire Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Houston Democratic Women's Club do express its admiration and respect for Albert Thomas, and state for all posterity its acknowledgment of the debt every American owes this man on behalf of public service and the general public good, that future generations may study and emulate the life and record of this great American patriot.

Passed March 17, 1966.

Mrs. Irl F. Kennerly,
President.
Mrs. A. Ralph Zobel,
First Vice President.
Mrs. C. A. Neal Pickett,
Second Vice President.
Mrs. Ira D. Sykes,
Founder.
Mrs. C. P. Wood,
Miss Adele Mansell
Miss Birnice Mansell,
Resolutions Committee.

Attest:

Mrs. C. E. Olsen,
Secretary.

Resolution by Houston Area Federal Business Association

Whereas the long continuity of leadership in both Houses of the U.S. Congress exercised by statesmen to whom the highest honor is the performance of service for the public welfare, has given our Nation the strength and the vision to surmount the dangers and obstacles in both internal and international affairs that have caused other democracies to falter and fail; and

Whereas the American people have been particularly fortunate in having in the national legislative branch men who through the years have given wisdom to policy and vision to action and guided the ship of state through dangerous waters to a successful completion of each voyage; and

Whereas among the beloved Representatives in Washington who have rendered long and effective service to the American people, none is more outstanding or distinguished, and none will be more sorely missed, than Albert Thomas, of the Eighth District of Texas, he who has given such faithful attention to his duty and who, despite the heavy burden of leadership he has always carried, has labored vigorously and faithfully on behalf of the men and women engaged in various aspects of the Federal service throughout the land; and

Whereas since first going to Congress in 1937, Albert Thomas has been an outstanding figure among American statesmen, and his compassion for humanity, his strength of character, and his devotion to the best interests of the American people, have bequeathed his countrymen a legacy of service that will set an inspiring standard of leadership through the years ahead; and

Whereas no Member of the House of Representatives has striven more diligently on behalf of Federal officials and employees than Congressman Thomas, and none has accomplished more for their benefit and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Houston Area Federal Business Association do express its admiration for Albert Thomas and his incomparable record in the public service, and do extend to his loved ones its deepest sympathy, sustained in the knowledge that his broad and helpful influence will always be felt in American statecraft and national leadership.

In witness whereof, we have caused our names hereunto to be affixed, this 16th day of February, A.D., 1966:

Neal Pickett, *President.*
Claude M. McLarty,
First Vice President.
John W. Clairborne, Jr., M.D.,
Second Vice President.
Wesley L. Hjornevik,
Third Vice President.
Sam D. W. Low,
Executive Committee.
Mrs. Virginia M. Slate,
Secretary-Treasurer.

JUDGE MORRIS OF DELAWARE DIES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a distinguished Delawarean, former U.S. District Court Judge Hugh Martin Morris, has died at the age of 87. Funeral services are being held today in Wilmington, Del.

Judge Morris' long career spanned notable achievements as a Federal judge, a corporation lawyer, and president of the University of Delaware's board of trustees.

Despite failing health in recent years, he never retired from the practice of law and continued to report for duty whenever he felt able at Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell in the Du Pont Building.

The Wilmington Evening Journal of March 21, 1966, carries an editorial on Judge Morris which notes that he "personified the best old-fashioned traditions of his native Sussex County."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Judge Hugh Martin Morris

Hugh Martin Morris has died at 87 after a long professional career as a respected lawyer who also rendered distinguished service as a Federal judge. Though he never went to law school or studied engineering, his decisions on patent law from the bench are regarded as classics in their field. He never held a teaching position on a college faculty—but he often showed signs of being a frustrated academician.

The truth is that Judge Morris was a complex man of greater civic stature and usefulness than even the most regular newspaper reader might have suspected. In many winning ways of friendly interest in people—including many much younger ones—he personified the best old-fashioned traditions of his native Sussex County.

Judge Morris liked to reminisce about his boyhood on the family place called "Morris' Pleasure" from colonial days. It was there, working in the fields, that he heard the whistle of the Delaware Road trains. To him it sounded like "Hugh-ee-eee. Hugh-ee-ee." echoing from one pine woods to another. He answered the call of the little city of Wilmington and broader horizons. But he could never get away from the land. For many later years his abode was that handsome old house and large farm of his on Polly Drummond Hill near Newark.

Born and bred as he was, Hugh Morris could never have avoided a strong interest in politics. In 1934 he could have had the nomination for U.S. Senator by acclamation in the Democratic convention. He recalled that while cheers resounded, he hid in a cloakroom with the wet umbrellas until it was safe to come out again.

Having turned down the chance of a senatorship in favor of the rewards of a flourishing practice, he still had to find some way to do a public service. Says John A. Perkins, of the University of Delaware: "In my own view the start of the change from a little college to a university can be dated from the time Hugh Morris and Rodney Sharp went on the board of trustees many years ago. As president of the board, Judge Morris just couldn't dream big enough to match his aspirations for this school. At budget time he always went down to the legislature with me. He could speak his mind in ways I couldn't. He simply called on the members to have the same kind of Delaware pride he had in the university."

There is much truth, accordingly, in what George Tyler Coulson, a long-time law partner, observes about Judge Morris: "One clear measure of his public service is the growth of the University of Delaware in size, influence, and program including graduate work and research."

A complex man was Hugh Morris, true enough. He was also one of his generation's best in Delaware or anywhere else.

THE CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF R. D. PENNEWELL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, yesterday's confirmation of the appointment of Mr. R. D. Pennewell to a 6-year term on the Federal Farm Credit Board places an eminently qualified individual with a wide background in agriculture on this important body.

In addition to assurances that he will exert all of the effort and spend all of the time necessary in behalf of the farm people, he has an outstanding record in the agricultural field. He has been associated with the agricultural industry his entire lifetime, and presently owns and operates the Flo-Ray Farms, a 700-acre dairy farm at Palmyra, Mo.

He is now serving his fourth 3-year term on the Farm Credit Board of the Sixth District, of which he is vice president. He has served as president of the Missouri Rural Electrical Cooperative since its beginning in 1936. This was the first electric cooperative to organize in the State of Missouri.

Mr. Pennewell has also been president of Northwest Missouri Electric Power Cooperative since 1948. This was the first power cooperative to operate in the State of Missouri and is comprised of eight member cooperatives—five in Missouri and three in the State of Iowa.

He has also been secretary-treasurer of the Associated Electric Cooperative in Springfield, Mo., since its beginning in 1961.

Mr. Pennewell is now serving as a director of the Sanitary Milk Producers of St. Louis, Mo., and was president for 12 years. He is also director of the St. Louis Dairy Council.

Other services to agriculture include chairmanship of the livestock disease committee of the Department of Agriculture for the State of Missouri; service on the National Milk Producers Executive Committee, Washington, D.C., for 12 years; directorship of the Hannibal Production Credit Association for 25 years; and presently serving as finance chairman in the State of Missouri for the American Institute of Cooperation.

Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure to see Mr. R. D. Pennewell confirmed as a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board.

IN PRAISE OF TEXAS WESTERN UNIVERSITY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to point with pride to the achievements of a Texas basketball team over the weekend, that of Texas Western University of El Paso.

This team in the best tradition of Texas entered the NCAA basketball tournament and with great poise and performance emerged victorious in one battle after another. Over the weekend, as is now well known throughout the sports world, this team from the western part of Texas won the national championship in its first attempt at that great honor. I wish to lend my voice in praise of the exploits of this team and wish for the Senate to take note of this great day for Texas Western University.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Poise Lifts Texas Western From Ranks of Unknown," written by Steve Guback and published in the Evening Star of March 21, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POISE LIFTS TEXAS WESTERN FROM RANKS OF UNKNOWN

(By Steve Guback)

Texas Western's basketball team switched from hot jazz in the afternoon to cool play at night and won the 1966 NCAA national championship.

"They have a lot of pride and not once this season—and not tonight—did we ever lose our poise," said Coach Don Haskins after his underrated Miners upset mighty Kentucky 72–65 in the NCAA's grand finale Saturday night at Cole Field House.

Kentucky's shooting was expected to be the difference—and it was, but in an unexpected way.

"Shooting has carried us all season, but that is exactly what hurt us tonight," said Coach Adolph Rupp of Kentucky, fingering a sheet of some slightly amazing statistics.

KENTUCKY SHOOTING OFF

Kentucky got off 70 shots to Texas Western's 49, but the usually sharp Wildcat sharpshooters were far off form. Jittery Kentucky hit a subpar 38.6 percent, far below its remarkable 49 percent season-long average. Time and again the Wildcats blew easy close-in shots.

Texas Western, meanwhile, played it cool.

In the afternoon, they moped around their College Park motel listening to some hot jazz.

"That was to ease our minds," said guard Orsten Artis.

Then at night, the Miners came out and played the game of their lives. They hit 45 percent of their shots from the floor and sank a phenomenal 28 of 34 free throws, far above their regular-season foul-shooting average.

"That might have been our best defensive game of the year," Haskins pointed out. "We realized we had to stop their breaking game. We told the team what they would have to do—play defense. We felt it would be our defense and not our offense which would win for us. It got us here.

NO. 3 GOOD SPOT

This was the third time in 7 years that the No. 3 ranked team nationally won the NCAA championship, when the Nos. 1 and 2 ranked teams were also in the final round of four.

Ohio State did it in 1960, when Cincinnati and defending champion California were ranked one-two. So did Loyola of Chicago in 1963, when Cincinnati and Duke were rated one-two in the final round of four.

For a title game, it really wasn't much of a thriller. There was some tenseness to be sure, but a couple of spectacular steals by 5-foot-10 Bobby Joe Hill, who zeroed in for easy layups, gave Texas Western an early 14–9 lead and the Miners never looked back. Kentucky, down by as many as eight points in the first half, closed to one on three occasions in the second half, but never could go ahead.

With 3:22 remaining, Texas Western led by 11 and its noisy, jubilant band of rooters began warming up their chant: "We're No. 1, We're No. 1," which lasted well into the long night.

CHAMBERS MOST VALUABLE

Hill, the game's top scorer with 20 points, made the all-tournament team, along with recordbreaking Jerry Chambers of Utah, selected the tournament's outstanding player. Rounding out the five were Pat Riley and Louie Dampier of Kentucky, both 19-point men in the finals, and Jack Marin, of Duke.

The victory was Texas Western's 28th in 29 games. The lone loss was to Seattle, 74 to 72, in the Miners' last game of the regular season. Texas Western earlier had beaten Seattle by 11.

"We played just as we have all year," said Haskins, the husky 35-year-old coach who was driving a bus and coaching a girls basketball team just 10 years ago. "We may have prayed a little more, but we didn't do anything different. We didn't even have a chalk talk before the game."

For Haskins and the small, 7,500-student college in El Paso, the title triumph will put them on the map. Haskins figures one thing for sure—it will help his recruiting.

"And we're really going to go out and recruit," he said.

The Miners lose two starters, Artis and Forward Harry Flournoy, plus Reserve Forward Jerry Armstrong. Haskins says his "worst" freshman team is moving up.

As Haskins put it so succinctly afterward no longer is Texas Western without a "name."

	Goals	Fouls	Total
Kentucky:			
Dampier	7	5	19
Conley	4	2	10
Jaracz	3	1	7
Riley	8	3	19
Kron	3	0	6
Berger	2	0	4
Tallet	0	0	0
LeMaster	0	0	0
Gamble	0	0	0
Total	27	11	65
Texas Western:			
Hill	7	6	20
Artis	5	5	15
Latten	5	6	16
Worsley	2	4	8
Flournoy	1	0	2
Cager	1	6	8
Shed	1	1	3
Total	22	28	72

NOTE.—Halftime: Texas Western, 34 to 31.

OUR WAR WITH RED CHINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, one of South Carolina's most noted writers on foreign affairs, published in the March 8 issue of National Review a most interesting and informative article entitled "Our War With Red China." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR WAR WITH RED CHINA

(An American editor, basing his view on strategic reality, history, and direct observation, argues that Red China is our enemy in the Vietnam war.)

(By Anthony Harrigan)

I. IN VIETNAM

Though Chinese Communist field armies in Yunnan and Kwangsi Provinces have not received marching orders from Marshal Lin Piao to move across Hanoi's territory into the highlands and coastal regions of South Vietnam, the real enemy facing the South Vietnamese and Americans in the southeast Asian war is Communist China. In warring by proxy, Peiping is resorting to ancient methods; and in North Vietnam, which is furnishing the proxy forces for the fight against the United States, Mao Tse-tung has a tributary state comparable in its supineness to the petty kingdoms that obeyed the will of the Chinese emperors of a thousand years ago.

It is in terms of Peiping's empire building that the South Vietnam war should be understood by the American people. If the United States is to define and attain its objective in the Vietnam war, it must bear in mind that Peiping is carrying out one of the epochal aggressive moves in history. The dimensions of the clash have yet to be spelled out to the U.S. public. The Johnson administration's statements on the Vietnam war do not begin to explain the historical necessity for an American presence on Asian battlefields. It is true that America wants to defend a small and brave nation, South Vietnam. It also is true that a defeat of the South Vietnamese by the Vietcong would have unpleasant effects on U.S. credibility as a great power. But these facts do not completely account for America's massive commitment of men and arms to the Asian struggle. The reason the United States is militarily engaged in Vietnam is that our country's survival is involved in the struggle. Communist China's thrust at the United States, through the agency of the Vietnam war, is as threatening as Japan's attack at Pearl Harbor a generation ago.

The directness of the Chinese Communist challenge cannot be doubted by reasonable men. Americans have the word of Peiping's Defense Minister who, on September 3, 1965, called for a people's war against the United States, saying: "Everything is divisible. And so is this colossus of U.S. imperialism. It can be split up and defeated. The peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and other regions can destroy it piece by piece, some striking at its head and others at its feet."

The message is perfectly clear; Peiping aims at nothing less than the expunging of U.S. power in the world. The stated method is the use of a human wave strategy—the triumph of numbers over our technologically advanced tools of defense.

Now it is true that the U.S. public has yet to experience the shock of recognition of Red China's fury in the Vietnam war. This is not surprising, for it has been a war of skirmishes that has continued by fits and starts. As yet there has been no spectacular direct Chinese action comparable to the Yalu

River crossing in the Korean war. The conflict has been bloody but piecemeal. It has been more like a particularly nasty frontier war, rather than an earth-shaking clash in which the destinies of great nations are involved. Peiping has planned it that way, for Americans would respond instantly and completely to another Pearl Harbor situation, whereas they still find a protracted struggle difficult to understand.

The Peiping regime believes its own propaganda to the effect that the United States is a paper tiger. Its expectation is that the American people have no stomach for a protracted conflict, and tire easily. Nibble by nibble, Red China hopes to swallow the portions of Asia that are under U.S. protection. If the nibbling process proves too time-consuming, then the Chinese Communists stand ready to launch human waves at the American and allied forces, confident that we are psychologically unprepared to deal with massed humanity used as a national weapon.

Much of the surface evidence helps Peiping reach the conclusions it wants to reach. Pacifism is a strong current among many left-oriented American intellectuals. Official indecision in Washington (as exemplified by the bombing pause) lends substance to Red China's belief that the American people want to escape struggle and will go to any length to avoid a test of stamina.

Yet these surface manifestations of weakness are illusory. In other times, other nations have similarly miscalculated the American spirit. If Hitler's ghost could speak, it could tell Mao Tse-tung how wrong he is to write off the American will to win once the survival issue is comprehended.

If Peiping's political analysts were to review America's 20th century history, with an objective eye appraising this Nation's growth and development, they would be compelled to cite the expansiveness of the American national dream. The century opened with Americans engaged in the Philippines. About that same time, U.S. troops were marching with Japanese and other Western forces to rescue Americans besieged in the capital of Imperial China. Throughout the 1920's, the United States helped police China in a period of revolutionary conflict and warlord rule. In 1930, Japan emerged as the chief source of danger in Asia. Four years of total war in the Far East ended with the nuclear humbling of Japan. This was followed by the fragmentation of the Japanese Empire and the reconstruction of Japan's political life on a new basis. Then followed the brief, bitter, but inconclusive clash with Communist China in Korea; the safeguarding of Formosa and the free Chinese offshore islands; and lately the approach toward a fresh confrontation with Peiping on the Asian mainland. In the 1950's the United States made a tremendously significant decision when it physically drew closer to the Asian world by admitting to statehood Hawaii, an island group in the central Pacific, and Alaska, a territory that extends into northern Asia.

It is extremely unlikely that the United States will withdraw from Asia and the Pacific world as Red China demands. The United States has strong ties to Japan, emotional as well as economic and military. Australia is recognized as vital to American security. Twenty-one years after the end of World War II, the United States is more than ever a Pacific power. Already there is talk that the South Pacific islands under American administration may in time become America's 51st State.

Thus the United States can be said to belong in Asia and have a developing role in that part of the globe. As a result of this, the logic of American history conflicts with the logic of the history of Communist China. One of the two nations cannot fulfill the destiny it desires. If Americans look ahead, they can see a bridge of civilization and mutual interest—or more than one bridge—linking the United States and Australia, and the United States and Japan. Australia is a strategic reserve for the free world—a potential new America in the Southern Hemisphere for people of our civilization. Our national destiny lies in the Pacific world, as much as in the Atlantic; and it is this destiny that will be vitally affected by the outcome of the war in Vietnam.

China then and now

Red China has begun a contest in Vietnam, the end of which it may regret. The end—let us admit—must be much more than a mere containing of the Chinese Communist regime. Our struggle, if it is to be effective, must have a much larger strategic objective—nothing less than the arresting of Peiping's expansionism and the fragmenting of the Red Chinese national state. Red China has a grand design: a new China across the seas in Australia and New Zealand, the return of all south Asia (including the Philippines, Indonesia, and India) to the ancient status of tributary states or territories, and the penetration of East Africa by Chinese agents and settlers, thereby fulfilling the dream of Cheng Ho, the eunuch admiral who led imperial fleets across the Indian Ocean in the 15th century.

The Chinese empire in that century did not appreciate its strategic opportunity. China had the technical ability in its naval forces to round the Cape of Good Hope and create bases on or near Europe, precisely as the European voyagers did in Africa and the New World. The Chinese empire in that period could have encircled Europe, as Mao Tse-tung today proposes to surround the advanced nations by means of revolutionary control of the world countryside. But in the 15th century a land party ruled in the imperial capital. The Chinese fleets were ordered back to their ports.

Mao Tse-tung has the ambition and the dream lacked by the Chinese emperors of half a millenium ago. He has marshaled his country's strength and intends to deploy it against the only significant adversary Red China faces to the south and east—the United States. Northward Mao cannot march at this time. Though the Soviet Union occupies former territories of imperial China, the Kremlin has no intention of relaxing the Soviet hold on lands that provide a buffer against the hundreds of millions living to the south.

Whether Mao Tse-tung will succeed in his imperial ambition depends in large measure on the American will to resist and American understanding of the historical mission and challenge facing the United States. Weakness in the United States will be Mao's opportunity. Thus it is imperative that the U.S. forces be utilized in a manner compatible with the extent of the crisis.

At present, U.S. Armed Forces are deployed on the periphery of the Red Chinese Empire. They have not come into direct conflict with Mao's main forces, simply the proxy forces of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese regulars. The United States could spend many years and vast amounts of national treasure fighting the proxy armies. Peiping will be pleased if the United States wears itself out fighting Red Chinese auxiliaries. The odds would be against the United States in a long-range, marginal conflict. Such a struggle gives little scope to the technological superiority which is the strength of the United States. Indeed the United States has been fighting at a disadvantage in the Vietnam war by refraining from the use of powerful weapons in its arsenal. It has been fighting in the zone in which Peiping wants America to fight. While American aircraft have bombed various installations in North Vietnam, the aerial blows have not been directed at the most vital targets. Even if the United States hit the hardest possible blows at North Vietnam, it still would be striking only a tributary of the nation manipulating the entire Asian conflict. Obviously, in a war in Europe the United States could never hope to cripple the Soviet colossus by bombing Bulgaria.

Yet we are tangling with a Bulgaria of the Far East. Thus over a lengthy period we could fight and fight and never finish off the real enemy. This means the United States must reconsider ends and means if it is not to be the loser in the struggle for the future of Asia and the Pacific world.

Perhaps the United States is getting closer to a confrontation with the major enemy. A year ago, few Americans would have considered this possibility. The American people are deeply immersed in their normal pursuits at home. Coming to terms with a direct challenge to national existence is not an easy process. In Vietnam, American troops have had to master anti-insurgent warfare. New tactics and combat air vehicles have had to be developed to deal with Communist revolutionary war forces in the countryside.

Despite new U.S. tactics and weapons for Asian struggles, a direct confrontation with Red China should be recognized as an unprecedented challenge for the American people. As Red China is the most populous country on earth, it is an enormously formidable foe even in the nuclear age. The American Republic should look at the dangers with eyes wide open.

If a direct conflict with Red China should develop, the United States must be very sure of its goals. Time in which to consider goals may not be extensive. Already U.S. aircraft have dropped bombs close to the Red Chinese border. And many Americans must realize that it is possible the future will find bombs being dropped on the other side of the border. In fact it is not inconceivable that U.S. bombing mission in time might inch forward until they reached the gaseous diffusion plants near Lanchow close to the Yellow River—the heart of Red China's nuclear facilities.

A direct confrontation with Red China could develop slowly or swiftly, with conventional or nuclear weapons. It could grow out of a sea blockade or materialize in the form of an amphibious assault against Hainan, the giant island that serves as a forward base for Peiping in its design on southeast Asia. No one seriously considers a conventional land campaign across the width of mainland China. It is not out of the question, however, that a U.S. strategic plan aimed at humbling Red China might (after an aerial knockout blow against nuclear facilities, railroads, and industrial plants) include occupation of key ports and coastal cities. In these areas the representatives of the legitimate government of the Republic of China might be installed to exercise civil power. It was precisely such an opportunity that President Chiang Kai-shek noted in a speech December 22, 1965, in which he proposed the study of programs for civil administration in mainland zones after the return of free Chinese troops.

Clearly, the U.S. aim should not be to expunge China as a nation. Even if that were possible, it would only create a power vacuum that the Soviet Union would hasten to fill. But it is well within the capability and interest of the United States not only to curb Red China's warmaking capacity (absolutely destroying its nuclear production facilities), but to arrest and reverse the growth mechanism of the Chinese Communist society. In this connection, Prof. George E. Taylor, director of the Far Eastern and Russian Institute of the University of Washington, recently stated in the Virginia Quarterly

Review that "our future in Asia is to participate in what may well be a long and decisive period in the decline of communism as an ideology and a system of state power."

This objective is as yet not fully understood by the American public. It is a goal that will be bitterly opposed by those elements in the United States who prefer coexistence with humiliation—even at the risk of future annihilation by Red China—to a test of wills between our free society and the anthill society of Red China.

It should not be cockiness that impels the United States to a confrontation with Red China, no matter how much we appreciate the real strength of our Nation. A confrontation, insofar as it is a deliberate choice on the part of the United States, should be firmly rooted in understanding that a conflict must be under the conditions and at the time of our own choosing so as to be most advantageous to our country and our civilization. A direct confrontation can only be justified on the basis of compelling necessity to assure our national survival. To wait past the limit of safety, to wear out U.S. forces in peripheral warfare while Red China rubs American nerve raw by heavy casualties over a long period (and while Peiping builds up its nuclear delivery capability)—all this would involve endangering the United States to the point of risking its continued existence. Thus if the United States must fight a major battle for its survival every effort should be devoted to assuring the success of the American strikes against the vitals of its chief enemy. Any other course of action would involve frittering away U.S. strength.

Hopefully, the military decisions made by the President will be related to a rational, long-range political goal such as the fragmenting of Red China. Those who view such a task as impossible should bear in mind that many empires have been fragmented in the past. World War I dissolved the German and Austro-Hungarian empires. World War II led to the dismantlement of the British and French empires. If the Ukraine had been detached from the Soviet state immediately after the Russian Revolution, the Soviet empire today would not be such a disturber of the peace.

To think in such sweeping terms may trouble some Americans. But it takes only a moment to recall that the United States fragmented the Japanese Empire in 1945, occupied the home islands, subordinated the revered Emperor to an American military pro-consul, amputated Japanese overseas territories—and today Japan is a good friend of the United States, and content within its territorial limits. What was achieved in taking aggression out of the Japanese Empire of the 1930's and 1940's can be done with the Red Chinese Empire if the American people are convinced of the need to do it.

II. IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Peiping is engaged in what it calls a war of no boundaries. Even as the military clash in the Far East transcends the physical limits of individual Asian States, the war is also waged in the political dimension. One of the principal war theaters for the forces of communism is the United Nations organization. The U.N. building on the East River is as much a combat zone as the Mekong River in South Vietnam.

Fulfilling the dictum of Sun Tzu—"Uproar in the east, strike in the west"—Mao Tse-tung hopes to score a major diplomatic and psychological warfare victory in 1966 by having Red China admitted to the United Nations.

If this happens, the United States will suffer a political defeat that would be the equivalent of a staggering military setback. Opposition to Communist China's admission to the U.N. has been a central feature of American foreign policy since the Communists came to power in Peiping. If Communist China were admitted to the United Nations organization, the United States would suffer a tremendous loss of face. It would be a colossal humiliation for the American people that could not be redressed by any ordinary feat of arms.

From the loss of face would stem grave political consequences. The Asian world undoubtedly would regard Communist China's admission to the U.N. as evidence that Peiping stands for the wave of the future. There would be tremendous pressure inside Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, India and Japan to seek an accommodation with the government of Mao Tse-tung. In the same measure it would be a reversal for the free Chinese in Asia, who believe that the land and civilization of China in time will be rescued from the new barbarians now in power on the mainland. Admission of Red China would also give its regime the respectability and platform that it seeks. It would make possible subversion of U.N. agencies and troublemaking inside the United States itself. All in all it would symbolize a giant step forward, in the political dimension, for the aggressor state that is attempting to overrun the free nations of Asia.

It is incredible, of course, that supposedly responsible states should consider Communist China eligible for membership in the United Nations. Article IV of the U.N. Charter specifies that the organization is open only to peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter. Most certainly, Red China—which has made a total commitment to violence as a national way of life—does not meet this basic formal test. Nevertheless, many governments are ready to admit Red China, no matter how much of a moral shock such an action would give to those Asian nations that want to preserve their independence.

Peiping in the U.N.?

In asking themselves why Red China is able to rally such wide support at the very time its aggressiveness is so manifest, Americans should bear in mind that force often compels obedience through fear. It is Red China's military prowess, especially its extraordinary achievement in sending infantrymen across the world's most formidable natural barrier—the Himalayas—that has excited the fear which is at the root of many votes in Peiping's behalf.

The last go-round at the U.N. saw Red China again excluded from membership, but by the closest of votes. Next time, unless the United States takes unprecedented action, Peiping will probably be admitted. It will have driven a salient into the organization that is dedicated by the terms of its charter to peace and international order.

The turn of the tide in the U.N. in favor of Red China's admission stems from America's failure to conduct a political offensive against Peiping to back up the U.S. military effort in the Far East. It has been as though our representatives at the U.N. didn't realize that there was a war on in Vietnam—a war masterminded by Mao. American policy toward Communist China has been characterized by negative thinking. Our goal has been the limited one of isolating Peiping; and we haven't worked very hard at that. Our vast national power has not been employed to make it difficult for those states that have traded with Red China. We have sat back and done nothing while Canada, for example, sold vast quantities of wheat to the Chinese Communists, thereby enabling Peiping to feed its armies.

It is not surprising that U.S. policy has been so negative on the political front, for the partisans of Western withdrawal from Asia have been immensely active. Thus one finds Malcolm Caldwell writing last year in International Affairs (London) and referring to American aggression and Chinese restraint. Professor Caldwell expressed profound defeatism when he said that "America could take steps toward conceding the eventual necessity of accepting things as they are (in Asia) and not trying to shape them to her wishes." Walter Lippmann tirelessly repeats the same pseudo-realist refrain, and —a new convert to isolationism—attacks "globalist illusion." Prof. Hans Morgenthau proclaims the inevitability of Peiping's domination of all Asian lands and waters. The defeatists are in truth attempting to condition the American mind to the inevitability of Peiping's rape of Asia.

Among the intellectual scandals of our time is the strategic blindness and moral obtuseness of many writers and academicians who would dismiss Red China's appetite for aggression. Thus Prof. Harold S. Quigley, of the University of Minnesota, has dared to say: "In my judgment, Red China has not and does not now menace the national security of the United States."

Fortunately, the American people and the Congress have a keener awareness of the danger that Red China poses to the United States. If other nations refuse to recognize this danger, the United States must act in the interest of its own survival. It has to use the best political weapon available. This, like the atomic bomb, we have never used since the United Nations organization was created; it is, of course, the veto.

American reluctance to use the veto, which the Soviet Union has used on so many occasions, has made Americans almost forget that the right to the veto is a power we can legitimately exercise whenever we choose to do so. As one of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, the United States may use the veto to prevent Red China from being admitted. The Security Council, after all, must approve the admission of every new member of the United Nations, no matter how the General Assembly votes.

The veto is a proper instrument for protecting the security interests of the United States and its allies in the struggle against Red China's war of political and military conquest. Its use would signal a tough new political line toward the Communists' warfare state in Asia. Certainly, if the United States is close to using its power in new ways in a direct military confrontation with Red China, then the time has come for a political confrontation. To open new military campaigns against Red China's forces in the Far East battlefield, and at the same time to let Peiping score a political victory in the U.N. would be an enormous folly. Indeed if the United States is not going to retire before Red China, but intends to fight for its interests, then it is necessary that the war be conducted with a full mixture of political and military arms. The veto can be the decisive weapon on the U.N. battlefield.

RHODESIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I rise to protest the continued American participation in the international efforts to topple the newly independent nation of Rhodesia by means of the unjustified economic sanctions presently being imposed against that friendly government. Never in the history of American diplomacy has the cooperation of the American Government been pledged to such an unworthy cause.

Many Americans who have been opposed to or disturbed by our ever deepening involvement in this tragic affair, as well as many others who have thus far supported our Rhodesian policy on the naive assumption that these economic sanctions would suffice to topple the Smith government, are now alarmed by mounting reports to the effect that our State Department is seriously considering an American endorsement of or participation in a military move against that friendly, peaceful, non-Communist country. And I predict that our involvement in the internal affairs of that small nation will soon become a major source of national discontent as the truth and the facts surrounding our role in that tragic affair are more fully developed.

Mr. President, on November 11, 1965, the legally constituted Government of Rhodesia proclaimed its independence from Great Britain with a proclamation echoing the American Declaration of Independence.

As declared by the Rhodesian proclamation:

> Whereas in the course of human affairs history has shown that it may become necessary for a people to dissolve the political affiliations which have connected them with another people and to assume amongst other nations the separate and equal status to which they are entitled.

The State Department wasted little time in becoming involved in the internal affairs of the new nation of Rhodesia. On November 12, Ambassador Goldberg dramatically appeared before the United Nations Security Council to announce the following hostile steps being taken by our Government toward the Smith regime:

First. Recall of the U.S. Counsel General from Salisbury and the termination of status of five Rhodesian diplomats in Washington.

Second. Immediate imposition of a comprehensive embargo on the shipment of all arms and military equipment to Rhodesia.

Third. Withholding of Rhodesia's 1966 quota for importation of sugar into the United States, in violation of contractual obligations already incurred by American commercial interests.

Fourth. Suspension of action on all Rhodesian applications for loan or credit facilities.

Fifth. Warnings to American investors about the risks of capital investment in Rhodesia.

Sixth. Discouragement of private travel to Rhodesia by American citizens.

Subsequently, the U.S. Government has progressively imposed embargoes on American exports to Rhodesia culminating on February 26 with the issuance of a Commerce Department order the effect of which is, according to press reports, "to halt virtually all U.S. exports to Rhodesia." These steps have been taken despite the fact that trade between the United States and Rhodesia runs 2 to 1 in favor of America, at a level of approximately $21 million in American annual sales in Rhodesia as contrasted to $11 million in Rhodesian sales in the United States.

Control of Rhodesian imports into this country raises more difficult legal problems, but these have been circumvented by administrative pressure upon American importers of chrome, asbestos, lithium and tobacco. These steps have been taken despite the fact that America has traditionally relied upon Rhodesia for approximately 50 percent of our metallurgical chrome supply, and despite the fact that American tobacco mechants have substantial investments in Rhodesia which will be placed in jeopardy if these trade sanctions are continued.

Mr. President, article I, section 8, clause 3 of the American Constitution specifically enumerates that Congress shall have the exclusive power to "regulate commerce with foreign Nations." Within this past year the Congress, acting pursuant to the exclusive authority vested by the commerce clause, amended the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide that:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States (A) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States and (B) to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies, or information, to refuse to take any action * * * which has the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

In view of the commerce clause of the Constitution and the foregoing section of the Export Control Act of 1949, I ask by what authority the administration has announced a system of discriminatory licensing of foreign imports from Rhodesia, while advising American business interests against the importation of goods from that friendly nation? This same question was asked by Representative GROSS and has yet to be answered by the administration or the congressional advocates of our present policies toward Rhodesia. As stated by Representative GROSS:

> No power is vested in the executive to block foreign trade except under laws which control trading with the enemy and Rhodesia has not been designated an enemy.

The Honorable David Lawrence, distinguished political observer and news commentator, in a learned and comprehensive analysis of our present participation in the economic boycott against the Smith government, raised some serious questions as to the constitutional and foreign policy precedents being set by our present course of action. In his column appearing in the Washington Evening Star of November 24, 1965, Mr. Lawrence observed:

> Unprecedented things are happening today in the conduct of the Government of the United States—but most people aren't paying any attention to it, and representatives of both parties in Congress are strangely silent.
>
> Nowhere in the Constitution, for instance, is the President given the right to decide for himself with what countries trade shall be conducted or what tariff duties shall be imposed—unless Congress specifically authorizes such broad powers by legislation.
>
> Yet, over the past weekend, the United States voted in the Security Council of the United Nations to call on Britain to quell the rebellion in Rhodesia. Then Ambassador Arthur Goldberg announced various economic measures decided upon by this Government to carry out the purposes of the resolution. He declared that steps will be taken to tighten the economic squeeze on the Rhodesian secessionists and said that President Johnson had cancelled Rhodesia's 1966 sugar-import quota of 9,500 tons—a shipment which already was on the high seas en route to America. Goldberg added:
>
> "The President has suspended Rhodesia's sugar quota for 1965 and has directed that this shipment will not be accepted. We will continue to consider urgently any other steps which will ensure that no action is taken to assist the illegal regime in Salisbury, Rhodesia. The writing is on the wall. The misguided rebels in Southern Rhodesia would do well to heed the voice of the Council and the voice of the vast majority of the nations of the world."
>
> But coincidentally American boys are being killed or wounded in South Vietnam as a result of attacks by the troops of the North Vietnamese Government—a regime that is obtaining supplies and commodities through trading with many nations of the world. But nothing is being done here to cut off trade between the United States and such countries.
>
> * * * * *
>
> If the principle is accepted that the executive branch has absolute power in international affairs—despite the plain words of the Constitution that Congress shall have the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations"—then the United States will again and again find itself in an awkward position with respect to policies pursued internally by various countries in the world. The economic weapon can be a powerful one, and Congress unquestionably would grant authority when an embargo would protect directly the interests of the United States. It is unlikely, however, that authorization would be given to pass judgment upon the internal policies of any country and to set up yardsticks to determine whether any government is or is not truly representative of the wishes of the people.
>
> * * * * *
>
> To use the economic power of the United States to meddle in the political affairs of a country in another hemisphere is unprecedented. The acquiescence of many people in a policy which reveals an avowed purpose to intervene in the internal affairs of Rhodesia is inexplicable.

This arrogation of constitutional authority by these executive decrees banning trade with Rhodesia has not gone unnoticed by other newspaper columnists around the country. Mr. Lyle Wilson, UPI correspondent, observed in his column:

> It does seem to be a fact that President Johnson stumbled over the U.S. Constitution when he undertook to interrupt commerce between the United States and newly independent Rhodesia in Africa.
>
> There is not much if any constitutional or other authority for the President of the United States to undertake the regulation of foreign commerce. Article 1, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution asserts in language both plain and vigorous that:
>
> "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is quite possible, of course, that global considerations dictate U.S. support of the British boycott against Rhodesia but that would not automatically make it constitutional.
>
> A recent news dispatch from Salisbury, Rhodesia, reported that the British were fudging on their own boycott. A British

> waiver of boycott restrictions was said to have enabled British concerns to import scarce chrome ore from Rhodesia after American firms had begun to boycott the Rhodesian ore. Chrome is scarce. Alternate supplies for the United States are in Turkey and the Soviet Union. But Turkey was reported to be unable to step up production to meet U.S. needs before August of next year.
>
> Out of the Johnson administration action against trade with Rhodesia, arises need for two inquiries:
>
> One by L.B.J. to determine the facts relating to chrome ore and a second by Congress to establish under what authority, if any, the President undertook to regulate U.S. commerce with Rhodesia. If no authority can be shown, the attempted regulation should cease.

This very serious assumption by the Executive branch of our government of a constitutional authority specifically vested in the Congress, was also the subject of a critical editorial appearing in the National Review Bulletin of December 21, 1965, wherein it stated:

> But to cancel the contracted enterprises of private citizens (as in the case of the 9,500 tons of Rhodesian sugar in transit to a U.S. buyer), to seize bank deposits, to prohibit commercial and financial undertakings between U.S. citizens and Rhodesians white or black? Under what law exactly, under what provision of the Constitution, does the President decree such measures?
>
> Oh, well, United States-Rhodesian trade doesn't amount to a damn anyway, so what's the sweat—at most, our actions have a symbolic significance. Indeed they do have a symbolic significance, and we will do well to try to understand just what they symbolize. Besides being symbol, moreover, they are, or become, precedent. Is this a precedent we really want to see established: that the President, without reference to law, to Congress or the courts, can on the single basis of his own reading of events, order us to break our contracts and tell us with whom we may or may not do business?

The illegal trade restrictions which have been sanctioned against the friendly people of Rhodesia by no other authority than administrative decree, as well as the publicly announced policy of our State Department to assist in toppling the Smith government, not only for the purpose of destroying the political institutions which they have wisely deemed best suited for their developing nation, but to impose upon them a system of government the primary objective of which being the furtherance of Anglo-American foreign policy objectives in Africa, is in direct contradiction to those principles enunciated in the state of the Union address of January 12, 1966, wherein are found the following statements:

> We will work to strengthen economic cooperation, to reduce barriers to trade, and to improve international finance.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence, the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions.
>
> For a peaceful world order will be possible only when each country walks the way that it has chosen to walk for itself.

It is also interesting to note that in the state of the Union address of December 2, 1823, another Chief Executive stated a policy which has become a basic principle of American diplomacy to the present date. That statement became known as the Monroe Doctrine, and reads as follows:

> The political system of the allied powers is essentially different * * * from that of America. * * * We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.
>
> With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered (Florida?) and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence * * * we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

For a country which has traditionally warned European powers against meddling in the affairs of the newly independent nations of this hemisphere, it seems somewhat ludicrous to say the least, that we should now find ourselves committed to a policy of overthrowing the government of an African nation and imposing upon it a political system of our own design. Our present ultimatum to the Rhodesian people becomes even more absurd when viewed in light of the rank hypocrisy with which our State Department applies a double standard around the world. It is highly improbable that more than a handful of the nations which have been created under the protective shield of our policy of self-determination have at any time in their history afforded their people the rights, the orderly legal processes, the economic opportunities or the political stability which is presently extended to the population of Rhodesia.

It is highly unfortunate, Mr. President, that at a time when we find ourselves so heavily committed to the defense of southeast Asia, Western Europe, and South America, we have embarked upon a course of action which threatens to involve our Nation in the problems of the troubled continent of Africa. I am sure the American people had hoped that our lesson in the Congo would cure our State Department's desire to assume responsibility for the peace and safety of these African nations.

As late as 1962, with the adoption of the recommendations of the Clay Committee on Foreign Aid, we adhered to the principle that the essential responsibility for guiding Africa's emerging nations rested with their former colonial sponsors. As stated by Washington columnist, John Bartlett:

> The theory has been that the interest and experience of these countries in African life, plus the preoccupation of the United States with the rest of the developing world, causes this to be a logical assignment of responsibilities.

We have now departed from this wise policy and find ourselves pledged to a course of action which is frought with potential danger.

There is another ironic aspect of our participation in an economic boycott of the non-Communist nation of Rhodesia which likewise raises serious questions concerning our role in that sad affair. In the state of the Union address of January 12, we find this statement:

> We follow this principle by building bridges to Eastern Europe. I will ask the Congress for authority to remove the special tariff restrictions which are a barrier to increasing trade between the East and the West.

The American people cannot understand the logic or the morality in the imposition of special trade restrictions as a barrier to trade with the non-Communist nation of Rhodesia on the one hand, while acting "to remove the special tariff restrictions which are a barrier to increasing trade between" this country and the Communist puppet states of Eastern Europe on the other.

Nor can the American people understand how our State Department spokesman in the United Nations can now pledge our country to a hostile policy of economic sanctions and possible military action against the non-Communist nation of Rhodesia, when these same professional diplomats urged our country to adhere to a policy of strict nonintervention when the reign of Communist tyranny gradually enshrouded the bludgeoned states of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania in direct violation of treaty obligations, and subsequently extended diplomatic recognition to these same blood-stained dictatorships.

As early as October 13, 1965, David Lawrence pointed out the hypocrisy of the double standard being applied against Rhodesia. In his column appearing in the Evening Star of that date, Mr. Lawrence commented:

> An event of tremendous significance has just occurred in the United Nations. By a vote of 107 to 2, the General Assembly has called on Britain to refuse to accept a declaration of independence by Rhodesia, because the latter's present government will not grant a majority of the inhabitants self-rule but will continue to give a white minority the preponderant power.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Thus, for example, the populations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are overwhelmingly white, but their independence is impaired by an outside power which holds them in subjugation under Communist colonialism.
>
> The fact that the General Assembly of the United Nations now is insisting on self-government for different nations throughout the world which have been ruled by outside powers is an encouraging sign. The captive nations in Eastern Europe, however, have never had the benefit of a United Nations resolution declaring that they should enjoy independence and be allowed to develop autonomously without interference from other governments. Certainly the United Nations has never advocated the use of "all possible force" to deal with this problem, as it has just recommended with respect to Rhodesia.
>
> In the case of the satellite countries in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union supposedly gave independence to this bloc of nations but nevertheless has managed to retain control through the apparatus of the Communist Party and often with military forces.

> The Russians try to spread the impression every now and then that these Eastern European countries are independent and can make trade arrangements with other parts of the world. But the fact remains that they do not really have self-government.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The State Department here has indicated it will participate in economic sanctions whereby trade would be cut off and aid of various kinds would be interrupted if the Rhodesian leaders insist upon separating themselves from the British and going it alone.
>
> But it will be asked, just why shouldn't Britain and other countries be willing to apply the same formula to Red China? For the Peiping regime has undertaken to prevent a majority of the people in South Vietnam from maintaining their independence.

How unbelievable it must be to the American people, to hear the delegates from such tribal states as Zambia demanding in the General Assembly of the U.N. that the standard of "one man, one vote" be imposed upon Rhodesia in order to assure majority rule, when that same nation supports the organization of the very forum from which they speak, where its 3½ million people cast the same vote as 179 million American citizens.

To consistently apply the standard by which we now judge the legitimacy of the Government of Rhodesia, would require severing our diplomatic relations with, and ending our economic aid to, all of the Communist countries, most of our allies, and would certainly require our withdrawal from the United Nations.

And what a strange paradox, Mr. President, that a country which continued to supply Red China during the Korean war, and refused to recognize America's boycott of Communist Cuba when our vital interests are at stake in the Caribbean, and which politely declines to forsake the benefits of its trade with Hanoi, even while American boys are fighting and dying on the battlefield, or to contribute one British pound or soldier to support our effort there, can now demand and obtain our immediate participation in, and economic support for, their boycott of the friendly, anti-Communist Government of Rhodesia.

The cruel irony of the situation becomes even more acute when we note the fact that the struggling nation of Rhodesia has offered military forces to fight in Vietnam.

Mr. Smith, whose message was read to a conference of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, said that the United States is, in his belief, embarked upon its present course of action in order that the backward peoples of the world "shall be free to choose between the compulsive doctrine of the Reds which demands subjugation to the state and of the Reds which demands subjugation to the state and freedom to live thir lives according to their desires. We in Rhodesia are involved in a death struggle with those same forces that seek to annihilate the very basis of our existence."

Mr. Smith said that he did not wish to be unduly cynical, but asked:

> Is it not significant that the Socialist regime in Britain has balked at the idea of committing troops to fight our common enemy in Vietnam?

Mr. Smith's message dwelt on the problems faced by the emerging African nations in recent years. He said:

> Unfortunately, Communist rule in the guise of military dictatorships is the pattern emerging right through Africa.
>
> Astonishingly, the philosophy of the West seems to be: "If violence and mayhem is visited on black Africans by black Africans, that is as it should be, but if a white African presumes to protect his heritage against the black instruments of communism, then nothing suffices but his complete extinction.

Mr. Smith said that in World War II many Rhodesians fought under American commanders, and in later years Rhodesia sent a contingent of troops to Malaysia and had sincere hopes that their stand against communism would be recognized.

Mr. Smith said:

> Today, we are holding the line in the battle against communism in Africa. In spite of this, my Government is prepared to offer to your President tangible help in your struggle against the Communists in Vietnam * * * what we ask in return is similar sympathy and understanding from the people of the United States in the justice of our cause.

Not only have the British shown an increasing reluctance to participate in enterprises which we judge to be of vital interest to the United States, but they have revealed a rather persistent inclination to call upon us to bail them out of their national crises and to shoulder a larger share in the defense of their commercial interests around the world. But perhaps we expect too much from a government which encourages its people to go into the jungles of Africa, to build a civilized nation with their toil and sweat, which accepts the benefits of their trade in time of peace and their sacrifices in time of war, and then elects to treat them as expendable, to sacrifice them to the insatiable demands of African demagogs who have brought only terror, despair, and chaos to their own people.

No, Mr. President, the families of those American boys in Vietnam are not amused at the ludicrous absurdity of our hostile policy toward a people who have offered to fight by their side, or our support for a nation which continues to trade with the very enemy which is now in the field against them.

To many American citizens, the Rhodesian issue brings into sharper focus the question as to the advisability of such a close association with an ally which has proven not only expensive but increasingly unreliable when the chips are down. The rank hypocrisy involved in the British request for American participation in its economic war against Rhodesia was very ably exposed in a recent article by the distinguished political commentator James J. Kilpatrick, appearing in the December 21, 1965, issue of the Washington Post. Commenting on Mr. Wilson's ridiculous explanation of as to why his country has refused to cooperate with the American sanctions against Cuba and North Vietnam, while asking American help against the non-Communist nation of Rhodesia, Mr. Kilpatrick caustically noted:

> Consider, if you please, the matter of Cuba, it is passing strange, merely to touch upon one point, that Wilson should have chosen to disprove a parallel by first emphasizing the "illegal" nature of the Smith regime. One has difficulty in recalling when Fidel Castro was elected to anything. Nor is one especially impressed by Wilson's denunciation (in his speech to Commons on Dec. 10) of the "police state methods" instituted by Smith at Salisbury. No measures taken in Rhodesia since November 11 could compare with the oppressions and confications imposed by Castro in Cuba.
>
> Yet there was much more. It was the official position of our own Government, long before that historic October of 1962, that Castro's Cuba presented a formidable threat to international security. As far back as May 1961, the House voted 401 to 2 to declare Cuba "a base and staging area for Communist subversion throughout the hemisphere." In the spring of 1962, Kennedy proclaimed a renewed embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba, and called upon our NATO Allies to support our position.
>
> Our good friends in England could not have cared less about assisting the United States in the enforcement of sanctions thought vital to U.S. interests. Over the first 8 months of 1962, 432 non-Communist ships carried Communist cargoes to Cuba; the Greeks were first, with 97 of these; the British ranked second with 77.
>
> In the fall of 1962 came the great confrontation, when the missiles were discovered and the world held its breath. Kennedy once more begged the British to clamp down on trade with Castro. On October 11, 1962, British shipowners voted unanimously to refuse.
>
> Throughout this period, British tankers carried oil to Cuba. Canada sold wheat to Cuba by the millions of bushels. In the summer of 1963, Kennedy asked Britain to ban trade and travel to Cuba; Britain refused. In February 1964, the effects of continued British trade with Castro were so serious that the United States temporarily suspended military aid to Britain.
>
> But hi, ho, parallels run awry. The U.S. Government supports Britain's sanctions against Rhodesia to the hilt—private contracts canceled, export restrictions imposed, funds frozen. And now, as the Prime Minister told the press conference, it is anticipated that U.S. planes will assist in an airlift of oil to Zambia.
>
> The sole ambition of Ian Smith appears to be to cling to an island of Western stability in a flood of African nationalism. It would not seem an unworthy ambition. But our Government will join the gang in seeking to pull him loose. We will crush him; we will bring him to heel. And meanwhile, our good friends of the West continue to trade not only with Castro in Cuba but also with Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam. In the world of presidents and prime ministers, one concludes, the theorems of geometry seldom apply; and parallel lines proceed elliptically instead.

Even more disturbing than the economic sanctions which have been decreed against the Rhodesian Government, are the increasing reports by reliable American and English news commentators to the effect that direct military action may soon be employed to bring down the government of Ian Smith. Typical of these reports was an article by Karl E. Mayer, foreign service correspondent for the Washington Post, appearing in the January 4 issue of that newspaper. The story carried a London dateline and stated as follows:

> Despite public disclaimers, the British Government is reconsidering its view that force is ruled out in resolving the Rhodesian crisis.

> Information from many quarters indicates that the British have moved away from a belief that economic sanctions alone would suffice to bring down the insurgent regime of Prime Minister Ian Smith.
>
> It is admitted in official circles that Prime Minister Wilson was initially too sanguine about the efficacy of sanctions in altering Rhodesian opinion. He also overestimated his ability to contain the hostile African reaction to his strategy.
>
> ### "HOW?" IS QUESTION NOW
>
> The question today is less whether and more how force could be used to end the Rhodesian secession. One possibility follows these lines:
>
> By March or April, the psychological moment may be ripe for a showdown, since economic sanctions will have begun to take real effect.
>
> The showdown could come in the form of an appeal from Sir Humphrey Gibbs, whom Britain recognizes as the sole constitutional authority in the colony.
>
> If Gibbs designated a new government in Rhodesia and called on the colony's armed forces to honor their pledge to the Queen and to support his decisions, a split among the military would probably occur.
>
> The split could produce a state of civil disorder that would enable Wilson to intervene in Rhodesia without contradicting his repeated pledges against the use of force.
>
> ### LOOPHOLE RETAINED
>
> This is because Wilson has always allowed himself at least one major loophole—that force could be employed to maintain civil order in the colony.

Thus it is admitted that the purpose of the economic sanctions against Rhodesia is not to prevent a civil war within that country, but to cause one. In order to justify the use of military force against the peaceful people of Rhodesia, as demanded by the United Nations resolution, the English now find it necessary to provoke internal disorder in that country.

The report that direct intervention will be employed against Rhodesia if the economic sanctions have not toppled that Government by April, calls to mind that famous poem which described the result of the first military move against our young Nation in 1776; a campaign which was likewise undertaken in that same month:

> By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
>   Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
> Here once the embattled farmers stood,
>   And fired the shot heard round the world.

Mr. President, the American people are entitled to know what our policy will be when these embattled farmers are also forced to fire in defense of their nation's independence.

What will our policy be when we have plunged this tranquil land of peaceful farmers into the abyss of civil war and have succeeded in igniting the fires of racial conflict throughout Africa?

Once we have endorsed, sponsored, or participated in a military expedition against that small nation, what will our policy be if the crack troops of the South African army move across the border in response to their neighbors call for help?

What will our policy be when the conflict spreads without the borders of Rhodesia, when the entire continent of Africa is engulfed by the night of barbarism which has descended upon the Congo, Ghana, and other African nations?

In the Congo we brought pressure upon the Belgian Government to grant the same unqualified democracy to the people of that new nation, and thereby accepted joint responsibility for the tragic events that followed there. Now we insist that the same policy be followed in Rhodesia, and express surprise that the Rhodesians have elected to fight rather than submit to the chaos which accompanied the abortive transfer of authority to the so-called Nationalist leaders of that tragic land.

The disgusting spectacle of these United Nations delegates, including our own, crying out in self-righteous indignation for the use of force to insure a one-man, one-vote democracy in Rhodesia, is so incredibly hypocritical as to almost defy belief, particularly when exposed to the most casual investigation of the conditions existing in the accusing nations. As stated by Lloyd Shearer, in an article appearing in the March 13, 1966, issue of Parade, the Sunday newspaper magazine:

> Most of Asia, most of South America, most of Africa and much of Europe—in fact, the great majority of the world's people—live more or less under totalitarian regimes, so that we may safely call our era the age of dictatorship and ask ourselves if most of the rest of the world wants or is ready for the sophisticated form of government known as democracy.

Referring to the present status of the new states of Africa, the article stated:

> In Africa it is much the same story. Since 1957, 13 new countries have gained independence in West Africa. In 1957, 11 of those countries boasted at least 2 substantial political parties. Today, the reverse is true. Eleven have become single-party states.
>
> The central political problem in post-independent Africa is how a government can rise above local and tribal differences to create a national loyalty. To deal with this problem Africa has produced the one-party state in which a strong central government is needed to hold the state together. Minorities have to be suppressed lest they challenge the central authority and disrupt the state. But politically this has meant that the party which found itself in power at the time of independence has brutally rooted out all opposition as a potentially subversive force. And the rulers of the various independence parties have become dictators more or less to guide the destiny of the nations with which they totally identify.

Yet, these are the conditions which the State Department, the British Foreign Office and the United Nations now attempt to force the Rhodesian government to emulate. We have heard so much propaganda about the success of our policy of "Africa for the Africans" as enunciated by Soapy Williams and company, I think it only fair that we note a few examples of how our abortive experiments in national independence have worked out in practice. The Washington Daily News of January 17, carried a story by Richard H. Boyce, Scripps-Howard staff writer, wherein he noted the conditions in a few of those countries which our State Department apparently considers to be showplaces of African democracy. Mr. Boyce states:

> The Congo government fell to a military coup, and the weak new government is ill-prepared to deal with a hard-hit economy, widespread hunger and unemployment, and the constant threat of renewed rebellion in the bush.
>
> Across the river in the former French Congo the government's life blood has been sapped by Chinese-linked Communists who dominate the country. Efforts to end this have begun, but feebly, and are not likely to succeed in 1966.
>
> ### THEY SEE RED
>
> In the past month, army leaders toppled governments in Dahomey, Upper Volta, and the Central African Republic.
>
> In each case the excuse was "to save the nation from Chinese communism. But only more confusion and weakness will result.
>
> Sulan's northern Arabs still massacre the southern Christian Negroes. Ethiopia and Somalia still fight an undeclared border war which often spills over into Kenya.
>
> Tanzania's President Julius Nyerere fights for his political life against surging leftist extremism abetted by Peiping, while thousands of alien rebels use his country as a haven to plot war against the white man.
>
> ### SLAUGHTER
>
> Neighboring Uganda is racked with political schisms, while bloodshed continues the order of the day in neighboring Burundi, whose Premier and every elected officer of both parliamentary houses were slain, and America's Ambassador kicked out, while the Burundi King dallies in the Swiss Alps.
>
> All this is largely because Africa's people were unprepared for sudden independence. They don't understand the big gap between dreams and reality. Economic instability makes security forces necessary, and this power breeds ambition. Also, some ambitious political leaders who have no army behind them turn to Communists who promise money and support—for a price.

Nor can our State Department divorce itself from the responsibility it shares for this tragic state of affairs in Africa, or absolve our Government of its complicity in these premature experiments in self-government. They were warned time and time again that these African nations were headed for the most ruthless forms of dictatorship, but still they pressed on for immediate self-rule for all of the colonial territories.

In October of 1963, the Prime Minister of Rhodesia and Nyasaland paid a special visit to the President of the United States in order to bring this deteriorating situation to his attention. While in Washingon he told the National Press Club:

> A most unpleasant matter is the form of government which pan-Africanism is bringing to the Continent of Africa, the dictatorships and single-party states which that movement favors. I have called it a confidence trick that these new dictatorships are now accepted as suited to the African. It is also, I think, a matter of dishonor.

Posing some embarrassing questions about American foreign policy in Africa, the Prime Minister continued:

> But I'll ask another question: Do we not want progress for the Africans as much as we want progress for the people of this continent, or Europe or elsewhere? Must he be forced back into the past? This I know is not what the African wants. The people of the continent cry out for education, for skill and work their condition is as poor today as it has ever been, yet all they are getting is the costly pomp of independence which to them means subservience to more ruthless and exacting masters than ever colonialism came near to bringing.
>
> There are no checks and balances in these new states, and little integrity. Instead

> power is growing more absolute day by day—and poverty for the people remains as real as it ever was before. The gift of freedom has been to the politician in power, not the people, nor can the people now easily change the governments they have got. They cannot do it by constitutional means. They cannot do it by opposition to the ruling party. Change now can only come with the death of the dictator, and in condoning what has happened the Western Powers have made it almost certain that political change in Africa must be by assassination. To those who may think I have exaggerated, may I say that in the last 2 years in Africa alone one such dictator has been assassinated and at least two attempts made on the life of a second.
>
> And so, I repeat—what right have we to wish this upon the people of Africa and why should we think that it suits an African to be the subject of such a state?

But our State Department experts on African affairs have shown themselves disinclined to listen to anything that might alter the course to which we have been committed. As shown by their efforts to silence the small Rhodesian Information Office here in Washington, they apparently cannot even tolerate the existence of any informaiton which tends to expose the absurdity of their African policies. As was so ably expressed by Chrysostom in his Trojan Discourse:

> Like men with sore eyes: they find the light painful, while the darkness, which permits them to see nothing, is restful and agreeable.

But I suggest that the time has come to pierce the news blackout which has thus far cloaked their operations in Africa and has shielded them from the criticism of an enlightened public.

Mr. President, how strange it is to hear this same State Department crown that led the American people to believe that Mao was a simple agrarian reformer, that Castro was a modern version of Robin Hood, and that Kwame Nkrumah was a contemporary of George Washington, now tell us that the interests of Rhodesia's Negro population will be best served by turning the country over to Joshua Nkomo and his black nationalist terrorists.

Following the pattern of other African takeovers, the black nationalist leaders of Rhodesia attempted earlier to wage the same savage and bestial campaign on atrocities against their own people. In 1961 Robert C. Ruark described the black nationalist strategy in Rhodesia in an article appearing in the Washington Daily News of October 5 of that year. I will insert the entire article at the end of my remarks, but I would like to note several paragraphs contained therein at this point as stated by Mr. Ruark:

> SALISBURY, SOUTHERN RHODESIA.—The topic here is terrorism; in short, intimidation, irresponsibility, sabotage, and a concerted effort by outside powers to inflame and create chaos. The pawns are wild, unemployed young men—youth wings, so to speak—who are spurred to violence and mass insurrection by skillful drill masters of social discontent.
>
> The violence is only occasionally directed against the whites. The real violence is aimed at the good things the white man has wrought—an attempt to destroy a black bourgeois class if it means peaceful coexistence with the white man to the mutual profit of both black and white.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In a span of a year and a half some 50-odd native schools have been burned down by youthful mobs * * *. The modern young African thirsts for knowledge, and in the past few weeks mobs have beaten up small children on their way to education to such an extent that the schools had to be closed.
>
> * * * * *
>
> A favorite form of intimidation is to burn the houses and fields of African small farmers; to maim cattle; and always to beat up, violently, the subject of the intimidation. An African with a small hotel may find it smashed and looted, or simply burned to the ground.
>
> The object, of course, is to mark, clearly, the penalty of getting along with the white man, and to destroy the greatest enemy of collectivism: Successful private enterprise.

The white and black people of Rhodesia joined together in a coordinated effort to put down the first wave of terror that threatened their mutual peace and prosperity. Ringleaders of the so-called black nationalist movement were arrested and isolated from the society they sought to destroy. But the black nationalists cannot tolerate the continued existence of such a successful example of racial cooperation. The success of the Rhodesians stands out in stark contradistinction to the dismal life of fear, frustration, and despair which these terrorists have brought to other African nations. It is an embarrassing and a constant reminder of their own failure, and thus it has become all the more imperative to wipe Rhodesia off the face of Africa.

But the black population of Rhodesia is not unaware of the fate of their neighbors to the north or of the reign of terror, chaos, and corruption that pervades those unhappy lands. They have seen first hand, in their own country, the atrocities those black nationalist demagogs have committed against them. It is little wonder that the Rhodesian Council of Tribal Chiefs voted unanimously in favor of UDI, or that the Rhodesian Negro population has remained calm throughout this crisis.

As a result of their prior experience with black nationalism, appeals for racial uprisings have been ignored and the previous claims that UDI would bring racial war to Rhodesia have now been exposed as ridiculous. The Christian Science Monitor of January 4, 1966, in an article by Robert M. Hallett, explained why the nationalist movement has been rejected by the Negro people of Rhodesia. As stated by the Christian Science Monitor:

> The ineffectiveness of the Rhodesian African nationalists is a great disappointment to other Africans on the continent. Exiled nationalists had said that a unilateral declaration of independence would bring direct confrontation of black and white in Rhodesia.
>
> CALM PREVAILS
>
> This has not happened. In fact, so far as is known, only one African has been killed by the police. He was shot during a stoning incident in a Bulawayo township. The country today is largely calm. Had there been widespread incidents among the African population, other African states would have been more militant in calling for international intervention.
>
> Radio Zambia has permitted Rhodesian nationalists to broadcast appeals for violence and sabotage to Africans here. They have had some small successess.
>
> A barn was set on fire and tobacco plants have been uprooted in parts of the northern section of the country reached by the radio. But they have provided no organized movement.

The Christian Science Monitor also contradicted the allegations that the Rhodesian Government has taken a harder line toward its Negro population as a reaction to pressures brought about by external efforts to create internal disorder within the country and the economic sanctions being applied against them by foreign nations. To the contrary, the Hallett article revealed that the Smith government has increased its efforts to improve the lot of the Negro population. The story concluded with this observation:

> It will introduce a pilot scheme to establish and promote small cottage industries in tribal areas. Loans are being made available to African councils to establish local government administration centers.
>
> Landowners are increasing the pace of building African housing. Tribemen's taxes are being cut in half (one point yearly rather than two). Money will be given over to local government councils in tribal areas.
>
> The government has set aside £500,000 ($1,400,000) for special schemes of assistance and development in tribal areas. An additional £150,000 has been provided for improving African education.
>
> This money will partly bolster chiefs who are paid by the government. They have been built up to counterbalance the nationalists.
>
> A special school for training the sons of chiefs and headmen is being considered.
>
> The government realizes that Africans working in the lowliest capacities in industry will be the first to suffer from unemployment due to sanctions. Various plans are also an effort to maintain African employment.

Mr. President, there are those who have deluded themselves into believing that the Rhodesians will not fight if a military expedition is sent against them. These were the same people who said that the Rhodesians would not dare follow through on their threat to declare independence, but they did just what they said they would do. And when the Rhodesians say that they will fight if provoked by a hostile military move, I believe they will do just what they say. I draw your attention to the recent statement by the Rhodesian Deputy Minister of Information:

> If Mr. Harold Wilson is prepared to use force, let him realize the consequences of what he would be doing. There would be no easy, quick victory. Under these circumstances I believe that 1 Rhodesian fighting on his home ground for the survival of his home, his family, and his country would be worth 10 of any other troops fighting reluctantly and with reservations, and this would be a long, drawn-out, bitter struggle.
>
> Does Harold Wilson believe that we in this country, whose forefathers fought at Agincourt, Dunkirk, and Vegkop, are endowed with less resolution than the Russians displayed when in retreat from the Germans? If he were to prevail in this country he would take over a smoking ruin and a desert.
>
> The Russians had the fortitude to adopt a policy of scorched earth and so have we,

> and everything in the path of an advancing army would be destroyed. Let Mr. Wilson realize this before he embarks on something which can only lead to disaster.

Even the Washington Post is disinclined to endorse the theory that Rhodesia's Army is either weak or of questionable loyalty to the Smith government. In an editorial dated November 16, 1965, the Post observed:

> Economic sanctions that make Rhodesia's course very expensive are a much better tool than the sort of military intervention demanded so blithely by some countries in the United Nations.
>
> In the second place, Rhodesia's military strength is not to be lightly ignored. She has some 12 battalions of infantry now under arms or rapidly mobilizable, plus artillery, plus sizable police contingents with armored cars, plus an efficient small air force with Canberra fighter-bombers. Perhaps 20,000 trained men are now at the disposal of the government. Many of these are Africans serving under white officers, but there is no reason at this point to suspect that they would not obey orders. No U.N. force is presently available, and even if there were agreement and contingents were volunteered the logistical problems would be formidable.
>
> Even if a military intervention could be mounted, the effectiveness would be doubtful. Embattling the white population, however, would be virtually certain to cause a bloodbath.

Mr. President, the perilous direction which British policy is taking in regard to the Rhodesian question, and to which we have apparently been committed, recalls the warning which Churchill gave the Labor Government in 1936:

> I have watched this famous island descending incontinently, fecklessly, the stairway which leads to a dark gulf. It is a fine broad stairway at the beginning, but after a bit the carpet ends. A little farther on there are only flagstones, and a little farther on still these break beneath your feet.

While there is still time for our Nation to withdraw from this unworthy enterprise, the American people should fully realize that we shall be held accountable for whatever consequences result from our involvement in this dangerous course of action.

Before it is too late, we should give serious thought to the reports that Great Britain may soon ask the United States to directly participate in, and assume the burden of a more aggressive policy toward Rhodesia. Mr. Charles Bartlett, in an article appearing in the December 9, 1965, issue of the Evening Star, commenting on reported State Department pressure on the administration for a more active American role in the Rhodesian affair, stated:

> Johnson and the top layer of the State Department will shrink from this advice as long as they can. The original decision to avoid an initiative was rooted in an awareness that while the British recognize the Rhodesian problem as their own, they will instinctively grasp at any chance to induce the United States to share the burden.
>
> Since the late 1940's, when Britain handed the problem of the Greek insurgents to the United States, this country has been a magnet for international responsibilities. In areas like the Middle East, some nation had to fill the vacuum left by the ebb of British power. In other situations, this country frequently resists in a firm but friendly fashion Britain's aspirations to shift her encumbrances onto the broad-shoulders across the Atlantic.

Mr. President, even assuming that these economic sanctions achieve the purpose of toppling the government of Ian Smith, as unlikely as that may be in my opinion, what will our policy be then? Those who endorse our present policy on the naive assumption that the government of Ian Smith will be peacefully overthrown, should ponder the questions raised by Eric Sevareid in his column appearing in the December 6, 1965, issue of the Evening Star, wherein he noted:

> The world's moral disapproval will not put forward this Rhodesian clock-in-reverse, not even if it includes a personal denunciation by the President of the United States, which Mr. Carl Rowan wants to hear. Economic sanctions would not only have to bite very deeply but would have to be sustained for a very long time to topple Mr. Smith and his crew. But suppose they do topple him, what then?
>
> The alternatives would be rule by the untrained black majority which virtually no Rhodesian white, however moderate, believes endurable and which they will resist; or, a direct rule from London, a prospect that must appall even Prime Minister Harold Wilson; or, the emergence of a white moderate ruling group that would extend the franchise and truly begin to train Rhodesian blacks for positions of power. The third alternative may be the best, by many judgments, but it remains much more a hope than a prospect.

Mr. President, while there is still time to turn away from the precipice toward which we are being so recklessly plunged in Africa, I urge our Government to take immediate steps to absolve our Nation of any further complicity in this unfortunate affair, by rescinding our support of the United Nations resolution calling for the use of force against the Government of Rhodesia; by revoking the illegal and arbitrary economic sanctions being imposed against the Smith government; by renouncing our policy of hostility toward Rhodesia, as well as any commitment to participate in any further ventures of this nature, the purpose of which being to topple that government; and to publicly announce our intention to return to our historic and traditional policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of friendly African nations.

I ask unanimous consent that some material dealing with this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM RHODESIA: POINTING THE WAY TO A MULTIRACIAL AFRICA?

(The report of the fact finding mission of the American-African Affairs Association, Members: Representative JOHN ASHBROOK, chairman; Dr. Max Yergan, Ralph de Toledano)

INTRODUCTION

(NOTE.—On November 11, 1965, the African State of Rhodesia declared its independence and, at the same time, pledged its loyalty to the free community of nations. Thus, Rhodesia joined a long list of former African colonies and territories that had achieved independence since the end of World War II. But what a different reaction it caused! Instead of offers of economic aid, an embargo was imposed on the newly independent state. Instead of immediately seating the new state in the United Nations, demands were made for U.N. military intervention to crush Rhodesia. Why was Rhodesia different than Kenya—or Ghana—or Chad?

(The Rhodesian situation raised questions that demanded answers. And answers were not forthcoming. In an attempt to find these answers, the American-African Affairs Association dispatched a three-man fact-finding mission to Rhodesia: Congressman JOHN M. ASHBROOK, of Ohio; Dr. Max Yergan, cochairman of the association whose knowledge of Africa extends over a score of countries in as many years; and Mr. Ralph de Toledano, author and nationally syndicated columnist. The cost of the mission was defrayed through the contributions of concerned Americans. The report of their findings follows below.

(The American-African Affairs Association is circulating this report as widely as possible as part of its program of presenting the facts on Africa without reference to any political or racial dogma. We hope that this report may answer some of the questions which have arisen so that America and the free world can act responsibly and honorably.)

I

American policy on Rhodesia represents the triumph of ideology over actuality. To excuse American intervention in what should be the purely private conflict between the British Government and Rhodesia, it is argued that the chain of circumstances leading to Rhodesian independence was improperly motivated—the result of a racist philosophy and a uniquely selfish economic interest. This position is based on a profound ignorance of the forces at work in Rhodesia—as well as in the rest of Africa.

The aim of both Britain and the United States is to bring down the constitutionally-elected government of Prime Minister Ian Smith and replace it by a puppet regime, to be followed by a "one-man, one-vote" formula—thus applying, in an undeveloped continent, a highly sophisticated Western political system divorced from the realities of the present situation in Rhodesia. Since that country has been significantly in the news for many months, it might have been expected that the American press would have sent numerous able reporters to Salisbury, the capital city, to report developments there at first hand. Instead, news reaching the United States has come almost exclusively from British circles taking their lead from Labour Party publicists. Dubious sources at the United Nations have added their mite to the muddle of misinformation.

Certainly, it is no secret that Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs G. Mennen Williams has used what influence remains at his disposal in Washington to discourage on-site inspection by responsible legislators and newspaper correspondents who believe that U.S. foreign policy should lead from the strength of knowledge rather than the fanaticism of a priori judgment. Important publications have been told that the Rhodesian Government is not admitting accredited journalists—a totally false charge. In actual fact, the Rhodesian Government is not only willing but anxious to open its doors to those able to report what their eyes and ears register. "We have nothing to hide," Prime Minister Smith told our mission when asked if he would receive a congressional delegation.

Planned myopia seems to be the technique of American policymakers—the same planned myopia which led millions of Americans to accept with no attempt at verification the myth that the Chinese Communists were "agrarian reformers" and Mao Tse-tung the George Washington of the Far East. A new myth now prevents a careful reading of the

Rhodesian situation and halts debate by describing that country as a crumbling bastion of white supremacy which must "inevitably" fall before the progressive onslaught of African nationalism. To the propagators of this myth the "petrol bomb" used by Rhodesian nationalists to intimidate their fellow Africans has seemingly become just an instrument of democratic persuasion, acceptable despite the terror it engenders.

The steps being taken in Rhodesia to maintain and extend a high level of living for all, to preserve public tranquillity, and to lift the economic, social, and political level of the African population may or may not be morally or pragmatically justifiable. But before any approbation or opprobrium are meted out, there surely must first be an accurate estimate of the situation. And this estimate cannot be valid unless it answers the following questions, which have been largely ignored by policymakers, the mass media, and those who derive their positions from both.

Is the Rhodesian Government of Prime Minister Smith stable?

What degree of active or passive support does it have from the Rhodesian people—white and black?

Is the Rhodesian economy sound, and how is it threatened by the sanctions which Britain has imposed and America accepts?

If these sanctions succeed, who would suffer most?

Can the country survive a political and economic collapse, yet still continue a respectable member of the family of nations?

Is the philosophy of the present Rhodesian Government racist?

What, in fact, is its philosophy, and where does it lead?

What are Rhodesia's strengths and weaknesses as a nation?

What is the nature of the African population?

Most important of all, would the enshrining of the "one man, one vote" principle in Rhodesia be possible today without subjecting the country to the chaos, despotism and barbarism which have all too often taken over in the so-called developing nations of Africa?

II

Americans, in contemplating the Rhodesian situation, are either unaware or refuse to take cognizance of its complete uniqueness among all the other colonies, possessions, or participants in the systems set up by the European powers in Africa. For example, few know that Rhodesia moved directly from its status as a chartered region to self-government. Until 1887—or 2 years before the Crown granted a charter to the British South Africa Co.—the area now called Rhodesia was the battleground for bloody tribal wars between the militarized Matabele tribes and the relatively peaceful Mashonas. An ancient and endless conflict had kept the Mashonas in a constant state of physical terror and economic uncertainty. These wars, and the incursions of disease and early mortality, had held down the African population to about 300,000. It has now risen to some 4 million—and it is estimated that barring starvation, cataclysm, or the kind of freedom which Britain wishes to impose, it will double in the next 20 years.

The white settlers who emigrated from Britain or South Africa were not looking for fast profits in gold and emeralds. They came to live as farmers, homesteaders, and businessmen. Rhodesia for them was not a way station on the road of imperial convenience, but a way of life. Under the governance of the British South Africa Co., they built cities, established trade, opened up the land, set up a school system, and organized the country with the same goals of permanence that European settlers carried with them to America. They did this with a minimum of damage to the tribal system and its customs, and they did not act with the rapacity which led settlers on the American continent to wipe out entire indigenous populations or to take over the entire area in their civilizing course.

By free choice, after a referendum, the Rhodesians voted in 1923 for responsible self-government as a member of the British Commonwealth, rather than for joining the Union of South Africa as a fifth province. The status was replaced by an assertion of full sovereignty by a legitimate and legally elected government in 1965, at a time when the British Government—with the blessing of the United States—was systematically granting independence to all sorts of former possessions with little or no training or tradition in self-government. The outcry at No. 10 Downing Street over Rhodesia's unilateral act of disassociation may be understood in terms of Commonwealth interest and the general inclinations of Prime Minister Harold Wilson. But to argue constitutionally under the circumstances, or to insist on the right of the British Government to determine the internal organization of the withdrawing state, should have sounded strange to Americans who seized their own independence by force of arms and set up their own government without the permission of George III or his ministers.

III

The test of legal validity will not be found in the animadversions of Britain's Labor government. Despite the reservations of Prime Minister Wilson, it remains a fact that the Rhodesian Government of Mr. Ian Smith was elected by an overwhelming vote of those who held the franchise. It remains a fact that the 14 African Members of the Rhodesian Parliament, elected in the same election—there are 65 Members of Parliament in all—do not favor the surrender of the country to the African nationalists. And it remains a fact that the present Constitution differs only in nonessentials from the 1961 Constitution which Mr. Wilson holds so dear. For Britain to attempt to inject itself into the internal affairs of Rhodesia, and especially its political life, when it has signally refrained from doing so in many former British possessions that are now frankly African police states, is hardly consistent, let alone fair.

The structure of the Rhodesian state and its qualifications for granting the franchise will be discussed later in this report. That it meets the requirements of the Rhodesian situation in an observable fact. Salisbury, the other cities of Rhodesia, and the agricultural countryside are tranquil to a degree unknown in many sections of the civilized world. The streets are policed by African officers far more relaxed than their law-enforcement counterparts in New York, Los Angeles, or Washington. Crimes of violence, an index to social malaise and instability, are relatively few. Political crime—consisting mostly of incinerating people in their beds by tossing "petrol bombs" onto thatched roofs—ceased almost entirely when the perpetrators were arrested, much to the relief of the African population. The telltale signs of racial tension are nowhere to be seen. Neither is that atmosphere of repression so visible in states where power is held against the will of the governed. Sanctions have, in fact, consolidated the hold of the Smith government by winning over to its side such scattered opposition as existed before their advent. For many of the Africans, the fear is not of more white government but of a return to that brief period when nationalist territorists, financed by Peiping, Cairo, et al., were allowed to employ the "persuasion" of bomb and knife.

Rhodesian Minister of Law Desmond William Lardner-Burke told our mission in this regard what others later confirmed. "We don't stop people from speaking," he stated. "The only time we get cross is when there is a bit of subversion." There was a heightening of that subversion when the African nationalists themselves split into two factions, each vying for the financial support of the Committee of Nine (the OAU "Liberation Committee") in Tanzania. During that period, with a cash subsidy of $30,000 set aside by the committee, African fought African with gasoline bombs and hand grenades. Much of the violence was directed against children, and the schools were virtually closed as a result of nationalist threats. When witchcraft was invoked to silence witnesses against the terror, the Rhodesian Government had no option but to disregard the finer points of law. This was admitted by Mr. Lardner-Burke when he said, "You cannot allow complete chaos because of due process." In the United States, this would be heresy. For the population of Rhodesia, black and white, it was a stark necessity.

IV

If there is any noticeable apprehension on the part of the white or African population, it does not derive from the steps taken by the Smith government to put an end to violence and subversion. The fear is that Rhodesia's course toward a viable and responsible multiracial state will be interrupted by some overt military move against the country from either the British or a neighboring African country—with or without the support of the United Nations. These military adventures might take the form of outright invasion—which Britain's allies in Africa have already threatened, should economic sanctions fail to topple the present government. Neutral observers in Salisbury, London, and Paris discount the possibility of British military intervention, however. Such a maneuver would profit Britain little and cost her much. A former American official noted that if, the British were to send in anything less than two divisions, they would be wiped out. An overwhelming force, moreover, would find a devastated country, put to the torch in "scorched earth" fashion. At least half the white population, with Africans at their side, are ready to fall, "rifle in hand"—a phrase heard with startling regularity in Rhodesia. The balance of the white population would probably leave the country permanently, emigrating to South Africa or to other countries which could absorb them and make use of their pioneering skills.

The African country most vocal in its incitements to violence is Zambia, which shares a border along the world's greatest manmade lake and also the hydroelectric installation at Kariba. But the Zambian economy has been sadly sapped by the sanctions which were to destroy Rhodesia in "a matter of months," and its government has so far survived only because of substantial aid from Britain, Canada, the United States, South Africa, and to some extent Rhodesia. Though demagogic passion often burns with a hard, senseless flame, it seems unlikely that the Zambian Government will risk its own downfall by launching an attack across the Kariba Dam against the well-trained and determined Rhodesian Army and Air Force. So far, there have been no overt acts to disturb the calm along the Zambia-Rhodesia border. On the Zambia side, there are no border guards, and the curious can cross over from Rhodesian territory without being challenged or molested. In the Rhodesian interior, Zambian workers continue to hold their jobs. They have made it plain that they do not want to return to the relative poverty of their Zambian homes.

There is, however, some concern that the more hot-headed African nations may mount a massive infiltration of saboteurs and activists whose aim will be to cause the kind of economic disruption which can be publicized abroad as "proof" of political unrest and a reaction to Rhodesian "tyranny." But here again, the government is prepared. An increase in unemployment, already making itself felt as a result of economic sanctions, can create the kind of unrest which feeds subversions. But with little official prompting, Rhodesian farmers and industrialists are spreading the work so as to lay off the fewest number of people. And unemployment will cease to be a problem if the Smith government is given time to rearrange the economy sufficiently to take up the slack. This rearrangement is already taking place as Rhodesia moves to manufacture at home many products once imported from Britain and the rest of the world.

Here again, the loser will be Great Britain. Though Rhodesian trade is not a major factor in the British economy, its loss is of sufficient importance to increase a balance-of-payments unfavorable to England and to force further retrenchment in an already distressing situation. Rhodesia, on the other hand, once she has survived this transition period, will find herself economically stronger and less dependent on the vagaries of Commonwealth politics. Even in the matter of oil, often called the lifeblood of a modern state, Rhodesia is not as pinched as Prime Minister Wilson or the American State Department had hoped. What stocks of oil existed at the time sanctions were imposed is a state secret. So, too, is the amount of oil coming in from Portuguese Mozambique and independent South Africa. There are still cars on the streets, however, and South African neutrality has not prevented a small but steady stream of oil from pouring across the border. At the same time, the Rhodesians are preparing to convert their transport, if necessary, to the use of industrial alcohol for fuel—and since there is an abundance of sugar, this may be the ultimate solution.

The present danger to the Rhodesian economy is to be found elsewhere. Sixty percent of the country's export trade was in tobacco. It is its major cash crop, and Britain was Rhodesian tobacco's major customer. To soften the blow, the Rhodesian Government has set up a corporation to buy at a fair price the entire tobacco crop—but this will put a considerable strain on the budget. Unless a substitute market is found, this will be a source of trouble for Prime Minister Smith. There are signs, however, that Rhodesia may have found an ally in Britain's tobacco industry. The Times of London has already reported considerable perturbation over the ban on Rhodesian tobacco. Grade for grade, it is considerably cheaper than American tobacco. If the ban is maintained, the profit margin will either be wiped out for British cigarette manufacturers—or they will have to raise prices, which they feel will bring serious complaints from smokers who have already sustained a long series of increases.

In other areas, British sanctions have failed to cause any real pinch. Stores in Salisbury are well stocked with luxuries and necessities—and goods on order prior to the imposition of the ban on trade are still coming in. There is no inflation so far, though Rhodesian businessmen bemoan the fact that the greatest boom in their history was cut short by Britain's action. Food is no problem, Rhodesia raises its own. The country has been ridden by drought, but Rhodesians find a silver lining in this. Food was an export, but with homegrown supplies down there will be no surplus to rot in warehouses. To date, there has been no hoarding of food or of other consumer items—a tribute to the self-confidence and self-discipline of the Rhodesians.

V

When Britain's Prime Minister Wilson declared economic war on Rhodesia, there were expectations that this would (1) drive a wedge between the Smith government and the people, (2) cause widespread defections in the civil service and the military establishment, and (3) encourage the Africans to rise up. It has already been noted here that points (1) and (2) were dismal miscalculations. The effect of sanctions was simply to bring the people together—and if there have been any important defections from the Government's civilian or military service, no one in Rhodesia knows about them. Point (3), however, continues to intrigue those who seek the overthrow of Prime Minister Smith and the ouster of his Rhodesian Front Party. Yet here again, their hopes are based on false premises and a profound ignorance of the attitudes and desires of the Africans in Rhodesia. In conversations with African members of the opposition in Parliament—and with the one white oppositionist Member of Parliament—it became abundantly clear to us that no one in Rhodesia wants to see the kind of upheaval which the African nationalists and their foreign supporters seek.

Among those Africans who have risen to public prominence, there are of course some who demand instant applications of the "one-man, one-vote" formula. But for the most part, the desire to rule is tempered by the knowledge that at this point in Rhodesia's development, the precipitate introduction of Western political ideas would benefit no one. P. H. Mkudu, chief whip of the opposition, has freely conceded that his people need much training before they can take over the reins of government. He puts the time period required as "not less than 5 years" and calls for increased educational opportunities and an end to social discrimination. And he has small patience with his colleague in the Parliament, I. H. Samuriwo, who insists that the Africans should be given the opportunity to rule—and then trained to administer the government and the economy of the country. The African opposition as a whole calls for a five-point program:

1. Change the franchise.
2. Institute a crash program in education.
3. Institute a crash program of agricultural development.
4. Change ownership rights and property rights.
5. End social discrimination.

What these points mean and how rapidly they are to be implemented are another matter. Specific proposals are shunned. Nor are the five points advanced as a panacea for Rhodesia's problems. The most articulate spokesmen contend that the acceptance of the five points will insure tranquility and prosperity for Rhodesia. The strongest argument offered in their favor is simple: Without the "change" that is demanded, the country faces bloodshed and turmoil. With it, there is "a possibility" that these eventualities can be avoided. But the demands for a "crash program" in this field or that fail to take into account the cultural context of the country. The changes that Rhodesia requires to make it a truly multiracial nation cannot come into being overnight. In a society as technologically sophisticated as Rhodesia, integration must take place gradually, on an individual basis and the gage must be merit rather than color of skin. Merit, moreover, must be measured by objective standards.

VI

The philosophy of the Rhodesian Government—and it is shared almost universally by the white population—is derived from these beliefs and from the practices that have evolved from them. But beyond this, there is a concept of the role of the races in Africa which commands respect. It is, as the Prime Minister has insisted, completely divorced from any trace of Herrenvolkism, as well as from the apartheid policy of South Africa. Rhodesians see the "one man, one vote" principle as a form of reverse racism, for in practice it would destroy the white community completely and deprive the country of all the techniques of a modern society.

In broad strokes, this has been painted by P. K. Van der Byl, the young Minister of Information. "In Rhodesia," he points out, "there are two distinct societies. One is Western, parliamentary, and democratic. The second is an African tribal society. This tribal society is authoritarian and hierarchical. In between, there is a no-man's land—an intermediary African group—for whom the tribal system has lost much of its meaning. This group belongs to neither the tribal nor the Western system. They are the problem in Africa today."

Like most other Rhodesians, Mr. Van der Byl believes that the whites have no right to tamper with the tribal society "except by example and persuasion." To take this view, however, does not mean that the Rhodesian Government will sit idly by and see its institutions destroyed, nor that it can condone violence and disregard of the law. "We must put a damper on such things as the killing of one of twins. But the Africans must be the arbiters of their own destiny. It would be morally and pragmatically wrong for Western society to impose its own mores. On the other hand, we will put no obstacle in the way of those who wish to leave the tribal society and join the Western system. There is no inhibition on an African getting the vote. But it is our belief that the franchise should call for a high degree of education or other qualifications."

The experience of the other new African nations would seem to confirm Mr. Van der Byl's contention that if those qualifications are forgotten or mechanically lowered to produce an overwhelmingly large percentage of enfranchised citizens, "it debases the entire system." It therefore boils down to two questions: (1) Is the electoral system theoretically impartial, and (2) is it also impartial in practice? There is no doubt that the Rhodesian whites have worked very hard at setting up an electoral machinery which will apply to all three categories of its population. There are two voting rolls—the A roll, which is dominant and which elects 50 members to the Parliament; and the B roll for those in the transitional stage, which elects 15 members. The qualifications for the A roll are higher than those for the B roll. But there are Africans in the A category and white men in the B category. Within the Parliament, members elected on either roll have the same rights and privileges.

To ascertain the practical impartiality of the Rhodesian system, factors other than the strict application of the electoral code must be considered. First, there is the attitude of those Africans still living within their tribal organizations. Among them, there is scant interest in the exercise of the suffrage. They are, therefore, pretty much represented by their chiefs, who have official status. Eventually, the Rhodesian Government hopes to institutionalize the role of the chiefs—by setting up a second legislative chamber somewhat analogous to the American Senate or the British House of Lords—replacing the present Council of Chiefs. Such an innovation will enhance the status of the Africans and give them a greater voice in government affairs without debasing the franchise.

But this is secondary to a matter of far greater significance in assessing the Rhodesian system. Are the whites sincerely dedicated to raising the educational and economic levels of the African population? Or are the inhibitions on the suffrage merely a polite way of preventing qualified Africans from using their numerical preponderance to take control of the country? On this point, the opposition is most vocal. It claims that the government of Ian Smith—or any other white government—will simply create new impediments to granting the franchise as the level of the African population rises to meet the present inhibitions. But this charge goes to the matter of motive and psychological imponderables. As such, it is almost impossible to weigh objectively. All the evidence at hand, certainly, points to an opposite conclusion.

Has the Rhodesian Government, for one thing, really tried to bring education to the African? The answer lies in economic statistics and an analysis of the school population. At present Rhodesia's ratio of children in school to total population is comparable to Britain's—even though there is a wide disparity (in favor of Britain) in the national incomes of the two countries. The following table of ratios tells a story which goes far to contradict those who reject the sincerity of the Rhodesian whites:

Great Britain	1 in 5.
Rhodesia	1 in 6.
Malagasy	1 in 11.
Tanzania	1 in 18.
Dahomey	1 in 20.
Mali	1 in 43.
Ethiopia	1 in 80.

African education is the single target expenditure of the Rhodesian Government, and it has trebled in the last 7 years. It is significant in this context that 98 percent of all direct taxation is paid by whites. Despite this financial inequity, the Rhodesian Government has been able to meet the demands of an African school population of some 2 million children under 17 for a primary education. As this demand is met, the government has moved ahead to provide secondary school education for those who desire it. But here the government has run into several problems. First, the 10 percent of the primary school population which is female has been kept out of the secondary schools by parents who take their daughters out of school when they become nubile and "sell" them into marriage. Secondly, the demand for the admittedly few but steadily increasing places in secondary schools has yet to equal the supply.

As a matter of educational philosophy, moreover, the Rhodesian Government has subscribed to the Western idea of providing as much education as possible for all, rather than to the practice prevalent in former French and British colonies of training a small elite group and ignoring the rest of the African population. The Rhodesian school system, moreover, is relatively young. (After all, the country has been under settlement for less than 75 years). Rhodesians note that in Britain, with its ancient traditions, only 34 percent continue to go to school after age 15—and in the United States, which boasts of its public education, there are today some 23 million adults who never went beyond elementary school.

The opposition has criticized the Government for not providing more vocational schools. But the Rhodesian experience has been one of apathy among Africans toward this kind of training; and what demand there was has tended to fall off in the past year. The Government nevertheless has pressed for longer periods of education, particularly in the secondary schools. It has organized correspondence courses and night schools. There are, again, no discriminatory practices against Africans, and all African students at the university are eligible for Government support. At the present time, those African students at the University of Rhodesia receiving scholarships, grants, and loans would not have qualified had purely academic standards been imposed. Instead, the school authorities have "discriminated" in their favor—hardly a sign that there is official reluctance to raise educational opportunities for Africans. Nor is it a sign of foot-dragging that the amount spent for African education doubled between 1963 and 1965—with the figure still rising—and that African pupil enrollment has tripled in the past 10 years, with approximately 700,000 students now attending school.

VII

Simultaneously, a strong effort—some of it governmental, and some private—is being made to raise the economic level of the African population by introducing better methods of working the land and by opening up new land for African use. Since 1920, farm and grazing land assigned for African occupation rose from 21.6 million acres to 44.3 million acres, whereas white acreage has been reduced by 12 million. There are 5.9 million acres open for sale to either whites or Africans—but African lands (for which no rent or purchase price is paid in the tribal areas) are protected from encroachment by the more prosperous white farmers. The opening up of increased acreage for African use has been a continuing process, to meet demands by the Africans themselves.

What is done with that land is another matter. The charge has been made that the farmland occupied by whites is much better than African land holdings. This, however, is not sustained by the facts. For example, a tract of "worked out" land was taken over by an agricultural school. On this presumably worthless "sandveld" proper farming methods have produced a high yield of corn—yet African farms in the same area have remained on a subsistence farming level. Soils in the African area roughly match the fertility of those in areas being farmed by whites. Studies have further shown that 37 percent of Rhodesia has a rainfall in excess of 28 inches—and half the African areas are within the preferred zone. The Government recognizes that it requires more than good soil and adequate rainfall to produce cash crops. Capital is necessary, and this is provided to African farmers in loans and grants.

At the same time, white farmers have banded together to help the African farmer increase his yield. They have provided seed, tractors, and instruction in agricultural know-how to those willing to join the program for a minimum period of 3 years. But they have run into what sociologists call a "high leisure preference" among Africans—as well as a tendency to retire from the economic contention once they have put aside enough money to provide subsistence for the immediate future. To counter these tendencies, the government and white businessmen have attempted to increase the level of consumer demand by stocking the shops with the kind of items which will be attractive to the wives of African farmers and to the farmers themselves—washing machines, radios, bicycles, etc. Whether this modified form of the Madison Avenue technique will provide the drive that Europeans and Americans take for granted is not yet susceptible of proof. But the fact remains that more and more African farmers are able to buy new farms in the unreserved areas, to pay substantial sums in cash for homes and farm equipment, and to derive incomes equal to or better than those of the white settlers.

It should be noted here that this previously steady development ran into trouble when the African nationalists began their campaign. An Englishman who has lived for some years in Rhodesia reported that "Agricultural agents would go to African farms to show how to improve the yield. Then the nationalists would follow and say, 'If you do that, we'll burn your house down.'" Since there were 35 "petrol bomb" raids a month before the Rhodesian Government clamped down, the effect on African farmers was considerable. The terror was not only physical, for many of the Africans still under tribal sway have not relinquished their belief in witchcraft and in the "power of the spirit." The nationalists invoked these beliefs and powers and would still be using them if the Government had not proved that it was impervious to nationalist magic.

VIII

That, in brief, is the Rhodesian picture. A stable Government, geared to the needs of a country in south-central Africa, commands the virtually unanimous support of the white population and the respect of a preponderance of the Africans. A sound and growing economy faces the threat of strangulation, but is moving energetically to adjust itself to new conditions. Should it fail, all of Africa will suffer. For the black people of Rhodesia, it would mean a return to the tribal wars which ended less than 70 years ago. It would mean the collapse of the economy as thousands of white farmers, businessmen, and technician either died in the convulsions of a forcible takeover or migrated to South Africa. Under those circumstances, the burnt-out case of Rhodesia would become another and more terrible Congo. Chaos would inundate order, and Africa would not fail to read the message that Western civilization had abdicated. The joint achievement of white and African in Rhodesia would go up in acrid smoke.

It would be comforting to assume that sanity will prevail, that the ideologized fury of Britain's Prime Minister Wilson would be recognized for what it is and not for the principled assault on racism that it claims to be. It would be pleasant to believe that, in American policy toward Rhodesia, facts will triumph over ideological commitments, leading to the withdrawal of this country from participation in the sanctions Britain has imposed; that knowledge will vanquish ignorance. It would be only human to hope that fanaticism over "majority rule" will bow to the realization that Rhodesia's 4 million Africans and 220,000 whites are not living in Chicago or Birmingham but are slowly evolving a sound and democratic compromise which will give the white minority a realistic chance of survival and the black majority an opportunity, almost unique in Africa, of achieving political and economic equality.

But these are not the reasons which lead to our conclusion, which is: that Rhodesia as now constituted will not be crushed by Mr. Wilson and the Labor Government of England. On the beautiful streets of Salisbury, there is a firm determination to stand up to whatever the British, the neighboring African states, and the United States can throw at them. There is a conviction that Rhodesia is pointing the way to the kind of Africa which can develop its tremendous resources for the good of all; that it can sustain a deepening democracy against the totalitarian forces which one by one have taken over the less fortunate nations of the continent. Firepower wins wars, but guns are sometimes loaded with more than bullets. The Rhodesians will feed themselves and find new markets for their goods, whatever the effort may temporarily do to the way of life they have created on the African yield. They are pledged to this without drama, without vainglory, without hatred. Unless the world goes mad, this spirit of resolution is better than firepower and stronger than economic sanctions. It alone can build the Rhodesia that is desired, and deserved, by all her peoples.

[Advertisement by the Rhodesian Information Office appearing in the New York Times, Oct. 31, 1965]

THE TRUTH ABOUT RHODESIAN INDEPENDENCE

WHAT IS RHODESIA?

Rhodesia is a country in transition between primitivism and modernity. Its advance toward a full parliamentary democracy can only be considered justly in the light of its brief history.

Rhodesia began to be settled by whites only 75 years ago. When the pioneers arrived shortly before the turn of the century they found an untamed land sparsely settled by tribes that had driven out the Bushmen whose original hunting grounds this had been. The last invaders to impose their will on the numerically superior Mashona and other tribes were the Matabele, who had made the countryside within raiding distance of Bulawayo their domain, only 37 years before the pioneers entered Mashonaland in accordance with a mandate granted by the British Government.

The early pioneers faced the same difficulties and endured the same hardships as the early American frontiersmen. They shared the same motivations—a spirit of adventure, a determination to make good and a desire to spread the values of western civilization in a pagan land. Largely by their industry and enterprise over 75 years a wilderness has been converted into one of the most highly developed and productive areas on the African continent. In contrast to America, where the indigenous population dwindled to slender numbers, the indigenous population of Rhodesia has multiplied tenfold since the turn of the century.

The black population amounted at that time to 400,000. With the advent of white settlement intertribal warfare was ended, the threat of famine receded and western medicine began to make ever-increasing inroads into the incidence of disease. Today there are 4 million blacks and their numbers are increasing by some 134,000 per year.

Understandably many of them, particularly the older generation, cling to a primitive and traditional way of life—a status recognized by special protective provisions in the Rhodesian constitution. The administration is making patient and strenuous efforts to improve their condition of life and to broaden their limited horizons. The task is great and the resources available for investment in social and economic betterment are small by comparison with the standards of the developed world.

Rhodesia has accepted the challenge of bridging the gulf between the stone age and the 20th century in the shortest time span that is humanly possible. This she accepts as her own responsibility. The goal is only attainable by the maintenance of those governmental, professional, industrial and technical standards that have put the western industrialized nations so far ahead in the pursuit of national prosperity.

ARE THERE RACIAL BARRIERS?

Rhodesians do not recognize any racial barriers to a man's accomplishments in any sphere of human activity.

What they do recognize is a necessity for a man to be properly qualified, be it as a doctor, lawyer, engineer, government official, artisan or whatever occupation in life he may have chosen. Only thus can society be protected from inexperience and incompetence. They consider—and for the same reason—that a voter should be qualified because inexperience and incompetence in voters expose the whole of society to damage.

From its earliest days Rhodesia has applied this principle to its political life, and voting rights have been extended on a nonracial basis to all its citizens as they satisfy certain minimum requirements of education, income or property ownership which are prescribed as tests of civic responsibility. This principle has yielded enviable results in terms of political stability and economic advance.

DOES THE NEW CONSTITUTION WORK?

Political institutions must keep pace with the aspirations of the people that they serve. In 1960 it was felt in Rhodesia that the time had come to refashion the country's constitution and this was done at a series of conferences with British participation and endorsement.

Three important points about this constitution tend to be forgotten—the initiative which brought it into being was taken by the Rhodesian Government; the constitutional conferences were attended by all political and racial groups; the group led by Mr. Joshua Nkomo, accompanied by his principal lieutenant of the day, Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole, was a contracting party to the agreement that was reached.

It is frequently asserted that Mr. Nkomo and his colleagues rejected the agreement. The truth is that at the time they claimed the credit for it. Foreign pressure was subsequently applied; Mr. Nkomo saw his leadership challenged and his funds in jeopardy. He capitulated and repudiated the agreement.

The nonracial character of Rhodesia's original constitution is preserved in the 1961 arrangements. The main body of the legislature—50 seats—continues to be elected on a nonracial franchise but, in addition, there is an arrangement whereby voters with much lower qualifications elect a group of 15 members. This special electorate is almost entirely black and therefore guarantees a minimum potential of 15 black seats. The same voters also exercise a qualified but significant influence in elections for the main group of 50 seats. If all black Rhodesians had taken up the voting rights that are available to them they could already have captured all the 15 special seats, plus a number of the 50 regular seats. They could also exercise such an influence on the remaining seats that a candidate would have little prospect of securing election without black support.

Moreover, the ratio of black/white voting influence must continuously shift in favour of black Rhodesians as more of them become eligible for voting rights through the spread of education and economic opportunity. Rhodesia is irrevocably committed to move progressively toward a completely democratic system of government on the western pattern. There are effective guarantees in the 1961 constitution for ensuring that this process cannot be reversed.

Why have black Rhodesians not taken advantage of the political opportunities available to them? The answer is partly apathy—a slow awakening of political consciousness, but primarily it is the savage power of boycott imposed by Nationalist strongarm gangs and supported by the ugly weapons of intimidation—muggings and the gasoline bomb in the middle of the night for nonconformists.

WHY THE BOYCOTT?

Because, although the 1961 constitution operates in the interests of black Rhodesians as a whole, nationalists recognized that for them as individuals it did not hold out the prospect of immediate personal power. It was the brutal intimidation of fellow blacks practiced by extremist organizations—the tyranny of the few over the many—that led Government to ban them and to rusticate their leaders.

What is likely to be the pace of black political advancement? This will depend very largely on black Rhodesians themselves but the following facts should serve to illustrate the efforts that are being made to equip them with voting qualifications.

HOW FAST IS EDUCATION PROGRESSING IN RHODESIA?

Ten years ago the Government set itself the following educational objectives: firstly to provide 5 years of primary schooling for all, to be followed as quickly as possible by a full range of universal primary education; overall to provide secondary education for as many as could benefit from it.

The first aim has been achieved. The second aim will be achieved by 1972, well before the 1980 target date proposed by UNESCO for Africa as a whole. As to secondary education, it is intended by 1973 to improve existing facilities to the extent of 173 new secondary schools. At that date there will be more black than white Rhodesians completing 4 years of high school education.

In 7 years Government's annual expenditure on education for black Rhodesians has trebled from $6.4 million to $18.1 million. It is the largest item in the range of services financed by Government.

The University College has always been fully integrated and there is exceptionally generous scholarship provisions for qualified black students.

These are not insubstantial achievements in a continent which has an illiteracy rate of over 80 percent. They are unquestionable proof of Rhodesia's determination to advance its black citizens.

DO RHODESIANS EARN ENOUGH?

Like most countries in Africa, Rhodesia is faced with the problem of finding employment for a population expanding at an exceedingly high rate. It is not easy to generate employment opportunities at the rate of population explosion. On the other hand, the more efficient training and use of labor has led to a marked rise in average wages.

The Rhodesian Government holds to the principles of free enterprise and private ownership. Its ability to influence wage levels is therefore limited.

However, industrial conciliation legislation embodies the principle of the "rate for the job" and makes discrimination on the grounds of race an offense. This applies to all workers in commerce and industry. Many black Rhodesians in employment are now in receipt of wages that are high by African continental standards and by the standards of poorer European countries.

The total number of blacks in employment is 654,000. Their average yearly wage has nearly doubled over the past 10 years. Rhodesia's gross national product has increased by 90 percent in the past decade. In 1964 it was $42 million higher than the 1963 total and a significant portion of this increase represents higher wages for black employees.

DEMOCRACY OR DICTATORSHIP?

It is the sincere conviction of Rhodesians, borne out by the evidence of many developments in Africa and Asia over the last few years, that democracy on the Western pattern can only thrive on the basis of a politically conscious and reasonably informed electorate. The hasty transfer of power to people unequipped to make intelligent and reasoned political choices has frequently led either to anarchy or to totalitarianism. It is fashionable in some quarters to accept the one with resignation and to justify the other on specious grounds which reflect little credit on the people who fall heirs to such a system. Rhodesians who have inherited the most refined political system that civilized man has evolved are not prepared to surrender it. They do not accept that the large mass of their black fellow citizens should be expected to forgo the best in Western political values any more than they should be expected to forgo the best in Western material values. The best is yet to come but most Rhodesians, black and white, believe that it will follow more surely for being laid on sound foundations.

RHODESIA HAS EARNED HER INDEPENDENCE

Rhodesia's claim to independence is frequently represented as a conspiracy on the part of white Rhodesians to perpetuate their political domination. From what has been said about the 1961 constitution, which is the basis on which Rhodesia claims her independence, this is demonstrably absurd. This constitution must lead to a black majority as inevitably as night follows day. Nor is it valid to claim, as many of Rhodesia's critics do, that white Rhodesians are only bidding for independence under the 1961 constitution in order to give themselves a point of vantage from which to erode black political rights. If they held constitutional safeguards in such contempt why would there be so much difficulty in negotiating satisfactory independence terms? Rhodesia could spare herself a lot of political agony by agreeing to almost any terms with the cynical reservation that she could walk out on them once independence was achieved. Her determination to secure independence on terms that she can live with both now and in the future is surely the best test of her sincerity.

The independence claim is based on totally different considerations. Primarily, it is a demand for the recognition of 43 years of capable and responsible government since Rhodesia was granted full self-government early in 1923. During this period a territory the size of California has been developed into one of the most productive and economically advanced areas on the African continent with no foreign assistance; has dramatically improved the standards of living of all its peoples; has made a major contribution to the defense of Western values in peace and war; has faithfully met its international obligations and in all respects demonstrated its capacity for good and efficient government. Rhodesia has a proud record of accomplishment. In a world in which it sees a number of small nonviable states being admitted as full members in the comity of nations Rhodesia believes it has waited long enough in the anteroom of full sovereignty.

Rhodesia offers to the United States:

1. Her friendship.
2. Total and unqualified alinement in any confrontation with the Communist world.
3. A strong and determined bulwark against Communist penetration in Africa.
4. A self-sustaining economy and, therefore, a relief from the burden of aid to underdeveloped countries.
5. A profitable area for investment with one of the best developed economic infrastructures in Africa.
6. An expanding market for American exports.

Rhodesia seeks from the United States:

1. Her friendship.
2. Her sympathetic understanding of the problems involved in perpetuating the values of western culture in Africa.
3. Support for the U.N. Charter principle of noninterference in the domestic affairs of nations.
4. Trading opportunities on a regular commercial basis.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Oct. 5, 1964]

NATIVES PREY ON NATIVES IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

(By Robert C. Ruark)

SALISBURY, SOUTHERN RHODESIA.—The topic here is terrorism, in short—intimidation, irresponsibility, sabotage, and a concerted effort by outside powers to inflame and create chaos. The pawns are wild, unemployed young men—youth wings, so to speak—who are spurred to violence and mass insurrection by skillful drill masters of social discontent.

The violence is only occasionally directed against the whites. The real violence is aimed at the destruction of the good things the white man has wrought—an attempt to destroy a black bourgeois class if it means peaceful coexistence with the white man to the mutual profit of both black and white.

SCHOOLS BURNT

In a span of a year and a half, some 50-odd native schools have been burnt down by youthful mobs, young roughnecks out for excitement in the name of God knows what. The modern young African thirsts for knowledge, and in the past few weeks mobs have beaten up small children on their way to education to such an extent that the schools had to be closed. Some are just reopening, but attendance is low.

In Zimunia Township a 500-unit modern housing development was built, with some such ridiculous rental as 10 shillings a month. It was irrigated, at Government expense, and the toughs came down and smashed all the irrigation pipes.

They've just declared a state of emergency in Southern Rhodesia in a largely native sector called Highfield. There were 14 separate states of emergency declared here last year to put down mob scenes by the youth wingers. Riot acts are twice read, but there is no gunplay by the called up reservists, who are always accompanied by native policemen who actually make the arrests.

BOMBS

Yet gasoline bombs, stones, sticks, any weapons at all are used by the defiant mobs, members of which have been known to spit in the faces of shock troops.

A favorite form of intimidation is to burn the houses and fields of African small farmers; to maim cattle; and always to beat up, violently, the subject of the intimidation. An African with a small hotel may find it smashed and looted, or simply burned to the ground.

The object, of course, is to mark, clearly, the penalty of getting along with the white man, and to destroy the greatest enemy of collectivism: Successful private enterprise.

But the implementers of the havoc, like the mobs in America, merely go along for the ride, reveling in the license to steal, pay off old grudges, and the exercise of sheer crowd hysteria.

The really emerging native finds himself penalized by his own people—hampered in education and agriculture and in civil rights. The sum is that the whites, who have been willing to bend, are now again tightening into a hard core. The end of this is what is called white uhuru here—a refusal to hand over the country on a one-man, one-vote basis because of intimidation.

TRUST LAND

From the outside, to one who does not know Africa, some of the actions of the white settlers may be thought harsh. But in light of the fact that half the country of Southern Rhodesia is tribal trust land, occupied by natives who do not crave immediate pants and privileges, and that the city spivs are making war on their own kind, there might be something to be said for a refusal to hand over a gracious land to a bunch of connivers at the top and strong-arm gangsters at the bottom.

That is the basic explanation of Southern Rhodesia's threat to declare its own uhuru, even if it means chopping off Mama England's apron strings.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 13, 1965]

A SIGNIFICANT VOTE IN THE U.N.

(By David Lawrence)

An event of tremendous significance has just occurred in the United Nations. By a vote of 107 to 2, the General Assembly has called on Britain to refuse to accept a declaration of independence by Rhodesia, because the latter's present government will not grant a majority of the inhabitants self-rule but will continue to give a white minority the preponderant power.

While there is a widespread feeling that the black man in Africa should have his rights, the incident raises the question of why the same principle shouldn't be applied to the people of other countries where a white majority have been and still are being denied the right to rule themselves.

Thus, for example, the populations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are overwhelmingly white, but their independence is impaired by an outside power which holds them in subjugation under "Communist colonialism."

The fact that the General Assembly of the United Nations now is insisting on self-government for different nations throughout the world which have been ruled by outside powers is an encouraging sign. The captive nations in Eastern Europe, however, have never had the benefit of a United Nations resolution declaring that they should enjoy independence and be allowed to develop autonomously without interference from other governments. Certainly the United Nations has never advocated the use of "all possible force" to deal with this problem, as it has just recommended with respect to Rhodesia.

In the case of the satellite countries in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union supposedly gave independence to this bloc of nations but nevertheless has managed to retain control through the apparatus of the Communist Party and often with military forces. The Russians try to spread the impression every now and then that these Eastern European countries are independent and can make trade arrangements with other parts of the world. But the fact remains that they do not really have self-government.

So any pronouncement by the United Nations today with respect to the right of self-government for the people of Rhodesia, the majority of whom happen to be black, could be taken to mean that the world's biggest international organization may soon express itself in favor of the principle of self-government for white people who have come under the yoke of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe.

It is significant that the United States voted for the resolution to hold up the grant of independence to Rhodesia by Britain, and in a friendly understanding with the British Foreign Office has undertaken to work in harmony with the authorities there. Pressure is to be brought to bear on the Rhodesian whites to prevent them from becoming independent under a government which, it is argued, wouldn't reflect the will of the majority of the people. There are nearly 4 million tribesmen, mostly uneducated, and 250,000 whites possessing skills of various kinds.

The State Department here has indicated it will participate in economic sanctions whereby trade would be cut off and aid of various kinds would be interrupted if the Rhodesian leaders insist upon separating themselves from the British and going it alone.

But, it will be asked, just why shouldn't Britain and other countries be willing to apply the same formula to Red China? For the Peiping regime has undertaken to prevent a majority of the people in South Vietnam from maintaining their independence.

The United Nations has, in effect, approved all measures of economic or military force that may be necessary to insure the independence of Rhodesia under a government chosen by a majority of its people. This gives hope that in the future perhaps the same concern will be felt and similar measures adopted to insure the right of the majority of the people of Vietnam to govern themselves without interference by a minority aided by Red China or the Soviet Union or any other country. Someday, too, perhaps the peoples of Eastern Europe will be helped by the United Nations to regain the independence they once enjoyed.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE FOR RHODESIA? WHY NOT FOR ALL COMMUNIST STATES?

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

If Prime Minister Ian Smith of Southern Rhodesia carries out his threat to declare his country independent, he is going to compel the Labor Government in London to put up or shut up. London will accept no independence that excludes the blacks, almost 12 times as numerous as the whites, from the vote. Smith knows that giving universal suffrage to a people totally unprepared for democracy would result in the killing or expulsion of the whites, the expropriation of their property, and the probable emergence of a new Ghana, half-fascist, half-Communist.

Rather than have this, Smith says, he and the other whites prefer to "go out fighting rather than crawling on our hands and knees."

Smith knows, as I reported from London last June, that Prime Minister Wilson dare not send white Britishers to shoot down white Rhodesians: men and perhaps officers, as well, would refuse. Economic sanctions by Britain alone would have little effect on white Rhodesians and might cause other African states to withdraw from the Commonwealth.

Apparently, Wilson is not alone. U Thant, the champion of enforced desegregation everywhere, believes the matter will come before the U.N. Security Council, possibly before these lines are printed. What can the Security Council do?

Send a "police force"—Indians, Ghanians, Yugoslavs—to impose desegregation? That would not be too easy. It was one thing for Dag Hammarskjold to send an Indian-commanded brigade to overcome Tshombe's Belgian mercenaries. It will be quite another to overcome white Rhodesians who feel they have their backs to the wall and no place else to go.

UNITED STATES WOULD FOLLOW THE LEADER

To be sure, just as Hammarskjold then, so U Thant now, would have the support of the United States. Last Friday, Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, representing the United States before the General Assembly's Trusteeship Committee, promised that the United Stats will "take the necessary concrete steps in concert with others" against an "illegal, unilateral declaration of independence" by Smith.

This is to me an astonishing position. It would have precluded the Declaration of Independence by the Founding Fathers in 1776. It would have prevented any number of similar acts since, in most cases, independence was the work of small minorities which, frequently failed to establish democratic regimes.

But Rhodesia, according to Mrs. Anderson and U Thant, is different. And the times have changed. In Rhodesia a small white minority intends to disenfranchise a black majority. Any such action may provoke other neighboring blacks to attack that country, and perhaps causing the whites of South Africa to come to its defense, thus possibly sparking a world war.

AMERICAN POSITION UNTENABLE

Both positions by an American administration are, in my eyes, untenable. I happen to deplore racial segregation and wars, of which I have witnessed five. But legally I see no difference between a 13th of the population ruling Rhodesia and less than that fraction ruling the Soviet Union, Red China, all the other Communist states, Egypt, and Indonesia (at least until last week), etc.

The same holds for the argument against "colonialism" which the irresponsible majority of U.N. members have made their sole criterion. If overseas colonies are bad, then so are the Soviets' internal colonies (comprising almost half of the total population), so is Red China's tyranny over Tibet and parts of Mongolia; so are Kenya's and Ethiopia's suppression of alien Somalis.

Why is the United Nations doing nothing about these situations? Why does it pick only on Rhodesia and, if it dared, on South Africa?

Color is not and cannot be made a binding touchstone in a world of law. Nor can the fear of local war "escalating" into major war. If the United States has, as I firmly believe, the right to wage war to liberate South Vietnam, Pakistan can do the same to liberate the Moslem Kashmiris—or at least to give them the right of self-determination.

Anything less is either an unprincipled bid for the favor of the nonwhite countries, rank hypocrisy or legal confusion which at some point can rebound against us. Oppression is oppression wherever it occurs.

If L.B.J. gets the full facts about Rhodesia, he will, I hope, decide that the independence of Rhodesia is strictly a matter for that country and for Britain. And let the anticolonialists in the United Nations squeal to their hearts' content.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 4, 1965]

Breathing Space in Rhodesian Crisis

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

A great many friends of Rhodesia, and friends of Britain as well, breathed a collective sigh of relief this past weekend when agreement was reached on the appointment of a royal commission to wet down the whole flaming issue of Rhodesian independence. This is not a guarantee of solution, but in the classic British tradition, it is a reasonable facsimile thereof; and it will give both sides a needed opportunity to let tempers cool off.

It is perhaps an oversimplification to say that all the merit is on the side of Rhodesia and all the power is on the side of Britain, but in the end it boils down to that. To his everlasting credit, Britain's Prime Minister Harold Wilson has rebuked the hotheads who were urging him to send in troops to quell incipient revolution. This is the least of the powers in Wilson's armamentarium; it could not possibly be invoked without inviting his own ruin. For the present, he has the force of a trumped-up world opinion, which may not amount to much in a showdown; and for the future, he has the threat of economic sanctions, which in the case of Rhodesia could well amount to a great deal.

Rhodesia is enormously dependent not only upon her tobacco exports, but also upon exports of asbestos, pig iron, copper, and meat. She exports gold, coal, groundnuts, chrome ore, raw sugar. And while a large part of this trade is with friendly South Africa, a much larger part depends for its existence upon access to markets—especially Commonwealth markets—in the rest of the world. Rhodesia lacks the self-sufficiency and diversification of South Africa; she desperately needs a continued inflow of foreign capital.

Yet it is a truism that might is not always right, and in seeking her independence, Rhodesia has every conceivable right on her side. Seventy years ago, Cecil J. Rhodes found in the Sabi-Limpopo region nothing but primitive jungle, riddled by disease, inhabited by tribes that scarcely had advanced from the Stone Age. Today the Sabi-Limpopo Irrigation Authority dramatically illustrates the fantastic story of modern Rhodesia. Thanks to the vision, industry, capital, and genius of the white settlers, a sturdy and prosperous nation has been brought into being—a nation that has the characteristics of nationhood in ways that Rwanda, Burundi, Gambia, and the Congo simply do not.

Who is it that opposes independence for Rhodesia? It is the same gaggle of professional liberals, hooked on the narcotic of instant equality, whose idiot chant of "one man, one vote" threw the Congo into chaos. These are the knee jerk opponents of colonialism—of Western colonialism, that is.

The several months required for the royal commission's study should provide time for the leaders of Rhodesia, out of a decent respect to the opinions of mankind, to declare more persuasively the causes that impel them to the separation.

In this interim period, perhaps it can be made clear that the Rhodesian constitution, coupled with the Rhodesian program of public education, must inevitably bring political power to the country's 4 million blacks. It can be made evident that within Rhodesia itself, opposition to independence comes largely from a handful of self-seeking black nationalist leaders, whose object is not peace and prosperity, but personal power.

If any people in the world should view the aspirations of Rhodesia sympathetically, surely it is the American people. When our Founding Fathers spoke for government by the consent of the governed, they were not speaking of the consent of illiterate Negro slaves and pagan Indian tribes. Their purpose was to provide new guards for their own future security, and toward that end they pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Theirs was the last unilateral declaration of independence within the British Empire, dated at Philadelphia July 4, 1776. We forget it today to our shame.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 24, 1965]

Silence on Rhodesia Inexplicable

(By David Lawrence)

Unprecedented things are happening today in the conduct of the Government of the United States—but most people aren't paying any attention to it, and representatives of both parties in Congress are strangely silent.

Nowhere in the Constitution, for instance, is the President given the right to decide for himself with what countries trade shall be conducted or what tariff duties shall be imposed—unless Congress specifically authorizes such broad powers by legislation.

Yet, over the past weekend, the United States voted in the Security Council of the United Nations to call on Britain to "quell" the rebellion in Rhodesia. Then Ambassador Arthur Goldberg announced various economic measures decided upon by this Government to carry out the purposes of the resolution. He declared that steps will be taken to tighten the economic squeeze on the Rhodesian secessionists and said that President Johnson had canceled Rhodesia's 1965 sugar-import quota of 9,500 tons—a shipment which already was on the high seas en route to America. Goldberg added:

"The President has suspended Rhodesia's sugar quota for 1965 and has directed that this shipment will not be accepted. We will continue to consider urgently any other steps which will insure that no action is taken to assist the illegal regime in Salisbury, Rhodesia. The writing is on the wall. The misguided rebels in Southern Rhodesia would do well to heed the voice of the Council and the voice of the vast majority of the nations of the world."

But coincidentally American boys are being killed or wounded in South Vietnam as a result of attacks by the troops of the North Vietnamese Government—a regime that is obtaining supplies and commodities through trading with many nations of the world. But nothing is being done here to cut off trade between the United States and such countries.

Also significant is the failure of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to voice any criticism about the interference in Rhodesia's internal affairs such as he expressed about the use of U.S. forces during a rebellion in the Dominican Republic. Not only was the action of Johnson then denounced as an improper interference with the right of a people to determine their own kind of government, but it was argued that the United States had no business interfering with a revolution organized by the people. In the case of the Dominican Republic, of course, there was a violation of the Monroe Doctrine as well as a threat by Communists to take possession of the government. But no such circumstances or precedents of international law are involved in Rhodesia.

If the principle is accepted that the executive branch has absolute power in international affairs—despite the plain words of the Constitution that Congress shall have the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations"—then the United States will again and again find itself in a awkward position with respect to policies pursued internally by various countries in the world. The economic weapon can be a powerful one, and Congress unquestionably would grant authority when an embargo would protect directly the interests of the United States. It is unlikely, however, that authorization would be given to pass judgment upon the internal policies of any country and to set up yardsticks to determine whether any government is or is not truly representative of the wishes of the people.

In the case of Rhodesia, Washington is doubtless motivated by a desire to please the British Government. But even more it seeks to curry favor with the large number of Negro voters in this country whose prejudices are easily aroused by the statement that Negroes in Rhodesia are being victimized by a white minority. In Rhodesia itself, however, there are many Negroes who feel that the future economic welfare of their country is linked to the opportunities of the whites to direct the development of the nation's resources.

The truth of the matter is that the Rhodesian question is being handled here as a political issue. Fear of the Negro vote in this country is what is influencing not only the executive branch of the Government but also many Members of Congress who are keeping quiet as Washington tries to tell the people of another country what kind of government they must have. To use the economic power of the United States to meddle in the political affairs of a country in another hemisphere is unprecedented. The acquiescence of many people in a policy which reveals an avowed purpose to intervene in the internal affairs of Rhodesia is inexplicable.

Rhodesia Challenges Forces of World Revolution

(By Eric D. Butler)

(Editor's Note.—Mr. Butler, Australian correspondent of the Canadian Intelligence Service is an internationally known writer and author, and one of the world's leading authorities on the world revolutionary movement. The following article is excerpted from the February Bulletin of the Canadian Intelligence Service.)

When the true history of our times comes to be written, it will be recorded that on November 1, 1965, Prime Minister Ian Smith, of Rhodesia, speaking for a handful of Europeans determined to uphold civilized values and to discharge their responsibilities toward their African brothers, struck a massive blow against the forces of world revolution. By their courageous stand, the Rhodesians have precipitated an international campaign which clearly reveals the nature of the conspiracy against civilization. At a time when Western leaders in London and Washington are allegedly engaged in directing a campaign of resistance against Communist criminals in Moscow and Peiping, they are in fact uniting with those same criminals in pursuit of the common objective of destroying the Smith government.

The tragic plight of a brainwashed world has never been more graphically demonstrated than by the international campaign against Rhodesia. Both Moscow and Pieping are devoting every effort to a total war—military, political, economic, and psychological—designed to produce a world Communist state. But the leaders of the non-Communist world solemnly proclaim that just over 200,000 Europeans in Rhodesia, threatening no one, upholding a rule of law which protects both European and African, are such a "threat to world peace" that every effort must be made to destroy them. In the "United" Nations, only two nations, South Africa and Portugal, declined to ally themselves with the call to "crush Rhodesia."

British Socialist Prime Minister Harold Wilson calls for the destruction of civilized government in Rhodesia, while advocating peaceful coexistence with the criminals of the Kremlin. Supporting him are the big international news agencies, responsible for what is called "world opinion," and powerful international financial groups.

It was significant that when Prime Minister Wilson blatantly stole Rhodesian financial reserves in London, and suspended the Governor and Directors of the Board of the Reserve Bank of Rhodesia, he replaced them with financiers who have long served revolutionary causes. The new chairman, Sir Sydney Caine, is director of the London School of Economics; while the merchant banker, S. G. Warburg, another member of Mr. Wilson's new bank board, has played a prominent role in attempting to destroy British sovereignty and institutions by forcing the United Kingdom into the European Economic Community.

AFRICA MAJOR COMMUNIST TARGET

The Rhodesian situation can only be realistically discussed against the background of Communist global strategy. Mr. Ian Smith is constantly stressing the fact that he and his fellows are attempting to hold the line for civilization in Africa against the threat of Congo-type reversions to barbarism which the Communists seek to exploit. The Communists have no interest in Africans except as the raw material of their revolutionary strategy. Africa is one of the Communists' most important strategical targets. We know this because they have been frank about their strategy. Following closely Lenin's teaching about conquering the Western nations through their colonies, and the development of this strategy by Stalin in his work on the "National Problem," the Communists have intensified their revolutionary activities in three major areas of the world: Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

A brilliant and authoritative exposition of current Communist strategy was provided by Mao Tse-tung's Minister of National Defense, Lin Piao, in an article in the Peiping Review of September 3, 1965, and subsequently republished in booklet form. After outlining Mao Tse-tung's theory of "the establishment of rural revolutionary base areas and the encirclement of the cities from the countryside," Lin Piao went on to observe: "Taking the entire globe, if North America and Western Europe can be called the cities of the world, then Asia, Africa, and Latin America constitute the rural areas of the world. Since World War II, the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in the North American and West European capitalist countries, while the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa, and Latin America has been growing vigorously. In a sense, the contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas. In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples."

The Smith government in Rhodesia challenges this revolutionary strategy as applied in Africa. By so doing it has brought down the wrath of the whole international revolutionary movement on its head. But it is also acting as a type of catalyst, forcing people around the world to face the issues involved in the Rhodesian stand, and to take sides.

Rhodesia could be the turning point in the struggle against the forces of revolution. Mr. Ian Smith firmly believes this to be the case, thus proving that he is not only a great statesman, but a leader of vision.

[Communist Party statement on Rhodesia appearing in the Worker, Nov. 21, 1965]

Communist Party Statement on Rhodesia

(Note.—The following statement was issued Tuesday by the national office of the Communist Party.)

Neither racism nor minority rule has any right to lay claim to political independence in the modern world. That is the fundamental issue at stake in the announcement by the Ian Smith regime that it was separating South Rhodesia from the British Commonwealth.

What is involved is a desperate attempt of a small white exploiting class to perpetuate its state rule over 4 million African people in a country having less than one-quarter million white inhabitants. The so-called declaration of independence of South Rhodesia, therefore, bears more resemblance to the secessionist proclamation of southern U.S. slaveholders in 1860 than to the 1776 charter of liberty whose language is now cynically invoked.

Once again our government is being put to the test of its readiness to carry out in action its verbal commitments to the defense of democracy. Mere resolutions will not do. Nor will it suffice to join with Britain in meaningless or insignificant economic gestures toward white supremacist Rhodesia while continuing to extract mounting superprofits from business with this country and its apartheid neighbor, South Africa, which inspired and supports the racist dictatorship headed by Ian Smith.

No pious partnership between the past masters of colonialism in the British Government and the neocolonialist aggressors of the Johnson administration can evade the call for justice now raised in the chambers of the United Nations. The world has not forgot the speed with which Great Britain has resorted to force to impose its will against the people anywhere who challenge its domination, whether in Aden in the East or Guiana in the New World. Neither are they unaroused by the armed invasion of U.S. forces in the Dominican Republic or in Vietnam.

Nothing less than the removal from power of the racist usurpers will do. The vast majority of Rhodesian people, through such organizations as the Zimbabwe African People's Union and the Zimbabwe African Nationalist Union, have called upon the British Government to use force to stop the rebellion. Thirty-six African nations in the U.N., supported by many others, including all the socialist countries, have called upon the world organization to give its immediate and full support to such action.

The Communist Party of the U.S.A. joins with all other Americans who cherish freedom, equality, and national independence in calling upon the U.S. delegates in the United Nations to put aside all sham or delaying measures in dealing with Rhodesia's racist rulers and to give full support to the use of the full power of the U.N. to insure the freedom and independence of the Zimbabwe people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 30, 1965]

Ironies Mount on Rhodesia Issue

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

And so the campaign continues against the independent Government of Rhodesia—

an ugly campaign, unreasoning, demagogic—and the ironies mount up.

In the United Nations, the air is filled with cries that the United Nations must not stand idly by while the rights of man are being violated in Rhodesia. Yet those who shed the largest tears stand dry-eyed as the rights of man are raped through the Eastern world.

By an overwhelming vote, the General Assembly calls for economic sanctions. To our own shame, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg joins the gang. Yet those who would close all ports to Rhodesian trade are strangely agreeable to other commerce—the commerce that feeds strategic goods to our enemies in Haiphong and Hanoi.

Our Government joins in a fervid resolution denouncing Rhodesia's independence as a threat to international peace. Not a scrap of reasoned argument supports this declaration, but one might as well try reasoned argument on a lynch mob. The sin of Ian Smith's regime is that the Rhodesian constitution fails to provide for the franchise in a fashion suitable to the tastes of Dahomey, Gabon, and Chad. To any objective eye, the shortcomings of Rhodesia's constitution would seem to be matters "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction" of that beleaguered country, and as such, beyond the reach of U.N. intervention under U.N. Charter. But the delegates from Dahomey, Gabon, and Chad—and from the United States—do not appear to have read that part of the U.N. Charter lately.

Life magazine is full of moral outrage. Think of it. Under the Smith government, "220,000 whites intend to maintain absolute domination over 4 million blacks, no matter what the cost." Yet the other side of this proposition is that 4 million blacks would maintain absolute domination over 220,000 whites, no matter what the cost—and the cost would be prodigious.

That is the heart of the issue. To the kindergarten mentalities whose intellectual capacity begins with one man and concludes with one vote, it sounds so plausible: Why shouldn't 4 million prevail over 220,000? As Edmund Burke observed 175 years ago, in reflecting upon the revolution in France, such an argument cannot be refuted if the constitution of a kingdom be a problem in arithmetic only. "This sort of discourse does well enough with the lamp post for its second," said Burke. "To men who may reason calmly, it is ridiculous."

The problem in Rhodesia is no mere exercise in sums on a schoolboy's slate. We are not dealing with weights in a scale or numbers on a chart. The object is the formation of government, the preservation of order, the defense of property, the management of public affairs, the regulation of commerce, the administration of law. Those who would deliver Rhodesia into the hands of the 4 million blacks, out of some obsessive lust for instant democracy, have whipped reason out of their temples. They fancy that all men are equal. It is not so; it has never been so.

Do we learn nothing from our history, our own laws, our own institutions? We do not send a boy with a jack-knife to operate upon a President, out of some delusion that competence runs with the edge on a blade. And by the same token, neither do we admit felons, morons, and mewling infants to the polls. Implicit in the franchise requirements of our own land is the sound rule that the vote should be confined, however roughly, to those of presumed virtue and wisdom. It was not until August 1920, just 45 years ago, that women were deemed the political equals of men.

Where, then, does the notion arise that the untutored blacks of Rhodesia are prepared for the heavy responsibilities it is proposed to put upon them? By what colossal impudence does the United States object to the composition of a distant parliament? It is none of our business to say that Rhodesia's franchise requirements, as to property and education, should be rewritten to the model of Kansas or New York. The government of Ian Smith is capable of governing; it is pledged to a continued program of public education and private employment that will lift the native population steadily toward a better life. If colonial status is to end, what more reasonably could be asked?

The answer of the egalitarians is that it is not enough that colonialism should end. "White supremacy" also must end. The demand has become a fetish, so wrapped in a fuzzy emotion that it provokes irrational reverence. In any government, some man, or men, or group must always be "supreme," for power must be vested ultimately in particular hands and minds. In Rhodesia today, by reason of their inheritance and their labor, the industrious whites who built the country have established their supremacy. If this be treason, they are entitled to a chance to make the most of it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 21, 1965]

CUBA, RHODESIA, AND TRADING

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The Prime Minister of England marched into the rotunda of the British Embassy a little before 6 o'clock Friday evening, with a small safari of briefcase bearers striding along behind him. He had come to meet the press; and the press had Rhodesia on its mind.

"Since the beginning of the Rhodesia crisis a month ago," the first questioner recalled, "the U.S. Government has cooperated fully with you in the imposition of economic sanctions against Rhodesia. What would be your position, sir, on a reconsideration of Britain's willingness to ship buses and other British commodities to Communist Cuba?"

Above his red tie, the Prime Minister's face turned a little pink; his cold blue eyes frosted over. It was a strawberry parfait effect.

"There is no parallel," snapped the Prime Minister of England. The Ian Smith government, he explained, is an "illegal" government. It is a part of the British Commonwealth in a way that Cuba was never a part of the United States. He could find nothing analogous in the two situations.

It was not the time or place for a newspaperman to argue with the operating head of Her Majesty's Government. Yet if the occasion had permitted, it would have been a fascinating business to pursue the matter with Harold Wilson. The longer the Rhodesian story continues, the more it emphasizes the double or triple or quadruple standards of political morality that prevail among the nations of the world.

Consider, if you please, the matter of Cuba. It is passing strange, merely to touch upon one point, that Wilson should have chosen to disprove a parallel by first emphasizing the "illegal" nature of the Smith regime. One has difficulty in recalling when Fidel Castro was elected to anything. Nor is one especially impressed by Wilson's denunciation (in his speech to Commons on December 10) of the "police state methods" instituted by Smith at Salisbury. No measures taken in Rhodesia since November 11 could compare with the oppressions and confiscations imposed by Castro in Cuba.

Yet there is much more. It was the official position of our own Government, long before that historic October of 1962, that Castro's Cuba presented a formidable threat to international security. As far back as May 1961, the House voted 401 to 2 to declare Cuba "a base and staging area for Communist subversion throughout the hemisphere." In the spring of 1962, Kennedy proclaimed a renewed embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba, and called upon our NATO allies to support our position.

Our good friends in England could not have cared less about assisting the United States in the enforcement of sanctions thought vital to U.S. interests. Over the first 8 months of 1962, 432 non-Communist ships carried Communist cargoes to Cuba; the Greeks were first, with 97 of these; the British ranked second, with 77.

In the fall of 1962 came the great confrontation, when the missiles were discovered and the world held its breath. Kennedy once more begged the British to clamp down on trade with Castro. On October 11, 1962, British shipowners voted unanimously to refuse.

Throughout this period, British tankers carried oil to Cuba. Canada sold wheat to Cuba by the millions of bushels. In the summer of 1963, Kennedy asked Britain to ban trade and travel to Cuba; Britain refused. In February 1964 the effects of continued British trade with Castro were so serious that the United States temporarily suspended military aid to Britain.

But hi, ho, parallels run awry. The U.S. Government supports Britain's sanctions against Rhodesia to the hilt—private contracts cancelled, export restrictions imposed, funds frozen. And now, as the Prime Minister told the press conference, it is anticipated that U.S. planes will assist in an airlift of oil to Zambia.

The sole ambition of Ian Smith appears to be to cling to an island of Western stability in a flood of African nationalism. It would not seem an unworthy ambition. But our Government will join the gang in seeking to pull him loose. We will "crush" him; we will "bring him to heel." And, meanwhile, our good friends of the West continue to trade not only with Castro in Cuba but also with Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam. In the world of presidents and prime ministers, one concludes, the theorems of geometry seldom apply; and parallel lines proceed elliptically instead.

JOHNSON'S RHODESIA BAN SAID TO BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

(By Lyle Wilson)

It does seem to be a fact that President Johnson stumbled over the U.S. Constitution when he undertook to interrupt commerce between the United States and newly independent Rhodesia in Africa.

There is not much if any constitutional or other authority for the President of the United States to undertake the regulation of foreign commerce. Article 1, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution asserts in language both plain and vigorous that: "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

The Constitution does authorize the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties with foreign nations. By treaty, the President often is authorized to negotiate commerce arrangements with foreign powers. No such treaty seems to apply precisely to the situation in Rhodesia which was a British colony until some months ago when the Rhodesian Government proclaimed its independence.

Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, last month reminded the House of Representatives of a law which would appear to forbid the President to boycott Rhodesian trade. GROSS recalled that last summer the Congress amended the 1949 Export Control Act. Among the amendments was the following provision: "The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States (a) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States and (b) to encourage and request domestic concerns * * * to refuse to take any action * * * which has the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States."

L.B.J.'s instant support of the British boycott against Rhodesia is in contrast to the British refusal to support the U.S. boycott of trade with Communist Cuba and with North Vietnam. The British Government does support the American war in southeast Asia but the support is tendered in words whereas support in substantial deeds is withheld.

It is quite possible, of course, that global considerations dictate U.S. support of the British boycott against Rhodesia but that would not automatically make it constitutional.

A recent news dispatch from Salisbury, Rhodesia, reported that the British were fudging on their own boycott. A British waiver of boycott restrictions was said to have enabled British concerns to import scarce chrome ore from Rhodesia after American firms had begun to boycott the Rhodesia ore. Chrome is scarce. Alternate supplies for the United States are in Turkey and the Soviet Union. But Turkey was reported to be unable to step up production to meet U.S. needs before August of next year.

Out of the Johnson administration action against trade with Rhodesia, arises need for two inquiries:

One by L.B.J. to determine the facts relating to chrome ore and a second by Congress to establish under what authority, if any, the President undertook to regulate U.S. commerce with Rhodesia. If no authority can be shown, the attempted regulation should cease.

[From an editorial, National Review Bulletin, Dec. 21, 1965]

WHAT FOR RHODESIA?—AN AMERICAN VIEW OF THE RHODESIAN CRISIS

To withdraw the U.S. consular representative from Salisbury was clearly within the Government's legal province, and perhaps appropriate to the wish of our closest ally. But to cancel the contracted enterprises of private citizens (as in the case of the 9,500 tons of Rhodesian sugar in transit to a U.S. buyer), to seize bank deposits, to prohibit commercial and financial undertakings between U.S. citizens and Rhodesians white or black? Under what law exactly, under what provision of the Constitution, does the President decree such measures?

Oh well, United States-Rhodesian trade doesn't amount to a damn anyway, so what's the sweat—at most, our actions have a "symbolic significance." Indeed they do have a symbolic significance, and we will do well to try to understand just what they symbolize. Besides being symbol, moreover, they are, or become, precedent. Is this a precedent we really want to see established—that the President, without reference to law, to Congress, or the courts, can on the single basis of his own reading of events, order us to break our contracts and tell us with whom we may or may not do business?

It seems especially odd when you look at it this way: At exactly this same moment that our Government joins to try to throttle the lifeblood out of the Rhodesian economy, it is moving on many fronts to try to expand our trade with the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations of Eastern Europe. Does this mean an official estimate that Ian Smith is a greater potential threat to our security and interests than Kosygin and his comrades? It is hard to see how otherwise the disparity in policy can make sense. Still odder is the asymmetry stressed by Barry Goldwater in a recent column. To Britain's call for a boycott of Rhodesia we give a prompt and positive response. To our 4-year continuing appeal to friends and allies for a partial boycott of Castro's Cuba, the response is nyet in every language.

But oddest of all is the fact that our Government has never even asked for a boycott, of any sort, of North Vietnam. Not merely Communist ships, but hundreds—literally hundreds, as Representative PAUL ROGERS of Florida has annotated—of free world ships are delivering cargoes, of free world as well as Communist origin, to Ho Chi-Minh. We boycot Ian Smith. We do not boycott Ho. Try that pair out on one of those logic machines the stores are offering.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 27, 1965]

WHAT'S RHODESIA ALL ABOUT?

(By David Lawrence)

What's Rhodesia all about? Why should anybody in the United States worry about events in that country in central Africa? Can the realistic situation be summed up and simplified so that the average American can understand it?

This correspondent has just received from an American businessman a letter that had come to him from a well-informed man of financial and business background in Rhodesia, who penned it primarily for the eyes of his close friend in the United States. It reads as follows:

"Having sold my business interests in Britain, I came here with my wife and two children in 1958. At that time there were three territories—namely, Rhodesia, Zambia, and Malawi—federated in one unit under the British Government.

"It was the fact of this single economic unit of 9 million people which attracted a great deal of business at that time, and the potential was very vast. The Federal Parliament was led by Sir Roy Welensky, and the economic and social progress during the years of its existence was remarkable.

"Unfortunately the spirit of African nationalism which demanded immediate power became rampant, and in the face of nationalist demands the British government broke up this federal unit and returned all the territories to their constituent parts.

"The most advanced territory in every respect was that of Rhodesia, and it had enjoyed internal self-government since 1925 and was a remarkably well-managed country. The Parliament consisted of 50 European members and 15 African members who were elected entirely on a nonracial basis and on a qualitative franchise.

"That is to say, the principle of 'one man, one vote' did not apply, but individuals of all races could obtain their vote by showing that they had some measure of educational or property qualification. In the case of what are known as the 'B roll' voters, these qualifications were minimal and resulted in 15 African seats in Parliament.

"Over a number of years, however, it was predictable that the African representation would increase as more of them qualified for the vote, and in anything between 10 and 15 years the control of government would pass into black hands.

"I have no doubt whatsoever that the principle of 'one man, one vote' is totally opposed to the interests of the people—and I mean all the people—of Rhodesia. There is no doubt that this country is today what it is as a result of the initiative, skill and capital of the white man. He is prepared to accept the African in government over a period as he becomes qualified to govern, but not to hand over instantly.

"Just to complicate the position further the African nationalists, who agreed to all these arrangements being put into force, later went back on their word and resorted to methods of intimidation, thuggery and violence in order to place themselves in power without delay.

"While the British Government granted complete national independence to the two less-developed territories of the former federation, they refused to grant independence to Rhodesia in view of the majority government of the white electorate which would not disappear until a number of years had elapsed. I consider that this was a grave injustice and, although our leaders tried to negotiate independence and offered guarantees that the constitution which would result in African rule in a number of years would be respected, these negotiations failed.

"Our Cabinet decided that it could no longer recognize the colonial aspect of British Government rule over this territory and declared the country to be independent.

"There is no doubt that this country could exist and take its place as an honorable member of the nations of the world if it were left to itself. But the British and American Governments have put their heads together to destroy Rhodesia. I hate this because if it were not for the action of the British and American Governments the other nations in the world would be powerless and most of them would accept Rhodesia in a short time as a national entity.

"It seems to me the utmost folly that this damaging policy should be pursued. There is an international effort being made to ruin this peaceful and delightful country which has been well governed for many years and which is a threat to no other nation in the world. It is, in fact, one of the best bastions against communism in Central Africa, and we cannot understand why America fights against communism in Vietnam but is doing everything possible to ruin the opponents of communism in Central Africa.

"We sincerely believe this policy is not only misguided but completely wrong in its conception. For those who live in the vicinity of the Congo and know what happens when a civilized economy is completely disrupted and savagery takes control, it is appalling to think of the policies which are being adopted against us at the present time."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 27, 1966]

THE DESPERATELY DETERMINED RHODESIANS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Three and a half months have now elapsed since Ian Smith set his pen to an awkward paraphrase of Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and thus asserted Rhodesia's status as a free and independent nation. Since then the ironies, the inconsistencies, the illegalities, and the hardships have mounted—but Rhodesia goes on. And if his besieged government can make it past this spring and summer, Mr. Smith may have survived his own Valley Forge.

The Rhodesians one interviews here in Washington are an attractive group of men, as men of well-born British background generally are. They exude the same tweed-and-leather charm, the same civilized urbanity that one finds at the British Embassy, but there is a subtle difference. The Rhodesians somehow bespeak a certain hardness of the hands and of the spirit. They have embarked upon a desperate struggle to preserve a way of life that seems to them right and wise and realistic; and they are desperately determined to succeed.

In their private conversations, they go as far in confessing resentment at America's policies—or more precisely, at Lyndon Johnson's policies—as the courtesies of the situation permit. How ironic it is, they remark, that the President willingly joins Britain in sanctions against Rhodesia, while Britain cooly refuses to join the United States in sanctions against Cuba. How remarkable that the United States continues to dwell in such amity with Communist Russia and her satellites, where free elections are a travesty, and yet insists upon "one man, one vote" for Rhodesia.

They have read the U.S. Constitution, and they understand that the President has broad powers in foreign affairs. But they raise the same valid question that Iowa's Representative Gross raised in the House a few days ago: Does not the Constitution vest in the Congress alone the regulation of commerce with foreign nations? And if this is so, by what authority may the President, on his own, impose sweeping restrictions upon private contracts for import-export trade in lawful goods? In the language of the Export Control Act of 1949, Rhodesia assuredly is a country friendly to the United States. Why, then, is it singled out for boycott and sanction?

The Rhodesian guests have other grievances that rankle. If one is to talk of racial policies (and the issue scarcely can be avoided), is not the position of the United States wholly inconsistent with past history and present reality? A century ago, they observe, the newly freed American slaves were by no means ready for intelligent exercise of the franchise, and this truth was plainly understood even by the framers of the 15th amendment. A hundred years have passed, and countless Negroes remain illiterate and apathetic, even though the civilizing benefits of a democratic society have existed all around them. By what stroke of the imagination is it conceived that the African tribes of Rhodesia are now equipped for the sovereignty it is proposed to thrust upon them?

In plain point of fact, our visitor insists, Rhodesia has gone much farther and much faster than the United States, at comparable periods, in the assimilation of the blacks into a political and economic structure created by the capital and know-how of the white. Fifteen seats in the Rhodesian Parliament are held by African voters. Easy communication prevails between black and white. Educational levels edge steadily upward. So do income levels. And race relations are tranquil. Can Harlem say the same? Or Birmingham? Or Los Angeles?

What of the double standards applied by the United States A month ago, the Nigerian Government fell to a military coup, and for the time being at least, civil liberties have been extinguished in Nigeria. Similarly, in Uganda, Prime Minister Milton Obote has seized apparently dictatorial povers and arrested five members of his cabinet. It is a reasonable assumption that civil liberties have gone down the drain in Uganda also. Yet the Liberal commentators and politicians who have wailed so loudly over press censorship in Rhodesia will have little or nothing to say of much grosser abuses of Western ideals elsewhere in Africa.

Are the sanctions hurting? Yes, our visitors admit. The time is almost at hand for Rhodesia's tobacco markets to open, and no one wants to predict how much of the immensely valuable crop will be sold—to whom, or at what prices. If the government is compelled to buy up most of the crop at a fixed minimum, both black man and white man will suffer grave hardship. Meanwhile, reserves of gasoline and oil are dwindling, and unemployment is increasing in business dependent upon export or import trade.

Yet the tough Rhodesians are accustomed to hardship, and they are remarkably united. George III had some loyal supporters in Boston 190 years ago, and Harold Wilson has some loyal supporters in Salisbury today. But they are relatively much fewer now than then.

"You made it with your revolution," says a Rhodesian spokesman. "And we'll make it with ours."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 15, 1966]

THE GREAT RHODESIAN CONSPIRACY UNMASKED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The downtown Washington chapter of the great Rhodesian conspiracy convened for lunch a few days ago, in order to take stock of the situation and to drink appropriate toasts to the Queen, to independence, and to Soapy Williams.

In the nature of things, this being a proper conspiracy, it is impossible for your correspondent to disclose everything that was said. Neither is it advisable to identify the restaurant where we met, though it was down near the Willard, its walls were a horrid magenta, and the oysters were fine though the martinis were undistinguished.

The meeting was called to order by the chairman of the conspiracy, the Hon. H. J. C. Hooper. His code name is John. He looks like a country banker and is slightly bigger than Gibraltar. The other two conspirators must be officially nameless. One of them, name of Rodney, is short, blue-eyed, mustached, brushed and weskited. The second, name of Ken, is short, brown-eyed, long-haired and tweedy. They all smoke Rhodesian cigarettes. By such infernal devices is the peace of the world imperiled.

The first order of business dealt with the remarkably offensive letter our leader had received on February 26 from Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. It did not even begin, "Dear John," which would have been friendly. It began "Dear Mr. Hooper," and went on, in the coldest kind of language, to object to the mere existence of a Rhodesian Information Office on McGill Terrace NW., or anywhere else. It was apparent that Under Secretary Mann wants no information about Rhodesia distributed. Members of the chapter agreed that, considering U.S. policy on Rhodesia, this was certainly a reasonable position on the part of Mr. Mann.

The chair inquired what should be done about the letter. After some discussion, it was resolved respectfully that nothing should be done about the letter. Perhaps Mr. Mann, on further reflection, would conclude that in a nation purportedly dedicated to free speech, it must seem peculiar to prohibit the Rhodesians from speaking freely. So the matter was tabled.

The next item of business dealt with the resignation of G. Mennen Williams as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. Following three cheers and a tiger, led by Rodney standing on his chair, order was restored. A motion was put to send a floral wreath to the voters of Michigan, with a legend wrought in carnations, "Africa's Loss, Detroit's Gain." The motion was approved by standing vote.

Resuming their seats, the members then resolved themselves into a conspiracy of the whole house in order to consider the threat to world peace presented by an independent Rhodesia. Several months ago, when independence was declared, it was widely apprehended that the Zambians, next door, might be fearfully endangered. "What's with Zambia these days?"

Thanks in part to the taxpayers of the United States and Britain, things in Zambia are dandia. At fantastic expense and considerable risk, gasoline is being flown into Zambia. (Rhodesia would be happy to haul it by rail.) Despite the cries of "let's you and him fight," Zambia and Rhodesia have no quarrel. In perfect amity, they still are operating the Central African Airways, which they own jointly with Malawi. Rhodesia continues to supply the cheap coal, hydroelectric power, and rail transport essential to Zambia's copper production. Travelers move freely back and forth.

If Rhodesia is not threatening the peace of Zambia, whose peace is Rhodesia threatening? Ghana? Not hardly. Guinea? Chad? Upper Volta? Tanzania? Nigeria? Kenya? The Congo? Arthur Goldberg? The conspiracy of the whole house looked diligently under the chairs, behind the posts, in Rodney's weskit. A threat to peace was nowhere to be found.

What about the future? Well, it was asked, what about it? The furious sanctions imposed by Harold Wilson and Lyndon Johnson are proving to be an inconvenience, not a disaster. So much petroleum is coming into Rhodesia that rationing has been eased for holiday trips. The de facto government of Ian Smith gets more de facto all the time. Unless Britain drags the United States into the astounding idiocy of a U.N. "peacekeeping" action this summer, it is anticipated that events will continue on their peaceful way.

Meanwhile, the conspirators voted to express their grateful thanks for all the support they are getting from Americans as private citizens. Some 15 organizations have sprung into being spontaneously, among them Friends in American of Independence for Rhodesia (FAIR), the Rhodesian Independence Gung Ho Troops (RIGHT), and Hooray for Ian Smith, Titan of Rhodesian Yearning (HISTORY). While most of these are in the late Confederacy, where the spirit of independence still grows like goldenrod, friendly mail comes in from all over.

No further business coming before the house, the conspiracy arose, paid the check, and proceeded into the real world of Washington, D.C., where friendly little nations are harassed, phantom threats are conjured out of nowhere, and legitimate world trade is prohibited out of deference to the Harlem vote. The great Rhodesian conspirary is make-believe. It's not alone.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Inasmuch as the Senate appears to have completed its business for the day, I move that under the previous order, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Friday, March 25, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 22 (legislative day of March 21), 1966:

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Farris Bryant, of Florida, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Mr. Paul Thornton Eckel, Grace Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Va., offered the following prayer:

Lamentations: 3: 22–23: *The steadfast love of the Lord never ceases, his mercies never come to an end; they are new every morning; great is Thy faithfulness.*

Let us pray.

Great God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for Thy love and faithfulness, without which our world would be chaos, our lives confused, our spirits confounded. In the press of our many duties we often fail Thee. Forgive us for receiving thoughtlessly and using carelessly Thy mercies.

In Thy faithfulness Thou hast given us a new day. We did not ask for it nor do we deserve it. It is a gift from Thee. We thank Thee for it. Help us to put its precious hours to good use.

In Thy mercy Thou hast equipped us to accept fresh duties. Help us to recognize our various tasks as ways we may serve the world Thou dost love. Grant that we may do our work as unto Thee.

In Thy love Thou hast endowed us with every noble and necessary resource. Cause us to use our minds creatively. Enable us to remain sensitive to human needs. And grant that we may always rely upon those inner resources of faith which sustain life and give eternal dimension to daily activities.

And so, inspired and empowered by Thy faithfulness, make us faithful, O God. We ask this in the name of Him, who in the work He did was faithful unto death, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12762. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; and

S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably absent at a conference in another part of the Capitol during rollcall No. 42. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

THE SUPREME COURT OBSCENITY DECISION

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to note briefly today the landmark decision of the U.S. Supreme Court yesterday in the Ginzberg and Mishkin cases.

To many of us who long have believed that Federal laws have been inadequate to cope with the flood of obscene and lascivious materials flowing into our society, the decisions of the Court majority are a step toward curbing this pollution.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored legislation which would curb the traffic in pornography through the mails by regulating the use of mailing lists.

In preparing this measure, H.R. 10331, I have had occasion to speak to, and correspond with, Post Office and Justice Department officials on the question of pornography.

The general attitude which I have encountered is one of reluctance to press existing laws because of the belief that if cases were appealed to the High Court, the defendants were almost certain to be released.

This assumption can no longer be made. Not only has the U.S. Supreme Court upheld obscenity convictions, it has added two new dimensions to the grounds for finding materials obscene.

First, it ruled that titillating advertising that panders to the baser appetites of the audience can be evidence that the advertised material is obscene.

Second, it ruled that material which is sadistic and masochistic can be considered to appeal to prurient interests even though such material appeals only to a sexually deviant audience.

These two rulings will strengthen our laws against obscene materials. They will put new vigor into the efforts of our Federal postal officials and our U.S. district attorneys who must ferret out and indict the peddlers of smut.

Further, the rulings make even more imperative the early enactment of my bill, H.R. 10331. This bill will give the Post Office Department a new instrument for discovering who is sending out the kind of pornographic "come-on" material which the Court has cited as additional proof of obscenity.

At present, H.R. 10331 is pending before the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is my hope that hearings can be scheduled on the proposal in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has struck a blow for decency and traditional American moral values. Now let us go forward toward the goal of making ours a good society by enacting new legislation to help our Federal officials move against those conscienceless individuals whose lust for profit leads them to spew filth and corruption into the American mainstream.

USE OF WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT BY JET AIRCRAFT

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, General McKee, announced commencing April 24 of this year Washington National Airport would be open for intermediate and short-range commercial jet operations. Since that time a number of my colleagues, some from the great State of Maryland and others from the northern Virginia area, have been critical of this decision. I would like to point out to the House that in my opinion General McKee was inherently correct in making this decision. He is being realistic and progressive and facing the times. Anyone who has any semblance of knowledge about the operation of commercial jet aircraft will note that by the year 1970 piston-type aircraft will be a thing of the past in commercial operations.

Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter to General McKee commending him on his decision. The letter reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1966.

Gen. WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL MCKEE: In the past several weeks I have noticed some of my colleagues in the House and Senate, particularly from the Maryland and northern Virginia areas, being critical of your decision authorizing intermediate commercial jet operations in Washington National Airport.

Frankly, it appears to me that the complaints concerning possible noise, traffic, etc., are unrealistic and not in keeping with the times.

Your decision in my opinion is the only proper decision that could be made in the public interest. Anyone with any semblance of knowledge of aircraft operations will recognize that commercial piston aircraft are rapidly being phased out, and by the year 1970 commercial planes other than jets will be a rarity.

The purpose of this letter is merely to point out to you that as the ranking minority member of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee, as a frequent commercial airline user, and as a member of the general public, I wish to commend and support your realistic and progressive decision making Washington National Airport available for short range and intermediate commercial jet aircraft.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
Member of Congress.

FEES FOR USE OF FEDERAL RECREATION AREAS

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BELCHER**. Mr. Speaker, since the idea of charging fees and admissions at our Federal lakes and recreational areas was first proposed, members of the Oklahoma delegation have strenuously objected. Over our objection this proposal was included in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 which the Congress passed last year. And I might add, over the objection of the Army Corps of Engineers who also opposed the charging of such fees at reservoirs.

Today I am left no alternative but to introduce a bill to repeal the authority of the Federal Government to make such entrance and admission fees at these Federal lakes and reservoirs.

I believe these charges are both unnecessary and unjustified. In fact, it is one of the best examples I have seen of the Federal Government practicing double taxation. First, it takes the tax dollar collected to build and provide these areas, and then turns right around and charges the taxpayer another tax to enter upon these waters and grounds.

It seems to me, also, to be doubletalk. On one hand the Federal Government urges the American taxpayer to "see America first," and then it pulls the rug right out from under him by saying, "Of course, there is a small entrance fee."

But more than these obvious arguments, we have been dishonest with the American people. For in too many areas, these reservoirs and lakes were approved by the local folk because they were led to understand that the Federal Government would not interfere with their right to enter upon and use these waters and lands, as they had in times past.

I believe it is immoral to so mislead the American taxpayer in this manner, and I would hope that this Congress will take early action to correct this.

FNMA PARTICIPATIONS—THE COSTLY WAY

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, last week on March 16, the Federal National Mortgage Association sold $410 million of participations against a pool of Government-owned home mortgages. The participations were sold at par. They are due serially in 1 to 15 years. The interest rate on the 3 to 7 year maturities was 5½ percent.

Only a month before, the Treasury on February 15 sold an issue of notes on an exchange basis with a maturity of 4¾ years. The interest rate was 5 percent.

The difference in rate between these two issues measures in part the added cost to the Government of financing through FNMA participations rather than through sale of Treasury notes. In this instance, for comparable maturities, the added interest cost to the Government was a full half percent per year.

Actually it could be claimed the interest differential was even more because on the day the FNMA participations were sold, the Treasury 5-percent notes were being freely traded in the Government securities market at a premium. At the close of March 16, these Treasury 5-percent notes were quoted 100 15/32 bid and 100 19/32 asked. At that asked price, an investor would receive a yield to maturity of but 4.86 percent.

The $410 million issue of FNMA participations was sold outright to an underwriting group of banks and investment bankers. The average underwriting commission of $3.51 per $1,000 of participations was modest enough for such an underwriting deal. Nevertheless, the commission amounted to $1,440,000 on the entire issue. The Treasury does not incur any similar expense when it sells an issue as it offers its securities directly to investors.

There is just no question about it. The FNMA participation way is the costly way for the Government to obtain financing.

Use of the more costly financing system can only be justified if there are other offsetting benefits. Such is not the case with respect to the $1.61 billion of FNMA participations sold to date nor the projected sales of $3.58 billion of FNMA participations in the remainder of this and the next fiscal years.

The objective of such sales has been and is to exclude Government expenditures from the administrative budget. This is accomplished by using the proceeds from FNMA participation sales to offset Government expenditures which otherwise would have to be included in the administrative budget.

FNMA participation financing is pure budgetary fiction. This costly fiction, misleading the taxpaying public, should be stopped.

ADAM YARMOLINSKY LEAVES THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I read in the newspapers that Adam Yarmolinsky is finally leaving the Government and going to Harvard to teach. All I can say is that Washington's gain is Harvard's loss. That is a down-east college which has been defined as the place where the "scions of the rich go, graduate, and turn left."

Along with several others, I attacked Yarmolinsky's record and background and demanded his removal as Deputy Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. I am pleased that this has been done, and he—plus any influence of his forebears—has been removed from Government in general and the Department of Defense in particular, in a time when we as a nation are in a killing war.

With unanimous consent, I introduce in the Record an article on this from the Washington Post:

Ex-Poverty Aid Hired By Harvard

Harvard University made it official yesterday that Adam Yarmolinsky, brilliant and controversial Defense Department aid, will become a law professor effective July 1.

At Harvard, Yarmolinsky will develop urban legal studies, teaching both urban law and land use planning. He also will teach criminal law, and probably will be associated with the Kennedy Institute when it is organized.

Yarmolinsky served as chief assistant to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara from 1961 until 1964 when he was loaned to Sargent Shriver to help design the administration's war on poverty.

Yarmolinsky was slated to be deputy director of the poverty war. But southern House conservatives believed him to be too liberal. To assure sufficient votes for the administration's antipoverty bill, Yarmolinsky was bounced out of the poverty program.

For 14 months Yarmolinsky waited for a White House appointment that never came. He wanted to be General Counsel of the Defense Department. Instead, he was named last October to be principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, a post that does not require Senate confirmation.

Before his 1961 Defense assignment, Yarmolinsky was a law clerk for Supreme Court Justice Stanley F. Reed, secretary of the Fund for the Republic, an editor for Doubleday, a Washington and New York lawyer, and a talent scout for President-elect John F. Kennedy. He received an A.B. cum laude from Harvard in 1943 and an LL.B. cum laude from Yale in 1948.

COPPER STOCKPILE RELEASE ALLEVIATES SHORTAGE

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Johnson's swift and timely action in releasing copper from our national stockpile to help alleviate the current shortage of this important metal. At a time when our men are engaged in a bitter struggle in Vietnam, we simply cannot afford to deny them the equipment and material that they need. And copper is certainly a key item. I cite the manufacture of ammunition as only one example.

By releasing this metal, the President has acted to head off what very possibly could have developed into a major crisis.

But the President's action this morning was more than just one of releasing copper from our stockpiles. He also took steps to expand domestic production of copper through the use of special incentives and to increase our own domestic supply of copper through assistance to the copper-producing industry.

Finally, President Johnson made provisions to replenish our stockpile of this strategic metal at an appropriate time in the future.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Ashley
Baring
Burleson
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Conyers
Craley
Diggs
Ellsworth
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Giaimo
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Henderson
Karsten
Lennon
Lipscomb
McEwen
McVicker
Mackie
Matthews
Monagan
Morris
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Roberts
Schmidhauser
Scott
Springer
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RESIGNATION OF CONFEREE ON THE OVERSEAS TEACHERS BILL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] be excused from serving as a conferee on the bill H.R. 6845.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none and the Chair appoints to the committee of conference the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] as one of the conferees. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the appointment.

MEMBERS OF VISITING DELEGATION FROM FRENCH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY'S COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of advising the House that a distinguished visiting delegation from the French National Assembly's Committee on Foreign Affairs is the guest of the House today. They include the following:

Hon. Maurice Schumann, President of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Centre Democratique, MRP, Deputy, Norde;

Hon. Jean-Franck de Preaumont, UNR/UDT Deputy, Seine;

Hon. Pierre Comte-Offenbach, UNR/UDT Deputy, Seine;

Hon. Gabriel Peronnet, Rassemblement Democratique Deputy, Allier; and

Hon. Edmond Thorailler, UNR/UDT Deputy, Eure-et-Loir.

AUTHORIZING AN OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 774 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 774

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United Sattes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and to myself such time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 774 provides for consideration of S. 2394, a bill to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

S. 2394 would provide authority for the construction of an official residence for the Vice President and to use as a site therefor Federal property comprising 10 acres located in the grounds of the U.S. Naval Observatory.

Also, the bill authorizes the GSA to provide for the care, repair, improvement, and alteration of the official residence. Heating, lighting, and air conditioning would also be provided.

Authority is provided for the acceptance of cash gifts, furniture, furnishings, and other types of gifts, both for furnishing and construction, but without requiring the United States to agree to any condition of such use.

The amount authorized to be appropriated for the design, construction, and furnishings and the cost incidental thereto is $750,000. Annual appropriations are authorized to permit the GSA to carry out its responsibility with respect to maintenance and other annual charges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 774 in order that S. 2394 may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, may I add that I introduced one of the first bills on this subject, which was a companion bill to the bill introduced in the other body by the able Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. MONRONEY, and passed by the other body.

That bill provided for the naming by the President of a Commission of three to select the site for the Vice President's residence, and to make other recommendations required for the establishment of such a home for our distinguished Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I attended the hearings before the distinguished Committee on Public Works and the subcommittee, headed by the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], and presented the merits, I thought, for the provision of a suitable home for our Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all agree that the time has come when we can no longer neglect the important duty and task of providing a suitable residence for the Vice President of our country. So, Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed upon that. There was early disagreement as to whether this particular site of land should be chosen by the act itself as the site upon which the residence could be constructed, or whether the Commission should be charged with the authority to make a survey and finally to recommend a site and a suitable residence.

Mr. Speaker, upon reflection about this matter I have concluded that the subcommittee has rendered to the Congress and to the country a very valuable service in the selection and designation of a 10-acre tract comprising part of the Naval Observatory Grounds just off Massachusetts Avenue. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the bill as it is reported to the House of Representatives by the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], and his committee, for expediting the bringing about of the establishment of a suitable home for the Vice President, by the selection of this tract of land. I have concluded that probably no better site could be chosen by a commission that might make a survey than the site located by the committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if the other body will concur in the action of this House if we enact the committee substitute, we will greatly expedite, I believe, the selection of a site, and finally the construction of a suitable home for the Vice President too long delayed by our country.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I suppose in the scheme of things that has been indicated by the founders of the Great Society, this bill does not rank very importantly in that scheme. After all, we are talking about an item involving the expenditure of three-quarters of a million dollars, which is a pretty small sum of money when it is put in the context of a budget of $112.8 billion for the next fiscal year, or in the terms of $119 billion which was appropriated by this Congress last year.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is important, and I believe that our action on this bill today is going to be watched by the executive branch. It is going to be watched by the people of this country very carefully, because what we do on this bill is going to symbolize whether or not we are going to have the restraint, in the weeks and months to follow, in enacting the various appropriation requests that are sent down; whether we are going to have the restraint that is needed to keep from further fueling the fires of inflation that are already threatening our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I noted the remarks that were made just the other day by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, when he said this:

> We are watching carefully what happens to the President's budget in the appropriations process. It could move the budget from the posture of approximate balance to either meaningful deficit or surplus.

Then, Mr. Speaker, he went on to say if a meaningful deficit develops that the President is not going to hesitate to call for increased taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the important thing, I believe, to point out to the Members of this body is that as recently as the first of March 1966, the Bureau of the Budget was opposed to this bill, because the report clearly indicates that they favored the approach adopted by the other body; namely, to appoint a commission which after a period of 18 months would then proceed to submit its recommendations as to what kind of residence, if any, should be built.

Let me say that my disagreement with the present Vice President, the incumbent of that office, on certain domestic issues does not extend so far as to want for 1 minute to deny him the proper kind of residence or to deny him the dignity or emoluments of his office. But I would submit that a GI sitting in a foxhole or in a pup tent over in South Vietnam reading the latest issue of the papers from home, when he comes to the item that says this Congress has decided here today to appropriate three-quarters of a million dollars to build a mansion for the Vice President—I wonder if he is not going to ask himself, Do the folks at home know that a war is going on—or is it just business as usual with the home folks?

Are we just going to go on doing the things that we want to do, that are desirable and comfortable to do? Or are we going to get down to business in this House and finally decide that we are going to steel ourselves to the necessity of taking those actions that are necessary to support the war—yes, but that we are not yielding to every impulse that we have to do something when somebody comes along and says—yes, this would be nice. We have waited 177 years to build a house for the Vice President so let us get busy and build one right now.

I hate to disagree with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, who has offered this bill. But when he appeared before the Committee on Rules a few days ago and in addressing himself to the guns and butter issue, he said, "Well this is really the low-priced spread that we are getting; this is not butter at all, this is the low-priced spread."

He actually spoke of this as if it was just a modest little house. Those were the very words he used in describing this mansion. That may be true in southern Illinois but where I come from in the northwestern part of the State, a $700,000 house exclusive of the cost of the land is more than a modest little home—it is something of a mansion.

Then getting back to the question of what actually will be spent to construct this mansion they say that they will only spend $45,000 during the next year at the most for architect fees and thereafter it will be decided whether we are actually going to proceed to build the $750,000 mansion for the Vice President.

I do not think there is a Member in this body here today who thinks that is the way things are really done here in Washington. I was not here at the time because I think it was back in 1955, but I am sure somebody must have stood right here in this well when they started on the Rayburn Building and said, Well, we are going to have a modest, humble little office building, but it turned out that they spent, I believe it was, $150 million or something like that for this monstrosity.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. First, I want to compliment the gentleman on an excellent statement. I was here at the time the Rayburn Building was authorized and we were given assurance that the building would cost $60 to $65 million. It wound up costing approximately $125 million.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

But the thing that disturbs me and now I wish to return to the point I made originally. When the time comes to present a tax-increase bill to the American people, you know who is going to get the blame. This is not an administration bill that we are considering here today. The Bureau of the Budget is not for this bill. They are for the commission approach. So when the tax-increase bill comes down and when the administration starts to add up the appropriations by Congress and compare them to the budget requests that were made by the executive branch, they are going to assess the blame for excessive spending on the Congress. If we vote for a million dollars here and a million dollars there that the executive branch did not want—the folks back home are going to get the message and they are going to get that message loud and clear—that it is not the executive branch that is to blame for the budget moving into a deficit, but it is this Congress which does not and did not have the self-discipline and the restraint to realize that in the kind of times in which we are living today we should not yield to every spending impulse that comes along.

I repeat that if these were normal times and if we were living today in anything approaching a normal period, I would be standing before you in support of this bill. I am not fundamentally opposed to this at all. I am not basically opposed to the idea of a residence for the Vice President of the United States. Although—I do not know—and with this remark I will close—I remember it was not too long ago that I heard or read the President of the United States quoted in a somewhat strong complaint to the fact that before the birds even began to sing the first morning carol, the President heard the tread of thousands of marching feet under his bedroom window.

Well, I suppose this will be another monument, and I suppose there will be the tread of thousands of marching feet of people coming to see this great, beautiful, palatial mansion that the Congress in its generosity in this war year of 1966 decided to build for the Vice President.

But I hope, and I say this in all sincerity without derogating in any way from the sincerity or the convictions of the gentleman from Illinois who is the author of this bill, but I hope today that this Congress will decide to do something about holding down expenditures and that we will acquit ourselves in such a fashion here today by denying the rule and voting against this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of visitors coming to Washington to see this mansion. I wonder if they are going to be able to see it. This is going to be segregated and there is going to be a barbed wire fence, apparently a high security type or cyclone fence topped with barbed wire, and it is going to be located on the restricted naval observatory grounds. I wonder how they are going to get in to see it?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I suppose that they will have to have passes the same as we have now and I do not know how many people are going to have to be employed for that purpose just to take telephone calls just as when Members call to say we want constituents to go to the White House. I suppose the same thing will be necessary here.

Mr. GROSS. With reference to the 10 acres of ground that this $750,000 palace is going to be built on, does the gentleman have any idea or did the hearings bring out any idea of the value of the 10 acres?

Would the gentleman think this is something in the nature of a country club?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. It is unquestionably very valuable property. Nothing was said before the Rules Committee as to any value that had been placed upon it by the Public Works Committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer], a member of the committee, tried his level best to find what the total bill would be in terms of real estate. I do not know whether we are going to get the information here today or not. I hope that we do, for the hearing record is silent on that point.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I heard the gentleman describe the building as a mansion. The gentleman from Iowa has described it as a palace. But at $20 a square foot—$750,000 for the house—it would make it more like a zeppelin hangar.

Does the gentleman have any idea what the structure will look like at that price?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The committee was not given any plans to look at; at least the Rules Committee was not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has made a very interesting and forceful talk. I am sure that my friend from Iowa wanted to be helpful to him, for he is usually helpful. But I just wanted to suggest that I think the opposition lost its fight here when the gentleman from Iowa pointed out that this house would be segregated out there.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Can the gentleman tell us about the cost of operation? Is it planned to take up that matter later?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am glad the gentleman raised that point, because in preparing for this debate today, I went back and looked at the figures in the White House appropriation bill for the operating expenses of the Executive Mansion. I found that in 1965 $696,000 was appropriated to run the Executive Mansion. In 1966 there was a big decrease because they turned out the lights. It went down $2,000 to $694,000. In other words, as it is often said about the well-known institution of matrimony, it is not the initial cost, it is the upkeep. We will be spending almost as much in annual operating expenses on this project as we will if we pass this authorization today.

Mr. HOSMER. It seems to me that a good rule for a Congressman in determining expenditures is whether or not the money will do something for the Republic. Throughout our history this money has not been spent and the Republic has prospered. I can see nothing in here but a repetition of the same kind of inconsistency that we got when we heard the lectures last year about the gold output. The President said that everybody should stay home and not go to Europe for a vacation. This year the Secretary of Defense goes to Switzerland and takes his family for a vacation.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in closing, in May of 1965 the Chief of Naval Operations told the House Appropriations Committee that 85,000 eligible Navy and Marine Corps families were unsuitably housed. Witnesses before that same committee said that even with the housing that was provided in last year's bill, a total of 106,000 Army personnel would still be living in housing rated either completely substandard or unsuitable. In other words, more than 200,000 military families are today housed in substandard or unsuitable housing.

And yet you know what happened last December. The Secretary of Defense canceled better than $600 million in appropriations that had already been voted for military family housing in this country. I think maybe if we can delay that kind of housing program, we can certainly delay for 18 months the construction of the Vice President's mansion.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Has the gentleman considered the fact that, as a matter of history, we have not had a Vice President for about 25 percent of the time, and while we have a constitutional amendment in process, it has not yet been ratified and there is a possibility, of course, perhaps remote, that it might not be ratified. Has any thought been given as to what use this mansion would be put to during the time there was no Vice President?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman will have to ask that question of some of the members of the Public Works Committee who conducted hearings on this bill. To my knowledge, there was no testimony on that point before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. That particular question was asked by the gentleman from Florida who is speaking now before the committee meeting. There was suggested at that time that if this unfortunate circumstance should occur again, there should be some provision to determine what will be done with the house during the period of vacancy in the position of the Vice Presidency. However, no language was drafted to accomplish that objective.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wonder if the gentleman in the well of the House, who has made such an excellent presentation of this rule, has any information as to whether or not the Vice President or his family is desirous of such accommodations.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Frankly, I have not talked to the Vice President, obviously, on this matter. But I wonder if the Vice President himself is not a little bit embarrassed, having recently himself been to South Vietnam and seen the conditions in that unhappy country. I wonder if he is not a little bit embarrassed about the fact that this Congress is taking up this bill today, because I think he is essentially a man of simple tastes. I do not think in his heart he would really approve of the timing of this particular measure.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I too am not privy to information from the Vice President, but I understand he does not desire it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, let me make two or three observations on the remarks made by the able gentleman from Illinois.

His first reference was to the suggestion that the Bureau of the Budget was not supporting this bill or this proposal. In the report which is before the Members of the House at this time, on pages 6 and 7, appears the statement of the Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, representing the Bureau of the Budget. Part of it is as follows, referring to one of the bills:

> An appropriation of $750,000 is authorized and the cost of care and maintenance would be borne by the United States.
>
> It appears that a wide variety of suggestions with respect to the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President has been laid before the committee. We believe that consideration should be given to all of the various possibilities in order to determine the most appropriate means of acquiring the residence. Accordingly, we believe that the approach taken in the study commission bills is preferable to that taken by H.R. 12994.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> *Phillip S. Hughes,*
> *Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.*

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget said they would prefer a commission, but the commission bill carried an authorization of $1 million, not $750,000. So the Bureau of the Budget is not opposed to the expenditure or the objective of the legislation, which is to provide a suitable residence for the Vice President of our country.

Next, Mr. Speaker, in 1958, President Dwight D. Eisenhower recommended that this country provide a suitable home for our Vice President. Only a few days ago, a former Republican incumbent of that office, the Honorable Richard Nixon, publicly stated that he favored the Congress providing for the country a suitable residence for the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether George Washington asked the Congress of the United States to provide him, as President of the United States, a suitable residence or not. I do not know whether or not John Adams, the first occupant of the White House, asked the

Congress to be sure to provide a suitable residence for the Chief Magistrate of our land. I presume they did not, and that the Congress took pride in providing a suitable residence for the President of the United States.

It is regrettable that we have delayed so long in the provision of an appropriate home for the Vice President. I realize that the functions and the office of the Vice President have been much enlarged, and therefore the public respect for the office has been much increased in later years.

The former beloved "Veep," Alben Barkley, used to tell the story that a lady in his State of Kentucky had two sons—one son went to sea, and the other became Vice President, and neither one of them was ever heard from thereafter.

That was a long time ago. Today the office of the Vice-Presidency looms greater than it ever has in history. The functions discharged by the Vice President, by the request of the President, have never been so important as today. The incumbent of that office today is rendering a great service to our country and the cause of freedom, in the way he is discharging his responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan matter. This is to provide for the Vice-Presidency of our country a suitable residence. I certainly hope that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it seems very strange to me to note the opposition of some on the Republican side. I hope that it will not spread to the great majority on the Republican side, because everybody admits that in the world of today and tomorrow the Vice President ought to have an official residence.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson], has made a very, very emotional speech. Of course, we know why it was made. He brings in Vietnam, and he talks about guns and butter. I thought that had gone out of the window when I had a little colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird]. I thought the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] repudiated that slogan, "guns and butter," because that was a reflection upon the great dairy industry of our country.

I was rather surprised to see my friend from Illinois failing to take advantage of what I thought was very wise judgment by the sloganized leader of the Republican Party, our dear friend from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], because he just directly repudiated that—the Republican-invented slogan of guns and butter. I suggested to my Republican friend that he ought to appoint a commission to create another slogan.

This fight brings my mind back to some years ago, when I was majority leader.

Some of the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations felt that the majority leader should have the dignity of an official automobile. Some here will remember that. The majority leader of the Senate had one, and they thought the majority leader of the House ought to have an official automobile. I heard that one of the Republican members of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of the Committee on Appropriations was going to oppose this automobile, so I said, "Well, I am not going to subject the House to a fight on whether or not I be given an official automobile." I am sure my friend from Iowa [Mr. Gross], might have supported it, but if he did not, I can imagine him in the well, with all the fluency of expression on his part as to why the majority leader at that time should not be given an automobile. Having brought my friend's name in, in a most pleasant manner, I naturally would like to yield to him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, of course.

Mr. GROSS. The point at that time—and I am sure the gentleman will recall it—was the fact that the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, said, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country." It was impossible for me to believe that those who were then ridiculing Wilson for having made that statement would at the same time accept the use of a General Motors car. I could not understand why you went to a General Motors product when you were ridiculing the Secretary of Defense, former head of General Motors, for his statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was he not a Republican? I thought Secretary Wilson was a Republican. However, in any event, I was just leading up to what I wanted to say here. So I said, "I am not going to have a fight on the floor of the House and have this Chamber reverberating to the oratory of illogical emotionalism. I am not going to subject the Members to a fight as to whether a poor fellow by the name of John McCormack, who happened to be a Democrat, should get an official car." So I said then, "Do not get it," and they did not. But the next year, in the 80th Congress, Charley Halleck was the leader, so the Republicans then gave him a car, and we Democrats supported him in getting the car. Now, when I came back as majority leader, I had to inherit the car from Charley Halleck. In other words, they would not give a Democrat an official car but at that point we gave the car to Charley Halleck. Charley and I have had much joshing about it through the years. I remember riding up to the White House one day about a year after Charley got his car, and I said, "Charley, you know, we Democrats are going to come back, and it looks like I am going to inherit this car through you." Well, that is just how it happened.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. All I wanted to point out was the gentleman's support paid off, because he got himself a nice, shiny Cadillac, and it was a General Motors product.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. But I did not get it originally.

Mr. GROSS. You did inherit a Chrysler.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I got it by way of inheritance. Now, my friend from Illinois [Mr. Anderson] made one or two frank statements. He said, "I am not opposed to a residence for the Vice President." You heard him as well as I did. Some time in the remote future, 20, 30, or 40 years from now, when the American people in a moment of mental aberration might reelect a Republican President. So he is for it not for a Democrat but for a Republican. Apparently what my friends want to do is to stop a Vice President who is a Democrat from being given an official residence, just as they did not want to give an official car to John McCormack as leader of the House, but they want any future Democratic Vice President to inherit it by way of a Republican Vice President.

To me this is not big. It is not big. The Vice President in these days and in the days of tomorrow, without regard to party, should have a residence, with all of the responsibilities placed upon him. I would be supporting this bill if there were a Republican Vice President now just as strongly as I support the bill today and urge its passage.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word in response to what the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives has just said. I would repeat my pledge that I am in favor of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, and I would be willing now to state that I would vote for such a bill when we are at peace, and when the war in Vietnam is over.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care whether we have a Democrat or a Republican as the incumbent of that office, I would be willing to support a bill for an official residence.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the very amusing little story as related by the distinguished Speaker of the House as to how he finally acquired a Cadillac. But I would remind the distinguished Speaker that that action took place back at an earlier time when we were at peace, and when we could afford a Cadillac. However, I do not believe we can afford this residence today for the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this proposed legislation to build a Vice-Presidential palace or mansion. We do not need one. The President has not said we need one. The Vice President has not asked for one.

I am sure that the Vice President does not want this three-quarter-of-a-million-dollar palace. I cannot imagine our distinguished Vice President asking this House to vote three-quarters of a million dollars to buy him a home while some of our soldiers sleep in tents on the cold ground for want of military housing appropriations. I do not think that we should authorize the expenditure of this money until we ask our distinguished Vice President what he wants because I cannot imagine him wanting a palace for himself while others suffer.

I also do not believe we ought to act without a statement from our great President that this palace is of the first priority. I cannot imagine our President wanting to spend all this money on housing for just one family. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee, I have been sitting through hearings on the President's immense "demonstration cities" concept. I cannot believe that the President wants to spend three quarters of a million dollars on one family while, according to his statistics, millions of American families are living without adequate shelter. I just cannot believe that the President would build a luxurious palace for the Vice President before using that same money to provide basic housing for the poor.

Last year, it was my privilege to play a part in a fight against a program which I thought was a menace—the rent supplement program. I said at the time that the real goal of the program was not to help the poor because the qualifying income ceilings were too high. Now I know I was right. If the bill before us today passes, the Vice President will be the recipient of the Nation's first full-fledged rent supplement.

He does not need a rent supplement. He can afford to buy his own house. To make things worse, the bill we have before us today does not require him to pay 25 percent of his income for rent like any other rent supplement recipients would have to if the program is set up.

I urge you to defeat this "rent supplement" for our Vice President. It deserves the same appropriation as the rent supplement program deserves—not a cent. We are in a war this year. We have a wartime budget. This is a good year to insist that people live in accommodations they can afford and save subsidies for the war effort and not rent supplements.

I urge the defeat of this rule.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in that apparently guns and butter is not to be the slogan used in the future, we could appropriately use the slogan of "guns and frills." That is exactly what this proposal represents, frills to go along with the guns, so in the year of the South Vietnam war if this bill passes, we will have guns and frills as the national objective.

This should be the slogan characterizing the actions of this Congress, if this bill passes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be far more practical to acquire an existing structure on a properly located parcel of real estate rather than enter into this most dubious suggestion of spending upwards of three quarters of a million dollars for a residence for the Vice President of the United States.

As the Members well know, one of the controversial aspects of the inflation sweeping the country has been the adverse effect on real estate values. Specifically, the rapid increase in interest rates and shortage of funds are slowing down home construction and home financing and are dampening real estate purchases and development across the country.

Certainly, there are a number of very substantial buildings in the District of Columbia which could be acquired for far less than this proposed new residence due to the soft real estate market. Surely, despite the size of the Federal deficit, the loss of purchasing power of our dollar due to inflation, and the continued outflow of gold, the credit of the Federal Government is still good enough to make it an acceptable buyer of a residence for the Vice President.

Even as an individual, the Vice President, I am sure, could qualify under the liberal provisions of the present FHA regulations. If necessary, he personally could qualify for a loan even though he would have to pay a much higher interest rate this year than a year or two ago before the administration let loose the inflationary tidal wave now adversely affecting all Americans.

I can picture a great number of socially prominent Washingtonians or loyal Democrats who would be willing to sell their homes at a very modest price to the Government for use by the Vice President so as to be able to tell their friends and grandchildren that they had the honor of disposing of their property for the hallowed use of the Vice-Presidential family.

There might even be some prominent Washingtonians interested in maintaining good will with this administration who would be willing to sell their residence at a very nominal price. Perhaps an executive of the aluminum or steel industry would appreciate an opportunity to acquire good will from the administration by negotiating a proper price on a home that could be used for a Vice-Presidential mansion.

Mr. Speaker, I raise all these questions since I join many of my colleagues in questioning the timing and the cost of the proposal before us this afternoon. At a time when our men in Vietnam are suffering from the direct costs of war and our homefront is being ravaged by war-stimulated inflation, this proposal is especially ill timed, extravagant, and indefensible. Perhaps my suggestions ought to be studied and we should remit the bill to committee for further consideration and a more proper solution to this issue could be forthcoming.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this point to offer just one or two comments in regard to this proposed legislation. I understand, of course, if we adopt the rule, we will then go into the Committee of the Whole and there will be further debate on the details. I want to be sure that my colleagues are fully aware of the fact that I prepared my minority views in verse and I hope that they all have had a chance to read them. For those who did not, I am going to recite them later on when we are in Committee of the Whole. Perhaps that is a good reason to vote down the rule because if we do not get into the Committee of the Whole, you will not have to hear the verse. In case we do vote down the rule, Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman for a question. Is the gentleman going to ask a question?

Mr. JOELSON. I will ask the gentleman a question. I would state first that we are all glad to see the gentleman here, and looking so well. I would ask the gentleman further if he has suggested to the police that perhaps what motivated the gentleman's assailant last night was that his attacker may have been a lover of good poetry.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman very much for asking that question. I am always interested in the way that the distinguished Member can make a comment out of a question. It had occurred to me that perhaps the man was a poetry critic of one of the metropolitan newspapers that apparently are in support of this legislation.

One of the main reasons I have taken this time is to correct what I believe to be a misstatement of facts. The distinguished gentleman from Florida pointed out that the Senate bill called for an authorization of $1 million, and then with great pride he points to this bill which has an authorization of three-fourths of a million dollars and this, he says, is a great saving. Well, now, that in my opinion is a specious and false argument because the Senate bill did not snatch off 10 acres of million dollar property at the naval observatory. The Senate bill had included in their $1 million the cost of land acquisition. We save absolutely nothing as compared to the Senate bill. Let us get the facts straight on that.

Another point I want to make is simply this. The remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. ANDERSON], are remarks that I subscribe to wholeheartedly.

With all due respect to our honored and revered Speaker, and I know he is a much honored and revered man and I have great respect for him as all of us do, and coming from New England perhaps my respect is even greater—I believe our distinguished Speaker has missed the single central point that the Republicans are trying to make. That is that you do not build this type of housing at this time and in this place in history. We are at war.

We socked the people of this country with a tax increase just last week, and you all know we may have to do it again before the year is out. At this time and in this place in history, if we build this type of palace and if we construct this type of mansion, we are sending out false signals to the world.

We are informing the world that we do not have the guts or the courage to say "no" or to practice self-restraint at the very time that our President is calling on us to practice self-restraint to save the dollar against the effects of inflation, at the very time we are fighting a war.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 21, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] introduced the bill now before us. He promptly announced that his Public Works Subcommittee would open hearings on it the following Thursday, February 24.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I could not understand why the rush. In truth I was shocked that there should be such great urgency about providing the Vice President adequate housing when, at the same time, the Secretary of Defense took a rather indifferent attitude toward a long-standing housing need for our servicemen for which funds had already been appropriated.

This prompted me to issue a public statement the day before the Public Works Subcommittee opened its hearings.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LESLIE C. ARENDS, OF ILLINOIS, MEMBER OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, RE HOUSE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Tomorrow morning the Committee on Public Works will open hearings on a bill introduced last Monday by my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] for the erection of a $750,000 home for the Vice President of the United States.

In the light of the speed with which the committee is acting on this proposal there is apparently some emergency with which we are not aware. But, paradoxically, there is no emergency from the point of view of the administration with respect to furnishing proper housing for our servicemen.

Last September the Congress provided funds for military housing sorely needed. Some of our servicemen have been living in little more than barns, even in tents. Last December the Secretary of Defense arbitrarily shelved our appropriation for military housing. In testimony before our committee the Defense Department claimed that this unilateral action was taken because of other budget demands and that the expenditure would add to the inflationary pressures.

I concur in the desirability of furnishing proper housing for our Vice President. But why the rush?

And I should like to ask this question: Why should we at this time concern ourselves about furnishing an expensive house for the Vice President, admittedly needed, when the Secretary of Defense refuses to use the funds we have already appropriated to furnish proper housing for our fightingmen?

If proper housing for our servicemen is to be deferred because of budget limitations and inflation pressures, why should not the same principle apply in connection with an expensive house for the Vice President? First things first.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman has on two occasions since he has been in the well referred to the great rush to supply a home for the Vice President of the United States. It seems to me that in 178 years we have not been in too much of a rush.

Mr. ARENDS. This is a comparatively young country, you want to remember. I am sure we will get it done before too long. I repeat, I favor the idea and objective, but not now, under conditions we presently face.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. My distinguished friend—and I do consider him one of my good friends—is a member of the Armed Services Committee. We are a young country. But I assume the gentleman has been down at Fort McNair and seen the big white-pillared mansions we have furnished for a few of our admirals.

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; we have seen those. But I should like to state in passing that this morning some of us had the privilege of meeting with the Secretary of Defense at breakfast. We discussed the tremendous problem we face in that part of the world. I am sure there must be concern on the part of all of us as to what is going on in Vietnam. The cumulative and tremendous costs of this undertaking will be with us for a period of years. Let us establish a priority list. Let us take these things in their order. Let us do those things that are necessary to do right now, put off those things which can be undertaken 1 or 2 years from now and, in the final analysis, eliminate all of those programs or projects that are unnecessary and unneeded.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman from Florida has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader such time as he might consume.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on the rule, but the argument which the distinguished Republican whip has raised deserves some comment.

In the first place, I do not think consideration of this bill should be tied to consideration of whether we need certain other housing for servicemen or anyone else. I think both propositions should stand on their own feet. The House in its historic devotion to men in uniform will take proper care of the men in uniform and their requirements. This country is big enough and strong enough to do what is necessary in all necessary areas at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think also we should consider the timeliness of this legislation, since that issue has been raised. This is important legislation. The gentleman from Illinois is to be complimented for bringing it to the floor. In my judgment he and his committee have done a service to the House and to the country in reporting this legislation for our consideration.

Legislation to accomplish this purpose was introduced as early as 1929. The need for it has been recognized by leaders of both major political parties. If I am not mistaken, in 1958 President Eisenhower recommended legislation of this kind, and at that time I certainly for one was in support of that recommendation. If we went back far enough, I believe we would find little reason for such a residence in the early days of our country. The responsibilities of the President and Vice President compared to what they are today were minor.

But today the burdens of the office of the President are enormous. He must call upon the Vice President to assist him in the performance of his duties more now than ever before. If there ever was a time when this legislation was needed, if there ever will be a time when this legislation is needed, it is needed now. We are at war, and being at war the burdens of the office of President have increased enormously. The burdens of the office of Vice President have also increased and must necessarily increase in time of war or other national crisis.

The problems of the world are daily becoming more and more complex. The maintenance of the position of the United States as leader of the free world is a greater and more demanding task than ever before. In order to give the President time to consider and deal with the problems of our government, more and more the Vice President has been called upon to assume not only ceremonial but also many other duties of the President.

Vice Presidents, particularly since 1953, starting with Richard Nixon, have become personal representatives of the President in diplomatic dealings and in foreign policy discussions both here and abroad.

As has been indicated in statements made heretofore, the Vice President, in addition to his constitutional duties, serves in many positions vital to the well-being of the United States.

He is Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. He heads the Peace Corps Advisory Council. He is Chairman of the Special Cabinet Task Force for Travel-USA. He is a member of the Security Council and he is a Cabinet level member of the Youth Opportunities Council. In addition, he performs many special duties for the President of the United States, as everyone knows.

It is right, I believe, that the Vice President, the second-ranking executive officer in the land, assume these duties and other duties which can reasonably be passed on to him in order to give the President the opportunity for consideration of the many other pressing problems which confront him.

It is also important as a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker, that we provide for our Vice President a residence suitable and appropriate to the high office which he holds. His is the second office in our land.

More important, the safety and security of the Vice President are of prime concern to the Nation and to the world. The orderly procedures of the U.S. Government, and even the fate of the Nation, may at some time depend upon the safety and the adequacy of security arrangements for the Vice President of the United States.

This bill would provide a residence for the Vice President, suitable to his duties, and it would locate the residence in an area where his privacy could be assured and his safety and that of his family guaranteed.

This House, in my opinion, should have acted long ago to help ease the burdens of the Vice President. This, of course, is not a partisan issue. We do not want a Democrat to have to inherit this job from a Republican, and we do not want a Republican to have to inherit this job from a Democrat. We want Republicans and Democrats alike to provide this residence for the Vice President of the United States, whoever he happens to be.

This is not a proposal for an individual. It is not a proposal for a Democrat or a Republican. It is a proposal for a man who is second only to the President of the United States, who symbolizes the greatness and the importance of our country. Surely all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, can support this important bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there is a need for a residence for the Vice President of the United States, whether he be Democrat or Republican. But we quarrel at the present time with the need and the necessity to take this action, bearing in mind the fiscal pressures that we face and the problems of inflation which are with us.

I think it is fair to point out, in light of the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned that former President Eisenhower had recommended a home or a residence for the Vice President, that recommendation was not made at any time such as the present time, when our Nation faces a conflict such as we are faced with today in Vietnam. Those recommendations from President Eisenhower came at a time when this country was at peace.

Mr. ALBERT. What the gentleman says is true, but I think that President Eisenhower would make the same recommendation now. This in a sense is a war measure. Security considerations for the President of the United States are always more important in time of war. The same is true for the Vice President, particularly as he takes on additional duties.

I think it is in the interests of national defense that we furnish this residence and the additional security that it will afford to the Vice President of the United States. That is one of the points I am trying to make.

We increase the security of our leading military people in time of war. It seems to me that no one, short of the President of the United States, has a more significant role in time of war. Certainly no one else has a role nearly so significant as the role of the Vice President, who by election and by training in the Office of the Vice President is most suitable to take over in case of the death or incapacity of the President of the United States.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think our majority leader has stressed the one point that apparently has escaped some on the other side; that is, that this war, in which we are now engaged, has been a war which has exposed the character on the part of the enemy facing us and a method and a system of conducting warfare that represents a new departure in warfare.

The problem of security for the second-ranking Executive of the United States is probably more acute today, by reason of he nature of the enemy that we confront in South Vietnam, than it has ever been before. I think this does indeed identify this as a war measure.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it should be apparent that one of the principal reasons for the decline of the minority party in the House over these years is that they have always been able to find some point, however untenable, on which to be against everything.

It also occurs to me, in connection with the previous remarks of the distinguished Speaker of the House that in the 80th Congress the Democratic minority leader was not furnished with an automobile. The Members on this side of the aisle then contributed $100 or more apiece and bought a Cadillac automobile for the late Sam Rayburn, then the minority leader.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, when the able minority leader referred to the recommendation of President Eisenhower not being in time of war, if it is not a fact that the recommendation of President Eisenhower was at or about the time that the Government had one of the largest deficits in peacetime history of over $12 billion.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think there is some difference between the country facing some economic problems and the United States facing a crisis of war such as we are facing today. Yes, a deficit of $12 billion is substantial, but I hasten to point out that this took place while the Congress of the United States was under the control of the gentleman from Florida's party.

The point is, if the Vice President needs additional security protection—and he may well need it—those of us on this side of the aisle will provide whatever is needed through the help of the Secret Service or others, but we do not think we should embark on a $750,000 construction job at this time when we have the kinds of commitments, both financial and manpower, that we have 12,000 miles away in Vietnam at the present time. That is the only issue we raise here today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the distinguished minority leader has said. But I had thought, Mr. Speaker, that we had reached here one little issue on which we had given our Republican friends the chance to erase the image of blind opposition. However, if there is any issue on which they will retreat from that position, nobody in the House of Representatives has been able to come up with it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should simply like to suggest that the Members vote for this rule and then listen carefully to the debate on the bill. In this way, they will share, as the committee shared, in a careful investigation of the need for this residence, a need which has been acknowledged by Democrats and Republicans alike in increasing numbers for 10, 20, and maybe 30 years. Certainly in the past there has been no question on either side of the aisle as to the need for such an official residence. In time of war this Nation never just stopped with its problems of civil government or with the ongoing provision for the necessary facilities of civil government.

During the Civil War when the question was very gravely posed as to whether this Union would survive, President Lincoln defended the continued building on the Capitol of the United States. He was severely criticized by those who said, "Oh, we cannot afford this in time of war." However, his reply was a classic. He said, "If the people see the Capitol going on, it will be a sign to them that we intend the Union, too, shall go on." Surely we need such an official residence for our Vice President. Clearly we can afford it. The rule should be adopted and the bill should pass.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 236, nays 135, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—236

Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kupferman
Landrum
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Race
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taylor
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Watts
Weltner
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—135

Abbitt
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Goodell
Greigg
Gross
Grover
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Vigorito
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Younger

NOT VOTING—60

Ashley
Baring
Barrett
Bell
Boland
Bolton
Brooks
Burleson
Cameron
Celler
Cohelan
Diggs
Dow
Ellsworth
Flynt
Fogarty
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Henderson
Karsten
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
McVicker
Mackie
Matthews
Monagan
Morris
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
Purcell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Roberts
Scott
Stephens
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.

Mr. Todd for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Karsten for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Mackie of Michigan for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Brooks with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Fuqua with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Murphy of New York.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Dow.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Murray
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Matthews.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hagen of California.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Cameron.
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Sullivan.

Mr. KUNKEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AUTHORIZING AN OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2394 with Mr. ST GERMAIN in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2394 which would authorize the establishment of a much-needed official residence for the Vice President of the United States on some 10 acres located on the grounds of the U.S. Naval Observatory. This is needed and necessary legislation.

I would be remiss in my remarks if at this point I did not pay full and proper tribute to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable KENNETH J. GRAY. Mr. GRAY's handling of this entire matter, both throughout the hearings and in his in-the-field inspection of various sites proposed for a Vice-Presidential mansion, was performed in the most efficient manner. It is his work basically and the time and effort that he put into it that brought to the floor of this House legislation which, I believe, will solve a longstanding problem of a residence for the Vice President.

The stature of the office of Vice President has grown continuously throughout the years, and over the past decade the importance placed upon this position has been clearly shown by the duties, both on a national and international level, that have been given to the Vice President under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. The Vice President can no longer efficiently and properly carry out his duties without a residence that will be fully in keeping with his office. I do not mean by this something on a wide and elaborate scale, but a proper modern residence that would give to the Vice President the opportunity to fulfill the many social functions in which he must engage in entertaining various dignitaries from all parts of the world and also provide for him an area where he can operate and carry out many of his official duties.

Since the beginning of this Nation there has been a continuing need for such a residence. Proposals authorizing this legislation have been before this Congress for some 18 years. I believe the bill before us today will solve the problem in the most efficient and practical manner. We are past the time for study of this matter. We have the record of the past to guide us, and the time is now for proper action to provide for the second highest officer of our Nation an official residence.

S. 2394 carries out these objectives, and I strongly urge its passage by this body.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Public Works takes great pride in presenting for your consideration a bill to authorize the General Services Administration to plan, design, construct, furnish, and maintain an official residence for the Vice President of the United States on a suitable site at 3400 Massachusetts Avenue NW., at the Naval Observatory in the District of Columbia. I hope all of my colleagues will join our committee in helping us reach this historic milestone.

There are many reasons why we need a permanent home for the occupant of the second highest office in the world. In order that my colleagues will have time to discuss this matter, I shall mention just a few of the compelling arguments in general debate and then will be glad to answer any questions propounded by the membership of the House at the time of my remarks.

Before I explain the bill, I want to take this opportunity to thank our distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Public Works [Mr. Fallon] my colleagues on the subcommittee and full committee on both sides of the aisle for their helpful consideration of this legislation. Although I am disappointed that the minority on our committee has not seen fit to support the bill, they have been fair. I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper], who introduced one of the first bills on this subject, and my other colleagues who have testified at our hearings and written letters on this subject. I want to thank our beloved Speaker [Mr. McCormack], and our majority leader [Mr. Albert] for their able assistance with this proposal. I also want to thank the Committee on Rules for their expedious action in granting a rule.

Mr. Chairman, the first reason for speedy passage of this bill is due to the fact that the Office of the Vice-Presidency has been catapulted into an enormous task. The Vice President cannot serve the President and the people adequately without facilities. As chairman of the Space Council, liaison with world leaders and troubleshooter for the President, we must realize that the Vice President's business is our business. With the Vietnam conflict occupying more than 50 percent of the President's time, many important functions must, by necessity, be delegated to the Vice President. If we give him the proper tools with which to work and he does a good job, we benefit. If he does a poor job, whoever he may be, we suffer. This bill will provide him with an official home in which he can live and conduct the people's business.

Second, the Members of the other body passed a bill last October authorizing a Vice-Presidential residence. Information provided at that time showed very clearly that the present accommodations for the Vice President are wholly inadequate, both from a financial and prestige standpoint.

Third, the people who know best have all urged Congress to act on this matter. Former Vice President, and later President, Harry S. Truman, has stated publicly his support for such a residence. Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, just 10 days ago, told Washington Post reporter, Marie Smith, that there was an urgent need for a home for the Vice President and advocated new construction in preference to remodeling an existing structure. President Eisenhower, in 1958, addressed an executive communication to Congress calling for the establishment of the Vice President's home. Former Vice President and now President, Lyndon B. Johnson, has voiced his approval. I ask those of you who may not have made up your minds concerning this proposal if this is not a pretty good testimony for the bill before you.

Fourth, not one witness, either in or out of Congress, testified against the need for a vice-presidential residence. We held 2 days of hearings, plus, I, personally, as subcommittee chairman on Public Buildings and Grounds, wrote all 435 Members of the House without a dissent as to need. It is true that certain witnesses had different locations or different methods to propose, but all were in support of a permanent home for the Vice President.

Fifth, the argument made by the minority that this is a desirable proposal but should be deferred because of the so-called guns and butter issue, is not a valid argument. Mr. Chairman, it is not a valid argument because of two factors:

First, it is our intention to ask for only $45,000 this year to draw the necessary designs, complete architectural planning, and other work. This will take from 12 to 18 months. At the end of this period, if the Vietnam war is still going on, we can make a judgment as to whether or not we want to proceed with actual construction.

Second, the "guns and butter" issue is not valid because this bill authorizes the acceptance of cash gifts and there is every reason to believe that by the time we are through with architectural and engineering plans, we may have received enough funds through donation to construct the residence without any of the taxpayers' money.

In 1957, the Annenberg Foundation of Philadelphia offered a cash donation of $250,000 for the construction of a permanent residence for the Vice President. This and other offers may come long before we have the plans completed. I know that many nonprofit foundations and organizations will want to share in the pride of furnishing either cash, furnishings for the house, or other gifts. The General Services Administration will make sure that there are no strings attached to any gift and that it will become the property of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, you will hear arguments advanced today by the minority that if this residence should be built, it will take millions of dollars to operate and maintain it.

Once again, I regret to take issue with my good friends on the minority side, but this is not an accurate statement. We do not plan to construct a residence for the Vice President of the size requiring a large number of people. To give the membership an idea of the size of this residence, we envision a three-story brick, with stone trim, structure, plus a full basement and a three-car garage. The basement, of course, will be for utilities. The first floor will be for public use areas such as dining room, ballroom, and a conference room that can be used for public gatherings. The second floor will be used for the private living quarters for the Vice President's family and will be equivalent to a six-bedroom, six-bath home. The third floor will be used for domestic help and could double as spare bedrooms during inaugurations and other busy times.

We envision each floor with approximately 4,000 square feet, so, if you take in the basement, we are talking about a house of approximately 16,000 square feet. Comparing this with the White House in size, there are 61,000 square feet, not including the executive wings of the White House. Therefore, you can readily see that we propose a home large enough to do the job but only one-fourth the size of the center part of the White House. To say it will cost millions of dollars to operate and maintain a house of this size is simply not true.

Just across the road from the proposed site, you will find the Admiral's house, a three-story structure. This is the home of the Chief of Naval Operations. I am sure he would resent being accused of spending millions of dollars in entertaining, operating, and maintaining his home. He is not and we are not going to either. Please do not believe this argument. It just is not so.

Mr. Chairman, we have selected the 10 acres at the Naval Observatory site as the best location for this residence. It affords a fenced-in, built-in security force, Government-owned land, is in the center of Embassy Row, and accessible to both the Capitol and the White House. The other body passed a bill to create a three-member commission to select a site and gave them the authority to spend $1 million. After careful consideration, we came to the conclusion that Congress is better able to determine the location of this home than some three-member Commission appointed by the President who would be in office a maximum of 18 months and with no assurance that they could even agree on a location.

Furthermore, the bill before you would authorize a maximum of $750,000, thereby cutting the Senate figure by one quarter million.

The bill before you provides for new construction. The Commission would have had authority to buy an existing structure and, believe me, most of the structures proposed to our committee were built around the turn of the century and would be very costly to renovate and very costly to maintain. The commission idea would only delay this proposal and certainly would cost more money. The bill before you is adequate to build and furnish this residence even if we do not get the expected donations.

Knowing the history of the Rayburn Building and other Government structures, I can assure you emphatically, as subcommittee chairman on public buildings and grounds, that our committee will not be back before the House asking for additional authorizations. You can inform your constituents that $45,000 is all that will be required for the first year and that Congress will insist that the administration stay within the limits authorized by this bill in planning and constructing the residence.

Mr. Chairman, in closing let me remind my colleagues that the lack of a vice-presidential residence has been a handicap to the office for years and it has seriously detracted from the dignity of the high post. The Vice President is a standby President. The trend in recent years is for the President to give additional responsibilities to his Vice President. Since 1948, five Senators have been elevated to the position of Vice President. They have all done an outstanding job with what they have had to work with. This bill transforms good intentions into action. Bills have been introduced into Congress for the past 18 years dealing with this subject. For 176 years we have failed to provide an official residence for the Vice President. Please lay partisan politics aside and join with me and the other members of the Public Works Committee in taking this historic step.

Some say we cannot afford this home. I would like to remind the membership of the House that the States of Georgia, California, Ohio, and other States are now planning Governors' Mansions costing more than this proposed residence. Louisiana recently completed a home for their Governor. Are we to say that a single State in this Union is better equipped than all the 50 States combined?

George Washington stood on the Naval Observatory site while a member of Braddock's army, and looked down on the rolling countryside and said, "This would make a nice location to build the Federal City." Let us stand here today with the courage of George Washington and point to the beautiful Naval Observatory grounds and say, "This would make a great location to build a permanent residence for the Vice President of the United States." I am sure generations yet unborn will be as proud of our action as we are of the action of our first President who gave us this beautiful Federal City. I hope all of you can agree with the reasoning advanced by your Committee on Public Works and support this historic proposal. In closing, let me recite the following poem I wrote this afternoon that explains why we must be builders:

I saw the gentlemen from New Hampshire tear the Vice President's home down.
He and a group of men in a busy town, with a ho heave ho, and a lusty yell,
They swing a pen and the proposal fell.

I ask you my dear colleagues, are these men as skilled
As the men you would hire, if you wanted to build?

I am sure you would say, no indeed
Just common labor is all you need.

So we should ask ourselves as we consider the bill today,
Which of these roles do we intend to play?

Will we be builders who work with care,
Measuring the need by the rule and square;
Passing our proposal providing for a well made plan.
Patiently doing the best we can?
Or, will we be wreckers who inform our great town,
That we have joined Mr. CLEVELAND in tearing the V. P. home down?

Lest we neglect our duty to our followers,
Let us go forth from this hall as builders.

45,000 dollars planning money is a small amount of dough.
With the truth out, the guns and butter issue will quickly go.

Thank you.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, after that impassioned plea by my beloved friend from Illinois, who is chairman of the subcommittee and for whom I have the highest regard, I would suggest that now, since we have a "White House," should this bill become law, that we should name the Vice President's residence the "Gray House."

The gentleman discussed a number of matters, but when you get right down to it, the sum total of what is being proposed here is one thing: a home for the Vice President.

The Vice President has a home. The Vice President is happy in that home. The Vice President's wife, I think, does not particularly desire to become a person required to spend many long hours on entertainment. She is, and has said so, happy in her home. The Vice President has said his home is paid for and he likes his home. So we are not talking about providing a home for the Vice President. He has a home. He is happy in it.

We are not talking about an office for the Vice President. The bill specifically indicates, and so do the hearings, that there is not going to be any office space in this new building. There will be no office space in it.

This is not like the White House, which is a "work" building, where there are working offices, where the Vice President is going to do his work and meet people who come in and have responsibilities, along with his office in the Senate.

This bill is for one specific purpose, when all the chaff is out of it, because there is nothing left. I repeat he has a place to live. I repeat he has a place to work, for he already has an office. I repeat there is going to be no office in this new building. So it is for one purpose: To provide a palace for entertainment for the part of the Vice President of the United States. The 4,000 square feet on the first floor is for entertainment. That is a great amount of square footage. This large House Chamber is only 7,752 square feet.

My distinguished colleague has suggested, with respect to the cost of this new residence, that the $750,000 does not have anything to do with the great value of the land. In the testimony it is admitted that the land, the 10 acres involved, is worth millions of dollars. So we are talking about millions for land plus an additional $750,000.

The evidence in the hearings is clear that the $750,000 has nothing to do with the cost of administration, with the number of gardeners, with the number of butlers and waiters, and with the number of special people brought in for entertainment purposes.

What about the chef? Are we going to be subjected in this country again to the lengthy discussions and very trying problems of who is going to be a chef for the Vice President?

I do not know exactly what salary we pay for the chef in the White House, but there is going to be a chef for the "Gray House." There are going to be gardeners, waiters, busmen, more chauffeurs, and more guards. When we get all of those additional employees on the Federal payroll, I think the bill on this is going to run close to what it costs to run the White House for entertainment purposes, $600,000 plus.

So what we are talking about is not the necessity of an official residence for the Vice President. He has one. He is happy in it. He likes it.

We are not talking about offices where he can administer the functions of the Vice President. He has those right here in the Capitol and in the Executive Offices of the White House.

We are talking about 4,000 square feet for entertainment. If the Members of the House want to go on record at this time, with the war in Vietnam—after having appropriated $13.6 billion just last week for the purpose of providing guns and support for our military personnel—to provide frills, support entertainment for the Vice President costing $750,000 to start, and millions to follow in years to come, then let them do so.

As someone said on the floor just a few minutes ago, the slogan probably should be "rifles and ruffles," not "guns and frills," perhaps.

Believing in fiscal responsibility at all times but particularly at this time being deeply concerned about the fact that our national debt is now $323 billion with an authorized debt of $328 billion and being deeply concerned about the fact that last February the cost of living went up seven-tenths of 1 percent and five-tenths of 1 percent in January—and if it continues at an average rate of six-tenths of 1 percent, then we are heading for a 7.2-percent cost-of-living increase in fiscal 1967—believing this and being concerned about this, I am opposed to this expenditure at this time. Democratic Members of the House say they have a concern about the poor man and woman on fixed incomes. Do they not have any concern about the American who today, because of our prolific spending and an unwillingness to set necessary priorities, which we have a fine opportunity to do here today, is being put in this terrible position? Do they not have any concern about him? This prolific spending is one of the major contributors to inflation. People on fixed incomes are being robbed in this fiscal year 1966 of possibly 7.2 percent of their wages and earnings. This, a year in which the United States of America, regrettably we must admit, is at war. Where is our sense of responsibility in setting proper priorities? Just where is it? If there is a bill that has come before this House this year with which we could better demonstrate our determination to protect the American people against continuously increased taxes, then I do not know of any better one than this one. We know increased taxes are coming. We have voted for them once already this session. Higher spending and the ravages of inflation have been occurring systematically. This bill is the best way I can think of to stop this. This is a symbolic bill. This involves more than the $750,000 suggested. It involves millions more that are going to be involved in the future.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida kindly yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will in a few minutes. I want to answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] first.

The gentleman mentioned Harry S. Truman. I think it is interesting that his wire was dated March 17 of this year. I would have expected to get a favorable reply, but I just wondered why, if this was so important, he did not ask for a similar residence and get one with a Democratic controlled Congress during the long period of time when he was President of the United States. Was it not equally important for him to have his Vice President housed in a building such as this, which, according to the Senate report, will be second only in stature to the Capitol itself, and the White House? Why now, after 175 years? What is the urgency? What is the urgency, in a time of war, that we should be considering this bill at this time? It was suggested here that President Eisenhower back in 1958 proposed it. However, my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] at the same time said or suggested that the burdens of the Presidency then "were not half so great." I agree with that statement. I do not think the President of the United States then, President Eisenhower, if he were President today, would recommend the building of a Vice-Presidential mansion at this time.

Now, with regard to former Vice President Richard Nixon and his statement, I talked to him on the phone about this the very day he was in town and made this statement. He told me on the telephone, and I am confident he would not mind being quoted on this, that he was in principle for the Vice-Presidential mansion but not if it was thought by the Congress that these expenditures were not justified at this time, in these critical years.

Now, with regard to other matters which were discussed, first of all with respect to Mrs. Gandhi, I just wondered why Mrs. Gandhi could not be housed equally well in Blair House. I understand that the Blair House is available for such purposes. If the President, as suggested by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, is spending a good deal of his time—and he assuredly is—on the South Vietnam war and is not entertaining at the White House to the extent that he would otherwise, then what is wrong with the Vice President entertaining at the White House? There are hundreds of square feet available there for wonderful entertainment at the White House, which is presently all tooled up with personnel to handle this. Why not have the entertainment go on there rather than build a new White House or Gray House in this instance?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Florida now yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida, realizes that we have the assurance of the committee handling this bill that actual construction costs of the building would not exceed $500,000. I also wonder if at the same time he realizes that we have a number of million-dollar residences all over the world for our Ambassadors. A number of these million-dollar-plus residences were acquired or constructed during the Eisenhower administration. I find no fault with that, but I do say that I feel that a residence for the Vice President is certainly more important than these residences for our Ambassadors abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised that the gentleman from New York did not vote against those expenditures if he felt they were wrong.

While I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], spoke of the alleged Eisenhower endorsement of this thing, as being in a crisis year of 1958.

Mr. Chairman, the Suez crisis was in 1956.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to remind the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], my distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, that appropriates for these $1 million residences for ambassadors, that during the Eisenhower administration he said they were built when the Republicans were in control. The Republicans, true, were in control for a period of 2 years, and for the other 6 years the gentleman from New York who complains about these buildings, was the chairman of the subcommittee which appropriates the money with which to build these structures abroad.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Florida yield briefly so that I may answer my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]?

The gentleman from Ohio apparently misunderstood my statement here on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. BOW. If so, it is the first time I have ever misunderstood the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am not placing myself in the position of defending anything. I note that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio went along during the Eisenhower administration in acquiring the properties about which we are talking.

My argument is simply that if we can spend $1 million plus for a residence for one of our ambassadors abroad, we certainly can afford to spend $500,000 to construct a residence on Government-owned property here in the District of Columbia for the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I would say this: that at the time we were doing that, much of it was being done with counterpart funds. We were furnishing properties which we had owned for some period of time. When we get into the $1-million class that was true. In addition to that, during the Eisenhower administration we were not in the position in which we are in today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, let us get now to the subject of the gentleman's suggestion that this building is going to be put up at a place where it is going to be fenced. I believe the gentleman from Iowa observed, "How does that make it available to the general public?"

Mr. Chairman, I suppose we ought to call this bill the antipicketing bill, based upon what the gentleman from Illinois has said. The gentleman said it was going to keep the people from expressing their views, in the nature of picketing, because you will have the pickets located a long way from the Vice President's mansion. So I guess you could call this the antipicketing bill of 1966.

Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that most of the people on the right side of the aisle, which is really the left, I guess, thought that picketing was all right. We have a bill which is scheduled to come up with respect to picketing in the very near future. I wonder if perhaps we should not call this the antipicketing bill of 1966.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida is putting words in my mouth. I said that the pickets would have to be outside the fence. I would not deny anyone the right to picket. I said that the security factor is an important factor, and it would certainly be much better to have the fence than it would be to be exposed like the Vice President was only last Sunday when pickets were present. The site is well protected, and located.

Mr. CRAMER. I doubt that anyone inside the house could see the pickets. Therefore it would not do much good.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If others are going to be picketed, why should not the Vice President be picketed? If the gentleman wants to protect the Vice President from picketing——

Mr. CRAMER. That is what I say. This apparently should be dubbed the antipicketing bill of 1966. It is all right for the President to be picketed, but it is not all right for the Vice President to be picketed.

Now, where do we stop? How far do we go? Is the next thing to come before us to be a bill for a mansion for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court? Is it next proposed a mansion for each of the members of the President's Cabinet? You can justify them almost equally as well. They have to entertain and represent the U.S. Government. So where does this stop?

Mr. Chairman, let me quote Mrs. Humphrey, who is quoted in the New York Times of December 17, 1964, in which she said, when pressed about whether she thought the Vice-Presidential family should move to a larger home, some interesting points. Let us give a little attention and consideration to what Mrs. Humphrey thinks, because she is the one who is going to have to operate this entertainment palace. She is the one who will have to do the entertaining. I am concerned about Mrs. Humphrey, and I think her view should be of concern to the Members of the House.

She said:

> We are very happy here, and would like to stay put. We can entertain very nicely and informally here.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not pay any attention to the Vice President's wife—and I believe almost everyone else realizes you have to pay attention to what your wife thinks about these things—let us talk about what Mr. HUMPHREY thinks about this proposal.

Let us talk about what Mr. HUMPHREY thinks about this proposal on the basis of his having been quoted: "I love that house I have."

He said that in August. I am concerned about his attitude. You know the Vice President of the United States and I agree that he is one of the busiest men now than ever before. He is out of the country three-quarters of the time and that means he is going to be using the house one-quarter of the time. The Vice President of the United States is a busy man and rightfully so. He has grave responsibilities particularly during these crisis hours of our great Nation. So why should we not give some thoughts to what he thinks about whether or not he wants to have this residence for additional entertaining and these 4,000 square feet for that purpose. He says:

> I have to admit I love that house I have. I have to admit it. It is paid for.

Well by golly, I agree with HUBERT HUMPHREY in that regard even though I do not agree with him on quite a few other things. But I do agree with him in that respect. Let us give some consideration to this man who is so overworked now and everybody admits that. Are we going to put on his shoulders this grave responsibility of spending such a large portion of his time entertaining when he should be out doing the work for the people of this great Nation of ours? I say, let us not overburden the Vice President of the United States. Let us heed what his wife said. Who in the world came in before our committee and testified for this bill? What is the urgency and what is the rush? Who is for it?

Despite the fact that it may be called a "Gray House" who is for it? Who else is for it? Well, we had one witness who testified for it before our committee and that was the General Services Administration. Every other witness came in and did not like the way the bill was drafted. One wanted the commission and one wanted something else. My own distinguished colleague from Florida and I am sorry he is not here at the moment wanted the commission. He wants this thing. Everybody tried to get into the picture. Some wanted the National Planning Commission brought into it. Someone else wanted the arts and science people and other people suggested that the architects be brought into the thing. They said, Let us do it and if we are going to do it and to make this a crash program and suggesting that this is a must. As a matter of fact, they tried to suggest that this is a wartime necessity. I doubt that.

But I wonder who is going to set the priorities? This session of the Congress—it is up to us to start setting priorities and to start today.

Will the administration be willing to set priorities? Yes. Let us take a look at the priorities that it has set up. Congress is going to differ with them I think. They say, "Let us decrease the school milk program from $103 million to $21 million annually while at the same time calling for the $82 million cut in the school milk program, he is proposing. $200 million to be spent on highway beautification."

Let us take another example. Who is going to set these priorities? I say it is time that we in the Congress do that.

In the national defense education program, he has knocked out the direct loan program. At the same time it is interesting to note that the administration is cutting out the direct loan programs for these students, it is paying 40 percent of the $2.1 million grant to the School of Technology of the University of Havana to train Communist students in the use of missiles and electronics, to which I have objected.

The impacted area program is going to be almost dismantled.

At the same time $5 million is proposed to eliminate racial imbalances.

Today is the day for the Congress of the United States to set priorities and this is the bill in which to do it.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], a member of the committee.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support enthusiastically the bill, S. 2394, as amended by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives because I firmly believe that now is the time for the U.S. Congress to provide an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

I also highly commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], the very capable chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, for his extremely effective leadership.

Mr. Chairman, no man can deny the fact that we are now living in times of uncertain international stress. Because of this fact it appears to me that we in Congress have an obligation to provide this modest but adequate official residence for the Vice President which we are considering today.

In particular, I am of the firm conviction, Mr. Chairman, that we have a responsibility to the American people to provide this official residence as well as ample security for the Vice President who is the servant of all the people of our great Nation regardless of political affiliation.

Should we fail in our responsibility today, we would not discharge our obligation to the American people to provide adequate facilities for the protection of all future Vice Presidents of the United States.

I should like to call the attention of Members of the House to the fact that only last week pickets gathered for a demonstration in front of the Vice President's small and modest home in Maryland. No one can answer this question, but the question is, Should this crowd have become violent, what could the police department, what could the Secret Service have done to protect his life?

In listening to the observations that have been made here today, I strongly state the opinion that our American forces fighting in Vietnam right this minute fully expect the United States Congress to provide adequate security protection for the second highest official of our Government.

In conclusion, it is my hope that this measure will be passed this afternoon by a substantial majority.

Mr. Chairman, the responsibility is ours. I feel that we will do the job which has been entrusted to us. Thank you.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for a very fine statement.

We have no further speakers on this subject at the present time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he begins his statement?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I would like to tell the House how very much our Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds regrets that the gentleman now in the well is leaving the Congress after this session. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] has been a very valuable member of the Committee on Public Works and the subcommittee which I have the pleasure of being chairman the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I wish to state publicly that we on the majority side regret seeing the gentleman leave the House after this session.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I, too, wish to join with my distinguished colleague in expressing to the gentleman from Pennsylvania our regret at his determination to retire. He has been one of the stalwarts, one of the outstanding members of our committee and in the Congress, and I am sure this House, the Nation and his district in particular will miss him. They are losing a great public servant.

Mr. KUNKEL. Thank you very much. Frankly, I would much rather stand here and listen to these kind comments than to make a speech against the bill, especially in view of the fact that our chairman has done so much work on it, and I think he has done a splendid job.

My only reason for being in opposition to the bill is that I think it is the wrong time. I listened to the gentleman from Illinois give a long list of all the appropriations and the authorizations passed by the Congress during the past two years. Then he drew the inference that we had to continue to pass everything that was proposed, irrespective of how nonessential it might be.

I just do not think you can go on that way. Every little bit added to what you have already spent makes your national debt and your expenditures just that much higher. I think we have to draw the line. We must keep to essentials. The principle involved here is most important, even though the amount is small This bill is a symbol of our fiscal policy and what it is to us in wartime.

The majority leader spoke about the Republicans being political on this. Well, in one sense we certainly are being political and properly so. Why? Because we think it raises one of the great issues now before the country. That is the one of making priorities and trying to cut expenses in nonessentials to the bone so that we can continue with the war in Vietnam as we must do, and so that we can continue with the programs here at home that are essential to our people at home to the greatest extent possible.

The only way we can do that is by cutting down and setting priorities and eliminating nonessential programs. If you vote for all these programs put together, even the so-called little ones, they add up.

For example, this year we have already passed the bill for the Interama down at Miami Beach. That may be a nice thing, but it certainly is not essential these days and it certainly is not essential for the Government to participate in it.

We have also passed the bill for the centennial of Alaska. That is a desirable objective, for which I would ordinarily want to vote, but I feel that it is not in the priority class by any means. So I voted against the Interama.

Mr. Chairman, a careful weighing of all the pros and cons ought to convince anyone that this bill today presents us with a splendid opportunity for saving $750,000. Only in that sense can it be said that this idea of building another Federal mansion has been brought up at the right time in the right place.

I think our distinguished subcommittee chairman had a slip of the tongue when he spoke about building residences for the postmasters, because I do not think we are doing that. What we are doing is building post offices and post office facilities for the American people. That argument is not very apropos.

We have a war going on. It is eating up tax dollars and I O U's at the rate of approximately $30 million a day. We have inflation bearing down on us. The latest danger signs are in the wholesale price index. It has shot up nearly 1½ percent in the first 2 months this year—in other words, at an incredible and ruinous annual rate of close to 9 percent if it continues. No one here needs a primer course in what inflation does to people—or in how Federal spending aggravates it.

The executive branch obviously refuses to set any meaningful priorities. I am at a loss to know who is going to set them if the Congress does not. But so far, sad to say, this body has failed to weed out nonessentials.

Certainly it cannot be convincingly argued that HUBERT HUMPHREY is being hampered in anything. In fact, I would like to take a moment out to compliment the Vice President greatly on the fine attitude he and his wife have taken in leaving this entirely up to the Congress. I also compliment him on the outstanding services he is rendering our Nation. If we follow this same general pattern as the Vice President and his wife, we will discard this program at this time, or perhaps I should say we will postpone it until a later time.

In fact, I agree with the majority report on this bill where it says:

> We are long overdue in establishing such a residence.

I hope that such a residence will be established. All I am saying is, this is not the time to do it. Let us reject this bill and be able to go home and tell the folks that we have saved a few dollars anyway. Then, when the war is over and we are no longer in such a fiscal bind, we can afford to be a little more free about what we spend money on, we can come back and pass this bill with a clear conscience. Then use the argument that this is long overdue—but not until then.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the legislation before us. The central issue under consideration seems to be twofold. First, whether the building of the Vice President's home should proceed with the minimal amount of study given to the proposal rather than evolving through the regularly established study commission concept as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; and, secondly, to reiterate the fact that a principle is at stake as we consider this legislation—the principle of establishing priorities on projects and programs to be approved and advanced by this Congress.

During the winter of 1964 and throughout most of 1965, many areas of the country were hard hit with natural disasters—floods, forest fires, tornadoes, hail storms, ice blocks, and hurricanes brought destruction of a magnitude heretofore unheard of in the history of this country.

These disasters dramatically point to projects that are urgently needed to provide the security and peace of mind to our citizens. This is particularly true of the many flood control, navigation, and water resource development problems in need of consideration and funding throughout the country. These are the priorities that I believe should be accelerated wherever possible.

While the amount of money to some is insignificant, it nevertheless represents an item that could be deferred, as some have suggested. However, this point is relatively unimportant, in my view, as compared to the many items and programs of a duplicating nature that are placed in appropriation bills year after year—many of which could be deleted in their entirety. This, of course, will not be resolved here today but I believe it incumbent on the minority to take this means of focusing attention on considerations before the Congress that can be deferred—this is the chief responsibility of the loyal opposition.

Finally, I want to again refer to a point that I made in committee—that being the desirability of submitting the architectural design to nationwide competition so as to incorporate the best and most creative ideas into the design of the structure.

I want to make myself abundantly clear, I do not strongly oppose the objective of providing the Vice President with a home. I do have some reservations about the manner in which we are proceeding. A departure from established procedure could lead to unforeseen problems that have occurred in the construction of other important buildings on Capitol Hill—this we should avoid, if at all possible.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Reid].

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, looking back over the past 20 years since the end of World War II, most of us will agree that the role of the Vice President in our Government has become increasingly prominent. This is as it should be, and I do not doubt that the office will continue to grow in importance in the future. In addition to the Vice President's official assignment as President of the Senate, today he must necessarily assume more and more of the oversight and ceremonial functions heretofore performed by the President himself; and I think it is essential that we recognize this. Certainly I agree that at some time we should provide an appropriate official residence in Washington for the Vice President and his family. Like the President, the Vice President is also a public man; and probably should live in a comfortable residence provided by the people—one which will reflect the dignity of his office, afford proper security, and free him during his tenure of office from the added burden and the perplexities of maintaining a private home sufficient for his official needs.

However, even though I subscribe to the long-range objectives of the bill before us today, I cannot in good conscience give the measure my support because I disagree with both its approach and particularly its timing. When S. 2394 was considered by the Senate last year, the Senate Committee on Public Works very wisely pointed out that this will be more than a family home—it will become a national landmark. For this reason, the Senate favored the establishment of a special commission to study and coordinate the project. Yet, the House version before us today, which abandons the commission approach, represents a crash program to provide an immediate official residence for the Vice President at a time when a dire and compelling emergency, beyond inconvenience, has not been demonstrated to exist. Admittedly, it would be nice to have an official mansion for our second-ranking elected official, and it may be that the site selected in this bill is a superior one. But I think this is not a decision we in the Congress should make, even if we were in fact fully qualified to make such a judgment. What we are contemplating in this legislation is a mansion which, by its very nature, will have great historical importance for the future. I believe it would be far more appropriate to submit the question as to the present and future needs of the Vice President to a nonpartisan commission of outstanding individuals in Government and the arts who could consult with the Federal agencies involved, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, the American Institute of Architects, and others.

The principal objection to the commission approach, of course, is the fact that it requires time—but it seems to me that the timing of this project is the most important factor which should be given even more serious thought by the Congress. S. 2394 as now written calls for the expenditure of an initial $750,000. Yet, after almost two centuries without an official residence for our Vice President, the proposal is being made at the very time when we are involved in an expensive and critical war of indefinite duration in Vietnam. I went to Vietnam during the last congressional recess and spent several days visiting with our boys who are so valiantly fighting in the cause of freedom. It was an experience I shall never forget. Perhaps having been there I feel more of a personal interest in what they are seeking to achieve and what we should be doing here at home. Frankly, I am disturbed over this attitude which many have that Congress should continue to authorize deferable and uncritical projects here at home as if Vietnam does not exist. I am disturbed, too, that while our boys over there take their daily hardships in stride as their duty to their country, we continue unnecessary spending with a domestic economy facing a new threat of inflation, with a national debt growing to alarming proportions, and with another year of deficit spending ahead. This is a time when the Congress should be realistic—when it should establish as I have said before some meaningful priorities as to essential and necessary spending. Vice President Humphrey has said that he loves his little house in Chevy Chase—that it is bought and paid for. How will he feel then, in a lavish official mansion with a $750,000 Federal mortgage? It has been said here today that in opposing this legislation we prove that we are against everything. Now I do not feel that I am against everything—I know I am for fiscal responsibility and for sound sensible economy in government.

I sincerely hope that we can one day soon provide an official residence for our Vice Presidents. This would make all of us proud. But I think a majority of Americans would want it to be both properly planned, properly budgeted, and properly timed—not just another symbol of an era of deficit spending. I think in truth this is the way our Vice Presidents would want it, too.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I am mindful of the fact that most of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle are in opposition to this legislation and particularly our leadership. I do not like to find myself in opposition to my Republican colleagues in their continued efforts to reduce, to eliminate, and to prevent nonessential Federal spending. In fact, on the contrary, Mr. Chairman, I think their success in attaining this objective is most essential if we are going to maintain a sufficient degree of fiscal stability in order to provide all of our people with the better things in life which we desire to provide for them. Most certainly we are going to have to maintain our economic strength if we are going to remain a free nation.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that this idea of trying to reduce nonessential Federal spending is not a popular cause or a popular political role to fill.

Mr. Chairman, it is not pleasant to hear demagogic statements to the effect that by attempting to reduce expenditures we are attempting to sacrifice the poor and the hungry.

Mr. Chairman, it would be much easier to get on the spending bandwagon and let the floodgates down. However, all of us know that unless there is some restraint exercised in some quarter there will not be any degree of fiscal stability in our Nation. We cannot obtain a millenium by uncontrolled Federal spending. On the contrary, we will have economic chaos if restraint is not exercised.

So, Mr. Chairman, while I agree with the objectives of my Republican colleagues, I do not agree that their opposition to this measure at this time is consistent with a sound economy drive.

Let me say in the first place that the amount involved by comparison is insignificant. It represents only a drop in the bucket. It is peanuts, if you please, insofar as the tremendous financial problem with which we are confronted is concerned.

I have always felt that there were two areas in which we could economize, in general. First of all is to eliminate a nonessential Federal program, to start with, or better yet, not to enact the program. That is how you can do some real economizing.

We could save billions by just eliminating a few of these unessential programs.

A second broad area in which we can economize is to continue looking for better or more efficient administration and management, as all industry must do in order to survive under the competitive free enterprise system.

Mr. Chairman, we most certainly cannot economize by failing to adopt good procedures or through failing to attract the best and the most qualified and the most efficient personnel.

We cannot economize by failing to provide proper equipment and facilities, even though at times this may require the purchase and construction of facilities that may have a luxurious appearance, which may have such items which in the past some people have said were luxuries, such as air conditioning, better lighting, and generally attractive surroundings.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to say is that we cannot always economize by failing to provide necessary expenditures with which to improve our operation equipment and our operating facilities even though it may require a substantial initial authorization of funds.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of the Vice President was created by the Constitution, obviously. It is silly for anyone to say or to even suggest that that office be abolished. Yet that would appear on the surface to save money by eliminating the salary and expenses of the Vice President and his assistants. But we all know that this would be ridiculous. I make this reference to show that there are limits to how far we can go in our efforts to economize. So, Mr. Chairman, we agree that we should maintain the Office of Vice President and it is the second highest office in the land, the second highest office in the greatest, the most powerful, and the wealthiest Nation in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, everyone agrees that the office of the Vice President is an office with increasing responsibility almost daily. In fact, during the last three administrations the Vice Presidents have played an excellent role in helping to create more good will throughout the world. I say our Nation can well afford, well afford, to provide adequate and proper facilities, in keeping with the dignity as well as the responsibility of that office.

And, Mr. Chairman, let me say that $750,000 is not too much to pay for such a facility. The fact of the matter is it is not going to buy too much of a home or a residence or headquarters for our Vice President. In fact, we are paying a great deal more of our money through foreign aid programs which in turn is buying much more expensive homes for foreign potentates throughout the rest of the world, and I say we are spending a great deal more for some of our embassies in some sections of the world. I say the State responsibilities, the official responsibilities of our Vice President require more than the minimum with repect to living standards and housing facilities.

This proposal contained in this bill would not provide the Vice President with a residence much greater than many of the foreign ambassadors have while they are stationed here.

I do not believe our Vice President should be required to go into debt in order to provide himself with this proper living standard and with proper headquarters. I do not believe we should subject the Vice President, whoever he may be, to the possibility—and I say possibility, because I do not believe that any of our Vice Presidents in our lifetime would be subjected to this—but I do not think we should subject the Vice President to the possibility of being obligated to some financial institution or to some individual in order to borrow the funds sufficient to purchase a home here in Washington in an attempt to provide himself with the minimum standards that we all feel he should have.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, we have waited too long to face up to this responsibility and to come up with an answer to this problem. There is never a good time to authorize the expenditure of additional funds. But I think this bill here today provides the absolute minimum that we, the greatest Nation the world has ever known, should provide for decent living standards and decent headquarters and a decent place from which the Vice President can carry out his duties of state and the responsibilities of the second highest office in this Nation of ours.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this House will by a substantial majority approve of this legislation at this time.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for the very fine statement on the subject of housing. It might interest the gentleman from Virginia and also my other colleagues to know that the State of Louisiana has just built a Governor's mansion at a cost of much more than we are proposing here. The State of California has authorized a Governor's mansion. The State of Ohio is going to build a Governor's mansion and the State of Georgia is going to build a Governor's mansion.

These legislatures have approved plans in those States that I know of and certainly if one State can afford a Governor's mansion costing more than we are suggesting here, certainly 50 States ought to be able to provide one residence for the Vice President of the United States.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for the stand he is taking here today on this legislation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I think in opposing this legislation, it would appear that some Members are guilty of being pennywise and pound foolish.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this legislation will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I will not take issue with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, relating to the figures more so than I already have, but I would suggest that it is my understanding that the Governor's mansion in Louisiana cost only $150,000. I suggest that there is a considerable difference between $750,000, as provided for in S. 2394, as reported, and $150,000 for the Governor's mansion in Louisiana.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I would say to the gentleman, I had the honor to live there once during the disaster and I would sure love to be able to buy it for $150,000.

Mr. CRAMER. I wish we could build one for that little.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what the gentleman from Virginia is correct in saying that this is an insignificant item in the overall economy of the Federal Government. But it is symbolic and I think symbols are quite important these days. I felt that President Johnson when he turned out the lights in the White House was engaging in symbolism—and very properly so—to try to call the attention of the Nation to the importance of economy in those times—2 years ago.

I think we must view this in this light—that it is symbolic at a time when we are fighting a war and when the President in his message to the Congress said that those who are talking about cutting expenditures would be directing attention to cutting programs for the poor. This same expression has been used by other supporters of this administration in its expenditure policy. Namely; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, one of the ranking members of the Joint Economic Committee at our recent press meeting when we filed the report on the President's Economic Report. He said the same thing. He said—Well, Republicans will be cutting out money that would be directed to the programs for the poor.

I said at the time, I resented the President's statement in his address to the Congress and I resented the remarks of the gentleman at that time; that certainly no one was anxious in these times to either cut back—for the war in Vietnam or on the poor people of this country. So this becomes very important in a symbolic fashion. This is not an item of military defense or for the poor. This is symbolic of an item that can be delayed.

This is symbolic of the very area where we have heated up our economy unduly—in the field of construction, where construction workers are in great demand today. We frankly have jobs going begging in this area and we can see a serious shortage in construction materials.

The Ways and Means Committee is holding hearings on a very critical situation in respect to copper shortage. The majority leader just today announced with pride that 200,000 additional tons of copper were released from the stockpile because there is a shortage. There is a shortage of aluminum, and a shortage of other building materials.

So this issue before us is highly symbolic. I think we must be concerned at the Federal level with these kinds of symbols. It is certainly true that if the Federal Government and the Federal Congress is not going to set an example in this area of building public buildings, the States will certainly not stand off. They will continue to build their Governors' mansions, mentioned during the debate and so will the people in the private sector continue along these lines. They will say, "If Congress symbolically does not say this is a serious problem that faces our society in this inflationary situation in time of war, why should we be concerned?"

I was frankly shocked the other day—again speaking of symbolism—when Secretary McNamara chose to vacation over in Switzerland in these times when the President of the United States had told American tourists and people contemplating touring abroad to try to cut back because we have a serious gold shortage and a balance-of-payments problem. No one begrudges the Secretary of Defense a well-earned vacation. But people in high position must realize that what they do is symbolic, just as, I again say, President Johnson realized the symbolism of turning off the lights in the White House, the result would be a pittance; it was meaningless as far as the actual money was concerned, but it certainly was symbolic of the issue that faced our society. And that, I submit, is the issue with which we are concerned here today.

I thought the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kunkel] expressed it beautifully. I think we do recognize that we should have a residence for the Vice President. I would agree with what was said on the other side. We have waited too long. But symbolically this is not the time, and there is every reason in the world why we in the Congress should demonstrate to our people that we are at war and we are in a critical situation as far as inflation is concerned. We must finance the war in Vietnam and also take care of the poor.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Missouri has put his finger on the critical issue which faces us here today. In setting priorities, if we cannot say "No" to the enactment of legislation to provide for the Vice President's residence, then we shall set a pattern in this Congress for endless spending on all sorts of matters that should not have the priority of wartime expenditures. That is the issue, which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] has put his finger on very pointedly.

I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, before I read into the Record the "poetry" that I have chosen to express my supplemental views on this legislation, I should like to call the attention of this Committee of the Whole to the fact that my supplemental views, which happen to be in poetry, or, as some critics that I think are slightly harsh have said, doggerel—I want my colleagues to know that my verse is footnoted. There are 13 footnotes.

For example, I cite the distinguished authority on Congress, Neil MacNeil. I cite the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers]. I cite a statement in connection with inflation attributed to our President, Mr. Johnson. I cite the distinguished Congressman from Florida [Mr. Pepper]. At one time I even cite one of my favorite authors, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Congressman Cleveland. I also have a quote here from the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman Brademas. So it goes. My footnotes are all in the report, Report No. 1310.

The doggerel may be rough. The poetry may be rough. But the points I attempt to make are important. I will not recount the many arguments made here today, but certainly we are at war in Vietnam, and certainly—and here I paraphrase the President of the United States—we are faced with the problem of inflation. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson], the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer], and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kunkel] have all pointed out this inflationary problem. There is no argument that it is a real problem.

We socked ourselves and we socked the people of our country—and I say this in my poem—with a big tax increase the other day because of the war in Vietnam and because we are afraid of inflation.

I quote the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, Mendel Rivers, on this, that we are so short of money that we cannot build adequate houses for the soldiers who are fighting this war.

We know, when we talk about this bill costing only $750,000, that we are kidding ourselves. We know what happened with the cost of the Rayburn House Office Building and we know what happens with almost every other public building. They always cost more. Do not kid yourself about that and do not try to kid the voters about it next fall.

With this background, let me share with you my supplemental views.

In this first verse, I remember the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Albert], criticizing the Republican leaders for being obstructionists. I am sorry he is not on the floor to hear this first verse.

Republicans, it's sometimes said
Are "No-men," who obstruct,
When all we ask is why and when,
How much and where construct?

So it is with trepidation
That here again I file dissent,
For it's * * * "to get along, go along"
Down here where the dough is spent.

The issue here before us
Is clearly drawn and square:
Do we need a junior White House?
Why? When? How much? And where?

The Senate says we need one,
Second only, so they say,
To the White House and these hallowed Halls
Where the spenders now hold sway.

But while boys who fight for freedom
Are poorly housed and chill,
Is it right to build a mansion,
A frill up on a hill?

While the dollar fades before us
And inflation robs the poor,
We should build and spend with true restraint
So the dollar may endure.

Let me say this, in connection with this line: That is where I am footnoting a direct quote of the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson. I want to repeat that verse.

While the dollar fades before us
And inflation robs the poor,
We should build and spend with true restraint
So the dollar may endure.

Our VP says he loves his home,
It's paid for free and clear;
Why move him from such happy state
To a mansion priced so dear?

They say there is a desperate need
For space to entertain;
But can our Nation stand it
If twisting halls are twain?

On the brighter, lighter side
We may perhaps agree
That the mansion will be lighted
So at night, it's there to see.

This bill, of course, will pass,
The word is out for sure;
So we may perhaps take comfort
If it's visible to the poor.

But bright at night or dark
It is the concept we should douse;
While we're at war and fighting
It is a we-can-do-without house.

The Great Society has needs
But here's a new low blow,
To sock us with a tax increase
And millions for a go-go.

Down here where money's easy,
Let's spend, let's spend, the cry;
And it's apres votes, the deluge,
Let's build to beat Versailles.

We talk about the signals false
That flash across the sky
When bearded students shrilly ask
"Why die for General Ky?"

Well, what then do we signal
If we vote this palace through,
While we talk of the poor and fight for our life,
To world opinion, what's that do?

Now it isn't really easy
And to question can be tough;
Understaffed and misunderstood,
The minority role is rough.

But our duty is clear as we see it
And may I suggest in this poem,
Though we fight for freedom abroad,
We can lose it here at home.

The cramming and jamming of spending bills,
The thud of the rubber stamps,
A sorry echo to the bugle calls
That sound in those far-off camps.

Hasn't the time come, colleagues,
To heed the voice of dissent?
Isn't it time for selective restraint
Before all of our money is spent?

Must every minority question
Be scoffed and laughed from view?
Yes, isn't it time for selective restraint
To do just what we have to do?

Your Committee on Public Works reports,
They ask that no Member shirks;
But when you vote, "yes," remember
It's the public who's getting the works.

Another executive fortress
Where come the people who please,
Another step back for Congress
With freedom down on its knees.

Why not a house for our Speaker,
Or a center where visitors roam,
Or a house for our Court's High Justice,
Or a Freedom Academy home?

Let's reason together, my colleagues,
Before it's too late to do so;
Let's screw up collective courage,
Let's learn again to say "No."

Let's reassert independence,
Let's let this proposal expire;
Our VP is happy at home
And his rivals far higher aspire.

Respectfully written and offered
These supplemental views;
We've writ before and we'll write again
Though most of the time we lose.

But over the hill and horizon
A light is beginning to burn;
Dissent is getting respectful again,
Thinking is taking a turn.

And the tired old labels of "no"
And "obstruction" are wearing thin,
And people are asking questions
And that's when beginnings begin.

For minority views are important
Though seldom heeded, it's true;
And minority staff is growing
To articulate our view.

So, courage my lonely colleagues,
Be of good heart and of cheer;
Minority views are sometimes read
And the public's beginning to hear.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, after that dissertation, I think regardless of how it is described, until someone comes up with something better, JIM CLEVELAND is entitled to the honorary title of poet laureate of the Committee on Public Works of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCEWEN].

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on this bill, may I first extend to my beloved colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] my sincere admiration for his interest in this subject, and my regret that I cannot agree that this is the time to enact this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am looking at those minority views of my very dear friend and colleague from New Hampshire and at that last verse:

> So, courage my lonely colleagues, be of good heart and of cheer; minority views are sometimes read and the public's beginning to hear.

Mr. Chairman, speaking only for myself, I can report for my district that the public is beginning to hear. For the benefit of my colleagues who might be interested and concerned about what the folks back home may be thinking, may I share two letters I received on this bill? One person wrote and said:

> I have just heard on TV that a new home for the Vice President is being planned at a cost of a million dollars or more.
>
> At a time like this when our boys are fighting in Vietnam, and all too many of them are giving their lives that others might live in any kind of a home at all, I am amazed that anyone in Congress, or out, would contemplate building this expensive home at this time.
>
> What will our boys living in the swamps and mud in Vietnam think about this plan?
>
> We taxpayers are having a hard time to pay our taxes now, and with the President's plans to wage a war on poverty, and other improvements, I ask you Mr. McEwen, where is the money coming from?
>
> The writer is a grandmother, nearing 60, a registered nurse, working 8 hours a day in order to help meet our expenses. We do no entertaining, our lives consist of work, work and more work. Our real estate taxes on an 85-year-old house are $500 a year.
>
> I hope you will do all you can to stop any unnecessary spending at this time.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the whole tenor of this letter is spending at this time.

Finally, another letter I received from a lady in my district very much along the same vein. She says:

> Surely this money could be used to better advantage—something essential, as Vietnam, or not appropriated at all.

Then she uses these words, which I think we might all heed. She says:

> Let us put first things first.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the words of my colleagues, including those on the Democratic side of the aisle. Let me say that I am listening more clearly, I hope, to those back home who are expressing themselves on this legislation. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] pointed out this may be small in dollars but important as indicative of whether or not we are giving attention to priorities and first things first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, just one final thing. In concluding, this lady said,

> As a registered Democrat—

And may I add she corrected her typing by penning in a large "D" she said—

> As a registered Democrat, who has voted for you every time, don't let me down now.

So I wish to assure the lady I will try not to let her down.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, most of the developed nations of the world provide official residences for their top elected officials. The United States of America has been remiss in failing to provide an official residence for its Vice President. Our colleague, Congressman KENNETH GRAY, of Illinois, on February 21, 1966, introduced a bill authorizing the General Services Administration to plan, design, and construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. The proposed structure would be located on a site at the U.S. Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue. The location would be ideal since it is both scenic and would provide physical security for the Vice President with a minimum expenditure. I heartily endorse the proposal and urge the Congress to speedily enact authorization for the construction of the residence.

The office of the Vice President is the second highest elected official in this country. His constitutional duties have grown through experience and history. This is especially true over the last several years when he has become an increasingly vocal and effective instrument of the executive branch. With these added responsibilities have come increasing demands on his time to represent the President at home and abroad.

These demands both official and ceremonial in nature require the Vice President to meet with important foreign and domestic leaders in formal and informal receptions. The present Vice President in his usual cordial manner has used his own home for these purposes. While he has made the best of a bad situation, it is apparent from the frequent, as well as large, receptions that a typical American home will not suffice for these purposes.

Certainly, the acknowledged leader of the free world can afford to properly house its Vice President and provide him with an official residence and household staff which befits the high position he holds. Today's diplomacy demands that the Vice President have a residence so that he can efficiently carry out his duties.

We must also remember that the Vice President is next in line of succession should anything happen to the President. The physical protection of the Vice President is, therefore, an important factor in the proposed residence. The 10-acre site at the U.S. Naval Observatory will enable the Secret Service to adequately protect the Vice President and his immediate family.

Mr. Speaker, the modest expenditure provided in Congressman GRAY's bill will correct this situation and will add further evidence to the value the American people place on the office of the Vice President.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in this country today we recognize the office of Vice President as one of significance, a position from which an individual can render great service to the American people.

And so I believe, Mr. Chairman, that as an elective official ranking second only to the President of the United States, the Vice President should have a house furnished him by the taxpayers. It should be a house of which the people can be proud. It should be a residence fully befitting the stature of the individual who, with his family, occupies it, the No. 2 man in the country.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a time to build and a time to mark time on a project of this kind. I say this is no time to be building a $750,000 mansion for the Vice President—and my opposition has nothing to do with the merits of the project itself or the individual occupying the office.

I would like to ask the supporters of this authorization bill: By what logic do they advocate the spending of $750,000 on a residence for the Vice President when the Secretary of Defense has sidetracked 8,500 units of urgently needed military family housing authorized and funded by Congress in 1965 for construction this fiscal year?

In a press release dated last December 20, Secretary McNamara said the Defense Department was deferring $620 million worth of military construction, including $160 million for the 8,500 military family housing units.

What was Bob McNamara saying by this action? He was declaring that it was vital to this Nation to refuse to spend not only $460 million in funds earmarked for general military construction but also $160 million tagged for housing the families of our men in uniform.

While he did not use the word "inflation"—and perhaps he avoided it deliberately—McNamara left no doubt he feared the deferred projects might have put extra push behind the already high cost of building in this country.

Only last week, McNamara said he will not ask Congress for any new military family housing construction for fiscal 1967. Instead he proposed leasing 13,075 housing units over the next 2 fiscal years.

I say we are experiencing a more heated inflationary situation than we were in December 1965, and the prospects are that the cost of living will be spiraling more in the months ahead. I say it doesn't make sense in times like these to be spending $750,000 of the people's money on a house for the Vice President.

If the Vice President were asked today how he feels about the project. I have great doubts he would want to go ahead with it knowing that some of our servicemen and their families are living in what amounts to slum quarters.

Bob McNamara last January 26 told the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations that the 8,500 family housing units he had frozen were justified but he was putting off construction just the same.

McNamara added in direct testimony:

> We think it wise to defer the start of that construction until there is less pressure on our total construction industry in this country.

Let us assume the Vice President's house is, to use McNamara's word, "justified." Is this the time to build it—when we are fighting a multibillion-dollar war in Vietnam and trying to dampen the fires of inflation at home?

Should we cut the school lunch and school milk programs but build a three-quarter-million-dollar house for the Vice President?

Should we cut agricultural extension programs and reduce support funds for our land-grant colleges but construct a handsome house for the Vice President?

Bob McNamara put a hold order on 8,500 places for our servicemen and their families to live while saying this construction was "justified."

Other Defense Department officials also testified the military housing was desperately needed. Unless we think they are given to telling fairy stories, we have to believe them.

J. J. Reed, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Family Housing, on May 25, 1965, pleaded with the military construction appropriations subcommittee to provide funds for all 12,500 family housing units then sought by the Defense Department for fiscal 1966.

He said the program was urgent because:

> First, decent living conditions create a better military man; second, the Nation has an obligation to provide decent living conditions for the family of the military man who has pledged to risk his life for the common defense; and third, decent living conditions make a military career more attractive—it assists the military forces to retain qualified personnel in competition with higher paying civilian careers.

Despite this justification for building all 12,500 housing units, Bob McNamara shelved 8,500 of them for an indefinite time.

Assistant Defense Secretary Paul Ignatius declared in testimony before the subcommittee April 13, 1965:

> In lieu of our request for 12,100 units in fiscal year 1964, only 7,500 were funded (by Congress). Last year (calendar year 1964), the Congress funded only 8,250 units as opposed to our request for 12,500 units. In view of the level of funding for new units that has been approved in the past 2 years, it is now apparent that it is impossible, without a crash building program, for the (Defense) Department to obtain its objective within the original 5-year program.

Ignatius said the Defense Department would have to build 12,500 family housing units annually over a 6-year period to meet the needs of its men.

Those plans have been crippled by McNamara's hold order on 8,500 units of family housing for our men in uniform.

Certainly, the Vice President and the Nation will not suffer if the proposed Vice-Presidential residence is left on the drawing board along with the family construction program for our servicemen.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I take great pride in yielding 10 minutes to close debate on this side to our very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] who serves on our subcommittee—and I started to say, Mr. Chairman—he is the Wordsworth of Texas since we have heard the poetry by the Wordsworth of New Hampshire.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I make no pretense to any such title. I was, however, so deeply moved by the sentimental strains and poetic prowess of our distinguished and lyrical colleague from New Hampshire that I felt constrained to reply in a verse in old English pentameter:

THE HOUSING OF THE VEEP

Sir Cleveland's verse
(And it could be worse)
Doth make the sad heart weep;
That a land so fair
Hath no butter to spare
For the housing of the Veep.

In Smith's fair hall
It cast a pall
Of socialism's creep;
Yet brave men all
Sought wherewithal
For the housing of the Veep.

Cleveland raiseth a ghost
That appalleth most
When he spake of the cost of it all;
He crieth aloud
And raiseth a shroud
Of a garish Taj-ma-Hall.

Yet wise men these,
Of birds and bees
And of castles and moats and mucks,
Asked: "How hath he spake
Of a Treasury break
Over forty-five thousand bucks?"

Sir Cleveland arose,
Struck lordly pose,
And with his fist he smote!
"It's bound to be
A great castle," said he,
"For the Senate so hath wrote!"

But Sir Kenneth expressed,
As a grin he suppressed,
"Methinks that argument dumb;
'Tis fact well known,
And often shown,
That their lordships exaggerate some.

"Build we houses not
For the woodland lot,
For all our forest rangers?
And upon our coast
Lighthouses we post
For countrymen and strangers.

"And in dungeons dank
We never shrank
From housing the prison's warden;
Can we be so cheap
With our only Veep
That we drive him to dwell in the garden?"

Still unimpressed,
One beat his breast,
And said: "None of that I wot!
For the Veep himself,
Though not burdened with pelf,
Hath said he needs it not."

But a wiser knight,
Too old for fright,
Recalled a day long past;
He averred with a groan,
" 'Tis not this Veep alone,
But whomever the Nation hast.

" 'Twould be the same
Were it—what's-his-name?"
And with this he brake into a frown,
Until from the past
The name came at last—
"Sir Richard of Whittier Town!"

Then strong men wept,
Or their silence kept,
Whilst the air grew heavy and hot;
'Til at last one said,
With a nod of his head,
"He's the onliest Veep we've got!"

Then all did say,
With a chorus of "aye!"

"He's the onliest Veep we've got,
We've got!
He's the very best Veep we've got!
Opposition we'll souse,
And we'll build him a house
Whether New Hampshire likes it or not.

"The lights he may douse,
But we'll build him a house:
He's the very best Veep we've got!"

Well, my colleagues and Mr. Chairman, while I hope that those last somnolent lines may be prophetic as well as poetic, in a quite serious vein, let us see now if we cannot bring this back into some semblance of sensible perspective.

For many, many years everyone who has looked at this problem has agreed that we do need an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. I know of nobody who has taken issue with that basic proposition.

As long ago as 1917, a distinguished lady, the widow of a former Member of the other body, offered her home to the United States in recognition of the need for an official residence for the Vice President.

In the year 1948, a bipartisan group of Republican and Democratic Members alike presented bipartisan legislation designed to construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

When I came to this Congress in 1955, everyone had by then agreed as to the need for a residence for the Vice President—a residence in which he could perform the duties of his office and in which he could hold the necessary meetings and receptions attendant upon the performance of those duties.

In the year that followed, 1956, Ambassador Davies offered his home for the purpose. Still no one said that it should not be done.

In 1958, as has already been mentioned, the then President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, officially recommended such a residence in his budget message, while stating that, of course, the times were perilous and the future uncertain, but nevertheless concluding that we needed to build an official residence for the Vice President.

So today no one says that it should not be done. As pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], all of our living former Vice Presidents have endorsed the basic proposition. Even the distinguished gentlemen on my left, who have said they do not believe we ought to pass the bill today, almost without exception have made mention of the fact that they believe it is a worthwhile objective. They are in sympathy with the purposes of the bill. They think it should be done. But they say, "Well, not just now," or, "Not right there," or "Not in just this way."

It is mindful, in a sense, of the prayer reportedly uttered, before he became such a great Christian, by St. Augustine. He is said to have prayed—

> Lord, make me holy, but not just yet.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, that we can talk until doomsday. Always there will be some reason for not doing it now. A vote against this bill today is a vote not to build an official residence for the Vice President. It is that simple. I think there is reason for doing it right now. I think there are valid reasons for deciding it this year.

First, the duties of the Vice-Presidency have assumed a far greater importance in our scheme of things and in our form of Government than they have ever held in the past. An official residence is, therefore, more greatly needed.

Second, the responsibilities of providing security for the President and for the Vice President of the United States are graver than ever they have been in the past. Enactment of this bill will facilitate the provision of that security.

Finally, I think we might give thought to the reasonable fact, on which everyone seems to agree, that American politics has become or is becoming a rich man's game. The sad lament has been heard in these halls that only a person of great personal wealth in this time can afford the luxury of participating in American politics. This is one way in which we can help to remove that unnecessary impediment upon the participation in American politics. This is one way in which we can say, with a loud affirmative "yea," that we do not believe that a qualification requisite to serving as Vice President of the United States ought to be a man's personal wealth.

I happen to know that when the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson was Vice President of the United States, out of his own personal resources, and at considerable personal expense to him, he purchased a large house known as the Elms for the sole and exclusive purpose of serving as an appropriate place for him to hold the meetings and the receptions that the President of the United States asked him to hold, and to provide the hospitality that he was asked to provide as an official part of his duties as Vice President.

It is fortunate that he was able to do so. And yet it is a little sad to contemplate that at least four out of the last five Vice Presidents of the United States would not have been able from their personal resources to have purchased such a house as that.

Why is the prospect of passing this bill today so frightening? Why is it such a terrible thing that we want to spend a maximum of $750,000 to provide an official residence for the Vice President of the United States?

I ask you to stop and contemplate all the things of a similar character that we have been doing without batting an eyelash. On every military base in the United States and every U.S. military base throughout the world we have provided an official residence for the commanding officer of that base. Nobody shudders at that. Is not the Vice President the second in command of the whole U.S. Military Establishment? Is not he as important as a local base commander?

As was mentioned earlier, in all the chanceries throughout the world we have provided residences for the American Ambassadors, and I do not object to that. No objection has been raised to that. Yet is not the Vice President of the United States today as important in our scheme of things as an American Ambassador?

Each of our forest rangers is provided at Government expense a home in which he lives. Are not our Vice President and the duties he performs as important as those of a forest ranger?

Every one of our prison wardens has a similar facility. Nobody raises a cry of "inflation" or says we should do away with them because of the war in Vietnam.

As I pointed out earlier, President Lincoln defended the proposition of continuing work on the Capitol Building during the War Between the States. Surely our Nation was in graver peril then than it is today. Additions were made to the White House during the Korean war. Just last year, we authorized $228 million—more than 300 times as much as this would cost—for public buildings. The Vietnam war was in progress then; yet nobody complained. The buildings were needed, and so is this one. We do not simply suspend the functions of civil government because we are at war. We never have.

Nobody has suggested that, because of the war in Vietnam, we should do away with these regular routine activities of the Government which I have mentioned. And yet, in composite form, the cost of these programs is many, many times the cost of providing one residence for the Vice President of the United States.

The question of cost has been magnified far out of proportion. When we think of the one-time cost of providing a residence to serve down through the years, and compare this with the wealth of the Nation, it seems absolutely ludicrous for anyone to raise the question of whether we can afford it or not.

The United States today is wealthier than any nation in the history of the world. Our gross national product is at an alltime high. Our national income is at an alltime high. If every penny authorized in this bill were spent on a suitable residence for the Vice President, the total maximum cost would come to approximately 39 cents per citizen. No staggering precedent would be set. It would not set off the specter of an expanding program. We have, after all, only one Vice President at a time. And we propose to build one official residence—just one—for all future Vice Presidents.

This is the first serious attempt to take this matter out of the talking stage and do something about it. To quibble and quarrel about such a matter seems at best dilatory and at worst childish.

If this bill should be voted down today, who knows how long it will be before Congress might summon the initiative to reach this point again. It could be 20 more years—or 30 more years—or 50 more years.

One of the gentlemen opposing enactment of this bill, while stating his sympathy with the basic purpose, asked: "Cannot we wait another 18 months?" Well, of course, we could wait another 18 months—or another 18 years—or another 180 years, for that matter. But what purpose would be served?

The logic of the matter is very plain. We clearly need such a residence. We surely can afford it. No purpose can be served by waiting. So, therefore, let us build it.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, no other Member of the House is in quite the same position today as that in which I find myself.

The incumbent Vice President is a resident of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, and we have found him to be a good neighbor. At the same time, the location of his residence in the Sixth District makes it a matter of daily observance that the Vice President incurs definite limitations in the discharge of his official duties because of the lack of an official residence.

Thousands of Marylanders pass his present home each day. They can imagine the problem created by the need to carry on official entertaining and cope with the flow of staff work incumbent upon the second highest officer of the land from a typical suburban residence.

Those of us who are interested in economy can be reassured by the fact that no excessive expenditures will be made in the immediate future, in accordance with understandings established in debate today. Republicans may join in support of this bill in anticipation of the day when the official residence of the Vice President will be inhabited by a Republican.

I personally am supporting the authorization of this residence because I feel that it is a necessary tool for the Vice President in the discharge of his official duties and responsibilities.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the pending legislation to provide an official residence for the Vice President. This legislation is long overdue and I hope that it will be overwhelmingly adopted.

I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that there is nothing in the pending bill which requires consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts. I would hope that provision can clearly be made for such consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts. This should be done prior to a final report to Congress by the Acquisition Commission, and most particularly if the Acquisition Commission recommends the design of the official residence for the Vice President. We are building a very important addition to the Nation's Capital city, and the nature of the design of this building must meet the high standards of beauty and character which most buildings in Washington now possess. I would hesitate to single out those buildings which do not measure up to these high standards, but this is why we have a Commission of Fine Arts in order to preserve these standards.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the merits of the basic idea of providing an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, I believe we would be ill advised to consider spending $750,000—plus the cost of 10 acres of valuable land—for this purpose at this time.

You will recall that the Secretary of Defense shelved the appropriation Congress made last fall for construction of housing for our military personnel. In taking this action, the Department stated it was doing so because of other budget demands and inflationary pressures. If adequate housing for our servicemen is to be deferred because of budget limitations and inflation pressures, why should not the same principle apply in connection with an expensive house for the Vice President? Why should we at this time concern ourselves about furnishing an expensive house for the Vice President when the Secretary of Defense refuses to use the funds we have already appropriated to give proper housing for our fighting men?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my endorsement of the establishment of a residence for the Vice President of the United States. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], for his leadership in resolving this longstanding need of the country.

The office of the Vice President has become increasingly important in the functions of our Government and it is appropriate that he and his family have an official residence which is befitting of the office he holds. The official responsibilities and consequently the stature of the Vice President have so increased that few will argue any more against the desirability of providing him with an official home.

Through the years we have had various suggestions for an official residence and these have been primarily nonpartisan in intent. Indeed, in 1948 a nonpartisan bill, to provide an official residence in the District of Columbia for the Vice President of the United States was introduced by a Democrat from Kentucky and a Republican from California. Calvin Coolidge, after serving both as Vice President, and as President, suggested a vice-presidential residency in his autobiography in 1929.

Any number of Presidents have urged the establishment of an official vice-presidential mansion, befitting the obligations and stature of the Nation's number two executive.

Our rapidly shrinking world has increased the number of visitors this country entertains officially from abroad. If the Vice President had an official residence which could be used for state functions, it would considerably ease the load of the President in providing necessary entertainment for our visitors from home and abroad. The Vice President performs so many official functions that relieve the President's burdens that he ought to be furnished a home second only to the White House in appearance and elegance in which to carry out his increasingly arduous duties.

The Vice President of today must be more familiar than ever with the problems of the White House and as the load of official duties increases in the office of the President, so it increases in the office of the Vice President. The record shows that the Vice President, particularly in the last three administrations, has more and more assisted the President with policy and ceremonial functions. On the grounds of prestige alone it would seem highly desirable to provide an official residence for the Vice President.

The arguments in favor of an official residence are very persuasive. Even the last boost in the salary of the Vice President is not enough to provide the kind of home that the Vice President ought to have if he is going to assume part of the President's burden of entertaining official visitors. The Vice President should not be asked to dig into his own pocket to entertain the Nation's guests.

The dominant consideration is, of course, that a Vice President today is frequently called upon to entertain distinguished visitors, including foreign heads of state. He should have a suitable place in which to do it. Only rarely is the Vice President apt to have the private resources required to meet this need, and certainly the pay and allowances of the office alone are insufficient.

In my opinion the proposal has merit and I urge its passage.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to vote against S. 2394. I would like to make it clear that I am not opposed in principle to providing a residence for the Vice President. However, in this year, when budget pressures are causing reductions in essential programs, the establishment of an official residence must be assigned a low priority.

It would be difficult for me to justify to myself and to my constituents a vote for S. 2394 when cutbacks have been proposed in the school lunch program, the special milk program, and impacted area funds. I, therefore, urge that action on the establishment of an official residence for the Vice President be deferred until such time as the defense budget can be reduced to normal levels and essential programs upon which so many people rely can be fully funded.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2394, a bill to establish an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

I think Members on both sides of the aisle can agree that the role which the Vice President plays has broadened considerably beyond the constitutional duty of presiding over the other body.

In recent years the Vice President's activities have broadened considerably. The Vice President's duties include the chairmanship of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, the Peace Corps Advisory Council, the Cabinet Task Force on Youth Opportunity, and the Special Cabinet Task Force Travel, U.S.A.

Additionally, the Nation's second highest elected official is a member of the National Security Council and the Board of Regents of Smithsonian Institution and is honorary chairman of the National Advisory Council to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

All of us are well aware of the diplomatic assignments which were handled by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon and by Vice President Johnson during the Kennedy administration, and the very recent and quite successful mission to the Far East by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. In short, the Vice-Presidency has become a position of vast importance. It is only fitting that the incumbent in this office is given an official residence which is in keeping with the high office he holds. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of S. 2394.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, so far as I can recall, no one has mentioned the U.S. Constitution during this debate. Of course, that is really not an unusual oversight. Indeed, to some it may seem in poor taste to try to test legislative proposals by the Constitution.

I took the trouble to examine the constitutional responsibilities of the Vice President and find them to be very limited. He is authorized only to be President of the Senate but interestingly, he is prohibited from voting except in the event of a tie vote.

By tradition, he has little influence in the Senate. This was illustrated dramatically when President Johnson served as Vice President. Although he had previously been one of the most powerful majority leaders in Senate history, he had little Senate influence once he became Vice President.

Mr. HUMPHREY is important only to the extent that President Johnson permits him to be. On those occasions he is important as the spokesman for the President, not by virtue of his office as Vice President.

The next Vice President—like many of his predecessors—may have no responsibilities whatever delegated to him by the President.

Therefore it would seem totally unnecessary, certainly way beyond the responsibility and authority vested in the Vice President by the Constitution, to authorize this expensive residence.

Mr. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, in his message to Congress yesterday on consumer interests—and I applaud him for a generally constructive and provocative statement in this important area of public policy—the President emphasized:

> Even the wisest consumer laws will not help the American public if their hard-earned dollars and savings are eroded by inflation.

I completely agree.

As the President knows, however, and as our colleagues are aware, inflation has already arrived and the process of erosion of purchasing power has already set in. Wholesale prices, for instance, rose at an annual rate of 6 percent in the period from last October through January. Many manufacturers report that the prices of the goods they buy have increased much faster than the price indexes—an observation most homemakers have confirmed especially in the area of food prices.

Last week's report of the Joint Economic Committee—the expert group of our colleagues on which we rely for sound economic advice—also called special attention to the threat of uncontrolled inflation. The majority members of the committee unanimously suggested that price pressures may prove stronger than the administration expected and they recommended providing standby authority to raise taxes upon approval of a joint resolution as well as reducing Federal expenditures which are "for the benefit of those already well provided for." The minority members of the committee also recognized that tax increases may be necessary and strongly urged that Congress exercise restraint on administration spending requests and that the administration reduce the projected administrative budget deficit of $6.4 billion for the current fiscal year and produce a small surplus in fiscal 1967.

To me, Mr. Chairman, it is significant and encouraging that minority and majority Members are so close in agreeing on the dangers of growing inflation and on some of the steps the Government should follow in controlling it. At a time of high employment, spreading labor shortages, and close to maximum utilization of production facilities, the booming economy could be drastically affected—and prosperity gravely threatened—by continuing high budget deficits and their inevitably inflationary impact.

The time to start is now, Mr. Chairman. And the place to start, as our distinguished majority colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee have advised us, is with those expenditures "for the benefit of those already well provided for." I suggest that the proposed new mansion for the Vice President fits this description and should come within the majority's prescription.

This should not be a partisan issue. I have great respect for the Vice President and I do not oppose the basic purpose of providing a suitable residence for him and his successors. But I do oppose—at a time when inflation presents a clear danger to millions of lower and fixed-income Americans, when the cost of supporting our forces in Vietnam is mushrooming, and when the administration says we cannot afford loans for deserving college students or milk for the country's schoolchildren—spending three-fourths of a million dollars plus other millions in valuable land simply to provide a more convenient way to entertain official guests.

Since it does not constitute priority legislation, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the pending bill.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, when I think of Tom Marshall wishing, as Vice President, only for "a good 5-cent cigar," I concede that I have a nostalgia for the good old days.

However, times change and we now have the administration's high society—with poverty administrators getting over $20,000 a year and people earning $10,000 a year also drawing money from the poverty program. Who am I to stand in the way of this magnificence? Now that the administration has lowered tariffs, why do we not bring in pink Italian marble and try for an American Taj Mahal—not only a living quarters but a memorial for all Vice Presidents.

This should have crystal chandeliers, gold service for the tables, escalators, and most of all, Mr. Chairman, an echo chamber. We all know that Vice Presidents are human. Some are great speakers. And what compulsive speaker has not looked in his bathroom mirror of a morning and delivered his speech for the day to test his voice and his gestures.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should specify an echo chamber as one of the important rooms of this palace. This would be better than any mirror for testing the voice, but we could have along its walls full-length mirrors for rehearsals in pointing with pride and viewing with alarm. I suggest that we name this "the Memorial Vice Presidential Palace" and remove the $750,000 limitation. After all, what kind of home can you get for three-quarters of a million in this period of administration inflation?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues in urging the passage of this most worthwhile legislation. I am proud to stand on the House floor today and support legislation which will provide a long overdue official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

I am pleased and proud to support H.R. 12944 which would designate an official residence for the Vice President on the grounds of the Naval Observatory. This legislation has been carefully thought out and diligently researched and the proposed sites have been personally inspected by members of the Public Works Committee, and I therefore believe the recommendations in H.R. 12944 are most fitting and deserving of your support for a home for the second-ranking officer of our Nation.

I am particularly proud to support this legislation today because it would apply to my dear friend of long standing with whom I have worked shoulder to shoulder for almost 20 years, the present incumbent, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. But this legislation goes beyond any one man. It will be a home for the years to come for all of the Vice Presidents who will follow the present incumbent in office.

The first bill authorizing a Vice-Presidential residence was submitted some 18 years ago. Since then we have had five Vice Presidents, all of whom have had to bear the burden and responsibilities the office entails and none of whom was given the facilities to perform his duties.

Today, as we know from recent past and tragic experience, the Vice President is a standby President. Over the years the trend has been for the President to give additional responsibilities to his Vice President. The job has consistently increased in stature and has not diminished.

The Vice President is no longer capable of fulfilling his responsibilities as a public servant either in the social atmosphere where he must of necessity move or the workaday world without the use of an official residence, which should be located somewhere in the Washington area. The Vice President entertains foreign dignitaries from far and wide as well as the highest citizens of our land in his home. The gatherings of this type are such that they require a proper atmosphere and background for the Vice President's receptions.

With this background of support and work on the subject before us, I think the time has passed when a further study by a commission would do the job. This matter has been considered for a great number of years and has widespread support. While I have proper respect for commissions and their work, I believe there are times, and this is one of them, when direct action, such as that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] proposes in his bill, is the only solution.

The proposal before us today, Mr. Chairman, is one that I think will fit in with our modern concept of the office of the Vice President and one that, at the same time, will provide a home that will be fully in keeping with the high office held by the Vice President. I might point out that the legislation proposed is some $250,000 less than the original proposal for a commission to select the Vice President's residence.

Once again, may I say I am proud to urge your support of H.R. 12944, and I trust you will give the measure favorable consideration. I can assure you it will have my heartiest support.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against H.R. 12944, for I do not believe that this valid but low-priority project should be allowed to absorb funds sorely needed this year for programs now threatened, such as the school milk and school lunch programs; the national defense education loan fund; and others.

While three-quarters of a million dollars out of a total Federal budget for the year of over $100 billion will seem a relatively small amount, nevertheless nonessential items such as this should be cut to justify our commitment of more substantial funds to continue the more vital programs.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, in analyzing S. 2394 now before the House, I have tried to determine whether the people of the United States should provide an official residence for all future Vice Presidents because of the nature of the office in relation to its importance to the Nation and not whether the present Vice President should have an official residence.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the decision to provide a home for our second most important Government official should not be motivated by the personality of Mr. HUMPHREY, his wants or his desires, but motivated only to further the dignity of the office, itself.

Furthermore, for security reasons, I believe the house should be located in an environment adaptable to the maximum amount of protection available for the Vice President and his family. The Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue is such a site and thoroughly approve of the committee's choice in this connection.

It would appear that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that construction of a house for the Vice President would begin next week or within the next 6 months. This is impossible. The fact is the appropriation will not be considerered by us today at all; only an authorization for an amount not to exceed $750,000.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] has indicated that only a $45,000 appropriation for architectural planning and designing will be requested at this time. This is the main reason, Mr. Speaker, that I shall vote for the bill.

An unusual feature that captured my imagination, Mr. Speaker, is the provision enabling foundations and the public to make gifts thereby reducing the overall cost of this project. If this bill becomes law, I propose to ask the chambers of commerce in my district to organize committees to collect funds for this worthwhile endeavor.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if we can furnish homes for our generals, colonels, other military personnel, and ambassadors, I feel we can afford, even during war, to spend $45,000 for the planning of an official residence for the Nation's second highest official.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to plan, design, and construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRAY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 2. The Administrator is further authorized to use as a site for such residence Federal land and property comprising approximately ten acres at the United States Naval Observatory, the specific area and boundaries thereof to be determined jointly by the General Services Administration and the Department of the Navy: *Provided*, That any roads and improvements thereon for which there is a continued need may be relocated and reconstructed.
>
> SEC 3. The Administrator is further authorized to provide for the care, maintenance, repair, improvement, alteration, and furnishing of the official residence and grounds, including heating, lighting, and air conditioning, which services shall be provided at the expense of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened patiently this afternoon during the general debate and I have heard about everything in defense of this proposal. Among other things, I heard the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] refer to this $750,000 Taj Mahal as "peanuts."

That amount of money for one house may be "peanuts" in Virginia. I do know it is not "peanuts" in Iowa. And remember this, $750,000 is for a house alone, without one dime for a lot or any other land acquisition.

I wonder if it is proposed to use gold wallpaper as the freewheeling spenders did when they fixed up the yacht for Emperor Haile Selassie, of Ethiopia, and whether they are going to have gold-plated bathroom fixtures and fur-lined bathtubs. We get little specific information as to what they are going to have in this palace for $750,000.

I did hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] say, in effect, that we are the wealthiest and most prosperous country in the world. I say to him, that we are also the most debt-ridden nation in the world, with $1,260 billion of public and private debt. Maybe that, too, is "peanuts." Then there are those in this Government who say this country is reeking with poverty, and hundreds of millions are voted by Congress to take care of the poverty stricken.

You cannot exactly have it both ways. Which is it?

Perhaps the House ought to know something about the income of the Vice President of the United States. I have not heard this discussed this afternoon. He draws a salary of $43,000 a year. He has $10,000 expense allowance. He has $186,000 annually for office expenses. I could go on down the list, but I will only add the Cadillac and chauffeur which a benevolent government furnishes and maintains.

Vice President HUMPHREY is not exactly in dire financial straits. I think at this time, when the country is as debt ridden as it is, and we are told it is reeking with poverty, that the Vice President of the United States could live right where he is, in his own home, where the mortgage reportedly is paid. He is not suffering.

I suggest he might even rent a dining-room when he has to entertain an especially large group. He gets the money for that purpose—rather than saddle upon the backs of the taxpayers at this time $750,000 for one house, not a dollar of which is to buy land on which to build it.

In fact, the land is 10 acres. I ask again, since 10 valuable acres are to be used, is it proposed to establish a country club for HUMPHREY on the Naval Observatory grounds?

I am not exactly Johnny-come-lately to this business. I was here when an attempt was made to build a mansion in the Naval Observatory grounds for Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Congress at that time wisely shelved that proposition. That would have cost, as I remember, $360,000, or $380,000.

I urge you not do this to the taxpayers of this country now. Do not do this to the millions who, you say, are living in poverty.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. During the general debate, which I followed very carefully, I have become somewhat confused as to just what this will be. Will it be a monument, or a mansion, or a jail, or what?

Mr. GROSS. I have no idea. On one hand, we hear that the Vice President is spending most of his time traveling about in this country and over the world.

It has been indicated that he would not be there 50 percent of the time. On the other hand, we hear a Vice Presidential palace has to be on the Naval Observatory grounds in order to provide security. I come back to the days when it was a subject of serious discussion in the House as to whether we should construct more buildings here in the District of Columbia; whether the Government should not be dispersed because of nuclear weapons and their destruction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I object.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am serious about this. I hope there is a vote on the motion to strike the enacting clause. That is the kind of fate this bill deserves at this time. Yes, there were serious questions raised in the past about constructing more buildings in the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] was here at that time. The building of additional important structures in the District of Columbia was questioned because a hydrogen or nuclear bomb might be dropped on the District of Columbia. What has happened? Is there no longer any fear of war? There was also a day, you know, when the authorization for buildings came to the House floor. All we see now is the backs of our necks. All we see is the appropriation for the building or buildings. The House has turned over to the Committee on Public Works a virtual blank check to approve hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of buildings.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I will. I mentioned the gentleman's name.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The Public Works Committee has done a splendid job in carrying out the Public Buildings Act of 1959 which was sponsored by President Eisenhower.

Mr. GROSS. Well, there may be some question about that.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida a question. Was any attention given to acquiring another site anywhere in the District of Columbia for this mansion?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say in response to the gentleman one of the points raised in our minority views was that it was our feeling adequate study of alternative sites should be made and other agencies that have an interest in this junior White House should have been consulted and an opportunity for a proper study should have been afforded. It is true, I readily admit, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois, along with Mr. Knott, of the General Services Administration, visited a number of sites and came to the committee and made this recommendation. However, so far as I am concerned, there has been no proper study made by the necessary people to determine the best site and the size of the facility needed and a true estimate given of what the cost might be. That is one of the points we make in our minority views.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, for instance, that Bobby Baker is not doing as well financially as he did at one time. He is reputed to have a pretty expensive piece of property out in Northwest Washington in an acceptable neighborhood. I wondered if the committee gave any thought to taking this off Bobby's hands.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, as a matter of fact, some of those very devotedly interested in providing a residence for the Vice President came before the committee and testified they were extremely unhappy with the proposed site at the Naval Observatory. Some suggested, for instance, the Glover Archbold park land as a possible alternative. So, I ask, why is there all this haste to say that this is the place and this is the amount? It has to be done now, they say, when there are many dissatisfied with this proposal.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I would like to ask the gentleman to answer, if he can, or to query further those responsible for the bill on the committee as to whether or not there have been any departmental reports from the Navy as to the use of this portion of the land. I find none in the reports or the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the hearings. Apparently, the Navy does not count when the Committee on Public Works goes to work on a proposition.

Mr. HALL. The Department of Defense is not even commenting.

Mr. GROSS. I want to be corrected if I am wrong, but I am sure I am right that there is not a word in the hearings from the Navy as to whether this poses any problems for them.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman know what proportion of the Navy property out there at the Naval Observatory is being taken over by this 10 acres?

Mr. GROSS. No. I imagine there is a total of about 20 acres, although I would not know. It is interesting, too, that it is proposed to move it from the site they first selected which was overlooking a playground. I do not know whether the Vice President does not want to watch children at play, or what the story is.

Mr. HALL. As far as the selection of sites is concerned, if the gentleman will yield further, do you know whether there has been any test boring made or anything to find out if this ground will support this junior-Gray-White House or not?

Mr. GROSS. The hearings say there have been no test borings.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state emphatically that the Department of the Navy does not object. Because of the time element involved, the Department of the Navy has not sent down an official report. However, I have a verbal report to the effect that they do not object to this bill.

We did not move the site location——

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will withhold for just a second, I would not expect that the Navy would object. I expect any admiral who made a protest or remonstrated in any way would be made to walk the plank the next day.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this bill as an unnecessary and flagrant raid on the taxpayers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to most of the debate here today, which has alternated between serious discussion of a very important matter and a rather humorous comment or two concerning this proposed project.

Mr. Chairman, I heard someone a moment ago on the floor of the Chamber say that we were discussing the proposed authorizing legislation for the "VP's teepee." I had not heard that description before, but to be more serious, let me make an observation concerning the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

I listened very carefully to his speech to us a moment ago. On the one hand, he said all the proponents were seeking was $45,000. And, then, later in his remarks he said the time is now to build this project this year. If you build it this year, it is going to cost more than $45,000. It will cost the $750,000 which is called for in the authorization and appropriation in this proposal.

Then, it has been mentioned during the debate that in 1948 a bipartisan commission recommended the acquisition and construction of a home for the Vice President, and no action was taken. Then it was indicated that in 1956 a very generous offer was made for one of the finer homes in the District of Columbia, and that was not accepted.

My good friend, the distinguished majority leader, said that in 1958 President Eisenhower in his budget message asked for a home for the Vice President. I do not believe it is unfair to ask at this point why was not affirmative action taken in 1958 by the Congress, which was then controlled by the Democrats, majority party today in the Congress? That would have been a far more auspicious time. We were not at war. We were not faced with the problems of inflation. But, nevertheless, the majority party took no affirmative action to push this legislation through the House or through the other body. It was left dormant.

Mr. Chairman, in all honesty and sincerity I wonder why in time of war, why at a time when we are facing the ravages of inflation, this project is now called off the shelf and brought before the Congress for action?

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I urge the defeat of this proposal.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. During the debate and during the hearings on the bill it has been my objective to try to find out who really wanted this residence, who was pushing for it. The President did not recommend it, he did not recommend it in his state of the Union message, he did not recommend it in his budget message or subsequently. Who does want it?

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the Vice President is not demanding it. I think it is quite clear that the wife of the Vice President is not demanding it. In the New York Times of December 17, 1964, she is quoted as saying, when being pressed about whether the Vice President's family should move to a larger home, Mrs. Humphrey replied:

> We are very happy here. We would like to stay put. We can entertain very nicely and informally here.

Mr. Chairman, does that sound like the Vice President's wife wants to take on the responsibility of this additional mansion?

Then let us take the quote of the Vice President himself which incidentally was cited in the hearings by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in which it was stated by Mr. HUMPHREY, "I have to admit I love that house I have. It is paid for."

So what I am trying to find out is—who in the executive branch of the Government feels that this is a matter of such a high priority and urgent matter that it should take in effect a war priority classification which is what is being asked for by this legislation today?

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Chairman, believe that legislation considered by the House should initiate or originate only in the executive branch of the Government?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, that is a very interesting observation because, as I recall, time and time again when the executive branch of the Government sends a message down, that is it—that is the law—do not cross a "t"—do not dot an "i".

When the Executive says he wants something, that is what the Executive should get, as the general rule.

The Executive so far as I know has expressed hardly any interest whatsoever in this legislation.

I say that in a time when we are fighting in Vietnam and with a $13.6 billion additional appropriation just last week, now is the time for the Congress of the United States to say "no" when it comes to starting priorities for these frill programs—not needed now—and programs that cannot be justified now, if we are going to have any consideration for the taxpayers or for the person who suffers from deficit financing and continuing inflation. This is the place to start. This is symbolic. Now is the time to act. If we do not turn this down, then I say the chance of turning anything down of any consequence this session, that is not needed, and that does not have a high priority is very slim.

That is why this fight is being made. That is why this is a symbolic issue. That is why the people of this country understand what we are talking about relating to this issue. That is why the people of this country, in my opinion, are not in support of this proposal.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Am I correct in my understanding that the funds necessary to implement this authorization are not budgeted in President Johnson's budget which he sent to us in January?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct. He did not ask for this, and the President did not put this in his budget so this is another deficit spending project.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, then the fact is that those who vote for this authorization of the funds in effect are voting to breach the line of the already excessive spending that has been recommended by the President. In other words, this will be another effort on the part of the Congress to spend more even than the President is recommending?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct.

A lot has been said about the Vice President, and about the needs of the Vice President. But what is the need here involved? The Vice President seemed to be happy with his home and it is paid for. His wife likes it. He does not want a new home. He has an office. He is not asking for a new office. He has one hundred and sixty and some odd thousand dollars for office expenses. He is not asking for that.

What is being proposed here is an entertainment palace. He has everything else—4,000 square feet to entertain and the cost of construction is minimal compared to what the cost of entertaining in the future is going to be which will run into the millions of dollars.

That is the issue we are faced with and I say, if we are to act responsibly, we should turn it down.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize for taking these 5 minutes, but we have had four or five speakers on the other side and they continue to tell the Members of the House that we propose to spend $750,000 this year and unbalance the budget and they tell us that this is going to cause inflation and so on and so forth.

I want to be fair and I want to be objective. We have worked long and hard on our Committee on Public Works so that the Members of the House of Representatives could take pride in this historic day. I do not want the RECORD cluttered by the kind of statements that have been made here which are not borne out by the facts.

The minority leader said a while ago that we ought to move forward with our military housing. That is an item involving $655 million. But according to my dear friend from Michigan, that will not cause inflation. But he stands here and tells you that a $750,000 authorization, if we appropriate it all, will cause inflation. The $655 million he proposes we spend now is 800 times more than the $750,000 appropriation that we will not need for a year or more and they argue is going to cause inflation. I say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, How can he reconcile his position?

Now they ask the question, Who is for this? The people are for this. I will not quote anyone in my home State. I do not want to be personal about this. But the minority leader has seen fit to address the House on four separate occasions today—this being such an important matter. But I have the testimony before our committee from an outstanding professor at the University of Michigan—a Republican if you please. He has been on the faculty as a professor of political science at the University of Michigan since the year I was born—40 years. Here is what he said before our committee:

> In many leading countries official residences are provided for certain cabinet officers in addition to the residences regularly provided for the heads of states and prime ministers. It is certainly no extravagance—

And mind you, this is a Republican speaking now—

> It is certainly no extravagance—and in fact it is a necessity—for the greatest country in the world to provide a proper residence for its second ranking official, who now performs so many official and ceremonial functions for the President.
>
> S. 2394 is a very modest recognition of the present needs for the Vice President and I trust that it will be passed.
>
> JAMES K. POLLACK,
> *Murfin Professor of Political Science, The University of Michigan.*

Why is it that the people who are here in the House of Representatives on the minority side cannot recognize we are only asking for $45,000 to plan this House for the next year—not $750,000.

There is a very good chance that donations will come in from people who do take pride in the proposal to build this very necessary residence for the Vice President of the United States.

We may not have to ask the taxpayers for a dime to construct this house. As I mentioned, in 1957, when President Eisenhower was in the White House and Mr. Nixon was Vice President, one foundation offered a $250,000 cash gift toward the construction of a home for the Vice President.

We have not spent $750,000. We will not cause inflation. We have not raised the public debt. We are merely saying, "Let us proceed on that long journey of a year to plan this house." Let us then see how many donations we get, and then we can make a judgment as to whether we want to go ahead and start construction of this home at that time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, since I used his name.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think the gentleman from Illinois would have to agree that this legislation which we are considering today and involving $750,000 would affect the living quarters of only one family at the present time, whereas the funds for military housing which Congress appropriated last year for fiscal year 1966 would improve the housing for 8,500 men and women in the military. So there is some difference in equity, I think.

You are comparing the benefits to one family with the benefits to 8,500 families in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The gentleman from Illinois takes great solace in the fact that only $45,000 is being requested for this fiscal year. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois whether he would agree to an amendment to knock out the $750,000 authorization.

Mr. GRAY. Since the gentleman has asked the question, I will be honest in trying to answer it. The $750,000 authorization was placed in the bill for one reason and one reason only. Frankly, I thought it was to please my friends on the minority side, because every time our committee reports out a bill, whether it is for the third Library of Congress, which we passed last year with only 5 negative votes, or some other proposal, the minority always gets up and says, "Look at the Rayburn Building. We started out by authorizing $60 million and it cost us $100 million."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. We were trying to tell the American people that the design plans, the architect's fees, the furnishings, the relocation of roads, and the construction of that house could not cost the American taxpayers more than $750,000. That is merely a maximum ceiling. I do not see the cost of that house being $750,000. But we want a maximum in the bill so that when you go home you can tell your folks the last dollar amount it could cost. That is the only reason the $750,000 is there.

If you take it out, we might later decide that a $10-million house would be suitable. The figure is in there for your benefit, and I hope you will support the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this entire debate. I have said very little, except to ask a question or two that I considered very pertinent—such as on the selection of the site, whether or not this has been properly engineered, whether or not a commission and/or self-appointed people have done such things as to consult an architect.

Certainly I have listened to all of the questions as to whether or not there would be security protection for the Vice President, whether or not there might even be fallout protection, which has not been mentioned, and the question of priorities to be established.

I have heard that we are going to violate the traditions of the Congress and allow gifts to be accepted for this house, which might or might not be appropriate under the circumstances. Certainly I have heard it proved that we are trying to follow both roads, of priority establishment and of fiscal responsibility, at the same time. I believe the chairman of our Ways and Means Committee said, over a year ago, that we could not follow both roads, but we must establish priorities, which is within the ken and the judicious duty of this legislatve branch.

I have heard much discussion about, "what is the reason?"—and I will tell you what the reason is. The reason is to get it while there is an overpowering majority in this Congress with which to do it, from those who believe in spend, spend, spend, and elect, elect, elect. But, Mr. Chairman, I have not heard enough.

Mr. Chairman, I have not heard enough about why, now, we should be precipitate, especially in view of a document I have in my hand, of over 24 pages on both sides, which lists in detail the deferrals of military construction, the deferral of military appropriations.

It is bad not to have the committee which has jurisdiction consulted about taking away part of the Naval Observatory, which serves a prime function in the military around the world, and not to have the departmental comments from Department of the Navy in either the report or the hearings. Here we have an assumption of power by the General Services Administration, the belief that they can take anything under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Works and the Public Buildings Act without consulting the agencies which, under the Constitution, are required to care for the defense of this country.

The Secretary of Defense lists installations page after page, Mr. Chairman—first by the Army, second by the Navy, and third by the Air Force—by States, if you please, and by locations overseas.

These include such things as hospitals, necessary quarters, POL facilities, instructional and training rifle ranges, enlisted men's barracks, and dental clinics. Yes, for the Army, then for the Navy, and then for the Air Force; domestically, by State, and then overseas; weapon storage buildings, enlisted men's barracks, necessary road construction; access, egress, and ingress; auto C-com switches; air defense areas; and classified areas that are being deferred as essential to the military progress in the interest of priorities under the 1966 fiscal appropriation, if you please, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us not do this. Let us act with some rational thought. If indeed the Secretary of Defense is going to defer these essential projects and if no one in the executive branch will establish necessary priorities for the construction of anything at this particular time in the history of the United States, when we owe billions of dollars, then let the legislative branch which, according to the Constitution, must issue priorities, assume the necessary budgetary acumen and do it here and now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Administrator of General Services is further authorized to accept cash gifts, furniture, and furnishings and other types of gifts on behalf of the United States for use in constructing and furnishing the official residence but without further conditions on use, all such articles thus given to become the property of the United States.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration, the sum of $750,000 for planning, design, construction, and costs incidental thereto, including the cost of initial furnishings.

SEC. 6. There is further authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration, annually, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 3.

Mr. GRAY (interrupting the reading of the committee substitute amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, pursuant to House Resolution 774, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 184, answered "present" 1, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—197

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Gallagher
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Halpern
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Weltner
White, Tex.
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—184

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Bandstra
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell

Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Goodell
Grabowski
Greigg
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Huot
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Ottinger
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Race
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Powell

NOT VOTING—49

Baring
Barrett
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Celler
Diggs
Ellsworth
Fogarty
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Henderson
Holifield
Karsten
Lennon
Lipscomb
McVicker
Mackie
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Monagan
Morris
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
Purcell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Roberts
Scott
Stephens
Talcott
Todd
Toll
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Karsten for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Mackie for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Todd for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Baring against.

Until further notice:

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Williams with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Cameron with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Hagen of California.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. McVicker with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Rees.

Mr. HORTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act authorizing the planning, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for other purposes.

RENT SUPPLEMENT CUT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my dismay at the report in yesterday's New York Times that the administration's request for $30 million for the rent supplement program has been cut by 60 percent to $12 million by the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

From the very beginning of debate over this rent subsidy program, I have contended that the administration's $30 million request was far too modest in the face of the Nation's overall housing needs. This latest setback for this much beleaguered program for providing better housing to low-income families is especially disappointing.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, President Johnson pointed out earlier this year in sending his rent subsidy request to the Congress, has already received preliminary proposals from sponsors to construct nearly 70,000 low-income units under the rent supplement plan.

Cutting back the $30 million to a meager $12 million amounts to gutting the subsidy program. President Johnson has said that the need for the rent supplement program is "obvious—it is the need of the poor and the disadvantaged."

Public housing officials estimate that nationwide some 500,000 families are on waiting lists for public housing units. In New York alone more than 125,000 families are on the waiting list.

Yet existing legislation and current authorizations provide at best for some 35,000 new public housing units a year. In New York State, because of percentage limitations written into present housing laws, this would amount to only 5,250 new units a year, and there would be much less for New York City.

This at a time when we should be building on the order of 200,000 new units a year.

The rent supplement program, while not nearly ambitious or massive enough in funding, would be an important tool with which the Federal Government in partnership with private developers could begin to meet the staggering need for more and better low-rent housing.

Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that before the bill comes to the floor the Appropriations Committee will restore the funds that reportedly have been cut from the program so that we can then proceed with the important task of providing decent and economical housing for all Americans.

I include at this point in the Record an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times:

RENT SUBSIDY REBUFF

The damage done to the President's low-income housing subsidy bill by a House Appropriations Subcommittee can and should be repaired before it is too late.

Mr. Johnson asked $30 million for the project last year and the same amount this year. In 1965 he was granted an almost meaningless appropriation for administrative purposes; and this year if the subcommittee has its way—and the House will probably follow its lead—the sum will be $12 million, well under half of what surveys have shown is needed if the experiment is to have substance.

The idea behind the plan is that the Federal Government would pay the difference between the real rent charged to very poor families and the rent the families themselves pay at a rate of one-quarter of their incomes. No one would loll in luxury, but many present slum-dwelling families would thereby be enabled to live in decent surroundings. There could be no private profiteering because the subsidies would go only to buildings owned by such nonprofit or limited-dividend organizations as unions, churches, and settlement houses.

The plan would be an economic stimulus and at the same time a preventive of social degradation. Government already subsidizes—directly or otherwise—many forms of housing. Included are facilities or guaranteed loans for the poor, for veterans, for middle-income families. Rent subsidies, as envisioned by President Johnson, are simply a more direct employment of funds designed to take the Government out of the costly landlord business and to encourage groups other than those motivated solely by profit to do the building and renovating.

Hope for salvaging a more substantial portion of the program lies with the Senate. If the Upper House votes the full sum the President requests, the $12 million figure can possibly be revised upward in conference.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS IN FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress recognized its responsibility to communities throughout the Nation where Federal activities imposed special financial burdens and it enacted Public Laws 874 and 815 in 1950. These laws provide financial assistance for school operations and maintenance, and construction of facilities in federally impacted areas.

While this legislation was designed to be of a temporary nature, the burden imposed on local communities has proved to be permanent. I do not feel the Congress can consider a reduction of these funds unless it provides adequate legislation to meet the demands made upon local school districts because of the lasting impact of Federal activities.

In my congressional district, where there are 5 military installations, 37 school districts will be drastically affected if the proposed reduction in appropriations to carry out the provisions of Public Law 874 is agreed to by the Congress. Approximately $2.4 million for which these school districts have budgeted will not be forthcoming unless the Congress enacts needed legislation $416 million the Office of Education estimated will be needed to maintain present levels of assistance during fiscal 1967. But the budget calls for appropriations of only $183.4 million—$233 million less than the estimated requirements. The suggested cutback in the program is harsh indeed.

At this point I insert excerpts of a newspaper clipping from the Sun-Telegram, San Bernardino, Calif., datelined February 9, 1966:

Federal Aid Loss of $600,000 Seen for School District

Barstow.—The new Barstow Unified School District faces the possible loss of $600,000 in Federal financial assistance unless funds are appropriated under the Public Law 874 program, C. Dean Hammans, chairman of the district's board of education, told the Barstow Chamber of Commerce yesterday at the Holiday Inn.

"I would like to call this to your attention, but not in an alarming way," said Hammans.

He explained that Public Law 874 helps local school districts which have military installations nearby. Both the Barstow Marine Corps Supply Center and Fort Irwin are located within the Barstow Unified District.

"The money previously allocated under 874 has not been done at this time," said Hammans. "It usually has been allocated in a routine manner."

He reported that if the funds aren't available, the local district would either have to curtail portions of its program or it would take an additional 71 cents per $100 assessment in the tax rate to replace the $600,000.

He added that Dr. Warren Linville, superintendent, will be in Washington, D.C., next week to talk to Congressman Dyal and Federal leaders about the program.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel there must be a continuation of the present funds under Public Law 874 and the current administration of same to permit proper planning and adequate budgeting at the State and local levels.

Under Public Law 815, the vital construction assistance program will also be slashed. In the past, Public Law 815 has been funded at an annual level of approximately $50 to $60 million. The fiscal year 1966 funds will be at the lower figure, and for the next year, the requested appropriation is expected to be approximately $23 million.

Public Laws 874 and 815 are essentially concerned with the burden placed on local school districts by Federal activities while Public Law 89-10 is concerned with the general quality of education, especially in economically depressed areas. If there is a retrenchment in programs to meet the ever-growing needs of local school districts caused by Federal activities, we will be violating our ultimate goal in that every student shall have an opportunity to participate in our educational programs. All of our plans for the future are of no avail unless the coming generations are to receive the best possible education, one preparing them for the world which they shall inherit.

REFUSAL OF RENTAL ACCOMMODATIONS

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, we have a new legislative assistant in my office. He is a young man who was born and well educated in Indianapolis. He is exceptionally intelligent and pleasantly polite.

If he were German or Irish or Belgian, I would not have occasion to mention it or him. But God and nature decreed that this young man be a Negro. And simply because of this, and no other reason, he and his wife and child were refused rental accommodations by the Cherry Hill Apartments at Hyattsville, Md.; the Forest Hills Apartments at 1405 Southern Avenue, Oxon Hill, Md., and the Fairview Terrace Apartments at Tacoma Park, Md.

This is what is commonly known as a "gentlemen's agreement." But my young assistant is a gentleman. And he does not agree.

And whether or not it is gentlemanly of me to bring this up, I do not agree, either.

Fifteen years ago I was not allowed to check in at a hotel because of a gentleman's agreement that servicemen would cheapen the place and I was an 18-year-old marine in uniform.

That is the only time a thing of that kind ever happened to me. But when you have it happen to yourself just for being yourself, you begin to understand the crushing feeling of futile rage that comes with being told by someone in authority that no matter how good you might be, you are not good enough, simply because of what you are wearing—clothes or skin.

It is hard to believe that any place of public accommodation would have been so unpatriotic as to exclude an American citizen simply because he was an American serviceman. Unfortunately, it seems we must still await the day when it will be hard to believe that a place of public accommodation would be so unpatriotic as to refuse an American citizen simply because of his race.

My father used to paraphrase Solon by saying:

> Civilized society is impossible until the unconcerned are as outraged as the victim.

Young Americans of all races can—and do die together in Vietnam. Why must some of their elders make it so difficult for them to live together in America?

This is America, all right. I just wish more people in our Nation's Capital realized it.

STATUS OF PROPOSED 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, near the beginning of this session of Congress on January 25, 1966, I last made a statement concerning the status of the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. This followed up my previous statements in the last session on July 9 and July 26, 1965, regarding the proposals made to the Atomic Energy Commission for sites for this accelerator. Today the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has received from the Atomic Energy Commission the report of the National Academy of Sciences' Site Evaluation Committee. This report is being made public today.

The Site Evaluation Committee of the National Academy of Sciences, after extensive study, has selected six sites which they believe on balance to be clearly superior. These sites are Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills, near Sacramento, Calif., and South Barrington—or Weston—near Chicago, Ill.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall insert the summary of the report of the National Academy of Sciences' Site Evaluation Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission's announcement relative to the submission of this report to the Commission.

I wish to again remind my colleagues, as I did last year and again last January, that neither the construction of the 200-Bev accelerator nor its architect engineering design has as yet been authorized by the Congress or recommended by the joint committee. In fact, the President's fiscal year 1967 budget makes no request for such authorization. However, on page 83 of the fiscal year 1967 budget message of the President the Congress was informed:

> Design funds for the 200-Bev machine will be requested once a site has been selected and the design has been authorized.

On March 10 of this year in the course of the joint committee's hearings on the AEC's fiscal year 1967 authorizations, Commissioner Tape, of the AEC, when asked concerning the length of time it would take the Commission to review the Academy's list and come up with a final selection as to a site, stated:

> It will probably take 3 months, and that is a short period of time, and I expect it could run as much as 6 months.

My colleagues will recall that the National Academy of Sciences' selection of these 6 sites was made from a list of 85 proposals representing more than 150 different locations in 43 States. The 85 proposals considered by the National Academy had been narrowed down by the AEC from 126 proposals representing more than 200 sites in 46 States.

It is my belief that the wide interest in this project will continue and I shall endeavor to keep the Members of this House informed of all major developments or activities regarding this proposed accelerator in the coming months.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1966.

Hon. Chet Holifield,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

Dear Chet: As you were informed by my letter of September 14, 1965, the National Academy of Sciences was asked to make a detailed evaluation of all proposed sites for the 200-Bev accelerator which met the basic criteria applicable to the proposed facility.

I am pleased to inform you that the Academy has completed its evaluation and has submitted its report to the Commission. Copies of the Academy's report are being transmitted with this letter. I am also enclosing for your information copies of a public announcement which we plan to distribute at 10:30 a.m. today concerning receipt of the Academy's report.

We have not had an opportunity to study the report in detail since it has just been received from the Academy. We plan to move as expeditiously as possible in carrying out any further studies which may be required. In this connection we expect to keep you informed of our plans and our progress in making a final site selection.

Should you desire discussions concerning the Academy's report we would be pleased to meet with you or the committee at your convenience.

Cordially,

Glenn T. Seaborg, *Chairman.*

The Report of the National Academy of Sciences' Site Evaluation Committee

Construction of the Nation's largest scientific instrument is now under consideration. It is an accelerator designed to explore the fundamental structure of matter. It will produce beams of protons with energies of 200 billion electron volts (Bev), more than six times the energy of particles produced by any existing accelerator.

The Site Evaluation Committee of the National Academy of Sciences was formed to assist the Atomic Energy Commission in the evaluation of sites offered for location of a national center to house the proposed accelerator. After extensive study, aided by many experts, the Committee has selected six sites which, on balance, are clearly superior. Five sites are principally characterized by having either the nucleus of a strong accelerator design group, or one of the Nation's outstanding universities nearby. These are: Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory, N.Y.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills near Sacramento, Calif.; and South Barrington (or Weston), near Chicago, Ill. The sixth site, Denver, Colo., has neither the university strength nearby nor the existing design group that is considered desirable. However, the Committee is of the opinion that the combined advantages of excellent geology, accessibility, good climate, and an area already available which is sufficiently large to accommodate any conceivable experiment or expansion are such as to make the site merit serious consideration.

The Committee's principal concerns have included the physical properties of the site, the problems of assembling an outstanding staff, and accessibility for visiting scientists who will conduct about 75 percent of the experiments. While none of the recommended sites is ideal, each is excellent in at least one of the most important features and within acceptable limits with respect to others.

Six Sites Recommended to AEC for 200-Bev Accelerator Facility

The Atomic Energy Commission has received a report from the National Academy of Sciences recommending six possible locations for the AEC's proposed 200-billion-electron-volt (Bev) proton accelerator.

The locations, recommended without ranking by the Academy are: Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills near Sacramento, Calif.; and South Barrington (or Weston), near Chicago, Ill.

In response to a public announcement last April, the Commission received 126 proposals for siting the planned accelerator center. These recommended more than 200 locations in 46 States.

After a review of all proposals, the Commission asked the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate each proposal on which there was sufficient information to indicate the location met the minimum site criteria. There were 85 such proposals suggesting more than 150 different tracts in 43 States. The criteria specified at least 3,000 acres meeting certain conditions with respect to water, power, geology, and other factors.

The NAS evaluation was performed by a 10-member special committee headed by Dr. E. R. Piore of New York, vice president and chief scientist of the International Business Machines Corp.

The Commission now plans to carry out additional studies as may be necessary. The completion of this work and analysis of the resulting data may take several months.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1967 contains a request for $2.2 million in operating funds to continue studies on the accelerator. These are being conducted primarily at the AEC's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley, Calif. As the budget states, design funds will be requested after a site is selected.

The accelerator would be the main facility in a proposed new national accelerator center. Cost of the project is estimated at a total of about $375 million. That figure includes approximately $300 million for construction, $40 million for additional research equipment to be installed during the first year of operation, and the remainder for a particle detection unit. Construction would require 6 to 8 years.

The proposed laboratory would employ about 2,000 people and would have an annual operating budget estimated at about $60 million.

A summary of the NAS report is attached.

SECURITY SYSTEM FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, no self-respecting village in America would put up with the so-called security system that is used in the House of Representatives.

Professional training is not required of the officers. Many of them are college students who have no interest whatever in a police career.

Almost all of them get—and keep—their jobs under an unbelievable system of personal patronage. Under it, senior Congressmen are each assigned a police position and given the privilege of selecting the person to fill it. This makes effective discipline impossible. If superior police officers attempt to require standards or impose punishment for infractions, it is an easy matter for the officer involved to run to his patron for intercession.

Although a number of the present officers are excellent—indeed superior—much of the force is indifferent, inefficient, unqualified, and of little security value.

The present force is also badly understaffed and underpaid.

It consists now of 225 officers. Considering the property which should be patrolled 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, the force should be at least double in number.

Capitol Hill policemen work 6 days a week but get less pay than Washington Metropolitan Police who work only 5 days.

I am today urging these changes to the Committee on House Administration:

First. That the personal patronage system be abolished completely, and all policemen selected on the basis of professional competence and aptitude by a House Police Board on which both political parties will have proper representation.

Second. That all present members of the force be required to complete successfully the 6-week course in the Washington Metropolitan Police Academy at the earliest possible date, and that all new members of the force be required to complete successfully the same course before going on duty.

Third. That pay, workweek, and benefits be placed and kept at the same level as the Washington Metropolitan Police.

Fourth. In filling future vacancies as elevator operators, preference be given to college students who may lose their jobs as the result of these new police standards.

Perhaps the best policing in the world would not have prevented the unfortunate incident last night in which Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, was injured. However, the incident should serve as a timely reminder that the Capitol Police force is not all that it should be, and hopefully spur the House to long-overdue improvement.

Another reminder occurred just a year ago when a costumed member of the American Nazi Party got to the well of the House of Representatives and made a brief speech before he was taken into custody.

I have developed these recommendations over the past year as a member of the Minority Employees Committee of the Republican Conference. This committee assists Minority Leader FORD in filling the 10 police positions assigned to the Republican side. In filling these positions, Republicans have endeavored to select qualified men seeking police careers.

PANAMA CANAL SITUATION: PROPOSED TREATIES MUST BE DEFEATED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since the bloody Red-led Panamanian mob assaults on the U.S. Canal Zone in January 1964, the sovereignty of our country over that territorial possession has been the object of incessant attacks by radicals in Panama in which they have been aided and abetted by elements in our Government and, with a few notable exceptions, by an administration policy of managed news in the mass news media.

In spite of these difficulties, the people of the United States have gradually become better informed and right now are far ahead of the legislative and executive branches of their Government in evaluating the situation and understanding what is at stake—the security of the entire Western Hemisphere, including the United States.

The statesman who more than anyone else is responsible for this public enlightenment is our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. In and out of the Congress over a period of years, he has courageously presented the issues in thoroughly documented addresses and statements. These supply invaluable source material on the more significant aspects of the overall interoceanic canal problem and they are being increasingly used by students in our colleges and universities in writing theses and by more thoughtful publicists seeking reliable information.

On October 31, 1965, Representative FLOOD, over the "Manion Forum" network, added another statement to his long list of constructive contributions in which he called for the display of only one flag over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, the flag of the United States, and for the defeat of the proposed canal treaties in the U.S. Senate.

The indicated broadcast featuring Dean Clarence Manion and Congressman FLOOD, with comments by other distinguished Members of the Congress and an able writer assailing the proposed surrender, follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Manion Forum, Oct. 31, 1965]

SENATE MUST DITCH PROPOSED PANAMA TREATY—U.S. SURRENDER WOULD OPEN GATE TO RED SUBVERSION OF LATIN AMERICA

(By Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress for Pennsylvania)

Dean MANION. Two short years and 4 months ago, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, opened his address over this microphone with these words: "Wake up America. Your house is on fire. Indeed the very foundation of your house—the Panama Canal Zone—is smoldering and every so often is spurting forth flames. For it is the Panama Canal which is the key target of the world revolutionary movement in the Caribbean." (Manion Forum broadcast No. 453).

In the course of that address, this able and courageous man brought us up to date on the kindling and development of the dangerous fire that he was announcing. He warned us about the destructive conflagration that was sure to come unless we did wake up, sound the alarm, and put the smoldering fire out.

Unfortunately, we didn't wake up to the fire in Panama. Too many exciting and diverting things were happening elsewhere; the war in Vietnam; the assassination of our President and the election of another; the subsequent preoccupation of the new Congress with the hasty fabrication of the Great Society.

Meanwhile, in January 1964, there were bloody Communist inspired riots in Panama. Our new President, Lyndon Johnson, hastily assured us that "the United States cannot allow the security of the Panama Canal to be imperiled." Relieved by that assurance we all turned our attention to the presidential campaign. Eleven months later (Dec. 18, 1964), those who were listening were disturbed to hear President Johnson say that his special envoys who had been negotiating with the Panamanians since the January riots had promised them that we would negotiate a revision of our 1903 Treaty with Panama, the treaty which ceded the Canal Zone to the United States in perpetuity.

The President went on to say that the negotiators would reconsider and redefine American sovereignity over the Canal Zone which had been expressly affirmed without qualification by the treaty of 1903. Finally, on last September 24, President Johnson announced that the United States and Panama have agreed to abrogate the 1903 treaty and to write an entirely new document which will "effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty over the area of the present Canal Zone."

This shocking announcement marked the climax of retreats and concessions to Panamanian revolutionaries that have continued straight through our last three presidential administrations. Unfortunately, the tragic implications of this misguided Panama policy have been all but completely smothered in the American press and thoroughly misrepresented by left wing apologists for what they call "the inevitable social revolution" in Latin America.

Thanks to the continuing research, eloquence and patriotic dedication of Congressman FLOOD, every step in our humiliating retreat from Panama has been promptly and fully described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Periodically, since 1960, (Manion Forum broadcast No. 298) he has summarized these reports over this "Manion Forum" microphone. When he heard the President's announcement last September, the Congressman ventured a prophecy in the course of his speech of protest to the Congress (September 27). "I predict," he said, "that the expressed willingness to surrender control over the canal will be taken as a signal for acceleraated activity among communistic revolutionaries all over Latin American and the Caribbean."

I am delighted to tell this audience that Congressman FLOOD is here with me now, when we need his advice very badly, believe me. Congressman, welcome back to the "Manion Forum."

Congressman FLOOD. Thank you, Dean Manion.

Dean MANION. Congressman FLOOD, the big question is what can the American people still do about the Panama Canal?

Congressman FLOOD. Of course, the question arises about the joint statement that was issued by the Presidents of the United States and Panama on areas of agreement reached in current canal treaty negotiations, but the thing that concerns me is what in the world were our diplomats doing during the 18 months of these negotiations? Certainly they were not playing very good diplomatic poker as far as the welfare of this Nation was concerned.

When they sat down around that table with the Panamanians, the Americans held all the cards. We have an absolutely sound juridical position in the treaty of 1903. The sovereignty in perpetuity of the United States in the Canal Zone was guaranteed and assured by that treaty, and certainly the defense and the operation and maintenance of the canal was in our hands; the great humanitarian and good works that have been done for the people of Panama by this country ever since the canal has been opened; and even more than that, the well-known fact that a new canal must be constructed.

UNITED STATES MISPLAYS HAND

We very well could have used this as one of our strong cards—the ace in the hole—in these negotiations. But, what happened? Well, our people instead of playing diplomatic poker must have been playing Old Maid or tiddlywinks because everything the Panamanians asked for the Panamanians got and in return the United States got absolutely nothing at all.

When the Panamanians sat down they demanded that the treaty of 1903 be abrogated, so the Americans agreed. The second point made by the Panamanians was that sovereignty be established in the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone Territory and the Americans agreed. Third, the Panamanians insisted that the tolls be raised and a greater profit come to them with increased payments from the canal, and the Americans agreed.

So, in effect, the Panamanians insisted that we throw in our hand or we would be blackmailed by threats of more riots. And this, while it's not a very nice word—it's a very ugly word—constituted on our part, in my opinion, abject and total appeasement to the demands of the Republic of Panama and against the best interests and the welfare of the United States.

The Panama Canal was never intended to be a moneymaking proposition. We have never raised the tolls. As a matter of fact that's a very delicate point, because we have always declared that the United States of America stands in a fiduciary relationship to the other maritime nations of the world to maintain and defend and properly operate the Panama Canal.

Now sovereignty is an absolute thing. You can't be just a little bit sovereign. You can't be almost sovereign. You certainly can't be half-sovereign. You are either sovereign or you are not. And, I repeat, under our treaty of 1903 with Panama, the United States was sovereign in perpetuity, and is today. If this is changed, I submit that it's impossible to establish jurisdiction and maintain authority if you do not at the same time have the necessary sovereignty upon which you can base that jurisdiction and that authority.

The grant of complete jurisdiction by Panama over the Canal Zone means that all the laws made by the U.S. Congress for the government of the Canal Zone and the operation and maintenance of the canal may be scrapped at any time by Panama and superseded by Panamanian law. This also means that all civil activities of the Canal Zone—courts, police, fire departments, schools, roads, public utilities, everything—will be taken over by Panama.

That certainly is not very much to look forward to when you realize that since 1955 Panamanians have not been able properly to collect the garbage in their own capital city of Panama, or in Colon either. When Panama has secured completely all of its claims, you can be sure they will inevitably demand all control over the canal enterprise with the withdrawal by the United States. And I warn that if such abetment occurs, Panama and all of Central and Latin America could be faced with the prospect of active Communist infiltration and activity.

With the President's announcement of the Panamanian position and of our position, this constitutes what I think is a very sad day for the United States, although I am sure it will bring rejoicing in Peiping and Moscow because one of the great targets of international communism from the very beginning has been the control and domination of all interoceanic canals. This is vital and important to world conquest by international communism. And one of these great interoceanic canals and one of communism's chief targets is the domination and control of the Panama Canal, because it is essential to the national defense of the Western Hemisphere. The Panama Canal is the jugular vein of our defense structure in the Western Hemisphere.

Now the Panama Canal as it exists today is certainly obsolescent. In 15 or 20 years it will probably be approaching saturation. So there is need for a new canal to be dug in that general area of Central America. But under all the circumstances, considering the diplomatic and political blackmail to which this country has been subjected by several succeeding republic governments of Panama and by their presidents, certainly Panama is the last place in the world where such a new canal should be dug, whether it be a sea level canal dug with nuclear power, or a new lock canal, or what have you. And this should have been one of the great cards, a trump card in our negotiations—one which we never played.

There should be only one flag over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone—a flag of the United States. And I hope and pray the proposed treaties are defeated in the U.S. Senate.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, for this frank statement of a dangerous and important truth.

My friends, over this microphone a few weeks ago you heard the humiliating story of our retreat from the Communists in the Dominican Republic, where our diplomats used American troops to kidnap and deport the leader of the Dominican anti-Communist forces. ("Manion Forum" broadcast No. 575.) Our foreign policy people have now planned another humiliating retreat from Panama. How long will it be before they tell us to turn and run from the Communists in South Vietnam?

Congressman FLOOD has asked you to fight against ratification of this perfidious Panama treaty in the U.S. Senate. Your Senators are back home now. Line up your pro-American, anti-Communist neighbors and go to work on these Senators. We have a valid legal right to continued control of the Panama Canal. Don't let the State Department give it away.

CONGRESSMEN, COLUMNIST ASSAIL OUR SURRENDER

"The U.S. Government has completely capitulated to the demands of Panama concerning the canal and we have come home from the so-called negotiations like a whipped pup with its tail between its legs. The country of Panama owes its entire existence to the United States, and we have continually given friendship and economic support to it * * *. This Nation has paid Panama the full indemnity and annuities agreed upon by the two nations, has completely carried out the terms of the treaty and stands on firm moral and legal footing in this dispute, and under no circumstances should it have conceded to the Communist-inspired demands of Panama. How do we expect other nations to have any respect for the United States when we do not even have enough self-respect to stand firm when we are on solid legal and moral footing?"—Congressman WILLIAM HARSHA, of Ohio.

"In Panama we are preparing to haul down the American flag. President Johnson has abrogated the 1903 Panama Canal Zone treaty to surrender sovereignty to Panama, a nation which owes its existence to the United States. The United States performed all its responsibilities under the treaty, building and guarding the canal, and developing and maintaining the Canal Zone, which was bought with American tax dollars.

"The Communists have long wanted the United States out of the canal. When Fidel Castro took over in Cuba, almost his first act was to launch an expedition against the canal, which proved abortive.

"Now the United States is giving up on its own * * *.

"Grave military questions are involved, but no one in the services dares to put his head under the ax of White House displeasure. We are reportedly to continue to guard the Panama Canal, but just how effective this can be when sovereignty has been abrogated is a grave problem. A nation that hauls down its flag can expect to be invited to take its troops out any time."—WALTER TROHAN, in the September 29 Chicago Tribune.

"Only 62 years ago, there was no Republic of Panama. It was created by a popular revolt from the nation of Colombia. The United States had been negotiating with Colombia for a 10-mile wide strip to dig a canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Colombia rejected the offer. Fearing the canal would go to Nicaragua, the people set up their own Government of Panama and the United States granted diplomatic recognition. The following year, 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt signed a treaty which granted to the United States: 'All the rights, power and authority within the zone—which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign * * * to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any sovereign right, power or authority.' "—Congressman RICHARD POFF, of Virginia.

PROTECT ANIMALS USED IN RESEARCH

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, for years unscrupulous individuals and firms have been preying on pet owners across the Nation by stealing cats and dogs to provide animals for scientific research. Once stolen, evidence indicates, these animals, and those bred or obtained from other sources, are aften treated inhumanely before they are turned over to the laboratories.

While there are many legitimate dealers in research animals, dealers who give their charges good care, there apparently are hundreds of others who make their living by stealing family pets. Recently, as evidence of this has accumulated, the public has begun to demand that legislation be passed to control this growing problem.

Hardly a day passes that I do not receive letters from several constituents who want something done and done quickly. They are angry and they have a right to be.

At least 22 bills aimed at correcting this situation have been introduced in this House. Last week an amended version of one of them, H.R. 12488, was recommended favorably by the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the House Committee on Agriculture. The subcommittee, under the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], held extensive hearings and reached the firm conclusion that legislation is indeed necessary.

The subcommittee's version of the bill basically would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used in research or experimentation. Dealers and researchers would have to keep complete records of each sale or purchase involving such animals. These records would be available for inspection by the Secretary, who would also have the power to prescribe the humane standards under which the animals would be kept and transported. Failure to comply with the standards could, after a hearing, result in suspension or revocation of a dealer's license, or withholding of Federal aid for research projects involving the use of animals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are serious problems in the way in which we presently allow these animals to be treated. And we all know the anguish the loss of a family pet can cause.

Therefore, I introduced yesterday a bill to regulate the dealers and their treatment of animals intended for research. It incorporates the subcommittee's recommendations and would in no way interfere with the research itself. This measure is needed and I hope it will be passed speedily by this House and the other body.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech by Senator Russell of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the Honorable Richard B. Russell, last December made a thoughtful and comprehensive speech to the annual convention of the Georgia Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts held in Macon, Ga.

During the course of this fine speech, Senator Russell said:

> We climbed aboard the program at an early date and are now 1 of the 25 States in which soil conservation districts cover every acre of our geography.

Mr. Speaker, let me submit for the Record that it was Senator Russell himself who provided early support for the program and sparked the drive for Georgia's magnificent climb.

One of the first programs I worked for after becoming a Member of Congress was the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. It has been a great source of pride to work with local and State officials in developing programs under this act. Of the 36 projects in Georgia authorized Federal assistance under the act, 15 are in my district, the Ninth Congressional District. And 14 of the 17 projects authorized Federal assistance under the Flood Control Act of 1944 are partially or wholly within my district.

These projects are superior examples of local, State, and Federal Governments working in unity for improvement of our land and water.

Mr. Speaker, conservation of our soil and water is a matter in which each of us should be deeply concerned. Senator Russell's remarks show how Georgia has vigorously moved forward in its conservation and land treatment programs, and I believe Members of the Congress will benefit from the opportunity to read his speech:

Remarks of Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat, of Georgia, at the Convention of the Georgia Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Macon, Ga., December 6, 1965

I am honored to meet again with the leaders of conservation in Georgia and to salute you for the outstanding work you are doing for our State and Nation.

No activity is more vital to the welfare of our people and to the future of America than the development and conservation of our resources of soil and water.

These precious and irreplaceable gifts of nature are part of our common heritage as Americans. They are the bedrock of our national strength and the source of much of our national wealth and prosperity. And they are the rightful inheritance of generations of Americans yet unborn.

In these times of international peril, it is hardly necessary to remind the people of this country that we must be on guard constantly against the continuing threat from the world-wide Communist conspiracy. We must resist this implacable foe of our liberty and our security with all our strength and vigor as freemen.

We also must constantly be on guard against the forces of man and nature that would denude and destroy our heritage of land, forests, and water. For these national assets are as essential to America and to her future as are the awesome weapons we possess to stay the hand of Communist tyranny.

Indeed, one of the significant advantages we enjoy over our adversaries of the Communist world is the vastly superior resources of American agriculture. Thanks to the efficiency of our farmers and the bounty of our land, we Americans are the best-fed and best-clothed people on the face of the earth. Our country is also the breadbasket of the free world and the mainstay of millions of near-starved people in the so-called undeveloped lands.

Compare that, if you will, with the continued failure of Russian and Chinese agriculture and the threat of famine that stalks vast areas of the globe today—notably in China, India, and some parts of Africa and South America.

In former times, there were many among us who looked upon conservation as essentially a rural problem and no particular concern to city dwellers. No idea could be more erroneous or dangerous. Conservation is the concern of everyone who eats food, drinks water, and rears a family—in short, it is the concern of all mankind.

It is a matter of pride to me that in Georgia, more than in some areas, the cause of conservation has long enjoyed a considerable basis of public support. The farmers and landowners of this State, together with many other far-sighted individuals interested in the welfare of Georgia, have pioneered in the soil and water conservation movement.

Today, Georgia's conservation districts are among the most active in the Nation. We climbed aboard the program at an early date and are now one of the 25 States in which soil conservation districts cover every acre of our geography. The work performed in these districts has yielded dividends to the entire community as well as to the individual farmers, far in excess of the modest investment involved.

Georgia is also one of the top two or three States in the country participating in the small watershed program.

I have always been a strong advocate of the comprehensive watershed approach to the interlocking problems of soil and water conservation. I am proud that I was able to have the Coosa River project included in the 11 original pilot projects authorized in Congress in 1944 to test the watershed idea.

On the basis of the demonstrated success of the Coosa and other pilot projects, Congress enacted the present and permanent small watershed program. Georgia now has 34 of these projects underway in every part of our State—a number exceeded only by Texas and Oklahoma. A hundred other Georgia watershed projects are in various stages of application and authorization.

In measurable dollar benefits alone, it is estimated that these watershed projects are returning $3½ million per year in prevention of flood and sediment damage, erosion control, water supplies for small cities and towns, and recreational activities for our people.

During my years in the Senate—all of which I have spent as a member either of the standing Committee of Agriculture and Forestry or the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, or both—I have championed the cause of conservation with all the ability and energy I could muster. I am proud of what has been accomplished in Georgia and in the Nation.

Of the conservation and agricultural programs that I have been privileged to help establish and shape, I must confess to some pride of sponsorship for the agriculture conservation program—commonly called ACP. This program, as those of you here are well aware, provides Federal financial and technical assistance to private landowners to help them establish needed conservation practices which in many cases would be too costly to be performed by the farmer alone.

I am pleased that our Georgia farmers have participated extensively in this program. In the past 10 years alone, some $150 million worth of land treatment and conservation practices has been accomplished under ACP in our State. For example, Georgia landowners have planted 713,000 acres in pine trees in the past decade, which is one-third of all land planted in trees throughout the country under ACP.

Georgia's leadership in pine tree planting is resulting in a threefold advantage for our State. It prevents and controls soil erosion; it takes marginal and unneeded farm land out of crop production and substitutes profitable tree farming; and it enhances Georgia's standing as a leading producer of a growing variety of forest products ranging from naval stores to paper and newsprint.

We have made impressive gains in the years since the Nation started to become conservation conscious in the midthirties. But we must intensify our efforts ahead if we are to feed and clothe our own growing population and help meet the needs of a hungry world, which gains 160,000 new people with each rising of the sun.

Our past progress has not always been easy. There have been attempts in Congress and in the executive branch to hamper and curtail conservation funds and programs.

In the past 10 years, the Senate on five occasions has voted to increase funds voted by the House to carry on the imperative work of the Soil Conservation Service. In 3 of those 5 years, the amount appropriated by the Senate was more than had been recommended by the President.

There also has been a continuing effort, starting with the arrival on the Washington scene of Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, to slash funds for the agriculture conservation program. Fortunately, we have had the votes in Congress to thwart these efforts.

I assume you are familiar with the attempt in the past session of Congress to hamstring the conservation program. The Bureau of the Budget sought to reduce the Soil Conservation Service appropriation by $20 million and proposed that farmers pay for technical assistance rendered by the Service. This proposal not only would be grossly unjust to farmers but would jeopardize the entire conservation movement.

The activities of the Conservation Service constitute a normal and regular function of the Federal Government. They are supported by tax dollars paid in part by the farmers themselves. If the farmer is going to be required to pay for soil conservation services, why should not the same principle be applied generally to all services of the Federal Government? It would make just as much sense to make a farmer pay for technical conservation assistance as it would to require a school dropout to pay for the job training he receives under the Great Society's poverty program.

I was vigorously opposed to this proposal soundingly. I shall continue to oppose this scheme if it is brought back to Congress next year.

I sometimes have been called a zealot on the subject of soil conservation—a charge to which I readily plead my guilt. But I am also a dreamer—and my dream is of a

Georgia whose land is as lush and green as the day the first plow stirred its soil * * * a Georgia whose rivers and streams run as clear as when only the Cherokee and Creek knew them * * * and of a Georgia whose water is as pure as a mountain brook pouring from the Blue Ridge and as sweet as the water bubbling from Radium Springs.

So long as the opportunity is mine, I shall continue to work in concert with such dedicated groups as this association to make this dream a reality.

Tomorrow, December 7, marks the 24th anniversary of one of the blackest days in the history of our country. On that peaceful Sabbath morning in 1941, bombs rained from the skies on an unsuspecting Pearl Harbor to begin the bloodiest test of arms ever to confront the American people. Almost 300,000 American men paid with their lives so that the rest of us might enjoy the blessings and freedom of this great land.

It grieves and saddens me—as I know it does you—that on this anniversary of infamy, American men once again are fighting and dying on a foregn field of battle to resist the forces of aggression and slavery.

For more and more American families, the harsh reality of the bitter fighting in Vietnam assumes personal meaning. We have now lost more than 1,300 of our finest young men in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam, and 6,000 other U.S. servicemen have fallen wounded in the conflict. I expect that these grim statistics have touched the families and friends of some of you, just as they have my own. The casualty list is bound to grow ever longer as the war continues and intensifies.

I have stated on many occasions that, in my view, we made a tragic mistake in 1954 by committing our national honor, our flag, and the lives of American men to the struggle in Vietnam. But that is now moot. We are in Vietnam, and I believe we must take whatever considered means are necessary to bring the conflict to a satisfactory conclusion as soon as possible. We must bring an end to the killing and wounding of American boys.

The President of the United States faces grave and momentous decisions in the days and weeks ahead. His decisions will determine whether there is to be a substantial step-up in the level of American participation in the fighting and a further deepening of our commitment on the mainland of Asia.

It is difficult to see what realistic alternative the President has. It daily becomes more evident that greater force must be applied and more punitive action must be taken against the Vietcong. There apparently is no other way to convince the Communist leaders in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow that we mean to stand firmly behind our commitment in Vietnam and that we intend to punish the aggressors until they sue for peace.

It is unthinkable that we turn back now. We must demonstrate to the Communists everywhere—in Asia, in Europe, and in Latin America—that the American will to resist tyranny is as resolute today as it was on December 7, 1941.

We must convince the Communists that the tiny handful of Vietcong flag wavers and draft card burners in our midst do not represent the great masses of the American people. We must prove by steadfastness, courage, and sacrifice that the true spirit of America is represented by our soldiers in Vietnam and that this bastion of democracy remains "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

FARM POPULATION DECLINE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, over and over again we hear the administration repeatedly cite the statistic that per capita farm income is up. Of course it is, mainly because farm population is down.

On April 1, 1960, there was a farm population of 15,635,000.

Latest estimates indicate that as of April 1, 1965, the farm population was 12.4 million.

In the last 5 years some 3.2 million people have left the farm.

In January 1960 there were 3,949,000 farms in the United States.

On January 1, 1966, farm numbers had declined to 3,286,000.

In the last 6 years some 663,000 individual farms have been swallowed up.

These facts must be kept in mind as we assess the administration's rosy statements about farm prosperity.

CURTIS AND WIDNALL INTRODUCE BILL TO ESTABLISH AN ECONOMIC COUNCIL TO ADVISE THE MINORITY

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, this year, at the 20th Anniversary Symposium of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am ranking House Republican, I proposed in a speech—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 28, pages 4209–4211—that a Minority Economic Council be established to enable minority party representatives in Congress to analyze and present better minority alternatives to administration economic policy decisions and to propose more creative, more comprehensive programs to meet the Nation's pressing needs.

The response to this proposal has been very gratifying. Therefore, today, I am introducing a bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish such a Minority Economic Council. I am pleased that my very able colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], who is a member of the Joint Economic Committee, and ranking Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee, is joining me in sponsoring this bill.

Mr. WIDNALL and I believe that a Minority Economic Council is an urgent need. It would enable minority party the necessary functions of developing sound legislation through the process of thorough study and informed debate accompanied by cross-examination and rebuttal.

The three-man Minority Economic Council would be appointed by and be responsible to a board of directors comprised of the leaders of the House and Senate not of the party of the President, and ranking members of the Joint Economic Committee, House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, and House and Senate Banking and Currency and Appropriations Committees not of the party of the President. For example, when one party controls both Congress and the White House, the control of the Minority Economic Council would go to the minority in Congress. But when one party controls Congress and the other controls the White House, the control of the Minority Economic Council would go to the minority party in Congress because it does not have access to the economic advisory resources of the President. When one House is controlled by one party, and the other House by the other party, the same rule applies: the majority in one House and the minority in the other House which are of the party other than that of the President, will control the Minority Economic Council.

The Minority Economic Council would be funded by Congress and would serve all minority Members in Congress with sound economic research and proposals. It would have headquarters in Washington and a full-time staff, and would establish continuing consulting relationships with academic and other economists from all sectors of the economy.

Debate on economic issues is today not extensive enough or thorough enough. Better debate requires a better informed, institutionalized challenger able to refine and clarify economic policy issues. The result of an organization created to assist the minority in Congress would be better national economic decisionmaking.

The size and diversity of the economy and of the Government's role in it require better means of understanding. The executive branch has at its command vast internal resources and a strong attraction for private advisers, but the minority party in Congress by comparison has no such resources, nor innate attraction.

In 1948, 2 years after the Employment Act when the economy had cooled off after the years of wartime spending, the gross national product—in 1958 dollars—was $323.7 billion and the fiscal year 1948 Federal administrative budget was $32.955 billion. In 1965 gross national product was $609 billion in 1958 dollars and the fiscal year 1967 Federal administrative budget is an estimated $112.847 billion. The budget for this tremendous amount, to which should be added for completeness trust fund account expenditures of $32.153 billion, is both an economic document of very great complexity and a political document of great importance. Adequate understanding of the economic impact of the budget as a whole is as important as understanding it program by program, item by item, yet congressional facilities do not exist for analyzing the effects of the total budget.

The Employment Act's sponsors correctly saw the need in 1946 for proper procedures through which to manage the huge new economic power of the Federal Government. Correspondingly, the President's Council of Economic Advisers has become accepted as one of the most important offices in the executive. Though the Council is itself small, it can draw on the almost limitless statistical and program resources of the other 14 executive departments and countless other agencies. The Council of Economic Advisers, rooted in academic institutions, has kept open its lines of communication with academic and other economic thinkers. It and the executive departments which also retain consultants are lodestones for professional economists throughout the country.

This is a problem of the preponderance of executive branch knowledge, combined with power, over the minority, and, essentially, this problem is an institutional one. The minority in Congress must have the research resources necessary to suggest workable alternatives to Government policy in all important economic areas. We believe there is considerable dissent in our society, within its broader consensus. Our problem is how to channel that dissent—to create a way to bring informed dissenters together to devise and propose creative alternatives based on their expert knowledge.

The losers under the present system, in terms of the better performance of our economy, are American men and women—scholars, workers, businessmen, and farmers. The effects of national economic decisions touch everyone, and everyone must be concerned that these decisions are the best decisions.

The legislative year 1946 was a time of great ferment. It saw passage both of the Employment Act and also of the Congressional Reorganization Act. Twenty years later the substantive and institutional problems facing us are as great as they were then—they require equally bold solutions, and we are convinced that what we propose would help solve them.

The text of this bill follows:

H.R. 13784

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6. (a) There is hereby created a Minority Economic Council. The Minority Economic Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the Minority Economic Council Board hereinafter referred to as "the Board" and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, to formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment, production, and purchasing power under free competitive enterprise, and to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of this policy. The Board shall designate one of the members of the Minority Economic Council as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman, who shall act as Chairman in the absence of the Chairman. The members of the Minority Economic Council shall be appointed within five days of the first day of the first session of each Congress, and shall serve for the remainder of such Congress. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each member of the Minority Economic Council shall be paid annual compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Board.

"(b) The Minority Economic Council is authorized to employ, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under his section, without regard to the civil-service laws, and is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this section.

"(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Minority Economic Council—

"(1) to assist and advise the Board on national economic policy;

"(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic developments and economic trends, both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information in the light of the economic policy it believes to be in the national interest for the purpose of determining whether such developments and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of such policy, and to compile and submit to the Board studies relating to such developments and trends;

"(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the economic policy it believes to be in the national interest for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing, and the extent to which they are not contributing, to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the Board with respect thereto;

"(4) to develop and recommend to the Board, national economic policies to foster and promote free competitive enterprise, to avoid economic fluctuations or to diminish the effects thereof, and to maintain employment, production, and purchasing power;

"(5) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of Federal economic policy and legislation as the Board may request.

"(d) The Minority Economic Council shall make an annual report to the Board in December of each year.

"(e) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this section—

"(1) the Minority Economic Council may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

"(2) the Minority Economic Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

"(f) To enable the Minority Economic Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

"(g) As used in this section the term 'Minority Council Board' means—

"(1) in the case where at the beginning of a Congress a majority of the Members of both Houses are of a political party other than that of the President, a board of directors consisting of the following: (A) the majority leader of each House, (B) the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, (C) the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, (D) the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and (E) the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

"(2) in the case where at the beginning of a Congress a majority of the Members of both Houses are of the same political party as that of the President, a board of directors consisting of the following: (A) the minority leader of each House, (B) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, (C) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, (D) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and (E) the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee.

"(3) in the case where at the beginning of a Congress a majority of the Members of one House are of the same political party as that of the President and a majority of the Members of the other House are of a political party other than that of the President, a board of directors consisting of the following members: (A) from that House the majority of whose Members are of a political party other than that of the President, the majority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, as the case may be, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and (B) from that House a majority of whose Members are of the same political party as that of the President, the minority leader, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the ranking minority member of the Committee of Finance of the Senate, as the case may be, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and (C) the ranking majority member of the Joint Economic Committee from the House the majority of whose Members are not of the same party as that of the President, and the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee from the House a majority of whose Members are of the same political party as that of the President.

CHICAGO HEADSTART FOR THE NOT SO POOR

Mr. **CARTER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. Speaker, Operation Headstart, fashioned along the lines of a proposal offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative Albert H. Quie, and the gentleman from New York, Representative Charles E. Goodell, back in 1961, is supposed to help preschoolers from poor families.

Out in Chicago, however, our investigation shows that the poverty program is doing a little bit more by giving a "headstart" to the not so poor.

Officials there admit that 27½ percent of the 23,804 children in the program are from families whose standards exceed the poverty level. Our investigation also shows they do not even know the family incomes for another 20 percent of the children.

This means another 5,000 children from truly disadvantaged homes could have been helped if the poverty warriors had stuck to their own guidelines. The Quie-Goodell proposal for an opportunity crusade would require adherence to strict poverty standards, meanwhile tripling the funds available.

How can Chicago justify the fact that more than one-fourth of their children in Headstart were above poverty standards? How can the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington justify the clear violation of their guidelines? When I visited Chicago recently, I was told that Washington ordered Chicago poverty officials to expand in 10 days Headstart from 4,000 to 24,000. I was also informed that very little solicitation was done in several hard-core poverty areas because teachers were afraid to enter those sections of the city.

Seven urban progress centers are in operation by the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity. One center showed 41.1 percent of enrollees over the income requirement, one showed 31.8 percent in excess, one 28.3 in excess; and outside of the urban centers, 36.8 percent reported income over requirements.

Thousands of impoverished youngsters were overlooked by Headstart recruiters in their frantic efforts to build impressive statistics. And these youngsters, children of hard-core poverty victims, are precisely the ones for whom this program was developed.

We cannot continue careless neglect of such a good concept as Headstart. We certainly cannot justify to the thousands of children unable to participate in Chicago's Headstart program the spending of Federal poverty money for those who are not poor.

The Quie-Goodell opportunity crusade offers a way out of the wasteland of bureaucratic confusion and callousness that has marked OEO's administration of the Headstart program.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Clarence J. Brown, Jr.] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the rollcall vote yesterday on H.R. 13448, to provide faster, more efficient, and less expensive mail service to our servicemen overseas, inasmuch as I was taking an annual physical examination at Bethesda Naval Medical Hospital and was unable to get back to the floor in time to vote. However, I was paired in favor of it. Having been in service in Korea and recognizing the value of prompt mail delivery, I would have voted "yea" on this measure had I been on the floor. I was assured this bill would pass without the necessity of my vote. I am pleased that the record shows it passed unanimously, even though I regret I was not recorded as being present to vote for it.

PROVISION TO INCLUDE VOICE RECORDINGS IN FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR SERVICEMEN IMPORTANT STEP

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Mize] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, because of some longstanding commitments to fill speaking engagements in Kansas, it was necessary for me to be absent from the House floor on Monday when H.R. 13448 was up for consideration.

I regretted having to be absent on the day this bill came up for a vote, but I was pleased with the unanimous support the bill received from the Members present and voting. Had I been present I would have joined in this unanimous support.

Incorporated in H.R. 13448 is a proposal which I made to the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to include voice recordings of personal messages in the free mailing privileges for our servicemen. My own bill is H.R. 12930.

I was gratified by the reception this suggestion received from the subcommittee which led to its inclusion in the bill reported out by the full committee. I want to personally thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] and the members of his subcommittee for their consideration and adoption of this proposal.

This proposal grew out of a suggestion of a newspaper friend of mine, Bill Colvin, editor of the Manhattan (Kans.) Mercury. Mr. Colvin was in Vietnam in December of last year and when he returned he wrote to me as follows:

> Through firsthand knowledge, I was utterly surprised at the number of tape recorders being used by our servicemen and the extent to which they are being used. I, from personal experience again, know the great warmth, and indeed inspiration, that comes to these servicemen as they listen to the voices of their wives, children, mothers, fathers, or other relatives in that very remote and frustrating area of the world. It is not really a matter of how much it costs to send the tapes back to their relatives and other loved ones that concerns the servicemen to whom I talked, but rather the principle of the thing, if you please. They feel, and rightly so, that if letters and postcards are to have free mailing privileges, it is simply logical that taped messages, which are really nothing more than live letters, should have the same privilege. I would stress the fact that peculiar and sometimes very small things have a profound effect upon the morale of our men, and this one regarding taped messages seemed to be one that they mentioned many, many times, and as a result of the free mailing, I think it would not only heighten their morale but also increase materially the use of this type of communication.

Everyone to whom I have talked about this proposal agrees with Mr. Colvin, so I was glad to see the Post Office and Civil Service Committee put its stamp of approval on the suggestion and have the House vote unanimously for it.

Letters reaching me from the wives and families of servicemen testify how important these taped messages are to all parties concerned. I would expect that Members of the Senate will also be in agreement and will approve this legislation, so that the tapes can be airlifted between here and Vietnam and make possible a broader and more rapid exchange of these valuable voice letters.

THE LATE AP NEWSMAN G. MILTON KELLY

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Associated Press Newsman G. Milton Kelly died Tuesday, and with his death the country lost one of its finest reporters. Mr. Kelly covered the U.S. Senate and always turned in excellent work.

I have a special feeling for Milt, as his friends called him, because Milt was a native of Hancock in Michigan's Upper Peninsula and worked for AP in my hometown of Grand Rapids as well as in Lansing, the State capital.

Milt was assigned to Washington in 1939 by the AP after serving in Michigan and in New Delhi, India.

Here he wrote some of the best stories of his career, doing an outstanding job in covering a series of Senate investigations that made top news throughout the country—the Army-McCarthy hearings, the Bobby Baker case, the TFX plane investigation, and the Labor Rackets Committee hearings.

One of the finest pieces Milt ever wrote was one about the nicknames of some of the characters summoned before the Labor Rackets Committee—men with such colorful names as "Greasy Thumb" Guzik. It made page 1 wherever newspaper deskmen were on the alert for a great feature story.

The journalism profession is the poorer for Milt Kelly's death. So is Washington, and so, too, is the Nation.

SAME TUNE, DIFFERENT WORDS

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALEY.** Mr. Speaker, I do not recall a time in our history when there was more criticism of government on every level than there is today. Why this should happen in a Republic where each citizen has the privilege and the responsibility to actively participate in government, I do not know. But, I do know the adults of our Nation are setting a poor example for younger generations to follow. Mr. John Heller, editor of the Fort Meade Leader, one of the fine weekly newspapers in my State, describes this problem well, in his editorial, "Same Tune, Different Words," which follows. As Mr. Heller suggests, to find the cause and the solution one needs only to go back to the mirror:

SAME TUNE, DIFFERENT WORDS

> Isn't it terrible the way some groups of young people show their immaturity by protesting against the war in Vietnam? Certainly these young people should know that the wonderful privileges and opportunities of freedom cost—they cost in time and money and effort.
>
> It is particularly surprising the way these young people act in light of the fine example set by the more mature, more responsible adults throughout the country.
>
> All one has to do to see these fine examples is to visit with some regularity the city commission meetings, the county commission meetings, the school board meetings, and the PTA meetings.
>
> Here, they will see real democracy in action. The vibrant, driving force that propels a great nation to new, dizzy heights of greatness. Throngs of concerned, informed citizens, taking an active interest in their government at work.
>
> NUTS
>
> The only people who go to the meetings of governmental bodies, generally, are those who go for a specific, selfish reason. They go to get something done for number one. When they get that done, they forget all about government until they want something else done for them, or when they get a tax statement.
>
> And yet the same lazy, indifferent citizens have the nerve to complain about others who are showing the same immaturity that they show by their indifference.
>
> If the end results were not so deadly serious, it would be comical. The apathy of so-called free peoples let Socrates be falsely condemned, let the Roman civilization crumble, let the British Empire deteriorate into second rateness. And yet those same disinterested, indifferent citizens in the dress of the 20th century, are doing the same thing again.
>
> Oh yes, it can be blamed on big government, and we can go back to the television set. It can be blamed on big business, and we can go back to the fish pole. It can be blamed on too many Communists in high places, and we can go back to our own little niche.
>
> It can be blamed on a lack of guts, and we can go back to the mirror.

THE AMERICAN-AFRICAN AFFAIRS ASSOCIATION AND ITS DETRACTORS

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **ASHBROOK.** Mr. Speaker, I recently read a very bitter attack on the American-African Affairs Association by Carl Rowan, former USIA Director and member of the Kennedy administration. His column carried so many inaccuracies and direct untruths that it is hardly worthy of reply. On the other hand, Mr. Rowan so well represents a vocal group of American liberals who use the smear but are the loudest to attack and charge others with this tactic. Mr. Rowan uses guilt by association with classic ingenuity but always attacks McCarthyism.

In his column he personally attacked Dr. Max Yergan, a fine gentleman whom I am pleased to count as a close personal friend. Mr. Rowan blithely brands American Negroes who do not go along with his brand of liberalism as reactionary or worse. Of all of his unfortunate charges, his attack on Dr. Max Yergan and George Schuyler is the most vicious and regrettable. I traveled with Max Yergan. I know and marvel at the breadth of his understanding, the wisdom of his philosophy and the depth of his compassion. To attack a good and just man in such a way is reprehensible—all the more so because Mr. Rowan tries to convince the American Negro community that this man, his fellow Negro, is a Judas to their cause.

Carl Rowan found Max Yergan a thorn in his side when we were involved in the Congo and Katanga fiasco. Max Yergan exercised judgment in that episode and has been vindicated by history. Even the State Department has come around to the position that Dr. Yergan, myself and others advocated at that time. In his best guilt-by-association form, Carl Rowan, then Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, gave the following tirade at a December 27, 1961, speech in Philadelphia:

> It is an extremely revealing thing to look at the sources of support for Tshombe and his policy of secession. In the United States, we have a conglomeration of arch conservatives; people who oppose the income tax; avowed defenders of racial segregation, opponents of fluoridation of water; those who want to destroy the Supreme Court, largely because of its ruling on school segregation, and so forth. * * * It should be of special interest to this audience that a couple of well-known Negroes, George Schuyler and Max Yergan, have been busy spreading the Struelens line. But, then, I guess Negroes are entitled to produce a few reactionaries, too.

I could at this point categorize those who oppose AAA in the same way but the preferable course is to appeal to reason. During the investigation into this matter, Mr. Rowan was presented an opportunity to explain his views. The report of the Senate Judiciary Committee states:

> Mr. Rowan offered no evidence to back his charges that support for President Tshombe came primarily from an amalgam of political extremists, including those who opposed the income tax and those who opposed the fluoridation of water. Mr. Rowan was not prepared to place any one in any of his several extremist pigeonholes.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to go around the country labeling people like Max Yergan, Bill Rusher, and myself by smear words of racist, reactionary, extremist, or the like. This is the usual posture of all too many liberals. They are long on accusations but short on facts when confronted.

As one who strongly supports the work of the American-African Affairs Association, Inc., I found his statement that this organization is "primarily interested in defending South African apartheid and Rhodesian racism" a blatant lie which must not go unchallenged.

The American-African Affairs Association, Inc., has its offices at 550 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. It has been approved by the Treasury Department and all contributions are tax deductible. Its leaders are as follows:

Cochairmen: Mr. William A. Rusher and Dr. Max Yergan.

Treasurer: Mr. Robert R. Richardson.

Secretary, Mr. Theodore Lit.

Directors: Mr. Lawrence Fertig, Hon. Loy W. Henderson, Mr. Leon Weil, Dr. Thomas Molnar, Prof. Charles E. Rice, Mr. George S. Schuyler, Prof. Ernest van den Haag.

A partial list of its membership includes such illustrious Americans as Mr. Arthur J. Andersen, Prof. James D. Atkinson, Prof. Patrick M. Boarman, Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Mr. L. Brent Bozell, Dr. Karl Brandt, Mr. James L. Buckley, Mr. Jameson G. Campaigne, Mr. John Chamberlain, Dr. Philip M. Crane, Mr. Ralph de Toledano, Mr. John Dos Passos, Dr. Donald M. Dozer, Dr. Stephen Enke, Mr. Clifford Forster, Mr. William J. Gill, Prof. Jerzy Hauptmann, Mr. Henry Hazlitt, Dr. Walter Darnell Jacobs, Mr. Frank J. Johnson, Dr. Walter H. Judd, Dr. Russell Kirk, Mr. George F. Koether, Mrs. Irene Corbally Kuhn, Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Prof. Reginald D. Lang, Mr. Victor Lasky, Mr. Neil McCaffrey, Mr. Edwin McDowell, Mr. J. Daniel Mahoney, Mr. Frank S. Meyer, Rev. Vincent P. Miceli, S.J., Mr. D. Thomas Miller, Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer, Mr. Michael A. Padev, Dr. Melchior Palyi, Prof. Sylvester Petro, Mr. Henry Regnery, Mr. William F. Rickenbacker, Prof. David N. Rowe, Prof. Edward J. Rozek, Mr. William S. Schlamm, Prof. William S. Stokes, Prof. Stephen J. Tonsor, Mr. Nathaniel Weyl, Prof. Francis G. Wilson.

These are distinguished Americans who have a common purpose. Most of them I count as personal friends. Those whom I have not had the good fortune to know well have my admiration and respect. How, for example, can you demean a great man like Dr. Walter H. Judd, one of the most beloved Americans of our time? Mr. Rowan and his type should have one one-hundredth of the understanding and respect of a Walter Judd.

In the statement of purposes of the AAA, the following language depicts what it is trying to do:

> The road to true progress for Africa lies through the diligent development of its own resources, in an orderly political and economic atmosphere. Here is where America can help: by precept, by example, and by judicious extensions of practical aid. Certainly it is in America's own interest to do this. But who deserves our help, and who does not? Which tendencies in Africa are

working constructively toward the betterment of its peoples, and which are divisive or purely destructive? These are the sort of questions that the American-African Affairs Association proposes to investigate and to answer.

My good friend, Bill Rusher, the target of Mr. Rowan's poison pen summed it up pretty well when he concluded:

> Evidently Carl Rowan fears those questions and their answers.

I might add, Bill, that the State Department and the liberal establishment are equally fearful as is Mr. Rowan, our chief detractor. For my part, I will work harder than ever to encourage the work of American-African Affairs Association. Over the years I have found that it is a pretty good rule of thumb to conclude that, when an organization elicits the smear campaign of the left, it must be hitting close to dead center. For that reason I will also double my contribution to this fine group and encourage my friends to do likewise.

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the President and Secretary of State are to be commended for their efforts, in support of the Government of the United Kingdom and of the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council, to prevent Southern Rhodesia from becoming another South Africa, an established bastion of racial discrimination and persecution.

It has just come to my attention that at its biennial convention in December, the AFL-CIO adopted a resolution in support of this policy. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith a copy of this resolution, dated December 16, 1965:

RESOLUTION OF THE 1965 BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE AFL-CIO

Believing in the fundamental right of peoples to free themselves from alien rule and their inherent right to self-determination on the basis of majority rule;

Aware of the explosive situation in Rhodesia stemming from the illegal seizure of power by the Ian Smith racist clique;

Conscious of the possibility of a race war in Rhodesia which will plunge the whole of Africa in a blood bath and poison race relations the world over; and conscious of the positive role and duty the free labor movement has in averting this human tragedy;

Reaffirms its support of the struggle of the people of southern Africa (South Africa, South West Africa, Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique) and other colonial territories in their fight for just and real equality;

Calls upon the U.S. Government to initiate moves that will help quarantine the Ian Smith racist regime and bring to a speedy end the pretentions of this insane, power-drunk clique;

Urges President Johnson to call upon their ally—Great Britain—on the occasion of the visit of Prime Minister Harold Wilson to the United States, to begin immediate and exploratory conversations with the African nationalist leaders with a view to the introduction of a constitution based on majority rule;

Calls upon the free labor movement to give all possible humanitarian and material assistance to the people of Rhodesia in their fight to secure majority rule and racial justice.

THE LAWYER AS A LAWMAKER

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to place in the RECORD the article entitled "The Lawyer as a Lawmaker," which appears in the February 1966 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

This article is of considerable interest to all the Members of this House as it outlines the vital function and role played by the legal practitioner in fashioning the law through his representation of clients before the courts and the administrative agencies.

Its author, Prof. Edward D. Re, is especially qualified to speak and write on this aspect of a lawyer's professional responsibility as a lawmaker.

He is presently the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, having been appointed to that position in 1961, and reappointed for a 3-year term in 1963. Under his leadership, the Commission, in its administration of the various laws under its jurisdiction, has made outstanding and considerable contributions to the field of international law.

Mr. Re himself is an authority on international law and his tangible contributions in this area of the law consist of, among other things, authorship of "Cases and Materials on International Law," 1955; "Foreign Confiscations in Anglo-American Law," 1951—with Lester B. Orfied. He is also a frequent contributor of articles to various legal periodicals.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE LAWYER AS A LAWMAKER

(NOTE.—Mr. Re declares that lawyers perform a vital function in fashioning the law when they represent clients before courts or administrative agencies. The counsel's brief, for example, should contain the articulated points, and perhaps even the language, on which the tribunal may support its decision. By representing his client competently, the lawyer contributes to the progress of law.)

(By Edward D. Re, Chairman of the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission)

All lawyers by education and training are made keenly aware of the many aspects of their professional responsibility. From its inception, the legal education of the lawyer is designed to inculcate a sense of responsibility. Specific reference is made to the duties owed to the client, the judiciary and the public. In addition, the organized bar has performed valuable public service through a number of programs and projects on local, State, and Federal levels. In recent years in particular, a great deal of constructive work has been done in affording competent legal services to the indigent. Bar associations also have shown commendable leadership in the defense of unpopular causes and the civil rights of citizens.

An extremely important, although often overlooked, phase of professional responsibility is the role of the lawyer as a lawmaker. I do not refer to the lawyer as a legislator. One may easily gage the importance of lawyers as legislators by noting their number in the Congress and the legislatures of every State. Nor do I refer to the role of the lawyer in assisting legislators in the drafting of legislation. Rather, I mean the lawyer as a practitioner of his profession, as an advocate in the daily practice of the law and his contribution to the judicial process, the judicial opinion and the law itself.

Alexis de Tocqueville in his famous book, "Democracy in America," observed that "In all free governments, of whatever form they may be, members of the legal profession will be found in the front ranks of all parties."[1] The accuracy of this observation can be proved by recalling that of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, 33 were lawyers; and of the 55 participants in the Constitutional Convention, 34 were lawyers.

My purpose in recalling these facts is not solely to honor the legal profession, but rather to highlight the role that it has played in the fashioning and development of the American form of government. With the ever-expanding complexity of government, the importance of this role has indeed increased.

Mr. Justice Cardozo in "The Nature of the Judicial Process," stated that "the work of deciding cases goes on every day in hundreds of courts throughout the land."[2] Although the statement is still true, today the work of deciding cases goes on daily not only in hundreds of courts throughout our land, but also in many hundreds of administrative agencies, boards, and commissions.

In the modern world of increasing governmental activity the judicial function is not limited to the courts. Hence, the contribution of the lawyer to the judicial process is not limited to the lawyer's professional work in the courts. The contribution today is broader and is made by the lawyer in the daily representation of his client, not only before the courts, but also before the numerous administrative agencies at all levels of government.

For instance, take one aspect of the lawyer's work—the writing of briefs.[3] The brief submitted by counsel ought to help shape not only the judicial opinion but also the law itself. George Rossman, a former justice of the supreme court of Oregon, has noted, "If better briefs are written, the courts will produce better decisions."[4] This statement highlights the responsibility of the advocate who in the first instance must prepare the case and submit his authorities for adjudication. Mr. Justice Brandeis stated the point most candidly when he said, "A judge rarely performs his functions adequately unless the case before him is adequately presented."[5]

All of these statements indicate that by properly fulfilling his responsibility to the client and by the competent and thorough presentation of his case counsel simultaneously is fulfilling a higher and more noble function by helping to shape the judicial opinion and the law.

---

[1] De Tocqueville, "Democracy in America," 274 (Bradley ed. 1956).

[2] Cardozo, "The Nature of the Judicial Process" 9 (1921).

[3] See materials on advocacy in "Re, Brief Writing and Oral Argument" (third ed. 1965).

[4] Rossman, "Appellate Practice and Advocacy," 34 Oregon Law Review 73 (1955).

[5] Brandeis, "The Living Law," 10 Illinois Law Review 461, 470 (1916).

Whitney North Seymour, a former president of the American Bar Association, in an address entitled "The Bar as Lawmaker," emphasized this responsibility by reminding the bar that "the advocate has played a part in the law-making process through the persuading of judges to decide cases in particular ways. Thus, in any treatment of Marshall's contribution to American constitutional law, it would be wrong to omit reference to Webster and the other great advocates whose arguments were accepted and became a part of the ultimate warp and woof of the law.[6]

The reference to the contribution of Daniel Webster recalls the famous decision of Chief Justice Marshall in "McCulloch v. Maryland," 4 Wheat. 316 (1819). For the specific contribution of Webster to that decision one ought to read the contentions of counsel set forth in the official report of that famous case. Not only does the Court follow closely the questions presented and the arguments of counsel, but it adopts several statements made by Webster. Indeed, his statement, "An unlimited power to tax involves necessarily a power to destroy," becomes Chief Justice Marshall's famous utterance that "The power to tax involves the power to destroy."[7]

There are many examples of the specific contribution of the advocate to the judicial opinion. This is a fascinating field of legal research designed to uncover the origin of passages and phrases that are so well-known to historians and lawyers. The origin of these familiar statements often is attributed without question to judges. As in the case of Chief Justice Marshall's remark, research may reveal that many famous phrases represent the skill and handiwork of counsel who submitted the case for adjudication.[8]

This has practical significance to the lawyer in the active and daily practice of his profession. It brings to mind the suggestion made by the late Karl N. Llewellyn, who speaks of "the proffered, phrased opinion-kernel." Professor Llewellyn in "The Common Law Tradition," states: "What is wanted is a passage which can be quoted verbatim by the court, a passage which so clearly and rightly states and crystallizes the background and the result that it is recognized on sight as doing the needed work and as practically demanding to be lifted into the opinion."[9]

All lawyers know that there is no substitute for careful and painstaking preparation. Although the immediate objective is to win the particular case, enough has been said to prove that the contribution of the lawyer goes far beyond the success of the moment. By the assistance that he grants to the adjudicator, be he judge, commissioner, or trial examiner, he will be contributing to the decision that will be rendered. And in a system in which precedents play so important a role in the shaping of the law of the future, the lawyer, too, will have played a part in molding and perhaps improving the law of the land. This realization gives a new dimension to the indispensable requirements of thorough preparation and the competent handling of cases before the courts and administrative tribunals.

The lawyer, by applying his professional skills, will succeed in accomplishing several goals. First, he will discharge his duty to his client. Second, he will help the judge or other adjudicator make a well-reasoned and well-written decision. Third, he will contribute to the substantive aspects of that opinion or decision. Fourth, he will play a vital role in giving impetus and guidance to the law itself. Indeed, the process proves that the lawyer, by the competent practice of his profession, is also truly a lawmaker.

HAWAII: OUR 50TH STATE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the week just past marked the seventh anniversary of the passage of Hawaii statehood legislation through the U.S. House of Representatives. To the words of my colleagues who have risen in praise and appreciation of Hawaii, our beautiful 50th State, I would like to add my tribute.

In retrospect, it seems incredible that the Congress of this country should have felt the need to deliberate so long over territorial Hawaii's admission to our sisterhood of States. Despite her unmatched charm, democratic spirit, and compelling material bounty, a century lapsed before the jubilant day of March 12, 1959, when the House cleared her way for statehood.

As early as 1854, the United States had negotiated a treaty of annexation with Hawaii, a treaty which provided for the immediate according of statehood. But the selfish opposition of certain vested interests in the country caused the treaty to be rejected by the U.S. Senate. Years of repeated reverses followed, but the people of the islands kept alive their hope.

On June 14, 1900, following passage of the Organic Act, Congress designated Hawaii as an incorporated territory and an integral part of our country. Her annexation was voluntary and long sought. After 100 years of independence the people of the Hawaiian Islands chose to cede to this country their lovely and abundant domain. It was a tremendous compliment to this Nation and to democracy.

It is a regretful part of our history that, though we were willing to accept her lands, we were not yet willing to grant her citizens the full and equal status of citizenship. For 59 years following annexation, the gracious and industrious islanders worked and built toward that dream. An estimated 50 pieces of legislation dealing with statehood were introduced into Congress during those years, while, at the same time, Hawaii thrust her economy forward toward exemplary prosperity. Already our most shining example of the democratic spirit of harmony and racial tolerance, she became the richest territory ever to seek admission into this Union.

Finally, the patient and determined quest after justice, equality, and dignity for the Hawaiian people was climaxed in 1959 by an overwhelming vote in both Houses of Congress creating our 50th State. It is doubtful that the citizens of any other State are more imbued with a living sense of responsibility for their own government and that of this Nation. The statehood petition presented to Congress in 1954 contained the signatures of an impressive proportion of Hawaii's adult population, men and women vitally interested in assuming the full responsibilities of U.S. citizenship. And, we can look to our youngest State for leadership and example in solving one of our oldest national problems.

The full dignity and equality of every human being, regardless of race or national origin, has been a most fundamental dream of American democracy. But it has been a dream which has too often eluded reality. Tolerance and brotherhood must come from the heart. The peoples of our island paradise offer to all a living example of the spirit and friendship which may someday give real tangibility to the great American ideal.

Hawaii, today, has more than fulfilled our expectations as an equal member of the United States. Her political maturity has been ably demonstrated by the outstanding contributions of Hawaii's elected representatives to these halls. The ability of our esteemed colleagues in the House, the Honorable Patsy Mink, and the Honorable Spark Matsunaga, has earned the respect and admiration of us all. Their keen minds and gracious aloha spirit have made our work as legislators more rewarding.

America is justifiably proud of her 50th State, and as we remember the joyous day that culminated the years of dedicated effort to achieve statehood for Hawaii, let us express our humble appreciation for the precious gifts which she has added to this land.

THE NEED TO PROVIDE FOR A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN EVERY STATE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced (H.R. 13879) would amend the act of June 29, 1938

---

[6] Seymour, "The Bar as Lawmaker" in Paulsen, "Legal Institutions Today and Tomorrow," 174 (1959).

[7] For an interesting discussion of this case in its historical context, see "Marke, Vignettes of Legal History" 42–46 (1965).

[8] See, for example, *Greene* v. *McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474 (1959), wherein Mr. Justice Harlan in a separate opinion wrote: "It is regrettable that my brother Clark should have so far yielded to the temptations of colorful characterization as to depict the issue in this case as being whether a citizen has 'a constitutional right to have access to the Government's military secrets' * * *." Id. at 510. Mr. Justice Clark in a footnote to his dissent replied: "My brother Harlan very kindly credits me with 'colorful characterization' in stating this as the issue. While I take great pride in authorship, I must say that in this instance I merely agreed with the statement of the issue by the Solicitor General and his cocounsel in five different places in the brief for the United States." Id. at 511.

[9] Llewellyn, "The Common Law Tradition," 241 (1960).

(52 Stat. 1233), "to provide for a national cemetery in every State," by making mandatory the establishment by the Defense Department of a national cemetery whenever land for the purpose has been donated to the Federal Government. The language of the act as it now stands is not mandatory, but is merely directory.

The Defense Department opposes this bill on the ground that its policy is not only to refuse to establish new national cemeteries, but to close existing ones. It argues that, since national cemeteries are already inequitably distributed, to establish new ones would merely add to the imbalance of their distribution. Why should this be so? Newly established national cemeteries might help to correct the admittedly unfair distribution that now exists. That a situation is bad is hardly a reason for arguing against steps that might partially correct it.

But there is more to this problem than a shortsighted policy on the part of the Defense Department. There is gross unfairness to those bereaved by the death of men who have valiantly served our country. For example, in the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1966, the grief of a father whose son lost his life fighting for his country in Vietnam is described. The article states:

> On Monday, when notified of his son's death, Mr. D——— decided that he wanted his son to lie in the New Jersey national military cemetery at Beverly.
>
> But then the father received another shock. An economy program started in the final months of the Eisenhower administration is closing out the national military cemeteries. New Jersey's shut its gates officially a month ago. Burials which were occurring at the rate of five a day have dropped to two a day, limited to the immediate families (spouses or minor children) of servicemen or veterans already interred.
>
> When a reporter relayed the story to * * * the New Jersey adjutant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, he interceded with cemetery officials yesterday and obtained an exception.

I am glad that an exception was obtained in this completely deserving case, but I am concerned that in other cases, equally deserving, exceptions will not be granted, or, for that matter, even asked for. Grief-stricken parents, wives, or children of those who have recently died or been killed are usually unable to take the steps necessary for obtaining such exceptions.

They should not have to ask that exceptions to this absurd policy be made. The policy should be changed. Instead of closing them down, we should expand the size and the number of our national military cemeteries. Relatives of the deceased should not have to travel incredible distances for the burial of their loved ones or to visit their graves. The very least that we can do for men who have served their country so well is to bury them properly, near their loved ones, in a national military cemetery.

Whenever land is donated for the purpose of establishing a national military cemetery it should be accepted by the Defense Department and such a cemetery should be established, immediately. I have received communications in support of such a policy from many interested citizens and from many veterans' organizations. It is just about time that the Defense Department's indifference to this vitally important matter be corrected.

MILLENNIUM OF POLAND

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, March 13, in Miami, Fla., there was a great celebration commemorating the millennium of Poland. There was a beautiful pageant depicting the great history of Poland and an inspiring program. The author, producer and narrator of the pageant was a lovely lady, a distinguished attorney and an eminent American, Mrs. Lillian J. Miciak. The presentation made by Mrs. Miciak so perfectly captured the glorious and great history of Poland, the dynamic and determined spirit of the Polish people and their long reverence for religion, and was so eloquent and moving, that I believe it deserves incorporation in the Record for the edification of the Members of the Congress and of all who read the Record. I therefore incorporate in the Record immediately following my remarks:

A Salute to Poland on Her Millennium Program Held in Miami, Fla., on March 13, 1966, Sponsored by the Florida Division of the Polish American Congress, Mrs. Maria Dambski, President

(Written, produced, and narrated by
Attorney Lillian J. Miciak)

To tell the story of 1,000 years' growth and development is a difficult task to say the least—but a task of love—for Poland's history is a love affair, a love story, a nation's love affair with God the Creator of all nations.

Poland belongs to the family of western Slavs and her original homeland was in the regions located north of the Carpathian Mountains and the Pripet River. From this center the western Slavs migrated in various directions but moving westward they were stopped by the Germanic peoples and these Slavs were the ones responsible for the founding of Poland and Bohemia.

The first mention of the northern organization of Slavic tribes under the Ruler Mieszko was in 963. Mieszko was the ruler of the Polanie tribe. The strongest and the most influential tribe in the organization of Polanie. He succeeded his father as the fourth member of the Piast dynasty and began his reign in Gniezno.

In 965 Mieszko, the pagan ruler of Polanie, married the very good Christian, Catholic Princess of Bohemia named Dobrawa, also called Dabrowska. She was the daughter of King Boleslaw of Bohemia. Historic accounts of this meeting tell us that Dobrawa, along with her brother, chaplain, and knights of the court, met Mieszko in the land of Polanie and after the wedding agreements were met they married.

The year 966, however, marks the momentous conversion of Mieszko and his baptism. Mieszko according to records of history was baptized a Catholic on April 14, 966, and along with him a great number of the Polanie court and the people of Polanie became Catholics.

Going back to historic accounts prior to Mieszko's baptism, we are told that as early as 885 A.D. the Slavic rite of Cyril and Methodius was blooming in nearby Bohemia (now Czechoslovakia) and the southern part of Polanie (now Poland) was greatly influenced by their teachings. No doubt Christianity was being practiced there since that time. But it was in A.D. 966 when the Ruler Mieszko I himself was baptized, that the nation accepted Christianity and became a member of the Church of Rome.

While it is true that there were many political reasons for Mieszko to marry Dobrawa, it is agreed without any argument that Mieszko's baptism was due to the influence of his good Christian, Catholic wife. By this conversion Poland forever alined herself with the Western World and the Latin rite and culture affected the educational, cultural, and political growth of all Polish living from that time on.

THE WAYSIDE SHRINES OF POLAND

During this year we celebrate the anniversary of Mieszko's baptism and Poland's entrance in a lifelong friendship with God. For without his love of God, his faith, the Pole would not be a Pole. For without hope and courage Poland would have ceased to exist. Mieszko and the pagans he ruled were plain dwellers—Polanie—and before Mieszko's conversion the idea that the Poles had of God was that of an all and powerful being. They worshiped the Swiatowid, but with the coming of the Catholic Faith the shrines of Poland were now dedicated to God, to the blessed Mother, and to the saints of the church. Shrines of various shapes and sizes sprang up around Poland like flowers of the fields. In every hamlet, town, and forest, from one part of Poland to the other, in the hills and in the mountains, near the rivers and on the fields, the shrines by the wayside sprang up.

Here we see a typical shrine—so well known to Poland in the past. Here the children and adults would stop and pray and give thanks to God. From the simple wayside shrine, to the coming of the Cistersians, the Dominicans, and Franciscans, and the Jesuits, the Polish soul blossomed and her great devotion to the Mother of God grew. Mary the Mother of God is honored by the Poles in Vilno as Our Lady of Ostrobrama; in Czestochowa as Our Lady of Czestochowa. Queen of Poland, she is called, and to her the millions of Poles call in their hour of need:

"Oh Mary, Mother of God, Queen of Poland, pray for us."

Poland is proud of her faith and it is no wonder that she has more hymns dedicated to the blessed Virgin Mary than any other nation in the world.

THE SAINTS OF POLAND

During its 1,000 years of Catholicism, Poland has given the church millions of members, hundred of thousands of priests, bishops, monks, friars, nuns, and brothers. Its finest sons and daughters—the fairest flowers in the land served God and country.

The Polish nation has given the Catholic Church 76 religious congregations of men and women, from the Knights of Christ in 1228 to the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in 1959.

Poland has defended the faith against the Tartars in 1241, the Turks in 1683, and in 1920 it defended the church and Poland against the Bolsheviks. Poland has supplied the College of Cardinals with 21 members from Zbigniew Olesnicki in 1421 to Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski in 1953, the present Primate of Poland.

Thus since Mieszko's baptism the life of the Polish people has been intimately linked with the Catholic Church in mutual exchange of devotion and service. Little wonder then that Poland has been called by the Holy Father the nation of saints.

Here we see St. Hedwig, Jadwiga, Princess of Slask, married to Duke Henryk of Silesia. It is written that she was an unusual woman having great compassion for the sick, the poor, and the unfortunate. She and he lived together happily for a great many years doing spiritual good works. They had six children, and following her husband's death Hedwig, who founded the Cistercian Order in Poland, joined the convent, taking the religious habit of the Cistercian nun where her daughter Getrude was the Abbess. Hedwig died in 1243 and she was cannonized a saint in 1268. Her feast day is celebrated on October 16.

St. Kazimier, Prince of Poland, son of King Kazimier III, King of Poland, was educated in the royal court but he had a horror of luxury and practiced many mortifications. Under the care of the great holy Canon John Dlugosz, Kazimiers grew in holiness. Kazimier (Casimir) is one of the patrons of Poland. He died in 1482 and was cannonized a saint in 1522. His feast day is on March 4.

The boy saint, St. Stanislaw Kostka, was a young Polish nobleman whose father was a very rich man. Stanislaw was brought up at court amid much splendor and riches. Early in life however, he dedicated himself to the Blessed Virgin Mary and God. He decided to join the religious—the Jesuits—and he walked from Poland to Vienna and thence to Rome where he was accepted into the Jesuit Novitiate. His life was short but all of it was dedicated to God. He was 18 when he died in 1568. He was canonized a saint in 1726. His feast day is November 13.

St. Andrew Bobola, born of the wealthy family of Bobolow in Poland in 1591, showed great devotion to God and early in life went to Vilno and entered the Jesuit Order. He worked with the young and became the spiritual director of the Legion of Mary. He was a great preacher and did missionary work for over 20 years. The Kozaki—the Cossaks—captured him and cruelly murdered him because he would not deny his faith. He died a martyr for his faith on May 16, 1657. He was cannonized in 1938.

Among the saints of Poland there were Jacek, St. Stanislaw the Bishop, Kinga, Czeslaw, Jan Kanty, Wladyslaw, Jolenta, and many more too numerous to mention now. Small wonder that Poland earned from the church the title "Mother of Saints," and after the Turks were crushed by the Poles in Vienna and Europe saved by the Christian armies of King Jan Sobieski of Poland, the Holy See called Poland "Bulwark of Christendom."

Today a 1,000 years after Mieszko's baptism in 966, there are some 40 million Catholics of Polish descent throughout the world and we salute Poland on her millennium. And although the majority of the Poles are of Catholic faith, Poland as a nation early in her history granted religious freedom to all faiths—the Protestants, the Jews all found haven in Poland—and both religious and civic rights were guaranteed to all in Poland by its constitution of May 3.

GREAT MEN AND WOMEN

Poland's great men and women were many, but to mention only a few now.

Music: Who in the world does not know of or hasn't thrilled to the music of Frederick Chopin, Ignacy Jan Paderewski, Wienawski, and Moniuszko.

Literature: The greatest sea story writer in the world is a Pole—Joseph Conrad, born Joseph Korzeniowski—and Adam Mickiewicz who wrote the great epic, "Pan Thadeus." And what about the great writers—Maria Konopnicka, Joseph Kraszewski, Zygmunt Krasinski—the great Polish painters—Jan Matejko, Brandt, Wyspianski, and the Gierymski's.

Here now we see:

Copernik: Born Nikolaj Kopernik in Poland in 1473 in the northern city of Torun, almost 500 years ago, Kopernik discovered that the earth was not stationary but orbited along with the other planets around the sun. Great priest, scientist, humanist, and great pole—Copernicus.

And the Polish Nobel Prize winners:

Wladyslaw Reymont: Polish novelist and poet, born in 1863 in Warsaw, Poland. He received little education and tried his hand at many different jobs, but found himself in writing. His novels—over 20 of them—were published in Russian, French, German, Swedish, Spanish; and then came his greatest work, "The Seasons: Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter," and for this he received the Nobel Prize in literature.

Maria Sklodowska Curie: Born in Warsaw, Poland, scientist, physicist, teacher, wife, and mother. She and her French husband won the Nobel Prize in physics in 1903; but after his death she continued her work and research in radium and in 1911 she won the Nobel Prize in chemistry. Her love for Poland was great and although she lived and worked in France she named one of her new elements after Poland—Polonium.

Henryk Sienkiewicz: Born in Poland in 1846, educated at the University of Warsaw, author of many books, famous all over the world. "With Fire and Sword," "The Deluge," "Knights of the Cross," the world-renown "Quo Vadis," and "Whither Goest Thou," which won for him the Nobel Prize in literature in 1905.

It is impossible to tell of a 1,000 years in so short a time. We can only tell of the names familiar to the world at large, but there are thousands upon thousands of great men and women of Poland who have contributed to Poland's growth.

Ignacy Jan Paderewski said in 1939 that Poland's greatest misfortune was her geographical situation—at the extreme European end, with no natural boundary between her and the turbulent East, Poland was predestined to be always the first to receive the shocks of the Tartars, the Mongolians, the Turkish invasions. Poland's first 500 years of existence were filled with these shocks. For the greatest part of her history Poland has been invaded or has been defending European countries. Considering such abnormal circumstances it is really astonishing how intense and how important has been her intellectual and artistic life.

Anna Maria Zajac Gacek, a great Polish American poet, teacher, and clubwoman wrote a special "Ode to Poland" for this Poland millennium and I would like to quote from it:

"Beloved land of the white eagle, land that fought so valiantly for its freedom in Warsaw, Narvik, Tobruk, Monte Cassino, Ankara, Falaise, Breda, Arnheim, and wherever freedom of liberty-loving nations was at stake—on land, in the air, and on the sea—firmly believing that out of the present chaos a better world would evolve wherein would abide charity for all and malice toward none—to thy impoverished, parched lips the big three raised a chalice filled with bitter gall—drink they say—drink to the Poland that was—drink to the Poland that hath ceased to be.

"Can it be beloved Poland that thou art doomed to be no more. Is the world so blind that it doth not see that there can be no compensation for thy great loss. Land of my forefather I do not believe such a thing will come to pass. Who has earned a right to live as an independent nation with a government of thine own choice—if not thee whose men and women with grenades in hands fought [the Nazis] for 63 days alone in Warsaw and with a handful of precious Polish soil clutched tightly in their blood drenched hands died with the words on their lips—Jescze Polska nie szginela. Poland is not yet dead. He who fell thrice on the road to Golgotha will not forget thee. Thou shall also be reborn and bring light unto this war-torn world. A nation that has given so much of the world cannot die. It will not die as long as freemen know of thee. Poland, land of my forefathers, we salute thee on this 1,000th anniversary of your conversion to Christianity.

"Poland, land of many arts, land of the white eagle, God grant you freedom to fly again as freely as the eagle does and may your next 1,000 years bring you peace joy and God's blessings on you—Poland."

MRS. MILLER: THE SPEAKER OF THE YEAR AWARD FOR 1965 BY THE PENNSYLVANIA SPEECH ASSOCIATION

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great and grand ladies of America is Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller. Mrs. Miller is the sister of one of the most distinguished men who ever served in the U.S. Senate and one of the most dedicated and devoted of Democrats, the Honorable Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania. I had the honor to serve with Senator Guffey in the Senate for many years. He and his three talented and lovely sisters were among the closest friends Mrs. Pepper and I had and we have cherished those friendships over the years. Mrs. Miller, now over 90, remains a dynamic, active, and eloquent lady and leader. She is surely the grand lady of American democracy and truly one of the most outstanding women America has ever known.

Last October Mrs. Miller was awarded the Speaker of the Year Award for 1965 by the Pennsylvania Speech Association at its annual convention. This address, replete with charming reminiscences of this distinguished and noble lady, is informative, inspiring, and delightful.

I commend it, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues and to those who will read it immediately following my remarks in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY MRS. EMMA GUFFEY MILLER

Dr. Holtzman, Dr. Haakenson, officers of the association, and members of the association, you'd scarce expect one of my age to speak in public on the stage. I was born over 91 years ago on a family property at Guffey Station, Westmoreland County, and was brought to Greensburg as a small child and there I grew into my being.

Greensburg was a typical country town, although it was the county seat of Westmoreland County. But it had no running water, no city paving, no electricity, gas of a sort, illuminating gas of a sort but lamps gave a far better light. And so I have come a long way since those early days. I entered politics in 1880 when I was 6 years old. And I wore proudly the button of the Democratic candidate for President in those days. I won't ask who he was, because I've stumped every history professor I've met. But alas, my cheers when I saw this wonderful parade, I've never seen anything like it since, an old fashioned torchlight procession, and my cheers then changed to tears. However, I soon forgot my disappointment because I started to school. With the slate bound in red flannel and a slate pencil and a tin cup around my neck in order to get a sanitary drink out of a common bucket in the corner. My teacher was a woman of doubtful age. She'd been teaching so many years. We didn't call her Miss This or Miss That, we called her Aunt Belle. And Aunt Belle give me my first lesson in spelling because she had a large chart on which little pictures of animals—d-o-g, dog; c-a-t, cat; r-a-t, rat; and so forth. However, she succeeded in getting something into my head, for before long I had a primer.

There were children of all types in that school. There were children of well-to-do parents, there were children of poor parents, there were children of different colors, but it made no difference to any of us. That was my first introduction to democracy. I wish you could say we had it everywhere in our Nation yet, but we're on the way.

Well one day coming down from school the following year, I heard the newsboy cry that the President had been assassinated and that he was likely to die. I went home and rushed to my father and said, "Now if President Garfield dies, won't Hancock be President?" He said, "No." And then I got my first introduction to law. I knew what politics was but I didn't know anything about law before that. However, he said, "Wait, and you'll see a Democrat yet in the White House." And so I did and the 4 years later brought one.

In the meantime, I was not only busy at school, but playing around with my little friends in the South Main Streets of Greensburg. And one Sunday my mother said to my brother Joe, "I want you to take this kettle that's filled with the Sunday dinner down to Mrs. So and So." Explaining to him where she lived. So we carried this down to this poor woman. I recall the house as if it were present right here. The house was not a poor house, it seemed well built. But we had to walk over, some distance, a boardwalk because underneath the boardwalk it was very swampy. Well we waited until she had emptied the pail and then my brother said, "Now on the way home, we'll stop to see Jimmy,"—a friend of his. "And you can play with his little sister." Well, we stopped at Jimmy's house but his sister wasn't home. So I had to listen to the erudite talks of these 10- or 11-year-old boys.

I said, "Why does Mrs. So and So, why is she so poor?" And Jimmy spoke up and said, "Well she can't read nor write." I was utterly dumbfounded to think that there was anyone who couldn't read and write. So after they talked it over they decided it probably was due to that.

Well, the President expressed those same sentiments when he was talking to Pope Paul just recently. It's the fact that people couldn't read and write kept them on the lower scale of the ladder.

One day as I was playing around I saw a wagonload of men, a wagon filled with men, not sitting down but standing up. And I wanted to know who they were. "Oh," they said, "they're bringing them in from the county home to vote." Later on I learned that idiots, women and children couldn't vote, but at any rate they were voting. And I wanted to know why there were no women in the wagon. "Oh," they said, "women don't vote." "No, they don't vote." And that puzzled me because I knew down at the county home, I had been taken there once by my mother who apparently knew the superintendent's wife, and there were some very kind women down there. But there were no old women's homes, there were no children's homes. So everybody that was left adrift, ended up at the county home.

And then I learned that the courthouse, which was several blocks upstream, as we said, belonged to the people. Anyone who wanted to make a speech, start a cause, or tell about something unusual that had come over the telegraph—that's the only means of outside communication we had—could ring the courthouse bell and then all the men ran to the courthouse to see what was happening.

In the campaign of 1884, the courthouse bell was rung, vigorously the night after the election. And the leader of the Republicans, a well-educated man and a good writer for the Republican paper, was so overcome with the joy that he thought Bland was elected that be began his speech like this, "The courthouse bells have rung." "The people have spoken and we're going to have another Republican president." Well my older brothers, of course, had rushed to the courthouse to see what was going on. And they came down and told my father. And he had a quizzical look on his face and he said, "The Old Boss, (that's what this man was called) better wait a day or two." So 2 days later the courthouse bell rang again and that time we were all pleased.

Well, there were no women's clubs in those days. The only time women gathered together by themselves, was in church society. Well, there were no DAR's or Colonial Dames. Although I suppose half, or probably more than half of the people who lived in Greensburg at that time, that we were all descended from colonial and revolutionary ancestors. But we didn't think anything about it. Everybody was just the same. No difference if they came in to travel down, to dig coals, or travel down on the Southwest Railroad. But one day there was a notice put up that a certain woman was going to talk on votes for women in the courthouse one afternoon. Why, it shocked the community. Many of the men refused to let their wives attend. But my mother attended. The woman that gave the talk was a very brilliant woman. I suppose she was the best Bible scholar in Greensburg. And she brought up a fine family. When my mother came home, my father said, "What did Mrs. So and So have to say?" So mother began to relate.

The different things she had said and the different reasons she had given why women should vote. And father said, "She has a point, she's proved her point." And I have always remembered that, knowing that in my early days, my father stood by the women.

Well, I went up grade by grade in school till I reached the high school. And then on Friday afternoon, if any of you are old enough, you will remember that you had entertainment on Friday afternoons. Some of the children recited poems. Some of the children sang. Sometimes the teacher read us very interesting stories and I think my love of poetry was due to the reading that one of the teachers gave us every once in a while. Well, I got into the debating society in the high school. I can't tell you what the first debate was about but I won it from a boy that was quite a talker. He later became a well-known judge in Westmoreland County.

The next time I had to debate on States' rights. I lost that one.

Well, due to moving and illness in the family when we went to Pittsburgh, I lost about a year and a half schooling, but I entered a preparatory school there and I entered Bryn Mawr College in 1896. Now there had never been a political meeting at Bryn Mawr College. Some of us decided we'd have one. So it was the first year that Bryan ever ran. And we had a hard time getting a group together. It was the most interesting group as I look back on it. There were some very good things in that 1896 platform. Of course none of us knew anything about "silver and 16-to-1" except one girl, and she was the daughter of the silver Senator from Nevada.

So he coached her; she could speak on the silver. There were two sisters who later became very distinguished in welfare work in New York State and they talked on the welfare planks which are considered, oh, socialistic, to a degree. And then there was a good civil service plank. And didn't we have the daughter of the president of the Civil Service League at Bryn Mawr at that time? So she talked on civil service. And then they gave me the end to wrap up. I had a difficult time but I did my best. There were six of us that night who sponsored the meeting and who evidently believed in the Democratic Party. The next day when the college voted, we got 15 votes. Never since have I doubled a vote like that.

Of course, then, I took up real suffrage for women. Our president was the late M. Terry Thomas, who did more for women's education and its advancement than anyone in this country. When she started out, she was made dean of the new college that just started at Bryn Mawr in 1885. She went around to get the best professors she could find. She wanted nothing but young Ph. D's. She found one in Virginia. He later became President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. She went up to Harvard and she found a number of brilliant men there. But the great Dr. Eliot, who made Harvard the great university which it is today. said, "Why Miss Thomas, you don't expect girls to learn biology and chemistry." She said, "I not only expect it, but they will." Two years later he apologized.

We had self-government at Bryn Mawr, the first college in the country to have self-government. And at the end of my freshman year, I was elected to the self-government board. And I defeated a very charming woman, charming girl then, who later married one of the great Federal judges of the United States. It always amused me.

Well, I got my degree, my majors were politics and history. And then I tutored 6 months, or rather I substituted 6 months, at a little private school on the North Side. I don't know how much the children learned while I was substituting, but I never forgot what one 12-year-old wrote. She was right, I was teaching, or trying to teach mythology. And I told them to write the story of women. And I have never forgotten her answer which I think is wonderful. She said, and this is all she wrote, "Apollo gave her music, Venus gave her beauty, Minerva gave her wisdom, and woman was made."

Then the next year I went over to Japan to visit a friend whose husband was with the Standard Oil Co. there. And there, of course, I found an entire new life and entire new interests. Having played basketball at Bryn Mawr, we organized a basketball team and, believe it or not, the school in Tokyo in a short time took up basketball.

Well, I was fortunate enough to marry a young Virginian, a graduate engineer of Stevens Institute of Technology who came over to Japan to look over a proposition in Osaka, Japan, where a group of New York industrialists were considering erecting a large gas plant. They had some electricity there, but it was the largest manufacturing city in Japan and the manufacturing was all done in the houses, the little wooden shacks that they lived in.

Well, later I came home and later he came home and we were married. And then went back and forth for 8 years. But I can remember we were there during the Japanese-

Russian War and I had been interested in donating something for the benefit of the soldiers, the wounded. So some Japanese friends, women, took me down one night to the train where we handed out flags and boxes of food to the soldiers that were going through.

Now most of these Japanese women, and they were very high class, most of these Japanese women, you might say, had never left the house before. And I recall writing home to my mother and saying, "The Japanese women have finally burst through the paper doors and eventually they'll go somewhere."

Well now they just have the same ideas as we have. In fact, I believe, a greater proportion of the Japanese women vote than we do. And they're taking an interest in public affairs, they're appearing together on the streets, the boys and girls, hand in hand, and it never was thought of when we lived there.

On our last trip over which was just before the war, just before it was declared, we were almost captured by the Russians. We were filled with contraband. All anybody had to do was to look at the boat. The deck was piled high with railroad rails. But fortunately the fog came down and we proceeded to end up in Japan.

After the birth of my oldest son in Osaka, where we saw Russian prisoners at that time, and I have thought of it many times since because those Russian prisoners were such a forlorn lot. And they seemed very pleased that they were settled in some other country for a time. And the Japanese were giving them very good food. But they had to stop giving them melon (that's a form or orange) because they were making boats out of it.

So they took away the fruit and gave them potatoes and they made it out of that. So you know the Japanese are clever, as we know it.

Well, then we came back to this country and we settled in Providence, R.I., for a few years. There I got into the suffrage movement again. And any of you who are old enough to be in the suffrage movement, I don't think any of you are, will recall we had various organizations. The American Suffrage Association, the College Equal Suffrage League, and I think there was the United States Association. There were various associations.

Well since we lived in a college town that was rather strict in those days, you professors will recall that just lately a former president of Amherst College was dismissed from Brown University. My husband and I didn't know why. We read the newspapers, but he was a great liberal center and later he became president of Amherst and died just recently, along after his retirement.

Well I became very equal in this College Equal Suffrage League and to this day I still marvel that there were women who didn't want to vote and who thought it was a wrong thing for women to vote. Who kept saying, "Well, our husbands vote". And I kept saying, "There are a lot of women without husbands; can't they vote? They pay taxes." "Oh, never mind, we don't want to vote." And I was very much amused, a few years ago here in Pittsburgh, where a woman who had been president of the Antisuffrage League passed away. She was a lovely woman and she was a business woman. But when her children gave out the information about her life, they said she was active in the suffrage movement.

Well, we then went to Illinois, and there I became interested in parent-teachers work. In the meantime I was raising a family of four satisfactory sons.

Came back to Pittsburgh in 1918, and by 1920 we had suffrage won. And there I went to the Democratic Convention of 1924, and there, with a minority, I fought for an anti-Klan plank. Well, last year we got it. So don't give up trying.

In 1924 and 1928, that period, I was attacked wholesale by Klan members in western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio. Their papers just mushroomed. They weren't against colored people then. They were only against Catholics and Jews. You never heard of any opposition to colored people.

Well, this died out, I'm glad to say, I think in Pennsylvania, and I hope the same is true of Ohio. But I was written up so vigorously and so violently that my husband kept a loaded revolver in his room. And one of the writeups said, "She says she has a husband and four sons; we don't doubt the sons," which amused the family very much. And one night they burned a cross on a hill just beyond us, because it could be seen by both the village and our farm, except we were all away. There was nothing but the charred remains when we came home, much to the disappointment of the boys, who had such a good time, they said, cutting it down.

Well, we have that trouble still, but gradually I'm sure we'll get the better of it.

Then in 1930 I entered the antiprohibition movement. If people were going to be kept sober, I decided after 10 years that that was no way to do it. And again I was attacked by the so-called dries. And I recall that one of the letters said, "Well, you may mean well, you may be sincere, but I'm tired seeing your picture in the paper." And my husband said, "That part I agree with."

Then by 1932 came a new regime and I think we've been following it, more or less, ever since. And then I went on the State board of education; I went on the State board of the welfare board and I enjoyed that work very much because it seemed to be in line. It seemed to follow the things that I had wanted and that I had believed in. Then I was made chairman of the Advisory Committee of the National Youth Administration.

Not many of you, perhaps, can remember the National Youth Administration in the 1930's, but it did a good work and it was one of the most rewarding things, to me, that I have ever entered into. I made frequent trips through the State and to Harrisburg. We had paid workers, but we had a wonderful board, of which I was chairman. As my husband said, I could collect more nonpaying jobs than anybody he ever did know. However, as I say, it was most rewarding. And the dropout idea now is a sort of a followup of the National Youth Administration.

I recall that in Philadelphia we made ammunition boxes for the Navy, and discovered that the girls had better eyesight than the boys. The girls could do everything but press one lever, which made the grooves in the lid of the boxes fit down on the box to close it. Well, presently, they had a machine that did that. By that time we were in war and the boys were ready to enlist and it was carried forward by the girls. There was some objection to the young women working there because they said, "They won't be safe on the streets at night." I said, "That isn't the fault of what they're doing or the National Youth Administration; that's the fault of your city administration." So they were allowed to continue.

You can see from this that I've been interested in welfare and education all my life. And I am still a member of the board of trustees of Slippery Rock College. I have been on the board under five Governors. When the legislature adjourns as a holdover, I suppose I'll be out. But I have seen the college grow from 750 to about 2,700. I have seen it grow from a teachers college to a regular college, a State college. I have seen it grow from merely training teachers but being able now to give an M.A. degree and presently, I believe, we will have the beginning of a medical degree. We have various plans to go forward.

Now, in 1933, a lot of us women began to realize that the vote was only a political right, it wasn't a legal right, if women were discriminated on account of sex. And so we began to campaign for the equal rights amendment. The National Women's Party wrote and has backed ever since this amendment which reads, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be abridged or denied by the United States or any State on account of sex." I was 4 years as chairman; I retired as chairman last year. Then they made me president for life. We're very successful, although we have labor opposing us. I don't mean all labor, but during the war a Senator called me from California (he was one of the eastern Senators).

They were trying to increase the output of ammunition and the ammunition factories were filled mostly by women. And they found out that if they could increase them, their working hours 2 hours a week, from 48 to 50, it would mean that much more ammunition. At that time, the League of Women Voters was opposed to the amendment. But they said that they would forget it during the war. They've forgotten it now, they don't oppose it. Neither does Mrs. Roosevelt, who once opposed it. Neither did she when she was representing our country on the United Nations.

Well, the law in Pennsylvania read, "The women could work 50 hours a week." And the law would last for 6 months there, after the end of the war. No sooner did President Truman announce that the war was over than the head of the labor department in Pennsylvania rushed to the Governor, Governor Duff I think it was, and said, "Abrogate that law immediately or the women will be taking our jobs." I don't want to deprive a man of a job if he's doing a good job. But if a woman can do as good a job, and many times a better job, I say let her have it. Don't discriminate on account of sex.

There is a group in the country that says, "All this may come someday, but we have to wait and see what the Supreme Court says." Well, I can tell them right now what the Supreme Court has said half a dozen times. In the 14th amendment, women, white women, are not considered equal to men. We had that decision several times. So the only way we can become equal in every respect legally, is to pass the amendment. And so that's what I'm doing now, as far as I can to end the discrimination.

Well, I've had a long life, and you can tell. Ninety-one years is a long time to spend living. But it's been an interesting life, a satisfactory life. There have been ups and downs and pleasures and sorrows. But if I had to relive it, I'd live it just as I have. The first time I ever heard the word "comet" must have been more than 85 years ago and they were having quite an argument in the family. And father ended it by saying, "Never mind, wake her up, put a blanket around her and carry her down so she can see the comet. She'll never see the like of it again."

I know perhaps it will be back, I don't know. And so I was bundled up and carried down a very short distance to a house on the corner. It was a two-story house in front and then had a long one-story addition. And there right over, as I kept telling them when I came back, right over Miss Shea's washhouse was the comet. Never before in all my travels have I seen anything to compare with it and I'm sure you haven't either. It was there that I heard such words as "magnificent spectacle," "marvelous," "wonderful." Well, I kept wondering for days what else was up there besides the comet. And now we've reached the space age and we're learning a great deal about what else is up there. And then I said to myself, "I'll have to wait until I'm a big girl to find out." Well, now I'm an old person. I haven't found out, I know little about space, but I'm willing to wait. Thank you very much.

Of all the moments of distinction which have been given to me, I appreciate this one more than any one that I've ever had and I hope that I am able to say to you how gracious you are and how grateful and thankful I am.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schmidhauser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining several of my colleagues in introducing a joint resolution to designate the second week of May each year as National School Safety Patrol Week. I want to join them in paying tribute to the devotion and effectiveness of the boys and girls who give of their time to insure the safety of their fellow school children. Thousands of children in my district and millions all over America travel to school more safely because the members of the school safety patrol are willing to get up earlier in the morning, eat lunch faster, and get home later, and to assume the responsibility which being a school safety guard entails. Membership in the patrol in this way serves a useful function above and beyond the vital one of safety for our youngsters. It also serves as a valuable initiation into the tradition of voluntary public service which provides much of the leadership for the communities and organizations of our society.

CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Moeller] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1966, the President, through the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitted to us the proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966. It is apparent in this message that Congress long ago began a task that we have left only partially finished. A generation ago, when some of my colleagues here today were still in public schools, Congress initiated a program to encourage schools to provide lunches for school children on a regular basis.

Today, more than a generation later, there are still school children who are not able to benefit by this effort of our predecessors because their schools do not have the facilities to provide them with one good meal per day. In conversations with teachers from even some of our more fortunate school systems, it has been revealed to me that some students obtain their only warm meal of the day from the school lunch program. Surely, children in the same dire need must live in school districts where they do not have the school lunch program because they have no equipment to furnish a meal. This single provision of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, to provide grants-in-aid to assist in providing the proper facilities, makes this proposal worthy of our most direct attention.

Another provision of the act, that of setting up a special milk program, is also aimed at the lofty, yet attainable, goal of raising a nation of children who have every possible chance to grow up to be healthy individuals. I ask that my colleagues in the House, in their efforts to represent their constituents in regard to the proposed budget cuts in the areas of school lunch and milk programs, do not overlook the possibilities that the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 holds. This could easily be one of the most important pieces of legislation that we have ever been called upon to examine.

As our President stated in his food-for-freedom message, "Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth." I am positive that no Member here present wants our yet uncounted future generations to have their minds poisoned, their bodies sapped of strength, and their hopes of future accomplishments destroyed by hunger. This natural enemy of every man on earth is also the enemy of many children in our own country. I ask again that all of us, who have the power and the responsibility to do so, examine this act and see for ourselves if this act is not the weapon we so desperately need to stamp out hunger.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE REPORT REVEALS FEW BANKS HAVE FULL INDEPENDENT AUDITS

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee released a detailed staff analysis on bank audits. This analysis, based on a survey of 10,362 banks, reveals some startling information which plainly shows that most of the Nation's commercial banks do not employ outside independent audits of their operations.

The report reveals that only 10 percent of the banks employed accountants to make full and independent audits. Less than 5 percent had these audits annually. The report further showed that results of the few audits conducted are usually released only to the officers and directors and rarely made available to the stockholders or the public.

In my opinion this is a serious situation and one which cries out for action by the Congress. As you know, the Banking and Currency Committee now has pending before it two bills which would require the banks to have full independent audits conducted on a regular basis. The report released today points up the need for this type of legislation in very clear terms.

Mr. Speaker, without these audit reports, the banks operate behind a heavy veil of secrecy. This secrecy leaves the depositors, borrowers, stockholders, and the general public to operate on blind faith without the benefit of the most basic information about the banks' operations.

Full independent audits would do much to help the banking industry as well as the public. I am convinced that bad practices uncovered in some recent bank failures would not have gone so far had there been adequate independent audits of these banks' operations on a regular basis. Independent audits would reveal these bad practices before they become serious banking problems and threaten the solvency of the banks.

Mr. Speaker, the staff analysis published today contains a number of significant points. The information is based on answers furnished by the banks to questionnaires submitted to them by the Banking and Currency Committee. Among other things, the answers to the questionnaires revealed these points:

First. Approximately 96 percent of the respondents to the questionnaire did not have annual, unqualified, independent audits during the years 1960 through 1964.

Second. Approximately 90 percent of the respondents did not use independent public accountants for unqualified independent audits; that is, audits unrestricted as to scope and time.

Third. As of December 31, 1964, only 23 problem banks, or 13 percent of 178 insured State-chartered problem banks in the United States had annual independent audits.

Fourth. As of June 30, 1965, only 24 problem banks, or 13.3 percent of 180 insured State-chartered problem banks in the United States had annual independent audits.

Fifth. Unlike many publicly owned corporations, unqualified independent audit reports are generally distributed only to the directors of banks so audited, but not to all of the banks' officers, and to relatively few of the banks' stockholders. Distribution of audit reports to the general public was found to be minimal.

Sixth. Despite the fact that 66 percent of the respondents indicated that they used the services of public accountants for a variety of reasons, most of this total used public accountants for limited specialized services, such as the preparation of the bank's tax returns or advice to banks on tax matters.

Seventh. The average cost of an independent, unqualified audit ranged from $1,400 for banks in the under $5 million assets category to $6,400 for banks in the $25 to $100 million assets category. Hence, the average cost of such audits in all categories does not seem to put an independent, unqualified audit outside the reach of most banks, especially considering the protection afforded to depositors, stockholders, and the public by such practices, as well as present levels of bank profits.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 1966

Mr. **EDWARDS** of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ROSENTHAL**. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to be designated the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966.

In 1964 and 1965, the Congress moved to correct certain inconsistencies and inadequacies in the body of civil rights law. In so acting, our hope was to provide the full framework necessary to allow all our citizens freely to exercise their constitutional rights. That goal, however, is not yet ours. Due process and equal protection of the law is still denied many of our citizens. Crimes of violence against Negroes and civil rights workers still occupy prominence in the news. People who seek the peaceful exercise of their constitutional rights are murdered with impunity. And this Congress cannot dismiss future obligations by justly praising itself for past accomplishments. We must have a civil rights act for 1966.

Justice delayed is justice denied. Our present delays are primarily the administration of just laws recently passed by the Congress. We do not wish to see the organization of the judiciary in this country tampered with or altered. This legislation is designed not to impose new arrangements but to stimulate the improvement of old procedures. States, in effect, are being asked to scrutinize and purify their own systems of justice. But the Congress should not permit unjust and unrepresentative courts to undercut the law of the land. For dereliction in the administration of justice threatens the rule of law.

To promote the just administration of the law, we must assure the equitable selection of juries in State and Federal courts. The manipulation of jury lists has been, for some time, a major weapon to obstruct the equal protection of the law in civil rights cases. Lily-white juries in the South are a disgrace to democracy. Often, they become accomplices to vicious and violent crimes against innocent citizens. Discrimination in jury selection procedures must stop. Accordingly, my legislation introduces a plan whereby population cross-sections are to be provided as the basis for equitable representatives of the citizenry on juries. Jury commissions in Federal district courts, working with the Director of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts would assure the enforcement of such a procedure. Provisions are also contained to extend such procedures to the selection of juries in State courts.

Another title of the bill provides for the removal of defendants, in certain cases, from State to Federal district courts where their localities have segregated and discriminatory systems of justice.

Also included is a provision designating certain crimes as Federal offenses. At present, the killer of a civil rights worker is tried for depriving that individual of his constitutional rights. He ought to be tried for murder under Federal jurisdiction.

Title V of the bill provides for the civil indemnification of persons injured or killed in the lawful exercise of his civil rights. This would be administered through a special board under the authority of the Civil Rights Commission.

Most of the provisions have been recommended in the past by the Civil Rights Commission. They are designed to meet a terrible reality in this country—the continuing disobedience to established law in certain of our States.

All of us are too well acquainted with the nature of this disobedience—the victimization of citizens exercising rights we are sworn to defend, the murder of citizens seeking to help guarantee those rights for their fellows. Daily reports of these incidents have become commonplace. Now is the time to do something about it.

I do not believe that civil rights workers and other citizens can be hostages to gradualism. We cannot callously write off violence as the necessary cost of progress. Having passed laws we must assure their enforcement. Having guaranteed citizens certain rights we cannot tolerate their intimidation. For these reasons we must act immediately to pass the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966.

THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY'S ROLE IN DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. **EDWARDS** of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FALLON**. Mr. Speaker, recently my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable John C. Mackie, addressed the 47th annual convention of the Associated General Contractors on the important subject, "The Construction Industry's Role in Disaster Relief." As former commissioner of highways, State of Michigan, former president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, and former director of the American Road Builders Association, John is a recognized authority in the field of highways. I feel that my colleagues in the House of Representatives, as well as citizens throughout the great State of Michigan and the Nation, will appreciate the opportunity to read his excellent remarks.

The address follows:

The Construction Industries Role in Disaster Relief

(Remarks by the Honorable John C. Mackie, before the Plan Bulldozer Forum, 47th annual Associated General Contractors convention, March 17, 1966, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. Armstrong, distinguished panel members, members of the Associated General Contractors, and guests, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you this morning on a most important subject: "The Construction Industry's Role in Disaster Relief."

As highway commissioner for the State of Michigan, I have enjoyed a close relationship with the Associated General Contractors. As a licensed civil engineer and land surveyor, I am appreciably concerned with the largest of all single industries—the construction industry—and the role that construction contractors play in disaster relief.

As Jack Matich, chairman of the AGC national emergency planning committee has stated:

"The general contractor has an obligation to protect his community and his country in times of natural or manmade disasters. Only the contractor has the ability, experience, and equipment to plunge into such an emergency, clear the wreckage, and put a community back on its feet after disaster has struck. This is true regardless of the seriousness of the situation.

"Plan Bulldozer involves organizing our capabilities in advance of an emergency so that the construction industry will be able to step in and help without delay. If disaster strikes, all construction contractors may be called upon to put their community, their State, their country back into operating condition.

"Every Associated General Contractors' chapter has a responsibility of this kind and needs to have the plans, equipment, specifications, and a crew of men ready to do the job. Plan Bulldozer means that you put together the necessary leadership, equipment, and crew in advance, instead of waiting until disaster is upon you and all is confusion."

To this end, I believe the construction industry, through Associated General Contractors, has created a plan that will utilize its capabilities most efficiently to assure public safety. To the membership of Associated General Contractors, I congratulate you for conceiving Plan Bulldozer.

The Michigan chapter of Associated General Contractors, has developed and activated this program several times. On June 6, 1963, Michigan's capital city of Lansing was hit by 70-mile-per-hour winds and rain totaling nearly 3½ inches in 3 hours. Fires caused by lightning and broken powerlines broke out over the city, and a large number of buildings were flooded. Every piece of city firefighting equipment was placed into service.

Around 7 p.m., local and State officials contracted seven contractors for men and equipment to fight flooding. All were members of the Michigan chapter of Associated General Contractors and cooperators in the chapter's Plan Bulldozer. Within 45 minutes, the first of them had reported to Lansing fire station No. 1, ready for duty.

About 2 hours later, with authority from the fire chief and his staff, the contractors moved into 14 buildings and brought the flooding under control. A vital highway underpass was flooded and the Michigan State Highway Department asked that it be reopened by 7:30 p.m. The contractors opened the underpass to traffic at 5:45 p.m., well before the deadline.

The fire department and the city council of Lansing issued special commendations to the Michigan chapter of Associated General Contractors and to the contractors who took part in the operation.

In April 1965, the Michigan chapter was called to activate Plan Bulldozer to clear extensive damage when tornadoes hit the Midwest. Michigan contractors worked with State police and reported receiving excellent cooperation from State labor organizations.

Plan Bulldozer provided further evidence of its effectiveness when it was implemented in North and South Dakota immediately following their hurricane-force blizzards earlier this month. Snow drifts as deep as 50 feet literally buried farms, livestock, trains, and towns, and presented one of the most critical livesaving snow removal tasks ever encountered in the Dakotas.

The result of the action taken by Plan Bulldozer in the Dakotas can best be described by quoting a small portion of a letter written to the Associated General Contractors of South Dakota, Inc., by the Director of the State civil defense in South Dakota, who wrote:

"The success of Plan Bulldozer is positively pleasing when I realize that this is the first time the plan was implemented. There is no doubt in my mind that as a result of the prompt reaction of the contractors that human life and many head of livestock were saved. The success is indicative of comprehensive planning on the part of the Associated General Contractors. The future potential of this plan is fantastic."

And a letter from the Governor of South Dakota, who stated:

"In my opinion Plan Operation Bulldozer for which you must be given the initial and fullest credit, proved to be a complete success."

Plan Bulldozer has been activated in many other States to aid in arresting damage and reestablishing an orderly physical environment.

Testimonials such as the Lansing disaster and others, merely reinforces what construction leaders have always maintained—that the industry has a vital contribution to make in disaster relief and control.

At the present time, 62 percent of the States have a Plan Bulldozer organization, and Associated General Contractors chapters in 36 percent of the States are developing the program which when completed would nearly give nationwide coverage.

Certainly, there is sufficient evidence to encourage the remaining States to organize a complete Plan Bulldozer program. The general public should be aware of the tremendous resources available in your industry, and your willingness to cooperate.

Emergency preparedness must be substantive. It should provide detailed information for public officials advising who to contact in the industry, how they can be contacted under emergency conditions, the resources available, and the operational criteria to perform disaster relief work.

All types of construction contractors should be interested in emergency preparedness, as well as subcontractors, equipment dealers, suppliers, and everyone related to the industry. The Associated General Contractors plan allows for all to participate.

Plan Bulldozer is indeed a logical program. Since the general contractor under the single contract system has undivided responsibility to manage a job, he is evidently, the logical source to coordinate the complex operation of disaster relief. He has the experience and the organization to manage a project whether it is building, heavy, or highway construction.

Cooperation must be a civic proposition where all heads of agencies work together, and political entanglements must be dropped when disasters occur. A coordinating group should set up rules of authority, such as under the Associated General Contractors plan, in order to assure an efficient operation. Plan Bulldozer has a very essential place in this type of activity since the program is available to all cooperating agencies. Emergency preparedness isn't a promotional scheme—it is a continuing job, and must be done if we are to assure public safety.

Do we need Plan Bulldozer? The average of 16 or 17 declared major disasters per year speaks for itself.

AMENDING TITLES II AND III OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act so as to permit the education programs authorized in those titles to be used to strengthen educational opportunities for the children of our overseas government and military personnel who must attend schools operated by the Federal Government in many foreign areas.

I am greatly disturbed by the findings of the Select Subcommittee on Education which visited these overseas school operations during the congressional recess. During the investigation of the select subcommittee, 327 dependent schools overseas were studied. These schools educate over 165,000 American children. The subcommittee was unanimous in its findings:

First. That there is a very serious disparity between the actual administrative and operating arms of the Department of Defense school network;

Second. That many schools are housed in improper facilities and suffer from a serious lack of necessary equipment and supplies—particularly so in the case of textbooks;

Third. That sufficient effort to recruit and retain experienced and qualified teachers is not expended, and that teacher salaries and compensation for teacher achievement and experience are woefully insufficient;

Fourth. That the number of students in most classrooms is exceptionally large, and that insufficient teachers and specialists are employed;

Fifth. That the schools do not take full advantage of the opportunities present for intercultural exchange with children of the host nation, and offer relatively few host national language courses;

Sixth. That there is a serious lack of uniformity in the quality and degree of education offered by the various schools;

Seventh. That the overseas dependent schools are ineligible to participate in Federal programs beneficial to many facets of education; and

Eighth. That there is an insufficiency of funds made available to the Department of Defense for the purpose of educating American dependents abroad.

In my observations concerning the operation of our dependent schools overseas, it is apparent to me that high on the priority list of deficiencies is the lack of textbooks and appropriate instructional materials. Title II of Public Law 89–10 seeks to strengthen educational opportunities throughout our Nation's schools by providing grants for the acquisition of library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of teachers and students in schools throughout the Nation.

Much of the testimony received by the General Subcommittee on Education last year in connection with the hearings on title II of Public Law 89–10 indicated that this was an area of elementary and secondary education in which much greater financial support was needed. A look at our dependent schools overseas indicates that the need there may be even greater than the need which prompted the enactment of title II of Public Law 89–10.

Great opportunities exist in overseas locations for the cultural enrichment of the elementary and secondary school programs through special education projects which would take advantage of the schools' unique locations in foreign countries. However, most of the schools studied were not taking advantage of these unique circumstances. The possibilities which exist for program enrichment of our elementary and secondary schools through title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Public Law 89–10—most certainly should be made available to our overseas dependent schools. With the additional funds that could be made available under this title, the presently lost opportunity for special enrichment of elementary and secondary school programs in foreign areas may quickly vanish.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that it is extremely regrettable that the improvement in educational programs in our dependent overseas schools must be obtained in this manner. It would appear that where we have a program of education fully supported and administered by a Federal agency that there would be closer attention given to the provision of an educational program which is in keeping with the new developments and support being given education in the States. The quality of the offerings of our dependent schools overseas should to large extent parallel the improvement in quality and the innovation in instruction that are being afforded our stateside pupils.

I should like to make clear that the changes I propose to make in titles II and III of this act to make eligible our dependent schools overseas will not in any way reduce the measure of support that should be given the States and local school districts in the continental United States and in the eligible territories.

The General Education Subcommittee, of which I am a member, now has before it the proposed legislation for the 1966 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. At the appropriate time I will introduce amendments to that legislation to increase the money authorization by an amount sufficient to cover the cost of adding these children to titles II and III of that act.

STREET LIGHTING AND CRIME

Mr. **EDWARDS** of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FARNSLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record several articles that recently appeared in the Lockport, N.Y., Union-Sun and Journal and the Evansville Courier, of Evansville, Ind., regarding the correlation of street lighting and crime:

[From the Lockport (N.Y.) Union-Sun and Journal, Feb. 10, 1966]

Lights Cut Crime

The city streets of Lockport are as a general rule well lighted and most of the time we take the lights for granted.

Good lighting is regarded as a deterrent to crimes of violence, the majority of which are committed at night. That is why many leave the lights in their home on when they go out at night and why many illuminate their backyards and driveways.

Figures prepared by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service at the request of Representative Charles P. Farnsley, of Kentucky, indicate that the supposition is correct. Well lighted streets, not only reduce major crimes but also cut down the number of highway accidents.

During a 2-year period 1953–55 more than 5,000 new lights were installed along every mile of the streets in Gary, Ind. A tabulation of reported crimes showed that the number of criminal assaults reported declined more than 70 percent and robberies decreased more than 60 percent. The decrease occurred in spite of a 27-percent increase in the population of Gary during the 2-year period.

In larger cities, too, a reduction in crime has followed improved street lighting programs. In 1957, New York City officials decided to try an extensive street lighting program in a 111-block area in five of the most crime-ridden precincts. Crime statistics for a 3-month period following the installation of the lighting declined 71 percent. During the next 2 years the incidence of murder, assault, and rape dropped 49 percent in that district and juvenile complaints declined 30 percent.

Boston, Cleveland, Indianapolis, and other cities reported similar good results from increased street lighting.

In Nashville, Tenn., it was reported that following a street lighting program, the night traffic accident rate declined from 40 to 29 percent, despite a 50-percent increase in motor vehicle regulation. The fact that Chicago's Northwest Expressway is continuously lighted over its 16-mile length is given credit for the low traffic fatality rate on this highway.

Between 1953 and 1960 new lights were installed in nine locations in the State of Virginia. A study by the Virginia Department of Highways indicated that the number of traffic accidents at these locations decreased 38 percent and traffic fatalities dropped 90 percent.

Good lighting may not be the whole answer to curbing crime and traffic accidents, but the surveys indicate such lighting is money well spent.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, Feb. 21, 1966]

New Streetlights Help Drop Crime Rate

(By George Uselton)

The installation of new streetlights has helped Evansville reduce the crime trend here, according to Police Chief Darwin Covert.

Crime statistics in the city dropped drastically in 1965—the first drop in 6 years—and Chief Covert credited the additional lights.

The chief said the number of muggings, purse snatchings and molestings have shown a major decrease where adequate lighting has been installed.

Dimly lit areas of the city are the favorite haunts of thieves and burglars.

Mayor Frank McDonald recently said Evansville was the worst-lighted city in the State and added the streetlighting program is well behind schedule.

City Engineer Melvin Pohlkotte agreed with the mayor about lighting conditions here. He said deficiencies in streetlighting are terrific.

Pohlkotte previously handled lighting problems in Gary, Hammond, and Indianapolis.

He agreed that adequate street lighting is a crime stopper.

"There's no question about it. Crime on Gary streets decreased about 60 percent after proper lighting was installed," he said.

Federal Bureau of Investigation Chief J. Edgar Hoover has said, "It is axiomatic that darkness is an ally to crime. The thief, the arsonist, the rapist, the peeping tom and all other perverse individuals often depend on darkness to cloak their misdeeds and conceal their identities."

Twelve times as many crimes of violence are committed at night compared to the daylight hours. Major crimes that occur at night cost the Nation about $20 billion every year.

Chief Covert said, "Pretty good strides have been taken here during the last few years to get proper lighting."

Pohlkotte said between 700 and 800 streetlights were installed in the city during 1965 and that between 500 and 600 should be installed every year until Evansville is properly lighted.

At the present time there isn't a regular program for the installation of new and brighter lights, but the traffic engineer said he would like to see one established.

"Mostly it is the lack of finances and too few men to do the job," Pohlkotte said.

He said new lights have been put up on Lincoln and Washington Avenues and that crews are busy putting up lights on West Franklin Street.

The National Safety Council reported that of the 43,600 deaths that occurred in traffic accidents in 1963, 53 percent—or 23,100—resulted from night accidents.

Since nighttime traffic is only one-third that of daytime, the night death rate is 2½ times as great as the day rate, according to the council.

"Well-lighted streets cause reductions in accidents as well as crime," Chief Covert said.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, Feb. 25, 1966]

Better Lighting Promotes Crime Control

Light and vice are deadly enemies, says Shakespeare.

Evansville residents are getting quantitative measurements of that statement these days. The city is in the midst of a steady program for the improvement of street lighting. The result, according to Police Chief Darwin Covert, is a sharp cut in crime in all areas where improvements have been made.

There were 7,046 lights on Evansville streets at the first of this year, with more scheduled for installation. There has been a steady increase since 1960, when there were 4,406. Nonetheless, Mayor Frank McDonald told the city council recently that Evansville is the most poorly lighted city in the State. A continuation of the lighting program has been pledged.

It's costly. The city doesn't pay for installation or maintenance of street lights, but it pays an annual fee to the power company for each one. That means that each new street light represents a long-term item in Evansville's budget. The cost is now $314,000.

Still, it would be wrong to describe the payment as extravagant. Not only is there the testimony of Chief Covert, but also a report that a thorough lighting program in Gary cut street crime by 60 percent.

The connection between light and crime ought to have close relationship to the location of new lights. A certain number have to be installed on new streets. There is a temptation, too, to splurge on Evansville's best looking residential districts. Block-by-block crime reports, though, ought to establish priority for a certain number of installations each year. For example, frequent reports of molestations and burglaries probably would provide a legitimate claim for the section just southeast of the downtown district.

Street crime is a growing problem for U.S. cities. It was a minor issue in the last election and could be a bigger one in future campaigns. Along with frequent police patrols, adequate lighting is an obvious and effective step toward crime control.

STREET LIGHTING AND CRIME

Mr. **EDWARDS** of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FARNSLEY**. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the rapid growth of crime and juvenile delinquency has become a subject of increasing concern to us all.

I have long believed there was a definite correlation between street lighting and crime and that adequate lighting in our cities and towns would do much to combat this problem.

At my request the Library of Congress prepared a timely and informative study which confirms the effectiveness of brighter lights as a crime deterrent, as well as an important factor in reducing traffic accidents.

Believing that this report will be of interest to you, I include it in the Record.

The Library of Congress,
Legislative Reference Service,
Washington, D.C., November 2, 1965.

The Honorable Charles P. Farnsley,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Farnsley: In answer to your request for a study on the possible relationship between street lighting and crime, the Education and Public Welfare Division of the Legislative Reference Service prepared and sent to you a memo dated April 28, 1965.

The interest shown by other Members of Congress in this subject has been so great that we decided to expand the material and issue it as a report. In this way we could more easily answer the many requests we have received for the information.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH L. ELSBREE, *Director*.

The Impact of Street Lighting on Crime and Traffic Accidents

(By Nancy Berla, Education and Public Welfare Division, Oct. 5, 1965)

J. Edgar Hoover has said, "It is axiomatic that darkness is an ally to crime. The thief, the arsonist, the rapist, the peeping tom, and all other perverse individuals often depend on darkness to cloak their misdeeds and conceal their identities."[1]

Twelve times as many crimes of violence are committed at night as in the daytime. Major crimes that occur at night cost the Nation about $20 billion every year. In Salt Lake City over 95 percent of all aggravated assaults take place at night. In Minneapolis 92 percent of the burglaries occur after dark. In Pittsburgh 85 percent of the stolen cars are taken at night.[2]

In a recent survey of police officials made by the Street and Highway Safety Lighting Bureau, it was reported by police chiefs that from two-thirds to three-quarters of all crimes are committed at night. Of these, an average of two-thirds took place in dimly lit areas.[3]

The daily average of burglaries in the months of December, January, February, and March of 1961 was 12 percent above the rest of the year. These are the months when periods of darkness are the longest. Another 1961 survey revealed that about 75 percent of the nighttime burglaries occurred in buildings where no lights were left burning.[4]

The National Safety Council reports that in 1963 43,600 deaths occurred in traffic accidents. Of these, 53 percent or 23,100 resulted from night accidents. Since nighttime traffic is only one-third that of the daytime hours, the night death rate is two and a half times as great as the day rate—10 deaths per 100 million vehicle-miles at night as compared with 4 deaths per 100 million vehicle-miles during the day.[5]

One expert has undertaken an analysis of the causes of traffic fatalities taking into account factors such as drinking, improper driving, and defective vehicles, which would be responsible for both daytime and nighttime accidents. After subtracting these accidents from the total, he estimates that in the year 1963 darkness on streets and highways apparently accounted for 8,030 fatalities.[6]

John E. Ingersoll, assistant director of the Field Service Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, made this statement in a speech before a community lighting conference in Chicago, in 1962: "It is the considered opinion of many responsible law enforcement officials that well conceived and developed streetlighting programs have decidedly beneficial effects on crime and traffic conditions * * *. Most police chiefs would welcome some way to minimize the effect of darkness. Many of our problems would then be solved. Because we obviously cannot completely eradicate darkness, then we must look for ways to minimize its dangers to public safety. We must learn more, for example, about the effective use of artificial light."

In a number of studies undertaken during the past 10 years an attempt has been made to measure the effect of improved street lighting on the incidence of crime and traffic accidents. The specific conditions in each city mentioned below are different, but in all cases the conclusions reached are that fewer crimes are committed and fewer traffic accidents occur following a significant increase in the level of illumination.

STREET LIGHTING AND CRIME

During a 2-year period (1953–55) more than 5,000 new lights were installed along every mile of the streets of Gary, Ind. A tabulation of reported crimes showed that the number of criminal assaults reported declined more than 70 percent and robberies decreased more than 60 percent. The decrease occurred in spite of a 27-percent increase in the population of Gary during the 2-year period.[7]

In a comprehensive street lighting effort in McPherson, Kans., a light was installed for every 2½ homes in the residential area. The project resulted in a sixfold increase in brightness. The incidence of nighttime prowling, window peeping, and burglary in the area was reduced 92 percent. The relighting in Chattanooga, Tenn., of a 12-block district which had experienced a very high homicide rate was followed by a 70-percent reduction in major crimes committed there.[8]

In larger cities, too, a reduction in crime has followed improved street lighting programs. In 1949 officials in Cleveland began a comprehensive program to improve street lighting in that city. When one-third of the lights had been installed, a check of crime statistics showed that the number of assaults reported had declined by one-third. Purse snatching had been reduced 78 percent, and the incidence of other night crimes was down 17 percent.[9]

The program in Indianapolis, Ind., involves the installation of 1,000 new lights each year. Crime and traffic reports are used to pinpoint those streets most in need of new lights. In 1960, there was a 60-percent reduction of nighttime crime on the streets which had the new lighting.[10]

In 1957, New York City officials decided to try an extensive street lighting program in an 111-block area in 5 of the most crime-ridden precincts. Earlier efforts to reduce the crime rate, such as saturating the area with plainclothesmen, had been only partially successful. The improved lighting fixtures provided 125 percent more light. Crime statistics were kept for the 3-month period following the relighting program to be compared with these prior to installation. In this 3-month period, there occurred a 71-percent reduction in the number of crimes reported.[11] During the next 2 years, the incidence of murder, assault, and rape dropped 49 percent in this district, and juvenile complaints declined 30 percent.[12]

A study made in Boston in 1959 used a different method but obtained the same results. A neighborhood committee in the south end, where a high crime rate exists, pinpointed the exact location of 104 offenses, from purse-snatching to assault, committed between August and December 1959. The results showed conclusively that on the blocks which had modern lighting fewer crimes were perpetrated.[13]

One writer[14] agrees with others that street lighting is an important factor in crime prevention and traffic safety, but he also points out that many variables are involved in compiling statistics of this sort. Such factors as which types of crime are considered, whether crimes taking place in the lighted areas or throughout the whole city are used, and whether crimes occurring both during the day and night are included can have a significant effect on the resulting statistics.

He cites a study made in one city where an increase of 250 percent in lighted streets took place from 1950 through 1954. When comparisons were made between the percentage of crimes committed at night, no reduction occurred in the categories of rape or larceny. A slight reduction appeared in highway robbery and burglary, and a significant decrease (17 percent) in auto thefts was recorded. However, a comparison of certain crimes during the peak month of October before and after the lighting was installed showed reductions of 16 percent in assaults, 33 percent in robberies, 5 percent in auto theft, and 10 percent in burglary.

"In this study, incidentally, great opportunity existed for misuse of statistics. The ones which I have quoted show the reductions found by measurements of the percentage change in night crimes. Had the actual change in number of night crimes been used (without regard to the number occurring during the daylight hours) then assaults could have been said to have been reduced from 24 night crimes in October 1945 to only 13 in October 1954. This would have been an apparent reduction of 54 percent.

"Similarly, robberies were numerically reduced from 26 at night in 1954 to only 6 at night in 1954. This reduction would have amounted to 77 percent. I have given these somewhat confusing figures to you solely for the purpose of illustrating the care which must be taken in applying statistics."[15]

The editorial writer for the Christian Science Monitor concludes: "These studies made in blight-threatened neighborhood 'laboratories,' should provide valuable information for city councils, city managers, and voters in all communities debating the usefulness of this weapon for preventing crime. Lights are not, of course, the whole answer, but they are an important and relatively inexpensive beginning to an overall attack."[16]

STREET LIGHTING AND ACCIDENT RATES

In many of the cities experiencing lower crime rates after street lighting was improved, a drop in the number of traffic accidents was also noted.

In Nashville, Tenn., it was reported that following a lighting program, the night traffic accident rate declined from 40 to 20 percent despite a 50-percent increase in motor vehicle registration over the same period.[17] Indianapolis noted a 54-percent decrease in night traffic accidents, after the initiation of a comprehensive street lighting program.[18]

The fact that Chicago's northwest expressway is continuously lighted over its 16-mile length is alleged to be responsible for the low traffic fatality rate on this highway. In 1961, there were .74 deaths per 100 million vehicle-miles on the Chicago expressway, as compared with a national average of 2.3 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles on all expressways.[19]

---

[1] A Brighter Las Vegas. Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 10, 1965.

[2] Don Murray. "How Bright Lights Reduce Crime." Coronet, February 1960, p. 30.

[3] Police chiefs say "Light Deters Crime." Distributed by Street and Highway Safety Lighting Bureau, 55 Public Square, Cleveland, Ohio.

[4] John Edgar Hoover. "The Lighted Way." General Federation Clubwoman magazine, February 1963.

[5] J. Parker Heck. "Traffic Accidents Claim 43,600 Lives in 1963." Street and Highway Lighting, 1964 third quarter, pp. 12–13.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Don Murray. Op. cit., p. 33.

[8] Ibid., p. 32.

[9] "Lighting Can Cut Crime." The American City, May 1964, p. 131.

[10] "Planned Light Prevents Crime and Reduces Accidents." The American City, March 1963, pp. 125–126.

[11] Hyman Goldberg. "Crimes of Darkness." Cosmopolitan, April 1959, pp. 60–65.

[12] "Lighting Can Cut Crime," op. cit., p. 131.

[13] Editorial. Christian Science Monitor, June 27, 1959.

[14] Paul C. Box. "Accident and Crime Prevention Experience with Modern Roadway Lighting." A paper presented at the Roadway Lighting Forum, reprinted in Street and Highway Lighting, 1964 second quarter, pp. 19–27.

[15] Paul C. Box, op. cit., p. 21.

[16] Christian Science Monitor, op. cit.

[17] A Brighter Las Vegas. Op. cit.

[18] "Planned Light Prevents Crime and Reduces Accidents." The American City, March 1963.

An additional benefit occurred in the case of Hartford, Conn., drivers. Improved street lighting which cost the city $20,000 was followed by a lower number of traffic accidents which in turn resulted in the reduction of insurance rates by 8 percent over a period of 5 years. This saved 22,500 car-owning residents $4 each per year.[20]

Between 1953 and 1960, new lights were installed in nine locations in the State of Virginia. A study made by the Virginia Department of Highways indicated that the number of traffic accidents at these locations decreased 38 percent and the traffic fatalities dropped 90 percent.[21]

In its reporting of 1963 traffic fatalities, the Montana Highway Patrol classified the fatal accident statistics according to whether they occurred in daylight, in darkness where the street was lighted, or in darkness on an unlighted street. The results are shown in this table:

	Accidents	*Total fatalities*
Daylight	5,532	75
Lighted streets and highways	1,113	15
Unlighted streets and highways	2,285	88

These statistics show that the ratio of deaths to accidents on dark streets was 1 death per 25.9 accidents, while the ratio of fatalities to the number of accidents was virtually the same in the case of daylight accidents (1 to 73.8) and streets lit at night by artificial lighting (1 to 74.2).[22]

LIGHTING STANDARDS AND COSTS

The Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) is the authoritative source of technical knowledge on lighting in the United States and Canada. The IES has the responsibility for establishing a standard practice for street and highway lighting. Such a code is then submitted to the American Standards Association (ASA) for acceptance, rejection, or modification. Once approved, a standard practice represents a guide to minimum good practice, taking into account current technical knowledge and prevailing economic factors. The most recent Standard Practices in the area of street lighting were published in 1962.

According to J. Parker Heck, education director, street and highway lighting bureau, fewer than 100 of the more than 18,000 incorporated towns and cities in the United States meet minimum lighting code standards prescribed by the ASA.[23] The Edison Electric Institute has estimated that not more than 15 percent of the downtown streets in the Nation are adequately lighted, and only about one-tenth of 1 percent of the streets in residential areas meet the ASA minimum standards.[24]

According to the Edison Electric Institute, "the chief deterrent to adequate street lighting is one of cost."[25] It is difficult to make a cost esimate for improving street lighting in a city, State, or the Nation due to the many variables involved. Experts from the Edison Electric Institute have stated:

"So much depends on the existing local conditions that such an estimate if it were to have a semblance of validity would have to be made for each individual community. For example, the present level of street lighting intensity varies greatly not only between cities, but also between areas in the same city. There is also a wide variation in the type and cost of fixtures used to obtain the same level of illumination. Some communities own all the street lighting equipment and contract with the utility for electricity and also inspection and maintenance. Others only buy electricity. In still others the utility charges include provision for ownership of some or all of the equipment as well as inspection, maintenance, and electricity."[26]

Various cities have undertaken comprehensive street lighting programs and have given broad estimates of the costs involved. Beginning this year, 3,000 street lights are to be installed on 73 miles of Las Vegas streets. The cost is estimated to be between $1.5 and $2 million.[27] In Seattle, Wash., 24,000 new fixtures are needed to bring 1,225 miles of residential streets up to IES standards. The cost of this project is $4 million.[28] The street lighting program in New York City, described above, required an expenditure of $500,000 to buy and install the new equipment. However, it was found that the new lamps use $9 less electricity apiece each year and give more than twice as much light.[29]

In the case of highway lighting, illuminating engineers say the lighting cost is generally less than 1 percent of the total cost of the highway. Installation of adequate lighting is considerably cheaper if it is done at the time the highway is constructed.[30]

The police chief of Gary, Ind., justifies such expenditures this way, "A good street light is as valuable as a good policeman, and a lot cheaper."[31]

"Only in recent years have case histories provided proof positive that proper street lighting can cut nighttime fatalities by 50 percent. For the entire nation, this means a saving of 20,000 lives annually, plus an economic savings estimated to be $2 billion per year."[32]

THE DODD BILL AND THE WAR AGAINST CRIME

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in an editorial that appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on March 11, 1966, strongly endorsing the President's proposals for a nationwide war against crime.

The paper terms the proposals a "mixture of immediate steps, experimental projects, and long-range programs to strike at the social conditions that breed lawlessness."

In the area of immediate action the paper feels that nothing is more important than ending the "easy availability of deadly weapons to professional criminals, to delinquent youth, and to the disturbed and deranged."

Knowing that it will be read with interest, I include this editorial in the RECORD.

THE DODD BILL AND THE WAR AGAINST CRIME

President Johnson's proposals for a nationwide war against crime are a mixture of immediate steps, experimental projects and long-range programs to strike at the social conditions that breed lawlessness.

In his message to Congress, the President charted an ambitious and far-ranging campaign against both organized and spontaneous crime. He spoke in tones of urgency.

Crime, he said, exacts a high cost in money and an even more widespread cost "from millions in fear * * * fear that can turn us into a nation of captives imprisoned nightly behind chained doors, double locks, barred windows * * * fear that can make us afraid to walk city streets by night or public parks by day * * *. These are costs a truly free people cannot tolerate."

He does not exaggerate. The trouble is there are no easy answers, no pat solutions. The sweep and variety of his proposals reflect an awareness of the complexity involved.

Among other things, the President wants to speed up the administration of justice in the courts, to reform the bail system so that the poor are not its principal victims, to have drug addicts treated as sick people rather than criminals, but to deal severely with pushers.

Certain steps are recommended to Congress for immediate attention. One is a doubling of Federal assistance to local police departments for improved training and other purposes. Another is the modernization of laws to "facilitate the prosecution of criminals."

In the area of immediate action nothing is more important than ending the "easy availability of deadly weapons to professional criminals, to delinquent youth and to the disturbed and deranged."

This is simply a renewed plea for passage of the Dodd firearms-control bill that languished in committee at the last session of Congress. It would prohibit the mail-order sale of firearms to individuals and impose other checks on the scandalous and deadly traffic in firearms in this country.

This bill will provide the real test of the administration's commitment to a serious attack on crime. This newspaper hopes the President brings all of his talents of persuasion to bear on passage of this key bill.

AMENDING THE SENIORITY RULE TO MAKE SERVICE BY CONGRESSMEN IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH MORE ATTRACTIVE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

---

[19] "Continuous Lighting Reduces Accidents." The American City, September 1963.

[20] "Modern Lighting for $1 a Year." The American City, August 194, p. 121.

[21] "Lighting Cuts Accidents on Virginia Highways." The American City, March 1964.

[22] J. Parker Heck, "Traffic Accidents Claim 43,600 Lives in 1963." Op. cit.

[23] "Lighting Can Cut Crime." Op. cit.

[24] Edison Electric Institute. Street Lighting Manual, 1963, p. xiii.

[25] Ibid., p. 81.

[26] Letter from Edison Electric Institute to Economics Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, dated Mar. 19, 1965.

[27] "Ambitious Lighting Program." Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 3, 1965.

[28] "Mercuries Boost Light Levels Fivefold." The American City, January 1965, p. 117.

[29] Don Murray, op. cit.

[30] Guide to Nighttime Highway Safety. Street and Highway Safety Lighting Bureau.

[31] "Lighting Can Cut Crime." Op. cit.

[32] Edison Electric Institute, op. cit., p. xiii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, both Congress and the executive branch would benefit from a slight change in the seniority rule which would make it more attractive for Members of Congress to serve temporarily in high-level posts in the administration.

I have recently submitted such a proposal for an amendment in the seniority system to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Because I believe many Members would be interested in this proposal, I ask that my statement to the Joint Committee be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

Congress ought to be an important source for the political executives who must be constantly sought for the administration. The service of Congressmen as administrators would help the President meet his need for men with a keen sense for policy. Their return to Congress would add the influence and experience of former heads of departments and agencies to the legislative process. Relations between the two branches could be improved and the United States, with its separation of powers system, could obtain some of the advantages of the broadening combination of executive and legislative service characteristic of parliamentary government.

As it is now, however, a Member of Congress who serves in the executive branch and is reelected to the same body starts again at the bottom in seniority, ranking ahead of only those Members first elected in the year in which he is reelected. This, plus the difficulty of winning back a seat after an absence of several years, strongly discourage executive branch service by Members of Congress.

Should we consider altering the seniority rules so that under certain conditions a returning Congressman would resume his seniority?

The text of my statement on this proposal follows:

A Proposal To Make Service in the Executive Branch More Attractive to U.S. Legislators

(Statement by Representative Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin, to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, Mar. 3, 1966)

In the course of its review of congressional organization and procedure the joint committee will, I hope, give consideration to the opportunity which exists to enlarge the role of Congress in our governmental system by making the membership of the House and Senate more available as a source of recruitment for high-level positions in the executive branch.

This can be done quite simply by amending present seniority practices so that a legislator who leaves Congress to accept such a position in the executive branch would maintain his seniority if he should later be reelected to Congress.

I. Congress ought to be, but unfortunately is not, a prime source of recruitment for high-level positions in the executive branch.

(a) There exists among Members of Congress talents and abilities useful in policy-making positions in the various departments and agencies.

New national administrations have in recent years drawn increasingly on business, on the universities, on philanthropic foundations and on the ranks of the career civil service in their endless search for capable and knowledgeable people to serve as high-level officials of major departments and independent agencies. These are the so-called political executives—the lieutenants of the Chief Executive, charged both with implementing his policies within the bureaucracy and with arguing for and defending his program before the public.

Experience in Congress is a valuable background for the requirements of top-level positions in the executive branch. A study by Walter Kravitz of the Governmental and General Research Division of the Library of Congress, dated February 8, 1966, summed up the advantages of congressional service this way:

"After spending many years, and in some cases decades, on specialized committees and subcommittees, many Members of Congress have become acknowledged authorities in their fields. Indeed, it has been said of of some chairmen and high-ranking members that they know more about the organization, administration and problems of the Federal agencies with which they deal than do those agencies' administrators, especially at the appointive level."

Important, too, in addition to the knowledge of particular Government programs, is the broad understanding of the process of formulating and carrying out national policy to be found among Members of Congress, and the comprehension of both the possibilities and the limitations of political action, growing out of long experience on the Washington scene.

(b) Many of the difficulties encountered in the recruitment of executives from outside the Government would not be encountered in an expanded effort to draw individuals from Congress.

The Library of Congress study noted six respects in which this seems to be the case:

1. "Reluctance on the part of individuals from business and industry to accept the financial sacrifice entailed by Government service. The pay is usually lower, the fringe benefits not so generous, and the future uncertain.

"For Members of Congress, salaries and benefits would be roughly comparable.

2. "Outsiders may be reluctant to divest themselves of holdings which might result in conflicts of interest.

"Members of Congress will find far fewer problems of this sort moving into an official position than will executives of business corporations.

3. "Among some businessmen and outsiders, service with the Government still tends to be held in low prestige.

"Members of Congress have no such view.

4. "Unfamiliarity with, and fear of, the redtape of Government bureaucracy, and an alleged loss of freedom and independence, still deter many outsiders from accepting posts with Federal departments and agencies.

"Members of Congress, on the other hand, are familiar with these procedures and know how to operate within them.

5. "One of the really critical qualifications for Federal service is often hardest to find among individuals in private affairs: That is, a sense for politics and an ability to deal effectively with Congress.

"This is the world, of course, in which Members of Congress have made their careers.

6. "Outsiders are often, finally, reluctant to move their families to an unfamiliar city and social environment.

"Members of Congress have established households in Washington."

(c) Only a few Members, however, have moved between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

One of the great strengths of our Federal system—though seldom commented on explicitly—has been the free movement of individuals not only between a city council and the State legislature, or between a State legislature and Congress; but also between a mayor's office and the State senate, and between a governorship and Congress, in a continual blending of executive and legislative experience. Not many men will be able, as was the late James F. Byrnes, to serve with great distinction at the top level of all three branches of our National Government. But it is an ideal to be encouraged.

There are in Congress at the present time a number of men who have held major positions in the executive branch. Senators Robert Kennedy and Abraham Ribicoff have been members of the President's Cabinet. Senator Stuart Symington is a former Secretary of the Air Force. Senator Thruston Morton is a former Assistant Secretary of State, as is Senator Donald Russell.

In the House, experience within the executive branch tends to have come at a more junior, lower level, often in staff positions and frequently at a relatively early stage in the Member's career. Representative Ken Hechler is a former special assistant to President Truman. Representative Jonathan Bingham served in the Department of State and later as deputy and acting administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration. Representative Clarence Long is a former staff member of the Council of Economic Advisers. Representative Tom Murray served during the early 1940's in the Office of the Solicitor of the Post Office.

This list is by no means complete. But it is representative. Particularly worth noting is that in many cases the executive branch service tends to have come during World War II. Barring another such untypical period Congress may, therefore, gradually tend to lose much of its presently accumulated first-hand experience in administrative service over the coming years.

Worth noting, too, is that so far as there is a discernible movement of individuals between Congress and the Executive, it occurs mainly as a flow away from the House, through the Executive and eventually into the Senate. The "purest" cases are those of Senator George McGovern, who began in the House, moved to the executive branch as a special assistant and director of food for peace in 1961–62, and then came to the Senate; and of Senator Clinton Anderson, who served three terms in the House, then became Secretary of Agriculture, and then came to the Senate in 1949.

II. Here are two obstacles discouraging Representatives and Senators from making themselves available for temporary service in a national administration, but the principal one is the present arrangement for determining seniority within the committees and subcommittees of Congress.

(a) Since ours is not a parliamentary system, a Member intending to serve with the Executive is obliged to resign his seat, and to return to the House must run for election and win again.

This is in itself a significant restraint. The seat a man vacates when he goes to serve with an administration is soon filled by another, who quickly begins making his own record, and building his own ties with the district. And—unlike the British system, in which a member of Parliament may seek out a constituency safe for his party in which to stand for election—Members of Congress still generally reside in and represent individual districts.

It would not, however, be an insuperable obstacle, by itself. From time to time, in different parts of the country, there be Congressmen willing to take the gamble, who would—after leaving the administration—try to secure again the endorsement and the nomination of their party, and who would, occasionally, be able to win back their seats. Occasionally, too, a Member who had at the time of his resignation represented one particular House district (perhaps of a larger city) would find an opportunity to move to a neighboring district where he had also been known, where he could run for election and win.

(b) The true deterrent is the present requirement that, upon returning to Congress, the Member starts again at the bottom of the seniority ladder in committees.

At the present time the two parties differ in the House in their practice for assigning to committees Members returning after an absence of one or more terms. The Republicans grant him some priority in claiming the committees on which he formerly sat; the Democrats do not. Both parties, however (and this is what is crucial) provide that—however senior the Member at the time he resigned from the Congress to enter the executive branch—he starts, upon reelection, behind all those Members newly elected during his absence and ahead only of those members of the committee elected the previous fall who do not have prior service.

This arrangement operates with particular force to discourage Members of Congress from resigning to serve in the executive branch, since it is precisely those more senior and better experienced Members—those most likely to be sought out by an administration as high-level officials—who have the most to lose by resigning.

III. This obstacle could be removed by providing that a Member who resigned to serve in the executive branch could, upon reelection, resume the places on his committees which he held when he left.

(a) A simple resolution of the party caucuses would be sufficient to introduce a basic change in the system for committee appointments.

The Library of Congress study points out:

"The seniority system is based on custom, not on rule. There are no formally adopted delineations of it. It remains in effect because the parties in both Houses of Congress voluntarily adhere to it. Technically the rules provide that committee appointments shall be made by each House (cf. Senate rule XXIV and House rule X). Actually, both chambers automatically accept the will of the parties. Members once assigned to committees retain their positions and their rankings without change unless their party's ratio on that particular committee is reduced, in which case the lowest ranking Members are dropped first. Assignment of new Members and transfers are decided on by the Committees on Committees.

"Again speaking technically, the powers of the committees on committees in both Houses and in both parties flow from authority delegated to them by the party caucuses. They are creatures of the caucuses and their decisions are subject to the approval of their parent political bodies. Since the final power lies with the caucuses, they may alter the present system as they choose or make exceptions to it. For example, at the beginning of the 89th Congress the House Democratic caucus reduced the seniority ranking of two Members.

"There is little question, therefore, that the caucuses have the authority, if they desire, to alter the present seniority system so as to provide that Members of Congress appointed to the highest level posts in the executive branch, and particularly posts requiring Senate confirmation, could, if later reelected to the same House, retain their seniority standings."

(B) None of the possible objections and complications really invalidates this essential proposal.

A number of specific questions do arise, both as to which appointments to positions in the executive branch should be covered *under this special provision in the seniority* system, and as to the particular adjustment of rankings within a committee or subcommittee.

Let me spell out the answers as I see them * * * with the aim, consistently, of keeping the adjustments in the seniority system as small and as uncomplicated as possible.

1. The right of return to committee posts should come into effect only for a Member who resigns while currently holding his seat. It should not be available to a lame duck who might be offered an appointment to an executive agency in the fall of the year following an election in which he either did not run or had run and been defeated.

2. The right ought to be limited in terms of the number of executive branch positions to which it would apply. One simple yet workable approach would be to limit it to those posts requiring confirmation by the Senate.

3. The provision ought to be open to any Member of Congress—specifically including even those most junior Members of the House and Senate.

4. It would be wise, however, to limit the right to a stated length of time. The value to Congress of a Member's temporary service in the executive branch will be greater, and the complications of his return fewer, if the period is limited to, say, 4 or 6 years.

5. Guarded and circumscribed in this way, it would be possible then for the change in the present arrangements to provide that a Member returning to Congress after such service with the executive branch would be permitted to return to the place on the committees and subcommittees which he would have held if in fact he had never left the Congress at all.

One other option, of course, would be to provide that a Member returning after such service would take the place on his committees and subcommittees to which he would then be entitled by the number of terms he had served on those committees prior to his resignation to join the executive branch. This sort of complicated arrangement could, however—particularly when a rapid turnover of committee positions can be anticipated—effectively raise up the same obstacle to a Member's serving in the administration which we have been trying to remove. If Members' service in policymaking executive positions is really to be encouraged, I am inclined to think the former, simpler arrangement will need to be adopted.

6. We can assume that most Members who might resign under this new provision would later be reelected from the same district from which they were originally elected. I see no objection, however, to making this a privilege that resides with the individual House Member, rather than with the district from which he comes. This approach would also avoid complications that might arise as a result of a redistricting during the period the Member was serving with the executive branch.

IV. The resulting freer exchange of personnel between the two branches of Government should be of important benefit both to the Executive and to Congress.

As the Library of Congress study points out:

"The complexities of today's public policy issues and their almost overwhelming number have resulted in serious management and organizational problems for both the executive branch and Congress. The increase in the number of persons sufficiently expert and experienced to meet the multifarious interests of the Federal Government has not kept pace with the need. Consequently, expertise has become a relatively rare and valuable social resource."

Little more need to be said about the desirability, to the executive branch, of opening up the Congress as a source of recruitment *for political executives.*

There would be important advantages to Congress, too, from any new arrangement which actively encouraged Members to take temporary service with an administration and thereafter to resume their legislative careers. It would open up an additional channel of influence for its Members. And it would bring back into its Chambers, ultimately, the additional influence and knowledge earned by those who have served as high-level officials in the executive branch.

It would also, not least, contribute significantly to a better understanding and smoother relationship between the two branches of our Government.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress carries not only an official charge to review the organization of committees and the rearrangement of functions within the House and Senate but also, in a broad sense, an informal charge to consider the changes and adjustments needed to keep Congress in the future, as it has been in the past, the strongest and most viable parliament of any government in the world. Changes, and new approaches, will be required for Congress to retain its vital role. I hope the joint committee will study the proposal I have been discussing, and will perhaps commend it to the Houses of Congress as a feasible and desirable step for either or both of them to take.

WGST CELEBRATES 44TH YEAR

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, 44 years is a venerable age among radio stations. That is the anniversary which WGST—the Georgia Tech radio station—in Atlanta, Ga., celebrated on March 17, 1966.

The year 1922 was a boom year in the recently born field of radio. The old radio committee of the Department of Commerce began licensing radio stations for the primary purpose of providing weather information for farmers. Early that year the Atlanta Constitution applied for a license to operate such a station and on March 15, 1922, that license was granted. The station signed on the air 2 days later at 7 p.m., Friday, March 17, 1922.

The following year the Constitution presented the fledgling station to the Georgia School of Technology and the call letters WGST were initiated. Forty-four years later the station continues its tradition of service and has proven one of the most valuable endowments of Georgia Tech.

Today the station operates at 920 kilocycles with 5,000 watts. WGST is operated under the auspices of the radio committee of the board of regents university system of Georgia for and on behalf of the Georgia Institute of Technology. Chairman of the radio committee is Mr. John Langdale, of Valdosta, and general manager of WGST is Mr. John W. Collins.

WGST has been a pacesetter in the field of radio communications in Georgia, the South, and the Nation. In the first month of operation the station set a long distance record when a two-way communication was established with San Francisco. Letters reporting reception were received from as far away as Alaska. On the second day of broadcasting the station aired a live concert by the Emory University Glee Club.

Some notable instances of service in WGST's history:

When a tornado devastated Gainesville, Ga., on April 6, 1936, WGST dispatched three cars with engineers, nurses, announcers, and medical necessities to the scene. The first communication between the stricken community and the outside world was established by the WGST engineers.

In 1962 WGST founded the Georgia News Network which has for the first time in the history of Georgia linked radio stations in every area of the State into a massive news gathering and disseminating media. The member stations of the Georgia News Network feed news from their coverage area to the WGST newsroom where it is edited and compiled into a 15-minute newscast which is fed via telephone lines to the member stations each weekday morning. The Georgia News Network has been utilized for many important events. WGST is the originating station for "Southern Farm Facts," a 5-minute daily program aired over 51 stations in the Southeast. Thus the interest of the farmer is still served as was the original licensed objective of the station.

As WGST enters its 45th year plans are underway to grow with Atlanta, particularly in the area of local news coverage. Two additional mobile news units complete with the latest transistorized equipment are being placed into service, along with a Portamobile transmitter.

I join WGST's many friends in saluting its achievements.

THE NEED FOR A VICE PRESIDENTS' HOUSE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rostenkowski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, let me point out one over-riding, salient fact in all this discussion about a Vice Presidential residence.

There is no disagreement about the need for such a building.

It has been suggested, advocated, and declared a simple necessity for more than 35 years, although offers of fine homes were made to the Federal Government long before.

But since the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, the office of the Vice President has been escalated into the status of "Assistant President," although we are reluctant to use this terminology. Every Vice President since Harry A. Wallace was delegated as a roving ambassador to the world at large, the duties of the Vice President have multiplied enormously.

This is common knowledge. And so is the realization that we are not giving the Vice President proper and adequate facilities and the tools to do the job all of us expect him to do. We get evidence of this every week, just by reading the daily press. There is a constant scramble to provide the Vice President with suitable quarters for conferences, ceremonial functions, and the social events demanded by international custom and courtesy. There cannot be argument that we are attempting to create good impressions on our visitors and abroad. And who will argue that we often fall short of putting our best foot forward at some of these occasions.

Again, I say that there is universal agreement that we need a Vice-Presidential residence and consent that it is a pressing problem.

With this universal admission and agreement, it just does not make commonsense to say: "Sure we need such an official residence—but not now—let us wait. Let us have another Commission to mull it over."

There never was a better time than now to get on with a job which needs to be done and delayed too long.

Any more study or investigation by any group would be sheer waste of the taxpayers' money. The proposal given to us today is well planned; it has foresight and financial prudence. Above all, it recognizes our obligations and responsibilities and it will meet them in the best way possible.

MICHIGAN CITY RED DEVILS WIN INDIANA STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I call to the attention of my colleagues this year's Indiana State championship basketball team, the Michigan City Elston High School Red Devils, from my congressional district.

In the State of Indiana, the sport of basketball is rivaled only by what some observers have called the sport of politics. For four weekends in a row, the citizens of Indiana are the victims of an overpowering end-of-winter malady, commonly known as "Hoosier hysteria." The symptoms are argumentativeness, runny eyes, hoarse voices, a ringing in the ears, and nervous palpitations. These symptoms are the result of overcrowded and overheated gymnasiums, thunderous cheering, do-or-die pep talks, and a desire to win rarely surpassed in human competition.

The Indiana State basketball tournament, unlike tournaments in many other States, has no divisions or classes. Every high school team—large, small, public and private—competes on an equal footing until the strong have been sifted from the weak and the final champion has emerged from 4 weeks of the toughest State basketball competition in the Nation.

For the first time in the history of the school, the Michigan City Elston High School Red Devils captured the State championship and closed their finest season with a 26 and 3 record and a 20-game streak of victories.

In addition, James Cadwell, a Michigan City senior star, won the coveted Arthur L. Trester Award for Mental Attitude in tournament play. He was the 50th recipient of the annual award and the unanimous choice of the Indiana High School Athletic Association's board of control.

The other members of the 10-man championship squad are Mike Adams, Stan Farmer, Sam Garrett, Larry Gipson, Harold Kennedy, Dennis Krueger, Rob McFarland, Terry Morse, and O'Neil Simmons.

Their fine coach is Doug Adams and the assistant coach is Al Whitlow.

Warren Jones is the high school principal and Elmer Millbranth is the athletic director.

The team manager is Bob Hampton.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my congratulations to this year's Indiana State champion basketball team, the Red Devils of Michigan City.

THE 117th ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE ST. PATRICK SOCIETY OF BROOKLYN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, March 17, I had the privilege of again attending the annual dinner of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn.

The following is the program on that occasion as well as the remarks of Rev. Daniel A. Gilroy, of Our Lady of Refuge Church in Brooklyn, entitled "The Day We Celebrate":

Toasts of the 117th Annual Banquet of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn

"The Star-Spangled Banner."

Invocation: Rev. Thomas J. Swarbrick, pastor, St. Joseph's Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Toast to the President of the United States.

Speakers: Eugene F. O'Connor, chairman, dinner committee; Walter E. Cooke, president of the society, toastmaster.

"The Day We Celebrate," Rev. Daniel A. Gilroy, Our Lady of Refuge Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Benediction.

The Day We Celebrate

(By Rev. Daniel A. Gilroy)

Throughout the United States in these past few days toastmasters have called on speakers to address the audience on the day we celebrate. For no matter how far removed one may be from the Emerald Isle, St. Patrick's Day brings out the cultural ties that span ocean waters and years. St. Patrick's Day is a day of thanksgiving to a missioner who brought a people from the darkness of paganism into the light of a spreading Judeo-Christian civilization.

In the early part of the fifth century after some Roman legions were withdrawn from their outposts in Britain, mauruading sailors from Ireland invaded the unprotected coastal villages. In one such Roman colony hostages were taken back to Ireland and sold as slaves. Patrick, a teenage son of a Roman tax official, was a victim of this kind of raid, brought to Ireland and sold into slavery as a tender of herds. The long days and short nights of this lonely boy were spent in prayer and dreams and, captivated by the people of Ireland, he had visions of being a help to them.

Escaping after a few years, he traveled to the continent bent on an education, his memory ever on the people of Ireland. After he became a priest and bishop he led a band of missionaries to Erin's shore. Twenty years had passed and his love for these people had increased. Though pagan, the Irish were not primitive. They had a well developed language, a high degree of culture and complex social and legal systems.

The legend of the shamrock, the traditional symbol of St. Patrick's Day, had its roots in an incident which took place shortly after Patrick had arrived in Ireland. On the eve of Easter, which coincided with the pagan feats of Beltaine when all hearth fires were quenched, the Christian missioner pierced the dark and gloom with the new Easter fire. Summoned by King Laoghaire for breaking the law, he presented his credentials in a conflict with the Druid priests and in explaining the Christian doctrine attempted to show the reasonableness of the belief in the Blessed Trinity by plucking from the earth the three-leaf shamrock. The work thus begun with this example spread over Ireland.

In the year 461 on the 17th of March he rendered his soul to God and immediately he was assigned a place with full honors in the Irish heroic cycle. The bards who sang of heroes of times gone by found their greatest subject in the slave boy who came back to conquer for Christ.

There is a racial affinity generated by heritage and culture so that the native-born Irishman will "welcome home" one who is Irish by descent and will look upon anyone anywhere with the tiniest drop of Irish blood as one of their exiles.

The Irish are conscious of tradition and history possibly more than any other race and because of it they are never able to forget their debt to St. Patrick. The sentimental Irish nature has created a historic fixation in the offspring of their exiles who will speak with pride of the county where their forebears originated or recount deeds of the great Irish patriots.

The road that passes every door in Ireland leads to the farthest corner or nook of the globe, and once it has been traveled there is a yearning to retrace the steps of its path, a yearning which if not fulfilled in person is passed on in the blood of offspring. Because of that blood we can proudly say tonight, "Thank God for St. Patrick and the faith he gave to us."

PUERTO RICO EMANCIPATION DAY, MARCH 22, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today on the lovely island of Puerto Rico, the people of the Commonwealth will be observing Emancipation Day. This observance commemorates the day upon which slavery was abolished in Puerto Rico. It commemorates the day upon which the people of this enchanting island tasted their first fruits of victory in a long and ardent struggle for complete freedom.

It is well for all Americans to join with our fellow citizens who have come from the great Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in congratulating all Puerto Ricans upon the observance of this historic event.

It is well for us to remember that ever since the discovery by Columbus of the island in 1493 its people and its physical location have been of great importance to the economic growth and to the political security of this Nation. As a territory it played an important role in our development. As a Commonwealth it has become even more important to us.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, of the part I was privileged to play back in 1952 in helping Puerto Rico achieve its unique status as a Commonwealth.

I recall with sincere pride the courtesy of our late and beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn in permitting me to chair the proceedings on May 28, 1952, which gave Puerto Rico its self-autonomy while at the same time permitting it to enjoy the position of an associated State in our federal system. On the heels of that important act of Congress, Puerto Rico has begun a whole series of dramatic economic, social, and political developments.

In spite of being one of the most densely populated areas of the world, it has the highest standard of living among all the countries loosely described as Latin America.

We as Americans share in the pride of the people of Puerto Rico and their leaders for the manner in which they have expanded and improved their transportation, electric power, and communications systems. We are proud, too, of the manner in which their public and private housing programs are progressing so rapidly. We marvel, too, at the manner in which Puerto Rico has accomplished so much in providing expanded school opportunities for the young people and for the grownups heretofore denied education. We rejoice that the Commonwealth has developed such far-reaching social welfare benefits to the sick and the needy.

Mr. Speaker, there is indeed a benign, bloodless revolution now at work in Puerto Rico which is bringing untold blessings to the people who today celebrate their Emancipation Day. I feel particularly close to them because of my intimate friendship with so many of them who today make their homes in my congressional district. I know firsthand the splendid contribution which so many of them are making to my district, my city, my State, and to the Nation. They are devoted citizens and conscientious workers. They bring to us a warmth of friendship, a love of beauty, and a richness of culture for which we are most grateful.

I extend to all who pride themselves in their Puerto Rican heritage my warmest best wishes for continued success and happiness.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. CARTER), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana), for 30 minutes, today, on two different subjects; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. RONCALIO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. REINECKE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. MACHEN.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. BANDSTRA.

Mr. HUNGATE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10553. An act to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of

1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 969. An act to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants;

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio;

H.R. 10553. An act to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships; and

H.R. 10722. An act to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes, p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 23, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2221. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws (H. Doc. No. 414); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2222. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1966, for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2223. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the budget for fiscal year 1967, for the Federal Aviation Agency (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2224. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed during February 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2225. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the fourth annual report of the Office of Civil Defense covering civil defense functions assigned to the Secretary by Executive Order 10952 of July 20, 1961, pursuant to the provisions of the Executive order and section 406 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2226. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report that no military construction contracts had been awarded on other than a competitive basis during the period July 1, 1965, through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-188; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2227. A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting the 84th Annual National Encampment proceedings of the national organization, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83-605; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2228. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10476. A bill to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 13848. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 13849. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 13850. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to broaden the veterans' educational assistance program under that title to provide for assistance in on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 13851. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13852. A bill to authorize the construction of the Klamath River project in the State of California for flood control and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13853. A bill to establish a consolidated Federal corrections system and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13854. A bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 13855. A bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 13856. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13857. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 13858. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13859. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13860. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

My Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 13861. A bill to make the overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense eligible for assistance under titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13862. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 13863. A bill to simplify the requirements of section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments executed to secure loans from federally insured banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 13864. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 13865. A bill to provide for the temporary suspension of duty on certain granulated and ground cork and on certain natural and composition cork cut or modeled into rods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 13866. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a civilian health benefits program for retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13867. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to increase health benefits for dependents of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13868. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13869. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13870. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13871. A bill to provide for a program to advance the humane care, comfort, and welfare of laboratory animals used in scientific study; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13872. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the position of Chief Veterinary Officer of the Service and provide for the rank of Assistant Surgeon General for said position; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 13873. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children and to insure that children participating in domestic nonprofit school lunch programs will be assured of adequate supplies of nutritious dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 13874. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 13875. A bill to amend section 255 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to eliminate epilepsy as an affliction prohibiting employment of aliens on board vessels arriving in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 13876. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 13877. A bill to correct certain inequities and relieve certain liabilities arising out of overpayments of compensation to Government employees as a result of administrative error in the application of certain provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964, and other provisions of law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13878. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13879. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 13880. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 13881. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 13882. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 13883. A bill to assist the State of Florida and certain property owners in resolving problems of landownership and use of the Naval Live Oak Reservation property at Gulf Breeze, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13884. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the purposes of strengthening and facilitating mutual cooperation and assistance, including training of personnel, in the administration and enforcement of that act and of State and local laws relating to food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13885. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to improve the safety and reliability of drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13886. A bill to protect children and others from accidental death or injury by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to aspirin intended for children, safety closures on drug containers, and cautionary labeling of containers of articles subject to the act where necessary to that end, and by amending the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to ban hazardous toys and articles intended for children, and other articles so hazardous as to be dangerous in the household regardless of labeling, and to apply to unpackaged articles intended for household use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 13887. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13888. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13889. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterpart funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13890. A bill to amend titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in school health and physical education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 13891. A bill to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 13892. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 13893. A bill to permit all patients currently using the drug Krebiozen to purchase same in Illinois for use in any State until a clinical test on cancer patients is completed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 13894. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 13895. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran's having served in World War I, the beneficiary shall if otherwise eligible have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provisions of title 38 as in effect on June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13896. A bill to set a definite limit on the number of employees supervised by a foreman of mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13897. A bill to establish and maintain orderly marketing conditions for processing pears in the interest of producers and consumers, and an orderly flow of the supply thereof to market throughout its normal marketing season to avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supplies and prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 13898. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to old-age, survivors, disability, and hospital insurance protection for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13899. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to old-age, survivors, disability, and hospital insurance protection for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 13900. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to old-age, survivors, disability, and hospital insurance protection for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13901. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to old-age, survivors, disability, and hospital insurance protection for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13902. A bill to provide a method of regulating and fixing wage rates for ungraded employees in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13903. A bill to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, lumber manufacturers, and others against false grade marking of lumber, to promote interstate commerce in lumber, to strengthen the standards program of the lumber industry and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 13904. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 13905. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 967. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 968. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.J. Res. 969. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning with the fourth Sunday of February of each year as National Father and Son Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.J. Res. 970. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.J. Res. 971. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning on April 17, 1966, as National Coin Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 972. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the 7-day period beginning the second week of September this year and each year thereafter as "National Family Health Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res 973. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 974. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 787. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 788. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 789. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 790. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Res. 791. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 792. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 793. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

427. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, relative to a special milk program for children, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13906. A bill for the relief of Giusto and Maria Saltarelli Nicastro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 13907. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Margaret Catherine Laming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 13908. A bill for the relief of Varunny A. Malickel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 13909. A bill for the relief of Edward G. Beagle, Jr., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13910. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 13911. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Chicago; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13912. A bill for the relief of Fiorina Gallo Braillon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13913. A bill for the relief of Cynthia Brandford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

352. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the president, Foggy Bottom Association, Washington, D.C., relative to the proposed use of jet aircraft at National Airport, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Future Homemakers: Tomorrow's Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a youth organization that probably receives far less recognition than it deserves.

This organization is the Future Homemakers of America. March 27 through April 2 has been designated National FHA Week. Throughout the week, more than 600,000 FHA members in 11,000 chapters will observe the event. There are chapters in secondary schools throughout the United States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and in American Army post schools throughout the world.

The members of FHA are the teenagers of whom the Nation should be proud. They are home economic students in junior and senior high schools. They are the good homemakers and good citizens of tomorrow.

In Minnesota, Future Homemakers claims more than 18,000 members in 420 chapters. In my district, Minneapolis, and its suburbs there are seven chapters in six high schools. Edison, North, Patrick Henry—two—Minnehaha Academy, Roosevelt and Brooklyn Center.

Minnesota's State FHA president is Jane Marcotte of Marshall. The State adviser is Lila M. Mallough of the Minnesota Department of Education.

My congratulations, Mr. Speaker, to this fine organization and its leaders.

Restore Budget Cuts in Special Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the deletion of $82 million in the special milk program, as proposed in the President's budget, would effect a drastic curtailment of this program. Many areas of the Nation have expressed concern over this segment of the proposed 1966-67 budget. This cut would, in effect, emasculate a program designed to promote sound nutritional benefit to school children throughout the Nation.

In my own State of New York for example, the far-reaching impact of such an unwise cut would affect 4,020 schools participating in the special milk program. New York State's allocation would be reduced by an estimated $8.6 million.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide for a permanent special milk program and to insure that school children receive top priority in distribution of dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Farmers' Hides Are Taken Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the livestock industry in Nebraska, and the Nation, will suffer heavy losses if the recently imposed export quotas on hides are not immediately removed by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The export quotas on hides, declares the Department of Commerce, are to "maintain existing domestic supplies."

This means that the tanners can now buy their hides at a lower price—at the expense of the farmer. Our livestock industry would prefer to sell domestically, provided the domestic markets would pay competitive world prices.

The domestic market has already dropped 5 cents per pound for hides. This amounts to about $4 per hide. The live cattle prices dropped immediately as the result of the lower domestic hide prices. These losses are always passed back to the original producer.

In Nebraska, the export quota order will mean a loss of more than $17 million to our producers this year.

The American livestock industry and the U.S. Department of Agriculture have been overseas promoting the sales of beef and beef byproducts—and getting results.

Last year, exports of cattle hides rose to 13.3 million—and brought us almost one-quarter billion dollars. The livestock industry not only helped itself, but helped the Nation with the foreign exchange problem of gold outflow and balance of payments.

Will we be paying less for shoes, Mr. Speaker, because hides are being bought for less money by tanners? About 25 pairs of shoes are made from a hide. This means there is about 70 cents of green hide in each pair of shoes. If the price of hides drops one-fourth, this means the price of leather in a pair of shoes will go down only 20 cents. It is difficult to believe that this savings will be passed on to the purchaser of a pair of shoes.

Mr. Speaker, if it takes legislative action to negate this export quota order on hides, let us act immediately.

Questionnaire in Missouri's Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we of the 89th Congress can be justifiably proud of our record achievements during the 1st session, but many weighty decisions must still be made on domestic and foreign issues before this session ends.

In an effort to sound the sentiment and gain the advice of my constituents on a number of our more controversial measures and the more pressing issues facing us at this time, I issued a questionnaire at random throughout the Ninth District. I think the results will be of great interest to my colleagues and request permission to reprint the results following:

1. Do you approve of our Government's policy in Vietnam? Yes (1,507), no (900), undecided (135).

a. Would you favor withdrawal of troops from Vietnam, leaving the area to Vietcong? Yes (424), no (1,938), undecided (175).

b. Would you favor extending the war with widespread bombings and additional troop commitments? Yes (1,577), no (693), undecided (275).

2. Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations? Yes (671), no (1,712), undecided (153).

3. Is the poverty program effective in your area? Yes (395), no (1,195), undecided (948).

4. Do you favor expanding coverage of fair labor standards and minimum wage laws to farm workers, restaurant, motel, and filling station employees? Yes (1,759), no (657), undecided (126).

5. Would you favor an increase in congressional terms from 2 to 4 years? Yes (1,389), no (1,189), undecided (66).

The 93d Anniversary of Abolition of Slavery in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 22, marks a shining moment in Puerto Rico's history—the 93d anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in Puerto Rico.

Slavery was first introduced to Puerto Rico in 1502 when Juan Sanchez obtained permission to bring five caravels of Negro slaves into Puerto Rico free of duty. In 1513 the general introduction of slaves was authorized upon the payment of a tax of 2 ducats per head, and by 1531 over 1,500 Negro slaves had been imported. By the end of the 16th century, Negroes had largely replaced Indians in the fields and sugar mills, and slave traffic continued to expand during the 17th and 18th centuries. It has been estimated that by 1830 the Negro slaves in Puerto Rico numbered about 34,000.

The relation between masters and slaves in Puerto Rico in the 19th century probably did not differ materially from such relations elsewhere. The most barbarous customs of earlier days, such as branding, had been abandoned, but racial strife continued, as evidenced by the severity of the slaveowners and the resulting sullen resentment of the slaves.

Elsewhere in the world, significant gains were made in man's age-old struggle for freedom. Slavery was abolished in Santo Domingo in 1801; in the British dominions in 1838; in France in 1849; in Holland in 1863; and in the United States in 1865. Such events could hardly fail to have an effect upon the movement in Puerto Rico.

One difference between developments in the United States and in Puerto Rico is worthy of note. The 13 North American colonies declared their independence in 1776 and subsequently won acknowledgment of that independence, but almost a century was to elapse before our Nation saw fit to apply the doctrine of freedom to the Negro slaves. In Puerto Rico, however, the movement toward self-government proceeded hand in hand with the movement toward emancipation.

The great liberal leaders who were in the forefront of this emancipation movement have bequeathed to Puerto Rico a noble heritage. Among these courageous leaders were De Castro, Acosta, Betances, Belvis, and De Vizcarrondo.

Román Baldorioty de Castro was born in Guaynabo and educated in Madrid and Paris. He was elected deputy to the Spanish Cortez in 1870 and concentrated his efforts on the emancipation of the slaves.

José Julián Acosta, primarily an educator, was also a leading patriot and abolitionist. Elected a deputy to the Cortez in 1871, he pleaded for the freedom of the slaves.

Ramón Emeterio Betances, who was born in Cabo Rojo in 1829, graduated with a medical degree in Paris and returned to practice his profession in Mayaguez. He collected money from his friends, bought slave children, had them educated, and set them free.

Segrundo Ruiz Belvis freed all his slaves upon his return from the University of Madrid, where he had received degrees in philosophy and law.

Julio L. de Vizcarrondo, who was born in San Juan in 1830, was forced to leave Puerto Rico at the age of 20 because of his activities in behalf of the slaves. Journeying to Spain in 1864, he founded the Sociedad Abolicionista Espanola and proceeded to attack slavery vigorously in the Spanish press.

In 1873, when Amadeo, a younger son of the King of Italy, abdicated the Spanish throne, a republican government was inaugurated and the cause of human rights triumphed. On March 22, 1873, the National Assembly of the Republic of Spain unanimously voted for the abolition of slavery in Puerto Rico, and made provisions for funds with which to compensate the slaveowners. Bonds were issued, owners were compensated at an average rate of 200 pesos per slave, and slavery in Puerto Rico was abolished.

The hope for human rights and the dignity of mankind was finally realized, and to this day, the island of Puerto Rico remains an undimmed beacon in the record of man's fight for freedom.

Voter Registration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel that one of the most important developments toward perfecting the democratic process in the United States in recent years was the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and subsequent efforts in the direction of universal registration to vote.

My own State of California has always been a leader in attempts to bring as many persons to the polls to vote as possible. I am currently sponsoring a registration drive in my own district and I am sending the following message to each household in the district:

> DEAR FRIEND: As your Congressman, it is my duty to urge you to take part in determining the future of America. Register to vote if you are not now registered. Congress has expressed its intent that every citizen should vote. Remember, you are responsible for the quality of your elected officials. Deadline to register to vote in the June 7 primary is April 14.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
> *Member of Congress.*
>
> YOU MUST REGISTER BY APRIL 14
>
> If you: 1. Have not registered in California before; 2. Have moved, changed your name legally, or wish to change your political party affiliation; 3. Failed to vote in the November 1964 general election.
>
> Registration headquarters: 4304 Brooklyn Avenue, East Los Angeles, phone: 263-9383; 4408 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, phone: 666-5442.
>
> Drive chairman: Well-known East Los Angeles civic leader Richard M. Calderon.
>
> You can register at all fire stations, city halls, many markets, registrar of voters office (808 North Spring Street, Los Angeles) or call headquarters for information.

Deprive American Students To Help the Reds on Castro's Campus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the following editorial was presented over WTAE, channel 4, in Pittsburgh, by Franklin C. Snyder, vice president and general manager, Pittsburgh Broadcast Division—the Hearst Corp.:

> Criticizing any money spent by or for the United Nations is a sure way to get yourself dismissed as a square, a moss-backed isolationist, or a far-out rightwinger.
>
> We're none of these things, but we still think the proposed gift by the United Nations development program to Castro's University of Havana is pretty silly.
>
> This U.N. agency has Castro's college of communism and kookery down for $3,100,000. Since the United States furnishes 40 percent of this program's funds, more than $1 million in American taxpayers' money would go to the University of Havana, a fountainhead of international communism 90 miles from our shores.
>
> And it is an ironic fact that while we send $1,200,000 to the University of Havana, the Federal Government is practicing some education economies at home—like proposing to cut funds available for American student loans and to reduce Federal aid to land-grant colleges, such as Penn State.

A similar editorial was broadcast over WRYT radio by F. Geer Parkinson, vice president and station manager.

Listeners are understandably provoked at this disclosure, which so far has had little public notice. The whole sordid story needs to be given public circulation, for it reflects an attitude on the part of the United Nations that will continue to prevail until its major underwriter, Uncle Sam, is no longer willing to permit his money to be appropriated to the cause of those who seek to destroy him.

As pointed out in the editorial of the air, it is ironic that more than a million dollars taken from the taxpayers of this Nation should be marked for shipment to Castro's university at the very time the administration proposes to cut funds for American student loans and for land grant colleges. The pending contribution for the education of Communist students in Cuba is also in step with the administration's request to reduce appropriations for the children's lunch program in our own schools.

Adding to the insult of serving Castro's bearded scholars to the neglect of our own students is the threat to increase taxes for the purpose of carrying on in Asia the battle against the very tactics and doctrine that Communist Cuba is attempting to impose upon the entire Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, American dollars have been donated to many strange and suspicious programs in recent years, yet in the light of current conditions it is doubtful if any has been more absurd than this plot to aid Cuba's detested dictator. I trust that the White House will make it clear that the United States will not stand for such nonsense under any circumstances.

Protect Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the ill-advised price advances in the economy, now current, or in the making, that may militate against price and economic stability, pushing the economy toward very dangerous runaway inflation, and making the imposition of price controls in the not too distant future a distinct possibility.

We greatly prize our free enterprise system. It has been responsible for our unmatched national, economic progress, prosperity and high standards of wages and living.

However, at a time when we are engaged in a desperate conflict with world communism, and when there is a special need and urgency for us all to work together for the national security and national interests, it would be a great mistake to do anything that would result in abnormal price escalation and imbalance in our economy. These consequences we must energetically strive to avoid and we should be very careful how we act and what we do in respect to anti-inflationary measures.

I hope and urge that business, labor, and Government will clearly recognize the dangers implicit in unrestrained, inflationary pressures and be willing to follow the guidelines that have been laid down by the President to prevent disruptive and dangerous price increases in goods, products, commodities, and services.

I do not believe that Congress will or should impose price controls, or other stringent controls over the economy at this time, or until this action becomes absolutely necessary and urgent.

But it should be recognized by all of us that we must hold the line against inflation one way or another, and if various segments of the economy do not cooperate to that end, then in the interests of the Nation, the national leadership will have no recourse than to act drastically to protect the stability of the economy.

To my mind, failure on the part of business, labor, and Government to adhere closely and voluntarily to reasonable guidelines to forestall inflation will inevitably result in compulsory controls and this, if it becomes necessary, could take the form of general price and material controls over every facet and feature of the American economy, and this would be most unfortunate, if there is any way we can avoid such drastic controls.

I hope that the leadership of the Nation, both private and public, will realize the fact that, in the economic sense, we are in effect at present literally perched on the top of a seething, financial and inflationary volcano. We shall either dampen its fiery upsurge, or we will in time see it catapult and explode this economy onto the dangerous stormy seas of runaway inflation.

Let us take note of our predicament and the dangers before us, and act before we are engulfed by perilous economic forces that are threatening to run riot and could bring us serious injury and disruption.

Washington Report of Hon. Lester L. Wolff to Third Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my most recent Washington report to residents of the Third Congressional District of New York:

> DEAR FRIEND: As your representative in Congress, I feel that it is vital to keep you advised of important bills and projects which can affect you and your family. For your convenience, I have taken the liberty of condensing the information on six subjects. If you prefer a more detailed report on any, I would be happy to comply with your request.

APOLLO MOON PROJECT

On February 16 of this year, after little more than 1 year's effort on the Space Committee, I was pleased to announce the largest single contract ever awarded by NASA to produce the lunar excursion module (LEM), $1 billion contract, awarded to our own Long Island Grumman Aircraft of Bethpage.

What LEM means to Long Island

This means more business, more work for residents of the Third Congressional District. Another ancillary benefit accomplished by the LEM contract, is that more and more of the Nation's space effort's highly technical aspects will be concentrated in our area. This is another step toward making Long Island the eastern space center of the United States. We look forward to the building of a space center of related industries and also a greater diversification of present defense industries.

I am working together with others who feel strongly that we must create a solid economic foundation for the business stability of Nassau. Too many years have gone by with little or no attention to this problem. In the past year it has been shown that aggressiveness and coordinated planning can alleviate a major portion of the economic dislocation we have suffered in the past.

NEW GI BILL

This past November I visited Vietnam (at my own expense) for the third time in 16 months. I toured the combat areas and visited the hospitals and various troop encampments with my distinguished colleague, Representative Olin Teague, of Texas, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. During our many conversations with the young men we met, and after reviewing some of their concerns for the future, Representative Teague and I felt that a new GI bill was needed. Upon returning to Washington, we prepared the legislation. I am pleased to be able to report that as coauthor of this bill, I was called to the White House to witness President Johnson signing into law this measure that will aid thousands of our young men who have served both in combat and in times of peace. They will now receive the benefits they so richly deserve. We have available an analysis of these benefits for anyone desiring them.

CONSERVATION

Many years ago I brought my family to Nassau County because we wanted to live in a "countrified" environment. Today, we are faced with the problem of halting the onrush of bulldozers and dredges which are quickly changing the face of the entire area. Air and water pollution have also become increasing menaces. Because of deep concern about these problems, I introduced in the past session of Congress legislation, H.R. 11557, calling for a comprehensive study of the Long Island Sound shores so that we may stop indiscriminate destruction of our homes and set up a master plan to preserve as much of the natural beauty as possible while encouraging progress.

We have made progress

Conferences have been held with Congressman Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to arrange for hearings on this subject. These hearings are now being scheduled and when the dates are announced, those who are interested are invited to attend or submit statements.

I have also requested on-site inspection visits to our shoreline areas by qualified people. Chairman Aspinall has also requested reports from the Departments of Interior, Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget. I will be glad to send copies of the bill to any interested individual or organization. The backbone of this conservation effort to save the urban character of our land in Nassau will be strengthened by your support and active participation.

PET PROTECTION BILL

There has been much interest of recent date over the protection of our pets. In 1965 I introduced legislation, H.R. 9875, making it a Federal offense to transport, sell, and handle dogs and cats inhumanely. Hearings were held in Washington the week of March 7 on my bill and an approved version should be reported out shortly.

CIVILIAN AIR ACADEMY

This Nation today faces a shortage of 1,800 commercial pilots. With the ever increasing need and the advent of highly sophisticated supersonic and V/STOL aircraft, the number of pilots now being trained by the Air Force and commercial airlines falls very short of our country's needs. I have, therefore, initiated plans calling for the establishment of a Civilian Air Academy similar to the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy, which would be a 4-year Federal college devoted to the training of civilians to maintain American air supremacy.

AN INDUSTRIAL AND BUSINESS CONTRACT PROCUREMENT WORKSHOP

In an effort to broaden the base of industrial recovery on Long Island, I have initiated a procurement contract workshop which will meet for the purpose of advising industry in our area of the proper procedures for obtaining a larger share of available government contracts. Ever mindful that industry must not be dependent upon Government as their sole source of business, I believe it important that I do, however, exert every effort to help the local industry get their just share of available Government contracts. There will be about 21 Federal procurement agencies, many brought here from Washington to this workshop. They will explain the "hows" and "whys" of Government contract competition. I invite all who are in business on Long Island to join at this session to help business help itself. Please call my office for further details.

Coming to Washington?

Need any information?

If my office can be of service to, or if you have any suggestions how I can better serve you, please contact me.

Washington office: Longworth Building, room 1629, Washington, D.C., phone 225–5956.

Regional office: 156A Main Street, Port Washington, phone 767–4343.

Regional office: 333 North Broadway, Jericho, phone 681–4120.

Area office: Glen Cove Post Office, Glen Cove, phone 676–9300.

Sincerely,

Lester L. Wolff,
Your Congressman.

Budget Bureau Limitations Threaten Cutback in SCS Watershed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House action taken by the Bureau of the Budget which, unless reversed, will be extremely harmful to future operations of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service watershed program.

The Budget Bureau, I have learned, has imposed upon SCS severe limitations for fiscal year 1967 sharply curtailing the number of approvals which can be made for both planning and construction of watershed projects.

In addition, and despite the lack of any authorization from the Congress, the Budget Bureau also has placed a limitation on the number of watershed planning approvals for fiscal year 1966.

If the Budget Bureau's limitations remain in effect, the results will be as follows:

For the remainder of fiscal year 1966, SCS will be able to approve planning for only eight additional watersheds.

For all of fiscal year 1967 SCS will be restricted to providing planning for 50 watersheds and approving the actual construction of only 35 projects.

In comparison with the past operation of the watershed program, these limitations are extremely severe. For example, from fiscal year 1963 through 1965, SCS has made an annual average of 114 planning approvals and 62 construction approvals.

Thus, if the Budget Bureau's limitations for fiscal year 1967 are not removed, the scope of the present watershed program will be virtually cut in half.

The most immediate problem, however, is the Budget Bureau's limitation on watershed planning for the current fiscal year. This limitation, covering the entire fiscal year 1966, restricts SCS to providing planning for 100 watersheds.

Thus far in fiscal year 1966, SCS has given approval to planning for 92 projects. If similar assistance can be provided for only another eight watersheds before June 30, SCS will be faced with a heavy backlog of planning requests.

At present, SCS has pending 47 such requests. Included is one from my home State of Iowa, asking planning assistance for the Carter Creek watershed in Davis and Appanoose Counties. Almost certainly, more planning requests will reach SCS before the current fiscal year ends.

In my view, these planning limitations for fiscal year 1966 are unfair, both to SCS and to the local people who are awaiting approval of watershed planning requests, and I feel very strongly that the Budget Bureau should remove them.

The limitations on SCS, both for the current and the coming fiscal year, were imposed only about 2 months ago. They appear in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967, sent to the Congress on January 24, as estimates.

These estimates, however, are in fact hard and fast limitations, and SCS is working with the knowledge that the estimates cannot be exceeded. But even though the Budget Bureau has imposed the limitations, it has, to the best of my knowledge, offered no explanation for them to SCS.

If the planning limitations for fiscal year 1966 remain in effect, it will be grossly unfair to the people on the local level who have spent a great deal of time and effort reaching agreement on the watershed planning requests now pending with SCS.

Preparation for a SCS watershed project requires an enormous amount of local cooperation, perhaps more than in any other Federal program. It requires coordination between farmers in the watershed, State and local conservation officials, and personnel in the State SCS headquarters.

Thus, by the time a watershed planning request reaches SCS in Washington, it represents perhaps a year or more, and sometimes several years, of preliminary planning and cooperation among State and local officials.

If SCS cannot approve more than eight additional planning requests during the remainder of this fiscal year, the probable result is that many of the proposed watershed projects will never reach the planning stage.

The danger of this is all the more acute, of course, if the even more restrictive Budget Bureau limitations for fiscal year 1967 are kept in force.

If this should happen, and if many of these watersheds never reach the planning stage, then much of the efforts toward cooperation and preliminary planning on the local level will have been spent in vain.

In fairness to those who have invested so much time and effort in these proposed watershed projects, the Budget Bureau should lift its planning limitations for the current fiscal year.

This will allow SCS to approve a reasonable number of planning requests before June 30, unhampered by an arbitrary and unrealistic limitation. If a local watershed merits planning approval, SCS should be allowed to provide that approval.

In addition, I think it is essential that the severe Budget Bureau limitations on planning and construction for fiscal year 1967 should be removed.

If the Budget Bureau itself does not do so, then I believe the Congress should spell out, in language accompanying the SCS appropriations for next fiscal year, that these limitations shall not remain in effect.

Unless they are removed, serious damage will be done to a time-proven program which has provided valuable benefits to rural America.

Since 1954, when Congress enacted the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, rural residents have been able to utilize SCS assistance for construction of watersheds in many areas across the Nation.

These watersheds have provided much-needed measures for soil and water conservation, as well as for flood control. Moreover, SCS now provides assistance for recreational development at watershed projects, and this can be a big help in promoting economic growth in some rural areas.

The Congress now has before it proposed legislation to establish new programs for both conservation and rural redevelopment. Continued efforts in these areas are, of course, much to be desired.

In my view, however, it makes no sense at all to propose new programs for conservation and rural redevelopment and, at the same time, sharply curtail the highly effective and widely supported SCS watershed program.

Personally, I do not believe that it is the intent of the Congress that the watershed program should suffer a severe cutback, and I am therefore hopeful that the Budget Bureau limitations on SCS will be lifted.

The National Water Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Water Commission Act."

THE NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is established the National Water Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members, who shall be appointed by the President. Members shall serve at the pleasure of the President. No member of the Commission shall, during his period of service on the Commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or retired civilian employee of the United States.

(c) The President shall designate a Chairman of the Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman") from among its members.

(d) Members of the Commission may each be compensated at the rate of $100 for each day such member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission. Each member shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The Commission shall have an Executive Director, who shall be appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the President and shall be compensated at the rate provided by law for Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The Executive Director shall have such duties and responsibilities as the Chairman may assign.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall (1) review present and anticipated national water resource problems, making such projections of water requirements as may be necessary and identifying alternative ways of meeting these requirements—giving consideration, among other things, to conservation and more efficient use of existing supplies, increased usability by reduction of pollution, innovations to encourage the highest economic use of water, interbasin transfers, and technological advances such as desalting and waste water purification and reuse; (2) consider economic and social consequences of water resource development, including, for example, the impact of water resource development on regional economic growth, on institutional arrangements, and on aesthetic values affecting the quality of life of the American people; and (3) advise on such specific water resource matters as may be referred to it by the President and the Water Resources Council.

(b) The Commission shall consult with the Water Resources Council regarding its studies and shall furnish its proposed reports and recommendations to the Council for review and comment. The Commission shall submit to the President such interim and final reports as it deems appropriate, and the Council shall submit to the President its views on the Commission's reports. The President shall transmit the Commission's final report to the Congress together with such comments and recommendations for legislation as he deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission shall terminate not later than five years from the effective date of this Act.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949; as amended: *Provided,* That not to exceed five persons may be employed and their compensation fixed at salaries not in excess of GS–18, without regard to such laws; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; (7) enter into contracts or agreements for studies and surveys with public and private organizations and transfer funds to Federal agencies and river basin commissions created pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act to carry out such aspects of the Commission's functions as the Commission determines can best be carried out in that manner; and (8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this title.

(b) Any member of the Commission is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CHAIRMAN

SEC. 5. (a Subject to general policies adopted by the Commission, the Chairman shall be the chief executive of the Commission and shall exercise its executive and administrative powers as set forth in section 4(a)(2) through section 4(a)(8).

(b) The Chiarman may make such provision as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the preformance of any of his executive and administrative functions by the Executive Director or other personnel of the Commission.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall, to the extent practicable, utilize the services of the Federal water resource agencies.

(b) Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency or river basin commission created pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act is authorized (1) to furnish to the Commission, to the extent permitted by law and within the limits of available funds, including funds transferred for that purpose pursuant to section 4(a)(7) of this Act, such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with this Commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(c) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services: *Provided*, That the regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46e) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: and *Provided further*, That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

School Milk and School Lunch Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, as Congress pursues a cautious and deliberate course through a stream of complex and serious national and international issues, it is imperative that those matters of a less crucial nature not be overlooked.

One of the seemingly less crucial problems that could be an unfortunate victim of our well-intentioned preoccupation with questions of paramount importance is the appropriation for the school milk and school lunch programs.

The Nation realizes that a certain degree of fiscal restraint will be necessary to insure our Government's capacity to meet our serious challenges, particularly our commitment in Vietnam.

The question is not whether increased economy measures are needed, but rather, where these economy measures can be safely directed.

I submit that the school milk and school lunch programs, proven and valuable Government services that they are, should not be summarily sacrificed.

We should instead direct our paring knives to appropriations for less proven and less valuable services that can better absorb cuts without serious impairment of such widespread impact.

If the Vietnam conflict is to require sacrifice on the part of certain Government programs, there are alternatives open to us. We may choose to begin by temporarily restoring the excise taxes on luxury items untouched by the recent tax adjustment measure.

Another alternative would be a move to effect reasonable reductions in certain antipoverty programs. Commonsense dictates that when economy measures are required, they should begin with those programs that have not as yet won broad acceptance nor demonstrated positive effectiveness.

In order to place into perspective the terrible impact of the proposed reductions, I would like to introduce some facts on the situation in my State.

In Wyoming, with a population of approximately 340,000, some 32,000 children in 273 participating schools were served lunches during fiscal 1965. During that year, 5.2 million lunches were served. Only 3 percent of the lunches were served free to needy children. For the remaining children, the cost of the lunch was 27 cents a meal, with the Government absorbing 10 to 11 cents a lunch. Wyoming received $222,000 in Federal assistance for the lunch program.

Under terms of the proposed cut, the Government would now pay 1 cent less per lunch, which would mean Wyoming would receive $40,000 to $50,000 less, based on 1966 participation. This would result in Government assistance of $170,000 to $180,000—instead of the $222,000 last year.

During fiscal 1965, milk was served in 314 schools with 3.6 million half pints of milk served to Wyoming schoolchildren. This was over and above the 5 million included in the lunch program.

In the proposed budget, funds for this program are cut from $103 million to $21 million, and milk is to be served only in schools with no lunch program. This reduction of four-fifths means that Wyoming could expect her share to be $25,800—instead of the $129,000 received in fiscal 1965.

These children have paid 3 to 4 cents a half pint with the Government providing the other 3 cents. The immediate consequence would be a doubling of the cost of milk to the student.

This summary indicates to what a great extent this reduction would work a hardship on Wyoming students. I know it cannot be any less severe in our sister States, and with the total effect calculated, this proposed reduction can only be viewed as a serious threat to one of the most beneficial of Government programs.

The cost of these programs is actually modest when we view them as an investment in the health of our Nation's youth. The merits of establishing good dietary habits for our youth is obvious. Health is an essential factor in learning.

To restrict the chief impact to needy students is to place them in a separate and distinct category—an outlook so contrary to our American equality concept of a public school.

The school milk and lunch programs have done more than any other Federal program to improve the diet and health of American students. Now we are asked to assume the impossible task of limiting it to the needy, when we know that any ruling established will still hurt deserving children. This program must continue to be open to all students.

Because the merit is so apparent, perhaps it is best to emphasize the harmful consequence of a reduction. The increased cost would certainly cause some students to withdraw from the programs entirely, often to a totally unsatisfactory situation.

The dairy industry, already troubled by farmers leaving because of low income, would be further damaged, since these programs create and develop markets for dairy products.

The milk program supplements the dairy price support program because markets are provided for Government-purchased milk. Otherwise, the Commodity Credit Corporation would have to buy and store dairy surpluses—at a direct cost of about $100 million—or almost the cost of the milk program in 1965.

Surely the scant savings ultimately realized by this ill-advised budget cut do not justify such a move. To continue the present program, as the public most surely will demand, will merely shift the burden to State governments already beset by increasing pressures upon their resources.

There is only one practical course open to us—total restoration of the necessary appropriations, for to handicap these programs in the false name of economy would be a grave disservice to the Nation.

Soviets Continue Persecution of Jews and Denial of Religious Freedom to Celebrate Passover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Passover is almost upon us once more. Millions of Jews the world over will again commemorate the liberation of their forefathers from Egyptian bondage. Unleavened bread, or matzoh, will be baked and eaten as it was in the wilderness in the time of Moses.

How glorious it is to be alive, free, and a citizen of America. For Jews and other citizens of the Republic, the cup of foreign suffering has been averted. We can sit down to our tables and participate in our respective religious celebrations in contentment and tranquillity. The blessings of liberty are ours, and we too often take them for granted.

We may worship God according to the dictates of our consciences, secure in the knowledge that they will not be questioned. We fear no knock on our door at night; no nocturnal trip to prison to be held incommunicado; no fear of a trial that is a mockery of justice, and whose verdict is preordained; no fear of concentration camp, or bleak, unrelieved imprisonment.

But for the oppressed of this world, the cup of affliction is forcefully held to their lips, and they are forced to drink ever so deeply. Jews of the Soviet Union cannot truly celebrate Passover. They cannot bake the matzoh they need to properly commemorate their history and celebrate their culture. They are forbidden to adequately teach the fruits of 6,000 years of civilization to their sons and daughters. If they attempt these activities on a full scale, they do so at their own peril. All liberty-possessing people cannot let this pass unquestioned, unrelieved, unopposed.

The Soviet Union is writing yet another page in the book of suffering of the people of Israel. Upon Babylonian captivity, Egyptian enslavement, Spanish expulsion and inquisition, crusades, and Dark Ages savagery, Eastern pogroms, Dreyfus injustice and excruciatingly horrible torments of Nazi genocide, they are cementing another gruesome stone. If Soviet policy does not change, their name shall forever be appended to this particular page of history; befouled with suppression and the crushing of the human spirit by dictatorship.

For it is ever true of dictatorship that it cannot abide full, free expression of religion. Open worship as an expression of individuality blinds the eyes of those who thrive in the darkness of totalitarianism, casting light they continually attempt to extinguish. Yet there are those, who, at risk of all the horrors of a police state, keep the flame of religious freedom alive and alight. We must let them know they are not alone. We must let them see the glow emanating from America.

For here the Jew, along with all other refugees from the oppressors of the world, lives in sunlight. Here we have intertwined the Judeo-Christian ethic with the sublime outpourings of Jefferson. It would ill behoove America to stand silent while Jews of the Soviet Union are deprived of their birthright as human beings.

For their cup of agony of the spirit does run over. They are a living reminder to us that so long as a single human being is denied the right to worship exactly as he pleases, the rest of us live and practice our faiths in perpetual jeopardy. What is even partially denied to one is potentially a complete denial to all.

Let us again remind the Soviets of this monstrous injustice. Let us tell them once again that we regard their actions toward Russia's Jews as a denial of the fruits of 6,000 years of civilization. It must not lie fallow and unused. The enforced silence of these people is as eloquent as any wail of torment. There are nonphysical tortures that crush the human spirit as surely as a gas chamber snuffs out a life.

Let the Soviets remember that free men and those who yearn to be free have survived many burners—both of books and of people. Attilas, Hitlers, and Stalins come and go like quicksilver ephemerally flitting across the sands of time. Their mark is that of a hole left behind by a finger stuck into the water of a pond. Their trail is that of the beast. Their monuments are ruins. When mankind does remember them, it is only with disgust, not reverence.

The suffering of one who yearns to be free is the suffering of all. It is apropos that we say this as the Passover approaches, commemorating the escape of an entire people from bondage at any cost. For men have shown again and again that they will pay any price for liberty. The battle for that liberty is no less today than the struggle was then. We have not forgotten. We shall not forget. One day the Jews of the Soviet Union shall have the freedom God wills for them.

At this time I again call upon the Government of the Soviet Union to grant complete religious freedom to its citizens. Freedom on this Passover to bake matzohs, to observe the Passover properly, to educate rabbis and their children. Let this Passover and subsequent ones be completely free.

For as long as one soul writhes in the mental or physical agony of totalitarian suppression of his body or spirit; as long as one human being is deprived of freedom and yearns for it; liberty will fight furiously, endlessly, for life and full expression.

Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 16, 1966, the very distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] was the guest speaker at the Bowie-Queen Anne District Democratic Club at the Somerset Elementary School, Stonehaven Lane, Bowie.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor of speaking to the Bowie-Queen Anne District Democratic Club on many occasions and it is one of the most stimulating groups in the district which I have the honor to represent. There is no better friend of the Federal employee than the gentleman from New Jersey. He is very well known in Prince Georges County where I live. I hope that his visit to my congressional district will be repeated again and again. On behalf of the more than 70,000 Federal employees in the 5th Congressional District of Maryland, I would like to express my thanks to the gentleman from New Jersey for his untiring efforts in behalf of the Federal employee.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I insert Chairman DANIELS' speech given to the Bowie-Queen Anne District Democratic Club:

ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT, INSURANCE, AND HEALTH BENEFITS, HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE BOWIE-QUEEN ANNE DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC CLUB, BOWIE, MD., MARCH 16, 1966

Mr. Chairman, friends, I am most grateful for your kind invitation to be here tonight and to have this opportunity to meet and talk with you. Your chairman thought you might be particularly interested in hearing about some of the proposals pending before this Congress which affect Federal employees.

Every piece of legislation before the Congress is, of course, going to affect the Federal employee. He is, after all, first a citizen and only then a Government worker. He may be a parent, a veteran, a young man beginning his career in Government service, or a woman near retirement age. The Federal worker is interested in—and will be affected by—everything this Congress does with regard to education, poverty, crime, air pollution, taxes, space exploration, transportation, aid programs, and, of course, our commitments in Vietnam.

I wish we could discuss all these issues. I would like to hear from you about the decisions that must be made. But I am afraid we would be here far into next week—or the week after that.

During his time in the House, a Congressman does, however, become something of a specialist in one or two fields. Guided by the particular interests of his constituents, a Representative soon finds he is spending a great deal of his time on one or two special problems.

One of my own interests is that legislation which most directly affects Government workers—their pay raises, health, retirement, and insurance plans—those matters which come under the jurisdiction of our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, particularly, under the jurisdiction of my own Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits.

I want to quickly add that I do not claim to have all the answers on the various health, retirement, insurance, and pay plans that are before this Congress. But I have been working on these programs for several years now, and believe I can be of some help to you in explaining just what proposals are before the Congress this year which will most directly affect Federal employees.

The key item is, of course, the President's new pay and fringe benefit package. In his message to the Congress on March 7, the President asked for enactment of legislation which will provide an average pay increase for Federal civilian employees amounting to 3.2 percent. About 2.85 percent of this would be in a direct salary increase, and the rest would be in certain fringe benefits.

These benefits include proposals to allow those who reach 55 with 30 years' service to retire without any reduction in annuity. It is proposed that retirement, disability, and survivor benefits payable to Federal employees be equal to the benefits payable to other citizens under the social security system. The administration suggests that the Government provide for the transfer to the social security system of service credit to employees who die, become disabled, or leave Federal employment before becoming eligible for Federal retirement systems benefits. A phased 2-year increase in the Government contribution to the health benefits program is suggested. There is also a proposal for a one-half percent increase in the contribution of both the Federal agencies and employees to the retirement fund. The administration proposes that these changes be effective January 1, 1967.

The President also recommended the enactment into law of a clear statement of retirement policy and adjustments between the civil service and the Foreign Service retirement systems. Other important recommended adjustments in our retirement system include the extension of medicare to Federal civilian employees, the continuation of benefits until age 22 for surviving children, still in school, of deceased employees. A guaranteed minimum to widows of employees who die after retirement for disability is recommended, as are continuing benefits for a surviving widow if she remarries after age 60. The administration recommends that these latter adjustments in our retirement program be deferred for at least another year—to January 1, 1968.

The package is an attractive one. As the President has said, America expects much of its public servants, and we make vigorous demands on their time and energy. We exact high standards of work and conduct and are fortunate indeed in having a civil service corps of honest, intelligent, efficient, and dedicated men and women. I could not agree more, and I am firm in my belief that the public interest is best served when these men and women are compensated equitably and competitively for equality performance.

I am sorry, however, that the proposals do not go further. My own proposal to extend life insurance benefits introduced in the Congress last session—is not mentioned. The pay raise is not as generous as I think it should be, for it will not close the gap between compensation for Government employees and those in private enterprise. The smallest increase—approximately 1 percent—will go to the lowest grades, and the very modest higher increases—up to 4½ percent—will go to a few upper grades. The recommended effective date for the pay raise is January 1, 1967.

Frankly, I had hoped we could do better, both with pay and with retirement, insurance, and health benefits. On January 25 of this year I introduced legislation to provide a 7-percent pay raise for Federal employees. I introduced a bill to liberalize the Federal employees group life insurance act on January 10, and hearings were held on the legislation this February. This bill would broaden life insurance coverage for Federal employees, raise the limitation on the amount of life insurance allowable, increase the Government's contribution to one-third of the cost of the premium charges, and would give additional protection to retirees.

Last year I suggested an amendment to the Health Benefits Act of 1959 which would increase the Government contribution for those enrolled in Government health benefits plans. This proposal is more generous than that of the administration.

I will spare you the technicalities of these various measures, but want to emphasize that their intent is to carry out a deep and binding commitment to our Federal employees, embodied in the Federal Pay Act of 1962, that their salaries and other benefits should be comparable to those salaries and benefits earned by employees in private industry for similar types and levels of work.

In signing that Reform Act the President emphasized the need for excellence throughout our society. In his words: "Challenges cannot be met in this modern world by mediocrity * * *. We must search for brilliance, welcome genius, strive for excellence." To hold men and women with such qualities in the Federal establishment we must offer them compensation equal to that offered elsewhere.

Last year the House retreated from the position it had taken in passing a reasonably decent pay raise bill for Federal employees and accepted the watered-down version handed to us by the Senate. As the late Sam Rayburn once remarked, "Legislation is the art of the practical." We were practical and accepted the possible.

The situation in Vietnam has put us in a similar position this year. If the administration proposal falls short of reaching the state of true equality for Government workers which we seek—as I believe they do—it is because our country has many other problems to solve and other worthy goals to strive for. Earlier I mentioned some of these—schools, clean air, clean water, roads and dams, space exploration, foreign aid. Our most immediate—and most grave—problem lies in our commitment in Vietnam.

To protect this country's interests, as we must do in Vietnam, to secure our children's futures as we hope to do through our poverty and crime and other programs, we are going to have to commit a large proportion of our available resources. And while we are a vigorous nation and these resources are indeed vast, our civil servants are being asked to wait for some of the benefits to which they are entitled.

Let me state at this time that I shall vigorously oppose any attempt to make Federal employees the only group to be denied needed pay increases while other groups in our society are not so restricted. The net result of such a policy would not just be a delay for the implementation of the comparability principle, it would be more in the nature of a complete rout.

I am not about to let the comparability gap grow any wider.

The major administration proposals—the suggested pay raise, the 55–30 retirement plan, liberalized disability and survivor benefits, a modest increase in the Government's contribution to the health benefits program—will most likely pass the Congress this year. I am hopeful that my bill to widen life insurance benefits will also pass, despite the opposition of the administration. I am afraid that other proposals must await future developments.

Whatever the successes—or the compromises—reached by this Congress in the areas of pay, retirement, health, and insurance benefits, we are committed to a rational and equitable system of compensation for the Federal worker. I will continue to work toward the full realization of that goal.

The Proposed Atlantic Expressway—Unanimous Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a proposed project which has been put forward by the New York State Department of Public Works for the construction of an expressway through the South Shore of Long Island over Sunrise Highway. The voice of the people is loud and clear in unanimous opposition to the proposed route. Because some have erroneously referred to the proposed Atlantic expressway as a Federal highway, many of my constituents wrote to me voicing their opposition to the project. The project is in the early stages of planning and, therefore, the State of New York has not yet applied for Federal funds—and probably will not do so for a number of years. However, because of the unanimous opposition to the proposed project, the State of New York should study various alternative routes before large sums of money are expended for the further development of a plan which has no local support.

Residents on the South Shore, local businessmen, churches, local civic organizations, elected officials, daily newspapers and community newspapers on Long Island have spoken out with determined opposition to this proposal. Based upon letters from officials and meetings with constituents, I wrote the following letter to Governor Rockefeller on February 24, 1966:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1966.

Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I acknowledge receipt and thank you for your reply of February 15, 1966 to my telegram concerning the proposed Atlantic expressway.

I am writing again because the voice of the people on the South Shore of Long Island is coming through to Washington loud and clear, and the sounds are unanimously opposed to the proposed route. The voices are those of owners of private dwellings; businessmen whose establishments are located along Sunrise Highway; mayors of the villages along the proposed route; civic associations; boards of trade, chambers of commerce and other organizations; and lastly, but by no means the least, the voice of the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead. Of the many communications which I have received from the residents and businessmen of the South Shore not a single one speaks in favor of the proposed Atlantic expressway route.

It is important that I inform you that there is considerable confusion in the minds of the public about the manner in which a highway is developed from the planning stage to completion. The reason for this is primarily because it is being referred to as a Federal highway and secondarily because there is a lack of coordination between local, State and Federal elected officials on matters of common concern. In my telegram to Mayor Robert Sweeney, of Freeport, dated February 7, 1966, the text of which was included in my telegram to you, I pointed out that New York State is engaged in planning the highway, and has not filed an application for Federal funds. I also pointed out that under ordinary circumstances the State would not do so until after public hearings on the proposal have been held. Therefore, I am not presently in a position to ask that Federal funds be withheld from the project as I am being requested to do by most of my correspondents, who firmly believe that the proposed route is not in the public interest.

In your letter you suggest that it is premature to hold a public hearing and state that you have suggested to Superintendent McMorran that when the plans for the proposed route have been firmed up to a reasonable degree he might plan to hold an informational meeting. Most respectfully sir, I do not believe that this is a satisfactory answer for the people on the South Shore of Long Island.

A public hearing on the proposed Nassau expressway was held January 21, 1966, after detailed plans were completed and after a public announcement that work was to commence. This was considered by those who attended the hearings as too late on a project planned over a period of more than 15 years. Forty-one witnesses testified at the hearings, including the Congressman, State legislators, the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead, and village mayors. All unanimously opposed that aspect of the Nassau expressway plans which called for an overhead rather than a depressed road in certain sections of Inwood and Lawrence.

As an illustration of the feelings in the community the following telegram was received by me on February 21, 1966:

"Congressman HERBERT TENZER,
"Congressional Building,
"Lynbrook, N.Y.:

"Proposed Atlantic expressway through South Shore will be irreparably disastrous to village of Lynbrook. Request your intervention to oppose this as presently proposed and urge a complete disclosure of plans before any other steps are taken to move the project further ahead.

"GEORGE H. MANGRAVITE,
"Mayor."

Your constituents and mine are not sufficiently aware that the Atlantic expressway is a State project, requiring State approval, and that before it receives such approval, public hearings will be held.

Because of the experience on the Nassau expressways and the widespread misunderstanding of the procedure, I respectfully suggest that you issue instructions for the calling of a preliminary public hearing, before large sums of money are expended on a project which has such unanimous opposition.

On the date of February 23, 1966, I received the following communication from the Federal Highway Administator, the details of which are self-explanatory.

"DEAR MR. TENZER: This is in reply to your letter of February 11 requesting a report on the status of the Atlantic expressway.

"The State has had consulting firms prepare engineering, traffic and revenue, and feasibility reports on the proposed Long Island-New England Bridge and connecting highways, including the Atlantic expressway. Any action to be taken on this project would be the responsibility of State authorities. We have received no proposals from the State for Federal participation. Under the circumstances we suggest that you write the New York Department of Public Works for information on any development plans and status of the overall project.

"Sincerely yours,
"REX M. WHITTON,
"Federal Highway Administrator."

Governor, at your meeting with the New York State congressional delegation held recently in Washington, you made a strong appeal that on matters of common interest we develop concerted action on a bipartisan basis. I agree with you most heartily in this approach. I am writing to the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead and the mayors of those villages along the proposed route which are located in the Fifth Congressional District, inviting them to join with me in developing a bipartisan approach to protect the interests of residents and businessmen whose property and investments will be affected by the proposed Atlantic expressway.

Finally, Governor, I would most respectfully urge that you ask for feasibility studies on alternative routes, including the possibility of using the route of the Southern State Parkway, and the possibility of building the expressway over the Long Island Railroad tracks. Both of these suggestions involve publicly owned property with enough width for a 10-lane expressway. Important however is the fact that neither one involves a disruption of residence and business property to the extent involved in the present proposed route.

Your early attention to this communication is most respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the local press expresses the voice of the people from villages along the South Shore of Long Island which includes the full length of the Fifth Congressional District of New York.

Elected officials and civic organizations as well as groups representing all the major political parties have expressed their opposition to the proposed expressway to me and they must be persuaded to express their opposition to Albany.

In my letter to Governor Rockefeller and in my letters to every Mayor on the South Shore of Long Island, I have endeavored to set the record straight. The proposed Atlantic Expressway is a State project in its early planning stages. While Federal funds have not been requested, I have expressed myself in opposition to the granting of such funds to the appropriate agencies. The voices of the people should be directed to Albany before it is too late.

The daily and community newspapers on the South Shore have rendered a unique public service by helping me to bring to public attention that we are dealing with a State project at this point. Their attention to the subject matter has brought about an unparalleled unity among elected officials of every political persuasion and I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point some of the editorial comment on this dismaying project:

[From Newsday, Mar. 1, 1966]

THE ROAD TO ROCKY POINT

The proposed Atlantic Expressway along Sunrise Highway, intended as a high-speed connection between New York City and the proposed Long Island-New England Bridge, has been running into opposition recently from the mayors of five South Shore communities through which it would pass. As projected, the road would be a 10-lane highway 84 miles long that, in Nassau, would require substantial changes inside the downtown business area it traverses.

Representative HERBERT TENZER, Democrat, of Lawrence, has now suggested that double-decking the Southern State Parkway might be an alternate and less disruptive solution. Edward McGowan, chairman of the Long Island-New England Bridge Study Commission, which proposed the Atlantic expressway, has described the Tenzer alternate as illegal—saying that the bonds for the section of Southern State, on which motorists must pay tolls, forbid its conversion to any other use. TENZER, however, has made a highly sensible suggestion. He wants the commission to hold hearings on the conversion of Southern State. If it represents a more acceptable route, with less disruption, then he feels the possible answer may be to retire the existing parkway bonds and to make use of that route.

We would take TENZER'S suggestion a step further. Why not check all possible routes—including, by the way, the overcongested Long Island Expressway? Something, very soon, has to be done to improve rush-hour travel between New York and Long Island. If a route can be found that achieves a smoother flow of traffic in and out of the city, requires minimum disruption and at the same time provides fast access to the Rocky Point Bridge, that's the route to choose for development. Until further feasibility studies have been undertaken by the Department of Public Works, with the concurrence of the bridge study commission, no conclusions can be reached.

Mr. Speaker, the Long Island Press, March 11, 1966, in an editorial relating to the Long Island Sound bridge project, had this comment relating to the Atlantic expressway:

What's more, the proposed $350 million Atlantic expressway, suggested as part of the commission's original package, has stirred up a storm of protest from one end of the island to the other. This 10-lane swath through some of Long Island's most prosperous shopping communities is an unwelcome prospect. And even more dismaying are some of the alternatives being blithely put forward—like elevating the Southern State Parkway or the Long Island Expressway.

The thought of such metal and concrete monsters is a nightmare to Long Islanders who know what elevated structures can do to communities. Many areas of Queens have been saddled with such structures—the "Els" in Richmond Hill, Jamaica, Long Island City, Ridgewood, Corona, Elmhurst, Jackson Heights, Woodside and Sunnyside, not to mention the Bronx and Brooklyn. The people of these communities wish they could be rid of these depressing, noisy monstrosities. It is hard to believe somebody would think of bringing them, in this day and age, to the heart of residential Long Island.

The Long Island Kernal (Freeport), on February 17, 1966, said this:

CONSIDER AN ALTERNATE PLAN

Instead of disrupting long-established business districts and municipal facilities and at the same time incurring fabulous condemnation expenditures—why not utilize already existing highway routes which will disrupt practically nothing? And which would incur practically no additional property condemnation.

How? Widen these existing routes where necessary and double-deck them. (This has been proposed for Sunrise Highway.)

The route for the proposed alternate super-expressway would start at the Verrazano Bridge, utilize the Belt Parkway south and east to Marine Parkway, then southeast to Beach Channel Drive. Thence east on Rockaway Freeway to Sheridan Boulevard to Burnside Avenue and Rockaway Turnpike. From Rockaway Turnpike to northeast on Peninsula Boulevard to Southern State Parkway thence east to Sagtikos Parkway. North on Sagtikos Parkway to Long Island Expressway—and from there you have it right through, past Riverhead and along the North Fork to the East Marion bridgehead.

Southern State Parkway to Sagtikos Parkway is no longer a pleasure driving route, but a vital traffic artery. Therefore double-decking it as part of the Long Island superhighway would not only facilitate traffic flow, but would solve the question of a route to the (proposed double-decked) Long Island expressway and eastern Long Island.

The route proposed here would add no more than 3.1 miles in distance from the Verrazano Bridge to the East Marion bridgehead as compared to the proposed property-destroying, tax-destroying Sunrise Highway route.

The Bellmore Life of January 26, 1966, had this to say:

EXPRESSWAY THROUGH BELLMORE

Engineers and planners have come up with a grandiose project for a bridge from eastern Suffolk to Connecticut and an even more grandiose sounding Atlantic Expressway through the length of Long Island. Further studies are being undertaken and perhaps they will lead to the decision to build the bridge. Perhaps from an overall point of view and in the name of progress the bridge should be built. It is too early to tell.

But, from a local standpoint, considering the interests of Bellmore, we doubt that the radical widening of Sunrise Highway would be a good thing. The net result would be more gas fumes and less business. It would destroy many small businesses in which men and women have sunk much of their lives and hopes.

The proposed expressway would cut our community in half, leaving crossings only at Newbridge Road and Bellmore Avenue, but closing off Bedford Avenue and Centre Avenue. During construction it would disrupt the lives of the citizens for many months.

However much a bridge to Connecticut may be needed, this seems a very expensive way to lead up to it. We hope some other solution can be found. The fact that a commission has recommended using Sunrise Highway does not necessarily mean that other solutions may not be preferable.

Mr. Speaker, at long last after many letters and speaking engagements on the subject, editorials are now directing readers to elected State officials as well as their Congressman. Now the voices may finally be heard in Albany. The editorials follow:

[From the Leader (Freeport, N.Y.), Mar. 3, 1966]

CHINESE WALL IN FREEPORT?

Of all the idiotic ideas that have come forth in recent years, the proposal to convert Sunrise Highway into a 10-lane super-expressway is the worst.

According to the plan offered by the Long Island-New England Bridge Study Committee, the elevated structure would be about the height of the LIRR elevation. It would extent from the Queens-Nassau line to Patchogue where it would turn north to connect at Rocky Point with a proposed bridge to New England. It would run through the heart of Valley Stream, Lynbrook, Rockville Centre, Baldwin, Freeport, Merrick, Bellmore, Wantagh, Seaford, Massapequa, Massapequa Park, Amityville and on through Suffolk. The South Shore would become part of a corridor stretching from Washington, D.C., to Boston.

Are they kidding? This could only mean that our wonderful residential communities would become suitable only for the high rise apartments and factories that would necessarily spring up along the route.

Who would lose on the deal? Everybody else, especially the businessmen along Sunrise Highway and bordering streets and the homeowners who moved here to escape the big city. Faced with providing services, schools, fire protection, etc., for the huge apartment houses, the taxpayer will even lose his proverbial barrel—he'll be over it instead of in it.

The proponents of the superhighway claim that it will create more jobs on Long Island. True—but it will also bring hundreds of thousands of new jobseekers to live in the multistoried apartment houses. It will provide easy access to additional jobhunters from New York City. The competition for jobs will be fierce. The benefit from the increased jobs will be wiped out and we will be worse off than before.

WHAT CAN YOU DO

Fast action is called for if we are to prevent this attempted rape of Long Island. There are State and Federal funds required for the proposal and an "authority" must be created to administer the project. You can stop it—write your assemblyman, State senator and congressman today if you value your investment in your home or business. (Send copies to this newspaper, too, so we can keep up with the thinking of our readers.)

None of us moved to Nassau County during the past 20 years just for the sake of moving. We were seeking something better for ourselves and our children—and our grandchildren. Must we lose it all to become part of a high-speed route from Washington to Boston?

This newspaper will devote all the energy and all the power of a free press toward putting down this onslaught against our suburban way of life. We can't do it alone, however. The forces behind the highway proposal are extremely influential. Your help is absolutely essential if the plan is to be defeated. Get those letters moving—and fast.

[From the Long Island Graphic (Freeport, N.Y.), Mar. 3, 1966]

PROPOSED HIGHWAY MENACES OUR WONDERFUL COMMUNITIES

There has been considerable controversy regarding the proposed superhighway slated for Sunrise Highway all the way from Valley Stream to Patchogue.

The 14-lane elevated structure is a plan offered by the Long Island-New England Bridge Study Committee extending from the Queens-Nassau line to Patchogue where it would turn north to connect at Rocky Point with a proposed bridge to New England.

Running through the heart of Baldwin, Freeport, Merrick, and other adjacent communities, the highway would bring about the erection of high rise apartments and factories and mean the end of our wonderful residential communities.

At the same time, the businessmen along Sunrise Highway and bordering avenues would be adversely affected, and homeowners would be faced with providing schools, and additional services for the huge apartment houses.

While the committee claims more jobs would be created on Long Island, they're forgetting it will also bring hundreds of thousands of new jobseekers to live in multistoried apartment houses.

Since State and Federal funds are required for the planned superhighway, an authority must be created to administer the program. Only you, the voter, can stop it. Write to your State senator, assemblyman, or Congressman today. The Freeport Chamber of Commerce should sponsor the protest and now.

If you live or do business in the Fifth Congressional District, your Congressman is HERBERT TENZER; your assemblyman is John Thorpe, Jr., and State senator Norman F. Lent.

Representatives of the chambers of commerce will meet on Tuesday night, March 29 at 8 p.m. at the Sea Crest Restaurant, Sunrise Highway, Massapequa, along with editors and publishers of weekly newspapers in affected areas.

The protest is on. While the local newspapers, such as the Massapequa Post and others, can't fight this attempted rape of Long Island alone, your help is needed. Get those letters moving to your legislators now.

[From the Maileader (Valley Stream, N.Y.), Mar. 3, 1966]

SKYWAY

With the growing tremor of the impending Atlantic expressway becoming more and more ominous, the sounds of an aroused populace are being heard in Washington and Albany. It is apparent that most Long Islanders affected by this arterial extravaganza are unaware of many aspects associated with its placement and ultimate construction.

We discussed last week the alternatives that accompany the present plan and during the past 7 days, the officials of our communities have communicated with Congressman TENZER and in turn with Governor Rockefeller. The answers have been most revealing and could be indicative of things to come. The project is first of all a State one—part of the tri-State transportation committee, and does not come under the Federal Highway department nor in turn, in its present scope, under Federal participation. The skyway is a project strictly State instituted and the accompanying engineering, traffic and revenue, and feasibility reports on both it and the proposed Long Island-New England Bridge have caused the resulting hue and cry. Every town or village in the path of the skyway is encouraging its citizens to make their views known to the town supervisor, county executive, and eventually to the Governor in Albany.

Much has been said about the resulting havoc which would affect property owners and business owners alike. A very important result which has been seemingly played down throughout this clamor is the burden placed on those who are not necessarily in the path of the proposed route. This means you, Mr. Citizen. Yes, you who live even miles away from Sunrise Highway but who nonetheless have to share this ever-increasing burden. Who will eventually have to shoulder the losses from the businesses forced to shut down or move away? Who will have to come up with the difference to keep your community and country treasuries in the "black"? You, the homeowner. The loss in taxes will have to be replaced in some way and where will they turn? To you, the homeowner. Rockeville Center, alone predicts that besides the losses to property which amounts into the $3 millions, the village would lose over $800,000 taxwise.

So let us think, while the time is right, of the proper course of action to set. The wheels are already in motion. What are you doing to make your voice heard?

[From the Baldwin (N.Y.) Citizen, Mar. 17, 1966]

WE ADD OUR VOICE

Proposals to put a 10-lane expressway above or alongside Sunrise Highway have been greeted with unanimous dismay by residents, business interests, and government officials all down the south shore.

Here in Baldwin, the effect would be disastrous. Not only would such a high-speed monstrosity destroy our business district; it would split our long, narrow community right in half.

The town board, chambers of commerce, and Congressman TENZER are among those whose voices have been raised in protest. We add our own.

Mr. Speaker, a resolution was adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Hempstead, N.Y., on March 1, 1966, stating that the town board "stands firmly opposed to the proposed route."

I am making this record in opposition to the proposed Atlantic expressway so that all Federal agencies having jurisdiction will be informed of the opposition and in turn advise the State of New York that Washington will not support a project which does not have the support of the people.

In conclusion I want to inform my colleagues that I am urging that Federal funds be withheld from this project so long as there is widespread opposition at the local level which indicates that the project is not in the public interest.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Martin L. Koehneke, president of Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill., used the following reading from Scripture and offered the following prayer:

Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.—St. Matthew 20: 26–28.

Grant us, O Father in heaven, the gift of penitent and believing hearts, so that we may know Thee as the one who sent Thy Son to serve us, to save us from our sins, and to give His life a ransom for us all.

Help us to know ourselves, as Thou knowest us. Show us Thy strength in our weakness, Thy pardon for our wrongdoing, Thy guidance for our faltering steps, Thy pleasure in doing Thy will.

Grant purity to our aspirations, integrity to our leadership, and nobility to our service, so that our Nation and the world may observe us walking in Thy fear and in Thy favor.

Abide with us in Thy love, dwell in us by Thy grace, and sustain us by Thy power, for the sake of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House, with amendments, to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1404. An act to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 801. An act to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures.

FILING OF REPORT ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, March 25, to file a report on the second supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 8, line 5, strike out "After June 30, 1965" and insert "During the current fiscal year".

Page 8, line 14, strike out "years" and insert "year".

Page 8, line 14, strike out "and 1967".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished gentleman from Texas advise the House as to what these amendments accomplish?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Ohio is aware of the fact that three small alterations were made by the other body in the general provisions of the bill which, in my judgment, improve the legislation. Members should be aware that there were no changes in the appropriation items—there is no difference between the bills as to the provision of the appropriations themselves.

The first change made by the other body provides that the authority granted in section 101 of the general provisions will be confined to the fiscal year 1966, the current fiscal year.

With respect to section 102, the language was also amended so as to apply only to fiscal year 1966.

These changes restrict in time the authority which was provided by sections 101 and 102 in the House version of the bill. I believe that all Members of the House would be in favor of this tightening up of the language of the bill.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations which handled the hearings on most of this legislation, has been consulted and agrees, as I understand, with this position. I know of no objections, by any Members, to these amendments. Therefore, we might approve the legislation today, and send it immediately to the President.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], the ranking minority member of the Defense Subcommittee, and he approves the amendments made in the Senate. He feels that they would strengthen the bill.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. The amendments to section 102 go along with the earlier amendments that were jointly sponsored during House consideration by the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California. The section 102 amendments that were adopted here on the floor, and those pending in the bill as passed by the other body, I think correct adequately the point that was made before the Rules Committee when this bill was up for consideration. I think they should be concurred in by the House.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight, March 26, to file a report on the bills H.R. 7524, H.R. 7406, and H.R. 3606.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE IS CRUEL AND COSTLY TO OUR ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, through its Social Security Administration, is being cruel and costly to its elderly citizens on the matter of birth certificates.

Most members of our generation who were not born in big towns have no recorded birth certificates. The Government very wisely decided many years ago that in such cases a birth certificate could be issued by the county on a close relative's affidavit.

I am told the Social Security Administration is now refusing to accept such birth certificates and is demanding that applicants pay $4 in advance for a delayed check of census records, or $5 in advance for an immediate search of the records.

I should find it difficult to understand the complicated instructions, and I am sure that the average retired person, even if he had the money to shoot on such a project, would find the instructions incomprehensible.

TRIBUTE TO THE CAPITOL POLICE FORCE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, now that the shouting is over and blame placed on the Capitol Police for a regrettable incident, which probably no police force could have averted, let us appraise the facts. Most of us will admit the Capitol Police force is made up of good men who give good service. They are courteous and helpful, and they can be firm when the occasion requires. Certainly it is to their credit that very few incidents involving lawbreaking occur on Capitol Hill.

They are not professionals; nor can they be, under the patronage system. That is not the fault of the force. However, lawbreaking occurs despite the best efforts of the best professional policemen—a great deal of it right here in Washington where there is a good professional force. It just is not possible to prevent all violence, regardless of the caliber or organization of the police officials. Ours do a good job. They are a faithful and dedicated force, and they should have a pat on the back for the effective performance which they give.

USE OF KREBIOZEN BY CANCER PATIENTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, yesterday I introduced a bill to permit all patients currently using the drug krebiozen to purchase it in Illinois for use in any State until a clinical test on cancer patients be completed.

There are in the district that I represent several dozen cancer patients who are taking krebiozen at this time. Until 2 months ago they were able to take it regularly. They have gone to Illinois to purchase this drug krebiozen.

Whether or not some of us believe it is an authentic cancer cure is not the point. The point is that every one of us should live up to his responsibilities and unite behind this bill to make it possible for patients to obtain this drug.

In the past 2 or 3 or 4 years, doctors have operated on these patients and have declared that the patients might as well go home and pass the time for the next 2 or 3 months and then die. Since then, these patients who have been using krebiozen are still living. I say it is our responsibility to see that they are able to purchase this drug krebiozen until there is a good clinical test.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WEST GERMANY PLANS TO BUILD STEEL MILL FOR RED CHINA

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, the recent news that West Germany—our NATO ally—is planning to build a steel mill for Red China is causing great concern. I strongly object to this behind-the-back deal. While I have a large steel industry in my congressional district, this is not a steel issue—it is a loyalty issue. After all the billions we pumped into West Germany to rebuild it after the war, how can that nation, with good conscience, help to build the warmaking potential of the aggressor in Asia?

I consider it imperative that a strong protest be made by the U.S. Government, and a thorough restudy of the proposed plans before West Germany carries them out.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, on yesterday, I was absent on official business with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I ask that the RECORD so show.

THE HOMEBUILDING INDUSTRY IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have sought a special order on Wednesday next, the 30th of March, to bring to the attention of this body and to the consideration of the Chief Executive and the administrative agencies involved, the serious condition facing the homebuilding industry in the State of California in particular, and in the Western States in general.

I call upon my colleagues from my own State and from the other Western States to join me here in this important discussion. While all around there is talk of inflation, in this homebuilding sector of the Western States economy there is already the clear mark of recession. Every phase of the construction business, which accounts for $8 billion in California's gross national product, is down from last year. But the homebuilding industry is dramatically and disturbingly reduced.

Through March 1 the housing construction activity is 44 percent below the activity for 1965. The situation is desperate. It needs the understanding and attention of this body and the attention of the housing and home financing agencies of the Federal Government.

OEO TEACHES CALIFORNIA A STRANGE LESSON IN SUBTRACTION

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recount for my colleagues the bewildering experience of the California State Office of Education's attempt to have the OEO fund our State's very successful adult basic education program.

Some of this information was introduced into the record of the poverty hearings by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

I bring it up again because it has escaped the attention of many of those who must be made to realize that all of the poverty programs are in peril if such irresponsible administration continues.

OEO's stop-and-go approach has caused considerable confusion for States operating adult basic education programs.

States have had difficulty in securing the money which OEO pledged them.

Numerous revisions of allocations have caused administrative problems, disappointment, and expenditures of State funds that will not now be reimbursable.

One of the States hardest hit by the OEO confusion has been California.

In June 1965, OEO sent a memo to the California State Department of Education, as it did to all States, notifying them of the anticipated State allocation for 1966. According to that memo, California was to receive $1,809,725.

Successive notifications indicated the following changes:

June 21, 1965	$1, 809, 725
Nov. 9, 1965	1, 622, 060
January 1966	819, 530

The final amount is less than half the original estimate.

OEO claimed that they ran short of funds and thus had to make the cuts.

If there were no funds available, where then did OEO come up with the $802,550 they restored to California on February 25, 1966, after I, and other Congressmen, lodged vociferous protests to OEO over their treatment of our State?

OEO claimed they are not responsible for the revised 1966 allocation.

They charge the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Education with the responsibility.

This bureaucratic buckpassing has to stop somewhere.

I commend to the consideration of my colleagues reforms proposed by the Quie-Goodell opportunity crusade that would fix singular responsibility for this program with the Office of Education.

DUMPING OF JAPANESE TITANIUM DIOXIDE

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have noted a comment which appeared in the March 19 issue of the Christian Science Monitor indicating that apparently the Treasury Department is concerned about foreign goods being dumped on the American market at prices well below domestic prices. Reference is made to the alleged dumping of Japanese titanium dioxide as having "stirred everything up again."

According to this article the Treasury Department intends to do something about these dumping practices. Now in view of the grain dumping activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation which I have brought to my colleague's attention recently, maybe it would not be out of line to suggest that the Treasury Department be vested with the authority to look into the dumping activities of the Department of Agriculture and do something about this, too.

The article referred to is as follows:

TRENDS

A "dump and run" problem is vexing the U.S. Treasury again.

Foreign goods are still being dumped on the American market at prices cut well below those at home. The Treasury hoped it had solved that problem a year ago when it spelled out a new antidumping policy.

But recent alleged dumping of Japanese titanium dioxide has stirred everything up again.

The Treasury Department now says it will fight hit-and-run dumping. If foreigners dump goods, grab a quick profit, and then skip out or boost prices again, they will be prosecuted for the period in which they dumped. That will be something new.

All this probably will take some of the congressional heat off the Treasury. Many Congressmen were irked before when their home industries were hurt by hit-and-run dumping and the Treasury did nothing.

NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I have entered in the House this day a bill calling for a National Water Commission. The purpose of this legislation is to generate new legislation concerning the use of better principles in the management of our great natural resource, water. In all fairness, I should say that I would not have had to introduce such legislation today because I did introduce an almost identical bill last July, H.R. 9895. However, even though the chairman of the committee called for reports on this particular bill, after 9 months none of the several agencies concerned in the executive branch of the Government saw fit to show the normal courtesy to a legislative committee to respond to the request. As such, this bill has had to come forth from the executive branch through one of my colleagues in the other body. I am glad to cosponsor it in this body at this time because my objective originally in introducing this bill was not for pride of authorship but to see that this legislation is passed to the betterment of our Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 15, because of an attack of Asian flu, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on rollcalls 36 and 38.

Rollcall No. 36 was on the passage of the conference report on H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, providing graduated income tax withholding, accelerated corporate tax payments, temporary suspension of certain telephone and automobile excise tax cuts, social security payments to certain persons over 72 not currently covered, and other tax law changes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 38 was on the passage of H.R. 13546, making fiscal 1966 supplemental appropriations of $13,135,719,000 for the Department of Defense. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SPREADING BUTTER ON THE GUNS

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday this House spread a little more butter on the guns. We authorized the expenditure of three-quarters of a million dollars for a home for the Vice President. In the last 30 days or so we have also authorized the spending of millions of dollars for Interama in Florida and millions of dollars to celebrate the centennial of the purchase of Alaska and millions of dollars for an air museum at the Smithsonian, all during this wartime emergency.

The trial balloon has gone up. It has been suggested from administration sources that perhaps there may be a 5-percent, across-the-board increase in income taxes. I saw last week where we will again be asked, for the 9th or 10th time since I have been in Congress in the last 8 years, for another increase in the national debt ceiling. The proposed figure to which it will be increased this time is $334 billion. So long as these wild, radical, vast spending schemes continue, the Democrat majority will have to increase the Federal debt ceiling to pay for the things that we cannot afford.

Inflation is particularly cruel to our retired people on a fixed income. It can be combatted by reducing Government expenditures more readily than imposing more and more taxes on an overtaxed society.

DIVERSION OF ANTIPOVERTY FUNDS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I saw on page 6310 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] inserted certain remarks entitled "Diversion of Antipoverty Funds." The remarks pertain to a Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston, W. Va. His remarks were the subject of a part of our investigation and hearing before the Education and Labor Committee this morning. I think it is fair to say Mr. QUIE's remarks although well intended are not accurate.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House, and so that the matter raised by Mr. QUIE will be entirely aired and open for public inspection, there will be included in the hearings and report on the Economic Opportunity Act for 1966 a complete summary of this entire matter. This report should be filed within a few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I detect in the remarks of Mr. QUIE an insinuation that the Democrats obtained a campaign headquarters which were for free or that some shenanigans were carried out in connection with the rental of the hotel that houses the Women's Job Corps. This is certainly not true and the record developed at our hearing today will show that.

Mr. Speaker, there are other misstatements in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about the costs and expenses about that headquarters that are inaccurate, and refutation will be contained in the testimony developed at our hearing today.

At this time, I wish to point out that the cost to the Government of housing these young women in this hotel building, including the use of all of its facilities, is less than $1 per day for shelter. In fact, the costs as testified to this morning amounted to $27 per month per enrollee. Mr. QUIE's remarks insinuate that our Government is squandering its money in renting this facility when the true facts are that the actual price is less than $1 per square foot per year, while the average rental for a like building in the city of Charleston is about $3 per square foot per year. The true facts are that everything has been done in an open, above-board, perfectly honorable manner—that we are receiving our money's worth and that the program is being well operated.

The high purposes of the Job Corps are not well served by those who continually seek to harp upon its shortcomings especially when their criticism is not accurate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include accurate figures pertaining to this statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MAIL TRANSPORTATION BY REGULATED MOTOR CARRIERS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would authorize mail transportation by regulated motor carriers engaged primarily in the transportation of property—that is, trucker-operators rather than motorbus operators—under ICC fixed rates or under 4-year special contracts at rates higher or lower than those fixed by ICC, just as in the case of such service by railroads under the Railway Mail Pay Act.

Several proposals have been advanced to solve the problem of transporting mail to points no longer served by the railroads. Recent years have seen the curtailment of railroad service in many areas of our country. This has created problems for the Post Office Department which must look elsewhere for modes of transportation to serve these areas.

I believe the provisions of the bill introduced today will eliminate the problems that now exist in providing adequate transportation of mail.

It will continue the existing authority of the Postmaster General to first, permit railroads to provide service by truck in lieu of rail service; and second, award a star-route contract to a regulated motor carrier based on the lowest responsible bid.

The Postmaster General may negotiate initial rates with truckers which will be effective until the ICC begins a general truck mail-rate case, or he may negotiate 4-year special contracts.

The ICC will, under my bill, be obligated to commence a general rate proceeding within 18 to 24 months after enactment, and will be required to classify motor carriers into groups, so that rates can be fixed for application to groups, rather than to individual truck operators.

Also, a truck operator would be obligated to provide mail service on request, once he has submitted a tender of availability, which cannot be withdrawn except by permission of the Postmaster General. While the tender of availability is outstanding, a motor carrier can be fined $500 for each day of refusal to transport mail, and can be subjected to deductions from pay for failure to perform the service in the manner required.

I strongly feel that legislation of this type is needed if we are to improve mail service, particularly in those areas where the railroads have discontinued trains.

WAS USE OF ANTIPOVERTY MONEY FOR CAMPAIGN PURPOSES?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] was not on the floor, I certainly think that it is a distortion of what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] said when Mr. GIBBONS indicated there was an implication that antipoverty money was used for campaign purposes. There was a reference in Mr. QUIE's remarks to a hotel in Charleston, W. Va., now used as a women's Job Corps center, which had been used as the Kennedy Democrat headquarters, and that the hotel is owned by a corporation, the president of which is the State commerce commissioner, a leading Democrat in West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] presented figures and background information that were developed by investigators. We had testimony this morning in the full Committee on Education and Labor which disputed some of those figures. The OEO, in effect, threw up a confusing fog of figures that seem to conflict with facts given to our investigators. We are pursuing this with both the majority and minority investigators in an effort to obtain the true facts of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, by any means, that the record is clear in the committee at this point.

Mr. Speaker, there were references to additional parcels of land, and there is a dispute as to what the contract provided. We have asked for the full contract and the data that should be provided to the Congress and to the American taxpayers, and then we shall report further when we obtain that information from our investigators.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit while the House is in session during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TO ESTABLISH UNIFORM DATES THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES FOR THE COMMENCING AND ENDING OF DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, with the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, ROGERS of Texas, FRIEDEL, SPRINGER, and YOUNGER.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 46]

Addabbo
Ashley
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Battin
Bingham
Brooks
Burleson
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Conyers
Craley
Diggs
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Farnum
Fino
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gilbert
Green, Oreg.
Grider
Griffin
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanley
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Henderson
Holifield
Hungate
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kupferman
McCulloch
McVicker
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
Monagan
Morris
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
Pirnie
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Ryan
Scheuer
Scott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Todd
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Williams
Willis
Wolff

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 781, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 781

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10607) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and, pending that, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SURVEILLANCE OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have an important matter to bring to the attention of the House today. It relates to the surveillance which the Armed Services Committee maintains over the Central Intelligence Agency.

As you know, the authority of the Armed Services Committee over the Central Intelligence Agency is based on the National Security Act of 1947.

First, I would like to say that upon my assumption of the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee, I increased the membership of the Subcommittee on the CIA to the point that it now has 11 members. My purpose in doing this was to spread both the responsibility and authority of this subcommittee as broadly as possible.

I cannot recall ever having discussed before the House the exact relationship between the Armed Services Committee and the Central Intelligence Agency; therefore, and quite understandably, it would not be understood how close this relationship is. As a matter of fact, hardly a day passes that a representative of the CIA does not visit my office and the offices of some of the other members of the CIA Subcommittee. It is a continuous association with the members being constantly up to date with respect to the development of important intelligence matters.

In addition to increasing the size of the subcommittee, I established a regular meeting schedule. Under this schedule the Director of CIA and his assistants appear before the subcommittee for briefings and for full and frank discussion of intelligence matters.

I can assure you—and you need have no doubt—that at these meetings there is full revelation by the CIA of all subjects which should receive congressional consideration.

I would like to interpolate here because it is so important: the CIA does what the President tells it to do. It does not initiate action by itself except, of course, the normal routine activities as would be expected. This appears not to be well understood by many people and I wanted to place a special emphasis on this relationship between the President and the CIA.

And now to the specific subject at hand.

I have discussed the close and frequent contact maintained between the committee and the CIA. In the course of these contacts in recent days, a somewhat unusual and extremely important matter came to my attention. I immediately called a special meeting of the subcommittee which, as it turned out, consumed almost a whole day.

The occasion for that meeting was to receive testimony from a man who said that he had had enough of communism and had chosen to come over to our side.

The man is Mr. Laszlo Szabo, until recently an officer in the Hungarian Intelligence and Security Service which is commonly known as the AVH.

According to his testimony, Mr. Szabo is a former major of the AVH, in which he had served for 20 years. He is 40 years old. For 1 year, beginning in September 1957, he was trained in counterintelligence procedures and techniques by the Soviets in Moscow. On October 18, 1965, he asked the U.S. Government for political asylum in London where he was assigned to the Hungarian Embassy. He is the first officer to break away successfully from the AVH since that service was organized after the Hungarian revolution in 1956. He left because of what he described as silent, anxious self-doubt and, ultimately, revulsion against the AVH and communism.

Members may recall that in late 1963, two forged issues of Newsweek magazine were circulated in Africa, Asia and elsewhere. The origin of these forgeries has always been a mystery. These forgeries attempted to convey by means of photographs, cartoons, and deceitful text, a false picture of the civil rights movement in America. Mr. Szabo told the committee that these forgeries were planned, printed, and secretly distributed by the Hungarian Intelligence and Security Service. These forgeries, I repeat, were intended to undermine the prestige and standing of this country among the new nations of Africa and Asia.

Mr. Szabo said that, from his personal knowledge, these forgeries were not an independent venture of the Hungarians but that they were planned in cooperation with the Soviet secret police, the KGB. Indeed, he stated, the Hungarian service undertakes no action of this sort without consultation with and advice from the Soviets. Officers of the Soviet secret police are permanently stationed in the headquarters of the Hungarian service in Budapest. These Soviet officials have full access to the files and records of the Hungarian service.

Mr. Szabo testified that in their operational philosophy and in their training the Hungarian service refers to the United States as the main enemy. The Soviet service and the other bloc services do the same. Hungarian service officers are trained to work against our Foreign Service officers stationed in Budapest and citizens of our country who visit Hungary as tourists. Every effort is made to blackmail Americans, Britains, and people of other Western nations, into serving as intelligence agents of the Hungarians in Budapest and other capitals. Every device, however crude and brutal, is enlisted to this end.

Mr. Szabo discussed, for example, just how spontaneous are the demonstrations in front of our embassies and legations behind the Iron Curtain. In Budapest, he testified, the Hungarian police were ordered in February 1965, to prepare an anti-Vietnam war demonstration. Since they planned a big show and anticipated that considerable damage to American legation property would result, the secret police budgeted and set aside in advance a large sum of money to pay for damage that had not yet taken place. Our witness made it abundantly clear that American diplomats in Budapest live in a virtual state of siege.

Those Hungarians, he says, who fled from communism during the 1956 revolt and sought refuge throughout the free world have recently drawn onto themselves the particular attention of the AVH. The Soviets and the Hungarians, as part of a common venture, have decided to exploit this emigration for espionage and subversive purposes. Hungarian refugees living in the United States, who have become loyal American citizens, are hounded, blackmailed and coerced by threats against loved ones and relatives into serving the interests of Hungarian communism. It is to their credit that many refugees have refused to fall into this trap. But our witness said that everyone of them is under the AVH gun. I think we can assume that refugees from other Communist-bloc countries are similarly threatened.

Mr. Szabo told the committee that these Communist services will also resort to murder. In May 1962, a young officer of the Hungarian service named Bela Lapusnyik left the service and fled across the border to Austria where he sought political asylum. He was lodged in a jail in Vienna under guard by the Austrians. Several weeks later he mysteriously sickened and died. Prompt medical attention was of no avail.

Mr. Szabo testified that, according to information he received from members of the AVH headquarters in Budapest, Lapusnyik was in fact poisoned by another Soviet-bloc service, the Czech Communist service.

Mr. Speaker, I have undertaken to give Members of the House only the highlights of the statements made to us by Mr. Szabo. But this document I hold in my hand contains Mr. Szabo's brief of his life history, an evaluation of the Hungarian Security and Intelligence Service (the AVH), a discussion of disinformation, the case of Bela Lapusnyik, a message to Hungarians at home and abroad and several other matters. It contains photographs and an extremely interesting exhibit in the form of an organization chart of the AVH. This document has been printed as a service to the House, the country, and the free world. It speaks for itself.

It will be available to the Members of the House. You should read it. You have no idea how fascinating this document is. I thought, and the committee thought, that the House should know this, and from time to time when we have other information we think you might be interested in, we will bring it to your attention. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire me to yield further time to him so that he might yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, this is the second year I have served on the CIA Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

The broad brush role of the CIA is no secret. Its functions have been a necessity for all countries, in one form or another, in eras that predate the fabled Trojan Horse. To participate in our hearings is interesting, exciting, and intriguing and it rounds out, in my case at least, information detailed in hearings of the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have found the Agency informed and responsive to my inquiries and those of the committee. There are those who contend that this Agency is some super department cloaked in anonymity, divested of any obligations or restraints except to its own dictation and that it initiates, and, executes policies which are self determined and conceals its activity from a higher authority as it sees fit. The charge is so ridiculous that it answers itself and its constant repetition fails to give it any increased validity.

I have known the last two Directors of the Agency both personally and professionally. Both are distinguished Americans. They are distinguished by their brilliant contributions to their country for a great many years in a variety of capacities. They are distinguished in that both of them accepted whatever challenges their Government handed to them but neither were of the type that would reach out for power or self aggrandizement.

The independent power which fictional writers ascribe to this Agency is vested in only one man under our Constitution—the President of the United States. I have never observed a scintilla of evidence or the most remote suspicion which would suggest that the modus operandi of this Agency is conducted in any fashion not in accord with our constitutional system of restraints and checks and balances.

I am, therefore, Mr. Speaker, pleased to rise on the floor today and join with the distinguished chairman of my committee in the thoughts he has conveyed.

As he has said, the case of Laszlo Szabo speaks for itself. A military budget of $60 billion annually is the answer of a determined American people who are determined to remain free.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. May I say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished Director of the CIA, Admiral Raborn, is a dedicated American. He works around the clock in his efforts to protect the security of this country. The CIA is indeed a great organization under his leadership, and it was before. It deserves our protection and our commendation at all times.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina on his remarks and further to associate myself with the sentiments he expressed concerning the Central Intelligence Agency.

As a member of the CIA Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services I have had the opportunity to become intimately acquainted with the activities of that Agency during the past several years. As the gentleman said, we are kept constantly in touch with the major intelligence reports available to the CIA and we are kept informed of their activities.

I would like to emphasize the point which the gentleman from South Carolina made concerning the direction of the CIA. This Agency does what the President tells it to do. It is not autonomous; it does not chart its own course.

There have been many misapprehensions concerning this Agency, including the idea that it is a free-wheeling system of superspies answerable to no one. That is not the case.

Unfortunately, the CIA cannot respond to each attack against it. The nature of its activities requires considerable secrecy. Those of us who know the facts would like to speak up in its defense, but for the most part that is impractical.

I would like to state the confidence and high regard I place in the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. I believe these attitudes are shared by the other members of the subcommittee. If Americans were fully aware of the job being done by the CIA they would be very proud of it.

The specific matter to which the gentleman referred shows us the kind of thing which the CIA is constantly up against. Here in the words of a Hungarian defector we see the complete, ugly pattern of the Communist attempt to spread lies about the United States and to win the cold war by the basest kind of deceit and treachery.

We recall the news two and a half years ago that counterfeit copies of Newsweek magazine were circulated in Africa in an attempt to foment ill feeling toward the United States. These magazines portrayed in completely false terms the U.S. reaction to the civil rights movement.

Mr. Laszlo Szabo, who spent almost 20 years in the Hungarian Intelligence and Security Service, testified before our subcommittee that the forged issues of Newsweek were planned, printed, and distributed by the Hungarian Intelligence and Security Service. He further stated that they were planned in cooperation with the Soviet secret police, the KGB.

In clear and unmistakable language, Mr. Szabo paints the picture of the Communist danger which we still face. He notes that spontaneous demonstrations in front of our embassies behind the Iron Curtain are in reality carefully planned by the police. While the Hungarian police were ordered to prepare a demonstration against our role in the war in Vietnam, the secret police even set aside money to compensate our legation for the property damage which they knew would result from the demonstration.

In training their secret agents, the Hungarian and other Communist services refer to the United States as the "main enemy." In free countries these agents try by every possible means to enlist others in espionage activities. They especially seek out Hungarian refugees and try to force their cooperation by threats against relatives still behind the Iron Curtain.

This man who knows from firsthand experience the terrors of the secret police world detailed one case in which another defector was tracked down and killed by other agents.

Mr. Speaker it is impossible to summarize the dramatic revelations in this amazing story. The Committee on Armed Services has submitted this man's statement as a House document and its important message is available to every Member of this body.

I believe it is of the highest priority that we all are given this glimpse into the actual practices of the Communist nations and I urge each Member to study this document.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the chairman yield to me?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, having sat on the committee and having heard all the testimony, I would like to commend to each Member of the House a reading of this document. It will give them a better insight into what the CIA is doing and a better appreciation of the fact that the Agency is working for us.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. May I say, on Document No. 49, the Armed Services Committee will send a copy to every Member of the House. The Members do not have to ask for it. It will be sent to their offices.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the committee for the actions taken here today. I think it has been not only informative but likewise it impresses on the Members of the House that the Subcommittee on the CIA of the Armed Services Committee is attending to its business. It is carefully watching these activities and doing its level best to be of help in this matter.

It was amazing to me, as I sat through these meetings, to hear of the great job the CIA is doing. They make mistakes. All human beings make mistakes. We are asking them to do almost unbelievable things. They are doing the best to fulfill their objectives. I am pleased with the action taken here today, because once again it emphasizes that the CIA is doing its best. We are working and cooperating with the Agency to the fullest.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman has certainly done the House a great favor in bringing this information to us.

I particularly want to associate myself with the gentleman in the remarks he has made about the great American who went to the Naval Academy many years ago, from Oklahoma, Admiral Raborn, and his associates in the CIA.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. May I say to the distinguished majority leader, being an Oklahoman did make him a great American.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the resolution under consideration provides for an open rule, 1 hour of general debate, on a bill which increases the travel allowance of certain Federal employees. The bill, I understand, will cost about $40 million. There is little controversy on it from the committee that has reported it.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 781 provides an open rule, 1 hour general debate, for consideration of H.R. 10607, which has to do with the amendments to the Administrative Expenses Act to provide greater reimbursement of Government employees' moving expenses.

According to a study completed in 1963 by the Civil Service Commission, 80 percent of Federal employees who are moved lose money under the present reimbursement program. The average loss is $558, with larger losses for larger homes and larger families. Losses are particularly associated with the higher grades, children in the family, and the sale of present homes.

The Bureau of the Budget will administer the new program, including the making of regulations.

The costs are estimated, although they are not firm, at something like $20 million to $40 million a year. There are a number of business firms that have expressed an interest in this bill, because the present tax law treats reimbursement funds as ordinary income. The aim is to get this bill passed and try to remove such payments to employees, both Government and private, from ordinary income for tax purposes. Legislation has been introduced on this matter which I believe is pending in the Committee on Ways and Means. The major provisions are set forth on page 2 of the report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no minority report on this legislation. I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMEND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10607) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H.R. 10607, with Mr. LONG of Maryland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10607 was introduced by me at the request of the U.S. Civil Service Commission and reported unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations, which is led and chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]. On page 6 of the hearings held before the subcommittee there is reference made to the letter of transmission by the Civil Service Commission which I think shows up the principal thrust of the bill. I would like to read two paragraphs therefrom:

> The Civil Service Commission is proposing this legislation both as a matter of equity to employees and as a matter of good administrative practice for Government. Underlying this proposal is the basic principle that when employees are transferred at the request of the Government the object is to improve the efficiency of the service. Transfers are usually made at Government convenience with respect to time, location, and frequency. Financial losses should, therefore, be largely assumed by the Government. A well-conceived and administered reimbursement plan will insure equitable treatment, encourage employees to transfer willingly, and implement internal promotion and career development programs.

The letter goes on to say:

> Nonreimbursable costs of moving are significant deterrents to relocation for many employees. If experienced employees are unwilling or unable to take the financial loss, their agency loses their services. The agency may have to promote less well qualified people or spend time and money finding, hiring, and training replacements. This is poor economy in the short run and is even poorer economy in the long run, for a reasonable degree of geographic mobility is an essential element in a sound career service.

Mr. Chairman, therefore we realize that the basic purpose of the bill is to help efficiency and economy be brought about in the Government and also to do equity by the Federal employees who are required to move from one location to another for the benefit of the Government by making the allowances that they now receive by law and regulation more nearly equal to the expenses and often the losses that they must sustain. Many employees have complained to Members of Congress of the costs they bear in such moves. These moves are not adequately reimbursed by the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I have here some letters that are illustrative of this widespread problem. I would like to read to the members of the Committee just a few short paragraphs from some of them.

Mr. Chairman, the first letter was sent to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. EARLE CABELL, referred to the committee, and was sent by Mrs. H. P. Small, of Dallas, Tex.

Mrs. Small writes as follows:

> Subject: Interstate Commerce Commission, freight allowances, U.S. Government relocated personnel.
>
> DEAR MR. CABELL: The freight allowance granted a U.S. Government employee relocating to a new geographic region in or out of contintental United States is totally unrealistic.
>
> My husband has been an employee of the U.S. Government for over 25 years—for the most part as a civil service employee. This figure includes nearly 5 years in the U.S. Army.
>
> He has been a dedicated employee—meriting promotions periodically, and now holds a GS–14 classification. Further, he has worked diligently for several agencies—U.S. Civil Service Commission, U.S. Air Force, and now Department of Defense.
>
> His employment in different agencies has necessitated a few transfers and relocations in other geographic regions of the country.
>
> It is of this matter I write.
>
> When a U.S. Government employee is transferred, his freight allowance is strictly governed and is entirely inadequate. A family of six, having lived in the same house

or region for a few years acquires interests and hobbies that take up space and add weight to a van load. The higher the employee's classification, the more varied the interest of the family he heads, because these are your more inquiring and interested families.

When we made an earlier move we had to dispose of an air conditioner, racks, rocks, shelves, books, toys, dishes, lamps and tables, furniture; we gave away items right and left. Our most recent move in June forced us to give away a sofa, bed, mattresses, books, glassware, dishes, toys, basketball equipment, tetherball set, plants, rugs, records, games, a gas dryer, and shelving in order to stay within our limited freight and move allowance.

It would seem to me that a more realistic figure could be reached so that the average Government family doesn't have to dispose of such a large percentage of their effects in order for the head of the house to accept a new position.

My husband is extremely capable in the line of work he is doing, and has a fine reputation among his superiors for his diligence and knowledge. For this reason he is being considered for a new job in a higher classification at another location. But we cannot afford to move.

Having eliminated so much of our goods, it was necessary to replace some of what we gave away—sofa, mattresses, glassware, etc. Some of this continually mounting expense to the employee could be eliminated if employees were to be granted a larger, greater freight and move allowance.

We were reimbursed for our move at the lowest rate allowable this last time, and I should like you to implement action toward raising the move allowance in keeping with the grades or classifications of the employees.

On behalf of all Federal employees, and their families, I respectfully submit this request.

Yours truly,

MRS. H. P. SMALL.

Another letter received by a member of the committee, and forwarded directly to the chairman of the committee, was one by Mr. Edward J. Meister of Grand Rapids, Mich. It is a letter addressed to Chairman DAWSON, and reads as follows:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
July 13, 1965.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DAWSON: I request that you give your fullhearted support to the bill before your committee which will ease the burdens of a Government employee who is transferred to a new location. As I understand it, the bill before your committee would provide for preassignment travel expenses for the employee and spouse to seek housing, help in the expenses incurred in buying and selling a home, and help in temporary living quarters expenses and per diem expenses for the employee and his family, plus actual moving expenses for household goods.

I am a career employee with 25 years' service in the Social Security Administration, an agency that requires an employee to move for promotion. I have worked for the Government in Baltimore, Md., Flint, Mich., Lansing, Mich., Dayton, Ohio, and Grand Rapids, Mich., and have acquired some experience in the problems and hardships of moving to a new job plus establishing a new home for my family of four youngsters. I can remember very well the $1,200 I lost in real estate fees and FHA discount on a home I purchased in Lansing, Mich., in February 1957 and sold 6 months later in order that I could accept a promotion in Dayton, Ohio, with the Government, in which my salary increase amounted to about $190 more per year (the equivalent of a one-step grade increase from GS-9 to GS-10).

I believe the Government should treat its employees as good as industry does toward all the problems of moving to a new location. It would make promotions and transfers more attractive to better qualified people.

I believe that a schedule for reimbursement of actual expenses be set up for all the expenses incurred by the employee and his family.

I am sure that all Government employees who have moved for the benefit of the Government will endorse the bill before your committee.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. MEISTER.

In another letter received by Chairman DAWSON, from Mr. John N. MacKay of Rome, N.Y., Mr. MacKay writes as follows:

ROME, N.Y.,
April 21, 1964.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee,
The U.S. House of Representatives, Capitol Hill, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I have been informed that the organization for which I work, is being functionally transferred to Oklahoma City, Okla., by August 1, 1964—a distance of 1,450 miles. Besides myself, are my wife and four children, or a total of six.

Under current civil service moving expense provisions for employees and dependents traveling together, the formula calls for $16 a day per diem with a blanket 12 cents per mile for the car which for 1,450 miles and 5-day traveltime makes a total reimbursement of $254.

Opposed to this are the following minimum expenses that will be incurred by a family of six for the 5-day trip:

3 meals a day at $36	$160
Motel at $40	200
Gasoline	35
Total expenses	395
Less reimbursement	254
Personal deficit	−141

The foregoing is just the beginning for me. It does not take into consideration the fact that after we move, I must find the money to send my son back to New Hampshire for college and pay his first semester fees—that I will lose money on my present home, and, that I will have to find expensive temporary lodging for my family.

As the functional transfer of my position constitutes the "satisfactory offer" of a job, my refusal would leave me without employment. If I accept, I face the certainty of going heavily into debt in a strange community with no established credit. As a career civil service employee just completing 24 years of service, my immediate outlook is bleak indeed. If I elect not to go, I am without income and the Government loses my 24 years of experience—if I go, I face formidable financial odds that are not of my own making.

It is my understanding that your committee is considering measures to correct this situation. I would appreciate your continued efforts in this direction and also, would like to hear from you.

Thank you for your courtesy and indulgence in reading this letter.

Respectfully,

JOHN N. MACKAY.

The last letter is from a housewife. I think it illustrates the real troubles that this family had.

The letter is signed by Mrs. Daniel Dake from Golden, Colo. It was addressed to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], chairman of the committee. It is as follows:

GOLDEN, COLO.,
January 24, 1966.

Representative WILLIAM DAWSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DAWSON: Our Congressman, ROY MCVICKER, informed us that you are a ranking member of the Government Operations Committee. Perhaps you can help us—at least better inform us on what we feel is quite an important topic.

Why must civil service people move at our employer's whim under such outdated standards?

Congress has made great strides to bring salaries close to private industry, good health benefits, and a decent retirement plan, but when it comes to "pulling up stakes" to move, the advantages are so passé that we cringe thinking about it.

It is no little task to prepare a family for a move—the emotional trauma is enough to shatter my spirit—but to know a financial loss is going to ensue also, is ridiculous. The cost of packing and crating household belongings is not, at present, entirely paid for under the current commuted rates, the cost of insurance is an additional expense, the expense of utilities, mainly telephone hookup charges is paid for by us, the real estate brokers fee is a great expense, the loss on carpets and draperies is another expense private industry allows their employees when they are transferred. Just the loss ensued by us on perishable food items in the refrigerator that must be discarded is a pain to me.

After arriving at a new assignment, there is the additional cost of keeping a family in a motel room until housing is available, usually awaiting the moving van's arrival and then added expenses of carpets and draperies for a different house, the utility connection fees, possibly a realtor's fee, new car license plates and driver's license, straightening out insurance papers on automobiles, etc., and trying to live with the hopes that the furniture isn't too damaged and is repairable, that it won't be too difficult to find new friends, church, and group activities for our family, that we had to leave behind.

I may sound like a naive idiot to you, but after more than a dozen moves since 1955 for the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, I have learned much concerning transfers and moves—through our own experiences plus being exposed to U.S. military personnel and people in private industries, and I can't help come to the conclusion that civil service transfer tactics are not at all sufficient in most cases to make it worthwhile.

Can't Congress please, after years of passing over this matter, please, please do something?

We, and many of our friends with families, feel why bother to accept a new position when the emotional and financial burden just can't compensate us enough to leave our happy homes and friends when we know that hundreds of dollars will be "down the drain" for us.

To know that we could move and be packed, "lock, stock, and barrel," and also have a few extra days of expense money to cover motel and restaurants until housing is available would greatly soothe many people's minds.

I certainly hope Congress can do something this term, or in the very near future for us who are not the poverty stricken but will be if we have to foot the bill for one more major move.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. DANIEL DAKE.

There is a P.S. at the bottom. At that time the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, our late colleague, Clarence Brown, was a member of the subcommittee and the postscript was apparently pertinent then. It said:

> P.S.—Could you also bring this letter to the attention of Clarence Brown of Ohio, and any other interested committeemen?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. The gentleman made reference to the fact that industry took care of their employees. I think that is as it should be. But it has come to my attention that in the case of employees who get some assistance from industry in moving around, the Internal Revenue Service fails to recognize this as an expense item and they have to pay taxes on that as income. I am wondering whether this particular piece of legislation affects that situation and where a person in the classified service is required to move and gets some compensation for it, whether this is going to be a taxable item as income—which certainly it is not—and I wonder if there could not be some legislative history written with regard to what the intent of the Congress is relative to this problem.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would have preferred to finish my statement and respond to the question later, but I know this is a matter that is of great interest to many Members of the House and is a matter that the subcommittee was deeply concerned with so I will briefly respond at this point, and continue with my statement later.

We discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget and with all of the Federal agencies concerned and under yesterday's date the Bureau of the Budget addressed a letter to me in which the following question and answer was posed:

> Question. What is the current status of moving allowances with respect to whether they must be reported as taxable income for income tax purposes?
>
> Answer. The Internal Revenue Service has held that moving expense allowances which taxpayers receive from their employers must be included as taxable income. The only exceptions have been allowances for subsistence expenses of employees and their families while traveling from old to new posts of duty and for transportation of employees, their families, and household goods. Under this interpretation most of the additional allowances provided under the bill would be considered taxable income. A circuit court of appeals decision upheld the Internal Revenue Service position. The Supreme Court has denied certiorari.

Under this interpretation most of the additional allowances provided in the bill would be considered taxable income. A circuit court of appeals decision upheld the Internal Revenue Service position. The Supreme Court has denied certiorari.

On February 24, 1966, Mr. BURKE introduced H.R. 13070, which is similar to several bills introduced recently. These bills would provide for the exclusion from gross income for income tax purposes of several designated categories of moving expense allowances which are essentially the same as those provided in H.R. 10607.

I trust that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman, and I hope this Congress will do something about it, because it does seem to be ridiculous. When an employee is compensated for a move, which certainly is an expense, he should not be required to pay a tax on it, and I think that point should be clarified in the law. I again thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the problems caused to people such as those whose letters I have just read have been magnified enormously by the recent number of base closings. A study conducted by the Civil Service Commission revealed that 4 out of 5 employees who were required to move suffered out-of-pocket losses that averaged for each employee approximately $558. Certainly our Government does not need to make its employees pay out of their own pockets such a large share of these expenses when these moves are themselves for the benefit of the Government.

The Committee on Government Operations considers this to be inequitable and unfair. It should be remedied.

Before I describe the provisions of the bill, let me emphasize the following:

First. The Administrative Expenses Act, which now provides reimbursement for certain moving expenses, has been on the books for 20 years. This is the basic law being amended. The pending bill treats moving expenses more realistically and adds to those expenses for which reimbursement is now permitted.

Second. The bill is not providing a benefit for any Federal employee. It seeks to save our employees from spending their own funds in situations over which they have little or no control.

Third. Private industry is far ahead of the Government in recompensing its employees. We received testimony on the extent to which many business concerns underwrite the losses of their transferred employees, sometimes even purchasing the homes they must vacate.

On page 49 of the hearings is a report submitted to the subcommittee by the American Management Association, in which they discuss how industry reimburses personnel for transfer and relocation costs.

Under existing law when Federal employees are moved from one location to another these expenses are reimbursed: The cost of transporting up to 7,000 pounds of household goods; when necessary, the cost of temporary storage of employees' household goods; the cost of transportation of employees and their immediate families to the new duty stations; and the subsistence expenses of employees—but not their families—when en route between the old and new duty stations.

Other expenses frequently incurred are those for household goods and personal effects in excess of 7,000 pounds; the subsistence expenses of members of the moving employee's family while en route to the new duty station; the costs of an advance trip to seek satisfactory living quarters for himself and his family; the rent of temporary quarters while waiting for permanent ones; the costs of selling and buying homes or in canceling leases; and a range of miscellaneous expenses such as connecting and disconnecting appliance, adjusting rugs and draperies, among many others.

To conserve time I will analyze only the principal provisions of the bill:

First. Transportation of furniture and household goods: Section 1, page 2.

The bill raises the current reimbursable weight limit of 7,000 pounds for civilian employees to 11,000 pounds which is the limit Congress has already set for the military. The Civil Service Commission found that families tend to acquire heavier effects these days and one out of every five families required to move had more than 7,000 pounds.

A technical change is also made to permit the Government to exercise discretion in deciding whether employees' household goods would be shipped within the United States through use of Government bills of lading on an actual expense basis or through use of a commuted rate system now in effect. There are instances when savings to the Government may be possible by using the bill of lading.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I see nothing in the report or in the bill itself dealing with insurance coverage on the property that would be transported for Federal employees.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is a question to which I can shortly address myself. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to finish the statement.

Second. Family travel expenses: Section 23–1, page 3.

This section provides that an employee may receive per diem allowances for members of his immediate family while traveling to his new post of duty. The employee already receives the per diem for himself. This means he would be reimbursed for such expenses as food and overnight lodging for those who must accompany him. The maximum under law would be $16 per day for each member, but the Bureau of the Budget will scale this down depending on the size of the family. I might remind you that this type of an allowance was enacted by Congress for relocated postal workers in the pay bill last year.

Third. Home-seeking trips to new locations: Section 23–2, page 3.

Under the bill an employee, prior to his move, may receive per diem and round-trip transportation expenses for himself and his spouse for one trip to seek permanent residence quarters at his new station. The Budget Bureau will issue regulations governing such house hunting trips. This is a commonly encountered expense which must now be borne by the employee.

Fifth. Temporary quarters at new locations: Section 23–3, page 3.

The bill would permit an employee to be reimbursed for the subsistence expenses of himself and his family while occupying temporary quarters pending the availability of a permanent abode. This could be on an actual expense basis, not to exceed $16 per day, at average daily rates to be prescribed by regulation. The maximum period for this allowance would be 30 days in the United States but an additional 30 days would be permitted in Hawaii, Alaska, and the territories to allow adequate time for the shipment of household goods. The $16 maximum—or lower set rate—would apply only for the first 10 days of occupancy of the temporary quarters. For the second 10 days the amount could not exceed two-thirds of the rate, and for periods in excess of 20 days only one-half of the rate.

A similar allowance for temporary quarters was provided for postal workers in the pay bill last year along with 5 days' leave with pay when moving.

Fifth. Real estate transactions: Section 23-4, page 4.

This section provides that reimbursement would be authorized for the transferred employee's expenses of selling his home at his old location, purchasing a new one at the new location, and for settlement of unexpired leases when the expenses of those transactions must be borne by the employee. Such expenses may include legal fees—as for title searches—and broker's commissions, document stamps and transfer taxes, closing or settlement costs, and others as would be prescribed by Budget Bureau regulations. Brokerage fees, and other expenses, however, shall not exceed those customarily charged in the locality where the applicable residence is located. Any loss on the sale of a residence would not be reimbursed.

Sixth. Miscellaneous expenses: Section 24, page 5.

Although the major items of moving expense are identified with the areas mentioned above there are numerous contingencies and smaller items of expense which when taken together come to sizable amounts. Such items as losses on prepaid fees, auto registration, use taxes, connecting appliances, and many others fall in this category. They are legitimate moving costs which merit reimbursement but they would be administratively burdensome to handle on an actual expense basis. Therefore, the bill proposes an allowance related to the principal determinants of the size of employee moving expenses; that is, salary level and family status. Employee losses on moves increase with grade level and are higher for employees with dependents than for employees without dependents. Single movers would receive the equivalent of 1 week's basic compensation and employees with an immediate family the equivalent of 2 weeks' basic compensation to cover these other costs of moving.

Seventh. Storage of household goods: Section 25, page 5.

This section provides that when transferred employees or new appointees are assigned to permanent stations in isolated locations in the continental United States which do not have residence quarters, they may be reimbursed for storage of this furniture and household goods elsewhere for up to 3 years, or these household goods may be stored in Government-owned facilities if this is more economical.

The Army and the Air Force, for example, are engaged in activating missile sites at remote, sparsely populated locations. The relatively short duration of the projects to activate these sites—8 to 36 months—makes it difficult to interest builders in putting up housing. Consequently, Federal employees assigned to such locations must live in contractor-furnished trailers or similar make-shift quarters where they cannot use their household goods. The costs of storing household goods for extended periods makes employees reluctant to accept such assignments and hampers recruitment. Thus the proposed authority is intended to alleviate this situation where there are no residence quarters at the site or within reasonable commuting distance.

Eighth. Preserving moving expense benefits: Section 27, page 7.

If an employee is separated from the service in a reduction of force or transfer of functions and is appointed or reinstated within 1 year he may still receive the moving expense allowance. The purpose here is to extend the same benefits to persons an agency tries to place during a reduction in force or transfer of functions, but has not successfully placed by the time it is necessary to separate them as are extended to employees the agency is able to retain on the rolls until their transfer.

The bill also contains a provision—section 28, page 8—to protect the Government. In order to receive the expenses allowed under the bill, employees must agree in writing to remain in Government service for at least 1 year after they have moved, unless separated for reasons beyond their control and acceptable to the agency concerned. If the agreement is violated, the amounts allowed for the moving expenses must be returned to the Government.

All of the provisions of this bill will require implementing regulations by the Bureau of the Budget. We have been assured that these regulations will be closely drawn to prevent, as far as possible, any abuse, windfalls or joy rides. The committee will maintain oversight to see that our purposes are carried out with efficiency and economy.

The committee wrestled with the problem of the estimated cost of this legislation. This is most difficult to project because there is very little available experience in some of the areas covered. We prefer to accept the outside figure of $40 million annually estimated by the Bureau of the Budget and hope that it proves to be lower.

Our aim here, however, is to do equity. I hope all Members will give this legislation an overwhelming vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I still am not clear as to the provision for insurance. Who pays insurance on these moves?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Insurance on household goods would be a legitimate cost of moving and would be a reimbursable item. There is no question about that.

Mr. GROSS. Would the person transporting the goods be compelled to take out insurance?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I do not think any one will be compelled to take out insurance.

Mr. GROSS. This is the point. Will the Government in moving and paying transportation costs, assume the liability for this moving? This is quite a problem, I will say to the gentleman, for the Federal Government today.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. This is a very pertinent question. The intention is that the moving should be done by commercial movers. It is within the employee's discretion to take out insurance. I assume good discretion will warrant his taking out insurance. It will be a reimbursable item. I think it should be.

Mr. GROSS. In my opinion the Federal employee being moved ought to carry insurance.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I agree.

Mr. GROSS. This is a contribution the employee ought to make. I would hope that something is provided statutorily.

Otherwise I can see a big increase in claims bills with the expansion of this program. The Lord knows we have had enough of them in the past few years. I would like to see something in this bill, with the liberalization which I know the Congress will approve, to compel those benefited to take out insurance. That will help solve a growing and costly problem.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I completely agree with the gentleman. I think this dialog will be helpful. I frankly believe the Bureau of the Budget will promulgate such a direction as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. May I ask, is it safe to assume it is the intention of the members of the committee that, as stated in the bill, 5 U.S.C. 73b-1(a) and so forth, of H.R. 10607, defining the term "employees" as those under the U.S. civil service law and employees of the Government, does or does not therefore include uniformed military service personnel and their moves in the Nation?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes. That is correct. Time does not permit me to answer completely but the Bureau of the Budget does have this language. The committee raised the very same question that the gentleman raises, and they responded as I have done. Time does not permit me to read the text of their answer, but I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to put it in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The document referred to is as follows:

Question. To what categories of Government employees and their families would the bill apply?

Answer. The bill would apply to civilian officers and employees of the Government other than those to whom the Foreign Service Act applies. It would not apply to members of the uniformed services who are covered by title 37, United States Code. The bill also applies to the "immediate families" of the civilian officers and employees to whom the bill applies. The term "immediate family" has been defined, in regulations prescribed under the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as follows:

"Immediate family" means any of the following-named members of the employee's household: spouse, children (including stepchildren and adopted children) unmarried and under twenty-one years of age or physically or mentally incapable of supporting themselves regardless of age, or dependent parents of the employee (but not of the spouse).

Mr. HALL. That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and associate my remarks and thought with the colloquy just had between the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], because there is pending additional legislation to avoid claims both in transportation of individual effects and household effects and in their storage, which should be well covered in order to prevent the Government assuming these losses, if they are or are not properly insured. We should certainly insist on insurance by those being transferred.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYAL].

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Chairman, this is legislation which, of course, I feel is long overdue. With the phasing out of many bases and increasing others, this puts a sudden burden on thousands of our employees. I am going to support the legislation. Surely they should be somewhat concerned with those who have already been harmed and for whom this bill does not provide relief except for an amendment which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania later in the session.

I would like to say at this time that I am going to support his amendment.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the bill (H.R. 10607) to provide for the reimbursement of expenses and losses incurred by the employees of our Federal Government, who must move to a new location for the convenience of the Government. This legislation has been long overdue.

For many years, private industry has recognized the desirability of being able freely to move employees to new locations, where they are needed and their skills can be put to the best use. This rebounds to the benefit of the overall economy. In order to achieve such mobility, private industry has long followed the practice of reimbursing such employees, not only for their actual transportation costs, but for the cost of moving their household goods, the cost of finding living quarters in the new location, the cost of temporary living expenses until such quarters are available, and the like.

In enacting the bill before the House today, we authorize the Federal Government to follow a similar practice, although, of course, there are limitations on the per diem allowances, the amount of goods to be moved, and the like, which are essential for the uniform application of any Federal statute.

I think we must recognize however, that reimbursement for this type of expense meets only a part of the problem. Under the Internal Revenue Code, as interpreted by recent court decisions, reimbursement for moving expenses other than actual transportation costs and subsistence while en route, results in the realization of taxable income by the employee. The fact that the employee may have sustained an out-of-pocket loss does not protect him from the income tax. It would be self-defeating if having passed this bill today, the Federal employee is subjected to an additional tax liability on account of the reimbursement of the moving expense.

For this reason, I have today introduced a bill which would exclude from income any reimbursement for transportation and moving expenses, including such costs as the moving of household goods and personal effects—as well as storage expenses where the move may be of indefinite duration; travel from the former residence to the new place of residence both for the taxpayer, his spouse, and his family; reimbursement for a house-hunting trip to the new location by the taxpayer, his spouse or both; and, for meals and lodging of the taxpayer and members of his household at the new place of residence while occupying temporary quarters for a limited period of time. In addition, the bill covers reimbursement for the expenses of disposing of an old residence, or the cancellation of a lease, together with the expenses of acquiring a new residence.

In general, my bill covers the same reimbursement for the same type of expense for which we authorize reimbursement under H.R. 10607. However, since my bill is intended to apply both to the Federal Government and private employers alike, instead of providing maximum limitations which are related to the Civil Service compensation schedules, I have substituted dollar amounts.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it is inconsistent to recognize that these expenses are a legitimate expense of the employer, that they are incurred for the convenience of the employer, and then say "yes; but if we reimburse the out-of-pocket and the actual expenses of the employee, he has received income as a result and he must pay income taxes on these funds."

Mr. Chairman, if we take this attitude it just seems to me that we defeat the very purpose that we have in mind here.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope therefore that upon the adoption of this bill in the House, and having indicated by the adoption of this bill that we believe these are appropriate reimbursable expenses, that the Committee on Ways and Means will proceed at the earliest possible date to provide a change in the tax law which will result in the curing of what seems to me to be an intolerable situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the gentleman and other members of the Committee on Ways and Means who are concerned about this problem, and to indicate my concern with reference to this problem.

Also I wish to indicate that I feel this is something we should do, because otherwise we are certainly going to limit the mobility of industry in this country. I believe this is one of the problems that we have today—the mobility of employees.

Mr. Chairman, when we have—as the gentleman from Wisconsin has so aptly stated—the employee's mobility limited, then this interferes with the regular commerce and the ability of business to respond to the economic situation in our country.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we agree with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am proud to have worked with the other members of the Government Operations Committee on this legislation and to take a stand strongly in favor of its passage.

Under the present situation, the Government is at a serious disadvantage in recruiting and maintaining high-caliber people because of the fact that they are not reimbursed for the necessary and burdensome costs of moving when transferred from one official post to another. Private industry has seen the need for reducing and, where possible, eliminating losses incurred by employees who are transferred for the benefit of and at the request of their employer. Some companies have gone so far as to guarantee the employee against loss from sale of his residence. It is not essential that we go this far, but the Federal Government, as a responsible employer must reimburse those losses and expenses which are generally associated with moving a family.

I believe that H.R. 10607 provides a fair program for placing Federal employees on a somewhat equal ground with employees in the private sector.

There is another aspect of the problem of employees moving expenses which I am concerned about. That is the treatment of reimbursements received by the employee by our Federal income-tax laws. Under present policies of the courts and the Internal Revenue Service, only that part of reimbursement which covers the actual moving of goods, the employee and his family to the new location is exempted from inclusion in the employee's taxable income. Other expenses, many of which are recognized as direct expenses of moving in the bill we are considering, are taxed to the employee as income. The effect of taxing many items of reimbursement is, in too many cases, a wiping away of any benefit of the reimbursement to the employee. Such items as the house hunting trip by the employee and his spouse, temporary living costs while waiting for permanent quarters, fees incurred in selling the old home, all of which are included in H.R. 10607 as reimbursable moving expenses, are presently considered taxable to the employee.

The Attorney General, when confronted with this problem of tax administration last year, suggested that the Congress should establish a clear policy directive on this question, rather than leaving its resolution to the courts.

I am in agreement with the Attorney General's suggestion, and I think that those of us who cast our votes today in favor of this bill, must also realize the importance of its underlying purpose—the real and beneficial reimbursement of amounts lost by an employee in moving his family for the benefit of his employer. To endorse the principle of reimbursement, without giving serious consideration to the effect of our income tax policies on the reimbursements we authorize is to pursue a constructive and equitable policy with the right hand while eradicating the benefit of that policy without justification with the left hand. It is heartening to note the concern of employers with this point of tax policy as it applies to their employees.

In my own congressional district of Rochester, N.Y., employers have taken an enlightened attitude toward employee moving expenses, and many are concerned about the erosion of reimbursement benefits by Federal tax policies. One employer in my district, which is particularly well known for its healthy employer-employee relationships, the Eastman Kodak Co., has expressed its support of H.R. 10607, both on the basis of equitable treatment of Federal employees, and on the grounds that this bill will bring the whole question of moving expenses under the scrutiny of Congress.

I urge the necessity of enacting H.R. 10607 upon my colleagues, in the hope that we will not only provide equitable reimbursement to Federal employees, but also that we will in the near future, see to it that these reimbursements, and those paid by private industry, will not be needlessly and unfairly eroded by Federal tax policy.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for bringing this bill out for the consideration of the House. I believe it has been entirely too long in coming.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], in his remarks as to the need to provide an up-to-date tax treatment for these kinds of expenses. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, our better and more advanced private companies have long given these kinds of reimbursements to their employees. It has been a very difficult thing to find that the Internal Revenue Service has come in and interpreted these kinds of expenses as not being proper and, therefore, the moneys paid in reimbursement to these employees are treated as taxable income.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question, as the Joint Economic Committee has been pointing out for years, I believe on both sides of the aisle, that mobility of labor is one of the important aspects of a dynamic economy.

Mr. Chairman, we have many instances where our tax laws are still impeding mobility of labor and so economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, on March 2 I introduced a bill to correct this, and my remarks appear on pages 4593 and 4594 of the RECORD.

But I want to call attention to the fact that our colleague on the Democratic side, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] introduced such a bill on February 24. I simply put in an identical bill as other Members have to point up our concern for taking this next step.

I would add further that even if we correct the tax laws in this respect to conform to what the civil service rules will now be on reimbursable moving expenses, we still have a long way to go.

The tax laws for example still say that a worker's home is where his job is. Well, as a matter of fact, thank goodness most of the employees in this country own their own homes and their home is where their family is. This becomes important as companies require employees to travel around like the McDonnell Aircraft employees were asked to move down to Alamogordo, N. Mex., for what was hoped to be a 6 months stay. But then the job extended and went beyond a year and the Internal Revenue Service said—Well, the employee's home is where his job is and therefore the compensation for being out of town is taxable income even though the clear fact was that the man's home was back in St. Louis County, Mo., where his family was and where his kids were going to school. The employees had the added expense of commuting back and forth let alone the expenses of living away from home.

The law still is the same in that respect. I have pointed out in the past about five or six different areas where we have failed to update our tax laws to conform to the great advancement in employment practices in this great dynamic economy which improve the mobility of labor.

I wish the Treasury Department would assist the Congress in updating our tax laws instead of impeding our efforts.

My concluding remarks are these: Back in 1964 when the Committee on Ways and Means was considering the very comprehensive tax bill, many of us tried to have this tax remedy for reimbursable moving expenses that we are now discussing put into the law at that time. We did go part of the way and we did have some improvements in the 1964 tax cut. But even though, as I understood then and pointed out, the Civil Service Commission was going to come out shortly with a liberalization in this area that is now exemplified by the bill before us, and although I argued that we ought to conform to what we could anticipate the Treasury took this adamant position in resisting a full updating of our Internal Revenue Code.

I thank the gentleman for yielding at this time so that I could put some of these thoughts in the RECORD.

I think this bill is a fine movement forward in Federal employment practices and I again say I commend the committee.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Missouri and say that earlier this month I introduced H.R. 13629, identical to the gentleman from Missouri's bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed expenses.

It is important, I think, to emphasize that the legislation before us at the moment, H.R. 10607, merely authorizes the Government to pay the moving expenses of Government employees transferred to different locations by the Government. It has nothing to do with Internal Revenue Service.

It is also important, I think, to make it clear that the Internal Revenue Service does not attempt to tax the barebones cost of moving. But IRS does tax everything else connected with moving that may be reimbursed by an employer.

Industry, generally speaking, looks around for bright young men to hire, most of these just out of school. As these young men show promise, industry more and more is attempting to give them an opportunity to develop, which is a mutually advantageous practice to both the man and his company.

For many years industry has followed the practice, whenever it moves a man, to assume the responsibilities of the extra costs it has caused employees to incur, and industry does this by reimbursing the employee not only for the actual costs of transporting him and his family and their furniture to the new job, but also for other essential costs such as the expense of selling the old residence and acquiring a new one. The family may have to be separated for a short time, perhaps the employee must move first while the rest of the family stays behind until the youngsters complete their school term. Perhaps the wife, on the other hand, may have to make an advance trip to the new location to find new living quarters, and so on. These costs are incurred to the benefits of the company, and the company generally pays for them.

Where the injustice in all this occurs is the Internal Revenue Service practice of insisting the employees pay taxes on these reimbursed amounts, just as though they are income to the employee, which they are not.

I join in support of H.R. 10607 because it will remove the present restrictions that limit Federal reimbursement to Government employees for moving expenses. This is a good bill and will correct the situation which has long needed correcting.

I am hopeful the House will today pass H.R. 10607, and I am also hopeful the House will soon give attention to the separate situation which would be corrected by the bill introduced by my distinguished colleague from Missouri and in which I have joined him in cosponsorship.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Tunney].

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the bill H.R. 10607, which will provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of Government employees. It would also authorize payment of expenses for the storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States. I was happy to be able to cosponsor this legislation last year.

The passage of this legislation will reduce the financial losses incurred by employees when they are transferred in the interest of the Government. A Federal employee should not be required to absorb the high cost of moving when the move primarily benefits the Government of the United States.

The bill would accomplish four major purposes:

First. It would raise the current statutory limits on the weight of household goods shipped, for which reimbursement can be made, from 7,000 to 11,000 pounds. Employees assigned to isolated areas where no residence quarters are available would be reimbursed for storage of household goods.

Second. It would permit reimbursement of travel expenses to an employee's immediate family while en route to a new official station.

Third. It would cover the expenses of certain real estate transactions resulting from the employee selling his home at his old station and purchasing a new residence at his new station.

Fourth. The employee would receive a flat allowance to cover miscellaneous expenses of their move which are not otherwise provided for.

It is only logical and equitable that when a Federal agency transfers an employee, the agency should pay some of the costs involved in moving.

The transfer of an employee benefits the Government. The payment of a portion of the costs of moving will help to attract talented personnel into Federal service. It would show that the Government has an interest in the future of its employees.

Automation and the closing of Federal installations are examples of the causes of periodic movement of personnel.

Extensive and expanding Federal programs also require career personnel to be constantly on the move throughout the Nation. Nonreimbursable costs of moving have represented significant deterrents to the relocation of many employees. If experienced employees are unwilling or unable to absorb this financial loss, the Government will lose their services. To retain skilled and trained talent we must alleviate as much financial hardship as possible in the movement of Government personnel.

I would therefore like to urge that the House give favorable consideration to the passage of this vitally needed legislation.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kunkel].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, this bill today is a big step forward, but even if passed, there still remains more to be done.

At this time I wish to associate myself vigorously with the proposals outlined so well by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May]. It seems to me they have stated an essential step to correct a very illogical existing situation. There is no reason why reimbursements by either government or private industry for business expenses should be treated as personal income.

I believe I was probably the first one to introduce a bill along the line of H.R. 10607—I did so as a result of a letter and a bill sent to me by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Of course, the committee has improved the bill and made it better, except in one respect, as to which I will submit an amendment. So I continue to do all I can to secure passage of the bill.

It is an excellent bill both from the standpoint of the Government—in other words, as a matter of good administrative practice—and from the standpoint of the employee. In terms of simple equity for the employee, it is an absolute necessity.

There are several reasons. First, let me call attention again to the survey the Civil Service Commission conducted 3 years ago. They checked into more than 5,000 transfer cases. They found that in 83 out of every 100 cases, the employees lost money in the process of moving their families and households from one area to another.

Moreover, they averaged losing $558. That is above and beyond what the Government reimbursed them.

Now $558 is a whale of a lot of money to come out of the pocket of the average Federal employee. What is more, it is a whale of an unfair situation when you consider that virtually every transfer is for the benefit of the Government and at the convenience of the Government.

The benefit to the employee, or his career development, is a secondary consideration at best. His move is intended, in one way or another, to enhance the efficiency of the agency involved. Yet under present law, he too often has to foot a large part of the bill. This legislation will correct that.

The problem of out-of-pocket expenses in these transfers was really driven home to me when the Defense Department began phasing out Olmsted Air Base up in my district last year.

Many of the civilian employees up at Middletown started figuring out how much cold, hard cash it was going to cost them if they accepted functional transfer and followed their jobs to these other bases in Utah and Texas and Oklahoma—and some down to Georgia and out to California. They started writing and talking to me about it, and then I started getting letters from people who had actually moved. These letters were very much along the line of the letters which were read by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal], a little bit earlier.

It is a crying shame. These people have taken an awful beating—probably an even worse beating than a lot of them realize. One man, for example, sent me a detailed breakdown on the costs of moving his family and household belongings out to California. It added up to $977 more than what the Government would pay for. I know it did not include all of his costs—just the most obvious ones. He did not even include the costs of selling his home and buying another one.

Incidentally, there was a proposal adopted last year that would have enabled the Defense Department to buy those homes at the prevailing market price on the date of the announced closings in November 1964. They would then be turned over to the FHA so that the FHA could hold the properties until the real estate market had had a reasonable chance to adjust itself. The properties would then be sold and the Government paid off. That provision was put in the law last year when the housing bill was enacted, and yet, Mr. McNamara has never requested any funds for that purpose. He did not request them last year. He has said he made a request to the Bureau of the Budget, but he has not and will not give me the information as to what his request was, so I do not know what it is.

I only hope that he does not hold off on this as he has on some other appropriations which the Congress has authorized. This phase of the problem has been brought out by a number of other speakers today. It is enormously important.

There were 11,000 people at the Middletown Air Depot. When that many houses in the same area are thrown on the market at one time, there is bound to be an immediate depreciation. There must be some method whereby the owners of those houses may have an opportunity to let the real estate market adjust itself, so that they will not be faced with an irreparable loss.

Then, when they go to a place like Ogden, with such a big influx of people, the real estate market skyrockets, and the people have to pay more for their new houses—far more than their normal values. The employees get "taken" both coming and going.

Many of the people at Middletown have skills desperately needed at the base to which their jobs are being transferred. But they have been weighing a large number of factors in their minds.

Even if many of them were not born in our community, they have nevertheless become attached to it. They have established homes there. They go to church there. They have friends and relatives there. They balance the transfer offer against the prospect of finding another Federal job in our area or a job in private industry. Add to these factors the high cost of moving. In many cases the result is the man decides to stay put. That costs the Government plenty.

But what does that say about Government efficiency? What it says is that the skills are not going where the Government needs them most. This means a delay in getting some vital jobs done. It means some heavy costs—maybe $5,000 to $25,000 a man—in recruiting and training new people to do these jobs.

I have just had information from Oklahoma City that they need 4,000 additional skilled employees there. Most of these skilled mechanics at Middletown are people who have had 5 to 10 year's training on the job. When a man like that is lost, it costs the Government very close to $25,000 to retrain a new man. A great amount of Government efficiency and Government saving is involved in this.

A few comparisons also will help us to see this legislation in the proper perspective. In general, private industries large enough to have written policies on the subject provide at least as much assistance to employees as this bill does. Many industries go far beyond it. Similar, or equivalent, assistance is provided by our military forces and for our foreign service people. It is already a requirement for employees of private firms performing defense contracts.

In view of all these things, I trust there is no question but that this bill deserves passage and early enactment.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point my newsletter No. 10 dated March 17, 1966:

NEWSLETTER NO. 10 OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN C. KUNKEL, 16TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

MARCH 17, 1966.

Robert Strange McNamara (sometimes referred to as "Strange Robert") is a unique man, at least in one respect. It is many years since any Cabinet member has made so many errors and miscalculations and yet retained his job and the confidence of a President of the United States. Time and time again, what Mr. McNamara and his whiz kids and computers say is the case turns out to be something entirely different. Of course, any criticism must, in fairness, be viewed with an overall perspective on the gigantic tasks our Defense Establishment has to perform and on the total job it is doing to protect the country and its vital interests around the world.

It might be well for Mr. McNamara occasionally to admit his errors and try to correct them. If he did this, the public would have more confidence in his level headedness and his judgment. But so far, the only time I can remember him admitting an error was when he confessed he had miscalculated on the number of helicopters to order for Vietnam.

I receive many letters telling about lack of supplies for our boys in Vietnam. Other Members tell me they receive similar letters. Of course, we are not in position to prove all of these things. But it does seem as though Mr. McNamara has made some serious miscalculations. We know he said in March of 1964 that most of the 15,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam should be withdrawn before the end of 1965 and that most of our people would be out of Vietnam shortly thereafter. If he really believed this, and if his calculations were based upon it, then it is easy to see why our boys in Vietnam may be short of some of the supplies they now need. Mr. McNamara still claims that they are completely supplied and have everything they need. Yet I am continuing to urge the Armed Services Committees of both the House and the Senate to continue their checking into this phase of our war effort. We can afford to take no chances in this field. It means American lives.

Perhaps it might be better to shift Mr. McNamara from Secretary of Defense to a job where his talents could be employed in finding cost accounting methods which would save money throughout other departments of the Government. Certainly this is much needed. It could create a great saving for the United States.

At the time of the Olmsted closing, the number of instrument technicians and other skilled people who would accept functional transfers from Olmsted to other military bases was much discussed. The boys from Middletown prepared excellent briefs on this. The vital question was whether enough of these skilled people would move to these other bases so that their functions could be carried on without undue interruption, and without too much of the delay and enormous cost otherwise involved in recruiting and training people to take their places. It costs a lot of money to train a man to the highly skilled level attained by most of our present and former Olmsted employees.

The Olmsted employees contended that only about 35 percent of our skilled workers at Middletown would accept offers to transfer to these other bases. They warned that these other bases would not have a sufficient pool of skilled people to offset this loss. This would mean a serious slowup in supply and logistics. McNamara's whizz kids discounted and pooh-poohed this argument. One document from Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance's office pointed to transfer rates of 44 and 50 percent from two military installations previously closed. Other documents placed great reliance on a transfer figure of 65 percent. This was based on 12,000 job transfer offers made during the first 11 months of 1964. The Department not only said the 35 percent estimate by our Olmsted employees was "unnecessarily low." It also added the insult of saying that those who made the estimate "did not have access to all information required to make a logical evaluation."

Well, in this case again—according to the latest information I have—the Department of Defense was wrong. It was dead wrong—and the Department's own figures show it.

I have had placed in my hands a memorandum prepared less than a month ago by the Assistant Director for Community Adjustment under the Assistant Secretary of Defense. It shows that, as of January 31 of this year, only 732 Olmsted employees have accepted functional transfer and moved with their jobs to the other bases. This is out of a total of 4,414 workers whose employment at Olmsted had ended by that time. Divide those figures to get the pecentage, and you come out with only about 16½ percent of the employees accepting functional transfer—16½ percent. That is nowhere near the 65-percent figure cited by the Defense Department—or its lower figures, either. It is not even anywhere near the 35-percent estimate by our Olmsted employees, who I am sure allowed every benefit of doubt in arriving at a figure that high.

I was glad to see that 2,252 Olmsted employees had found other Federal jobs. The memorandum indicated that about half of these—1,115—had been hired at Mechanicsburg and New Cumberland.

But the 16½ percent figure indicated to me that the Defense Department must be having some real trouble getting the work done at the bases taking over Olmsted's functions. Then came a letter to me from a former Olmsted worker who is now at the Oklahoma City base. He sent along a clipping from the base newspaper. It said there is now a critical need for 4,000 workers at Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area. It quoted Maj. Gen. Melvin McNickle there as saying, "We're hurting right now to fill 2,000 vacancies." It told about McNickle leading a delegation to Middletown to try to entice our people to move to Oklahoma City. It quoted the general as saying, "If we don't get them (from Middletown), we will have to go into a training period the likes of which we have never seen before." The news story further said there are few if any people in Oklahoma with the skills needed to do the job.

I could not help thinking back to one of the documents I received early last year from Deputy Secretary Vance. It estimated the number of skilled workers available around the Oklahoma City base, and it said: "This large pool of skilled labor assures us that, even if no Middletown employees choose to transfer, the instrument workload transition at Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area can be accomplished with no serious impact."

This was, patently, a grave miscalculation. I wish it had not been, but it was. While I like to be right—and while I find myself and our Olmsted employees to have been correct in our analysis—I wish for the sake of our country that we had been wrong. Particularly is this so in that it came at a time when our Vietnam war effort requires more and more logistical support here at home. From recent reports about our problems over there, I am forced to conclude that it was one of McNamara's many miscalculations.

We have all seen the reports about the shortages of weapons and ammunition and other war materiel showing up in Vietnam. Just the other day, I read about machineguns being stripped from tanks in Europe to be pressed into service in South Vietnam. A large percentage of our troops have been eating C-rations as a steady diet because of food shortages. Some of our soldiers have written home asking their families to mail them such essentials as combat boots and fatigues and underwear and socks.

The Defense Department's logistical support of our men in Vietnam is now under investigation in the Congress. There is much evidence to show it has not been up to standard. If the decisions leading up to this were as flimsy as those dictating the Olmsted closure, then it is no small wonder.

Mr. Chairman, the main reason for this bill before us today stems from the reorganization of military bases undertaken by the Department of Defense over the past 17 months. I am going to suggest an amendment, as the gentleman from California indicated, that this bill be made retroactive to January 1, 1965.

Those were the largest number of base closings ever in the history of this country. If we do not protect the people who were crucified by those actions of the Secretary of Defense in those closings, then we shall have failed to meet the problem squarely. We will have failed those to whom the greatest injury has been done.

I have talked to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] on this subject. I know the difficulties with which Congress is faced. I know the long policy against making retroactive legislation. I know the administrative problems involved. They have given me a very fair hearing on this subject. But I still feel that it is up to the House to repair the damage done to those who have been affected already. I hope the Members will support my amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct the question to the gentleman handling this bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL]. It has come to my attention that one of the agencies of the Government, namely the Social Security Administration, will not promote a man or woman to a higher grade unless they move the man or woman.

In other words, they do not make promotions in the same town or in the same office. They will only make promotions when they move someone to a different town. This has caused untold expense to people who are engaged in trying to handle the affairs of social security. Is there anything in this bill which would prevent the social security system from changing its rules and regulations and allowing promotions from assistant manager to manager within a town or area?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If the gentleman will yield, there is nothing in the bill that covers that point directly. However, earlier in my presentation I read a letter from an individual affected by the identical circumstances that the gentleman refers to. In order to gain a promotion he had to move. The intention of this bill is to make that somewhat easier on the employee. There is nothing in the bill that would cover their policy as far as promotions are concerned.

Mr. SAYLOR. I sincerely hope, while I am very much in favor of this bill, that your committee will look into this matter and determine whether or not there should not be a change in policy in the social security aspects.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, speaking, as I am, at the end of the hour of debate, there is not much that I can say about this bill to explain it that has not already been ably said by the gentleman from New York and some of the other speakers. I do want, however, to indicate my support of this bill. I think it is wise. It is far reaching in its application, and it will improve the Federal service and improve the conditions of those employed in the Federal service. I think one of the most forward thinking and one of the most humane of the provisions is the one that provides for the reimbursement of moving expense for those who may have been separated from the service due to a base closing if they are reemployed within 1 year after being separated and if, in such reemployment, it is necessary for them to move from their present location to a new location. I think at this period in time when we are having so many base closings and having had so many last year, this will be one of the provisions that will be utilized immediately. It will be an aid in reemploying those who have, through no fault of their own, been separated from the Federal service. I think also we have made a good record here as to the fact that it is the intention of this Congress, although we cannot do it through this vehicle, to make these reimbursements of expenses nontaxable. Certainly this can be done only by the passage of another substantive piece of legislation, several of which have been discussed during the debate here today. I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will act favorably on one of those bills so that this bill may reach its fullest meaning and these reimbursement expenses will not be counted as income to the employees, which would mean they would in fact receive only a portion of the benefit that we intend to give them by the passage of this bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the privilege of addressing my colleagues in the House today to urge their support for H.R. 10607. The bill provides moving expense payments to civilian Government employees when they are forced to relocate as a result of their employee relationship to the Federal Government. I myself was pleased to be the original sponsor within the Committee on Government Operations of a similar proposal.

The purpose of H.R. 10607 is to make the Government truly competitive with the private sector in terms of attracting and retaining desirable talent. Thus far the Congress has considered legislation to create such comparability only insofar as rates of direct compensation are concerned. The proposal before us today would extend this principle to include reasonable moving expenses as well.

The original concept for this legislation comes from the Civil Service Commission's own recently conducted survey on employee moves. This study of over 5,000 Federal employees shows that every day of the year nearly 100 employees are relocated to suit the purposes of their employer, the Federal Government. Over 80 out of every 100 of these lose money on their move. The study shows further that the average out-of-pocket cost for each employee is $560 and many persons lose over $1,000 when they are forced to transfer. It would seem reasonable under accepted practices of modern business for these losses to be absorbed by the employer.

The burden of the present Government practice, vis-a-vis its employees, is especially unfair in view of the Nation's current drive for economy. Military bases and other Federal installations and facilities in my home State of Massachusetts, as well as elsewhere around the country, are being closed down in increasing numbers. Whatever the merits of these shutdowns may be, the inevitable result is a great hardship on those who must move home and family in order to stay employed.

The general rule of thumb contained in H.R. 10607 is to compensate employees who are forced to move from one Federal job to another for whatever might be the complete and reasonable costs of that move. Such a guideline seems to me to be realistic. If the Federal Government is to continue to efficiently administer the great number of programs which circumstances dictate that it must, then we in the Congress must see to it that the Government as an employer is able to attract the kind of people who can do a topnotch job. The persons who will benefit from the increased efficiency are, of course, the citizens we represent, the entire Nation as a whole.

In conclusion, therefore, I call upon my colleagues here in the House to vote in favor of the bill that is before them now, realizing that to do so is to strengthen the entire country which we are privileged to represent.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that my colleagues will unanimously approve this measure before us, H.R. 10607, to provide for reimbursement of certain expenses of moving and storage to Federal employees when they are transferred from one duty station to another for the benefit and convenience of the Government. I have had firsthand observation and experience in this matter because of the phasing out of certain Defense Department facilities in my district and the transfer of the career employees to other and remote sections of the country. Obviously there are great and severe human and material hardships associated with such unhappy developments and especially when the people affected have had long service and are deeply rooted in the area communities.

There is nothing that can be done to assuage the individual and family human hardships that arise from the necessity to suddenly move to an unfamiliar region in another part of the country, but this Government can and should do something to alleviate the great financial hardships that are visited upon the worker and his family when these most distressing events occur.

The purpose of this bill is to extend simple justice to these Federal employees who are so suddenly uprooted from their longtime home environment and forced, in order to retain their employment, to move to another community with their children and household effects. It is easy to imagine the terrible difficulties of trying to sell your home, locate another one in a new area, make arrangements for shipping your household goods, get the children enrolled in new schools, and still report to your work station within a stated interval.

Hitherto, this could not be accomplished without the individual suffering severe financial losses which this bill is designed to correct. The measure proposes to raise the weight limit on the amount of household goods to be shipped for which reimbursement can be made, to allow travel expenses reimbursement to the employee's immediate family in going to the new work station and permit certain expenses that are incurred while the employee and his wife are trying to find suitable living accommodations in their new location. The measure further provides limited reimbursement for expenses incurred in the selling of his primary home and purchasing a new home in the community area to which he has been transferred.

Mr. Chairman, the principle of reimbursing employees for transfer expenses has long been followed in private business; the reimbursement provisions of this bill are certainly well within reason and the basic objective of the bill is to extend simple justice to loyal and faithful Government employees who are being transferred for the benefit of the Government. I hope this House will overwhelmingly approve the measure without further delay.

The **CHAIRMAN.** There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a) of section 1 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 806, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 73b–1(a)), is amended by—

(1) striking the words "the Act of February 14, 1931" appearing in the first parentheses contained therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 837)";

(2) striking the word "seven" appearing in the second parentheses contained therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eleven";

(3) striking out of the first proviso contained therein the words "the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926 (5 U.S.C. 828)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "section 5 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 838)".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 1 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 807, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 73b–1(b)), is amended by adding the following words immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence in the subsection ", except that payment of actual expenses may be made whenever, under regulations prescribed by the President, the head of the agency determines that such method of payment is more economical to the Government."

Sec. 2. The Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 806), as amended, is further amended by adding the following new sections:

"Sec. 23. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe and to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate, as provided therein, appropriations or other funds available to the departments for administrative expenses shall be available for the reimbursement of all or part of the following expenses of officers or employees for whom the Government pays expenses of travel and transportation under subsection (a) of section 1 of this Act:

"(1) The expenses of per diem allowance in lieu of the subsistence expenses of the immediate family of the officer or employee while en route between his old and new official stations, not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed in or pursuant to section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 836).

"(2) The expenses of per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence of the officer or employee and his spouse, not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed in the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 836), and the expenses of transportation to seek permanent residence quarters at a new official station when both the old and new stations are located within the continental United States, excluding Alaska, provided that such expenses may be allowed only for one round trip in connection with each change of station of the officer or employee.

"(3) The subsistence expenses of the officer or employee and his immediate family for a period of thirty days while occupying temporary quarters when the new official station is located within the United States (including the District of Columbia, its territories and possessions, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone: *Provided,* That the period of residence in temporary quarters may be extended for an additional thirty days when the officer or employee moves to or from Hawaii, Alaska, the territories and possessions, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, except that reimbursement for subsistence expenses actually incurred may not exceed an amount determined from such average daily rates per person as may be prescribed in such regulations, but not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed in or pursuant to section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 836), for the localities in which the temporary quarters are located, for the first ten days of such period, two-thirds of such rates for the second ten days, and one-half for the balance of such period, including the additional thirty days

"(4) The expenses of the sale of the residence (or the settlement of an unexpired lease) of the officer or employee at the old official station and purchase of a home at the new official station required to be paid by him when the old and new official stations are located within the United States (including the District of Columbia), its territories and possessions, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, but reimbursement for brokerage fees on the sale of the residence shall not exceed such fees as are customarily charged in the locality where the residence is located and no reimbursement shall be made for losses on the sale of the residence. This provision applies regardless of whether the title to the residence or the unexpired lease is in the name of the officer or employee alone, in the joint names of the officer or employee and a member of his immediate family, or in the name of a member of his immediate family alone.

"Sec. 24. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe and to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate, as provided therein, and notwithstanding other reimbursement authorized under this Act, an officer or employee who is reimbursed under section 1(a) or section 23 of this Act shall, if he has an immediate family, receive an amount equal to two weeks' basic compensation, or, if he does not have an immediate family, an amount equal to one week's basic compensation: *Provided,* That such amounts shall not exceed amounts determined from the maximum rate of grade GS–13 in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"Sec. 25. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe—

"(a) Whenever any civilian officer or employee (including any new appointee in accordance with section 7(b) of this Act, as amended) is assigned to a permanent duty station at an isolated location in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, to which he cannot take or at which he is unable to use his household goods and personal effects because of the absence of residence quarters at such location, nontemporary storage expenses or storage at Government expense in Government-owned facilities (including related transportation and other expenses), whichever is more economical, may be allowed such officer or employee under regulations issued by the head of the Executive Department or agency concerned. In no instance shall the weight of the property stored under this subsection, together with the weight transported under section 1 or section 7(b) of this Act, exceed the total maximum weight the officer or employee would be entitled to have moved, and the period of nontemporary storage shall not exceed three years.

"(b) This section does not authorize reimbursement to officers and employees traveling under orders issued more than sixty days prior to the effective date of this section.

"Sec. 26. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe and notwithstanding the provisions of the fourth proviso of section 1(a) of this Act, in transfers between departments for reasons of reduction in force or transfer of function, expenses authorized under section 1, subsections (a) and (b) and subsections (e) and (f) other than expenses authorized in connection with transfers to foreign countries, and under sections 23 and 24 of this Act may be paid in whole or in part by the department from which the officer or employee is transferred or by the department to which he is transferred, as may be agreed upon by the heads of the departments concerned.

"Sec. 27. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, a former officer or employee separated by reason of reduction in force or transfer of function who is reemployed within six months of the date of such separation by a nontemporary appointment at a different geographical location from that where such separation occurred may be allowed and paid the expenses authorized by section 1 of this Act, and may receive the benefits authorized by sections 23 and 24 of this Act, in the same manner as though he had been transferred to the location of reemployment from the location where separated in the interest of the Government without a break in service.

"Sec. 28. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 1, and of sections 23, 24, 25, and 27 of this Act, the travel and transportation expenses, including storage of household goods and personal effects, and other relocation allowances shall not be allowed thereunder when a civilian officer or employee is transferred within the continental United States, excluding Alaska, unless and until such officer or employee shall agree in writing to remain in the Government service for twelve months following his transfer, unless separated for reasons beyond his control and acceptable to the department or agency concerned. In case of violation of such agreement, any moneys expended by the United States under said sections of this Act on account of such officer or employee shall be recoverable from him as a debt due the United States."

Sec. 3. Regulations under this Act shall be prescribed within ninety days following the date of enactment but shall be retroactive to such date.

Mr. ROSENTHAL (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] a question or two about the bill. The phrase "transferred at the convenience of the Government" has been used several times this afternoon. What about an employee who asks to be transferred? Would that employee be transferred at the convenience of the Government?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No.

Mr. GROSS. Then, this bill would not apply to the employee who seeks a transfer to another job?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The answer to that question is that it would not apply to him.

Mr. GROSS. Earlier we discussed to some extent the insurance phase of the bill. Do I understand that the gentleman's committee or some other committee of the Congress is proposing to do something about the subject of insurance to be carried on household goods that are transported under the terms of this bill?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The Bureau of the Budget indicated to us that this is a matter that they were deeply concerned with, as is the gentleman from Iowa, and they intended to handle it by regulation. As I said earlier, I am in complete agreement with the gentleman that insurance is something that should be obtained on the transfer of household goods and it should be an allowable expense.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Am I correct in assuming that schedule (C) appointees in Government will be covered as well as Class Act employees? In other fords, that political appointees in Government will be covered by the bill?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Under the first section of the bill it says that, "Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, any civilian officer or employee of the Government who," and it continues to go on and says that in the interest of the Government is transferred.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman would conclude from that, that any civilian officer, or one who meets that definition, would come under the definitions of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Would it be reasonable to assume that the cost-plus contracts into which the Government enters with private enterprise have had a bearing and contributed to the pressure for this legislation?

In other words, cost-plus contractors working for the Federal Government have no trouble insofar as I know in adding moving costs of their employees to the costs that are charged to the Government.

I just wondered if in the hearings on this bill and in the development of this legislation the gentlemen has found that this created pressure for the legislation?

There have been statements made this afternoon that private industry is increasingly paying the moving expenses of employees.

I wonder how much of this might be attributable to the cost-plus contracts which run into the billions of dollars?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I recall no direct testimony on the point that the gentleman from Iowa raises.

I believe the major emphasis of the bill is directed toward the inequity that the Federal employees suffered in not being compensated for these expense items. Apparently there was some limitation on behalf of the Federal Government, or reluctance, to move employees around as freely as they would like, and also some reluctance on the part of the employees to make these moves. However, I believe the gentleman from Iowa makes an interesting observation.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I will say to the gentleman from New York and to the Members of the House that this bill is going to result in a substantial increase in costs to the Federal Government.

It is my understanding that more than 100,000 employees are going to be added to the Federal payroll this year.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the taxpayer can be expected to live with these burdens, if the number of Federal employees continues to be increased at that rate, and if the fringe benefits to Federal employees are to be increased. This bill, if finally enacted, does represent another fringe benefit.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of the House and all Members of Congress will keep in mind the fact that as the number of Federal employees increase, and 100,000 in 1 year is a lot of them, so will the direct costs of employees in specific jobs, and added must be the fringe benefits as embodied in bills of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will take cognizance of this. I hope there will soon be some sign—some indication—that the expansion of the already huge Central Government is going to end.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 4, line 7, strike out "Zone, except that" and insert in lieu thereof "Zone; *Provided further,* That".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 5, line 1, strike out "shall not exceed such fees as are customarily" and insert in lieu thereof "and other expenses under this subsection shall not exceed those customarily".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 5, line 15, strike out "equal to" and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 5, line 16, strike out "equal to" and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 7, line 10, strike out "six months" and insert in lieu thereof "one year".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUNKEL

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Kunkel: Page 8, strike out lines 11 to 13, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Sec. 3. Regulations under this Act shall be prescribed within ninety days following the date of enactment of this Act but shall be retroactive to the effective date of the amendments made by this Act.
>
> "Sec. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective as of January 1, 1965."

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes the provisions of this bill retroactive to January 1, 1965. As presently written, the provisions would apply only to employees transferring after enactment of the bill.

I submit that this legislation would not have come before this Congress had it not been for the military base closings announced by Secretary of Defense McNamara in November of 1964. Time and again, the Civil Service Commission has made reference to the base closings as a motivating factor behind this bill.

But the fact is that thousands of Defense Department employees already have moved, or are in the process of moving, under the old law which provides completely inadequate reimbursement of the expenses involved.

Unless this bill is made retroactive, we are going to be faced with a vast inequity—an unfortunate paradox. Employees moving before enactment of this bill will have been compensated at far lower rates than employees of the same department moving after enactment of this bill. But all of the moves are dictated and made necessary by the same program.

Remember this: The military base closings announced in 1964 are still in progress. More base closings were initiated only last December. They, too, are still underway.

If this bill is not made retroactive, then we will be treating one group of employees in a different and far less suitable manner than another group.

And yet all of these employees actually are in the same boat. They really have no choice about when they are transferred—whether it is before the enactment of this bill or after its enactment.

More important, they are all affected by the same set of orders—the military base closings orders of November 1964, and December 1965. The lives and small savings of all of these employees—regardless of their dates of transfer—have been and will be affected by the same set of orders.

My amendment carries the provisions of this bill back to what I think is a logical date. It is the start of the past calendar year. Undoubtedly, few if any Defense Department employees were transferred before that time as a result of the November 1964 orders.

Mr. Chairman, we have a rare situation here. This is not a case where, at any given time, just a few employees here and there throughout the Government are being transferred. This is a case where large numbers of employees, all at the same time and all at the same Federal installations, have been confronted with the unhappy prospect of moving. The impact has been immense.

This fact, more than anything else, has brought to the fore—in their minds as well as our minds—the inequities of the existing provisions for moving expenses. Make no mistake. It also has brought to the fore, in their minds, the injustice which will result if one group has been compensated inadequately under the old law and another group is compensated adequately under a new law.

Over the years, Mr. Chairman, I have been proud of the way this body has taken action on countless occasions to correct inequities showing up in our laws.

Except for the abrupt manner in which Secretary McNamara announced the base closings in November 1964—let alone those of last December—the Congress would have had an opportunity to help make these massive transitions less burdensome and less disruptive for the individuals involved.

By all standards—except that we were taken by surprise—this bill should have been, and would have been, enacted many months ago.

It was not enacted many months ago, but we can correct that by adopting my amendment to make it retroactive.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much will your amendment cost?

Mr. KUNKEL. I cannot tell the gentleman that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee considered this amendment. In response to an inquiry made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, we communicated with the Bureau of the Budget about this problem. Their answer was as follows:

> Question. There have been proposals to make the bill applicable on a retroactive basis in order to include groups of employees who have been moved to new stations recently. Would this be feasible?
>
> Answer. It would not be feasible to make the bill effective retroactively because the employees, in most instances, would be unable to substantiate their expenses through the submission of receipts, or other acceptable evidence, in instances where receipts would be required. For example, allowances for expenses of temporary quarters must be supported with receipts, and similar evidence would be required for expenses of selling and buying residences. We believe in most instances such records would be unavailable and incomplete and consequently it would not be feasible to provide the allowances on a retroactive basis.

Because, Mr. Chairman, the regulations have yet to be promulgated and because all of the evidenciary support that would be required under the regulations would more than likely be unavailable, we must oppose the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and urge that it be defeated.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I merely wish to take this opportunity to commend the Committee on Government Operations for bringing out this piece of legislation. I also wish to commend the administration for proposing it, because this is based upon an original administration proposal submitted last year.

In our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service we have encountered many instances where a transferred employee was penalized by several hundred dollars. I remember one case of an FAA employee who was assigned to a new station across the country and lost as much as $800 by being transferred. I think the Government is attempting to be and should be a model employer. We want to provide benefits of this kind for the very dedicated and very able people who make Government service a career.

So I intend to support this bill, and I wish to commend the author of it and all of those who made it possible for us to vote on it here today.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10607) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States, pursuant to House Resolution 781, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR PLAN TO SELL SILVER DOLLARS TO AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY AND AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a number of members of the Banking and Currency Committee have introduced legislation which would permit the Treasury Department to sell silver dollars to the American Cancer Society and to the American Heart Association.

The bills would permit the two health organizations to resell the silver dollars using the profits exclusively for research for cancer, heart disease, and stroke. The silver dollars, including 2,800,000 minted at Carson City in the 1800's, are believed to have a numismatic value several times their monetary worth. In fact, it has been estimated that the sale of these silver dollars could raise as much as $35 million for this very worthwhile and necessary health research.

While this plan would help these two nonprofit health organizations, it would also give the Treasury Department an orderly means of disposing of its idle stock of silver dollars. This legislation would provide a means of distributing these valuable silver dollars without the profits going to speculators.

Yesterday leading members of the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association met informally with the Banking and Currency Committee to indicate the organization's support for this legislation.

Among those present from the American Cancer Society were Mrs. Charles W. Bailey, Austin, Tex., a member of the Society's National Crusade Committee and a director of the Texas Division of the American Cancer Society; Travis T. Wallace, Dallas, chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Cancer Society; Mrs. Robert E. Ringle, Palo Verdes Estates, Calif., a member of the national association's board of directors; and Dr. Thomas J. Hartford, Washington, D.C., eastern program consultant.

In attendance from the American Heart Association were Dr. Helen B. Taussig, president of the American Heart Association and professor emeritus of pediatrics, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; and Ross Reid, New York, chairman of the Association's Finance Committee. Dr. Murray M. Copeland, associate director of education, M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute, Houston, Tex., was unable to attend because of illness.

The executive committees of both organizations adopted resolutions which were presented at the meeting yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record copies of both of these resolutions:

Resolution of the American Cancer Society

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson has challenged the Nation's conscience with his statement, "Unless we do better, two-thirds of all Americans now living will suffer or die from cancer, heart disease or stroke"; and

Whereas the American Heart Association and the American Cancer Society carry out extensive programs against the two greatest disease killers and are thoroughly experienced and qualified in the area of research; and

Whereas only through research can many millions of living Americans escape the tragedy and suffering of death from cancer; and

Whereas the Honorable Wright Patman introduced on March 1, 1966, a bill (H.R. 13150) authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars at face value to the American Heart Association and the American Cancer Society, to enable them to resell the dollars at market price which is substantially more than face value for the benefit of research: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Cancer Society agrees that the entire net proceeds from the sale of its share of the silver dollars will be used for cancer research as part of a fund to be known as the Sam Rayburn-Robert Taft Memorial Cancer Research Fund of the American Cancer Society; and further

Resolved, That the sale of the dollars will be so conducted as to give opportunities to both small and large collectors and avoid benefits to speculators; and further

Resolved, That the American Cancer Society congratulates Congressman Wright Patman and his colleagues of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives for their support of this imaginative legislation whose enactment would be a major contribution to cancer research.

March 18, 1966.

Resolution of the American Heart Association

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson, in convening the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, pointed out: "Unless we do better, two-thirds of all Americans now living will suffer or die from cancer, heart disease or stroke. I expect you to do something about it."

Whereas the U.S. Treasury is desirous of finding an equitable and sensible way to dispose in the public interest of an inventory of standard silver dollars now held in the Treasury so that they will be available to coin collectors, large and small, throughout the country;

Whereas the American Heart Association and the American Cancer Society, the two voluntary agencies named in the report of the President's Commission, need funds for research, the recruitment and training of vitally needed manpower, and other important program needs in heart disease, cancer and stroke;

Whereas the Honorable Wright Patman on March 1, 1966, introduced a bill (H.R. 13150) in the House of Representatives that would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to sell such inventory of standard silver dollars at face value to the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Heart Association hereby endorses H.R. 13150 and urges the Congress that it be enacted into law, with the understanding that the entire net proceeds received by the association from the sale of dollars acquired pursuant thereto will be used solely for research, manpower recruitment and training, and other vitally needed programs in the fields of heart disease and stroke, it being the intent of the association to place all such proceeds in a special fund suitably named in honor of outstanding Americans who have faced serious problems of heart disease; and

The association expresses its deep appreciation to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and its chairman, Congressman Wright Patman, for their support of this legislation and commends them for their ingenuity in finding a solution to the Treasury's problem that is equitable and sensible and feasible and that will not result in windfall profits for speculators but will furnish needed support for urgently needed programs in the fight against heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the American Heart Association, Saturday, March 19, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation will have widespread support in the Congress and among the general public. Already 16 members, from both sides of the aisle, of the Banking and Currency Committee have introduced bills on the subject. In addition to legislation which I introduced on March 1, these bills have been placed in the hopper by Representatives Reuss, McGrath, Moorhead, Rees, Ashley, Barrett, Dwyer, Grabowski, Minish, St Germain, Widnall, Todd, Annunzio, Fino, and Hansen.

The plan is also receiving favorable comment in the press. I place in the Record a copy of an editorial from the Dallas Morning News of March 3, 1966, entitled "Coins for Cures" and a letter which I have written to the newspaper in response to this editorial:

Coins for Cures

Has there ever been a Federal-aid plan that didn't cost the taxpayer a dime? A novel proposal from Representative Wright Patman, of Texarkana—a Federal-aid plan, pure and simple—offers just that: aid for two charities that would leave the taxpayer's wallet untouched.

The Patman plan would have the Federal Government sell about 3 million rare silver dollars at face value to the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association. The two charities would buy the coins for precisely what they were worth when most of them were minted at Carson City in the 1800's—$1 each. On the coin collectors' market, however, the coins are worth many times $3 million.

The plan is so simple that the wary citizen, accustomed to figure juggling and other sleight-of-hand tricks, may suspect an ace up the proponent's sleeve. But the plan is entirely devoid of tricks. It would be a mere exchange, dollar for dollar.

The profits that the ACS and AHA would realize from the transaction would be poured directly into the two groups' primary function—the search for cancer and heart disease cures.

The Federal Government, with good results in most cases is already subsidizing medical research. That subsidy is borne by the taxpayer.

Because the Patman plan is virtually cost-free and the proceeds would aid two worthy charities it deserves the most favorable consideration.

March 12, 1966.

Mr. Dick West,
Editorial Editor,
The Dallas Morning News,
Dallas, Tex.

Dear Mr. West: I want to thank the Dallas News for its editorial which appeared in the early part of March on "Coins for Cures."

This bill proposing that the Treasury sell the $2,900,000 of $1 silver coins is receiving tremendous support. Your editorial will be very helpful to the cause.

Some of the silver dollars are very valuable, as you probably know. It is estimated that less than 3 million silver dollars will bring as high as $35 million at public auction, which would be a tremendous lift for these two worthy funds.

It is considered to be the best plan that has been proposed for the Treasury to dispose of them and at the same time not permit any person or selfish group to receive such a tremendous windfall of profit.

The thousands of coin collectors are small business concerns that too will be helped tremendously by the release of the coins on the market. The fact that small business is being helped in such a major way in addition to the very worthy causes of heart and cancer will also be pleasing to all of us.

Again thanking you for the editorial, I am

Sincerely yours,

Wright Patman.

I also place in the Record an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal today on the pending bills.

Silver-Dollar Parlay May Hit the Jackpot for Disease Fighters—Bill Would Allow Sale of Coins to Heart, Cancer Groups for Resale at Profit to Public

Washington.—Gaining support in Congress is a novel proposal to parlay 3 million of the Treasury's silver dollars into as much as $50 million for private disease-fighting research.

The plan would authorize the Treasury to sell its silver dollars at face value to the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association. These groups then would resell the coins to collectors. Many of the silver dollars in the Treasury stockpile were minted in Carson City, Nev., in the 19th century, and supposedly are greatly valued by coin collectors.

Mrs. Charles W. Bailey, a director of the Texas division of the American Cancer Society, estimates the two groups could realize a profit between $35 million and $50 million on the resale of the coins. Sales might be spread over 5 years to avoid glutting the collectors' market.

A bill authorizing the Treasury to sell the coins is being sponsored by House Banking Committee Chairman Patman, Democrat, of Texas. Unlike other domestic money proposals, which often split the Banking Committee into warring fanctions, Mr. Patman's plan has produced feelings of friendship and harmony among his colleagues. At a meeting yesterday with delegates from the two disease-fighting organizations, one lawmaker after another made a little speech in support of the coin sale. Representative Widnall, Republican, of New Jersey, for example, called the proposed sale "an extremely worthwhile project."

Chairman PATMAN said formal hearings on his bill will be held soon.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION—NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, legislative interest in the housing and urban development field right now is focusing among others on a program for certain demonstration cities, and hearings are in progress to glean from all the knowledgeable leaders in this field their ideas of what form this national effort should take. In this connection, it has been interesting to note that this is not regarded in our country as a purely domestic concern. The problem of the breakneck growth of cities and resulting complications exists on every continent. At the recent White House Conference on International Cooperation one of the liveliest discussions was sparked in the section devoted to the subject of urban development. More than 300 leaders from every section of the country came specifically to participate in this panel and discuss the recommendations for action to be made to the President.

This solid evidence of interest is a reflection of the care with which the Committee on Urban Development had worked on its report. They had been meeting for almost a year preceding the White House Conference, and had for chairman my fellow Texan, Raymond Nasher, of Dallas. Ray Nasher worked his Committee hard and brought them to Washington repeatedly until they could hammer out a report with recommendations on which all of them could agree.

The members of that Committee were: Charles Abrams, professor, Columbia University; Oscar A. deLima, president, Roger Smith Hotel Corp.; George Duggar, director, urban affairs program, University of Pittsburgh; Patrick Healy, executive director, National League of Cities; Ralph Lazarus, president, Federated Department Stores, Inc.; Stanley Marcus, president, Neiman-Marcus; Margaret Mead, American Museum of Natural History; Harvey S. Perloff, director, regional and urban planning studies, Resources for the Future; Raphael D. Silver, president, Keller-Silver Corp.; Shelby Southard, Cooperative League of the United States; Herman W. Steinkraus, United Nations Association of the United States; Lawrence A. Wien, partner, Wien, Lane & Klein; Frazar B. Wilde, chairman of the board, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

The general approval and interest with which this document has been greeted by experts and laymen alike make its contents of more than ordinary interest, and for that reason I submit it for the RECORD at this time:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

I. SUMMARY

Cities, the wellspring of civilization, modernity and progress, are growing at a breathtaking rate—for, of course, the population explosion has its principal impact on urban areas. This startling rate of change, much of which is uncontrolled growth, has been accompanied by a tardy recognition of the magnitude of what is happening. Accordingly, cities all over the world are in deep trouble. Advanced countries struggle with decaying central districts, slums and blight, painful social problems, and serious traffic congestion. In developing countries urban conditions are considerably worse with unbelievable, tragic slums and mushrooming squatter settlements with populations in the hundreds of thousands. Inattention, frequently sheer inability to meet the many urban problems with limited domestic resources, are creating bubbling cauldrons of social and political unrest. In both advanced and developing countries, choked, unplanned and still-growing cities present not only deplorable social conditions but also an inefficient economic structure and an unhealthy economic climate, factors which inhibit national development.

Urban growth problems are a matter of major international importance. The Urban Development Committee believes that appropriate international cooperation efforts can make strategic and decisive contributions to the solution or alleviation of these problems. The problems and pressures, already great, grow greater by the hour. Early action, its scope related to the size of the problems, is imperative.

In brief, the recommendations of the Committee are as follows:

Recommendation 1

That the United States should give higher priority and more recognition to urban development programs in its bilateral assistance and should attempt to secure comparable priority and recognition for urban development programs within the United Nations assistance programs. In particular, the United States should vigorously seek to secure adequate budget and personnel for the newly established United Nations Center for Housing, Building, and Planning.

Recommendation 2

That the United States should take the initiative within the United Nations to inaugurate a concerted international program, supported by voluntary contributions of member nations, to attack the specific problem of slums and squatter settlements in developing countries.

Recommendation 3

That additional attention and consideration should be focused on the problem of financial resources for carrying out urban development programs.

Recommendation 4

That the United States should establish a World Urban Development Research Laboratory and Institute. This Laboratory and Institute would be sponsored by the United States, be financed principally by the United States and be headquartered in the United States. It would function, however, as a world organization, with full international participation, possibly with branches in other regions of the world, and its products would be for all nations.

Recommendation 5

That the United States should sponsor a United Nations World Conference on Urban Development to emphasize the importance of urban development and to gain understanding and support from decisionmakers in the countries concerned.

II. THE SUBJECT

Urban development is the process of growth and change in the urban portion of society. It encompasses the political dynamics and administration of urban places; their economic activities; their changes in physical size, quality, and form; and their social programs and activities. These four broad elements break down into important practical matters that affect the lives of every urban citizen—among them jobs, decent housing, adequate roads, location of industry and residential areas, property taxes, health and sanitation, and recreation. Since urban communities are living entities, there is considerable interaction and potential conflict among these elements.

The goal of urban development planning, a better life and environment for city dwellers—both as producers and consumers—can be achieved only through the planned coordination of the above four elements and the cooperation of civic groups with local, regional, and national governments. The problems and complications that face urban communities are significantly influenced by the rate of urbanization—the process wherein urban areas grow more rapidly than rural areas and wherein rural populations relocate in the city.

III. THE CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY

Our earth is rapidly becoming a planet of urban peoples. Today throughout the world breakneck urbanization is a universal experience for both advanced and developing countries. In the 18th and 19th centuries, the pace of urban growth was still slow enough to permit more or less gradual adaptation to the changing urban scene. Since then, rapid change has become commonplace. In 1962 a group of U.N. experts gravely warned that the problems of urban housing and urban development were fast becoming a full-fledged crisis. In the first half of the 20th century, 1900–1950, total world population increased by 50 percent, but the urban population in cities of 20,000 or more increased 240 percent. This breakneck growth of cities shows no signs of slackening. In the second half of the 20th century the luxury of gradual, almost unconscious, adaptation to urban growth has moved out of our reach.

In developing nations, growth of cities proceeds at a pace even greater than city growth in the advanced countries. As a result, more than 50 percent of the urban population of the world now resides not in industrially advanced countries, but in developing countries. In Asia, alone, it has been estimated that just in the large cities—those of 100,000 population or more—there will be a net increase in population between the years 1960–75 of more than one-quarter billion people. At the same time, continued urbanization of advanced countries is fraught with urgent consequences. In some of these countries, urban growth through migration from rural areas has proceeded to the point where both relative and absolute reductions in the size of rural population have resulted. If the predictions and estimates of some responsible experts materialize, children now of preschool age, living in many parts of the globe, will live in a world which on average will be 80 to 90 percent urban.

In a review of a recently published book on world urban problems, the Economist noted with concern the existing situation, which it described as "the gap between the gathering world crisis of urbanism and the almost complete failure of governments and agencies to come to grips with it." The Committee is deeply concerned with this gap perceived by the Economist. Only perfunctory research is needed to disclose that almost no nation—advanced or developing—pursues adequate urban development planning.

The consequences of such grossly inadequate urban development planning are serious. Man shapes the city, but the city in turn shapes man and his activities. Failure to plan for urban development leads generally to a haphazard, inefficient urban framework for new as well as existing investment. The logistics of the urban system become increasingly complex, tangled, and inefficient. Structures of steel, concrete, and stone may be placed in the path of logical long-term transportation routes, or be of inadequate measure for future needs, leading to great inefficiencies or exorbitant future costs. Housing is treated as an entity by itself and not simply one part of the unfolding urban scene. Academic circles allude to urban land reform as a critical need (particularly for developing countries), but urban land prices and land uses continue to frustrate rational urban planning and allocation of land in both developing and advanced nations. Many decisions based on short-term advantages are proving to be very expensive in the long run.

Continued unguided growth of already large urban places can lead to unmanageable, unattractive giant cities, suffering from slums and squalor, poor facilities and community services, strangling traffic and administrative chaos. In spite of all this, the large city, in the absence of nationwide urban development planning that could produce alternatives, continues to attract new industries and migrants seeking jobs. But its impersonal character makes the task of assimilation difficult, and the migrant finds it hard to become truly a part of the urban community.

It is imperative that effective programs of international cooperation be designed to cope with or to ameliorate this situation. Right now there is virtually no recognition in international cooperation programs of the need for a coordinated, multiaspect approach to urban development. The number of nations which integrate urban development planning with national development plans is also exceedingly small. It is not surprising, therefore, that in international cooperation (bilateral and multilateral) there is no international strategy for guiding and recasting urban growth. The Committee feels that such strategy is sorely needed.

In contrast to the overall strategy—geared to increased productivity and more equal distribution of income—which is accepted and is being applied somewhat to rural areas in developing countries, technical cooperation efforts aimed at urban areas of developing countries are essentially unrelated bits and pieces of urban planning. Urban areas—their growth, form, location, and quality—should be treated as a whole. The strategy should encompass the national urban picture, specific attention to major metropolitan areas, and pertinent urban-national and urban-rural relationships. Each year in developing countries the annual investment expenditure for urban infrastructure and urban housing ranges generally between 20 to 40 percent of total capital investment. In advanced countries the figure is even higher. These expenditures must be viewed as a whole and in relation to other urban oriented investment (e.g., industry) if overall development planning is to be successful. Viewed from the crucial standpoint of output or production, the primacy of the urban areas is also unquestioned. In the United States, despite a superb, incomparably efficient agricultural sector, more than 70 percent of the gross national product (GNP) is produced in urban areas. In Latin America, where the urban population is less than one-half of the total, the urban population produces an estimated 80 percent of GNP. This kind of performance puts the city into economic focus and highlights the importance of retaining urban efficiencies and, more important of improving these efficiencies and developing new efficiencies.

Without international assistance specifically aimed toward this objective, it is unlikely that there will be appropriate recognition soon of the vital nature of urban development in developing countries. Through international cooperation, improved recognition and programing for urban development can also be achieved in the advanced countries. The Committee is convinced, for the foregoing reasons, that priority must be given to efforts at international cooperation for urban development planning "before the urban Niagara of the next 40 years engulfs nations, developing and developed alike, and sweeps them beyond the point at which rational human action is possible." [1]

Here in the United States we are committed to an effort to achieve the Great Society, and President Johnson has said this will be achieved in cities. In less-developed countries the situation for progress and national improvement is closely analogous. It is the Committee's view, which it repeats again for emphasis, that if international cooperation is to aid in the modernization and rationalization of the economies of both developed and developing countries, it must not ignore their choked, inefficient but still rapidly growing urban areas. Economic and social evolution of a nation toward its potential capability as a modern society, with an efficient urban environment for economic, political and social activities, cannot be achieved without urban development planning and the integration of such planning within national development planning.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Urbanization, once a manageable, gradual and slow-moving force in man's history, has accelerated and has made such impact in the last 50 years that it must be accounted one of the truly great revolutionary forces of the 20th century. Urbanization has made this the century of the city. And in terms of man's welfare and well being, the conclusion must be drawn that this is all to the good. Urbanization poses many perplexing and anxious problems, but it is indeed a net advantage to mankind and an integral and essential element of progress. The task men face is to minimize the problems and to maximize the benefits of urbanization. The International Cooperation Year provides a framework for achieving some of these ends, and it is in this spirit that the Urban Development Committee makes the proposals which follow.

Recommendation 1: The United States should give higher priority and more recognition to urban development programs in its bilateral assistance and should move to secure comparable priority and recognition for urban development programs within the United Nations assistance programs. In particular, the United States should vigorously seek to secure adequate budget and personnel for the newly established United Nations Center for Housing, Building, and Planning.

The Agency for International Development (AID), the Agency which administers U.S. bilateral assistance, has taken some steps in the direction of placing proper emphasis on urban development programs. Administrator David E. Bell, in a statement of general policy on urban development, has stressed that AID assistance "should be directed to the building of institutions and capabilities rather than the building of physical structures." AID will make assistance available to developing countries to train personnel who can man the institutions needed to plan for and to achieve orderly urban development. This emphasis on institution building through technical assistance merits the fullest support.

Unfortunately, in all too many cases national governments do not appreciate the need for national planning for urbanization. To encourage developing countries to begin such planning, and to integrate this urban development planning within overall national planning, the Committee recommends that the United States consider the establishment within its bilateral programs of national planning grants for the support or creation of necessary planning institutions or to develop necessary urban planning skills in developing nations. In view of the large number of competing program interests in AID and the relatively low priority assigned hitherto to urban development programs, it is felt that a special program of grants administered by the housing and urban experts within AID is advisable, at least until the merits and importance of urban development are more widely recognized.

The United States, moreover, should take a spirited policy initiative in the United Nations so that the United Nations will alter and strengthen its programs appropriately, giving much greater emphasis to the urban component of national development plans. In this connection, the Committee feels it must call attention to the understaffed, underbudgeted and largely unsupported urban and housing activities within the United Nations. Conclusions or recommendations, by competent United Nations organs supported by expert studies, have led only to pious expression, paper organization, and ineffectual implementation. It is axiomatic that the efficacy of any policy or program can be no greater than the competence and resources of the institutions or tools created to carry them out. A new United Nations Center for Housing, Building, and Planning is in process of establishment. Only if this new instrument is both strong and well supported can an adequate international contribution in the urban field be expected.

Recommendation 2: The United States should take the initiative within the United Nations to inaugurate a concerted international program, supported by voluntary contributions of member nations, to attack the specific problem of slums and squatter settlements in developing countries.

The low income groups in urban areas of developing countries, a vast number of squatter and slum families, comprise an army of destitute, hopeless, and angry people. The literature on urban problems gives this group considerable attention. However, effective programs aimed at improving their lot are rare. In one view, they are a potentially incendiary force in developing countries. On the other hand, squatters have been described as an important national resource, since they are for the most part aggressive and searching individuals who have left either the inner-city slum or the rural hinterlands to look for something at least a little better. They need assistance and guidance so that they may obtain improved shelter. The living environment of these families should be improved by the provision of critical urban services, such as potable water, waste removal, and educational and health facilities. Efforts must be made to provide a greater measure of order and stability for these families and for their communities.

---

[1] "The Processes of World Urbanization," by Barbara Ward, background paper No. 1 for the United Nations' Symposium on the Planning and Development of New Towns, 1965.

The Committee recommends, therefore, that a concerted international program to cope with the problems of urban slums and squatter settlements, supported by a special request for funds from member nations, be inaugurated by the United Nations. The United States should take the initiative in proposing and supporting this program. The United States, moreover, should make a significant pledge to a United Nations fund to carry out this program.

The Committee recommends that the program be aimed in major degree at institutional development and elimination of administrative and legal roadblocks. In particular, the Committee feels that this program for slum dwellers and squatters should address itself to the inordinately high cost of urban land which is characteristic in so many developing countries and to the legal issues involved in squatting. The prevalence of the phenomenon of squatting is due in no small measure to the almost complete inability of families to acquire alternative residence or to obtain legal possession of a small plot of urban land.

Recommendation 3: Additional attention and consideration should be focused on the problem of financial resources for carrying out urban development programs. The heartening successes of such undertakings as savings and loan and credit union institutions recently organized in Latin America are an augury of what might be done by even more zealous promotion of these institutions or the introduction of other imaginative and practice instruments or policies.

There is widespread agreement that the financial aspects of urban and housing problems are the most important and critical elements of these complex overall problems. It is the Committee's firm conviction that the deep pessimism and negativism frequently associated with the financing problems of urban development and housing are overdrawn. The encouraging results of still quite new savings institutions in Latin America, promoted and established under the Alliance for Progress, suggest that the prospects of mobilization of very important amounts of local capital for housing and like purposes are indeed very favorable. The possibilities of wider introduction of popular savings institutions, of guarantees, insurance and of strategic international lending should receive greater consideration and, as appropriate, employment.

In this connection, the Committee feels that the United States should take a policy initiative in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to encourage the Bank and its affiliates to consider in greater depth the impact of their loans on urban development as well as their effect on national development. Efforts should be made, for example, to have the World Bank include in development loans funds which would be earmarked for urban development planning (to assess impacts of the new or enlarged industry, study possible alternatives in location of future industrial plants, etc.). This proposal is consistent with a position the United States has taken at the United Nations and is logical since the great bulk of the Bank's loans are put to work in urban areas or are for auxiliary projects which support urban activities.

In recent years the World Bank, through the inclusion of urban and housing experts in its country survey teams, has shown increasing recognition of the existence and importance of an urban component in national development plans. It is important that the Bank's focus and perspective on urban development, as a strategic and weighty element of national development, be sharpened further, and that this be reflected in its lending activities.

Recommendation 4: The United States should establish a world urban development research laboratory and institute. This laboratory and institute would be sponsored by the United States, be financed principally by the United States and be headquartered in the United States. It would function, however, as a world organization, with full international participation, possibly with branches in other regions of the world, and its products would be for all nations.

This new institution would provide a focal point for study, education, and exchange of information and experience. It would attract and provide for foreign students and faculty, visiting foreign experts and practitioners. Results of its studies and research would be published, the more important ones in several languages. It would carry out research of a complex and inter-disciplinary nature at one center, but at the same time would promote research in urban problems at various universities throughout the country through grants, more or less in the pattern of the National Institutes of Health. The Laboratory might well concern itself, for example, with the new technologies in urban sanitation and water supply, means of quickly and cheaply assembling prefabricated construction components, improved techniques for promoting savings and channeling private funds to investment in urban construction in the less-developed countries, optimum densities in land use under various conditions, stronger means of promoting self-help housing, administration of housing agencies and programs, and interrelations of urban to national development.

The dynamics of urban growth are incredibly important—but also incredibly complex. Being now more than halfway through the century of the city, we must not tarry longer in mobilizing resources: (a) to isolate individual urban problems, identify relationships, assess their probable evolution, and develop solutions; and (b) to ensure much wider adoption of those relatively limited but important approaches and techniques which have been proved effective.

Early and effective action to meet and solve the intricate and serious problems of urban growth is an obligation that we owe to the generations of the future. The happiness, freedom and contentment of future generations—our sons, daughters and their children—will depend as never before on the character and efficiency of urban places. In the judgment of the Committee, the solution or amelioration of the present and coming problems of the city would be one of the most solid blows for world peace and progress that could be struck.

Although this Laboratory would make a notable world contribution, it is clearly evident that the United States would benefit substantially from its work. These collateral domestic benefits add to the attractiveness of this international cooperation proposal. At some point in the future, it may be deemed appropriate to transfer the Research Laboratory and Institute to United Nations management under the United Nations Center for Housing, Building, and Planning.

Recommendation 5: The United States should sponsor a United Nations World Conference on Urban Development to emphasize the importance of urban development and to gain understanding and support from decisionmakers in the countries concerned.

The Committee recommends that a top-level world conference for policymakers and principal planners be called by the United Nations. The theme of the World Conference would be "Urban Development: A Major Element of National Development Planning." The planning and conduct of the Conference should be closely patterned after the highly successful Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas held in 1963. The Committee recommends that the United States assist in highlighting the importance of the Conference and that it send a carefully selected delegation of the highest caliber. Observers and participants of the Conference, representing all parts of the globe, should include not only city planners and housing experts, but political and civic leaders, representatives of great institutions of learning, physical scientists, and leaders of industry and labor.

Under the general theme, the Conference would include the issues which are represented in the four points immediately preceding this one: the urban development component in national planning urban slums and squatting, financial resources, and research in urban development. Many other aspects suggest themselves, e.g., urban administration, transportation, utility and land problems, possible technological breakthroughs, and social development.

The Committee suggests that the Conference be held in 1967 or possibly 1968, so that sufficient time will be allowed for adequate preparation. It would be fitting, and would have great collateral benefit, if the Conference would take place at the inauguration or dedication of the World Urban Development Research Laboratory and Institute.

In the course of its study and discussions, the Committee was heartened by evidence that increasingly writers and development experts recognize the city as a totality, as a vital political and economic instrument in the progress of mankind, and also the growing awareness that rapid urban growth, multiplying new functions and rising expectations have put the city into deep trouble. But the hour is late and time is short. The magnitude of the troubles of the city are as yet inadequately appreciated. The problems are particularly great in developing countries where the resources are few and the needs are many. The proposals that the Committee has made are aimed at meeting the more urgent, immediate problems and at mounting the kind of effort and approach which will anticipate and avoid many problems in the future. International cooperation offers great promise for both meeting immediate problems and avoiding others.

Although the Committee recommendations deal with world problems in an atmosphere of international cooperation, these recommendations dealing with urban problems have very important meaning to U.S. domestic interests and activities. In 1958, a study completed by a U.S. private foundation stated: "The metropolitan problem has been called the major domestic problem of our times. But the Nation as a whole has not awakened to its gravity. The piecemeal approach to date is inadequate and self-defeating. Many programs now cancel each other out or have results opposite to those intended."[2] Despite significant progress, the situation in 1965, 7 years later, is not greatly different. It is clear, therefore, that the United States does not possess all the answers and that it, too, can gain much from international cooperation. In the particular area of urban development, the Committee is convinced that the proposals that it has made will not only advance the broad foreign interests of the United States, but will also contribute in very important measure to the enhancement and improvement of vital domestic programs.

DEEP-SEA SPORT FISHING THREATENED BY DEPOPULATING FISHING METHODS

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

---

[2] "The Challenge to America: Is Economic and Social Aspects," Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958, p. 44.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 1966, I introduced House Joint Resolution 908 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake research on marlins, sailfishes, tuna, and related species to collect for future international conferences data on the migrations, populations, growth rates and other necessary information, which is not now available. Such research is a matter of interest to all nations and to future generations.

There came recently to my attention some facts and figures indicating that an alarmingly heavy drain has developed recently on the world's stocks of billfish—striped marlin, blue marlin, black marlin, and sailfish—as a direct result of accelerated long-lining activities by Japanese commercial fishermen, and perhaps also by Russian long-liners and those of other nations.

A long-line consists of a connected series of baskets, each containing a 300-yard-long line supporting a succession of baited hooks. Many baskets are fastened end to end, resulting in a long-line that may extend for 10 or more miles. These literally sweep the ocean for fish, and do so without regard as to which species of fish may take the bait.

The Japanese naturally have a need to harvest great quantities of sea fish in order to feed the dense population of their country. Recently there was developed in Japan a novel means of processing part of their huge world catches of fish into sausages, which have a popular appeal something like the American hot dog. This new food fad has lead to the increasing utilization of the billfishes, which formerly have not been generally regarded as desirable for food. Consequently, previously, the billfishes were little sought or utilized by the Japanese. Instead, the giant billfishes supported extensive oceanic sport fishing that generated and supported substantial tourism wherever they were abundant as, for example, in the Caribbean and Atlantic waters of Puerto Rico.

Consequently, sport fishermen, who liked the waters around Puerto Rico, are becoming concerned that once plentiful marlin, sailfish, and other billfishes are growing both scarce and smaller in size. This concern is being shared by sport fishermen who use the waters off the east coast and the west coast and in the Gulf of Mexico, because there are indications of a definite and dramatic drop in the world populations of these sport fish.

Dr. James E. Morro of the University of Alaska, a noted authority on billfishes, reported last year that over 1 million pounds of black marlin, alone, were being processed annually as of 1963 into fish sausages in Japan. However, he noted that the spectacular fighting black marlin, which grow to 1,500 pounds or more, is a prize sought by sport fishermen because of its great size and sporting qualities. Dr. Morro stated, with respect to striped marlin, that Chinese and Japanese "commercial landings run into millions of pounds annually," and that sport fishermen hold striped marlin in especially high regard. Similarly, blue marlin and sailfish are hunted heavily by both sport and commercial fishing interests.

While the use of billfishes for fish sausages is not as great as that of other species, the alarming fact emerges that such use is growing rapidly, although billfish are scarcely essential as a fish sausage component. Nevertheless, information published nearly a year ago by Outdoor Editor Kenneth Foree in the Dallas, Tex., Morning News suggests that Japanese harvests may already be making noticeable dents in the world populations of these great game fish. If this should be verified through the research sought by my resolution, it is cause for alarm, not only on the part of the U.S. sport fishermen and the Japanese, but by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization as well.

A reported encounter off Baja California, in Mexico, between a flotilla of Mexican charter boats and a Japanese fishing vessel illustrates the magnitude of apparent local depletion of these fish. The charter men claimed to have taken a 10-mile-long line that Japanese fishermen had set there earlier. They are reported to have found more than 300 sailfish and marlin on the 2,000 hooks on that single long-line. In all, Japanese fishermen had been working five such lines simultaneously in the area. Assuming a similar rate of daily catch, it is estimated that 1,500 billfish may have been harvested daily during a fishing period of 14 days, thus totaling an estimated 21,000 billfish taken in 2 weeks by one vessel. Much poorer sport fishing is said to have prevailed in the region long afterwards and is attributed by sport fishermen as the result of this kind of commercial harvest presumably by a number of similar vessels.

Other reports support similar observations and conclusions. The New Zealand sport fishing authorities, as reported in the New Zealand Herald of Auckland, have credited Japanese long-liners with near elimination of deep-sea fishing off the famed Mayor Island. Reportedly, no big fish were caught there in 1964 as compared to 900 big fish landed there in 1949. Moreover, a steady decline was said to have occurred after the appearance in the area of the first Japanese fishing boats in the early 1950's. It is known that they have taken from New Zealand waters great quantities of black marlin, striped marlin, and broadbill swordfish.

In addition, marlin harvests by Japanese long-liners off the Pacific coast of Central America were poor last year. Reports indicate that catches of striped marlin by 60 vessels fishing the area in June 1965 were only 3 or 4 fish per boat. This contrasts sharply with catches of hundreds per boat in 1964. Moreover, the average weight of marlin taken in 1965 approximated only 70 pounds. In 1964, the average weight per marlin was 110 pounds.

The huge catches by the long-lines in 1964 appear to be among the major factors contributing to poor fishing in 1965. Cooler water temperatures may also have been a factor, possibly causing marlin populations to shift to other waters. To exactly what extent either or both of these factors caused the declines in marlin fishing is a matter of speculation in the absence of firm biological evidence. Such evidence will be made possible by the research provided for in my House Joint Resolution 908.

An analysis of the Japanese commercial long-line catches of marlins and tunas from 1956 to 1962 in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean has recently been published. A further study of these catches, made in 1963, indicate some interesting figures. The analyses showed that greatly increased catches of striped marlin—from 200 fish in 1956 to 126,700 in 1963—and blue marlin—increasing from 400 fish in 1956 to 75,300 fish in 1963—have gone hand in hand with a rapid expansion of Japanese long-lining eastward across the Pacific Ocean, reaching the western coastal waters of the United States, Mexico, and Central America by 1963. Development of the fish sausage in 1955, utilizing billfishes together with other fishes—various tunas, whale meat, and so forth—served to stimulate a rapid increase in the Japanese efforts to catch these great fishes. Some of the marlins also are frozen whole for home consumption as raw "sashimi."

The number of long-lining fishing days increased from 97 in 1956 to 8,035 in 1962. Also, in 1956, a total of only 164,000 hooks were fished, but by 1963 over 50 million hooks were being used by the Japanese long-lining fleet. This represents a 300-fold increase in only 7 years. At first, the major fishing for striped marlin was conducted offshore from the most westerly point of Peru in the Galapagos Island area. In 1963, fishing was intensified in that area with resultant large catches, and limited data for 1964 indicate that long-lining for striped marlin has been intensified off the American coast, as well.

The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior recently obtained partial catch data on the Japanese long-line fishing in the Atlantic Ocean covering the period 1956 to 1962. As in the Pacific, the growth of the Atlantic fishery was astronomical. In 1956, when 130,000 hooks were set by the Japanese fishermen, they caught 554 marlin and swordfish. By 1963 they fished more than 54 million hooks. Records from only 59 percent of the Japanese fishing trips showed a harvest of 185,190 marlin and swordfish. The publication of this and similar information has caused real public concern about the substantial and accelerating take of billfish by commercial long-liners for use in fish sausages.

One major concern is that large capital investments are generated by the prospect of catching such large game fishes on rod and reel. Substantial tourism and service industries develop wherever supplies of these fish occur in order to accommodate the many anglers that they attract. In Puerto Rico, for example, many sports fishermen come to the island each year to fish in the Atlantic and Caribbean waters surrounding us.

Sport fishing is a substantial factor in many local economies on U.S. coasts. This public concern that these local economies may be threatened by the possible destruction of these vital billfish resources upon which they thrive. this public concern is indicated by articles recently carried in several leading magazines, such as Time magazine, January 28, 1966; Yachting magazine, February 1966; Sports Afield, February 1966; Sport Fishing, February 1966; Salt Water Sportsman, January 1966; Sports Illustrated, January 31, 1966; and Motor Boating, February 1966. The authenticity of most of these articles is guaranteed by their reliance for factual content on the result of studies by the scientific staff of the Sport Fishing Institute of Washington, D.C., which is the only privately supported national fish conservation organization.

What are we going to do to protect our interests in these valuable fishery resources? It is an international problem, for conservation is a problem for all nations. If we are to resolve it favorably and rationally, we must have basic data that are not now available. A large part of the needed data may be obtained most quickly by means of intensive tagging programs designed to determine population distribution, migrations, abundance, and essential life history information. Such studies will cost amounts of money only modest in proportion to economic results in the future considering that these fish are being slaughtered even faster than the great buffalo herds of the past. Therefore, I urge the adoption of my resolution which would authorize a substantial increase—$250,000 the first year and $500,000 in each succeeding 9 years—to be made in the research appropriations by the Congress for the marine game fish research program of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. This should be marked for use in expanding the important marlin and sailfish tagging program—now being carried out on a very limited basis—both in the Pacific and the Atlantic, including the Caribbean concentration area.

I note that up to $2.7 million of annual appropriations were authorized by the Marine Game Fish Research Act of 1957—Public Law 86-359. However, only a small fraction of these authorized funds have ever been appropriated, and current expenditures for billfish research amounts only to a few thousand dollars. By comparison, a 5-year plan as originally proposed for the gradual program development would have provided a substantial billfish research program in being by 1966. Had this occurred as was planned, we would be in possession of many of the facts that are so sorely needed now for rational solution, through international conference, of the troublesome long-lining problems.

Mr. Speaker, the future of this great oceanic resource is in our hands. I plead that we take the necessary first step now that would do the most to help protect and enhance a most important element in the tourist economy of Puerto Rico and other similar regions where billfishes occur. This means the entire east coast, gulf coast, and Pacific coast States, as well as Hawaii. All of them have an economic interest in the solution to this problem. In addition, sport fishermen from the interior regions have a recreational stake in it.

A very modest annual appropriation, as provided in my resolution, would almost certainly provide the key for saving this economically vital resource from destruction, and would surely repay the investment many times over. All that is required is for us to take this small action, and we must do it quickly. I hope most earnestly that all of our colleagues will support this needed legislation so that we may obtain through research information to share with other nations and seek their cooperation in the interest of conservation.

REDS CONFIRM DOMINICAN REVOLT ROLE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, last September 23 I spoke on the floor of the House of Representatives at some length on the situation in the Dominican Republic. My remarks were made in an effort to answer some in the Congress who had implied in their statements that the United States actually had intervened in the Dominican Republic to block the return to power of former President Juan Bosch and that the dangers of a Communist takeover there were grossly exaggerated. Unfortunately, some segments of the press supported these distorted views—views which were not in accord with testimony given the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs by responsible officials of our Government.

A recent article in the Los Angeles Times, quoting Communist sources, indicates the accuracy of the reports received by the subcommittee—that the Communists moved quickly to take over the Dominican revolt and "only the landing of American troops caused the Red power play to fail."

The full text of the article follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 25, 1966]

Now the Reds Confirm Dominican Revolt Role

(By Ernest Conine)

A recent article in world communism's house organ should be "must" reading for all those who remain convinced that President Johnson was seeing Reds under the bed when he ordered U.S. troops into Santo Domingo.

Two Dominican Communists, in a report to their brethren on the events of last spring and summer, give an account which tallies on most points with what the administration said at the time.

While not claiming credit for the initial revolt, the Communists tell how they quickly moved in to assert their influence.

Only the landing of American troops, they say caused the Red power play to fail. And, the continuing presence of the imperialist forces is described as the "chief obstacle to the development of the Dominican revolution."

The Communist version of events, then, fails to bear out Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's cherished illusion about the revolt.

In a withering blast last fall, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said Mr. Johnson's decision to send troops in was based on "exaggerated estimate of Communist influence in the rebel movement."

He felt that a Red takeover could have been avoided without armed intervention.

The readers of World Marxist Review, published in Prague for and by the Moscow-oriented Communist Parties of the world, are getting a different story.

The article was written by Dominican Communists J. I. Quello and Antonio Isa Conde. The latter has been identified as a prominent participant in the Communist power grab last April.

The authors are members of the Popular Socialist Party (PSP), which is the pro-Moscow Communist organization. Historically, it has been less militant than the pro-Peiping Dominican Popular Movement (MPD) and the Castroite June 14 movement.

All three have been dedicated to the overthrow of the generals who, in September 1963, staged the coup that resulted in the ouster of President Juan Bosch and the suspension of the constitution.

The Moscow-lining PSP, however, prudently abstained from the guerrilla campaign launched by the other two revolutionary groups in late 1963, which was quickly crushed by government forces.

After a "stubborn internal struggle in our party," Quello and Conde relate that the PSP itself repudiated its faith in nonviolent solutions.

In March 1965—only 6 weeks before the revolt which resulted in U.S. intervention—the party's Central Committee issued a manifesto calling for the return of Bosch on the basis of "mass action."

"Fight in the streets, squares, factories and in the countryside for the return of President Bosch as head of the constitutional government," said the manifesto.

While this hardly proves that Bosch was a willing Communist stooge, it shows that the Reds considered his return important to their cause.

Quello and Conde concede that the revolt which began on April 24, 1965, was not at first led or dominated by Communists.

In fact, they confess that "our party found itself unprepared" when two infantry barracks mutinied and set off the rebellion.

All three Communist factions quickly moved in, however, and the "patriotic actions of the democratic-minded army men merged with the action of the working people"—i.e., the Communists.

Victory was within the rebels' grasp, report Quello and Conde, when the U.S. Marines landed on April 28. Soon the rebels were isolated inside the city, and their territory cut in half by the "international safety zone."

THE SOUTHWEST IDAHO WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, introduction today of a bill to authorize the southwest Idaho water development project culminates many months of study, preparation and advocacy. To the First Congressional District of Idaho, it is the single, most important bill in the 89th Congress. The project, which consists of four divisions, will irrigate over one-half million acres of desert lands and will produce over 400,000 kilowatts. Waters of the Snake River and its tributaries will be put to use in the State of their origin—Idaho—for the production of wealth within the State and for the Nation.

The Bureau of Reclamation has conducted studies over the past few decades which point out the desirability of reclaiming the fertile acreages along the middle Snake River. In the past, the divisions and units of the project were considered singly. The Mountain Home division of the project was planned to utilize waters from the Boise and Snake Rivers. The Garden Valley division would store and distribute Payette River waters. The Weiser division was considered a part of the development of the Weiser River. The Bruneau division was sketched as a separate entity on the Bruneau and Snake Rivers. Little enthusiasm for any of the individual divisions or units was expressed, because of the need for a water exchange between the tributary drainages. Some opposition was expressed to the production of hydroelectric power.

Others believed that fish and wildlife would be hampered by the construction of the dams and irrigation works.

Over a year ago I reviewed the individual plans and concluded that not only would each be beneficial to the State, but would be necessary additions to the agricultural potential of this country in which we must feed an ever-expanding population, and which will help furnish food and fiber for starving nations throughout the world. Noting the resistance to a project-by-project approach, I proposed that all be included in one comprehensive authorization bill. The total project has been named the southwest Idaho water development project.

The assurance of respect for existing water rights is certain through the coauthorization of divisions. In evidence of this I would like to introduce in the RECORD at this point a memorial adopted by the Idaho State Legislature which recently concluded a special session:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7 OF STATE OF IDAHO

Joint memorial to the Honorable Senators FRANK CHURCH and LEN B. JORDAN, and the Honorable Representatives COMPTON I. WHITE and GEORGE HANSEN

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas in order to provide for the comprehensive development of the Snake River in Idaho for the purposes, among other, of regulating the flow of the Snake River and its tributaries, furnishing water for irrigation and for municipal and industrial purposes, controlling floods, controlling water quality, producing and distributing hydroelectric power, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities, and for other purposes the southwest Idaho water development project is being proposed to promote the development, whether by private effort or by reclamation projects, of the Mountain Home division, the Garden Valley division, the Weiser River division and the Wickahoney and Burneau division, as outlined in the Bureau of Reclamation proposal, and other projects, such as supplemental water for the Salmon Falls tracts, that might fall within the area;

Whereas our congressional delegation has advised us that united support from the State of Idaho is necessary to their efforts in our National Capitol;

Whereas time is perhaps short for the State of Idaho to start using her waters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, That we, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do wholeheartedly endorse the concept of the southwest Idaho water development project as supported by the entire congressional delegation from the State of Idaho; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to Senators FRANK CHURCH and LEN B. JORDAN, and Representatives COMPTON I. WHITE and GEORGE HANSEN, congressional delegates for the State of Idaho.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, recent events which have further enkindled the desire of Idahoans to meet the challenges of the coming decade through development of our State's resources are the floods of 1964 which would have been prevented by the construction of the southwest Idaho water development project and the latter-day realization of wildlife groups that reclamation is a friend. Further, the need for low-cost Federal hydroelectric power development has been brought home to the vast majority of Idaho citizens. In short, every facet of opposition which existed only 2 years ago has been removed and I can happily say today that the bill which I introduced has the support of every water conscious Idahoan familiar with the southwest Idaho water development project.

Final feasibility on the Mountain Home division and the power production and flood control features of the Garden Valley division are due within a few weeks. The same studies on the Weiser division will be completed within the year. The bill which I introduced today authorizes the feasibility study for the Bruneau division. All divisions of the entire project are authorized subject to the findings of final feasibility.

The bill also calls for the participation of Idaho in the Columbia Basin account. Reclamation costs which are beyond the capacity of irrigators to bear will be provided from surplus power revenues within the Bonneville power marketing area. Each of these points has met with the approval and support of an association which was formed in Idaho to engender interest in the project. A draft of the legislation was sent to virtually every person in the State who has a responsibility for water development. On Monday of this week I received the final recommendation of these persons and have embodied them within the bill which I today introduced.

In making my appeal to the Congress for positive and early action on the legislation, I would like to point out that we in Idaho are desirous of using the water originating within our State. We want the opportunity to utilize our resources before they might be exported to other areas. The southwest Idaho water development project bill achieves this objective. The projects are sound and I hope the prospects are good.

SOUTHWEST IDAHO WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, an abundant supply of fresh, clear water is one of the greatest natural resources of my State of Idaho. Today the Idaho delegation to the Congress of the United States is introducing legislation calling for the orderly and early development of the water resources in a broad area in the southwestern portion of the State—to be known as the southwest Idaho water development project.

Some 15,500 square miles are included in this 4-divisioned project which involves 11 southwestern Idaho counties. Nearly a half-million acres of land are to receive a full supply of water, while an additional 62,000 acres that are now insufficiently irrigated would receive an additional supply.

The 4 divisions in the project would affect nearly 250,000 people directly, and would have beneficial impact—not only on Idaho—but on the entire Pacific Northwest.

The southwestern Idaho water development project, Mr. Speaker, is a multipurpose project. In addition to irrigation and reclamation, it provides for flood control, municipal and industrial water supplies, recreation, fish and wildlife benefits, and power.

In regard to the latter item—power—Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in its wisdom, and as an amendment to legislation authorizing a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam in Washington, just today gave its approval to a Columbia River Basin account—on which our project will depend, in part, for funding. In so doing, the committee recognized the fact that much of the water which produces power in the Columbia River Basin is Idaho water. It recognized the fact that there is a tremendous potential for growth in the area, and, by its action, paved the way for an orderly growth process. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the full House will give the same thoughtful consideration to this basin account as was given by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and, when the differing versions of the bills authorizing the third generating unit at the Grand Coulee Dam go to conference, I would further hope that the House would insist that its position with regard to the basin account be maintained.

The basin account, Mr. Speaker, could well prove to be the catalyst that could cause the desert to continue to bloom through this and future projects. As an indication of the enthusiastic support for the southwestern Idaho water development project legislation we are today introducing, the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho passed a joint memorial urging adoption of the project which has been included in the Record today by my colleague, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. White].

Mr. Speaker, the southwestern Idaho water development project will lead to the orderly and accelerated development of an area of almost unlimited riches. This development should be started at the very earliest moment possible.

I strongly urge early and favorable consideration by the Congress of this project.

MEMORANDUM FROM THE PRESIDENT ON 1966 BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a directive from the President of the United States to the executive departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following "Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies on 1966 Budget Expenditures From the President." I am sure it will be of interest to everyone.

It follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES ON 1966 BUDGET EXPENDITURES FROM THE PRESIDENT

On November 27, 1965, I wrote you that it was imperative for you to hold 1966 expenditures to the absolute minimum required for carrying out essential responsibilities.

Today, the need is doubly imperative. As the rising costs of Vietnam are added to the private demands generated by a prosperous, highly employed economy, the necessity to guard against inflation takes on added urgency.

In this period, your careful control over every dollar of Government spending will not only avoid direct waste of our resources, but will also help prevent the indirect and inequitable waste that results from the deterioration of the dollar's value.

Therefore, I am asking that you—

Report to the Budget Director no later than April 1 your best and most up-to-date estimate of fiscal 1966 expenditures for your agency—for the administrative budget and for the major trust funds (i.e., those shown separately in table B-4, p. 390, of the 1967 budget) as well.

Identify the programs involved and explain the reasons for the differences if your latest estimate for 1966 differs from the amount shown for your agency for 1966 in the 1967 budget document.

RECENT INVENTION OF REPRESENTATIVE RESNICK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, scratch a Congressman and who knows what you may find. Congressmen come from every walk of American life, and many of them have very interesting, unusual, and even unique backgrounds.

Among the many fine gentlemen who today sit in the House of Representatives, we have one colleague whose background is truly unique. I am referring to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, Joseph Y. Resnick, who has the honor of representing a large part of the beautiful Hudson Valley in the State of New York. We know him as an intelligent, dynamic, and forthright young Congressman who is never afraid to speak up when he thinks it's necessary. He enjoys an excellent reputation as a quick-thinking, hard-working Representative.

But while I knew these things about Joe, there was one thing I did not know: Joe is a successful inventor.

It is my pleasure, therefore, to note that only last week the U.S. Patent Office issued Joe a patent for a recent invention of his, a machine for making plastic bottles. This was his 12th patent, all of which are in the fields of electronics and plastics.

I do not know whether Joe Resnick is the very first Congressman ever to have a patent issued while a Member of the House. But if he is not, I am sure he belongs to a pretty select club.

The issuing of this particular patent was written up on the business page of the New York Times this past Saturday, March 19, and I am pleased to insert the story in the Congressional Record:

LAWMAKER DOUBLES AS INVENTOR

(By Stacy V. Jones)

Washington, March 18.—Representative Joseph Y. Resnick, Democrat, of New York, doubled this week as an inventor. The legislator, who represents his native county Ulster and four other counties, was granted a patent for a blow-molding machine. The apparatus, which is called the Jyrak, turns out plastic jars and bottles. It cuts off sections of a warm plastic tube, blows them up, and closes one end of each.

The containers are automatically delivered to a conveyor line. Among the advantages seen in the machine are its simplicity and its economy in electric power and floor space.

Before his election to Congress in 1964, Mr. Resnick was active in electronics and plastics research and production. During World War II, he was a radio officer in the merchant marine.

The patent (13,239,879) is assigned to Questron America, Inc. The company's plant at Ellenville is on the Resnick family property, where the inventor was born in 1924.

Mr. Resnick, who organized the company, sold it recently to William A. Jacobs. Mr. Jacobs operates several Jyraks, and a number are used in other plants under lease.

The Congressman-inventor is chairman of another Ellenville company that he founded—the Channel Master Corporation, which has more than a thousand employees.

Channel Master, owned by Representative Resnick and two brothers, Harry and Louis, manufactures television antennas and black-and-white tubes. It is just beginning production of color tubes.

Mr. Resnick holds a dozen patents in electronics and plastics. He also orginated the names Jyrak and Questron.

Even in the House office building he has not stopped inventing. He has suggested to the Department of Agriculture the design of a solar still for purification of the brackish canal water in the Mekong Delta area of Vietnam during the dry season.

THE TIME HAS COME TO CONSIDER A TWO-CHINA POLICY FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for close to a generation our policy with respect to Communist China has been one of containment and isolation—containment, by opposing adventurism, direct or by proxy, in Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, and India; isolation, by declaring an embargo on trade, by substantially prohibiting exchange of persons, by withholding recognition, and most of all by opposing membership for Communist China in the United Nations.

Now, suddenly, American public opinion, though still supporting the containment part of our policy, is beginning to take a second look at the isolation part. A number of thoughtful and informed witnesses within the last few weeks before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and before Congressman Zablocki's Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, have testified that our policy of isolation is not working and should be modified. Within the State Department, there is an authoritative and growing group holding the same opinion. Vice President Humphrey last week described "containment without necessarily isolation" as an emerging policy. The President has said as much.

It is time, and more than time, for public discussion of whether remorselessly pursuing our policy of isolation is, in fact, in our national interest.

It is time, and more than time, to consider whether persistence in a policy of attempting to deny the 700 million people of mainland China any voice in the United Nations is in our national interest or in the interest of the stability of Asia and the peace of the world.

In the last months we have realized the importance of a rehabilitated United Nations. Yet a United Nations without representation from mainland China cannot be an effective instrument for dealing with such vital world issues as control of the spread of nuclear weapons and the achievement of a just settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Other aspects of our policy toward China likewise demand our reconsideration—questions of whether we should recognize Red China, trade with it, and exchange persons with it.

But there is a special urgency for Congress to consider the question of American policy on the representation of Red China in the United Nations, for two reasons:

First. The question will be at the top of the agenda when the United Nations General Assembly reconvenes next September.

Second. On some 20 occasions between 1951 and 1962, Congress has formally gone on record as opposing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

On the following occasions Congress has passed resolutions expressing the sense that Communist China should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China:

Resolution	Date passed	Chamber	Vote
S. Res. 37	Jan. 19, 1951	Senate	91 to 0.
H. Res. 627	July 15, 1954	House	381 to 0.
H. Con. Res. 265	July 16, 1956	do	391 to 0.
H. Con. Res. 265	July 23, 1956	Senate	86 to 0.
H. Con. Res. 369	Aug. 17, 1959	House	368 to 2.
S. Con. Res. 34	July 28, 1961	Senate	76 to 0.
S. Con. Res. 34	Aug. 31, 1961	House	395 to 0.

Quite often, Congress has attached riders to Department of State or foreign aid appropriations bills also expressing the sense that Communist China should not be admitted to the U.N. as the representative of China. The following is a list of those bills which have included such clauses:

Title	Date ratified	Bill
Public Law 195	June 3, 1953	State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies appropriations.
Public Law 665	Aug. 26, 1954	Mutual Security Act.
Public Law 471	July 2, 1954	State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies appropriations.
Public Law 133	July 7, 1955	State, Justice, Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations.
Public Law 138	July 8, 1955	Mutual Security Act.
Public Law 853	July 31, 1956	Mutual security appropriations.
Public Law 603	June 20, 1956	State, Justice, Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations.
Public Law 279	Sept. 3, 1957	Mutual security appropriations.
Public Law 86-84	July 13, 1959	State, Justice, Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations.
Public Law 86-704	Sept. 2, 1960	Mutual security appropriations.
Public Law 87-329	Sept. 30, 1961	Foreign aid appropriations.
Public Law 87-843	Oct. 18, 1962	State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies appropriations.
Public Law 87-872	Oct. 23, 1962	Foreign aid appropriations.

In my judgment, these advisory resolutions of Congress are no longer in effect, and the administration is thus free to explore new alternatives for next autumn's United Nations session based upon new judgments of how the national interest may best be served.

Let us examine the history of United Nations representation for mainland China. For much of what follows, I am indebted to Mr. Russell J. Leng, of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, for his excellent research assistance.

1. THE ISSUE OF CHINESE REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS, 1950–64

China, under Chiang Kai-shek, was a founding member of the United Nations and by virtue of its size, population, and potential importance in Asian affairs became one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. In 1949, however, the Chinese Communist forces overthrew Chiang's Nationalist government and set up a Communist government on the mainland of China: the People's Republic of China. The Nationalist government fled to Taiwan—Formosa.

Shortly after their seizure of the Chinese mainland from the Nationalists, the Chinese Communists, supported by the U.S.S.R., challenged the Nationalists' right to remain seated as the representatives of China in the U.N. General Assembly and Security Council. During 1950 the Soviet Union made two attempts to unseat Nationalist China in the Security Council and substitute Communist China, but both moves were defeated. Since 1950 an attempt has been made each year in the General Assembly to displace the Nationalists and seat the Communists. All these attempts have failed. Peking's supporters have also tried, without success, to replace Nationalist representation by Communist Chinese representation in other organs and agencies of the United Nations.

A year-by-year tabulation of the U.N. General Assembly's votes on Chinese representation follows. The 1950 vote was on a proposal to seat Communist China. The votes from 1951 to 1960 were on proposals to shelve the question during the session. The votes from 1961 were on proposals to seat Communist China and expel Nationalist China:

Year	For Nationalists	For Communists	Abstentions
1950	33	16	10
1951	37	11	4
1952	42	9	9
1953	44	10	2
1954	43	11	6
1955	42	12	6
1956	47	24	8
1958	44	28	9
1959	44	29	9
1960	42	34	22
1961	48	36	20
1962	56	42	12
1963	57	41	16
1964	(1)		
1965	47	47	20

(1) No vote was held.

Technically, the problem of seating the Communist Chinese in the United Nations is a question of representation rather than admission. China does not need to seek admission since it is already a member. The question is rather which government—the Nationalist Chinese, now based on Taiwan, or the Communist Chinese—should represent China in the world organization, or whether both should.

Between 1951 and 1961 there was no substantive discussion of the Chinese representation issue in the General Assembly. During these years the United States proposed at the beginning of each session to postpone consideration of the Chinese representation question for the duration of that session. Each year the U.S. proposal was adopted, at first by a large majority, and then by slowly declining majorities. By 1960 the margin voting for postponement had become slim: 42 in favor, 34 against, and 22 abstentions.

The United States changed tactics at the 1961 General Assembly session. First, the United States, in cosponsorship with Australia, Colombia, Italy, and Japan submitted a resolution designating the Chinese representation issue an important question. This resolution was adopted by a substantial majority of 61 in favor, 34 against, and 7 abstentions. The step was significant because representation questions normally are considered a matter of credentials and are decided by a simple majority. Since important questions require a two-thirds majority, this step forced proponents of Communist Chinese representation to secure the support of two-thirds of the membership of the United Nations if the Communist Chinese were to be seated.

The opponents of Communist Chinese admission were able to carry the day by substantial majorities through the 18th General Assembly in 1963. In 1961, 37 members voted in favor of Communist China's admission; 48 voted against, and 19 abstained. In 1962, 42 voted in favor, 56 voted against, and 12 abstained, and in 1963, 41 voted in favor, 57 voted against, and once again 12 abstained.

There was no vote on the Chinese question in 1964 due to the no-voting policy which resulted from the stalemate over United Nations peacekeeping finances. Nevertheless, it was clear that the majority against seating the Communist Chinese delegation had begun to dwindle.

The issue over Chinese representation has sometimes been presented as a battle between the United States and the Communist voting bloc in the United Nations to win over the support of unalined nations. But there is also a good deal of disagreement on this matter among members of the Western alliance. Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries have favored seating Communist China since the early 1950's. France extended diplomatic recognition to Communist China in January 1964 and announced that she would reverse her previous stand and vote for Communist China's admission to the U.N. in 1965.

2. THE ISSUE IN 1965

(A) THE FRENCH POSITION: AN ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF COMMUNIST REPRESENTATION

Speaking before the General Assembly shortly before the 1965 vote on the admission of the Peking government, French Representative Roger Seydoux argued that the Communists should be admitted to membership, and given a seat on the Security Council. Furthermore, he said, the matter should be decided by a simple majority vote. Seydoux stated that diplomatic recognition did not entail a political appraisal but depended solely on whether or not a particular regime was, in fact, governing a particular state. France recognizes the People's Republic of China as the Government of China; China is a member of the United Nations; therefore the People's Republic should take its "rightful place in the United Nations—that is to say the seat of China." Moreover, he said, as a matter of credentials and procedure, the issue should be decided by majority vote.

Outside of the legal right of the People's Republic to China's seat in the U.N. Seydoux contended that there were very good political reasons as well. Beyond the oft-stated argument that Communist China represents one quarter of the world's population and it is situated in immediate proximity to the world's most unsettled regions, Seydoux pointed to the conflicts in Vietnam and Kashmir:

> Can anyone imagine for a moment today that the painful dispute dividing two great countries of one and the same continent can, in the last analysis, be finally settled without the cooperation of China?

On the contrary, he said, everything seemed to demonstrate that Asia's problems cannot be settled without the direct participation of the largest Asian power.

The French representative felt that the same reasoning should apply to the problems of disarmament. How could one expect to achieve a true settlement of the problem without having all five nuclear powers, including Communist China, participate?

Finally Seydoux quoted the words of Couve de Murville, the French Foreign Minister:

> The time will come when the People's Republic of China will represent that country in the General Assembly and in the Security Council and participate on its behalf in the discussion of world affairs. * * * By wishing to persist in excluding it, one simply risks seeing it continue to take its own initiatives on its own behalf.

In the eyes of France, and those members who have taken a similar position, Communist China's admission to the United Nations is now both necessary and inevitable. Others strongly disagree.

(B) THE UNITED STATES: AN ARGUMENT AGAINST ADMISSION

Responding directly to Mr. Seydoux's contention that Communist China should be admitted to help solve the difficult problems in southeast Asia and to pave the way for fruitful universal disarmament, the U.S. Deputy Representative, Charles Yost, maintained:

> It is the absence of will, not its absence from the United Nations which has prevented Peiping from helping to solve the serious crisis in southeast Asia. It had the opportunity at Geneva in 1954, and again in 1962; it has the opportunity now in 1965—by simply agreeing itself or permitting its friends in Hanoi to enter into unconditional negotiations, in Geneva or any other place. There has been no hint or suggestion from Peiping or its supporters here that Peiping would be any less opposed to negotiations concerning Vietnam if it were granted a seat here on its extravagant and unacceptable terms. * * * Similarly, it is the absence of will, not its absence from this organization, which bars Peiping from contributing to a solution of the complex problems of disarmament. Peiping had and still has the opportunity to join the partial test ban treaty. It not only chooses to remain aloof but also condemns that treaty and ridicules the idea of extending the ban to cover all tests. Similarly, it belittles the idea of nuclear free zones and disparages the very concept of nonproliferation. And there has been neither hint nor suggestion from Peiping or its supporters here that these attitudes would be in any way altered if Peiping were granted a place here on its terms.

Ambassador Yost restated many of the arguments that opponents of Communist China's admission have been presenting for the past 15 years; however, it was the conditions for acceptance of membership and the expressed intentions of the Peiping government itself that many observers felt added the greatest weight to the American attack against membership for the Communist regime.

> The sponsors of this item (the resolution to admit Communist China) have not presented us with any evidence that Peking's wishes to be represented here, nor have they said anything to dispel the serious doubts on this score which have become widespread in the light of Peking's open enmity toward the United Nations—its membership, its principles, it leadership, and its activities. * * * The sponsors have failed to state, moreover, whether Peiping—if offered a seat on its conditions—would cease to insist that there are certain areas of the world—the Indochinese and Korean peninsulas—where the United Nations has and can have no competence, or whether Peking would forgo its plans to establish a rival revolutionary international organization.

(C) THE 1965 VOTE ON REPRESENTATION

The 20th General Assembly of the United Nations voted on the question of seating Communist China in the United Nations in place of Nationalist China on November 17, 1965. Forty-seven nations voted in favor; forty-seven voted against; twenty abstained; one did not participate, and one was absent. The vote came after the General Assembly approved a resolution declaring the issue an important matter requiring a two-thirds majority to approve the seating of the Peiping delegation; thus, the Communist Chinese were not admitted to the United Nations in 1965.

Three nations: France, the Central African Republic, and the Congo—Brazzaville—switched their opposition on previous votes to support in 1965. Eight other nations which had previously voted against Communist China's admission abstained. They were: Cameroon, Chile, Cyprus, Iran, Jamaica, Libya, Rwanda, and Senegal. Nigeria, which abstained in 1963, voted in favor of admission.

Israel, on the other hand, changed from a position of abstention to a vote against admission; Tunisia abstained after having previously voted for admission; and Laos, after having voted for admission in 1963, did not participate in the vote this year.

Supporters of Communist China's admission considered the tie vote a considerable victory for their side, and many observers ventured the guess that if the resolution for admission of Communist China had not been worded in such a way that the Nationalists would lose their seat in the United Nations, it would have received a clear majority. An amendment to this effect was proposed shortly before the voting by the delegations of Ceylon and Mauritania, but Cambodia and Albania, sponsors of the original resolution, asked them to withdraw it. The amended resolution, instead of calling for the expulsion of Nationalist China along with Peking's admission, would have stated only that "the representatives of the People's Republic of China be seated in the United Nations and all its organs." According to the sponsors of the original resolution—Cambodia, Albania, Algeria, Congo—Brazzaville—Cuba, Ghana, Mali, Pakistan, Rumania, and Syria—the Peiping Government insisted on the expulsion of Nationalist China as a precondition for accepting admission in the United Nations; therefore, the original resolution was not changed.

3. THE TWO-CHINAS PLAN

The abortive amendment proposed by Ceylon and Mauritania brings up a third approach to the Chinese representation question, one which seems to have been gaining ascendancy in the United Nations in recent years, particularly among the Afro-Asian group. This is the two-Chinas solution which holds that both Communist China and the Nationalist government should be represented in the United Nations. First proposed by Britain in 1950, it is a view that has been explicitly espoused by nearly all those members which have abstained on recent resolutions to seat the Communists and unseat the Nationalists. It is interested to note, for example, that Nigeria, which had abstained on the Chinese representation question until it voted in favor this year, had previously indicated that its abstention reflected its desire to see Communist China admitted to the United Nations but not at the expense of having Nationalist China expelled from the Organization. Chile, one of the eight nations who abstained in 1965 after previously voting to refuse admission to the Communist government and the first Latin American nation—excluding Cuba—to break a solid front against Communist Chinese admission, explained its position in the following terms:

> We do not feel at one with either of the two positions, neither with that of those who wish to prevent the participation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, nor with that of those who wish to make it possible through the imposition of circumstances that involve our turning a blind eye to the fate of several millions of human beings. * * * Neither can we accept the proposal of bringing the People's Republic of China into this organization by the plain and simple expulsion of the representatives of the Republic

> of China, with its capital in Taiwan, the inhabitants of which would then be abandoned to their fate. We do not believe that we can deal so carelessly with the fate of 12 million people, a population which, as has been stated here, exceeds those of 83 states members of this organization.

The two-Chinas approach has gained more and more ground in the United Nations within the last few years. Those who support the policy recognize Communist China as the legitimate government of the mainland and the Nationalist government as the legitimate government of Taiwan. They argue that since the Nationalist government exercises no control over the mainland and the Peiping government exercises no control over Taiwan, the two governments should represent the areas which they do govern and those only.

A number of countries have also expressed support for the creation of U.N. machinery to study the possibilities of a two-Chinas solution. Australia, Britain, Canada, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Scandinavian countries, several Latin American nations, and a number of African members are among those which have either explicitly or implicitly acknowledged support for a two-Chinas solution or else have suggested the creation of U.N. machinery to study such a solution. A California professor of international relations, Dr. Urban Whittaker, reported that in interviews with 96 of the then 99 delegations to the U.N. in 1961, he found that more than three-fourths of them felt Communist China should be seated as the representative of China both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, and that more than two-thirds of them believed Nationalist China should retain a seat in the General Assembly. Philip Geyelin, writing in the Wall Street Journal on February 14, 1964, indicated that the "best guess of seasoned onlookers" at the U.N. was "that a comfortable majority does favor Red China's membership but not at the Nationalists' expense."

Widespread support for a two-Chinas solution in the U.N. has never found expression in a formal resolution. Since substantive discussion of the issue was initiated in 1961, each year the problem has been posed in terms of a resolution for seating the Chinese Communists and unseating the Nationalists. Perhaps one of the reasons delegates have never been faced with a choice of a two-Chinas solution is that none of the main protagonists—neither the Soviet bloc nor the United States nor the Nationalist Chinese nor the Communist Chinese—has favored such a solution. Although the Soviet Union and the United States, the Communist and Nationalist Chinese differ on who should represent China in the U.N., they have agreed on one thing: that there is only one legitimate Government of China.

4. THE PROCEDURAL QUESTION IN 1965

Recognizing that the vote on Chinese representation would be close in 1965, the United States reiterated its stand of 1961 that any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question within the meaning of article 18 of the U.N. Charter and requires an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the membership. Thus, the United States, along with nine other member states—Australia, Brazil, Colombia, Gabon, Italy, Japan, Madagascar, the Philippines, and Thailand—submitted a draft resolution restating the 1961 position that Chinese representation was an important question.

Ambassador Yost defended the resolution against its opponents in the General Assembly:

> These members argue as though the General Assembly had not previously discussed this question and reached a firm decision, by a vote of 61 to 34, in 1961, "in accordance with article 18 of the Charter of the United Nations that any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question" (1668 (XVI)). They also argue as though the General Assembly had not previously discussed the controversies which can arise from competing governments' claims to represent a member state in the United Nations. But the General Assembly has discussed that—in 1961 and as far back as 1950, when it came to the conclusion, by a vote of 36 to 6, that such questions "should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the charter * * *" (396 (V)).
>
> I can think of nothing more unrealistic than to pretend that a decision to accept Communist China in this Organization on its own belligerent terms is not an important question in the most profound meaning of the word. It is a decision which the cosponsors of the draft resolution readily admit could entail the expulsion of a sovereign, independent member state. It is a decision which would be interpreted by Peiping as an internationally granted license to attempt to seize Taiwan, with its 12 million people, by force; a decision which would in effect endorse Peiping's repeated rejection of peaceful coexistence; a decision which could bring into our midst a group which has declared open enmity toward everything the United Nations is doing and every principle it stands for; a decision which could entitle Peiping to believe that threats and blackmail produce results, that political power does indeed grow out of the barrel of a gun. It is a decision, in short, which is of fundamental importance in that it could increase the likelihood of war in Asia and the use of violence throughout the world.

Those who opposed the American stand that the Chinese representation question is an important question under the provisions of article 18 maintained that none of the matters listed in the article could possibly be construed as applying in this instance, not even the question of admitting new members. The following statement to the Assembly from the representative from Ghana is typical:

> It is a clear and unmistakable question of deciding who should legally occupy the seat of China in the United Nations. China's membership in the United Nations has never been in doubt and no useful purpose is served by talking about admissions.

The General Assembly voted in favor of the U.S. resolution, declaring that the seating question required a two-thirds majority by a vote of 56 to 49 with 11 members abstaining. The margin on the 1965 vote was considerably less than in 1961 when the only previous vote on the procedural question was taken. Then the resolution was approved by a vote of 61 to 34 with 7 abstentions.

In the 1965 vote 6 of the 12 nations which had abstained on the question of admitting Communist China voted in favor of the resolution to consider the issue an important matter. They were: Chile, Iceland, Lebanon, Libya, the Netherlands and Trinidad and Tobago. Britain voted in favor of seating Communist China but also in favor of the resolution requiring a two-thirds majority to make the decision effective. Congo—Léopoldville—and Dahomey, who did not participate in the vote on admission, voted in favor of the resolution on the procedural question.

5. PROSPECTS FOR THE 1966 U.N. SESSION

The result of the November 17 voting was met with a cheer from the supporters of Communist China's admission who felt they had clearly won a victory in the gradual attainment of membership of that nation. Several supporters of Communist Chinese admission viewed the vote as a decisive defeat for the United States as well. U.S. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg argued to the contrary:

> Once again it has been demonstrated that it is not the United States alone which kept Communist China out of the United Nations. It is a substantial vote of the membership.
>
> The vote fell far short of the two-thirds that a simple majority has decided has continuing applicability. In fact, it failed of a simple majority.

Many of Communist China's supporters are now confident that they will be able to achieve the necessary majority to win admission for the Peiping government in the next session of the U.N. General Assembly. Several feel that if the demands of Communist China had not been so great—especially its insistence on the expulsion of Nationalist China prior to accepting admission—the voting would have gone the other way in 1965.

They came close. The all-important procedural vote on whether or not to require a two-thirds majority for Chinese admission was passed in favor by only seven votes. Some members were clearly influenced by the fact that the Communists were insisting upon the expulsion of the Nationalists prior to accepting their seat in the U.N. The Chilean delegate declared:

> However much one may wish to stretch the interpretation of the rules of procedure, no good arguments can be found to support the claim that this matter, in which the future fate of a population in excess of 12 million human beings (is considered), lacks importance and constitutes a simple question of procedure. Therefore, with regard to this draft resolution, we wish to state that we shall vote in the affirmative, that is to say in the sense that the matter before us constitutes in itself, and in accordance with the rules of procedure, an important question.

It would only take a simple majority, that is, a switch in four votes, to change the procedural situation to require only a simple majority to decide on Communist China's admission at the 21st General Assembly in 1966. And in 1965, that vote ended in a tie.

What are the prospects on the China representation matter when the U.N. convenes next September? Whether the United States may continue to succeed with its past policy of no representation for mainland China depends upon two things: First, whether the issue presented is simply that of mainland China's admission to the General Assembly, without carrying with it the expulsion of Nationalist China; and, second, whether there will be other changes in the votes of U.N. delegates, particularly among those who have abstained in the past.

An examination of the second question suggests that perhaps the United States might be able to prevail once again if the issue presented is one involving the exclusion of Nationalist China. But an examination of the first question, as we have seen, suggests that if a two-China resolution is presented, the United States may lose. And a loss would present serious consequences not only for the interest of the United States, but for the future of the United Nations.

Let us look at the lineup of nations.

Three nations did not vote when the resolution on representation, which resulted in a 47-to-47 tie with 20 nations abstaining, came up last November: Dahomey, Congo—Léopoldville—and Laos. Since then the Congolese delegation has formally sent a letter to the Secretary-General stating that its absence during the voting was an oversight and had the delegation been on the floor it would have opposed the representation of the Communist Chinese. One month after the voting, Dahomey underwent a successful military coup, and on January 3 of this year broke diplomatic relations with the Communist Chinese. Thus, all other things remaining equal, these two delegations could be expected to vote against Communist Chinese representation in 1966. This would add two more votes against representation and one more vote for declaring the issue a substantive matter requiring a two-thirds majority. The Congo delegation was present to cast its vote in favor of the U.S. resolution last fall, whereas Dahomey did not vote on this issue.

Military coups have also occurred in the Central African Republic, Ghana, and Nigeria, all of which voted for Communist representation and against the U.S. procedural resolution declaring the issue an important question requiring a two-thirds majority in 1965. The Central African Republic and Ghana have expelled a number of Communist Chinese from their countries and, on January 6, the Central African Republic broke diplomatic relations with China. Many observers feel that, barring any unforeseen changes, the Central African Republic will vote against Chinese representation next fall. Ghana and Nigeria, on the other hand, continue to recognize the Communist Chinese Government diplomatically and have yet to indicate any change in their general policy toward the Peiping regime.

Finally, there is the obvious question mark represented by Indonesia. It is difficult to speculate at this time on whether Indonesia will reverse its policy and seek readmission to the U.N., much less to determine how Indonesia would vote if it did return prior to the vote on Chinese representation next fall.

These changes would seem to indicate that, all things remaining equal, the United States is likely to gain two votes—Dahomey and Central African Republic—in favor of declaring the issue an important matter and three votes—Dahomey, Central African Republic and Congo—Léopoldville—against admitting the Peiping regime and expelling the Nationalists as the representatives of China. Since the Central African Republic's vote would represent a change from favoring admission, the vote could change to 59 to 48 to 11 on the question of declaring the issue an important matter and to 50 to 46 to 20 against Peking's representation. The positions of Ghana and Nigeria appear much less likely to change.

Of course, all other things are not going to remain equal. It is hard to imagine that the 21st General Assembly will convene with the same governments and in the same international atmosphere that prevail today. The attitude and action of the Peking regime will have a great deal to do with the voting between now and next fall. Lately its policy of doctrinaire opposition on the U.N. and intrigue in the underdeveloped areas has apparently hurt its chances. But there is always a very real possibility that these policies could change. A change in Peking's attitude would affect the attitude of the unalined nations in the U.N.

What this all boils down to is that the 1966 vote on both the procedural and substantive questions could be quite close. This alone is an important reason for the United States to reexamine its position.

But there are reasons for the United States to reexamine its position quite apart from the possibility of a United Nations vote next September opposed to our policy of no representation for mainland China.

Universality of membership in the United Nations is more than an ideal. It is a practical necessity if the organization is to make its maximum contribution to the establishment and maintenance of world peace. With the absence of important countries, the United Nations is hamstrung in what may be its important role as the focus of a continuing process of diplomacy and negotiation.

Acceptance of China as a member of the international community and its participation in the United Nations may well in time help induce a moderation in Chinese foreign policy.

Certainly the United States at least should not stand in the way of such a possibility.

True, Communist China is bellicose; true, it imposes its regime by force; true, China in the U.N. might work to impair the useful work of the United Nations. These are infirmities of other nations now within the United Nations, as they will be of any universal organization for years to come.

True, Communist China has said that it will join the U.N. only if Nationalist China is expelled, and if the United Nations excludes from its membership all imperialist puppets and chastens the United States. An editorial in the Peiping People's Daily of November 19, 1965, 2 days after the 1965 U.N. vote, said:

> China may as well stay out of a United Nations like this. As a matter of fact, the United States may keep China out of the United Nations for 1,000 or 10,000 years without harming China one iota.

A two-China position by the United States, adopted by the United Nations, would not result in Communist China's immediate acceptance of membership. Rather, there would be a contemptuous turndown. But such a two-China position would serve the enormously important function of demonstrating that the United States is not bent on isolating Red China, that that position is shared by a majority of United Nations members, and that it is Red China, not the United Nations, which is indulging in fantasies. It would then be open to a less belligerent Communist Chinese regime to respond to the light in the window at a later time.

A two-China arrangement would mean that the United States would vote for, or at least abstain from voting against, an invitation to Communist China to join the General Assembly as one of its 118 members. Nationalist China would continue to remain a member of the General Assembly.

There is a precedent for accepting two Chinas in the General Assembly, where before there was only one—Nationalist China. When the United Arab Republic, which was a member of the General Assembly, broke up into Egypt and Syria some years ago, both Egypt and Syria were considered successor states to the United Arab Republic, and the credentials of representatives of both countries were accepted, so that neither had to reapply for admission. Communist China could come into the General Assembly under this precedent. Since this would be a question of representation rather than admission, it would not be subject to the veto applicable to admissions possessed by the five permanent members—the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, France, and Nationalist China, the last of which would surely exercise its veto. Equally, since Nationalist China would not be seeking admission, its application could not be vetoed by, say, the Soviet Union.

One does not get very far in considering the admission of Communist China to the General Assembly before one confronts the question of Security Council membership. A permanent seat on the Security Council is held by Nationalist China. China got this seat when the U.N. was created in 1946 because there was assumed to be one China, a great power which deserved such a seat by virtue of its size, population, and importance in Asian affairs. A fragmentary Nationalist China in a two-China United Nations obviously does not deserve a permanent Security Council seat. Neither, for that matter, does an irresponsible Communist China. Equally obviously, as a veto-holding permanent Council member, Nationalist China could prevent transfer of its Security Council seat to Communist China or to anybody else, as well as prevent an amendment to the U.N. Charter reducing the permanent seats in the Security Council to four—the United States, France, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain. An amendment to the U.N. Charter requires a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly, plus the vote of each of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

We are here getting a little ahead of ourselves, since Communist China, as has been said, is most unlikely at present to accept a two-China solution—one which leaves Nationalist China in the United Nations. But the United States, and hopefully a majority of the rest of the United Nations, could take a position in favor of an amendment to the charter granting India—a great Asian power with strong support in the developing world—the fifth seat now occupied by Nationalist China should such a procedural possibility present itself in the future. Alternatively, the number of permanent seats could be enlarged, to accommodate others. The United States could thus be in the position of favoring a just and rational solution, however difficult to realize.

Let me now summarize: the Government of the United States ought to be carefully considering whether it should not abandon its policy of isolating Communist China, and instead, at the 1966 U.N. session, withhold opposing a proposal to offer Communist China a membership in the General Assembly along with a continued membership for Nationalist China.

6. CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTIONS DO NOT PREVENT THE ADMINISTRATION'S CONSIDERING A TWO-CHINA POLICY

I believe our Government should be considering a two-China policy on its merits, and without being hemmed in by the advice that Congress has given it in the 20-odd resolutions of Congress during 1951–62 that Communist China should under no circumstances be admitted to U.N. membership.

I base this upon what I believe to be a valid precept of U.S. congressional-Executive relations: that a "sense of Congress" foreign policy resolution is valid, in the absence of more permanent language, only during the Congress for which it is enacted. The last expression of Congress against Communist China in the U.N. was in the 87th Congress. This is the 89th Congress.

The administration, I submit, has in fact adopted this view. Just a year ago the United Nations was hopelessly deadlocked because of the dispute over the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations. The Soviet Union and France were both more than 2 years in arrears in paying their assessments for peacekeeping forces. In August 1964, the 88th Congress, with administration encouragement, passed a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 343) calling on the permanent U.S. delegate to the United Nations to "make every effort to assure invocation of article 19," which would have denied to the Soviet Union and France their votes if they did not pay up. At the September 1964 United Nations General Assembly session, permanent U.S. Delegate Adlai Stevenson did "make every effort to assure invocation of article 19," but without success. In the spring and summer of 1965, it appeared that a further effort to invoke article 19 would result either in the defeat of the United States, or in the withdrawal of the Soviet Union and France from the world organization. Fortunately, the State Department changed its position in August 1965, and Ambassador Goldberg was sent to the United Nations in September with authority not to press for the invocation of article 19. Ambassador Goldberg failed so to press, and the United Nations was thus rehabilitated and able to play its important peacekeeping role in the India-Pakistan dispute, in Vietnam, and elsewhere since last September.

The State Department, quite properly, held that the congressional concurrent resolution of August 1964 was that of the 88th Congress, and would not bind the 89th Congress. The two Congresses are composed of different members. As those of us in the House well know, each Congress is a new one, which organizes itself and, at least in the House, readopts its rules.

Thus the 20-odd resolutions against Communist Chinese representation in the United Nations are not advisory in this, the 89th Congress.

The President, I am aware, has from time to time referred to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution (H.J. Res. 1145, Public Law 88–408) adopted in August 1964, as indicating congressional support for action in Vietnam today in the 89th Congress. The vital difference is that the Tonkin resolution contained the phrase:

> This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress (sec. 3, Public Law 88–408).

Such language is not presented in any of the 20-odd resolutions pertaining to Communist China and the United Nations.

I hope that the administration will give early and earnest consideration to abandoning our effort to isolate Communist China, and to supporting a two-China policy next September. It could do so unencumbered by any congressional resolution on the matter.

INACTION SPEAKS LOUDER THAN WORDS—THE PRESIDENT'S STAND ON NATO

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's inaction as the ex officio leader of NATO speaks louder than his words. In his televised speech today he uttered many fine principles but gave no hint whatever that he will act to carry them out.

He rightly denied that "there is any righteousness in standing pat" but his NATO policy can be summed up accurately in those same two words "standing pat." He rightly stated that division is the common danger of the alliance but he has taken no initiative to meet complaints which France has been voicing for years.

He rightly stated that "consultation, not isolation is the road to reform" but he has made no effort to discuss differences man to man with President de Gaulle. He has even rebuffed France's requests for consultation. Indeed, his inaction and neglect of leadership responsibility has strengthened the forces pushing France into a position of isolation. In effect, he is forcing France to choose between the status quo, which to De Gaulle is subordination, described as integration—or no alliance.

He rightly stated that NATO must grow and change with the times like the U.S. Constitution in order to be alive and vital, but he has taken no steps to develop a constitution for NATO so it too can be alive and vital.

He rightly criticized old and narrow concepts of sovereignty but he has given no hint that the United States will ever yield its absolute national control over any of the nuclear weapons on which other NATO nations now depend for their most basic defense.

He has given no encouragement to the resolution now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to establish an Atlantic Union delegation, which could well be the first step toward a hopeful new concept of sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, I am fearful that the worst may be yet to come in French-American discord and for the fourth time in less than a year I have proposed that President Johnson go to Paris to visit French President de Gaulle.

In a letter March 17 to President Johnson, I said:

> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: French-American relations have plunged to the lowest point in many years, and the worst may be yet to come. Many Americans place the sole blame for the present NATO crisis on French President de Gaulle. Whatever the real reasons, the severity of the crisis has provoked emotional outbursts on both sides of the Atlantic. Unchecked, this tide of bitterness may destroy in a matter of days the friendship built up over two centuries between these oldest allies and cause difficult new problems throughout the Atlantic Alliance.
>
> France is enormously important to NATO and therefore to the United States. The Communists must not succeed in their major postwar objective, which of course is to break up the alliance of free nations.
>
> Therefore I once again urge that you visit Paris as soon as possible for a long overdue meeting with the French President.
>
> The trip would be a sign of responsible concern and common sense, not of weakness.
>
> It would ease mounting tensions, demonstrate our desire for friendship and cooperation—whether France stays in NATO or not—and hopefully forestall bitter American reaction against further participation in European affairs.
>
> As President of the United States, you are the unquestioned ex officio leader of the

> alliance. You alone control the nuclear weapons on which all NATO nations depend for their most basic defense. You personally select the two U.S. officers who are supreme commanders of the alliance military structure. Indeed the structure, often described as integrated, is actually heavily dependent on decisions you alone can make.
>
> It therefore seems logical and proper for you to take this personal initiative to deal with the crisis.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> PAUL FINDLEY,
> *Chairman, House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community.*

This critical moment demands calm appraisal of facts.

First and foremost is the simple reality of French authority over its own territory. As the chief executive of France, De Gaulle is in a position to carry out his announced plan to place all military forces in his country under French command by the end of the year whether his allies like it or not. To argue that the question should be settled by NATO as a group and not by France alone is completely academic. NATO is not a government and never has been. It is an alliance of independent nations, with each of them—France included—able to pursue its own independent policies. Joint action is possible only if all 15 members agree.

We may fuss and fume, brand De Gaulle an ingrate, and denounce him as untrue to the Americans who lost their lives in two world wars trying to save France from captivity, but the simple fact of French authority over its own soil cannot be effectively challenged.

We must not forget that France is enormously important to the United States and always has been. In candor, we must recall that America entered the two great world wars reluctantly—only when it was clear to our leaders that our national interest was at stake. We take part in NATO and keep U.S. armies stationed in Europe mainly because of national self-interest.

It is noteworthy that France is not the only nation sensitive about foreign troops. Norway and Denmark have never voluntarily tolerated foreign troops on their soil. Although they are in a more forward position than France with respect to the Soviet frontier, no criticism of their policies has been heard. Bases in Britain at which U.S. forces are stationed are commanded, nominally at least, by British officers, but no similar gesture toward French sensitivities in regard to bases in France has ever been made.

The United States can hardly be expected to understand fully De Gaulle's attitude concerning foreign troops because our Nation has had no similar experience. Even in the dark days of the Revolutionary War when the King of France sent his finest troops to aid General Washington, all French forces—including the veteran General Rochambeau—were under American command.

Certainly, the United States and its NATO allies have had advance warning of De Gaulle's attitude on foreign troops. His statements early last year—couched in moderate language that left ample room for discussion and negotiation—were ignored. Only recently have the terms become hard and clear.

Must President Johnson assume any personal responsibility for the rapidly-mounting crisis in NATO?

Major alterations may have been inevitable. Perhaps nothing he could have done would have dissuaded President de Gaulle from extracting France from NATO's military structure and the structure itself from French soil.

Even so, Americans may properly ask whether President Johnson did everything that could reasonably be expected to keep differences within the alliance from taking on the atmosphere and proportions of crisis.

What efforts—if any—did he make to understand and harmonize conflicting views within NATO, keep cordial communication open at the highest level between those with opposing views, and adjust the alliance structure in light of the massive changes which have occurred in western Europe since it was established in 1949?

President Johnson may not wish to assume the burden of NATO leadership. He may prefer, for example, to center his foreign-policy attention and energies entirely on a small part of the world in southeast Asia, and let others worry about the Atlantic Community. He appears to have done just that. But the responsibility has been his since he became President and remains so. Neglect does not relieve him of it.

In Atlantic affairs, as elsewhere, the test of leadership is whether policies and programs are constantly updated to meet new conditions—and equally important, whether the forces seeking change are accommodated to mutual advantage.

The test of leadership is not—as one might surmise from President Johnson's attitude on NATO—whether the status quo is preserved and all efforts at change beaten off.

Up to now, President Johnson must be charged with failure in his ex-officio responsibility as leader of NATO. He has quite obviously proceeded on the assumption that somehow the status quo will survive. He has made no significant effort to reshape the alliance to meet new realities. He has ignored complaints, missed opportunities to build good will, made no apparent move to bridge the gulf between himself and President de Gaulle, and thereby permitted opposing positions to harden.

His policy on NATO can be summed up properly and accurately with just one word—neglect.

On April 20, 1965, 11 members of the Republican committee, myself included, first proposed the trip in a joint letter to the President. The letter said, in part:

> Misunderstanding between friends threatens to split asunder the free world's most essential institution—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. * * * We believe it is high time for the Presidents of the two great republics to confer with each other. We urge that you be the one to break the ice, and make the kind of visit to President de Gaulle that President Kennedy originally planned (in 1961) but failed to carry out.

Signing it were Representative E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana, Representative JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., of California, Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan, Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, Representative ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas, Representative HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts, Representative ROGERS C. B. MORTON, of Maryland, Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York, Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, Representative JAMES D. MARTIN, of Alabama, and myself.

The trip proposal was repeated on June 30, 1965, in a report to the President summarizing a Republican-sponsored fact-finding mission to Paris to study NATO problems. It stated:

> Any tendency to procrastinate in the handling of common problems by France and the United States can lead only to deterioration of the climate for successful negotiation. If it is wise to attempt to ease tensions with the Communist world, is it less so with a friend and ally?

The mission consisted of Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York, Representative HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts, Representative JAMES D. MARTIN, of Alabama, with myself as chairman.

Noting that opposing views of the United States and France had hardened to an alarming degree, I made the suggestion for a third time in a statement issued February 22 of this year.

The committee has made a series of additional proposals, beginning in August 1963, aimed at strengthening NATO.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the March 22, 1966, meeting of the House Republican Policy Committee, a policy statement regarding the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966 was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this statement.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the Johnson-Humphrey administration is engaging in a tragic game with this Congress. Unfortunately, the stakes in this game may be the American economic system that has produced unparalleled opportunities and abundance for our people.

In recent weeks a combination of alarming factors have created grave concern over this country's economic condition. In February the wholesale price index increased 0.7 percent, the sharpest rise since the Korean war. The cost of living continues to mount. A recent Gallup poll reported that, according to the American public's own appraisal of living costs, it takes a family of four about $18 more a week to get along this year than it did a year ago. And this is at a time when this country is experiencing the effects of accumulated deficits of 6 years of unbalanced budgets and sharply increasing defense demands.

In spite of this serious inflationary situation and the spiraling costs of a massive war in Vietnam, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has continued to insist upon a large number of new programs.

For example, in this bill there is money for rent supplements and for the Federal Teachers Corps. This is money that was requested, considered, and then rejected during the first session of this Congress.

Once an appropriation is made for rent supplements, the Federal Government will be on its way to a 40-year, $6 billion program. Also, even though the proposed regulations governing allowable income limits and assets have been tightened since last year, if funds are appropriated, Congress will have little or no control over future regulations.

The Federal Teachers Corps has had an even more checkered career. In the House of Representatives, only one witness testified on this proposal. It then was added to the Higher Education Act by the Senate. House Republican conferees refused to sign the conference report and moved to recommit the report with instructions to delete the Teachers Corps. Thereafter, the $13.2 million that would have been used to finance the Teachers Corps was removed from an appropriation measure.

Objections to the Teachers Corps center on the fact that it will be a federally-financed project in which the U.S. Commissioner of Education has the extraordinary authority to recruit, select, train, and pay the salary of teachers and then choose the district, from among those that apply, in which such teachers would be assigned. Certainly, this is a new and dangerous extension of Federal power into local school districts.

The record now reflects that in fiscal 1966 the Johnson-Humphrey administration underestimated the escalating Vietnam military needs by $15 billion. And this undoubtedly will be repeated in fiscal 1967. Until such time as a realistic appraisal of the Vietnam costs is forwarded to Congress, all new and nonessential spending must be curtailed. Under the circumstances, it is both reckless and dangerous to feed the fires of inflation as this appropriations bill would do. Certainly, in this period of grave uncertainty, new starts on broad and expensive programs should not be called for in a supplemental appropriations bill. In times such as these, new spending requests should be contained in a regular appropriation request and given the careful scrutiny they deserve.

All too often, this Democratically controlled Congress has earned its rubber-stamp characterization. It has winked when the occasion demanded firmness. It has grinned when it should have gagged. We hope that this time Congress will respond to the challenge.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES SPEAK OUT ON H.R. 6277

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Commander Andy Borg of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States stated his organization's views on H.R. 6277.

Commander Borg is seriously and justly concerned about the broad effects of this bill, and I also am deeply concerned.

I think we should all be aware of Commander Borg's position and that we must study this proposed legislation in light of his remarks. Therefore, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the letter, which Commander Borg sent to Chairman Macy, together with an article, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, March 21, 1966:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1966.

JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACY: In passing the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 without a dissenting vote, the Congress of the United States has reaffirmed its traditional support of veterans' preference. The overwhelming support of this extension of veterans' preference to veterans of the cold war was heartening to members of this organization.

It is a matter of great concern to me, however, that the Civil Service Commission is on record as favoring H.R. 6277, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, which would strip Department of State employees of rights so recently reaffirmed.

The Civil Service Commission's support of H.R. 6277 causes me to question whether the Commission is properly discharging the mandate of Congress that it enforce the Veterans' Preference Act. More than that, for the Commission to confirm the personal endorsement you gave this legislation when you appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in the capacity of Presidential adviser raises serious doubts as to the Commission's present capability of objectively appraising proposals that would erode the rights of employees who have contracted for employment in the classified civil service.

Commission endorsement of the House-passed bill places the weight of its authority and standing behind the effort to make the State Department the first department of the Government to be released from the obligation to comply with veterans' preference.

It was President Franklin Delano Roosevelt who said, "I believe that the Federal Government, functioning in its capacity as an employer, should take the lead in assuring those who are in the Armed Forces that when they return special consideration will be given to them in their efforts to obtain employment."

Surely the Government's responsibility under the Veterans' Act is of greater importance during a time when the obligation to perform military service under the draft law falls upon a minority of the eligibles.

It is ironic, also, that veterans of service in foreign lands should be eliminated from special consideration by the very department of Government concerned with these foreign areas. Under the circumstances it seems fair to conclude that the Commission's support of the Department of State indicates a willingness if not an intent to preside over the liquidation of veterans' preference.

I urge the Commission to reconsider its position with respect to H.R. 6277 and oppose its enactment.

Very truly yours,

ANDY BORG,
Commander in Chief.

VFW CASTIGATES CSC ON BILL STRIPPING RIGHTS FROM THOUSANDS

(By Joseph Young)

The Veterans of Foreign Wars charges that the Civil Service Commission has shown "a willingness, if not an intent, to preside over the liquidation of veterans' preference in Government employment."

VFW Commander in Chief Andy Borg, in a letter to CSC Chairman John Macy, castigated the Commission for its support of a bill that would strip civil service rights from many thousands of career employees in the three Foreign Service agencies.

The House already has approved the measure and it is now before a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee.

The so-called Hays bill would transfer these civil service jobs to a new foreign personnel system under which employees would be deprived of civil service and veterans' preference procedural rights and subjected to arbitrary "selection out" removal.

Borg's letter contained some of the most critical charges ever made by a veterans organization against the Civil Service Commission.

Declaring that by approving the recent GI cold war veterans bill unanimously Congress had reaffirmed its traditional support of veterans' preference in the Federal service, Borg charged that the Johnson administration's support of the Hays bill negates these principles.

The VFW chief charged that the Hays bill would corrode the rights of Federal career employees.

He said the CSC's support of the measure raises serious doubts as to its capability to protect the rights of career employees.

Other groups, such as the American Legion and the various Government employee unions, are also strongly opposed to the Hays bill, fearing it would set a dangerous precedent whereby other Government agencies will seek similar authority to discard civil service and secure summary firing authority over their employees.

The Hays bill covers the State Department, Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency.

THIS NATION MUST BE THE LAUGHING STOCK OF THE GEOPOLITICAL WORLD

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the following two items illustrate just another of many reasons why this Nation must be the laughing stock of the geopolitical world.

When Great Britain placed an economic embargo on Rhodesia, the United States through our executive branch generously cooperated by, first, recalling of the U.S. consul general from Salisbury and the termination of status of five Rhodesian diplomats in Washington; second, immediate imposition of a comprehensive embargo on the shipment of all arms and military equipment to Rhodesia; third, withholding of Rhodesia's 1966 quota for importation of sugar into the United States, in violation of contractual obligations already incurred by American commercial interests; fourth, suspension of action on all Rhodesian applications for loan or credit facilities; fifth, warnings to American investors about the risks of capital investment to Rhodesia; and sixth, discouragement of private travel to Rhodesia by American citizens.

In addition, the New York Times of March 20 reported:

> U.S. exporters were forbidden Friday to send Rhodesia virtually any commodities useful to its economy.

Now, to keep your sanity and to avoid confusion, just forget that article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the American Constitution specifically states that Congress shall have the exclusive power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations."

Also, banish from mind the fact that last year Congress amended the Export Control Act of 1949 to read in part:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States (A) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

Needless to say, no action of Congress was requested before this policy went into effect.

So what? It is only the U.S. Constitution.

Now reverse the situation, with the United States asking its allies for help in the periods before and after the Cuban missile crisis.

In the spring of 1962, Kennedy proclaimed a renewed embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba, and called upon our NATO allies to support our position.

Great Britain "cooperated." Near the end of 1962, of the total number of non-Communist ships doing business with Castro, the second largest number were British.

What happened during the missile crisis? According to James J. Kilpatrick, in his column of December 21, 1965:

> In the fall of 1962 came the great confrontation, when the missiles were discovered and the world held its breath. Kennedy once more begged the British to clamp down on trade with Castro. * * * Throughout this period, British tankers carried oil to Cuba. * * * In the summer of 1963, Kennedy asked Britain to ban trade and travel to Cuba; Britain refused. In February 1964, the effects of continued British trade with Castro were so serious that the United States temporarily suspended military aid to Britain.

Following are the two items from the London Times of March 17 concerning Britain's embargo of Rhodesia in which this Nation is participating so fully.

[From the London Times, Mar. 17, 1966]

ROYAL NAVY INTERCEPTS CARGO SHIPS OFF MOZAMBIQUE—AGENTS DENY BUZZING BY AIRCRAFT

CAPE TOWN, March 16.—Two cargo ships flying the South African flag—one a British vessel—were approached by a British frigate between the Mozambique port of Beira and Durban and asked for their identity, a shipping company said here today.

The company, Safmarine, added that this was international practice between merchant and naval vessels on the open sea. It denied a Durban report that the two ships had been "buzzed" by aircraft.

The ships concerned were the South African *Transporter*, 9,063 tons, and the 8,929-ton *Saldura*, which is registered in Leith. The *Saldura* is on charter to Safmarine, which owns the South African *Transporter*.

The South African Press Association news agency said earlier that it was learned on board the two ships when they docked at Durban today that they had been "buzzed."

Just north of Lourenco Marques an aircraft—no identity was given—swooped low over the South African *Transporter* and swept around its stern, it was reported. An earlier "buzzing" was said to have occurred after the ship had left Beira heading south.

The *Saldura*, which was astern of the South African *Transporter*, received the same treatment on her Beira-Durban voyage, the news agency said.

The first of a task force of five R.A.F. aircraft landed in Malagasy today to start a watch in the Mozambique channel for "pirate" tankers carrying oil for Rhodesia. A four-engined Shackleton landed at Majunga airport, northwest of Tananarive.—Reuter.

"EAGLE" TAKES OVER FROM "ARK ROYAL"

(From our Defense Correspondent)

The aircraft carrier *Eagle* has now relieved the *Ark Royal* in the Mozambique channel, the Navy Department announced last night. The *Eagle*, with her escorts, will continue the watch on Beira.

The *Ark Royal*, accompanied by the frigates *Lowestoft* and *Rhyl*, will take up station in the Far East, and the *Eagle's* escorts are the frigate *Plymouth*, and the destroyer Cambrian.

Should the watch in the channel have to be maintained indefinitely, with a carrier on station permanently, the *Ark Royal* will have to return from the Far East when the *Eagle* has to go into harbor for a short self-maintenance period. The *Eagle* will presumably slip up to Mombasa when the occasion permits or demands.

A considerable number of ships have been interrogated by the *Ark Royal* or her escorts during their tour of patrolling in the Mozambique Channel. About a quarter of all shipping passing through the channel are tankers, and the number of ships accosted is likely to be nearer 100 than 50, as the daily traffic averages about 7 ships.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT CONTROLS OVER CATTLE HIDE AND LEATHER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ellsworth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the livestock industry in Kansas and throughout the Nation will suffer if the Commerce Department does not remove short supply export controls over cattle hide and leather. Yesterday the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feedgrains of the House Agriculture Committee conducted hearings on the Commerce Department's action. I submitted testimony and ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record:

TESTIMONY SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND FEEDGRAINS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, MARCH 22, 1966

Mr. Chairman, the nursery rhyme, "There was a crooked man who walked a crooked mile" is perhaps the best description of administration agriculture policy I have yet come across. The Johnson administration, faced with climbing inflation, an unbalanced budget, and a draining gold supply, has indeed "walked a crooked mile" with strange twisting and turning policies often directed against the most effective programs in the agricultural sector. These policies slash away at lean and leave the fat. The administration would slash the sound, successful Eisenhower special milk program almost out of existence. The administration would shirk responsibility for Federal meat inspection, established by Theodore Roosevelt, by passing the cost to the processor, who would in turn be forced to pass the cost to the consumer. The administration would cut the heart out of agriculture research appropriations for our land-grant colleges at a time when the prospect of world famine looms over us, and food research is of the essence. Yet, one of the strangest twists is the sudden decision of the Commerce Department to impose short supply export controls over cattle hide and leather products.

A more successful administration program has been the effort to reverse the gold drain. This has been the result of the magnificent voluntary response by the private sector of our economy. Former Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges bruskly told agricultural people to quit whining and seek new markets abroad. The cattle industry, already challenged by synthetic materials invading the leather market, responded with remarkable success, aggressively seeking, at no small cost, new markets all over the globe. The quarter of a billion dollar income from hide exports last year was one big factor in redressing our balance of payments. Are we now to twist our policy and say—stop whining, go out and seek new markets, unless of course, you are seeking them for hide and leather? A great deal has been made by the Secretary of Commerce and others, about the important Kennedy round to remove free world trade barriers. Are we to slap the Kennedy round in the face by imposing new barriers on an American item the free world is asking for?

On the domestic scene, with the development of the byproduct, the processor, purchasing cattle on the hoof, is able to make more money on what he buys. The cattleman can sell his cattle at a higher price. Going the other way, with greater income on the byproduct for the processor, the wholesaler and consumer realize savings on the meat they purchase.

Just who is benefitted by the Commerce Department's action? Perhaps the shoe manufacturer? The cost of leather going into a pair of shoes is small. During 1963 and 1964, when there was a drastic decline in hide prices, the cost of a finished pair of shoes rose. I understand there is more than an adequate supply of hides to meet domestic needs. Beyond that, much of the hide exported is of a lower quality than will be used by American manufacturers, yet is acceptable in foreign markets. For example, there is a heavy variety of hide, for which there is practically no use in the United States, but is being put to great use by Japanese manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, the Commerce Department's action is a blow to farmers, cattlemen, processors, and consumers in my State of Kansas, and throughout the Nation. My office has been in contact with the Department of Commerce since its action was announced—without satisfactory result. I commend this committee for its speedy hearings, and look forward to meeting with the Secretary of Commerce next week. As of now, I am in no way satisfied.

OREGON LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Wyatt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the backbone of the economy of the State of Oregon is the lumber industry. The Federal Government owns very substantial amounts of timber in Oregon. These lands are managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

These agencies, conservationists, the lumber industry, and most citizens of Oregon now recognize the absolute necessity of maintaining this great resource on a sustained yield basis. The real problem in management is to determine accurately the maximum allowable cut consistent with guaranteeing the maintenance of the sustained yield program.

Studies are constantly being made. In July 1958, Dr. William A. Duerr, while on leave from the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University, began supervising a special project on timber trends in western Oregon and western Washington. The results of this research have been partially published in a pamphlet entitled "Timber Trends in Western Oregon and Western Washington."

The Oregon Legislature has created an Interim Committee on Public Lands. This is a nonpartisan committee. The chairman, Republican State Representative Robert F. Smith, and Democrat State Senator Ted Hallock, have asked to have published portions of the research which have as yet not been released for public consumption. The Forest Service has released copies of these missing pages to many people requesting them, including myself, and the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee. Much confusion has followed the failure to make public all of the material.

Even though Federal timberland is involved, I feel strongly that this committee has a legitimate interest in this material and in its free use, just as every resident of Oregon does.

This work was paid for by the taxpayers, and since no question of national security is involved, I see no reason why the missing pages, available to a few now, should not be available to everyone on an equal basis.

These pages have been described as a "preliminary review draft." Professor Duerr has said that before the ideas set forth on the missing pages could be actually applied, a great deal needs to be done in the field of forest research on regeneration and reforestation of conifers. He has also stated that this material needs translating before release to avoid misinterpreting.

With this caveat in mind, I am today, and on successive days, until all of the missing pages are printed, offering the balance of Dr. Duerr's work. I do this with no thought in mind to discredit the agencies involved, but to remove the cloud of mystery surrounding this material, and to dispel any remaining confusion. I firmly believe that whatever research value is contained in these pages should be made freely available to the public which pays for it.

It follows:

August 19, 1960.

To: The Record.
From: William A. Duerr.
Subject: Production economics (timber trends study), manuscript of August 1960.

This study was begun in July 1958 as a special project of the Division of Forest Economics Research in the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station. T. A. McClay and I planned the study, with guidance from R. W. Cowlin and F. L. Moravets. We tried to choose a major question on the forest future of the Pacific Northwest. We hoped to analyze it so as to help guide public and private forestry policies. The topic that we did choose was timber-output potentials in the Douglas-fir subregion during the transition to young growth and in the long run; i.e., timber trends in western Washington and Oregon.

While we were planning the study, and later while we were making it, we sought advice from men in the Forest Service regional office and national forests, in other public agencies, and in private firms, all of whom gave us a great deal of help. Of course none of these advisers can be held responsible for our procedure or results.

Those immediately responsible for the study are T. C. Adams, R. O. McMahon, John Fedkiw, and I. Messrs. Adams and Fedkiw (the latter having joined the experiment station in June 1959 to replace Mr. McClay, who was transferred from the station early in the project) are to be credited with planning and carrying out the projections that are the basis for chapter 4 of this report. Mr. McMahon helped with the projections, but his principal responsibility is for the forecasts of land use, forest ownership, and related matters in chapter 2. Specifics aside, all contributed to the continual thinking, discussing, and planning that produced this report.

Many others at the experiment station have worked with the project to help it along. The Research Center leaders in western Washington and Oregon were very cooperative.

The present manuscript is written as an office report. I had no particular readership clearly in mind when I put the report together. I was not even sure that it would ever become more than an in-station or in-service report. I am afraid that as a consequence I indulged in writing to ourselves, and that a certain amount of translating will be needed if the report is to be prepared for outside use. However, I hope that the translating will not be very hard, and that the raw material will be found here for an interesting and strongly pointed story of the forest future, whoever the chosen audience may be.

There are a couple of mechanical weaknesses in the present draft that should be mentioned. One arises from the fact that after the assumptions and calculations had been completed that led to the forecast of longrun potential output of timber, the estimates of current forest acreage and timber volume which had formed the starting point for the forecast were changed. The changes, all made in the southwest Oregon estimates, were relatively small, not enough to have any appreciable effect on the longrun yield figures. Accordingly, in order to avoid going to a great deal of labor for very little purpose, the reported data pertaining to the long run—acreage, yield, and so on—were all left unchanged, even though the reported current data were all revised to agree with the new estimates for southwest Oregon. The land-use and ownership sections of chapter 2 were rewritten to accommodate this revision in current inventory and thus in the apparent shifts expected in future. There is still, however, some lack of accommodation remaining in the present draft of the report: a few of the acreage figures in tables 12 and 16 [not shown in Record], representing the unrevised material, do not bear close comparison with corresponding acreages in table 8 [not shown in Record] and related tables, which are revised. The problem can be solved either by revising tables 12 and 16 [Lot shown in Record] and all the data related to them or by compressing these two tables so as to eliminate at least the figures for individual type-site classes. We believed that it was best to leave the tables unchanged in the present draft, postponing the decision about them until a decision was made about the report as a whole.

Another weakness in the present draft centers in the timber growth estimates used as a basis for the projections in chapter 4. I think many of these estimates may be too low. I think they may have the same fault, and for the same cause, as some of the growth estimates that were being made in the South 30 years ago. Those estimates belittled the potentialities of southern forestry. We run the risk of doing the same thing today for Pacific Northwest forestry. Our estimates in chapter 4 need to be carefuly reviewed and analyzed, and revised as may be indicated. This job, too, can just as well be postponed. Certainly the growth figures used in the present draft have this advantage: Being conservative, they understate—without essentially weakening—the case for aggressive timber management. They deal gently—though to unmistakable effect—with that concept of management in which the forest is handled as though it were a lumber yard.

* * * * *

Federal Government as a conservative owner: Another forest owner generally believed to function at low guiding rate of interest is the Federal Government. Federal planners weighing prospective investments in resources development have often used interest rates of 2½ or 2 percent. Sometimes it is held that the rate to use is the carrying charge on the national debt, which now runs about 3 percent. In any case the rate sought is, like that for private concerns, an alternative rate of return adjusted for fringe benefits, risks, and transfer costs.

Studies of the interest cost of Federal investments as a social alternative rate of return show that this rate probably lies between 5 and 6 percent (4). Such a rate at first suggests that the rational program of timber management on Federal forests is a less intensive program, with a lower output, than on many private forests.

However, a number of considerations argue for holding the Federal rate for timber growing investments below such a level. One is the existence of fringe benefits of Federal timber management: benefits from nontimber values, and from pursuance of the national conservation policy to alter resource use in favor of future generations. Among fringe benefits may also be included that of helping to secure the national raw-material supply, a benefit to society analogous to what the integrated private firm enjoys, and similarly serving to lower the guiding rate of interest. Another consideration is the long-run obligation of the government to offer the Federal forests as examples of successful conservation practice. It would be scarcely rational for the Government, with its paramount long-term interests and its responsibilities for the wood supply, to manage its own holdings generally at any higher a guiding interest rate than that appropriate for the group of most conservative private owners.

The guiding rate of interest chosen here to represent the conservation forest decisions of the Federal Government is 3 percent.

Here it is well to stand aside briefly from specific interest rates and review the line of thinking developed and implied up to this point regarding Federal forest management. Take the question of rotation length as the case at hand. The argument is that the Federal Government should, like any private owner, follow the forest rotations that will maximize its net revenues per unit of time. That is to say, the Federal forests should be managed on what one may call an "economic rotation." If a 3-percent guiding rate of interest applies to Federal forest management, then in the particular case illustrated in table 3, the economic rotation for Federal forests is 65 years, more or less. This is not so long a rotation as will in fact be arrived at for site-III Douglas-fir forests in Federal ownership: The table 3 case is oversimplified to the exclusion of a number of rotation-lengthening influences that will be brought in later—principally a thinning regime. Nevertheless, it is a fact that all economic rotations tend to be "short" rotations: short, for instance, by comparison with that which maximizes mean annual growth, 110 years in the example.

The question is whether it is appropriate to take an economic approach to Federal forest-management decisions, including rotation length. A brief and partial answer is offered at this point. Other parts of the answer are attempted later.

To use an economic rotation in Federal forests is not to suggest that the Federal Government owns and manages forests with the single aim of making money. It is not to imply that the public, as a forest owner, is motivated just as any private owner would be. It is not to deny that the public interest in forests is both long and far-reaching and includes not only timber but also the imponderable values such as those of wildlife and recreation.

To use an economic rotation in Federal forests is merely to recognize certain inescapable facts. Resources are necessary to produce an output, whether of timber or of anything else. Resources are the means of production—the means of livelihood—and they are scarce. Resources tied up in any use are thereby withheld from all other uses. Consequently, in order to achieve abundance—high income, wealth—a community or nation must try to put its resources into those uses that will yield the most valuable output, and to keep shifting resources from purposes that are less valuable to those that are more so. Obviously it is in most cases in the interest of private individuals and firms thus to direct and shift their resources, and so far as the community and Nation are concerned, their interest in such behavior is even more certain and clear. Assuming a fairly consistent standard of value, the community and Nation are in position to gain whenever any owner of resources, private or public, shifts them from less to more valuable uses. The larger the share of resources owned or controlled by the public, the greater the possible gain from such shifting of public resources.

Behavior toward resources, of the sort just described is economic behavior, in that it is directed toward making the most net value, or net income, per unit of time. It is economic behavior, generally speaking, on the part of private managers of resources and on the part of public managers. It isn't something appropriate for one class of managers but not for another; it is appropriate for all.

To use an economic rotation in forest management, private or public, is to provide for shifting resources from less into more valuable uses. The resource mainly in question is capital. The alternatives involved in the problem of rotation length—and these alternatives exist all during the merchantable life of a timber stand—are to keep the capital tied up in the timber or to release it for other uses. For the private timber owner, these other uses are investment and spending, as discussed under the head of determinants of the guiding interest rate. For the public owner, the other uses are the same, investment and spending, and to the degree that they are met by means of timber liquidation, they need not be met through taxes. It is this taxation alternative—this alternative of taking funds out of the income of individuals and firms which may place high value on using the funds themselves—that tends to push the public's guiding rate of interest to 5 or 6 percent.

When an owner manages his forest at a 5-percent or a 3-percent rate of interest, it means that he is trying to shift his capital in such a way that it will increase in value at a rate never less than 5 percent or 3 percent. When he follows a guiding rate of zero percent—which he does, for example, in using the rotation that maximizes mean annual (value) growth—he is insuring only that his capital will earn no less than nothing. That is to say, he is not shifting capital at all unless the capital otherwise would be destroyed. He is withholding capital from all the alternative uses in which it has any positive value whatsoever.

A nation that managed all its capital in such a way would starve to death, whether the capital was so managed by private interests or by the public. And where any resources are handled in this fashion, they will make a net contribution only to starvation—again regardless of whether their ownership and management are private or public.

It may seem contradictory to speak in such dismal terms of a forest policy like culminating the mean annual growth, which is in fact intended to produce the greatest possible amount of timber per unit of time. Should not such a policy contribute to abundance?

The answer is that the policy does of course contribute to timber abundance, but at the same time it subtracts from the national product other goods and services with a value greater than that of the timber added. And so people end up poorer than they would have been otherwise. This is another way of saying what was remarked earlier in this report, that the long rotation can be justified only by concentrating on its gross revenues and overlooking its costs. Later in this report, economic and long rotations will be compared and the conclusion drawn that the latter, on the subregion's public lands, would represent an added cost of $300 million per year: nearly as much as the total gross revenue from all the timber that could be produced if mean annual growth were maximized.

However, the question still remains whether, for this demonstration, revenue and cost are acceptably measured.

For example, what about the values of the imponderable forest products—scenery, wildlife, water, and so on: Does not the economic rotation overlook these values, and is it not, therefore, too short? Again, is not forest management peculiar in respect to the long period of production it involves, and does this not imply that exceptionally long-range planning is necessary in forestry? Does it not also imply the need for exceptionally high allowances for emergencies—that is, extra large ultimate outputs, such as one may get through the use of extra long rotations? Is timber, perhaps, peculiar among resources in that the public may quite properly subsidize the holding of it at the apparent expense of other resources?

* * * * *

Time bias in property taxation: The feature of a property tax that leads to effects of the sort just illustrated is sometimes termed "time bias," in recognition of the fact that it stems from the manner in which the tax changes over time. A time-biased property tax necessarily tends to discourage forest conservation. It is time bias which has been mainly responsible for giving property taxation a bad name in forestry circles. Along with the absolute amount of the tax, time bias arising out of assessment practice, and not the annual feature of the taxation, is the crux of the so-called forest property tax problem.

Forest property taxation is much in the public eye these days in the Douglas-fir subregion, and especially in Oregon. Many timber owners and foresters are concerned about its effects. Fears are expressed that property taxation may negate much of the favorable influence to which forest practice has become subject in recent years: that it may lead to timber liquidation and may generally discourage the private interest in timber-growing. However, there is little evidence yet of serious effects. Furthermore, many forest taxpayers look upon their present troubles as a passing phase. They are optimistic about the future of timber growing in the region, and base their long-range plans on the premise that inequities, both in the amount of the tax and in its biases, are bound to be discovered and eliminated as the programs of taxing authorities are improved.

Time bias can be attacked in numerous ways. One is to change the form of tax, as by substituting a tax on timber yield. Another is to reduce the tax on certain types of forest property so as to counteract tendencies toward bias in assessment. The use of discounted values for old-growth forests is a measure of this sort. Still another approach is to use a flat, unchanging assessment per acre on forests of each productivity class, regardless of their condition. That such a system would be neutral toward forestry is apparent in table 3 [not shown in Record]: a fixed tax would reduce equally all the yields of column 4 and so would have no influence upon the extra yield of column 5 or the rate of return of column 9.

The assumption made in this study is the same one made by optimistic forest owners, that procedures will be established for making the property tax neutral toward forest management.

Income taxes: Unlike property taxes, income taxes tend generally to favor forest conservation. For the taxpayer, escape from the property tax lies in the direction of reducing his property: increasing immediate timber output at the expense of output later. But escape from the income tax lies in just the opposite direction: curtailing immediate timber output and income, accumulating the growing stocks, lengthening the rotation, and thus establishing conditions for ultimate higher yields. This effect of income taxation is another aspect of what was discussed previously: the role of the tax, as a transfer cost, in lowering the forest owner's guiding rate of interest.

Beyond the influences of any income tax upon timber management are the specific effects of the Federal tax, with its provisions regarding the treatment of long-term capital gains. One of these effects is to encourage the forest owner to incur silvicultural expenses that may be charged against his ordinary income. Another is to stimulate forestry investments in general because of the favorable treatment their revenues will receive. The result is to increase the timber output of private forest owners, particularly in the long run. This is a result additional to that which flows from the tax as a fringe benefit working through the guiding rate of interest.

The effects of the Federal income tax law upon forest practices are most noticeable in the case of large-scale owners, both individual owners with upper-bracket income and corporate owners with wood-processing enterprises. The law tends to fortify the advantage of these larger forest owners over smaller private owners in timber management.

It is assumed that the features of the Internal Revenue Code which have proven so friendly to conservation will be strongly defended by all forestry interests and will be retained indefinitely.

* * * * *

Problem of altering output: The relationships important to analyze are those between output on the one hand and its major determinants on the other. These are the vital relationships because they must come into play in any effort by the community (that is, the industry, the State, or the Nation) to alter the supply outlook, either by deliberate measures or through the automatic devices of the economy.

What is involved in altering the supply outlook? Though 13 billion board feet is the economical longrun level of timber yield under the principal assumptions of this study, higher figures may be considered by the community and, moreover, proposed as a goal. For example, even by the year 2000, according to the timber resource review (10) [not shown in Record], the demand for U.S. timber may seek to reach 95 to 111 billion board feet (international ¼-inch kerf rule). If, as suggested in an earlier nationwide study (8) [not shown in Record], the Douglas-fir subregion is expected to furnish some 14 percent of the national timber supply, then a longrun goal of well over 13 billion board feet appears to be implied. What is involved in reaching such a goal?

To raise output in the long run will involve a cost to the community. That is to say, it will mean a cost to the forest owner, who accordingly will need to have in view a repayment from some source if he is to undertake the required extra timber-production measures. The cost may be large. For example, if the carrying charge is 3 percent per year on growing stock worth $40 per thousand board feet, the extra cost on public lands of extending rotations beyond the ages arrived at in this study, to the ages where mean annual growth culminates, is of the order of $300 million annually. That is to say, the additional storage charge—on the additional public growing stocks required to culminate the mean growth—is about $300 million per year, or nearly as much as the value of the total timber harvest that could be taken from these lands if the heavier growing stocks were carried. On private lands, where interest rates would run higher, the extra annual storage cost would be greater than this, perhaps $500 million, and would exceed the total harvest value.

The foregoing thoughts about cost lead to two observations regarding any efforts by the community to raise timber output in the long run. First, in order for the method to be worth considering, it must be effective. Second, the preferable effective method for raising output by any given amount is the method that will cost the least.

* * * * *

Approaching output through interest rates: One way that guiding rates of interest are reduced is through transfers of forest properties from the possession of high-rate owners into that of lower rate owners. It is assumed in this report that such transfers will proceed in future through the initiative of the lower rate, stronger private owners. The assumed trends in ownership represent a gain in longrun timber output potential and a loss in breadth of the private landownership base as the holding of land becomes concentrated in fewer hands. Such gains and losses from concentration are the factors that the community can weigh in order to determine its policy respecting forest ownership trends.

If the community proposes either to acknowledge or to promote the trend toward concentration in private forest ownership, then it has open to it various steps in extension education and in research which may make for more orderly and equitable land transfers. One of the most obvious of these steps concerns the land market, where the forces at work are concentrated. It consists of discovering and encouraging the adoption of procedures whereby the market can measure and reflect all the values in timberland, especially the value of slow payout investments, as in the planting and early care of the forest stand. Thereby the forest owner may be encouraged to go ahead with such investments even if the permanence of his tenure is much in doubt.

Besides changes in ownership, the other way that guiding rates of interest are reduced is through a rate reduction trend for individual owners or classes of owner. The analysis of determinants of a guiding rate on pages 28 to 30 [not shown in Record] provides a checklist of the conditions under which a forest owner's rate may be reduced:

First, a maturing of the economy and consequent decline in the prospective rate of return from alternative investments. This condition is irrelevant to the present problem, which is one of providing ample timber supplies for an expanding economy.

Second, a rise in the real incomes of the forest owners whose guiding rates are determined by consumption alternatives. The owners in question here are primarily the farm woodland owners. Any agricultural policy that favors the retirement of marginal farms and the development and consolidation of productive commercial farms will promote timber conservation and high outputs in the long run.

Third, the institution of public controls or subsidies to intensify the timber management practices of forest owners in the exploitive and intermediate groups. The subsidy in question here is very likely not subsidized forest credit, which could be expected to have negligible bearing upon guiding interest rates. Rather, it might consist of direct benefit payments for the performance of specified practices.

Fourth, measures to raise fringe benefits and transfer costs of forestry investments. Among the assumptions of this study is that the favorable long-term capital gains features of the Federal income tax will be retained. In general, public policies that foster the use of net income taxation in preference to other forms of taxation for raising public revenues will tend to promote intensive timber management on private lands.

Fifth, measures to reduce the risks of timber management. Risks associated with forest property taxation—with the threat of higher rates or of disadvantageous changes in the terms of taxation—may be important here. Early adoption of the neutral methods of taxation assumed in this study will greatly help to reduce risk. Also helpful will be research and action programs that will reduce prospective timber losses from insects, disease, and fire.

All such measures, of course, cost something. Costs of raising timber output are worth undertaking so long as they are less than the rewards. But then the output is reached at which further costs threaten to exceed rewards. To raise the timber goal above this output is against the public interest. In the Douglas-fir subregion, the critical level of output may lie not far beyond 13.2 billion board-feet per year in the long run. And the critical level will not be much affected by timber prices, whether high or low. The alternatives to pushing beyond the longrun critical level of timber output in the Douglas-fir subregion are quite simple: (1) Get more wood from other parts of the United States, up to their own critical levels of output; (2) import more wood and wood products; (3) use more substitutes for wood.

CHAPTER 4—TIMBER YIELDS DURING TRANSITION

The report has been concerned up to this point largely with the timber yields of the long run. An economic potential output of some 13.2 billion board feet and 400 million additional cubic feet per year has been worked out for the Douglas-fir subregion under assumed conditions of land use and forest management. The forces that control the long run potential have been studied, and the measures necessary to change long-run output have been inferred. Generally, the guiding rate of interest appears to be highly influential in timber production, while timber prices have comparatively little effect.

The long run output is in the nature of a destination or target. Since the long run is distant, some may view the target with detachment or unconcern. But when it comes to the means and the route for reaching the longrun level of production, that is a different matter, of obviously immense and immediate interest to everyone who has a stake in the Douglas-fir industry. The report turns now to this vital matter of the transition period—the period of conversion to a young growth economy.

Some of the principal questions and issues that will be studied are the following:

1. What are the current forest acreage and timber volume in the Douglas-fir subregion and how are the prospects for the transition period affected by their current distribution among districts, forest type-sites, classes of ownership, and, most especially, standage classes?

2. If present trends in forest management and timber cutting should continue, what changes would be most likely to occur in timber output and growing stock during the transition period in the Douglas-fir subregion, and what problems might result?

3. If, on the other hand, forest management were intensified faster than present trends suggest, and if the subregion's old-growth timber were converted to young growth more rapidly than is now intended, how would the consequences differ from those of a continuation of present trends?

4. What rate of converting old growth and of intensifying the management of young growth appears to be most compatible with such aims as sustaining the economic development of the subregion, maintaining an even flow of all timber for industrial use, and achieving a well balanced growing stock to insure timber supplies for the more distant future? To what extent are these various aims compatible among themselves?

5. What, then, are likely to be some of the special problems of transition in the Douglas-fir subregion, and what are likely to be the consequences of alternative approaches to these problems?

The analysis aimed at the foregoing questions will be built around a sawtimber-management objective, including a sawtimber rotation, and not a wood-fiber objective and rotation. It will use as its principal unit of timber measurement the board foot (net Scribner scale) rather than the cubic foot. Since the analysis concerns the immediate and near future, this conformity with today's viewpoint and conventions is believed to be appropriate.

Even flow of timber in near future: It appears that the circumstances which may lead to a gap in production—that is, a marked departure from even flow—during the transition period are these: (1) an excessively great acreage of forest (much more than its share in the ideal distribution) in an age class of stands younger than rotation age. This situation has developed on some individual forest properties and in some widespread communities after rapid timber cutting or extensive forest burning. (2) An excessively long rotation: one which reduces the ideal percentage of area in any age class to the point where the commonest class becomes overabundant.

Beyond the transition period, departures from even flow may occur because of today's nonstocked areas, or simply because young growth yields a smaller harvest than old, with the result that the cut declines when the old growth is nearly gone. However, discussion of these post transition problems will be put aside for the present in favor of the gap question that arises during the transition period itself.

It appears in the upper-left chart of figure 12 [not shown in RECORD] that in the Douglas-fir subregion as a whole, in all classes of ownership combined, there is no threat of a gap in the flow of timber during the period of transition. The same is true of all public holdings as a group and of all private holdings. Small private holdings appear to include an excessive acreage of stands in the 21- to 40-year age class—until it is realized that these holdings will surely be carried on a shorter rotation than 80 years. On medium sites, the average saw-log rotation foreseen for small private forest holdings even in the long run amounts to only 56 years, which implies an ideal age-distribution rectangle 56 years wide and 36 percent high: more than high enough to accommodate the bars in the lower-right corner of figure 12 [not shown in RECORD]. The corresponding data for major classes of ownership are these:

	Average rotation, in years	Rectangle height, in percent
Private holdings:		
Large	77	26
Medium	63	32
Small	56	36
Public holdings:		
National forest	80	25
Other	75	27

On the basis of these data, and referring now to figures 16–19 in appendix A [not shown in RECORD], one concludes that there is evidence of gaps here and there in all major categories of forest ownership except national forests. The evidence is found primarily in the Puget Sound district, secondarily in the Columbia River district. Few if any indications of gaps are to be discovered in these summary charts for national forests in any part of the subregion or for any class of ownership in southwest Oregon. However, it is clear that abnormalities in the age-class distribution appear more and more widely as one examines smaller and smaller categories of forest. Surely, marked departures from the ideal are very common among individual forest holdings—at least among private forest properties outside the southern part of the subregion. It is this condition of the forest resource that has led to widespread discussion and some trial of the cooperative-sustained-yield-unit idea, and to widespread belief among wood-manufacturing concerns, both those which own forest land and those which do not, that the public forests whose age-class distributions generally complement those of private forests should be opened up for faster cutting during the current rotation.

In the last analysis, there is just one sort of remedy for the raw material problems that abnormal age-class distributions create for individual manufacturers of wood products. The remedy is to take advantage of the subregion's gap-free aggregate age-class arrangement. This, in turn, means relying upon the market and upon transportation facilities to let the overages that exist on some holdings go to cancel out the underages on others. Much of the flow of overage toward underage is a flow of public timber to private firms. Since this is the direction of the flow anyhow, the issue resolves itself into that of the volume of flow. This subject will be taken up soon. At the same time it will be possible to explore the problem of gaps a little further, with particular reference to the effect of conversion rate and forest-management intensity upon the gaps during the conversion period.

Even flow in far future: As for the gaps that may occur after conversion, it is conceivable that these may come in part simultaneously on most forest holdings and thus be inescapable by the process of balancing-out within the subregion alone. The point of view here to be cultivated concerning this prospect is that it does not matter nearly so much as one is perhaps at first inclined to think. For just as the overages and underages of the forest industry in an area may be traded off, so those of different areas or different regions or nations may be traded off and the public derive benefit as a result. Or, what is equally important, the trading-off may happen between the forest industry and other industries of the same area or region: It will take the form of labor and capital moving from the one industry to the others. Such movement is part of the general social effort to shift resources continuously toward their most efficient uses. It is the essence of what is necessary in order for the economy to grow and the people to prosper. Consequently, in this report, some attention will be given to the position that an even flow of timber—or, for that matter, sustained yield—is an outmoded public policy. It was well suited to nations and times in which, relatively, economic growth was slow and resources were immobile. A more appropriate policy for latter-20th-century America is even (increasing) flow of aggregate economic activity. Indeed, such is the national policy, and it makes no demand upon forestry—sets no individual requirement—other than that of dovetailing. This line of thought will be pursued further in what follows.

* * * * *

Yields over time, 1960–2000: If present trends continue, the yield from all commercial forest lands of the subregion—the harvest cuts, thinnings, salvage, and the rest, both live and dead timber—will average about 11.6 billion board feet per year during the four decades 1960–2000. This figure is in terms of standing timber equivalent, the same terms used throughout this report except in the very few cases which are clearly noted.

The 40-year average output of 11.6 billion board feet is close to the average for the 5 recent years, 1955 through 1959: 12.3 billion feet. Indeed, the projected annual cut holds fairly steady from decade to decade, especially after the first decade, which is the only one of the four in which the average annual cut deviates from the 40-year average by more than 4 percent. Apparently if the Douglas-fir subregion is headed for trouble—for a gap, or great departure from even flow—it does not threaten to get there within 40 years. When will it get there? Or under what circumstances may it do so within 40 years? These will be interesting questions to explore.

It should, of course, be noted that the rather level trend foreseen for timber harvests is so in terms of total board feet of physical volume. The character of wood in the board foot is not expected to be just the same at the end of the period as at the beginning. Nor will the uses and value of a board foot be just the same, nor the quantity of other wood produced along with a board foot. The changes expected are the normal and usual changes of a transition era.

TABLE 20.—*Prospective annual yield of timber in the Douglas-fir subregion if present trends continue, by decade, ownership class, and source of yield, 1960–2000*

[In million board feet]

Source of yield	Private holdings				Public holdings				All holdings
	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	
DECADE OF 1960's									
Inventory	1,064	526	1,374	2,964	1,717	581	104	2,402	5,366
Growth	3,085	191	951	4,227	1,063	476	505	2,044	6,271
Salvage	327	43	28	398	248	113	39	400	798
All	4,476	760	2,353	7,589	3,028	1,170	648	4,846	12,435
DECADE OF 1970's									
Inventory	609	303	884	1,796	1,543	570	18	2,131	3,928
Growth	3,339	241	744	4,324	1,297	505	728	2,531	6,855
Salvage	282	17	----------	299	322	118	33	472	770
All	4,230	561	1,628	6,419	3,162	1,193	779	5,134	11,553
DECADE OF 1980's									
Inventory	92	221	687	1,000	1,590	469	35	2,094	3,094
Growth	3,924	215	543	4,682	1,243	644	771	2,658	7,340
Salvage	200	8	1	209	377	134	42	553	762
All	4,216	444	1,231	5,891	3,210	1,247	848	5,305	11,196
DECADE OF 1990's									
Inventory	474	53	281	808	1,421	628	69	2,118	2,926
Growth	4,036	320	560	4,916	1,490	511	770	2,771	7,687
Salvage	164	3	1	168	362	107	38	507	675
All	4,674	376	842	5,892	3,273	1,246	877	5,396	11,288

APPENDIX C

FUTURE PROJECTIONS

Tables 45–47 [not shown in RECORD] record projected yields of timber in the three districts of the Douglas-fir subregion during the four decades 1960–2000, assuming a continuation of present trends in management and output. They represent a subdivision of table 20 and are similarly organized by decade, ownership class, and source of yield. In the same fashion, tables 48–50 show the district-wise breakdown of the subregional total yields in table 25, assuming an accelerated management and production program.

Figures 20–25 [not shown in RECORD] diagram the age-class distributions of even-aged coniferous commercial forest area in the various classes of ownership in 1960, and in the year 2000 under each of the two assumptions regarding the intervening years: a continuation of present trends and an accelerated timber program.

In this study, detailed projections of timber yield and inventory were made for the period 1960–2000. Summary projections of yield were continued thence to the year 2070.

DETAILED PROJECTIONS, 1960–2888

The projection of present trends was worked out, generally speaking, on the assumption that on public lands today's allowable cuts will continue in force, and that on private lands cutting will proceed at the same rate (measured in percent of current growing stock) as in the 3 years 1955–1957. Rates of reforestation, thinning, and the salvaging of mortality were assumed to increase moderately and differently on each class of holding.

In the projection of an accelerated program, the forest rotations derived in chapter 3 [not shown in RECORD] for a saw-log objective were used. It was assumed that four-fifths of the acreage of timber older than rotation age would be cut over by the year 2000. In these respects, the accelerated program is, for private holdings, much the same as the continuation of present trends, though of course it is quite different for the public holdings. In the accelerated projection, reforestation, thinning, and salvage of mortality were assumed to progress at a substantially more rapid rate than in the present-trends projection.

The projection procedure was to apply the estimated timber cuts to the inventory at the start of the first decade—by age class, typesite class, ownership class and district—then to project the residual stand to the end of the decade; an then to repeat the process for successive decades. Along with this projection of cut and growth, it was necessary to allow for shifts in land use and forest ownership, for fire and catastrophic losses, for progress in reforestating nonstocked lands, for thinning young growth, and for salvaging mortality in old growth.

Updating inventory to 1960

In the Puget Sound and Columbia River districts, the timber inventory of the 1950's was taken to apply to 1955. In southwest Oregon, it was taken to apply to 1960 for national forests, and 1950 for other holdings. These inventories were updated to 1960 by subtracting reported cuts and adding growth estimated from the "empirical yield tables" of Appendix B [not included in RECORD].

Estimation of harvest cut

The public and private harvest cuts are defined to include only the live timber volumes harvested by clear cutting and the estimated harvestable dead volume from fire and other catastrophic losses. Thinning, mortality salvage, and prelogging cuts are estimated separately on bases to be discussed later.

Present-trends projection: The annual harvest cuts on public holdings were assumed to be the allowable cuts reported by the managing agencies. For county, municipal, and some State and other public agencies not reporting allowable cuts, the annual cuts were estimated by using rates similar to corresponding properties elsewhere. Except when reported otherwise, the annual allowable cuts were assumed to hold for the entire period from 1960 to 2000.

Private harvest cuts were tentatively estimated as a percent of growing stock, using the actual average annual percentage for the 3 years, 1955–57. The percentages were then modified for individual ownership classes to reflect their generally different cutting rates. Large private owners were assigned a rate lower than the average. Small private owners were assigned a cutting rate above the average. Medium private owners were assigned an intermediate rate, generally closer to the rate for large private owners. Individual class rates were determined so that their weighted average would equal the percentage first tentatively estimated for each district. The results, used in all four decades, are given in schedule A.

SCHEDULE A.—*Assumed annual cutting rates (percent of growing stock) on private holdings in present-trends projection*

[Percent]

Size class	District		
	Puget Sound	Columbia River	Southwest Oregon
Large	2.0	2.5	4.0
Medium	3.0	3.5	4.5
Small	3.7	4.8	6.0
All classes	2.4	3.3	4.7

Accelerated projection: For private owners the harvest cut was estimated by the same method as for the present-trends projection using the data of schedule A.

For public owners the annual harvest cut was recalculated using rotation ages given in schedule B and a 40–50-year period for the conversion of all stands above rotation age.

SCHEDULE B.—*Economic rotation ages, sawlog objective*

[Years]

Type site	Conservative owner	Intermediate owner	Exploitive owner
1	70	55	45
2	80	60	50
3	90	75	55
4	95	80	60

As with the present-trends projection, thinnings, mortality salvage and prelogging yields were estimated separately from harvest cuts and will be discussed later.

Distribution of cut among type-site classes—both projections

In allocating the harvest cut (excluding thinnings, salvage and prelogging yields) among type-site classes, the hardwood cut was determined separately, and the balance distributed among the conifer type-site classes. The hardwood cut in type-site 5 was estimated according to schedule C. Analysis of data on hardwood utilization indicated that the current hardwood cut in the Douglas-fir subregion was approximately 0.5 percent of the current inventory in type-site 5. This percent was increased to 2 percent by 2000 to allow for the trend toward increased utilization of hardwoods.

SCHEDULE C.—*Estimated annual hardwood cut as a percent of hardwood inventory volume*

	Percent
Decade:	
1950	0.5
1960	.7
1970	.9
1980	1.0
1990	1.5
2000	2.0

Within each ownership class the conifer cut was allocated among the four conifer type-site classes in proportion to their inventory volume, except for type-site 4 where a reduction factor was applied to reflect the presently less intensive utilization of upper-slope types. The relative cut in type-site 4 was estimated to increase each decade until the cut in each type-site class was proportional to its inventory volume. Schedule D shows weighting factors used to allocate cut from type-site 4.

SCHEDULE D.—*Weighting factors applied in allocating cut to type site 4*

Decade	Present-trends projection	Accelerated projection	
	Public and private owners	Public	Private
1960	1/3	1/2	1/3
1970	1/2	3/4	1/2
1980	2/3	1	2/3
1990	3/4	1/1	1/1
2000	1/1	1/1	1/1

The allocation of the total cut among the age classes for each ownership class was made in three steps. First, the volume available from a percentage of the area in each age class above a certain age was the basis for allocating the cut. If this cut was less than the total estimated cut, the volumes in the oldest available age classes were added until the total estimated cut was reached. If the addition of the oldest age classes indicated cutting less than the rotation age, the total estimated cut was reduced to that volume available above rotation age.

In the first step, for the small private ownerships, 2 percent of the conifer type-site area was estimated to be cut annually in age classes over 40 years. For all other owners, 1 percent of the conifer type-site area was to be cut annually down to 160 years of age.

Withdrawals and shifts in ownership—both projections

Forest land withdrawals and shifts in ownership (see ch. 2 [not printed in RECORD]) were allowed for, one-fourth in each decade, so as to be completed by the year 2000 in both projections. They were accounted for at the beginning of each decade, before application of cut and growth. In the case of withdrawals for roads and reservoirs, the timber on the withdrawn areas was taken as part of the cut for the decade. Withdrawals and shifts were proportioned among the age classes on the basis of area.

Losses due to fire and catastrophic mortality—both projections

Schedule E tabulates factors used to estimate timber losses due to fire and to catastrophic mortality for both projections. Separate factors were developed for stands under and over 35 years to reflect the greater losses experienced in younger stands. Acreage fire losses were based on the 10-year experience of 1948–57. Reductions in losses to the year 2000 are consistent with those predicted in the Timber Resource Review.

SCHEDULE E.—*Estimated annual acreage loss due to fire and catastrophic mortality*

[Percent of acreage in each age class]

Decade	Stands 1 to 35 years	Stands over 35 years
1950	0.282	0.134
1960	.231	.126
1970	.210	.108
1980	.187	.100
1990	.166	.092
2000	.152	.087

Catastrophic losses were calculated to have averaged 0.050 percent per year since 1902. This factor was added uniformly to fire-loss estimates to produce schedule F.

To simplify projections, factors were applied to ownership, age, and type-site classes separately rather than to aggregate areas. Under this approach losses are about one-third less than would be developed by applying factors to the aggregate area.

Volumes salvaged after fire or catastrophic loss were estimated according to factors in schedule F. The percent of salvage is higher in the later years and in the accelerated projection due to the greater development of roads. The percentages are averages applicable to the total annual loss.

SCHEDULE F.—*Estimated salvage from losses due to fire and other catastrophic loss*

[Percent of original volume salvaged]

Decade	Present-trends projection	Accelerated projection
1950	50	50
1960	50	55
1970	55	65
1980	60	75
1990	70	85
2000	80	85

Thinnings, mortality salvage, and prelogging—both projections

Thinning yields: Thinnings were estimated according to tables 35–38, appendix B [not shown in RECORD]. Thinnings were initiated in 30-year and older stands and repeated each decade until final harvest in the decade following attainment of rotation age. In the present-trends projection thinnings on national forests were continued until age of culmination of mean annual increment.

Schedule G shows the estimated percent of the immature sawtimber area thinned in each decade.

SCHEDULE G.—*Percent of immature sawtimber area under a thinning regime*

Decade	Owner class							
	Large private		Medium private		Small private		All public	
	Type sites 1 and 2	Type sites 3 and 4	Type sites 1 and 2	Type sites 3 and 4	Type sites 1 and 2	Type sites 3 and 4	Type sites 1 and 2	Type sites 3 and 4
Present-trends projection:								
1960	15	0	15	0	5	0	5	0
1970	20	0	20	0	10	0	10	0
1980	35	0	35	0	15	0	15	0
1990	50	0	50	0	20	0	25	0
Accelerated projection:								
1960	30	2	30	2	10	0	10	2
1970	40	5	40	5	20	3	20	4
1980	60	10	55	10	30	5	30	8
1990	80	20	70	20	40	10	50	10

No thinnings were made in hardwood types. The percentages apply to the acreage in each age class between initial thinning and rotation age. The allocation of thinned areas by intensity of management is given in schedule H for each ownership class. It was assumed that exploitive owners do not thin.

SCHEDULE H.—*Allocation of thinned areas among conservative and intermediate owners*

[Percent]

Owner class	Conservative owners	Intermediate owners
Large private	85	15
Medium private	20	80
Small private	0	100
National forests	100	0
Other Federal	85	15
Other public	60	40

Salvage yields: In both projections it was assumed that all except small private owners would advance-road to salvage accumulated mortality in old-growth stands 120 years and older on type-site classes 1 and 2 and 200 years and older on type-site classes 3 and 4. Initial salvage yields were estimated at 10,000 per acre for type-site 1 and 2 stands over 200 years old; at 5,000 for those 120 to 200 years old. Initial salvage yields from type-sites 3 and 4 were estimated at 5,000 per acre. Schedule J shows the proportions of the uncut stands advance-salvaged in each decade.

SCHEDULE J.—*Percent of old growth advance salvaged*

Decade	Owner class			
	Large and medium private		All public	
	Present trends	Accelerated	Present trends	Accelerated
1960	10	20	5	10
1970	15	25	10	15
1980	20	30	15	20
1990	25	35	20	25

Whenever application of schedule J percentages produced an area less than that advance-salvaged the previous decade, the area salvage was increased to that of the previous decade.

For both projections all stands previously advance-salvaged were assumed to be reworked each decade for salvage of subsequent mortality. Salvage yields were estimated at 80 percent of the periodic mortality after reduction for cull and breakage. Mortality was estimated as the difference between gross growth and the net growth per acre given by the "empirical yield curves." Schedule K lists estimated net salvage yields.

SCHEDULE K.—*Net board-foot yields per acre from salvage of previous 10-year mortality*

[In thousand board feet per acre]

Age	Type-site class			
	1	2	3	4
120	2.6	1.4		
130	2.2	1.4		
140	2.0	1.4		
150	1.8	1.4		
160	1.7	1.4		
170	1.8	1.5		
180	1.8	1.6		
190	1.9	1.7		
200	2.1	1.8	0.8	0.4
210	2.2	1.9	1.0	.4
220	2.4	2.1	1.0	.5
230	2.6	2.2	1.1	.6
240	2.8	2.4	1.3	.6
250	3.0	2.6	1.4	.6
260	3.2	2.7	1.5	.7
270	3.4	2.9	1.6	.8
280	3.5	3.0	1.8	.9
290	3.7	3.2	1.8	1.0
300	3.8	3.4	2.0	1.0
310	4.0	3.5	2.1	1.1
320	4.1	3.7	2.2	1.1
330	4.2	3.8	2.3	1.2
340	4.2	4.0	2.4	1.3

On clear-cut areas salvage yields were estimated in the same way as for advance salvage of accumulated mortality.

Prelogging and relogging yields: Prelogging and relogging in stands of high volume per-acre increase yields over single stage clear-cutting. The extra volume is realized through reduced breakage, and through utilization of tops, small trees, and cull logs not included in the live sawtimber inventory. Much of the material is of pulpwood quality. Schedule L shows percent of clear-cut stands of 40,000 per acre and over that were assumed to be prelogged or relogged. Additional yields were estimated at 10 percent of the net volume per acre.

SCHEDULE L.—*Percent of clear-cut stands over 40,000 per acre relogged or prelogged*

PRESENT-TRENDS PROJECTION

Decade	Large and medium private	Small private	Public owners
1960	10	0	5
1970	20	0	10
1980	30	0	15
1990	40	0	20
2000	50	0	25

ACCELERATED PROJECTION

Decade	Large and medium private	Small private	Public owners
1960	15	0	10
1970	30	0	20
1980	50	0	30
1990	70	0	40
2000	80	0	45

Reforestation—both projections

Old burns and cutovers: Schedule M presents the rate at which the backlog of nonrestocked areas were estimated to be successfully reforested. Areas restocked in each decade were assigned an average age of 5 years at the beginning of the following decade.

SCHEDULE M.—*Cumulative percent of 1955 backlog of old burns and cutovers reforested*

PRESENT-TRENDS PROJECTION

Decade	Private owners			Public owners
	Large	Medium	Small	
1950	5	5	0	5
1960	30	30	15	30
1970	60	60	30	60
1980	70	70	40	65
1990	75	75	50	70

SCHEDULE M.—*Cumulative percent of 1955 backlog of old burns and cutovers reforested*—Continued

ACCELERATED PROJECTION

Decade	Private owners			Public owners
	Large	Medium	Small	
1950	5	5	0	5
1960	30	30	20	30
1970	75	75	50	75
1980	85	85	70	85
1990	90	90	90	90

New burns and cutovers: Current burns were considered to be reforested at the same rate as current cutovers in any decade. Schedule N was used to establish the rate of successful reforestation of new burns and cutovers.

SCHEDULE N.—*Years of delay until successful reforestation of new cutovers and new burns*

Projection	Small private owners		All other owners	
	Percent of area	Years of delay	Percent of area	Years of delay
Present trends	75	5	100	5
	25	10		
Accelerated	25	0	50	0
	75	5	50	5

* * * * *

SUMMARY PROJECTIONS, 2000–2070

In each district prospective cuts for one rotation beyond the year 2000 were estimated by decade, using an area-volume check based on the year 2000 inventory for each ownership. Type-site classes were averaged within ownership classes. Average rotations were applied, derived from those in schedule B by weighting according to area of each type-site.

In the present-trends projection the guiding principle was to sustain the cutting rate of the 1990's throughout the rotation within districts and ownership classes. Occasionally some reductions were necessary when age-class shortages appeared. Within districts these were mostly compensated for by increased cuts in other ownerships.

In the accelerated projection the guiding principle was to gradually reduce or increase the cut within districts and ownership classes to the estimated long-run potential. However, it was not possible to provide a gradual transition in every instance. In the case of national forest lands, cuts in the early decades after 2000 were sharply reduced below the cuts of the preceding decades due to a 1960 shortage in the 1–40 year age classes.

In both projections cutting ages were not allowed to drop more than 10 years below rotation except for small private owners, where cutting sometimes was reduced as much as 15 years below rotation age. In all ownerships the time required to cover the entire area once was not allowed to fall more than 5 years below rotation age.

The trend toward increased thinning was continued beyond 2000 in both projections. In the present-trends projection, a determination was made of 1990 thinning yield as a percent of clear-cut yield for each ownership class. These percentage figures were increased an additional 5 percent each decade to a maximum of 40 percent of the yield from clear-cutting. At the highest level, thinnings constituted 28.6 percent of the total cut.

In the accelerated projection, thinning rates of schedule G were gradually expanded to include 80 percent of the immature sawtimber area in small private ownerships in type-sites 1 and 2, 90 to 95 percent of the corresponding area in type-sites 1 and 2 for other owners, and 80 percent of similar areas in type-sites 3 and 4 for all owner classes. At the highest level, thinnings under this program constituted 30.8 percent of the total cut.

Due to the complete conversion of old growth in the first decades after 2000, extra yields from prelogging, relogging, and salvage of mortality, other than that realized through thinnings, were assumed to become negligible and were not counted after the year 2000 in either projection.

TABLE 48.—*Prospective annual yield of timber in the Puget Sound district under an accelerated management program, by decade, ownership class, and source of yield, 1960–2000*

DECADE OF 1960's

[In million board feet]

Source of yield	Private holdings				Public holdings				All holdings
	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	
Inventory	236	14	57	307	1,220	8	272	1,500	1,807
Growth	922	135	431	1,488	242	34	362	638	2,126
Salvage	106	11	8	125	152	2	31	185	310
All	1,264	160	496	1,920	1,614	44	665	2,323	4,243

DECADE OF 1970's

Source of yield	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	All holdings
Inventory	-----	20	154	174	1,005	6	257	1,268	1,442
Growth	1,254	135	339	1,728	398	44	444	886	2,614
Salvage	92	8	(1)	100	153	2	39	194	294
All	1,346	163	493	2,002	1,556	52	740	2,348	4,350

DECADE OF 1980's

Source of yield	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	All holdings
Inventory	-----	12	270	282	1,339	33	419	1,791	2,073
Growth	1,701	130	136	1,967	244	27	351	622	2,589
Salvage	114	7	-----	121	153	2	45	200	321
All	1,815	149	406	2,370	1,736	62	815	2,613	4,983

DECADE OF 1990's

Source of yield	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	All holdings
Inventory	502	83	112	697	1,280	31	567	1,878	2,575
Growth	1,326	114	254	1,694	316	32	393	741	2,435
Salvage	97	9	1	107	125	2	35	162	269
All	1,925	206	367	2,498	1,721	65	995	2,781	5,279

[1] Less than 500,000 board feet.

TABLE 49.—*Prospective annual yield of timber in the Columbia River district under an accelerated management program, by decade, ownership class, and source of yield, 1960–2000*

DECADE OF 1960's

[In million board feet]

Source of yield	Private holdings				Public holdings				All holdings
	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	
Inventory	421	366	700	1,487	2,592	374	-----	2,966	4,453
Growth	1,475	54	497	2,026	1,423	228	283	1,934	3,960
Salvage	180	29	12	221	299	111	22	432	653
All	2,076	449	1,209	3,734	4,314	713	305	5,332	9,066

DECADE OF 1970's

Source of yield	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	All holdings
Inventory	46	241	641	928	3,080	352	-----	3,432	4,360
Growth	1,930	96	439	2,465	636	276	395	1,307	3,772
Salvage	161	10	-----	171	275	156	16	447	618
All	2,137	347	1,080	3,564	3,991	784	411	5,186	8,750

DECADE OF 1980's

Source of yield	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	All holdings
Inventory	64	141	521	726	3,073	335	69	3,477	4,203
Growth	2,102	126	272	2,500	445	281	452	1,178	3,678
Salvage	119	10	1	130	242	43	17	302	432
All	2,285	277	794	3,356	3,760	659	538	4,957	8,313

DECADE OF 1990's

Source of yield	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	All holdings
Inventory	523	5	456	984	2,555	413	-----	2,968	3,952
Growth	1,923	209	21	2,153	774	263	489	1,526	3,679
Salvage	140	5	(1)	145	185	40	13	238	383
All	2,586	219	477	3,282	3,514	716	502	4,732	8,014

[1] Less than 500,000 board feet.

TABLE 50.—*Prospective annual yield of timber in southwest Oregon under an accelerated management program, by decade, ownership class, and source of yield, 1960–2000*

DECADE OF 1960's

[In million board feet]

Source of yield	Private holdings				Public holdings				All holdings
	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	
Inventory	715	123	397	1,235	1,115	594	79	1,788	3,023
Growth	489	17	70	576	318	177	15	510	1,086
Salvage	136	15	2	153	138	108	8	254	407
All	1,340	155	469	1,964	1,571	879	102	2,552	4,516
DECADE OF 1970's									
Inventory	517	70	170	757	1,222	461	65	1,748	2,505
Growth	440	31	64	535	205	294	16	515	1,050
Salvage	73	4	--------------	77	135	120	7	262	339
All	1,030	105	234	1,369	1,562	875	88	2,525	3,894
DECADE OF 1980's									
Inventory	180	23	21	224	1,200	504	44	1,748	1,972
Growth	610	32	116	758	206	320	27	553	1,311
Salvage	49	1	--------------	50	96	130	6	232	282
All	839	56	137	1,032	1,502	954	77	2,533	3,565
DECADE OF 1990's									
Inventory	--------------	9	--------------	9	1,122	526	45	1,693	1,702
Growth	964	42	86	1,092	209	313	17	539	1,631
Salvage	21	2	--------------	23	97	68	4	169	192
All	985	53	86	1,124	1,428	907	66	2,401	3,525

CLAREMONT EAGLE FURTHERS CAMPAIGN FOR CONNECTICUT RIVER PARKWAY BILL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take note of the growing support for the proposal to establish the Connecticut River National Parkway and Recreation Area, of which I am one of the sponsors.

The Daily Eagle of Claremont has been one of the leading voices in New Hampshire backing this measure. I am pleased to offer at this point in the RECORD a copy of its most recent editorial from the pen of Mr. Kenneth Whipple, the Eagle's able editor:

[From the Claremont (N.H.) Daily Eagle, Mar. 11, 1966]

PRESERVING THE VALLEY'S BEAUTY

We've written, at intervals, about the steadily brightening prospects for the new Connecticut River National Parkway and Recreation Area.

First proposed in the Senate a number of weeks ago, it has won increasing favor with high administration officials. Now a House group, with Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, a prominent participant, is sponsoring similar legislation through the medium of a companion measure.

Congressman CLEVELAND's statement to the House, in introducing the legislation, is worthy of reprinting here as a summation of the project's aims and a survey of the project's possibilities.

"The Connecticut River" he said, "some 400 miles long, is the longest river in all New England; it is longer than the Jordan, the Tiber, the Thames, the Hudson, the Suwanee, and the Potomac Rivers.

"It flows through the heart of New England, rising in the Connecticut Lakes of New Hampshire, flowing to form the border between New Hampshire and Vermont, through Massachusetts and Connecticut to Long Island Sound at Old Saybrook, Conn.

"It flows through one of the most scenic valleys in the country. But today it also flows through some of the most unsightly industrial wasteland in the country.

"The purpose of this legislation is to provide an effective means by which substantial and appropriate portions of this river, throughout its length, may be recaptured and preserved in their natural beauty for the enjoyment of future generations.

"Every economic and population forecast available today shows that the economy and population of New England is going to continue growing. This means that we must move now to salvage and preserve sufficient public recreation land while it is still available. Once these priceless resources are lost, they are lost forever.

"This bill is designed to be flexible so that the public benefit may be measured and met most effectively as the Parkway is developed. The area designated by the Secretary of the Interior, as authorized by the bill, is to be administered for the preservation of natural beauty and for such forms of outdoor recreation and objectives as driving for pleasure, walking and hiking, picnicking, fish and wildlife management, scenic and historic site preservation, fishing, hunting, boating, camping, riding, bicycling, winter sports, and other kinds of outdoor recreation.

"This proposal, carefully carried out, will give New England space and protected land along one of the finest waterways in the country; a place of immense natural beauty where people will be able to get away from crowded city streets."

K.D.W.

TAX CONSIDERATION FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to give the same tax break to senior citizens who sell their homes just before reaching age 65 as is now available to those who sell after their 65th birthday.

Current law permits a taxpayer who has reached age 65 at the time he sells his home to avoid paying capital gains taxes on the profit from the sale. But a 64-year-old taxpayer who sells his home is subject to capital gain taxation on the profit even if he will reach age 65 before the end of the year in which the sale was made.

The bill which I am introducing today would permit the tax exclusion for senior citizens who will reach age 65 before the end of the taxable year in which the sale occurs, rather than limiting it to sales which occur only after the taxpayer's 65th birthday.

Present law permits a taxpayer to claim an additional $600 exemption for age if he is 65 or older on the last day of the tax year. My bill would apply the same principle to the senior citizen exclusion on sale of homes, basing the exclusion upon the taxpayer's age on the last day of the tax year, rather than upon the taxpayer's birth date.

It seems unfair that a senior citizen whose 65th birthday does not fall, for example, until December when he would not have sufficient time to complete the sale of his home before the end of the year, should be deprived of the tax break given to a taxpayer whose 65th birthday comes earlier the same year.

Under the Schweiker bill a senior citizen would be entitled to the existing capital gain exclusion on sale of his residence if the sale took place at any time during or after the taxable year in which he turned 65. No longer would the exemption, which the Congress enacted in 1964, apply only if the sale took place after the day on which the taxpayer turned 65.

Mr. Speaker, the general instructions for form 1040 contain a statement that a taxpayer is entitled to the additional $600 exemption for age if he is 65 or older on the last day of the tax year. But the instructions for schedule D, gains and losses from sales or exchanges of property, state that the tax-free exclusion for all or part of the gain on the sale of a residence is available to a taxpayer who sold his residence on or after his 65th birthday and meets certain other requirements. I feel that a taxpayer should be entitled to this exclusion if he is 65 or older on the last day of the tax year in which the sale occurred.

The present exclusion is contained in section 121 which was added to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by section 206 of the Revenue Act of 1964. In examining the legislative history of the 1964 provision, neither the Legislative Reference Service nor I can find anything to indicate whether the limitation on individuals who sell at age 64 during the same year in which they will attain age 65 was imposed intentionally or whether the matter was overlooked by the Congress. I am inclined to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress overlooked this inequity.

I urge my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to right this wrong at the earliest opportunity.

THE LOGICAL PLACE FOR THE AEC ACCELERATOR IS THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN WEST

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **RONCALIO**. Mr. Speaker, many of us experienced keen disappointment when our States were rejected by the Atomic Energy Commission in its admirably thorough investigation of sites for the 200-Bev. accelerator.

The course before us now is to offer support to the site that will best serve the Nation's interests. I have today indicated my support of the Denver, Colo., site to Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, dean of the Colorado delegation, and have notified the two Senators from Colorado of my offer to be of help to them. I am hopeful that my colleagues, who perhaps are not as well aware of Denver's many advantages, will see fit to unite in recognition of its solid case for the accelerator site.

The Denver area has all the necessary qualifications to recommend it as a superior location for the Atomic Energy Commission accelerator. Its recommendations in the physical prerequisites set down by the AEC are a matter of record which I am sure my worthy colleagues from Colorado have labored most ably to demonstrate. The long-range considerations—the considerations that place the Denver location first in the Nation's best interests—may not be so readily apparent.

ESCAPE TO OPEN PLAINS

The explosive growth of our cities is becoming a matter of heightened concern as population experts tell us that half of our people live on less than 1 percent of our land—that in years to come as many as one-third of our people will live in four extended cities—the east coast concentration from Boston to Richmond—the Great Lakes industrial complex—the gulf coast megalopolis in Texas—and the California coast.

As we view the staggering problems already facing our cities—the lack of fresh water, the polluted air, the lack of adequate mass transit facilities, and an already overburdened tax base, only one realistic solution presents itself.

The population of the United States, which streamed into our cities in pursuit of greater economic opportunity, must be distributed once more across the breadth of this land.

HISTORICALLY LOGICAL

There are some historical precedents for the role our Government can play in the relocation of our population into the so-called virgin areas. When the United States acquired the vast expanses to the West, our Government both encouraged and rewarded development of the land through homestead acts, land-grant colleges, and support for a transcontinental railroad.

Today we are faced with a not-so-new frontier, but nonetheless a still virgin area in the great Rocky Mountain empire where resources await development, where cities stand ready to absorb manpower.

By situating the AEC accelerator in the Denver area, the Government would do far more than bring several thousand scientists to the State of Colorado. It would, in addition to introducing these visitors to the abundant potential of the area, herald the movement of allied and related industries to the Intermountain West. The already attractive potential of this area would become all the more conducive to migration from our crowded cities. The location of the AEC accelerator in Denver would provide a gateway to the Rockies for the armies of industry who constantly seek promising new markets.

The vote of confidence so implicit in this selection would signify this Government's recognition that the West has just begun to grow. Mindful of the considerable research and the demanding standards associated with this publicized search for a location, the leaders in industry would be reminded again that the Rocky Mountain States have much to offer.

If I may remind my colleagues of the capacity and willingness of my State of Wyoming to serve the AEC's purposes, then perhaps the potential of which I speak may be better outlined.

WYOMING'S ROLE IN EDUCATION

I will limit my remarks on this phase to a description of Wyoming's ability to assist the Denver area in the growth requirements so essential for a facility of this nature.

Ground was broken last summer at the University of Wyoming in Laramie for a new $3 million physical science building to house the departments of physics, chemistry, and mathematics.

Concurrently, doctoral programs are being expanded, instituted, and planned in chemistry, physics, and mathematics, respectively. The newly appointed chairman of the physics department specializes in high-energy research and undergraduate and master's programs have been offered for several years in nuclear physics, chemistry, and engineering in association with the university's Atomics International L-77 reactor. Wyoming is already one of the more active participants in the Associated Rocky Mountain University AEC cooperative program of graduate education in nuclear science and technology.

Wyoming's university will continue to provide vigorous support for the scientific development in the Rockies. Because the university is the only 4-year institution of higher learning in the State, it receives the full support of Wyoming's people and generous appropriations from her legislature.

The University of Wyoming's proven capacity for growth is the rule in the Rocky Mountains where residents have the highest educational attainment, where schools have established a hard core of competence that will be strengthened by the location of an AEC accelerator in Denver.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will recognize in the residents of the Rocky Mountains a flexing of newly developing muscles—muscles that can be put to work for the development of a better economic base in the Intermountain West and the establishment of new homes for weary urban dwellers.

MEN TO MATCH OUR MOUNTAINS

Mr. Speaker, the issue can be defined as a choice of two courses. We can locate still another vast complex in an area that is already overstrained—possibly to the detriment of existing operations, certainly to the despair of harassed cities and their worried leaders.

Or we can choose to take the first positive step in relieving the pressure on our cities by creating an environment that will encourage migration. The possibilities of such a venture excite the imagination. In this single action a chain reaction can be set off whose benefits will spread over the entire Nation.

THE UNITED NATIONS ACTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Moss). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to note that the United Nations Human Rights Commission has now moved to complete action on a draft convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance.

For the first time, in an official undertaking such as this, antisemitism is cited as a form of religious intolerance. This inclusion of antisemitism was initiated by Israel and drew the strong support of the American delegation.

And so in this draft convention we have specific mention of antisemitism as an example of religious discrimination. Despite vigorous efforts on the part of the American representatives, the Convention on Racial Discrimination, approved last year by the U.N. General Assembly, did not refer to antisemitism. This was a serious mistake and a grievous misunderstanding.

It is a great pity that the work of the U.N. Human Rights Commission has received so little public notice. It is shunned by our communications media which, perhaps understandably, sees very little drama in these quiet affairs. But on the contrary, I view these developments as having great importance.

This convention on religious intolerance will urge upon participating states action to combat prejudice. New ground has been broken, and it is directed at the standing of the individual person before his government and his government's instrumentalities.

It has been recognized that much of the disorder and calamity which has plagued mankind since time immemorial is due to the license the community has insipidly given to states which ignore the rights of individuals and groups which differ from the majority thinking. Thus we have tried to move in the direction of protecting the human rights of individuals in religious and racial spheres. It is a great, compelling enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, we in the House must keep abreast of these activities. In turn, I wish to commend the American delegates and participants, as well as the U.N. Human Rights Commission.

This country must continue to lead in this field. For this reason, on a related issue, I urge congressional passage during the session of my bill, H.R. 12306, to establish a U.S. Human Rights Committee. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced a companion bill in the Senate last week, and he was joined by 26 cosponsors.

It remains my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that this great Nation can avoid being paralyzed by the recurrent crises of the day to such an extent that we lose our bearings; that we unconsciously withdraw from those areas of compelling human import which can have great consequences for the future. The field of universal, human rights deserves our constant, unrelenting effort.

PENTAGON TESTIMONY ON VIETNAM SHORTAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, recently the American people have been reading and listening to various and sundry accounts of reported shortages of supplies and equipment for our Armed Forces in Vietnam and elsewhere; the use of certain ammunition in Vietnam on an "as available" basis; of gigantic logistics problems being encountered in Vietnam; of our Nation's dependence upon a sole U.S. manufacturer of powder and that that company's employees recently went out on strike; that we have had to transfer military hardware to Vietnam from other crucial areas; and so forth, and so forth.

I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that such reports are of real concern to the American people. They are the ones who have been asked to provide, and have been providing, billions upon billions of dollars for our Defense Establishment to make it the most powerful the world has ever known. They are the ones who are presently providing the young men to fight and die in Vietnam. Hence, can anyone dispute their right to ask questions and to expect answers when they read these reports? Can anyone dispute their right to truthful and factual answers when security is not involved?

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, and I firmly believe that they deserve every answer that we can give them as Members of Congress from our limited knowledge of this situation. Undoubtedly, every Member of Congress has had letters from parents of servicemen pointing out this or that shortage or they have read about them in such reliable newspapers as the New York Times or they have read about them in the December 24, 1965, issue of Time magazine, or they have listened to them being reported on TV or radio. I choose not to look to these reports for answers to their questions, but rather to look to the testimony by such men as Secretary McNamara, Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. Wallace Greene, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps, before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees at the time they were considering the supplemental authorization bill for Vietnam in January and February of this year. These censored hearing reports are available for all to read and I would suggest that all Members—who have not done so—read these reports.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the testimony of these witnesses was all screened for security reasons by the Pentagon and the classified portions deleted before the printed hearings were reported to the Congress and released to the press. I well realize that all of the answers the American people want cannot be gleaned from reading these censored or declassified hearing reports as they naturally might want to know something about the classified matters which have been stricken. Nevertheless, I have deemed it worthwhile to go through these declassified hearings in search of light to shed on these questions. I now wish to report on my findings and I shall do so by reading the declassified answers given by Secretary McNamara, General Wheeler, and General Greene in response to questions put to them by committee members and committee staff personnel. At the outset, however, let me say that Mr. McNamara insisted all through these hearings that none of these items which will be mentioned have "adversely affected our combat operations" in Vietnam:

THE 2.75-INCH ROCKET AND 40-MILLIMETER AIR-LAUNCHED GRENADE

(House hearings, p. 4900)

Mr. BATES. Just what is our situation today in Vietnam with respect to ammunition, bombs, and so forth? What kind of shape are we in?

Secretary MCNAMARA. I think we are in good shape, Mr. Bates. The best indication I can give you is this, that last month we were scheduled on an annual rate basis—this is on a 12-month basis at last month's rates—we were planning in South Vietnam and in its associated operations, to drop [deleted] and to launch [deleted] 2.75-inch rockets, [deleted] rounds of air-to-ground ammunition [deleted] small arms rounds including .30-caliber machinegun ammo, [deleted] million air-launched 40-millimeter grenades, [deleted] mortar rounds, and [deleted] artillery rounds. These were the planned levels of expenditures for the month of January, the one we just completed, on an annual rate basis.

The supplies to permit that level were in Vietnam. This was also the level desired by the military command in Vietnam.

There are only a few items on which I think you might say supplies are tight, and those are primarily new items. The 40-millimeter air-launched grenade, which was an experimental item up until a few months ago, is now proving highly effective and very popular. Another example is the 2.75-inch rockets with fragmentation warheads, not the HEAT warheads (the antiarmor warheads). This latter case arose because the armed helicopter (the arming of helicopters is a relatively recent innovation) are now being widely used in Vietnam. We decided to procure this new type 2.75-inch rocket only in the past 12 months.

Apart from items of that kind, I would say that, overall, our ammunition supplies are very good indeed.

ILLUMINATING FLARES AND PERIODIC PROBLEMS IN AMMUNITION

(Senate hearings, p. 104)

Senator SMITH. Are there any shortages in ammunition in the Vietnam fighting?

Secretary MCNAMARA. There are none that have had in the opinion of the senior commanders, and, I am speaking of Admiral Sharpe and General Westmoreland, any significant effect on combat operations but there have been shortages in specialty items. One example is illuminating flares. We have found more need for such illuminating flares than ever before. When General Wheeler and I flew over the Plei Me area you could see the landscape dotted with flares. Their use far exceeded anybody's concepts of requirements. So at various times, there have been low inventories of such items, but even then combat operations have not been significantly affected.

The most significant problem which we have in ammunition relates to the 2.75-inch rocket, and there the problem is not one of shortage but rather one of new uses. These rockets are used primarily on armed helicopters. This is a relatively new tactic. The armed helicopters was a research and development project even in the last 2 or 3 years. We have never used such a vehicle in combat and the expenditures of those rockets by helicopters we anticipate will reach [deleted] by January of this year. This is far more than anticipated in any requirement calculation and the result is that our 2.75-inch rocket inventory has been drawn down worldwide very substantially. But this has not significantly affected combat operations as yet in the views of Westmoreland and Sharpe, and we are starting to produce them in extraordinary quantities.

I should mention, when I speak of the 2.75-inch rocket, that there is a distinction between the previously developed rocket which was designed to be launched from fixed-wing aircraft against hard objects on the ground such as tanks, and the currently utilized rocket which is designed primarily to be launched from helicopters against personnel on the ground. The latter, therefore, requires a fragmentation head as opposed to the hard object-piercing head required by the former and it is really the fragmentation head rocket that is causing us problems today.

But, apart from the illuminating round and the 2.75-inch rocket there have been other periodic problems in ammunition but none of them are significant.

THE 2.75-INCH ROCKET DISCUSSION CONTINUED

(Senate hearings, p. 209)

Senator CANNON. Have you had or do you anticipate any shortages of the 2.75 rocket?

Secretary McNAMARA. We have had extremely high usage of that rocket. That rocket has been used only on an experimental basis in helicopters up until very recently when it was fully authorized for regular operational use. It is a different form of rocket than the rocket that the Navy and Air Force have heretofore used from aircraft. It carries a fragmentation head. It is designed to be used primarily against personnel, and it is, in a sense, the personnel oriented 2.75-inch rocket which has caused our problem because it has just moved out of the experimental stage. So it is going to be "touch and go" in matching production and consumption on that ammunition item. Tremendous quantities of that rocket are being consumed, far in excess of anything that anyone could sensibly have anticipated. For example, in the month of January we estimate we will use [deleted] of those, but our inventory so far is reasonably satisfactory.

Senator CANNON. So you have had no shortage up to the present time?

Secretary McNAMARA. I don't want to say no shortage because we have used such huge quantities that I think General Westmoreland has had to ask his commanders not to waste these rockets and to watch their use carefully. But there has been no adverse effect on combat operations for any lack of such rockets. We have plenty of other ammunition which can be fired from helicopters.

(Senate hearings, p. 211)

Senator BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. McNamara, have there been any shortages in rockets?

Secretary McNAMARA. I said that the 2.75-inch rocket, of which we have ample stocks, had until relatively recently been equipped with a warhead that was what I would call an armor-piercing warhead, it was to be used from the air against hardware on the ground. There are no shortages of those.

However, in the last year or two we have experimented with the use of 2.75-inch rockets for use against personnel when fired from helicopters, and this is a new use and requires a different head, a fragmentation head.

The expansion of our helicopter force in South Vietnam and the arming of that force with this rocket has so sharply expanded our requirements for it that its supply has been tight.

With respect to whether there has been a shortage or not, I can't answer the questions other than to say that the supply has been tight but that the commanders have said that the tight supply has not adversely affected their combat operations. But I think if we had more they probably would have used more.

Senator BYRD of West Virginia. Has there been a rationing or budgeting of these rockets as a result of this tight situation?

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, I would like to have General Wheeler speak to the technical management devices the Army uses to manage its ammunition. I have even forgotten the name you apply to it but whatever it is it applies to 2.75 as it does to other ammunition in the theater.

General WHEELER. General Westmoreland has applied out there what is called an available supply rate for the 2.75's. I believe I have some information regarding this subject.

Senator BYRD of West Virginia. Perhaps that could be supplied to the committee.

General WHEELER. I have that information now. [Deleted.]

Senator BYRD of West Virginia. So there has been a restriction then because of lack of proper supply upon our use of rockets?

General WHEELER. I think I would question your use of the term lack of proper supply, Senator BYRD. As the Secretary explained the 2.75 HE round is a relatively new round just coming into production. [Deleted.]

Senator BYRD of West Virginia. So if the helicopter is on a mission and x amount of rockets have been used, and the need arises for additional rockets the helicopter is not restricted from using those additional rockets?

General WHEELER. I wouldn't think he would be, Senator. In other words, in an emergency he would go ahead and fire what he needed. Of course, he probably would have to make a report to the higher authority telling him what the need was in order to justify using them.

AMMUNITION AND PROXIMITY FUSES, 105-MILLIMETER ILLUMINATING

(House hearings, p. 5068)

Mr. BLANDFORD. How about 105 ammunition, proximity fuse ammunition, proximity fuses, and 8-inch howitzer ammunition? Has there been any reduction in that for practice purposes?

General GREENE. We have had some shortages in 105-millimeter illuminating ammunitions. I have checked on that specifically when I was out this last time in South Vietnam. However, although we don't have the levels that we would like, our operations at night using this ammunition have not been restricted. We still had enough on hand. I would say that 105-millimeter illuminating would have to necessarily be used carefully in training.

Mr. BLANDFORD. Well, actually, am I correct that there has been a reduction in the availability of this type of ammunition for training purposes?

General GREENE. That would depend, of course, upon the division commanders. I cannot give you the specific answer.

THE 4.2 MORTAR AMMUNITION

(House hearings, p. 5068)

Mr. BLANDFORD. How about 4.2 mortar ammunition?

General GREENE. We have had a problem there again in 4.2 illuminating projectors.

AMMUNITION SHORTAGES

(House hearings, p. 5069)

Mr. BLANDFORD. Where are the other places where we have problems?

General GREENE. I believe the committee in their visits and examination of this problem as I recall, found six different types of ammunition in which there were indications of shortages. The Marine Corps has not been hampered or crippled in actual operations in South Vietnam in any of these areas.

Mr. BLANDFORD. No, I prefaced it by talking about training. I don't believe the actual operations in Vietnam have been affected.

* * * * *

General GREENE. Well, I would say from my own personal observations of training in our aviation units, as well as ground units, that no one is going out to southeast Asia now, either in an air or ground unit, that isn't adequately trained to use the weapons and ammunition with which the Marine Corps is fitted.

Mr. BLANDFORD. When was this shortage of ammunition first brought to the attention of higher authorities, General?

General GREENE. I will have to provide that date.

(The information referred to follows:)

"Marine Corps ground ammunition requirements were first submitted to OSD on July 22, 1965, for inclusion in an amendment to the fiscal year 1966 budget request. An additional list of ammunition needs, [deleted] was submitted on November 28, 1965. Monthly report of selected items of ammunition [deleted] showing current and projected inventory status, have been provided to ASD (T. & L.) beginning with the August 1965 report."

THE 750-POUND BOMB

(House hearings, p. 4938)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. At the present time, do you foresee any problem in this area as far as having adequate supplies of ammunition to meet all contingencies we may face?

Secretary McNAMARA. With the exception of what I would call new items. For example, the 40-millimeter air-launched grenade which was type classified not too long ago, I have forgotten, perhaps a year or so ago. That kind of a new item, of course, we may be in short supply for a period of time after it is initially produced until stocks can be built up. Or there may be a case where we are using an old item in an entirely new way such as the 750-pound bomb which is being dropped by strategic bombers, the B–52's, in quantities of [deleted] per B–52, against double-thick jungle canopy targets for area bombing. This is a use never anticipated when the inventory requirements for the 750-pound bomb were established.

Now, in that kind of a——

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Did you have any shortages there?

Secretary McNAMARA. In that kind of a case I can conceive shortages developing. We don't at the moment have a shortage of 750's [deleted]. Actually, the bomb racks in the B–52 are being changed to allow it to carry not 51 bombs at a crack, but [deleted] bombs, mixed between 750's and 500's. This is just a fantastic expenditure rate for these bombs [deleted].

M-16 RIFLE

(Senate hearings, p. 135)

Senator Towers. Are we meeting the demand for the M-16?

Secretary McNamara. Well, we are not meeting the demand for it because everybody——

Senator Tower. I mean, what progress are we making toward meeting it?

Secretary McNamara (continuing). Because everybody in the theater wants to have one of them at the present time. But before any requirements came in from the field for additional M-16's I just put [deleted] more on order with the thought that it would be useful to have them in inventory and they don't cost very much. Since that time the requirements for [deleted] has come in, and we have put an additional quantity on order. [Deleted.]

[Colloquy deleted.]

SPARE PARTS FOR THE C-141 AIRPLANE

(House hearings, p. 4927)

The Chairman. I gather you are having a little difficulty in getting spares for the aircraft?

Secretary McNamara. For the C-141?

The Chairman. For the 141.

Secretary McNamara. I hadn't heard that, but it is entirely possible and not unusual for a new aircraft just entering the inventory to encounter some spare shortages until actual experience can help establish the inventory levels to be maintained. We are certainly utilizing them at a higher rate than originally planned, although I think we are justified in that.

The Chairman. I think you are.

Secretary McNamara. This increase from 5 to 8 hours per day for the Military Airlift Command aircraft, both the C-141's and C-130's, increases our effective capability by three-fifths, or 60 percent. It is a tremendous increase. When we did that we put more spares on order. You authorized us additional funds.

TRANSFER OF MATERIAL FROM EUROPE

(House hearings, p. 4906)

Mr. Arends. Have we drawn down on existing inventory substantially, ammunition, supplies, et cetera, from other areas of the world?

Secretary McNamara. Generally speaking, no.

Mr. Arends. Generally speaking?

Secretary McNamara. The inventory drawdown for South Vietnam has come basically from central stocks in the United States. There was a drawdown of $50 million worth of equipment, and supplies from Korea, I think, and there has been a shift of some surplus supplies from Europe.

TRANSFER OF AMMUNITION FROM EUROPE

(Senate hearings, pp. 202–203)

Senator Cannon. In a very recent report I saw an indication or an outright statement that we were having to take machineguns from tanks in Europe, thus depleting our firepower there to make them available in South Vietnam. Is there any truth to that statement?

Secretary McNamara. I have never heard of any such situation. I can't imagine it is true. General Wheeler, have you ever heard of a place where we have taken machineguns from tanks because of a requirement in South Vietnam?

General Wheeler. I certainly don't know of anything like that. In fact, I would, without knowing anything about it, say it can't be true. I can't see any reason for it.

Secretary McNamara. Every single movement of men and equipment from Europe to South Vietnam requires the prior personal approval of either Mr. Vance or myself, and I know I have never approved anything like that, and I doubt very much that he has. As a matter of fact, we have approved very few cases of movements of equipment or men for that matter, from Western Europe to South Vietnam. It hasn't been necessary to make such transfers.

Senator Cannon. But there have been some movements?

Secretary McNamara. Very, very small number.

Senator Cannon. Troops or material?

Secretary McNamara. Very small numbers. I would be happy to give you the list if you wish. The most notable one I can think of was five aircraft, I think they are—what were they [deleted].

General Wheeler. [Deleted.]

Secretary McNamara. Those are the most significant movements I can think of, but I would be happy to insert in the record a list of all the others.

Senator Cannon. Has there been any shift or transfers of supplies or spare parts from Europe to South Vietnam?

Secretary McNamara. I think not, with the exception of some surplus ammunition stocks. But I will be happy to check that. (The information requested is classified and was forwarded separately to the committee.)

Senator Cannon. What is the basic movement of ammunition; what caliber is the basic movement of ammunition from Germany to Vietnam?

Secretary McNamara. I can't answer the question offhand, but I will be happy to insert it in the record.

(The information requested is classified and was furnished separately to the committee.)

THE 1,000-POUND BOMBS—AVAILABLE IN WORLDWIDE INVENTORIES

(Senate hearings, p. 204)

Senator Cannon. Yes. Now, I note that you don't propose the use of any 1,000-pound bombs. I have heard this statement from some military people that the thousand-pounders could be used to good advantage in Vietnam in some instances.

Secretary McNamara. We are using them, and we do plan to continue to use them.

Senator Cannon. You have started to use them now?

Secretary McNamara. Well, we used them in July through September, and we have been using them every month since then, and we plan to use them clear through even to June of 1967.

Senator Cannon. What airplanes were carrying those?

Secretary McNamara. I can't answer the question. I will be happy to find out.

(The information requested is classified and was furnished separately to the committee.)

Senator Cannon. You weren't using the B-52's; they weren't using them?

Secretary McNamara. No.

Senator Cannon. The B-52's were carrying the 750's and this was an area of criticism that I heard when I was there personally, that they had none available for use——

Secretary McNamara. There are inventories available, I may be in error on this, but my understanding was that the 750's were preferred for the B-52's. As a matter of fact, we have got substantial stocks of thousand-pound bombs in our worldwide inventories. We could support many, many times the present rates of usage and I would be happy to see them used more.

I will look into it.

ROTOR BLADES

(Senate hearings, p. 206)

Senator Cannon. Now, there was a real problem that developed in connection with the rotor blades. The life expectancy was very much greater originally than actually turned out to be a fact. Has any corrective action been accomplished in this area?

Secretary McNamara. I think so.

General Wheeler. [Deleted.]

HOSPITAL BEDS AT CLARK FIELD

(Senate hearings, p. 137)

Senator Mansfield. Mr. Secretary, are there funds in this request to enlarge the hospital at Clark Field?

Secretary McNamara. Let me check. There are funds for Clark Field, and I have forgotten whether the hospital enlargement is included. Yes, the Subic Bay Hospital in the Philippines is included.

Senator Mansfield. Now, the figures given to me, Mr. Secretary, indicate on page 10-B, that $605,000 is to be spent to enlarge the hospital facilities at Clark Field.

Secretary McNamara. About $3 million at Subic Bay.

Senator Mansfield. Yes. But $605,000 at Clark. It seems to me that it was overcrowded, and they were doing a magnificent job there but they certainly needed a lot more room, a lot more beds and a lot more personnel.

CLOTHING SHORTAGES

(House hearings, pp. 5067–5068)

Mr. Blandford. General Greene, we have had some information to the effect you are going to reduce the clothing issued to recruits by one-half or you have reduced the clothing issued by one-half to recruits; is that correct?

General Greene. We are reducing the issue of clothing to recruits, but in our opinion this is not going to have any immediate serious effect.

Mr. Blandford. Well, for example, on fatigues, and on underclothing, what will the issue be, do you happen to know?

General Greene. The issue on utilities is three now, and there will be no change on that.

Mr. Blandford. They will get three. How about clothing?

General Greene. There will be a reduction in other articles of clothing. I have the list right here. There will be a reduction in green uniforms, from two to one.

Mr. Blandford. Two to one in green uniforms. How about khakis?

General Greene. Khakis, there will be a reduction in the number of cotton shirts and also trousers?

Mr. Blandford. How about socks?

General Greene. We are going to substitute brown for black socks.

Mr. Blandford. You are going back to brown. You have excess brown?

General Greene. We have excess brown, we are going to use those.

Mr. Blandford. How about belt buckles?

General Greene. I don't think we will run out of those.

POWDER SUPPLY

(Senate hearings, p. 33)

Chairman Russell. Mr. Secretary, are you taking any steps to get alternate sources of supplies? I notice that you had a strike at a plant that makes all the powder we use and that was the only such plant in the United States. Are you taking any steps to assure that we shall not be crippled by that?

Secretary McNamara. Yes, sir; Mr. Chairman, if the committee is interested in this, I can put in your record the ammunition production system that we have, showing for each major item the company or companies producing each item. We believe we are adequately protected against strikes.

(The information was supplied for the record.)

Secretary McNamara. In the case of the Olin Mathieson strike to which you referred a moment ago, while it is true that Olin was the only supplier, our inventories were such that we could absorb the loss during the strike. We had the option of applying the Taft-Hartley Act but I chose not to do so, believing that with the inventories we had we weren't in danger of any shortage, and that the intervention of the Government through the Taft-Hartley process would simply substitute for the free collective bargaining process. I believed that this would be undesirable and, therefore, we shouldn't apply the Taft-Hartley Act until the strike really began to pinch us.

Before that occurred, it was settled by negotiation between the parties.

Chairman Russell. I read somethng in the press that you proposed to open another source of supply.

Secretary McNamara. Yes.

Chairman Russell. Was that just to bring the parties together?

Secretary McNamara. No, sir.

Chairman Russell. Or did you really intend to open up a new source?

Secretary McNamara. We do intend to open up another source later this year. It will be run by Olin Mathieson, by the way.

Chairman Russell. With the same strikers employed there, would that be wise?

Secretary McNamara. No, sir; I was going to say it would be run by Olin Mathieson, but with a different union, and, therefore, we don't believe that one strike would close down the two plants. We chose Olin Mathieson because they had built the plant, I think during the Korean period or, in any event in prior years, and we see no risk from their operating both plants. But our decision to operate the second plant was not related to the strike.

Chairman Russell. It had no relation to the strike?

Secretary McNamara. No sir, it did not.

Chairman Russell. Then the press misrepresented it.

Secretary McNamara. I think they did.

Chairman Russell. The press indicated it was going to be opened because you were afraid you would run out of ammunition.

Secretary McNamara. No, sir; that was not the case.

Chairman Russell. It had nothing to do with it?

Secretary McNamara. It wouldn't have come into operation anyway in time to have given us relief from the results of the strike.

Chairman Russell. [Deleted.]

Secretary McNamara. [Deleted.]

HELICOPTER CUTBACK

(Senate hearings, p. 37)

Chairman Russell. Do you recall back in 1965 we appropriated a very substantial sum for the Iroquois and the Chinook helicopters and the Department asked for approval of a reprograming request to reduce that number substantially that was based in part on a reevaluation of aircraft requirements? Since the step-up in hostilities in Vietnam the procurement of them has been sharply increased and this program today requests a further increase in production. None of us have perfect foresight, of course, but the Congress has been castigated so much for its errors—I wonder if you would agree there was at least a small mistake in the Department of Defense when the Department cut back the helicopter program in 1965?

Secretary McNamara. Mr. Chairman, I won't say it was a mistake of the Department of Defense. I cut it myself. I cut it from 75 a month to 60 a month in line with the requirements as we saw them at that time, which was before we made the decision to vastly increase the number of Army helicopter companies. In retrospect, it was my mistake, because we didn't appear to need the additional production, and I am not sure it would have made very much difference if we had had them, because we are now planning on a much higher rate of production.

In the case of the Chinook, I don't remember the figures but I don't believe the cut was great.

Chairman Russell. No; it wasn't extensive.

Secretary McNamara. Anyhow, it wasn't the Department of Defense; it was I who made the mistake.

Chairman Russell. You would have a mighty hard time convincing the people in this country and particularly everybody in uniform that you are not the Department of Defense, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary McNamara. In that case——

Chairman Russell. So if you made the mistake, it was the Department of Defense's mistake?

Secretary McNamara. No; it is perfectly clear in retrospect that the decision I made then was in error. There is no doubt about that.

HELICOPTER PARTS

(Senate hearings, p. 354)

Senator Inouye. During our visit in Vietnam, in conferring with officials of the 1st Cavalry Division, we were informed that [deleted] percent of the helicopters were on that day grounded because of lack of parts. What is the present situation?

Secretary McNamara. The total theater situation with respect to helicopters grounded for lack of parts has improved materially. For the 1st Cavalry it was down to [deleted] percent on January 11. This improved substantially because of the Red Ball Express which we initiated about December 8 or so. This was after you had been there and returned, I think.

One of the reasons we organized the Red Ball Express was that our experience—General Wheeler's and mine—at the 1st Cavalry Division was identical to yours. I don't think they had as many as [deleted] percent grounded when I was there but they did have a fairly substantial number down for lack of parts. When we came back we set up this special supply chain in order to overcome that deficiency. It involves three elements, basically: Westmoreland's office in South Vietnam which does nothing but specialize in expediting the distribution of critical military items (a special allocation of the military Airlift Command aircraft is reserved specifically for that purpose); a Westmoreland-managed office on the Pacific coast which receives a request from the Westmoreland office in Saigon, expedites it through the supply chain in this country, and puts the needed parts on the airplane. Since that express service was set up we have shipped about 1,400,000 pounds of special freight through this system and it has dramatically cut the out-of-operation-for-parts rate for helicopters in Vietnam.

We still have some problems on parts for bulldozers and material-handling equipment, however.

HELICOPTER PARTS AND MATERIAL-HANDLING EQUIPMENT DEFICIENCY

(Senate hearings, pp. 139–40)

Senator Mansfield. What is being done to rectify the deficiency in spare parts especially in the 1st Cavalry area where as a result of the battle of the Iadrang Valley and other encounters, there were a good many of the helicopters on the ground in late November and the first part of December?

Secretary McNamara. Well, the out-of-commission rate of helicopters at the present time, I think, is very satisfactory. It is so for several reasons. Among them was the establishment of a special air transport system in early December 1965 to allow the prompt delivery of critically needed parts. Partially as a result of that action and partially as a result of other actions taken, the "out-of-commission" rate for helicopters has dropped very substantially—down to a level that I think is satisfactory at the present time.

Senator Mansfield. Good.

Secretary McNamara. This doesn't apply, by the way to some other items of equipment, most notable of which would be material-handling equipment which still has a very high "out-of-commission" rate largely because of a diversity of types and makes and models and the difficulty of providing spare parts for such a diverse group of equipment.

Senator Mansfield. Of course, we realize, Mr. Secretary, that there has been a very difficult situation there with the buildup in men and in trying to bring up the logistics supply to par, and I raised the question not in criticism but in order to set the record straight to make sure that something is being done to correct it.

Secretary McNamara. I think we have had imbalances in stocks and equipment reflected in high "out-of-commission" rates, and I am sure we will continue to have them in the future as unanticipated situations develop. It takes time to correct the planning factors used in planning the logistical system but as of the moment the helicopter situation is very good indeed. We have about [deleted] operating there, and they are operating quite satisfactorily.

SHORT SUPPLY OF WAREHOUSES AND SHIPPING BACKLOG

(Senate hearings, p. 138)

Senator Mansfield. In the matter of logistics, we are all aware by now, I think of the fact that for months past our ships have had to stand in line outside of Danang, Saigon, and other ports of entry. That on occasion ships have had to leave the line because of being low on petrol and food, go back to the Philippines, refuel and restock their food larders and then come back and stand in line again. We are also aware of the fact that the docking facilities are not anywhere near adequate or capable of handling the shipping which is going in. There is a short supply of warehouses. Are those factors being rectified at this time to any considerable degree?

Secretary McNamara. Well, I think that the solution will not prove too difficult nor need it take too much time to achieve it. In November there were 122 ships being unloaded in South Vietnam or awaiting their turn to be unloaded in South Vietnamese waters or in the holding areas. That total of 122 had dropped to 81 on January 11 and that compares with what we consider to be a normal inventory of 59.. So, I think considerable progress has been made between November and January 11 and we anticipate still further progress will be made to reach the normal level sometime in March. Moreover, the port capability we believe, will expand about 75 percent between January of this year and midyear, so it looks to us as though we are well underway in a program to absorb the tremendous increases in tonnages which are moving into South Vietnam. [Deleted.]

In any event, the present delays, according to Westmoreland and Sharpe have not affected adversely our combat operations.

SHIPPING BACKLOG

(Senate hearings, p. 355)

Senator Inouye. How is your military construction program progressing there?

Secretary McNamara. Slowly, I think.

Senator Inouye. Is it up to your satisfaction?

Secretary McNamara. Well, it is probably progressing as rapidly as it possibly could under the circumstances. As you know, construction labor, skilled construction labor, is in limited supply. There was literally nothing in the way of infrastructure in the country, the airfields and ports had to be constructed virtually from scratch, and the roadways and communications system all had to be installed. The buildup has been slow for that reason.

However, I think it is fair to say that up to the present time we haven't suffered seriously as a result of it. The shipping backlog was very great in November. We had 122 ships, either there or waiting in holding areas to move to South Vietnam, compared to what we would consider a normal backlog of about 59.

That 122 backlog in November, however, dropped to 73 by the 20th of January. So I think that while the construction work has been difficult and slow because of lack of skilled labor, it has not been a serious limiting factor up to the present time. It may become so in the future but it hasn't been so far.

RED BALL EXPRESS

(Senate hearings, p. 207)

Senator Cannon. What has been done to speed up, in the requisitioning system, items that are in short supply, repair parts and items of that nature?

Initially, as I understand it, when the units first went in they were given a forced supply account that was automatically shipped, automatically sent to them. But when they developed shortages the requisition system did not seem to be adequate in some instances to keep them supplied with the repair parts that were actually needed.

Secretary McNamara. We have set up a special procedure and associated air transport system known as the Red Ball Express for taking care of unanticipated requirements. There is a unit under General Westmoreland's command in South Vietnam, another unit in this country, on the Pacific coast, and a certain daily tonnage of air shipment capacity is reserved solely for his use. He has his unit in South Vietnam obtain from the combat units any special requirements they have, forward them over here to the units under Westmoreland operating on the west coast. That unit, in turn, picks them up from our defense inventories in this country, and has the authority to utilize this reserved air transport capacity. I think that this already has, and will in the future continue to relieve some of these unanticipated shortages and requirements as they develop.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my remarks and I prefer without further comment to have this declassified testimony speak for itself on the subject of reported shortages in Vietnam and elsewhere.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to any cutback in the present operation of the school lunch program. I find it most difficult to conceive how the cutback from $202 million in fiscal 1966 to $183 milllion proposed expenditure for fiscal 1967 can be contemplated, either as a justifiable saving in the Federal budget or as a move that would not affect the health of our Nation's children. Though I applaud the administration's proposal to increase its support of free lunches for needy children, I think it most unwise to withdraw subsidies from other young people, many of whom will undoubtedly cease to participate in the lunch program if the cost to them is increased.

The importance of the school lunch program has been recognized by five successive administrations, starting back in 1936 during the Presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and has been maintained in full operation ever since, having been made permanent by the National School Lunch Act of 1946. Under this program, the Department of Agriculture works closely with school districts around the country to see that as many children as possible have hot meals available to them at reduced cost. At the present time, more than 18 million young people are benefiting from this Federal program by way of reimbursement in the form of cash payments and by surplus commodities.

The U.S. Congress in 1946 declared the intent of the National School Lunch Act to be "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children, and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food." Mr. Speaker, I pose the question of whether this 89th Congress will be the one to declare this program not important enough to be maintained at full level. Is this a Congress that will declare the nutritious diet of our schoolchildren to be even partly expendable? I would hope not.

The school lunch program is too vital to my State and to America to be even slightly curtailed. I am receiving letters daily from school officials, cafeteria managers, and concerned citizens about the administration's proposed cutbacks for 1967. Typical of their sentiments is the following commentary by Mrs. Sakiko Okihara, cafeteria manager at Waimea High and Elementary School in Kauai County:

> I firmly believe that our national stamina is so tied up with the health of our people. For physically strong and mentally awake good bodies, wholesome food is a basic ingredient. If the cost of school lunches has to be raised to keep the school lunch program operating, and if some families should find it necessary to send their children to school hungry, then I would conclude that the contemplated and proposed slashes should not be enacted.

The school lunch program is highly utilized in Hawaii, Mr. Speaker, for both educators and parents recognize its contribution to the health of our youth. In fiscal 1965, over 20 million school lunches were sold at reduced cost in Hawaii, and more than 800,000 free lunches were served under this program. I cannot see how turning federally subsidized programs more and more in the direction of welfare assistance to needy children only, instead of allowing all our children to benefit, can be serving the public interest, and I urge my colleagues to see that the proposed cutbacks are not made.

To demonstrate the deep concern engendered in Hawaii by the Department of Agriculture's reduction in the school lunch program, I insert in the Record at this point a concurrent resolution adopted by the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii urging continuation of the program at current level:

> "Whereas proposed cuts in the President's budget for the school lunch program means a loss of about a million dolars to the State of Hawaii and will cause an increase in the cost of school lunches which may lessen participation in the school lunch program and thereby further increase the cost to the State to maintain the school lunch program: Now, therefore be it
>
> "*Resolved by this senate* (*the house concurring*), that the Honorable Senator Daniel K. Inouye, the Honorable Senator Hiram L. Fong, the Honorable Representative Spark M. Matsunaga, and the Honorable Representative Patsy T. Mink be requested to do everything in their power to restore the proposed cuts in the President's budget to the national school lunch program, particularly in the areas of Federal cash subsidy, the Federal milk program and the Federal surplus commodity program; and be it further
>
> "*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the foregoing senators and representatives forthwith."
>
> The Senate of the State of Hawaii,
> *Honolulu, Hawaii, March 17, 1966.*
>
> We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1966.
>
> Kazuhisa Abe,
> *President of the Senate.*
> Seichi Hirai,
> *Clerk of the Senate.*
>
> The House of Representatives
> of the State of Hawaii,
> *Honolulu, Hawaii, March 17, 1966.*
>
> We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1966.
>
> Elmer F. Cravalho,
> *Speaker, House of Representatives.*
> Shigeta Kanemoto,
> *Clerk, House of Representatives.*

LEGISLATION TO AMEND TITLES 26 AND 37, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend titles 26 and 37, United States Code, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to members of the uniformed services for dependents' schooling, and for other related purposes.

At the conclusion of last year, I had the opportunity to serve on a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor charged with the responsibility of investigating educational facilities and opportunities for American dependents abroad. These are primarily the children of servicemen. The subcommittee recently made a full and complete report to the House, defining our findings and outlining our recommendations for improving the school system operated by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, my eyes were opened to serious deficiencies in that system—in terms of both educational quality and administration. One area of patent inequity is addressed by my bill.

The purpose, then, of this legislative proposal, is to extend to dependents of members of the uniformed services authority, similar to that for dependents of civilian employees, for the payment of travel, transportation, and living expenses incurred in connection with enrollment in schools located in areas other than that in which the sponsoring parent is assigned.

Some of these members serve at posts in areas of the world such as Asia, Africa, and the Near East where there are no dependent primary and secondary schools operated by the Department. Because of language and cultural differences, the local schools are unsuitable, and there are often so few American children in the area that the organization of a special school in the area of assignment is not feasible. Consequently, the parents are forced to send their children to suitable schools in other areas, and only tuition assistance in such cases is available under existing authority. This means that the expenses of travel, transportation, and room and board must be borne by the parents. Needless to say, these expenses present a severe financial burden on the family—particularly so in the case of enlisted men. There are no available means to provide such transportation as a matter of law or practicality.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation follows closely the applicable provisions of the Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act, by which allowances for the transportation, travel, and room and board of dependents of civilian employees may be paid in accordance with appropriate regulations. This includes authority to pay the travel expenses for the purpose of obtaining undergraduate college education, since we now recognize college to be a modern necessity. The same benefit for dependents of military personnel is included in this proposal.

My bill, however, would not authorize the payment of an education allowance for the dependents of military members who are stationed in the Canal Zone, but would authorize the payment of travel expenses for the purpose of obtaining undergraduate college education. Undergraduate college facilities in the Canal Zone are not offered beyond the first 2 years. Military personnel who plan a 4-year college program for their children would likely want them to spend the entire 4-year period in one institution. Further, since these allowances for incidental educational expenses of dependents of civilian employees are excluded from gross income for Federal income tax purposes, a similar exemption is included in this legislation for military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is in accord with the recognized principle that the Government should provide, to the extent practicable, uniform treatment for its personnel, both civilian and uniformed, with respect to additional expenses necessarily incurred in relation to their overseas service, and with respect to hardships, inconveniences, or other differences which justify additional compensation or allowances. It will also provide a uniform basis for the granting of special benefits to all Government personnel stationed outside the United States.

This bill is supported by the Department of Defense and is acceptable to the Bureau of the Budget. I commend it to the House for consideration with the hope that favorable action may be soon forthcoming.

THE FILING DEADLINE FOR INCOME TAX

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Lynn Brown, of Irving, Tex., has brought to my attention a problem which I am certain exists throughout the United States in all major cities on April 15, the filing deadline for income tax. He states that annually it is necessary for citizens of Irving—population 57,500 in 1962—to drive some 10 to 15 miles into the main Dallas post office after 5 p.m. on April 15 to assure that their income tax forms will be postmarked before midnight. The Irving post office is a branch of the Dallas post office. It therefore closes at 5 p.m., which negates the possibility of an April 15 postmark on income tax forms mailed there after 5 o'clock.

It would seem to me that the Post Office Department could revise its working schedule on that date for branches and substations in major cities, thereby eliminating this problem for millions of taxpayers throughout the Nation as well as avoiding unnecessary congestion at all main post offices. A further suggestion was employed by the District of Columbia post office last year. Postal clerks were stationed at the curb of the Main Post Office so that a citizen could drive up and place his income tax in the bag of one of the clerks. This eliminated long waiting lines and parking problems, and was a great public service.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in urging the Post Office Department to take both these suggestions under immediate consideration for utilization this year.

ADAM YARMOLINSKY AMERICAN PATRIOT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme regret that I have learned of the departure from governmental service of a great American, who has distinguished himself in public service.

It is a shame that patriotic Americans sometimes are suspect only because of the unorthodox sound of their surnames or their above-average intelligence which prevents them from parroting the jingoistic balderdash we are sometimes subjected to. Mr. Yarmolinsky is the son of a great and inspired and talented and creative parents. As Deputy Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, he has done an outstanding and valuable job for the American people. His talents were quickly and appreciatively recognized by our great President John Kennedy.

I regret that Mr. Yarmolinsky is leaving Government service, for I feel we are losing a great talent our country sorely and desperately needs.

However, Mr. Yarmolinsky will be teaching law at the great and respected Harvard University. This, of course, would make him suspect by the neanderthal and anti-intellectual element that is sometimes so vociferous—and unjust, as they are untruthful—in our country today.

Nevertheless, I take this opportunity to wish Mr. Yarmolinsky Godspeed in his future endeavors and hope that some day he will make available to our Government his exceptional talents and ability once again.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE CURTAILED

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, our national school lunch and special milk programs, which affect the health and welfare of millions of schoolchildren, are, in my opinion, two of our most valuable and needed federally subsidized programs.

I am strongly opposed to the budget slash of $82 million in the milk program. Congress appropriated $103 million for fiscal 1966, and this program has proved to be one that has rendered great value for the dollar spent. It is one of our most effective means of reaching children of poverty and of insuring good eating habits and balanced diets for these children.

The school lunch and milk programs were begun years ago with two main objectives: First, to provide milk and hot lunches to thousands of children who otherwise would not receive them; and second, to assist the oppressed farmer and utilize surplus farm foods and milk acquired by the Government. These programs have given well-balanced, hot lunches to schoolchildren at the lowest possible cost to them, and the less fortunate who cannot afford it have received the lunches free. They should continue to do so. Congress did not intend these cutbacks.

Mr. Speaker, we continually strive for a more healthy young America. Our Government encourages and supports physical fitness programs in our schools, and we are participating in overseas child-feeding programs. We continue to extend and expand programs to reach the needy and to improve child health and nutrition. We have the Headstart program under the Antipoverty Act, we have child welfare services, aid to dependent children, the food stamp plan, maternal and child health services—all good programs which I heartily support. It seems inconsistent, then, with our dedication to fight poverty, and to improve our Nation's health, to sacrifice the nutritional needs of schoolchildren, and especially at a time when we have such tremendous increases in school populations.

Presumably the new proposals would reach more needy children, and I laud the President for his intent. I believe the proposed pilot school breakfast program for schools in low-income areas is highly commendable, and I will support this proposal. I welcome and support any good program to improve the health of our young and aimed to reach more needy children, but in doing so, I do not believe it is necessary to curtail our present school milk program.

The special milk program for children is being used by 92,000 schools and child-care institutions throughout the country as a means of improving the nutrition of about 16 million children. In my State of New York 5,438 schools use the program, which benefits between 1.6 and 1.7 million children. Families of the lowest incomes—who most often have the largest number of children in school—are the very ones who will be hurt the most if the present milk program is curtailed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see any needy children in my congressional district deprived of this program, and I am sure that my colleagues in the House all share my views and concern.

The funds cut from the milk program should be restored. I urge every Member of the House to join me in seeking restoration of budget cuts in full and to support the continuation of this program in its present form. If this is not done, I will support legislation to set up a permanent children's special milk program.

THE LUMBER AND PLYWOOD GRADE MARKING ACT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Lumber and Plywood Grade Marking Act. It is my understanding that Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, is introducing similar legislation in the Senate today. Our able and distinguished colleague from Illinois, JOHN KLUCZYNSKI, is also proposing a virtually identical bill and I am most pleased and honored to have Congressman KLUCZYNSKI's support.

The purpose of this legislation is to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, lumber manufacturers and others against false grade marking of lumber and to strengthen the standards program of the lumber industry.

We propose to bar from interstate commerce any lumber which is not properly grademarked unless it is prominently marked "ungraded." Through this means the consumer will be adequately warned of the quality, or possible lack of quality, of the lumber which is purchased. In view of the tremendous and continuing use of lumber if the construction of homes and other buildings used for human habitation, the Congress can do no less than provide this basic protection.

I wish to make it crystal clear that whatever problems have arisen in the misgrading of lumber can be traced to a few unscrupulous operators, rather than the vast bulk of honest businessmen engaged in the lumber industry.

Congressional action is required because much of the lumber used in construction is transported over State lines and local jurisdictions are virtually powerless to enforce safe standards.

This bill represents a middle way, a course of moderation. We propose to strengthen the industry's own standards and means of enforcement, under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce, rather than injecting direct Federal grading. This proposal constitutes a vehicle which can be utilized to bring the Federal Government and the responsible leadership of the lumber industry together in an effective drive to eliminate deception in the grade marking of lumber and, thereby, to safeguard the public interest.

We provide realistic penalties should the legislation be violated. Improper grading and use of counterfeit grade stamps is made a crime. Injured parties are permitted to bring civil treble damage action. The Federal district courts are empowered to issue injunctions against improper practices.

There is reasonable question as to whether our objectives can best be achieved by the bill as I have drafted it or whether separate legislation concerning plywood would be advisable. I am quite sure that the appropriate committee will study this question. Public hearings will help to clarify the potential impact of this legislation although I do wish to report that the proposal now being introduced has already benefited from extensive consultation both within and without the lumber industry.

We look forward to early hearings and an opportunity to perfect and strengthen the bill. Much work remains to be done but protection of the American consumer and the vitality of our essential lumber industry requires that Congress move quickly and resolutely in this field.

CHICAGO: A BIG CITY MEETS ITS PROBLEMS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, while most big cities are running downhill and are beset with problems encompassing such broad areas as welfare programs, urban renewal, clogged traffic arteries, and racial tension, Chicago is setting an example for other major cities to follow. Our great city, under the outstanding leadership of Mayor Richard J. Daley, is meeting its problems head on, and is making thoroughgoing and vigorous efforts to solve them and to make progress toward real improvements which all its citizens may enjoy.

In the U.S. News & World Report for March 28, 1966, an article appears on what Chicago has accomplished to date and its plans for the future. It is my pleasure to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CHICAGO: A BIG CITY MEETS ITS PROBLEMS

How does a metropolitan center keep from running downhill to destruction? Chicago has all the troubles of other big cities. Yet it is making progress in tackling urban blight, crime, debt, pollution, other problems. It has even cut welfare costs. Still, it's not yet a promised land.

Chicago, the Nation's second-largest city, has the same agonizing problems that plague all big urban centers. But there's one big difference.

Chicago is trying—perhaps a bit harder than others—to solve its problems. It is tackling them with the energy and zest that always have characterized this bustling capital of mid-America.

And what is happening here—the successes and shortcomings—may provide a blueprint for what needs to be done if a city's people, business and institutions are to be served.

THE FIRST STEPS

Here you find a city in action. The downtown area is being revitalized. Big, new apartment, office, commercial, and government buildings of striking architectural design are forming a new skyline.

Miles of clean public beaches line Lake Michigan. There are hundreds of parks, scores of housing and renewal projects, public parking lots and garages, new and enlarged schools in every neighborhood. A fast, efficient transportation system speeds commuters to and from work.

In Chicago, the crime rate actually is falling. Welfare rolls and costs are dropping.

If you live in the city, you may pay lower taxes than suburbanites pay. The city's debt is being held down.

Chicago, moreover, is proud of a string of awards for budget and purchasing policies; for clean streets, pure water, good fire prevention, traffic safety.

YET TO BE SOLVED

Has Chicago solved its problems to become a kind of promised land? Hardly. If you look behind the city's achievements, you find these sore spots:

A continuing flight of middle-income families—usually a stabilizing element—from the city.

Deteriorating neighborhoods and growing racial tension.

A loss of industry and jobs, plus miles and miles of poverty-stricken areas.

An approaching crisis in financing new programs.

The dangers of air and water pollution, clogged traffic.

An active crime syndicate.

Discontent with the school system.

A political deadlock between Chicago and the rest of the State.

Yet Chicago is working on all these problems—and making some progress, too. Even some of the loudest critics concede that pressures being applied are forcing changes.

THE POPULATION TURNOVER

Probably the most far-reaching problems here stem from the movement of Negroes into Chicago, and of whites out of the city. This has created difficulties in employment, welfare, housing, education, tax revenue—the whole range of social problems.

Chicago's population of 3.6 million has held steady for about 15 years. However, between 1950 and 1964, the white population dropped by 462,000, and the nonwhite population rose by 441,000. Today, Negroes make up about one-fourth of the population. There are more Negroes in the city than in the entire State of Mississippi.

The Negro ghettos have spread gradually through the south and west sides of town. White families in their path have sold out and moved to the suburbs. So have businesses. And the process continues. There are small signs of a change in this trend: a trickle of Negro families into all-white suburbs; a slowdown in the migration of Negroes from the South; some outmigration of Negroes to other parts of the country; a diminishing birth rate for Negroes. These developments, if continued, may be significant in the long run.

FACTORIES FOR RENT

Industry has moved out of Chicago at a faster rate than it has been replaced. There are whole square miles in the city where no new building has taken place in the last 10 years. When industry and property owners leave, sources of tax revenue are lost.

Attempts are being made to fight this trend. The city offers to help business to find suitable land for new facilities. Special zoning sometimes is applied, such as closing off a street to permit a company to expand.

Rebuilding of downtown office space is encouraged. This has staved off a loss of office jobs.

Because so much of the available labor is untrained, about 100,000 job openings now exist in the metropolitan area. Basic education and job training programs for adults are being offered under the sponsorship of government agencies and private employers.

That some of these efforts are paying off is shown in a look at the incomes of Negroes. Although the majority of Negroes remain in the low-income group, the Negro middle class is expanding.

A study by the city's commission on human relations reported that the proportion of nonwhite families in Chicago earning $6,000 or more a year rose from 4.4 percent in 1950 to 34.1 percent in 1960. Home ownership by Negroes has climbed rapidly. Negro purchasing power is increasing, creating new markets in the city.

CHANGING NEIGHBORHOODS

Chicago is given good marks for achievement in providing better housing for its residents. James C. Downs, Jr., chairman of the Real Estate Research Corp., which analyzes urban problems the world over, says the city has good, dynamic housing construction and replacement, mainly by private development.

In Government-financed housing and renewal, Mr. Downs says, "Chicago was way out front in taking advantage of opportunities. Some people think we are creating slums faster than we are destroying them, but the fact is that simply is not true."

In low-cost public housing, this expert adds: "Quantitatively, the city has done a fair job. Qualitatively, it probably has concentrated too much in nonwhite areas. But that's because of resistance to public housing in white neighborhoods."

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been poured into public housing and neighborhood redevelopment. Some of this money appears to have been wasted.

The low-rent housing project called Robert Taylor Homes—the world's biggest—is a 15-block string of high-rise buildings housing 28,000 people—almost all Negroes. It cost $70 million and has become a vertical "ghetto." Few people now defend the project. City officials say that Federal regulations that emphasized cost per unit forced them to employ the crowded high-rise concept in its buildings. Newer housing projects are more spacious, less crowded.

Can anything be done to halt the flight of whites to the suburbs and the growth of Negro ghettoes? Mr. Downs thinks that the key to this problem is the schools—that white families will stay in the cities if they can be assured that the number of nonwhites in schools will be an acceptable percentage. He explains:

"This is not really a racial thing. The idea that most whites object to having a Negro neighbor is specious. The real problem comes when a white is convinced that his entire neighborhood will become nonwhite. He thinks so, and he is right—that is exactly what is happening in central cities. So the white man moves. A majority group, when its majority is threatened by an identifiable minority group, will get out."

The exception, housing experts say, is where there is an element of management in housing patterns. Examples in Chicago include an integrated apartment project called Prairie Shores, and the Hyde Park-Kenwood area, where renewal was fostered by the University of Chicago.

If people know, as they do in those two places, that members of a race will remain at a certain percentage, both white and nonwhite will live in peace side by side, this theory goes. It is a kind of social zoning.

REBUILDING CHICAGO

Rebuilding in many areas is proceeding at a fast clip. One whole neighborhood—Old Town—has been renovated. It has antique shops, restaurants, entertainment, gift shops, clothing stores, art galleries. Old Town has become a fashionable place to live.

Lake Meadows, an integrated apartment complex with a shopping center, has replaced a slum area on the South Side just west of the Loop, a college campus opened a year ago as a branch of the University of Illinois. Enrollment now is 8,200 and is expected to rise to 25,000 by 1974. A convention center called McCormick Place was built on the lakefront and opened in 1960.

Downtown, a new civic center and other government buildings have gone up. Several firms have built eye-arresting syscrapers. One new building will be John Hancock Center, a combination residential and commercial structure of 100 floors. It will be the city's tallest building. Construction is underway. The twin round towers of Marina City, on the Chicago River, are already widely known.

A long-range goal is to tear down the elevated railroad tracks in the Loop. As for the rundown buildings seen all around the city, Mayor Richard J. Daley has said: "In the next 2 years we will eliminate every slum and blighted building in Chicago."

STORM OVER SCHOOLS

For many months, Chicago has been torn by controversy over its public schools. At the center of the storm is the general superintendent, Benjamin C. Willis, who has been in that post since 1953.

In the last decade, about 250 new schools and additions have been built. Class sizes have been reduced to an average of 32 pupils, from 39. Special education programs—classes for the culturally deprived, health services, adult education, psychological services—have been undertaken. Teachers' salaries have been increased. The school budget rose from $158 million in 1953 to $387 million this year. But the school system continues to be in trouble.

Much of the controversy is the result of de facto segregation inherent in the neighborhood school system. Last year, 48 business and civic leaders called for the school board to establish immediately a "positive policy and program to eliminate segregation."

This would be difficult. Officials agree that white families take their children out of public schools when Negro enrollment rises. Negroes now outnumber whites in the city's public schools.

Most children attend schools where enrollment is predominantly of one race.

SCHOOLS: VERY GOOD TO VERY BAD

One educator here says it is impossible to evaluate the school system as a whole—it's too big for that; that the quality of education in Chicago schools ranges from very good to very bad.

Criticism is not confined to the location of schools or assignment of pupils. There are complaints of inadequate textbooks and shortages of books; inferior teaching and overcrowding, especially in slum schools; lack of discipline in some schools; shortages of teaching specialists; dilapidated facilities and faulty equipment; neglect of "average" students. Many white parents say Chicago's schools generally do not measure up to standards of education in the suburbs.

Dr. Willis has become the symbol of all these problems and the target of most criticism. Civil-rights groups have demanded that he be fired. The school board refused to oust him but agreed to a compromise whereby Dr. Willis will retire when he becomes 65 next December.

Last autumn, another crisis arose. After charges of racial discrimination were made, the Federal Government temporarily withheld $30 million in school aid for Chicago. But Mayor Daley is said to have great influence in Washington. The funds were quickly restored, though the matter is still not settled. A Federal team has been in Chicago, investigating the discrimination charges.

WELFARE COSTS DOWN

At a time when welfare rolls have swollen in many cities, both volume and cost of public aid in Chicago have been declining.

Public aid in Cook County, which encompasses Chicago, reached a peak in May 1962, with 290,000 persons on relief at a cost of $17.3 million a month. Last January 256,000 persons in the county—mostly in Chicago—received $15.9 million in public aid.

As in other cities, the big increases over the years have been in aid to dependent children. Recently, in Chicago, these rolls have declined slightly. January was the fifth straight month to show a reduction.

Some of the decrease in welfare here might be attributed to economic prosperity. But welfare costs are rising in other prosperous places.

Raymond M. Hilliard, director of the Cook County department of public aid, believes the decline is due largely to programs, started in 1962, to give basic education to illiterate or semi-illiterate adults on relief, followed up by job training. People on relief have been trained in such skills as typing, welding, sewing, packaging, taxi driving, service-station work, food preparation and as nurses' aids and domestic workers. This rehabilitation service placed more than 13,000 persons in private employment in 1965.

The department holds a club over persons on relief. Anyone who does not attend education or training courses, and cannot offer a valid excuse, can be taken off welfare. In practice, a department official says, the number who have lost their aid is "negligible."

THE DISSENTERS

Despite general approval of the welfare program, there are dissenters. One is Prof. Alan D. Wade, of the school of social service at the University of Chicago. He says:

"We have allowed our desire to save money to destroy families even further. The department has gone too far with the idea that the best thing for women on relief is to go to work." Mr. Wade has no quarrel with job training for men, but he thinks that women on relief should not be forced into low-paying jobs when they have children to care for.

Mr. Wade also objects to the policing and harassment of welfare recipients by case workers. He thinks the workers spend too much time on such chores and not enough on rehabilitation. One result, he says, is a high turnover of social workers who become discouraged by their police work. He calls the welfare program bureaucracy run wild.

THE CRIME PICTURE

While crime rates keep going up in many cities, the story in Chicago is different. Major crime has decreased in each of the last 3 years. Last year, major crimes here fell 12 percent below the 1964 figures. However, two categories of major crime, homicide, and rape, increased slightly.

Most of the credit for the drop in crime is given to O. W. Wilson, former dean of the University of California's school of criminology, who became superintendent of a scandal-ridden Chicago police force in 1960.

Mr. Wilson has cracked down on police corruption, expanded the force, helped raise morale by increasing salaries. He completely reorganized the department and its methods. More police cars now patrol the streets and alleys. A new radio system has been installed which helps direct officers to the scenes of crimes more quickly. A public-education program has been encouraging people to report crimes—and many now do.

A computer analyzes crime trends day by day and provides officers with data that suggest changes in patrol patterns and enforcement policies. More Negroes have been recruited and promoted, improving police relations with the Negro population. Police officers now get legal advice from experts on procedures to improve chances of getting criminals convicted.

A major problem that remains is the crime syndicate, which has embarrassed and plagued Chicago since the days of Al Capone. The mob now controls some legitimate business and operates in more sinister ways. But city, county and Federal crimebusters keep fighting organized crime with variable success.

POLLUTION PROBLEMS

U.S. health officials have called Chicago's program of air-pollution control a model for the country. An air-monitoring network dispatches patrol cars to places where the pollution code is being violated. There have been crackdowns on the burning of debris and junked cars, and on industrial processes that pour out excessive smoke. Steel companies in the area have started a 5-year, $50 million program to curb air pollution.

The problem is far from solved. There is no control of auto exhausts. And homes and industries still put thousands of tons of pollutants into the air.

The water situation also is deteriorating. In the past, Chicago used unprocessed water from Lake Michigan. As this water became more contaminated, the city built filtration plants at intake points. Unlike some other major cities on the Great Lakes, Chicago has kept its swimming beaches open, but increasing pollution is threatening these beaches, too.

On February 2, the U.S. Water Control Administration, newly armed with enforcement powers, ordered industries in the huge steel, petroleum, and chemical complex at the south end of Lake Michigan to meet strict new standards of water quality by the end of 1968. Some industries already have spent millions to purify water and waste that they dump into the lake. The entire cost to the industries for this program in the Chicago area may reach $100 million.

Federal officials are calling the new plan here a blueprint for the whole country. They say that improvements in the condition of lake water should show up by this summer.

TRANSIT BREAKTHROUGH

Several Chicago-based railroads have shown how to move commuters rapidly—and on time—and still make a profit on the service.

One railroad executive says that commuter service by rail can be successful if customers are given modern, comfortable cars and can rely on regularly scheduled departures and arrivals. Commuter railroads here have invested heavily in new equipment, such as air-conditioned, well-lighted cars. Some have modernized ticket handling, shaved costs by cutting payrolls and eliminating inefficient operating procedures. Even though fares have gone up, improved service has attracted more customers. The city-owned Chicago Transit Authority has been modernized and is praised for providing fast, efficient service.

Plans are being made for a downtown subway system connecting all commuter services. City planners now are studying how such a system should be built. Behind the idea is the hope of reducing traffic congestion. On a typical weekday in May 1965, a count showed that 475,000 people entered the central business district via mass transit, and 276,000 arrived in private autos.

GROWTH OF EXPRESSWAYS

Most drivers get to and from the downtown area on expressways. These superroads move toward the Loop from the northwest, west, southwest, and south—converging downtown at a massive interchange known as "spaghetti junction." Drivers on the expressways must brave bumper-to-bumper traffic as they approach the Loop or leave it in rush hours. Traffic on the north-south Lake Shore Drive is heavy, too, but usually less congested.

Latest big road proposal for Chicago and its environs is a north-south expressway on the west side of the city. It would link up with five other expressways and cost $300 to $500 million. People are calling it a stiltway because designers want to build it on stilts over an existing rail line. They claim this would avoid tearing down many homes and business buildings. Protests are mounting.

The expressway system here is controversial. Critics say it has aggravated traffic jams downtown, wasted central-city land and revenues from that land, increased costs for road maintenance and police, and discouraged the use of mass transit service.

One headache for Chicago is its skyway, an elevated toll road linked to the Indiana Turnpike and a freeway on the South Side. The trouble is that not enough drivers use the skyway. They choose free, alternate routes. The skyway cost $100 million. It has lost money since its opening in 1958, and is behind in interest payments on bonds.

METRO GOVERNMENT?

More and more leaders in Chicago believe the metropolitan area should be unified under some form of central government. Last summer, the Chicago Committee on Urban Progress—a voluntary group of civic leaders, including many who live in the suburbs—recommended establishment of a metropolitan government.

No detailed plan was proposed, but one step advocated by the committee was merger of the Chicago and Cook County governments to permit "coordinated action on countywide problems, while leaving to the cities and villages within the county those functions best handled in their jurisdiction." The county now has 457 separate governmental bodies, all with taxing powers.

The committee suggested that the metropolitan area would be better served if such matters as zoning regulations, mass urban transportation and revenue raising were coordinated. Not surprisingly, many suburban leaders are opposed to metro government because it would dilute their political power. But a good many businessmen here have been saying that the whole area depends on the central city, and if this core—Chicago—is weakened, the entire area suffers. Thus, they are calling on the suburbs to help Chicago with its problems.

PAYING CHICAGO'S WAY

Some of the city's services are paid for directly by users, in such ways as water-service charges, motor fuel taxes, a city vehicle license and revenue from O'Hare Airport. But probably the greatest burden for city expenses falls on property owners—businesses and individuals. There is no State or city income tax. From the State sales tax of 4 cents on the dollar, the city gets half a cent. Although property taxes have gone up over the years, city hall figures indicate that they still are lower in Chicago than in some of the suburbs.

Mayor Daley sought last year to avoid an increase in property taxes this year by asking the State legislature to double the city's share of the State sales tax, and to establish new city taxes on liquor and tobacco. The package would have raised $50 million. But it was denied.

State controls over local matters, from revenue to minor housekeeping matters, are a sore point in Chicago. Mayor Daley's mighty Democratic machine here often is frustrated by the Republicans in Springfield, the State capital.

Chicago frequently turns to Washington for big amounts of cash—and gets it. Federal money has helped to pay for the expressways, public welfare, urban renewal, education, public housing, health programs and airports.

Admits Mayor Daley: "We couldn't carry on many of our programs without Federal aid."

Chicago has a relatively good debt position. Its net per capita bonded debt—including the city's share of bonded debt of Cook County and other other local taxing bodies—is far below that of New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, or Detroit.

THE MAN WHO RUNS CHICAGO

Mayor Daley, who is presiding over the changes taking place in Chicago, was born on the South Side. He was first elected to the office 11 years ago and is serving a third term. As a Democratic politician, he runs one of the strongest organizations in the country. A measure of his power, says an associate, is that Mayor Daley is a telephone call away from the President. The mayor enjoys the support and cooperation of many of the city's most influential business and professional men, clergymen, labor chiefs, and civic leaders. He is not blamed for all of Chicago's problems, nor is he credited with all of the city's achievements. It's more a team job.

Herbert V. Prochnow, a banker and former president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, says this: "We have hard problems in Chicago. Any big city does. But there is a willingness to work on them here, and to put aside politics. The relationship between the business community and the city administration is excellent."

Others have criticized the mayor for one-party rule. To that, he replies: "If you are doing a good job, what's the difference? Government is created to serve the public. The first question is, what is good for the people of Chicago? If my party can give superior representation and service, that's better than if we were politically divided and gave inferior service."

FIGHTING THE ESTABLISHMENT

Opponents of the mayor include, in addition to Republicans, a number of liberal Democrats, many Negro and civil-rights spokesmen. A coalition of civil-rights and peace groups has just been formed to battle the Daley organization and the combination of political, commercial, industrial, labor-union, religious and other powers that is known as the establishment.

Almost everything Mayor Daley does is lambasted by some opponent. In general, the complaints run like this: The Daley machine is patronage ridden. It plays up to white ethnic groups and buys Negro votes with jobs, welfare, public housing, and promises.

Further, these opponents claim: The establishment builds visible things such as skyscrapers, but overlooks the deeper problems in slums and schools. It pleases suburbanites with the commuter trains and expressways, but allows the lake front and parks to be eaten away. And, when the city does respond to people's needs, its actions are too little and too late.

WHAT A NEGRO THINKS

Edwin C. Berry, a Negro who is executive director of Chicago Urban League, is familiar with the city's most difficult problems—race relations and the plight of the Negroes. He also knows the powerful men in Chicago, and their opponents. He says:

"In the last 10 years, progress in race relations in Chicago has been remarkable—mainly because we had so far to go. Now, we are on the verge of major breakthroughs that may make Chicago the most progressive major city in the North. This has come about for various reasons.

"The major reason is the recognition of our problem by decisionmakers in the city's power structure, and their determination to do something about it. That goes for every decisionmaking person or organization, except for the school board and school administration. Religious leaders, business leaders, the city government and labor unions are committed to help.

"Now, a lot of criticism can be aimed at all these groups. Many people, including leaders, have thought that just because we are a little less unjust to Negroes today, everything's OK. I am sure we rate favorably with other cities—because their records are so bad. That's an odious comparison. We can't be proud of being way ahead of the worst. The question should be: How near are we to what we ought to be? The important thing is whether we've begun to work toward progress."

Mr. Berry thinks Chicago has begun. So do many others, who know what this city's problems were a decade ago—and the improvements that have been made since then.

"FACELESS" VIETCONG

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of March 21, 1966, which deals with the "Faceless Vietcong."

The editorial quotes from an article, written by George A. Carver, Jr., which appears in the April issue of Foreign Affairs magazine.

As the Baltimore Sun points out:

> Mr. Carver's article supports the general position of Secretary Rusk and other officials of the Johnson administration in that it finds that the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong are, basically, instruments of the Communist party of North Vietnam.
>
> They were inspired largely in North Vietnam, he (Carver) writes, and are controlled and energized from North Vietnam. It is incorrect, he feels, to think of either the Liberation Front or the Vietcong as non-Communist to any important extent, even though some non-Communists may be represented in them, and even though they are exploiting a social revolution which goes back a long way.

The editorial in its entirety will be of general interest, and it is with this in mind that I have asked permission of my colleagues to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

"FACELESS" IN VIETNAM

The leading article in the April issue of Foreign Affairs is a useful addition to our knowledge of the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam. The article, called "The Faceless Vietcong," was written by George A. Carver, Jr., who is identified by the magazine as a student of political theory and Asian affairs and a former officer of the U.S. aid mission in Saigon.

Mr. Carver's article supports the general position of Secretary Rusk and other officials of the Johnson administration in that it finds that the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong are, basically, instruments of the Communist Party of North Vietnam. They were inspired largely in North Vietnam, he writes, and are controlled and energized from North Vietnam. It is incorrect, he feels, to think of either the Liberation Front or the Vietcong as non-Communist to any important extent, even though some non-Communists may be represented in them, and even though they are exploiting a social revolution which goes back a long way.

Thus he writes that "the current struggle in South Vietnam is an historically rooted, political phenomenon of infinite complexity, particularly since it involves an externally directed Communist drive for power interlarded with a genuine indigenous social revolution. In analyzing such a phenomenon 'truth' is often a function of one's angle of vision, and myth is not always easy to distinguish from reality. Despite the fact that there are many aspects of the current situation in Vietnam concerning which confident assertion is a mark of ignorance or disingenuous intent, there are certain aspects of the insurgency, and of the Vietcong structure through which it is being waged, which are not open to intellectually honest dispute."

"There are unquestionably many non-Communists heroically serving in various components of the National Liberation Front out of a desire to redress genuine grievances or in the honest belief that they are thereby helping to build a better political structure for their native land," he goes on to say. "As an organization, however, the National Liberation Front is a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots, subject to the ultimate control of the Lao Dong (Communist) party in Hanoi."

In this analysis the Vietcong is identified essentially as a field command of Hanoi, and the National Liberation Front has no serious claim to be considered the sole legitimate voice of the people of South Vietnam. The Vietcong has been kept faceless, to the public, to mask its dependence on North Vietnam.

As Mr. Carver says, truth is hard to pin down. We would add that informed opinion, in a matter like this, becomes all the more valuable.

HAVANA MANIFESTO

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, here on the floor of this House I called the attention of my colleagues to an ominous conference which was held in Havana, Cuba, during the first 2 weeks of January of this year and which was attended by more than 600 leading Communists from the 3 continents of Asia, Africa, and South America.

I warned at that time that this Havana meeting constituted the revival of the Communist Internationale and that at this 2-week meeting the Communists had laid plans for a series of aggressions similar to what we are now experiencing in Vietnam, with subversion and terrorism as the main weapon in these bold attempts for Communist victory.

I said that one of the tragedies of our time is the fact that the American press has paid so little attention to this historic meeting wrought with danger to the entire free world.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to point out today that during the ensuing 6 weeks, more and more attention is being paid to the full significance of the Havana conference by some of America's most responsible publications. I have already included in the RECORD an excellent editorial which appeared on this subject in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Today, I would like to call attention to a penetrating article which appears this week in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, and also the very searching article prepared by Paul D. Bethel, which appeared in the current issue of the Reporter.

Because I consider this Havana conference so extremely important as a prelude to a better understanding of why we cannot abandon South Vietnam to the Communists, I am inserting both of these articles in the RECORD today.

I hope they will help our Nation better understand that what we are doing in Asia today is not fighting for a piece of real estate known as South Vietnam, but actually blocking the pattern of Communist conquest spelled out in Havana for three continents if the Communists should succeed in South Vietnam.

The two articles follow:

[From Barron's, Mar. 21, 1966]

HAVANA MANIFESTO: THE UNITED STATES IS AT WAR WITH A NEW COMMUNIST INTERNATIONALE

"Cuba is the new world headquarters for a master plan to subvert Latin American governments and accelerate guerrilla warfare in this hemisphere. The plan, drawn up at the three-continent Communist conference in Havana last January, calls for 'the use of every form of struggle ncessary, including armed battle * * *.' Although the Soviet Union managed the conference, the 'stars' attending were the guerrilla leaders of 'national liberation movements,' including those from the four 'fighting zones'—Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru. Latin American governments are so alarmed that the Organization of American States has condemned the conference's policy of aggression and intervention. Brazil's OAS Ambassador declared that except for the Soviet missiles in Cuba, 'no event threatens more dangerously the territorial and political integrity of our continent.' "

One publication rarely quotes from the pages of another, let alone from its publicity blurbs. Herewith, however, Barron's is pleased to reproduce the first paragraph of the release summarizing the contents of the current issue of The Reporter. Though open to the world press, as the magazine quietly observed, and followed closely in Europe, the Havana Conference "received little or no coverage in the major U.S. newspapers." Thus, the New York Times considered only one short, unilluminating dispatch from Reuter's fit to print. Time somehow succeeded in briefly mentioning the Conference without even hinting at its menacing import. (The same journal, however, last week managed to devote a cover story to "Eastern Europe—Life Under a Relaxed Communism.") CBS News apparently chose to ignore the whole affair.

Unlike the Iron Curtain, which supposedly isn't soundproof, a wall of silence has kept most Americans from learning the truth about Havana. Yet despite the remarkable lack of interest shown by so many great media of communication, the tricontinental conference was momentous news. With monolithic unity worthy of Stalin himself, the leaders of the global Communist conspiracy—including the "relaxed" East Europeans—in effect declared war on the Western Hemisphere.

Thereby the Communists willy-nilly did more. They served notice that the great achievements of private capital, such as the oilfields of Venezuela and the copper mines of Chile, have become prime targets in a class struggle which honors neither privileged sanctuaries nor national boundaries. They exposed the dangerous folly of the Fulbrights and know-nothings who refuse to acknowledge that the United States is fighting for survival. Finally, by flaunting their purpose in Havana, the Reds have flung down the gauntlet to a government which has vowed to prevent Cuba from becoming a base for revolution. "Don't worry," satirically proclaimed a bumper sticker in the fall of 1964. "They're still 90 miles away." But they're getting closer all the time.

They're also growing bolder. In Havana, indeed, the Communists didn't trouble to conceal their aggressive designs. To head a 34-man delegation, the Kremlin sent Sharaf R. Rashidov, candidate member of the Presidium of the Central Committee. Mr. Rashidov quickly set the tone. "The Soviet delegation," he said, "came to this conference to promote in every conceivable way the unity of anti-imperialist forces of the three continents, so as to unfold on a still greater scale our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism headed by U.S. capitalists." The Conference then proceeded to accept resolutions which some reporter might have thought worth noting. One called for recognition of the National Liberation Front (the Vietcong) as the legitimate government of Vietnam. Another urged "the most powerful support" for the U.S. civil rights movement, adding that "in the uprisings in Watts, Los Angeles, and Chicago, the Afro-Americans openly declared that they were fighting * * * in a common cause with their Vietnamese brothers." The Conference demanded "total eradication of Yankee military installations in Puerto Rico," and urged maximum effort by those "who are fighting with arms in their hands against the forces of domestic oligarchy which are in the service of the United States, as in Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and Guatemala, or are being subject to brutal persecution under military tyranny, as in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, and other countries."

Long before the latest call to arms, Red-inspired violence had flared up throughout Latin America. Three years ago, according to the Reporter, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee listed 10 known guerrilla training camps in Cuba; today over 40, capable of turning out 10,000 activists yearly, are functioning. In Venezuela Red terrorists have captured and held as hostage U.S. military personnel; last December, the wife of a Caracas lawmaker was killed by a bomb concealed in a statue of the Virgin Mary. Communist bands roam through Colombia and Guatemala, where they have raised kidnaping to a high criminal art; in Peru Red guerrillas launched a near revolt which Lima has had trouble putting down. Last week President Eduardo Frei, of Chile, denounced an illegal walkout which recently shut down Anaconda's El Salvador mine and triggered a clash costing more than a dozen lives, blaming the strike and ensuing violence squarely on the Communists.

To both open provocation and hidden aggression, the United States, which officially clings to the myth of "good" and "bad" Communists, has largely failed to respond. True, mounting congressional hostility has persuaded the administration quietly to shelve some of its plans for expanding trade and otherwise "building bridges" between East and West. However, despite such atrocities as the death of Salesman Newcomb Mott, Washington still promotes travel and hopefully pushes so-called cultural exchanges with Iron Curtain countries. Other Western Hemisphere capitals have learned better. In 1962, after suppressing a Castro-inspired uprising financed by the Czech legation, Ecuador severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Two years later, upon discovering the source of the rebellious tin miners' arms, Bolivia broke with the busy Czechs. Tracking down the perpetrators of the Caracas bombing, the authorities found them to be "specialists from Havana, Moscow, and Peking who are trying to penetrate Venezuela and carry out terrorist operations."

Last month the Organization of American States laid it on the line. OAS roundly denounced the Havana manifesto as "an act contrary to the peace and security of the hemisphere." It also declared that sovereign states must answer "not only for the open use of force against another but also for giving support to any of the indirect forms of aggression, such as the promotion of civil strife in another state, or the organization of armed bands and the furnishing of war material or elements of combat and of money with offensive intentions against another."

In a press conference on September 13, 1962, the late President Kennedy flatly stated: "If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies." To judge by all the foregoing, that time has come. The United States is at war not only with the Vietcong and North Vietnam but also with a new Communist Internationale. Until it learns to recognize the enemy, it cannot hope to win.

[From the Reporter, Mar. 24, 1966]

THE HAVANA CONFERENCE

(By Paul D. Bethel)

During the first 2 weeks of January while President Johnson was still conducting his "peace offensive," a tricontinental Communist Conference was in progress in Havana whose overriding purpose was to organize worldwide subversion against the United States. With Fidel Castro as host and officially designated as the First Conference of the Solidarity of Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the assembly brought together some 600 delegates and observers from 82 countries in the 3 continents. From January 3 to January 15, the delegates debated, plotted, harangued, and egged each other on to even greater militancy against the United States and its "imperialist stooges." Hanoi and the Vietcong were duly represented. So were China and the Soviet Union, with large delegations whose rivalry—and eventual adjustment—provided one of the high spots of the conference. More immediately important was the high-pitched determination, repeated in scores of speeches and resolutions, to step up the pace of terror and subversion in Latin America.

Although the Havana Conference received little or no coverage in the major U.S. newspapers, it was followed closely in Europe, where Le Monde of Paris, for example, published a series of detailed articles. In Latin America it caused profound dismay and was promptly denounced by an extraordinary session of the Organization of American States. Ambassador Ilmar Penna Marinho of Brazil, Chairman of the OAS Council, said of the Havana Conference that "Except for the placing of nuclear weapons in Cuba in October 1962, no event threatens more dangerously the territorial and political integrity of our continent."

Penna's alarm was echoed by most other members of the OAS Council and by the Latin American press generally. In Panama, a commentator of Radio Mia, noting the huge U.S. effort to contain communism in Vietnam, observed that "Communism exists next door to Florida, and there they do nothing * * *. It may be that they are afraid of it, or are keeping promises made to the Russians, while that insane bearded man raves daily about invading Latin America." El Universo in Ecuador underscored the importance which the Soviet leaders attach to the conference, and that "while the Russians continue to seek compromises with the United States, they are not disposed to pay any price" to this end.

THE SOVIET HAND

There was not much question that Moscow was the chief planner as well as omnipresent manager of the conference. Last December 9, a month before the delegates gathered in Havana, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko rose in the chambers of the Supreme Soviet and briefed its members on the tricontinental conference. "The Soviet Union," Tass quoted him, "in taking part in the Havana Conference * * * will do everything to help consolidate the front of struggle against imperialist aggression." On January 2, the two Soviet supreme leaders, Leonid I. Brezhnev and Alexei N. Kosygin, followed up with a message of greeting to the conference. As reported by Tass, the message read in part: "Today, Havana attracts the attention of all fighters against the forces of imperialist aggression and colonialism, and for the national and social liberation of peoples * * *. The U.S. imperialists are challenging all progressive forces."

The head of the 34-man Soviet delegation was Sharaf R. Rashidov, a candidate member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and first secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee of Uzbekistan. Speaking before the conference in Havana on January 6, he paid lip service to Russia's avowed "struggle for peace." But, foreshadowing one of the final resolutions of the conference, he made a sharp and significant qualification: "We believe," he said, "that relations among sovereign states with different public systems should be based on peaceful coexistence * * *. It is clear that there is not, nor can there be, any peaceful coexistence between the oppressed peoples and their oppressors."

Rashidov then told the conference what was expected of it. "The Soviet delegation," he said, according to the Tass dispatch, "came to this conference to promote in every conceivable way the unity of anti-imperialist forces of the three continents, so as to unfold on a still greater scale our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism, headed by the U.S. capitalists." Specifically, he pledged "fraternal solidarity with the armed struggle being waged by the Venezuelan, Peruvian, Colombian, and Guatemalan patriots for freedom against the stooges of imperialism."

The day-to-day work of the conference was carried out by numerous committees on social, political, and economic affairs, as well as a special Tricontinental Committee to Aid Vietnam. These provided the temporary machinery of the conference. What emerged by way of a permanent setup is more to the point. According to the chief of the Venezuelan delegation, Pedro Medina, "Only two organizations came out of the conference and they will rule—a General Secretariat which will receive all information concerning the three continents, make plans on the basis of the needs of each continent, and deliver its recommendations to an executive organ * * * named the 'Committee of Assistance and Aid for the Peoples Fighting for Their Liberation.'" This committee, which emerged as the central policy and strategy body for wars of subversion, included Soviet, Chinese, and Cuban members along with representatives of nine other participating nations. As for the General Secretariat, Havana was designated its headquarters, for the next 2 years at least, and Capt. Osmany Cienfuegos, the chairman of Cuba's three-man Foreign Relations Committee, was named secretary general. The question of its permanent headquarters was scheduled to be reviewed at the Second Tricontinental Conference, to be held in 1968 in Cairo at the invitation of President Nasser.

The 12-nation Secretariat also has equal representation from the 3 continents. Asia is represented by South Vietnam (Vietcong), North Korea, Syria, and Pakistan; Africa is represented by the United Arab Republic, Guinea, one member to be chosen from the Portuguese colonies, which the delegates have decided are to be "freed" and the Léopoldville Congo; Latin America by Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and Chile. One of the jobs of the Secretariat, as laid down at Havana, is to establish in each continent an action group to carry out the resolutions of the conference. The first of these was established 4 days after the conference adjourned, when the Secretariat announced the creation of a Latin American Solidarity Organization, with Havana as its permanent headquarters. It immediately began to issue calls to action.

THE NEW BREED

One of the major Soviet aims of the Havana Conference was to give direct support to guerrilla leaders rather than to the established Communist Parties of their countries. This became clear with the list of delegates, many of whom were little known or had never been heard of before. Absent was Fabricio Ojeda of Venezuela; in his place came Pedro Medina, leader of the Venezuelan National Liberation Front. Luis Corvalán, Secretary General of the Chilean Communist Party, and many other old-line Communist politicos were also missing. Senator Salvador Allende, the defeated Marxist candidate in Chile's presidential elections of 1964, headed the Chilean delegation, but he played only a minor role.

"The real stars," according to the correspondent of Le Monde, "were the lean, bronzed men who had arrived, after so many detours, from the guerrilla camps of the four 'fighting' zones of the hemisphere: Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru * * *." Népszabadság of Budapest also commented on the makeup of the delegations, emphasizing that the conference was not in the "hands of catastrophic politicians" but in the firm grip of Castro-type revolutionaries. The reason why Moscow had chosen at Havana to throw its weight behind the guerrillas, rather than the Communist Parties, was underscored by Le Monde's conclusion that the conference was clearly aimed at obtaining results "in direct action, and more precisely in armed action." It observed correctly that "With the exception of those in Venezuela and Colombia, the orthodox Communist Parties in Latin America up to now have shown no great enthusiasm for guerrilla wars."

The special publicity given to guerrilla spokesmen obviously reflected Soviet determination to capture control of the conference by giving the lie to China's familiar hard-line attack against Moscow's "appeasement" of the United States and its failure to lend all-out support to militant "wars of liberation." Throughout the conference, the Chinese delegates, as reported by Radio Peking, kept up a drumfire of criticism on this well-worn theme. In the end, the apparent contradiction between Russia's avowed policy of peaceful coexistence and the support it gave at Havana to the principle of "armed struggle" was resolved by typical Soviet logic. A special resolution on "peaceful coexistence" which was passed at the closing session of the conference on January 15 declared: "Peaceful coexistence applies only to relations between states with different social and political systems. It cannot apply to relations between social classes, between the exploited and the exploiters within separate countries, or between the oppressed peoples and their oppressors." This simply restated the Soviet line put forward a few days earlier by Rashidov.

The final declaration of the conference fully endorsed the thesis of "armed struggle." According to Tass, it "calls for expressions of militant, active, dynamic solidarity * * * for intensifying the anti-imperialist nature of the national liberation movements." The Chinese, it would seem, had reason to be satisfied. Even Castro's public and bitter denunciation of Peking the day before the conference opened, for backing down on its sugar-for-rice deal with Cuba did not discourage them. On January 19, after the close of the conference, the New China News Agency reported: "The Tricontinental Peoples' Solidarity Movement ran into various difficulties at the outset. However, in accordance with the will of the people of the three continents, the movement is sweeping forward with irresistible momentum."

To many observers, however, the most substantial success of the Chinese at Havana—and probably their major reason for being present—was to prevent the Russians and their Cuban allies from gaining exclusive control not only of the movement in Latin America but above all of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization. This group grew out of the Bandung Conference of 1955 and the Chinese have long regarded it as their own special charge, even to the point of attempting to exclude the Soviets from membership. Although the point was left somewhat cloudy, it appeared that AAPSO, while participating fully in the new tricontinental organization, would maintain its separate identity. For example, it was announced at Havana that AAPSO will hold its own conference next year in Peking.

THE JOBS TO BE DONE

The final declaration of the Havana conference is global indeed. The most significant of its general resolutions "proclaims the peoples' inalienable right to complete independence and the use of every form of struggle necessary, including armed battle, to win that right." It hailed the Vietnam war as "an inspiring example for the national liberation movement of the peoples of three continents." It urged a concerted campaign directed at the "governments of all peace-loving countries to recognize, de facto and de jure, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam as the sole genuine and legal representative of the South Vietnamese people." It urged "the most powerful support" for American Negroes and the civil rights movement, and stated that "In the uprisings in Watts Los Angeles and Chicago, the Afro-Americans openly declared that they were fighting against racism and U.S. imperialism in a common cause with their Vietnamese brothers."

As to Latin America, it called for maximum militancy by those "who are fighting with arms in their hands against the forces of domestic oligarchy which are in the service of the United States, as in Venezuela, Columbia, Peru, and Guatemala, or are being subjected to brutal persecution under military tyranny, as in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, and other countries."

"Latin America," the document said, "is the rear of the most powerful and barbarous imperialism in the world and the mainstay of colonialism and neocolonialism." It went on to map efforts to sabotage U.S. investments abroad: "Every blow dealt the United States and domestic oppressors by the Latin-American peoples has decisive effect in weakening U.S. imperialism." There are sections that deal with the "liberation" of Puerto Rico, which it classified as "under U.S. occupation," and the Dominican Republic, which, it said, has "set a valiant example of resistance to U.S. aggression." Puerto Rico's chief delegate, Norman Pietri, in addressing the conference on January 10, cited "the imperative need to win national independence in order to promote * * * total eradications of Yankee military installations in Puerto Rico and the threat they pose to the rest of Latin America."

Finally, the inspirational theme was summarized with a peroration: "Faced with the criminal alliance of the reactionary forces, the people of various countries in the three continents have reacted with active, vigorous, and militant solidarity, and with their readiness to reply to every act of imperialist aggression by revolutionary action, carrying on this battle until the complete liquidation of all forms of imperialist, colonial, and neocolonial oppression."

As already noted, the Latin American Solidarity Organization, created on January 19, was the first of the three continental action groups to emerge from the Havana Conference. According to Agence France-Press, the 27 Latin American delegations met with Fidel Castro and Pedro Medina of Venezuela. Cuban President Osvaldo Dórticos, the Cuban chiefs of staff of the army, and the principal Communist leaders were also present. In the course of the meeting it was decided that the organization would be permanently established in Cuba and that it would include representatives from all the Latin American countries, as well as Puerto Rico and Trinidad-Tobago. With Medina as its Secretary General, it will presumably come under the general control of Captain Cienfuegos and his tricontinental Secretariat.

Its operations are already underway. On February 12, the Latin American Solidarity

Organization backed a call to action by the Tricontinental Committee to Aid Vietnam, another permanent organization that emerged from the conference. This appeal urged the recently departed delegates to launch "a wave of sabotage against Yankee interests throughout the world." It also called for "demonstrations, sit-ins, protests, meetings, and denunciations in front of U.S. Embassies all over the world." A call also went out from Havana to "boycott production and refuse to load ships, or to transport arms or any kind of war material bound for North American troops."

Once again Puerto Rico came in for special attention. On February 10, according to El Imparcial, Puerto Rican "freedom fighters" established a "Free Puerto Rico" embassy in Havana, and on the same day signed a "pact of solidarity" with the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam at its Havana headquarters. The Puerto Ricans claimed that they were "recognized as the only legitimate representative of the Puerto Rican people." Shortly thereafter, 26 Latin American Communist delegations agreed to establish National Committees of Solidarity with Free Puerto Rico in their countries.

All members of the tricontinental organization must contribute funds to the Aid Vietnam Committee. One way to raise money was described by Pedro Medina in an interview broadcast by radio Havana. The Vietcong delegation had presented the helmet of a U.S. pilot shot down over North Vietnam to the Venezuelans. In turn, he said, "The Venezuelan NFL gave the helmet to the Tricontinental Committee to Aid Vietnam." He continued, "We will wage a campaign with it, on the island of Cuba and in Latin America, and we will carry it to every continent to give more impact and more brilliance to the week of solidarity with Vietnam which is scheduled for March on all three continents." Similar solidarity demonstrations are planned for the U.S. mainland and Puerto Rico.

THE CUBAN SPEARHEAD

Havana was a natural choice as the operational headquarters for worldwide subversion and wars of national liberation, for it is dedicatedly anti-American and pro-Soviet, and has a well-developed apparatus of subversion already active in the hemisphere. Following the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962, many of the obsolete Soviet military establishments in Cuba were converted into guerrilla training camps, and new camps have also been constructed. The U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee listed 10 such installations as early as 1963. Today, according to some intelligence estimates, there are 43 camps equipped to train as many as 10,000 activists a year—guerrillas, terrorists, propagandists, experts in sabotage and espionage, and specialists in sophisticated radio equipment. The basic training period lasts 4 months, with longer periods for certain categories.

When the guerrilla candidate arrives in Havana by a clandestine route, he is given a questionnaire on areas and personalities vulnerable to subversion techniques. He is asked, for example, about targets for sabotage and the terrain surrounding those targets, about homosexual tendencies among members of his hometown police force, army units, and politicians, and about tax irregularities condoned by local bureaucrats. This information, checked and rechecked by contacts in the country in question, provides a starting point for campaigns of subversion.

Castro's Soviet-financed fishing fleet is especially useful in bringing guerrilla recruits to Cuba and reinfiltrating them into their homelands. According to a defecting crew member of one of the ships, "Cuban patrol boats and fishing vessels are continually introducing arms and men into Mexican territory."

The Cuban training program is coordinated with international Communist subversion. Vietcong, Soviet, Red Chinese, and Spanish Communist instructors teach recruits from Africa as well as from Latin America. Cuban Negro instructors have been used to train African recruits in special camps established in the Provinces of Las Villas and Oriente. One, identified as Sádez Gómez García, was killed while operating with guerrillas in the eastern Congolese district of Maniema. A diary found on his body indicated that he had arrived in the Congo from Cuba via Moscow, Prague, and the Tanzanian capital, Dar-es-Salaam. Defected Castro officers state that 200 Africans have returned to Dar-es-Salaam following 8 months of leadership training in the Minas del Frío guerrilla camp in Cuba. On September 17, Congolese Government forces patrolling Lake Tanganyika intercepted and sank a troop and supply boat, the *Ajax*, which had been running Cuban-trained Congolese guerrillas from Tanzania into the eastern Congo. Last June, 27 Senegalese were tried in Dakar and found guilty of subversion. All 27, it was brought out at the trial, also had completed 8 months of training in Cuba.

Lumumba University in Moscow, according to a broadcast from the Soviet capital, is training thousands of Latin American students. The broadcast, beamed to Latin America in the Quechua language of the Indians of Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador, said that when these students return to their homelands, "They will teach their brothers the modern techniques they have learned. But they will do more than teach * * *. They will fight alongside peasants and humble people to insure that their countries have freedom."

The collaboration between Cuba and Soviet-bloc embassies in Latin-American subversion is exemplified in Ecuador, which broke relations with Cuba, Czechoslovakia, and Poland in April 1962. After an uprising launched by a youth organization that took its inspiration from Castro, the government found that the Czech legation had been handing over funds to the Ecuadorian Communist Party obtained through the sale of Skoda trucks and other Communist-bloc products. Poland was also involved. Bolivia broke with Czechoslovakia in October 1964, when the embassy in La Paz was shown to have delivered 500,000 Bolivian pesos to rebellious tin miners that were used to buy Czech weapons.

Venezuela, under almost constant attack for years from Cuban-supported guerillas and terrorists, discovered last October that the Communists had set up an efficient underground arms factory on the outskirts of Caracas. There were "enough explosives to blow up Caracas," according to a Cabinet Minister, and the Director General of the Interior Ministry declared that "specialists from Havana, Moscow, and Peking are trying to get into Venezuela to execute terrorist operations" planned for 1966—what they called "The Year of the Explosives."

Castro-trained men have also infiltrated the notorious bandit groups of Colombia that have extorted more than a million dollars' ransom from relatives of 148 Colombian ranchers kidnaped over the past few years. Kidnaping has been used to raise funds by guerrillas in Guatamala, as well as to create an atmosphere of terror to disrupt the recent elections there. And in the remote valleys and mountains of Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala, minor government officials and pro-government peasants are sometimes murdered, Vietcong style. Che Guevara's "Guerrilla Warfare" is the handbook for Latin-American rebel leaders: it preaches the same tactics urged by the Tricontinental Conference "to sow seeds of discord everywhere and keep the oligarchs busy putting out the fires."

The Soviet Union has backed up its investment in direct support for subversion by diplomatic maneuvers in the United Nations. It has striven constantly to divert OAS complaints against Cuban subversion from the OAS to the Security Council, where the Soviet veto could block any punitive measures. It has also succeeded in heading off in the world body any definition of aggression that would include "wars of liberation."

At the same time, Moscow has pursued its double track policy of peaceful coexistence, attempting to maintain friendly diplomatic relations with the very governments its agents are working to destroy. In Uruguay, on the verge of bankruptcy and beset with social problems as a result of a disastrously overextended welfare state, the Soviets found one of the hemisphere's weakest points. The oversized embassy in Montevideo has long been the center of a clandestine network extending throughout Latin America. In December Soviet agents were accused by the government of having engineered a strike that paralyzed the country for days. This intervention, according to one Latin American expert in Washington, was an "act of supreme contempt" for Uruguay's weakness.

The Uruguayan Foreign Minister asked the Soviet Ambassador for an explanation of his Government's role at the Havana conference and was not impressed by the answer that Sharaf Rashidov was speaking "privately." National Council President-elect Alberto Heber Usher called the reply "insulting." Heber has now vowed to muster the votes in Uruguay's ruling nine-man National Council to break relations with Moscow as a first step toward diplomatic rupture with the Communist powers.

In other Latin American countries, particularly those most exposed to subversion, the leaders did not mince words either. Peruvian Premier Daniel Becarra de la Flor said that the Soviet Union was involved in "tacit aggression," and that Delegate Rashidov's statements in Havana now made Soviet activities in Peru official. Minister of the Interior Gonzalo Barrios Bustillos of Venezuela recommended the use of force to combat the subversion planned at the conference, which he told Agence France-Presse "is nothing more or less than a consequence of the blind struggle the Communists are waging against the United States, particularly in southeast Asia." In 1964, the Cuban newspaper Revolución had made more or less the same point, declaring that "Colombia and Venezuela form the embryo of a vast Latin American Vietnam."

The resolution which the OAS passed on February 2 "emphatically" condemned the policy of aggression and intervention adopted at Havana. Chile and Mexico abstained, saying that while they deplored intervention from whatever source, they considered the resolution exceeded the Council's powers. The U.S. alternate delegate, Ward Allen, voted in favor, but was less fiery than some of his Latin American colleagues. The resolution denounced in particular "the open participation * * * of official or officially sponsored delegations of member states of the United Nations" which on December 21 had voted in the General Assembly in favor of a nonintervention and self-determination resolution. Among those voting in favor was the Soviet Union, which a few days later sent its delegation to Havana.

The central issue was stated before the OAS by Colombian Ambassador Alfredo Vázquez Carrizosa, who said, "If there is to be war and no peace, let it at least be known who declared it."

A LAND NAMED BYELORUSSIA

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there is a land named Byelorussia, and a people named Byelorussians, and in that land and among those people there dwells a thirst for freedom.

As with many of the other areas along the western, northern, and southern reaches of the Soviet Union, the Byelorussians did not enter that union by free choice. They were dragooned into the Soviet state by force of conquest, just as they had once been held into the Russian Empire by the czars.

In the aftermath of the collapse of the Russian front against the Kaiser in World War I, the Byelorussians seized their opportunity to proclaim their independence. Everything was fluid, and a new Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born on March 25, 1918.

Then came the collapse of the Kaiser's armies, and into the vacuum the Red army marched. Overwhelming forces smashed the defenders of the new republic, and there was created instead a so-called Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic—simply an administrative arm of the Moscow government, a new tyranny imposed by superior force.

Byelorussians throughout the free world will celebrate March 25 as the symbol of their national aspirations. Americans of Byelorussian descent celebrate this day as a symbol of what should be recognized as their fatherland's national and political rights.

It is good that this occasion be celebrated in this House, which is a spokesman for freedom.

PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON'S STATEMENT ON NATO

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Congressional Record the text of the remarks of President Johnson, delivered this morning at the Foreign Service Institute.

The President's remarks are directed to one central issue: The problems which are confronting NATO and our determination to maintain that organization as an effective force for the preservation of peace and order in the North Atlantic area.

Just recently, the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs undertook a series of hearings directed at the problems confronting the North Atlantic Alliance.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have been delighted by the response which our undertaking has evoked among Members of Congress. I have long felt that in our very necessary yet almost total concentration on problems in southeast Asia, we have been paying too little attention to the developments taking place in the North Atlantic community.

During the past 2 weeks, our subcommittee has received testimony from our Ambassador to France, the Honorable Charles Bohlen; the Honorable John Leddy, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs; and the Honorable John McNaughton, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

In the weeks to come, we will receive additional testimony from Under Secretary of State George Ball and from other governmental as well as private witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert the text of President Johnson's remarks this morning and to commend them to the attention of the membership of the House of Representatives:

Text of the Remarks of the President to Foreign Service Institute at State Department

Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to address the Foreign Service Institute this morning and to meet with so many Americans preparing to serve abroad. As one who believes we cannot shorten our reach into the world, I am encouraged by the number and quality of those who are studying at the Institute. You have the gratitude of your countrymen and my own assurance of support. We have come a long way from the day someone observed that "Some diplomat no doubt will launch a heedless word and lurking war leap out."

That was more than half a century ago when diplomacy was often war by another name. Today your task is different. Those of you about to go abroad represent a continuity of purpose in a generation of change. That purpose is to build from reason and moderation a world order in which the fires of conflict yield to the fulfillment of man's oldest yearnings for himself and his family.

Your job, wherever you serve, is peace. That is the task facing all of us today.

The question, as always, is how? How do we, for example, maintain the security of the Atlantic community upon which so many of the world's hopes depend?

For the answer we must begin with the gray dawn of the world of 1945, when Europe's cities lay in rubble, her farms devastated, her industries smashed, her people weary with war and death and defeat.

From that desolation has come abundance.

From that weakness has come power.

From those ashes of holocaust has come the rebirth of a strong and vital community.

The Europe of today is a new Europe. In place of uncertainty, there is confidence; in place of decay, progress; in place of isolation, partnership; in place of war, peace.

If there is no single explanation for the difference between Europe then and Europe today, there is a pattern. It is a luminous design woven through the history of the past 20 years. It is the design of common action—of interdependent institutions serving the good of the European nations as though they were one. It is the design of collective security protecting the entire Atlantic world.

So I come this morning to speak to you of one important part of that design—I speak of a structure some of you have helped to build: The North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Let me make clear in the beginning that we do not believe there is any righteousness in standing pat. If an organization is alive and vital—if it is to have meaning for all time as well as for any particular time—it must grow and respond and yield to change. Like our Constitution—which makes it the law of the land—the North Atlantic Treaty is more than a legal document. It is the foundation of a living institution. That institution is NATO—the organization created to give meaning and reality to the alliance commitments.

The crowded months which immediately preceded and followed the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty 17 years ago had produced an atmosphere of crisis. It was a crisis born of deep fear: fear for Europe's economic and political vitality—fear of Communist aggression and Communist subversion.

Some say that new circumstances in the world today call for the dismantling of the Organization. Of course NATO should adapt to the changing needs of the times. But we believe just as firmly that such change must be wrought by the member nations working with one another within the alliance. Consultation, not isolation, is the route to reform. We must not forget, in success and abundance, the lessons we learned in danger and isolation: that whatever the issue, we share one common danger—division—and one safety—unity.

What is our view of NATO today?

We see it not as an alliance to make war but an alliance to keep the peace. Through an era as turbulent as man has ever known—and under the constant threat of ultimate destruction—NATO has insured the security of the North Atlantic community. It has reinforced stability elsewhere in the world.

While NATO rests on the reality that we must fight together if war should come to the Atlantic area, it rests also on the reality that war will not come at all if we act together during peace. It was the Foreign Minister of France who, in 1949, insisted that to be truly secure, Europe needed not only help in resisting attack but help in preventing attack. "Liberation," he said, "is not enough."

The success of NATO has been measured by many yardsticks. The most significant to me is the most obvious: War has been deterred. Through the common organization, we have welded the military contributions of each of the 15 allies into an effective instrument. So convincing was this instrument that potential aggressors took stock and counted as too high the price of satisfying their ambitions. It has been proved true that "one sword keeps another in the sheath."

War has been deterred not only because of our integrated military power, but also because of the political unity of purpose to which that power is bent. It is difficult to overstate the importance of the bonds of culture, of political institutions, traditions, and values which form the bedrock of the Atlantic community. There is here a political integrity and an identity of interests that transcends the personalities and issues of the moment.

If our collective effort should falter—and our common determination be eroded—the foundation of the Atlantic's present stability would be shaken.

The mightiest arsenal in the world will deter no aggressor who knows his victims are too divided to decide and too unready to respond. That was the lesson of two world wars. Yet, a nation—not by the action of her friends, but by her own decision to prepare and plan alone—could still imperil her own security by creating a situation in which response would be too late and too diluted. Every advance in the technology of war makes more unacceptable old and narrow concepts of sovereignty.

No one today can doubt the necessity of preventing war. It is our firm conviction that collective action through NATO is the best assurance that war will be deterred in the Atlantic world.

Look at the Atlantic community through the eyes of those who in years past have yearned for conquest. The sight is sobering. Integrated commands, common plans, forces in being in advance of an emergency for use in emergency—all testify to a collective readiness and the integrity of collective purpose. To other eyes NATO can only be a clear warning of the folly of aggression.

NATO today must be shaped on the experience of the past. Reliance on independent action by separate forces—only loosely coordinated with joint forces and plans—twice led to world wars before 1945. But collective action has proved successful in deterring war since 1945—during 20 years of upheaval and grave danger.

We reject those experiences only at our own peril.

For its part, the United States is determined to join with 13 of her other allies to preserve and to strengthen the deterrent strength of NATO. We will urge that those principles of joint and common preparation be extended wherever they can be usefully applied in the Atlantic alliance.

We are hopeful that no member of the treaty will long remain withdrawn from the mutual affairs and obligations of the Atlantic. A place of respect and responsibility will await any ally who decides to return to the common task.

For the world is still full of peril for those who prize and cherish liberty—peril and opportunity.

These bountiful lands washed by the Atlantic—this half-billion people unmatched in arms and industry—this cradle of common values and splendid visions—this measureless storehouse of wealth can enrich the life of an entire planet.

It is this strength—of ideas as well as arms, of peaceful purpose as well as power—that offers such hope for the reconciliation of Western Europe with the people of Eastern Europe. To surrender that strength by isolation from one another would be to dim the promise of that day when the men and women of all Europe shall again move freely among each other.

It is not a question of wealth alone.

It is a question of heart and mind. It is a willingness to leave forever those national rivalries which so often led to the useless squandering of lives and treasure in war.

It is a question of the deeper spirit of unity of which NATO is but a symbol. That unity was never better expressed than when, at the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, a great French leader declared that "Nations are more and more convinced that their fates are closely bound together—that their salvation and their welfare must rest upon the progressive application of human solidarity."

It is to the preservation of human solidarity that all our efforts must be directed. Let all of you, of the Foreign Service Institute, make it your task as well as mine.

THE PRESIDENT'S APPROACH TO THE NATO CRISIS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure and privilege of listening this morning to the President's address to the Foreign Service Institute in which he discussed the situation confronting our NATO alliance.

The President's address was a forceful and statesmanlike exposition of the importance to us, both now and in the future, of preserving and strengthening the ties which have bound us to our North Atlantic Treaty allies for almost two decades. He stressed the importance of effective international arrangements, as the best deterrent to a potential aggressor. At the same time, with great tact and restraint, he referred, indirectly and without rancor, to General de Gaulle's recent statements and indicated that the door would remain open for France.

The NATO crisis is a very real and dangerous one for the free world. The President's approach to it is in the finest tradition of American statesmanship and diplomacy.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON FIRM ON NATO'S FUTURE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, after nearly two decades of constructive cooperation and progress, the North Atlantic community is faced with a fundamental problem. General de Gaulle has notified the other 14 members of NATO that France intends to withdraw its forces from alliance control and to force the removal of all troops stationed on French soil but not subject to French command.

President Johnson and the other NATO allies have met this challenge with resolution and great restraint. The 14-nation declaration of March 18 clearly stated the determination of the United States and 13 other treaty signatories to continue and improve the joint military arrangements which have so well served the common interest.

This morning, in a speech at the Foreign Service Institute, the President spelled out the basic principles of our position. This eloquent and historic address is a proud page in the history of our foreign policy. I include it in full at this point in the Record:

Remarks of the President to the Foreign Service Institute

Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to address the Foreign Service Institute this morning and to come here to meet with so many Americans that are preparing to serve their country abroad. As one who believes that we cannot shorten our reach in the world, I am greatly encouraged by the number and the quality of those who are studying at this Institute. You have the gratitude of your countrymen and my own assurance of support.

We have come a long way from the day that someone observed that some diplomat no doubt will launch a heedless word and lurking war leap out. That was more than half a century ago when diplomacy was often war by another name.

Today your task is different. Those of you about to go abroad represent a continuity of purpose in a generation of change. That purpose is to build from reason and moderation a world order in which the fires of conflict yield to the fulfillment of man's oldest yearnings for himself and his family.

Your job, wherever you serve, is peace. That is the task that faces all of us today. The question, as always, is how? How do we, for example, maintain the security of the Atlantic community upon which so many of the world's hopes depend?

For the answer, we must begin with the gray dawn of the world of 1945, when Europe's cities lay in rubble, her farms devastated, her industries smashed, her people weary with war and death and defeat.

Now from that desolation has come abundance. From that weakness has come power. From those ashes of holocaust has come rebirth of a strong and a vital community.

The Europe of today is a new Europe. In place of uncertainty there is confidence; in place of decay, progress; in place of isolation, partnership; in place of war, peace.

If there is no single explanation for the difference between Europe then and Europe now, there is a pattern. It is a luminous design that is woven through the history of the past 20 years. It is the design of common action, of interdependent institutions serving the good of the European nations as though they were all one. It is the design of collective security protecting the entire Atlantic community.

So I have come here this morning to speak to you of one important part of that design. I speak of a structure that some of you have help to build: the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Let me make clear in the beginning that we do not believe there is any righteousness in standing pat. If an organization is alive and vital, if it is to have meaning for all time as well as for any particular time, it must grow and respond and yield to change. Like our Constitution, which makes the law of the land, the North Atlantic Treaty is more than just a legal document. It is the foundation of a living institution. That institution is NATO, the Organization created to give meaning and reality to the alliance commitments.

The crowded months which immediately preceded and followed the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty 17 years ago had produced an atmosphere of crisis. It was a crisis that was born of deep fear, fear for Europe's economic and political vitality, fear of Communist aggression, fear of Communist subversion.

Some say that new circumstances in the world today call for the dismantling of that great Organization. Of course, NATO should adapt to the changing needs of the times, but we believe just as firmly that such change must be wrought by the member nations working with one another within the alliance. Consultation, not isolation, is the route to reform. We must not forget either in success or abundance the lessons that we have learned in danger and in isolation, that whatever the issue that we share, we have one common danger—division—and one common safety—unity.

What is our view of NATO today? We see it not as an alliance to make war, but as an alliance to keep peace. Through an era as turbulent as man has ever known, and under the constant threat of ultimate destruction, NATO has insured the security of the North Atlantic community. It has reinforced stability elsewhere throughout the world.

While NATO rests on the reality that we must fight together if war should come to the Atlantic area, it rests also on the reality that war will not come if we act together during peace. It was the Foreign Minister of France who, in 1949, insisted that to be truly secure, Europe needed not only help in resisting attack, but help in preventing attack, "Liberation," he said, "is not enough."

The success of NATO has been measured by many yardsticks. The most significant, to me, is the most obvious—war has been deterred. Through the common organization, we have welded the military contributions of each of the 15 allies into a very effective instrument. So convincing was this instrument that potential aggressors took stock and counted as too high the price of satisfying their ambitions. It has been proved true that "one sword keeps another in the sheath."

War has been deterred not only because of our integrated military power, but because of the political unity of purpose to which that power has been directed and bent. It is difficult to overstate the importance of the bonds of culture, of political institutions, traditions, and values which form the bedrock of the Atlantic community. There is here a political integrity and an identity of interests that transcends personalities and issues of the moment.

If our collective effort should falter and our common determination be eroded, the foundation of the Atlantic's present stability would certainly be shaken. The mightiest arsenal in the world will deter no aggressor who knows his victims are too divided to decide and too unready to respond. That was the lesson that we learned from two World Wars. Yet a nation not by the action of her friends, but by her own decision to prepare and plan alone, could still imperil her own security by creating a situation in which response would be too late and too diluted. Every advance in the technology of war makes more unacceptable the old and narrow concepts of sovereignty.

No one today can doubt the necessity of preventing war. It is our firm conviction that collective action through NATO is the best assurance that war will be deterred in the Atlantic world. Look at the Atlantic community through the eyes of those who in years past have yearned for conquest. The sight is sobering.

Integrated commands, common plans, forces in being in advance of an emergency for use in any emergency—all of these testify to a collective readiness and the integrity of collective purposes. To other eyes, NATO can only be a clear warning of the folly of aggression.

NATO today must, therefore, be shaped on the experience of the past. Reliance on independent action by separate forces only loosely coordinated with joint forces and plans twice before have led to World Wars before 1945. But collective action has proved successful in deterring war since 1945—during 20 years of upheaval and during 20 years of grave danger. We reject those experiences only at our own peril.

For our part, the United States of America is determined to join with 13 of her other allies to preserve and to strengthen the deterrent strength of NATO. We will urge that those principles of joint and common preparation be extended wherever they can be usefully applied in the Atlantic Alliance.

We are hopeful that no member of the treaty will long remain withdrawn from the mutual affairs and obligations of the Atlantic. A place of respect and responsibility will await any ally who decides to return to the common task, for the world is still full of peril for those who prize and cherish liberty—peril and opportunity.

These bountiful lands that are washed by the Atlantic, this half-billion people that are unmatched in arms and industry, this cradle of common values and splendid visions, this measureless storehouse of wealth, can enrich the life of an entire planet.

It is this strength of ideas as well as strength of arms of peaceful purpose as well as power that offers such hope for the reconciliation of Western Europe with the people of Eastern Europe. To surrender that strength now by isolation from one another would be to dim the promise of that day when the men and women of all Europe shall again move freely among each other.

It is not a question of wealth alone. It is a question of heart and mind. It is a willingness to leave forever those national rivalries which so often led to the useless squandering of lives and treasure in war.

It is a question of the deeper spirit of unity of which NATO is but a symbol. That unity was never better expressed then when, at the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, a great French leader declared that "Nations are more and more convinced that their fates are closely bound together—that their salvation and their welfare must rest upon the progressive application of human solidarity."

And it is to the preservation of human solidarity that all of our efforts today should be directed. So let all of you of the Foreign Service Institute make it your task, as well as mine.

Thank you and good morning.

FUNERAL SERVICE FOR MRS. EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the President of the United States for the opportunity today to attend the funeral of Mrs. Emanuel Celler, wife of the chairman of our Judiciary Committee.

The President and Mrs. Johnson attended the funeral in Brooklyn, New York City, and invited the New York City delegation and members of the House Judiciary Committee also to attend and to accompany them on the Presidential jetplane, Air Force I.

The funeral was held at noon, and for that reason those of us who attended missed the opening of our session today. However, I am sure we will be excused for that, and we were back at 3 p.m. today on the House floor.

Among others who attended the funeral were Mayor John V. Lindsay, of New York City, whom I succeeded as Congressman from the 17th District, New York.

I am certain the sympathy of all Members of the House is extended to Congressman CELLER on his bereavement and on this day of his sorrow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KUPFERMAN, for 6 hours, today, from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., on account of attendance in New York City at funeral of wife of Congressman EMANUEL CELLER.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, March 23, 1966, on account of funeral services for the late Mrs. Emanuel Celler:

Mr. EUGENE J. KEOGH.
Mr. JOHN J. ROONEY.
Mr. ADAM C. POWELL.
Mr. ABRAHAM J. MULTER.
Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY.
Mr. LEONARD FARBSTEIN.
Mr. JACOB H. GILBERT.
Mr. OTIS G. PIKE.
Mr. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO.
Mr. HUGH L. CAREY.
Mr. WILLIAM F. RYAN.
Mr. JOHN M. MURPHY.
Mr. LESTER L. WOLFF.
Mr. HERBERT TENZER.
Mr. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.
Mr. JAMES H. SCHEUER.
Mr. RICHARD L. OTTINGER.
Mr. JOHN G. DOW.
Mr. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK.
Mr. JAMES M. HANLEY.
Mr. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY.
Mr. WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS, for 40 minutes, today.

Mr. HANNA, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, March 30, 1966.

Mr. RONCALIO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LATTA (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. ABERNETHY and to include tables.

Mr. KUNKEL to include a newsletter with his remarks during the general debate in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN.
Mr. WYDLER.
Mr. COLLIER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.
Mr. OLSON of Minnesota.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
Mr. TENZER.
Mr. ZABLOCKI.
Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.
Mr. DINGELL.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 801. An act to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12762. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; and

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 24, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report on defense contract audits—24th report; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the special study mission to the Far East, southeast Asia, India, and Pakistan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 13914. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southwest Idaho water development project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13915. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13916. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13917. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 13918. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 13919. A bill to terminate price supports on tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13920. A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 19, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 13921. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13922. A bill to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, lumber manufacturers, and others against false grade marking of lumber, to promote interstate commerce in lumber, to strengthen the standards program of the lumber industry, and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 13923. A bill to amend the act providing talking books for the adult blind so as to make such books available to certain physically handicapped persons; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 13924. A bill to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 13925. A bill to amend chapter 95 of title 39, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 13926. A bill to amend titles 26 and 27, United States Code, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to members of the uniformed services for dependents schooling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREIGG:

H.R. 13927. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to express the appreciation of the American people for the sacrifices of our servicemen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 13928. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southwest Idaho water development project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 13929. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 13930. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 13931. A bill to establish and maintain orderly marketing conditions for processing pears in the interest of producers and consumers, and an orderly flow of the supply thereof to market throughout its normal marketing season to avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supplies and prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 13932. A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 19, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 13933. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the granting of free transportation to guides or dog guides accompanying totally blind persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACKIE:

H.R. 13934. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 13935. A bill to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for contributions to political parties or candidates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 13937. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 13938. A bill to establish a "Bread and Butter Brigade" for the purpose of implementing the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening the agricultural economies of friendly nations, improving agricultural skills and knowledge in such nations, promoting world peace and friendship, and combating the threat of world food shortages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 13939. A bill to increase the rate of pension payable to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, their widows, and certain other dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 13940. A bill providing for a National Water Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13941. A bill providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 13942. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 13943. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring Maj. Gen. Frederick Funston; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 13944. A bill to prohibit the curtailment of agricultural research carried on under authority of the Hatch Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13945. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13946. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 13947. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 13948. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 13949. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 13950: A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

H.R. 13951. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 13952. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 13953. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rates of duty on certain densified wood, and on plastic pickers used on textile looms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 13954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the existing exclusion of gain from the sale or exchange of a residence by a taxpayer aged 65 or over shall be allowable if he attains such age at any time before the close of the taxable year in which the sale or exchange occurs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13955. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant patents to certain lands under the provisions of the Color of Title Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 13956. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 13957. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 13958. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 13959. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 13960. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 13961. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.J. Res. 975. Joint resolution providing for a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 976. Joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 977. Joint resolution proposing a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.J. Res. 978. Joint resolution proposing a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 979. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.J. Res. 980. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Teenage Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 619. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 2 of the committee print entitled "Conflicts Between the Federal Research Programs and the Nation's Goals for Higher Education"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. Con. Res. 620. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the giving of cigarettes in hospitals administered by the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. Con. Res. 621. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the giving of cigarettes in hospitals administered by the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 622. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the giving of cigarettes in hospitals administered by the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H. Con. Res. 623. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the giving of cigarettes in hospitals administered by the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 794. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the committee print entitled "Conflicts Between the Federal Research Programs and the Nation's Goals for Higher Education"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 795. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings entitled, "Conflicts Between the Federal Research Programs and the Nation's Goals for Higher Education"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 796. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional Capitol Police for duty under the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 13962. A bill for the relief of Maria Christine Munoz de Reyes and Juan Pedro Reyes-Munoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 13963. A bill for the relief of Chain Hoong Yuen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13964. A bill for the relief of Chai-Ming Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13965. A bill for the relief of Ko Chuen Po; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 13966. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13967. A bill for the relief of Kinuyo Nishibayashi and the estate of her husband, Kasuke Nishibayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13968. A bill for the relief of Joao Borges Tavares de Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13969. A bill for the relief of Maria de Fatima Gouveia Victoria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13970. A bill for the relief of Santino Badalamenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13971. A bill for the relief of Calogero Di Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13972. A bill for the relief of Rocco Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13973. A bill for the relief of Gloria Syliva Goldson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13974. A bill for the relief of Baldassare Marasa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13975. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Piuchinotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13976. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Viggiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13977. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13978. A bill for the relief of Hung Shik Park and his wife, Myoung Hee Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 13979. A bill for the relief of John Rask (Hanna Rizk); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

353. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the president, Foggy Bottom Association, Washington, D.C., relative to home rule for the citizens of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as we again celebrate the anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day, March 25, 1918, it is gratifying to be reminded of the importance of ideas in a world which seems to be impressed chiefly by facts and actions.

We are, to be sure, honoring a very important fact—the emergence of Byelorussia as an independent democratic republic. Yet that fact and, alas, even the existence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic in its truly independent form were of short duration in the annals of history.

The idea behind that fact was, however, hundreds of years old, and it had persisted and has since persisted in spite of all attempts to eradicate it.

The very briefness of the actual existence of that independent Republic emphasizes the strength of the idea that brought it into existence and which has kept it alive in the minds of the Byelorussian people for the nearly half century since repressive Soviet measures turned it into a component part of the Soviet Union.

The alleged sovereignty of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in the United Nations is a hollow mockery. It is merely a designation by the Soviets for the sole purpose of an additional sympathetic vote in that assembly; and completely violated by them in all other respects.

Despite earlier Russian and later Soviet domination and cruel repression of all evidence of nationalistic tendencies in the Byelorussian S.S.R., however, the idea of true independence for Byelorussia has continued to flourish for centuries. For the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic which we celebrate today was the culmination of the hopes and efforts of the people of that country who had sought to be free for hundred of years. In spite of cruel buffeting from one to another by their covetous neighbors—Russia, Poland, Germany, and Russia again—the Byelorussian people had nevertheless maintained their determination to be free, their faith in the eventual attainment of freedom, and also their homogeneity of culture and custom. Despite all outward pressures they were to succeed in bringing their idea to fruition; and for a short time the Byelorussians enjoyed true independence.

When the Soviet armies crushed the Byelorussian Democratic Republic as an independent nation, and took it over completely, destroying all but its nominal outward independence, the idea of true independence did not die. Despite all Soviet efforts to eradicate it, it persists.

We in the United States, who have cherished the idea of freedom from our earliest beginnings, honor it today in the Byelorussian anniversary celebration. Against all odds, the free spirit of Byelorussia prevails.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, just 48 years ago, after centuries of enslavement and oppression, the Byelorussian people declared to all mankind they were a free and independent people. This declaration followed on the heels of the Russian Communist revolution and the downfall of the Romanovs. The reality of freedom was short lived, for before a full year had passed, the Russian Red Army marched through the countryside, and Byelorussia was again under Russian control.

Rahel, the medieval Christian chronicler, wrote many years ago:

> To have freedom is only to have that which is absolutely necessary to enable us to be what we ought to be, and to possess what we ought to possess.

Today Byelorussia is not free. The Byelorussians have no way to assert their own national identity. They cannot be what they want to be, or possess that which they want to possess. They are being denied their own individual history, culture, and national pride. They are clearly and simply a ward of the Kremlin.

As freemen who do not take our freedoms and liberties for granted, we are a link between the principles of freedom and self-determination and those who aspire to be free and guide their own destiny. On this 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, let us reaffirm to the Byelorussian people that their hopes have not been forgotten by the free world.

Pakistan Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 19th anniversary of independence for the people of Pakistan. This is a memorable occasion, and we wish to take this occasion to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Ayub Khan, President of the Republic of Pakistan; and to His Excellency Ghulam Ahmed, the Pakistani Ambassador to the United States.

The idea of independence grew in the 1930's, was fostered by the Muslim League in the 1940's, and from it has evolved the present state of Pakistan, one of the leaders of the new Afro-Asian states. At the conclusion of World War II Britain undertook steps to grant independence to India. However, the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League were unable to agree on either the terms for drafting a constitution or for setting up an interim government.

Then on June 3, 1947, the British Government announced it would give independence to two separate states—India and Pakistan. Pakistan was to consist of the contiguous Moslem majority areas of British India. On August 14, 1947, Pakistan became an independent nation within the Commonwealth.

Independence did not bring immediate peace and prosperity to the people of Pakistan. On the contrary, they were shocked into the reality of how much hard work and sacrifice lay before them. Difficulties emanating from religious differences, political unrest, and economic handicaps all proved too much for the Government to handle, and in 1958 under the leadership of Gen. Ayub Khan, the military carried out a peaceful revolution. Under General Ayub's leadership stability emerged, and by 1962 the new National Assembly convened and promulgated the new constitution. That was on March 23 and has been designated as Pakistan's Independence Day.

Pakistan has been concentrating on diversifying its economy from a dependence on agriculture to a more even basis in which industry might play a larger role. Natural resources have not been exploited to their capacity yet, though there is hope that the natural gas and petroleum supplies may be increasingly developed.

While there have been some differences of opinion between Pakistan and the United States, relations between the two countries are still warm. There is every reason to expect they will continue to remain so. Pakistan's relations with India are still distant, though there is the constant hope that the Tashkent Agreement of January 1966 will go a long way in eroding some of the hostility between those two neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of the House will agree with me that 19 years in the life of a nation is but a small fraction of time. And yet, in the case of Pakistan we have been able to observe that national leadership has exhibited much wisdom, diplomacy, and reason in its relations with other countries of the international community. I hope that this trend will continue. As I express my congratulations to President Ayub and the people of Pakistan, I am confident they will continue to carry on the magnificent work to which they have pledged their economic development program and dedicated themselves to the betterment of their country.

Wyoming: High, Wide, Windy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the April 1966, issue of National Geographic magazine contains a brilliant article by David S. Boyer entitled "Wyoming: High, Wide, and Windy," which I should like to commend to my colleagues' attention. The exquisite photography and the coverage of all important points of interest in Wyoming which appear in this 40-page article are well worth reading. My compliments to Mr. Boyer for a job well done.

Mr. Boyer was able to touch upon every timely aspect of Wyoming's scenery, industry, recreational facilities, educational development and heritage held very dear to the heart's of every Wyomingite in a tasteful and informative manner. My only thought while reading this article was you must read and enjoy it.

Record Number of Watershed Projects Approved in 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, during the year just ended the Congress gave its approval to 80 watershed projects under Public Law 566. Combined with the 20 smaller projects authorized by the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, this was the largest number ever approved in 1 year. It is a fitting indication of this body's interest in improved water and related land resources.

A good example of the worth of watershed project activity exists in my own State. Structural and land treatment measures in the Chippewa River tributaries and Hawk Creek pilot watershed project were completed just in time this past spring to take a real test.

The spring of 1965 saw one of the worst spring floods in Minnesota history. Heavy March snows resulted in accumulations of up to 55 inches. This was accompanied by a fast snowmelt and torrential rains that set the stage for the floods. This was in addition to thick ice on the streams and lakes. When the ice started moving and jamming, it created a real flood hazard.

Mr. Ronald Anfinson, editor and publisher of the Swift County News at Benson, spoke of the project's effect in an editorial:

> Though this city will always be spared major flooding from the Chippewa River, had it not been for the Mud Creek (watershed project) we would have found water lapping at our doorstep, causing difficulty and damage. Farms along the Mud Creek watershed project area would have been inundated—not for a week or so, but for weeks. The same is true for the Shakopee Creek watershed. Had the Chippewa River been the shallow, narrow, tree-choked, meandering stream it was before completion of the Mud Creek watershed project, this community would be experiencing considerable hardship * * * bad enough to result in thousands of dollars in property damage and lost land.

The large detention reservoirs on Shakopee Creek stored thousands of acre-feet of water. These reservoirs reduced and in many cases eliminated flooding of the cropland below. Cropland that was flooded remained that way only for 2 to 4 days, where previously it would have lasted several weeks. Due to the quick recession of floodwaters in the flood plains it was possible to get crops planted with very little delay.

Upland flooding and erosion were greatly reduced by the installation of soil and water conservation measures throughout the watershed, including terraces, field windbreaks, contour stripcropping, and many farm ponds.

Mr. Anfinson continued in a later article:

> This area, aided by the cooperation of the Government, has taken sensible measures to meet the menace of high water. Our watershed projects, covering millions of acres, demonstrated their great worth in recent days. These projects are costing the individuals and organizations affected considerable money, but the savings from 1 year such as this will more than offset the entire cost in many instances. We didn't have to sell a part of our independence to the Federal Government, but we did take advantage of Government aiding us in what was impossible on a strictly local basis. Perhaps by the next flood year, more communities, now fighting desperately to recover from the effects of high water, will have taken similar measures.

Mr. Anfinson has summed it up well. The efforts of the local people who are willing to spend their own moneys in worthwhile resource development activities deserve the continued strong support of the Federal and State Governments.

Independence of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has enjoyed almost two centuries of independence, having severed its ties with Great Britain July 4, 1776. Most of the countries of North America and South America consist of nations which long ago threw off the yokes of various European powers.

In our own day we have witnessed the coming of independence to scores of new countries on the continents of Africa and Asia. Americans of all shades of political opinion have welcomed these infant lands to the family of nations.

While we have, through the years, rejoiced whenever men have thrown off the chains of colonialism, we have at the same time been saddened when the lights of freedom have been extinguished in nations which once enjoyed freedom and independence. One of the many peoples who have lost their freedom in modern times are the Byelorussians, who are now behind the Iron Curtain.

After the collapse of czarist Russia during World War I, the Byelorussians proclaimed their independence by establishing the Byelorussian Democratic

Republic. Unfortunately, their freedom was shortlived. The Communists who had seized power in Russia soon conquered Byelorussia and made it part of the Soviet empire.

Friday, March 25, will be the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. Let us hope and pray that the people of Byelorussia may soon celebrate the return of freedom rather than commemorate an independence that has been destroyed by a ruthless tyrant.

May God grant that the Byelorussians, as well as other peoples who now live under the Communist terror, will, at an early date, regain their freedom.

Cotton Checkoff Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall that on March 3 during the deliberation on H.R. 12322, more particularly known as the cotton checkoff bill, I offered certain amendments. The purpose of one particular amendment was to strike from the bill a provision which would enable a few large cotton producers to literally overwhelm thousands of small producers in the referendum to determine whether or not a checkoff program would be put into effect.

Since that time I have had numerous inquiries as to the number of farms by States and the volume of cotton produced by size of farm. After considerable research this information is now available. I am taking this opportunity to provide this detailed information for the particular benefit of my colleagues and the cotton farmers of the 14 cotton-producing States. It is set forth in the following tables:

Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture, totals for 14 States

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Total farms	Total production	Total farms	Total production
10,000 or more	8	191, 111	0. 002	1. 38	0. 002	1. 38
5,000 to 9,999	18	113, 567	. 004	. 82	. 006	2. 20
4,000 to 4,999	17	74, 614	. 003	. 54	. 009	2. 74
3,000 to 3,999	42	140, 892	. 01	1. 02	. 02	3. 76
2,000 to 2,999	101	234, 223	. 02	1. 69	. 04	5. 45
1,500 to 1,999	138	230, 211	. 03	1. 66	. 07	7. 11
1,000 to 1,499	419	501, 782	. 08	3. 63	. 15	10. 74
500 to 999	1, 819	1, 200, 086	. 36	8. 67	. 51	19. 41
200 to 499	8, 626	2, 503, 025	1. 72	18. 08	2. 23	37. 49
100 to 199	15, 417	2, 097, 698	3. 07	15. 16	5. 30	52. 65
50 to 99	26, 431	1, 798, 561	5. 26	12. 99	10. 56	65. 64
40 to 49	12, 392	538, 179	2. 47	3. 89	13. 03	69. 53
30 to 39	19, 976	670, 741	3. 98	4. 85	17. 01	74. 38
20 to 29	39, 996	940, 658	7. 97	6. 80	24. 98	81. 18
10 to 19	105, 202	1, 420, 091	20. 96	10. 26	45. 94	91. 44
Under 10	271, 406	1, 184, 605	54. 06	8. 56	100. 00	100. 00
Total	502, 008	13, 840, 044	100. 00	100. 00		

In 1959: 8 large farms in California produced 191,111 bales; 43,719 small farms (less than 10 bales) in Alabama produced 184,856 bales; 26,879 small farms in Georgia produced only 123,951 bales; 45,228 small farms in North Carolina produced 174,920 bales; and 33,270 small farms in South Carolina produced 139,409 bales.

The 18 largest farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or more than the 248,937 bales produced by 36,194 19-bale-or-less producers in Georgia.

Thirteen percent of the total number of cotton-producing farms accounted for over 69 percent of total cotton production.

Alabama—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
1,000 or more	1	1, 118	0. 002	0. 17	0. 002	0. 17
500 to 999	10	5, 978	. 02	. 88	. 02	1. 05
200 to 499	125	34, 718	. 20	5. 13	. 22	6. 18
100 to 199	313	40, 642	. 49	6. 01	. 71	12. 19
50 to 99	995	64, 610	1. 56	9. 55	2. 27	21. 74
40 to 49	730	31, 838	1. 14	4. 71	3. 41	26. 45
30 to 39	1, 583	53, 123	2. 47	7. 86	5. 88	34. 31
20 to 29	3, 956	92, 692	6. 18	13. 71	12. 06	48. 02
10 to 19	12, 557	166, 696	19. 62	24. 65	31. 68	72. 67
Under 10	43, 719	184, 856	68. 32	27. 33	100. 00	100. 00
Total	63, 989	676, 271	100. 00	100. 00		

In round numbers, 32 percent of the farms accounted for 73 percent of Alabama's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 69,633 bales more than the 43,719 smallest cotton farms in Alabama.

Arizona—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
5,000 or more	3	20, 443	0. 12	3. 09	0. 12	3. 09
4,000 to 4,999	6	25, 478	. 25	3. 85	. 37	6. 94
3,000 to 3,999	7	22, 936	. 29	3. 47	. 66	10. 41
2,000 to 2,999	19	44, 129	. 78	6. 67	1. 44	17. 08
1,500 to 1,999	27	45, 783	1. 12	6. 92	2. 56	24. 00
1,000 to 1,499	72	85, 768	2. 97	12. 97	5. 53	36. 97
500 to 999	231	154, 939	9. 54	23. 43	15. 07	60. 40
200 to 499	504	154, 681	20. 81	23. 39	35. 88	83. 79
100 to 199	499	67, 399	20. 60	10. 19	56. 48	93. 98
50 to 99	340	23, 355	14. 04	3. 53	70. 52	97. 51
40 to 49	151	6, 428	6. 23	. 97	76. 75	98. 48
30 to 39	92	3, 135	3. 80	. 48	80. 55	98. 96
20 to 29	153	3, 719	6. 32	. 56	86. 87	99. 52
10 to 19	174	2, 376	7. 18	. 36	94. 05	99. 88
Under 10	144	757	5. 95	. 12	100. 00	100. 00
Total	2, 422	661, 326	100. 00	100. 00		

In round numbers, 15 percent of the farms accounted for 60 percent of Arizona's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 147,320 bales more than the 1,553 smallest cotton farms in Arizona.

Arkansas—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
4,000 or more	1	4, 356	0. 003	0. 29	0. 003	0. 29
3,000 to 3,999	3	9, 468	. 01	. 62	. 01	. 91
2,000 to 2,999	6	14, 850	. 02	. 98	. 03	1. 89
1,500 to 1,999	7	11, 447	. 02	. 76	. 05	2. 65
1,000 to 1,499	37	44, 297	. 11	2. 92	. 16	5. 57
500 to 999	238	155, 386	. 68	10. 25	. 84	15. 82
200 to 499	1, 173	349, 436	3. 36	23. 06	4. 20	38. 88
100 to 199	1, 874	254, 960	5. 38	16. 83	9. 58	55. 71
50 to 99	3, 435	231, 172	9. 86	15. 26	19. 44	70. 97
40 to 49	1, 600	70, 014	4. 59	4. 62	24. 03	75. 59
30 to 39	2, 674	90, 521	7. 67	5. 97	31. 70	81. 56
20 to 29	4, 262	101, 579	12. 23	6. 70	43. 93	88. 26
10 to 19	9, 095	126, 425	26. 09	8. 34	70. 02	96. 60
Under 10	10, 450	51, 454	29. 98	3. 40	100. 00	100. 00
Total	34, 855	1, 515, 365	100. 00	100. 00		

In round numbers, 19 percent of the farms accounted for 71 percent of Arkansas' cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 76,610 bales more than the 19,545 smallest cotton farms in Arkansas.

California—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
10,000 or more	8	191,111	0.09	10.39	0.09	10.39
5,000 to 9,999	10	63,378	.11	3.45	.20	13.84
4,000 to 4,999	7	32,182	.08	1.75	.28	15.59
3,000 to 3,999	27	91,258	.31	4.96	.59	20.55
2,000 to 2,999	42	99,086	.48	5.39	1.07	25.94
1,500 to 1,999	53	89,890	.60	4.89	1.67	30.83
1,000 to 1,499	140	167,334	1.60	9.10	3.27	39.93
500 to 999	476	321,743	5.43	17.50	8.70	57.43
200 to 499	1,295	392,011	14.77	21.32	23.47	78.75
100 to 199	1,357	188,545	15.48	10.25	38.95	89.00
50 to 99	1,530	109,299	17.45	5.95	56.40	94.95
40 to 49	595	25,515	6.79	1.39	63.19	96.34
30 to 39	793	26,892	9.04	1.46	72.23	97.80
20 to 29	972	23,469	11.09	1.28	83.32	99.08
10 to 19	952	13,789	10.86	.75	94.18	99.83
Under 10	510	3,169	5.82	.17	100.00	100.00
Total	8,767	1,838,671	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 23 percent of the farms accounted for 79 percent of California's cotton production.

The 52 largest cotton farms in California produced more cotton (66,630 bales) than the entire State of North Carolina.

Georgia—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
500 or more	8	5,345	0.02	1.04	0.02	1.04
200 to 499	69	17,831	.16	3.47	.18	4.51
100 to 199	303	39,462	.72	7.68	.90	12.19
50 to 99	876	57,450	2.06	11.18	2.96	23.37
40 to 49	756	32,919	1.78	6.41	4.74	29.78
30 to 39	1,271	41,972	3.00	8.17	7.74	37.95
20 to 29	2,973	69,826	7.00	13.59	14.74	51.54
10 to 19	9,315	124,986	21.94	24.33	36.68	75.87
Under 10	26,879	123,951	63.32	24.13	100.00	100.00
Total	42,450	513,742	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 37 percent of the farms accounted for 76 percent of Georgia's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 130,538 bales more than the 26,879 smallest cotton farms in Georgia.

Louisiana—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
1,500 or more	2	3,602	0.01	0.78	0.01	0.78
1,000 to 1,499	13	15,002	.05	3.24	.06	4.02
500 to 999	59	38,741	.24	8.37	.30	12.39
200 to 499	273	78,257	1.12	16.91	1.42	29.30
100 to 199	385	52,672	1.58	11.38	3.00	40.68
50 to 99	690	47,345	2.83	10.23	5.83	50.91
40 to 49	389	16,922	1.60	3.65	7.43	54.56
30 to 39	755	25,376	3.10	5.48	10.53	60.04
20 to 29	1,804	42,360	7.40	9.15	17.93	69.19
10 to 19	5,589	75,041	22.92	16.21	40.85	85.40
Under 10	14,420	67,568	59.15	14.60	100.00	100.00
Total	24,379	462,886	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 18 percent of the farms accounted for 69 percent of Louisiana's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 27,222 bales more than the 22,957 cotton farms that produced less than 50 bales in Louisiana.

Mississippi—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
5,000 or more	1	5,781	0.001	0.37	0.001	0.37
4,000 to 4,999	1	4,397	.001	.28	.002	.65
3,000 to 3,999	1	3,800	.001	.24	.003	.89
2,000 to 2,999	7	15,121	.01	.97	.01	1.86
1,500 to 1,999	15	24,589	.02	1.58	.03	3.44
1,000 to 1,499	67	80,634	.09	5.18	.12	8.62
500 to 999	296	197,208	.38	12.67	.50	21.29
200 to 499	937	286,862	1.21	18.43	1.71	39.72
100 to 199	953	132,389	1.23	8.50	2.94	48.22
50 to 99	1,502	102,323	1.95	6.57	4.89	54.79
40 to 49	961	41,498	1.25	2.67	6.14	57.46
30 to 39	1,851	61,346	2.40	3.94	8.54	61.40
20 to 29	5,873	136,539	7.60	8.77	16.14	70.17
10 to 19	19,375	264,602	25.08	17.00	41.22	87.17
Under 10	45,404	199,673	58.78	12.83	100.00	100.00
Total	77,244	1,556,762	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 16 percent of the farms accounted for 70 percent of Mississippi's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 54,816 bales more than the 45,404 smallest cotton farms in Mississippi.

Missouri—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
5,000 or more	1	6,600	0.01	1.44	0.01	1.44
4,000 to 4,999						
3,000 to 3,999						
2,000 to 2,999	3	6,800	.03	1.48	.04	2.92
1,500 to 1,999						
1,000 to 1,499	5	5,600	.05	1.22	.09	4.14
500 to 999	30	18,594	.30	4.06	.39	8.20
200 to 499	218	59,229	2.19	12.92	2.58	21.12
100 to 199	710	97,719	7.11	21.31	9.69	42.43
50 to 99	1,726	116,742	17.29	25.46	26.98	67.89
40 to 49	719	31,346	7.21	6.84	34.19	74.73
30 to 39	1,197	40,293	11.99	8.79	46.18	83.52
20 to 29	1,516	35,790	15.19	7.81	61.37	91.33
10 to 19	2,133	30,624	21.37	6.68	82.74	98.01
Under 10	1,723	9,118	17.26	1.99	100.00	100.00
Total	9,981	458,455	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 27 percent of the farms accounted for 68 percent of Missouri's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 107,318 bales more than the 7,288 cotton farms that produced less than 50 bales in Missouri.

New Mexico—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
2,000 or more	2	4,300	0.07	1.47	0.07	1.47
1,500 to 1,999	1	1,500	.03	.51	.10	1.98
1,000 to 1,499	7	8,104	.24	2.78	.34	4.76
500 to 999	51	33,297	1.71	11.41	2.05	16.17
200 to 499	329	93,397	11.03	31.99	13.08	48.16
100 to 199	544	75,364	18.24	25.82	31.32	73.98
50 to 99	645	46,432	21.62	15.90	52.94	89.88
40 to 49	208	8,847	6.97	3.03	59.91	92.91
30 to 39	231	7,821	7.74	2.68	67.65	95.59
20 to 29	270	6,213	9.05	2.13	76.70	97.72
10 to 19	352	4,788	11.80	1.64	88.50	99.36
Under 10	343	1,871	11.50	.64	100.00	100.00
Total	2,983	291,934	100.00	100.00		

In round numbers, 31 percent of the farms accounted for 74 percent of New Mexico's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales or 9,756 bales more than the 2,922 cotton farms that produced less than 500 bales in New Mexico.

North Carolina—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
200 or more	4	857	0.01	0.28	0.01	0.28
100 to 199	32	4,219	.06	1.35	.07	1.63
50 to 99	152	9,948	.29	3.20	.36	4.83
40 to 49	186	8,014	.35	2.57	.71	7.40
30 to 39	358	11,961	.67	3.84	1.38	11.24
20 to 29	1,157	26,464	2.19	8.50	3.57	19.74
10 to 19	5,745	74,916	10.87	24.07	14.44	43.81
Under 10	45,228	174,920	85.56	56.19	100.00	100.00
Total	52,862	311,299	100.00	100.00	----------	----------

In round numbers, 14 percent of the farms accounted for 44 percent of North Carolina's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 4,653 bales more than the 50,973 smallest cotton farms in North Carolina.

Oklahoma—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
1,000 or more	1	1,037	0.01	0.28	0.01	0.28
500 to 999	2	1,300	.01	.36	.02	.64
200 to 499	111	30,591	.65	8.36	.67	9.00
100 to 199	390	49,127	2.30	13.43	2.97	22.43
50 to 99	1,234	81,225	7.26	22.20	10.23	44.63
40 to 49	769	33,112	4.53	9.05	14.76	53.68
30 to 39	1,114	37,124	6.55	10.15	21.31	63.83
20 to 29	2,023	47,440	11.90	12.97	33.21	76.80
10 to 19	3,732	50,929	21.96	13.92	55.17	90.72
Under 10	7,620	33,946	44.83	9.28	100.00	100.00
Total	16,996	365,831	100.00	100.00	----------	----------

In round numbers, 33 percent of the farms accounted for 77 percent of Oklahoma's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 51,938 bales more than the 15,258 cotton farms that produced less than 50 bales in Oklahoma.

South Carolina—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
500 or more	3	2,433	0.01	0.59	0.01	0.59
200 to 499	49	12,104	.11	2.94	.12	3.53
100 to 199	190	24,542	.42	5.97	.54	9.50
50 to 99	661	44,097	1.46	10.72	2.00	20.22
40 to 49	380	16,497	.84	4.01	2.84	24.23
30 to 39	703	23,866	1.56	5.81	4.40	30.04
20 to 29	1,791	41,454	3.97	10.08	8.37	40.12
10 to 19	8,076	106,832	17.90	25.98	26.27	66.10
Under 10	33,270	139,409	73.73	33.90	100.00	100.00
Total	45,123	411,234	100.00	100.00	----------	----------

In round numbers, 26 percent of the farms accounted for 66 percent of South Carolina's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 8,248 bales more than the 41,346 smallest cotton farms in South Carolina.

Tennessee—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
1,000 or more	1	1,100	0.003	0.18	0.003	0.18
500 to 999	17	9,705	.04	1.59	.04	1.77
200 to 499	113	31,190	.30	5.10	.34	6.87
100 to 199	324	43,007	.85	7.03	1.19	13.90
50 to 99	1,089	69,283	2.86	11.33	4.05	25.23
40 to 49	788	33,983	2.07	5.56	6.12	30.79
30 to 39	1,824	60,683	4.78	9.92	10.90	40.71
20 to 29	4,787	112,063	12.55	18.32	23.45	59.03
10 to 19	11,913	163,556	31.24	26.74	54.69	85.77
Under 10	17,278	87,043	45.31	14.23	100.00	100.00
Total	38,134	611,613	100.00	100.00	----------	----------

In round numbers, 23 percent of the farms accounted for 59 percent of Tennessee's cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 3,890 bales more than the 29,191 smallest cotton farms in Tennessee.

Texas—Distribution of cotton production by number of bales produced, 1959 Census of Agriculture

Bales per farm	Number of farms	Number of bales produced	Percentage of—		Cumulative percentage of—	
			Farms	Production	Farms	Production
5,000 or more	3	17,365	0.004	0.42	0.004	0.42
4,000 to 4,999	2	8,201	.002	.20	.006	.62
3,000 to 3,999	4	13,430	.01	.32	.01	.94
2,000 to 2,999	22	49,937	.03	1.20	.04	2.14
1,500 to 1,999	33	53,400	.04	1.28	.08	3.42
1,000 to 1,499	75	91,788	.09	2.20	.17	5.62
500 to 999	398	255,417	.49	6.13	.66	11.75
200 to 499	3,426	961,861	4.19	23.10	4.85	34.85
100 to 199	7,543	1,027,651	9.22	24.67	14.07	59.52
50 to 99	11,556	795,280	14.12	19.10	28.19	78.62
40 to 49	4,160	181,246	5.08	4.35	33.27	82.97
30 to 39	5,530	186,628	6.76	4.48	40.03	87.45
20 to 29	8,459	201,050	10.34	4.83	50.37	92.28
10 to 19	16,194	214,531	19.79	5.15	70.16	97.43
Under 10	24,418	106,870	29.84	2.57	100.00	100.00
Total	81,823	4,164,655	100.00	100.00	----------	----------

In round numbers, 28 percent of the farms accounted for 79 percent of Texas' cotton production.

The 18 largest cotton farms in California produced 254,489 bales, or 147,619 bales more than the 24,418 smallest cotton farms in Texas.

Backward Ho—At State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by newspaper accounts of the State Department reorganization that would abolish the Bureau of Security Affairs—an action which has led to the resignation of its Administrator, Abba P. Schwartz. I am happy to join a number of my colleagues in urging that this matter be investigated thoroughly by the appropriate congressional committee.

I do not know Mr. Schwartz, but I do know that in the last several years, during his tenure as Administrator, there has been a tremendous improvement in our official attitude toward travel both into and out of the United States. It would be disastrous if this trend should be reversed.

I know of dozens of instances in which foreign officials, educators, and publicists who needed to have their misconceptions of America corrected and whose understanding and good will could have been of inestimable benefit to us were denied visas because officials in Washington drafted regulations on admissibility going even beyond the letter of the

McCarran-Walter Act and consular officers interpreted those regulations with inflexible rigidity.

All this has changed in recent years. It would be disastrous if the spirits of Joe McCarthy and Scott McLeod should again dominate our passport and visa policies. Are we once more to assume—or act as if we assumed—that every foreign liberal or radical is an enemy agent, that our democracy is so wobbly that a few hundred or even thousand of such visitors would topple it, and that American citizens are so untrustworthy that they must not be permitted to examine other societies at firsthand?

This may not be the intent of the reorganization, but the manner in which it was engineered—in deep secrecy, without consulting the person most directly concerned—is certainly suspicious.

Surely consular affairs are important enough to be assigned to a separate bureau, not relegated to an already overworked and exceptionally competent man, Deputy Under Secretary William J. Crockett.

An inquiry is in order. I hope it is begun without delay.

Mid-America Council of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, the Mid-America Council No. 326, of the Boy Scouts of America, headquartered at Omaha, Nebr., adopted an ambitious 8-year growth program known as Breakthrough for Youth. It is designed to make possible a tremendous growth in Boy Scout membership each year until 1972, when it is hoped that the mid-America area can serve some 54,000 boys. This would be 50 percent of all available boys at that time. The plan not only envisions reaching all boys who desire to be Scouts, but provides for a continual upgrading of the program offered.

It was gratifying for me learn last week, Mr. Speaker, that the plan now having been in effect for 1 year is on target and there is every anticipation it will continue to be so at the end of 1966.

I wish to congratulate the leaders in the Mid-America Council. They are men of vision and high purpose. They seek to make the opportunities of Scouting possible for thousands of new boys each year, and they are ever alert to see that the quality of the program offered shall be increasingly good. The leaders have seen that the master plan of operation was carefully drawn and is both practical and workable. The one element yet to be proven is their faith that the people of the Mid-America Council will back their council with the necessary support, in both time and money.

Service hours totaling hundreds of thousands are given each year by dedicated volunteers in order to make effective the splendid character-citizenship training program of the Boy Scouts of America. If these hours were to be translated into dollars and cents, the price of the Boy Scout program would be staggering. Since this is not the case, however, Scout budget needs are very, very modest indeed. Particularly is this seen by comparing the Scout budget with request from correctional institutions in the State of Nebraska, for rehabilitation purposes. How much better to put only a fraction of this cost into the "ounce of prevention" the Scouting movement represents.

The Boy Scout program all over America is doing a truly magnificent job in fostering the ideals of true Americanism in our growing boys. In fact, I am inclined to agree with the statement once made by the beloved Will Rogers, "The only trouble with the Boy Scouts is—there just ain't enough of them."

The Mid-America Council is to be commended on making a sincere effort to remedy this situation.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians are perhaps the least known of the many peoples forcibly brought under Soviet communism. One hears of the Ukrainians, the Baltic peoples, and of peoples in the Caucasus. Even those in distant Asiatic countries, such as the Kazakhs, Turkmens, and the Uzbeks, are often heard of in the West. But one seldom hears of the Byelorussians, despite the fact that they, as an ethnic group, are more numerous than most of the nationality groups mentioned. As a matter of fact the Byelorussians constitute the third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union; only the Russians and Ukrainians are more numerous.

The history of the Byelorussian people has been as glorious as the histories of their more powerful neighbors. From the late Middle Ages down to the beginning of the modern period, this sturdy people has occupied the central area east of the Baltic States and north of the Ukraine in northeastern Europe. For centuries they had their independent existence. Then in the 17th century their country was annexed by Russia, and they did not regain their independence until after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. During their subjugation by Russia's czarist regime, Byelorussians managed to retain their ethnic characteristics and national traditions. Their national feeling was kept alive in the course of several centuries. Finally, after the Russian Revolution, when other ethnic groups sought and secured their national independence; the Byelorussians did likewise and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. Then they set up their government and took their destiny into their own hands. Unfortunately this period was very brief, for their country was soon attacked by the Red army, overrun, and despite continued opposition amid the changing fortunes of war, was finally overcome by superior force. It was then made part of the Soviet Union. Thus came to an end the short-lived independent state of Byelorussia whose 48th anniversary of independence is being celebrated this week.

For more than 45 years the Byelorussian people have been living under the oppressive and unrelenting rule of Soviet communism. For a brief period during the last war they experienced the tyranny of Nazi dictatorship, but soon again they were brought under Soviet tyranny. Neither those Byelorussians who have endured the horrors of Communist totalitarianism, nor those living abroad, have recognized the Soviet rule over their homeland. Nor have they become reconciled to the foreign ideas and brutal practices of their Communist overlords. Americans of Byelorussian descent detest and despise both the rulers and their minions in the land of their ancestors. On the 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, Mr. Speaker, we join them in this celebration and hope that one day the Byelorussian people will regain their freedom from Communist Russian domination.

Baseball at Bat in Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the prestigious Wall Street Journal yesterday carried on its editorial page an article which explains why and how Milwaukee and Wisconsin are fighting organized baseball in the courts.

Written by Steven M. Lovelady, the article, "Baseball at Bat," provides an excellent summary of the events of recent weeks as Milwaukee fights in the courts to keep a major league baseball team.

Of particular note is Mr. Lovelady's conclusions about what may happen if the Milwaukee judge orders the Braves to play the 1966 season in Milwaukee.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have addressed the House on this subject a number of times in the past. It is my belief that what our people in Milwaukee County and Wisconsin are doing goes beyond our local situation.

We are fighting to restore sanity and public responsibility to the national pastime. This is a cause in which all baseball enthusiasts can take an interest, no matter where they live.

The national interest in this question was reemphasized recently when the

March issue of the American Legion magazine featured the question "Should Professional Baseball Be Put Under Antitrust Laws?" in its "Washington Pro and Con" feature.

It was my privilege to be on the affirmative side of that question. The negative was represented by an esteemed friend and colleague, the gentleman from Atlanta, Ga. [Mr. WELTNER]. In the thought that this debate would be of interest to our colleagues, I am also inserting it in the RECORD.

I might note that this article has brought dozens of letters to my office from all over the country supporting my contention that baseball should be stripped of its antitrust exemption. Not one letter has been received opposing my position.

This indicates to me that the people of our Nation understand what we in Wisconsin are attempting to do, that they approve and support efforts to clean up professional baseball.

The items follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 22, 1966]

Baseball at Bat: Milwaukee Antitrust Suits May Profoundly Change the Game

(By Steven M. Lovelady)

MILWAUKEE.—Professional baseball has finally been forced to come to bat for itself, and against the pitcher it's tried mightily to avoid for 44 years—the law.

Feelings in the critical series run so high there's even a rhubarb among the umpires, and a playoff seems certain. But at the moment, with Judge Elmer W. Roller calling them in Wisconsin Circuit Court here, baseball is behind in the count, about two strikes and no balls.

Judge Roller presides over the antitrust suit by the State of Wisconsin and Milwaukee County to ban the National League's Braves from moving to Atlanta, or anywhere else, unless they provide a substitute major league franchise for Milwaukee. The judge has already ordered the league to "be prepared" for an order to play in Milwaukee, but a Georgia court has ordered the Braves to play in Atlanta.

At least two National League club managements regard it entirely possible, if not in fact likely, that conflicting orders will prevent the Braves from playing at all this season anywhere, incredible as that may seem. Financially and otherwise, this would be a disaster for the league and a catastrophe for the Braves. An order to play in Milwaukee this year could, National League Attorney Bowie K. Kuhn affirms, "lead to the utter destruction and ruination of baseball."

The weighty immediate prospects, moreover, pale by comparison with the possibility lurking in the wings: An all-out attack on the monopolistic position baseball was given or has assumed under a 1922 Supreme Court decision, that it is not interstate commerce. Such an attack might not stop merely at curbing major league wanderlust. It could upset some of organized baseball's most cherished foundations, notably the reserve clause indenturing players to one team and the exclusive territorial rights the leagues give their teams.

So far, however, Milwaukee has only perfunctorily attacked baseball's monopoly as illegal. True, it has contended for the record that league decisions and limits on franchise locations are a conspiracy in restraint of trade. And since the suit is under Wisconsin State antitrust law, the 1922 decision about interstate commerce has scant effect. But the State has not stressed these points, possibly because to do so would put it in the awkward position of telling a judge, in effect, "Baseball is an invidious monopoly, and we are suing to make sure we keep a piece of the action."

THE PLAINTIFF'S STRATEGY

Rather, the plaintiffs' strategy so far has been to agree, even to plead, that baseball is a legal monopoly because it is generally recognized as such. With this understood, they are trying to hoist baseball with its own petard. For the law holds that to retain any sanction, a monopoly must behave reasonably, not capriciously.

Specifically, one interested lawyer explains, precedents indicate that "when a legal monopoly is supplying a market that is economically productive, it can't remove itself from the market without providing another supplier." It is illegal for the Braves to pull out of Milwaukee, County Corporation Counsel Robert P. Russell contends, in the same way it would be illegal for the manufacturer of a patented product to withdraw a local franchise and then enter agreements with other patent licensees to prevent the distributor from getting a franchise from anyone else.

Thus, county lawyers demand, allow baseball to keep its monopoly powers, but order it, as a recognized monopoly, to refrain from abandoning an economically productive area without producing an alternative supplier—namely, a replacement major league franchise.

So far, the main battleground has been the phrase "that is economically productive." The Braves management testifies that it lost $3.5 million in the last 3 years in Milwaukee, a circumstance which would justify its withdrawal even as a monopoly. The State and county contend this is merely a paper loss, and that under more "accepted" methods of accounting, the Braves have about broken even or turned a slight profit.

State witnesses, including some businessmen willing to undertake a new Milwaukee franchise, have offered detailed and generally convincing testimony that baseball can be profitable here. They contend a team can earn money on attendance of 800,000 a year, though the Braves say 1,400,000 is necessary. The Braves attendance peak here was 2,050,000 in 1956, but it slumped to 555,584 last year, when fans boycotted the team because of its announced intention to move.

Another important issue is what impact the move would have on the Milwaukee economy. The Braves are offering witnesses contending it would do no significant damage. The State put Washington Economist Robert R. Nathan on the stand to testify that his consulting firm found the move would cost the city $18 million in income, 2,600 jobs, and more than $600,000 in tax revenue. Judge Roller has struck down other Brave contentions, such as the one that his State court has no jurisdiction over baseball because it is a "national sport."

Meanwhile, Atlanta Judge Sam McKenzie has ordered the Braves to honor their contract with the Fulton County Stadium Authority, which calls for the Braves to play there 25 years starting this season. Both Judge Roller and Judge McKenzie were elected by constituencies apparently anxious to have major league baseball in their cities, a fact which may or may not have bearing on their decisions.

In Houston, a Federal judge, James Noel, granted the Fulton County Stadium Authority's request for a temporary injunction enforcing the Atlanta contract. He said Milwaukee's antitrust accusations were inconsistent with the purpose of keeping the Braves there. Judge Roller observes, however, that the Federal court decision does not answer the question of whether the move violates Wisconsin law.

EXPOSURE TO PENALTIES

Thus, if Judge Roller issues a permanent injunction calling for the Braves to play in Milwaukee, an attempt to play in Atlanta would open the team to the massive financial penalties of the Wisconsin law. Milwaukee's lawyers, moreover, could ask enforcement of the injunction by courts in each of the seven other States that have National League teams. Conflicting rulings from two such courts could make the league schedule impossibly complicated.

An Ohio court, for example, might order the Cincinnati Reds to play the Braves' home games in Milwaukee. At the same time, a court in Illinois could favor the Georgia ruling to order the Chicago Cubs to play the Braves in Atlanta. In the words of one club owner, the schedule would be "wrecked beyond repair." Such a conflict could eventually be worked out in a Federal court, but that would be time consuming, and the baseball season's opening day is April 12.

Even if the Braves simply did not play, the other teams would face large expenses in revamping their travel arrangements. Some observers conceive of a compromise, with the league offering Milwaukee a team later, say in 1967, in return for letting the Braves go now. So far, however, the owners have adamantly refused this idea.

To make the situation even more threatening for baseball, Milwaukee has also filed a Federal antitrust suit, which is dormant pending the end of the State trial. Milwaukee could change tactics in this suit to press the contention that the league is guilty of illegal restraint of trade, and demand that baseball be stripped of its monopolistic privileges. Then, presumably, the Braves would be free to move and the Milwaukee businessmen—or anyone else—would be free to form their own franchise and bid for established players on the open market.

Baseball has long feared the 1922 precedent would no longer protect it from such a challenge. Since then, the U.S. Supreme Court has obviously evolved a far broader definition of interstate commerce, and with the advent of television, baseball has in fact become more involved in interstate operations. In recent years, the Supreme Court has ruled that professional football and boxing are indeed interstate commerce. In 1963, however, it refused to reconsider the 1922 baseball decision, suggesting the matter would be appropriate for legislation. So far, Congress has not taken the hint.

If antitrust laws were applied strictly to baseball, the leagues could no longer limit the number and location of franchises. Nor could they maintain their reserve clause. Traditionally, this clause has meant that once a player signs a contract with one team, he cannot offer his services to any other. Last year, moreover, baseball started a "free agent" draft which all but eliminates even the chance for a player to bargain one team against another before signing his first contract.

SETTLEMENT OUT OF COURT

In a 1949 test of the reserve clause, a State court ruled that baseball was interstate commerce, the 1922 decision notwithstanding. To avoid a Supreme Court test, baseball paid $60,000 in an out-of-court settlement with Danny Gardella, who had been barred from U.S. baseball for 5 years after jumping his contract to play in Mexico. Team owners maintain the clause is needed to prevent a few wealthy teams from buying up all the best players. Critics reply that no serious imbalance of wealth would occur were it not for another league rule distributing TV and radio income among teams on the basis of won-lost records.

Some critics question the owners' assertion that loss of current antitrust protection would hamper the game seriously. Professional football has not, to say the least, suffered discernibly since being ruled interstate commerce. In that case, the court allowed some exemption from antitrust enforcement because of the unusual nature of the enterprise; football even operates a player draft, but with reserve clauses much less greedy than baseball's.

Ralph L. Andreano, a University of Wisconsin economist, studied the effect of entirely removing baseball's antitrust exemption in "No Joy in Mudville," published before the Braves' hassle arose. He concluded, "Major league baseball would not materially differ in its structure or performance in the long run if the courts were to strike at the institutional heart of its monopoly position."

Whatever its ultimate legal and economic effects, the Milwaukee episode is doing baseball no good on most of the nation's sports pages. Hearst columnist Jimmy Cannon proclaims that what the Braves have done to Milwaukee "would make a man with a zinc-lined stomach vomit." Dick Young of the New York Daily News agrees; baseball, he says, "moved in like a gay young blade, ravished the land, and is about to move on to other parts where money is fresher and the suckers riper."

At least in a publicity sense, baseball is unlikely to forget anytime soon its time at bat in Judge Roller's courtroom. And when the legal skeins are finally untangled, who knows what the result may be? Contemplating the day-to-day complications of the case, one Chicago lawyer sighs, "The national pastime ain't what it used to be." If the good burghers of Milwaukee have anything like their way, it certainly never will be again.

[From the American Legion magazine, March 1966]

SHOULD PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL BE PUT UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS?

YES

(By Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, Fourth District)

Of all professional team sports, organized baseball alone is exempt from the restrictions of the Nation's antitrust laws. This highly privileged position results from a 1922 U.S. Supreme Court decision that professional baseball was a "personal effort," a sport rather than a commercial venture, Although baseball and the times have changed drastically, the decision has remained, mainly because it has never been seriously challenged either in the courts or by Congress.

Baseball was principally a sport in 1922; today it is first and foremost a big business. Major league franchises cost millions of dollars and generally are owned by syndicates of wealthy businessmen. These businessmen tend to view their teams as they would any other investment, in terms of the profits to be made. Baseball, indeed, has become very profitable, particularly because of lucrative, television and radio contracts.

In 1965, for example, organized professional baseball reaped a total of $25,310,000 from the sale of game broadcasting rights. Broadcasters, in turn, charged sponsors $85 million for advertising rights. The result has been that team owners are more concerned about the fan in the armchair at home than the fan in the stands. Baseball today is being operated not so much to quicken the clicks of the turnstiles at the ball park as to affect the click of TV channel selectors.

Further evidence of the ties between baseball and broadcasting are the many persons with extensive holdings in radio and television stations and networks who are officials and major stockholders of American and National League teams. In 1964, for example, the Columbia Broadcasting System bought the New York Yankees, marking the first time a network had gained actual control of a baseball team.

The power of TV over baseball also is apparent in the decision to move the Milwaukee Braves to Atlanta, Ga. Milwaukee, which once set the National League attendance record, is recognized as a good baseball town, but it has a limited TV market because of geographical location. Atlanta, on the other hand, is the focal point of a large area of the South and rich with potential broadcasting money. That apparently is the reason the Braves' owners want to move there. They are shamefully disregarding the hundreds of thousands of Braves' fans in Wisconsin who loyally have supported the team for years.

There is, of course, nothing wrong in televising games or making a profit. But something is wrong with claiming an exemption from antitrust laws as a sport and then using that privilege for strictly business purposes which flaunt the public interest. That is the reason I have introduced a bill into Congress which would strip the baseball industry of its antitrust exemption.

Stringent measures are necessary in order to restore public confidence to what once was our national pastime. Congress cannot do more damage to the sport than its owners have done already.

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

NO

(By Representative CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia, Fifth District)

On January 4, 1965, a bill, H.R. 6, was introduced in Congress which would place professional baseball under the complete jurisdiction of Federal antitrust laws. In my opinion such legislation, if enacted into law, would prove detrimental to the future of professional baseball. In the first place, it would place such important business practices as player drafts, reserve clauses, and territorial franchises under the cloak of legal uncertainty. Also, such legislation would negate two Supreme Court decisions of 1922 and 1953 which held that professional baseball was "not a subject of commerce," and thus was not subject to the antitrust laws.

Professional baseball today is a highly competitive enterprise, both on and off the field. Competition, not monopoly, is the best assurance of success to baseball owners and players alike.

In order to maintain equalization of competitive strength between teams, it is necessary for clubs to engage in substantial cooperation—for example, in the distribution of player talent and in the granting of territorial rights to team franchises. Under the Commissioner of Baseball, baseball has managed its own house, and done so quite well.

In opposing H.R. 6, I realize that during the 1950's the U.S. Supreme Court rendered two important opinions which place professional basketball, football, and ice hockey squarely under the jurisdiction of the Federal antitrust laws. Aware that these opinions collided with those on professional baseball, the Court stated, "the orderly way to eliminate error or discrimination, if any there be, is by legislation, and not by court decision."

During the current session of Congress, bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate which, with certain important exceptions, would place all professional team sports under the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws. Antitrust laws will not apply to agreements and rules pertaining to:

Equalization of competitive player strengths;

Employment, selection or eligibility of players, or the reservation, selection or assignment of player contracts;

The right to operate within specific geographic areas.

This proposal, strongly supported by ex-Commissioner Ford Frick and the Senate Judiciary Committee, would clear up uncertainty pertaining to business practices outlined above, would prohibit improper restraint and would allow all professional team sports to continue to operate effectively by self-regulation.

H.R. 6, however, poses a serious threat to self-regulation because all business practices of professional baseball would be subject to antitrust laws.

Professional baseball has benefited immensely from self-regulation. If professional baseball is to continue to serve the national interest, we must assure the continuance of those natural, competitive instincts which have made it the national sport.

CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER.

"Nation Guides Its Economic Destiny With Prudent Fiscal Management"—Secretary Fowler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, has given a most learned and informed analysis of economic growth in a speech before the recent National Home Loan Bank Board Conference in Washington, D.C.

Secretary Fowler points out that in sustaining the current record economic prosperity, "we have come to know and to understand the use of fiscal measures, expenditures, and tax reduction to give the economy that extra sense of trust and healthy climate of confidence necessary to continuing growth and expansion."

Under unanimous consent, I include the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of its interest to my colleagues and to the American people:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Chairman Horne, gentlemen, here, among so many old friends and colleagues, both in public and private life, I would like to share with you for a few minutes some of the problems we have in Treasury.

Recently a noted newspaper editor commented on the Treasury and its Secretaries. "With rare exceptions," he said, "Secretaries of the Treasury go on to oblivion. If things go well with the Nation's finances, somebody gets the credit; if they go wrong, the man in the counting house gets the blame. In most administrations, the Treasury Secretary is not only unremembered but unnoticed, unheard, and unloved." In referring to me and the frustrations of the job, the writer observed that conceivably mine "could be the hapless term in which the roof falls in, and it certainly won't be repaired unless he has the courage to say no to fiscal shiftlessness, which won't make him popular. His consolation, if that's the word, is that succeed or fail, hardly anyone will remember him. The counting house is no place to seek fame or glory."

But I doubt if anyone, whether he is called Secretary of the Treasury or Chancellor of the Exchequer, enters the counting house seeking either fame or glory. When England's Chancellor of the Exchequer, Jim Callaghan, was recently here conferring with me on problems of the pound, the first question he was asked after speaking at the Press Club was this: "How do you explain, Mr. Chancellor, that an Irishman named Callaghan from a Welsh district is in the House of Commons?" Without hesitating, the Chancellor replied: "That's our way of getting back at the brutal British."

The Chancellor was also asked why it was that the British Empire 50 years ago did not have a balance-of-payments problem when its empire extended throughout the world and the sun never set upon it. After a moment's deliberation, Mr. Callaghan replied: "There were no balance-of-payments problems 50 years ago because we had on balance-of-payments statistics." Secretaries of the Treasury and Chancellors of the Exchequer, alike, can be forgiven a nostalgic thought as to how it must have been in simpler times.

Fortunately, today's flood of statistical information not only highlights problems, but also measures our successes. One heartening success in recent years is seeing a revitalized and dynamic American economy performing once again close to its full potential.

A few years ago we used to hear about the European "economic miracle." The reason for this, you will recall, was that the rate of growth in Western Europe's industrialized countries and in Japan far exceeded our rate of growth in the 1950's. From 1953 through 1960, the growth rate in the European countries was around 5 percent, and Japan did even better. During the same period, the economic growth rate of the United States was a relatively disappointing 2.4 percent annual average. When, as Under Secretary of the Treasury, I went to the first meeting of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in November of 1961, the U.S. delegation proposed that the industrialized nations of the Atlantic Community—Japan was not then, but is now, a member of OECD—adopt a common goal of 50 percent economic growth during the 1960's. The only real concern voiced at the meeting in Paris, in adopting that target, was whether or not the U.S. economy with its slow rate of advance would pull the rest of the free world down or whether we would be able to hold up our share.

Well, in the last few years, we've come to hear about the "American miracle." In 1965, our rate of growth was about 5.5 percent, and averaged 4.5 percent from 1960 to 1965. Western European countries and Japan, on the other hand, according to a recent assessment by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, may have a 1965 rate of growth around 3.5 percent. Vigorous U.S. growth during the entire 1960–65 period has been a key factor helping the OECD as a group to meet, and even exceed at mid-decade, the growth target that seemed so ambitious in 1961.

This same progress has presented us domestically with an entirely new economic environment, a new set of problems. In a sense, most of our past economic experience had been something like riding the roller coaster—up, down, up and down. The aims of economic policy had been largely concerned with how do we go up and keep going up, then, once we start down, how do we pull ourselves out of the dip and get back up again. But, now in the 1960's, we have made steady expansion the aim of economic policy, and demonstrated how it can be done. For 5 years, the economy has been moving upwards. The gap between supply and demand is at its narrowest point since the days of World War II and, for a brief period, during the 1951–52 era. The problem we now face is a relatively new one for us. The problem is whether we'll have the knowledge, capacity, restraint, and discipline that will be required to keep the economy moving ahead in a noninflationary expansion.

During the current expansion, we have come to know and to understand the use of fiscal measures, expenditures, and tax reduction to give the economy that extra sense of thrust and healthy climate of confidence necessary to continuing growth and expansion.

The various fiscal measures that we have employed—the liberalization of depreciation, the Revenue Act of 1962 with its investment tax credit, the Revenue Act of 1964, and the Excise Tax Act of 1965—have resulted in removing from the private enterprise economy the annual weight of about $20 billion of taxes, at this year's level of incomes. During this period since fiscal 1961 when annual tax reductions have amounted to $20 billion, the actual increase in annual revenues because of an expanding economy amounts to $21 billion. Now these two facts standing together take on added significance when you realize that in the preceding 5 years, when there were no substantial tax reductions, the revenue increase was substantially less. In fact, it was less than half of the $21 billion increase in revenue that we've had in the past 5 years—an increase, I want to reemphasize—that accompanied a $20 billion tax reduction.

Now, I would like to say a word about expenditures during this same period, and I want to focus directly on the last 3 years. There is an illusion that's going around the country—another myth. You read in some of the papers that there has been a lot of profligate expenditure. Let me tell you what the real facts are since President Lyndon Johnson has been in the White House.

When President Johnson took over in 1963 after the tragic death of President Kennedy, the estimate for the 1964 budget was $98.8 billion. By the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1964, the expenditure level had been held down to $97.7 billion, over $1 billion less than the January estimate. And then you will recall that to everyone's surprise, the President unveiled a 1965 fiscal budget with estimated expenditures of $97.9 billion, rather than the considerably more that had been expected. And, by the close of fiscal year 1965, which ended last June 30, the actual expenditure level was $96.5 billion—almost $1.5 billion less than the January estimate.

Last January, President Johnson projected an expenditure level in the administrative budget of $99.7 billion. Had it not been for the $4.7 billion additional expenditure, which is the special costs of Vietnam in this fiscal year, and some $2 billion of uncontrollable expenditures, which the President didn't ask for but were imposed upon the budget by actions of the Congress and by the increase in interest charges on the public debt, the current budget for this fiscal year would be well within the $99.7 billion range. Moreover, we would have ended this fiscal year on June 30 at about that level.

For the nearly 3 fiscal years President Johnson has been in charge, expenditures in the administrative budget would have increased less than $900 million, had it not been for the unavoidable cost increases in Vietnam and the uncontrollable cost increases just mentioned. This should be compared with the average rate of increase in expenditures in the preceding 10 years of $3 billion annually. As a consequence, when we were confronted by the situation of last July and the President announced to the world the underlying reasons why we had to live up to our commitments in South Vietnam and increase our efforts there, we had a solid financial base from which to operate.

I know you've had the pleasure this morning of hearing from our colleague Charles Schultze, Director of the Budget. He told you about the $112.8 billion of expenditures estimated for this coming year's fiscal 1967 budget. Some of you are asking in your own mind "where is that money coming from?" Well, I've thought about this too over the last few months. One part of it is fairly clear. In 1965 we had an expansion of just over $47 billion in our gross national product. We have grown from about a $504 billion gross national product in the first quarter of 1961 to a rate of more than $695 billion in the last quarter of 1965. If this thrust continues, and there is no reason why it shouldn't, we could expect a very substantial growth in revenues.

Now against the $112.8 billion of anticipated expenditures, and after conservative estimation of anticipated receipts, the President had three choices: He could have gone along with a deficit of something over $6 billion—$6.5 to $6.6 billion—he could have cut back substantially some of the new programs that he had already cut back in a very substantial way; or he could have asked for an increase in the rates of income tax on individuals and corporations. He did none of those three things. He decided to raise the money rather than face the deficit, but he decided to do it in a manner that would not involve an increase in the income tax rates or the final tax liabilities of any individual or business in the United States.

He followed the policies which the Congress had adopted, of putting the taxpayers—personal and corporate—on a pay-as-you-go basis, by proposing graduated withholding for the individual, current payment of social security taxes by the self-employed, and a speedup in the accelerated corporation-tax-payments plan adopted by Congress in the 1964 Revenue Act. This latter system had already been scheduled to bring larger corporations to a pay-as-you-go basis by 1970; now it would occur by 1967. The President also asked Congress to defer for 2 years just two of the excise taxes—automobiles and telephones—that Congress had already decided to remove on a graduated basis.

The revenue increases from all those measures during fiscal 1967 would be $4.8 billion, which would bring us to a revenue estimate of $111 billion. This would reduce the administrative budget deficit to $1.8 billion in fiscal 1967 from the $6.4 billion estimated for fiscal 1966.

Now, the President has made it quite clear in his state of the Union message, his economic report, and his budget message that this is the way we see our requirements today through the fiscal period 1967, insofar as Secretary McNamara and his colleagues in the Defense Department can foresee. But we cannot foresee the unforeseeable. If there are increased requirements beyond those predicted today, or if the economy should be overstrained by the requirements placed upon it, the President has left no doubt that there will have to be further fiscal actions to keep the economy on an even keel. This, however, is not entirely a problem for Government. It is also a very important problem for the private sector of our economy.

Our most serious economic challenge in 1966 will be to preserve the essential stability of costs and prices which has contributed so significantly to the very balanced economic progress that I have outlined. Not only have we grown faster than our friends and allies in other countries, but our price level has been far more stable than that of any other industrialized country in the free world. A good deal of this has been due to the voluntary discipline that leaders of business and leaders of labor have imposed upon their own operations pursuant, not in any hard and precise way, but, nonetheless, pursuant to the administration's guideposts for noninflationary price and wage behavior. Now these guideposts are not Government law or fiat. The Government does not have direct wage or price control authority and does not want it. It is striving by every device it can to avoid any necessity for it.

I think we should look at the situation this way: every businessman and every leader of labor must recognize that every decision he makes or influences regarding prices and wages, particularly in the economic situation I have described where we are relatively close to capacity output, affects not only the wages of his union members and the returns of his stockholders, but it also affects every American. As President Johnson said in his economic message: "Shortsighted pursuit of short-run interests fails in the longer run to advance the interests of either labor or management. And it surely does not advance the interests of the Nation." The President has also said that he is confident that the overwhelming majority of private decisions in 1966 will be sound and responsible. I think we all share that confidence.

Now, with the additional costs of Vietnam, which add up to about $10.5 billion more for fiscal 1966 and for fiscal 1967 than we had counted on a year ago, I think it's readily apparent that we've got to keep a very close watch for inflationary pressures where and when they develop. As the President pointed out in his 1966 economic report, the extent of the fiscal or monetary restraint that will be needed to avoid inflationary pressures will depend directly on the restraint and moderation exercised by those who have power over wages and prices.

I have discussed these issues with you at some length because I think it helps to cut through the fog that shrouds much of the public discussion of such questions as "will the Government go for tax increases later this year or next year or at some other time?" As I said earlier, we can't foresee the unforeseeable with respect to Vietnam, but we all can play a very direct role in finding the right answers in both the public and the private sectors of the economy. Those right answers will permit us to maintain the healthy, well-balanced, economic growth pattern that we have now, and the sort of well-balanced, healthy economic pattern that we want to have when we have resolved the problem of Vietnam and we can return once again with our full national attention addressed to developing a truly Great Society.

Thank you.

A Law Against Invasion of Privacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, today I received the following telegram:

Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly protest following matter and urge your intervention to prevent flagrant abuse of local government power.

Last night at public urban renewal meeting Mayor Harry Lister of Rockville Centre announced hiring private agency to investigate recent report of Nassau County Human Rights Commission which blamed village officials for racial tension in urban renewal area. Agency is Vincent Gillen who conducted General Motors probe of Ralph Nader. Gillen detectives were present at meeting unannounced. Mayor acknowledged presence but refused to identify men.

For mayor to use private detectives to investigate local critics and government agency critical of village is open abuse of public trust and public funds. Mayor is willing to spend taxpayers' money to attack critics and whitewash self but refused for years to spend enough money to relieve unbearable conditions in urban renewal area. Proposed investigation cannot be impartial since mayor announced it would present his side of story. He can do this without aid of private detectives. Clear implication is that investigation will result in personal attack on critics and invasion of privacy in manner of Nader probe.

Are citizens to be subjected to same tactics by their own elected officials who last year arrested women, later acquitted, for protesting denial of right to speak at public meeting? Who concealed microphone in village hall to record conversation of critics, who last night suggested investigation and possible discipline of priest who helped write diocesan commission report critical of village?

We implore you to intervene in mayor's action which has no place in civil government in America.

Rockville Centre Tenants
Association,
Mrs. Alfreda Brewster, *Chairman.*
Rockville Centre Committee
for Human Rights,
Dr. James Bernstein, *Chairman.*

Mr. Speaker, I responded to the above telegram as follows:

Mrs. Alfreda Brewster,
Chairman, Rockville Centre Tenants Association, Rockville Centre, N.Y.
Dr. James Bernstein,
Chairman, Rockville Centre Committee for Human Rights, Rockville Centre, N.Y.:

I acknowledge and am shocked by the contents of your telegram relating to events in Rockville Centre. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I recognize the responsibilities of Congress to protect the right of privacy of individuals. I will place my comments on this subject in the Congressional Record to call the attention of my colleagues to these events. It is my hope that 10 years of history and tensions will be merged and buried with the first shovel of dirt turned on the Rockville Centre Urban Renewal Project.

Sincerely,

Herbert Tenzer,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper articles from Long Island's two daily newspapers provide the background to the events which have occurred in Rockville Centre, N.Y.:

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Mar. 24, 1966]

"PRIVATE EYE" SITS IN AT VILLAGE MEETING

(By Paul Wiseman)

Rockville Centre village officials hesitantly admitted last night that at least one of the 70 persons sitting in the audience at a village urban renewal meeting was a private detective invited by the officials to observe the meeting.

Minutes before the meeting started, this reporter noticed some village officials apparently briefing a stranger. Asking who the man was, the reporter was told: "His name's Fairfield. The village's hiring him to investigate urban renewal."

The stranger identified himself to the reporter as Irwin Fairfield of Vincent Gillen Associates Inc. of Garden City. A congressional committee discovered earlier this week that General Motors had used the Gillen firm to investigate the author of a controversial book charging that Detroit-built cars were unsafe.

General Motors publicly apologized for the probe which asked questions about the author's sex habits, political beliefs and attitudes toward Jews.

As last night's meeting got underway at 8 p.m. at the village's recreation center, Acting Village Clerk Arthur DeMott, sitting on the stage with the other board members, was expectantly watching the doors to the meeting room. Suddenly he left the stage and walked to the back of the room to chat with an unidentified man who had just entered.

After several minutes, the man took a seat in front of Fairfield and then leaned back to exchange some words with him. Asked by a reporter who the man was, Fairfield said: "What are you asking me for? I have nothing to discuss." At the end of the meeting Fairfield and the other man left together.

Mayor W. Harry Lister announced at the start of the meeting, that the board was "retaining an organization of professional management and personnel consultants" to make a thorough study of the Nassau Commission on Human Rights' report which largely blamed village officials for racial unrest in the urban renewal area.

When Dr. James Bernstein, president of the Human Rights Committee, asked whether the village had hired a private detective agency, the mayor hesitated briefly, then said: "We haven't hired totally * * *."

Bernstein challenged him on the secrecy of the matter and Lister replied it would not be secret as soon as the village decided whether to hire the firm.

Trustee Albert Rubin then interrupted the exchange saying that the board would not release details of its investigation until the county commission makes public the means it employed in investigating the village situation.

* * * * *

Local civil rights groups have asked the county commission to hold public hearings on the urban renewal controversy, contending such hearings would allow the village to cross-examine witnesses. The village board has avoided making similar requests to the county body.

When Bernstein asked Lister if there was a private detective present at the meeting at the board's request, the mayor did not answer directly. Bernstein then turned about and facing the audience asked: "Is there a detective in the audience?" No one responded and Lister said: "Wait a minute, who's running this meeting? * * * There is a man in this room representing a firm.

Lister was told that if the village retains Gillen, he will specify that no inquiries may be made by the firm into any individual's sex habits or other personal privacy.

* * * * *

Lister said he expected it would take from 30 to 60 days for an investigation commissioned by the board to be completed. The investigation, he said, would take the form of interviews with "residents and nonresidents of the urban renewal area, including officials, to come up with factual statements in regard to the critical observations in the commission's criticisms and conclusions."

Mrs. James Bernstein, wife of the doctor, quipped that since the board was hiring the investigative firm to present its side of the story, "how can you say in advance that it's going to be factual?"

A spokesman for the Tenants Association said after the meeting, "This is the second time in the last few months that the village is using taxpayer's dollars for underhand investigations of its critics. First the bugging, now the dicks." The "bugging" referred to the microphone found by this reporter last November in the public telephone booth in the village hall. Later explained at the time that the bug was intended "to record the antics of (Dr. Ralph G.) Sorley"—the village's most outspoken critic.

[From Newsday, Mar. 24, 1966]

HOUSING MEETING ENDS IN EVICTION OF 11

ROCKVILLE CENTRE.—The village board, whose policy is to have residents save their urban renewal questions for its special meetings devoted to the subject about every 2 months, sometimes has trouble answering them all in one night.

Last night, for instance, the village police force had to eject 11 questioners from the meeting hall after the meeting was over who just kept sitting and waiting for more answers.

The 11 officers, members, and supporters of the tenants association, which has led urban renewal area tenants in a campaign against the village's administration of the program, had come to the Rockville Centre Recreation Center to find out what the village board had to say about a Nassau Human Rights Commission report last month condemning the board's administration of the project for discriminating against Negroes in the administration of its urban renewal project.

MEMBERS STAY IN SEATS

But at 11 p.m. after several hours of vigorous questioning, the board adjourned the meeting but association members decided to stay in their seats until they were satisfied. The result, said Charles Scwartz, 20, of 130 Lakeview Avenue.: "They carried us out and dumped us on the sidewalk." Rockville Centre police said their reports showed only that "the hall had to be cleared," according to a spokesman, who said he did not know if any of the demonstrators were removed bodily. He said no arrests had been made.

Scwartz, who said, "We didn't leave because we weren't satisfied with what the board had to say" in response to questions from the tenants' group about the composition of the grievance board which the village trustees have promised to establish. The grievance board, which was one of the recommendations of the county human rights commission report, would mediate disputes between the predominantly Negro tenants of the village-zoned temporary housing in the West End urban renewal area. The village and the tenants, however, have different ideas about who should sit on the board. The Tenants Association is claiming the right to represent all tenants on the board, but according to Dr. James Bernstein, chairman of the Rockville Centre Committee for Human Rights, Mayor W. Harry Lister "told us he did not think the association is representative enough." Bernstein added: "He's going to do everything he can to avoid appointing someone from the association to the grievance board." Lister's telephone was reported off the hook last night by the telephone company, and he could not be reached for comment after the meeting.

INVESTIGATION PLANNED

Bernstein also said the mayor told the tenants he was hiring a management consultant firm, which he refused to identify, to investigate the village's urban renewal program and issue a report in answer to the county human rights commission. "It sounds to me like he's hiring some private eyes," Bernstein said. "I gather they are even going to investigate the county commission." Bernstein, who said the mayor denounced the commission's report as prejudiced and libelous in parts, said, "We feel the commission must hold a public hearing now. The village has no plans to talk to anyone about the recommendations in the report."

It is the responsibility of Congress to protect the rights of the individual against the resources of government and corporations which threaten the right of privacy and to draft legislation which will put teeth in the unwritten law against invasion of privacy. The right of law-enforcement officers in the field must be clearly defined. The exposure of recent cases of government snooping and industrial espionage by the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, and the recent events in my own Fifth Congressional District point up the need for legislation.

The charge that the mayor of Rockville Centre plans to spend taxpayers' money to hire private investigators to investigate critics of the urban renewal project is shocking. Last November I was shocked when I discovered a microphone hidden in a public phone booth in the Rockville Centre Village Hall. The purpose of this secret installation, as stated by the mayor, was to record conversations of one of the mayor's critics, but a grand jury returned no indictment against the village official who installed the microphone.

The laws pertaining to wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping vary from State to State and a thorough study of these laws is needed. Incidents highlighting invasion of privacy sometimes receive national attention, as in the General Motors case, and other times receive only local attention as in Rockville Centre, but the invasions of privacy are equally serious.

The drafting of legislation to define the limits of government and corporation investigations will not be easy; however, we should not be deterred in making an effort to clarify allowable legal limits for such investigations. It is high time that we investigate the investigators so that we may guarantee to our citizens their rights and privacy.

The courts have been able to define civil liability for invasion of privacy without infringing upon the right of free speech. It is time to protect individuals from such abuses by providing criminal liability.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOM,
March 24, 1966.

To the House of Representatives:

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rev. J. Hodge Alves, Falls Church Episcopal Church, Falls Church, Va., offered the following prayer:

Micah 6: 8: *He has showed you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?*

O God, Father of all mankind, we know that Thou hast made us and art concerned for each one of us. We see that our world tempts us to think that what we want is most important. Save us from self and from smallness: that our concern may grow larger every day; that these Thy sons and daughters called to lead this good land may serve the best interests of all the people of these United States; that they may be capable politicians and day by day may be becoming truer statesmen. May the good interests of Thy children of every nation be ever in their hearts; may they labor for peace and righteousness and mercy everywhere; may they in quietness and reality know Thy guiding presence and Thy love; and may they find inner peace and strength in doing Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 28

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the remainder of the week and the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand that there is one legislative matter today dealing, I think, with an agreement to a Senate amendment. However, we have no scheduled legislative program as such for today. After today's business we will go over until Monday.

In response to the distinguished minority leader's inquiry with respect to the program for next week, Monday is District Day. There are no bills.

Tuesday we will have the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1966.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 707, Tualatin Federal reclamation project; H.R. 2829, Manson Unit, Chelan Division, Chief Joseph Dam project; H.R. 3606, National Water Research Act; S. 2729, amending Small Business Act to establish separate revolving funds for disaster, business, and small business investment loans.

I might advise that there are no rules yet on these bills and this announcement is made subject to the granting of rules by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, all of those bills listed under Wednesday and the balance of the week are subject to rules being reported out.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. The Committee on Rules is meeting on some of them on Tuesday, and it is anticipated that they may meet on others later in the week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Thank you.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, this is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said of the rapid pace of journalism today that a later truth never catches up with an early misconception.

Last year many highly placed Americans and certain influential segments of the U.S. press ridiculed our Government's contention that intervention was necessary in the Dominican Republic in order to prevent a Communist takeover there.

Now, in a recently published article in the World Marxist Review, two self-declared members of the executive committee of the Dominican Communist Party not only admit the extent of Communist involvement in the last year's Dominican upheaval, but also state that except for U.S. military intervention the island of Santo Domingo would have become another Red base in the Caribbean.

There were Members of this body as well as Members of the U.S. Senate who supported the thesis that our intervention in Santo Domingo was unnecessary, and that there was no real threat of a Communist takeover in that country.

I would now ask them, as well as those segments of American press and television who also supported this thesis, to give the American people the benefit of their reaction to the World Marxist Review article.

I would especially hope that news media such as the New York Times, the Herald Tribune, and the Columbia Broadcasting System's television news division would make some effort to permit the later truth to catch up with the early misconception in the case of the 1965 Dominican crisis by giving wide coverage to the Dominican Communists' recent admission.

Last year, the Times, the Herald Tribune and CBS were seemingly quick to emphasize those aspects of the Dominican story which supported the thesis that U.S. intervention there was unnecessary and that the Communist participation in the so-called rebel cause was minimal. It would be in the interests of responsible journalism if these news agencies were now to give this year's truth the same space and time as last year's misconception.

Toward this end, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today's column by William S. White on this subject.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 24, 1966]

REDS ADMIT ROLE—AIDED DOMINICAN REVOLT

(By William S. White)

International communism has now not merely acknowledged but roundly boasted of its deep and armed complicity in the Dominican Republic revolt of last April which was nipped by U.S. military intervention.

The Communists have themselves thus destroyed the case of those American critics of the American action who so long have argued that what was afoot down there was only a good "democratic revolution" not too dissimilar, say, from George Washington's rebellion against King George III.

An article in one of the most authoritative of all the worldwide publications of Moscow-directed communism, the magazine World Marxist Review, has let this already ill-concealed cat well and truly out of the bag.

Its authors are self-identified members of the executive committee of the Communist Party in the Dominican Republic, J. I. Quello and N. I. Conde. They say, in so many words, that the attempted putsch would have succeeded but for "the direct armed intervention of U.S. imperialism." They say, moreover, that what was planned by the Communists for the Dominican Republic differed only superficially from the earlier revolution in Cuba that put Fidel Castro in power. The two, they add, were "in spirit, meaning and lessons" two parts of one whole.

They ought to know. For at least one of them, Conde, is an old hand in Cuba. And Quello was clandestinely landed in the Dominican Republic from Moscow shortly before the uprising.

Quello and Conde describe the Dominican affair as "another contribution to the arsenal of revolutionary experience on the (American) continent." Though the Communists were not able at its start fully to control the uprising they shortly were "allocating armed Communists" to revolutionary commands organized block by block in Santo Domingo. The piece repeatedly discloses the close relationship of this assault upon the Dominican Republic, not only to what had happened earlier in Cuba, but also to the general tactics for Communist subversion in Latin America long since prepared in Castro Cuba.

Something else is also disclosed—an outline of what the Communists learned in the Dominican Republic for future use. "Our experience showed," Quello and Conde write, "that the task of [Communist] revolutionaries during an armed insurrection is to influence it and guide it militarily and politically, to organize the struggle in accordance with the processes underway at the time.

"At first we combined all our forces in a single command. The fallacy of this decision soon made itself felt. It restricted, on the one hand, our propaganda (which was conducted chiefly among our own members). On the other hand, this command became the target for attacks on the movement by the imperialists. Having realized our mistake, we thereupon allocated armed Communists to a number of commands."

So much, then, out of the mouths of the Communists themselves, for the persistent attempt in some quarters here to depict the U.S. tough response to this peril as only another instance of "redbaiting," of looking for Communists under every bed, and so on.

The same people who have attacked the American intervention in these terms also had long pooh-poohed the existence of such a danger in Cuba, too. Their judgment—not their motives—really would seem to have been proved twice catastrophically wrong.

For just as Fidel Castro himself at length proclaimed, in several thousand words broadcast from Havana radio, admitting both his Communist membership and his Communist purposes in this hemisphere, Conde and Quello have now unmistakably and openly identified the Communist Party as the ultimately moving force in the Dominican upheaval.

Moreover, the complaints of critics of the American intervention that anyhow there really weren't very many Communists visible in Santo Domingo are now shown to be the quibbles they always were. They weren't too visible at any one point in Santo Domingo simply because the Communist leaders quickly dispersed them—armed—among the various commands.

RECENT DECISION OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD UPON ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES AGAINST THE J. P. STEVENS CO.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great concern the reports in the newspapers this week about a recent decision of the National Labor Relations Board relating to charges of alleged unfair labor practices against one of the textile employers of the country, the J. P. Stevens Co.

Mr. Speaker, I have read with concern this decision, because, if we can assume that newspapers have reported the reports accurately, the decision accurately, then we are to understand that the National Labor Relations Board is continuing to set itself up as a policymaking body.

Mr. Speaker, I have contended here for many years that voluntary membership in a union is a fundamental right of every American. I believe in the right of collective bargaining. I advocate the right of any American to join, belong to, and actively support an organized labor union. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that once an election is held that all parties at interest should accept the results, and wait the prescribed 12 months to seek another election, and while doing so not advance charges that create tension between the employer and its employees, and general discord in our labor-management relations.

Mr. Speaker, this decision to which I refer requires the reemployment by the employer of certain discharged employees whose dismissal allegedly constituted an unfair labor practice. This is not the time or the place to try or retry those charges and the authority of the National Labor Relations Board to examine such complaints and render a decision requiring reinstatement if the facts developed sustain the charges is not questioned. But, Mr. Speaker, when the National Labor Relations Board goes beyond this and in its decision orders the employer to admit publicly to all of its employees that they have been in violation of the law, that they are guilty of charges which they have heretofore denied, that they have sinned but will sin no more, the Board, in my opinion, goes far beyond its constituted authority and responsibility and seriously infringes upon a fundamental right of every American employer and every individual in this country.

The published reports in the newspapers say that this decision requires this employer to go before its thousands of employees and say to them in effect, "We have sinned, we have been guilty of violating the law and we will, if you will forgive us, not be guilty of any such acts again."

The **SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] has expired.

NLRB DECISION

Mr. **RIVERS** of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RIVERS** of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself completely, irrevocably, and eternally with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Georgia and now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. **LANDRUM.** Mr. Speaker, as I have said we are not here trying to pass upon the correctness or incorrectness of this decision. We merely say that the directions to the employer, if we are to take at face value the reports published in the newspapers indicate that the National Labor Relations Board continues to set itself up as a policymaking body.

I have said many times before that the National Labor Relations Board serves a good purpose, so long as it serves within the limitations put upon the Board by the Congress. Here in the Congress is where policy is made by this Nation—in the House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate. This agency, while rendering a necessary service and in many instances doing a great job in furthering harmony in our labor-management relations, by such decisions as we are reading in the papers in this case, creates unrest and creates a lack of confidence in the executive branch of our Government and suggests again that it is time for the Congress to take a serious look at reorganizing the National Labor Relations Board with a view to deciding whether it ought to be a labor court with complete authority and jurisdiction to try cases as our district courts try cases—or whether it should be, as Congress intended when it was spawned, a Board without authority to make policy.

The **SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has expired.

NLRB DECISION

Mr. **McMILLAN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McMILLAN.** Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM]. We were all shocked to learn that the National Labor Relations Board is making laws by such rulings as we have read about this morning. Mr. Speaker, this certainly was not the intent of the Congress in establishing the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. **LANDRUM.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **McMILLAN.** I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **LANDRUM.** Again let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we do not here wish to try or to retry this matter or pass judgment on the correctness or incorrectness of the decisions rendered by the National Labor Relations Board in this case or in any other case. But what we do wish to emphasize is that it is time the appropriate committee in this Congress take notice of the need to begin now a careful study of reorganization of this important agency of our Government, and clearly define its limited authority and jurisdiction.

NLRB DECISION

Mr. **DORN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DORN.** Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the distinguished and able gentleman from Georgia. This is a shocking decision. It is a far-reaching matter.

We do want to discuss this decision further. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] that we do need a revision of the rules governing some of the actions of this Board.

This NLRB decision in the Stevens case, I understand, will be challenged in the Federal courts, as I believe it ought to be. This is an unprecedented decision, which, in effect, is an attack upon our free enterprise system and if allowed to stand it could well destroy enlightened industrial labor relations.

This decision is so outrageous to employees and employers alike that it ill behooves any Member of this House to ignore the long-term implications of this case should the decision be allowed to stand.

This matter will undoubtedly receive additional attention in this House and I look forward to participating in the colloquy.

SHUSH! DON'T SHUSH

Mr. **HALL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALL.** Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems that confronts the American people today is the problem of hypocrisy in Government.

There is no better example of this than was highlighted in a recent editorial in the Joplin, Mo., Globe, and which concerns the National Labor Relations Board and its apparent efforts to encourage trial by public opinion:

> SHUSH! DON'T SHUSH
>
> Well, well. Now we have a quasi-judicial branch of the Federal Government seeking pretrial publicity, or at least inviting it. Quite a departure, we would say, from stern guidelines laid down with much fanfare by the Department of Justice and endorsed by some of the courts, sharply restricting pretrial publicity in some proceedings, notably criminal trials.
>
> In the process, as we recall it, much ado was made of protecting the rights of the accused, with a certain onus cast upon an aggressive press with some courts going so far as to even threaten contempt action for pretrial and trial publicity.
>
> But such policy and such guidelines apparently do not apply to the National Labor Relations Board in its handling of labor union complaints against employers. For, the other day, there came to this newspaper a letter from the Kansas City regional office of NLRB advising that the Teamsters Union has lodged a complaint against a Joplin firm, alleging violations of labor law in dealing with employees active in behalf of union organization. A copy of the complaint was enclosed, together with notice that a hearing would be held in Joplin April 12 before a trial examiner.
>
> The cover letter said the information was transmitted "with the thought that you might consider it to be of interest to some of the people in your area." Significantly, it was added, the regional office already has concluded that the employer in question "has violated the Federal law as the result of evidence produced by an investigation." No facts were offered as to the employer's side of the controversy.
>
> There has been considerable publicity from Washington from time to time accusing the NLRB as being biased in favor of labor

unions. This incident adds weight to that allegation, along with confirming that in politically slanted bureaucracy frequently there are double standards of justice.

ASSETS AND INCOME OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, 1963, I placed in the Congressional Record a list comprising all the assets and income of my wife and myself. The original schedule read as follows:

Equity in my home in Atlanta, Ga	$5,000
Equity in my residence in Bethesda, Md	5,000
Patent	300
Savings accounts	505
Checking accounts	560
Cash value of life insurance	3,000
Two automobiles	1,500
Stocks, bonds, mortgages, notes, etc	none

Subsequently, on September 22, 1964, I reported the status of my estate, disclosing slightly increased equities in our two residences—one in Georgia and one in Maryland—together with income of $182, exclusive of rent and my congressional salary. I noted that my personal indebtedness had occasioned a slight increase since my last report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to report once again on my financial affairs.

By monthly payments on two mortgages, we have reduced the principal balances by a few hundred dollars, increasing our equity commensurately. My patent is still awaiting discovery by the world. Our savings account has increased by about $25 a year interest payments, and stands at about $580. My checking account, at this juncture, is in a perilous state of less than $100, to be replenished, however, next payday. Cash values of my insurance policies are up about $200. Our 1964 car is still running, as is, fortunately, my 1962 model—notwithstanding continuing radiator troubles. There are still no stocks, bonds, indentures, or securities.

Since September 1964, I have finally collected a legal fee, earned in 1962, of $500.12, together with some $55 royalty on my lawbook, and net advances on another book of $963. Other than these items, and sometime rental on my home, there have been no honoraria, no legal fees, and no income of any kind outside of my congressional salary.

Though our assets have increased only slightly, I can report that I am making steady progress on the accumulated personal debt of five election campaigns, some part of which relates as far back as 1962.

Mr. Speaker, my own financial position hardly commends the U.S. Congress as a sure road to wealth. Yet, it is a sure way to service, and I remain grateful for that opportunity.

POPULATION CONTROL IS OUR FOREMOST PROBLEM

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the most important single issue facing this Nation and the world today is population control. It is now generally recognized throughout the world that unless prompt and effective steps are taken to check the galloping rate of population growth, awesome consequences are inevitable. Unless effective steps are taken to curb this growth, the world is faced with the stark reality of another dark age, enshrouded in hunger, poverty, overcrowding, wars and famine, ending in human cannibalism or exploding into possible nuclear war.

That is the view of many, including some of the world's foremost scientists and statesmen.

President Johnson has sounded the warning repeatedly, and so have many other world speakers. Here in Congress I have joined with others in the introduction of legislation to set up two sub-Cabinet posts to disseminate birth control information upon request, at home and abroad.

There is a pressing need for a crash program. Nothing less will suffice.

An unequal race is being waged today between human production and food production, with the population growth outstripping food production each year.

Let us look for a moment at this growth rate. It is appalling. In 1930 there were only 2 billion people on this earth. In 1970 it will be 4 billion; and by the year 2000, at the present rate, the figure will reach 7.4 billion, according to the Population Reference Services.

Any good that results from foreign aid in the underdeveloped countries is largely wiped out by the increase in population. Any such aid, to be meaningful, should be tied to education and free dissemination of birth control information. Without that, our assistance becomes an exercise in futility.

We spend billions on poverty, with its effectiveness offset or negated by excessive births among recipients. In the United States we are told that 9 out of every 10 impoverished women still lack competent birth control information and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out. There is no time to waste. Every possible effort should be made to educate the general public and arouse them to the seriousness of this problem, along with the free dissemination of the best birth control information that can be provided.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ATTENDS THE FUNERAL OF MRS. EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was to pay tribute to a fine American lady and the husband she inspired to great achievements in the Congress that President Johnson yesterday attended the funeral of Mrs. Emanuel Celler. The death of Stella Celler is a personal loss to each of us in New York. She was a woman who would not be defeated by illness or age. She retained her vitality, her dedication and her joy of life to her last moments. We New Yorkers extend our condolences to the gentleman from New York, Chairman Celler, the patriarch of our delegation, recognizing fully that we, too, will miss her.

That the Nation shared Mr. Celler's sorrow was symbolized by the presence of the President at the funeral services in New York. The President stood for the community of peoples and faiths which this country of our represents. He stood for the compassion and understanding of a government which we sometimes think of as too large to be personal. He stood in a Jewish house of worship yesterday as a mark of recognition of the magnificent contributions that the gentleman from New York, Emanuel Celler, has made to the country, contributions to which he was ever urged by his now departed wife.

HOSPITAL AND EXTENDED-CARE FACILITIES

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I have very recently addressed a letter to the President and to Secretary Gardner of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare asking that they set up a national commission to deal with the emergency that may be created by medicare, if hospital facilities do not prove to be adequate

I have received alarming reports from doctors and social workers in my district. They are short of nurses to operate available equipment, to say nothing of the shortage of hospital beds.

On January 1, 1967, we will be commencing the benefits provided as posthospital extended care, or nursing-home care. We will be assuming this operation with a national shortage of 500,000 beds in such nursing homes. Many of the existing homes are not up to par in meeting proper standards.

We know that an Advisory Council and a National Medical Review Committee have been provided under the existing medicare legislation. However, neither of these groups has emergency authority to take positive steps to cope with bottlenecks, lack of facilities, personal disappointments and public outcries at the critical times and places when medicare benefits will be demanded, and then prove to be unavailable. In some places and critical situations it may be necessary to set up emergency facilities. Authority for this should be provided.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that all of us in the Federal Government address ourselves to this problem so that we will not be charged with lack of foresight later this year or next when medicare becomes our obligation.

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the support given the President for his policies in Vietnam has been greatly strengthened of late, the Salt Lake Tribune comments in a recent editorial entitled "Closing Ranks."

It notes the unanimous vote given by the 39 Governors who attended a White House conference, and says this "is further buttressed by the latest public opinion poll which showed more than 7 to 1 approving the President's actions."

I believe a great deal of the recent increase in support approving the President's actions comes from the favorable reaction of the American public to the Honolulu Conference and the recent emphasis of the administration on the social, political, and economic reforms to be carried on in South Vietnam.

The recent visits of the Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of HEW all indicate the importance of the United States supporting the economic and social reforms in South Vietnam to create a strong government.

An important part of this was the recent establishment of former Major General Lansdale as Minister to South Vietnam. This is a great step forward in recognizing the importance of being successful in all parts of the conflict in southeast Asia.

The editorial commenting on the support given the President will be of interest to my colleagues, and with this in mind I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Mar. 15, 1966]

CLOSING RANKS

The unanimous vote of 39 Governors attending a White House conference in support of President Johnson's Vietnam policies is the best indication that the administration has survived the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's intensive examination of that policy with support strengthened, if anything.

Such a conclusion is further buttressed by the latest public opinion poll which showed more than 7 to 1 approving the President's actions.

At the White House conference, the Governors were briefed on the current Vietnam situation by Mr. Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, Defense Secretary McNamara, and military leaders. Utah's Governor Rampton, who was present, described the briefing as thorough and frank, and he said he was heartened to learn "the picture in Vietnam is a lot better than when we were here 8 months ago."

That is heartening news, although it must be tempered with the knowledge that the fighting continues vicious and costly, with no reason to hope that the end is in sight. But while public debate of American policy relative to Vietnam is fully justified when the debate ends, it is well to close ranks in the face of an enemy all too ready to interpret debate in terms of indecision and weakness.

Besides, there is work to be done in Washington—and it is good to have Majority Leader MANSFIELD report that after the weeks of debate, Congress is now "getting into the groove."

REDS ADMIT THEIR ROLE IN DOMINICAN REVOLT

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I take no real pleasure to bringing to the attention of this body the frank admission of the hierarchy of international communism that they armed and fomented the revolt last April in the Dominican Republic.

Anyone whose head is not in a pink cloud knew that the revolt was their doing as the President said, but for the first time, we have their open admission that they tried it and were blocked only because of the intervention of the United States. There is a group in the executive branch and one in the other body that will not like this public admission because they have stoutly denied that Communists had any part in that upheaval and have bitterly criticized this Government for stepping in to protect this hemisphere from additional Communist encroachment. Not only did this misguided group originally take that position, but they have continued to hew to that line in spite of every evidence to the contrary. It will be interesting, if saddening, to see what this clique has to say now that the Communist confession is a matter of public record.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it would not surprise me too much if they try to ignore this confession and stick to their own little party line to the effect that Communists had no part in the Dominican revolt. Columnist William S. White gives the lie to that fallacy, however, in his column, "Reds Admit Role; Aided Dominican Revolt," which I would like to make a part of my remarks. His entire column is worthy of every Member's attention:

International communism has now not merely acknowledged but roundly boasted of its deep and armed complicity in the Dominican Republic revolt of last April which was nipped by U.S. military intervention.

The Communists have themselves thus destroyed the case of those American critics of the American action who so long have argued that what was afoot down there was only a good "democratic revolution" not too dissimilar, say, from George Washington's rebellion against King George III.

An article in one of the most authoritative of all the worldwide publications of Moscow-directed communism, the magazine World Marxist Review, has let this already ill-concealed cat well and truly out of the bag.

Its authors are self-identified members of the executive committee of the Communist Party in the Dominican Republic, J. I. Quello and N. I. Conde. They say, in so many words, that the attempted putsch would have succeeded but for "the direct armed intervention of U.S. imperialism." They say, moreover, that what was planned by the Communists for the Dominican Republic differed only superficially from the earlier revolution in Cuba that put Fidel Castro in power. The two, they add, were "in spirit, meaning and lessons" two parts of one whole.

They ought to know. For at least one of them, Conde, is an old hand in Cuba. And Quello was clandestinely landed in the Dominican Republic from Moscow shortly before the uprising.

Quello and Conde describe the Dominican affair as "another contribution to the arsenal of revolutionary experience on the (American) continent." Though the Communists were not able at its start fully to control the uprising they shortly were "allocating armed Communists" to revolutionary commands organized block by block in Santo Domingo. The piece repeatedly discloses the close relationship of this assault upon the Dominican Republic, not only to what had happened earlier in Cuba, but also to the general tactics for Communist subversion in Latin America long since prepared in Castro Cuba.

Something else is also disclosed—an outline of what the Communists learned in the Dominican Republic for future use. "Our experience showed," Quello and Conde write, "that the task of (Communist) revolutionaries during an armed insurrection is to influence it and guide it militarily and politically, to organize the struggle in accordance with the processes underway at the time.

"At first we combined all our forces in a single command. The fallacy of this decision soon made itself felt. It restricted, on the one hand, our propaganda (which was conducted chiefly among our own members). On the other hand, this command became the target for attacks on the movement by the imperialists. Having realized our mistake, we thereupon allocated armed Communists to a number of commands."

So much, then, out of the mouths of the Communists themselves, for the persistent attempt in some quarters here to depict the United States tough response to this peril as only another instance of "red-baiting," of looking for Communists under every bed, and so on.

The same people who have attacked the American intervention in these terms also had long pooh-poohed the existence of such a danger in Cuba, too. Their judgment—not their motives—really would seem to have been proved twice catastrophically wrong.

For just as Fidel Castro himself at length proclaimed, in several thousand words broadcast from Havana radio, admitting both his Communist membership and his Communist purposes in this hemisphere, Conde and Quello have now unmistakably and openly identified the Communist Party as the ultimately moving force in the Dominican upheaval.

Moreover, the complaints of critics of the American intervention that anyhow there really weren't very many Communists visible in Santo Domingo are now shown to be the quibbles they always were. They weren't too visible at any one point in Santo Domingo simply because the Communist leaders quickly dispersed them—"armed"—among the various commands.

REVISE PAY SYSTEM

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation—a pay bill—which will automatically place all postal employees in the first four levels in the level immediately above that which they now occupy.

This is badly needed legislation. When we passed the Federal Employees Pay Reform Act of 1962 we felt, in good faith, that the long battle of postal employees to achieve comparability with their opposite numbers in private industry had been won.

Our hopes have been frustrated beyond redemption. The principle of comparability, both in its concept and its application, has been fundamentally faulty. As a result, comparability has not been the foundation for a sound and equitable wage structure for postal employees; it has been an uncompromising ceiling which has had the effect of depressing and compressing the pay structures.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, deals only with levels one through four, because these are the levels that need help most. When Public Law 68 was enacted in 1955, substantial pay increases were provided for supervisors and postmasters in the higher levels, and considerably smaller pay increases were provided for those in the lower echelons. In the Pay Reform Act of 1962 the postal employees in the higher echelons were once again given preferential treatment, while the rank-and-file employees were given less help.

Now, this year, the bureaucrats in the executive branch tell us that postal employees in level four for instance—the level that includes postal clerks and letter carriers—would be getting full comparability if they received an insignificant pay increase of 2.4 percent—while those in the upper echelons would achieve comparability only if they received considerably greater pay increases.

Well might we ask, comparability with what and with whom?

The basis for the computation is Bulletin No. 1469 entitled: "National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay."

In the first place, this bulletin was put together in February and March 1965. That makes it a year out of date already. In the second place, most of the information in the bulletin was gathered as early as August 1964. That makes the information at least a year and a half out of date. In the third place, if the Congress followed the recommendation of the executive branch in making the pay increase take effect on January 1, 1967—this would make the information a full 2½ years out of date.

We would be giving postal employees comparability only with what workers in private industry were getting 2½ years previously. This makes the entire concept of comparability a farce.

But let us investigate further. Let us talk about level four of the postal field schedule—where most of the rank-and-file postal employees are huddled. We find that level four postal employees were compared with clerical officeworkers. In most of the areas studied, the employees with whom postal clerks and letter carriers were compared, were women. In fact—quoting the bulletin—we read:

> Women accounted for nine-tenths or more of the employees in 11 (of the 17) clerical work levels.

We have come a long way in improving the economic level of female workers. But, we are not nearly at the point where we can fairly compare their wages with the wages of letter carriers and postal clerks, who must be expected to house, clothe, feed, and educate their children on those wages.

And it is absolutely grotesque to regulate the wages of letter carriers and postal workers according to what female officeworkers were being paid 2½ years ago.

Let me ask one further question: Why officeworkers? I strongly suggest that officeworkers were chosen because they are seldom members of organized labor and because, historically since they are unorganized they are discriminated against by management in the matter of pay levels and, especially, pay raises. There is no other explanation, in my mind, why female officeworkers should be chosen as a basis by which to regulate the pay of letter carriers and postal clerks.

When the Federal Pay Reform Act was passed we first heard the term "linkage." This meant that the pay of letter carriers and post office clerks were arbitrarily "linked" to the pay level of grade 5 employees in the other Federal agencies. Administration spokesmen admitted that this linkage was artificial at the time because, as they freely stated:

> There is no one in private industry to whom we can compare letter carriers.

This is true. The job of a letter carrier is unique. It is extremely difficult work physically and mentally. It is highly specialized. It requires a remarkable blend of strength, endurance, integrity, brains, and judgment.

But—through the principle of linkage—these men are limited in their pay level to that of comparatively junior typists and office clerks in GS-5.

Aside from the fact that there is no possible grounds for this linkage, it should be remembered that GS-5 is a grade in which the vast majority of Federal employees merely pause on their way up the promotional ladder. But 95 percent of the letter carriers—and postal clerks—in the service must stay in level 4 all of their career lives. This is the level of pay at which they must raise their families and, if they are extremely fortunate and frugal, save a little to take care of their old age.

The point of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that comparability is a hopeless failure as it is conceived and practiced now. There is no chance of postal employees in the lower four echelons getting an even break economically as long as its depressing and distorting influence exists.

The only way we can break through the economic bonds that are holding these fine employees down is to take a bold step such as I have proposed in my legislation—by raising every employee in the first four levels of the postal service one level higher.

This will increase morale in the postal establishment and create greater efficiency. It will enable us to recruit more talented people of the level of competence and career potential that we need. It will enable us to hold on to our best employees instead of losing them to private industry.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, if enacted, would be an act of plain justice. I sincerely believe it deserves the support of every Member of the House.

AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF ONONDAGA LAKE AND ITS MAJOR CONTRIBUTORY STREAMS

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress has made great progress in the enactment of legislation to promote a national program for the preservation and reclamation of our water resources. The State of New York has inaugurated a seven-point program with a view toward abating water pollution within the State. The citizens of New York gave their overwhelming ratification for this program in November of 1965 by approving the $1 billion Pure Waters Bond Act. The Governor of New York termed this "an unprecedented mandate for action."

And now Onondaga County, which I am privileged to represent, has been presented with the opportunity to move vigorously toward the solution of its most pressing water pollution problem.

On March 16, John Mulroy, Onondaga County executive, unveiled a report entitled "An Environmental Assessment of Onondaga Lake and Its Major Contributory Streams." This report was prepared by a scientific council composed mostly of academic and industrial professionals, private citizens, who gave freely of their time and energy to answer a call that came basically from the citizens of Onondaga County. The council addressed itself to three major goals: First, the existing condition of the lake and its watershed; second, an examination of its feasible multiple uses; and third, a plan of action for restoration.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to the members of the scientific council on a job well done and to thank them for the service they have performed for the citizens of Onondaga County. All too often we take for granted the sacrifices private citizens make for their communities when they are asked to donate their professional skill and ability to some needed task. Onondaga County owes a debt of gratitude to these men.

Perhaps what is more important to a professional man than gratitude is the thoughtful recognition by citizens of the substance of the service performed. Onondaga County now has a document that must become the focal point for serious discussion and consideration toward a public policy with regard to the Onondaga Lake drainage basin. If the Pure Waters Bond Act is an unprecedented mandate for action in New York, then the scientific council's report is an unprecedented mandate for action in Onondaga County. Every civic group and every citizen, concerned with water resource management, ought to examine the report fully with a view toward making it the basic document for a plan of action. Only vigorous and sustained citizen response will prevent the report from becoming another pipe dream. What Onondaga Lake really needs is an unclouded and unguarded willingness to get on with the task.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to review some of the highlights of the "Environmental Assessment of Onondaga Lake and Its Major Contributory Streams" because I believe it contains a number of generalizations and suggestions of national importance which extend beyond the immediate problem of what to do about Onondaga Lake.

In blunt fashion the council states that the lake was lost for want of a water-resource-management program, and the destruction of the lake must be attributed to public apathy, the greed of early industries, the inability of elected political leadership to comprehend the importance of a natural resource from the total aspect of cost benefits, and false economy. The council singled out this last contributing factor and warned that no compromises should be made in behalf of false economy in the promulgation of a program to restore the lake.

The council did not avoid discussion of that basic premise regarding the multiple uses of our water supply, but rather it listed the current and potential uses of Onondaga Lake and suggested a program that could reconcile all of these uses. The council would have the community develop fully the lake's recreational potential. In the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, Congress declared its interest in seeing to the preservation, development, and accessibility to such quality and quantity of outdoor recreation resources as may be available, necessary, and desirable. In its plan for outdoor recreation, which qualified the State for participation in the land and water conservation fund program, New York cited Syracuse as being most deficient in recreational acreage. The plan noted that pollution limits the recreation potential of water in urban areas, and pointed to Onondaga County's deficiencies in swimming and boating facilities. The scientific council suggests rather strongly that a well-managed Onondaga Lake can fill a portion of the deficiencies.

President Johnson's recent message to Congress on the preservation of this Nation's natural heritage states that estimates of the losses this generation has suffered because of pollution run into the billions of dollars each year. However, the President made the point that the losses are really incalculable. The scientific council made a similar point when it said:

> It would seem less esoteric and far more honest to decide that a clean lake is necessary for a better or fuller life without dreaming up ways to put meaningless dollar values on it.

The scientific council's report makes a number of general and specific recommendations regarding the lake, its tributaries and land on its shoreline. The call is made for a comprehensive and integrated program to abate pollution in the Onondaga Lake drainage basin which would involve the cooperation of industries and all the levels of government and their appropriate agencies. This is quite similar to the declaration of policy which this Congress made last year with the enactment of the Water Resources Planning Act.

The council made cost estimates for the pollution abatement taking into consideration the State's pure waters program and the Water Quality Act of 1965. The council made note of the decision of this Congress to incorporate into the Federal Water Pollution Control Act a program of demonstration grants for the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes. More importantly, the council urged Onondaga County to move quickly on a study to determine the feasibility of such a project. Combined sewers contribute to the pollution of Onondaga Lake and the council expressed great interest in the possibility of a waste stabilization pond as a detention basin in the lake. The council suggests that the idea is both unique and practical. Immediate attention ought to be given to this idea.

A recommendation was made that the New York Water Resources Commission, now in the process of updating best use classifications for the State's waterways, take special note of the lake's many unique characteristics.

The council called for the enforcement of sound antipollution laws and standards against individuals, industries, and governmental units. This statement is in accord with both the New York State program and the proposals contained in the pending amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

One of the report's specific suggestions asks for a joint study by the county and the Solvay Process Division, the third largest industry in the area, to investigate waste drainage and thermal effects from the division's operation upon the chemistry and biology of the lake. It is noteworthy that the division's director of research is a member of the council. The proposal contained in the report prompted the announcement a few days ago that Solvay has been prepared to go much further. The company is very interested in the possibility of joining with the county in the development of a single treatment facility to deal with the industrial waste and the municipal sewage in Nine Mile Creek, the stream into which Solvay's waste water flows. Solvay has offered to pay for the feasibility study. A spokesman for the division terms the action "a growth in company policy," but I believe it is much more than this. At the very least it is an example of Solvay's responsible recognition of a problem, its progressive willingness to contribute to a solution, and an expression of leadership that both other industries and units of government should emulate.

I am hopeful that the true spirit of cooperative federalism, resting, as it must, on local initiative and planning, will bring about in the very near future the long awaited restoration of Onondaga Lake.

H.R. 13993, HORTON BILL TO ALLOW AN INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN COSTS OF MOVING

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall the strong support I voiced and voted yesterday in behalf of H.R. 10607, a bill to provide reimbursement to Federal employees for many of the costs they incur when they are required to move from one job location to another. I believe we acted wisely in according Government employees a protection that is already practiced widely in private industry.

However, there is another aspect of these moving expenses that deserves our consideration and constructive correction, and this problem involves all employees, public or private, who receive reimbursement for moving costs. I am referring to the tax treatment of such reimbursement.

Certain categories of reimbursement for employee moving expenses; namely, travel costs of the employee and his immediate family as well as the costs of moving household goods from the old to new place of employment, have not been considered income to the employee and thus have not been taxed. As a logical extension of this tax-free treatment, the 88th Congress provided that these expenses, whether reimbursed by a new employer or paid for by the employee changing employers, in his move from one location to another, were similarly deductible.

The problem presented and that which my new bill seeks to overcome is that the aforementioned expenses do not embrace the total cost burden to a moving employee. Just as we have legislatively recognized in H.R. 10607, he faces—

The expenses of a house-hunting trip for himself and his wife;

Temporary living costs at his new location while he and his family await the arrival of their household effects;

The fees and other costs of selling his old house;

Expenses attendant on the purchase of a new house, such as attorney fees and other closing costs; and

The numerous items commonly considered as a lump sum or miscellaneous figure, including appliance connections, licenses, size adjustments, and other incidentals.

Repeating, H.R. 10607 recognizes these items as a burden on the moved Federal employee that his Federal Government employer should assume. Similarly, many private concerns already make provision for the reimbursement of these costs.

But, the benefit of reimbursement becomes considerably diminished when the employee must treat it as ordinary income. Further, his employer is required to withhold from it and report it in the same manner as the employee's wages.

A taxpayer who carried a case through the courts involving his belief that he should be permitted a deduction for reimbursement received lost out when the Supreme Court denied a review. However, in opposing the review, the Attorney General argued that Congress rather than the Court should decide the issue involved.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is this additional reason for a congressional response to the present unfair tax treatment of thousands of Americans required to move from one place to another each year because such a move is required by the nature of their employment or the mobility of our economy.

For two principal reasons, first, that it is manifestly inconsistent for the Government to recognize the legitimacy of these expenses for reimbursement on the one hand while taxing that reimbursement as income on the other, and second, that it is not proper policy for Government to impose a drag on the necessary mobility of our society and economy.

I urge my colleagues to consider closely the need for this legislation with the hope they will join me in working for its prompt passage.

TIME TO REPLACE DEBATE WITH SUPPORT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks there has been a continuous dialog concerning the U.S. activities in Vietnam. While this discussion has disclosed areas of controversy, it has also demonstrated the fact that most Americans support our present Vietnam policy.

The principle of free speech is deeply ingrained in our American life and it has proven its benefits over the years. The arguments we have heard have served to crystallize the areas of controversy, to define the issues more clearly and, therefore, to give all Americans a better opportunity to understand our course of action.

An editorial appearing in the March 11, 1966, issue of Life magazine comments on this debate. It suggests that we should now call a truce on such divisive debate and give the administration an opportunity to demonstrate what it can accomplish in Vietnam.

I suggest that such a pause would be wise and would serve our Nation's interest well. While we recognize that there is not total unanimity of opinion on all phases of our Vietnam policy, there is substantial agreement by a great majority of Americans in support of it.

Let us now get on with the job. Our position has improved, our troops have the initiative. Let us spend the next few months determining how to give them the maximum support rather than engaging in a great debate which will gain no material purpose.

The editorial follows:

[From Life magazine, Mar. 11, 1966]

TIME FOR A PAUSE IN THE BIG DEBATE

The overwhelmingly favorable vote on the President's request for an additional $4.8 billion in funds for Vietnam shows that most Congressmen recognize the need to pay for our commitments. Even so, the action was not accomplished in a spirit of pure unanimity. Senator FULBRIGHT cast an approving vote only because he belatedly decided that a money bill is not the proper place to amend policy. Seventy-five Members of the liberal House Democratic study group thought it necessary to explain their "ayes" did not mean that they favor unrestrained or indiscriminate enlargement of the military effort in Vietnam (as if anyone did).

Congress reflects the undercurrent of dissent and controversy that continues to flow beneath our Vietnam policy. But for all their qualms and misgivings most Americans seem convinced that the hard course chosen by the administration is the correct one. The conviction of this majority deserves to be honored too.

The debate during the last 2 months has been enlightened, and enlightening, in our tradition of free speech. FULBRIGHT's forum, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, succeeded in defining the main issue as whether or not we can or should contain Red China. Answers to this come no easier, but the questions make more sense than they often did before.

Now that the hearings are complete, and the money deposited to account, perhaps the time has come to recognize that we are engaged in a war in Vietnam which can in fact be won. President Johnson observed a 37-day pause in the bombing at the beginning of this year, to give North Vietnam a chance (which it ignored) to respond with some pacific gesture. How about a 37-day pause in the criticism to let the President's policy go forward unhindered? Or better yet, a 137-day pause, during which time the administration should have a real opportunity to show what can be accomplished militarily and otherwise in Vietnam. After that, criticism might be appropriate or even—who knows?—unnecessary.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 6845.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EDWARD F. MURZYN AND EDWARD J. O'BRIEN

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10403) for the relief of Edward F. Murzyn and Edward J. O'Brien, with Senate amendments thereto, and occur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,615" and insert "$6,500".

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,903.41" and insert "$6,500".

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN F. BALDWIN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it was my sad duty on March 10 to announce to the House that our beloved colleague, JOHN BALDWIN, of the 14th District of California, had passed away the evening of March 9.

It had been my privilege to serve with JOHN BALDWIN ever since he came to the House of Representatives as a member of the California delegation in 1954. I believe that one word—dedication—sums up his whole approach to serving his district, California, and the Nation.

JOHN was truly dedicated. He had a well-deserved reputation for always being on the job and for getting results. He was completely unselfish about giving of himself to the work that needed to be done.

His exemplary personal life brought credit not only to himself and family, but also to the Congress as well.

JOHN BALDWIN's life was one of many achievements and it is one of those ironies of life that he was taken from us, cutting short his illustrious career when he had so much more to give.

JOHN was born June 28, 1915, in Oakland, Calif. He had a fine analytical mind and compiled a fine scholastic record. After graduation from the University of California in 1935 he was assistant manager of the South-Western Publishing Co., in San Francisco.

He enlisted in the U.S. Army and served with distinction from 1941 to 1946, and rose from the rank of private to the rank of lieutenant colonel. JOHN was an expert in financial matters and served as director of training of the Army Finance School from 1943 to 1944. He was Chief of the Foreign Fiscal Affairs Branch of the Office of Fiscal Director of the War Department in 1945, and was executive officer of the Office of the Fiscal Director of the Mediterranean Theater in 1946. He was decorated by the Italian Government for work in the devaluation of the lire currency in 1946.

In 1949 he was graduated from the University of California Boalt Hall School of Jurisprudence and practiced law in Martinez, Calif., from 1949 to 1954, when he entered Congress.

John Baldwin was a great asset and a credit to the Congress. He was a hard, conscientious worker and obtained results. His work as a member of the House Public Works Committee on which he served for 11 years was outstanding. He contributed very importantly to the drafting of the Federal Interstate Highway Act, truly a landmark piece of legislation in the history of the United States.

He sponsored or left his imprint on many other pieces of legislation relating to our national resources, the highway system, waterways, and water pollution.

Just a little over a month ago, in January, he received an award from the National Collegiate Athletic Association in recognition of his contribution to college athletics and scholarship. As a student at the University of California he was a a member of the track and cross-country teams and was awarded membership in Phi Beta Kappa, national scholastic honor society.

He was a man of faith, of wisdom, of achievement. John Baldwin was highly esteemed and will be missed very much.

To his wife and partner, Mary, and their daughters, Georgia, Doris, and Sylvia, we extend our sincerest sympathies and condolences.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from California has ably and properly and in fine manner expressed, I am sure, the views of all of us concerning our good friend and beloved colleague John Baldwin. It was my privilege and pleasure to know John all the time he served in the House of Representatives. He did an outstanding job representing his district, his State, and our country. John Baldwin always spoke thoughtfully and constructively. He voted with a deep conviction the way that he felt he should in his responsible position as a Member of this body. John Baldwin was a fine family man with the highest principles. All of us on both sides of the aisle will badly miss him in the months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from California in extending to his lovely wife and his family our deepest condolences.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. The loss of John Baldwin leaves every one of us with a keen feeling of sorrow and regret. I join with the California delegation in their deep sense of loss that they have at the passing of our dear friend, John Baldwin.

John Baldwin was a dedicated legislator. He devoted himself seriously to his duties and his responsibilities. He had a profound personality which made itself felt in the making of friends and in his contacts with his fellow colleagues and other human beings. When we passed I always liked to get that little smile of his that he always gave—a smile of warmth, sincerity, and friendship. By his words and his actions he reflected the thoughts and considerations of a fine mind possessed of the noble and deep implications that make up not only character but nobility of mind. His years of service here were constructive and effective. As I stated before, he performed his duties in a serious and dedicated manner.

We all grieve at John Baldwin's passing. We shall miss him very much. Mrs. McCormack joins with me in extending to Mrs. Baldwin and her daughters our deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my friends and colleagues from California in their expression of sorrow over the death of John Baldwin. John was a constructive, able, forward-looking Member of this House. He was a good man—fine, decent, and clean. He had a bright and wholesome outlook on life. He greeted everyone with a friendly smile and pleasant salutation.

He has served his Nation and his people well. His performance in this House has been above and beyond the call of duty.

We shall miss him.

May God protect and comfort his family and loved ones. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues, I was saddened by the death of John Baldwin, who I am sure was considered a friend by all who knew him.

I first met John when I was assigned to the Public Works Committee early last year and was immediately impressed by his outstanding ability and friendly cooperation and helpfulness to all the Members serving with him. As I grew to know him better, I could appreciate more and more the fine character of this man and why he was held in such esteem by his colleagues. All of us respected John for his reasonableness and his willingness to cooperate to the fullest extent for the benefit and betterment of our country. He was a man of great integrity, with a keen and probing mind, a gentle sense of humor, who won friends effortlessly. His service and devotion as a Member of Congress will be greatly missed in the House of Representatives.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his wife and family and I know that the thoughts of all of us are with them at this time of bereavement and sorrow.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, a member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, all of us deeply mourn the death of our friend and colleague, John Baldwin, who has set so many fine examples for this House through his excellence of character, diligence, and honesty.

No Member of this House fashioned a larger storehouse of respect and friendship than John Baldwin.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity over the years to work closely with John. He was a leading Republican member of the Committee on Public Works and served on the following subcommittees: Public Buildings and Grounds, Watershed Development, Roads, Flood Control, and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program. He was the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Flood Control.

It was only natural that during our years of association John Baldwin and I had our differences over legislation, sometimes in manner of approach, sometimes in matters of substance and policy. However, we remained friends because John Baldwin was never mean in dispute and never failed to respect or objectively consider an opposing point of view. He was unfailingly fair and kind and gentle—and, above all, reasonable.

John Baldwin, Mr. Speaker, was a man totally dedicated to the highest pursuits of the public service. He made it clear to those of us who worked shoulder to shoulder with him that he was in Congress to serve vigorously and without pause his constituents and his Nation. John never swerved from this goal and I like to think that all of us are the better for it. Through example, it might be said, John Baldwin has made us more effective legislators, more effective public servants.

Mr. Speaker, John Baldwin possessed every dimension of the complete Congressman and certainly each of us should strive to emulate him.

I shall miss John sorely, but I shall always be inspired by the knowledge that he regarded me as a true friend.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, as all Members of this body, I deeply regret the passing of our beloved colleague, John Baldwin. I join my colleagues in extending my heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving with John Baldwin for 6 years on the Public Works Committee. I can honestly say that I do not believe anyone could say that among the very able men on that committee any served with more dedication and more diligence in his work concerning the legislation pending before that committee than JOHN BALDWIN.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN was a constant source of guidance and assistance to others on the minority side of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN BALDWIN never opposed legislation just for opposition's sake alone. Whenever JOHN opposed any legislation he did so solely upon the principles in which he deeply believed. By the same token, he never supported measures except those based upon principles in which he deeply believed. Truly, he was a leader among leaders and a man among men. A man of deep conviction and high principle.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret his passing. This Nation has lost a valued servant and a fine citizen and I have lost a wonderful friend.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time a tribute to JOHN BALDWIN by my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN], and also a statement by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of this Congress who are referred to as "the gentleman." There are few who really deserve the title in the sense of being a real "gentle" man. JOHN BALDWIN was one. The affection felt for him crossed the center aisle of this Chamber as if it did not exist. He will be missed, not only by his constituents but by his colleagues. "So long, JOHN."

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express a feeling of profound loss. JOHN BALDWIN, who served long and well in this House, died after a hard fight against a difficult and dreaded disease.

Those of us from the State of California who have served with him for the past years will miss him very much. His hard work on behalf of the people he represented and the ideals he believed in have been models which we, as his colleagues, have often tried to match. The people of Contra Costa County sent JOHN BALDWIN to Congress six times, each time by majorities of greater magnitude. He received the support of Democrats and Republicans alike, who recognized his abilities, his diligence, and his determination. His constituents could always be proud of him; in his fight for life over the past weeks, he displayed the same determination which marked his political endeavors. I wish he could have been as successful in this, his most difficult battle, as well.

The people of the 14th Congressional District of the State of California, and of this Nation, have lost a public servant in whom they placed justifiable pride and trust. JOHN BALDWIN's wife and family, his friends, and colleagues have lost a man who held their great affection and respect.

Our present time of sorrow should also give us an opportunity to reflect on the qualities which made JOHN BALDWIN an excellent public servant and a good man. With this reflection, perhaps we can more meaningfully enrich the lives of our own constituents and friends. And the continued growth and development of the Members of this House can stand as a monument to JOHN BALDWIN's life, work, and aspirations.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is no one that I have known in the U.S. House of Representatives easier to eulogize than my good friend and friend of the people of the State of California than JOHN F. BALDWIN. JOHN formerly represented a portion of my existing congressional district including my hometown of Vallejo, Calif. He was a Congressman's Congressman in every sense of the term. Needless to say, I have never made the mistake of trying to emulate him.

I met JOHN first and knew of him almost 20 years ago when we both attended Boalt Hall of Law, University of California at Berkeley. JOHN was in the class ahead of me, had just completed a distinguished war career in Europe and had played a leading role—lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army—in Italy in the reorganization of that country's postwar currency. Many of JOHN's contemporaries were first attracted to his capabilities when his law school class reelected him president for 3 successive years.

On graduation from law school, JOHN was admitted to the California bar, entered private practice of law in Martinez, Calif., and made an astronomical rise. He developed a reputation and knowledge of water law that was second to none.

In 1952 JOHN determined to represent the then newly formed Sixth Congressional District which included Contra Costa and my home county of Solano. Though JOHN was on the Republican side, I readily volunteered to chair Democrats for JOHN BALDWIN and I managed his advertising campaign. Unfortunately this was the only election he ever lost. I quickly became impressed with JOHN's indelible sterling traits of character I would hardly expect to find in another man. His abstinence from drink, smoke, his affinity and respect for all religious belief and minority rights were qualities which set this man apart from other men.

JOHN came back in 1954 to win the seat in Congress which he held until his death a few days ago. He was reelected by successive greater majorities in a district 2 to 1 Democratic against him such that in the last election he won by better than 50,000 votes. I might mention that the Democrats considered are of a liberal stripe. No greater tribute for achievement is in the Congress of the United States.

JOHN did not accomplish this vote however, without campaign and representation effort. His political campaigns were costly but this Congressman always made a tremendous effort to campaign in every geographical sector and speak on every issue. During the time I have been in Congress, I was pleased to see him many times stand in a division vote or walk in a teller line not necessarily with his party but because he thought his action was right.

Over a decade in the Congress, my colleague developed on his Public Works Committee to the position of ranking member from his party on the important Flood Control Subcommittee. JOHN had great respect both on the committee and with all the important agencies of Government with which he worked. I know of no Member of the minority side whose word and argument was more plausible in his field of concentration than this fallen legislator from California.

In 1962 when JOHN's Sixth District was split and Solano was placed in the new Fourth District which I now represent, I was frankly always hard pressed to attempt to achieve the tremendous stature that JOHN created. I probably would not have been able had I tried. JOHN never missed a rollcall or a quorum call until he acquired the illness last year that eventually claimed his life.

Even in illness JOHN was remarkable as was his devoted wife Mary who survives him. Never a word to suggest pity. JOHN, even in ill health, gave several remarkable speeches last year, some spontaneously. Particularly I recall his important amendment to Mrs. Johnson's beautification bill last year that extended the coverage of the act within as well as without the highway right-of-way. This is law today.

JOHN made many other contributions that are chronicled in the records and the laws of this House and also they are etched in the water projects in the valleys and rivers not only of his district but of the entire Nation.

JOHN was an able adviser to me when I came to Congress 3 years ago; we have coauthored many legislative bills of mutual concern.

Perhaps the best tribute is a reflection I have had many times: that were all Members of this House as hard working, honest, and dedicated as JOHN BALDWIN of California, our democracy would truly be that shining outstanding example of representative government—a symbol for the entire world.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, JOHN BALDWIN and I were elected to Congress at the same time in November 1954. During this period of over 11 years since then I came to admire JOHN more and more as each year passed. As we all know he had a brilliant mind, unflagging energy, and a character of absolutely unimpeachable integrity. Furthermore, he was always kind, tolerant, and helpful to anyone who sought his advice or assistance. What more is there to say? No finer man than JOHN BALDWIN ever walked the face of the earth.

Marjorie and I extend to Mary and to the Baldwin daughters our deepest sympathy.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, every one of us in this Chamber knows what a fine gentleman and what a fine Congressman John Baldwin was.

It was a severe shock for me to realize he had passed away. It has been a deeply saddening experience. I only wish there were appropriate words to comfort his family and friends and to convey my high regard for him.

He and I served closely together as members of the Public Works Committee. John not only was a leader on our committee, he was an exceptionally intelligent and thoughtful leader. It was a joy—and it was also an education—to work with him. The contributions he made in our committee and to the broader work of the Congress will always shine forth for their distinguished excellence.

Among the things about the man that account for this, one stands out in my mind above all others. John Baldwin had a remarkably strong and noble and impelling conscience.

It was reflected in everything he said and did. It drove him, even when he could or should have rested, to work hard and long for his constituency, his State and the Nation. It caused him to shoulder the burdens of others as his own, and to grace with his kindness the life of every fellow human being. It forced him, even to his frequent disadvantage, to be extraordinarily fairminded in all matters.

Our Creator bestowed a special privilege upon all whom He placed in John Baldwin's presence.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the Congress, last year it was my privilege to come before the distinguished committee of which John Baldwin was a member. The courtesy that he showed me and my constituents and the keen insight and complete grasp of the problems involved in the legislation that came before the Committee on Public Works was certainly outstanding and will always be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all the poorer for the loss of John Baldwin, but we are all richer because he served with us.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the tribute to John Baldwin, a friend and outstanding citizen and a very distinguished Member of this body. I ask to be allowed to join in the eulogy for John Baldwin delivered by the distinguished gentleman from California who has this time.

We shall miss John Baldwin. The people of his district and his State will miss him. Indeed, the people of this country will miss John Baldwin.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of personal loss that I realize that the late Congressman John Baldwin has been called home to a greater life.

Congressman Baldwin was a dedicated public servant—a true statesman. It has been my privilege to see the fair and objective manner in which he thoroughly studied and considered legislation presented to the Committee on Public Works for action. His first consideration was for our Nation and its future. From this association I learned to fully respect the sincerity of his efforts and respect for his judgment. Our committee, the House of Representatives, and our Nation have benefited because of the public service so effectively rendered by Congressman John Baldwin of California.

To his family I extend deepest sympathy.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I join in the eulogies for our distinguished deceased colleague, John Baldwin. There are no words I can speak, I know, to fill the void that his family now feels. But they can have great solace and a degree of happiness in knowing that many of the monuments that John Baldwin legislatively constructed, not to himself, for he was an unselfish man, but to this Nation, will last for many years to come.

This Nation and his district have lost a great public servant, one of the most outstanding and capable public servants that I have had the privilege of serving with in this House in the last 12 years.

John Baldwin and I came to Congress at the same time. We served on the Public Works Committee continuously side by side since 1955.

John Baldwin rendered as monumental a service as any member I know of on that committee, and I think that it is generally conceded on both sides of the aisle. As a matter of fact, one of those monuments is not only now in existence but is acknowledged by people throughout this Nation. For instance, I have in my hand the testimony of Under Secretary of Commerce Alan S. Boyd, who appeared before our committee on the highway safety bill just this week. Here is what he had to say:

> While Congress interest in highway safety dates back to the earliest days of Federal-aid-to-highway legislation, probably the most significant action to date was taken last year, and that at the initiative of this committee. I am referring, of course, to the Baldwin amendment, after the late Congressman John F. Baldwin, whose untimely death was a tragedy to everyone interested in the improvement of highway transportation.

We are now holding hearings on a highway safety bill that everyone acknowledges was given impetus by this Baldwin amendment and, as a matter of fact, these hearings are being held in memoriam to John F. Baldwin.

As another monument, last year, for example, in the rivers, harbors, and flood control program there was included the Jones-Baldwin amendment that permits for the first time authorization by the Public Works Committee for projects not in excess of $10 million to expedite projects for public works throughout the Nation. These are just two specific instances of the very important contributions of our distinguished colleague, John Baldwin, in the legislative process.

John Baldwin was a gentleman—a gentleman and a gentle man. He was kindly at all times. In fact, I know of no time in those 12 years that I can remember John Baldwin ever getting angry with anyone. But I also know of no one who could plead a case better or more effectively or with greater conviction than John Baldwin.

I had the privilege of visiting with John after his operation at Bethesda last year. And what was on his mind? "What is happening in the committee?" "What is happening in Congress?" "What am I missing?"

I say to you, there has been no man to serve in this House more dedicated, in my mind, than John Baldwin. It is a privilege for me to join in these remarks relating to a most capable public servant whom we will all miss, whom the Nation and his district will miss.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to extend my appreciation to him for taking this time to permit the close friends and colleagues of our beloved John Baldwin to express themselves in this final eulogy.

I can say without reservation that John Baldwin was my closest friend here in the Congress. He has been an adviser to me since the first day I arrived. The fact that I served on the Public Works Committee with John gave me an exceptional opportunity to observe this kindly man firsthand and thereby benefit from our association as he shared his great abundance of knowledge with me—for which I shall remain eternally grateful. Our great State of California, and in particular, the Bay area communities, will benefit from this day forward because of the extraordinary legislative skills of this great man.

In many ways John Baldwin reminded me of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. Both were "long and lean" in physical structure. They possessed similar philosophies. Their approach to problems was one of total objectivity—always seeking the constructive solution that would benefit all mankind. Both were brilliant, articulate, humble, Christian gentlemen with a burning desire to serve God and their fellow man. Both were blessed with a unique quality of character that immediately instilled a sense of love and respect in the minds of their associates privileged to serve with them.

John Baldwin was president of our congressional prayer breakfast group when he invited me to attend the weekly meetings. Each Thursday morning we prayed together with our colleagues in the best example of true brotherly love that exists on Capitol Hill. Again, his stabilizing influence was felt and will be missed more than he will ever know.

I am pleased that the ranking Republican on the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer], has brought to the attention of the House the fact that we are now holding hearings as a memorium to John Baldwin. His comment relating to Under Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd's statement that John's amendment on highway safety served as the genesis for developing the highway-safety legislation now being considered by our Public Works Committee, certainly testifies to the respect and leadership of this outstanding California Congressman.

During the funeral services held in John's home county of Contra Costa in California, the minister described John Baldwin as a very modest man and in keeping with this characteristic referred to the fact that John would not want to have an elaboration of his many accomplishments.

While I can respect the position taken by this man of the clergy in carrying out John's wish, I must suggest that this request was not directed to me. Therefore, I feel motivated to record for posterity, here in the Congressional Record a few of the outstanding contributions made to his State and his Nation by this warm and unassuming gentleman.

Representative Baldwin served on the Committee on Public Works for 11 years. His service on the committee began in January 1955.

During the 89th Congress, Mr. Baldwin served on the following subcommittees: Subcommittee on Flood Control—ranking minority member—Subcommittee on Roads, Subcommittee on Watershed Development, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program. These subcommittee assignments reflected Mr. Baldwin's particular areas of interest in public works legislation—water resources development and the Federal-aid highway programs.

A highly significant Baldwin proposal was incorporated as section 4 of Public Law 89–139 last year. Mr. Baldwin had long expressed a sincere interest in highway safety, and this section is a forerunner of the President's recently announced highway safety and traffic safety legislation. Mr. Baldwin's proposal provided that after December 31, 1967, each State should have a highway safety program designed to reduce traffic accidents and deaths, injuries, and property damages resulting therefrom on highways on the Federal-aid system. Such highway safety programs are to be in accordance with uniform standards approved by the Secretary and are to include provisions for an effective accidents records system, and measures calculated to improve driver performance, vehicle safety, highway design and maintenance, traffic control, and surveillance of traffic for detection and correction of high or potentially high accident locations. The enactment of realistic highway safety programs will be a fitting monument to the gentleman who is responsible for this provision in last year's act.

Mr. Baldwin was an exceptionally enthusiastic supporter of flood control and river and harbor legislation during his years in the Congress. Last year, he and the gentleman from Alabama, Representative Robert Jones, were coauthors of the provision in the Flood Control Act of 1965 which authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10 million. No appropriation can be made to construct, operate, or maintain such a project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the House and Senate. This is a highly significant provision of that act. By such a procedure, the Congress expedites approval of projects under $10 million.

Mr. Baldwin was a vigorous advocate of cleaning up our Nation's waterways. He was an ardent supporter of realistic water pollution control legislation. He was a continuing antagonist of pollutors of San Francisco Bay and adjacent waters and introduced important legislation to prohibit pollution of the bay from irrigation projects.

During the last session, Mr. Baldwin introduced bills of highway beautification and was an advocate of that measure. On the House floor, Mr. Baldwin sponsored an amendment, which was adopted, to provide for landscaping and scenic enhancement within the highway rights-of-way.

Mr. Baldwin was one of the first advocates of programs to protect the vital shorelines of our coastal areas against erosion.

Mr. Baldwin also had introduced legislation, in the past, to provide for the advancement of Federal funds for flood control projects undertaken by non-Federal entities.

He had introduced legislation to provide for maintenance of harbors and waterways at depths required for defense purposes. He introduced this legislation during the last Congress and reintroduced it during this Congress.

In 1961, Mr. Baldwin sponsored a bill to amend the act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property, which was embodied in Public Law 87–874, the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act of 1961.

In 1958 he cosponsored a bill which became Public Law 85–381, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. That same year, he cosponsored the legislation which became the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1958, Public Law 85–500.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the John Baldwin story is eloquently presented on this historic day. His eulogy will serve as an inspiration to all of us. At times, we are all inclined toward "hero worship" or the desire to emulate someone we admire and respect very much—John Baldwin is this kind of a man. The years we served together in the Congress will remain with me forever as a constant reminder of how best to serve my pepole.

Channel 7—KGO-TV, serving the San Francisco Bay area, recently delivered a final tribute that succinctly provides the unforgettable qualities of this courageous man:

A Fighter Gone

The late Congressman John F. Baldwin has been laid to rest in his beloved Contra Costa County. The Bay area, which he served for so long in Washington will miss him. He was a tireless, and effective, fighter for his beliefs and for projects which he felt would benefit his county, the Bay area and California.

Congressman Baldwin was a man of deep conviction—a grassroots politician in the real sense of the phrase. He often crossed party lines to carry out the wishes of the people he represented. And he learned their wishes by writing to them, by walking the streets and talking to them, by asking them questions. The voters liked this: They elected him five times—and he was a Republican in a predominantly Democratic district.

Channel 7 worked closely with Mr. Baldwin in his fight against the threat of the San Luis drain spilling polluted water into San Francisco Bay. We were impressed by his courage and tenacity. We learned to respect and admire him as a legislator and a man.

His seat in Congress will be difficult to fill. Our area and State will feel his loss.

John Baldwin has answered his last rollcall in the Halls of Congress. Like the "Tall Trees" of California, he will stand forever as the superlative example of man's service to his country—constantly seeking peace on earth and goodwill toward all men.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for granting this request to join with my colleagues in speaking words of eulogy to a truly great man, John Baldwin.

As I observed him here on the floor of this House, I think he stood head and shoulders, among many, as a man who would take a very objective look at each piece of legislation, for which I am sure he was commended many, many times.

I learned to know John Baldwin better, not so much as a Member of this body, but as one who regularly attended our weekly prayer breakfast sessions. John Baldwin was a very religious man. His deep spirituality was evidenced in remarks and presentations he made at our weekly prayer breakfast sessions.

So truly, I am sure, constituents of his district recognize the loss of a devoted servant, and this body loses a great colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I also bring to the members of the family my profound condolences in this, their sorrow.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, it seems strange and unreal to be joining the devoted friends and colleagues of JOHN BALDWIN in paying respect to his memory and expressing our sympathy to his family. Though God in his wisdom has called him to a higher purpose and physically JOHN is not with us, somehow he has never left this Chamber and this House of Representatives which he loved and served so well.

JOHN BALDWIN was always present and rarely did he miss the prayer and opening ritual of the House. His record of attendance and devotion to duty is among the best who have ever served in this legislative body. As a symbol of the ideal representative of citizens of this Republic, the memory of JOHN will be ever present in this Chamber.

JOHN BALDWIN was an unusual man. He sat on the Republican side of the aisle, but he was loved and respected on both sides. His approach to human problems was honest and nonpartisan. In the sense that his compassionate regard for human problems rose above partisanship, JOHN exemplified the greatness of this House and of the system of government of which it is a basic part. His example and his memory will never leave this Chamber.

JOHN BALDWIN was a worker. He was in his office at an early hour every morning serving his constituents. He knew the details of each day's pending bills; his mail was answered promptly; his committee work was attended to without fail and his constituents were informed on a weekly basis of exactly what he had done during the preceding week. His reports to his constituency were factual, honest, straightforward, and prompt, four adjectives which seemed to characterize JOHN BALDWIN, a truly professional legislator.

I have followed JOHN BALDWIN in the halls of our office buildings, observing his giant strides as I vainly tried to catch him. I have admired his great love of nature as God created it, his sincere regard for conservation, and have been inspired by it. I have felt the inspiration of his clean and wholesome way of life without ever feeling inferiority because I could not equal it. I have watched his zeal and perserverance as he became the advocate of things which were in the best interest of those he represented. And, as I watched all of these fine qualities I always wondered how one mortal man could come so close to perfection and whether there might be an unseen or hidden flaw in his makeup.

It was not until JOHN had left us that I found the answer. There was no hidden flaw. I heard his minister speak eloquently at his memorial service at the Trinity Presbyterian Church on Saturday, March 12. In the midst of the service I realized that JOHN BALDWIN's energy and his devotion to duty and right as he saw it was the product of his faith in God. Then I saw the courage and warmth and friendliness of his good wife Mary as she greeted each of JOHN's friends on this sad occasion. Clearly, JOHN BALDWIN and the things he stood and fought for were the product of himself, his loving family, and his devotion to God.

As JOHN's minister spoke the words of the 23d Psalm on that Saturday morning:

> Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Our friend and colleague, JOHN BALDWIN, now dwells in the house of the Lord forever, but his memory and the fine human American traits he symbolized shall also dwell forever in this, another of his houses, the House of Representatives.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in speaking words of sadness at the untimely passing of our admired and beloved colleague the gentleman from California, JOHN BALDWIN. He was among the first of the Members of this great legislative body with whom I struck up a warm relationship of friendliness and cooperation, when I came to Congress nearly 8 years ago. As the years went by the proof of his ability, diligence, and dedication to the service of the people of his district, and State, and country became ever more impressive—and the deep respect and admiration of his colleagues increased apace. We will miss him, but are all a little better for having known him.

To JOHN BALDWIN's lovely wife and other members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy in which my wife, Martha joins.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from California in paying tribute to the life, character, and public service of the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN, late a Representative from California.

Mr. BALDWIN represented the very finest attributes of a good public official and dedicated public servant. He was a man of ability, character, and integrity. On many important and some highly controversial issues, he never hesitated to take a strong position, and was always able to capably defend that position. On some occasions, I disagreed with the position which he took, but never questioned his reasons or his motives because I know that they were honest and honorable.

He limited his committee service to membership on the House Committee on Public Works, where he was a knowledgeable, capable, and effective member. At the time of his death, he was the second ranking minority member of that committee, and served on the Subcommittees on Flood Control, Roads, Watershed, and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highway Program. He was well known for his efforts in the highway safety field, and especially for the Baldwin amendment to the Highway Funds Authorization Act of 1965, which required States to develop effective highway safety programs.

JOHN BALDWIN and I came to Congress within 2 months of each other. Our association and friendship began at that time and continued and grew stronger during each year of our service in the House of Representatives. His State and district have lost an outstanding Representative, and they, together with those of us who knew and served with him, mourn his loss.

Mrs. Flynt joins me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Baldwin and their children.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN BALDWIN as a man universally loved and respected and, significantly, he was a man of tremendous intellect. He possessed one of the finest minds that ever contributed its wisdom to the decisions of this body. Yet also he was a man of great humility and remarkable humanity. He possessed an impeccable character. He was ever guided by the highest of moral principles.

Mr. Speaker, among equals he was truly far more than equal.

As we grieve his passing and extend our deepest condolences to his widow and three daughters, it also seems appropriate to extend condolences to the people whom he so outstandingly represented during his long period of service in the Congress of the United States. It is safe to say that no Americans have been represented in this body more ably, more honorably or with greater dedication or skill or effectiveness, than those represented by JOHN BALDWIN.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN BALDWIN's constituency will miss him greatly. His passing is a personal loss to them. It is a personal loss to all of us who knew him. Even more significantly, it is also a loss to America.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying my respects to the late JOHN BALDWIN. I knew him very well, perhaps better than most, because before JOHN came to the Congress I represented his district for 6 years as a part of the old Sixth District before the 1950 reapportionment.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN BALDWIN was a fine man. I subscribe to all of the comments that have been made about him, and to the tributes paid to him by our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN BALDWIN was a true American, and served his country sincerely, and served this House with great honor.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Miller and I wish to join others in paying respects to Mary and the children, and like all of you, we too feel the vacuum that his loss has created.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, true friendships formed in the course of a lifetime occasionally begin at the very first meeting. A natural affinity felt at the time provides the vehicle for the relationship. And there are certain rare individuals who have a unique and unfailing capacity for engendering good will, for appealing to the best in each of us as we encounter one another on "the bridge of time." JOHN BALDWIN was such a man. His character and personality unquestionably and immediately revealed his sincerity of purpose, inspiring immediate confidence in him as a man and public servant. It was my personal privilege to be numbered among his friends.

In a century of splintering personalities, JOHN BALDWIN was a whole man. In private and public life he was respected and admired by his associates as a man without guile, a man dedicated to his home, community, and country. His devotion to his wife and daughters, his deep religious conviction and unswerving recognition of human and spiritual values gained him the honor and respect of the people he served and his associates in public life.

The loss we sustain in the untimely passing of our friend and colleagues leaves a void that will be felt for a long time by the Congress of the United States and Congressman BALDWIN's home State of California. It also again illuminates in sharp focus the uncertainties in the life of man and his failures, even with the dramatically expanded knowledge of medical science, to control some of the dread diseases that continue to take men and women in their prime years when their contributions to our society are reaching greatest fruition.

Nothing that we do or say here can fully assuage the sorrow and grief of his wife, Mary, and daughters Georgia, Doris, and Sylvia. Our expressions, however, can convey to them the love and affection held by each and all of us for JOHN BALDWIN, husband, father, and American citizen. He has established his place in the Halls of Congress as a man of complete personal integrity and devotion to duty.

In the divine plan for man, JOHN BALDWIN has also, through a life of exemplary Christian living, in my humble opinion, assured himself of personal immortality. JOHN was a bridge builder in whose footsteps any and all of us could profitably follow. May divine providence with our help, comfort and sustain his family.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, our colleague [Mr. TALCOTT].

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, every one of us was saddened and grieved by the early death of our friend and esteemed colleague JOHN F. BALDWIN, of California.

I was privileged to know him only briefly, but I am grateful for the special opportunity of knowing and working with him.

JOHN epitomized the good for which men strive. He dignified the office of Representative in Congress. He was a highly dedicated public servant. He was an able and conscientious legislator. His service to his district and his nation was selfless and sustained—the highest criteria of public service. He tried to practice his deep and abiding Christian faith. He was a gentleman in the truest sense of the word. He was a devoted husband and father. He was a trusted and helpful friend.

We may not understand why he should die so young; but we know that he made an extraordinary contribution to his fellow man while he lived.

JOHN's death seems a great and sad loss to us; but we can rejoice that his life was a joy and an even greater benefit to all of us, his family, his community, and nation.

Mrs. Talcott and I extend our condolences to Mary, his wife whose faith and courage has surpassed understanding, and to his daughters.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I too join in the eulogy to JOHN BALDWIN. He was a man who did justly and who loved mercy and walked humbly before God. These are the only attributes God ever required of man and JOHN had them all. Not only was he respected—he was loved and admired. I have always felt that JOHN would never violate a commitment. When he made a commitment, it was just as good as signed, sealed and delivered. I always admired JOHN for standing firmly for his own convictions.

I hope God will be gracious and that his wife and family may be sustained in their bereavement and that they may carry on in the true tradition set by a great statesman, JOHN BALDWIN.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE].

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, during the history of the House of Representatives, California has given to the Nation many great leaders, as executive, judicial, and legislative officials. Today, unhappily we mourn the passing of a great legislative leader, our colleague, Representative JOHN F. BALDWIN. He was a great Californian, a native of our Golden State. He grew up with the State. He educated himself during the hard years of the depression, and gave his early efforts to the publishing business in San Francisco. Even before this country was formally at war, JOHN BALDWIN volunteered his service in the U.S. Army. He rose from a private to the rank of lieutenant colonel. He distinguished himself as chief of the Foreign Fiscal Affairs Office of the War Department, and was decorated by the Italian Government.

Not content with these achievements, JOHN BALDWIN returned to law school to launch himself on a new career. In the 5 short years after graduating from law school he so distinguished himself in community service that he won the high respect of his neighbors in Contra Costa County, and they honored him by electing him to the U.S. House of Representatives. JOHN BALDWIN, the great Californian, became Congressman BALDWIN, a great American and national leader.

I had the privilege of knowing him only 1 short year but came to have high regard for him as we worked together "whipping" the Republican delegations: I, for California; he, for the Western States.

He distinguished himself in the Congress on the Committee on Public Works. My colleagues from California are honored to have served with him. And we shall miss him and his wise counsel greatly. All the Members of this House are inspired by his example, and the memory of his friendship. A true indication of his accomplishments is measured by the respect and devotion shown him by his colleagues of the Democratic Party as well as the Republican. When JOHN BALDWIN stood on this floor to speak, all Members listened carefully as they knew that he never spoke unless he had a significant, responsible statement to make. We give to his wife and his three daughters, who knew him best of all, our deepest expression of sympathy.

His memory among us will stand tall and proud like those great ancient trees in our State which he loved so well.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our collegaue, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL].

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened by the untimely passing of our friend and colleague, JOHN BALDWIN. Our Nation, the State of California, his district, and this House have suffered a great loss. In his 11 years in the House he had become a most valuable member of the House and of the Public Works Committee, for especially in this way he had helped to build America, to improve its roads, its rivers and harbors, and protect it against the ravages of floods that comes within the jurisdiction of that great committee.

It was my privilege to serve with him on that committee and work closely with him on many important projects. Our districts are contiguous and we shared many problems, and cooperated closely to solve them for our people.

JOHN BALDWIN's life will forever stand as a memorial to his own actions and his character as a man, and a tribute to the greatness of our country. He performed distinguished service for our country in war and peace.

In both wartime service and in this Congress, he was successful by virtue of the force of his own great character, his diligence and ability and his devotion to his country. The people of his district held him in high esteem by reason of these qualities as did everyone of us here in the House.

His wife, Mary, and his three daughters have lost him but they can console themselves with the knowledge that his district, our State, and our country is greater and the world itself is better because he lived. All of us must leave this world and we can only hope that we can leave it with some honor as did JOHN BALDWIN.

My wife joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife, Mary, and his three daughters.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I had not come to this chamber today prepared to speak on the life of our late departed colleague John Baldwin. But as I have sat here today and listened to this spontaneous flow of tribute to the memory, the life and the character of our departed colleague, I cannot refrain from, too, rising to join in paying tribute to a man who was, I believe, a truly great legislator.

It was a most painful experience for those of us who knew him to witness his slow decline as the ravages of that awful disease that finally took his life continued to take its toll these past few months. And yet as we saw him walk among us with courage and with calm conviction, we recognized in him the same steadfast character that we had always known in him for the years that we were privileged to serve together in this House.

John Baldwin was an active and faithful member of his church and here on Capitol Hill he was an active member of the House Prayer Breakfast Group. However, even more importantly he daily lived his Christian faith. I can never recall hearing him speak ill of any man. His life was a magnificient testimonial of what a living faith in Christ can mean to a man constantly exposed to the pressures of public life. His honesty, kindness and essential decency and goodness in all his actions will continue to remind us in the years to come of the true nobility of his Christian character.

I think reference has already been made to the fact that whenever John took the floor of this House and spoke on a subject, it was generally on a bill which had come out of his committee, the Committee on Public Works. He was listened to because he was at all times an eminently reasonable man with reasonable convictions. Therefore he did enjoy the esteem, the confidence, and the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle. So I certainly wish to join today in extending very deepest sympathy to the wife and to the surviving daughters of our late beloved friend, John Baldwin.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the death of John F. Baldwin was a great personal loss to me. We worked together on the Republican committee on NATO from the first day it was established 3 years ago. He was a diligent, effective, conscientious, creative member. I remember many projects, on which we worked together closely, and the association was always a pleasant and profitable one. When I became chairman, I frequently looked to John for guidance, advice and assistance. He was never failing. I shall miss him as a colleague and even more so as a friend. His fine qualities of character will live on as an inspiration to us all.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to rise in this Chamber to pay tribute to the memory of our departed colleague, John Baldwin, for in memory I can still see him sitting just back of the committee table, listening most attentively to every debate. Each day as the session opened, he could be found there worshiping with the opening prayer by the Chaplain.

For over 12 years John never missed a rollcall. He did not often participate in the debate unless the bill came from his Public Works Committee, but when he did speak the Members listened with dignified respect and grateful admiration. Truly, I can say that no more dedicated Member of Congress ever entered this Chamber.

John carried the same earnest devotion into his family life, and into the life of his church. For 12 years he was a most constant attendant at the Thursday breakfast of the House prayer group. It was the year when John was president of the group that the weekly attendance reached its peak. Again, it was his humble devotion to an assumed duty that made the difference.

We shall miss this kindly, good, Christian colleague, but we are comforted in the knowledge that he has gone home to his Father's mansion. Our deepest sympathy goes to his wife, Mary, and their children.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I include a transcript of the services for Congressman John F. Baldwin, conducted on March 14, 1966, by the Reverend Orville L. Shick, at the Community Presbyterian Church of Danville, Calif.:

I have been asked to be modest and sparing in reference to the deceased and I wish to honor that request.

I am sure, however, that you would desire me to express on this occasion the real deep loss which we feel in the passing of our friend and neighbor, John Baldwin.

Congressman Baldwin distinguished himself as an able legislator for almost 12 years—faithfully serving his people, all people, until the end. This was his life and to this he gave untiring service and selfless dedication.

We knew him as a man identified with other men in a relationship that was warm, open, and genuine. He exemplified the most noble traits of sincerity, moral courage, understanding, and tenacity—voting not for that which was expedient, but for that which was right as he saw it. He brought dignity and honor to the title of public servant.

John Baldwin was a man of simple faith. Ordained as an elder in this church at the age of 19, Christian principles and insights made him a loving husband and father, a faithful friend, and a trusted confidant. Without ostentation he practiced a practical piety in a culture not characterized by moderation.

We loved him; we respected him; this world is better for his being with us. But he is not gone, he is just away. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him" (2 Thessalonians 4: 14).

Though we cannot understand fully the meaning of death, we may rest our faith in the words of Holy Scripture: "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints" (Psalm 116: 15).

PASTORAL PRAYER BY THE REVEREND MR. SHICK

God of all grace, who didst send Thy Son, our Savior Jesus Christ, to bring life and immortality to light; most humbly and heartily we give Thee thanks that by His death He destroyed the power of death; and by His glorious resurrection opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers. Grant us assuredly to know that because He lives we shall live also, and that neither death nor life, nor things present nor things to come, shall be able to separate us from Thy love, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We bless Thee for our knowledge, in Christ, that death is not the destruction but the expansion of our life; that it opens the way into new opportunities of service and worship; new disciplines, new joys. Help us to realize the faith of Christ, and the peace of Christ, that the bereavements that darken our homes may not break our trust in Thee.

We offer our thanksgiving for this Thy servant suddenly called from our side and from his abundant ministry. We bless Thee for the heritage of faith to which he was born, for the influences of home and church which molded his early years, for the charm which drew friends to him and the integrity of spirit which made them trust and admire him, for his dedication of himself to the ministry of public service, for the causes of civic justice and social advance into which he threw himself.

We thank Thee for Thy loving kindness to him: For the many desires of his heart which were fulfilled, for his constant happiness in his work, for the rich comradeship Thou gavest him in her who was so one with him in thought and labor and life: And for the daughters in whom he rejoiced: and for all he has meant to every one of us. Having fought the good fight and finished the course, grant unto him the crown of life that fadeth not away.

Now grant us, we beseech Thee, the comfort of Thy presence, and the ministry of Thy holy spirit. Renew within us the gifts of faith, patience, and enduring love. With an urgency born of hope may we apply ourselves to present tasks as we strive for a better world—not despairing in the face of disappointment and defeat—ever steadfast in the hope of the final triumph of our God. May we find direction in the life and ministry of Jesus Christ who struggled against temptation, who had compassion for the needy and poor, who was angered by all hypocrisy and deceit, and who was willing to suffer for others—even into death.

We sorrow with and for this family—yet we rejoice in the love and pride which they feel in him whom they love; and beseech Thee to bestow Thy peculiar blessing upon them, comforting their hearts as only Thou canst, giving them the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness, that they may find light in darkness, and the peace of God that passeth all understanding. All this we ask, O Lord, for Thy mercy's sake. Amen.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from California, Congressman John F. Baldwin, who passed away on March 9 after a very courageous fight against cancer.

We are all saddened by his death which takes from our ranks a man of strong convictions, a man of determined purpose, a man who held an unswerving devotion to his country, a man richly endowed with the qualities of raw courage, and a man whose commitment to the rule of law as the heartstone of American democracy was total.

John was a tireless worker, ever present on the floor of the House when legislation was considered, and one who was completely devoted to serving his district in the best possible manner at all times. He was an expert on public works and his district, the State of California, and the United States will long be indebted to him for the many projects he helped to make possible.

Mrs. Smith joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his loving wife, Mary, and their three daughters.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today as we pay tribute to a departed colleague with whom I have worked since I first came to Congress.

JOHN BALDWIN was one of the most dedicated, hard-working Representatives that this Congress has ever known. We worked together during the past 7 years on many projects and legislative matters of great importance to all of the State of California. I want to say that when the good of the State of California was at stake JOHN BALDWIN let nothing deter him in his fight for what he thought was right. JOHN was a battler who would not in any way compromise his convictions.

As a Member of the House of Representatives he was outstanding in a quality we respect—he did his homework, he was informed, he was knowledgeable and stated his case with excellence.

The mark of his dedication I believe is his voting record. I do not believe that in his service to his country during the 11 years he was in Congress, he ever missed a rollcall until about a year ago when he was hospitalized for an operation. You will recall during his last illness he rose from his hospital bed and came to cast his vote on two issues of great importance to the people he represented. This act, and the fall which he suffered while he was here, probably hastened his death so that we can truly say that JOHN BALDWIN gave his life to his first and only responsibility since coming to Congress, that of representing the people he served.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say that no one knows or understands the work of a Member of Congress more than the staffs who serve with them. At the services held in Arlington I talked with JOHN BALDWIN's executive secretary, Ann Schreiber, who told me of her feelings toward her boss. I quote her comments here for I think they say what we all have in our hearts:

> Working for Congressman BALDWIN for almost 12 years has given me an insight into the man himself, which I am proud to say was a privilege for which I will be grateful as long as I live.
>
> Mr. BALDWIN was an inspiration to all who knew him, and he will be greatly missed by his colleagues, his constituents, and his staff. He was truly a statesman in every sense of the word. He was kind, thoughtful, and fair to each member of his staff and treated each with courteous respect at all times.
>
> Congressman BALDWIN was without doubt a most dedicated, sincere, and unceasingly hard-working servant of the people, to which I can attest most wholeheartedly. The California 14th Congressional District and the Nation have lost a man of unequaled high principle, who will unquestionably go down in the annals of history as a man of greatness.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory of the late Representative JOHN BALDWIN, of California, and in expressing deepest sympathy to his wife, Mary, and her daughters.

JOHN was one of our most distinguished and most courageous legislators. If anyone in the House ever had complete courage of conviction, JOHN BALDWIN had. He was a strong man, with the character and humility of our beloved President Lincoln. We shall miss him in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of the late Congressman JOHN BALDWIN.

I have had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives for almost 12 years with JOHN BALDWIN. As a fellow member of the California congressional delegation, I had the occasion to work with him on a number of projects, and in all instances I found him to be a most able and fair-minded legislator.

JOHN BALDWIN and I were fellow students at the University of California and I watched his career with a great deal of interest. The conscientiousness and zeal which he demonstrated in college carried over into his public career.

JOHN BALDWIN represented his congressional district in a bipartisan manner without fear or favor. He was a good Congressman and will be sorely missed.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, everyone who had the pleasure of knowing and working with JOHN BALDWIN surely must have recognized the truly outstanding qualities of character which he epitomized.

Having served rather closely with JOHN in these 12 years on the House Public Works Committee, I feel certain that it is no exaggeration to say that no Member brought to his work a more earnest purpose or gave more unstintingly of his mental resources and his physical energies to the public good.

JOHN BALDWIN never wearied of the arduous and sometimes onerous tasks of legislation. He was one of those rare craftsmen who performed every task to which he was assigned with unusual meticulousness and care. Often in the committee, where the shape and form of legislation was being hammered out upon the anvils of compromise and detailed discussions, JOHN would reveal a bit of knowledge which none of the rest of us had noted concerning the particular matter involved. His labor was painstaking; his scholarship was thorough; his integrity was without blemish.

When I think of JOHN BALDWIN, I think instinctively of the adjective, "sincere." It fits him like a glove. The word, I am told, derives from two Latin words meaning, literally, "without wax."

The use of this phrase dates back to a time when articles of various manufactures were imported and offered for sale in the old Roman markets. If a vessel or other artifact had been cracked or broken, occasionally it would be mended with a waxlike substance to conceal the flaw. Thus, for an article of merchandise to be stamped with the reassuring label "without wax" meant simply that it was precisely what it purported to be—free of artifice or pretense or clever camouflage.

And this, most surely, was JOHN BALDWIN. He was in every word and deed completely genuine and thoroughly sincere.

His contributions to our Nation, some of them largely unknown and publicly unsung, will endure to bless the Nation he loves and served so well.

To his family, then, we extend our heartfelt sympathy. And we can but hope that, through his dedicated service, this Nation may be in future years a fit place for others of his type.

Any nation which has men like JOHN BALDWIN is a rich nation indeed.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, it was my happy privilege to be associated with JOHN BALDWIN in numerous ways.

Although we were not members of the same political party, for some 4 years, our congressional offices were on the same hall, which naturally threw us together a great deal.

We shared in common membership on the House Public Works Committee, and on many occasions we cooperated on legislation, projects, and proposals of mutual interest—some of primary interest in his State and area—some of primary interest in my State and area—but many of great interest and importance to the Nation generally.

Despite our partisan differences, I invariably found JOHN BALDWIN to be a man of high principle, great integrity, and unswerving loyalty and devotion to what be believed to be right.

My third common interest with him was the House prayer group. He was an officer and faithful attendant of this group for many years.

I can say without equivocation and from the bottom of my heart that JOHN BALDWIN was the kind of man every district in the country ought to have representing it in the Congress of the United States.

We who were his friends and colleagues shall miss his presence among us; his State and constituency will be deprived of his representation; and our country will be the poorer for the passing of this gentlemanly statesman.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult, indeed, to find adequate words of tribute to JOHN BALDWIN, for his life was in itself a tribute to those qualities of personal character and professional achievement to which we all aspire but which all too few of us attain.

All of us will miss him, but I shall miss him especially, for I have over and over again through the years been indebted to him, as a colleague and as a friend. He was a gentleman in the finest definition of that word, and working with him was always a pleasure and it was always helpful. Many of us must, like me, have found our own load made lighter because the load he was willing and able to carry was so heavy. I always knew that he would be fully informed, that his approach to every problem would be one of constructive craftsmanship, and that when someone was needed, he would be there.

JOHN BALDWIN was truly an exceptional man, the kind of man whose qualities are not limited to a given time or a given place, the kind of man we always need. Moliere wrote some 300 years ago:

> If everyone were clothed with integrity, if every heart were just, frank and kindly, the other virtues would be well-nigh useless.

That, I think, is a good description of JOHN BALDWIN.

His absence is a sorrow to all of us. I know that his loss is a heavy burden of grief for his fine wife and children. I hope they will be able to draw strength and guidance from the inspiration of his devotion to them and to his country, and for their sake I pray it is true, as it says in the 34th Psalm, that the Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we all knew JOHN BALDWIN to be a very effective and dedicated legislator. He maintained a very expert knowledge of the complex legislative problems facing his committee, and his judgment and reasoning were respected by all.

In the last few years, we recognize the obstacles he faced due to his physical condition and recognized the great courage and perseverence he demonstrated and his unfailing confidence and dedication to his responsibilities of office. He was the type of Member which makes the Congress a great body. He made a most practical, lasting contribution during his service here, and we will miss him as a friend and as one of our most effective legislative colleagues.

Mrs. Derwinski joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Baldwin and her daughters at this especially sad time in their lives.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I join with all the others who today have expressed sorrow at the death of JOHN BALDWIN. In the years that we have served together in this House, I have found him always to be an individual who sought truly to be a representative of the people in the best sense of the term.

JOHN was a man of very deep convictions and, while he would always listen patiently and attentively to the arguments which were presented upon a question, in the final anlysis he would make up his mind on the basis of what he believed to be right and proper. He was the type of individual this country—or any other—can ill afford to lose. We need more men of his stature.

In every sense of the word, he was truly a Christian gentleman, and our sympathy certainly goes to his wife and children.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of JOHN F. BALDWIN all of us sustained a grievous loss. It was my special privilege to serve with JOHN on the Committee on Public Works during my first 7 years in Congress. Much of that time, JOHN and I sat next to one another during committee sessions—and I came to know and to respect him not just as a colleague but as a personal friend.

To me, JOHN BALDWIN typified the very highest in those kind of personal qualities to which we all aspire. He was warm and openhearted, interested in the problems of the "other fellow" and never too busy to try to help find a solution for them. He was kind and decent, and truly respectful of the rights and opinions of others. He was dedicated to serving the people he represented and to serving the Nation he loved, in the true meaning of that sadly overworked word, "dedicated."

He was strong in the right, and convinced that if one kept digging he could find the right—and once he felt he had found it he clung to it tenaciously, regardless of political or personal consequences.

And this, Mr. Speaker, was because JOHN, perhaps above all other things, was a man of integrity—a man whose desire to be honest, honest with himself and with his fellow human beings, came from the very wellsprings of his own being.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as we all now know so well, JOHN BALDWIN was a man of great courage—a courage born of his own deeply held religious faith—and his demonstration of that courage to us during the last year of pain and trouble for him will serve as a constant source of inspiration to those of us who are left.

I have lost a tried and true friend. This House has lost one of the best men who ever served in it. I feel that loss, as we all do, down deep inside of me, and my heart goes out to his equally courageous wife, and their three daughters, to whom Mrs. Robison and I join in expressing our sympathy and our regrets.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, we all mourn the passing of our distinguished colleague, JOHN F. BALDWIN, of the 14th District of California. The end came after a siege of illness which would have broken the spirit of the average person. Yet, to the very end, he struggled bravely, displaying a quiet courage which we will long remember. Just a short time before his death, he returned briefly to the floor expressing to me his interest in the Asian Development Bank passage. I sensed the effort he put forth and admired the spirit which made it possible.

JOHN BALDWIN loved his country and served it well. Six times the people of his district chose this able and sincere man to be their Representative. This success is a real tribute to his personality and his record. He was admired and respected by people in all walks of life, regardless of party affiliation.

The remarks this afternoon will record for all time the affection and high regard his colleagues had for JOHN BALDWIN. May they also serve to bring comfort to his wife and children, as well as confirming the heritage of his distinguished service. He will live in their memory as a loved and loving husband and father, and in the memories of us all as a true American and as a dedicated public servant.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, JOHN BALDWIN was a true gentleman in every sense of the word. In all the years I knew him I never heard him say an unkind word about anyone. He was a dedicated public servant who conscientiously gave his best in the performance of his duties as a Congressman. He was a man of character and high moral principles whose friendship made us better for having known him. I am proud to have been one of his friends and am deeply saddened at his untimely passing.

Mrs. Betts and I both extend our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Baldwin and her family.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, JOHN BALDWIN is gone, and we in the House of Representatives have lost a distinguished and dedicated colleague—a dear and trusted friend. I join with all of those who were privileged to know him in mourning his untimely passing.

There is perhaps no greater legacy to leave to those who follow after than years of conscientious and devoted public service. JOHN BALDWIN has left such a legacy, and I know that we in the Congress will long remember his diligence, his outstanding ability, and his genuine and honest concern for the welfare not only of those he represented in the Congress with such dignity and honor but his concern for all people throughout the Nation.

I personally shall never forget the wise counsel and many courtesies which he extended to me as a new member of the Committee on Public Works; and I know that I express the sentiments of all members of our committee when I say that we will sincerely miss him in the days ahead.

May I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Baldwin and all members of the family.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable sorrow and a sense of personal grief that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our beloved colleague JOHN F. BALDWIN, of the California 14th District, who has passed from this world to the next.

JOHN BALDWIN was many things—husband, father, lawyer, legislator, finance expert—and everything he did, he did well. At the time of his demise he was a veteran of 11 years' service in the House, and second-ranking Republican on the House Public Works Committee.

JOHN BALDWIN graduated with honors from the University of California where he majored in accounting and finance. He then studied law at the University of California Law School where he was elected president of his class.

When this country entered the Second World War, in 1941, he entered the Army as a private, and at the close of the war was discharged with the rank of lieutenant colonel. During his time in service JOHN BALDWIN was director of training for the Army Finance School and chief of the foreign fiscal affairs branch in the Office of Fiscal Director of the War Department. Ultimately, he held the post of executive officer of the Office of Fiscal Director in the Mediterranean Theater. When Italy became an American ally, toward the close of the war, there was a great need, international in scope, for the devaluation of the Italian lira. Colonel BALDWIN was called in to assist in meeting this need, and for his work was decorated by the Italian Government.

As a member of the House Public Works Committee, JOHN BALDWIN was able to bring to bear his knowledge of finance to the great benefit of the Nation and the national pocketbook.

In the death of JOHN BALDWIN the country has sustained a tragic loss.

I wish to pay my highest respect to the memory of this most remarkable man, and to extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved widow and children. May the Almighty bless them with the courage to brave the morrow with hopes for the future.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying honor and respect to the memory of our late and beloved colleague, JOHN BALDWIN, of California.

JOHN BALDWIN was a man who possessed great intellectual capacity and demonstrated throughout his entire service in the Congress a conscientious dedication to his district and his country. An important and informed member of the Committee on Public Works, JOHN was one of the most knowledgeable and quietly effective Members of the entire House of Representatives. His entire life, as evidenced by a reading of his biography, is indicative of his great patriotism, his love of intellectual pursuits and industry, and dedication to service.

In a highly personalized and competitive world, JOHN BALDWIN commanded the respect and earned the affection of all who knew him. He understood and loved his fellow man and this was reflected in his kindly, thoughtful, and generous treatment of all with whom he was associated. I never heard JOHN BALDWIN say an unkind work about any man and have never heard any man say an unkind word about JOHN BALDWIN. He will indeed be missed greatly by all who knew him.

The 14th District of California has lost an outstanding representative, the Congress of the United States an invaluable Member, and all of us who knew JOHN BALDWIN have lost a wonderful friend.

Mrs. Cahill joins me in expressing sincere sympathy to his family in their hour of sadness.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as one who knew and respected JOHN F. BALDWIN, I welcome the privilege of joining the California delegation and other colleagues in eulogizing him today.

His colleagues in this 89th Congress, his former school and college mates, his constituents in the 14th District of California, his military comrades and distinguished fellow officers, his coworkers in the civic and community life of Contra Costa County, Calif., and his grieving wife and daughters are so familiar with his life and its many good works that such references will add little honor.

In addition to my observation of JOHN BALDWIN as a leading Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I came to know him personally as chairman of the congressional prayer group. In this capacity, JOHN BALDWIN displayed a spiritual goodness which characterized him.

It is heartening to know that at this hour the spirit of the man lives on and that Congressman JOHN BALDWIN embodied this spirit in full measure.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve in the House with our late beloved colleague JOHN BALDWIN for almost 12 years. During that span of years he served his district, his State, and the Nation with dignity and honor. He was a tireless worker for the things in which he believed. His position on important issues were never misunderstood. He fought and fought hard for principle.

JOHN served on my whip organization for many years and as western regional whip the last 2 years of his service here. He not only was attentive to his job but believed in doing it as well as he possibly could and I add here, he always did it well. All one needed to do was to ask JOHN to do this or that and it was taken care of immediately. He was one of the most delightful and pleasant individuals I have ever worked with.

Truly he was a man of great character. I was proud to call him my friend. He will be sorely missed.

I extend to Mrs. Baldwin and the family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my words of farewell to our late, beloved colleague from California, the Honorable JOHN BALDWIN.

JOHN BALDWIN was a man of clear and strong conviction who devoted boundless energy to his State, to the House of Representatives, and to his Nation.

But the esteem in which he was held by those of us who were his colleagues here in the House was not solely because of these attributes. JOHN BALDWIN was a man of the highest principles and was guided by his unswerving faith in God. He seldom missed our weekly prayer breakfast and he was a stanch supporter and former president of the International Christian Leadership Movement.

He was held in high esteem by Members of the House on both sides of the aisle and his presence will be greatly missed by all of us who had the opportunity to serve with him in these great Halls.

To his wife, his daughters, and his friends I offer my deepest sympathy in this time of sorrow.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned of the passing of our distinguished colleague, JOHN BALDWIN.

During the years that I had the privilege of serving with him, he proved himself to be a truly dedicated public servant. He was a man of high principles and an effective legislator. Congressman BALDWIN was a man of integrity and ability—an able advocate and a worthy adversary.

With JOHN BALDWIN's passing the people of his district, his State, and the entire Nation have lost a dedicated leader and a noble American.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Member of the House of Representatives, JOHN BALDWIN. His passing is a great loss to his friends, to the great State of California, and to the Nation.

From my first days in the 87th Congress, JOHN BALDWIN was my friend. He went out of his way to be helpful to me and to those I represent. His dedicated work in the Public Works Committee not only was of great and everlasting value to his State, but to every part of the United States of America. He was an able legislator, a Christian gentleman, and won the esteem and admiration of his colleagues and friends during his years of service in the House. We are saddened by the death of JOHN BALDWIN, and we shall truly miss him.

Mrs. Shriver and I join in expressing our sorrow and deepest sympathy to his lovely wife and other members of his family.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to join in these tributes to our departed colleague, the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN, of California.

JOHN BALDWIN, with his gentle but yet dynamic Christian example, was that type of effective legislator to which all of us aspire and few achieve. He insisted both in his public and his private life on the highest levels of integrity. He combined great intellect with untiring labors on behalf of the people of his district and of the United States. His quiet courage even in the face of his final great adversary was a source of inspiration to all of us.

Perhaps it was in the meditations of our congressional prayer breakfast group that I came to know JOHN BALDWIN best. His humility before his God gave him strength to endure all things.

JOHN BALDWIN was an eminent lawyer, a fiscal expert, and a distinguished military man during his wide-ranging career. As a ranking member of the House Committee on Public Works, he was acknowledged as an expert in that complicated field of legislation. His great store of wisdom and knowledge were of assistance to me on a number of occasions in connection with projects in my own State.

To his devoted wife and three daughters go my deepest sympathy. To them he leaves a precious legacy of faith, devotion, courage, and love that must give them comfort in these difficult days.

The rest of us are better Americans for having enjoyed the privilege of living and working with this distinguished man.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of our distinguished colleague, JOHN BALDWIN. During the 12 years we served together on this side of the aisle, I learned to know him well and to admire him for his devotion to the problems and interests of the 14th District of California and for the conscientious approach he made to legislation that was presented to us.

He not only served his country well during his career in the Army but he continued to serve it well when the citizens of his district selected him to represent them in the Halls of Congress.

I want to extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to the late, beloved JOHN BALDWIN, of California.

It was my good fortune when I first came to Congress to have the opportunity of talking with Congressman BALDWIN relative to public works affairs. He was knowledgeable, but above all else, he was courteous and thoughtful and I do not believe that I ever heard Congressman BALDWIN say a critical word about any one of his colleagues.

Mr. Baldwin was an able champion of the entire West and particularly the State of California.

His State, his Nation, and his family have lost a distinguished Representative. We have lost a friend.

To his family, my deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with the grieving members of the Honorable John F. Baldwin's family, with his many friends in the House, and with his thousands of loyal constituents in mourning his passing.

He represented the 14th Congressional District of California with ability, integrity, and distinction from the time of his first election to the House in 1954 until his recent tragic and untimely death. His work on the House Public Works Committee, where he was second ranking minority member, furnished him an opportunity to display his many and varied abilities.

Those abilities had been shown earlier in his academic and military careers. He was graduated with honors from the University of California where he majored in accounting and finance. He then studied law at the University of California Law School where he was president of his class.

He enlisted in the Army as a private in 1941. Eventually he served as director of training for the Army Finance School and as Chief of the Foreign Fiscal Affairs Branch in the Office of Fiscal Director of the War Department. He became executive officer of the office of fiscal director in the Mediterranean theater. When he was released from active duty he was a lieutenant colonel.

He practiced law successfully in California prior to winning election to Congress. All of those who knew him during his congressional career were impressed by his knowledge, by his courtesy, and by his untiring devotion to his duties as a Member of Congress. He will be greatly missed here and in the 14th California Congressional District which he served so well.

While in Congress he lived in Arlington, Va. Following a service at the Presbyterian Church, his body was flown home to Martinez, Calif., where funeral services were held at the Danville Community Presbyterian Church.

His epitaph was spoken by his beloved wife who was at his side when he died. She said then that:

> He fought for his own life with the same tenacity that he fought for the best interests of his congressional district, his State, and his Nation.

I extend my deepest personal sympathy to his brave and sorrowing widow and to his dearly beloved daughters. I have lost a friend, they have lost a husband and father, and our country has lost one of its best and most devoted public servants.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the State of California and all America lost a valuable public servant when Representative John F. Baldwin, of California, passed away at the Bethesda Naval Hospital on March 9. We are all familiar with the great and good fight that our colleague conducted during his tragic illness.

His death has taken from the House of Representatives a tireless and extremely capable Member. He served with distinction in the Congress for 11 years. His devotion to duty was exemplary. He served as second-ranking Republican on the House Public Works Committee. John Baldwin not only knew his Government, but he had a great faith in our way of life. His life was dedicated to his country's preservation and its betterment.

The late Representative Baldwin was born in California and was graduated from the University of California, where he majored in accounting and finance. He was also graduated from the University of California Boalt Hall School of Jurisprudence. His leadership was apparent at an early age as he served as president of his law class all 3 years in law school from 1946 to 1949.

As a financial expert John Baldwin was director of training of the Army Finance School for more than a year. He was Chief of the Foreign Fiscal Affairs Branch in the War Department during World War II. While with the U.S. Army in Italy, he was executive officer of the office of the fiscal director. The Italian Government decorated him for helping to devalue the Italian lire. He entered the Army in 1941 as a private and rose in rank to a lieutenant colonel.

His interest and membership in worthwhile organizations showed his capacity for citizenship in its best sense. He served his constituents as a responsible lawmaker. His duties he regarded as a sacred trust. He was admired by his colleagues.

To his courageous wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy. And I am certain this body joins with me in acknowledging a deep sense of personal loss in the death of John Baldwin.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of our colleague, Congressman John Baldwin, whose tragic death at the height of his career has saddened this House and deprived the Nation of a tireless servant.

John Baldwin brought courage, independence, and a piercing intellect to the work of Congress. He understood the great burden of decisionmaking which falls upon the legislative branch and was willing and able to do more than his share in meeting that challenge. The work of our body requires more than tireless study and informed debate. It also requires the unique human qualities that make it possible for men and women to work together toward common goals despite temporary disagreement about the path to be pursued. Kindness, understanding, and compassion were the hallmarks of John Baldwin's service. As a Californian, I was especially proud to serve with him. Our State and our Nation will miss him.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my collegues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to my good friend, the late John F. Baldwin, of California.

John Baldwin was serving his district and his State in his 12th year here this year when his untimely death occurred.

I had a high personal regard for him—for his integrity, intelligence, perseverance, and good fellowship in his work in the Congress. We will all miss his wise counsel very much.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that we note today the passing of yet another colleague, the distinguished and Honorable John F. Baldwin, of California. A Member of this body for 11 years, John Baldwin served his California district and the United States well and faithfully and at the time of his death was the second ranking minority member of the House Committee on Public Works. His loss saddens Members of this body on both sides of the aisle.

To his wife, who shared his final moments, and his three daughters I extend my deepest sympathy and prayers.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, John Baldwin and I came to Congress the same year and shared a strong common interest in conservation legislation.

I knew him as an able and diligent legislator. His record of never missing a rollcall during his first 10 years in Congress—until, in fact, illness kept him from the floor—is only an indication of the dedicated service he gave to the United States and to the people of the 14th District of California.

It was an honor and privilege to have served with him. I deeply regret his untimely death. Mrs. Reuss joins me in condolences to his wife, Mary, and their three daughters.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I rise to pay tribute to my friend John Baldwin, of California. As my senior and mentor on the Public Works Committee he was a valued counselor. His untimely death cut short a brilliant career of public service and destroyed the promise of even more brilliant accomplishments.

He was a master of the difficult art of legislation, having both the technical expertise required and the instinctive sense through which sound policy is determined and given life. He was a recognized expert on rivers, harbors, and flood control matters. These vast programs bear many hallmarks of his careful work and constructive thoughts. It was at his suggestion that the committee was empowered to authorize on its own projects of less than $10 million in cost, a legislative improvement which greatly increased the efficiency of handling these operations.

He was equally versed in questions concerning our Federal highway programs and was one of the first public figures in the land to grapple with the highway safety problem. Mr. Baldwin authored the amendment that became part of Public Law 89-139, which expresses the sense of Congress that each State develop an adequate highway safety program. This provision established the first congressional policy in this tremendously important field. It forms the necessary policy foundation for further progress in developing Federal efforts to reduce the tragic carnage on our highways.

On a personal basis, I am deeply grateful to John Baldwin for the constant kindness and courtesy he showed me from the day I entered Congress and joined his committee. He was invariably generous with his time and his counsel, something especially valued by new Members.

His personal honor, his love of country, his dignity, his balanced judgments, his sense of humor, and his sense of calling to the difficult art of politics make him a model for all to follow who would serve their country in Government.

Those of us who served with him will regard it always as a high privilege to have done so and I shall treasure for the rest of my life a warm and inspiring memory of this good man.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the country are deeply indebted to our late colleague, the Honorable John F. Baldwin, for his service to his Nation, his State, and his congressional district. He brought to his life and his work sound integrity, ability, and courage, and his contributions as a legislator, a lawyer, and a financial expert have been notable.

For more than a year, John Baldwin was Director of Training of the Army Finance School, and during World War II served as Chief of the Foreign Fiscal Affairs Branch in the War Department. While with the U.S. Army in Italy, he was executive officer of the office of fiscal director, and for his assistance in devaluating the Italian lire, he was decorated by the Italian Government. He entered the Army as a private and rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

As a member of the House Committee on Public Works, he served with great distinction and always fought for the best interests of the country and his congressional district. He will be long remembered as a distinguished and respected Member of the U.S. Congress, as well as a friend. I personally feel a deep sense of loss at his passing, and extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and his family.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 I had the privilege of serving as a fellow freshman with John F. Baldwin in the 84th Congress, and it is with deep regret that I join this membership today in mourning the loss of our good friend and colleague from California. For the past 11 years, I have watched with admiration John's dedicated service to the House of Representatives, the Nation, and to the district which he represented with distinction and honor. Before becoming a conscientious and effective legislator, John enjoyed a brilliant military career and we frequently reminisced about our Army experiences. Although quiet, John was friendly, kind, and considerate. He spoke with conviction that comes only with a thorough knowledge of one's subject and was highly respected by his colleagues. As he fought for the principles in which he believed, he courageously fought to the end to conquer the dread disease which took his life. He will be sorely missed by all of us. Mrs. Minshall and I extend our deepest sympathy to John's wife, Mary, and their three children.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late friend, Congressman John Baldwin, and also join in the many compliments and statements which have been made.

Johnny Baldwin and I were elected to the 84th Congress. It was my great privilege to develop a very close personal friendship with John and his lovely wife, Mary. Mrs. Sisk and I have never enjoyed a relationship more than the wonderful friendship of these two very great people. My wife always considered Mary among her close personal friends. In addition, they had a very lovely family which we had the pleasure of knowing.

Besides being a wonderful person and outstanding individual, he was friendly and helpful to his associates and was one of the hardest working Members of the Congress I have ever had the privilege of knowing. His untiring dedication and service to his district will certainly go down as a very great contribution to Contra Costa County, Calif., which was privileged to have such a stalwart individual represent them in the Congress of the United States.

I had the opportunity to work with John on many legislative matters. In most cases we found ourselves in complete agreement, but, as invariably happens, there were occasions where differences arose due to the varying interests in our districts. However, even in those instances where we found ourselves on opposite sides of a policy question, I found John to be a gentleman, honest and completely fair in stating his position and in keeping me fully informed as to the reasons for the position he took. Because of the community of interest which was involved in our districts being similar in nature, one of the truly gratifying experiences of my tenure in the Congress was working with John on matters concerning water projects, water pollution, flood control, matters pertaining to the national park system, and the conservation of our natural resources, agriculture, and so forth. In fact, the range of endeavor in which we were mutually involved is too great to mention.

I am proud to say that in each and every instance in which we were involved, John conducted himself in the way that we would all like to be treated on any occasion.

In concluding my remarks, I want to say that Contra Costa County, the State of California, and the Nation have truly lost a devoted friend, dedicated servant, and great American. I extend my deepest sympathy to his charming wife, Mary, her lovely daughters, the other members of his family, and his multitude of friends.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for more than 11 years our good friend and colleague from California, John Baldwin, has served with distinction in this body. How unfortunate it is that he is no longer with us, that his voice of good commonsense and strong principle will not be heard here again. He possessed a great devotion to the House of Representatives and was deeply dedicated to the interests of good government. Certainly, we all will long remember the courtesy, integrity, and understanding nature which he gave to every duty.

John Baldwin was appreciated by his colleagues, as we have heard today. We respected him as a man and valued him highly as a friend. In our thoughts, we should be strengthened in the knowledge that we have been privileged to serve with this fine man and true American.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to John's family. Though it is a time of sorrow for them, I know they will find a measure of comfort in the fact that he served his fellow man and his Nation for many years with dedication and achievement.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my late departed friend, John Baldwin, an outstanding citizen of California and of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, the passing of a colleague is always an awesome experience, and in the passing of John Baldwin we experienced not only the loss of a colleague in this honorable body, but the passing of a gentleman who was both admired and loved.

As a member of the Public Works Committee he was most knowledgeable in this important field, and he was always willing to share this knowledge and to help any who called upon him.

Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him are aware of the qualities of character and integrity which he possessed, and little we can say here today will add or detract in any way from the enviable record which he has built over the years for his State and Nation. That record will stand as a monument to his devotion to his people and to his friends and to his loved ones.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our colleague John Baldwin, the Congress has lost one of its ablest Members. At the same time, his associates have lost a dear friend who will be sorely missed. But saddest of all and even more tragic is the fact that the legislative branch of our Government has been deprived of a public servant who was an inspiration and an example to all. For certainly John Baldwin typified to the highest degree three qualities that make for good government; namely, intelligence, diligence, and integrity, and his loss is no ordinary one.

Often, Mr. Speaker, I went to John when legislation was being considered by the House and asked how he intended to vote—and why—because of my respect for his views. At such times I gained an insight into his reasoning processes and his analytical powers and above all the moral standards by which he passed judgment. So, as I have indicated, I came to know his voting was based on integrity and that is what we must have in Congress and what our country needs.

Mr. Speaker, truly our Government has suffered a grievous blow and we, the friends of John Baldwin, have suffered a personal loss beyond words.

My wife joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his family in their hour of sadness.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives lost a distinguished Member and the State of California lost a respected public servant in the passing of our colleague, the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN.

As a member of the California congressional delegation, I had the privilege and pleasure of working with Representative BALDWIN on many occasions.

He devotedly served the people of Contra Costa County for nearly 12 years, and he will be greatly missed. His achievements, though, will remain as a monument and tribute to this faithful work in the House of Representatives. He was a loyal and capable public servant who established a record of outstanding service. He carried out his duties conscientiously and with fairness and integrity.

The House of Representatives is a better place for his having served here.

To Mrs. Baldwin and their daughters I want to express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened by the untimely passing of our colleague, JOHN BALDWIN.

I first met JOHN and Mary Baldwin when I campaigned for Congress some 8 years ago. In those short years I learned to know him well and to appreciate his gracious and gentle qualities as a human being. Mrs. Cohelan and I have the happiest memories of our association with the Baldwins in the course of our social life in Washington and my work with JOHN on matters of mutual interest relating to the district and to California.

In the course of JOHN BALDWIN's years of service in the House of Representatives he earned a well-deserved reputation for integrity and hard work. He set a standard for all of us. Coming from a district with a predominately Democratic registration he was returned to office repeatedly in recognition of his unceasing attention to the problems of his district. As we all know he performed outstanding service as second ranking member of the Public Works Committee. In this capacity he was able to be of valuable service to the far western region of our country as well as to the State of California and the 14th California District. Until his illness he could say with pride that he never missed a rollcall. Considering the variety of demands made upon us, this was no small feat.

JOHN BALDWIN was a devout and practicing Christian. At an early age he became an elder in the Presbyterian Church. In his personal habits, speech, and conduct he lived the precepts of his deep faith. During his congressional service he was a leader of the Prayer Breakfast Group and served as its president with the same sense of dedication he gave to his congressional service. That JOHN BALDWIN should be taken from us in the prime of his constructive life leaves us humble and mindful of the fragile, unequal, and transitory nature of man's life on earth.

We will always remember him for his quiet and effective public service, and for his devotion to his daughters and to his lovely wife, Mary.

Mrs. Cohelan joins me along with all of the members of our family in extending to Mary Baldwin and the children our love and heartfelt condolences.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on attending the House Thursday morning breakfast meeting, the sorrowful announcement of the passing of JOHN F. BALDWIN was made to our group. He had attended these meetings over the years and had served as its president. He was regular in his attendance as he was in the devotion to his Committee on Public Works. He occupied the position of ranking Republican member on the Subcommittee on Flood Control. Long hours were consumed in the hearings last fall in the development of the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Flood Control Act of 1965. Many days of hard work went into the hearings and executive sessions of the subcommittee. JOHN BALDWIN was found on the job consistently. When the legislation came to the floor of the House, his efforts were most significant in the approval by the House of this legislation which affected many, many of the States.

He was a dedicated and devoted public servant. I have lost a true friend in his passing.

I would like to express sympathy to Mrs. Baldwin and their three daughters and the family in their time of great grief and sorrow.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 14th District of California have lost, as have we in this House, a dedicated servant and kind and devoted friend. JOHN BALDWIN was a noble and sincere man who served with us for more than 11 years; he worked very hard for his people and his State. and I am proud to salute him on this sad occasion. I am confident that JOHN BALDWIN was aware, Mr. Speaker, that his death was coming, but he continued to serve his District and State until his strength gave way.

JOHN BALDWIN displayed great courage in his public and his private life, and we all have been ennobled by his service in this House. We all shall miss him, as will his many friends and constituents in California. Mrs. Boggs joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Baldwin and to his three lovely daughters on their loss and the loss to our country.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, to lose a close and trusted friend is a deeply personal loss.

To lose an able and conscientious legislator is a national loss.

We have suffered both with the death of JOHN F. BALDWIN.

I counted it a privilege to call him "friend," as did so many others here in the House of Representatives and in his home State of California.

At the same time, I counted it a privilege to serve with a man with so many professional qualifications, so much integrity and with such a depth of understanding of the problems of our Nation.

JOHN BALDWIN tackled every task presented to him, in Congress and out, with verve and vigor, with determination and courage.

He rose from the rank of private to lieutenant colonel following his enlistment in the Army during World War II, and he served with distinction here in the United States and in the European theater.

He served 11 years in the House of Representatives with outstanding distinction, and his extensive background in accounting and finance helped many of his colleagues on the Public Works Committee and on the floor of the House to better understand the forces at work in our Nation's economy.

We grieve with his widow and his three daughters. Each of us in the House of Representatives has lost a friend. Each of JOHN BALDWIN's constituents in California's Contra Costa County has lost a wise and forthright champion. Each of us in our Nation has lost a capable and dedicated legislator.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sadness that I join with my colleagues today in paying my respects to the memory of our departed colleague, JOHN F. BALDWIN.

The people of his district have lost an able Representative, who served them with great distinction in the House of Representatives. The State of California has lost an outstanding Congressman and the Nation a devoted public servant.

JOHN BALDWIN was elected to the House of Representatives on November 2, 1954. He came to Washington admirably qualified to serve the people of California with distinction. Through his service in the Armed Forces, his practice of the law, and his participation in many local civic organizations he was keenly aware of the interests and needs of his constituents.

The members of his family and the people he so ably represented can take pride in the record made by JOHN BALDWIN in the House of Representatives. To the members of his family Mrs. Whitener and I extend our deep personal condolences on the great loss which they have sustained.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to comprehend the sudden loss from our midst of colleagues who have contributed so much of their lives to the service of our Nation. Today our grief is further burdened by the realization that a man still in his prime has been taken. JOHN F. BALDWIN had reached the point in life where his vast experience and great accomplishment particularly fitted him for many more years of dedicated service. It is particularly regrettable, then, that our Nation should be denied his continued efforts.

It was my privilege to have been counted among his friends, and I speak from those warm, friendly experiences when I recall his sincerity and dedication to every task at hand. It is difficult to recall a harder working man in these halls. And his efforts were backed up by a quick and probing mind that was always on top of the complexities contained in the maze of legislation before us.

With all of his capabilities, all of his obvious accomplishment and determination, JOHN BALDWIN still understood the truth that no man is an island. He realized that his strength and his wisdom had to come from sources beyond himself. He was perhaps as pronounced a Christian as these halls will ever see, and he worked at his faith. As a past president of the Thursday morning men's prayer group, he was a familiar figure as men gathered to gain strength.

Add to this his roles as a devoted husband and loving father of a growing family, and we have a composite picture of a man who not only had accomplished much through a full life, but also a man who had much to live for. Our sympathies not only go out to his family, but to this Congress and the entire Nation. All of us have lost much in the passing of JOHN BALDWIN.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved by the passing of JOHN BALDWIN, for he was a brave and gentle man, a wise public servant, and a good friend and guide. We all knew and admired the intelligence and judgment which he brought to our deliberations, and the tenacity with which he continued to work despite serious and painful illness.

His ability to lead and to command the respect of his colleagues was apparent early in his life, as shown by the many honors bestowed on him during his years at the University of California and Boalt Law School in Berkeley, where he was president of his law school class for 3 successive years.

His mastery of complex fiscal problems became renowned during his service in World War II, when he labored as Chief of the Foreign Fiscal Affairs Branch in the Office of Fiscal Director of the War Department, and later as executive director in the office of fiscal director in the Mediterranean theater. Having enlisted in the Army as a private in 1941, he attained the rank of lieutenant colonel by the time of his discharge, and was decorated by the Italian Government for his work in devaluing the Italian lire.

After the war, Mr. BALDWIN completed law school, then built a solid reputation for hard work and commonsense during 6 years of practicing law in Martinez, Calif. In 1954 the people of the 14th Congressional District of California, recognizing his ability, elected him to the first of seven consecutive terms in the Congress.

As one who was privileged to know JOHN BALDWIN for 5 of his nearly 12 years in this House, I can testify to the keenness of his intellect and the depth of his devotion to public service. He was one of the most conscientious members of the Public Works Committee, and his judgment on committee legislation was always sound and reliable. I must note, too, his unfailing kindness to more junior Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we will all miss JOHN BALDWIN, and I join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his wife, Mary, and his three daughters.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have a deep and abiding respect for every Member of the House of Representatives and when any one of this great body passes from us it is very saddening. I am especially grieved at the loss of my good friend JOHN BALDWIN, of California. JOHN and I served on the Public Works Committee for 11½ years together. We were on many of the same subcommittees. As I join the House leaders and membership today in expressing great sorrow at his passing I want to say that I have never seen a more dedicated public servant.

JOHN BALDWIN was always well versed on the subject under discussion and above all was courteous and fair to everyone. These virtues coupled with many others he possessed will indeed be missed. The Baldwin family has lost a devoted husband and father, the Nation has lost a great public servant, and I have lost a good friend. I want to express my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Baldwin, the children, and the other members of the family.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join my colleagues in paying my respects to the late JOHN F. BALDWIN, of California. Although I was not fortunate enough to know him very long, I quickly came to admire JOHN BALDWIN for the high caliber of his work and of his character.

He had a deep Christian commitment which shone brightly in all that he did and said. He was a dedicated and able man, a scholar in his chosen field, one to whom we all listened.

We shall miss him greatly, and I join with the others who have honored him in this Chamber by extending my profound sympathy to his family.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a great public servant. We who served at his side will long mourn the death of JOHN BALDWIN, for we had learned to value his friendship. We had also learned to respect his great knowledge of the law and his legislative ability.

The Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN epitomized all that was best in public service. He loved his country and dedicated himself to its service.

His was a most distinguished career, both as a member of our Armed Forces and as a legislator. I know that many of the Members of this House will speak warmly of the loyal comradeship that he gave to all who turned to him for friendship.

Many of us here, myself included, turned to him for constitutional advice on matters before us for he was a great student of the Constitution. He was always most willing to share this knowledge with us.

The people of the 14th California Congressional District loved JOHN BALDWIN, and well they might because he served them well.

This Nation will long mourn the passing of this good patriot.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN, of the California 14th District, is a great loss to us all. In life he was recognized as an outstanding leader in his particular field of legislative interest. In death he is remembered with the greatest respect, on both sides of the aisle, as a man of principle and a most competent colleague who has served in six Congresses. And all of us who knew him as a friend and who warmed to the glow of his kind and gracious personality are saddened far beyond mere words.

JOHN BALDWIN made his name in the Congress, and prior to that in 5½ years of service in the U.S. Army, as a finance expert of extraordinary proportions. Having majored in accounting and finance at the University of California, from which he was graduated with honors before obtaining a law degree from the same institution, he was well equipped for the role he chose to play in life. As a lieutenant colonel in World War II, he became Director of Training for the Army Finance School, Chief of the Foreign Fiscal Affairs Branch in the Office of Fiscal Director of the War Department, and executive officer of the Office of Fiscal Director in the Mediterranean Theater. He was decorated for his services.

In civilian life, JOHN BALDWIN established a thriving law practice in Martinez, Calif., thereby attracting the attention of local political organizations. In 1954 he was nominated for Congress and elected, and the following decade was reelected five times in succession. In the House of Representatives he was named to serve on the Public Works Committee, where he promptly established himself as a financial wizard. At his untimely death during his 51st year, he was the second ranking Republican member on the committee, and greatly admired by all.

With a deep sense of appreciation and respect for this fine man, I salute his name on this occasion, and hail him as a person of great ability and integrity, who has brought honor to his family, his district, and his country. I extend my sincere sympathy to his wife and three daughters.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is with utmost sincerity that I say that our late friend and colleague, JOHN F. BALDWIN, was one of the most effective Members of the Congress I knew and observed during his tenure among us.

JOHN BALDWIN was a Member for 12 years, but the accumulation of his ideas and work here for California and the Nation will have salutary effect for generations. He was among the most stimulating and inspiring colleagues I have known. He was an originator of ideas and gave fine example to all of us on the Public Works Committee by his willingness to undertake any study or task. JOHN BALDWIN brought more than a sense of duty to his work.

We valued his many gifts and talents, but especially his incisive mind which could penetrate to the base of the most complex problems quickly. Coupled with this was his ability to analyze problems. Eloquent and highly articulate, I was always impressed by his ability to present legislation and the reason for his views on the floor of the House, as well as in our committee.

His good deeds remain to benefit all of us in the country. His ideas and work for traffic safety, development of watersheds and conservation of our natural resources, economic recovery of Appalachia, highway construction, redevelopment of older roads, and his interest in future prosperity for Alaska can be his lasting monuments.

His genuine dedication to his tasks was illustrated within recent weeks, when he left his bed in the Bethesda Naval Hospital to attend hearings before our Public Works Committee and when his contributions were made, returned to the hospital. It is only one example of how he insired us all.

JOHN BALDWIN's passing left a void and we will miss his physical presence among us, but he will remain with us in the memory of him as a really great and good man who used unusual gifts generously for the benefit of many millions.

Mrs. Fallon joins me in condolences to Mrs. Baldwin and the three daughters who survive him. We pray that the justifiable pride they can take in a husband and father who had a parental concern for the welfare of all Americans will help assuage their grief.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the loss of a fine public servant and a dedicated Member of Congress, JOHN BALDWIN. Those of us who were privileged to know him and to work with him can only too well appreciate the full expenditure of his talents and energies on the causes and purposes in which he believed.

JOHN BALDWIN was a man who had a feeling for the rightness of upholding the fundamental principles which have allowed this Nation to develop to its great stature among all nations. He was always aware of the people, as both master of their Government and servant of the basic American ideals. He enjoyed a quick capacity to recognize the issues which would strengthen our freedom of thought, expression, assembly and petition, and he was equally quick to aline himself on the side of those proposals which restated the freedoms in any situation.

He realized that we must be strong as a nation but maintained that political and economic power must be balanced to develop our strength without threatening our individual liberties. For his great skill and energy, his personal kindness and sense of fairness, we shall miss him in these Halls, but those whom he has left behind at home may feel proud of his work and confident of the good memories which they share with many of us in Washington.

He has left the stage, but the applause will linger for many years as we remember from time to time the pleasure and satisfaction of our years in his company.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Congressman JOHN BALDWIN has left a deep void in the House of Representatives. I feel sure I speak for all my colleagues when I reflect upon the distinguished public career which JOHN BALDWIN rightfully enjoyed. As a Member of the House since 1954, his concern and care for the welfare of his district and the country were unflagging.

Congressman BALDWIN as 2d ranking minority member of the House Committee on Public Works, was diligent in promoting wise and progressive legislation for the building of a better America. Especially notable was his singular contribution to the drafting and passage of the Federal Interstate Highway Act, the nationwide highway safety program, and the highway beautification program.

These achievements were so recognized last year when Speaker MCCORMACK appointed Representative BALDWIN to every conference committee on public works legislation. For this outstanding committee service, he was cited three times by the Council of California Congressional Recognition Plan, a nonpartisan organization.

Where he felt that his leadership could be vital, JOHN BALDWIN was always ready to give. Formerly a president of a 4–H Club, he won a 4–H Club award in 1965 for his continuing service to the youth of our Nation. And, just this past January, he was acclaimed for his contribution to athletics and scholarship by the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

To Representative BALDWIN, the opportunity to serve in the Congress was a privilege and a trust. In over 10 years, until falling ill, he never missed voting on a recorded rollcall vote, a record achieved by no other California Congressman in history. Now, when the two bells are sounded, we can only grieve that he is no longer with us.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add at this time my own word of sincere regret at the passing of our conscientious colleague, the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN, of California.

Since coming to Congress, I have been impressed by the backgrounds of public service of many of my colleagues, of both political persuasions, and I noted with particular interest the World War II record of our colleague, Mr. BALDWIN, in which he enlisted in the Army as a private in 1941 and served for 5½ years, being discharged in the rank of lieutenant colonel.

The important thing about his military service, as I reviewed it, was the excellent work he did in Italy toward the stabilization of the currency of that country in the postwar years.

Later, as his own people well know, he devoted himself to public improvements in his own State and community, with particular emphasis on recreational development. At this sad time, my sympathy goes out, as I know it does from his other colleagues in this House, to the family in this great loss.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Maine join with Members of Congress and with the people of California in mourning the passing of our late respected colleague, the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN.

I came to know Congressman BALDWIN under less than favorable circumstances. It was while I was fighting for approval of the Dickey-Lincoln school hydroelectric power project.

Congressman BALDWIN was opposed to this project. While I failed in my efforts to persuade the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] to alter his position, I came to know him and to respect him for his convictions, sincerity, friendliness, and candor.

In January of this year, I was hospitalized because of a leg injury. Congressman BALDWIN was also a patient at the time and occupied a room across the corridor from me. Here, under far different circumstances, we renewed our acquaintance. During my stay at the hospital, I came to know JOHN BALDWIN more intimately and my respect for him increased immeasurably.

He was suffering from an illness from which I suspect he knew he would not recover. In spite of this fatal prospect, he continued his dedicated devotion to his congressional duties.

He was friendly and thoughtful, and his courage was an inspiration to me and to all who knew him.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of JOHN BALDWIN's death following his long illness. His passing is a great loss to the Congress, to the Nation, and to his own people in California.

During my five terms in Congress I have been close to JOHN BALDWIN and I have always admired him for his courage, deep thought, and sound judgment. We looked to JOHN for leadership in the House and he never failed us.

At the present time, I am president of the Thursday morning prayer breakfast group. JOHN was diligent in his attendance and served as secretary, vice president, and president of the group. We know of his deep faith and with this assurance realize that he is now home with his Maker. The love of Jesus Christ was very meaningful in the life of JOHN BALDWIN. His imprint will be witnessed for a long time to come in the life of not only his family, but all of us who were in touch with him.

I pray that his family can find the same solace through their grief as he found through his trials and tribulations and realize with confidence the world is a better place because JOHN BALDWIN lived.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to know and respect the late JOHN BALDWIN. He was a man of tremendous integrity—always seeking the right solution to the many vexing issues that arose during his tenure of distinguished service in this body. As a result, his contribution to legislation was always accepted as worthy and constructive, because everyone knew JOHN BALDWIN was sincere, forthright, honorable, and dependable.

Few men who have served here have enjoyed a more enviable reputation in that respect. In addition, he was a very able advocate. With a storehouse of information on many subjects, JOHN's influence was felt on many occasions. He always acted from experience and knowledge. A great patriot, he always put the welfare of the country ahead of partisanship, and faithfully performed his duties in a most able and courageous manner.

To the surviving family I express my deep sympathy during their bereavement.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation shares California's loss of a great man. JOHN BALDWIN stood a solid example of the perfect Congressman. His integrity was matchless and his ability as a dedicated Member of the House was recognized by all his colleagues of both sides of the aisle.

Indeed, it is appropriate that we acclaim this unusual man who did so much for his friends at home, his native State, and for his country. Those who would follow in his footsteps must be aware of the example he laid down in his own humble and quiet way. This Congress has gained in stature for having JOHN BALDWIN serve in its Chambers.

As a legislator, he was a master. No complication of legislative semantics escaped his thorough and incisive mind. At a time when so many of us find it impossible to remain aware of the ramifications and details of the legislative flood that is before us, JOHN BALDWIN had the capacity to grasp the total picture and develop a clear and reasonable approach.

California has suffered the loss of a great man. JOHN was a close friend and I know of his devotion to California and of his dedication to the good of the people he represented here in Congress. I am certain that God has rewarded his selfless work as leader among men.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, 48 years ago, an oppressed and unhappy people finally had the momentary good fortune to be able to declare themselves independent of their neighbors. I speak of the Byelorussian people, who for centuries had seen their territory usurped by others, their homeland occupied, and their national wealth dissipated or destroyed.

As a result of the fortunes of war, surely an unsurpassed irony in itself, the Byelorussian people were temporarily in a position to decide their own fate. And that day, nearly half a century ago, they declared themselves independent and embarked upon a series of programs designed to benefit all of the Byelorussian people. They were not to succeed. Before the year was out, and then again in repeated acts of Communist repression, the troops and overwhelming military might of the Soviet army eliminated Byelorussia from the roster of free nations.

It is self-evident that an independent Byelorussia was not erased from the minds of its people, or for that matter from the memories of free peoples everywhere. It remains for the Byelorussians, as well as ourselves and all nations of the free world a symbol not only of the cruel sham which membership in the Soviet Union is, but also of the desire of peoples everywhere to decide their own destiny.

In commemorating this date, we honor not only the memory of the patriots who dared to stand against the Communists, but also those rights which we firmly uphold and defend. We can rest assured, I believe that the desire for an independent Byelorussian state remains as strong as ever in the hearts of Byelorussians everywhere; at the same time, I believe that sooner or later the day must come when this dream will be fulfilled.

Secure in the knowledge that no dictatorship has ever been able to root out the basic human desire to live in freedom and independence, we look forward with anticipation to the day when these liberties will once again be the rule rather than the isolated exception in Byelorussia. I therefore take this opportunity to add my sincere best wishes to the Byelorussian people in all countries, and express my firm conviction that their wishes and hopes will not long remain unfulfilled.

FUTURE OF THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I had the high honor of addressing the American Society of Tool & Manufacturing Engineers, Long Island Chapter 88, on the occasion of their annual installation dinner. This was the occasion of chapter 88's 15th anniversary, and the chapter today has grown to about 800 members.

I spoke to this distinguished gathering on the future of our Nation's space program and believe the message I carried to them is of interest to my colleagues in Congress and the Nation at large:

THE FUTURE OF THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

It is a pleasure for me, of course, anytime I can get together with a group like the American Society of Tool & Manufacturing Engineers who are contributing so much to our highly technical civilization. I congratulate all the new officers installed tonight and wish you every success for the coming year.

This occasion is a particularly important one for another reason. That is, it gives me a chance to compare notes with the scientists and engineers who are involved daily in the aerospace industry—notes that become very useful to me in my work in the Congress as a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. We have just completed hearings on the fiscal year 1967 budget authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. It is from this vantage point that I would like to briefly discuss the future of the aerospace industry. Further, I want to suggest to you a course of action and personal participation in helping plan this future.

At the outset, let me say that this industry is going to prosper. It is going to contribute to the Nation's security and welfare in new ways, making full use of its unique capabilities. The prospects for corporate profits and individual gratification are outstanding.

This optimistic forecast will not come true without hard work, astute thinking, and timely planning, however. In fact, some would say that I have disregarded the recent press commentary and budgetary facts completely. But let us see if we can put all of this in perspective.

It is true that the requirements of the Vietnam war have forced the space program to accept a lower budget for the first time since NASA was created. And despite the final approval of the Manned Orbiting Laboratory in the Department of Defense, expenditures for this program will be held down as long as we are buying large quantities of munitions.

It is also true that recent opinion polls, both in the general public and in the scientific community, have shown a decreasing approval of a fast paced space exploration program. A recent Harris survey indicated that if reductions in nonessential Government programs had to be made, space projects should be the first to be cut. In November, the same pollster found that only by a margin of 45 to 42 percent did the public believe that the lunar landing game was worth the gamble, and then only because of the Russian exploits in space.

A third omen which is currently pointed out by the Cassandras is that the President delivered his entire state of the Union message without once mentioning space—this despite the fact that he was one of the architects of the program while in the Senate.

Recently, Congressman OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, a close associate of the President, charged that the President does not wish an aggressive space program for our Nation.

We in Congress have heard impressive testimony that the goal, which President Kennedy announced in 1961, of placing an American on the moon in this decade will be successfully accomplished. The President took the occasion of the recent successful launch of Gemini VIII to challenge the Russians to beat us to the moon. The difficulties later encountered in this flight indicate that the time is more propitious for hard work than challenges. Nevertheless, the long leadtime items are well into development. Our achievements in Gemini flights show that man can survive and function in the space environment for the required length of time. There is much hard work to be done, and perhaps some deadly peril in manned flights, but Apollo is on its way.

Strangely enough, the success of our program is what is causing the perplexity about the future. We know more than ever before about the possibilities for space exploration. And we have erected a formidable industrial and governmental resource consisting of trained manpower, facilities, and organizational management to exploit space. We have the capabilities to meet a variety of future contingencies—military, scientific, and national prestige goals will be served.

Any one of these goals would justify some substantial level of effort. But the current funding level is $7 billion per year when the NASA, Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, Weather Bureau, and other agency programs are totaled. This is one-half of all Federal funds for research and development. Only a well-defined program can command this large portion of our science resources. A clear long-range plan is essential.

That is why so many of us have been dismayed by the lack of post-Apollo planning from NASA—the principal source of firm recommendations to the Congress and the public.

Two years ago, I asked Administrator Webb for NASA's future space plans and was told that none existed. I pointed out then that such plans were essential. Last year, we received assurance that the presentations of the fiscal year 1967 budget would reveal such plans. But none has been issued. Instead, NASA Administrator Webb has told us "the future of the NASA program lies largely in the decisions for fiscal year 1968." He went on to say that if new plans were not adopted at that time, employment in the space industry would decrease from its present involvement of 400,000 persons in 20,000 companies by as much as 100,000, which would total one-fourth of the persons now working on this program. This constitutes an alarming warning of impending crisis.

NASA Deputy Administrator, Dr. Robert Seamans said:

"The capability now coming on stream cannot be mothballed * * * We must use it or see its value erode * * * If we do not use what we have created, continued expansion of the Soviet program will very likely lead to future Soviet missions that will have the impact of Sputnik I. If we retrench, we may not be able to develop scientific information and advanced technology in time to meet the requirements of other agencies of the Government and U.S. industry. If we retrench, we will not continue to energize large segments of the scientific community. If we retrench, we will not have the capability to bring our new and powerful resources to bear upon critical problems outside of the immediate space area."

What is the reason for all this hesitation and procrastination? I believe it is essentially one of public opinion. No national policy or program can be successfully pursued without the backing of a constituency.

Our space program began in an atmosphere of perplexity and fear. Our adversaries in Russia had chosen a new arena for the struggle of international power and prestige. They threatened to achieve impressive capabilities which we would be unable to match. But, characteristically, the United States rose to the occasion in one of the biggest sustained technological efforts ever seen. Today, the U.S.S.R. is denied many of the options for surprising space spectaculars which they once had. From month to month, one country or the other may seem to be leading the so-called space race, but our proven capability shows that we are not to be placed at any military or strategic disadvantage.

Therefore, it is time again for public opinion to assert itself. What do we want to do with his hard won space capability? The possibilities fall into two major areas.

First, we can continue space ventures of many kinds:

Military applications as in the Manned Orbital Laboratory program are essentially reinforcements of our peacekeeping potential. The remarkable photographs from space taken by the Gemini astronauts show the power for reconnaissance and surveillance.

It is, indeed, necessary that our Nation take the lead in joining together our civilian and military programs into one program for manned-earth orbit under basic military direction. An insistence on two duplicating hardware systems may break the back of the public's acceptance of the expenses of space exploration.

Meteorology can move rapidly toward improved weather forecasting, storm warnings, and eventually perhaps to weather modification through the information gathered by satellites.

Communication between Europe and America is now an accomplished fact. Surprisingly long-lived and dependable satellites have been placed into service by the private enterprise of the Communications Satellite Corp.

Scientific facts relating to the basic question of our time—the origin of life, and the nature of the universe—are pouring in from unmanned probes into the solar system.

Direct broadcast TV and FM programs are only a few years away. Navigation aids over midocean via satellites are being discussed by international aviation groups. Forestry, agriculture, and oceanography interests can be served by observations from the perspective of orbital flight.

The increasing use and involvement of the private sector in space will compliment public funds in future space development.

The second category for future employment of space capabilities is more mundane but just as important. If indeed we do decide to reduce our launch rates and carry on space exploration at a lower level of effort, it will be because other public needs and private sector markets have commanded a greater share of our resources. These needs and demands are most likely to have a very high technology content, for that is the sort of world we live in.

It seems obvious then, that the aerospace industry skills and facilities will be called upon to serve these alternative social purposes such as improved transportation, pollution abatement, innovations in housing, efficient medical care, and modern crime control.

Long Island must take a leading role and involve itself deeply in the adaptation of aerospace industry skills to meet the problems we face in controlling our environment.

The systems management approach of the aerospace industry is well suited to the complexities of urban civilization. The State of California has begun several projects. Mayor Lindsay is investigating specific applications for New York City. Senator Nelson has begun hearings on the application of aerospace techniques at the Federal level.

This is why I see a productive and profitable future for your industry. It is recognized as a unique national asset, already proven magnificently successful in aeronautics, guided missiles and space technology; and ready to contribute to other national objectives of economic growth and environmental quality.

The remaining problem is to avoid any loss in momentum for this industry—a peculiar amalgamation of scientists, engineers, and management which thrives on change, cannot stand still, and insists on progress. This brings me to my suggestion for action on the part of your society and as individuals.

When institutions seem uncertain, as is the case today with the administration and the space program, informed public opinion is all the more important. The opinion polls to which I referred earlier have an unfortunate deficiency in that the way in which the question is asked may influence the answer. Few Amercians would agree that the aerospace industry should be allowed to deteriorate. And yet without the presentation of benefits and alternative plans and schedules, the public may identify space technology only with the symbolic lunar landing. This would be a tragic failure of the scientific and engineering community.

We do not have a technocracy in this country where experts decide what is best for us. Rather, we depend on a steadily increasing understanding of even complex technical issues to allow a democratic discussion and judgment on the allocation of our money and manpower.

I believe the professional technicial societies have a great opportunity to lead this discussion and to assist in raising the awareness of the public to the options for decision. The cross section of opinion represented by your membership would be most valuable to those in Government. The respect which you hold from your fellow citizens would make your evaluation of alternatives meaningful and important. Do not remain concerned only with your esoteric journals and with exchanges of technical information among one another. The society which confronts us demands your participation in policy formation as well as its practical implementation.

Thus, the future of the aerospace industry is very much in your own hands. Past successes have led you to another time of transition, with opportunities in many directions. The great expense and long leadtimes of large technological ventures give us all pause in decisionmaking. The wise and experienced counsel of aerospace engineers is needed along side that from economists, strategists, and politicians.

I invite and urge you to come forward in the next few months as far-reaching decisions are formed.

America needs your counsel and advice—your country has a right to expect every man and woman to give their best for our Nation's future leadership in the man's quest for peace and human fulfillment.

WHAT PRICE THE GREAT SOCIETY?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have been told by the President of the United States that it will not be necessary to sacrifice his Great Society programs in order to pay for the mounting costs of the war in Vietnam. We have seen his estimates in the fiscal 1967 budget submission, and have noted that he would prefer that the Congress prune some tried and tested programs, such as the school milk program and Federal aid to land-grant colleges.

But until recently, I have not seen any estimate of what all the new and unproved Great Society programs are going to cost when they become fully implemented and are all added together. The first-year costs of most Federal programs are relatively small, but they have a way of growing bigger every year, and I can hardly recall during my 18 years here of one ever starting to shrink.

In the current—March 1966—issue of the respected magazine, Reader's Digest, an article by Mr. Charles Stevenson examines this serious problem under the title "What Price the Great Society?" The article reports that even if the war in Vietnam is brought under control, economists estimate conservatively that by 1975—just 9 years hence—we will have a Federal budget of around $204 billion and that welfare-state programs will account for more than half the total expenditures.

It also notes that State and local governments will be compelled to find matching funds so that their combined spending will soar during this period from about $72 billion in 1964 to $179 billion in 1975. I commend this interesting and informative article to the attention of my colleagues and all Americans who wonder why we Republicans are trying to hold down the high cost of Government during this Great Society, or high society, spending spree.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by Mr. Stevenson:

WHAT PRICE THE GREAT SOCIETY?

(By Charles Stevenson)

(NOTE.—President Johnson's something-for-everybody welfare revolution is being pushed ahead in spite of heavy Vietnam expenditures. Overlooked are these fundamental questions: Where is the money coming from? Can our economy stand the strain?)

"A new chapter in greatness" is how President Lyndon B. Johnson describes the flood of Great Society legislation enacted by the last session of Congress. There's the appearance of something for everybody: poverty programs, rent subsidies, aid for farmers, cities, public schools, recreation, the arts. And the chapter has not ended; even now, as the 89th Congress settles into its 2d session amid belated realization that there's also a war to pay for, there are pressures for still more for everybody.

The President himself, ordering a stepping-up of his all-encompassing welfare proposals, makes plain that the war in Vietnam will not be allowed to interfere with "building a Great Society at home."

There is less enthusiasm from MIKE MANSFIELD, the dour Senate leader from Montana. Alarmed at the quality of the 321 Presidential requests that he guided through Congress, he has already called for not just a letup but a reappraisal. "We passed a lot of bills, some of them very hastily," says Senator MANSFIELD. "They stand in extreme need of going over for loopholes, rough corners, and particularly for an assessment of cost."

What worries men of Senator MANSFIELD's stamp is this: By hiding costs—indeed, not even reckoning them—the administration steamrollered its program through without regard even for our peacetime capacity to pay. Now the economy bears the additional burden of a $10-billion-a-year war. Political history indicates that so long as welfare laws are on the books, the expenditures they authorize will be made—if not openly in the budget, then deviously through supplemental or deficit appropriations. No amount of budget juggling or rosy claims about future income can erase the certainty that nondefense expenditures and our cumulative national deficit, already at the highest level in history, will continue to go up.

The stated purposes of much Great Society legislation were worthy. But the bills were rammed through Congress with no concern for priorities, price tags, or the cancerous inflation that deficit spending is already causing.

FORGOTTEN REQUIREMENT

Public Law 801, passed in 1956, stipulates: Whenever any unit of the executive branch recommends expansion, costing more than a million dollars a year, of any function, it must set forth "for each of the first 5 fiscal years the estimated maximum expenditures for all purposes." The intent, as the late Senator Olin D. Johnston, Democrat, of South Carolina, declared at the time, was to "enable Congress to consider proposed legislation with a full understanding of the cost involved." But, in a canvass of congressional committees, I have been able to find among the 321 enacted Johnson legislative requests only three instances in which the administration fully complied with this statute.

Typically, when Chairman John L. Sweeney, of the Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia, went before the Senate Public Works Committee, he admitted that he could not provide even an informed guess concerning any long-range cost of his program. In pushing through its program for aid to elementary and secondary education, the Office of Education held its publicized figure on anticipated costs to $6.66 billion—simply by not estimating the cost of subsidy payments for a fourth and fifth year of the heart of the plan. Had the agency included such estimates for those 2 years, the figure would have run to at least $10.7 billion.

In defense of the administration's disregard of Public Law 801, the Budget Bureau boldly declares that the "cost projections for individual legislative proposals have seemed to us of little value in many, if not most, cases." Thus, the administration not only hid the costs from Congress and the public; it didn't even bother to figure them out beforehand for itself. Proof is contained in Budget Bureau bulletin 66-3, now being quietly circulated among Government agencies. Tardily it directs them to try to come up with some notion of how much we are going to have to pay for each of the new programs already underway.

Let's look at some of the spending projects—and where they lead.

EDUCATION

In World War II, Congress began appropriating small sums to school districts in "impacted areas" where untaxed Federal activity, mostly military installations, overloaded the schools. Once started, the program burgeoned. In 1964 alone, there were handouts for 12,500,000 children in 50 States.

For example, Montgomery County, Md., is an "impacted area." Because many residents work at upper-bracket Government jobs in nearby Washington, it has the second highest median family income in the United States. Yet because they are Government workers, it gets assistance for its schools.

Now President Johnson has inverted the idea of impacted-area aid: school districts where military installations are due to shut down will receive funds to build schools which they had argued were needed to take care of the Government pupils they're now losing.

By a similar process, a $474 million, 4-year subsidy to higher education—inaugurated in 1958 in response to sputnik—evolved into an authorization to spend $845,350,000 in a single year. The money goes for everything from college libraries to subsidies and guarantees for student loans, the latter despite the ready availability of privately financed, nonprofit student loans. (United Student Aid Funds, Inc., had already guaranteed 82,000 loans for a total of $52 million to students in 685 colleges, and signed up 5,500 banks in 49 States to provide additional aid.)

The House Education and Labor Committee met, deliberated, and reported this bill out in less than 20 minutes. "A mockery of the legislative process," declared Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois. In similar procedures, most of President Johnson's legislative requests dealing with education became law. Thus the Government's educational expenditures, which totaled $291 million in 1945, and had soared to $6.3 billion in 1965, will top $8.7 billion this year.

And there's no end in sight, for, as a House minority report points out, "Experience proves that once an area or group, however wealthy and self-sufficient, acquires a vested interest in Federal school-aid funds, it will join a powerful lobby for the continuation of those funds."

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

All spending schemes are dwarfed by those dreamed up for cities—where the big votes are. One of the President's urban plums is the $125 million community service program, through which university professors will tell city residents what to do. To provide for massive Federal intervention, the administration created a Department of Housing and Urban Development (DHUD), and rammed through a set of "big brother" programs for the agency to handle. Congress passed an $8.2 billion omnibus housing bill, after the House Banking and Currency Committee heard friendly witnesses in secret sessions from which all who disagreed were barred. In a cloud of confusion, Congress additionally authorized $6 billion in long-term rent subsidies.

Before his retirement, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, calculated that if DHUD grows at the same rate as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has—a reasonable enough assumption—it will be dispensing an incredible $225 billion annually within 13 years. Other estimates vary. But the real point is that no one, in government or out, knows how much DHUD has already been committed to spend. Nor can anyone be sure as to what areas DHUD will barge into. In its very first press release as a unit of DHUD, the Public Housing Administration announced approval of a loan for construction of 50 low-rent houses in President Johnson's own Johnson City, Tex.—population 625. "Urban development" on that scale would mean new housing for one family in every four.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

The scheme to revive the economy of the 11-State Appalachian area got under way last March with a $1,092,400,000 authorization, nearly 80 percent of it for roads. The House Public Works Committee acknowledges that the program is so new that it is "still too early to be able to draw conclusions." Nevertheless, at the President's direction, Congress passed still another law to set up more "economic development regions"—for example, for northern New England, the northern Great Lakes, the Ozarks, a Deep South area, the Southwest's Indian-reservation country, the Pacific Northwest mountains.

This new program is concurrent with a revival of the old Area Redevelopment Administration, which was established in 1961 with the hope of creating permanent jobs in a handful of economically depressed communities scattered around the country. However, by pork-barrelers' intrusions, ARA soon was ladling our grants for everything from street lights in Miami Beach, Fla., to county buildings in San Diego, Calif.

Congress refused in 1963 to breathe new life into ARA, and the agency was due to expire last June. But the administration had other ideas. A $3.25-billion authorization—2½ times as much as ARA was ever allowed to spend—was pushed through Congress to carry on everything ARA did and more, only under a new agency name, the Economic Development Administration (same place, same phone number). The big difference is that an increase in flexibility makes the new law even more susceptible to abuse than the old one.

This new flexibility permitted the President to announce that not only were the

952 counties that qualified under ARA still eligible for aid, but also 116 other areas which under the earlier criteria had been declared ineligible, plus still another 212 needy areas. All these 1,280 counties—more than a third of the Nation's total, containing 50 million people—are to join the Nation's poor as wards of Washington. This, in addition to the big Appalachia-type regional-development organizations which will embrace who-knows-how-many-more millions.

The question: Can the remaining healthy communities of the country possibly continue to pay their own way and pay for the other communities too?

TOTALING UP

Some of Washington's leading economists, sharpening their pencils after the recent legislative binge, have come up with the following figures, fantastic yet real: In 1955, Federal cash expenditures totaled $70.5 billion. By last year the outlay had climbed to $122.4 billion. This fiscal year it is expected to range between $132.3 and $135 billion. Even if the war in Vietnam is brought under control, the economists anticipate conservatively that by 1975—just 9 years hence—our spending will total around $204 billion, with more money going into welfare-state activity than into any other function. Such activity will account for 53.6 percent of all Federal outlays. (In 1955 it totaled 18.9 percent.)

Furthermore, State and local governments will have to dig so deep for matching funds to meet Federal-aid requirements that their overall expenditures must also soar—from *$72.4 billion, in 1964, to $179 billion by 1975.*

Here, then, is the outline of the Great Society's reckless, emotional revolution. Bear in mind that the forecasts are based on extension of already established spending trends. Another projection, by economist Leonard Lecht for the National Planning Association, shows that if we are to achieve all the national goals that our political mentors have declared desirable, the cost by 1975 will be $150 billion more than the economy can produce.

Isn't it time for us to stop kidding ourselves that politicians' statements of noble purpose, combined with phony "gifts," constitute a substitute for achievement? Isn't it time for us to insist that the politicians make old welfare programs work before they plunge us into a host of new ones? The record shows that the inherent wastefulness of Government spending programs is invariably compounded by inefficiency. Still more of the same will waste the taxpayers' hard-earned money while risking national ruin by inflation and taxation. And it will turn a nation of self-reliant people into a nation of individuals so dependent on Government handouts that they have neither the will nor the capacity to endure.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CONTINUES TO HARASS THE COUNTRY ELEVATORS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, despite protests by me and several of my colleagues during the past few weeks, the Commodity Credit Corporation is proceeding with its price-breaking policies which have and are disrupting the economic footing of the grain farmers, the country elevator operators, and the entire grain trade. These actions are coming at a time when these people have their backs to the wall because of adverse weather conditions.

Recently, the CCC ordered the removal of 47 to 50 million bushels of corn from the country elevators to be delivered to buyers at the terminal markets. These stocks are to be removed immediately from feed-deficit areas to be sold for unrestricted use. The country elevators were given no advance warning of this action, nor were they given a chance to purchase any of this badly needed corn. Instead, the corn was sold to large corporate buyers at a low price, indeed a price that the country elevators would have jumped at, and these buyers can now turn around and sell these same stocks at higher prices back to the elevators in the deficit areas. This is a very easy way to make a nice profit at the expense of the country elevators and ultimately the farmers.

My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] has tried repeatedly to obtain scarce boxcars for the Red River Valley to remove stocks of grain now threatened by spring floods. If this grain is not moved, the grainmen will suffer great losses. *And yet, at this very time, we find* the CCC issuing immediate loading orders for at least 47 million bushels of corn. According to figures I have received from Mr. Rupert G. Quinn, Jr., president of the Minneapolis Grain Commission Merchants Association, these 47 million bushels will require the use of 23,500 boxcars. This amounts to the use of 100 cars per day for 47 weeks, if they can get that many. By this action, the CCC is condemning the Red River Valley warehousemen to heavy losses, and there is absolutely no need for it. I urge the Secretary of Agriculture to act now to halt these sales and come to the assistance of the agricultural economy.

Another aspect of these sales should be pointed out, even at the risk of being called a "political noisemaker" again by Secretary Freeman. Portions of the supplies of corn which have been sold will be moved directly from the bin sites to the terminal markets, thus bypassing the country elevators, the traditional collecting points. This goes directly against the provision in the charter which established the CCC, which requires that the customary and usual channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce shall be used wherever possible. Why have these usual channels not been used in this case?

Mr. Speaker, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks a letter I have received from Richard J. Sundberg, the secretary-treasurer of the Minneapolis Grain Commission Merchants Association. This association represents several hundred cooperative and independent elevators in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana. I am sure that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree that these elevator operators' protests are based on economic considerations and are not merely political noise:

THE MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN COMMISSION MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 22, 1966.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Members of the Minneapolis Commission Merchants Association are terminal representatives for several hundred cooperative and independent elevators throughout the 4 States of Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana, and as representatives of these elevators and their owners, we vigorously protest the manner in which the recent sale of about 50 million bushels of corn, from elevators and bin sites, was made by the Department of Agriculture.

We understand this sale was made for unrestricted use and not necessarily for export. It was also publicly stated by one of their men that, under terms of the sale, it would be possible for corn moved out of a country position to be resold by the buyer at the terminal market and trucked back to the original starting point.

No advance warning was given to country elevators nor were they given a chance to buy any of this corn nor can they buy it now. A large number of elevators would have bought this grain had they known that the corn in their elevators, and that much of the corn in the bin site, was to be moved out as quickly as possible on loading orders which are presently in the process of being issued.

Many of these areas are deficit areas and *the corn is badly needed in the local* communities.

The price at which this grain was offered to terminals would also have appealed to these country elevators as contrasted with prices they had paid earlier on the purchase of CCC corn.

At the present time there is considerable grain in the country position which must be delivered against sales to arrive which carry penalties for late delivery.

This enormous volume of corn which was sold is to be moved as quickly as possible by both rail and truck and is going to seriously aggravate an already very serious transportation problem in our area.

This grain will be moved by both rail and truck and that portion to be moved out of bin site direct to terminals will bypass the country elevator, thereby denying warehouseman earnings which supplement the meager payments for services performed under the bin site service contract.

If country elevators permit the movement of warehouse grain by truck, they will lose the right to Federal appeal of the original grade.

Directing grain to the terminal and bypassing the country, is contrary to the charter under which the Commodity Credit Corporation operates, as it specifies that the customary and usual channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce shall be used wherever possible.

A large proportion of the elevators of our area have cash grain on hand which was purchased before Commodity made their large sale of corn and much of that cash grain on hand was sold to arrive in the marketplace with specified delivery dates and which now are going to be very difficult to meet with this additional drain on these transportation facilities available.

This cash grain on hand in elevators has been paid for with borrowed money at the rate of 7 percent plus insurance costs and the longer this grain is obliged to remain in the country elevator, the less opportunity the country elevator man is going to have for realizing any profit whatever.

CCC simply specifies that regardless of these previous purchases by the country, they will, on receipt of loading orders, have to deliver car for car if they wish to obtain extensions on their storage termination dates.

We urge you to protest the manner in which this sale was made and the problems it provides for the country and we urge you to take whatever action is necessary to protect your constituents from any similar trades being developed.

Very truly yours,

Richard J. Sundberg,
Secretary-Treasurer.

TWISTED BY KNAVES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1960, before a House Appropriations Subcommittee, the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, speaking of Communist-front groups, warned that "special priority is also being given to the need for establishing a Communist-controlled youth group."

Now, after the lapse of some years, how *correct Mr. Hoover's statement was and* with what directness of purpose the CPUSA set about its task can best be judged by the following informative article on the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs by Philip Abbott Luce.

Mr. Luce is especially qualified on this subject as he attended the convention in San Francisco in which the DuBois Clubs organization was founded. Formerly a leader of the New Left and the young Communists, Philip Luce broke with the Progressive Labor Party in January 1965, and has since cooperated with various Government agencies.

The foremost claim to fame of the Du Bois Clubs to date is, of course, the student demonstrations on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley in September 1964. It will be remembered that the demonstrations became so serious that the Governor found it necessary to clear the administration building of more than 800 defiant students who had entered and staged a sit-in demonstration. Many arrests were made, the student rebellion received international publicity, and the image of a great cultural institution received irreparable damage.

If the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs organization is finally directed to register as a Communist front, it will lose most of its effectiveness and will in all probability go out of existence. But, as sure as night follows day, another front, devised to attract American youth, will replace it.

This flexibility of the CPUSA provides still another cogent argument for providing our youth with responsible courses in the philosophy, strategy and tactics of the International Communist movement as advocated by the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the National Education Association, and others who are interested in the future welfare of our Nation.

For the information of my fellow Members and the many other readers of the Congressional Record, I place the very timely article "Du Bois Clubs: The Making of a Communist Front," in the Record at this point:

DuBois Clubs: The Making of a Communist Front

(By Phillip Abbott Luce)

On March 4, 1966, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach instituted action against the DuBois Clubs of America to force them to register as a Communist-front operation as defined under the provisions of the McCarran Internal Security Act.

According to the McCarran Act the DuBois Clubs and the Department of Justice are now obliged to appear before a hearing examiner of the Subversive Activities Control Board. If the SACB agrees with the Attorney General that the DuBois Clubs are really an instrument of the Communist Party of the United States, it will then cite the clubs as a Communist-front organization and the provisions of the McCarran Act relating to such organizations will become operative.

These provisions include the registration of the organization with the Attorney General, the public listing of the officers of the organization, the labeling of its literature as Communist and other actions designed to inform anyone coming into contact with the DuBois Clubs that they are a part of the Communist apparatus.

The action by Attorney General Katzenbach *is the culmination of concerted efforts* on the part of a number of governmental agencies and officials, especially J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, to identify the DuBois Clubs as a Communist group. Now that the DuBois Clubs will have to appear before the SACB, there is no question that the spotlight of truth will destroy the lies perpetrated by their leadership that they were not Communist controlled. They have gone so far in their denial tactics that Mike Meyerson, a DuBois leader, has noted, "Today, the DuBois Clubs are very much a part of, well, the 'Pepsi Generation.'" That in itself is a sobering thought.

The DuBois Clubs of America were officially organized at a convention in San Francisco held over the weekend of June 19, 20, and 21, 1964. According to a preconvention document, however, a DuBois Club had been in existence in Berkeley for 3 years. The document went on to state that it was formed as a "small semiclandestine" group.

The DuBois Clubs have since come to be recognized as one of the leading organizations on the so-called New Left. But in reality the only thing new about the DuBois Clubs is the name, because the politics are part and parcel of the Old Left: the left of the Communist Party.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., has always tried to influence and propagandize students and has created a number of Communist organizations to try to achieve this end. The Young Communist League, the Labor Youth League, the American Student Union, the Progressive Youth Organizing Committee and Advance Youth Organization are a few examples of groups operating under Communist Party control. Just prior to the formation of the DuBois group, the CPUSA set up the Progressive Youth Organizing Committee (PYOC) as a national youth organization and Advance as a New York City youth club.

As might be assumed, many of the persons surrounding both PYOC and Advance have appeared in the DuBois Clubs. PYOC was founded in Chicago in December 1960, during the Christmas holidays. This meeting was controlled by Danny Rubin (then 29 years old), a long-time member of the Communist Party who was the Communists' national youth director at that time. Rubin has since risen to the auspicious role of national administrative secretary and has also served as editor of a newsletter called Communist Viewpoint.

The meeting in Chicago also found two other young Communists taking a lead role. Mrs. Alva Buxenbaum was elected chairman of the newly formed PYOC; she was then, and is today, a member of the CPUSA. The role of vice chairman and executive secretary went to Marvin Markman, who has for years been a Communist Party functionary operating out of their office on 26th Street in New York City. In fact, Markman has already been called before the SACB because he failed to register as a member of the Communist Party under the provisions of the McCarran Act.

Just as the DuBois Clubs have denied their Communist heritage, so PYOC also engaged in the same deception. Mrs. Buxenbaum, speaking at the Chicago meeting, tried to create the illusion that PYOC was an "independent" organization. She said in part that "Hoover and his friends would like to prevent this conference from taking place. Every method is being used. He is trying to divide by injecting a false issue. His charges of secret Communist meetings and Communist control are obviously ludicrous."

The charges may have been "ludicrous" to Mrs. Buxenbaum, but they were proved true in sworn testimony before the SACB during the investigation that culminated in designating Advance a "Communist-front" operation.

It has now been thoroughly established *that at a number of closed-door Communist* Party meetings, beginning in April 1959, leaders of the party urged the setting up of a new Communist youth organization. By November 5, 1959, the issue was being discussed at the New York County Communist Party committee meetings and the whole question was raised at the National Convention of the Communist Party, United States of America, during December 1959.

PYOC never managed to grow out of its original shell and few students even knew it existed before it folded up when Advance fell under the SACB ax. Advance never grew to more than 200 members and was always tightly controlled by the Communist Party, United States of America. When the U.S. Attorney General moved against Advance in January 1963, the organization was headed by Marvin Markman and Mike Stein, who was then a member of the New York State Youth Commission of the Communist Party.

The first immediate effect of the Attorney General's action in 1963 was a membership panic followed closely by the impossibility of recruitment; few students with any sense would knowingly join an organization about to be proscribed by the Government.

Following the SACB's designation of Advance as a front, the group passed from the scene, but the same leadership personnel then began to help lay the plans for the formation of the DuBois Clubs. And, just as is now happening, a number of liberals immediately began to scream about the return of McCarthyism, totally ignoring the findings of the SACB in the Advance case. Among the board's conclusions:

"Based on the findings made herein and on the record as a whole, the evidence preponderates to establish that respondent (Advance), a new Marxist-Leninist youth organization, was created by the Communist Party. One purpose of the organization was to indoctrinate youths in Marxist-Leninist political philosophy and thereby provide a source from which the party could draw recruits.

"To insure that the Marxist youth organization would operate in accordance with the party's program, the individuals who became the principal officers * * * were predominantly members of the Communist Party.

"This new youth group gave aid and support not only to the policies of the Communist Party but to the party itself in that it provided a fertile field for recruitment to the party.

"Respondent is, therefore, found to be a Communist-front organization."

No sooner had the Attorney General begun his action against the Advance organization than the leadership of the Communist Party set about organizing a replacement. The culmination of these plans was the formation of the DuBois Clubs of America.

What went on at the San Francisco founding convention should be enough evidence for anyone who doubts the Communist Party set up and controls the DuBois Clubs.

A statement was distributed during the registration of the delegates which declared that the convention was called by "a group of young people who felt that Socialist alternatives must be explored if this country is to solve pressing political, social, and economic problems." The rest of the registration statement read like it was written by Gus Hall:

"1. This Nation can best solve its problems in an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence, disarmament, and freedom for all peoples throughout the world.

"2. These solutions will be reached mainly through the united efforts of all democratic elements in our country and particularly through the unity of Negro and white Americans and all other minority groups.

"3. It is the working people of our country through their organizations, whatever their present difficulties, who will ultimately be the decisive force in meeting our pressing social and economic needs.

"4. The greatest danger to American democracy comes from the racist and rightwing forces acting in alliance with the most reactionary sections of the economic power structure.

"5. The most effective tool used in the fight against social progress has been the divisive weapon of anticommunism. This weapon must not be used to split young people as it has in the past."

This 1964 founding convention was held in the hall owned by Harry Bridges' union (the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union) which has a long record of Communist affiliations. Communist Party control over the convention was obvious from its inception:

Alva Buxenbaum was seated on the stage next to Marvin Markman and they were conspicuous in their strongarm attempts to squelch all opposition to the prevailing Communist Party "line"; Mike Zagarell, who is presently the national youth director of the CPUSA, was in charge of the delegation from New York City (most of whom were former members of Advance); Eugene Dennis Jr., son of the late chairman of the CPUSA, headed the delegation from Wisconsin; Bettina Aptheker, who is the daughter of the Communist Party theoretician and recent traveler to North Vietnam and who has since publicly proclaimed herself a member of the Communist Party, was one of the leaders of the Berkeley contingent; Carl Bloice, a member of the CPUSA, took a leading role at the convention. (Bloice is now editor of the DuBois magazine, Insurgent, but he previously had been a writer for People's World, the official Communist Party organ on the west coast.)

The invited "observers" to this convention included Al Richmond, editor of People's World; Douglas Wachter, a delegate to the 1959 national convention of the CPUSA, a star of the movie Operation Abolition and now a photographer for Insurgent; Roscoe Proctor, a member of the Communist Party National Committee; and Mickey Lima, chairman of the Communist Party of northern California.

But through it all the DuBois leadership continued to proclaim its "independence."

In order to insure that nothing went wrong the Communists insisted that a "weighted" voting system be used at the convention, thereby guaranteeing the acceptance of their "line." (The Communists were fearful that the ultraleft—Progressive Labor and the Trotskyist Young Socialist Alliance—might try to take over the convention.)

The voting procedure the Communist Party set up gave some 40 people from New York City and Wisconsin, the majority of whom were past members of Advance and PYOC, the power to decide any question. The method was simple: the delegates from San Francisco got one vote apiece, those from the East got three votes, and the Wisconsin group got six votes apiece. Therefore, on a close vote (the "civil liberties" report was carried 228 to 202) the Communist Party position was assured of having nearly 150 votes before anyone from California even cast his ballot.

Added to this was the fact that the ruling oligarchy at the convention refused to allow any minority reports to be brought out of the various committees (civil liberties, civil rights, peace, etc.) and the only issues that the delegates could vote on were those already approved by the party representatives.

On Sunday, June 21, the organization finally voted to name itself the DuBois Clubs of America. The name comes from Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, who founded the NAACP and later, at the age of 93, from the safety of Ghana, joined the American Communist Party. The name of both the organization and the man are not, incidentally, pronounced as in the French but rather "duh-boys."

The two sparkplugs on the west coast for this convention were the millionaire sons of Vincent Hallinan, who once ran for President of the United States on the ill-fated Progressive Party ticket. Terence (Kayo) and Matthew (Dynamite) Hallinan combined their own money with that of the Communist Party and are credited with a lion's share of the responsibility for the convention.

"Kayo" is the national organizing secretary of the DuBois Clubs and "Dynamite" was elected educational director during the Labor Day weekend in 1965. Their nicknames are a result of their pugnacious and often violent temperaments. A third brother, Patrick, is presently representing the DuBois Clubs as their counsel.

Among the many DuBois Club leaders who arose from this 1964 convention was Michael Myerson, a 24-year-old Californian who has been touted as being groomed for future leadership in the CPUSA.

Myerson, who previously headed the U.S. contingent to the 1962 summer Communist Youth Festival held in Helsinki, Finland, was assigned as international secretary of the DuBois Clubs. In September 1965 he traveled to North Vietnam in violation of State Department regulations and has since had his passport invalidated.

The first president of the DuBois Clubs was Phil Davis, who went to school in Michigan and California. Davis attended a CPUSA recruiting school in October 1962. In the summer of 1965, he traveled to France to discuss the abortive World Youth Festival scheduled for Algeria prior to the coup there.

While in Europe, Davis also discussed the possibility of sending Americans to North Vietnam and of affiliating the DuBois Clubs with the World Federation of Democratic Youth, although such a move could easily be in violation of Federal statutes. Davis has since been replaced by Hugh Sterling Fowler II, a 20-year-old student from California.

The DuBois Clubs had some immediate success in California and later managed to set up some chapters on the east coast. They claim a membership of 2,500, but this is certainly exaggerated. Whatever their membership, the DuBois Clubs did manage to play a significant role in the Berkeley "free speech" battle and ensuing riots. The story of Berkeley has already been well documented and the 13th report of the California Un-American Activities Committee gives a complete picture of the role of the Communists in spurring on these riots.

Following Berkeley, the DuBois Clubs turned their attention to the war in Vietnam. In combined efforts with Students for a Democratic Society and Progressive Labor, the DuBois Clubs have picketed, demonstrated and shouted for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

Naturally, the DuBois organization has a vested interest in seeing the United States out of Vietnam and the Communists in power in that country. Alva Buxenbaum summed this up at the New York DuBois Clubs conference in December 1964, when she said, "World peace demands an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of American troops."

The most successful venture for the DuBois Clubs on the east coast has as yet gone unpublicized, although it is a striking example of what a few leftwingers can do to a college.

At New Paltz State University in New York the DuBois Clubs have set up a small chapter which has succeeded in turning the campus upside down. On a smaller scale this is another Berkeley, with the students demanding more and more from the administration and with a college president apparently unwilling to strike down the rebellion.

The DuBoisers at New Paltz are now demanding that the students decide their own course schedules without any interference and that the students decide how many credits are needed for an individual to graduate. Conditions at New Paltz have deteriorated to the point where communications between the administration and the student radicals are almost nonexistent.

Since its founding the DuBois Clubs have been of primary interest to the Communist Party, U.S.A. The summer of 1965 found DuBois members spending their full time organizing. They were paid a salary of $30 a week from the Communist Party coffers.

Early that summer, the CPUSA also conducted a secret training school for some 75 young comrades from various sections of the country at Camp Midvale in Ringwood, N.J., about 35 miles from New York City. At this school the young radicals studied Marxism-Leninism and political tactics.

Security was at a maximum. The students were not allowed to communicate with the outside world. No phone calls, either incoming or outgoing, were permitted. Students were not allowed to send letters from the camp and, as an added security measure, only the first names of those assembled were used.

Among the teachers at this school were Gus Hall, Hy Lumer, Clyde Lightfoot, Henry Winston, James Jackson, Herbert Aptheker, and Betty Gannett, all of whom are leaders in the CPUSA. Mike Zagarell, the national youth director of the party, also taught a class, as did Marvin Markman and Alva Buxenbaum.

Hy Lumer claimed at the end of the 2-week session that because such a group of promising young Communists had been brought together under one roof, those who are prone to consider the CPUSA an aging group with little or no future are wrong.

The DuBois Clubs ended up the summer with another secret meeting with top leaders of the CPUSA.

This pre-school-year assembly was held on a farm in the vicinity of Monterey, Ind., certainly a remote enough spot to be missed by the mass media and, the participants hoped, the Federal Government. This 4-day meeting was conducted in the same secret manner as the one held earlier in New Jersey. Again, only first names were used, although this practice was somewhat absurd, considering the fact that everyone knew everyone else.

Four of the top five leaders of the DuBois Clubs met with Gus Hall, Mike Zagarell and other leading functionaries of the CPUSA. Hall told the participants of plans to increase the protests against American involvement in Vietnam and reiterated the "line" of the CPUSA regarding the "inevitable" defeat of the United States in southeast Asia.

Then, to the surprise of almost everyone present, Hall launched into a lengthy criticism of the DuBois Clubs for being too sectarian. He complained that they were appearing to be merely an adjunct of the CPUSA (which of course they are) and suggested that they attempt to alter their public image by "broadening" both their leadership and membership. Then speaking as if he suffered from delusions of grandeur, Hall proposed that the DuBois Clubs expand their membership to a total of 50,000 members within a year.

When the U.S. Attorney General announced the SACB action against the DuBois groups, several events happened almost simultaneously.

The San Francisco office of the DuBois Clubs, which also served as national headquarters, was mysteriously destroyed by a bomb blast some 27 hours after the Katzenbach statement. Interestingly enough, the DuBois Clubs had no records or files in the building at the time of the blast (contemplating a move to Chicago) and no one was in the structure when it blew up. Half an hour before, and throughout the earlier part of the day the building had been occupied by DuBois officials and friends. They all happened to have just left in time to avoid the dynamite blast. At least one law enforcement agency has already expressed doubt that the blast was triggered by anyone outside of the DuBois Clubs.

Across the country in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, the DuBoisers also came in for their share of action the day after they had been fingered as Communists. And just as the Vietniks had discovered on October 16 when they were attacked in Berkeley by the Hell's Angels, so the DuBoisers have now learned that it is better not to wake up some elements of the U.S. public.

In Brooklyn nearly 1,000 people surrounded the DuBois chapter house and, unfortunately for them, members gathered inside decided to try to leave the building before the police arrived.

When the DuBoisers hit the streets the people hit them and in a bloody conflict a number of the members were beaten up. Six DuBois members were arrested: three for brandishing knives and one for suddenly pulling an air pistol from under his coat and brandishing it at the crowd. Of course, the DuBois people are now screaming that the police failed to give them adequate protection.

But if they are screaming about the Brooklyn massacre, they are beside themselves with the action of Katzenbach. The Hallinans are claiming that the membership has increased, but all the existing evidence points to the fact that a number of young people have already left the organization and that only one new member has been publicly admitted. Staughton Lynd, who is neither uncommitted nor a youth, has publicly cast his lot with the DuBois people in order to share their hour of grief.

A number of liberals have also joined The Worker in denouncing the Attorney General's action as "Red-baiting." A member of the New York City Council, Ted Weiss, the initiator of the police review board bill, has also condemned the Attorney General for picking on a group of young people "because they oppose the war in Vietnam." The American Civil Liberties Union attacked the Government for "suppressing political dissent."

Undoubtedly, the Department of Justice in conjunction with the FBI is in a position to have various members of the DuBois Clubs testify as Government witnesses before the SACB. The attorney general would never have taken these steps if he were not certain that he possessed overwhelming evidence of the control that the CPUSA influenced over the DuBois groups.

And no matter how loudly the "comrades" in the CP shout their innocence, there is no question that the DuBois Clubs are about as independent of Communist party control as COPE is of the AFL-CIO.

"New Left" Jumps to Clubs' Defense

Within hours of Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach's crackdown on the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs as a Communist front, the group had received statements of support from almost every organization on what has come to be called the "New Left." Among the more prominent "peace" or civil rights leaders who have spoken out are:

Elizabeth Sutherland, director of the New York office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, who pledged solidarity with DuBois Club leaders.

SNCC Chairman John Lewis.

Georgia's controversial Julian Bond.

The Reverend James Bevel, high-ranking official of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, head of Women Strike for Peace.

Pacifist A. J. Muste, chairman emeritus of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

David Dellinger, editor of Liberation magazine.

Clark Kissinger, an official of the Students for a Democratic Society.

DuBoisers Receive Hasty Instructions

Within hours of the March 6 bombing of the DuBois Clubs' San Francisco headquarters, these orders were sent special delivery to local units of the DuBois Club across the country:

"1. All areas should call press conferences. Read the national office press release (enclosed) or write your own.

(The enclosed press release included an attack against the McCarran Act's registration provisions, a denunciation of the bombing as the work of rightists and a plea that leftists not "fall into the trap laid by the Justice Department and begin baiting ourselves" by failing to defend Communists.)

"2. Set up tables on campuses, or in communities if possible, to register people as members of the DuBois Club in protest against [the] registration petition.

"3. Approach prominent individuals to join the DuBois Club as a symbolic act of protest.

"4. Approach prominent individuals and organizations to issue statements of support for our organization.

"5. Hold rallies at local Federal buildings this Sunday (Mar. 13) to protest the attack on the DuBois Club and the antiwar movement."

TRAINING A KEY TO SOLVING MANPOWER PROBLEMS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, although the unemployment rate is now at the lowest point in many years, aside from the fact that this partly is the result of war, we must not be lulled into a sense of complacency about the future peacetime manpower outlook. For one thing, the difficult problem of matching available manpower with the jobs needed to be filled is likely to become worse in the future. While the Nation's total labor force is expected to grow at a 50-percent greater rate between now and 1970 than it has over the past 5 years, the number of male workers aged 35 to 44 will decline substantially the same period. This indicates that a severe shortage of experienced key personnel may well develop.

Changes in the overall structure of the demand for labor may also strain the labor market. White collar employment as well as employment of service and similar workers is expected to increase very substantially. These changes will put high demand on workers with relatively high educational qualifications, that is, high school graduates and above. It is essential that trained manpower be available to fill this demand if our economy is to continue to grow and prosper.

The best way to meet these employment demands is for the Government to aid the further development of training and retraining programs to fit workers into available jobs. It is not enough to produce low unemployment now and rest on our laurels, expecting the future to take care of itself. Now is the time to insure that harmful labor shortages do not develop which could drastically curtail economic growth.

An article in the March 15 edition of the Wall Street Journal points out some of the difficulties our economy may be facing in the years ahead. This article also takes note of a development that the administration's delay in creating adequate manpower training and retraining facilities may turn into a serious problem in the near future. The current high investment in modern facilities and cost-cutting machinery is likely to make present marginal hirees highly expendable. The fear is that the current hiring of workers with only marginal skills, along with increasingly urgent efforts to fill present skilled manpower gaps, is building extra imbalances into the economy. Should the economy turn downward, a quick reversal of the recently declining unemployment rate may result as these workers are let go.

I ask unanimous consent that the aforesaid article be included in the Record at this point.

Labor Letter: A Special News Report on People and Their Jobs in Offices, Fields, and Factories

A look at employment statistics now being examined by President Johnson and his aids gives a clearer understanding of the depth of administration concern over prospects for maintaining a balanced economic expansion.

The figures' clear message: Trouble lies ahead. In the next 5 years there's likely to be a constantly increasing strain to match available manpower with the jobs needed to be filled—assuming an orderly business expansion.

Just beneath the surface is a more ominous note: If the economy falters, the imbalance between available workers and job vacancies will quickly plunge the Nation back into the same manpower surplus problem from which it has begun to emerge after 5 years of continuous economic growth.

The President's fourth annual manpower report to Congress, submitted last week, contains some little noted but highly revealing projections of labor force growth, occupational changes and rates of economic expansion considered necessary for the desired stability and nearly full employment during the next 5 years.

From now until 1970, the Nation's total labor force is expected to show an average increase of 1.5 million a year, some 50 percent greater than the rate in the past 5 years and nearly double that of the 1950's. Teenage and young adult workers and workseekers are due to rise by an average of 700,000 a year, about 45 percent of the entire labor force increase; this is far greater than the rise for any other age group.

While youngsters pour in at the bottom of the labor force, other age groups will be increasing much more slowly. A danger signal for employers: The number of male workers aged 35 to 44 will decline substantially between now and 1970, averaging a drop of 115,000 a year. Because this group is an important source of manpower for middle-management and other highly responsible and skilled jobs, a shortage of key personnel could develop.

Hence employers will probably have to turn to the brighter young workers, women, and experienced older workers to fill gaps in quality manpower. Age limits and early retirement plans seem likely to undergo more careful scrutiny.

For new work seekers and for many already working, job opportunities in the next half decade will be sharply changing under a variety of pressures. Recent shifts in the occupational structure of the work force will be accentuated. White-collar employment growth will be accelerating; State and local government jobs will increase by nearly one-third, to more than 10 million. Service and similar workers, including cooks, barbers, hospital attendants, and building service employees, are expected to rise nearly 25 percent. Finance, insurance and real estate, transportation and public utilities, and retail trade employment will show gains of 12 to 15 percent. Construction will be the only goods-producing industry to show a comparable gain; manufacturing jobs will rise only 5 percent.

These changes will put high demand on workers with relatively high educational qualifications (high school graduates and above). As projected by the manpower report, the requirements of the 1970 economy (assuming a 3-percent unemployment rate is achieved) will be for 2 million additional professional, technical, and kindred workers; it's figured this sector will be the most rapidly growing, partly because of growth in research and development, partly because of added concentration on urban rebuilding and rehabilitation which will require many more city planners, engineers, architects, social scientists, teachers and the like. One Government official calculates that in medicine and education, Federal and State goals will entail filling 10,000 jobs a month for 10 years.

To support 81 million jobs by 1970 (the number calculated as necessary to achieve 3 percent unemployment), it's figured, would require an annual average growth of 4½ percent in the Nation's real total output (adjusted to eliminate the effects of price changes) over the next few years. Though such growth would be less than the 5¼ percent superpace of the past 2 years, it would be well above the average 3¾ percent for the whole period since 1947. Even a 4 percent average rate would mean some buildup in unemployment, some Federal economists assert.

Uncertainties and imponderables abound, of course. It's worth noting, for one thing, that the current employment boom (with jobholders increasing at a 4-million annual rate during the past 2 months) is largely fueled by hiring in the goods-producing industries, in turn stimulated by consumer buying and the Vietnam buildup in Government spending. This hiring has bitten notably into the ranks of the unemployed marginal workers. The less educated, less skilled, the elderly, Negroes, and other disadvantaged groups are benefiting. But the reigning opinion among labor experts is that "it can't keep going like this."

In any case, other questions must be considered: What will be the employment impact of a tax increase if the President decides one is needed? What will be the effect when current high investment in plant and equipment brings modern facilities and cost-cutting machinery in line?

In the latter case, the likely answer is that the present marginal hirees will be speedily shucked. At any rate, some economists are assuming so. They fear the current hiring of these workers, along with increasingly urgent efforts to fill present skilled manpower gaps, is building extra imbalances into the economy.

Should the economy turn downward (a prospect that Federal economists emphatically assert they cannot yet see), it's reasoned that the impact of imbalances in the labor force would quickly reverse the recent swift descent of the unemployment rate. "The kids, the Negroes, the older workers—all those who have become the last hired would be the first fired," says one Federal economist. The gloomy prospect seen under such circumstances: A rapidly rising jobless rate—John Grimes.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, although czarist absolutism had crumbled only to be replaced by Red tyranny in 1917, the vast Eurasian area of Russia was still beset by internal chaos. For what had been held together by force under the czars, known to the world as Russia, was showing the true ethnic and cultural divisions by the uprisings of the oppressed peoples so long held together in an uneasy and unnatural political union. The new Red masters, now power heirs to the old order, were interested in preserving an outward display of unity while consolidating their hegemony of power.

Yet, despite the application of force by the Bolsheviks in order to preserve a false status quo as had existed under the czars, the people of Byelorussia proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918, just 48 years ago. This proclamation was not born of an ordinary splinter group held together only by their collective desire for self-aggrandizement or a group of political opportunists who saw in the chaotic conditions of Russia the moment to strike for their own purposes. It was not even a new movement thought expedient as an antithesis to chaos. On the contrary, in the act of proclaiming their freedom, the Byelorussian people were manifesting a right long established by the precedents and justified by the facts of history.

The Byelorussians from the beginning of their history have developed quite independently of Russia. By the 13th century, a political entity had been achieved and so it was to remain, despite severe trials, until the 18th century when it formed a union with Poland. Unfortunately, under the partitions of Poland in the 18th century, Byelorussia was incorporated into the Russian Empire. It is interesting to note that at this period a revolt—organized and led by that great friend of America, Thaddeus Kosciusko, was attempted and failed. Liberated again by the French, these people enjoyed a brief period of autonomy only to fall under the Russian yoke again. There followed the cruel pattern of methodical destruction of the very basics of a culture—their religion, language, and any self-expression.

Despite all of these cruelties the Byelorussian people were ready to assert their right of self-determination in 1918. Unfortunately, caught between the armies of Germany and Russia, they were unable to consolidate effectively. Left alone, Byelorussia once again ceased to exist as a state.

Such a past proved beyond a doubt that Russian homogeneity is a myth—a myth which is exposed by the brave cultural-ethnic peoples who, by their courage and persistence, remind the world that not only do they continue to exist but that they have the same fervor and hope for freedom inherited from their forefathers.

It is important, therefore, that we recognize this day, because by so doing we bear witness to the fact that Byelorussia exists—that its brave peoples are captives under foreign tyranny and domination.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we commemorate this occasion and we salute this brave nation; tomorrow, let us hope that we can commemorate her welcome into the family of nations as an equal and free member.

THE ICC AND THE COMMUTER RAILROAD CRISIS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill, H.R. 14007, which would prohibit the Interstate Commerce Commission from granting a discontinuation application involving commuter rail service for a period of at least 1 year, where there was hope for local, State, Federal, or regional relief which would substantially benefit the railroad, thus making the continuation of improved commuter service feasible.

The logic of this proposal to restrict ICC action is compelling because it makes no sense whatsoever for the Federal Government to embark upon a vast program of mass transit research and assistance while another Federal agency independently allows the abandonment of commuter service and irreplaceable rights-of-way. This is directly in line with President Johnson's coordinated approach to transportation, although this particular problem unfortunately was not touched upon by the President in his transportation message.

It is equally logical to require consideration of local, regional, or State efforts to improve commuter service and relieve the railroads of unreasonable financial burdens. To concentrate solely on Federal assistance would be to ignore the fact that local, regional, and State actions are of far more overall importance, and would downgrade the efforts already being made in this area. By allowing the ICC to set a reasonable timetable for action, however, local, State, and regional bodies will be encouraged to develop realistic solutions rather than relying on temporary expedients or fond hopes for the distant future.

My bill goes far beyond those proposals which merely ask the ICC to consider the availability of Federal financial aid, but which do not in any way prevent the ICC from acting favorably upon a request for discontinuation of service. It should be noted, too, that my proposal has the potential for widespread bipartisan support. New Jersey is not the only State facing a commuter crisis where the ICC could be involved. I understand that the ICC recently indicated its intention to explore further the request by the New Haven railroad to discontinue commuter service, even though State and local officials in New York and Connecticut are hard at work on a possible solution to the problem.

I am certainly not unwilling to consider improvements in the language of the bill, but the intent must remain clear. Practical suggestions are already being worked out in New Jersey, including the call for a State transit agency from local Bergen County officials in my area of the State.

For my part, I have already introduced legislation to place the present temporary program of Federal mass transportation aid on a permanent basis, with an increased authorization, a bill which has earned favorable comment from witnesses before our Subcommittee on Housing. I have continued to press for approval by Federal officials of a $5 million demonstration project request involving the Erie-Lackawanna commuter service, approval that has met with unnecessary and inexplicable delay. I have called for a Governor's conference for all interested public and private parties in order to begin coordinated planning now. And I stand ready to cooperate with anyone on any suggestion that holds out a realistic possibility of help in the immediate crisis.

In this regard, I would be performing a disservice to my constituents and the people of New Jersey if I did not state my candid opinion about the present prospects of proposals for Federal subsidies of operating revenue losses for commuter rail and subway lines. Given the adverse congressional reaction to the recent New York subway strike, we would be kidding ourselves if we expected any congressional action on these proposals. Moreover, these suggestions do not have White House support, and without that they are dead.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REGULATION ADOPTED

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, last summer the Post Office Department hired 8,600 young people under the President's so-called youth opportunity campaign. As I disclosed, 3,360 of them were hired through political patronage. An even larger number, my investigation showed, were not needy. President Johnson, in announcing the program, said that the jobs were to go, insofar as practicable, to young people who needed them the most because of educational or economic disadvantages. My investigation clearly showed that the Post Office Department made little or no attempt to comply with this guideline.

This lack of compliance with the President's announced purpose was the first fault I found with the so-called youth opportunity campaign as conducted in the Post Office. The second was its refusal to supply Members of Congress and the press with the names of the young people hired. As I said many times, I believe that when a Federal make-work project is created to help those supposedly in need, the people of the United States have a right to know who they are employing. I was successful in obtaining the names and other pertinent information relating to these summer employees after a long 8 months of hard work and many evasions on the part of the Post Office Department.

During my investigation, I exchanged correspondence and held telephone conferences with Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy regarding secrecy in Government relating to nonsecurity information. I am pleased to say that, as a result of my investigation, and other obvious governmental attempts to withhold nonsecurity information from the press, the people and even Members of Congress, the Civil Service Commission has now seen fit to issue the following statement regarding a general policy on release of such information.

Mr. Speaker, following is a Federal personnel manual system letter to heads of departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government, outlining this policy:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FEDERAL PERSONNEL MANUAL SYSTEM LETTER

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 17, 1966.*

FPM Letter No. 294–1.

Subject: Issuance of general policy on responding to requests for names of employees and identifying information.

Heads of departments and independent establishments:

From time to time a Federal agency may be asked for the names alone, or for the names and certain identifying information, of some or all of its employees. The Civil Service Commission holds that the names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations of Federal employees are public information. As an example of the public nature of this information, the Official Register of the United States for many years contained the names of all Government employees, with title, salary, State of origin, and duty station.

The Commission believes, therefore, that standard Government policy generally should be to release names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations in response to requests.

For assistance in carrying out that broad policy when lists are requested, the Commission has issued the following guides, based on its own experience and after consultation with interested groups:

The agency should comply promptly with every request for the names, position titles, grades, salaries, and duty stations of Federal employees unless—

(a) There is a definite showing that the release would be contrary to the public interest;

(b) It is evident that the list is sought for purposes of commercial or other solicitation;

(c) There is reason to believe that the names would be used for purposes which may be in violation of the Hatch Act; or

(d) The costs or labor involved in the preparation of the list would require an unwarranted expenditure of agency funds or interruption of the work of the agency. If unwarranted time or cost would be involved, the person requesting the list should be told that and what costs must be paid or work arrangements made by him before the lists will be furnished.

The guides may be applied to specific requests along the following lines:

From Congressmen or congressional committees: The information should be furnished promptly; if furnishing lists precisely as requested would entail undue cost, this should be reported to the requesting party along with suggestions of any possible alternatives that would be helpful but more economical.

From the press and other information media on behalf of the public: The information should be furnished promptly if it is available without unreasonable public expense or interruption of regular work; otherwise, estimate the necessary time and costs, inform the requesting party what is involved, and determine if the needs can be met with information that can be furnished at reasonable cost or expenditure of time. When information media desire lists for solicitation purposes, they are treated like other commercial firms.

From commercial firms and individual solicitors: Such requests should ordinarily be refused; exceptions should be made only when it is clear that the public interest will be served (for example, requests from compilers of widely used directories) and there

> will be negligible public expense or interruption of work. In no event will names be furnished for solicitation purposes.
>
> From charitable organizations: Few if any requests should be received from charitable organizations since the arrangements for charitable fundraising in the Federal service are prescribed by the Federal Fund-Raising Manual. Mail solicitation of employees at place of employment is not authorized, and this should be emphasized to any group requesting a list of names. If a charitable organization desires a list for other than solicitation purposes, it should be treated like other nonprofit organizations.
>
> From nonprofit organizations such as professional societies, schools, unions, veterans organizations, State societies, etc.: In general, it should be the policy to cooperate fully with these organizations when it is evident that little cost to the agency or interruption of work would result. Otherwise, estimate the necessary time and costs, inform the requesting party what is involved, and determine if the needs can be met with information that can be furnished at reasonable cost or expenditure of time.
>
> By direction of the Commission:
>
> NICHOLAS J. OGANOVIC,
> *Executive Director.*

Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish to commend Chairman Macy and the Civil Service Commission for taking this action. It may be noted that the language of this policy statement is fairly broad. However, I agree that it is impossible to write such guidelines too strictly.

I believe that the important thing is that the Civil Service Commission has gone solidly on record as favoring as much freedom of information regarding operations of the Federal Government as is possible. For this, the Commission is to be commended and all public officials of the executive branch should be adequately informed concerning the right of the people to know the operations of their Government.

Mr. Speaker, the secrecy which was practiced by the Post Office Department during my investigation of the so-called youth opportunity campaign, has thus been successfully countered and the issue resolved.

However, I still believe that the original intent of the youth opportunity campaign is to help young people who are educationally or economically disadvantaged, as the President said. Therefore, I am disturbed by the following report from the March 4 edition of the Washington Post:

> Uncle Sam will hire 25,000 to 50,000 financially needy and other students for summer jobs this year. They will be in addition to an estimated 50,000 young people who will be hired by agencies for the May–September vacation period * * *. Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY outlined this year's program to some 200 Federal personnel men yesterday and told them not to reject applicants just because they are not poor.
>
> "While the emphasis should be on helping the poor and disadvantaged," he said, "some people are in need who are not poor in money."
>
> He explained that the responsibility of holding down a job might be valuable to some upper income students who are "poor in opportunity or poor in spirit."
>
> Several personnel men in the audience appeared startled when HUMPHREY made the statement.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that a good many people, including many in this Chamber, are startled at such a statement.

I have written Chairman Macy asking to know the guidelines for judging the "poor in spirit." I am sure that all of us are anxious to know his reply.

SHADOWBOXING IN INFLATION FIGHT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the Johnson administration has victimized the American cattlemen by inflicting price controls in the guise of export quotas on the cattle hide industry.

The news reports this morning indicate the airline mechanics have asked for a 15-percent pay raise. This is nearly five times the guideline figure established by the administration.

Since the administration swung its mailed fist against threatened price increases in leather goods, will it act as quickly in cutting off a tremendous increase in the cost of maintaining airplanes?

There seems to be a strangely one-sided attitude on the part of the administration manipulators, who are overly concerned with fixing prices and apparently unconcerned about the rising costs of services.

To attempt to fight inflation and erosion of the dollar by such one-sided tactics, greatly resembles the fruitless forays of Don Quixote. Unfortunately, everyone's financial future is at stake in the zigzag course of the administration's economic shadowboxing.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join other Members of the House today in paying tribute to the brave people of Byelorussia. The 48th anniversary of their declaration of independence is commemorated tomorrow. Unfortunately, the Byelorussian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden by their present Red tyrants. Therefore, on this great historic day for Byelorussians, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to these brave people and all the other captives of communism.

On March 25, 1918, the national independence of Byelorussia was proclaimed by the Rada of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, but the Russian Communists occupied and subjugated Byelorussia in 1920. Another attempt to establish her independence was made by the Byelorussian people in 1944, and again she was conquered by Communist forces.

In addition to observing national days, Mr. Speaker, we must take practical steps to show our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism. Therefore, I again urge that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established.

The Voice of America should provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the Byelorussian people. In recent years the VOA has cut back both its hours of broadcast in Byelorussian and in the nature of these broadcasts. Only straight news is given because of the administration's fear of offending the Soviet Union. The Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering the message of truth so that the Byelorussians would not be brainwashed and their resistance weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

PROPOSED THREE-STEP REDUCTION IN CERTAIN PERCENTAGE DEPLETION RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a progressive three-step reduction in certain percentage depletion rates. The minerals affected by this bill include oil and gas which presently enjoy a percentage depletion rate of 27½ percent and sulfur, uranium, and certain other minerals which are extracted from deposits within the United States and which are allowed a depletion of 23 percent.

Initially, this bill would reduce the percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas from 27½ to 25 percent. This would be the percentage depletion applicable to oil and gas income for 1966. As a result of the contemplated change $75 million in new revenue would be realized in the Treasury and would help offset the cost of the first stage of the income tax reductions.

The next step under the bill, applicable during the taxable year of 1967, would be to further reduce the percentage depletion allowance for gas and oil to 22½ percent. At the same time, it would have its first impact on the minerals—sulfur, uranium, and certain other deposits—in the 23-percent classification. As in the case of gas and oil, the allowance for these minerals in 1967 would be 22½ percent, a reduction, initially, of but one-half of 1 percent. The changes envisioned in the second phase of the bill would produce an additional $75 million in new revenues for the Government, and would, as in the first step, offset part of the cost of the second-step reduction in income tax.

The third and final step in my bill would take effect in the taxable years beginning in 1968. It would reduce the percentage allowance to 20 percent for gas and oil and for the minerals now in the 23-percent category. Thus, in 1968 and thereafter there would be no percentage depletion allowance above 20 percent. This last step in 1968 would be responsible for the production of additional revenues of $100 million for the Federal Treasury, putting the total revenue gain for a full year of operation of this law in 1968 at about $250 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially important at the present time that we make every effort to practice a frugal policy in view of the vast Federal expenditures which are now taking place and which have been forecast in the near future. It is necessary for the oil and gas industry to pay its proportional share of the total tax burden. Certainly during a time when approximately one-half of the roughly $100 billion annually required to support our Government goes to support the national defense, it becomes more apparent than ever that this great industry should be called upon to pay its fair share of the tax burden.

It should be noted, however, that the oil industry, for which I have the greatest respect, would under this legislation be in no way discriminated against. As the Speaker and my colleagues in this great body know, a large amount of the oil and gas business is located or has its headquarters in New York City. The various oil companies operate under an intricate set of tax laws. There is often a good deal of concern exercised by these companies over any proposed change in definitions, in terms of laws and, generally, in the way in which foreign income is treated in relation to its sources.

The bill I have introduced today, however, does not seek to change the existing law in any way other than to reduce the amount of deductions. In other words, the bill directs itself solely to a change of the existing rate of depletion and not to any changes in the formula.

Since 1926 Congress has made several changes in the tax rates, mostly to raise them. Individual rates have been increased percentagewise from about 11 percent to as high as 91 percent. Corporate tax rates have been likewise increased from some 20 to 52 percent. During this entire period, however, the 27½-percent rate applicable to the gas and oil industries has been considered sacrosanct. Apparently, the need is present to reduce this rate of exemption to a more realistic percentage and more in keeping with a fair contribution required from the oil and gas industry relative to the tax structure.

Legislative effort along the lines contemplated in the bill I have today introduced has been forthcoming in the past. As a matter of fact, Senators JOHN J. WILLIAMS and GEORGE D. AIKEN introduced legislation in this field in the Senate during February of this year.

I strongly urge this great body to act now to insure a realistic appraisal of the present deductions enjoyed by gas and oil companies and the minerals in the 23-percent category, and to reduce them to the more sensible rates suggested in my bill. To do so would be squarely within the national interest as well as good housekeeping in the national budget department.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION: A REAPPRAISAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it will undoubtedly require a vigorous effort from key quarters to wrest the Convention on Genocide from permanent abandonment by the United States. Since the initial debate of some 15 years ago, 67 sovereign nations have ratified the agreement. At least officially, we remain conspicuously indifferent.

The United States was a major force in the making of this world convention, designed to prevent and punish the crime of genocide. After its referral to the Senate for advice and consent, a special Foreign Relations Subcommittee heard testimony and submitted for "understandings" along with its approval in 1950. The 81st Congress adjourned without taking further action.

Briefly, the convention defines genocide as a crime under international law, which the signatories pledge to prevent and punish. Persons can be charged with genocide whether they are Government bureaucrats or private individuals, and each State, after ratification, is bound to enact penal statutes. Trials shall proceed in the country on whose territory the crime is committed. Parties to the treaty can carry any dispute as to interpretation or fulfillment of the clauses to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

Successive administrations have not been moved to answer the widespread misgivings stirred among Senators and the general public. Nor has there been any disposition to make the total moral and political commitment which is indispensable to overcome doubt and illusion.

These steps will be necessary because, unhappily, the convention has been unable to generate much heat in the intervening years.

The sole claimants have been special interest groups struggling valiantly to drum up popular support. But this will not be enough if and when the Senate is moved to act. So far the tendency is to reiterate the same well-meaning generalities which proved so inadequate in 1950, instead of pondering the gut issues.

There was at that time considerable agitation among influential international lawyers who felt that the convention would injure the tenuous fabric of world law. Moreover, it would profoundly change the character of the law which, through history, had served to regulate the relations between States exclusively. Fear was expressed that in rushing into novel contractual responsibilities, violations of common practice and codified law would become more numerous. The nations, in effect, may be undertaking obligations which go beyond their capacity to comply.

This was 15 years ago, and since that time the concept of human rights has become more acceptable to our thinking. There is still opposition. But the convention can no longer be viewed as a radical adventure in addressing itself, to the States as well as their citizens. The United Nations has been drafting new treaties on racial and religious discrimination. At Geneva, the International Commission of Jurists continues to condemn the denial of basic human freedoms as a violation of the rule of law. Anti-colonialism, perhaps the most consequential force unleashed by the Second World War, embodies the legal right of a people to self-determination.

International law is more and more embracing the individual as endowed with certain unalterable rights. The European Court of Justice is evidence of the trend, where nationals of the participating states may seek relief from wrongs perpetrated by their own governments.

Opponents in 1950, while terming the convention "revolutionary," were in the same breath able to disclaim its effectiveness. They argued that repeated American defeats during the negotiations stripped the final investment of real meaning. In some instances we were forced to accept language which constituted a deliberate sap to the illegitimate sensitivities of the Soviet Union. This, insofar as I can tell, generated very damaging rightist propaganda in this country at a time when dealing with the Russians bordered on treason.

Admittedly, the convention falls short of the ideal. In omitting political and economic groups from the definition of genocide, we are failing to include the most tyrannical and willful persecution imaginable. Theoretically, the Soviet Union under this prescription cannot be accused of genocide if it massacres all peasants with bourgeois inclinations, because the purpose is political and economic. But it is downright foolish to infer, as some did, that the treaty is therefore useless. The definition as it stands enumerates certain acts "committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, as such." This suggests a very broad coverage. Nor should we expect from multilateral conferences the absolute satisfaction of all our expectations.

The American Bar Association found additional fault in the convention's definition of genocide, which failed also to mention Government complicity as an essential to the crime. In effect, this rather innocent deletion removes exclusive state responsibility and broadens the application directly to private citizens. Moreover, it was said that without Government complicity as a necessary element, we are left with nothing except a familiar set of common-law crimes already punishable by domestic statutes.

Let me say at first, that there is no conquerable Federal crime in our books. Genocide is not an offense in this country, although its several parts are. Under any and all circumstances, the evidence necessary to prove a genocidal act will be excruciatingly difficult to muster.

As a practical matter, it is difficult to share with legal experts their fear of subjecting American citizens and particularly American courts, to the application of treaty law. Various multipartite conventions are in force today which make use of the treatymaking power. The Constitution states that treaties are the supreme law of the land, enforceable in our courts, and yet in the year 1950, we are still burdened by self-styled superpatriots unconvinced by Missouri against Holland.

Article IV of the convention includes all persons as possible offenders, "whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials, or private individuals." Genocide may be committed with the connivance of government, but this is not essential. Hypothetically, I am guilty of genocide in murdering numerous Moslems with intent to destroy them as a group because of their religion; it makes no difference whether I am Prime Minister or private citizen.

This interpretation is preferable because with the subtle persuasive instrumentalities now available to the modern State, official participation in the crime may indeed be difficult to prove. Moreover, the narrower definition opens up an escape hatch, for no responsibility is fixed for the commission of genocidal acts by persons not connected with their government. Simply put, murder with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a racial group as such, is genocide, and the nature of the offense is not really altered according to who commits it. With government complicity as integrally part of the definition we would be establishing a double standard which, parenthetically, is repugnant to American law.

At the same time, there would ensue endless debate as to how one defines "government complicity." It was a mistake for the American representative to offer this as an amendment during the Conference. Fortunately we were outvoted. For what constitutes government complicity? Can it be merely implicit? Where does it begin and end? Is inaction by the local police force in refusing to suppress group persecution government complicity?

This type of vague conditioning is an invitation to deceit. Guilty parties will find ample room to screen nonfulfillment or defend their illegalities through a strict interpretation of the treaty's provisions. The ambiguity of the phrase "government complicity," and the means available to the state to avoid incrimination, would impair the effectiveness of the convention. And it is precisely the inclination toward obscurity which in practice has rendered so much of international law meaningless.

At the same time, in accepting official involvement as elementary to the crime, all cases are lifted to the sensitive area of states' responsibility. This internationalizes all alleged violations, opening the United States to increased possibilities of foreign scrutiny and stricture, a potential which many find abhorrent.

My feeling is that it will be more difficult to secure compliance with the treaty if governments are implicated in the crime. In making this mandatory through elusive wording we would be making our task more difficult, perhaps impossible. In the international sphere, it is a relatively easy matter to sentence a defeated enemy for atrocities in the aftermath of war; but in peacetime it is a different story.

The Genocide Convention must depend principally on its article VI, endowing each contracting party with primary jurisdiction over offenses committed within their own territory. Hence by adding the ingredient of official complicity we would face a contradiction. Governments are notoriously hypocritical. It is doubtful whether, in response to accusation, states will relish the idea of prosecuting their own bureaucracy. If rulers are implicated, and prosecution of lower officials might bring this out, we are not likely to see much action. The extent to which genocide constitutes official policy will determine the degree of reluctance on the part of state organs to prevent and punish the crime.

It is certain that this agreement would be less effective in restricting its applicability to official acts alone. Prescribing that genocide can only be committed in response to national policy, it is possible to conceive of identical offenses which are different only to the extent of government involvement. We would be assessing guilt and penalty not on the basis of whether the outrage occurs, but rather in terms of whether a government conspired to produce it. This is immensely difficult ground to plow. Furthermore, the moral underpinning of the convention, intended to outlaw an offense against humanity, is weakened as indictment comes to rest upon a variable which is, strictly speaking, irrelevant to the integrity of the crime.

We should add appropriately, that at Nuremberg, Nazi defendants were unsuccessful in claiming immunity as state officials. The court ignored reference to state responsibility used as a defense. These men were, of course, government agents carrying out state commands; but this was used as a defense in this instance, and proved to have no bearing on the case, for the offenders were convicted on the basis of their crimes alone. They were declared responsible for their acts as individuals, and the instigation, participation, or acquiescence on the part of their government was deemed irrelevant. It does seem that the Genocide Convention, as drafted, is fully attuned to the judgments rendered at Nuremberg.

When the convention is considered anew, further complication is likely to arise concerning its language, "to destroy, in whole or in part." The State Department inferred in 1950 that genocide meant "partial destruction" of a group with the intent to destroy the entire group. But ABA spokesmen argued that part of a group could mean one single individual. Logically, part of a group may constitute one, five, or a million persons. We can logically assume, therefore, that if I murder a Chinese deliberately because of his race, with the intent to destroy all Chinese, I can be hauled into court and charged with genocide. But wait a minute: the convention refers to genocide as "killing members of the group," using the plural; all other acts are also enumerated in plural. My reading of the convention indicates that you will have to murder several of the group before the accusation will stick. Nonetheless, the Senate subcommittee offered to clarify the point in one of its understandings. It construed the phrase to mean commission "with the intent to destroy an entire national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, in such a manner as to affect a substantial portion of the group concerned." In a sense, there are two clarifications: Commission of the crime is dependent upon intent to destroy the entire group, while actually destroying a substantial portion of it. This should be sufficient to answer the legal hypothesis of many who saw a real or imagined conflict with existing common law crime.

The subcommittee also dealt with the words "mental harm." Genocide is described additionally as "causing serious mental harm" to members of a group. This clearly was intended to cover permanent incapacity, as may be caused by drugs which damage the brain, for instance. The United States, the subcommittee reported, understands the words "mental harm" to mean "permanent physical injury to mental faculties."

Many people quietly comprehended that without a strict interpretation, the racial policies of the Southern States were, perhaps, implicated. Maybe this was so in any case. To this day apprehension exists among southern Senators and Congressmen that the provisions of the convention can be used by member States to challenge southern practices of racial discrimination. In rebuttal, it should now be adequate to point to the Supreme Court school decision of 1954, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the even more recent Voting Rights Act, to deny at least an indictment against the Federal bureaucracy.

But it is a malicious misreading of the letter and spirit of the convention which supposes that its prohibitions extend to American race relations. During the subcommittee hearings the then Deputy Under Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, rejected these implications, as did other Government spokesmen:

> This convention does not aim at the violent expression of prejudice which is directed against individual members of groups.

Genocide is not simple violence. Rioting on the part of townsmen angered because of the alleged crime of a Negro is not genocide. It must constitute, rather, the deliberate denial of existence of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. In the subcommittee's language, the guilty must commit a conscious persecution against a "substantial portion" of a group with the intent to destroy the entire group. Segregation has been the effort to deny the Negro race in this country through mass murder or through deliberate infliction of bodily harm, mental harm, birth prevention, and forcible transfer of children. These purposes were never part of the psychology and strategy of racial segregation. It is a lamentable fact that this national disgrace has led to race riots, lynching, and murder; but genocide does not deal with isolated incidents of violence.

Another source of apprehension is article III, wherein "direct and public incitement to commit genocide" is punishable. This supposedly infringes upon our well-known constitutional guarantee of free speech.

Philosophically, I would question whether any right is absolute. Through statutes we have placed restrictions upon freedom of the press and free speech. Under our laws, inciting a mob to commit murder, for instance, is a crime; direct incitement to riot is illegal. None of us have the right, furthermore, to shout "fire" in a crowded theater when knowing the same to be false.

In 1950, the ABA would have admitted the criminality of public and direct incitement to commit murder, a common-law crime which inhibits the so-called absolute right of free speech. But for some unknown reason they could not bring themselves to substitute the word "murder" for "genocide."

In accordance with our law, only those incitements which present a clear and present danger are prescribed. By prohibiting incitement to commit genocide, any possible conflict with constitutional guarantees can easily be avoided through the enactment of implementing legislation which the convention calls for, or otherwise through specifying our understanding of the prohibition. The objection in itself is invalid; but to ease the apprehensions there is no reason why a clarification cannot be appended.

As a matter of fact, the Justice Department has circulated a working text of proposed legislation implementing the convention, if and when it becomes law. This is required by article V, although the treaty is binding upon this country upon ratification regardless of our subsequent failure to pass a bill setting forth penalties. The Department's draft omits reference to incitement entirely in its listing of punishable acts. However, it strikes the term "complicity in genocide" as it appears in the convention for "aids, abets, counsels, commends, induces, or procures the commission of genocide," and this usage is probably broad enough to embody both complicity and incitement as contained in article II of the convention. Excepting this substitution the Department's draft follows the convention's language closely.

There may still exist much weeping and wailing over the international tenor of the convention. Article VI refers to the establishment of an international tribunal with jurisdiction over genocidal acts. Horror was voiced about the possibility of subjecting American citizens to international judicial procedure, where traditional American rights in court may not be recognized. But we are again reminded of article VI:

> Persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the State in the territory of which the act was committed.

Primary responsibility for the prevention and punishment of genocide rests with the nation on whose territory the offense is committed. Without a world tribunal, states assume the major obligation vis-a-vis their nationals.

Furthermore the creation of a special world court to try offenses is not strictly mandated. None of the ratifying states has even hinted at such action to date. Nor, in approving the convention, would the United States be legally bound to accept the jurisdiction of such a court without specific authorization.

However, article IX, which requires that disputes relating to interpretation, application, or fulfillment of the provisions be referred to the International Court of Justice, may conflict with the Connally-Vandenberg resolutions. That is to say, the convention obligates us to accept the jurisdiction of the Court. Article IX applies to the contracting parties and not to their nationals. In effect, any nation could, in accusing the United States of nonfulfillment, seek a judgment from the Court. The Court's ruling may go against us. If the United States willingly undertakes the obligations of the treaty then there should be no cause for alarm. We all know that the World Court lacks enforcement powers in any case, and thus in not complying with its finding we will only face the bar of public opinion.

I cannot imagine such an eventuality, however, and the argument is distasteful, mainly because I cannot stomach the cowardice, presumption, and small faith of those unwilling to subject aspects of our international behavior to communal purview. In this age we cannot expect the growth of world law and order without sacrificing a little something of our patriotic ego. Always when the question arises as to whether America should assume contractual duties, the cry goes up that we are surrendering sovereignty, or subverting untouchable safeguards. Such deceit forgets that the assumption of responsibility by treaty is itself the exercise of sovereignty. The doctrine of State sovereignty is as old as the nation-state, and for centuries it has been misconstrued by ignorant and willful men.

One must recognize, at the same time, that the effectiveness of all treaties will depend not merely on their provisions, which contain imperfections, but basically upon the will of the parties. There are no international policemen to enforce sanctions against those who break contracts. Most, if not all, states will violate the law when it comes to conflict with vital interests. Although the disposition to do so has lessened through the years, we should not delude ourselves into believing that written multilateral agreements will restrain the parties when essential security questions arise. Additionally, there is the inevitable textual ambiguity of most covenants. Almost any treaty contains phraseology which can be interpreted in various ways. Nations in trouble will tend to construe the conferred responsibilities according to their natural political objectives.

These are lamentable truths of international life. In approaching the Genocide Convention, or any other world compact, we must bear them in mind. The trick is not to become hopelessly embroiled in technical probing which, in the extreme, will obscure the major winning tenets of the agreement. It will serve our cause best to look objectively at the principal obligations entailed and see whether they conform to policy goals, and then to make use of understandings and reservations if necessary to clarify secondary points which are presumed to cause difficulty.

One relatively recent poll of senatorial thinking confirms that doubts persist about the Genocide Convention. I think, however, that sufficient strength can be attained if the treaty is granted a thorough hearing. It is now possible to answer much of the legal criticism registered in 1950, without destroying, through alteration of the convention, the fundamental duties imposed. Perhaps in 1966 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee can find the time to consider the convention along with other subjects stored away for too long because of historic controversy or the press of current business.

A realistic appraisal should reveal to us that with understandings and effectuating legislation, the obligations of the convention are readily acceptable. We are declaring that the hideous crime of genocide is so serious that it represents a threat to world peace, and therefore we undertake a responsibility toward other nations to prevent and punish the offense in our courts. In the final analysis the effectiveness of the convention depends upon the will of the parties, in either preventing or punishing the crime. The convention does give the mass of humanity a legal instrument with which to confront the transgressor. It will serve as an additional deterent in prohibiting recourse to a form of human destruction which we do not want to see happen again.

"I DON'T SEE ANYTHING WRONG WITH HATING"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, less than a week after Poverty Director Sargent Shriver told Representative ADAM C. POWELL's poverty subcommittee that funding Harlem's Black Arts Theater was a mistake, Washington's antipoverty agency welcomed with open arms the theater's controversial leader, playwright LeRoi Jones.

Jones, whose federally sponsored workshop in Harlem produced dramas that Shriver called vile racist plays in the language of the gutter unfit for youngsters in the audience, was brought to

Washington by the United Planning Organization and a neighborhood arts committee to narrate a 3-day music festival for youngsters at Cardozo High School March 18–20.

The festival, named the "Three Days of Soul," is the second in a planned series of cultural programs being offered by the Cardozo Area Arts Committee in cooperation with three centers of the United Planning Organization, Washington's antipoverty agency.

Mr. Speaker, Jones came under sharp criticism last summer for producing "hate white" plays with the aid of Federal money. The Black Arts Theater received $40,000 in funds from OEO. Jones, responding to criticism that the program preached racism, said:

> I don't see anything wrong with hating white people.

Shriver admitted OEO goofed when it gave funds to the project without checking into its purposes:

> The facts are no Federal dollars should have gone to Black Arts in the first place—

Shriver testified last week—

> It was a mistake. I acknowledge it. And, as a result, we tightened up on the review of subcontracts under community action grants.

Mr. Speaker, I think the taxpayers would like to know why poverty money continues to be used to sponsor people like LeRoi Jones. Festivals of this type may serve a useful purpose but should we really cloak a "vile racist" with the dignity of Federal sponsorship? Mr. Speaker, I strenuously object and wish to express my indignation that OEO has insisted on making the same mistake all over again on LeRoi Jones.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY—1966

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, Alexander Ypsilanti, a local patriot, and Archbishop Germanos of Patras, unfurled the flag that sparked the revolt leading to the Greek War of Independence. This is the 145th anniversary of that event.

Every civilized man and woman is indebted to the ancient Greeks for their great and pioneering contributions to learning. Indeed, we are indebted to all who came before us and accumulated the knowledge that is ours for the taking. The ancient Greeks, because of their exceptional contributions, draw our particular plaudits.

On this Greek Independence Day it is appropriate to pay our respects to the ancient Greeks and to the modern Greeks.

Each generation of men must necessarily live in one small corner of the world for one little stretch of time. An appreciation of the past is essential. As the President's Commission on the Humanities has said:

> Even the most gifted individual, whether poet or physicist, will not realize his full potential or make his fullest contribution to his times unless his imagination has been kindled by the aspirations and accomplishments of those who have gone before him.

The ancient Greeks left such an imprint on their world that the modern Greeks live in their shadow. One might reflect for a moment that our own State of Virginia has been the site of so many battles during the Revolutionary and Civil Wars and has been the birthplace of so many great men that it can fairly be said every acre has a story to tell. In the case of Greece, with its longer history of struggle and glory, virtually every rock has a story to tell.

The most esteemed modern Greek writer, Nikos Kazantzakis, has written:

> Greek soil has been so saturated with blood, sweat, and tears, the Greek mountains have witnessed so much human struggle, that you shudder in contemplating the fact that here on these mountains and shores, the destiny of the white race, of all mankind, was at stake.

Greece's victories became the victories of all mankind.

A frequent theme in Kazantzakis' work is that each modern Greek must strive to be worthy of his ancestors, to continue the national tradition without disgracing it, and "to do his duty." In one eloquent passage, he says:

> Man can feel no religious awe more genuine and profound, I believe, than the awe he feels when treading the ground where his ancestors, his roots, repose.

This thinking permeates and bedevils the Greeks today.

The challenge of the past is immediately evident to the visitor as he arrives in Athens. The classic Acropolis looks down on a sprawling city of 2 million. It is not trivial before the modern city of Athens; the modern city of Athens seems trivial before the beauty of the Acropolis.

But modern Greece is far more than a museum of classical ruins. It is a vital nation of 8 million energetic, individualistic people of drive, determination, and a joy for life. Just as their ancient forebears did, the modern Greeks gave every sign of excelling out of all proportion to their numbers.

A strong sense of patriotism is a Greek characteristic. Let me cite one 20th century example: In 1912–13, an estimated 50,000 Greek immigrants returned from America, paying their own passage, to help their motherland capture northern Greece during the Balkan wars. The magnitude of this undertaking becomes clear when it is realized that free Greece's population at that time was 3 million. The volunteers from America were decisive.

In addition to national patriotism, a special kind of regional patriotism exists to one's province. A compatriot, or "patrioti," to a Greek, is not a fellow Greek as much as a fellow townsman or a fellow Spartan, Arcadian, or Epiroti. But regardless of his regional ties, every Greek shares with every other Greek a common struggle to survive under difficult economic and geographical circumstances. And he joins in the common ambition to complete the winning of the "unredeemed lands."

The struggle to redeem the Greek population began in 1821. By 1828 Peloponnessus and the Athens area had thrown off 400 years of Turkish rule, and modern Greece was born. Slowly, one by one, Greek territories returned home—the Aegean Islands, the Ionian Islands, Thessaly, Crete, Epirus, Macedonia, and Western Thrace. The "great idea" of redeeming Constantinople and Smyrna collapsed in 1922 with the defeat of the Greek Army in Asia Minor and the exchange of populations that followed. In 1945, the Dodecanese Islands were added to Greece as part of the World War II settlement. Only Northern Epirus and Cyprus remain unredeemed.

It should be noted that over half the population and half the land area of Greece have been added in this century. And it is only in the last few years that education has been made universal. The added population and the added educational opportunities give rise to the belief that Greece stands on the threshold of a new flowering of intellect and perhaps a new golden age. By the same token, Anglo-Greeks, Greek-Americans, and persons of Greek blood in Canada and Australia are making increasingly significant contributions to learning. For example, it was an Anglo-Greek, the late Michael Ventris, who deciphered the ancient script called Linear B and thus added hundreds of years to man's known history by reaching back into the bronze age.

Let us take another look at two of the names associated with the date of March 25, 1821—Ypsilanti and Bishop Germanos.

Little could Ypsilanti have dreamed that his exploits would be noticed by two real estate developers in faraway Michigan and a new town named after him. Nor could he have conceived that nearly a century and a half later a group of public-spirited citizens would develop the idea of building America's first theater for the production of classical Greek plays in Ypsilanti, Mich. The group was formed under the leadership of an inspired Grecophile, Mrs. Clara Owens, of Ypsilanti. The first performances are scheduled for this summer.

The fact that Bishop Germanos helped raise the flag of revolt is something we should understand. It seems unusual for a clergyman to exert political leadership. This accounts for much of the discomfort with which some Americans and Europeans view Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus. During the oppression of the Ottoman empire, it was the Greek Orthodox Church which took the lead in preserving national spirit and providing a sanctuary of language and learning. Archbishop Makarios is following in this tradition.

On this anniversary of its independence day, Greece is in the midst of a continuing political crisis. Few American correspondents have been there lately, so American readers have not been receiving the crisis reporting that creates a crisis consciousness here. Nevertheless, a political crisis does exist and it threatens the stability of the nation.

The government of Prime Minister Stefan Stefanopoulos, which was appointed by the King, has a precarious 3-vote margin in the 300-man Assembly. Stefanopoulos and 43 other deputies broke with the majority Center Union Party and entered into an alliance of convenience with the conservative ERE Party. The former Prime Minister, George Papandreou, leads 123 of the 148 deputies who are in opposition. His hold on public opinion remains great. This public opinion, by the way, links the United States with "the palace," notwithstanding our professions of neutrality.

The events of the past 9 months—since the June 1965 downfall of the Papandreou government—have placed the future of the Crown in jeopardy. Greece, a "crowned democracy," is one of the few nations left in the world in which a King has executive powers. The King in this case is young Constantine, 25, descended from the Danish-German line of royalty imposed on the Greeks by the great powers in 1840.

Economic troubles have now arisen, partly out of the political uncertainty. After a decade of remarkably stable currency, inflation has gradually set in. The chronic balance-of-trade deficit is worsening, and the nation badly needs $30 million in loans. American foreign economic aid was cut off 2 years ago in the ambitious belief that Greece had reached the necessary point of development and could be self-sustaining. It appears now that the cutoff might have been premature.

If Greece's current political and economic problems can be resolved, and if the severe manpower drain to the labor-scarce nations of Western Europe can be curtailed, then Greece can look forward to exciting progress in the rest of this decade.

Ancient Greece picked man up and set him on his feet as an individual of individual worth. After many centuries of decline and foreign occupation, the revolution of 1821 began the liberation of modern Greece. Creative forces had been set free and the land which gave us so much has much to give to the world once again.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to salute Greece and its sons and daughters all over the world.

SIN AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the accomplishments of which the 89th Congress may be justly proud is the enactment of legislation markedly reducing, and in some instances preventing altogether, the loss which previously had been sustained by a widow who remarried after beginning to receive, under Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act, benefits from a deceased husband.

I first introduced legislation—H.R. 2465—to accomplish this purpose in the House. Others, feeling that such widows experienced a hardship which was unfair, joined me in such legislation. Able members of the House Ways and Means Committee took up the effort and strongly advocated such legislation.

Members of the other body later introduced bills toward the same end. Later, Members of the other body put an amendment on the bill, popularly known as the medicare bill, achieving much of the objectives we sought in the House; the House accepted such amendments.

Credit for the initiation of this legislation should go to an enterprising reporter for the Miami Daily News, Bob Wyrick, who found in the Greater Miami area many senior couples living together without marriage because they could not afford the diminution in their income which would result from their marriage under existing law.

I saw the series of stories written by Mr. Wyrick and introduced the first bill to remove the impediment of the loss of income for couples desiring companionship, indeed love, in their later years.

An outstanding resident of Miami and a neighbor of mine, formerly in private practice in Stamford, Conn., author and distinguished psychiatrist, Dr. Stanley R. Dean, has recently written of this whole subject most interestingly and informatively under the heading "Sin and Social Security" which appears in the 1966 winter edition of Psychiatric Opinion, published through the cooperation of the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health.

I commend this excellent article from this able psychiatrist to my colleagues and to the country and include the article following my remarks in the Record:

Sin and Social Security

(By Stanley R. Dean, M.D.)

(Note.—Dr. Stanley R. Dean, a resident of Miami, Fla., was in private practice in Stamford, Conn., from 1940 to 1965. He has written and published numerous scientific papers, including a chapter entitled "Man and Wife," in the Official A.M.A. Book of Health. The Fund for Behavioral Sciences each year bestows the Stanley R. Dean Award for Research in Psychiatry an annual $2,000 award for outstanding research in schizophrenia.)

About a year ago a geriatric problem was revealed in Miami, Fla., that had nationwide repercussions and caused considerable consternation among our lawmakers. Psychiatrists, especially, should be aware of the situation, for it created serious sociopsychiatric problems for large numbers of senior citizens and their families, the sequelae of which may linger for a long time to come.

In a series of incisive articles under the byline of ace Reporter Bob Wyrick, the Miami News recounted the poignant, incredible story of thousands of old people living together "in sin," because to get married would mean losing pensions or social security. Sample headlines: "Oldsters' Tragic Burden—Living Out of Wedlock for Survival," "Perils of a Planned Society," "Flood of Letters Tell Tragedy, Heartbreak."

Following those disclosures other reports across the country indicated that the situation was not confined to the Miami area but was widespread throughout the United States. Almost immediately Florida's alert Representative, Congressman Claude Pepper, Democrat, introduced a bill in Congress to remedy the predicament, and other lawmakers also took up the cause.

How the problem was finally resolved through the dedicated efforts of newsman and Congressman is an inspiring American phenomenon that deserves to be chronicled in the annals of psychiatry and sociology. The author has been concerned with the social, ethical, moral, and psychiatric implications of the dilemma since it was first announced, and this report is based upon a detailed analysis of published material, interviews with several principals, and representative case histories.

The problem under discussion stemmed from a provision in the Social Security Act that a widow will receive 82½ percent of her deceased husband's benefits on condition that she does not remarry; if she should do so, she could lose all or most of those benefits. With such a restrictive clause, it is understandable why there should have been so relatively few remarriages. Last year more than 2 million widows and widowers over 62 drew social security benefits. But only 6,000 of that number remarried. If only 2 percent of the remainder is taken as a minimal estimate, it stands to reason that tens of thousands were living together without benefit of clergy; nor are the reasons hard to see: their need for companionship was great; they did not wish to or simply could not afford to lose their pittance; they could live more comfortably by pooling their resources; and, as psychiatrists know, the need for romance, intrigue, and even sex does not necessarily disappear with old age. Says Max Friedson, director of the senior citizens' service in Miami, "Old people do not cease to be human just because they are old; they have the same desires as the young—and their need for companionship is even greater."

Since social security was never intended, in the first place, to provide more than a bare minimum to live on, the actual amount involved was small. However, it was often necessary for subsistence; or, at best, made the difference between retention or deprivation of such meaningful little dignities of living as a rare movie, dinner in a restaurant, or gift to a loved one, so necessary to self-esteem and approval.

To retain that small advantage it is small wonder that oldsters were tempted to sacrifice legality for expediency. That they were practically forced into it by the very law intended to help them is one of the paradoxes of our benevolent society. The theory seemed to be that the new husband should be responsible for his wife's support; but, needless to say, theory and practice do not always coincide.

Surprisingly enough, the greater number of old people who circumvented the law by teaming up without marriage adopted a good philosophical attitude, rationalized their guilt sufficiently to maintain ego integrity, and were able to make a reasonably good psychological adjustment. Fortunately they were helped by a generally benign public sentiment which, more often than not, was sympathetic rather than critical. The prevailing attitude seemed to be that the law was being bent rather than broken and that remedial legislation was only a matter of time. The greatest exception was found to be with their children, who were overwhelmingly condemnatory and even threatening. They feared the disgrace of possible scandal; equally important, though not as openly expressed, they thought it ridiculous that an old person could fall in love, and were convinced that the suitor was a fortune hunter intent only upon depriving them of their possible inheritance, no matter how meager.

At best, however, psychic trauma related to shame, embarrassment, and religious conflicts were an ever-present if hidden threat, and considerable ingenuity and resourcefulness were displayed in coping with it. The chief object was to keep the union as secret as possible. To achieve that, the principals might maintain separate addresses, spending as much time together as possible; or a woman might take in a "boarder"; or the couple might pose as legally married man and wife, while maintaining separate names in the social security files. Said one elderly woman, referring to her common-law husband, "When my daughter comes down from the North for a visit, Bert moves out. I don't want my daughter to know. She wouldn't think it was right, me and Bert. She'd say I belonged in an insane asylum."

To illustrate another side of the coin, a widow of 65 sacrificed her $82.50 a month to marry a man on a much smaller allotment. Her new-found happiness soon gave way to despair when she found that they could not subsist on their resultant monthly total of $60. She developed a serious depression traceable in part to guilt associated with death wishes against her husband, and had to be committed. It is a sad commentary that had she resorted to a common-law union, she may have been spared that fate.

Of course, any subterfuge was easier if the participants moved away from home and family, hence the prevalence of the practice in resort areas. But, despite the tolerant attitude of social workers, clergy, and law-enforcement agents, the fear of exposure was ever present, the affront to pride and dignity ever real; and men of good will agree that the onus was not so much upon defenseless old people as upon a heedless quirk of the law.

Excerpts from interviews with some of the key intermediaries in the Miami area reveal how the solution was eventually accomplished:

Max Friedson: "As director of the Senior Citizens Service Center, I'm a sort of father confessor to these people. I've known about this situation for 7 years but when I tried to tell people about it nobody would pay any attention. The law put a tragic burden on old people. It forced them to live alone in loneliness or together in sin. Lonesomeness is the greatest killer of old people and it is normal to seek companionship. Neurotics and crackpots don't have the proper initiative. It takes a well-adjusted intelligent person to realize that companionship, both spiritual and physical, is the best therapy for growing old gracefully. So it is the mentally stable who seek it and the result is basically a healthy situation. Congressman PEPPER got the law changed within 6 months after reading Wyrick's story, and I hope this will open the door for all the other problems of our neglected old people. They've got to know that people care. When no one wants them they lose the will to live."

Bob Wyrick: "I stumbled on the 'living-in-sin' problem by accident. I was originally assigned to write a series of articles dealing with the rise in automobile insurance costs for older persons. I went to some of the retirement hotels to interview the people and discovered numerous apartments shared by old men and women with different names, and was at first told that one or the other was staying as a guest. After winning their confidence, however, the truth came out; and with further corroboration from Mr. Friedson and others, I wrote my first article on January 10, 1965. Fortunately, Congressman PEPPER noticed it and a few days later introduced his first bill in Congress; the law was modified about 6 months later. Before that the situation was pitiful. The money involved was only a few dollars, but to them it was a windfall, so they kept their secret from their closest friends, and like characters in a Balzac novel, they spent nickel by nickel. Often it enabled them to get out of their depressing rooms, have lunch in a cafeteria and spend all day in a cheap movie holding hands. No matter how tight things got most of these couples put away a little money that they refused to touch. It would be used when the masquerade was over. So they could be buried as they tried to live, decently. But people are eager to help when the truth is known and offers of aid poured in from everywhere: PEPPER's bill was supported by Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, and other legislators; the Veterans of World War I gave it their backing; likewise, Marshall Wise, former district manager of social security in Miami; Henry Gillman, secretary of the Florida Senior Citizens League of Voters; Harry Sparling, chairman of the Progressive Seniors League; Melvin Richards, then mayor of Miami Beach; John W. Edelman, president of the National Council of Senior Citizens and a leading figure in national programs for old people; and many other civic and religious leaders too numerous to mention.

"All were determined to help our senior citizens spend their golden years without penalty. Wire services, magazines and network television picked up our stories and revealed that the same problem existed throughout the Nation. Stacks of letters poured in from all over the United States. This one from Mrs. E. B., of Louisville, Ky., expressed the feeling of most of them: 'Aged people are lonely and walk into their final years sadly abandoned except for one another. Even a dog couldn't abide such loneliness. Do something please.'"

Representative CLAUDE PEPPER: My conscience was aroused by Mr. Wyrick's story and I lost no time letting Congress know about it. In my 17 years in Congress I have never seen an issue gain so much notoriety in the first session it was discussed. My bill was promptly labeled "The Living Sin" bill but I think that history will honor it as "The Living in Dignity" amendment. I felt so deeply moved by Wyrick's articles and my own investigations that I said before the House Ways and Means Committee that I believed this to be a problem of a special character, and that I did not believe that we had the right to require our older citizens to pay this price in sacrifice of their living standards or else be forced to live alone for the rest of their lives.

"After getting into this a little, I discovered that the problem was bigger than social security. Widows under civil service, retired railroaders, and other pensioners also would lose their benefits if they remarried, and I won't be satisfied until the entire situation is corrected. Meanwhile, the bill which I introduced, H.R. 2465, was supported by 90 Congressmen and 6 Senators before it was brought to issue in either House. Of that number nearly half introduced companion bills, similar in content. One of them happened to be Representative J. J. PICKLE, of Texas, and for a while the newspapers had some good-natured fun with a Pickle-Pepper bill.

"Finally, a companion bill to mine, coauthored by Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, and Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, was added in the Senate and, at my explicit urging, agreed upon by the House. This was signed into law by the President last July and the first checks were sent out in September. It provides that a widow who remarries may elect to retain her previous allotment or change it in accordance with her new husband's benefits, depending on which sum is greater. And there you have it—the cause, the people, the press, the Congress, the result. It is teamwork at its best—democracy American style."

What results may be expected? It is still too early for actual figures. An important indicator will be the number of marriages among oldsters receiving social security in the coming year. But the statistics tell only part of the story. Says Dr. Michael Sossin, gerontologist, authority on noninstitutional living arrangements for senior citizens, and himself the owner of a retirement hotel: "Already you can see a change—like a shot in the arm. My guests show better morale, their spirits have perked up and—believe it or not—there's romance in the air. I'm not sure yet about the number who will remarry, but there is one thing I am sure of—we won't have to worry about an increase in the population explosion."

The author is grateful for additional information furnished by the following: Ken Valentine acting manager of the Social Service Administration district office in Miami; Marvin S. Schreiber, executive director of Senior Centers, Inc., Miami; Mrs. Revy Wikler, senior editor, and Mrs. Peg Grey, reporter, the Beach Reporter; E. V. W. Jones, staff assistant to Senator SMATHERS.

MILITARY CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, during the past 7 months the Department of Defense has taken great steps toward providing credit union service for every man in uniform. In August, the Department published a directive that endorsed and encouraged the establishment of military credit unions in the United States. Recently, the Department has added a second directive that, for the first time, will permit the formation of credit unions on military bases overseas.

The military community in the State of Hawaii has long recognized the need for military credit unions and has made certain over the years that every member of our Armed Forces serving in Hawaii is served by a credit union. There are 168 credit unions in Hawaii and 15 of these credit unions are established on military installations. It is interesting to note that the largest credit union in Hawaii is a military credit union, Pearl Harbor Federal Credit Union. Out of a military and civilian population of 16,000 at Pearl Harbor, 13,279 belong to the Pearl Harbor Federal Credit Union. The credit union has assets of more than $6 million and at the present time has loans outstanding of nearly $3.5 million.

Through the active direction of its president, Charles Grune, and its manager, Richard Lum, Pearl Harbor Federal Credit Union has become a leader among financial institutions of our State. The credit union was the first financial institution in the State to offer FHA title 1 loans, and is currently participating in efforts to promote the higher education and the vocational student loan programs. In addition to promoting savings through its own share accounts, the credit union is active in the sale of savings bonds. The credit union has also been a pioneer in the field of extended automobile loans. Traditionally, loans to purchase automobiles have been limited to 3 years. However, Pearl Harbor Credit Union found that some of its members were unable to pay for new automobiles during a 3-year period because the payments would capture too large a portion of their monthly paycheck. The alternative would have been for these individuals to purchase a used car, which might require costly and frequent repairs. The officials at the credit union decided that in the long run it would be far cheaper for the member to invest in a new car and spread the payments out over a 5-year period. The 5-year payment period is used only in justified cases.

Pearl Harbor Federal Credit Union has also been active in its savings program. For the second year in a row the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions has presented the Thrift Honor Award Certificate to the credit union. The award is granted yearly to Federal credit unions that have outstanding records and meet rigid criteria in promoting thrift. During the previous year the Pearl Harbor Credit Union increased member savings by $1 million.

Mr. Speaker, although Pearl Harbor Federal Credit Union is the largest credit union in the State, as well as the military community, its operations are typical of many of the defense credit unions in Hawaii. In order to meet the loan demands for our servicemen, many of the credit committees—the committees which approve loan applications—meet every day and on their own time. It is not unusual for a volunteer loan officer to be nibbling away at his lunch while processing a loan request. At one credit union a volunteer officer, who found that he could not complete all of his work during his lunch time, took 9 days of annual leave in order to conduct his credit union responsibilities. In each credit union there are paid employees; however, the large share of the work is done by volunteer participation. In many cases this volunteer participation also prevents the credit union official from receiving more than token loans from the credit union because of restrictions. The Federal law prohibits loans to credit union officials in amounts greater than their shareholdings.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense credit unions on Hawaii are to be commended for the wonderful job they have done in helping the serviceman with his debt problems and for keeping him out of the clutches of fast-dealing companies, whose only object is to grab as much of the soldier's, sailor's, marine's, or airman's paycheck as possible.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence, and the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born. By 1920, the republic was no more and the people were under Russian domination.

Today, it is time for freedom-loving men to once again pledge their support and hope for the end of Soviet oppression in Byelorussia. These brave people, yearning for independence, have not renounced their hope for the restoration of democratic government. Regardless of Soviet attempts to sovietize the country, the national spirit of the Byelorussians lives on.

This Soviet form of subjugation of the Byelorussian people is just one more chapter in a history of repression of this proud people by their larger and more powerful Russian neighbors since the 18th century. March 25, 1918, marks the most recent in a long history of Byelorussian attempts to shake off the Russian yoke and to achieve self-determination. Similar revolts occurred with varying success in 1794, 1830, and in the 1860's. In fact, it was in the famous uprising of over 80,000 Byelorussians in 1863 that the great Byelorussian hero, Kastus Kalinouski, told his people:

> Know ye that ye will never be happy if the Muscovites rule over ye.

Kalinouski could not foresee the brutal brand of tyranny that has become the trademark of communism; nevertheless, he was well aware of frustrations which face a proud people denied their rightful independence.

A BILL TO PROTECT CONSUMERS, HOMEBUILDERS, BUILDING MATERIAL SUPPLIERS, AND LUMBER MANUFACTURERS AGAINST FALSE GRADE MARKING OF LUMBER

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, and lumber manufacturers against the false grade marking of lumber. The provisions of the bill are quite simple. It would require that all lumber placed in interstate commerce must bear the grade mark of a properly certified grading agency or that it prominently be marked "ungraded."

The bill would provide needed consumer protection for the millions of Americans buying new homes which are required to comply with FHA standards and local building codes. The bill provides a full set of remedies for anyone injured by improperly graded lumber. The Secretary of Commerce would have the power to rescind the licenses of any grade marking agency shown to have marked lumber inaccurately or fraudulently. Additionally, anyone falsely grading lumber would be subject to criminal fine and imprisonment. Those injured by fraudulent lumber marking would be given the right to obtain treble damages in Federal court. There are also provisions for injunctive relief should they appear necessary.

I am pleased to join with my colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman JAMES CORMAN, in introducing this legislation. I agree with Mr. CORMAN that protection must be provided consumers with relation to both softwood lumber and plywood. It is my understanding that his bill is identical to the one which I have introduced but also requires grade marking of plywood. The question of whether this might be best accomplished in one bill or in separate bills is most technical. I am confident that the legislative committee which will consider this proposal will study this matter closely and make the appropriate judgment.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR JOHN F. HENNING

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, recently, Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning made some very pertinent comments in addressing the annual communion breakfast of the Loyola Retreatants at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., on Sunday, February 27, 1966. Under leave to extend my remarks I include that speech along with a report on it which was published in the Loyolan:

SECTIONS FROM ADDRESS OF JOHN F. HENNING, UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR, TO THE ANNUAL COMMUNION BREAKFAST OF THE LOYOLA RETREATANTS, WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 27, 1966

THE RESIDENT CHURCH

On November 16, 1789, the Holy See proclaimed the founding of the diocese of Baltimore and named the Very Reverend John Carroll as its first bishop. Here began the history of the resident church.

Our first diocese reached from Maine to Georgia and from the Atlantic to the Mississippi. The church of 1789 had an approximate 35,000 members in a total American population of some 4 million.

In all of this immense territory, John Carroll had less than 30 priests to meet the demands of a frontier civilization.

Beyond these bleak aspects, there was the frightening anti-Catholic legacy of colonial America. In the years before the Revolution only Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, of the 13 colonies, offered freedom to Catholics. The Revolution was to change that, but neither the Revolution nor the constitutional liberties of 1789 could at once change the minds and hearts of those who had chained the church of colonial America.

FAITH, WILL, DISCIPLINE

The American church was built by Catholics of faith, will, and discipline. These ingredients are as compelling today as they were in the time of John Carroll.

The test of faith. If Christ be not in the Eucharist, then there is no church, but only the memory of a blasphemous legend, espoused by countless millions of Catholics through the ages.

The question of will. If the laity abandon the teachings of Christ and Catholicism to win the acclaim or favor of a secular world, then there is no church, but only a whited sepulcher, enclosing the odor of fallen men.

The matter of discipline. If the laity or the priesthood renounce the authority of the chair of Peter, or of the bishops as successors to the Apostles, then there is no church, but only a sundered body, dismembered by the anarchists of left and right.

BEHAVIOR AND BELIEF

In every age the church has survived those of the faithful who have ceased to behave. She has also survived those who have ceased to believe.

A TIME OF PERIL

There are those who would deny the church three times daily before the cock crows. Unlike Peter, they do not weep.

There are those who would defame her. In treating the Catholic past, they would turn every century against her. Whatever the dispute, they hold the church was not only wrong, but rotten.

They are Catholic, but for them the church is the harolt of history. She is not that, she is, rather, the bride of Christ. If her gown be spoiled by those without or within, she herself remains untouched and unspoiled by the failure of man. Christ is with her always.

A TIME OF PRIDE

The Second Vatican Council renewed the church for the work of Christ.

It committed the church to freedom of worship and conscience for all men.

It removed the suggested madness which would place collective and retroactive guilt on our Jewish brothers and sisters for the destined crucifixion of Christ.

Its spirit of ecumenism meant a sharing with other believers. Like the children of Israel, we claim a covenant with God. We now share the covenant.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

The future of the American church rests in large upon the Catholic schools, upon their continuance, their expansion, their improvement, their direction. Those who would destroy the schools, would destroy the church.

VIETNAM

We are proud of Pope Paul VI for seeking to bring the peace of Christ to Vietnam.

We are proud of Archbishop O'Boyle of this see for defending the morality of the American position in Vietnam.

We respect the right of Catholic dissent. But Catholics who march and picket against the American presence in Vietnam should demonstrate with equal fervor for the release of Bishop James A. Walsh, the imprisoned Maryknoll martyr of Red China. They should march and picket for the freedom of Cardinal Mindzenty and Catholic Hungary. Let them march for the crucified church of Cuba and of all Communist lands.

THE RETREAT MOVEMENT

The laymen's retreat movement each year finds a near half million of the American faithful giving themselves to the prayer, to the philosophy, to the solitude of the church.

For millions of us, the retreat is the most impressive spiritual exercise of our lives. For a few, brief days we withdraw from the noise of the street and the clamor of men. We face the full dimensions of personal sanctity. We are alone. We can share neither sin nor guilt.

In the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius we see the horror of life and death without God. We see the terror of personal corruption and personal doom. But we see also the promise and glory of personal sanctity.

The retreat recalls the command of balance. We must pray in common, but we must also pray alone. We require the sense of communion and family which comes with common prayer. But like Christ in the desert, we must pray alone, for like Christ we must face temptation alone.

There is an essential social character to religion, but in the ultimate hour, we will be judged alone, not in committee.

THE CHURCH

Her honor we would defend. Her sanctity we would embrace. Her destiny we would serve.

UNDER SECRETARY HENNING

The principal speaker of the occasion, Under Secretary of Labor, Hon. John F. Henning, himself a retreatant at Loyola and formerly at El Petiro in his native California, gave an unforgettable address on the divine character of the Catholic church and on American Catholics that held his listeners enthralled from start to finish. In giving this eloquent utterance to his love of the faith, he used not even a single note. Because of space limitations, there will be no attempt to quote here from Mr. Henning's talk. It is expected that it will be possible to print the entire address or the substance of it in the next issue. For now let it be said that it was acclaimed as the finest talk of its kind given by a layman in this area. The greatest accolade came from Bishop Spence who declared in his remarks that he would like to seek some kind of dispensation to make it possible for John Henning to don a cassock and to give the next retreat for the priests of the archdiocese. The bishop also pointed out that Vatican II had called for renewal of the Christian life and that the annual retreat was one of the surest ways of providing for this renewal for the layman. And so ended a great day for the retreat movement.

LETTERS COMMENTING ON H.R. 8282 REFLECT A GOOD DEAL OF MISINFORMATION

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of letters commenting on H.R. 8282 which reflect a good deal of misinformation concerning this proposal. I am certain that the same situation confronts many of my colleagues.

First, many of the letters I have received state that H.R. 8282 would encourage people to quit their jobs or to refuse suitable employment because there is no penalty for doing so. Actually, H.R. 8282 provides that a person who does this will get no benefits for at least 6 weeks—plus a waiting week. At that point, he can receive a review of his situation. If he has not actively sought work in the 7-week period following his quit or refusal to accept suitable employment, he still will not get benefits.

I am informed that about half the States now use a similar system. It is based on the theory that, although a person may be voluntarily unemployed today—and therefore ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits—he may later actively and conscientiously seek employment and, if he cannot get a job, he is then involuntarily unemployed.

Second, many of the letterwriters believe that H.R. 8282, as written, would preclude experience rating, which provides a lower unemployment tax rate for employers who have few layoffs. As I understand the bill, the States would still have authorization to provide such tax concessions.

A third major area of confusion reflected by my mail concerns the level of benefits contemplated by H.R. 8282. The confusion apparently stems from a failure to distinguish between the basis of setting a maximum dollar benefit and the standard for determining an individual claimant's benefit. Under H.R. 8282, as I understand it a claimant will never receive, under any circumstances, more than one-half of this weekly wage. Depending on his weekly average earnings, some workers will not receive even as much as one-half. The formula under H.R. 8282 provides that, in the initial stage 1967 the maximum weekly check cannot be more than 50 percent of the average wage in the State. This maximum rises in stages until 1971 when it will be set at two-thirds of the State average.

Perhaps some examples would demonstrate how the system would work. In my own State of New York, average weekly wages were $117 as of January 1, 1966. Under H.R. 8282 an unemployed worker could get no more than one-half of his weekly wages or one-half of the State average—that is, $58.50—whichever is lower. When the maximum becomes two-thirds of average weekly wages, an unemployed worker could get one-half of his weekly wages or two-thirds of the State average—that is, $78—whichever is lower. Thus, if a man is earning $100 a week, he could never get more than $50 a week in unemployment benefits. A man earning $150 a week could get no more than $58.50 at this first stage of the program under H.R. 8282 and when the final step is reached, 5 years from now, he would still get no more than $75 a week. The unemployed worker who averaged more than $156 a week could never get as much as 50 percent of wages at any stage. The higher his weekly earnings average, the smaller would be the percentage of earnings which he could ever get from unemployment compensation.

These examples assume that there would be no increase in the State's average wage from 1967 to 1971. Of course, an increase is likely, but this would not change the principle that an unemployed person could never get more than one-half of his own average weekly earnings.

Since New York State now provides maximum weekly benefits of $55, the initial increase in the maximum under H.R. 8282 in New York would be only

$3.50, to $58.50, which is one-half the present State average. Thus the additional burden on employers in New York State would be very small.

At the same time, New York State would benefit greatly by the application of H.R. 8282 in those other States which today provide low benefits for unemployed workers and correspondingly low unemployment tax rates, and therefore tend to attract business, in unfair competition with New York State. Thus passage of H.R. 8282 would tend to help keep jobs in New York State which might otherwise be lost to the State.

The situation in other States varies. Some provide a maximum level of unemployment benefits far less than one-half the average weekly wages, sometimes barely more than one-third of this figure. Some States have an unemployment tax rate of only 0.7 percent, or less than one-fourth of New York's average tax of 3 percent on taxable payroll. The standards set forth in H.R. 8282 would require an increase in the unempoyment benefits of those States which today are below par, and a corresponding increase in their tax rates, thus bringing them in both respects to a level more comparable to New York. This, as I have said, would tend to remove one of the incentives employers cite in explaining why they move their operations out of New York to other States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the source of the misunderstandings and confusion about the provisions of H.R. 8282. I am confident that the bill reflects the usual reasoned care which characterize proposals that come from the Committee on Ways and Means and its distinguished chairman from the State of Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. I am equally confident that the actual provisions will command the overwhelming support of my constituents.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is customary for us to set aside the 25th of March each year to commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence.

The declaration of independence came on the heels of the Russian revolution of 1917, a revolution which marked the end of over a century of rule over Byelorussia by the Czarist empire. The fall of the Czarist regime fired the Byelorussians with new hopes for independence from Muscovite domination. A Byelorussian National Congress was convened in December of 1917 and when a Bolshevik armored infantry division occupied Minsk to renew the Russian occupation the Byelorussians rallied to drive them from the city. With the Soviets repulsed, the Byelorussians formed an executive committee to form the first truly legal Government of Byelorussia. And on March 25, 1918, the National Council formally proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian democratic Republic.

Unfortunately, the brave little Republic could not hope to withstand the harsh realities of international power politics. The new government of Soviet Russia signed a peace treaty with the Germans at Brest-Litovsk which placed three-quarters of Byelorussia under German occupation. By the time the Allied forces had defeated Germany and the First World War came to a close, the Soviet Government in Moscow had grown in strength and the new Red Army followed on the heels of the departing Germans. Another popular revolt against Russian occupation occurred in 1920, but this time the Soviet forces simply overwhelmed the gallant Byelorussians.

Since the 1920's Byelorussia has either been divided between Russia and Poland or ruled almost solely by the Kremlin. Yet the Byelorussians have never quite yielded to the foreign occupation, and to this day they maintain a determined passive resistance to Soviet acculturation and political domination.

The determination of the Byelorussians is proof that freedom-loving people, regardless of the staggering odds against them, will not allow themselves to be completely conquered by Communist oppression. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to the courage and determination of the Byelorussians and renew my support of their quest for true freedom and independence.

EXTENSION OF ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR SUPPLEMENTAL MEDICARE COVERAGE

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, which would extend the initial enrollment period for the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged from March 31 of this year through September 30 of this year. I have been convinced, from talking with people in my district and with other Members of Congress, that those people who have not signed up for this part of the medicare plan—or who have indicated that they did not wish to participate—do not fully understand the import of the program. This is understandable, because it involves an expenditure of $3 per month on the part of people living on retirement income, but it overlooks certain facts which must not be overlooked.

First of all, those who do not enroll within the initial enrollment period will have to wait 2 more years before they can sign up, and when they do sign up, they will have to pay higher premiums. This is customary in group enrollment plans and is sound financial and administrative policy from the standpoint of so large and comprehensive a plan.

Second. Surveys shows that more than half of those who said "no" to medicare's voluntary medical insurance system did so because they already have private insurance or some other means to cover doctor bills. What many did not realize is that virtually all private and company health insurance policies are being drastically changed to take up where medicare leaves off. Another reason for extending the first enrollment period for another 6 months is that many insurance companies and other providers have not yet completed preparation of the new policies. So a decision before March 31—depending upon an individual's particular circumstances—may seem like buying a pig in a poke.

Third. Although this insurance calls for an expenditure of $3 a month by people living on a retirement income, this is at an unprecedented bargain for a plan covering the major portion of physicians' fees for office, home, and hospital or nursing home consultation and services, up to 100 home visits by skilled nurses, and other similar medical needs. It is possible to offer this insurance at this remarkably low figure because it will be equally matched by the Government and because it covers many millions of people.

Fourth. It has been my experience that many people 65 and over have failed to act because they found it difficult to understand all of the ramifications of the benefits to which they will be entitled. And so they have either lost or misplaced their enrollment cards. They do not know that this situation can be remedied by a trip to the local social security office. Some of them also do not know that anybody 65 or over can qualify, whether he is entitled to social security benefits or not.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that more than 12 million people 65 and over in this country have elected to pay the $3 a month for the voluntary medical insurance program—about three-fourths of the number it was anticipated would be signed up by March 31. I know that the social security people, insurance agents, and other interested parties are doing their level best to make certain that everyone is fully informed as to his rights, but this is a tremendous job. There are around 19 million aged people in this country—of whom some 53,000 are in my district—and we must be sure that all of them have the opportunity to join with a full knowledge of the facts.

By extending the first enrollment period beyond March 31 through September 30 of this year, we will be able to accomplish this purpose. Since the effective date for the program to go into effect is July 1, those who still remain doubtful or uninformed will have an opportunity to see the program in action and learn of all the benefits to which they could become entitled. Those who are now carrying insurance policies will know more definitely how these policies have been changed to supplement the new plan. And they will be signing up for a program in existence, rather than one which goes into effect 3 months after they make their decision.

My bill, is a companion bill to one introduced in the Senate by my colleague, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, a member of the Committee on Finance. I urge action on this matter in the House of Representatives at an early date.

GREEK AND BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 25, marks the Independence Day of both Greece and the Byelorussian democratic republics. We in the United States might pause to consider the lessons of the histories of both these nations.

On March 25, 1821, Greece declared its independence after four centuries of striving toward that ideal during which little support was forthcoming from the nations of Europe, while the Greeks were fighting battles for independence on an average of one every 11 years.

It was in the United States that support was found, and that support quickly grew as the North American Nation, which had fought for and secured its own liberty, wholeheartedly determined that a people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy should be free.

The contributions made and still being made to the growth of the United States by Greeks who have chosen to make their homes here continue to cement the feelings we Americans have for Greece, and it is altogether fitting that we should join in the celebration of this important Greek occasion.

The history of Byelorussia teaches us another, more ominous lesson, but it is one we must heed. Although independence was declared on March 25, 1918, today the Byelorussian Democratic Republic exists as the Byelorussian S.S.R. In the modern history of Byelorussia, we can take a warning from the cruel manner in which their Soviet masters absorbed and crushed this freedom-loving people, and we must strengthen our resolve to make certain the fate of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic never befalls the United States of America.

The Byelorussian S.S.R. has within its present borders less than half of the population and about one-half the territory its ethnography and language would fix as its population and area. Thus, we join with Byelorussians throughout the world and particularly those Americans of Byelorussian descent in celebrating March 25 as their independence day and in the hope that the national and political rights of that Republic will be restored.

TREATMENT PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES IN WHICH THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HAS PIONEERED

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, last fall the Veterans' Administration was requested to prepare a brief but comprehensive list of the various treatment procedures and techniques which it had pioneered in the medical and hospital field. This was not limited to procedures originated solely in the Veterans' Administration, but rather limited to those procedures in which the Veterans' Administration has acted as a pioneer.

I have just recently received a most impressive document which I believe will be of interest not only to Members of Congress, but to all those who are concerned with hospital care for all our people.

This impressive list of accomplishments further supports the need for legislation such as my bill H.R. 11688.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement prepared by the chief medical director, Dr. H. Martin Engle.

STATEMENT BY DR. H. MARTIN ENGLE

INTRODUCTION

A tradition of innovation and discovery is a basic part of the VA medical program. The accomplishments of recognized significance have brought a demand for distribution of VA findings on a worldwide basis. The VA also has been host to scientists and other students of medical knowledge from other countries.

For a detailed discussion of VA research, the reader is referred to the Administrator's Annual Report to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on Medical Research in the Veterans' Administration. What is attempted here is a brief interpretation of just what this program means in terms of specific improvements in the treatment of the various diseases and disabilities suffered by veterans. The extensiveness of the program, of course, requires selected emphasis. A complicating factor is that the line between research and fruition cannot always be drawn. Furthermore, the implementation of an organizational or administrative idea often shares as much in the drama as a laboratory discovery.

The following arrangement of material, therefore, merely represents general guidelines for the purpose of a modicum of completeness, without inconvenience to the reader.

H. MARTIN ENGLE, M.D.,
Chief Medical Director.

PART I. TREATMENT AND THERAPY

Artificial limbs

The postservice VA treatment of amputees and related casualties has made prosthetics and orthotics a major area of interest and progress. While the basic principles of fit and motion were established some time ago, many new techniques and methods have been pioneered by the VA since World War II. Early in this development, from 1948 to 1954, the VA, with the assistance of private industry, adopted the concept of prefabrication of components which allowed mass production resulting in higher quality and lower costs. The VA also instituted centralization in the procurement and distribution of parts and devices and adopted functional standards and ancillary methods of testing and evaluating, thereby supplanting the need for detailed, individual design specifications. The VA's use of plastics in the place of other materials, beginning in 1950, has resulted in more durable and hygienic appliances, and is now being followed throughout the world.

The specific advancements and contributions made by the VA in stump preparation, and in the fitting and control of protheses are too numerous to be included in their entirety in a report of this type. For those interested, however, an appendix showing the highlights may be found at the end of this report.

Tuberculosis chemotherapy

Tuberculosis chemotherapy, the treatment of tuberculosis by chemical means, forged ahead following the discovery of streptomycin in 1944. When streptomycin became available in 1946, a series of carefully controlled trials were conducted by cooperating VA installations. The findings from VA cooperative studies with drugs revolutionized the treatment of tuberculosis resulting in a greater percentage of survivals, shorter hospitalization, and fewer operations. The number of veterans requiring hospital care for tuberculosis decreased from 17,000 in 1954 to less than 6,000 in 1965. Only 2 VA tuberculosis hospitals are now in operation compared to 21 in 1955.

The Pacemaker

The Pacemaker is designed to initiate or continue normal heart rhythm when the heart's controlling mechanism slows or fails. It is a lightweight, transistorized, self-powered device implanted in the abdomen or chest wall and makes contact with the heart by means of electrodes stitched to the heart muscle. The first successful implantation of the cardiac Pacemaker was carried out by the VA chief of surgery at Buffalo, N.Y. Further developments simplifying the insertion of the wires into the heart without the need of major chest surgery occurred at that same hospital in 1965. The use of the Pacemaker, therefore, which had already preserved and made profitable thousands of lives, was opened to an even wider group of people.

Heart rate control

Slowing of the heart permits a damaged heart to function more efficiently. In 1964, a new method for electrically slowing hearts with disturbed and rapid rhythms was developed. The same heart specialists (VAH, Buffalo), who developed the lifesaving Pacemaker, also developed a technique for delivering a paired electrical impulse to the heart by way of a small wire passed through the heart through a neck vein. This development gives much promise for control of several serious forms of heart disease previously thought to be hopeless.

Hypothermia

Cooling the patient by various means and to various degrees has become a relatively common and well-accepted practice in open heart surgery, and in the treatment of serious infections and other conditions associated with increased rate of metabolism. One of the pioneers in this field has been Dr. Frank Gollan, of the VA hospital, Coral Gables, Fla. Many of his contributions, extending back into the early fifties, have paved the way for many advances, especially in the field of open heart surgery.

Coronary artery surgery

A better understanding of disease of the coronary artery and its blockage has resulted from pioneering studies by a group at the VA Hospital, Oteen, N.C. They have developed a new approach for implanting a good artery into heart muscle which has suffered from a deficient blood supply. This understanding is of tremendous importance and the efforts of these investigators has awakened new interest throughout the country in the surgical treatment of coronary heart disease.

Blood vessel replacement

The VA Hospital, Houston, Tex., did much of the early work in developing replacement parts for diseased blood vessels in collaboration with Dr. Michael E. DeBakey and his group at the Baylor Medical School. Preserved aortas were used and later synthetic aortas and smaller artery replacements were developed. This work has culminated in tremendous savings in lives of patients who can now have damaged sections of their blood vessels safely removed and replaced. Also, replacement of blocked leg arteries has greatly improved the comfort and productivity of many patients and saved many legs which previously would have had to be amputated.

Control of high blood pressure

Control of high blood pressure with drugs is an area pioneered by the Veterans' Administration and one in which the VA continues to lead. Two nationwide VA studies, begun in 1955, have determined the most effective combination of drugs for reducing blood pressure with the fewest side effects. These studies have proved that the most severe forms of high blood pressure can be reduced and that this results in prolonging the life of the veteran. A third large-scale study is now in progress to determine whether health is improved and life prolonged in patients with mild and moderately elevated blood pressures when their blood pressure is treated with drugs.

Renal dialysis

Research in renal dialysis procedures—purifying the blood of waste products by circulating it outside the body through an artificial kidney—has progressed to the point where it has become possible for the patient to undergo the treatment periodically, either overnight in the hospital or actually at his home. By the end of June 1966, the VA will have 12, possibly 13, renal dialysis units in operation and it is estimated that between 20 and 30 patients will be able to be treated at each unit. Dr. Bedding Scribner, pioneer in the field and a former VA physician, accomplished much of his original research as an investigator at the VA hospital in Seattle, Wash. Because of these research studies at several VA hospitals, patients with severe kidney damage, who would normally die in a matter of days, can now have their lifespan considerably prolonged and live relatively normal lives.

Organ transplantation

Eighteen VA hospitals are engaged in basic research in organ transplantation. Kidney transplants have been accomplished over 100 times by a team at the VA hospital in Denver, Colo., by far the largest series of cases in the world. This work is contributing essential information about this important area. Considerable experimental work on liver replacement gives promise of ultimate success in replacing this organ. These procedures provide one more chance of saving the lives of patients who are otherwise inevitably doomed.

Cancer chemotherapy

Since its inception in 1956, the National Cancer Institute's clinical program for studying cancer chemotherapy has been substantially benefited by the active collaboration of the VA. In fact, one-half of the patients and about one-third of the hospital services have been contributed by VA installations. Five years of this program were devoted to developing suitable facilities and training personnel in many disciplines to perform and evaluate the complex task.

Cryosurgery

Adapting a technique already developed for using intense cold as low as −170° F., a group at the VA Hospital in Buffalo developed, starting in 1962, a totally new approach to surgery for prostatic cancer. Cryosurgery, using extremely low temperatures for surgery, has clear advantages over current practice in that the patient loses less blood, suffers less shock, and needs less anesthesia. The method also has been used successfully in treating enlarged prostate glands and cancer of the mouth and tongue.

Laser surgery

Pioneering work in the use of laser beam surgery has been in progress since 1963 in VA hospitals in Pittsburgh, West Roxbury, and Washington. These efforts should do much to define the place of this fascinating and immensely powerful agent (a concentrated and intense beam of light) in the treatment of cancer and other diseases where controlled removal or destruction of tissues is desired.

Psychotropic drugs in the treatment of mental disorders

Psychotropic drugs are, generally, the drugs used in the treatment, control, and analysis of mental disorders. In 1955 the VA began a cooperative continuing program of research, especially in the use of psychotropic drugs. As a result of progress in the treatment of mental diseases, the turnover rates in mental hospitals has doubled. This makes possible the treatment of twice as many patients in the same number of beds. Results cannot be measured in dollar savings alone. Since the introduction of the newer psychopharmacologic agents, the more hazardous treatments (insulin coma, electroconvulsive, frontal lobotomy) have been largely supplanted. The use of restraints has decreased to the near-vanishing point. The once noisy, turbulent, dangerous, closed psychiatric ward has now become a quiet, open-door community purposefully occupied in therapeutically oriented activities.

Architecture in psychiatric treatment

While he was with the VA, Dr. Paul Haun, in 1946, initiated a program of design of psychiatric hospital facilities on the basis of patient treatment needs. The criteria he developed recognized the benefits to patients of privacy, accessibility of personal belongings, and quietly optimistic surroundings. Incorporated, too, were features to satisfy the treatment staff's requirements for ample, suitably coordinated space with treatment facilities in the nursing unit, psychiatric security and safety, and flexibility of utilization permitting a wide diversity of diagnostic and therapeutic procedures. Basic in the plans was provision of a higher staff-patient ratio and small treatment units. The value of the new architectural plans was tested in the large laboratories of seven VA hospitals built in accordance with his concepts, and was demonstrated by a showing of greater effectiveness. The influence of the modern concepts has been felt in construction of non-VA psychiatric hospitals in this country and abroad.

Incentive therapy

The furtherance of rehabilitation of patients and members of hospitals, domiciliaries, and outpatient clinics required the development of therapeutic programs incorporating an incentive approach. Such therapeutic programs have as their objectives the establishment of self-reliance and the goal of return to the community. Various programs were established for selected patients based on the medical needs of the individual as well as the rehabilitation potential. These programs include industrial-therapy programs, monetary-incentive programs with the goal of eventual outplacement, work-for-pay programs conducted in conjunction with the local community for members or patients with specific skills.

These programs were initiated as early as the middle 1950's and rapidly increased in scope and extent. In the last fiscal year about $350,000 was expended in support of the monetary-incentive program among the 41 psychiatric hospitals. Various examples of community-related programs are CHIRP,[1] the programs at Perry Point, and the program in the Providence Day Treatment Center.

Foster-home care

Foster-home care is the placement of improved psychiatric patients out of the hospital on trial visit in homes other than their own. This program was formerly started in the VA in 1951. There had been scattered and limited experiments with this type of placement by a few VA hospitals over the years and several States had been developing such programs of care. The formalization in VA of this program and the success of this type of treatment and care for the patient provided the impetus for the program to spread and flourish. Each year the number of patients released from the hospitals into foster homes has increased so that during 1964 there were almost 4,500 veterans living in foster homes on trial visit, being provided care by the "foster parents" and under the supervision and guidance of the VA social worker. Since the beginning of the program in 1951 a total of amost 13,000 patients have been released from the hospital to the community to live in a foster-home placement. These are patients who either had no homes of their own or whose homes were not favorable to their needs or in their best interest at time of hospital release.

This community placement program has expanded to include placements in other types of living arrangements than their own homes, such as nursing homes, halfway houses, and special placements. This community care program is available to medical patients, as well as psychiatric patients. It has had significant impact on the medical-care program, permitting release from hospital living for the patient no longer in need of the active treatment provided in the hospital but who cannot leave because he lacks an appropriate home living situation. During 1964 this program made it possible for 11,500 patients, both medical and psychiatric, to leave the hospital to live in the community.

Group therapy for geriatric patients

Group therapy for geriatric patients was begun by Dr. Kurt Wolff in 1959 at the VA hospital, Coatesville, Pa. The aged patient has become an increasingly serious problem within the mental hospital. Left to themselves—and they receive only custodial care in many institutions—the older patients usually sit idle and dejected in the wards, their lives empty and without goal or direction; they seem to be waiting to die. Of the approximately 100 elderly patients treated by this program especially oriented toward their resocialization, almost 40 percent improved sufficiently to be released from the hospital. These results are unusually good for long-term patients.

Geriatric-oriented group therapy appears to be better tolerated than individual psychotherapy by these patients. Their anxiety decreases, personal relations improve, and feelings of isolation decrease. The elderly patient has to clarify his ideas in the group setting and respond to the attitudes of others, forcing him to face reality. In this way, a more realistic outlook on life for the elderly is achieved by common effort. In 1961, a census of the patient population in Coatesville indicated that 38 percent of the patients were over 60 years old, and the trend is toward an increasing number of older patients, at a more rapid rate in VA hospitals than in the general population, a forecast of the medical problems of an aging population in the Nation as a whole.

---

[1] Community-hospital-industry-rehabilitation program.

Hyperbaric medicine

Since 1963 the Veterans' Administration has been experimenting with and evaluating pressurized oxygen as a treatment for several diseases, such as coronary artery disease, strokes, and others. In 1965, the first large pressure chamber was used at the VA hospital, Buffalo, N.Y. The excellent results with this method in treating gas gangrene, which responds dramatically to oxygen under pressure, were followed up by plans to make this treatment available on a national scale for treatment of gas gangrene. Four VA hospitals are able to administer this treatment now.

Portacaval shunting

The problem of bleeding esophageal varices (enlarged blood vessels) as a cause of death in the VA hospital population is a major concern. Since January 1962, 12 VA hospitals have been engaged in a cooperative study to evaluate the place of an operation, portacaval shunting—creating a circulation bypass to reduce pressure on the enlarged blood vessels of the esophagus. So far, it seems that the portacaval shunt does not offer protection against bleeding as the cause of death. Continuing study is required to determine whether survival time is extended.

New help for stroke victims

Dr. Walter Liberson at VA Hospital, Hines, Ill., has developed a technique by which patients with a paralyzed leg because of stroke or other brain injury can walk without the usual braces or crutches. An electronic device delivers at precisely the right moment a small electrical stimulation to the nerves that control the paralyzed muscle groups required for walking. The timing and amount of current is sufficiently exact that the result is a normal stepping with the paralyzed leg. Since the VA cares for more than 10,000 stroke victims a year, this development is clinically very important.

Oral drug control of diabetes

In progress since 1958, published results of a VA diabetes cooperative study clearly established the relative effectiveness of two oral drugs commonly used for treatment of diabetes. Fully 25 percent of the control patients responded favorably to an inactive (placebo) medication, clearly indicating the necessity for such a comparison in any test of drug effectiveness.

PART II. DIAGNOSIS AND ANALYSIS

The autoanalyzer

Much of the fundamental work in the development of the autoanalyzer, a semiautomated chemical analyzer, was done in the VA Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio. This instrument will perform a variety of chemical analyses on blood samples. After the samples have been loaded, the analyses proceed automatically. The operation is effected by a continuous flow system with a proportioning pump and a recording system. The impact of the autoanalyzer on laboratory operations is tremendous since it permits more procedures to be performed more accurately than was hitherto possible and enabled laboratories to handle considerable increases of certain work in many hospitals without the addition of staff.

Radioisotopes

The Veterans' Administration has been in the forefront of pioneers in the diagnostic and therapeutic use of radioisotopes, as evidenced by the following examples:

In 1950, in the radioisotope laboratories at VAC Los Angeles, Dr. H. C. Allen first began "scanning" of thyroid glands by manually moving the detector to coordinates of a grid. Improving upon this very time-consuming procedure, Dr. B. Cassen, University of California at Los Angeles, atomic energy project, and his coworkers built a mechanically operated "scanner" which was clinicially tested at the VAC by Dr. Allen and Dr. Goodwin. This first scanner was the forerunner of models now widely used throughout the world.

The idea to use capsules as a dosage form for radioisotopes originated and was developed in the radioisotope laboratory of VAC Los Angeles, in 1952, by R. L. Libby and M. Tubis. This dosage form for radioisotopes is now used by all radioisotope pharmaceutical laboratories.

Other radioisotope developments in which VA pioneered are:

(a) Development of a rapid and simple liver function test using radioactive Rose Bengal (Blahd and Nordyke, 1957).

(b) Original preparation of radioactive Hippuran, for kidney function studies and renograms (Tubus, Posnick, Nordyke and Blahd, 1960).

The first reactor to be installed directly in a hospital setting was installed at the VAH Omaha. It has been used for training purposes and for neutron activation analysis. It has also been available to investigators from Creighton and University of Nebraska medical school for studies in conjunction with the VA.

The first sodium iodide-thallium activated scintillation crystal "canned" in aluminum was clinically tested and found superior to the Geiger counter in the VA Hospital at Cleveland. The crystal is still in use in the radioisotope laboratory there. These crystals have essentially supplanted other defectors.

The water shielded whole body counter installed at VAH, Iowa City, is the only one utilizing this unique design. It is used for measurements of minute quantities of radioactive materials with minimal interference from background radiation.

Cardiac catheterization

Now routine for diagnosis of diseases affecting the valves of the heart, cardiac catheterization is a procedure in which a long, flexible, hollow tube is inserted through a blood vessel into the heart to allow direct sampling of blood and measurement of pressures in the different heart chambers. The first of these research units was set up by the Veterans' Administration in 1948. In succeeding years, these catheterization units played a key role in evolving techniques and information needed to treat heart disease medically and surgically and they continue to add new information to the cardiologist's arsenal. Information from 43 laboratories during the past 3 fiscal years shows that each station averaged 3,500 catheterizations a year. Present plans are to establish 43 laboratories in fiscal year 1967.

Computers in heart disease

Results of research at the VA Hospital, Washington, D.C., has produced and stored in a computer a mass of information useful for diagnosis in heart disease. Any of 10 VA hospitals linked with the computer can transmit the electrocardiogram of a patient over telephone lines. Not only does the machine make a quicker diagnosis, but it can read far more detail than the human eye could detect.

The amount of valuable information on the clinical condition of hospital patients that is being uncovered through study of the electrical activity of the heart is growing enormously as the computers make possible types of analysis unattainable through human interpretation. An investigator at the Washington hospital has discovered that blood levels of certain substances previously measurable only by actual chemical determination can be accurately predicted from the electrical tracings of the heart. These tracings provide not only proved detailed information on the presence and nature of heart disease but also show the degree to which disease has disturbed the chemical balance of the body.

Ultrasonics in eye research

The eye research unit at the Bronx VA hospital pioneered in using sound and its echo (like the submarine-detecting system sonar to map the structures in and around the eye socket. The principal investigator began his work in 1952, built his own equipment, and continues to improve it. Clinically, the technique is in demand by doctors all over the world for differentiating tumors in the eye from other growths, and for locating foreign bodies in the eye as a guide for the surgeon.

Standards in diagnosis of endocrine disorders

The results of a VA endocrine cooperative study in progress for more than 5 years, have firmly established laboratory standards for diagnosis of pituitary and adrenal gland disorder based on determinations of blood hormone values by standardized test procedures. This procedure allows detection of borderline abnormalities and leads to earlier diagnosis and treatment.

Researchers at several VA hospitals have pioneered in the successful treatment of gouty arthritis. Patients failing to respond to conventional therapy are participating in a study which tests new drugs of potential value.

Improved diagnosis for diabetes

The radioisotope laboratory at the VA hospital, Bronx, has received international recognition for developing a practical and reliable method for measuring insulin in blood. This technique led to diagnosis and treatment of different types of diabetes and abnormal states produced by the presence of insulin-secreting tumors.

A method for diagnosing potential of early diabetes by observing changes in small blood vessels has been developed at the VA hospital in Dallas. Recognition of the disease in these patients results in earlier control and better results from therapy.

Device for estimating degree of arteriosclerosis

The degree to which a blood vessel has aged, or become arteriosclerotic, has been found in the last 3 years to change the manner in which it conducts the heartbeat. The senior medical investigator at the VA hospital in Washington, D.C., has devised a pickup which, when laid on the skin over a blood vessel, transmits the shape of the pulse. For the first time the degree of aging in living human blood vessels can be measured simply and painlessly. This technique now allows scientists to measure the effectiveness of the many substances now being investigated for retarding or reversing arteriosclerosis.

New forms of treatment for aging of blood vessels (the cause of heart attacks and strokes) cannot be evaluated satisfactorily because of the difficulty in testing them on enough patients to produce significant results. The Veterans' Administration, through its organized system of patient care, has the unique capability to provide this necessary large-scale testing and simultaneously provide the veteran patient the benefit of the latest therapy available. Since 1957, 8 separate cooperative studies with a total of almost 5,000 patients have been directed toward finding an effective treatment for the prevention of heart attacks and strokes. One of these studies has already shown that anticoagulants (blood-thinning drugs) will protect the patient against a second heart attack. Another study has shown that these same drugs provide no protection from strokes. Research continues in these areas.

Tests for drug effectiveness

Soon after the advent of drugs used in the treatment of psychiatric patients, it became evident that a test for their detection would be extremely valuable to verify the patient's cooperation in taking medication. A husband and wife team at VAH, Brockton, Mass., psychiatrist, Fred Forrest, M.D., and biochemist, Irene Forrest, Ph. D., described a rapid, simple urine test for the detection of a tranquilizing agent and for other related drugs as these were introduced into clinical use. The Forrest tests have been adopted around the world and contribute to the effective care of many thousands of patients in mental hospitals and mental hygiene clinics and those treated by private physicians. Because VA cooperative studies have provided unequivocal evidence regarding the value of the tranquilizing drugs in treating schizophrenia, many other psychiatrists and institutions have borrowed the VA protocols and instruments for measuring the effects of the drugs on patients. Prior to the VA cooperative studies there were few studies that used adequate controls, and results were based on too small numbers which resulted in conflicting opinion as to the value of the new drugs.

PART III. RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY

Research in laboratory automation

The Automated Biochemical Research Laboratory, VAH, Bronx, N.Y., supported out of administrative research funds, is engaged in refining existing methods or developing new ones for blood chemistry determinations utilizing semiautomated equipment such as the autoanalyzer. The value of such developmental methods is considerable since some methods cannot be transposed from the older manual procedures to the new instrumentation. Several publications of note have emanated from this laboratory and are contributing to improvement of clinical chemistry.

Linkage of precancerous lung changes with cigarette smoking

Dr. Oscar Auerbach is a nationally and internationally recognized authority on the subject of lung cancer in cigarette smokers. He has demonstrated by means of microscopic studies changes, believed to be precancerous, in the bronchial epithelium of human beings and that these changes have a higher incidence in smokers than in nonsmokers. His work has been published in leading scientific journals and has been widely acclaimed by many experts.

VA pathologist pioneers in investigating auto fatalities

Dr. Paul W. Gikas, chief, laboratory service at VA hospital, Ann Arbor, Mich., is engaged in significant investigations on the mechanism of infliction of fatal injuries in fatal automobile accidents. This work is supported by a U.S. Public Health Service grant. Dr. Gikas' coinvestigator is Dr. Donald F. Huelke, of the anatomy department of the University of Michigan School of Medicine.

These workers have investigated 161 fatalities produced by 125 accidents. They have determined that death results either from ejection from the vehicle or from injuries resulting from secondary collision between the individual and the interior of his car. Ejection is the most common cause of death followed by secondary collision with the steering assembly, the door, or the instrument panel, in that order. Their conclusion is that 40 percent of victims could have been saved by the wearing of simple lap belts in both front and back seats.

The importance of Dr. Gikas' work has been widely recognized and he has addressed a number of organizations, both medical and those concerned with safety, on this topic. He has assisted in the writing of safety standards for Federal vehicles.

Transfusion stockpiles

The VA holds the patent on a new blood substitute developed in the Veterans' Administration in 1959. To date, the need has not been sufficient to justify commercial production of this substance, glutamyl polypeptide, but with the Vietnam conflict making increased demands on available supplies, this material—which is nearly ready for testing—could contribute immeasurably to the support of shock victims. Also, starting in 1960, development and testing of a technique for preserving blood by freezing has been carried out at three hospitals: Ann Arbor and Buffalo VA hospitals are working with one technique while Birmingham VA hospital is engaged with evaluation of another. Both techniques have proven successful in preserving blood for at least a year.

Evaluation of analgesics

The National Research Council has studied various natural and synthetic analgesics over a period of 30 years. There has never been a continuing facility until the Veterans' Administration established in 1958 a continuing long-term cooperative study for evaluation of these drugs as preoperative preparation, pain controlling mechanisms in both acute and chronic distress, and evaluation of these substances in addiction liability. Limited earlier studies had been done in drug addicts at the VA hospital, Lexington, Ky. These materials have been clinically evaluated in the Veterans' Administration and several analgesics are now available to the public, because of Veterans' Administration efforts. Continuing efforts to identify such agents is undergoing study at several Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Slipped disk study

The largest review of operated slipped (herniated) disks has been a joint endeavor of the NAS–NRC[2] and the VA, since 1963. Most of these patients have undergone surgery while in the military service over 10 years ago. This study should go a long way toward answering many questions concerning this affliction.

Stomach ulcer study

Since 1957, a group of 12 VA hospitals have engaged in a cooperative effort to review the problem of surgery in the patient with duodenal stomach ulcer disease. This was by far the largest restrospective study yet carried out and has resulted in the publication of a book entitled, "Results of Surgery for Peptic Ulcer" released by W. B. Saunders & Co., in 1963. For the past 3 years this same group has been engaged in a prospective study of the "Efficacy of Four Different Operation Procedures in Patients With Duodenal Disease."

Study of suicide

An interest in the problem of suicide, which has national and international implications, was expressed in the VA by organization in 1950, of the central research unit for the study of unpredicted deaths. This was the first, large-scale, scientifically coordinated study of this type. From this unique group with its access to the Los Angeles community and to the VA experience have come some of the most comprehensive and scientifically validated reports about this major cause of death.

The VA has profited particularly from the educational activities of the center through the preparation of medical bulletins and presentations of seminars. The non-VA community has profited from the many publications of a scientific nature, and has benefited from the consequent removal of the concealment which has prevented open public acknowledgment of this serious social problem.

Mobility aids for the blind

The VA has sponsored a research program in electronic mobility aids for the blind which commenced with an effort to improve an aid developed in the Army Signal Corps during and just after World War II. Since then, much has been learned about mobility of the blind and a number of prototype aids have been built and evaluated. The best technique so far evolved seems to be the mounting of electronic sensors on a cane structure. Such a unit is near completion by a VA contractor and will combine the advantages and safety of a cane with the convenience and value of detection at a distance and in zones of head and shoulder level which are not within a cane's reach. Based on VA's pioneering efforts in the long cane technique, specifications were developed for the typhlocane. These canes are now items of issue for blinded veterans and similar designs are available for civilian blinded.

Reading devices for the blind

The VA has also attacked the problem of reading of ordinary inkprint by the blind. Ten optophones have been built and are currently being evaluated. These units are improved versions of an instrument built some years back, in England. More sophisticated reading machines, involving character recognition and various types of spoken outputs, are also engaging the interests of VA research contractors.

PART IV. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Interagency standardization of laboratory workload reporting

Each Federal agency with a major medical program, the VA, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service have all used different methods for reporting their clinical laboratory workloads. As a result no meaningful comparisons could be made among them though all recognized the importance of such statistics in relation to staffing and space allocations. Since clinical laboratory workloads have been increasing explosively in recent years, such reporting discrepancies have become more serious.

At the invitation of the Chief Medical Director to each Surgeon General, a committee was formed to develop an acceptable common workload reporting system. This has been accomplished and each agency will adopt it on July 1, 1966.

The significance of this achievement can be comprehended only when it is realized that never before has a group of hospitals agreed to report laboratory workload data in a uniform manner. Considerable interest is being evinced by pathologists in university and community hospitals. From the work of this committee may evolve a nationally accepted system. The VA has been the pioneer and the prime mover in the development of the interagency laboratory workload reporting system.

Day treatment center

Since the advent of the tranquilizing drugs, an increasing number of patients, after long residence in hospitals, have been able to leave. Many of these patients are not fully prepared to integrate back into productive community living and require further treatment. The VA pioneered in recognizing the concept of utilizing and capitalizing on the residual capacities and abilities that patients have to return them to the community in an environmental setting appropriate to their limitations. This new treatment facility provided an intermediate step toward integrating the long-term psychiatric patient into normal community living. Emphasis in treatment is placed on relearning basic habits of socialization with others, prevocational counseling and on-the-job learning experiences are utilized to move the patient toward vocational rehabilitation. Every effort is utilized to prevent regression and avoid rehospitalization. The VA initiated this program officially in 1961, although several stations had started pilot programs as early as 1957.

---

[2] National Academy of Science and National Research Council.

Psychiatric services in general hospitals

The post-World War II trend toward provision of psychiatric treatment in general hospitals has been led by the VA. While he was with the VA, Dr. Haun, in his book, "Psychiatric Sections in General Hospitals," in 1950, established guidelines for the integration of construction and treatment programs based on VA studies. The general hospital concept established by the Chief Medical Director in 1962 more explicitly affirmed as policy the practice of equipping each VA hospital to provide psychiatric treatment in fiscal year 1965.

VA general medical and surgical hospitals and psychiatric services, 36 of which were integrated outpatient (mental hygiene clinic)—inpatient programs, and the first comprehensive 240-bed service in a G.M. & S. hospital was inaugurated in Washington, D.C. During that year, 23,546 patients were discharged from G.M. & S. treatment programs. This represents one-third of all the psychiatric discharges. The figure has increased steadily each year.

Team approach in the treatment of psychiatric disorders

In the field of psychiatric treatment, the use of the team aproach was utilized by VA both in the mental hygiene clinics and hospitals. The psychiatrist is the director of the team, consisting of a group of individuals of various disciplines, such as clinical psychologists, psychiatric social workers, nurses, nursing assistants, rehabilitation workers, etc. All of these individuals participate in the total treatment of the patient, utilizing their particular skills in furtherance of attaining the goals of treatment.

The VA began utilizing the team approach to the treatment of psychiatric patients soon after the end of World War II. It is now established firmly in inpatient and outpatient facilities throughout the VA and has served as a paragon for organizational planning in non-VA hospitals and clinics.

Unit system in psychiatric hospitals

The unit system was established in the larger, predominantly psychiatric, hospitals to permit the hospitals to be divided into smaller, self-sufficient units. It facilitates, through the use of smaller groups, the rehabilitation process. The patient is treated by the same therapeutic team throughout his period of hospitalization, thereby improving interpersonal relationships between the staff and the patient. It provides service in examination, diagnosis, care, and treatment from admission to discharge and aids in the furtherance of training, research, and clinical studies. Should a patient require readmission at a future time, he is readmitted to the same unit, where all the staff personnel are acquainted with him and the problems he presents.

This procedure was initiated at the VA hospital, Topeka, Kans., in 1958. Now that 32 of the hospitals have been reorganized, it has become officially established as the fundamental organizational structure.

Social work assistants program

The VA has established a new position of social work assistant to permit employment by social work service at VA stations of college graduates as assistants to social workers. The basic purpose of the social work assistant position is that of accomplishing social work tasks of a nonprofessional nature which are related to achieving social work objectives. Through the establishment of this type of position, social workers may delegate to the assistant selected tasks not requiring professional knowledge and skill. Prior study of the use of these agency-trained personnel in seven selected VA stations demonstrated successfully that this is one approach through which social work services can be helped in extending the effectiveness of the work of social workers in achieving medical-social objectives in VA patient care.

Satellite program of research in aging

Of major portent to the field of aging research is the "satellite program of research in aging," evolved by the Veterans' Administration over 2 years ago. Cognizance was taken of the need for bold and novel approaches to satisfy the critical requirement of bringing new ideas and new talent to the field. The "satellite" program induces outstanding non-VA scientists working at the frontiers of knowledge to participate in collaborative research conducted in VA laboratories especially designed and staffed for the effort. This is feasible by virtue of the fact that the broad geographical distribution of VA hospitals permits the development of facilities wherever distinguished scientists may be found. Currently, six programs are in effect involving leading investigators in the following institutions who are collaborating with VA colleagues in nearby VA installations:

Boston University and VA Hospital, Bedford, Mass.

Northwestern University and VA Hospital, Downey, Ill.

New York University at Buffalo and VA Hospital, Buffalo, N.Y.

National Institutes of Health, Gerontology Branch and VA Hospital, Baltimore, Md.

California Institute of Technology and VA Hospital, Sepulveda, Calif.

It is planned that additional "satellites" will be launched in the future.

Hormone banks

The unique pituitary bank at VAH, Denver, in existence since 1958, has made giant strides in perfecting the extraction and purification of human growth hormone. This preparation is very essential for the treatment of patients wtih this glandular deficiency.

The pancreas bank at VAH, Dallas, established in 1961 has pioneered in methods of extracting human insulin and glucagon, both hormone products of this gland. Its studies have contributed immeasurably to the development of highly successful treatment with glucagon for low blood sugar which may follow an overdose of insulin.

Early detection of oral cancers

Cancers of the mouth comprise 5 percent of all cancers seen in the United States. Since the earliest possible detection of cancer is very important to saving life, the VA initiated in 1959 in 10 hospitals and 3 outpatient clinics a cooperative study for detection of cancer cells in the mouth. This study was successfully concluded after 3 years. The results indicate the value of using this technique, taking a sample of cells from mouth abnormalities and examining them under a microscope, in the early detection of oral cancer. The study received worldwide recognition and the technique is now being used as a routine procedure in the oral examination of VA patients. Also, numerous community cancer detection programs using this procedure have been initiated by the Public Health Service in cooperation with local dental societies throughout the Nation.

Hospital infection control

In response to a nationwide concern which began in 1957–58 that contamination and hospital infection were serious problems and dangerous to patients, the Veterans' Administration initiated a program to determine the frequency of contamination and infection, the influences and circumstances attendant, and means of control.

A procedure of infection control has been instituted in VA hospitals using a reporting system on hospital infections as a controlling mechanism. The Veterans' Administration demonstrated that attention to the details of housekeeping and clinical efforts can keep cross contamination and infections at an appreciably low level. The VA pioneered in the use of a reference laboratory for identification of infecting agents, phage typing, and information on the infecting agents sensitivity to various antibiotics available for treating these infections.

APPENDIX

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROSTHETICS AND ORTHOTICS ADVANCEMENTS

The suction and quadrilateral socket for the above-knee amputee

Based on an early American invention and work done in Germany following World War I, the Veterans' Administration pioneered the use of suction suspension in the above-knee sockets in the United States starting in 1946. Later, as a body of biomechanical principles became available, the quadrilateral-shaped socket was evolved to improve comfort and control for the amputee. Resulting from this work has been the establishment of the quadrilateral socket as a basic design for sockets all over the world. Amputees have greater functional capability, as well as improved comfort, from its use.

Total contact

Starting in 1959, the use of socket designs which employed low-pressure contact in the lower portion of the socket was refined and developed by the Veterans' Administration after earlier work by the U.S. Navy. Such socket design, now being used all over the world, improves amputee comfort and control over that achieved by the quadrilateral socket, as well as improving the stump environment for better stump circulation. Dermatological problems are also alleviated.

Casting systems

Starting in 1960, the Veterans' Administration and one of its contractors (University of California) pioneered the development of several casting methods employing special equipment to introduce controls over the process of casting above-knee and below-knee amputation stumps. These systems are being used generally throughout the world and have resulted in more uniform results in achieving better fitting sockets.

The patellar-tendon-bearing below-knee socket

Based on biomechanical concepts, the Veterans' Administration in 1957 through one of its contractors (University of California) achieved a socket design for the below-knee amputee which allows, in most cases, the elimination of the burdensome thigh corset. These sockets are now used all over the world. They permit unrestricted normal knee function and provide improved comfort and prosthetic control.

Syme prostheses

In 1957, because of recurring structural problems with existing Syme prostheses, the

Veterans' Administration, through its own laboratory and one of its contractors (University of California), developed two improved designs of plastic Syme prostheses. These designs are now generally used throughout the world. These devices are more durable and hygienic. Increased comfort and improved control also result since their designs were based on sound biomechanical principles.

Alinement concepts and devices for alinement

In 1951, the Veterans' Administration, through one of its contractors (University of California), developed a basic concept of alinement for artificial legs. Consequently, devices to allow prosthetists to achieve dynamic alinement were developed by the University of California and the Veterans' Administration Prosthetics Center. The alinement concepts and these devices are now used on patients on an international scale. The use of these principles and devices results in prostheses which are more functional and stable.

Pylon lower extremity prosthesis design

Conventional artificial legs are usually built up on solid wood parts. Starting in 1961, the Veterans' Administration pioneered pylon designs to provide the required structural support; such designs are lighter and more durable than solid wood or plastic prostheses.

Temporary prostheses

To permit early conditioning of amputees to walking or to determine the feasibility of prosthesis use, many diverse makeshift designs of artificial limbs have been used. The Veterans' Administration in 1959 pioneered the development of standardized devices for this purpose, as well as in the method of treatment with temporary prostheses. VA methods have been generally adopted and VA-developed devices are now generally used. Resulting from this program has been a better control of the treatment program for amputees, as well as better, more functional equipment for early ambulation.

Hydraulic mechanisms

With the assistance of several research contractors of the Veterans' Administration as well as one private developer, the Veterans' Administration participated in pioneering the employment of hydraulic knee controls in above-knee artificial legs primarily through its development and evaluation program, which started in 1946. Presently, three devices are being used on veteran beneficiaries. The results have improved amputees' performance and capability.

Sach foot

This device, developed primarily by the Veterans' Administration, is a mass-produced device of simple design which provides necessary foot-ankle function. The use of this type of foot since 1956 has resulted in greater durability for foot-ankle mechanisms, as well as improved performance for the amputees.

Immediate postsurgical application of protheses

Based on work done in Poland and France, the Veterans' Administration is now conducting a pioneering study of the use of protheses applied immediately after surgery. The process permits very early ambulation and thus early conditioning of stump and amputee. Many other research groups have already adopted the techniques of the VA project in Seattle, Wash. Eventually, it is expected that this mode of treatment will result in improved performance by amputees, as well as in their early rehabilitation and discharge from hospitals.

Myoplastic surgery in amputations

The use of myoplasty during the amputation surgical process is now being pioneered in the United States by the Veterans' Administration through the same investigator (Seattle, Wash.) studying immediate postsurgical prostheses. Myoplastically prepared stumps appear to show improvements in prosthetic capability. Moreover, such stumps may result in improved circulation which is of special significance in those cases where circulatory defects were the causes of amputation. If successful, the myoplasty technique and the use of immediate postsurgical prostheses may in many cases permit the election of below-knee amputations rather than above-knee amputations.

Sockets for lower extremity braces

Using the principles underlying socket fit for lower extremity artificial limbs, brace socket designs were pioneered by the Veterans' Administration starting in 1959. With such weight-bearing braces, improved comfort and control result.

Single-bar bracing

Starting in 1963, the Veterans' Administration pioneered the use of the single-bar brace for lower extremity nonspastic paralytic conditions. Simpler construction results from this design. The patient obtains a less bulky appliance which he can control better.

Upper extremity armamentarium

The Veterans' Administration, starting in 1949, with the assistance of the Army Prosthetics Research Laboratory and the VA project at the University of California at Los Angeles, as well as several manufacturers in the field, pioneered in the development of an array of terminal devices, wrists, elbows, and accessory hardware for use in artificial limbs for the upper extremity amputee. Such appliances are now being used on an international scale. Amputees have been given improved function in their artificial arms, leading to increased vocational capability and greater independence in coping with daily activities.

External power

Starting in 1950, primarily through the sponsorship of the work by International Business Machines, Inc., the Veterans' Administration pioneered the use of electric power in artificial limbs. Because of the control problem, much of this early device development had to be held up. Other systems have now been developed by various research and development groups, but the use of power was demonstrated many years ago by the Veterans' Administration through the IBM project. Hopefully now, such power applications will improve amputee capability particularly for the severely disabled. Starting in 1962, the Veterans' Administration pioneered the concept of hybridization wherein external power is introduced for certain selected functions only. Such mixing of intrinsic and extrinsic power will enable many amputees with lesser (unilateral) disabilities to achieve improved functional capability without excessive prosthetic hardware.

Control systems for external power

Because of the difficulties confronted in the earlier development work on electric power in prosthetics at IBM, the Veterans' Administration starting in 1958, began exhaustive laboratory studies into the control problem. This research, based on both biomechanical and myoelectric systems for operating powered devices, was a pioneering effort of the Veterans' Administration through its research contractor at the University of California at Los Angeles. Presently, many other researchers throughout the world are fostering similar developments.

AT THE ROOTS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Constitution states editorially that the city of Atlanta is fully aware of the need—as President Johnson put it—of attacking crime "at the roots."

The paper points out that an effective strategy against crime must rest on a base of prevention, and it cites the work and recommendations of the Atlanta Commission on Crime and Juvenile Delinquency.

The subject concerns us all at this time, and in the belief that the editorial sheds light on this matter, I am offering it for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 14, 1966]

ATTACKING CRIME "AT THE ROOTS"

Read far enough in President Johnson's message on crime, and you see it getting down to basics.

In addition to other steps, says the message, "an effective strategy against crime must also rest on a base of prevention.

"The programs now underway to eliminate the degradation of poverty, the decay of our cities, the disgrace of racial discrimination, the despair of illiteracy—are all vitally important to crime prevention."

Four months ago, a report of the Atlanta Commission on Crime and Juvenile Delinquency made somewhat similar observations. The commission's report pointed out that an Atlantan in the lowest-income areas is more than 20 times as likely to be a convicted offender than one living in the highest income areas.

"All efforts to reduce poverty, and thus indirectly to reduce crime, need the full support of the city and its citizens," said the report.

Since then, as a result of a crime commission recommendation, the Atlanta police department has started neighborhood-level crime prevention work in poverty areas. A policeman is on duty daily at each of five neighborhood offices of the poverty program. The assigned policemen are seeking to overcome traditional hostilities toward the badge and to stop patterns of crime before they develop.

These are neighborhoods in which hatred for the police uniform often begins at the prekindergarten level, so the challenge is enormous. The program is only 3 months old. But already there are encouraging signs that it is getting results, especially among young people.

Much credit is due the police department for putting this approach into operation. Of Atlanta it can be said, fortunately, that it is aware of the need, as Mr. Johnson's message puts it, to "attack crime at the roots."

POWER OF CONGRESS TO LEGISLATE AGAINST ELECTRONIC EAVESDROPPING

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the subject, which is the basic right of privacy which all Americans should enjoy and many are being denied, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a memorandum for me on the power of Congress to make certain electronic eavesdropping practices a Federal offense.

I have received a well thought out memorandum prepared by the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service. This memorandum comes to the conclusion that although the Congress can legally impose restraints against electronic eavesdropping by Government employees, our hands are virtually tied with respect to private snoopers, including private detectives who have in some cases engaged in most shocking invasions of privacy through the use of "bugging" devices.

I believe that the Congress should enact whatever legislation it can to control Federal employees, and I hope that the several States will take the necessary action to control snooping by private citizens.

Because I consider the matter of such urgent importance, I insert in the RECORD the following memorandum I have received from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Power of Congress to enact remedial legislation directed at eavesdropping effected by means including electronic and other devices but not wiretapping, and engaged in by private citizens as well as by Federal and State law enforcement officers.

At least three types of eavesdropping devices are embraced within the coverage of this report. These are: (1) radio electronic devices which entail the detection or pickup and transmission of oral sounds, and (2) recording devices, and (3) acoustical detection devices neither of which are connected with any electronic transmitting equipment. With reference to the first category of eavesdropping equipment, it is believed that the constitutional power to regulate commerce (art. 1, sec. 8, cl. 3) available to the Congress will enable it to impose valid restrictions more sweeping in scope than those contained in the recently issued regulations of the Federal Communications Commission (47 C.F.R. 2.701, 15.11; 31 Fed. Reg. 3397 (Mar. 4, 1966)).

As to the second and third class of devices, the use thereof by private citizens as distinguished from law enforcement officers, would appear to be susceptible of effective control only by the States.

Insofar as Congress may be disposed to eliminate the exemption of Federal and State law enforcement officers from the regulations issued on February 28, 1966, by the Federal Communications Commission, it is believed that the Federal power to regulate interstate commerce would prove adequate to sustain legislation accomplishing this result. Independently of this power, Congress manifestly is competent to prescribe the standards of criminal detection which may be employed by Federal officers, and therefore, a legal problem would arise only with reference to the extension of such measure to State officers. As the Federal Communications Commission acknowledges, the power of Congress to regulate the use of instrumentalities of interstate commerce, to wit, radio devices, is plenary; and, consistently with the principle of national supremacy (art. VI), Federal legislation expanding the coverage of the Commission's regulations validly may include State law enforcement (31 Fed. Reg. 3399—4000, par. 21); *Weiss* v. *United States*, 308 U.S. 321, 327 (1939); *Benanti* v. *United States*, 355 U.S. 96, 103–105 (1957); *Pugach* v. *Dollinger*, 365 U.S. 458, 459 (1961)).

In attempting to proscribe the use by both State as well as Federal officers of the second and third classes of nonelectronic eavesdropping devices, a more significant constitutional difficulty would be encountered. To the extent, however, that Federal or State officers enter private property by stealth for purposes of planting and later removing nonelectronic devices, legislation to correct such practices would not appear to be urgently required; for relevant Supreme Court precedents contain an unmistakable intimation that such modes of intrusion are violative of the constitutional guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures and that incriminating evidence thereby obtained may be excluded in subsequent Federal or State prosecutions founded theron (*Irvine* v. *California*, 347 U.S. 128 (1954); *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961); *Silverman* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 505 (1961)).

As previously noted, it is clearly within the competence of Congress to enact self-denying legislation whereby Federal law enforcement officers are instructed to desist from further utilization of nonelectronic detection devices notwithstanding that the employment thereof, according to the Supreme Court, entails no violation of the searches and seizures guarantee of amendment four.

Included among devices of this type previously approved by the Court are: (1) an acoustical device, a detectophone, "having a receiver so delicate" that "when placed against a partition wall" of an office to which Federal officers legally had gained access, it was capable of picking up and amplifying sound waves originating in an adjoining office occupied by the parties under surveillance (*Goldman* v. *United States*, 316 U.S. 129, 131–132, 135 (1942); and (2) a pocket wire recorder (Minifon) concealed on the person of a Federal officer whereby he was enabled to record and later corroborate a conversation with a tax evader in the course of which a bribe was offered (*Lopez* v. *United States*, 373 U.S. 427, 437–439, 441 (1963)).

In the first holding one Justice dissented and two other Justices expressed a considerable measure of sympathy for his views; whereas in the second, three Justices dissented with another indicating a considerably milder degree of appreciation of their views.

These dissents have been noted in the belief that they afford a basis, however slight, upon which to found a prediction that in the event that Congress were to extend the application of this self-denying measure to include State and local law enforcement officers, the Court would respect the judgment of a coordinate branch of the National Government and uphold this extension. Sought to be conveyed by the latter assertion is the postulate that Congress is competent to enact legislation implementing the fourth amendment guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures, now applicable to State and local officers by virtue of its incorporation into the due process clause of amendment 14; and, accordingly, by its own reappraisal of the last mentioned detection devices, to proscribe future use thereof by State and local officers as violative of said guarantee.

Manifestly, if the Court were to prove unwilling to concede that Congress, by legislative fiat, can redefine as unlawful means of surveillance heretofore judicially sustained as permissible, such extension of the coverage of this legislation would prove abortive.

Since the prohibitions of amendment 4 and the due process clause of amendment 14 impose limitations only upon the conduct of public officers, Congress is not vested with any power deducible therefrom such as would support adoption of a blanket ban against continued employment by private citizens of the nonelectronic detection devices. (*Burdeau* v. *McDowell*, 256 U.S. 465, 475 (1921).)

Commentators, however, entertain the opinion that utilization of these instruments for purposes of industrial espionage by entrepreneurs engaged in interstate commerce constitutes an unfair competitive practice such as will presently support a private right of action for damages under the antitrust laws (15 U.S.C. 15). If this be the case, Congress would be empowered to supplement this civil right of action by an amendment of the antitrust laws converting such use into a criminal violation thereof.

SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my very able colleague, Congressman BOB KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin, in sponsoring the designation of the second week in May as "National School Safety Patrol Week." We have become used to seeing these youngsters alert to the dangers of passing traffic protecting their fellow students.

It is time we stop and think for a moment about the really magnificent job this program is doing. May 14, the Capital City will be hosting over 30,000 boys and girls for the National School Safety Patrol Parade. At this time, gold lifesaver medals will be presented to patrol members who have actually saved a school child's life. It is only appropriate that we set the week leading up to this event as one in honor of all the patrol members and those who sponsor their activities.

There are over 900,000 patrol members in 40,000 schools in the United States alone and an additional 156,000 in 20 foreign countries. They serve 19 million other children. The idea of a school safety patrol was first conceived around 1916 and an early promotion was given by the Chicago Motor Club. The program today thrives on the active cooperation of school authorities, police officials and local motor clubs affiliated with the American Automobile Association. The familiar belts, badges and raincoats as well as the manuals used by patrol members are generally provided by the AAA clubs.

The duties of the patrol are to guide and protect children at school crossings. The success of the program is clearly evident in one look at the traffic fatality statistics. Since 1922, the traffic death rate of schoolchildren has been cut almost in half while the traffic death rate of other age groups has doubled. Deserving of every honor and recognition are these conscientious youngsters and for this reason I am introducing a joint resolution to establish the week of May 8 to May 14, 1966, as National School Safety Patrol Week.

SUSQUEHANNA STUDY WILL HELP SOLVE NORTHEAST WATER PROBLEMS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, our water problems are much in the news. Problems of too much water and too little water. Problems of water quality. The need to work quickly toward solution of these problems is especially apparent in the rapidly urbanizing Northeast.

Among the many active programs in this field, the Susquehanna River basin study is an activity of special interest and pride for me. This study, being carried out cooperatively by a number of Federal and State agencies, seeks to find ways to bring about orderly development of water and related land resources in the 27,500-square-mile river basin that covers parts of Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland. Objective of the study is to meet water needs of the basin for the next 50 years. I am proud to have been a sponsor of the original resolution to begin this study.

This study is expected to be completed in 1969. Recommendations of the study group will be of great benefit toward lessening flood dangers and water pollution, providing better agricultural and municipal water supplies, increasing outdoor recreation opportunities, and improving the land across which our water moves.

The USDA Soil Conservation Service already has completed field studies in 89 tributaries of the basin, working with local people to determine water needs and problems. The information that SCS and other agencies are gathering about basin resources will be useful to many organizations involved in resource planning—especially to local planning boards and commissions and to the many soil and water conservation districts.

I am impressed by the excellent resource improvements already being made by Pennsylvania's conservation districts with the technical help of the Soil Conservation Service. More than 24,000 landowners in the basin area already have adopted conservation plans through these districts, and have applied many measures to improve the use and protection of land, the management of water, and habitat for wildlife. These conservation measures will do much to store more of the rainfall in the soil, reduce stream siltation, and improve agriculture in the basin.

The Susquehanna River basin study has been unique in respect to the number of people who have become interested and concerned about the programs that will result from the study. The broad public interest that has been generated in the study has been a worthwhile achievement.

I commend the untiring efforts of all persons and agencies involved in planning orderly use and development of land and water resources along the Susquehanna.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, nearly half a century ago, President Woodrow Wilson wrote:

> Every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live.

Unfortunately, this basic right has yet to be exercised in those many nations held captive behind the Iron Curtain. A most striking example is Byelorussia, whose people have for centuries been subjected to a variety of purges and regimes designed to eliminate both their existence and national consciousness.

Tomorrow we commemorate that one brief moment in 1918 when the Byelorussian National Council declared independence. The Byelorussian people were at long last to determine their own and separate destiny. For the few remaining months of 1918 these brave people were able to live under the sovereignty of their choice.

Then, as fate decreed for many of her sister nations, Byelorussia was ruthlessly crushed by the first of the Red Army. Sporadic rebellion continued for years, showing an immense bravery in the face of overwhelming armed might. The Soviet Government met this opposition with increased force and the attempt to wipe the memory of freedom from the minds of the people of Byelorussia was intensified.

We may take justifiable pride in the fact that American Presidents have always vigorously advocated the cause of self-determination. I am particularly proud that President Wilson, a fellow New Jerseyan, is remembered as a leading expounder of freedom of choice. But today we have a new source of pride. President Johnson by his policies in South Vietnam is again coming to the aid of self-determination. And again, I might add, in the face of overt Communist aggression.

I think today we should reaffirm our basic commitment to the protection of any nation threatened with an abrogation of its right to self-determination. Today in Byelorussia we can see the results of this denial. Self-determination is a right—a basic and human right—which all civilized nations should recognize. Yet, some still refuse.

It will be impossible for any dictatorship to forever suppress this right to freedom. We have learned from history that despite the most brutal programs of extermination, the desire for independence cannot be eliminated. The will remains, waiting for a propitious moment to reappear.

I join my colleagues today in reminding the Soviet leaders of this fact, and in expressing the hope that the time when the Byelorussian people shall be able to express and exercise this right will not be long in coming. The Byelorussian people have not forgotten, and we ourselves and other free nations have similarly not forgotten. I look forward to the day when Byelorussia and all nations once again become independent and able to exercise the sovereignty which all American Presidents from Woodrow Wilson through Lyndon Johnson have so ably defended.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we join with our good friends and allies in Greece to celebrate the 145th anniversary of Greek independence.

On March 25, 1821, the Greek nation broke from 4 centuries of Ottoman oppression. As in the case of our revolution, many world leaders were skeptical of the chances for Greek independence. Thomas Jefferson wrote worriedly to John Adams, "and what of the poor Greeks, and their small chance of amelioration."

Adams replied:

> My old imagination is kindling into a kind of missionary enthusiasm for the cause of the Greeks.

The Greek nation has stood since 1821 as a bulwark of freedom and independence. But the threats to this independence have been many and grave.

The fierce efforts of the Greek Army against the numerically superior forces of the Nazis and Italian Fascists in World War II have become legendary.

In 1945 a new threat faced war-torn Greece. Communist guerrillas, not unlike those now facing us in South Vietnam, attempted to subvert Greece. With the help of American aid, the Greek people defeated the Communists and once again proved their dedication to freedom.

President Johnson has said:

> We in America know that the people of Greece yield to no other peoples of the world in their devotion to freedom and independence, and in their desire to keep the peace won and maintained by such great sacrifice from freemen in our times.

I think these words are especially applicable on this anniversary of Greek independence, I ask my colleagues to join with me and with the American people in renewing our respect and friendship for Greece and the Greek people, and our common dedication to world peace and freedom.

THE EXEMPLARY REHABILITATION CERTIFICATE

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to correct one of the most inequitable procedures existent in our present body of laws. I refer to the concept of other than honorable discharges which remain with a man throughout his life. My bill would establish a review board within each of the services, composed of civilians, which at its discretion could exonerate a man of the stigma of a dishonorable discharge and issue to him an exemplary rehabilitation certificate.

Today there are so many things that can remain to plague a man throughout his life, to hold him back, to stifle initiative, to prevent him from fulfilling a useful and valuable role in our society: A police record, a bankruptcy proceeding, perhaps unfavorable results of a personality test, a bad credit rating, and manifold others. These become in the words of Samuel Taylor Coleridge:

> The albatross about my neck was hung.

Many of these mistakes are the products of youth. They result from immaturity. They stem from mistakes, that upon sober reflection in later years many wonder how they could have ever done such a thing. But regardless of regret and shame the record follows.

I feel that the feelings of mercy, compassion, and clemency should never be allowed to depart from even the most seemingly impersonal agency. I have always felt that America is guided by the Judaic-Christian heritage of forgiving a man his past mistakes. But in too many cases an other than honorable discharge denies another chance.

Time and again I have come in contact with people who received bad conduct discharges, for example in World War I, and they have been haunted by this specter throughout their lives. Many times this lifetime punishment results from a relatively minor offense.

I do not advocate giving an exemplary rehabilitation certificate lightly. It must be won by a definite showing of reform and rehabilitation.

I am sure that most of my colleagues have received letters from young men in their prime of life who are faced with the ignominy of struggling through life with a dishonorable discharge. They are faced with perhaps taking a second choice job, the suspicion of neighbors, and the humiliation of their wives and children. A great many of these people are truly sorry for any misdeeds.

In determining whether to issue an exemplary rehabilitation certificate the Board shall take into consideration:

First. The conditions prevailing at the time of the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to the discharge or dismissal.

Second. The age of the person at the time of discharge.

Third. The normal punishment that might have been adjudged had the incident or act occurred in civilian life.

Fourth. The moral turpitude, if any, involved.

In applying for a certificate, a person must include written evidence from the chief law-enforcement official in the town or city in which he is living, statements from employers, and statements from five persons who have known him for 5 years attesting to his good reputation and any other material that might be of help to the Board in making its final decision.

These certificates may not be awarded until at least 3 years have elapsed since the discharge.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress must always be ready to justify any hardship or restriction placed on any member of our constituency by the Federal Government. I think that in the instance of other than honorable discharges and their permanency we must act to lessen the consequences of the end result. We must insure that this great Nation never strays from the concept of being "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION AIDING GI'S

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 9 months the Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Domestic Finance has been conducting an investigation of loan sharking and sharp-practice finance companies who have preyed upon our young servicemen. The subcommittee's persistent and far-reaching investigation revealed shocking loan shark operations on our military personnel, both here and overseas, and has, in my opinion, done more to expose the plight of the credit problems of our servicemen than any other investigation ever conducted in this area.

One of the hardest working members of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee is the gentleman from New Jersey, JOSEPH MINISH. JOE MINISH headed a special investigation to Europe this past fall and performed yeoman service in revealing the terrible credit situations facing our servicemen at our large military installations in Europe. The subcommittee's previous hearings on the credit problems of our servicemen in the States was fully supplemented by Mr. MINISH's valuable work in Europe.

An editorial praising our committee's fine work and the vigorous investigative work of the gentleman from New Jersey has come to my attention and I commend it to the Members' attention:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star Ledger, Mar. 19, 1966]

A BREAK FOR THE GI's

A system of credit unions for overseas troops will do much to break up a loan shark racket and ease harassment by sharp-practice finance companies.

Numerous instances of American servicemen being exploited by loan sharks and dubious lending companies were turned up in an investigation by a House subcommittee headed by Representative JOSEPH MINISH, Democrat, 11th.

The gouging of servicemen had been going on for years and had created morale problems among American personnel. Loan sharks were doing a big business, estimated at $50 million; interest rates ranged up to 70 percent and in many instances were pegged on the full amount of the loan, regardless of the balance.

Finance companies abroad also were guilty of dubious practices, Representative MINISH said. When military authorities were apprised of the facts in some specific cases, the loan companies backed off; but there were other cases where these transactions never came to their attention.

The creation of credit unions by the Defense Department, an action growing directly out of the investigation made by the Minish committee, should wipe out the loan shark racket and ease dependence of American troops on foreign loan companies.

In a directive setting up credit unions, the Defense Department has made it clear that nothing should be done to discourage servicemen from using these facilities. Military commanders are put on notice that nothing must be done to restrict the activities and the scope of the sanctioned credit unions.

The success of the new credit system will depend in large measure on the servicemen themselves and the cooperation of their officers. The facilities are there to be used; they should be far more preferable than being in the grasping hands of loan sharks or dubious finance companies that charge usurious rates. The Minish committee has performed a commendable service, translating the findings of its probe into a program that has the potential and the promise of wiping out a reprehensible loan shark racket that had shaken the morale of American oversea forces.

TWO MAJOR CREDIT UNION STATES SUPPORT CHECKING ACCOUNT BILL

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for far too long commercial banks have had an exclusive in allowing customers checking account services. No matter how shoddily and poorly they have performed this service, they still have the right under law as the only financial institution to offer checking account services.

It is well known that when a business or an individual is given the power to perform something that no one else is allowed to perform the lack of competition leads to a stagnation of the sole supplier.

In order to provide stimulation of competition in the checking account field which can only lead to far better services for customers who are now bank captives, I introduced legislation—H.R. 8199—which would allow Federal credit unions and Federal savings and loan associations to afford checking account services to their patrons by accepting demand deposits on a 100-percent reserve basis.

I am happy to report that two of the largest State credit union leagues—California and Pennsylvania—have endorsed this legislation. In California there are alone 1,700 credit unions, nearly 2 million members, and savings of more than $1 billion. Passage of H.R. 8199 would mean in California alone that some 2 million people would have a choice of checking account services and would not be required to deal solely with a commercial bank.

I sincerely urge my colleagues to support H.R. 8199 so that competition can be injected into a stagnated field of commercial banking.

TO ESTABLISH A ST. CROIX NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, today, a bill to establish the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway. The St. Croix River rises near Lake Superior and flows south through Riverside, Wis., where, for the remaining 100 of its 165 miles, it forms the Minnesota-Wisconsin boundary until its junction with the turbid Mississippi at Prescott, Wis. The purpose of this bill is to preserve portions of the St. Croix River and its Namekagon tributary in Wisconsin as a wild river in a primitive condition.

The St. Croix is one of the last clean rivers near a major population center. Not far from the Minneapolis-St. Paul complex, this is an area that abounds with great natural beauty and is said to be the most popular boating water between Lake Michigan and the west coast. This wilderness area provides the kind of recreation most needed by the increasingly large numbers who now seek out the wilderness. Such an area affords a background for the kind of outdoor recreation for which conveniences and accommodations are provided—the frontier where those who do not wish to experience the rigors of wilderness living and travel may still know in some degree the tonic benefits of its wilderness.

One of the first Americans to sense the values of wilderness as wilderness and the possibility of its preservation in the public interest was Henry David Thoreau. "In wildness," he wrote, "is the preservation of the World." In his classic "Walden," Thoreau went on to exclaim in a rhapsody of understanding:

> We need the tonic of wildness—to wade sometimes in marshes where the bittern and the meadow-hen lurk, and hear the booming of the snipe; to smell the whispering sedge where only some wilder and more solitary fowl builds her nest, and the mink crawls with its belly close to the ground. At the same time that we are earnest to explore and learn all things, we require that all things be mysterious and unexplorable, that land and sea be infinitely wild, unsurveyed and unfathomable. We can never have enough of nature. We must be refreshed by the sight of inexhaustible vigor, vast and titanic features, the seacoast with its wrecks, the wilderness with its living and decaying trees, the thundercloud, and the rain which lasts three weeks and produces freshets. We need to witness our own limits transgressed, and some life pasturing freely where we never wander.

All too often, however, the battle to preserve such natural areas for their scenic values are lost. In the name of economic development and industrialization, much of our Nation's beauty and seemingly endless resources has been systematically destroyed. Our great rivers have fallen prey to industrial wastes and half-treated sewage. As Senator NELSON, of Wisconsin, so profoundly pointed out:

> Call the roll of the great American rivers of the past, and you will have a list of the pollution problems of today—the Androscoggin in Maine; the Connecticut, that boundary water between the Green Mountain and the Granite States; the mighty Hudson, the thermally polluted Delaware; the Ohio; the Mississippi; and Missouri.

The St. Croix must not endure such a fate.

Industrialism, however, accompanied by its companion, pollution, is now threatening the St. Croix. Pollution's damaging effects are well known. Outdoor recreation suffers. Beaches have been closed to swimmers because of health hazards. Boating not only loses its esthetic appeal when waters are loaded with pollution; it becomes actually dangerous. The joys of waterside picnicking and camping are destroyed. Sport fishing produces few pleasures and fewer fish. Substantial economic loss is suffered by the recreation industry, which is an important source of income in many States.

The location of the St. Croix and its tributaries confers untold advantages on the people living in nearby St. Paul and Minneapolis. The river, with its waterfalls, lakes, swamps, broken in spots by islands and sloughs, heavily forested with pine and hardwood, colorfully decorated with plants, features a wilderness park that attracts many people. Virtually all traces of the lumbering industry, which flourished in the river in the late 19th century, have disappeared; the valley has remained a quiet wooded area, the last such unspoiled valley so near a major metropolitan area. This gift of nature, molded by the forces of time and weather, offers to each of its visitors the chance to pursue his own personal outdoor pleasure.

This exceptional river achieved national recognition when a Federal Wild Rivers study team recommended that it, along with its tributary, the Namekagon, be preserved in their natural, free-flowing condition as two of only a dozen such waterways in the United States.

Today, there is no other large river so near a major metropolitan area in the United States that can offer so much to so many, the special qualities of infinite variety, pristine, clear water, and unspoiled beauty. At present, no industry pollutes its water. The St. Croix, one of the last great clean rivers, is worth saving for the future.

OMINOUS DEVELOPMENTS IN GERMANY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, this week the press has reported two ominous developments in West Germany which I feel must be viewed with alarm.

The news that the Bonn Government proposes to sell steel mills to Communist China is indeed frightening. It certainly seems that the construction of such plants will assist Communist China in its militarily aggressive endeavors. This could very well serve to stiffen Peking's antagonistic attitude toward the United States, especially at a time when we are deeply committed to halt aggression in Vietnam and other areas of the world. I share Secretary Rusk's misgivings regarding this proposal and feel it is in the interest of the entire free world that West Germany be persuaded not to go through with this deal.

Every right thinking person must also view with alarm the reported rise of a neo-Fascist organization in West Germany called the "National Democratic Party of Germany." I am sure it is not necessary for me to allude to a matter of history—the rise of Hitler and the lack of concern regarding the Nazis until it was too late. I hope we will not make this same mistake again.

These two developments appear to be more than coincidental, therefore, I have written to Secretary Rusk commending him for his expression of doubt of the wisdom of Germany selling steel mills to the Chinese Reds and requesting that he advise the Bonn Government that the United States deplores the apparent rebirth of fascism in West Germany with its accompanying inhumanity, hate and wars of aggression. I suggested that the Bonn officials be told in no uncertain terms that, should the Nazis again attempt to gain power, the United States would not hesitate to take such steps as may be necessary to insure that the world will not again be engulfed in a total war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the Baltimore Sun which describes the recent development of the National Democratic Party of Germany and I urge my colleagues to weigh these events carefully in the light of history.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 20, 1966]

New Group Stirs Alarm in Bonn—Probe of Neo-Fascist Election Victories Urged

(By Stuart S. Smith)

Bonn, March 19.—Shocked officials here are demanding an investigation of the election victories of a new neo-Fascist organization called the National Democratic Party of Germany.

Careful attention and stern measures are needed to counter the sudden development of this radical rightist movement in the Federal Republic, several Bundestag delegates warned.

The alarm was caused by the Nationalists' unexpected success in last Sunday's local elections in the Franconian part of Bavaria.

According to the final results, which have just been published, Nationalist Party candidates won 1.6 percent of the total vote cast in Bavaria.

FOUNDED LAST YEAR

While this modest showing attracted little comment, the party, which was founded late last year, captured several city council seats in north Bavaria and elected buergermeisters in a number of Franconian villages.

In Passau, Coburg, Erlangen, Kulmbach, Ansbach, and Nuernberg the party won between 8 and 10 percent of the votes.

In Bayreuth three Nationalists were named to the 44-member council and the organization received 10.6 percent of the ballots.

One of the three Nationalist winners was the local party leader, Aold Wolf, who was an infantry general in the Reich Wehrmacht.

EARLY CENTERS OF NAZI SUPPORT

Franconia as a whole and Bayreuth in particular were early centers of Nazi support.

Adolf Hitler frequently visited Beyreuth, a city of some 60,000 inhabitants, to visit Richard Wagner's family and to attend opera festivals of his works.

The day before last week's elections a thousand National Democratic activists marched through Nuernberg and beat up some young counterdemonstrators.

The scene reminded one responsible West German newspaper of Nazi storm troopers in their prewar heyday.

In the south Bavarian town of Tegernsee—population 5,000—a National Democrat named Franz Florian Winter was elected to the city council.

During the September Bundestag election campaign, Winter went to the Landesberg prison, where Hitler wrote "Mein Kampf," and laid a wreath in the prison cemetery beside the graves of the Nazi criminals who were hanged there at the end of World War II.

The National Democrats campaigned for the local elections on a platform devoted to rebutting "the so-called war guilt lie."

The party stands for German neutrality, the withdrawal of American and Russian troops and the expulsion of West Germany's foreign workers, who are mostly from southeast Europe.

The party's racist sentiments are pronounced but couched in language carefully enough worded to avoid prosecution under the Federal Republic's statutes barring hate propaganda.

One commentator pointed out, however, that their views do not basically differ with those of arch anti-Semetic Julius Streicher, the Nazi ruler of Nuremberg.

Another aspect of the elections which has attracted attention is the large number of West German soldiers who ran for public office.

Altogether, 13 officers and 20 noncommissioned officers won seats, including Ulrich Horna, a 40-year-old Bundeswehr captain, who was elected to the council in Roth, a small town near Nuremberg.

A Defense Ministry spokesman commented that Horna, a staff officer at the Luftwaffe training regiment in Roth, ran as the candidate of a legal party in a democratic country.

Although the center of National Democratic support is in Bavaria, the party has supporters throughout the nation.

An investigation of the radical right movement in Berlin revealed that one-half of the party's executive committee consisted of former Nazi Party members.

Leaders of West Germany's three large Democratic parties expressed concern at the situation, particularly as the National Democrats packed Bayreuth's biggest meeting halls during the campaign.

Fritz Erler, Social Democratic floor leader in the Bundestag, said that the nationalists "remarkable" showing means that parliamentary parties will have to be on the alert.

It is necessary to prevent the nationalists from gathering in all the country's dissidents, he said, and the party's leaders should be investigated.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we can all afford to pause in the midst of these turbulent times to give thought to the significance of an anniversary which the Greeks and those of Greek lineage will celebrate everywhere. Tomorrow, which marks the 145th anniversary of Greek national independence is of far more than just passing interest to Americans. It commemorates the successful culmination of American efforts to help Greece overthrow the cruel rule of the Ottoman Empire. It goes even further in commemorating a date upon which Americans and Greeks firmly cemented bonds of friendship which have survived almost a century and a half of testing.

All Americans appreciate the heritage from the ancient Greeks which we enjoy today. Not one American can fail to be grateful for the priceless gifts of art, sculpture, architecture, drama, music, literature, and science which have enriched our culture and enjoyment of life.

Unfortunately not enough Americans realize the magnitude of our debts to the Greeks for our very type of government—our democratic process. Few Americans are aware of the constant support which Greeks as individuals and as a nation have given us in our struggle to preserve our form of government when its existence has been threatened. Yet all Americans are conscious of a strong bond of friendship and understanding which has long existed between the peoples of our two nations. These bonds have been so strong that the Greeks have allied themselves with us in defeating the Nazis and Fascists; and more recently in containing the threat of communism and the preservation of world peace.

Mr. Speaker, it was only natural that liberty-loving Greek patriots looked upon the young America with admiration and were filled with the hope that they too could throw off the irons of enslavement by a foreign power. It was just as natural that when these fervid patriots from all parts of Greece, from the rugged mountains and the sea—farflung ports, from the myriad of islands and from the noble cities united in their struggle for independence they would have the active support of this Nation and its people.

We can take pride in the great tribute paid this country when the fledgling Greek Senate in one of its first official acts in 1821 sent the following dramatic message to the American people:

> Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode. Though separated from us by mighty oceans your character brings you near.

America's response not only included financial and material help along with strong moral and political backing but many Americans went to Greece and fought alongside the Greek patriots.

It was a long and bitter struggle lasting 6 painful years. Perhaps it was because of its long duration and the suffering which ensued that its end was so dramatic when Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of freedom over the monastery of Kalavrita in 1827.

This was indeed a memorable occasion for it summoned forth the recognition of Greece as a sovereign nation by the then great powers, Great Britain, France, and Russia. It marked the culmination of centuries of futile struggles against foreign domination. With the signing of the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829 and the London Protocol of 1830, Greece could then begin a full century devoted to the establishment of a stable government for all men of Greek heritage.

It began a century and a half of friendship and mutual understanding between ourselves and the Greek people. It marked the beginning of a close alliance of our governments in both war and peace.

We are proud of our Greek ally in NATO. We are grateful for Greek support of our costly and painful efforts to preserve world peace.

We are grateful for the heritage of our Hellenic culture which so greatly influenced our Founding Fathers. We are justifiably proud that our country maintains the same ideals and follows the same precepts advocated by the illustrious scholars and statesmen of ancient Greece 2000 years ago. And tomorrow we can take sincere pride in joining with our loyal Greek-American citizens and the fine people of Greece in commemorating this meaningful anniversary of Greek national independence.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Kupferman, for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Goodell (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rooney of New York (at the request of Mr. Kee), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Duncan of Oregon.

Mr. Fisher and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Dulski.
Mr. Carey.
Mr. Daddario.
Mr. Buchanan.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Morse.
Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Fino.
Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Hosmer.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Kee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Donohue in two instances.
Mr. Rooney of New York.
Mr. Annunzio.
Mr. Dyal.
Mr. Corman.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia.
Mr. Nedzi.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12762. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; and

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 28, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2229. A letter from the Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Railroad Retirement Board for "Limitation on salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriations, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2230. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of Vernon M. Nichols against the United States, pursuant to the provisions of 43 Stat. 413, 31 U.S.C. 236; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2231. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a request for the withdrawal and return of a certain case involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on the American Research Hospital for Children in Krakow, Poland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee of conference. Conference Report on H.R. 6845, an act, to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1347). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2729. An act to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 13980. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 13981. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 13982. A bill to amend the act of August 14, 1964, to authorize payment of any amounts authorized under the act to the heirs or devisees of persons who would have been eligible for payments under the authority of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 13983. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13984. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13985. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through September 30, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 13986. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13987. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13988. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide that, in calculating the income of a tenant of low-rent public housing for purposes of determining his eligibility for continued occupancy or his liability to pay increased rent, certain pension or annuity increases shall be disregarded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 13989. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13990. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13991. A bill to guarantee equal justice under law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 13992. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 13993. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 13994. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 13995. A bill to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, lumber manufacturers, and others against false grade marking of lumber, to promote interstate commerce in lumber, to strengthen the standards program of the lumber industry, and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 13996. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13997. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit the maximum rate of percentage depletion to a rate of 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13998. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that nationals of the United States and citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be enlisted in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 13999. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 14000. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish REA electrification and telephone loan accounts and Federal banks for rural electric and rural telephone systems to provide supplemental financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 14001. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fahkahatchee Strand, Collier County, Fla., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 14002. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 14003. A bill to repeal section 1106 (c) of the Social Security Act so as to permit the disclosure of information concerning the location of deserting parents, to State and local welfare agencies, in the same manner and to the same extent as such disclosure was permitted under the law and regulations in effect prior to such section's enactment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 14004. A bill to permit all patients currently using the drug Krebiozen to purchase same in Illinois for use in any State until a clinical test on cancer patients is completed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 14005. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran's having served in World War I, the beneficiary shall if otherwise eligible have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provisions of title 38 as in effect on June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14006. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 14007. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to prevent the discontinuance of certain commuter operations which could benefit from new governmental programs for the improvement of commuter services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 981. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.J. Res. 982. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

428. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to restoration of funds requested for general agricultural research in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

429. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the enactment of legislation to assist native-operated enterprises; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

430. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to experimental plants for manufacturing fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

431. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia transmitting a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 adopted March 8, 1966, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 14008. A bill for the relief of J. Carlton Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 14009. A bill for the relief of Aurelia Tambuatco Deacosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 14010. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under authority of the act of Congress approved August 1, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14011. A bill for the relief of Sarwan Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

354. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Chan Do Park, Tongdaemun-ku, Seoul, Korea, relative to claim for injury in Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

355. Also, petition of Ralph Boryszewski, 67 Northampton Street, Rochester, N.Y., relative to appointment of a House Committee on Impeachments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

356. Also, petition of American Historical Association, Washington, D.C., relative to proposed changes in the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Federal Assistance Spurs Expanded Local Action in Resource Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's land and water resources offer abundant economic opportunities if properly developed. Recognition of this has been reflected in much of the conservation legislation passed by the Congress in this decade.

Resource development in my congressional district in Oregon is a good example. The Upper Willamette resource conservation and development project is one of the first 20 such projects to be carried out as a result of legislation in 1962.

The Oregon project covers 3 million acres in four counties. It has opened many avenues for communities in the area to develop unexplored potentials of their land and water resources. The products of land-use adjustments, forest land improvement, and changes in cropping patterns will lead to the need for new manufacturing and processing enterprises. Expansion of recreation facilities, development of agricultural and municipal water supply, enhancement of wildlife, and protection of the area from crippling and costly floods will improve economic opportunities.

I have been close to this project as the local people have planned it. I have visited the area and talked to the local people. Their interest has been beyond expectation. The project has brought public and private agencies and local people together for a common purpose, and they have each contributed to planning the project. They now look forward to making the plans a reality, with each doing his part.

Stimulated by the enthusiasm of working out the plan, local people have already started many projects that require no Federal cost sharing and some that require only a small amount of technical help. I understand that the other 19 resource conservation and development projects have created this same kind of enthusiasm, with people going ahead on their own before the program actually got underway. Just the act of getting together and bringing out the potentials of the area has given them new life and new hope.

The concentration of conservation and development activities of all the public and private agencies and the local people has promoted closer working relationships among them. It has also served to inform communities of what assistance is available and how programs of the various levels of government fit together.

I believe this group approach is an especially effective tool to resource development. It enables local people, by their own initiative, to make full use of their resources. It gives support to the concept that local people should be the mainstay of such an undertaking.

The Upper Willamette project is sponsored by six of the local soil conservation districts, which are locally formed and managed units of State government. It is an endeavor in which towns and cities and rural people are participating. When completed, the area expects a $15-million-a-year increase in their economy, with more than 200 new businesses in the area.

The door has been opened. These people are showing what can be done with a little help. They have my support.

Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, we mark the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. It is significant that so many Members of this body should commemorate a holiday which might seem to some to have very little to do with the United States.

However, in its way, March 25, 1918, is as important a date as any that we celebrate in this country, for that day so many years ago the people of Byelorussia declared their independence and established a Republic separate and apart from the Bolsheviks who had seized control of czarist Russia. For but a few short months, the Republic of Byelorussia prospered and then the Red army swept across its plains and forests and communism clamped its iron hand on the people.

To this day, communism rules Byelorussia and to this day the people of Byelorussia refuse to submit, insisting that some day, one day, they shall be free again. March 25, 1918, is a symbol, then, of man's indomitable spirt and thirst for freedom. I salute the spirit and symbol of the people of Byelorussia and join with my colleagues in assuring them that their example is a shining example in a world too often dulled by compromise and accommodation with the enemy.

Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 27 through April 2, 1966, has been designated National FHA Week as a tribute to the Future Homemakers of America. This is a national youth organization of more than 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses with local chapters in every State, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The Future Homemakers of America was founded in 1945 as an incorporated, nonprofit organization, supported by membership dues. It was the outgrowth of various State and local clubs of high school economics students which were known by different names and had no unified program. By the end of that first year the national organization had a membership of just under 100,000 in some 2,500 chapters. By the end of the second year, membership had almost doubled, and now as the Future Homemakers of America begin their 21st year they count well over 600,000 members in more than 11,000 chapters. It is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association.

In this age of constant change and challenge, in this era of too much disregard for tradition and precedent, in this environment of population explosion and increased pressures, the need for new patterns in home life is widely accepted. These young people who are in the Future Homemakers of America are serious-minded, community-spirited, fun-loving youngsters who are concerned about the responsibilities of the future and are conscientiously doing something about it. These are the future mothers, wives, teachers, jobholders, voters, and opinion molders of this great land of ours.

National FHA Week finds the 11,000 local chapters spotlighting activities and projects concerned with a 4-year national program of work. Its objectives are to help each member recognize her abilities, strive for their full development, and participate actively in family, community, and world improvement projects.

To further these objectives the elected youth officers of FHA developed nine projects which stress individual development; emphasize mental and physical health; encourage serious consideration in choosing and training for useful careers; develop codes of ethics, morals, and manners; further understanding of people of all heritages, customs, and beliefs; promote appreciation of all family members and their abilities and problems; teach selective spending; inculcate citizenship responsibilities; and encourage using leisure time for activities beneficial to the individual and society.

In these times when so much publicity is given to juvenile delinquents, beatniks, and draft-card burners, all of whom are really a small minority of today's youth, it is good to pay tribute to the Future Homemakers of America who are seriously preparing themselves to be good citizens.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, a most persistent theme of Soviet propaganda has been that in the Soviet Union racial and ethnic groups enjoy perfect freedom to pursue and develop their distinct national cultures within the framework of the Soviet system. This clever move had deceived millions of people, but all well-informed people of the free world know that it is a hoax, a mere sham. We know that what the Soviets do is almost the opposite of what they say in this as in many other respects. Not only are the nationality groups within the Soviet Union denied the freedom to follow their own national cultural, artistic, and educational development, but this is also forbidden even in the allegedly sovereign Soviet satellite countries. The leaders in these countries do not even contemplate, for fear of brutal reprisals by their masters in the Kremlin, doing anything that would arouse the wrath of their Communist overlords.

The story of the Byelorussians is a case in point. These gifted and genial people, today numbering more than 10 million, have had their ups and downs in their turbulent history. In modern times theirs has been a sad and tragic lot. After enjoying relative peace and prosperity through the Middle Ages and in early modern times, their country was overrun by the Russians in the 17th century and it became part of the Russian empire. For centuries they strove to maintain their distinct national traits and national traditions. They kept alive their sentiment of nationality, and the spirit of freedom they never allowed to shrivel. And in the First World War, when the Russian empire was crushed in the Revolutions of 1917, these people saw their chance to free themselves and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918.

That memorable event took place 48 years ago. Since then untold numbers of catastrophic events have overtaken the Byelorussians, but these events have no extinguished their long-cherished spirit of national independence and freedom. Their independence lasted for about 2 years; and soon Communist Russians put an end to that, making Byelorussia a part of the Communist Soviet Union. There the Soviets imposed their rigid and inflexible tyranny, and turned the country into a large prison house. Amid all the misery and suffering prevailing there for more than four decades, it is encouraging to know that the Byelorussians still cherish their national goal, their freedom, and independence. On the 48th anniversary of their independence we ardently hope that some day and soon they will cast off their Communist yoke and regain their freedom.

A Small Business Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today when we are so concerned over the difficulties of many small enterprises who must compete with huge business complexes, I feel that the story of one company in my constituency might well serve as an inspiration to men whose financial resources are modest but whose dreams, ambitions, and human resources are great.

Less than 5 years ago two residents of my district, Walter Rein and Edward Gross, joined to form a new company. They named it Twinco Products, and in 1962 in a 4,000-square-foot San Fernando, Calif., factory with two sewing machines, these two men embarked in one of the most competitive businesses in the Nation: the manufacturing of ironing board covers.

In 2 years, this fledgling company, because of the high standards it set for itself, the quality of its products, an adherence to giving value that would be recognized by the consumer, and service welcomed by its distributors, its merchandising acumen, its bold marketing programs, and its flair for communications, became known in its industry as the company to watch.

Expansion followed expansion. The 4,000-square-foot plant grew to 6,000 square feet, then 7,000 square feet. Other products were added to its lines and then there was an expansion to a 20,000-square-foot plant.

Brains were as important to Twinco as products, and 2 years ago, Mr. Ernest Anderson, another resident of my district, sensing the bright future of the company, left his post as one of the top executives of a large corporation to become executive vice president of the housewares manufacturer.

Soon there was another step forward. Twinco moved into its own 50,000-square-foot building, one of the most modern automated production plants in southern California.

While this company was experiencing its rapid growth, with all the heavy duties and work that this entails, its executives still had time for community activities and concern.

All of them are extremely active in civic organizations. And it is this concern for the people of San Fernando, where their success is rooted, that brings us to this moment.

For some time now there has been an unemployment problem with the women of the community, as well as the men.

To create work was a real necessity. And Twinco put its mind to it. It is my pleasure to announce that on March 25, Twinco Products received its initial contract for manufacturing trousers for the armed services—a contract that will bring approximately $500,000 to the San Fernando area.

It is the first supply contract ever issued in the city of San Fernando, a city that most desperately needed it.

Over 100 people, many of them now unemployed will be immediately added to Twinco's working force with an estimated 200 more in the next few months.

For some time I have urged businessmen in my district to compete for Defense Supply Agency contracts. These cooperative efforts have been successful. The resulting contribution to the economy of the San Fernando Valley once again demonstrates the value of the small businessman to our free enterprise society.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, March 25 is the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of the Byelorussian National Republic in Minsk.

After centuries of foreign domination, and unsuccessful attempts to revolt in 1812, 1830, and 1863, Byelorussia proclaimed its independence in 1917. Within 4 years, however, Russian domination was reimposed.

The Byelorussians are the third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union. They maintain their religion and a distinctive language, as well as a sense of national entity. The Soviet Union has devised a role for Byelorussia as a state of the U.S.S.R., a role many Byelorussians refuse to accept. Numbering 15 million people, they are larger in population than many of the vocal members of the United Nations.

Americans of Byelorussian descent continue to call attention to their compatriots' fight for self-determination. By our observance today, we encourage them in their fight for justice.

The 145th Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 25, 1966, we commemorate the 145th anniversary of Greek independence from four centuries of oppressive rule under the Ottoman Turks.

Traditionally, March 25 is regarded as the day when a small band of patriots, under the leadership of Ypsilanti, struck the first blow for Greek liberty. Because the Ottoman Turks greatly outnumbered the Greeks, Ypsilanti suffered an initial defeat, but the struggle continued both on land and on sea for 7 succeeding years.

In the meantime, world events were gradually changing the balance in favor of the Greeks. Such occurrences as the American and French Revolutions, the decline of the Ottoman Empire, the fall of Napoleon, the outbreak of nationalistic revolutions in other countries such as Serbia, and most important of all, the awakening of a strong nationalistic feeling among the Greeks themselves, served to give a cohesiveness to the Greek struggle and to rouse the sympathy and support of Europeans and Americans alike.

Among the Americans who took an active part in the Greek fight for freedom were Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, Gen. George Jarvis, Capt. Jonathan Peckham Miller, and Lt. William T. Washington, who lost his life in July 1827, during a factional outbreak.

And, of course, it is fitting that we remember here the contribution of England's illustrious poet, Lord Byron, who went to Greece in 1824 to help the Greeks and who did much to popularize their cause. Lord Byron finally lost his life from exposure, but his most important poem about the Greek struggle, in which he wrote the immortal line, "I dreamed that Greece might still be free," lived on to inspire the Greeks to continue their fight for freedom.

The years between 1821, when the struggle began, and 1827, toward the close of the war, were marked by a series of both victories and defeats for the Greeks.

Finally, on October 20, 1827, the British, French, and Russian fleets intervened in the Bay of Navarino and dealt a crushing blow to the Ottoman naval power. Sixty out of 89 Turkish-Egyptian vessels were destroyed, the Greeks seized the initiative, and the tide was turned irreversibly in their favor.

Although the Battle of Navarino made the independence of Greece a certainty the fighting continued for another 2 years and almost 5 years elapsed before the new state took shape. In 1832 the Treaty of Constantinople was signed, and with the signing of this treaty, the Turks renounced their claims and recognized Greek independence.

The Greek ideal of democracy, born in ancient Greece over 2,000 years ago, once more prevailed, and Greece took her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to participate in the 145th observance of this significant event, and wish to express my admiration for the indomitable courage of the Greeks and to pay tribute to them for their enduring and universal contributions to civilization.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussians proclaimed their independence from Russia and established the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The history of these people and their struggle to maintain their independence throughout many centuries is fraught with wars, partitions, revolts, and severe trials. Time and again their hopes for liberation faded, but their will to freedom remained strong.

After their declaration of independence in 1918, the Byelorussians passed a provisional constitution guaranteeing freedom of speech and assembly, liberty of conscience, inviolability of the person and of the home, the right of national minorities to autonomy, and equality of all citizens before the law. Byelorussia was accorded recognition by over a dozen foreign states and established legations and consulates in foreign capitals. Unfortunately, this period of independence was short-lived, and once again these people were brought under the subjection of the U.S.S.R.

During World War II, the Byelorussians put up stubborn resistance to the Germans and showed open hostility to the Russians. This struggle on two fronts took a great toll in Byelorussian lives. After the expulsion of the Germans, Soviet forces again occupied the country and incorporated it into the U.S.S.R.

Efforts to eradicate the national spirit of the Byelorussians and their desire for independence have not been successful, and to this day the struggle for the restoration of democratic government and self-determination goes on. March 25 is commemorated each year by the Byelorussians throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations, and all freedom-loving people join in their hopes and prayers that the day will soon come when the Byelorussians can join the family of free and independent nations.

The 48th Anniversary of the Declaration of Freedom of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, March 25, we note and honor the 48th anniversary of the declaration of freedom of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The Soviet Union lists the population of Byelorussia as a little over 8 million persons, but scholars place the ethnic population in surrounding areas at a total closer to 18 million. For almost a thousand years this land, bounded by Russia, Poland, and the Baltic States, has been the unfortunate scene of war, pillage, revolution, and counterrevolution.

It was no wonder then that with the downfall of the Tsar the Byelorussian people joyfully proclaimed their independence. Persecution by Russia was not new to the country, for as early as 1832 the Russians had closed all the schools and abolished the predominant church.

In World War I the Russo-German front passed through the area and one-third of the country was occupied by German troops. Following the overthrow of the Tsar, a National Congress was convened at Minsk for the purpose of declaring the Republic free. The Bolshevik Party had other ideas, however, and the Commisar for Nationality Affairs, the infamous Josef Stalin, sent a Siberian armored infantry regiment to Minsk to smash the National Congress. These efforts failed and on March 25, 1918, the National Convention decared the Byelorussian Democratic Repubic to be a fact.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that at that time the constitution of the new republic granted equality to all under the law, freedom of speech and assembly, the right to form labor unions, and to strike, freedom of conscience, the inviolability of the person and the home, and the right of minorities to autonomy. In addition, all large estates were to be broken up and divided among the landless peasantry, the mineral wealth of the country was nationalized and a standard 8-hour workday set.

But the freedom so proudly proclaimed in 1918 was to perish under the Communist heel by the end of 1920 although partisan resistance continued until 1924.

The blood bath of the freedom-loving people of Byelorussia was not to stop then, however. Throughout the 1920's and 1930's the Russian persecution continued and with the advent of World War II the area was once again a battlefield. More than 2 million Byelorussians perished.

After the war the Communist Russian masters accused the Byelorussians of collaboration with the German Army and the executions, deportations, and other depredations resumed.

Is it not a sad thing, Mr. Speaker, to look at the history of our country which was so blessed by being removed from neighbors like the Soviet Union and then compare our history and growth to those less fortunate through the quirk of location?

We shared all the noble ambitions that were proclaimed in the Byelorussian constitution—freedom of speech and assembly, religious freedom, the rights of man—yet we were able to make ours work because to a large degree we were left alone during the crucial years. We both were blessed in having brave, patriotic men to lead the cause and in fact even shared one of those men.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a hero in the struggle for Polish and American independence, led a fight in 1794 against the Csarist Empire in the name of what was then the Grand Duchy of Litva. The Byelorussian people were the heart of the Duchy and their culture and language was that of the Duchy. Kosciuszko was a Byelorussian noble by descent.

America survived and prospered. The Byelorussian Republic and the other of what are known today as the captive nations did not. It was not for lack of fight, or ideals or brave and noble leaders. It was merely because of the proximity of a rapacious neighbor, never to be satisfied, that these countries are no longer free.

As we salute these people tomorrow, let us therefore be ever mindful of our good fortune. Let us also hope and pray that the people of Byelorussia, along with all captive peoples, will soon be free once again.

The 145th Anniversary of Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN W. DYAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 145th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. On this date in 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised a new national flag over his monastery at Kalavryta. This started the bitter climax to the struggle which the Greek people had been carrying on for 400 years against rule by the Ottoman Empire.

The final Greek revolt, against overwhelming odds, lasted 8 years—longer than the American War for Independence. But the indomitable spirit of the brave Greek people prevailed.

On this anniversary we celebrate a triumph of the human spirit over all the obstacles of history. The Greek people have proved their valor repeatedly for thousands of years.

I wish the Greek people peace and prosperity, and I wish all Americans, whatever their national origin, would study and appreciate the reasons for the celebration of this holiday. Our constitutional form of government owes a tremendous debt to the great political thinkers of ancient Greece whose philosophy has become part of our heritage.

Export Controls on Cattle Hides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MASTON O'NEAL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues who have expressed deep concern over an injustice to our livestock producers resulting from a Department of Commerce order imposing export controls over cattle hides.

I am no longer shocked when agriculture is singled out to take the loss in a back-door attempt to impose Federal price controls. I do wonder, however, just how long the American farmer will be able to exist on a smaller and smaller share of the consumer dollar.

In a statement presented to the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the House Agriculture Committee, I attempted to show that the entire livestock industry has been adversely affected by the export control order.

I am taking the liberty of inserting my testimony in the RECORD to call attention to the need for a careful reconsideration of the matter:

STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND FEED GRAINS, BY MASTON O'NEAL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SECOND DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, like so many of my colleagues who are concerned over any development adversely affecting the American farmer, I was surprised to learn of the decision of Secretary of Commerce Connor to impose export quotas and validated license control over cattle hides.

I have been advised by a number of constituents that the order has already resulted in the reduction of prices on live cattle by the equivalent of 25 cents per hundredweight.

I am deeply concerned over the fact that our livestock producers are suffering as the result of a seemingly arbitrary decision by Secretary Connor. And I should add that the decision is totally inconsistent with previously announced departmental policies to promote the exports of livestock byproducts.

It should be pointed out that the quota does not just affect livestock producers for we do not know with certainty from where the 25 cents per hundredweight on cattle is coming. We are all representatives of consumers and should be particularly interested in the answer to such a question.

Mr. Chairman, I for one question the wisdom of imposing export controls on cattle hides when it seriously affects the entire cattle industry.

The Department of Commerce says its move was designed to check an inflationary trend in leather prices. However, I deem the move unwise and unnecessary, for we are apparently dealing with a temporary situation that should correct itself within a year or so, or perhaps less.

Evidence indicates that the increased demand for exports resulted from the serious drought in Argentina. The reduced exports of hides from Argentina are already being reversed. The South American Republic has traditionally supplied the world market with 9 to 12 million hides per year. Last year this figure was reduced to 6.7 million because of problems resulting from the drought. However, it is estimated that exports from Argentina this year will be 8 to 8½ million hides, and the figure will probably return to near normal next year.

In the meantime the United States has a golden opportunity to substantially increase exports of cattle hides this year with livestock producers and meatpackers reaping the benefits of increased world prices. In addition, a continuation of normal distribution under the free market system without export quotas will certainly prove beneficial in lowering our balance-of-payments deficit. High ranking officials in the Department of Commerce have stated that they want to encourage the export of hides to help our balance of payments. Recent action, specifically the imposition of quotas, is diametrically opposed to the lipservice on the part of certain officials.

As always, I, too, am concerned about inflation. But I am also concerned about the economy of agriculture and the development of exports. I am equally concerned about the balance of payments favoring the United States. Is it naive to think that expanded world trade is a worthwhile goal for our Nation?

If I have not misconstrued the thinking of officials in the Department of Commerce, the export quota was ostensibly imposed to hold down the cost of raw materials for domestic shoe manufacturers.

If my assumption is correct, there is no reason to believe that holding down the price of hides will hold down the price of shoes. Past experiences indicate just the opposite.

It is interesting to note that during the alltime high cattle slaughters of 1963–64, hide prices based on the 1957–59 price index of 100 were down to around 75 while leather footwear prices had risen to 108. The cost of the green hide in a pair of shoes is so little that even a sharp increase in hide prices would cause only a negligible increase in the cost of a pair of shoes. Shoe prices have increased while hide prices were going down, and manufacturers agree that 15 to 25 average pairs of shoes can be made from 1 cowhide. Although the average price on a pair of shoes is already over $10, ominous signs, supported by statements from manufacturers, point to another increase in shoe prices in the not too distant future. This is in spite of the fact that the Secretary of Commerce has taken punitive action to halt any possible threat of inflation in the tanning industry.

It is inconceivable to me that the Secretary of Commerce would impose an export quota that is of questionable advantage to domestic shoe manufacturers in holding the line on prices while it creates an economic hardship for the American farmer. The reasoning behind stealing from poor Peter to pay wealthy Paul taxes my mental capacity.

Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion the action taken by the Secretary of Commerce, with the concurrence of the Department of Agriculture, is just another sad chapter in the story of our American farmer being made the whipping boy under our economic system. Let's face the harsh facts.

A shortage of hides created by problems in Argentina caused world market prices to increase. The American cattle producer, because of adequate hide supplies in the United States, was the obvious benefactor of Argentina's unfortunate circumstances. Due to the fact that the American farmer was and is getting approximately one-half of what he was selling hides for 15 years ago, he naturally increased his exports to realize a better market price. The depressed domestic price then increased, bringing prices nearer to where they should be.

This move was interpreted by Commerce officials, at the urging of shoe manufacturers, as a sign of critical shortage, not to mention inflation. Of course, there never would be any shortage if domestic prices for hides matched world prices. We all know our producers had rather sell at home.

The remainder of the story is quite clear. The obvious solution was to restrict exports because it would hurt no one but our farmers. After all, why should a big sturdy boat be rocked when you find a little one accustomed to traveling on stormy seas? After all, who will speak up for the farmer?

Mr. Chairman, I intend to speak up for the American farmer just as you have along with many of our colleagues who understand the economic plight of rural America.

I sincerely hope that the testimony given during this hearing will convince the Secretary of Commerce that his order is definitely not in the public interest and that he will rescind his order at the earliest possible date.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to require local public housing agencies to ignore certain income in computing income levels and resultant rent levels for tenants in federally aided public housing projects.

This bill would require local public housing agencies to exclude from tenants' income such part of any governmental pension increase—Federal, State, and local pensions—which the agency shall find to represent a cost-of-living increase, as well as such income as the tenant family spends for medicare coverage.

One of the greatest difficulties in public housing today is the continual readjustment of tenants' rent levels based on changing income levels. Each time a tenant's income goes up, his rent must go up.

This is particularly unfair as regards the many old people in public housing who live on small social security and other pensions. When these people receive a small pension boost, it is often to cover a rise in the cost of living or the expense of a new program like medicare. This type of pension hike should not be gobbled up in increased public housing rents.

My bill provides that the contract between the Federal Public Housing Administration and the local public housing agency must provide that in calculating tenants' income, and rentals based thereon, the public housing agency must omit the amount spent for medicare coverage and also that part of any pension increase which the agency shall find as corresponding to a rise in the cost of living.

Government pensioners living on small fixed pension incomes have it hard enough in these inflationary days without having to see any cost-of-living pension hike they get eaten up by rent boosts. My bill would keep cost-of-living pension hikes and boosts to cover medicare expenses from being counted in income so as to cause public housing rent rises. I think that this exclusion is in the true spirit of the public housing program.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence and organized a democratic republic. The emergence of this people as an ethnic entity dates back to the 9th and 10th centuries, and as a political entity to the 11th century. From the 11th century until now, the Byelorussians have sought to achieve national independence. They have endured persecution, terror, and murder, political division, repression of their cultural institutions, exile, and repeated conquest. Yet the flame of this nationalism has not been quenched throughout eight and a half centuries.

The brightest hope in modern times for emergence of an independent Byelorussian nation came with the 1918 effort to establish a national Byelorussian government representing minorities and guaranteeing basic social forms, freedom of speech and assembly, and providing protection against arbitrary and unwarranted search and seizure and other authoritarian excesses which characterize the tyranny to which the Byelorussians have been subjected so often. The Bolsheviks, already in power in Russia, strongly opposed Byelorussian autonomy, and Josef Stalin attempted to crush the independence movement but was unable to obliterate the nationalist fervor.

After declaring their independence on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian nation was given de jure recognition by over a dozen foreign states. However, the peace treaty between Germany and the Bolshevik Russians at Brest-Litovsk led to the occupation of three-fourths of the Byelorussian territory, first by the Germans, and then by the Russians after German withdrawal.

The tangled and fast-moving events of post World War I, as the peace treaties were signed and national borders were adjusted, led to partition of Byelorussia by Poland and Russia in 1921. Appeals for aid from outside nations during an uprising by the Byelorussian Democratic Republic against the Russians in 1920 had been ignored.

Following the 1921 agreements, both Poland and Russia initially allowed considerable cultural freedom and local independence for Byelorussians. However, these freedoms were repressed drastically in Poland in 1926–27, and, in a radical shift in Russian policy, were ruthlessly crushed in a campaign of terror and betrayal in 1928. The events of World War II, although offering temporary hope to the Byelorussians, did not result in any improvement in Byelorussian autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, March 25th is being celebrated by Byelorussians throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations. The tenacity and loyalty of Byelorussians in their struggle for national autonomy is an impressive display of human persistence and commitment to the cause of individual freedom. We deplore the repeated imposition of tyranny on the Byelorussians, and we salute their valiant and continuing efforts to achieve nationhood for their people.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, we pay tribute to the inspiring courage and fortitude of the Byelorussian people.

The Byelorussians are among the less numerous and little known Slavic peoples on the east European borderland, east of Poland and west of Moscow. For centuries they have been subjected to ruthless Russian czarist regimes, and their struggle to gain independence and liberty continues to this day despite deprivations, hardships, national persecution, economic exploitation, and social oppression. They have never forgotten their distinct national identity.

On March 25, 1918, the events of World War I and the Russian revolution gave the Byelorussians their long-sought opportunity to break away from the shackles of their oppressors. They proclaimed the establishment of the Byelorussian Republic, and organized a new government designed to give them educational, cultural, and social opportunities which had been denied to them for so long.

But these 10 million hard-working and liberty-seeking people were able to enjoy the fruits of freedom only for a short-time. Early in 1921, Soviet forces attacked and overran their country. Since then they have been living under the unrelenting and oppressive rule of the Communists.

Despite this tyranny, the Byelorussians have not abandoned their ultimate goal for freedom and independence, and they ardently look forward to the day of their liberation.

On this anniversary of their independence day, let us all fervently hope and pray for their freedom and independence.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of Byelorussian Independence Day this year marks the 48th anniversary of March 25, 1918, that day on which the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was proclaimed. While that day is of extreme importance to the Byelorussian people as the culmination of their efforts at self-determination, their long-dreamed independence from Russian domination, it is also of significance to freedom-loving people the world over. For each such triumph in the age-old struggle for the betterment of mankind is a milestone toward the goal of those who believe that true democracy is the route leading to a better life for all humanity.

At that time in 1918 when the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was established a provisional constitution provided for the basic freedoms for all citizens of the new democracy. The rada—council—of the first legal government of this republic was representative of all of the populace, including such national minorities as the Jews, Poles, and Russians. The constitution guaranteed within the boundaries of the Byelorussian Republic freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, the right to form labor unions, and the right to strike. It guaranteed liberty of conscience, inviolability of the person and of the home, the right of national minorities to autonomy, and the equality of all citizens before the law.

The fact that these hallmarks of democratization were to enjoy short success, and that the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was itself of short duration, does not detract from the lasting significance of the effort. It is, in fact, the more remarkable that, despite the sorry fate that was soon to overcome this triumph of independence, the spirit of the people was to persist through all frustrations.

The physical boundaries of the Byelorussian territory were rent asunder when the Bolsheviks signed the peace treaty with the Germans at Brest-Litovsk. The Germans occupied three-fourths of the Byelorussian territory. They adopted a hostile attitude to the new government because of what they termed a radical social policy, and completely disarmed it. Left completely defenseless, the Byelorussians were then at the mercy of the Soviet forces, who reoccupied the territory.

A new effort at independence on the part of the Byelorussians was crushed soon after. The Soviets established the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to rival the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

As we all know, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was to be independent in name only. Domination by the Soviet Union was to be complete.

Nevertheless, despite all Soviet efforts at control, the spirit of independence among the Byelorussian people could not be eradicated. It has remained until this day. And, Mr. Speaker, it is this indomitable spirit of freedom which we today honor in celebrating Byelorussian Independence Day.

Federal Legislation Is Imperative for the Protection of the Lives and Safety of the American Public Traveling Our Public Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, no less an authority than the American Trial Lawyers Association has warned us that the number of deaths on our highways will reach a staggering number of some 100,000 a year by 1975.

And even today the annual death rate very nearly equals the number of American battle deaths in all of World War I. It is a fact that the motorcar now ranks among the four leading causes of deaths in this country today. Obviously there is an imperative need, I believe, from the Federal level, to attempt to stop this terrible slaughter occurring on our highways each year, and growing worse each year.

As an approach to the control of this national problem and in an effort to initiate action that may save the lives of fellow citizens traveling our highways I have introduced a bill, H.R. 12556, in this 89th Congress, designed to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency within the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, on March 15, last, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held a most timely hearing on this critical problem and it was my privilege to present to the committee a statement in support of my bill and the substance of all the related bills that are pending before the Congress to promote safer travel on our highways. I most earnestly hope this esteemed committee and the Congress will expedite action on this challenging legislative problem and I include, at this point, the statement I presented to the committee.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 12566 AND RELATED MEASURES ON MARCH 15, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on behalf of millions of Americans, may I express the deepest appreciation to you for the conduct of these hearings on various legislative proposals to save the lives and the limbs of our people traveling upon the American highways. In my opinion, this is one of the vitally important legislative subjects that today challenges our legislative prudence.

I am grateful to you, indeed, for the opportunity to testify in favor of my bill, H.R. 12556, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency within the Commerce Department and the similar and related bills you are currently considering. Please let me emphasize right now my earnest conviction that the particular measure or author is not the important thing in this matter. My sole reason for being here is to urge your approval of whatever bill or combination of bills you deem best designed to protect and promote the lives and safety of our fellow citizens traveling our highways.

In summary my bill, and similar bills, proposes the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Center to pinpoint the principal causes of traffic accidents and project practical means for their prevention through the application of national traffic safety standards that would be based on the profound research and findings of the National Traffic Center. The bill also provides incentives to enlist the cooperation of automobile manufacturers and further offers encouragement, through grants, to the States for the expansion of their own programs to improve highway traffic safety.

Over these past several years, the issue of highway safety has been steadily arousing the conscience of the American public and I believe the time is long overdue for it to become a major legislative concern of the American Congress.

In 1965 the national auto fatality toll reached the 50,000 mark. The annual injury list is over 1.7 million persons. The direct cost of automobile accidents has been reliably estimated at more than $8 billion a year.

The dimensions of this problem, on these statistics alone, are staggering in their revelation of losses of life, permanent injuries and economic waste. Surely it is a most urgent matter that calls for national leadership and guidance for correction.

Mr. Chairman, such national leadership and guidance would be projected by the establishment of the National Safety Center we propose and effectively applied through cooperating Federal, State, and local campaigns to accomplish national reductions in the almost unbelievable number of fatalities and injuries now occurring on our highways each year.

Such an agency, at the Federal level, would also provide imperatively urgent overall direction and assistance to traffic safety efforts now being extended by 16 different Government units and more than 45 private organizations.

Mr. Chairman, the objective of all of these bills before you is clearly in the national interest. The need of the legislation is practically of a desperate nature. The duty and obligation of the Congress to act in sensible concern for the protection of the lives and safety of American taxpayers is clear. For these basic reasons, I urge this committee to approve and recommend appropriate legislation for the accomplishment of these objectives at the earliest possible date.

I would like to again, Mr. Chairman, thank you and your distinguished committee members for your courtesy.

A Suggestion for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, U.S. economic aid—$77 billion—and military assistance—$34 billion—have amounted to $111 billion gross. These funds, in loans and grants, have been advanced for economic reconstruction and development and for the prevention of subversion in the recipient countries. In addition to rebuilding Western Europe, the United States has undertaken the burden of assisting the economic development of a large number of developing countries. In fiscal year 1966 the United States had bilateral aid programs operating in 72 countries.

The largest recipient of U.S. aid in terms of total dollar amounts is and has been India. Since 1948 we have contributed approximately $7 billion to the support of India. Member countries of the Aid India Consortium organized by the World Bank are currently committing about $1.3 billion a year in aid to India. The U.S. share, including Public Law 480, food for peace, is almost a billion dollars a year. This support has been based both on the humanitarian impulse to help the millions of Indians as well as on a realistic appraisal of India's strategic importance in both size and location.

Between 1960 and 1963 net disbursements of Aid India Consortium loans increased by 125 percent, rising from $384 million to $864 million. This was reflected in greater U.S. aid, which rose from $139 million to $549 million, including local currency loans resulting from Public Law 480 title I sales.

At the same time there was a decline in aid disbursements by Germany and the United Kingdom. The comparison of long-term loans to the government with those to the private sector is highly illuminating. Only $40 million of $904 million in long-term loans received by India in 1963 went to the private—nonmonetary—sector.

The United States ranks second only to IDA in providing the softest loans. In effect we are helping to finance the repayment of some of India's debts to hard loan creditors, as well as finance some of the exports to India from these countries. For instance, in 1963 Germany provided $55 million in economic assistance to India, but had a trade surplus of $164 million. Also, as it stands now, the bulk of our aid is import assistance for the maintenance of Government-owned industries.

The Indian economic development plans have imposed a program on the country which has proved misguided and inadequate. The most essential need of India, improved agricultural production, was neglected in favor of heavy industry; and the problem of population growth was overlooked. Agricultural production has improved somewhat and should increase with a greater supply of fertilizers, but the primitive methods of cultivation remain. India is well blessed with productive agricultural lands, but a technological revolution is necessary for major increases in agricultural production.

This requires the utilization of techniques and talents not now possessed by Indian farmers. A major effort must be made in agriculture, with the assistance of foreign technology and know-how, to modernize farming in India. This will require much greater allocation of human and capital resources, including foreign aid, to improve the agricultural production methods, food distribution system and storage facilities.

The allocation of foreign exchange reserves and the large-scale entry of private investment for fertilizer production was necessary years ago and only came now after the publicity created by the severe drought in India. Indian officials state that this particular area should not be interpreted as a precedent in utilizing foreign investment in all areas. The Indian Government still intends to promote industrial development through the public sector first.

It is readily apparent that a substantial increase in private foreign investment in India is necessary to maintain or increase the rate of growth in the per capita gross national product and to improve the standard of living of the Indian people appreciably. It is a sad commentary on the private investment climate in India that in 1964 total foreign private investment amounted to a mere $60 million, while total annual foreign aid was approximately $1.3 billion. This disparity can be explained to a large extent by the Government's attitude toward private business and individual initiative.

High tax rates on private business—60 to 70 percent—discriminatory allocation of imports to private industry compared with similar allocations to Government-owned industries, preemption of certain areas of the economy for development by Government enterprises, and the requirement of Indian majority control, all discourage much needed private foreign investment.

Other Asian countries, such as Thailand and Pakistan, have realized the importance of the private sector and are working to improve the investment climate. Should the Indian Government change its attitude toward treatment of the private sector and start by altering the above-enumerated impediments and disincentives to private investment, both domestic, and foreign, it could expect a substantial inflow of foreign capital and technology.

The Indian Government has further injured the climate for foreign investments by introducing in the Parliament a new patents bill, which restricts patent protection in India. Industries which consider industrial property rights an important factor in the investment climate will hesitate to enter a country in which the government may destroy the market by undermining patent rights. Inordinate restrictions on private industry and attenuation of industrial property rights will necessarily reduce the amount of technology available to a less developed country.

In his 1966 foreign aid message, President Johnson declared the essence of economic development to be work—"hard, unremitting, often thankless work"—most of which must be done by people in the aid-recipient countries.

The President added:

> Only these people and their leaders can: Invest every possible resource in improved farming techniques, in school and hospital construction and in critical industry; make the land reforms, tax changes and other basic adjustments necessary to transform their societies; face the population problem squarely and realistically; create the climate which will attract foreign investment and keep local money at home.
>
> As I said last October: "Action, not promises, will be the standard of assistance." It must be clear that the principle of our assistance is cooperation. Those who do not fulfill their commitments to help themselves cannot expect help from us.

If the above-noted points were made mandatory guidelines for self-help for recipient countries, the United States would have to end its aid program to India. In view of the total amount of aid being given by the United States, we have the right to expect that India will efficiently utilize all available resources, including aid, to attack its basic problems, so that the greatest possible balanced economic development will ensue. Prior to the commitment of additional funds, Congress should carefully study the reports prepared by the World Bank and the AID mission to India.

The 145th Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 145th anniversary of the struggle for Greek independence. The concepts of freedom and democracy given birth in ancient Greece were the same goals of those valiant Greeks who, many centuries later, took up the cause of freedom against the hated repression of the Ottoman Empire.

Our admiration for the courage and fortitude of the Greeks in response to Communist aggression in the hills after World War II played a major role in the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Greece is a valuable and respected member. Even now Greece's geographical proximity to the Soviet Union serves as a constant reminder of the struggle for freedom.

The free world can never fully repay its debt to the values and ideals that have come down to us from the Greek heritage. Our repayment is made even more difficult because of the many contributions that are being made to our Nation by the million and one-half Greek-Americans. They are active in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in social, civic, cultural, and community enterprises; they are valued citizens and trusted neighbors.

On the occasion of the 145th anniversary of Greek independence, let us join in thanking our friends of Greek ancestry for their many contributions to our national life.

State Department Says Nuclear Power Reactors Do Not Help the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. State Department apparently concludes that civil research reactors, power reactors, major components thereof, and fuel and moderators therefor are not very meaningful in relation to Communist-bloc military power. For the benefit of interested parties my letter to the Department and its reply are reproduced below:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
February 17, 1966.

HON. ANTHONY M. SOLOMON,
Administrator, Mutual Defense Control Act,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SOLOMON: As you may know, the recent decision of the International Security Trade Coordinating Committee (COCOM) relating to the export of nuclear power reactors to countries of the Sino-Soviet bloc was the subject of discussions at a public hearing held on January 27, 1966, by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee's Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation. The COCOM decision to which I refer provides that COCOM members will "sympathetically" consider requests by member-countries for the export to Communist countries of civil research and power reactors, major components thereof, and fuel and moderators therefor, when the purchasing country has agreed to allow International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to be applied to the exported facility.

My reason for writing to you relates to your implementation of this decision. According to the State Department's recent report to the Congress on operations under the Battle Act, the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act lists—the so-called Battle Act lists—have been revised to correspond with revisions made in the lists of items embargoed by the COCOM countries. Specifically, I note that the Battle Act lists have been amended so that the above-named atomic energy materials and equipment now appear in category B of the title I list when the recipient Communist nation has agreed to allow the application of IAEA safeguards; when no agreement has been reached as to the application of international safeguards, the subject materials and equipment are considered category A items.

I understand the administration of the Battle Act lists, the items determined to warrant embargo under title I of the Battle Act are divided into categories A and B, with the items shown in the category A list being those for which no exceptions are possible under the termination-of-aid clause of the Battle Act. The items shown in the category B list are those for which the President may grant exceptions under the termination-of-aid clause in unusual circumstances. Thus, under the Battle Act Administrator's recent revision of these lists, any allied nation which hereafter exports a nuclear power reactor to a Sino-Soviet bloc country which agrees to the application of international safeguards thereto may continue to receive military, economic, or financial assistance from the United States if the President so directs. Prior to this revision of the lists the President could not make such an exception.

This change in the Battle Act lists raises several questions. One is whether or not this revision contravenes the general policy underlying the Battle Act; namely, the policy of not giving assistance to any foreign nation which permits the export of arms, ammunition, or other material to the Soviet Union or any of its satellites when such material might contribute to the strength of those States. (See in this connection Senate Report 698, Aug. 21, 1951.) It would seem that a power reactor would contribute to the industrial strength of a country, even if the application of IAEA safeguards prevented the diversion of the reactor to military uses.

A more serious question is whether, as contemplated under your recent amendment to category B, the President may invoke the exception to the Battle Act's termination-of-aid clause in the case of the export by an allied nation of a reactor to a Communist-bloc country. The proviso to the termination-of-aid clause in section 103(b) of the Battle Act provides that "the President * * * may direct the continuance of such [military, economic, or financial] assistance to a country which permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials when unusual circumstances indicate that the cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States." The distinct implication of this proviso seems to be that while aid can be continued despite the export to Sino-Soviet bloc countries of strategic materials "other than" arms, ammunition, implements of war, or atomic energy materials, such continued aid cannot be allowed where the exported item falls into the category of arms, ammunition, implements of war, or atomic energy materials.

I would very much appreciate receiving your early comments to the foregoing questions.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 4, 1966.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: Your letter of February 17 refers to the recent decision of COCOM relating to the export of nuclear power reactors to Soviet bloc countries and raises certain relevant questions pertaining to Battle Act administration.

You are quite correct in your understanding that the effect of the transfer from category A to category B of title I is to make it possible for the President to exercise discretion under section 103(b) in determining whether or not to continue aid in the case of a power reactor sale by an aid-recipient country to a Communist-bloc country, whereas termination of aid is mandatory with respect to category A. Your questions relate to whether the determination to transfer the items in question from category A to category B of title I contravenes the general policy underlying the Battle Act and whether the President may properly invoke the exception to the Battle Act's termination-of-aid clause in section 103(b) in the case of a power reactor sale by an aid-recipient nation to a Communist-bloc country. It is our view that the title I listing determination taken, including its implications for the President's authority under section 103(b) to continue aid, is in accordance with the provisions of the Battle Act. Moreover, similar decisions have been made in the past and have been reported to the Congress. I believe the following explanation will be helpful to you in understanding the reasons for our conclusion.

In the administration of the Battle Act, and in working out the international control lists under the act, the key judgment which Congress entrusted to the Battle Act Administrator was whether particular items should be embargoed for purposes of the act.

Section 103(a) of the Battle Act (22 U.S.C. 1611b) provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

"The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to determine within thirty days after enactment of this Act * * * and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, which items are, for the purpose of this Act, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum * * * and those items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war which should be embargoed to effectuate the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That such determinations shall be continuously adjusted to current conditions on the basis of investigation and consultation."

Section 103(a) of the Battle Act uses two phrases which make clear that the categories of items listed in that section are inherently qualified. They must be (1) items which "for the purpose of this [Battle] Act" are arms, ammunition, and implements of war and the like, and (2) items "which should be embargoed to effectuate the purposes of this [Battle] Act".

The purposes of the Battle Act are perhaps most succinctly expressed in its long statutory title; i.e., "An act to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes." The key words are "control" and "cooperating foreign nations". These statutory words show that the Congress had in mind not absolute, unilateral embargoes but an international cooperative program of control.

In this cooperative control program, as the Congress was aware, the United States necessarily would have a variety of objectives and means to pursue these obejctives.

H.R. 4550 (82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951) was the bill which, with some amendments not relevant here, became the Battle Act. In the House Foreign Affairs Committee report on H.R. 4550, the complex nature of our objectives in controlling exports to Russia was discussed, and the report made the following comment:

"In order to carry on strategic operations of this nature it is essential that the executive branch be given a considerable degree of discretion and it is clear that legislation prohibiting broad categories of exports might prevent the attainment of these objectives." (H. Rep. 703, 82d Con., 1st sess., July 16, 1951, p. 12.)

We have reviewed Senate Report No. 698 on the same bill, which was referred to in your letter, and find nothing inconsistent with either this statutory statement of purpose or this recognition of executive discretion. Section 101 of the Battle Act, which elaborates the statement of purpose, states that the objective of controls, so far as the U.S.S.R. and its satellites is concerned, is to impede the ability of such countries to conduct military operations.

We have, therefore, concluded that the act was not intended to require the embargo of items which would not contribute to the military capability of Sino-Soviet bloc countries, even though they might contribute to the industrial strength of a country. This conclusion is consistent with the views of previous administrators of the act and is supported by practice. The periodic Battle Act reports to the Congress provide evidence of the selective listing of items under the act, of periodic changes in accordance with section 103(a), and of the movement of items from category A to category B of title I.

The Battle Act's embargo provisions went into effect on January 24, 1952, and the published reports thereafter included information on the embargo lists, how they were established, and how they are maintained. There are two lists under title I of the Battle Act. The title I, category B list originally included 263 item listings, of which one was petroleum products and equipment for producing them. By the time of the second Battle Act report, 16 new item listings had been added and 15 original listings broadened. The specific item listings in category B were classified for security reasons, but the report could identify the added listings in general terms. ("Problems of Economic Defense," second report to Congress on the Battle Act, January 1953, pp. 7 and 8.)

By the time of the fourth Battle Act report, the decision had been made not to pursue an extension of the control lists to many other items but to recognize the need for simplifying the lists and removing or downgrading items which were no longer considered so important. ("East-West Trade Trends," fourth report to Congress, May 1954, pp. 46–48.) The results of this reappraisal were announced in a press release on August 25, 1954; there was a reduction in the embargo item listings from 297 to 217, and many of the 217 items were redefined so as to split off less important sizes and types of goods covered by the item. ("The Revision of Strategic Trade Controls," fifth report to Congress, November 1954, pp. 39–42.)

The same process, of course, was carried out for category A items. Thus, in the 1958 Battle Act report, revisions in the category A list were announced in the following terms:

"Some new items * * * embodying recent technological and scientific advances, and whose strategic significance had increased since the 1954 revision, were added. Other items were deleted because of a corresponding decrease in their strategic importance." ("The 1958 Revision of East-West Trade Controls," 12th report to Congress, Apr. 20, 1959, pp. 4–5.)

In the unclassified category A list printed in this report, it was noted, for example, that some changes resulted in the deletion of items from the atomic energy material listing under category A and the incorporation of those items in the classified category B list (p. 12). These changes were of the same type as those about which you have inquired.

This legislative history and reported practice make clear that there is no statutory distinction between category A and category B of title I in terms of the determination of whether an item should be embargoed for the purposes of the act. In determining whether or not an item shall be considered an "atomic energy material" for the purpose of the act, the Administrator considered that the application of IAEA safeguards would give reasonable assurance that the materials would be devoted to peaceful uses only and that the shipment would therefore lack the strategic element to which the Battle Act restrictions were addressed. It follows, therefore, that the Administrator acted in accordance with the listing authority of the act in removing those materials from category A to category B, because they still remain covered under title I. Whether or not the President decides to continue aid to a country selling such a category B item to a Communist-bloc nation will depend upon the circumstances of the particular case.

For the reasons I have set forth in detail above, I consider that the modification in title I treatment of civil research and power reactors, major components thereof, and fuel and moderators therefor is in accordance with the purposes of the Battle Act and appropriately furthers the U.S. policy of discouraging nuclear weapons proliferation and encouraging peaceful uses of atomic energy.

May I add that if you have any remaining questions on this matter, please let me know. We and the Atomic Energy Commission people would be glad to meet with you or other members and staff of the Joint Committee in order to be certain that there is full understanding of our actions under the Battle Act and in COCOM concerning nuclear power reactor subject to IAEA safeguards. We have done this previously, as you know, both through informal discussion and in letters to the chairman, and we would like to be sure that no area of misunderstanding remains.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY M. SOLOMON,
Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs.

Forty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor and privilege to take part in the celebration exercises of Lithuania's 48th anniversary of independence that took place in my home city of Worcester, Mass., on February 20, last.

At this point, I would like to include an article appearing in the February 21, 1966, issue of the Worcester Telegram, describing the events that took place at this celebration, together with my address to the assembly and the remarks of attorney Anthony J. Miller of Worcester.

The article and addresses follow:

[From the Worcester Telegram, Feb. 21, 1966]

LITHUANIANS NOTE ANNIVERSARY

Thirty-one Lithuanian organizations of Worcester County sponsored a celebration yesterday in the Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club, 67 Vernon Street, marking the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Lithuania, now under Communist rule declared its independence February 16, 1918.

Local and State dignitaries addressing the group included Rev. John C. Jutt, pastor of St. Casimir's Church; Pranas Stanelis, president of the Worcester Council of Lithuanian Organizations; U.S. Representative HAROLD D. DONOHUE; Mayor Wells; District Attorney William T. Buckley; State Senator Vite J. Pigaga and Cochairman Anthony M. Seskevich.

Master of ceremonies was Richard J. Sarapas.

Lithuanian songs and folk dances were presented by several groups.

Performers included songstress Miss Nancy Miller, accompanied by Miss Olga Kershis; the Lithuanian Art Lovers Choral Group, directed by Zigmas Snarskis; and the Lithuanian Folk Dance Ensemble, under the direction of Miss Saulute Staska.

The year 1966 has been designated by Lithuanians in all parts of the world as Lithuanian Youth Year.

A national convention of all Lithuanian organizations in the United States will be held June 30 through July 4 in Chicago, Ill.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 20, 1966

Forty-eight years ago on February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared their independence. On that day she became a free independent democratic republic, marking the end of well over a century of persecution under a hostile foreign rule. There was cause for rejoicing and the future was faced with confidence. The people of Lithuania were happy and prosperous under their own sovereignty.

Today, however, there is no free Lithuania, any more than there is a free Poland, a free Hungary or a free Czechoslovakia. All are completely crushed beneath the heel of the Russian tyrant.

For over 20 years following that day in February 1918, she enjoyed the right of freedom to worship, freedom of the press to speak or write what they thought, freedom to choose their representatives in government, freedom to start a business; freedom to come and go within and outside their country—all these and every other privilege which free men and women everywhere enjoy is now denied these unfortunate people. Like that of her two Baltic neighbors, Latvia, and Estonia, freedom and independence is today an empty symbol.

Little wonder then, that this day which should be one of rejoicing and celebration is filled with sadness for not only the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain, but also their friends and loved ones in this country.

Although we mourn her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressors. Her Christian faith which at different times in history saved all of Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. There is no power that can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

All over the world, Lithuanians are gathering at this time to renew their vows to work and strive for the independence of their homeland.

Here, in the United States, I earnestly believe that most Americans are becoming increasingly more concerned about the goals of communism, and Lithuania and other countries stand out in accusing testimony of the failure of freedom-loving nations to act in accordance with the principles for which our people have fought and died in two world wars.

In simple justice, our Government and the governments within the United Nations must insist that Lithuania and all of the other small nations shall be permitted to exercise their inalienable rights to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

The illustrious Lithuanian poet, Maronis, from 1862 to 1932, aroused his nation with his undying verses and instilled all Lithuanians with fervent love of their country, their language, and their people.

He preached, through verses, the gospel of national resurrection and even today his words continue to be a source of spiritual strength, a battlecry, and a promise of ultimate victory.

Although Lithuanians are forbidden to sing their national anthem in their homeland on this 48th anniversary, I am sure that Lithuanians everywhere will be repeating these words of consolation and strength written by Maronis many years ago, when he said:

"Protect, O Almighty, our beautiful homeland,
The soil where we labor, where our fathers rest.
Thy fatherly mercy is boundless and lasting;
Hear us, Thine own children, long ages oppressed.
Foresake not our land, all Highest, while the fury rages;
For Thou art our hope and vision, now and through the ages."

All Americans, not just Lithuanian-Americans, share, I am certain these sentiments and look forward to the time when Lithuania will again take her rightful place with the free nations of the world. Let us pray together this afternoon that the Almighty will speed that happy day.

SPEECH OF ATTORNEY ANTHONY J. MILLER

As a Lithuanian-American it is a great privilege, indeed, to join with our esteemed Congressman, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, in this annual program celebrating the proclamation of independence and establishment of the Lithuanian Republic on February 16, 1918.

That fateful day marked the realization of a goal for which our Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination—1795–1915—followed by German occupation during the First World War.

No nation ever strove harder or waited longer for independence than did Lithuania.

For over two decades Lithuania prospered and grew under its newly won independence. Then in the summer of 1940, the Soviets demanded immediate formation of a "friendly" government and occupied the country. A rigged election was held to produce a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

On August 8, at this request, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by the supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Since that unfortunate day our native Lithuania has seen her people executed and deported by the thousands, her land exploited and her independence ground under the heel of Communist terror.

The opposition of the Lithuanians to this Soviet aggression has been nothing short of heroic and provides an inspiring example to the rest of the world.

Our courageous nation has had a long history of fighting off aggressors and it is this tradition which has been one of the underlying strengths of our people in their brave resistance of Soviet tyranny.

I am sure that our fellow Americans and other peoples throughout the world stand in admiration of the stanch faith and undaunted valor of our Lithuanian people who are suffering so terribly under ruthless Soviet subjugation but who, in spite of tyrannical oppression, consistently maintain their spirit and their devotion to the Christian principles of freedom and democracy.

It is the obligation of all free peoples and the special obligation of Lithuanian-Americans to offer every possible encouragement to the persecuted people of Lithuania so that they will continue to be strengthened in their persevering resistance to Communist domination.

Those of us of Lithuanian descent are principally responsible for carrying on the day-to-day struggle to help our homeland regain her freedom.

In these dark days when our native Lithuanian people are undergoing terrible persecutions we, who are enjoying freedom, must be ready and willing to make every sacrifice necessary to keep the spark of freedom and independence brightly burning in the hearts and minds of our besieged countrymen. We must convince our subjugated people that we, their free brothers, cannot truly enjoy our freedom unless and until our homeland is free again.

Also, as Lithuanian descendants, we must never cease in our efforts to rally all the free world governments to Lithuania's just cause.

We must ever persist in asking and urging the United States and all other governments to bring every possible pressure of diplomatic appeal and public condemnation upon the Russian Kremlin to persuade them to release our beloved Lithuania from tyrannical bondage.

Let us then, on this occasion, solemnly pledge that neither our conscience nor the conscience of the free world will be permitted to rest until liberty and justice reign again in our free and independent homeland.

Decline and Fall of the 50 States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent privilege to address the Conopus Club in San Antonio. Under leave to extend my remarks I enclose those remarks. The address follows:

DECLINE AND FALL OF THE 50 STATES

I welcome this opportunity to visit the San Antonio Conopus Club at your weekly luncheon today, and am grateful for the privilege of speaking to you for a few moments.

I have chosen for my subject the "Decline and Fall of the 50 States." It could be entitled "The Winds of Change," or perhaps "The Thundering Heard in the Sixties." It will be an attempt to appraise, in brief, some of the developments of this decade.

For several years now we have been repeatedly reminded that the decade of the sixties is a decade of change—a period of forward thrust when America is at last casting aside the shackles of the past and moving ahead on the high road of progress.

Now, the question of just what constitutes "progress," and the direction this "forward thrust" is taking us, have become lively topics of conjecture. The decade having now passed the halfway mark, it would seem to be a good time to pause for a moment and take stock of a few of the things that have transpired and some that are in the works.

While I entertain strong views regarding the wisdom and propriety of many of the changes that are taking place, it will not be my purpose today to argue the merits. Let us take a reading and try to get a glimpse of some of the implications of the winds of change to which the American people are being subjected. Perhaps in that way we can better judge how the ship of state is weathering the storm. Someone said: "I want to move with progress, but I want to read the compass and see which direction I am traveling."

This reminds me of the verse about the Arkansas railroad, which goes like this:

> It wiggled in and wobbled out,
> And left the people all in doubt—
> Whether in its zigzag track
> It was going west or coming back.

It is not my purpose to be critical of change. We all know that in this age of science and technology, certain changes are inevitable. The big problem of Government is to try to channel changes in the right direction, while holding fast to those concepts which have proven their worth through the ages.

In this age of change, let us not lose sight of fundamentals, because certainly there are certain enduring principles that underlie all real progress. It was a wise—though perhaps old-fashioned—Solomon who said: "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set."

In approaching this subject I am reminded of the old tugboat captain who had guided ships through the rocks and shoals of Boston Harbor for nearly half a century, and was summarily dismissed by a new reform city government that had been swept into power many years ago. He sought a hearing, and appeared before his critics. One of them asked him: "Captain, can you say that you know for sure where all the obstacles to shipping are located beneath the waters in our harbor?"

The old man thought a moment, and answered: "No, I reckon I can't say I know where all of them are, but I know where they ain't."

And so it is with government. There are certain basic concepts which we know are free of certain destructive elements—and as I see it we must not dare lose sight of those concepts.

Let us summarize for a moment a few of the more radical changes that are being wrought in our society and in our Government. I am thinking in particular about the galloping momentum of Federal power, manifested in so many ways, at the expense of the States.

DEMONSTRATIONS AND CRIME

To begin with, this decade has been shocked and shamed by an outburst of demonstrations, riots, and an alarming upsurge in the crime rate. Indeed much of the rising crime rate has been triggered by agitation generated by civil rights demonstrations. The destructive and bloody race riots have followed on the wake of the emotional hysteria generated by this form of agitation, with many politicians and opportunists sharing in the responsibility.

Even in the midst of a bloody war we have heard the squawks and jeers from draft-card burners, and others, who would give aid and comfort to the enemy. This minority group of pacifists, crackpots, and peaceniks, including some retarded intellectuals, was well described by J. Edgar Hoover as halfway citizens who are neither morally, mentally, nor emotionally mature.

At the same time, and a part of this same movement, America has witnessed the appearance of those who preach civil disobedience, a seditious slogan of gross irresponsibility, which has captured the imagination of citizens who are in many respects immature. We have all been obliged to stand by while celebrity status has been accorded those whose sick minds and corrupt souls tamper with and ridicule our orderly processes of government under law.

And, as I have said, out of all this has come riots and bloodshed, and a conscious defiance of law and order.

DECLINE OF STATES

And along with it have come demands for the Federal Government to invade the sanctities of State responsibilities in dealing with these and many other conditions.

Indeed the genesis of this trend toward concentralization is traceable back to New Deal days, when F.D.R., deterred by actions of the Supreme Court, virtually declared war on that tribunal and proceeded to fill several vacancies with men whom he knew would do his bidding in the interpretation of the Constitution. Whereas the prior Court had upheld the power of the States and the limited power of the Central Government, the revamped Court, and succeeding ones, upheld the expansion of power of the Central Government in almost every conceivable situation where there was a conflict with the States. Thereafter the 10th amendment has been all but ignored.

Whether for good or ill, the skids were thus greased for the Federal takeover, and that is what is happening. The movement is today—in the sixties—being accelerated. Out of the window and into the ashcan went James Madison's assurance to posterity that the Founding Fathers were giving us "two kinds of government, harmonious with each other, but each supreme in its own sphere."

Those who adhere to that philosophy are quite frank and open in their views. Modern Supreme Court decisions are replete with that doctrine, and a subservient Congress has refused to do anything about it. In fact, in the enactment of a succession of laws, usually at the prodding of the Executive, the Congress has been *particeps criminis* to this takeover.

David Brinkley, the well-known radio and TV commentator, in a speech to students at Ohio University last July 17, was quoted as saying:

"The decline and fall of the 50 State governments will be completed within our lifetime. The movement of political power from State capitals to Washington, D.C., is inevitable and unstoppable whether we like it or not."

In another speech at Harvard last March, Brinkley said: "The States will be left with nothing to do but the routine chores like passing traffic laws [on their own highways only, not Federal highways] and planting roses and painting the benches in the public parks * * * while the real business of political leadership will have moved to Washington."

And Brinkley contended this change will give us a better form of government. This, of course, is not a change that he envisions—it is a revolution in government.

Now, the tragic thing about it is that Brinkley may be right. His thinking is shared by many others, and the winds of change that are sweeping over the body politic in the sixties would seem to vindicate that way of thinking.

EVIDENCES OF EXPANDED POWER AND CONTROL IN WASHINGTON

I do not want to appear here in the role of an alarmist or a pessimist. I have faith in the ability of our people to cope with the situation, once they fully understand it and all its implications. In any event, it would seem most desirable that we face up to what is happening, and then form our own judgment about what if anything should be done to try to change the trend. If the people do not like this trend and want to do something about it, they have the privilege of electing men and women to Congress who will apply the brakes and effectively change the trend. It is just that simple.

Let us briefly examine a few evidences of this switchover—this trend toward big government in Washington. I shall not dwell upon the many Supreme Court cutthroat decisions which have played havoc with the part States are supposed under the Constitution to play in governmental actions; rather, I shall refer to a few actions by the Congress, which so often in recent years have bypassed the States and local governments, in moving pellmell toward the decline and fall of the 50 States.

Only last year, riding a wave of emotional hysteria, the Congress enacted a voter registration bill. This was done despite the fact that only the year before the Congress approved a measure to give Federal courts all the authority they could want to protect every citizen in the legitimate exercise of the ballot.

The new law was cleverly worded to limit its application to only a handful of States—where fewer than 50 percent of eligible votes were cast at the preceding general elections. All other States were exempted from its harsh mandates.

The bill gave the Attorney General, at his discretion, the power to send Federal registrars into any of these few States, push aside local election officials, ignore State laws, virtually conduct elections and count the ballots—a measure highly reminiscent of Reconstruction days.

In that unprecedented action, the Congress refused to admit that illiteracy, abysmal ignorance, or moral decay, must be matters for consideration in qualifying a citizen to participate in self-government.

In recent weeks we have witnessed right here in Texas the abuse of that law with respect to voter registration. The Attorney General, evidently assuming that some of our Texas officials are corrupt, dishonest, and irresponsible, sent FBI agents in to spy on county tax collectors while citizens were being registered to vote. Yet, by and large, Texas has one of the cleanest records in the Nation in allowing qualified citizens to vote.

I cite this voter law as an example of the extension and abuse of Federal power in the area of voting—clearly the responsibility of the States and local units of government, and so provided by the Constitution.

Let me cite another example of how the Federal Government, at the instance of the Congress, is moving into local affairs. Last year, by a six-vote margin in the House, a rent subsidy law was enacted. Under it Uncle Sam is to send checks each month to hundreds of thousands of eligible tenants to apply on their monthly rent bills. Under this revolutionary concept, copied from the British, the fortunate eligible tenants will be required to pay no more than one-fourth of their monthly incomes on rent—the balance to be paid by a benevolent government in Washington.

This approach will, obviously, tend to discourage homeownership in America. It will tend to undermine the incentive of individuals to better themselves by their own efforts. In a way, it provides a bonus for shiftlessness and other defects of individual character. We already have ample provision to take care of worthy and needy families who have housing problems.

I might add that Robert Weaver, the new Secretary of Housing, has made it quite clear that a prime purpose of this new concept is to enable and promote integration in middle-income neighborhoods.

That same housing bill, which included the rent supplemental provision, contains a mass of Federal aids and handouts which will cost the American taxpayers many billions of dollars. It even provides for a direct grant of up to $1,500 to certain homeowners for use in refurbishing their homes.

Be that as it may, this is a classic example of "creative federalism," which is involving the Central Government in a myriad of purely local and individual area of responsibilities.

OTHER EXAMPLES

In 1954 Federal tax money was being rechanneled back to State and local levels at the rate of $3 billion a year. Ten years later, in 1964, the figure was $10 billion, and it will be more than $13 billion this year. This grant and aid is administered by more than 120 Federal aid programs, and the outlays account for 15 percent of all State and local revenues. Yet, the simple fact is that for every $3 of tax money that goes to Washington to be used for Federal aid programs, less than $2 ever finds its way back.

The Federal Government is moving feverishly into the field of local education. Last year the Congress enacted a general aid program, applicable to secondary and elementary schools. Already many school boards are fretting because of the many strings attached to the money they spend. In many instances they find the Federal Government giving aid with one hand and then taking it back with the other, under guise of authority to insist that before the money is theirs they must conform with some obscure Federal fiat or a racial custom.

Indeed this use of power to force conformance with Federal edicts and policies has become commonplace. It is a form of legalized blackmail to force recipients of aid in various forms to yield obedience to the whims of the Federal establishment—another gimmick to make the States totally subservient.

Last year and again this year the Nation witnessed a massive drive to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, in order to deprive the States of the right to determine for themselves whether they should or should not have a form of compulsory unionism in order to work and earn a livelihood.

Legislation is now pending to federalize and vastly increase the unemployment insurance in the various States—which if enacted, incidentally, will cost Texas employers alone an extra $100 million annually. This represents a grab for power and an attempt to force conformity on the part of the States in the area of unemployment compensation.

Besides, it is well known that to loosen and expand this program will encourage more people to devise excuses to take advantage of it and quit working. It seems that we spend all kinds of money on promoting employment, then take steps to promote unemployment.

Another example of an eager-beaver Federal bureaucracy which yearns for more power is the depressed area legislation. Enacted in 1961, billions of dollars have already been spent under this program. Later it was called area redevelopment. A year ago it was considered a dead duck, having been quite discredited, but an obedient Congress approved another 5-year, $3 billion extension. The 400 employees in that agency, who were already looking around for new jobs, remained and an additional 1,200 were promptly added.

THE POVERTY NIGHTMARE

We now spend nearly $2 billion in the so-called poverty war—that being but one phase of the battle. No one wants poverty and everyone would like to see it reduced or eliminated. But the country was making great strides in this area long before its presence was officially discovered.

For example, without any special programs, the number of American families with real income below $3,000 a year decreased by 60 percent between 1929 and 1962, while during the same period the number of family units increased by 63 percent.

Indeed, there are now 115 different Federal programs available to combat poverty. The present poverty program is an administrative nightmare, topheavy with administrative costs. In fact, 44 of the top people in that agency draw about $1 million a year—1 in every 18 employees gets above $19,000 a year. Here we have a sprawling bureaucracy, with overlapping and duplications all over the place.

Now, the only sound program in this area is one to help people help themselves. To the extent that this or any other program does that, on a sound basis, there is no quarrel. But the waste, duplication, and the very magnitude of the undertaking almost defies efficiency in administration.

On the heels of these massive programs there are naturally many ill effects, aside from certain good that is accomplished. In combating poverty, money alone will not suffice. Some of these welfare programs actually encourage unemployment and shiftlessness. There are those who would rather have a welfare check than a job. And there is the problem of how to keep children from becoming infected with a life on public assistance. In other words, this type of aid, improperly applied, can debilitate rather than rehabilitate.

Not long ago a Los Angeles judge told of a young couple with six children, with another on the way, who came before him seeking a divorce. They said they needed the divorce, not because of a domestic rift but rather because, once divorced, the wife could then draw $300 a month in welfare, and the husband was then earning only $250 a month.

There are today 8 million Americans—1 in every 24—receiving some form of public assistance. And this does not include unemployment insurance cases. Direct welfare now costs more than $5.5 billion a year, and is steadily rising at the rate of about a billion dollars every 3 years—despite all the billions that are being spent in the so-called war on poverty.

That raises the question of whether we are treating the symptoms more than the disease. Perhaps more attention should be directed at planned parenthood, free dissemination of birth control information for the benefit of those who seek it. We are told, for example, that 9 out of 10 impoverished women in this country still lack competent birth control information and assistance. More help along that line would give some permanent relief from this chronic and ever-recurring problem.

CONCENTRATION OF POWER MEANS LOSS OF LIBERTY

Thus, we continue this Great Welfare Society outlay of goodies from Washington, despite the fact that we are waging a $10-billion-a-year war in Vietnam. Most of these expensive programs cumulatively bring about an erosion of the States in our scheme of government. Perhaps this would be a good time to be reminded of Woodrow Wilson's warning, when he said:

"The history of liberty is a history of limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because a concentration of power always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

I should like to conclude my remarks with another quotation—this from the prophet Jeremiah, who, in another troubled age, 600 years B.C., said:

"Stand ye in the old ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein."

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 25, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Archbishop Vasili, of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in the United States and Canada, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we humbly bow our heads before Thee, and offer our profound gratitude for the abundant blessings Thou hast bestowed upon America and her people.

O Lord and Redeemer, we ask Your assistance, that a spirit of wisdom, strength, and love direct our esteemed President and Vice President of the United States, and that Your blessings of counsel and guidance remain abundantly with this august body, the honorable Senate of the United States, this temple of peace, freedom, and justice.

Eternal God and Saviour, we pray today for Thy divine mercy and judgment for the welfare of the Byelorussian Nation, whose proclamation of independence, as the Byelorussian National Republic, was observed 48 years ago, and whose people have striven during these years to free themselves from the tyranny of an atheistic oppression, in the hope of enjoying the liberties and freedom, under God, as is the way in the United States. We pray today that the benefits of freedom granted to democracies all over the world may serve as an infallible encouragement to the people of Byelorussia, for the vision of everlasting freedom is not lost among them, but burns as a torch deep in their hearts.

Our God and Redeemer, we faithfully implore Thee: accept this our prayer; bless the United States of America and Byelorussia.

May Thy glorious name, our God and Saviour, reign and shine in our hearts and be blessed now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 22, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 22, 1966, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 23, 1966, received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12762. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; and

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 22, 1966,

The following reports of committees were submitted on the dates indicated:

On March 23, 1966:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 233. Resolution to print as a Senate document the third annual report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on air pollution (Rept. No. 1080).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the placing of a bust of Constantino Brumidi in the Capitol (Rept. No. 1081);

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on District of Columbia home rule (Rept. No. 1082);

S. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966 (Rept. No. 1083);

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Joint Economic Committee of additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings entitled "Recent Federal Reserve Actions and Economic Policy Coordination" (Rept. No. 1084);

S. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of the hearings of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico as Senate documents (Rept. No. 1085);

S. Res. 228. Resolution providing additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

S. Res. 232. Resolution to print a report on "A Study of Pollution—Air" (Rept. No. 1086);

S. Res. 235. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services; and

S. Res. 236. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print "Digest and Analysis of the Cold War GI Bill," for use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 1087).

On March 24, 1966:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 2669. A bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1089).

ORIGINAL RESOLUTIONS REPORTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 22, 1966, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolutions, which were ordered to be placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 238

Resolution to pay a gratuity to Georgia Wendell

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Georgia Wendell, daughter of Thomas E. Harty, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to the gross compensation paid him by the Senate in calendar year 1965, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

S. RES. 239

Resolution to pay a gratuity to Alma F. Brahan

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Alma F. Brahan, widow of Thomas S. Brahan, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

S. RES. 240

Resolution authorizing the printing of the sixty-eighth annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document (S. Rept. No. 1088)

Resolved, That the sixty-eighth annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1965, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 22, 1966,

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, on March 24, 1966, reported the following nominations:

William H. Terrill, of Colorado, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Colorado;

Frederick J. R. Heebe, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana;

Russell E. Smith, of Montana, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Montana;

Clinton N. Ashmore, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Florida;

Harry D. Mansfield, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee;

Joseph L. Ward, of Nevada, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Nevada;

Frank M. Wozencraft, of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General; and

Mitchell Rogovin, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10403) for the relief of Edward F. Murzyn and Edward J. O'Brien.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. YOUNGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10607) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10607) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Democratic steering committee, and with their unanimous approval, I send to the desk an unusual resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 241) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. LONG of Louisiana be and he is hereby assigned to service in the Committee on Commerce, in lieu of Mr. MCGEE, resigned; that Mr. MCGEE be and he is hereby assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations, in lieu of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, resigned.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I note that in the list of nominations just confirmed by the Senate is the name of an old friend, Russell E. Smith, for the position of U.S. district judge for the district of Montana.

Russell Smith is one of the State's outstanding attorneys, if not one of the Nation's. He has an excellent record, born in Butte, reared in Billings, he has practiced law in Cut Bank and in Missoula, and has also served on the faculty of the University of Montana Law School.

I am delighted that the Senate has shown its confidence in Judge Smith by this unanimous vote.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am proud to have the opportunity to endorse the nomination of Russell E. Smith for judge of the U.S. district court. In my opinion, he will be a superb trial judge. His experience, his natural sense of justice, his thorough knowledge of the law, all contribute to his qualifications for this important position.

I have known Russell Smith since 1928 when I started to school at the University of Montana and he was then an upperclassman. I knew him then as a leader on the campus. He was admitted to the Montana Bar in 1931 and, after 2 years as a law clerk in the Montana Supreme Court, came back to Missoula, Mont., to practice. When I went into law school in 1936 he was a member of the firm headed by now retired Circuit Judge Walter Pope. One of the courses that Judge Pope taught in the law school was evidence and several times when the demands of his practice made it impossible for Judge Pope to take the class, he sent Russell Smith to handle it for him. So, I have known Mr. Smith as a student in his classes.

For a time I practiced law in the same area in which Mr. Smith dominated the practice and have known him as an opponent before the bar. Once I had the good fortune to be on the same side and we worked as colleagues.

After the end of World War II when I was elected to the Montana Supreme Court he made repeated appearances before the court and his arguments were always well prepared, logical, and convincing.

I know of no one who has had the variety of experience he has had. Teacher of evidence, trial lawyer in all phases of a general practice, he has represented plaintiffs in liability cases, he has represented insurance companies, and he has defended clients in criminal actions. He is an acknowledged expert on mining and irrigation law. He has helped to revise the codes of the State of Montana. He has made his contribution to the profession by serving as president of the Montana Bar Association and several times as delegate to Federal conferences with the lawyers and judges of the ninth circuit.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe that we are fortunate in Montana that Russell Smith has consented to accept this nomination.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial about Judge Smith from the December 23, 1965, issue of the Park County News, Livingston, Mont., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Livingston (Mont.) Park County News, Dec. 23, 1965]

RUSSELL SMITH HAS ABILITY, EXPERIENCE, COMMONSENSE TO BE CREDITABLE U.S. JUDGE

Montana's Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and LEE METCALF have made an excellent recommendation in submitting the nomination of Russell E. Smith, a distinguished Missoual attorney, for the vacancy as a U.S. district judge to succeed the Hon. James D. Murray. Russell Smith, a native of Billings and University of Montana Law School graduate, began his legal career as marshall for the Montana Supreme Court in 1930. Later, for a time he practiced law at Cut Bank as an associate with the late Gov. Sam C. Ford, who previously had served as Montana's attorney general and as an associate justice of the Montana Supreme Court.

From Cut Bank he moved to Missoula, where he became associated with Walter Pope, another distinguished Montana lawyer, who later was named a justice of the San Francisco U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. However, Smith carved out a niche for himself in all phases of the law and has built up a substantial law practice.

To his credit has been his continuous loyalty to his alma mater, the University of Montana law school. Starting in 1937, and continuing to the present except for his period of service in the U.S. Navy during World War II, he has taught the key evidence course at the institution. During that 25-year period he has had perhaps 500 young lawyers as students, most of whom have remained in Montana. Talking with any number of them, here and throughout the State, one soon senses the high esteem in which he is held as a lawyer, a teacher, and a friend.

Down through the years he has been a close and esteemed friend and supporter of his former teacher, Senator Mike Mansfield, and the junior Senator, Lee Metcalf. Smith's name was mentioned prominently a few years ago when Judge Pope retired from the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, but James Browning, another Montanan and then secretary of the U.S. Supreme Court, was nominated by Senator Lee Metcalf with the approval of Senator Mansfield. However, it was known at the time that Smith was favored by Mansfield.

But, Smith, a past president of the Montana bar association, has the respect of his associates, regardless of political affiliation. He has unquestioned ability, good judgment, and the potential to make a highly creditable judge and an able associate to the other Montana U.S. district judge, William J. Jameson. When Judge Murray was nominated there were many, including the News editor, who questioned his ability in comparison with other nominees. The contention was that his nomination was possible only because his father, the late Senator J. E. Murray, was in a position to obtain his nomination. However, Judge Murray has distinguished himself, just as we know Russell Smith will do in the years to come. Our congratulations to Senator Mansfield and Metcalf for picking a man of ability, one who has been a good lawyer and a responsible citizen.

F.J.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Title I Agreements Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Overobligation of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the National Capital Housing Authority for "Operation and maintenance of properties," for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Insurance and Guarantees on U.S. Exports to Yugoslavia

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees of U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of February 1966, not previously reported, totaled $296,569; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Civil Defense Functions

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on civil defense functions, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Military Construction Contracts

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of the Air Force awarded no military construction contracts on other than a competitive basis, during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965, and that the total military construction contracts awarded by competition by that Department for the same period was $10,818,994; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Reserve Forces

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on reserve forces, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report

A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, stockpile report, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July 1965–January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Publication Entitled "Typical Electric Bills, 1965"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Typical Electric Bills, 1965" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Economic Development of the Territory of Guam

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the economic development of the territory of Guam (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Dolores Project, Colorado

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Dolores project, Colorado (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

National Water Commission Act

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Case of Moorland Court, Inc., *v.* The United States

A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the court's opinion and findings in the case of *Moorland Court, Inc.*, v. *The United States* (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Government Printing Office

A letter from the Public Printer, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Government Printing Office, during the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters

A letter from the assistant secretary-treasurer, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that institution, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Drafts of Proposed Legislation Relating to Public Health

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to improve the safety and reliability of drugs;

A bill to protect children and others from the accidental death or injury by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to aspirin intended for children, safety closures on drug containers, and cautionary labeling of containers of articles subject to the act where necessary to that end, and by amending the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to ban hazardous toys and articles intended for children, and other articles so hazardous as to be dangerous in the household regardless of labeling, and to apply to unpackaged articles intended for household use, and for other purposes; and

A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the purpose of strengthening and facilitating mutual cooperation and assistance, including training of personnel, in the administration and enforcement of that act and of State and local laws relating to food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 109

"Concurrent resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, and to govern occasions when the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 1st session of the 89th Congress proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to more clearly define the order of succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, and occasions when the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; and

"Whereas the amendment so proposed was the will of the Congress and is believed to be a legal and workable compromise on the question of presidential succession and presidential disability; and

"Whereas said proposed amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress; and

"Whereas our Nation has heretofore been faced with grave and serious problems of presidential succession when near fatal or prolonged illnesses have struck down the President, and that to insure an orderly and responsible exercise of the powers and duties vested in the highest executive office of our National Government; and thence to insure the proper discharge of the powers and duties of the office of the President of the United States and Vice President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, That the herein proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and the same is hereby ratified and approved:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'Sec. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'Sec. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'Sec. 4. Whenever the Vice President and the majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as the Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon, Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office;' and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Mississippi transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Administrator of General Services of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate, February 3, 1966.

"Carroll Gartin,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, March 10, 1966.

"Gray Payne Cossar,
"Acting Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Senate Resolution 59

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States H.R. 11798, the proposed Federal Interstate Taxation Act, which was introduced on October 22, 1965; and

"Whereas the proposed legislation purports to simplify the responsibility of corporations doing multi-State business in meeting tax obligations due the respective States; and

"Whereas it appears that this proposed legislation, if enacted, would require State laws to conform to the Federal Internal Revenue Code, as it now is or may be amended from time to time, in arriving at corporate taxable income, thereby removing from the States the power of adjusting taxable bases; and

"Whereas this proposed legislation, if enacted, would place the interpretation, regulation, and enforcement of the uniform apportionment formula with the Internal Revenue Service, with appeal rights to the Federal Tax Court, thereby removing from the States the responsibility for administration and appeal; and

"Whereas this proposed legislation, if enacted, would erode State revenue bases and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, at its budget session of 1966, That the Congress of the United States and Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to reject and defeat H.R. 11798, the proposed Federal Interstate Taxation Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, the Honorable Hiram L. Fong and the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senators from Hawaii, and the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga and the Honorable Patsy T. Mink, Members of Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Resolution 351

"Resolution relative to the Federal appropriation for the special milk program for children and for other purposes

"Whereas the proposed Federal budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, drastically cuts funds for the special milk program for children; and

"Whereas these reductions in funds will greatly reduce this program in many schools; and

"Whereas this program is beneficial to both children and farmers and has been supported by educators, nutritionists and farmers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States be, and is, memorialized to appropriate not less than $110 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and not less than $115 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not less than $120 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each succeeding fiscal year thereafter for the special milk program for children; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secertary of Agriculture of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Secretary of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Georgia delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"Read and adopted in the House, February 14, 1966.

"Glenn W. Ellard,
"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution

"Joint resolution relative to the national school lunch program and the special milk program

"Whereas the National School Lunch Act, Public Law 79–396, was established in 1946 and the special milk program, Public Law 85-478, was established by Congress in 1954 to encourage the consumption of wholesome and nutritional foods and fluid milk by children in the United States; and

"Whereas, these programs have provided as much as a 9-cent-per-lunch reimbursement to schools in addition to Section 32 surplus price-supported food donations and enable schools generally to serve a one-half or one-third quart of milk to a child for 5 cents; and

"Whereas, the success of the programs is shown by the fact that during the 1964–65 fiscal year more than 18 million children were covered by the national school lunch program; and in California, more than 800,000 type A lunches were served daily, more than 1 million cases of section 32 surplus commodities valued at more than $18 million were donated to schools; and more than 140 million half-pint equivalents of milk were served, in addition to 286 million half-pint equivalents served under the special milk program; and

"Whereas, during the past several years reimbursements for lunches have declined to 4 cents, stocks of surplus commodities are becoming exhausted and the Bureau of the Budget has held special milk program funds to $100 million annually on a national basis, as a result of which it has been necessary for the U.S. Department of Agriculture to reduce claims for reimbursement submitted by participants in order to keep within available funds; and

"Whereas, beginning February 1, 1966, a 10-percent reduction in claims has been ordered because of a $3-million cut in the current budget appropriation for the special milk program; and

"Whereas, the President's budget request for 1967 has cut the proposed appropriation for the national school lunch program from $202 million to $183 million and for the special milk program from the $103 million deemed by Congress to be the minimum needed for the 1965–66 fiscal year to an unrealistic $21 million, cuts which would make it financially impossible for many schools currently participating in these programs to continue their participation, or would permit such participation only at such reduced levels, and might consequently deprive millions of children of low-income families of the only basic foods they receive during the schoolday: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the

United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and Congress to restore the $3 million cut in the current budget for the special milk program and to increase the proposed appropriations in the 1967 budget for the school lunch program to at least the existing level of $202 million, and, for the special milk program to at least the existing level of $103 million; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the President of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and Congress should give serious consideration to expanding both the school lunch and milk programs, and to replenishing and expanding stocks of surplus agricultural commodities for donation to lunch programs; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative from California in Congress, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed Allen Camp Dam and Reservoir

"Whereas it has been proposed that a new unit in the Central Valley project be constructed, an Allen Camp Dam and Reservoir in Modoc County on the Pit River 10 miles north of Lookout; and

"Whereas this huge dam-reservoir-recreation project will involve construction of a 22-mile reservoir backed up by an earthfill dam 129 feet long and holding about 190,000 acre-feet of water, which will provide great flood control advantages and water for irrigation in southwest Modoc and northwest Lassen Counties; and

"Whereas in addition to its flood control and irrigation advantages, the project will facilitate the creation of a Big Valley National Wildlife Refuge on 7,000 acres of land now in private ownership, and it is planned that $430,000 will be spent initially on land and facilities for recreation purposes, including boating, fishing, swimming, camping, and picnicking; and

"Whereas the plans for this much-needed project are now being reviewed before submission to the Department of the Interior and ultimate submission to Congress for authorization: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the appropriate officials in the Department of the Interior and the Congress of the United States to approve the proposed Allen Camp Dam and Reservoir and take all necessary action as soon as possible in order that construction of this great project may be begun and be completed at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the California State Board of Education, Sacramento, Calif., favoring an increased appropriation for the national school lunch program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the California State Board of Education, Sacramento, Calif., favoring an increased appropriation for the special milk program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Conservative Club of Yonkers, N.Y., protesting against the formation of an Atlantic Union constitutional convention relating to NATO; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Ridgewood Unit of Republican Women, of Ridgewood, N.J., favoring the Dirksen amendment to the Constitution relating to apportionment of State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs, Moorestown, N.J., relating to more equitable method of electing the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts):

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolution by Senate of Massachusetts

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact proposed legislation relative to increases in size and weight of packages shipped via the U.S. mail

"Whereas H.R. 12367 is currently pending before the Congress of the United States, relative to certain increases in weight and size of packages shipped via the U.S. mail; and

"Whereas the far-reaching effect of this bill will be the loss of thousands of jobs for employees of certain express companies in the Commonwealth, the cancellation of the construction of a modern express terminal, and the cancellation of millions of dollars in orders for automative equipment: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts Senate hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact H.R. 12367, relative to increases in weight and size of packages shipped via the U.S. mail; and be it further

"*Resolved* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate, March 7, 1966.

"*Thomas A. Chadwick,*
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3125. A bill for the relief of Ding Y. Tam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 3126. A bill to provide indemnity payments to farmers whose agricultural commodities are removed from the commercial markets because such commodities contain residues of poisonous chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3127. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 25th anniversary of the first controlled and sustained nuclear reaction by man; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pearson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho):

S. 3128. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southwest Idaho water development project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina:

S. 3129. A bill for the relief of certain civilian employees of the U.S. Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 3130. A bill for the relief of Hershel Smith, publisher of the Lindsay News, of Lindsay, Okla.; and

S. 3131. A bill for the relief of Alvin P. Hanes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 3132. A bill for the relief of Samuel K. Abrams, on behalf of Richard K. Abrams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3133. A bill for the relief of the Colbert County Board of Education, Colbert County, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3134. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; and

S. 3135. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to increase from 4 months to 5 months the maximum period for which a child may be out of school between school years without losing his status as a student for purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3136. A bill to facilitate the provision of adequate, economical and dependable electric service for the present and future needs of the public and the proper and timely installation and use of the products of advancing technology in the generation or transmission of electric energy; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3137. A bill for the relief of Hye Huk Paeng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 3138. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, and handling of dogs and cats in commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3139. A bill to improve the administration of community action programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3140. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 241) making changes in the membership of certain standing committees of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO CREATE A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON FILM CLASSIFICATION

Mrs. SMITH submitted a resolution (S. Res. 242) to create a Special Committee on Film Classification, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mrs. SMITH, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 243) amending rule XXV of the standing rules relative to meetings of standing committees while the Senate is in session, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULES III AND IV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 244) amending rules III and IV of the standing rules with respect to the commencement of daily sessions and the Journal, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE VIII OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 245) amending rule VIII of the standing rules relative to motions for the consideration of matters, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO FARMERS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill that will establish permanent provisions whereby farmers can obtain indemnity payments for any condemned commodity found to contain residues of pesticide chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government and where the reported findings of such residues are the result of no fault of the farmer or due to factors beyond his control. I ask unanimous consent that this bill remain at the desk for 1 week to permit other Senators an opportunity to join in sponsoring this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, chemical pesticides have become an absolutely necessary element in the production of food. Because of pesticides, the quantity of food produced by American farmers has been greatly increased. Moreover, the use of pesticides by the farmer means that the American housewife is able to buy higher quality foods and at lower prices than would otherwise be the case.

Although pesticides are essential to food production there are certain potential hazards in their use. Under certain conditions food can become contaminated with chemical residues which could have possible harmful effects when consumed.

Because of this the production and application of pesticides is carefully regulated by the Federal Government, with the objective of assuring that all consumers can enjoy the positive benefits of the greater quantity and quality of food made possible by the use of pesticides.

Not only is the production and application of pesticides carefully regulated, but the Food and Drug Administration carries on an extensive monitoring to assure that no contaminated food ever reaches the shelves of the supermarket. If such residues are detected, the commodity is immediately condemned.

Mr. President, these programs are rightfully designed to protect the consumer from any potential hazard over which he had no control. But, Mr. President, there are no adequate programs designed to protect the individual farmer against the great economic loss of having his produce confiscated even though the suspected contamination occurred through no fault whatsoever of the farmer or because of factors totally beyond his control.

This anomalous situation has resulted several times in great economic hardship to individual farmers. Let me cite some specific examples to illustrate the problem.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has for several years recommended that certain authorized pesticides be used in the production of livestock hay for dairy cattle. One of the regulations of the Food and Drug Administration prohibits the marketing of milk containing any pesticide residue. In 1964, because of new, supersensitive analytical devices capable of detecting the most minute pesticide residue traces, Federal inspectors began to detect traces of pesticide residue in milk at various places. Acting under the existing rules the FDA had no choice but to order such milk to be dumped. In these cases the contamination came from feeding cows hay which had been treated according to USDA recommendations. Thus, all of a sudden a number of farmers found that the same milk that they had been marketing for some time was now condemned. Moreover, the farmer had been using the offending pesticide in accordance with the instructions and recommendations of USDA. During 1964 and 1965 hundreds of dairy farmers were caught in this anomalous position and as a consequence suffered great economic losses.

To illustrate another type of situation let me cite a concrete case. In July 1965, a very good dairyman near Larned, Kans., was found to have an excessive amount of a pesticide residue in his milk and he, therefore, could no longer market the milk which was the sole source of his livelihood. Now this particular farmer had never used the pesticide in question, and, in fact, had never sprayed his pastures or crops with any economic poison. How the milk came to be contaminated is not known and probably never will be, but this, of course, had no bearing on the fact that his milk had to be removed from the market.

In 1963 a shipment of spinach was seized by the FDA after inspectors reported that the spinach contained traces of a certain pesticide residue. Investigation showed that the pesticide had never been applied to the crop or even used in the vicinity. Upon rechecking the FDA found that its original analysis had been in error and that the spinach was not adulterated after all. But by this time the spinach had spoiled and the farmer had suffered a great economic loss.

These few examples show that through no fault of their own individual farmers can suffer economic losses at times because of conflicting Government regulations, or because of mistakes made by Government scientists, or because of other factors totally beyond his control.

Mr. President, it is imperative that this situation be rectified. The bill I introduce today is intended to accomplish this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kansas.

The bill (S. 3126) to provide indemnity payments to farmers whose agricultural commodities are removed from the commercial markets because such commodities contain residues of poisonous chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3126

A bill to provide indemnity payments to farmers whose agricultural commodities are removed from the commercial markets because such commodities contain residues of poisonous chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make indemnity payments, at a fair market value, to any farmer who, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, has been directed by Federal or State officials to remove or withhold any agricultural commodity, or product thereof, from commercial markets because such commodity or product contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government at the time of such use. Such indemnity payments shall continue to any such farmer until such time as he is permitted to dispose of such commodity or product on commercial markets.

SEC. 2. Indemnity payments shall not be denied any farmer under this Act if the agricultural commodity, or product thereof, produced by such farmer was contaminated (by chemical residues) through no fault of such farmer; but no farmer shall be eligible for such payments on any such commodity, or product thereof, removed from commercial markets if he failed to follow the procedures prescribed by the Federal Government for use of the offending chemical or failed to comply with any rule or regulation issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary and desirable to effectively administer the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SPECIAL STAMP TO COMMEMORATE THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST CONTROLLED AND SUSTAINED NUCLEAR REACTION BY MAN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today I introduce proposed legislation which calls for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 25th anniversary of the first controlled and sustained nuclear reaction by man.

I submit this bill as support for the issuance of such a stamp which is presently under consideration by the Post Office Department's Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee. The bill would provide for a stamp to be issued on December 2, 1967, and it is my hope that the design could follow that of a mosaic created by students and staff at Kansas State University's Departments of Architecture and Nuclear Engineering. This particular mosaic to which I refer is mounted on the concrete shield of the new TRIGA teaching and research reactor at Kansas State University. It is 6½ feet high and 4½ feet wide, contains nearly 10,000 pieces of colored glass, with "hands of supplication" which convey mankind's hope that the gift of nuclear energy will be used wisely.

I am sure there will be others who will wish to add their support to the issuance of such a commemorative stamp.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3127) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 25th anniversary of the first controlled and sustained nuclear reaction by man, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

THE SOUTHWEST IDAHO WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of introducing legislation that will provide new opportunities, develop arid lands in southwestern Idaho, produce wildlife, flood control, power, and recreational benefits, and add to the economic well-being of the entire Pacific Northwest. My colleague, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], joins me in cosponsoring this proposal.

Seldom does a proposal for new development reach so many public needs as does the southwestern Idaho water development project.

At a time when we are faced with dwindling food surpluses and growing national and international food requirements, the southwest Idaho water development project will, upon its final completion, open for cultivation nearly a half-million acres of vacant desert land. It will also bring supplemental water to more than 60,000 acres of farmland now under cultivation, but without adequate water supply. It will assure the cities and towns within the project area of needed water to turn the wheels of industry and meet growing domestic requirements. At the reservoirs to be constructed, the project will add the places for outdoor recreation, thus helping to meet the burgeoning demand for fishing, swimming, and water sports of our fast-growing population.

With our population growth expected to reach 350 million by the end of this century—just 34 brief years away—there is an obvious need for getting on with comprehensive development projects of this kind. Our best forecasters tell us that, by the turn of the century, this country will be facing a "land deficit," that is to say, there are not enough arable acres under production today to furnish the foodstuffs that will be needed to meet the greatly expanded population four decades hence. Not only are there not enough acres available today, but without further reclamation work nearly 25 million acres now under cultivation will have been lost to urbanization as the Nation's growing cities spread ever wider upon the face of the land.

We cannot wait until that time is upon us to meet the emergencies. Then it will be too late. Wise planning today, as envisioned by this project, storing and diverting the abundant waters of Idaho near their source and spreading them upon arid lands close by, is not a matter of simple ambition on the part of Idahoans—it is a matter of utmost concern to the entire Nation.

This is the objective we seek to serve in asking congressional authorization for the southwest Idaho water development project.

It embraces under a single concept, several well-developed and already studied plans for utilizing the unappropriated waters of the Snake River and its tributaries in 11 southwestern Idaho counties. It taps this rich potential at a series of key points, utilizing every tool of the reclamationist's trade.

A series of dams, some already built and others to be constructed, will provide needed storage, while diversion tunnels at three sites will funnel the waters to the reservoirs in the system. Balanced usage and integrated development are the bywords of the proposal. Through a system of diversion works, water will be channeled from surplus mountain torrents in the Garden Valley division, to irrigated lands in the Boise Valley, and to yet-unopened desert lands south of the Snake River in the Mountain Home and Bruneau divisions of the project. In the course of harnessing these surplus waters, additional benefits will accrue to the public in the form of greatly expanded recreational facilities and electric power generation. The principal power source for the project will be in the Garden Valley division where the brimming waters of the Payette River, which have spilled and flooded over downstream farmlands and communities in past years, will be harnessed to generate 368,500 kilowatts of electricity at two powerplants. At the Guffey Dam in the Mountain Home division, another 85,000 kilowatts of power will be produced, which will turn mighty pumps to suck the waters up from the canyon of the Snake River and turn them out upon the fertile but thirsty desert.

However, irrigation is just one aspect of the overall project. I stated a few moments ago that serious floods have swamped the lower Payette drainages in recent years. Providing effective flood control to prevent needless destruction of already developed farmlands and damage to the downstream communities in the drainage basins, is another goal of the project.

As these wasting waters are brought into use through the network of dams and reservoirs, extensive new recreational opportunities will be created, new sources of relaxation and outdoor activity for many additional thousands of vacationers seeking relief from the growing pressures of metropolitan living. Opening new lands to farming means the development of wildlife cover and habitat for game birds and animals. Water quality control and creation of manmade lakes will greatly enhance fishing resources.

Growth breeds growth. As the agricultural base broadens, the cities and towns in the project area will expand to supply the services and, in turn, will require new and assured water supplies for municipal use. The southwest Idaho water development project will furnish that assurance and the city of Mountain Home has already committed itself to purchase a share of the water when available. Water quality is equally important. By regulation of flow, quality can be achieved.

Specifically, the southwest Idaho water development project bill asks immediate authorization of the Mountain Home division, including the Guffey Dam and Reservoir and the Long Tom diversion tunnel and Hillcrest unit. It also seeks immediate authorization of that portion of the Garden Valley division which includes the Garden Valley Dam, Reservoir, and related power facilities. It calls for accelerated studies on the Weiser and Bruneau division and sets a time limit for completion of studies on the remainder of the Garden Valley division.

Let me make it crystal clear, Mr. President, that in every division of this project, all existing water rights are completely protected and that, in any exchange of use that may be contemplated, no basic water rights will be altered or impaired.

It is our hope to hold hearings both in Washington and in the field, this year. At that time, any questions as to water diversion limits, or other spelled out assurances as to protection of existing water rights, and related matters, will be fully and carefully explored.

It is seldom that a proposal has received as much general support as has the southwest Idaho water development project. Although it had not yet come before the Congress, the proposed project has already received the endorsement of the Idaho State Legislature and the State's principal water policy agency, the Idaho Water Resources Board. House Joint Memorial 7, enacted by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Idaho State Legislature on March 7, 1966, says in part:

> We, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do wholeheartedly endorse the concept of the southwest Idaho water development project as supported by the entire congressional delegation from the State of Idaho.

Additionally, the project has received equally enthusiastic support from public and private organizations and individuals throughout the State. Farmers, ranchers, conservationists and leaders of business and industry, all recognize the need for balanced and integrated development of our wealth of natural resources. They acknowledge the need to create a single hydrologically acceptable program for the use of these resources.

The costs of construction will be repaid from numerous sources. While irrigators will pay a substantial share of the overall costs, a part will be charged to recreational benefits, to municipal and industrial users, and to fish and wildlife benefits. A substantial share of the costs would be covered by a project basin account against Federal power-producing sources. Idaho water provides a sizable share of the flow energizing the Columbia River Federal power system. The Snake River enters Idaho with an annual flow of 4 million acre-feet at our eastern border. When the Snake leaves Idaho and crosses into Oregon and Washington to join with the Columbia River, it is carrying an annual flow of 38 million acre-feet—more than a ninefold increase in its passage through Idaho. Accordingly, it is both just and necessary that a subsantial share of the overall project costs be repaid through surplus power revenues of the Bonneville Power Administration.

I feel, Mr. President, that I am asking the Senate to consider one of the most comprehensive and well-developed plans that has ever been presented for the multipurposed utilization of a great natural resource. It will extend its benefits not only to the more than a quarter of a million persons living in the 11 counties in which the project is located, but it will have dramatic effects upon the long-range economy and well-being of the entire Northwest.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the bill, together with the memorial of the Idaho Legislature in support of it, be printed at this point in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorial will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3128) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southwest Idaho water development project, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Church (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3128

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to provide for the comprehensive development of the Snake River and its tributaries in southwestern Idaho for the purposes, among others, of furnishing water for irrigation and for municipal and industrial purposes, controlling floods, controlling water quality, producing and transmitting hydroelectric power, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388) and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is hereby authorized—

GARDEN VALLEY DIVISION

(a) To construct, operate, and maintain the Garden Valley division of the project, providing a supply of irrigation water to approximately 165,000 acres of land. The principal features of the division shall consist of the Garden Valley Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork of the Payette, and other dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities. and appurtenant facilities: *Provided,* That construction of the Garden Valley division, excepting the Garden Valley Dam and Reservoir and related power facilities, shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has submitted his report and finding of feasibility on this division to the President and to the Congress; and

MOUNTAIN HOME DIVISION

(b) To construct, operate, and maintain the Mountain Home Division of the project, consisting of the Guffey, Long Tom, and Hillcrest units, and providing a supply of irrigation water to approximately one hundred and thirty-one thousand acres of land. The principal features of the division shall consist of the Guffey Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant, the Long Tom diversion dam, and the Upper and Lower Canyon Creek diversion dams, together with reservoirs, transmission facilities and appurtenant facilities; and

WEISER RIVER DIVISION

(c) To construct, operate, and maintain the Weiser River division of the project, providing a supply of irrigation water to approximately sixteen thousand, five hundred acres of land. The principal features of the division shall consist of a diversion dam on the West Fork of the Weiser River, enlargement of the existing Lost Valley reservoir, other diversion dams, reservoirs, canals, and pumping plants and appurtenant facilities: *Provided,* That construction of the Weiser River division shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has submitted his report and finding of feasibility on this division to the President and to the Congress; and

BRUNEAU DIVISION

(d) To construct, operate, and maintain the Bruneau division, including the Wickahoney unit, of the project, providing a supply of irrigation water to approximately two hundred and forty thousand acres of land. The principal features of the division shall consist of Grindstone Butte Dam and Reservoir on Deadman Creek, Clear Lakes Dam and Reservoir on the Snake River, other diversion dams, reservoirs, canals, and pumping plants and appurtenant facilities: *Provided,* That construction of the Bruneau division shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has submitted his report and finding of feasibility on this division to the President and to the Congress.

Sec. 2. The authority contained in section 1(d) of this Act shall constitute the authority required under Public Law 89–72 to initiate the feasibility studies of the Bruneau division of the southwest Idaho water development project in the Snake River Basin in Twin Falls, Elmore, and Owyhee Counties, Idaho, including the Wickahoney unit.

Sec. 3. In carrying out investigations under the authority of this Act, the Secretary shall expedite completion of feasibility reports on the Garden Valley, Weiser River and Bruneau divisions of the southwest Idaho water development project, and shall submit the feasibility report of the Garden Valley division to the Congress by January 1, 1969. The exchange of water in connection with the operation of the project authorized by this Act shall in no way jeopardize, diminish, or otherwise alter contractual rights and obligations now in existence.

Sec. 4. The period provided in subsection (d) of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, for repayment of construction costs properly allocable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by the irrigators may be extended fifty years, exclusive of a development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block, or as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a repayment formula as therein provided. Power and energy for operation of project pumping and other electrical facilities shall be supplied from the project power facilities and from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges to the water users as established by the Secretary. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within a fifty-year period shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

Sec. 5. The Secretary is authorized, as part of the project, to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for public outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities, to acquire or otherwise make available such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for public outdoor recreation of fish and wildlife use, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of project lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other project purposes.

Sec. 6. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital costs allocated to interest-bearing features of the project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable the public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

Sec. 7. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water users for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 9. This Act shall be known as the Southwest Idaho Water Development Project Act of 1966.

House Joint Memorial 7

Joint memorial to the Honorable Senators Frank Church and Len B. Jordan and the Honorable Representatives Compton I. White and George Hansen

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas in order to provide for the comprehensive development of the Snake River in Idaho for the purposes, among other, of regulating the flow of the Snake River and its tributaries, furnishing water for irrigation and for municipal and industrial purposes, controlling floods, controlling water quality, producing and distributing hydroelectric power, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities, and for other purposes, the southwest Idaho water development project is being proposed to promote the development, whether by private effort or by reclamation projects, of the Mountain Home division, the Garden Valley division, the Weiser River division, and the Wickahoney and Bruneau division, as outlined in the Bureau of Reclamation proposal, and other projects, such as supplemental water for the Salmon Falls tracts, that might fall within the area; and

Whereas our congressional delegation has advised us that united support from the State of Idaho is necessary to their efforts in our National Capitol; and

Whereas time is perhaps short for the State of Idaho to start using her waters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, That we, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do wholeheartedly endorse the concept of the southwest Idaho water development project as supported by the entire congressional delegation from the State of Idaho; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to Senators Frank Church and Len B. Jordan, and Representatives Compton I. White and George Hansen, congressional delegates for the State of Idaho.

Passed the house on the 28th day of February 1966.

Pete T. Cenarrusa,
Speaker of the House
of Representatives.

Passed the senate on the 2d day of March 1966.

W. E. Drevlow,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

Dryden M. Hiler,
Chief Clerk of the House
of Representatives.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join with my distinguished colleague, Senator Church, in placing before this body a bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southwest Idaho water development project which includes four divisions, the Mountain Home division, the Garden Valley division, the Weiser River division, and the Bruneau division. This project truly represents full comprehensive development of a major segment of the Snake River in my State.

The southwest Idaho water development project encompasses the water, land, and related resources of the Snake River Basin in southwestern Idaho from Bliss downstream to and including the Weiser River Basin. This multipurpose project of interrelated units and divisions will provide irrigation, power generation, recreation enhancement, fish and wildlife habitat improvement, flood control, water quality control, and municipal and industrial water supply needs. The units of this project will be integrated with the Boise project thus enhancing existing water development.

Mr. President, there is political unanimity on the southwest Idaho water development project as is evidenced by the fact that all members of Idaho's congressional delegation are joined in sponsoring this measure.

I have stated often that development of land and water resources should not be a political matter. The best interests of Idaho and the Nation require bipartisan cooperation in resource development planning. I have stated on many occasions that I will actively support every sound, comprehensive water resource development project regardless of who makes the original proposal. I am pleased to join with my Idaho colleagues in the Congress in sponsoring this project. I am also pleased that they have incorporated in the bill my suggestions for expanding this project to make it a truly comprehensive southwest Idaho water development project by including the Bruneau division for providing water to irrigate those lands in southwest Idaho south of the Snake River.

My distinguished colleague, Senator Church, has given his support to a similar water resource development program for southeast Idaho which was recently proposed by Idaho's Second District Congressman George Hansen and myself. In his announcement of support my colleague outlined some suggestions for improving this southeast Idaho water development plan. I assure him that his suggestions are welcome and will be used to improve our southeast Idaho water development project. His support is most welcome.

The southwest Idaho water development project we are introducing here today and the companion measure for southeast Idaho water development project which will be soon introduced represent a new era of farsighted, comprehensive planning for development of Idaho's water resources. In this time of national concern over water needs, we have moved none too early into this new era.

A recent study by the Geological Survey of the Department of Interior discloses that under full future reclamation development, Idaho's great Snake River Basin will be a region of water shortage rather than one of surplus. This study supports my own conclusions. Over the years both as Governor of Idaho and now as one of Idaho's U.S. Senators, I have said repeatedly that Idaho has more thirsty acres to reclaim than the available water supply can satisfy.

I have always believed that this generation's responsibility to future generations makes it imperative that we pass on to them these great national resources of land and water as good or better than they came to us. Wise multipurpose use and comprehensive development of the water resources of Idaho's Snake River will do much to meet our responsibility in this field.

To keep pace with the needs of the billion persons who have entered the world since 1940, agricultural production must rise. Agriculture can keep up with the demands of new population, but not without greater efforts to increase efficiency and to expand into undeveloped regions.

Agricultural production can advance in two ways. One is to use more acres of potential arable land. The other is to increase the efficiency of utilization of the land now farmed. Expanding irrigation may be an absolute necessity to extend crop acreage; it may be the most productive of all possible improvements on present cropland.

Water is the key. It makes possible the full use of technology farming—the proper applications of fertilizers, suitable crop rotations, the best of adopted varieties and so forth.

The reclamation program of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation in 60 years has made an outstanding contribution to the economic development of the West.

Its continuing work is vital to the growth of western irrigation agriculture. The necessity for full multipurpose development of our water resources to include recreation, fish and wildlife, flood control, and such needs is restricting private expansion of irrigation.

At this point let me digress a moment to make clear that private development of land and water resources should be encouraged in areas where such development is still possible and will not interfere with full comprehensive development of the land and water resources of an area. Such private initiative will conserve Government funds for other projects that are not conducive to private development either because of their size or location.

By and large, however, easily achieved irrigation projects are a thing of the past. Yet new project starts are needed even more than before as we look to the future at the demands for food and fiber which the world's burgeoning population is making on every acre of land still available to produce crops.

Reclamation projects from 1906 through 1962 produced a gross farm value of all farm crops amounting to $18.9 billion. That is five times the cost of all reclamation projects including both irrigation and nonirrigation features, such as hydropower, flood control, recreation, and municipal water supply.

Our stewardship of the Nation's water resources lies in putting these resources to the highest possible use. The southwest Idaho water development project and its "soon to be prepared" companion, the southeast water development project, meet this obligation well. In Idaho we presently have about 3 million acres of land under irrigation with another 1½ to 2 million acres yet to be irrigated.

Mr. President, Idaho is ready to move ahead with its water resource development. However, it is necessary to have assistance from the Federal Government to achieve Idaho's enormous developmental potential. I am pleased to be associated with my colleagues, Senator CHURCH, Congressman COMPTON WHITE, and Congressman GEORGE HANSEN in launching efforts to get this effort moving with the introduction of legislation to authorize the southwest Idaho water development project.

The reaction to this project is generally favorable, but we know that penetrating analysis will suggest changes for improving this bill as it will for our companion bill, the southeast Idaho water development project. I am desirous of having public hearings conducted in Idaho by the Senate Committee on Interior to get the benefit of all thinking on these projects before the committee members who will act on the measures.

Already, we have received a strong recommendation to write into this legislation language providing for an adjudication of existing rights to the use of water from the Payette River and stipulating that the Secretary of the Interior shall provide adequate capacity in the project works to assure that the existing water entitlements can be met during each irrigation season. We can, I believe, better determine the precise language needed in taking this and other recommendations into account after hearings are held.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have House Joint Memorial 7 and Senate Joint Memorial 1, together with a letter addressed to Secretary Udall by Congressman HANSEN and myself, inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

Joint memorial to the Honorable President of the United States, the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, and the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture

We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 3d extraordinary session of the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas the State of Idaho has an abundance of fertile virgin land which, with the application of water that is available can be called upon to help feed the growing population and the hungry people of the world; and

Whereas the State of Idaho and committees of the Congress of the United States have recognized these facts and are presently working on legislation to create what is known as the southwest Idaho water development project; and

Whereas we wholeheartedly endorse and commend the concept of said proposed project; and

Whereas we also believe the State of Idaho should enlarge the concept of comprehensive development of the Snake River and its tributaries as set forth in the proposed draft of the southwest Idaho water development project legislation to include an emphatic declaration that the proper development of all water projects must recognize fully the utilization of upstream projects to beneficially apply the water to projects upstream, and the return flow of those waters applied for reuse in projects downstream throughout the State of Idaho; and that any legislation must include ironclad guarantees that no waters shall be removed from the basin of its origin for any purpose at any other place unless such waters are surplus to any and all present and future uses within the basin, including domestic, agricultural, mining, and industrial uses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we request that the Congress of the United States immediately engage in a study to prepare and complete feasibility reports fund, and/or take whatever action is appropriate, and authorize as a unit project the development of the entire Snake River and its tributaries, under the concept of full utilization of upstream development in projects like Lower Teton, Lynn Crandall Dam, Ririe flood control dam, Blackfoot Dam raising and refacing, American Falls replacement, Jackson Lake replacement (five smaller dams in the State of Wyoming), Snake River Plains recharge, Salmon Falls project, Raft River-Oakley diversion, and the recharge of the downstream by return flow from such projects for downstream development of those projects specified in the southwest Idaho water development project and others that may be feasible for the complete development of the Snake River and its tributaries; we further urge the immediate funding and construction of the Lower Teton Dam; that the foregoing shall be done without obstructing or delaying the southwest Idaho water development project legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho, is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the individual Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in the U.S. Congress, the Secretary of the Department of Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Joint memorial to the Honorable Senators FRANK CHURCH and LEN B. JORDAN and the Honorable Representatives COMPTON I. WHITE and GEORGE HANSEN

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that;

Whereas in order to provide for the comprehensive development of the Snake River in Idaho for the purposes, among other, of regulating the flow of the Snake River and its tributaries, furnishing water for irrigation and for municipal and industrial purposes, controlling floods, controlling water quality, producing and distributing hydroelectric power, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities, and for other purposes the southwest Idaho water development project is being proposed to promote the development, whether by private effort or by reclamation projects, of the Mountain Home division, the Garden Valley division, the Weiser River division and the Wickahoney and Bruneau division, as outlined in the Bureau of Reclamation proposal, and other projects, such as supplemental water for the Salmon Falls tracts, that might fall within the area; and

Whereas our congressional delegation has advised us that united support from the State of Idaho is necessary to their efforts in our National Capitol; and

Whereas time is perhaps short for the State of Idaho to start using her waters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, That we, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do wholeheartedly endorse the concept of the southwest Idaho water development project as supported by the entire congressional delegation from the State of Idaho; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to Senators FRANK CHURCH and LEN B. JORDAN, and Representatives COMPTON I. WHITE and GEORGE HANSEN, congressional delegates for the State of Idaho.

Passed the house on the 28th day of February 1966.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate on the 2d day of March 1966.

W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MARCH 1, 1966.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is written to thank you for the fine cooperation your Department has provided in studies and research on various Idaho projects and to formalize the request for further studies which we think are timely and warranted.

We have already expressed to you the keen disappointment in our State over the fact that the fiscal 1967 budget provided no construction funds for either the Ririe project or lower Teton. These two authorized projects will provide great multipurpose benefits, are economically sound with very favorable benefit-to-cost ratios and should have first priority of new starts in Idaho. We know your Department cannot prevail over the Bureau of the Budget, but a good case can be made for these projects before any committee or bureau and we earnestly solicit your help in this matter.

Director Harold Nelson and his staff have been cooperative and constructive in helping us put together the several divisions that will constitute the southwest Idaho development project. We have submitted a tentative bill of authorization to the people of Idaho for review and discussion. The reaction generally is very favorable but we know that penetrating analysis will suggest changes for improving the bill. Processing of applications for desert land entries should not be held up by reason of discussion on the overall development.

Discussion of the southwest Idaho project has served to stimulate interest in other areas where studies have been made in varying degrees of intensity. We believe that a similar package should be assembled for southeastern Idaho.

As you know vast blocks of land south of the Snake River have been watered by inadequate surface and pumped water. These lands need supplemental water. This area includes, but is not limited to, the Salmon Falls, Raft River, and Oakley Fan divisions. Possible sources of supplemental water are: (1) Snake River flood waters stored in the wet years for use in dry years. (2) Provide pumped water in exchange for present surface water rights in areas where pumped water supplies can be increased. (3) Explore the possibility of pump back and reuse of return flows from below the Thousand Springs in Hagerman Valley.

1. First let us consider additional headwater storage, which is so essential. A recent study by the Geological Survey predicts that under conditions of full reclamation development the Snake River Valley will be a water deficient area. Hence the need for all the headwater storage we can get that is economically feasible. Several years ago Senator Jordan requested that the old Burns Creek project be replaced with a larger dam that would utilize the full potential of that site. We are pleased to note that the September 1965 Report on this site, now called the Lynn Crandall division, is most encouraging. The following is a quote from that report:

"The Lynn Crandall site offers the most practical potential for major storage in the upper Snake River basin because: (1) it appears to be the best site in Idaho on the upper Snake River from a geological standpoint without risk of loss of water to underground aquifers that do not reappear above existing upper Snake River diversion points: (2) it would provide the large capacity needed for future development at a single location above all major diversion points and flood damage areas."

Additional storage might be obtained from several sources among which are (1) raise the height of Palisades, or (2) Alpine site in Wyoming. Recreation interests in Wyoming are interested in maintaining the level of Jackson Lake during the tourist season. Wyoming could accomplish this on a quid pro quo basis by cooperating in No. 1 (if feasible), or No. 2 above. Under no circumstances should storage in Lynn Crandall be considered as a replacement for Jackson Lake storage.

2. The possibility of pump back and reuse of return flows from below the Thousand Springs in Hagerman Valley has never been explored. Such dams as are needed to accomplish this pool-to-pool pump back only need to be high enough to provide slack water from the point downstream that will capture the return flows to the point of diversion upstream that will flow by gravity to the thirsty acres. Pumping could be done with low grade secondary or dump power as is presently used in the Columbia Basin project.

We respectfully request that your Department request funds for such a study.

3. The cheapest storage available is in the underground lava bed aquifer north of the Snake River. Studies have been made for diverting flood water by canals into this aquifer at several upstream points. These diversions should be a component of the overall resources development package. By providing additional underground supplies for lands north of the Snake River some surface water now used on these lands could be made available to other lands south of the river where the underground water supply is less reliable.

One other project which has been studied and reported as not feasible as a strictly flood control project is Wood River. Last December, Senator Jordan attended a meeting in Ketchum which included those interested in flood control, recreation, sports fishing, and irrigation. With the growing interest in water sports it is possible that local interests would cooperate financially in a two dam development on Wood River, the upper dam to store only the amount of water to be used by the irrigators in order that the water impounded by the lower and larger dam need not be drawn down during tourist season. Both dams could be emptied late in the fall to provide storage for flood control. This would require less intensive channelization on Wood River.

We urge that your Department explore the possibilities of such a plan.

These are some of the components, but not necessarily all, which should be put together in a package to be known as the southeast Idaho water project.

As in the southwest Idaho project, assistance beyond the ability of water users to pay must depend on basin account participation.

One other source of financing suggests itself as the National Wild Rivers System takes shape. That source is a nonreimbursable credit to Idaho reclamation by reason of Idaho's contribution to the Wild Rivers System. As you know, under the proposed bill nearly one-half of the water that originates on Idaho's watersheds must leave the State undiminished—to maintain a free flowing condition.

Before Idaho's full reclamation potential is realized we shall need not only Idaho's proper entitlement of power revenues from a Columbia Basin account, but we shall need also a nonreimbursable reclamation credit in an amount compensable for Idaho's contribution to the National Wild Rivers System.

With best wishes we are,
Sincerely yours,
Len B. Jordan,
U.S. Senator.
George V. Hansen,
Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CERTAIN CHILDREN TO REMAIN OUT OF SCHOOL WITHOUT LOSING THE STATUS OF A STUDENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President today I am introducing a measure to allow the child of a deceased civil service employee to remain out of school for 5 months between school years without losing his status as a student for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act. This problem has been called to my attention by a Civil Service Commission ruling against a young student in my State. The young man, Frank Arthur Myers, was graduated from high school May 21, 1965. He had been accepted for enrollment in a State junior college on May 14. However, the junior college did not open its doors until September 27, 1965.

In ruling that this young Alabamian had lost his benefits under the act, the Civil Service Commission stuck to a rigid interpretation of the present 4-month statutory limitation on the break between school years.

Because I feel that there are now or will be other cases of young men and women who face the problem faced by Mr. Myers, I have introduced a bill to resolve the problem for his case and all future situations of this type. I earnestly commend this bill to my colleagues and I hope it will be speedily enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3135) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to increase from 4 months to 5 months the maximum period for which a child may be out of school between school years without losing his status as a student for purposes of such act, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

INTERCONNECTIONS AND POOLING AGREEMENTS BETWEEN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a measure dealing with interconnections and pooling agreements between electric power utilities.

Two facets of the complex electric power industry are the National Power Survey and the Northeast power failure on November 9 and 10, 1965.

One illustrates the need for more power pools, and the other illustrates the need for stronger pools. The common subject, however, is power pools. Pool operations require that several companies of diverse ownership reach agreement on the common operation of their companies and that these agreements extend over a period of years. Whatever inhibits efforts to complete and improve these agreements also inhibits the growth and strength of the pools.

For example in the Pacific Northwest, public and private generating utilities, acting in cooperation with the Federal power producing and marketing agencies, have voluntarily concluded many joint programs to attain the advantages of economy and dependability. These programs are based on a policy of securing the advantages afforded by large size and electrical diversity without affecting the basic identity of the constituent organizations and without changing their individual responsibilities to the public. The Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie is one example.

Another factor in pooling is the technological advances in generation and transmission which make it possible for the consumer to pay low rates and still receive a high degree of reliability and service. There are increasing advantages in the use of large generating units and long distance, extra high voltage transmission lines to meet the increasing demand for electricity.

The Pacific Northwest generating utilities have indicated that their continuing voluntary efforts to secure practical pooling agreements are inhibited by the possibility of prosecution or litigation under a strict application of the antitrust laws. Pooling agreements are usually long-term arrangements on which power supply will depend. Such agreements often involve large commitments of capital. The possibility of an antitrust action arising after the conclusion of a pooling agreement is one threat to the type of pools envisaged in the National Power Survey and demanded in order to reduce the likelihood of another failure.

These utilities admit, however, that to date no antitrust actions have arisen, but as pools become more prevalent and larger, the threat becomes more ominous. The Legal Advisory Committee of the National Power Survey, composed of lawyers representing the investor-owned, local public agency, cooperative and Federal segments of the industry, said:

> Existing laws or the lack thereof do constitute legal impediments to the full realization of the benefits of pooling and coordination and may affect the form which a particular pooling transaction will take.

I have been told that the possibility of antitrust action is an inhibiting factor in company operations in the Northwest and elsewhere in the Nation. In the interests of encouraging pool operations, this issue should be publicly debated before it has a detrimental effect on the national power picture.

The utilities in the Northwest have requested that I introduce legislation so that this problem can be debated openly. I have studied their suggestion and I believe that it represents a highly satisfactory way to open the debate.

Accordingly, I offer for congressional consideration, a bill to authorize the Federal Power Commission to be the sole agency to approve or reject pooling agreements and police the competitive practices of utilities signing pooling and interconnection arrangements. It would enable the Commission to decide whether or not contracts filed with it unduly restrain competition. This can be accomplished without affecting the substantive rules of competition that should apply without extending the regulatory jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. FPC action, of course, would be subject to judicial review.

The bill empowers the FPC to review, in a hearing, the terms of the contract. It is intended to provide a mechanism whereby an expert agency of the Government can maintain surveillance in the public interest over the industry in this specialized field. It will provide a method by which utilities intending to make long-term power and management commitments through pooling arrangements can receive assurances in appropriate cases that such commitments will be free from subsequent antitrust attack. Relief from the danger of the possibility of antitrust litigation will improve implementation of the congressional directive to the Federal Power Commission to encourage voluntary interconnection and coordination.

Section 202(a) of the Federal Power Act states:

> It shall be the duty of the Commission to promote and encourage * * * interconnection and coordination.

This bill would amend that section. The bill is intended to make the implementation of such arrangements legally more secure.

Hearings may be demanded by anyone interested in the contract or in its effects including its competitive effects. The Department of Justice could request such a review, for example. The hearing provides a forum where all views can be expressed and considered.

The bill would allow parties to seek approval of new contracts, contracts already in existence, or existing contracts that are amended. Such an amendment might have an impact on competition. A pooling contract solely between nonjurisdictional organizations, like public agencies or utilities not in interstate commerce, would not come under the bill. No extension of FPC jurisdiction is intended or involved.

The bill would exempt from the antitrust laws all persons and organizations participating in the contract, whether or not they are within the jurisdiction of the FPC for other purposes. The Commission could require conditions, which the parties could accept, before approving the contracts. If these conditions were not accepted, the Commission could prevent performance of disapproved contracts, thereby giving the FPC some powers to enforce the antitrust policy of the United States.

This is not a merger bill. Its intent is to facilitate and encourage independent entities to secure the best and most economical service for all consumers no matter whether the organization which serves them is large, small, public, private, or Federal. Pooling agreements can benefit small companies since they can share the advantages of large generation units and high voltage transmission lines.

This is what the bill would do if enacted. What the bill does now is to bring this important question into the public forum. The debate may show that such a bill is needed. It may show that this particular bill needs modification. It may show that no legislation is needed.

By 1980, the demand for electric power will have doubled. We should debate and decide the critical issues now so that the supply will meet the demand at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3136) to facilitate the provision of adequate, economical, and dependable electric service for the present and future needs of the public and the proper and timely installation and use of the products of advancing technology in the generation or transmission of electric energy, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

TAKE THE POVERTY WAR OUT OF PARTISAN POLITICS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to improve the administration of community action programs and other aspects of the war on poverty. This legislation embodies the four-point program to help salvage the war on poverty which I proposed in a statement on January 10, the opening day of the present session of Congress.

My bill provides for the following:

First. Transfer of the responsibility for directing and administering the community action program from the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Second. Prohibition against the expenditure of Federal funds to pay inordinately high salaries of administrators of local community action programs.

Third. Restoration of the Governors' veto power contained in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Under this provision, no community action program, adult education program, or Neighborhood Youth Corps project could be undertaken in a State if its Governor disapproved the program within 30 days of its submission to him.

Fourth. Extends coverage of the Hatch Act, which prohibits political activities by Government employees, to employees of local community action programs and to VISTA volunteers.

I have supported the war on poverty in its two congressional enactments. But I am dissatisfied with the way some of its programs, especially the community action program, is being run.

These proposals are designed to provide money for the poor instead of partisan politicians as is too often the case now.

The administrative shambles into which the community action program has degenerated must be cleaned up. We can accomplish this objective, I believe, by enacting the proposals contained in the legislation I am introducing today.

A major step toward remedying the administrative deficiencies of the war on poverty would be the transfer of the community action program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Such transfer, I might point out, was recommended by a majority of the special study committee on urban affairs which President Johnson appointed last fall to develop plans for the organization and operation of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. The task force, chaired by Prof. Robert C. Wood, who has since become Under Secretary of the new Cabinet agency, was given the job of developing bold proposals aimed at giving the new agency a vibrant and dynamic role in the Government and at bringing about coordination and clear direction to the many and varied urban programs of the Federal Government.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development ought to be something more than the old Housing and Home Finance Agency with but a new name. Therefore, the proposed transfer of the community action program makes sense. The new department should not concern itself solely with the problems of physical development of cities. Human and social development programs are just as important. The thrust of the community action program ties in closely with this objective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the text of my bill and the text of my statement of January 10 on the war on poverty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3139) to improve the administration of community action programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) parts A and D of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are amended—

(1) by striking out "Director" in clause (5) of section 202(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Secretary')", and by striking out "Director" wherever that word appears in the other provisions of such part A and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(2) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(b)" in section 205(b) thereof and adding the following new paragraph at the end of such section:

"(2) No grant or contract authorized under this part may provide for the payment of any salary of a person engaged in administering or conducting a community action program in excess of the salary paid for comparable work in the area to be served by such program, taking into consideration also the salary paid to local officers in the area.";

(3) By adding at the end of section 205 the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to appoint without regard to the civil service laws, one or more advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of the Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to his functions under this part; and members of such committees, other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government, while serving on the business of such committees, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.";

(4) by striking out in section 209(c) thereof "and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "and such plan has not been disapproved by him within thirty days of such submission";

(5) by inserting immediately after section 211 thereof the following new section:

"POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

"Sec. 211A. For the purposes of the Act entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities', approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), any agency administering or conducting a community action program receiving assistance under this part shall be deemed to be a State or local agency, and any person who is employed by such agency administering or conducting a community action program and whose salary is paid in any part from funds appropriated pursuant to this part, shall be deemed to be an officer or employee of a State or local agency."; and

(6) by amending section 221 to read as follows:

"Sec. 221. The Director shall carry out the programs for which he is responsible under this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the three succeeding fiscal years. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall carry out the programs provided for in part A of this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the succeeding fiscal year. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $340,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the sum of $850,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the sum of $—— for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the succeeding fiscal year such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law."

(b) Section 603 of such Act is amended by—

(1) striking out "paragraph (2)" in subsection (d) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (2) and (3)"; and

(2) adding at the end of subsection (d) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) For the purposes of the Act entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities', approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), a volunteer under this section shall be deemed to be a person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government.".

Sec. 2. (a) So much of the personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balance of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, available or to be made available, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily with respect to any functions of the Office of Economic Opportunity transferred under the provisions of the preceding section are transferred to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(b) All laws relating to any office, agency or function transferred under this Act shall, insofar as such laws are applicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by any office or agency in connection with any function transferred by this Act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect and to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any agency or any officer of the United States acting in his official capacity shall abate by reason of any transfer made pursuant to this Act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the appropriate agency or officer of the United States.

Sec 3. This Act shall become effective ninety days after its date of enactment except that the amendments made by clauses (2) and (4) of subsection (a) of the first section shall be applicable only with respect to contracts, grants, agreements, loans, or other assistance made after the date of enactment of this Act.

The statement presented by Mr. Scott is as follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT,
JANUARY 10, 1966

America is the richest nation history has known, yet millions of Americans are trapped in the dead-end street of poverty through illiteracy, lack of basic skills, racial discrimination, broken homes, age and ill health. Such conditions are hardly touched by the general economic growth and affluence of our society.

That is why I supported the war on poverty.

I voted for the declaration of war against poverty in 1964, and I voted to escalate that war last year.

I supported that effort because, despite our enormous agricultural surpluses, about 2,000 Americans still die yearly from diseases of malnutrition, and many American children still go to bed with empty stomachs.

I supported that effort because more than 34 million Americans have been estimated as living in poverty or near poverty. Fifteen million of them are children and over five million are old people.

From the worn out country hollows of Appalachia to the grey slums of our big cities, America's poor huddle in hopelessness and despair, and many Americans do not even know they are there.

Poverty is the real Trojan Horse in our midst. It insidiously gnaws away at our ideals of equality and often makes a mockery of American democracy in the eyes of a watching world.

Our battle with communism in Vietnam dominates the headlines today, and is consuming American lives and resources. But it would be an empty victory if we won the war against communism overseas and lost the war on poverty here at home.

And I fear that we are losing the war on poverty.

The war on poverty, as administered from Washington by the Office of Economic Opportunity and implemented at the local level by community groups, is distinguished today not for its accomplishments, but for its failures. The war on poverty has degenerated into a nightmare of bureaucratic bungling, overly paid administrators, poorly organized fieldworkers, and partisan politics.

These developments would be serious enough in any Federal program. But its real tragedy is that in this program money that should be going to the poor is not reaching the poor, because the principal concern among too many people in the war on poverty today is simple; who is going to control the loot?

This was expressed most poignantly by the Reverend Lynward Stevenson, head of a local community organization in Chicago, who said:

"The records are full of direct political patronage. How do you think we (poor) feel when we know that men who drive Cadillacs, eat 3-inch steaks, and sip champagne at luncheon meetings, discuss our future while we are pushed off the highways of self-help and told to keep our hats in hand?"

THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The Economic Opportunity Act is administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), whose Director is Sargent Shriver. The original legislation enacted in August 1964, authorized appropriations of $947.5 million for fiscal 1965. It was extended in August of last year through fiscal 1968 and appropriations of $1,785 million for fiscal 1966 were authorized.

Key sections of the Act authorize: (1) the OEO to operate a Job Corps to provide work experience and training to youths in conservation camps and urban and rural residential training centers; (2) the domestic peace corps, called the Voluteers in Service to America (VISTA); and (3) the community action program under which the Federal Government financially and technically assists a variety of local human development efforts.

I hesitate to place all the blame for the problems of the war on poverty on the shoulders of Sargent Shriver, because he is an able and well-motivated administrator. But since he has retained his position as Director of the Peace Corps, the war on poverty had been run by a part-time general.

Moreover, as the minority members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee pointed out, in the OEO there is 1 supergrade (highly paid) official for every 18 ordinary Government employees. For purposes of comparison, there is 1 supergrade employee for every 1,000 Government employees in the Department of Defense, and 1 supergrade for every 500 employees in the Department of Agriculture.

With all these chiefs to supervise so few "Indians" it is unfortunate that they have not found more time to supervise some of the projects in various other parts of the country which have been using Federal money to implement the war on poverty.

For instance, I have never seen an explanation for this type of lopsided development in the Job Corps:

One of two brothers from an Indiana community, recently was serving under enemy fire in Vietnam, while the other brother became a school dropout, having beat up his mother and his teacher. The brother in Vietnam was being paid $78 per month, while the dropout was being given $200 monthly by the Job Corps for running a lawn mower.

Nor for these costly attempts at news management:

Jack Steele, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, reported that in the St. Petersburg Women's Job Corps Center no officer may talk to the press without reporting the conversation by long-distance telephone to Washington.

LEGISLATION

However, it serves little purpose to cite isolated instances of problems in the war on poverty. Nor would one accomplish much merely by suggesting that some vague changes in the administration of the programs would end the turmoil.

Rather, I propose to discuss specific faults within the war on poverty and make legislative recommendations which might bring the war back to its main objective: defeating poverty which besets so much of America.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

The most frequent problems in the war on poverty seem to occur in the community action program. The community action program has as its functions to (1) coordinate and utilize a broad variety of resources available within a community; (2) provide—through these varied services—projects and assistance to those in need of them; (3) combine in its structure "the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served;" and (4) be run by either a public or a private nonprofit agency.

But from one end of the Nation to the other there are reports of turmoil in the community action program.

In my own city of Philadelphia, the program first foundered, then floundered, and is still not fully underway.

Community action program agencies come in three basic varieties: (1) existing municipal governments which take on poverty war functions, (2) foundation structures, and (3) nonprofit corporations. Philadelphia tried them all.

First, something called human renewal was set up with 13 city officials as members. It was a paper plan designed to give the mayor control of Federal antipoverty money so it could be used to finance existing municipal departments. When funds were requested, Washington saw through the scheme and said "No."

Second, Philadelphia's mayor tried the foundation approach and attempted to work through the Ford Foundation sponsored Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement. But that group had already reduced its staff from 35 to 9, and, despite maneuvers to restaff the organization from city agencies and to use another name, Washington again said "No."

Private groups next attempted to set up an agency, but the city government met that threat to their own power by declaring that a nonprofit community action corporation unconnected with city hall would be illegal. This was done despite the fact that such groups were operating and receiving funds in Pittsburgh and Washington, D.C.

Finally, a community action program agency called the Philadelphia Anti-Poverty Action Committee was established.

Among the first 16 group leaders hired under Philadelphia's poverty program to work with youngsters in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 13 had arrest records which included larceny, assault and battery, and morals counts involving minors.

In the words of the Greater Philadelphia magazine, "until Philadelphia's poverty program is completely extracted from politics and patronage, the most likely gainers will not be the poor."

Los Angeles furnishes a most tragic example of the ineptitude of the community action program. The mayor has charged that one of the causes of last summer's riot in the Watts District was the "deliberate and well-publicized cutting off of poverty funds to this city, pending our efforts to reorganize the Youth Opportunities Board to meet the chameleonic OEO criteria."

Sargent Shriver responded that "a few local officials have made it extremely difficult for the private agencies, minority groups, and the poor to join in the war."

Then the nonpartisan commission to investigate the Los Angeles riots concluded that one cause of the riots was the widespread publicity about Federal antipoverty funds that for various reasons "did not live up to their press notices" in Los Angeles. Prior to the riots the war on poverty received much publicity but the Watts District had received no aid.

In Chicago, city hall controls the appointment of 42 representatives out of a total of 75 on the committee that operates the local community action program. This has enabled the mayor to maintain iron control over the $21 million which has been received and, in the words of one observer, to use those funds to "oil his political machine."

In New York City, Harlem's poverty agency Haryou-ACT is reportedly unable to account for up to $2 million of the funds it has received in the past year. Its executive director has stepped down temporarily, ostensibly to work full-time on the agency's books.

Newark, N.J.'s city councilmen fear that that city's independent community action agency—the United Community Corporation—poses a political threat to them. As of December 7 they were trying to place it under a politically appointed commission. In retaliation, the corporation's president has vowed that the agency "would alter the power structure of the city." While the battle for control in Newark rages on, the poor remain poor.

For whatever the reasons, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been unable to find the answer to these and other problems that plague the community action program. Therefore, I propose that the community action program be removed from that agency and placed in the newly created Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. Special provisions should be made to protect the interests of rural communities with community action programs.

Administration of this program by the new Cabinet-level Federal Department would take the program out of the "crisis-to-crisis" and often overly political atmosphere of the OEO and bring its administration into the mainstream of urban planning, development and renewal.

POLITICS

One of the most prevalent problems in the war on poverty has been its intermixture with partisan political activity. Money designed to help the poor has been diverted instead into helping the "poor" politician.

Early in the program's conception, the Johnson administration delivered to each Democratic Congressman's office a "poverty kit" for use in the 1964 elections. Chairman Adam Clayton Powell of the House Education and Labor Committee has described the program as "giant fiestas of political patronage."

A director of the privately sponsored Woodlawn Organization of Chicago said during hearings that the list of those running the war on poverty in Chicago read "like a fundraising committee for the Democratic Party."

Syracuse University received a grant to train students who would then organize low-income groups into what have been termed "politically effective citizens." A New York Times writer said the program turned into a pretty specific effort to organize "the poor to fight city hall. Antipoverty funds were used to pay babysitters and hire taxis to register voters in a heavily Democratic public housing area and to transport people to heckle Syracuse Mayor William F. Walsh during his reelection campaign.

Therefore I propose that legislation be enacted that would put under the Hatch Act—and thereby prohibit partisan political activity—those employees of private organizations conducting community action programs whose salaries are in principal part paid from Federal funds.

The Hatch Act already covers the employees of State and local governments who administer programs financed by Federal funds. If we put under the Hatch Act employees being paid through the war on poverty, it would make some of the pork barrel aspects in the present arrangement far less attractive to the big city political bosses who now tend to confuse the U.S. Treasury Department with their county campaign finance committees.

GOVERNOR'S VETO

The original act of 1964 provided that no community action program, adult basic education program or Neighborhood Youth Corps project could be undertaken in a State if the Governor of that State disapproved the program within 30 days of its submission to him.

Last year the Congress, in a move that I opposed very strongly, emasculated that provision to the effect that the Governors no longer have a veto.

This action was taken despite the fact that Governors of 49 out of the 50 States opposed such a change. Its net effect was to reduce still further the controls on war on poverty programs, increase the instabilility of existing local programs, and encourage duplication and waste. In other words, the majority in Congress took the war on poverty one step still further away from helping the poor.

I propose that the Governors be given back the veto power as originally provided in the law.

SALARIES OF POVERTY OFFICIALS

Finally, the salaries paid some officials of the war on poverty have been scandalously high.

One of Chicago's top poverty officials who had previously made $14,000 jumped to $22,500 when he enlisted in the war on poverty. It was recently revealed that the New Jersey director of the program was being paid $25,000 annually, more than any member of the Governor's cabinet. In Washington, D.C., the local poverty war director has been getting $25,000 annually, which is the same amount received by two of the three District Commissioners. Just prior to the riots in the Watts district of Los Angeles, the head of Los Angeles' poverty effort was drawing a salary of $25,000 and his two top assistants were receiving $25,000 and $21,000. But the Watts district had received no aid.

I therefore propose that legislation be enacted that would put reasonable ceilings on all salaries paid under the war on poverty.

NEED FOR ACTION

I do not believe that these legislative proposals are the only ones needed, nor that they, of themselves, will radically change a situation that has deteriorated so seriously. But I believe that the Congress has an obligation to deal forthrightly with problems that are very important to the welfare of our Nation.

There was an inadvertent deception involved in the publicity buildup for the war on poverty. There are many people who, throughout their lives, have been waiting for someone to come along and give them a helping hand.

In the war on poverty they saw hope for the first time, an opportunity to pull themselves up out of the mire of hopelessness—a chance to learn a new trade, give their children a better start than they had themselves, hold their heads a little higher.

But disillusion followed the early promises and—as we saw in the Watts riots—for some this bitter disappointment led to violence and bloodshed. For many others it merely meant a return to the old and bitter ways, back to the alleys that have no exits.

For the sake of these individuals and for the sake of society itself, we must rectify the wrongs done by the maladministration on all levels of the war on poverty, and we must do so promptly.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF SCHEDULES RELATING TO SELLING PRICE OF CERTAIN FOOTWEAR OF RUBBER OR PLASTICS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the rubber footwear industry is an important part of the expanding economy of Connecticut.

Recently the Customs Bureau adopted a new policy that could seriously affect the earnings of this industry and subsequently the jobs of thousands of employees, in my State and other areas of the country.

For over 30 years the Customs Bureau used the highest cost of the American product—now approximately $2.65 per pair—as the basis for establishing tariffs on rubber footwear.

The guidelines just adopted are based on the lowest cost of domestic production—about $0.90.

This is a substantial change in procedure, large enough in scope that it should not be done by administrative fiat.

If this ruling is permitted to stand, the percentage of the American market enjoyed by the foreign producers will surely jump from the already large 17 to 50 percent, or more.

Something must be done to avert a substantial economic problem for this vital industry and its thousands of employees, many of whom live in Connecticut's Naugatuck Valley.

One way we can help is to pass legislation and I now introduce a bill which would reverse the new guidelines of the Customs Bureau plus restore to the Treasury the full measure of accrued back duties which have been owing since early 1963.

This bill is a companion measure to H.R. 12983 introduced in the House by my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN.

In addition, I am cosponsoring a resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) introduced by another distinguished colleague from Connecticut, [Mr. RIBICOFF]. This resolution would prevent any tariff changes either in rates or methods of valuation prior to the outcome of a study requested of the U.S. Tariff Commission by the Committee on Finance.

The study is designed to investigate the method of valuation used by the United States and its principal trading partners and is to be completed by February 28, 1967.

It is my hope that the obvious inequities present in the Custom Bureau's recent decision will become obvious to all and that the highest cost of American rubber footwear will be reestablished as the basis for setting the tariff on imported goods of like character.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3140) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE ON FILM CLASSIFICATION

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, we are all aware of the criticism being directed toward many of the movies that children are seeing today. That a marked increase in the use of shameful, perverted themes in our motion pictures has followed in the wake of judicial decisions over the past 10 years is no longer debatable. Movies, it is said, are more adult than ever.

While I will not quibble over what is adult and what is plainly offensive, I do share the concern of many of my fellow Senators over what can be done to reconcile the differences between the two forces that seem to collide when controls over motion pictures exhibited to the public are discussed; namely, those who wish to protect impressionable children and teenagers from erotic or violent motion pictures; and those who see in the prior censorship activities of State and local censor boards a threat to constitutional guarantees of free speech.

To meet this widely discussed problem, I shall today submit legislation so designed as to steer a middle course between these two groups.

I propose that a Senate special committee be formed to study the merits of a classification system, similar perhaps to the English solution. In this system, either an industrywide, or governmental, or industry-government board would certify domestic and foreign movies as to their suitability for children, for the entire family, or only for adults. The means of providing enforcement of this certification while keeping within the guidelines laid down by the courts would, quite naturally, be a proper area of committee inquiry.

I might add that my proposal to study the merits of motion picture film classification has long been suggested by parent groups, church organizations, legislators from several governmental levels, and more than a few members of the motion picture industry itself.

I ask unanimous consent that my resolution lie on the table for 6 days so that, should any of my colleagues wish to join me in cosponsoring this resolution, they may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received, and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the table for 6 days, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 242) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. RES. 242

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special committee to be known as the Committee on Film Classification and to consist of five Senators appointed by the Vice President of whom not more than three shall be members of the majority party.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all of the problems of film classification as they have appeared or may appear both in this country and elsewhere throughout the world, and to obtain all of the facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation contemplating limitations upon the exhibition of certain motion pictures to minors, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practical date but not later than January 31, 1968, the result of such studies and surveys. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have the power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. Said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, not to exceed $25,000 as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD certain background material.

There being no objection, the background material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND MATERIAL ON MOTION PICTURE CLASSIFICATION

Most Americans remember when movies were simply something they went to. But over the years the motion picture industry has changed from a novelty to a major cultural force, and the effect which motion pictures have on America's young boys and girls has been magnified proportionately. This effect on children may well be laudable to the extent movies provide honest entertainment, as well as an incentive to honor, to decency, to the development of a sense of moral responsibility at an early stage in life.

Unfortunately a mounting swell of criticism is being directed at the movie industry for its increasing tendency to exhibit motion pictures—both foreign and domestic—in America's movie houses which are objectionable under any standards of decency when viewed by children. Most criticism is centered on the overemphasis of violence and the lack of respect which is shown toward the areas of sex.

Certainly no one wishes to see the abridgment of our hard-won freedoms of expression. What does seem deserving is a recognition of the very strong feelings now held by great numbers of people in our country over the exhibition of unsuitable movies to children.

For unsuitable movies do exist. And children do see them. The Los Angeles Times, written in the movie capital of the Nation, carried the following review of a double feature playing the neighborhood theaters in and around Los Angeles on Friday, March 11, 1966:

"SADISM RAMPANT IN DOUBLE BILL

" 'Faster, Pussycat! Kill! Kill!' and 'Motor Psycho' pack as much sex and violence as possible on the screen without bringing out the police. In fact, they're so ludicrously erotic and sadistic they can be taken as parodies of the entire genre of exploitation pictures.

"Both were made by Russ Meyer, the man who gave the world 'The Immoral Mr. Teas,' 'Eve and the Handyman,' and 'Lorna.'

"And both are essentially fetishist fantasies, projected with crude gusto. In the first picture, three bosomy babes—two lesbians and one bisexual—in skintight pants and high-heeled boots converge in their sports cars on a desert ranch owned by a rich but crippled dirty old man, who has two sons, one a mentally retarded muscleman and another who's not much more intelligent and a lot less muscular.

"The ensuing conflict which takes place on perhaps an unintentionally symbolic wasteland—reminds you of those mindless clashes between the pea-brained King Kong and Godzilla. Like all sex fantasies it is as funny as it is sad, with everyone dropping sarcastic double entenders so leaden they would break your big toe.

" 'Motor Psycho' is more of the same, only this time it's a trio of maniacal motorcyclists who murder and rape their way across the countryside. After watching two rapes and one murder in less than 30 minutes, there seemed little point in sticking around for more.

"Amidst all the delirious savagery of both pictures, Meyer, who low-angles his camera constantly to give the girls an incredibly cantilevered look, never loses his head: bosoms remain covered no matter how heaving. Again, it's a case of all tease and no show, but then that's the point.

"Nobody in either picture—they're being double-billed in multiple runs—is familiar and most of them deserve their anonymity."

Nor is this an isolated instance of today's crop of so-called exploitation films. A front-page article in the newspaper of show business, Variety, in its edition for February 10, 1965, carries the headline: "Wider Public for Sexy Films." Reports Variety:

"FOLKS 'TSK-TSK' BUT BUY TICKETS

"What are sexploitation pix? For the benefit of the uninitiated, there follows a rundown on some of the films being offered currently or due for future release by two distribs, which specialize in such product, Audubon Films and Cambist Films:

" 'Warm Nights and Hot Pleasures' (Audubon), made locally by Joe Sarno and produced by Bingo Brandt, who runs the Rialto Theater in New York. Story has to do with three college girls who come to New York to try to get into show business. Some sex and some nudity. Two of the girls decide virtue is its own reward and return to college.

" 'Sexus' (Audubon), made in France. A girl is kidnapped and after being abused by one of her captors, decides she likes it. The ad line reads 'Too Much, Too Often.' (Original title in French, was 'The Longest Night,' no relation, of course to 'The Longest Day'.)

" 'Soft Skin on Black Silk' (Audubon), made in France as a serious drama starring Agnes Laurent. A boy who wants to be a priest is led astray by a girl hired by his father, who wants the boy to go into the family business. Some nudity and sex. (Original title, in French, was 'Temptations.')

" 'The Weird Lovemakers' (Audubon). Japanese drama about street gangs. Legalized abortions provide the happy ending.

" 'The Marijuana Party' (Audubon). Danish import. Young people out for kicks.

" 'The Exploiters' (Cambist). Argentine pic made in Venezuela, starring Argentine sexpot Libertad Leblanc. Girl is lured to South America with a phony contract as a nightclub singer by an international vice ring. (Original title, in Spanish, was 'Accused.')

" 'The Unsatisfied,' (Cambist). French-Spanish coproduction starring Colette Descombes. Wild youth, some nudity and sex, one rape.

"As an example of the kind of money that can be made by some exploitation product, Cambist prez Lee Hessel points to his French-made Elke Sommer starrer, 'Daniella by Night.' In 8 weeks at the New York Rialto, film had a total boxoffice of $80,000, which returned about $14,000 in film rental. Hessel estimates that most of the sexploit imports are brought in and opened at a total cost of not much more than $25,000, meaning that some of the product can pay off in just a few dates. 'Daniella,' of course, was somewhat special in that it starred a name which subsequently received a big Hollywood buildup and thus has permitted Hessel to get attention and dates not available to most sexploit pix.

" 'Despite the talk of censorship and so-called public outrage, more and more theaters are playing this (sexploitation) product all the time.'

"Chief suppliers

"So states Ava Leighton who, with Radley Metzger, has in 5 years made Audubon Films one of the most successful sexploitation distribberies in the business. Audubon, along with the indie firms of Joe Brenner and Bill Mishkin and Lee Hessel's Cambist Films, supplies a large proportion of all the sexploitation product (not to be confused with nudie pix) available in the United States today.

"There is, however, a shortage of 'decent' sexploitation product—that is, exploitation pix with some kind of rational dramatic content, says Miss Leighton, one of the few femme sales execs in the film biz today. As a result, Audubon, which first hit the jackpot with the French 'I Spit on Your Grave' (estimated U.S. rental: $500,000), has just completed its first film, 'The Dirty Girls,' a title sure to rank alongside M. A. Ripps' 'Poor White Trash' in the hearts of sexploit devotees.

"Pic was shot last year in Paris and Munich for a cost of less than $100,000, which is not much more than United States-Canadian rights to imports which, dubbed and ingeniously retitled, make up most of the sexploitation product in release here today. Audubon head Metzger not only directed the picture himself, but also plays a featured role in it. Film, like so many others of the same ilk, treats with prosties, from streetwalkers to high-class (?) call girls.

"Estimates vary as to the number of U.S. theaters which this product can play today, but Miss Leighton says it may now run as high as 700 to 800 houses, 'but it depends.' It seems that more or less conventional sexploitation dramas, about prostitutes, dope smuggling, wayward youth, etc., with titles more sensational than content, can play the maximum number. But when the dramas involve teenage girls in particularly sordid circumstances (perversion), and treatment includes nudity, graphic scenes of lovemaking or rape, the number of potential outlets dwindles considerably.

"Ultimate title

"Miss Leighton is particularly optimistic about the b.o. outlook for 'Dirty Girls,' which she says has no nudity and was passed by the New York censors 'with only minor cuts' (the same board, incidentally which is still trying to hold up Audubon's 'Twilight Girls'). Big deal about 'Dirty Girls' is that Audubon, for very little more money than it would have cost to import a pic, owns the worldwide rights to its own film.

"While there are profits to be made in the sexploitation market, it requires a tight hold on selling procedures, because of the size of the market, says Miss Leighton. As a result, Audubon seldom makes more than 20 prints with which to cover the market, and takes up to 3 years to play off that comparatively limited number of theaters."

Clearly children today are seeing movies which children should not see. It is as simple as that. Our concern should then be directed to the question of how best to rectify constitutionally a bad situation and thus meet the growing demands of civic leaders, of parents, of religious groups, of conscience, and of good sense.

Censorship can be argued about endlessly. What we must seek is a means whereby the Nation can protect its young and at the same time meet the Supreme Court's criteria for protecting freedom of speech and avoiding the abridgment of civil liberties.

One hopeful area of study deals not with censorship but rather with a workable type of motion picture classification system: A system similar to that adopted by other advanced countries: A system which does not prohibit adults from seeing what they please but which provides a measure of protection for young boys and girls.

In Great Britain, for instance, an independent group known as the British Board of Film Censors delivers three types of certificates to approved films: "U" meaning suitable for general release, "A" meaning more suitable for adult than juvenile audiences, and "X" for adult audiences only.

Nor is the idea new to the United States. Several nationally prominent, highly respected groups have long supported a classification system of one type or another for American movie theaters. Those groups include the Protestant Motion Picture Council, the National Legion of Decency, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Film Estimate Board of National Organizations, the Schools Motion Picture Committee, the American Jewish Committee, and others.

The drama critic of the Washington Post, Mr. Richard L. Coe, took note of the classification proposal in an article written January 31, 1965. Mr. Coe concisely summarized the breakdown of "self-regulation" among Hollywood producers, and the economic factors involved, in the process of discussing the classification proposal. Wrote Mr. Coe:

"Hollywood's long history of "self-regulation" in the censorship area faces a fuzzy future.

"For 40 years film producers have more or less stuck to a basic agreement that certain situations, themes or words would not be used.

"Until 20-odd years ago this agreement was fairly enforcible because the filmmakers also controlled the major theaters. This ensued obedience to the rule because films without their united seal of approval would not be widely distributed.

"Under the Supreme Court consent decree joint ownership of studios and theaters was broken up. No longer could the studios keep the major theaters from showing a film which lacked the Production Code Administration seal of approval.

"At this stage, from 1948 on, several events were happening simultaneously:

"For a film titled 'The Moon Is Blue,' producer Otto Preminger made a fight. Basically, this was a highly moral tale of virtue rewarded, but its use of words like 'virgin' and 'virginity' placed it outside the seal of approval. Preminger released it anyway, theaters showed the film without its seal, and both profited.

"This single step had, in turn, several results. It shook the system's foundation; now, if the seal is refused, the releasing company resigns from the Motion Picture Association but later may rejoin. This has vastly weakened united action.

"Because the code itself forbade silly particulars, and because efforts to alter the code always ran behind public acceptance, its hypocritical aspects were exposed.

"And because filmmaking inevitably had drifted into the main force of American life—the profit motive, and away from the educational and artistic areas where many idealists would prefer it to be, that profit motive dominated thinking of studios, theaters, and public.

"The second simultaneous occurrence was the rise of the foreign film in the United States. Millions of Americans during World War II were exposed to films which until then had had minimal exposure in this country.

"The past 15 years have seen a striking influx of foreign films on American screens, the best of them so admired by influential critics that a new public has been created which reaches into remote drive-ins.

"These films have been of cultures strikingly at variance with the Puritan strains in our own, a strain so strong that it has infused Old World religious philosophies in this country.

"And this very period has brought a staggering change in our youthful population. Now 24 million persons in this country, one-eighth of the population, are between the ages of 13 and 19. They spend $1.5 billion a year on entertainment. Entertainment has its effect on what this age group buys, an estimated market of $12 billion.

"Thus, the breakup of the self-regulatory system happened at just the time when a lively slice of a profit-minded nation's economy is controlled by the very age group the old rules were designed to protect.

"It is, then, hardly surprising that the license of some recent films has given what is left of the system a further shudder. Carefully watching all this are publicity-seeking members of the Federal and State Legislatures.

"Some boldy admit they haven't seen the pictures, condemn them anyway. A side issue is the age's obsession with 'image,' which raises others into attacks on the screen.

"Abetting these are the greed of some, the tastelessness of others, the laziness of parents, and, even, the burgeoning evolution of our educational system.

"Among the solutions to gathering discontent is the classification proposal, long opposed by the studios, theater owners, and their organizations.

"Classification, established in Britain, provides that some films are suitable for all, some for adults only, and a third category to be denied to those under 16 unless accompanied by adults. Britain's apparent success with the system, very loosely controlled, provokes the response that juvenile delinquency is not unknown in Britain.

"Classification also raises the fact that some 16-year-olds are mature people, some 21-year-olds always will be emotionally 12. Who is to decide?

"Producer George Seaton, in town for the opening of his exciting but highly proper '36 Hours,' spoke up for classification, reflecting how seriously responsible producers are considering the problem. A conspicuously literate leader of the Hollywood Establishment, Seaton has come to believe that despite its nibble at freedom, classification should be considered and carefully enforced.

"Our freedoms, we claim, are our precious heritage and the freedom of the screen has been linked by the Supreme Court to the established freedom of the press.

"With this freedom comes responsibility. Will parents, filmmakers, theater owners, in fact will the young for whom this anxiety is concerned, have the responsibility freedom demands?

"That is the question in a year which seems to promise widespread attacks on the hard-fought freedom of the screen."

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court suggest that statutes requiring classification of films can now be written with a good chance of being upheld in the courts.

In the Maryland Freedman case, for instance, the Court upheld the right of State agencies to review films prior to their exhibition.

Perhaps the most instructive Supreme Court decision in recent years, laying out relatively clear constitutional guidelines, is the Jacobellis case, where the Court suggested that if legislators were really concerned about protecting children, they should attempt to write obscenity laws specifically for children. That case was summarized by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress in its supplement to "Censorship of Motion Pictures."

In *Jacobellis* v. *Ohio,* supra, the Supreme Court held that the French film "Les Amants" was not obscene. In line with its previous rulings, the Court held that:

1. Obscenity is not subject to first amendment guarantees of freedom of speech and press.

2. The question whether a particular work is obscene raises an issue of constitutional law and such an issue must be ultimately decided by the Supreme Court.

3. Motion pictures are within the constitutional ambit of the first amendment guarantees of free speech and press.

4. The test of what is obscene is that laid down in *Roth* v. *United States,* 354 U.S. 476, 489; namely, whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest.

5. What is meant by "contemporary community standards" in the foregoing test means contemporary national standards and not local standards.

6. The Court also made some suggestions as to how laws designed to curb the spread of objectionable material could be made more effective. The majority opinion suggested that such laws be designed specifically to prevent dissemination of objectionable material to children rather than attempting to suppress it totally.

So a system of classification can indeed be devised to meet the objectives of both jurists and parents. It will require exhaustive study and a careful avoidance of the pitfalls inherent in this most complicated field of contemporary ethics. The English experience will be useful. The needs of the Nation and our Nation's young can well be served by the devising, at long last, of a reasonable, equitable means to balance free expression with society's transcendent interest in protecting the welfare of its children.

[From Variety, Feb. 9, 1966]

Children as Censors' Battering Ram?—Critic Arthur Knight Warns That Classification Only Way To Defeat Bluenoses

American religious groups are in a far better position than ever before to help set standards of quality for motion picture production, now that they're beginning to take a constructive, rather than merely censorious, attitude toward films, Arthur Knight, Saturday Review film critic, told board members of the National Council of Churches' Broadcasting and Film Commission last Thursday (3).

"The ultimate answer to public responsibility for developing and maintaining film standards," he said, "is not censorship but classification." Unlike censorship, a system of classification would protect the mature adult's freedom to see whatever films he wishes in their original form, while at the same time protecting children and youth from films which society deems inappropriate for their viewing, he said.

Knight warned that "the procensor forces are gathering, usually with the cry of 'Save the children.'" While he has nothing against children, the critic said that he had no desire to spend the rest of his life looking at kiddie films.

The NCC Film Awards (he's a member of the nominations panel) are indicative of organized religion's new attitude toward motion pictures, he said. "Producers have, for too long, looked upon the churches as the opposition—to be cozened into supporting their biblical spectaculars, but otherwise feared and suspected of imminent attack." And, he added, "historically, the studios have not been altogether wrong in this attitude," referring to the church-spearheaded drives in the twenties against so-called Hollywood immorality and the 1930's banding together by Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religious leaders to "create and support the League of Decency, which, although now exclusively in Catholic hands, remains the single strongest pressure group affecting American film production."

An accelerating movement is underway, he said, toward the support of films rather than simply their censure. "What makes this all the more remarkable is that it takes place at a time when most of the standard censorship controls, instruments, and committees are rapidly disappearing, thanks to the Supreme Court." One could expect, under such circumstances, to find church authorities redoubling their efforts to control what goes on the screen.

Knight cited Britain's film classification system as one that could be reasonably effective in the United States. He doesn't find classification the perfect system, as there's always the question of who'll do the classifying, the enforcing and setting of age limits. However, he said, a "realistic classification program" is probably the only workable alternative to censorship in view of current pressures for banning so-called offensive films in many parts of the country.

Such a program, he reminded the board members, must be established with needs and goals of the churches, according to their more recent, supportive mode of approach, firmly in mind. Such classification might take place at the national level with Federal officials leaving enforcement up to local authorities (just as State and local officials determine "adult" drinking ages). "Above all, we must not hazard the adult artist's freedom to communicate with his adult audience for the sake of protecting minors—when we know from the example of other countries that this same protection can be guaranteed by other and less totalitarian means than censorship."

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF SENATE RULES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate referral three amendments to the Senate rules.

The first amendment would provide that a motion for permission for a committee to sit while the Senate is in session would be privileged and nondebatable. Under existing practice a single Senator can prevent a committee from sitting while the Senate is in session after the conclusion of morning business. My amendment would provide a means by which a committee could obtain consent to sit by a swift majority vote.

The second amendment would repeal the archaic rule which permits any Senator to force the reading of the Senate Journal. In addition, it would modernize the rules by taking cognizance of the fact that the Congressional Record has taken the place of the Journal.

The third change would repeal the rule which permits a motion to take up to be filibustered. It would provide a procedure for making a motion to proceed to the consideration of any measure on the Senate Calendar a nondebatable motion, thus obviating the possibility of a double filibuster.

Each of these changes is contained in my proposed comprehensive revision of the Senate rules (S. Res. 103). However, for the convenience of members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which has jurisdiction over these matters, I am submitting them today as separate resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolutions, submitted by Mr. Clark, were received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 243. Resolution amending rule XXV of the standing rules relative to meetings of standing committees while the Senate is in session:

That paragraph 5 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"5. No standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session. A motion for leave for a standing committee to sit while the Senate is in session shall be a privileged motion and shall not be debatable."

S. Res. 244. Resolution amending rules III and IV of the standing rules with respect to the commencement of daily sessions and the Journal:

That (a) rule III of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out paragraphs 1 and 2 thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"1. The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, motions to correct any mistakes made in the entries of the Senate Journal of the preceding day shall be in order and proceeded with until disposed of, unless objected to. If objection is made, the Senator moving to correct the Senate Journal and the Senator objecting may file at the clerk's desk briefs in support of their positions. Such briefs shall be printed in the Senate Journal for the calendar day on which the motion to correct was made, together with a notice that a vote on the motion will take place on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session at a time certain to be set by the Presiding Officer. At the designated time, the motion to correct shall be submitted to the Senate and decided without debate.

"2. Unless a motion to read the Senate Journal of the preceding day, which shall be nondebatable, is made and passed by majority vote, the Senate Journal shall be deemed to have been read without actual recitation and approved.

"3. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn."

(b) Paragraphs 1 and 2 of rule IV of the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended to read as follows:

"1. The proceedings of the Senate shall be accurately stated in the Senate Journal, which shall be the Senate section of the Congressional Record. Messages of the President in full; titles of bills and joint resolutions, and such parts as shall be affected by proposed amendments; every vote, and a brief statement of the contents of each petition, memorial, or paper presented to the Senate; the legislative proceedings; and the executive proceedings in open executive sessions, shall be entered.

"2. The executive proceedings in closed session, the confidential legislative proceedings, and the proceedings when sitting as a Court of Impeachment, shall each be recorded by the Journal clerk in a separate book."

S. Res. 245. Resolution amending rule VIII of the standing rules relative to motions for the consideration of matters:

That paragraph 2 of rule VIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"2. All motions to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be debatable, unless otherwise provided in these rules: *Provided, however,* That when any Senator shall file, at the desk of the clerk, a notice of intention to move to consider any matter on the Senate calendar on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session, such motion for consideration when made by such Senator shall be decided without debate. The notice of intent shall be printed in the Senate Journal."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2995) the Emergency Food Reserves Act of 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 2921, a bill to provide a special milk program for children, that the name of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3081) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to impose sanctions against its members for exceeding production quotas, which I introduced on March 14, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of March 14, 1966:

S. 3079. A bill relating to rates of postage on air mail parcel post mailed to or by members of the Armed Forces in overseas combat areas: Mr. Case, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. McIntyre.

Authority of March 17, 1966:

S. 3097. A bill to provide financial and other aid, under the Housing Act of 1949 and related Federal programs, to encourage and assist in the preservation and maintenance of historic structures: Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Sparkman, and Mr. Yarborough.

S. 3098. A bill to promote and coordinate historic preservation activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, other public bodies, and private organizations and individuals: Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Long, of Missouri, Mr. Mansfield Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Sparkman, and Mr. Yarborough.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Monday, March 21, I announced that the Subcommittee on Housing would commence hearings on all pending housing bills on April 19, and that these hearings would run generally for a 2-week period.

In this connection I should like to make a further announcement regarding this year's housing legislation. During the debate of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, amendments were offered to that bill on the floor of the Senate dealing with the granting of noncash credit for specific urban renewal projects in several cities throughout the Nation. Later, during the conference which transpired between the House of Representatives and the Senate on this legislation, very serious questions arose regarding these amendments primarily because the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency had no opportunity to study, review, or consider these amendments in committee. In addition, neither the subcommittee nor the full committee had the opportunity to obtain the views of the administration regarding these floor amendments. The conferees, therefore, unanimously concluded in Conference Report No. 679, which accompanied the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, that in the future such amendments would not be accepted unless they had been formally presented to the House and Senate committees for consideration. The conference report on this subject reads in part as follows:

> The conferees were unanimous in their concern over the potential danger of amendments offered on the floor to provide special benefits to specific urban renewal projects. Such procedure does not give the committees sufficient opportunity to study the merits and implications of the proposals. In the future such proposals should be made to the committee early enough so that proper study can be made of each request. By so doing, the proponents of these amendments will

protect themselves from the persuasive criticism that they have not been adequately studied and therefore should be rejected.

I would, therefore, like to put all Senators on notice today that should they have any proposals dealing with noncash credit for specific urban renewal projects or any proposals dealing with assistance for any specific housing projects, they should introduce such proposals so they may be properly referred to the Banking and Currency Committee to be given consideration and so that the committee may obtain the views of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the consideration of such proposals.

NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE IN HEARINGS SCHEDULE ON S. 3046

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, due to unforeseen circumstances, it has become necessary to reschedule the hearings by the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 3046.

It had been our original intention to start these hearings on March 31. These plans have been changed and instead, the hearings will be initiated on April 1, 1966, in room 4232 of the New Senate Office Building, at which time the subcommittee will receive testimony from administration witnesses, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of the Interior.

It is our plan to continue hearings on April 4 and 5, and at later dates to be subsequently announced.

In this connection, because I know that many senatorial offices are particularly interested in the impacted areas changes, I should like to assure Senators that the subcommittee will devote at least 1, and if necessary, 2 days, later in April to this aspect of the bill.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by him on Greek Independence Day.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1047, Senate Resolution 233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first bill.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF A REPORT ENTILED "AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION"

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 233) to print as a Senate document the third annual report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on air pollution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "for the use of the Committee on Public Works, two thousand five hundred copies of", and after line 7, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. There shall be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

So as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the third semiannual report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles and measures taken toward its alleviation, dated December 17, 1965, in compliance with Public Law 88-206, the Clean Air Act.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The resolution (S. Res. 228) to provide funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 228

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $25,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The resolution (S. Res. 235) increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 235

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

PLACEMENT OF BUST OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI IN THE CAPITOL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) authorizing the placing of a bust of Constantino Brumidi in the Capitol was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Library is authorized and directed to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi, and to cause such bust to be placed in the corridor, known as the Brumidi corridor, on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol.

SEC. 2. Expenses incurred by the Joint Committee on the Library in carrying out this concurrent resolution, which shall not exceed $2,500, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the Joint Committee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on District of Columbia home rule was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 76

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia two thousand five hundred additional copies of its hearings of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "District of Columbia Home Rule, Delegate to House of Representatives" (S. 268, S. 1118).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM FOR FISCAL 1966

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966 was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 77

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations fourteen thousand additional copies of its hearings on supplemental foreign assistance, fiscal year 1966—Vietnam, of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ENTITLED "RECENT FEDERAL RESERVE ACTIONS AND ECONOMIC POLICY COORDINATION"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) authorizing the printing for the use of the Joint Economic Committee of additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings entitled "Recent Federal Reserve Actions and Economic Policy Coordination," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON RES. 79

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee five thousand additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Recent Federal Reserve Actions and Economic Policy Coordination."

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENTS THE 1965 HEARINGS OF THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 82) to authorize the printing of the hearings of the 1965 United States-

Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico as Senate documents was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 82

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as Senate documents, in separate volumes, the transcripts of the bilingual public hearings held by the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico on (1) legal constitutional matters, (2) social-cultural matters, and (3) economic matters held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on May 14–16, July 28–August 2, and November 27–December 1, 1965, respectively.

Sec. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed four thousand five hundred copies of such Senate document for the use of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "A STUDY OF POLLUTION—AIR"

The resolution (S. Res. 232) to print a report on "A Study of Pollution—Air," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 232

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, three thousand additional copies of the staff report, "A Study of Pollution—Air", prepared by the Committee on Public Works, during the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE PRINT ENTITLED "DIGEST AND ANALYSIS OF THE COLD WAR GI BILL"

The resolution (S. Res. 236) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print "Digest and Analysis of the Cold War GI Bill," for use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 236

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare eighteen thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Digest and Analysis of the Cold War GI Bill (S. 9, Eighty-ninth Congress, as enacted)" prepared by its Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

GEORGIA WENDELL

The resolution (S. Res. 238) to pay a gratuity to Georgia Wendell was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 238

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Georgia Wendell, daughter of Thomas E. Harty, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to the gross compensation paid him by the Senate in calendar year 1965, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ALMA F. BRAHAN

The resolution (S. Res. 239) to pay a gratuity to Alma F. Brahan was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 239

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Alma F. Brahan, widow of Thomas S. Brahan, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF THE 68TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 240) authorizing the printing of the 68th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 240

Resolved, That the sixty-eighth annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1965, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

U.S. POLICY ON NEGOTIATIONS FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at my request, the Library of Congress has researched into U.S. policy on negotiations for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam—reports 1 and 2—since 1965. This service was performed by Ellen C. Collier, analyst in U.S. foreign policy, Foreign Affairs Division, Library of Congress. She has done an excellent job in putting in brief form the many attempts which have been made by President Lyndon B. Johnson and his administration to seek to bring the conflict in Vietnam to the conference table for settlement.

I think we should never lose sight of the fact that the responsibility of the Presidency is almost too much for any one man to bear. Nevertheless, the man who holds that office does have to assume that responsibility and President Johnson has, with dedication and resolve.

The many public statements he has made seeking to reach the conference table and the many avenues he has tried to open up are all indications of his desire to bring the Vietnamese conflict to an honorable conclusion. That he has failed so far is not for lack of effort or lack of ideas.

Before I close, I would like to once again call to the attention of the Congress and to the people of this Nation and, I would hope, to the people and Government of North Vietnam what the President said in the state of the Union message on January 12, 1966. On that occasion, addressing both Houses of the Congress and the American people and the world, President Johnson spelled out in the clearest detail the lengths to which the United States is willing to go to initiate negotiations. He stated:

> There are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table, discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and consider the views of any group.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the research statements referred to printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the research statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Policy on Negotiations for a Peaceful Settlement in Vietnam[1]

ITS DEVELOPMENT SINCE APRIL 7, 1965

Prior to President Johnson's speech at Johns Hopkins University on April 7, 1965, the United States had taken the position that there was no point in negotiations for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam until North Vietnam gave some indication that it was ready to stop its aggression against South Vietnam. In both words and actions the United States indicated that it was unwilling to enter negotiations until there was some hope of making progress toward an agreement acceptable to the United States and South Vietnam.

For example, on March 24, 1965, President Johnson had said: "I am ready to go anywhere at any time and meet with anyone whenever there is promise of progress toward an honorable peace. We have said many times—to all who are interested in our principles for honorable negotiation—that we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable arrangement to guarantee the independence and security of all in southeast Asia. At present the Communist aggressors have given no sign of any willingness to move in this direction, but as they recognize the costs of their present course, and their own true interest in peace, there may come a change—if we all remain united."

Similarly, on February 25, 1965, Secretary of State Rusk had said: "This question of calling a conference, under what circumstances—these are procedural matters. What we are interested in, what is needed to restore peace to southeast Asia, is substance, content, an indication that peace is possible in terms of the appetites and the attitudes of the other side."

As Vietcong military activities intensified and the war escalated with the bombing of North Vietnam and the introduction of American combat troops, calls for negotiations became more frequent both in the United States and abroad. On April 1, 1965, representatives of 17 nonalined countries issued a declaration appealing to the parties concerned to seek a peaceful solution in Vietnam by starting negotiations as soon as possible, "without posing any preconditions," so that a political solution might be found. It was after this, on April 7, 1965, that President Johnson, in the speech at Johns Hopkins University, indicated U.S. readiness for unconditional discussions.

The readiness for unconditional discussions appears to have been largely a change in position on procedure, rather than on substance. The new policy proclaimed that henceforth the United States would be willing to enter discussions even if there was no reason to hope that the outcome would be an agreeemnt which would be acceptable to the United States.

Similarly, while there may have been a few modifications in the substance of the peace terms which the United States would accept, the principal changes since April 7, 1965, in U.S. policy on negotiations regarding Vietnam have also related to procedure. For example, while the April 7 speech referred to "unconditional discussions," it was later made clear the United States was also willing to enter negotiations, which implies some willingness to give and take, without conditions, and on December 4, 1965, Secretary Rusk stated that the United States would be willing to discuss Hanoi's four points along with others.

---

[1] Principal source: U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations. Background information relating to southeast Asia and Vietnam. (Committee print, 2d revised ed., March 1966, 297 p.)

In the summer of 1965 the United States also moved from the position of being willing to negotiate "with any government" to the position that the inclusion of the National Liberation Front in the negotiations was not an "insurmountable problem."

In the August 8 communication to the United Kingdom the Department of State said:

"As to the so-called National Liberation Front, the U.S. Government is convinced that the front was created by the authorities in North Vietnam and remains under their effective control. Hence, the U.S. Government does not regard the front as an independent party, although it would have no objection if, for example, front representatives participated in the discussions as part of the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. As President Johnson has stated, there would be no difficulty in representation for the so-called Liberation Front if Hanoi were to decide to cease its aggression and to seek a peaceful solution."

In addition, the United States has in recent months taken the position that a cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or the subject of preliminary discussions, and that the United States could stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward peace, presumably if there were some indication from the other side that this would have a positive response. It has expressed willingness to have a conference on southeast Asia or any part of that region. The draft resolution which the United States presented to the Security Council on January 31, 1966, contained a clause under which the United Nations would offer to assist by all appropriate means, "including the provision of arbitrators or mediators."

The U.S. position on entering peace negotiations now appears to be fairly flexible and, assuming the willingness of the North Vietnamese to negotiate, to contain only one stipulation—that the Hanoi regime not make substantive agreement with its position a precondition to negotiations.

At the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 18, 1966, Secretary Rusk stated:

"Both Hanoi and Peiping have repeatedly rejected our proposal for unconditional discussions. They have insisted instead that before any discussions can take place our side must agree in advance to the four points of Hanoi's program. The words that they have used have differed from formulation to formulation. Sometimes they have said their points are the "sole basis" for negotiations, sometimes "the most correct basis." But the effect is the same. What they are insisting upon is that we accept in advance their substantive position and then discuss only the ways in which it shall be given effect. The technique of demanding such substantive agreement in advance is a familiar Communist negotiating tactic. It does not mean that the basic points are open for discussion or that they can be loosely interpreted. It means just what it says."

Developments in substance of peace terms

The principal aims of U.S. policy, or the conditions on which it seeks to make peace, appear to remain much the same as before. As stated by President Johnson in the April 7, 1965, speech, the essentials of peace were "an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed, and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference—tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country."

In a speech of June 23, 1965, Secretary Rusk endorsed as a basis for peace four points which had been set forth the preceding day by Foreign Minister Tran Van Do, of South Vietnam. They were—

"An end to aggression and subversion [a version transmitted to the United Kingdom on August 8, 1965, added: including the withdrawal of political and military personnel introduced by North Vietnam into South Vietnam;]

"Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape for itself its own destiny in conformity with established democratic processes without any intervention of whatever form and whatever source;

"As soon as aggression has ceased, the ending of the military measures now necessary by the Republic of South Vietnam and the nations that have come to its aid to defend South Vietnam, and the removal of foreign military forces from South Vietnam.

"Effective guarantees for the independence and freedom of the people of South Vietnam."

As stated on August 8, 1965, when the United States replied to a message from the United Kingdom, as a cochairman of the Geneva Conference, on positions concerning the Vietnam situation, the U.S. position was:

"The essential element in a peaceful settlement is the ending of aggression, which in turn would permit the termination of American supporting military action. The ultimate objective must be the conditions under which the people of South Vietnam can determine their own future free from external interference, and when this condition has been created, the United States will be ready and eager to withdraw its forces from South Vietnam. Future relations between North and South Vietnam should then be worked out by peaceful means."

When the 14 points were first issued by the Department of State in early January 1966, they were followed by the phrase, "In other words, we have put everything into the basket of peace except the surrender of South Vietnam."

On February 18, 1966, Secretary Rusk again referred to the ending of aggression as being the essential condition for peace. After citing the "14 points" in the U.S. position Secretary Rusk stated: "Our Government has made quite clear what kind of peace we are prepared to accept—a peace that will guarantee the security of South Vietnam, a peace that will stop armed aggression in violation of international agreements and international law."

However, subsidiary aims of the United States have been elaborated or clarified or redefined on a number of occasions. Proposals for terms of settlement have been proposed by the Communist opponents, by friendly or neutral foreign governments and spokesmen, and by Members of Congress and others, and these have been taken into account in official policy in varying degree. Following are a few examples:

On April 8, 1965, the day after President Johnson's Johns Hopkins speech, Phan Van Dong, the Premier of North Vietnam, set forth the four points which Hanoi considered the basis for political settlement in Vietnam. If this basis were recognized, he said, it would be possible to consider reconvening a conference along the lines of the 1954 Geneva conference. The four points might be summarized as—

1. Recognition of the basic national rights of the Vietnamese people—e.g., withdrawal of U.S. forces and bases from South Vietnam and cessation of U.S. military activity against North Vietnam.

2. Pending reunification, strict respect for terms of 1954 Geneva agreements with no military bases or personnel from other countries or military alliances.

3. Internal affairs of South Vietnam to be decided without foreign interference by South Vietnamese themselves, "in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation."

4. Peaceful reunification to be settled by Vietnamese in both zones without foreign interference.

These points were interpreted by the United States, according to a speech by Secretary Rusk on June 23, 1965, as meaning that Hanoi was "not even prepared for discussions unless it is accepted in advance that there will be a Communist-dominated government in Saigon, and unless too—so far as we can determine—American forces are withdrawn in advance."

Later, however, only the third point appeared to constitute a major difference between the two sides. On February 18, 1966, Secretary Rusk gave an analysis of the four points and U.S. policy. In regard to the first point he said:

"The United States has made clear that we, too, are prepared to support a restoration of the provisions of the Geneva agreements and that we are prepared to withdraw our troops and dismantle military bases once there is compliance with the accords by all parties. We have said also that we would not expect or require a military alliance with a free South Vietnam."

He continued:

"The second point relates to the military clauses of the Geneva agreements, and these, too, we could agree to under the conditions I have indicated.

"The fourth point provides that the issue of peaceful reunification should be settled by the Vietnamese people without foreign intervention. This also we could accept if it be clearly understood that conditions must first be created both in the north and south that will make it possible for truly free elections to be held.

"It is in the third point that the core of the Communist position is disclosed.

"They insist on our recognition of the Front as the sole spokesman for the people of South Vietnam since our acceptance of the Front in that capacity would in effect mean our acceptance of the Communist position as to the indigenous nature of the conflict and thus our acceptance of a settlement on Hanoi's terms—which would mean delivering South Vietnam into the control of the Communist north."

On June 25, 1965, a peace mission composed of the heads of four Commonwealth Governments—Britain, Ghana, Nigeria, and Trinidad and Tabago—issued a statement of guidance in which they set down four suggested objectives of a peace conference: (i) end the war in Vietnam; (ii) secure the withdrawal of all foreign military presence from Vietnam and the neutralization of the area; (iii) establish, for a period, an international peace force, under the auspices of the Geneva agreement to safeguard peace in Vietnam; (iv) establish principles for the eventual unification of the country through free and internationally supervised elections.

As circumstances for bringing about such a conference, the statement included: (a) a suspension of all U.S. air attacks on North Vietnam; (b) a North Vietnamese undertaking to prevent the movement of any military forces or assistance or material to South Vietnam; (c) a total cease-fire on all sides to enable a conference to be convened to seek a peaceful solution.

The 14 points issued by the United States in early January 1966 specified that the countries of southeast Asia could be nonalined or neutral if that was their option. While this had been implied in President Johnson's April 7, 1965, speech, it represented a change of policy since the end of 1963 when President Johnson, in a New Year's message to General Khanh, had said:

"The U.S. Government shares the view of your Government that "neutralization" of South Vietnam is unacceptable. As long as the Communist regime in North Vietnam persists in its aggressive policy, neutralization of South Vietnam would only be another name for a Communist takeover."

On September 1, 1965, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the majority leader, suggested the need for clarifying the basic conditions which the United States considered essential for peace in Vietnam. He set forth five points which he had identified from official statements of U.S. policy. They were—

First. There must be a verified choice by the people of South Vietnam of their own government—a choice free of terrorism, violence, and coercion from any quarter.

Second. There can be a future for South Vietnam either in independence or as a part of a unified Vietnam on the basis of a peaceful, free, and verified expression of the wish of the people in each segment of that region and in general accord with the Geneva agreements.

Third. There shall be a withdrawal of all foreign forces and bases throughout Vietnam, north and south, provided peace can be reestablished and provided the arrangements for peace include adequate international guarantees of noninterference, not only for Vietnam, but for Laos and for Cambodia as well.

In connection with this point, Senator MANSFIELD pointed out that the United States was a party to the Geneva accord of 1962 which was designed to achieve these ends in Laos and that the United States has expressed its willingness to join in a resumption of a Geneva conference for the purpose of considering international guarantees of the integrity, independence, and borders of Cambodia.

The Senator added the following two corollaries to the above three points:

First. There needs to be provision for a secure amnesty for those involved in the struggle on all sides in Vietnam as an essential block to an extension of the barbarism and atrocities of the struggle into the subsequence peace and, indeed, as an essential of that peace.

Second. There needs to be a willingness to accept, on all sides, a cease-fire and standfast throughout all Vietnam, which might well coincide with the initiation of negotiations.

Subsequently, in November 1965, the United States began including the Geneva agreement of 1962, as well as the agreement of 1954, as a basis for peace in southeast Asia. The chief current significance of the 1962 agreement, which recognized the neutrality of Laos, might be that it was based on the establishment of a coalition government, although no reference to this aspect of the Laotian settlement has been made by the administration.

In addition, in the Declaration of Hawaii in January 1966 the United States included among its purposes "the principle of open arms and amnesty for all who turn from terror toward peace and rural construction."

A CHRONOLOGY OF STATEMENTS BY ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

April 7, 1965: President Johnson, in a speech at Johns Hopkins University, states that the United States is ready for "unconditional discussions" regarding a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. He describes as essentials of a final settlement: "an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference—tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country."

He also states: "There may be many ways to this kind of peace: in discussion or negotiation with the governments concerned; in large groups or in small ones; in the reaffirmation of old agreements or their strengthening with new ones."

April 8, 1965: United States replies to the April 1, appeal of the 17 nonalined countries to start negotiations for peace in Vietnam without any preconditions. The reply reiterates that the United States remained ready for unconditional discussions, and also states that peace could be achieved the moment the aggression from North Vietnam was eliminated; when conditions were created so that the people of South Vietnam could determine their future free from external influences, the United States would be ready to withdraw its forces.

April 27, 1965: President Johnson reaffirms the offer of unconditional discussions and says he will talk to any government, anytime, anywhere, and that the offer will remain open.

He also states: "I reaffirm my offer of unconditional discussions. We will discuss any subject, and any point of view, with any government concerned.

"This offer may be rejected, as it has been in the past. But it will remain open, waiting for the day when it becomes clear to all that armed attack will not yield domination over others."

June 25, 1965: President Johnson, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary celebration of the United Nations at San Francisco, calls upon the nations of the world, individually and collectively, to use their influence to bring "those who seem determined to make war" to the peace table.

July 28, 1965: President Johnson in a press conference states that the United States is "ready to discuss their [Hanoi's] proposals and our proposals and any proposals of any government whose people may be affected." In answer to a question as to whether he would be willing to permit direct negotiations with the Vietcong forces, President Johnson states: "The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem. I think that could be worked out."

The President announces that Ambassador Goldberg will request the United Nations to use its resources to halt aggression and bring peace in Vietnam.

July 28, 1965: President Johnson, in letter to Secretary General U Thant, wrote that the United States was still prepared to enter into negotiations for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam without conditions.

July 30, 1965: Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, in letter to President of the United Nations Security Council, states that the United States continues to stand ready to "collaborate unconditionally with members of the Security Council in the search for an acceptable formula to restore peace and security" in southeast Asia. He states that the United States has initiated or supported efforts for peaceful negotiations at least 15 times in the past 4½ years.

The efforts he cited "beginning with our acceptance of the terms of the Geneva Accords of 1954" were:

"Various approaches to Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow.

"Support of peaceful overtures by the United Kingdom, Canada, and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

"Favorable reactions to proposals made by 17 nonalined nations, and later by the Government of India.

"Approval of efforts by the Secretary General of the United Nations to initiate peace talks.

"Endorsement of a larger role for the United Nations in southeast Asia, including a U.N. mission of observers along the frontier between Vietnam and Cambodia, a U.N. mission to investigate alleged suppression of minority rights in Vietnam, and a U.N. invitation to Hanoi to participate in Security Council discussions of the incident in the Gulf of Tonkin.

"Major participation, directly and through the United Nations, in economic and social development projects in southeast Asia.

"A direct appeal by the President of the United States to the members of the United Nations to use their influence in bringing all parties to the peace table.

"Repeated assertions on the highest authority that the United States is prepared to engage in negotiations or discussions of any character with no prior conditions whatever."

November 17, 1965: State Department confirms that a peace feeler had been made May 20, 1965, by a North Vietnamese representative in Paris.

November 26, 1965: In a news conference, Secretary Rusk says in regard to "so-called peace feelers of last autumn" that "it seemed clear beyond a peradventure of doubt that Hanoi was not prepared to discuss peace in southeast Asia based upon the agreements of 1954 and 1962 and looking toward the lifting of aggression against South Vietnam. * * * Throughout all of last year, the general attitude of the Communist world was that they might consider some device to save the face of the United States while they themselves imposed their will upon South Vietnam. Our attitude was and is that we are not interested in saving face but in saving South Vietnam."

He also states that although the President's statement on April 7 regarding readiness for unconditional discussions had been the first time this had been said publicly in precisely that way, it was not a major change in that the United States had been talking about peace, and willing to talk about peace, for several years.

He also states: "I do not suppose that anyone would expect the United States, in agreeing to discussions without preconditions, to imply thereby that we are going to accept the program of the other side in such discussions."

December 4, 1965: Secretary Rusk replies to Foreign Minister Fanfani's letter of November 20, 1965, which conveyed a report that Ho Chi Minh had expressed a desire to find a peaceful solution based on a ceasefire and the application of the Geneva accord and that Ho Chi Minh and Van Dong President of the Council in North Vietnnam had said that Hanoi's four points were really the explanation of the Geneva text.

Secretary Rusk states that the United States would be willing to engage in negotiations on the basis of the Geneva agreements of 1954 without any qualifications or conditions but that it did not agree that Hanoi's four points were an authentic interpretation of the Geneva agreements. Elements in the four points particularly the political program of the National Liberation Front he said had no basis in the Geneva accords and Hanoi's insistence on a prior declaration accepting the four points were a condition. Nevertheless he said the United States was prepared to include the four points, along with proposals the United States and other governments might wish to make, for consideration in peace talks.

January 3, 1966: Following remarks made by Vice President HUMPHREY at the conclusion of a trip to the Far East, an "Outline of U.S. Position on Vietnam" distributed to the press states that reports of peace feelers had to do with initiatives of third parties, that Hanoi had denied it had ever made any peace feelers. In addition, the following 14 points are listed as "on the public record about elements which the United States believes can go into peace in southeast Asia."

1. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in southeast Asia;

2. We would welcome a conference on southeast Asia or on any part thereof;

3. We would welcome "negotiations without preconditions" as the 17 nations put it;

4. We would welcome unconditional discussions as President Johnson put it;

5. A cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or could be the subject of preliminary discussions;

6. Hanoi's four points could be discussed along with other points which others might wish to propose;

7. We want no U.S. bases in southeast Asia;

8. We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured;

9. We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice;

10. The question of reunification of Vietnam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision;

11. The countries of southeast Asia can be nonalined or neutral if that be their option;

12. We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic resconstruction of southeast Asia than in war. If there is peace, North Vietnam could participate in a regional effort to which we would be prepared to contribute at least $1 billion;

13. The President has said [2] "The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem."

14. We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped.

January 5, 1966: In a letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant, Ambassador Goldberg points out that the United States has not resumed bombing of North Vietnam since Christmas truce and has dispatched messages to many heads of governments reaffirming its desire to achieve a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

He summarizes the points made in the messages as follows:

"That the United States is prepared for discussions or negotiations without any prior conditions whatsoever or on the basis of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962, that a reciprocal reduction of hostilities could be envisaged and that a cease fire might be the first order of business in any discussion or negotiations, that the United States remains prepared to withdraw its forces from South Vietnam as soon as South Vietnam is in a position to determine its own future without external interference, that the United States desires no continuing military presence or bases in Vietnam, that the future political structure in South Vietnam should be determined by the South Vietnamese people themselves through democratic processes, and that the question of the reunification of the two Vietnams should be decided by the free decision of their two peoples."

January 12, 1966: In state of the Union message, President Johnson states that the United States is fighting "for the principle of self-determination—that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence, without terror, and without fear," and that the people of all Vietnam should make a free decision on reunification. He states:

"We will meet at any conference table, we will discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group. We will work for a cease-fire now or once discussions have begun. We will respond if others reduce their use of force, and we will withdraw our soldiers once South Vietnam is securely guaranteed the right to shape its own future."

January 16, 1966: In a joint communique from Saigon, Prime Minister Ky states that peace in Vietnam must accord with the pledges and desire of the Vietnamese people, including an end to aggression and independence to permit eventual unification, and be accompanied by guarantees against a resumption of aggression. Secretary Rusk expresses his full appreciation of this position, and both agree that "the basic positions of the two Governments were consistent in all fundamental respects."

January 30, 1966: Under Secretary of State George Ball states in address that the United States supports free elections in South Vietnam as soon as the people can vote without intimidation and the United States would accept the results of the election. However, he said, the United States has little doubt about the outcome because it is confident the South Vietnamese will not be the first people to give up their freedom to communism in a free exercise of self-determination.

January 31, 1966: President Johnson announces that U.S. bombing of North Vietnam is being resumed after a 37-day halt because the efforts to bring about peace negotiations during that time have been rebuffed. He says that the pursuit of peace will be continued, and Ambassador Goldberg has been instructed to ask for an immediate meeting of the United Nations Security Council and will present a resolution to open the way to the conference table.

January 31, 1966: United States presents resolution to Security Council calling for immediate discussions among the "appropriate interested governments to arrange a conference looking toward the application of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia," recommends that the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for an effectively supervised cessation of hostilities. In addition, under the resolution the Security Council would offer to assist by "all appropriate means, including the provision of arbitrators or mediators."

February 8, 1966: In declaration of Honolulu, the "purposes of the Government of the United States" include statement that within the framework of their international commitments, Vietnam and the United States aim to create a stable peace in southeast Asia. It states: "With the understanding and support of the Government of Vietnam the peace offensive of the U.S. Government and the Government of South Vietnam will continue until peace is secured."

The joint communique issued at the end of the meeting states that the leaders of both nations had agreed upon continued diplomatic efforts for peace.

February 18, 1966: At hearings before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Rusk reiterates the 14 points and states that the United States has made clear the kind of peace it will accept, "a peace that will guarantee the security of South Vietnam, a peace that will stop armed aggression in violation of international agreements and international law." He states that the four points put forth by North Vietnam constitute a demand for substantive agreement in advance of a conference.

He states: "In other words the Hanoi regime is demanding the following preconditions to which the United States must agree before the Communists will even condescend to negotiate: 'First, that the South Vietnamese Government be overthrown; second, that the Liberation Front, the creature and agent of Hanoi, be accepted as the sole bargaining representative for the South Vietnamese people; third, that South Vietnam be put under the control of a coalition government formed by the Communists and from which the South Vietnamese Government would be excluded.' "

The United States was not asking Hanoi to give up anything, he states, "except their appetite to take over South Vietnam by force."

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY ADDRESSES VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on the evening of Tuesday, March 8, last, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held their congressional dinner at the Sheraton-Park Hotel here in the Nation's Capital. As usual, this annual affair was attended by many of the highest officials of our Government. The Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, was present along with the Vice President, Mr. Humphrey. There was also present a quorum of both Houses of Congress.

One highlight of the evening was the presentation of the winner and four runners-up of the VFW's 19th Annual Voice of Democracy Contest. Another highlight, which brought tears to the eyes of the nearly 2,000 persons who attended the dinner, was the rendition of two of the pieces from "The Ballads of the Green Berets" by their author, Special Forces Sgt. Barry Sadler.

A very fine speech was delivered by the Vice President of the United States before the Veterans of Foreign Wars and their guests. His talk was inspirational and, to my mind, laid out our foreign policy so that anyone could understand where our Nation stands.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech by Vice President Humphrey be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address Delivered by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, Before 18th Annual Congressional Banquet, Veterans of Foreign Wars, March 8, 1966

Officers and members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, members of the President's Cabinet, distinguished Members of Congress, young people who are here as winners of the Voice of Democracy Contest and ladies and gentlemen:

Let me first of all say that it is a real, special privilege to be introduced by a gentleman who lives in Wisconsin, attended the University of Minnesota and has honored his nation by faithful service in peace and war—Andy Borg. We are mighty proud of Andy. He was visiting here with Senator Dirksen just a moment ago. While Senator Dirksen represents so ably, honorably and devotedly the State of Illinois in the U.S. Senate, Andy comes from Wisconsin, and I was born in South Dakota, we all attended the University of Minnesota, so you're in "for trouble" tonight.

I am very pleased to be here with old associates of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. May I take this opportunity to congratulate and to thank the VFW, not only for great patriotic service to this Nation in time of war, but above all, for the foresight and the vision that the commanders, officers and members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have had in these years, particularly since World War II, when the VFW has come to Washington, time after time, in these legislative conferences to ask Members of Congress and officers of Government to keep the defense forces of America ready and in balance, so that we could meet any emergency, anytime, any place. We are indebted to you for that vision.

Tonight, we are particularly delighted to have these 53 young men and women with us. I couldn't resist the temptation to go to each of them and extend the hand of congratulation and warm friendship, because these are the winners of your Voice of Democracy Contest, in all of our 50 States and the District of Columbia, Panama, and Japan. What wonderful young people.

---

[2] At a press conference on July 28, 1965.

How well I remember last year's dinner and how well I remember the VFW National Convention in Chicago. I recall that, when I came into the auditorium, your winner of last year was presenting his magnificent speech, and somebody interrupted that speech, namely me. I have never forgiven myself, but I did have the chance when I got up to speak, to introduce that young man, so he could deliver the real speech of the day. And what a job he did.

Tonight, I am very, very pleased to be present when you honor one of America's most distinguished public servants with the VFW Congressional Award. It is indeed a high honor. In 1964, this award was given to the dean of the U.S. Senate, none other than that young man from Arizona, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN. In 1965, it was given to one of America's most distinguished patriots, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, and in 1966, it is given to none other than EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN of the great State of Illinois. Now, I want to share with you what EVERETT DIRKSEN already knows, that on my recent journey, I stopped off in Bangkok, Thailand, for a few days.

While I was there, I took a moment out of the busy day, one early morning, to go into a shopping area. There, I found in the market two superbly carved wooden elephants. I thought of my friend, the minority leader, EVERETT, right then and there. It was just sheer hard luck, EVERETT, that those two beautifully carved elephants that you will get in due time were shown goring each other in ferocious combat. I thought, this is not the right thing to do—to buy a gift like that—he may misunderstand my feelings of friendship. So, I asked the vendor if he had one showing two elephants pulling together in harness. But he said, they didn't make them that way in either Thailand or America. But, Senator, may I say that in recent days, I don't know what you, in turn, might say about those donkeys the way they've been acting up.

Let me just be serious with you for a brief moment. We are deeply indebted to the VFW for many, many wonderful good works. We are indebted to you for your support of programs of education, of health care of our veterans and their families. We are indebted to you for your constant vigilance for the defense of this Nation. And we are indebted to you for your foresight on the role of America as a leader in the world—a world that is oftentimes divided, a world filled with tension and a world at the same time, filled with opportunity. The VFW gives us courage, because you represent the spirit of indomitable valor.

You give us strength, because you have demonstrated your faith in this land of ours.

I want to say just a few words this evening that might be particularly worthy of the young people. You have every reason in your daily life, every reason in the days you yet have to live, to have unbounded faith in this great land of ours. History does not tell us of the future, but it gives us good guidance from the past, America's past is a noble one, and America's future will undoubtedly be a glorious one. I say this, because we have every quality that a nation entrusted with leadership should have.

Fortunately, we are blessed by divine providence with wealth and power. This wealth and this power are not for the purpose of luxury, nor are they for the purpose of domination. This wealth and this power are for the purpose of helping ourselves and others to live a full and good life and to protect the weak. We seek in this world of ours that the rule of law shall prevail, rather than the rule of the jungle.

The United States of America is not the policeman of the world, but the United States of America does stand for a standard of decency for the world. But it can't be that way if we were to forfeit that great privilege and honor. Leadership, as I have often said, is not a luxury; leadership imposes responsibility and duty. It gives you no hope of comfort, but it does give you duties and opportunities.

Tonight, over 200,000 young men, the best that this Nation has to offer, are in a faraway place. Some people say, it is so far away that we ought not to be so deeply involved. I say that there is no place "far away" when freedom, self-determination, and liberty are at stake, and America knows that.

Neville Chamberlain, the man who in terms of history is remembered for Munich, once said, at the time when the free nations were going to appease Hitler, that Czechoslovakia involved a "quarrel within a remote country among people of whom we know nothing." And yet, this organization knows how close was Czechoslovakia, how close Western Europe was, how close Hitler was.

Now, the continent of Asia may seem distant and remote to us here in this comfortable ballroom, but in the nuclear age, in the space age, and in the age of the jet, nothing is far away. If we have learned anything, we have learned that this is one world, shrunken in size. Everybody is your neighbor.

In this time, I think we should well heed the words of a great Asian thinker, Confucius. These are his words, my young Americans, "If a man take no thought about what is distant, he will find sorrow near at hand." Those are profound words. Freedom is everybody's business, and freedom has never been free. Nothing is distant, when it affects the great human values of brotherhood, of liberty, of decency, of individualism. So knowing that nothing is remote, we take a keen interest today in the world in which we live, because we cannot isolate ourselves from it.

One of the most historic meetings of recent days was the meeting at Honolulu, Hawaii, just a month ago. It was there in Honolulu that the President of the United States with his top advisers met with the chief of state and Prime Minister of the Republic of South Vietnam and with General Westmoreland, who by the way, may I say, once again, is one of the finest citizens that this country has ever produced—a great soldier and a great patriot.

There, in Honolulu, they outlined what is known as the Honolulu declaration. I believe that the essentials of that declaration are to be found in the concluding paragraph. Just as Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt met together to outline the Atlantic Charter, this was a charter of hope, a charter of promise, a pledge to stand together in the cause of freedom.

The declaration made certain specific pledges, and I'd like to repeat them here tonight, because these are the pledges to which this country is committed, and friend and foe alike should know. They are pledges to defense against aggression; to the work of social revolution to the goal of free, self-government; pledges to the attack on hunger, ignorance and disease; a pledge to the unending quest for peace.

And it is by keeping these pledges that we can finally hope to achieve a world where men may be safe from external threat, and where they may have the chance of their lifetime for happiness and fulfillment. Now, these are not new pledges; they're as old as this Republic, and they're as old as the hope of freedom and democracy. They are the pledges to which many a President has given his word and hand.

I do not take the time this evening to repeat these words of the President. Within the lifetime of many here in this room, I would remind you, Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson—in our lifetime—have pledged America to the defense of freedom, to resistance of aggression, to helping to build for a better world for ourselves and our posterity. It is to those objectives, my fellow Americans, that tonight, our young men on the battlefield give their lives, and it is to those objectives that we have pledged the resources of this Nation to see to it that not only is Communist aggression defeated, but that a better life shall be open to people in Vietnam and everywhere.

Yes, I use good old fashioned words—we seek victory over poverty and disease. We seek victory over the idea that aggression, terror and murder are the proper vehicles of political power. We seek to end the fighting in a just and honorable peace. We seek to impose no form of government upon anyone. We seek to let people select their own form of government. We seek no bases. We seek no territory. We seek no conquest. We threaten no people.

All that we ask is that the rule of law be substituted for the rule of force. We ask that the rule of reason supplant brute power. We ask that those who talk peace be willing to sit down and achieve it. We say to those who defy the hope of mankind for peace that their brute force can never prevail. We say this in the spirit of a nation that loves justice, a nation that loves peace, but a nation that is strong, too strong to be afraid and too determined to retreat. I ask that every citizen in this land dedicate himself to the opportunity that is ours to force the aggressor to abandon his plans. I ask that we help to build the kind of life that is worthy of mankind.

Thank you very much.

COMMUNISTS ADMIT ROLE IN DOMINICAN UPHEAVAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post, William S. White presents *the final proof of the part played by the* Communists in the violent upheaval in the Dominican Republic early last year. He does it by the simple but effective method of quoting from the boasts now being published in the organs of the international Communist movement.

Two members of the executive committee of the Dominican Communist Party, writing in the magazine World Marxist Review, describe the tactics they used during the fighting and the lessons they learned. More importantly, when we recall the *statements that the Com*munists were not really important in the events which took place, they state plainly that their efforts in the Dominican Republic were "in spirit, meaning, and lessons" two parts of one whole with the earlier revolution which placed Castro in control of Cuba.

These writers and coconspirators also give their opinion frankly as to the reason for their failure to achieve power in Santo Domingo, and their words should be heard by all of those who criticized the actions of the President in sending our troops into the Dominican Republic. Except for this action by the President, it is admitted the Communist putsch would have succeeded. Only the "direct armed intervention of U.S. imperialism" brought about their defeat, by their own admission.

I hope that all Senators will read this significant article by Mr. White. Our Communist opponents in the struggle for the Dominican Republic are blatantly proclaiming their responsibility for the uprising and describing for their comrades in other countries how they went about it. For me, one of the most brazen and important tactics they disclosed was their allocation of their armed Communists throughout the commands involved in the rebellion—as soon as they discovered that their concentration made them a target for our criticism. They also found that this was a more efficient use of their forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Reds Admit Role," by William S. White, from the Washington Post of Thursday, March 24, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS ADMIT ROLE: AIDED DOMINICAN REVOLT

(By William S. White)

International communism has now not merely acknowledged but roundly boasted of its deep and armed complicity in the Dominican Republic revolt of last April which was nipped by U.S. military intervention.

The Communists have themselves thus destroyed the case of those American critics of the American action who so long have argued that what was afoot down there was only a good "democratic revolution" not too dissimilar, say, from George Washington's rebellion against King George III.

An article in one of the most authoritative of all the worldwide publications of Moscow-directed communism, the magazine World Marxist Review, has let this already ill-concealed cat well and truly out of the bag.

Its authors are self-identified members of the executive committee of the Communist Party in the Dominican Republic, J. I. Quello and N. I. Conde. They say, in so many words, that the attempted putsch would have succeeded but for "the direct armed intervention of U.S. imperialism." They say, moreover, that what was planned by the Communists for the Dominican Republic differed only superficially from the earlier revolution in Cuba that put Fidel Castro in power. The two, they add, were "in spirit, meaning and lessons" two parts of one whole.

They ought to know. For at least one of them, Conde, is an old hand in Cuba. And Quello was clandestinely landed in the Dominican Republic from Moscow shortly before the uprising.

Quello and Conde describe the Dominican affair as "another contribution to the arsenal of revolutionary experience on the (American) continent." Though the Communists were not able at its start fully to control the uprising they shortly were "allocating armed Communists" to revolutionary commands organized block by block in Santo Domingo. The piece repeatedly discloses the close relationship of this assault upon the Dominican Republic, not only to what had happened earlier in Cuba, but also to the general tactics for Communist subversion in Latin America long since prepared in Castro Cuba.

Something else is also disclosed—an outline of what the Communists learned in the Dominican Republic for future use. "Our experience showed," Quello and Conde write, "that the task of (Communist) revolutionaries during an armed insurrection is to influence it and guide it militarily and politically, to organize the struggle in accordance with the processes under way at the time.

"At first we combined all our forces in a single command. The fallacy of this decision soon made itself felt. It restricted, on the one hand, our propaganda (which was conducted chiefly among our own members). On the other hand, this command became the target for attacks on the movement by the imperialists. Having realized our mistake, we thereupon allocated armed Communists to a number of commands."

So much, then, out of the mouths of the Communists themselves, for the persistent attempt in some quarters here to depict the United States' tough response to this peril as only another instance of "red-baiting," of looking for Communists under every bed, and so on.

The same people who have attacked the American intervention in these terms also had long pooh-poohed the existence of such a danger in Cuba, too. Their judgment—not their motives—really would seem to have been proved twice catastrophically wrong.

For just as Fidel Castro himself at length proclaimed, in several thousand words broadcast from Havana radio, admitting both his Communist membership and his Communist purposes in this hemisphere, Conde and Quello have now unmistakably and openly identified the Communist Party as the ultimately moving force in the Dominican upheaval.

Moreover, the complaints of critics of the American intervention that anyhow there really weren't very many Communists visible in Santo Domingo are now shown to be the quibbles they always were. They weren't too visible at any one point in Santo Domingo simply because the Communist leaders quickly dispersed them—"armed"—among the various commands.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, President Johnson made a highly important statement of U.S. policy on the Atlantic Alliance in remarks to the Foreign Service Institute at the Department of State on Wednesday, March 23, 1966.

In the course of his remarks, President Johnson said:

> For its part, the United States is determined to join with 13 of her other allies to preserve and to strengthen the deterrent strength of NATO. We will urge that those principles of joint and common preparation be extended wherever they can be usefully applied in the Atlantic Alliance.
>
> We are hopeful that no member of the treaty will long remain withdrawn from the mutual affairs and obligations of the Atlantic. A place of respect and responsibility will await any ally who decides to return to the common task.

Mr. President, I am confident that this basic policy on NATO is supported by the steady will of Congress and of the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of the remarks of the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE AT STATE DEPARTMENT MARCH 23, 1966

Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to address the Foreign Service Institute this morning and to meet with so many Americans preparing to serve abroad. As one who believes we cannot shorten our reach into the world, I am encouraged by the number and quality of those who are studying at the Institute. You have the gratitude of your countrymen and my own assurance of support.

We have come a long way from the day someone observed that "Some diplomat no doubt will launch a heedless word and lurking war leap out."

That was more than half a century ago when diplomacy was often war by another name. Today your task is different. Those of you about to go abroad represent a continuity of purpose in a generation of change. That purpose is to build from reason and moderation a world order in which the fires of conflict yield to the fulfillment of man's oldest yearnings for himself and his family.

Your job, wherever you serve, is peace. That is the task facing all of us today.

The question, as always, is how? How do we, for example, maintain the security of the Atlantic community upon which so many of the world's hopes depend?

For the answer we must begin with the gray dawn of the world of 1945, when Europe's cities lay in rubble, her farms devastated, her industries smashed, her people weary with war and death and defeat.

From that desolation has come abundance.

From that weakness has come power.

From those ashes of holocaust has come the rebirth of a strong and vital community.

The Europe of today is a new Europe. In place of uncertainty, there is confidence; in place of decay, progress; in place of isolation, partnerships; in place of war, peace.

If there is no single explanation for the difference between Europe then and Europe today, there is a pattern. It is a luminous design woven through the history of the past 20 years. It is the design of common action—of interdependent institutions serving the good of the European nations as though they were one. It is the design of collective security protecting the entire Atlantic world.

So I come this morning to speak to you of one important part of that design—I speak of a structure some of you have helped to build: The North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Let me make clear in the beginning that we do not believe there is any righteousness in standing pat. If an organization is alive and vital—if it is to have meaning for all time as well as for any particular time—it must grow and respond and yield to change. Like our Constitution—which makes it the law of the land—the North Atlantic Treaty is more than a legal document. It is the foundation of a living institution. That institution is NATO—the organization created to give meaning and reality to the alliance commitments.

The crowded months which immediately preceded and followed the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty 17 years ago had produced an atmosphere of crisis. It was a crisis born of deep fear: fear for Europe's economic and political vitality—fear of Communist aggression and Communist subversion.

Some say that new circumstances in the world today call for the dismantling of the Organization. Of course NATO should adapt to the changing needs of the times. But we believe just as firmly that such change must be wrought by the member nations working with one another within the Alliance. Consultation, not isolation, is the route to reform. We must not forget, in success and abundance, the lessons we learned in danger and isolation: that whatever the issue, we share one common danger: division—and one safety: unity.

What is our view of NATO today?

We see it not as an alliance to make war but an alliance to keep the peace. Through an era as turbulent as man has ever known—

and under the constant threat of ultimate destruction—NATO has insured the security of the North Atlantic community. It has reinforced stability elsewhere in the world.

While NATO rests on the reality that we must fight together if war should come to the Atlantic area, it rests also on the reality that war will not come at all if we act together during peace. It was the foreign minister of France who, in 1949, insisted that to be truly secure, Europe needed not only help in resisting attack but help in preventing attack. "Liberation," he said, "is not enough."

The success of NATO has been measured by many yardsticks. The most significant to me is the most obvious: War has been deterred. Through the common organization, we have welded the military contributions of each of the 15 allies into an effective instrument. So convincing was this instrument that potential aggressors took stock and counted as too high the price of satisfying their ambitions. It has been proved true that "one sword keeps another in the sheath."

War has been deterred not only because of our integrated military power, but also because of the political unity of purpose to which that power is bent. It is difficult to overstate the importance of the bonds of culture, of political institutions, traditions, and values which form the bedrock of the Atlantic community. There is here a political integrity and an identity of interests that transcends the personalities and issues of the moment.

If our collective effort should falter—and our common determination be eroded—the foundation of the Atlantic's present stability would be shaken.

The mightiest arsenal in the world will deter no aggressor who knows his victims are too divided to decide and too unready to respond. That was the lesson of two world wars. Yet a nation—not by the action of her friends, but by her own decision to prepare and plan alone—could still imperil her own security by creating a situation in which response would be too late and too diluted. Every advance in the technology of war makes more unacceptable old and narrow concepts of sovereignty.

No one today can doubt the necessity of preventing war. It is our firm conviction that collective action through NATO is the best assurance that war will be deterred in the Atlantic world.

Look at the Atlantic Community through the eyes of those who in years past have yearned for conquest. The sight is sobering. Integrated commands, common plans, forces in being in advance of an emergency for use in emergency—all testify to a collective readiness and the integrity of collective purpose. To other eyes NATO can only be a clear warning of the folly of aggression.

NATO today must be shaped on the experience of the past. Reliance on independent action by separate forces—only loosely coordinated with joint forces and plans—twice led to world wars before 1945. But collective action has proved successful in deterring war since 1945—during 20 years of upheaval and grave danger.

We reject those experiences only at our own peril.

For its part, the United States is determined to join with 13 of her other allies to preserve and to strengthen the deterrent strength of NATO. We will urge that those principles of joint and common preparation be extended wherever they can be usefully applied in the Atlantic alliance.

We are hopeful that no member of the treaty will long remain withdrawn from the mutual affairs and obligations of the Atlantic. A place of respect and responsibility will await any ally who decides to return to the common task.

For the world is still full of peril for those who prize and cherish liberty—peril, and opportunity.

These bountiful lands washed by the Atlantic—this half-billion people unmatched in arms and industry—this cradle of common values and splendid visions—this measureless storehouse of wealth can enrich the life of an entire planet.

It is this strength—of ideas as well as arms, of peaceful purpose as well as power—that offers such hope for the reconciliation of Western Europe with the people of Eastern Europe. To surrender that strength by isolation from one another would be to dim the promise of that day when the men and women of all Europe shall again move freely among each other.

It is not a question of wealth alone.

It is a question of heart and mind. It is a willingness to leave forever those national rivalries which so often led to the useless squandering of lives and treasure in war.

It is a question of the deeper spirit of unity of which NATO is but a symbol. That unity was never better expressed than when, at the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, a great French leader declared that "Nations are more and more convinced that their fates are closely bound together—that their salvation and their welfare must rest upon the progressive application of human solidarity."

It is to the preservation of human solidarity that all our efforts must be directed. Let all of you, of the Foreign Service Institute, make it your task as well as mine.

INCREASE IN TAXES NOT LIKELY THIS YEAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the odds right now are less than 50–50 that Congress will increase taxes this year. There are three big reasons why the administration may not have to recommend a further tax increase this year. They are:

First. The productive capacity of the economy has increased so vastly; the Nation's work force is growing at such a rapid rate; and the capacity of the Nation's farms to meet food demand is so immense that there is a good chance that prices may level off without further Government tax action.

Second. This year's $6 billion increase in social security taxes; the recently enacted speedup in corporate and individual income taxes and restoration of excise taxes on autos and telephones; and the past 3 months restraint of tight money, especially on home building and small business activity, will all tend to slow down price increases.

Third. It is unlikely but perfectly possible that the President and Congress could opt for a $5 billion reduction in Government construction spending instead of a $5 billion tax increase.

Such a cut is possible if the Government eliminated Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects—$1.2 billion; cut the roadbuilding program by three-quarters—a $3 billion reduction; imposed a moratorium on GSA public buildings—$246 million; postponed NASA facilities construction—$300 million; delayed Bonneville power construction—$102 million; and postponed TVA construction—$182 million.

Postponement of spending on this scale would not affect education, health, welfare or training programs, the Defense or Atomic Energy establishments; housing or community development. It could be stopped at once by the President without any congressional debate or delay.

It could be resumed by the President without congressional action or delay whenever the economic conditions make such action appropriate. Also the President could reduce this spending as much or as little as is appropriate to meet manpower and material shortages. Obviously, there is some delay involved in the economic impact of such a spending reduction. But it is doubtful if the delay would be as long as the delay involved in tax action.

Actually the President has already instituted similar economies on a smaller scale. In his press conference Tuesday he cited the saving of 50,000 to 100,000 skilled workers in the NASA cutback he has recommended in his budget.

I want to make it crystal clear that I do not recommend the postponement of these construction expenditures at this time. But in the event inflation forces do develop greater virulence in the economy, such a policy is available to the President.

The sharp and deep disagreement on tax cut expressed before the Joint Economic Committee by expert witnesses in the last few days, the recent 78-to-10 Senate vote against repealing the investment credit which has been the most frequently recommended tax increase by the experts—all suggest that Congress would probably not act on a Presidential recommendation to hike taxes without a delay that could last several months.

Hearings also indicated that some of the most highly favored tax increases could not affect the economy for many more months. In view of the unreliability of long-range economic forecasting, a Presidential recommendation for a tax increase might not be effective until the economy was going downhill, and inflation was a matter of history.

WAGE-PRICE GUIDELINES HELP INCREASE REAL WAGES TWO AND A HALF TIMES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of continuing complaint about wage-price guidelines, and threats by interested parties that they intend to ignore them.

Mr. President, if this were done, it would be a serious error, both for business and for labor.

What has happened to wages, prices, and profits in the past years makes what I think is a devastating case for the guidelines.

Labor has strongly proclaimed that guidelines have permitted business to reap a bonanza in profits. And there is a case for this.

In the 5 years before guidelines, 1956 to 1960, corporation profits after taxes dropped from $27.2 billion to $26.7 billion, or about 2 percent. That was before the guidelines went into effect. In the nearly

5 years of guideline use, corporate profits have risen from $27.2 billion in 1961 to $44.5 billion in 1965, or more than 65 percent.

But what happened to wages during these two periods? In the 1956-to-1960 preguideline period, wages climbed from $243 billion to $294 billion, or about 20 percent.

What happened under guidelines?

Wages climbed more sharply, from $302 billion in 1961 to $391 billion in 1965, or 30 percent.

Now let us consider the price level. Without guidelines, prices climbed between 1956 and 1960 on the Consumer Price Index by 10½ percent.

Then guidelines were used, and what happened? Between 1961 and 1965, prices climbed far less—in fact, by only about one-half the rate—that is, by 5½ percent.

This is remarkable, because the 1956 to 1960 period was characterized by growing unemployment and a growing availability of plant capacity. But during the 1961 to 1965 period, when unemployment was diminishing and demand pressing against plant capacity, prices were far more stable. Guidelines, obviously, do have a significant effect.

Now, Mr. President, for the coup de grace. Consider what happened to real wages—that is, wages corrected for the rise in prices.

Before guidelines—in 1956 to 1960—wages climbed 20 percent but the rise in prices of 10½ percent ate up more than half of that, so that real wages went up only 10 percent.

Now what happened with wage-price guidelines giving the price level more stability? Between 1961 and 1965, real wages increased not by 10 percent or 15 percent or 20 percent, but by nearly 25 percent.

So with wage-price guidelines. Between 1961 and 1965, real wages increased more than 2½ times as fast as they did without wage-price guidelines.

Mr. President, as I have said before, there are real inequities for labor in the lack of cost-of-living provision in the wage-price guidelines. But with all their inequities—and we should work hard to correct them—the workingman is far better served by the administration of wage-price guidelines than if we abandon them and permit prices to rise, as they surely will in their absence.

WHAT SCHOOL MILK, LUNCH CUTS MEAN TO MILWAUKEE FAMILY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have talked often on this floor about the impact the administration's plan to cut the school milk program by 80 percent could have on millions of American families who are not poverty stricken but have substantial expenses to meet from a modest income.

These families simply could not qualify to receive free milk under a means test. Yet they will have great, perhaps insuperable, difficulties in meeting the extra costs resulting from the withdrawal of the partial Federal subsidy that now is the rule.

Take Mr. Gerald J. Dugan of Milwaukee, Wis. In a letter to the Milwaukee Journal Mr. Dugan states:

> On a family basis we are not eligible for any city, county, State or Federal assistance. Yet our physical needs are great and our financial status is precarious. I support eight persons on a net income of $8,000. We are paying for a home and a car. We send our kids to Catholic school. We have medical and dental bills and we buy food and clothing like anyone else. And we pay the same prices.
>
> The little subsidy you dismiss amounts to 70 cents per day. At 190 days per year it is $133. And $133 will buy 19 pairs of shoes. Or pay the dental bill or the book bill for five kids.

Just last Monday Secretary Freeman told the members of the Midcontinent Farmers Association at a national farm conference:

> It is not asking too much when we ask those families who can afford it—like yours and mine—to spend a few cents to buy that supplemental half-pint of milk * * * the milk in addition to that served at lunch time * * * so that youngsters now denied school lunches can get them.

Of course this is a loaded "either, or" statement to begin with. The proper answer is "why not give poor youngsters a free school lunch and continue the school milk program at its present level?" Certainly this country is not so poor that it has to force the kind of choice Secretary Freeman mentions. Furthermore, the $80 million that the administration proposes be cut from the school milk program will not go to beef up the school lunch program, as Secretary Freeman intimates. This is a budget cutting decision pure and simple.

I think the Secretary of Agriculture would be somewhat reluctant to tell Mr. Dugan that families "like yours and mine" do not need this Federal help. Yet the vast preponderance of families with children in grade and high school fall into Mr. Dugan's income category, rather than Secretary Freeman's.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2394, and I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to plan, design, and construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States in the District of Columbia.
>
> SEC. 2. The Administrator is further authorized to use as a site for such residence Federal land and property comprising approximately ten acres at the United States Naval Observatory, the specific area and boundaries thereof to be determined jointly by the General Services Administration and the Department of the Navy: *Provided*, That any roads and improvements thereon for which there is a continued need may be relocated and reconstructed.
>
> SEC. 3. The Administrator is further authorized to provide for the care, maintenance, repair, improvement, alteration, and furnishing of the official residence and grounds, including heating, lighting, and air conditioning, which services shall be provided at the expense of the United States.
>
> SEC. 4. The Administrator of General Services is further authorized to accept cash gifts, furniture, and furnishings and other types of gifts on behalf of the United States for use in constructing and furnishing the official residence but without further conditions on use, all such articles thus given to become the property of the United States.
>
> SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration, the sum of $750,000 for planning, design, construction, and costs incidental thereto, including the cost of initial furnishings.
>
> SEC. 6. There is further authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration, annually, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 3.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act authorizing the planning, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, S. 2394 will finally bring into reality a project which many Democrats and Republicans in the Congress have long advocated—an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

This bill has had extensive study in both the Senate and the House, and I believe the Senate should concur with the House amendments, which were inserted after much hard work in the House Public Works Committee and on the floor of the House itself.

Bills designed to accomplish this objective have been before the Congress numerous times in the past two decades. Last year the Senate indicated it is now prepared to support this project, and the changes made in the House will not prevent it from going forward without delay. I fully support the bill as it has been brought back to the Senate.

This bill provides that a 10-acre tract on the Naval Observatory grounds just off Massachusetts Avenue NW., shall be set aside as a site for the Vice President's residence. The Senate had proposed that a commission be created to select a site, but the great amount of public discussion that has occurred on this issue during the past year has brought a consensus of opinion on the Naval Observatory location.

The bill as approved in the Senate had called for an investment of $1 million but with the acreage that is available at the Naval Observatory campus, the authorization of a maximum of $750,000 in this measure should be adequate to cover the planning, construction and furnishing of this residence.

There can be no reasonable argument against this measure based on its cost. The Vice President of the United States has duties and responsibilities to the entire Nation that can be more effectively fulfilled when this residence becomes available.

The expansion of governmental functions, both in domestic and foreign affairs, requires this expenditure starting this year.

I am sure that the General Services Administration will secure, through appropriate procurement procedures, the services of highly talented architects to assist in the planning of this residence.

This project should inspire a public design competition of unusual proportions. Certainly, many of the leading architects of the Nation will want to submit their ideas for a residence of this kind. And certainly, the Fine Arts Commission, whose members are well qualified to pass judgment on matters of this kind, should be consulted. The Commission's expertise will help insure a final design choice that will reflect the best, most artful resources now available in this country.

I anticipate spirited bidding by the construction and engineering industries for the privilege of participating in this historic project. I also anticipate continued cooperation from the military departments who now control this ground, although the project and the residence itself will be under civilian management throughout.

I believe the Members of the Senate will be particularly interested in the provisions that are made for the acceptance of gifts in the furnishing of this residence. The project offers a new opportunity in the arts that now flourish as never before in our home building and home furnishing industries.

I urge approval of the pending motion as offered by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the senior Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, an editorial appeared in the Baltimore Sun recently urging quick congressional action on the matter of providing an official residence for the Vice President. The editorial praises the proposed compromise solution of building a new house on the Naval Observatory grounds.

Last August, Senator MONRONEY, Senator HARTKE and I introduced a bill to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President. The Senate passed the bill, and in amended form, the House did likewise. The House amendments are scheduled to be discussed on the floor of the Senate today.

The Sun editorial points out very aptly that an official residence is in keeping with the increasingly-important duties of the Vice President. I hope that the Senate will not fail to act on this matter as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "For a Vice President" in the March 18, 1966, edition of the Baltimore Sun be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A VICE PRESIDENT

Something of a compromise, and a reasonably sensible one, too, seems to have developed in Washington over the question of an official residence for the Vice President. Some persons had thought that the rather stately residence of the Chief of Naval Operations, on the spacious grounds of the Naval Observatory in the embassy section of Massachusetts Avenue, would be just the thing for a Vice President. But the Navy, and friends of the Navy, objected strenuously that service traditions should not be so lightly brushed aside. So the proposed compromise is to build a new house for the Vice President on the Naval Observatory grounds. Such a proposal is scheduled to come up in the House of Representatives soon.

An official residence for the Vice President is in keeping with other moves to increase the duties and importance of this office. Quite obviously, the United States cannot stipulate that its prospective Vice Presidents must own a big house in Washington to qualify for the nomination, or must be wealthy enough to buy or rent a house large enough for the official entertainment expected of our No. 2 man. Both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Johnson moved to large houses, at considerable personal expense, after they advanced from the office of U.S. Senator to Vice President, but Mr. HUMPHREY thus far has found it necessary to remain in his Senator-sized house, which is a bit crowded for a Vice President. And whatever might have been said about previous Vice Presidents, no one can argue that Mr. HUMPHREY isn't trying to earn his pay.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to S. 2394.

The motion was agreed to.

PROTESTATION OF DEFAMATION OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT McNAMARA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I take the floor this morning to protest and to denounce a defamation of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara emanating from Springfield, Mass.

Before I discuss this matter let me give some background information.

Mr. President, in November of 1964 Secretary of Defense McNamara announced a decision that all activities of the Springfield, Mass., Armory were to be phased out over a period of 2½ years and that some of the work being done at the armory would be delegated to private industry and some of it transferred to other Government facilities, as dictated by economy and efficiency. The Secretary of Defense had made studies of the most efficient way of producing certain small arms and weapons systems. Mr. McNamara's original decision to phase out the Springfield Armory was reaffirmed in a thorough study made by the management consulting firm of Booz, Allen, and Hamilton. This study concluded that:

> The long-range retention of the Springfield Armory for the acquisition of the small arms weapons and weapons systems is neither necessary nor desirable.

The report suggested that the Springfield Armory should not be retained and that part of the work done there should be transferred to the Rock Island, Ill., Arsenal.

The Springfield people objected very strenuously to this recommendation. The Massachusetts Senators and Members of the House made gentlemanly remonstrances, and I want to make it quite clear that these Congressmen bear none of the blame for the false and brutal charges that have been made, but I hold in my hand a copy of the Springfield Herald for February 6, which has this headline, "How McNamara Plays Ball With Nazis."

On one side of the page there is a picture of Secretary McNamara, and underneath appears the words: "McNanama: 'The Flow of Dollars.' "

On the opposite side of the page, there is a picture of Adolf Hitler, and underneath, the words "Hitler—The Final Solution"—which was Hitler's phrase for the elimination of the Jewish people.

In the text of the editorial by Sidney Edelberg the charge is made that Secretary McNamara is continuing to "play ball with the Nazis."

On that same page is also a letter from the mayor of Springfield, somewhat more restrained in tone.

I resent from the very bottom of my being this foul attack upon Secretary McNamara. I have never known in all my experience in public life a man more devoted to the public good than the Secretary of Defense, a man who spends himself more fully, with complete devotion to the interests of the United States, a man who is more patriotic, than the Secretary of Defense. He has been shot at; imputations have been made about him; and now comes this utterly false and foul defamation. I resent it deeply, and I believe the American people resent it deeply.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The 3 minutes of the Senator from Illinois have expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 minutes more.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if this sort of thing continues, it may drive Secretary McNamara out of public life. It is amazing to me how he has been able to take this abuse for so many months and years. It may result in losing capable, patriotic, and energetic men by this kind of abuse.

We have had too much of this public dishonesty going on in the United States. A few days ago I exposed on the floor of the Senate the fact that the American Medical Association had been circulating a false radio program purporting to represent Paul Normile, speaking in behalf of medicare.

This program portrayed Mr. Normile in a very false light. After having been carried on the radio, it was revealed as a complete forgery. The American Medical Association was forced to apologize and compensate Mr. Normile for damages.

We have seen this same thing in the industrial community, in respect to General Motors and Ralph Nader, who was critical of the General Motors cars, particularly the Corvair. Mr. Nader was shadowed, and inquiries made into his personal life including his sex habits, the only reason being that they wanted to use the information to offset the criticisms

Mr. Nader made. They failed to find anything about Mr. Nader's activities which would embarrass or discredit him, and their own actions were exposed. When he appeared before the Senate committee, the president of General Motors had the good grace to apologize and say he did not know the nature of the investigation being made.

But, there has been too much of this industrial spying and spying by Government on its employees, and too many attempts to smear and intimidate persons who stand up for the public interest.

The result has been that the whole basis of American life is being corrupted by these activities. Unless these activities are exposed and denounced, they will continue and will lower the tone of public discussion and shake our national faith that truth can and will prevail in a democratic society.

I hope the Senate registers its deep resentment at the tactics being used.

I ask unanimous consent that various items in connection with the Springfield Armory matter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[A news release from the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Washington, D.C., Nov. 16, 1965]

SPRINGFIELD ARMORY WILL BE CLOSED

Secretary of Defense McNamara has directed that all activities at the Springfield Armory, Mass., be phased out over the next 2½ years. Reaffirming a decision announced on November 19, 1964, the Secretary has ordered that the facility be closed and reported to the General Services Administration by April 1968.

The reaffirmation of the decision to close the Springfield Armory follows a comprehensive study by the Booz, Allen & Hamilton firm of management consultants.

The company concluded:

"The long-range retention of the Springfield Armory for the acquisition of small arms weapons and weapon systems is neither necessary nor desirable."

The study further stated that "the Armory's manufacturing capacity and capability are not needed. The same is true of the Armory's development capability."

The company recommended:

"The Springfield Armory not be retained as an active installation in the Defense Establishment."

As in the case in similar inactivations of surplus facilities, all career employees whose jobs are eliminated will be offered another job opportunity. If the new job requires a move to another location, the moving expenses involved will be borne by the Government. The services of the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment will be made available to the community, if requested.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Herald, Feb. 6, 1966]

HOW MCNAMARA PLAYS BALL WITH NAZIS

(Editorial by Sidney Edelberg)

The letter in the adjoining column tells the story of how Secretary of Defense McNamara continues to play ball with the Nazis who enslaved in their factories and then murdered hundreds of Jews, Poles, and Danes.

The story came out this weekend as the B'nai B'rith announced that the factory, namely Rheinmetal, has refused to grant $800,000 to $1 million in reparations to 1,000 survivors despite the fact that the German War Ministry believes that such reparations should be paid.

Springfield, of course, is vitally concerned because McNamara has given Rheinmetal a huge order for a 50-millimeter weapon that can be better made at the Springfield Armory.

Perhaps Secretary McNamara was unaware that Otto Paul Caesar and Ernest Blume who run Rheinmetal today are two pioneer Nazis who must share the blame for Hitler's encyclopedia of horrors.

If McNamara was unaware of this when he made the deal, he is fully aware now. In fact he was made aware of it on November 24, 1964, but he refused to cancel the deal when he had a chance giving vague reasons such as "involvement in flow of dollars."

He said nothing about the involvement of 1,500 Springfield Armory workers including 200 disabled veterans working there who will be out of jobs as a result of McNamara's reasoning.

This is another shining example of McNamara's respect for cloudy mathematics over living men.

We are thankful that Mayor Charles Ryan and Accountant Henry T. Downey have brought the facts of this case to the President of the United States, Secretary of State Rusk, and McNamara himself. We are further thankful that they are being given wide publication by Jack Raymond of the New York Times, by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff of the Des Moines Register, and by William Putnam of station WWLP.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Herald, Feb. 6, 1966]

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is a letter Mayor Ryan has sent to President Johnson, similar copies of which have been sent to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.)

FEBRUARY 4, 1966.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On November 24, 1964, and January 5, 1965, we wrote to you asking you to take whatever steps were necessary to kill a proposed $50 million contract with a German producer for a 20 millimeter automatic weapon which was to be purchased by the U.S. Government. We pointed out to you at that time that the people of the Springfield Armory, who have given loyal, devoted and talented service to this Nation since the birth of our country could manufacture a better weapon. Our requests were to no avail and the United States has continued on the path of closing down this arsenal. We reiterate at this time that in spite of what might be told you by the people of the Defense Department, we still claim and can substantiate the fact that Springfield can produce a better weapon of greater reliability, faster, with more security, and of higher quality than the gun the Defense Department intends to buy from Germany.

We think that you should be made aware of the fact that the German manufacturer which is to produce this gun under a $50 million contract with the United States of America is the Rheinmetall Co., located in Dusseldorf. This same company during World War II enslaved thousands of Jewish, Polish, and Danish men, women, and children. It was to this Rheinmetall horror factory that the German S.S. delivered their helpless victims to be starved, whipped, beaten, and literally worked to death to manufacture arms to kill Allied soldiers. When the Rheinmetall staff judged that the slave worker was of no further use, they would efficiently dispatch the tortured and exhausted body to Buchenwald for extermination.

It is Rheinmetall, managed even today, by two pioneer (1935–37) Nazis, Otto Paul Caesar and Ernest Blume, that continues arrogantly to spurn the pleas of its few surviving victims for even token reparations. To deal now with these unrepentant Nazis of Rheinmetall desecrates the memories of the millions of martyrs who perished in the German death camps and crematoria. It desecrates the memories of the Jews, the Poles, the French, the Greeks, the Czechs, the Dutch, the Scandinavians, and others slaughtered by the Nazi invaders. The shocking thing about this, Mr. President, is that even if they were not aware of it when they originally entered into negotiations, the top officials of our State Department and Defense Department have been aware of the true facts concerning Rheinmetall's actions during World War II for approximately one whole year.

The 1,500 veterans employed at the Springfield Armory and the 200 disabled veterans also employed at the Springfield Armory want to know why their Government is closing them out, lock, stock, and barrel when they have demonstrated their great ability, devotion, and loyalty to their Government time and time again, while at the same time the United States is on the threshold of signing a contract for an inferior gun made by people with no loyalty to our country so that Nazi pockets can be enriched.

The U.S. Government which throughout the world asserts respect for human rights, should not encourage those which show utter contempt for human rights. Those who have used and abused slave labor without any sign of remorse should not now win the favor of this Government. This $50 million arrangement is a scandal and we protest its monstrous infamy.

CHARLES V. RYAN, Jr.,
Mayor of Springfield.
HENRY T. DOWNEY, C. P. A.,
Attorney at Law, Consultant to Springfield Armory Technical Committee.

MARCH 14, 1966.

In reply refer to: I–2994/66ct.
Hon. CHARLES V. RYAN, Jr.,
The Mayor of Springfield,
Springfield, Mass.

DEAR MAYOR RYAN: The President has asked that I respond to your February 23 letter to him concerning the proposed procurement by the United States of 20-millimeter guns from the Federal Republic of Germany. Your letter expressed concern about three major points: that the Hispano-Suiza 820 20-millimeter gun is an inadequate and unsatisfactory weapon; that proposed procurement by the United States from Rheinmetall, a German firm, should not be made for overriding reasons; and that the United States is considering off-shore procurement when the Springfield Armory can produce a better weapon than the Hispano-Suiza gun.

Concerning your first point, the version of the Hispano-Suiza 820 now under consideration is quite different from the gun which was subject to the 5-year-old criticism cited in your letter. It has gone through a complete U.S. Army modification and test program. Based on the results of this program, which included test and evaluation work at Aberdeen Proving Ground, the modified gun meets the stated requirement.

I can assure you that the U.S. Department of Defense does not make gun purchases casually and will not in this instance. If the Hispano-Suiza 820 is procured, it will only be because no better weapon is or will become available within the time frame during which a procurement action must be taken.

As to the second point, you are incorrect in assuming that the United States plans a $75 million contract with the Rheinmetall firm. Our contract, if any, will be with the Federal Republic of Germany. Rheinmetall's role would be to supply the Federal Republic of Germany with less than half of the total U.S. requirement to be filled. Nevertheless, we regard the charges against Rheinmetall as serious and important. Their accuracy and their implications are being reviewed by the two Governments involved.

In any event, the Rheinmetall controversy is irrelevant to the Springfield closure question for the armory does not have a substitute weapon under development, nor could it develop one to be ready for production in time to meet the requirement the Hispano-Suiza 820 is intended to fulfill—which leads to your third point.

The Hispano-Suiza 820 is part of an interim weapons system to tide us over the next 2 or more years until an even better weapon of this type is available. The offshore procurement now under consideration will meet the entire current requirement for an interim weapon. The Army is just beginning early development work on a successor weapon, and experience teaches that we are several years away from the delivery of an approved new weapon.

Your pride in Springfield Armory's past accomplishments is quite understandable. It is shared by this Department. However, there is no gun available for current production at Springfield or anywhere else in the United States which would be an adequate substitute for the Hispano-Suiza 820 in meeting the immediate interim requirement described above.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. MCNAUGHTON,
Assistant Secretary of Defense.

"THE TWO AMERICAS"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Brien McMahon lecture at the University of Connecticut delivered by Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

In my judgment, the Senator's address, entitled, "The Two Americas," contains some very sound statements, and deserves the attention of both the Senate and the country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWO AMERICAS

(Statement by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Brien McMahon Lecture, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn., Mar. 22, 1966)

There are two Americas. One is the America of Lincoln and Adlai Stevenson; the other is the America of Teddy Roosevelt and General MacArthur. One is generous and humane, the other narrowly egotistical; one is modest and self-critical, the other arrogant and self-righteous; one is sensible, the other romantic; one is good-humored, the other solemn; one is inquiring, the other pontificating; one is moderate and restrained, the other filled with passionate intensity.

We have tended in the years of our great power to puzzle the world by presenting to it now the one face of America, now the other, and sometimes the two at once. Many people all over the world have come to regard America as being capable of generosity and far-sighted behavior but no less capable of pettiness and spite. The result is an inability to anticipate American actions which in turn makes for apprehension and a lack of confidence in American aims.

The inconstancy of American foreign policy is not an accident but an expression of two distinct sides of the American character. Both are characterized by a kind of moralism, but one is the morality of decent instincts tempered by the knowledge of human imperfection and the other is the morality of absolute self-assurance fired by the crusading spirit. The one is exemplified by Lincoln, who found it strange, in the words of his second inaugural, "that any man should dare to ask for a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces," but then added: "let us judge not, that we be not judged." The other is exemplified by Theodore Roosevelt, who, without question or doubt as to his own and his country's capacity to judge right and wrong proclaimed the duty of the United States to exercise an "internal police power" in the hemisphere on the ground that "Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America * * * ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation,"[1] Roosevelt, of course, never questioned that the "wrongdoing" would be done by our Latin neighbors and we, of course, were the "civilized nation" with the duty to set things right.

After 20 years of world power, the United States must decide which of the two sides of its national character is to predominate—the humanism of Lincoln or the aggressive moralism of Theodore Roosevelt. One or the other will help shape the spirit of the age—unless of course we refuse to choose, in which case America may come to play a less important role in the world, leaving the great decisions to others.

The tendency of recent months has been toward a more strident and aggressive American foreign policy, which is to say, toward a policy closer to the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt than of Lincoln. We are still trying to build bridges to the Communist countries and we are still—in a small way—helping the poorer nations to make a better life for their people; but we are also involved in a growing war against Asian communism, a war which began and might have ended as a civil war if American intervention had not turned it into a contest of ideologies, and in Latin America we remain trapped by the consequences of an ideologically motivated and politically unsuccessful intervention in the Dominican Republic.

Our national vocabulary has changed with our policies. A few years ago—even some months ago—we were talking of detente and building bridges, of 5-year plans in India and Pakistan, of agricultural cooperatives in the Dominican Republic and land and tax reform all over Latin America. Today these subjects have an antique ring. Instead of emphasizing plans for social change, the policy planners and political scientists are conjuring up "scenarios" of escalation and nuclear confrontation and "models" of insurgency and counterinsurgency; in Latin America they seem more interested in testing the "images" of armies than in the progress of social reform.

Commenting last October on the reaction to those who have opposed the war in Vietnam, a European observer wrote: "The airy contempt with which many of the unofficial defenders of official policy nowadays treat such 'sentimental' considerations as international law, neutral opinion, or even the wishes of the unfortunate people of Vietnam, is indeed something new in responsible American circles; to one European who has just spent a year in the United States, it sounded ominously similar to the notorious 'Realpolitik' of Imperial Germany, while the protesters seemed to embody the American democratic tradition."[2]

The change in words and values is no less important than the change in policy, because the words are deeds and style is substance insofar as they influence men's minds behavior. What seems to be happening, as Archibald MacLeish recently put it, is that "the feel of America in the world's mind" has begun to change and faith in "the idea of America" has been shaken, for our own people as well as for the world. MacLeish is suggesting—and I think he is right—that much of the idealism and inspiration is disappearing from American policy, but he also points out that they are not yet gone and by no means are they irretrievable. "If you look closely," he said, "and listen well, there is a human warmth, a human meaning which nothing has killed in almost 20 years and which nothing is likely to kill * * *. What has always held this country together is an idea—a dream if you will—a large and abstract thought of the sort the realistic and the sophisticated may reject but mankind can hold to."[3]

The foremost need of American foreign policy is a renewal of dedication to an "idea that mankind can hold to"—not a missionary idea full of pomposities about saving the sinful and civilizing the heathen but a Lincolnian idea expressing what Aldous Huxley has called "the simple human preference for life and peace."[4]

A year ago, in domestic affairs, we vigorously reasserted our "preference for life and peace;" it seemed that the United States might be about to undergo something of a social revolution. What a degree of partisan harmony that would have seemed inconceivable a few years ago the Congress in 1965 adopted sweeping legislation to expand education, to provide health care to the aged, to combat urban and rural poverty on a large scale, to renew our cities and purify our streams, and to meet many other long neglected problems. These accomplishments reflect brilliant legislative leadership, for which President Johnson is justly famed, and they also are an expression of the humane and idealistic side of the American character.

Vigorously executed and adequately funded, the legislation adopted in 1965 can open the way to an era of abundance and opportunity for all Americans, but, for the present at least, the inspiration and commitment of a year ago have disappeared. They have disappeared in the face of deepening involvement in an Asian war, and although it may be contended that the United States has the material resources to rebuild its society at home while waging war abroad, it is already being demonstrated that we do not have the mental and spiritual resources for such a double effort. In concrete terms, the President simply cannot think about implementing the Great Society at home while he is supervising bombing missions over North Vietnam; nor is the Congress much inclined to debate—much less finance—expanded education programs when it is involved in debating—and paying for—an expanding war; nor can the American people be expected to think very hard or do very much about improving their schools and communities when they are worried about casualty lists and the danger of a wider war. My own view is that there is a kind of madness in the facile assumption that we can raise the many billions of dollars necessary to rebuild our schools and cities and public transport and eliminate the pollution of air and water while also spending tens of billions to finance an "open-ended war in Asia, but even if the material resources can somehow be drawn from an expanding economy I do not think that the spiritual resources will long be forthcoming from an angry and disappointed people.

---

[1] Annual message to Congress, Dec. 6, 1904.

[2] Richard Lowenthal, "America's Asian Commitment," Encounter, October 1965, p. 58.

[3] Archibald MacLeish, address to the Congress of the International Publishers Association, May 31, 1965.

[4] "The Politics of Ecology."

Wars breed war fever; when a nation is involved in a bitter foreign conflict, hopes give way to fears and creative and generous attitudes give way to a false and strident patriotism. That, I believe, is what is happening in America today, and there can be no cure for it except an end to the war in Asia. As long as the war continues, whatever our material resources, the harsh and egotistical America will prevail over the generous and humane America. It will prevail not only in Vietnam but, to one degree or another, depending upon the length and size of the war, in relations with the Communist world, with the neutrals, with our allies and in relations with each other here at home.

How have we come to this state of things? How has it come about that the greatest and richest of nations, a nation with a tradition of decency and humanity in its conduct both at home and abroad, a nation with the will and resources to contribute powerfully to peace and development in the world, is now caught up in a spiral of violence in a poor and backward Asian country, with results that are damaging our foreign relations all over the world and poisoning our political life at home? Is it entirely, as the Secretary of State seems to believe, because of the evil and malice of the other side. Or is there something wrong on our side as well, some failure of judgment, some weakness of character, some blind spot in our view of the world?

Before suggesting an affirmative answer to the last question, I emphasize that I do not think our country is the author of the world's misfortunes, or any significant part of them, but only that we are no more immune than the rest of humanity from failures of insight and judgment. It is never pleasant to criticize one's own country but, seen in perspective, criticism is an expression of confidence; it bespeaks a faith in the capacity of our country to realize its own best possibilities.

A society can never be any better than its citizens require it to be. In one of his letters to a German friend, Albert Camus wrote in 1943: "This is what separated us from you; we made demands. You were satisfied to serve the power of your nation and we dreamed of giving ours her truth."[5]

In this spirit, I say that I do not think there is something wrong with our foreign policy; I do think there is a discrepancy between two Americas, one magnanimous and humane, the other arrogant and self-righteous, a discrepancy which has nothing to do with the faults and failures of the "other side."

The resulting ambivalence of our policy, as currently manifested in Vietnam and Santo Domingo, arises specifically from the fact that in the years since World War II the United States has been simultaneously committed to policies of opposing communism and supporting nationalism. Insofar as the two have been separate, U.S. policy has been largely successful. In such instances as the Soviet threat to Western Europe in the late forties and the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 the danger was clearly one of Soviet power and the United States had little difficulty in deciding on effective counteraction. In the case of the colonial revolution in most of Asia and Africa the United States took a strong lead in supporting national independence movements. Only in such instances as the Cuban and Dominican revolutions and the war in Vietnam, in each of which communism and nationalism became closely associated with each other, has the United States encountered cruel dilemmas in the shaping of policy and signal failures in its execution.

For complex reasons, deriving in large part from our early postwar experience with Soviet Communist imperialism, we have tended to give our opposition to communism priority over our support for nationalism. The result has been that, with certain exceptions, we have strongly, and for the most part unsuccessfully, opposed those genuinely nationalist movements which have been controlled or influenced by Communists. The most notable—and rewarding—exception has been Yugoslavia, whose national independence we have supported since 1948 with the result that it has posed a powerful barrier to Soviet aspirations in southeastern Europe—a more powerful barrier, it should be noted, than many non-Communist governments have been able to erect.

Whatever wisdom or lack of it our emphasis on communism has had in the past, the realities of the present require a reversal of priorities as between opposing communism and supporting nationalism. The basis of my criticisms of American policy in both southeast Asia and Latin America is a belief that American interests are better served by supporting nationalism than by opposing communism, and that when the two are encountered in the same country it is in our interest to accept a Communist government rather than to undertake the cruel and all but impossible task of suppressing a genuinely national movement.

Far from being unified in a design for world conquest, the Communist countries are deeply divided among themselves, with widely varying foreign policies and widely varying concepts of their own national interests. Unless, therefore, we accept the view that Communist ideology in itself constitutes a threat to the free nations, we are bound to regard Communist countries as menacing or not, depending on whether their foreign policies are aggressive or benign. If we accept the premise that it is aggression rather than communism which endangers us, then it follows that the existence of a strong Communist state which poses a barrier to expansion by an aggressive Communist power may be more desirable from the viewpoint of American interests than a weak non-Communist state whose very weakness forms a vacuum which invites conquest or subversion.

Such a nonideological approach may commend itself to the practical and humane strand in our national character, but it is anathema to that other, puritanical strand, which predisposes us to ideological conflict and, indeed, suggests that there is something immoral about any other kind of conflict. The ambivalence in our foreign relations seems to arise, therefore, from the discrepancy between the two Americas, the one making us the friend of social revolution all over the world, the other making us an enemy to communism in all its forms, and the two together making for a troublesome inconstancy and self-defeating policies.

It is with this dilemma in mind, and with a view to encouraging a renewal of the spirit of humanitarian idealism in American policy, that I turn now to comment on some of the issues that agitate the American people and their leaders.

The tragedy of Vietnam is that a revolution against social injustice and foreign rule has become a contest between Asian communism and the United States. In the years after World War II an unenlightened colonialism bred a militant form of communism in Indochina. A nationalist movement that might have developed peacefully and democratically as in India and the Philippines was driven to Communist control by France's insistence on reasserting her prewar colonial authority. The West represented by France thus came to be regarded as the enemy of Vietnamese nationalism, and communism was able to play the role of its friend.

The United States has found itself in the difficult and undesirable position of sustaining a series of governments in Saigon which have signally failed to reflect or advance Vietnamese nationalist aspirations. The United States, it must be remembered, did not create this situation but inherited it. In the case of the Philippines, by contrast, for which we had initial responsibility, the commitment to national independence was made even before the Second World War. Our difficulties in Vietnam are the direct result of the ambivalence in our policy in a situation not of our own making involving both communism and nationalism. The United States has opposed more nationalist movements than it should have, but this has happened not because of a conscious decision to support counterrevolutionary forces in the world, nor for lack of sympathy with the national aspirations of emerging peoples, but primarily because of errors in judgment in the face of genuine and apparent threats of expansion by Communist powers.

The fact that the United States did not cause or precipitate the Vietnamese tragedy does not make it less of a tragedy. However worthy the motives for our involvement, however contrary it is to our wishes—and our interests—we are committed once again to the support of an unstable and unrepresentative regime. One very striking indication of the weakness of that regime is the low morale of the South Vietnamese Army, from whose ranks no fewer than 96,000 soldiers are reported to have deserted in 1965.[6] The tragedy of Vietnam is summarized in one extraordinary sentence written from Saigon by James Reston on August 31, 1965: "Even Premier Ky," wrote Reston, "told this reporter today that the Communists were closer to the people's yearnings for social justice and an independent national life than his own government."[7]

So-called wars of national liberation are political wars, whose outcomes depend on a combination of political and military factors. The Communist guerrillas in Malaya could not have been beaten without hard fighting, but neither, in all probability, could they have been beaten if Malaya had not been given its independence. The Hukbalahaps were defeated in the Philippines primarily because of the political isolation imposed on them by the reforms of President Magsaysay. The major reason for the success of the Vietcong in South Vietnam has not been aid from the north but the absence of a cohesive alternative nationalist movement in the south. Both the success of the Communists in South Vietnam and their failure in India, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, and the Philippines strongly suggest that "wars of national liberation" depend for their success more on the weakness of the regime under attack than on the strength of support from outside.

Nationalism, rather than Western democracy or Soviet or Chinese communism, is the dominant force in southeast Asia, as it is in much of the rest of the world. Because of the heritage of colonialism, national self-assertion often and naturally takes the form of hostility to the West. It would seem to follow that friendship with the West will be possible for many colonial people only when the West no longer plays a dominant role in their national lives. It would also seem to follow that as long as American military forces are fighting Asians on the Asian mainland—regardless of their motives and purposes and regardless of the character of the enemy—Asian nationalism is likely to retain its anti-Western character and communism will continue to be able to offer itself as the true friend of national aspirations. The American military presence in southeast Asia thus has a kind of "counterdomino" effect, strengthening the very forces it is meant to contain.

---

[5] Albert Camus, "Second Letter," December 1943. "Resistance Rebellion and Death" (New York: Random House, Inc., 1960), p. 10.

[6] Neil Sheehan, "1965 Desertions Up In Saigon's Forces," New York Times, Feb. 24, 1966.

[7] "The Politics of Texas and Asia," New York Times, Sept. 1, 1965.

I have suggested a number of times what seems to me a promising approach toward peace in Vietnam and I will not elaborate again on these suggestions here. Very briefly, I believe that the United States should recognize the Vietcong as a belligerent with whom it is prepared to negotiate peace along with the Government of North Vietnam and that we should use our considerable influence to persuade the South Vietnamese Government to do the same. I have also recommended that we state forthrightly and explicitly in advance of negotiations, that we are prepared to conclude a peace agreement providing for an internationally supervised election to determine the future of South Vietnam and, further, that we are prepared to accept the outcome of such an election, whatever that outcome might be. Beyond that I have proposed that we use all available channels to persuade the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong that, whatever the future political complexion of Vietnam, Communist or non-Communist, united or divided, it can enjoy a secure and independent national existence and normal relations with the United States as long as it respects the independence of its neighbors and as long as it upholds its own independence of China.

It is contended that if the United States makes major concessions in Vietnam the credibility of our other guarantees and commitments will be undermined and countries which depend on American support, from Thailand to Germany, will lose faith in the United States. As H. L. Mencken once said, there is something in this but not much. In fact, many of America's allies are more inclined to worry about an undue American preoccupation with Vietnam than to fear the consequences of an American withdrawal, provided that withdrawal is orderly and based on a negotiated agreement. One hears German commentators, for example, expressing the fear that in its preoccupation with Asia the United States may be losing interest in Germany and Berlin. In his press conference of last February 21, General de Gaulle cited as one reason for his decision to withdraw French forces from NATO in 1969 the danger that the United States might drag its European partners into non-European wars. As to the small Asian nations bordering on Vietnam, it is possible that the violence and inconclusiveness of the war have raised doubts in their minds as to whether it is not more painful to be saved than to be abandoned by the United States.

Our major allies are not supporting us in Vietnam. There are three possible explanations for their refusal to participate in the war, each of which, if valid, suggests that there is something wrong with American policy: First, they may believe that it simply does not matter, from the viewpoint of their own security, who wins the Vietnamese war. Or, second, they may believe that their security is affected but there is no point in becoming involved because the United States, under what has been called the "Rusk doctrine," is unilaterally committed to resist any and all threats to the free world and will take all the risks and accept all the costs regardless of what anyone else does. And, finally, our allies may have judged that it is neither necessary nor possible to engage China successfully on the Asian mainland and that their security, and ours, can be defended from the islands and waters off the coast of Asia where our sea and air power are dominant.

If there is merit in any of these arguments, there is something wrong with American policy. My own view is that there is some truth in all of them but it is the last which suggests the basis of a constructive new policy in Asia. The issue on which everything else depends is the shaping of a new relationship between the United States and China in the rimlands of Asia.

History and logic and commonsense suggest that a viable settlement in Vietnam must be part of a general settlement in southeast Asia. The central issue is the contest between Chinese and American power and the prospect for a lasting peace depends far more upon the resolution of that issue than it does on the matter of who is to participate in a South Vietnamese government and by what means it shall be formed. If the issue between Chinese and American power in southeast Asia can be resolved, the future of Vietnam should not be too difficult to arrange; but if the issue of Chinese and American power is left unresolved; even a total victory in South Vietnam is unlikely to solve very much. As long as China and America are competitors for predominance in southeast Asia, there can be no lasting peace or stability in that part of the world.

It seems to me possible that the crisis in southeast Asia can be resolved on a lasting basis by the withdrawal of American military power to the islands and waters around the coast of Asia, coupled with a political arrangement for the neutralization of the small countries of the southeast Asian mainland, notably the Indochinese states, Thailand, Malaysia, and Burma. China is profoundly fearful of American bases on her periphery, as she demonstrated by intervening in the Korean war in 1950 only when American troops approached her Manchurian frontier. Fearful as she is of American military power in southeast Asia, China might well be willing to purchase its removal by a commitment on her own part to abstain from military intervention. It would seem to me highly advisable that, by one means or another, we indicate to the Chinese that we are prepared to remove American military power not only from Vietnam but from all of southeast Asia in return for a commitment on the part of China to abstain from military intervention and respect the political independence of the southeast Asian states. Such a neutralization agreement could and should be placed under the guarantee of the major powers with interests in southeast Asia, notably the United States, China, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, India, and Japan.

There is even some reason to believe—and I say this in full awareness that it contradicts the strongly held view of most Americans—that China may not wish to subject the small countries around her borders to her military and political domination. China undoubtedly wants friendly countries around her periphery in the same way that Russia insists on friendly governments in Eastern Europe and the United States wants friendly governments in Latin America. This requirement, which is characteristic of great powers, can be applied with varying degrees of stringency: It can mean total subordination as Stalin required of the Eastern European states; it can mean a high degree of domestic autonomy and a small degree of independence in foreign policy, such as the Eastern European countries have enjoyed under Khrushchev and Kosygin; or, as in the case of the United States and Latin America—except, of course, for Cuba—it can mean full independence as long as a country does not aline with the enemies of the United States or adopt a Communist government.

The ferocity of Peking's language has obscured the fact that in practice China has tolerated a high degree of independence on the part of her neighbors. Burma, for example, despite the fact that it is weak and nonalined, remains independent and, so far as one can tell, untroubled by her Chinese neighbor. North Vietnam, despite its dependency on China for economic and logistical support for the prosecution of the war, remains substantially in command of its own affairs; and it seems logical to suppose that if there were no war, if there were normal relations with the United States, North Vietnam would be even more independent of China. One does not know, of course, but the thought that the Chinese, despite their colorful language, may actually not wish to subjugate their neighbors is less "unthinkable" on examination than it might at first glance appear.

The most interesting example is North Korea. During and after the Korean war North Korea was occupied by hundreds of thousands of Chinese troops. Then in 1958, despite the fact that there was no outside pressure to compel them to do so, the Chinese withdrew from North Korea. In the wake of that withdrawal the North Koreans purged many pro-Chinese officials from their own government and acquired substantial freedom of action in their relations with both China and the Soviet Union.

A highly respected expert on Far Eastern affairs told me in a conversation some weeks ago that it is possible that the North Vietnamese, noting the North Korean experience and recalling their own dependence on China in the war against the French, may be less fearful of Chinese military intervention than is generally supposed by U.S. policymakers. This same expert suggested that the differences between the North Vietnamese and the Chinese regarding the war may be no deeper than, say, the squabbles between Generals Montgomery and Eisenhower during World War II and that the attitude of the North Vietnamese toward Chinese military intervention might even be comparable to the British attitude toward the American forces in England during the Second World War: they didn't much like having them there but neither were they afraid that the Americans would not go home when the war was over.

If this is the case, if, as the expert to whom I refer contends, it is superficial to stress too much the North Vietnamese fear of Chinese intervention, then our policymakers may be underestimating the danger of Chinese participation in the Vietnamese war. If, as seems possible, the North Vietnamese are not fearful of permanent Chinese domination, then it would be dangerous indeed for American policymakers to suppose that North Vietnam would sue for peace in the face of escalating force rather than call for Chinese assistance.

American policymakers seem convinced that China is determined to subjugate her neighbors, but they also contend that there is little likelihood of Chinese intervention in the Vietnamese war. I have already suggested some reasons for questioning China's aggressive intentions. I am at the same time less sanguine than some administration officials about Chinese abstention from the war.

The danger of war between the United States and China cannot be discounted, for one reason, because China is ruled by men who are intensely hostile to the United States, men whose long isolation and narrowly ideological outlook have left them dangerously ignorant of the outside world, particularly of the United States. The extent of their misinformation about America was apparent in an article published on March 3 in the Chinese Communist Party newspaper (Jenmin Jih Pao), which described both "hawks" and "doves" in the United States as a "bunch of fools" and asserted that "there is no fundamental difference of opinion between them with regard to aggression against Vietnam." (I can only say that this is interesting news to all us "hawks" and "doves"; maybe the "consensus" is more solid than we thought.)

We do well, in the face of such patently misinformed assertions on the part of the Chinese Communists, not to become angry and denounce them as hopeless fanatics but to remember the wise words of United Nations Secretary General U Thant, that in a "difficult stage of development" such as China is going through "countries will show certain emotions, certain strong reactions, certain rigidities, and even certain arrogance." "Countries, like individuals," said the Secretary General, "have nervous breakdowns," and it is the duty of the community to try to understand and find some solution.

Another reason why the danger of war between China and the United States cannot be discounted is the continuing danger of miscalculations on our part resulting from our own lack of knowledge of the mind and character of modern China. To most of us, China is a strange, distant, and dangerous nation, not a society of 700 million individual human beings but a menacing abstraction.

I believe that the most immediate need in our policy toward China—and possibly the only useful thing that can be accomplished for some time to come—is a concerted effort to dispel myths with realities, to get to know something about Chinese behavior and attitudes, about the Chinese past and its effects on the present, about why the Chinese are so hostile and inflexible and what if anything can be done about it. It was in the hope of helping to increase congressional and public knowledge of China that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations undertook the public hearings which are now in progress. I myself have found these hearings highly instructive and I hope that they are having some effect around the country—including the District of Columbia.

There are two ways of looking at China, one of which commends itself to the puritanical strand in the American character, the other of which commends itself to the pragmatic and humane strand in our national character. One can harbor a nightmare view of China as an insane and predatory creature, as the fulcrum of "Asian hordes" which at any time may spill over the world like lava from a volcano. Or, on the other hand, we can treat China according to the standard suggested by U Thant, which is to say, as a respected member of the world community now going through a period of dangerous chauvinism and warranting our best efforts to rehabilitate her to the world community.

At present our Government seems wedded to the nightmare view of China. On February 23, 1966, Secretary of Defense McNamara declared before a joint session of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations that "The long range objective of the Chinese Communists is to become dominant in the Asian, African, and Latin American countries, and to frustrate the process of peaceful development and free choice in the developing nations."

The basis currently cited in support of the nightmare view of China's intentions is the doctrine enunciated in September 1965 by the Chinese Minister of Defense, Lin Piao. The Lin Piao doctrine divides the world into two parts, the "cities," so-called, consisting of the United States, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union, and the "rural areas" of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which will gradually surround and conquer the cities in the same way that the Chinese Communists started from the countryside and gradually took over all of continental China.

All this, in Churchill's eloquent phrase, is "jaw jaw jaw." It is a terrifying doctrine no doubt, but it is only a doctrine not an existing fact. The Chinese have a ferocious vocabulary but surely some distinction must be made between what they say and what they do, and between what they might like to do and what they are able or likely to be able to do. As I have already pointed out, this is no clear evidence that China wishes to conquer and subjugate her neighbors. In Vietnam itself, one must remember, the United States has over 200,000 troops and the Chinese have only work teams supporting the North Vietnamese.

China's ability to implement the Lin Piao doctrine is even less clear than her desire to conquer southeast Asia. In fact, China is doing very badly in foreign policy: within the last 6 months, for example, Chinese influence has been destroyed in Indonesia, Ghana, and Cuba. As we look ahead, it is difficult indeed to see how a country still in an early stage of industrialization and burdened by the enormous task of feeding its population of 700 million is going to be able at any time in the foreseeable future to overturn the governments of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, much less those of Europe and America.

Chinese doctrine is bloodthirsty indeed, but Chinese policy is cautious and, at the moment, strikingly unsuccessful. The question for the United States is whether it is to base its policy on Chinese words or on Chinese deeds. It is a fateful choice, going to the very heart of the ambivalence of the two Americas.

If we are to base our policy on Lin Piao's doctrine rather than on what China is actually doing or able to do, then I suppose it would be logical for us to take the first good excuse that comes along to strike a devastating military blow against China while she is still relatively weak, especially against her incipient nuclear capacity. The trouble with this option is that it would disable China temporarily but not permanently while converting her present enmity into an enduring fury. It would also outrage the conscience of peoples all over the world, including, I would expect, the American people. Some might call such a course realism. I myself think that it is unrealistic, because one simply cannot engage in barbarous action without becoming a barbarian, because one cannot defend human values by calculated and unprovoked violence without doing mortal damage to the values one is trying to defend.

The other possibility in our relations with China is to continue doing what we must to contain her power while doing what we can to encourage more responsible Chinese behavior. The second option, in short, is to take a chance that China will change and that a new generation of leaders will not try to do what the aging men who now rule in Peking insist they will do, that is, engage in relentless conflict with the non-Communist nations until they have been destroyed. One hopes that the Chinese people, with their high civilization and great traditions, increasingly will bring a peaceful and constructive influence to bear on their rulers.

Do we dare take the second choice and gamble that China will change as Russia has changed, toward a better understanding of the world and more moderate policies? I think that we can and we must take that chance, first, because we cannot take the first option of preemptive war without destroying the democratic values we wish to preserve, and second, because it is completely reasonable to anticipate change in China—and in every other society for that matter—because change is the law of life, if indeed there is a law of life.

It is sometimes said that communism is unaltered and unalterable in its goals and strategy. The more I think about this hypothesis, the less I am able to accept it. Since communism as an ideology exists only in the minds of living Communists, and since Communists, however reluctant we may be to admit it, are human beings, contentions as to the unalterability of communism rest on the premise that a whole branch of humanity is immune from one of the basic facts of human nature, the fact of change and changeability.

Far from being unchangeable, communism has never ceased to change since the Bolsheviks seized power in Petrograd almost 50 years ago. The first generation of Soviet leaders has now mostly passed from the scene and been succeeded by more practical men whose actions seem to have much more to do with Soviet national interests than with ideological zealotry. It is not a certainty, to be sure, but there seems at least a reasonable possibility that when Mao Tse-tung and the first generation of Chinese Communist revolutionaries pass from the scene they will be succeeded, if not immediately then eventually, by less fanatical and more flexible men. China indeed has changed tremendously in the last 20 years and it seems reasonable to suppose that it will continue to change, hopefully in the direction of moderation already taken by the Russians.

It is, of course, a gamble to allow China to continue building its strength, including a nuclear arsenal, in the hope that by the time Chinese power is truly menacing it will be wielded by less dangerous men than those who now rule Peking. But when one considers that the alternative is a preemptive war—a war which would inflict temporary physical damage on China but irreparable moral damage on the aggressor—it seems clear that we have no real choice except to take a chance that China, like Russia, will evolve toward moderation.

Communist China, sooner or later, is likely to become a member of the United Nations. Some will regard this as a calamity; others will proclaim the dawn of a peaceful world community. I do not think Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations will mean either of these things. It seems more probable that it will have little if any immediate effect on Chinese foreign policy or on China's relations with the West. It may, however, help to draw China out of her political and ideological parochialism and start her down the long road toward a realistic assessment of the world and of her own role in world affairs. The journey is likely to be slow and arduous but it represents the only real hope for drawing China into a peaceful community of nations.

There is not a great deal Western nations can do to hasten China's evolution. France is engaged in a long term, and I think constructive, effort to open lines of communication with Peking, albeit at the cost of what seems at times unnecessary rudeness to the United States. About all that we can do for the time being is to learn what we can about China and try to understand her behavior, avoid recrimination and invective—even in the face of high verbal provocation—and continue in a quiet and patient manner to express sympathy for the Chinese people and our desire for friendly relations.

I hope that the generous and humane side of the American character will govern our relations with China in the years ahead. I hope that in its attitude toward China America will act with the magnanimity that befits a great nation by following the advice of Pope Paul, who said in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly: "Your vocation is to make brothers not only of some, but of all peoples, a difficult undertaking indeed; but this it is, your most noble undertaking. * * * We will go further and say: strive to bring back among you any who have separated themselves, and study the right method of uniting to your pact of brotherhood, in honor and loyalty, those who do not yet share in it."[8]

---

[8] Address to the United Nations, Oct. 4, 1965.

Nowhere has the ambivalence of the two Americas been more apparent and more troublesome than in the relations of the United States with Latin America. In Latin America as in Asia, the United States, a profoundly unrevolutionary nation, is required to make choices between accepting revolution and trying to suppress it.

Thus far we have been unwilling, or unable, to choose. On the one hand, we have made ourselves the friend of certain progressive democratic governments and have joined with Latin America in the Alliance for Progress, the purpose of which is social revolution by peaceful means. On the other hand, we have allowed our fear of communism to drive us into supporting a number of governments whose policies are incompatible with the aims of the Alliance, and on three occasions—Guatemala in 1954, Cuba in 1961 and the Dominican Republic in 1965—we resorted to force, illegally, unwisely, and—inasmuch as each of these interventions almost certainly strengthened the appeal of communism in Latin America—unsuccessfully as well.

The United States thus pursues two largely incompatible policies in Latin America—discriminating support for social reform and an undiscriminating anticommunism that often makes us the friend of corrupt and reactionary oligarchies. These incompatible policies are an expression of the two Americas—the one humane and tolerant, the other strident and puritanical, the one disposed to help its neighbors to be happy, the other disposed to force them to be virtuous.

Over the years since President Monroe proclaimed his doctrine, Latin Americans have had their fill of the second disposition in the North American character. They have had the advantages of U.S. tutelage in fiscal responsibility, in collective security, and in the techniques of democracy. If they have fallen short in any of these fields, the thought presents itself that the fault may lie with the teacher as well as with the pupils.

When President Theodore Roosevelt announced his corollary to the Monroe Doctrine in 1905, he solemnly declared that he regarded the future interventions thus sanctified as a burden and a responsibility and an obligation to international equity. Not once, so far as I know, has the United States regarded itself as intervening in a Latin American country for selfish or unworthy motives. Whatever reassurance the purity of our motives may give must be shaken a little by the thought that probably no country in all human history has ever intervened in another except for what it regarded as excellent motives. "The wicked are wicked, no doubt" wrote Thackeray, "and they go astray and they fall, and they come to their deserts; but who can tell the mischief which the very virtuous do?"[9]

For all our noble intentions, the countries which have had most of the tutelage in democracy by U.S. marines are not particularly democratic. These include Haiti, which is under a brutal and superstitious dictatorship, the Dominican Republic, which is in turmoil, and Cuba, which, as no one needs to be reminded, has replaced its traditional rightwing dictatorships with a Communist dictatorship.

Maybe, in the light of this extraordinary record of accomplishment, it is time for us to reconsider our teaching methods. Maybe we are not really cut out for the job of spreading the gospel of democracy. Maybe it would profit us to concentrate on our own democracy instead of trying to inflict our particular version of it on all those ungrateful Latin Americans who stubbornly oppose their North American benefactors instead of the "real" enemies whom we have so graciously chosen for them. And maybe—just maybe—if we left our neighbors to make their own judgments and their own mistakes and confined our assistance to matters of economics and technology instead of philosophy, maybe then they would begin to find the democracy and the dignity that have largely eluded them and we in turn might begin to find the love and gratitude that we seem to crave.

The Latin American policies of the United States have been distorted by a tendency to identify reform with revolution and revolution with communism. It is assumed, because they have something to do with each other, as indeed they do, that they are one and the same thing, which indeed they are not. The pervading suspicion of social revolutionary movements on the part of U.S. policymakers is most unfortunate because there is the strong possibility of more explosions in Latin America and, insofar as the United States makes itself the enemy of revolutionary movements, communism is enabled to make itself their friend. The antirevolutionary bias in U.S. policy, which is rooted in the fear of communism, can only have the effect of strengthening communism.

The Alliance for Progress encouraged the hope in Latin America that the United States would not only tolerate but actively support domestic social revolution. The Dominican intervention has at least temporarily destroyed that hope and it is reported by some observers that for the first time progressive Catholic leaders in Latin America are talking seriously about joining forces with the Communists as the only feasible way of bringing about social revolution and, indeed, as the only possible way of keeping the Communists from dominating social revolutions.

It is not too late for the United States to play an important and effective role in helping Latin Americans to achieve their aspirations to democracy and social justice. These aims after all are the same as those which we seek for ourselves in our own society. Although we are an unrevolutionary society, we have traditionally been sympathetic to the aspirations of people all over the world to democracy and social justice. Despite the strand of harsh puritanism in our national character, I continue to believe that there is a stronger strand of democratic humanism, an elemental decency which has motivated us, despite grievous lapses, to seek social justice in our own society and to encourage it in others, not only because this was the prudent and politic thing to do but also, and perhaps primarily, because it was the decent thing to do.

It is thus in keeping with that which is best in our own character, and it is unquestionably in our interests, that we make ourselves the friend of social revolution in Latin America. It will require a renewed commitment and increased contributions to the Alliance for Progress—contributions which I regret to say do not seem likely to be forthcoming from the Congress in the immediate future. It will also require a drawing away from military and economic oligarchies, whatever the short-term advantages of supporting them. It may require the acceptance of gradual expropriation of U.S.-owned enterprises. It will certainly require the acceptance of great and rapid change, not all of it necessarily by peaceful means.

It will also require acceptance of the fact that Latin America is coming into its own in the world and can no longer be regarded as the special ward of the United States. We must be prepared to see the Latin American countries, whose channels to the outside world have traditionally run through Washington, enter into new relationships with Europe and with Asia and Africa, some of which may not be much to our liking. We must recognize that paternalism is no longer a workable basis for our relations with Latin America, that, as President Frei of Chile said in France last summer, the people of Latin America "desire true political and economic independence; they want a system without hegemony."

This review of our country's involvements in Asia and Latin America suggests that our people and our policy are troubled by three major questions: First, are we to be the friend or the enemy of the social revolutions of Asia and Latin America? Second, are we to regard the Communist countries as more or less normal states with whom we can have more or less normal relations, or are we to regard them indiscriminately as purveyors of an evil ideology with whom we can never reconcile? Finally, are we to regard ourselves as a friend and counselor and possibly as an example for those around the world who seek freedom and who also want our help, or are we to play the role of God's avenging angel, the appointed missionary of freedom in a wicked and benighted world?

The answer to each of these three questions depends on which of the two Americas is speaking. There is no inevitable or predetermined answer because our past has prepared us to be either tolerant or puritanical, generous or selfish, sensible or romantic, humanly concerned or morally obsessed, in our relations with the outside world.

For my own part, I prefer the America of Lincoln and Adlai Stevenson. I prefer to have my country the friend rather than the enemy of demands for social justice; I prefer to have the Communists treated as human beings, with all the human capacity for good and bad, for wisdom and folly, rather than as embodiments of an evil abstraction; and I prefer to see my country in the role of sympathetic friend to humanity rather than its stern and prideful schoolmaster.

The "blessings-of-civilization trust," as Mark Twain called it, may have been a "daisy" in its day, uplifting for the soul and good for business besides, but its day is past. It is past because the great majority of the human race are demanding dignity and independence not the honor of a supine role in an American empire. It is past because whatever claim America may make for the universal domain of its ideas and values is countered by the Communist counterclaim, armed like our own with nuclear weapons. And, most of all, it is past because it never should have begun, because we are not in the phrase attributed to McGeorge Bundy, the "engine of mankind"[10] but only one of its more successful and fortunate branches, endowed by our Creator with about the same capacity for good and evil, no more or less, than the rest of humanity.

We must choose between the two Americas—the one imperious in its wealth and power, the other a civilized example for the world. We would do well in making our choice to consider the words of Pope Paul before the United Nations General Assembly. "It is pride," he said, "no matter how legitimate it may seem to be, which provokes tension and struggles for prestige, for predominance, colonialism, egoism." America and all nations would do well to ponder Pope Paul's message, that "pride disrupts brotherhood."[11]

---

[9] William Makepeace Thackeray, "The Newcomes," ch. 20.

[10] McGeorge Bundy is reported to have described the United States as the "engine of mankind" and the rest of the world as its "train" in an interview with Henry F. Graff, professor of history at Columbia University, who reported it in "How Johnson Makes Foreign Policy," New York Times magazine, July 4, 1965, p. 17.

[11] Address to the United Nations General Assembly, Oct. 4, 1965.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, turning to another matter, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not more than 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEGREE OF COMMUNIST INVOLVEMENT IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of March 24, William S. White devotes his column to an article on the Dominican Republic in the December 1965 issue of the World Marxist Review. The article, by two Dominican Communists named J. I. Quello and N. Isa Conde, is entitled "Revolutionary Struggle in the Dominican Republic and Its Lessons."

Mr. White chortles that in the article the Communists not only acknowledge but boast of their "deep and armed complicity" in the Dominican revolt of April 1965. Thereby, says Mr. White, the Communists themselves have destroyed the case of the critics of the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. President, no critic of the administration ever argued that Communists were not involved at all in the Dominican revolution of last April. The whole point of the argument was the degree of Communist involvement. And on this point, the article in the World Marxist Review says more to support the critics than it does to support Mr. White's administration.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the full text of Mr. White's column and of the Marxist Review article, so that readers of the RECORD may draw their own conclusions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at this point, I would only call attention to a few passages. In the first place, the article makes it clear that the Dominican Communists had nothing to do with organizing or inspiring the April revolution. Indeed, the authors of the article indulge in rather severe self-criticism for having been caught napping.

> We failed to see—

They write—

> that an armed uprising was inevitable. Consequently, our party found itself unprepared for the uprising and was unable to head it, although as far as possible it took a firm and resolute part in it.
>
> Besides, our party adopted a sectarian attitude to the armed forces, lumping them all together as a group of "guerrillas" in the service of reaction. We did not take into account the class composition of the army, whose ranks reflect the contradictions and struggles taking place in society, although as a whole it defends the interests of the reactionary state * * *. Our sectarian attitude to the army * * * prevented us from correctly assessing the changes taking place in it and isolated us from the entire process of preparation of the coup in the barracks. As a result constitutionalist officers and soldiers established contact primarily with the vacillating and moderate circles of the democratic movement, which were planning armed action merely as a countercoup.

The article does confirm—as no one has disputed—that the Communists immediately supported the revolution. Significantly, however, the article also confirms—as critics of the administration have maintained—that the Communists at no point controlled the revolution. It even criticizes leadership of the revolution as being "rightist."

For example, it reports that the rebels were initially confused as to the object of the U.S. intervention:

> Many actually believed—

The article says—

> that the Americans had landed for the purpose of protecting the people from Wessin's air attacks, or to insure the return of Bosch * * *.
>
> Only the more politically advanced among the participants in the struggle saw at once the real object of the U.S. intervention. The Communist Party explained the situation to the masses.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, one may note here the great depth of good will toward the United States in the Dominican Republic and the propaganda weapon which the intervention handed to the Communists.

The authors of the Marxist Review article also complain about rebel acceptance of the cease-fire. They put this down to a "lack of anti-imperialist consciousness" which "was to a great extent reflected in the position of the military-political leadership."

Finally, they complain that the rebel negotiators were too soft in the talks leading to the establishment of the provisional government of President Garcia Godoy:

> The composition of the negotiators—

They write—

> did not adequately reflect the real sentiment of the armed masses (spokesmen of the right occupied a disproportionately big place among them) * * * In the end the more conservative and conciliatory group got the upper hand.

None of this, Mr. President, sounds very much as though the Communists were in control of the rebel movement. Of course, they aided it. Of course, they tried to control it. They will do this with respect to any movement of the discontented and dissatisfied. And we will only make things easier for them if we use force to suppress such movements.

I suggest that Mr. White has been caught off base, and not for the first time.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 24, 1966]

REDS ADMIT ROLE—AIDED DOMINICAN REVOLT

(By William S. White)

International communism has now not merely acknowledged but roundly boasted of its deep and armed complicity in the Dominican Republic revolt of last April which was nipped by U.S. military intervention.

The Communists have themselves thus destroyed the case of those American critics of the American action who so long have argued that what was afoot down there was only a good "democratic revolution" not too dissimilar, say, from George Washington's rebellion against King George III.

An article in one of the most authoritative of all the world-wide publications of Moscow-directed communism, the magazine World Marxist Review, has let this already ill-concealed cat well and truly out of the bag.

Its authors are self-identified members of the executive committee of the Communist Party in the Dominican Republic, J. I. Quello and N. I. Conde. They say, in so many words, that the attempted putsch would have succeeded but for "the direct armed intervention of U.S. imperialism." They say, moreover, that what was planned by the Communists for the Dominican Republic differed only superficially from the earlier revolution in Cuba that put Fidel Castro in power. The two, they add, were "in spirit, meaning and lessons" two parts of one whole.

They ought to know. For at least one of them, Conde, is an old hand in Cuba. And Quello was clandestinely landed in the Dominican Republic from Moscow shortly before the uprising.

Quello and Conde describe the Dominican affair as "another contribution to the arsenal of revolutionary experience on the (American) continent." Though the Communists were not able at its start fully to control the uprising they shortly were "allocating armed Communists" to revolutionary commands organized block by block in Santo Domingo. The piece repeatedly discloses the close relationship of this assault upon the Dominican Republic, not only to what had happened earlier in Cuba, but also to the general tactics for Communist subversion in Latin America long since prepared in Castro Cuba.

Something else is also disclosed—an outline of what the Communists learned in the Dominican Republic for future use. "Our experience showed," Quello and Conde write, "that the task of (Communist) revolutionaries during an armed insurrection is to influence it and guide it militarily and politically, to organize the struggle in accordance with the processes underway at the time.

"At first we combined all our forces in a single command. The fallacy of this decision soon made itself felt. It restricted, on the one hand, our propaganda (which was conducted chiefly among our own members). On the other hand, this command became the target for attacks on the movement by the imperialists. Having realized our mistake, we thereupon allocated armed Communists to a number of commands."

So much, then, out of the mouths of the Communists themselves, for the persistent attempt in some quarters here to depict the United States' tough response to this peril as only another instance of "redbaiting," of looking for Communists under every bed, and so on.

The same people who have attacked the American intervention in these terms also had long pooh-poohed the existence of such a danger in Cuba, too. Their judgment—not their motives—really would seem to have been proved twice catastrophically wrong.

For just as Fidel Castro himself at length proclaimed, in several thousand words broadcast from Havana radio, admitting both his Communist membership and his Communist purposes in this hemisphere, Conde and Quello have now unmistakably and openly identified the Communist Party as the ultimately moving force in the Dominican upheaval.

Moreover, the complaints of critics of the American intervention that anyhow there really weren't very many Communists visible in Santo Domingo are now shown to be the quibbles they always were. They weren't too visible at any one point in Santo Domingo simply because the Communist leaders quickly dispersed them—armed—among the various commands.

[From the World Marxist Review]

NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT TODAY: REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND ITS LESSONS

(By J. I. Quello and N. Isa Conde)

On April 24, 1965, the people of the Dominican Republic rose against the dictatorship installed by the coup of September 1963. The rebels demanded the return to power of a government headed by President Juan Bosch, who had been duly elected in December 1963, and the restoration of the Constitution adopted during his administration. The democratic constitutionalist movement, in which the armed masses took part, grew by leaps and bounds. Within 3 days the old tyrannical structure had been toppled and the army, which had been built up and controlled by the United States, defeated. Another facet was added to the new situation in the Latin American liberation movement marked by an upsurge in the struggle for national liberation and socialism with revolutionary Cuba setting the example for the peoples of the Americas. Only by direct armed intervention was U.S. imperialism able to prevent the Dominican democrats and constitutionalists from achieving their immediate aims, to retain its grip on the Republic and temporarily to check the development of the revolution. The fact that imperialism had to take this action is, however, a sign of its weakness, of its inability to preserve its spheres of influence and to prevent popular uprisings.

These events made our country and its capital, Santo Domingo, one of the key sectors of the international struggle. The Dominican uprising is new proof that October 1917 ushered in an epoch of worldwide revolutionary reconstruction and that nothing can prevent the final victory of the peoples.

1. U.S. IMPERIALISM—ALWAYS AN AGGRESSOR

U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic was by no means unprecedented. The first landing of U.S. troops on Dominican territory took place as far back as 1898. In 1903 and 1904 gunboats were used to protect the investments of the American capitalists and the local rulers subservient to them. In 1905 Washington used the threat of a new intervention to impose on the Dominican Republic a treaty which placed its customs in the hands of U.S. officials. Little by little the U.S. monopolies, ousting the Belgian, British, Dutch, and French monopolies, established their undivided domination over the Republic.

In 1915 the United States insisted on the Dominican Republic accepting a U.S. financial adviser and a comptroller of the armed forces. In 1916 troops were again landed, and this time they remained until 1924. U.S. military government was established. It "relinquished" the reins of power on the following conditions:

1. That Customs control and supervision over finances, including payments on the foreign debt, remain in U.S. hands;
2. That an electoral law approved by the United States be enforced;
3. That a new "national guard" trained by U.S. officers take the place of the old national army.

By 1924 the United States had established complete economic control. It could now withdraw its troops, since the imperialists could count on the new national guard fully protecting their interests. The national guard was placed under the command of a reliable officer who had distinguished himself by persecuting patriots and suppressing struggles waged by the sugar refinery workers—Rafael Leonidas Trujillo.

In 1930 a coup took place which put Trujillo in power.

The Trujillo regime was a military tyranny of the classical type, subservient to the oligarchy (the semi-feudal latifundists and the big bourgeoisie who had betrayed the nation) and U.S. imperialism. Its distinguishing feature was that Trujillo used his political power to enrich (through state monopolies) his own economic group while coming into conflict with equally reactionary groups of the traditionally oligarchy. The national economy largely fell under the absolute control of the Trujillo group which retained close ties with its sponsors, the U.S. monopolies.

This group basically set out not to promote capitalist development as such or to head the so-called national bourgeoisie, as some people hold, but to prevent the free, independent growth of national capitalism in order to build up a single giant monopoly closely linked with imperialism. This monopoly owned all the big industrial enterprises and the best land, which it seized by force of arms. Consequently, during the military occupation and the Trujillo regime a peculiar type of capitalism developed in both industry and agriculture, under which the natural trends of growth and expansion were distorted by the monopoly on which it rested. This deformed capitalist structure experienced its own specific types of crises and periods of recession and recovery.

2. THIRTY-ONE YEARS OF PROIMPERIALIST DICTATORSHIP

Throughout the 31 years of the Trujillo era the Dominican people carried on an unflagging clandestine struggle against the most ruthless dictatorship in Latin America. Thousands of Dominicans were arrested, tortured or killed.

Only during a very brief period was it possible to wage an open struggle against the regime. In 1945 a movement for higher wages and better living conditions spread through the U.S. monopoly-owned sugar refineries. This movement, and also the atmosphere of antifascist unity during the Second World War, enabled the Communist Party, founded secretly in 1942 and originally called the Popular Socialist Party, to function legally in 1946–48. But with the beginning of the cold war these legal possibilities were reduced to nil. Many members of our party were thrown in prison, and many others fell in the struggle or were forced to emigrate. The only organized political opposition in the country was suppressed.

The years of economic upswing from 1950 to 1956 were the most stable period for the Trujillo regime. But during this period too the completely unorganized Dominican democrats who came out against the regime were viciously persecuted.

The specific features of the economic base of the regime, its policy aimed at retarding the march of history, and its naked despotism led, however, to growing conflicts between the ruling camarilla and all other classes, strata, and groups of Dominican society.

The 25th anniversary of Trujillo's advent to power, into the celebration of which millions of dollars were poured, was followed by a crisis that deprived the regime of its principal domestic bulwark, the support of the proimperialist bourgeoisie and prompted new influential groups to join the fight against the dictatorship. At the same time a broad democratic movement was sweeping the entire Caribbean area. This movement overthrew the regimes of Magloire in Haiti, Rojas Pinilla in Colombia, Perez Jimenez in Venezuela and Batista in Cuba, and enabled the Dominicans in exile to intensify their activities and to cement their unity. Cuba set our people an example of how to fight dictators. A large number of Dominican exiles fitted out an armed expedition which landed in the Republic on June 14, 1959. Its heroism notwithstanding, the force was destroyed, but the blood shed was not in vain. The revolutionary June 14 movement was organized in secret. Resistance to the regime grew in all parts of the country, finding legal expression in the Dominican Popular Movement led by a group of revolutionaries who returned in 1960.

In the meantime the Cuban revolution, rapidly passing through its national-liberation stage, entered the phase of socialist reconstruction. The dawn of socialism in Latin America gave a new powerful impulse and set the example to all peoples oppressed by imperialism, our people included.

Imperialism was now compelled to maneuver in the Dominican Republic in order to check the maturing of a second revolution in the Antilles. It was precisely this that was the object of the conspiracy engineered by the U.S. Embassy which led to Trujillo's downfall. The dictator was assassinated by a group of his close associates on May 30, 1961. At this period U.S. imperialism was engaged in working out forms of domination better suited to meet the requirements of the epoch of rapid growth of the national-liberation movement and to counteract the example Cuba had set for all the oppressed peoples of the Western Hemisphere. The methods used then were those devised by Kennedy and his entourage and abandoned after his assassination. (Today too these methods are taken out of the mothballs from time to time and used in combination with Johnson's hard-riding Texan methods.)

However, the assassination of Trujillo, far from stopping the maturing of the crisis, accelerated developments. All sections of the population, all classes whose interests prompted them to resist Trujillo, now openly carried on the fight. New conflicts took place and new crises developed in the overall context of the deep-going general structural crisis from which the Dominican Republic cannot extricate itself so long as it remains in the capitalist orbit.

3. ASSASSINATION OF TRUJILLO—CATALYST OF NATIONAL CRISIS

After Trujillo's death leadership of the national-democratic movement was temporarily taken over by the National Civic Union (NCU). Ostensibly pursuing patriotic objectives, this organization was controlled by bourgeois elements with close links with the U.S. Embassy. At the same time a number of prominent leaders of Juan Bosch's Dominican Revolutionary Party (DRP) returned from exile. The revolutionary June 14 movement (then known as the June 14 political group) emerged from illegality. These organizations were the main political forces in the country at the time. The Popular Socialist Party (now the Communist Party) began reorganizing itself after the secret return from exile of some of its leaders. The Dominican Popular Movement (DPM), which at first functioned legally, was soon outlawed.

The mass struggles of August–November 1961 forced the remaining members of the Trujillo family to leave the country, and the 11-day general strike of November–December 1961 shook the rule of Joaquin Balaguer, Trujillo's principal puppet during the last years of his regime. Early in 1962 U.S. imperialism, operating through the NCU, and with State Department officials openly taking a hand in the matter, installed in power the so-called State Council consisting of spokesmen of the traditional oligarchy.

During his brief administration Balaguer was compelled to confiscate the property of Trujillo's family and his accomplices who controlled 60 percent of all investments in trade and industry. The oligarchy did not venture to lay hands on this property, though it launched a campaign against "unprofitable state companies" and to boost the virtues of private property.

Imperialism, whose policy was then shaped by the proponents of the view that the Dominican Republic should be made a "show window" of the Alliance for Progress, wanted early elections, counting on a NCU victory. Bosch's party, believing that the oligarchy could be voted out of the saddle, likewise supported the idea.

The left forces, headed by the revolutionary June 14 movement which enjoyed wide popular support and adhered to clear-cut patriotic and democratic positions, refused to recognize the State Council as the legitimate government and called for its overthrow and the establishment of a national unity government based on the program advanced by the participants in the heroic 1959 expedition. All classes, economic groups and the country's three main political forces (DRP, NCU, and the revolutionary June 14 movement) were to be represented in this government. The left forces called for a boycott of the elections. Our party, which in June 1962 hesitantly urged the convocation of a democratic constituent assembly, later consistently supported the stand of the other left groups.

The elections were held on December 20, 1962, with a great popular turnout at the polls. Although the people generally did not support the left boycott of the elections, they voiced their democratic aspirations by voting for Juan Bosch, the most progressive candidate standing for election. Bosch put forward a program condemning latifundism and calling for the preservation and promotion of the state sector (though without further nationalization), as well as a return to secular education. The underlying idea of his campaign was the struggle of the poor against the rich.

Bosch polled 400,000 votes more than his chief opponent (out of a total electorate of 1 million).

The outcome of the elections made it impossible for imperialism and the oligarchy to lay their hands by legal means on the property left by the Trujillo family.

4. PROGRESSIVE BOURGEOISIE-DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT IN OFFICE

In April 1963, during the Bosch administration, a democratic constitution was adopted. It set forth the following basic principles:

Labor is the foundation of national wealth.

The latifundia, being unprofitable enterprises, are undesirable.

Dominican land is to be sold only to Dominicans.

Private ownership is the basis of economic development.

It is the duty of the state to protect national wealth and not sell it to private individuals.

The state should guarantee education on a scientific footing for all and exercise control over education.

The workers must be guaranteed a share in the profits of enterprises.

Private industrial and trade monopolies are prohibited.

Democratic freedoms must be fully observed.

The people are the basis of national sovereignty. Those who would turn national sovereignty into an object of barter with foreigners should be severely condemned.

President Bosch annulled the agreement signed by Balaguer with Esso Standard Oil on the construction of an oil refinery. His government pursued an independent foreign policy founded on respect for the right of nations to self-determination. It gradually moved toward the Mexican position and away from that of the proimperialist reformist government of Venezuela. A few days before the coup d'état, following a meeting between Bosch and Lopez Mateos, a statement was published defending the right of the peoples to choose their own governments without foreign interference.

The law fixing the maximum price of sugar brought Bosch into sharp conflict with the South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., a U.S. monopoly.

All this explains why the oligarchy and the reactionary military closely linked with the Pentagon began feverish preparations for the overthrow of the Bosch administration.

At that time two trends became apparent in the policy of the U.S. rulers. Ambassador John Martin, appointed by Kennedy, actively supported the Bosch government and advocated extending long-term loans and economic aid to it. On the other hand, General O'Meara, commander of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Caribbean, representing the Pentagon, openly engaged in conspiratorial activity against the constitutional regime (without official invitation he made several visits to the air force base in San Isidro—the stronghold of the conspirators).

Our party was the first to expose the preparations for the coup several weeks before it took place, and called upon the people to take a united stand against the putschists. The other left forces (the revolutionary June 14 movement and the DPM) also called for action against the coup, although some people in these organizations believed that the coup should be allowed to take place since this would make it easier to start guerrilla actions. Many people who failed to understand that popular unity against the putschists would in any event help to unite the people against the dictatorship which a successful coup might install, accused our party of "Boschism."

In an address to the Dominican youth, Bosch also exposed the preparation of a coup and laid the blame for it on the military, the Catholic hierarchy, and the U.S. sugar monopoly. He called for action to safeguard state property, against the sale of Dominican land to foreigners and against shameful concessions to foreign oil monopolies (as in the case of building the oil refinery). However, apart from this impassioned appeal, Bosch did nothing to prevent the coup in the 3 months during which it was obviously maturing. His party—DRP—did not urge the masses to bar the way to the coup, hoping to prevent it through negotiations with the U.S. Embassy and the top military rather than through actions of the masses whose support it enjoyed.

5. STRUGGLE AGAINST THE COUP

On September 25, 1963, the reactionary military, expressing the interests of the oligarchy and the U.S. investor-monopolies, seized power with the support of the Pentagon and the CIA.[1] Bosch was banished, Parliament dissolved, and the 1963 Constitution abolished.

After the coup even the democrats had different, often conflicting, views concerning the methods of struggle against the putschist government—the so-called triumvirate.

The most influential group among the left—the revolutionary June 14 movement—advocated guerrilla war at all costs. In so doing, they ignored the concrete conditions necessary for its development and victory at the given moment. In practice this slogan led to weakening the struggle of the masses. This was connected, in particular, with the problem of the so-called countercoup. It was feared that a military countercoup which would reinstall Bosch in office would abolish the conditions created as a result of the reactionary putsch conditions which some left leaders believed to be conducive to guerrilla struggle. For some time the leaders of the revolutionary June 14 movement directed all their efforts toward preparing military actions and did nothing to draw the masses into the democratic struggle.

This erroneous trend manifested itself even more among the leaders and rank and file of the Dominican people's movement, who maintained that any mobilization of the masses and any political strike could be used for a countercoup. Even before the uprising which was being prepared by the June 14 movement, they tried to form their own guerrilla unit. But these guerrillas were soon taken prisoner in the Cevicos Mountains.

Activity of this kind tended to isolate these parties from the masses, although many admired their heroism.

Early in November an attempt to organize a general strike ended in failure because it was not supported strongly enough by all the forces opposed to the triumvirate. At the end of November the June 14 movement formed five guerrilla units in the mountains, but hardly a month had passed before they were defeated. Many fighters fell in the battles fought by the last guerrilla detachment, among them Manuel A. Tavarez Justo, leader of the revolutionary June 14 movement and a popular national figure. For a time, though not for long, the struggle slackened. Our party, which stood for the all-round development of the mass struggle, published a critical appraisal of these events. At the same time the party did all it could to support the revolutionaries who risked and sacrificed their lives in the heroic struggle.

As regards the Bosch party (DRP), it was under the influence of various tactical concepts of struggle against the coup. The most conservative of its leaders, for instance, cherished illusions with regard to the course of action the U.S. Embassy and State Department would take.

Their tactical differences notwithstanding, all these forces, including the Christian Socialists (who at first were extremely passive and hesitant in their opposition to the coup), became more united in the struggle for the reinstatement of the constitutional regime. A broad front for the restoration of democratic institutions gradually came into being, although still without a common tactical line and a clear-cut organizational structure.

The changes in the policies of the different parties were due to the changes in the political attitude of the classes and social groups of Dominican society. In its early days the coup was actively resisted only by the students and also the national bourgeoise which had previously opposed Bosch's program in the elections but later, during his presidency, came to realize that he was defending its interests against both the parasitic oligarchy and the U.S. monopoly investors, as well as against the working class. But the support extended by the national bourgeoise to Bosch diminished as the aims of the struggle, under the impact of developments, went beyond the range of its interests.

The most important changes took place in the political struggle of the working class. It should be noted that throughout the 30 years of the Trujillo dictatorship the Dominican proletariat was unorganized (except in 1955–47). And the labor movement had barely been organized, when, in 1961–63, it split into three main trade union centers. This was due not only to the pressure brought to bear by the U.S. Embassy and the activity of the agents of the clergy; it was above all the result of the general low level of class consciousness of the proletariat. The working class thus began the struggle against the dictatorship with its trade unions and parties divided, and lacking a party effectively representing its class interests. (That the working class did not fully support Bosch at the critical moment was also due to the temporary increase in unemployment caused by some of the economic measures of his government and to repressions against the strike movement.) But as this struggle mounted, the militancy and consciousness of the working class grew.

---

[1] In respect to the coup, the difference between the two tactics of U.S. imperialism in Latin America was revealed again. Kennedy and his group, who wanted to turn the Dominican Republic into a "show-window" of the Alliance for Progress, sharply denounced it (the U.S.A. recognized the new regime only after the assassination of Kennedy on November 22). On the other hand, the Pentagon, Thomas Mann and the U.S. military attachés actively supported the dictatorial regime.

On May 2, 1964, a strike of public transport workers in the capital, supported by the dockers union, rapidly acquired features of an armed uprising. Barricades were erected in the working class neighborhoods and the police proved powerless against the people. Only after 4 days of heroic resistance was the strike crushed by the joint actions of the army and the police.

In the course of the struggle against the coup changes took place in the leadership of the movement, with the working class coming to the fore, especially after the uprising of May 2. The strike movement gained scope, drawing in all the active opposition forces. On the other hand, the national bourgeoise, fearing the growing mass movement, increasingly adapted its positions to those of the oligarchy and imperialism, and, in particular, supported the attempts of the oligarchy to find a way out of the crisis through elections.

It should be admitted that for some time our party, too, was under the influence of these views. By advancing, during the rule of the triumvirate, an erroneous thesis calling for an "impartial and serious government which would hold elections," our party departed from the Marxist concept of the state and supported an idea which did not have the backing of the masses. This was a grave tactical mistake.

6. EVE OF THE EXPLOSION

A stubborn internal struggle in our party led to the defeat of the right opportunist concept and to repudiation of the impartial and serious government thesis.

On March 16, 1965, the central committee of our party published a manifesto rejecting the "way out of the crisis through election" and calling for the "return of Juan Bosch and the restoration of the 1963 constitution on the basis of mass actions." The manifesto helped provide a revolutionary orientation to the mass movement, which subsequently developed into an armed uprising.

"Bosch should be returned to power through popular action," stressed the manifesto, and not through compromise with the enemies of the people. The return of Bosch on the basis of mass actions signifies not only the restoration of the national dignity and sovereignty of the people. It will signify above all an extremely important step toward uniting the forces which will lead the Dominican people to complete liberation.

"At present the struggle for the fulfillment of this task must be headed by the Dominican working class—the only class capable of leading the people as a whole and heading the struggle for their supreme objectives.

"Therefore the Popular Socialist Party calls on the working class and the people as a whole to launch a struggle for the return of President Bosch to the post of head of the legitimate government of the republic on the basis of the democratic gains recorded in the 1963 constitution.

"Fight in the streets, squares, factories, and in the countryside for the return of President Bosch as head of the constitutional government," concluded the manifesto.

This document had the widest circulation of any ever put out by our party. The entire party understood the significance of the slogan proclaimed in the manifesto, supported it and acted in accordance with it before and during the uprising. The Dominican people's movement and the revolutionary June 14 movement came out against our position, maintaining that our slogan imparted a personal character to the struggle of the people, allowing the personality of Bosch to overshadow, as it were, the entire democratic movement. However, a little more than a month later the living dialectics of history demonstrated the rallying and mobilizing force of this popular slogan. In the first days of the armed uprising the demand for the return of Bosch symbolized all the aspirations of the people. Subsequently, the masses extended their support to Caamano, insofar as he showed himself to be an ardent champion of the general democratic aims of the people. Moreover, the entire struggle acquired an anti-interventionist (essentially anti-imperialist) character in the course of the resistance to the U.S. troops.

The period of the despotic rule of the triumvirate saw events more inexorably toward an armed uprising of the people. At the end of April 1965, a revolutionary situation developed in the country. The masses no longer wanted to live in the old way, while the rulers had exhausted all possibilities of maneuvering to preserve their power by the old methods.

The growing political character of the strike, the rapid disintegration of the army and the universal indignation at the actions of the despotic regime paved the way to the realization of the slogan put forward by our party and supported by the whole people. We saw all this and were able to advance the slogan that could unite the whole people. But we failed to see that an armed uprising was inevitable. Consequently, our party found itself unprepared for the uprising and was unable to head it, although as far as possible it took a firm and resolute part in it.

Besides, our party adopted a sectarian attitude to the armed forces, lumping them all together as a group of "gorillas" in the service of reaction. We did not take into account the class composition of the army, whose ranks reflect the contradictions and struggles taking place in society, although as a whole it defends the interests of the reactionary state. Lenin pointed out that "the history of the Russian revolution, like the history of the Paris Commune of 1871, teaches us the incontrovertible lesson that militarism can never and under no circumstances be defeated and destroyed, except by a victorious struggle or one section of the national army against the other section." Our sectarian attitude to the army, on the contrary, prevented us from correctly assessing the changes taking place in it and isolated us from the entire process of preparation of the coup in the barracks. As a result constitutionalist officers and soldiers established contact primarily with the vacillating and moderate circles of the democratic movement, which were planning armed action merely as a countercoup.

Although Bosch himself undoubtedly linked a military conspiracy with the struggle of the masses, the DRP leaders in Santo Domingo did not understand this and for months engaged solely in preparing a military conspiracy, doing nothing to rally the people.

In the process of preparing a countercoup three main groups of conspirators emerged in the armed forces. One supported the slogan of the masses for the return of Bosch and the restoration of the constitution; another insisted on overthrowing the regime installed by the coup, forming a junta of young officers and holding free elections; the third was only interested in thoroughly purging the armed forces of smugglers, hired assassins, and similar elements, regardless of what government carried out the purge. But under the impact of events, as the conspiracy developed and later in the course of the armed struggle, a large part of the officers realized the need to be in the van of the armed movement which was destined to carry the constitutionalist democratic struggle to completion.

Originally, the movement was conceived only as a coup d'état with democratic aims which would greatly enhance the role of the army as an arbiter in relation to the rest of the national institutions. In other words, even though this coup would have had a progressive significance, it would have led to the strengthening of an organism which, in the specific conditions of Latin America, would in the long run present a permanent threat to all other state institutions (despite the fact that in the beginning it might have consolidated them for a time).

Developments, however, took a different course.

7. THE ARMED UPRISING BEGINS

Alarmed by the arrest of one of their members, the military conspirators took action earlier than originally planned. On April 24 two infantry barracks mutinied. When the news reached the capital, the entire population poured into the streets in jubilation. The members of our party and other parties (chiefly the left) who had opposed the triumvirate also came out. The popular struggle had begun.

From the very outset, however, it was clear that the people would not have as easy a victory as some optimists had predicted. Donald Read Cabral, the chairman of the triumvirate, announcing the meeting on television, said he had appointed General Wessin commander of the armed forces and member of the triumvirate, and that the rebels had been given until dawn the next day to surrender.

Through the night of April 24, however, the mass movement in the capital continued to mount; the rebel army units now had the backing of the people and entered the city in support of the popular demands. Thus, the patriotic actions of the democratic-minded armymen merged with the action of the working people. What had started out as a military coup became a popular uprising, a revolution of a profoundly democratic nature.

On the morning of April 25 the city was occupied by the rebel units supported by powerful mass demonstrations. It was during the capture of the national palace that Colonel Caamano, little known until then, distinguished himself by persuading the palace guard not to offer resistance and arresting their officers with their assistance. Shortly after midday Jose Molina Urena, chairman of the Chamber of Deputies, was proclaimed acting President pending the return of Bosch.

Continued reports of troops in the province coming over to the side of the rebels were broadcast over the national radio and TV. At the same time, the commander of the air base in San Isidro, under U.S. pressure, refused to adhere to the decision of the people and the rest of the army. A committee of air force officers attempted to persuade the rebel leaders to form a military junta. When this proposal was rejected, the "guerrillas" subjected the national palace and adjacent residential districts to machinegun and artillery fire from air and sea. (A tape recording of the negotiations during which the air attaché of the U.S. Embassy issued the order to open fire has been preserved.)

The bombardment of residential districts of the city continued throughout the following 2 days (April 26 and 27). U.S. Ambassador Bennett invited Molina Urena and members of his cabinet to the Embassy and advised them to ask the U.S. Government for "military protection." Molina Urena and the officers accompanying him emphatically rejected the proposal, Caamano strongly objected to this open interference by the U.S. Ambassador and the use of threats and provocation. Later on, however, the group which had been invited to the Embassy divided. Molina Urena, several officers and almost the entire leadership of the DPR found asylum in the embassies of Latin American countries; Caamano, Montes Arache and a number of other officers went back to the center of the town to organize resistance.

The leaders of the uprising left the national palace, taking with them the contents of the palace arsenal. Repairs were started on the radio and television station which had been badly damaged by shelling. The masses proceeded to set up a military organization to offer armed resistance.

The constitutionalist military command, consisting of the officers, headed by Caamano, who had decided to offer resistance, published a statement pledging to carry on the struggle until the return of President Bosch and the restoration of the 1963 Constitution. The document, put out in the form of a leaflet, also contained advice of a military nature to the civilian population. Among other things it pointed out that the city could not be captured by air attack. This could only be done by infantry. But the resistance of the people had prevented it from entering and would continue to do so. This leaflet, which gave the masses a general orientation, finally established Caamano as the leader of the struggle. That role was assigned to him not by decision of a political party or on orders from some embassy. It was determined primarily by his actions at the head of the popular resistance. Leaders are not made by impromptu decisions, they are born and gain stature in the course of the mass struggle. Only those political, military and trade union leaders retained their positions who, in the crucible of the battle, proved worthy to hold such positions. The rest were left behind on the rubbish heap of history.

In the course of the fighting in the capital the police barracks were captured along with a considerable quantity of weapons. In the hinterland provinces army units in many places joined the movement under pressure from the masses. There, however, weapons were not distributed to the civilian population on the pretext that the armed forces would protect them from the reactionaries.

The decisive engagement with the "gorillas" on the streets of Santo Domingo was fought on April 28. On that day, 23 of Wessin's tanks managed to cross the Duarte Bridge, but were later destroyed or captured by the people. The Ozama fortress, the last stronghold of reaction in the capital, was taken at the same time along with a substantial quantity of arms. The people, supported by army units, thus obtained the wherewithal to continue the struggle. Control over the use of the weapons was established and sentry posts set up. So-called "commandos" were organized for the defense of the city. These were military-political bodies organized at the height of the struggle by political parties, trade unions and other popular organizations in the various districts, streets, and separate buildings, and acting within their particular zone as organs of executive power. This was a new and original form of peoples' power. Headed by those who displayed the most organizational ability and courage in the fighting, the "commandos" represented a wide cross-section of the population, including soldiers and civilians, workers and students, intellectuals and unemployed.

With the destruction of Wessin's tanks and the capture of the Ozama fortress, the military machine of repression set up by the United States in 1942 and subsequently modernized by Trujillo was for all practical purposes abolished. The chief obstacle to the development of the revolution was thus removed and the people directed their efforts toward wiping out the last seat of putschist resistance, the San Isidro military base, where Wessin and the millionaire cutthroats in league with him were hiding to escape retribution for the bombardment of the civilian population. It was at this juncture that the U.S. marines landed.

8. ARMED U.S. INTERVENTION

The repressive machine of Dominican reaction having been smashed by the masses, U.S. imperialists hastened to replace it with their troops in an attempt to check the development of the revolution which threatened to advance beyond the democratic-constitutional demands. "A people which fights so resolutely for democracy cannot be content with simple democracy," said Juan Bosch at the time, speaking in Puerto Rico. The more far-reaching objectives of the movement emerged, needless to say, not by the will of the notorious "group of 56 or 57 Communists." They stemmed from the dialectics of the struggle of the armed masses who within the space of a few days had destroyed the hypertrophied military machine. At the same time, the development of the democratic-constitutional revolution depended (and still depends) on united mass action for immediate objectives and the gradual winning of these objectives.

The political consciousness of our people had risen to the point where they succeeded in launching an armed uprising against their internal enemies. They knew who these enemies were, and they dealt them defeat after defeat. However, at the moment when the U.S. troops landed, our people were not prepared to offer organized resistance to their main, external enemy. The opinion of the fighters differed as regards the object of the U.S. intervention. Many actually believed that the Americans had landed for the purpose of protecting the people from Wessin's air attacks, or to insure the return of Bosch. It was thanks to this initial confusion that the United States of America was able to begin landing troops without immediately encountering the armed resistance of our people.

Only the more politically advanced among the participants in the struggle saw at once the real object of the U.S. intervention. The Communist Party explained the situation to the masses and predicted that events would very soon reveal the true purpose of the U.S. action. That is precisely what happened. Within a few days the interventionists, who had begun by using the "gingerbread" method, handing out corn flour, Coca-Cola, and ice cream, took recourse to armed force. Vigorous action on the part of the population of the capital, however, eventually halted their offensive.

At that point, however, the constitutionalist leadership was taken unawares by the proposal for a cease-fire and the signing of an act of "reconciliation." In these negotiations the U.S. troops and the remainder of the Dominican reactionary forces, the OAS delegates, and the papal nuncio represented a bloc of world reaction poised in opposition to the progressive forces of the modern world. One might say that lack of anti-imperialist consciousness which caused the temporary wavering of the masses at the time of the U.S. troop landing was to a great extent reflected in the position of the military-political leadership when it agreed to the cease-fire and the establishment of a "safety zone" and a U.S. cordon. The cease-fire and the terms on which it was enforced at this juncture (the precise moment when the revolution was on the ascent, and when a major offensive had been launched against the San Isidro base) only facilitated the penetration of U.S. troops and the rearming of Wessin's forces. At the same time it isolated the revolutionary movement inside the city, with the territory occupied by the constitutionalists, moreover, cut in half by the "international safety zone." The armed uprising now passed from the offensive to the defensive.

This was a serious setback for the movement. Before long, however, when events revealed the real object of the imperialist intervention, the vacillation in the leadership ended.

Around the beginning of May, when the capital, occupied by the constitutionalist forces, was surrounded by U.S. troops, when the entire Dominican people supported the struggle in Santo Domingo and the movement of international solidarity was steadily mounting, negotiations began. (It was at this time that Caamano was elected constitutional President.)

Realizing that the military and political situation at this time did not augur well for their success at the negotiation table, the imperialists decided to change that situation. Around the middle of May, in violation of the cease-fire, they permitted and helped Wessin's forces, newly armed by them, to attack the northern part of the capital. For over a week a bloody and unequal battle was fought in this quarter. The resistance of the defenders of the northern zone was no less heroic than that of the fighters in the southern part of the town operating later against direct attack by the U.S. forces. But here the situation was complicated by the lack of weapons, terrain affording little cover, and the absence of trenches, antitank barriers, and well-fortified barricades. Besides, insufficient use was made of guerrilla tactics in courtyards and back alleys. Added to this was the lack of coordination and centralized command, which made itself increasingly felt as the ring of U.S. troops tightened around this sector, isolating it more and more from the neighboring sector where the main leaders were and which was better supplied with arms and reserves. On May 22–23 organized resistance in the northern zone ended. Part of its defenders succeeded in joining up with the main forces of the constitutionalists, but hundreds fell in battle or were shot down in cold blood on the streets by the military.

At the end of May the negotiations were resumed. Representatives of the OAS, the U.S. "ministry of the colonies," participated in the talks not as mediators but as spokesmen for imperialism, the oligarchy, and military putschists. (It is not for nothing that the constitutionalists repeatedly appealed to the United Nations to mediate between the OAS and those it represented, on the one hand, and the national-democratic movement on the other.)

At first the constitutionalists went to the talks without any definite plan, and this gave the imperialists and their skilled diplomats certain advantages. However, a plan was finally worked out on the basis of Caamano's "five points" providing for the restoration of the 1963 Constitution, reconvening the National Congress, the participation of democratic leaders in the future government, retention by the constitutionalists of commanding posts in the army, and the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops.

Early in June an agreement was concluded on this basis. Understanding was reached on the establishment of a constitutional government headed by Antonio Guzman (a landowner and member of Bosch's party who had held the post of Minister of Agriculture in his government and had the reputation of being a democrat). Moreover, until then Guzman had been regarded with favor by U.S. officials and by Johnson himself. But the U.S. Government went back on the agreement following the intervention of Thomas Mann and his backers.

The imperialists resorted to diverse maneuvers to wrest further concessions from the constitutionalists. On June 15 and 16, in an effort to secure better bargaining positions, they launched a major offensive in which U.S. troops took part openly for the first time. The people, however, put up a heroic resistance, showing that they were prepared to die fighting rather than permit the "peaceful" occupation of Free Santo Domingo by foreign troops. The imperialists had not expected the constitutionalists to hold out for more than 24 hours, but the fighting continued for 48 hours without abating. After the enemy attack had been halted at the cost of considerable losses for the constitutionalists (nearly 30 percent of whose territory was captured) a cease-fire was arranged with the help of the United Nations. The U.S. forces lost heavily in the engagement. The valiant resistance offered by the masses in these 2 days gave fresh impetus (though not immediately) to the international solidarity movement which had begun to wane.

It was thanks to the heroism of the fighting men and also to the lessons of the actions fought in the northern sector of the city that the constitutionalists were able to repulse the enemy in the June 15 and 16 fighting. They had strengthened their defenses, dug trenches, converted ordinary jeeps armed with heavy machineguns (some taken from tanks damaged in the fighting) and protected with sheet steel into makeshift "armored carriers," employed more mobile firepower and made extensive use of antitank ditches, mines, and other obstacles. Guerrilla tactics too were employed with greater effect. At the same time propaganda conducted among the masses and in the "commandos" strengthened the conviction that the invaders could be driven out provided the people united their forces and waged a resolute struggle.

9. NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE IMPERIALISTS

The imperialists called off their offensive because of the armed resistance of the Dominican masses and the growing indignation of people all over the world. Immediately after the fighting of June 15 and 16, however, taking advantage of the new balance of military strength, they advanced proposals which ruled out the possibility of a government being established on the basis of the 1963 constitution and thereby rejected in effect the basic demands of the Dominican people.

After the events of June 15 and 16 it became clear to the U.S. State Department that to score a military victory and to break the resistance of the revolutionaries the constitutional sector of Santo Domingo would have had to be reduced to rubble and its defenders and the population generally exterminated. In view of this the offensive, undertaken in the hope of being able to occupy Santo Domingo within the space of a few hours and thereby to face the world with a fait accompli, was conceded to be a failure.

The imperialists realized that the total destruction of the constitutional sector would only have increased the hatred of the Dominicans for the invaders and their local allies, and lead to the establishment of a military dictatorship and still heavier fighting in the immediate future. The political crisis would have remained as acute as ever with no prospect of stable government. Moreover, a massacre of the constitutionalists would have given new impetus to the protest movement in Latin America, in the United States itself, and throughout the world, aggravating the difficulties in which imperialism found itself as a result of the intervention. These considerations strengthened the positions of those sections of the imperialists and their Latin American servitors who advocated negotiations as a tactical move best able to perpetuate their rule in our country and throughout Latin America.

These groups realized that only by means of a compromise with the constitutionalists was it possible to achieve relatively stable government.

On their part the constitutionalists were compelled to negotiate a political settlement inasmuch as it was impossible, so long as they were completely surrounded, to win a military victory over the army of intervention such as that won in April over the San Isidro generals. As the negotiations got underway it also became clear that only complete victory of the revolution (which was made impossible by the U.S. intervention) could have restored the 1963 Constitution with all its implications. To have insisted on this demand as the only acceptable solution to the national crisis would have been tantamount, under the circumstances, to refusal to negotiate and plunging headlong into a frontal military collision with the enemy in a situation favorable to the latter.

In view of this, the constitutionalist government put forward in its talks with the Organization of the American States a counterproposal which roughly incorporated the project advanced by the U.S. proconsuls and provided for the establishment of a provisional government and elections in 9 months' time. At the same time, however, the constitutionalist proposal, reflecting the aspirations of the people who wanted to see democratic freedoms restored and the army of intervention withdrawn at the earliest possible date, called for a revision of many of the stipulations of the original OAS draft. It was underscored that the guarantee of the realization of the popular demands was vigilance and militancy on the part of the people, and certainly not the commitments that might be undertaken by the representatives of an imperialist power notorious for its readiness to go back on its word.

Our party was fully aware that although negotiations as a way out of the crisis were an expedient forced upon us which did not meet the democratic aspirations of the people, they nevertheless made it possible for the revolutionary forces to fall back in an organized way and escape the imperialist military encirclement with the least losses and under conditions favorable for a subsequent regrouping of forces and renewal of the revolutionary struggle in more propitious circumstances.

In other words, the enemy was able to force the rebels to go over from the offensive to positional defense. Consequently, our political demands too could not remain unchanged. From a popular armed offensive, the highest form of revolutionary struggle, the movement had to go over to negotiations and political concessions. A compromise became imperative since we could not defeat the enemy on the battlefield. The balance of forces may at times necessitate exceedingly unpleasant compromises, but this is not a reason for despair if the object of the compromise is not surrender but better political and military preparation of the masses for new battles.

"It would be a crime from the standpoint of the defense of the country to engage an immeasurably stronger and better prepared enemy in battle knowing that you do not have an army," Lenin said. "From the standpoint of the defense of the country we are obliged to sign the most onerous, the most oppressive, the most harsh and ignominous peace—not to 'capitulate' to imperialism but to learn and to prepare to fight him in a serious, proper way." It was by this counsel that our party was guided in giving its support to the constitutionalist government at that grave and trying moment when it was necessary to abandon at the negotiation table demands for which thousands of Dominican patriots had laid down their lives.

At the same time two erroneous approaches crystallized in regard to negotiations and the practical tasks of the movement.

The right-wing, conservative elements in the movement exaggerated from the outset the military strength of imperialism and underestimated both our ability to resist and the heroism of the Dominican people and other peoples who stood by us against the common enemy. For these elements any resistance to imperialism spelled meaningless sacrifice and defeat; they sowed pessimism and defeatism in the ranks of the fighters. "We must find a way out as soon as possible, we can no longer resist, we must accept what the Yankees propose"—this was the cry of those with little faith in the masses and the revolution.

On the other hand, the ultra-revolutionaries those "without a blot on their escutcheon," who would not "enter into any compromise with imperialism or the bourgeoise," took a diametrically opposite stand, demonstrating their utter lack of understanding of Marxist method. They minimized the military potential of imperialism and argued that no concession should be made to it, for this allegedly meant betraying the revolution. They tried to persuade the masses that the Constitution of 1963 could be restored and the immediate withdrawal of the interventionist troops brought about through negotiation.

The rightwing opportunists considered imperialism omnipotent and hence pressed for abject submission to its dictates. For the ultraleft, imperialism was weak and hence it did not have to be taken seriously; these people, reiterating the catchword "we shall remain firm," thought the negotiations could be dragged out endlessly.

The conservative position was shared by the rightwing of the DRP and groups of the national bourgeoisie who "privately" took part in the struggle. The leadership of the Revolutionary Social Christian Party published declarations in support of the "untainted" position (i.e., the position that the Constitution afforded the only basis for negotiations) while some of its members spread defeatism in the masses. Eventually, however, this party supported the proposal of the constitutional government.

The Dominican popular movement adhered throughout to an ultraleft stand, rejecting negotiations out of hand. It charged the Government and those who supported its proposals with "betrayal" and "conciliation."

The revolutionary June 14 movement, although it did not agree with the position of the constitutionalist government, nevertheless did not wish to sow dissension in the masses. It published an ambiguous proposal suggesting that the role of mediator be transferred from the OAS to the United Nations (thereby recognizing the OAS as mediator at the time), yet qualifying both organizations as "instruments of North American neocolonialism." While maintaining that the negotiations should be conducted on the basis of the 1963 Constitution, the June 14 movement refrained from leveling charges of betrayal and conciliation at those who supported the proposals of the Government. Its position was synthesized in the formula: "support for the Government but no negotiations." The duality of the movement's attitude was a reflection of the erroneous understanding of struggle for the purity of political line which prevailed in this organization worthy of the esteem of the Dominican people, an organization with an irreproachable revolutionary record but not always with the correct political orientation.

The negotiations lasted for more than 2 months, during which period there was no diminution of vigilance or resolve to fight the perfidious enemy who sought to terrorize the civilian population by keeping residential quarters under mortar fire night after night.

More was done during these months for the defense of free Santo Domingo than on the eve of the actions of June 15–16. New fortifications were built and systematic political work conducted in the "commandos" to forestall the dissension threatened by the spread of right-wing defeatist attitudes. Mass demonstrations were organized which showed that the people stood firmly behind their sons and daughters who had taken up arms in defense of national sovereignty and democracy. At the initiative and under the leadership of the revolutionary June 14 movement (which came to carry the greatest weight in the Armed Forces), a military school (April 24 Academy) was established both for the fighting men and unarmed revervists. Until then training for armed action had been given on the go, which cost the movement many unwarranted losses.

All this prepared the masses for the decisive and inevitable battles to come against the powerful enemy, battles for aims the achievement of which had been checked temporarily by the intervention. These measures strengthened the hand of the constitutionalists at the negotiating table, showing as they did their resolve to repeal, at a moment's notice and at whatever cost, any armed offensive the enemy might undertake.

In the course of the prolonged discussion of proposals and counterproposals, which the enemy deliberately dragged out in the hope of weakening the constitutionalist position, imperialism had to make concessions. Stipulations providing for the restoration of all civil liberties and prohibiting the sale or resale of state property were included in the Institutional Act by which the provisional government was to be guided. At the final phase of the negotiations, when the so-called Dominican act of reconciliation was deliberated, an attempt was made to open the doors to immediate political persecution and to empower to this end the "inter-American Peace Force" to confiscate all weapons in the hands of civilians. This move was foiled by the threat of a breakdown in the negotiations. The solution of this delicate problem was finally entrusted to constitutionalist officers, which made it possible to effect an organized retreat. Similarly, agreement was reached to reinstate all constitutionalist officers, including those who had been discharged from the army because of their democratic views before the uprising of April 24.

Our party maintained that it was extremely important during the negotiations to compel the imperialists to set the exact date for the withdrawal of their troops so as to provide the movement with a basic demand around which the struggle could be continued. However, this aim was not achieved because, first, the negotiations followed a pattern laid down by the enemy, with priority given to the search for a candidate for president and examination of the basic issues and concretization of the fundamental commitments left until later. Second, the composition of the negotiators on behalf of the movement did not adequately reflect the real sentiment of the armed masses (spokesmen of the right occupied a disproportionately big place among them). Third, the differences caused by the defeatist attitudes of some and the splitting activities of others afforded imperialism an opportunity to advance more and more demands, whereas the representatives of the movement knew that time was not on their side. There was open disagreement among the negotiators for the movement as to the time limit for the withdrawal of U.S. troops; some wanted to leave the matter to Garcia Godoy, while others insisted on the immediate signing of a document on this question. In the end of the more conservative and conciliatory group got the upper hand. But at the same time the movement as a whole reserved the right to carry on the struggle for its original aims and for the withdrawal of the interventionist troops.

The provisional government was thus created as a result of U.S. intervention, a government completely without the support of the people and the national political forces (with the exception of cases where one or another positive or negative move on its part has the corresponding backing of either progressive or reactionary groups). The Garcia Godoy administration has no army apart from the interventionist troops. This is a new element in the Dominican situation.

10. THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION AND THE PERSPECTIVES

After the establishment of the provisional government consolidation of the gains of the April uprising began throughout the country. When the participants in the movement returned from the constitutionalist zone to their own districts campaigns were organized against those government employees who had been involved in the 1963 coup and the subsequent repressions. The workers of the state-owned Azucarera Haina Co. (the Republic's main sugar producer with assets running to $100 million), by means of a general strike and subsequently by direct mass action, threw out the managers appointed by the triumvirate. The same happened at all other state-owned companies. At the same time workers and office employees dismissed for patriotic activities were reinstated in their jobs.

A few days before the withdrawal of the constitutionalist armed detachments, the political forces supporting the movement began discussing the formation of a united front of struggle for the common aims which still remain to be achieved. There still are differences on this question and especially as regards the organizational structure of the united front. The revolutionary Social Christian Party is against any united front with the Communists on principle and, though favoring united action, is opposed to organizational unity. The rightwing of the DRP steers clear of any joint statements with the Communists, although it in practice accepted cooperation and united action with them. The more progressive sector of this party is not opposed to unity of all constitutionalist groups. The three left parties are already working to build a nationwide united front. The differences of a secondary nature among them as regards a common program are being overcome in the course of practical actions.

We believe that the durable popular unity achieved in the recent struggle will make it possible, on the basis of the continued practical development of this struggle, to overcome the existing disagreements. The entire people is ready to fight for the withdrawal of the occupation forces and for the 1963 constitution. The establishment on this basis of a united front which will give battle to the invaders and defeat them is today the paramount organizational task of the popular movement.

The chief obstacle to the development of the Dominican revolution is the presence of imperialist troops. Their expulsion by popular action would pave the way to immediate revolutionary changes in the economic structure of the country.

The basic form of struggle essential for defeating the enemy and establishing revolutionary government is armed struggle—not only against the reactionary segment of the army but also against the powerful imperialist aggressor.

The Communist Party is working toward the realization of this momentous immediate task—the expulsion of the U.S. troops from our country. At the same time we proclaim as our ultimate aim the building of socialism and communism, the only social system which will abolish exploitation.

The contemporary Dominican scene is marked by a powerful upsurge of mass struggle. The forces of intervention are trying to intimidate the democrats, and clashes take place between troops and demonstrators. Popular feeling is running high. The people remain united in the fight for the original aims of the movement and against the intervention. It may be said that this unity and the heightened political consciousness of the masses are the most important result of the 5 months of armed struggle.

The oligarchy and its politicians, defeated and lacking mass support, are resorting to terror and are whetting the dictatorial appetites of some generals. It is not excluded that a naked military tyranny may be installed. Hence it is imperative to combine the struggle to carry further the gains won and to secure the withdrawal of foreign troops with the struggle against putschist schemes.

The terror unleashed by the right underscores the urgency of organizing self-defense groups. This task has already been tackled. It was begun even before the barricades of the constitutionalist zone were taken down and before its fighting forces returned to their respective districts throughout the country.

For the first time a powerful fight for the land is developing in the countryside. The peasants are demanding division of the latifundia which once belonged to Trujillo and later passed over to the army officers and landlords behind the coup. The arrest of hundreds of peasants in the La Vega area and the emergence of new contradictions among diverse groups of the military with regard to this problem paves the way to the growth of a strong guerrilla movement fighting for the peasants' demands. In the long run this movement is destined to become part of the mustering of the entire people for a new countrywide uprising.

All the maneuvers and aggressive actions of imperialism are encountering the resistance of a people united and ready for the battle under the watchword: "Yankees, get out of the Dominican Republic."

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the special Subcommittee on International Complex of the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

SPRUCE KNOB—A PACESETTER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am especially pleased when the U.S. Forest Service can offer assistance to our States.

In West Virginia, the Forest Service—with the never-ending assistance of our colleague, Senator Robert Byrd—is moving ahead rapidly on the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. In years to come, this will undoubtedly be one of the most popular recreation areas on the east coast.

It is reassuring to note that newspapers in West Virginia welcome this development and believe that it will set an example for State development. I also believe this, because I know that the demand for recreation areas will increase in coming years.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser on March 15, and entitled, "Spruce Knob Center Should Spur Other State Projects," be reprinted in the Congressional Record, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Spruce Knob Center Should Spur Other State Projects

Another significant stride in the development of West Virginia playgrounds for millions of visitors has been taken in the creation of Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area.

The reservation includes not only 4,860-foot Spruce Knob, the highest peak in West Virginia, and the geological curiosity called Seneca Rocks but thousands of acres of natural beauty and lakes and mountain streams abounding in fish.

Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat, of West Virginia, began his campaign to preserve the area as a natural wonderland in 1963. The legislation he sponsored in the Senate has become law, and this year thousands of visitors are expected to enjoy the area's rugged beauty.

In an Izaak Walton League magazine article Senator Byrd has told of the reservation's attractions and of its future value as an ideal recreation center for the millions of people from the populous East and Middle West.

It has been estimated, he said, that the population within a radius of 250 miles exceeds 30 million. By 1970 visitors are expected to number a million a year and eventually 5 million.

The center will thus become not only a fine natural retreat for those seeking relief from the congestion of the big cities but an important stimulant to the economic development of the State.

It can serve as a stimulant also for the creation of other attractions for tourists and vacationists that will contribute millions of dollars annually to business.

Although the western part of the State lacks high mountains, it still has many scenes of unusual natural beauty suitable for recreational centers.

The reservoirs to be created by dams at East Lynn and in Beech Fork near Huntington will afford opportunities for developing private recreational facilities.

The beauty of the Ohio River has been celebrated even in song, and as the expanding population creates a national shortage of water, it will become increasingly important as an attraction to people and industry.

Besides beauty, the valley also has important historic interest. It was visited by George Washington and others in the early days and was considered ideal for the development of new settlements.

The battle of Point Pleasant in the triangle of the confluence of the Ohio and Kanawha Rivers has been officially recognized by act of Congress as the first engagement of the Revolutionary War.

With the proper promotion, Tuendie-wei Park overlooking the two rivers could draw many more tourists every year.

Another place of historic interest at the home of Albert Gallatin Jenkins only a few miles north of Huntington.

A modern highway along the valley would afford tremendous new impetus to tourism and to industrial development. Such a base for economic progress is necessary not only for improving the physical conditions of living but for revenue to speed educational and cultural development.

Few States have more natural resources than West Virginia. But progress has lagged because the people have failed to take full advantage of nature's gifts.

This is the time to broaden the base for a new era of progress and prosperity.

VICTORY IN VIETNAM—LETTER FROM LT. WILLIAM P. HAUSER

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, several days ago, the Decatur, Ala., Daily published as an editorial a letter from 1st Lt. William P. Hauser. This young American officer serving in Vietnam has presented an excellent case for seeing the situation through to victory in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, the editorial containing Lieutenant Hauser's letter, which was published in the Decatur Daily, Decatur, Ala., on March 7, 1966.

There being no objection, the editor was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Editorial From Vietnam

Some Americans, including some U.S. Senators, apparently are not yet clear on the reasons fighting men of the United States are in Vietnam. There are other Americans who seem to think we can just call it a day and get out of Vietnam.

We have running debates in this country for and against President Johnson's policies in conducting the Vietnamese war.

But there are no running debates among the fighting men in Vietnam. They know why they are there.

No stronger an editorial could be written than that contained in a letter from 1st Lt. William P. Hauser, grandson of Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Stone, Route 1, Box 6, Highway 20 Mobile Court, Decatur, Lieutenant Hauser served as a missionary in Uruguay, married a Uruguayan, then enlisted in the U.S. Air Force about a year ago.

He writes this letter which we are presenting to you as an editorial:

Cam Ranha, Vietnam,
February 28, 1966.

Dear Grandpa and Grandma: Oh, this is a bitter war. Although it is the middle of winter, the temperatures are already ranging into the nineties and one-hundreds. I returned from an air strike yesterday only to discover that the seat underneath me had stopped two machinegun slugs from entering my legs.

Each day spells new problems, new challenges in this poor land. I know the newspapers and American public have expressed various opinions concerning our involvement in southeast Asia and so I am going to express my point of view. It comes from first-hand knowledge of people in many lands and the Communists and their activities. As long as communism and democracy exist there will be no peace on earth and love for our fellow man. I believe with all my strength that democracy is the best form of government on the earth today, not perfect mind you, but the best at present. I believe that a representative government is an inspired government. Communism, on the other hand, is antireligious, anti-individual freedom, and in policy is dedicated toward the destruction of democracy. In this day and age many new nations are emerging and struggling toward independence and self-government. Their course, in a large measure, depends upon confidence in American protection. South Vietnam is one such nation, and if we back down on our pledge to protect and aid them against aggression, then nobody in Asia will ever believe in America again. The American commitment to defend South Vietnam is 12 years old. Although the military and politicos have made numerous mistakes in this commitment, I believe that we came here to help South Vietnam stay free and we will remain here until their independence is assured.

Please continue to write as I have time between missions to answer your letters.

My love to you both.

Paul.

COMBAT READINESS OF 187TH TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE GROUP, AIR NATIONAL GUARD, MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have just learned that the 187th Tactical Reconnaissance Group, Air National Guard, at Montgomery, Ala., achieved full combat readiness in less than 1 week after it was designated to receive intensified training. This reflects great credit on the dedication, capability, and preparedness of the Alabama Air National Guard and the National Guard and Reserve Forces as a whole.

The 187th is commanded by Col. Henry Fillingim, Jr., of Montgomery. This unit, by the way, is one of the units mobilized during the Berlin crisis in 1961. Its membership includes combat veterans of World War II and Korea. Gen. Reid Doster is wing commander and chief of staff for the Air National Guard of Alabama.

As an Alabamian, I am, of course, particularly proud that this Alabama unit made this fine record. I call to the attention of the Senate this evidence of National Guard readiness.

ASIAN BANK BILL OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it should be noted for the Record that an event of importance to Asia and to the world took place on March 16. On that date, President Johnson signed the Asian Bank bill of 1966. This is the legislation which provides for the participation of the United States in the Asian Bank. Having signed the bill into law, the President was enabled, thereby, to pledge the U.S. share of one-fifth of the Bank's initial operating capital.

The Asian Bank is a great international effort which had its inspiration in the United Nations, in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. It unites 31 nations in a concerted effort to contribute to economic development in Asia.

The years since World War II have shown what multinational and regional lending institutions can do in the way of assisting in rapid rehabilitation and development. Indeed, the restoration and growth of the economy of Western Europe and, to a lesser degree, Latin America, bear witness to the efficacy of international financing efforts of this kind. The same techniques can prove to be of great help in Asia.

As indicated, 30 other nations are also involved in the new bank. Many are non-Asian states which by their participation offer proof of a growing recognition of the interdependence of nations, and the intertwining of the hopes and aspirations of all peoples. In fact, the non-Asian nations other than this country will contribute a share equal to that pledged by the United States—that is, $200 million or one-fifth of the total initial capital.

Asian nations will supply 60 percent of the total. Japan's share of $200 million is the largest, and it will place Japan on a par with the United States in voting power on the bank's board of directors. Subscriptions for Asian nations range from the high Japanese figure down to $60.000 for western Samoa.

More significant than the contributions of capital, however, is the spirit which prompted the Asian states to join in this effort and what may be augured from it for the future. Nowhere is cooperation more essential than in Asia; nowhere are the problems of peace any greater. Indeed, it is most encouraging to see nations which have otherwise had deep differences, such as India and Pakistan and Cambodia and Thailand, joining in this constructive venture. The new bank will gain a great lift when the hostilities in Vietnam, as they must, come to an end, and southeast Asia as a whole can get on with the business of reconstruction and development.

In this connection, the United States and seven other nations have already pledged $24.1 million to construct the largest Mekong River basin dam and power project to date. I refer to the high-priority Nam Ngum Dam on a Mekong tributary in Laos.

President Johnson has exercised outstanding leadership in this Nation in promoting the Asian Bank and the Mekong project and U.S. participation in these regional undertakings. These creative uses of American resources in cooperation with others for a noble and peaceful purpose is the path which the President would invariably take by personal and national preference, if it were possible. Unfortunately, this path has so far proved elusive in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's remarks upon signing the Asian Bank bill, the press release on the Nam Ngum project, and the lits of countries subscribing and their pledged subscriptions be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the text of the President's remarks, the press release, and the list were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Press release from the office of the White House press secretary, Mar. 16, 1966]

Background on Nam Ngum Project

The United States and seven other countries have pledged $24.1 million to construct the largest Mekong River project to date—the Nam Ngum tributary project in Laos. The U.S. pledge of half this amount is the first major commitment under President Johnson's program to expand economic and social development in southeast Asia.

The U.S. contribution will be provided by the Agency for International Development.

The Nam Ngum project is the Mekong Committee's highest priority undertaking and represents a major accomplishment in international cooperation in the Far East. The United Nations took the lead in raising funds for the project, and the World Bank has agreed to administer the project. Thailand and Laos have signed a convention providing for an exchange of electric power.

The first phase of the Nam Ngum project will include a dam and power station with an installed capacity of up to 30,000 kilowatts. The dam is designed so that additional generators—up to 120.000 kilowatts—can be installed as needed. An international transmission line, with a link across the Mekong River, will connect the power station with Vientiane, Laos, and northeast Thailand, where part of the power will be used.

The following amounts have been pledged:

Japan	$4, 000, 000
Netherlands	3, 300, 000
Canada	2, 000, 000
Thailand	1, 000, 000
Denmark	600, 000
Australia	500, 000
New Zealand	350, 000

The United States matched the total of these contributions, as well as an additional $315,000 pledged by Japan on a bilateral basis to Laos, in accordance with an earlier offer made to the Mekong Committee.

The total pledged for the project is $24,130,000.

The contributions from all the developed countries were made on a grant basis. The Thai contribution is in kind: cement—to be repaid by electrical power after completion of the project.

Remarks of the President at Signing of the Asian Bank Bill of 1966 in the East Room

Mr. Vice President, Secretary Rusk, Secretary Fowler, Mr. Black, distinguished Ambassadors, Members of the Congress, my fellow Americans:

This is a moment in which history and hope meet and move on from here as partners. Less than 1 year ago, on April 7, 1965, I asked for the creation of the Asian development plan to seek economic advance and social justice for all of Asia. I pledged the full support of the United States of America to that task.

Today we have begun to redeem that pledge. The act I sign this morning authorizes the United States of America to ratify the charter of the Asian Development Bank. Seldom have nations joined together in a collective venture that is so endowed with promise. For that reason this moment is a very special one for so many people.

First, for the Asian leaders, who conceived and organized the bank and who are so ably represented here today by the Ambassadors from their countries. For the people of those non-Asian nations which have signed the charter, and whose Ambassadors have come this morning to bespeak again their vision and generosity. Finally, for my great friend, a true American, Eugene Black, whose energy and tact have been as indispensable as his experience and wisdom. And to the Congress of the United States and the members of both parties who have acted to invest in this enterprise not only the resources but the faith of 190 million people whom they represent.

This act is an economic Magna Carta for the diverse lands of Asia. Its charter links 31 countries in a union against the involuntary economic servitude imposed on the people of Asia by time and circumstance, and by neighbor and nature. There is also a deeper meaning. This billion-dollar bank is a symbol that the twain have met, not as Kipling predicted, "At God's great judgment seat," but at the place of a man's shared needs.

It is no longer possible to be a mere observer at that place. It is not possible and it is not right to neglect a people's hopes because the ocean is vast, or their culture is alien, or their language may be strange, or their race different, or their skin another color. Asia must no longer sit at the 2d table of the 20th century's concern.

The economic network of this shrinking globe is too intertwined. The political order of continents is too involved with one another. The threat of common disaster is too real for all human beings to say of Asia, or any other continent, "Yours is another sphere."

I believe that those who make that case are no less patriotic and no less sincere than those who believe that we cannot shorten the length of our reach into the world.

But I believe equally as firmly that those people are wrong. And while I expect they will continue to make their argument of isolationism, for we all are determined to preserve their right to speak up in this land, I hope they, too, expect me to try to keep on making my case for realism. That, I think, is the right of the President of this country and the President feels that is his duty.

And what is that case? It is simply that there is no rest from the trials of freedom, there is no recalling what the pace of change has done to the map of this big world, there is no reducing our responsibilities while the challenges of progress will not permit us to name the site for our duel or the weapons that we use.

It is that we cannot turn from the place of shared needs and expect either peace or progress to follow us.

So today we have come here to the historic East Room of the White House and gathered at this place to start a journey together. The Asian Development Bank is the first step of what I conceive to be a very long journey.

We are taking another today by announcing that we have pledged a half of the $24 million that is needed to construct the large Mekong River project, the Nam Ngum tributary project in Laos. Seven other countries, Japan, the Netherlands, Canada, Thailand, Denmark, Australia, and New Zealand, are joining us in that effort.

For the United States it is our first major commitment under our promise to expand economic and social development in southeast Asia. The Nam Ngum project is the Mekong committee's highest priority undertaking and, like the Asian Development Bank, it represents a major accomplishment in joint cooperation in the world.

The first phase of the project will include a dam and power station with an installed capacity up to 30,000 kilowatts. Additional generators up to 120,000 kilowatts can be installed as they are needed. An international transmission line, with a link across the Mekong River, will connect the power station with the capital of Laos and northeast Thailand.

This is just one example of how the fruits of technology and the ingenuity of cooperation can bring new life to whole new regions of the world. More, yes, much more, awaits our response. Schools and hospitals can be built. Rivers can be tamed. New crops and new breeds of livestock can be developed. There are no bounds to the possibilities, if there are no limits to our dreams

It has been said that no statue was ever erected to the memory of a man or woman who thought it was best to let well enough alone. So it is with the nations that we represent here today. We seek no statues to our memory. We seek only one real monument, a monument with peace and progress for its base and justice for its pinnacle.

Together, your lands and mine, we will build it.

TABLE I.—*Subscriptions to Asian Development Bank capital stock (based on information as to pledges available through Feb. 15, 1966)*

Country	Subscription amount	Percentage of total subscriptions	Percentage of developed country subscriptions	Percentage of regional country subscriptions
Regional:	*Millions*			
Afghanistan	$3.36	0.3		0.5
Australia	85.00	8.5	12.9	13.1
Cambodia	3.00	.3		.5
Ceylon	8.52	.9		1.3
Republic of China	16.00	1.6		2.5
India	93.00	9.3		14.5
Iran	60.00	6.0		9.3
Japan	200.00	20.1	30.4	30.9
Korea	30.00	3.0		4.6
Laos	.42			
Malaysia	20.00	2.0		3.1
Nepal	2.16	.2		.3
New Zealand	22.56	2.3	3.4	3.5
Pakistan	32.00	3.2		4.9
Philippines	35.00	3.5		5.4
Vietnam	12.00	1.2		1.9
Singapore	4.00	.4		.6
Thailand	20.00	2.0		3.1
Western Samoa	.06			
Subtotal	647.08	64.8	46.7	100.0
Nonregional:				
Austria	5.00	.5	.8	
Belgium	5.00	.5	.8	
Canada	25.00	2.5	3.8	
Denmark	5.00	.5	3.8	
Finland	5.00	.5	.8	
Germany, Federal Republic of	34.00	3.4	5.2	
Italy	20.00	2.0	3.0	
Netherlands	11.00	1.1	1.6	
Norway	5.00	.5	.8	
Sweden	5.00	.5	.8	
United Kingdom	30.00	3.0	4.5	
United States	200.00	20.1	30.4	
Subtotal	350.00	35.1	53.4	
Grand total	997.08	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE.—Total may not add due to rounding.

"NATION CONCERNED ABOUT WASHINGTON"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, our colleague from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, has served as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia since February 1961. He is a tireless worker in this role and we have heard him express his views on programs to solve problems in the Nation's Capital.

Senator BYRD detailed his ideas for Washington recently in an address to the Federation of Citizens Associations for the District of Columbia.

His recommendations met with praise from the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser in an editorial published on March 22, 1966. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD for others to read.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Mar. 22, 1966]

WASHINGTON'S BIG PROBLEMS ARE OF CONCERN TO NATION

A vision of Washington as a National Capital famed around the world for culture and beauty was presented to the District of Columbia Federation of Citizens Associations the other day by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia.

The address went back to the days of the Revolution when a mob of disgruntled soldiers marched upon the meeting hall of Congress in Philadelphia and disrupted vital business at a crucial stage in history.

Congress moved to Princeton, N.J., where it could conduct its affairs without interruption, but the experience remained with the members and influenced those who drafted the Constitution.

The Founding Fathers provided for the location of the Capitol not in some part of an existing city but in an area ceded to the Government and under control of Federal authorities.

The District of Columbia was thus set up as the seat of the National Government, and Congress was given authority to enact legislation for governing it.

Although in 1871 Congress created a separate government for the District with powers similar to those in territories, this plan was abolished in 1878, and the present system was instituted.

In recent years there has been strong agitation for self-government in the District based on the argument that the people there should have the same right of franchise as other citizens.

While declaring that the city should have its representation in Congress, Senator BYRD took the position that there was no basis for assuming that independent government would improve conditions.

As the home of the Federal Government, he pointed out, the District "commands a prestigious position unequaled by any other American city or, in many respects, by any other city in the world."

As a cosmopolitan center richly endowed with museums and memorials and as the seat of Government of the most powerful nation in history, Washington should still be representative of the country and its people.

But its population imbalance of recent years has resulted in the development of slum areas in which Negro families are crowded five and six to a room.

This condition, Senator BYRD declared, presents a challenge to the Federal Government for an attack upon racial and population problems as a step toward making the Capital a model city.

Other important needs discussed included public works such as freeways and the subway system now under design and improved educational facilities.

A handicap to the development of better schools, however, is the persistent vandalism illustrated by the breaking of 27,689 windowpanes in 1 year costing $112,868 for replacements.

The welfare program of the District of Columbia should also set a high standard for the entire Nation, but this effort has been impeded by abuses such as welfare payments to 170 mothers of 850 illegitimate children.

Unjust attacks upon the police and "maudlin mollycoddling" of criminals have also thwarted efforts to curb the spiraling rate of crime.

In 1957, Senator BYRD said, Washington stood 12th among 16 cities of comparable size in crime-index offenses. Last year it was in fourth place and has now moved into third place.

In pointing to these grave problems, Senator BYRD declared "Washington can never become a model city until it first becomes a safe city."

These are problems for the consideration of people throughout the country because Washington is not just a place where the Capitol is located. It is the Capital of our Nation.

Its vandalism, its poverty, its abuses, and its serious crimes are a reflection upon us all.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it was entirely appropriate that today His Excellency, Archbishop Vasili, of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in the United States and Canada, should deliver the invocation in the Senate Chamber, because it was on this day, March 25, 48 years ago, in the city of Minsk, that the Byelorussian people proclaimed the Byelorussian National Republic. But since that time Russian domination has been reimposed on that province.

Over a period of time, I have submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, calling for action by the United Nations to convince the Soviet Union that it should permit self-determination by the people of the Baltic States and all the people behind the Iron Curtain.

I was delighted to see His Excellency in the Chamber today, and to listen to his entreaty in behalf of his people and in behalf of their freedom and independence.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is unavoidably absent. If he were here, he would like to express himself on the subject of Byelorussia and to commemorate the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence, an independence which was subsequently lost. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from New York be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

On March 25, 48 years ago, the people of Byelorussia proclaimed their independence from the Soviet Union. On that date the

Byelorussian Democratic Republic was created. A rada, or council, consisting of Jews, Poles, and Russians as well as Byelorussians was formed. A provisional constitution providing for free speech and assembly, liberty of conscience, autonomy of national minorities, and equality of all before the law, was passed.

Just as this new state, finally free from centuries of Russian domination, was beginning to exercise its freedom and independence, after its Government had already been recognized by over a dozen states, the troops of the Soviet Union reoccupied Byelorussian territory and reimposed the yoke of slavery. All the appeals for help by the Byelorussian Government went unheeded. The Byelorussian people tried to fight off the Russian armies, but ultimately and with much difficulty, the superior manpower and guns of the Soviet Army crushed the rebellion.

The Byelorussian people were free for only 3 years. Since 1921, these brave people have been incorporated into an administrative arm of the Soviet Government. What is now called the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is actually a new form of subjugation of the Byelorussian nation.

We take this day to honor the struggle and the spirit of the Byelorussian people. We take this day to commemorate with them their moment of freedom and independence. Our prayers and thoughts for their eventual liberation are raised to keep their hopes alive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it took a world war and the Russian Revolution of 1917 to remind us that the Byelorussian people are a distinct ethnic group in northwestern Russia who struggled for their freedom for centuries, but who were almost lost to the rest of the world. In those days much of the world was quite unaware of the existence of the rest. But World War I shattered the barriers between Europe and Russia, and one of the peoples that asserted their freedom and regained their independence were the Byelorussians.

For centuries these sturdy people had been held down by the czarist regime of Russia; but now that the decrepit Russian autocracy was no more, they proclaimed their national independence on March 25, 1918, and hoped that thenceforth they would be allowed to live in freedom in their ancient homeland. They barely had time to express their joy and celebrate their freedom before they were shocked by the overwhelming attack of the Soviet Union's Red army. Soon the Bolshevik forces swept over Byelorussia, occupied it, and subsequently Byelorussia became one of the constituent republics of the Soviet Union.

But the Byelorussian people have not ceased their struggle for their freedom. Even under the relentless and rigid rule of the Communists, they carry on their fight for freedom, confident that eventually they will attain their goal. In their righteous cause, Mr. President, they have our wholehearted sympathy; on the 48th anniversary of their independence, I wish them forbearance and fortitude, and hope for their success.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, today marks the 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence. I believe that the remarkable courage and determination of these people should be recognized. The Byelorussians are captive peoples, captives of the Soviets. Prof. Vincent W. Beach, of the history department at the University of Colorado, has written a fascinating article dealing with the techniques of Communist exploitation of these and similarly subjected peoples.

We cannot afford to ignore the national aspirations of the enslaved peoples in the captive nations. We cannot afford to let go these hopes of dignified and spirited individuals who have for years labored under Communist domination. As Professor Beach's article shows, they have been forced to buckle under overpowering odds, against their will. We must develop programs carefully designed and implemented to aid them in obtaining their eventual liberation.

I have called many times for a reaffirmation of our belief that one day the captive nations, including Byelorussia as the third largest constituent Soviet republic in that group, should be freed.

Today, when we are hearing more and more about increased trade with the Soviet Bloc, there is an even greater need for a definitive and concise policy in this area. We should employ our economic resources including trade, toward this end. Peaceful means which utilize our strongest resources—the American individual and his creative potential—are ready and waiting, if only our Government will recognize them.

Professor Beach's article sheds light on the weaknesses of the Communist approach and shows clearly where our resources could be used most effectively. The Byelorussian people, and the people of all nations enslaved by the Communist bloc, deserve the notice and the support of all free men.

I join Professor Beach and many of my colleagues today in calling for renewed efforts toward their eventual freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Professor Beach's excellent article printed in the RECORD for the benefit of the American people and for the commemoration of the long-ago proclamation of Byelorussian independence on March 25, 1918.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TECHNIQUES OF COMMUNIST EXPLOITATION: A NEW LOOK

(By Dr. Vincent W. Beach)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Some of the material in this article was included in an address by Professor Beach to the student body of East Missouri State College, which was published in the Queen's Quarterly. Presented below is an up-to-date analysis of the methods used by the Communists to exploit captive peoples.)

It seems almost unnecessary to point out that recent developments in Russia, central Europe, the Middle East, Africa, China, and southeast Asia confirm once again what is obvious to most: That the political domination and economic control of the human and material resources of the entire earth still are the ultimate objectives of the Communists—a control which would make it possible for Russia or China (or both) to siphon in their directions the cream of the efforts of the human race. Today, over 1 billion people, constituting one-third of the world's total population, must be counted within the Communist orbit.

Russian imperialism (or Chinese expansionism) is not new. In fact, the Russians basically are following the pattern of war and conquest set by Peter the Great, Catherine the Great, and other rulers of Russia during the Czarist era. But while the Russian people and many of the basic objectives of Russian foreign policy have changed little during the past 300 years, the world balance of power has changed greatly.

By the beginning of the modern era, the national state system of political organization had taken form, and by 1648 the system in existence today was well defined. Because a number of independent nations such as France, England, Russia, Spain, Austria, and Prussia developed institutions which they were willing to protect against outside intereference, by force of arms if necessary, it became axiomatic that the interests of each demanded that no one state should become so powerful as to have the strength to dominate completely any one of the others.

Thus, a precarious balance of power came into existence which made it impossible for conquerors, or would-be conquerors, of the mold of Louis XIV, Frederick the Great, and Napoleon I, to make large areas inhabited by alien populations permanently subservient to them. If one state seemed to threaten the independence of another, a coalition was formed to put the overly-ambitious country into its proper place. This uneasy equilibrium made world domination by a single power or creed virtually impossible until World War II.

Almost 6 years of modern warfare, however, temporarily left only the United States and Russia as major military powers. The material and human losses of two world wars reduced England, France, and Italy (as well as China) to second-rate status and temporarily destroyed the military potential of Germany and Japan. Thus, the shifting combinations which had kept national and dynastic ambitions in check for centuries were no longer possible and out of the debris of World War II emerged two superstates. Not until recently has a multipower situation again developed with the recovery of Western Europe and the emergence of China and India. However, decisive military power, in the form of nuclear weapons, still belongs to Russia and the United States.

The defeat of anti-Communist Japan left a vacuum in Asia which Russia exploited by turning over the guns and equipment of the disarmed Japanese to Mao Tse-tung, who was then at war with Chiang Kai-shek. Earlier, at Yalta, Stalin had wrung from the Western Allies territorial concessions and special privileges which enormously strengthened the Soviet position in the Far East. The Russians now must wonder why they went to so much trouble to create the Red dragon in China that is now challenging them for the leadership of international communism.

The Russians exploited the vacuum created in Central Europe by the defeat of anti-Communist Germany, and Eastern Europe easily fell under the Russian heel. And the decline of French and British prestige, combined with national revolutions in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia, have created situations which the Russians (and now the Chinese) are exploiting. Russia and China, utilizing one of the most effective propaganda instruments in history, Marxian socialism, have made substantial progress in creating a system of Socialist states completely subservient to Communist interests.

Russia now dominates the Eastern European area (as well as others) and China has made a beginning in her drive to assert her leadership over the 15 nations and 800 million people now outside the Chinese orbit in Asia. Tibet and certain border areas of India have already fallen, and Chinese influence in North Vietnam and Laos is significant. With 15 million Chinese living outside the homeland, China's Communists have a readymade vehicle for subversion which they are already using. Millions of these Chinese are anti-Communist businessmen, but some of them can be coerced into giving support to the Peking regime.

In addition, there are significant Chinese minorities in the ranks of the working classes in various states of southeast Asia which have been particularly susceptible to propaganda from Red China. In the background is the new Chinese army (2.5 million men) which should have operational nuclear weapons at its disposal in the near future.

The Sino-Russian split reveals polycentric tendencies within the socialist structure and indicate a degree of diversity within international communism which the West may exploit. However, since ultimate military power in the Socialist world still is in Soviet hands and since we are much better acquainted with the Russian than the Chinese method of exploitation of captive peoples, it is with the Russian brand of Marxism that we are primarily concerned in this article. Khrushchev, at the 22d Congress of the Russian Communist Party in October 1961, put it this way: "The building of communism in our country is an integral part of the building of Communist society in the whole Socialist commonwealth. The successful development of a world system of socialism opens up a prospect of the more or less simultaneous transition of the Socialist countries to communism." Thus, he made it clear that coexistence with the capitalist states is a temporary phase of the Communist drive for control of the earth.

A victory by Russia or China over the United States could mean centuries of Communist domination. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century science has produced the instruments through which the "winner" of an all-out conflict between the two power blocs could enslave the loser. Thus, a Russian or Chinese victory would result in the creation of a Moscow- or Peking-centered world in which the earth's resources would be exploited by the new "superior" race (or races).

And once the industrial potential of the defeated was destroyed there would be little hope of a comeback until institutional decay brought a palace revolution or a civil war of sufficient magnitude to shake the victor's grasp. Modern technology has provided the weapons which place the domination of the earth by one power within the realm of possibility, and it is only the nuclear capacity of the United States which prevents immediate conquest by Russia of those areas of the world now outside the Russian sphere. De Gaulle sabotages NATO and Nasser tells us "to drink from the sea." Sukarno is difficult and Castro is impossible. Not one of these men, however, would be the leader of an independent state today were it not for the American nuclear umbrella which, at this moment, is the only force left which the Russians (and Chinese) really fear.

As has been the case since World War II, the fate of the world in our time hinges on our ability to convince the Russians (and the Chinese) that wild bids for world hegemony would result in the complete destruction of communism. Real disarmament cannot come until such changes occur in the fundamental character of Communist political, economic, and social institutions as to make Russia and China no longer threats to the independence of free nations.

Russia is using her position as a great power to further an imperialistic program which makes the 19th-century capitalist "exploiters" so bitterly assailed by Marx look like rank amateurs. The Chinese are in an early stage of the Communist exploitation cycle, but the Russian record in the Sovietized areas of Europe and Asia, or wherever they have had an opportunity to show their true colors, is clear; Red China's attack on India and her subversive activities not only in Asia but in faraway Africa and Eastern Europe indicate that she will use the Russian methods not only to undermine Western-oriented governments but those leaning toward Moscow as well. An examination of the Russian record of exploitation not only gives us some idea of how Communists deal with the West but how they treat one another.

II

One of the earliest tricks used by the Soviets was brought into play during the closing days of World War II and during the months directly after the end of hostilities. "War booty" became the excuse for stripping Eastern Germany, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Manchuria, and North Korea of machinery, rolling stock (despite the difference in railway gages), and about anything else that it was profitable to move. In Rumania, armistice terms gave the Russians the right to requisition transportation equipment such as locomotives, tugs, trucks, barges, and freighters and much of this eventually was kept by the Soviets as "war booty." In August 1964, the U.S. delegation at the Paris Peace Conference estimated that Russian operations in Rumania since the armistice had cost that country $2 billion; by 1956, the wealth taken from Rumania by the Soviets totaled $3 billion.

In Manchuria, Russian engineers followed the army and dismantled and shipped to Siberia, by land and sea, rolling stock, machine tools, generators and the like which should have been left for the use of the exhausted Chinese. Japanese-built iron and steel plants, as well as lead and zinc factories, were pulled down and sent to Russia.

In 1946, a U.S. State Department bulletin recorded that an American reparations commission estimated direct damage to the Manchurian economy at $858 million; over $2 billion would be required to replace what had been taken. The Russians (Izvestia, Jan. 29, 1947) set the value of the loot at $97 million and justified their conduct by labeling the grab as legitimate "war booty." Soviet operations in Korea followed much the same pattern with about 30 percent of North Korea's industrial plant finding its way northward to Siberia.

Eastern Germany, as might be expected, was given a thorough shakedown. The Russians dismantled and removed equipment from 1,000 seized plants and transferred to their ownership 220 of the zone's largest to produce reparations. In 1957, one authority estimated that "the material wealth removed from East Germany to the Soviet Union * * * was in excess of $15 billion at the time it was taken away." Others have estimated that properties and goods worth $26 billion have been removed. The ruthless exploitation of this area resulted in the June 1953 uprising in Berlin.

The "war booty" gimmick worked rather well for a short time, but another angle, reparations of the more conventional type, soon was being explored. For example, according to the armistice agreement signed between the major Allied Powers and Hungary on June 20, 1945, it was decreed that the Hungarians pay a reparations bill of $300 million with $200 million of the total slated for Russia. Reparations were to be paid in goods, but their value was to be determined on the basis of the 1938 world-price level rather than the inflated one of the postwar period. This decision, in fact, more than doubled Hungarian reparations to Russia and gave the Soviets an opportunity to put on a generous front when they later agreed, at Hungarian request, to a lowering of the amount originally demanded. The Russians, of course, held the whip hand; they were in a position to define quality as well as set the prices paid for goods transferred and applied to the reparations account.

Another facet of the reparations question concerned the disposal of German and Italian assets in the former German satellite states. In a weak moment the Allies conceded to the Russians the right to obtain reparations through the exploitation of German assets in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland.

Italian assets in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary also were turned over to the U.S.S.R. but, to the dismay of the Allies, the Soviets unilaterally assumed authority to interpret and define what constituted former enemy assets; not only German and Italian properties as such but some of the holdings of the Allies which had fallen under German and Italian control during the war fell into Russian hands. The U.S.S.R. made its definition of Allied property even more flexible by demanding the obtaining payment of certain sums which firms and individuals supposedly owed the Third Reich. The magnitude of this concession by the Western Allies is indicated by the tenacity with which the Soviet Union held onto this right during the negotiations which culminated in the Austrian peace treaty.

Even more significantly, the exploitation of former enemy properties provided an opening wedge for Russian introduction of one of the cleverest operations ever utilized by any conqueror—the joint or mixed company. The assets obtained through seizure of German and Italian properties were used as Soviet contribution to newly organized Russo-Rumanian, Russo-Hungarian, and Russo-Bulgarian joint companies, supposedly financed and operated by Russia and the satellite states on a 50–50 basis. The Soviet share, in the countries where she was conceded former enemy properties, almost invariably was paid by the device of surrendering her claims to German and Italian assets in the industry concerned.

For a decade, the joint company was one of the most important tools used by the U.S.S.R. to exploit captive peoples, and it deserves more attention. Russia and Hungary, for example, were supposed to be equal partners in the management of Russo-Hungarian mixed companies, but although the chairman of any one company was a Hungarian, the Russian general manager normally ran the enterprise. The joint companies operated rent free, paid no taxes, and were recipients of other special privileges such as priorities for labor and raw materials and exemption from exchange regulations.

Obviously, the mixed companies were in position to drive strictly Hungarian, Bulgarian and Rumanian competitors out of business, and a substantial portion of the profits which accrued to Russia from these operations really amounted to a subsidy from the satellite state in which the company operated. The joint company was a diabolically clever method of transferring to Russia, with a minimum of confusion, the fruits of the labor of the helpless masses in the Soviet-dominated areas.

Substantial segments of the Hungarian oil, chemical, transportation, and mining (40 percent of Hungarian bauxite production was controlled by a joint company) industries fell under Soviet control, and Rumanian banking, oil, timber, shipping, chemical, metallurgical, and mining industries were penetrated by the Russians through the use of the joint-company device. The mixed companies accounted for half of Rumanian production (outside the field of agriculture) and included 397 commercial and industrial enterprises, 33 oil and mining firms, and 97 banks and insurance companies. The joint companies not only provided the Soviets with a source of revenue but finished a tool which was used to harness the satellite economies to the Russian.

It is not surprising that one of the major bones of contention between Russia and Yugoslavia before the 1948 break concerned Soviet-Yugoslav joint companies. On October 7, 1949, Dr. Jose Vilfan, Yugoslav delegate to the United Nations, charged that

Russia rigged the transportation charges of the joint Yugoslav-Soviet steamship company, causing a loss of $19 million to Yugoslavia in 1948. On March 31, 1949, Borba, the official Communist Party newspaper in Yugoslavia, described how the Soviet Government had forced the Yugoslavs to sell raw materials to the U.S.S.R. below world market prices and had forced Yugoslav students in the Soviet Union to pay their way in dollars.

Throughout the entire area where the satellization process has been carried out, the joint or mixed company became the standard tool of exploitation. In Eastern Germany, Albania, Sinkiang, and Manchuria, as well as in Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, it was used to advantage. It gave the Russians a toehold which made unnecessary reliance upon crude and shopworn devices such as war booty. But in the mid-1950's the U.S.S.R. started disposing of its share in the joint companies, relinquishing control, for a price, to the governments of the states in which they were operating. This phase of Soviet exploitation gradually came to an end. There was a point beyond which even complacent native stooges could not go in milking their peoples in the Russian interest.

Bulgaria and Poland furnish outstanding examples of how brotherhood in the Soviet bloc actually works. The largest new plants in Bulgaria are the Stalin chemical works and the Marx soda and Lenin metallurgical plants. Most of their production is channeled to Russia and other members of the Soviet bloc, with scant regard for Bulgaria's needs. Bulgaria's primary role in Russia's colonial empire is to produce agricultural products, but the U.S.S.R. has placed undue emphasis on heavy industry (Bulgaria has little hard coal and iron) and given too little attention to the country's traditional small-scale manufacturing enterprises.

The Russians have profited greatly from their commercial relationship with Poland. In 1946, the Soviets paid only 66,000 zlotys a ton for sugar that the Poles sold to other nations for 148,000 zlotys per ton. The lucky Russians paid their satellite only $10.70 a ton for cement that normally brought $14. Coal, Poland's most important export, sold for only $14 a ton in Russia, but the price was $18 to $19 for the same quantity elsewhere. And available evidence indicates that Russian manipulation of German reparations payments resulted in a one and one-half billion dollar loss to Poland. All told, it appears that the U.S.S.R. cheated the Poles out of over $2 billion between 1945 and 1954. It comes as no surprise that the standard of living has risen more slowly (since World War II) in the dependent states than in Russia. Interestingly enough, the some $25 million squeezed from the satellite states by the Russians just about equals the $24.6 billions the United States pumped into Western Europe during the same period (1945–56).

Soviet operations have not been limited to Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Poland. Although it is done in more subtile fashion, Russian experts manage the Czechoslovakian economy and have saddled it with an exaggerated concentration on heavy industry and agriculture. Russian experts supervise the manufacture of products destined for the Soviet Union, and the emphasis upon heavy industry makes it easier for the Russians to cut down the quantities of goods available for Czech consumption and increase the flow to the Soviet Union at prices set by the Russians.

Not only did the Russians dominate and milk the captive economies with joint companies, but the exploited peoples are forced to endure the ministrations of a horde of Soviet officials intent on remaking in the Russian image the political, economic, and social institutions of the satellite states. Indeed, a Bulgarian decree of November 7, 1950, permitted the Soviet citizens to hold controlling positions in the Bulgarian regime, thus legalizing the presence of Russian administrators who, of course, were paid by the Bulgarian Government. For years, high party officials, generals, engineers and technicians, experts in every field, infested the satellites like locusts, living on a scale to which they were not accustomed in their homeland.

Before the break with Russia, Yugoslavia counted among her minor irritations the fact that Soviet officials, paid by the Yugoslavs, were drawing salaries higher than those of her own citizens in comparable positions. Reports are persistent that Russian political, economic, and military experts are living off the fat of the land in the Soviet dominated areas, inevitably faring much better than the people they are supposed to be helping and who are footing the bill.

Russia had not only the forced labor of her own political prisoners to help build her economy, but for years after World War II she ruthlessly exploited the labor of Japanese and German prisoners of war. In 1945 Russian troops occupied Manchuria to disarm the Japanese and, supposedly, to restore the area to the control of China's Central Government. The Russians took over 1 million Japanese prisoners who were put to work on projects in the Soviet Union. Pravda facetiously made a point of recalling shattered Japanese and German dreams as follows: "Nazi and Japanese ambitions of meeting in central Asia are being fulfilled as German and Japanese prisoners of war work on railway and highway construction in Siberia."

It was announced that 800,000 Japanese prisoners were working on the new Siberian railway and on highways under construction north and south of the railroad. It later came to light that 50,000 former Japanese soldiers were mining gold at Bodaibo and that some 2,000 Japanese officers were working in various industrial plants in Leningrad.

Thus, it is not strange that the Russians were slowing in repatriating Japanese and German war prisoners. Some years ago the Japanese announced that 108,000 of their soldiers still were missing and presumed to be in Russia, while the then Chancellor Konrad Adenaur insisted that over 110,000 Germans still were held by the Soviets. The Russians have repeatedly declared, however, that all German and Japanese prisoners of war have been repatriated, except for a number of convicted war criminals. Most of the missing are dead, of course. But in all probability, German and Japanese soldiers will trickle back to their homelands for years to come, living monuments to Russia's failure to keep the repatriation agreements signed after the war.

III

Other facets of Russian imperialism are worthy of mention. Maintenance of Red army troops has been an expensive proposition for captive peoples. Russian printing presses, particularly during the months immediately following the end of hostilities, turned out worthless paper money with which Soviet soldiers were paid and which the occupied states were asked to redeem, thus providing a readymade tool for stripping conquered areas of consumer goods and, of course, setting the stage for a runaway inflation.

In North Korea, for example, the Russians immediately printed paper money, and when the inevitable inflation followed, Russian officers, as well as active Communists, reaped a rich harvest when stabilization measures, of which they had prior knowledge, were inaugurated.

The Soviets, as senior partner in the negotiation of trade agreements with their puppets, set the exchange rate of the ruble to their advantage as well as grade the goods and determine the prices which will be paid. Since the Eastern European states import over half of their basic raw materials from the Soviet Union, allocation of these products has become a powerful weapon in the hands of the Russians. True, Russia and the satellite nations have signed conventional trade agreements, theoretically as equals, but significantly enough the published portions of these agreements do not indicate prices paid or give other details as to the real nature of the exchange. The Council of Economic Mutual Assistance, sponsored by Russia, operates to perpetuate Soviet leadership, but since the Russian break with China, some of the European satellite states have been a bit more independent. Determined U.S. resistance to Soviet imperialism and the emergence of Red China as a major power have made the Russians a little more reasonable in their demands on their stooges in Eastern Europe.

While never bothering to give statistics, the Russians boast that they pay the highest prices and sell at the lowest. In order to cut satellite trade with the West and tie the Central and East European people more securely to his apron strings, the U.S.S.R. buys satellite surpluses and, if she cannot use them, markets them elsewhere, sometimes at a profit. Russia has made herself the broker for the entire region and has a stranglehold on the satellite economies which makes effective resistance to Soviet exploitation difficult.

In those areas of the Far East where the Russians have had the opportunity to throw their weight around, the pattern has been the same. For years reports filtered through the bamboo curtain that trainloads of food products were moving from China to Russia and that almost continuous famine conditions in some areas of China during the late 1950's were as much the result of Russian demands for Chinese food products as they were the result of climatic and other factors. The Chinese, desperately in need of machine tools, electronic equipment, guns, jetplanes, and oil paid high prices to the Russians for the limited quantities of these war essentials which the Soviets chose to make available to them.

The Soviets shipped to China such items as blast furnaces, flax mills, and hydroelectric plants. For a time Russian help was of such magnitude that it threatened to reduce China to a state of vassalage and promote a Russification of China's institutions unique in the long history of that country. Spare parts to keep Russian-furnished machinery in operation had to be obtained from the Soviets, and for several years the Chinese paid the salaries of an army of over 50,000 Russian technicians who gave "Little Brother" advice in practically every area of political, economic, and social life. However, in the early 1960's, ideological differences and resurgent Chinese nationalism resulted in the departure of the Soviet technicians. The Chinese recently announced that the Russians had given them no help in the nuclear-energy field since 1960, and they seem to give themselves chief credit for the technological advances that made it possible for China to explode her first nuclear device in 1964, her second in 1965.

In Manchuria, between 1945 and 1954, the Russians did a thorough job. They harnessed the Manchurian economy to their own with such Manchurian raw materials as grain, hides, and wool going into Siberia while the U.S.S.R. furnished such items as cigarettes, shoes, and breeding stock to the Chinese. Manchurian industrial plants complemented the Russian economy, and the Chinese Eastern Railway (as well as Port Arthur and Darien) were under Russian control. The U.S.S.R. also participated in the exploitation of Manchuria's coal and iron. However, in 1954 the Russians gave up their interest in the Manchurian joint stock companies, and in 1955 they withdrew their troops from Port Arthur. After ruthlessly exploiting Manchurian resources for almost a decade, the Russians, no doubt under pressure from Peking, tacitly acknowledged Chinese control of the region. The ferocity and bitterness which have characterized recent verbal exchanges between leaders of the Communist behemoths indicate that the Chinese deeply resent the way they were treated by the Russians.

Russian operations in Sinkiang followed the Eastern European and Manchurian patterns. It is reported that agreements signed between China and Russia on March 27, 1950, provided for joint companies and that half the petroleum and minerals extracted in Sinkiang went to the U.S.S.R. In Sinkiang's northern and western areas the Russians busily exploited oil, coal, gold, copper, lead, tin, tungsten, and iron reserves and these regions, while nominally autonomous Chinese Provinces, were temporarily under Soviet control.

In 1955, however, the Russians agreed to transfer to China their interest in Sinkiang joint mining companies, and the Chinese are presently building a railroad that will make their control over this area more effective. The Russians found it more difficult to exploit an ally with a population of over 600 millions. Until very recently, Red China was one of the most dependent (as well as the most belligerent) of the Soviet satellites. It is probably only a matter of time until bellicose Mao Tse-tung demands the return (from Russia) of the Maritime Provinces. (Vladiovostok is built on former Chinese territory.)

Whatever the present situation, China desperately needs Russian aid and the help of her satellites in order to continue the industrialization upon which the ultimate existence of the regime depends. For a time it appeared that the departure of either Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung from positions of leadership in their respective countries might very well result in Russia and China patching up their differences. But the fall of Khrushchev seems to have changed nothing. The split between the Communist giants is no sham affair, and it seems likely that tensions will increase as China becomes stronger. The Vietnam crisis has resulted in an attempt by the two major Communist states to present a united front, but the Russian Kosygin's recent visit to North Vietnam must be interpreted as a direct challenge to Chinese pretensions to leadership in that area.

Thus has the human and natural resources of Eastern Europe and Communist China been used in the Russian interest. Collectivization and industrialization programs which the U.S.S.R. is promoting in Eastern Europe are part of the long-range plan to make this region an integral part of the Soviet political and economic structure. The various economic programs of the satellite states are cut to mesh with Russian needs and desires. When native politicians dare to protest above a weak whisper, or otherwise fail to play the Soviet game, they soon find themselves in serious trouble. Laszlo Rajk in Hungary, Traicho Kostov and Georgi Dimitrov in Bulgaria, Rudolf Slansky and Vladimir Clementis in Czechoslovakia, Ana Pauker in Rumania, after lifetimes of stooging for their greedy Soviet masters, are dead or headed for oblivion because, for one reason or another, their destruction served Russian interests. (The Czech Communist Party, over a decade after the execution of Slansky and Clementis, rehabilitated them.)

IV

Russia not only has her way in those areas under her direct control, but to a remarkable degree, she has been able to exploit the brainpower and other resources of the free nations. A number of gifted Western scientists have been taken in by the Soviets, making it possible for Russia to profit from advances in Western technology while concealing her own from the rest of the world. Dupes of the Communists in the United States and elsewhere contribute to Communist party coffers. French and Italian Communist party members and sympathizers have been partially successful in infiltrating the political, economic, and social institutions of their respective countries. In France, Communist deputies in the National Assembly keep only a fraction of their annual salary, turning over the remainder to the Banque commerciale pour Europe du nord, a Paris banking outfit which stooges for the Russians.

The Russians have made many friends in India where they have spent over $300 million in the construction of "easily identifiable, strategically necessary, and much publicized" plants and industries. Nehru, however, turned to Britain and the United States for arms when Communist China occupied a strip of Indian territory in 1962. Indeed, the Russians are on the prowl everywhere. They use the U.N. Trusteeship Council as a sounding board to stir up trouble for the Western powers in Africa and elsewhere. The Soviets woo African students as well as others in English, French (and Russian), universities, hoping to send them back to their homelands as dedicated Communists.

In southeast Asia the Reds are making a determined bid to bring the rubber, tin, rice, copra, manganese, and other resources of that region under their control; their efforts have not been without success. Here the Chinese Communists can operate more effectively than the Russian, since small but dedicated Chinese minorities in Thailand, Malaya, Cambodia, and Laos look to Peking and constitute a potential fifth column. Undoubtedly, Chinese and probably Russian aid to the Vietcong (channeled through North Vietnam) helps keep the United States bogged down in South Vietnam.

In the Middle East the Russians are exploiting Arab nationalism and poverty in their effort to gain control of that strategic and oil-rich area. Russian imperialism still looks less dangerous to the Arabs than a dying Western colonialism. The Soviets, still hoping for warm-water ports, control of Middle-Eastern oil, and domination of the land bridge between Europe and Asia, have made particularly large loans to Egypt and Afghanistan.

Neither in the U.N. nor at other international gatherings have the Russians given any indication whatever that they visualize any let-up in the pattern of exploitation and subversion that has been described.

From time to time coexistence is the theme song of the Soviets, since present military realities pose a threat of nuclear destruction for which they have no taste. To assume that occasional smiles means that the Soviets are giving up their ultimate objective, domination of the earth, would be naive indeed. The gang in control of the U.S.S.R. applies good Leninist strategy, a pattern which Lenin explained in the follow words: "Sometimes we might have to zig-zag, retracing our steps, sometimes giving up the course once selected and trying various others." The Russians alternate the smile and the frown, but their long-range view of historical process was described by the same Lenin in these words: "We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states and the existence of the Soviet Union side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end."

The recently signed agreement which prohibits all except underground testing of nuclear weapons must be taken seriously. No avenue which might lead to a lessening of the danger of nuclear war can remain unexplored. However, we must be prepared for the probability that as soon as the Russians have completed preparations for new tests, it is quite likely that they will find an excuse for repudiating the ban. (China is not bound.)

There is no significant evidence to indicate that Lenin's successors have changed the Leninist script. To the 22d congress of the Communist Party, recently deposed Nikita Khruschev declared: "As long as the imperialist aggressors exist we must be on guard, keep our powder dry, perfect the defense of the socialist countries and their armed forces. * * * If contrary to reason, the imperialists dare to march on the socialist countries and cast mankind into * * * war, then this foolish step will be their last; this will be the end of the entire capitalist system."

Marxism (the Russian and Chinese brands of it) is the world's most reactionary force in the 1960's. There is nothing progressive about exploitation and brutality, and the Communists are using police-state methods which have been the trademark of despotisms for the last 8,000 years. Responsible conservatism and liberalism have adapted to changing needs and changing times, but the Marxists continue their adherence to rigid dogma expressed in a jargon which has lost most of its original significance.

In highly industrialized societies, most factory workers are too sophisticated and too prosperous to be convinced that the Marxian dialectic provides the ultimate explanation of world-historical process. The Communists have now turned to the underdeveloped areas, where they are exploiting poverty and ignorance and riveting new shackles for those so recently freed from Western exploitation.

There is no doubt about it. The Russians know how to use their fellowmen. Soviet or Chinese conquest of the world would mean that its human and material resources would be used to create a better life for the Russians or Chinese, or at least the privileged portions of the populations of the Communist states. At the present time the Soviets are doing an efficient job of exploiting their Communist comrades in Central and Eastern Europe but it seems quite logical to conclude that the tempo will be stepped up considerably if ever they are freed of the restraints imposed by public opinion and the military potential of the United States. Communist colonialism has replaced the old-fashioned Western brand, and since the world is gradually catching on to the shabby Soviet tricks, it is quite likely that imperialism will be the last stage of communism rather than, as the Marxists predict, the last stage of capitalism.

Again and again it has been pointed out that the struggle to prevent Communist control of the world is an attempt to save the Western birthright. Russian and Chinese imperialism are threatening the foundations of Western Christian civilization with despotisms which have not the slightest regard for the concept of rule by law, a concept which won its place in the West through sacrifices, extending over many centuries, of tens of millions of men. That amalgam described as Western Christian civilization is, in the last analysis, based upon the concept of the uniqueness, dignity, and worth of the individual.

The free and creative Greek intellect, untrammeled by the shackles of superstition and authority, was one of the earliest contributors to this ideal. Objective Roman law, the moral and ethical concepts of the Judeo-Christian heritage, and English common law played their part and contributed much toward making the individual the primary concern in Western institutional development. With this heritage upon which to build, increasingly successful attempts to make liberty the basis of human evolution emerged. The British revolutions of the 17th century and the American and French revolutions of the 18th established principles and created machinery which extended to increasing numbers of people that freedom which makes possible differentiation and the full development of the innate capacities of the individual. Russia, China, and their satellites seek to destroy this legacy and replace it with a system of values which is the negation of all that has meant progress in the past. In the Western world arbitrary rule by men was replaced with rule by law only after a long and bitter struggle; the liberties enjoyed by Americans exist because stubborn men, in generations past, have had the courage to preserve the Western heritage, against all threats, in their time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it seems particularly appropriate to me that, at a time when many Senators have been talking about whether the United States should be in Vietnam, there should be some exposition on the floor of the Senate on the question of what communism has done to other peoples in other nations.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, 145 years ago, the people of Greece began a long and bitter struggle to throw off the yoke of the Ottoman Turks and establish their independence. For centuries, the Greeks had been subjected to foreign rulers. The disunited city-states of ancient Greece fell first to the Macedonians. The Macedonians were followed by the Romans, and the Romans by the Turks. During this long period of subjugation and exploitation, however, the Greeks never lost their taste for independence, and they made every effort to maintain their cultural and commercial traditions. Thus when nationalist feelings were beginning to be kindled all over the European continent in the early 19th century, the Greeks were among the first to respond.

On March 25, 1821, the Archbishop of Patras raised the standard of revolt against the alien Turkish rulers at a monastery in the Peloponnese. The cause of Greek independence immediately caught the imagination of the American people, and expressions of support and sympathy were soon forthcoming from Government officials and communities throughout the young American Nation. But Americans could ill afford to offer the Greeks material help. Ultimately, the Greeks benefited most from rivalries among the great powers of Europe—all anxious to curb the power of the Turks, each anxious not to see the expansion of another's power as the consequence of a defeat for the Turks.

When Greek efforts faltered in the face of the far superior forces of Turkey, the Russians, French and English came to their assistance. By the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829 and the London Protocol of 1830, Greece secured her independence with the blessings of the three assisting powers.

Mr. President, the people of Greece have undergone many trials since their first days of independence. But never, during times of war and invasion, during times of civil strife, and during times of severe economic hardship and political instability, has their spirit faltered. Today, Greece is a modern nation with rapidly expanding cities, new industries, an efficient army and a far-flung merchant fleet. The people of Greece remain, as always, dedicated to the principles of liberty, independence and self-determination. It is a pleasure to join with them and with Americans of Greek descent in observing an occasion that can inspire liberty-loving people everywhere.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, today Greeks throughout the world are celebrating Independence Day. March 25 marks the 145th anniversary of the national rebirth of the Hellenes in which an enslaved people started their struggle to free themselves from the domination of the Ottoman Empire.

I join with freedom-loving Americans in paying tribute to America's many, many citizens of Greek extraction and to their independent spirit and courage on this, their day of independence.

Anyone with a sense of history can readily acknowledge the contribution that Greece has made to the development of the democratic ideals we cherish so much today.

The concept of government and democracy which was the basis of the government at Athens more than 2,000 years ago also is the concept of government and democracy we have today. The city-state methods have been altered to fit the needs of today's modern world, but the key features calling for the dignity of the individual and much of the spirit of the law experienced then have remained unchanged.

In virtually every field of our culture—not only in government—can one find Greek influence. Architecture, literature, art, philosophy, teaching are some that come immediately to mind.

Many of the very words we are using in this body today, many of the rules of procedure, many of the inspiring contributions in the entire life cycle of man have come from the creative and spirited Greek mind of both the past and the present.

Freedom did not come easy for Greece 145 years ago and it has not been easy for Greeks to maintain that freedom since that first March 25 Independence Day celebration. Greece's position on the map—so strategically situated in the Mediterranean Sea, near Turkey, near Russia, near the very gateway between Europe and Asia—has placed the Greeks time and again in the middle of armed conflicts which have done great harm to the economy, the culture, and the social structure of this gallant country.

However, neither the oppression of the Ottoman Empire nor the armies of Hitler and Mussolini failed to dampen the well-known Greek spirit.

After World War II, when the rest of Europe started rebuilding itself, Greece became involved in an attempt at a Communist takeover, not unlike what we are witnessing on a larger scale in Vietnam today. War broke out in the towns and hamlets, but the Greeks managed to stave off Communist aggressors, and today it remains a free and living symbol of democracy practically at Russia's front door.

Greece is one of our most valued and trusted allies, and its participation in NATO speaks highly of its intent to remain on our side and to remain free.

Americans everywhere owe much to the Greek people who for centuries have helped mold and contribute so much of what we have and what we use today. I am happy to join in honoring the more than one and a half million Americans of Greek descent as well as Greeks throughout the world on this occasion of their Independence Day.

Locally, in Utah, all of us are proud of our large Greek community which has contributed so much to the civic and economic betterment of our State. I would like to add my tribute to those Utahans of Greek descent whose influence is so widely felt in so many aspects of the community life.

The Independence Day celebration in Utah this year will be held Sunday, March 27, in the Hellenic Memorial Building, where a number of events are scheduled. I would like to add my congratulations and best wishes to the Greeks of Utah and the country today.

THE LIBRARY: CORE OF CONSCIENCE AND COMMUNITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention was recently directed to a speech delivered by Dr. Samuel B. Gould, president of the State University of New York, entitled, "The Library: Core of Conscience and Community."

This lecture was the eighth annual Mary C. Richardson lecture delivered at State University College, Geneseo, N.Y.

In this session, the Education Subcommittee will be considering library legislation in connection with S. 3046 and 3076. Dr. Gould's thoughtful presentation can be, I feel, most helpful to Senators interested in these bills and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks, together with a short bibliographical paragraph concerning Dr. Gould and informational paragraphs relating to the Mary C. Richardson lectures.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY: CORE OF CONSCIENCE AND COMMUNITY

(By Dr. Samuel B. Gould)

I

I find a double honor in tonight's occasion. First, there is the privilege of visiting the College at Geneseo officially for the first time, a pleasure to which I have looked forward for many months. And no less of an honor is the opportunity of offering the Mary C. Richardson lecture. As to the latter, however, I must say that after seeing the list of lecturers in other years, I approach this assignment with considerable diffidence. It was rash of me, perhaps, to accept the invitation, but I could not forgo the possibility of talking about my favorite subject—libraries.

You will forgive me, I hope, when I tell you I cheated a little in preparing this talk by looking back to what some of the previous lecturers have said. And when I did, I quickly found that they had very brilliantly taken care of whatever ideas I had. Even the introductory idea I had anticipated using was preempted by Dr. Evans last year. You will remember that he began by pointing out what he called the "revolution in the world today," and by showing its changing characteristics.

For my part, since I, too, thought I would talk about our changing civilization, I was ready to begin by telling you of Nicholas Murray Butler's insistence that in the Garden of Eden, Adam paused at one point to say, "Eve, we are living in a period of transition." Well, I shall have to find another introduction and another idea, even though I still look at Dr. Evans' theme somewhat covetously.

II

Let me say as strongly and as categorically as I can that I believe the library is the most important element not only in a university but in a community as well. A university cannot rise to greatness without a great library, nor can a community develop in intellect and conscience unless it provides to its citizenry the fullest and freest access to the historical, social, and artistic record of the past and present. So far as the State University of New York is concerned, the development of its library system is to me a task equal in primary importance and in priority to the development of its faculty, for one cannot be strong without the complementing strength of the other.

My interest in and my love of libraries are intensely personal. They come out of the experience of my childhood and early youth, and perhaps illustrate the tenor of my remarks tonight.

The first 15 years of my life were spent in a relatively small community in Connecticut, a town of about 10,000 inhabitants, typical of most New England small towns. Saturday night was a gala shopping night on the main street, the parade on Decoration Day (as we called it) was a major and thrilling event in our lives, we agonized over the unpredictable achievements of the high school football team, and we were familiar with every path and running brook in the countryside that surrounded us. We were a polyglot community, and racial or religious intolerance were vague shadows rarely apparent. There was an aristocracy of a few families who ran the factories and lived in what seemed like palatial houses on the hill above the town, but they, too, were vague shadows. Local elections had an excitement akin to a world series, and we would stand outside city hall on election night, transfixed by the drama of rising and falling fortunes of candidates as the ballots were methodically tallied. It was all simple and unsophisticated, I suppose, but it was Americana of a pleasant and fine sort.

Yet, there was one very atypical element of this community—its library. The lovely old building and most of its books had been the gift of a local benefactor, and the maintenance and progress of the library were matters of great pride. It became the center of my life as a boy.

My first contact with books occurred before I had even seen the library. I was 4 years old and in bed with the measles. My sister brought me two books from the children's room of the library, and within a day I was learning to read. I can still remember the joy I experienced in handling those books even while I could look at only their pictures. The same joy touches me today each time I pick up a new volume; and though I have nothing but praise for the movement toward paperbacks, I confess that my heart never warms to them. To me there is something happily different and esthetically satisfying in the texture of a read, hardcover book.

As soon as I was eligible for a card, I began to use the library itself, and when I grew older it became a place where I spent hours every day in its stacks. The librarians all knew me, and I suppose they used to laugh at my avid consumption of books. But they were also interested enough to guide my reading, and understand enough to give me free range of every room. By the time I left at 15 to go to college, I think I had read or skimmed through virtually everything the library possessed, no matter what the classification. And, assuming that it is still basically organized the same way, if I were to go back to that library today after all these many years, I believe I could walk unerringly to any stack for whatever book I wanted. Far more important, the foundation for any sensitivity to human values which I may have I owe to those hours and hours of reading. I keep remembering Emily Dickinson's simple statement:

> "He ate and drank the previous words
> His spirit grew robust;
> He knew no more that he was poor,
> Nor that his frame was dust.
> He danced along the dingy days,
> And this bequest of wings
> Was but a book. What liberty
> A loosened spirit brings."

III

I have bored you this long with personal reminiscence only because I think it illustrates what a library can mean in a community. And in these changing times, with the stresses of modern life touching our youth just as much as our adults, the importance of the library becomes even more significant to all. Our new and exciting gadgets of communication, fascinating as they may be, are not a substitute. Indeed, when intelligently used, records and films and television can stimulate reading rather than stifle the desire for it. It is still possible, and all the more esential, to inculcate in the young child good reading habits and a love of books.

As other facilities in a community become more crowded, the library has increased responsibility as a quiet haven for the individual. Granted that there are difficulties in providing facilities and personnel for added numbers of library users, the basic goal of service to the greatest possible number cannot be forgotten or altered. What makes this goal all the more crucial is the vast amounts of leisure time with which our citizenry are soon to be blessed or cursed, depending upon how such time is occupied. We are in some ways reaching the point of ancient Greek civilization where the citizen devoted himself creatively to political, cultural, and intellectual matters while a slave class performed all the necessary and more mundane affairs. In our civilization, however, it will be the machine rather than a slave class that will do our bidding. We shall be freed from much drudgery, but the question of what we shall then become remains largely unanswered.

Our libraries should be looking ahead to this not-so-distant day, and should be formulating the kinds of broad plans which can assure us that the new leisure society will be intellectually and artistically productive. In every community there should already be some organization or committee of planners who are beginning to address themselves to this overarching problem. They should examine recreation and continuing education and performing arts and scientific or technological invention, but at the heart of all this they should be examining the library of the future.

Even today one of the major indices of library effectiveness is the degree to which it is involved in the life of the community. I have already asserted that the library is a prime force in inculcating reading habits in the very young and have tried to illustrate out of my own experience how important this is. You could undoubtedly match my story many times over. But there are other kinds of involvement that have within them sound and responsible aspects of leadership, that reflect a concern for civic problems, and that make the library a vibrant factor in community development.

Let us take, for example, some of the most pressing problems facing the State of New York, problems which will take years to solve and will require, besides the citizen's attention, literally billions of his dollars as a taxpayer. We can think immediately of mental health, education, water pollution, and conservation of natural resources, to name only four.

The library has the responsibility for keeping its constituency informed on all these issues. There should be special collections gathered out of its book and periodical resources, adequately publicized and readily available, and reflecting the many and conflicting points of view. There should be picture exhibits to accompany these collections, and lecture series organized and arranged by the library and preferably held within it. The library should be the first place to which the citizen turns naturally and expectantly for information, and the librarian should be far ahead of him in knowing what he will require.

The community librarian should be writing and speaking regularly to his constituency about the problems of the day and how to learn more about them—in bulletins, in the local newspapers, on radio and television. He represents the intellectual consciousness of the entire community. It depends upon him as to whether citizens will arrive at hasty or ill-conceived conclusions on problems affecting their region, the State, and the country, or whether they will have been thoroughly prepared by fact and discussion to influence a decision intelligently.

In similar fashion, the library is the tinderbox for striking the spark of interest in cultural growth within a community. It must give leadership in stimulating the fine and performing arts, not through its own efforts alone, but with the cooperative involvement of cultural and performing arts organizations as well as the active assistance of any college or university nearby.

Here in New York, with colleges in every part of our State, there is an unusual opportunity for mutual participation and sharing of the burden. I assure you that, so far as the State university is concerned, every one of its campuses will welcome the possibility of being a partner.

Perhaps I am being vehement about all this because I suspect that libraries and librarians are too often content with a passive role in these matters. Whether out of fear or shyness or essential conservatism, they tend to hang back and let others take the initiative, assuming there are others. Many times, however, there are no others, and so the leadership stands vacant and the opportunity remains unmet. So much can be done for the prestige of librarianship itself when its representatives become community leaders by the very nature of their profession and the sensitivity of their concern. Young people, seeing such possibilities for service and involvement, will find a new attraction and a new desirability in entering the profession.

What I am pleading for is a new and forward thrust in the whole conception of a library's function and in the dynamic potential of those who staff it. Working together with our more formal institutions of learning, the library has a crucial problem to solve, a crucial community growth to foster, a crucial leadership to give.

Books are admittedly among our most priceless attributes of civilization, and libraries are the means to their use and influence. But as old "Copey" of Harvard used to say, "A man is always better than a book." The library that works actively with men and women whom it can attract and make into citizens conscious of their power, will be assuring the world that it is doing much more than providing books. It will be making better men for the new society we require, perhaps even for the Great Society of which President Johnson speaks.

IV

Thus far we have been considering the library as the core of a community, truly an important mission. But we should give equal consideration to the library as the core of conscience, perhaps a mission of even greater implications.

The first part of this mission is that of creating and nurturing a respect for intellect. This is not so simple and obvious a task as might appear, for we are living in times when there is unusual suspicion and mistrust of intellect and the intellectual. As a nation we show too many signs of placing intellectualism and subversiveness hand in hand. It seems impossible to convince some people (all too many people) that one can love his country deeply, be proud of its history and achievements, be ready to give his life for it, and still be critical when it falls short of its ideals or its promise.

There seems to be some mysterious comfort for us to keep repeating to ourselves like Candide that we are the greatest of all possible people in the best of all possible worlds.

Yet in our hearts we know we must give our very lifeblood, if necessary, to protect the completeness of the freedom by which our universities and libraries flourish and achieve excellence. And we know, also, that we must think carefully about the elements of freedom and how we use those elements, lest we find ourselves guilty of equating freedom with irresponsibility and thus indulging ourselves and encouraging others in license.

We cannot emphasize too often these days the necessity for complete and absolute academic freedom for the scholar and a similar sense of freedom for the lay citizen. We live in a time when the clash of ideologies have shaken the foundations of our constitutional beliefs insisted upon and defended so fiercely by Jefferson and his contemporaries as well as by many statesmen of modern times.

Every decade has brought forth crises that challenge these beliefs, that tempt us, perhaps in the interests of temporary peace of mind, to relinquish a small portion of our freedom to believe or to discuss or to explore. Ultraliberals and archreactionaries alike, representing opposite poles of political and social philosophy, steadily test our willingness to adhere to the fundamental principles of the Bill of Rights.

It does not matter that some aspects of the philosophies of these people may be repugnant to us as individuals. Under such circumstances we cannot afford to forget that the denial of this freedom to any person ultimately threatens the freedom of all of us. We cannot and must not permit any corrosion of the spirit of inquiry as a value in the free world and most particularly in America.

Libraries are as much threatened by anti-intellectualism as are universities, in the books they are allowed to choose and circulate and the free exchange of ideas they are allowed to encourage. They must be alert to the dangers and unequivocal in their opposition to pressure. You will recall John Milton's ringing sentence in the Areopagitica:

"As good almost kill a man as kill a good book: who kills a man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but who destroys a good book kills reason itself."

Another part of the library's mission as the core of conscience lies in the preservation of individual dignity. The unrelenting bustle of our world and the incessant pressures to make of man a manipulative animal who can be persuaded and cajoled into buying or believing anything combine to attack man's dignity and privacy. As a human being, he is so hemmed in by his fellows wherever he turns, so constantly led to a rejection of any solitariness or silence, that when he finds himself, by some mysterious magic, alone and in a place of peace, he is restless and unhappy. Some inner sense makes him long for moments of privacy, moments when he can meditate and determine some measure of balance between the life of the marketplace and that of the mind. But he is either fearful of this inner sense or deaf to its urgings. He has long since adjusted himself to what he thinks is inevitable—a scrambling, cacophonous, mechanistic, and intensely gregarious world.

August Heckscher describes the significance of this so well when he says:

"It is clear, I think, what all this means for individuality—for man as he is himself, with his own being and his eternal soul. To be inescapably in association with one's fellows, to be jostled by the crowd—to flee and find there is no way of being saved; to stand and find that one is in the midst of the great mass; this is to lose one's identity. Privacy becomes a concept out of the past. Solitude becomes an empty hope. For reasons both subjective and objective modern man feels himself increasingly invaded and diminished by numbers. He moves between a state of crowdedness which alarms him and a state of emptiness which depresses and bores him."

As a consumer, man and his habits are studied as though he were caged as part of a controlled experiment. As a voter or citizen of the community, he is the target of artfully contrived publicity and public relations campaigns designed to fill his mind with preconceptions before he has any opportunity to analyze what he hears or sees or reads. A great conforming fence is built round him over which he dares not climb for fear of endangering his material progress.

The conditioning process that makes and keeps him docile and even eager to fade into a conglomerate anonymity has long been underway in our society. A century ago, Emerson said, "Things are in the saddle, and ride mankind." There is no indication today that "things" have been unhorsed. On the contrary, mankind has become an even more willing burden bearer.

What happens to the essential dignity of man under such circumstances? Is he so far down the road in his headlong dash that nothing or nobody can rescue him or even call to him?

Only through doorways to the mind and the soul is there any hope for escape from these clamorous and grasping attributes of our lives. Nor are all these doorways in our formal institutions of learning. They are to be found in other places as well, and are established by other means. Among the most important of these is the library—not only a sanctuary where man may think and learn and refresh his soul, but a constant reminder to him that he can use all that mankind has thought, accomplished, won, or been if he but takes the trouble to go where it awaits him. And this will happen when there are men and women who can guide him while he is there, men and women who have the rare quality of understanding humane needs and the equally rare gift of fulfilling them.

Such a person was Mary C. Richardson, in whose name this lecture is given. I have been honored by this privilege you have granted me tonight.

MARY C. RICHARDSON

The eighth annual Mary C. Richardson Lecture was presented by Dr. Samuel B. Gould in honor of Dr. Richardson's outstanding contribution to the training of school librarians at Geneseo. Mary C. Richardson was head of the library education department at Geneseo from 1920 to 1940. Under her capable leadership, the curriculum for the training of school librarians at Geneseo evolved from a 6 to a 36 semester hour program and the student body enrolled in library education grew from 10 to 150 members.

Dr. Richardson attended the State Normal School, Castine, Maine; received her bachelor of arts degree from Wellesley College; attended New York State Library School; received her master of education degree from Harvard University and her doctor of education degree from New York University.

Dr. Richardson is presently retired and lives in Wellesley Hills, Mass.

DR. SAMUEL B. GOULD

Dr. Samuel B. Gould, president of the State University of New York, has had a long and notable career as an educator. Prior to being named president of the State University of New York, he served for 2 years as president of channel 13, the educational television station in New York, as chancellor of the University of California at Santa Barbara from 1959 to 1962, and as president of Antioch College from 1954 to 1959.

As chancellor at Santa Barbara, Dr. Gould guided the transition of that college from a 4-year liberal-arts institution to a general university offering advanced degrees in the arts and sciences and professional programs in education and engineering. At Antioch, he is remembered for his unique contributions to that institution's "work education" program and for the responsible role students were encouraged to play in the administration of the college.

THE FORTHCOMING SENATORIAL ELECTION IN NEBRASKA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the February 20, 1966, issue of the Chicago Tribune there appeared an article by Willard Edwards entitled "Johnson Pits Reluctant Dragon Against Nebraska Political Foe."

This article calls attention to the fact that the administration is making Senator Curtis their No. 1 target in the 1966 congressional election. Their determination to defeat Senator Curtis is based upon the leading role which he played as a member of the Senate Rules Committee in attempting to expose the shenanigans of Bobby Baker.

It is ironical to note that at the same time the administration is launching an all-out campaign to reelect the chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, who led the whitewash brigade.

Senator Curtis is a great American and a great public servant, and I am confident that the good people of Nebraska—Democrats and Republicans—will not allow this statesman to be purged because he insists upon honesty and integrity in government.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Johnson Pits Reluctant Dragon Against Nebraska Political Foe—Uses Governor in Attempt To Beat Curtis

(By Willard Edwards)

Washington, February 19.—When President Johnson listens to the congressional election returns next November 8, it's a certainty that he will frequently demand:

"What's the latest on the Senate in Nebraska?"

A race is shaping up for the Senate seat in the Cornhusker State which promises to be not only the most exciting and closest political battle of its history but one with portentous implications for the entire Nation. Johnson's interest will be intensely personal as well as political.

SENATOR FACES GOVERNOR

The two contestants are Senator Carl T. Curtis, a Republican seeking reelection to a third term, and Gov. Frank B. Morrison, a Democrat completing his third 2-year term as Governor.

Morrison, by general agreement, could have won reelection to an unprecedented fourth term as Governor but was induced by the President to attempt the unseating of CURTIS. He is reported to have been solaced with the promise of an appointment to the Federal bench if he fails.

Both men are 60 years old. Both are highly respected, intelligent, and competent, skilled in the art of pursuing votes, and aggressive exponents of differing political philosophies. A veteran Senator, familiar with the capacities of the two candidates, remarked unhappily:

"Whoever wins, a good man will lose. Neither party has a surplus of officeholders of this caliber and it's too bad that one of them has to be sacrificed to a party leader's campaign of vengeance."

PUSHED INTO RACE

The party leader, of course, is the President who has pushed Morrison into the race as the only Democratic candidate who could possibly defeat CURTIS in Nebraska.

CURTIS earned Johnson's enmity by his relentless probing of the scandal involving Bobby Baker, the Senate secretary who accumulated $2 million while serving under Johnson as Senate majority leader. Bobby, Johnson once said fondly, was the last man he saw at night and the first one he saw in the morning. The Baker case, many of its ramifications still undisclosed, remains as a threat to Johnson's reputation in the pages of history.

ONE OF FIVE ON BLACKLIST

CURTIS was one of five Republican Senators placed on a White House blacklist last fall because of their outstanding resistance to Great Society designs. One of the five, Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Wyoming, decided to retire, giving Johnson a victory by default.

The President has seemingly failed in his efforts to remove three of these rebels from the Senate by persuading powerful Democratic candidates to gamble their careers in races where victory was uncertain.

In Iowa, Gov. Harold E. Hughes, the strongest Democratic vote-getter in the State's history, rejected White House overtures to run against Senator JACK MILLER, the Republican incumbent.

CONNALLY DECLINES BID

In Texas, Gov. John B. Connally declined to run against Senator JOHN TOWER, who is seeking a second term as the first Republican Senator since Reconstruction days. This GOP invasion of his home State has long rankled the President.

In South Carolina, Senator STROM THURMOND remains virtually unchallenged by any Democrat of vote-pulling authority as he seeks reelection as a Republican. THURMOND is a special White House target because he resigned from the Democratic Party in September 1964, at the height of the presidential campaign, declaring Johnson a traitor to the principles upon which the party was founded.

Only in the case of CURTIS, of Nebraska, has the President succeeded in lining up a Democrat of demonstrated political power to forsake the security of almost certain reelection to the post he now holds to attempt the ouster of an incumbent Republican Senator.

CURTIS BUCKS TRADITION

For Morrison, the sacrifice was a little more substantial because the gubernatorial term in Nebraska has just been lengthened to 4 years and he was conceded to be a virtual shoo-in if he ran. On the other hand, current polls taken by both parties show him trailing CURTIS in public estimation as a candidate for the Senate. He is bucking State tradition. No Nebraska Governor has been directly elected to the Senate. The last Nebraska Democrat in the Senate was Edward R. Burke in 1934.

In a talk with Morrison, when he visited Washington last December to see President Johnson, this writer sensed a very reluctant Senate candidate. With engaging candor, Morrison had confessed to reporters earlier that the subject of a judicial appointment came up in his discussion with Johnson, and some of his friends think that the donning of judicial robes is his idea of an ideal climax to a distinguished career.

His apparent reluctance seemed to be evident as he long delayed an announcement that he would clash with CURTIS. He did not disclose his candidacy until February 11 and the decision was a closely guarded secret until then.

CHARGE DECISION DICTATED

Nebraska Republicans did not mince words in charging that the decision was dictated from the White House. The delay, they said, also gave Lt. Gov. Philip Sorensen the inside track for winning the Democratic nomination for Governor. Sorensen is the youngest brother of Theodore Sorensen, former aid and biographer of the late President Kennedy.

"The Governor has succumbed to pressure from the national administration," said Walter Witthoff, State GOP chairman. "His arm was twisted to the extent that he was forced into a race he did not want to make and which he cannot win."

FIRED THE SHOTS

For President Johnson, defeat of CURTIS would almost be recompense for his frustrations in an attempted purge of MILLER, TOWER, and THURMOND, the other three GOP incumbents who aroused his ire. In the Bobby Baker investigation, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, was the man who provided much of the ammunition, but CURTIS was the ranking minority member of the Senate Rules Committee who fired the shots in the group's inquiry.

It was CURTIS, for example, who exposed and fought the planned death of the investigation in March 1964, leading to its continuance and expansion and the revelation of more charges of fraud in connection with Baker, the Johnson protege. CURTIS did not hesitate to mention the President's accumulation of a fortune during his political career when he commented on the Baker scandal and the Billie Sol Estes case. He called it the mystery of a $14 million fortune built up from nothing at all by a man who has spent his entire life in government service and public office.

NOTICE OF UNVEILING OF STATUE OF THE LATE SENATOR CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on March 31, 1966, at 2 p.m. in the rotunda of the Capitol, the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez will be unveiled. Senator Chavez was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from 1931–34, and a Member of the U.S. Senate from 1935 until his death in 1962. He was a friend and a colleague to many of us here today. During his 32 years of dedicated service, Senator Chavez played a large role in the transformation of our Nation and New Mexico. A grateful Nation and constituency will gather on March 31 to pay this man honor. On behalf of Mrs. Dennis Chavez and the New Mexico congressional delegation, I would like to extend an invitation to the Members of the Senate to attend this auspicious occasion.

REBECCA LATIMER FELTON, FIRST WOMAN U.S. SENATOR

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the first woman to serve in the Senate of the United States was a Georgian. She was Mrs. Rebecca Latimer Felton, who was born near Decatur, Ga., and who was very active during her lifetime in political affairs of the State.

There appeared in the March 23 edition of the Atlanta Journal a column written by Mrs. Bernice McCullar, one of the State's most noted educators and historians, which traces the life and career of Rebecca Felton and recounts the circumstances of her being appointed to serve in the Senate, thereby becoming the first women to sit in this body.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. McCullar's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGIA NOTEBOOK: FIRST WOMAN IN U.S. SENATE GOT ASSIST FROM GEORGE

(By Bernice McCullar)

You never can tell what will happen at commencement.

A 17-year-old honor graduate in Georgia, many years ago, married the commencement speaker, and teamed up with him to upset political tradition in Georgia and set old and staid politicians quaking in their boots.

Rebecca Latimer Felton also went on to become the Nation's first woman U.S. Senator. For 1 day.

She had been born in Decatur in 1835. Her father, the postmaster, read the newspaper when it came in by stagecoach, to the villagers. She listened, little dreaming that one day thousands of Georgians, in the remotest rural areas, would be eagerly awaiting the mailman bringing the newspaper that contained her own column.

She went to Madison Female Academy, graduating in 1852. The speaker she married in 1853 was Dr. W. H. Felton of Cartersville, also a farmer. They farmed in Etowah Valley, had a newspaper, lost their first two babies, refugeed before Sherman, and buried two more babies from a shack near Macon.

They returned to their valley just before the bloody battle of Chickamauga, where 37,000 Americans were killed or wounded. She helped nurse them while her husband doctored. Seeing them gave her a lifelong horror of war.

In 1874, when Georgia was revolting against the "Bourbon cliques," Felton decided to run for Congress. She helped him. They made fun of her. One editor printed this jingle:

"Some parsons hide behind their coat
To save their precious life;
But Parson Felton beats them all;
He hides behind his wife."

But another editor wrote, "Thank God for her. We need more wives helping their husbands bear the burdens of life."

The Feltons crusaded against the convict lease system under which big planters and mine owners were able to rent convicts for a dime a day. Three companies in which powerful politicians owned stock, leased hundreds for 20 years, agreeing to pay the State $50,000 in 20 annual installments.

The Feltons also crusaded against liquor and for women's rights. He won. Later, he lost his congressional seat, but went to the Georgia Legislature. The Feltons helped unseat the regular Democrats and elect a farmer (William Northen, of Hancock County) Governor.

After the doctor died, Hoke Smith, who owned the Atlanta Journal, hired the 65-year-old widow to write a column in his paper. She wrote it from 1899 to 1920. She kept a horse and rider near her door to send the copy to the train when necessary.

Her column became enormously popular. Georgians wrote her about everything from advice to the lovelorn to which candidate to vote for. One man who had 78 grandchildren wrote her about how to rear them.

She became the most powerful and influential woman in Georgia. Tom Watson was her friend and colleague, though sometimes they disagreed.

She had an opinion—some people called it meddling—about everything under the sun. She crusaded for diversified crops, lower prices on fertilizer, less debt, and more sobriety. She defended lynching.

She opposed Wilson and the League of Nations. She helped elect Tom Hardwick Governor and Tom Watson senator. Hardwick appointed her, at 87, as U.S. Senator. The gallant Walter George, named to the regular term, stood aside for a day so she could make history: The first woman in the U.S. Senate.

Said she, "The women of this Nation have cause to rejoice this day. A door that was closed to them has been opened." She came back home to Cartersville, died in 1930, at 95. Not many people remember her. She would be annoyed at that. Once her name was on every tongue, a household word in Georgia. Thus with mortal fame.

DODGE CITY AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, yesterday's Wall Street Journal carried an article which I believe merits the attention of all of us who are here to serve and represent the people of these United States.

Because it tells of the impact of our involvement in southeast Asia on the everyday life of Dodge City, Kans., it may perhaps be more personally meaningful to those of us who represent that great State in the heart of our Nation. But, Mr. President, the impact of Vietnam on Dodge City is the impact of Vietnam on towns and cities throughout this country. As the article's headline states, "Dodge City Illustrates War's Growing Impact at Grassroots Level."

In citing, for instance, the reaction of the townspeople to the death of Sgt. Frank Sanchez, Jr., a helicopter crew chief hit by Vietcong fire, it relates:

> The soldier hadn't lived here for 10 years and few people remembered him. But the funeral mass at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church was packed and flags with mourning streamers flew all over town. "All at once Frank was everybody's buddy."

Reported here are instances of reactions to shortages, delivery difficulties, the draft—some petty, some noble—all human.

The one topic on which I receive the most mail is our Vietnam commitment. The same, I am confident, holds true for every office on both sides of Capitol Hill. I have been trying, and I am sure others have been, reading these letters and trying to answer them as time permits. It is not easy. I cannot answer all the questions. It is not always enough to explain why we are there or the importance of honoring our commitments. People are concerned, and deeply concerned, I believe, because they are confused by earlier optimistic pronouncements from the administration and by unclear policy and seemingly indecisive performance in southeast Asia.

It is not my intention to suggest any solutions. Let me simply say that this article made a deep impression on me and, in urging my colleagues to read it, I ask unanimous consent that "Vietnam's Shadow: Dodge City Illustrates War's Growing Impact at Grassroots Level," by Everett Groseclose be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 24, 1966]

Vietnam's Shadow: Dodge City Illustrates War's Growing Impact at Grassroots Level—Its 14,000 Residents Worry About Draft, Shortages, Mourn Victim of Vietcong—Hard-to-Get Guitar Strings

(By Everett Groseclose)

Dodge City, Kans.—The jungles of Vietnam are approximately 9,500 miles from this "cowboy capital" on the monotonous Kansas plains. But the war isn't a remote skirmish to Dodge's 14,000 residents.

"Six months ago it was inconceivable that we would ever feel Vietnam's effect here," drawls First National Bank President Dean R. Young. "But now we're getting one jolt after another."

One jolt came last month. Sgt. Frank Sanchez, Jr., became the town's first Vietnam casualty when the helicopter on which he was crew chief was hit by Vietcong fire. The soldier hadn't lived here for 10 years and few people remembered him. But the funeral mass at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church was packed and flags with mourning streamers flew all over town. "All at once Frank was everybody's buddy," says a boyhood chum, Robert E. Campbell.

BEATING THE DRAFT

Death, however, isn't the only thing that's bringing the war closer. Talks with scores of Dodge's citizens make clear that Vietnam is rapidly sifting down to grassroots America in all sorts of ways. Local merchants and manufacturers cope with late deliveries and manpower shortages that they attribute to the Asian war. Younger men play a new "game"—how to beat the draft. And some businessmen fear the war's cost will mean a tax boost soon.

"It's Korea all over again," laments Burel Rice, head of Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.'s Dodge City district.

Take a stroll through downtown Dodge, where narrow red brick streets still remind a visitor of the raw frontier town it once was, and where three automobiles can create a traffic jam. At Jay P. Scholle's cafeteria on Gunsmoke Street (named for TV's "Gunsmoke," whose locale is Dodge) coffee-break conversation turns as often to Vietnam as to cattle prices and the paucity of rainfall.

Confusion abounds over certain points of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. But advocates of a U.S. pullout are hard to find. "We may not understand everything that's going on," says Bill Ridgway, executive director of the local chamber of commerce, "but we're certainly patriotic."

SO MAD I COULD SPIT FIRE

The local Elks Club has mounted a write-a-soldier campaign; for a while, it listed in the Dodge City Daily Globe the names and addresses of the area's soldiers serving in Vietnam and urged citizens to write them letters of encouragement and support. Mrs. Richard E. Speirs, a physician's wife, organized her church circle and bridge club to send packages of food, toiletries, and candy to men fighting in Vietnam. "We just can't do enough for those soldiers," says Mrs. Speirs, whose daughter is married to an Army paratrooper. "The attention those draft card burners have gotten makes me so mad I could spit fire."

But "patriotism" takes several forms around Dodge City.

Students at the town's two small colleges recently donated 200 pints of blood for the wounded in Vietnam, twice the goal, but most of the males are showing an uncommon seriousness toward their school work—apparently to lessen their chances of being snatched by the draft. The Dodge City High School junior class recently sent packages to GI's in Vietnam but at the moment, says class sponsor Helmut Schmeller, who also teaches foreign languages, "the biggest concern is with the junior-senior prom—not Vietnam."

The local Ford dealer, H. M. Skaggs, Jr., complains that military priority on truck production is cramping his operation. "I've had five four-wheel-drive pickups on order for periods ranging from 30 to 60 days," he says, "and I still don't have an inkling of when to expect them." Park Eckles, a partner in Eckles Department Store, says: "6 months ago we could get delivery on bedsheets in a month; now it's taking 4 months because so many are going to the Government."

DAMNED IRRITATED CUSTOMERS

Over at Harms' Music Store, owner Howard B. Harms tells how some customers "get damned irritated" when he explains that Vietnam war demands are delaying orders. "Lightweight guitar strings are almost impossible to get; it's the same type of wire used in instruments for jet planes," Mr. Harms says. "And oboes—I've had seven on order for 6 months." The silver used in the musical instrument's keys "is the same material used in the firing pins of some rifles," he adds. A nearby high school band which ordered three copper kettle drums from Mr. Harms gave up after waiting 6 months for delivery; it got prompt action on plastic substitutes.

The most noticeable pinch, however, comes from the military's ever-growing manpower needs. While this is typical across the country, it's more evident in smaller towns such as Dodge because when Johnny goes marching off to war, everybody is sure to know about it.

This month the Dodge City draft board has summoned 28 young men for their physicals; March of last year it tapped only 6. Volunteer enlistments are up, too. In his second-floor office in the post office building, Navy Recruiter B. D. Legg relaxes to the beat of a radio blaring the Vietnam-inspired ballad, the "Ballad of the Green Berets."

"My business is great—just great," says the Navy man. "Vietnam is making my work easy. This month we're enlisting 13 boys from Dodge; we have 30 boys wanting to go for every 1 that we can take." Most, he concedes, are enlisting in the Navy to beat being drafted into the Army.

Across the way at the courthouse, Mrs. Ralph E. Oringderff, the area's Red Cross representative, has seen her workload pick up sharply. Part of her job is acting as liaison between servicemen and their families. But she also has a personal interest in how the war goes. Just the other day her younger brother left for the Army. And her 26-year-old husband, serving his first term as county clerk of Ford County, of which Dodge is part, is subject to the draft.

"I'm scared green they'll draft Ralph because he's so disgustingly healthy," Mrs. Oringderff says with a sigh. "It could just ruin us; I can't even watch pictures of fighting and wounded soldiers on television anymore." Recently the couple bought a new $20,000 house.

Mrs. Terry L. Hamilton, 19, already is experiencing the drastic changes the draft can bring. When her husband, a well-paid machinist, was drafted, she had to give up their apartment in Dodge and move back home with her family at Ensign, a hamlet west of here. "It really hurt us financially," Mrs. Hamilton reports. "I thought I was supposed to have a (dependent's allotment) check the first of February, but I just found out that I wouldn't be getting anything until Terry's out of boot camp."

To Eugene A. Conrardy, who farms 960 acres east of here, the drafting of his son Donnie poses what he considers a serious threat to the family's livelihood. Like many other small farmers in these parts, Mr. Conrardy has sought to supplement his income by working regularly at an off-the-farm job—in his case at a local metal shop.

"If the wheat comes on strong I'll be sunk," says Mr. Conrardy. "I won't have anybody to run my combine because Donnie did that. So it's either quit my job in town or hire someone to do the farmwork, and you just can't get dependable farm help."

Already, Mr. Conrardy says he has had to abandon his practice of leasing pastureland to graze cattle. "I was running 500 head a year," he says, "but when Donnie left, I had to let them all go. It's hopeless."

Even as they enjoy boom times, the handful of small factories along Dodge City's "manufacturer's row" on the southeast edge of town are becoming increasingly concerned about Vietnam.

HIGH COST OF TRAINING

A visitor finds R. H. Curtis, president of Curtis Machine Co., bending over a drafting table designing a new combination of gears for a gearbox the company produces. Five of the concern's 35-man work force have been drafted in the past year. "These days if applicants are eligible for the draft, we won't even bother to see them," Mr. Curtis says. "Our people cost too much money to train."

Mr. Curtis frets about rumors of priorities being placed on steel and machine tools. "If there are priorities," he says, "the guys with the Government contracts will get all the equipment." The shirt sleeved executive also complains that a stretchout of deliveries is causing his company mounting problems. Steel bearings, castings and even grease seals are in short supply, he reports.

Down the street, Speed King Manufacturing Co., a maker of conveyer systems, ordered a new milling machine the other day and "We were told we wouldn't get it for 6 months," says R. Nathan Massey, chief engineer. "A few months ago we would have had it within a month."

Three of Speed King's 98 employees have gone into the military in the past year, "and we're having trouble replacing them with satisfactory help," according to Mr. Massey. If the draft is extended to include young married men with children, the plant would stand to lose its head machinist, shipping foreman, head draftsman, and two top salesmen. Adds Mr. Massey with a touch of sarcasm: "We lost a couple of workers to those so-called defense jobs," in which workers are often declared essential to the defense effort and thus avoid the draft.

Some employers are taking it upon themselves to try to help keyworkers avoid military service. Polkinghorn Feed Yards, Inc., a large cattle fattening operation on Dodge's east side, recently paid an attorney $100 to draw up affidavits for prominent citizens to sign that would attest to Polkinghorn's hardship if one of its employes was drafted.

A "TOUGH" DRAFT BOARD

The local draft board—known as a tough one—turned down the appeal and the employee went off to Kansas City for his physical. But for Polkinghorn the story still had a happy ending; the employee flunked the medical exam and he's back at work inspecting cattle for disease.

Vietnam also is bringing some changes at the town's two colleges. At St. Mary of the Plains College, a 4-year institution, enrollment usually sags at the end of the first semester. This year, however, enrollment held steady at 619 students, mostly men. Sister M. Cecilia, St. Mary president, says, "Obviously, it's the threat of the draft that's keeping them in school."

The college did suspend five male students for disciplinary reasons, raising a local ruckus. Says Dean of Men Donald R. Barber: "We got more criticism over that than for anything we've ever done. Everybody said we were throwing those boys to the wolves—you know, the draft."

Students at St. Mary and at Dodge City Community Junior College, a 2-year school, are jittery about reports that some students will lose their draft deferments unless they make high grades. Recently a rumor swept through the junior college that the drafting of students was imminent. "One student hit the panic button and went down and volunteered," says Orville Kliewer, the college's dean of admissions and registrar.

Vietnam accounts for 7 of every 10 letters written to the Washington office of Republican Congressman Bob Dole, who represents the Dodge City area. A year ago, Mr. Dole says, wheat allotments and tax matters made up most of the mail. Now, he says, the letter writers "want to know what's going on" in Vietnam and "when it's going to end." He adds: "They're about evenly divided between escalation and negotiation."

In addition, "more inquiries about farm deferments are coming in," he says. "Farmers and ranchers are writing that they don't think it's right to draft a man who's got a big investment in land and equipment—and then not take the college boy who has nothing invested and is hanging on in college by his teeth." For Mr. Doyle's constituents, Senator William Fulbright's recent televised hearings aimed at clearing the air on the Vietnam issue apparently haven't meant much, the Congressman says. "Many say they're more confused now than ever," he reports. "I'm even confused."

WHO'S FOOTING THE BILL ON THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 23, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] asked in a Senate colloquy just where the big money is coming from to push the Dirksen amendment. As Senators know, the high-priced and high-powered California public relations firm of Whittaker & Baxter is being retained by undisclosed forces to promote the Dirksen amendment which would overrule the Supreme Court's defense of equality of citizenship in its reapportionment decisions.

The Milwuakee Journal has now joined in my colleagues' call for disclosure of the source of the funds being used in this massive effort to lobby the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Journal's editorial of March 14, entitled "Who's Footing This Bill?" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Who's Footing This Bill?

Senators Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, are asking legitimate questions: How much is being spent to drum up support for the fight against the one-man, one-vote concept and by whom is it being contributed?

This assault on the democratic apportionment of legislatures is not in the public interest. Senator Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois wants States enabled to apportion one house of their legislatures on a basis other than people—square miles, cows, motels, pine trees, or what have you. To that end he organized the Committee for Government by the People—a deliberately misleading title for a group trying to rule out government based on people. And he named himself president. Then he hired Whittaker & Baxter, a public relations firm with some success in furthering political causes of all kinds, to handle the campaign. The firm opened a suite of Washington offices, hired a full-time local lobbyist and has begun distributing literature over the country.

All of this costs money, probably big money. It is an effort to override a Supreme Court ruling that legislatures must be apportioned on a "one-man, one-vote basis." The public has a right to know who is behind it all. Dirksen owes it to the people to tell them.

NATIONAL MILK SANITATION LEGISLATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the voting delegates of Land O'Lakes Creameries at their annual meeting on Friday, March 1, 1966, passed a number of resolutions—one of which is of particular interest to the dairy farmer and dairy industry in the State of Minnesota.

Resolution 11 wholeheartedly endorses and supports the national milk sanitation legislation, which I introduced in the Senate with Senators Nelson, Proxmire, McCarthy, Burdick, Inouye, and Moss last year.

I am most appreciative, as I am sure my colleagues are, of the support of the Minnesota delegates, and ask unanimous consent that Resolution 11 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 11, the National Milk Sanitation Bill

The national milk sanitation bill was designed to provide for the free flow of milk between States under standards provided by the U.S. Public Health Service in Washington. Such regulations should be the same throughout the United States.

We reaffirm our endorsement and support of the national milk sanitation bill. This bill has much national support particularly through the associations of public health officials. This support is evidence of the fact of the bill's reasonableness. We believe that because this is true the move to pass such legislation has already considerably improved the situation in the marketing of milk. We believe also that the U.S. Public Health Service is one organization which is eminently qualified to provide and promulgate standards for pure and wholesome milk in all uses in the United States.

We thank our Congressmen and Senators who have supported this bill for their support and again urge passage of this proposed legislation at the next session of the Congress. In particular we urge the Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and adjoining States in which Land O'Lakes operates, to make an all-out effort to secure passage of this bill in order that interstate commerce, with reference to milk, shall be simplified and the standards shall be uniform to all persons.

SEAWAY ROBBERY ONCE AGAIN—A PLEA TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON TO SUPPORT HIS OWN STAND AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, those of us who have a special concern for the welfare of the consumers of the Nation were encouraged and heartened by a message earlier this week from the President urging action by all sectors of the Government and the economy to act and make decisions in the interest of consumers. The President stated:

> Every domestic program of the Federal Government in a very real sense is directed toward the consumer.

Of particular importance in the President's message was the expression of the exceptional importance to the interest of consumers of maintaining a stable purchasing power protected from dangers of inflation. The President stated:

> The success of our efforts to bring full prosperity to the American economy has sharpened the challenge of maintaining price stability. * * *
>
> That environment of stability is strengthened whenever responsible action is taken on prices and wages. * * *
>
> It is strengthened when businessmen lower prices to share the benefits of lower costs and rapid productivity gains.

For the consumers of Alaska the single most important factor in maintenance of a stable and productive economy is the amount of money shippers have to pay for the cost of transporting commodities to point of use in Alaska. Our State is almost wholly dependent on maritime transportation of every commodity needed for daily life in Alaska.

The maintenance of reasonable freight rates is, therefore, absolutely essential to development and, indeed, the survival of Alaska.

Unfortunately, throughout the history of Alaska as a territory and, now a State, Alaskans have been the helpless victims of ever-increasing costs of water transportation. Since passage of the Jones Act in 1920, Alaska has been uniquely discriminated against, its development delayed, and its people impoverished by the arbitrary imposition of one freight rate increase after another by Seattle-based water carriers in the Alaska trade.

Now the Alaska Steamship Co. has called for yet another increase in the rates it charges for transportation of commodities to Alaska. I have been informed by the Federal Maritime Commission that the Alaska Steamship Co. has filed a tariff, which would be effective April 8, 1966, to increase by 15 percent all rates and charges on cargo moving between Seattle, Wash., and Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Juneau, Haines, Skagway, and Sitka. Coincidentally with this inflationary demand for higher rates, the Alaska Steamship Co. has also announced it has refiled a tariff recently denied by the Federal Maritime Commission which would increase general cargo rates by 10 percent to the northwestern areas of Alaska, including Bristol Bay, Nome, Kotzebue, and the Bering Sea areas. The tariff recently denied by the Commission also included a 20-percent increase on cannery cargo—cans, cartons, and salt used in the salmon canning process—and a 10-percent increase on southbound canned salmon products from all areas of Alaska.

These increases proposed by the Alaska Steamship Co. constitute a crippling blow to the infant and struggling economy of the new State of Alaska. If allowed to go into effect the economy of the State will immediately suffer the damage resulting from embedding in the cost of doing business in Alaska the increased tribute to the Alaska Steamship Co. for the necessary service of transporting necessary commodities to the State. The cruelly increasing cost of living in Alaska will rise to new heights while burgeoning prospects for progress will be stifled again.

The action of the steamship company in announcing a rate increase to southeast Alaska is particularly inexcusable at a time when the same carrier has announced a decrease in service to Wrangell and Petersburg, Alaska. While community leaders in southeast Alaska have been expressing their serious need for improved service, this announcement of increasing costs together with lessening service is depressing news, indeed.

The increases announced are particularly unconscionable since this Alaska Steamship Co. continues to maintain its traditional monopoly of the trade to Alaska in the very areas where increased rates are to be inflicted.

Until the summer of 1964, the Alaska Steamship Co. was virtually the only water carrier in the Alaska trade. It methodically eliminated competitors from the trade by methods so ruthless the company was once the subject of a criminal and civil antitrust complaint filed by the Department of Justice—a complaint dismissed on grounds that the Federal Maritime Board had jurisdiction over the matter and that it was not one to be adjudicated by the courts in the absence of Maritime Board action. No action was ever taken by the Federal Maritime Board even in the face of obvious evidence of unjustifiably monopolistic practices, and Alaska Steamship Co. continued its rule of the Alaskan waters.

However, in the railbelt area of Alaska, the Alaska Steamship Co. has recently found itself in unprecedented competition with other carriers and in this region of the railbelt of Alaska, we have seen a gratifying halt to the general trend of increases in freight rates over the years before. Significantly, the company asks for no increase in rates to the railbelt.

However, in western Alaska and in southeast Alaska where Alaska Steamship Co. is still a monopoly carrier, steamship rates have risen and continue to rise. The worst experience has been in the northwest region where it is estimated the level of freight rates has increased by 20 percent since 1960. The southwestern ports of Alaska have shown an upward trend of 12 to 13 percent increases in the same period.

In southeastern Alaska, where Alaska Steamship Co. would now impose another 15 percent, rates have increased by 12 to 15 percent since 1960.

The people of Alaska will have no faith in the noble words of the Presidential message on the protection of consumer interest if increased rates now demanded by Alaska Steamship Co. are allowed to go into effect. If it is the President's intention that inflation be controlled, no better case exists for demonstration of this intent.

As it happens, another occasion on which the Alaska Steamship Co. called for a scandalous increase in freight rates occurred in January 1960 at a time when President Eisenhower had recently made his state of the Union message. In that message of January 1960, President Eisenhower made a strong plea for prevention of economic inflation and said:

> We must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home.

At that time I took the floor of the Senate to express the same plea to President Eisenhower for control of inflationary freight rates I now express to President Johnson.

Despite the stated purpose of the administration, of which President Eisenhower was the chief, to prevent inflation, the Federal Maritime Board overruled a contrary decision of a hearing examiner and rubber-stamped the Alaska Steamship Co. rate increase it demanded in 1960.

Since 1960, a new agency, the Federal Maritime Commission, has been established. The record of this new Commission, reorganized by President Kennedy, and under the chairmanship of Adm. John Harllee, indicates that the people of Alaska may hope for more enlightened and effective regulation of freight rates than could have been anticipated under predecessors of this agency. The new demand by the Alaska Steamship Co. presents the Federal Maritime Commission with a fine opportunity for the demonstration of the highest possible standards of regulatory procedure and action.

I believe the Commission will recognize the challenge presented to it by this action of the steamship company and it is my fervent hope it will act in the interest of the consumers of Alaska.

The record of the Federal Power Commission in halting rising costs of natural gas to American consumers resulting in refunds of more than $650 million and reductions in gas costs by $130 million annually was cited in the President's message yesterday as an example of the kind of constructive contribution to consumer welfare that can be made by a consumer-oriented regulatory agency.

I commend this example to the attention of the Federal Maritime Commission and I hope that agency will take the opportunity now before it in the Alaska Steamship rate case to implement an equally progressive regulatory policy.

Meanwhile, the State of Alaska has entered a formal protest. I ask unanimous consent that the petition for suspension and investigation of proposed rate increases, presented to the Federal Maritime Commission by Warren C. Colver, attorney general, and George L. Benesch, assistant attorney general, be printed in the RECORD.

Before the Federal Maritime Commission, Petition for Suspension and Investigation of Proposed Rate Increases

(Submitted by State of Alaska)

(Proposed tariff effective Apr. 8, 1966, State of Alaska, Capitol Building, Juneau, Alaska.)

(Date of protest, Mar. 18, 1966, by Warren C. Colver, attorney general, George L. Benesch, assistant attorney general.)

Comes now the State of Alaska by its attorneys and protests the increases in rates issued by Alaska Steamship Co., on March 7, 1966, to become effective April 8, 1966. More specifically the State protests and requests suspension of the following tariff changes:

"Alaska Steamship Co., tariff No. 832; FMC–F No. 114, eighth revised page No. 1 effecting a general increase of 15 percent on all rates and charges named in tariff FMC–F No. 114 excluding southbound cargo loaded by shippers to carrier's 24-foot containers."

In support of its petition the State of Alaska represents and shows:

1. That this proposed tariff revision will place a 15-percent surcharge on all freight moved north to southeastern Alaska by Alaska Steamship Co.

2. That, as to some items in tariff FMC–F No. 114 such a surcharge constitutes a rate increase upon a recent increase or proposed increase. Effective December 23, 1965, Alaska Steamship Co., increased its penalty rates in this tariff on trailers over 30 feet in length (item 230). This increase in item 230 was allowed by the Commission and, in effect, increased rates on such trailers over a range of from 6.2 to 53.0 percent, depending on length and destination. This matter was discussed at length in the State's protest of December 31, 1965. A 15-percent surcharge on top of this prior increase will yield an aggregate increase on item 230 ranging from a low of 22.1 percent to a high of 76 percent.

Effective December 29, 1965, the previous rates applicable to item 375 were canceled with the notation that class rates will apply. The effect of this revision varies as to different commodities and destinations, but apparently all commodity rates were increased thereby. The maximum commodity increase was 24.5 percent. An added 15 percent surcharge will provide an overall increase since December 28, 1965, of 43.1 percent.

On March 1, 1966, Alaska Steamship Co. issued rate increases in tariff FMC–F No. 114 affecting items 265, 295, 300, 310, and 640. These items relate to commodities shipped north in Alaska Steam's seasonal trade. These item rates were reduced on February 10, 1966, by Alaska Steam in compliance with the Commission's final order in docket No. 969. The aggregate increase as to these items will range from a low of 20.1 percent (item 300) to a high of 21 percent (item 295). These increases totally defeat the purposes of the Commission's order in docket No. 969.

3. That on December 31, 1965, the State of Alaska protested the rate increase of December 23, 1965, effected in item 230 of tariff FMC–F No. 114; and on March 15, 1966, the State protested the proposed increases of March 1, 1966, to items 265, 295, 300, 310, and 640 of tariff FMC–F No. 114.

4. That a 15-percent across-the-board rate increase will in turn increase the cost of living and cost of doing business in southeastern Alaska, an area where the level of such costs are already much too high. The end result will be detrimental to the people, the economy of this area, and to Alaska Steamship Co. itself. In January 1966, Alaska Steam curtailed its service to Petersburg and Wrangell which had been called weekly by C1–MAV–1 vessels. Such vessels now call biweekly at these ports. On the off weeks vans of fresh produce and mail are unloaded at Ketchikan and transshipped via the Alaska ferry. For commodities other than produce, however, this 50-percent reduction in service necessitates substantial increases in inventory and storage facilities, increases delay time in obtaining goods, parts, etc., and contributes to loss of retail business to other communities including Seattle. Now, coupled with a 15-percent surcharge in freight rates, these two communities will be staggered by increases in costs. In essence the cost of transportation (as provided by Alaska Steam) may well exceed the value of service received.

5. Alaska Steam points out that it has not received a general rate increase since 1960 while attendant operating costs have risen substantially. This contention is no doubt true as far as it goes. However, standing alone, it presents a distorted picture. The company has periodically increased rates on individual items by reclassification or direct rate changes. A piecemeal approach to rate increases can be very effective. Furthermore, it is more difficult to detect than an across-the-board surcharge and much less susceptible to protest and suspension. Although operating costs have no doubt risen since 1960, this may easily have been offset by increasing tonnage and attendant increasing total revenues. Alaska Steam had made no effort to disclose to the State to what extent this may or may not be true. However, there is little question that the population of southeast Alaska has increased substantially since 1960 and that its economy is much stronger today than it was 5 years ago. For example, population estimates for 1964, prepared by the Alaska Department of Labor, show a population increase over 1960 in the Ketchikan area of 1,272 (13 percent), Petersburg-Wrangell, 668 (16 percent), Sitka 1,259 (19.1 percent), and Juneau, 2,133 (22.3 percent). Employment in southeast Alaska continues to rise steadily. In the short period 1962–64, average annual employment rose 9.3 percent in the Ketchikan area, 14 percent in the Petersburg-Wrangell area, 13.6 percent in the Sitka area, and 14.9 percent in the Juneau area.

6. Alaska Steam's competitive position in southeastern Alaska is substantially that of a monopoly. However, this is not true of its position in the Railbelt trade where competition is severe. There is every indication that Alaska Steam proposes to support its allegedly noncompensatory Railbelt rates at the expense of southeast Alaska. The recent individual item rate increases capped by the proposed 15-percent surcharge; the discontinuance of Tacoma rates; and the curtailment of service to Petersburg and Wrangell all tend to confirm this reasoning. In addition, on March 1, 1966, the new Alaska Railroad Tariff No. 74, ICC F–40 went into effect. In its answer of February 19, 1966, to petitions requesting suspension and investigation, the Alaska Railroad represented this joint Alaska Railroad-Alaska Steam tariff as containing "at least as many reductions as it does increases in rates." The inferred net effect is no increase in these overall rates and possibly a decrease. However, Alaska Steam has stated that it is suffering an operating loss in this Railbelt trade. The subsidy conclusion is inescapable.

7. In the past, including 1965, there has not been a complete separation of the southeastern service from the southwestern-railbelt service of Alaska Steam. Ships have frequently called at ports in both areas on the same voyage. The allocation of expenses and revenues of such combined voyages would have considerable influence on the extent of total profit or loss in each area, which in turn bears directly on the reasonableness of the proposed 15-percent rate increase in southeastern Alaska.

8. Alaska Steamship Co., is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Skinner Corp. The same corporation also owns the companies which provide terminal services for Alaska Steam at Seattle (Alaska Terminal & Stevedoring Co.) and at Ketchikan, Juneau, and Cordova, Alaska (Ketchikan Wharf Co.). In turn Alaska Terminal & Stevedoring Co. may now own a controlling interest in Arctic Terminals, Inc. which furnishes containers, vans and associated land carrier and temperature control equipment to Alaska Steam. Alaska Trainship Corp. which serves between Whittier, Alaska, and New Westminster, British Columbia is a subsidiary of Alaska Steamship Co. The Lomen Commercial Co. of Nome is a division of Alaska Steam. This intertwining owner relationship between carriers and their servicing agents raises a number of questions as to proper allocation of expenses and revenues and use of funds. A review of these matters is essential to a determination of the reasonableness of the proposed 15-percent freight rate increase.

9. If the proposed 15-percent surcharge had been in effect during the calendar year 1965, Alaska Steam estimates that its gross revenues would have been at least $650,000 greater. Similar with-and-without projections for 1966, based on expected 1966 tonnages apparently have not been made. However, it is a reasonable expectation that the upward trend in southeast Alaska's economy will continue through 1966 which will in turn generate greater tonnages than in 1965. In addition the estimate of increased 1965 revenue (even assuming it to be correct) does not take into account the late 1965 and early 1966 item rate increases recently effected and to which the 15-percent surcharge would be pyramided. Therefore it should be expected that the 15-percent increase will bring in added revenues substantially exceeding $650,000 in 1966.

In the final analysis, the ultimate consumer pays this increase. There is no way of safeguarding his interests once such increases are collected.

Wherefore, the State of Alaska respectfully requests the Federal Maritime Commission to suspend the proposed general 15-percent rate increase in tariff FMC–F No. 114 and initiate an immediate investigation of the lawfulness of such a surcharge.

Respectfully,

Warren C. Colver,
Attorney General,
State of Alaska.

George L. Benesch,
Assistant Attorney General,
State of Alaska.

VERIFICATION

State of Alaska, *ss.*

Warren C. Colver, being first duly sworn on oath deposes and says: That he is the Attorney General for the State of Alaska and is the person who signed the foregoing petition for suspension and investigation of proposed tariff rate increases; and that he has read the petition and that the facts set forth therein are true.

Warren C. Colver.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of March 1966.

Goldeen R. Goodfellow,
Notary Public in and for Alaska.

My commission expires January 4, 1968.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon the following party of record in this proceeding by mailing via airmail, postage prepaid, a copy to such party in sufficient time to reach such party on the date the document is due to be filed with the Commission.

Alaska Steamship Co.
Seattle, Wash.

Dated at Juneau, Alaska, this 18th day of March 1966.

Warren C. Colver.

TRACKING DISEASE UNDERGROUND

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the publication, Medical World News of March 25, 1966, carries an article entitled, "Tracking Disease Underground," which I believe to be an excellent in-depth study of Federal research into the chest diseases which plague coal miners.

The article represents outstanding research and observation by Reporter John M. Blamphin of the magazine's staff. It reviews the work carried out by the Public Health Service among coal miners in the areas surrounding Beckley, W. Va.

I am happy to have had a role in initiating this study because my early life was spent living with miners and having first hand knowledge of the dangers to their health. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee which votes funds for the Public Health Service, I have been able to secure additional funds for the study in fiscal year 1963, 1965, and 1966.

Because of the importance of this work, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Two Public Health Service doctors in blue overalls and hard hats with miner's lamps climbed into the low-slung gondola car of the entrance to the Layland coal mine near Beckley, W. Va. The little train lurched through the small square opening in the barren hillside and disappeared down the narrow tracks into the chilly darkness.

Drs. Hawey A. Wells, Jr., and William Lane, pathologists with the PHS Appalachian Coal Miners Research Unit, crouched low in the car, as beams from their lamps reflected off the jagged walls of the 9-mile entry tunnel to the bituminous drift mine. They were on their way into the mine to see for themselves the conditions that lead to coal workers' pneumoconiosis, a troublesome disease, characterized by shortness of breath on exercise, that forces many miners to quit work years before retirement.

Through its Division of Occupational Health, the PHS is now plowing more than half a million dollars into research on the disease, hoping to find its cause and means of preventing it. One of the most exciting leads has come from the work done by Dr. Wells, Chief of the Beckley Research unit, and Drs. Lane, Werner A. Laqueur, and others at the Beckley Appalachian Regional Hospital.

They have good evidence that soft-coal pneumoconiosis, unlike classic silicosis with which it is often confused, damages the vascular system of the lungs and leads to pulmonary hypertension and eventual right heart failure. This discovery, Drs. Wells and Laqueur reported at the International Academy of Pathology meeting in Cleveland, may turn out to be a valuable contribution to the understanding of pulmonary physiology as well as lung diseases such as emphysema that is caused in air pollution.

Two miles into the hillside, the little train carrying the two doctors came to a grinding stop. The doctors climbed out, stooping to avoid the top of the 6-foot-high tunnel. A few feet down the track, a miner was guiding a steady stream of dusty coal from a conveyor into gondola cars. He told the doctors that he had been doing the same job for 27 years. His face was black from the fine coal dust, and he wore a mask. But the mask, he admitted, "don't do no good, just makes it even harder to breathe."

The doctors did not have to examine him to know that this miner, like many others, had coal workers' pneumoconiosis. In fact, a recently completed survey of Appalachian coal miners, conducted by PHS' occupational health division, revealed that in 1 out of 10 working miners, the disease is advanced enough to show on X-ray. In addition, one of every five inactive or retired miners has pneumoconiosis, and Dr. Wells believes that many more have it in early stages, before the lesions can be detected radiologically.

For 2½ hours, Dr. Wells and Lane crawled on hands and knees along a coal vein that in some places were no more than 36 inches high. They watched the dust kicked up as a long, low electric miner, with an auger 2½ feet in diameter, corkscrewed its way through the vein, pulling out coal and feeding it onto a conveyor. They looked on as human miners stuffed dynamite into solid rock to blast loose tons of coal and stone.

Coal miners' pneumoconiosis, the doctors point out, is characterized mainly by shortness of breath upon exercise. The miner has coughing spells and his sputum is usually coal-stained. An invariably fatal complication is progressive massive fibrosis of the lungs. The lungs of a miner who has spent most of his life at the coal face are virtually black with coal dust.

The question whether pneumoconiosis results from coal dust or silica in rock dust has remained unresolved in this country. Britsh and German studies implicate coal dust. Since the 1930's, when the problem became serious, little effective work has been done on it, in large part because of public apathy toward the problem and the unwillingness of the industry to admit that coal dust was killing off its miners.

Pneumoconiosis first received serious scientific consideration by the PHS in 1963, when Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat, of West Virginia, pushed for more research on the problem and secured a $100,000 appropriation for the PHS Division of Occupational Health to begin its coal studies. The projects, headed by Dr. George H. L. Dillard, of the Division's research and training facility at Cincinnati, include prevalence studies in Appalachia and Utah, a study of death rates among coal miners, and, in cooperation with the United Mine Workers of America, studies of mine conditions.

Perhaps the most productive project is the work being done at the Beckley research unit. Scientists there are trying to prove that pathologically and clinically, pneumoconiosis is basically a disease of the vascular system of the lungs. They believe that the causative agent is coal dust, but they are not ruling out silica as a possibility. If they can prove that the basis of the disease is vascular, they expect to be able to develop a diagnostic procedure that would reliably identify it in the early stages, before the breathlessness appears.

The day after their trip through the mine, Drs. Lane and Wells stood in the X-ray room at the Beckley hospital and watched as Dr. Lawrence Cohen threaded a 125-centimeter-long catheter through the right median cubital vein of 47-year-old Earl Stafford, a miner for 30 years. Dr. Cohen, a cardiologist and at that time a member of the PHS coal study team, pushed the thin, hollow tube through the right atrium and ventricle into the right pulmonary artery and up to the pulmonary-capillary wedge. He took a pressure reading to rule out disorders of the left side of the heart, then positioned the catheter in the pulmonary artery, where it would remain for later pressure readings.

Minutes later, with the catheter in place and hooked to a pressure transducer, the miner sat in a chair in the pulmonary function room while Dr. Cohen and Dr. Donald L. Rasmussen, a pulmonary physiologist, took readings. They measured pulmonary and systemic pressure, cardiac output, blood gases, and CO diffusion capacity, and took a vectorcardiogram. Then Stafford straddled a bicycle ergometer and pedaled vigorously for 6 minutes while the two physicians repeated their measurements. As expected, the vectorcardiogram shifted to the right during exercise, indicating increased right heart work and pulmonary hypertension.

The relationship of increased pulmonary blood pressure to exercise was discovered almost by accident about 2 years ago, Dr. Rasmussen notes. At that time, Dr. Harold Draper Warren, a cardiologist, was working with vectorcardiography at the Beckley hospital. Studying coal miners, he found that during exercise, the vectorcardiogram shifted unexpectedly to the right, indicating that the right heart was meeting some resistance as it pumped blood to the lungs. But when the patient rested, there was no shift.

He mentioned his finding to Dr. Albert D. Kistin, chief of the hospital's division of medicine. A noted cardiologist, Dr. Kistin had done a pioneering epidemiologic study that showed a correlation between development of pneumoconiosis and years spent in the mine. Dr. Rasmussen and the two cardiologists catheterized a miner with pneumoconiosis and found that his pulmonary blood pressure did indeed go up as the vectorcardiogram shifted to the right during exercise, but returned to normal when the miner rested.

This was the first time that abnormalities in the pulmonary vascular system had been associated with coal workers' pneumoconiosis. More important, it suggested the possibility of using vectorcardiography in screening coal miners for the disease and getting them out of the mines before it was too late.

The Beckley researchers will continue catheterization of pneumoconiosis patients to prove the reliability of vectorcardiography. So far, they have studied 22 patients. Drs. Kistin and Warren are no longer directly associated with the study.

Now it is up to Drs. Wells and Lane, as well as Dr. Laqueur, who is chief pathologist at the Beckley Hospital, to prove that coal dust and perhaps silica have an abnormal effect on the cardiopulmonary system. Their theory is that coal dust—or silica—too fine to be filtered out with a mask is breathed into the miners' lungs. The particles are absorbed into lung tissue where they collect in and near lymphatics surrounding the arterioles. This tissue becomes fibrotic. A black cuff of coal-impregnated tissue wraps around the arterioles, restricting the vessels from their normal pulsatile movements. The result is pulmonary hypertension on exercise.

The pathologists are now conducting autopsy studies comparing heart mass and pulmonary vascular resistance in coal miners and noncoal miners. Dr. Laqueur has perfected the methods used to dissect the heart and inflate the lungs. He dissects the heart into its left and right halves by unrolling the myocardium into one long length of muscle and cleaving through the septum.

By weighing the separated ventricles of normal hearts, he found that they conformed to the established ratio of 1.4 to 1.0 between left and right. A ratio decrease to 1.2 to 1.0 indicates that there was definite right heart failure. In the study of 150 coal miners' hearts, Dr. Wells reports, "We have found that 40 percent had right heart hypertrophy." Right heart failure was the cause of death in about one-third of the 150 miners.

The second part of the pathology study is an attempt to show that miners' lungs offer greater resistance to blood flow than do nonminers' lungs. To demonstrate this phenomenon, Drs. Wells and Lane have built a large rectangular Plexiglas vacuum box in which they place the lungs from a coal miner, with the bronchial tubes open to room air. The pulmonary artery is attached to the right side of the heart, which is in turn connected to a heart pump.

As air is pumped from the box, the lungs expand. Then a respirator inflates and deflates the lungs at near normal respiratory rates while the heart pump sends blood through the vascular system at known flow rates.

The pathologists concede that they cannot compare this setup to normal living pulmonary physiology. "What we hope to do," says Dr. Wells, "is show an increased resistance curve in the lungs of coal miners as compared with persons dead from other causes."

No one expects this proof overnight. Anticipating that it will take several years, the Division of Occupational Health wants to move most of the project to Morgantown, W. Va. It would be called the Appalachian Facility for Occupational Respiratory Diseases and would have the support of the medical school and the new environmental health center to be built there. Some of the research will probably still be carried out at the Beckley Hospital.

A good reason for moving, says Dr. Dillard, chief of the coal studies, is that the whole project must be expanded before it can have any real effect on the pneumoconiosis problem. More basic studies are needed, such as Dr. Robert G. Burrell's work, in Morgantown, on the immunology of lung diseases. Practical engineering studies will have to be carried out to develop more effective ways of screening out the small coal dust particles. And standards will have to be set for dust control within the mines.

Meanwhile, men like Earl Stafford—stricken with coal workers' pneumoconiosis when he still has 8 years to go before he can collect his $100 a month retirement pension—will not get better. "I went to the doctor in July and had my first chest X-ray," Stafford recals. "He hold me I had rock dust in my lungs. You see, I run a motor and I've got to get out and walk around cars and I just plumb run out of breath. If it doesn't get better, I'm going to have to quit. If you can't work, the company doesn't want you."

CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I recently had the opportunity to read an excellent article on reapportionment by the distinguished political scientist, Dr. Robert H. Horwitz. I was much impressed with its analytical clarity and depth of insight. Dr. Horwitz reminds us that the Supreme Court's apportionment decisions and the subsequent State reapportionment activities have potent ramifications that greatly transcend the question of rural versus urban interests, to which the whole reapportionment debate has too often been reduced.

Mr. President, I recommend this article by Dr. Horwitz to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Case of the Malapportioned Decision: Reapportionment in the State of Hawaii

(By Dr. Robert H. Horwitz)

I. INTRODUCTION

Speaking from his office on the evening of March 9, 1937, President Franklin D. Roosevelt sought the support of the American people for his bold proposal to secure a new balance or apportionment between liberal and conservative Justices on the Supreme Court of the United States. Not only, argued F.D.R., did the majority of judges then serving on the Court fail to represent the will of the American people; even worse, the Court "has been acting not as a judicial body, but as a policymaking body," and in so doing had called into question the ability of the legislative branch of Government to meet "squarely our modern social and economic conditions."[1]

Unwilling to wait for a change of views by the "nine old men," F.D.R. proposed to "reapportion" the Court, to change its composition, and thereby to induce necessary improvements in its institutional operation. Young, progressive judges, whose outlook would represent the current aspirations of the American people, would be added in sufficient numbers to outvote the "reactionary oligarchy" and thus restore the Court to its proper relationship with the other branches of Government:

"I will appoint Justices who will act as Justices and not as legislators—if the appointment of such Justices can be called "packing the Courts"—then I say that I, and with me the vast majority of the American people, favor doing just that thing."[2]

F.D.R. had never been more wrong. The reaction to his "Court-packing" scheme revealed that the vast majority of the American people regarded the Court with a degree of respect approaching sacred awe. Fortunately for the New Deal and the unity of the country as a whole, the "Court-packing" issue was cut short by an adverse report of the Senate Judiciary Committee which quickly killed the scheme. The Senate committee understood better than an understandably impatient President the critical importance of institutional integrity and stability in the American constitutional system. The Senate committee contended that:

"Inconvenience and even delay in the enactment of legislation is not a heavy price to pay for our system. Constitutional democracy moves forward with certainty rather than with speed. The Constitution of the United States provides ample opportunity for the expression of popular will to bring about such reforms and changes as the people may deem essential to their present and future welfare. It is the people's charter of the powers granted those who govern them.[3]

"Even if every charge brought against the so-called reactionary members of this Court be true," argued the committee, "it is far better that we await orderly but inevitable change of personnel than that we impatiently overwhelm them with new members."[4] By this action, the Senators maintained the institutional integrity of the Court, as well as traditional relationships among the several branches of government.

With the "inevitable change of personnel" of which the Senators spoke, the Court became very modern and progressive indeed. Paradoxically, it was gradually to become an institution of government greatly cherished by those who had sought to reduce its power in 1937.

Only a quarter century after F.D.R.'s unsuccessful attempt to pack the Court a younger Supreme Court found itself in a position strikingly similar to that faced by the Senate committee in 1937. "The wheel has come full circle." The reapportionment cases confronting the Court, especially since the 1962 session, raise claims which parallel the charges made by F.D.R. in 1937: claims in this instance that American State governments are not able to deal with modern social and economic conditions, such as education, transportation, and housing. Why this failure? Because, runs the charge, moss-backed, rural legislators improperly dominate State legislatures. The charge is stated in a familiar vein by the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers as follows:

"Since World War II, the explosion in city and suburban population has created intense local problems in education, transportation, and housing. Adequate handling of these problems has not been possible to a large extent, due chiefly to the political weakness of municipalities. The situation is directly attributable to considerable underrepresentation of cities in the legislatures of most States."[5]

Or, as more succinctly stated by H. L. Mencken, "The yokels hang on because old apportionments give them unfair advantages."[6] However stated, the charge is that rural reactionaries have been blocking progress, that a nonrepresentative minority has been preventing the passage and implementation of much-needed, modern, social legislation and is thereby thwarting the will of an overwhelming majority of the American people.

The U.S. Supreme Court, which earlier had been subject to these very charges, has now been asked to provide relief from a comparable alleged malfunctioning of another branch of Government, despite the fact that a long line of distinguished Supreme Court Justices had found that problems of State legislative apportionment lay outside the Court's jurisdiction. By reversing a long-established position in *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Court invited students and practitioners of government to evaluate its institutional prudence and competence in the light of its handling of this extraordinarily delicate, important, and complex matter. How far has the Court been guided in the reapportionment cases by the lessons of the "Court-packing" plan and by the understanding of American government expressed by the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1937?

It may be granted that a serious apportionment problem existed in many State legislatures and that there appeared no imminent prospect of relief outside of the U.S. Supreme Court. It nevertheless remains the case that ours is a federal government in which State legislatures, some of which are older than the Supreme Court itself play a vital part. The question must therefore be asked whether the Court has acted in a fashion designed to achieve a necessary reapportionment with the minimum amount of judicial intervention in State affairs and a minimum of damage to the integrity and continuity of State legislatures as a whole.

The effects of the Court's action in the reapportionment cases require careful consideration within each of our 50 States, because each of the State governments is an important part of our Federal Government. To dismiss or to forget the importance of State government is to imperil the future of our Government. The critical significance of State government in this country can be overlooked only by those unfamiliar with the duties with which the States are charged. That the States have always carried, and continue to carry, primary responsibility in such areas as welfare, education, and highway development must not be forgotten. Furthermore, the very success of the burgeoning Federal assistance programs depends upon the close cooperation of viable State governments combining their efforts with agencies of the National Government.

This paper will concentrate on the effects and implications of the reapportionment decisions on the State government of Hawaii. While some of the effects of the Court's reapportionment decisions are unique to Hawaii, I think that the overall issues posed by the decisions are of general significance. There may be special advantages in examining these problems in Hawaii, for this island polity is relatively small and self-contained, which facilitates the study of politics there. Pertinent, too, is the fact that Hawaii has enjoyed a remarkably broad and diverse political history; as noted in one of the Federal district court orders which will be examined subsequently, Hawaii "is the only State that has been successively an absolute monarchy, a constitutional monarchy, a Republic, and then a Territory of the United States before its admission as a State."[7] Its rich political heritage notwithstanding, Hawaii is now in most respects a typical American State. It is therefore pertinent to consider the effects of the reapportionment decisions on Hawaii's polity and to discuss the broader implications of these decisions in the light of these effects.

---

[1] Senate reports, 75th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 5 to Aug. 21, 1937, vol. 1, Rept. No. 711, "Reorganization of the Federal Judiciary," pp. 41–42, passim.

[2] Ibid., p. 44.

[3] Ibid., p. 19.

[4] Ibid., p. 14.

[5] Quoted in *Baker* v. *Carr*, 369 U.S. 248–249 (1962).

[6] Quoted in J. Anthony Lukas, "Barnyard Government in Maryland," Reapportionment, ed. Glendon Schubert (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964), p. 55.

II. REAPPORTIONMENT IN HAWAII PRIOR TO REYNOLDS

As was the case in very many States throughout the Nation, the Supreme Court's decision in *Reynolds* v. *Sims* came at a time when reapportionment was in no way an issue in the State of Hawaii. This critical fact is clearly stated by Judge Jertberg, of the Federal district court in Honolulu (some months after he had taken jurisdiction of the reapportionment problem in Hawaii). As he frankly said:

> "There isn't any clear evidence in my view that anybody was really concerned about any malapportionment in the State of Hawaii prior to these June 15 decisions (Reynolds). There may have been some informal discussions but apparently no strong convictions that this State was malapportioned."[8]

The judge's point is reinforced by the findings of De Grazia, where, on each of five counts, he finds that there was no interest in reapportionment in Hawaii.[9]

The question of apportionment had been examined and debated in exhaustive detail in the course of Hawaii's constitutional convention of 1950.[10] The popularly elected delegates to this convention had resolved the issue, and their proposed constitution had been approved by 3 to 1 in a referendum vote in which approximately 90 percent of Hawaii's registered voters had participated. There had been extended public discussion of the constitution's apportionment provisions prior to the referendum vote. These provisions were put into effect in 1956, a few *years prior to statehood.*

During the constitutional convention all the basic problems of apportionment, including the question of whether a unicameral or bicameral legislature would best serve the needs of the islands, had been thoroughly considered. The consensus on this issue was well stated during the floor debates of the Committee of the Whole when a delegate argued:

> "If we are going to base the representation on population alone, then I would say we should recommend a unicameral legislature, but if we are going to base our representation on (other criteria) * * * then a check and balance method of a bicameral legislature is our choice. Let us agree, and there is no question that one house will be on the basis of population but the other on the basis of a just and fair method where the check and balance is not only a word but something that is in practice."[11]

During the convention one of the chief arguments for a bicameral legislature based on differing principles of representation was that, as Oahu's population constituted such a large part of the whole, the representatives from Oahu could dominate the popularly elected House. Oahu would also have the largest single bloc of senators, and the convention delegates were concerned "that no single major island group should be in a position to control legislation for the State."[12] The resolution of this problem was reached through the creation of a 25-seat senate, with 40 percent of the seats (10 senators) assigned to Oahu and the remaining 60 percent (15 senators) assigned to the other counties on the following basis: Hawaii County, 7 senators; Maui County (consisting of the islands of Maui, Lanai, and Molokai), 5 senators; and Kauai County (consisting of the islands of Kauai and Niihau), 3 senators.

Some sense of the spirit in which these discussions of apportionment were conducted and the fairness of their outcome is strikingly revealed by Judge Jertberg in his consideration of the records of the constitutional convention.

> "As the records of the constitutional convention show (proceedings 103–111), the districting, both for the senate and the house of representatives, followed along historical, political, geographic, and physical lines. There was no gerrymandering in the invidious sense."[13]

The success of the constitutional convention was revealed during the final period of territorial administration (1956–59) and the first few years of statehood; years during which the legislature was apportioned on the basis provided by the new constitution. During the period of approximately 5 years from statehood until the Reynolds decision, the first and second State legislatures were convened again and again in general, budget, or special sessions. These legislatures dealt successfully and rapidly with a multitude of issues posed by transition from a Territorial government to statehood—including the complete reorganizaiton of Hawaii's administrative agencies into the new departments established by the constitution. During these sessions, Hawaii's Legislature was called upon to deal with virtually every major problem besetting State government: fiscal reform (including sharply increased taxation), land reform, antitrust legislation, home rule for the counties, economic development, urban redevelopment, reorganization of the politically dangerous Hawaiian homes program, mounting unemployment, and disaster relief.

One would not do justice to these legislators by simply saying that they dealt successfully with these many issues. They developed solutions which in some instances have been nationally recognized as remarkably innovative, e.g., Hawaii's "green belt" laws and other aspects of land reform. Even more fundamental is that they dealt with these problems in a fashion which appears to have been just from the perspective of the various segments of the community. Stated differently, one may reasonably conclude that basic concerns, objectives, and judgment of the population were adequately represented in the fashioning of the laws. As a consequence, the tenor of political discourse in Hawaii in recent years has not been disrupted by violent antagonisms, nor characterized by shrill charges of injustice. The political harmony which has prevailed generally since statehood stands in marked contrast to the early postwar period of Territorial government, when political passions resulted in civil strife which, for a time, threatened the stability of the community, as bitter partisan divisions produced partisan legislation.

This point deserves emphasis, for State government which is both viable and progressive, as well as essentially stable, is an achievement of no small magnitude. On issue after issue Hawaii's State Legislature has shown itself able to take adequate account of the needs of the extremely complex elements which constitute Hawaii today. This includes, for example, the special needs of the neighbor islands (Hawaii, Maui, Molokai, Lanai, Kauai, Niihau), as well as Oahu; and, for another example, the needs of long-established and wealthy corporate agriculture, as well as the needs of the powerful labor unions.

The success of the legislature in dealing with a series of difficult and explosive political issues constitutes a continuing tribute to those who framed the State constitution. It directs attention especially to the fashion in which they constructed its bicameral legislature, and their legislative districting. Evidently, the use of historical, political, geographical, and physical lines in districting proved sound. More basically, the differing composition of the senate and house of representatives constituted an effective way of meeting problems of representing diverse elements in the community.

Limitations of space require me to resist the temptation to delve more extensively into this matter, but at least one brief illustration of the workings of Hawaii's representative system under the 1950 constitution is necessary for present purposes. Undoubtedly, one of the most critical problems faced by Hawaii's legislature after statehood was that of land reform. From the time of annexation (1898) to statehood (1959), the U.S. Congress had final authority for Hawaii's public land legislation; the Statehood Act granted the legislature only 2 years for the enactment of new public land laws. The importance of land laws was tersely, if not especially gracefully, summed up by a Federal antitrust official during a trip to Hawaii: "Everything out here ends up being tied up with land."[14]

The culmination of a sustained effort to revise the public land laws came with the formation of a conference committee composed of six senators and six representatives. The makeup of the two committees was as follows:

Senate

Party	Senator	Island	Age	Occupation
Republican	Francis Ching	Kauai	49	Trucking executive for subsidiary of Alexander & Baldwin.
Do	Marquis F. Calmes	Maui	59	Business executive for subsidiary of Alexander & Baldwin.
Do	Randolph Crossley	Oahu	57	Business executive; director, self-owned major business enterprises.
Do	Calvin C. McGregor	do	46	Attorney, investment counselor, former circuit court judge.
Democratic	Thomas Ogata	Maui	44	Attorney in private practice.
Do	John T. Ushijima	Hawaii	38	Do.

---

[7] Opinion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii (R. 370) dated Feb. 17, 1965, reported at 238 F. Supp. 468.

[8] Oral Decision of the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii, Aug. 26, 1964. Cited in "A Resumé of Legislative Apportionment in Hawaii (as of Aug. 30, 1964)" (Legislative Reference Bureau, University of Hawaii, request No. B–0729, Sept. 2, 1964), p. 9.

[9] Alfred de Grazia, "Apportionment and Representative Government" (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1963), p. 134.

[10] Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of Hawaii, 1950 (2 vols.; Honolulu: Published under the supervision of the Office of the Attorney General and the Public Archives, State of Hawaii, 1961), passim.

[11] Ibid., vol. II, p. 88.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Opinion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii (R. 370) dated Feb. 17, 1965, reported at 238 F. Supp. 468.

[14] Robert H. Horwitz and Norman Meller, "Land and Politics in Hawaii" (East Lansing: Bureau of Social and Political Research, College of Social Science, Michigan State University, 1963), flyleaf.

House

Party	Representative	Island	Age	Occupation
Democratic	David McClung	Oahu	34	Attorney in private practice.
Do	Robert Oshiro	do	37	Do.
Do	Tadao Beppu	do	42	Sales manager.
Do	Frank W. C. Loo	do	39	Attorney in private practice.
Republican	Robert Teruya	do	35	Do.
Do	Fred Rohlfing	do	33	Do.

The composition of the senate and house delegations was strikingly dissimliar. Neighbor islanders were in the majority among the senators, while the house delegation was comprised exclusively of representatives from Oahu. The senators were generally men with business backgrounds, while almost all the representatives were independent attorneys in private practice. The average age of the house delegation was not quite 37, as contrasted with 49 for the senate delegation. The senators, by and large, had reached maturity and embarked upon business careers before World War II, while the representatives were the product of Hawaii's postwar democratic revolution.

That the character, composition, and spirit of the senate, as evidenced by the makeup and actions of the conference delegation, differed in important respects from that of the house of representatives contributed positively to the formulation of sound legislation. More generally, Hawaii's Legislature has dealt fairly with the competing claims of the many and varied elements which constitute the islands' population precisely because it has had to take into account the contribution each of these elements makes to the welfare of the community. The legislature had recognized that corporate agriculture contributes materially to the community by paying taxes, furnishing employment, and developing the islands' natural resources. Its contribution and needs have been taken into account in the framing of tax legislation, land reform programs, and unemployment compensation laws. The contribution and needs of the unionized working men of the islands have been recognized and taken into account in the framing of legislation dealing with antitrust matters, labor organization, public education, and welfare. It can be concluded the Hawaii's Legislature has been largely successful in its attempt to achieve a form of distributive justice in the formation of the laws. As of 1962, Hawaii had a viable State government, a legislature which functioned well when judged by standards which were meaningful and largely satisfactory to the community as a whole. Within the legislature, various forms and principles of representation were functioning simultaneously.

We have purposely stressed the argument that the most significant result of Hawaii's 1950 constitutional convention was the comprehensive representation it achieved for significant elements within the community. This is not to say that some leaders of the Republican Party, which had long been dominant in Hawaii, did not attempt to preserve their position through the districting provisions of the new constitution. It is axiomatic that political leaders, when presented with the opportunity to redistrict, will generally attempt to maximize their strength. Nevertheless, the work of the constitutional convention succeeded in taking such effective account of diverse partisan claims and heterogeneous community needs that it effectively prevented any particular partisan faction from achieving exclusive domination of the community.

III. REYNOLDS—THE AFTERMATH

It was precisely this most equitable aspect of Hawaii's government that was threatened by the Reynolds decision of June 15, 1964. The U.S. Supreme Court's 1962 decision in *Baker* v. *Carr* naturally directed the attention of Hawaii's Democratic Governor and administration to the political possibilities inherent in reapportionment. Speaking of the Baker decision, the Governor noted that:

"The U.S. Supreme Court, in keeping with its philosophy coveting the rights of individuals, had entered into what it had referred to as political decisions as being properly within the scope of its authority in extending the protection of the judicial branch of the Government to the individual rights secured by the Constitution of the United States."[15]

As soon as the Reynolds decision was announced, Hawaii's attorney general, acting on the instructions of the Governor, undertook "a thorough review of the decision and of the constitution of the State of Hawaii in relation to the Court's decree."[16]

The attorney general's thorough review of the complex June 15 decisions and of their bearing on Hawaii's constitution required only 3 weeks. On July 6, he issued an opinion which found unconstitutional virtually every aspect of Hawaii's existing system of apportionment, including the composition of the senate and house of representatives, the system of districting, and the method provided for reapportionment.

With this opinion in hand, the Governor moved with extraordinary dispatch. His avowed objective was to secure complete reapportionment before the November 1964 elections; accordingly, he called a special session of the legislature, which convened on July 23, some 5 weeks after the Reynolds decision. In his opening day address to the legislators, the Governor implored them to set some kind of record in reapportionment. As he noted:

"The State of Colorado within 23 days of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States adopted a reapportionment plan. It is my considered judgment that the people of Hawaii expect as much, if not more, of us who asked for and accepted the responsibility of leadership."[17]

Inasmuch as Colorado had established an unbeatable record for speed in adopting the reapportionment plan, the something more for which the Governor appealed appears to have been the meeting of the goal set by "the English Levellers of the mid-17th century," who, he said, "were the first to demand a mathematical subdivision of the Nation into election districts of equal population."[18] It was such "egalitarian democrats, as typified by the Levellers," whom the Governor praised for having broken "the monopoly over representative government exercised from the 13th to the 18th century by the landed nobility and the entitled landholders," and who were thereby able to "rationalize the representative system."[19]

The Governor further developed his understanding of just representation by quoting extensively from the well-known Twentieth Century Fund study, "One Man—One Vote." He stressed the view of that study that "the history of democratic institutions points compellingly in the direction of population as the only legitimate basis of represented "not people but great estates, titles, wealth, geographic strongholds. But as feudal concepts of privilege ended and social and economic leveling took place, poresentation today."[20] Formerly, parliaments litical responsibility spread also." "Most of us here today," added the Governor, "can sympathize with that last observation from our personal knowledge of Hawaii's highly compressed sociopolitical evolution of the past decade."[21]

The Governor had ready at hand the devices through which the legislature might quickly complete this phase of Hawaii's "sociopolitical evolution." As he said, "I have prepared and will submit proposals to you in accordance with the two-pronged approach which this administration favors."[22] These proposals were promptly submitted to the legislature the following morning in the form of house bills No. 2[23] and No. 3.[24] In essence, they called for the creation of a senate and house apportioned exclusively on the basis of population. The multimember representative districts which had been utilized for well over a century in Hawaii were proscribed in favor of single-member districts. To make this change more feasible, house bill No. 4[25] proposed an amendment to the constitution designed to eliminate the requirement that a candidate for the legislature be a resident of the district which he sought to represent. House bill No. 2 specifically provided that it was the Governor who "shall apportion the members of the senate" and "the members of the house of representatives."[26] In this duty, the Governor was to be restricted only by the admonition that the new senate and house districts "be composed of contiguous and compact territory and contain as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants."[27]

The Governor and his advisers, in short, were to be given instant authority to draw anew the political map of the islands on their own terms. The effective authority which this legislation would have placed in the hands of the administration in shaping the island polity rivaled the authority of Hawaii's constitutional monarchs. Had these bills passed, there is little question that the "highly compressed sociopolitical evolution" of which the Governor spoke would have been rapidly carried through. Among other things, the administration would have been in a position virtually to eradicate the vestiges of Hawaii's Republican Party, since many Republicans survived the Democratic landslide of the past decade by virtue of being candidates within multimember districts. With the administration's authorization to redistrict, the temptation to reduce Republican strength still further would have been hard to resist. In the past, island politics have been singularly free of gerrymandering, but how could any administration pass up the opportunities for redistricting along lines designed to increase its own strength? More fundamentally, under the provisions of house bill No. 2, the redistricted senate would be no more than a mere shadow of the House of Representatives. Under the terms of the proposed legislation, the number of senators from the neighbor islands would have been reduced from 15 to 5 or 6, thus abruptly terminating the services of many of the established senate leaders in favor of 9 or 10 newly elected senators from Oahu. Had the house bill carried, there is little question that the administration would have been in a position to establish the hegemony of a particular faction of the Democratic Party in Hawaii for a long period of time.

---

[15] Address by Gov. John A. Burns, joint session of the second State legislature, first special session of 1964, July 23, 1964, p. 2.

[16] Ibid., p. 5.

[17] Ibid., p. 10.

[18] Ibid., p. 15.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid., p. 9.

[21] Ibid., pp. 9–10.

[22] Ibid., p. 11.

[23] House bill No. 2 is titled: "A bill for an act relating to composition, apportionment and election of the State legislature."

[24] House bill No. 3 is titled: "Proposing amendments to the constitution of the State of Hawaii, relating to the composition, districting, redistricting, apportionment, reapportionment, and constitutional amendment provisions affecting the State legislature."

[25] House bill No. 4 is titled: "Proposing an amendment to art. III, sec. 7 of the constitution of the State of Hawaii, relating to qualifications of members of the legislature."

[26] Art. III, sec. 4 of Hawaii's constitution provides that "On or before June 1 of the year 1959, and of each 10th year thereafter, the Governor shall reapportion the members of the house of representatives" in a prescribed manner. Hawaii appears to be one of the very few States which vests primary responsibility for reapportionment in the hands of the Governor. Inasmuch as district boundaries were written into the constitution, the Governor's duties were simply magisterial.

[27] House bill No. 2, p. 2.

The administration's plan very nearly succeeded. The legislature had been called into special session and was presented with the administration's bills before the community had any real awareness of the Reynolds decision, certainly before there had been any thoughtful consideration of the alternative responses that might be made to it. Nor did it appear that the administration intended that there be any such consideration. Indeed, the Governor spoke at some length against the calling of a constitutional convention to consider carefully the question of legislative apportionment and related issues. Among the arguments advanced against the calling of a constitutional convention was the contention that:

"It is also a slow process. The State of Hawaii and its people would be placing themselves in the position of people in States with whom we claim no similarity in philosophy, with people in those States where individual and human rights have not been given the recognition that we so proudly claim, as justly we do." [28]

Bewildered by arguments such as these and subject to other pressures, the house speedily passed the administration's bills, and the senate appeared ready to commit hari-kari according to the administration's ritual. However, a handful of critics of the administration's recommendations succeeded in making counterproposals during the course of senate hearings on the house bills. A sufficient number of neighbor island and Republican senators, among others, were soon convinced that alternative responses to the Reynolds decision were feasible. Consequently, the senate drafted counterproposals, amended the house bills, tied up the ensuing conference committee discussions—and thereby aborted the special session. The administration's objective of speedy reapportionment had been forestalled, but that the price of directly involving both State and Federal courts in subsequent reapportionment action.

Even before the special session of the legislature had concluded, a suit was filed in the U.S. district court in Honolulu praying the court to enjoin the State's Lieutenant Governor from carrying out preparations for the forthcoming primary and general elections "unless the State legislature enacted a valid reapportionment plan for use in the 1964 elections." [29] The court took jurisdiction, but sensibly refused to interfere at this juncture "because of the imminence of the 1964 elections and the disruptive effects which an injunctive would have had thereon." [30]

The scheduled elections for the third State legislature were therefore carried out on the basis of the apportionment provided under the State constitution. Hardly had the newly elected legislature convened than the district court filed a decision and order on February 17, 1965, stating that "any change in the representation from any Hawaii senatorial district must be made by constitutional amendment." [31] The court enjoined the legislators "from passing any but preliminary 'housekeeping' acts until it had set up the machinery for the convening of a constitutional convention to amend the State's legislative scheme of apportionment before the 1966 election." [32] Underlying the court's ruling was its view that necessary revision or amendments to the State constitution could be obtained by two possible routes: (1) constitutional amendments proposed by the legislature and submitted to the people for ratification, or (2) by constitutional convention. Inasmuch as the legislature had failed during its special session in 1964 to propose constitutional amendments which could be presented for ratification at a general election in time for reapportionment to be carried out by November 1966, the court held that the other route should be followed.

The court temporarily amended its order in response to a request from the legislature that it should at least be permitted to draft temporary reapportionment legislation and proposed constitutional amendments. It retained jurisdiction of the case, but, because of agreement by the parties, it asked the legislature, acting in some sort of advisory capacity to the court, to submit a reapportionment plan. The district court might then, if it found the plan sound, act to adopt the plan as its own.

The legislature responded energetically and quickly, and, on March 18, 1965, advised the court that it had made considerable progress in developing a provisional reapportionment plan which had been approved in substance by both houses and was being polished in a conference committee. The views of the court were sought to make certain that the plan would meet the criteria set forth in Reynolds and related cases. The legislature's plan provided that Oahu should have 19 of the 25 seats in the State senate, but the court found the proposal deficient in that too many senators were included in the two, multimember Oahu districts. Accordingly, the legislature resumed its deliberations, and on April 14, 1965, presented to the court a plan to divide the State into eight senatorial districts as follows: [33]

County	Senatorial district	Number of Senators	1964 registered voters per district
Hawaii	1st	3	28,130
Maui	2d	2	18,786
Honolulu	3d	3	27,073
Do	4th	4	35,780
Do	5th	4	39,361
Do	6th	4	40,629
Do	7th	4	37,336
Kauai	8th	1	12,266

The court raised no objections to the apportionment of senators between Oahu and the neighbor islands or to the number of registered voters per senatorial district; but it did find fault with the demarcation of Oahu's senatorial districting on two main grounds. First, the multimember senatorial districts coincided in some instances with multimember house districts, as in the case of the third senatorial district and the eighth house district. "Thus from one political and geographical unit would be elected four representatives and three senators—seven members of the legislature all responsible to and representing exactly the same constituency"—exclaimed the court.[34] The court's remark raises the interesting question whether any system including multimember districts would, on the same argument, face critical judicial scrutiny. This matter will be considered subsequently.

The court's second and stronger objection to the legislature's proposed apportionment plan was that it created districts which the judges termed "monolithic political units of representation." This resulted from the fact that—

"In drawing the district lines the legislature reported that it relied very heavily on the standards of compactness and contiguity—geographical separation and long-established representative precinct lines.

"It appears that no other criteria, save number of registered voters, geographical boundaries and historical representative district lines were considered or used in forming the plan. Apparently, ethnic, political, industrial, economic, social, occupational factors, and community of interests and problems were given little if any consideration by the legislature." [35]

By failing to take account of these ethnic, political, industrial, economic, social, occupational and other factors, the legislature had, according to the court, failed to create representative districts of equal "realistic political weight." Unless representative districts were of realistic political weight" [36] they could not provide "vital equality of voter representation." [37] Going further, the court attempted to set forth rough guides to the factors which must be taken into account in designing representative districts:

"While it is a fundamental factor under the decisions of the court, population is not the sole definitive measure for setting up either representative or senatorial districts. Compactness and contiguity of the territory are admittedly also factors, but community of interests, community of problems, socioeconomic status, political and racial factors—each and all must be considered, and not only must the electorial districts be laid out with the totality of those factors having been taken into consideration, but even more, the sum total of all the districting must result in substantial equality of meaningful representation to each and all the voters of the State." [38]

The court's demand for "meaningful representation," as opposed to representation affording merely formal equality, does, of course, require that a multitude of political factors be taken into account. This and other aspects of the court's holding will be considered in the conclusion, but first we must quickly complete the chronological account of the effects of the Reynolds decision on the operation of Hawaii's legislature. The immediate effect of the district court's opinion was temporarily to foreclose further reapportionment efforts on the part of the legislature. Inasmuch as the legislature had failed to fashion a reapportionment plan acceptable to the court, the judges again required the legislature to entrust reapportionment to a constitutional convention. At the same time, the court reinstated its injunction prohibiting the legislature from enacting laws before completing action on reapportionment that would satisfy the court. This threatened to be especially disruptive, for a substantial amount of important legislation was pending, and little time remained of the 60-day session permitted by the State constitution. Accordingly, on May 7, 1965, the Governor filed a motion in the district court to suspend the injunction and to stay the order of April 28, pending determination of an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. The district court denied the motion, but on May 21, 1965, Mr. Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court granted the stay.

---

[28] Address by Governor Burns, p. 8.

[29] Opinion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii dated Feb. 17, 1965, reported at 238 F. Supp. 468.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Opinion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii dated Apr. 28, 1965, reported at 240 F. Supp. 724.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid.

Shortly thereafter, three separate appeals were filed with the U.S. Supreme Court by the president of Hawaii's senate, the speaker of the house, and the Governor. These appeals are presently before the Court, and even the temporary resolution of Hawaii's judicially created reapportionment problems depends on action by the Nation's highest tribunal.[38a] Although, the definitive discussion of the significance of the reapportionment cases for Hawaii's polity must await the determination of these appeals by the Supreme Court, some tentative conclusions may be drawn at this time.

IV—CONCLUSION

One of the most interesting and potentially significant aspects of Hawaii's experience thus far with the reapportionment problem was the district court's rejection of the legislature's proposed districts, which were substantially equal numerically, on the grounds that the proposed scheme did not provide "meaningful representation." As we have noted, the court insisted that if representation is to be meaningful in the sense of affording "vital equality," it is necessary that a multitude of political factors (in the broadest sense) be taken into account. The district court's argument should prove challenging to the Supreme Court and provide an especially illuminating illustration of the difficulties encountered by the lower courts in attempting to perceive and apply the basic principles of the Reynolds decision.

The Court's reasoning in Reynolds recommends itself to many as providing a clear-cut, simple standard, the application of which appears to insure equal representation to all of the inhabitants of our 50 States. By setting forth the seemingly unambiguous standards of one man, one vote, instead of some broader standard by which the reasonableness of State apportionment provisions might be judged (such as those suggested, for example, in the opinions of some of the Justices in the Reynolds case), the Court probably expected that it would avert an endless stream of litigation through which each of the States would seek judicial determination of the reasonableness of its apportionment provisions.

If this was the Court's expectation, it has proved groundless in Hawaii. As we have seen, the district court rejected the legislature's plan on the grounds that equality of population is only one of many relevant factors which must be taken into account if representative districts are to have "equal political weight" and thereby to afford what the court terms "vital equality." The criterion of numerically equal districts may afford formal equality, but, as the district court emphasized, ethnic, economic, occupational, social, and many other factors have a direct bearing on the degree and character of political participation within representative districts. The court was therefore led to the sensible, if complicating, conclusion that these factors must be taken into account if the "realistic political weight" of various representative districts is, in fact, to be equal. But this argument on the part of the district court points implicitly to a fundamental ambiguity in Reynolds. If the district court's interpretation is upheld (which would be surprising), courts throughout the Nation will be explicitly, continually, and heavily involved in the exercise of political discretion of an unusually subtle, fundamental, and demanding kind. If, on the other hand, the district court is overruled, the questions it has raised about the meaning of the Reynolds formula in securing genuine equality in apportionment still stand. If some "monolithic political units," whose power far exceeds that of other political units, even though they may be of equal population, are permitted to result from application of the guides furnished by Reynolds, then the cause of "equal protection" has not been furthered, for minorities may continue to exercise an inordinate influence in State legislatures. Or, alternatively, minorities may be liquidated, rather than being allowed to mitigate majorities.

Issues of this kind lie at the heart of each of the three Hawaii appeals now lying before the Supreme Court. Of special significance are (1) the issue of "registered voters" versus the use of "census population" as the basis of apportionment, and (2) the issue of "multimember" versus "single-member" representative districts.

Turning to the issue of whether "registered voters" or "census population" should serve as the basis of apportionment, it may be noted that Hawaii's lawmakers have, for well over a century, been explicitly concerned with determining the degree and type of civic participation which should be afforded the populace under a succession of regimes. It was the delegates to Hawaii's 1950 constitutional convention who most recently deliberated long and carefully on this question. Their recommendation, which was approved by an overwhelming vote in a popular referendum, was that apportionment should be based on registered voters.[39] But this practice has been challenged as incompatible with Reynolds. Governor Burns, in his opening address to the special session of the legislature, called for the rejection of the registered-voters standard and proposed instead "that apportionment be established upon the basis of the 1960 census population figures, including aliens and military personnel living in civilian communities." [40] The Governor's grounds for rejecting Hawaii's traditional practice was developed at length in his appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. He argues there that a change is needed "because the use of the 'registered voters' test tends to discriminate against persons in the lower economic levels, and under the circumstances prevailing in Hawaii, introduces other inequities into legislative apportionment." [41] As might be expected:

> "The proportion of registered persons in Hawaii—and very likely in other States—in the lower economic brackets is substantially less than those in the higher * * * of persons with a family income of less than $4,000, only 43.8 percent of those eligible were registered, while those in the $10,000 to $14,999 bracket, 72.4 percent were registered. It is apparent therefrom that the use of registered voters unduly favors those on the higher economic levels and discriminates against those on the lower. The right to be fairly and effectively represented is a fundamental one and should not be made to depend upon an assiduousness in the pursuit of other rights, such as the right to vote." [42]

The Governor is quite right in his assertion that use of the registered-voters criterion discriminates (but not, as he says) "against" that part of the community which, for whatever reason, is not assiduous in its exercise of the franchise. It also discriminates between citizens and aliens; between adults and children ineligible to vote; between those in possession of their mental faculties and those confined to mental institutions; between law-abiding citizens and inmates of prisons; and, most importantly, between those duly qualified citizens who exercise the franchise and those apathetic, irresponsible, or uninterested people who don't care enough about their right to vote to bother to register. The "registered voters" test, in short, discriminates between that part of the community which has the legal right and personal motivation to exercise the suffrage and that part of the community which cannot or does not vote. The islands' statesmen have long made sound use of this politically reasonable distinction, and some consideration of Hawaii's experience in this respect may assist us in considering the necessity or desirability of judicial determination of political questions of this sort.

As is generally known, the islands have been dependent on plantation agriculture as the mainstay of their economy for the past century. The plantations placed primary reliance on an alien work force from roughly the end of the American Civil War to the end of World War II. Laborers were recruited chiefly in China, Japan, and the Philippines. They came to Hawaii voluntarily, generally in the expectation of working for a period of some 5 to 10 years, and then returning with savings sufficient to purchase farms in their native lands. The bulk of these laborers did so, although a small proportion remained in the islands.

Very few of these laborers became citizens of the Hawaiian monarchy or the Republic. After Hawaii's annexation to the United States, the Chinese and Japanese there were not eligible for citizenship under American law.[43] They were protected by the law, and were in fact represented by the consuls of their native governments, each of which maintained consular offices in Honolulu. As aliens, however, they were not permitted to register as voters and were therefore not included in apportionment calculations. As inhabitants of a country in which they were residing for a limited, special purpose, and presumably only temporarily, they were not obliged to assume the responsibilities of citizenship. They were not called upon to fight in the Armed Forces, to serve on juries, to devote time to running for office at any level, or to contribute generally to the community as citizens.

[38a] Cases Nos. 318, 323, and 409, appeals from the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii, were heard by the U.S. Supreme Court on Feb. 21, 1966. 180 minutes were allotted to the attorneys presenting the Hawaii appeals, which were heard by eight justices. Justice Fortas retired from the Court chamber when presentation of the Hawaii appeals began. As a former member of the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, he had been associated with preparation of the appeal filed by Governor Burns.

[39] Art. III, sec. 4, which reads in part: "The total number of representatives shall first be reapportioned among four basic areas * * * on the basis of the number of voters registered at the last preceding general election in each of such basic areas and computed by the method known as the method of equal proportions, no basic area to receive less than one member."

[40] Gov. John A. Burns, address to the joint session of the second State Legislature of Hawaii, first special session of 1964, July 23, 1964, p. 11.

[41] John A. Burns, Governor of the State of Hawaii, *Appellant* v. *William S. Richardson, et al., Appellees,* Appeal from the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii in the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1965, p. 18.

[42] Ibid., p. 21.

[43] Hawaii's Organic Act, as written by the 56th Cong. in 1900, provided "That all persons who were citizens of the Republic of Hawaii on Aug. 12, 1898, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States and citizens of the territory of Hawaii." Ch. I, sec. 4. A small number of Chinese were so qualified, but almost no Japanese plantation laborers had become citizens of the Republic.

In basing apportionment on registered voters, Hawaii's constitution-makers took the not unreasonable view that people who, because of disabilities, legal or whatever, are unable to participate actively as citizens in at least a minimal fashion, should not be permitted to affect decisively the mode of representation. In Hawaii today, in fact, one of the most immediate and significant effects of a shift from registered voters to census population as the basis of apportionment would be to open up vast possibilities for political exploitation, especially in those areas where there are large numbers of politically apathetic aliens or military personnel. While the precise results are impossible to predict, there are inherent possibilities for political aggrandizement which might well be envied by political bosses anywhere. At the minimum, it is indisputable that the proposed change from registered voters to census population would afford significant additional political advantage to Hawaii's already dominant party, while likely lowering the quality of Hawaii's political life.

This is not to argue that the community has not, does not, or should not take account of the basic needs of people not counted in the apportionment scheme because they are not registered voters. In fact most observers of Hawaii would agree that the needs of its alien population have been met reasonably well, as is partly suggested by the very substantial role played by their descendants in the political life of the State today.

Any such arrangements have their dangers to the individuals concerned; these are obvious enough, especially to a court, which is quite properly concerned to protect individual rights. But against these dangers, as we have tried to suggest, must be balanced other weighty considerations bearing on the character of the whole polity. Inevitably, statesmen are confronted with the problem of representation. Their determinations at any given time must be based on an intimate knowledge of the complexities of their respective polities. These determinations are not always just or wise, but the question posed by Reynolds is whether any all-embracing, nationwide judicial doctrine is likely to be better. It is at least questionable—and on the basis of the Reynolds opinion perhaps more than questionable—whether the courts are likely to see these considerations clearly and to weigh them well, especially considering the great variety of such questions throughout the 50 States.

A comparable and related question, central to reapportionment in Hawaii, is whether the courts will permit the islands to continue to make use of multimember representative districts, or whether the State will have to be carved into single-member districts exclusively. Testimony on the political usefulness of Hawaii's long-established practice in this area was provided by one of the chief witnesses during the 1964 Senate hearings on reapportionment: "Ever since we have voted in Hawaii—and this started over 120 years ago—we have had multimember districts for our legislature. Multimember districts, when tied with Hawaii's long-known habit of plunking (voting for only one candidate, when multiple votes are possible) permits a minority to secure representation." [44] Partly for this reason, a Democratic minority was able to maintain its existence during the extended period when the Republican Party was dominant in the islands. In recent years, the preservation of a Republican minority has been fostered during a period of Democratic ascendancy through multimember districts.[45]

The understandable temptation on the part of a dominant political party to redistrict the minority party out of existence has been thwarted in Hawaii by the fact that district boundaries have been firmly fixed both by nature and tradition. As the district court noted, "The records of the constitutional convention (proceedings 103–111) show the districting, both for the senate and the house of representatives, followed along historical, political, geographic, and physical lines." [46] Thus, the senate districts under Hawaii's present constitution consist of separate islands, with two exceptions, while the sixth representative district consists of the islands of Molokai and Lanai, the seventh district of the islands of Maui and Kahoolawe (five representatives), and the eighth district that portion of the island of Oahu known as Koolaupoko and Koolauloa (two representatives). As the witness before the Senate, previously quoted, stressed:

"What are the metes and bounds of these districts? They are known only by history, and historical boundaries go far to explain our present apportionment. Roughly, our present political districting conforms with our island groupings, and as units in political structuring they go far back to the beginning of representative government in Hawaii. Anyone who would chip off a part of Oahu and link it with Kauai or the island group which has had Maui as its center bears the burden of proof of demonstrating that our major political divisions have no saliency for today's world." [47]

Evidence that Hawaii's traditional system of multimember districts continues to be salient for the needs of the contemporary community is afforded by the fact that virtually no one had been seeking changes in the district lines until the Court's action in Reynolds. The district court's rejection of the legislature's reapportionment plans indicates that the Federal judiciary will not permit Hawaii to retain its well-established representative districts. Should the delegates to a constitutional convention be no more successful than the legislature in proposing a redistricting plan acceptable to courts, then, presumably, the judges will undertake this delicate task themselves. If redistricting is carried out by the district court, it is probable that the judges could most easily avoid the danger of creating what they termed "monolithic political units" by replacing the present, multimember districts with single-member districts. Reapportionment based on a combination of single-member districts and on census population in place of registered voters (two of the major objectives being sought by the Burns administration) would introduce swift and radical changes in Hawaii's polity. Among other inevitable consequences would be the sudden and sizable increase in the political power of that portion of Oahu presently included in the fifth senatorial district. This area includes all of Oahu's sugar and pineapple plantations, as well as most of its military bases. As of 1964, the fifth senatorial district had only 84,000 registered voters within its population of approximately 300,000. By way of comparison, the fourth senatorial district, which includes most of Honolulu proper, the University of Hawaii, and the residences of a large part of the professional and civic leaders of the islands, had 80,000 registered voters within its population of approximately 180,000.[48] Those who are experienced in the realities of American State politics will recognize in the fifth district the characteristics—political apathy and low voting rates, among others—of constituencies in many other States that suffer from entrenched political machines and "bossism."

The ultimate question raised is whether representative government in Hawaii is not weakened regardless of the outcome of the judicially created reapportionment problem. Should this prove to be true, it would be all the more paradoxical, given the Supreme Court's avowed intention in these decisions. It is undeniable that Justice Warren and his majorities intended the reapportionment decisions as a rejuvenating tonic to strengthen debilitated legislatures. But the effect of forcing Warren's tonic down the gullet of Hawaii's Legislature has been to choke the patient, leaving a formerly healthy legislative body in need of further medication. It is clear that the judicial doctors who compounded Warren's tonic failed to understand important aspects of government in general and representative government in particular. A better understanding of the spirit of representative government would have impelled the Court to reconsider the soundness of prescribing sweeping, uniform remedies in the reapportionment cases. Here, in the name of "majoritarianism," the Supreme Court overthrew a vast array of varied representative institutions, most of which had been sanctioned by democratic electorates in referendum elections.

More broadly, the Court failed to remember the political teaching which had preserved it own independence a quarter-century earlier, when F.D.R.'s liberal objectives impelled him toward reckless action. The Senate committee which preserved the Court knew that all government must rule through a judicious mixture of force and persuasion. The attachment of the American people to its long-established institutions has gradually contributed to the creation of a law-abiding spirit, thereby reducing the coercive element of rule. One might have thought, and could certainly have wished, that the Court had dealt with reapportionment in a manner designed to minimize changes in the institutional structure and workings of State legislatures. But the Court allowed itself to lose sight of this truth of conservatism through its zeal for liberal legislation. In this respect it would have done well to remember the words of a Senator who led the fight to protect the Court. Said Burton K. Wheeler, "A liberal cause was never won by stacking a deck of cards, by stuffing a ballot box, or packing a Court." Nor, in the case of Hawaii, by reapportioning a legislature.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE IN VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, every day our newspapers and radio and television bring us a graphic story of the gallant fighting of the South Vietnamese, the American forces, and our allies in that wartorn country. But there is another battle being waged out there about which the American people are not so well informed.

It is the struggle for the loyalty and commitment of the Vietnamese people; and in the final analysis its outcome will be just as important as the military effort. For this other conflict also arrays the forces of freedom against those of oppression, terror, and coercion.

---

[44] Norman Meller, statement delivered to the Second State Legislature of Hawaii, first special session of 1964, July 20, 1964, p. 2. For further discussions of the relationship of different voting systems and representation of minorities see George S. Blair, "Cumulative Voting: An Effective Electoral Device in Illinois Politics" (Urbana, Ill.: The University of Illinois Press, 1960). Also helpful is Maurice Duverger, "Political Parties."

[45] At present the Republicans hold two of five senate seats in the fourth senatorial district although the Democrats are in the majority. Similarly, in the heavily Republican 15th representative district the Democrats have consistently held two of the six seats.

[46] Opinion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii dated Feb. 17, 1965, reported at 238 F. Supp. 468.

[47] Meller statement, p. 2.

[48] Ibid., p. 3.

In this struggle, the psychological factor is of cardinal importance; and the American Government is using every means at its disposal to advise and assist the Government of Vietnam in waging an intensive and effective campaign in that field.

The President has delegated the overall responsibility for coordinating and directing U.S. psychological and informational activities in Vietnam to Leonard H. Marks, Director of the U.S. Information Agency. A U.S. field organization—the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office, under the direction of Embassy Minister-Counselor Barry Zorthian—has been established to carry out this responsibility within Vietnam.

This organization, which combines the talents and resources of the U.S. Information Agency, the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense represents a unique development in integrated U.S. Government activities abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article from the Wall Street Journal describing some of these operations be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR—U.S. AIR-DROPS RADIOS, SAFE-CONDUCT PASSES TO WIN OVER VIETCONG—"DADDY PLEASE COME HOME" LEAFLETS, OTHER PLEAS HELP LIFT FOE'S DEFECTION RATE—2,500 TV SETS LURE CROWDS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—Psychological warfare experts here recently hit on what seemed a promising ploy. They proposed to drop 1-pound bags of rice on tiny parachutes to the rice-hungry cities of North Vietnam. Attached to each bag would be a message of brotherhood from the South Vietnamese.

The proponents foresaw these gains:

The northerners might conclude that South Vietnam was a lot better fed and so might sour on their own government in Hanoi.

The recipients would realize the food-dropping planes could instead have delivered bombs; mixed feelings of gratitude and apprehension about air attack might be aroused.

If Communist authorities rushed up to wrest the free food from people in the streets, public discontent would rise.

But psychological warriors in Saigon warned that the Communists might secretly inject poison into some of the rice bags and then charge the United States with waging "poison warfare." Recalling the Communists' loud "germ warfare" cries during the Korean war, they insisted this prospect was real.

IMAGINATIVE THINKING

So the plan, rather than the rice, was dropped. But the incident provided an insight into the kind of imaginative thinking that is going into an increasingly active effort to influence the minds of soldiers and civilians in North Vietnam and enemy-controlled areas of the south.

"Psychological operations in one form or another are as old as war itself," says one Pentagon practitioner, a combat veteran. "In World War II we took the attitude: 'To hell with psyops; if we kill enough of the enemy and capture enough territory, victory will take care of itself.' But you can't win with that philosophy in Vietnam. Now, the objective is not just to kill and capture, but to win over the people."

In this war for men's minds, the United States and its South Vietnamese allies are loosing such weapons as propaganda broadcasts, air-dropped propaganda leaflets, safe-conduct passes for Communist soldiers desiring to defect and much more. The aim is not only to spur desertions from Red ranks but to encourage surrender of arms, to impede Communist recruiting of guerrilla fighters and to discourage local supply of food and information to the enemy. Some solid, if small, successes are being reported.

In all, this campaign now employs the talents of several hundred United States and South Vietnamese specialists, military and civilian. Since April last year, when propaganda broadcasts to North Vietnam began to be supplemented by air-dropped messages, over 113 million leaflets have cascaded upon nearly every city, town and hamlet in Ho Chi Minh's domain. During the same period, more than 133 million leaflets have been directed at areas of South Vietnam controlled or threatened by Vietcong guerrillas.

THEMES THAT GET STRESS

According to Leonard Marks, director of the U.S. Information Agency, which coordinates American psychological operations in Vietnam, the leaflets and broadcasts stress a few simple themes: The destructive war in South Vietnam continues because of Communist aggression directed by North Vietnam and egged on by the Red Chinese; the Saigon government is trying its best to bring peace and progress to its citizens; the combined military might of the Allied forces is so great the Communists can't prevail; defectors from Red ranks will be well treated; the U.S. bombing in the north is simply aimed at bringing the war to an end.

The exact effect of this verbal offensive is naturally difficult to ascertain; Mr. Marks and associates do at least point to virulent counterattacks by Radio Hanoi and North Vietnamese newspapers as evidence that "It's getting under their skin."

But as one military man puts it, actual results, especially among hostile troops, depend more on the tide of war than the brilliance of the propaganda. If the enemy thinks he's winning, he'll put up with danger, fatigue and short rations; but if he feels he's losing he's much more prone to look for a way out and listen seriously to offers of safety and food. And with the war's fortunes lately seeming to turn against the Communist side, the psychological warriors have some specific gains to point to.

Recently they keyed a special campaign to the Buddhist New Year in late January; some leaflets aimed at guerrillas operating away from home portrayed little girls appealing "Daddy, won't you please come home?" Other leaflets attacked Vietcong taxation, forced labor and killing of innocent peasants. Before this campaign, daily defections from enemy ranks averaged about 40; during January and February the rate more than doubled. Among the defectors was a 22-man guerrilla platoon, the largest single unit to come over during the war, along with growing numbers of enemy officers, including the commander of a North Vietnamese army battalion.

A FRIENDLY PHOTO

Properly exploited, key defections often start a chain reaction, the professionals say. To insure that a defector won't change his mind and go back to his unit, his picture is taken with the arm of a South Vietnamese or American officer around his shoulder. He's told that copies of this photo will be dropped among his former comrades "to let them know of his right decision."

Any defector is first fed, clothed, interrogated, given medical attention and some political indoctrination. Then he is urged to make statements explaining to his former friends why he switched sides and how he has been treated. Some statements are printed on leaflets for airdrop, others are taperecorded and broadcast from airborne loudspeakers over his guerrilla stomping grounds.

In one recent operation in Bey Tuy Province, a 40-year-old Vietcong platoon leader, a guerrilla for 15 years, was captured. After friendly treatment he agreed to record a surrender appeal; he even flew with a psychological operations officer in a helicopter and pointed out hiding places of his unit so the tape could be played. This effort, it's said, helped induce several Vietcong to surrender.

To undermine the countryside's confidence in the Vietcong, the "psywarriors" are turning knowledge of Vietnam's folkways to their advantage—in what's called Operation Rigor Mortis.

It seems there's a strong feeling among Vietnamese that when they die they want to be buried in their own villages, near their ancestors. In recruiting guerrillas, the Communists promise not only that the men will fight in their own localities, but if killed, will be handed over to their relatives for proper burial. This is why, in the war's early stages, few enemy dead were found on the battlefield; the guerrillas would haul them away to fulfill this promise.

DISCOURAGES RECRUITING

But in some of the recent large-scale battles, it has been impossible to remove the bodies. So psychological warfare people make an effort after battles to get the names of the remaining dead (from papers found on the bodies) and quickly broadcast to their home areas the news that loved ones have been abandoned to die, far away from home. It's admittedly a somewhat grisly business, but it's considered very effective in discouraging guerrilla recruiting by the Vietcong and in lowering morale among their units.

Within South Vietnam, much of the psychological warfare effort concentrates on spreading good news, beamed as much at the ears and eyes of the general populace as at the enemy. Word goes forth telling of the Saigon government's building of roads and bridges and hospitals, protection of rice harvests being moved to market, victories in battle. Such information is disseminated by radio, provincial newspapers, hamlet bulletin boards, roving government information teams and drama groups that weave their message into entertainment programs.

Early last month, the Saigon regime started using television to help get the word out. U.S. funds, through the Agency for International Development, were used to purchase 2,500 23-inch table model TV sets from Radio Corp. of America for distribution to public reading rooms, community centers and schools in areas within 40 miles of Saigon. From 8 to 9 p.m., daily, the Saigon government broadcasts news and information, beaming the signals through equipment abroad a pair of U.S. Navy-operated C-121 aircraft hovering overhead; a TV tower is to be built eventually.

TV is such a novelty in Vietnam that throngs are said to gather around the community sets each evening to watch the Vietnamese language broadcast over channel 11. Since the U.S. Army telecasts American TV shows over channel 9 and doesn't want to lure viewers from the Government program, it blanks out for that hour. "We don't want to put Premier Ky up against 'Gunsmoke,'" comments a U.S. officer.

AN AUDIO THORN

Far more information is put out by radio: The Voice of America alone broadcasts music, news and other programs 6½ hours a day in Vietnamese from a powerful transmitter at Hue, on the northern coast of South Vietnam. The message goes both to North and South Vietnam, and has evoked an explosive reaction from the north. "This installation must be an audio thorn in the side of the Communists, since they have shelled it several times over the past year and a half and our personnel there have found it prudent to carry out their duties wearing sidearms," reports Mr. Marks.

To make sure the other side hears these messages, the United States has dropped more than 10,000 cheap little transistor radios into enemy stations. "We don't want them to use our gifts to tune in Radio Hanoi." Not surprisingly, North Vietnamese authorities have urged their people to turn in any of these "Yankee radios"; they even claim the sets are booby-trapped and can be exploded by a special radio signal.

Many leaflets dropped on populous areas in the north are intended to avert needless loss of civilian lives there, and perhaps to spare the United States from blame for such loss. These messages simply urge civilians to move away from installations likely to be bombed. One leaflet resembles a green and white North Vietnamese 50-piaster note on one side; on the other is says, among other things: "For your safety, stay away from military installations and communications facilities."

A specially planned sequence of leaflets is aimed at North Vietnamese Army men on the way to infiltrate the south. In their northernmost training camps, they receive leaflets saying: "We know you are destined to come to South Vietnam to fight." Further south along the infiltration route, they are told: "If you do come across, we'd like you to join us in our struggle against the Communists." Just before they cross the border, they are messaged: "Here is a safe-conduct pass; it will pass you safely through our lines and save your life." Toward the end of their southward trip, perhaps along the Ho Chi Minh Trail in eastern Laos, they get not only safe-conduct passes but also specific money offers for arms they may bring with them.

Typical inducements: 6,300 piasters ($87 at the official exchange rate) for a heavy machinegun, 2,000 piasters for a submachinegun, 1,000 piasters for a carbine, 800 piasters for a pistol. (Because it may be dangerous for the northerners to try to defect with their arms, they're told they can hide a weapon and still get the specified reward when it's picked up by South Vietnamese forces who have been tipped off on the hiding place.)

A NEW ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN SCHOOL IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the New Mexico State Legislature adopted House Joint Memorial 14, urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate necessary funds to provide for a new Albuquerque Indian School in New Mexico. This is a facility of great importance to the betterment of Indian youngsters, and I have urged approval of funds to plan the construction of the new school. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 14

Joint memorial urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate necessary funds to provide for a new Albuquerque Indian School in New Mexico

Whereas an emergency presently exists in New Mexico to provide adequate facilities for a basic education and post-high school vocational training to an ever-increasing number of Indians; and

Whereas the present Federal Government Albuquerque Indian School in New Mexico has unsafe and unsuitable facilities for a modern educational program, and does not provide a much needed post-high school vocational training program; and

Whereas the public schools in New Mexico are unable and will be unable to provide the education and training to Indians in time to meet this urgent need; and

Whereas if the Indians are to strike a telling blow against unemployment and poverty among themselves, expanded facilities for the education and training of Indians is required; and

Whereas it has been proposed that the Federal Government build a new Albuquerque Indian School to provide a basic education and post-high school vocational training program for Indians so that they may compete on an equal basis with others in this modern world; and

Whereas the new Albuquerque Indian School could provide boarding facilities so that there could be a necessary transition for more and more Indians from reservation life to city life;

Whereas the new Albuquerque Indian School is endorsed by all major Indian tribes and pueblos in New Mexico including the Navajo Tribe, the All-Indian Pueblo Council, the Mescalero Apache Tribe and the Jicarilla Apache Tribe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to appropriate necessary funds to provide for a new Albuquerque Indian School in New Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to U.S. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and to the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

BRUCE KING,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
MACK EASLEY,
President, New Mexico Senate.

A DEDICATED HEART—A YOUNG WIDOW WRITES ON VIETNAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, recently a longtime friend, who is serving in southeast Asia, sent me a copy of the Observer, a weekly publication of U.S. Forces in Vietnam. Like many newspapers these days, the Observer carried a letter to the editor in regard to the war in Vietnam. But this letter was most unusual in its message and eloquence.

It matches in poignancy anything I have read concerning the need for young men to take up arms in defense of a country or a cause.

I ask that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD together with a brief editor's note which explains, in part, why the newspaper chose to print it and why I choose to have it appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I urge all my colleagues, particularly those who cannot find it in their hearts to support the struggle for freedom in Vietnam, to read this letter from a young bride who said goodby to her husband 17 days after their marriage and learned less than a month and a half later that he had died in battle.

There being no objection, the letter and editor's note were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEDICATED HEART

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Hundreds of letters in support of the war in Vietnam come across the desk of the Observer each week, representing all degrees of articulateness and viewpoint.

(However, we have never received a letter with the eloquence, the emotional impact, of this letter from a 17-year-old widow whose 19-year-old husband was killed in action in Vietnam.

(Her courage is in the finest tradition of this land that has become the United States of America, and her unusually mature recognition of her husband's desire to defend his country, his way of life and his posterity, prompts us to print the letter in its entirety.

(There is a lesson to be learned from the courage, understanding and patriotism of this young American. The letter was addressed to Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, COMUSMACV.)

DEAR GENERAL WESTMORELAND: I received your letter today and I was surprised but pleased to get it and I felt that I should write and tell you this.

Tom and I were married only 17 days when he was shipped overseas or rather to California. He left there on December 28. We were married 1 month and 24 days when he died. I loved Tommy and I know that he died for a purpose. He told me over and over again to try and understand why he had to go. I learned that Tom could have been deferred because he was the only one left to carry on the Devlin name, now there is no one when his father dies. He said that he didn't want to be deferred, it was his job and he had to do it. I understand and I loved him for it. Tom was a brave man and I'm proud of him. He said that he had rather fight the Communists in Vietnam and die if he had to, than to let them come over here and he said that if we don't stop them now, it won't be too long until we'll be fighting them at home.

Tommy was only 19 years old. I'm 17. We were young to get married, but it was what we wanted and my parents agreed. We both knew that he might never come back alive, but we had such faith and hope that he would. I know that God had a reason for taking Tom and I must accept this. Tom and I went to see the chaplain on the day before he left. He told Chaplain Crick, "I'm not afraid; God will deliver me—one way or another." Since Tom's death the people in our community have realized that the war in Vietnam isn't so far away any more. Tommy was the first boy in Hopkins County to be killed in this war.

I feel the same way Tom and all the guys over there feel toward the draft-card burners and protesters. Tom and hundreds of guys like him are fighting and dying every day for them, for all of us here in America so that we can live in a free world. Why can't these people realize this? I know that my husband didn't die in vain, he died for what he believed in and I'm proud that he stood firm on this. He was proud to be a paratrooper and to be able to do something for his country. Maybe that's one of the reasons I loved him so much, he was a paratrooper—all the way.

I hope you don't mind my writing you this letter, but it was just something I felt I had to do and I wanted to do it. May God watch over and protect you and all the men there fighting for America. I pray for all of you, my prayers can't help my Tommy any more, he's at peace now and he's with God, but maybe they'll help somebody.

I've enclosed an editorial that appeared in our local newspaper 2 days after we learned of Tom's death. May God protect all of you and give us strength and faith to accept his will.

Sincerely,
VELMA DEVLIN.

BAD TIMING DOOMS CUTS IN SCHOOL AID

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Congress is showing more concern each day about administration proposals to reduce substantially four exceptionally successful education programs in fiscal 1967.

The programs are financial assistance for impacted areas, funds for the National Defense Education Act, support for land-grant colleges, and the school lunch and milk programs. The proposed reductions would cut about a half billion dollars in appropriations from fiscal 1966 from these vital programs.

Plans for increased educational services in Nevada, which continues to increase in population at a phenomenal rate, would be seriously curtailed if the Congress were to go along with the proposed reductions. Funds for education in all the States would likewise be curtailed, and the areas effected by the cuts would not benefit by proposals to increase educational spending for other programs.

It has been gratifying to see so many Members of both Houses of Congress speak out against the proposed reductions, and I am confident that these unsound cuts will be rejected.

Mr. President, an excellent editorial on reaction to education reductions appeared in the March 21 edition of the Las Vegas Sun, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BAD TIMING DOOMS CUTS IN SCHOOL AID

President Johnson's proposals to reduce Federal grants for education means a lot of money to us as it does the rest of the States, with the impact of the cuts emphasized, because they would come at a time when distress signals are being sent aloft by Nevada educators.

In two major areas, Federal payments to land-grant colleges and in Federal aid to impacted school districts, nearly $3 million is at stake in Nevada.

Mr. Johnson called for cutbacks of $482.7 million in appropriations and $291.9 million in spending in the programs. The cutbacks from the current fiscal year funds would affect every State and congressional district in the Nation.

Cuts were asked in aid to federally impacted school districts, assistance for land-grant colleges, direct Government loans for college students, and programs which supply hot lunches and milk to schoolchildren.

The presidential ax chopped deeply into aid for schools which serve children whose parents live or work on Federal property. Reductions amounted to $163.6 million for school operating costs and $27.1 million for construction.

The Government paid Nevada school districts more than $2.7 million last year to help pay the costs of educating children whose parents live or work on Federal installations. Federal grants to the University of Nevada under the Land-Grant College Act exceed $200,000 a year.

If the President's proposal is accepted, Nevada school districts will receive only $949,759 to help pay the costs of educating the children of Federal workers, servicemen, and others who live or work on Federal installations. The President requested no appropriation for land-grant colleges in fiscal 1967.

He also proposed cuts in school hot lunch and milk program appropriations and a reduction in funds for Federal loans to students.

But there is a serious question whether Congress will accede to the President's proposals.

Members of Congress as liberal as Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, and as conservative as Senator John G. Tower, Republican, of Texas, opposed the cuts. Opponents included key members of Education Committees in both Chambers.

Representative Adam C. Powell, Democrat of New York, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, said, " I don't think there is a chance of passing any kind of retrenchment in school aid. The President is not running for reelection. We are."

Morse, chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee's education subcommittee, said, "Open the window and let the Great Society fly out. That is exactly what the President is trying to do."

Cutbacks in other education programs amounted to $179 million in National Defense Education Act (NDEA) funds and $101 million in school food programs.

The proposed cuts would be made in programs which have long, popular histories in Congress. Aid to land-grant colleges started in 1862 with the Morrill Act. School food programs started in 1936, aid to impacted areas in 1940, and direct loans to college students in 1958.

Former Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy tried to cut back the impacted areas programs, but were rebuffed by Congress.

President Johnson, despite intensive opposition, is attempting to focus the school food programs on needy children. He proposed the Child Nutrition Act in 1966 to provide free hot lunches and school breakfasts for the needy. He asked for $50 million to finance the program.

The vocal opposition in Congress gives the administration scant hope of cutting back on any education program in this election year.

TRIBUTE TO CLAUDE L. CALLEGARY, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DAV

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on February 16, I had the honor of introducing to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs the national commander of the DAV, Mr. Claude Callegary, of Baltimore, Md. Mr. Callegary delivered before the committee a comprehensive statement of the DAV legislative objectives for the year 1966.

For many years, Mr. Callegary has been a close personal friend of mine. It was my pleasure to place his name in nomination for his present post at the DAV national convention in New Orleans last August.

The life of Claude Callegary provides a story that should be an inspiration to all Americans. In order to help support his family during the depression, he was forced to leave school at the 7th grade level, and between 1935 and 1941, he worked in the cotton mills, attended filling stations, and drove trucks.

In March 1941, 9 months before Pearl Harbor, Mr. Callegary volunteered for service in the Army. In 1944, after serving with distinction in the Aleutians, he was ordered to the South Pacific. In October of that year, he was one of three to survive a plane crash on the tiny Pacific island of Biak.

While convalescing in Army hospitals, Mr. Callegary spent his time studying for a high school diploma. At the war's end, he enrolled in the University of Maryland. He passed the Maryland Bar exams in 1949, ranking among the top 10 in the State. At present, he is a senior partner in his own law firm, and a recognized expert in labor law.

Claude Callegary has played an active role in veterans' affairs since the Second World War. He has shown himself to be a resourceful and dynamic leader in Maryland as well as in the DAV. No man is better qualified than he to speak on matters concerning the disabled veterans of this country. His testimony deserves the widest possible attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Claude L. Callegary, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, before the House of Representatives Committee on Veterans' Affairs on February 16, 1966, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CLAUDE L. CALLEGARY, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 16, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my appearance here today is at one and the same time a very special occasion for me, personally, and the main event of our national executive committee meeting and the annual commanders' and adjutants' conference which has been underway in the District of Columbia since Monday last. The conferees all of whom are in the room with me, represent our organization's highest echelon of leadership at both the State and National levels. In their behalf, I wish to express our deepest gratitude for extending to me the high privilege of appearing before you to present the 1966 legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Chairman, as you and the committee members know, the DAV membership is comprised of veterans who were honorably discharged during a period of war and who were wounded, injured, or otherwise disabled by reason of such service. Included in the term "during a period of war" are veterans whose wounds, injuries, or disabilities were incurred as a result of armed conflict, or while engaged in extrahazardous duty, including service under conditions simulating war.

The Disabled American Veterans was founded in 1920 and our congressional charter specifically charges us with the responsibility of caring for the welfare of our Nations war disabled, their widows, and orphans. We are a single-purpose organization dedicated to service. In every Veterans' Administration Regional Office and Center in the United States, we have national service officers—men who were themselves disabled as a result of wartime service.

They are familiar with the problems which beset other veterans of like circumstances. They assist veterans, their widows and orphans in connection with claims for compensation, pension, hospitalization, medical treatment, educational and vocational training, and sundry other benefits available under law. He represents claimants in personal appearances before local VA rating boards. He concerns himself deeply in the employment problems of disabled veterans, particularly the seriously disabled.

The DAV furnishes this service, without charge, to any disabled veteran whether he is or is not a member of our organization. Our membership, incidentally, is at its highest level in DAV history. Our service budget this year exceeds $2 million, which is derived primarily from our Idento-Tags. Through the operation of this effective fundraising program over a million and a half people in the last 10 years have had their lost keys returned to them.

Mr. Chairman, the DAV realizes how deeply your committee has engaged itself in legislative matters relating to the true needs of our membership. Legislation inspired by this committee, through the years, has done so very much to improve the welfare of the disabled veteran, his widow, his children and dependent parents. Confirmation of this fact is established most conclusively when we examine the committee's record in the 1st session of the current 89th Congress.

We saw legislation enacted to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program; increases in the rates of subsistence allowances paid disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training; the extension of time limits to seriously disabled veterans who need additional vocational rehabilitation training, or retraining; to entitle children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to the benefits under the war orphans' educational assistance program. Legislation was also enacted to provide a group life insurance program for all members of the uniformed services and death gratuity payments to widows, children, and parents of deceased veterans.

The first session's most dramatic highlight for the service-connected disabled veteran came, of course, with passage of the compensation increase bill, H.R. 168. This bill which is now Public Law 89–311 contains—in addition to increases in basic rates of compensation—eight provisions, which by their very nature would normally require the introduction of eight separate bills, each covering its own specific legislative proposal. This law, then, may truly be described as a legislative "package deal" for veterans and their dependents. In any event, the combination of benefits embraced in this one law serves to enlarge the committee's record in terms of legislative enactments in the preceding session of the 89th Congress.

We are profoundly grateful for the prompt, sympathetic, and effective action taken by the committee with respect to this most beneficial legislative measure.

In all, your committee last year held 21 executive sessions, resulting in the reporting of 18 bills. Of this number, 10 were enacted into law.

In our opinion, this represents a splendid record of achievement for the committee. This is especially so, when we recall that the committee's time and attention was occupied with many weeks of hearings in connection with the Veterans' Administration proposal to close 32 of its operating facilities. The hearings were laborious and protracted, and we wish to commend the committee members for their patience and understanding and for bringing the facts of this vital matter before the public.

Mr. Chairman, the subjects which I shall discuss and emphasize here this morning represent the DAV legislative objectives for the year 1966 which, if achieved, will do much to improve the welfare of our country's disabled veterans, their dependents, and survivors.

In preparing our program we recognize the fact that there is need for restraint and good judgment in asking for extension of veterans' benefits in view of the added expenditures required to prosecute the war in Vietnam. However, we feel our requests are reasonable and will not, to any noticeable degree, disturb the national economy nor in any way impede our country's effort to halt Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, we want our servicemen over there to know we support them and appreciate the sacrifices they are making.

The question of U.S. involvement in Vietnam was once debatable, but we are now committed to fight a successful war to halt militaristic expansion there and bring about a peaceful settlement. I was recently privileged to visit in Hawaii, Japan, Taiwan, Manila, and eventually Saigon, Vietnam; and I know, from personal experience, the tremendous additional burden that this committee will have in determining the benefits which will be due the veterans serving in Vietnam. It gives me a profound feeling of satisfaction to know that members of this committee, including its chairman, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. DORN, and other members who went to Vietnam know from firsthand knowledge of the terrible war in which our fighting men are now engaged; and I wish personally to commend them for their visitation for I know of the hardships encountered on a journey of this nature.

In this war we do not have a Hitler, or a Mussolini, or a Tojo, who so treacherously attacked Pearl Harbor. However, it appears to me, from my observations and briefings, that we have an even more deadly enemy—militaristic China—who is manifestly dedicated to conquering all of the Asian countries.

The closeness of China's activities in relation to America's interest was brought home to me very clearly when I discovered that Saigon is about 700 miles from Manila in the Philippine Islands; and hence any Chinese victory in the areas of southeast Asia would certainly endanger the security of the Philippines, as well as the adjoining countries.

In the course of my visitation to the Pacific theater of operations, I visited our wounded soldiers in American and Vietnamese hospitals in many areas. I also learned, of course, that there are new hospitals being opened as quickly as possible to take care of the additional American wounded. During my stopoff at DaNang, I watched hundreds of wounded GI's being brought out by helicopters and taken on hospital planes for swift shipment to general hospitals. I spoke to many of these soldiers, some of whom were 19 and 20 years of age, and they were all very much concerned about what would happen to them as a result of their wounds when they became civilians again.

I can tell you gentlemen here that I promised them, as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, that we would urge your committee and the Congress at the earliest moment to pass appropriate legislation to assist them in overcoming their wounds so that they may once more become productive members of the American society.

Also, on my trip around our own country, I have observed men training under wartime conditions which, in my opinion, is almost as hazardous as the actual fighting.

I would like to take a moment of the committee's time to comment on the wounds incurred by the Vietnamese. It was quite apparent to me that the Vietnamese are suffering many more wounds than the Americans and that their loyalty to the American soldier is firm and steadfast. It was also apparent to me that the Vietnamese veterans do not have adequate hospitals, doctors, or medical supplies, and particularly their amputees had no prostheses, or even wheelchairs, or crutches.

I have therefore instituted a program of help which will be called Amp-to-Amp. In this endeavor, we will work directly with the Vietnamese wounded in collecting artificial limbs, wheelchairs, crutches, which we shall supply to them directly to show that we, the wounded of the United States, do care what happens to the wounded of South Vietnam.

I might say in connection with our involvement in Vietnam that many Americans are still uncertain about the cause, the expectations, and the ultimate objectives of our military effort. It appears to us that there is only one valid reason for the sacrificing of American lives in Vietnam today. It is to save millions of Americans from being killed or wounded later in the enlarged war that can come if the Communist governments in Moscow and Peking are not blocked in their ambition to take over control of small as well as large nations in Asia. Whatever the eventualities, it is shortsighted, we think, to question the justice in our basic purpose of trying to check the Communist lust for world enslavement.

The daily reports from the battlefields of Vietnam cry out for our attention day after day in the newspapers, on radio, and television. We feel that any American citizen concerned with his country's welfare should not oppose the efforts of our servicemen. If there are differences of opinion as to the reasons why we should or should not be in Vietnam, or how the war should be prosecuted, there should be no difference of opinion at all about fully supporting our own troops in distant lands.

In any event, the DAV support will continue unabated; and we would say to those who challenge our country's commitment on ethical, moral—or any other grounds—that they should give us the benefit of some reasonable and practical advice rather than take to the streets in clamorous protests that give aid and comfort and encouragement to the enemy.

At this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I wish to mention that the DAV strongly recommends approval of pending legislation to provide wartime veterans' benefits to these men who are currently serving in our Armed Forces.

We feel that conditions under which they serve fully justify wartime readjustment benefits. No young man entering the service today has assurance that his time will be spent in peaceful stateside duty. Under present circumstances it is almost certain that he will eventually be exposed to the risk and peril of combat duty in some other country threatened by Communist expansion.

Our country's obligation to this serviceman is no less than the obligation owed to his counterpart of World War II and the Korean conflict. We must provide for all of them in whatever variety and quantity may be required. This objective was fulfilled in large measure when your committee cleared the way for House passage of H.R. 12410 on February 7.

This bill, fully endorsed by the DAV, not only provides necessary programs of home loans and educational assistance to post-Korean veterans, but also extends the presumptions for establishing service connection for tropical and chronic diseases and other valuable benefits to the service-connected disabled.

We wish to express our appreciation to the committee for its prompt action which opened the opportunity for the bill's passage this session of Congress.

In discussing prospective benefits for current members of the Armed Forces, it comes to mind that attempts are being made to bring GI educational and other programs within the scope of the sweeping welfare activities of the Great Society. We want to state here that the DAV is utterly and fundamentally opposed to any plans that would shift control of veterans' programs from the Veterans' Administration to another Government agency.

As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, the DAV legislative program is based upon proposals set forth in resolutions adopted by our national conventions. At our most recent national convention held in New Orleans, La., last August, there were 64 resolutions approved which specifically require legislative action. I should like at this time to call attention to several key proposals upon which we earnestly urge the committee's early and favorable consideration.

One of the more compelling DAV legislative objectives concerns a proposal well-known to this committee—one which our organization has included in its legislative program for almost a decade. I refer, of course, to legislation proposing establishment of a Court of Veterans' Appeals. We are aware of the extensive hearings conducted in this matter by the committee, the long and sometimes wearisome days spent listening to an endless array of witnesses testifying pro and con.

We recognize that there are individuals and organizations, powerful and articulate, who consistently offer strong, deep-laid opposition to this legislation. As a consequence of this, our determination and our united effort to win support for this most significant of DAV goals are all the stronger. We hope that the intensity of interest shown by members of the committee in the past will not diminish, but will instead increase in degree and measure until the Nation's 22 million war veterans are assured of their day in court.

There are several DAV legislative resolutions which were introduced and left unsatisfied in the first session of the 89th Congress. These resolutions represent continuing mandates which must be carried over for attention during the second session now underway.

One such resolution which has concerned the DAV for an extended period of time is set out in H.R. 1745, a bill introduced by your chairman at our request on January 6, 1965. It proposes to enable certain permanently and totally disabled veterans to receive the full rate of disability compensation found payable for their wartime service connected disabilities and also a proportionate amount of disability pension under a specified formula. The formula would apply to compensable ratings ranging from 10 through 90 percent.

The amount payable under the formula is determined by deducting from 100 percent the compensation rating evaluation, the result representing the percentage of pension payable in the case. For example, a veteran rated 40 percent for compensation purposes would receive his full rate of payment, $82 a month, for his service-connected disability, and in addition, an amount equivalent to 60 percent of the pension ordinarily payable.

We do not contend that a veteran should be given the full amounts of both compensation and pension, and we do not request such legislation; but we do earnestly urge this committee to approve the very reasonable modified adjustment proposed in H.R. 1745.

As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, that the primary obligation of the DAV inherently lies with the service connected compensation program. However, our membership includes a number of veterans who are receiving pension payments in lieu of disability compensation. This is so, because in some cases, the pension payments result in the greater monetary benefit. The effect of the recent social security increases on pensions payable to veterans and the widows of veterans brought about reductions and, in some instances, actual discontinuance of pension benefits. We know that this matter is being studied by your committee. The DAV is in complete accord with the purpose of this study, for we feel that an equitable solution will be reached.

Another pending DAV bill on the subject of compensation is titled "H.R. 177." It provides that veterans having a service connected disability rated at 40 percent or more shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents. Under existing law, a veteran who is totally disabled and has a wife receives an additional $25 compensation monthly. A veteran rated 50 percent and with a wife receives additional compensation equal to one-half of $25, or $12.50. Veterans rated 40 percent receive nothing additional for dependents.

This seems highly unreasonable in view of the fact that many disabilities rated at 40 percent reflect a high degree of impairment. Some of the disabilities rated at 40 percent include leg amputations; multiple finger amputations; enucleation of an eye; and severe symptoms associated with diseases covering all systems of the body. Any one of these conditions can place the individual in the seriously disabled class where his industrial capacity is adversely affected. We seriously urge that your committee act favorably on this reasonable and desirable measure.

Also in regard to disability compensation, our legislative program contains a resolution expressed in H.R. 11930, which would amend current law with respect to the preservation of certain disability compensation ratings.

Present law provides that a disability which has been continuously rated at or above a certain percentage for 20 or more years, shall not thereafter be rated at a lesser percentage except upon a showing that the rating was based on fraud.

It has come to our attention that occasions arise where a disability rating is reduced during the statutory 20-year period and a short time later, on the basis of previously unrevealed facts or additional medical evidence, the prior rating is restored. Instances also occur where a rating reduction is based on an actual showing of improvement in the disability. In a large number of these cases, however, the improvement is merely a temporary remission of the symptoms. Soon after the reduction, medical evidence is introduced indicating the symptoms have resumed their ordinary level of severity. The former rating is then restored.

Considering the circumstances distinctive in the cases just cited, we feel that these veterans are being unfairly deprived of the protective feature of the law. H.R. 11930 would correct this inequity by providing, with respect to the 20-year statutory period that, "breaks of continuity for periods of less than 1 year in any disability rating applicable to any individual shall be disregarded."

We believe that the committee will see the equity and the need for this legislative proposal.

On January 4, 1965, your chairman introduced at our request H.R. 226, to make the children of veterans having a service-connected disability rated at not less than 50 percent eligible for benefits under the war orphans' educational assistance program.

The Veterans' Administration has conceded that a 50-percent rating puts a man in the class of seriously disabled. This bill refers specifically to seriously disabled individuals. We are not asking for the full subsistence allowance granted the war orphans and children of the totally disabled, but only the amount which would be payable on a proportionate basis.

During the first session of the present Congress the DAV requested the introduction of H.R. 1583, a bill to provide increases in compensation for veterans having single statutory awards based on service-connected disability.

VA records reveal there are about 75,500 veterans receiving the statutory award under section 314, subparagraph (K), title 38, United States Code, and 58,300 veterans receiving the award under subparagraph (Q).

It is worthy of note that these particular rates have not been increased in the past 13 years. The conditions which are the basis for these special awards include anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot; of a creative organ; or one hand; or both buttocks; or blindness of one eye; or complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech; or deafness of both ears. In addition to these conditions, there is a statutory award for arrested pulmonary tuberculosis. The bill covering this matter would provide an increase of only $6 per month for all but the arrested tuberculosis, which would be $8 per month—certainly not much to request after 13 years. We believe that further study and consideration of the facts by your committee in this matter will lead to increases during this session of Congress.

Also of special interest to the DAV is a bill entitled H.R. 1743, to provide for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to certain survivors of deceased veterans who were rated 100 percent disabled by reason of service-connected disabilities for 20 or more years.

In assessing the merits of this legislation we think it entirely reasonable to say that a veteran who has suffered the distress and debilitating effects of a service-connected total disability for 20 years should, thereafter, have statutory assurance that upon his death his widow will be provided for by payment of dependency and indemnity compensation.

Generally, the totally disabled veteran is unable to follow a substantially gainful occupation. He, very definitely, has had no possible opportunity to accumulate money or materials for his survivors.

Additionally, we feel there is another sound basis for extending DIC benefits to the widow of a veteran totally disabled for 20 years—that is to say, it should not really matter how he died; but how he lived, and if he was a 100-percent service-connected disabled war veteran, then his wife played a very great part in his living which ought to be fully recognized.

We think the Government has a responsibility, in this instance, which has so far been overlooked. We therefore respectfully urge favorable action on H.R. 1743.

The DAV also has a genuine interest in legislation to increase DIC payments to parents of deceased veterans.

In order to be eligible for monthly payments, the parents are required to meet an extremely strict test of financial need. If we compare the tests of need or income limits necessary for parents to qualify for compensation payments with the tests of need or income limits necessary for veterans and widow to qualify for non-service-connected pension, the gross inequity is readily apparent.

We respectfully urge, Mr. Chairman, that you and the members of your committee give thoughtful consideration to this meaningful legislation.

While on the subject of death compensation and its related features, there is a bill pending to increase rates of death compensation payable to widows, children, and dependent parents of veterans who died from service-connected causes prior to January 1, 1957. The bill titled H.R. 1169, was introduced January 4, 1965, by Mr. SECREST.

Survivors of veterans who were on the death compensation rolls before January 1, 1957, were permitted to continue on the rolls or elect to receive payments under the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act which became effective January 1, 1957.

It is significant to note that as of September 1965 there were 4,212 widows on the death compensation rolls. Why these widows have not elected to receive DIC may be ascribed to misunderstanding, indifference, or lack of knowledge of the greater benefit.

In any event, we think the DIC and death compensation programs should be reviewed and appropriate legislation enacted to correct the imperfections in the existing law.

The Disabled American Veterans has an abiding interest in matters pertaining to the

Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program. We have a special interest in the estimated budget request submitted to the Congress each year by the VA for nursing home care, research, and domiciliary centers. In connection with the domiciliary program, your chairman on January 10, 1966, introduced at DAV request H.R. 11929. It would amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall operate at least 18,000 beds in its domiciliary facilities. We see this legislation as a means of ending the situation in which the domiciliary patient membership capacity is steadily being reduced. I might also mention here that Public Law 88–450, which gave the Veterans' Administration authority to place veterans in private nursing homes, is not being implemented at a reasonable and acceptable pace. It has been brought to our attention that there are many veterans who require nursing-type care and are being retained in VA general hospitals even though there is bed space for them in private nursing homes. These homes meet all the standards set by the Veterans Administration and the various States and we cannot understand why this situation should prevail.

We hope that your committee would investigate this phase of the VA hospital program.

We want to acknowledge here that this committee has unfailingly recognized its responsibility to provide the best possible medical and hospital care for veterans whose disabilities are a result of their military service.

Not only veteran patients but all sick and disabled can be thankful for the support this committee and the Congress has given to the development of the medical and prosthetic research programs carried out in VA hospitals and clinics under VA sponsorship outside their own facilities.

The Disabled American Veterans has been particularly interested with the progress made in recent years in the area of care and treatment of patients with psychiatric disorders.

More than half of all VA hospital beds are occupied by the mentally ill, and many of them have been hospitalized for years. While some of them may never leave the hospital in spite of every effort, there is increasing hope in view of some of the results achieved where resources were sufficiently marshalled.

Some idea of the size of the problem may be obtained when you consider that 1 out of 10 people in this country are suffering from a serious mental or emotional disorder that will require hospitalization and will disable them from carrying out their daily activities. The need for psychiatric treatment for the veteran as well as the general population, keeps increasing. Clearly, better and more effective methods of treatment have to be found.

The Disabled American Veterans strongly supports the position that the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery continue to maintain its prominence in the field of mental care. The new treatment methods that are receiving much publicity in the press and scientific fields are very costly and will require a continuing increase in Veterans' Administration appropriations.

There is in the Veterans' Administration the potential to lead the way in mental health research. What is needed here is an adequate supply of funds for competent professional staff. Money to train badly-needed professions in an effort to supply a great demand. Funds to buy space to do the research; and finally, funds for the equipment and programs that are vitally needed.

We are confident that the committee will lend its complete and stanch support to an expansion of the VA mental health research program.

One other point on the subject of VA medical treatment is contained in DAV bill H.R. 186. Essentially, it provides that the Veterans' Administration shall authorize complete medical services for any veteran totally disabled from a service-connected disability.

Under provisions of Public Law 88–450, outpatient treatment may be given to veterans for chronic illnesses even though such illnesses are unrelated to military service. The 100-percent service-connected disabled veteran is usually in no position to supplement his income through employment; hence he cannot afford the current high costs of drugs, medicines, and treatments. In view of this, and considering the liberal outpatient treatment benefits accorded the non-service-connected veteran under terms of Public Law 83–450, we feel the purpose of DAV bill H.R. 186 is justifiable and merits the committee's sympathetic attention.

An issue which does not directly fall within the purview of this committee but which deeply concerns the DAV involves the growing lack of burial space in the existing national cemetery system. It is our good fortune that three members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee are also members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the body having jurisdiction over the national cemetery program. Mr. Haley, Mr. Baring, and Mr. Saylor are the members to whom I refer. We know that they, too, have considerable concern over the decreasing cemetery space and will give their support to any legislation to improve this situation.

While discussing this matter, Mr. Chairman, we might suggest that the operation and maintenance of national cemeteries be transferred from the Department of the Army to the Veterans' Administration. We recognize that this transfer of functions would place legislative matters relating to the cemeteries under the jurisdiction of your committee. This transfer would serve to bring about a solution of the many long-standing problems associated with the national cemetery system.

Another legislative matter beyond the scope and responsibility of your committee but which has the continuing interest of the DAV is the proposal to establish a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the U.S. Senate. We believe that creation of such a committee, with an appointed full-time professional staff to assist it, will serve to facilitate and accelerate action on veterans legislation in the Senate.

The DAV constantly centers its attention on efforts by individuals and groups to weaken and impair the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended. In concert with other veteran organizations the DAV has, thus far, been successful in opposing and defeating these efforts. In a similar connection, a high-priority effort of the Disabled American Veterans is to seek, each year, congressional approval of funds sufficient for effective operation of the Veterans Employment Service of the Department of Labor. This agency performs an outstanding service in solving the employment problems of the Nation's disabled veterans.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank you for your kindness and courtesy in permitting me the opportunity to appear before you. I want, also, to take this occasion to recognize the House Veterans' Affairs Committee staff—a staff distinguished by experience and high competence. I wish to express to each of them our sincere thanks for the cooperation, interest, and help extended to us throughout the past year.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I should like at this point to submit for inclusion in the record a statement covering many other important legislative items included in our current program requiring your attention, and a copy of legislative resolutions adopted at the 1965 DAV national convention.

Thank you.

THE WORLD FOOD PROBLEM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 1 month ago, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman made a truly significant speech to the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation here in Washington on the subject of the world food problem.

I have long been interested in this problem, and, indeed, made my first major speech on the floor of the Senate on this particular issue. I think the Secretary's speech is worthy of note by the Senate and the Congress, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman Before American Freedom From Hunger Foundation National Conference, Washington, D.C., February 24, 1966

I shall try to be reasonably brief in my remarks, though this may be somewhat difficult because of the deep interest I share with you in the subject.

This topic, this subject, this challenge, if you will, was the one which was primarily instrumental in my wishing to be the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture. Long before I was honored by that designation I was, like you, deeply concerned about world hunger. I was struck with the shocking contradiction that while two-thirds of the people of the world were hungry, one-third were getting more and more of the world's goods, and where the problem was not one of starving, not one of having too little to eat, but one of having too much food and of worrying about obesity.

This was a world in which we had, on the one hand, unmet wants, and on the other unused capacity—and what a living contradiction that is.

And so, the No. 1 resolve of many I had when I took office was to do what I could to work with the dedicated and able people in the Department of Agriculture to try to make a contribution in meeting this great problem, this great contradiction, this great challenge of a world in which so many have so much and so many more have so little.

That was 5 years and some months ago. Perhaps this morning we should call the roll and see what kind of accounting we might all give.

What has happened in the past 5 years?

Well, many things have been done. In terms of dollars, we have expended some 15 billions for food and fiber distributed around the world. Wherever there have been disasters, typhoons, volcano catastrophes, floods or pestilence—American food has been there almost within hours. We have contributed to needy people through a variety of means, and we have developed a host of new techniques for using food for economic development. Techniques ranging from grubstaking people to open new lands in many places, to financing education for people who wished to diversify their farming operations, for payment on the job with food to do a host of things involving schools, hospitals, roads, irrigation, drainage, and many other worthwhile projects.

We have reached more than a hundred million people a year in more than a hundred countries. But there are a lot more to be reached, and there is a lot more to be done.

It adds up, I think, to a truly herculean effort to provide wherewithal to needy people and to meet need with outstanding service. The magnitude of this effort is such that we can all be proud to be Americans.

This has been a truly significant accomplishment and if credit is to be given, you here in this room have earned a mighty share indeed.

But if we look at the other side of the coin, we'll understand that we can't be complacent, that we can't even allot credit, because basically speaking we simply haven't made any progress.

Today, on a per capita basis, food availabilities around the world have not increased. I say this because recent studies have shown that the 2.6-percent-a-year food production increase has been all but cancelled out by the tremendous increase in population. So, like Alice in Wonderland, we have to run twice as fast just to stay in place.

This presents us with a grim picture. There are millions of new bodies born each year, some 67 million in all. Enough people to create a new nation the size of France, and it takes a tremendous increase in the amount of available food just to stay abreast in the face of that kind of onrush.

And so you see that if we've put in a great deal of effort, a tremendous amount of treasure, a good bit of ingenuity and a real desire to meet and serve human needs, and if, after 12 years with Public Law 480 and the food-for-peace program, we are still not any further down the road to providing the world's population with adequate food and health-giving nutrition, then it is, indeed, a grim picture.

We could be discouraged. I don't think we should. I assure you that I am not. Quite the contrary.

Well, then, we might ask ourselves what we should do to begin making significant progress in this race between food and people.

First of all I want to say that I am encouraged instead of discouraged. I am encouraged because all of you are here, and this organization is here. And I am encouraged because a bright, energetic and gifted young man like Jim O'Connor is here and giving a great deal of his time and energy to providing excellent leadership.

Because of you, and others like you, I think this country of ours is alert and aware now as to what the problem is and is eager and anxious to support sensible measures to do something about it.

I have been making speeches on this subject for a long time now—some before I became Secretary of Agriculture, and many since—and few got much public attention.

Informed people were concerned. Humanitarian leaders were concerned. But the great mass of the American people had not been reached and were not concerned.

That's not true now. Almost any issue of almost any newspaper has something in it about food, land, people and the race between food and people. This is tremendously important, because in a democratic nation not much is going to be done if there isn't understanding and support by the great mass of the people.

Secondly, I draw encouragement from having been exposed to the critical areas in the world. I speak of Vietnam, which I visited recently, and India, which has occupied so much of my attention in recent months.

I think important breakthroughs are being made in these areas and that a determined followup can, indeed, develop the proper balance between food and people.

India and Vietnam are dramatic examples of the vital importance of agriculture, of the need for investment in it, and the necessity for hard work to make it move.

An agricultural program which will produce an adequate food supply is the obvious pad from which to launch the general economies of these two countries and of all the other less developed nations of the world.

Speaking for a moment of Vietnam, where I recently visited, I am firmly convinced that it is understood and recognized by the Vietnamese Government, and certainly by ours (and the Honolulu Declaration strongly emphasizes this) that the war with communism engendered by the invasion from the north must be met and won on two fronts.

Fighting the war with guns and bullets constitutes only one front. The basic and important war is the social revolution offering the people something to live for, something to fight for, and a reason to be loyal to their own country and their own institutions.

I believe the leadership in Vietnam today is thoroughly aware of this, and I believe that through agriculture we will find the real key to that social revolution.

I believe this because 80 percent of the people in that country make their living on the soil.

Furthermore, there is today in Vietnam an awareness that there are new methods, new means, new techniques in agriculture which can open the door to a bright new world of peace and plenty. And that awareness is as apparent among the Nation's farmers as it is among its Government officials.

This awareness reflects itself in a strong demand for improved seed, for fertilizers, chemicals, various antitoxins for animals, improved grades of animals. There is a recognition that these new techniques and products can bring about increased yields and a higher standard of living.

Less than 10 days ago, I stood on a hectare of land in an area about midpoint up the coast in Vietnam. An area which only 2 years before had been a sand dune. Under the Government land reform program, that hectare of land had been deeded to the peasant I visited.

The dune had been leveled. A Chinese technician from Taiwan had come to the area to advise, and a number of American vegetables, in this particular instance the onion, had been adapted. Matt Drosdoff of our Department of Agriculture was one of those instrumental in keeping the technician who had adapted this particular vegetable to Vietnam conditions working on the job for 4 years.

What did all this mean to this particular peasant? Well, it meant that last year he netted from his farming operation 200 piasters—or $2,000. Had he been growing rice instead of onions, he would have netted about $20.

With his profits, he was able to build a new little home, buy a bright red motor bike and install a simple little irrigation system. With some of his neighbors, he bought a gasoline pump, and then the community decided to construct a warehouse through the self-help method. The people in this village look cheerful, well-fed, and healthy—and there is no Vietcong problem.

The province chief told me he didn't go out in the daytime to interrupt the men in the fields, but visited them at night so as not to disrupt their schedules. It is interesting to note that this was the only province I visited where the province chief dared travel at night, for in other areas guerrilla infiltration was too great a threat.

Security was such that had a Vietcong infiltration been attempted, there would have been an immediate report to the authorities and the infiltrators quickly apprehended.

Why was this so? Because this particular community had a stake in the future, and I drew hope from it. I drew hope because it indicated to me that the average Vietnamese peasant farmer realizes and appreciates what improved farming techniques and tools can mean to him and to his country.

The same is true in India. Today in that country there is a strong demand for improved seed and fertilizer. As a matter of fact, just yesterday fertilizer was selling on the black market in India for twice what it is selling through commercial channels.

This eager desire to try new techniques and to use the other tools and materials of modern agriculture is both a source of encouragement and a reason to commend Mr. Bell, of the AID agency. For the AID program has begun to bring about an awareness on the part of the cultivators in these counties as to just what can be done by them.

I mention this in some length because basically and fundamentally the key to the problem that we are here to try to solve is the ability of the less developed countries to shoulder an increased share of the responsibility of providing food for their own people.

Finally, I am optimistic this morning because of the message in the bill the President sent to the Congress of the United States a few days ago. The food-for-freedom message I am sure you all have read. And I am sure you will reread it again and again.

Yesterday, it was my privilege to open the official testimony on this bill before the House Committee on Agriculture. This is a great and meaningful program. One that will make it possible to gear the tremendous agricultural productivity of this country to the kind of programing that will permit us to produce what is needed and to schedule its production as it can be used effectively.

There are two basic new features in this bill. The first emphasizes self-help; the absolute necessity that the less developed nations bring to their own agriculture concern, the best minds, the basic parts of their economic programing and the necessary resources to make it move.

Though we are a contributing force in this program, we must not permit our food and its use to be a crutch for these nations. Rather, our help must serve as a stimulant.

In the testimony I gave yesterday we used a chart. You can't very well see the chart today, but I will refer to it for illustrative purposes.

There is a black line which represents the worldwide demand for food, assuming that minimum nutritional needs are met, and population growth, which assumes a likely program of population control. That line climbs very rapidly.

Then there is a dotted line here that goes up very quickly but then levels out. That line represents U.S. productive capacity.

I make two points in connection with this that I think are fundamental. First, in the next few years our productive capacity will be significantly more than is necessary to reach the additional needs based on the minimum standard projected here.

But this will not hold true for long, for those two lines would cross at about the 1985 mark on the chart. After that, in the absence of a very significant increase in agricultural productivity by the less developed countries, the more developed countries no longer would have the capacity to meet the needs around the world. And then we would be faced with the horror of mass starvation.

So the challenge is one of effectively using technical assistance and food as part of the self-help encouragement program to bring to these countries the techniques and organizational ability and know-how to increase their own production. Hopefully, as they do this, the United States will continue to make its food available to them—but more and more on a commercial, rather than a concessional, basis.

The strong thrust and emphasis on self-help is a matter, in my judgment, of critical importance as we view the magnitude of this whole problem of food and people imbalance.

It is not going to be easy to increase production by these countries in sufficient amount to meet the increase in population. As you all well know, many of these nations do not even have stable government. Illiteracy is widespread, resources are sharply limited, and most have a subsistence economy.

But, again, we should not be discouraged nor of faint heart. I say this because of what is revealed rather clearly in a study made recently in the Department of Agriculture and financed, incidentally, by AID. This study, called "Agriculture in 26 Developing Nations," reports that about half of the newly developing countries, in all continents, have had an agricultural growth rate in excess of 4 percent since 1948.

Now we have never reached that growth rate here in the United States. But one of the highest increase rates was achieved by Sudan, a country with a high level of illiteracy.

What this demonstrates, of course, is that if there is a will, if the people in a given country have the desire, if they mobilize their resources, and if they have a little help, there is no reason why they cannot increase their own agricultural growth rate to match or surpass their population increase.

This can be done. But it does require real desire, real concentration, and real effort.

And frankly, in the past in most of these countries, and in part in our own policies (and I don't speak critically of anyone when I say this) there has not been the emphasis on agriculture that there should have been.

It has been easier to do other things you can see and measure—build a road, construct a public building—do something which demonstrates the results of investment and effort. It isn't that easy in the field of agriculture, and so there has been a tendency to put it off and wait for another day.

But now we are at the place and time where we cannot put it off and wait for another day. Increasingly there is a worldwide awareness of this point of no more procrastination, and this very awareness is a cause for encouragement.

The second main thrust of our new agricultural program is to link our own domestic agriculture with the worldwide food crisis.

Under the Food and Agriculture Act passed last year, the Secretary of Agriculture has considerable discretion in setting price supports, acreage allotments, and moving land in or out of production as needs may require. This new bill would continue that authority, and a companion bill would sanction the establishment of agricultural reserves of the key commodities.

As matters now stand, I am by law permitted to sell everything and to clear out the cupboard and sweep it bare. Why, if I really carried this out to the extent the law allows we could be on a crash selling program right this moment and dispose of every kernel we have.

We haven't done that. And it would be national folly to do so.

On the other hand, there has not been a national policy which says we ought to have reserves of certain amounts—reserves that could meet drought, short crops, reserves that could be used to meet needs in other places.

This new bill would provide for such definite reserves. We would then have in effect what I referred to 5 years ago as a "real food budget." We would have a food budget where we would be able to sit down and figure out what is going to be needed and how much of what. And we would be able to do that in a manner and fashion which would provide an adequate return for the producer and would provide us with those commodities which could be used to meet both domestic and foreign commercial and concessional needs.

And this bill would provide the warmth and the heart and the muscle for this great humanitarian effort to stamp out famine, malnutrition, and need throughout the world.

Only as we do that are we going to have the security and insurance of living in a peaceful world.

In this struggle between communism and totalitarianism and a free way of life, the key element, in my best judgment, is agriculture and the capacity to produce. This followed, of course, by the dedication and the wisdom to use well what we are able to produce.

With 50 percent of its population on the land, the Soviet Union today cannot even feed its own people. It is a heavy importer—and becoming increasingly so. We, on the other hand, with fewer than 8 percent of our people farming, have an actual and potential outpouring of food and fiber the like of which mankind has never seen.

Worldwide, the need for that food and fiber and the need for that know-how is growing day by day. In the relationship of demonstrating what is the best way of life, our great gift of abundance and the power that goes with it is a powerful instrument in those lands where 50 to 80 percent of the people take their living from the soil and in those lands where two-thirds of the people are malnourished or hungry.

The full measure of the power of that instrument of abundance we are only beginning to understand and effectively use.

The President put it well in his message, I thought, and I would like to quote the first paragraphs of that message:

"Men first join together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter. These are the essentials of peace and progress. But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled.

"When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad and ill-housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace. Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth. I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger. There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us. The program I am submitting to Congress today, together with the proposals set forth in my message on foreign assistance, look to a world in which no man, woman or child need suffer want of food or clothing."

This is our goal.

And the fact that you are here today is great encouragement that we can meet it. Thank you very much.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD TO WIBG, PHILADELPHIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Storer Broadcasting Co.'s radio outlet in Philadelphia, station WIBG, has been awarded the Freedoms Foundation's George Washington Honor Medal for its series of editorials on "The Menace of Communism." The award was made recently at Washington's birthday ceremonies at Valley Forge, Pa.

The editorials featured recorded statements by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover; U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut; U.S. Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Montgomery County, Pa.; and additional comments by Joseph T. Conway, vice president of Storer Broadcasting Co. and general manager of WIBG.

The series was written by Edward F. Devenney, the station's editorial director, and produced by James T. Marks, WIBG program manager. It was originally broadcast by WIBG last October.

After the original broadcast and the rebroadcasts, WIBG received hundreds of requests for copies of the series from organizations, teachers, students, and other listeners.

WIBG has added new luster to a long tradition of public service in broadcasting.

THE NEED FOR POLITICAL WARFARE EDUCATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Report is published weekly by the American Security Council. It reports on national and international developments affecting the Nation's security. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point the March 14 edition of the Washington Report entitled "The Need for Political Warfare Education."

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Report, Mar. 14, 1966]

THE NEED FOR POLITICAL WARFARE EDUCATION

Ever since Vietnam became the major overseas concern of the American people, skilled observers have reported on our inability to come to grips with the political aspects of the conflict. In the fall 1964 issue of the quarterly Foreign Affairs, Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale, USAF (retired), emphasizes the U.S. failure to fully understand the Vietnam struggle. He advocates direct organizational opposition to "the political base which the Communists set up in 1960, in their hope to gain control of 14 million people living in South Vietnam through a wide assortment of 'fronts' to appeal politically to the farmers, the workers, the youth, the intellectuals, and even the civil servants and military."

U.S. Government spokesmen readily concede that the political front in Vietnam is of paramount importance. Every administration since Truman's has recognized, in theory, that the capacity of any developing nation to cope with Red nonmilitary warfare is as essential as its armed capacity to quell Communist insurgency.

WE ARE STILL AMATEURS

Although ex-Ambassador George Kennan appears to have lost his grip on today's realities in Vietnam, he once made an appraisal of the Communist nonmilitary challenge that still has validity. Expansion of Kremlin power, he noted after the end of World War II, was due "one part to Soviet resourcefulness and singlemindedness of purpose, two parts to the disunity, complacency and amateurishness of the West."

Today's Communist world has its own problems of disunity, and today's Washington may have lost some of its complacency. But amateurishness remains the outstanding characteristic of the U.S. response to the challenge of Red political warfare. And Communist leaders remain resourceful and singleminded in their global pursuit of political power. They also have an ominous capacity for developing and increasing their trained manpower in all countries. Their constantly renewed strength comes from the annual output of graduates from "Lenin Institutes" in Moscow, Peking, Prague, Havana, and scores of other cities, some outside Communist-bloc countries.

Trainees spend from a few months to 7 years learning various aspects of the business that has been the backbone of Communist singlemindedness ever since Lenin wrote "What Must Be Done." Although the studies include guerrilla warfare, bombmaking, sabotage, etc., the major training is in nonviolent tactics and nonmilitary conflict management, with emphasis on propaganda and infiltration techniques.

The revolutionary idea behind Communist political aggressions cannot be bombed out of existence in Vietnam or anywhere else. But it can be successfully opposed by equally revolutionary political goals. "To start the Vietnamese moving realistically toward those political goals" says General Lansdale, requires "an aggressive commitment of organizations and resources. * * * In essence, this is revolutionary warfare in the spirit of the British Magna Carta, the French 'Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite' and our own Declaration of Independence. * * * (Although) the United States has felt inhibited about trying to make a contribution in areas in which it feels that the chief responsibility must rest with the Vietnamese themselves, Americans cannot escape responsibility in this area either."

That responsibility has also been emphasized by native Vietnamese leaders. In July 1963 the patriot Dan Van Sung wrote: "In order to make sure that an emergent people really control their own destiny, the United States is expected to make positive efforts helping them develop control of themselves."

MASSIVE CHALLENGE, FRAIL RESPONSE

To date, U.S. "positive efforts" and "commitment of organization and resources" have been limited to such overseas undertakings as the foreign aid programs, the U.S. Information Service and the Peace Corps. These efforts have been but pinpricks in the political hide of the bear and the dragon. They cannot forestall the kind of conspiratorial aggressions that result in a Cuba, a Vietnam, or a Dominican Republic. Despite years of such efforts, involving expenditures of billions, U.S. missions still operate under Red-streaked horizons today in many areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

TO CLOSE THE EDUCATIONAL GAP

U.S. Freedom Academy

The need for a political warfare training academy on a scale commensurate with the challenge has long been recognized by far-seeing Members of Congress. Convinced that neither the Department of State nor the Pentagon are equipped to counteract nonmilitary aggression, these legislators advocate an independent agency to organize, research, and develop a training program for U.S. personnel and for citizens of other free world nations who are possible targets for Communist political and psychological warfare. On the one hand their bill aims to adequately train U.S. personnel serving overseas. On the other, improve the political skills of non-Communist citizens of emerging nations.

The legislation they propose would establish a U.S. sponsored free world counterforce to the Lenin Institutes. The concept has been variously called a Cold War West Point, a Political Warfare Training Center, and a Freedom Academy. The formal name for the legislation is the Freedom Commission bill. It would establish not merely an academy, but a full time, seven-man bipartisan commission appointed by the President and approved by Congress, to guide the needed research and administer the dual training programs. Structured like the Atomic Energy Commission, this one would cooperate with the Department of State, but operate independent of it. Such detachment permits the training of natives of emerging nations in meeting problems of modern political development without being committed to current U.S. foreign policy. The Academy can develop techniques of mass communication and instruct foreign students in related political skills. A separate branch can train personnel of the State Department, USIA, AID, and other overseas agencies in greater depth than their present limited briefings on the Communist challenge.

In the development of an academy curriculum and the staffing of a faculty, there is no reason why a Freedom Commission need confine itself to the services of American citizens. At its disposal are brilliant, politically experienced citizens of other nations who are articulate champions of the open society and keenly perceptive of the Communist threat to it. Some may be more effective than any American in convincing foreign students and the world at large that the Academy's basic concern is for the advance of free societies everywhere, and that its teachings are in no way circumscribed by U.S. national interests.

With that concept clearly developed in hearings on the Freedom Commission bill, in 1960 the Senate Judiciary Committee urged its immediate passage as "one of the most important bills ever to come before the Congress." The Senate accepted that Committee recommendation by a voice vote but it did not reach the House during that session. Ever since then the bill has been bottled up by Senator FULBRIGHT in his Foreign Relations Committee. However, it cleared the House Committee on Un-American Activities last year and because the Vietnam situation focuses increased attention on political warfare, sponsors of the bill believe it will come to a vote in both Houses during the present session.

The freedom studies center

Senators DODD, MUNDT, DOUGLAS, and PROXMIRE are among many congressional advocates of a U.S. sponsored Freedom Academy who also encourage private citizen initiative in the same area. "Since governments move so slowly," says Senator THOMAS DODD, "it is my conviction that an effort should be made on a private basis to make serious cold war education more generally available than it is today, to all those who can make use of it."

Forty-two senior Members of the Congress and 10 State Governors serve on the Advisory Board for the Freedom Studies Center, a privately financed "freedom academy" soon to be launched. The Center recently acquired a 671-acre estate-campus near Culpeper, Va., 1½ hours from Washington, D.C. Some initial courses for members of congressional staffs are scheduled for late summer 1966.

The Freedom Studies Center is administered by the Institute for American Strategy, Chicago, with the cooperation of 40 other organizations, many of which are universities. It is 100-percent privately financed by foundations, corporations, and individuals.

PRO AND CON VOICES

Whether privately or officially sponsored, any move by the American people to seriously challenge the Lenin Institute pattern for global political warfare training will trigger characteristics Sino-Soviet reactions. After denouncing such an Academy as "a provocative cold war aggression," the Communist world will probably find it as handy a permanent propaganda target as the CIA. That possibility has struck some administration worriers as sufficient reason for opposing the idea. However, it is anticipated that the legislation proposing a Government-operated academy will get serious consideration from President Johnson, despite long-standing State Department resistance. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is not himself responsible for that resistance. In a 1963 conference with this reporter, he revealed an open-minded unawareness of the scope and purpose of the legislation his Department had been officially opposing for years.

Many individuals in the Department quietly endorse the Freedom Academy concept. Among those emphatically advocating it before congressional committees were such Foreign Service veterans as Adolf A. Berle and Robert C. Hill, former Ambassador to three Latin American nations. A total of 59 witnesses familiar with cold war problems have testified in favor of the bill at congressional hearings. The only opposition voices were those of Walt W. Rostow and W. Averill Harriman, both of whom revealed a misunderstanding of the purpose and scope of the bills under consideration.

Whatever the outcome of the pending legislation, it becomes increasingly clear that the American people must begin to build a more adequate political defense structure for the free world. A substantial part of the foundation for such a structure can be provided by a "freedom academy," official or private.

HENRY MAYERS,
Guest Editor.

THE NEW PARTNERSHIP IN EDUCATION—AN ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FRANCIS KEPPEL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a thoughtful address entitled "The New Partnership in Education," was delivered recently before the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City by Francis Keppel, Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Keppel was dean of the faculty of education at Harvard University from 1948 to 1962; then U.S. Commissioner of Education until his recent appointment as Assistant Secretary. He speaks with wisdom and authority. As one who believes in the priority of education in our free society is the essential ingredient in the democratic process, I welcome the opportunity to request unanimous consent that Secretary Keppel's address be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW PARTNERSHIP IN EDUCATION[1]

(An address by Francis Keppel, Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Educational needs can no longer be, if they ever could have been, considered apart from society's other needs—or from politics. Education may be as deeply affected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the income tax laws or the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as by the education bills of 1965 themselves. Education is not a special need of a particular group in society. It is the business of everyone and affects everyone.

President Johnson, a former teacher, has taught the Nation that the American goal of a Great Society cannot be considered apart from its goals in education. And educational goals have to face these issues:

(a) How best to fuse national interests with private, State and local responsibility in providing both equality of opportunity and high quality of educaton; (b) how best to give proper weight to innovation and to the views of the scholars and other experts in the areas of knowledge that should be taught;

---

[1] Before the Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Convention Hall, Atlantic City, N.J., at 9:30 a.m., Monday, February 14, 1966.

and (c) how best to strengthen the machinery of government to relate educational policies and program to other needs of the society.

The 88th and 89th Congresses wrote out in a series of new acts between 1963 and 1965 the national approach to these problems. These acts provide:

1. That the national interest in assuring equal opportunity for education is to be expressed by special programs for the economically, educationally and physically disadvantaged—relying on local, State, and private funds for the management and funding of the regular budgets of schools and colleges. Programs are to be designed for the needy pupils, whatever their school, under public auspices—thereby setting a new pattern for local cooperation on the church-State issue.

2. That support of research, development and innovation is a national responsibility, to be conducted by making grants designed to join the interests of scholars and school men in creating new and better curriculums, and finding better ways of preparing teachers and better ways of diffusing good practices. Contracts with industry for research are authorized in order to tap the energy and skills of the private sector of the economy.

3. That decisions on operating programs for the schools supported by Federal funds (as distinguished from the program in 2 above) should be made by State authorities on the basis of local proposals, and that for this purpose Federal funds should be made available to the States for support of personnel and procedures to strengthen State departments of education.

4. That it is in the national interest to expand facilities for higher education to meet the demands of the onrushing generations, and to finance through grants, loans, and work-study programs the costs of such education for worthy students in need, and to help to provide college faculty. The use of higher education for helping to solve community problems is encouraged.

5. That a start be made in recording the results of these programs through establishment of advisory committees, several of which were directed to report to the President and the Congress.

6. That Federal expenditures should be over and above, not in place of, existing expenditures.

In short, the terms of a new partnership have been written.

These actions, when seen in the longer perspective, are but another turning of the wheel, another revolution that started nearly two centuries ago. For the Federal Government has for many years compensated individuals for what they had given the Government or lost to it. Thus Federal funds for education have gone to veterans and their children, who have given something to the Government; and to Indians on reservations, who have had something taken away.

The Congress has also made expenditures which it thought would be in the interest of the Nation and its people as a whole. This second kind of Federal grant dates back to the first days of our Republic. The preamble to the ordinance of 1787, for example, declared that "an educated populace being to the benefit of society," one section of every township carved out of the vast Northwest Territory should be reserved, tax free, for schools. Tax laws have long supported nonprofit educational enterprises.

The Smith-Hughes vocational legislation of 1917 stemmed at least partially from the Nation's wartime shortage of skilled mechanics. The National Science Foundation was established after World War II to meet a gap in the national resources just as the National Defense Education Act of 1958 won passage because threatening developments abroad convinced Congress that the Nation needed more persons trained in science, mathematics, and the neglected languages of Asia and Africa.

The focus changed as the national situation changed. Year after year, witnesses displayed pictures of hovels that passed for schoolhouses in some parts of the Nation. They cited figures to show that their part of the country could not raise enough taxes to build better schools or hire the teachers to staff them.

While sympathetic, Congress has held to the position that since operation of the schools was State and local business, basic financing is as well.

In no case has Federal money been voted as aid in the usual sense of that word. The traditional thinking on Federal expenditures in the national interest still prevails. Hence to speak of "Federal aid" simply confuses the issue. It is more appropriate to speak of Federal support to special purposes. It might, indeed, be still more appropriate to think of Federal funds—or, for that matter, State or local funds—as an investment in education, an investment made by a partner who has clearly in mind the investments of other partners—local, State, and private.

For the past several years, the Federal contribution to the operation of our public elementary and secondary schools has averaged between only 4 to 5 percent, with all the rest of the support for this national enterprise coming from State and local sources. With the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act it is estimated that the Federal share will increase during the first year (1965–66) to about 9.7 percent. The percentage for higher education is perhaps double that for the schools, but in neither area can Federal investment be described as the majority interest in the partnership.

It has been argued that the glory of education in the United States has been its diversity. We have encouraged the kind of local initiative that is lacking, for example, in the French or in the Italian system. The advantage of diversity is the advantage of the diffusions of centers of initiative. The disadvantage is the difference in quality of education and the difficulty in adjustment faced by students who, in an increasingly mobile society, move from one place and one school to another. The choice here is not between good and evil. Diversity, and consistency or coherence, far different from conformity, are both good.

The diffusion of centers of initiative in the United States has kept a fluid system alive, permitting the existence of some remarkably good institutions as well as some remarkably bad ones. The decentralized local educational system has allowed experimentation and variation, and the development of strong educational programs which have been described as lighthouses. Other districts, seeing the glow, have aspired to similar excellence. The dead hand of mediocrity, which theoretically can result from more centralized systems, is thus avoided, according to those who plead for no change in present arrangements.

Yet diversity left many districts unable economically to finance the exemplary programs even when they wished to. Too often the lighthouse districts have been primarily the result of concentrations of wealth into small districts with little effect on their neighbors. If there have been concentrations of wealth, there have also been concentrations of poverty.

If equality of quality in education is to have meaning, it necessarily applies to the poor as well as the rich, to the Negro as well as the white, to the bright as well as the average. It applies also to every student without favor and without regard to the place in which he happens to live. There can be no inequality based on accidents of geography.

Again, let us look at the facts. The sections of the country with the lowest per capita income tend to have the heaviest educational burden. And within States also, inequality is common. A child in a rural community or urban slum has a less equal chance for a good education than a suburban child. Inequities exist from region to region, from State to State, from urban to rural, from slum to suburb. In 1960, 63 percent of college-age children of white-collar workers went to college; 29 percent of manual and service workers' children, and 27 percent of farmworkers' children.

The Congress has recognized and bolstered the policy that the structure of the American education must rest on a strong State foundation. Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Act, which provides Federal help to strengthen State departments of education is explicit evidence of its belief that the States are the basic instruments in the management of America's system of elementary and secondary education. The importance of this decision cannot be overstated. For the Nation in 1965 reached a new plateau of challenge. The social and economic changes placed a far higher order of demand and stress upon our schools than ever before. Most of this stress was placed upon the educational leadership of the States and, in large measure, upon the State departments of education.

In the long run, therefore, nothing that the citizen or educator can do, wherever he may be, can be more important than strengthening the capacity of the States to respond to the educational needs of our time. This is the crux of the challenge. In education, the Nation looks to the States not merely as a matter of law or precedent, but as a matter of practical soundness and necessity. In a nation of 50 States operating vast and independent enterprises for education, the Federal Government decided to help, as a partner, but only as a partner, and a somewhat junior partner at that.

Yet the present situation in the States is far from satisfactory. The inadequacy of methods of financing has been shown if the national goal of equal educational opportunity is to be met. State organization and State policies will need a thorough overhaul if the Nation is to assure the strength, perhaps even the viability, of America's decentralized system of public education. To bring about this change requires action on three key areas for improvement—the need for better information on the condition of education within the States and among the States; the need for stronger leadership and planning by State departments of education in relation to local districts; and the need for innovation based upon sound research throughout the educational enterprise.

In each of these problem areas, the Federal Government may help, has been called upon to help, both in providing perspective and funds. But the strategic link between America's 26,000 autonomous school districts and Washington is within the States, and it is here that American education may ultimately meet or fail to meet the extraordinary challenges of our time.

In relation to the need for better information on the condition of education, I hope that you will permit me to say again what I said to the chief State school officers a few months ago.

We must now recognize across the Nation what our State agencies so clearly recognize: that we are woefully short of the basic information we need to carry forward our educational purposes, to set sound goals and work together to reach them.

The Office of Education today can tell you all sorts of things about education: how many teachers we have, how many schoolchildren, how many school buildings, and possibly whether they are printed or not. But we do not know, nor can we yet report, on how much our children really know; the subjects in which they are strong or weak;

the relation between income levels and learning, or age and learning, or a host of other matters.

In the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Congress requires specific information from the localities, States, and the Office of Education on what effects its funds are having on our schools. This requirement is written into the law. It is hardly surprising that when you put up a billion dollars or so, you tend to be interested in what happens to it.

The Congress and the President will expect an annual accounting from us on particular aspects of the new law * * * not just a fiscal accounting, but an educational accounting. This is required by the Congress on behalf of every citizen, every taxpayer of the United States.

Congress has asked us for one kind of accounting, and properly so. But as educators, I think we should consider what other forms of accounting, what other statements of profit and loss, can benefit American education.

At the White House Conference on Education last summer, one of the topics of discussion was the assessment of our nationwide educational performance. In advance, one might have predicted a calm, sobering discourse by educators on how, where, and by what means to proceed with this assessment. Instead, the discussion boiled into controversy, and it is not over yet.

Controversy is healthy, provided the issues are reasonably clear. But if we are going to have a controversy, we ought to be sure we are all talking about the same thing.

Thus far, however, we have become embroiled not in the need for assessment but in the evils of testing. Some have said, and still say, that we have more tests right now than we know what to do with. Others have declared that national testing would lead ultimately to conformity of all our schools, or worse.

The mischievous word here is "testing," and it has generated much more heat than light. Perhaps a few comments would help to lower the temperature a bit.

Personally I am vigorously opposed to any mammoth national testing of all children. I do not think it is either justified or necessary. At the same time, we are now in an age when we are going to need a far better reporting system than we have ever had on the quality and the progress of American schools.

The word "assessment" was deliberately chosen. Today, the science of statistical sampling is well advanced. It can produce answers accurate within 5 percent, even from very small samples. While we are accustomed to statistical sampling in public opinion polls, we have hardly begun to employ it in education.

Because I believe that the theory and technology of statistical sampling have developed to a point where we can benefit from them, I encouraged the Carnegie Corp. of New York, with private funds, to explore the matter. They have set out to find whether a good educational reporting system can be developed by taking samplings of the knowledge of schoolchildren—perhaps only 1 percent of the children, but certainly much less than 10 percent.

The development of these sampling procedures is now being undertaken with private funds by several research groups. This winter, they are exploring a number of promising approaches. This spring, they will try some samplings experimentally.

These assessment efforts are not designed to test individual students, or individual schools, or individual teachers. They are designed to report on regional or nationwide educational levels over a period of time.

It is my belief that this project deserves the full attention of the professional educational world. We are not now reporting satisfactorily to ourselves, to our States, or to the Nation on where we stand in education, where we are going, where we plan to go.

At this time of expanding commitments, what we don't know about education can assuredly hurt us. Through a sound assessment program, we have the opportunity to learn what we need to know.

Meanwhile, there is another national need if we intend to make the maximum use of our Federal educational programs. We need constantly to reassess the policies and procedures of the Federal partner to establish priorities, to review our national educational objectives. This is my present job as Chairman of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education, and I would like to speak of it for a few moments.

One of the Committee's priority tasks is to examine both our old and our new Federal education programs so that we can see if they are really doing what we want them to do. It has been said that there is overlapping and duplication. This will be rigorously investigated.

The growth of Federal education programs has made it essential to provide for a regular, thorough going review. The Interagency Committee will serve as a forum for this purpose. Hopefully, it will resolve conflicts, avoid unnecessary complexities, and bring together a comprehensive and high-level attention to the totality of our national educational needs.

It will be the objective of this Committee to attempt to reach agreement on program policies in the more than 40 Federal agencies that now handle funds that affect the schools and colleges, so that the policies will be consistent, noncompetitive, and equitable. Our overriding goal is to employ our funds for the maximum contribution to all parts of the education structure.

I spoke earlier of the rapid and timely expansion of the Federal commitment to education, a commitment which comes to $8.7 billion this fiscal year. If we examine the pattern of these expenditures from 1965 to those projected for 1967, certain important trends emerge, trends that show how the Federal partner has adjusted to the educational needs of our times.

First, the major expansion in the Federal commitment is now taking place in elementary and secondary education. This is where support has been long and most urgently needed. In 1965, Federal support came to less than $800 million. Next year, in 1967, it will be almost $2.5 billion—a threefold increase. In this same period, funds for higher education will increase by only 15 percent.

Second, vocational and technical education is also receiving a substantial boost. In 1965, Federal expenditures came to $639 million. By 1967, they will have more than doubled—to $1.3 billion.

Third, educational research is similarly receiving a major increase in Federal support. In 1965, the total Federal expenditure was less than $40 million. In 1967, it will come to $125 million—again a threefold increase.

Fourth, the range of subjects in which the Federal partner provides funds has widened far beyond the earlier focus on science and its applications. The arts, social sciences, and humanities are supported in a variety of ways today.

Through this emphasis on elementary and secondary education, on vocational and technical education, on research, and a broader range of subjects, the Federal Government is now providing seed money, planted where the needs appear greatest. Through this infusion of Federal funds, the Nation hopes to stimulate innovation and improvement in all those sectors of education that so urgently need to be improved. We hope to bring the poorest of our schools up to the level of the best—and to make the best better.

The challenges that confront us in education today are great, but the opportunities are greater still. Morever, they do not begin and end in America alone. Two weeks ago, the President urged the Congress to enact legislation based on the principle that education is a major factor in our international relations—and therefore urged it to extend our labors through an International Education and Health Act of 1966.

Vice President HUMPHREY, who was to have addressed you here, was in Saigon on a mission of international education, a mission which is really an extension of the objectives we hold for education in our own land.

Education's needs today are indeed related, one to another. We cannot any longer separate our local goals from our national goals from our international goals. Our approach to our problems must be unified on a wide front by coordinated plans and by comprehensive effort.

In this partnership, it is you who are the senior members. In the past, State and local responsibility, State and local initiative have made American education great. Today you still hold the golden keys to success as we set out on the greatest educational mission of the 20th century.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM C. WELCH, DIRECTOR OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON SERVICE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, William C. Welch, who has served for the past 5 years as Director of the Veterans' Administration Congressional Liaison Service, has been named to a position on the VA Administrator's Advisory Council, and he will assume his duties on the council next week.

I know Senators and their staffs are aware of the outstanding service performed by Bill Welch as congressional liaison for the Veterans' Administration on Capitol Hill. He has certainly rendered my office invaluable assistance on many occasions, for which I am extremely grateful.

Bill Welch is a native of Rome, Ga., and a veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps. Prior to joining the Veterans' Administration, he served on the staffs of three Georgia Members of the House of Representatives, former Congressmen Henderson Lanham and Erwin Mitchell, and Congressman JOHN DAVIS.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Welch for a job well done, and to wish him every success in his new position.

MRS. INDIRA GANDHI'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am looking forward to the visit of India's Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, which gives us the opportunity to return the hospitality shown to the Members of Congress who visited India last fall. The discussions between Mrs. Gandhi and President Johnson should enable them to clarify positions and improve our relations.

During my recent trip to India, I had an opportunity to study and discuss the difficulties confronting the Indian Government. The tasks facing the Government are monumental in character and require the utilization of every resource at their disposal.

The Aid India Consortium, composed of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, the World Bank, and the International Development Association as the major contributors, pledged $1.028 billion to India in 1965. In addition to being the largest contributor in dollar loans—over $500 million through bilateral and multilateral commitments—the United States programed almost $500 million in Public Law 480 for food assistance. Although the dollar aid program has been curtailed, food assistance has been greatly increased.

The foreign exchange requirements for the next 5 years in India are extensive, with foreign assistance projected at over $8 billion exclusive of food-for-peace assistance. This huge requirement will have to be met either by an increase in foreign aid or by foreign private investment. Some of the members of the Aid India Consortium have expressed reservations about foreign aid. It is, therefore, probable that the commitment level will not be raised any appreciable extent and may in fact be curtailed. The additional funds required would therefore have to come from the private sector.

As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am concerned about the size of our commitment to India in view of the expressed hostile attitude of the Indian Government toward private investment and its advocacy of socialistic operations of industry. Foreign private investment in India in 1964 was less than $100 million, compared with foreign aid commitments of over $1.5 billion. The main limiting factor is the hostile attitude of government toward private business. In addition to the setting aside of certain segments of the economy for future development by governmental operation, India practices discrimination against the private sector as against the public sector in the allocation of foreign exchange for needed imports, in the requirement of Indian majority control of corporate enterprises, and in the imposition of high rates of taxation—to 70 percent—all these have discouraged private investors.

At the very moment when India should be making a major effort to attract private investment, both for developmental purposes and as a means of ameliorating its foreign exchange crisis, the Indian Government introduced a patents bill which can only serve to discourage potential investors. By comparison with existing patent laws, it is by far the most restrictive, containing provisions giving broad discretionary powers to the Government to limit the rights of the patentee. Unlike the U.S. patent law, the proposed Indian bill does not place the emphasis on encouraging creativity through the incentive of patent protection, but provides for government utilization almost at will.

The bill would enable the Indian Government to:

First. Utilize patents for governmental purposes, including publicly owned industrial enterprises, without incurring liability for infringement;

Second. Revoke patents in the public interest;

Third. Issue compulsory licenses and licenses of right without adequate remuneration related to the value of the patent;

Fourth. Reduce the term of existing and future patents; and

Fifth. Acquire inventions and patents with no right of appeal by the inventor, applicant, or patentee.

It is to be hoped that Mrs. Gandhi and her delegation will realize during their visit the value of private enterprise in a dynamic economy and can, upon their return to India, convince the members of the Congress Party to modify their position toward private investment. Without full utilization of the private sector in the manner of the developed countries, it is questionable if India can reach the goals set forth by her planners. It is in India's interest for economic, political, and military as well as humanitarian reasons to utilize private investment to increase food production and raise the standards of living.

We who visited India would like to see the development of a country steeped in democratic principles and having a strong, balanced economy. However, our desires should not blind us to the economic realities which India must face in order to complete the transition from a nation dependent on others to one which is independent.

Our hearts are open to Mrs. Gandhi, and our prayers are with her. She has a difficult burden to bear. We should be ready to help to the extent that her own government shows willingness to adopt necessary economic reform measures.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, this week, the Strategic Air Command marks its 20th anniversary. I do not need to tell anyone how ably the Strategic Air Command has served our Nation during the cold war years.

As a quiet sentinel on the outposts of the free world, SAC stands ready to bring swift retaliation to any aggressor. As the backbone of our Nation's deterrent force, SAC stands ready as a strong bastion for peace and stability.

To all who now serve with the Strategic Air Command and to all who have been members of this proud team, I extend my congratulations on this 20th anniversary week.

Pease Air Force Base in my home State of New Hampshire is an outstanding member of the Strategic Air Command team. For 10 years, this SAC base has been continually on the alert in the defense of freedom. On this proud day, I wish to express my gratitude to the men who are on duty at Pease. Under the capable leadership of Brig. Gen. Robert W. Strong, Jr., commander of the 817th Air Division; Col. James O. Frankosky, 509th Bomb Wing commander; and Col. Reuben A. Baxter, base commander, this base has and will continue to play a vital role in the fine work of the Strategic Air Command.

NOTHING IN EXCESS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, recently a young Kansan, John G. Peterson, delivered a speech in Wichita, Kans., and thereby won the American Legion State oratorical contest. John is one of the outstanding youth leaders of Kansas and of the Nation. He has been a leader in student government at Topeka High School; he was chosen outstanding youth leader by the Topeka Optimist Club and the Kansas B.P.O.E.; and in 1965 he was governor of Kansas Boys' State. John represented Kansas at Williamsburg, Va., as a student burgess and at the Boys' Nation where he was appointed to the Supreme Court.

It is young men such as John Peterson that inspire us with confidence in the future of this Nation. The speech with which he won the oratorical contest shows a fine sense of history and an understanding of our system of government by laws rather than by men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech by John Peterson, "Nothing in Excess," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTHING IN EXCESS

The Greeks had a term for it—pon metrion asiston—the middle ground. Aristotle described all virtue in terms of the mean between two extremes. Such as between rashness and cowardice, vanity and humility, bashfulness and shamelessness. Thales, who gave us the multiplication table, also gave us the saying, "Nothing in excess."

Nothing too much. If you don't have enough water, you soon starve; too much, and you drown. And it is the same with everything else, whether it be food, fire, money—or government. Not enough government, and your neighbor steals from you; too much, and the government does the stealing.

Since man first realized that to survive he would have to live with other men, and they would have to choose a leader, those leaders, greedy for the excess of power and wealth, have subjugated them. And, whether they have been called czars or Caesars or kings, virtually every civilization has suffered from the excess of too much government. Some people accepted it. Some resented it. And still others refused to submit to it.

We refused. So, in 1776, the American people rebelled and won. And, all of a sudden, we found ourselves free. But uncontrolled freedom can become a tyranny in itself. And we soon discovered that, while the rest of the world was suffering from the excess of too much government, we were suffering from too little.

Now came the all-important turning point. Could we preserve our newly won freedom? Could we find the golden mean of government? The medium somewhere between anarchy and totalitarianism. But even more important, could we develop a system to preserve those liberties for generations to come? Because men and nations had obtained this golden mean before, but it never lasted. It was only for one generation, or during the lifetime of one benevolent leader, and in the end, it was destroyed by the natural tendency and desire for the excess of power.

So, in May 1787, we gathered together the best and the wisest men America had to offer. For 4 months they deliberated and argued and compromised. They established, for the first time in history, a system of laws, not of men—a republic, not a democracy—mob rule—where everybody voted on everything; that is not enough government, but a republic—a system where the people elect the best men, and they make the decisions within the framework of our Constitution, and establish laws.

But how did they guarantee against the other extreme, too much government? The excess which had destroyed the liberties of almost every person since the world began. They remembered the words of Patrick Henry, "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience." And so these men looked back through the centuries and observed those liberties which a tyrant first had to destroy in order to establish his power. And then they wrote into the Constitution that this Government shall never pass any law denying the right of peaceful assembly or of a speedy trial by jury, nor shall it ever abridge an individual's right of freedom of speech, religion, or of the press.

Then they looked back again, and realized that power-hungry politicians could simply usurp power, or even convince the people to yield more authority to them in exchange for temporary benefits or security. So they specifically enumerated those activities which the State would be allowed to do. Then, through the 9th and 10th amendments, they said that everything else—all other rights, were reserved to the people.

Finally, they examined those powers which they had given to this new Government. And they realized a fundamental lesson of history is that power corrupts and, like narcotics, demands more power to satisfy itself, and that the danger would be if the powers ever became concentrated in one man, or one area. And so they divided these powers into three branches—the legislative, executive, and the judicial, and they developed a system of checks between these branches so that no power could ever accumulate in any one area. Nothing in excess. Through a document which English Prime Minister Gladstone called "The most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." They found the golden mean. A government that was neither too much nor too little—a republic.

At the end of the Constitutional Convention a lady came up to Benjamin Franklin. She asked, "Mr. Franklin, what have you given us?" He replied, "Madam, we have given you a republic, if you can keep it." And, indeed, as perfect as this document is, as much as it guarantees that golden medium to us, it is good only as long as we respect it, and follow it, and abide by it. Thomas Jefferson once said, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance." But at this time in history, human nature is finally catching up with us. For the fun of excess we are willing, not to abandon our Constitution, but to simply ignore it. We have been lured by the siren of something-for-nothing. Our greatest interest today no longer is self-sufficiency—the challenge and freedom of striving for greater heights—but security. And if we can't provide for it for ourselves, we think the Government owes it to us. We have forgotten the danger of excess—even excess ease. We have forgotten that wild ducks which become domesticated are soon too fat to fly, and that sea gulls which live off a shrimp factory, starve when that factory shuts down. And that self-reliant individuals who no longer have to provide for themselves, soon become dependent, and moral and social decay sets in.

We have declined—to a democracy—to where a politician now supports something, not because it is right or good, but simply because it is politically expedient. Our morals have been eroded to the place that we are willing to be bribed by our own money. We have declined to the place where an individual can stand up in front of nationwide television, openly defy laws, tear up a court injunction, and know that nothing will be done, or even said, simply because he knows that it wouldn't be politically expedient for a mayor, or a Governor, or a President. That's a democracy.

We laugh and make fun of our Constitution. We say that it was written for a different society and under different conditions, that it is antiquated and outmoded, that it must now serve only as a foundation, a starting point for the powers of government.

We must remember that the purpose of that Constitution was to limit the powers of Government. Those men had seen from history, and even during their own lives, what uncontrolled governmental power led to. And so they gave us the system and the freedom—the nothing-in-excess for which men had fought and died for thousands of years. And so it falls to us to either preserve it, or to let it continue to decline. The future is in our hands.

And so our challenge today rests in returning to a system of laws—not of men; in returning to those principles exemplified in the Constitution, of responsibility and independence and self-sufficiency. Nothing-in-excess. Our challenge rests in those words of Benjamin Franklin speaking out of the voice of history, "We have given you the most perfect system of government ever devised by man, if you can keep it."

THE NEW MEXICO STATE LEGISLATURE HONORS THE NEW MEXICO NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the New Mexico State Legislature adopted House Memorial Resolution 6, honoring the New Mexico National Guard. Because of this military organization's outstanding achievements, not only in New Mexico but throughout the Nation, it is with honor that I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Memorial 6 of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico

Memorial honoring the New Mexico National Guard

Whereas the militia has been an important part of the Nation's Military Establishment since colonial days, defending our country in time of war, and serving our citizens in time of desperate need; and

Whereas the New Mexico National Guard, as a part of the Nation's military force, has efficiently discharged the duties assigned by the President of the United States for the defense of the country; and

Whereas through its commander in chief, the Governor of the State, the New Mexico National Guard has faithfully and willingly responded to urgent requests for help in times of disaster, and has also assumed responsibility for the direction of military support to civil defense; and

Whereas the New Mexico National Guard and its officers and men, each of whom sacrifices his time, money, and family obligations, are a distinct credit to all the State by action, stature, and deed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico express their sincere gratitude to the officers and men of the New Mexico National Guard; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to Maj. Gen. John Pershing Jolly, the adjutant general of the State of New Mexico; to Jack M. Campbell, Governor of the State of New Mexico; to Robert S. McNamara, the U.S. Secretary of Defense; and to the New Mexico congressional delegation.

Bruce King,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
Albert Romero,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on March 12, 1966, a significant editorial appeared in the Washington Post newspaper. It, however, leaves one impression that I think should be corrected, and that is that Secretary Freeman is finding little support in the Congress for his rural community development legislation. That is most decidedly not the case, and I would point out that S. 2934 has at the present time 19 cosponsors, 7 of whom are members of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. In the hearings the Senate Agriculture Committee held last week, we heard little opposition to this bill, and indeed, to the contrary, we heard most vigorous support and enthusiastic endorsement of the legislation and its goals.

I am a cosponsor of that legislation, and will support it both in committee and on the floor of the Senate, and am sure that other members of the Senate Agriculture Committee will do the same. I ask unanimous consent that the attached editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1966]

Reversing Migration

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is urging a solution to urban problems that is not getting the attention or action it deserves. He would reduce some of the difficulties of our cities by diminishing the surge of population from rural to urban area. He told the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee on Thursday that there is an alternative to ever-larger urban complexes with all their crises. "A promising alternative," he said, "is making more adequate public and private services—and more jobs—available in rural America." He rightly warned that the cities will lose ground in their struggle to restore and maintain a healthy social and economic environment if they must absorb more and more families.

National planners, hitherto, have accepted the greater and greater concentration of population in cities as a foregone conclusion, an unalterable phenomena of our time. Many of them, over the last three decades, have even urged an acceleration of migration from rural areas.

The consequences of this population shift have been socially destructive both to rural America and to urban America. Rural towns have found it increasingly difficult to maintain the social and economic structure capable of making rural life rewarding. And the cities have not been able to cope with the rural emigrants flooding in upon their limited facilities. So the quality of both urban and rural life has been adversely influenced.

The Secretary has been trying to induce industry and business to direct their expansions into rural areas. And he has been trying to get Congress to support his rural development program. While some enlightened enterprises have begun to act on his advice, most have not. And while his pleas have met with some response in Government, the reaction has not been great enough to permit an effective program. He is, as yet, a voice crying in the wilderness—and the wilderness is the congested slums, the crowded streets and the overburdened public and private facilities of the cities. But he will be heard, one of these days, and the tide of migration will be reversed.

ORAH DEE CLARK, ALASKA PIONEER TEACHER

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a widely beloved citizen of Alaska who had taught in the schools of our State for more than half a century was removed from the Alaska scene when Orah Dee Clark died recently at Anchorage. Orah Dee lived to see Alaska become a State and the city of Anchorage, several generations of whose children she had taught, become a bustling way point on world air routes.

The day Orah Dee Clark died, her doctor, F. J. Phillips, M.D., FACS, who had been one of her many dear friends, was so moved that he wrote me a letter which constitutes such a beautiful tribute to this pioneer Alaska teacher that I believe it deserves preservation in the Congressional Record.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Dr. F. J. Phillips be printed at this point, together with the text of a brief poem which Miss Clark had written 20 years ago to express her thoughts of death when a friend of hers had passed along.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Ernest Gruening:
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: This morning at 5 minutes after midnight Orah Dee Clark died quietly in her bed at Presbyterian Hospital. She was conscious to the last and a true Alaskan patriarch. One of her friends had been at her bedside and had stepped out to answer a phone call from another friend. When she returned a few minutes later Orah Dee had shuffled off the frail mortal coil and had cast her lot among the immortals. And this I seem to think she did. Fear was not an ingredient of her spirit.

It has been my very satisfying privilege to have been her chosen physician and friend a little short of a decade. In those years it has been difficult for me to determine which one of us was the real physician. She did something for deserving people that is unpurchasable and neither changed nor afflicted by time and circumstance. I have had one other patient in my acquaintance who ranks with her: Thomas Mann. It was my fortuitous lot to be the associate of the surgeon who successfully removed part of his lung for cancer at the University of Chicago Clinics Hospital in May 1946. I remember him with affection and admiration. On the fly leaf of "Buddenbrooks," his Nobel Prize winning novel, he inscribed in his own hand, "To Dr. Francis J. Phillips to whom I owe much comfort in difficult days—Chicago May 22, 1946, s/s Thomas Mann."

That I should have the unmeasurable good fortune to have had two such personalities in nearly three decades of the practice of medicine and surgery, more than justifies the arduous travail of studying the ways of a physician.

It seemed to me that you would want to know this passing of Miss Clark. What a storehouse of "things" about Alaska goes with her. What weak and ineffectual physical beings we are that we cannot capture for all time the rare jewels of knowledge from her great human and educaitonal experience of nearly six decades in Alaska. But so must it be. School children and people have been bettered by her years of inspiration and teaching. In a way, this is perpetuation of the spirit of Orah Dee Clark. This I am sure she knew. This is all she wanted. The dignity of such modesty can be shared by only a few, but admired by many.

Her body will be cremated at Vancouver, Wash. By her request her ashes will be buried in the Clark family plot there. As you know, she was born in a sod house near Firth, Nebr. After living for a short period of time in western Kansas, her father moved the family to Vancouver, Wash., in 1889. She came to Alaska to teach school in 1906. After other assignments she finally came to Anchorage in 1915 which was then only a tent town. She helped organize and became the first superintendent of schools that year. You must have known her well in Juneau when she worked for the OPA. You know she was not without discrimination but she used to speak of you with a subtle air of comradeship as "Ernie."

So now we say, "Farewell, Miss Clark, but not goodby.'

Respectfully yours,
F. J. Phillips, M.D., FACS.

P.S.—Here is a fitting poem of her own:

"In Memoriam

"The kindly veil of death has fallen down
between us and the lives of those we knew.
The shadow that it casts now over spreads
their acts and sayings, soft as morning dew.
'The evil that men do'—we bury it;
The good we cherish as a garden plot,
hoping that when our passing hour shall come,
Such generous treatment, too, shall be our lot."

February 4, 1936, for Mrs. Cribb.

SPEECH BY GOVERNOR ROMNEY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, earlier this month my good friend Governor George Romney, of Michigan, addressed a Pennsylvania Republican dinner which was held in Philadelphia. This great Governor, whose outstanding record of accomplishment needs no elaboration by me, spoke to us of the needs of America. He spoke to us of the challenges posed to the Republican Party by those needs. He stirred and inspired us. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Romney's address be inserted in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Governor George Romney, of Michigan, Before Pennsylvania Republican Dinner, Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., March 9, 1966

It's a pleasure to join this great Republican crowd here in Philadelphia, the birthplace of the American Nation, and to bring you greetings from your fellow Republicans in Michigan, the birthplace of the Republican Party.

From small beginnings, both our Nation and our party have risen to greatness and responsibility. The Republican Party came out of nowhere in 1854, to fill the vacuum created by the inability of either major party to face or solve the deep, divisive issues of the day.

Six years later, the Republican Party under Lincoln was the majority party in America.

How did it happen? I think the answer lies in just two words: Lincoln cared.

Lincoln cared about his country, and he cared about his party. But most of all, Lincoln cared about the people and their problems.

Lincoln cared enough to fight for the principles and institutions on which the people's well-being depended. He cared enough to face burning issues and make hard choices. He cared enough to risk defeat for what he knew was right, and he gave his life that the Nation might live.

Lincoln put the stamp of his own greatness on the Republican Party. And for almost three-quarters of a century—as long as it was clear to the people that the Republican Party was true to the legacy of Lincoln—the people were true to the Republican Party.

To make the Republican Party the majority party in America, we must demonstrate as Lincoln did that the Republican Party is the party of the people—because Republicans care. And today, as they did in Lincoln's time, the people will respond.

That's why men like Governor Scranton and Senator Scott are major forces in rebuilding the Republican Party—because they have proved that they care about the people and their problems.

Under Bill Scranton, State support for education in Pennsylvania has gone up 40 percent. Aid to State colleges has more than doubled. You have a new program of student loans and scholarships, higher teacher salaries, three times as many technical and vocational schools, a new State board of education, a new community college system—all designed to open the doors of opportunity to every youngster in the State. Pennsylvania's strengthened educational system demonstrates that Bill Scranton cares.

There are 311,000 more Pennsylvanians working today than when Bill Scranton took office, and 112,000 who were on welfare are now self-supporting. Unemployment fell below the national average to an all-time record low—industrial expansions hit a record high. Retail sales are booming. Pennsylvania's record economic growth demonstrates that Bill Scranton cares.

In money matters, Bill Scranton has shown that money matters. He had the courage to go for a needed tax increase to finance vital services, particularly education. He ended deficit spending. He gave Pennsylvania sound management techniques and efficient government. You can't meet the people's needs without a solid fiscal base. Pennsylvania's financial footing demonstrates that Bill Scranton cares.

The Scranton record of caring goes on and on—in civil rights, human services, strengthened State and local government, highways and mass transportation, natural resource conservation, recreational development, and many more.

Bill Scranton has done a great job for the people of Pennsylvania, and although his term as Governor will end this year, his service to the people of his State and Nation is far from over.

Republican Governors in other States are proving that they care. They have demonstrated the effectiveness of State government in solving the people's problems. Bill Scranton's record and their records show what the people get under Republican leadership. As Hugh Scott has pointed out, the record of Republican Governors can be the major factor in carrying the Republican Party to victory in 1966.

Our American system provides four basic ways of solving problems that are too big for individuals to handle by themselves.

One is through the Federal Government. Another is through State governments and the local governments which they create. The third is through private, economic organization—business, agriculture, labor—the so-called private sector.

The fourth method—and the better way for solving most public problems—is through action in the independent sector: voluntary, cooperative action by free individuals and independent associations. This is a unique American method. It has been the mainspring of our progress.

This country flourished and grew great not so much by what Government did as by what the people did themselves, either individually or cooperatively through their voluntary, private institutions. Government's main function was to provide a climate in which people could do for themselves and others what needed to be done, and then to keep out of their way and let them do it.

Early visitors to America, like De Tocqueville, were struck by this unique American method of voluntary cooperation. Everywhere he went, De Tocqueville said, he found Americans forming associations to get things done—working together to solve the physical and social problems of a new nation—clearing land, raising barns, organizing to help each other.

This was the strength of the American people. They didn't wait for some paternalistic governmental agency to come do the job for them. They did it themselves. And most important, they did what they did because they wanted to do it—not because they were compelled to do it.

Independent, voluntary effort is needed even more to meet today's human and social problems than it was for the physical problems of the frontier. Nothing can melt a human or social problem faster than the willingness of one individual to get involved in the problems of another individual—voluntarily.

Sure we need professionals. Sure we need welfare programs. Sure government has a role. But there is no substitute for one human being who cares enough about another human being to go out and help him lick his problems.

But today, voluntary, cooperative action by free individuals and independent associations is being tragically neglected and cynically undermined.

More and more, we are turning to government and money as the cure-all for every human and social problem. And eager do-gooders, quick to capitalize on the chance to peddle something for nothing, have deliberately fostered the myth that government, because it is the servant of the people, ought to wait on the people hand and foot—neglecting to point out that that kind of servant, by making its master dependent, will soon turn the tables and rule with an iron hand.

The tables are being turned in America.

In his state of the Union address, President Johnson said, "A great nation breeds a great people."

This is not true.

This is not the philosophy that made America, but it does express the basic difference between the philosophy of those who now control the Democratic Party and the philosophy of the Republican Party.

Republicans know it's not a "great nation that breeds a great people" but a great people who build a great nation.

Those who control the Democratic Party by their actions indicate they believe in unlimited government and the myth that problems can be best solved with government and money.

When the President launched his Great Society program at Ann Arbor, Mich., he made it clear that it would be based on money from Washington sent directly to local governments. There was no significant place in it for the States or for the people themselves and their voluntary institutions.

And that's exactly what he's done. Government more and more is replacing and smothering independent effort under a flood of Federal dollars. The Great Society is out roaming the countryside, subsidizing voluntary programs and making them dependent. It is bypassing and undermining State and smalltown governments to forge a political alliance between Washington and the big cities. And the end is not in sight.

Despite the tremendous increase in the role of government and use of money, our human and social problems are soaring. Twice as many people are on welfare as 10 years ago. Crime and juvenile delinquency are at record levels. Immorality and illegitimacy are commonplace. Broken homes and adult debauchery are undermining all of society. Mental illness and human suffering are increasing, not decreasing. A young Negro woman just back from Africa reported that the Africans are saying, "The Communists won't have to destroy America. Americans are destroying themesives."

The Johnson Great Society is doomed to fail. It just won't work. A genuine great society cannot be built upon a great government or a great leader. It can only be built by a great people through their own voluntary efforts.

For the first time in history, America has no need for concern about having enough government. But we do need to be profoundly concerned about having enough independent, voluntary effort—the mainspring of our progress. For the first time we need to strengthen personal, family, and private independent institutional responsibility. The greatest threats to our future are the decline in religious conviction, moral character, and family life.

Government does not have to be the enemy of the voluntary action. In Michigan, we are trying to strengthen it. We are systematically experimenting with a new role for government: to act as the catalyst which stimulates and strengthens voluntary programs for meeting public needs.

We don't have money to hand out. We don't have a centralized bureaucracy to pass on every local or voluntary project. We don't undermine or duplicate independent effort. We encourage it.

We are starting a cooperative program to strengthen family life. We are encouraging community volunteer service projects. We have increased the use of volunteers to assist professionals in corrections, welfare, and mental health programs. We are enlisting Peace Corps graduates for service at home.

We also have a statewide student volunteer movement—3,000 student volunteers at 40 colleges and universities who work with deprived children. They are getting results that amaze even the professionals.

One of our State universities is near an Indian reservation. For years, professional workers had been trying to win the Indians' confidence, but they had never won acceptance. Then college volunteers began working with the Indian children. Within 3 weeks, every one of the students had been invited into an Indian home. The students said it was because, when they were asked if they were getting paid, they could honestly answer, "No, I'm doing what I'm doing because I want to help you." The Indians knew they really cared.

Today's human and social problems can only be solved by those who care enough to involve themselves in helping those who need help. Such efforts don't foster dependence on Government from generation to generation, because they require a personal contribution for personal benefit. They apply our proven American principles of individual initiative and voluntary cooperation to new, tough human and social problems.

This is our Republican opportunity. Because we care, we can offer the people a superior Republican program—not just an alternative, not just a choice, but a superior program which calls on all the Nation's resources—individual, cooperative, and governmental.

If we do, the people will come to our support. One of the best kept secrets of our time is that people want to give themselves to something they believe in, rather than to live in pampered ease.

It's not just Republicans who are concerned. Bill Scranton wouldn't be Governor of Pennsylvania, and Arlen Specter wouldn't be district attorney of Philadelphia, and I wouldn't be Governor of Michigan, if it hadn't been for Democrats and Independents, as well as Republicans.

As Republicans, we must recognize that genuine conservatives—whether Democrat, Republican, or Independent—and genuine liberals—whether Democrat, Republican, or Independent—have no place to go except the Republican Party.

A genuine conservative is willing to recognize that problems exist and believes in solving them to the full extent possible by applying proven principles. The pseudo-conservative, on the other hand, either ignores problems or blindly and negatively opposes solutions proposed by others without offering a sound solution of his own.

The genuine liberal—and I mean genuine liberal—believes that the primary source of progress is the individual, that ultimate power should rest with the individual, and that the solution of public problems should not deny the individual his opportunity for self-development as long as it does not interfere with the rights of others. But the pseudo-liberal believes that progress will result primarily from the use of government and money.

The genuine conservative, who wants to solve problems, can reach his goals only by applying the proven principles of genuine liberalism, which exalt the individual. The genuine liberal, who wants to secure the importance of the individual, can reach his goals only through the proven problem-solving methods of genuine conservatism, which assert the superiority of voluntary individual and cooperative action as the prime source of human progress.

Neither the genuine conservative nor the genuine liberal can accomplish his own purposes without accomplishing the purposes of the other.

And today neither the genuine conservative nor the genuine liberal can accomplish his purposes within the Democratic Party—because the Democratic Party is controlled by pseudo-liberals who believe in unlimited government and put their trust in government and money.

Let's welcome to our ranks all Americans who care.

Let's open the doors and let the people in.

If we take our party to the people, we will once again become the majority party. And we must become the majority party, not just for the sake of party victory, but for the sake of America.

This Nation faces crises in the years ahead as great as any in our history. American freedom and American survival are at stake. The opposition has run out of answers—answers which only the Republican Party can supply.

Because we care, we shall not fail.

A CENTURY OF PROGRESS OF EDUCATION IN GEORGIA

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, my able colleague and valued friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], recently delivered a significant address on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the public school system in Georgia.

The Senator's outstanding address was delivered at ceremonies in Savannah, the oldest community in our State, where the first local board of education in Georgia was chartered.

No more appropriate speaker for this milestone observance could have been chosen than Senator Talmadge, for no one has made a greater and more lasting contribution to the cause of public education in our State than has he.

We in Georgia had the good fortune to have Senator Talmadge as our Governor for 6 eventful years, from 1948 to 1955. No other 6-year period in Georgia's history has been marked by greater progress in public education, particularly in the elementary and secondary schools.

Under the leadership of Governor Talmadge, the Georgia School Building Authority was established and funded which has been responsible for the construction of almost 22,000 modern new classrooms in the past 15 years. The Talmadge administration also took the lead in financing the minimum foundation program for education, the Magna Carta of the modern public school system in Georgia. This program has provided the basis for greatly increased State assistance to local schools, for higher and more equitable salary scales for teachers, and for the overall improvement of public education in Georgia.

Mr. President, all Georgians take great pride in Senator Talmadge and in his record as Governor of the State and as a Member of this body, and we are particularly proud of his dynamic and constructive leadership in putting Georgia's schools on the pathways to progress.

I commend his excellent address at Savannah to the Members of this body and to the readers of the Congressional Record, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Remarks of U.S. Senator Herman E. Talmadge on the Observance of "A Century of Progress of the Public Schools in Georgia," Held in Savannah, Ga., March 21, 1966

This is truly an historic day for Georgia.

For the observance of this centennial—the commemoration of 100 years of public education in Georgia—it is fitting that we meet in the city of Savannah, whose rich and colorful history cannot be matched.

It was here that Georgia history began when English settlers arrived in 1733 to open the way for the colonization of our State at a place called Yamacraw Bluff on the banks of the Savannah River.

It was here in Savannah, according to the archives of the State, that the first public school in Georgia was established. And on this date, March 21, 100 years ago, the Board of Education for the City of Savannah and the County of Chatham was chartered by the Georgia General Assembly.

GEORGIA'S PAST AND FUTURE

You have gathered here for this centennial from all across the State, not only to recall past history, but also to think of today, and to look ahead into future years that promise to be even more glorious than those which already have been laid aside.

Thus, tonight, we shall look into the past. But we shall also consider the present. And we shall project our thoughts to the challenges and opportunities which are yet to be encountered.

One hundred years ago, Georgia still lay under the ashes of devastation. Tragedy—personal and economic—swept the land. The people were without homes, without businesses, without food or money. They were downtrodden by an alien and vengeful rule that sometimes seemed bent upon their destruction. But the people of Georgia were not without hope. They were not without the same spirit that strengthened the will and determination of the men and women who landed on these shores almost 250 years ago.

This spirit prevailed throughout Reconstruction, through the uncertainties of the turn of the century, through the disastrous great depression, and through the countless trials of recent decades, both social and economic.

That spirit, perhaps in even greater measure, lives today in the minds and hearts of all Georgians.

The people of Georgia have not been held back by the past, but instead have built upon it. At the same time, they have held on to and nurtured fundamental principles of honor and dignity that remain eternally unchanged even though the passage of time may alter the face of our society. They have preserved these principles and protected them, but they have not been unbending to the demands of economic and social growth in the 20th century. The people of Georgia know that those still living in the past are unable to cope with the present, and for them there is no hope for the future.

Like their forefathers before them, the people of Georgia are mindful of the past for all of its lessons. They are alert to the present for all that it has to offer. And they are unafraid of the future. Thus was achieved the greatness of Georgia which stands today. Thus will be attained the goals of tomorrow.

EDUCATION HOLDS THE KEY

I know of no other force more vital to the fulfillment of the destiny of our State than that which we have come to honor tonight.

Education, and the assurance that every Georgia child, every boy and girl, regardless of who he is, what he is, or whether he lives in the big city or on the farm, will be given an opportunity to learn and to develop his God-given talents and abilities to the fullest extent possible.

I speak of education that according to economic research pays a return many times over the investment in the form of increased earnings. I speak of education that guarantees the security and happiness of the individual and that contributes to the economic growth of society as a whole.

But I also speak of education as the acquisition of knowledge which is now and will always be an end unto itself. Aside from its economic dividends, education pays returns that cannot be estimated in intellectual development, and in increasing the ability of man to get along with his fellow man, to live, and work, and grow together.

The purpose of education in America was well described by Dr. James Conant in this manner. Said Dr. Conant: "Our purpose is to cultivate in the largest possible number of our future citizens an appreciation of both the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are Americans and are free."

I share great pride with all my fellow citizens that in this endeavor, the State of Georgia is second to none.

UNPARALLELED PROGRESS

With a current enrollment of approximately 1,200,000, one out of every four Georgians is in public school today. These young minds, which are among the finest in the Nation, are being trained and inspired by a dedicated force of some 40,000 well-educated and hard-working teachers who rank among the elite of this country. They attend classes in school buildings as modern and well-equipped as any to be found anywhere in the world. Leadership for the formulation and administration of the State's educational programs is provided by a corps of public servants whose devotion to duty is unexcelled.

The State of Georgia need never apologize for its schools and system of education. A long and consistent record of outstanding achievement is a most eloquent spokesman for the progress that has been made in education in Georgia. In this record is dramatic evidence of how Georgia has come farther more rapidly than any other State in the Union in providing top-grade education for its children.

It is a record of which every citizen can be proud. It is especially gratifying to me that as your Governor during a critical period in Georgia education, I was able to have a part in the development of programs for our schools which have been continued and expanded up to the present time.

Moreover, the great advancement of Georgia education is to the everlasting credit of all the people of Georgia, the General Assembly, and the boards of education at the State and local levels, without whose support and guidance nothing would have been possible.

Georgia now operates the 12th largest school system in the Nation. In "Poor Richard's Almanack," Benjamin Franklin said "an investment in knowledge pays the best interest." Georgia has chosen to follow the advice of the wise Dr. Franklin, and the State spends 56 percent of its income for education. Only six other States devote a higher percentage of their revenue to learning.

More than three times as many Georgians are graduating from high school today than just 20 years ago. The holding power of Georgia schools has so increased in recent years that the number of high school graduates rose 162 percent from 1950 to 1965, although the birth rate for the years in which these graduates were born increased only 46 percent.

Just 5 years ago, only 32 percent of Georgia high school graduates went to college. Of the 1966 graduating class—which in itself represents more education per person than ever before in the State's history—about 45 percent can be expected to pursue learning at institutions of higher education.

RECORD BUILDING PROGRAM

In school building, Georgia has done more—has built more classrooms in the past decade—than any other State except New York and California. More than half the classrooms that now stand in Georgia have been built in the past 15 years.

Since 1951, when the Talmadge administration launched Georgia's first gigantic school building program, 21,478 classrooms have been constructed, and the State has invested almost $314 million in capital outlay funds for school construction. Prior to 1951–52, the State had not spent a nickel on school buildings.

Georgia is still building schools at a breathtaking rate. Every year the State is faced with a need for 3,000 or more additional classrooms to house the rapidly increasing enrollment, or to replace those which have become substandard. With a baby born every 5 minutes in Georgia, it has been a hard race just to keep up and the pressures for more and better classrooms will be even greater in the years ahead.

Georgia, at the same time, is fast moving toward providing its children with efficient school programs and higher quality education, at lower cost per pupil. In 1920, there were more than 8,000 schools in Georgia, and more than 5,000 as recent as 1940. This year there are 1,944.

And proposals are constantly under study to find the ways and means for further reducing money-wasting duplication in school organization, and to provide the child with an even more comprehensive education at lower cost.

ELITE TEACHER CORPS

Henry Adams said a teacher affects eternity, and he can never tell where his influence stops. I am reminded of the anecdote about the inauguration of President Lincoln, who invited his old teacher, one Mentor Graham, to the ceremonies. Someone commented that if it were not for Lincoln, nobody would ever have heard of Mentor Graham. To which a wise man replied: "Perhaps if it had not been for Mentor Graham, nobody would ever have heard of Abraham Lincoln."

It is absolutely impossible to calculate the value of a good teacher. One cannot discuss the preeminence of Georgia education without giving foremost credit to the men and women to whom we entrust our children, 5 days a week, 9 months a year. The children of Georgia are in good hands.

Georgia teachers today are better trained and educated for their work than ever before. It was only 15 years ago, however, that only 40 percent of the State's teachers had college degrees. Last year, about 950 out of every thousand had 4 years or more of college training.

While still lagging $1,200 behind the national average, the Georgia teacher's salary has moved up to $5,050, compared to less than $2,000 annually just 15 years ago. We have come a long way in teacher salaries. But we still have far to go. Too many of our professional teachers are still paid wages comparable to those of a high-priced babysitter.

Teacher pay and how to get more good teachers are but two of several problems confronting the State today. There are others—the dropout rate, the curriculum and how to further improve the content and quality of instruction, consolidation of services and school organization, and many more.

MEANINGFUL PROGRESS

Although we cannot fail to recognize the shortcomings and problem areas in Georgia education, they are far less meaningful than the positive side of the ledger.

At a time when Georgia and the South are still regarded by many of our uninformed neighbors to the North and West as a backward and underdeveloped region, I say that it is no time to hide the State's light under a bushel basket. I say that it is incumbent upon each and every one of us to tell the good story, to carry this message to the far reaches of these United States.

And there is no finer example of Georgia progress than Georgia education, and the unprecedented gains that have been made throughout all of the Georgia school system.

A building program that makes ours among the best housed children in the world.

Greatly increased enrollment and the phenomenal rise in the number of high school and college graduates.

A future teacher scholarship program that pays big dividends and is giving young people a new respect for the teaching profession.

An educational television network with which only one other State can compare.

A system of vocational-technical training institutes that has become a model for the Nation.

The STAR student program, and the Governor's Honors Program.

This is to name but a few of the momentous advances made in Georgia education. But it gives a good idea how far the State has traveled in the brief span of just one generation from what President Roosevelt said was a part of "the Nation's No. 1 economic problem."

Near the bottom not too many years ago, today Georgia stands among those at the top. Yet this is not to minimize the multitude of problems facing Georgia schools. Perhaps there is some comfort in knowing that our State is not alone in experiencing what might be called educational growing pains.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

The problem of school finances ranks high on any list. In recent years, we have seen the growing importance of education in our modern world underscored by larger participation of the Federal Government. Vast new programs have been devised for providing aid for the improvement and expansion of school facilities, and we have exerted a mighty effort to insure that there would be a maximum of Federal cooperation and a minimum of Federal interference.

Georgia ranks 11th in the Nation in Federal aid to education under 35 various programs, one of the most outstanding of which is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Georgia last year received about $38 million in Federal assistance, and add to that amount approximately $40 million the State is to receive during fiscal 1966 under the 1965 education act.

Of all the programs of Federal assistance to Georgia schools, one of the most important is that which provides aid for schools in areas of Federal impact. Over the years, some 83 school districts in Georgia have received millions of dollars under this program, Public Law 874. At the same time, literally millions of Georgia schoolchildren have reaped untold benefits from the Federal school lunch program and the special milk program.

The administration in Washington, at the behest of so-called budget experts, now proposes to cut back funding these programs for fiscal 1966 and the next fiscal year beginning July 1. These cuts, if allowed to stand, would work a severe hardship on our schools, not only in Georgia but throughout the Nation.

I can tell you here and now that the Congress does not look with favor upon these cutbacks. Every effort will be made to restore the funds necessary for the full continuance of these programs. These efforts have my full endorsement and support.

I have long been an advocate of economy in Government. I have repeatedly urged that all nonessential Government spending be curtailed, and that we start moving toward a balanced budget. I have condemned the fiscal policy of spending more than we take in year after year and piling up one deficit after another, while the national debt reaches astronomical heights. And I continue to stand for fiscal responsibility, and make no apologies for it.

FALSE ECONOMY

I applaud the efforts of the administration to economize, and there are certainly many areas of Federal spending that can and should be reduced. But I submit that it is false economy to take away from our schools in such a way as to aggravate their already serious financial burdens, which can only have the result of short-changing the education of our children. It is pennywise and pound foolish.

At a time when the United States is spending millions upon millions to feed and look after people all over the world and to prop up foreign governments, surely the health and education needs of American children can be attended to. You may be assured that I will continue to work to see that Georgia children are not shortchanged and that the State's splendid, hard-won educational programs will go uninterrupted and unimpaired.

WEAPON OF FREEDOM

In this rapidly changing world and in times more perilous than ever before in the history of mankind, education has taken on new meaning and greater significance. Without a doubt, our public schools are the best weapons we have in the world struggle to preserve freedom. An educated people are more vital to the security, both economic and political, of the United States and the free world than all the missiles and planes we can build. The world gets smaller and its problems more complex every day. As the leading exponent of freedom, it has fallen upon our shoulders to take the lead in a veritable race for survival in order to outpace and defeat an aggressive, totalitarian ideology bent on world domination. The United States bears this burden today in Vietnam. It is a burden of necessity, not because we covet territory or seek the conquest of any foreign people, but because we are committed to the cause of freedom, and we have pledged to defend it and our vital interests whenever and wherever they are challenged by aggression. This struggle is a contest between ideas as much as machines and weaponry.

For this reason, we must seek and find ways to strengthen education in America. It must be given the highest priority at every level of government.

Our Nation has been built upon the premise that an educated people are a strong people. Our form of government and the freedom which the American people enjoy have always depended upon common education. Thomas Jefferson recognized this when he wrote in 1816: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and what never will be."

It was the wise man indeed who thus described the importance of education to the preservation of freedom: "Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern, but impossible to enslave."

DOMESTIC HEALTH

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, few afflictions are more tragic than mental retardation. Statistical information showing the number of mentally retarded persons in our Nation cannot begin to depict the suffering and frustration experienced by those afflicted, and by their families.

The bill President Johnson has proposed to deal with this problem is designed to give assistance in four areas involved in our efforts to combat and prevent mental retardation.

Research facilities: Support of scientific research in all fields is essential to the prevention of mental retardation. The President's proposed legislation would extend authority for the construction of mental retardation research centers for 4 additional years.

University affiliated facilities: The proposed legislation would also extend for 4 more years the construction of facilities for the training of physicians and other vital personnel who work with the mentally retarded.

Personnel for community facilities: One of the most important and far-reaching programs included in the 1963 mental retardation legislation was the construction of community facilities for the mentally retarded. When constructed, these facilities will permit our States to offer a wide range of needed services to mentally retarded persons. But unless sufficient staff can be secured, these new community programs will face insurmountable obstacles. President Johnson has urged that we authorize the Federal Government to participate in the cost of compensating professional and technical personnel needed for the operation of these facilities. By sharing in up to 75 percent of the cost of such staff, we offer a helping hand to our responsible State agencies and to the mentally retarded who will benefit from the services offered in the community facility.

Special programs for the severely mentally retarded: The severely mentally retarded are in the unique position of requiring special services which must be designed specifically to meet their needs. The proposed legislation would authorize project grant support to encourage the development and operation of special programs for this neglected group.

All these measures are urgently needed by those struggling with mental retardation. They deserve the support of the Congress.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE FARMERS UNION CONVENTION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last week the National Farmers Union Convention was marked by the selection of Mr. Tony T. Dechant as national president, and Mr. Edwin Christianson, president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, as vice president. We were very pleased in Minnesota by his selection, and are sure that the National Farmers Union will profit greatly by his capable and experienced leadership.

We were, however, mindful of the fact that Mr. James G. Patton, whose service to the National Farmers Union for 25 years was without blemish, was retiring. Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY spoke on that subject, and on some of the most pressing domestic and foreign issues to the convention by way of a soundfilm recording. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks to the Farmers Union Convention be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY TO THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION CONVENTION, MARCH 15, 1966

President Jim Patton of the National Farmers Union and my good friend, Glenn Talbott, and the other officers of the Farmers Union and all the many delegates that have gathered out at the beautiful city of Denver, Colo., for this annual convention. I extend through film and through the recorded word warm personal greetings to each and every one of you. I am sure you know that if I had my wish, at least that that wish could be fulfilled, I would be with you in person but there are demands upon my time, as you can well understand, and I do have other responsibilities which necessitate that I remain in Washington, D.C.

I simply had to get to your convention though, some way, some how. At first I thought I would just send a telegram or a printed message. Then, I said no, that is not good enough, let us do it by the tape and finally, with your cooperation I am able to send my message, give you my message, by film, filmed with sound so that at least you can see me and you can hear me. I only wish that somehow I could see you and hear you. I always feel better that way and frankly, enjoy talking to an audience much more when there is an exchange of views, at least where we can be in close contact.

For this is a historic convention for the National Farmers Union. It represents many, many years of growth and progress on the part of your great organization. It is historic too because our good friend, Jim Patton, your friend and mine, will be retiring as the president of National Farmers Union. I hope you notice where I said "retiring as the president of the National Farmers Union" because I do not think Jim Patton will ever retire. He will be at work as long as the good Lord gives him the breath of life. Jim Patton has earned, however, retirement from your great organization because he has even broader fields that he needs to give his full attention to. Can I say just a few words about Jim and then just a word or two about Glenn. Jim Patton is not only a fine organizer and a great leader of an outstanding American farm organization but he is a great citizen. He is an all-American citizen. Yes, he has been your articulate, battling, fighting spokesman for the family farmer and for the Farmers Union. He has carried your message in the councils of government for years. He has spoken all over the world on behalf of the family farmers of America and farm people of the world. Jim Patton has been interested in foreign policy, national security, full employment, civil rights; he has been interested in everything that makes America a better place and a better nation and he has some mighty fine records to point to.

Only recently we celebrated the 20th anniversary of the forming of the Employment Act of 1946. I am sure you know that Jim Patton was one of the inspirations behind that Employment Act and while it does not bear his name, it surely has his spirit and it has been a powerful force for economic progress and social progress in America. Jim Patton backed the Marshall plan. He has been in the forefront of a fight for the technical assistance program, the point 4 program. He was one of the real authors of the food-for-peace program and because it was out of his thinking and out of Jim Patton's philosophy that the use of our abundance of our food abundance for the relief of human suffering came about. I know I talked to Jim about it and I was one of the authors of the food-for-peace program but I cannot claim that it was my own idea, I can only claim that I was lucky. I had Jim Patton as a friend and when you have Jim as a friend, you not only have an associate, but you have a philosopher, you have a political action man and you have a fellow who knows how to get things done. So, Jim, I want to wish you the best. I could brag on you all during this film but you would not want me to do it, you are too modest for that. I can only say that you have been the friend of Presidents and Cabinet Officers and Prime Ministers but above all, you have been the friend of the people—the plain people, the farm people, the man on main street, the workingman, the student, the teacher. You have been in there working for the Great Society, for the New Deal and for the Fair Deal and the New Frontier. Your identification with all of these great movements of America, political, economic, and social life, is clear and unmistakable so enjoy your retirement, Jim.

We are going to keep you at work—you do not have to worry about that—you are not going to be able to have an easy life. I noted here too that you were the first president of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers—just another way to underscore that Jim Patton is a citizen of the world—he is a world citizen, he understands the great economic and social forces at work in this world and he is a profreedom man. He is a democrat with a small "d" and Jim I even like it because you are a Democrat with a capital "D" but I am not supposed to inject any partisanship in this message.

Now a word about Glenn Talbott. Of course, I think the world and all of Glenn. He comes from a great part of America up there in the Dakotas and Glenn Talbott has been the strong right arm of Jim Patton and the Farmers Union. He has been the man who sort of managed things as he has had to be the person that was in there day after day fighting to see that the farmers got a better deal, to help build those farmers cooperatives and to take care of the economic and the organizational interests of the Farmers Union and whenever Jim Patton was out on the stumps, so to speak, carrying the spirit and the message of the Farmers Union, Glenn Talbott was right back there in Denver taking care of the day-to-day business of the Farmers Union and that is a mighty big business. It goes into producers cooperatives, into distribution cooperatives, into marketing cooperatives. The Farmers Union is more than a name and it is more than an idea, it is a working organization, so Glenn, I want to pay my respect to you and to wish you well and to congratulate you on all the good work that you have done. How lucky we are to have men like Jim and Glenn, two great American citizens.

Now, I want to conclude in these next few moments a few reflections and observations on our country and this troubled world that we live in. We have been enjoying a great period of economic growth and prosperity in America these past 5 years. It has been phenomenal and even as we have grown richer and stronger we have understood the importance of more and more people in our country coming into full participation of the social and economic life of the Nation.

Think of the wonderful gains we have made lately. The opening up of opportunity to millions and millions of people. The training of workers, the passage of the Civil Rights Act, the implementation of our Peace Corps where we send our young people out around the world to be of help to those who need help. Just think of the advances we have made in education and in health. Why, Jim, you and I were fighting for medicare 20 years ago. I am sure you were doing it 30 years ago. The first bill I ever introduced in Congress was to provide medical care for our elderly under social security. So we have been there on the firing line for all of these great programs of social progress and they are coming now into reality and they are really working. We are building a better America, a stronger America but more importantly, we are building a more just America, a more moral America, a more socially conscious America—that is what the war on poverty is all about and that poverty war is being waged not only in the cities, but in the world countryside where too many of our people have been the victims of poverty. We have taken some time to get this thing under operation and get it going but it is working and today we see thousands of young children in Project Headstart getting their first chance at a little education and getting their first chance to have a little love and attention and care. We see thousands of young men in the Job Corps Centers and young women in our Neighborhood Youth Corps and hundreds and thousands of college students in the work study programs and people who were illiterates only a few months ago that are in our adult education classes. Things are happening and there is improvement. Oh, I wish I could say to you that everything was completed but you and I have been in this business of democratic living long enough to know that Democracy's business is never finished, there is always something more to do.

The important thing is to get started and to make sure that we continue our progress and we are doing that and the Farmers Union has made that possible. You backed us all the way and I want to thank you and we are making progress in the fields of agriculture. We have a good farm program now. Oh, it can stand improvement and we are going to continue to improve it. The farmers of America, the family farmers, are entitled to not only parity of income but parity of opportunity, which is only another way of saying equality of opportunity. All the progress that has been made and yet so much more to be made so we are restless and we are determined, we are energetic and we are also people committed to making this great opportunity available for every person in this land regardless of race, creed or color because every American is needed working at his best.

Now I just returned from a long journey, in fact, two journeys to the Far East and the Pacific and these past 2½ months I have traveled over 100,000 miles as a representative of our Government to 11 Asian and Pacific countries. I have been to Vietnam, I have been to India, Pakistan, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Laos, New Zealand, Australia, Taiwan—I have been in many areas that I never knew before, except as I read about them. Now, what do I find, I find the same urges there, the same hopes amongst the people that we have here. They want to be free and independent, they want to live a better life and what is so really interesting to me is that with a little help from the United States and from other countries that are blessed with prosperity and progress, they can live a better life.

President Johnson went to Honolulu not long ago and there met with the leaders of South Vietnam and the importance of that meeting was not so much military as it was social and political because you and I know that in order to have any success in South Vietnam, a success of preventing aggression, the success of self-determination and of the right of South Vietnam to live as a free nation and a free people, in order to have that, people have to believe that there will be a better day. We cannot win this struggle with just military power. We know that, but we need, of course, military power to provide security but it actually will be won when people believe that there is a new life for them. The peasantry believes there will be a new life and there is a great social revolution underway now in South Vietnam. If South Vietnam and those areas of the Far East had the family farm system that we have, and the farm cooperatives, I doubt that the Communist movement would make any progress. Communism feeds upon social misery so we are now determined to defeat social misery and what a wonderful task this is. It really draws upon the best of us and we are going to help the peoples of South Vietnam in their villages and hamlets and out in the countryside where over 80 percent of the people live in these areas. We are going to help them with their schools and education, with land reform, with modern technology in agriculture, with irrigation and flood control, with rural electrification. I was in one area in Thailand not long ago where there were 8,000 farm families in a rural electrification cooperative. That is an area where the Communists are going to have a tough time to penetrate. So what we seek to do is to build a world in which there is opportunity and justice—that is a long-term project but we can do it and we need to face up to the problems boldly and courageously abroad just as we have at home. And I submit that there is no nation on the face of the earth that knows better how to cooperate with others than the United States of America. We have a pattern of example of a fair, a decent, and a good life for our people. This is exportable. We can help others so we are now pledged and committed in southeast Asia to defeat aggression, to defeat social misery, to help build democratic institutions and, above all, prayerfully, hopefully, and irresistibly to pursue the noble goal of peace.

I want to wish you all well in your convention. I wish I could be there as I have said, and to you Jim, thanks for all the many years of your service, thanks for what you are. You, Glenn, may you also have many more happy days of productive and good work. God bless each and every one of you. Thank you.

ADMIRAL NIMITZ' VIEWS ON THE POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I do not know how many Americans have had the opportunity to read the news accounts of an interview the late Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz gave to West Coast radio newsman Fred Goerner. As I read the account of part of that interview which appeared in a recent issue of the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily Times, I learned that Admiral Nimitz had been greatly concerned about population growth.

This is what Admiral Nimitz said in response to the question "do you feel world war III is inevitable?":

> I'm afraid it is * * * for one reason—population. If man is not able to control population growth, and that battle is being lost now, the pressures in coming decades will be immense. When people are starving, uneducated, without housing, they will eventually explode * * * they can be manipulated by any despot with a promise of something better. War is the most repugnant product of the human mind, but unless we solve that prime problem of population—there will be war.

The world's population problem is ours. Let us hope that man is smart enough to solve the problem he has created.

More than three centuries ago John Donne wrote:

> No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friends or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

And less than one century ago Thomas Huxley wrote:

> It is futile to expect a hungry and squalid population to be anything but violent and gross.

As Admiral Nimitz said:

> The pressures in coming decades will be immense. When people are starving, uneducated, without housing, they will eventually explode * * * they can be manipulated by any despot with a promise of something better.

As Pope Paul VI said:

> No more war. War never again—peace.

Enormous responsibilities confront every citizen today as we create the heritage for tomorrow.

On March 1 for the 19th time since his election President Johnson spoke publicly about the population problem in his message to the Congress on domestic health and education. He said:

> Family planning: We have a growing concern to foster the integrity of the family, and the opportunity for each child. It is essential that all families have access to information and services that will allow freedom to choose the number and spacing of their children within the dictates of individual conscience.
>
> In the fiscal 1967 budget, I have requested a sizable increase in funds available for research, training and services in this field. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development will expand its own research and its grant program to study human reproduction. The Children's Bureau and the Office of Economic Opportunity will support family planning to the maternal and infant care programs in local communities when requested. State agencies will be aided by Federal welfare funds to provide family planning services to mothers.

I applaud the President for his deep concern and for his outstanding and continuing leadership in this most important area.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, next week has been designated National FHA Week as a tribute to the fine young women who are members of the Future Homemakers of America.

The Future Homemakers of America is a national youth organization of more than 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses. The FHA has local chapters in every State.

The Future Homemakers of America has 1,200 members in my home State of New Hampshire. Forty-nine high schools in the State participate in this worthwhile program.

Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the New Hampshire members of this organization. Under the capable leadership of Miss Rebecca Raynes of Exeter, N.H., High School, the State president, and Miss Lila C. Murphy and Miss Dorothy F. Kingsbury, the State adult advisers, the New Hampshire Future Homemakers of America are performing an excellent service for their communities and State.

WYOMING: HIGH, WIDE, AND WINDY—THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY VISITS WONDERFUL WYOMING

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Wyoming has been paid many tributes in her 75 years as a State, but none has topped the accolade in word and picture which appears in the April 1966 issue of National Geographic. On the Confucian premise of one picture being worth a thousand words, the text of David S. Boyer's story would surpass a novel in length. The photographs alone insure that "Wyoming: High, Wide, and Windy" will be a collector's item in Wyoming. The photos and text together constitute an inimitable testimony to Wyoming as a land of beauty, opportunity, and history. Mr. Boyer had a well laid out itinerary through Wyoming. He covered the State like a blanket and his article, replete with names, dates, and places, reads like an historically based travelog of our Nation's 44th State.

Mr. Boyer deftly places in juxtaposition the past, the present, and the future of wonderful Wyoming and the several paragraphs which he devotes to the fact that Wyoming's "rangeland bristles with minutemen," illustrates that Wyoming is more than a livestock, oil, and tourist State. For, as Mr. Boyer points out:

> Around Cheyenne clusters the free world's greatest concentration of combat intercontinental ballistic missiles * * * the 90th strategic missile wing controls 200 of the Nation's more than 800 minuteman missiles.

Truly, the paradox of the times in which we live can be no more graphically illustrated than by the sight of Wyoming cattle and sheep grazing within a few hundred yards of a concrete mound beneath which poises a Minuteman missile ready to hurl skyward with but minutes notice.

Mr. President, the April issue of National Geographic will become a much sought after item, for the text and pictures recount superbly the accomplishments and hopes of Wonderful Wyoming.

I had intended to have the article printed in full in the daily Record. However, I was later informed that to do so would cost the taxpayers nearly $470. I cannot justify the printing of the complete article at that great cost. I will be content, therefore, to allude to it and reiterate to my colleagues and readers of the Congressional Record that a marvelous word and photo tour of Wonderful Wyoming awaits those who have the good fortune to obtain the April 1966 issue of National Geographic.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE TIRES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2669) which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Tire Safety Act of 1966".

PURPOSE

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to protect the public against unreasonable risk of highway accidents occurring as the result of tire failure, through the establishment and the enforcement of minimum safe performance standards for tires. It is also the purpose of this Act to authorize a study of the feasibility of a quality grading system for tires which reduce confusion in the marketing of tires.

Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "interstate commerce" means commerce between any place in a State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and any place in another State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or between places in the same State or the District of Columbia through another State or the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(c) The term "motor vehicle" means passenger cars and station wagons, but does not include any motor vehicle classified as a special purpose vehicle, such as an antique or racing car, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

(d) The term "tire" means a pneumatic tire for use on motor vehicles.

(e) The term "retreaded tire" means a used tire on which the worn tread rubber has been replaced with new tread rubber.

(f) The term "regrooved tire" means a tire on which an iron or a tread design device has been used to cut into a smooth tire carcass to produce a new tread design.

INTERIM MINIMUM SAFE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR NEW TIRES

Sec. 4. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, on or before January 31, 1967, the Secretary shall adopt and publish in the Federal Register interim minimum safe performance standards for new tires, which shall be based upon existing public and private standards.

(b) The interim minimum safe performance standards adopted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall become effective one hundred and eighty days from the date on which the standards are published.

REVISED MINIMUM SAFE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR TIRES

Sec. 5. (a) On or before January 31, 1969, and thereafter as he deems necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall, by order, establish and publish in the Federal Register in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) (1) revised minimum safe performance standards for new tires, and (2) minimum safe performance standards for newly retreaded tires, which may be in the form of minimum safe procedures for retreading tires. Regulations established and issued pursuant to this subsection shall be made on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing.

(b) In such standards, the Secretary shall prescribe such maximum permissible loads for each size of tire, and the application of such maximum permissible load standards, as he determines necessary to achieve the purposes of this Act.

(c) In prescribing standards pursuant to clause (2) of the preceding subsection the Secretary shall not require retreaders to use tire casings produced under the minimum safe performance standards for new tires, until such time as the Secretary finds that such casings are generally available for retreading.

(d) Standards issued pursuant to this section shall become effective on a date specified by the Secretary which shall be no later than one year nor sooner than one hundred and eighty days from the date on which the standards are published, except that standards for newly retreaded tires shall not take effect before June 30, 1969.

(e) In order to carry out sections 4 and 5 hereof, the Secretary—

(1) shall consult with tire and motor vehicle manufacturers and tire retreaders; with the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission; scientific, technical, business, and trade organizations; State, local, and interstate agencies, and tire users; as appropriate; and

(2) shall take into consideratioin such factors as size, load-carrying ability under the conditions likely to be encountered in regular highway travel, resistance to impact and fatigue, resistance to cornering and skidding, resistance to detachment from rim, and such other factors as he deems relevant.

AMENDMENT OF STANDARDS

Sec. 6. The Secretary, from time to time, subject to the administrative procedural requirements set forth in subsection 5(a), may, by order, amend the minimum safe performance standards issued under this Act. Amendments shall become effective on the date specified therefor by the Secretary in said order which shall be no sooner than one hundred and eighty days, nor later than one year from the date on which the amendment is issued, unless the Secretary finds, publishing his reasons therefor, that an earlier or later date is in the public interest.

PREEMPTION

Sec. 7. No State or political subdivision thereof shall establish minimum safe performance standards for new or newly retreaded tires which differ from minimum safe performance standards promulgated pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and any law, regulation, or ordinance purporting to establish such different standards and providing punishment for an act of noncompliance therewith shall be null and void. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the Federal Government, a State or political subdivision thereof from establishing standards for the exclusive purposes of its own procurement of new or newly retreaded tires.

LABELING

Sec. 8. In all standards published pursuant to this Act, the Secretary shall require that tires subject thereto be permanently and conspicuously labeled with such safety information as he determines to be necessary to achieve the purposes of this Act. Such labeling shall include suitable identification of the manufacturer (and in the case of a retreaded tire suitable identification of the retreader), and a recital that such tires conform to Federal minimum safe performance standards. In lieu of such recital, the Secretary may prescribe an appropriate mark or symbol for use by such manufacturers or retreaders who comply with such standards. The Secretary may require that additional safety-related information be disclosed to the purchaser at the time of sale.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS

Sec. 9. (a)(1) In a case of actual controversy as to the validity of any order under this Act, any person who will be adversely affected by such order if placed in effect may at any time prior to the forty-fifth day after such order becomes effective, including the period after publication in the Federal Register before the order becomes effective, file a petition with the United States court of appeals for the circuit wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, for a judicial review of such order. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary or other officer designated by him for that purpose. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which the Secretary based his orders, as provided in section 2112 of title 28.

(2) If the petitioner applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shows to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Secretary, the court may order such additional evidence (and evidence in rebuttal thereof) to be taken before the Secretary, and to be adduced upon the hearing, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Secretary may modify his findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so

taken, and he shall file such modified or new findings, and his recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original order, with the return of such additional evidence.

(3) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the order, or to set it aside in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.

(4) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such order of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28.

(5) Any action instituted under this subsection shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Secretary or any vacancy in such office.

(6) The remedies provided for in this subsection shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other remedies provided by law.

(b) A certified copy of the transcript of the record and proceedings under this section shall be furnished by the Secretary to any interested party at his request and payment by such party of the costs thereof, and shall be admissible in any criminal proceeding, libel for condemnation, exclusion of imports, or other proceeding arising under or in respect to this Act whether or not proceedings with respect to the order have previously been instituted or become final under subsection (a) of this section.

DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS FOR GRADING TIRES

SEC. 10. In order to assist the consumer to make an informed choice in the purchase of motor vehicle tires, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate the feasibility of a uniform quality grading system for motor vehicle tires. On or before January 31, 1969, the Secretary shall report to Congress and make recommendations with respect to the implementation of such uniform quality grading system as he may find to be feasible. The Secretary shall also cooperate with industry and the Federal Trade Commission to the maximum extent practicable in efforts to eliminate deceptive and confusing tire nomenclature and marketing practices.

RESEARCH, TESTING, AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 11. The Secretary, in cooperation with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, is authorized to—

(a) conduct either directly or by way of grant, contract, or otherwise, research, testing, development, and information gathering and disseminating activities necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, which activities shall include consideration of—

(1) relating tire performance characteristics to tire safety;

(2) determining the effects of wear and use of tires upon tire safety;

(3) evaluating and developing methods and equipment for testing, inspecting, and determining safety of tires;

(4) evaluating and developing methods and equipment for determining adequacy of minimum safe performance standards for tires, and compliance of tires with minimum safe performance standards;

(5) developing improved minimum safe performance standards for tires; and

(6) determining the feasibility of a uniform quality grading system for tires;

(b) purchase, acquire, or fabricate all equipment and facilities necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, tires for research or testing purposes may be purchased and tested even though such tests may damage or destroy the tires being tested;

(c) sell or otherwise dispose of tires tested pursuant to the preceding clause, notwithstanding any other provision of law, and reimburse the proceeds of such sale or disposal into the appropriation or fund current and available for the purpose of carrying out this Act: *Provided*, That tires which have been rendered irreparably unsafe for use on the highways, by testing pursuant to subsection (b), shall be sold or disposed of in a manner insuring that they shall not be used on the highways or on vehicles for use on the highways.

INSPECTION AND TESTING FOR COMPLIANCE: RECORDS AND REPORTS

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary is authorized to conduct such testing and inspection as he deems necessary to aid in the enforcement of standards issued and in effect under this Act and shall furnish the Attorney General and, when appropriate, the Secretary of the Treasury any information obtained and test results indicating noncompliance with such standards, for appropriate enforcement or customs action.

(b) For purposes of this section, officers and employees designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized to enter, at reasonable times, (1) any plant, facility, warehouse, or other business establishment or premises where tires are held prior to their sale or delivery, or where tires are retreaded, and to make a reasonable inspection of such tires or (2) any motor vehicle assembly plant and to make a reasonable inspection, after the motor vehicles have left the assembly line, of the tires with which such motor vehicles are equipped.

(c) Every manufacturer and retreader of tires and every manufacturer of motor vehicles shall establish and maintain such records, make such reports, and provide such information as the Secretary may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer or retreader has acted or is acting in compliance with the provisions of this Act and standards prescribed pursuant to this Act and shall, upon request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee to inspect appropriate books, papers, records, and documents.

(d) All information reported to or otherwise obtained by the Secretary or his representative pursuant to subsection (b) or (c), which information contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, shall be considered confidential for the purpose of that section, except that such information may be disclosed to other officers or employees concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 13. (a) No person shall—

(1) manufacture for sale, sell, offer for sale, or introduce or deliver for introduction in interstate commerce, or import into the United States for resale, any tire manufactured or retreaded or any motor vehicle assembled on or after the date any applicable standards take effect under this Act unless it is in conformity with such standards as prescribed or amended by the Secretary pursuant to section 4, 5, 6, or 8 of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section; or

(2) fail or refuse to permit entry or inspection as authorized under section 12(b) of this Act or fail or refuse access to or copying of records, or fail to make reports or provide information, as required under section 12(c).

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall not apply to the sale, the offer for sale, or the introduction or delivery for introduction in interstate commerce of any tire or motor vehicle after the first purchase of it in good faith where the tire is labeled as conforming to Federal minimum safe performance standards.

(c)(1) A tire or motor vehicle offered for importation in violation of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be refused admission into the United States, but the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary may, by joint regulations, provide for authorizing the importation of a tire or motor vehicle, or class thereof, into the United States upon such terms and conditions (including the furnishing of a bond) as may appear to them appropriate to insure that any such tire or motor vehicle will be brought into conformity with any applicable standards prescribed under this Act, or will be exported or abandoned to the Government.

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary may, by joint regulations, prohibit the importation of any tire or motor vehicle, or class thereof, into the United States, unless it meets any standards or regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(3) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall not apply to a tire intended solely for export, if it is labeled on the outside of the shipping container to show that it is intended for export and is so exported.

(d) No person, firm, or corporation shall sell, offer for sale, or introduce for sale or deliver for introduction in interstate commerce any tire or motor vehicle equipped with any tire which has been regrooved, except that the Secretary may by order permit the sale of regrooved tires or motor vehicles equipped with such times which he finds are designed and constructed in a manner consistent with the purposes of this Act.

CIVIL PENALTY

SEC. 14. (a) Whoever violates any provision of section 13(a)(2) or 13(d), or any regulation issued thereunder, shall be subjected to a civil penalty of not to exceed $1,000 for each such violation.

(b) Any such civil penalty may be compromised by the Secretary. The amount of such penalty, when finally determined, or the amount agreed upon in compromise, may be deducted from any sums owing by the United States to the persons charged.

INJUNCTION; SUBPENAS

SEC. 15. (a) The United States district courts and the United States courts of the territories and of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65(a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of this Act upon petition by the appropriate United States attorney or the Attorney General on behalf of the United States.

(b) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an order, injunction, or restraining order issued under this section, which violation also constitutes a violation of this Act, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedures applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

(c) In all libel or injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this Act, subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

SEIZURE

SEC. 16. (a) Any motor vehicle tire that has been manufactured or introduced into commerce in violation of section 13 of this Act shall be liable to be proceeded against by the United States while in interstate commerce on libel of information and condemned in any district court of the United

States and in any United States court for the territories, possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) Such tire shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and the procedure in cases under this section shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in any such case shall be tried by jury. When libel for condemnation proceedings, under this section, involving the same claimant, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the United States or the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (1) any district selected by the applicant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (2) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the United States or the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court (after giving the other party, the claimant, or the United States attorney for such district, reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard) shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the case covered thereby.

(c) Any tire condemned under this section shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may, in accordance with the provisions of this section, direct and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, but such tire shall not be sold under such decree contrary to the provisions of this Act or the laws of the jurisdiction in which sold: *Provided*, That, after entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such tire shall not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of this Act or the laws of any State or territory in which sold, the court may by order direct that such tire be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this Act under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the tire under bond.

(d) When a decree of condemnation is entered against the tire, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the tire.

(e) In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by subsection (c) of this section—

(1) the clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction;

(2) the court to which such case is removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of such case, which the court from which removal was made would have had, or to which such court would have been subject, if such case had not been removed.

REGULATIONS, AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATION

SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary is authorized to issue and amend such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or appropriate to carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary, in exercising the authority under this Act, shall utilize the services, research, and testing facilities of public and competent private agencies to the maximum extent he determines practicable in order to avoid duplication in research, facilities, or operation services.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 18. To carry out the purpose of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,900,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $1,450,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and 1969, and $1,600,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending measure, S. 2669, take place at 2 o'clock p.m., on Tuesday next and that for this purpose rule XII, clause 3, be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The vote will begin at 2 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday next.

(The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing is as follows:)

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Tuesday, March 29, 1966 at 2 o'clock p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on final passage of S. 2669, a bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose of asking for a recess is so that Senators who wish to discuss the bill will have the time intervening between the prayer by the Chaplain and the hour designated for the vote in which to do so.

UNIFORM DATES FOR DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1404, the Uniform Time Act of 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement *to the amendments of the Senate to the* amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McGEE, and Mr. COTTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMON ABUSES IN CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the rule of germaneness, I may proceed for not more than 15 minutes on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the rule is waived, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in his message on consumer interests, the President reiterated his recommendation that Congress enact a truth-in-lending law. Such legislation has been with us for several sessions, and lengthy hearings have been held.

I have supported the effort of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] over the years to have such legislation enacted. I believe that I am a cosponsor of all such bills that have been introduced by him.

Most of us are already aware, at least in a general way, of the purpose of this legislation. But I think it will be well worth recalling the abuses that led to it.

A bewildering variety of methods of stating consumer finance charges confronts the typical borrower or buyer today. Often he is unable to understand or compare the financing terms offered by sellers or lenders.

Theodore Yntema, vice president of the Ford Motor Co., said at a Senate hearing on automobile financing a few years ago:

> The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for the finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives available elsewhere.

The borrower or buyer is at a double disadvantage: he is unaware of the true *costs of credit use, and he is unable to shop around and compare alternative fi*nance charges offered by different lenders and sellers. This is because there are so many different ways of stating the cost of credit use.

Let me list for you four of the most common practices:

First. No rate quoted: The buyer or borrower is told only that the charges will be so much down and so much per week or per month.

Second. Add-on or discount rate: The borrower is given a rate on the original amount of the credit rather than on the periodic declining balance. The annual percentage rate is approximately twice as high as the so-called add-on or discount rate.

Third. Add-on discount rate plus fees: Numerous extra fees may be charged in addition to the add-on or discount rate. This serves to raise the annual percentage rate to considerably more than twice the quoted rate.

Fourth. Simple monthly rate: The finance charge is disclosed to the borrower in terms of an all-inclusive simple monthly rate. The annual percentage rate is 12 times the monthly rate.

The consumer can only be confused or deceived by this variety of ways to state the charges for credit use. It is impossible for anyone who is not an expert in the practices of the consumer credit fields to compare costs expressed in these many ways.

In fact, even Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, when he was testifying at hearings on this legislation, said that he was confused by some of the practices in use to state—or misstate—the cost of consumer credit.

We cannot expect the average wage-earner or housewife to understand something that is confusing to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

The purpose of this legislation is to eliminate the confusion. Credit is a valuable asset. Consumers are well advised to use their credit wisely and guard it carefully. But they cannot do a good job of either unless they know how much their credit use is costing them.

This legislation, which is recommended by the President, would require that lenders and vendors disclose their finance charges in a standard, clear, and meaningful way—both in dollars and as an annual percentage rate.

It is time we acted to guarantee the American consumer this vital information. It is the essential clue which will enable him to find his way through the confusing and misleading labyrinth that is the consumer credit marketplace today.

Mr. President, I commend the President of the United States for his support of the consumers' interest in this message. I hope the result will be legislation by Congress along the lines of the bill for which the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so long fought. I am delighted that the President of the United States is now urging on us to act to correct these evils.

INTENSIFIED BOMBING IN NORTH VIETNAM NOT DESIRABLE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the debate on the supplemental appropriation bill for Vietnam earlier this week several distinguished Senators took issue with the view of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that further intensification of bombing in North Vietnam was not desirable.

Both the Secretary and General Wheeler spelled out in the course of the hearings, in what was to me a completely logical way, their reasons for concluding that it was not wise under the present circumstances either to start bombing the cities of North Vietnam, or to attempt to destroy the oil installation and storage faciliies there, or to bomb or mine Haiphong Harbor.

Nevertheless, these Senators, as was their right, undertook to disagree with General Wheeler and Secretary McNamara. Now I note that the cause of the generals who favor intensified bombings has been taken up by their usual protagonist, that arch hawk columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop.

On the other hand, the position taken by the Senators in question has been criticized by Mr. James Reston, and was this morning commented on again in a column by Mr. Marquis Childs.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's column entitled "Politics of War," and Mr. Reston's column entitled "Washington: How To Make Things Worse Than They Are," and Mr. Child's column entitled "A Rising Pressure To Bomb Cities," may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS OF WAR

(By Joseph Alsop)

Like the usual cloud no bigger than a man's hand, the politics of the war in Vietnam are already beginning to appear above the horizon.

On the one hand, President Johnson has taken to representing himself as a stalwart rampart of "restraint," almost alone in holding off the dangerous designs of the military. This has become a standard turn, complete with Billy Graham organ tones in the vox humana range, at large rallies like the recent Governors' meeting at the White House.

The designs cited tend to be pretty hair-raising. One of them, reportedly, was to bomb the Chinese nuclear powerplants. No one, of course, has even remotely suggested doing anything of that sort, unless the Chinese get into the Vietnamese war with both feet. Hence the news of these quasi-public Johnsonian image-polishings have not exactly promoted good feelings in the Pentagon.

On the other hand, the military leaders are beginning to be manifestly restive, in the face of what someone has called the President's "image-warmaking." The restiveness is reflected in the recent demands for an air blockade of Haiphong Harbor by Senators RICHARD RUSSELL, STUART SYMINGTON, and others who are close to the military leadership.

In reality, blockading Haiphong is fairly low on the priority list of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But it must be noted that this low priority for Haiphong was authoritatively revealed in the course of the meeting which gave the strongest of all the recent hints of military restiveness. This was a background interview accorded to a group of correspondents by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle Wheeler.

The reporters were told by Wheeler that they could say that the Joint Chiefs wished to intensify the northern bombing by attacking the vital oil-fuel stores of North Vietnam. They were also told that the Chiefs attached far less importance to Haiphong Harbor.

General Wheeler naturally did not speak for direct quotation; but as always happens in such cases, the highly significant identity of the spokesman for the Joint Chiefs is now an open secret. And the step that Wheeler took was truly remarkable by current standards; for there has been no room for the old-fashioned free expression of the American military in the new Pentagon of Robert S. McNamara.

What then, is all this churning really about? First of all, it is about the extremely detailed, indeed minute Presidential management of many aspects of the war. The precedent was set in the Cuban missile crisis. This was a psychological-political confrontation of hideous gravity, but a confrontation in which there was no fighting. It was ideally managed, too.

It is extremely questionable, however, whether the Cuban precedent should be followed, at any rate to anything like the present extent, in the quite different present case. No matter how many cables he reads, the President cannot sense the true effects of this hesitation, that delay, this other veto on an unseen and ugly war halfway around the world.

Yet the really major source of the present churning is something quite different. To find out its nature, it is only necessary to have a look at the Joint Chiefs' position on bombing the North Vietnamese oil-fuel depots, as formulated by General Wheeler.

To understand this position's real meaning, it is needful to bear in mind the long-range intelligence forecasts. These indicate a stepped-up North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam, which is expected to continue until our troops are fighting the equivalent of 18-plus divisions of enemy regulars, in addition to guerrillas and Vietcong local forces.

These same forecasts indicated a stepped-up North Vietnamese treaty violation, to deliver close to 6,500 tons a month through Laos to South Vietnam. Without that tonnage, the divisions facing our troops will have no teeth—meaning ammunition. And this supply movement, calculated from port across North Vietnam, and down the Ho Chi Minh trail to the South Vietnamese border will require something like 10,000 trucks.

Naturally, then, the Joint Chiefs want to try to halt the trucks and cripple the supply movement by taking out the very vulnerable North Vietnamese oil-fuel stores. The Chiefs are going on the rule of doing what needs doing, which is always the necessary course in wartime.

If the intelligence forecasts prove correct, failing to do what so obviously needs doing will cost a shocking price, not only in Vietnam, but also here at home. President Johnson should remember his hero, Franklin Roosevelt, who was not deterred from doing what needed doing by, for instance, threats of petulance in the Chicago Tribune.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1966]

WASHINGTON: HOW TO MAKE THINGS WORSE THAN THEY ARE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The pressure seems to be building up in the Senate for a policy of bombing, mining, or blockading the North Vietnamese harbor of Haiphong, and one reason for the pressure is obviously the forthcoming elections.

Not to close that harbor to the ships carrying war materiel to North Vietnam and the Vietcong, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, said today, "flies in the face of commonsense." He was supported by Senators STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, and HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

"It is going to be necessary to have a change in policy in some direction in the very near future, in my opinion," Senator RUSSELL added, "or this war will assume political proportions that will absolutely force it upon any man who has to go before the electorate of this country and seek public office." He thereupon proposed a blockade.

WAIT A MINUTE

Maybe we should look this one over a little before we jump. The thing can be done easily enough. Legally, it is a little misty since the United States is not formally at war with North Vietnam, but the lawyers will find a way through that thicket. An effective sea and air blockade of Haiphong, however, raises more practical questions.

First, if a Soviet ship carrying munitions to North Vietnam is intercepted by an American destroyer approaching Haiphong and refuses to turn around or be boarded, what do we do? Blow her out of the water? The consequences of that are likely to be rather awkward.

Second, a policy of mining the harbor, therefore, seems more likely to be more practical and less risky, though this too has to be considered in something other than domestic political terms.

No doubt it would have considerable effect on free world shipping now carrying supplies but not munitions to Haiphong. Insurance rates on ships heading that way would reach almost prohibitive heights as soon as the mining was announced. That would discourage those who are making a profit out of the war, and nobody would sob much about them.

THE SOVIET PROBLEM

The critical problem lies with the Soviet Government, now approaching a major ideological showdown with Communist China at the Communist Party Congress later this month. Peking's charge against Moscow is that it is soft on capitalism, timid in its approach to the Vietnamese war, and more interested in peaceful coexistence with the United States than in waging the Communist revolution.

In these circumstances, the Soviet Union is not so likely to turn back, as it did in the United States blockade of Cuba during the missile crisis of October 1962; but even if it decided not to risk blowing up its men and ships in Haiphong, there would still be a problem.

For diverting Soviet seaborne shipping to the air or the land would mean rerouting it over or through Communist China and thus placing the North Vietnamese Government even more in the grip of Communist China, which is precisely what the Johnson administration has always said it wanted to avoid.

This, to use Senator Russell's phrase, really "flies in the face of commonsense." One objective of our policy surely is not to force Moscow and Peking closer together but to keep them apart; not to isolate Hanoi with the Communist Chinese but to give them some freedom of action to work with Moscow; not to increase Peking's leverage over North Vietnam but to limit it as much as possible.

The aim of closing the port is clear enough—to reduce our casualties—but to plunge into it worrying about senatorial casualties is another matter.

President Johnson, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of State Rusk and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, are all dubious that the advantages of closing Haiphong would be greater than the disadvantages, that it would really seriously hamper the flow of supplies to the enemy, and that it would do anything but bring about even more trouble in keeping the narrow channel of the Saigon River open for our own supplies. But Senator Russell differs on both military and political grounds.

POLITICS AND POLICY

"I do not think we can afford to let this war drift on and on as it is now," he told the Senate yesterday. "Search and destroy tactics may, after 10 or 12 years, bring the Vietcong to their knees, but the American people are going to be very unhappy about it, and someone who comes along and says: 'I will go in and clean this thing up in 6 months,' will, I'm afraid, have some advantage over the Senators who say 'let's play this thing along for 10 or 12 years as we're going now.'"

Politicians who run for reelection, of course, have to worry about such things, but good politics is not necessarily good policy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 25, 1966]

A Rising Pressure To Bomb Cities

(By Marquis Childs)

The rumbling sound that comes from across the Potomac is the barely suppressed muttering of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Pentagon. This low-keyed thunder out of the Military Establishment underscores the half-suppressed war within a war that is part of the tangled web of Vietnam.

Whether this portends a crisis in the direction of the war is what many observers are beginning to ask. The Joint Chiefs insist that they cannot win the war with the restraints imposed by policy set in the White House. They believe it is imperative to bomb installations in and around the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi and the port of Haiphong and at the same time, although there are differences on this score, to mine Haiphong harbor.

The JCS are acutely sensitive to the needling of Gen. Curtis LeMay and Gen. Thomas Power, both now retired from the Air Force where they were unremitting advocates of bombing everywhere.

So far these are subterranean noises. They have an echo in Senator Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, but that is a natural phenomenon that never fails. In short, the confrontation between the Commander in Chief and his chiefs is not a direct one.

The reason, of course, is the hard-pressed Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. He has come closer than any Secretary to imposing civilian control over the vast military apparatus, with spending set for the coming fiscal year at $60 billion. He speaks to the President for the Pentagon.

But as a kind of dam—a filter is the word some Pentagon critics apply—McNamara finds it increasingly difficult to resist the big-bomber pressures from both his own establishment and from Capitol Hill. The fly boys and the aircraft manufacturers are a powerful combination. They exploit the popular mythology expressed in the conviction of the effectiveness of pinpoint bombing and a quick and comparatively painless victory through air power.

President Johnson, determined to hold the present status which he considers middle of the road, is in a bind. One thing most of his associates agree on is that the President finds the incessantly mounting demands of the war galling in the extreme. Sensitive to the play of public opinion, he is aware of deeply conflicting views—find a compromise way out on the one hand and get it over with quickly on the other. As spending on the war escalates into more billions the President's Great Society programs are faced with starvation.

At his elbow in the White House is Gen. Maxwell Taylor, whose title is special consultant to the President. Taylor is in agreement with the views of the Joint Chiefs. He put on the record before a congressional committee his beliefs that mining the harbor of Haiphong would be a step in shutting off supplies to the Communists fighting the war in the south.

In the midst of this crossfire in Washington have come two developments in Vietnam—one deeply worrying, the other moderately hopeful. As to the first, the Honolulu honeymoon with Premier Nguyen Cao Ky is definitely cooled as a result of his handling of the firing of the flamboyant Lt. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, commander of the Vietnamese Army 1st Corps area. Instead of sending Thi out of the country, as was done when Gen. Nguyen Khanh was removed in 1964, he was allowed to go back to his stronghold. While this may prove to be no more than another jig by the dominant military, an upset in Saigon is still an ominous possibility.

The hopeful prospect was in a report from that straightforward soldier in command in Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland. Westmoreland pointed out that for a variety of reasons the direct impact on the enemy of American troops has never added up to more than 20,000 to 25,000. But he was confident that by late summer, when the overall total is as high as 275,000, up to two-thirds or more of that number will be directly engaged in fighting the Vietcong. Then, in Westmoreland's view, with 200,000 men fighting the enemy the Communists will know they can never drive the Americans out.

In the background of the Honolulu Conference was the private prediction that by mid-1967 the Vietcong would begin to fade out. That was the hopeful note communicated to the President. It seemed to imply a holding position in the middle ground that he is convinced, in spite of critics on both sides, he occupies. But, as so often before, events in Vietnam have a way of catching up with the best laid plans.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with Secretary McNamara, General Wheeler, Mr. James Reston, and Mr. Marquis Childs. The proposals that we intensify the bombing of North Vietnamese installations, that we destroy oil supplies by bombing, that we mine or bomb Haiphong Harbor, seem to me most unwise and ill advised.

I should like to quote two statements which were made in the course of the hearings on the supplemental appropriation bill. The first statement was made by Secretary McNamara in response to a question from the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] about the desirability of bombing or mining the port of Haiphong.

When the Senator from North Carolina raised the point that the mining of the harbor of Haiphong would cut down the flow of "essential supplies," the Secretary replied, at page 177:

> Essential supplies, perhaps, to the economy of North Vietnam, but not essential supplies to the operation in the south.
>
> The tonnage that is required in the south, as I indicated, is relatively small, and it is not necessary for it to come in by port or, for that matter, by railroad or even over automotive roads. It could be carried on the backs of men, as it has been done many times before by the Chinese.

On page 178 of the testimony, in response to a suggestion that it would aid our war effort in the south to bomb the industries in the north, the Secretary testified:

> The industries in the north contribute very little to the supplies that are used in the south for the prosecution of the war.
>
> In my opinion, it would have no measurable effect upon their capability to furnish the supplies they are presently supplying to the Communist forces in South Vietnam.

At page 299 of the record, Admiral McDonald, responding to a question from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], said:

> The Vietcong in South Vietnam need few petroleum items because they walk everywhere; they don't need much.

I support the position taken by Admiral McDonald and by Secretary

McNamara. I point out the grave danger of changing our policies, as indicated in the columns of Mr. Reston and Mr. Childs.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE TIRES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2669), to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the American people know that no car can be safer than its tires. Yet today, there is deepening public anxiety as to the adequacy both of tires supplied with new cars and of replacement tires purchased in the "after market."

There are, today, 300 million passenger tires in use on the Nation's highways and, as the vast new Interstate Highway System reaches out across our country, these tires are being subjected to punishment of a kind and degree virtually unknown 20 years ago.

Today, station wagons heavily laden with family and baggage customarily speed across hundreds of miles of highway in the heat of summer, at legal speeds up to 80 miles an hour. As car owners, we expect our tires to perform such service safely, though it may be demanded only once or twice a year. We expect such performance from our tires not only when they are new but throughout their tread life. And when we subject millions of worn tires to retreading, we expect the retreaded tires to perform safely throughout yet another tour of service.

At the very time that tires are being subjected to greater and greater stress the so-called cheapie tire—the low-price replacement tire usually sold under the marketer's own unfamiliar brand name—has captured a substantial share of the replacement tire market.

The committee received disturbing testimony that significant numbers of these tires were of poor quality, often evidencing, upon close inspection, fatal defects and incapable of performing safely under normal conditions of use.

With respect to tires on new cars, our committee received a surprising volume of complaints of unexplained tire blowouts at mileages as low as 6,000, 5,000, and even 4,000 and 3,000 miles.

One tire manufacturer said:

> Over the years, vehicle manufacturers, in an attempt to cut costs, have cut down the amount of tire they are designing on their vehicles.

Some vehicles are overloaded when they are empty of passengers or baggage.

More than 20 percent of the 300 million passenger tires presently in use are retreaded tires, produced in thousands of shops throughout the country. The safety of such tires is subject not only to the strength of the tire carcass—which has already outworn one tread—but to the quality of materials, processing methods, and the maintenance of quality control techniques as well. Yet retreaded tires must be capable to bearing up under the same conditions of use as new tires. The testimony was overwhelming to this effect. There is little doubt that far too many retreaded tires fall short of this mark.

An attempt has been made by both the industry and the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission to develop minimum safe standards for tires but, after 3 days of hearings and after reviewing the extensive hearings conducted by the Federal Trade Commission last year, our committee was convinced that the public today remains inadequately protected against the risks of unsafe tires.

There is great confusion, too, in the marketing of tires. I know of no consumer commodity more sharply characterized by confused and misleading nomenclature than the tire.

Though no uniform grading system presently exists, the great majority of the private label marketers and domestic manufacturers market tires on the basis of an apparent grading system. Thus, "premium," "first line," "second line," and "100 level," imply that an objective grading system exists. Yet these designations today have no uniform fixed meaning or definitive value. One marketer's "premium" is the inferior of another's "third line" tire—and a single manufacturer may market a tire under its own brandname as a "third level" tire while his private label customer markets the same tire as a "first line" tire.

Tires are unlike many consumer items which are bought, rapidly consumed, and bought again. The tire consumer has little opportunity to sample and test for himself the quality of each of the multitude of brands marketed. Fortunately, he need not buy a new set of tires every week.

In summary, the bill, as reported by the committee:

First. Directs the Secretary of Commerce, on or before January 31, 1967, to adopt interim minimum safe performance standards for new passenger car and station wagon tires, based upon existing public and private standards.

Second. Directs the Secretary, on or before January 31, 1969, to establish revised minimum safe performance standards for new tires and minimum safe performance standards for newly retreaded tires, based upon a comprehensive program of tire research, testing, and development also authorized by the bill; these revised standards will include maximum permissible loads for each size of tire.

This is a very important provision, because in many cases it will be found that although on a new car there may be brandnew tires, and good tires, they may not be the type of tire that is needed for the weight of the car. That happens many times.

Third. Directs the Secretary to study and to make recommendations to Congress on or before January 31, 1969, for the implementation of a uniform quality grading system for tires, if feasible, and to join with the Federal Trade Commission and the industry in efforts to eliminate deceptive and confusing tire nomenclature and marketing practices.

Fourth. Prohibits the sale of regrooved tires.

Fifth. Authorizes testing, inspection, and the imposition of recordkeeping requirements in order to establish meaningful compliance with standards issued under the bill.

After many consultations with the industry and all of those involved—and there will be many more conferences with the Secretary of Commerce under the bill—the committee is hopeful and I am sure that there will be no particular harassment or undue inspection. I am sure that by 1969 the minimum things necessary to be done can be arrived at, and that most of the regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary will have been complied with.

Sixth. Authorizes the seizure of tires manufactured or sold in violation of any standards issued under the bill, injunctive relief to restrain violations of the bill, and imposes a penalty of $1,000 for failure to permit entry or inspection under the bill and for the sale of regrooved tires.

This is a source of many of the bad tires which get on the road: What they call, in trade terms, "regrooved tires."

Seventh. Directs the Secretary to require permanent safety labeling of tires, and the disclosure of additional safety-related information to the tire purchaser at time of sale.

We hope that will be in such language and in plain enough terms that the public can understand it.

Eighth. Prohibits any State or local authority from enforcing standards differing from those promulgated by the Secretary under this bill.

Ninth. Authorizes appropriations of $2.9 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $1.45 million for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968 and 1969, and $1.6 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970 through 1974.

After much discussion, the bill received the unanimous approval of the Commerce Committee. In addition to three days of public hearings, we have had scores of conferences with people in the automobile industry, tire and automobile manufacturers, tire dealers and retreaders, and organizations representing the driving public.

It was agreed that the procedure provided in the bill is a good long-time approach to the situation, that it is long overdue, and that passage of the bill would mean great progress in the field of automobile safety.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a communication which is typical of the many communications received from all over the United States with respect to this bill, from the Automobile Club of my own State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF WASHINGTON,
SEATTLE, WASH., *March 23, 1966.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: We have just learned that S. 3005 and 2669 are up for hearings now.

We want to remind you of our support for the Tire Safety Act of 1966, and to express our appreciation to you and your committee for the vigil and pursuit of these important measures.

Last November we wrote to all of our congressional delegation, expressing our interest in this matter. As a reminder, and for your information, our November 8 letter to Washington's delegation read as follows:

"We have just had an opportunity to review the proposed Federal Tire Safety Act of 1966, introduced as a committee bill under Senator MAGNUSON.

"As a motoring organization in the State of Washington we are keenly interested in S. 2669, and while there may be some suggested changes later when Congress acts on this measure, we wish to express our endorsement of the objectives of the bill.

"We knew that the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission, on which our State had direct representation, was promulgating tire standards.

"In anticipation of Congress enacting a Federal study program of standards at an early date we encouraged our own State, at its last legislative session, not to act separately.

"Further, we had actively supported our State's inclusion in the Interstate Vehicle Equipment Compact. If Congress adopts the proposed tire standards we shall actively seek our State's ratification if such is desirable or necessary during the appropriate meeting of our legislature."

If there is anything further we may do to be of assistance on this matter, please let us know.

Most cordially,
AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF WASHINGTON,
RUSSELL W. VAN ROOY,
General Manager.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I rise to support the bill and to urge its approval by the Senate.

As the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Commerce which has unanimously recommended the approval of S. 2669, as amended, I want to take a minute to discuss some features of the bill and to try to place it in a somewhat clearer perspective.

Briefly stated, the bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to publish safety performance standards for new tires effective sometime next year. After a 2-year program of research and testing he would then issue revised standards for new tires and additional safety standards for newly retreaded tires. The bill contains adequate and effective means for the enforcement of these standards, and makes provisions, too, for the testing and research necessary to develop new tire safety standards.

There is no need for me to go into an elaborate discussion of the need for improved highway safety. The fact that 49,000 Americans were killed last year and another 1.8 million injured speaks so loudly and clearly that no other comment is needed.

The safety of the tire is, obviously, crucial to the safety of the car, its passengers, and others nearby. And tires present special problems, not associated with other elements of the automobile. The principal and most relevant difference arises from the fact that, while tires are manufactured by only 15 companies in the country, they are sold to consumers under nearly a thousand brand and trade names. The fierce competition, especially on the low-priced, private-label tire, has had an inevitable tendency to drive down not only the price but also the safety standards and the reliability of such tires.

Under such circumstances, it is clear that only the Federal Government, through effective nationwide legislation, can assure the minimum standards of safety for tires that the American public has a right to expect.

At the same time, however, I think it is only fair to note that, in a sense, this bill attacks the problem like a man swatting flies with a sledge hammer.

This legislation is something of a new departure for the Federal Government. It is the first comprehensive Federal action in the field of safety standards for manufactured products. It also gives very broad powers to a single Federal official to set performance standards that could have a major impact on an important industry, and a considerable effect on the pocketbooks of the millions of Americans who buy tires. The Secretary of Commerce, under the bill, can wield a big stick, but I believe he will do so with reason and good judgment, after full and careful consideration of all the factors which may be involved.

Available information on the relationship between tires and automobile accidents is limited and incomplete. But, witnesses for the Department of Commerce told the committee that tire failure was listed as a contributing factor in 5 percent of all accidents on turnpikes in 1962 and 1963. An 18-month study of accidents on the Pennsylvania Turnpike showed that 2.7 percent of the accidents were attributed to blowouts or soft tires.

These accident percentages relate to all tires, new ones or old ones, bald tires and heavily treaded tires. In contrast, the bill deals with only new tires—or in its later stages with newly retreaded tires. It has no provisions dealing with the safety of old tires, whose tread may be gone. It has no provisions alerting the motorist to the need for a regular check on the inflation pressure, even though the evidence presented to the committee indicated that inflation pressure is a critical factor in the safety and life of automobile tires.

I cite these facts not as criticism of the bill. Problems such as these are outside the scope of this legislation—in fact they are generally outside the scope of effective Federal action. They are mentioned to warn that enactment and full implementation of the bill cannot be taken as a signal for any slackening in the drive for highway safety on the part of the motorist, law enforcement officials, States, and all others concerned.

The bill provides for a solid attack on one of the problems of highway safety, but it is a narrow attack on a single aspect of a broad problem.

As a sledge hammer for swatting flies, it is justified because the "flies"—in this case safety problems of new tires—are an integral part of the deadly serious problem of highway safety.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, I support the bill. I regard it as an important and necessary piece of legislation and urge the Senate to approve it.

I would also like to pay a tribute to the Senator from Washington, Senator MAGNUSON, the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, for his leadership in the development of this legislation. He, and his staff, have done a fine piece of work.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to call to the Senate's attention the admirable manner in which the Secretary of Commerce is carrying out the provisions of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, and the progress which has been made to date.

The Senate deliberated long and hard and enacted a law to control outdoor advertising and junkyards and to preserve the natural beauty along the major highways of this great land. The law was a compromise which satisfied no one completely. When the bill was signed, President Johnson said:

> This is not all we asked for, nor all the public interest requires, but it is a step forward.

Provisions were made that before the promulgation of any standards, criteria, rules, or regulations, by the Secretary of Commerce, that public hearings be held in each of the several States; and that these standards and criteria be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary. It furthermore provides that in case of a dispute which could result in the withholding of Federal aid to a State, that State be given ample opportunity for a hearing and the full protection of judicial review.

Mr. President, I think the Secretary of Commerce is to be highly commended for the fairness, candor, and care with which he has proceeded to carry out the provisions of the act and the intent of this body.

Within a matter of weeks after passage of the act, the Secretary together with his Bureau of Public Roads called for a series of meetings with State highway officials; outdoor advertising, junkyard and roadside business groups; as well as conservation and beautification representatives. At these meetings, the act was not only fully explained, but what is more important, individuals and groups alike representing the full range of interests were invited to work with the Bureau of Public Roads to assist it in developing effective and equitable draft standards.

At the same time, the Bureau of Public Roads was proceeding with all deliberate speed to arrange for the public hearings and to publish the hearing notice and draft standards in advance of the hearings was clearly stated at the time of publication and I quote from the Federal

Register, volume 31, No. 19, Friday, January 28, 1966:

> The following draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations, intended solely as guidelines for consideration and discussion purposes at the public hearings, do not represent any conclusions, or even tentative conclusions, on the part of the Secretary of Commerce.
>
> The advance publication containing the categories or groups of draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations to be considered at the public hearings is only intended for the express purpose of permitting all interested persons a sufficient opportunity to consider, prepare, and develop information and comments relevant to each group or category of standards and criteria to be considered at the public hearings.

In a press release issued by the Department of Commerce to announce the publication of the draft standards, it was again clearly pointed out that, and I quote:

> They were prepared as a basis for holding the public hearings and do not represent conclusions or proposals of the Secretary.

Furthermore, a note from Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton accompanying advance copies of the draft standards sent to all members of the Public Works Committee and to other Senators who had expressed an interest in them, said, and I quote:

> The attached notice of hearings includes draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations which are presented solely as guidelines for consideration and discussion purposes at the public hearings. It must be emphasized that these standards and guidelines do not represent any conclusions, or even tentative conclusions on the part of the Secretary of Commerce.

I think, Mr. President, that the actions by the Bureau of Public Roads clearly comply with the intent of this body by not proposing standards before all affected interests have had an opportunity to make themselves heard.

Really, Mr. President, I would like to see more stringent standards promulgated than the Department has published for hearing purposes—standards which would assure the more complete control of billboards, which, because of their unsightly proliferation, have become the blight of our Nation's highways; standards which would assure the preservation of the natural beauty of our country that many of us value so highly and which would make our highways safer, especially at interchanges on limited access highways.

But, whatever the final result, draft standards were necessary at this time to provide interested parties, whether pro or con, with a common frame of reference on which to base their comments. Therefore, we should be pleased to have this preparation of draft standards for the purpose of holding these hearings in each State. The Department of Commerce is to be commended for causing them to be prepared. Without them, it seems to me, the hearings which are required by statute could result in volumes of irrelevant statements and arguments that would make the task of developing a set of proposed standards, following the hearings, needlessly difficult for the Department of Commerce.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there may be some people in the billboard advertising business who have the notion that, under the law the Congress enacted last year, the Department of Commerce is—with respect to billboards—to do no more than make a survey of the whole country to find out what is now the customary practice in the billboard industry, and then simply to translate into official standards and regulations whatever the outdoor advertising business is doing as a matter of trade practices. This would indeed make a mockery of the law which the Congress enacted last year, and, furthermore, this would indeed be an incorrect application of that law. If customary use had always been consistent with roadside safety and beauty, there would be little need for this legislation. In this connection, I think it is relevant to quote from the statement by the very distinguished and able senior Senator from West Virginia, Senator RANDOLPH. His statement is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 20, page 26844, and I quote:

> On careful consideration of the phrase, "consistent with customary use," in the House-approved bill, and which was not contained in the Senate version, it is my conclusion that there should be no objection to writing into the statute the interpretation and the intention stated by the Secretary of Commerce in his letter of September 14, in the House Committee Report accompanying S. 2084. Certainly, it seems to me that any regulations which the Secretary adopts in agreement with the States should, consistent with the purposes of this act, be helpful to the advertising industry. Any regulations of criteria with respect to size, spacing, and lighting of outdoor advertising signs should, insofar as possible, be consistent with customary use in the industry. Therefore, I cannot perceive any valid objection to this particular language in the House-approved bill.

Furthermore, many States have adopted laws regulating signs in commercial and industrial areas, which laws in some cases have been in effect many years. For example, what is customary in my State of Washington along the interstate and certain primary highways are the rules and regulations of Washington's Highway Advertising Control Act of 1961.

Certainly, it was the understanding of the senior Senator from West Virginia, and it was the understanding of the Members of the Senate, that when we approved the House version of S. 2084, we were not instructing the Secretary of Commerce to issue standards and regulations which would simply rubberstamp whatever practices are current in the billboard advertising industry. Rather, the policy direction of the Congress is that regulations or criteria with respect to size, spacing, and lighting of outdoor advertising signs should be consistent with customary use in the industry only insofar as possible consistent with the purposes of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 and even consistent with the purposes of the many existing State regulations directed to accomplish goals similar to those of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

The Congress worked very hard last year on the consideration and approval of the Highway Beautification Act. We enacted a meaningful law and we have a right to expect that the Secretary of Commerce will administer that law in a way that is meaningful, and I am sure that the overwhelming sentiment in the Congress is to support the Secretary of Commerce in his efforts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notice of hearings, the draft standards, and the cover memorandum of explanation from the Bureau of Public Roads.

There being no objection, the notices were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Federal Register, Vol. 31, No. 19, Jan. 28, 1966]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS, HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION, PUBLIC HEARINGS

(NOTE.—The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 requires the Secretary of Commerce to hold public hearings in each of the several States for the express purpose of gathering all relevant information on which to base the promulgation of standards, criteria, rules and regulations, to be applied in obtaining a reasonable, orderly, and effective display of outdoor advertising in certain areas along the primary and Interstate highway systems.

(The attached notice of hearings includes draft standards, criteria, rules and regulations, which are presented solely as guidelines for consideration and discussion purposes at the public hearings. It must be emphasized that these standards and guidelines do not represent any conclusions, or even tentative conclusions on the part of the Secretary of Commerce.

(Official standards will be promulgated only after completion of public hearings and consideration of information gathered thereby, and where required by law in agreement with the States.—U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads.)

Notice of Public Hearings to be held in each State by the Secretary of Commerce before the promulgation of standards, criteria, rules and regulations, necessary to carry out sections 131 and 136 of title 23 of the United States Code.

Pursuant to section 303(a) of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 approved October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1033 (1965)), the Secretary of Commerce is required to hold public hearings in each of the several States, including Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, for the express purpose of gathering all relevant information on which to base the promulgation of standards, criteria, rules and regulations, to be applied by the Secretary of Commerce in carrying out the provisions of sections 131 and 136 of title 23, United States Code.

All persons having a reasonable interest in the subject of the above hearings are invited to attend and participate in the hearings and to submit such relevant information.

Public hearings will be conducted in each State for the above specified purposes. All scheduled hearings will begin at 9:30 a.m. standard time on the dates specified and at the location or address designated below for each State.

State	City	Address	Date
Alabama	Montgomery	Alabama Highway Department, Room 204, 11 Union St	Apr. 12, 1966
Alaska	Juneau	Department of Fish and Game Auditorium, Subport Building	Mar. 10, 1966
Arizona	Phoenix	City of Phoenix, Central Library Auditorium, Central Ave. and McDowell Rd	Mar. 8, 1966
Arkansas	Little Rock	Fish and Game Building and Auditorium, State House Grounds	Mar. 15, 1966
California	Sacramento	State Resources Building, 9th and O Sts	Apr. 12, 1966
Colorado	Denver	Colorado Department of Highways Auditorium	Mar. 29, 1966
Connecticut	Hartford	Hall of the House (House Chamber), State Capitol	Mar. 15, 1966
Delaware	Christiana	Highway Department, Division Office, Delaware Route 7, Post Office Box 8, Bear, Del.	Mar. 22, 1966
District of Columbia	Washington, D.C	Department of Commerce Building Auditorium, 14th and E Sts. NW	Mar. 8, 1966
Florida	Tallahassee	House of Representatives Chamber, Florida State Capitol	Apr. 26, 1966
Georgia	Atlanta	State Highway Department Building Auditorium, Capitol Square	May 3, 1966
Hawaii	Honolulu	Ruger Theatre, Alohea and Makapuu Aves., Fort Ruger, Honolulu	Apr. 5, 1966
Idaho	Boise	State Highway Building, Hearing Room	Apr. 26, 1966
Illinois	Springfield	Illinois Building, State Fair Grounds	Mar. 15, 1966
Indiana	Indianapolis	House Chambers, Indiana State Capitol Building	Mar. 1, 1966
Iowa	Ames	Iowa State Highway Commission, Letting Room, North Part of Building No. 2	Apr. 12, 1966
Kansas	Topeka	Kansas Historical Society Auditorium, 10th and Jackson Sts	Mar. 8, 1966
Kentucky	Frankfort	State Office Building Auditorium, High St. between Clinton and Mero Sts	Mar. 29, 1966
Louisiana	Baton Rouge	State Highway Department Building Auditorium	Mar. 8, 1966
Maine	Augusta	State Office Building, Hearing Room No. 105, Capitol St	Apr. 26, 1966
Maryland	Baltimore	U.S. Army Reserve Center, Turner Armory, Hillen Rd. and Argonne Dr	Mar. 1, 1966
Massachusetts	Boston	Registry Building Auditorium, 4th floor, 100 Nashua St	Mar. 22, 1966
Michigan	Lansing	Michigan National Guard Headquarters, 2500 South Washington	Apr. 26, 1966
Minnesota	St. Paul	State Office Building, Capitol Complex, Park Ave. between Aurora and Fuller	Mar. 15, 1966
Mississippi	Jackson	Woolfolk State Office Building Auditorium, Northwest St	Apr. 5, 1966
Missouri	Jefferson City	Highway Department Hearing Room, East Capitol and Jefferson Sts	Mar. 22, 1966
Montana	Helena	State Highway Building Hearing Room	Apr. 12, 1966
Nebraska	Lincoln	Senate Chamber of the State House	Apr. 5, 1966
Nevada	Carson City	Nevada State Highway Department Auditorium	Mar. 22, 1966
New Hampshire	Concord	Representatives Hall, State House	May 3, 1966
New Jersey	Trenton	War Memorial Building Ballroom	Mar. 29, 1966
New Mexico	Santa Fe	New Mexico State Highway Department, 1120 Cerrillos Rd	Mar. 15, 1966
New York	Albany	Chancellors Hall, State Education Building, Washington Ave. and Swan St	Apr. 5, 1966
North Carolina	Raleigh	State Highway Building Auditorium, Wilmington St. and New Bern Ave	Mar. 15, 1966
North Dakota	Bismarck	North Dakota House Chamber, State Capitol Building	Mar. 1, 1966
Ohio	Columbus	Arts and Crafts Building Auditorium, 600 East 17th Ave., State Fair Grounds	Apr. 5, 1966
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City	Civil Defense Auditorium, New State Office Building, State Capitol Grounds	Mar. 1, 1966
Oregon	Salem	Highway Building, Room 418	Mar. 22, 1966
Pennsylvania	Harrisburg	State Capitol Grounds, William Penn Memorial Museum Auditorium, North 3d and North Capitol Sts.	Apr. 12, 1966
Puerto Rico	Santurce	Puerto Rico Communications Authority Building Auditorium, 1314 Ponce de Leone Ave.	Do.
Rhode Island	Providence	Providence Journal Auditorium, Fountain St	Mar. 1, 1966
South Carolina	Columbia	Drayton Hall Auditorium, University of South Carolina, South Main St. between College and Green Sts.	Do.
South Dakota	Pierre	House Chambers, State Capitol Building	Mar. 29, 1966
Tennessee	Nashville	House of Representatives Chamber, Tennessee State Capitol	Mar. 22, 1966
Texas	Austin	Texas Highway Department Building Hearing Room, 11th and Brazos Sts	Mar. 29, 1966
Utah	Salt Lake City	State Office Building Auditorium	Mar. 1, 1966
Vermont	Montpelier	Montpelier City Hall, Main St. between Barre and State Sts	Mar. 8, 1966
Virginia	Richmond	Highway Department Auditorium, 1221 East Broad St	Mar. 20, 1966
Washington	Olympia	GSA Building Auditorium, State Capitol	Apr. 5, 1966
West Virginia	Charleston	National Guard Armory, 1703 Coonskin Dr	Apr. 26, 1966
Wisconsin	Madison	Wisconsin National Guard Armory, 3002 Wright St	May 3, 1966
Wyoming	Cheyenne	State Highway Department Auditorium	Do.

Preregistration facilities will be provided at each hearing site location or address listed hereinabove for each State between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. standard time on the day immediately preceding each scheduled hearing date.

All persons who wish to participate in the hearings and to offer relevant information, either written or oral, must register at the designated time and place prior to the hearings at which they desire to present such information.

Interested persons will be given a fair and reasonable opportunity to present all relevant written and oral information. To accomplish this purpose in an orderly way and expedite the hearings, participants will each be allowed a limited time to present oral information, not in any case to exceed twenty (20) minutes.

In the event the time allowed is not adequate for a full and complete presentation of all relevant information, a supplemental written statement may be submitted and may be accepted for consideration as a part of the official record.

The following draft standards, criteria, rules and regulations, intended solely as guidelines for consideration and discussion purposes at the public hearings, do not represent any conclusions, or even tentative conclusions, on the part of the Secretary of Commerce.

The advance publication containing the categories or groups of draft standards, criteria, rules and regulations to be considered at the public hearings is only intended for the express purpose of permitting all interested persons a sufficient opportunity to consider, prepare and develop information and comments relevant to each group or category of standards and criteria to be considered at the public hearings.

The six (6) categories of draft standards, criteria, rules and regulations, for consideration and the sequence or numerical order of their presentation and discussion at the public hearings will be as follows:

I. DRAFT DEFINITION OF AN UNZONED INDUSTRIAL AREA FOR JUNKYARDS

An unzoned industrial area means an area not zoned by State or local law, regulation, or ordinance. A junkyard shall be deemed to be in an unzoned industrial area when:

1. The junkyard is located within a distance of 1,000 feet of at least one industrial activity which is in continual operation for at least 6 months of the year, and

2. There is no building or other structure within 1,000 feet of the junkyard which is used or designed for use as a residence.

II. DRAFT DEFINITION OF AN UNZONED COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL AREA FOR OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

An unzoned commercial or industrial area means an area not zoned by State or local law, regulation or ordinance. A sign, display or device shall be deemed to be in an unzoned commercial or industrial area if within a radius of 300 feet thereof, there are at least two industrial or commercial activities which are in continual operation for at least 6 months of the year.

Outdoor advertising structures shall not be considered a commercial or industrial activity under this definition.

III. DRAFT CRITERIA FOR SIZE, LIGHTING, AND SPACING OF SIGNS PERMITTED IN COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL ZONES AND AREAS

The standards drafted in this part do not apply to "on premise" advertising or to "official and directional" signs as permitted under section 131(c) of Title 23, United States Code.

Purposes: The standards herein are intended as guidelines solely for those signs, displays and devices whose size, lighting and spacing, consistent with customary use, is to be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary, as authorized under section 131(d) of Title 23, United States Code, and which may be erected and maintained within 660 feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way within areas adjacent to the Interstate and Federal-aid primary systems which are zoned industrial or commercial under authority of State law, or in unzoned commercial or industrial areas as may be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary.

Definitions: Sign means an outdoor sign, light, display, device, figure, painting, drawing, message, placard, poster, billboard, or other thing which is designed, intended, or used to advertise or inform, any part of the advertising or informative contents of which is visible from any place on the main traveled way of the Interstate or Federal-aid primary highway.

Traveled way means the paved portion of the roadway exclusive of shoulders.

Erect means to construct, build, raise, assemble, place, affix, attach, create, paint, draw, or in any other way bring into being or establish.

General: 1. The following signs shall not be permitted:

A. Signs which are obsolete.

B. Signs which are illegal under State or Federal laws or regulations in effect at the location of such signs.

C. Signs that are not clean and in good repair.

D. Signs not securely affixed to a substantial structure.

E. Signs which attempt or appear to attempt to regulate, warn, or direct the movement of traffic or which interfere with, imitate or resemble any official traffic sign, signal, or device.

F. Signs which are erected or maintained upon trees or painted or drawn upon rocks or other natural features.

G. Signs which move or have any animated or moving parts.

H. Signs which are not consistent with the Standards in this part.

Size of signs: 1. For signs which are located closer than 150 feet from the nearest edge of the traveled way:

a. Maximum area—300 square feet.

b. Maximum height—15 feet.

c. Maximum length—30 feet.

2. For signs which are located 150 feet or more from the nearest edge of the traveled way:

a. Maximum area—400 square feet.

b. Maximum height—20 feet.

c. Maximum length—40 feet.

3. All dimensions include border and trim, but exclude supports.

4. Double-faced or V-type signs shall be considered one sign. Maximum size of signs shall apply to each face.

5. The highest point of any sign shall not extend more than 30 feet measured from either the ground level at its supports or the nearest edge of the right-of-way of the interstate or primary highway, whichever is lower in elevation.

Lighting: Signs may be lighted, subject to the following restrictions:

1. Signs which contain, include, or are illuminated by any flashing, intermittent, or moving light or lights are prohibited.

2. Signs which are not effectively shielded as to prevent beams or rays of light from being directed at any portion of the main traveled way of the Interstate or primary highway or which are of such intensity of brilliance as to cause glare or to impair the vision of the driver of any motor vehicle, or which otherwise interfere with any driver's operation of a motor vehicle are prohibited.

3. No sign shall be illuminated by red, green, or amber lights which interfere with the effectiveness or obscure an official traffic sign, device, or signal.

Spacing of signs: 1. (a) No two signs shall be spaced less than 500 feet apart, and

(b) Not more than six signs may be permitted within any mile distance measured from any point and facing any one side of the highway.

2. No sign may be located within 2,000 feet of an interchange or intersection at grade along the Interstate system or other freeways. (Measured from the nearest point of the intersection of the main-traveled way and the entrance or exit traveled way.)

3. No sign may be located within 500 feet of any intersection at grade, except that this distance shall be reduced to 250 feet between intersections which are less than 1,000 feet apart. (Measured from the nearest point of intersection of two traveled ways.)

4. No sign may be located in such a manner as to prevent the driver of a vehicle from having a clear, unobstructed and undistracted view of official signs and approaching, merging, or intersecting traffic and driveways.

5. No sign may be located within a radius of 250 feet of a major official guide sign.

6. All signs shall be set back at least 25 feet from the nearest edge of right-of-way.

IV. SUGGESTED DRAFT OF NATIONAL STANDARDS CONCERNING OUTDOOR ADVERTISING CONTROLS ON PUBLIC LANDS AND RESERVATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES PURSUANT TO SECTION 131(h)

Purpose: The standards promulgated herein are intended as guidelines for the control of outdoor advertising on public lands and reservations of the United States pursuant to section 131(h) of Title 23, United States Code.

Definition: Sign means an outdoor sign, light, display, device, figure, painting, drawing, message, placard, poster, billboard, or other thing which is designed, intended, or used to advertise or inform, any part of the advertising or informative contents of which is visible from any place on the main traveled way of the Interstate or other Federal-aid primary highways.

Traveled way means the paved portion of the roadway exclusive of shoulders.

Erect means to construct, build, raise, assemble, place, affix, attach, create, paint, draw, or in any other way bring into being or establish.

General: 1. The following signs shall not be permitted:

A. Signs which are obsolete.

B. Signs which are illegal under State or Federal laws or regulations in effect at the location of such signs.

C. Signs that are not clean and in good repair.

D. Signs not securely affixed to a substantial structure.

E. Signs which attempt or appear to attempt to regulate, warn, or direct the movement of traffic or which interfere with, imitate or resemble any official traffic sign, signal, or device.

F. Signs which are erected or maintained upon trees or painted or drawn upon rocks or other natural features.

G. Signs which move or have any animated or moving parts.

H. Signs which prevent the driver of a vehicle from having a clear and unobstructed view of official signs and approaching or merging traffic.

I. Signs which are not consistent with the Standards in this part.

Signs permitted on public lands and reservations of the United States: The following signs may be permitted to be erected and maintained off of, but within 660 feet of, the nearest edge of the right-of-way of Interstate and primary highways:

1. Directional and Official Signs: Directional and other official signs and notices which shall include, but not be limited to, signs and notices pertaining to natural wonders, scenic and historic attractions, as may be required or authorized by the appropriate Federal agency. Such signs and notices shall be located within 12 air miles of a turn off from an Interstate or primary highway to the activity or place being advertised, and shall be limited to two such signs advertising the same activity or place on any one Interstate or primary highway approach.

2. On Premise—Sale, Lease Signs: Signs, displays and devices advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located. Not more than one on-premise sign advertising the sale or lease of property may be permitted in such a manner as to be visible to traffic proceeding in any one direction on any one highway.

3. On Premise—Activities Signs: Signs, displays and devices advertising activities conducted upon the property on which they are located. Not more than one on-premise sign more than 50 feet from the advertised activity may be permitted in such a manner as to be visible to traffic proceeding in any one direction on any one highway.

Size of signs: No sign except on-premise signs not more than 50 feet from the advertised activity, may be permitted to exceed 20 feet in length, or height, or 150 square feet in area, including border and trim but excluding supports.

Lighting of signs: Signs may be lighted, subject to the following restrictions:

1. Signs which contain, include, or are illuminated by any flashing, intermittent, or moving light or lights are prohibited.

2. Signs which are not effectively shielded as to prevent beams or rays of light from being directed at any portion of the traveled way of an interstate or primary highway or which are of such intensity or brilliance as to cause glare or to impair the vision of the driver of any motor vehicle, or which otherwise interfere with any driver's operation of a motor vehicle are prohibited.

3. No sign shall be illuminated by red, green, or amber lights which interfere with the effectiveness or obscure an official traffic sign, device, or signal.

Trade names: No sign may be permitted which displays a trade name more conspicuously than the name of the advertised activity or place.

Exclusions: The standards in this part shall not apply to markers, signs and plaques in appreciation of sites of historical significance.

Federal agency regulations: Nothing contained herein shall prevent any Federal agency from:

1. Establishing standards which are more restrictive than those included herein;

2. Establishing informational centers at safety rest areas pursuant to section 131(i) of title 23, United States Code.

3. Erecting signs within the right-of-way giving information of specific interest to the traveling public as provided under section 131(f) of title 23, United States Code.

V. DRAFT STANDARDS FOR DIRECTIONAL AND OTHER OFFICIAL SIGNS AND NOTICES OFF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY

The draft standards in this part do not apply to directional and other official signs and notices erected or maintained in zoned and unzoned commercial or industrial areas. All such signs erected or maintained in zoned or unzoned commercial or industrial areas, shall conform with criteria to be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary, as provided under section 131(d).

Purpose: The standards herein are intended as guidelines for the lighting, size, number and spacing and other requirements pertaining to the erection and maintenance of directional and other official signs and notices, which signs and notices shall include, but not be limited to, signs and notices pertaining to natural wonders, scenic and historical attractions, which may be erected and maintained within 660 feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way within areas adjacent to the Interstate and primary systems. These standards are to be promulgated by the Secretary, as required under section 131(c)(1) of Title 23, U.S.C.

Definitions (for the purpose of the draft standards for this part): Sign means an outdoor sign, light, display, device, figure, painting, drawing, message, placard, poster, billboard, or other thing which is designed, intended, or used to advertise or inform, any part of the advertising or informative contents of which is visible from any place on the main traveled way of the Interstate or primary highway.

Directional and other official signs and notices mean signs located off the right-of-way but within 660 feet of the nearest right-of-way line, any part of the informative contents of which is visible from any place on the main traveled way. Such signs and notices shall include, but not be limited to, those pertaining to natural wonders, scenic and historical attractions which are required or authorized by law.

Official Signs mean directional or other official signs and notices erected and maintained by public officers or agencies pursuant to and in accordance with direction or authorization contained in Federal or State law for the purposes of carrying out an official duty or responsibility.

State law means a State constitutional provision or statute, or an ordinance, rule, or regulation enacted or adopted by a State agency or political subdivision of a State pursuant to State constitution or statute.

Signs pertaining to natural wonders, scenic and historical attractions mean signs containing only information about public places operated by Federal, State or local governments, natural phenomena, historic sites, areas of natural scenic beauty or naturally suited for outdoor recreation, and places for camping deemed to be in the interest of the traveling public. It is not intended that these signs provide roadside advertising for tourist-oriented roadside private businesses. Each State shall determine those official signs and notices pertaining to natural wonders, scenic or historical attractions, which it deems of sufficient interest to the traveling public. A State may include some privately owned or operated natural wonders, scenic or historical attractions, only if they are regionally known and of outstanding wide interest to the traveling public, and signs giving information about public places operated by Federal, State or local governments.

Main-traveled way means the traveled way on which through traffic is carried. In the case of a divided highway, the traveled way of each of the separated roadways for traffic in opposite directions is a main-traveled way. It does not include such facilities as frontage roads, turning roadways, or parking areas.

Traveled way means the portion of a roadway for the movement of vehicles, exclusive of shoulders.

General: 1. The following signs shall not be permitted:

A. Signs which are obsolete.

B. Signs which are illegal under State or Federal laws or regulations in effect at the location of such signs.

C. Signs that are not clean and in good repair.

D. Signs not securely affixed to a substantial structure.

E. Signs which attempt or appear to attempt to regulate, warn, or direct the movement of traffic or which interfere with, imitate or resemble any official traffic sign, signal, or device.

F. Signs which are erected or maintained upon trees or painted or drawn upon rocks or other natural features.

G. Signs which move or have any animated or moving parts.

H. Signs which prevent the driver of a vehicle from having a clear and unobstructed view of official signs and approaching or merging traffic.

I. Signs which are not consistent with the Standards in this part.

Size of signs: 1. (a) Maximum area—150 square feet;

(b) Maximum height—15 feet; and

(c) Maximum length—20 feet.

2. All dimensions include border and trim, but exclude supports.

3. Double-faced or V-type signs shall be considered one sign. Maximum size of signs shall apply to each face.

4. The highest point of any sign shall not extend more than 30 feet measured from either the ground level at its supports or the nearest edge of the right-of-way of the Interstate or primary highway, whichever is lower in elevation.

Lighting of signs: Signs may be lighted, subject to the following restrictions:

1. Signs which contain, include, or are illuminated by any flashing, intermittent, or moving light or lights are prohibited.

2. Signs which are not effectively shielded so as to prevent beams or rays of light from being directed at any portion of the traveled way of an Interstate or primary highway or which are of such intensity or brilliance as to cause glare or to impair the vision of the driver of any motor vehicle, or which otherwise interfere with any driver's operation of a motor vehicle are prohibited.

3. No sign shall be illuminated by red, green, or amber lights which interfere with the effectiveness or obscure an official traffic sign, device, or signal.

Spacing and number of signs: The following requirements apply only to those signs pertaining to natural wonders, scenic and historical attractions as defined in this part:

1. (a) No two signs shall be spaced less than 1 mile apart, and

(b) not more than two signs may be permitted within any 5-mile distance, measured from any point and facing any one side of the highway.

2. No sign may be located within 2,000 feet of an interchange or intersection at grade along the Interstate system or other freeways (Measured from the nearest point of the intersection of the main traveled way and the entrance or exit traveled way.)

3. No sign may be located within a radius of 250 feet of an official major guide sign.

4. All signs shall be set back at least 25 feet from the nearest edge of the right-of-way line.

5. Signs for a specific attraction shall be located within a radius of 50 air miles from the advertised activity, and shall not exceed a total of 10 signs for each attraction.

6. Any new or reconditioned sign erected after January 1, 1968, shall be uniform in background color. Background color shall be limited to either blue or brown.

State regulations: Nothing contained herein shall prevent any State from establishing standards which are more restrictive than those included in this part.

VI. DRAFT OF STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR OFFICIAL HIGHWAY SIGNS WITHIN INTERSTATE RIGHTS-OF-WAY GIVING SPECIFIC INFORMATION FOR THE TRAVELING PUBLIC

Purpose: To establish standards for the erection within the right-of-way of signs at appropriate distances from the interchanges on the Interstate highway system which will give the traveling public specific information as to gas, food or lodging available on the crossroad at or near the interchanges.

Authority: Section 131(f), title 23, United States Code, as amended by the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. "The Secretary shall, in consultation wth the States, provide within the rights-of-way for areas at appropriate distances from interchanges on the Interstate System, on which signs, displays, and devices giving specific information in the interest of the traveling public may be erected and maintained. Such signs shall conform to national standards to be promulgated by the Secretary."

Definitions: (1) Specific information panel means the assembly of signs for the display of specific information which shall consist of the gas, food, and lodging symbols and the supplemental (individual business) signs on a single mounting.

(2) Symbol means the approved standard symbol each for gas, food, and lodging which are to be displayed as the top portion of the specific information panel.

(3) Supplemental (individual business) sign means the permitted sign mounted below the appropriate symbol on the specific information panel to show the name and/or brand of the motorist services available on the crossroad at or near the interchange.

General: (1) The specific information panel, which consists of an assembly of symbols and supplemental signs in a single mounting, shall be erected in advance of each exit from the Interstate highway system where not more than seven qualifying motorist services are available. The symbols mounted horizontally to form the top portion of the panel, shall show the approved standard symbols for "GAS," "FOOD," and "LODGING" from left to right in that order.

Where no motorist services are available at an interchange, the specific information panel is not to be erected.

The supplemental signs for individual businesses are to be mounted vertically under the appropriate symbol. These signs are to be mounted in the order of the distance measured in either direction along the crossroad from the nearest point of the intersection of the crossroad main traveled way and the specific exit traveled way, the closest at the top, the next closest second from the top, etc., or alternatively, in alphabetical order. In the combined specific information panel no more than three supplemental signs shall be mounted below each symbol, nor more than seven in total. Nationally, regionally or locally known commercial symbols for service stations, restaurants and motels shall always be used when applicable.

(2) Where there are eight or more qualifying motorist services at an interchange crossroad, the gas, food and lodging messages may be erected as three separate specific information panels, each at least 800 feet removed from the other panels and major guide signs. Each such panel is to consist of a single symbol at the top with supplemental signs for that type of business only mounted vertically beneath, as generally described under (1) above. Not more than 6 supplemental signs of the one type shall be included. There may be two vertical rows of supplemental signs below the symbol. In the direction of traffic the successive signs shall be those for lodging, food, gas.

(3) In any special case where the total number of qualifying motorist services on the crossroad at or near the interchange exceeds that which could be displayed as separate information panels, described in (2) above, consideration should be given to placing the information panel in a safety rest area.

(4) The "GAS," "FOOD," and "LODGING" symbols shall have reflectorized white symbols and borders on a reflectorized or opaque blue background.

The supplemental or individual business sign color shall be a white message on a blue background except in the case where an established commercial symbol is used alone. The principal legend on the supplemental sign shall be at least 6 inches in height, whether capitals or lowercase. When the commercial symbol is used alone for the supplemental sign, any legend on the symbol shall be in proportion to the size of symbol, consistent with customary use.

(5) The specific information panels are designed for application on rural sections of the Interstate Highway System where a number of motorist services normally are not available near each interchange. Specific information panels are not to be installed within suburban or urban areas, except on circumferential, bypass, of beltway-type routes where existing roadside development is not urban in character.

Location of specific information panel: (1) The specific information panel is to be located in the same general manner as normal traffic signs in advance of the interchange, directly visible from the roadway. This location of the specific information panel will vary depending upon existing standard guide signs; however, it shall be at least 800 feet from the nearest standard interchange guide sign, and should be a minimum of 1,500 feet from the exit approach nose. It shall be erected on the right-hand side of the roadway, and between the last advance guide sign and the exit directional sign. Where three separate specific information panel signs are located in advance of the interchange, the last in the series and closest to the interchange shall be located as above described.

Separate panel may be required within the same guide sign series in the case of a cloverleaf-type interchange. If this is the case, each panel will require additional directional signing on the assembly. The directional legends "Next Right" or "Second Right" may be used, or an exit number on each panel may be used.

The specific information panel shall not be erected at an interchange where an exit from the Interstate highway is provided, but no entrance ramp exists at that interchange or another reasonably convenient location that would permit a motorist to proceed in the desired direction of travel without undue indirection or use of poor connecting roads.

The specific information sign is to be repeated on the interchange ramp or crossroad where the service installations are not nearby or within sight. The signs shall be the same in shape, color and message as those shown on the Interstate roadway special information panels, together with an arrow showing the directions for the different services and, where needed, the mileage to the service installation. These sign legends normally will be smaller (minimum 4-inch letter height) then those shown on the Interstate roadway special information panels.

(2) Specific information panels may be located within safety rest areas or scenic overlooks. Where applicable, specific information may be given at the one area for several interchanges. The specific information panels in roadside areas shall be located so as not to be readable from the through roadway of the Interstate highway.

Size: The size of the sign showing the symbol on the specific information panel shall be 48 inches horizontally and 30 inches vertically. The supplemental signs for individual businesses to be displayed on the specific information panel shall be limited to 6 square feet. The maximum width shall be 36 inches. The maximum vertical dimension shall be 24 inches.

The supplemental signs for individual businesses to be mounted on the specific information panels in safety rest areas, scenic overlooks or special constructed areas shall be 24 inches by 24 inches. Standard commercial trademark symbols, where applicable, shall be displayed on the individual signs for glance recognition.

Lighting: The supplemental signs on the specific information panel may be reflectorized or illuminated, but on any single panel all supplemental signs shall be reflectorized or all should be opaque. Illumination of the panel shall be consistent with the treatment for other guide signs for the particular interchange.

Draft criteria to determine specific information permitted: The following are minimum criteria for permitting supplemental signs, giving specific information to the traveling public, to be erected on the right-of-way in advance of the exit from the interstate highway.

(1) General: The service installation shall be located not more than one-half mile from the point of intersection of the crossroad main traveled way and the specific exit traveled way.

(2) Gasoline and associated services to qualify for erection on a specific information panel: (a) Two or more pumps furnishing locally or regionally advertising brands of gasoline.

(b) Supplementary vehicle services such as oil, lubrication, tire repair and water.

(c) Personnel capable of minor vehicle repair or adjustments.

(d) Restroom facilities and drinking water.

(e) In continuous operation at least 16 hours per day.

(f) Telephone.

(3) Food to qualify for erection on a specific information panel: (a) Space for seated service for at least 10 people, or in the case of drive-in restaurants, parking for at least 10 cars.

(b) Where required, licensed or approved as satisfactory by State health or other public controlling agency.

(c) In continuous operation each day (approximately 7 a.m. to 9 p.m.) during the hours that 3 meals normally are served.

(d) Telephone.

(4) Lodging to qualify for erection on a specific information panel: (a) At least 15 bedroom units for hotels and motels.

(b) Hotels and motels which have a private bath for each bedroom unit, or other reasonably acceptable sanitary facilities.

(c) Where required, licensed or approved as satisfactory by State or other controlling agency.

(d) Telephone.

Dated: January 20, 1966.

REX M. WHITTON,
Federal Highway Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 66–1060; Filed, Jan. 27, 1966; 8:49 a.m.]

ADMIRAL RABORN HONORED BY FORRESTAL AWARD

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an award just made to a man known to many in the Senate.

Last night, the National Security Industrial Association presented its annual Forrestal Award to Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr. For more than 40 years, Red Raborn has served his country in truly distinguished fashion. He has been the recipient of many honors during an outstanding and varied career, a career which has taken him from naval cadet to a commanding position of aircraft carriers, which has taken him into the design of the great Polaris missile, and now has taken him into new executive leadership as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Red Radford has been the recipient of many honors during his outstanding career, and I believe it is fitting and proper that he should be as well recognized as he was at the huge banquet which was held by the National Security Industrial Association last night.

We all know the outstanding job he did to bring the Polaris missile project from its first idea or initial inception to a most successful conclusion, well ahead of schedule.

Today, under the seven seas, Polaris missile submarines stand guard as a great defensive weapon, which can also insure certain retaliation in a thermonuclear exchange, should anyone be so careless or so callous as to risk such a conflict.

Successful development of this weapons system contributed significantly to the security of this Nation. Today, Red Raborn is continuing to contribute to the security of our country by his distinguished service as Director of Central Intelligence. I believe that he will do an outstanding job wherever he serves. Surely, there is no more important job than the one he now has. I am sure that Admiral Raborn is applying his penetrating judgment and management skills to the most complex and difficult task of providing the best possible intelligence to the President and the policymaking officers of the Government.

Mr. President, I am proud that while Admiral Raborn was born in Texas, he was raised and educated in Oklahoma and went to the Naval Academy under an appointment from the State of Oklahoma.

I have been proud to be associated with him for many years, and join in congratulating him on winning this newest and most outstanding award.

Let me thank the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] for his courtesy in yielding to me at this time.

LATIN AMERICA TODAY: THE PROBLEMS AND THE PROMISE

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, to the south of the United States lies a vast region which is bursting with future promise, but which is also bursting with such staggering present-day problems that there is a danger that this great future will never be realized.

Latin America today is one of the most dynamic regions on earth. There is great intellectual ferment. Real progress toward peaceful, democratic change is being made in several countries.

But illiteracy, bad health, inadequate food, and unemployment are still the regular way of life for many millions of Latin Americans, and unless we in the United States can hasten the alleviation of these conditions, we run the very real risk that the Latin countries will slide backward instead of seizing the bright future which can be theirs.

In undertaking a review of the critical problems which confront us in our efforts to help the Latin nations to help themselves, it is not my intention to shift the focus from the overriding problem of Vietnam.

Until we can guarantee the security and freedom of the brave people of South Vietnam, their needs must retain the top priority position in the concerns of President Johnson and the Government of the United States.

Nevertheless, we must not permit our involvement in Vietnam to divert our attention from the Latin American situation, because the problems there also command great importance.

The development and support of stable and democratic societies are, and must remain, a prime concern of the United States, whether the region is Latin America or southeast Asia, or the emerging nations of Africa.

I propose today to examine some of the factors which have blocked the road to political, social, and economic development in Latin America, some of the reasons we can hope for the future, and also some of the historical background for the unique relationship that exists between us and our southern neighbors.

I would then like to suggest some of the things that we in this country can do to improve our relations with Latin America, and some of the things that we and they together can do to speed up the pace of economic and social progress.

First. We must move with increased vigor against the hunger and poverty which provide a fertile field for the growth of communism. The Alliance for Progress has been of great help in dealing with the underlying causes of poverty in Latin America, but it has not gone far enough nor fast enough.

The Alliance is a heavy burden on the taxpayers of the United States. We are investing over $1 billion a year in these programs, and the results do not match the investment and the dedication we have made.

Much of the trouble stems from a lack of deep-seated commitment to the goals of the Alliance in some of the countries of Latin America.

We must have a complete rededication to the principles of the Alliance in every Latin American country if we are to see the elimination of disease and poverty, and if we are to see the end, once and for all, of the threat that Communists will exploit local conditions to steal the freedom of the liberty-loving people of the south.

Second. The overriding problem of Latin America today, beside which all others pale into insignificance, is the growing specter of aggressive, subversive communism. Until we and our friends in Latin America devise effective techniques for countering this threat, everything else we do will be like grains of sand in a windstorm.

Third. This threat of violence and subversion is of such immediate concern that I believe there should be convoked immediately a conference of all the foreign ministers of free countries of the Western Hemisphere to devise a concerted drive against the Communist threat. Only through sustained collective action by the governments of all threatened countries can we hope to eradicate this curse from the hemisphere.

Fourth. We must reassure the people of Latin America of our deep and abiding friendship and respect for them, and of our determination to help them to a better way of life.

Anxiety has been expressed in some quarters in recent months that we are drifting back to an old and discredited policy which was sometimes known as gunboat diplomacy.

Nothing could be further from the truth, but the history of our relations with Latin America is such that we must back up our words with deeds if we are to be believed.

Let us examine that history for a moment.

THE HISTORICAL SETTING

For our purposes, it is enough to go back to the early decades of this century—to the era which began with President Theodore Roosevelt and his characterization of American policy in Latin America as "Speak softly and carry a big stick."

Teddy Roosevelt was a man of his times, and he was right for his times, but his view that U.S. interests in Latin America should dominate every situation left a blot on our relationships there which has still not disappeared.

Those were the years of the Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, and of dollar diplomacy—and they were years of dissension and discord between the United States and her southern neighbors.

Under the Roosevelt corollary, the United States assumed the right to intervene in any Latin American republic which could not or would not pay its debts, on the grounds that our action precluded European powers from taking matters into their own hands. In our views, we were defending the hemisphere from the imperialistic designs of European powers. However altruistic our motives might have seemed to us, Latin Americans bitterly resented this policy.

The 1905 Roosevelt corollary, based on security considerations, soon expanded to dollar diplomacy. This was a policy of automatic U.S. support for any U.S.-owned business which found itself in trouble in any Latin American republic, regardless of the cause or the justness of its case. Unscrupulous U.S. companies quickly discovered that a howl to the State Department—or even the threat of a howl—could cow small Latin American governments into submission rather than risk the landing of U.S. marines.

By the time of the Hoover administration, growing hatred for the "colossus of the North" had become an obstacle to good private as well as government relations throughout Latin America. President Hoover began the withdrawal of troops from some of the republics where they were stationed.

THE GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

While the first steps to alter U.S. policy toward Latin America were taken by President Hoover, it was during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt that the most fundamental changes in our policy occurred. Under F.D.R., all vestiges of the Roosevelt corollary and dollar diplomacy were dismantled.

Franklin Roosevelt understood clearly that our policies toward Latin America required new initiatives and new directions to bring about a better day. Under his direction, U.S. troops were withdrawn from Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Unilaterally, we renounced the Platt amendment which had given us the right to intervene in Cuba and which we had forced the Cubans to incorporate into their Constitution as the price for independence after the Spanish-American War.

The new concept of nonintervention also meant that the United States would no longer use armed force or even exert heavy political pressure to back U.S. firms operating in Latin America. All we asked was the same right that we would have in any other nation in the world to protest if U.S. enterprises were being treated in a discriminatory way and were not getting the same rights extended to others under similar circumstances. In short, the United States recognized the full juridical equality of the Latin American nations.

President Roosevelt proved to the Latin American people that he meant what he said about nonintervention when Mexico expropriated several United States and British oil companies in 1938. Resisting pressure to intervene directly, or to make economic reprisals, Roosevelt specifically recognized Mexico's right as a sovereign nation to expropriate, and asked only that the U.S. companies involved be treated fairly.

As Dean Acheson once described it, the United States entered on a deliberate policy of "the renunciation of domination," and the result was a rapid growth in the respect and cooperation of the Latin nations in their dealings with the "colossus of the north."

In the good neighbor era, the names of Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Under Secretary Sumner Welles became household words in Latin America. Both men were loved and respected, for their own efforts in the development of the good neighbor policy, and as the representatives of Franklin Roosevelt.

Under their leadership, the Latin nations learned that the friendship of this country for their countries was the dominant element in our policy, not the protection of our foreign investments.

With all traces of the policy of the "Big Stick" removed, the stage was set for inter-American cooperation in security matters. As war clouds gathered in Europe, a series of Pan-American conferences were held to work out procedures for joint consultation.

A decade of friendship and mutual respect paid off when this country entered World War II. Every Latin nation joined us in the struggle for freedom against the Axis powers.

But the good neighbor policy went beyond the discarding of old concepts. During the depression and throughout World War II, the United States sought new avenues of economic cooperation. The Sugar Act of 1934 guaranteed Cuba—in dire need as a result of the collapse of sugar prices—a sizable share of the U.S. market at decent prices.

It is one of the ironies of history that, a quarter of a century later, the Communist masters of Cuba, led by Fidel Castro, accused this country of saddling Cuba with a one-crop economy because our generosity made sugar production so attractive.

But it is another irony of history that Cuba's reliance on sugar exports should provide incontrovertible evidence of her slavery to the masters of world communism in the Kremlin. Castro and company are now singing the praises of the Soviet Union for agreeing to do what we did in 1934—agreeing to buy a stated share of Cuba's sugar.

The Roosevelt decade—filled as it was with understanding, mutual respect, and imaginative policies—healed a dangerous rift in the hemisphere.

We have only to imagine the effect on our struggle for freedom during World War II if we had had to contend with a vast sea of disaffected and hostile people to the South.

Today Latin Americans recall Franklin Roosevelt's good neighbor policy with deep affection. Throughout Latin America schools and streets bear his name.

THE DROUGHT YEARS

But suddenly, the good neighbor policy ended. At the end of World War II, international communism began its unremitting efforts to expand in Europe and Asia. In rapid-fire succession, the United States—the only free world country sufficiently strong to cope with the Communist onslaught—concentrated its attention on Iran, the Greek-Turkish crisis, the Berlin airlift, the Marshall plan to reconstruct war-devastated Europe as a bulwark against communism, the Korean war, the Formosa crisis, the Hungarian revolt. In the process of meeting these global commitments, Latin America was ignored by U.S. policymakers.

Many Latin American leaders recognized that U.S. efforts to meet the Communist threat in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East served the security interest of the entire hemisphere. At the same time, they were keenly aware that political and social tensions in their own countries were mounting dangerously. But their problems got no hearing in Washington.

The ardor of the good neighbor policy had turned to glacial indifference.

Thus, it came as a severe shock to our policymakers when, in 1954, the first successful Communist subversion of an American country occurred in Guatemala.

Our reaction was swift and pointed. At the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas that year, the U.S. delegation demanded and got an anti-Communist resolution passed.

Thus, we were able to get on record for the first time that Communist subversion constituted foreign aggression within the terms of the inter-American agreements.

But unfortunately, we did not go the next mile and offer the Latin nations the economic aid and cooperation which they considered so essential to combat the threat of communism.

Relations between the United States and her Latin neighbors remained chilly.

How is it that, almost overnight, the warm embrace of the good neighbor policy turned into suspicion and outright hostility?

How did U.S. leadership get so out of touch with our friends in Latin America?

Foremost, I think, was the fact that the United States emerged after World War II with worldwide commitments as the leader of the free world. Our responsibilities outside the Western Hemisphere attracted the attention of the best minds in the foreign service, our best economists, academicians, and journalists. Meanwhile, the avalanche of crises in distant places preempted limited space in the papers and time on the air. Operating on the old maxim that "no news is good news," the American people—and Congress—were lulled by the deceptive lack of information into thinking all must be well south of the border.

But lack of public concern is one thing. What about official concern? One powerful factor relegating Latin America to the bottom of the priority list was an unfortunate identification of the good neighbor policy with isolation.

When isolation fell into disrepute, to some extent it dragged pan-Americanism with it. Many of those eager to promote European and Asian ties looked with disdain on the Pan-American movement. You will recall the fight at San Francisco, led by the Latin Americans and Senator Tom Connally, to retain the regional organization after the establishment of the United Nations.

In the postwar period, those in ascendancy in the Department of State looked upon Latin American specialists with suspicion or just ignored them. Latin American assignments in the Department of State and Defense were considered to be inconsequential. Career-minded people scrambled to get positions in more fashionable areas. Thus, the ranks of those in the State Department who might have understood the ferment in Latin America—and what it meant to the United States—were sorely depleted. A few diehards stubbornly held on, but their voices were inaudible.

Ironically, the good neighbor policy itself contributed to the low priority attached to Latin America at the time. The policy had been so successful, that long after it was no longer sufficient to the times, a residue of the good feeling it had engendered lingered in many people's minds. And the news media carried little information to challenge that complacency.

Meanwhile, alarmed democrats in Latin America—such as Venezuela's Romulo Betancourt and Jose Figueres in Costa Rica—repeatedly warned of the region's revolutionary ferment and dangerous drift. The status quo, they argued, could not maintain stability. Rather, the rigid economic and social structures in the region, unless modified, would bring social upheaval. They urged a concerted effort to bring social, political, and economic justice to Latin America as the only means of immunizing masses of embittered people against the Communist virus.

Belatedly, President Eisenhower turned to mending our Latin American fences. By 1960, the Inter-American Bank, flatly turned down by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey several years before, was in operation. That same year, U.S. representatives helped to draft the Act of Bogota which called for more equitable land tenure and tax systems as well as "prompt action of exceptional breadth in the field of international cooperation."

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

But it was President Kennedy who erased lingering reservations and sparked an outburst of enthusiasm in Latin America unequaled since the days of the good neighbor policy. In the tragically short time President Kennedy held office, he was to become as revered in Latin America as President Roosevelt.

President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress picked up Roosevelt's good neighbor policy and expanded it to fit the exigencies of the times. Where Roosevelt had recognized the sovereignty and political independence of the American republics, Kennedy proposed to assist Latin America's quest for economic independence and social justice.

In the process, John Kennedy changed the image of the United States from a rich, self-satisfied Nation concerned only with preserving its own gains, to a dynamic Nation deeply interested in the welfare of its neighbors. Columnist Joseph Kraft has summed up the Kennedy magic this way:

> For the first time, the United States deliberately moved to cut ties with narrowly based reactionary regimes abroad. Instead, Washington systematically backed political leaders of the moderate left with popular appeal and social purpose. * * * By that kind of political choice it was possible to close the gap between the United States and the aspirations of peoples that are not rich and powerful.

I cannot overemphasize how important this ideological stance was in Latin America. It provided hope to millions in Latin America, and it provided a democratic alternative to Castro and communism.

And so the Alliance began the overwhelming task of raising up to a new way of life a whole continent of people who had known nothing but hopeless want and poverty for all of their lives.

A brave beginning was made, but too soon, it became apparent that the ideals of the Alliance had far outrun the reality.

Then came the tragic death of President Kennedy in Dallas, and a new president succeeded to the leadership of the democracy which was the leader and the hope of the free world.

What kind of man was President Lyndon B. Johnson? Would he carry forward this Nation's dedication to liberty and justice for all men?

Throughout Latin America, there was a period of uncertainty, a kind of breathless groping to take the measure of the new man in the White House.

But they were not long in finding out. President Johnson redoubled this Nation's commitment to the Alliance for Progress and spelled out in no uncertain terms his determination that any further efforts at invasion of this hemisphere by foreign communistic ideologies would be resisted by all the force at our command.

It was President Johnson's eloquent evocation of this Nation's hopes for the Alliance on its fourth anniversary last year, coupled with a report on what had already been achieved, which most-heartened the people of the Latin countries.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON RENEWS THE COMMITMENT

Speaking to a distinguished gathering of hemispheric leaders at the White House last August, President Johnson reminded them:

> People long oppressed demand their share of the blessings and dignity which the modern world can offer man. The peaceful democratic social revolution of the Alianza is not the alternative to tranquillity and changelessness. It is the alternative—and the only alternative—to bloodshed, destruction, and tyranny. For the past is gone. And those who struggle to preserve it enlist unawares in the ranks of their own destroyers.
>
> We will shape the future through the principles of our Alianza, or find it swallowed up in violence bred of desperation.
>
> And how fortunate we are to live in such a time, when justice so mingles with necessity, and faith with opportunity.

Mr. President, in my many years in public life, I have never heard a more stirring or eloquent commitment to the cause of social progress and social justice.

Now the alliance is nearly 5 years old, and we must again ask ourselves how well we have delivered on the hopes and aspirations which we have created.

It is time for the most searching examination of our present course in Latin

America to determine whether we and our partners in the alliance are doing enough to achieve the great goals which we have set before us.

We must honestly and objectively examine our present policies so that we may know which to refine, which to strengthen, and which, if that is necessary, to discard.

At present, there is far too much reliance on the self-adulatory diplomatic pouch as a source of information. Let us develop fact-finding techniques that will really produce facts rather than defenses of existing policies and programs.

Let us make a public confession of our past failures and begin anew.

The Latin people will understand that.

We must drop our patronizing and complacent attitude. For too long, we have either ignored our Latin friends, or we have provided them with lavish handouts, and sometimes we have managed to do both at the same time.

We must recognize that Latin America is not a single diplomatic context. There is great variation in economic resources, literacy, political issues, and the quality of leadership, and there are many entities.

It is vitally important that those responsible for formulating our policies know and understand these differences.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has poured over $9 billion in economic aid into Latin America, half of it in the last 5 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks a table which shows the trend of this aid.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, in spite of the Alliance for Progress, the Agency for International Development, exchange programs, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Export-Import Bank, Food for Peace, the Social Progress Trust Fund, and all the other public and private agencies which are working in Latin America, we have not come to grips with the central problems of this great region.

It is time we went over from the defensive to the offensive. There are many things we must do, but the most important is to take more vigorous steps to protect the hemisphere from the threat of Communist attacks from within. If we permit the Communists to seize power in friendly countries, the opportunity to help in any other way will be lost. Where there is peace and progress, communism cannot thrive.

For that reason alone, Mr. President, if for no other, we must step up our efforts to help the free people of Latin America to protect themselves from subversion from within.

CASTROISM THREATENS ENTIRE HEMISPHERE

The hour is already late. For 7 long years, we have had at the very doorstep of the United States a Communist state devoted to the destruction of liberty and freedom. Generously financed by the Soviet Union and Communist China, Castro's Cuba has been the fountainhead of an endless stream of propaganda, aimed not only at the United States but at all the nations of this hemisphere.

It has been from the outset the location of numerous training centers where men bent on violence from all the Latin countries are taught the techniques of subversion.

These training centers were the subject of a detailed study by a Special Consultative Committee on Security of the Organization of American States over 3 years ago. The Committee specifically identified nine of these training centers, and said the list was among the many in existence in Cuba.

Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, and, most recently, the Dominican Republic are among the countries which have been victimized by this training.

As the OAS Special Committee reported:

> There can be no doubt that the creation and maintenance of a Communist government in Cuba facilitates to an extraordinary degree the subversive action of international Communist ideology, but also—what is more dangerous—because it constitutes a center quite nearby for training agents of every kind whose function it is to develop subversion in the countries of the hemisphere.

It is time that this country awoke to what is going on. We must forget the Soviet-Chinese quarrel because it has no relevance in Latin America, other than to appreciate its effect from the outside. Both octupi, through Castro, are determined to overthrow the lawful governments of the hemisphere, so it matters little when they argue about techniques.

As President Kennedy said when the Soviet-Chinese quarrel first erupted:

> A dispute over how to bury the West is no ground for Western rejoicing.

Two months ago, Castro mounted his supreme challenge to the sovereignty and the security of the nations of Latin America when he sponsored a so-called Tri-Continental Conference in Havana.

Delegates from all over the world gathered to lay out detailed programs for violence and revolution, and the countries of Latin America were declared to be special targets.

This congress of subversion attracted surprisingly little attention in this country, but it created widespread alarm in Latin America. Newspaper comment from every political spectrum condemned the naked threat of aggression which this conference posed.

Mr. President, it is high time that this country launched a counterattack which will expose Castro's Communist Cuba for what it is.

More than 325,000 people have fled from Cuba since Castro seized power. Refugees are leaving at the rate of 3,000 to 4,000 a month in the current controlled airlift program.

What more damaging evidence is there of what people who live under communism think about communism? And yet we are not getting the message across to the people of Latin America.

In many cities, I have seen cheap, subsidized paperback books which villify Americans and our democratic system in every bookstore.

And I have wondered where the books are that tell of the deeds of Lincoln, Washington, Roosevelt, and Kennedy.

Our U.S. Information Agency in the last few years has made great improvements in its publications program but there are areas that are still not being reached. I know that there are difficult problems of printing and transportation, but we must heighten our effort to counter the flood of vicious material which flows from Cuba and her masters.

Communication is the key to better understanding, and we are not doing an adequate job. For too long, we have relied on the silver dollar as the prime vehicle of communication, and that is a false reliance.

Subsidized books in Spanish which glorify Lenin, Trotsky, Mao, and Castro are in every bookstore, but where are the books in Spanish which tell of the deeds of Lincoln, Washington, Roosevelt, and Kennedy?

UNIVERSITIES NEED REFORM

The universities of many countries are, in effect, privileged sanctuaries for the dissemination of Communist propaganda and for fomenting disloyalty to their governments.

Through the abuse of traditions of student independence, and through the use of the free and easy admission standards that encourage "professional" students, the Communists throughout Latin America have been able to exert influence on the universities far out of proportion to their numbers.

With few academic requirements to fulfill, and well-financed by local Communist cadres, Communist-oriented students have been able to control the selection of faculty members and university administrators, and have brought the universities into national politics in an unwholesome way.

One of the most serious aspects of this situation is the steady production of Marxist-oriented teachers who can spend the rest of their lives on government salaries spreading Communist propaganda among the young people of their countries.

This was pointed up by my good friend, the Honorable ARMISTEAD SELDEN, when he and several other members of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs made an inspection trip to five Latin countries.

Mr. SELDEN reported that our food for peace school lunch program has been of great value throughout the continent. But he also pointed out:

> We are concerned by the presence of Marxist-inclined teachers in the schools and colleges. It makes little sense for the United States to be the instrument for increasing school attendance if the pupils are going to be fed Communist doctrine along with their lunches.

Mr. SELDEN's committee recommended that this country urge the governments benefiting from the food for peace program to have these leftist teachers removed from their strategic positions.

That was nearly 3 years ago, and little if any change has been noted.

Only Venezuela and Brazil have moved effectively in this area. Several thousand Marxist-oriented teachers have been removed from Venezuelan secondary schools, and Brazil has cleansed its universities of teachers with extreme leftist views.

Elsewhere, Communist-influenced activity is increasing in the elementary and secondary schools, as well as the universities. In fact, the indoctrination job at many universities has become easier in recent years because students are already "softened up" by the time they matriculate.

The leaders of each country must seize the initiative and tell their young men and women the truth.

Most Latin students are patriotic to their core, and they are also highly nationalistic. This is commendable, but it means that any direct representations by the United States would be viewed with deep suspicion. The leaders of each government must take the responsibility for informing these students of the subversion which surrounds them.

Students must be shown how to distinguish between honest nationalism and cloaked Communist agitation. The autonomy of the university should not be used as a shield for Communist activity among liberty-loving and patriotic students.

They must be shown that the torch of liberty is fueled in the veins of patriots, not through the machinations of the paid emissaries of foreign ideologists.

Government leaders have hesitated to act, lest they incur charges of attempting to reduce the freedom of their universities.

But all that is needed is to tell the truth and show the ways in which communism has been used to pervert liberty and justice and to foster economic subjugation everywhere that it has had the opportunity.

Just as we need the leadership of the free Latin governments in the fight against communism in the universities, we must call on more vigorous help from our allies in sealing off the source of the cancer.

CUBA AND FREE WORLD TRADE

Castro's Cubana Airlines is still permitted to maintain regular service between Havana and Mexico City, and Spain maintains scheduled service between Madrid and Havana.

The United Kingdom, Canada, Spain, and Japan, as well as Mexico, have refused to recognize the trade embargo imposed on Castro Cuba by the OAS in July 1964. There has been a decline in this free world trade since that time, but more vigorous efforts are needed if we are to succeed in sealing off the support that Red Cuba is receiving from our allies.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table at the end of my remarks which shows the most recent status of this trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, although the threat of communism remains the overriding problem in Latin America, this is a struggle which must be fought out on many fronts.

After years of massive U.S. aid in various forms, the lot of the average family in many countries is no better than it ever was, and in some places they have actually lost ground.

Every major city in Latin America is surrounded by a grim ring of tarpaper and corrugated iron slums, the home of millions of people who have been driven to the cities by poverty on the farms, only to find conditions as bad or worse in the cities.

Illiteracy is a problem of staggering proportions, and one that has been barely touched. Many experts believe that all efforts to solve the problems of Latin America are doomed to failure until this one problem is solved because an illiterate people is in no position to help themselves or to benefit from the help of others.

I do not suggest such a singleminded approach, but there must be far more effort put into the eradication of illiteracy.

For the past several years, AID assistance in Latin America has been gradually changing its emphasis to favor industrial development at the expense of modernizing agriculture to support a rapidly increasing population. It seems to me that the emphasis should shift back or, at least, equalize to the point where agriculture is receiving as much emphasis as industrial development.

The last year was 1963 in which AID grants and loans for Latin American agricultural projects exceeded the amount allocated for industrial development. That year, the Agency provided $87 million for agriculture and $67 million for industry. The situation is completely reversed now. In the current fiscal year, we are providing $129 million for agriculture and $152 million for industry.

The exaggerated hopes which were stimulated by the Alliance for Progress have not materialized. I recognize, of course, that the broad economic and social changes which are envisioned in the charter of Punta del Este will take a long time to accomplish.

But I am also convinced that these programs could move much faster if there were more determined leadership both in the recipient nations and in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks a table which shows the latest measure of economic growth in all the Latin countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, as will be noted, some are reaching the Alliance's minimum goal of an annual growth rate of 2.5 percent, but too many are not.

Too rapidly, the Alliance for Progress has become a bureaucratic institution with all its attendant evils. Along with the older Agency for International Development, the Alliance produces a steady flow of optimistic statistics about the number of schools built and the number of loans made which have taken attention away from the fact that we have so far barely scratched the surface.

Little has been done for land reform in a continent where half the arable land is owned by 1.5 percent of the people, and millions of men and women are living at the bare subsistence level on inadequate, wornout plots which should long since have been retired from cultivation. At the same time, millions of acres of potential farmland lie fallow.

Already food is in short supply in some of these nations, and they face mass starvation unless the twin dilemmas of lagging food production and booming birth rates are resolved.

As the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reported last year:

> Agricultural production in Latin America has increased only fractionally faster during the decade (1955–65) than this region's particularly rapid population growth, and on a per capita basis remains less than the prewar level. In Cuba and Uruguay, total agricultural production has sharply declined during the decade. * * * Production has lagged slightly behind the growth of population in Argentina, Chile, Colombia, and Peru. On the other hand, it has exceeded population growth by quite a wide margin in Brazil, Guatemala, Venezuela, and especially Mexico.

I ask unanimous consent to have three tables showing the relationship between food supplies and birth rates printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits 4, 5, and 6.)

Mr. MONTOYA. There have been some major gains in the field of environmental health, notably in the control of malaria, but significant indices such as infant mortality rates are still rising in several countries.

Examination of these figures points up a problem of a purely technical nature, but one which is of great importance in development planning.

Statistics from many of the Latin American countries are woefully inadequate, and it is no wonder that we often do not know what is going on there.

To assist the Congress in carrying out its heavy responsibilities to the American taxpayer, I recommend that establishment of a permanent, regular system of inspection which will help us to accurately evaluate the situation in each country.

Occasional visits such as the one by Mr. SELDEN's committee have produced valuable information, but we need this kind of information regularly.

CAUSE FOR HOPE

In spite of the disappointments and shortcomings of some of our current programs, and in spite of the growing menace of communism, there is also much reason for hope for the future.

The Alliance for Progress has already accomplished much, but more importantly, it has stirred the hope of a better life in millions of people. We must not let the Alliance lose it momentum, either in this country or in Latin America.

If we do, we will dash the aspirations of a whole continent.

From the hard lesson of the Dominican crisis, we have learned that we must act quickly and decisively in the face of Communist aggression.

It is now nearly a year since the Dominican Republic erupted in bloody revolt—April 24, 1965. From the very outset, uninformed elements in this country and abroad have criticized the U.S. decision to send its Armed Forces into Santo Domingo to restore order, and subsequently, to preserve the precarious peace.

Mr. President, it is with considerable wonderment that I note that the sector of the press which has echoed these charges as never reported the revealing findings of the Special Committee of the OAS itself. That committee—composed of the Ambassadors of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, and Panama—was sent officially to the Dominican Republic to ascertain the true facts.

Because they felt their findings were of such great importance to the entire hemisphere, the OAS decided to release the minutes of the committee.

A few excerpts from the findings of the special committee suffice to vindicate President Johnson's decision to act speedily.

For instance, Ambassador Vasquez Carrizosa, of Colombia, in reporting on the leadership of the rebel forces under the command of Col. Francisco Caamano said that:

> Many diplomats accredited in the Dominican Republic, and I can include my country's diplomatic representative, feel that if not Col. Francisco Caamano, whom I do not know to be personally a Communist, there are indeed numerous persons on his side that, if they are not members of the Communist Party, are actively in favor of Fidel Castro's system of government or political purposes.

Listen to the words of Ambassador Penna Marinho of Brazil:

> Neither do I believe that I am, nor does any of the members of this committee believe that he is, in a position to state with assurance that the movement of Colonel Caamano, inspired by the truly popular figure of former President Bosch, is a clearly Communist movement. But one fact is certain: In view of the real anarchy in which the country has been engulfed for several days, especially the capital city, where bands of snipers have been sacking and killing and obeying no one, any organized group that landed on the island could dominate the situation.
>
> For that reason, and our understanding coincides with that of a majority of the depositions of the chiefs of diplomatic missions accredited there, all of the members of the committee agree in admitting that the Caamano movement, fortunately truly democratic in its origins, could be rapidly converted into a Communist insurrection; above all, it is seen to be heading toward a government of that kind, susceptible of obtaining the support and assistance of the Marxist-Leninist powers.

Subsequent events have borne out the wisdom of President Johnson's decision. American armed forces, later incorporated into an Inter-American peacekeeping force under Brazilian leadership, were able to stabilize the situation sufficiently to permit the OAS to negotiate the establishment of a provisional government under the leadership of the able Dr. Hector Garcia-Godoy.

Only last month—February 1966—events have again underscored the absolutely essential role the United States has played in the Dominican Republic.

President Garcia-Godoy had been successful in bringing both sides of the revolution under his control, and had arranged for free elections to form a permanent government.

Then, bloody rioting, sparked by the reluctance of a rightist leader to accept voluntary exile in conformance to a prior agreement, spread quickly throughout Santo Domingo.

Castro-trained agents immediately capitalized on the new crisis and organized a general strike which paralyzed the nation for days.

Before it was over, 20 persons had died.

Without the stabilizing influence of the inter-American peace force, there is no doubt that either the Communists or the rightists would have deposed President Garcia-Godoy and seized power. The result in either case would have been a renewed bloodbath.

Now, with the leaders of both right and left finally out of the country, President Garcia-Godoy can resume his planning for an honest and peaceful national election in June of this year.

There is a good chance that he will succeed, so long as he has the support of the international peacekeeping forces.

The Dominican situation highlights a serious weakness in the inter-American system. The American Republics are fully aware of the threat that Castro and his followers pose to peace but they have not yet devised collective measures to deal with this problem.

I regret to say that there is no indication that this issue will be dealt with at the meeting of the special committee of the OAS which is now going on in Panama City.

This meeting, called to consider revisions of the OAS Charter, will study ways to strengthen the peacekeeping machinery of the OAS, but there appears to be little likelihood that a permanent inter-American peace force will be discussed.

In the absence of such machinery, the United States must act to prevent the spread of communism by subversion in Latin America, in the interests of all the peoples of the hemisphere.

This country, after all, is the only power which is capable of rapid and effective action to keep the peace.

I have little sympathy with the arguments advanced by some Latin leaders that they must tread cautiously in devising ways to deal with subversion, lest they exacerbate their problems with their own leftwings.

Such an attitude only encourages the Communists, who will function in any climate they can, and who are most active in the States where they are handled with kid gloves.

Venezuela and, more recently, Peru have been forced by open Communist insurrection to deal forcefully with this threat, and both these democratic governments have been greatly strengthened by their decisive action.

The lesson for all of us, North and South, is to meet this threat head-on.

The image of the United States cannot be improved by the bland kind of "education" programs we are carrying on now. Communist propaganda, which tears this country down as imperial exploiters of the people, has been far more successful than ours.

We must abandon our exculpatory defensive tactics and launch a counteroffensive that will show the Communists for what they are.

This approach works in Latin America.

THE COSTA RICAN EXAMPLE

Only last month—February—Prof. Jose Trejos defeated the candidate of the ruling National Liberation Party in a free election in Costa Rica.

And one of Professor Trejos' main issues was the danger that communism poses to the freedom and liberty of the people of Costa Rica.

Let us learn from this example. When the dangers of communism are forcefully and effectively presented to the people, they will respond because there is nothing more precious to a Latin American than his freedom.

Too often, the message of freedom is not carried effectively to the man in the street, and he does not fully realize what it will mean to him once communism and Marxism close the jaws of subjugation upon his liberty.

We in the United States, the cradle of liberty and the bastion of freedom for the entire world, must work harder to show the freedom-loving people of Latin America what it means when communism makes the state the master of the people and stifles their liberties.

We must get through to them with the message that the visionary promises of the Communist exploiters mean a life of slavery and bondage to a foreign ideology. Once the followers of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Kosygin, and Mao Tse-tung fasten their grip upon free people, there is no shaking it free, and what begins as theft of liberty and repression spirals downward to an ever greater slavery.

We must show the people of Latin America how we in the United States have dealt with this threat. Here in this country, we fight the Communists openly and vigorously because we understand them for what they are. The threatened nations of Latin America must understand that forceful action is demanded to handle these subversives and underminers of freedom.

Mexico and Venezuela and Peru have traveled this road, and they are among the most democratic nations of the hemisphere. We in the United States must show the other threatened nations that the route to successful control of the Communist threat has already been plotted, and we must help them to have the courage and resolution to follow it through.

Mr. President, I have great faith in the Latin American people. They love freedom and liberty as dearly as any people in this world, and they will respond when they are called to eradicate the paid agents of Soviet and Chinese subversion.

In summary, we in the United States face a great opportunity and a great challenge in Latin America.

If we can help our Latin friends to hurl back the danger of Communist subversion, we will be accomplishing one of those goals;

If we can help our Latin friends to move with greater force and vigor toward the elimination of the conditions which provide the seedbed for communism;

Then, too, if we can help the democratic leaders of Latin America to strengthen and consolidate their positions;

Then, the United States and Latin America can move forward with assurance toward our common goal of secure and democratic societies throughout this hemisphere.

Thank you, Mr. President.

EXHIBIT 1

TABLE I.—*Trend of U.S. economic loans and grants, Latin America, net obligations and loan authorizations, fiscal years 1958–65*

[Millions of dollars]

U.S. fiscal years	Total economic	AID programs	Food for peace	Export-Import Bank	Other economic
1958	$376.8	$87.9	$63.6	$213.5	$11.8
1959	579.6	123.0	36.6	411.1	8.9
1960	351.2	105.0	54.3	105.4	86.5
1961	864.2	253.8	158.5	450.0	1.9
1962	1,086.7	478.2	153.7	108.6	346.2
1963	1,008.6	552.4	181.6	68.0	206.6
1964	1,248.5	612.8	340.6	169.9	125.2
1965	1,037.4	524.8	132.8	258.2	121.6
Total, 1946–65	9,211.9	3,003.1	1,437.9	3,578.0	1,192.9

Source: Statistics and Reports Division, Agency for International Development.

EXHIBIT 2

TABLE 2.—*Free world shipping in Cuba, number of calls*

Country	1965	1964
United Kingdom	125	180
Lebanon	55	91
Italy	23	20
Greece	22	27
Yugoslavia	14	11

Source: U.S. State Department.

EXHIBIT 3

TABLE 3.—*Free world nations trading with Cuba, total exports and imports*

[Millions of dollars]

Country	1965 (January to September)	1964
United Kingdom	46.6	52.6
Canada	[1] 37.1	60.54
Japan	28.5	87.9
Spain	[2] 23.1	97
Morocco	[2] 20.7	59.1
France	20	24.3

[1] 8 months.
[2] 5 months.

Source: U.S. State Department.

EXHIBIT 4

TABLE 4.—*Average annual rates of increase in gross national product per capita at constant market prices, 1950–55, 1955–60, and 1961–65*

Country	1950-55	1955-60	1961-65	1961	1962	1963	1964 [1]	1965 [2]
Argentina	1.4	0.9	−0.1	4.1	−5.0	−6.4	6.6	5.6
Bolivia	−1.8	−2.6	2.0	.9	1.7	2.5	3.3	2.5
Brazil	2.4	2.5	.2	3.7	1.8	−2.0	−.5	1.4
Chile	.9	1.0	1.7	.9	4.1	.2	−.3	2.5
Colombia	2.3	1.1	1.6	2.0	2.1	.5	1.8	1.6
Costa Rica	3.2	1.5	1.7	−5.0	4.4	2.1	0	.9
Dominican Republic	4.2	1.8	−.3	−2.4	7.0	4.3	−.7	−10.0
Ecuador	2.2	1.2	1.4	−.6	1.3	−.7	3.2	1.8
El Salvador	2.1	.9	4.5	4.3	5.7	4.1	4.2	3.6
Guatemala	−.7	2.3	3.9	.9	−.4	9.4	2.7	3.9
Haiti	−.4	.1	0	−4.4	3.8	.1	−1.8	−2.3
Honduras	−.8	1.5	1.6	.4	2.4	.3	1.1	2.6
Mexico	2.9	2.7	3.4	.2	1.5	2.9	6.4	2.4
Nicaragua	5.0	−1.3	4.7	2.9	6.7	3.7	4.2	4.0
Panama	.3	2.7	3.9	5.2	6.7	.8	2.9	2.1
Paraguay	.3	−.1	.5	3.1	−.9	1.4	.4	1.8
Peru	2.6	2.0	2.9	6.4	4.6	1.0	2.6	3.4
Uruguay	2.8	−1.1	−1.4	.6	−3.9	−3.3	0	0
Venezuela	4.6	2.4	4.2	−3.1	3.9	6.8	3.9	1.8
Latin America	2.4	1.8	1.4	2.3	.9	−.8	2.9	2.5

[1] Provisional.
[2] Preliminary estimates.

Source: "The Future of Latin America's Development and the Alliance for Progress."

EXHIBIT 5

TABLE 5.—*Population growth in Latin America compared to United States and other regions*

Continent and country	Population estimated, mid-1965 (millions)	Annual rate of income from 1958–63 (percent)	Number of years to double population	Birth rate per 1,000 population	Death rate per 1,000 population	Infant mortality rate	Per capita gross nation product 1963 (in U.S. dollars)
Middle America	(75.9)	(2.8)	(25)	----------	----------	----------	(331)
Costa Rica	1.4	4.5	16	47–50	8.8	86.4	385
Cuba	7.6	1.8	39	31–36	9–13	77–90	305
Dominican Republic	3.6	3.6	20	48–54	15–20	80–100	269
El Salvador	2.9	3.2	22	46.8	10.4	65.5	275
Guatemala	4.4	3.2	22	47.7	17.2	92.8	284
Haiti	4.7	2.3	31	----------	----------	----------	80
Honduras	2.2	3.2	22	45–50	15–20	47–60	216
Jamaica	1.8	1.8	39	39.9	7.8	39.4	429
Mexico	40.9	3.2	22	45.4	10.3	66.3	402
Nicaragua	1.6	2.9	24	43–52	12–17	75–85	282
Panama	1.2	3.2	22	40.4	9–12	55–65	448
Puerto Rico	2.6	1.9	37	30.2	7.1	51.3	952
Trinidad and Tobago	1.0	3.2	22	34.5	6.2	39.6	630
South America	(162.7)	(2.7)	(26)	----------	----------	----------	(310)
Argentina	22.4	1.6	44	21.7	8.1	60–65	614
Bolivia	3.7	1.4	50	41–45	20–25	135–155	154
Brazil	81.3	3.1	23	43–47	11–16	----------	196
British Guiana	.6	2.8	25	42.6	7.9	55.0	260
Chile	8.7	2.3	31	33.7	12.0	111.0	483
Colombia	15.8	2.2	32	42–46	14–17	100–110	292
Ecuador	5.1	3.1	23	45–50	15–20	94–107	199
Paraguay	2.0	2.4	29	45–50	12–16	110–120	193
Peru	11.7	2.8	25	42–48	13–18	95–105	262
Uruguay	2.7	1.2	58	21–25	7–9	75–85	478
Venezuela	8.7	3.4	21	45–50	10–15	60–75	728

TABLE 5.—*Population growth in Latin America compared to United States and other regions*—Continued

Continent and country	Population estimated, mid-1965 (millions)	Annual rate of income from 1958–63 (percent)	Number of years to double population	Birth rate per 1,000 population	Death rate per 1,000 population	Infant mortality rate	Per capita gross national product 1963 (in U.S. dollars)
Latin America	238.6						
United States	194.6	1.6	44	21.2	9.4	24.2	3,083
North America	215.0	(1.6)	(44)	(22)	(9)		(2,990)
Europe	443.0	(.9)	(78)	(19)	(10)		
Africa	311.0	(2.3)	(31)	(46)	(23)		(135)
Oceania	17.0	(2.1)	(33)	(27)	(11)		(1,443)
Asia	1,842.0	(1.8)	(39)	(38)	(20)		
World	(3,308)	(2.0)	(35)	(36)	(16)		

Source: Population Reference Bureau.

EXHIBIT 6

TABLE 6.—*Annual rates of change in yield per acre of rice, wheat, and corn, and annual rates of population growth, major grain-producing countries*

[In percent]

Country	Crop	Change in yields, 1935-39 to 1960-62	Population increase, 1958-62	Population growth less yield increase
United States	Corn	3.7	1.7	+2.0
Mexico	Wheat	3.3	3.1	+.2
United States	do	2.7	1.7	+1.0
Mexico	Corn	1.8	3.1	−1.3
Argentina	Wheat	1.0	1.7	−.7
Chile	do	.8	2.4	−1.6
Colombia	Corn	.7	2.2	−1.5
Brazil	Rice	.5	3.1	−2.6
Argentina	Corn	.3	1.7	−1.4
Brazil	do	−.1	3.1	−3.2
Do	Wheat	−.1	3.1	−3.2
Guatemala	Corn	−1.0	3.1	−4.1

Source: Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MONTOYA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico for bringing to the attention of the Senate and the people of the United States the great problems which our neighbors to the south in Latin America are facing.

His speech emphasizes the fact that we cannot afford to let our involvement in Vietnam completely distract our attention from the tremendous social revolution which is occurring among our Latin American neighbors.

The Senator from New Mexico renders a valuable service to the American people in pointing out that there are other areas which deserve our attention as well as those in southeast Asia.

Last year, I had the privilege of going to Mexico as a member of the U.S. Interparliamentary delegation, of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was one of the leaders. The Senator speaks Spanish with the ease of a Castilian. It was a great pleasure and source of pride to all of us on the delegation to have him as our spokesman and to be able to converse with the highest members of the Mexican Government in their own language. It raised the stature of the American delegation and simplified our communications immensely. As a result, I believe that we made a number of contributions to Mexican-United States understanding.

The Senate is fortunate to have a man with the background of the Senator from New Mexico who is able to focus attention on the great problems of Latin America, and I commend him for the excellence of his speech today.

Mr. MONTOYA. I wish to thank my good friend the distinguished Senator from Maryland for his very kind remarks, and for his great contribution this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDIA: FREEDOM'S FULCRUM IN ASIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, next week's visit to this country by the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, comes at a crucial juncture in the 18-year history of the Republic of India and in Indo-American relations.

Mrs. Gandhi, a vigorous and highly intelligent woman, has just taken the reins of the world's largest democracy under the most trying conditions. Taken together, a severe drought, impending famine, a damaging war with Pakistan and Chinese raids along the northeast frontier present the most severe challenge that India has faced since independence from the British in 1947.

Meanwhile, our basic policies affecting India have been undergoing critical reevaluation. Last summer, President Johnson suspended all economic and military aid, and placed food shipments on a month to month basis. In recent months we have stepped up the level of food shipments, resumed limited military sales and economic aid. But the wheels of U.S. assistance that ground to a halt last fall will not shift into high gear again without purposeful redirection on the part of both India and the United States.

Against this backdrop, the talks between Prime Minister Gandhi and President Johnson assume great importance. The questions they discuss and the decisions they reach may shape Indo-American relations for at least a decade. And this may be the most critical decade in India's history.

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF INDIA

My trip to India last fall convinced me that India, the second largest nation in the world, holds the key to the future of Asia. Because the emergence of the nations of Asia is shifting the balance of world power, away from the North Atlantic nations to the east, India's fate will substantially affect the future of the rest of the world.

Our recent concentration on the U.S. commitment in Vietnam has tended to warp our understanding of our stake in Asia and the role we should play there in supporting non-Communist governments.

I fear that many of us have come to look on Vietnam as the turning point in the struggle between the free nations and the Communist system to influence the development of Asia. This view is subject to serious doubt. If we prevail in Vietnam it could lead us into a false sense of optimism about the future of freedom in Asia. If we fail in Vietnam, this false outlook could lead us to give up hope for the peoples in Asia. Either view would be shortsighted.

In broad historical perspective, even our enormous military commitment in Vietnam represents little more than a skirmish in the much larger and more complex struggle for responsible self-determination among the billion and a half people of Asia, and among the peoples of Africa and Latin America as well. It is a holding action designed to convince the Chinese that the United States will not tolerate the substitution of force for persuasion in the contest to determine the future of the underdeveloped world.

THE TWIN REVOLUTIONS

The seeds for the current contest between freedom and communism were sown during the 17th century, when European colonization began to spread across Asia. For three centuries, the vital decisions affecting hundreds of millions of people in China, India, Burma, Indochina, and Indonesia were made over brandy and cigars in the drawing rooms of London, Amsterdam, Paris, and St. Petersburg.

In the first five decades of this century, virtually every vestige of European colonialism was ripped away from the Asian scene by the irresistible revolutions of nationalism and rising expectations. In one of the most significant and thoroughgoing revolutionary movements in history, the third of all the world's people who live in Asia have achieved, in just five decades, the power to determine their own futures.

Because independence for the nations of Asia had dawned only during the first half of the 20th century, they will not be able, as we were in the West, gradually to evolve modern economic, social, and political institutions over a period of 500 years. The rising expectations among these people will not wait another five centuries to be satisfied. Indeed, they want to compress the experiences of five centuries into five decades, and, in some cases into 5 years.

There is general agreement throughout the underdeveloped world about what these peoples want. From Suez to the China Sea, in Africa and Latin America, the new nations want political independence and material well-being.

They want education and opportunity for their children, food and medical care for their families and some of the amenities that make life worth living. In short, they want a decent life.

But there is widespread disagreement throughout the underdeveloped world about how to achieve these goals. Some nations, like China, believe that political independence and economic development can only be achieved on the Communist model, exemplified by the industrialization of the Soviet Union. Other nations, most notably the Republic of India, are reluctant to pay the price in slavery and the loss of human dignity and individual freedom that economic development in Communist terms demands.

The choices the underdeveloped nations will make between the Indian and Chinese models cannot be predicted with certainty. The average Asian, who lives at or slightly above the level of subsistence, consumed by the elemental struggle to put food in his children's mouths, is understandably less concerned with democracy than we. Nehru is reported to have observed that a nation cannot have democracy on an empty stomach.

We in the West are determined that the new nations should have a real chance to be free nations, pursuing a course of rapid self-development which avoids the barbarous human cost that the Communist system exacts as its price for achieving a self-sufficient, industrial society.

But we labor under severe difficulties in seeking to convince these formerly colonized peoples that a way like ours is best for them.

First, we are associated with the colonial powers who ruled and exploited these same people for nearly four centuries.

Second, most Asians consider the Communist system responsible for Russia's enormous transition from a backward, agricultural economy to the world's second greatest power in less than four decades. And now, China is trying to use the Communist ideology to thrust itself into national achievement and international prominence.

THE CHINESE MODEL

China, asserting the superiority of the Communist system as an economic, political, and social model for the underdeveloped world, has made significant material progress in the last decade and a half—but at the price of incredible dehumanizing and deprivation of the people.

To implement its "agrarian reform" program, Communist China began with the mass execution of more than a million landholders in a mass conscription of more than a million peasant families into 700,000 collective farms. Then, in 1958, the Chinese planners interned 99 percent of all Chinese peasant households—more than 120 million households and 500 million people—in 26,000 agricultural communes. Private property was obliterated, families were destroyed by segregation into male and female dormitories, and peasants were subjected to 18-hour workdays for uninterrupted weeks at a time.

To attack its industrial backwardness, China chained men to their machines, refusing to allow a choice or change of jobs, and lashed them on until the machines themselves began to collapse during "the great leap forward."

To consolidate its political power, the Chinese Government has instituted a system of thought control which extends from the highest to the lowest levels of Chinese society and a propaganda program which attempts to keep the Chinese people at a fever pitch of paranoia against an imaginary invasion by the West.

Yet, the inhuman character of the Chinese drive for development has produced some impressive results. China has begun to develop modern industry. The Chinese are the first nonwhite nation to possess a nuclear weapon.

If the Chinese should succeed in effecting the historic transition from primitive economy to industrial society within a relatively short time, even at this enormous human cost, the Chinese experience will have an incalculable impact on the hundreds of millions of people in Asia and Africa. All the Western preachments about elections and individual freedom and free enterprise will mean nothing if this third of all the world's people see no practical alternative to the Chinese method of economic development.

THE INDIAN MODEL

If the nations of the West are mistrusted among the people of the underdeveloped world, who is to compete with the Russian and Chinese economic and social models? Who can show the other underdeveloped nations a way to develop their economies without sacrificing individual freedom and social justice?

The only answer is India.

Lying in the heartland of Asia, sharing a 2,000-mile border with China, India has emerged as a rival model to Chinese Communist development. India has pursued a course of development since independence which has preserved individual freedom and respected human dignity while making substantial industrial and agricultural progress.

India has borrowed freely from Western democratic principles and social thought to create an amalgam with the traditions of her own ancient civilization. She demonstrates by her very existence that a backward and once oppressed nation can lift herself into the modern world without radical, totalitarian methods, without rejecting its cultural heritage, and without destroying individual freedom. This is the essence of India's importance to us.

The greatest accomplishment of the Indian people in the 18 years since independence has been the creation and effective functioning of a democratic parliamentary system. Despite the barriers of two antagonistic religious groups, 13 separate and distinct languages, mass illiteracy and inexperience in self-government, India has forged a viable parliamentary democracy, with a written constitution and a bill of rights much like our own. The rights of India's many cultural and linguistic minorities are well protected in the courts and by the electoral system.

In less than two decades, the Indian democratic system has demonstrated its strength and flexibility in three national elections and two orderly transitions of executive power, without any coup d'etat, without any great revolution.

Five major political parties vie for popular support. Under the umbrella of the dominant Congress Party, a broad spectrum of political opinion, from doctrinaire socialist to radical conservative flourishes. In the Parliament, and in the press, the Government is subject to the same careful scrutiny and vigorous criticism as our own.

While building and strengthening its system of personal and political freedom, however, India has made tremendous progress toward modernization of its economy.

Here is one area where I believe there is a common misconception in the United States. India has great problems, perhaps the greatest population problem in the world and one of the greatest food-production problems. However, she has made tremendous economical progress.

Since adoption of its constitution in 1951, India has completed three 5-year plans designed to mobilize her energies and her material resources into a planned and purposeful development effort. Since 1951:

Production of food grains has increased about 50 percent and overall agricultural production has increased 60 percent. Fertilizer production has increased almost 200 percent. Industrial production has increased almost 250 percent. Annual production of machine tools is 90 times greater than in 1951 and is expanding at the rate of 20 percent a year. Electricity generation has grown 300 percent.

Overall, industrial production in India has grown about 9 percent a year since 1950 and food-grain production about 3½ percent a year.

India has also made a widespread attack against disease through a broad public health program. Malaria and smallpox, widespread in India 15 years ago, have been practically eliminated. A network of 12,000 health centers for the rural population has been established. The number of hospital beds has doubled and the number of doctors has increased by 50 percent since 1951. The Indian mortality rate has been cut by one-third and the average life expectancy at birth has increased more than 30 percent.

Progress in education has been equally extraordinary. Total school enrollment in India has almost tripled since 1951. India now trains more doctors each year than we do.

National per capita income has increased 30 percent since 1951, and substantial increases have been achieved in India's standard of living.

Of the greatest significance, however, is the fact that the Indians are paying their own way toward development. Although our assistance to them has been substantial, almost 80 percent of India's total investment has been financed by internal savings. India's rate of internal savings has doubled since 1951 to a current rate of 11 percent. That is a significant rate of savings.

But these formidable statistics of Indian growth tell only half the story, albeit the happy half and the half generally unknown in this country. The other half has to do with the crises which the Indian people and the young Indian democracy is now facing.

II. THE CRISIS IN INDIA

These favorable rates of growth and expansion are dwarfed by the fact of India's enormous population and the primitive point from which India began its growth in 1951.

India's 55-percent increase in total food production since 1951 has been nearly matched by a 33-percent increase in India's population. With food production rising at the rate of 3 percent and population rising at a rate of more than 2 percent each year, India has to run hard just to stay even.

India's 30-percent gain in national income per capita since 1951, is not so impressive when national income per capita is still only $80 per year.

Tripling the school enrollment seems not so significant when the illiteracy rate still approaches 80 percent and only 10 percent of all Indian youths finish high school.

The economic dislocations caused by the conflicts with Pakistan and China and the deadly drought-induced famine now threatens all the progress which India so far has made. India's third 5-year plan, which began with the reasonable goal of expanding national income by 30 percent by 1966, is ending this month with a crisis in agriculture and serious underemployment of industrial resources.

The famine sweeping India now threatens to drag the subsistence diets of many Indians below the starvation level.

Indian industrial production is also seriously threatened by a drought-caused loss of hydroelectric power, by a war-deranged national economy and by shortages of raw materials resulting from excessive bureaucratic controls and a lack of foreign exchange.

In part, these failures reflect inadequate planning on the part of the Indian Government, which committed itself to an overly ambitious goal of rapid industrialization at the expense of the agricultural sector. Now, with hunger upon them, the Indians have turned their attention and their efforts to improvements in agriculture.

Whether the present crisis will amount to a major and perhaps fatal setback for India, or whether it will be only a brief interruption of her otherwise rapid march to development could be decided in the coming months.

TOO LITTLE FOOD

Underlying the entire Indian crisis is the weakness in Indian agriculture which struggles along under the growing specter of a birth rate which constantly threatens to outstrip the growth in agricultural production.

If India is to survive as a nation, it must feed its people. If India is to feed its people, it must make a radical improvement in the productivity of its land already under cultivation—and that improvement will require drastic changes in India's agricultural technology. The supply of new land that can readily be brought under cultivation has been virtually exhausted. India simply must improve its use of irrigation, seeds, tools, pesticides, and most important of all, fertilizers.

In the last 2 years, the Indian Government has made very substantial strides in the structural aspects of its farm program. There are new policies and programs in farm credit, price incentives, seeds, technical assistance, training, marketing, and transportation services. But the failure to plan for and produce an adequate supply of fertilizer is the worst failure of the third 5-year plan.

The Indian soils, tilled for centuries to the point of virtual exhaustion in many areas, respond dramatically to chemical fertilizers. In one area I visited last fall, north of New Delhi—in the Punjab-Ludhiana district—farmers had tripled their yields in 1 year simply through the application of more fertilizer. It was land which had never had chemical fertilizer. If increased use of fertilizer is coupled with the use of improved seeds and adequate irrigation, yields can be even higher.

The long range solution of India's fertilizer shortage must, of course, include a drastic increase in domestic production of fertilizer. But a severe shortage of the raw materials from which fertilizer is manufactured is going to leave India, which now relies on imports for two-thirds of its total fertilizer needs, dependent upon imports for some four-fifths of its total needs for at least 5 years if food output targets are to be met.

Because our aid to India supplies most of its credits for import purchases, her critical dependence on growing fertilizer imports has significant implications for our aid program to India over the next 5 years.

TOO MANY MOUTHS

Raising food is only one side of India's agricultural crisis. The other side is that India simply has too many mouths to feed. And every year there are almost 15 million more. The population growth every year in India exceeds the combined populations of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, and Tennessee.

If the Indian economy seems to be running up an escalator marked "down," one answer clearly lies in the realm of population control. The Indian Government estimates that the present birth rate must be cut by more than one-third if economic development is to have any real meaning.

I was delighted to learn that, under Mrs. Gandhi's leadership, the Indian Government intends to tackle the population problem as a national crisis and triple its investment in family planning measures.

India hopes to reach 90 percent of the married population through its 12,000 health clinics. These centers will promote group acceptance of the concept of small families, provide information on contraception, and supply cheap contraceptive supplies and services.

Agricultural underproduction and human overproduction are the twin crises facing India today.

Many reputable observers believe that India can achieve agricultural self-sufficiency by 1971, if it can get the increased agricultural assistance it needs from the United States and if it can control its birth rate. India has the will and determination to meet its twin crises. But India needs help.

III. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD INDIA

We are, and have been, one of India's best friends. We have already supplied substantial economic aid to support India's development and some military aid to protect it.

But having come halfway down the road to self-sufficiency with India, the world's largest democracy, we cannot now lay down our burden. With more than half the world's people now deciding between China and India as a model upon which to fashion their development, we dare not tire or slacken in our historic role of friendship toward India. We must do what we have to, we must spend what we need to, to help India prove to herself and to the world that political freedom and rapid economic development are not incompatible.

A hard examination of India's problems and our own interest in India's success indicates that the U.S. policy toward India must embody at least six basic principles:

First, we must increase the dollar amounts of our aid, knowing that by supplying assistance in sufficient amounts now we can lessen the ultimate burden by hastening the day when our assistance can end altogether.

This was the principle under which the Marshall plan worked. It poured aid into European countries after World War II, and within a short time not only were those countries self-sufficient, but they were able to contribute to the aid of other underdeveloped nations.

Second, we must strengthen and encourage the operation of the international consortium through which 10 nations have joined together to plan and fund India's aid program.

Third, we must make reforms in the administration of our assistance program, particularly with respect to our creditor relationship with India. Our vast holdings of Indian rupees—the United States holds about one-fifth of the currency of India—could act as a potential source of friction while achieving no useful purpose for us.

Fourth, in conducting our foreign policy toward India, we must respect and appreciate the value of India as a nonalined, independent, and sovereign state. To a large degree, India is still the leader of the underdeveloped world. She is not a tributary of any nation, including the United States.

Fifth, in administering our aid program toward India, we must recognize the fact that we are dealing with a democracy. We cannot expect India to act with the speed and certainty of a totalitarian state. We must recognize that India's leaders cannot be or appear to be our puppets if they are to keep their offices and carry out joint policies.

Sixth, we should limit our arms programs to both India and Pakistan while leaving open an option to extend substantial aid to either in case of invasion by China.

INCREASED U.S. AID

American economic assistance to India has been substantial. We provide more than half of all the foreign aid India receives. We give more aid to India than we give to any other nation. However, none of the major nations we aid receives less U.S. aid on a per capita basis than India.

Although India finances about 80 percent of her development investment from her own resources, we provide the critical margin of finance—mainly foreign exchange for capital import needs—which India must have if she is to continue her drive toward self-sustained growth.

India has the industrial capacity, the transportation facilities, the managerial skill, and the capacity effectively to absorb more capital than she is now receiving. Even before the United States cut off its aid last summer to protest the Indo-Pakistan war, many Indian plants were running at half capacity or less—not because there was no demand for their products—but because they lacked the imported materials or replacement parts to permit full production. In her recent appeal to President Johnson, Prime Minister Gandhi bluntly observed that India desperately needs the critical margin of foreign exchange that U.S. aid provides in order to keep her country's factories from shutting down completely.

Indian planners have recently committed themselves to a special emphasis on agriculture and on population control and have simultaneously modified a previously hostile attitude toward the role of foreign private enterprise in the development effort.

We should be prepared at this critical juncture to provide the aid necessary to give the Indian economy the final push that they are going to need during the next 10 years to achieve self-sustained growth. The time now appears ripe for a substantial increase in development loans to India, particularly with respect to the construction of fertilizer plants.

In the opinion of some of our most knowledgeable experts, the time for a major injection of external aid is now or never for a democratic India. In this connection, it is highly important that the United States continue as the leader of the international consortium which had been assisting India until the time of the Pakistan involvement.

THE CONSORTIUM APPROACH

We should not, and we do not, have to carry the whole burden of helping to bring India to economic maturity. Every free nation has a stake in India's fate. To make sure our aid is used most effectively, and to encourage other free nations to do their fair share for India, we must work to strengthen the existing international framework for planning and financing India's economic development.

Aid to India from the advanced free world countries is presently coordinated through a consortium of non-Communist governments working with the World Bank and the International Development Association. The industrialized governments which constitute the consortium to aid India meet annually to review India's economic progress, to coordinate their foreign aid programs to India and to pledge their respective contributions of assistance for the following year.

This consortium arrangement, which began in 1958, provides many advantages unique to multilateral forms of foreign aid. Not only does the consortium approach give Indian planners more orderly and reliable estimates of what quantities of aid they can expect each year, but it also creates an atmosphere of international responsibility for India's future.

The consortium arrangement brings pressure on developed countries of the free world to give their proper share of aid. It provides a framework within which to coordinate all the Western aid programs to India, in order to avoid duplication of effort. It also relieves Indian fears that individual countries might use aid as a bludgeon to extract political and economic concessions from India or to impinge upon her sovereignty.

Disturbingly, the consortium has not yet scheduled a meeting this year. The reasons advanced for the failure of the consortium to meet include the Indo-Pakistan war and the subsequent suspension of U.S. aid. And the members of the consortium are reported to have second thoughts about the adequacy of the next 5-year plan to meet India's present development crisis. Consequently, the Indian Government is revising its fourth 5-year plan and has delayed its initiation for a year.

The consortium approach to coordinating aid to India is far too important, however, to be neglected or abandoned. As the principal aid-giver and as free world leader, the United States dominates the consortium. We should vigorously press for the resumption of consortium operations as soon as possible.

THE EMBARRASSMENT OF EXCESS RUPEES

Our present foreign aid laws require the aided nation to repay us in its own currency for all of the surplus food sales we make under title I of Public Law 480. It would be largely self-defeating to provide the aided nations with food if we demanded repayment in dollars. A basic purpose of our aid program has been to supply them with the food they lack but must have to modernize.

Recognizing that to remove these foreign currency repayments from the aided country would bankrupt it, Congress wisely provided that these repayments could only be used to finance our own operations or additional aid programs in each country.

Under our present foreign aid laws and arrangements, however, those foreign currencies we own are generally loaned back to the aided country for further projects, thus actually increasing our holdings in those foreign currencies as the principal amounts of the loans are repaid with interest. We do probably gain some extra degree of influence over the course of economic development in the aided countries by owning some local currencies in each for investment in aid projects in each country.

The amount of Indian currency we own, however, has been mounting rapidly and relentlessly as our aid program has continued. We now own $2.5 billion worth of Indian rupees. This is over 20 percent of all of India's money, and could very well become almost 30 percent of it within the foreseeable future.

We must ask whether we really need to own up to a third of India's money supply in order to guide its development. Can we expect the Indian people to resent and fear our ownership of a third of their currency any less than we would resent French or British ownership of our own currency?

France was upset when the United States owned a substantial interest in a few of their motor companies. Imagine how the people of Great Britain would feel if the United States owned one-third of Great Britain's currency.

The basic question is really not whether we need to limit our growing title to Indian money, but simply whether we will end that accumulation in a reasoned, deliberate manner or only after some crisis has seriously impaired our relations with India and retarded the progress of Indian economic development.

President Johnson has wisely moved, through his new food-for-freedom program, to stem further accumulation of foreign currencies in our hands as a result of food sales.

But the additional accumulation of Indian currency generated by the Indian money now in U.S. accounts in India is not only useless, it is unnecessary, foolish, and dangerous.

Congress this year should provide in its foreign aid legislation for a limitation on the amount of Indian currency we own. Congress should direct that the principal and interest of all Indian loan repayments be redisbursed as grants since we have no reasonable need for greater accumulations of Indian currencies.

RESPECTING INDIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Our attitudes toward India have greatly matured from the days when Secretary of State John Foster Dulles condemned India's nonalinement under Nehru as immoral. Events have proven the futility and stupidity of attempting to preach or bully the uncommitted nations of the world into the Western camp. President Kennedy set us on the proper course when he announced our policy as trying "to make the world safe for diversity."

Indeed, India's nonalinement is of positive benefit to the United States. First and foremost, India demonstrates to the rest of the underdeveloped world that it is possible to be closely affiliated with the United States in achieving common development objectives without becoming an American puppet.

India's independence from both the East and the West creates the very opportunity upon which we are trying to capitalize in our assistance to India. Reduced to its simplest terms, we are trying to show the half of the world which does want alinement with either the East or the West that there is a way to economic development and self-determination which does not sacrifice national interest or do violence to the spirit of nationalism which runs throughout the underdeveloped nations of the world.

The existence of a bloc of nonalined nations, representing half the world's population, also frustrates China's theory of two hostile world camps—Western capitalism and world communism—which must inevitably clash in war and revolution.

The Chinese theory is that the two camps must inevitably clash in world war or revolution. The nonalined nations, under India's leadership, simply have not played China's game. And it is in our interest that they do not play the Chinese game. Nehru himself analyzed the Chinese invasion of India in 1962 as having been motivated in part by a desire to drive India out of neutralism and into the Western camp, in order to advance China's plans for anticapitalist conflict.

Having refused alinement with either the Communist world or the West, India and the other nonalined nations act as a brake on the cold war. Since both blocs are courting the favor of these uncommitted peoples, their independence is a generally beneficial check on the conduct of both the Communists and the West.

In this century, as in the last, the hope for world peace has depended in large measure upon a balance of power between the great nations. Today, when the consequences of mutual distrust are so terrible, it is more vital than ever to have one or more nations which can serve as a channel of communication and mediate disputes between competing power blocs. Such a nation must not be alined with either bloc, and must be respected as fair and impartial by both. India well fills this role as between the United States and the Soviet Union.

A strong, independent, nonalined India serves as a conduit and affords an opportunity for liaison between the Communists and the West. This opportunity would be tremendously valuable in our efforts to maintain world peace.

In view of the value of nonalined countries to the long-range interests of the United States, we should not pressure these nations to join the Western camp. We would be tragically shortsighted, for example, if we tried to use our aid as a lever to obtain India's public approval for our efforts in Vietnam. The purpose of our aid is not to buy the political allegiance of the sovereign government of India to policies which are not supported by all our Western allies. We certainly did our cause no good when we abruptly canceled a state visit by India's Prime Minister, apparently because he chose to publicly disagree with our policies.

RESPECTING INDIA'S DEMOCRACY

Winston Churchill's dictum that democracy "is the worst form of government, except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time," is relevant to our relations with India.

India is a democracy. As such, the Indian Government must adjust its plans and programs to the political forces within India, just as we do here.

Woodrow Wilson could not lead the United States into the League of Nations. How can we demand that Madam Nehru, or anyone else try to deliver her democracy into supporting our policies? It cannot be done. In a democracy, it is not a matter of pushing a button as in a totalitarian nation, and having everyone jump. That is the difference between India and China.

The democratic process may be a limitation on India's development. Certainly the Communists think so. But that is what the epic of India's development is all about.

If we are to help India prove that democracy is not incompatible with rapid development, we have to accept the limitations of democracy along with its strengths. We must recognize that frictions and differences of opinion are bound to arise during the continuing intimate relationship that the United States and India will share as long as our aid is necessary.

This problem comes to the fore in the difficult and delicate area of what strings or conditions we place upon our aid. Of course, we have the right and the duty to ourselves to insist that U.S. aid is employed effectively and efficiently. India cannot expect us to deposit our money or our wheat on its national doorstep, and abandon interest in how it is used. We have a legitimate interest, for example, in insisting that our aid be used in the development of India's agriculture. But I do not think we have a right to tell India that fertilizer must be developed by private enterprise rather than by a state-owned factory. That is an internal decision that India must make for itself.

Fortunately, the Indian Government usually demonstrates a keen awareness of and sensitivity to valid United States interest in India's development plans.

But just as India must be, and is, prepared to accept what amounts to U.S. intervention in its national economic planning, we must understand India's right to determine her own course. The reforms we see as vital may seem less significant or politically impractical to an Indian politician or administrator.

We must always remember that we are talking about reforms in their nation, not ours. We must be patient with action that may seem at times—as it does—to be all too slow or too grudging. And we must be prepared, on occasion, to accept no change at all.

Nor can we expect miracles once plan changes are agreed upon. We are dealing in India with Nehrus, Shastris, and Gandhis, not with Hitlers, Mussolinis, or Stalins. India's democracy is no more automatic in its political processes than is ours.

Of course we reserve the right to terminate our aid, in whole or in part, if we find that over the long run India is not responding to what we consider minimum conditions. But we must not use the threat of withdrawing assistance to club unwilling Indian leaders into reluctant compliance with our economic views. To do so, in a nation like India, is foolish, for it is counterproductive.

The Indians are a justly proud people. They are also understandably sensitive to pressure from a Western power. Once it even appears that an Indian minister is advocating a change in policy because of U.S. pressure, that policy has a less than even chance of being accepted in Parliament. Naturally, we should use the influence that our substantial aid gives us in helping India to guide its development, but we must exercise that influence deftly, and with a light touch, or we will prevent our friends in India from carrying out the very policies which we endorse.

We must maturely recognize the fact that it better serves our long-range interest to have India as a strong, independent, and nonalined nation than to create a "Charlie McCarthy," mouthing United States foreign policy, in Asia. I believe that we will, in the long run, attract more adherents to the cause of democratic self-development with the honey of respect than the vinegar of coercion. After the Chinese border incidents, the Indians and her Asian neighbors have little doubt as to who are their real friends.

INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Our policies toward India are complicated by the fact that the independence of the subcontinent from Great Britain resulted in two nations, with common borders and common economic problems, but tremendously antagonistic religions and hostile ambitions to govern Kashmir.

During the term of Secretary Dulles, we began arming Pakistan as part of a worldwide policy of containing communism through military alliances. Viewed in the light of its outcome, our decade of arms aid to Pakistan must surely be considered as one of the major blunders in postwar American foreign policy.

India, wishing to remain nonalined, declined to accept U.S. military assistance. In light of the conflict over Kashmir, however, it complained that Pakistan's weapons were likely to be used against India instead of against the Communist powers to the north. The Indians pointed out that much of the equipment we gave Pakistan, particularly the heavy Patton tanks, was suitable only for use on the plains of India and Pakistan, and not in the mountains of Afghanistan which lie between Pakistan and Russia. But President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles assured the Indian Government that we would not let this happen. Nehru said: "How are you going to stop it?" We said that we would stop it.

Last summer the pace of history outran our policy, and our assurances evaporated. India and Pakistan fought a war over Kashmir in which India faced a U.S.-equipped Pakistan army on one front while trying to stave off Chinese border incursions on another.

The fact that in the late stages of the war the Indians withdrew some U.S.-assisted mountain divisions from the Himalayan frontier for use against Pakistan compounded the bankruptcy of our military aid policy on the subcontinent.

Indian soldiers in the Indo-Pakistan war were killed by American bullets and Indian villages were hit by planes, tanks, or bombs which we had given Pakistan. Indeed, last fall, when I was in India, I saw equipment bearing the clasped hand symbol of AID, which was captured from Pakistan airborne troops parachuted onto Indian soil.

Regardless of the mistakes of the past, however, the realities of the present are clear. Whether Pakistan ever faced a threat of invasion by China or Russia, it does not think it faces one now. Indeed, President Ayub Khan, of Pakistan, recently told his people that "It has been our belief from the beginning that there is no danger to the subcontinent from China, provided no uncalled for provocation is aimed against that country."

India, on the other hand, remains vulnerable to further invasion by China.

In the light of these developments, I believe the United States should reexamine the agreements on which our present policy of supplying arms to Pakistan is based. We should discontinue supplying new arms to both Pakistan and India, reserving the option, if circumstances warrant, to supply each nation those items essential to keep previously supplied equipment in repair and such new equipment as may be truly defensive in character. Finally, we should be willing to extend a unilateral guarantee of both India's and Pakistan's territorial integrity from Chinese or Soviet incursions.

Indeed, the Indian Government itself appears to favor a continuation of the moratorium on arms aid imposed when the Indo-Pakistan war broke out last summer.

In light of the still monumental economic development tasks facing both India and Pakistan, our aid will be much better spent to provide development than to supply the machinery for devastating war. Limiting military assistance to Pakistan should not, however, abate our willingness to supply economic aid. Pakistan is an important nation of 100 million people. It has demonstrated an ability to use our economic aid effectively.

We should use every bit of persuasion we can to encourage cooperation between India and Pakistan in the field of economic development and to prevent competition on the field of battle.

When you think of the cost to the two nations of their fratricidal struggle, which has been estimated at nearly $6 billion, and that our total aid to both nations since their independence has amounted to only $10 billion, we can see that the conflict between the two has had frightful effects on the economy of both and the future of both.

IV. INDIA AND THE FUTURE

The war in Vietnam, which absorbs so much of our attention today, may mark a significant turning point in a far broader campaign for national independence, democracy, and economic development in Asia.

But I believe we have come to realize that the outcome of the struggle for freedom and self-determination will not be decided on one battlefield or several, and certainly will not be decided quickly.

It may be a generation or more before the nations of free Asia are in a position to guarantee their own security and to provide a decent life for their people. It may be that long before China judges the cost of hostility too high and decides to rejoin the family of nations.

But throughout this period, the course of India, with its vast population and vast resources, its successful democracy and incredible potential, will remain the most important index by which our success or failure in encouraging freedom will be measured.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I think it would be incredibly shortsighted on the part of our Government to fail to realize the importance of the survival of India as a democracy. There are rather grim premonitions that we can already see as the devastating drought there spreads and causes food riots from one end of the country to the other. It would be incredibly shortsighted to fail to appreciate the significance of the crisis facing India today, and the importance of the next 10 years to India.

India is the largest democracy in the world in point of numbers. We cannot let India fall; because as long as India is a viable, functioning parliamentary democracy, we can maintain stability in Asia, we can go a long way toward maintaining stability in the world, and the prospects of world peace are immeasurably brighter than were India to fall under the Communist sphere of influence.

PARKING AND REAL ESTATE SPECULATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Washington Post has recently run a highly informative and important series of articles on parking and real estate speculation in Washington.

This series, ably written by Mr. Dan Morgan, amply documents many of the points that were made before my District of Columbia Subcommittee during the recent hearings on parking in our Nation's Capital.

The series demonstrates that the parking lots in Washington are generally transitional uses for land during a period of land assembly and real estate speculation. The Post shows that parking revenues are used to pay the taxes and carrying cost on vacant land prior to the time it is developed for a higher use. The Post proves that various tax incentives and loose zoning regulations make parking a highly lucrative interim use of land.

No one objects to private real estate development. Washington has enjoyed and benefited from an unprecedented building boom.

But no one should be fooled into thinking that transitional parking lots are an adequate solution to the ever-mounting parking problem. These lots, as the Post points out, are located wherever a developer happens to want to build a new building. They are not located to serve the needs of existing commercial or employment centers.

My parking bill, which was recently reported unanimously from the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee would not limit or prevent the use of land for parking. It would, however, authorize the District of Columbia to construct multilevel garages to serve the needs of tourists, employees, shoppers, and business visitors in the many areas of the city that currently lack adequate parking facilities. It would also authorize the construction of fringe lots, served by mass transit, to encourage commuters to ride into the central business district by bus or subway, and thus help ease the parking problem.

The only significant opposition to this bill is the parking lobby. This series in the Post demonstrates that these operators are not truly interested in providing parking where it is needed at reasonable rates. Rather they are concerned in milking a property for maximum parking revenues until a plot of land can be devoted to some other use.

I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KINGDOM OF GOULD AND ANTONELLI, I—TWO MEN BUILD FORTUNE ON NEED FOR PARKING

(By Dan Morgan)

Washington's parking lots don't look like the foundations on which a new fortune is being built.

Rows of cars flanking towering buildings or crammed between row houses seem to be the backwash of the modern American city, not the springboard to its future.

Yet a new empire is rising from these blacktop fields, one little known even to Washingtonians who move through it every day.

A resident of the Capital can awaken in an apartment building that is part of that empire, drive to work in a car rented through it, park on a lot owned by it and work in an office building built by one of its syndicates.

NAMES SELDOM SEEN

Later, he can eat at a restaurant owned by the parking lot empire, cash a check at a bank organized by its bosses, pick up a magazine in a hotel owned by another of its syndicates, and drive back home in the car that is rented through it.

Not once is he likely to hear or see the names of Dominic F. Antonelli, Jr., and Kingdon Gould, Jr., the men who control these and other far-flung holdings.

"Nick" Antonelli and Kingdon Gould defy cataloging.

They are "parking operators," owners of Parking Management Inc., the biggest firm of its kind in town with 90 lots and space for more than 10,000 cars. Yet parking is only the underpinning for their vast real estate development operation, which controls half a million square feet of downtown Washington, has controlled another half million, owns 110,000 square feet of choice downtown land in Baltimore, and, finally, half a million acres of land in Panama.

PRODUCTS OF CHANGE

Unlike the familiar Washington real estate names of Cafritz or Luchs the names of Antonelli and Gould are little known outside the Washington business community.

A close associate estimates the value of the holdings in which they have an interest at $15 to $25 million, 10 times the assets of PMI, the bread and butter operation in the Antonelli-Gould combine. PMI's annual gross income is believed to exceed $1 million.

In a sense, these two men, one from the streets of Washington, the other born into a wealthy family, are products of the changes that are ripping out the heart of Washington, and building it over.

In another sense, they are the molders of these economic forces and, for better or worse, their exploiters.

Since the Antonelli-Gould star began to rise in the mid 1950's, their never-say-die kind of capitalism has been waging a bruising war with Washington's Government structure.

And in this city's peculiar Government, divided between Federal and agencies, the District Building and Capitol Hill, they have often found the weak spots.

POWER LARGELY UNSEEN

The power of the Antonelli-Gould empire is unseen most of the time. But it surfaces suddenly when Government's plans for the city clash with their own private plans in the domains of parking and land development.

For instance, Downtown Progress tried for a half a dozen years to bring Federal urban renewal to Washington's stagnant downtown. Antonelli and Gould hired a lobbyist to fight it.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, wants legislation giving the District Commissioners power to condemn land for municipal parking garages. These entrepreneurs have been fighting this threat for a decade.

Washington's planning staff wants to keep the present limit on building heights. Antonelli and Gould want allowable building heights increased to "encourage development."

The District Building thinks parking for downtown shoppers, commuters, and workers should be set by public policy. Antonelli-Gould say Government should keep out.

WHO PLANS CITY'S FUTURE?

The city's planning staff says present building densities should be kept through 1985. Antonelli, Gould, and other developers pressure the District Building to change the zoning, and thereby the land values, on downtown's fringe.

Just who is planning Washington's future? These facts may give a clue:

The city has no municipal parking garages, commonplace facilities in most large cities.

It has no control over parking rates, though that power could give the city a tool to control who drives into the city and prompt greater use of the Capital's subway system when it is completed.

It has no master plan for parking, in an era when government has control of roads, subways, and other transportation links that are no more vital to commuters and tourists than is parking.

Washington's parking and land magnates like the present setup. And so do Antonelli and Gould, who are tough, candid, young, rich, and convinced they're making a contribution to Washington's future. Their alliance is, if nothing else, a paradox.

Gould is the great-grandson of railroad and finance magnate Jay Gould, nicknamed the "Mephistopheles of Wall Street." He's the scion of one of the wealthiest dynasties in American history, and one of the heirs to an $82 million fortune.

Antonelli, 43, is the son of a struggling Washington olive oil importer. He's a former newspaper circulation route man and a one-time parking attendant.

Gould, 42, is the product of the East's finest social and educational circles: Private schools (Buckley and Millbrook in New York), Yale College (Phi Beta Kappa), and Yale Law School.

Antonelli is the epitome of the self-made man: A dropout from McKinley High School who worked his way up from parking attendant to lot operator to lot owner to entrepreneur. (He grew up in a house on the block where his own office building now stands at 1725 DeSales St., NW.)

Gould is urbane and cultivated (he played the violin until wounded in World War II); a "gentleman jockey" who rides in the Howard County Hunt and leaves his work behind when he quits Washington to rejoin his wife and nine children in their big country home.

Antonelli is divorced and lives in an undistinguished house at 5914 Onondaga Road, Bethesda. He drives himself through an 18-hour day, 7-day week that leaves little time for anything but work. His only real outside interests are his daughter and adopted son, for whom he named his now defunct Leejon holding company.

In 1964, for instance, the District property books list 134 separate purchases by "Antonelli et al." Some of the lots were then turned over to one of their two dozen real estate ventures in the metropolitan area. Many of them involve the gradual acquisition of land by syndicate in various target areas for future buildings.

BUILD ROSSLYN COMPLEX

In Rosslyn, Antonelli and Gould ventures are erecting a high rise complex of five office and apartment buildings. They recently purchased a half interest in the venerable Mayflower Hotel. And they have a long lease and option to buy the Capital Garage, the city's largest at 1320 New York Avenue NW.

Meantime, they've found time to have a go at parking in the Los Angeles area (it wasn't highly successful, says Gould); run a Baltimore company manufacturing auto hose clamps; organize the Madison National Bank; set up a bank in Mrs. Gould's home area of Conway, N.H., and act as agents, through PMI, for the Kinney car rental service.

As he prospered, Nick Antonelli, portrayed by associates as the sparkplug of the partnership's drive to riches, gained a reputation as "tough," a "hard trader," "a very smart boy" and, with few exceptions, "fair."

Kingdom of Gould and Antonelli, II—Behind Pair's Present Prosperity Lies Hard Work, Good Planning

(By Dan Morgan)

(Second in a series)

Looking out the window of his office into the dark canyon of DeSales Street, Dominic F. Antonelli, Jr., can survey the scene of his humble past and his prospering present.

There, in the 1700 block of DeSales Street, he got his introduction to the parking business, as a "fender bender" parking cars on the lot beside the house where he lived.

There, 19 years ago, he leased his first lot, a tiny 12-car operation.

There, he bought his first piece of property, using borrowed funds and income from his budding parking business to make the small downpayment on a single lot.

And there, after four more purchases, he completed the land assembly for the present Parking Management, Inc. (PMI) building at No. 1725.

Today, this is Antonelli country.

Across the street from his second floor office suite is the Mayflower Hotel, in which he and his Yale-educated lawyer partner, Kingdon Gould, Jr., purchased a half interest in January.

Close by is 1140 Connecticut Avenue, where a syndicate in which Antonelli and Gould have a major interest, is erecting an office building.

At 1730 M Street is the Madison National Bank, of which Antonelli, 43, and Gould, 42, are directors and organizers, as well as controllers of the majority interest in the building itself.

At 1700 M, a syndicate they control is assembling land for another office building, and around the corner at 1101 17th Street stands a building in which they have a share.

The headquarters of Antonelli and Gould's PMI firm at 1725 DeSales Street—which operates 90 lots in Washington—includes, of course, a parking garage.

TOP OF THE ICEBERG

But parking is only the top of the iceberg in the growing Antonelli and Gould enterprises.

Back in the 1940's Nick Antonelli saw that land was the precious asset of the future in booming downtown, and he began collecting it.

As he picked up a wedge here, a little lot there, he leveled the houses and used the land for parking, while he added to his holdings.

As he did this, Antonelli was able to get financing for new properties by assigning future parking lot revenues to lending institutions, thus pyramiding his assets.

Around that time Antonelli was also plunging into the hectic taxicab business. He once operated a fleet of cabs, but now has only remote ties to the business.

And the parking fees of thousands of Washingtonians have gone to pay the mortgage or taxes on a prime piece of downtown real estate.

Once an assembly of lots was complete, Antonelli either sold his holdings as an office building site, as he did at 1701 and 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., or he formed a syndicate and developed the property himself.

Parking, say the men who know the business, leads logically into the real estate field.

"It became apparent," says Antonelli, "that if you couldn't rent properties the next best thing to do was buy them and tear them down."

Today, Antonelli and Gould own the ground under the blacktop in 20 of the 90 PMI operated lots.

F. Warren Brokaw, who sold out his partnership with Antonelli in 1957, says, "You couldn't be in parking without being in real estate."

"You get the idea (of assembling land) when you go to work in parking. It's commonsense. You don't want to go on working for somebody else," he adds.

But making the transition from parking attendant to entrepreneur wasn't easy for Antonelli.

STARTED WITH NOTHING

"Nick started with nothing. I mean nothing," says Brokaw.

At the start, Antonelli experienced the not unusual tax problems of the inexperienced businessman. Court records show Federal tax liens were filed against him twice, $900 for 1948 income taxes and $4,915.86 for 1955. "It was just one of my fights with the IRS," says Antonelli. "It was an argument and it got settled." Both liens have been released.

Ulysses G. (Blackie) Auger, a restaurateur and now an investor in several Antonelli-Gould ventures, recalls that his first connection with Antonelli was 12 to 15 years ago when he and Antonelli invested in a used car lot in Virginia.

"I had cardboard in the bottom of my shoes then," says the genial owner of Blackie's House of Beef. He and Antonelli now own joint interests in the Black Rose at 1101 17th Street, NW., and several carry-out shops.

"Money," asks Auger, in a sentence that could describe the Antonelli-Gould success, "What do I want money for? It decreases in value 2 percent a year. I want real estate."

May 31, 1949, was a milestone in Antonelli's career. He and Brokaw officially set up their first company, Federal Parking Services, precursor of the giant PMI.

TEAMED UP IN 1957

In 1957, Antonelli teamed up with Gould, great-grandson of the railroad magnate Jay Gould, and some of the pressure on Antonelli to find capital for investments was removed. Gould had capital, lots of it.

By the late 1950's, Antonelli and Gould were running seven parking firms—Auto Centers, Columbia Parking Corp., the DeSales Street Corp., Federal Parking Services, Parcar Inc., and Virginia Parking Corp. These were merged into PMI in September 1964.

Now, their land holdings have grown to at least half a million square feet in Washington, 110,000 square feet in downtown Baltimore, and half a million acres in Panama. For tax and bookkeeping reasons, the holdings aren't owned by PMI, but by Antonelli and Gould, or one of the syndicates.

KEPT ROOTS HERE

The Panama venture dates to 1956, when Gould learned that half a million acres of land were available in the coconut country of the Azuero Peninsula. They soon acquired control of the Boston & Panama Co., and with it, land thought to be worth at least $2.5 million and hardwood forests with more than a billion feet of timber.

The investment "hasn't prospered," says Antonelli.

But the Central American venture provided an entry into other operations outside the United States. Antonelli later incorporated an edible-oil plant in Panama. He once had an interest in a company dealing in Bahamian onion crops, and is now an officer of the second largest auto rental firm in Puerto Rico, Budget Rent-a-Car.

But over the years, Antonelli kept his roots in Washington.

His former partner Brokaw, who sold out in 1957 for what he says was a "sizable figure," says of the early successes:

"It wasn't just the efforts of a couple of squirts. Washington was changing. Property was beginning to move up in value and people didn't have the understanding of values."

Antonelli and Gould made the leap into the Washington financial world abruptly in 1962. One day, Louis C. Paladini, a banker, lunched with Gould and suggested that Gould and his partner help organize a bank.

Gould was enthusiastic. Within 60 days the charter application to the comptroller of the currency for the Madison National Bank was prepared. As the pressure increased to get the application in ahead of other groups the 10 Madison organizers were quickly rounded up to sign the application. Antonelli was found shaving in an office lavatory and signed these.

This move had had its advantages. The bank is now financing the undertaking of several development syndicates in which Madison Bank directors and organizer's Antonelli and Gould have a major interest.

According to Madison president Louis C. Paladini, one syndicate, Municipal Associates Ltd., which is building the new District Welfare Department high-rise office at First and E Streets NW. has a construction loan "in excess of $2 million" from the Madison.

A GAPP joint venture, another Antonelli and Gould syndicate, got a $225,000 Madison Bank first deed of trust last April to buy land in the 100 block of G Street and Massachusetts Avenue NW., Paladini said.

CHAIRMAN IS PARTNER

The Madison also made a $1.85 million loan last year to a third syndicate in which the two have an interest, 1700 M Street Associates. The loan financed grounds east of the Madison Bank building in the same block, said Paladini.

Madison Board Chairman Charles E. Smith, the builder, is also a partner in the latter venture.

What is this empire worth? Probably at least $25 million, says a colleague. But Antonelli worries. PMI, says he, has run a deficit at times, because of rising real estate tax assessments, which he blames for stiffer parking rates.

Several years ago, he said, he wrote to the House District Committee complaining that assessments on downtown property had doubled or tripled.

That is only one example of the smoldering war that Antonelli and Gould have fought with the District government.

They view the city's plans for municipal garages, for highways through the city, for Federal renewal, as a threat. These programs take land off the private land market—land they dearly want.

STILL WORK AS DAY ENDS

In a long interview he willingly gave recently, Antonelli warned that "condemnation laws are going to put the merchants of this town out of business." He didn't add that his own land buying operations displace people and businesses, too.

The day darkens in the DeSales Street canyon, but Nick Antonelli still has work to do.

Restlessly, he gets up, leaves the office with the sign behind the desk, "Rifletette," (think in Italian) and enters the office of his partner, Kingdon Gould.

He thrusts a paper on Gould's desk,

"Sign this."

"What is it?"

"A note for $85,000."

Gould signs without reading the document further. Antonelli is that kind of businessman.

KINGDOM OF GOULD AND ANTONELLI, III—TWO HAVE OWN CITY MASTER PLAN

(By Dan Morgan)

(Third of a series)

Washington's planners still don't have a master plan for the city. But Dominic F. Antonelli, Jr. and Kingdon Gould, Jr., do.

There's nothing in it about municipal parking garages, Federal urban renewal or "public and private cooperation."

It's based on plain old American business sense and their balance books.

That may not sit too well with Washington's planners, but, unlike the planners, Antonelli and Gould know what they want and how to get it.

These two young capitalists, who run the city's biggest parking firm, Parking Management, Inc., don't have a master plan as such, of course. But the real estate syndicates in which they have a major share give an inkling of their blueprint for the future.

Only last week, Antonelli asked the District government to donate 1,500 square feet of unused public property valued at $90,000 to One DuPont Circle, a syndicate in which he has an interest. The gift would almost round out a land package put together by Antonelli at P Street, 20th Street, New Hampshire Avenue and the circle.

Meantime, he and Gould's Municipal Associates are building a high-rise office facility for the District Welfare Department at First and E Streets NW., under a unique contract. The city, for the first time, negotiated with private developers to build a structure for future leasing by the city.

But some of the biggest Antonelli-Gould ventures are still in the planning stage.

For instance, their Capital G venture was set up "to construct one or more buildings" in the vicinity of the Capital Garage at 1320 New York Avenue NW. It recently got a $190,000-mortgage loan to buy 1334 New York Avenue from the trustees of the Bricklayers, Masons & Plasterers International Union.

Another of their syndicates, Providence Associates, which controls the block-sized old Providence Hospital site on Capitol Hill, is eager to build an eight-story apartment hotel there if the city will change the zoning to permit it.

And their CAG Medical Center Associates has a 99-year lease from a syndicate of doctors for land in the block bounded by 18th, 19th, H, and I Streets NW. Eventually CAG hopes to use the property for an office or medical facility.

Another 99-year lease is the basis for a planned development on the southwest corner of 11th and G Streets NW. McLachlen Banking Corp. gave the lease to MCL Associates, in which Antonelli and Gould are partners along with McLachlen Bank Director and Parking Executive Leonard B. (Bud) Doggett, Jr.

These development plans are going to take financing, lots of it. But the credit of Antonelli and Gould is good, say business experts who should know.

ESTEEMED PARTNERS

Most of their holdings, both men emphasize, are heavily mortgaged. They've had to be, to free working capital for new ventures. But financial observers in the Capital don't see their assets as a mere paper empire. One reason is that their syndicates include some of the most esteemed businessmen, speculators, and financiers in town, a group that is a closely knit establishment of its own, little known but powerful.

Among the Antonelli-Gould partners in one or more enterprises are:

Jack I. Bender, president of Blake Construction Co., the Nation's 33d largest.

Charles E. Smith, Washington builder and chairman of the board of Madison National Bank, which Antonelli and Gould helped organize (Bender is vice chairman).

Irvin and Israel Feld, the music store owners and entertainment promoters who operate the Carter-Barron Amphitheater.

William Cohen, another self-made man who worked his way up from trash company president to bigtime real estate investor. He leases the Statler-Hilton garage to P.M.I. for $200,000 a year.

Ulysses G. (Blackie) Auger, the restaurateur.

Other lesser known partners include Angelo A. Puglisi, a longtime friend of Antonelli's; John W. Lyon, P.M.I. treasurer and president of the Washington Parking Association; and Werner G. Puppa, a retired employee of the General Services Administration, the Government's land buying agency.

Puppa's Government Enterprises, Inc., now dissolved, sold Foggy Bottom property to Antonelli and Gould. He now owns a small share in several syndicates of the two partners.

Though these ventures aren't invariably controlled by the partners, Antonelli has usually assembled the property. According to one person familiar with the land market, the intelligence systems of the big operators are such that "they know a piece is for sale before the owner does."

The astuteness of the Antonelli-Gould investments can also be judged by the list of highly placed men who have invested in the same enterprises, independently from the two parking men.

For instance, Antonelli made a small investment in Duke Associates, the real estate syndicate that developed Orleans Village, a 440-unit garden apartment complex at Duke Street and Southerland Avenue in Alexandria.

The syndicate lists these publicly prominent persons among its 40 limited partners:

Mrs. Abraham A. Ribicoff (wife of the Connecticut Senator)—2.14 percent ownership, held in trust by Hartford lawyer and former RIBICOFF partner, David Kotkin.

Chief Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals here—7 percent.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice and Mrs. Abe Fortas—3 percent.

Former Internal Revenue Service Director and Mrs. Mortimer Caplin—3 percent.

Judge Simon E. Sobeloff of the U.S. court of appeals for the fourth circuit—less than 1½ percent.

All were brought in as partners by Builder Charles E. Smith, who is a limited partner himself and whose son, Robert, is one of three general partners, a spokesman for the Smith companies said. The Smith firms built the apartments. They also manage the PMI headquarters building at 1725 DeSales Street NW.

Judge Bazelon also is a limited partner in Downtown Associates, of which Antonelli and Gould have about a third interest. Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr., of the court of general sessions, has a limited partnership as well. The associates own the office building at 1201 E Street NW. Both judges said their investments stemmed from friendships with Charles Smith.

Senator RIBICOFF said he met Smith because of the builder's philanthropic and fundraising activities.

"He told me from time to time of real estate investments I might be interested in for my family," the Connecticut Democrat said. "He has always had very clean real estate to offer with no conflict of interest. I'm a very small part of the total picture."

In this area of real estate boom, it sometimes seems that everybody, in fact, is getting into the land market, including men usually associated with the parking field.

Doggett, for instance, is a partner with Antonelli and Gould in the 11th and G Street venture.

And William G. Barr, registered lobbyist for the National Parking Association and outspoken critic of Federal urban renewal, is a partner with Antonelli in a local real estate venture as well as a car rental business in Puerto Rico.

Reversing the pattern, Bender, the Blake Construction Co. president and investor, owns an interest in a parking firm—Redneb (Bender spell backward).

In fact, the old-fashioned parking man, who stuck to parking cars and nothing else, is fast becoming outdated.

And with established parking men controlling large amounts of land, it's getting harder for small, competitive operators to break into the parking field.

A former official who has watched the parking industry closely over the years doubts "if it would be possible to break into the business today," so tightly is it controlled by large operators who combine land development with parking.

SOME ADVANTAGES

Meanwhile, the parking men have some potent advantages working for them when they step into real estate.

By strange tax twists, Federal and local governments have been allies—not enemies as is so often claimed—in their quest for riches.

Federal tax laws can work in their favor, especially when the parking men have the know-how: A year ago, PMI hired a young Harvard-educated attorney, Mitchell Blankstein, from the office of the Internal Revenue Service's Chief Counsel and put him to work in a back office.

"There's plenty for him to do," said Gould recently on a tour of PMI headquarters.

A parking man who uses the land he acquires for parking while he's accumulating more can claim that storing cars is his business or trade. So, if he decides to sell his holdings the IRS is likely to let him pay the 25 percent capital gains tax on the profit, instead of the much larger straight income tax paid by land dealers.

Under some circumstances, he can take some tax loss on buildings he tears down on land he later uses for a parking lot. And if the Government condemns his land, it lets him pump the profits back into the cost of a new lot and postpone paying any tax.

TRICKS OF THE TRADE

A good tax lawyer can also minimize his client's tax bite by dexterous use of transfers, long-term leases and other devices.

Take the Capital Garage, the city's largest at 1320 New York Avenue NW. Two years ago, National Mortgage Corp., a first and second-trust firm of which Gould's brother-in-law, Martin, was a director, deeded it to "Antonelli and others" trading as the Capital G syndicate.

Simultaneously, Capital G deeded the building to Harry P. Zitelman, one time chairman of the Committee for the Rights of the Washington Business Community, an enemy of downtown urban renewal.

By taking back a long-term lease, Capital G saved the fat downpayment that would have been required if it had held onto the building.

Capital G then subleased to PMI, enabling the parking firm to deduct the rent as a business expense.

The land under the garage, which can't be depreciated for tax purposes, was sold to Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Add to those advantages the soaring price of downtown real estate and the developers have a good thing going.

KINGDOM OF GOULD AND ANTONELLI, IV—NEW-STYLE BLOCKBUSTING BREAKS UP CITY'S OLDER AREAS INTO PARKING LOTS

(By Dan Morgan)

(Fourth of a series)

Along the edge of Washington's downtown, a different kind of "blockbusting" is breaking up the old residential areas.

It's perfectly legitimate. And it has nothing to do with the more familiar variety, in which unscrupulous real estate men sell homes to Negroes in white neghborhoods to create a carefully planned panic.

It involves the busting up of blocks of housing for parking lots.

After the first parking lot appears, the chain of events is predictable.

Residents find the new neighbor unpleasant. It causes noise. People gather on the lot when the attendant goes home. Heating bills rise in winter in adjacent row houses, whose sides suddenly have been laid bare to the cold. Land developers offer residents handsome prices for their property, in hopes of extending holdings. The stepped-up buying activity in the area catches the tax assessor's eye, and real estate taxes, to conform with rising sale prices, rise—an added inducement to residents to sell out.

Lot by lot, houses are purchased, razed and the land blacktopped, in a chain reaction.

Finally, as downtown's growth overtakes the once-residential street, and the zoning is changed, the lot is sold to a development syndicate and a tall building sprouts on the site.

Over the years, the technique has been skillfully used by Kingdon Gould, Jr., and Dominic F. Antonelli, Jr., whose appetite for Washington land has enabled them to collect hundreds of thousands of square feet while also running Parking Management, Inc., the biggest parking firm in town.

Antonelli himself, whose tough business side, friends say, conceals a genuine desire to help people who've come on misfortune, has little stomach for the business of throwing people out of their houses. He has personally sought new quarters for some.

But the new "blockbusting" is just good business.

Land in the center of town is more expensive and harder to put together in big chunks than in adjacent residential neighborhoods. And there's always the developer's hope that officials will agree to earmark the outlying land for commercial or high-rise use, automatically raising its value.

If they don't, a parking lot will pay most of the taxes, rent or mortgage on the holdings until the city grows more sympathetic.

The problem, as some District officials see it, is that all this amounts to a sort of unilateral city planning by the powerful parking and real estate men, who often are one and the same.

SIGN OF VIGOR

Take the south side of G Street, between 18th and 19th Streets NW. In 1958, that strip was zoned for residential use. The next year, the zoners approved medium commercial zoning. In 1962 the heavy commercial designation was sought and approved and a building housing the Madison National Bank rose from the site.

The trend is a sign of Washington's economic vigor, of unproductive uses being unsentimentally ripped out to make way for the expanding needs of the growing downtown.

But it poses these ticklish problems to city officials, who haven't begun to face the consequences of the trend.

This type of "blockbusting" is fast depleting the already low housing supply of the city.

The lots springing up along the edge of downtown are far from the retail area east of 15th Street and south of Massachusetts Avenue, where parking needs of tourists, shoppers, commuters and Government workers are greatest.

The developers are putting relentless pressure on the District Building to lower the zoning barriers to major developments far from downtown's center.

Some fear that unless officials can hold the line the retail area will be left stranded, as the latter-day homesteaders stake out claims in peripheral areas.

A year ago, Antonelli and Gould began urging the District Zoning Commission to place a high-rise designation on the old Providence Hospital site, owned by one of their syndicates, on Capitol Hill.

PARKING LOT ALLOWANCE

Their plan had the special backing of Representative Alvin E. O'Konski, Republican, of Wisconsin.

But the Commission refused to grant the spot zoning. So, the owners did the next best thing. They asked for a parking lot allowance—required in any residential zone.

Residents howled in protest. Their protests were rejected. Officials of the Board of Zoning Adjustment said afterward it seemed the parking was being sought to provide the owners temporary income while they waited for the zoning men to become more understanding.

The special allowance for parking lots in residential areas was never meant to hand developers a way of waiting out the Zoning Commission.

In fact, the Board of Zoning Adjustment has been casting a skeptical eye on recent applications. It also turned down an Antonelli request for parking on several lots in the 2100 block of O Street for similar reasons.

LAND ACQUISITION

Still, the effects of the District building's easygoing past policy on allowing the lots can be seen readily in numerous residential areas.

Square 120, as the property books describe it, provides an example of what happens when parking lots are allowed haphazardly.

The block, bounded by G, H, 19th, and 20th Streets NW., is a land acquisition target for Antonelli and Gould.

A decade ago, it was lined on all four sides by owner-occupied row houses and neatly kept rooming houses.

Today, a blacktopped parking lot for 322 cars covers large parts of it. On 19th Street, No. 710 stands surrounded by cars on three sides, like a lighthouse in an ocean. Row houses along G and H Streets have been leveled at intervals, leaving gaping holes.

The block is zoned for residential use. Yet, zoning records indicate, the Board of Zoning Adjustment has granted every request for parking in the square since 1959, when Antonelli began buying properties there.

Parking is certainly needed in the area. Across 19th Street stands the towering International Monetary Fund Building, banks, Government offices, and hotels.

Yet the Board's action has left the block good for little else but piddling amounts of parking.

While Antonelli has been tearing down houses (most recently at 1914 H Street) George Washington University has been busily restoring them. A hotel, church, apartment house, and college office occupy the four corners, making it unlikely that a major land assembly can be put together there.

Antonelli despairs at the residential designation and claims the District Building has given the university "special treatment" in not granting top densities next to the campus.

HANDFUL OF RESIDENTS

Meantime, a handful of residents, too late it seems, have become concerned at what has happened to the block.

A group recently trooped to the District Building to protest extension of the main lot to the freshly cleared land at 1914 H Street.

One of them, B'nai B'rith public relations man James R. Black, charged that Antonelli and PMI had "exploited" the block and destroyed good housing on the assumption parking would later be allowed by the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

Such an assumption would hardly be surprising in light of past actions by the Board.

Responding to Black's statement, Board Chairman Samuel Scrivener questioned that a vacant lot would be preferable to a parking lot.

As general counsel for Perpetual Building Association and trustee for hundreds of mortgage loans—including some in square 120—Scrivener is well aware of the feverish activity occurring on the edge of downtown.

But few officials seem to have a tough policy in mind to halt the widespread razing of houses.

CLOSE LOOK AT REQUESTS

An exception is Arthur Hatton, planning director for the Zoning Commission:

"Many of these areas are going to have to be cleared eventually. Much of the housing is substandard. But we're going to have to look more closely at these requests when it appears that temporary lots are being used to eventually get around the zoning."

"I don't think there's anything we can do to prevent people from tearing down housing. But it might be that if they didn't think they were going to be allowed parking, they would leave housing standing and get rental income," says Hatton.

At the same time, land economics, not parking need, often determines where the parking goes.

"You have people with no concern for traffic movement deciding where the parking will be," says Paul D. Spreiregen, head of urban design projects for the American Institute of Architects.

Lot sizes, likewise, aren't being determined by how much traffic the feeder street can handle, but by the size of the developer's holdings, he adds.

A commuter who parks regularly in square 120's lot says congestion on 20th Street results from cars waiting to enter the lot.

Spreiregen favors a drastic solution to all this, one that gives the shivers to the private parking industry: governmental control over all aspects of parking, from rates to the location of lots and garages.

"These people are thriving off a shortage," says Spreiregen. "This is where free enterprise is hurting free enterprise."

Antonelli answers this charge: "Our lots are where the parking is needed—otherwise we wouldn't have any customers."

Kingdom of Gould and Antonelli, V—Hard-Driving Pair Uses Legal Action, Cash, Persuasion To Advance Plans

(By Dan Morgan)

(Fifth in a series)

In the free-wheeling era of railroad magnate Jay Gould, the barons of capitalism had little trouble bending government to their will.

When Gould needed legislative help for his Erie Railroad, he simply named as a director New York Political Boss Bill Tweed.

Today's hard-driving capitalists, epitomized by men like Jay's great-grandson, Kingdon Gould, Jr., and his partner, Dominic F. Antonelli, Jr., shun the crude, sometimes downright illegal tactics of the spoilsmen era.

But they skillfully use money, persuasion, high pressure, and legal action when Government's plans threaten their own.

That happens fairly often in the growing empire of the partners, who own vast real estate holdings here and else while running Parking Management, Inc., whose elliptical "PMI" signs proclaim the city's largest parking firm.

Municipal parking garages, Federal renewal, and freeways are distasteful to the big developers. All take land off the private market.

In the winter, 1965, issue of Parking magazine, Antonelli tersely summed up his highest hopes for the National Parking Association, of which he is treasurer.

"To effect the best public relations possible with the general public and lawmaking * * * and to fight the threat of municipal parking in every city in the land."

In an interview, he was more blunt about his feelings toward Government and officials:

"They've made a mess of everything they've been involved in. I learned one thing early; don't trust Government officials."

But NPA "clout" apparently has its limits. In 1964, Antonelli and Gould found it necessary to hire the Dallas law firm of Phinney, Hallman & Pulley to lobby against downtown urban renewal and unsuccessfully for termination of the Columbia Plaza renewal project.

House records indicate that Antonelli and fellow parking executive, Leonard B. (Bud) Doggett, contributed $100 each to the 1964 campaign war chest of the man who sponsored the bill to end the Plaza development, Representative Frank Horton, Republican, of New York.

The same year, the records indicate, Antonelli contributed $300 to the campaign of another Republican, Joel T. Broyhill, of Virginia, who 2 years earlier had teamed with Representative John L. McMillan, Democrat, of South Carolina, to strip the District Motor Vehicle Parking Agency of funds that might have gone to build municipal parking garages.

(McMillan listed no campaign donations.)

Antonelli is disarmingly frank about his willingness to contribute to politicians "who think along the same lines I do."

But he says influence on the city's law-shaping body, the arch-conservative House District Committee, has been exaggerated.

Even so, they've shown an ability to find the weak spots in Washington's impotent city government—prey as it is to the whims of the Congressmen on the Hill—and to harass local bureaucrats to a frazzle.

Consider a fuss that developed over the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project. During a 2-year dispute with the local government Antonelli and Gould interests were skillfully able to use sentiment on the Hill against urban renewal to gain a platform for their own position.

In 1962 Antonelli who had been acquiring property in Foggy Bottom since 1946, sold his holdings to the Redevelopment Land Agency at a profit.

However, he soon complained that he'd been bilked into taking a minor share of the Columbia Plaza Corp., which was named to redevelop the low-lying land south of Virginia Avenue and west of 23d Street.

He and his partners retained a 26-percent interest in the corporation (31 percent if the 5-percent interest of Gould's brother-in-law, Gay Martin, is considered). Antonelli contended that as a former holder of a majority of the property in the project area he and his partner deserved more.

In early 1963 Representative John J. Dowdy, Democrat, of Texas, of the House District Committee, a strong foe of Federal urban renewal, decided a congressional investigation was in order.

The investigation proved more than a little unpleasant for local officialdom. The District Engineer Commission and the RLA came under fire for setting the resale price to the redevelopment corporation too low. Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner conceded that the whole project might have been a mistake. And one property owner charged that the District government and property holders had "qualified" the area for renewal by letting the buildings deteriorate.

In late 1963 Antonelli extended a carrot to RLA. He suggested that a solution to the mixup might be a stock transfer giving half of the Columbia Plaza Corp. to him and his partner and half to Bake Construction Co., headed by his business associate, Jack I. Bender.

When RLA turned down that idea, Antonelli reverted to the stick. He filed suit against RLA in district court in 1964, seeking to have his former holdings reconveyed to him. The suit was dismissed in January of this year.

The dogfight went up the Hill and down again, with several repercussions.

During the course of it, two RLA directors quit or were fired. And Washington's must downtown urban renewal bill became linked with the Horton-sponsored measure to end the plaza project.

As the 1963 session came to a close, House District Committee Chairman McMillan refused to call up downtown renewal for a floor vote, after the Columbia Plaza bill was blocked. Downtown renewal for the Nation's Capital wasn't approved for another year, when it was tacked on to the 1965 Housing Act.

Looking back on the Columbia Plaza affair, one RLA official feels Antonelli and Gould had some legitimate grievances, but hurt their cause by fanning the fires to keep the issue hot when it became obvious the project was going ahead.

For his part, Gould, a scholarly looking Yale-educated lawyer, finds criticism puzzling.

Says Gould, "I know parking seems to some people like a crummy business. But it's a little funny for us to be criticized for footdragging. I think we've been creative. Nick has developed useful properties; he's sent parking attendants to school and helped people."

On the other hand, Senator Joseph D. Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, who has introduced a bill in the Senate to give the District Commissioners power to condemn land for municipal garages, blames the parking men "for blocking every effort by the Government to meet the parking needs of the city."

Certainly, the parking and real estate men pack a powerful one-two punch on the Washington Board of Trade. And the Board's desires traditionally have received sympathetic attention from the House District Committee.

Just how close they come to controlling the Board was demonstrated in January when 41 of the Board's directors voted 21 to 20 in favor of a parking bill along the lines of the one proposed by Tydings.

Only after a feverish month of phone calls and meetings in Washington's executive suites could the liberals muster the votes for their narrow victory. The issue itself took a year to reach the floor.

The makeup of the Board gives a hint why.

First vice president is Doggett, who's also a member of the National Parking Association's "government encroachment committee."

Next comes second vice president William Calomiris, well-known real estate and investment man.

Also on the Board is real estate man Donald C. Rosinski, a speaker at the 1961 NPA convention and a man with close ties to the private parking industry. He chairs the Board's community planning committee, which has urged lengthy delays in downtown renewal. Antonelli is a new member of the committee. Rosinski is a fellow director, with Doggett, of the McLachlen Banking Corp.

It was Rosinski's visit to Engineer Commissioner Charles M. Duke's office last fall that preceded General Duke's announced plan to delete eminent domain from the parking bill then being drafted.

General Duke later retracted the announcement, but the sequence of events led certain businessmen on the Board of Trade to suspect they were about to be the victims of a humiliating power play.

"We were just getting tired of being stomped on," said one, who later voted for a strong parking bill.

His concern was later summed up in testimony before Senator Tydings' committee by Llewellyn Jennings, board chairman of the Federal City Council.

"It is my belief that the great void in Washington's parking picture goes much deeper than the common complaint that there is not enough parking. The great void is in lack of planned parking," said he.

Kingdom of Gould and Antonelli, VI—City's Disappearing Parking Lots Is Key Issue in Legislative Hassle

(By Dan Morgan)

(Last in a series)

Washington's parking lots have a funny way of disappearing.

For 2, 3, or even 10 years you can drive in from the surburbs and park on one of them. Then one day the bulldozers are scooping out the ground where you had berthed your car. Within 6 months an office building occupies the site.

Perhaps it has a garage, in which case most of the spaces may be used by the workers drawn to the new building; or perhaps there is no garage.

Since 1959, 52 commercial, government, or private lots have disappeared this way. Some of them have been owned by Dominic F. Antonelli, Jr., and Kingdon Gould, Jr., whose farflung parking and land investments are the subject of this series.

Why is the disappearance of lots important? Because one key to the success or failure of vital Washington programs like downtown urban renewal and a subway system lies in the kind of parking legislation, if any, forthcoming from Capitol Hill.

Congress can pass controls over parking rates, and so give the city a way to discourage hordes of commuters from driving into town. High all-day rates can spur commuters to use mass transit while low short-time ones lure housewives from suburban shopping centers.

Or Congress can do nothing and watch as growing numbers of commuters clog the freeways into town and acre after acre of city land is cleared and cemented over for roads.

It can give the District Commissioners the means to condemn land for municipal garages, and so bolster the city's revitalized shopping area with ample parking at strategic locations.

Or it can do nothing, and leave the merchants and their shops to fight the downhill battle with parking lot-circled suburban shopping centers.

Parking, in brief, can go a long way in settling the battle of suburbs and city.

If Congress keeps hands off, the outward spread of blacktop parking lots into cheaper priced residential areas is going to continue—gobbling up land, destroying houses, increasing the housing shortage, and pushing more people into the suburbs.

Perhaps, as some experts have seriously suggested, Washington and other cities should give up on efforts to make the metropolis a place in which to live and shop. In that case, it should be left to the big developers, to become the daytime office of the future metropolitan area, closing down at night.

But that was not the kind of city Congress had in mind when it passed the downtown urban renewal bill, the subway bill, and the 1965 housing bill. And it certainly was not the kind of Washington that President Johnson had in mind when he announced his model cities plan.

Some might think the choice on parking is simple. It is not. Not even Washington's business community can agree on what has to be done. Only by the margin of 21 to 20 did the Washington Board of Trade vote to back a strong parking bill with condemnation powers for municipal garages.

Now the fight is in the hands of Senator Joseph D. Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, and Representative B. F. Sisk, Democrat, of California, who are sponsoring the legislation in Congress.

The views of the pro-municipal parking group was summed up in January before the Tydings subcommittee of Lewellyn Jennings, chairman of the Federal City Council. The council is made up of businessmen who think innovation is needed downtown, and quickly.

Jennings was calling a spade a spade. He said:

"The temporary lots are an interim public service that is only incidental to an ultimate land use providing greater financial rewards."

THE PROBLEM

"They are real estate investments," he went on. "I have no quarrel with the use of land in this way, but it goes without saying that it is not conducive to a solution of our business area parking problem."

What problem?

Since 1959, according to William D. Heath, of the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency, 99 new buildings have been completed or started in the big area east of 22d Street, west of North Capitol Street and south of Massachusetts Avenue.

Eighty-two provide parking, for a total of 10,806 spaces. But the new buildings wiped out 6,363 offstreet parking spaces, reducing the gain to 4,443. Estimates are that the buildings will draw 47,000 workers and less than 10 percent of them will have a place to park in the new structure.

In the retail area east of 15th Street, which attracts the largest numbers of tourists and shoppers, the picture is bleak. Buildings completed or underway knocked out 1,239 spaces and provided only 1,288 new ones—a gain of 49. The new offices are expected to house 9,067 workers.

Nine of the new buildings in the central business district have been completed in whole or in part, by Antonelli and Gould. Seven have built-in garages, five run by their firm, Parking Management, Inc.

The buildings house workers in modern, pleasant facilities.

The parking they provide sometimes is right where it is needed. But, say the planners, adequate car storage is too vital to the city's long-range future to be left to economic accident, and to the men motivated mainly by profit.

Antonelli and Gould portray themselves as underdogs in the fight they have waged with Government on their way to riches.

Yet they have some big cards in their hands, too. Not the least is their wealth, itself, a factor which apparently has intimidated local officialdom more than a little.

On February 18, 1963, for instance, the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment authorized a PMI lot at 800 to 814 25th Street NW.—provided the lot be paved. Since then, the Foggy Bottom Association has contacted Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, the Zoning Board and Corporation Counsel to make the operators pave the lot—all with no results. At the same time the parking permit has expired and has not been renewed. And cars continue to park there.

Meanwhile, a bank they helped organize makes big loans to their development syndicates, and the Government they so often chastise leases space in their buildings. (The local Internal Revenue Service office, for instance, is located at 1201 E Street NW., a building in which the partners have a one-third interest.)

Their contacts extend all the way to Capitol Hill, and some say are far better than those of District government officials.

They have used their influence to fight Federal renewal projects, freeways, and municipal parking garages.

BALTIMORE OPERATION

Other cities, including neighboring Baltimore and far-off Los Angeles, have strong municipal parking garages that operate side by side with the private parking industry.

Ironically, PMI itself operates six lots and two garages in Baltimore.

"Parking in the City Center," a general study by Wilbur Smith and Associates of New Haven, concluded last year that "where municipal parking needs cannot be met effectively in full by private enterprise, municipal agencies concerned with the welfare of downtown may be justified in assuming the role of parking developer."

Ironically, that document is dispensed by the Washington headquarters of the National Parking Association, of which Antonelli, an outspoken foe of Government interference, is treasurer.

"Governmental agencies," the study noted, "participate in virtually every aspect of urban transportation."

Yet in the Nation's Capital, the local government has no tools to participate in planning what now is recognized as part of the transportation program—where to put the vehicles. It has no master plan for parking, no control over rates and no municipal garages.

POSITION STATEMENT

In a statement of position in December, the Federal City Council said:

"Parking is an element of the transportation system.

"The storage of vehicles is as much the public's business as the movement of them.

"Parking facilities should be developed in accordance with an overall plan.

"Legislation permitting the use of eminent domain is essential to enable the District of Columbia to plan and execute a parking program."

Whether the men on Capitol Hill heed this statement, or the parking executives and land developers, is now to be decided.

AID ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD OF POPULATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is most encouraging to learn that the U.S. Agency for International Development is stepping up its activities in the field of population. A recent position paper prepared by AID stresses that "the U.S. Government shares the serious worldwide concern over the social and economic implications of rapid population growth rates in many countries."

To assist the developing countries in meeting this challenge, AID will, in effect, be doubling the funds committed to population programs from $2 million in fiscal year 1965 to $5½ million in fiscal year 1966 to a possible $10 million in fiscal year 1967.

Mr. President, I am very pleased at AID's increased commitment in this important field. Economic development and prosperity and a significant betterment in the lives of individuals are not possible in many of the nations of the world unless population problems are appreciated and dealt with on a realistic and acceptable basis. I congratulate AID for its expanding program in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a story from the Washington Post, dated March 5, 1966, reporting the planned increase in AID supported population control programs, and a recent summary of AID activities in the field of population.

There being no objection, the article and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 5, 1966]

UNITED STATES TO DOUBLE AID FOR BIRTH CONTROL PROGRAMS ABROAD

The United States will double its support of birth-control programs overseas next year under plans of the Agency for International Development.

The Agency foresees an outlay of $10 million in foreign-aid funds in the years starting July 1 to handle requests from foreign countries for assistance on family-planning programs.

And that figure "can reasonably be expected to double again" within the next few years, AID said in a population memo prepared for the House Appropriations Committee.

In the current fiscal year, the Agency is spending $5.5 million—up sharply from the $2 million of fiscal 1965—for population assistance overseas.

Requests for family-planning assistance have come from several foreign governments, the Agency noted. The memo for the congressional committee listed these:

South Korea and Taiwan are drawing local-currency counterpart funds to support health and family-planning clinics.

Turkey is seeking a loan to purchase vehicles to transport family-planning workers and educational materials over the countryside and to continue the services of population experts.

Honduras has requested aid for training and educational materials and to help establish birth-control services in rural health centers.

Pakistan and Tunisia have asked for technical assistance, vehicles, and educational aids for family-planning programs. India is discussing similar assistance with AID officials.

To date, AID technical assistance to foreign countries has gone to improving maternal and child health services, population surveys, census refinement, and research into population problems in the developing countries.

To get AID's help on population problems, a country must initiate the request, have its own family-planning program, and allow freedom of choice. AID does not provide contraceptives or equipment for their manufacture.

The Agency also is supporting research and training programs at American universities and institutions.

Among these are the University of Pittsburgh, developing an economic model to estimate costs of family-planning programs; University of Notre Dame, studies on changes in family patterns under urbanization; Population Council, fertility studies and surveys; Census Bureau, population projections; Columbia Institute for Social Development, audiovisual techniques for public education programs, and the International Federation of Institutes for Social and Socio-Economic Research, Latin American population studies.

AID ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD OF POPULATION

DEALING WITH POPULATION PROBLEMS

The U.S. Government shares the serious worldwide concern over the social and economic implications of rapid population growth rates in many countries.

Considerable AID technical assistance has already gone to improving maternal and child health, to demographic studies and surveys, census refinement and research into population problems in the developing countries. Since President Johnson determined, early in 1965, to "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion of world population and the growing scarcity of world resources," AID has begun to respond to requests from governments for direct assistance to family planning programs:

South Korea and the Republic of China on Taiwan are already drawing local currency funds to support health and family planning clinics.

Turkey is seeking a loan to purchase transport vehicles for family planning workers and their educational materials, in addition to continuing the services of a demographer.

Honduras seeks training, education materials, and help with the cost of establishing family planning services in rural health centers.

From Pakistan and Tunisia have come requests for a wide range of technical assistance, transport vehicles, education aids and training in support of family planning programs. India is discussing similar assistance with AID officials.

To get AID's help, the developing nation must have its own family planning program. That program must allow freedom of choice to each family. AID will not provide contraceptives or equipment for their manufacture.

To evaluate the requests, individuals in every AID mission were designated to be responsible for population matters. The Population Branch of the Technical Cooperation Staff and the Population Division in AID's Latin American Bureau follow program developments and work with international organizations, American public and private groups, universities and other institutions engaged in population work.

AID supports research and training programs at the following universities and institutions:

University of Pittsburgh—developing an economic model for estimating costs of family planning programs.

University of Notre Dame—studies on changes in traditional family patterns due to modernization and urbanization.

Bureau of the Census—population projections in selected countries.

Population Council—fertility studies and surveys.

Columbia Institute for Social Development—audio-visual techniques for public education programs.

International Federation of Institutes for Social and Socio-Economic Research—Latin American population studies.

AID has also signed contracts with the University of North Carolina and Johns Hopkins to develop training programs in family planning for doctors and public health workers. Related programs are being developed for nurses and midwives in the Children's Bureau; for statisticians in the National Center for Health Statistics; and for census and survey specialists in the Census Bureau. The PAHO gets AID's help to establish and improve demographic training in Latin American medical and public health schools. So do the Latin American Center for Demography and Statistical Studies in Chile, the National Center for Studies of Population and Development in Peru, and the Central American Demographic Studies Unit in Guatemala.

AID's investment to date: $2 million in fiscal year 1965, $5½ million in fiscal year 1966, with prospects of expanding assistance levels to $10 million in fiscal year 1967. That figure can reasonably be expected to double again in the years immediately thereafter.

We recognize the growing seriousness of the imbalance between food and people. The problems impede social and economic development, threaten the health and well-being of many, and will jeopardize man's long search for peace. But these problems are not solved quickly or easily.

More research is required on the relationship between population growth and economic development, on changes in traditional family patterns, and on methods of evaluating the effectiveness of family planning programs.

Training facilities must be expanded here and abroad.

Finally, AID will need to put more advisers in the field to meet a rapid increase in requests for assistance to national family planning programs.

THE GREATER PORTLAND COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OPPOSES DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Greater Portland Council of Churches in Oregon has studied the proposed constitutional amendment to dilute the Supreme Court's reapportionment decisions. Based upon its study, its board of directors has unanimously approved a thoughtful statement which declares theological reasons for support of the concept of substantial equality of population.

Many of us who have fought against the Dirksen amendment believe that the reapportionment decisions, like the equal protection clause of the Constitution upon which they are based, ultimately rest upon the moral principle that each man is created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights. Among these is the right of political equality. We are therefore gratified to have the support not only of the National Council of Churches of Christ but now of the Greater Portland Council of Churches. I ask unanimous consent that their statement on equal representation be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Statement on Equal Representation

RESOLUTION

"*Be it resolved,* That the Greater Portland Council of Churches opposes any and all efforts to change or dilute the 'one man, one vote' ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court."

BACKGROUND OF THE ISSUE

In the past decades many State legislatures have refused to reapportion their representation in view of shifting population trends, so that the votes of all citizens would be substantially equal in effect.

In 1964 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that both houses of a bicameral legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population. The decision enunciated the "one man, one vote" concept. Justice Black, in the majority opinion in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders* wrote, "We hold that, construed in its historical context, the command of (the Constitution) that representatives be chosen by the people of the several States means that as nearly as is practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's."

During the past session of the Congress efforts have been made to change or dilute the impact of the U.S. Supreme Court "one man, one vote" ruling. It is apparent that these efforts will be intensified during the 2d session of the 89th Congress by attempts to amend the U.S. Constitution in such a way that the membership of one house of a bicameral legislature may be determined by factors other than population (e.g., geographical). The move would also withdraw the issue from the jurisdiction of the courts, thus depriving the citizenry of the right to appeal to the courts for redress in the event that the legislature fails or refuses to reapportion the electorate on the basis of population.

POSITION OF THE COUNCIL

We believe that the "one man, one vote" concept proceeds from sound moral and theological premises, and that efforts to restrict the application of the concept are not in keeping with our concern for social justice and the advancement of human rights as expressed in many previous statements.

1. A MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION

Our concern for this issue is prompted, in the first place, by our recognition of the fact that members of the churches in the cities and suburbs, on the farms and in the small towns, are caught up in the tensions which have been heightened by the recent actions of the Court and the Congress. Following their Lord, through whom God reconciled the world to Himself, the faithful are charged to be "agents of reconciliation" who seek to bring reconciliation and peace to this situation of strife and alienation.

2. THE NATURE OF MAN

We believe, furthermore, that the concept of "one man, one vote" is consistent with the Christian understanding of the nature of man, and supports the dignity of man as responsible creatures of God. We concur with the statements of the National Council of Churches of Christ, which affirms: "When the founders of our Nation declared, 'All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights,' they perceived and expressed a profound truth about the nature of man, which earlier generations had not had the social experience or political opportunity to discover. In the Christian view man is a child of God who is loved by his Heavenly Father, and who is called to love his brother as a member of God's family. As such he is also a son of God who is of infinite value in God's sight and who, in obedient response to His will, values all other human beings as sons of God with the dignity and the freedom of action of such sonship." (A policy statement of the NCCC, U.S.A., "Equal Representation Is a Right of Citizenship." Adopted by the general board, June 3, 1965.)

Thus we do not discover in the nature of men as creatures of God any distinction of kind such that one man should cast a vote worth more than another's. No criteria of race or religious preference, of wealth, property or education, of residence or appeal to State's rights may be advanced to support the claim of any man or group of men to a disproportionate share in the basic franchise by which their civic affairs are governed.

3. CONCERN FOR JUSTICE

As the faithful respond to the love of God in Christ they seek justice in all human relationships. "He who does not love his brother whom he has seen, cannot love God whom he has not seen. And this commandment we have from him, that he who loves God should love his brother also." (I John 4, 20–1.) Love must express itself in the concern for justice. In recent years our struggle for social justice has been directed toward securing the right to vote for all citizens; it is our conviction that this concern extends not only to equal access to the ballot but also to the protection of the value of the ballot. We believe this to be a moral issue of considerable importance because if a person is denied the right to vote, or if his vote is diluted, then to that extent the membership of the voter in civil society is diminished and his political personhood is impaired. The value of the vote is fundamental to all that is done by and for and to the individual and determines countless other rights. When the quality of the vote is diminished innumerable injustices result.

4. THREAT TO RACIAL JUSTICE

Attempts to dilute the Supreme Court ruling represent a grave threat to the cause of racial justice, and would frustrate the intention of the civil rights law, the voting rights bill, and other measures intended to elevate the Negro and other minorities to first-class citizenship. By allowing factors such as education, economic attainments, or geographic placement to be considered in determining the composition of one house of the legislature, racial discrimination in legislative apportionments of certain States will in effect be "legalized." The measures currently before the Congress would not prevent "gerrymandering" electoral districts in such a way that the Negro and other minorities could continue to be deprived of the full effectiveness of their votes with the result that practical political enslavement would be effectively preserved.

5. URBANIZATION AND THE CHURCHES

Finally, efforts to alter the decision of the court by amending the Constitution fail to recognize the revolutionary social change toward an urban society in the United States. They represent an attempt to preserve or return to an nonurban society no longer a reality or possibility in the face of cybernation, population explosion, and other factors. The metropolis, with its teeming population, infinite variety, and boundless resources need not be feared and dare not be ignored; rather, it presents new challenges for the development of new dimensions of freedom and responsibility.

One of the consequences of the election of representatives of one house of a bicameral legislature on the basis other than population is rural domination of a State legislature. Under such arrangements the complex and massive needs and problems of the burgeoning metropolitan areas do not receive proper attention. Our concern for the city is prompted by the fact that it is the locale for the concentrations of the poor, the disadvantaged, for the tensions between management and labor, for the problems of race and minorities, for the challenges of education at all levels, and for a variety of other situations involving human need. The Christian's concern extends not only to a specific stratum of society or special interest group, but to the entire community. Thus the Christian in the rural areas is concerned for all his brethren in the metropolis, the urbanite for the suburbanite, and the suburbanite for the smalltown dweller.

UPHOLD "ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE" CONCEPT

In the light of the foregoing considerations the Greater Portland Council of Churches holds that fundamental and substantial moral and ethical issues are involved, based on our understanding of the divine intention for man as a redeemed creature, and grounded in our passion for justice.

We hold that the basic moral issue which underlies the "one-man, one-vote" concept should determine civic practice rather than considerations of political expediency or pragmatic procedure. We also believe that, where men of good will get together in a spirit of mutual concern for common goals, the satellite issues of rural versus urban rights, etc., can be resolved for the benefit of the entire community.

We urge the Oregon congressional delegation and our fellow Oregonians to oppose any and all efforts to deny any American citizen the right to cast an equal vote in the exercise of his franchise and to insist that equal representation is a person's fundamental right and a necessary component of full political personhood.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED IN ITS EFFORTS TO MINIMIZE WASTE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, yesterday the House Committee on Government Operations issued a report which indicates that the Comptroller General is now to be expected to tone down his criticism of officials in the Defense Department and other agencies which are found to have been responsible for waste and extravagance in procurement of supplies.

I hope that I have misunderstood the meaning of that report—but in any event I wish to make it clear that in my opinion, the General Accounting Office in the past has been doing an excellent job, and has saved the taxpayers millions of dollars.

Rather than tone down their criticism of such waste, I only hope they will be more forceful in the future, and spell out very clearly the names of the responsible officials, as well as identify the companies which have overcharged the Government. I think this agency should be encouraged rather than discouraged in its efforts to expose such overcharges.

THE CHALLENGE OF CREATIVE FEDERALISM

I. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS: WHAT IT IS ABOUT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, perhaps at no time in the history of our Federal system has the issue of intergovernmental relations been of more critical importance. No longer is this a subject consigned primarily to political science classrooms, constitutional lawyers and scholars of American government. No longer is it to be ignored by public administrators as an abstract concept of conflicting governmental principles and differing laws. And no longer can Congress give this issue secondary priority. Intergovernmental relations lies at the heart of our rapidly changing Federal system of government.

Intergovernmental relations involves people: their health, their homes, their jobs, their rights as citizens, and their security as free men. When our governments do not apply their laws or allocate their resources effectively—when they do not bring the full force of their programs to bear on social and economic problems, it is the people who suffer, and it is the Nation which loses.

During the past five sessions of Congress we have developed the most impressive package of Federal legislation since the depression to attack poverty, ignorance, economic distress, urban blight, discrimination, and other human problems. But the success of this legislation is only as good as the machinery which carries it to the people—in the fastest, most effective way possible. During the past two Congresses we have concentrated primarily on the substance of government; now the spotlight must be turned on the procedure. Here is where the new challenge lies.

President Johnson has recognized this challenge. In his recent state of the Union message to the Congress he urged that we must "move on to develop a creative federalism to best use the wonderful diversity of our institutions and our people to solve these problems and to fulfill the dreams of the American people." In the budget message, the President described his interest in more specific terms:

> Many of our critical new programs involve the Federal Government in joint ventures with State and local governments in thousands of communities throughout the Nation. The success or failure of those programs depends largely on timely and effective communications and on readiness for action on the part of both Federal agencies in the field and State and local governmental units. We must strengthen the coordination of Federal programs in the field. We must open channels of responsibility. We must give more freedom of action and judgment to the people on the firing line. We must help State and local governments to deal more effectively with Federal agencies. We must see that information gets to the field and to cooperating State and local governments, promptly and accurately.

The President's concern with the improvement of intergovernmental relationships in our federal system is indeed most welcome, and it is extremely important to the task ahead.

Creative federalism, as I see it, involves both cooperation and competition of ideas and performance between all levels of government, between Government and private organizations, and between individuals. It is a partnership in the common objective of building our country and improving the lives of our citizens; but it involves a matrix of independent powers and differing methods of achieving this objective.

Creative federalism does not make the National Government the senior partner in this partnership, as a recent Wall Street Journal editorial alledged. Its primary reliance is on joint effort, joint planning, and joint programs with State and local jurisdictions, rather than on direct Federal action. This is symbolized most vividly by the expansion of the grant-in-aid device in Great Society programs.

Creative federalism is not a political maneuver to make the States and their localities financially dependent on the National Government. On the contrary, its financial contribution is merely a response to the staggering fiscal burden under which these jurisdictions presently labor. As a percentage of State-local revenue, Federal aid has increased by a mere 4 percentage points—from 11 to 15 percent—between 1955 and 1965. And the projected figures for fiscal 1966 and 1967 are not expected to indicate a significant rise.

Creative federalism is not an administrative device for strengthening the power position of the Federal bureaucracy. The Federal civil service numbered some 2.4 million in 1946 and during the past 20 years the figure has risen by only 200,000 employees. This is to be contrasted with the increase for State and local personnel: 4 million employees during the same period. Moreover, those who know anything of the administration of Federal grant programs are fully aware that Governors, county executives, mayors, local planners, and citizens groups are neither inarticulate nor unwilling to fight for their viewpoint in the face of Federal administrative decisions they dislike.

Creative federalism does not imply that the national administration "can and should run the whole show," again as the Wall Street Journal editorial contended. Such an argument misses the entire purpose of our political tradition: that long-range national goals will never be achieved unless the Federal Government, the States, and the localities join voluntarily in seeking to implement them. Creative federalism, then, is based on the traditional American habit of sharing responsibility.

Finally, creative federalism is not concerned with the dialog of States rights or local rights versus centralized Federal power. This debate belongs to the past. Rather, it accepts the expanding role of State and local governments to take on greater political and administrative responsibilities as the Nation grows. At the same time, it relies on a strengthened Federal role to provide new ideas, incentives, and resources to the States and localities to meet common goals.

Our country is involved in a very real and costly ideological struggle with competitive world powers. It has taken the lead in using its own resources and manpower to assist underdeveloped countries and to protect them from oppression. This commitment will last for some time—if anything, it is bound to get more involved. While we strive to maintain leadership on the world scene, we cannot afford inefficiency and undue discord between administrative levels of government at home. Healthy competition for better programs, easier and less costly administration, and higher performance are necessary and must be encouraged. But waste, corruption, incompetence, and neglect must be minimized. Our strength as a viable nation, in large measure, will depend on the effective and cooperative use of all components of our federal system.

Is this hope for a harmonious federal system naive and unrealistic in a country which thrives on politics, pressure groups, power struggles, profits, and proud bureaucrats? I do not think so.

A good politician knows the political mileage which can be gained by getting the job done well. A businessman knows that productivity increases when the environment of workers is improved. The Government administrator knows that his effort can be enhanced by improved management and personnel practices. And most citizens do not want to see their tax money wasted on ineffective administration. Every large corporation in this country concentrates on eliminating waste and duplication, and corporate officials are constantly seeking new ways to coordinate their efforts for better performance and productivity. We can expect no less from our federal system.

This is what intergovernmental relations is all about.

II. THE EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

If improved relationships between Federal, State, and local governments are basic to the success of creative federalism, what are some of the problems, and how serious are they?

First there is the question of numbers: expanding programs, proliferating jurisdictions, and soaring budgets. Here are a few statistics. At the moment there are more than 170 separate Federal aid programs being administered by some 21 Federal departments and agencies, involving an annual outlay of over $14 billion. This is in contrast to a $4 billion total Federal expenditure 10 years ago for the same purpose. These Federal programs, in turn, are administered by more than 90,000 State and local jurisdictions which are expected to generate in 1966 an additional $80 billion to meet their public needs. Since 1948, these expenditures have tripled.

State and local jurisdictions now have a combined debt of nearly $100 billion—a 420-percent increase over the 1946 figure. They employ nearly 8 million people to administer their services—over three times the number employed by the Federal Government—with a monthly payroll of $3.4 billion. The total monthly payroll for both Federal and State and local civilian public employment is almost $5 billion. With increasing population and urbanization, economic expansion and greater social responsibilities, combined expenditures are expected to climb even more rapidly. Population growth, especially in metropolitan areas, will trigger the expansion of governmental agencies, making the administrative task more complex.

These figures show the overwhelming part that the States and local communities play in our Federal system. They certainly dispel the notion that a centralized federalism is replacing the rights of States and localities to govern themselves. Rather, the facts make clear to me the tremendous burden which State and local governments must continue to bear in meeting public needs, and the overwhelming responsibility which the Federal Government has to help State and local jurisdictions obtain the maximum benefits of Federal aid and technical assistance so that they can plan and provide for the future. Complicated as this task may be because of the bigness of government and the fragmentation of local jurisdictions, it is imperative that the lines of administration from Washington to the local scene be cleared and strengthened for maximum program effectiveness.

A second major intergovernmental relations problem is one of administration—or rather, attitudes about administration. The Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, which I am privileged to chair, recently completed a 3-year survey of Federal, State, and local aid officials to determine what they thought about the Federal system, and where the weak spots were. The results of this survey are both enlightening and disturbing.

We found substantial competing and overlapping of Federal programs, sometimes as a direct result of legislation and sometimes as a result of empire building. Similar competition and duplication were found at the State and local levels. We learned that too many Federal aid officials are not interested in, and in fact are even hostile to coordinating programs within and between departments, and that they are reluctant to encourage coordination and planning at State and local levels. These conditions frequently and predictably result in confusion and conflicting requirements which discourage State and local participation, and adversely affect the administrative structure and fiscal organization in these jurisdictions.

At the same time, Federal officials complained that State and local administration was understaffed, lacking in quality and experience, unimaginative, and too subject to negative political and bureaucratic pressures. They found a variety of State requirements and limitations blocking the application of Federal programs.

The subcommittee's survey indicated that there are too many special-purpose districts and authorities conflicting with, and ofttimes duplicating, general-purpose governments, leading to the impairment of efficiency and unwise borrowing procedures. The survey underscored the critical need for channeling better program and planning information to State and local decisionmakers; for special Federal aid to encourage the training of State and local administrators; for an extension of the merit system, and of the technical assistance program administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Division of State Merit Systems.

In short, we found conflict between professional administrators at the Federal level and less professional administrators at the State and local levels, between line agency officials and elected policymakers at all levels, between administrators of one aid program and those of another, between specialized middle-management officials and generalists in the top-management category, and between standpat bureau heads and innovators seeking to strengthen the decisionmaking process at all levels.

The picture, then, is one of too much tension and conflict rather than coordination and cooperation all along the line of administration—from top Federal policymakers and administrators to the State and local professional administrators and elected officials.

III. FOUR AREAS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFLICT

1. INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFLICTS AT THE METROPOLITAN LEVEL

Intergovernmental conflict and tension hit hardest at our metropolitan areas where more than 70 percent of our total population now lives. In 30 years, at least 85 percent of an estimated 300 million people will be living in these communities. In some areas it is becoming difficult to tell where one population center begins and another leaves off. There is urban, suburban, and exurban sprawl, and at the same time there is an intensification of demand for central city living. With the increase of our economic growth, industries are expanding plants, services and offices within and around metropolitan areas in order to be close to markets and labor supply. Finally, when existing land becomes used up, new cities will have to be formed in more remote areas to further accommodate the process of population and commercial expansion.

As the cities spread out, the demand for more and better public services accelerates, and orderly planning becomes imperative. The potential chaos of too many people crowding into too limited space in our metropolitan areas is already apparent. The responsibility of local government is no longer one of merely maintaining law and order, and providing basic services. It concerns the development of a total environment for the people—their housing, health, education, jobs, water supply, transportation, recreation, and their equal rights and opportunities as citizens.

A serious obstacle to achieving better public administration at this level is the haphazard proliferation of local governing units which has developed. The 1962 Census of Governments reported that there were over 90,000 such units operating among our 50 States. These included general-purpose governments such as counties, cities, boroughs, towns and villages possessing general public powers; and special-purpose districts such as school, fire, water soil conservation, and urban renewal districts, with more limited functions. Most of these jurisdictions have independent powers and responsibilities and taxing authorities as well as differing boundaries. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in a 1961 report, has called this "a bewildering pattern because of their extreme numbers and their frequent territorial overlapping."

For instance, a single community near Chicago was found to be directly involved with two counties, three townships, a village, four school districts, a sanitary district, a mosquito abatement district, and a tuberculosis sanitarium district. Many of these jurisdictions had differing boundaries and separate authorities not under the control of any centralized authority. Within the standard metropolitan statistical area of Chicago there were, in 1962, 6 counties, 246 municipalities, 114 township governments, 340 school districts, and 354 special districts. This intergovernmental complex involved over 6 million people.

The New York metropolitan area is a more terrifying example of governmental fragmentation: 17 counties, 551 municipalities, and more than 1,400 local units of government covering portions of a three-State area involving 17 million people. Its problems of coordinated planning and administration are further compounded by a number of regional authorities—having jurisdiction over ports, roads, bridges, transportation facilities, water supplies and other services—which are not subject to the control of any local government or areawide planning group. In addition, there are hundreds of units of government situated on opposite sites of State boundaries operating under different laws and financial authorities.

Lest we be misled that New York is unique, let me say that one eminent authority predicts that by the end of the century, the United States will possess at least five supermetropolises which will have the general complexity and geographical extent of the present-day Metropolitan New York.

The largest contributor to the intergovernmental confusion is the special-purpose district. This category of government accounts for nearly 58 percent of all local jurisdictions—over 53,000 districts. Since 1952, special governments—not including school districts—have had a 50-percent growth rate. As metropolitan areas expand, this rate may accelerate.

Special-purpose governments or authorities are created for a variety of reasons. Some are formed to avoid State constitutional or statutory limitations on the tax rates or debt ceilings of general-purpose governments. Others find this route—whether for political or legal reasons—an easier substitute for the annexation of cities and towns or the transferral of functions to county-wide governments. Still others promote the special district to remove a program from political control, to cut through redtape, or to give the program a special status for enlisting community support.

Whatever the reasons for setting up these jurisdictions, many public administrators, scholars, and political leaders find the special-purpose district or authority a genuine threat to local government coordination and democracy at the lower level. They say that these special governments separate essential programs—urban renewal, water, public housing, transportation, sanitation—from the central source of administrative control and make joint programing very difficult, if not impossible. As Prof. Roscoe C. Martin points out in his recent book, The Cities and the Federal System, Atherton Press, 1965, "special district government means special clientele and special pleader government," because in most instances the governing boards of these organizations are made up of persons not directly responsible to the voters. Dr. Martin states:

> On the one hand, the citizen who participates here has his interest and energy diverted from the affairs of the city; on the other hand, he is likely to become prisoner to a myopic commitment to what is, after all, a sideshow to the main performance. Citizens who interest themselves particularly in urban redevelopment are distinguished by higher economic status, those who participate actively in school affairs by higher education, from the politicians who run the city. Dedication to an individual program by a vigorous, purposeful, and specialized clientele may have adverse results not alone for the city but for the program itself, as for example, when the realtors seize control of the local public housing program. In such a case the housing authority may find itself in the hands of people who are in fact opposed to public housing. Now and again the governing board by positive action or by default delegates all substantial decisionmaking to the professional manager. This surrender, unhappily not uncommon, installs the bureaucrats in the seats of power; it represents the ultimate triumph of aseptic professionalism over politics. It may also mark the advent of utter irresponsibility.

By no means do I feel that special districts should be completely eliminated. There are many good ones, excellently run, cooperating with local general-purpose governments. But their expansion must be curtailed, and their enormous total cut down. Only where there are no alternatives to adequate administration should they be resorted to.

2. COORDINATION OF URBAN PROGRAMS AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

Two years ago, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations analyzed Federal aid programs affecting urban development. It found no evidence of any unified Federal policy or organizational machinery for coordinating such programs in this area. Nor could the Commission find any positive policy on the part of Federal agencies to promote joint-project sponsorship of comprehensive planning among local governments involving a mixture of functions. What planning requirements there were, seemed to relate to the single function involved rather than to its impact on total development.

Similar findings with respect to the Federal attitude toward program coordination were made by the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations in its recent survey, "The Federal System as Seen by Federal Aid Officers":

> The great majority of these middle-management administrators are unsympathetic to efforts at the national or urban field levels which are geared to interrelating Federal urban development programs and to injecting a broad-gaged metropolitan viewpoint into the administration of such programs. And most of this distrust is rooted in fear—fear of change, fear of delay, fear of a dilution of individual program goals, fear of meddling by inexpert generalists, fear of dual or triple supervisory procedures, and fear of a diminution of bureau or agency autonomy.

The recently established Department of Housing and Urban Development is designed, at least in theory, to bring together Federal policies to improve our urban areas. Its enabling legislation directs the Department to "assist the President in achieving maximum coordination of Federal urban programs," and instructs the new Secretary "to exercise leadership, at the direction of the President, in coordinating such Federal activities." Thus it would seem that the President is the chief urban coordinator, and insofar as he delegates the power, the Secretary of HUD is to be the President's man in hammering out joint-action policy.

However, it must be remembered that HUD has been given direct control of a comparatively small segment of the 100-odd Federal programs affecting our cities. It houses, among other things, FHA and FNMA, urban renewal, college dormitory construction, public housing, mass transportation, basic water and sewer facilities, and metropolitan planning.

These are indeed important programs, but they are only a part of any real urban development. Primary, secondary, and higher education, health, welfare, antipoverty, air and water pollution, manpower and employment, roadbuilding, economic development, and other Federal assistance programs have an equally critical impact.

HUD, in essence, is another department among formidable equals such as HEW, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. Its powers of coordination—yet untested—are only as effective as the degree to which these other Federal agencies will give up some of their autonomy and cooperate. If the past record of voluntary cooperation among Federal agencies is any indicator, HUD will have tough going unless a strong and positive mandate of program coordination is assured for this new department, and effective machinery for carrying out that mandate is put into operation.

At this time, I am not sure whether the mandate or the machinery for effective coordination is sufficiently strong to pierce the veil of traditional Federal functionalism, and to spur interagency cooperation. As for the machinery, I have particular doubts in the light of HUD's new organizational plan.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development Act specifically provides for an Office of Urban Program Coordination to "assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities to the President with respect to achieving maximum coordination." Congress created this office by special amendment to the original bill because it believed that the Secretary, to be effective, would have to have a full-time, high-level staff working directly with him to "maintain close liaison with other Federal departments and agencies," and "consult with State, local, and regional officials"—Senate Report No. 536, 86th Congress 1st session, Committee on Government Operations.

However, under the HUD organizational scheme, the Office of Urban Program Coordination has been given a secondary position in one of the six divisions of the Department, and instead of sitting at the Secretary's right hand as Congress intended, its Director finds himself tucked away under six assistant secretaries and the Under Secretary, which leaves serious doubt in my mind whether he will ever be able to get an effective accommodation in his own department, let alone someone else's. If he does not get that cooperation, the whole cities program could well break down. It is that serious.

The proposed demonstration cities bill provides for a local Office of the Federal Coordinator headed by directors to be placed in each municipality having a demonstration program. The intent is that he must help to achieve maximum effective coordination of Federal grant-in-aid programs. This means all Federal programs. How can such a coordinator be successful in his community, in his relations with State and local officials, unless everyone knows—Federal agencies included—that he is backed up in Washington by a top, tough, decision-making official who will go to bat for him, and by a strong executive policy of Federal coordination? Without such backing from Washington, the director would be little more than a program information service.

It may well be that the recently-proposed housing legislation—S. 2842, Demonstration Cities Act, and S. 2977, Urban Development Act—will improve the situation, but there is still the basic difficulty—perhaps more acute at the middle-management level of the Federal bureaucracy than at the top—that Federal agencies are jealous of their functions and are, in the main, hostile to coordination.

I intend to explore this problem at greater length during the forthcoming hearings on the new housing legislation. In my opinion, the issues of program coordination and comprehensive planning go to the heart of economic and social development, whether it is in the cities, the suburbs, or our rural communities. Those responsible for these matters should be at the top of the haystack, not somewhere down in the straw.

3. FEDERAL COORDINATION AND THE ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

We have already begun to see where the lack of coordination and cooperation between Federal departments and agencies is working a serious hardship in the war on poverty. The staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has just completed a 3-month survey of the opinions of over 40 top-ranking people working in this important endeavor. This involved officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity as well as other Federal agencies, representatives of State and local governments, welfare organizations, the poor, the Negro, labor, and business. If there was one complaint which was heard more than all others, it was that Federal resources are not being effectively marshaled to zero in on hard-core areas of poverty, and that the OEO does not have sufficient powers to enforce adequate coordination at the Federal level, or encourage it at State and local levels. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has termed this "the most important threat" to the local poverty effort. In a recent report, the mayors said that communiy action agencies were "continuing to encounter difficulties in getting comprehensive programs underway because of a serious and continuing lack of coordination at the Federal level."

The mayors pointed out that Federal agencies were not implementing the preference provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act which was working to a particular hardship. Section 612 of the act requires to the extent possible that the head of each Federal agency administering a Federal program is directed to give preference to any application for assistance or benefits made by an approved community action program. It is not clear whether this section means preference in taking up and processing the application or in granting the aid, but whatever the meaning, the survey revealed that not one local government representative interviewed knew of a single instance where a local CAP application had received any special attention. The mayors' report concluded:

> If coordination is to become a reality in the community, someone needs to be able to say that when interagency conflict occurs one practice or project is to prevail over another. This is not now possible, considering the multiple Federal units that are unilaterally dealing with both public and private agencies at the local level.
>
> Virtually, all of those involved in these sessions agreed that some clarification of authority is very much needed to help determine program priorities. The clarification needs to take place both in Washington and at the community action level.

At its recent meeting in Washington, attended by over 300 CAP poverty administrators, the National Association for Community Development demanded that presently fragmented Federal programs such as Neighborhood Youth Corps, adult literacy, work experience, youth opportunity centers, be funded as an integral part of a comprehensive manpower effort, coordinated at the local level by the CAP, and at the Federal level by the OEO.

A policy statement issued by NACD on the principles of coordination and preference in community action, contained the following comment:

> The community action programs are faced with a statutory responsibility to serve as the central coordinating device for the war against poverty at the local level. Attempts to carry out this responsibility have proven especially difficult in the area of manpower development and employment programs in large part because this central plan and coordinating role is not afforded priority in Federal bureaucratic practice.

There is language in the Economic Opportunity Act which recognizes the need for coordinating Federal programs affecting poverty, and there is some attempt to provide machinery for getting the job done. But the language is not sufficiently clear, nor the machinery sufficiently strong to provide the necessary powers to enforce coordination.

Section 611(a)(1) of the act authorizes the Director of OEO to "call upon other Federal agencies to supply such statistical data, program reports, and other materials as he deems necessary to discharge his responsibilities and to assist the President in coordinating the antipoverty efforts of all Federal agencies."

Finally, section 604 of the act provides for the establishment of an Economic Opportunity Council which "shall consult with and advise the Director—OEO—in carrying out his functions, including the coordination of antipoverty efforts by all segments of the Federal Government." This Council includes the Director as Chairman; the Attorney General; the Departments of Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, the Small Business Administration, and others.

Nowhere in any of this language is there a definitive mandate to Federal departments to get together and work out coordinated poverty programs with the OEO in the various phases of poverty. Nor is OEO given any substantial powers to require such coordination of programs. Nor is anyone—other than the President—given any real authority to pull the Federal establishment together to focus on poverty problems and poverty areas.

The language in this act is more the expression of an intent that there ought to be coordination—voluntarily arrived at—rather than a positive procedure for getting the job done.

The Economic Opportunity Council could be the binding force between Federal departments and the State and local governments on poverty matters, but it is not. There have been only a few meetings during the past 16 months, and each of these was general in nature, with no substantial consideration of the problem of coordination. There is no secretariat, but certain employees of the agencies are designated to be liaison officers on poverty matters and on the drafting of the Council's agenda. None of the representatives designated to work with the Council are of sufficient policy rank to grind out a meaningful cooperation policy. Community action directors and OEO personnel are forced to resort to a series of complicated ad hoc relationships with agency personnel in order to develop joint-action programs.

4. NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Next only to the problems of obtaining interjurisdictional harmony in joint-action programs is the lack of quality and experience in governmental manpower at State and local levels. Confronted with urban congestion, slums, water pollution, juvenile delinquency, racial tension, chronic unemployment, rising tax rates, and suburban sprawl, State and local governments now function in an age of unrivaled administrative complexity. Never before has the need for professional competence and efficiency been so critical at these levels of government.

The Municipal Manpower Commission's study of this topic found that "our Government institutions are ill-prepared to make the necessary decisions, and to act on them." The Commission conducted an extensive study of State and local personnel systems and closely examined the so-called "manpower crisis." The Commission emphasized:

> It is impossible to separate the performance of local governments from the abilities of their personnel. Ordinances are not self-executing, highways are not self-constructed, and no other service of local government has meaning except as it is planned, directed, and delivered by people. Persons with technical and managerial skills provide the special knowledge, background, continuity and imagination needed to keep private and public organizations abreast of new situations.

The primary need of State and local governments is to attract and retain quality personnel. And the national demand for skilled manpower is rising sharply. Compared with an 18-percent increase in the total number of workers of all kinds, the U.S. Department of Labor foresees a rise of 40 percent in the number needed for professional and technical jobs. Even today New York City has been losing qualified employees through resignation and retirement. Of the roughly 30,000 positions classified as professional, technical, and managerial, about one-fifth are unfilled. Statistics compiled by the Manpower Commission show that more than one-third of all municipal executives are within a decade of retirement.

This problem is further complicated by the failure of educational institutions to prepare young people for Government service. The Municipal Manpower Commission warned:

> The schools and colleges are failing to equip young men and women for careers in the specialized fields of local government. A few institutions strive to meet this need, but their number is small and the total supply they generate is totally inadequate for the present and future needs. The courses in urban economics, urban sociology and local government, offered in too few universities, are generally not functionally or operationally oriented.

Unfavorable working environments and inadequate personnel systems discourage both prospective employees and careerists. Too often, administrative personnel are given assignments without clear objectives, are frustrated by complicated intergovernmental structures, and find that the public holds them in low esteem. Compensation is substantially below industry standards. Career development programs, including opportunities for job mobility, in-service training and promotions are minimal except in some of the larger jurisdictions. Lack of effective merit systems permits the loading of agencies with incompetent, uninspiring and often indifferent personnel. Responsible administrators are often frustrated by inflexible rules and regulations dictating whom they may hire; whom, when, and how they shall promote; and whether, if at all, they may discipline or fire the incompetent or insubordinate.

The Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, in its survey of Federal officials, called for a basic program of personnel improvement to broaden the basis of administrative cooperation and minimize much of the conflict that exists in Federal-State-local relations. It listed seven basic needs as follows:

> Modification of the Hatch Act in order to vary the kind and degree of neutrality required with the nature of the responsibility discharged at State and local levels.
>
> Improvement of State merit systems arrangements, giving the Governor greater discretion.
>
> Modification of traditional methods of patronage and specialization.
>
> Improvement of in-service training programs for personnel.
>
> Expansion of the technical assistance for personnel administration to States and their localities now provided by the Division of State Merit Systems of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
>
> Provision for the Civil Service Commission, individual Federal agencies, and private organizations, such as the Brookings Institution, to establish a series of intergovernmental institutes and seminars which would bring together Federal, State, and local administrators of the same or even dissimilar aid programs.

IV. SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR IMMEDIATE AND LONG-RANGE ACTION

1. COORDINATION AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

We can hardly expect State and local jurisdictions to coordinate their programs and services if the Federal house is not in better order. Thus, one of the first items of business should be a wholly new policy of coordinating Federal aid, and working with State and local governments to help them improve their financial resources and administrative effectiveness. It is now quite apparent that the present use of interagency committees and councils is just not sufficient to meet this need. Most of these coordinating agencies are understaffed—if staffed at all—meet too infrequently, and concern themselves too often with vague pronouncements rather than specific ground rules for integrating programs. In addition, while many departments and agencies have designated officials to handle their own intergovernmental relations, those officials are too far down the chain of command to be effective. The two areas—better program coordination and better interlevel cooperation—should be the major concern today of top domestic policymakers in the executive branch.

First. Consideration should be given to designating a special assistant to the President for program coordination and intergovernmental relations who would keep abreast of interdepartmental and interlevel conflicts and assist the President in solving them. At the same time, he could establish a more direct liaison between the White House and State and local leaders to improve State and local relations.

Second. This special assistant should, in turn, be aided by a topflight Bureau of the Budget official, equipped with a sufficient staff, which would make continuing investigations of intergovernmental problems and recommend policies for improving Federal-aid administration.

Third. To help both the special assistant and the President, the Bureau should develop—far more than it is presently planning—a computerized information clearinghouse system which could provide immediate information to the President and others concerning: (a) social, economic, and other basic characteristics of individual States and local areas; (b) efforts on the part of these jurisdictions to meet their growth problems and projected needs; (c) Federal aid programs which now are assisting specific State and local jurisdictions; and (d) those available Federal assistance programs which have not been utilized but could improve State and local programs.

Such a clearinghouse system would be of great benefit if it were linked to regional, departmental, and Bureau of the Budget levels, with each providing pertinent information concerning its particular jurisdiction. The Civil Service Commission has recently initiated Federal Information Centers in 55 major communities throughout the country. Regional computerized clearinghouses could be located at these offices, thus providing a meaningful "one-stop shopping center" for local officials and others.

Fourth. At the department and agency level, a deputy undersecretary—or his equivalent—should be given a full-time responsibility for the coordinating of aid programs on a department, interdepartmental, and intergovernmental basis, and he should work directly with the special assistant to the President in formulating coordination guidelines and in identifying the more serious problem areas. To assist him in this task, a special staff should be assigned. Placing the responsibility for coordination and Federal-State-local relations in the office of the undersecretary puts muscle into the program, and brings the machinery for coordinating the coordinators much closer to the Secretaries and to the President. One wonders how many Watts-type riots might be avoided—or at least mitigated—with this new approach. As a matter of fact, I had expected that HUD would put its Office of Urban Program Coordination in the immediate charge of the undersecretary, and—as I have stated—I think it has made a strategic mistake in not doing so.

Fifth. What about Federal coordination in the field? Here HUD is to be commended. According to its new organizational scheme, it has brought all of its functions at the regional level under a regional administrator from whom it expects "strong local-level program leadership and coordination through decentralization of operations"—Secretary's Organization Order No. 2, February 24, 1966.

But other Federal departments with key aid programs would do well to follow its example. In particular, regional offices should be set up in accordance with standard geographical boundaries. Each should be headed by a regional director who would represent the secretary or agency chief on all matters in the area, and be responsible for coordinating all departmental activities at the regional level, and for achieving similar coordination with other agencies. The regional director should be given sufficient decision-making powers to implement this coordination, and to the largest extent possible, resolve intergovernmental conflicts. This regional director and his staff could be a very important information source to the Secretaries, Bureau of Budget, and the President with respect to interlevel problems and possible solutions.

Sixth. Ideas for developing improved intergovernmental relations at the local level are finding their way into recent administration proposals. Here again HUD has paved the way with its proposal for local program coordinators located in metropolitan areas to work with local government administrators to help them find their way through the maze of Federal programs, expedite applications for assistance, stimulate areawide planning, assist in resolving intergovernmental conflicts at the local level.

Seventh. Also to be commended is the proposal to establish one-stop shopping centers for local officials and others to get up-to-date program and planning information, government publications, statistical data, administrative counseling and data processing services.

Eighth. Consideration, however, should be given to creating Federal coordinators and services in State capitals for the benefit of State planners and the nonmetropolitan communities. To some extent, this has been done, but there must be more emphasis on Federal planning and technical assistance to encourage areawide and regional planning as it affects the broad scope of economic and social development.

Ninth. For long-range action, serious thought should be given to establishing permanent operating machinery in the Executive Office of the President for enforcing coordination guidelines laid down by the President, and for establishing working relationships with State and local leaders for a continuing assessment of their needs and for a speedy resolution of administrative conflicts.

One suggestion—which I think makes a tremendous amount of sense—would be the creation of a National Council for Intergovernmental Affairs—NCIA—chaired by the President and composed of those Cabinet officials and agency heads whose activities have a major impact on domestic grant-in-aid programs and intergovernmental relationships. Its membership would include the Secretaries of HUD, HEW, Labor, Agriculture, Commerce, the Attorney General, the Director of OEO, the head of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and others.

Patterned somewhat after the National Security Council, this body would have an Executive Director, and a working secretariat composed of the deputy undersecretaries representing the departments and agencies, and top-level executives independently selected and responsible to the Executive Director.

The Council would go far beyond the advisory responsibilities of the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers. It would be an operating mechanism for developing the President's policies of program coordination, and overseeing their implementation. It would provide the forum for determining basic intergovernmental policies and provide the President with an immediate liaison with State and local governments.

At the same time, it could be the President's ombudsman, a watchdog for crises, a central domestic information agency and an inspector general for program effectiveness. It would be concerned with both urban and rural development as a multidepartmental responsibility involving education, housing, transportation, public facilities, law enforcement, civil rights, and other issues. It would play a strategic role in long-range planning, and assist States and local governments in regional planning.

NCIA could also provide the leadership and the organization for calling conferences of Governors, mayors, and other leaders for a review of national and regional problems and for the development of new approaches to meet economic and social needs. Such conferences and special meetings with the Council's secretariat would be very helpful to the Federal Government in getting an up-to-date review of regional, State, and local problems. They would be helpful to the States and local governments because they would provide a forum for the airing of complaints and the discussion of new ideas.

Such a domestic security council could well be called on to use its experience and expertise in the domestic field to assist foreign countries in their own development programs. For instance, a national council of this nature might have been brought into immediate action by the President in his recent promotion of economic and social development assistance for certain Asian countries. Although there may be differences between the United States and our foreign friends in terms of traditions and political and social outlooks, the technical lessons learned in building communities, cleaning up rivers, developing transportation systems, providing health facilities, and improving agriculture can be applied advantageously in most areas. Therefore, what we learn in America through basic and applied research, through industrial development and through the development of more efficient coordinated planning, we can apply to our commitments overseas to obtain maximum effectiveness.

As I see it, a National Council for Intergovernmental Affairs could be an effective substitute for various interdepartmental committees and councils that presently exist under various pieces of legislation.

I am presently preparing legislation which would embody the concepts of this suggestion of a National Intergovernmental Council, and I expect to introduce it within the next few weeks.

Tenth. Long-range action concerning Federal field management should also be considered. Just as a National Council for Intergovernmental Affairs would provide the President with greater control over Federal programs at the national level, a similar overall coordinating mechanism should be created in each of the various regions of the country. Many competent observers feel that a large percentage of intergovernmental conflicts could be resolved at this level.

The suggestion is made that a Federal Regional Coordinator—not connected with any department or agency—be established to obtain across-the-board implementation of Federal programs in accordance with State and local comprehensive plans—of course consistent with national objectives and standards. He would be the President's man in the field, concerned with effective interrelationships of programs, the efficiency of administration, the cooperation of Federal officials with their State and local counterparts, and the developing problem areas. He should have a competent staff to assist him, and a status which would be above all other Federal regional officials in his area.

If a National Council for Intergovernmental Affairs is established, this Regional Coordinator should be paid by it, and made immediately responsible to its Executive Director. Prior to such establishment, he should be paid by the Executive Office of the President, and be directly responsible to a special assistant to the President and to the Bureau of the Budget.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, provides for the creation of regional planning commissions each with a Federal cochairman and governors—or designates—as members from the States involved. At the moment, this Federal member is responsible to the Secretary of Commerce. As these commissions develop, consideration might well be given to making these Federal cochairman Regional Coordinators. If this is feasible, they should be taken out from under the Secretary of Commerce and put in the Executive Office of the President.

Another long-range alternative which deserves attention is the suggestion that the Bureau of the Budget return to its system of regional field offices which was abandoned in 1953 as part of an economy move. In this situation, the Bureau of the Budget's regional director could be the President's Regional Coordinator, both with respect to Federal aid programs and planning, and to obtaining and providing essential information about regional needs, plans and trouble spots. He could also serve in the role as the President's intergovernmental liaison in the field.

Before leaving the matter of Federal field management, mention should be made of the Federal Executive Boards. Up to now, these organizations—made up of department and agency chiefs in each region—have been ineffective in coordinating Federal programs, except as they may apply to personnel or administrative expenditures. FEB chairmen have no meaningful powers, or separate staffing, and, except in limited situations, they have been given no real mandate to integrate substantive programs. There is much doubt as to whether the FEB's should be continued, but if they are to remain, they certainly should be strengthened, and used as active boards for coordinating Federal policy with respect to Federal aid, improvement in administrative practices, technical and planning assistance to State and local governments and problem identification. Chairmen should be assigned by the President on the basis of their ability and knowledge of Federal economic and social programs.

2. FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATIONS

For many years, State and local governments have been reluctant to organize their governing units and coordinate their programs for maximum efficiency. Whatever the historical and political reasons for this, most experts feel that this reluctance must be softened and a more positive approach to program coordination, regional and area-wide planning, and professional administration must be promoted. Many State and local officials agree.

First. Enactment of S. 561, the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, would be a very helpful step in encouraging these objectives. I was privileged to introduce this legislation in the Senate early last year, where it received wide bipartisan support. Its 42 sponsors include members of both parties, conservatives, moderates, and liberals, and small-State spokesmen as well as those from the larger urban States. It passed the Senate unanimously with improving amendments, and is now under consideration in the House.

Among other things, this legislation authorizes the President to establish rules and regulations for uniform application in the formulation, evaluation, and review of urban development programs and projects. It requires, as a matter of congressional policy, that Federal departments and agencies must take into account all viewpoints—national, regional, State, and local—in administering these programs. In particular, it requires that Federal aid for urban development, "to the maximum extent practicable," shall be consistent with and shall further the objectives of State and local plans. Consideration, says the bill, shall be given to all developmental aspects of the total urban community—housing, transportation, economic development, natural resources, community facilities, and the improvement of living environments.

The legislation makes it clear that Congress intends that Federal departments and agencies administering such programs consult and seek advice, one from another, through interagency mechanisms in order to assume fully coordinated urban programs. It stipulates that systematic planning presently required by highway, urban renewal and open-space programs, be extended to all Federal programs affecting urban development.

Mention has been made previously in this statement that local general-purpose governments must be given far greater authority to coordinate and control essential services at the local level, either individually or through joint councils, and that the existing Federal policy of favoring special-purpose districts must be discouraged. To meet these objectives S. 561 contains a requirement that Federal departments and agencies must, "in the absence of substantial reasons to the contrary" make urban development loans and grants to general-purpose units rather than special-purpose ones.

In the event a loan or grant-in-aid is to be made to a special-purpose district, the governing authority of the general-purpose district affected must be notified and shall have the opportunity to have its comments made a part of the loan or grant application. This provision does not bar the use of special districts and authorities, but it does put Congress on record as favoring local units of government that are responsible for a wide range of functions and are directly involved in the difficult political task of reconciling conflicting interests and public needs.

The bill goes further. It provides that after June 30, 1966, any application for the construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewage facilities and waste treatment works, water development and land conservation within any metropolitan area shall be submitted to the general-purpose government in whose area the project is to be located, and no Federal action shall be taken unless that government certifies that such project is consistent with its planning objectives.

Under the legislation, each application for the programs cited above or for highways, transportation facilities, urban and open-space projects must be accompanied by the comments and recommendations of an areawide agency performing metropolitan or regional planning and a statement by the applicant that it has considered such comments and recommendations prior to presenting the formal application. The Federal agency receiving the application need not be bound by any negative recommendation of the areawide agency. Such agency, it should be carefully noted, will, to the greatest practicable extent, be composed of, or responsible to, the elected officials of the area's units of general local government. This guarantees that planning will not be divorced from politics, a most important point.

S. 561 also provides other helpful procedures. It requires that State Governors be informed of facts about Federal aid programs to give them a better chance to prepare the State budget and to improve State planning. It seeks to systematize and simplify accounting procedures for the handling of Federal programs, and to provide for specialized and technical services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis.

Second. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has, over the past 5 years, made some excellent studies of ways in which State and local governments can improve the administration of public programs and provide for more orderly urban development. The Commission's recommendations must receive serious consideration by all levels of government.

The Advisory Commission is a bipartisan body of 26 members established by Congress to give continuing study to relationships among all levels of government. Its membership includes Members of Congress, officers of the executive branch, Governors, State legislators, mayors, county officials, and representatives of the public at large.

Its major proposals are incorporated in a very important and comprehensive document entitled the 1966 State legislative program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., 1965, and are presented under three subject headings: "I. Taxation and Finance"; "II. Urban Problems"; "III. Other Intergovernmental Problems." Each proposal is accompanied by a highly professional draft of specific legislation which could be enacted into law by the States. At the end of the document, there is a table indicating which proposals have been endorsed by the Governors' conference, the National Legislative Conference, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Unfortunately, time does not permit a discussion of these proposals here. I do seriously urge that State and local legislators and officials obtain a copy of the 1966 program and read it thoroughly. It provides a splendid format for modernizing State and local government administration.

In addition, the Commission during the past 6 years has published over 35 comprehensive study reports with respect to State and local financing, taxation, planning, legislative apportionment, implementation of Federal aid, governmental reorganization and other key issues. These provide a basic library for those interested in State and local reform.

Third. The Federal Government can make a major contribution to the overall effectiveness of joint-action development programs by encouraging State and local governments to improve the competence and efficiency of their administrative personnel. After all it is these governments that carry the bulk of the responsibility for making the Great Society work. It is Congress' responsibility to help them. Certain needed improvements are imperative.

The merit system should be extended to more grant-in-aid programs; this type of requirement now covers only health, welfare, employment, security, civil defense, and a few other programs. A program of Federal financial and technical assistance to State and local governments for strengthening their personnel administration should be established on an across-the-board basis and should be geared to critical personnel management problems that have emerged in our metropolitan communities. In addition, Federal agencies should be allowed to permit State and local employees to participate in their training courses; those Federal agencies administering grant programs should be authorized to conduct training for such employees and to permit such grants to States and localities to be used for educational leave. In order to encourage and strengthen the training and development of State and local career employees, particularly in the professional, administrative, and technical fields, the Federal Government should launch a grant-aided inservice training program for these civil servants. We must recognize that the success of joint Federal-State-local programs, in large measure, depends on effective action in this area.

Serious consideration should be given to the suggestion that a national public administration college—comparable to the National War College—be established. Its faculty could be drawn from top and middle management officials at all levels, and from qualified academicians. In addition, consideration might be given to establishing a Federal fellowship program for State and local employees in midcareer to enable them to invest a year in graduate education in order to increase their professional competence.

Shortly I shall introduce a proposed Intergovernmental Personnel Act which will include many of these recommendations.

CONCLUSION

Stimulating the States and local jurisdictions to plan for their expanding needs and to coordinate their own resources is admittedly a difficult task. Some observers feel that the political and competitive traits of these jurisdictions make this task impossible. I disagree. Governors, county commissioners, mayors, and other public officials seriously want to do a better job of meeting the mounting needs of their constituents. They do not want—nor can their political reputations afford—racial tension, transportation crises, poverty and disease, air pollution, water shortages, and crime and disorder in their streets. But more than ever today, State and local leaders are earnestly seeking a means to reduce jurisdictional conflicts. Indeed they expect the Federal Government—as one of the partners under our Federal contract—to assume its role in helping them carry out national programs. We must not fail them.

EXHIBIT 1

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

A. TAXATION AND FINANCE

1. Estate and gift taxes (January 1961)

Amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to increase the credit against the Federal estate tax for inheritance and estate taxes paid to the States, such amendment to be effective with respect to any given State only after (a) State legislative action to shift the State tax from an "inheritance base" to an "estate base" and (b) legislative action adjusting State tax rates to assure that the effect of the increased credit would redound to the benefit of the State treasury rather than to individual Federal taxpayers.

2. Investment of idle cash balances (January 1961)

Where such authority does not now exist, enactment by States of legislation authorizing State and local governments to invest their idle funds in interest-bearing deposits with insured institutions and in obligation of the State or the Federal Government. (Mayor Celebrezze did not concur in this recommendation.)

Technical assistance by financial officers of the State government to smaller local units of government with respect to the desirability of, and opportunities for the investment of idle funds.

Cooperative action by the U.S. Treasury Department and State and local finance officers designed to provide full and current information regarding the investment opportunities in short-term Treasury obligations, including exploring the desirability of special Treasury issues particularly designed to meet the needs of State and local governments.

3. Public Health grants (January 1961)

Amending the Public Health Service Act of 1944 to grant authority to States to transfer funds up to 33⅓ percent among specific health categories of Federal grants-in-aid for tuberculosis, venereal disease, heart disease, and cancer control and general health services;

Amending the Public Health Service Act of 1944 to place Federal grants-in-aid for the aforementioned categories under a single apportionment and matching formula instead of the different formulas now existing. (HEW Secretary Flemming did not concur in these recommendations.)

4. Reassessment of Federal grants-in-aid (June 1961)

The enactment by the Congress of a general statute, applicable to any new grants which may be enacted in the future, to provide that each new grant would be reenacted, terminated, or redirected at the end of 5 years, depending upon the results of a thorough reexamination of the grant by the cognizant legislative committee of the Congress. (Senator Leslie Cutler did not concur in this recommendation.)

Periodic review by congressional committees and executive agencies of the status of Federal grants-in-aid now in existence.

5. Legislative and tax jurisdiction over private property on Federal areas (June 1961)

(a) Favorable congressional action on pending legislation to authorize and direct Federal agencies to retrocede legislative jurisdiction to the States over U.S. Government properties as rapidly and extensively as consistent with their essential needs.

(b) That the States enact legislation, if required, to enable them to accept jurisdiction.

(c) That the President and Governors support implementation of the legislation.

6. Cooperative tax administration (June 1961)

(a) The enactment by the States of legislation authorizing the exchange of tax records and information among States and with the Federal Internal Revenue Service.

(b) Joint action by the Treasury Department, the Council of State Governments, and the Commission's staff to identify those State and local records and types of information that are potentially useful for the administration of Federal income and other taxes.

(c) Development by the States for admission to the Treasury Department and the Congress of a proposal for the admission of State and local tax enforcement personnel to training programs conducted by the Internal Revenue Service (authorized by Public Law 87–870).

(d) Favorable consideration by the Congress of pending legislation to authorize the Internal Revenue Service to perform statistical and related services for State tax agencies on a reimbursement basis (enacted, Public Law 87–870).

7. Local nonproperty taxes (September 1961)

(a) Providing cities and adjoining jurisdictions in large metropolitan areas with uniform taxing powers and authority for cooperative tax enforcement.

(b) Authorizing the addition of local tax supplements to State sales and income taxes where these taxes are used both by the State and a large number of local governments.

(c) Permitting pooled administration of similar local taxes levied by numerous local governments.

(d) Limiting local governments to the more productive taxes and discouraging the smaller jurisdictions from excessive tax diversity.

(e) Providing State technical assistance to local tax authorities including tax information, training facilities for local personnel, access to State tax records and where appropriate, using sanctions against State taxpayers who fail to comply with local tax requirements.

8. Local government debt (September 1961)

(a) Maximum flexibility for local government borrowing with any governing State provisions being as comprehensive and uniform in character as possible.

(b) Vestment of authority to incur debt with the governing bodies of local governments, subject only to a permissive referendum if petitioned by the voters and resolved generally by a simple majority vote.

(c) Repeal of constitutional and statutory provisions limiting local government debt by reference to the local property tax base (Mr. Michaelian and Mr. Burton did not concur in this recommendation).

(d) Provision by the States of technical assistance to local governments regarding debt issuance and State prescription of the minimum content of public announcements of local bond offerings.

(e) Consideration by the States of a substitute basis for the regulation of long-term local debt; namely, by reference to the net interest cost of prospective bond issues in relation to the prevailing yield of high-quality municipal securities (Mayor Clinton, Senator Cutler, and Mr. Burton did not concur in this recommendation).

9. State constitutional and statutory limitations on local taxing powers (October 1962)

(a) Statutory provisions are preferred to constitutional provisions.

(b) Use of full market value of taxable property as the basis is preferred to fractional assessed value.

(c) Limitations on local functions in general are preferred to singling out individual functions.

(d) Capital financing and debt service needs should be excluded.

(e) Provision should be made to enable local governing bodies to obtain relief from tax limitations either by reference to the electorate or administratively by a State agency.

(f) The electorate should always have power to initiate referendums on proposed rate increases.

(g) If governing bodies and citizens are provided with the avenues of relief specified in (c) and (f), then tax limits embracing all overlapping local taxing jurisdictions are preferred to single jurisdiction limits.

(h) Home rule charter counties and cities should be excluded from tax rate limitations.

10. The role of the States in strengthening the property tax (June 1963)

(a) Each State should take a hard, critical look at its property tax law and rid it of all features which cannot be administered as written, encourage taxpayers' dishonesty, force administrators to condone evasion and which, if enforced, would impose an intolerable tax burden. Each State should exclude from its property tax base any component it is unwilling or unable to administer completely.

(b) To give legislatures and Governors flexibility and responsibility for producing and maintaining equitable, productive, administrable property tax systems, constitutions should be divested of all details that obstruct sound utilization and administration of the property tax.

(c) No new changes in the property tax system, whether by exemption or classification, should be undertaken without weighing the effect on facility of administration. Where administration has been needlessly complicated by such changes in the past, the defects should be eliminated wherever feasible.

(d) In any State where the laws governing assessment administration have not been carefully reviewed and recodified in recent years and where ambiguities, inconsistencies, and other weaknesses have developed, the laws should receive a thorough reexamination, overhauling, and recodification.

(e) In the instance of any class of self-assessed personal property, unless the local assessor is given adequate means to audit the declarations of the taxpayers, the property should be assessed by the State or the tax on such property abolished.

(f) Both the legislative and executive branches of the State governments should study the property tax as consistently as the other major sources of State-local revenue and treat it as an integral part of overall State and local financial planning. Adequate provision should be made for continuing study and analysis in the research divisions of State tax commissioners and tax departments and by the interim tax study committees, legislative councils, and legislative reference bureaus of State legislature, with workable liaison arrangements.

Eliminating Underassessment

(a) The States should eliminate all requirements for fixed levels of assessment except for specifying the minimum assessment ratio (in relation to market value) below which assessments may not drop, and use for equalization and measurement purposes the annual assessment ratio studies conducted by their State supervisory agencies, as follows:

(1) The determined average level of assessments in each of a State's assessment districts would provide the basis for tax equalization in taxing districts located in more than one assessment district and for equalizing State grants for schools and similar purposes.

(2) The determined figures for the market value of taxable property in each taxing district would be the base for all regulatory and partial tax exemption provisions now related to assessed valuations or valuations equalized at fractional levels.

(b) In conjunction with adoption of the foregoing course of action, a State should conduct a thorough reevaluation of all regulatory and partial tax exemption provisions that have been related to assessed valuation, consider the desirability of their continuance from the point of view of sound policy, and, for any that may be continued, make such adjustments as are called for by new market value relationships.

(c) Because there is a tendency for nonuniformity of assessment to increase when property is assessed at low fractions of full value, it is important to use as high a floor as is feasible in setting minimum assessment levels.

Tax Exemption

(a) In order that the taxpayers may be kept informed, each State should require the regular assessment of all tax exempt property, compilation of the totals for each type of exemption by taxing districts, computation of the percentages of the assessed valuation thus exempt in each taxing district, and publication of the findings, including the function, scope, and nature of activities so exempted.

(b) Outright grants, supported by appropriations, ordinarily are more in keeping with sound public policy and financial management, more economical, and more equitable than tax exemptions and should be used in preference to the latter, with allowance for such exceptions as are clearly indicated by the public interest. No tax exemption for secular purposes should be initiated or continued which would not be justifiable as a continuing State budget appropriation.

(c) In the instance of mandatory tax exemptions extended to individuals for such purposes as personal welfare aid (the aged) and expressions of public esteem (the veterans), the States should reimburse the local communities for the amounts of the tax "loss."

Centralization of Assessment and Assessment Supervision

(a) Centralized assessment administration with more inclusive centralization when dictated by efficiency should be considered for immediate adoption by some States and for ultimate adoption by most States because it offers an uncomplicated and effective means of obtaining uniformly high-standard assessing throughout a State by the use of an integrated professional staff following standard methods and procedures under central direction.

(b) The geographical organization of each State's primary local assessment districts should be reconstituted, to the extent required, to give each district the size and resources it needs to become an efficient assessing unit and to produce a well-ordered overall structure that makes successful State supervision feasible.

(c) No assessment district should be less than countywide and when, as in very many instances, counties are too small to comprise efficient districts, multicounty districts should be created.

(d) All overlapping assessment districts should be abolished to eliminate wasteful duplication.

(e) The State's share in joint State-local assessment administration should be vested in a single agency, professionally organized and equipped for the job, and headed by a career administrator of recognized professional ability and knowledge of the property tax and its administration.

(f) In States in which tax administration is coordinated in a central tax department, the agency should be a major division of that department; in States where organization for tax administration is diffused the agency should be given due prominence as a separate department or bureau. Under the latter condition, particularly when strong central executive control is lacking, it may be desirable to have the career administrator serve under a multimember commission appointed for overlapping terms.

(g) The State supervisory agency should be responsible for assessment supervision and equalization, assessment of all State-assessed property, and valuation research, with adequate powers clearly defined by law.

(h) The State supervisory agency should be empowered to establish the professional qualifications of assessors and appraisers and certify candidates as to their fitness for employment on the basis of examinations given by it or of examinations satisfactory to it given by a State or local personnel agency, and to revoke such certification for good and sufficient cause. No person should be permitted to hold the office of assessor or to appraise property for taxation who is not thus certified.

(i) Assessors should be appointed to office, with no requirement of prior district residence, by the chief executive or executive boards of local governments when assessment districts are coextensive with such governments and by the legally constituted governing agencies of multicounty districts; they should be appointed for indefinite, rather than fixed, terms; and should be subject to removal for good cause, including incompetence, by the appointing authorities.

(j) To avoid obstruction to local recruitment and retention of competent professional personnel, State legislatures should not prescribe or limit the salaries paid certified local assessors and appraisers.

(k) State legislatures should prescribe, or authorize the State supervisory agency to prescribe, and in either case authorize the agency to enforce minimum professional staffing requirements in all local assessment districts. Legislatures should authorize the supervisory agency and any local districts to enter into agreements under which the agency will provide the district with specified technical services.

(l) Each State should (a) evaluate the structure, powers, facilities, and competence of its present agency or agencies for the supervision of assessment administration; (b) in continuing the existing setup or in creating one more suitable, determine, and establish clearly its proper and necessary functions, services and powers and equip it with adequate and appropriate personnel and facilities for meeting its responsibilities; and (c) provide for continuing systematic evaluation, by the legislative as well as the executive branch, of the usefulness of the agency and the means of improving its utility.

(m) In any State establishing professional qualifications for assessors and appraisers, the State supervisory agency should cooperate with educational institutions in planning and conducting preentry courses of study, and should conduct or arrange for regular internship training programs.

(n) To guard against weak spots among local assessing districts and to assure that assessing throughout the State meets at least acceptable minimum standards, each State should determine by thorough research the minimum level of acceptable assessment performance and require the State supervisory agency to provide for appropriate assessment administration, at district expense, in those local districts that fail to meet the minimum standards. (Senator Muskie did not concur in this recommendation.)

State-Assessed Property

(a) State assessment should be extended to all property of types (a) which customarily lie in more than one district and do not lend themselves to piecemeal local assessment, (b) which require appraisal specialists beyond the economical scope and most local district staffs, and (c) which can be more readily discovered and valued by a central agency.

(b) The division of assessment jurisdiction between State and local agencies should be clear both to taxpayers and assessors.

Studies and Reports

(a) The State agency responsible for supervision of property tax administration should be empowered to require assessors and other local officers to report data on assessed valuations and other features of the property tax, for such periods and in such form and content as it prescribes, in adequate detail to serve its needs for supervision and study. The agency should be required to publish meaningful digests of such data annually or biennially.

(b) The State supervisory agency should be required to conduct, annually, comprehensive assessment ratio studies, in accordance with sound statistical procedures, of the average level of assessment and degree of uniformity of assessment overall and for each major class of property, in all assessment districts of the State. The agency should be required to publish the findings of each study, both as to the quality and average level of assessment, in clear, readily understandable form.

(c) States should take all feasible steps to facilitate the compilation of comparable interstate property tax information by the Bureau of the Census, particularly by improving and standardizing their own collection, compilation, and analysis of essential data.

Taxpayer Appeals

(a) The present administrative-judicial hierarchy of agencies for assessment review and appeal in most States should be objectively evaluated and reconstituted, as necessary, to provide the remedies to which taxpayers are entitled, but do not now receive under the uniformity provisions of State laws and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

(b) The review machinery should have a two-level organization, with both the local and State agencies serving only an appellate function and being professionally well staffed for that purpose; the State agency—either an administrative board or a tax court—should be separate from any State agency for property tax administration, should be an appellate body to hear appeals from decisions of local review agencies and from central assessments by the State supervisory agency, and should include a small claims division with a simple, inexpensive procedure; appeals from the State agency, but on questions of law only, should be to the supreme court of the State.

(c) To aid the taxpayer in proving inequitability in his assessment (a) the State supervisory agency should be required, following sound statistical procedures, to make and publish the findings of annual assessment ratio studies which, in addition to serving the purposes of supervision and equalization, will inform the taxpayer of the average level of assessment in his district; and (b) the legislative should provide that the assessment ratios thus established may be introduced by the taxpayer as evidence in appeals to the review agencies on the issue of whether his assessment is inequitable.

12. Industrial development bond financing (June 1963)

(a) The Commission recommends that the States restrict and regulate by law the precise conditions under which local governments may engage in this activity, as follows:

(1) Subject all bond issues to approval by a State supervisory agency;

(2) Restrict authority to issue such bonds to counties and municipalities; deny the authority to special districts;

(3) Give priority to communities with surplus labor, outside the area of the effective operation of conventional credit and property leasing facilities;

(4) Limit the total amount of such bonds which may be outstanding at any one time in the State; and

(5) Prohibit such financing for the pirating of industrial plants by one community from another.

(b) The Commission recommends that local industrial development bond financing be confined to rural areas. States desiring to stimulate employment in urban and industrial areas, can accomplish this best by a program of second mortgage loans to supplement local civic and conventional financing or by State guarantees of conventional loans.

(c) The Commission finds the industrial development bond device particularly offensive when it is used to finance plants for strong national firms which themselves have access to adequate financing through conventional channels. The abuse is especially glaring when the firm itself acquires the tax-exempt bonds issued to finance the plant it occupies, thus becoming also the beneficiary of tax exempt income. Therefore the Commission recommends that the Congress amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the firms which buy the tax-exempt bonds themselves cannot deduct as a business cost the rents paid for the use of industrial plants built with these bonds.

13. The role of equalization in Federal grants (January 1964)

(a) The national policy considerations which require Federal grant programs require also that, with important qualifications, the distribution of Federal grants among the States take account of the relative inequalities in the fiscal capacities of the States (together with their local governments) in such a way as to facilitate the achievement of a more uniform level of minimum program standards in all States.

(b) The equalizing aim of Federal grant distributions should be limited to the functions and services specifically related to and involved in national objectives and only to the minimum service levels consistent with these national objectives.

(c) Explicit equalization provisions are inappropriate to several categories of grants, including (a) planning and demonstration grants, (b) stimulation grants, (c) grants to meet localized emergencies, and (d) grants which cover substantially all of the program costs. Apart from these exceptions, Federal grant distributions should reflect differences in the States' relative fiscal capacities to support the particular program or services at the required minimum level. This conclusion is subject to the overriding qualification that where program need is proportionate to relative State fiscal capacity, the objectives of an equalization grant can be met without use of an explicit equalizing provision.

(d) To the extent practicable, equalization provisions, introduced through both allocation and matching requirements, should aim for a reasonable uniform level of minimum program performance in every State; that uniformity in the mechanics of the equalization provisions is preferred over variety; and that statutory specification is preferable to administrative discretion.

(e) Departments and agencies charged with the administration of Federal grant programs should be required by the President to review periodically (a) the adequacy of the need indexes employed in the respective grant programs, and (b) the appropriateness of their equalization provisions and that this review be coordinated by the Bureau of the Budget. This requirement may be coordinated with the periodic congressional review of grants-in-aid recommended in an earlier report of this Commission and embodied in legislation pending before the present Congress.

(f) The President, through his Executive Office, should provide for the development of plans and procedures to assemble the data required for improving measures of State relative fiscal capacity and a tax effort for use, to the extent practicable, on a Governmentwide basis and to collect and tabulate such necessary data on a continuing basis.

14. State-Federal overlapping in cigarette taxes (September 1964)

(a) That the Governors direct their tax policy officials to explore with representatives of the tobacco industry the procedures that would be required to place the cigarette tax on a return basis at the manufacturing level in such a way that the burden on the industry would be minimized.

(b) That the Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service, participate in this exploration, which should include the potential scope of Federal-State administrative cooperation.

15. The intergovernmental aspects of documentary taxes (September 1964)

(a) Congress should amend chapter 34 of the Internal Revenue Code to repeal the stamp tax on conveyances, such repeal to be effective 3 years after its enactment.

(b) When the Federal tax on real estate transfers is repealed, those States without such a tax should consider it for use at either the State or local level.

B. GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS

1. State constitutional and statutory restrictions on the structural, functional, and personnel powers of local governments (October 1962)

(a) Amendment of State constitutions to grant "residual powers" to units of general local government; namely, all powers not reserved to the State in the constitution or preempted for the State by action of the legislature.

(b) Modification of State and Federal grants-in-aid programs to provide incentives to small local units of government to join together in the administration of the function being given a grant assistance.

(c) Authorization to county governments individually or jointly to establish service corporations or authorities, where clearly necessary and with appropriate safeguards. (Mr. Hummel did not concur in this recommendation.)

(d) Authorization to municipalities and counties to adopt optional forms of local government.

(e) Authorization to county governing boards to fix appointment, tenure, and salaries of all county officials and personnel except those engaged in so-called liberty and equality functions such as elections administration and district attorney and sheriff functions.

(f) Authorization to municipalities to appoint all city officers other than the mayors and council members.

(g) Provision by the State government of technical assistance upon request of local governments with regard to personnel administration.

2. Apportionment of State legislatures (December 1962)

(a) Apportionment of seats in State legislative bodies is a basic factor of representative government and hence should be clearly specified in State constitutions.

(b) Where a legislative body is to be apportioned on the basis of population a maximum deviation of 10 percent should be constitutionally specified.

(c) The constitution should charge the State legislature with initial responsibility for apportionment but should further provide for a nonlegislative and nonjudicial body to do the apportioning job if the legislature fails to act or acts unconstitutionally.

(d) The constitution should further specify the frequency of reapportionment and should endow State courts with both jurisdiction and remedies with respect to reapportionment actions.

(e) The people of the State should be provided the opportunity to react at the polls at any time to the continuance or change of apportionment formulas.

(f) State and Federal courts confine their apportionment roles to adjudicating and enforcing the constitutionality of apportionment actions and should refrain from the prescription by judicial decree of specific apportionment formulas or the geographic composition of legislative districts.

(g) Both houses of a State legislature be apportioned strictly on the basis of population. (Governor Anderson, Supervisor Donnenwirth, Governor Hollings, Mr. Hummel, Senator Newell, and Governor Smylie joined in a dissenting view regarding this recommendation, and Senator MUSKIE, joined by Senator MUNDT, Congressman FOUNTAIN, and Senator ERVIN, expressed views not in accord with this recommendation.)

3. Transferability of public employee retirement credits among units of government (March 1963)

(a) Public employees of all units of government be provided coverage by a staff retirement system.

(b) States, in which numerous small public employee retirement systems operate, examine the situations, and provide the necessary leadership for merging these systems where feasible.

(c) States which do not now have an intrastate reciprocal retirement law enact such legislation in order to provide for a considerable measure of preservation and continuity of retirement credits for public employees who transfer employment between covered units of government within the State.

(d) The employee's benefits be vested when he has completed a period of service of not more than 5 years in the system and that the employee be granted a deferred retirement annuity at the normal retirement age, providing he does not withdraw his contributions to the retirement fund when he leaves employment covered by the fund.

(e) Units of government not now covered under social security review the situation and give careful consideration to the possible advantages of extending social security to their employees.

4. Control associated with Federal grants for public assistance (May 1964)

(a) To provide for judicial review of decisions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding conformity of State public assistance plans with the act. (Secretary Celebrezze, Mayor Naftalin, and Administrator Weaver dissented from this recommendation.)

(b) To provide the Secretary with discretion for declaring parts of State public assistance plans out of conformity with the act. (Secretary Celebrezze dissented.)

(c) To give the Secretary discretion to waive the single State agency requirement for the public assistance titles when he is certain that the objectives of the program will not be endangered. (Secretary Celebrezze dissented.)

(d) To establish a permanent Public Assistance Advisory Council to advise the Secretary on proposed legislation, administrative regulations, and other related matters. (Secretary Celebrezze dissented.)

(e) To remove the prohibitions in the act denying Federal participation in assistance payments to needy individuals who are patients in institutions as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis. (Secretary Celebrezze and Mayor Goldner dissented from this recommendation.)

5. The problem of special districts in American government (May 1964)

(a) That no special district be created prior to review and approval of the proposed district by an agency consisting of representatives of city and county government in the county within which the proposed district will operate. Creation of districts undertaking functions of statewide concern also should be approved by an appropriate State agency.

(b) That prior to granting consent to creation of a special district, municipalities, counties, and districts performing the same function which would be undertaken by the proposed district be given an opportunity to indicate an ability and willingness to provide the service within the territory of the proposed district and, where such willingness and ability is expressed, the proposed district not be created.

(c) That activities of existing and subsequently created special districts be coordinated with the activities of units of general government, specifically: (1) Proposed acquisition of title to land by a district should be approved by the unit of general local government within which the land lies; and (2) proposed district capital improvements should be submitted to the appropriate unit or units of general local government for comment prior to final action on the proposal by the governing body of the district. Where the district is performing a function that directly affects a program conducted by the State, approval and review also should be required by the State agency responsible for the State program involved.

(d) That a designated State agency and the county governing body be informed of the creation of all special districts within respective county borders.

(e) That to the extent practicable, special district budgets and accounts be formulated and maintained according to uniform procedures and that State or private audits of district accounts be made at regular intervals.

(f) That counties and municipalities, when sending out their tax bills or providing receipts to individual property owners, itemize special district property taxes and special assessment levied against the property.

(g) Simple procedures for consolidation, merger, or dissolution of special districts. Such procedures should permit an appropriate unit of general government to assume responsibility for the function of the special district, and a consolidation and merger of districts performing the same or similar functions.

(h) Review and approval by a State agency of service charges or tolls levied by special districts where such charges or tolls are not reviewed and approved by the governing body of a unit of general government.

(i) Authorization for counties to establish subordinate taxing areas in parts of their territories to enable these governments to provide and finance a governmental service in a portion of the county.

C. METROPOLITAN AREAS

1. Governmental approaches to providing metropolitan services (April 1961 and June 1962)

(a) Simplified statutory requirements for municipal annexation of unincorporated territory.

(b) Authorization for interlocal contracting or joint performance of urban services and for formulation of voluntary "metropolitan councils" of elected officials.

(c) Authorization for establishment of metropolitan service corporations for performance of particular governmental services that call for areawide handling. (Mr. Michaelian and Mr. Burton did not concur in this recommendation.)

(d) Authorization for municipalities to exercise extraterritorial planning, zoning, and subdivision regulation in their unincorporated fringe areas.

(e) Authorization for voluntary transfer of govermental functions for cities to counties and vice versa.

(f) Authorization for the creation of metropolitan area study commissions on local government structure and services. (Mr. Michaelian and Mr. Burton did not concur in this recommendation.)

(g) Authorization for creation of metropolitan area planning bodies.

(h) Establishment of a unit of State government to give continuing attention, review, and assistance regarding the State's metropolitan areas.

(i) Inauguration of State programs of financial and technical assistance to metropolitan areas.

(j) Stricter State standards for new incorporations within metropolitan areas.

(k) Financial and regulatory action by the State to secure and preserve "open land" in and around metropolitan areas.

(l) Assumption by the State of an active role in the resolution of disputes among local units of government within metropolitan areas.

(m) Where effective county subdivision control does not exist over fringe areas, State legislatures enact legislation authorizing their municipalities to exercise extraterritorial planning, zoning, and subdivision regulation in their unincorporated fringe areas.

(n) The State government make its "good offices" available in the event of disputes in connection with interlocal contracts.

(o) The States facilitate the formation of voluntary "metropolitan councils" of elected officials by enacting the suggested legislation authorizing the making of interlocal agreements, supplemented by whatever special provisions may be required in the particular instance in according legal entity status to voluntary councils desirous of such status.

(The Commission also recommended expanded activity by the National Government with respect to metropolitan area problems, including:)

(a) Financial support on a continuing basis to metropolitan area planning agencies. (Governor Smylie did not concur in this recommendation.)

(b) Expanded Federal technical assistance to State and metropolitan planning agencies.

(c) Congressional consent in advance to interstate compacts creating planning agencies in those metropolitan areas crossing State lines.

(d) Review by a metropolitan planning agency of applications for Federal grants-in-aid within the area with respect to airport, highway, public housing and hospital construction, waste treatment works, and urban renewal projects. (Provision for item (a) has been made by administrative regulation and items (b) and (c) were included in the Housing Act of 1961.)

2. Mass transportation (April 1961)

(a) Provision of Federal financial assistance in the form of loans and demonstration and planning grants to metropolitan areas for mass transportation facilities and services. (This was largely accomplished through the incorporation of mass transportation assistance in the Housing Act of 1961.) (Mr. Burton did not concur in this recommendation.)

(b) Legislative and administrative action by the States, particularly the larger industrial States, in initiating programs of financial and technical assistance to their metropolitan areas with respect to mass transportation facilities and services.

(c) Enactment of State legislation, particularly in the larger industrial States, authorizing the establishment within metropolitan areas of mass transportation authorities, with powers to construct and operate transportation systems, to issue bonds, and to impose user charges. (Mr. Burton did not concur in this recommendation.)

3. Intergovernmental responsibilities for water supply and sewage disposal in metropolitan areas (October 1962)

(a) Increased investment by local governments in urban water and sewer facilities, particularly for sewage treatment plants.

(b) Improvement in central city—suburban contractual and planning relationships including suburban representation on city water and sewer agencies serving suburbs under contract.

(c) Cooperation among local units of government in metropolitan areas so as to plan, develop, and regulate water and sewer facilities on an areawide basis.

(d) Enactment of State legislation vesting responsibility for overall State water resource planning and policymaking in a single agency and providing for representation of urban interests on interstate water agencies.

(e) Enactment of State legislation to provide for (1) abatement and control of pollution of rivers and streams; and (2) State and local regulatory authority over individual well and septic tank installations, minimizing and limiting their use to exceptional situations consistent with comprehensive land use goals.

(f) Enactment of State legislation to (1) provide State financial assistance for local sewage treatment works, supplementing existing Federal aid; (2) provide incentives for areawide or regional development of local water and sewer facilities; (3) provide State technical assistance to local waste treatment facility planning and construction; (4) liberalize debt limits and referendums requirements for water and sewer utility financing; and (5) permit joint action by units of local government in meeting area water and sewer needs.

(g) More vigorous enforcement of existing State pollution abatement laws.

(The Commission also recommends the following legislative and administrative actions by the National Government:)

(a) The Commission sees no present need for any new Federal grant-in-aid program for local water works comparable to Federal grants for sewage treatment construction.

(b) Amendment of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 to provide (1) an additional matching incentive for the development of sewage disposal facilities on a regional or areawide basis; and (2) an increased dollar ceiling in Federal grants to larger cities for sewage treatment works.

(c) Amendment of statute governing public facility loans program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to permit (1) communities of 50,000 or more to qualify for sewer and water loans; and (2) the joining together of communities with an aggregate population of over 50,000 for purposes of such loan assistance.

(d) Amendment of statutes governing the FHA mortgage insurance program and the home loan program of the Veterans' Administration to (1) tighten eligibility requirements for individual well and septic tank installations; and (2) include as insurable site preparation and development costs of water and sewer lines and systems.

(e) Evaluation by the Federal executive branch of present Federal enforcement powers and financial incentives relative to industrial pollution of rivers and streams.

(f) Consideration of urban water needs in future Federal water resources planning equal to that given water requirements for navigation, power, and agriculture.

4. Impact of Federal urban development programs on local government organization and planning (January 1964)

(a) (1) All organizational limitations which require or promote special purpose units of local government to the disadvantage of general purpose units of local government (i.e., municipalities, towns, and counties), be removed from Federal aid programs for urban development; (2) general purpose units of government be favored as Federal aid recipients, other factors being equal; and (3) special purpose units of government be required to coordinate their Federal aid activities with general purpose governments.

(b) Joint participation by local governmental units having common program objectives affecting the development of an urban area overlapping existing political boundaries be authorized and encouraged.

(c) Federal grants-in-aid for urban development be channeled through the States in cases where a State (1) provides appropriate administrative machinery to carry out relevant responsibilities; and (2) provides significant financial contributions and, when appropriate, technical assistance to the local governments concerned. (Administrator Weaver and Mayors Tucker, Blaisdell, and Naftalin dissented from this recommendation.)

(d) Effective planning at the local levels be required and promoted to the extent appropriate in all Federal aid programs significantly affecting urban development.

(e) Eligibility requirements for Federal urban planning assistance, under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, be broadened to include all municipalities and counties over 50,000 population which are undergoing rapid urbanization.

(f) Legislation be enacted by the Congress to establish the principle of Federal interagency coordination, and this principle be implemented by preparing and adopting a unified urban development policy within the executive branch.

(g) State governments assume their proper responsibilities for assisting and facilitating urban development.

(h) Legislation be enacted by the States to encourage joint undertakings by political subdivisions having common program objectives affecting the development of an urban area overlapping existing political boundaries.

5. Metropolitan social and economic disparities: Implications for intergovernmental relations in central cities and suburbs

(a) That each local governmental unit and agency within metropolitan areas ascertain, analyze, and give recognition to economic and social disparities affecting its programs. Federal planning aids for urban development should specifically authorize and encourage economic and social policy planning for the community as a basic justification for physical planning.

(b) To encourage a wide range of housing prices, that State legislation be enacted restricting zoning authority in metropolitan areas to larger municipalities and to county government and that metropolitan planning agencies prepare plans and ordinances for adoption by local governments reflecting this objective.

(c) That (1) States enact legislation authorizing the adoption of uniform housing, building, zoning, and platting codes within metropolitan areas; and (2) local governments utilize such authority.

(d) To encourage diversification and geographic dispersal of housing for low-income groups. Federal, and, where necessary, State legislation should be amended to (1) facilitate use of existing private housing by local public housing authorities; (2) authorize subsidizing of rents of low-income families in existing private housing; and (3) permit financial assistance to private nonprofit organizations to enable them to provide subsidized housing for low-income families.

(e) That the appropriate Federal and State agencies accelerate the adoption of cooperative agreements for the enforcement of Federal and State laws and regulations forbidding discrimination in housing.

(f) That the Congress remove existing limitations on nonresidential renewal from the Federal urban renewal program.

(g) That Governors of the several States and the Secretary of Labor take steps, including interstate agreements, to assure that public employment services are provided to all job applicants and employees within metropolitan area labor markets regardless of State lines and action by the Secretary to assure himself that such arrangements are being effectively carried out as a condition to Federal grants for employment security administration.

(h) That States enact legislation authorizing counties in metropolitan areas to provide urban renewal and public housing services to unincorporated areas and small municipalities and provide financial and technical assistance.

(i) That States enact legislation authorizing and encouraging areawide coordination and administration—through county governments or other appropriate means—of vocational education and retraining programs within metropolitan areas.

(j) That State legislation be enacted to authorize the use of taxing powers by responsible areawide metropolitan service agencies carrying on functions not solely financed by user charges.

(k) That each State examine its present system of grants and shared taxes and remove all features that aggravate differences in local fiscal capacity to deal with service requirements in metropolitan areas and that encourage the proliferation of local governments within such areas.

(l) That States consider the merit of using State grant funds to equalize local property tax loads among local jurisdictions in metropolitan areas.

(m) That each State make a critical review of its present school grant formula to insure that it provides for an educational level below which no community should fall and that it contains factors designed to measure local tax effort and diverse community educational requirements.

(n) That the States finance at least one-half of the cost of general assistance welfare programs, accompanied by adoption of State standards for such programs.

(o) That local governments in metropolitan areas negotiating the sharing of costs for areawide urban services utilize cost-benefit studies as a basis for such negotiations.

(p) That the States and the Federal Government develop standards of measurement of costs and benefits for areawide services that they support through grant and loan programs.

6. Relocation: Unequal treatment of people and businesses displaced by governments

(a) That the Congress require State and local governments administering Federal grant-in-aid programs, before proceeding with any property acquisition that displaces people, to assure that there is a method for temporary relocation and that standard housing units in sufficient quantities, at a comparable location, within their financial means are or will be available.

(b) That the Congress establish and executive agencies implement a uniform policy of relocation payments and advisory assistance for persons and businesses displaced by grant-in-aid or direct Federal programs.

(c) That each State establish a uniform policy within the State covering relocation assistance and relocation payments for persons and businesses displaced by State and local programs.

(d) That the Congress and State legislatures assign to administrative agencies responsibility for determining the amount of relocation payments, subject to specific statutory maximums.

(e) That the States enact legislation with a similar requirement for State and local agencies.

(f) That under Federal grant-in-aid programs, the full costs of payments to any person for relocating a family, and the costs of payments up to $25,000 to any person relocating a business should be completely reimbursed by the Federal Government; and the costs of business relocation payments in excess of that amount should be shared on the basis of the cost-sharing formula governing the particular program.

(g) That the States share in local governments' costs of providing relocation payments and services when programs for which localities receive State or Federal grants to which the State contributes part of the local share.

(h) That the Small Business Administration Act be broadened to authorize disaster loans to small business concerns suffering substantial economic injury as a result of a construction program conducted by State and local governments.

(i) That the Small Business Administration Act be amended to authorize disaster loans to small business concerns that are adversely affected but not actually displaced by Government property takings.

(j) That Congress amend the Manpower Development and Training Act to permit widow and widower owners of displaced firms to be eligible for manpower retraining allowances.

(k) That Federal, State, and local governments authorize and encourage all agencies causing displacements in urban areas to centralize the responsibility for all aspects of relocation programs in a single agency which is part of the regular administrative organization in each major urban jurisdiction.

(l) That cities in metropolitan areas with relocation staff and experience offer to contract to provide relocation services and areawide studies of housing needs and resources for all local governments and agencies operating in the area and that smaller units, where necessary, undertake to provide such services and studies jointly.

(m) That States and regional organizations assist local governments in planning for relocation through such means as technical assistance in preparation of workable programs and community renewal programs; where States make urban renewal capital grants, advances therefrom should be provided for relocation planning.

(n) That Federal and State Governments require their departments and agencies and special districts causing displacement to give advance notice at the earliest practicable time to local units of general government of any construction programs which will displace persons and businesses.

RESIGNATION OF C. FRANKLIN DANIELS, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, MULTIFAMILY HOUSING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have just been advised that C. Franklin Daniels, Assistant Commissioner for Multifamily Housing, has tendered his resignation effective June 3, 1966.

I congratulate Commissioner Brownstein on his prompt acceptance of this resignation. I express the hope that this represents but the first step toward a long overdue correction in some of the procedures that have been followed by this agency.

RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, pursuant to the prior order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, March 29, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 25, 1966:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. MARSHALS

Vance W. Collins, of Kansas, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Arthur C. Elliott, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years vice Fred F. Hoh, deceased.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Smithmoore P. Myers, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Washington for the term of 4 years vice Frank R. Freeman, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

The following named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Lucile B. Florey, Vincent, Ala., in place of R. T. McGraw, retired.

ALASKA

Sophia S. Hapoff, Unalaska, Alaska, in place of J. E. Caldwell, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Jack Whillock, Clinton, Ark., in place of J. F. Graddy, transferred.

Leo J. Eckart, Paris, Ark., in place of N. O. Hixson, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Leonard J. Bednorz, Banning, Calif., in place of J. T. Smith, retired.

Jack W. Wilkins, Courtland, Calif., in place of L. E. Stuart, deceased.

June M. LeRoy, Dobbins, Calif., in place of M. H. LeRoy, retired.

David Hartshorn, Holtville, Calif., in place of W. J. Reynolds, retired.

Wilbur F. Hammond, Lomita, Calif., in place of E. F. Rishel, retired.

Daniel J. Taylor, Modesto, Calif., in place of M. H. Moorehead, deceased.

Harold J. Mahar, Orange, Calif., in place of N. E. Case, deceased.

COLORADO

Ruth M. Gurley, Englewood, Colo., in place of J. E. Adams, retired.

Lois E. Mall, Louisville, Colo., in place of James Fenolia, retired.

Beryl E. Lambert, Yuma, Colo., in place of H. L. Grauerholz, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

John T. Smith, Brooklyn, Conn., in place of T. P. Smith, retired.

DELAWARE

Richard H. Quillen, Lincoln, Del., in place of E. M. Clendaniel, retired.

FLORIDA

George W. Kelley, Howey In The Hills, Fla., in place of M. F. Mathews, retired.

Norton B. McNeal, Ocala, Fla., in place of W. J. Beckham, deceased.

Delmas E. Pittman, Oneco, Fla., in place of R. H. Roesch, retired.

Dorothy L. Smith, Sumterville, Fla., in place of H. H. Belton, retired.

GEORGIA

Wilma G. Lawrence, McCaysville, Ga., in place of M. T. McCay, deceased.

HAWAII

Shigeko O. Ishibashi, Makaweli, Hawaii, in place of J. K. Saito, retired.

ILLINOIS

Mervin J. Hoffman, Lenzburg, Ill., in place of G. J. Frech, deceased.

Thomas H. Nolan, Oakland, Ill., in place of L. M. McLaughlin, retired.

Helen L. Brent, Stanford, Ill., in place of T. A. Dossett, retired.

INDIANA

Harry F. Gillespie, Fortville, Ind., in place of V. R. McVay, deceased.

Marie W. Beck, Mount Summit, Ind., in place of S. B. Brammer, retired.

IOWA

John D. Kaster, Afton, Iowa, in place of R. C. Myers, retired.

Harvey W. Spurgeon, Koesauqua, Iowa, in place of Leslie Fahrner, retired.

Charles A. Papach, McIntire, Iowa, in place of J. G. Parker, retired.

Robert C. Dee, New Hampton, Iowa, in place of W. J. Gleason, retired.

KANSAS

Harold H. Derby, Dresden, Kans., in place of P. T. Welter, transferred.

Edwin M. Whitmore, Fall River, Kans., in place of M. S. Whiteside, transferred.

Ray T. Amer, Pleasanton, Kans., in place of L. W. Leisure, retired.

KENTUCKY

Heskel W. Roaden, Corbin, Ky., in place of O. C. Seeley, retired.

Carl W. Preston, Junction City, Ky., in place of H. A. Reynolds, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Georgiana M. Authement, Cut Off, La., in place of V. T. Remont, retired.

Charles V. Giles, Hosston, La., in place of R. H. Fuller, retired.

Alma L. Guillot, Norco, La., in place of Dennis Gomez, Jr., retired.

MAINE

Theodore A. Johns, Carmel, Maine, in place of E. L. Garland, retired.

Carroll A. Nevells, Lee, Maine, in place of M. F. Hanson, retired.

Waldo E. Lincoln, Wayne, Maine, in place of V. A. Lincoln, retired.

MARYLAND

George H. Buck, Havre de Grace, Md., in place of H. H. Colburn, retired.

Joseph A. V. Duchaine, Kensington, Md., in place of M. B. Tierney, retired.

C. Irving Pinder, Queenstown, Md., in place of E. K. Goodhand, deceased.

Franklin P. Coulbourne, Salisbury, Md., in place of E. L. Leonard, retired.

Harry O. Baker, Willards, Md., in place of E. M. Dennis, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles W. Stiles, Duxbury, Mass., in place of G. J. Newitt, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Daniel J. Fox, Decatur, Mich., in place of J. H. Mahoney, resigned.

Luther S. Larkin, Drayton Plains, Mich., in place of K. F. Oakes, retired.

Norman F. Knorr, East Detroit, Mich., in place of S. L. Schook, retired.

Monte C. Sauers, Lake Odessa, Mich., in place of Marjorie Hershiser, retired.

Samuel L. Buck, Rapid City, Mich., in place of C. K. Guy, removed.

Lawrence A. Frith, Vermontville, Mich., in place of R. K. Kilpatrick, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Eldon L. Rootes, Elk River, Minn., in place of A. I. Donahue, retired.

James M. Hawkinson, Jr., Kandiyohi, Minn., in place of E. A. Roser, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

James N. White, Wiggins, Miss., in place of M. D. Baker, retired.

MISSOURI

Gerald E. Wilson, Blythedale, Mo., in place of C. M. VanHoozer, retired.

Ralph W. Anderson, Holcomb, Mo., in place of Buren Napper, retired.

Glenn K. Chaney, Humansville, Mo., in place of Z. B. Reynolds, retired.

Blanche A Goodan, Hurdland, Mo., in place of H. L. Epperson, retired.

Raymond L. McDonald, New Haven, Mo., in place of M. L. Grannemann, retired.

NEBRASKA

S. Gertrude Neubauer, Brewster, Nebr., in place of F. T. Zeigler, retired.

Donald C. Lange, Gibbon, Nebr., in place of J. D. Bishop, retired.

Harold L. Bausch, Leigh, Nebr., in place of H. M. Cramer, retired.

Donald E. Warnke, Meadow Grove, Nebr., in place of H. W. Botsford, retired.

Evelyn A. Skokan, Niabrara, Nebr., in place of George Skokan, deceased.

Wilma M. Novotny, Odell, Nebr., in place of L. R. Vejraska, retired.

Merle S. Treadway, Rising City, Nebr., in place of W. A. Aregood, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph C. Thomas, Englewood, N. J., in place of L. J. Gilsinan, retired.

Walter H. Shillito, Hammonton, N.J., in place of I. M. Adams, retired.

Mary E. Bernard, Kingston, N.J., in place of R. F. Woolf, deceased.

Robert F. Kelly, Palisades Park, N.J., in place of W. J. Dorgan, resigned.

Lois L. Kern, Readington, N.J., in place of J. G. Scannicchio, resigned.

Francis W. Kasse, Ridgefield Park, N.J., in place of V. E. Heineman, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Cyril B. Tate, Moriarty, N. Mex., in place of B. L. Gloss, retired.

NEW YORK

Edwin J. Faber, Caroga Lake, N.Y., in place of Burton Yates, retired.

Neil G. Van Allen, Central Square, N.Y., in place of M. B. Crabtree, retired.

Jerome P. Meyer, Corfu, N.Y., in place of Celestine Reynolds, retired.

Howard D. Holland, Hadley, N.Y., in place of V. B. Hawk, retired.

James E. Adams, Morrisonville, N.Y., in place of R. M. Darrah, resigned.

Grant D. Morrison, Northville, N.Y., in place of P. H. Griffing, retired.

Carroll H. Belgard, Ogdenburg, N.Y., in place of Frank LaVigne, retired.

Andrew T. Pink, Pleasant Valley, N.Y., in place of J. E. Clark, retired.

Anne Wolstencroft, Sayville, N.Y., in place of W. J. Greene, retired.

Katherine I. Bristol, Schuylerville, N.Y., in place of W. R. Reel, removed.

Sarah J. Keene, South Colton, N.Y., in place of L. H. Selleck, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Allen T. Powell, Jr., Ahoskie, N.C., in place of Alvah Early, retired.

C. Odell Merrill, Beaufort, N.C., in place of J. P. Betts, retired.

James L. Perry, Carrboro, N.C., in place of C. R. Oakley, retired.

Charles L. Marks, Chapel Hill, N.C., in place of J. P. Cheek, retired.

Paul D. Gilmore, Julian, N.C., in place of G. R. Hemphill, retired.

Roger C. Royall, Roaring Gap, N.C., in place of C. W. Inskeep, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marie E. Lockhart, Egeland, N. Dak., in place of E. L. Swank, retired.

OHIO

Mildred L. DeVault, Maynard, Ohio, in place of Katherine Matson, retired.

Eldon E. Rychener, Pettisville, Ohio, in place of B. B. Emmons, retired.

Otto McClanahan, Springboro, Ohio, in place of Rhodabelle Mullen, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Jack E. Cochran, Wagoner, Okla., in place of Clark Moss, retired.

OREGON

Iona A. Barclay, Troutdale, Oreg., in place of R. D. Hewitt, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Dorald E. Clark, Breezewood, Pa., in place of L. H. Wilt, removed.

Mattis A. Pottiger, Harrisburg, Pa., in place of W. E. King, retired.

Michael A. Elias, Irwin, Pa., in place of W. B. Lewis, removed.

Jack Montanile, Leetsdale, Pa., in place of V. B. Segeleon, resigned.

Donald J. Kelchner, Jr., Orangeville, Pa., in place of D. H. Brewer, transferred.

Elizabeth P. Durinzi, Republic, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Morris, retired.

Albert L. Seals, Rices Landing, Pa., in place of C. A. Benjamin, deceased.

Marshall W. Beightol, Winburne, Pa., in place of Stephen Rohart, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Benjamin Cole, Mayaguez, P.R., in place of Alberto Bravo, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Henry A. Correia, Portsmouth, R.I., in place of C. L. Levesque, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sara L. Hendrix, Conestee, S.C., in place of W. C. Hendrix, retired.

Louise W. Sottile, Isle of Palms, S.C., in place of R H. Klump, retired.

M. Alexander Foster, Roebuck, S.C., in place of E. M. Rogers, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Eugene C. Lauer, Howard, S. Dak., in place of W. P. Klein, retired.

TENNESSEE

Kermit S. Boals, Finley, Tenn., in place of Helen McDaniel retired.

Jack F. Naifeh, Mason, Tenn., in place of B. T. Transou, retired.

Nancy L. Shaw, Pleasant View, Tenn., in place of M. E. Harris, deceased.

Arthur E. Reynolds, Tennessee Ridge, Tenn., in place of R. C. Mobley, deceased.

TEXAS

John O. McMahon, Bremond, Tex., in place of C. D. Brown, deceased.

Laura E. Seago, Gustine, Tex., in place of C. T. Seago, retired.

James L. Davis, Howe, Tex., in place of A. T. Davenport, retired.

A. J. McAlister, Post, Tex., in place of Harold Voss, retired.

Martin E. Parker, Round Rock, Tex., in place of R. E. Johnson, retired.

Charles B. Townes, Tahoka, Tex., in place of W. E. Smith, retired.

Leona M. Page, Wink, Tex., in place of O. M. Wilson, retired.

UTAH

Robert A. Cornaby, Pleasant Grove, Utah, in place of J. R. Mills, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Eleanor W. Smith, Farnham, Va., in place of I. D. Lyell, retired.

Murray O. Cates, Lawrenceville, Va., in place of C. L. Epperson, retired.

Robert M. Dwyer, Remington, Va., in place of J. A. McConchie, retired.

Annie J. Lewis, Stony Creek., Va., in place of M. N. Ridley, resigned.

Samuel B. Sheffield, Jr., Waverly, Va., in place of M. F. Herbert, retired.

WASHINGTON

Clifford K. Brock, Chehalis, Wash., in place of J. C. Nowadnick, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles B. McDonald, Jane Lew, W. Va., in place of Jacob Seitz, retired.

WISCONSIN

Inez I. Goodell, Wheeler, Wis., in place of R. M. McIntyre, retired.

WYOMING

Francis W. Freese, Lander, Wyo., in place of L. M. Buckley, retired.

Imogene L. Stalder, Linch, Wyo., in place of E. V. Arnwine, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 1966:

U.S. COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith, U.S. Coast Guard, to be commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of admiral.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be rear admirals

Capt. William B. Ellis.
Capt. Douglas B. Henderson.
Capt. Russell R. Waesche, Jr.
Capt. Mark A. Whalen.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mitchell Rogovin, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Frank M. Wozencraft, of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Frederick J. R. Heebe, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana.

Russell E. Smith, of Montana, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Montana.

Clinton N. Ashmore, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

Joseph L. Ward, of Nevada, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Nevada for the term of 4 years.

William H. Terrill, of Colorado, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years.

Harry D. Mansfield, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 25, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, today, March 25, marks the 145th anniversary of Greek independence. On this day in the year of 1921 the Archbishop of Patras unfurled the national flag of Greece and the revolution against rule by the Ottoman empire.

The independence of Greece is one of the most glorious events of the 19th century. The fight for freedom by the Greek people attracted the support of many outstanding world personalities and we all remember the glorious efforts in this endeavor of the great poet, Lord Byron.

It took 8 years of hard fighting to regain the political independence of Greece. This was accomplished through the supreme sacrifice which Greeks cheerfully made for the attainment of their most cherished ideal—the ideal which has been the base of Western civilization—freedom. Today Greece stands as a fortress of freedom in the Mediterranean and stands as true and stanch ally in the continuing struggle for self-determination throughout the world.

Here in our own country the Greek American community has made a great contribution to our culture, to our economy and our democratic spirit. On a day such as this it is a great privilege to join with the rest of the free world and with all of our Americans of Hellenic origin in observing March 25 as Greek Independence Day.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Andrew Pier, O.S.B., director, Slovak Institute, Cleveland, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, Master of the universe, we thank Thee for Thy blessings of freedom and Thy infinite bounty, and we ask Thee, Father of all nations, that Thou bestow these blessings upon all.

On the occasion of the 27th anniversary of the declaration of Slovakia's independence, we beg Thee in the name of this august assembly of freemen that Thou help to realize the legitimate aspirations of the Slovak nation to its own free, self-governing state.

We pray that America, our beloved country, may find ultimate fulfillment of its glorious destiny of leadership of the nations of the world by final victory over the forces of evil.

Grant that this Congress be ever mindful of the Christian heritage of our Founding Fathers, and that it continue to perpetuate and cherish the ideals of freedom, truth, justice, and human rights, for all ages to come.

Hear us, O Heavenly Father, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 24, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2394. An act to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1404) entitled "An act to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the placing of a bust of Constantino Brumidi in the Capitol;

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on District of Columbia home rule;

S. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966;

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Joint Economic Committee of additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings entitled "Recent Federal Reserve Actions and Economic Policy Coordination"; and

S. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of the hearings of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico as Senate documents.

PEACENIK AND BEATNIK DEMONSTRATIONS CREATE DISUNITY

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly disturbed by a recurrence of these demonstrations throughout the United States in opposition to our policy in South Vietnam. It appears to me that this wave of demonstrations over the weekend is coordinated with the arrival of fresh North Vietnamese regulars in South Vietnam and with some of our own military efforts in South Vietnam. Just when it seems that we are launching a major campaign in key areas of that country, these demonstrations occur. Demonstrations by peaceniks, beatniks, and various assortments of characters in this country are timed to divert attention from our effort there and cause disunity in this country and disunity throughout the world. Every report I get from southeast Asia is that these demonstrations very definitely aid the enemy. I believe there would have been negotiations when the President extended the olive branch of peace in January had it not been for these demonstrations in this country and over the world which encouraged the Communists to continue their aggression and terror tactics in South Vietnam. When in Saigon in January I was informed that some Vietcong captured not too far from Saigon had in their possession pictures of demonstrations around the White House and of demonstrations by beatniks and peaceniks in the United States, thus proving beyond any shadow of a doubt that these demonstrations are coordinated with the Communist effort in southeast Asia and that these demonstrations do aid that Communist effort and prevent negotiations and prevent peace and cause the killing of more American boys.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time for all of us to unite, as we did in World War I and as we did after Pearl Harbor, and support our men in South Vietnam on the firing line. The question is no longer debatable. We are actively engaged in fighting stark ruthless aggression. It is high time for us to consider the subversive nature of these demonstrations and deal with them accordingly.

SENATOR SPARKMAN ADDRESSES NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I was privileged to attend and to address the 35th anniversary of the National Housing Conference. Addressing this same conference along with myself was the distinguished Senator from Alabama, JOHN SPARKMAN, a longtime personal friend and a vigorous defender of the small businessman.

For many years Senator SPARKMAN has headed the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and has been an important and vital force in all post-World War II housing legislation. It has been my honor to be alongside Senator SPARKMAN in many of these battles. Senator SPARKMAN's address is an illuminating reflection on the history of housing legislation from the early New Deal programs to the President's very recent proposals on a demonstration cities program. I was pleased to see that the Senator from Alabama raised some misgivings over the present tight money policies, which threaten to severely hurt the housing market and the individual homeowner's ability to obtain sound home mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members to read Senator SPARKMAN's address; it is a refreshing restatement of what many of us have long believed and successfully fought for:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN SPARKMAN, DEMOCRAT, OF ALABAMA, BEFORE THE 35TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I welcome the opportunity of speaking once again at the annual convention of the National Housing Conference.

Your convention is well timed with early discussions in Congress on 1966 housing legislation which, I assume, will be the principal topic of your meetings while you are here in Washington.

As you may know, the Housing Subcommittee of the House of Representatives has already held 3 weeks of hearings on the administration's proposed legislation; but I understand there is still much to be done before the committee is ready to report a bill.

On the Senate side, we decided to wait for the House to "shake out some of the bugs" and to clarify the issues before we take up the administration's proposals. We expect to start hearings in about a month.

Until we hear testimony and understand the issues better, I cannot speak in detail about the bills before us, but from what I have read, the broad implications of this year's legislative proposals on the development of our cities and suburbs is the most far reaching that we have ever dealt with in housing.

Actually, I was surprised when the President sent up his Housing Message and followed it not just with one bill, but with three bills.

Only a few months ago we passed a 4-year housing bill, authorized a host of new programs, and established a brand new Housing Department which should have been enough to keep the administration busy for some time.

The President apparently thought otherwise and submitted for congressional approval a program which, in his words, would represent "an effort larger in scope, more comprehensive, more concentrated, than any that has gone before."

If approved, it is obvious that the new program would have an impact not only on every Federal program of assistance to our cities, but also on every State and local activity involving urban problems.

It is a most ambitious undertaking, and no one could possibly argue against its objectives, as stated by the President, to "set in motion forces of change in our great urban areas that will make them masterpieces of our civilization."

This is beautiful prose, but the tough question must be answered—How do you do it?

Our task in Congress is to comprehend the significance of the proposal and, after due consideration, write a law which will accomplish the President's objectives and one which will work.

I believe that we have much work to do and I plan extensive hearings to hear all concerned before we act.

Some of you recall the history of the 1949 Housing Act which took 4 years to become law. It was sponsored by Senator Wagner, who was chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senator ELLENDER, and Senator Taft.

This bill was called the WET bill—Wagner, ELLENDER, Taft.

In 1947, the Republicans became the majority in the Senate and the bill then became known as the TEW bill—Taft, ELLENDER, Wagner. In 1948, when President Truman won his great upset victory, the Democrats regained the majority in the Senate and the bill again became known as the WET bill and became law as the Housing Act of 1949.

I recall well the hard fight in getting that bill through and the fine work done by the National Housing Conference, and many in this room, which made it possible.

When one looks back over the years, it is interesting to note the great evolution that has taken place in housing legislation since 1932 when the first major Federal bill was passed.

In 3 successive years, 1932, 1933, and 1934, laws were written which authorized the Federal Home Loan Bank system with its regional banks, Federal charters of savings and loan associations and the insuring of accounts through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration with its insurance of mortgages, and the Federal National Mortgage Association with its system of mortgage purchases to back up the FHA.

These laws were intended to shore up our financial system and help provide capital for the revival of a privately financed home construction industry. To many people of that day these were indeed revolutionary actions sure to lead us straight down the road to socialism.

This kind of criticism disappeared years ago and, for the most part, our home financing systems have done a most commendable job.

However, they did not cover the financing needs for low-cost housing and it was necessary to write new legislation—the Housing Act of 1937—to provide help for low-income families.

The same critics who opposed FHA earlier rose up in arms against public housing and never really let up on it except possibly last year when subsidies were authorized for existing housing under the flexible formula and the rent certificate plan—but that is another story.

After public housing, the next step in our evolution was the slum clearance and urban redevelopment legislation in 1949. With this legislation, the Federal Government got deeper involved with city problems and with such purely local matters as planning, land use, property taking and relocation.

One more step was taken in 1954 when the 1949 act was amended to an urban renewal concept emphasizing rehabilitation as well as clearance, and the necessity for city cooperation through planning and workable program requirements.

In 1961 we became further involved by introducing mass transit and open space assistance programs.

In 1964, code enforcement, rehabilitation assistance and a tightening of workable program requirements followed the same direction.

In 1965, more planning assistance, water and sewer grants, neighborhood facilities, and a host of minor amendments were included in the housing bill, all of which further involved the Federal Government in urban development problems.

Now comes the 1966 proposals which, if enacted, will represent a complete shift in the form of Federal housing assistance from that which was started in 1932. We will have moved from a single Federal program established to help finance homes to a multilateral program designed to help finance all sorts of city improvements and environmental amenities and even direct assistance to the people themselves.

This is a most significant change and I suppose it bears out the saying that not by bricks and mortar alone can families be decently housed. Other things—environment and a good community life must be added.

This is consistent with the national housing policy developed after the war and spelled out in the 1949 Housing Act, and no one can quarrel with its objectives.

My concern is the method and whether too much government is involved, particularly the Federal Government.

In the 1949 act the policy to be followed in attaining the housing objective clearly stated that private enterprise should be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as possible, and Government assistance should be utilized to help private enterprise. Public bodies were to be assisted only when private enterprise refused or was unable to do the job.

I am sure you understand, private enterprise does not mean big business alone. More important by far is the private initiative of the families and people who are directly involved—and I would add the initiative of the local officials who are directly concerned.

There is not enough money in the Federal Treasury to do the job without this important ingredient, and I worry sometimes that we do not pay enough attention to it.

I wonder if there is not also a place for private enterprise with a capital E—big business if you will. So far we have failed to apply America's productive genius—so outstanding in most other endeavors—to the rebuilding of our cities.

There must be a way—and frankly, I was disappointed that the President's recommendations were sterile on this point—to utilize advanced mass production techniques in residential rehabilitation.

As extensive as the President's 1966 program appears to be, I feel there is still missing an effective plan for housing the great masses of low- and moderate-income families who form the bulk of our city residents.

Rehabilitation has been a program formally on the books since 1954 but with only sporadic success.

I hope that as we consider the President's program, we do not neglect giving proper emphasis to rehabilitation and some devices for attracting both the homebuilding industry and the vast resources of our home financing system into taking on the task of upgrading and rebuilding homes within the areas the President refers to in his bill.

I should like now to turn to another subject.

I want to say a few words about our economic picture and what effect it may have on your programs.

You may recall last fall that there was a great deal of speculation on how the President would treat the "guns or butter" issue in his budget message to the Congress.

He surprised everybody when he said that our economy is strong enough for both guns and butter, and he promised to continue existing levels on his domestic programs, and this included housing.

Of course, it was understood that the budget estimates were very tight and there would be strong resistance to any new spending programs or a liberalization of existing programs.

Since preparing the budget, however, several things have happened. The economy has "heated up" much more rapidly than anyone had predicted, the Vietnam situation is causing continuing concern, and the indices of inflation are beginning to move up.

Many economists claim that we are in a critical situation and the President must take action immediately to curb inflation, either through new taxes or by cutting back Government spending, or both.

The administration is watching the trend carefully but doesn't feel that the critical time for action has arrived and, in fact, if you read what Secretary of the Treasury Fowler said last week, the administration sees absolutely no need for drastic tax or wage-price controls within the foreseeable future.

Nevertheless, partly spurred by the action of the Federal Reserve Board, interest rates on mortgage loans and other investments are at a 30-year high. This bodes no good for housing and may well cause a significant cutback in housing starts for the coming year.

Now I know that some of you believe that allocations for your programs in housing and urban renewal are far short of needs and you have, in fact, included as part of your 1966 program a boost in these funds.

I am sure that Congress will be glad to listen to your appeals and do all it can to see that current levels are maintained or, where needed, increased. But I wanted you to know the current situation and what you are up against.

It is an old pet peeve of mine that whenever money gets tight, housing gets squeezed out. The strong borrowers, that is, those industries who have access to the supply of funds and can afford to pay the price, will get the money regardless of the need, whether it be used to finance consumer purchases for second cars, or to finance new plants and machinery to make bikinis.

I am reminded of the President's statement when he said that we should not place the burden of the Vietnam war on those least able to bear it, but that the burden should be placed on those who are already well provided with the material benefits and comforts of our highly productive economy.

This is well said and we in Congress intend to act accordingly, but it is an uphill battle because strong economic pressures often dictate otherwise.

I give you these thoughts because I know of your interest in the welfare of the public and your long continued efforts to get a better break for the "little man."

We all mourned the loss a few months ago of Monsignor O'Grady, one of your most illustrious founders who, with his Irish brogue and indomitable will, invaded Congress year after year to push through programs in the public interest. The housing situation today is much brighter than it used to be partly because of men like Monsignor O'Grady and other leaders of your organization who have been in the forefront for better housing for over 35 years.

Considering what has transpired since you met here last year, this meeting must have particular significance to you.

The 1965 Housing Act, the establishment of a new Department and now a brand new approach to city renewal gives you plenty of "grist for your mill," and I daresay that there is little chance of your meetings being dull.

I have enjoyed talking with you and I look forward to being with you at your 36th annual convention in 1967.

WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL DEMANDS THAT FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM ACTIONS BE CONSISTENT WITH POLICIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, is conducting hearings on the economic report of the President, pursuant to the provisions of the Full Employment Act of 1946.

In view of these important hearings, as well as the problem President Johnson faces in the Federal Reserve's December decision to work at cross purposes with his administration, an editorial appearing in the February 2 edition of the Washington Post is most timely and thought provoking.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

A TASK FOR SOLOMON

President Johnson will have to exercise the wisdom of a Solomon—and experience a bit of good luck to boot—if he is to replace Dr. C. Canby Balderston on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System without offending the sensibilities of the "easy money" populists in Congress or the "tight money" spokesmen in the business community.

When the President chastised the majority of the Board of Governors for raising the discount rate without prior consultation in December, he was challenging the dominance of Chairman William McChesney Martin. That dominance can be broken by replacing Dr. Balderston with a liberal who would vote in accordance with the wishes of the administration. But in that event the President would have to face up to the possibility of having Chairman Martin resign at a time when the "tight money" policies with which he is identified are appropriate, at a time when the administration can ill afford to alienate business confidence. But a candidate who is congenial to Mr. Martin is not likely to please the Fed's powerful critics in the Senate.

The relevant issue, as we see it, is not one between "easy" and "tight" money. Both prescriptions have their place, depending upon whether the state of aggregate demand calls for measures of stimulation or restraint. Rather the issue is one of whether the Federal Reserve System's actions are consistent with the economic policies of the incumbent administration. Congress does not ask the President to accept the fiscal policy decisions of an "independent" Treasury. But it has severely limited the ability of the Executive to influence monetary policy by fixing the terms of Federal Reserve Board governors at 14 years.

There is nothing that the President can now do about amending the Federal Reserve Act, although he should surely consider requesting legislation in the future. But he need not accept the domination of the Board by men who may wish to work at cross purposes with his economic policies. His candidate should be a man of independent views, preferably an industrialist without ties to the commercial banking industry or the Federal Reserve System who takes a balanced and pragmatic view of monetary ease and tightness. Such an appointment may prove offensive to Chairman Martin. But the force of his objections would be diminished by an appointee who commands the respect of the nonbanking segments of the business community.

War, Clemenceau once remarked, is too important to be entrusted to generals alone. And the same must be said for monetary policy and central bankers. President Johnson is confronted by difficult choices in making the next appointment to the Fed. More restrictive monetary measures may be required in the near future, and they ought to be adopted at the initiative of the administration and coordinated with its other economic policies.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT PATMAN'S NEW BILL TO PROHIBIT NEGOTIABLE "CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT"—AN UNSAFE AND UNSOUND BANKING PRACTICE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I introduced a bill which, if enacted, will bring an end to the unsound and dangerous practice of almost unlimited issuance of negotiable certificates of deposit by money market banks. This instrument, the negotiable certificate of deposit, which in reality is a time deposit, or interest bearing currency was virtually unknown until 1961. In the past 5 years, the amount of negotiable certificates of deposit outstanding has increased at an astronomical rate from almost nothing to $16 billion at the present time. And throughout this period, the negotiable certificate of deposit has figured in numerous abuses jeopardizing the very soundness and solvency of our commercial banking system.

The negotiable certificate of deposit is a device which threatens to cause a wholesale flight of fast-buck money into Wall Street—money from all over the country, including small town banks, thrift institutions, and corporate treasuries—causing undue injury to those financial institutions losing these huge sums of money and to businessmen and farmers who find themselves no longer welcome at their bank's loan windows. Three-quarters of the $16 billion in outstanding negotiable certificates of deposit were issued by just 30 of the very largest money market banks, or just two-tenths of 1 percent of all our commercial banks.

Obtaining this money is very, very expensive to the banks which use the negotiable certificate of deposit to attract it. Many banks are paying up to 5½ percent interest on negotiable certificates of deposits. This naturally forces the issuing banks to seek higher yields and, therefore, higher risk and even unsound loans to put the money to work in an attempt to get a profit on this high cost money.

The negotiable certificate of deposit causes recurrent liquidity crises in the banks which have large amounts of certificates of deposits outstanding. I refer my colleagues to an article appearing on the front page of the Wall Street Journal of March 22, 1966, entitled "Banking Cliffhanger," which describes the liquidity crisis that banks find themselves in because of the large amounts of certificates of deposit which corporations may refuse to renew.

In addition to the unsound banking practices involved in certificates of deposit—and do not forget that certificates of deposit figured prominently in a number of very serious and costly bank failures—their effect on U.S. Government financing costs has been extremely detrimental and expensive for the American taxpayer. It is no secret that the Government bond market is demoralized. Recent bond prices have been at their lowest in 30 to 40 years. I have been advised by the Treasury Department that the negotiable certificates of deposit are a main cause of the Government's low bond prices and the current high cost of financing the public debt, including expenditures for the war in Vietnam. The Treasury Department has informed me that certificates of deposit now occupy a position second only to Treasury bills among money market instruments, so this is no minor or temporary problem. Certificates of deposit are interfering with normal flows of funds at reasonable rates of interest required for public and private uses. Certificates of deposit are a prime factor in leapfrogging interest rates and they have a clear inflationary impact on the economy.

Negotiable certificates of deposit are purchased in large amounts by our corporations which at times have bought them, as a temporary investment of excess cash, in preference to U.S. Treasury securities. In addition to causing disruption in the Government bond market and higher interest rates which I have just mentioned, negotiable certificates of deposit unquestionably cause a liquidity squeeze when the corporations suddenly demand their cash to meet their quarterly income taxpayments or for normal corporate uses—particularly when money is tight. Prior to recent years, banks had not paid interest on corporate deposits since the days of the financial scandals of the late 1920's. One of the reasons that Congress has prohibited the acceptance by banks of corporate savings deposits is to protect the banks from sudden massive withdrawals. Naturally, a large sudden withdrawal can have devastating effects on any bank, no matter how soundly managed otherwise.

The recurring crises faced by banks because of certificates of deposit runoffs is not healthy, not only for the banks which are involved, but also for the entire economy. The banks have gotten themselves into a bind which only Congress can deal with. The situation becomes more serious day by day, and at present the Federal banking agencies lack authority to adequately cope with the situation. Therefore, I expect hearings to be held on this emergency measure in the Banking and Currency Committee very soon.

The text of my bill, which would not prohibit the issuance of nonnegotiable certificates of deposit, reads as follows:

> SECTION 1. Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:
>
> "(j) The Board of Directors shall by regulation prohibit insured banks from making or issuing any negotiable certificate of deposit, note, debenture, or other negotiable obligation which is issued at a discount, or is interest bearing, or otherwise yields any return."
>
> SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this Act shall apply only with respect to obligations of insured banks incurred or issued after March 31, 1966.

GEN. MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY ON VIETNAM

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the April 5 issue of Look magazine, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway presents an analysis of the war in Vietnam. He rejects the alternatives of pullout and all-out war, and then proceeds to point out that our military objectives should be linked to our political objectives. Our political objectives, he maintains, remain unclear.

General Ridgway states:

> Unless we have already announced an unlimited political objective: i.e., the complete subjection of the outside world to American domination * * * then a halt should be called soon to control our military buildup.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that General Ridgway's article sounds a note of sanity in a discussion which has too often been dulled by the blaring calls of bugles.

General Ridgway's article follows:

[From Look magazine, Apr. 5, 1966]

PULL OUT, ALL OUT, OR STAND FAST IN VIETNAM? GEN. MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY, WHO COMMANDED THE UNITED NATIONS FORCES IN KOREA, QUESTIONS OUR POLITICAL AND MILITARY OBJECTIVES IN VIETNAM, AND APPLIES THE LESSONS OF KOREA

One of our most deeply embedded traditions asserts the supremacy of the civilian authority over the military. It follows that the only justification for a military policy is to support and execute the policies decided by our civilian authorities. Miliary effort must always be so closely tied to the political objective that at no time do we risk a mushrooming, unlimited war, while the political goal remains definitely restricted.

What troubles many good citizens, people who support the President as I do, is exactly where the balance lies between our military and our political objectives in Vietnam, and whether, in fact, the military effort may soon be dominant if, indeed, it is not already so.

The cry of "Why are we in Vietnam?" echoes two of the questions I heard from soldiers and civilians in December 1950, when I took command of a defeated and dispirited army. "Why are we in Korea?" and "What are we fighting for?" were the queries then. As the new commander, intent on rebuilding confidence and the offensive spirit, I had to answer.

I told our troops that we were in Korea because we had been ordered there by properly constituted authorities. The loyalty that we gave and expected barred any questioning of those decisions. As to what we were fighting for, my answer was essentially this: "The real issues are whether Western civilization shall defy and defeat communism. This has long ceased to be a fight for freedom of our Korean allies alone. It has become a fight for our own survival in an honorable independent national existence."

Today, in Vietnam, I think questions like these are rarely asked. Our combat forces seem to have a better understanding of why they are fighting than do many people at home. The soldiers draw no parallel with the Korean war, for many of them hardly recall that conflict. They know that we are using armed force to repel an armed aggression that seeks to impose Communist control over people who reject that tyranny. In Korea, our obligation was a moral one. In Vietnam, we have a treaty obligation: The Southeast Asia Treaty of 1954 and its protocol commit us to help with armed force when a nation in the treaty area asks for our aid, as South Vietnam has done.

It should be perfectly clear, then, that the President has but one basic course to pursue. He must honor our treaty commitment while concurrently making an intensive effort to find some honorable and acceptable solution. He must also enlist the greatest possible support—diplomatic, economic, and military—from the greatest possible number of nations, to bring the fighting to an end and to lessen the danger of drift into a catastrophe of unimaginable proportions.

Currently, a great deal of loose talk in the United States tends to increase the probability that our military effort will become divorced from the political objective and we will stray toward nuclear disaster. When presumably responsible citizens urge upon the Nation, "Let's get it over with now. Let's plaster Vietnam and China, too" or "Let's bomb North Vietnam back into the stone age," the danger of our losing all sight of our political objective becomes very real. These hardy folk, who, like Omar Khayyam, are ready to "take the cash and let the credit go, nor heed the rumble of a distant drum," would be talking sense only if our political objective were unlimited—the imposition of a pax Americana upon the entire world—and if we confessed no national morality whatever.

We cannot ignore this moral question. Otherwise, we retreat overnight to the jungle from which the human race took millennia to crawl. The civilian authorities themselves bear much responsibility for the widespread confusion among well-meaning people over the military situation and our political objectives. Within the past 2 years, pronouncements on our military efforts by highly placed authorities have ranged from rosy euphoria to grim foreboding. As for our political aims, we have been chided for not grasping "the simplicity of our basic objectives" in Vietnam. Yet we have been given numerous definitions of those objectives: To contain communism; to halt aggression; to prove to Communist leaders that aggression cannot be made to pay off; to support "the right of a people to choose their own government"; to help the South Vietnamese realize their desire to "live in the way they prefer"; and to assist a helpless people "to advance toward economic prosperity and social improvement." As recently as December 7, 1965, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT called for the negotiation of "an honorable compromise." On the same day, Secretary of State Dean Rusk was quoted: "There is no room for compromise" on Vietnam.

Our military objective has been frequently and beguilingly described as "victory." This word always rings gladly on American ears. What American does not want to win any fight he gets into? It is a deeply ingrained national trait to go all out for victory, using whatever force we possess. There is, we are told, and we foolishly agree, "no substitute for victory." But we are not dealing with a lawsuit, a prizefight, or a football game. We live in a world very unlike the one we were raised in. We have a potential for wholesale destruction so indescribably vast that many words, including "victory," lose their meaning. It would hardly be counted a "victory" if one football team were to defeat another through the use of knives; neither would we savor triumph in a "victory" that would reduce three-fourths of the civilized world to rubble.

With no clearcut limit upon our immediate military objective, we commit ourselves to an upward-spiraling course that may approach annihilation. If we decide to employ whatever force is needed (and no one is wise enough to estimate now how much that will be) to achieve victory in Vietnam, do we double, then triple, then quadruple our ground forces? And if victory even then eludes us, do we extend the war to wider and wider arenas? And if we still fail to eliminate all resistance, do we then use nuclear weapons?

We cannot thus engage to achieve victory at whatever cost unless we have already announced an unlimited political objective: i.e., the complete subjection of the outside world to American domination. And I cannot see in the current situation anything to justify the setting up of so rash a goal as that. But if, in the light of their greater knowledge of the situation, our highest civilian authorities believe that something like this should be our goal, then the public should be told immediately. If our policymakers do not believe in aiming for such a goal, and there is certainly no indication that they do, then a halt should be called soon to control our military buildup.

In my opinion, it is the immediate duty of our civilian authorities to define more precisely and pragmatically just what is our political goal—assuming it is something less than global defeat of all resisting forces. At the very least, we should have what Senator KARL MUNDT called for recently in a TV debate moderated by Eric Sevareid: "A declaration of policy from the White House to the Senate, where that policy can then be debated." With that objective precisely fixed, the size of the military effort needed to attain it could be clearly determined. With our aims loosely described only as "freedom for the people to choose their way of life" or as "standing up to communism," we have drifted from a point where we were told, a scant 2 years ago, that our military task would be largely accomplished and our troops withdrawn by December 1965, to a point where the faint outline of a half-million troop commitment becomes a distinct possibility. And even that commitment is not offered as a final limit. The situation remains, to use Senator MIKE MANSFIELD's apt phrase, "open-ended," and we have made, to date, I believe, an unconvincing argument to our people that our goals lie within the zone of vital national interest that cannot be compromised. The falling-domino theory—if Vietnam falls, then Laos, Thailand, and all south Asia will collapse—is a theory I have never accepted. Like many other premises upon which people tend to rest their position, it is deserving of more searching analysis than it generally gets.

I am fully aware that I am speaking in generalities. Whatever course I propose or whatever action I oppose, I still cannot deal in specifics. The plain truth is that no individual, outside of the top levels of Government has, or should have, access to enough inside information to do otherwise. I have no private sources of top-level intelligence and no access to top-level military plans. Yet the proper functioning of a democracy demands that the conscientious citizen speak his carefully considered views. Only then can patriotic and competent officials, civilian and military, who bear the ultimate responsibility for decisions, find the guidance they must have. The recent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee served an admirable purpose in stimulating public thought and discussion of one of the most difficult problems this country has had to face.

Many of those who have thoughtfully endorsed a widening or an intensifying of the war have spoken. I believe, from the conviction that they have been applying the lessons learned in Korea. Lessons can be learned from Korea. But there are far more dissimilarities between the two actions than there are parallels. In South Korea, we had a workable government, led by a fiercely patriotic and powerful civilian leader whose opposition to communism was widely known and who held the allegiance of the majority of his people. We acted in concert with many nations and had been deputized by the United Nations to repel the aggressor in its name.

Relatively little terrorist activity occurred in South Korea. United Nations personnel rode in open Jeeps throughout our zones without ever drawing an assassin's fire. Our power easily contained guerrilla activity, even though our forces were neither as well-equipped nor as mobile as they are in Vietnam. A unified military command kept both United States and ROK armies under the direct control of the U.S. commander. In short, our line of battle was well-defined, the enemy clearly identifiable, and the political divisions were sharp.

None of these conditions holds for Vietnam today. Yet we do have a "right" to be there, for our treaty obligation is clear and specific. I think we should take care, however, not to misread history in an effort to justify unlimited military effort. Most people will agree that we face confused, complex, and unpredictable situations. Most people will agree that each contains potential perils of great and undetermined extent.

Confronted with such circumstances, would we not be wise to avoid further dispersion of our already overextended resources? Would it not be sound judgment to husband our strength and to refuse further far-flung commitments in our "open-ended situation" until we can discern more clearly the shape of things to come?

Again, we hear talk of "sanctuaries." Yet the bombing of sanctuaries never turns out to be a simple matter. During the Korean war, the Manchurian bases, the so-called sanctuary, were indeed wide open to attack from the air. We deliberately refrained from bombing them, as we refrained from taking out the vulnerable Yalu bridges. The advisability of carrying this war over the border into Manchuria in this manner was considered in the highest councils of our Nation. The decision not to bomb the sanctuary was made for reasons that seemed then, and still seem, wise to me. Had we attacked mainland China through air raids, we would have unleashed a war of unknowable dimensions. Not one of our major allies would have approved this adventure, and the coalition formed to stop Communist aggression would have dissolved. Furthermore, our "shoestring" air force (this was Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg's own description) would have dwindled, through combat losses and natural attrition, to a shadow. We would have been left without power to honor the many IOU's we had extended on a worldwide basis. The time then required to rebuild sufficient strength to honor our obligations would have been 2 years.

Nor should it be forgotten that the United Nations forces had their own sanctuary during the Korean conflict, just as we have one now in South Vietnam. Both China and the United States operated under self-imposed limitations as to the bombing of hostile bases. The Chinese air force in Manchuria and other nearby bases was strong enough to have done us major damage, not only in South Korea, but in Japan. Similarly, Red China now may possess the power to destroy Saigon and inflict heavy damage on our South Vietnam port facilities in one swift strike should we carry our air attack close to her own vitals.

China has the strength, too, to reopen the Korean front. Should we, in that instance, oppose her there, or should we withdraw to more defensible positions to the south and east, an unthinkable abandonment of our Korean allies? An attack upon mainland China might well bring Soviet Russia into the fray, with Western Europe open to immediate invasion. Where do we draw our line of defense then, and what weapons do we use? And where do we concentrate our strength?

These questions suggest the immensity of the problem the President and his advisers now wrestle with. Those men in public life who urge prompt and unlimited escalation of the war are neither diminishing the problem nor strengthening the President's arm. They only make it even more difficult for the President to steer the Nation on that careful course between duty and disaster.

And those who call for immediate disengagement from Vietnam, as if it had all been a mistake, likewise make the President's path more difficult. We cannot escape now from the obligations we took upon ourselves when we first pledged our word to the South Vietnamese. One lesson to be drawn from Korea is that we cannot pull out of a sticky situation without regard for those who have fought at our side.

During the Korean war, soon after the Chinese launched their New Year's offensive in January 1951, serious thought was given in Washington to our abandoning the peninsula and pulling our forces back to Japan. (I opposed this strongly.) It quickly became clear that such a withdrawal would require the evacuation of at least a million South Koreans, those who had been our battlefield allies or had worked with us since the invasion. To have left them to the vengeance of the Communists would have been an infamous betrayal.

We are under similar obligation in Vietnam not to abandon the hundreds of thousands who have been our allies there. We cannot pick up and run home without making extensive and permanent provision for all the Vietnamese who have supported our arms. A concept like the one discussed by Gen. James Gavin, for holding fast to our defensive enclaves, would enable us to fulfill our obligation to our Vietnamese allies, before committing ourselves to unlimited military effort, while we continue to seek an honorable solution.

Korea also taught that it is impossible to interdict the supply routes of an Asian army by airpower alone. We had complete air mastery over North Korea, and we clobbered Chinese supply columns unmercifully. Unquestionably, we inflicted serious damage upon the Chinese and greatly complicated their problems of reinforcement and supply. But we did not halt their offensive nor materially diminish its strength. The Chinese, like the Vietnamese, traveled light, with each man carrying his ammunition, his food, and his weapon on his back. They moved at night or on hidden footpaths and goat tracks, immune from air attack. And where we did find their concentrations and strike them, we still could not force them off the disputed ground. In Korea, I saw whole sections of railroad bombed into scrap iron by aircraft, and yet the enemy rebuilt the tracks in a single night, and the trains ran the next day. After the Chinese repulsed the ill-fated advances to the Yalu, Gen. Douglas MacArthur himself expressed disillusionment with the value of tactical airpower. It could not isolate the battlefield, he said, and its effectiveness had been greatly overrated. It is easy for the civilian mind to be seduced with talk of "easy" conquest through airpower. But the crucial battles are still won by foot soldiers.

There is yet another lesson etched by our experience in Korea: It is folly to base military strategy upon our interpretation of enemy intentions. As our forces pushed toward the Yalu in the home by Christmas offensive of November–December 1950, the high command assured all doubters that the Chinese had no intention of intervening in force because the psychological moment for this had passed, because "no commander in his right mind" would send his forces across the Yalu at this season and because of various other reasons understood only by those who had made a study of the "oriental mind." We knew, however, that the Chinese were capable of dealing us a mighty blow along the Manchurian border, where our forces would be strung out almost haphazardly, without mutual support between commands and without supplies enough to sustain more than a light engagement. We knew that close to a hundred thousand well-disciplined and well-armed Chinese troops were mobilized on the other side of the river. We knew that Chinese volunteers had already appeared in force south of the Yalu, for we had suffered severe attacks from them and had taken prisoners from units known to be in the Chinese order of battle.

Yet, despite this intelligence, we hurried forward in pursuit style, our forces thoroughly dispersed and improperly clothed for fighting in subzero temperature. We "knew" the Chinese were bluffing, and we "knew" they would never commit more than a token force of volunteers. We abandoned elemental prudence. Instead of being guided by enemy capability, we divined the enemy intentions. The mistake cost us very dearly in American lives and took us close to disaster. It might be pointed out, too, that MacArthur's earlier brilliant coup at Inchon, where he cut the enemy's lifeline in one spectacular and surprising strike, succeeded in large part because of his stated reliance on the enemy's assumption that no commander would risk the monstrous tides, the tortuous channel, and the 2-mile mudflats outside Inchon Harbor. Custer likewise knew that the Indians would not attack at Little Bighorn. And the French "knew" that Wolfe would never be fool enough to try to scale that precipice guarding Quebec.

We should be wary of experts who feel they can correctly interpret Chinese intentions and can predict how they will react to any move of ours. We know what the Chinese are capable of in southeast Asia. This is the knowledge that should guide us in appraising our strategy.

The one final important lesson we can draw from what happened in Korea is that we cannot enter into agreements with the Communists unless we have ironclad sanctions, underwritten by the world's major powers, including, if possible, the Soviet Union. Vietnam, as Senator JOSEPH CLARK pointed out in that TV debate I referred to previously, is only an incident. The major threat to our security and our way of life still comes from Red China and the Soviet Union. It is with our eye upon them that we must plan our global strategy. To do that calls for the best minds we can asembly in farsighted statesmanship and creative thinking.

Finally, I want to put proper emphasis on one aspect of the whole military and political problem that tends too often to be either minimized or ignored—that is the moral factor. In June 1955, when I was chief of staff of the Army, I had occasion to address a letter to the Secretary of Defense regarding the military defense of the United States. My conviction, pressed in that letter, remains unaltered:

"Just as the ultimate and most deadly threat of communism is the destruction of the religious and moral principles which have guided man to new heights of dignity and self-respect so also do we find the same threat in the increasingly significant ignoring by our planners of the consequences of omitting the moral factor in considering the use of the immense destructive capability which now exists in the world."

It is my firm belief that there is nothing in the present situation or in our code that requires us to bomb a small Asian nation "back into the stone age." While we should be prepared to pay any price in order to live up to our obligations, there must be some moral limit to the means we use to achieve victory. A victory that would require the wholesale devastation of a country by nuclear arms because it would not yield to conventional force would be the ultimate in immorality.

GENERAL RIDGWAY'S NINE POINTS FOR VIETNAM

1. We should emphatically reject the two extreme courses—"pullout" or "all-out war"—that have been adovcated by certain groups.

2. We should give our full support to the President's determined efforts to fulfiill our treaty obligations and to honor our pledges, while at the same time seeking an honorable solution of the basically political problem in Vietnam.

3. With due regard for diplomatic secrecy, our Government should spell out, more specifically and pragmatically, our immediate and long-range political objectives, firmly rejecting any unlimited political objective that might entail unlimited military effort.

4. We should also reject any political involvement that might gradually commit us to military efforts that would jeopardize our basic security and those vital American interests that cannot be compromised.

5. Once having announced our political objectives within the framework stated above, we should then employ whatever force is needed to attain them.

6. We should categorically reject "preventive" war, employing nuclear weapons, the use of which would be, in my opinion, a deliberate move down the road of international immorality past the point of no return.

7. We should enter into formal agreements with the Communist leaders of southeast Asia only after establishment of enforceable sanctions to guarantee the permanent protection of the South Vietnamese people.

8. We should sign no instrument with those leaders without prior agreement in good faith among a group of nations, including, if possible, the Soviet Union, to join in fairly sharing the task of applying proper sanctions.

9. We should repose complete confidence in the capability of our military leaders in southeast Asia to accomplish any mission they may be assigned, for these men are among the best that our Nation has produced.

"DO YOU WANT TO WORK ALL SUMMER WHILE YOUR NEIGHBOR IS FISHING?"

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have received a photocopy of a postcard which reads as follows:

> Do you want to work all summer while your neighbor is fishing? If not rent your corn and cotton to the Government. Final date for signing up in the feed grain and cotton programs is April 1, 1966. So hurry.

This postcard was sent to the farmers of Chester County, Tenn., by the local Agricultural Conservation and Stabilization Service office in Henderson, Tenn., February 21, 1966, bearing the signature of R. L. Plunk, office manager. It bore the notation that postage and fees were paid by the Department of Agriculture.

I could not believe that an agency of the Government was appealing for participation in its programs by encouraging farmers to lay down the sickle and the hoe and go fishing. A member of my staff called the Henderson ASCS office and a young lady there confirmed that the postcard is real, part of their effort to get farmers to come in and sign up.

This must come as a shock to farmers. For generations we have lauded them in speeches, poems, and songs for their hard work, diligence, perseverance despite hardship, drought, and flood. And now their Government is urging them to adopt "Lazybones" for a theme song.

And I might add that no matter how successful this appeal may be in signing up farmers for their corn and cotton programs, it has the possibility of producing a dangerous boomerang effect among city folk. If they get the idea that their tax dollars are being used for a farm program that encourages farmers to go fishing, the farm programs may be in real trouble.

STANDBY TAX POWERS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, on a television program said he doubted if Congress would be willing to delegate standby authority to the President to increase taxes.

I certainly hope Mr. Ackley is right, but I am not so sure. A tariff is a tax and President Kennedy requested and was given the power by Congress to adjust tariffs. Frankly, as the years go by, the legislative branch increasingly has yielded its constitutional responsibility to the executive branch.

The Constitution reads:

> Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes.

The Founding Fathers vested this power in the legislative branch of the Government because the legislators were elected by the people. Taxation by the consent of the taxed was a part of the doctrine of government by consent of the governed. In fact, this issue was at the very heart of the American revolution. Congress represents the people and would violate its responsibility if it surrenders this power to the President.

Political rumors have circulated around Washington as to the desirability of a law to delegate to the President the authority to raise or lower taxes. With the threat of increasing inflation and the present spiraling cost of living admittedly it may be necessary to raise taxes and the temptation by Members of Congress to escape public disfavor, and instead to let the President take the blame is always a danger. The argument is advanced by advocates of standby authority that it might be necessary in an emergency to act swiftly. But, of course, Congress can legislate promptly when the exigencies of the national welfare dictate. Over and over again it has so demonstrated.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I was glad to have Gardner Ackley express the opinion that Congress would not yield its constitutional power. The Congress and not the President should make the decision if and when that time comes.

AWARD TO ADM. W. F. RABORN OF THE THIRD ANNUAL FORRESTAL AWARD

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, last week on the evening of March 24 the National Security Industrial Association conferred on Adm. W. F. Raborn their annual Forrestal Award. This is a most distinguished award, granted by this association whose purpose is to promote mutual understanding between industries and departments of Government responsible for national defense. Just to name a few of the recipients in the past would be to include President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara.

I believe this honor is richly deserved by Admiral Raborn. I have known him for many years now. We are all aware of his outstanding accomplishments, including the development of the Polaris missile weapon system and the management skills which he brought to that program, with the result that it was completed 2 years ahead of the planned operational date.

For more than 40 years Admiral Raborn has dedicated his energies to the defense of this Nation. Upon retirement from the Navy he took up residence in my State of California. Before too long, however, we were to lose him. President Johnson called on Admiral Raborn to again serve his country and as always Red Raborn responded. In April of 1965 the President appointed Admiral Raborn as Director of Central Intelligence. I know of no more demanding job in Washington. However, Admiral Raborn brings to it his considerable talents and personal dedication. I was proud to have been present when the Forrestal Award was presented to Admiral Raborn, and I am proud to have been associated with this outstanding American for these many years. I am looking forward to our continued association.

SHALL CONGRESS BE TELEVISED?

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Broadcasters is meeting in Chicago this week. I know from the correspondence which I have had with leaders in the television industry that there is a great interest in the proposal now pending before the Congress to authorize the televising of sessions of the Congress.

As indicated in House Resolution 641, sponsored by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] and a similar resolution, House Resolution 644, of which I am the sponsor—the televising and telecasting of sessions of the House of Representatives would be authorized pursuant to guidelines established by the Rules Committee and under the supervision of you, Mr. Speaker, and of the minority leader of the House.

Many of the great debates which occur in this Chamber are historic in their significance and provide the widest public interest of any information which is produced in our land during these times.

The public attention given when this Chamber is the setting for a joint session of the House and Senate, provides an indication of the great national interest which would be generated during debates on critical issues which are decided here.

We provide a continuing privilege to the public to witness our proceedings but, with the seating facilities of the House galleries, the largest number which may view and hear debates during a House session is about 600 persons. Were it not for the press, an important segment of mass communications media, much of what transpires here would not be reported to the citizens across the Nation. True, of course, the Members of the House participate in radio and television presentations outside this Chamber—with regard to events which occur within the Chamber.

However, it is my understanding that more citizens receive their news reports by television than by any other medium. Certainly with appropriate guidelines and with the consent and approval of the leaders on both sides of the House, our important and frequently history-making sessions might become the subjects of telecasts.

It has been said that more than 100 million television viewers saw and heard the President at the recent joint session of Congress in this Chamber.

Likewise it is estimated that a similar number followed the Senate committee hearings on Vietnam, with whole schoolrooms participating in teach-ins by television, in representative government. If so much interest was manifested in what was the privilege of every citizen during these special telecasts, may we not well ask ourselves why the public is denied the opportunity to see and hear the debates in which all Members of this House participate?

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Congress and the Committee on Rules may recommend that the rules of the House be altered to permit televising of our sessions, at least those important sessions when legislation is being considered of great national interest.

FINO INTRODUCES HISTORIC PRESERVATION BILLS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills aimed at enlisting the Federal Government in the landmarks preservation fight. One of the bills provides that urban renewal programs must include the preservation of historic structures. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee, I have long been concerned with humanizing urban renewal. All too often, urban renewal occurs in just those parts of our cities where historic buildings are concentrated, and I firmly believe that urban renewal projects ought to be obliged to preserve such landmarks.

My second bill provides for a Federal aid program to help landmarks preservation programs. My bill is modified in comparison with other bills in that I particularly want to see Federal aid underwrite local efforts to preserve structures of local rather than just national historic interest. I want to make sure that local landmarks preservation efforts like those of the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission qualify for Federal grants. I want to see a Federal landmarks preservation program which would help preserve a structure of local interest like the old Bronx Borough Hall in my own county.

I think Federal landmarks preservation efforts should help instill a sense of local history through concern with local landmarks as well as those of national interest. A little pride in locality is a good thing in these days of the superstate. Federal money spent in this way is Federal money well spent.

MARK WATSON OF THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I heard last Friday with deep sorrow of the death of the dean of the Pentagon press corps, Mr. Mark Watson, of the Baltimore Sun. During my 12 years as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee I was privileged to know and work with Mark Watson, and can well understand why he was so highly regarded in his profession and won so many honors, including a Pulitzer Prize, the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award and two U.S. Army Medals of Freedom. He was a fine reporter who put love of country and love of truth beneath his byline in each of the many contributions to public enlightenment which distinguished his 78-year career.

MAURY HIGH SCHOOL WINS TENNESSEE STATE GIRLS BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, March 26, the Maury High School girls basketball team of Dandridge, Tenn., overcame 16 other teams to win the Tennessee State girls basketball championship.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Maury's coach, Mr. Bob Carlyle, and all the members of the team, as well as their parents, the school, and the citizens of Jefferson County, of whom east Tennesseans are all proud and grateful for bringing back the State championship to east Tennessee.

I wish I could have been there yesterday for the celebration staged in their honor upon their return from Murfreesboro. This was such a memorable occasion, paying tribute to the new State champions.

So that all of the United States might know of this outstanding accomplishment, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD an article from the Knoxville Journal, which details the events which led to Maury's great victory:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, Mar. 28, 1966]

MAURY WINS GIRLS' CHAMPIONSHIP

DANDRIDGE, March 27.—Unheralded Maury High has brought the girls' State basketball championship back to east Tennessee.

The Hornets, overlooked when the 16-team tournament commenced last Tuesday at Murfreesboro, won the championship Saturday night by turning back a sister east Tennessee entry, Friendsville, 52 to 47.

A large crowd welcomed the State champions home today after they drove here from Murfreesboro with a State highway patrol escort. The Hornets were met by a large motorcade and escorted on into Dandridge for welcoming ceremonies.

Fantastic second half shooting, cautious play in the fading minutes and the scoring talents of Jane Hill and Freshman Margie Rutherford won for Maury.

The Hornets hit 9 of 11 second half field goals but shot only once in the last 4 minutes as they clung to their slim lead.

Miss Rutherford finished with 21 points and Miss Hill with 20 to give Maury a potent one-two punch. Miss Hill was named the most valuable player in the tournament.

NEW RECORD

But Friendsville's Julie Endsley was equally brilliant. She scored 27 to break the tournament scoring record. Miss Endsley had 137 points for the four games, bettering the old mark of 136 set by Porter's Doris Rogers in 1964.

Maury set a tourney free-throw record in the championship game, hitting on 14 of 15 attempts. The old record, set by Walland last year, was 10 of 11.

Coach Bill Carlyle praised his team. "I thought our girls did a great job," he said. "You always like to win a game or two in a State tournament but they really came through for us.

"And the thing that make it more impressive is the fact that we were the smallest team in the field."

Defending champion Somerville, which had a 64-game winning streak broken by Friendsville in the semifinals Friday night, won consolation honors with an easy 70-to-44 victory over Nashville Maplewood.

The teams battled to a 16-to-16 tie in the first period but Friendsville's Falcons edged to a 29-to-26 lead at intermission.

The Hornets came back in the third quarter. Teresa Denton hitting two key baskets to put her team into a 42-to-40 lead. From a 45-all tie, Miss Hill sank two free throws and Miss Rutherford one to give Maury a 48-to-45 advantage.

Maury then played it close to the vest and stayed on top the rest of the way. Miss Denton added 11 points to the Maury victory.

Doris Coppock was runnerup to Miss Endsley in the Friendsville scoring with 14 points.

Maury and Friendsville each landed three players on the all-tournament team. Joining Miss Hill for Maury were Guards Pat Newman and Jennie Batson. In addition to Miss Endsley, Friendsville placed Guards Judy Moore and Jo Ann Breeden.

Others on the all tournament team were Rita Rochelle of Lebanon, Janette Gray and Judy Kelley of Somerville, Linda Reagan of Walland, and Sheila Kirkpatrick and Donna Vaughn of Maplewood.

GREECE INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, since the House was not in session on March 25, today I would like to note the 145th anniversary of the 1821 revolt in Greece which culminated in her independence. I am sure most Americans are deeply impressed by the fact that so much of the world's basic knowledge in so many varied fields is of Greek derivation. For example, Grecian art, philosophy, literature, and science have left a profound impression on innumerable facets in each of our daily lives.

Americans recognize the concept of freedom of the individual. Historically, individual freedom was a Greek idea. Our concern today for man's freedom was no less important to the Greeks. Indeed, it was the basis of much of their civilization. Herodotus, the Greek historian quotes a Greek conversing with a Persian:

> You do not know what freedom is. If you did, you would fight for it with bare hands if you had no weapons.

That comment is certainly appropriate today.

Paramount among the reasons for Greek freedom was their willingness to obey the law, whether written or not. Their respect for law is also a cornerstone upon which our cherished freedoms rest. In addition, their ideals of self-control, moderation, and devotion to reason served to substantiate their commitment to freedom.

While Grecian culture flourished under the city-states, the inability of Greece to unite politically led to the annexation of her territories. The death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C., the shattering of his empire, and the lack of national unity laid the groundwork for defeat by Rome near the end of the Macedonian Wars in 146 B.C. Greece became a Roman province; but Athens remained a center of learning, and the Greek language and culture were widely influential in Rome as well as other places. In A.D. 395 the Roman Empire crumbled, and Greece became the center of the Byzantine Empire for more than one thousand years—a genuine recognition of Greek knowledge and influence.

The Ottoman Turks who conquered Constantinople in 1453 gave the Greeks a large measure of political autonomy. Greek merchants became engaged in worldwide trade, and the Greek Orthodox Church gained ascendancy in communal affairs. But the age-old flame for individual freedom and liberty was still smoldering in the hearts of the Greek people. The spark was ignited unsuccessfully in the uprising of 1770. That revolt led to severe retaliation by the Turks in an attempt to curb the nationalists' desire for an independent Greece. But in 1821, under the leadership of Archbishop Patras, the Greeks on March 25, launched their war of independence against Turkish suzerainty. Their cause was assisted by Britain, France, and Russia who recognized Greece's independence in the London Protocol of 1830.

Nineteenth century Greece was visited with numerous domestic unheavals and unrest resulting primarily from the failure to consolidate politically. Nevertheless, she was able to add the Ionian Islands and Thessaly to her territory.

During the first part of the 20th century Greece was engaged in bitter rivalries with Turkey and was still beset with internal difficulties. Following World War II during which she fought with the Allied Powers, Greece became embroiled in a tragic civil war, which began in 1944 when members of the Greek resistance refused to surrender their weapons to the Government. The National Liberation Front—EAM—represented a major threat and collapse of the Government appeared imminent. Initial responsibility for defending Greece lay with the British, but by 1947 Britain's strength had been severely strained, and she could no longer shoulder the burden of Greece's civil war. Alarmed by this situation, the Greeks turned to the United States which hurriedly responded with a massive program of economic and military assistance. By 1949 the hard core of the EAM support had been destroyed, and the civil war officially ended.

The end of hostilities did not mean cessation of other threats to the internal stability of Greece. She found herself racked with the staggering problems of unemployment, a devastated economy, and innumerable refugees. But once again the Greek ethos of determination, hard work, and patriotism rose to the fore and by 1952 a remarkable degree of stability was achieved. Since 1952 Greece has been consistently focusing much of her energy on improving her economy. That she has attained a large measure of success is attested to by her associate membership in the European Economic Community. In addition, Greece has participated in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to mention some aspects of the role which Greek immigrants have played and continue to play in helping make a better America. Up until 1890 the number of Greeks who came to the United States was rather limited. However, since 1890 more than 550,000 Greeks have immigrated to this country. Their initial settlements were New York, New England, and Chicago, but gradually they spread throughout the country. Today there are more than 300 Greek communities in the United States.

Two basic factors underlying the cohesiveness of Greek communities are the church and the Greek press. The great majority of Greeks in America belong to the Eastern Orthodox Church. New York is the see of an archbishop of North and South America, and there are more than 300 churches in the United States under his jurisdiction. St. Basil's Academy at Garrison, N.Y., has played a large role in preparing priests for the church and teachers for theological schools.

The Atlantis—founded 1894—and the National Herald — founded 1915 — continue to play vital roles in the Greek community. Numerous philanthropic and fraternal associations have also continued to be of significant value in the lives of Greek immigrants and their families. In the book "One America," 1952, by Brown and Rousek, the authors remark:

> There is no domain of American life where the Greeks have not been active and to which they have not brought some contribution.

This statement cannot be overemphasized since the influence and contributions of Greek-Americans can be found in such diverse fields as commerce, education, military science, literature, science, the press, entertainment, industry, politics, and so on. In the realm of music Dimitri Mitropoulos and Nicola Moscona have become prominent names. The Skouras brothers have had a marked influence in entertainment, and Dr. George Papanicolaou was a pioneer in the fight against cancer. The list reads on and on, and this fact is a clear indication that the ancient Greek quest for learning and the meaning of life has been carried to the new world by the sons and daughters of Greece.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting for us in America, who have adopted and refined so many of the democratic and philosophic principles of the Greeks into our own institutions, to pay tribute to the anniversary of her reentry upon the world scene as an independent state. I am sure that I speak for all the American people when I extend congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece whose glory and power earned the admiration and respect of the entire world.

WE JUST DON'T KNOW IF IT'S WORTH IT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, those are the words of an angry school superintendent who has been trying for 13 months to get a year-round Headstart program approved by poverty officials for Waterloo, Iowa. I place in the Record today the detailed account of similar frustrations in six other communities which have been baffled, beseiged, and befuddled by poverty bureaucracy.

Having sponsored Headstart 3 years before the poverty program, my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell], the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell], and I are dismayed that this program, described by Mr. Shriver as his best, has been so crippled by fuddle-headed administration in Washington. Here are the highlights, or low-lights if you will, of a typical case history, repeated with gory variations in other cited communities:

First. Waterloo, Iowa: Application for $43,600 for a year-round preschool project was made by the Waterloo School system on February 24, 1965. This was 4 months after appropriations were made available for preschool programs by the Congress. Having heard nothing on their year-round application, Waterloo officials applied for, and successfully carried out, a $15,000 summer Headstart project. On August 7, 1965, they resubmitted an application for their year-round project to the Office of Economic Opportunity. In September, they were asked by Michael C. Moore, OEO area coordinator, for additional information which was sent. In late September, they received a notice signed by Theodore Berry, OEO Community Action Director, dated August 23, telling them they should allow 60 days for approval of Headstart applications. In October, 8 months after their original application, they received a form notice from Dr. Julius Richmond, Director of Headstart, to submit their Headstart preplanning form, which had never been received or heard of prior to then. On November 23 they were told by C. Edwin Gilmour, director of the Iowa OEO, to apply through the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act. One week later they were notified by the OEO regional office that their application for Poverty Headstart funds will be processed as "rapidly as possible." On December 22, they were asked by Gilmour to withdraw their Headstart application because it could be better taken care of under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

On January 3 they were notified once again by the regional office that their application for Poverty Headstart funds had been received and would be processed as "rapidly as possible." One week later they were notified that they had applied for Headstart on the wrong forms and would have to fill out new 32-page forms. On January 26 they received a memo from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare admonishing them that the opportunity offered under Headstart "is too precious to allow it to slip away." Finally, on February 7, Waterloo officials were notified by Gilmour to come to a meeting to talk about a new summer Headstart program. When asked the status of their year-round Headstart application, Waterloo School superintendent replied:

> Your guess is as good as mine * * *. We're getting to the point where we don't know if it is worth it.

If this sounds like something out of George Orwell's "1984," I suppose someone might sardonically comment that at the present pace it looks like it might be 1984 before Waterloo gets Headstart funds out of poverty officials.

Second. Laramie County, Wyo.: Immediately after successful completion of a summer Headstart program, Laramie officials began preparations for a year-round program. They plunged into what they termed a "maze of bureaucratic involvement" including telephone commitments subsequently reversed, attempts to dictate local salaries, and filing and refiling of forms. By February 1966, the local school had spent $1,500 in staff time, phone calls, and other expense. School Superintendent Chester R. Ingils bitterly assailed the redtape, autocratic attitude of OEO officials, and announced abandonment of any plans for a year-round Headstart for this year.

Mr. Ingils' letter of withdrawal from Headstart is an eloquent testimony to OEO's lack of concern with the needs and unique limitations of the individual community. I wish to include the full text of Superintendent Ingils' letter at this point in the Record:

FEBRUARY 18, 1966.

Re WYO–CAP 66–6153.
Mr. Don Thomason,
Acting Regional Director,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR MR. THOMASON: I wish to inform you that the board of trustees of School District No. 1, Laramie County, Cheyenne, Wyo., has taken action retracting its former action approving the operation of the Headstart program in this school district for school year 1965–66. The board of trustees has never been overenthusiastic about our involvement in federally aided programs. Their action was not predicated on their personal feelings, but rather instead, was based upon the overwhelming amount of time and effort on the part of the staff of this school district in preparing an application requesting approval of a program for preschool age children, and your capricious and arbitrary change of the financial structure of the program without consultation with this school district, and the inordinate amount of time between the submission of the application and your approval.

It is estimated by this district that approximately $1,500 in staff time was put into the preparation of this application. The application was originally completed on October 13, 1965, and was mailed to you on October 23, 1965. This application had the approval of your office in every respect prior to its submission to you. This school district conceded to a number of demands on your office's part in the development of this program which included an increased overall potential cost to you and this school district of some 10 to 15 percent, largely due to the increased number of personnel which you required to be added to the program.

We received from your office shortly after the first of the year a telegram and then a letter approving the program, but with a 15.6-percent cut in funds which would be allocated by the Office of Economic Opportunity. In attempting to reconcile your reasons for doing this, since you had never given us any indication of any anticipated reduction in funds, particularly after our close cooperation with your personnel, we can only believe that you wished to control our salary structure and certain other aspects of the program. This was verified in conversations with your office in the direct statement that all salaries had been reduced because they were above the salary that you could approve. It would have been impossible to operate the program with this financial cut, particularly in view of the number of personnel which you insisted upon within the program, and on the salary schedule which this school district operates under. In no instance was the salary structure left the same as had been agreed upon in your final approval of the application for any person, regardless of his position.

After a rather unpleasant conversation with your office, as well as a quite unsatisfactory experience in further expenditure of time and with increasing frustration on our part in even developing a rapport with your staff, you agreed to reinstate all of the money, with the exception of approximately $3,500. By this time, the first of February had arrived. Our facilities were then being used for other purposes. The staff which we had hoped to use in the Headstart program no longer existed as a unit, or for that matter, were individuals available for the program. It became administratively unwise at that time to attempt to recruit a new staff and arrange for new facilities, further delaying the program. In view of these factors, the board had no choice but to reject the program after our experience with your office and upon the administration's recommendation to do so.

I am taking this means to express my strong professional and personal feelings regarding the bureaucratic approach used with us, as well as the autocratic and demanding manner in which we were individually and collectively treated on the part of members of your staff. In reflecting back on the matter, I do not believe that I can come to any other conclusion than that the OEO has changed the original intent of the legislature from one of a program designed to help the local community and its needs to one not intended for the local community, but which must meet the demands of the OEO.

It is still our hope, in spite of our reticence of involving ourselves further with possible increased frustration in the planning of a Headstart program for this coming summer. But, I do not believe we have any choice as administrators but to work toward assisting those children who were meant to be provided for under the Headstart program.

We cannot, and will not, accept any of the responsibility for the delay which has been evident in this application, for in no instance can it be shown that the delay was due to any of our staff members failing to pursue this application with vigor. It is interesting to note that our relationship with the Office of Education has not had any of the difficulty which we have had with your office and your staff. Nor have we been treated in the fashion in which you have seen fit to deal with us.

It is my hope that you will consider these remarks as they are intended, and that is to think, as we have, that Headstart is for the purpose of meeting the needs of certain children at the local level.

Sincerely,

C. R. INGILS,
Superintendent of Schools.

Third. Port Huron, Mich.: Having meticulously completed a mountain of reports on their summer Headstart program, Port Huron officials were notified that their forms were literally filled with fatal errors. School Superintendent Gerald S. DeGrow called OEO in Washington and was told that reports from all over the country had been misinterpreted because of inexperience in the report-receiving staff at OEO and the whole thing was a "hopeless mess." The superintendent was informed that OEO had notified all school districts in the country that they had goofed in their reports in order to get the schools to file new reports, giving Uncle Sam's hired nephews another chance at them.

Tearing his hair, Dr. DeGrow asked the man in Washington:

> Who shall I have to call to get this straightened out, L.B.J.?

Whereupon he was told:

> That wouldn't do much good because he probably got one of the letters too.

I am placing in the RECORD today similar incredible accounts of life in the bureaucratic poverty jungle as experienced by officials from Salina, Kans.; Minnesota; Denver, Colo.; and North Tonawanda, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver has described Headstart as his most successful program. We agree, but it appears the success was in spite of, not because of, OEO officials. Our opportunity crusade would transfer Headstart into the Office of Education to be administered through State and local school systems in conjunction with local community action boards. This action should be taken immediately to insure that Headstart gets the management and administration it deserves in the year ahead.

Is it any wonder that with examples such as these at OEO, multiplied hundreds and hundreds of times, we describe OEO as a "fuddle factory."

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a change.

[From the Tonawanda (N.Y.) News, Jan. 13, 1966]

MORE FEDERAL REDTAPE SNARLS NORTH TONAWANDA'S SECOND HEADSTART PROGRAM

North Tonawanda's troubled winter Headstart project which gets off to a belated start Monday, has hit another snag, School Superintendent Maurice E. Friot reported last night.

The newest trouble is lack of Federal funds to pay its director, Miss Pauline T. Liotti, for 4 months of work in planning the program and interviewing prospective Headstart pupils and hiring teachers. The program is for prekindergarten youngsters.

Last Friday, Miss Liotti learned the effective date to use the funds would be this January 15. This means that the $36,529 Federal grant to the school district technically cannot be used to pay for Headstart services carried on before January 15. The program ends June 30.

"We don't mind spending some school district money as our share of the program, but this is ridiculous," Dr. Friot said.

The Office of Economic Opportunity supposedly finances 90 percent of the total cost of Headstart projects. School districts or other sponsoring agencies pay the remaining 10 percent. North Tonawanda's share under this arrangement would be $4,392 of the $43,920 total project cost.

The school district's share, however, generally is covered by providing classrooms and janitorial services for Headstart classes. Thus, the school district normally does not contribute cash toward the program.

Whether Dr. Friot can get OEO officials to make the funds retroactive to September 1 to pay Miss Liotti's salary may be settled when he meets with Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and OEO officials "sometime soon" in New York City.

The program is the second Headstart project for North Tonawanda. The first was for 8 weeks last summer for 100 preschool youngsters. The new program for 60 children was to have begun October 15 if OEO officials had approved the plan on time.

"Some people running this project are just plain jerks filled with self-importance who know little if anything about New York State laws and education," Dr. Friot commented.

"I have asked Senator KENNEDY to meet me in New York City at the OEO office to iron out some of these snags," Dr. Friot told the school board.

Dr. Friot had enlisted Senator KENNEDY's aid in obtaining funds for the winter project after innumerable delays by OEO's New York City regional office.

Last night, Dr. Friot thanked Senator KENNEDY and Representative HENRY P. SMITH for their assistance in getting the funds.

Senator KENNEDY is the brother-in-law of R. Sargent Shriver, who heads the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity.

[From the Denver, (Colo.) Post, Jan. 7, 1966]

LATE HEADSTART BETTER THAN NONE

At long last, Denver is getting a start—delayed 4 months though it is—on a Headstart program for some of the children who need it. We hope the arrival of Federal funds means those involved locally cannot only get this winter's program going, but get some guidance soon on plans for the future.

The Headstart program, which provides classes aimed at bringing culturally deprived (usually poverty-stricken) children up to educational par with middle-class youngsters before they start kindergarten, is no panacea.

There are other youngsters now in school who, because they lacked a headstart, are falling further behind the pace every year. They too need special help. And there are others who already have dropped out, utterly defeated by middle-class-oriented schools, who can only be reclaimed by something like Opportunity School or the Job Corps.

But Headstart is the best tool yet devised to break the generations-old cycle of poverty-stricken, ill-educated parents raising ill-educated children doomed, because of their lack of education, to more poverty. For this reason, Headstart is vital to any complete campaign against poverty. And for this reason we have been anxious to see it get off to a good start and unhappy at Washington's delay in allocating funds to start it.

Now the dedicated people in the Denver area who have been itching to get going on Headstart can get going. But the start will not be as good as they could have made last fall.

For one thing, they have lost some good people—teachers and other professionals who were ready to go last fall, but who couldn't afford to wait this long and have had to take other jobs.

For another, Denver's War on Poverty, Inc., umbrella agency for all local war-on-poverty programs, had asked for $1.1 million for Headstart. It has gotten $619,000. Even though the program now will run only about 5 months, instead of a year, the fund cut apparently is going to force some personnel cuts.

For instance, one DWOP spokesman said, a project that asked for a psychologist or nurse originally may now have to share that professional aid with other projects. "They're likely to have to get along with a third of a psychologist, or a third of a nurse," the spokesman said.

Perhaps some Headstart projects can get along with a nurse only 2 days a week instead of 5, but we hate to see such a skimping, corner-cutting start on such a worthwhile project.

And, as Dr. Bernard Hyman, DWOP executive director, pointed out, this program is only for 1,565 children, while probably twice that many in Denver could benefit from Headstart.

Well, any start is better than none, but we'll hope Headstart can soon grow bigger and better. The need is there.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch, Dec. 31, 1965]

HEADSTART PROJECTS SEEN PUT IN JEOPARDY BY AID CONFUSION

Fear that Headstart projects may fall by the wayside through overlapping and confusion in Federal aid programs was voiced at today's meeting of the State board of education.

Farley Bright, assistant State education commissioner, brought up the problem in discussing title I programs. He said that while during the past year 73 percent of Office of Economic Opportunity funds had been used for educational programs, he understands OEO has been told to limit the amount of 25 percent.

Bright said it is his understanding that the big cutback is due partly to a feeling that "we should share funding of Headstart programs with OEO."

The problem, said Bright, is that title I administrators have stayed completely away from Headstart because they considered it OEO jurisdiction. He said the question the board must answer is whether it wants to assume responsibility for prekindergarten programs, such as Headstart.

Bright's prediction that "Headstart would fold up in Minneapolis with an OEO cutback of from 73 to 25 percent" brought sharp disapproval from Mrs. Miriam Seltzer, board member from Minneapolis.

Duane J. Mattheis, State education commissioner, noted that the problem is one of a proliferation of agencies and offices administering Federal programs.

This has caused many conflicts in just a few months, Mattheis said, despite requests from educators for centralization of programs.

Mrs. Seltzer said heatedly that she hoped "we're not going to let programs drop in the meantime," and asked that the State "stop crying about that sort of thing."

Mattheis responded by saying the State had not been included in the OEO Headstart planning to begin with. The consensus of the board was that the OEO was in danger of "pulling the rug from under" Project Headstart.

They agreed to attempt to clarify the situation on the local level by inviting Jim Turgeon, new OEO director, to the next meeting.

Bright also emphasized the importance of clearing every education project under title I with local community action committees.

Bright said another problem has been that some school districts are not taking advantage of special State aids available, because "it is easier to apply for the full amount (of a program) in Federal money."

He said the title I committee wants to emphasize that title I funds cannot supplant State or local funds available.

[From the Port Huron (Mich.) Times Herald, Dec. 17, 1965]

ALL TOGETHER NOW

Uncle Sam's nephews whom he employs in Washington do their work in a variety of ways, not always understood by us mere mortals whose taxes pay their salaries.

An example of this occurred not long ago in connection with "Project Headstart" conducted here with the assistance of Federal tax funds.

School officials conducted the program with what they felt was due regard for all the redtape and Government regulations. All of the numerous reports required were made with meticulous care as prescribed therein, to wit, ad infinitum, etc.

Then the school people sat back and relaxed, satisfied that they had done a job well and that many children had been well served. But that didn't end it as is often the case with such things.

Soon thereafter a message was received from Washington that the reports were literally filled with fatal errors.

Nonplussed, the schoolmen scratched their heads and reviewed the entire project and the myriad of reports and still could find nothing wrong.

So, Dr. Gerald S. DeGrow, superintendent of schools, could see no way out except to call Washington—which he did.

He was told that, because of inexperience in, apparently, the "report receiving" staff, the reports from all over the country were misinterpreted—or something—and, the whole thing was a hopeless mess. So Washington decided to send the same letter to all school districts telling all of them that they "goofed" in their reports.

The theory seemed to be that this would get Uncle Sam an entirely new set of reports, giving his hired nephews another chance at them.

Dr. DeGrow, by this time entirely out of patience because he realized that this school district, and others around the country, were being "put upon," asked the nephew, "Whom shall I have to call to get this straightened out, L.B.J.?"

Whereupon the nephew replied: That wouldn't do any good "because he probably got one of the letters."

[From the Salina (Kans.) Journal, Feb. 14, 1966]

HEADSTART FOLLOWUP MAY BE STRANGLED BY REDTAPE

Salina's Headstart program is bogged down in Government redtape.

The Headstart Association of Salina had planned to conduct a followup program this semester among 72 children who were in the 1965 summer Headstart program. Most are in kindergarten.

Purpose was to see how well the children are doing this year, give additional special training, and check on dental and medical care.

CHECK FOR CHANGES

The association wanted to see if any revisions should be made in the summer Headstart program for 1966.

Project Headstart is designed to help educationally disadvantaged children catch up in basic learning skills before entering school. It is designed primarily for low-income families although others in the project area may participate.

After three tries, the followup application has been given still another go-around by officials in the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Arthur Miller, Project Headstart Director, told the Journal he now is waiting for instructions on what to do next.

NOT CLEAR

He said the regional OEO office in Kansas City called last week to say the educational section needed further revision, but didn't make clear what was wanted.

"I've asked them to put in writing what they want, and also to send us the new guidelines just out for the summer program," Miller said.

"Because of the time involved, we may have lost the opportunity to carry out our educational followup, but still could do the dental and medical check before school ends."

Since March 31 is the deadline for applications for the summer Project Headstart, local officials also are under the pressure of that deadline.

STARTED EARLY

"The followup application first was submitted in December," Miller said.

It was returned with additional forms to be completed, and this was resubmitted in January.

Next came several telephone conversations, a list of questions and still more forms, all of which were completed.

"About a week ago," said Miller, "came the telephone call raising still more uncertainty."

What seems to be the problem?

Miller said "OEO officials apparently object to having any Headstart instruction given during schooltime."

"Our plan was to have the Headstart material used in the regular class as supplemental work," he said, "then to extend the kindergarten period for a half hour and give cultural activities.

"This would require Federal funds to provide a teacher's aid at Hawthorne and Oakdale, where the Headstart children are enrolled.

"Also, we wanted money for a social worker and health nurse to work with the parents on the health and home information.

"We asked for some money to complete dental work for children whose parents weren't able to have it done."

Miller said it would be difficult to do the educational activity outside schooltime. Hawthorne has sections of kindergarten both in morning and afternoon, and Oakdale has a morning section.

IT'S CONFUSED

"From our telephone conversations," he said, "it seems they'd like to have any educational work tied in with the title program."

Title 1 is the section of the 1965 bill for Federal aid to education which is designed primarily for children of low-income families, the same group Project Headstart works with.

Miller said he wasn't sure how this could be handled, since title 1 is under the U.S. Office of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Also, the title 1 program in Salina, known as Project Stepup, already is underway.

"We just don't know what they want," said the Headstart director.

"We thought we had a good program last year, and good cooperation among the Headstart association, the schools, public health department, and the welfare department.

"We wanted the followup to see if we needed to make any changes either in the instruction or health aspects of the program.

"It looks as if we'll just have to go ahead and plan the same program again this summer."

The followup application asked for approximately $21,000 for personnel and equipment. Tentative plans for the summer application call for $40,000 for 3 centers to serve 200 children.

Miller said the delay in approving the schooltime Headstart didn't appear to be connected with Salina's lack of a community action program.

This is a total community approach to problems of low-income families.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Feb. 24, 1966]

HEADSTART CANCELED

Superintendent of schools, Dr. Chester R. Ingils, disclosed today that the Laramie County School District No. 1 had been forced to cancel a scheduled Headstart program for the current year because of what he described as bureaucratic delays in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Ingils made public the text of a letter that he had written to Don Thomason, the regional director of the OEO, bitterly assailing the redtape and "autocratic" attitude of OEO officials in attempting to work out an $82,000 Headstart program for the Cheyenne public schools for the current school year.

Ingils said he was still hopeful of getting a Headstart program launched for this summer. A similar program was undertaken last summer and the superintendent of schools described it as "superb" both from the standpoint of the preschool children who were enrolled and their parents.

Even this year's Headstart program was "a wonderful idea" and was needed, Ingils said.

He put the blame for its cancellation squarely on officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and raised the question whether they were changing the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act as designed by its legislative authors.

Ingils disclosed today that the efforts of Laramie County School District No. 1, which is the Cheyenne public schools, began last summer, aimed at devising a Headstart program for the current school year. He said after numerous telephone conferences with OEO spokesmen at the region VI headquarters in Kansas City, it was agreed that a total expenditure of $82,000 would be devised with the Federal Government providing $71,000 and the local school district the balance.

Immediately thereafter, however, Ingils said, local school officials ran into a maze of bureaucratic involvement. In the process of attempting to work out the program, the local schools spent $1,500 in staff time, phone calls, and other expenses. At one time, he said, an OEO official in Kansas City kept assistant superintendent of school Lloyd D. Crane on the phone for 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Even though the OEO officials agreed verbally to the plan that was worked out by local school officials, Ingils said, they subsequently drastically revised it, reducing the Federal Government's contribution from $71,000 to $61,000.

In addition, he said, the OEO attempted to dictate salary provisions for the teachers and staff members who would be employed in the Headstart program which Ingils described as substandard of those of the other teachers in the Cheyenne public schools.

He said he had protested this which would have amounted to a discrimination against the Headstart staff members as compared with other members of the public schools teaching and employee staff, but without success.

Finally, Ingils said, he wrote Thomason under date of February 18 saying that because of the delays and the changes, the Headstart program had to be abandoned for the present school year.

When things really got hot before the decision to scrub the program was taken, Ingils revealed, he said he called Shriver's office in Washington and talked to a ranking OEO official there about the problem.

Very shortly thereafter, within 20 minutes, he received a phone call from the regional headquarters asking to talk further on the impasse.

"But they still wouldn't come around," Ingils said. "It finally got where we couldn't talk any further."

After lengthy discussion, he said, "I recommended to the board of trustees that we not follow the Headstart program for this school year."

It was too late in the year and the whole program would have had to be revised, he said. He emphasized, however, that he thinks Headstart is "a wonderful idea" and that he remains hopeful that a workable program can be devised for the summer months.

Meanwhile, he said, he has received no reply to his letter of Febrruary 18 to Thomason, castigating the regional OEO officials' conduct of the program that had to be abandoned.

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier]

Federal Education Aid Maze of Forms—Waterloo School Officials Wrestle With Frustration

(By Dave Brown)

Hundreds of man-hours, and hundreds of dollars, have been spent by the Waterloo Public Schools in the past 11 months in attempts to unstick $43,000 from war on poverty redtape for an Operation Headstart project.

So far, despite three applications for the same funds and correspondence with officials ranging from Iowa Gov. Harold Hughes to war on poverty officials in Kansas City, efforts so far have been in vain.

The most recent application is still pending, somewhere.

DISCOURAGED

Superintendent of Schools Dr. George Hohl has commented of the situation: "We're getting to the point where we just don't know if it's worth it."

C. Edwin Gilmour, director, Iowa Office of Economic Opportunity, complaining that "we are horribly understaffed," and conceding that "we're writing the book as we go along," predicted in Waterloo Wednesday night "action within a matter of weeks, and I don't mean many weeks" on the school applications.

Gilmour said, "How would he [Hohl] like to have to be told to prepare his budget in 2 weeks?"

Told it had been 11 months since the first application was filed, the Grinnell College professor then commented, "I'm not defending it [the delay]. I just hope he understands our problems."

Gilmour indicated that it has been a policy of his office not to give final approval of fund applications until the local Community Action agency has been awarded its planning and development funds.

AGENCY'S THIRD TRY

The Black Hawk County Community Action Agency, which was one of the first incorporated in the State, last June, submitted its third application for those funds Wednesday. The application was to be in Kansas City, Mo., Thursday, at the regional Office of Economic Opportunity, for study.

Presumably, once the county CAC funds are cleared, approval of the school application will soon follow.

The school district's 11-month battle with conflicting and sometimes incongruous redtape began in February 1965, and has continued, becoming progressively more complicated.

REVERSAL OF PLEA

At one point, late in December, Gilmour called Dr. Hohl from his Des Moines office and pleaded with the superintendent to withdraw the application and submit it again under the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Monday, Hohl received a form letter from Gilmour urging all superintendents to apply for preschool enrichment programs under his Economic Opportunity Act.

HISTORY OF PROCEDURE

Here is the anatomy of the 11-month-old applications:

March 9, 1965: Hohl received a letter signed by Iowa Governor Hughes acknowledging receipt of the Waterloo proposal for a preschool project for culturally deprived children. Hughes said it had been forwarded to the Office of Economic Opportunity for approval. The proposal had been submitted on February 24, 1965.

At that time, Operation Headstart had not been developed.

The proposal asked for $43,600 in Federal funds. The Waterloo public schools were to pay another $6,050 toward the project.

HEADSTART DEVELOPED

Later in the spring of 1965, Headstart was developed. Having heard nothing of their original proposal, which was to have been a year-around project, school administrators applied for a $15,000 summer Headstart project.

That was approved, and in the opinion of Hohl and members of his staff, was very successful. A total of 110 preschool children, designated as culturally deprived, took part in the project.

FIVE PROJECTS LISTED

August 1, 1965: The Waterloo public schools submitted another application requesting a total of $371,200 in Economic Opportunity Act funds for five projects, including the same $48,000 Headstart project.

The other projects included were a remedial skills program, study center program for culturally deprived youngsters, in-service training program for instructors, and a home-school social work program.

That application was 61 pages long.

MORE SUGGESTIONS

August 19, 1965: Hohl received a form letter signed by Gilmour and State Superintendent of Public Instruction Paul F. Johnston.

The letter called that summer's initial Headstart program in Iowa, affecting 4,205 children in 41 counties "productive."

"The main point of this letter," it said, "is to call your attention to the opportunity for the development of (1) follow-through programs, (2) full-year development programs, and (3) development of programs for next summer."

LETTER DELAYED

August 23, 1965: Another form letter, this one signed by Theodore Berry, director, community action program, was addressed to Hohl. He did not receive it until September 28.

The letter explained that "there are three basic kinds of Headstart * * * programs which the Office of Economic Opportunity will assist this year." It then repeated the three projects described in the letter of August 19.

It continued, "You should allow about 60 days for approval of an application, but we will expedite action on programs scheduled to start this fall."

ASKS FURTHER DATA

September 15, 1965: Hohl received from Michael C. Moore, acting area coordinator of the OEO, notice that there had been a "preliminary review" of the $371,000 application.

The two-page report asked for additional information on all except the Headstart project. The additional information was sent.

Only reference to the Headstart project, next to the smallest of the five programs, was that it had been "referred to Headstart staff for review."

ANOTHER FORM DESIRED

October 19, 1965: Hohl received a form postcard from Julius B. Richmond, M.D., director of Headstart. It said "you have not yet returned your Headstart preplanning form, please do so as we need the requested information for future planning."

Hohl had never, to his knowledge, received a "preplanning form."

It had been 8 months since the first proposal was filed.

GENERAL POLICY PROPOSAL

November 23, 1965: Suddenly, after months of boosting the Economic Opportunity Act and its stepchild, Operation Headstart, Gilmour and Johnston sent a form letter to school officials suggesting that funds for preschool enrichment projects be applied for through the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Citing "some concern and confusion" over which act should be used to apply for the funds, the two men said, "It is our joint opinion that the following general policy might be followed by superintendents making applications for preschool enrichment programs:

"1. The first approach on preschool programs should be to consider the use of funds available under title 1, Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

"2. If a district has a high priority on these funds for other projects, study should be made of the advisability of applying for a Headstart program under the Economic Opportunity Act to supplant these funds."

AGENCIES LABELED PARTNERS

Ironically, the letter concludes, "These two agencies are partners, not competitors."

Meanwhile, worried that the application had not been approved, with the school year already well underway, Hohl had contacted Gilmour for an explanation. Gilmour wrote to Kenneth Rashid, Headstart coordinator for the Mountain-Plains Region, an 11-State area, to ask for information on the Waterloo application, pointing out that it had been filed in August.

Gilmour cited the successful Waterloo Headstart project of that summer.

ACTION COUNCIL GETS LETTER

November 30, 1965: Thomas O'Connor, director of the Black Hawk County Community Action Council, received a letter, apparently in reply to Gilmour's note, from William L. Shovell, acting regional director, community action program.

Attached was a copy of the front page of the August 7, Waterloo Public School application.

"Thank you," the letter enthused, "for sending us your application for financial assistance under the community action program. This office will process your application as rapidly as possible and will communicate further if there are any questions or problems in connection with it."

It had been 9 months since the first application was filed.

WITHDRAWAL SOUGHT

December 22, 1965: Gilmour called Hohl this Thursday and asked him to withdraw the five project applications, saying they could be better taken care of through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Hohl agreed that three of the five projects did, in fact, overlap with projects requested in the district's Education Act application, and could be dropped. The other two, including Headstart, he insisted, would have to stay.

PROGRAMS CALLED SUCCESSFUL

December 29, 1965: Dr. Hohl sent a letter to Michael Moore referring to Gilmour's recommendations. Hohl noted that the first Waterloo preschool enrichment program application had been made in February; that a successful summer Headstart program had just been carried out; and that parents of the children in the areas served by the summer program had "repeatedly urged" that the program be extended.

"Hundreds of hours," Hohl charged, "have been spent by Waterloo teachers and administrators in planning programs and preparing applications for funds in accordance with provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, and, indeed at the urging of CEO. "Hence," Hohl concluded, "it does not seem reasonable now to withdraw the entire applications."

The letter was mailed December 29. So far, Dr. Hohl has received no reply, not even verification that it arrived in Moore's office.

ANOTHER FORM LETTER

January 3, 1966: Hohl received a form letter worded exactly like the November 30 letter from Shovell. It had been 11 months since the first proposal was written.

January 10, 1966: Hohl received a telephone call from O'Connor, who said he had received notice that the Headstart application had been submitted on the wrong forms and would have to be done over again. This was 3 months after the September request for additional information on all the other projects was requested.

The new forms, still to be completed, for the Headstart program, are 32 pages long.

OPPORTUNITY CITED

January 26, 1966: Hohl received a form letter from Richard E. Orton, staff director on followthrough programs of Headstart. Attached was a memo from John F. Hughes, Director, Division of Program Operations, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It said: "The progress which these children have made is too precious to allow it to slip away. Would it be possible for you to alert your local education agencies to the importance of this opportunity?"

MEETING FRIDAY CALLED

February 7, 1965: Hohl received a letter from Gilmour urging all school superintendents to attend a February 18 meeting in Des Moines, when the new 1966 summer Headstart programs will be explained. Enough funds are available, he said, to take care of all summer Headstart programs.

Where does the latest letter leave the Waterloo application?

"Your guess," Hohl shuddered Wednesday, "is as good as mine."

But he is certain there will be a new set of application forms waiting.

BETTER STREET AND HIGHWAY LIGHTING

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, across the Nation, we have become more and more concerned in recent months with both automobile accident prevention and with crime detection and prevention. In connection with a motor vehicle safety bill I introduced a short time ago, I emphasized the importance of including safety features in the manufacture of automobiles, although it was pointed out that attention must be paid to other causes of traffic accidents as well. Similarly, I recently spoke of the desirability of using more modern devices in the detection of crime while leaving the problem of prevention of crime to a later discussion.

Now I wish to emphasize the importance of an improvement which has a direct bearing on the prevention of both crime and automobile accidents. That improvement is one of creating better lighting conditions—more light during the hours of darkness on our streets and highways.

We should be able to learn from experience, so let me mention just a few of the experiences I have surveyed on the decreased crime and automobile accidents that have resulted from better street and highway lighting.

During a 2-year period more than 5,000 new lights were installed along every mile of the streets of Gary, Ind. Criminal assaults declined 70 percent and robberies decreased 60 percent, even though the population increased 27 percent during the same period. Illumination of a 12-block district in Chattanooga, Tenn., which had experienced a very high homicide rate was followed by a 70-percent reduction in major crimes committed there. In Indianapolis, a street-lighting program has been going on for some time accompanied by a 60-percent reduction of nighttime crime in the areas of better illumination, and in the same city a 54-percent decrease in night traffic accidents was noted. In Hartford, Conn., a street lighting program which cost the city $20,000 was followed by fewer traffic accidents which in turn resulted in the reduction of insurance rates by 8 percent over a period of 5 years. This saved 22,500 car-owning residents $4 each per year.

There have been similar reports for other areas, relating both to traffic accident and crime reduction. Whether one examines the experience of McPherson, Cleveland, Boston, New York City, Nashville, Chicago, the results all go in one direction, none in the opposite direction: More light means reduced crime and traffic accidents.

There is more evidence of a general nature leading to the same conclusion. Twelve times as many crimes of violence are committed at night than in daytime. The daily average of burglaries in the months of December, January, February, and March was, during 1961 for example, 12 percent higher than for the rest of the year. These, of course, are the months when periods of darkness are the longest. And, as to traffic accidents, the National Safety Council reported that in 1963 53 percent of all traffic deaths occurred at night, even though nighttime traffic is only one-third that of day-time hours. In other words, the night traffic death rate is 2½ times as great as the day rate.

All of this adds up to a belief in my mind that we need to pay much more attention to the need for better street and highway lighting. Just on the basis of general observation, the Maryland congressional delegation has pushed for better lighting on the Baltimore-Washington Parkway—and the Department of Interior has agreed to improve the lighting on the Federal portion of that parkway. Also, some financing for better street lighting is available under Federal urban renewal legislation. Baltimore City, for example, can provide better lighting under this legislation in its urban renewal areas.

Last year we passed the Law Enforcement Assistance Act which provided modest assistance to the States for such purposes as helping to produce studies and plan to develop programs to reduce crime. That law also authorized the Attorney General to make more intense evaluation and supply more information on ways to reduce crime. I hope these studies, at the Federal, State, and local levels, will give us "more light"—both figuratively and literally—which will result in both crime and traffic accident prevention.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY SPEAKS AT THE "STEPPING STONES TO MARS" SYMPOSIUM IN BALTIMORE

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged today to address the "Stepping Stones to Mars" symposium of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics at the Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore.

Remarks of Vice President Humphrey were also read at the meeting by Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

In his remarks the Vice President looked toward the possibility of making man's first voyage to Mars an international effort.

My speech pointed out the need for the application of the techniques of America's space program to the unmet national needs in the fields of housing, air and water pollution control, and mass transit.

I include hereafter excerpts from Vice President Humphrey's remarks and the full text of my speech:

Excerpts From Remarks by Vice President Hubert Humphrey Delivered by Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council

I know that all of you join with me in joy and thankfulness that David Scott and Neil Armstrong made such a safe, happy—and phenomenally accurate—landing a few days ago.

We have gained a new appreciation through our space effort, of the vastness of the universe, but we have also come to realize, even more vividly the high achievements of which individual men—tiny and insignificant as they may seem by comparison—are capable.

I don't mean only the vision of our scientists and the ingenuity of our technologists, which have made it possible for us to set forth into space.

I also mean human skill, human courage, and human ability to cope calmly and effectively with grave emergencies—such as the Gemini astronauts demonstrated to the highest degree.

Believe me, my heart was with them—and the hearts of all Americans and of people throughout the world—not least, I am sure, the Soviet astronauts, who share with them firsthand knowledge of the grandeurs and perils of space.

They showed courage and skill of the highest order in getting out of an extremely tight corner—and believe me, we now know how tight a corner there can be, even in the vastness of space.

Their superb performance is a tribute to the excellence of their training. It is a tribute also to the worldwide ground support team, which converted an emergency into a routine landing.

These are Americans all of us can be profoundly proud of.

I think, however, too few people realize what these two brave and skillful men really accomplished before they ran into trouble.

When the history of man's adventure into space comes to be written—a kind of 20th-century equivalent of Richard Hakluyt and his "Voyages and Discoveries of the English"—I think we shall be more impressed by what went precisely according to plan on this flight than distressed by what went wrong.

The main purpose of the Gemini 8 flight was the physical joining—the docking—of two space craft in orbit, a maneuver of great delicacy. This was, in fact, accomplished.

What was left undone, in the way of space walking and other maneuvers, was not fundamental to the objective of this flight.

Let me note one other point—the prompt decision to cut short the mission rather than risk the safety of the astronauts. It is a heartening reminder that, even in this age of the computer, human life comes first and technology is the servant rather than the master of man.

This experience has been a stern warning of all of us that things can go wrong up there in space.

When I addressed the Goddard space dinner less than a fortnight ago, I stressed the vital importance of maintaining the most meticulous standards of forethought and performance at every level of our space effort.

I noted that, although this tremendous effort involves hundreds of thousands of people, each and every person involved in it must fully recognize and fulfill his own individual responsibility for its success.

I am therefore pleased and impressed, in examining your agenda, to see that you will be dealing in detail with a very wide range of the complex problems involved in a voyage to Mars. Painstaking preparation like this has made the remarkable overall success of our space program possible.

As for myself, my confidence in our advancing science and technology is such that I believe that man can land on Mars—although I do not venture to set any timetable for it.

Of course, I believe that we can and will achieve the original goal set by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson: a manned landing on the moon before 1970.

Thus far, we have engaged in space cooperation with about 70 countries, advanced and developing nations alike. All cooperative projects are conducted openly, and the scientific and technological data resulting from them must be made freely available to the scientific community.

All such projects must be scientifically valid. There are no token programs or public relations gimmicks.

Ground-based cooperative projects are very appealing to less affluent nations because they permit some degree of participation in space programs without requiring costly space vehicles or hardware. While NASA's international program absorbs only about $180 million, a small fraction of its total budget, a cooperative effort with another nation may represent that country's total space program.

The United States has arrangements with educational and professional centers in 34 countries around the globe providing for postdoctoral awards to senior scientists for participation in space research in this country, technical training at NASA centers in the United States in support of agreed cooperative projects, fellowships to graduate students on a shared-cost basis for training in space sciences at U.S. universities, and technical training at NASA installations abroad in connection with tracking-station agreements.

The United States has received about 13,000 visitors from more than 100 countries who came here to observe various aspects of the U.S. civilian space effort or to discuss opportunities for foreign participation in NASA programs.

A further instance of international cooperation in space is the fact that about 50 nations have already joined the international Comsat consortium for the financing, ownership and operation of a system that is intended to extend its space satellite communications activities into a global network by the latter part of next year.

So far, the United States is the only country to devote a considerable portion of its energies and resources to space activities of immediate practical benefit to all the world by advancing science generally, and by giving other nations the opportunity to participate in this advance.

If imagination and enlightened self-interest continue to prevail in our space program, and I have every confidence that they will, we will press vigorously forward with ever wider international cooperation in this field—thus supplementing our own resources in minds and money, furthering our shared adventure into space, and hopefully reducing, in some measure, political and economical tensions here on earth.

Coming back, in conclusion, to the theme of this gathering, it is indeed worth considering the possibility of having man's first voyage to Mars become a truly international undertaking. We in this country are eager to share the thrills and the benefits of space exploration with other nations. This enterprise is of such tremendous, such breathtaking scope that there is ample opportunity for many nations to contribute to it, each in its own way. There are many imaginative and ingenious scientists and engineers in other countries, and we welcome their ideas on how Mars may best be reached and explored.

I know that the great dream of many of you is to make contact with life—and hopefully with intelligent life—perhaps on Mars, perhaps elsewhere in the universe.

I think that this prospect should give us renewed determination to order our affairs better here on earth. I hope that we shall move with increased urgency and dedication from our present perilously obsolescent international system into a new world of freedom and justice under law.

OUR FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: SPACE-AGE THINKING NEEDED ON NONSPACE GOALS

(Remarks of Representative HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin)

The space program is a source of immense pride for all Americans. You, the space frontiersmen, have managed, time and again, to do the apparently impossible. You have removed forever the doubts and anxieties we all felt at the time of sputnik. In less than a decade, you have convinced us that going to Mars is no flight of fantasy but a flight objective we'd better get ready to decide on soon.

Quite apart from restoring this country's leadership in advanced technology, I believe that you, in the space program, have given us a still unappreciated dividend.

You have taught us how far we can go when we really harness the Nation's research and development genius to a national goal. In melding the talents and resources of scientists, engineers, industry, and the Government in the space program, you have perfected new ways of thinking through and organizing complicated jobs so that they really get done. The science of systems analysis and management has come of age along with space technology.

It is the essence of this new science of management to be clear about choices—to have a well-defined program objective, to consider and pick from alternative means all along the way to make sure that we reach the objective.

Debate is already underway on the next big thing for the space program after Apollo. NASA has begun to talk with Congress about three possible choices in manned-flight programs: more lunar exploration; interplanetary flights; or a variety of low-orbit laboratories.

Some scientists, I gather, are strong for a better look at the Moon, or at Mars. But many engineers and others tend to favor the low-orbit labs—on the ground of their potential for research on weather, oceanography and other things "of greater benefit to people here on Earth."

But a new space goal is but one of many national goals. In 1960, President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals listed the country's needs in 15 different areas, including defense. A year later, President Kennedy put space on the list.

Our national needs are as tremendous and varied today as they were in 1961. Some have become more urgent through neglect. The needs are great to rebuild our cities, and to clear up our befouled rivers; to build schools and modern mass transit systems; to modernize and build more hospitals; to clean up the air we breathe.

In the face of these pressing needs, none of us with public responsibilities can neglect the lessons we've learned from the space program—the importance of research and development in areas of heavy dependence on technology.

OUR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CAPABILITIES AND OUR NEEDS

Some of this Nation's highest priority goals will require new technology. And without research and development, we won't have the technology. Urban transportation comes quickly to mind as but one of many examples.

It is now clear that the kind of capability your industries have demonstrated in space and defense can be applied also to these domestic programs. The systems you develop need not be only space and weapons systems. If you can develop a vehicle to travel quickly and safely through the hazards of outer space, I know you can also solve the technical problems of developing a vehicle to travel quickly and safely on the ground.

I'm sure you know about the studies recently done by the aerospace firms at the request of Governor Brown of California. They show that out of your competence can come not only new transport systems but also useful new systems for waste management, for crime control, and for the gathering of information in public management.

WHY THE GIANTS HAVE IT ALL

We should not allow the heavy concentration of research and development in the three fields of space, defense, and atomic energy to blind us to the potential for research and development in civilian technology.

There are some reasons for this concentration.

These fields began to get huge applications of research and development, for one thing, at a time when these areas assumed top priority among national goals. Atomic energy, for example, began its development in wartime as an effort to build a bomb.

There were, in addition, few practical or political obstacles standing in the way of the Federal Government's assuming a leadership role.

But much of the growth and success of these three research and development "giants" must be explained in terms of the remarkable men associated with them—of the intelligence, ability, persistence, and dedicated vision, frequently of single individuals willing and able to work for the realization of their projects.

We think of Admiral Rickover and the nuclear submarine. Of Jim Webb and the space program. Of Congressman FOGARTY in the expansion of biomedical research. Of the personal sponsorship of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson for our manned landing on the moon. And of the accomplishments of Secretary Robert McNamara in reorganizing and modernizing the Department of Defense, and in putting its operations—civil as well as military—on a firm base of technological research and development.

Thomas Carlyle gave us the "great man" theory of history—that events happen because great men make them happen.

IN DOMESTIC AREAS, NO SUCH MEN

But this is precisely what our domestic programs have not had—the scientists and program administrators deeply committed to the belief in the fruitful application of technical skills to the problems, for example, of our cities—arguing forcefully for the Research and Development they believe is needed.

Let me give you two—what I consider shocking—examples of the absence of Research and Development in important domestic programs.

The Federal Government has by now put more than $7 billion into public housing in this country, without spending one one-hundredth of 1 percent of that sum either to analyze what the requirements of public housing clients really are, or to design a living unit appropriate for those requirements, or to development of new and lower-cost methods by which these units could be constructed.

The Government is currently putting millions of dollars into urban transportation. But it is failing to develop new systems—of vehicle, propulsion, control, and track—tailored to the requirements of the cities of the 20th century. Instead, when it talks about "new concepts in transit" it usually means minor improvements in essentially the fixed-rail systems developed originally to serve the high-density cities of the 19th century.

We have yet to say to industry: "This is what we require—a system more than competitive with the private automobile on a freeway; able to provide nonstop service from point of origin to point of destination; offering service on demand; with close station spacing; needing minimum right-of-way; with operating costs low enough to produce a profit out of fare collections; and closely integrated with all other modes of travel. Now, what can you develop?"

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS HAVE NOT MOVED AGGRESSIVELY

Why have we not moved more aggressively in these program areas?

A high Government official told the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee in January that it was Congress that must take the lead in decisions about when to move ahead with research and development in particular areas.

In some areas—certainly in research on water pollution control—Congress has done just this and done it well.

Still, I cannot accept the proposition that it is solely Congress job to lead—and to know always when it is time to call for a higher level of research and development effort.

It is precisely the job of the technical experts within the agencies in the executive branch always to be pressing the case for needed research and development, in every way they know how, in every program where they think it can make a significant contribution.

In most of our domestic programs, unfortunately, this has not been done. For years the words "research and development" were not even to be heard from the administrators of our principal domestic programs until one suspected the concept itself had been forgotten.

Moreover, the absence of research and development proposals in the annual budgets of the agencies went largely unquestioned at the top executive office level.

A major reason for the slow progress of research and development in civilian fields, a top Presidential adviser recently told us, is a "lack of solid research and development program proposals." But the same would have been true in your field in the days before sputnik.

YOUR INDUSTRY IS INTERESTED IN CIVILIAN TECHNOLOGY

Firms in your own industry are eager to prove him wrong. Solid research and development proposals will be forthcoming if the Government will only define its goals, firm up its commitment to meet them, and begin dealing with its programs for cities and natural resources in the same way it has dealt with its programs for defense and exploration of space.

Jack Jones of North American Aviation said this last month to our subcommittee in reference to transportation. John Rubel in Litton Industries said it to a conference on "The Troubled Environment" in reference to the development of a new city.

And in California—where first a group of local school districts and now the University of California are beginning to take the performance approach to the development of new schools and student housing—industry is currently proving its interest in these domestic areas with millions of new research and development dollars.

PROSPECTS HAVE BEEN IMPROVING

In fairness I must say that recent developments within the government have been encouraging.

The new planning-programing-budgeting system, which played so large a part in the transformation of the Department of Defense into a research and development-minded agency, is now being installed (if with some pain) in all agencies. As the Bureau of the Budget begins to take what it aptly calls a creative role in program development, the absence of research and development proposals in the domestic programs is increasingly unlikely to go unchallenged.

The Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament—which is concerned, as you know, with the future of your aerospace and defense industries should these Federal programs begin to taper off rapidly—has promised to watch closely to make sure the Government is adequately staffed and appropriately organized to evaluate complex proposals for large-scale research and development related to civilian needs.

Most significant, to my mind: Good progress is being made on an amendment which Congressmen ASHLEY, MOORHEAD, and I have proposed to this year's urban development legislation. It would require the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to submit to the President and to Congress, as soon as possible, a solid research and development program proposal looking toward a breakthrough within 5 years to a really new system of urban transportation—one which will be fully adapted to our modern urban environment and which will, in addition, avoid polluting our atmosphere.

WE NEED YOUR COOPERATION

What I am saying is that I think we stand—Government and industry—with respect to research and development in these domestic programs very much where we stood with respect to defense research and development in, say, 1948 or with respect to space research and development in 1955.

We are about to take off. And I think you will want to be aboard.

The study of high-speed transportation in the northeast corridor—Boston to Washington—and, more recently, the decision to proceed to the construction of prototypes for the supersonic transport, are clear indications of what is to come.

The Director of the Budget told the Joint Economic Committee not long ago that Federal participation in the supersonic transport was justified "because of the unique benefits (it) will bring to the Nation as a whole and because the substantial costs involved are well beyond the capacity of the industry to finance." If this is to be the test, then I am sure—based on the testimony given to our subcommittee—that new systems of urban transport, and the control of pollution in our major river basins, are also going to qualify for the investment of Federal research and development funds.

I urge you, then, to help with the effort to firm up research and development programs in these areas of domestic need—surface transportation, building technology, waste management, urban development.

All these will be, I recognize, at least potential competitors for some of the space projects in which some of you are now engaged.

But they are at the same time alternative opportunities for the employment of your research and development skills. And, I trust, for the profitable employment of these skills.

And only when we have, at last, aggressive and sophisticated programs for the application of research and development resources in the pursuit of all our national goals will we have a basis for deciding, in some rational way, how much is to go for defense, how much for space, and how much for things here at home.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, March 29; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, March 30; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. FALLON.

Mr. MARSH.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the placing of a bust of Constantino Brumidi in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on District of Columbia home rule; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Joint Economic Committee of additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings entitled "Recent Federal Reserve Actions and Economic Policy Coordination"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of the hearings of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico as Senate documents; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10403. An act for the relief of Edward F. Murzyn and Edward J. O'Brien.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2394. An act authorizing the planning, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 29, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2232. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the agricultural conservation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 50 Stat. 329; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2233. A letter from the Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for "General operating expenses," for the fiscal year 1966 had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation because of increased pay costs under Public Law 89–301, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2234. A letter from the District of Columbia representative, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting the annual report of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, pursuant to the provisions of 73 Stat. 76; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2235. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2236. A letter from the chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting lists containing (1) the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board, (2) cases heard and/or decided by the Board, and (3) the fiscal statement showing total obligations and expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2237. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the proposed gift of certain property that will enlarge the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library located at Abilene, Kans., pursuant to the provisions of 44 U.S.C. 397(f); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2238. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of operation of a dairy farm by the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2239. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of practices which resulted in the invalid and other questionable use of fiscal year 1964 appropriation, U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2240. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvement in the management of vehicle utilization, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2241. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination into policies for the recovery of Government expenditures incurred in the management and operation of Indian forest enterprises, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2242. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the management and utilization of Capehart, Wherry, and other Government-owned family housing, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2243. A letter from the Comptroller General of the Army, transmitting a report of review of procedures for measuring national forest timber in the Pacific Northwest region (region 6), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2244. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of economies from making electron tubes available to other Government users, Federal Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2245. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2246. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 23, 1966, the following bill was reported on March 25, 1966:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14012. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 23, 1966, the following bills were reported on March 26, 1966:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3606. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7524. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted March 28, 1966*]

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1804. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8376. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10998. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid; without amendment (Rept. No. 1354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R.11653. A bill to make permanent the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite; without amendment (Rept. No. 1355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12262. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12328. A bill to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty; with amendments (Rept. No. 1357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12461. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12463. A bill to extend until June 30, 1969, the suspension of duty on crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory; without amendment (Rept. No. 1359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12657. A bill to continue the suspension of duty on certan alumina and bauxite; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12864. A bill to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; with amendments (Rept. No. 1361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12997. A bill to extend until July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum; without amendment (Rept. No. 1362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 23, 1966, the following bill was introduced on March 25, 1966:

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 14012. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

[*Submitted March 28, 1966*]

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 14013. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 14014. A bill to amend the Library Services and Construction Act to extend its provisions for 5 years, to restrict its application to rural areas, and to delete the provisions thereof for construction assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 14015. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 14016. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14017. A bill to provide financial and other aid, under the Housing Act of 1949 and related Federal programs, to encourage and assist in the preservation and maintenance of historic structures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14018. A bill to promote and coordinate historic preservation activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, other public bodies, and private organizations and individuals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 14019. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 14020. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 14021. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through September 30, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 14022. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 14023. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 14024. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 14025. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14026. A bill to prohibit insured banks from issuing negotiable interest-bearing or discounted notes, certificates of deposit, or other evidences of indebtedness; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 14027. A bill to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 14028. A bill to establish eligibility for hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration of veterans retired from active military, naval, or air service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14029. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that malignant lymphoma developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 7 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14030. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the east side division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 14031. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the east side division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 983. Joint resolution expressing the approval of Congress for the establishment under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution of an International Center for Advanced Study in the Nation's Capital; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 984. Joint resolution to provide parking facilities, standards for rental housing, and the repair and rehabilitation of residential buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.J. Res. 985. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

432. By the **SPEAKER**: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to

urging enactment of the proposed National Potato Labeling Act as proposed in S. 1058, H.R. 909, and H.R. 2982; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

433. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to opposing H.R. 8282 and urging enactment of alternate legislation proposed which preserves in the States the primary responsibility for the development and administration of the unemployment insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

434. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to granting to veterans of World War I pensions comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 14032. A bill for the relief of Mary Knezovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

357. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Conservative Club of Yonkers, Yonkers, N.Y., relative to an Atlantic Union constitutional convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

358. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors, County of Solano, Fairfield, Calif., relative to a resolution on the passing of the Honorable John Finley Baldwin, Jr.; to the Committee on House Administration.

359. Also, petition of Ralph Boryszewski, Rochester, N.Y., and others, relative to reassignment of an original petition to a Committee on Impeachments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

360. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

361. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors, County of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, relative to hospitalization of veterans in local hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Jim Patton: A Quarter-Century of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to pay a tribute to my good friend Jim Patton. My acquaintance with Jim began in the days when I was helping my father with his congressional responsibilities some 15 or 20 years ago. Like most others, I was surprised to find a farm leader so well informed and so sympathetic to the problems of the urban workers.

When I was elected to Congress 11 years ago, I found Jim a warm and knowledgeable friend.

Jim Patton will be remembered for his distinguished leadership of the Farmers Union for more than a quarter of a century. But he will be remembered for far more than a militant farm leader. He has been a great leader and mover in a host of liberal causes. He will be remembered for his vision, his rare courage, and for his willingness to join in the battle for any just cause where the public interest was involved.

Jim Patton was one of the stalwart leaders in the Roosevelt administration who helped organize the International Food and Agriculture Organization and the other specialized agencies of the United Nations. He was a leader in, and an early president of, the organization of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, a federation of national farm organizations.

He was a leader in the group which sponsored full-employment legislation leading to the Employment Act of 1946 and the creation of the Council of Economic Advisers. His labors on behalf of medicare and the liberalization of the Social Security Act have earned him a secure place in the affection and gratitude of millions of Americans.

He has always been a leader in the efforts to develop the natural resources of this great country of ours in the interests of all the people. And we all are aware of his leadership of international efforts to free the world from hunger; a campaign which led to President Johnson's recent declaration of a worldwide war on hunger.

I join with other Members of Congress who have said, "Voices which champion the cause of the farmer are sorely needed in the United States today and Jim Patton's voice has been heard." We will miss him speaking as the president of the Farmers Union, but I am sure we will continue to have his help on national and international welfare problems.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the fate of the Byelorussian people and their history are so inextricably mixed with that of the Russian people that it is not easy for some to distinguish the two peoples. Their difficulty stems from the unfortunate fact that for centuries the Byelorussians have been subjected to Russian rule, and the Russians have done their utmost to eradicate all Byelorussian national traits and traditions. But the Byelorussians have not forgotten their distinct identity, and they have always wanted to regain their freedom and independence. The year 1918 offered them the opportunity they had long awaited.

In that year, when the despotic czarist regime of Russia was no more, the Byelorussians felt themselves free and proclaimed their national independence on March 25. Then they set up the Byelorussian National Republic, and the 10 million Byelorussians were happy under their own Government. But their independence was of very brief duration. Early in 1921 Soviet forces finally quelled a long and determined resistance, put an end to the independent Byelorussian Republic, and then incorporated the country into the Soviet Union.

Fortunately, that did not mean the end of the spirit of freedom and independence among the Byelorussian people. Even though for more than 45 years they have been enduring the oppressive yoke of totalitarian tyranny, they still cling to their idea of freedom and carry on the struggle for the attainment of their national goal. Mr. Speaker, on the 48th anniversary celebration of their independence we all echo their genuine sentiment and hope that they will attain their objective.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HOWARD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1966 marks the 48th anniversary of independence of a large Eastern European people who are not independent. I doubt if the Byelorussian people are celebrating their independence anniversary tonight except with remembrances for the old and hopes for the young, but we here in free America can pay tribute to these peoples and let them know that as long as we in the United States do not lose our hope and remembrances of days past, their future is not an entirely dark one.

In remembering Byelorussian independence we are in fact remembering a great principle of political man; namely, self-determination. It is a principle and a goal of all democracies, whether actual or theoretical; it is the foundation of the American system of government; it is a thought that ennobles man. Simply, self-determination is the exercise of a basic human right which speaks of organized men determining their own national destiny in dignity and honor.

Self-determination is not a 20th century concept; rather it is as old as man's ability to think rationally about himself, his relations with other humans, and his relationship to his state. Through the centuries the great minds of political philosophy have worked the principle of government, self-determination found its shape in the 18th century enlightenment, which was based on the assumption that men were capable of making rational decisions affecting their personal and national lives.

Here in this country our Colonial Fathers fought for this right in 1776 and the years following, and put the concept into practice with the establishment of a new kind of government in 1789. That constitution stands today as a shining beacon for all who would know that self-determination is a working principle.

That is why we in this country must not lose faith. That beacon must never go out. The Byelorussians saw that light 48 years ago, declared themselves independent and put into motion a government embodying the idea of self-determination. Soviet Russia never permitted those forces of government or the Byelorussian people the opportunity to determine their national destiny.

Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to that nation. Today we hold out the beacon of hope. Today we reassert our own faith in the principle of self-determination. Today we remind the Byelorussian people that that principle will be kept alive long after Soviet colonialism has disappeared from the face of the earth.

Happy Birthday—Congresswoman Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 29, is the birthday of our esteemed and distinguished colleague, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON. She has rendered outstanding service to the Nation over the course of 26 years as a Member of the House. Her work as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has brought her great distinction here at home as well as winning great admiration from many foreign governments with whom our country maintains relations.

Our distinguished colleague has established an equally great record in the field of civic services, particularly public health and nursing, education, and in the social services. My home city of Cleveland has been the beneficiary of our colleague's unique services in all these fields. She has made Cleveland a better place to live for many thousands of families who have been the beneficiaries of her leadership in civic services as well as her generous philanthropies.

I salute my friend and our esteemed colleague, Mrs. BOLTON, for her outstanding work as a Member of Congress and for the tremendous energy and interest she has given to literally hundreds of worthwhile projects in the Greater Cleveland community. I have long regarded her as one of the outstanding women in the United States. I know my esteem for her is shared by my colleagues. On this occasion I extend to her best wishes for a happy birthday and may she have many more years of service to her country and to her fellow man.

Vice Adm. William F. (Red) Raborn Jr. Is Recipient of Forrestal Memorial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night I had the honor of attending the 12th annual Forrestal Memorial Award dinner sponsored by the National Security Industrial Association. The purpose of this association is to maintain a close working relationship and to promote mutual understanding between industry and those agencies of Government responsible for the national defense. The Forrestal Award is given annually in honor of those who have furthered these objectives. A long line of distinguished Americans have received this award, commencing in 1954 with President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Last night's recipient is an outstanding American and a personal friend, Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., better known to his friends as "Red."

"Red" Raborn has had a distinguished career serving his country, beginning in 1924 when he was first appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy. He served in a variety of posts with the Navy during World War II, including operations against enemy forces in the Philippine Islands, the South China Sea, Iwo Jima, and the Japanese homeland.

Admiral Raborn is probably most noted as the Director of Special Projects of the Department of the Navy. In this capacity he was charged with the task of developing a fleet ballistic missile system. His management genius and his leadership resulted in the successful launchings of Polaris missiles in 1960, 2 years ahead of the planned schedule. One of the management systems that he developed in producing the Polaris missile is known as the program evaluation reporting technique, commonly known as PERT. The widespread adoption of this method by large sections of American industry reflect his perception and resourcefulness. "Red" has been the recipient of many awards, both military and civilian, during his career including the Distinguished Service Medal and the Collier Trophy Award, presented by President Kennedy in 1963.

I have long been associated with "Red" Raborn and can think of no man more deserving of the award. Over the years I have known him, I have always admired him as a warm and human man, deeply dedicated to the concept of team work.

After he retired from the Navy in 1963, he accepted a position as vice president of Aerojet-General Corp. I was sad to see my good friend depart from the service of his country, although certainly he had earned the opportunity of spending more time with his family and to provide the larger measure of material things for them which employment in private industry made possible.

As would be expected when the President called on him to return to the service of his country in April 1965 as Director of Cental Intelligence, "Red" responded without hesitation. I was personally delighted that he accepted and brought to the CIA his talents and dedication. He has been totally cooperative and responsive to the needs of the CIA Subcommittee of Armed Services of which I am chairman and has seen to it that this subcommittee has been kept thoroughly and currently informed.

"Red" has applied his highly developed management skills to the direction of the Central Intelligence Agency which plays such a vital part in the defense and security of this Nation. I can attest that he is doing an outstanding job as Director of Central Intelligence and is a credit to this Agency which has had other outstanding Directors in the past. This is small tribute to offer to a man of Admiral Raborn's dedication, patriotism, and loyalty but I hope in some small measure it may contribute to greater recognition that in one of this Nation's most important jobs, the occupant fully deserves the commendation of "well done."

Byelorussian Independence Day: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, after suffering over a century of political servitude at the hands of Tsarist Russia, the people of Byelorussia established an independent Democratic Republic.

The Byelorussian Republic did not have the good fortune to remain independent for long. After 2 years of hard and gallant fighting, the tiny republic was finally overwhelmed by the armies of the new expansionist government of Soviet Russia. Since then the Byelorussians have continued to resist passively, but determinedly, every Communist attempt to Sovietize their nation.

Today Byelorussia is one of the many tiny but proud nations that suffer under the new form of colonialism pursued by the Soviet Union. Despite their domination by the Muscovite Russians during the last two centuries, historically the Byelorussians developed quite separately from the tribes of great Russia. Even today, their culture remains distinctly different from that of the great Russians. As a distinct and different nationality, the Byelorussians suffer from the degradation of their culture and attempts at forced assimilation by the Russian Communist regime.

As a democratic nation which professes a firm belief in the rights of all nations to self-determination, we cannot forget the plight of the Byelorussians. Someday they must have the right to determine their own future free from foreign oppression. It is appropriate that we continue to observe the anniversary of Byelorussian independence every March 25 and renew our support of their right to self-determination.

Problems in Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, commercial loans increase the overheating of the economy. There are ample signs and signals to demonstrate this fact.

New plant investment, which was up last year, is projected for an even greater increase this year; up over 8 billion, which indicates an increase of over 10 percent of our gross national product. For 1966, there will be 80-plus billion in new plant expansion. Why does the first increase in interest rate fail to touch it? There are two very good reasons, both of them tax oriented.

First. A tax incentive credit of 7 percent which is well above the interest rise effect. Second. The Internal Revenue Service ruling of March 1965 allowing full deduction on Federal income tax returns for all loan reserves. This encourages banks to double 1965 commercial loan rates.

It is, therefore, evident that a further increase would only result in its being eventually nullified. Please, Mr. Martin, do not give us any more of your "interest increase meat-tax surgery." Our need is for more selective and precise instruments to do the delicate balancing operation.

May we suggest to the Congress the following: First. Decrease the investment tax credit to where it matches a prime interest rate, say, to 5½ percent. Second. Create a tax increase standby of 1 percent income tax and 2 percent corporate tax.

May we also suggest to the Federal Reserve the following: Decrease the money supply by requiring greater reserves from banks. This action will cause banks to use their available money to purchase Federal Reserve notes to soak up available surplus cash which is now going out in commercial loans.

As we have urged for an increase in money supply for expansion, it is only reasonable that we should call for a decrease to apply the appropriate "braking" action.

Snow Survey for Water Forecasts Beneficial to West and Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, each winter in the high mountain places of the Northwest, there unfolds a kind of silent drama, familiar to few people in most of the Nation, but significant to millions in the West.

This little-known activity is the annual cooperative snow survey coordinated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service.

Snow surveyors go into the mountains periodically from January to May, traveling over permanently designated snow courses, to measure the snow depth and to determine how much water is in it. From these findings come data for water supply forecasting that enable users to plan for and cope with adequate and inadequate water supply during long dry summers, or controlled and uncontrolled runoff during spring thaw.

A year ago, key snow courses throughout my State of Idaho indicated the heaviest snow pack ever recorded. Many courses had more snow-water as of January 1 than occurs for an entire season.

This discovery stimulated special snow surveys near the middle of each succeeding month to determine if the storm patterns were continuing throughout the winter season and to caution the people on impending consequences. The mounting snow data indicated a snow melt that would cause the heaviest volume flows ever recorded on the Salmon, The Big and Little Lost, and the Boise Rivers. The forecasts proved correct and the greatest peak flows ever recorded in 70 years resulted in the rivers.

Forewarned, the private, State and Federal water-using organizations had lowered the water levels in their reservoirs and thereby averted tremendous flood damages in areas below the reservoirs that otherwise might have been inundated.

These annual snow surveys are carried out by specially trained people who travel set schedules over remote areas, using over-snow machines, skies, snowshoes, helicopters, and airplanes.

For this extraordinary work the entire expenditure of money for all purposes by private, State, and Federal sources in Idaho is less than $90,000 a year; yet in Boise, Idaho, alone, it helped to avert $3,513,000 damages last spring.

SCS conservationists and technicians working with them on forecasting problems feel that additional work and instrumentation is necessary to keep up with the increased demands and needs for accurate forecasts of water supply each year.

This is a unique service. It is a needed program. It is appreciated and depended upon by farmers and ranchers of Idaho and the great Northwest, and it is of actual benefit and potential interest to the Nation at large.

I take this means to salute the efforts and achievements of the people in this program who help our western farmers and other water users to cope with their water problems.

The 48th Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the 48th anniversary of independence of the Byelorussian people was observed on March 25, 1966, but it was not a day of great rejoicing but one of hope that some day they will regain their freedom.

It was on March 25, 1918, that the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born but its independence was short-lived and within 3 years complete Russian domination of the new nation was reimposed.

Today the hopes of those who brought the Byelorussian Republic into existence are still alive but their subjugated country now bears the name of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and is wholly unrepresentative of some 18 million people.

So on this day of national commemoration we of the free world join in paying tribute to these courageous people who despite heart-rendering hardships over these many years have not given up their dreams of self-determination once again.

On Sunday, March 27, the Byelorussian-American Association, of which Nicholas Horoshko is national president, observed the 48th anniversary by presenting a commemorative program in the Biltmore Hotel in New York City.

The Byelorussians comprise one of the most important groups of Slavic people in Eastern Europe. Their historic country of 80,000 square miles borders Poland on the west, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia on the northwest, Russia on the north, and the Ukraine on the south.

Early in the 16th century Byelorussia became part of the Russian Empire and remained as such until the Bolshevik Revolution which overthrew the czarist empire in 1917.

Among the non-Russian groups which proclaimed their independence was the Byelorussians and on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian National Republic was established.

But before the Byelorussians, or White Russians as they are also known, had a chance to enjoy the benefits of their victory the Red army overran the country and made it part of the Soviet Union. Byelorussia had been swallowed up in less than 3 years.

So today let us continue our prayers that the day may not be distant when these long suffering people may once again experience the blessings of freedom in their historic homeland.

Future Homemakers of America—More Than Two Decades of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure most Members of this House are aware, we are marking, this week, National FHA Week, as a tribute to the Future Homemakers of America.

There may be some confusion, in that the initials also designate the Federal Housing Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration—both of which are Federal agencies which have made important contributions to the public welfare in rural areas and in the cities—but what we have particularly in mind at this moment is another FHA, composed of young women who will become the wives and mothers of our Nation, within a few years, and many of whom also will undertake additional efforts as teachers, or workers in offices or industrial plants.

It is important to recall, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Future Homemakers of America was founded more than 20 years ago and now consists of more than 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses in 11,000 chapters among the 50 States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Additionally, it is important that we recognize, in saluting these young women this week, that the programs in which they are participating have the official sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education and of the American Home Economics Associations.

With the growing importance, in recent years, of home economics as a serious concern of every homemaker, whether she might live in the city or in the country, it is worthwhile, I think, that we have this annual recognition of the program of the Future Homemakers of America.

Even though I am sure all of these young ladies can make wonderful fudge, we have come to the realization, in recent years, that homemaking—and training in home economics—means much more than learning how to make a good fudge.

I am glad to have this opportunity to commend to the attention of the House the current observance of National Future Homemakers of America Week.

The 48th Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Public ceremonies celebrating this historic occasion were held in many cities throughout the United States.

Last Sunday such a ceremony was held in my district and it was my privilege to speak before an enthusiastic assemblage made up of friends of a free Byelorussia.

Mr. Speaker, by leave previously granted, I include the text of my remarks on Byelorussian Independence Day:

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

I welcome this opportunity to join with you in celebrating this 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

I am proud of the fact that this center of Byelorussian cultural and religious life is located in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

The officers and members of the Cleveland Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association deserve public commendation for their work in promoting the just cause of the Byelorussian nation and for keeping faith with this historic event in the history of a submerged but not forgotten nation of Eastern Europe.

Your work is in harmony with the oldest, the richest, and the most fundamental political ideals of the United States.

As Americans, we are ever mindful that our country is the birthplace of the national independence movement.

Our Declaration of Independence is a powerful testament to mankind's right to be free and self-governing.

From the time it was issued, nearly two centuries ago, the political ideals it proclaimed have inspired people in many distant lands to secure for themselves the same blessings of liberty which we enjoy as a birthright.

It is these same political ideals which bind us in common cause with the people of Byelorussia and the peoples in all the captive nations of Europe and Asia.

There can be no doubt of a strong historic connection between Byelorussian Independence Day, which we celebrate today, and the political ideals of the United States.

During World War I, President Woodrow Wilson annunciated the principle of national self-determination as one of the major planks in his program to establish peace and world order.

That doctrine held then as it does today, that all people have a natural right to be master of their destiny, to freely choose for themselves the form of government best suited to assure their peace and happiness.

The powerful influence of that Wilsonian principle on the fate of empires and the future of self-government is known to every student of history.

It brought about the collapse of the old European empires, including the downfall of the Russian empire.

Nations long submerged in the grip of foreign rule and occupation rose up to demand their rightful place in the community of free nations.

It was in those circumstances that the people of Byelorussia declared their independence on March 25, 1918.

Within a matter of days a provisional constitution was adopted by a broadly representative council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

The provisional constitution guaranteed freedom of speech, of assembly, of conscience, the unviolability of the individual and the home, the right of labor to form unions and to strike for just cause, and equal protection of all citizens under law.

It is worth noting that all of these basic human rights had been denied the people under the absolute system of rule imposed upon them by the Russian czars.

Some 12 foreign nations extended de jure recognition to newly independent Byelorussia and her future in the community of nations seemed assured.

In less than 1 year the happy era of Byelorussian independence was ended by armed aggression launched by the Red regime which had seized control of the Russian nation.

Thus Byelorussia became the first victim of Communist aggression.

Other newly independent nations soon thereafter became the victims of that same aggression.

Today Byelorussia is occupied by a foreign power, foreigners are in control at all levels of the government imposed upon the people.

There is no self-government, there is no freedom of speech, of assembly, or of conscience; neither the individual nor the home is protected from the unchecked power of the State, labor has no rights and the law of Moscow is no more than the claims of the new imperialism of communism.

But aggression and foreign occupation has not been able to break the spirit of Byelorussion people or to weaken their aspirations for freedom and a restoration of their national independence.

They resist the foreign commissars today just as they resisted the rule of the tsars in past generations.

Their commitment to the cause of human freedom is unbreakable.

It is that spirit which forms the bond of common cause between them and the people of the United States.

That is why the people of Byelorussia are the proven allies of the United States in our struggle to establish a peaceful world in which all nations and people will be masters of their destiny.

Today—at this very hour—our Nation is standing up in defense of the principle of self-determination, the right of all peoples to freely chose the form of government best suited to assure their peace and happiness.

It is for that ideal, and that ideal alone, that we defend the people of free Vietnam.

In that distant land the organized forces of Communist aggression are attempting to impose by force of arms, the same system of terror and tyranny that today afflicts the Byelorussian homeland.

Forty-seven years ago it was open war and aggression which robbed the Byelorussian people of their national independence.

Today that same aggression carries out its evil purposes under the misleading banner of a so-called National Liberation Front in Vietnam.

But the objective is the same—to destroy human freedom and to impose a foreign dictatorship upon all of Vietnam.

No amount of camouflage or propaganda can alter this harsh fact of life.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, exposed the true nature of the conflict in Vietnam.

By unchallenged documentation he laid bare the conspiracy of Hanoi to subvert and occupy the entire Vietnam nation.

He established the so-called National Liberation Front as the military and terroristic arm of the Hanoi Communist regime.

He left no doubt that the conflict in Vietnam is a result of Communist aggression and that our purpose was to meet and turn back that aggression.

President Johnson has made it clear that we will stand by our commitments to defend the people of free Vietnam.

He has made a determined effort to negotiate a peaceful settlement of that war but the aggressors have responded with demands that amount to a complete surrender of freedom's cause.

Nevertheless, there now can be no question as to the cause of war in Vietnam, what we are fighting for and why Communist aggression must be turned back in southeast Asia.

Events of our lifetime have taught us that armed aggression unchecked can start a chain reaction which could lead to all-out war on a global scale.

The appetite of the aggressor cannot be satisfied by immoral concessions.

The keepers of the peace have always been leaders of courage who made bold decisions on the side of freedom and justice when confronted with a crisis.

President Johnson has demonstrated that courage and has made the decisions to meet and stop aggression.

The goal of our Nation has always been a peaceful world, a world in which justice prevails over the affairs of nations and of mankind.

The journey toward that goal has never been easy, nor will it be easy in the future.

But we are committed to that goal and we must pursue it with the confidence that free men have always had when faced with adversity.

In the pursuit of that goal justice will come to the Byelorussian nation and to all other nations now deprived of their right to self-government.

Tyranny cannot long delay the demands of justice.

I salute the Byelorussian people for their commitment to the cause of human freedom.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 25, marked the 48th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia and it was observed by the Byelorussian Americans in Chicago on Sunday, March 27.

March 25 is the symbol of unity, freedom, independence, and democracy for the Byelorussian people everywhere; however, only in the free world can the Byelorussian people keep these ideals alive and continue their hope for a truly independent Byelorussia. Each year, on the anniversary of their independence day, the Byelorussians in the free world are reminded to strive in a united tradition to achieve the independence of the Soviet dominated Byelorussian nation.

I am happy to join with my colleagues in the House and Senate on commemorating this important day. We who know the blessings of liberty will continue our efforts to secure that liberty for all men.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, when we hail the anniversary of Byelorussian independence we do not have in mind a celebration for the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, a so-called constituent republic of the Soviet Union. We honor instead the tragically shortlived Byelorussian Democratic Republic as it was proclaimed on March 25, 1918. The loudly proclaimed independence of that area, insisted upon at the United Nations by the Soviet Union to gain support for what was to be a series of negative positions by the Soviets in that organization, is a travesty on the true independence of spirit of the Byelorussian people. That independence has been maintained not because of, but in spite of the Soviet Union.

Overrun for centuries by the neighboring Russians, Byelorussia was never willingly a part of their territory or sympathetic with its neighbors to the east. Superior in development and culture, its civilization was much older than that of the Russia which sought to absorb it.

Despite all efforts of its neighbors at domination, Byelorussia has remained separate in its allegiance and true to its own national traditions. It has remained an entity, preserving its identity and its independence of spirit against all efforts to Russify and to Sovietize it.

Though its richer resources have been the envy of the rapacious on its boundaries, they have also been the basis for the higher degree of civilization which the Byelorussians enjoy. Superior as they have been in social, economic, and cultural development, their spirit of individual and national independence is also a product of this refinement.

It was this true love of freedom and loyalty to ethnic origins and native characteristics which led to their brief but real independence, proclaimed 48 years ago. Despite outward political adversity, the spirit of liberty which manifested itself at that time is alive today. That is the true independence which we celebrate today.

What the Adult Health Protection Act Will Mean to Optometry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the American Optometric Association luncheon at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., on March 24, 1966:

WHAT THE ADULT HEALTH PROTECTION ACT WILL MEAN TO OPTOMETRY

(By Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY at the American Optometric Association, Washington, D.C., Mar. 24, 1966)

Thank you for your invitation to participate in the American Optometric Association's Conference on Aid to the Visually Limited. While I would have been happy to attend this luncheon under any circumstances, I must admit that your invitation did reach me at the proper psychological moment. I was just putting some finishing touches on a bill I was about to introduce on the House floor to be known as the Adult Health Protection Act of 1966.

The bill calls for the establishment of adult health protection centers at which persons over 50 would be given free a battery of tests designed to detect abnormalities and diseases at an early stage. And, included among the diseases or conditions to be tested under this program is vision impairment.

It is obvious that no age group in our Nation has a greater need for vision care than the millions who have passed their 50th year. And it takes little analysis, by and large, to determine that a major proportion of this group is not adequately prepared financially to translate this urgent need into realization.

While no one can predict accurately the appropriate interval at which our older people should have an eye examination, I believe your association recommends that a complete eye examination and visual analysis should be seriously considered at least every other year. It is true that those who wear glasses may not need a change of lenses that often, but examination at regular intervals is definitely essential. The screening examination for early signs of visual impairment that is provided for in my bill will act as a forerunner to referral to professional practitioners for those who require such services.

When I talk to a gathering of this nature—a group of professionals—I always do a little homework beforehand to acquaint myself with the aims and objectives of the group, and to reinforce my knowledge of the profession, its practices, its impact on the Nation's health, and what it is doing or might do to further the health goals of the Nation.

But I should note that, in this instance, my homework was a matter of reacquaintance—a refresher course, if you will. I had delved deeply and at great length into the field of optometry in the past several years when we were working to include schools of optometry and optometric students in the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and its amendments.

I believe you and I were equally gratified when we won our case, and schools of optometry became eligible for construction grants and grants to improve educational program quality; we were equally gratified when students at these schools became qualified for benefits from the student assistance features of the legislation—student loans and Federal support for scholarships.

To return to my earlier statement: during my "homework" period, I came again to a little volume edited by Drs. Monroe Hirsch and Ralph Wick, titled "Vision of the Aging Patient—An Optometric Symposium."

While I was quite aware of your profession's interest in the aging and aged, I had not realized how far that interest reached back into time. Dr. Henry Hofstetter's introduction, for example, reminded me that "Optometry, perhaps longer than any other professional group, has had specific concern with aging," and traced that concern back for some 500 years. And, while Dr. Hofstetter cited the age of 40 as a clinical point of demarcation between young and old, I was especially interested when he wrote that "* * * from a purely physiological point of view, 50 to 55 years of age would have been a more logical point of demarcation."

This certainly added validity to my choice of the half-century mark as the age at which our adult population would become eligible for the services of our proposed adult health protection centers.

And Dr. Vincent Ellerbock, writing about partial vision: "It now is apparent that both cataract and glaucoma are subject to detection and care and in a great majority of cases need not produce any serious loss of vision." This statement certainly fortified my belief that detection—followed by the application of preventive measures—spelled out the most practicable way to assure the continued health and well-being of our aging generations.

My reading produced one other plum. The value of proper eye care for our older people has rarely been expressed more succinctly than by Dr. Ethel Percy Andrus, then president of the American Association of Retired Persons. In the foreword to Drs. Hirsch and Wick's symposium, Dr. Andrus noted in part "the increased provision for eye care and the early detection and control of eye disabilities is one of the important trends in the current nationwide movement for the welfare of the aged. The human need for protecting the eyesight of the elderly cannot be magnified. Preserving for them their vision opens for them opportunities for more abundant living, and so assures for them wider dimensions of health and enjoyment."

I believe you can understand more readily now why I am pleased to appear here today, and most grateful for the invitation to join you.

I note that this conference will deal with the identification of visually limited individuals—how to serve not only their visual needs, but also their social and economic needs; and how to effect their proper care. This overall concept, as it relates to obtaining treatment for the less affluent of our aging citizens, moves hand in hand with that of my bill.

In 1956, when I recommended a White House Conference on Aging, I said that "aging touches or pervades most aspects of American life today; urban and rural living; wages, salaries, pensions, insurance, and other affairs of our economy; biological and psychological fields; and civic and political matters."

In 1957, shortly after its establishment, the special staff on aging of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated the problem in a slightly different manner: "We must help older people * * * to employ better the skills, the experiences, and the resources they have gained over a lifetime. To the extent we succeed in meeting this challenge, we shall have built a tremendous reservoir of strength for the Nation. Otherwise, the growing number of older people * * * will become an overwhelming social, medical, and financial burden on their children, the community, and the total economy."

The progress that has been made in the intervening years is a source of pleasure for all of us. Many opportunities have been afforded our older citizens for increasing their self-sufficiency and continuing their usefulness to the community. And yet, the task of deriving the utmost from their full potential remains a substantial one.

Admittedly, we are doing a great deal to make it possible for more of our elderly people to live healthier and more productive lives. But much more remains to be done in this area, and it is here that the impact of the Adult Health Protection Act will be felt. Only by early identification and subsequent control of disease and prevention of illness and disability can we begin to keep our adult population in a state of good health that will enable them to sustain a potential we will find it worthwhile to tap.

The bill I have introduced is an outgrowth of an idea I expressed last fall when I helped dedicate Cranston, R.I.'s first low-rent housing development for the elderly. I stressed at that time the urgent need for long-term comprehensive care for the elderly—an entire program of services to provide all the needs of life. I called that concept living care.

At about the same time, on the Senate floor, Senator Harrison Williams, of New Jersey, reminded his listeners that the dramatically increasing numbers of our aged and aging population presented a "growing problem with special significance for chronic diseases." His program was called preventicare.

Acting independently, but with the same long-term goals in mind, Senator Williams and I had come to the same conclusion.

What we are proposing—I know that most of you are aware that Senator Williams has introduced a similar bill in the Senate—is that it be the sense of the Congress that "the Federal Government has a duty to assist the adult population of the United States, particularly the aged and the aging, in protecting, maintaining, and improving their health."

Specifically our aim is to launch a genuine nationwide preventive medicine campaign, in the form of a $60 million, 3-year demonstration program, including training and research, in health protection centers. Having fought—and to a great extent won—the battle against infectious diseases, we consider it most logical to combat the chronic diseases with the same kind of aggressive, thoroughgoing, and determined approach. Experience has shown us that complete prevention can be attained in many instances and that disability, crippling, and premature death can be delayed by preventive methods and techniques.

Through grants, we would encourage and assist the planning, establishment, and operation of 5 regional and 20 community adult health protection centers; provide assistance for training the essential manpower that would ultimately be involved; and assist in conducting research related to the centers and their operation.

The health protection centers would make available to any person over 50, on a voluntary basis, a series of basic tests that would detect abnormalities in the cardiovascular, respiratory, gastrointestinal, genitourinary, and musculoskeletal systems, as well as defects in metabolism and in the organs of special sense.

The tests would be administered by qualified technicians, nurses, and other medical specialists, using automated equipment capable of providing rapid and reliable results. These results, available within a matter of a few hours, would be referred to the individual's private physician or, where the individual had none or was indigent, would be referred as determined by local practitioners.

I want to repeat that in every case the results of screening tests would be forwarded to a practicing physician. I am emphasizing this feature of the program because some people who have only scanned our proposal have the misconception that the centers are to be diagnostic and treatment centers.

This is not the case. Where treatment is indicated, the function of the center staff will be to assure that the patient is properly referred and brought under a doctor's care. And in those cases where the screening tests reveal no sign of incipient disease, test results will still be forwarded to a physician, since they will provide a firm basis for any future complete physical examination, whenever accomplished.

In passing, a word or two about the application of automation to health checkups. Probably the best-known program is that of the Kaiser-Permanente Group, operating in the Oakland, Calif., area, which has supplied much concrete evidence of the value and practicability of automated preliminary health tests. For those of you who might like more specifics on automation in a health program setting, I refer you to the published writings of Dr. Morris F. Collen, director of medical methods research for Permanente.

My correspondence tells me that automated multitest screening programs are presently in operation on a limited basis in Michigan, Indiana, and here in the District of Columbia, generating great interest because of their ability to discover ailments in apparently healthy people before any symptoms make their appearance. In a dozen other instances, States, universities, and individual communities are contemplating use of a similar technique.

An audience of this nature has humanitarian as well as a professional interest in people and their good health. Because of this double-barreled interest, I emphasize to you the importance of this proposed program. We have made great progress in advancing the cause of our older citizens, but our entire investment to date—although it represents many, many millions of dollars—although it has broken new paths and added new dimensions—will lose a great deal of its meaning if we do not do more to help our aging population to anticipate their golden years. We must do everything within our power to make certain that more and more of our citizens reach that period of their lives with a clean bill of health.

I sincerely believe that the program we are recommending represents the surest and most practical way to accomplish this. Certainly more aging people stand a chance to do so if their medical histories reflect concerted preventive action against those disabilities that cause so many of them misery and untold suffering today.

There is still another preventive angle that is implicit in this program, and that is a human and psychological one. Properly utilized, this program will prevent an incalculable number of our aging citizens from entering into the isolated and secluded type of existence that has been their portion so often in the past. On the contrary, by bolstering their sense of well-being, it will help them to add their renewed vigor and experience to a host of community projects from which their personal dividend will be better and more substantial lives.

A New York Herald Tribune editorial of a few weeks back stated that "Only now is it widely realized that the health of an individual or a family is not simply a private affair, that preventable illnesses and death due to ignorance and neglect are a waste of the Nation's most precious resource—its people." I could not have asked for a better articulation on the basis of my concern for our aging people. And I am heartened to find that many of our leading physicians have expressed their agreement with our plan wholly, in principal, and almost without exception in design.

With medicare, we began to apply the Golden Rule to the golden years. Our proposed program—The Adult Health Protection Act of 1966—conceives of the years after 50 as the time to make certain that more of our citizens will enter the golden years in full possession of their faculties, physical and mental. We consider it a logical extension of medicare.

I am encouraged by the support that our proposal has gained thus far. I have great respect for those who may oppose it in good conscience. To those who cry "creeping socialism," I can only say that every man is due his personal prejudices. In this regard, I believe all of you know that my prejudices are in accord with those of President Johnson, whose health proposals this year set as the Nation's goal: "Good health for every citizen to the limits of our country's capacity to provide it."

I have no doubts as to this country's capacity to provide the health opportunities that the Adult Health Protection Act contemplates. The need for the program is urgent; the technology for the program is at hand. I am confident that the Congress—with the expressed support of professional organizations such as yours—will make the right choice.

Speech of Congressman W. R. Poage at the National Convention of Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 14 in Denver, Colo., our distinguished colleague, the honorable W. R. (Bob) Poage delivered an exceptionally fine speech to the national convention of the Farmers Union. For as long as I have known him, I have been impressed that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] has in his mind the finest storage of knowledge of things agricultural of any man in the country. Had his views prevailed over the years agriculture would be in a much better economic position than it is today.

I commend to each Member of the Congress a careful perusal of Mr. Poage's outstanding speech, a copy of which it is my privilege to insert in the Record:

Speech of Congressman W. R. Poage at the National Convention of Farmers Union, March 14, 1966, in Denver, Colo.

Mr. Chairman and my friends, you have honored me by including me on your program at this historic meeting. When I was first invited, I realized that this meeting would be at a time when I should be in Washington, and the closer we have approached the meeting date the more pressing have become the demands at Washington, but when I was told that this would probably be the last meeting at which Jim Patton would preside as president, I decided that I was going to be present—and now that I am here I am more convinced than ever that this is where I wanted to be today.

Frankly, I am glad to be here because I look upon Jim Patton as a fine and worthy personal friend of more than a quarter of a century. Jim Patton is a great man, as all who know him can attest, but entirely apart from the personal features, I would want to attend this meeting because I feel that it marks the opening of a different era in agriculture—not one based upon any conflict with Mr. Patton's views—probably one based upon a great deal of the very effective work that he has done over the past generation, but nevertheless, a completely different era.

Historically, Jim Patton, more than any other man in the United States, has been recognized as the spokesman for higher farm income. Though I have often disagreed with him as to the most effective means of obtaining his objective, I have never disagreed with him as to his goal—a better living for farmers everywhere.

We are still plagued with the same questions as to how we can best attain an increase in farm income, but we have made considerable progress. We have not solved our problems and we never will because these problems are just like the problems of making a crop. They are new each year. We have, however, as I see it, made far more progress than we, ourselves, sometimes realize. In the relatively short time since I went to Congress we have observed a complete revolution not only in our methods of production but even more in our pattern of rural life. And certainly while we have lost much of value, we have also made great strides in the living conditions of our rural people.

I am old enough and I lived close enough to the frontier to have hauled water in barrels on a sled from the stock tank to serve our domestic needs. I have seen our roads change from axle-deep mud to paved highways. I have seen our rural homes electrified, and I have seen the old woodpile replaced with bottled gas, and the surrey, or more often the wagon with a few chairs and quilts in it, replaced by an automobile of some type. All of this is certainly tangible evidence that the living standards of the American farmer have been improved and they will continue to improve, but the point which disturbs us today is that these living standards have not improved as rapidly as have standards or opportunities in our urban centers.

This is due solely to the fact that farm income has not increased as rapidly as has urban income and is not today comparable with the income of the city worker. As a result, rural areas have been and still are losing population at an alarming rate. We are likely to be misled if we look only to the improved circumstances of those who remain on our farms. We must remember that there are fewer people on our farms. But surely it is no answer to suggest that we should try to reduce the living standard of our urban friends or to slow down the progress of industry or of industrial workers.

On the contrary, we live in an era of interdependence. Agriculture cannot succeed without a successful development of industry and urban citizens. We know that unless our neighbors in the cities have adequate buying power that our farm people will not have an adequate market. Probably our greatest challenge today is to show our urban neighbors that agriculture is not yet receiving its fair share of the national income. I am one of those who believe the American people are fair; that when they know the facts, they will deal fairly with their fellows.

I think I can understand why the housewife who sees the price of groceries going up very naturally complains that the farmers are charging too much. Of course, that housewife does not realize that she is today buying more and better food for a smaller percentage of her family's expendable income than did any people anywhere at any time in history. Right now I believe Americans are spending just over 18 percent of their income for food. In Western Europe it takes 25 to 30 percent and in the Soviet Union it takes about 50 percent, while in India and Red China it takes from two-thirds to three-quarters of the family's total earnings just to buy the grossly inadequate food to which these people are accustomed. I think, therefore, that it is clear that American consumers, far from being mistreated or overcharged, are a most favored group. But, on the other hand, I hope that we can all agree that it should be our purpose to continue to provide food and fiber on highly favorable terms.

To do this our farmers must be assured of adequate and stable markets. We have heretofore tried on the one hand to keep our production of farm products at reasonable and adequate levels, but on the other hand we have tried to maintain fair but not excessive prices. This is really all that our farm programs have ever sought to accomplish and certainly if we could accomplish this, any program would be a success.

Last October Congress passed a basically equitable farm bill—one which made substantial changes in the involvement of the Government in American agriculture—one which opened the door to more competitive agriculture and at the same time substantially protected the income of our farmers. We all knew that the bill was no panacea. Indeed, it did not even represent a consensus of opinion on the subject. It simply reflected the fact that here we had the best compromise of conflicting views which could, under the circumstances, be secured. Possibly the fact that no group or individual is entirely satisfied with its provisions is a good thing. It proves that the democratic process is still working and that no one can dictate to this Nation.

Whether this program will hurt or help us as individuals must depend in a large part on the way it is administered, and with no desire to question any individual's sincerity, I must point out that I have already had to question several phases of the administration of this bill. I think that the Department has, unfortunately, misinterpreted and misapplied it, but the guidelines of the bill move a long way from the old and discredited idea of production for the loan, although they do not go as far as some of us would like for them to go.

I have often stated that I would like to see cotton and other commodities sell for whatever they would bring in the markets of the world and have the Government make up the difference between such a free price and a fair return to the producer, just as we have long done with wool. This bill does not go that far, but it does go far enough that the bulk of most of our crops are going to move into the market rather than into storage, and the public is going to save billions of dollars in unneeded storage.

But the basic problems of American agriculture are still just what they have been for a number of years. They resolve around our ability to produce more food, feed, and fiber than can be disposed of at profitable levels. Farmers, like all other producers, must receive enough for their product to pay all costs plus enough to maintain at least some kind of minimum living standards. In a completely free economy it is difficult for producers, and especially for the producers of agricultural products, to receive enough for their products to even recover production costs in those years when the volume of production exceeds the volume of demand.

Unfortunately, the need for some kind of governmental intervention has been most clearly recognized and, indeed, most effectively used by some of those who have historically been most critical of farmers for seeking any type of governmental control. Probably the best illustration of the necessity of governmental intervention is seen in the operation of our private power companies.

Like other utilities they long ago recognized the futility of producing more power than the market would take or of building unnecessary or duplicating facilities to serve a limited market. Although we are very likely to find their spokesmen insisting that everybody else should live in a world of complete and unlimited competition, very few of these spokesmen would for a moment volunteer to meet unlimited competition in the field of electrical energy. On the contrary, they recognize that investment in duplicating unneeded generation and distribution is unsound and in the long run that such investment imposes a needless burden on the public. And they can be found at the head of the line demanding governmental protection of their geographical monopolies.

I need not tell a Farmers Union audience that it is just as unsound to produce two bales of cotton where only one is needed as it is to put two lines of electric poles down the streets of Denver, and that it is just as unsound to buy a combine to handle wheat for which there is no market as it is to build an unneeded electrical generating plant. And I don't think that I need dwell upon the necessity of balancing supply with demand. I trust that we can accept this need as an economic fact.

What we must do now is to look into the future. How can we expand the demand for farm products? Only by expanding demand can we build a permanently greater agriculture—one in which more people can enjoy more of the good things of life. An expanded demand for agricultural products benefits not only the producer but the consumer of those products.

I think we can all agree that our first responsibility and our first opportunity is to supply the consumers of the United States with all of the food and fiber they need. Basically, we are doing this but there are still ill-fed and ill-clothed people right here at home. Probably the greatest domestic expansion should be anticipated in the consumption of fiber, both wool and cotton, and in the consumption of the high protein foods—primarily dairy and livestock products. In these fields we need an opportunity for all to share.

I think that the proposed restrictions on the school milk program and the school lunch programs are ill advised. I am not one who believes that our Government should take over the responsibility of the family grocery bill. I prefer to see people work for what they get, but I do challenge the validity of the argument that we should abandon the school milk program because it ofttimes makes milk available to children whose parents could pay for it. If we were to accept this new and restrictive philosophy, it seems to me that we must abandon our whole public school concept.

The public schools of America were founded on the assumption that every child, rich or poor, is entitled to an education at public expense. I think this is a sound concept and I think that the school lunch and school milk programs have pretty well become a part of our public free school concept. If they have, there should be no discrimination against the rich, but even assuming that this might carry us too far, I think we will agree that we should never subject a group of our children to the stigma of pauperism in any of the activities of any of our free schools.

And when you go any further than we are now going in separating those who are able to pay and those who are not able to pay, I think you are going to establish an unfortunate and very undesirable class or caste system in our schools. I would far rather say that some who could pay do not than to say that some who should get the benefit of these programs should be denied.

But the fact remains that after we have provided all of the food and all the fiber that is needed for all the people of the United States, we still have the productive ability to feed and clothe a great many more people. Certainly not all the needy of the world, but a great many more than we have in our own country, and we will all agree, I am sure, that it should be our purpose to use this productive ability for the benefit of our farmers and for the benefit of those who need our production.

Normally, about one-fourth of our agricultural production is exported. Of course, in the case of wheat the percentage is much greater. In the case of corn the percentage is lower, but by any standard our export market is vital to our domestic agriculture. For a number of years we have moved approximately one-third of our agricultural exports under what we have come to know as Public Law 480. While we have received lots of foreign currency and some dollars under this program, we have, by and large, looked to the American Government to provide the funds needed to purchase these commodities from our farmers. Right now there is a lot of talk, and I am afraid some overly optimistic talk, that we are going to be able to suddenly make a 180 degree turn and abandon all production controls as a result of a program of feeding and clothing the world, which effort will, allegedly, in some manner use all of our agricultural productivity.

Certainly I recognize that there has been a decided improvemet in the position of our wheat and our feed grain surpluses. Indeed, they are fast approaching a desirable relationship. Certainly I recognize, as every thinking person does, that the population explosion in many of the nations of the world is creating a tremendous demand for agricultural commodities. I think there is some possibility that we can produce and distribute more American commodities for use in meeting this demand and at the same time help both American producers and hungry and underdeveloped people in other parts of the world—and like each of you—I want to move just as far as we can in this direction. This will, however, be possible only in the event that we can achieve a far better balance between production and demand than we now have at home.

Certainly we are not going to deliberately increase our production of cotton, for instance, when we have 14 million bales of surplus staring us in the face. Certainly we are not going to deliberately return to the production of enough wheat and feed grains to rebuild the surpluses that we have worked so hard to eliminate. Certainly no tax conscious Congress or administration would deliberately impose the added cost of additional production on our taxpayers while we are still paying storage on stupendous quantities of unused farm products. In other words, we have got to make the present law work. We have got to cut down our existing surpluses still further before we can begin to dream of the happy days when all farm production will be uncontrolled.

Then we have got to recognize and accept the fact that if we are going to use any substantially larger share of our agricultural production in the feeding of underdeveloped people, that the Government is going to have to pay the difference between a fair price for the production of these commodities and the price which the underdeveloped people can pay. Definitely they cannot pay on the American basis. A man who is making 30 cents a day can't buy much 30-cent cotton or two-bit pork, and yet I don't think that there are many who would want to urge that our American farmers should have to produce and sell on a 30-cent-a-day basis.

Actually, the only hope that I can see for any immediate substantial increase in the use of food and fiber for the underdeveloped people is to finance it through the aid of our Government. This is, of course, what our committee is working on in its consideration of the reorganization and modification of the present Public Law 480, and what has recently been termed food-for-freedom program. This is no recently discovered shortcut to unlimited domestic production or prosperity and, even at the risk of being misunderstood, I feel I must warn that this proposal definitely does not justify the highly bullish psychology of some farmers. If this engenders widespread false hopes, it could do incalculable harm.

The 480 program originally consisted of three titles. Title I provides for the sale of our agricultural commodities for local currencies. It also provides for the gift and loan of such currencies back to the purchasing governments. In past years this program has served well but in many countries of the world, particularly those in greatest need of our commodities, the volume of this local currency or counterpart now held by the United States is getting completely out of hand. Neither this country nor the purchasing countries can allow these funds to build up much further.

Titles II and III both relate to giving food to needy people. This concept will undoubtedly be retained in principle and rather large quantities of grain will doubtless continue to be shipped to India to meet the existing famine conditions there, but these titles offer no longtime or commercial market for our commodities.

Title IV, which was added to the original bill as the Poage amendment, provides for the sale of our surplus agricultural products for dollars on longtime credit and at attractive interest rates. Frankly, I think we are going to have to remove the requirement that the products be in surplus and that we are going to have to make our credit terms even more favorable, but I think it is good to go just as far as we can toward assuring the United States of the ultimate dollar payment for as much of this food as can be sold, and that is basic to the concept now being considered by the Agriculture Committee.

As the nations of the world develop economically we can sell more food for dollars and for cash. Just a few years ago Japan was buying surplus food for local currency, but today Japan is our best cash dollar market. We are, however, if we are to expand our production, going to have to realize that for a long time to come we will be selling much of that production in the underdeveloped countries on a concession basis, and we are going to have to recognize that there are very formidable limits as to the amount we can move on such basis and on the amount of food and fiber that these underdeveloped countries can receive and distribute, even if it were all supplied as a gift.

Right now there is a serious question as to whether we can move any substantially increased volume of food into India. India clearly needs larger quantities of food. We have the food. We are willing to give it to meet famine emergencies but are the ports and transportation facilities within India adequate to move much more than we are now sending? In any event, this donation program is no longtime solution of either their problem or ours. Only by increasing productivity in the underdeveloped countries can we or they hope that they will be able to meet their dietary needs, and right here seems to be one of the most practical opportunities that I can see for the mutual benefit of both the United States and our hungry friends.

As I see it, this opportunity lies in the substitution of food for fiber in the productive pattern in India. India presently devotes about 20 million acres to the production of cotton—about 8 million more acres than the United States used last year, although India produces a good deal less cotton. We have far greater reserves of cotton than of any other agricultural product. We have called upon our cotton producers to cut their acreage to a much greater degree than the acreage of any other crops has been cut. Indeed, we have dropped froom a maximum of 43 million acres down to a probable 10 million acres this year. I recognize that no country can make a complete and abrupt change on any such scale as would be involved in the complete elimination of cotton production in India, but I know of no reason why the farmers of India could not be reasonably expected to reduce their cotton acreage by at least as much as American farmers reduce their cotton acreage in the year of 1966 as compared with last year. Apparently this reduction is going to amount to at least one-third.

If India would make such a reduction and devote what has been cotton land to the production of food, her own economy would be greatly strengthened. In turn the United States could supply cotton under the same favorable terms that we are presently supplying wheat. Both countries would be benefited.

I don't know how far we could carry this idea but it is true that the four largest recipients of American food aid—India, Brazil, Egypt, and Pakistan—are all substantial cotton producers, yet they are all deficit producers of needed food. To me it seems to make a lot of sense to suggest that they get out of the production of a commodity of which we have such substantial surpluses and produce at least a larger part of the food they need at home.

One of the most widespread fallacies indulged in by Americans in connection with our aid to foreign countries seems to me to stem from a misunderstanding of the basic nature of foreign trade. Altogether too many people take the position that if we help foreign nations increase their own production that they will become less attractive markets for American products. History proves just the reverse. The more advanced and prosperous nations provide the better markets. Canada's production parallels our own, but Canada is our second best customer. Canada has only half the population of Mexico but she buys 5 times as much goods from the United States—10 times as much per capita. She does so because she has buying power. If we expect to sell to the nations of the world, we must help them develop buying power. Our farmers can't make a living selling to a country with a 30 cents a day wage scale.

At the end of the war we could do nothing except give aid to western Europe and Japan. Their productivity was paralyzed. Their living standards were very low. With our help they restored their industry and their agriculture. They raised their living standards. They are now buying our goods and paying cash for them.

Need for our products does not of itself create a market for our products. Basically, we must, from a selfish as well as a humanitarian standpoint, help these nations build their own purchasing power. There is a great opportunity to use American agricultural production and I think it can be made much greater as the world develops the ability to pay for our products, but I think it would be a great mistake for you to indulge in the assumption that we are standing on the verge of some newly discovered outlet for American products that will enable us to remove all of our controls over agriculture.

We should feed and clothe a larger part of the world's population, and we will do so, but we will do so only as the American farmer is assured of a fair and reasonable share of the national income in return for his investment and labor because if he doesn't get such a fair share, he is going to be forced to devote his talents—even more in the future than he has in the past—to other activities. It takes a lot of capital; it takes a lot of brains to produce cheap food and fiber, and in this modern economy of ours you can't get either capital or brains in large quantities unless you can offer a reasonable financial reward. That is why city people as well as rural people—indeed, even more than rural people—must be vitally concerned with the maintenance of sound farm programs and, of course, that is why the Farmers Union, and all other farm organizations that really represent farmers, must be concerned, as you are, with the development of sound programs for the movement of food and fiber to the people all over the world.